

EXHIBIT A

Description of OIA Staff

Description of OIA Staff

Marcella A. Bell, Esq., Independent Administrator and Director. Ms. Bell is the principal of the Law Offices of Marcella A. Bell. She served as Director of the OIA from August 2000 through March 28, 2015, and she became the Independent Administrator effective March 29, 2015. She is a graduate of Loyola Marymount University and the University of West Los Angeles School of Law, where she served on the Moot Court Board of Governors. Her legal experience is primarily in the areas of civil rights and alternative dispute resolution. Ms. Bell was an attorney with the Law Offices of Sharon Lybeck Hartmann from 1995 to 2003, and the Law Offices of Sharon Oxborough from 2003 to March 2015. Ms. Bell supervises the overall operation of the OIA and its staff. She also decides fee waiver applications and petitions for expedited proceedings, supervises the neutral arbitrator selection process, speaks with neutral arbitrators about their selection and the progress of their cases, compiles and analyzes statistical data, and answers substantive questions from claimants and attorneys. She also reviews neutral arbitrators disclosures to ensure that the disclosure required by Ethics Standard 12(b) is made and is timely, and the Standard 8 disclosures provided by the OIA are served on the parties. Ms. Bell meets with Ms. O'Neal and Ms. Armas monthly regarding the status of cases. She also meets quarterly with the AOB, where she reports on the work of the OIA.

Sharon Oxborough, Esq., Of Counsel and Independent Administrator. Ms. Oxborough served as the Independent Administrator from March 29, 2003 through March 28, 2015, and she has been of counsel to the Bell firm since March 29, 2015. Ms. Oxborough is a graduate of Hamline University, *summa cum laude*, and Harvard Law School, *cum laude*. She was a federal law clerk in the Central District of California. She has over twenty-five years of experience in general civil litigation, appeals, and alternative dispute resolution. She was of counsel to the Hartmann firm. In that capacity, Ms. Oxborough drafted and negotiated the original *Rules* and forms used by the OIA and consulted about issues as they arose. As Independent Administrator, she supervised the overall operation of the OIA.

Stephanie L. O'Neal, Esq., Director. Ms. O'Neal is a graduate of Dartmouth College and UCLA School of Law. She also holds a Masters in Urban Planning from UCLA. Her legal experience is primarily in the areas of civil rights and alternative dispute resolution. Ms. O'Neal was an attorney with the Hartmann firm from 1996 to 2003, and the Oxborough firm from 2003 to March 2015. At the OIA, Ms. O'Neal reviews neutral arbitrator applications and fee waiver applications, decides fee waiver applications and petitions for expedited proceedings, supervises the neutral arbitrator selection process, speaks with neutral arbitrators about their selection and the progress of their cases, and answers substantive questions from claimants and attorneys. She reviews neutral arbitrators disclosures to ensure that the disclosure required by Ethics Standard 12(b) is made and is timely, and the Standard 8 disclosures provided by the OIA are served on the parties. She also assists Ms. Bell in supervision of the OIA and its staff. Ms. O'Neal is an adjunct instructor at Los Angeles Valley College and Santa Monica College where she teaches Business Law.

Tracy Holler, Network Administrator and Office Manager. Ms. Holler is a graduate of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. She studied Business Administration, with a concentration in Management and Human Resources. She worked for the Hartmann firm from 1994 to 2003, and the Oxborough firm from 2003 to March 2015. She is the Network Administrator and Office Manager for the OIA. Ms. Holler designed, set up, and maintains the OIA's extensive computer databases. She was responsible in 2002 for redesigning the OIA's

software to meet the reporting requirements of both the Ethics Standards and of California Code of Civil Procedure §1281.96. Because of her, the OIA posted all data required before the statutory deadline of January 1, 2003. She was also responsible for the OIA creating a sortable table with expanded data disclosure requirements, effective January 1, 2015, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §1281.96, as amended in 2014. She generates the statistical reports upon which these annual reports are based. She also maintains the neutral arbitrator electronic files, including updating applications with awards, decisions, and evaluations of neutral arbitrators.

Vivian Arroyo, Administrative Staff. Ms. Arroyo worked for the Hartmann firm from 1997 to 2003, and the Oxborough firm from 2003 to March 2015. Prior to that, she worked for Mexicana Airlines as a sales representative for fifteen years. Ms. Arroyo traveled all over the world during her career with the airline. At the OIA, Ms. Arroyo is responsible for sending out the lists of possible arbitrator (“LPA”) packets to the parties. She sends letters confirming the granting of 90 day postponements with new due dates. She also tracks each case’s compliance with the *Rules* to the extent that it can be tracked through the computer database, sends form letters reminding parties and neutrals of deadlines, and maintains case files. She assists Ms. Armas with the neutral arbitrator selection process, including generating reports to comply with both notice and disclosure requirements of the Ethics Standards. She is fluent in Spanish.

Lynda Tutt, Legal Assistant. A native of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Ms. Tutt attended Temple University. She is a graduate of the University of Phoenix, where she majored in Business Management. She has many years’ experience as a legal assistant. She worked for the Hartmann firm from 1995 to 2003, and the Oxborough firm from 2003 to March 2015. Ms. Tutt is a licensed notary and a member of the Legal Secretaries Association, Beverly Hills/Century City Chapter. Ms. Tutt answers incoming telephone calls and responds to questions from lawyers, claimants, and the public. She creates case files, enters information about new cases into the OIA’s computer database, and sends letters regarding payment of filing fees. She also sends letters to neutral arbitrators confirming their selection. Ms. Tutt enters all of the responses to the questionnaires and evaluations of neutral arbitrators into a database.

Aura Armas, Legal Assistant. Ms. Armas is a graduate of Mount Saint Mary’s University, Los Angeles where she received a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science and Philosophy with a minor in Pre-Law. After graduation, Ms. Armas completed two terms of service with AmeriCorps, where she worked at the Los Angeles Superior Court, Resource Center for Family Law, assisting self-represented litigants with their cases. Ms. Armas has also worked as a Firm Administrator and litigation assistant with a Los Angeles law firm. At the OIA, Ms. Armas reviews neutral arbitrator applications and fee waiver applications, selects neutral arbitrators based on parties’ responses, speaks with neutral arbitrators about their selection and the progress of their cases, and answers substantive questions from claimants and attorneys. She generates the LPAs and assembles copies of the neutral arbitrator applications for the LPAs. She reviews neutral arbitrators’ disclosures to ensure that the disclosure required by Ethics Standard 12(b) is made and is timely, and the Standard 8 disclosures provided by the OIA are served on the parties. Ms. Armas speaks with neutral arbitrators about the status of their cases, monitoring the progress of those open more than 15 months. She is fluent in Spanish.

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT B

**Rules for Kaiser Permanente Member
Arbitrations Administered by
the Office of the Independent Administrator,
Amended as of January 1, 2016, redlined**

**RULES FOR KAISER PERMANENTE MEMBER
ARBITRATIONS**

ADMINISTERED BY

THE OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT ADMINISTRATOR

AMENDED AS OF JANUARY 1, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. GENERAL RULES 1

 1. Goal 1

 2. Administration of Arbitration 1

 3. Confidentiality 1

 4. Code of Ethics 1

 5. Meaning of Arbitrator 1

 6. Authority of Arbitrators 1

 7. Contents of the Demand for Arbitration 1

 8. Serving Demand for Arbitration 2

 9. Serving Other Documents 2

 10. Representation 3

B. RULES ON COMMENCEMENT OF ARBITRATION AND SELECTION OF ARBITRATORS 3

 11. Initiation of Arbitration 3

 12. Filing Fee 3

 13. Waiver of Filing and Neutral Arbitrator Fees 4

 14. Number of Arbitrators 4

 15. Payment of Neutral Arbitrator Fees and Expenses 5

 16. List of Possible Arbitrators 6

 17. Joint Selection of the Neutral Arbitrator 6

 18. Selection of the Neutral Arbitrator When the Parties Do Not Agree 7

 19. Acceptance by the Neutral Arbitrator 8

 20. Disclosure and Challenge 8

 21. Postponement of Selection of Neutral Arbitrator 9

 22. Selection of the Party Arbitrator 9

 23. Appointment of Chairperson 9

C. RULES FOR REGULAR PROCEDURES 10

 24. Deadline for Disposing of Arbitrations 10

 25. Arbitration Management Conference 10

26.	Mandatory Settlement Meeting	11
27.	Discovery	12
28.	Postponements	12
29.	Failure to Appear	13
30.	Securing Witnesses for the Arbitration Hearing	13
31.	Close of Hearing or Proceeding	13
32.	Documents	14
D.	RULES FOR EXPEDITED PROCEDURES	14
33.	Expedited Procedures	14
34.	Seeking Expedited Procedures from the Independent Administrator	14
35.	Seeking Expedited Procedures from the Neutral Arbitrator	15
36.	Telephonic Notice	15
E.	RULES ON AWARD AND ENFORCEMENT	15
37.	Time of Award	15
38.	Form of Award	15
39.	Delivery of the Award	16
40.	Notice after Settlement or Withdrawal	16
41.	Sanctions	16
42.	Release of Documents for Judicial Proceedings	17
F.	RULES OF ADMINISTRATION	17
43.	Counting of Days	17
44.	No Limit on Immunity	17
45.	Neutral Arbitrator Fees	17
46.	Expenses	17
47.	Forms	17
48.	Questionnaire	17
49.	Evaluation	18
50.	Amendment of Rules	18
51.	Conflict with Law	18

52.	Acknowledgment of No Warranty	18
53.	Public Reporting	18
54.	Legal Advice	19

A. GENERAL RULES

1. Goal

These Rules are intended to provide an arbitration process that is fair, timely, lower in cost than litigation, and that protects the privacy interests of all Parties.

2. Administration of Arbitration

The arbitrations conducted under these Rules shall be administered by the Office of the Independent Administrator. Arbitrations conducted under these Rules shall be considered to be consumer arbitrations under California law.

3. Confidentiality

Information disclosed to, and documents received by, an Arbitrator or the Independent Administrator by or from the Parties, their representatives, or witnesses in the course of the arbitration shall not be divulged by the Arbitrator or the Independent Administrator. With respect to the Independent Administrator, this Rule shall not apply to communications concerning Arbitrators, disclosures required by law, or statistical information used in its annual reports.

4. Code of Ethics

All Neutral Arbitrators shall comply with the Ethics Standards for Neutral Arbitrators in Contractual Arbitration, Division VI of the Appendix to the California Rules of Court ("Ethics Standards.") All party arbitrators shall comply with the AAA Code of Ethics for Arbitrators in Commercial Disputes.

5. Meaning of Arbitrator

The term "Arbitrator" in these Rules refers to the arbitration panel, whether composed of one or more Arbitrators or whether the Arbitrators are Neutral or Party. The term "Party Arbitrator" means an Arbitrator selected by one of the sides to the arbitration. The term "Neutral Arbitrator" means any Arbitrator other than a "Party Arbitrator."

6. Authority of Arbitrators

Once appointed, the Neutral Arbitrator will resolve disputes about the interpretation and applicability of these Rules, including disputes relating to the duties of the Arbitrator and the conduct of the Arbitration Hearing. In cases involving more than one Arbitrator, however, issues that are dispositive with respect to a claim, including summary judgment motions, will be ruled on by all three Arbitrators and decided by a majority of them. Upon commencement of the Arbitration Hearing and thereafter, all substantive decisions shall be made by a majority of the full panel or as otherwise agreed by them.

7. Contents of the Demand for Arbitration

The Demand for Arbitration shall include the basis of the claim against the Respondent(s); the amount of damages the Claimant(s) seeks in the Arbitration; the name, address and telephone number of the Claimant(s)

and their attorney, if any; and the name of all Respondent(s). Claimant(s) shall include all claims against Respondent(s) that are based on the same incident, transaction, or related circumstances in the Demand for Arbitration.

8. Serving Demand for Arbitration

- a. In Northern California, Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. ("Health Plan"), Kaiser Permanente Insurance Corporation ("KPIC"), Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, and/or The Permanente Medical Group, Inc. shall be served with a Demand for Arbitration by mailing the Demand for Arbitration addressed to that Respondent(s) in care of:

Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. or
Legal Department
P.O. Box 12916
Oakland, CA 94604

Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.
Legal Department
1950 Franklin Street, 17th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612

Service on that Respondent shall be deemed completed when received.

- b. In Southern California, Health Plan, Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, and/or Southern California Permanente Medical Group, shall be served with a Demand for Arbitration by mailing the Demand for Arbitration to that Respondent(s) in care of:

Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.
Legal Department
393 East Walnut Street
Pasadena, CA 91188

Service on that Respondent shall be deemed completed when received.

- c. All other Respondent(s), including individuals, must be served as required by the California Code of Civil Procedure for a civil action.
- d. All Respondent(s) served with a Demand for Arbitration in the manner described above shall be Parties to the Arbitration. The Arbitrator shall have jurisdiction only over Respondent(s) actually served. If Claimant(s) serves any Respondent(s) other than an organization affiliated with Kaiser Permanente, the Claimant(s) shall serve a proof of service of that Respondent(s) on the Independent Administrator.
- e. Where an order to arbitrate has been entered, the underlying court complaint constitutes the Demand for Arbitration and the entry of the order constitutes its service.

9. Serving Other Documents

- a. Service of other documents required by these Rules will be made on the Parties or Arbitrator at their last known address. If the Party is represented in this arbitration, that counsel shall be served instead of the Party. Service may be made by personal service, Federal Express or other similar services, facsimile transmission, or by U.S. mail.
- b. Parties should only serve the Independent Administrator with those documents specified in these Rules. Unless otherwise directed by the Neutral Arbitrator, the parties should not serve the Independent

Administrator with copies of motions or briefs. Service for the Independent Administrator shall be directed to:

Office of the Independent Administrator for the
Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.

