GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE, SECURITIES, AND BANKING

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING ON SURPLUS AND

REVIEW OF GHMSI

Thursday, September 10, 2009

Office of Zoning

Hearing Room 220 South 441 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

The Public Hearing on Surplus and Review of GHMSI before the District of Columbia Department of Insurance, Securities, and Banking convened at 10:00 a.m., Gennet

Purcell, Acting Commissioner, presiding.

DISB COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

GENNET PURCELL, Acting Commissioner PHILIP BARLOW, Associate Commissioner

ALSO PRESENT:

LESLIE JOHNSON, Hearing Officer, DISB STEPHEN C. TAYLOR, General Counsel, DISB MICHELLE MATHIS, Paralegal Specialist, DISB ROBERT H. MYERS JR., Morris, Manning & Martin CINDY CHANG, Morris, Manning & Martin

JIM TOOLE, Rector and Associates NEIL RECTOR, Rector and Associates SARAH SCHROEDER, Rector and Associates

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WITNESSES

GHMSI

Robert Dobson 50 Thomas Carlson 71 Ralphy Tyler DC Appleseed Center for Law and Justice Cory Zaas Mark Shaw Kurt Calia. 302 Barbara Lang David Wilmot

Adjourn

		Page 3
1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S	
2	(10:01 a.m.)	
3	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Good	
4	morning. Before we get started, if I could	
5	just ask everyone to please set their phones	
6	to vibrate, or turn them off, so we don't have	
7	any witness interruptions. I'd appreciate	
8	that. Thank you all for coming.	
9	I am Gennet Purcell, Acting	
10	Commissioner for the District of Columbia	
11	Department of Insurance, Securities, and	
12	Banking. I would like to welcome everyone to	
13	this public hearing.	
14	This hearing is being held	
15	pursuant to D.C. Official Code, Section	
16	31.3506, Subsections (e) and (f) of the	
17	Hospital and Medical Services Corporation	
18	Regulatory Act of 1996, or the HMSCR Act, as	
19	amended by the Medical Insurance Empowerment	
20	Amendment Act of 2008, or the MIEAA Act.	
21	The Department convenes this	
22	hearing to assist in making its determination	

as to whether the portion of surplus
 attributable to the District of Columbia of
 Group Hospital and Medical Services, Inc., or
 GHMSI, a subsidiary of Care First, Inc., is
 excessive under the MIEAA.

6 With me today also representing 7 the Department are Mr. Phil Barlow, Associate Commissioner for the Insurance Department, Ms. 8 9 Leslie Johnson, Department Hearing Examiner, 10 Mr. Stephen Taylor, General Counsel for the Department, Ms. Michelle Mathis, Department 11 Paralegal. Serving as experts on behalf of 12 13 the Department are Mr. Jim Toole, Mr. Neil Rector, and Ms. Sarah Shroeder of Rector & 14 Associates, and Mr. Robert Myers, and Ms. 15 Cindy Change of Morris, Manning & Martin LLP. 16 The purpose of today's hearing is 17 to assist the Department in gathering 18 information about the appropriate levels of 19 20 surplus necessary for the corporation to meet 21 its, one, statutory and corporate surplus 22 requirements; two, actuarial determined risk

1 exposures; and, three, expected an 2 unanticipated contingencies. Additionally, the Department hopes to gather information 3 4 regarding the most appropriate way to 5 determine the portion of the corporation's excess surplus, if any, which is attributable 6 7 to the District of Columbia. GHMSI is unique among all Blue 8 9 Cross/Blue Shield plans in the United States, 10 in that it was created by an act of Congress, which establishes its purpose in a 11 Congressional charter. This charter empowers 12 13 GHMSI to enter into contracts with individuals, or groups of individuals for the 14 provision of health insurance coverage as a 15 non-profit company for the benefit of its 16 subscribers. 17 GHMSI is a Hospital and Medical 18 Services Corporation chartered by the 19 Department, and subject to the surplus review 20 required by the HMSCR Act. The MIEAA's 21 22 implementing regulations, DCR Chapter 46,

1 Title 26 provide the regulatory standards 2 governing these proceedings, and define greater than the appropriate risk-based 3 4 capital requirements to mean greater than the 5 minimum risk-based capital requirements of the National Association of Insurance 6 7 Commissioners, the NAIC, and the Blue Cross/Blue Shield Association. 8 9 On July 17th, 2009, the former 10 Commissioner for DISB, Mr. Thomas Hampton, issue the 2009 Group Hospitalization and 11 Medical Services Inc. adequate surplus 12 13 determination. He determined that the surplus as of December 31, 2008 was greater than the 14 appropriate risk-based capitol requirements, 15 as that phrase is defined in MIEAA's 16 implementing regulations. 17 18 Pursuant to the terms of the MIEAA Act, the Department is required to conduct a 19 public hearing to determine whether GHMSI 20 surplus attributable to the District of 21 Columbia is excessive. The surplus 22

attributable to the District shall be deemed
 excessive only if the further finding is
 reached that the portion of the surplus is
 unreasonably large, and inconsistent with
 GHMSI's Community Health Reinvestment
 obligation set forth in Section 6A of the
 HMSCR Act.

The purpose of today's hearing is 8 9 to shed light on this very important issue. In order to make a final determination as to 10 whether GHMSI surplus which is attributable to 11 the District is excessive, and unreasonably 12 13 large, I will take into consideration the entire record, which will include all 14 submissions and testimony. I will listen and 15 consider the views of interested parties and 16 members of the public. The information 17 received here today will be made a part of the 18 official record of this hearing. 19 20 Notice of the public hearing was published in the District of Columbia Register 21 on July 24th, 2009 at 56 DCR 005967, and 22

revised notice was published in the District of Columbia Register on July 31st, 2009 at 56 DCR 006000. Notice was delivered to Care First on July 24th, 2009, and again on July 31st, 2009. The revised notice of public hearing was also posted on the Department's website.

On July 31st, 2009, as required by 8 9 the Department, GHMSI issued the GHMSI Report 10 incorporating the December 4th, 2008 Milliman Report entitled, "Need for Statutory Surplus 11 and Development of Optimal Surplus Target 12 13 Range." Pursuant to the regulations governing these proceedings, on August 31st, 2009, GHMSI 14 issued the GHMSI Pre-Hearing Report 15 incorporating as Exhibit A the August 28th, 16 2009 Milliman Report titled, "Evaluation of 17 GHMSI Surplus Attributable to D.C.", and 18 several attachments. 19 Also on August 31st, 2009, a Pre-20 21 Hearing Report was issued by the District of 22 Columbia Appleseed Center for Law and Justice

1	incorporating Exhibits A-C, a Covington &	
2	Burling LLP Legal Analysis Report, an	
3	actuarial risk management report titled,	
4	"Excess Surplus Assessment Report of GHMSI	
5	Position", and a Mathematica Policy,	
6	Incorporated Senior Fellow Research Statement.	
7	Additional written materials have	
8	also been submitted to the Department. These	
9	parties have been listed on our witness list,	
10	and will testify as public witnesses here	
11	today.	
12	So, next I will try to explain the	
13	general procedure for today's hearing. We'll	
13 14	general procedure for today's hearing. We'll commence each witness or witness panel with a	
14	commence each witness or witness panel with a	
14 15	commence each witness or witness panel with a swearing in of each witness. This will be	
14 15 16	commence each witness or witness panel with a swearing in of each witness. This will be conducted by a Hearing Officer, or by me.	
14 15 16 17	commence each witness or witness panel with a swearing in of each witness. This will be conducted by a Hearing Officer, or by me. After each panel's presentation, the	
14 15 16 17 18	commence each witness or witness panel with a swearing in of each witness. This will be conducted by a Hearing Officer, or by me. After each panel's presentation, the Department Staff and experts may pose	
14 15 16 17 18 19	commence each witness or witness panel with a swearing in of each witness. This will be conducted by a Hearing Officer, or by me. After each panel's presentation, the Department Staff and experts may pose questions to the witnesses. After all	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	commence each witness or witness panel with a swearing in of each witness. This will be conducted by a Hearing Officer, or by me. After each panel's presentation, the Department Staff and experts may pose questions to the witnesses. After all testimony has been heard, and all the	

listed on the witness list, or to other
 members of the public who have signed up here
 at the hearing today to testify.

There are witness cards located 4 throughout the room, I believe to the rear to 5 my left of the room. Please list your name, 6 7 affiliation, if any, and deliver the card to our transcriber at the front of the room to my 8 9 right. We will first hear from GHMSI and The GHMSI Panel Members will have 90 10 panel. 11 minutes for the presentation of their testimony. We will then hear from the 12 13 District of Columbia Appleseed Center for Law and Justice, which will have 20 minutes for 14 the presentation of their testimony. Next, 15 we'll hear from other interested parties, who 16 also have 20 minutes, and other public witness 17 will have a total of three minutes for the 18 presentation of their testimonies. 19 I will call for a 20-minute break 20 21 approximately halfway through today's 22 proceedings. We will end at 5 p.m. today, and

we'll continue the hearing tomorrow morning
 beginning at 10 a.m. to hear any remaining
 witnesses, and the rebuttal testimony.

Once all the parties and public 4 5 witnesses have been heard, and all the Department's questions have been answered, 6 7 GHMSI will be permitted 30 minutes to deliver their final rebuttal statement, after which 8 9 time these hearing proceedings will adjourn. 10 Please note that the Department will be producing a stenographic record of 11 these proceedings, which will be a part of the 12 13 official record of this hearing, so, as such, again, witnesses not listed on the witness 14 list please fill out a card, and provide it to 15 16 our court reporter. Witnesses, please speak into the microphone, and begin your testimony 17 by giving your full name, affiliation, and 18 title. All testimony should be addressed to 19 this hearing body, should be relevant to the 20 issues just outlined, and should not be of a 21 22 personal nature.

In the interest of time, please be mindful of 1 2 the time limits allotted for your testimony. The official record in this matter 3 will remain open until close of business on 4 5 September 25th, 2009. Anyone wishing to submit written testimony or rebuttal 6 7 statements may submit those in writing to the attention of Ms. Leslie Johnson, DISB Hearing 8 9 Examiner, 810 1st Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002, or by email to 10 Leslie.Johnson@DC.gov. 11 12 Following the hearing, after a 13 final review of all the relevant submissions, consideration of the entire record and 14 application of the relevant laws and 15 regulations, I will make a final determination 16 as to whether GHMSI Surplus which is 17 attributable to the District is excessive and 18 unreasonably large. The final determination 19 will be issued in writing no later than 20 September 30th of 2009. If I determine that 21 22 the surplus is excess and unreasonably large,

Page 12

I will order GHMSI to submit a plan for my 1 approval for dedication of the excess to 2 Community Health Reinvestment pursuant to the 3 4 statute. 5 So, again, welcome to this DISB Public Hearing this morning. Are there any 6 7 preliminary matters that need addressing before we get started? Okay. And with that, 8 9 we will commence. I will call our first witnesses 10 who are already seated, GHMSI. Good morning. 11 If you could just, after being sworn in, 12 13 identify those who are testifying on your behalf in what order, and then we will 14 15 proceed. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Would each of 16 you raise your right hand to be sworn in, 17 please. 18 19 WHEREUPON , CHET BURRELL, MARK CHANEY, ROBERT DOBSON, 20 THOMAS CARLSON, DESMOND HOGAN 21 was called as a witness and, after having been 22

1 first duly sworn, was examined and testified
2 as follows:

MR. BURRELL: I'll just introduce 3 4 the speakers for GHMSI. I am Chet Burrell. 5 I am the CEO of GHMSI. Speaking will be Robert Dobson. He is a principal with 6 7 Milliman, and to his right, Tom Carlston, who is a Managing Director of Lewin. Others with 8 9 me at the table to my immediate right are Mark 10 Chaney, CFO of GHMSI and of Care First, Inc. And to my left, Des Hogan, a partner at the 11 12 law firm of Hogan & Hartson. 13 Again, my name is Chet Burrell,

14 and I am the CEO of both Care First and our 15 affiliate in the District, Group Hospital and 16 Medical Services, Inc., GHMSI. Together the 17 companies serve 3.4 million members, 18 approximately one million of whom are members 19 of GHMSI. Of the GHMSI members, approximately

20 10 percent are residents of the District of 21 Columbia. Nearly half live in Maryland, with 22 the balance in Virginia, and out of area. In

total, Care First serves 45 percent of the 1 insured population living in Maryland, 2 Northern Virginia, and the District of 3 Columbia region. 4 5 We are here today, as you know, to 6 talk about GHMSI's surplus. The very word 7 "surplus" means, or seems to imply extra, unneeded, or too much. Yet, in the insurance 8 9 world, it is an essential requirement that 10 represents amounts held for the protection of 11 subscribers to assure that come what may, their claims will be paid. 12 13 Let me observe at the outset that we are not here today for a routine hearing 14 that is part of a regular long-established 15 We are here under a new law in the 16 process. District called the Medical Insurance 17 Empowerment Act, MIEAA of 2008, which requires 18 the Commissioner, as the Commissioner has 19 20 already said, to review a portion of GHMSI's surplus attributable to the District, and to 21 22 determine if that surplus is excessive under

1 the act.

2	It is important to note that so	
3	far as we know, there are only two states in	
4	the country that actively seek to monitor the	
5	upper surplus limits of an insurer, and	
б	neither state's approach is even remotely	
7	comparable to the District's framework under	
8	MIEAA.	
9	It is apparent that this hearing,	
10	indeed, the entire framework established by	
11	the MIEAA, is the culmination of nearly a	
12	decade of intense work on the part of D.C.	
13	Appleseed Center for Law and Justice, a	
14	Washington-based advocacy group. Appleseed	

15 has operated with a theory in mind that lies 16 behind all of its arguments and efforts. To 17 start, I would like to summarize this theory, 18 since I believe it illuminates important 19 background and context for the issues that 20 come before you today.

It is Appleseed's view that GHMSIis a charitable and benevolent institution

that has, as its primary mission, service to 1 2 the public to promote general health of the community. Indeed, Appleseed has said that 3 GHMSI's assets belong to the public, that 4 5 GHMSI exists to serve the public, and if GHMSI were a for-profit company, its profits and 6 7 surpluses would benefit its shareholders, and that residents of GHMSI service area are the 8 9 company shareholders. Appleseed argues that 10 this entitles the public to the equivalent of dividends to be paid out of GHMSI's surplus. 11 It calls these dividends Community Health 12 13 Reinvestment. These elements of Appleseed's 14

15 theory find expression in its interpretation of the MIEAA. The Act seeks to impose an 16 obligation on GHMSI to engage in Community 17 Health Reinvestment to the maximum extent 18 feasible consistent with financial soundness 19 20 and efficiency. According to Appleseed, that 21 means GHMSI must use its resources to promote 22 the general public's health.

1 In the context of the MIEAA, the 2 Appleseed theory holds that GHMSI should maintain a reserve consistent with financial 3 4 soundness, but, Appleseed argues, this is a 5 reserve that is well below where it presently It says that if the company fails to keep 6 is. 7 reserves to a absolute minimum, it is not doing what it can to the maximum extent 8 9 feasible in meeting its obligations to the 10 public. There is a clear object, we 11 believe, of the Appleseed theory, to cause 12 13 GHMSI to expend as much of its reserves and resources as possible for the public benefit, 14 and cause this to happen continuously. To put 15 this in concrete terms, Appleseed has said 16 that GHMSI should be able on a sustained basis 17 to provide as much as \$60-100 million per year 18 for the public benefit. And Appleseed claims 19 20 that GHMSI's current aggregate reserve level is excessive by hundreds of millions of 21 22 dollars. These themes are central to the pre-

hearing reports filed by Appleseed a week or
 so ago.

Naturally, the idea that such sums 3 might be available for District programs, 4 5 which otherwise cannot be funded out of the District's budget, has caught the eye of some 6 7 District officials. What government jurisdiction would not be attracted to the 8 9 idea that such large sums could be raised without having to face the ire of the 10 11 taxpayer, or could be obtained through an esoteric regulatory process few in the public 12 13 follow. Further, who would rise to the defense of an insurance company, even if it is a local 14 one, that sought to resist this idea? 15 This creates the real possibility 16 of a dangerous perversion in the regulatory 17 The desire to obtain the funds 18 process. causes a strong incentive to deem GHMSI's 19 surplus "excessive", and to demand a plan for 20 its distribution to the general public. And 21 22 the political incentives are especially

skewed, we believe, because the source of the
 funds is overwhelmingly from residents of
 other jurisdictions, not District residents,
 themselves. As noted earlier, District
 residents comprise only 10 percent of GHMSI's
 membership.

