



# **Minnesota Association of Health Underwriters**

**2009 Legislative Session Report**

**June 2009**

## **Legislative Report Table of Contents**

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Cook Hill Girard Cover Letter</b>
<b>Pages 4-7</b>	<b>2009 Legislative Session – General Summary</b>
<b>Pages 8-10</b>	<b>2009 Legislative Session – Healthcare Summary</b>
<b>Pages 11-12</b>	<b>2009 Legislative Session – General Business Summary</b>
<b>Pages 13-18</b>	<b>2009 Legislative Session – Tax Summary</b>
<b>Pages 19-26</b>	<b>2009 Legislative Session – MAHU Bills of Interest</b>



180 East Fifth Street, Suite 970  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101  
Phone: 651-917-6001  
Fax: 651-917-6002  
Email: [chginfo@cookhillgirard.com](mailto:chginfo@cookhillgirard.com)

---

“Capitol Strategies for Effective Public Policy Results”

June 30, 2009

Ms. Margaret LeClair  
MAHU  
6701 Upper Afton Road  
St. Paul, MN 55125

Dear Margaret;

Cook Hill Girard was pleased to represent MAHU during the 2009 Minnesota legislative session and we look forward to continuing to work with you. This session MAHU made a number of legislative strides with your proactive agenda. We also further established MAHU as a reliable resource for legislators working on insurance and healthcare reform.

As we've learned in the past, the key to success will be the development of strong coalitions and a sound strategy for the interim and 2010 session. In representing MAHU, Cook Hill Girard will continue to work during the interim to gather information, help build coalitions, develop strategy and educate key policy makers. We will work closely with the MAHU Legislative Committee in the coming months to further develop MAHU's legislative agenda and principles. .

On behalf of the entire Cook Hill Girard staff, we want you to know we enjoy representing MAHU and working on issues of concern to your organization.

Sincerely,

Todd A. Hill  
CEO/Senior Partner

## Cook Hill Girard -- 2009 Legislative Session Summary

When the 2009 legislative session began, no one could have predicted how it would end. Even seasoned Capitol veterans were admittedly clueless as to how the legislature and the Governor would agree to bridge the \$6.5 billion budget deficit. The number was daunting and unprecedented. Its historic size, about 20% of the state's general fund budget, combined with the diametrically opposed political views of Republican Governor Tim Pawlenty and the DFL-led legislature, was enough to make even the most optimistic politico view the glass as half empty. It was difficult to see how the two sides would ever come together on a plan.

Memories of the 2005 session were front and center this year. 2005 saw the state's last record budget deficit, a \$4.5 billion monster which caused a government shutdown. The 2005 deficit was solved by massive cuts and a tobacco tax increase, dubbed a "fee" to help the Governor keep his "no new taxes" pledge. Here we were four years later with the same Governor and another unprecedented deficit, but this time both bodies of the legislature were in DFL hands. A bigger shortfall with less available to cut, and a greater philosophical divide between the legislature and the Governor was a recipe for high drama, but not a quick solution.

Beside the DFL holding majorities in both bodies, there were two additional differences which set the session apart from 2005. First, the state received nearly \$2 billion in federal stimulus funding. In the end, this boost turned out to be both a blessing and a curse. On the positive side, it helped reduce the state's short term deficit to \$4.5 billion. Conversely, it was all one-time money and therefore did little else than push the state's budget problems to the next biennium. The accounting was complicated and it took the administration and legislature months to get a handle on what strings were attached and how the money could be distributed. The state's leaders were grateful to receive the funding, but there is no doubt it complicated the budgeting process in new ways.

Second, the DFL's insistence for budget negotiations to take place publicly put a new spin on things. Traditionally, end-of-session budget talks take place behind closed doors and despite some public rhetoric by DFLer's in the past, they continued to be held in private. This year, Speaker Kelliher (DFL-Mpls.) and Majority Leader Pogemiller (DFL-Mpls.) utilized the heretofore little-known Legislative Commission on Planning and Fiscal Policy (LCPFP) as a public forum for budget discussions. In the beginning, the LCPFP served as a venue for the administration to update legislative leadership on the federal stimulus dollars and how they would interact with the state's budgeting process. The primary guest star of the LCPFP meetings was the MN Management and Budget Commissioner, Tom Hanson, who is also serving as the Governor's Federal Stimulus Coordinator. Hanson retained his position in the hot seat throughout session as the LCPFP morphed from a federal stimulus update to a site for budget negotiations and political drama.

As session wore on, LCPFP meetings became regular occurrences, increasing to almost daily meetings during the final weeks of session. Topics of discussions ranged from budget targets to federal stimulus money, and were often tense affairs. Eventually, the meetings included House and Senate Budget Chairs who were brought forward to report on their negotiations with each other and the Governor's office. It was both a fascinating and frustrating process to watch. Negotiations still included private meetings between the Governor and leadership; however the LCPFP met up until the very end of session in an attempt to shed sunlight on budget negotiations. Whether or not they succeeded in their attempt depends on who you talk to and which side of the aisle they sit on.

Half of the budgeting process was centered around the budget targets for each division, while the other half was focused on the need for additional revenue. Even with serious cuts made in most areas of the budget, some new revenue would be necessary to escape the deficit. Governor Pawlenty's budget proposed selling revenue bonds backed by the state's tobacco settlement payments to get an influx of nearly \$1 billion. The proposal was met with skepticism from the start and never gained much traction with anyone outside the administration, Republican or Democrat.

Both the House and Senate opted for tax increases in addition to cuts. House Tax Chair Ann Lenczewski (DFL-Bloomington) proposed an overhaul of the current tax system, including the elimination of the home mortgage interest deduction, some education credits and the charitable giving deduction. It was a bold move given the current crisis in the housing market and general gloom of the economy. The House Tax bill also included a new 4<sup>th</sup> tier income tax, increased liquor taxes and gave counties the ability to increase their sales tax. Other than the 4<sup>th</sup> tier income tax, the Senate Tax bill had little in common with its House counterpart. It was not surprising, since Senate Tax Chair Tom Bakk (DFL-Cook) made no bones about his dislike for the House reform package. In addition to creating the new top tier, the Senate bill temporarily increased the three existing income tax tiers and created a 30% tax on loans with an interest rate over 15%. Both bodies passed their tax proposals without the full support of the DFL caucuses, with no votes to spare. The Senate, generally the seat of trouble-free operations because of their supermajority, failed to pass the bill on the first attempt.

