

**BEFORE THE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER
OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE**

In the matter of :
Proposed Affiliation of :
BCBSD, Inc. Doing Business as : Docket No. 99-09
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of :
Delaware, With CareFirst, Inc. :

DECISION AND AMENDED ORDER

BACKGROUND

On March 20, 2000, I issued a Final Order and Decision (“Affiliation Order”) approving the affiliation (the “Affiliation”) of BCBSD, Inc., a Delaware non-profit health services corporation (“BCBSD”), and CareFirst, Inc., a not-for-profit Maryland corporation (“CareFirst” and together with BCBSD, the “Companies”), in accordance with the terms of that certain Business Affiliation Agreement dated as of December 23, 1998, the Affiliation Plan appended thereto, and an Amended and Restated Intercompany Agreement dated as of March 22, 2000 (the “Intercompany Agreement”).

Under the Affiliation, CareFirst became the sole member of BCBSD, and BCBSD relinquished its primary Blue Cross® and Blue Shield® license and began operating under a controlled affiliate license issued by the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association (the “Association”) to BCBSD through CareFirst. As discussed in prior Orders in this matter, the Affiliation represented neither a change of control under the Delaware holding company act, 18 Del. C. Chapter 50, nor an acquisition of assets of BCBSD by CareFirst. Rather, the Affiliation Order was premised on the benefits to be gained by the affiliated companies through a consolidation of services and expense reduction mechanisms as opposed to the integration of BCBSD into CareFirst through a purchase and sale agreement. Under the Affiliation, as proposed, approved, and implemented, Carefirst would not and did not pay BCBSD, the State of Delaware or any other person or entity any consideration for the transfer of the membership interest in BCBSD or the transfer of the primary licenses for use of the Blue Cross® and Blue Shield® trademarks (the “Marks”) in Delaware.¹

¹ I note that the record reflects that Carefirst continues to recognize that the right to use the Marks in Delaware has been and continues to be an asset of BCBSD, and not of Carefirst. *See* letter of John Piccioutto, Esquire to Lester Schott, dated March 2, 2004. (Stipulated Exhibit No. 36.)

My approval of the Affiliation was conditioned upon strict adherence to certain enumerated Conditions, attached as Exhibit B to the Affiliation Order. Among others, the required Conditions included:

- a. CareFirst and BCBSD were to comply with the provisions of Chapter 50 of the Delaware Insurance Code and the general supervisory authority of the Delaware Insurance Commissioner (the “Commissioner”). (Stip. Exh. 1 ¶ 3).
- b. Any change in CareFirst’s Board structure could only be made with the prior approval of the Delaware Department of Insurance (the “Department”). (Id. ¶ 4).
- c. Certain transfers of assets were subject to the prior approval of the Delaware Insurance Commissioner. (Id. ¶ 5).
- d. Any change in BCBSD’s corporate status (including conversion to for-profit status) needed the prior written approval of the Department. (Id. ¶ 10).
- e. The Conditions were subject to further Order as circumstances may require, and the Findings and Recommendations and the Commissioner’s Order were subject to further modification, amendment or review, either sua sponte by the Commissioner or by motion of a party. (Id. ¶ 19).

SUMMARY OF THE PROCEEDINGS

In April 2003, the Maryland General Assembly passed legislation (the “Maryland Legislation”) directly affecting CareFirst that had the potential to adversely affect BCBSD and its Delaware subscribers. As a result of concerns regarding such legislation as detailed in the record of the Hearing (as defined below), I issued a standstill order on April 10, 2003 (the “Standstill Order”) as the first of a series of efforts to protect Delaware consumers.

Subsequently, on May 22, 2003, I issued a Rule to Show Cause why (1) the effect of the Maryland Legislation would not contravene the Affiliation Order, (2) the Affiliation Order should not be terminated, (3) BCBSD’s participation in the Affiliation should not be withdrawn, (4) any assets, licenses, authorities, or the like yielded by BCBSD to CareFirst should not be returned, and (5) any other and necessary Order should not be entered protecting the rights of Delaware citizens to the full benefits offered prior to the Affiliation Order (the “Rule to Show Cause”).

On November 4, 2003, in accordance with 29 Del. C. § 101 et seq. and 18 Del. C. § 323, a hearing was held before me, as hearing officer, where all parties were heard with respect the issues set forth in the Rule to Show Cause (the “November Hearing”). At the November Hearing, BCBSD and CareFirst jointly proposed a modified affiliation arrangement between the Companies on the terms and conditions set forth in the forms of an Administrative Services and Business Affiliation Agreement (the “ASBAA”) and related documents. Among other things, the ASBAA and related documents provided for (i) restoration of majority membership of BCBSD to the BCBSD Board of Directors; (ii) an

ongoing business relationship between BCBSD and CareFirst; (iii) oversight by, and reporting requirements to, the Commissioner; and (iv) CareFirst's surrender of the primary licenses to use Blue Cross® and Blue Shield® trademarks (the "Marks") in Delaware. The record reflects that the parties desired to preserve the benefits of their prior Affiliation by replacing the structural corporate relationship with one that was based on a contractual agreement. The parties agreed that this new contractual relationship would avoid the deleterious consequences of the Legislation on BCBSD and its subscribers.

In my Order of December 1, 2003, I approved the ASBAA and the associated transactions on the condition that, inter alia, the closing of the ASBAA be consummated by December 31, 2003. Although BCBSD and CareFirst agreed that the ASBAA would not become effective unless approved by the relevant insurance regulatory authorities (i.e., Maryland and the District of Columbia), my Order was not so subject. The December 1, 2003 Order provided that the Rule to Show cause would be reinstated should the ASBAA not be executed and implemented by December 31, 2003. As set forth more fully below, on December 23, 2003, the Maryland Insurance Commissioner disapproved the ASBAA pending the MIA's completion of its review of the proposed modified Affiliation Agreement between BCBSD and CareFirst. To date, the ASBAA and related documents remain under review before the Maryland Insurance Administration and therefore, the ASBAA remains unconsummated.

