

Group Health Permanente, P.C.

SELF-INSURANCE

Subsidiaries (WAC 296-15-023) (repealed 1999, See WAC 296-15-027)

When one corporation exercised virtually complete authority and influence over a second corporation, controlled the assets of the second corporation, as well as the policy and daily operations through the appointment of the medical director, the second corporation is a subsidiary of the first under the definition in WAC 296-15-023. ...***In re Group Health Permanente, P.C., BIIA Dec., 98 20064 (2000)*** [Editor's Note: WAC 296-15-023 was repealed in 1999; its replacement, WAC 296-15-031 was repealed in 2006; the current definition of subsidiaries is found in WAC 296-15-027.]

Scroll down for order.

BEFORE THE BOARD OF INDUSTRIAL INSURANCE APPEALS
STATE OF WASHINGTON

1 IN RE: GROUP HEALTH)
2 PERMANENTE P C)
3)
4 FIRM NO. 944,637-00) DOCKET NO. 98 20064
5)
6)
7)
8) DECISION AND ORDER

6 APPEARANCES:

8 Employer, Group Health Permanente P C, by
9 Keehn Arvidson, per
10 Gary D. Keehn

12 Department of Labor and Industries, by
13 The Office of the Attorney General, per
14 Frederick S. Staatz, Assistant

16 This is an appeal filed by Group Health Permanente P C (hereinafter GHP), on November 3,
17 1998, from a letter of the Department of Labor and Industries dated September 9, 1998, which the
18 Department stated could constitute an order and that denied GHP's request to include GHP under
19 Department of Labor and Industries dated September 9, 1998, which the
20 Department stated could constitute an order and that denied GHP's request to include GHP under
21 Group Health Cooperative's (hereinafter GHC) self-insurance certification. **REVERSED AND**

23 **REMANDED.**

25)
26)
27)
28)
29)
30)
31)
32)
33)
34)
35)
36)
37)
38)
39)
40)
41)
42)
43)
44)
45)
46)
47)
DECISION

28 Pursuant to RCW 51.52.104 and RCW 51.52.106, this matter is before the Board for review
29 and decision on a timely Petition for Review filed by GHP of a Proposed Decision and Order issued
30 on February 1, 2000, in which the order of the Department dated September 9, 1998, was affirmed.

34 The Board has reviewed the evidentiary rulings in the record of proceedings and finds that
35 no prejudicial error was committed and the rulings are affirmed.

38 The corporation, GHC, provides prepaid health care to a large number of subscribers in
39 Washington State. From the advent of self-insurance in Washington, GHC has been a self-insurer.

42 Because of the planned and subsequent accomplishment of an affiliation between GHC and
43 the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, GHC initiated the separate corporation, GHP. GHP is a
44 professional service corporation whose corporate shareholders are physicians, physicians'
45

1 assistants, certified nurse midwives, and other professional health care providers. GHP was
2
3 granted corporate status by the state and the professionals began providing health care as
4
5 shareholders on or about December 31, 1997. Under the law, such a corporation must have all of
6
7 its shares of stock owned by the professionals.

8
9 A contract, in the form of a medical services agreement, was concluded between GHC and
10
11 GHP to become effective January 1, 1998. The contract provides the basis of the relationship
12
13 between the two corporate entities. On page 6, the contract provides that GHP will not contract
14
15 with anyone else to provide health care without the prior written consent of GHC. On page 7, the
16
17 contract states that GHP and GHC are separate corporate entities. On page 8, GHP is required to
18
19 make certain that all of its doctors meet the GHC credential requirements. On page 11, GHP
20
21 authorizes GHC to bill for services and make payment to GHP for services rendered. On page 18,
22
23 the contract states that GHC will pay GHP on a semi-monthly basis. See Exhibit No. 2.

24
25 GHC and GHP applied to the Department of Labor and Industries to allow GHP to be
26
27 self-insured for purposes of workers' compensation under the self-insurance certificate granted to
28
29 GHC. GHP maintained that under the controlling regulations it was a "subsidiary" of GHC and,
30
31 therefore, entitled to the self-insured status within GHC's certificate. WAC 296-15-023.