There wasn't much in either of the Tax bills which Governor Pawlenty liked. He repeatedly reminded the legislature he would not sign a tax increase. So as the budget conference committees made progress, the Tax conference committee was stagnant. Early in the process, two omnibus budget bills were sent to the Governor; both were signed with only one line-item veto between them. With roughly 10 days to go in the session, a bill was sent to the Senate floor from the Rules committee containing not only tax policy, but also blank appropriations for education, nursing homes and hospitals.

Majority Leader Pogemiller didn't pull any punches as to the bill's purpose. He admitted it was a vehicle the legislature could use to quickly send a revenue-generating proposal to the Governor, since the Tax conference committee wasn't progressing. The bill went quickly to a conference committee, chaired by Bakk and Lenczewski, where the 4<sup>th</sup> tier, alcohol tax increases and interest surcharge were added to fund the appropriations. Governor Pawlenty wasted no time vetoing it as soon as it hit his desk, but it wasn't the last he'd see of those proposals.

After the tax veto, work continued on the appropriations side, where the House and Senate DFL reached agreements on most areas. The big question was how the Governor would deal with them if there was no budget agreement between the legislature and his administration. If he signed them, even with line-item vetoes, there would still be a gap because he vetoed the tax bill. If he vetoed them, the question remained whether there would be enough time to pass new bills before the May 18<sup>th</sup> adjournment date. Regardless of his decision, a special session seemed imminent. Then with four days left in the session, the Governor sent shockwaves through the Capitol. He announced he would sign all of the remaining budget bills the legislature had sent him and, if a global budget agreement could not be reached before adjournment, he would also use his executive power of "unallotment" to close the remainder of the budget deficit.

Without any new tax revenue, tobacco bonds or proposed accounting shifts, the budget was nearly \$3 billion dollars short. Governor Pawlenty said he would balance the remainder by

“unallotting,” or cutting money already appropriated by the legislature. Unallotment does not require any legislative approval, allowing the executive branch full control over the cuts. There are some limitations to the authority, but there is no denying it is a powerful tool which will likely fall heavily on DFL priority areas. Some observers were surprised DFL leadership sent all of their spending bills to the Governor after the tax veto, making this situation possible.

The DFL’s frustration was prevalent in the public meetings held after the Governor’s announcement. Legislative leadership worked to get a handle on what the decision meant while groups most likely to be hurt by unallotment, including local units of government and hospitals, scrambled to come up with alternatives to avoid the chopping block. Pawlenty said he was willing to continue negotiating, but he would not budge from his stance against any tax increases. He insisted the remaining deficit be closed through cuts, shifts or his tobacco bond proposal. Without an agreement he would go it alone, cut as he saw fit and session would come to an end on May 18. Legislative leadership appeared torn as to their next move; find an additional billion dollars to cut in the state’s budget or allow the Governor to unallot and spend the next 9 months fighting in the court of public opinion to make Pawlenty own the consequences. There were risks with both choices and the stakes were high, both for them and the Governor.

The danger to Health and Human Services was made especially clear by the Governor’s line-item veto of \$381 million to fund General Assistance Medical Care in FY 2011, a program providing medical coverage to the state’s poorest individuals not eligible for other public insurance programs. The House attempted to override the line-item during the last weekend of session. Some of the most impassioned speeches heard in years were made; even lobbyists in the halls were silenced as long-time House members were brought to tears. But, when the vote was taken the House Republicans held together and sustained the Governor’s veto. Immediately afterwards, an attempt was made to override the veto of the tax bill. That debate, too, was long and passionate and suffered from the same fate. However, this time 2 DFLer’s defected and joined all of the House Republicans in sustaining the veto.

Negotiations between the Governor and legislative leadership began again on the final day of session. DFL leaders were going to take another look to see if they could reach a compromise on budget cuts. The Governor’s spokesman said Pawlenty was committed to balancing the budget.

As the clock ticked down and hours became minutes, no agreement was ever reached. An hour before adjournment, the Tax conference committee passed another bill to the floor comprised of the 4<sup>th</sup> tier income tax bracket, a larger increase in the liquor tax increase, the tax on interest rates and education and property tax recognition shifts to bridge the budget gap. The House took up the bill just 30 minutes before midnight and the debate was heated and chaotic. With only 7 minutes left in the session, the bill was passed to the Senate on a vote of 82-47. The Senate’s process wasn’t any more orderly, as Republicans in both bodies were vocal in their opposition to the last-minute bill. At 11:59pm the Senate started the vote and amid the chaos the final tally was 35-1; Senate Republicans abstained from the vote in protest.

Governor Pawlenty wasted little time vetoing the bill, as he did its predecessor. He is now authorized to begin cutting government expenditures on July 1. Any unallotment decisions are required to be presented to a legislative committee. Although they require no legislative approval, we expect DFL leadership will make the most of the hearings in an attempt to publicize the Governor’s cuts. Pawlenty sent a letter to lawmakers after session’s end asking them for suggestions and input on unallotment, but the invitation was not well-received. It doesn’t appear

DFL members will be making any formal recommendations, though Speaker Kelliher and Majority leader Pogemiller did send a brief letter in response to the Governor's request.

Although the outcome of this political fight was up in the air to the very end, the problems at hand and the positions of each side were clear from the beginning. The lack of agreement between the Governor and legislature and the Governor's decision to unallot will be the topic du jour across Minnesota for a while to come. Some warned that the 2010 election has already started, something that rings even more true now, with Governor Pawlenty's June 2nd announcement that he will not seek a third term. Pawlenty kept people guessing as to his future plans, but in the end decided it was time to move on. Whether his next steps include a run for the White House is unclear, but his announcement has set off a firestorm of activity at the state level. A slew of Republicans have already announced their interest in seeking the Governorship, including many current and former legislators. They will join an already crowded field of DFLer's looking to take over the state's top job. It's going to be a heated summer in Saint Paul, regardless of the weather.

## Health Care Issues

Health care related issues were not expected to garner significant attention in the 2009 session. This was largely due to the passage of health care reform legislation in 2008, which is currently being implemented. Nonetheless, health and human services issues took center stage once again as a result of the looming budget deficit and the amount of state resources spent on state health care programs, consuming 27% of the budget and growing. There was little doubt health and human service programs would be facing potential significant cuts. The cuts became very apparent when the governor presented his original and supplemental budget proposals. Federal stimulus funds blunted some of the impact by providing \$1.8 billion to Minnesota's public health programs, but it carried restrictions on eligibility reforms — further limiting how the DHS budget could be impacted. The House and Senate made significant cuts to the DHS budget with the final Health & Human Services Budget bill including a \$489 million cut to Human Services for FY 10/11, encompassing provider rate cuts, program changes and other measures to reduce DHS spending.