7 Nevertheless, we find ourselves here today to carry out the dictates of the 8 9 MIEAA legislation that was crafted, we 10 believe, to advance Appleseed's theory. So, let me start with the essential facts of the 11 12 matter, and see if they fit the theory. Let 13 me speak to GHMSI's Congressional Charter, what does it say, and whose money is it? 14 Among the things that make GHMSI 15 16 unique, as has already been noted, is the fact that it is the only Blue Cross and Blue Shield 17 plan established and governed by an enabling 18 charter from the U.S. Congress. 19 It is also 20 the single-most important Blue plan in the

22 Benefits program, a role of continuing great

operation and support of the Federal Employee

21

interest to the Congress. This causes
 Congress to have a special concern with, among
 other things, the financial viability of
 GHMSI.

5 GHMSI's charter, established by an act of Congress in 1939, sets forth its 6 7 mission in very succinct, clear terms. GHMSI, "Shall not be conducted for profit, but shall 8 9 be conducted for the benefit of the certificate holders." And that, "GHMSI is 10 authorized and empowered to enter into 11 contracts with individuals or groups of 12 13 individuals to provide for hospitalization and medical care of such individuals upon payment 14 of specified rates or premiums, and to issue 15 to such individuals appropriate certificates 16 evidencing such contracts." 17

18 The charter, in other words, says 19 GHMSI's mission is to provide healthcare 20 coverage to subscribers, and that its duty is 21 to those subscribers. It is as simple and 22 direct as that. To assure the mission would

be carried out, the Congress placed the 1 2 company under a Board of Trustees who would oversee the business of the company. And, to 3 4 this day, 70 years later almost to the month, 5 that is exactly the way the company operates. To be sure, the charter goes on to 6 7 say that the company, "Is hereby declared to be a charitable and benevolent institution, 8 9 and all of its funds and property shall be

exempt from taxation." But this charitable 10 and benevolent language is all about tax 11 At the time of its charter, the idea 12 status. 13 of health insurance was still novel, and the American Hospital Association had drafted 14 model language to guide states who were in the 15 process of setting up organizations like 16 17 GHMSI.

18 It was widely believed that there 19 was no commercial market in these services, 20 but that they would do a lot of public good by 21 covering people for hospitalization expenses, 22 while insuring the viability of hospitals.

This justified their non-profit status and 1 2 exemption from taxes; that is, the company's services to subscribers were seen to be of 3 4 such value to society that by themselves, they 5 justified the company's charitable and benevolent non-profit, non-taxable status. 6 7 Congress drew this section of GHMSI's charter directly from the model act. 8 9 What Appleseed has done is take 10 the language applicable to the tax status of the company to justify its view that the 11 company has far broader, indeed, primary 12 13 obligations to the public at-large. From this, in Appleseed's view, all else is 14 derived, including its concerns with the size 15 and the use of surplus. 16 It is noteworthy, if one reads the 17 various reports issued by Appleseed over the 18 years, including the ones prepared for this 19

20 hearing, that the clear, Congressionally

21 intended purpose of the company is rarely 22 cited, or even referred to. It was only a few

years ago that the last round of hearings were
 held here in the District by then Commissioner
 Larry Mirel on these very issues.

Appleseed liberally refers to this in its pre-hearing report in support of its theory. However, Appleseed fails to mention the actual conclusion reached by Commissioner Mirel, or the accompanying opinion issued by then Attorney General, Robert Spagnoletti. I briefly summarize them here.

Commissioner Mirel wrote, "The 11 Department finds that although GHMSI may meets 12 13 its legal obligation to engage in charitable activity solely through the provision of 14 health insurance in its service area, GHMSI 15 has an additional responsibility to engage in 16 charitable activities in the District of 17 Columbia which advance the public health. 18 The Department finds that it is the responsibility 19 of the Board of Directors, in the first 20 instance, to determine the amount of 21 additional charitable contributions which will 22

1 be made, and the manner in which the 2 contributions will be made."

Attorney General Spagnoletti in an 3 opinion issued on March 4th, 2005, made a 4 5 series of important statements. I refer to just a few here. "D.C. Appleseed fails to 6 recognize that GHMSI can be faithful to its 7 charitable and benevolent designation by 8 9 operating its non-profit health plans for the 10 purpose of promoting better public health. Indeed, by providing or improving non-profit 11 health plan benefits for as many subscribers 12 13 as possible, GHMSI can do much to promote better health in its service area. GHMSI may 14 even choose to fulfill its charitable mission 15 by devoting all of its resources, including 16 profits and excess surplus to maximizing the 17 quality, benefits, affordable, and 18 accessibility of its health plans, while 19 maintaining fiscal soundness. GHMSI may meet 20 its obligation under its charter through the 21 22 operation of non-profit health plans, even if

the only direct beneficiaries are the plan's 1 past, current, and future paying subscribers. 2 With hundreds of thousands of paying 3 subscribers, and the potential to enroll 4 5 hundreds of thousands more, GHMSI can have a broad and positive impact on the public 6 7 health, if it conducts itself for the benefit of subscribers, as its charter requires." 8 9 None of the cases cited by D.C. 10 Appleseed undermine the conclusions derived from General Charitable Trust Principles that 11 GHMSI may fulfill its obligations as a 12 13 charitable and benevolent institution through the provision of health plan services to 14 paying subscribers, and that GHMSI has no 15 obligation to divert the profits generated by 16 its health plan services to other charitable 17 activities. 18 In other words, this very agency, 19 20 and the District's top law enforcement official adopted our understanding of the 21 22 company's charter, and rejected Appleseed's

idea that GHMSI has a legal obligation to turn 1 over its subscribers' premium payments to the 2 public. They also make clear that GHMSI's 3 Board of Trustees is authorized to make 4 5 decisions on how much subscriber money should be diverted to the general public's needs, but 6 7 these holdings do not fit the Appleseed theory, and, therefore, they were not 8 9 mentioned in the pre-hearing report. 10 So, in plain language, we believe 11 the surplus and reserves of the company are held for the protection and the benefit of 12 13 subscribers, and that GHMSI Board must find a particular community need to be of such value 14 and benefit that it justifies using subscriber 15 funds for other than the subscribers' direct 16 Indeed, the Board gives generously, 17 benefit. but always with this in mind. Simply put, the 18 funds held in reserve by GHMSI are for the 19 benefit of the subscribers, not for the 20 21 general public.

22

Appleseed turns this all on its

head, and states that the company has 1 repeatedly violated its core obligation by 2 doing the very thing charter commands it to 3 do. And, in this regard, it is worth noting 4 5 that the charter uses a command in the word "shall" in connection with serving 6 7 subscribers, and never mentions a word about the general public. 8

Let's now turn to another way to 9 10 look at it, and let's deal with the issue of affordability, which we believe is a crisis in 11 the making for subscribers. As Commissioner 12 13 Mirel and Attorney General Spagnoletti wrote in 2005, "It is up to the Board of Trustees to 14 balance how much GHMSI can afford to invest in 15 the community at-large, after meeting the 16 needs of subscribers. In doing so, the most 17 important consideration for the trustees, all 18 of whom are residents of the community, is how 19 20 affordable premiums are for paying 21 subscribers. Stated another way, the central 22 question the Trustees must address is, when

GHMSI gives a dollar to others, is this a 1 2 burden our subscribers can bear, or is that dollar better spent more directly on their 3 It would be a contorted reading of 4 behalf? 5 the charter to ask the question the other way What is the maximum extent that can 6 around. 7 be given to the public before considering the needs of the subscribers?" 8

9 Appleseed's and MIEAA's test for 10 the limit of community health reinvestment is the financial soundness of the company, not 11 the burden on the subscribers who contribute 12 13 the money to make it financially sound. But, in our view, financial soundness must include 14 the concept of affordability to the 15 subscriber, not just consider whether the 16 company can minimally cover its claims costs. 17 Without this focus on subscribers, there is no 18 real meaning in the command that the 19 corporation shall be "conducted for the 20 benefit of the certificate holders." 21 22 On this issue of affordability, a

1 full fledged crisis is emerging. Indeed, the
2 unaffordability of health coverage has reached
3 alarming levels. This was the essence of the
4 President's message last night. The signs are
5 everywhere. We live with this daily, and a
6 few statistics clearly illustrate this.

7 D.C. mirrors national trends in that the number of small employers who offer 8 9 health coverage is steadily declining, and is 10 now at 60 percent, meaning 40 percent don't. So far in 2009, more than three-quarters of 11 small employers who left Care First coverage, 12 13 left because the cost of providing coverage was no longer affordable. Many just dropped 14 the coverage all together, rather than going 15 16 to a competitor.

Together, GHMSI and Care First provide coverage to the majority of employer groups in the region, which suggests that small and medium groups see the most value in the company's offerings. Yet, even these groups have found these offerings increasingly

unaffordable. More than half of the members
 in small groups who left GHMSI coverage did so
 because they lost their job, the highest since
 we started keeping such records.
 Substantial numbers of these

members go into the ranks of the uninsured 6 7 because they cannot afford coverage. Premiums have been rising in lockstep with health care 8 9 costs at an average rate of over 10 percent a 10 year. At this rate, costs double every seven 11 These costs are rising at three to years. five times the increase in family income in 12 13 this region, and are consuming an ever-larger share of disposable income. 14

Small employers who are not 15 dropping coverage, and this is significant, 16 are moving with lightening speed to high 17 deductible health plans as a way to lower 18 costs for themselves, but in the process, 19 20 shifting huge burdens onto employees and their 21 dependents. From a position of nearly no 22 market penetration for these plans in 2005,

now more than half of all small employer
 groups in Maryland are covered by these
 designs, with groups in the District rapidly
 following suit.

5 In addition to the cost shift 6 caused by high deductible health plan designs, 7 employers are steadily and more rapidly of late reducing the portion of premiums they pay 8 9 for. This decline has reached the point where 10 the portion of premium paid by small and medium employers is now at the 50 percent mark 11 for the first time, an historic low. These are 12 13 but some of the indicia of the emerging crisis in the health care, health insurance 14 marketplace. It is even worse for individuals 15 16 who have no employer to arrange and partially pay their premiums. 17

18 In response, Care First has re-19 doubled its efforts at cost containment, and 20 has operated at extremely small operating and 21 underwriting margins in its overall product 22 portfolio, averaging a total bottom line for

underwriting of between 1 and 2 percent over 1 the entire last decade, and a fraction of 1 2 percent last year. The company's Board of 3 Trustees has laid out a plan to continue with 4 5 these small margins over the foreseeable future, but the demographic forces pushing 6 7 healthcare costs and usage higher are extremely powerful, and we see no sign of 8 9 abatement. 10 Given these facts, it is well to remember where GHMSI's reserves come from. 11 They come directly from individuals and small 12 13 and medium group policy holders, and only from Large groups self-insure and typically 14 them. contribute minimally to reserves. 15 To ease the burden, GHMSI targets the earnings of its 16 reserves for the benefit of individuals and 17 small group premium payers in order to help 18 moderate premium increases on their behalf. 19 20 In effect, it seeks to target a dividend to them as a benefit to those who are most in 21

22 need among its subscribers.

1 We know of no individual, or employer group that ever paid its premium 2 thinking that the payments that they would 3 make would be used for anything other than 4 5 their benefit, particularly in these trying If we lose the battle for healthcare 6 times. 7 affordability among the working population, no government program can step in to fill the 8 9 void. Keeping premiums as low as possible is 10 the most essential good we can do for the general community, and is certainly the thing 11 most sought after by our premium rate payers, 12 13 particularly individuals and small groups. Indeed, it is the essential intent of our 14 Congressional charter. 15 It is precisely these individuals 16 and groups who will be most harmed if 17 Appleseed's theory is put into practice. 18 Ιt is they who most built the company's reserves, 19 20 and they who should benefit from them. In so 21 doing, the whole economy of the region is 22 helped, and the greater good is achieved.

1 If, on the other hand, a large 2 portion of reserves is taken from subscribers, as if their needs were secondary to the 3 general public's, they not only suffer a loss 4 5 in the degree of their protection, but also an important source of rate moderation. 6 Τn 7 effect, Appleseed's logic is that others in the public, not subscribers, are the real 8 9 targeted beneficiaries. We do not agree. The 10 reserves of the company are held for the benefit of subscribers, not others among the 11 12 public. 13 To put things in perspective, if \$100 million were taken out of the reserve, 14 this equates to about \$300 per member for all 15 individuals and small groups in the GHMSI 16 service area. 17 I'd like to speak a little bit 18 about community health reinvestment, and ask 19 20 the question how much is enough? The facts on 21 this question are telling. Let us start with 22 the observation that the level of community

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

Page 35

health reinvestment is possible only -- and that is possible at any point in time by a company such as GHMSI is directly affected by the premium tax policies of the various local jurisdictions in which GHMSI operates.

6 Much attention has been given by 7 Appleseed to the Pennsylvania model, which 8 very explicitly uses the concept of community 9 health reinvestment with regard to Blue Cross 10 and Blue Shield plans. However, Pennsylvania 11 law allows a premium tax offset against any 12 community health reinvestment obligation.

13 The Commonwealth has set community 14 health reinvestment obligation at 1.6 percent of commercial premiums, and 1 percent of 15 Medicare Advantage premiums, but allows a 16 dollar-for-dollar offset for premium taxes 17 paid. In effect, the Blues plans in the state 18 pay the difference between these percentages, 19 20 and what they pay in taxes into the community 21 health reinvestment program. This is not a 22 novel concept to the other jurisdictions in

1 which GHMSI does business.

2 Maryland law establishes a 2 percent premium tax, and then waives it to the 3 degree that the plans, Care First of Maryland, 4 5 Inc. and GHMSI, contribute to worthy community programs identified by the state. Virginia 6 7 provides a partial premium tax offset for open enrollment program losses experienced by GHMSI 8 9 in that state. Only the District of Columbia 10 imposes premium tax at 2 percent of premium revenue with no offset for community giving. 11 Who pays this tax? The answer is, only those 12 13 who pay premiums, individuals, and small This means that all giving by GHMSI 14 groups. in the District is in addition to this tax, 15 and on the backs of premium payers. 16 17 So, to get an apples-to-apples comparison among the three jurisdictions GHMSI 18 serves, one needs to add up three categories 19 of payments, premium taxes, community giving, 20 21 and subsidies, planned losses on open 22 enrollment products. When all three are added

1 up for GHMSI, here is the bottom line. 2 Approximately 3.3 percent of its total premium revenue is given over by GHMSI for these three 3 purposes combined in the District, while this 4 5 total is 2.3 percent in Virginia, and only 1.7 percent in Maryland. In dollar terms, GHMSI 6 7 contributes \$14 million to the District for these three purposes, while contributing \$6.9 8 9 million to Maryland, and \$10.3 million to Virginia, which account for substantially 10 higher subscriber counts. 11 12 Expressed another way, of all the 13 GHMSI expends for these three purposes in its service area, 45 percent goes to the District, 14 despite the fact that it has only 10 percent 15 of GHMSI's membership. The reverse is true 16 for Maryland, which has 44 percent of GHMSI's 17 membership, and receives 22 percent of all 18 GHMSI payments for these three purposes 19 20 combined. 21 This, however, is not the end of 22 The MIEAA contains an open the story.

enrollment program requirement that would 1 2 cause GHMSI to lose between \$20-30 million annually in each of the next five years. 3 And this is due to the fact that this open 4 5 enrollment product would be required to be sold at well below cost. This provision is 6 7 now temporarily suspended while GHMSI seeks to work out a public/private partnership with the 8 9 District. But if it were to take effect, the 10 portion of GHMSI's premium revenue that would qo for the combination of District taxes 11 giving in subsidies would rise to 12 13 approximately 7.5 percent of premium income, and consumer nearly two-thirds of all GHMSI 14 contributions for these purposes among the 15 three jurisdictions. This is a level that is 16 at least triple the level of all of the 17 surrounding jurisdictions. 18 19 From our members' perspective, this would mean adding approximately \$100 a 20 21 month to the average monthly family premium of 22 \$1,800, just for the difference between the 2

1 percent average of the other two

2 jurisdictions, and the 7.5 percent in the 3 District.

The City Council has deliberately 4 5 left the open enrollment provision in the MIEAA as an assurance that GHMSI would be more 6 7 inclined to a favorable, from their perspective, outcome in the negotiations on 8 9 the public/private partnership. GHMSI has 10 been explicitly informed by the City Council that the MIEAA open enrollment requirement 11 will be a feature in any permanent legislation 12 13 going forward for this purpose. It should be noted that while more 14 modest in comparison, the proposed 15 public/private partnership would still cause 16 the combined total of GHMSI contributions for 17 taxes, giving, and subsidies to be in the 5.5 18

19 percent range, or approximately 50 percent of 20 all GHMSI payments for these purposes in these 21 three jurisdictions. This level is well more

22 than double the rate of surrounding

jurisdictions, and would cause GHMSI's
 spending for these three purposes to exceed
 \$23 million annually.

I would ask a disinterested
observer, is this too little in the way of
community health reinvestment on GHMSI's part?
Compare these percentages to what GHMSI seeks
to put away in reserves for its subscribers
each year, an average of 1-2 percent annually.
How much is enough?

