UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20580

By Facsimile and First Class Mail

January 18, 2002

The Honorable Lisa Murkowski
Chair, House Labor and Commerce Committee
Alaska House of Representatives
Alaska State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Re: Alaska Senate Bill 37

Dear Representative Murkowski:

We write in response to your request for comment on Alaska Senate Bill 37, a bill that seeks to authorize competing physicians to engage in collective bargaining with health plans over fees and other terms.(1) As discussed below, the Commission has opposed legislation before the U.S. Congress that would create an antitrust exemption for physician collective bargaining, and the Commission staff has expressed similar concerns about bills before state legislatures. cn 70.56 432 470.8

significantly increase health care costs and harm consumers.

You also specifically solicited our opinion on whether the bill meets the legal test of the state action doctrine. As you know, state economic regulation can immunize private parties from federal antitrust liability, but only where the displacement of competition furthers a clearly articulated policy of, and is actively supervised by, the state government. In the case of Senate Bill 37, the level of government involvement described falls far short of the level of "active supervision" required by the Supreme Court.

I. Physician Collective Bargaining

The Commission's opposition to legislation intended to create an antitrust exemption for physician collective bargaining has historically focused on two fundamental points, both of which are relevant to your consideration of Senate Bill 37:

alternatives to accepting the collective demands of health care providers for higher fees. The effect of the bill . . . can be expected to extend to various parties, and in various ways, throughout the health care system:

- Consumers and employers would face higher prices for health insurance coverage.
- Consumers also would face higher out-of-pocket expenses as copayments and other unreimbursed expenses increased.
- Consumers might face a reduction in benefits as costs increased.
- Senior citizens participating in Medicare HMOs would face reduced benefits . . . .
- The federal government would pay more for health coverage for its employees through the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program and military health programs.
- State and local governments would incur higher costs to provide health benefits to their employees.
- State Medicaid programs attempting to use managed care strategies to serve their beneficiaries could have to increase their budgets, cut optional benefits, or reduce the number of beneficiarif coulenefdy <</MCID sciar-1(be3(er

Arguments that consumers would not be harmed by an antitrust exemption for collective bargaining by independent health care professionals appear to rest on assertions that the [federal] bill would balance the bargaining power between health care professionals and health plans. These assertions, however, are incorrect. The bill would permit doctors to create monopolies. On the health plan side of the ledger, the evidence does not support the suggestion that most (or even many) areas have only one or two health plans.(8)

Furthermore, even if the assumption that physicians confront monopoly health plans were correct, authorizing collusive conduct by physicians would not necessarily serve the interests of consumers. The argument that physician collusion would merely counterbalance hypothetical monopsony power by health plans implicitly assumes that collective bargaining would generate physician fees no larger than the fees that would exist in a competitive market. However, there is little reason to believe that a successful physician cartel would settle for fees at the competitive level. If a health plan possessed actual market power, health care consumers could be doubly harmed by physician collective bargaining, because they could be forced to pay the health care plan's monopoly mark-up on top of the elevated fees charged by the physicians.

B. Quality of Care

Proponents of antitrust exemptions for physicians often suggest that greater physician bargaining power against health plans would result in increased quality of care for patients. This claim fails for two reasons: (1) physician collective bargaining has historically focused on physician compensation, rather than patient care; and (2) current antitrust law already permits physicians to work collectively on legitimate quality of care issues.

Immunizing collective bargaining imposes costs while providing littlve'1(s)-3(i)-([(l)(y)11(oMCID 2 >>t)15(ha)]TJ 11(v)11(e)-1(ai)13(m)-3

plans.(14) Specific language was inserted in that order, and in subsequent orders, to make it clear that bans on anticompetitive agreements among competing providers do not prohibit the provision of information and views to health plans concerning any issue, including reimbursement.(15)

Accordingly, blanket antitrust immunity for physician price-fixing is not necessary to protect patient welfare.

II. The Alaska Bill

Nonetheless, Senate Bill 37, like its federal and state counterparts, seeks to confer antitrust immunity with respect to collective physician conduct. To be sure, Senate Bill 37 also contains a number of provisions designed to protect consumers from the potential harms arising from a physician collective bargaining exemption. In some respects, these provisions resemble protections contained in physician collective bargaining bills introduced in Texas and the District of Columbia, on which the Commission staff also has commented.(16) As with the protections in the Texas and District of Columbia bills, these provisions - addressing a health plan's market power, the size of the physician bargaining group, and potential boycott conduct - do not alleviate the risk of substantial consumer harm resulting from a collective bargaining exemption.

A. Minimum Threshold for Health Plan Market Power

Section (d)(1) of Senate Bill 37 states that physicians may "collectively negotiate with a health benefit plan the items described in (b)" - including fees or prices - provided that the health benefit plan has "substantial market power." "Substantial market power" is defined as "more than 15 percent of the market share." Id. at § (s)(4). Alternative formulas by which market power may be measured are set forth in Sections (f)(1) and (f)(2).

