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“The Jungle” – Upton Sinclair -- 1906

“All day long the blazing midsummer sun beat down upon that square mile of abominations: upon tens of thousands of cattle crowded into pens whose wooden floors stank and steamed contagion; upon bare, blistering, cinder-strewn railroad tracks, and huge blocks of dingy meat factories, whose labyrinthine passages defied a breath of fresh air to penetrate them; and there were not merely rivers of hot blood, and carloads of moist flesh, and rendering vats and soap caldrons, glue factories and fertilizer tanks, that smelt like the craters of hell—there were also tons of garbage festering in the sun, and the greasy laundry of the workers hung out to dry, and dining rooms littered with food and black with flies, and toilet rooms that were open sewers.”
Birth of Workers’ Compensation—
Early 1900s

• “Deserving” Population
  — Workers
    • Seriously injured
    • In the workplace

• Few other sources of care
  — Health insurance was rare
    — No Social Security or Medicare/Medicaid

• Seeking care often meant costly litigation
Objectives—in 12 minutes

- Workers’ Compensation a very costly and inefficient medical delivery system
- Most “occupational” conditions are no longer easily defined—Making distinction an anachronism
- Savings from integration could fund significant portion of incremental cost of expansion of health coverage
- Savings from integrating occ/non-occ medicine accrue predominately to the employers and workers facing the cost of expanded health coverage
Primer on Workers’ Compensation

• **Size**—United States
  - $85 Billion Total (2006)
  - $55 Billion Medical

• **Covers both medical treatment and wage replacement**

• **Mainly property-casualty insurers**

• **Employers premium based on % of payroll**

• **Premium rates vary greatly by occupation**
## Primer on Workers’ Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$/$100 payroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8859</td>
<td>Computer Programming</td>
<td>$ 0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8741</td>
<td>Real Estate Agencies</td>
<td>$ 0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4512</td>
<td>Biomedical Research Labs</td>
<td>$ 0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8810</td>
<td>Clerical Office Employees</td>
<td>$ 0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5645</td>
<td>Carpentry (non-union)</td>
<td>$28.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8293</td>
<td>Furniture Moving</td>
<td>$29.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5552</td>
<td>Roofing (non-union)</td>
<td>$41.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9185</td>
<td>Carnivals or Circuses</td>
<td>$42.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primer on Workers’ Compensation

Medical Treatment

• No co-pays or deductibles

• Fee-for-service

• Lifetime treatment for condition
Cost of Delivering $1 of Medical Benefits

- Provider Payments
- Admin/Overhead

Group Health: $1.00
Workers' Compensation: $4.00
Current Distribution of Occupational Conditions

- Non-traumatic Injuries & Illnesses
- Traumatic Injuries
Fractures--MEPS

Fracture by Occupational/Non-Occupational and Risk

% with new condition in year

Low risk
- Non-Occ 2.9
- Occ 0.5

Medium risk
- Non-Occ 3.4
- Occ 0.5

High risk
- Non-Occ 3.0
- Occ 1.7
Back Conditions--MEPS

Back Condition
by Occupational/Non-Occupational and Risk

% with new condition in year

- Low risk: Non-Occ 6.1, Occ 0.9
- Medium risk: Non-Occ 5.7, Occ 1.4
- High risk: Non-Occ 4.4, Occ 2.8
Percent of Non-Union Workers Covered by Employment-Based Health Insurance
(By Employers’ Cost for Workers Compensation)
CALIFORNIA WORKERS’ COMPENSATION MEDICAL PAYMENTS BY DURATION FROM YEAR OF INJURY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yr. of Injury</th>
<th>Losses Paid in 10-30</th>
<th>% of Total Accident Year Losses Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr. of Injury</td>
<td>Yr+1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yr+2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yr+3</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yr+4</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yr+5-6</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yr+7-10</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yr+11-15</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yr+16-20</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yr+21-30</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yr+30+</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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“Occupational” Medical Cost Under Integration ($ billions)

- Integrated
- Separate
Summary

- Workers’ Compensation somewhat anachronistic
- Majority of conditions hard to identify as occupational or non-occupational
- Medical treatment very costly under “comp”
  - Mostly administration and overhead
- Integration could save as much as $30-50 billion/year
- Savings accrue to employers and workers facing the cost of expansion under universal health insurance