

2001

## Judd v. Drezga : Unknown

Utah Supreme Court

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu\\_sc2](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu_sc2)



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Original Brief Submitted to the Utah Supreme Court; digitized by the Howard W. Hunter Law Library, J. Reuben Clark Law School, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; machine-generated OCR, may contain errors.

Michael D. Zimmerman; Snell and Wilmer; David W. Slagle; Brian P. Miller; Snow, Christensen and Martineau; Attorneys for Defendant and Appellee.

Ralph L. Deswnup; Paul M. Simmons; Dewsnp, King and Olsen; Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Appellants.

---

### Recommended Citation

Legal Brief, *Judd v. Drezga*, No. 20010646.00 (Utah Supreme Court, 2001).  
[https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu\\_sc2/1906](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu_sc2/1906)

This Legal Brief is brought to you for free and open access by BYU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Utah Supreme Court Briefs by an authorized administrator of BYU Law Digital Commons. Policies regarding these Utah briefs are available at [http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/utah\\_court\\_briefs/policies.html](http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/utah_court_briefs/policies.html). Please contact the Repository Manager at [hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu](mailto:hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu) with questions or feedback.

MERRILL F. NELSON

LAW OFFICES OF  
**KIRTON & McCONKIE**  
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION  
1800 EAGLE GATE TOWER  
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84111-1004

FAX (801) 321 4893  
TELEPHONE (801) 328 3600

October 2, 2002

Clerk of the Court  
Attn: Pat Bartholomew  
Utah Supreme Court  
450 South State  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0210

**FILED**  
UTAH SUPREME COURT

OCT - 3 2002

**PAT BARTHOLOMEW  
CLERK OF THE COURT**

**RE: Judd v. Drezga  
Case No. 20010646-SC**

Dear Pat:

Pursuant to Utah R. App. P. 24(i), please find herewith citation to supplemental authority that supports the position of Amici Curiae Intermountain Health Care, Inc.; UHA, Utah Hospitals and Health Systems Association; and Utah Medical Association ("Health Care Amici"), which filed an amicus brief in support of the defendant/appellee.

Specifically, Health Care Amici refer the Court to a new report issued by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services entitled, "Confronting the New Health Care Crisis: Improving Health Care Quality and Lowering Costs By Fixing Our Medical Liability System." This report was issued after filing of the amicus brief. For the convenience of the Court, a copy of this new report is attached, with copies of press releases that accompanied the report, issued by the White House and HHS Secretary Tommy G. Thompson.

This new government report pertains to Point B.2. of the amicus brief, pages 23-26, regarding the essential role of a statutory limit on noneconomic damages in stabilizing malpractice insurance rates, reducing medical costs, and maintaining access to quality medical care. (Report, pp. 7-9, 17-19.)

Sincerely,

KIRTON & McCONKIE



Merrill F. Nelson

MFN:cb

Enc.

ODMA\PCDOCS\DOCS\644916\1

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Letter of Supplemental Authority with attachments** to be mailed through United States mail, postage prepaid, this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of October, 2002, to the following:

Ralph L. Dewsnap  
Paul M. Simmons  
DEWSNUP, KING & OLSEN  
2020 Beneficial Life Tower  
36 South State Street  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Appellants


Elliott J. Williams  
Andrew G. Deiss  
WILLIAMS & HUNT  
257 East 200 South, Suite 500  
Salt Lake City, UT 84145  
Attorneys for Amici Curiae  
Utah Medical Association

David W. Slagle  
Brian P. Miller  
SNOW, CHRISTENSEN & MARTINEAU  
10 Exchange Place, Eleventh Floor  
Salt Lake City, UT 84145  
Attorneys for Defendant/Appellee

David C. Gessel  
2180 South 1300 East, Suite #440  
Salt Lake City, UT 84108  
Attorney for Amici Curiae  
UHA, Utah Hospitals and Health  
Systems Association

Michael D. Zimmerman  
SNELL & WILMER  
15 W. South Temple, #1200  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
Attorneys for Defendant/Appellee

Mark L. Shurtleff  
Brent A. Burnett  
UTAH ATTORNEY GENERAL  
160 East 300 South, Sixth Floor  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114  
Attorneys for Amicus Curiae  
State of Utah

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Nicole E. Nelson

# **Confronting the New Health Care Crisis:**

## **Improving Health Care Quality and Lowering Costs By Fixing Our Medical Liability System**



July 24, 2002

Prepared by  
**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**  
**Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation**

## **Confronting the New Health Care Crisis: Improving Health Care Quality and Lowering Costs By Fixing Our Medical Liability System**

American health care is the envy of the world, but with rapidly rising health care costs, reforms are needed to make high-quality, affordable health care more widely available. These include new approaches to making employer-provided coverage more affordable, new initiatives to help states expand Medicaid and SCHIP coverage for lower-income persons, and new policies including health insurance credits for persons who do not have access to employer or public health insurance. A critical element for enabling all of these reforms to provide real relief, and to help all Americans get access to better and more affordable health care, is curbing excessive litigation.

Americans spend proportionately far more per person on the costs of litigation than any other country in the world. The excesses of the litigation system are an important contributor to "defensive medicine"--the costly use of medical treatments by a doctor for the purpose of avoiding litigation. As multimillion-dollar jury awards have become more commonplace in recent years, these problems have reached crisis proportions. Insurance premiums for malpractice are increasing at a rapid rate, particularly in states that have not taken steps to make their legal systems function more predictably and effectively. Doctors are facing much higher costs of insurance, and some cannot obtain insurance despite having never lost a single malpractice judgment or even faced a claim.

This is a threat to health care quality for all Americans. Increasingly, Americans are at risk of not being able to find a doctor when they most need one because the doctor has given up practice, limited the practice to patients without health conditions that would increase the litigation risk, or moved to a state with a fairer legal system where insurance can be obtained at a lower price.

This broken system of litigation is also raising the cost of health care that all Americans pay, through out-of-pocket payments, insurance premiums, and federal taxes. Excessive litigation is impeding efforts to improve quality of care. Hospitals, doctors, and nurses are reluctant to report problems and participate in joint efforts to improve care because they fear being dragged into lawsuits, even if they did nothing wrong.

Increasingly extreme judgments in a small proportion of cases and the settlements they influence are driving this litigation crisis. At the same time, most injured patients receive no compensation. Some states have already taken action to squeeze the excesses out of the litigation system. But federal action, in

conjunction with further action by states, is essential to help Americans get high-quality care when they need it, at a more affordable cost.

## **Access to Care is Threatened**

There are a number of obstacles that limit access to affordable health care in this country, including lack of affordable insurance and an outdated Medicare program. We now face another--the litigation crisis that has made insurance premiums unaffordable or even unavailable for many doctors, through no fault of their own. This is making it more difficult for many Americans to find care, and threatening access for many more.

- Nevada is facing unprecedented problems in assuring quick access to urgently needed care. The University of Nevada Medical Center closed its trauma center in Las Vegas for ten days earlier this month. Its surgeons had quit because they could no longer afford malpractice insurance.<sup>1</sup> Their premiums had increased sharply, some from \$40,000 to \$200,000. The trauma center was able to re-open only because some of the surgeons agreed to become county government employees for a limited time, which capped their liability for non-economic damages if they were sued. This is obviously only a temporary solution. If the Las Vegas trauma center closes again, the most severely injured patients will have to be transported to the next nearest Level 1 trauma center, five hours away. Access to trauma care is only one problem Nevada faces; access to obstetrics and many other types of care is also threatened.
- Overall, more than 10% of all doctors in Las Vegas are expected to retire, or relocate their practices by this summer.<sup>2</sup> For example, Dr. Cheryl Edwards, 41, closed her decade-old obstetrics and gynecology practice in Las Vegas because her insurance premium jumped from \$37,000 to \$150,000 a year. She moved her practice to West Los Angeles, leaving 30 pregnant women to find new doctors.<sup>3</sup>
- Dr. Frank Jordan, a vascular surgeon, in Las Vegas, left practice. "I did the math. If I were to stay in business for three years, it would cost me \$1.2 million for insurance. I obviously can't afford that. I'd be bankrupt after the first year, and I'd just be working for the insurance company. What's the point?"<sup>4</sup>
- Other states are facing the same problem. A doctor in a small town in North Carolina decided to take early retirement when his premiums skyrocketed from \$7,500 to \$37,000 per year. His partner, unable to afford the practice expenses by himself, may now close the practice, and work at a teaching hospital.<sup>5</sup>