During the final days of session, much discussion focused on the Governor's line-item veto of the General Assistance Medical Care (GAMC) funding in 2011. As part of his initial budget, the Governor had proposed a reform of this program which provides health care to single adults not eligible for medical assistance. The program currently receives no federal matching funds and is projected to cost more than \$380 million in 2011. The issue became very polarizing. The House attempted a veto override, citing the dramatic impact on individuals served by GAMC; as well as a handful of safety net hospitals in the state which must provide care, but would not be reimbursed by the state. The Governor made his initial unallotment proposal on June 16, which included an additional \$236 million in cuts to human services. However, these reductions will not impact hospitals and nursing homes as much as the initial reports on cuts may have. It is expected these issues will undergo much discussion during the interim and into the 2010 session as the legislature works to minimize the Governor's cuts.

Legislators are also closely monitoring Washington, D.C. and federal efforts regarding health care reform. They are eager to understand how national reform may impact the reform Minnesota made in 2008, as well as the potential for decreasing the number of Minnesotans who rely on state funded health care programs. Some providers are also concerned about the impact on reimbursements, particularly when coupled with state cuts. Like the stimulus funds, this will play into decisions related to health care and human services funding over the interim and into the 2010 session.

In addition to the focus on budget cut impacts to hospitals, nursing homes and public health program recipients, there were a number of other health related measures discussed, some of which passed into law this session. Several of these are perennial issues or revisions of current law.

### **Health Policy Legislation**

- **False Claims Act** - Health care providers raised considerable concerns with this bill, which increased penalties for entities who knowingly submit false claims to the state by enhancing incentives to whistleblowers and their attorneys. This would have significantly increased the risk to health care providers of lawsuits for unintentional inaccurate claims. It became a very contentious issue with many hearings and much discussion. The bill was included in the House State Government Finance bill with a "right to cure" clause, added in conference committee, improving it from the perspective of providers. The effective date was also delayed until July 1, 2010. Because of the delayed effective date and Congressional action on the federal false claims law, it is expected this issue will be revisited in the 2010 session.

- **Licensure Bills:** During the 2009 session, many health care groups introduced legislation to change their scope of practice and licensure. The two which passed were licensure for Physician Assistants and Respiratory Therapists. The remaining bills will likely be reconsidered in 2010, as we expect the groups seeking licensure to continue their efforts.
- **Medical Records Fee:** Legislation to significantly decrease the allowable charge for copies of medical records was defeated—but only with an agreement by hospitals and other health care providers to work on the issue over the interim. The bill was introduced to address fees charged to trial lawyers and their clients for accessing medical records.
- **Health Information Technology and Infrastructure** - A bill updating the law on health technology and infrastructure brings Minnesota in line with federal law and changes the name of the Health Information Technology Advisory Committee to the e-Health Advisory Committee. There were also updates to the e-prescribing law to bring it into compliance with federal law.
- **Radiation Therapy Construction Moratorium:** The moratorium preventing the construction of new radiation therapy facilities in the metropolitan area and other specified counties was once again discussed and the sunset extended to 2014.
- **Prairie St Johns Mental Health Hospital:** The controversial proposal for an exception to the hospital moratorium, not adopted in 2008, was changed significantly to reduce opposition. As passed this year, the bill allows an exception to the hospital construction moratorium in Western Hennepin County for a 20-bed mental health hospital for patients 21 years of age or younger.

### Insurance/Coverage Legislation

- **School Insurance Pool** – Once again, Education Minnesota presented the legislature with a proposal to mandate all school districts to participate in a health insurance pool run by Education Minnesota. This year’s proposal called for PEIP to run the plan in conjunction with Education Minnesota. The changes made to the bill did not eliminate the controversy of the proposal. In the end, the House and Senate were able to address the differences in their proposals; however the final conference committee agreement was not presented on either floor in the final hours of the session. This legislation will be available for consideration again next session.
- **Single Payer Health Care** – There continues to be an active group of legislators and supporters who are pushing for the creation of a single payer health care system in Minnesota. Unimpressed with the significant reforms passed in 2008, a number of bills were introduced in 2009. There was discussion in committees on the issue, but concerns over a government run health care system continues to prevent the adoption of single payer legislation.
- **Claims Information Disclosure** – Legislation supported by members of the business community, health insurance agents and some carriers will require greater claims history disclosure to policy holders. The legislation will reduce confusion and require consistent reporting of claims history and allow for better comparisons when comparing products and

prices from carriers. As part of a compromise to some carriers opposed to the legislation it does not go into effect until August 1, 2010.

- **Small Group Size Expansion** – The proposal passed the House, but failed to gain support in the Senate. The legislation would increase the definition of small groups from the current limit of 50 lives covered to 100. The change would provide employers in the 51 – 100 groups the same protections on premium increases which smaller employer groups receive. The Minnesota Department of Commerce has become interested in the issue and may work with the bill's proponents over the interim to study the potential impacts of the proposed changes on the fully insured marketplace.
- **Section 125 Reforms** – The legislature passed two provisions this session to address concerns raised by the business community in response to legislation adopted last year mandating employers with 11 or more full-time employees to establish section 125 plans. These plans allow employees to purchase pre-tax individual or employer-based health coverage. The reforms passed this year make changes to the reporting requirements of employers and when a statement of benefits must be provided.
- **Healthy Minnesota Plan** – This proposal which would provide private sector coverage to a portion of the MnCare population received some attention toward the end of the legislative session. The plan has the potential to save money, to provide greater reimbursements for providers and offers better coverage than the traditional MnCare product offered today.

#### **Legislative Mandates**

- **Acupuncture Coverage** – This legislation was signed by the Governor and requires carriers to allow for direct access to providers of acupuncture services.
- **Mandated Autism Coverage** – This proposal would have required specialized treatment coverage for sufferers of autism received a great deal of attention during the legislative session. The mandate has the potential to dramatically impact insurance rates as the projected cost for such coverage ranges from \$50,000 - \$100,000/individual. The legislature decided to instead create an Autism Task Force which will provide greater insight into issues and potential solutions to the problems of autism.
- **HSA Preventative Services Mandated Coverage** – This proposal would have required all high-deductible HSA's to cover 100% of all preventative services prior to reaching any deductibles. The marketplace currently has a similar product available for those entities seeking such coverage, but does not mandate such coverage to always be offered. The legislature was unable to reach an agreement on the proposal in conference committee.

It is also important to note the implementation of the health care reform legislation which passed in 2008 has seen frenzied activity at the Department of Health, though little additional legislation was needed in 2009. In recognition of the health care reform efforts, primary care clinics were held harmless from rate cuts this year to promote the growth and development of the medical homes. Cook Hill Girard is compiling a complete report on health care reform activities which will be made available to clients in the upcoming weeks.