Fax: 213-637-8658

or

Email: oia@oia-kaiserarb.com.

- c. If a Party or Arbitrator serves the Independent Administrator by fax or email, the Party or Arbitrator shall call the Independent Administrator's office at 213-637-9847 to confirm receipt or shall retain confirmation of receipt of the faxed or emailed document.
- d. Service on the Independent Administrator is effective on the date the Independent Administrator receives the document.

10. Representation

Parties represented by counsel shall not contact the Independent Administrator except through counsel.

B. RULES ON COMMENCEMENT OF ARBITRATION AND SELECTION OF ARBITRATORS

11. Initiation of Arbitration

Demands for Arbitration shall be served in accordance with Rule 8. Whether or not the Claimant(s) has enclosed a filing fee, within ten (10) days of such service upon the Health Plan at the address set forth in Rule 8, Health Plan shall transmit the Demand for Arbitration and the envelope it came in to the Independent Administrator using the Transmission Form. If the Claimant(s) submitted a filing fee with the Demand, the Health Plan shall transmit the filing fee as well. Health Plan shall also serve a copy of the Transmission Form on the Claimant(s).

12. Filing Fee

- a. Claimant(s) seeking arbitration shall pay a single, non-refundable, filing fee of \$150 per arbitration payable to "Arbitration Account" regardless of the number of claims asserted in the Demand for Arbitration or the number of Claimants or Respondents named in the Demand for Arbitration.
- b. **The Independent Administrator will waive the filing fee for Claimant(s) who submit forms that show that the Claimants' gross monthly income is less than 300 percent of the federal poverty guidelines. A copy of this form may be obtained from the Independent Administrator. Claimants should not serve a copy of this form on Respondent(s).**

- c. If Claimant(s) wishes to have both the filing fee and the Neutral Arbitrators' fees waived, the Claimant(s) should follow the procedure set out in Rule 13. If Claimant(s) wishes only to avoid paying the fees for the Neutral Arbitrator, but can afford the filing fee or has received a waiver under 12.b, the Claimant(s) should follow the procedure set out in Rule 15.
- d. If a Claimant(s) fails to pay the filing fee or obtain a waiver of that fee within seventy-five (75) days of the date of the Transmission Form, the Independent Administrator will not process the Demand and it shall be deemed abandoned.
- e. While the filing fee is normally non-refundable, if Claimant(s) has paid the filing fee with the Demand for Arbitration before receiving notice of the opportunity to have it waived, the Independent Administrator will refund the fee if it receives a completed waiver form within seventy-five (75) days of the date of the Transmission Form and grants the waiver.

13. Waiver of Filing and Neutral Arbitrator Fees

Any Claimant(s) who claims extreme hardship may request that the Independent Administrator waive the filing fee and Neutral Arbitrator's fees and expenses. A Claimant(s) who seeks such a waiver shall complete the Fee Waiver Form and submit it to the Independent Administrator and simultaneously serve it upon Respondent(s). The Fee Waiver Form sets out the criteria for waiving fees and is available from the Independent Administrator or by calling the Kaiser Permanente Member Service Customer Center at 1-800-464-4000. Respondent(s) may submit any response to the Independent Administrator within ten (10) days of the date of Claimant's Fee Waiver Form, and shall simultaneously serve any submission upon Claimant(s). Within fifteen (15) days of receipt of a Fee Waiver Form, the Independent Administrator shall determine whether the fees should be waived and notify the Parties in writing of the decision. In those cases where the Independent Administrator grants the waiver of fees, the Independent Administrator shall waive the filing fee and Health Plan shall pay the Neutral Arbitrator's fees and expenses.

14. Number of Arbitrators

- a. If the Demand for Arbitration seeks total damages of \$200,000 or less, the dispute shall be heard and determined by one Neutral Arbitrator, unless the Parties otherwise agree in writing that the arbitration shall be heard by two Party Arbitrators and a Neutral Arbitrator. The Arbitrators shall not have authority to award monetary damages that are greater than \$200,000.
- b. If the Demand for Arbitration seeks total damages of more than \$200,000, the dispute may be heard and determined by one Neutral Arbitrator and two Party Arbitrators, one appointed by the Claimant(s) and one appointed by the Respondent(s). Parties who are entitled to select a Party Arbitrator under these Rules may agree to waive this right. If both Parties agree, these arbitrations will be heard by a single Neutral Arbitrator.
- c. A Party who is entitled to a Party Arbitrator and decides to waive this right shall sign a Waiver of Party Arbitrator Form and serve a copy of it upon the Independent Administrator, Neutral Arbitrator, and other Party. The Claimant(s) shall serve this form on the Neutral Arbitrator and Respondent(s) no later than the date of the Arbitration Management Conference set out in Rule 25 and shall serve the Independent

Administrator no later than five (5) days after serving the other Parties. If a Claimant(s) serves Respondent(s) with a signed Waiver of Party Arbitrator - Claimants Form, Respondent(s) shall inform Claimant(s) within five (5) days of the date of that Form if Respondent(s) will also waive the Party Arbitrator.

- d. The Blue Ribbon Advisory Panel on Kaiser Permanente Arbitration concluded that Party Arbitrators increase the cost and cause more delay than would occur with a single Neutral Arbitrator. The Independent Administrator therefore encourages Parties to use a single Neutral Arbitrator to decide cases.
- e. The number of Arbitrators may affect the Claimant(s)' responsibility for paying the Neutral Arbitrator's fees and expenses, as set out in Rule 15.

15. Payment of Neutral Arbitrator Fees and Expenses

- a. Respondent shall pay for the fees and expenses incurred by the Neutral Arbitrator if
 - i. Claimant(s) agrees to waive any potential objection arising out of such payment, signs the Waiver of Objection to Payment of Fees Form, and serves a copy of it on the Independent Administrator and Respondent(s); and
 - ii. either the arbitration has only a single Neutral Arbitrator or the Claimant(s) has served a Waiver of Party Arbitrator - Claimants Form as set out in Rule 14.c.
- b. In arbitrations where the Independent Administrator has granted Claimant's Fee Waiver request, Respondent shall pay the fees and expenses incurred by the Neutral Arbitrator.
- c. In all other arbitrations, the fees and expenses of the Neutral Arbitrator shall be paid one-half by the Claimant(s) and one-half by the Respondent(s).
- d. Nothing in this Rule shall prohibit an order requiring the payment of the Neutral Arbitrator's fees and expenses which were incurred as a result of conduct which causes the Neutral Arbitrator to incur needless fees and expenses. Such conduct includes, but is not limited to, failure to respond to discovery requests, abusive discovery practices, the filing of frivolous motions of all sorts, and untimely requests for continuances. In the event that such a finding is made by the Neutral Arbitrator, those fees and expenses shall be paid by the responsible Party or counsel. The Neutral Arbitrator shall make such a finding in writing, shall specify what fees and expenses are covered by the order, and shall serve a copy of the finding on the Independent Administrator with the Parties' names redacted.
- e. In arbitrations brought by Health Plan or KPIC:
 - i. "Claimant(s)" means KPIC or Health Plan. "Respondent(s)" means the member or member's family or representative.

- ii. Claimant KPIC or Health Plan shall pay for fees and expenses incurred by the Neutral Arbitrator if:
 - (a) Respondent(s) agrees to waive any potential objection arising out of such payment, signs the Waiver of Objection to Payment of Fees Form, and serves a copy of it on the Independent Administrator and Claimant(s); and
 - (b) either the arbitration has only a single Neutral Arbitrator or the Respondent(s) has served a Waiver of Party Arbitrator - Consumer Form as set forth in Rule 14c.
- iii. If the Respondent fails to appear in the arbitration, KPIC or Health Plan shall pay for the fees and expenses incurred by the Neutral Arbitrator.

16. List of Possible Arbitrators

- a. Within three (3) business days after the Independent Administrator has received both the Demand for Arbitration and the filing fee, or has granted a request for waiver of fees, it shall simultaneously send to each Party an identical List of Possible Arbitrators, along with the Application forms of and redacted Awards, if any, by each of the possible Neutral Arbitrators.
- b. The List of Possible Arbitrators shall contain the names of twelve (12) persons. The Independent Administrator will choose the twelve (12) names at random from the Independent Administrator's arbitration panel for San Diego, Southern or Northern California, based on the location where the cause of action arose.
- c. Unless there is a ninety (90) day continuance pursuant to Rule 21, the Independent Administrator must receive the Parties' responses to the List of Possible Arbitrators on or before the deadline date appearing on the List of Possible Arbitrators. This deadline will be twenty (20) days from the day the Independent Administrator sent the List of Possible Arbitrators. Rules 17 and 18 specify how the Parties may respond.

17. Joint Selection of the Neutral Arbitrator

- a. The Parties may all agree upon a person listed on the List of Possible Arbitrators. If they do, the Parties and counsel shall sign the Joint Selection of Neutral Arbitrator Form. Unless there is a ninety (90) day continuance pursuant to Rule 21, the Independent Administrator must receive the form by the deadline set out in Rule 16.c.
- b. Rather than selecting a Neutral Arbitrator from the List of Possible Arbitrators, the Parties may agree to select another person to serve as Neutral Arbitrator, provided that the person agrees in writing to comply with these Rules. If the Parties collectively select a person not on the List of Possible Arbitrators, all the Parties and counsel shall complete and sign the Joint Selection of Neutral Arbitrator Form. Unless there is a ninety (90) day continuance pursuant to Rule 21, the Independent Administrator must receive the form by the deadline set out in Rule 16.c.
- c. The Independent Administrator encourages Parties, if possible, to make more than one joint selection and requires the Claimant and Respondent to individually submit the List of Possible Arbitrators under Rule 18. If the person the Parties have jointly selected is unable to serve, the

Independent Administrator will then first use other joint selection(s). If only one joint Selection was submitted, the Independent Administrator will then use the strike and ranked List(s) of Possible Arbitrators. If no such List was submitted, Rule 18.c shall apply, and the Independent Administrator will randomly select a possible Neutral Arbitrator from the List of Possible Arbitrators.

- d. After the Independent Administrator has received these forms, it will send a Letter Confirming Service to the person who has agreed to act as Neutral Arbitrator, with a copy to the Parties.

18. Selection of the Neutral Arbitrator When the Parties Do Not Agree

- a. If the Parties do not collectively agree upon a Neutral Arbitrator, the Neutral Arbitrator shall be selected from the List of Possible Arbitrators in the following manner. Claimant(s) and Respondent(s) may each strike up to four (4) names to which the Party objects and shall rank the remaining names in order of preference with "1" being the strongest preference. No name should be left blank. Unless there is a ninety (90) day continuance pursuant to Rule 21, the Independent Administrator must receive the forms by the deadline set out in Rule 16.c.
- b. Regardless of the number of Claimants or Respondents, the Claimant(s) shall return only one list of preferences and the Respondent(s) shall return only one list of preferences. If they do not, Rule 18.c will apply.
- c. Unless there is a ninety (90) day continuance pursuant to Rule 21, if the Independent Administrator does not receive a response from a Party by the deadline set out in Rule 16.c, all persons named on the List of Possible Arbitrators shall be deemed equally acceptable Neutral Arbitrators to that Party.
- d. At any time before the Party's response is due, a Party or representative may request to review further information, if any, which the Independent Administrator has in its files about the persons named on the List of Possible Arbitrators. Parties and their representatives may call the Independent Administrator at 213-637-9847 to request such information. The Parties and their representatives may review the information by going to the Independent Administrator's office. If requested, the Independent Administrator will also send the information to the Party or attorney by mail or fax. Parties who request that further information be sent to them shall be responsible for the Independent Administrator's cost of providing it, with no charge made for duplication of the first twenty-five (25) pages. Time spent requesting or waiting for the additional information shall not extend the time to respond to the List of Possible Arbitrators.
- e. Working from the returned Lists of Possible Arbitrators it has timely received, the Independent Administrator shall invite a person to serve as the Neutral Arbitrator, asking first the person with the lowest combined rank whose name has not been stricken by either Party. If the person with the lowest combined rank is not available, the Independent Administrator will ask the second lowest ranked person who was not stricken by either party, and will continue until a person whose name was not stricken agrees to serve. When the Independent Administrator contacts the persons, it shall inform them of the names of the Parties and their counsel and ask them not to accept if they know of any conflict of interest. If there is a tie in ranking, the Independent Administrator shall choose at random a person from the list of those who are tied.

- f. If a Party disqualifies a Neutral Arbitrator, the Independent Administrator shall send another List of Possible Arbitrators to the Parties. The procedure and timing in that case shall be the same as that for the first List of Possible Arbitrators. After two Neutral Arbitrators have been disqualified, the Independent Administrator shall randomly select a Neutral Arbitrator from the other members on the panel who have not been named on prior Lists of Possible Arbitrators.
- g. If a Neutral Arbitrator should die, become incapacitated, or otherwise become unable or unwilling to proceed with the arbitration after appointment, the Independent Administrator shall serve the Parties with a new List of Possible Arbitrators and the selection process as set out in Rules 16 through 18 shall begin again.