32
33 The Department denied the application. GHP appealed to the Board. The issue before the
34
35 Board is whether GHP is a subsidiary of GHC under the definition of subsidiary within the
36
37 regulations promulgated by the Department.

38
39 The appeal is decided on the interpretation of the following words: "A subsidiary is defined,
40
41 for the purpose of this rule, as an entity which is fifty percent owned and/or has its interest
42
43 controlled by another single firm." This is the second sentence of subsection (1) of WAC 296-15-
44
45 023. The first sentence of that subsection requires that all subsidiaries or divisions doing business
46
47

1 in the state of Washington shall be included in the self-insurance certification of a firm. The latter
2
3 term is defined as the parent corporation or entity.
4

5 Clearly, under general corporation law, the term "subsidiary" has but one meaning, that is, a
6
7 corporate entity, which has all or a controlling portion of its common stock (voting stock) owned by
8
9 another corporate entity. GHP does not qualify, within that definition, as a subsidiary of GHC. The
10
11 Department alleges it has attempted to safeguard the interests of the state of Washington and
12
13 presumably the state's workers by defining the word subsidiary as used in the regulation to be
14
15 consistent with the classic definition. Such a definition prohibits GHP from qualifying for
16
17 self-insured status within GHC's certificate. We find the classic definition is not the exclusive
18
19 definition based on the wording of the regulation.
20

21 The Department is concerned that corporate entities will spin off divisions or subsidiaries that
22
23 have high risk factors for their employees so that those entities will be covered under the State
24
25 Fund and not be a burden to the self-insurer. The Department also claims its intention by drafting
26
27 the language of subsection 023 was to prevent one business entity from insuring another business
28
29 entity without there being the subsidiary status as defined by the subsection.
30

31 The testimony elicited from Department employees indicates the Department has interpreted
32
33 the meaning of subsection 023 to require stock ownership. Larry Wilkinson, supervisor of the
34
35 certification services unit of self-insurance for the Department of Labor and Industries, testified for
36
37 the Department that controlling interest is defined as financial ownership.
38

39 The subsection provides as follows:
40

41 (1) The certification of a firm will include all of its subsidiaries or divisions doing
42
43 business in the state of Washington. A subsidiary is defined, for the purposes
44
45 of this rule, as an entity which is fifty percent owned and/or has its interest
46
47 controlled by another single firm.

 (2) One certificate will be issued to an approved self-insurer, including
all subsidiaries or divisions. The entities will be considered as one employer
for all purposes of Title 51 RCW.

1
2 The disjunctive final phrase of the second sentence of subsection 023 defines "subsidiary"
3
4 as that entity which has its interest controlled by another single firm. The first part of that
5
6 disjunctive phrase defines a subsidiary as an entity that is fifty percent owned by another single
7
8 firm. The Department, had it so desired, could have stated in the second part of the phrase that
9
10 fifty percent ownership was not required, but only that ownership which would control the destiny of
11
12 the business entity would be required. Instead, the Department chose to use the word "interest."
13
14 "Interest" is not necessarily defined as ownership. According to the dictionary, it may be a title or
15
16 legal share, but it can also be a right. It can be something in which an entity has a share of
17
18 ownership or control. It is something because of which an entity has the power of influencing
19
20 another entity. It is the effective controlling of an enterprise. *Webster's Third New International*
21
22 *Unabridged Dictionary* (1986).

23
24 Our industrial appeals judge correctly determined that GHP is not a subsidiary of GHC in the
25
26 classic sense. However, the judge arrived at that decision and the decision that GHP did not
27
28 qualify under the second portion of the final phrase of section 023 by reading it in conjunction with
29
30 section 022. Part of section 022 reads "[f]or the purposes of this rule, a parent firm is defined as
31
32 one which owns fifty percent, and/or has a controlling interest in, another firm which shall be
33
34 considered to be its subsidiary." As the judge correctly points out, the words "controlling interest"
35
36 and "interest controlled" are two different things. These different phrases give rise to inconsistent
37
38 definitions of parent and subsidiary in the two sections. The judge, then, in an attempt to achieve
39
40 the objective of reconciling the difference by reading the two subsections together and giving effect
41
42 to each of them, read the two as complementary rather than in conflict with each other. See *Waste*
43
44 *Management of Seattle, Inc. v. The Utilities and Transportation Commissions*, 123 Wn.2d 621
45
46 (1994); *In re Eaton*, 110 Wn.2d 892 (1988); *Tommy P. v. Board of County Commissioners*, 97
47
Wn.2d 385 (1982).