- Pennsylvania physicians are also leaving their practices. About 44 doctors at the height of their careers in Delaware County outside Philadelphia left the state in 2001 or stopped practicing medicine because of high malpractice insurance costs.<sup>6</sup>
- When Chester County (Pennsylvania) physicians were polled in January 2001, 65% said they were seriously considering moving their practice to another state. Many specialists (such as neurosurgeons) have already moved to less hostile medical-legal environments of surrounding states.<sup>7</sup>
- At Frankford Hospital's three facilities in Northeast Philadelphia and Bucks County, all twelve active orthopedic surgeons decided to lay down their scalpels after their malpractice rates nearly doubled to \$106,000 each for 2001.<sup>8</sup>
- Many physicians in Ohio saw their malpractice premiums triple in 2001, and some are leaving their practice as a result. Dr. James Wilkerson, an Akron urologist, decided to retire. Had Dr. Wilkerson continued to practice, he would have spent seven months of his yearly income to cover the \$84,000 premium. "I would have had to go back to working 90 hours a week and I didn't want to do that..."<sup>9</sup>
- West Virginia is also facing critical access problems for urgently needed care such as obstetrics. In rural areas, such as Putnam County and Jackson County, the sole community provider hospitals have closed their OB units because the obstetricians in those areas cannot afford malpractice insurance.<sup>10</sup>
- Many communities in Mississippi are losing access to needed medical care. Physicians who specialize in family medicine and obstetrics/gynecology in Indianola, and in other rural areas of the state, have stopped delivering babies because of skyrocketing insurance costs.<sup>11</sup> Ambur Peterson's obstetrician in Cleveland, Mississippi, stopped practicing three weeks before her due date, and she had to drive out of state, over a hundred miles, to Memphis, Tennessee, to get the care she needed.<sup>12</sup>
- Most of the cities with populations under 20,000 in Mississippi no longer have doctors who deliver babies.<sup>13</sup> Doctors in Natchez say they will relocate their practice across the Mississippi River to Louisiana because of the cost of insurance in Mississippi and runaway jury awards. They are planning a new \$6 million medical office building in Vidalia, Louisiana.<sup>14</sup>
- In Georgia, the 80-bed Bacon County Hospital in Alma took out a loan to cover a premium that more than tripled.<sup>15</sup>

- Another Georgia hospital, Memorial Hospital and Manor in Bainbridge, that operates a hospital and a nursing home, was faced with a 600% increase.<sup>16</sup>
- In New Jersey, 65% of the hospitals report that physicians are leaving because of increased premiums (over 250% over the last three years).<sup>17</sup>
- In Tacoma, Washington, some doctors were faced with a tripling of their premiums. High premium rates and an inability to obtain insurance may force many physicians in the state to leave.<sup>18</sup>
- Doctors who would volunteer their time to provide care in free clinics and other volunteer organizations, or who would volunteer their services to the Medical Reserve Corps, are afraid to do so because they do not have malpractice insurance. This makes it more difficult for clinics to provide care to low-income patients. The clinics must spend their precious resources to obtain their own coverage, and have less money available to provide care to people who need it. The proportion of physicians in the country providing any charity care fell from 76% to 72% between 1997 and 1999 alone, increasing the need for doctors willing to volunteer their services.<sup>19</sup>
- Health Link Medical Center opened in March 2001 in Southampton, Pennsylvania, to provide free health care to the working poor. Dr. Theodore Onifer, a retired physician, volunteers his services on the board but is unable to volunteer to provide medical care because of the fear of lawsuits and the cost of insurance.

## **Patient Safety is Jeopardized**

Because the litigation system does not accurately judge whether an error was committed in the course of medical care, physicians adjust their behavior to avoid being sued. A recent survey of physicians revealed that one-third shied away from going into a particular specialty because they feared it would subject them to greater liability exposure.<sup>20</sup> When in practice, they engage in defensive medicine to protect themselves against suit. They perform tests and provide treatments that they would not otherwise perform merely to protect themselves against the risk of possible litigation. The survey revealed that over 76% are concerned that malpractice litigation has hurt their ability to provide quality care to patients.

Because of the resulting legal fear:

- 79% said that they had ordered more tests than they would, based only on professional judgment of what is medically needed, and 91% have noticed other physicians ordering more tests;



- 74% have referred patients to specialists more often than they believed was medically necessary;
- 51% have recommended invasive procedures such as biopsies to confirm diagnoses more often than they believed was medically necessary; and
- 41% said that they had prescribed more medications, such as antibiotics, than they would based only on their professional judgment, and 73% have noticed other doctors similarly prescribing excessive medications.

Every test and every treatment poses a risk to the patient, and takes away funds that could better be used to provide health care to those who need it.

Physicians' understandable fear of unwarranted litigation threatens patient safety in another way. It impedes efforts of physicians and researchers to improve the quality of care. As medical care becomes increasingly complex, there are many opportunities for improving the quality and safety of medical care, and reducing its costs, through better medical practices. According to some experts, these quality improvement opportunities hold the promise of not only significant improvements in patient health outcomes, but also reductions in medical costs of as much as 30%.<sup>21</sup>

A broad range of experts on improving health care quality have developed strong evidence that the best way to achieve these needed improvements in quality of care is to provide better opportunities for health professionals to work together to identify errors, or practices that may lead to errors, and correct them. Many problems in the health care system result not from one individual's failings, but from complex system failings. These can only be addressed by collecting information from a broad range of doctors and hospitals, and encouraging them to collaborate to identify and fix problems. Already many health care systems are beginning to make these improvements:

- Intermountain Health Care and LDS Hospital in Utah improved quality and efficiency of the intensive care unit by applying quality improvement techniques and improving collaborative efforts.
- The Pittsburgh Regional Healthcare Initiative has brought together hospitals, health plans, physicians, and purchasers of health care in a collaborative effort to identify better ways to provide care. It has reduced blood infections in intensive care units by 20% in just two years, and it is encouraging reporting to reduce medication errors.
- The Baylor Medical Center in Dallas, Texas, has recently initiated an error reporting system and integrated it into care delivery to reduce medication and other errors.<sup>22</sup>

- Through the Northern New England Cardiovascular Disease Study Group, eight hospitals reduced mortality for cardiac bypass surgery by developing a collaborative patient registry, tracking how care is delivered and what the outcomes are, and sharing what they learn.

However, these efforts and other efforts are impeded and discouraged by the lack of clear and comprehensive protection for collaborative quality efforts. Doctors are reluctant to collect quality-related information and work together to act on it for fear that it will be used against them or their colleagues in a lawsuit. Perhaps as many as 95% of adverse events are believed to go unreported.<sup>23</sup> To make quality improvements, doctors must be able to exchange information about patient care and how it can be improved--what is the effect of care not just in one particular institution or of the care provided by one doctor--but how the patient fares in the system across all providers. These quality efforts require enhancements to information and reporting systems.

In its recent report, "To Err is Human," the Institute of Medicine (IOM) observed that, "[R]eporting systems are an important part of improving patient safety and should be encouraged. These voluntary reporting systems [should] periodically assess whether additional efforts are needed to address gaps in information to improve patient safety and to encourage health care organizations to participate in...reporting, and track the development of new reporting systems as they form."<sup>24</sup>

However, as the IOM emphasized, fear that information from these reporting systems will be used to prepare a lawsuit against them, even if they are not negligent, deters doctors and hospitals from making reports. This fear, which is understandable in the current litigation climate, impedes quality improvement efforts. According to many experts, the "#1 barrier" to more effective quality improvement systems in health care organizations is fear of creating new avenues of liability by conducting earnest analyses of how health care can be improved. Without protection, quality discussions to improve health care provide fodder for litigants to find ways to assert that the status quo is deficient. Doctors are busy, and they face many pressures. They will be reluctant to engage in health care improvement efforts if they think that reports they make and recommendations they make will be thrown back at them or others in litigation. Quality improvement efforts must be protected if we are to obtain the full benefit of doctors' experience in improving the quality of health care.

The IOM Report emphasized the importance of shifting the inquiry from individuals to the systems in which they work: "The focus must shift from blaming individuals for past errors to a focus on preventing future errors by designing safety into the system."<sup>25</sup> But the litigation system impedes this progress--not only because fear of litigation deters reporting but also because the scope of the litigation system's view is restricted. The litigation system looks at the past, not the future, and focuses on the individual in an effort to assess blame

rather than considering how improvements can be made in the system. "Tort law's overly emotional and individualized approach...has been a tragic failure."<sup>26</sup>

## **Health Care Costs are Increased**

The litigation and malpractice insurance problem raids the wallet of every American. Money spent on malpractice premiums (and the litigation costs that largely determine premiums) raises health care costs. Doctors alone spent \$6.3 billion last year to obtain coverage.<sup>27</sup> Hospitals and nursing homes spent additional billions of dollars.

The litigation system also imposes large indirect costs on the health care system. Defensive medicine that is caused by unlimited and unpredictable liability awards not only increases patients' risk but it also adds costs. The leading study estimates that limiting unreasonable awards for non-economic damages could reduce health care costs by 5-9% without adversely affecting quality of care.<sup>28</sup> This would save \$60-108 billion in health care costs each year. These savings would lower the cost of health insurance and permit an additional 2.4-4.3 million Americans to obtain insurance.<sup>29</sup>

The costs of the runaway litigation system are paid by all Americans, through higher premiums for health insurance (which reduces workers' take home pay if the insurance is provided by an employer), higher out-of-pocket payments when they obtain care, and higher taxes.