19. Acceptance by the Neutral Arbitrator

- a. When a Neutral Arbitrator receives an offer from the Independent Administrator or the Parties, the Neutral Arbitrator must comply with any requirements under California Law, including Ethics Standard 12(d).
- b. The Independent Administrator may decline to appoint a Neutral Arbitrator if the Independent Administrator determines that the Neutral Arbitrator has not complied with the Ethics Standards. When a person agrees to act as a Neutral Arbitrator under Rule 18, the Independent Administrator shall send the person a copy of these Rules and a Letter Confirming Service. The Independent Administrator shall also serve the Parties with a copy of the Letter Confirming Service.
- c. If a person in the Independent Administrator's pool is appointed as the Neutral Arbitrator in a case and either served a notice saying no further work by the Parties or the attorneys would be accepted during the pendency of the case, or failed to serve the disclosure specified by Ethics Standard 12(b), the person shall be removed from the pool until the case is closed.

20. Disclosure and Challenge

- a. The person who has agreed to serve as Neutral Arbitrator shall make disclosures as required by law, including California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1281.9 or its successor statute and the Ethics Standards simultaneously upon the Parties and the Independent Administrator. Party responses, if any, shall be in accordance with the Code, with a copy served to the Independent Administrator. After the time for any response has passed, the Independent Administrator will deem that the Neutral Arbitrator has been appointed if no timely objection is received.
- b. The Neutral Arbitrator shall make all further disclosures as required by law, including California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1281.9 or its successor statute and the Ethics Standards simultaneously upon the Parties and the Independent Administrator. Party responses, if any, shall be in accordance with the code, with a copy served to the Independent Administrator.

21. Postponement of Selection of Neutral Arbitrator

- a. The Claimant(s) may obtain a single postponement of up to ninety (90) days for the appointment of the Neutral Arbitrator if the Independent Administrator receives a written request for postponement on or before the date that the response to the List of the Possible Arbitrators is due under Rule 16. Claimant(s) shall serve a copy of this request for postponement on the Respondent(s). Regardless of the number of Claimants, Claimant(s) is entitled to only a single ninety (90) day postponement of the appointment of the Neutral Arbitrator.
- b. If the Claimant(s) agrees in writing, Respondent(s) may obtain a single ninety (90) day postponement for the appointment of the Neutral Arbitrator. The Independent Administrator must receive this written request for postponement before the date that the response to the List of the Possible Arbitrators is due under Rule 16.c.
- c. There shall be only one postponement whether made by either Claimant(s) or Respondent(s) pursuant to this Rule in any arbitration.
- d. In arbitrations brought by Health Plan or KPIC, the member is entitled to the postponement and Health Plan or KPIC can obtain a postponement only with the member's permission.

22. Selection of the Party Arbitrator

- a. If the Parties are entitled to a Party Arbitrator and have not waived that right, the Claimant(s) and the Respondent(s) shall each select a Party Arbitrator and notify the Independent Administrator and the Neutral Arbitrator of the Party Arbitrator's name, address, and telephone and fax numbers. Each Party Arbitrator shall sign the Agreement to Serve, and submit it to the Independent Administrator before serving in the arbitration.
- b. If possible, the Parties should select the Party Arbitrators before the Arbitration Management Conference that is set forth in Rule 25. Any Party Arbitrator who is selected after the Arbitration Management Conference shall conform to any arbitration schedule established prior to his or her selection. Notwithstanding any other Rule, if a Party Arbitrator has not been selected, or has not signed the Agreement to serve, or does not attend a hearing, conference or meeting set by the Neutral Arbitrator of which the Party Arbitrator or Party had notice, the remaining Arbitrators may act in the absence of such Party Arbitrator.
- c. Regardless of the number of Claimants or Respondents, all of the Claimant(s) are entitled to only one Party Arbitrator and all of the Respondent(s) are entitled to only one Party Arbitrator.
- d. No Claimant, Respondent, or attorney may act as Party Arbitrator in an arbitration in which he or she is participating in any other manner.

23. Appointment of Chairperson

In cases involving more than one Arbitrator, the Neutral Arbitrator will chair the arbitration panel. Absent objection by any Party, the Neutral Arbitrator shall have the authority to decide all discovery and procedural matters, but may not decide dispositive issues without the Party Arbitrators. Dispositive issues shall be decided by a majority of the Arbitrators. The Neutral Arbitrator will also set the time and location of hearings and be

responsible for submitting all necessary forms to the Independent Administrator. Upon commencement of the Arbitration Hearing and thereafter, all substantive decisions shall be made by a majority of the Arbitrators or as otherwise agreed by them.

C. RULES FOR REGULAR PROCEDURES

24. Deadline for Disposing of Arbitrations

- a. Unless Rule 24.b, 24.c, or 33 applies, the Neutral Arbitrator shall serve an Award on the Parties and the Independent Administrator, or the arbitration shall be otherwise concluded, within eighteen (18) months of the Independent Administrator receiving the Demand for Arbitration and filing fee or granting the fee waiver. The Parties and Arbitrator are encouraged to complete the arbitration in less time than the maximums set forth in the Rules, if that is consistent with a just and fair result.
- b. If all Parties agree that the claim is a complex case and the Neutral Arbitrator agrees, the Neutral Arbitrator shall serve an Award on the Parties and the Independent Administrator, or the arbitration shall be otherwise concluded, within twenty-four (24) to thirty (30) months of the Independent Administrator receiving the Demand for Arbitration and filing fee or granting the fee waiver. Unrepresented Parties, counsel, and the Neutral Arbitrator shall sign and serve the Designation of Complex Arbitration Form upon the Independent Administrator.
- c. There may be some small number of extraordinary cases which cannot be disposed of within thirty (30) months, such as those where the damages or injuries cannot be ascertained within that time. If all the unrepresented Parties, counsel, and Neutral Arbitrator agree, the Neutral Arbitrator may select a later date for disposition of the case. Unrepresented Parties, counsel, and the Neutral Arbitrator shall sign and serve the Designation of Extraordinary Arbitration Form upon the Independent Administrator. This form will set forth the reason for this designation and the target disposition date.
- d. It is the Neutral Arbitrator's responsibility to set a hearing date and to ensure that the arbitration proceeds within the time limits set out in these Rules. Failure by the Parties or counsel to comply with this Rule may subject them to sanction. Failure by the Neutral Arbitrators to comply with this Rule may subject them to suspension or removal from the pool of Neutral Arbitrators. However, this Rule is not a basis to dismiss an arbitration or a claim. Nothing in this paragraph affects the remedies otherwise available under law for violation of any other Rule.

25. Arbitration Management Conference

- a. The Neutral Arbitrator shall hold an Arbitration Management Conference with the attorneys representing the Parties, or the Claimant in pro per and the attorney(s) representing Respondent(s) within sixty (60) days of the date of the Letter Confirming Service of the Neutral Arbitrator. The Neutral Arbitrator shall give notice to the Parties of the time and location at least ten (10) days in advance. The Arbitration Management Conference may be conducted by telephone or by video conference if such facilities are available.
- b. The Neutral Arbitrator shall discuss, but is not limited to, the following topics:

- i. the status of the Parties, claims, and defenses;
 - ii. a realistic assessment of the case;
 - iii. any pending or intended motions;
 - iv. completed and intended discovery;
 - v. the procedures to be followed, including any written submissions the Neutral Arbitrator requires or permits; and
 - vi. if appropriate, whether the Parties have or will waive any Party Arbitrator.
- c. At the Arbitration Management Conference, the Arbitrator shall establish:
- i. the schedule for motions and the mandatory settlement meeting and
 - ii. the dates of the Arbitration Hearing. The Arbitrator and the Parties shall schedule the Arbitration Hearing for consecutive days if more than one day is necessary. If the Arbitrator permits post-Arbitration briefs, the dates for the Arbitration Hearing must be set early enough to ensure that it will be closed within the deadlines established in Rule 24.
- d. If any of the Parties is not represented by counsel, the Neutral Arbitrator should refer the Parties to Rule 54 and offer to explain the process to be followed. Parties who have questions about the Arbitration Hearing, use of motions, waivers, and costs should raise them at the Arbitration Management Conference.
- e. The Neutral Arbitrator shall record all deadlines established by the Neutral Arbitrator during the Arbitration Management Conference on the Arbitration Management Conference Form. The Neutral Arbitrator shall serve the Arbitration Management Conference Form on the Parties and the Independent Administrator within five (5) days of the Arbitration Management Conference. The Neutral Arbitrator shall also serve a copy of the Arbitration Management Conference Form on the Party Arbitrators if and when they are named.
- f. At any time after the Arbitration Management Conference, the Neutral Arbitrator may require, or the Parties may request, additional conferences to discuss administrative, procedural, or substantive matters and to assure that the case continues to move expeditiously. Neutral Arbitrators are encouraged to conduct such conferences by telephone or video conference if facilities are available.

26. Mandatory Settlement Meeting

- a. No later than six (6) months after the Arbitration Management Conference, attorneys representing the parties, or the claimant in pro per and the attorneys representing the respondents, shall conduct a mandatory settlement meeting. ~~Represented parties are not required to attend, but if they choose not to do so, either their attorneys must be fully authorized to settle the matter, or the parties not present must be immediately available by phone for consultation with their attorneys while the meeting is in~~

~~progress.~~ The Parties shall jointly agree on the form these settlement discussions shall take, which may include a conference by telephone, a video-conference, an in-person meeting or any other format they shall agree upon. Represented parties are not required to attend, but if they choose not to do so, either their attorneys must be fully authorized to settle the matter, or the parties not present must be immediately available by phone for consultation with their attorneys while the meeting is in progress. This Rule does not require that a neutral third party oversee the mandatory settlement meeting; nor does it preclude the presence of such a person. The Neutral Arbitrator shall not take part in the mandatory settlement meeting. Within five (5) days after the mandatory settlement meeting, the Parties and their counsel shall sign the Mandatory Settlement Meeting Form and serve a copy on the Independent Administrator to confirm that the meeting occurred. If the Parties have settled the claim, they shall give notice as required in Rule 40.

- b. This Rule sets a deadline for the Parties to conduct a mandatory settlement meeting. The Parties are encouraged to engage in settlement discussions at an earlier date.
- c. Section 998 of the California Code of Civil Procedure (Offers by a Party to Compromise) applies to arbitrations conducted under these Rules.

27. Discovery

- a. Discovery may commence as soon as the Health Plan serves Claimant(s) with a copy of the Transmission Form, unless some Party objects in writing. If a Party objects, discovery may commence as soon as the Neutral Arbitrator is appointed. Discovery shall be conducted as if the matter were in California state court. Any extension of time for completion of discovery shall not affect the date of the Arbitration Hearing.
- b. The Parties should address problems stemming from the discovery process to the Neutral Arbitrator for rulings. The time for serving any discovery motions shall commence as required by the California Code of Civil Procedure or upon the appointment of the Neutral Arbitrator, whichever is later.
- c. If the Claimant(s) requests and at the Claimant's expense, Health Plan or the affiliated entities that are named as Respondent(s) shall serve a copy of that portion of Claimant's medical records requested on the Claimant(s) within thirty (30) days of Claimant's request.
- d. At the request of the Parties and as would be permitted in state court, the Neutral Arbitrator may issue orders to protect the confidentiality of proprietary information, trade secrets, or other sensitive or private information.

28. Postponements

- a. Any postponement of dates other than that set out in Rule 21 shall be requested in writing from the Neutral Arbitrator if one has been appointed or from the Independent Administrator if the Neutral Arbitrator has not been appointed or has become incapacitated. The request shall set out good cause for the postponement and whether the other Party agrees. Postponements, absent extraordinary circumstances, shall not prevent the Arbitration Award from being served within the time periods specified in

Rule 24. Failure of the parties to prepare for a scheduled hearing or to keep the hearing dates free from other commitments does not constitute extraordinary circumstances.

- b. Whenever a Party requests a postponement of an Arbitration Hearing, the request must be in the form of a written motion to the Neutral Arbitrator, with a copy served on the Parties. In addition,
 - i. The motion must state the reasons for the request.
 - ii. The Neutral Arbitrator must issue a written order that either denies or grants the motion for postponement, states who made the motion, and gives the reason for the decision. The order must be served on the parties and the Independent Administrator. If the Neutral Arbitrator grants the motion, the order must state the date to which the hearing has been postponed.
 - iii. If the motion for a postponement is granted, the Neutral Arbitrator has the discretion to enter an order requiring that the Neutral Arbitrator's costs and fees associated with the postponement of an Arbitration Hearing be paid by the party requesting the postponement.

29. Failure to Appear

- a. The arbitration may proceed in the absence of a Party, a Party's attorney, or a Party Arbitrator who, after due notice of the date, time, and location of the Arbitration Hearing, or any other conference or hearing, fails to be present and failed to obtain a postponement. If the date of the Arbitration Hearing has not been changed, service of the Arbitration Management Conference Form on a Party shall constitute due notice.
- b. An Award shall not be made solely on the default of a Party. The Arbitrator may require each Party who attends to submit such evidence as the Arbitrator requires for the making of an Award.

30. Securing Witnesses for the Arbitration Hearing

The Party's attorney, the Neutral Arbitrator, or other entity authorized by law may issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses or the production of documents. The Independent Administrator shall not.

31. Close of Hearing or Proceeding

- a. When the Parties have rested, the Neutral Arbitrator shall declare the Arbitration Hearing closed.
- b. The Neutral Arbitrator may defer the closing of the Arbitration Hearing until a date agreed upon by the Neutral Arbitrator and the Parties, to permit the Parties to submit post-Hearing papers. The date for the post-Hearing submissions shall not be more than fifteen (15) days after the Parties have rested. If post-Hearing papers are to be submitted, the Arbitration Hearing will be deemed closed on the date set for the submission. If a Party fails to submit the papers by the closing date, the Neutral Arbitrator need not accept or consider them.
- c. The time limit under Rule 37 for the Neutral Arbitrator to make the Award shall begin to run upon the closing of the Arbitration Hearing or

proceeding. The late filing of a post-hearing paper shall not affect the deadline for making the Award.