On December 30, 2003, BCBSD notified me that the parties would be unable to meet the deadline set by my Order of December 1, 2003. As a result, the Rule to Show Cause was reinstated. In anticipation of the hearing set for March 9, 2004 (the "Show Cause Hearing" or "Hearing"), I ordered the parties to submit memoranda on two issues: (1) whether the Affiliation Order has been violated by the effect of provisions of the Maryland Legislation, and (2) if the Affiliation Order has been violated, the appropriate remedy for such violation(s). Following the submission of memoranda by BCBSD, CareFirst, the Department of Insurance ("Department") and the Attorney General's Office, I convened a hearing on March 9, 2003 to hear evidence on those two issues. At the conclusion of the proceedings on March 9, I determined that sufficient evidence had been presented concerning a possible violation of the Affiliation Order that it was appropriate to receive evidence concerning an appropriate range of remedies should a violation be found. Accordingly I continued the hearing until April 15, 2004 to consider evidence with respect to what remedy, if any, would be appropriate should a final Order issue that a violation of the Affiliation Order had occurred.

At the conclusion of the April hearing, I asked the parties to separately submit their respective proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendations by May 3, 2004.

SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE

Evidence was presented in the form of briefs and exhibits thereto, through a stipulation of facts, and through the sworn testimony of the following witnesses:

- Max S. Bell, Jr., chairman of the board of directors of BCBSD and a Class III director of CareFirst;

- John A. Picciotto, executive vice-president and general counsel of CareFirst;
- Darryl Reese, director of the Delaware Insurance Department’s Examination Rehabilitation and Guaranty;
- Timothy J. Constantine, president of BCBSD;
- Ann Pruett, senior financial analyst for the Delaware Insurance Department; and
- Harold Sandstrom, a principal of Sandler O’Neill and Partners, L.P., an investment banking firm.

During the course of these proceedings, the parties submitted evidence regarding four broad issues: (1) whether the Maryland Legislation conflicted with the terms of the Affiliation Order and the relationships created thereunder; (2) the effect, if any, a partial or total disaffiliation would have upon BCBSD’s ability to provide vital services under the Marks; (3) the likelihood of timely approval of the ASBAA by the Maryland Insurance Commissioner; and (4) the effect a partial or total disaffiliation would have on BCBSD’s business, operations, and ability to provide service to its subscribers and the residents of the State of Delaware. The evidence presented is summarized below.

A. Evidence Regarding Violations of the Affiliation Order

BCBSD and the Department presented evidence that the Maryland Legislation has caused a violation or violations of the Affiliation Order in four principal ways.

1. Alteration Of The Corporate Structure

First, BCBSD and the Department submitted evidence that the Legislation has had the effect of significantly altering the corporate structure agreed to by the parties. For instance, the Maryland Legislation mandated that five new Class II members of the CareFirst board be nominated by a committee designated by the Maryland General Assembly and Governor by December 31, 2003 (the “Nominating Committee”), and that seven new class II directors be selected by the Class II directors by July 1, 2004 from a pool of applicants determined by the Nominating Committee to meet the minimum qualifications established by the Maryland Legislation. (Stip. Exh. 6, 7 at §14-115).

On January 1, 2004, five persons selected by the Nominating Committee replaced five of the Class II directors on the CareFirst Board. (Pre-Trial Stip. ¶ 16; see also Stip. Exh. 34). The remaining seven directors will be removed and replaced effective July 1, 2004. (Stip. Exh. 8; Testimony of M. Bell, Tr. at 85). Mr. Bell testified that “the Maryland General Assembly has taken away the company we had become affiliated with and has replaced it with a very different entity.” (Tr. at 87).

Mr. Bell testified that prior to agreeing to become affiliated with CareFirst, the BCBSD Board conducted due diligence on the CareFirst Board and its management, and developed a full understanding of the philosophy and principles guiding CareFirst’s Board and management. Mr. Bell testified that the BCBSD Board came to believe that CareFirst was a company that was

focused on fiscal discipline, market competitiveness, stabilization of surplus, and product innovation. (Tr. at 85-86).

Mr. Bell further testified that by July 1, 2004, all of the Maryland directors of CareFirst, constituting a majority of the Board, will be replaced by persons who lack institutional memory regarding CareFirst and its affiliates. (Id. at 88). He expressed concern with the fact that the new directors were all either appointed by the State of Maryland, or will be appointed from “a limited pool of applicants screened by the State of Maryland.” (Id.).

According to the testimony of Mr. Picciotto, the process by which Class II directors are nominated and appointed represents a departure from what had been the process under the then-existing CareFirst bylaws and charter. (Id. at 65-66). However, Mr. Reese testified that neither BCBSD nor CareFirst has ever applied to the Department for approval of mechanisms for the selection and election of board members (other than that which was approved in the Affiliation Order). (Id. at 124; Pre-Trial Stip. at 16).

In addition to a change in the composition of the Class II directors, BCBSD and the Department presented evidence of other changes in the corporate governance and structure of CareFirst. For instance, the Maryland Legislation, by its terms, provides for, inter alia:

- *An increase in the size of the Board.* Section 14-115(d) of the Legislation increases the maximum size of the CareFirst Board from 21 to 23. (Stip. Exh. 6, 7). Mr. Reese testified that there has been no application to the Department of Insurance regarding any change in the composition, size or structure of the CareFirst Board. (Tr. at 124).
- *The creation of oversight committees.* (Stip. Exh. 6, 7 at §§ 14-115(d)(6)(V), (VI). The provisions cited herein mandate the creation of a Mission Oversight Committee and a Service and Quality Oversight Committee for the CareFirst Board. (See also BCBSD Memo at 6-7; Testimony of M. Bell, Tr. at 89).
- *A limitation of the compensation of CareFirst board members.* (See Stip. Exh. 6, 7 at § 14-115(g)(1); BCBSD Memo at 7-8; Dept. Memo at 9).
- *A reduction in length of board terms.* Section § 14-115(e) reduces the length of a term on the CareFirst Board from three to two years (Stip. Exh. 6, 7; BCBSD Memo at 7, Dept. Memo at 9).

Given the regulatory and legislative environment in Maryland, and the changes in the CareFirst Board, Mr. Bell testified that BCBSD saw little prospect that CareFirst would be managed the way it was prior to the enactment of the Maryland Legislation. To the contrary, Mr. Bell testified to BCBSD’s concern that the new Board will take CareFirst in a different direction, one that might put BCBSD and its subscribers at risk. (Testimony of M. Bell, Tr. at 86-92).