The Federal Government--and thus every taxpayer who pays federal income and payroll taxes--also pays for health care, in a number of ways. It provides direct care, for instance, to members of the armed forces, veterans, and patients served by the Indian Health Service. It provides funding for the Medicare and Medicaid programs. It funds Community Health Centers. It also provides assistance, through the tax system, for workers who obtain insurance through their employment. The direct cost of malpractice coverage and the indirect cost of defensive medicine increases the amount the Federal Government must pay through these various channels, it is estimated, by \$28.6-47.5 billion per year.<sup>30</sup> If reasonable limits were placed on non-economic damages to reduce defensive medicine, it would reduce the amount of taxpayers' money the Federal Government spends by \$25.3-44.3 billion per year.<sup>31</sup> This is a very significant amount. It would more than fund a prescription drug benefit for Medicare beneficiaries and help uninsured Americans obtain coverage through a refundable health credit.<sup>32</sup>

## **The Increasingly Unpredictable, Costly, and Slow Litigation System is Responsible**

Insurance premiums are largely determined by the expensive litigation system. The malpractice insurance system and the litigation system are inexorably linked. The litigation system is expensive, but, at the same time, it is slow and provides little benefit to patients who are injured by medical error. Its application is unpredictable, largely random, and standardless. It is traumatic for all involved.

Most victims of medical error do not file a claim--one comprehensive study found that only 1.53% of those who were injured by medical negligence even filed a claim.<sup>33</sup> Most claims--57-70%--result in no payment to the patient.<sup>34, 35</sup> When a patient does decide to go into the litigation system, only a very small number recover anything. One study found that only 8-13% of cases filed went to trial; and only 1.2-1.9% resulted in a decision for the plaintiff.<sup>36</sup>

Although most cases do not actually go to trial, it costs a significant amount of money to defend each claim--an average of \$24,669.<sup>37</sup> The most dramatic cost, however, is the cost of the few cases that result in huge jury awards. Even though few cases result in these awards, they encourage lawyers and plaintiffs in the hope that they can win this litigation lottery, and they influence every settlement that is entered into.

A large proportion of these awards is not to compensate injured patients for their economic loss—such as wage loss, health care costs, and replacing services the injured patient can no longer perform (such as child care). Instead, much of the judgment (in some cases, particularly the largest judgments, perhaps 50% or more) is for non-economic damages. Awarded on top of compensation for the injured patient's actual economic loss, non-economic damages are said to be compensation for intangible losses, such as pain and suffering, loss of consortium, hedonic (loss of the enjoyment of life) damages, and various other theories that are imaginatively created by lawyers to increase the amount awarded.

Non-economic damages are an effort to compensate a plaintiff with money for what are in reality non-monetary considerations. The theories on which these awards are made however, are entirely subjective and without any standards. As one scholar has observed: "The perceived problem of pain and suffering awards is not simply the amount of money expended, but also the erratic nature of the process by which the size of the awards is determined. Juries are simply told to apply their 'enlightened conscience' in selecting a monetary figure they consider to be fair."<sup>38</sup>

Unless a state has adopted limitations on non-economic damages, the system gives juries a blank check to award huge damages based on sympathy, attractiveness of the plaintiff, and the plaintiff's socio-economic status (educated, attractive patients recover more than others).<sup>39</sup>

The cost of these awards for non-economic damages is paid by all other Americans through higher health care costs, higher health insurance premiums, higher taxes, reduced access to quality care, and threats to quality of care. The system permits a few plaintiffs and their lawyers to impose what is in effect a tax on the rest of the country to reward a very small number of patients who happen to win the litigation lottery. It is not a democratic process.

The number of mega-verdicts is increasing rapidly. The average award rose 76% from 1996-1999.<sup>40</sup> The median award in 1999 was \$800,000, a 6.7% increase over the 1998 figure of \$750,000; and between 1999 and 2000, median malpractice awards increased nearly 43%.<sup>41</sup> Specific physician specialties have seen disproportionate increases, especially those who deliver babies. In the small proportion of cases where damages were awarded, the median award in cases involving obstetricians and gynecologists jumped 43% in one year, from \$700,000 in 1999 to \$1,000,000 in 2000.<sup>42</sup>

The number of million dollar plus awards has increased dramatically in recent years. In the period 1994-1996, 34% of all verdicts that specified damages assessed awards of \$1 million or more. This increased by 50% in four years; in 1999-2000, 52% of all awards were in excess of \$1 million.<sup>43</sup> There have been 21 verdicts of \$9 million or more in Mississippi since 1995--one of \$100,000,000.<sup>44</sup> Before 1995 there had been no awards in excess of \$9,000,000.<sup>45</sup>

These mega-awards for non-economic damages have occurred (as would be expected) in states that do not have limitations on the amounts that can be recovered, as shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1. Mega Awards In States Without Caps		
State	Jury Award	Year
Arizona	\$ 3,000,000	1998
Kentucky	\$ 13,000,000	1998
Mississippi	\$100,000,000	2002
Nevada	\$ 6,000,000	2001
	5,400,000	2001
	4,600,000	2001
North Carolina	\$ 23,500,000	1997
	4,500,000	2001
	8,100,000	2001
Pennsylvania	\$100,000,000	1999
Washington	\$ 3,790,000	1998
Source: ASPE Review of Media Reports from The Advocate, Las Vegas Review, North Carolina Lawyers Weekly, and other select sources.		

Mirroring the increase in jury awards, settlement payments have steadily risen over the last two decades. The average payment per paid claim increased from approximately \$110,000 in 1987 to \$250,000 in 1999.<sup>46</sup> Defense expenses per paid claim increased by \$24,000 over the same period.<sup>47</sup>

The winning lottery ticket in litigation, however, is not as attractive as it may seem at first blush. A plaintiff who wins a judgment must pay the lawyer 30-40% of it, and sometimes even more. Lawyers, therefore, have an interest in finding the most attractive case. They develop a portfolio of cases and have an incentive to gamble on a big "win." If only one results in a huge verdict, they have had a good payday. Thus, they have incentives to pursue cases to the end in the hope of winning the lottery, even when their client would be satisfied by a settlement that would make them whole economically. The result of the contingency fee arrangement is that lawyers have few incentives to take on the more difficult cases or those of less attractive patients.

One prominent personal injury trial lawyer explained the secret of his success: "The appearance of the plaintiff [is] number one in attempting to evaluate a lawsuit because I think that a good healthy-appearing type, one who would be likeable and one that the jury is going to want to do something for, can make your case worth double at least for what it would be otherwise and a bad-appearing plaintiff could make the case worth perhaps half..."<sup>48</sup>

For most injured patients, therefore, the litigation process, while offering the remote chance of a jackpot judgment, provides little real benefit, even for those who file claims and pursue them. Even successful claimants do not recover anything on average until five years after the injury, longer if the case goes to trial.<sup>49</sup>

The friction generated by operating the system takes most of the money. When doctors and hospitals buy insurance (sometimes they are required to buy coverage that provides more "protection" than the total amount of their assets), it is intended to compensate victims of malpractice for their loss. However, only 28% of what they pay for insurance coverage actually goes to patients; 72% is spent on legal, administrative, and related costs.<sup>50</sup> Less than half of the money that does go back to injured patients is used to compensate the patient for economic loss that is not compensated from other sources--the purpose of a compensation system.<sup>51</sup> More than half of the amount the plaintiff receives duplicates other sources of compensation the patient may have (such as health insurance) and goes for subjective, non-economic damages (a large part of which, moreover, actually goes to the plaintiff's lawyer).

The malpractice system does not accurately identify negligence, deter bad conduct, or provide justice. The results it obtains are unpredictable, even random. The same study that found that only 1.53% of patients who were injured by medical error filed a claim also found, on the flip side, that most events for which claims were filed did not constitute negligence.<sup>52</sup> Other studies show the same random results.<sup>53</sup> "The evidence is growing that there is a poor correlation between injuries caused by negligent medical treatment and malpractice litigation."<sup>54</sup>

Not surprisingly, most people involved in health care delivery on a day-to-day basis believe that the system does not accurately reflect the realities of health care or correctly identify malpractice. A recent survey indicated that 83% of physicians and 72% of hospital administrators do not believe the system achieves a reasonable result.<sup>55</sup>

With this randomness, the litigation system cannot be expected to deter error or set meaningful standards of care. That this is, in fact, the case is evidenced by the IOM's estimate that as many as 98,000 people die each year from medical error.<sup>56</sup> If so, the system is failing not only to compensate patients fairly, but even more importantly to ensure quality care.

Yet our current system forces injured patients to sue their doctors in order to obtain compensation and forces both patients and doctors to go through what is a traumatic process for all. Patients must wait years for recovery (if they ever win any). Doctors are subject to minute scrutiny of actions they took, often years before, and their actions are judged on the basis of hindsight and perhaps even on the basis of changed medical standards. The process consumes the time and energy of the doctor that could better be spent in patient care. It is essentially punitive in nature, yet random. Rather than helping doctors do better, it causes them to engage in defensive medicine. It is a process that benefits no one except those who live off it--trial lawyers, both those who represent plaintiffs and those who represent defendants.