To further put these numbers in 11 12 perspective, we researched other jurisdictions 13 around the country. Only a handful, most notably those in neighboring jurisdictions, 14 even require or measure community giving, and 15 the combined burden is usually 2 percent or 16 less after tax offset, as is the case in 17 Pennsylvania. 18

19 The District is a distinct anomaly 20 in this regard, substantially higher than any 21 other jurisdiction we could find, and heading 22 sharply to higher levels yet. Further, since

1 these burdens are borne only by GHMSI's premium payers, no other insurer operating in 2 the District has this mandated burden. 3 Thev 4 force up rates to cover the cost. This 5 includes rates paid by the 90 percent of members who reside in Maryland and Virginia, 6 7 or elsewhere. Hence, the interest of these other jurisdictions in this proceeding, and 8 9 what its outcome will be. 10 If Appleseed gets its way, and the theory were to prevail, meaning that GHMSI is 11 ordered to pay out a portion of its reserves 12 13 to the public, then a taking of reserves will have occurred in addition to the 5 to 7 14 percent annual contribution that GHMSI makes 15 for taxes, subsidies, and giving. And there 16 will be harm to premium payers. 17 Further, the means to moderate 18 future premiums through earnings on our 19 20 reserves will be sharply reduced. There could 21 scarcely be worse news for premium payers if 22 that should come to pass. In a broader sense,

1 there could scarcely be a more discouraging message to the business community in the 2 District and the region at a time of deep and 3 prolonged financial and economic distress. 4 5 And all of this is occurring before the outlines, contours, and demands of Federal 6 7 Health Reform are known. It appears likely, especially based on what the President said 8 9 last night, that these reforms will place additional taxes and fees on insurers, further 10 adding to the burden on subscribers. 11 12 Just one other further perspective 13 on GHMSI's reserves. In its reports of July 31st and August 31st to the Commissioner, GHMSI 14 presented how it determines overall reserve 15 levels, and how it believes the requirement of 16 MIEAA to attribute a portion of the reserves 17 should be carried out. There is no need to 18 repeat those key points here. But we wish it 19 20 understood that we have carefully reviewed the 21 statements made regarding GHMSI's reserves by 22 Appleseed, ARM, and Mathematica, and find them

1 replete with error, mischaracterization, and 2 misunderstanding. Just a few examples are offered now to point this out. 3 Milliman will speak to this further in its 4 5 testimony in a more complete listing in a separate submission that will be made 6 7 following this hearing. With regard to the statements made 8 9 about the RBC ranges used in Pennsylvania, it 10 is not fair or correct to say, as the 11 Appleseed family of reports do, that the 12 Commonwealth approved RBC ranges that are far 13 below GHMSI's current range. The Pennsylvania legislature adopted ranges for a different 14 purposes, and did, indeed, assign a lower 15 range to the largest plan in the state. 16 However, for the plan that is most like GHMSI 17 in size, Capital Blue Cross and Blue Shield, 18 it approved a range that is virtually 19 20 identical to the range GHMSI currently uses on the advice of Milliman. Nor among a long list 21 of criticisms of Milliman's work is it fair or 22

correct to say that the Milliman report
 excluded FEP, and administrative services
 lines of business that have low-risk profile,
 and investment income. It did not. This is
 flat wrong.

6 The ARM reports that GHMSI surplus 7 was reduced by a large amount due to a large increased in non-admitted assets, implying 8 9 that without this the company would have much larger reserves. As a matter of fact, the 10 11 change had no impact on surplus, and was 12 agreed to by GHMSI's external auditors, and by 13 the DISB in their separate audit of GHMSI's financial filings. 14

The combined criticisms of the 15 16 Milliman report are virtually all unfounded, and we, and they, intend to respond to this on 17 a point by point basis. We do not wish to let 18 stand the misleading impression that 19 20 Appleseed's reports seek to create; namely, that there is no creditable basis for the 21 22 range Milliman developed. The Lewin Group's

review came to essentially the same conclusion
 as Milliman, using a different analytical
 approach.

Lewin, it should be noted, was the 4 5 advisory to the Pennsylvania General Assembly's Legislative Budget and Finance 6 7 Committee in reviewing the surplus levels and company benefit activities of the four Blues 8 9 plans, including a review of the Pennsylvania 10 Insurance Department's order, which established surplus ranges for the Blue plans. 11 Additionally, as a Lewin representative will 12 13 tell you, Lewin has served as an advisor to the District on a variety of health-related 14 issues. 15 It is also worth emphasizing that 16 the mandate to the Commissioner under the 17 MIEAA is not ultimately to judge whether 18 GHMSI's total reserves are excessive, or 19 20 unreasonably large, but just that portion of the reserves attributable to the District. 21 We 22 reiterate our position that it is the

residents of the other jurisdictions who mostly built GHMSI's reserves by incurring over time less in claims where they live, than what they paid in premiums. The portion left to the District is essentially proportionate to the share of the District's portion of total membership.

So, in conclusion, we believe that 8 9 the facts do not fit Appleseed's theory; yet, 10 the theory has shaped much of the perception, and, unfortunately, the law in the District. 11 GHMSI, by command of its Congressional 12 13 charter, exists to serve its subscribers. Ιt best fulfills this command to conduct its 14 business for their benefit by offering the 15 best possible value to its subscribers. 16 То succeed in this purpose, which, at its heart, 17 means providing affordable access to 18 healthcare for subscribers is to serve the 19 20 whole community well. We believe no other 21 interpretation of the charter can be made, nor 22 do we believe that District law can modify, or 1 override the mandate in the charter.

2	GHMSI subscribers are struggling
3	greatly to pay premiums that are escalating
4	faster than their incomes, and their ability
5	to pay for them. This is made worse by the
6	shift of cost to them by the advent of high
7	deductible health plans, and lower
8	contributions from employers, who find
9	themselves struggling to offer coverage at
10	all. Our subscribers are the working backbone
11	of the community, of the District, and of the
12	larger region.
13	If Appleseed's approach is
14	adopted, and premiums are driven up still
15	further, more and more of our subscribers will
16	be unable to afford their premium payments.
17	This does no one any good, and no local
18	government program will be able to offset the
19	harm that results. The reserves that GHMSI
20	maintains are in a range that is appropriate
21	for a plan of its size and characteristics.
22	The Pennsylvania approach validates this.

1 The company, by its own policy, 2 and track record, has never exceeded this range, nor even risen above the midpoint of 3 4 the range. And the company's subscribers 5 already bear a community health reinvestment obligation that is, by far, the highest in the 6 7 nation. And that under any foreseeable scenario will increase, given actions pending 8 9 with the City Council. Certainly, this burden 10 is already far higher than the neighboring jurisdictions GHMSI serves, and far higher 11 than that imposed in Pennsylvania, the 12 13 jurisdiction held up by Appleseed as a model. 14 GHMSI has never sought a confrontation over these issues raised by 15 Appleseed's theory, nor does it now. 16 Ιt believes that the opinions rendered four years 17 ago by both the Commissioner and the Attorney 18 General were essentially on the mark, and the 19 20 company has acted in accordance with this 21 belief. But according to what theory, and in 22 what context will the requirements of MIEAA

1 now be carried out?

2 We seek an interpretation of the MIEAA that is consistent with our charter, one 3 that recognizes that by doing right by our 4 5 subscribers, we do right by the whole community. We intend to continue our 6 7 community giving, which has consistently exceeded all other non-profit organizations 8 9 combined on a regional basis, but we wish to 10 do so under the guidance and oversight of our Board of Trustees, as charged by Congress, not 11 have community giving determined by a 12 13 District-only regulatory process. We believe the company holds no 14 excess in its reserves, particularly with 15 regard to any portion that is attributable to 16 the District. And any order to GHMSI by the 17 Commissioner to expend any portion of its 18 reserves to other than subscribers is nothing 19 20 more than a government taking of subscriber 21 money for District purposes. Worse, it is a 22 taking of subscriber money from neighboring

jurisdictions. So, our view, in closing, can
 be stated simply as follows.

If any legitimate excess is ever 3 found on a different set of facts than those 4 5 present here, it can mean only one thing, that subscribers were overcharged, and are due a 6 7 return of excess. It does not mean that they should have their funds taken based on a 8 9 theory not supported by the charter, or the 10 facts. In such a circumstance, the only 11 remedy the company can and would pursue is to do what its charter commands, to return the 12 13 excess to its subscribers. We hope the MIEAA will be 14

15 implemented in a way that allows us to carry 16 out the central command of our charter, and we 17 are deeply concerned with the regional 18 consequences, if this is not to be the case.

19 Commissioner Purcell, we recognize 20 and respect your new responsibilities to reach 21 a decision on these critical issues in a few 22 weeks time, but for the sake of all involved,

1	mostly for our subscribers, including those in
2	other jurisdictions, we urge you to take care
3	in your decision, and we stand ready to offer
4	any assistance you may need in doing so.
5	In this connection, we strongly
б	suggest that you coordinate your review and
7	decision on the surplus with the Insurance
8	Commissioner of Maryland, who is currently
9	engaged in an in-depth review of GHMSI's
10	surplus. Thank you very much.
11	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Thank you.
12	MR. BURRELL: Okay. With that, I
13	would like to turn it over to Robert Dobson
14	from Milliman.
15	MR. DOBSON: Is that fine?
16	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: That's
17	fine.
18	MR. DOBSON: Okay. Hello. My
19	name is Bob Dobson. I'm a Consulting Actuary
20	with Milliman, and I'm here at the request of
21	our client, Care First. I'm one of the
22	authors of several Milliman reports for Group

Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc., or 1 2 GHMSI, a Blue Cross and Blue Shield licensee that is an affiliate of Care First, Inc., and 3 is domiciled in the District of Columbia. 4 5 Three of these studies are the subject of my comments today, and I will refer 6 7 to these three as the 2005 Optimal Surplus Study, the 2008 Optimal Surplus Study, and the 8 9 Attribution Study, which was just completed in 2009. 10 11 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Excuse me, 12 Mr. Dobson. I'm sorry. Do we have copies of 13 your testimony? Are there copies available? I don't think we have them up here. 14 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Just pause 15 16 the time for one moment, please. COMMISSIONER BARLOW: You don't 17 have one? 18 19 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Do you have 20 prepared written testimony for the rest of the 21 panel, as well? Okay. Thank you. 22 MR. DOBSON: Shall I continue?

1 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: You may 2 continue. 3 Thank you. Although MR. DOBSON: 4 the reports and these studies are lengthy and 5 highly technical, the results can be summarized very simply. In the 2005 Optimal 6 7 Surplus Study, Milliman recommended that GHMSI, which I refer to sometimes as the Plan, 8 9 operate with surplus which was simply the difference between assets and liabilities in 10 a range of 800-1,100 percent of authorized

control level risk-based capital, or RBC, for 12 13 short.

11

14 In the 2008 Optimal Surplus Study, based on changes to GHMSI's risk profile 15 between the two studies, we recommended that 16 the plan operate with surplus in the range of 17 750-1,050 percent of RBC. In the Attribution 18 Study, we opined that a reasonable way to 19 20 allocate surplus, based on our understanding of the legislation that requires attribution, 21 is residency of the subscribers. 22 The

1	calculations resulting from this approach were
2	actually quite involved, but the end result is
3	that some 11.6 percent of GHMSI's surplus
4	would be considered attributable to the
5	District of Columbia.
6	Note that the legislation, as has
7	been said, requires the D.C. Insurance
8	Commissioner to review the portion of GHMSI's
9	surplus that is attributable to the District,
10	and to determine whether the surplus is
11	excessive.
12	The reports related to Optimal
13	Surplus Studies recommend ranges of surplus
14	
	measured by a percentage of RBC. RBC is the
15	measured by a percentage of RBC. RBC is the measuring stick we use, but the ultimate issue
15	measuring stick we use, but the ultimate issue
15 16	measuring stick we use, but the ultimate issue relates to the actual surplus of GHMSI, which,
15 16 17	measuring stick we use, but the ultimate issue relates to the actual surplus of GHMSI, which, as I mentioned, is simply the difference
15 16 17 18	measuring stick we use, but the ultimate issue relates to the actual surplus of GHMSI, which, as I mentioned, is simply the difference between assets and liabilities.
15 16 17 18 19	<pre>measuring stick we use, but the ultimate issue relates to the actual surplus of GHMSI, which, as I mentioned, is simply the difference between assets and liabilities. Before providing a brief</pre>

black box. Our modeling involves a highly
 technical process involving a significant
 degree of detail, which reflects the
 complexity of the financial operations of an
 organization such as GHMSI.

6 It's not a process that can be 7 readily described in a report of the type that we prepared for GHMSI. Nevertheless, we have 8 9 prepared detailed documentation of all 10 assumptions, methods, formulas, and resolves, 11 and have subjected the process to rigorous review among Milliman consultants. We also 12 13 have taken this detailed documentation and presented it to the consultants working with 14 the Maryland Insurance Administration, or the 15 MIA, and the District of Columbia Department 16 of Insurance, Security, and Banking, DISB 17 during on-site meetings at our offices. 18 During these meetings, we 19 20 described our processes in detail, provided 21 copies of documentation, and responded to 22 questions. In addition, we provided follow-up

1 information, as requested. The details of the 2 description that I am going to outline have been addressed in our documentation, and our 3 discussion with these consultants. 4 5 Our approach to the Optimal Surplus Studies involves the identification 6 7 and evaluation of major risk that GHMSI faces now, and into the future. We considered seven 8 9 major risk categories, as follows. First, 10 rating adequacy and fluctuation. That means the risk that actual claims and expenses 11 differ from the assumptions made in setting 12 13 the premium rates. This is the most significant of the risks, but the others are 14 important, as well. 15 The second is the unpaid claim 16 liabilities, and other estimates, which 17 considers the risk that the reported 18 liabilities, which were estimates subject to 19 20 uncertainty, do not make adequate provision for unpaid claims, and other items. 21 22 Third, interest rate, and

portfolio asset value fluctuations involving 1 2 risks associated with the investment portfolio, and the implications for reported 3 surplus levels. 4 5 Four, overhead expense recovery This one reflects the implications of 6 risk. 7 a decrease in business, and the inability to cover overhead in the short term before 8 9 adequate adjustments to the operation can be made. 10 Other business risks, number five, 11 such as the potential for default among large 12 13 administrative services, or ASC groups, leaving GHMSI to pay claims with no premium 14 collection for the group. 15 16 Six, catastrophic events, such as epidemics and pandemics, natural or public 17 health disaster, terrorist attacks. And, 18 seven, provision for unidentified development 19 20 and growth. This reflects the possibility of 21 unanticipated investment needs, such as new 22 systems, or administrative processes,

development of new products, or response to legislation.

1

2

For each of these categories, all 3 4 of which reflect potential cost, it could 5 reduce GHMSI's surplus. We developed a distribution of potential outcomes, both 6 7 favorable, and unfavorable, where applicable. To evaluate the financial implications of 8 9 these possible outcomes, we used an automated 10 process to simulate the tens of millions of possible combinations of all these different 11 assumptions produced by our distributions. 12 То 13 accomplish this, we employ a simulation methodology that's commonly applied in 14 financial modeling. 15 Based on these simulations, we 16 identified the levels of cumulative, multi-17 year losses that represent the 90th, 95th, and 18 98th percentile, respectively, of all possible 19 20 losses. Again, this is looking forward. The 21 90th percentile, for example, means that 90

22 percent of the simulated losses are at or

below that level. These identified loss
 amounts were used to develop surplus targets
 that meet our criteria, and I'll describe
 those criteria now.

5 The first one is that we wanted to provide a very high likelihood that the 6 7 overall surplus level for GHMSI will remain above the Blue Cross/Blue Shield Association 8 9 early warning monitoring threshold of 375 10 percent of RBC. This would be even after a particularly adverse period of multi-year 11 operating losses, underwriting losses, and/or 12 13 capital market losses. In order to meet this goal, the surplus target must be high enough 14 to cover 90-95 percent of all the projected 15 loss cycles without allowing the surplus level 16 to drop below the early warning monitoring 17 threshold, the 375 percent. 18

19 And then, second, and also very 20 important, we're going to assure with virtual 21 certainty that surplus will remain above the 22 PCBSA loss of trademark threshold of 200

percent of RBC, even if a severely adverse period of multi-year losses were experienced. In order to meet this goal, the surplus target must be sufficiently higher to cover 98 percent of all projected loss cycles, without allowing the surplus level to drop below the loss of trademark threshold.

We also analyzed historical 8 9 underwriting loss cycles for GHMSI in a 10 comparison set of Blue Cross/Blue Shield We did not use these historical 11 plans. results directly in our analysis, though. 12 13 Rather, we used them to evaluate the reasonableness of the cycle losses developed 14 through the simulation process that I just 15 described. 16

Based on a comparison, we found that the historical loss cycles were materially greater in severity than those produced by our simulations. From this, we concluded that our simulated loss cycles were reasonable, considering the recent changes in

health plan loss patterns and operating
 environment.