2. Control Over BCBSD Management Decisions

BCBSD and the Department further submitted evidence that the Maryland Legislation requires routine management decisions made by CareFirst or any affiliate or subsidiary of CareFirst to be pushed up to the CareFirst Board or a Board committee for approval. According to Mr. Bell, “these are decisions that are not limited to policy but involve substantial operations and, in effect, have board members without the expertise of their officers having to pass on actions not traditionally coming to board attention.” (Tr. at 85). Mr. Reese testified that no party has applied to the Department with respect to such a change. (Id. at 123-24).

Specifically, Section 14-115(d)(11)(I) of the Maryland Legislation provides that the approval of the CareFirst board is required before BCBSD or CareFirst may (1) modify benefit levels; (2) materially modify provider networks or provider reimbursement; (3) modify underwriting guidelines; (4) modify rates or rating plans; (5) withdraw a product or withdraw from a line or type of business or geographic region; or (6) impact the availability or affordability of health care in the State of Maryland. (Stip. Exh. 6, 7; BCBSD Memo at 7; Dept. Memo at 9-10).

During the April 15, 2004 portion of the Hearing, counsel for CareFirst asserted that the Maryland General Assembly had recently passed a bill (the “2004 Legislation”) that may mitigate certain of the more onerous provisions of the Maryland Legislation.² The 2004 Legislation was introduced as evidence in this proceeding as Stip. Exh. 67.³

The 2004 Legislation purports to address certain issues of concern to both the Department and BCBSD, including, inter alia, a clarification that the mission statement does not apply to BCBSD. Under the Maryland Legislation, this new mission statement applies to insurers or health maintenance organizations “owned or controlled” by a non-profit health service plan that is issued a certificate of authority in Maryland. The 2004 Legislation would amend this by requiring that the non-profit health plan that owns or controls the subject insurer also be doing “business in this state.” While the intent of this provision appears to have been to limit the scope of the state-mandated non-profit mission to entities doing business in Maryland, the practical effect of the amending language may be otherwise. CareFirst is a non-profit health service plan doing business in the State of Maryland and, to the extent CareFirst is considered by Maryland authorities to “own or control” BCBSD, the amendment provides no relief to BCBSD whatsoever. To the extent the Maryland Legislation included BCBSD within the scope of the

² The implementation of certain aspects of the Maryland Legislation may be modified by a Consent Judgement entered into the United States District Court for the District of Maryland among parties to that litigation: Carefirst, the Association, and the State of Maryland. BCBSD and the Department were not parties to that litigation. In any event the uncertain effect of the modifications does not alter the facts before me, or the result reached.

³ We take notice of the fact that the Legislation was subsequently signed into law by Maryland Governor Ehrlich on May 11, 2004.

non-profit mission requirement before the 2004 Legislation, it may continue to do so. In all events, the 2004 Legislation does not address numerous other provisions of the Maryland Legislation, which impact BCBS and its subscribers, including:

- The five-year moratorium on conversion;
- The appointment of the two non-voting members to the CareFirst Board;
- The requirement to replace the seven remaining Class II directors by July 1, 2004;
- Elimination of the Oversight Committee;
- Exemption of BCBSD disaffiliation from the requirement of Maryland approval; and
- Repeal of Board compensation caps.

3. Imposition of a New Not-For-Profit Mission

BCBSD and the Department set forth evidence that Section 14-102(f) of the Maryland Legislation adds additional language to the Maryland Insurance Article emphasizing the “nonprofit mission” of CareFirst. (See BCBSD Memo at 5; Dept. Memo at 10).

According to the testimony of Mr. Picciotto, the not-for-profit mission statement is different from “what had been used in the past in the individual companies.” (Tr. at 60). However, Mr. Reese testified that no party had sought Departmental approval for the new mission statement. (Id. at 123). According to Mr. Bell’s testimony, “the Maryland [L]egislation has now locked CareFirst into a mission that is inconsistent with the mission of The Delaware Plan, and that cannot be changed without a further act by the Maryland General Assembly. We consider this to be a most unacceptable change of circumstance.” (Id. at 87).

As noted above, the 2004 Legislation will not insulate BCBSD, directly or indirectly, from the negative impact of the Maryland Legislation.

4. Imposition of a Five-Year Acquisition Moratorium Affecting BCBSD

Section 7 of the Maryland Legislation provides that a nonprofit health service plan that is subject to the Legislation (including CareFirst and CareFirst of Maryland, Inc., the Maryland Blue plan subsidiary) may not be acquired for a period of five years after the effective date of the Maryland Legislation, irrespective of whether the board feels that such a merger is in the best interests of the company and its subscribers. (Stip. Exh. 6, 7; BCBSD Memo at 9; Dept. Memo at 10-11; Testimony of M. Bell, Tr. at 85).

According to Mr. Bell’s testimony, “[g]iven the commitment to the so-called ‘nonprofit mission’ that all CareFirst directors are now required to demonstrate, any acquisition that would involve a conversion to for-profit status is effectively foreclosed for the indefinite future. Even if another potential strategic partner were to come forward with a proposal to replicate the original

arrangement we had with CareFirst ... that strategic alternative is effectively off the table for The Delaware Plan⁴ so long as it remains subject to the current structural affiliation.” (Tr. at 91-92).

Both BCBSD and the Department note the negative effect this provision will have in BCBSD’s ability to participate in any transaction that might be in the interest of BCBSD and its subscribers. (BCBSD Memo at 16; Dept. Memo at 10-11).

B. Evidence Regarding the Effect of the Return of the Marks to BCBSD

The parties further presented evidence regarding the effect, if any, a total or partial disaffiliation would have upon BCBSD’s ability to provide uninterrupted service under the Marks. Among other evidence, the parties introduced a letter from Scott P. Serota, president and chief executive officer of the Association, stating that Association and the Department shared a common interest in ensuring continued Blue Cross® coverage for Delaware subscribers. (Stip. Exh. 51). Mr. Serota’s letter affirmed that should CareFirst no longer hold the licenses to use the Marks in Delaware, the Association “would seek to award those licenses to BCBSD.” (Id.). That letter further represented that in the event of a dispute about BCBSD’s licensure status, provided the *status quo* is maintained, the Association would “continue to deem BCBSD a Controlled Affiliate in good standing, with all attendant rights and responsibilities under the Licenses, until its status were finally determined.” (Id.).