## General Business Summary

Several issues of concern to the general business community were considered during the 2009 session. Many did not receive significant media attention, but nonetheless have an impact on businesses operating in Minnesota. There was much discussion about unemployment benefits due to the recent economic crises. Minnesota employers are most concerned about the UI fund balance. These discussions will continue and the fund balance will more than likely become an issue in the coming year. There had been talk of an extensive workers comp reform bill, however the Workers Compensation Advisory Council could not reach agreement and opted for technical changes instead. Other issues brought forward by strong supporters of the DFL, including unions and trial lawyers, did have some momentum. One such bill of significant concern to the business community would have mandated sick leave benefits. This bill had hearings in the House and is still alive for 2010. There were also a number of bills impacting court cases and settlements which had some activity and will be alive for consideration in the next session.

Below is a review of issues which passed and a full report on legislation of concern to the business community.

**Reporting on Section 125 Plans** – One of the first bills signed into law included an attempt to fix an error in the health care reform agreement contained in the 2008 tax bill regarding Section 125 Health Plans. The “fix” would have required all employers to send a new annual report to each Minnesota employee which included the dollar amount of any health insurance premium paid by the employee (on a pre-tax basis) through a "cafeteria" plan under Section 125 of the Internal Revenue Code. After the bill passed, the business community became aware of the difficulties to comply with the provision since it required the information to be provided to all employees. The concern was addressed in HF 1298, a bill with a number of non-controversial tax provisions. The change in HF 1298 makes the statement necessary, but only upon the request from an employee who might be qualified for the credit based on information the employer will have; if the employee had coverage for less than a year and participated in the 125 plan for less than a year.

**MN False Claims Act** – Legislation for a revised Minnesota False Claims Act has been introduced for the past several years. However, this session it became a high priority for House leadership and gained real traction. Proponents focused on the potential revenue which could be generated from financial incentives offered by the federal government to states with false claims acts. Buoyed by a handful of local trial attorneys, the House DFL pushed the bill through with surprising ferocity, despite active opposition from hospitals and nursing homes.

Based on the federal law, the bill creates increased penalties for entities who knowingly submit false claims to the state and offers enhanced incentives to whistleblowers and their attorneys. Health care groups were very concerned these penalties and perverse incentives would significantly increase the risk of frivolous lawsuits for inadvertently inaccurate claims. They sought some relief through “right to cure” language; a provision allowing the contractor to fix a mistake and reimburse the state for any improperly collected funds without facing a court case and serious monetary penalties. The bill’s authors were not initially inclined to agree to this kind of provision, however they did make adjustments to better conform their bill to the federal act.

Of interest, the Office of the Attorney General had a \$4 million fiscal note for the bill due to the increased workload for the office. This fiscal note stalled the bill in the Senate State Government

Finance division, but the House questioned its accuracy and included the legislation in their Omnibus State Government Finance bill without full funding. The inclusion set off a significant flurry of activity in the final weeks of session in both the House and Senate. In the end, the Governor's office and the Senate insisted on meaningful "right to cure" language as suggested by health care providers. The bill was adopted as part of the Omnibus State Government Finance bill with the "right to cure" provision and a delayed effective date of July 1, 2010. The delayed effective date coupled with the displeasure of the trial bar over the difficulty in gaining passage and the concessions made to business groups leave little doubt it will resurface in 2010.

**Business Recovery for Insurers Breach of Contract** – A bill was brought forward by some business owners seeking to recover attorney fees, damages and higher interest rates on awards when they successfully sue their insurer for breach of contract. It was a difficult issue, pitting the business community against the insurance community. In the end a compromise was reached to allow the prejudgment interest rate for commercial coverage disputes to be set at 10%, while dropping the attorney fee provision.

**Interest Rate Modifications for Civil Judgments and Awards** – A key legislative priority of the Minnesota Trial Lawyers Association was introduced late in the legislative session and failed to receive any hearings in a legislative policy committee. The bill's author, Rep. Steve Smith (R-Mound) the Deputy Minority Leader, worked to have the language included in the Omnibus House Public Safety Budget Bill. The language maintained the current process for establishing interest for any judgment or award of \$50,000 or less. For awards or judgments above \$50,000, the interest rate increases to 10 percent per year. The business community tried to have the language removed from the budget bill and urged a veto of the entire bill because of the inclusion of this proposal. Their efforts were unsuccessful and the changes take effect on August 1, 2009 and apply to judgments and awards entered into on or after that date.

## 2009 Tax Summary

With the historic budget deficit, it was no surprise tax policy was at the forefront of budget discussions during the 2009 session. The House and Senate put their budget bills together which included serious cuts, but they would still need new revenue to help close the budget gap. This posed difficulty to the DFL majorities because Governor Pawlenty kept to his hard line stance against tax increases. Although he agreed to the “Health Impact Fee” which raised taxes on cigarettes to help balance the budget in 2005, the likelihood he would agree to something similar again were bleak. If he refused to compromise, the House would need to pick off three Republican votes to override his veto.

The House and Senate had serious difficulties reaching a tax agreement and it wasn't until the final weeks of session their joint proposal began to come together. There were few similarities in the two bills, outside of the 4<sup>th</sup> tier income tax, though both bodies had difficulties passing tax bills off their respective floors. Once the bills made it to Tax Conference Committee the progress was even slower and the bills lingered for weeks. During the last week of session leadership brought out their “tax and expenditure bill” which included the 4<sup>th</sup> tier, alcohol tax increases and an interest rate surcharge; the Governor vetoed it immediately.

On the last night of session the House attempted to override the veto, but failed, as the House Republican caucus stuck together. They passed a second tax increase bill late in the night, as well, which included the same increases in the vetoed bill. It was no surprise the Governor also vetoed the second bill. The major DFL tax initiatives for 2009 were defeated, but it should be noted some non-controversial tax bills, including a federal conformity/tax policy bill, did pass this year leaving many pages of new tax policy. With the state's continued fiscal instability, many tax provisions which failed to pass this year are likely to reappear in 2010 and beyond.

Below are highlights of the federal conformity/policy bill, along with provisions of interest in the vetoed bills and other tax bills introduced this year.

### **House File 1298**

#### **Federal Conformity**

Minnesota adopted, with some alterations, the federal changes passed as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 enacted by Congress earlier this year.