## Insurance Premiums are Rising Rapidly

The cost of the excesses of the litigation system shows up in the cost of malpractice insurance coverage. Premiums have increased rapidly over the past several years. Experts believe we are seeing just the tip of what will happen this year and next. Rates have escalated rapidly for doctors who practice internal medicine, general surgery, and obstetrics/gynecology (see Table 2 below). The average increases ranged from 11% to 17% in 2000, were about 10% in 2001, but are accelerating rapidly this year. A recent special report revealed that rate increases are averaging 20%.<sup>57</sup>

TABLE 2. Medical Malpractice Liability Average Premium Increases by Specialty, 2000-2001			
	July 2000	July 2001	December 2001
Internists	17%	10%	22%
General Surgeons	14%	10%	21%
Obstetricians/ Gynecologists	12%	9%	19%
SOURCE: Medical Liability Monitor, 2001			

However, these increases have varied widely across states, and some states have experienced increases of 30-75%, although there is no evidence that patient care had worsened. As seen in Table 3, a major contributing factor to the most enormous increases in liability premiums has been rapidly growing awards for non-economic damages in states that have not reformed their litigation system to put reasonable standards on these awards.

TABLE 3. Premium Increases in Non-Reform States Between 2000-2001 or 2001-2002	
State	Premium Increase
Nevada	30%
Mississippi	30-40%
North Carolina	50%
Pennsylvania	40%
Virginia	75%
Florida	30%
Ohio	30%
Illinois	Over 30%
Source: Survey of PIAA companies, July 2002 and ASPE Review of Articles, 2000-2002.	

Among the states with the highest average medical malpractice insurance premiums are Florida, Illinois, Ohio, Nevada, New York, and West Virginia.<sup>58</sup> These states have not reformed their litigation systems as others have. (Florida's caps apply only in limited circumstances. New York has prevented insurers from raising rates, and accordingly it is expected that substantial increases will be needed in 2003.) The comparison of the rates in these states



with those in California, which has reformed its litigation system, is shown in Table 4 below.

<b>TABLE 4. States with High Annual Premiums in 2001 by Specialty Compared to California</b>			
	<b>OB/GYN</b>	<b>Surgeon</b>	<b>Internists</b>
Florida	\$143K-203K	\$63K-159K	\$27K-51K
Michigan	\$87K-124K	\$67K-94K	\$18K-40K
Illinois	\$89K-110K	\$50K-70K	\$16K-28K
Ohio	\$58K-95K	\$33K-60K	\$11K-16K
Nevada	\$60K-95K	\$32K-57K	\$9K-16K
New York	\$34K-115K	\$19K-63K	\$6K-22K
West Virginia	\$63K-85K	\$44K-56K	\$8K-16K
<b>California</b>	<b>\$23K-72K</b>	<b>\$14K-42K</b>	<b>\$4K-15K</b>
Source: Medical Liability Monitor's "Trends in 2001 Rates for Physicians' Medical Professional Liability Insurance," Vol. 25, No. 10, October 2001.			

The effect of these premiums on what patients must pay for care can be seen from an example involving obstetrical care. The vast majority of awards against obstetricians involve poor outcomes at childbirth. As a result, payouts for poor infant outcomes account for the bulk of obstetricians' insurance costs. If an obstetrician delivers 100 babies per year (which is roughly the national average) and the malpractice premium is \$200,000 annually (as it is in Florida), each mother (or the government or her employer who provides her health insurance) must pay approximately \$2,000 merely to pay her share of her obstetrician's liability insurance. If a physician delivers 50 babies per year, the cost for malpractice premiums per baby is twice as high, about \$4,000. It is not surprising that expectant mothers are finding their doctors have left states that support litigation systems imposing these costs.

In addition to premium increases for physicians, nursing home malpractice costs are rising rapidly because of dramatic increases in both the number of lawsuits and the size of awards. Nursing homes are a new target of the litigation system. Between 1995 and 2001, the national average of insurance costs increased from \$240 per occupied skilled nursing bed per year to \$2,360. From 1990 to 2001, the average size of claims tripled, and the number of claims increased from 3.6 to 11 per 1,000 beds.<sup>59</sup>

These costs vary widely across states, again in relation to whether a state has implemented reforms that improve the predictability of the legal system. Florida (\$11,000) had one of the highest per bed costs in 2001.<sup>60</sup> Nursing homes in Mississippi have been faced with increases as great as 900% in the past two years.<sup>61</sup> It has been recently reported that "nearly all companies that used to write nursing home liability [insurance] are getting out of the business."<sup>62</sup> Since the costs of nursing home care are mainly paid by Medicaid and Medicare, these increased costs are borne by taxpayers, and consume resources that could otherwise be used to expand health (or other) programs.

## **Insurers are Leaving The Market**

The litigation crisis is affecting patients' ability to get care not only because many doctors find the increased premiums unaffordable but also because liability insurance is increasingly difficult to obtain at any price, particularly in non-reform states. Demonstrating and exacerbating the problem, several major carriers have stopped selling malpractice insurance.

- St. Paul Companies, which was the largest malpractice carrier in the United States, covering 9% of doctors, announced in December 2001 that it would no longer offer coverage to any doctor in the country.<sup>63</sup>
- MIXX pulled out of every state; it will reorganize and sell only in New Jersey.
- PHICO and Frontier Insurance Group have also left the medical malpractice market.<sup>64, 65</sup>
- Doctors Insurance Reciprocal stopped writing group specialty coverage at the beginning 2002.<sup>66</sup>

States that had not enacted meaningful reforms (such as Nevada, Georgia, Oregon, Mississippi, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Washington) were particularly affected.<sup>67</sup> Fifteen insurers have left the Mississippi market in the past five years.<sup>68</sup>

## **States with Realistic Limits on Non-Economic Damages Are Faring Better**

The insurance crisis is less acute in states that have reformed their litigation systems. States with limits of \$250,000 or \$350,000 on non-economic damages have average combined highest premium increases of 12-15%, compared to 44% in states without caps on non-economic damages, as shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5. Comparison of States with Caps to States without Meaningful Non-Economic Caps (Average Premium Increase)			
States with Caps ≤ \$250,000		States without Caps	
California	20%	Arkansas	18%
Indiana	15%	Connecticut	50%
Montana	21%	Georgia	32%
Utah	5%	Nevada	35%
		New Jersey	24%
		Oregon	56%
		Pennsylvania	77%
		Washington	55%
		Ohio	60%
		West Virginia	30%
AVERAGE	15%	AVERAGE	44%
States with Caps ≤ \$350,000		States without Caps	
California	20%	Arkansas	18%
Hawaii	0%	Connecticut	50%
Indiana	15%	Georgia	32%
Michigan	39%	Nevada	35%
Montana	21%	New Jersey	24%
New Mexico	13%	Oregon	56%
North Dakota	0%	Pennsylvania	77%
South Dakota	0%	Washington	55%
Utah	5%	Ohio	60%
Wisconsin	5%	West Virginia	30%
AVERAGE	12%	AVERAGE	44%
SOURCE: Medical Liability Monitor, 2001. Percentages represent the combined average of the highest premium increases for OB/GYNs, Internists, and General Surgeons among select states, 2000-2001. Average highest premium increase is derived from the highest potential premium increase among internal medicine, general surgery or obstetrics/gynecology specialists in that state during 2001. These combined averages are not weighted.			

As Table 6 below shows, there is a substantial difference in the level of medical malpractice premiums in states with meaningful caps, such as California, Wisconsin, Montana, Utah and Hawaii, and states without meaningful caps.


TABLE 6. Malpractice Liability Rate Ranges by Specialty by Geography as of July 2001			
	Cap in Non- Economic Damages	Low	High
<b>INTERNISTS</b>			
State Wide Data			
Wisconsin	\$350,000	\$5,000	\$6,000
Montana	\$250,000	5,300	7,000
Utah	\$250,000	5,900	5,900
Hawaii	\$350,000	6,800	6,800
Connecticut	No cap	6,200	15,800
Washington	No cap	7,100	9,000
Metropolitan Area Data			
California (Los Angeles area)	\$250,000	\$7,900	\$13,000
Pennsylvania (Urban Philadelphia area)	No cap	10,700	11,800
Nevada (Las Vegas area)	No cap	11,600	15,800
Illinois (Chicagoland area)	No cap	16,500	28,100
Florida (Miami and Ft. Lauderdale areas)*	No cap	17,600	50,700
<b>GENERAL SURGEONS</b>			
State Wide Data			
Wisconsin (state wide)	\$350,000	\$16,000	\$17,500
Montana (state wide)	\$250,000	23,300	27,000
Utah (state wide)	\$250,000	26,200	26,200
Hawaii (state wide)	\$350,000	24,500	24,500
Connecticut (state wide)	No cap	26,200	45,800
Washington (state wide)	No cap	20,100	32,600
Metropolitan Area Data			
California (Los Angeles area)	\$250,000	\$23,700	\$42,200
Pennsylvania (Urban Philadelphia area)	No cap	31,500	35,800
Nevada (Las Vegas area)	No cap	40,300	56,900
Illinois (Chicagoland area)	No cap	50,000	70,200
Florida (Miami and Ft. Lauderdale areas)*	No cap	63,200	126,600
<b>OBSTETRICIANS/GYNECOLOGISTS</b>			
State Wide Data			
Wisconsin (state wide)	\$350,000	\$23,800	\$27,500
Montana (state wide)	\$250,000	36,000	38,600
Hawaii (state wide)	\$350,000	40,900	40,900
Utah (state wide)	\$250,000	44,300	44,300
Connecticut (state wide)	No cap	45,400	64,800
Washington (state wide)	No cap	34,100	59,300
Metropolitan Area Data			
California (Los Angeles area)	\$250,000	\$46,900	\$57,700
Pennsylvania (Urban Philadelphia area)	No cap	45,900	66,300
Nevada (Las Vegas area)	No cap	71,100	94,800
Illinois (Chicagoland area)	No cap	72,500	110,100
Florida (Miami and Ft. Lauderdale areas)*	No cap	108,000	208,900
Source: Medical Liability Monitor, Vol. 26, No. 10, October 2001: Shook, Hardy, Bacon, L.L.P., October 9, 2001.			
* Florida imposes caps of \$250,000-350,000 unless neither party demands binding arbitration or the defendant refuses to arbitrate.			