Through the testimony of Max Bell, BCBSD asserted that the surrender of the Marks to BCBSD would not affect coverage under the Marks. (Tr. at 95). He testified that

the single most important asset held by The Delaware Plan is its right to use the [Marks] in Delaware, and it remains critical that we preserve this asset. As you will recall, the ASBAA called for surrender of the marks by CareFirst so that The Delaware Plan could return to the status of primary licensee. We worked closely with the Association last fall and obtained a commitment from it that The Delaware Plan would qualify for, and receive, the primary license once it was relinquished by CareFirst. We have not abandoned our resolve on this issue, and the salient features of The Delaware Plan that caused it to qualify for primary licensee status last fall remain in place today. We have every confidence that the Association will again agree to grant us primary licensee status when the rights are surrendered by CareFirst. I have experience with [the] Association and I know that its interests in protecting our customers is just as great as ours.

(Id.). According to the testimony of Mr. Constantine, if CareFirst refuses to surrender the Marks, the Association would likely take the Marks from CareFirst because it cannot meet the Association’s criteria for maintaining a license in Delaware without BCBSD. Were this to occur, Mr. Constantine testified that correspondence and contacts with the Association led him to believe that the Association would award the Marks to BCBSD. (Tr. at 149-50). He further

⁴ In his testimony, Mr. Bell refers to BCBSD as “the Delaware Plan”.

testified that BCBSD is confident that “either limited or total disengagement from CareFirst can be achieved without disruption to or negative impact on our subscribers.” (Id. at 136).

C. Evidence Regarding the Likelihood of Timely Approval of the ASBAA

Additionally, the parties presented evidence that the Maryland Insurance Commissioner disapproved of the parties’ application for approval of the ASBAA, pending receipt of sufficient information for him to make a decision. (Testimony of J. Picciotto, Tr. at 77; Testimony of M. Bell, Tr. at 82; Dept. Memo at 12). During the March 8 portion of the Show Cause Hearing, counsel for CareFirst stated that he understood that the Maryland Insurance Administration would rule on CareFirst’s ASBAA application or before April 15, 2004, provided CareFirst’s informational responses were deemed complete. (Tr. at 27).

The Maryland Insurance Commissioner did not rule on the parties’ application for approval of the ASBAA as of the date of the April 15, 2004 portion of the Show Cause Hearing. According to the testimony of Mr. Constantine, the parties “see little likelihood that an approval will be forthcoming” from the Maryland Insurance Commissioner in the foreseeable future. (Tr. at 135). Mr. Bell testified that “[w]e do not have a date certain when we might expect [a] decision. Instead, we have been told only that a decision might be produced on or about April 15, and this depends on how [the] Commissioner ... views the information recently submitted to him by CareFirst.” (Id. at 82). As of the date of this Order, no decision of the MIA has been issued, or is expected in the immediate future.

D. Evidence Regarding the Impact of Partial or Total Disaffiliation on BCBSD’s Operations

Mr. Constantine’s testimony provided evidence regarding the impact on BCBSD that would result from a limited or total disengagement from CareFirst. Mr. Constantine testified that even under the most conservative projections, BCBSD was confident that either limited or total disengagement from CareFirst “can be achieved without disruption to or negative impact on our subscribers.” (Tr. at 136).

Mr. Constantine noted that in many areas of the operation of BCBSD subsequent to the affiliation with CareFirst – such as maintenance of provider networks, claims handling and payment and most of its information systems – BCBSD has continued to perform the primary functions involving those areas. (Id. at 136-137). As to others, such as marketing, product development, market research and product marketing as well as payroll, human services and employee benefits, BCBSD is confident that it can cost effectively resume these functions on behalf of an autonomous BCBSD. (Id. at 136-39).

Mr. Constantine testified that BCBSD would face projected increases in administrative costs in connection with its return to independent status in the following amounts: \$1.8 million for the last six months of 2004; \$3.8 million for 2005; and \$3.9 million for 2006. (Id. at 141). In the event of a complete disaffiliation, the net incremental administrative expense increase would be \$1.3 million for the last six months of 2004; \$2.7 million for 2005; and \$2.8 million for 2006. (Id. at 142, see also Stip. Exh. 63).

Mr. Constantine's forecasts were based on the assumption that the BCBSD membership would be returned on July 1, 2004. His calculations further assumed that BCBSD's membership rate would grow at a slower rate in 2005 and 2006 than has historically been the case and, for purposes of a sensitivity analysis, that BCBSD would encounter a three-percent decrease in membership for 2005 and 2006. (Tr. at 141, see also Stip. Exh. 63).

Mr. Constantine then took the projected expenses discussed above and used them to model what the impact of these expenses would be on BCBSD's overall financial performance under a one percent membership growth and a three percent membership decline scenario for three years. He assumed that BCBSD's medical loss ratio would increase from 88.4 percent in 2003 to 89.4 percent, 89.6 percent, and 89.9 percent for 2004, 2005 and 2006, respectively. Under this model, BCBSD would "remain in a solid financial position even if CareFirst is unable or unwilling to continue a business relationship" with BCBSD." (Tr. at 144, see also Stip. Exh. 63). Specifically, the model demonstrated projected results for 2005 as follows:

- Revenue: \$976,000,000
- Incurred care: \$875,000,000
- Operating expense ratio: 8.7 percent (excluding HIPAA costs)
- Net income ratio from operations: 1.1 percent
- Risk based capital as a percentage of ACL RBC: 1,340 percent

(Stip. Exh. 63). With respect to 2006, the model demonstrated the following projected results:

- Revenue: \$1,022,000,000
- Incurred care: \$918,000,000
- Operating expense ratio: 8.6 percent
- Net income ratio from operations: 1.1 percent
- Risk based capital ratio: 1,370 percent

The Department's review of BCBSD's testimony and projections was performed by Ann Pruett, a senior financial analyst at the Delaware Department of Insurance, who testified on behalf of the Department. Ms. Pruett, who is responsible for the review and analysis of health insurance companies licensed in Delaware, reviews company statements to assure compliance with the Delaware insurance code and statutory accounting practices. She reviewed the projections prepared by BCBSD and presented by Mr. Constantine in his testimony to determine if BCBSD would still be in regulatory compliance under Delaware law if it became disaffiliated with CareFirst. (Tr. at 168-70). In that regard, Ms. Pruett reviewed not only the BCBSD projections but the financial statements for BCBSD from 1999 through 2003. She also interviewed BCBSD's corporate controller regarding the financial projections discussed by Mr. Constantine. (Id. at 170).