In order to carry out our surplus 3 modeling, we developed an initialized pro 4 5 forma projection model, which is based on GHMSI's own internal financial forecasting. 6 7 This model reflects the overall financial characteristics of the company's operation, 8 9 including the profits generated by the Federal 10 Employee program, the treatment of AFC business, and the investment income generated 11 by surplus, and other funds. 12 13 We then developed the surplus target range by effectively stress testing the 14 selected loss cycles against a range of 15 surplus thresholds. This allows us to assess 16 the surplus levels that are necessary to 17 withstand the cycle losses. 18 19 Let me emphasize that the reports 20 and these studies say a lot more than this, and a thorough reading of each of them is 21 22 necessary to understand them. I'm not going

to attempt to summarize the major points of 1 these studies, because it would impossible to 2 do them justice in the allotted time. Each of 3 these reports, of course, is available to the 4 5 public, and I will, of course, be happy to respond to questions related to the reports, 6 7 either following this testimony, or following the hearing. 8 9 These assignments for Care First 10 and GHMSI are very important to me, personally, and to Milliman. I want to make 11 it clear that we don't take our 12 13 responsibilities to the Board of Trustees of GHMSI, and, ultimately, GHMSI subscribers, the 14 public, and the regulators, lightly. Our work 15 on all three of these studies involved many 16 hours of detailed financial analysis, 17 interviewing all levels of management, and 18 asking many probing questions. All of our 19 20 work was thoroughly peer reviewed. This is a 21 long-established practice at Milliman, 22 resulting in more products that involve at

1 least two fully qualified professionals. 2 In the case of the 2008 Optimal Surplus Study, five fully qualified 3 professionals were involved. 4 Everv 5 assumption, formula, and conclusion was discussed, understood, and agreed upon by a 6 7 minimum of two of these consultants, and in many cases as many as four. We at Milliman 8 9 are proud of the work that we've done on these 10 assignments, and we stand solidly behind our 11 work. I'll give you more background on 12 13 myself, and on Milliman in a minute, but first I want to mention a group that I chaired way 14 back in the late `70s, and early `80s, showing 15 my age here, and this was a Technical Advisory 16 Committee to the NAIC, the National 17 Association of Insurance Commissioners, on the 18 subject of Loss Reserves and Contingency 19 20 Reserves, or Surplus for Hospital and Medical Service Corporations. That includes Blue 21 22 Cross and Blue Shield plans, similar entities,

and HMOs, or health maintenance organizations.
 This, of course, was well before risk-based
 capital was implemented.

The first conclusion from our 4 5 report that was presented to and adopted by the NAIC read, in part, "The nature and 6 7 magnitude of the risk will vary for each corporation, but the risk must be recognized, 8 9 and provision must always be made to minimize the ultimate risk of financial failure. 10 One of themes was that no rule of thumb level for 11 appropriate surplus could be developed. 12 13 Rather, the specific characteristics of each entity must be studied and evaluated, and an 14 appropriate range of surplus developed." 15 This is what we still believe in how we approached 16 our work for GHMSI, and for the other entities 17 for which we provide consulting services. 18

Many Blue Cross and Blue Shield
plans have encountered financial difficulty
over the years, including GHMSI. While only
one Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan has ever gone

all the way to bankruptcy, many HMOs, and similar organizations have. I've been involved in efforts to resolve many of these situations, and many of them I've studied after-the-fact.

6 When a corporation of this type 7 goes bankrupt, the consequences are dire. Real people suffer, subscribers, doctors, 8 9 hospital employees, business owners, and 10 others all lose money, coverage, or access to In fact, I don't think it's an 11 treatment. overstatement to say that the public at-large 12 13 is disadvantaged when that happens.

I've actually sat in courtrooms 14 and galleries with galleries of subscribers, 15 and providers waiting to hear a judge declare 16 how the limited proceeds from bankruptcy will 17 be distributed. I've sat with Insurance 18 Commissioners while they agonized over a 19 20 decision among many undesirable alternatives to deal with a potential insolvency. I've 21 observed first-hand that there are many worse 22

problems to have than a financially stable
 Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan.

I'll now give you some background 3 on myself, not Milliman. I'm a graduate of 4 5 MIT and fully accredited actuary holding professional designations of Federal August 6 7 Society of Actuaries, member of the American Academy of Actuaries. I first joined 8 9 Milliman, which was then known as Milliman and 10 Robertson, in 1973. I've been a consulting actuary ever since, with the exception of 11 three years that I spent in the early 1980s 12 13 serving as Chief Financial Officer of Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama. 14 In addition to chairing the NAIC 15 Advisory Committee that I mentioned earlier, 16 I've served as President of two actuarial 17 organizations, and as a Vice President of the 18 American Academy of Actuaries. I also served 19 20 on a Technical Advisory Group on Medicare, and was a member of a Blue Ribbon Panel on 21 22 Solvency for the American Academy of

1 I've been involved in regulatory Actuaries. issues for many years, and consulted for at 2 least 12 different State Insurance Departments 3 over the years, as well as the NAIC. 4 5 In addition, and in particular 6 relevance to my understanding of the operating 7 environment of GHMSI, I've served as a consulting actuary for the Blue Cross/Blue 8 9 Shield Association and Federal Employee 10 program for over 15 years now. Prior to that, 11 I was one of the principal authors of a comprehensive study of the Federal Employees 12 13 Health Benefits program. That study was performed directly for the United States 14 Office of Personnel Management. So, that's a 15 quick description of my background and 16 qualifications. 17 18 Milliman has some 200 fully qualified health actuaries, many with equally 19 20 strong or stronger credentials than mine, in 21 a variety of sub-specialties. In fact, one of 22 my partners led the group that developed the

1 formulas and factors currently used by the 2 NAIC for health-based risk capital calculations. Founded in 1947 by Wendel 3 Milliman, the firm just announced the opening 4 5 of our 50th office worldwide in San Juan, Puerto Rico. Milliman has over 1,100 6 7 qualified consultants and actuaries in all specialties. We're independent, and we're 8 9 beholding to no outside ownership or shareholders. The firm is owned by 300 10 principals, each of whom is actively employed 11 with the firm. 12 13 We believe that this ownership and our financial structure allow us to attract 14 and retain the best talent there is. I think 15 it's safe to say that we are recognized in the 16 healthcare industry as a premier actuarial 17 firm. Our opinions are our own, and they're 18 formed on the basis of absolute integrity. 19 20 We work for the majority of Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans, and other health 21

22 insurance companies, and perform numerous

1	aurolug our lustions in addition to advising
T	surplus evaluations, in addition to advising
2	companies on surplus-related issues. We have
3	an outstanding reputation that we strive
4	diligently to protect.
5	I want to close by saying a few
б	words about the criticisms that have been
7	directed at Milliman, primarily by D.C.
8	Appleseed, and the actuaries and Actuarial
9	Risk Management, or ARM. Many, if not all of
10	the assertions made are simply wrong, whether
11	our of lack of understanding, or otherwise.
12	Here are some examples of the errors,
13	misunderstandings, and mischaracterizations
14	contained in the report.
15	First, it's not true that we
16	exclude gains from the Federal Employee
17	program, or investment income on surplus, and
18	other funds. These items are directly
19	reflected in our analysis as an offset to
20	potential underwriting losses on non-FEB
21	business.
22	Second, we do not directly use the

prior loss cycle experience. The loss cycle 1 2 assumptions that we used are substantially lower than the historical cycles, as 3 4 demonstrated in tables on page 51 of the 5 report on the 2008 Optimal Surplus Study. Ιf we had used the prior loss cycles, our 6 7 cumulative loss scenarios would have been higher, resulting in higher target surplus 8 9 levels.

10 Three, we can demonstrate that our 11 premium growth assumptions are consistent with 12 past experience. It appears to us that in 13 citing a 7 to 8 percent growth rate, ARM may have failed to consider the premium growth of 14 Care First, Blue Choice, GHMSI's jointly owned 15 subsidiary. ARM states that Milliman most 16 likely used a four-year loss period, and 17 criticizes our use of four, rather than three 18 In fact, we used both three and four-19 years. year loss periods. But, in Milliman's 20 methodology, the four-year loss period 21 22 actually produces a smaller surplus

requirement than the three-year period,
 because cumulative loss in the projection is
 the same prior to pricing margins, whereas,
 there is one additional year of margin to
 offset that loss.

6 Five, we tested the use of an 8 7 percent growth rate with a three-year loss period, which ARM estimates would reduce the 8 9 surplus target ranges by 22.5 to 26 percent. 10 We found that these assumptions would not change the lower end of our range. 11 In any 12 event, we stand by our assumption, and do not 13 believe that 7 to 8 percent is a reasonable growth rate assumption. 14 Six, Appleseed and ARM 15 characterize the Blue Cross/Blue Shield 16 Association, or BCBSA, early warning 17 monitoring level of 375 percent RBC as nothing 18 more than some additional reporting 19 requirements, implying that its inclusion of 20 21 the key measurement of financial soundness by

22 Milliman is inappropriate. Their position is

1 overly simplistic representation of the 2 insurance marketplace sensitivity to having coverage with a financially strong company, 3 4 especially given the events of the past year. 5 Furthermore, they underestimate the responsibility that BCBSA has to all Blue 6 7 plans to aggressively protect the value of one of the most respected and recognized brands in 8 9 the nation. 10 Seven, Appleseed mischaracterizes the conclusions of the Pennsylvania Insurance 11 Commissioner with regard to the analysis 12 13 carried out by Milliman. Appleseed claims that the Pennsylvania Commissioner, "rejected 14 Milliman's methodology." That simply is not 15 Rather, the Pennsylvania Commissioner 16 so. merely disagreed with a few of the assumptions 17 Milliman used, out of many. Appleseed has 18 quoted quotes from the Pennsylvania report out 19 20 of context, to improperly suggest that this constituted a wholesale rejection. 21 22 The Pennsylvania Commissioner did

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

1 disagree with Milliman over whether to account 2 for low probability, high loss events like terrorist attacks. She concluded that it was 3 not appropriate to do so, because, "They are 4 5 most efficiently prepared for through a combination of government, industry-wide, 6 7 societal, and individual company-specific initiatives." We respectfully question that 8 9 conclusion. 10 Where appropriate, other 11 assumptions that were questioned by the Commissioner in Pennsylvania have been dealt 12 13 with through refinements to our methodology, as applied in the 2008 GHMSI Optimal Surplus 14 Study. 15 Milliman intends to vigorously 16 defend our work. We stand behind it. We will 17 provide further detail in the post-hearing 18 submission process. Although I've been 19 20 involved in many adversarial proceedings over 21 the years, I must say that the attacks leveled 22 against us in this case are the most

unfounded, and unprofessional that I've seen
 in my 40-year career.

Questions about our work are 3 certainly welcome, but uninformed allegations 4 5 presented as fact do a disservice to the Commissioner, the District Council, GHMSI 6 7 subscribers, and the citizens of the District, as this important, but complex matter is 8 9 considered. Thank you for your time and 10 attention, and I'll be happy to respond to any 11 questions at the appropriate time. 12 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Thank you. 13 MR. CARLSON: Hi, my name is Tom I'm an FSA and an NMA, and I work 14 Carlson. for the Lewin Group. 15 The Lewin Group, Lewin is a member 16 -- is a premier national health and human 17 services consulting firm, which has delivered 18 objective analysis, and strategic counsel to 19 20 public agencies, non-profit organizations, and 21 private companies across the United States 22 since 1970. The value we place on accuracy,

independence, and objectivity is reflected in
 the trust our clients place in the Lewin
 Group.

As a subsidiary of Ingenix, and 4 5 its parent, UnitedHealth Group, the Lewin Group safeguards its integrity by maintaining 6 7 separate business and technical practices, while operating under editorial independence. 8 9 We have delivered objective analysis and insight to 39 states, and the District of 10 Columbia on issues related to Medicaid, health 11 insurance coverage, health reform, long-term 12 13 care, and other related issues. We also have extensive experience working with private 14 payers, and federal agencies, including the 15 Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, 16 CMS, the Department of Defense, DOD, on a wide 17 range of health and human services priorities. 18 Finally, we have conducted 19 20 projects on behalf of the District of Columbia, or D.C., such as our work in 21 22 assisting the D.C. Department of Health on

D.C. Alliance, which is a public program aimed 1 at providing insurance coverage for D.C. 2 residents not qualifying for Medicaid. 3 We have several other projects 4 5 currently underway in the District that are assisting both private and public 6 7 organizations in improving children's access to healthcare, and education. 8 9 With regard to the issue at hand, 10 Lewin has extensive experience in evaluating, and analyzing insurance surplus. We assisted 11 the Pennsylvania General Assemblies 12 13 Legislative Finance and Budget Committee in reviewing the surplus levels and community 14 benefit activities of the four Blue Cross/Blue 15 16 Shield plans operating in Pennsylvania. This assessment included a review 17 of the determination and order issued by the 18 Pennsylvania Insurance Department, which 19 20 implemented target surplus ranges for the BCBS 21 plans operating in that state. 22 We have worked on behalf of the

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

Page 77

1 Insurance Commissioners in Rhode Island and Washington to assist and provide expert 2 guidance in evaluating options for regulating 3 surplus. We've also worked on behalf of 4 5 several private health plans, primarily, Blue Cross/Blue Shield plans, which have required 6 7 our assistance in either addressing the regulator concerns about surplus, or in 8 9 establishing internal surplus targets. Our experience working for both regulators, and 10 insurers, provides us with a unique 11 12 perspective on how to evaluate surplus, as 13 well as public policy options for regulating 14 surplus. I am here to explain Lewin's 15 findings regarding some questions that GHMSI 16 asked us to comment us, as well as comment on 17 treatment of surplus limits in other states, 18 and conclusions from the work we did for the 19

20 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Before diving 21 in, it is important to define both surplus, 22 and risk-based capital, or RBC.

1	Surplus is generally defined as an
2	insurer's retained earnings, or funds on hand
3	to protect the company and its customers
4	against adverse business conditions, and to
5	support investment needs. Since surplus
6	amounts do not provide perspective on a health
7	plan's risk profile and organizational
8	structure, state regulator commonly use RBC to
9	assess an insurer's level of risk.
10	RBC is a measure generally used by
11	regulators to establish the minimal amount of
12	capital appropriate for a health plan to
13	support its overall business operations during
14	a period of adverse conditions. In D.C, if
15	RBC drops below 200 percent, an insurer is
16	required to present a plan to the D.C. DISB
17	for improving its surplus. Blue Cross/Blue
18	Shield plans have similar, but more stringent,
19	RBC requirements imposed by the Blue
20	Cross/Blue Shield Association. The
21	Association requirements generally call for a
22	licensee to maintain an RBC ratio of at least

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

_	
1	375 percent as a threshold below which
2	additional reporting and monitoring with
3	regard to surplus levels is required.
4	The 375 percent level to maintain
5	good standing within the Blue Cross/Blue
6	Shield Association, is important to keep the
7	trust and confidence of employers and
8	subscribers who place a premium on the
9	financial stability of their vendors and
10	insurers.
11	The Lewin Group's findings
12	regarding GHMSI. I will now discuss Lewin's
13	findings regarding Care First's D.C.
14	affiliate, GHMSI. Lewin was retained by Care
15	First to perform an independent assessment of
16	the RBC suggested by Milliman for GHMSI.
17	Lewin produced a report with findings in
18	response to three key questions. Those key
19	questions are, question one, is the approach
20	used and the range of RBC set forth by the
21	Milliman Report appropriate? Number two, is
22	RBC an appropriate mechanism for assessing
1	

upper limits of insurer's surplus? 1 And, three, is the concept of attributing excess 2 surplus to a geographic area reasonable? 3 4 To answer these questions, Lewin 5 relied on several sources of information to conduct this assessment. First, we relied on 6 7 our experience in having conducted similar analyses on behalf of states and other health 8 9 insurers. Second, we used statutory financial statements as the basis for much of our review 10 of GHMSI's financial condition. 11 Finally, we 12 used publicly available reports and documents, 13 such as Milliman's December 4, 2008 report to Care First executives, and the documents 14 publicly available on the D.C. Department of 15 Insurance, Securities, and Banking website. 16 We did not perform extensive 17 modeling, or GHMSI-specific research for this 18 analysis, but we did carefully review 19 20 Milliman's report, and we did independent testing with our own models and tools to 21 22 verify that Milliman's outputs were within

1 reasonable range.

2	Our findings from our review are
3	as follows. First, our review of the
4	development of surplus targets set forth by
5	the Milliman Report suggests that the approach
6	and range of potential targets developed is
7	generally reasonable based on our
8	understanding of their model, and our
9	consideration of their assumptions, as
10	discussed in their report.
11	We have several models that we
12	might apply, exercises such as loss cycle
13	model can produce a range of answers based on
14	input assumptions, and output parameters.
15	Therefore, our answers may differ as to the
16	precise RBC percentages recommended. However,
17	the model Milliman applied is consistent with
18	an approach that we would consider. The
19	outcomes do not differ significantly from
20	those we might expect, and the choice of
21	probability for sufficiency among potential
22	outcomes seems appropriate. Specifically, the

90 to 95 percent confidence that surplus would
 not go below the 375 percent RBC levels, and
 the 98 percent confidence that surplus would
 not go below the 200 percent RBC levels.