In the early 1970s, California faced an access crisis like that facing many states now and threatening others. With bi-partisan support, including leadership from then Governor Jerry Brown and now Congressman Henry Waxman, then chairman of the Assembly's Select Committee on Medical Malpractice, California enacted comprehensive changes to make its medical liability system more predictable and rational. The Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act of 1975 (MICRA) made a number of reforms, including:

- Placing a \$250,000 limit on non-economic damages while continuing unlimited compensation for economic damages.
- Shortening the time in which lawsuits could be brought to three years (thus ensuring that memories would still be fresh and providing some assurance to doctors that they would not be sued years after an event that they may well have forgotten).
- Providing for periodic payment of damages to ensure the money is available to the patient in the future.

California has more than 25 years of experience with this reform. It has been a success. Doctors are not leaving California. Insurance premiums have risen much more slowly than in the rest of the country without any effect on the quality of care received by residents of California. Insurance premiums in California have risen by 167% over this period while those in the rest of the country have increased 505%.<sup>69</sup> This has saved California residents billions of dollars in health care costs and saved federal taxpayers billions of dollars in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

FIGURE 1. Premium Growth: California vs. U.S. Premiums 1976-2000  
(billions of dollars)



SOURCE: NAIC Profitability Study, 2000.

## The President's Framework for Improving the Medical Liability System

Federal and state action is needed to address the impact of the medical liability crisis on health care costs and the quality of care.

### Achieving a Fair, Predictable, and Timely Medical Liability Process

As years of experience in many states have proven, reasonable limits on the amount of non-economic damages that are awarded significantly restrain increases in the cost of malpractice premiums. These reforms improve the predictability of the medical liability system, reducing incentives for filing frivolous suits and for prolonged litigation. Greater predictability and more timely resolution of cases means patients who are injured can get fair compensation more quickly. They also reduce health care costs, enabling Americans to get more from their health care spending and enabling federal health programs to provide more relief. They improve access to care, by making insurance more affordable and available. They also improve the quality of health care, by avoiding unnecessary "defensive" treatments and enabling doctors to spend significantly more time focusing on patient care. Congress needs to enact

legislation that would give all Americans the benefit of these reforms, eliminate the excesses of the litigation system, and protect patients' ability to get care.

The President supports federal reforms in medical liability law that would implement these proven steps for improving our health care system:

- Improve the ability of all patients who are injured by negligence to get quicker, unlimited compensation for their "economic losses," including the loss of the ability to provide valuable unpaid services like care for children or a parent.
- Ensure that recoveries for non-economic damages could not exceed a reasonable amount (\$250,000).
- Reserve punitive damages for cases that justify them--where there is clear and convincing proof that the defendant acted with malicious intent or deliberately failed to avoid unnecessary injury to the patient--and avoid unreasonable awards (anything in excess of the greater of two times economic damages or \$250,000).
- Provide for payment of a judgment over time rather than in one lump sum--and thus ensure that the money is there for the injured patient when needed.
- Ensure that old cases cannot be brought years after an event when medical standards may have changed or witnesses' memories have faded, by providing that a case may not be brought more than three years following the date of injury or one year after the claimant discovers or, with reasonable diligence, should have discovered the injury.
- Informing the jury if a plaintiff also has another source of payment for the injury, such as health insurance.
- Provide that defendants pay any judgment in proportion to their fault, not on the basis of how deep their pockets are.

The success of the states that have adopted reforms like these shows that malpractice premiums could be reduced by 34% by adopting these reforms.<sup>70</sup> The savings to the Federal Government resulting from reduced malpractice premiums would be \$4 billion.<sup>71</sup>

Legislation such as H.R. 4600--a bill introduced by Congressman Jim Greenwood with almost 100 bipartisan cosponsors--is now pending in Congress. Enactment of this legislation with improvements to ensure that its meaningful standards will apply nationally, will be a significant step toward the goals of

affordable, high-quality health care for all Americans, and a fair and predictable liability system for compensating injured patients.

In addition, there are other promising approaches for compensating patients injured by negligence fairly and without requiring them to go through full-scale, time-consuming, and expensive litigation. Just as states like California have demonstrated the effectiveness of litigation reforms, they should also adopt and evaluate the impact of alternatives to litigation.

Early Offers is one innovative approach.<sup>72</sup> This would provide a new set of balanced incentives to encourage doctors to make offers, quickly after an injury, to compensate the patient for economic loss, and for patients to accept. It would make it possible for injured patients to receive fair compensation quickly, and over time if any further losses are incurred, without having to enter into the litigation fray. Because doctors and hospitals would have an incentive to discover adverse events quickly in order to make a qualifying offer, it would lead to prompt identification of quality problems. The money that otherwise would be spent in conducting litigation would be recycled so that more patients get additional recovery, more quickly, with savings left over to the benefit of all Americans. It may also be possible to implement an administrative form of Early Offers as an option for care provided under federal health programs.

A second innovative approach involves strengthening medical review boards. Boards with special expertise in the technical intricacies of health care can streamline the fact-gathering and hearing process, make decisions more accurately, and provide compensation more quickly and predictably than the current litigation process. As with Early Offers, incentives are necessary for patients and health care providers to submit cases to the boards and to accept their decisions.

The Administration intends to work with states on developing and implementing these alternatives to litigation, so that injured patients can be fairly compensated quickly and without the trauma and expense that litigation entails.

### **Encouraging Improvements in Health Care Quality and Patient Safety Through Litigation Reform**

The best protection for patients can be provided by medical professionals, not lawyers. High quality care that achieves the best possible patient outcomes makes litigation unnecessary. The Administration is already taking many steps to improve quality of care.



The ability of Americans to work with their doctors to choose and control their own health care is an important ingredient of quality. The people who are most affected by the quality of care--patients and their families--should be the ones deciding how they obtain their health care. To do so, they need helpful information.

The Administration is undertaking a number of activities to promote quality by increasing and improving the information available to patients, and taking other steps to make the system safer and better. Some specific activities include:

- Developing the Consumer Assessment of Health Plans Survey (CAHPS) that provides information on consumers' descriptive ratings of health plans as well as evaluative ratings of care.
- Providing quality information about nursing homes on the Internet to enable families to make comparisons and informed judgments.
- Examining how information technology, such as decision support systems embedded in clinicians' personal digital assistants (PDAs), can improve safe patient care.
- Promoting the introduction and use of bar coding for dispensing prescription drugs to reduce errors.
- Developing voluntary standards necessary to make the creation of an electronic health care record possible; this would make a patient's medical records available across different care sites, and to the patient.
- Examining model disease management programs that can improve the quality of care for people with asthma and diabetes.
- Developing computer software that hospitals can use to identify quality problems, assisting in quality improvement activities.
- Developing a program called "Put Prevention into Practice" in order to assure that evidence-based recommendations for clinical prevention are actually translated into improved delivery of services.

The Administration will work to expand these efforts, to give patients and their doctors the information they need to make informed and appropriate medical decisions, while protecting the confidentiality of sensitive information from inappropriate uses.

One of the key ingredients to reducing errors is optimizing doctors' inherent ethical imperative to improve patients' health care. We must do a better

job of helping them and other experts to identify problems before they result in injury and to develop better ways of providing care.

Researchers have found that most errors are system failures, rather than individual faults. Doctors could do their job correctly, and most errors would still occur. In addition, since human error inevitably occurs, built-in systems should automatically prevent, detect and/or correct errors before they occur. Continuous quality improvement processes, which have been effective in many other “high-risk” sectors, focus on finding ways to design work processes so that better results and fewer errors can be achieved. This requires measurement and analysis of the ways health care is provided, and the results of care for patients. By encouraging the experts to work both inside their own organization and with outside groups to share information on how medical errors or “near misses” occur and ways to prevent them, health care organizations have begun to develop tools to prevent injury and increase knowledge of how errors occur.

Success in improving health care practices to prevent errors and deliver high-quality care, however, requires a legal environment that encourages health care professionals and organizations to work together to identify problems in providing care, evaluate the causes, and use that information to improve care for all patients.