Ms. Pruett specifically focused on the projections to ensure that BCBSD took into account services the Company would need to obtain if they were no longer receiving those

services from CareFirst. Ms. Pruett concluded that BCBSD did in fact take these services into consideration as part of its projections. (Id. at 171). Ms. Pruett specifically focused on the capital surplus, operating results and management of BCBSD in performing this analysis. She examined the three capitalization ratios traditionally employed by the Department to measure a company's financial health: the RBC ratio, the premium surplus ratio and the combined ratio. (Id. at 172). She noted that the RBC ratio for 2003 was \$118.4 million – a figure well above the minimum standard, and one which has remained stable since 1999. The RBC ratio has increased \$29.3 million from 1999. (Id. at 172). As to the premium surplus ratio, Ms. Pruett noted that for a healthy insurance company, the Department likes to see a maintained ratio of less than 5:1. In 1999, BCBSD had a premium surplus ratio of 1.78:1. In 2003, such ratio was 2.26:1. (Id. at 173). Finally, Ms. Pruett calculated the combined ratio (the sum of the medical loss ratio and the administrative expense ratio). BCBSD's combined 2003 medical loss and administrative expense ratios were 93.9%. (Id. at 173).

Ms. Pruett testified that while there had been some minor changes in management as a result of the affiliation, staffing had generally increased following the affiliation and there were no changes for BCBSD that were out of line with any other health insurance company doing business in the State. (Id. at 174). In her professional judgment, Ms. Pruett concluded that the principal expense incurred under disaffiliation would occur in administration, and that the total increases in costs as a result of disaffiliation would be relatively small compared to the Company's total expenses. (Id. at 175).

In addition, Ms. Pruett testified that she "stressed" BCBSD's projections and increased the administrative expense figure by 50%. She found even at that level, BCBSD would not face any financial difficulty or be out of regulatory compliance should its administrative expenses increase to such an extent. (Id.). She concluded that BCBSD's projections were appropriate, and were a realistic measure for valuing a scenario in which BCBSD would disaffiliate from CareFirst. She concluded that BCBSD would, in her judgment, be able to meet all the applicable regulatory and statutory requirements to remain a solvent and viable health service corporation under Chapter 63 of the Delaware Insurance Code. (Id. at 176).

Finally, Mr. Harold Sandstrom, a principal of the firm of Sandler O'Neill & Partners, L.P. ("Sandler O'Neill"), presented testimony on behalf of the Department. Mr. Sandstrom had previously testified as an expert for the Department at its November 4, 2003 hearing in this matter. He testified that he had been asked to reconsider his opinion of November 4 based on an assumption that BCBSD and CareFirst would disaffiliate, that there would be no ASBAA agreement between them, and that BCBSD would have to obtain the services provided for under ASBAA from other sources. Mr. Sandstrom submitted and summarized a letter report introduced into evidence in this proceeding as Stip. Exh. 68. He noted that the Department of Insurance had asked Sandler O'Neill to update its previously submitted November 4, 2003 report to consider the impact on BCBSD of a modification of its relationship with CareFirst, the principal provisions of the proposed modification being that: (1) CareFirst would no longer provide certain services for BCBSD; (2) BCBSD would continue to operate as a Blue Cross® Blue Shield® licensee;

and (3) that BCBSD's operative corporate documents would be amended to accommodate the transfer of a majority membership in BCBSD back from CareFirst to the BCBSD board of directors. (Tr. at 183-84).

Mr. Sandstrom testified that his firm's conclusion, while financial in nature, is predicated on BCBSD retaining its Blue Cross Blue Shield status. (Id. at 184). Beyond the earlier work performed by it, Sandler O'Neill examined the previously referenced BCBSD management financial forecast (Stip. Exh. 63) as well as various other information available regarding BCBSD, including:

- a member Touchpoint Service update for the second half of 2003 with results dated April 2, 2004;
- a Standard and Poor's Insurance Rating Analysis dated December 2003;
- interviews conducted with BCBSD senior management including Phillip A. Carter, corporate controller for BCBSD, Timothy J. Constantine, and William E. Kirk, BCBSD's vice president, general counsel and corporate secretary, regarding the business financial condition results of operation and prospects of BCBSD in the impact of the proposed assumption of services previously provided by CareFirst.

(Tr. at 185-86).

Mr. Sandstrom testified that, based upon his Company's review and analysis of the information and data referenced in the letter report, Sandler O'Neill believes that the assumption by BCBSD of the services heretofore provided by CareFirst, together with the assumption of the related cost of such services as projected by BCBSD, would cause no material adverse effect on the financial condition of BCBSD. Moreover, Sandler O'Neill noted that the significant consolidation of the health insurance sector and the likely impact on smaller insurers indicate that an affiliation with a substantial regional or national health insurer will continue to be important to BCBSD's operating and financial condition. (Id. at 187-88).

Carefirst, for its part, offered no separate evidence or meaningful cross examination to dispute or contradict the testimony cited above. Indeed, although Carefirst urges a different standard of review and result, it does not seriously challenge the applicability or credibility of the testimony presented by the other parties to this proceeding.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECISION

I have carefully reviewed the extensive evidence presented in this matter and have considered all of the legal arguments of the parties and the law applicable to the issues under consideration. Based on the extensive record in this matter and the findings made below, the relief ordered herein is appropriate, supported by substantial evidence, and, as set forth more fully below, within my broad statutory power to grant. Moreover, in light of the numerous violations of the Affiliation, such relief is justified on the basis of the evidence before me.

The Maryland Legislation (which failed to appropriately distinguish any of the Maryland CareFirst companies from each other or from BCBSD) creates conflicts in various ways with the terms of the Affiliation Order and the relationships created thereunder. BCBSD identified thirteen such issues, but both BCBSD and the Insurance Department focused on four fundamental problems arising from the Maryland Legislation involving corporate governance and board composition; Board review of routine management decisions; imposition of a newly configured Maryland not-for-profit mission; and the imposition of a five-year acquisition moratorium affecting BCBSD. I shall address each of these below.