The following are changes to Federal Law for business:

- Bonus Depreciation – Does not conform to extension of 50 percent depreciation to tax year 2009, but requires taxpayers to add-back 80% of the amount in the first year and subtract one-fifth of the amount added back in each of the following five years.
- Federal law allows for the extension of the increased section 179 expensing amount and phase-out threshold to tax year 2009. Minnesota does not conform to the extension, but retains its current law requirement that taxpayers add back 80% of the expensing amount in the first tax year, and then subtract one-fifth of the amount added back in each of the next five tax years.

Minnesota would require individuals to add-back to Federal Taxable Income several items making them taxable for Minnesota income tax purposes:

- Motor vehicle sales taxes
- The additional standard deduction amount for motor vehicle sales tax
- The first \$2400 of unemployment compensation
- Deferred income from the discharge of indebtedness resulting from reacquisition of business indebtedness

### **Property Tax Changes**

**Institutions of Public Charity** – Codifies the criteria set forth in the North Star case to make the determination as to whether an institution is a “purely public charity”. This clarifies for assessors whether an institution is eligible for the property tax exemption.

**Nursing Homes** – Due to some concern that nonprofit nursing homes and boarding care facilities would not meet the requirements of a purely public charity, a separate exemption is provided for these facilities. The nursing home must be certified to participate in the medical assistance programs or certify to the Commissioner of Revenue they do not discharge residents due to their inability to pay.

### **Sales and Use Taxes**

**Non-profit Car Sharing** – Non-profit car operations are exempt from the special car rental fee applied in lieu of the motor vehicle registration tax. The exemption would apply only to a nonprofit corporation who charges persons or groups on an hourly basis. The vehicles would be subject to the motor vehicle registration tax.

### **Miscellaneous**

**Health Premiums Credit** – The 2008 Tax Bill required employers who offer section 125 plans to provide statements of premiums to all participating employees. The language in HF 1298 instead will require employers to provide statements on request of the employee who might be eligible for the health premiums credit.

### **HF 2323 and HF 885 – Vetoed by the Governor**

**Increase in Individual Income Tax Rate** – The bills would have added a new 9% rate for filers with taxable income above \$250,000 (married filing jointly). The rate would have been reduced to 7.85 % for tax year 2014 if the office of Management and Budget estimated there was at least a \$500 million unrestricted general fund balance surplus in the February 2013 economic forecast.

**Surtax on Interest Income** – This provision would have subjected income earned on interest in excess of 15% to a 30% tax. There were significant questions as to whether this provision was constitutional or whether it would be possible to actually collect the tax on some companies due to nexus issues.

**Liquor Tax Increase** – The excise tax and liquor gross receipts tax would have increased in this bill, the gross receipts tax would have doubled from 2.5% to 5.0% and the excise tax increased by varying amounts depending on type of drink and alcohol level.

**Investment Income Tax Credit (HF2323 only)** – The bill would have provided up to a \$50,000 per individual non-refundable 25% credit on investments in qualified new Minnesota high-tech, biotech, medical device or green manufacturing businesses. The business would have been required to have 51% of their employees and payroll located in Minnesota, fewer than 25 employees, gross receipts of less than \$2 million and been in operation for less than 10 years.

### **Provisions of the Senate Omnibus Tax bill that did not pass**

#### **Individual and Corporate Income**

**Interest on Second Residence** – Taxpayers would be required to add back interest paid on a second residence they had taken as an itemized deduction on their federal income tax return.

**Individual income tax rates** – Increased rates for all taxpayers. 5.35% rate increased to 6%, 7.05% to 7.7%, 7.85% to 8.5% percent and a new fourth tier rate of 9.25% for income levels starting at \$250,000 for married individuals filing joint returns, \$141,250 for unmarried individuals and \$212,500 for unmarried individuals qualifying as head of household.

**Alternative minimum tax rate** – Increases the AMT rate to 7% from the current 6.4% rate for tax years 2009 to 2013.

#### **Sales and Use Taxes**

**Single Sales Factor Apportionment** – The bill would freeze the apportionment formula at the 2008 level. Currently the formula has a sales factor of 81%, and property and payroll factors are at 9.5% each.

**Solicitor to establish nexus** – This language was in both the House and Senate bills as they passed each body. A business would be presumed to have established a presence in the state and would have to collect sales tax if it had at least \$10,000 of sales annually into Minnesota based on referrals from residents or businesses with a physical presence in the state. The original bill was based on language passed in New York state.

**Upfront sales tax exemption for capital equipment** – Capital equipment which is exempt from sales tax would be exempt at the time of purchase and businesses would not have to apply for the refund.

#### **Property Taxes**

**State General Levy Changes** – Two changes to the state general levy would have been made in the Senate bill. One removed seasonal residential recreational property from the tax. The result would be a shift to commercial-industrial (C-I) property. The bill also froze the rate on C-I property taxes payable in 2006 resulting in an increase in taxes on the affected properties.

## **Provisions of the House Omnibus Tax bill that did not pass**

### **Income Taxes**

**Individual Income Tax Deductions** – The bill would have disallowed itemized deductions for real estate property taxes, mortgage interest and charitable contributions. In addition, most interest on Minnesota State and local government bonds would have been taxable under the language in the bill. The mortgage interest and charitable contribution deductions would have been replaced in part by a tax credit made available to all taxpayers, including non-itemizers.

**Federal Taxable Income Subtractions** – Several subtractions from FTI would have been eliminated, thereby raising taxes for individuals:

- K-12 Education expenses
- Elderly Exclusion
- Charitable contributions subtraction for non-itemizers
- Foreign subnational taxes in excess of the federal foreign tax credit
- Organ donor expenses

**Fourth Tier Tax Rate** – A new income tax rate of 9% would have been imposed on income above \$300,000 for married joint filers.

**Individual Income Tax credits repealed** – Credits currently available would have been repealed and the dependent care credit would have been replaced by an appropriation for basic sliding fee child care and a refundable credit. Listed below are some of the individual income tax credits which would have been repealed:

- Dependent Care credit
- K-12 education expenses credit
- Long term care insurance premiums credit
- Lower income motor fuels credit

**Research and Development Credit** – The original bill introduced by Chair Lenczewski repealed the R&D Credit. The final House Tax bill kept the credit and allowed individuals to utilize the credit against individual income tax. It also increased the credit on the first \$2 million in expenditures from five percent to ten.

**Foreign Operating Corporation** – The remaining rules pertaining to FOC's would have been repealed.

**Tax Havens** – Identified specific countries as tax haven countries and subjected companies with a significant presence in those countries, or companies incorporated in a tax haven country and are part of a unitary business, to inclusion on the combined report, thus making them subject to the Minnesota Corporate Franchise Tax.