1 As the judge stated, rules of statutory construction apply equally to administrative rules and
2 regulations. *State v. McGinty*, 80 Wn. App. 1006 (1995). "If a statute is plain and unambiguous, its
3 meaning must be derived from the language of the statute itself." *Western Telepage v. City of*
4 *Tacoma*, 95 Wn. App. 140, 144 (1999). "In determining what a statute means, words should be
5 ascribed their plain and ordinary meanings. When a statute does not define a nontechnical word,
6 the court may look to the dictionary for guidance." (Citations omitted.) *U.S. Tobacco Sales and*
7 *Marketing Company Inc. v. The Department of Revenue*, 96 Wn. App. 932, 939 (1999).

8
9 A controlling interest in an entity is defined as the ownership of a sufficient number of shares
10 of the corporation to control the policy of that corporation. *Webster's II New Collegiate Dictionary*,
11 246 (1995). The definition of "interest controlled" is totally different from the definition of controlling
12 interest. Interest, as noted above, is only a claim or right in something and control is the exercise of
13 authority or influence over something or someone.

14
15 The judge stated that the only way the regulatory scheme would constitute a unified whole is
16 to use the same definition of the words in question in both subsections. He, therefore, concluded
17 that GHP could not be a subsidiary within the definition of section 023.

18
19 We come to a different conclusion from that of our judge. Both sections 022 and 023 have
20 the specific words "for the purpose of this rule" as a part of the definitions used in each.
21 Section 022 is a rule and section 023 is a different rule. Each rule has a different purpose. It does
22 not strain the definition in one to give a different meaning to what amount to different words in the
23 other. As stated before, "controlling interest" is not the same as "interest controlled." In section
24 023 the intent of the rule is to make certain that one self-insured employer is required to keep all of
25 its subsidiaries or those business entities over which it has control within one self-insurance
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1 certificate. As is pointed out by the Supreme Court, sitting *en banc* in *Manor v. Nestle Food*
2
3 *Company*, 131 Wn.2d 439 (1997), the intention of section 023 is:

4
5 [R]ational approach to the problem of self-insured businesses spinning a
6 risky portion of their enterprise off to state fund coverage, and ensuring
7 that corporate parents bear complete responsibility for the coverage of
8 the workers of the parent and any of its subsidiaries. The rule is
9 designed to ensure, with the changes in status of employers through
10 merger, consolidation, combination, and otherwise, employees will not
11 have to guess who their employer is for purposes of the IIA, and
12 employees will receive the statutorily-mandated coverage.

13
14 *Manor*, at 454-455.

15
16 The purpose of section 022 is to define the level of security if companies are to be insured
17 separately. It applies when a subsidiary alone is applying for a self-insurance certificate. It requires
18 a parent to be the guarantor of the subsidiary's financial responsibilities under the Act. It contains
19 one way in which to define a parent corporation. Section 023, on the other hand, requires that a
20 parent entity applying for self-insurance status must include all of its subsidiaries, as well as those
21 business entities over which it has control.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 GHC exercises virtually complete authority and influence over GHP. GHP must have the
29 approval of GHC to do business. GHC controls the assets of the two corporations and the policy
30 and daily operations of GHP through control of the appointment of the medical director of GHP.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 We find that GHP is a subsidiary of GHC under the definition of that word in WAC 296-15-
49 023. As such, GHP should be granted the right to be a self-insurer under GHC's certificate.