Restructuring of CareFirst Governance

The Maryland Legislation, even as allegedly modified by the Consent Judgment, has caused the removal and replacement of five of the initial twelve Class II directors by January 1, 2004. The five new Class II directors, seated on January 1, 2004, were selected by the Nominating Committee created by the Maryland Legislation, and the remaining Class II directors had no voice in their selection. The remaining seven Class II directors must be replaced on or before July 1, 2004. The replacement directors are selected by the now existing Class II directors (five of whom are brand new) out of a finite pool of applicants screened by the Nominating Committee. This action forces the replacement of a voting majority of a Board upon which BCBSD conducted careful due diligence before deciding to proceed with the Affiliation. These changes to the CareFirst Board, none of which have been approved by the Department, put a significantly different Board, with significantly different goals, objectives and responsibilities, in control of CareFirst, a result inconsistent with the terms of the Affiliation I reviewed and approved. I find there is substantial risk that the new Class II directors, a majority of the CareFirst board, will not and cannot exercise the judgments and attitudes about the company's governance and strategic direction that characterized the CareFirst Board at the time I approved the Affiliation. I further find that there is a substantial risk that this new majority will govern CareFirst in a manner that is inconsistent with the present long term objectives of the BCBSD Board.

Board Review of Routine Management Decisions

The Maryland Legislation, as originally enacted, imposed on CareFirst and its affiliates including BCBSD, a new requirement providing that six categories of routine management actions be approved by the CareFirst Board or a committee of the Board. Specifically, Board approval must be obtained in order to (1) modify benefit levels, (2) materially modify provider networks or reimbursement; (3) modify underwriting guidelines, (4) modify rates, (5) withdraw a

product or withdraw from a line of business, and (6) any other action that would impact the availability or affordability of healthcare in “the state.”

The 2004 Legislation, modifies this new requirement to clarify that it only applies to action that affects Maryland residents. However, this clarification addresses only certain of the concerns expressed in this proceeding, because BCBSD engages in none of the activities in question in the State of Maryland. I find that the requirements of this section, even as modified by the 2004 Legislation, place new, specific and detailed requirements on the CareFirst Board which did not exist at the time of my review and approval of the Affiliation. In addition, I also find that the CareFirst charter and Bylaws that I approved in connection with my approval of the Affiliation do not contain provisions limiting the authority of management in this manner.

The New Not-For-Profit Mission of CareFirst

As revised by the Maryland Legislation, Section 14-102 of the Insurance Article now contains a provision mandating that the mission of CareFirst shall be to:

- (1) Provide affordable and accessible health insurance to the plan’s insureds and those persons insured by its affiliates;
- (2) Assist and support public and private health care initiatives for individuals without health care; and
- (3) Promote the integration of a statewide health care system that meets the needs of all Maryland residents.

CareFirst is charged with developing goals, objectives and strategies for carrying out this statutory mission, and is required to make a report of such to the oversight committee created by the Maryland Legislation. (Md. Ins. Code § 14-102(d)). This mission was not a part of CareFirst’s corporate Charter and Bylaws when I approved the Affiliation.

As noted previously, the 2004 Legislation as a practical matter and in light of the Maryland authorities’ apparent view that CareFirst “owns or controls” BCBSD, does not fix the imposition of this mission on BCBSD. In all events, I must assume that the Maryland Insurance Administration will enforce the non-profit mission on CareFirst.

This may well include the view of the Maryland Insurance Administration that the non-profit mission of CareFirst requires that it remain in, or otherwise subsidize, unprofitable markets and lines of business. A non-profit mission which causes CareFirst to be governed, managed and operated in a way that does not give first priority to its financial safety and soundness is not consistent with the type of Company CareFirst was when BCBSD sought Affiliation, and at the time I reviewed and approved the Affiliation. Further, continued structural Affiliation with such a company is not in the best interest of BCBSD and its Delaware subscribers.

The Five Year Moratorium on Acquisition

Section 7 of the Maryland Legislation provides that a nonprofit health service plan that is subject to the Legislation (including CareFirst and CareFirst of Maryland, Inc., the Maryland Blue plan subsidiary) may not be acquired for a period of five years after the effective date of the Legislation (May 22, 2008). This assures that BCBSD, whose sole member is CareFirst, will not be sold, combined or converted as a part of CareFirst, even if the BCBSD Board determines such a transaction is in BCBSD's best interest. I further see little possibility that, under the present structural affiliation, BCBSD could be acquired independently of CareFirst, because this would require the consent of CareFirst as BCBSD's sole member. New Class II Board members cognizant of and accountable to a new set of non-profit principles and a moratorium on sales compelled by Maryland law are most unlikely to allow BCBSD to be sold and converted. CareFirst Board approval is necessary to authorize this transaction under the present BCBSD Certificate of Incorporation. (See Stip. Exh. 45 at Article ELEVEN(b)). This is particularly the case if the financial condition of CareFirst deteriorates, a circumstance in which BCBSD is most likely to determine that it needs to leave the CareFirst fold.

I find that the five-year moratorium included in the Maryland Legislation, when coupled with the statutory non-profit mission of CareFirst, effectively precludes BCBSD from being acquired by a third party at least through May 22, 2008, and very likely for the indefinite future thereafter, notwithstanding that such an acquisition might be in the best interests of BCBSD and its subscribers. It also precludes me from considering and approving such an acquisition, which is contrary to my retained authority to do so under conditions 9 and 10 of Exhibit B to the Original Order.

Effect of Return of the Marks to BCBSD

I have also carefully considered the record with respect to the effect, if any, the return of the Marks would have upon BCBSD's ability to provide services to its customers. Evidence on this issue was presented, *inter alia*, in the form of (1) a letter from the president and CEO of the Association, affirming that in the event CareFirst no longer held the Marks, the Association would seek to award them to BCBSD (Stip. Exh. 51); (2) the testimony of Max Bell, stating among other things that BCBSD obtained a commitment from the Association that it would receive the primary license once it was relinquished by CareFirst (Tr. at 95); and (3) the testimony of Tim Constantine, who stated that BCBSD was confident that "either limited or total disengagement from CareFirst can be achieved without disruption to or negative impact on our subscribers." (Tr. at 136).

None of the parties have offered evidence indicating that the Association would not promptly return the Marks to BCBSD in the event of a partial or total disaffiliation. Indeed, the parties presented evidence that a failure to promptly return the Marks to BCBSD is not in the best interest of the Association. CareFirst has no ability to use the Marks in Delaware except through BCBSD, and if BCBSD is not a controlled affiliate of CareFirst under the Association's rules, CareFirst would no longer be in a position to exercise any rights as "primary licensee." In

such instance, the Association would be required to find another plan to serve as a “primary licensee.”