**Foreign Royalties Exclusion** – The 80% exclusion for foreign royalties would be repealed.

**JOBZ, Biotechnology and Health Industry Zones (BHSIZ), and International Economic Develop Zones (IEDZ)** – The individual and corporate tax preferences for these economic development zones would have been eliminated, except for the JOBZ jobs credit.

**Single Sales Factor Apportionment** – The House Tax bill accelerated full implementation of single sales factor apportionment to tax year 2009, rather than 2014.

**Minnesota Development Subsidies** – A development subsidy is defined as the greater of:

- Corporations receiving a benefit who have entered a development agreement would have to add back one-half of the payments deducted on their federal tax forms for property taxes paid on property which is in a TIF district or abatement project. If the property owner or developer did not enter into a development agreement or if the property did not receive a direct benefit from the TIF or abatement expenditures they would not be required to add the deduction back.
- The amount of payments directly received by the corporation under a development which is funded by tax increments or abatement, but excluding amounts reimbursable for pollution cleanup under a removal or remediation plan approved by the PCA.

Tax increments from housing, soils and hazardous substance districts would not be subject to the add-back requirements.

### **County Revenue Reform**

**Local Option County Sales Tax** – Counties would have been allowed to impose a ½-cent sales tax as another source of general fund money. If a county imposed the tax it would preempt other local sales taxes in the county and they would have to fund the obligations related to those taxes. The sales tax was subject to a reverse referendum, the petition of which would require the greater of 500 or 2% of the votes cast in the last general election.

**Levy Limits** – Would have been repealed for cities immediately and for counties after pay 2010.

### **Property Taxes**

**Street Improvement Districts** – Cities would have been authorized to establish municipal street improvement districts to finance street improvements and maintenance. Costs would have been apportioned to all parcels in the district on a uniform basis within each class of property.

**Airport Exemption from the State General Tax** – Property at Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport and Holman Field in St. Paul would have become subject to the state general tax. Both airports would have remained detached and not subject to city or school district property taxes.

### Special Taxes

**Moist Snuff** – The bill would have changed the current 70% tax on the wholesale price to a weight based tax, so a 1.2-ounce can of snuff would be taxed at \$2.18 per container. In its final form, the tax would have been prorated to the amount based on weight and adjusted on an annual basis for inflation.

**Cigarette Tax Increase** – Cigarette taxes would have increased by 54 cents a pack to a total of \$1.02, plus the health impact fee of 75 cents, for a total of a \$1.77 per pack.

### Sales and Use Taxes

**Digital Products** – Expanded the sales tax to digital products such as movies, music videos, music, digital books and other digital products.

**Solicitor** – Same provision as in Senate bill.

### Bills introduced and not included in Omnibus Bills

**Corporate Income Tax Rates** – The Governor’s bill would have reduced the rate and other bills would have phased the tax out completely.

**Airport Property Taxes** – Bills were introduced in both the House and Senate to reattach Holman Field in St. Paul to the local property tax base.

**Alternative Minimum Tax Repeal** – Would have repealed both the individual and corporate AMT.

**First Tier C-I** – Would have been exempted from the state general tax shifting the burden to other properties.

**Throwback Rule** – A bill implementing a throwback rule for income in states where there is no corporate income tax or a company does not have nexus was introduced and heard in the House Tax committee.

**Sales Tax Base Expansion** – Several bills were introduced expanding the sales tax to clothing, accounting and financial services, brokerage and legal services. Some of the bills were amended so business-to-business transactions would not be taxed, while others would have taxed all transactions.

## 2009 MAHU Bills of Interest

\*Indicates priority bill

### *Adopted*

HF: 1362      Author: Huntley      SF: 695      Author: Berglin  
Description: Omnibus Health and Human Services Finance  
Status: (HF1362) Signed by Governor 5.14.09 (line item veto p. 373, line 11, 2011 appropriation); MN Session Laws 2009, Chapter 79

HF: 95      Author: Lenczewski      SF: 49      Author: Bakk  
Description: Health insurance premium income tax credit  
Status: (SF49) Signed by Governor 2.20.09; MN Session Laws 2009, Chapter 3, Various effective dates

HF: 120      Author: Hosch      SF: 203      Author: Kubly  
Description: Rural health care cooperative arrangements antitrust immunity and review procedures  
Status: (SF203) Signed by Governor 5.16.09; MN Session Laws 2009, Chapter 97

HF: 286      Author: Clark      SF: 245      Author: Berglin  
Description: Equal Access to Acupuncture Act and Edith R. Davis memorial  
Status: (SF245) Signed by Governor 5.7.09; MN Session Laws 2009, Chapter 45, Effective 8.1.09

HF: 384      Author: Thissen      SF: 704      Author: Dahle  
Description: Technology standards and tools developed to exchange information electronically between groups, and benefit assignment for health and medical savings accounts required  
Status: (HF384) Signed by Governor 5.22.09; MN Session Laws 2009, Chapter 155

HF: 704      Author: Knuth      SF: 166      Author: Scheid  
Description: Insurable Interest Act  
Status: (SF166) Signed by Governor 5.9.09; MN Session Laws 2009, Chapter 52

HF: 1322      Author: Thissen      SF: 1890      Author: Lourey  
Description: Health information technology incentive requirements created for the use of federal funding, legislative approval required, and federal fund appropriation limited  
Status: (SF1890) Signed by Governor 5.19.09; MN Session Laws 2009, Chapter 102

HF: 417      Author: Atkins      SF: 528      Author: Bakk  
Description: Third-party administrators of health coverage plans, health claims clearinghouse regulated, breach of an insurance policy, and surviving spouse permitted to retain ownership

Included in this bill was the following bill of interest:

HF: 1345      Author: Abeler      SF: 1743      Author: Scheid  
Description: Claims processing practices by third-party administrators of health coverage plans prohibited, health claims clearinghouses regulated, and insurer audits of health claims payments time limit provided

HF: 1853 Author: Atkins SF: 1653 Author: Sparks  
Description: Miscellaneous commerce provisions modifications; model coordination of benefits (COB) contract provisions  
Status: (HF1853) Signed by Governor 5.22.09; MN Session Laws 2009, Chapter 178

*Not Adopted*

\*HF: 84 Author: Mullery SF: 140 Author: Latz  
Description: Consumer fraud regulated  
Status: Substituted by SF140/Passed Senate 4.28.09, passed to House floor

\*HF: 135 Author: Bly SF: 118 Author: Marty  
Description: Minnesota Health Act  
Status: Introduced to Health and Human Services Policy and Oversight/Amended, passed to State and Local Government Operations and Oversight