A principal obstacle to taking these steps is the fear by doctors, hospitals, and nurses that reports on adverse events and efforts to improve care will be subject to discovery in lawsuits. As several distinguished physicians recently wrote, “for reasons that include liability issues and a medical culture that has discouraged open discussion of mistakes, the power of individual case presentation, so important in the physician’s clinical medicine education, has not been harnessed to educate providers about medical errors.”<sup>73</sup>

A number of states have enacted peer review statutes that protect the confidentiality of information reported to hospitals and other health care entities. States that have such laws have found that they improve reporting of adverse events, thereby facilitating efforts to identify problems and improve quality. These protections do not take away from the ability of plaintiffs to succeed in lawsuits: all of the medical information currently available to pursue a lawsuit is still available.

Confidentiality protections provided by law for specific activities also have proven successful in identifying problems and reducing medical errors:

- The National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance System, operated by the Centers for Disease Control, receives voluntary reports from hospitals on hospital-acquired infections. It has reduced these infections by 34%. The system works because federal law assures participating hospitals that information supplied by them will be kept confidential.

- MedWatch is a voluntary Medical Products Reporting System operated by the Food and Drug Administration. Adverse events concerning medical devices and drugs may be reported to it to identify problem areas. Names of the reporting doctors and hospitals, and the name of patients involved, are not releasable under the Federal Freedom of Information Act.
- The Department of Veterans Affairs maintains a Patient Safety Reporting System to learn about issues related to patient safety. To encourage reporting, federal law provides that reports relating to new safety ideas, close calls, or unexpected serious injury are confidential and privileged. This is based on the successful system operated by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for aviation safety reporting.
- New York State operates the New York Patient Occurrence Reporting and Tracking System. Adverse events are reported to it. New York State law prevents disclosure of reports under the state's freedom of information law.

The IOM report "To Err is Human" noted that while many of the legal protections developed by states have promise, many current state peer review statutes do not go far enough. For example, these laws typically apply only to a single institution and do not reflect the systemic nature of health care as it is now provided. They do not provide a way to obtain data from various providers at one time and to compare results. Many states, moreover, do not have any peer review statutes at all. The IOM, therefore, recommended legislation to ensure that peer review proceedings and reports remain confidential.<sup>74</sup>

The President believes that new, good-faith efforts to improve the quality and safety of health care should be protected and encouraged, not penalized by new lawsuits. In his speech in Milwaukee on February 11, President Bush urged Congress to do something about this problem by enacting legislation that will give health professionals the confidence necessary to expand their reporting of problems in the health care system.

Following the President's request, and with assistance from the Administration, legislation was introduced in both Houses of Congress that would provide protection from discovery in lawsuits for reports made to Patient Safety Organizations and for their collaborative efforts to improve care. A tri-partisan Bill that reflects the President's goals, sponsored by Senators Jeffords, Breaux, Frist, and Gregg, has been introduced in the Senate (S. 2590). Chairwoman Johnson and others have introduced a similar Bill in the House (H.R. 4889). Enactment of this legislation will ensure that patient safety and quality reports are given the protection they deserve. Information developed or used as part of Patient Safety Organizations' activities would be protected, and would not be available for trial lawyers to exploit in order to find new opportunities for litigation.

The assurance of confidentiality is a proven approach to increase reporting by doctors, nurses, and other health care providers. With more information, quality experts will be better able to identify problems and recommend improvements in a proactive way. Rather than reacting to an avoidable injury or quality problem after it occurs, without benefit of careful and systematic review, medical professionals will be able to find system weaknesses and fix them before a patient is injured. Passage of the legislation will improve the quality of health care.

---

<sup>1</sup> Washington Post, July 4, 2002.

<sup>2</sup> Los Angeles Times, "Physicians Fold Under Malpractice Fee Burden," March 4, 2002.

<sup>3</sup> Los Angeles Times, March 4, 2002.

<sup>4</sup> Los Angeles Times, March 4, 2002.

<sup>5</sup> Senn, Dunn, Marsh, Roland Insurors, Personal Correspondence, July 2002.

<sup>6</sup> Allentown Morning Call, "Care crisis: Malpractice premiums crippling doctors," January 3, 2002.

<sup>7</sup> Philadelphia Inquirer, "Doctors and Patients are at Risk," January 19, 2001.

<sup>8</sup> Philadelphia Inquirer, "Rising Costs of Insurance Sends Doctors Scurrying," December 21, 2000.

<sup>9</sup> Akron Beacon Journal, January 2002.

<sup>10</sup> Advancing Health in America, June 12, 2002, Statement before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law.

<sup>11</sup> Los Angeles Times, "Mississippi Doctors Give Up Obstetrics," November 19, 2001.

<sup>12</sup> Associated Press, "Exodus of doctors causing crisis for moms-to-be in Mississippi," July 11, 2002.

<sup>13</sup> Fox News, "Lawsuits Fueling Health Care Crisis," May 14, 2002.

<sup>14</sup> The Advocate, "Natchez Doctors Eye Vidalia," May 19, 2002.

<sup>15</sup> Bryant, Julie, "Malpractice Rates Sicken Hospitals," Atlanta Business Chronicle, March 25, 2002.

<sup>16</sup> Bryant, Julie, "Malpractice Rates Sicken Hospitals," Atlanta Business Chronicle, March 25, 2002.

- 
- <sup>17</sup> American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, "The Hot States," Red Alert Facts: The Professional Liability Insurance Crisis, May 2002.
- <sup>18</sup> American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, June 12, 2002.
- <sup>19</sup> Center for Health Systems Change, "An Update on the Community Tracking Study, A Focus on the Changing Health System," Issue Brief No. 18, February 1999.
- <sup>20</sup> "Fear of Litigation Study," conducted by Harris Interactive, Final Report, April 11, 2002.
- <sup>21</sup> Berwick, Donald M., "As Good As It Should Get: Making Healthcare Better in the New Millennium," National Coalition for Healthcare, 1998.
- <sup>22</sup> Maulik, Joshi; Anderson, John; et al., "A Systems Approach to Improving Error Reporting," Journal of Healthcare Information Management, Vol. 16, No. 1.
- <sup>23</sup> Maulik, Joshi; Anderson, John; et.al., "A Systems Approach to Improving Error Reporting," Journal of Health Care Information Management, Vol. 16, No. 1.
- <sup>24</sup> Committee for Quality Health Care in America/Institute of Medicine, "To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System," 2000.
- <sup>25</sup> IOM Report, "To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System," 2000.
- <sup>26</sup> O'Connell, Jeffrey; Baldwin, Joseph, "Tort Law as Melodrama--Or Is It Farce?," forthcoming article in UCLA Review.
- <sup>27</sup> A.M. Best, Statistical Study, July 16, 2001.
- <sup>28</sup> Kessler, D.; McClellan, M., "Do Doctors Practice Defensive Medicine," Quarterly Journal of Economics, 111(2): 353-390, 1996.
- <sup>29</sup> A recent health insurance study estimate that a 1% increase in health insurance premiums leads to a 0.31% reduction in employer-sponsored coverage. Gruber, J.; Lettau, M., "How elastic is the firm's demand for health insurance," National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper, #8021, 2000.
- <sup>30</sup> This amount includes \$23.66-42.59 billion for the cost of defensive medicine; \$3.91 billion in liability insurance paid to Medicare, Medicaid, Veteran's Affairs, and other federal programs; \$246 million in liability insurance paid through health benefits for its employees and retired employees; and \$778 million in lost tax revenue from self-employed and employer-sponsored health insurance premiums that are excluded from income.
- <sup>31</sup> This amount includes \$23.66-42.59 billion in savings from elimination of defensive medicine and \$1.68 billion in reductions in liability insurance premiums paid by the Federal Government.
- <sup>32</sup> The Administration's proposed Medicare prescription drug plan is estimated to cost \$190 billion over ten years by the CBO. The Administration's proposed Health Insurance Tax Credit is estimated to cost \$89 billion over ten years.
- <sup>33</sup> Localio, A.R.; Lawthers, A.G.; et.al., "Relation between malpractice claims and adverse events due to negligence. Results of the Harvard Medical Practice Study III," New England Journal of Medicine, Volume 325:245-251, July 25, 1991.

---

<sup>34</sup> GAO, "Medical Malpractice: Characteristics of Claims Closed in 1984," GAO/HRD-87-55, April 1987, p. 18; PIAA.

<sup>35</sup> Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law before the House Judiciary Committee, testimony presented by PIAA, June 12, 2002.

<sup>36</sup> O'Connell, Jeffrey, "An Alternative to Abandoning Tort Liability," 60 Minnesota: 501-506-509, 1976.

<sup>37</sup> PIAA Fact Sheet, Malpractice Insurance: The Basics, 2000.

<sup>38</sup> Weiler, Paul, "Medical Malpractice on Trial," 1991.

<sup>39</sup> O'Connell, Jeffrey; Kelly, Brian, "The Blame Game," p.125; Dodd, Christopher, "A Proposal for Making Product Liability Fair, Efficient, and Predictable," p.139; Statement of George Priest, "Punitive Damages: Tort Reform and FDA Defenses," Hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, Serial No. J-104016, April 4, 1995, p. 85. (Dealing with product liability litigation generally).

