

## **TAKING AN ACTIVE ROLE IN YOUR EMPLOYEE BENEFIT PLAN CAN SAVE YOU A LOT OF MONEY**

*By Charles T. Young, Jr.*

May 17, 2011

The continuing rise in the cost of health care is increasing the level of scrutiny and risk associated with an employer's benefit plan. Most employers maintain some sort of responsibility for their employees' health care coverage, but they may engage a third party administrator and/or purchase insurance to cover larger losses. Rising costs have increased the stress on these relationships.

The financial stress has shown itself in a number of different ways. For instance, insurers have a dramatically increased incentive to perform audits or deny reimbursement under "stop loss" coverage. The lack of adequate documentation or records will also tend to cause problems between employers and employees. Moreover, employees who are no longer actively working can get "lost" in the employer's human relations system, which leads to rapidly escalating complications for a business.

In the present environment, many businesses have stop loss insurance that covers catastrophic losses, but the companies themselves are responsible for typical, medical expenses incurred by employees. In this situation, the employer's responsibility to its employees is controlled by an employee benefit "plan." In contrast, the insurer's responsibility to the employer is controlled by an insurance policy. Unfortunately, the language in the plan is not always consistent with the policy issued by the insurer.

Situations arise in which an employer gets trapped between the restrictions in the insurer's policy, the coverage provided by the plan, or a summary plan description ("SPD") provided to employees. For example, many stop loss carriers provide reimbursement only for medical expenses incurred by employees who are actively at work. At the same time, employers may have leave policies or provide benefits to employees suffering family or medical problems. The result can be trouble obtaining reimbursement for the employee's medical expenses.

The motivations and responsibilities of an employer and insurer are not the same. An employer may seek to limit its potential exposure under the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") by providing an employee with reasonable accommodations in the form of supplemental leave time. The stop loss insurer, in contrast, has no such concerns. The employer and insurer must generally afford coverage for 12 weeks under the Family and Medical Leave Act ("FMLA"). Beyond this, an insurer will likely demand that employees be actively at work to receive benefits.

In an effort to reduce costs, an employer may choose to outsource the administration of its employee benefit plan. This third party administrator (“TPA”) handles the paperwork associated with the plan, and it may even prepare the SPDs describing the plan to company employees. However, the employer remains responsible for the medical costs incurred by employees, at least up to the stop loss amount. The TPA is administering the process and paying claims with company funds.

As in any other industry, the performance and quality of a TPA varies. Some TPAs are excellent and timely communicate the information an employer needs to intelligently manage its claims. Unfortunately, other TPAs do not communicate well with the business. They do not make wise decisions with respect to paying claims, and they fail to comply with the sometimes burdensome requirements imposed by stop loss carriers providing coverage for catastrophic losses.

With the rising costs of healthcare, a stop loss carrier may increasingly deny claims for reimbursement based on the conduct of an employer’s TPA. At the same time, the employer may be increasingly reliant on the TPA because it lacks the personnel and/or commitment to actively monitor the claims made by its employees. Frequently, an employer has little, if any, knowledge of the medical procedures undergone by employees until it is too late.

Inactive employees present a particular problem and risk for businesses. Your HR Department may have little trouble keeping in touch with employees who are at work on a daily basis. The situation can become dramatically different when an employee takes an extended leave of absence for medical or family reasons. During his or her absence, the employee is “out of sight,” and frequently “out of mind.”

Typically, an employee will transition through active status coverage under the FMLA, and then COBRA continuation coverage (if elected). During this period, the company generally has little contact with the employee. The contact that does occur may consist of form letters generated by the TPA. If no one stays on top of the situation, the gaps in coverage between the plan and policy, or between the SPD and plan, may create real problems for employees seeking coverage for their medical procedures.

While FMLA coverage generally lasts for only 12 weeks, COBRA continuation benefits extend for 18 or even 36 months. The employer often does not understand the former employee’s status, and inactive employees can incur very large medical expenses. Proper documentation becomes particularly important. If documentation is inadequate or coordination is lacking, an employer can be stuck paying hundreds of thousands of dollars in medical bills. The employee’s leave time may not have been properly recorded or classified. He or she may never have actually elected

COBRA benefits. The employee's injuries may not be covered. Any number of problems can occur.

While a TPA and insurer may handle the bulk of claims administration, an employer can help coordinate their actions and better manage its claims. The motivations of a TPA and insurer are not necessarily the same as those of the employer. The failure to timely communicate information may penalize the employer, and not the TPA. The lack of adequate documentation may result in an employer paying higher claims, and not the insurer. The "lost" employee may create real problems for the employer, and not the TPA or insurer. As such, an employer should seriously consider taking an active role in overseeing its employee benefit plan.

© 2011 McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC

*This document* is presented with the understanding that the publisher does not render specific legal, accounting or other professional service to the reader. Due to the rapidly changing nature of the law, information contained in this publication may become outdated. Anyone using this material must always research original sources of authority and update this information to ensure accuracy and applicability to specific legal matters. In no event will the authors, the reviewers or the publisher be liable for any damage, whether direct, indirect or consequential, claimed to result from the use of this material.