Mr. Constantine testified that, other than through BCBSD, CareFirst would not be able to meet the Association’s criteria for licensing in Delaware. Mr. Bell testified that BCBSD would qualify under the Association’s criteria to serve as a “primary licensee” in connection with the contemplated closing of the ASBAA, and that nothing had changed that would prevent BCBSD from qualifying as primary licensee today. For all of the foregoing reasons, I find that a return of the Marks to BCBSD would have no adverse effect on BCBSD’s ability to provide services to its customers and the residents of the State of Delaware under the Marks.

I have also considered the effect of any disaffiliation of CareFirst and BCBSD on the financial condition of BCBSD. Based on the record evidence, including testimony of Mr. Reese, Mr. Pruett, Mr. Constantine and Mr. Sandstrom, I find that disaffiliation will not have any internal adverse financial effect on BCBSD and that, if disaffiliation occurs, BCBSD will be able to satisfy all applicable regulatory and statutory requirements to remain a solvent and viable health service corporation under Chapter 63 of the Delaware Code.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Approval of the Affiliation was premised upon an order that BCBSD “must maintain” its separation from CareFirst for insurance regulatory purposes (Stip. Exh. 1, Exhibit B at ¶ 1) and that the Department would retain “oversight ability [after the Affiliation] with respect to the future activities and transactions of CareFirst and BCBSD” in order to ensure “no substantial alterations of BCBSD health services as currently provided in Delaware can occur absent prior notice and approval of the Insurance Commissioner and Attorney General.” (*Id.* at p. 3).

Based upon the factual evidence in this matter, it is obvious that CareFirst cannot or will not be able to adhere to various conditions set forth in the Affiliation Order (the “Required Conditions”) and conditions ordered subsequent to the Affiliation Order. A prominent example of such a violation is the alteration of the CareFirst Board without the approval of the Delaware Insurance Commissioner. The provision of the Affiliation Order that is most clearly affected by the Maryland Legislation is condition 4, which provides:

The Boards of CareFirst and BCBSD shall be *restructured*, to the extent necessary, to (i) comply with the terms of the draft amended Certificates of Incorporation and By-Laws of the two companies (Stip. Exh. 9, 10, 11 and 12);

* * *

Any change in this *structure* must receive prior approval of the Insurance Department.

(Stip. Exh. 1, Exhibit B at ¶ 4) (emphasis added).

The structure of the Boards must not change without the prior approval of the Insurance Department. If for *any* reason the structure of either Board is altered, such alteration cannot be

accomplished until after the Department has been apprised of it, and approves it. Such approval was neither sought nor obtained in connection with the passage of the Maryland Legislation, nor was it sought or obtained in connection with the Consent Order entered by Judge Motz on June 6, 2003. Still further, no approval was sought or obtained pursuant to the Standstill Order when the first five new Class II Directors took office in January. Consequently, I find that both my Original Order and the Standstill Order have been, and continue to be, violated as a result of the Maryland Legislation and the changes that resulted from it.

The Delaware Insurance Commission is an administrative agency responsible for enforcing the provisions of the Insurance Code. See State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Hale, 297 A.2d 416, 418 (Del. Ch. 1972). In order to fulfill that responsibility, the Insurance Commissioner has been granted broad statutory powers. See 18 Del. C. § 310(b) (“The Commissioner shall have the powers and authority expressly vested by or reasonably implied from this title.”); see also 18 Del. C. § 5008 (“The Commissioner may, upon notice and opportunity for all interested parties to be heard, issue such rules, regulations and orders as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter.”). This broad statutory power carries with it the authority to do all that is reasonably necessary to execute that power. Dep’t of Correction v. Worsham, 638 A.2d 1104, 1107 (Del. 1994); Atlantis I Condo. Ass’n v. Bryson, 403 A.2d 711, 713 (Del. 1979). The implied authority of Delaware administrative agencies has been described by the Court of Chancery as follows:

[I]t is . . . well established that an express legislative grant of power or authority to an administrative agency includes, by implication, the grant of power to do what is reasonably necessary to be done to implement such power and authority. And in determining whether or not there is an implied grant of authority, a particular statutory scheme must be viewed in its totality. When an agency is vested with a broad range of discretionary powers it is likely that the General Assembly intended to vest implied authority in such agency to do that which is incidental, implied, necessary and proper in light of the objectives sought to be gained and in light of the express powers granted.

Retail Liquor Dealers Ass’n of Delaware, et al. v. Delaware Alcoholic Beverage Control Comm’n, 1980 WL 273545 (Del. Ch. Apr. 23, 1980).

It has also been frequently held that when an administrative agency makes a decision, it has the inherent power to vacate it so long as it has retained jurisdiction over the matter. See Lyons v. Delaware Liquor Comm’n, 58 A.2d 889, 895 (Del. Gen. Sess. 1948); Henry v. Dep’t of Labor, 293 A.2d 578, 581 (Del. Super. 1972). As the following excerpts from the Affiliation Order demonstrate, I expressly retained jurisdiction in this matter in order to enforce the provisions of the Affiliation Order:

For the reasons set forth herein, including Exhibits A and B, the affiliation of CareFirst and BCBSD, as outlined in the Business Affiliation Agreement, is hereby APPROVED, subject to scrupulous adherence to Conditions Nos. 1-20 set forth in Exhibit B. (Stip. Exh. 1 at 3-4).

* * *

3. CareFirst must agree to comply with the provisions of 18 Del. C. Ch. 50 (Insurance Holding Company System Registration). CareFirst must also agree to the general supervisory power of the Delaware Insurance Commissioner pursuant to 18 Del. C. Ch. 3. (Id., Exhibit B at 1).

* * *

19. These conditions are subject to further order as circumstances may require. These Findings and Recommendations and the Commissioner's Order are subject to further modification or amendment or further review either sua sponte by the Commissioner or by motion of a party. (Id., Exhibit B at 5).

For all of the foregoing reasons, I have the power to reopen and amend the Affiliation Order if circumstances warrant.

The changes brought about because of the Maryland Legislation, as evidenced by the extensive record in this matter and summarized above, have not only detrimentally affected the rights of the parties, they have ignored and impaired the authority of the Delaware Commissioner of Insurance, under Delaware law, to independently regulate a major domestic Delaware health insurer. The conscious disregard of this authority and the conditions contained in my prior orders cannot pass unaddressed without undermining the authority of the Commissioner and the Department. See Eastern Commercial Reality Corp. v. Fusco, 654 A.2d 833, 836 (Del. 1994).