\*HF: 174 Author: Thissen SF: 9 Author: Anderson  
Description: Minnesota Health Security Act  
Status: Passed to Health Care and Human Services Finance/Amended, passed to Judiciary

\*HF: 866 Author: Hosch SF: 915 Author: Dibble  
Description: School districts required to obtain employee health overage through the public employees insurance program  
Status: Substituted by SF915/Amended, passed Senate 5.8.09, amended, passed House 5.15.09, CC report no action

HF: 3 Author: Welti SF: 3 Author: Berglin  
Description: Omnibus state mandates elimination  
Status: Introduced to State and Local Government Operations, Reform, Technology, and Elections/Amended, passed Senate 4.6.09, referred to House State and Local Government Operations, Reform, Technology, and Elections; See also SF1328, Art. 3, Sec. 26

Included in this bill were the following bills of interest:

HF: 42 Author: Thissen SF: 347 Author: Bonoff  
Description: Four-month waiting period waived for unemployed persons for MinnesotaCare, and money appropriated  
Status: Amended, passed to Health Care and Human Services Finance/Amended, passed to Senate floor

HF: 181 Author: Thissen SF: 207 Author: Berglin  
Description: MinnesotaCare eligibility expansion and waiver of maintenance of effort requirement repeal  
Status: Amended, passed to Finance/Amended, passed to Finance

HF: 264 Author: Clark SF: 178 Author: Berglin  
Description: Durable medical equipment health care coverage expansion to reduce asthma symptoms  
Status: Amended, passed to Health Care and Human Services Finance Division/Amended, passed to Finance

HF: 410 Author: Norton SF: 339 Author: Sheran  
Description: Plasma protein therapies and home nursing services health insurance coverage  
Status: Introduced to Health Care and Human Services Policy and Oversight/Amended, passed to State and Local Government Operations and Oversight

HF: 534 Author: Davids SF: 613 Author: Skogen  
Description: Certificates of insurance authorized and regulated  
Status: Amended, passed House 5.5.09, passed Senate 5.13.09, CC no report/Substituted by HF534

HF: 705 Author: Loeffler SF: 1599 Author: Olson, M.  
Description: Preventative health care promoted by requiring high deductible health plans used with a health savings account to cover preventative care with no deductible as permitted by federal law  
Status: Passed House 5.12.09, amended, passed Senate 5.16.09, CC no report/Substituted by HF705

HF: 730 Author: Thao SF: 688 Author: Lynch  
Description: Health plans required to cover formulary-based wound care required  
Status: Introduced to Health Care and Human Services Policy and Oversight/Amended, passed to Health, Housing, and Family Security

HF: 811 Author: Davids SF: 1812 Author: Scheid  
Description: Insolvent life and health insurance company policyholder maximum dollar protection amount increased to provide greater comparability with limits of federal deposit insurance of bank accounts  
Status: Amended, passed to House floor/Introduced to Commerce and Consumer Protection

HF: 969 Author: Atkins SF: 857 Author: Olson, M.  
Description: Health records patient access modifications and costs regulation  
Status: Introduced to Health Care and Human Services Policy and Oversight/Passed to Judiciary

HF: 1140 Author: Huntley SF: 696 Author: Berglin  
Description: Patient-centered decision making for surgical procedures and medical conditions requirement  
Status: Amended, passed to Health Care and Human Services Finance/Amended, passed to Finance

HF: 1345 Author: Abeler SF: 1743 Author: Scheid  
Description: Claims processing practices by third-party administrators of health coverage plans prohibited, health claims clearinghouses regulated, and insurer audits of health claims payments time limit provided  
Status: Amended, passed to House floor/Amended, passed to Health, Housing, and Family Security, Included in HF417

HF: 1563 Author: Huntley SF: 825 Author: Berglin  
Description: MinnesotaCare application coordinator designation  
Status: Introduced to Health Care and Human Services Oversight/Passed to Finance

HF: 1647 Author: Huntley SF: 1404 Author: Berglin

Description: Prepaid medical assistance program contracts prescription drug coverage elimination  
Status: Introduced to Health Care and Human Services Policy and Oversight/Passed to Finance

HF: 1800 Author: Laine SF: 1469 Author: Marty

Description: Individual health plan denial prohibition due to previous cesarean delivery procedure  
Status: Introduced to Health Care and Human Services Policy and Oversight/Amended, passed Senate 4.20.09, referred to House Health Care and Human Services Policy and Oversight

HF: 1811 Author: Slawik SF: 1551 Author: Senjem

Description: Autism Spectrum Disorder Task Force created, appointments provided, and report required

Status: Amended, passed to State and Local Government Operations, Reform, Technology, and Elections/Amended, passed to Health, Housing, and Family Security

HF: 1847 Author: Fritz SF: 1761 Author: Scheid

Description: Health plans required to establish equal out-of-pocket requirements for oral and intravenously administered chemotherapy medications

Status: Introduced to Health Care and Human Services Policy and Oversight/Passed to Senate floor

HF: 1940 Author: Brod SF: 1971 Author: Vickerman

Description: Dependent returning from active military duty permitted to enroll as a dependant in the state employee group insurance program regardless of status as a full-time student

Status: Amended, passed to State Government Finance Division/Introduced to State and Local Government Operations and Oversight

HF: 2163 Author: Loeffler SF: 1905 Author: Scheid

Description: Small employer health insurance market expanded, and small employer health coverage standard application form development process created

Status: Amended, passed to House floor/Amended, passed to Finance

HF: 2245 Author: Bunn SF: 1052 Author: Saltzman

Description: School districts state employee group insurance plan (SEGIP) participation study

Status: Introduced to State and Local Government Operations, Reform, Technology, and Elections/Amended, passed to Finance

### ***No Action***

\*HF: 675 Author: Hilstrom SF: 263 Author: Olson, M.