32. Documents

After making the Award, the Neutral Arbitrator has no obligation to preserve copies of the exhibits or documents the Neutral Arbitrator has previously received.

D. RULES FOR EXPEDITED PROCEDURES

33. Expedited Procedures

- a. Expedited Procedures are available in an arbitration where the Claimant(s) requires an Award in less time than that set out in Rule 24.a. The need for the Expedited Procedures shall be based upon any of the following:
 - i. a Claimant or member suffers from an illness or condition raising substantial medical doubt of survival until the time set for an Award according to Rule 24.a; or
 - ii. a Claimant or member seeks a determination that he or she is entitled to a drug or medical procedure that the Claimant or member has not yet received; or
 - iii. other good cause.
- b. The Claimant(s) and Respondent(s) may submit evidence, including declarations by physicians or others, to establish any of these criteria.
- c. If either the Independent Administrator or the Neutral Arbitrator decide that Expedited Procedures are required, the arbitration shall be disposed of within the time set out in that order. No extension of that time is allowed.
- d. Except when inconsistent with orders made by the Neutral Arbitrator to meet the deadline for the disposition of the case, the other Rules shall apply to cases with Expedited Procedures.

34. Seeking Expedited Procedures from the Independent Administrator

- a. If Claimant(s) believes that Expedited Procedures are required and a Neutral Arbitrator has not yet been appointed, the Claimant(s) may serve a written request, with a brief statement of the reason for request for Expedited Procedures and the length of time in which an Award is required, on the Independent Administrator, with a copy to Respondent(s). Respondent(s) shall provide written opposition to the request for Expedited Procedures, if any, within seven (7) days of the date of the request. The Independent Administrator shall decide the request and inform the Parties of the decision no later than five (5) days after any opposition by Respondent(s) is due.
- b. Should the Independent Administrator determine that Expedited Procedures are necessary, the selection procedures set out in Section B of these Rules shall be followed except that no ninety (90) day continuance shall be allowed and the Independent Administrator shall require that the Neutral Arbitrator agree to render an Award within the period required.
- c. After the Neutral Arbitrator is appointed, he or she shall promptly confer with the Parties to decide what schedule, actions, or modifications of these

Rules will be needed to meet the deadline. The Neutral Arbitrator shall issue any additional orders that are necessary to assure compliance with that deadline and serve the Independent Administrator with a copy of such orders. The orders may require, by way of example and without limitation, shortening the length of time for discovery responses or motions.

35. Seeking Expedited Procedures from the Neutral Arbitrator

If a Neutral Arbitrator has been appointed, the Party seeking Expedited Procedures may, at any time, petition the Neutral Arbitrator to proceed on an expedited basis. If the Neutral Arbitrator issues an order to proceed on an expedited basis, he or she shall issue any additional orders that are necessary to assure compliance with that decision. The orders may require, by way of example and without limitation, shortening the length of time for discovery responses or motions. The Neutral Arbitrator shall serve a copy of any such orders on the Independent Administrator, including the date by which such Award shall be served.

36. Telephonic Notice

When Expedited Procedures apply, the Parties shall accept all notices, process, and other communications (other than the List of Possible Arbitrators) from the Independent Administrator and Arbitrator by telephone. The Independent Administrator and the Arbitrator shall promptly confirm any such oral notices, process, and other communications, in writing to the Parties.

E. RULES ON AWARD AND ENFORCEMENT

37. Time of Award

The Neutral Arbitrator shall serve the Award on the Parties and the Independent Administrator promptly. Unless otherwise specified by law, the Neutral Arbitrator shall serve the Award in Extraordinary and Complex cases, no later than thirty (30) business days after the closing of the Arbitration hearing, and in all other cases, no later than fifteen (15) business days after the date of the closing of the Arbitration Hearing. If post arbitration briefs are submitted, the Arbitration Hearing is closed on the date the briefs are due.

38. Form of Award

- a. A majority of the Arbitrators shall sign the Award. The Award shall specify the prevailing Party, the amount and terms of the relief, if any, and the reasons for the decision. In setting forth the reasons, the Award, or any decision deciding an arbitration, shall provide findings of fact and conclusions of law, consistent with California Code of Civil Procedure Section 437c(g) or Section 632. The reasons for the decision will not become part of the Award nor be admissible in any judicial proceeding to enforce or vacate the Award. The Arbitrator may use the Arbitration Award Form. The Neutral Arbitrator shall be responsible for preparing the written Award.
 - i. The Award shall specify whether the hearing was conducted in person, by telephone or video conference, or by documents only.
 - ii. If attorney's fees are awarded, the Award shall specify the amount of attorney's fees awarded.

- b. As required by California regulation, all written decisions, except for those involving KPIC products or self-funded products, must contain the following language in bold, twelve (12) point type,

“Nothing in this arbitration decision prohibits or restricts the enrollee from discussing or reporting the underlying facts, results, terms and conditions of this decision to the Department of Managed Health Care.”

39. Delivery of the Award

- a. The Neutral Arbitrator shall serve a copy of the Award and any decision by the Neutral Arbitrator to correct the Award on the Parties and Independent Administrator by mail.
- b. The Neutral Arbitrator shall inform the Independent Administrator of application to correct the Award.
- c. Respondent(s) shall redact the Award by eliminating the names of the enrollees, the plan, witnesses, providers, health plan employees, and health facilities.
- d. Respondent(s) shall serve the redacted Award on the Independent Administrator and Claimant(s). The redacted version of the Award will become part of the Neutral Arbitrator’s file.
- e. In arbitrations brought by Health Plan or KPIC, Health Plan or KPIC shall serve the redacted Award.

40. Notice after Settlement or Withdrawal

- a. At any point in the proceedings, if the Parties reach a settlement, they shall promptly inform the Neutral Arbitrator and the Independent Administrator in writing. Upon receiving such notice, the Independent Administrator shall deem the arbitration terminated.
- b. If a Claimant decides to withdraw a demand, the Claimant or the Claimant’s attorney shall serve a notice of withdrawal upon Respondent, the Neutral Arbitrator, and the Independent Administrator.
- c. Except in cases in which the Independent Administrator receives a decision from the Neutral Arbitrator, the Neutral Arbitrator’s appointment is terminated on the date the Independent Administrator receives written notice under Rule 40.a or 40.b. No further Neutral Arbitrator will be appointed.

41. Sanctions

The Neutral Arbitrator may order appropriate sanctions for failure of any Party to comply with its obligations under any of these rules or applicable law. These sanctions may include any sanction available under applicable law, as well as payment of all or a portion of the other Party’s expenses for its Party Arbitrator or the Neutral Arbitrator’s fees and expenses.

42. Release of Documents for Judicial Proceedings

The Independent Administrator shall, upon the written request of and payment by a Party, furnish to the Party, at the Party's expense, copies of any papers, notices, process or other documents in the possession of the Independent Administrator that may be required in judicial proceedings relating to that Party's arbitration.

F. RULES OF ADMINISTRATION

43. Counting of Days

- a. Unless a Rule specifies otherwise, "days" mean calendar days. Thus, all days, including holidays, Saturdays and Sundays are to be counted when counting the number of days. In determining the date an action is required, the date of the event or document that triggers the action is not included, but the date by which the action must occur is included.
- b. If a Rule refers to "business days," federal holidays, Saturdays, and Sundays are excluded when counting the number of days.
- c. If the date on which some action is to be taken, or a notice, process, or other communication would otherwise be required to be sent or a period would otherwise expire, falls on a holiday, a Saturday, or a Sunday, the date is extended to the next succeeding business day.

44. No Limit on Immunity

Nothing in these Rules limits any statutory or common law immunity that the Independent Administrator or Neutral Arbitrator may otherwise possess.

45. Neutral Arbitrator Fees

- a. If the Neutral Arbitrator was selected from the List of Possible Arbitrators, the Neutral Arbitrator's compensation for an arbitration shall accord with the fees and terms sent out to the Parties by the Independent Administrator with the List of Possible Arbitrators.
- b. The Independent Administrator is not responsible for, or involved in the collection of, the Neutral Arbitrator's fees.

46. Expenses

The expenses of witnesses for any Party shall be paid by the Party producing them. The fees and expenses of the Party Arbitrator shall be paid by the Party who selected that Party Arbitrator.

47. Forms

The Parties and the Neutral Arbitrator may request blank copies of any forms mentioned in these Rules from the Independent Administrator.

48. Questionnaire

- a. At the conclusion of the arbitration, the Neutral Arbitrator shall complete and timely return the arbitration questionnaire supplied by the Independent Administrator. This information may be used by the Independent Administrator and the Arbitration Oversight Board ("AOB") in evaluating the arbitration system.

- b. If the Independent Administrator received the Demand for Arbitration on or after January 1, 2003, at the conclusion of the arbitration, the Neutral Arbitrator shall inform the Independent Administrator of the total fee and the percentage of fee allocated to each party. This information will be used by the Independent Administrator to comply with the disclosure requirements of California law.

49. Evaluation

At the conclusion of the arbitration, each Party shall complete and timely return the evaluation form supplied by the Independent Administrator.

50. Amendment of Rules

- a. The AOB may amend these Rules in consultation with the Independent Administrator and Health Plan. The Rules in effect on the date the Independent Administrator receives the Demand for Arbitration will apply to that arbitration throughout unless the Parties agree in writing that another version of the Rules applies. The Parties shall serve a copy of that agreement on the Independent Administrator.
- b. If the relevant law changes or an event occurs which is not contemplated by these Rules, the Arbitration Oversight Board may adopt a new Rule(s) to deal adequately with that event. New Rule(s) shall apply to all pending arbitrations if the AOB deems such a change necessary notwithstanding Rule 50.a. Any such new Rule(s) shall be created in consultation with the Independent Administrator and Health Plan and shall not be inconsistent with existing Rules unless the Independent Administrator agrees to the change. The Independent Administrator shall serve all Parties and Arbitrators in pending arbitrations with a copy of any such new Rule(s) and it shall be binding upon the Parties and Arbitrators.
- c. In the event of an urgent condition that in the judgment of the Independent Administrator threatens the orderly administration of the arbitration system, with the concurrence of the Chair or Vice-Chair of the AOB, the Independent Administrator shall adopt such temporary rules as it deems necessary to preserve the orderly administration of the arbitration system.

51. Conflict with Law

If any of these Rules, or a modification of these Rules agreed on by the Parties, is discovered to be in conflict with a mandatory provision of applicable law, the provision of law will govern, and no other Rule will be affected.

52. Acknowledgment of No Warranty

The Independent Administrator makes no representation about, or warranty with respect to, the accuracy, or completeness of any information furnished or required to be furnished in any Application Form or with respect to the competence or training of any Neutral Arbitrator. Information is supplied to allow Parties to conduct their own inquiries.

53. Public Reporting

Annually, the Independent Administrator will report in a collective fashion the lengths of times it took to complete various tasks in the process of adjudicating the claims, how the arbitrations were disposed of, and the choices made by the Parties and Arbitrators. This report may be available to the public. The Independent Administrator will also post on its website disclosures required by statute or the Ethics Standards.

54. Legal Advice

While the Independent Administrator will try to answer questions about these Rules, it cannot give legal advice to Parties or their counsel or provide them with referrals. The following "Information for Claimants Who Do Not Have Attorneys" may answer some of the most commonly asked questions.

If You Do Not Have An Attorney

What are my responsibilities when proceeding without a lawyer?

This handout is for people who represent themselves in arbitration without help from a lawyer. Lawyers say that a person who represents him or herself is acting *in propria persona* or "in pro per". The following information provides some facts and answers some questions most commonly asked by such persons. This handout does not replace the *Rules for Kaiser Member Arbitrations Administered by the Office of the Independent Administrator (Rules)*. Everyone is responsible for following the *Rules*.

If you represent yourself you must do all of the tasks that a lawyer would do, including:

- Understand and comply with the *Rules* governing Kaiser member arbitrations administered by the Office of the Independent Administrator (OIA),
- Learn the California law that applies in your case,
- Find and subpoena witnesses you need,
- Find, hire, and pay expert witnesses you need, and
- Write and deliver all documents that the *Rules*, California law, or the Neutral Arbitrator directs you to prepare.

Some of these tasks take time, are difficult, and have deadlines. We encourage people to get a lawyer to represent them.

What is the Office of the Independent Administrator?

The OIA administers the arbitration process used by Kaiser and its members. The OIA is neutral. It is not a part of Kaiser Permanente. The *Rules* and California law control the arbitrations. If you represent yourself, the OIA will tell you what the *Rules* mean. However, the OIA cannot advise you on how the *Rules* might affect your specific case. Neither the OIA nor the neutral arbitrator can give you legal advice or help you find an expert witness. If you have questions about the *Rules*, call the OIA at (213) 637-9847 or visit the website at www.oia-kaiserarb.com.

What is arbitration?

Arbitration is a legal proceeding. It is similar to a case filed in court. At the arbitration hearing, you and the other side present witnesses, including medical experts, and other evidence. Unlike most trials in court, there is no jury. Arbitrators hear the evidence and act as the judges. Arbitrators decide cases based on the evidence presented by both sides and the law. The Arbitrator's decision is final, binding, and can be enforced in court. Only rarely can a court overturn the arbitrator's decision.

Are arbitration and mediation different?

Yes. Arbitration is a proceeding where evidence is presented similar to a case in court. In mediation, parties solve their dispute with the help of a neutral person called the "mediator", who tries to help the parties reach an agreement and end their dispute. Mediation is an attempt to settle the dispute voluntarily. A mediator cannot force the parties to accept a decision.

What is discovery?

