

June 25, 2026

Representative Brian BeGole
Chairman, House Government Operations Committee
Michigan House of Representatives
124 North Capitol Avenue
Room 307
Lansing, MI 48933

Dear Chair BeGole,

On behalf of the Detroit Regional Chamber, the Grand Rapids Chamber, the Michigan Chamber of Commerce, and the Northern Michigan Chamber Alliance, we write to express our unified opposition to House Bills 6116 through 6119. While healthcare affordability remains a critical concern, any major reform should be carefully analyzed to ensure that efforts to lower costs do not inadvertently compromise access to care or the quality of services available to patients across Michigan.

This package represents severe government overreach and sets a bad policy precedent that threatens the entire business climate. Government entities have historically proven ill-equipped to manage complex market dynamics, as evidenced by chronic structural failures in government-managed programs like Medicaid.

In contrast, healthcare systems make economic decisions designed to optimize efficiency, satisfy customers, and expand access to care. Heavy-handed intervention strips away operational flexibility. If the state begins dictating prices and consolidation rules for one sector, it signals a slippery slope where any industry in Michigan could face arbitrary state-mandated pricing next.

The administrative burden of this proposed board is fundamentally flawed and a massive increase in the size of government. When Delaware implemented a similar cost-review model for their 17 hospitals, it cost that state over \$900,000 and required two full-time employees for a vastly smaller footprint. Michigan has 183 hospitals and facilities and almost 10x the population. Replicating this model here would create a multimillion-dollar bureaucracy staffed with dozens of new state employees.

The healthcare industry is Michigan's largest employer, providing nearly 222,000 jobs statewide. Forcing arbitrary price cuts onto organizations already facing macroeconomic inflation and shifting labor markets will directly compel employers to cut jobs to absorb costs. These cuts would disproportionately affect rural and underserved areas. Rural Michigan has already seen two hospitals close in the past 2 years; this legislation would add more to the list.

Imposing rigid rate caps would make Michigan an outlier among states and send a troubling signal about the state's willingness to intervene in private markets. Such a significant policy shift creates uncertainty for healthcare providers, potentially affecting their ability to innovate and maintain the infrastructure needed to provide high-quality care and broad access for Michigan patients.

There is no single policy change that will completely address healthcare affordability; several incremental changes are needed to foster a more competitive economy and ultimately enable all stakeholders in the healthcare market to lower prices. While we stand ready to facilitate that conversation, there are other policy proposals that can be acted on today:

- Strengthen price transparency requirements as provided in [Michigan Senate Bill 95 of 2025](#), which requires provider-specific, shoppable pricing for the most common health care services.
- Require the Michigan Department of Insurance and Financial Services (DIFS) to analyze the impact that coverage mandates have had on the overall cost of health care - including a focused review of mandates adopted after 2010 and the financial implications of state-mandated defrayal requirements under federal law.
- Strengthen the health care workforce pipeline through targeted attraction and retention incentives for high-demand professionals, such as tax credits, student loan repayment assistance and state-sponsored subsidization of student loan programs.
- Provide grants to support technology and operational efficiencies in healthcare administration that improve value and reduce system costs.
- Create pre-tax savings accounts for wellness expenses to encourage preventive care and healthy behaviors.

On behalf of our combined memberships, we urge a "no" vote on House Bills 6116 through 6119.

Sincerely,