<sup>40</sup> Medical Malpractice, III Insurance Issues Update, March, 2002.

<sup>41</sup> Fox News Channel, "Lawsuits Fueling Health Care Crisis," May 14, 2002, source from American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG).

<sup>42</sup> Trends in Personal Injury by Jury Verdict Research, 2001.

<sup>43</sup> 2001 Current Award Trends in Personal Injury by Jury Verdict Research, 2002.

<sup>44</sup> Personal Communication from Rep. Chip Pickering, July 2002.

<sup>45</sup> Personal Communication from Rep. Chip Pickering, July 2002.

<sup>46</sup> Physician Insurers Association of America (PIAA), Trend Analysis of Claims by Close Year, 2000.

<sup>47</sup> PIAA in Health Care Financial Trends Report, April, 2002.

<sup>48</sup> Quoted in Keeton, Robert; O'Connell, Jeffrey, "Basic Protection for the Traffic Victim," Little Brown, 1965.

<sup>49</sup> Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law before the House Judiciary Committee, testimony presented by PIAA, June 12, 2002.

<sup>50</sup> O'Connell, Jeffrey, "An Alternative to Abandoning Tort Liability," 60 Minnesota: 501-506-509, 1976.

<sup>51</sup> O'Connell, Jeffrey, "An Alternative to Abandoning Tort Liability," 60 Minnesota: 501-506-509, 1976.

<sup>52</sup> Localio, A.R.; Lawthers, A.G.; et.al., "Relation between malpractice claims and adverse events due to negligence. Results of the Harvard Medical Practice Study III," New England Journal of Medicine, Volume 325:245-251, July 25, 1991.

- 
- <sup>53</sup> O'Connell, Jeffrey; Pohl, Christopher, "How Reliable is Medical Malpractice Law?," 359 Journal of Law and Health, 1998. A Review of Vidmar, Neil, "Medical Malpractice and the American Jury: Confronting the Myths About Jury Incompetence, Deep Pockets, and Outrageous Damage Awards," University of Michigan Press, 1995.
- <sup>54</sup> O'Connell, Jeffrey; Pohl, Christopher, "How Reliable is Medical Malpractice Law?," 359 Journal of Law and Health, 1998. A Review of Vidmar, Neil, "Medical Malpractice and the American Jury: Confronting the Myths About Jury Incompetence, Deep Pockets, and Outrageous Damage Awards," University of Michigan Press, 1995.
- <sup>55</sup> "Fear of Litigation Study," conducted by Harris Interactive, Final Report, April 11, 2002.
- <sup>56</sup> IOM Report, "To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System," 2000.
- <sup>57</sup> Medical Liability Monitor, Vol. 27, No. 1, January 2002.
- <sup>58</sup> American Tort Reform Association, December 2001--Non-Economic Damage Reform; Shook, Hardy & Bacon L.L.P, Liability Reform Laws, October 2001.
- <sup>59</sup> Aon Risk Consultants, Inc., "Long Term Care General Liability: Professional Liability Actuarial Analysis," February 28, 2002.
- <sup>60</sup> Aon Risk Consultants, Inc., "Long Term Care General Liability: Professional Liability Actuarial Analysis," February 28, 2002.
- <sup>61</sup> Information supplied By Rep. Chip Pickering.
- <sup>62</sup> A.M. Best Company, Inc., "As Nursing home liability losses soar, carriers stop writing business," February 7, 2000.
- <sup>63</sup> Modern Healthcare, January 7, 2002; Medical Malpractice, III, Insurance Issues Update, March 2002.
- <sup>64</sup> The Record (New Jersey), December 23, 2001.
- <sup>65</sup> The New York Times, "Doctors Face a Big Jump in Insurance," March 22, 2002.
- <sup>66</sup> The Clarion-Ledger, "Lloyd's of London Agrees to Insure Mississippi Doctors But 25-Member Group Will Pay Rates 400% Higher," December 22, 2001.
- <sup>67</sup> HHS Analysis of PIAA and other source data, 2002.
- <sup>68</sup> Best's Insurance News, "Mississippi Looks for Answers to Lack of Med-Mal Coverage," December 28, 2001.
- <sup>69</sup> NAIC Profitability by Line by State, 2001, presented before House Judiciary Committee by PIAA June, 2002.
- <sup>70</sup> Zuckerman, Stephen, Bovbjerg, Randall R., and Sloan, Frank, "Effects of Tort Reforms and Other Factors on Medical Malpractice Insurance Premiums," Inquiry 27: 167-182, Summer 1990.
- <sup>71</sup> Analysis from the Council of Economic Advisors, July, 2002.

---

<sup>72</sup> O'Connell, Jeffrey, "Offers that Can't be Refused," 1977 Northwestern University Law Review 589 (1982); Moore, Henson; O'Connell, Jeffrey, "Foreclosing Medical Malpractice Claims by Prompt Tender of Economic Loss," 44 Louisiana Law Review 1267 (1984); Moore, Henson; Hoff, John, "H.R. 3084: A More Rational Compensation System for Medical Malpractice," 49 Law and Contemporary Problems 117 (Spring 1986). A Statement by the Committee for Economic Development, "Breaking the Litigation Habit," 2000. A Bill to implement this approach was first introduced by Rep. Henson Moore and Rep. Richard Gephardt in 1987, H.R. 5400, 98<sup>th</sup> Congress.

<sup>73</sup> "Learning from our Mistakes: Quality Grand Rounds, a New Case-Based Series on Medical Errors and Patient Safety," *Annals of Internal Medicine*, Volume 136, Number 11, June 4, 2002.

<sup>74</sup> IOM Report, "To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System," 2000.



**From:** Sandy Marks  
**To:** GPA\_II  
**Date:** 7/25/02 10:37AM  
**Subject:** White House Liability Fact Sheet

Fact Sheet: President Proposes Minimum Standards for Medical Liability  
New HHS Study Highlights Higher Costs, Lower Quality Care  
Resulting from Badly Broken Liability System

#### TODAY'S PRESIDENTIAL ACTION

In a speech at the Highpoint University, President Bush proposed major legislative reforms to address the medical liability crisis. To make health care more affordable, more available, and better and safer for patients, the President proposed national minimum standards for medical liability reforms and new protections for good-faith efforts by health professionals to improve health care quality and safety through new Patient Safety Organizations.

The President was accompanied by HHS Secretary Tommy Thompson, who released a new HHS report on Confronting the New Health Care Crisis: Improving Health Care Quality and Lowering Costs by Fixing Our Medical Liability System. The report presents a comprehensive review of how excessive litigation is threatening access to care, threatening patient safety and the quality of health care, raising health care costs for all Americans, adding billions to Federal health expenditures. The report also highlights the proven success of the national medical liability reforms proposed by the President in reducing medical costs and improving health care access and quality.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S FRAMEWORK FOR IMPROVING THE MEDICAL LIABILITY SYSTEM

In his speech today, the President proposed a framework urgent Federal action to address the medical liability crisis.

National adoption of proven minimum standards to make the medical liability system more fair, predictable, and timely. Experience in many states has demonstrated that these standards can reduce Federal government costs by \$30 billion per year or more, freeing up needed funds for making health care more affordable. These standards can reduce health care costs for all Americans by \$60 billion or more, and improve access to quality health care as well.

Secure the ability of injured patients to get quicker, unlimited compensation for their "economic losses," including the loss of ability to provide unpaid services like care for children or parents.

Ensure that recoveries for non-economic damages do not exceed a reasonable amount (\$250,000).

Reserve punitive damages for cases where they are justified, and limit punitive damages to reasonable amounts (i.e., up to the greater of two times economic damages or \$250,000).

Provide for payments of judgments over time rather than in a single lump sum, to ensure that appropriate payments are there when patients need them.

Ensure that old cases cannot be brought years after an event.

Ensure that juries are informed if a plaintiff has other sources of reimbursement for an injury.

Provide that defendants pay judgments in proportion to their fault.

Improvements in health care quality and patient safety through litigation reform. Patients deserve

high-quality health care without avoidable medical errors and complications, and the Administration is supporting many efforts to achieve this goal, through better information and other steps to improve quality. One proven approach to reducing errors and complications is patient safety and quality improvement programs implemented by doctors and health care organizations working together. By sharing information on quality problems, errors, and near-misses, health professionals can determine ways to avoid errors and complications in the first place. But these efforts are blocked by fear of litigation -- good-faith efforts to improve quality and safety result in lawsuits based on the new information about opportunities to improve care that these efforts create.

Earlier this year, the President called for legislation to give health professionals the limited liability protections necessary to implement new programs to improve quality and safety.

Bipartisan legislation is now pending in both the House and the Senate that will provide protection from use in lawsuits of new reports and efforts of Patient Safety Organizations to improve patient care.

This protection will make it possible for health professionals to work together more effectively to provide the best possible care for all patients.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE NEW HHS REPORT, CONFRONTING THE NEW HEALTH CARE CRISIS:  
IMPROVING HEALTH CARE QUALITY AND LOWERING COST BY FIXING OUR MEDICAL LIABILITY  
SYSTEM, RELEASED TODAY BY HHS SECRETARY TOMMY THOMPSON

The HHS report includes a detailed review of recent studies on the consequences of out-of-control medical liability, and new evidence on the magnitude and consequences of the medical liability crisis that is threatening health care in many parts of America.