Before the arbitration hearing, all parties have the right to conduct discovery. This means both sides can send written requests for information, usually in the form of Requests for Admissions, Interrogatories, and Requests for Production of Documents. Both sides can also issue subpoenas for records and set depositions. You will be responsible for following the procedures in the California Code of Civil Procedure or any discovery procedure that the arbitrator may set up.

Is a medical expert always necessary to prove a claim of medical malpractice?

Almost always. Under California law, a medical expert's testimony is almost always needed to prove medical malpractice. This is true both in arbitration and in court. If you do not have a medical expert, you will probably lose the case. Neither the OIA nor the neutral arbitrator can help you find or hire a medical expert.

Are any other expert witnesses needed?

Sometimes. For example, if you are asking for lost wages or future damages, you may need an economist or other financial expert to testify. Other experts may be needed depending on the nature of your claims.

May I ask a friend or relative to assist me in the case?

Yes, an unpaid friend or family member may accompany you and assist you, if in the judgment of the neutral arbitrator your personal circumstances warrant such assistance. This person may not represent you. As in court, you may only be represented by yourself or a lawyer.

What is a party arbitrator and when are party arbitrators used?

Party arbitrators are used when the claimant or Kaiser prefer to have three arbitrators decide the case rather than the neutral arbitrator alone. If you claim more than \$200,000 in damages, both sides have the right to select a party arbitrator. If you choose to have a party arbitrator, you will have to find and pay the party arbitrator. You must also pay one-half of the neutral arbitrator's fees, unless you qualify for a fee waiver under Rule 13.

If both sides give up their right to a party arbitrator, a single neutral arbitrator will hear your case. The other side will pay all of the neutral arbitrator's fees and expenses if you sign the Waiver of Objection to Payment of Fees and the Waiver of Party Arbitrator – Claimants Forms. For more information see Rules 13, 14, 15, and 22. Having your case heard by a single neutral arbitrator does not limit the amount of damages you can claim.

Most Kaiser arbitrations are decided by a single neutral arbitrator.

What is an *ex parte* communication ?

Ex parte communication occurs when one party communicates with the neutral arbitrator (in writing, by telephone, or in person) without giving the other side a chance to participate or respond. *Ex parte* communication is prohibited unless it is about the time or place of a hearing or conference. If you need to contact the neutral arbitrator for any other reason, write a letter to the neutral arbitrator and send a copy of the letter to the other side. You may also ask for a conference call with the neutral arbitrator and the other side.

What is summary judgment and why is it important to my claim?

Kaiser Permanente may make a motion for summary judgment. This means they argue that there is no dispute about the facts. They also argue they deserve to win under the law. If this happens, you must prepare your position in writing and send it to the neutral arbitrator and the other side before the deadline. If you fail to do this, the neutral arbitrator will probably grant the motion and your case will be over. If Kaiser Permanente has included an expert declaration, you probably need to do the same. You can also take part in the hearing on the motion in person or by phone. If the neutral arbitrator grants a motion for summary judgment, the case is over.

Are there other resources to help people who represent themselves?

There are books written for people who represent themselves in legal proceedings. Please check your local library or bookstore. If you need help finding a lawyer, call the State Bar and/or your County Bar Association.

If you have any questions, please call the OIA at (213) 637-9847. Copies of the *Rules* for Kaiser member arbitrations, forms, and other helpful items can also be found at the OIA website at www.oia-kaiserarb.com

EXHIBIT C

Resume of Dr. Patrick T. Dowling

Patrick T. Dowling, M.D., M.P.H.

Patrick T. Dowling, MD, MPH is Professor and Chair of the Dept. of Family Medicine at the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA as well as the Kaiser Benefit Endowed Professor of Community Medicine. A graduate of the Medical College of Ohio and the University Of Michigan School of Public Health, he completed his residency training in Family Medicine at Cook County Hospital in Chicago and is board certified in Family Medicine, Preventive Medicine and Public Health.

Dr. Dowling was selected as the first permanent chair of the Dept of Family Medicine the UCLA School of Medicine in 1998, after serving as Chair of Family Medicine at Harbor-UCLA for nine years. Prior to that, he served as Associate Chairman and Director of Family Medicine training at Cook County Hospital in Chicago for seven years and Family Medicine director at Brown University for three years. After completing residency training in Chicago, he worked in migrant health centers for three years in Coachella and Imperial Valley on the Mexican-Californian border. In each of the teaching programs—UCLA, Harbor-UCLA, Brown and Cook County Hospital, he has been instrumental in linking graduate medical education to community health centers in physician shortage areas.

He is co-founder and Associate Director of the UCLA Department of Family Medicine IMG program, an innovative program to prepare bilingual (English-Spanish) International Medical Graduates (IMGs) from Latin America, who have immigrated here legally, to become eligible for licensure and residency training in Family Medicine in California. To date the program has placed 95 immigrant Hispanic physicians into Family Medicine training programs, all but 4 California All are bilingual, English-Spanish, and 5 are tri-lingual (Hispanic-Asians) raised and educated in Latin America. The program was conceived while he was a California Health Care Foundation fellow.

He has served on the National Advisory Council of the National Health Service Corps, and for the past 6 years has served as a Commissioner on the 5- member LA County Public Health Commission. Moreover, he is on the board of the California Community Foundation and has been a of the board of the Charles Drew University of Medicine and Science in South LA. In this latter role, he is involved with efforts to develop new graduate education programs in South Los Angeles, including new residency training programs in conjunction with new Martin Luther King Jr. Community Hospital.

His professional interests include health policy, and the provision of care to underserved and under-resourced communities. A common thread in his career has been the linkage of graduate medical education to underserved communities as a means to improve access and reduce health outcomes disparities among racial and ethnic minorities. Moreover, his

research interests include cross cultural and bi-national medicine and the integration of behavioral medicine and substance abuse treatment within primary care

August 20, 2015

EXHIBIT D

**Lists of Neutral Arbitrators
on The OIA Panel as of
December 31, 2015**

OIA Panel of Neutral Arbitrators

Northern California

Title	First	Middle	Last	Suffix
Justice	Nat	Anthony	Agliano	(Ret.)
Ms.	Arocles		Aguilar	Esq.
Mr.	Roger	F.	Allen	Esq.
Mr.	Claude Dawson		Ames	Esq.
Justice	Carl	West	Anderson	(Ret.)
Mr.	J. Randall		Andrada	Esq.
Ms.	Karen	G.	Andres	Esq.
Mr.	Ronald	A.	Arendt	Esq.
Judge	Robert	A.	Baines	(Ret.)
Judge	Richard		Bennett	
Mr.	Robert M.		Bennett	Esq.
Judge	Michael J.		Berger	(Ret.)
Judge	Joseph	F.	Biafore	Jr., (Ret)
Ms.	Barri	Kaplan	Bonapart	Esq.
Mr.	Robert	J.	Brockman	Esq.
Mr.	Gerald E.		Brunn	Esq.
Mr.	Clayton	E.	Clement	Esq.
Ms.	Patricia Lee		Connors	Esq.
Mr.	John	P.	Daniels	Esq.
Mr.	Gary	S.	Davis	Esq.
Mr.	Thomas	H.R.	Denver	Esq.
Judge	Benjamin	A.	Diaz	(Ret.)
Mr.	Robert N.		Dobbins	Esq.
Mr.	John	M.	Drath	Esq.
Mr.	Paul	J.	Dubow	Esq.
Judge	Michael B.		Dufficy	(Ret.)
Judge	Lynn		Duryee	
Mr.	Charles	A.	Dyer	Esq..
Mr.	Joseph		Elie	Esq.
Mr.	Eric	S.	Emanuel	Esq.
Judge	James		Emerson	(Ret.)
Mr.	W. Gregory		Engel	Esq.
Mr.	Steven	R.	Enochian	Esq.
Mr.	Douglas	L.	Field	Esq.
Judge	John	A.	Flaherty	(Ret.)
Judge	Richard S.		Flier	(Ret.)
Mr.	Mark	B.	Fredkin	Esq.
Mr.	Kenneth	D.	Gack	Esq.
Judge	David A.		Garcia	(Ret.)
Mr.	Chuck		Geerhart	Esq.
Ms.	Ruth	V.	Glick	Esq.
Mr.	Stephen	B.	Gorman	Esq.
Judge	Ronald		Greenberg	(Ret.)
Mr.	Shirish		Gupta	Esq.
Ms.	Melinda		Guzman	Esq.
Mr.	Jon	Anders	Hammerbeck	Esq.
Judge	Zerne	P.	Haning	(Ret.)
Mr.	Stephen	S.	Harper	Esq.
Ms.	Catherine	C.	Harris	Esq.

OIA Panel of Neutral Arbitrators

Northern California

Title	First	Middle	Last	Suffix
Mr.	William	W.	Haskell	Esq.
Mr.	David M.		Helbraun	Esq.
Judge	John F.		Herlihy	
Mr.	Robert G.		Heywood	Esq.
Mr.	David Keith		Hicks	Esq.
Mr.	Val	D.	Hornstein	Esq.
Mr.	Garry	J.D.	Hubert	Esq.
Mr.	C. Mark		Humbert	Esq.
Judge	David E.		Hunter	
Ms.	Nancy		Hutt	Esq.
Judge	Ellen	Sickles	James	(Ret.)
Judge	Ken	M.	Kawaichi	(Ret.)
Judge	Margaret J.		Kemp	(Ret.)
Mr.	Alfred	P.	Knoll	Esq.
Judge	William M.		Kolin	(Ret.)
Judge	Jack		Komar	(Ret.)
Ms.	Barbara		KongBrown	Esq.
Mr.	P. Beach		Kuhl	Esq.
Dr.	Urs	Martin	Laeuchli	Esq.
Mr.	Ernest	B.	Lageson	Esq.
Mr.	Panos		Lagos	Esq.
Justice	James R.		Lambden	(Ret.)
Mr.	B. Scott		Levine	Esq.
Ms.	Renee		Lias	Esq.
Mr.	Perry D.		Litchfield	Esq.
Mr.	Patrick A.		Long	Esq.
Justice	Harry	W.	Low	(Ret.)
Mr.	Robert S.		Luft	Esq.
Mr.	Kenneth M.		Malvos	Esq.
Justice	Richard J.		McAdams	(Ret.)
Mr.	John	J.	McCauley	Esq.
Mr.	Otis		McGee	Jr., Esq.
Mr.	John	P.	McGlynn	Esq.
Mr.	Brick	E.	McIntosh	Esq.
Mr.	David	J.	Meadows	Esq.
Ms.	Barbara		Monty	Esq.
Justice	Fred K.		Morrison	(Ret.)
Judge	Kevin J.		Murphy	(Ret.)
Mr.	Robert	A.	Murray	Esq.
Ms.	Barbara Reeves		Neal	Esq.
Mr.	Thomas D.		Nielsen	Esq.
Judge	Suzanne	K.	Nusbaum	(Ret.)
Mr.	William	J.	O'Connor	Esq.
Mr.	Marc	D.	Paisin	Esq.
Mr.	Thomas	A.	Paoli	Esq.
Mr.	Herman D.		Papa	Esq.
Ms.	Julia	J.	Parranto	Esq.
Judge	Lise A.		Pearlman	(Ret.)
Mr.	William	J.	Petzel	Esq.

OIA Panel of Neutral Arbitrators

Northern California

Title	First	Middle	Last	Suffix
Mr.	Anthony	F.	Pinelli	Esq.
Ms.	Andrea	M.	Ponticiello	Esq.
Mr.	Daniel	F.	Quinn	Esq.
Judge	Linda		Quinn	(Ret.)
Mr.	M. Scott		Radovich	Esq.
Mr.	Thomas	D.	Reese	Esq.
Judge	Elaine		Rushing	(Ret.)
Judge	Bonnie		Sabraw	(Ret.)
Judge	Ronald M.		Sabraw	(Ret.)
Judge	Ann Elizabeth		Sarli	(Ret.)
Judge	Laurence		Sawyer	(Ret.)
Mr.	Stephen G.		Schrey	Esq.
Mr.	Michael	D.	Senneff	Esq.
Judge	Harry R.		Sheppard	(Ret.)
Mr.	Douglas L.		Smith	Esq.
Mr.	Yaroslav		Sochynsky	Esq.
Justice	William D.		Stein	
Judge	Frederick	R.	Stevens	(Ret.)
Professor	Jon	H.	Sylvester	
Mr.	William Zak		Taylor	Esq.
Mr.	Joseph E.		Thielen	Esq.
Ms.	Patricia		Tweedy	Esq.
Judge	Brian	R.	VanCamp	
Mr.	Gregory	D.	Walker	Esq.
Mr.	Gary	A.	Weiner	Esq.
Judge	Rebecca		Westerfield	(Ret.)
Mr.	Matthew N.		White	Esq.
Mr.	Richard M.		Williams	Esq.
Mr.	W. Bruce		Wold	Esq.
Judge	Charlotte Walter		Woolard	
Mr.	Russ J.		Wunderli	Esq.
Mr.	Otis Philip		Young	Esq.