5 Here, I would like to make a 6 comment on our experience with Milliman. As 7 actuaries and consultants, we often encounter Milliman both as a competitor, and a colleague 8 9 in our client engagements. It is our 10 experience that Milliman always maintains its professionalism and technical competence, and 11 as a firm, it is highly respected in the 12 13 actuarial arena, as Bob just discussed. Their tools and models are well known and respected 14 throughout the industry, in our experience. We 15 were very taken aback by the unprofessional 16 nature of some of the commentary filed by 17 others. 18

Second, the RBC calculation was never designed to regulate the upper limit of insurer surplus. RBC calculations should be applied as an element in determining minimum

regulatory solvency consistent with the 1 2 purpose for which they were developed. In recent years, regulators and insurers alike 3 have used RBC beyond its original intent. 4 5 Insurers want to provide an adequate margin of safety, so that the company can endure periods 6 7 of adverse experience, without triggering any form of regulatory intervention, while 8 9 maintaining operational vitality, and the 10 ability to nimbly respond to unfolding market conditions. 11 12 Many insurers, including GHMSI, 13 use RBC as one tool by which that margin of safety can be measured. However, the use of 14 RBC as a regulatory mechanism is much more 15 controversial, as it can lead to several 16 unintended consequences within the 17 marketplace, which we will discuss later in 18 our testimony. 19 Third, the attribution of any 20 21 excess surplus to a geographic area is not a 22 straightforward, or easily determined outcome.

Regarding other states' actions, I now will 1 2 discuss other states' actions. Two states currently enforce upper limits on the amount 3 4 of surplus Blue Cross/Blue Shield companies 5 can hold, while two other states have recently repealed surplus limits. Minnesota repealed 6 7 its surplus cap in 2005, when it enacted NAIC's Model Health RBC Act. Hawaii repealed 8 9 its cap, which applied to all non-profit The two states 10 insurers several years ago. that currently enforce upper limits on surplus 11 are Pennsylvania, and Michigan. I'll discuss 12 13 Pennsylvania in more detail later.

Michigan, the other state, passed 14 a law in 2003 that stipulates that the Blue 15 Cross/Blue Shield insurer operating in that 16 state shall not maintain an RBC ratio greater 17 than 1,000 percent. A few other states have 18 19 considered action to set upper surplus limits. 20 Three to four years ago, several states, 21 including Rhode Island, Washington, Minnesota, 22 North Carolina, and New Jersey considered

action to either limit the accumulation of
 surplus, or force the plans to draw down on
 surplus levels. There were two common themes
 that led to this interest.

First, each state has a Blue 5 Cross/Blue Shield plan, and those Blues plans 6 7 started seeing large increases in their earnings. Second, the economy softened at the 8 9 same time that healthcare costs swelled. This 10 increased the numbers of uninsured, and made it harder for those having insurance to afford 11 Some stakeholders argued that the Blue 12 it. 13 Cross/Blue Shield plans in each state should give up portions of their surpluses to help 14 make health coverage more affordable. 15 However, in each instance, these states 16 elected not to set upper limits on insurers 17 surplus levels. In some instances, changes in 18 the underwriting cycle limited future surplus 19 20 levels, and as the surplus levels declined, 21 other matters became more pressing. In other 22 instances, such as Rhode Island, the Insurance Commissioner has been using more traditional
 mechanisms for managing insurer surplus, such
 as denying premium rate increases.

Another reason often cited for not 4 5 placing limits on surplus is the potential for market disruption. When a regulation limits 6 7 the amount of surplus that a company can hold with a potential of losing their surplus, 8 9 they likely will respond by lowering premium 10 rates temporarily to get rid of the excess. The resulting lower premiums would likely harm 11 other carriers in the market, and discourage 12 13 new carriers from entering the market. If limits were followed by a prolonged decline in 14 underwriting profit, the solvency of the 15 company may also be threatened, which would 16 impact the ability of providers in the market 17 to be reimbursed for services, as well as 18 disrupt the subscribers of the health plan. 19 20 Most recently, in addition to the focus on GHMSI's surplus, we have seen renewed 21 22 interest in insurer surplus in a few states,

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

1 including Massachusetts and Washington. This new focus is not surprising, given the state 2 budgetary shortfalls, as well as the current 3 economic crisis. However, much of this recent 4 5 scrutiny is on insuring the solvency of health insurers, and the affordability of healthcare 6 7 to subscribers, rather than setting maximum levels on surplus. 8

9 The Pennsylvania background. As 10 previously mentioned, Pennsylvania is one of the two states that actively set limits on 11 surplus accumulation. Lewin was engaged by 12 13 Pennsylvania's Legislative Budget and Finance Committee to examine options and alternatives 14 available to the Commonwealth with respect to 15 the regulation, oversight, and disposition of 16 reserves and surpluses of health insurers. 17

Lewin's report focuses on other states' surplus regulation, the capping of surplus, determining an optimal amount of surplus, and action needed regarding Pennsylvania Blue plans' surplus.

1	In February 2005, the Pennsylvania
2	Insurance Department defined acceptable ranges
3	for the Blue plans' level of surplus capital,
4	giving a lower range of 550 to 750 percent of
5	RBC for the largest two plans. Those are
6	Independence and High Mark, and giving a
7	higher range of 750 to 950 for the two smaller
8	plans, Capital Blue Cross, and Blue Cross of
9	Northeastern Pennsylvania.
10	None of the plans were above the
11	range. However, three of the plans were
12	deemed as having sufficient capital, which
13	precluded these three plans from including
14	risk and contingency factors in future rate
15	requests. In other words, the plan's
16	moderated rate increases to their subscribers
17	in light of their healthy reserve levels.
18	The Commonwealth also executed an
19	agreement on community health reinvestment
20	with the four Blue plans, setting forth a
21	program by which the Blues pledged somewhat
22	more than 1 percent of their premium revenues

to community benefits for the years 2005 to
 2010.

Making a high level comparison of 3 the Pennsylvania Blue plans with GHMSI, we 4 5 observed that Capital Blue Cross, CBC, is the most similar to GHMSI with respect to premium 6 7 and enrollment. Of course, there are a number of additional risk factors and individual 8 9 market considerations that should be 10 considered when comparing surplus needs, but GHMSI is a similar-sized plan in terms of 11 premium and enrollment, and they are currently 12 13 within the Pennsylvania recommended surplus range for Capital Blue Cross in Pennsylvania. 14 Lewin's Pennsylvania analysis 15 concluded that the Commissioner's ruling set 16 reasonable bounds on the Blue plans' 17 accumulation of surplus. We found that it is 18 not likely that the ruling will disrupt the 19 20 Pennsylvania insurance market, as the process set forth for managing surplus offers both the 21 Blues and the Commissioner sufficient latitude 22

1 to act prudently.

2	The upper limits on surplus that
3	the Commissioner chose, again, it's 950 for
4	Blue Cross of Northeastern Pennsylvania and
5	Capital Blue Cross, and 750 for High Mark and
6	Independence Blue Cross, will slow premium
7	growth somewhat, because no risk contingencies
8	are allowed, but not trigger large premium
9	reductions that might have disrupted the
10	competitive landscape.
11	For Blue plans found to have
12	sufficient reserves, the Department will not
13	approve premium rates which include any risk
14	and contingency factors. This policy change
15	should have the effect of slowing premium
16	growth, while still assuring a reasonably
17	competitive market.
18	The Commonwealth's surplus limits
19	also reflect the fact that less diversified
20	plans experience more volatility with respect
21	to their annual profits and losses, and,
22	therefore, holding a higher reserve is

1 appropriate.

2	Furthermore, we found that it
3	would be unproductive to require a Blue plan
4	to return surplus to customers due to
5	potential market disruption, which I discussed
6	above. Prudent accumulation of surplus within
7	reasonable limits, plus long-term rate
8	stabilization for customers, is both sound
9	business strategy for Blues, and good public
10	policy.
11	Our quantitative analysis suggests
12	that the surpluses of the four Pennsylvania
13	Blue plans could be justified in order to
14	maintain a high degree of confidence that they
15	could withstand an extended period of adverse
16	underwriting experience.
17	In summary, Milliman's approach
18	and range seem reasonable. RBC is not an
19	appropriate mechanism for assessing upper
20	limits of insurer's surplus, and attributing
21	surplus to a specific geographic region is not
22	a straightforward process.

1 In closing, we appreciate the 2 opportunity to provide testimony to you today on this issue, and look forward to any 3 4 questions you may have on our report, or on 5 our experience working on this important issue with other states. 6 7 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Thank you. Does the conclude the prepared testimony? 8 9 Thank you. I'm going to start with you, Mr. Burrell. 10 You stated in your testimony that 11 in your opinion, GHMSI's charter mission is to 12 13 provide healthcare coverage to its subscribers, and that your duty is to those 14 subscribers. I think you said it was simple, 15 and it wasn't as direct as that. 16 In light of the media, however, 17 how do you, and the mandate, specifically, to 18 engage in community health reinvestment, how 19 20 do you reconcile that new obligation, or that continuing obligation in some people's mind? 21 MR. BURRELL: Well, I think the 22

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

Page 93

1 thought we would have on that is that the -as I said in my testimony, the Board of the 2 company, the Board of Trustees, has to weigh 3 4 how much it gives to the community to a 5 variety of worthy causes, and there are many, versus how those dollars otherwise could have 6 7 been spent for the benefit of the subscribers. And in doing so, they have to weigh the 8 9 affordability of coverage, and the access to 10 care that subscribers, themselves, have. As a matter of record, the level 11 12 of giving of the company in the community has 13 been rising. And over the last 20 months since I have been CEO, has been rising 14 steadily, but it was rising before I got to 15 16 the company. And, so, the company has done substantial, and intends to continue to do, 17 substantial community giving. A lot of it is 18 for universities, for low-income people who 19 20 are otherwise unable to afford coverage, and for what we call catalytic giving, which is 21 22 fostering, or sponsoring approaches that in

the long-term help, or encourage the control
 of healthcare costs.

3 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Can you 4 tell me about the Board Mission and Oversight 5 Committee, how they function, what their role 6 is?

7 MR. BURRELL: Yes. There is a 8 committee of the Board composed of 9 representatives of both GHMSI and CFMI, and 10 there is a dedicated staff that reviews a 11 series of funding requests. We get hundreds 12 of funding requests in any given year.

13 The perspective that is brought by the Board Committee is to look at those kinds 14 of community health reinvestments that would 15 likely have the greatest beneficial impact on 16 the community. So, we have developed, or they 17 have developed a, what we call our giving 18 triangle. And where the bulk of the giving 19 20 is, is on the base of the triangle. That base is, essentially, mostly oriented towards, or 21 22 completely oriented towards subsidies for low-

1 income people who would otherwise not have 2 access, or subsidies on premiums that make healthcare more affordable. This is true in 3 4 Maryland, this is true in the District. 5 And the second biggest area of 6 giving is on catalytic types of changes in the 7 system. So, for example, we sponsored a electronic connection between academic center, 8 9 medical, intensive care units with community-10 based hospitals. We enabled that to happen. The idea was that the real specialists on a 11 lot of cases for ICU cases are best in the 12 13 academic centers, and a lot of the community hospitals didn't have these capabilities. By 14 connecting them electronically, enabling the 15

16 experts in the academic center to see what was 17 going on in the ICU that we could get better 18 care outcomes, and that, hopefully, what this 19 would also do is improve costs results. I 20 just use this as an example. 21 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Right.

21 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Right. 22 MR. BURRELL: We sponsored that in

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

the hope that this would help improve the 1 2 healthcare system over a long period of time. It wasn't specific to our subscribers. It was 3 4 generic to the healthcare system, as a whole. 5 So, what the Board Committee does, is it looks at funding requests, or can initiate funding 6 7 for projects that are consistent with these general parameters. 8 9 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Is there a 10 budget determined by the Committee, or a -MR. BURRELL: 11 There is in the Financial -- yes. In the financial plan of 12 13 the company, and by that I mean the entire regional company, CFI, the parent. 14 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Right. So, 15 this is something that's set out at the 16 beginning of each budget year, or fiscal year? 17 MR. BURRELL: It is, actually, 18 So, the -- as I say, the giving levels 19 yes. 20 have gone up. Our target for 2009 is \$46 21 million in the region, and we are on pace to 22 do \$46 million worth of community giving.

Each year, obviously, is looked at as part of 1 2 the overall budget cycle as to what is the appropriate number. If I remember correctly 3 from last year, it was more in the \$40 million 4 5 range, and prior to that, in the 30 something million range, so it has been climbing. 6 7 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: So, do you feel that by virtue of this Board, and the 8 9 services that they provide, and I assume there's a workflow where decisions are 10 arrived, and they sort of describe those 11 12 decisions. Is there anyone at the executive 13 level sitting on this Board, or is it --Committee, rather? 14 MR. BURRELL: The Committee is 15 only -- that can make the decision is only 16 Board members. 17 18 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Okay. 19 MR. BURRELL: However, the 20 Committee -- I go to every single Committee 21 meeting. 22 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Okay.

1	MR. BURRELL: And our Senior Vice
2	President for Community Affairs, Maria Tilden,
3	does, as well, and Staff that support the
4	Committee. So, what is done is a fairly
5	extensive process of preparation goes on
6	before the Committee is asked to make a
7	decision.
8	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: So, in your
9	opinion, Mr. Burrell, do you feel that the
10	Board has developed a clear enough framework
11	to support its charitable mission?
12	MR. BURRELL: I actually believe
13	that the Board has developed a very clear
14	framework that has guided its giving. What we
15	didn't want to do, and I think what the Board
16	didn't want to do is take what one would
17	consider to be dear subscriber money, and not
18	know what focus would have best impact for the
19	general community. Where can you have the
20	biggest effect, positive effect?
21	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: But why
22	such loud and consistent criticism then of

your level of investment in the community? 1 2 I think -- my own MR. BURRELL: perception, and I have been with the company 3 20 months, and one of the reasons, I might 4 5 add, that I came to the company, perhaps the principal reason I did, was by being attracted 6 7 to its mission, and, particularly, to its notfor-profit mission. Could it have a positive 8 9 effect in the community? I believed it could, and should, and that if I were ever the CEO, 10 I would be dedicated to that proposition. 11 12 My perception is that the 13 experiences of the company going back to the failed well point attempt, and perhaps prior 14 to that, linger on, and color the opinions of 15 people, in some cases, key decision makers, 16 about what the company is all about, and do 17 not adequately take into account the degree to 18 which the company has actually changed, and 19 20 the seriousness with which the company takes its mission. 21

22

I know every Board member

personally, but I specifically know very well 1 2 the Board members that are on the Mission 3 Oversight Committee, and I know that they all take it very, very seriously. 4 5 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: How would you, in your own words, characterize GHMSI's 6 7 duty to the residents that purchase the products? 8 9 MR. BURRELL: That purchase our 10 products? 11 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: That's 12 right. 13 MR. BURRELL: Which means our 14 insurance plans. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Your 15 16 insurance plans. 17 MR. BURRELL: Yes. 18 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Correct. 19 MR. BURRELL: That is our principal duty, and the whole goal of the 20 company is to give them the highest possible 21 22 value, which, essentially, means broad and

affordable coverage with the broadest possible 1 access to network providers, and the strongest 2 possible service when they do get ill. I have 3 4 said to our own management team, our whole 5 philosophy would be -- mine, all the way down through the company is that when you need us 6 7 most, we are most there for you. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Let's talk 8 9 about surplus for a minute. In general terms, 10 can you explain the need for surplus at a Board level, as determined by the Board of 11 Directors? 12 13 MR. BURRELL: Yes. The surplus level of the company, or the reserves of the 14 company are really there, as has been said 15 already, for, principally, the protection of 16 the subscribers, but it's also the only source 17 of working capital the company has. And it's 18 there to take into account, and assure that 19 20 the company is there to pay the bills. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Other than 21 22 to address regulatory issues, has the Board

ever formally sought to determine an 1 2 appropriate level of surplus for GHMSI? MR. BURRELL: Yes, they have. 3 4 This has been a major area of attention for 5 the Board, and to that end, they have developed, and adopted, and approved a formal 6 7 policy on reserves, and the whole essence of which I can capsulize very briefly, which is 8 that the Board seeks to have the company hold 9 10 an optimal level of reserves, a reserve range that is considered to be neither too much, nor 11 too little. And that if it appeared to the 12 13 Board that by increasing rates the company were to build surplus that was heading towards 14 the upper end of that range, or even outside 15 of that range, it would moderate or not make 16 rate filings. It would bring down the reserve 17 18 first.

19 If, on the other hand, the company 20 were to drop below the reserve range that was 21 optimal, then it would take another approach, 22 which is to gradually, as gradually as is possible, increase premiums to get it back
 into the range, and only into the range, not
 above the range.