This market power screen is unlikely to guard against consumer harm.

First, the screen does not apply to all collective bargaining by physicians, or even to all price-related bargaining. Rather, it applies only to certain kinds of price-

Third, in practice, the market share screen appears unlikely to provide any limitation at all. That is because the bill would create a presumption that a health plan has substantial market power (Section (f)), unless the health plan persuades the Attorney General that it does not meet the 15 percent threshold. It seems unlikely that a health plan would seek to offer such proof, however, because the kind of price-related collective bargaining to which the market share screen applies can occur only if the health plan agrees to engage in such negotiations. See Section (d)(3). Thus, it appears that a health plan could simply decline to negotiate with physician collective bargaining groups, without making any showing regarding market share.

In addition, it should be noted that the bill's restrictions on collective fee negotiation to situations where the health plan consents to such negotiations would offer only limited protection to consumers. Such a restriction could limit certain kinds of anticompetitive effects, by preventing groups without health plan consent from engaging in even preliminary bargaining activities (such as physicians entering into agreements on the fee levels to be sought) that could facilitate anticompetitive agreements with respect to ph groerometsuTT0 1 ET5caoe f* ntilefhit-11(lei)13(an 4o-1(t)2(h rp)13(et2t)1

successfully negotiating agreements with the members of the group separately.(19) Furthermore, by immunizing agreements among competing physicians on the fees and other terms they will accept from health plans, the bill

categories of potentially critical competitive information: (1) communications from physicians to authorized third parties, (2) communications from authorized third parties to health plans, (3) communications between physicians, and (4) communications between authorized third parties.

It is worth noting that the core conduct at issue here, naked price-fixing among horizontal competitors, is deemed to be per se illegal precisely because the law presumes that in almost no circumstances imaginable will the benefits "outweigh any anticompetitive effects."(30) To be able to attempt such a judgment, the Attorney General needs to be able to review the relevant information.

(b) Insufficient Time

The law of active supervision requires that the Attorney General have and exercise "independent judgment and control" sufficient to render the challenged conduct effectively that of the State and not that of private parties. Yet Section (i) allows only 30 days for the Attorney General to review the facts and render a decision about the anticompetitive effects of a given contract. The time period is mandatory ("shall either approve or disapprove . . . within 30 days") and there is no provision for extension.(31) It is by no means clear that the Attorney General could complete the "pointed reexamination" required to immunize the underlying physician conduct in such a short time.

IV. Transparency

Section (i) of Senate Bill 37 provides that "[i]f the contract is disapproved, the attorney general shall furnish a written explanation of any deficiencies along with a statement of specific remedial measures that would correct any identified deficiencies." Notably, the bill contains no complementary provision requiring a written decision to approve a proposed contract. A written decision, expressly considering the potentially anticompetitive implications of a proposed contract and attempting to quantify the consumer impact and expected effect on consumer prices, would serve a number of salutary purposes. First, it would inform affected parties of the levels at which prices were being fixed, and so provide an opportunity for comment or challenge as to the appropriateness of those levels. Second, it would help inform the public of the likely impact of the proposed contract on their health care costs.

Under the current draft, an explanation is required only when the Attorney General disapproves a contract. From a consumer perspective, however, disapproval of a contract is the less troubling result. Disapproval indicates that market forces will continue to govern, whereas approval indicates that they will be temporarily suspended, with a potentially adverse impact on price and access. It is the latter situation that more clearly warrants an explanation and is more properly subject to consumer scrutiny.

* * *

In sum, the proposed antitrust exemption for physician collective bargaining is likely to result in increased consumer costs and threatens to reduce access to care. Furthermore, the risk of consumer harm does not appear to be offset by any substantial procompetitive benefits or increased quality of care.

Parties claiming immunity under the state action doctrine bear the burden of establishing their entitlement to such immunity. If the Alaska Legislature were to enact a bill that fails to provide for the level of active supervision required by Supreme Court precedent, physicians relying on the bill's provisions to confer antitrust immunity would risk exposure to potentially significant financial liability for their actions.

Thank you for your inquiry. We hope you find these comments helpful. Should you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact Jeff Brennan at (202) 326-3688.

Sincerely,

have tended to accept such claims where the review included hearings and an opportunity for potentially affected parties to be heard. See, e.g., TEC Cogeneration Inc. v. Florida Power & Light Co., 76 F.3d 1560 (11th Cir.), amended in part, 86 F.3d 1028 (11th Cir. 1996) (rates determined by Public Service Commission rulemaking and subject to extensive agency proceedings); DFW Metro Line Services v. Southwestern Bell Telephone, 988 F.2d 601, 606-07 (5th Cir. 1993) (Public Utility Commission conducted both broad-