OIA Panel of Neutral Arbitrators

Southern California

Title	First	Middle	Last	Suffix
Mr.	Marc	D.	Adelman	Esq.
Judge	James		Albracht	(Ret.)
Judge	James J.		Alfano	(Ret.)
Ms.	Karen	G.	Andres	Esq.
Mr.	Maurice	J.	Attie	Esq.
Mr.	Robert M.		Bennett	Esq.
Mr.	Byron		Berry	Esq.
Judge	Joseph	F.	Biafore	Jr., (Ret)
Judge	Joseph		Biderman	(Ret.)
Mr.	Michael	J.	Bonesteel	Esq.
Mr.	Viggo		Boserup	Esq.
Judge	David	H.	Brickner	(Ret.)
Mr.	Michael D.		Brown	Esq.
Mr.	Gerald E.		Brunn	Esq.
Ms.	Adriana	M.	Burger	Esq.
Honorabl	Yvonne B.		Burke	(Ret.)
Judge	Luis	A.	Cardenas	(Ret.)
Mr.	Richard	A.	Carrington	Esq.
Judge	Eli		Chernow	(Ret.)
Judge	Dennis Sheldon		Choate	(Ret.)
Mr.	Richard M.		Coleman	Esq.
Judge	Jacqueline		Connor	
Judge	Chris R.		Conway	(Ret.)
	Jaime R.		Corral	(Ret.)
Judge	Lawrence W.		Crispo	(Ret.)
Mr.	Joseph	Sylvester	D'Antony	Esq.
Mr.	John	P.	Daniels	Esq.
Mr.	Joseph	E.	Deering	Esq.
Judge	Joseph F.		DeVanon	(Ret.)
Justice	Robert	R.	Devich	(Ret.)
Mr.	Charles H.		Dick	Jr., Esq.
Ms.	Susan Fox		Dixon	Esq.
Mr.	Robert N.		Dobbins	Esq.
Judge	Anthony B.		Drewry	(Ret.)
Mr.	James	M.	Eisenman	Esq.
Chief	Chief Nnamdi A.		Ekenna	Esq.
Mr.	Eric	S.	Emanuel	Esq.
Mr.	Randolph	M.	Even	Esq.
Judge	Joyce	K.	Fahey	(Ret.)
Mr.	Barry A.		Fisher	Esq.
Judge	John	A.	Flaherty	(Ret.)
Judge	Terry		Friedman	(Ret.)
Mr.	Thomas	I.	Friedman	Esq.
Judge	Arnold H.		Gold	(Ret.)
Mr.	Martin	S.	Goldberg	Esq.
Mr.	Darryl		Graver	Esq.
Mr.	Bruce	A.	Greenberg	Esq.
Mr.	Jon	Anders	Hammerbeck	Esq.
Justice	James Gary		Hastings	(Ret.)
Judge	John F.		Herlihy	
Judge	Joe	W.	Hilberman	(Ret.)

OIA Panel of Neutral Arbitrators

Southern California

Title	First	Middle	Last	Suffix
Judge	Herbert	B.	Hoffman	(Ret.)
Judge	David	Allen	Horowitz	(Ret.)
Judge	James A.		Jackman	(Ret.)
Judge	C. Robert		Jameson	(Ret.)
Mr.	Kevin	M.	Kallberg	Esq.
Judge	Craig S.		Kamansky	(Ret.)
Judge	Burton S.		Katz	(Ret.)
Judge	Andrew C.		Kauffman	(Ret.)
Judge	Victor B.		Kenton	
Judge	Jack		Komar	(Ret.)
Judge	Ann		Kough	(Ret.)
Ms.	Wendy		Kramer	Esq.
Judge	Peter		Krichman	(Ret.)
Mr.	Steven R.		Kuhn	Esq.
Judge	Owen Lee		Kwong	(Ret.)
Judge	Stephen	M.	Lachs	(Ret.)
Judge	Michael A.		Latin	
Judge	Charles C.		Lee	
Judge	Linda K.		Lefkowitz	
Mr.	Philip	R.	LeVine	Esq.
Mr.	Leonard S.		Levy	Esq.
Mr.	Patrick A.		Long	Esq.
Judge	Michael D.		Marcus	(Ret.)
Mr.	John	J.	McCauley	Esq.
Mr.	Monty A.		McIntyre	Esq.
Judge	Peter Joseph		Meeka	
Judge	Wendell		Mortimer	(Ret.)
Mr.	Rodney	E.	Moss	Esq.
Judge	Gregory		Munoz	(Ret.)
Ms.	Barbara Reeves		Neal	Esq.
Judge	Jack M.		Newman	(Ret.)
Judge	Michael G.		Nott	(Ret.)
Mr.	Jeffrey	P.	Palmer	Esq.
Ms.	Natalie		Panossian-Bassl	Esq.
Mr.	Charles	B.	Parselle	Esq.
Mr.	Robert C.		Pearman	Esq.
Judge	Alan S.		Penkower	(Ret.)
Judge	Victor		Person	(Ret.)
Mr.	Alexander	S.	Polsky	Esq.
Judge	Russell D.		Pulver	(Ret.)
Judge	Linda		Quinn	(Ret.)
Mr.	Robert	A.	Rees	Esq.
Mr.	Roy	G.	Rifkin	Esq.
Mr.	Edward J.		Roberts	Esq.
Mr.	Gene	E.	Royce	Esq.
Judge	Charles	G.	Rubin	(Ret.)
Dr.	Lawrence	J.	Rudd	Esq.
Judge	Michael B.		Rutberg	(Ret.)
Judge	Philip M.		Saeta	(Ret.)
Mr.	Robert	F.	SaintAubin	Esq.
Mr.	Daniel R.		Saling	Esq.

OIA Panel of Neutral Arbitrators

Southern California

Title	First	Middle	Last	Suffix
Mr.	Michael	F.	Saydah	Esq.
Ms.	Jan Frankel		Schau	Esq.
Judge	Patricia		Schnegg	(Ret.)
Judge	Harvey A.		Schneider	(Ret.)
Judge	Keith		Schulner	(Ret.)
Judge	Tam Nomoto		Schumann	(Ret.)
Judge	Leroy	A.	Simmons	(Ret.)
Judge	James L.		Smith	(Ret.)
Mr.	David C.		Solinger	Esq.
Judge	Bruce J.		Sottile	(Ret.)
Judge	James A.		Steele	
Judge	Frederick	R.	Stevens	(Ret.)
Ms.	Dana		Susson	Esq.
Judge	Coleman A.		Swart	(Ret.)
Mr.	William Zak		Taylor	Esq.
Mr.	Joseph E.		Thielen	Esq.
Judge	Robert W.		Thomas	(Ret.)
Judge	David C.		Velasquez	(Ret.)
Judge	John Leo		Wagner	(Ret.)
Judge	Stuart T.		Waldrip	(Ret.)
Mr.	Thomas		Weaver	Esq.
Judge	Rebecca		Westerfield	(Ret.)
Mr.	Garry	W.	Williams	Esq.
Mr.	Joseph		Winter	Esq.
Ms.	Deborah	Z.	Wissley	Esq.
Judge	Leonard	S.	Wolf	(Ret.)
Mr.	Laurence	Y.	Wong	Esq.
Mr.	Michael D.		Young	Esq.
Judge	Eric	E.	Younger	(Ret.)
Mr.	Shep	Alan	Zebberman	Esq.

OIA Panel of Neutral Arbitrators

San Diego

Title	First	Middle	Last	Suffix
Mr.	Marc	D.	Adelman	Esq.
Mr.	Robert M.		Bennett	Esq.
Mr.	Byron		Berry	Esq.
Judge	Joseph	F.	Biafore	Jr., (Ret)
Mr.	Viggo		Boserup	Esq.
Judge	David	H.	Brickner	(Ret.)
Judge	Luis	A.	Cardenas	(Ret.)
Judge	Dennis Sheldon		Choate	(Ret.)
Judge	Chris R.		Conway	(Ret.)
Judge	Geary	D.	Cortes	(Ret.)
Judge	Patricia Ann Yim		Cowett	(Ret.)
Mr.	Joseph	Sylvester	D'Antony	Esq.
Mr.	John	P.	Daniels	Esq.
Mr.	Charles H.		Dick	Jr., Esq.
Mr.	Robert N.		Dobbins	Esq.
Judge	Anthony B.		Drewry	(Ret.)
Mr.	Eric	S.	Emanuel	Esq.
Judge	John	A.	Flaherty	(Ret.)
Judge	Terry		Friedman	(Ret.)
Mr.	Thomas	E.	Gniatkowski	Esq.
Mr.	Darryl		Graver	Esq.
Mr.	Jon	Anders	Hammerbeck	Esq.
Judge	Charles R.		Hayes	
Judge	John F.		Herlihy	
Judge	Herbert	B.	Hoffman	(Ret.)
Mr.	Lawrence	A.	Huerta	Esq.
Judge	Anthony	C.	Joseph	(Ret.)
Judge	Jack		Komar	(Ret.)
Judge	Ann		Kough	(Ret.)
Judge	Lillian Y.		Lim	
Mr.	Patrick A.		Long	Esq.
Mr.	Thomas	L.	Marshall	Esq.
Judge	Robert	E.	May	(Ret.)
Mr.	John	J.	McCauley	Esq.
Mr.	Monty A.		McIntyre	Esq.
Mr.	Cary W.		Miller	Esq.
Judge	David B.		Moon	(Ret.)
Judge	Wendell		Mortimer	(Ret.)
Ms.	Barbara Reeves		Neal	Esq.
Judge	Michael G.		Nott	(Ret.)
Judge	Thomas P.		Nugent	(Ret.)
Mr.	Dale E.		Ordas	Esq.
Mr.	Marc	D.	Paisin	Esq.
Mr.	Robert C.		Pearman	Esq.
Judge	Alan S.		Penkower	(Ret.)
Judge	Wayne L.		Peterson	(Ret.)
Mr.	Gregory	A	Post	Esq.
Judge	Russell D.		Pulver	(Ret.)
Judge	Linda		Quinn	(Ret.)
Judge	Sheridan		Reed	(Ret.)
Mr.	Charles	D.	Richmond	Esq.
Mr.	Gene	E.	Royce	Esq.

OIA Panel of Neutral Arbitrators

San Diego

Title	First	Middle	Last	Suffix
Judge	Philip M.		Saeta	(Ret.)
Mr.	Robert	F.	SaintAubin	Esq.
Mr.	Michael	F.	Saydah	Esq.
Judge	Tam Nomoto		Schumann	(Ret.)
Mr.	Thomas E.		Sharkey	Esq.
Judge	James L.		Smith	(Ret.)
Judge	Frederick	R.	Stevens	(Ret.)
Judge	Coleman A.		Swart	(Ret.)
Mr.	Joseph E.		Thielen	Esq.
Judge	David C.		Velasquez	(Ret.)
Judge	John Leo		Wagner	(Ret.)
Judge	Stuart T.		Waldrip	(Ret.)
Judge	Rebecca		Westerfield	(Ret.)
Mr.	Michael D.		Young	Esq.
Mr.	Shep	Alan	Zebberman	Esq.

EXHIBIT E

Qualifications for Neutral Arbitrators

**Qualifications for Neutral Arbitrators
for Kaiser Permanente's Mandatory Arbitration System**

1. Neutral arbitrators shall be members of the State Bar of California, members of the state bar of another state with extensive practice in California during the past five years, or retired state or federal judges.
2. Neutral arbitrators shall successfully complete an application provided by the Independent Administrator.
3. Neutral arbitrators shall
 - (a) have been admitted to practice for at least ten years, with substantial litigation experience; AND
 - (b) have had at least three civil trials or arbitrations within the past five years in which they have served as either (i) the lead attorney for one of the parties or (ii) an arbitrator; OR
 - (c) have been a state or federal judge; OR
 - (d) have completed within the last five years a program designed specifically for the training of arbitrators.
4. Neutral arbitrators shall provide satisfactory evidence of ability to act as an Arbitrator based upon judicial, trial, or legal experience.
5. Neutral arbitrators shall not have served as party arbitrators on any matter involving Kaiser Permanente, or any affiliated organization or individual, within the last three years.
6. Neutral arbitrators shall not presently serve as attorney of record or an expert witness or a consultant for or against Kaiser Permanente, or any organization or individual affiliated with Kaiser Permanente, or have had any such matters at anytime within the past three years.
7. Neutral arbitrators shall not have received public discipline or censure from the state bar of California or any other state bar in the past five years. In the case of former judges, they shall not have received public discipline or censure from any government body that has authority to discipline judges in the past five years.
8. Neutral arbitrators shall follow applicable arbitration statutes, substantive law of the issues addressed, and procedures of the Independent Administrator.
9. Neutral arbitrators shall comply with the provisions of code of ethics selected by the Office of the Independent Administrator.
10. Neutral arbitrators shall administer Kaiser arbitrations in a fair and efficient manner.

EXHIBIT F

List of 2015 Awards to Claimants and to Kaiser

List of 2015 Awards to Claimants

Case Number (not actual OIA case number)	Amount of Awards	Month/Year
1	\$72,000.00	01/15
2	\$167,395.00	02/15
3	\$296,461.84	02/15
4	\$263,374.40	02/15
5	\$258,000.00	03/15
6	\$98,500.00	03/15
7	\$250,000.00	03/15
8	\$66,000.00	03/15
9	\$48,000.00	03/15
10	\$11,640,000.00	03/15
11	\$3,257,295.10	03/15
12	\$150,600.00	04/15
13	\$440,294.10	04/15
14	\$150,000.00	05/15
15	\$2,739,410.00	05/15
16	\$503,500.00	06/15
17	\$155,600.00	06/15
18	\$322,682.92	07/15
19	\$2,097,792.00	07/15
20	\$838,788.09	08/15
21	\$458,809.00	11/15
22	\$1,110,277.00	12/15
23	\$199,604.00	12/15
24	\$5,196,737.50	12/15

List of 2015 Lien Awards to Kaiser

Case Number (not actual OIA case number)	Amount of Awards	Month/Year
1	\$50,000.00	01/15
2	\$54,772.57	05/15
3	\$33,333.33	06/15
4	\$20,020.40	07/15

EXHIBIT G

Pro Per and Attorney Evaluations of Neutral Arbitrators

Party or Attorney Evaluation of Neutral Arbitrator

Instructions: In accordance with Rule 49 of the *Rules for Kaiser Permanente Member Arbitrations Administered by the Office of Independent Administrator*, we ask that you complete the enclosed anonymous evaluation. It will be placed in the folder of the neutral arbitrator who handled your case and copies of it will be sent to other parties who are considering using your neutral arbitrator in the future. We ask for comments where you have them and are glad to receive any that you have the time to offer. Please feel free to add sheets if you need additional space. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is included for your convenience. Please send your response to the address below in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Thanks for your help.