As a matter of fact, the company 4 has operated at the midpoint or less of the 5 range that has been established since I've 6 7 been with the company, and for basically the entire last decade. So, the problem I think 8 9 the Board faces, and these are very dedicated 10 community people, is how does one know enough to establish what the optimal range is? 11

12 In the case of our Board, they did 13 not want to, and Mark is our Chief Financial Officer, say that they would determine that 14 level simply by what the management said. 15 We have actuaries on our staff, simply by what 16 those actuaries said. And it wasn't so much 17 that they were questioning the competency of 18 those actuaries, as to say rather that because 19 of the complexity of it, that it was wise to 20 21 get the best possible advice you could get 22 externally.

1	We believe that the one with the
2	best reputation in this field, and the one
3	that is most creditable and established in
4	this field, independent of us, they do believe
5	this, is Milliman. So, they retained
6	Milliman, and they asked Milliman, given all
7	the risks that the company faces, and all of
8	its needs, and the possibilities of unforeseen
9	events, and so on, what would you say to us is
10	the optimum range we should have? And
11	Milliman came back first in 2005, they were
12	asked to come back again in 2008, and they did
13	tell the Board what the range out to be, and
14	they told the Board what the reasons for that
15	range ought to be.
16	The Board then had to consider all
17	that in light of the circumstances of the
18	company, and what they wound up doing was
19	formally adopting that range. What they
20	thought they did, and this is very important,
21	is they thought that it would guide two
22	things. It would guide what the rate increase

requests or not would be of the company, 1 because they never wanted the company to build 2 up too much surplus, or, on the other side, it 3 4 would gradually give them guidance as to how 5 much they ought to increase rates, as moderately as possible. And it would also 6 7 guide them on how much community health reinvestment to make. So, when I say that the 8 9 Board adopted a plan in 2009, that the company would give \$46 million, it was done in the 10 context of well, where is the company's 11 Is it high, or low against an 12 reserve? 13 optimal range? And by paying that, what would it do to the company's reserve position? 14 The goal being -- frankly, there is the range, but 15 the company has stayed within the bottom half 16 of that range consistently. To my knowledge, 17 there is no one on the Board that is in the 18 least interested in having the company even go 19 20 to the upper half of the range, or certainly 21 outside of the range.

22

COMMISSIONER PURCELL: But there

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

is an understanding, or an opinion that you 1 can do more, and that the surplus that is 2 there, even though it's based on your 3 actuarial models certified by Milliman, a very 4 5 reputable firm, and can be justified, as we saw in your reports, that still the excess --6 7 there is an excess there. There is a large amount of surplus that is, perhaps, not 8 9 needed. 10 MR. BURRELL: Well, I think the 11 perspective we would bring to that, and I 12 think the way the Board thinks of it is, if 13 one were to define excess as above the regulatory minimums, indeed, there is excess 14 in that sense. Nobody wants to be at the 15 minimum. 16 17 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Right. MR. BURRELL: That is not the 18 19 place to be. 20 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Right. And I think that's understood. We know what RBC 21 22 is there for, and anything over RBC -

1	mR. BURRELL: Right. So, then the
2	question becomes how much above that do you
3	really think you need to be?
4	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Right. And
5	how much above that do you really think you
б	need to be?
7	MR. BURRELL: Well, the bottom
8	line for that came down to getting expert
9	outside advice, and to get it repeatedly, and
10	to get it with a second opinion, in this case
11	with Lewin. And to be so advised. That's
12	part of the Board's fiduciary obligation, and
13	responsibility, not to invent the number
14	themselves.
15	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: So, the
16	surplus is there. That's agreed. To whom
17	does this GHMSI surplus belong?
18	MR. BURRELL: We believe that as
19	long as the company is an ongoing operating
20	company, those funds are held for the benefit
21	of the subscribers. And as I tried to say in
22	my testimony, and I think this is a difficult

1	thing for anyone to say when there are funds
2	available, is it the subscribers that should
3	benefit who paid in, or is it the community
4	that should benefit?
5	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: And your
6	opinion on that is?
7	MR. BURRELL: And then it's really
8	a challenge as to how does one strike the
9	right balance. That's not an easy thing to do
10	under any circumstance, and it's constantly
11	shifting. In the last 10 years, GHMSI RBC
12	levels have gone up and down 50 percent based
13	on the fortunes of the market, and the trends
14	in the medical field, and so on, so that they
15	try, the Board tries to balance this as best
16	they can with outside expert advice. But my
17	basic answer is, these monies have been paid
18	in by subscribers. They expect, particularly
19	and the whole point about affordability,
20	expect that with costs rising the way they
21	are, that the funds will be used to help them,
22	and the way we read the charter is that that's
1	

what Congress, in fact, intended. 1 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: 2 so, what are some of the ways that you've used the 3 funds to help your subscribers? 4 5 MR. BURRELL: By keeping rates as low as possible, and by -- basically, that, 6 7 and by providing other services to subscribers that help moderate trends, that induce wise 8 9 use of access of healthcare services, and that 10 support subscribers with the best possible service. 11 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: What other 12 13 types of services? MR. BURRELL: And then there are 14 community services. And, as I say, \$46 15 million has been budgeted for that, and will 16 be spent this year. 17 18 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Now, a portion of that \$46 million is the premium tax 19 that is paid by GHMSI. Correct? 20 21 MR. BURRELL: No, that is just \$46 22 million in giving.

1 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: In giving, 2 so that's not considering mR. BURRELL: It doesn't count 3 4 tax. 5 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Okay. 6 MR. BURRELL: Tax is on top of 7 that. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: 8 Okay. Does 9 the need for additional surplus, or to keep 10 your surplus at the rate that your actuaries have suggested keep the premium rates high, or 11 12 higher? 13 MR. BURRELL: Well, I think the answer to that is very direct, and very 14 obvious. We want premium rates that cover 15 16 costs. We're non-profit. We are not in this to make a profit. For-profit insurance 17 companies typically run profit ranges of 6 to 18 10 percent. In the last decade, we have 19 20 averaged a percent to 2 percent. We operate 21 on extremely skinny margins. In fact, I often 22 say to people, if you ever ran a multi-billion

Page 111

dollar company on which you take 100 percent
 risk, and the best you could hope for was a 1
 percent margin, you would think you would be
 ill-advised. But that's what we do.

5 In the last year, our operating 6 margin, our net bottom line from underwriting 7 was two-tenths of 1 percent. This year, we think it will be something, perhaps, 1 or 8 9 less, we're not finished with the year yet. 10 We're worried, just as an example, as anybody would be, that would be, I guess in my 11 position, or the management's position, that 12 13 with the advent and the worry about the flu season, I'll just take that as one example. 14 If that were to have some much as a 1 percent 15 16 impact, and who is to say what impact it will have, but if it were that, it could hit the 17 company's bottom line \$50 million. So, the 18 company tends to operate with extremely thin 19 20 margins, and anything that it earns on those 21 margins, any money that is actually retained, 22 where does that go? It goes into the reserve.

1 And whose benefit is that for? For the policy holders, or for the community, as the Board 2 decides what the giving level should be in 3 light, first, of what the subscribers needs 4 5 are. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: And does 6 7 your description of policy holders or subscribers include future subscribers, or 8 9 future policy holders at all? 10 MR. BURRELL: Current subscribers. 11 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Only current subscribers. 12 13 MR. BURRELL: Only current subscribers, because anybody that is not a 14 current subscriber is in the public. 15 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: And a 16 community member. 17 18 MR. BURRELL: And a member of the community, and we do give to the community. 19 20 But the -- when you ask about who is a 21 subscriber, it is somebody that is covered by 22 a policy of our's that is paying premium.

1 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: So, you 2 distinguish between your duty, and your -- the giving side of what GHMSI does, because you 3 give to the community, and through these 4 5 various means that you just described, but you restrict your duty to only your current 6 7 subscribers. MR. BURRELL: I don't know that 8 9 it's -- no, I'm not trying to convey that. 10 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Okay. 11 MR. BURRELL: I'm trying to convey a balance. 12 13 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Okay. 14 MR. BURRELL: The right balance. 15 That's all. And I am saying that the command in the charter is clear in one sentence, Thou 16 shalt exist to serve your certificate holders. 17 It's not a maybe, it's not discretionary, it's 18 19 a command. 20 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Right. But 21 there's also the MIEAA Act, which exists, and which is law, and which is -22

Page 115 1 mR. BURRELL: And then there's the And, in principle, as a concept, 2 MIEAA Act. we agree. And that's what we think we do. 3 And we think that's what the Board's 4 5 responsibility really is. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: As a 6 7 concept, you agree to the community reinvestment mandate? 8 9 MR. BURRELL: As a larger 10 community role. 11 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Okay. 12 MR. BURRELL: But I would also 13 say, and, again, in the context of balance, that if - and this was what we -- the reason 14 I put the quotes in from the prior 15 Commissioner Mirel, and from the Attorney 16 General in 2005, if we best carry out the goal 17 of giving high value to our subscribers since 18 we cover millions of people, that has a huge 19 20 benefit to the general community, as a community. It also has a huge benefit to the 21 22 economy of the region, and helps small

employers and medium-sized employers make ends 1 2 It has a huge value by itself. And, as meet. I say, the tradeoff then is, do you put your 3 complete emphasis there, because that has huge 4 5 value, or do you balance that somehow with other giving to the community? That's what 6 7 the Mission Oversight Committee does, that's what the Board does, that's why they set a 8 9 plan this year to do \$46 million in giving. 10 And, basically, what they're saying is, we deem that that's the right level, given the 11 needs of our subscribers. 12 13 What's particularly worrisome in 14 the affordability equation here in this region, but this is true, this is what the 15 President spoke to last night, is that the 16 costs are rising so rapidly in healthcare that 17 it's disenfranchising. It's cutting people 18 off from access to healthcare, and the 19 20 statistics I cited are all from this region.

21 If you sit where we sit, and hear the demands

22 of employers, and the worries of employers,

and watch them move to high deductible health
 plans, and try to cut their expense down, you
 begin to get really worried about what the
 affordability is.

5 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: So, this worry of affordability, and the crisis, I 6 7 think you described in your testimony, does that not cycle back around, in your opinion, 8 9 to GHMSI? Yes, you provide health insurance, 10 you provide coverage for subscribers at a 11 discounted rate, an affordable product, in your opinion, so that in light of the way 12 13 healthcare costs have risen, and continue to rise, and in light of what's on the forefront 14 federally, which we don't know, but, 15 certainly, there's uncertainty there, isn't 16 there a circling back that then greets itself 17 in your community mission, and your charitable 18 obligation, that then requires you to 19 reinvest, just as the word that's used in the 20 statute, to then reinvest in the community? 21 22 And how do you -- what is your opinion on

1 that, and how do you think that you fulfill 2 that, if you agree?

MR. BURRELL: Well, again, I think 3 it's all a matter of balance. If I could, or 4 5 we could know that by investing in a certain way, we could cause subscriber premiums to be 6 7 1, 2, 5 percent less by doing certain things, and I include not in that list cutting them 8 9 off from benefits, but things that would 10 actually productively restrain the rise in healthcare costs, on the one hand, and know 11 what those investments would look like, and on 12 13 the other hand, say let's give to worthy causes in the community, this, on lowering the 14 trend in healthcare costs may be, probably is 15 16 the single-most important thing we could do. Because without doing it, we think that in a 17 few years time, it becomes flat out 18 unaffordable for everyone. And I would put 19 this in concrete terms, \$1,800 family premium 20 in the District of Columbia right now, our 21 22 most common product for a family of four.

1	If healthcare costs keep going up
2	10 percent a year, in seven years that number
3	will double. Who affords \$3,600 a year, a
4	month? Who? And what degree of cost shift
5	will have occurred at that stage? And what
б	small employer group is going to pay that
7	premium, or 60 percent of that premium? And
8	what individual subscriber will pay a \$10,000
9	deductible, if we see the rise of deductibles
10	continuing the way they are? So, the concern
11	we have is that that's the fundamental
12	challenge.
13	We view our role not simply as a
14	passive insurer, but as a proactive force to
15	try to deal with that situation.
16	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: And what
17	are some of the ways that you've dealt with
18	them?
19	MR. BURRELL: There are many ways,
20	and there and, unfortunately, for us, as a
21	society, there is no single way, but let me
22	give you some examples.

1 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Please. 2 MR. BURRELL: We are actively developing, and will soon roll out, this 3 4 requires regulator approval, your approval, 5 what I would call a healthy choice product 6 line. What ways could you induce people to --7 encourage them to live healthier lifestyles? We know there is a rise of chronic disease. 8 9 We know there is a rise of diabetes, and 10 obesity, lack of fitness, poor diet. What ways could individuals be induced to live 11 12 healthier lifestyles? And then when they do 13 get sick, are there better ways to have their care coordinated, not necessarily by us, but 14 by providers who are in networks that we 15 contract with. 16 Today, as you've heard so often in 17 the public press, everything is oriented 18 around a fee for service system of payment. 19 20 We're looking at ways that we could provide 21 incentives to providers to better coordinate 22 care, develop care plans for people that have

incipient high risk for future disease. 1 It's 2 the connection of the provider contracting strategy with the way the benefits are 3 designed, with the way that they are all 4 5 administered, which requires more sophisticated data systems, all of that knit 6 7 together, explained, supported, serviced, and convincing employers that they ought to go in 8 9 that direction. That's our challenge. That is 10 the core of what we see as our challenge. And 11 that takes investment. That's probably investment on an order that we have not seen 12 13 before, and I'm not speaking just for And when you ask about how does ourselves. 14 that compare with community health 15 reinvestment, I'm telling you that that is a 16 very difficult judgment to make, because this 17 side on investment, dealing with the bending 18 of the cost curve, is very substantial. 19 So, 20 that's what the Board has to weigh. And that decision, and that framework is weighed 21 22 virtually at every meeting, and certainly on

an annual basis, as each annual plan is
 approved by the Board with the level of giving
 to the community involved.

4 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: What does
5 maximum feasible consistent with financial
6 soundness and efficiency mean to you?

7 MR. BURRELL: It means to me that it is not simply financially feasible for the 8 9 company out of its reserves to pay its claims. 10 What it means is, that the people who actually build the reserve are finding the products 11 that we offer affordable. That, to me, is the 12 ultimate test. And if the company cannot make 13 its products affordable, then -- especially, 14 a company like this, that is so prevalent in 15 the community, then the community really 16 suffers. And that, to me, is the ultimate 17 test, is a test of affordability. And then if 18 you can meet that test, which is extremely 19 20 difficult, and we, as a society, are not 21 meeting it, and I would say "we" as a company 22 are not meeting it, what is it that's left for

1 the general community?

2	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: But, to me,
3	that term is indicating something that's
4	required of the company, not required of the -
5	- none in the sense of the subscribers, so
6	maximum feasible it's calling for an
7	amount, or for a level, in my opinion, that
8	phrase, maximum feasible consistent with
9	financial soundness and efficiency. So,
10	that's a sort of a self-imposed, if you will,
11	analysis that you have to do, and then come up
12	with an amount. I mean, I'm not asking you to
13	come up with an amount, but I'm asking you for
14	maybe a summary of what it means to the
15	company, maximum feasible, you said
16	affordability for the subscriber, but -
17	mR. BURRELL: I think we've
18	already stated our view, or I've stated mine.
19	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Okay.
20	MR. BURRELL: And we, as a company
21	have stated it, which is, essentially, the
22	company ought to operate within an optimal

range of reserve, not a minimum, and not an 1 2 In order to do that, it ought to get excess. the best advice it can, and it ought to have 3 used that range to have guided what it's 4 5 premium increase or changes ought to be. Now, having said that, then the 6 7 question becomes a challenge of how do you design the products and services that make 8 9 healthcare more affordable, and more 10 accessible to the general public of the area, or to the subscribers, the present subscribers 11 that we have, 3.4 million people in the region 12 13 as a whole. And that is the essential challenge of the company, and we think that's 14 what the charter had in mind. And I think 15 that's our answer. 16 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: 17 I have a couple of questions from your testimony, and 18 then I may get into some more general 19 20 questions. 21 MR. BURRELL: Sure. 22 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: On page 2 of

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

your testimony kind of in the middle of the paragraph that starts with "naturally," it kind of seems like you're saying that your community reinvestment would be a substitute for government spending. Is that what you -am I reading that correctly, and is that the way you interpret it?

