August 23, 2016

Mr. Roger A. Sevigny Insurance Commissioner, State of New Hampshire New Hampshire Insurance Department 21 South Fruit Street, Suite 14, Concord, NH 03301

Dear Commissioner Sevigny:

Subject: New Hampshire Proposed Network Adequacy Rules

The New Hampshire Prostate Cancer Coalition, is an active New Hampshire non-profit committed to raising awareness about Prostate Cancer, supporting patient's rights and choices and raising funds for much needed Prostate Cancer Research. We also are committed to raising our voices on behalf of men diagnosed with Prostate Cancer and their families as well as the families who have lost someone to this serious and deadly disease. Indeed, several members of our Board of Directors have battled or are battling Prostate Cancer. Just the past year we lost a member of our Board to this Cancer.

We have become aware of New Hampshire's Proposed Network Adequacy Rules. On behalf of New Hampshire patients with Prostate Cancer we have a moral and ethical obligation to advocate on their behalf. The New Hampshire Prostate Cancer Coalition strongly urges the NH Department of Insurance to expressly include physician pathology services in the proposed rule for health plan network adequacy assessment.

The College of American Pathologists has shared your communication with them from June 7th in which the Department declined to expressly list physician pathology series, namely biopsy interpretation, in the proposed rule. While the taking of a biopsy is listed, the physician pathology service that provides the interpretative diagnosis of the biopsy is not included. Indeed, there appears to be no physician pathology service identified as medically necessary in the entire rule, which for our organization and the thousands of NH patients and their families, is a great concern.

For any cancer patient, the full and scientifically effective analysis by a pathology physician is a vital and critical part in the development of an adequate diagnosis and treatment plan. We believe that the intentional omission of any physician pathology service, in a list of necessary medical service that is exhaustive and comprehensive for the effective evaluation of a health plan's network adequacy, is detrimental to patients being screened, monitored or treated for cancer. We expect that this omission will receive your careful reconsideration to ensure that patients with cancer or at high risk of cancer in New Hampshire are able to avail themselves of health plans with adequate numbers of in-network pathologists.

Thank you for consideration of this request. NH men and their families are hopeful your final decision will be a favorable one.

Richard L. Hatin
President - New Hampshire Prostate Cancer Coalition
5 River Field Path, Hooksett, NH, 03106