Office of Independent Administrator

I am the Claimant _____ OR

I am the attorney who represented _____ the Claimant OR _____ the Respondent

This claim was:

- _____ Withdrawn
- _____ Settled
- _____ Dismissed by the Neutral Arbitrator
- _____ Decided by a Motion for Summary Judgment
- _____ Decided After a Hearing:
 - _____ For Claimant
 - _____ For Respondent
- _____ Other - please specify: _____

Type of injury:

- _____ Medical Malpractice
- _____ Benefits
- _____ Third Party Lien
- _____ Premises Liability
- _____ Other Tort
- _____ Other - please specify: _____

Neutral Arbitrator's Name: _____
 _____ Chosen Jointly OR _____ Chosen through Strike and Rank Process

On the scale below, please rank your experiences with your Neutral Arbitrator. Please circle the number that applies. If the statement does not apply to your case, please circle the "N/A" which appears at the right-hand side. We ask for your comments where you have time and inclination.

1. The neutral arbitrator was impartial and treated all parties fairly.

5	4	3	2	1	N/A
Agree				Disagree	

Please comment: _____

2. The neutral arbitrator treated all parties with respect.

5 4 3 2 1 N/A
Agree Disagree

Please comment: _____

3. The neutral arbitrator kept the case moving in a timely fashion.

5 4 3 2 1 N/A
Agree Disagree

Please comment: _____

4. The neutral arbitrator responded within a reasonable time to telephone calls or written communications.

5 4 3 2 1 N/A
Agree Disagree

Please comment: _____

5. The neutral arbitrator explained procedures and decisions clearly.

5 4 3 2 1 N/A
Agree Disagree

Please comment: _____

6. The neutral arbitrator understood the applicable law governing my case.

5 4 3 2 1 N/A
Agree Disagree

Please comment: _____

7. The neutral arbitrator understood the facts of my case.

5 4 3 2 1 N/A
Agree Disagree

Please comment: _____

8. The neutral arbitrator served his/her decision within a reasonable time.

5 4 3 2 1 N/A
Agree Disagree

Please comment: _____

9. The fees billed by the neutral arbitrator were consistent with those described in his/her application materials which I received from the OIA at the beginning of case.

5 4 3 2 1 N/A
Agree Disagree

Please comment: _____

10. The fees charged by the neutral arbitrator were reasonable given the work performed.

5 4 3 2 1 N/A
Agree Disagree

Please comment: _____

11. I would recommend this arbitrator to another person or another lawyer with a case like mine.

5 4 3 2 1 N/A
Agree Disagree

Please comment: _____

Party Evaluation / Total Counts

Report Date Range: 1/1/2015 through 12/31/2015

General Counts

	<u>Sent</u>	<u>Received</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Total Count of Evaluations	292	119	41%
Count of Pro Pers	69	12	17%
Count of Claimant Counsel	77	20	26%
Count of Respondents	146	84	58%
Count of Anonymous		3	

Counts of Received

	<u>By Disposition</u>		<u>How NA Chosen</u>	
Withdrawn	2	Hearing - Claimant 21	Joint	38
Settled	0	Hearing - Respondent 34	Strike and Rank	66
Dismissed by NA	16	Hearing 0	<u>Blanks</u>	
MSJ	40	Other 1	Blank	0

Claimant and Attorney Evaluations of Neutrals; Statistical Summary of 2015 Responses

As of 12/31/15

Claimant or Respondent?	Evals Rec'd	Fair Q1	Respectful Q2	Timely Q3	Response Q4	Explained Q5	Knew Law Q6	Knew Facts Q7	Decision Q8	Fees Q9	Fees Q10	Recommend Q11	Cnt/Avg
Unidentified Count	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	
Unidentified Average		3.7	4.0	4.0	4.3	3.7	5.0	3.7	4.3	5.0	5.0	3.7	4.2
Unidentified Median		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Unidentified Mode		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Claimant Attorney Count	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	6	6	19	
Claimant Attorney Average		3.8	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.5	4.2	4.2	3.6	4.2
Claimant Attorney Median		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Claimant Attorney Mode		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Pro Per Count	12	12	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	7	7	11	
Pro Per Average		2.3	2.6	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.0	3.3	3.1	2.7	2.2	2.7
Pro Per Median		1.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.3
Pro Per Mode		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.4
Respondent Count	84	83	82	84	84	81	83	77	82	76	77	83	
Respondent Average		4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.8
Respondent Median		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Respondent Mode		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Total Count	119	118	116	118	118	115	116	111	116	91	92	116	
Total Average		4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.3	4.5
Total Median		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Total Mode		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Party Evaluations - Questions 2, 5, 7, and 11 - 2015 Responses

Count	Disposition	Treated Parties with Respect	Explained Procedures Clearly	Knew the Facts of the Case	Would Recommend NA
		Q2	Q5	Q7	Q11
55	Decided After Hearing Count	53	53	51	53
	Decided After Hearing Average	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.1
	Decided After Hearing Median	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Decided After Hearing Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Decided After Hearing Min	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Decided After Hearing Max	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
40	Decided After MSJ Count	39	39	38	39
	Decided After MSJ Average	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.6
	Decided After MSJ Median	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Decided After MSJ Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Decided After MSJ Min	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Decided After MSJ Max	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
16	Dismissed by NA Count	16	15	14	16
	Dismissed by NA Average	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.1
	Dismissed by NA Median	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Dismissed by NA Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Dismissed by NA Min	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Dismissed by NA Max	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
2	Withdrawn Count	2	2	2	2
	Withdrawn Average	2.5	3.0	1.0	2.0
	Withdrawn Median	2.5	3.0	1.0	2.0
	Withdrawn Mode	none	3.0	1.0	none
	Withdrawn Min	2.0	3.0	1.0	1.0
	Withdrawn Max	3.0	3.0	1.0	3.0
5	Unidentified Count	5	5	5	5
	Unidentified Average	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Unidentified Median	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Unidentified Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Unidentified Min	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Unidentified Max	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
1	Other Count	1	1	1	1
	Other Average	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Other Median	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Other Mode	none	none	none	none
	Other Min	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Other Max	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
119	Total Count	116	115	111	116
	Total Average	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.3
	Total Median	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Total Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Total Min	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Total Max	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

EXHIBIT H

Neutral Arbitrator Evaluations of OIA Procedures and Rules

Questionnaire for Neutral Arbitrators

Instructions: In accordance with Rule 48 of the *Rules for Kaiser Permanente Member Arbitrations Administered by the Office of Independent Administrator*, we ask that you complete the enclosed questionnaire about the arbitration named below. Your answers will be used to evaluate and make changes in the OIA system. We ask for comments and are glad to receive any that you have to offer. Please feel free to add sheets if you need additional space. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Please send the returned form to the address below in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. Thanks for your help.

Office of Independent Administrator

Neutral Arbitrator: _____

Arbitration Name: _____ **Arbitration Number:** _____

This claim was:

- Withdrawn
- Settled
- Dismissed by the Neutral Arbitrator
- Decided After a Motion for Summary Judgment
- Decided After a Hearing

On the scale below, please rank your experiences in this matter. Please circle the number that applies. If the statement does not apply to your case, please circle the "N/A" which appears at the right-hand side. We ask for your comments where you have time and inclination.

1. In this case, I thought the procedures set out in the *Rules for Kaiser Permanente Members Arbitrations Administered by the Office of Independent Administrator* worked well.

5	4	3	2	1	N/A
Agree				Disagree	

Please comment: _____

2. Based on my experience in this case, I would participate in another arbitration in the system administered by the Office of Independent Administrator.

5	4	3	2	1	N/A
Agree				Disagree	

Please comment: _____

3. In this case, the Office of Independent Administrator accommodated my questions and concerns.

5	4	3	2	1	N/A
Agree				Disagree	

Please comment: _____

4. Based on my experience in this case, I found the that the following characteristics of the system **worked well**. (Check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> manner of neutral arbitrator's appointment | <input type="checkbox"/> the system's rules overall |
| <input type="checkbox"/> early management conference | <input type="checkbox"/> hearing within 18 months |
| <input type="checkbox"/> availability of expedited procedures | <input type="checkbox"/> availability of complex/extraordinary procedures |
| <input type="checkbox"/> award within 15 business days of closure of hearing | <input type="checkbox"/> other (please describe): _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> claimant's ability to have respondent pay cost of neutral arbitrator | |

Please comment: _____

5. Based on my experience in this case, I found that the following characteristics of the system **need change or improvement**. (Check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> manner of neutral arbitrator's appointment | <input type="checkbox"/> the system's rules overall |
| <input type="checkbox"/> early management conference | <input type="checkbox"/> hearing within 18 months |
| <input type="checkbox"/> availability of expedited procedures | <input type="checkbox"/> availability of complex/extraordinary procedures |
| <input type="checkbox"/> award w/in 15 business days of closure of hearing | <input type="checkbox"/> other (please describe): _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> claimant's ability to have respondent pay cost of neutral arbitrator | |

Please comment: _____

6. Have you had experience with a similar case in Superior Court? Yes No

If yes, what was your role? _____

If yes, was your experience in this system with this case:

better worse about the same?

Please comment: _____

7. Please offer your suggestions for improving the communications with our office.

8. Please offer your suggestions for how this office can improve the system.

9. Please offer your suggestions for improvement or change in the *Rules*.

Questionnaire Count by Disposition

1/1/2015 - 12/31/2015

<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Unidentified	3	1.96 %
Decided After Hearing	73	47.71 %
Decided After MSJ	58	37.91 %
Dismissed by NA	13	8.5 %
Settled	2	1.31 %
Withdrawn	4	2.61 %
<i>Total</i>	153	

Count of Blank Questionnaires

Neutral Arbitrator Questionnaire - Responses to Questions 1 thru 3 - 2015 Responses

Count	Disposition	Procedures Worked Well	Would Participate Again	OIA Responsive Questions/Concerns
		Q1	Q2	Q3
73	Decided After Hearing Count	72	72	54
	Decided After Hearing Average	4.8	4.9	4.9
	Decided After Hearing Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Decided After Hearing Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Decided After Hearing Min	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Decided After Hearing Max	5.0	5.0	5.0
58	Decided After MSJ Count	58	57	46
	Decided After MSJ Average	4.8	4.9	4.9
	Decided After MSJ Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Decided After MSJ Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Decided After MSJ Min	3.0	4.0	4.0
	Decided After MSJ Max	5.0	5.0	5.0
13	Dismissed by NA Count	13	13	11
	Dismissed by NA Average	4.8	5.0	4.9
	Dismissed by NA Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Dismissed by NA Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Dismissed by NA Min	4.0	5.0	4.0
	Dismissed by NA Max	5.0	5.0	5.0
2	Settled Count	2	2	1
	Settled Average	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Settled Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Settled Mode	5.0	5.0	none
	Settled Min	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Settled Max	5.0	5.0	5.0
4	Withdrawn Count	4	4	3
	Withdrawn Average	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Withdrawn Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Withdrawn Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Withdrawn Min	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Withdrawn Max	5.0	5.0	5.0
3	Unidentified Count	3	3	3
	Unidentified Average	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Unidentified Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Unidentified Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Unidentified Min	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Unidentified Max	5.0	5.0	5.0
153	Total Count	152	151	118
	Total Average	4.8	4.9	4.9
	Total Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Total Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Total Min	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Total Max	5.0	5.0	5.0

NA Questionnaire / Count of Questions 4-5

1/1/2015 - 12/31/2015

4. I found that the following characteristics of the system worked well. (Check all that apply):
 5. I found that the following characteristics of the system need change or improvement.

	4. Worked Well	5. Needs Change/Improvement
a) Manner of neutral arbitrator's appointment	117	1
b) Early management conference	109	1
c) Availability of expedited procedures	57	1
d) Award within 15 business day of hearing	64	5
e) Claimant's ability to have respondent pay cost of neutral arbitrator	100	4
f) The system's rules overall	98	1
g) Hearing within 18 months	61	1
h) Availability of complex/extraordinary procedures	34	1
i) Other	13	11
Total	653	26

6. Have you had experience with a similar case in Superior Court?

If yes, what was your role?

If yes, was your experience in this system with this case Better, Worse, or About the Same?

<i>Role</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Better</i>	<i>Worse</i>	<i>Same</i>	<i>BLANK</i>
	2	2		1	
Attorney	21	10	2	5	4
Claimant Attorney	4	2		2	
Judge	61	36	2	22	1
Mediator	4	1		1	2
Neutral Arbitrator	4	4			
Respondent Attorney	7	3	1	2	1
<i>Total</i>	103	58	5	33	8

EXHIBIT I

Pro Per and Attorney Evaluations of OIA Procedures and Rules

Party or Attorney Evaluation of Arbitration System

1. In this case, I thought the procedures set out in the *Rules for Kaiser Permanente Members Arbitrations Administered by the Office of Independent Administrator* worked well.

5	4	3	2	1	N/A
Agree				Disagree	

Please comment: _____

2. In this case, the process for obtaining medical records worked well.

5	4	3	2	1	N/A
Agree				Disagree	

Please comment: _____

3. In this case, the Office of Independent Administrator was responsive to my questions and concerns.

5	4	3	2	1	N/A
Agree				Disagree	

Please comment: _____

4. Have you had experience with a similar case in Superior Court? Yes No
If yes, was your experience in this system with this case:
 better worse about the same?