MR. BURRELL: I think what we 8 9 meant to convey is if the thought exists that 10 by finding excess a very large amount of money can be, in effect, demanded out of the 11 12 company, presumably to be used for good 13 purposes in the community, but at the direction ultimately of the government, does 14 it, in effect, serve as a supplemental budget? 15 Doe sit affect fund programs that in this case 16 the District itself could not fund? 17 18 And when you're talking about the money that we're talking about, 60 to \$100 19 20 million or whatever it is, it's pretty 21 tempting. 22 And so is there an incentive to

1	find excess in order to actually get the
2	money? And that's what I was addressing.
3	That's a very different situation
4	if the money goes back to the policy holders
5	as their money.
6	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay, but in
7	the law, I believe, if it were determined that
8	there was an excess, you would present us a
9	plan on how to utilize that. That could be
10	done through
11	MR. BURRELL: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: I mean, we
13	wouldn't direct how that's given. You could
14	decide that.
15	MR. BURRELL: Well, you have the
16	power to approve, and we would take the view,
17	as I did in my testimony that if any excess
18	were actually legitimately found, it would in
19	our view must go back to the subscribers, and
20	the question is how would that be done, and
21	that's what a plan would entail, but not in
22	effect be taken from subscribers. And I think

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

1 that's what we're trying to give voice to. COMMISSIONER BARLOW: 2 Okav. On page 7 of your testimony you talk about the 3 4 community health reinvestment obligation from 5 Pennsylvania, and then you talk about the similar kind of thing from Maryland where it 6 7 seems like those jurisdictions are directing you to make a certain amount of charitable 8 9 contributions, but those contributions are 10 based on premium volume rather than surplus. Can you explain the difference in 11 12 those two things? 13 MR. BURRELL: Well, I think that in the case of take our neighboring 14 jurisdiction, Maryland, there's an in lieu of 15 situation there. To the extent that we give 16 to a variety of worthy causes in the 17 community, we do not pay tax, premium tax, up 18 19 to two percent. 20 So the premium tax is a two 21 percent tax, two percent of premium income, premium revenue, dollar for dollar offset. 22 So

1 that if we give to various causes in the 2 community, the state does identify certain 3 ones of those. We do give to those causes and 4 give more, I might add, but we do give to 5 those.

Then there's a dollar-for-dollar 6 7 offset against the tax liability. The company has always given at or higher than what the 8 9 tax liability is. If we were not to give up 10 to the full tax extent, liability, then presumably we would pay some difference in the 11 form of a tax, the rest of what was due on the 12 13 premium tax. But we always have given at or above the tax level. 14

So it's an in lieu of situation. 15 16 Community health reinvestment in Pennsylvania is largely the same thing. It sets a 1.6 17 percent giving level for commercial business 18 and a one percent level of premium for 19 Medicare business, and then it allows a 20 dollar-for-dollar offset for tax obligations 21 22 in that state.

1 The thing I was trying to make clear in my testimony was that in the District 2 there is no offset. It's two percent tax, and 3 4 then any giving is on top of that, and that's 5 presumably government saying, "We think we know better what to do with the premium 6 7 revenue, and we will take that two percent and use it." 8

9 And so there is no in lieu of in 10 the District. Any giving is on top, and then there are two forms of giving in our view. 11 One form is giving to worthy causes, which we 12 13 do, and the other is subsidies, known, deliberate losses on certain products that are 14 geared -- like open enrollment products --15 that are geared towards people who otherwise 16 couldn't get coverage, which is the whole 17 essence of what the President was trying to 18 say last night, except he wasn't saying it to 19 20 be on just one company, but we do run those loses. 21

22

COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Right. I

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

understand that, but what I don't understand, 1 there is a requirement from Maryland that you 2 give two percent premium to charitable 3 contributions or you pay premium tax. 4 So 5 theirs is a requirement based on premium. Ours determines a requirement based on 6 7 surplus. I mean, other than the thing 8 9 that's used to determine the amount, is there a difference? 10 MR. BURRELL: I don't think there 11 is a requirement to give in Maryland. I think 12 13 there's a tax in Maryland, and if you give, that tax is abated in lieu of, and I think 14 that's a key distinction. 15 16 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay, and then on page 9 of your testimony you talk 17 about how if there was a community 18 reinvestment, it would force up rates for all 19 subscribers of GHMSI regardless of 20 jurisdiction. 21 22 Could you explain that to me?

1 Because it seems like it would only need to 2 drive up rates if your intent was to restore the surplus to the level that it was prior to 3 the community reinvestment. 4 5 MR. BURRELL: Well, in certain sense, that's true if you go back to what I 6 7 said. The company seeks to operate within an optimal range, not below an optimal range. 8 It 9 doesn't seek to be put in the position of every year its surplus goes down below an 10 11 optimal range. 12 I think our board feels that that 13 would not be the proper fulfillment of their responsibility is to allow such a thing to 14 15 happen. 16 So you want to stay within the optimal range. If you want to stay within the 17 optimal range and you have to pay premium tax 18 plus losses, you know, defined losses and 19 subsidies, plus giving, that total burden is 20 what has to be built into premiums which 21 22 escalates premiums in order to keep the

1 company in the optimal range. And as I say, we've always stayed 2 within the lower end of that range. We don't 3 4 really seek to be in the upper end of that 5 range or certainly over the range. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: And so what 6 7 level in that optimal range developed by Milliman will the company stop building 8 9 surplus? 10 MR. BURRELL: We were at 845 11 percent RBC in 2008. We're projecting we will be at 825 this year. This is a projection. 12 13 We don't seek to build it beyond that. We just want to stay within that lower end of the 14 15 range. And then the question becomes what 16 rates do you need to do that. What are the 17 minimal rates that get you there? That's the 18 only question that I think we grapple with. 19 20 There's no aspiration to build 21 that higher, no need to build it higher as 22 long as you are in the optimal range, even if

Page 132

you're at the lower end of the range. 1 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: 2 Okay. Did GHMSI make any changes as a result of the 2005 3 hearing chaired by Commissioner Mirel? 4 5 MR. BURRELL: I think what the 6 company did was very deliberately and very 7 consciously put a process together. This is when the Mission Oversight Committed of the 8 9 board was established. This is when a real 10 focus was made on community health reinvestment, if you want to use those, you 11 know, words. This is when the ideas for 12 13 catalytic giving and other giving, you know, began to get more focused, and this is when 14 there was more of a deliberate planning 15 16 process to actually give more, which has happened, I might add, in every single year 17 since 2005. 18 Six was higher than five. 19 Seven 20 was higher than six. Eight was higher than 21 seven, and nine is higher than eight. 22 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. I had

a couple of questions to just get a better 1 2 understanding of the Blue Cross/Blue Shield 375 percent requirement. 3 4 MR. BURRELL: Yes, yes. 5 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Could you 6 explain what happens --7 MR. BURRELL: Yes. COMMISSIONER BARLOW: 8 -- at the 9 various levels of the Blue Cross/Blue Shield? 10 And also, I guess I kind of understand there's the 375 level and the 200 11 12 level. Is there anything else as part of 13 that? MR. BURRELL: Yes, there is, yeah. 14 Well, I think the best way to understand that 15 is that -- and I think the starting point here 16 is that the Blue Cross/Blue Shield association 17 from which we get the name and the mark by 18 license believe, I think, correctly that the 19 20 public, when they see the Blue Cross and Blue 21 Shield logos, believes that it is completely safe and is a Good Housekeeping seal of 22

approval. It means that the company is very
 solid.

And people, particularly small employers, but even large ones and certainly individual, buy on the basis of the belief in the solidity of the company. It's what the name and the mark have become synonymous with, among other things.

9 So the licensor, in this case the 10 association, is very, very concerned, and I 11 would say increasingly vigilant and tough 12 about what reserve levels plans ought to have 13 and how they ought to conduct themselves.

And so there are really two other 14 levels. Obviously there's the minimum 15 regulatory level of 200. No one would ever 16 aspire to get anywhere near that. 17 Then there's 375, which is not simply a reporting 18 It is the beginning of intense 19 level. 20 monitoring by the association ultimately under threat that if you cannot operate as a solid 21 22 licensee, you could have those license marks

1 removed.

2	And so it's not just simply
3	monitoring. They demand plans. They begin to
4	send in teams to work with the plan, to say,
5	well, what is your corrective action.
б	There's a higher level, which is
7	500, which begins to make them sit up and take
8	notice. We report to them. They monitor very
9	carefully what it is our surplus levels are,
10	this because a number of plans around the
11	country have from time to time run into
12	difficulty. They want to minimize that so
13	that the name remains synonymous with the
14	security that comes with Blue Cross and Blue
15	Shield.
16	And so they are increasingly
17	vigilant. I sit on the Blue Cross/Blue Shield
18	board of directors. I sit on the committee
19	that oversees plans when they get in trouble,
20	and there's always somebody in trouble, and
21	right now there are plans that are in trouble
22	and not meeting the requirements, and I know

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433 how difficult it is for those plans because
 the association is very tough on it.

3 So it's not simply here's a casual 4 reporting level. It's treated with the utmost 5 seriousness by the association. Our stock and 6 trade in many ways is the Blue Cross and Blue 7 Shield logo and name, and we wish ourselves to 8 preserve its value.

9 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: What sources 10 are available to increase the surplus of GHMSI 11 should that be necessary?

MR. BURRELL: We have only one source and a second that derives from it. The only source for us is from the premiums that our subscribers pay, and as I said, we typically produce an operating margin of one percent or one to two. That is the only source.

19 And the other source that it's a 20 derivative of that is income on the assets 21 that are invested on behalf of the 22 subscribers. So instead of paying dividends

to stockholders or paying it to anybody else, 1 anything that we earn goes into our reserve. 2 Our reserve is invested, and it is invested 3 4 extremely conservatively. 5 All of the earnings of that go to the benefit of the subscribers, and so there's 6 7 only two sources. One is from the subscribers, the difference between premiums 8 9 and expense claims mostly, and the other is 10 earnings on those assets. Other organizations, particularly 11 for profit organizations, may have other lines 12 13 of business that produces profits for them. They may have technology companies or other 14 for-profit companies that they own or control 15 that can generate or other lines of business 16 that can generate other sources of income. 17 We don't. 18 So for us it's a one product kind 19 20 of company with one source for gain. 21 MR. TOOLE: I have a couple 22 follow-up questions on that. First of all, in

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

the Milliman report, there were three lines of 1 business that were modeled that contributed to 2 surplus. 3 4 MR. BURRELL: Right. 5 MR. TOOLE: So I perceive you to be diversified. 6 7 Second of all, in terms of access to capital --8 9 MR. BURRELL: Can I respond to that for a minute? 10 MR. TOOLE: Sure. 11 12 MR. BURRELL: The three principal 13 lines that we have are all health lines. Okay? I mean, it's just different forms of 14 insurance risk for the same thing. They are 15 the small and individual, small groups and 16 individuals on which we take 100 percent risk, 17 and by the way, that's where the bulk of this 18 comes from, the reserve, to serve them, from 19 20 them. The second is administrative 21 22 services only contracts with large employers

Page 139

who themselves take the risk but hire us to do 1 the servicing. That often has either minimal 2 gain on it or it's operating at break even or 3 sometimes even at a loss. 4 5 And then there's FEP, the federal employee program on which that's a risk 6 7 premium, but they largely hold their own reserves, and the opportunity in FEP is 8 9 largely on how well we service that contract. 10 We can get an award to service that contract Administratively I'm talking about, and 11 well. we have typically gotten those awards, 12 13 including this year. But in the scheme of the total 14 picture, it is not material. 15 MR. TOOLE: But I'm concerned to 16 hear that these large groups may be operating 17 at a loss, which takes surplus from your 18 other --19 20 MR. BURRELL: It depends on the 21 nature of the group. You know, our goal is 22 not to run a loss on those, but group to group

1 it can vary.

2 MR. TOOLE: Okay. Talk to me about access. Well, first of all, the 3 4 intercompany agreement between your --5 MR. BURRELL: Yes. MR. TOOLE: And I know that Mr. 6 7 Chaney has some insight on that as well. MR. BURRELL: Well, there is an 8 9 intercompany agreement between CFMI, the 10 Maryland company, and GHMSI and vice versa, and basically when the companies affiliated, 11 they thought there would be, they sought to 12 13 get benefits out of the affiliation, and one of the benefits was that each could back each 14 15 other up. So if one ran into trouble the 16 other was there for them, and so the nature of 17 that intercompany is essentially as backup if 18 It's a source, a source we haven't 19 needed. 20 drawn on and don't want to draw on, but it is 21 there as a backup. 22 Use of it raises all kinds of

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

interesting issues because if Maryland money 1 is backing up D.C. money, Maryland subscribers 2 have a material interest in that, and so one 3 4 looks at that as a matter of last resort, and 5 it has not been used, and we would hope it wouldn't be, but it's there for the protection 6 7 of the larger whole. MR. TOOLE: And also the question 8 9 of surplus notes as a capital --10 MR. BURRELL: That's a more 11 technical question. 12 MR. CHANEY: Yeah, the typical 13 access to capital is limited when you're trying to just add surplus, and obviously 14 going and getting a bank loan doesn't do you 15 any good because you had an asset, you had a 16 liability, and then they all said there's no 17 addition to surplus. 18 The one mechanism that does exist 19 is surplus notes, and the largest example of 20 that is when GHMSI got into financial 21 difficulties and had to borrow \$60 million 22

from other Blues plans. The price that comes
 with is extremely high.

The board turned over and a number 3 4 of out of state people had to be placed on the 5 board from other Blues plans that had provided the funds. Typically if you try to get it 6 7 from a non-Blues source it comes at an extremely high funding level because people 8 9 don't want to have the repayment of their note 10 subject to Commissioner approval. So I think that you would find 11 that that's little used and for very good 12 13 reason. 14 MR. TOOLE: And finally insurance is often used as a surplus tool. 15 16 MR. BURRELL: Yes. We are our own reinsurer, but Mark. 17 18 MR. CHANEY: Exactly. I think what you find is with organizations of our 19 20 size, you know, if you would go to reinsure, there's someone wants to make 70 cents or so 21 22 or 30 cents on every dollar and only spend 70

cents. Why pay that? 1 2 And if it were a catastrophic type of event, in today's world you have to make 3 4 sure you're with a reinsurer that can really 5 stand behind you. And one comment on the 6 7 intercompany agreement. Now that this is a potential source to GHMSI, it's a potential 8 9 use , which most plans don't have. Again, it would come with all sorts of regulatory ties 10 and issues, but if CFMI in theory ever needed 11 to fund something, GHMSI is standing behind 12 13 them. 14 MR. RECTOR: I'm sorry. This is Neil Rector, also with Rector & Associates. 15 16 One question on the intercompany. I guess it's really for Mr. Dobson. 17 In the modeling, did you consider either the 18 potential risk to GHMSI if Carefirst of 19 20 Maryland dipped below the 375 or the potential 21 safety net to GHMSI if GHMSI stepped below the 22 Did either of those aspects factor into 375?

1 your modeling?

2	MR. DOBSON: The short answer is
3	we were aware of it. We reviewed it. We
4	considered it, but, no, it did not affect our
5	modeling. We judged, and we had a lot of
б	considerations at the time. I probably can't
7	remember all of them right here because I
8	haven't looked at it in a while, but I do
9	remember thinking that there would be so many
10	strings in either direction and likelihood
11	that the plans might be both in trouble at the
12	same time, and just we did our evaluation
13	separately for GHMSI and for CFMI.
14	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Can the
15	company also rely on its parent in that same
16	manner? Are there any agreements between
17	MR. BURRELL: No.
18	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: There are
19	not. Okay.
20	Skip.
21	MR. MYERS: Thank you.
22	Just a couple of questions. Back

1	on the reinsurance issue, in the testimony it
2	talks about the justification for the high
3	surplus. One of the issues is, you know,
4	catastrophic loss.
5	Have you gone through the analysis
6	of trying to price that out? It seems that,
7	you know, commonly insurers use reinsurance or
8	stop loss insurance economically to prevent
9	their having to maintain, in effect, being
10	their own reinsurance as you just said you
11	were.
12	So have you done that analysis and
13	can you share that?
14	MR. BURRELL: Let me give a
15	general response and then ask if Mark and Bob
16	Dobson would further develop it.
17	But when we say we are our own
18	reinsurer, we have concluded that that's the
19	most cost effective way for us to go. There's
20	no profit margin in it for anyone else who
21	might stand in the reinsurance role, which
22	often there's large margins in there for them

1 to take that kind of risk.

2	And I think the second part of the
3	general answer is when looking at the risk of
4	catastrophic events, the modeling that
5	Milliman does takes that into account and
6	weighs that into the overall equation.
7	And I'd ask Bob maybe if he would
8	speak more to that.
9	MR. DOBSON: Yes. That's
10	definitely one of the factors in our
11	probability distributions.
12	MR. BURRELL: I mean, I think I
13	would make the distinction that there are
14	certain types of risks that are more frequent
15	and perhaps of less magnitude, and then there
16	are less frequent but potentially when
17	occurring very catastrophic.
18	And one of the things that makes
19	the setting of a reserve difficult is how does
20	one weigh all of that and model all of that
21	and understand all of that and come out with
22	a framework, a range that would reasonably

1 accommodate it, and that is why we decided to
2 go to outside experts like Milliman, because
3 there's a particular expertise and a
4 particular way of modeling that kind of things
5 that gives you a reliable range.