50 After consideration of the Proposed Decision and Order and the Petition for Review filed
51 thereof, and a careful review of the entire record before us, we make the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1
2
3 1. On November 12, 1997, Group Health Permanente P C, a corporate
4 employer, requested that the Department of Labor and Industries
5 include Group Health Permanente P C under Group Health
6 Cooperative's self-insurance certification. The Department denied this
7 request by letter dated December 24, 1997.

8
9 Group Health Permanente P C protested the December 24, 1997 letter
10 on January 27, 1998. On September 9, 1998, the Department issued a
11 letter denying the request for inclusion and stated that the letter should
12 be considered an appealable order. Group Health Permanente P C
13 appealed this letter to the Board of Industrial Insurance Appeals on
14 November 3, 1998. On December 1, 1998, December 11, 1998, and
15 December 22, 1998, the Board issued orders extending the time to act
16 on the appeal. On February 2, 1999, the Board issued an order granting
17 the appeal, assigning it Docket No. 98 20064, and ordering that further
18 proceedings be held.

19
20 2. Group Health Cooperative is a corporation that provides prepaid health
21 care to residents of Washington in service areas where it is licensed to
22 do so. It has been a self-insured employer for purposes of industrial
23 insurance benefits since the inception of the self-insurance program in
24 Washington.

25
26 3. In 1996, Group Health Cooperative began discussions with Kaiser
27 Foundation Health Plan about affiliating the two organizations. To
28 further this, plan healthcare professionals, including physicians,
29 physicians' assistants, certified midwives, and a few other categories of
30 professional medical providers resigned from Group Health Cooperative
31 as of December 31, 1997. These professionals then became
32 shareholders in Group Health Permanente P C, a professional services
33 corporation.

34
35 4. Group Health Cooperative provides all the facilities, services, support
36 staff, almost all the patients and income for Group Health Permanente
37 P C. Group Health Permanente P C agrees not to provide medical
38 services to any other provider without the express permission of Group
39 Health Cooperative. All shareholders of Group Health Permanente P C
40 must be licensed and granted privileges by Group Health Cooperative to
41 practice in Group Health Cooperative facilities. If such shareholder's
42 certification is denied, that person must surrender his or her share and
43 resign from Group Health Permanente P C. Group Health Cooperative
44 provides all Group Health Permanente P C shareholders with their
45 malpractice insurance.
46
47

- 1
2 5. The two corporations entered into a medical services agreement
3 effective January 1, 1998. The agreement provided that Group Health
4 Permanente P C would not contract with any other entity to provide
5 health care, that all Group Health Permanente P C doctors would meet
6 the Group Health Cooperative credential requirements, that Group
7 Health Cooperative would bill for services and make payment to Group
8 Health Permanente P C for services rendered, that Group Health
9 Cooperative would pay Group Health Permanente P C on a
10 semi-monthly basis, and that Group Health Permanente P C would only
11 name a medical director with the consent of Group Health Cooperative.
12
- 13 6. All shares of stock in Group Health Permanente P C are owned by the
14 professional medical caregivers employed by Group Health Permanente
15 P C.
16

17 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

- 18
- 19 1. The Board of Industrial Insurance Appeals has jurisdiction over the
20 parties and the subject matter of this appeal.
21
- 22 2. Pursuant to the definitions contained in WAC 296-15-023, Group Health
23 Permanente P C is a subsidiary of Group Health Cooperative and
24 should be included under Group Health Cooperative's self-insurance
25 certification.
26
- 27 3. The Department letter of September 9, 1998, is incorrect and is
28 reversed. The cause is remanded to the Department with directions to
29 allow Group Health Permanente P C to be self-insured under the
30 self-insurance certificate of Group Health Cooperative.
31

32 It is so ORDERED.

33
34 Dated this 26th day of June, 2000.
35

36 BOARD OF INDUSTRIAL INSURANCE APPEALS

37
38
39 /s/ _____
40 THOMAS E. EGAN Chairperson

41
42
43 /s/ _____
44 FRANK E. FENNERTY, JR. Member

45
46
47 /s/ _____
JUDITH E. SCHURKE Member

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47