The medical liability crisis is threatening access to care in many states.

In Las Vegas, Nevada, the only Level 1 Trauma Center had to close temporarily because its surgeons could no longer afford malpractice insurance -- and it may have to close again. Overall, 10% or more of Las Vegas doctors may leave their practice as a result of the crisis, and many patients including expectant mothers cannot find a physician.

In New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, dozens of physicians are ending their practices, depriving patients of long-term, trusted relationships and sometimes leaving them without a physician altogether.

In Mississippi, no doctors are available to deliver babies in many communities.

As a result, in many of these states, patients must travel to a different state in order to get care.

Many doctors cannot volunteer their services for patients who cannot pay, and the proportion of physicians who provide any charity care at all has declined, because doctors cannot afford the required liability coverage.

The medical liability crisis is threatening patient safety and quality of care.

Many preventable errors and complications in the health care system do not result from failures by individual doctors, but from problems in how health professionals work together to provide increasingly complex medical services. For this reason, health care organizations have been able to reduce errors and complications through better information systems and careful studies of how mistakes occur, and how to prevent them. For example, the doctors and hospitals of the Pittsburgh Regional Healthcare Initiative has reduced blood infections in intensive care units by 20 percent through collaborative work to identify safer ways to treat intensive care patients.

But these efforts are impeded by litigation fears: good-faith efforts by medical professionals to generate new information and insights to improve care should not be rewarded by lawsuits based on this new information.

The medical liability crisis is raising health care costs, including adding billions to Federal spending.

Doctors alone had to pay over \$6 billion in medical liability premiums last year, and premiums this year in many states have increased by more than 20% on average and more than 75% for specialties in some states.

In addition, the costs of "defensive" medicine -- additional, unnecessary tests and treatments that help avoid frivolous lawsuits but do not improve patient health -- add many billions more to American health expenditures.

Altogether, medical liability adds \$60 to 110 billion to the costs of health care each year -- higher health insurance premiums and higher medical costs for all Americans.

Excessive medical liability also adds \$30 to \$60 billion annually to Federal government payments for Medicare, Medicaid, the State Children's Health Insurance Program, Veterans' Administration health care, health care for Federal employees, and other government programs. It also accounts for billions in additional tax deductions for the added costs of liability of employer health insurance coverage.

The cause of the medical liability crisis is a badly broken system of litigation that serves the interest of specialized trial lawyers, not patients.

The vast majority of medical liability claims (up to 70%) do not result in any payments to patients. Less than 2% of cases result in trial victories for plaintiffs. But each of these cases costs almost \$25,000 on average to defend.

Within the very small proportion of jury cases that find for the plaintiff, "mega-verdicts" with large awards of noneconomic damages have been increasing in states that do not have reasonable limits on non-economic damages. For example, there have been over 20 verdicts of \$9 million or more in Mississippi since 1995, and individual cases in Pennsylvania and Mississippi have reached the \$100 million level.

Yet even patients who are lucky enough to get awards don't get most of the money. Lawyers' fees account for 40% or more of the multimillion-dollar payouts. And less than 30% of all the money that doctors pay in liability insurance fees goes to patients. And patients must wait five years on average for these payouts (longer in cases that go to trial).

This system rewards personal injury lawyers who adopt a "lottery" strategy: seek out patients and encourage them to file lots of claims, even though the vast majority will have no merit and the patient will get nothing; and then encourage patients to wait it out through years of litigation for a small chance of a big win. If exaggerated awards are possible, even if very unlikely, a personal injury lawyer only needs to win one out of hundreds of cases to make it all worthwhile -- from the standpoint of the lawyer. But the vast majority of patients get nothing for their troubles, doctors lose billions in insurance costs and time and may have to leave their practice altogether, and all patients pay higher prices and get worse care as a result.

The HHS report also shows that there is a proven solution: liability reforms including reasonable limits on non-economic damages (\$250,000-350,000) are working in many states to reduce health care costs and improve access and quality of care.

Reasonable caps on noneconomic damages result in lower medical liability costs, resulting in much lower medical liability premiums and stable availability of liability insurance, so that access to doctors is not threatened. Liability premium increases last year averaged 12% in states with caps, and 44% in states without. Liability premiums for OB/Gyns in Florida (no cap) are \$100,000-\$200,000 but in California (reasonable cap) are \$46,000-\$57,000. Over the past 25 years since California instituted a reasonable cap on noneconomic damages, liability premiums have increased by less than one third as much as in the rest of the country.

If applied nationally, studies based on the experience of these states indicate that: over \$60 billion per year in health care costs could be redirected from lawsuits and unnecessary care toward paying for valuable drugs and other treatments; over \$30 billion in Federal payments could be redirected toward improving Medicare, Medicaid, and other Federal programs for reducing health care costs; and over 2 million more Americans would be able to afford health insurance.

Studies also show no adverse effects on patient care associated with these caps. In fact, quality of care improves because of greater access to physicians.

For your information below is the text of yesterday's HHS Press Release on Professional Liability. Attached is the HHS Report on Liability Reform and the White House Liability Fact Sheet. If you have trouble reading the HHS report, there is a link to the report at the end of the press release.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Wednesday, July 24, 2002 Contact: HHS Press Office  
(202) 690-6343

HHS CALLS FOR NATIONAL MALPRACTICE LEGISLATION  
TO PROTECT ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF HEALTH CARE

-----

----  
HHS Secretary Tommy G. Thompson today released a policy report calling for new federal legislation to improve Americans' access to care, encourage efforts to improve quality of care and squeeze the excesses and abuses out of the malpractice litigation system.

The report says Americans increasingly are finding that their doctors are closing their practices, limiting the types of patients they will see, or leaving communities where they have long practiced because they cannot afford the rapidly increasing cost of malpractice insurance or because it is simply not available.

"This is a problem for America's doctors -- and a danger to all Americans," Secretary Thompson said. "Americans are paying the price of excessive lawsuits through higher health insurance premiums, difficulty in getting a doctor when they need one, higher taxes and missed opportunities to improve patient safety. We must put an end to the malpractice litigation lottery that favors a handful of powerful personal injury lawyers and instead create a common-sense system that ensures injured patients receive fair and prompt compensation without threatening access to quality care for all other Americans."

The report, "Confronting the New Health Care Crisis: Improving Health Care Quality and Lowering Costs By Fixing Our Medical Liability System," highlights the problems created by the rising costs of malpractice insurance for doctors and hospitals -- particularly in states that have not reformed their legal systems. The system is raising the cost of health care that all Americans pay through out-of-pocket payments, insurance premiums and taxes.

The report also cites specific problems that result from the current system. For instance, women are losing their obstetricians in mid-pregnancy in states that have not reformed their litigation systems. Also, earlier this month, the major trauma center in Las Vegas had to close temporarily after its surgeons quit when their malpractice premiums increased sharply.

The report cites estimates showing the cost of malpractice insurance for specialists has risen more than 10 percent in recent years and could increase by an average of 20 percent or more this year. States without any limits on non-economic malpractice damages are experiencing the sharpest increase -- 30-50 percent.

It also details other threats to quality health care caused by rising malpractice costs:

Patients undergo unnecessary tests and treatments as doctors and hospitals practice "defensive medicine" to ward off potential malpractice lawsuits. This exposes patients to additional risk and drives up the cost of health care.

Fears of malpractice litigation may stop doctors and hospitals from reporting adverse events and potential errors to quality improvement groups -- reducing the chances that potential threats to patient safety are identified and corrected before anyone is hurt.

Doctors are avoiding high-risk specialties, such as obstetrics and surgery, due to the excessive costs of malpractice insurance. Hospitals also may drop high-risk services, such as trauma care and emergency rooms, to reduce their insurance costs.

Fearing malpractice litigation, retired physicians and others health-care professionals are choosing not to volunteer their services at community clinics and other locations that people without health insurance rely on for needed care.

It calls for key national reforms that would both strengthen patient safety and quality improvement efforts by making it possible for doctors to collaborate to identify problems and fix them, and establish reasonable limits on non-economic damages in malpractice cases.

The report also suggests ways to reform the way lawsuits are conducted and to avoid litigation in the first place. It suggests adoption of a plan called Early Offers that would encourage doctors to offer economic compensation to injured patients soon after an adverse event and encourage patients to accept them. In this way patients would be assured of fair compensation quickly, and without having to undergo the long delays, great expense and trauma of litigation.

The report also suggests adoption of strengthened medical review panels that would provide streamlined disposition of malpractice claims, with incentives for doctors and patients to use them and accept their judgments.

"California led the way for the nation by establishing statewide limits on malpractice claims 25 years ago, with bipartisan support," Secretary Thompson said. "We should learn from the successes of California and other states that have successfully reformed their malpractice systems. The billions of dollars we could save would permit increased benefits such as a reasonable prescription drug benefit for seniors and help for the uninsured to obtain insurance."

The report is available at <http://aspe.hhs.gov/daltcp/reports/litrefm.pdf>.

###