Please comment: _____

5. Please offer your suggestions for how this office can improve the system.

6. Please offer your suggestions for improvement or change in the *Rules*.

Evaluation of OIA Procedures and Rules / Total Counts

Report Date Range: 1/1/2015 through 12/31/2015

General Counts

	<u>Sent</u>	<u>Received</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Total Count of Evaluations	1,072	257 *	24%
Count of Pro Pers	125	23	18%
Count of Claimant Counsel	411	70	17%
Count of Respondents	536	145	27%
Count of Unidentified		19	

Counts of Received

	<u>By Disposition</u>		<u>How NA Chosen</u>	
Withdrawn	2	Hearing - Claimant 18	Joint	34
Settled	0	Hearing - Respondent 29	Strike and Rank	50
Dismissed by NA	12	Hearing 0	<u>Blanks</u>	
MSJ	33	Other 1	Blank	4

*4 of these are Blank

Evaluations of OIA Procedures and Rules - Questions 1 thru 3 - 2015 Responses

Count	Role	Procedures Worked Well	Obtaining Medical Records Worked Well	OIA Responsive Questions/Concerns
		Q1	Q2	Q3
70	Claimant Attorney Count	67	52	57
	Claimant Attorney Average	4.3	3.9	4.6
	Claimant Attorney Median	5.0	4.0	5.0
	Claimant Attorney Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0
22	Pro Per Count	19	15	18
	Pro Per Average	2.3	2.3	3.1
	Pro Per Median	1.0	2.0	3.5
	Pro Per Mode	1.0	1.0	5.0
142	Respondent Count	136	92	129
	Respondent Average	4.9	4.8	4.9
	Respondent Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Respondent Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0
19	Unidentified Count	18	16	17
	Unidentified Average	4.2	4.4	4.6
	Unidentified Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Unidentified Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0
253	Total Count	240	175	221
	Total Average	4.5	4.3	4.7
	Total Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Total Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0

Evaluations of OIA Procedures and Rules - Questions 1 thru 3 - 2015 Responses

Count	Disposition	Procedures Worked Well	Obtaining Medical Records Worked Well	OIA Responsive Questions/Concerns
		Q1	Q2	Q3
45	Decided After Hearing Count	41	36	39
	Decided After Hearing Average	4.2	4.4	4.7
	Decided After Hearing Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Decided After Hearing Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0
32	Decided After MSJ Count	30	21	29
	Decided After MSJ Average	4.8	4.8	4.9
	Decided After MSJ Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Decided After MSJ Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0
12	Dismissed by NA Count	9	7	10
	Dismissed by NA Average	3.9	4.0	4.2
	Dismissed by NA Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Dismissed by NA Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0
2	Withdrawn Count	2	2	2
	Withdrawn Average	1.0	1.5	1.5
	Withdrawn Median	1.0	1.5	1.5
	Withdrawn Mode	1.0	none	none
1	Other Count	1	0	1
	Other Average	5.0	none	5.0
	Other Median	5.0	none	5.0
	Other Mode	none	none	none
161	Unidentified Count	157	109	140
	Unidentified Average	4.5	4.3	4.7
	Unidentified Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Unidentified Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0
253	Total Count	240	175	221
	Total Average	4.5	4.3	4.7
	Total Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Total Mode	5.0	5.0	5.0

Evaluations of OIA Procedure and Rules - Results of Question 4

4. Have you had experience with a similar case in Superior Court?

If yes, was your experience in this system with this case Better, Worse or About the Same?

Role	Made Comparison	Better	Worse	About the Same
Claimant Attorney	62	27	9	26
Pro Per	4	2	2	0
Respondent	103	61	3	39
Unidentified	8	6	0	2
Total	177	96	14	67

EXHIBIT J

Kaiser Arbitration Oversight Board Comments on the Annual Report for 2015

KAISER ARBITRATION OVERSIGHT BOARD

Board Comments on the Annual Report

Introduction:

The Arbitration Oversight Board has the responsibility to review and comment on the Annual Report of the Independent Administrator. For this purpose, a draft of the 2015 Annual Report was distributed to the Board in February 2016 and discussed at length during the Board's March 17th meeting. The Board offered comments, suggested edits, and made recommendations regarding the draft that the Independent Administrator took under consideration and, according to her best judgment, subsequently incorporated into this final report.

The Annual Report is a key document that is published on the Office of the Independent Administrator's (OIA) website (www.oia-kaiserarb.com) and provides, for all interested parties and the public –at –large, current quantitative and qualitative information about the functioning of the Kaiser arbitration system during the previous calendar year, with comparisons to previous years and commentary about trends. The Report provides insight into the continuing evolution of the system and an opportunity for the Independent Administrator, Kaiser Administration, the Oversight Board and, by extension, interested members of the public, to assess how well the Kaiser Arbitration system is meeting its goal for fair, timely, and cost-effective operation.

Developments During the Year:

As mentioned in the Report, 2015 saw a number of significant developments, including important personnel changes. Also, an especially notable event was the publication, in the **Dispute Resolution Journal**, of a paper by Professor Alan B. Morrison, titled "*Can Mandatory Arbitration of Medical Malpractice Claims Be Fair? The Kaiser Permanente System*".

Personnel Changes

One of the major personnel changes during the year was the **appointment of Ms. Marcella Bell** as the new Independent Administrator to succeed Ms. Oxborough. Ms. Bell had been a long-standing associate of Ms. Oxborough in the Office of the Independent Administrator, and was highly regarded by the Board. This has allowed a very smooth transition. The Board acknowledged the excellent contributions made by Ms. Oxborough during her long tenure.

Another notable personnel change was the **retirement of Dr. David Werdegarr** as Chair of the Board in December 2015. Dr. Werdegarr was recruited in 2001 to establish the Arbitration Oversight Board and to serve as its first Chair, and had served continuously in the role since that time. As an emeritus professor of Community Medicine at UCSF he brought to the AOB Chairmanship position a broad range of administrative, health policy and clinical experiences. In addition to his academic contributions at UCSF, he had held positions as Director of Public Health for San Francisco and as Director of the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development in Sacramento. When he became Chair of the Arbitration Oversight Board in 2001, he stated "*we have set our sights on making*

this a model arbitration system and we are eager to get to work on achieving that goal". That set the direction for the Board's subsequent work. During the AOB's December 2015 ceremonies marking his retirement, Dr. Werdegar assured the Board that he would make himself available for consultation and advice during the leadership transition.

With the retirement of Dr. Werdegar, the AOB Vice Chair, **Dr. Cornelius Hopper** assumed responsibility for the **Chairmanship position**. Dr. Hopper, Emeritus Vice President for Health Affairs, University of California System- wide, has also served on the Board since its beginning in 2001 and brings to the role a broad background in Academic Health Sciences Administration, together with substantial State, National and International health policy experience.

Mr. Richard Spinello was selected to serve as the new Vice Chair. Mr. Spinello is a hospital consultant and former Executive Director of Financial Risk and Insurance at Children's Hospital of Orange County. A member of the Board for the past seven years, he is well informed about its responsibilities. He played a major role in implementing a comprehensive audit of the OIA's data management, including the security procedures to safeguard the safety and privacy of the files.

At the meeting of the Board on September 15th, anticipating that Dr. Werdegar's imminent retirement would create a vacancy in the Board's 13 member size designated by the By-Laws, Dr. Hopper introduced **Dr. Patrick Dowling**, Chair of the Department of Family and Community Medicine at UCLA as a prospective new

Board member and gave a brief overview of his distinguished career. Drs. Werdegar and Hopper then recommended Dr. Dowling as a new Board member-elect, to take the seat that would be vacated by Dr. Werdegar's retirement. The recommendation was approved by the Board by acclamation. Dr. Dowling's resume can be found as Exhibit C of the 2015 Annual Report.

Professor Morrison's Paper

Alan Morrison, Professor of Law at George Washington University, and a self-described "arbitration skeptic", undertook a comprehensive examination of The Kaiser Arbitration System. This included the historical facts that led to the creation of the current system, the roles of the Board and the Independent Administrator, key elements of the Rules that govern the arbitration process, and the independent, exclusive authority of the Board to amend the Rules to address needs that become identified as the system operates and evolves.

Professor Morrison's review of Kaiser Arbitration's goals of providing a *"fair, timely, and low cost system that protects the privacy of the parties"* pointed out their general similarity to the goals of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure which are the *"just, speedy, and inexpensive determination"* of cases decided under them. He proceeded to evaluate the Kaiser System's success in meeting its goals, utilizing the extensive data available in the OIA Annual Reports, with special attention to the 2013 Report, and the OIA Website. His overall conclusions, which are worth repeating at this time, were: *"the Kaiser Permanente arbitration system is almost certainly less expensive for claimants and faster than court*

litigation, and neither its speed nor its low cost seems to interfere with a claimants ability to present his or her case fully". "The results seem reasonably just, and there is no evidence that claimants would be happier (and win more often and/or obtain larger verdicts) in the civil justice system, in the same time frames and at the same costs".

Professor Morrison's published journal article provides a substantial independent view that the Kaiser Arbitration System is meeting its most significant goals.

MEASURES OF PERFORMANCE

The Board receives reports on the performance of the arbitration system at its quarterly meetings. The accumulated performance metrics for the entire year are detailed in the Annual Report. Close attention is paid to the time it takes to resolve cases, since that had been a cause for criticism in the past, prior to the independent administration of the system. Even when accommodating allowable delays owing to postponements and disqualifications, or both, the reported data shows that the Office does an admirable job of keeping the arbitration process on track and on time.

The size of the OIA pool of neutral arbitrators has remained ample, well-distributed geographically, relatively stable in terms of turn-over, and fairly balanced. Work is very widely distributed among the arbitrators. A significant fraction of the arbitrators are retired judges; a significant percentage devote full time to arbitration. Applications, updating their experience must be renewed

every two years. The arbitrators, in the main, continue to receive favorable ratings from parties responding to evaluation questionnaires. The evaluations serve a further purpose: they are kept on file and made available to new parties, to help them in their arbitrator selection decisions. For the most part, parties utilize the OIA's pool of arbitrators, whether by a strike and rank process, or by joint selection. There is a continuous effort to increase the gender, racial, and ethnic diversity of the arbitrator pool.

The way in which cases close in the Kaiser Arbitration system has not changed significantly over the years. Of interest is the large percentage (44 %) that close by a settlement and the relatively small percentage (10%) that close after a full hearing. In the full hearing, the judgements were for Kaiser in 61 % and for the claimant in 39 %.

Arbitrators and participating attorneys, both plaintiff and defense, generally give high ratings to the OIA in its administration of the arbitrations, comparing experience in OIA cases very favorably to their experience in Court.

Concluding Comments

In the Board's view, the Annual Report provides a thorough account of the operation of the Kaiser Arbitration system during 2015, with useful comparisons to data from previous years. Excellent ratings in measures of performance – as detailed in the Report – give good evidence that the independently administered

Kaiser Arbitration system is striving successfully, on a model of continuous improvement, to meet goals of fair, timely, and cost effective arbitration.

The Board takes this opportunity to acknowledge the significant contributions of Board members who have retired, and to express appreciation for the fine work of the OIA staff.

Addendum

Essential Elements of a Model Arbitration System

At an earlier time, the Oversight Board sought to identify the hallmarks of an exemplary arbitration system. What were the essential elements or attributes of a model system? The following were thought to be the essential elements, and it is useful to have these features of a model system in mind when reading the Annual Report and reviewing the Kaiser Arbitration system.

INDEPENDENT ADMINISTRATION: The system is administered by a neutral entity, independent of the parties involved, and empowered to achieve desired goals for fair, timely and cost-effective arbitration.

RULES: An explicit, written set of rules governs the system, to assure that it is fair. All parties must abide by the rules. The rules are periodically reviewed and modified, as necessary, based on experience, to improve the system.

OVERSIGHT: the system has oversight and governance by a body that reflects the diverse perspectives of interested parties, and the public interest.

ACCESSIBILITY: The system is readily accessed by claimants and their claims are entered into the system promptly.

QUALIFIED ARBITRATORS, FAIRLY SELECTED: The system provides well-qualified and experienced arbitrators who are selected through a process consciously designed to avoid bias. Parties evaluate the arbitrators, anonymously, in questionnaire surveys.

TIMELINESS: Deadlines are established to move the arbitration process along as expeditiously as possible, with appropriate safeguards for extenuating circumstances. They must be respected. The meeting of deadlines is monitored and enforced.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES: Accurate and verifiable data are collected systematically to permit objective review of the processes and outcomes of the arbitration system.

EVALUATION: The performance of the system is routinely evaluated by surveys of the participants conducted with appropriate anonymity. Arbitrators are routinely evaluated by the parties.

COST EFFECTIVENESS: The costs of arbitrations are tracked whenever possible. Costs to claimants are kept reasonably low.

CONVENIENCE: Arbitration meetings and hearings are scheduled at times, and in locations, that are convenient for the parties.

CLARITY: Basic information about the arbitration system and its procedures is provided in easily understood, non- technical language.

AUDIT: The data recorded and reported by the administrator of the system are periodically checked by an independent auditor.

TRANSPARENCY: Detailed information about the operation and performance of the arbitration system is published and readily available to interested parties and the public-at-large.

CULTURAL SENSITIVITY: The system seeks diversity in its arbitrator pool. Information to claimants is provided in multiple languages and in non-technical vocabulary. Interpreters are provided without charge if needed.

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT: Administration of the arbitration system strives for continuous improvement, guided by the evaluation conducted, the performance measures conducted, and constructive oversight.