The State of Maryland removed the CareFirst with which BCBSD became affiliated and has effectively replaced it with another entity. This action was taken without consultation with Delaware authorities and entirely without the consent of the BCBSD Board. The Maryland Legislation gives rise to a number of substantial risks to the safety and soundness of CareFirst, and it also precludes the acquisition and conversion of BCBSD in the future, even if BCBSD determines such to be in the best interests of its subscribers. I do not believe it is appropriate to take a "wait and see" attitude with respect to these concerns. If the financial condition of CareFirst deteriorates as a result of the changes in its mission and governance, it may be too late at that time to disentangle a structurally affiliated BCBSD from CareFirst before irreparable damage to the financial condition or reputation of BCBSD occurs. Real damage to the Affiliation has been done and action must be taken now.

With respect to the 2004 Legislation, while it does provide some relief as to certain items in the Maryland Legislation, it falls far short of the reforms needed to fully address the many concerns of the changes which have been and will continue to be implemented.

I have carefully considered all of the arguments raised by CareFirst in its memorandum, including, without limitation, those asserting that I lack authority to order any remedy, excuse of violation of my Orders based on the concept of "impossibility of performance" or lack of "just cause" to order disaffiliation. For the reasons presented by BCBSD and the Insurance Department in their memorandum, I am not persuaded by CareFirst's view of the facts or the law.

The remedy proposed both by BCBSD and the Department is reasonable not only because of the gravity of the difficulties created by the Maryland Legislation and the infringement upon my authority, but also because the remedy has, for a number of reasons, little prejudicial impact on CareFirst. First, the remedy sought mirrors quite closely the fundamental terms and conditions of the ASBAA; for instance, the Marks shall be restored to BCBSD, but the practical aspects of the affiliation may be preserved. Second, CareFirst's current membership in BCBSD does not equate to "ownership" in the sense that ownership of shares of a stock corporation does. BCBSD is not an asset of CareFirst and no part of the value of BCBSD could ever be distributed to CareFirst. Third, CareFirst has recognized that the right to use the Marks under any license of the Association is an asset of BCBSD's, and because CareFirst can not transact "Blue" business in Delaware except through BCBSD, permitting CareFirst to hold the right to use the Marks would be useless absent an affiliation with BCBSD. Fourth, no consideration was paid by CareFirst in return for becoming sole member of BCBSD and for becoming primary licensee with respect to the Marks in Delaware.

Changes in the CareFirst Board and other violations of my Orders can be ameliorated by return of the membership of BCBSD to the BCBSD Board. Such a remedy will remove BCBSD, by definition, from various onerous provisions of the Maryland Legislation. Achieving this, along with CareFirst's surrender of the Marks in Delaware – which is appropriate since the Marks are assets of BCBSD and CareFirst cannot transact business in Delaware under the Marks except through BCBSD – will eliminate significant problems arising under the Maryland Legislation; avoid the uncertainty of decisions of CareFirst's new management, which itself faces considerable challenges and pressures from the changed environment in Maryland; and will allow, if the parties so elect, the continuation of a contractual affiliation between BCBSD and CareFirst.

Based on all the foregoing, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

1. The Affiliation Order has been violated by the effect and implementation of the Maryland Legislation, including, *inter alia*, by provisions which have the practical effect of altering the corporate governance of CareFirst and BCBSD and impinging upon the ability of the Insurance Commissioner to maintain supervisory authority over BCBSD for the benefit of the residents of the State of Delaware.
2. Neither BCBSD nor the residents of the State of Delaware will be adversely affected if BCBSD were required to operate as a primary licensee of the Blue Cross® and Blue Shield® Association in the State of Delaware.
3. Subject to the further terms and conditions of this Order, henceforth BCBSD's further participation in the surviving aspects of the 1998 Business Affiliation Agreement and the Amended and Restated Intercompany Agreement (the "1998 Agreement") is prohibited.
4. Within 30 days of the date of this Order, CareFirst and BCBSD shall execute and file all documents and otherwise take such steps as are necessary to transfer corporate membership in BCBSD from CareFirst to the board of directors of BCBSD. CareFirst and BCBSD are directed to consult and cooperate with the Association and to undertake to ensure

that the transfer of membership does not jeopardize BCBSD's use of the Marks following the transfer of membership to the BCBSD Board.

5. Within 30 days of the date of this Order, CareFirst shall take such steps as are necessary to surrender its rights to use the Marks as "Primary Licensee" in Delaware, CareFirst shall cooperate with BCBSD and the Association as necessary to facilitate BCBSD's attainment of "Primary Licensee" status in Delaware. BCBSD shall take all necessary steps to ensure that its right to use the Marks is not interrupted or lost.

6. If, within 10 days following receipt of this Order, CareFirst and BCBSD separately give notice in writing to the Insurance Department of their respective intentions to continue the Affiliation on a contractual basis, then, notwithstanding the prohibition set forth in Paragraph 3 hereof, CareFirst and BCBSD may continue to operate pursuant to the surviving terms and conditions of the 1998 Agreement that do not prevent the parties thereto from either the transfer of membership in BCBSD to the BCBSD Board, or the surrender by CareFirst of its licenses to use the Marks in Delaware.

7. CareFirst and BCBSD shall submit to the Insurance Department for approval such contracts and agreements as they may jointly propose to implement, in order to continue the affiliation of the companies on a non structural basis, within 60 days from the date of this Order.

8. If no notice is forthcoming from the parties pursuant to paragraph 6 of this Order, CareFirst and BCBSD shall cooperate fully in the orderly termination of the affiliation. In this event, BCBSD shall submit, within 30 days of the date of this Order, a plan for the orderly termination of the affiliation and replacement of services presently provided to BCBSD by CareFirst.

9. For such time as BCBSD and CareFirst remain structurally affiliated, and prior to any subsequent Order issued in connection with any approval of a future contractual relationship between BCBSD and CareFirst, I retain jurisdiction over this matter and the parties to this Docket, and all of the conditions set forth in Exhibit B to the Affiliation Order and of the Standstill Order shall remain in effect until expressly rescinded.

SO ORDERED this 30th day of June, 2004.

DONNA LEE H. WILLIAMS
Insurance Commissioner