Description: Credit and insurance scores use regulation

\*HF: 1564 Author: Huntley SF: 1473 Author: Berglin

Description: Health care reform and program requirements; health insurance products affordability and eligibility increase provisions; Minnesota health insurance exchange establishment and adoption

\*HF: 1908 Author: Zellers SF: - Author: -

Description: Insurance industry trade practices regulated, and loss experience data reporting regulated

HF: 34 Author: Lesch SF: - Author: -

Description: Mandatory arbitration clauses regulated

HF: 61 Author: Mullery SF: - Author: -  
Description: Health insurance premiums subtraction allowed

HF: 171 Author: Emmer SF: 325 Author: Koch  
Description: Freedom of choice in health care constitutional amendment proposed

HF: 233 Author: Slawik SF: 138 Author: Wiger  
Description: Autism spectrum disorder task force creation

HF: 247 Author: Thissen SF: 346 Author: Rest  
Description: Long-term care savings plan provided

HF: 358 Author: Ruud SF: 302 Author: Carlson  
Description: Multiple sclerosis drugs health insurance co-payments limitations

HF: 516 Author: Peppin SF: - Author: -  
Description: New mandated health benefit moratorium established

HF: 773 Author: Atkins SF: 619 Author: Scheid  
Description: Health carrier definition clarification

HF: 856 Author: Emmer SF: - Author: -  
Description: Medical assistance providers allowed to repackage and reprice services, health opportunity account project established, and human services commissioner required to develop and seek federal approval, MinnesotaCare voucher project established, and proposals and timetable required

HF: 867 Author: Davnie SF: 797 Author: Dahle  
Description: Self-insurance pools providing health coverage to local government employees regulated

HF: 992 Author: Dill SF: 814 Author: Bakk  
Description: School district employees state employee group insurance plan (SEGIP) eligibility

HF: 1012 Author: Laine SF: 539 Author: Erickson Ropes  
Description: Nonprofit health companies maximum financial reserves limitations

HF: 1022 Author: Anzelc SF: - Author: -  
Description: Local governments allowed to provide health coverage for employees through negotiated contributions to self-funded, multiemployer health and welfare plans

HF: 1211 Author: Ruud SF: - Author: -  
Description: Interpreter service coverage required, and interpreter services work group established

HF: 1219 Author: Kahn SF: 1153 Author: Pappas  
Description: Health insurance benefit availability required for domestic partners of state employees if they are also made available to spouses

HF: 1232 Author: Abeler SF: - Author: -  
Description: Evaluating health care provider performance certain factors prohibited, and statement added to health plan issued identification cards

HF: 1255 Author: Seifert SF: - Author: -  
Description: Minnesota Family Investment Program and general assistance eligibility requirements modified, MinnesotaCare eligibility for persons convicted of crimes of violence eliminated

HF: 1315 Author: Dean SF: - Author: -  
Description: State prepaid health care programs required to contract for services on a single-plan basis

HF: 1318 Author: Dean SF: - Author: -  
Description: MinnesotaCare demonstration project established and required to allow flexibility in the delivery of benefits, and health benefits account required to be established for each demonstration project participant

HF: 1334 Author: Gunther SF: 716 Author: Rosen  
Description: Medical Assistance (MA) treatment of life insurance policies, nursing facility private pay residents rate charging modifications and long-term care employer health insurance costs payment

HF: 1417 Author: Loon SF: 2009 Author: Hann  
Description: Subtraction for health insurance premiums allowed

HF: 1520 Author: Falk SF: 329 Author: Kubly  
Description: West Central health care purchasing alliance appropriation

HF: 1524 Author: Falk SF: 330 Author: Kubly  
Description: MinnesotaCare supplemental hospital coverage purchase option

HF: 1545 Author: Ruud SF: 1432 Author: Lourey  
Description: Emergency room and ambulance alternative payment mechanism for certain patients

HF: 1571 Author: Abeler SF: - Author: -  
Description: Governor's budget for health and human services established, various health care provisions amended, Protecting Children and Strengthening Families Act and Northstar Care for Children established, fees increased, work groups created, and money appropriated

HF: 1572 Author: Falk SF: 328 Author: Kubly  
Description: Health care purchasing alliance stop-loss fund reenactment

HF: 1601 Author: Otremba SF: 1278 Author: Kubly  
Description: Minnesota Pregnant Women and Parent Support Act

HF: 1642 Author: Gardner SF: - Author: -  
Description: Medical assistance health opportunity account demonstration project established

HF: 1656 Author: Bigham SF: 1470 Author: Sieben

Description: Required behavioral health coverage specified for children and young adults who have autism spectrum disorder

HF: 1722 Author: Huntley SF: 1547 Author: Berglin  
Description: Physician payment rates for state health care program reduced

HF: 1736 Author: Masin SF: 1727 Author: Doll  
Description: Medical provider conflicts of interests prohibited, criminal and civil penalties provided

HF: 1778 Author: Otremba SF: 1700 Author: Jungbauer  
Description: Prepaid health plans and county-based purchasing plans serving state health care program enrollees required to offer contracts to health care providers subject to the MinnesotaCare tax

HF: 1801 Author: Laine SF: 1468 Author: Marty  
Description: Hospital policies on cesarean sections regulated

HF: 1817 Author: Ruud SF: 1442 Author: Berglin  
Description: Alternative basic health plan for families with children eligible for medical assistance (MA) establishment

HF: 1865 Author: Gottwalt SF: 1735 Author: Hann  
Description: MinnesotaCare service provision modified, healthy Minnesotan plan requirements established, and healthy Minnesota accounts established for MinnesotaCare enrollees

Note: Proactive

HF: 1935 Author: Murphy, E. SF: - Author: -  
Description: MinnesotaCare and medical assistance consolidated, enrollment and eligibility procedures streamlined

HF: 1952 Author: Abeler SF: 1755 Author: Hann  
Description: Hearing aid dispenser fees limited

HF: 2076 Author: Loeffler SF: - Author: -  
Description: Equal access and equitable funding health and human services reform created, and steering committee created

HF: 2126 Author: Loon SF: 1280 Author: Hann  
Description: Health care coverage right to purchase in another state; physician's council on health care policy establishment; health insurance credit

HF: 2151 Author: Brod SF: - Author: -  
Description: Health care statewide system redesign plan developed

HF: 2219 Author: Loon SF: - Author: -  
Description: Tax credit provided for certain health insurance premiums

HF: 2256 Author: Laine SF: 419 Author: Carlson  
Description: Minnesota Health Act

HF: 2306      Author: Huntley      SF: 2072      Author: Berglin  
Description: Constitutional amendment for dedicating the proceeds of the health care provider tax to MinnesotaCare and health care access

HF: 2315      Author: Huntley      SF: 2076      Author: Berglin  
Description: MinnesotaCare tax rates increased

HF: 2356      Author: Peppin      SF: -      Author: -  
Description: State employee insurance plan regulated, plan established as a high deductible health plan, and health savings accounts required to be offered to enrollees

HF: -      Author: -      SF: 416      Author: Anderson  
Description: Minnesota Health Act

HF: -      Author: -      SF: 417      Author: Lourey  
Description: Minnesota Health Act

HF: -      Author: -      SF: 418      Author: Olson, M.  
Description: Minnesota Health Act

HF: -      Author: -      SF: 420      Author: Foley  
Description: Minnesota Health Act

HF: -      Author: -      SF: 1282      Author: Hann  
Description: Constitutional amendment for freedom of choice in health care