6 If you're a board member of a 7 nonprofit and you're running the possible risk 8 that you were inadequately reserved, you would 9 want to know that something like a complicated 10 model that had tested all the possibilities, 11 and there could be millions of combinations of 12 variables.

We've seen things happen that no one would have said two years ago. We have seen a financial crash no one anticipated. It had a big effect on our asset values, even though we are conservatively invested.

18 We have seen trends persist in 19 health care costs that we wouldn't have 20 expected. We issued products that we thought 21 would discourage excess use that didn't do it 22 to the degree that we thought. We've had all kinds of things happen that we couldn't have
 anticipated.

3 Now we add on top of that the possibility of a flu epidemic. What is the 4 5 possibility that the combination of infrequent large things and many other things that happen 6 7 frequently, what's the possible combinations that one would have to protect against of all 8 9 of them? 10 What's the possibility that customers in a hard economic environment don't 11 pay their bills on time? We can't collect the 12 13 revenue. What's the possibility that 14 providers will accelerate their billings to us 15 because they themselves want money faster? 16 What's the possible combination of 17 all of that? And that's what happens when you 18 put the reserve together and you put a range 19 20 around that because no one on earth could ever 21 predict what the possibilities were precisely 22 going to be at any given point in time.

1	What we were convinced and I think
2	our board was convinced about was that
3	Milliman had a very, very carefully developed,
4	sophisticated way of doing that, and they
5	themselves put a range around it, and that's
6	where our optimal range comes from, and then
7	we had them look at it again, and then we had
8	Lewin look at that, and that's the way you get
9	comfortable.
10	And then you observe what the
11	actual experience is that emerges from it and
12	tests the real world against what it is you
13	thought it was going to be. That's the way it
14	was done.
15	MR. MYERS: Understood, and I
16	appreciate that explanation. The question
17	though was why not use reinsurance in that
18	equation, let's say, for a high severity risk
19	like terrorism with, you know, very, very low
20	opportunity of occurrence.
21	MR. BURRELL: Because the price of
22	doing it is higher than the way we're doing

it, and I think --1 Well, and probably MR. CHANEY: even more relevant in today's times is that 3 even though the industry sometimes has 4 5 difficulty working together, right after 9/11, it came together, both the not for profit 6 7 Blues and the for-profits, and they set up a committee to establish a reinsurance pool for 8 9 just that. It could not be done to the 10 satisfaction of enough participants to stay in 11 that pool. The main thing that we would want 12 13 to reinsure against, in addition to that catastrophic event is multi-year cycle losses, 14 and for those who think the underwriting cycle 15 may be dead, and it's always gains, 50 percent 16 of the Blues' plans in the first six months of 17 2009 had underwriting losses. GHMSI is one of

19 them.

18

2

20 So what we are very much concerned 21 about could be facing us today, going into a 22 down cycle, government changes ahead of us,

not knowing what the cost of that might be,
 and still having the possibilities of the flu
 epidemic and other catastrophic events.

4 So reinsurance is something that 5 we've all looked at, but it's very difficult because no one can reinsure against a multi-6 7 year loss cycle. The catastrophic events, it's not worth the price because no one is 8 9 going to take enough exposure to keep this 10 type of company solvent if it had a truly 11 catastrophic event happen. 12

MR. MYERS: Okay. Thank you. 13 I wanted to ask another question about the class of subscribers. 14 In your testimony you talked about that the charter 15 required that the exempt function, the 16 charitable function is to benefit your 17 subscribers, and then you responded to a 18 question by saying that that would be the 19 current subscribers. 20

21 There are, of course prior22 subscribers who would have dropped out of the

plan or died or whatever it would be who would 1 have contributed to the surplus of the company 2 and, therefore, by just focusing your efforts 3 on current subscribers, you get the benefit of 4 5 the activity of the prior subscribers. I'm using this to set up the 6 7 question as to would you consider it within your exempt function to expand the class of 8 9 subscribers to new subscribers who would 10 benefit. Let's say there's a determination 11 that there is some excess surplus so that that new class of subscribers could have their 12 13 premium underwritten. That it seems to me would be 14 consistent with your exempt function, but what 15 are your thoughts? 16 MR. BURRELL: Subscriber in the 17 sense of a party that's actually paying a 18 premium? 19 20 MR. MYERS: Yes. 21 MR. BURRELL: You're describing 22 nothing but a discount or a subsidy.

1 MR. MYERS: That's right. 2 MR. BURRELL: And we, like any company, you can't price yourself below cost 3 4 for very long. You can do it temporarily, but 5 you can't do it on a sustained basis. Part of our obligation is, as I 6 7 say, to be there, to be solid, and to have continuity, and we operate, as it is, with one 8 9 percent last year, .2 of a percent margin, and 10 there are certain product lines on which we tend to lose, if we're going to lose anywhere, 11 and those tend to be individuals and small 12 13 groups. And so if there's a tilt anywhere, 14 it's to favor those who are most in need of 15 the coverage and are struggling most to keep 16 the coverage and make it affordable, and it's 17 always a tension. Every month new data 18 emerges to tell you where you actually are, 19 20 and so we're constantly vigilantly looking at 21 it. 22 But to develop below realistic or

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

Page 154

market pricing on a sustained basis is not
 viable.

3 MR. MYERS: I see. I'm just 4 trying to get at, I think, the theme. One of 5 themes of your presentation was that you are 6 constrained by your charter to act and provide 7 benefits for your subscribers.

MR. BURRELL: Right. 8 If it were to come to 9 MR. MYERS: 10 pass, let's assume that there is a determination that there is some excess 11 12 surplus and it would toss back to you to say, 13 you know, how you're going ot use this excess surplus, it would be within your exempt 14 function, would it not, to use that for the 15 benefit of subscribers, whether they be old, 16 current or new subscribers? 17 18 MR. BURRELL: Well, I think it

19 would certainly be within our thought that it 20 would be for current subscribers, and in all 21 likelihood what we would wind up looking at is 22 a way to return any excess in one form or

1 another to current subscribers.

2	And that has its own consequences.
3	It creates certain changes in the market, has
4	certain downstream effect os artificially
5	depressing price for some period of time for
6	some component of our subscriber base, and the
7	consequence of that is hard to understand
8	fully in the marketplace.
9	And then when it's over, what
10	tends to happen is that rates tend to pop up
11	very dramatically in order to come back to a
12	break even situation.
13	There's nothing in the collective
14	experience of the company that would suggest
15	that artificially low prices for some period
16	of time followed by precipitously large
17	premium increases all of a sudden is a wise
18	way to operate the business in the interest of
19	the public or of the subscribers.
20	So it's a very careful road of
21	moderation that we try to follow, and for all
22	of those reasons, there's no desire to hold

excess and there's no intent to hold excess. 1 We want to be only in an optimal range, and by 2 holding a steady course with very skinny 3 margins as a not for profit, paying no one, no 4 5 shareholder, no one, just for the benefit of the subscribers, we think it can have what its 6 7 intent, what its charter says, which is to actually serve for the benefit of subscribers. 8 9 And if we do that well for 3.410 million people, we actually have helped this community tremendously. That's our view. 11 12 MR. MYERS: Thank you. 13 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. Ι have a few financial questions. So these may 14 15 be more appropriate for Mr. Chaney. But can you explain the increase 16 in the non-admitted assets in the 2008 17 financial statement? 18 19 MR. CHANEY: Certainly. Let me 20 start off by saying that the 2007 statutory 21 surplus is accurate. The 2008 statutory 22 surplus is accurate. The RBC calculations

1 associated with both of them are accurate, 2 unlike some of the filings that were made related to this hearing. 3 In fact, that's not just 4 5 management's representation. Typically when one looks at our financial situation, it's 6 7 required to send in along with the NAIC statutory financial filings audited financial 8 9 statements. Those audited financial 10 statements actually have two footnotes describing this very issue. 11 Those are made available to the public, I believe, by the 12 13 DISB for anyone who requests them. If not, anyone who calls the company can always have 14 them made available. 15 And lastly, it's not only my 16 opinion or the company's opinion, ENY's 17 opinion. It's also your all's opinion. 18 The DISB just recently completed their 19 examination; no adjustments to statutory 20 surplus. No significant findings on how we 21 22 reported in the NAIC statutory filing.

1	What happened is that as we always
2	do, we talked to our independent auditors
3	about more current presentations of various
4	items in our financial statements.
5	We pay 20 percent alternative
6	minimal tax rate for the federal income tax.
7	Everyone else pretty much pays 35 percent. We
8	used to treat our deferred tax asset on a net
9	basis, offsetting deferred tax assets and
10	liabilities. All those are is a difference
11	between tax accounting and statutory
12	accounting.
13	In 2008, it was decided a more
14	comprehensive presentation would be to gross
15	up the asset side and offset that gross-up by
16	increasing the non-admitted asset. No impact
17	on statutory surplus, no impact on RBC,
18	certified by two different sets of auditors
19	including your own.

20 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay, and 21 then there was another big item in the non-22 admitted assets, which I believe was a

1 pension contribution.

2	MR. CHANEY: Yes. As we're all
3	aware, 2008 was not good to the capital
4	markets. Our pension asset allocation is very
5	typical of a company of our size,
6	approximately 60 percent equities, 40 percent
7	fixed incomes. Whenever you have the sorts of
8	hits to market values that took place on both
9	of those, statutory pension accounting
10	requires certain adjustments to be made that
11	flow through into your statutory surplus.
12	Very technical accounting
13	treatments, debits and credits. Again, two
14	sets of auditors, including your own, have
15	agreed with our approach and presentation.
16	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay, and
17	again, when I read the testimony, I just, to
18	be clear, I don't think we gave prior approval
19	for those things. We just did not object to
20	them in reviewing the financial statements.
21	MR. CHANEY: I wasn't suggesting
22	that.

1	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: right.
2	MR. CHANEY: We're talking about
3	independent auditors. You all review it
4	retrospectively because we never ask for your
5	prior approval. You always want us to have
6	your findings based upon audits.
7	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. And
8	could you explain? For like the previous
9	three years up to 2007, your authorized
10	control level RBC was roughly 70 million, and
11	then in 2007 and 2008 it jumped up to roughly
12	80 million. Can you discuss if there was a
13	reason for what gives an appearance of a spike
14	up in the ACL?
15	MR. CHANEY: I think the simple
16	answer is the NAIC approved RBC calculation
17	has five different risks. They are by formula
18	taken right out of the statutory filings. A
19	number of different factors impact that.
20	I couldn't cite to you right now
21	the particular drivers between the five
22	different risks which had more impact, but the

biggest risks are your premium increases 1 because it impacts underwriting gain and 2 downstream affiliate ownership and the premium 3 4 increases at that impacts the separate RBC, in 5 this case computed for Carefirst/Blue Choice. Those typically are the two 6 7 biggest drivers to RBC increases. They both continue to have good premium increases and 8 9 enrollment increases over the last two years. 10 To Chet's point of affordability, the Carefirst family of affiliates has had its 11 best enrollment for 2007 and 2008 that it has 12 13 seen in the past decades. I think that is the best demonstration of affordability, and that 14 drives the RBC calculation. 15 16 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. Are there any limitations or constraints or is it 17 available for GHMSI to pay dividends to 18 Carefirst, Inc.? 19 20 MR. CHANEY: Not without the 21 Commissioner's approval in both jurisdictions. 22 Carefirst, Inc. is set up as a not for profit

holding company with no operations. 1 It's 2 capitalized to the tune of about \$500,000. The agreement that's set up, the affiliation 3 back in 1998 specifically required that 4 5 Carefirst, Inc. stay as that type of company. So there's been no consideration and no 6 7 provision for paying dividends upstream. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Are there 8 9 any subsidiaries of GHMSI? 10 MR. CHANEY: The largest single 11 subsidiaries are 40 percent ownership of the HMO jointly owned with Carefirst of Maryland. 12 13 That's a significant piece of the total business of Carefirst. 14 The other subsidiaries include a 15 16 TPA, a life insurance agency. We don't have 17 a life insurance company. We sell on behalf of others, and a subsidiary related to the FEP 18 operation center relationship with the 19 association. 20 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: If there is 21 22 a finding of unreasonably large surplus, how

would you want the department to consider the 1 2 impact of that on the GHMSI subsidiaries or what would the impact of that be on the GHMSI 3 subsidiaries? 4 5 MR. CHANEY: Well, I think ultimately how NAIC has established the whole 6 7 risk-based capital formula, the combined statutory surpluses of all the subsidiaries to 8 9 the extent that some have and some don't have 10 any rolls up to the two affiliates, Carefirst of Maryland and GHMSI. 11 So I think as Chet has 12 13 highlighted, our abilities to offer affordable services throughout will be directly impacted 14 by any changes that are made to the financial 15 strength of GHMSI and Carefirst of Maryland. 16 So I think it's a linkage that 17 goes without saying because they are 18 completely controlled by GHMSI in this case. 19 20 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Could you 21 explain, I guess, the purpose or the reason you have a line of credit, I think? 22

1	MR. CHANEY: We do, which we've
2	never drawn upon. Sometimes it's better to
3	establish such a line of credit when you have
4	no need of it. You never know with the
5	capital markets today when you might be put in
6	a position that a cash need develops and you
7	don't want to liquidate a portion of your
8	portfolio because of the losses that you might
9	have to take that would damage the subscribers
10	and the health of the company, and it's
11	available.
12	We've never drawn upon it. It
13	also actually sits well when you respond to
14	RFPs because they don't understand the nuances
15	of a Blue plan. So just to say you have a
16	debt facility with a commercial bank is one of
17	the things they have to check off as they
18	review our RFPs for some of our major
19	accounts.
20	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. Could
21	you tell us what the advantages and
22	disadvantages of being a nonprofit health

insurance company as opposed to a for-profit? 1 2 MR. BURRELL: Let me start with that, please. I think there's an advantage to 3 4 being a not-for-profit or nonprofit, and the 5 essential maybe two or three advantages. One is we can actually operate at margins that are 6 7 very small, and so when I say one or two percent, and that's what we've done for the 8 9 last decade, in a for-profit world you couldn't do that. 10 The second thing is that in a for-11 profit world, particularly in insurance, 12 13 health insurance, one of the ways -- and the President spoke to this last night -- that you 14 can make profit is skim risk, not serve the 15 whole community, not be really there for the 16 community, just draw out better risk and make 17 a margin on it. 18 The third thing I would say is 19 20 that in a not-for-profit environment, you can take a somewhat longer term view of things. 21 22 We're not in the business of having to report

quarterly profits to shareholders, and all the 1 pressures that come from short-term decisions. 2 We want to look at what our role is in the 3 4 larger health system and make wise choices, 5 moderate choices about how to play a constructive role without the worry that on a 6 7 quarterly basis you don't look so good to shareholders because you had a dip in profits 8 9 or something of that nature. 10 So it's the thin margins. It's the way you approach your mission, and it's 11 the long-term nature of the view you can take 12 13 that we think translates into value. And if I could, to 14 MR. CHANEY: echo Chet's point, it is very helpful to be 15 doing what we're doing and using a three-year 16 planning cycle even in the management of RBC 17 because it is not something you can sit down 18 at the beginning of the year and say, "Here's 19 20 how we get to this number at the end of the 21 It is dramatically impacted by the year. 22 capital markets. It's dramatically impacted

by health care trends that you're projecting
 but you don't control.

I certainly agree with the idea of 3 not having to report quarterly earnings. 4 We 5 can focus more on running the business. One of the advantages we don't have that people 6 7 think we have is we do pay federal income taxes to the tune of about \$40 million a 8 9 couple of years ago. We're right now at a 20 10 percent rate versus 35, but we'll lose that eventually, and we will be paying the same 11 taxes as all of our competitors, income taxes, 12 13 premium taxes, plus our giving to the community, which most of those do and nowhere 14 at the terms we do it in. 15 16 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. Could you tell us in terms of determining an 17 appropriate level of surplus how market share 18 comes into play? I mean, do you have 19 20 advantages in having the largest market share in this area? 21 22 MR. BURRELL: Well, I think the

reserve is in proportion to your market share, 1 and one of the non-obvious effects of having 2 a large market share is that typically there's 3 really only one way to go, which is down. 4 5 Every single other competitor looks with determination as to where they can find their 6 foothold, and we see a market on the high end, 7 large groups, that is extremely sophisticated, 8 9 usually purchases only through consultants and 10 consulting advice, and we see on the small end 11 a broker-driven market that spreadsheets every 12 option.

13 The President talked last night about exchanges, but I would say that we 14 already have it in this market, which is 15 virtually every small group that we're aware 16 of comes to us through spreadsheeted 17 approaches, which is to say here's the 18 benefits you get, here's the network you get, 19 20 and here's the price you pay for us compared 21 to every other option on the market, and 22 that's the typical process that is gone

1 through.

2	So if we were to look in any
3	material way, not attractive because we didn't
4	have the right network; we didn't have the
5	right price, we weren't offering the right
б	benefits. The market would detect it quickly,
7	and we would start to lose enrollment, and so
8	we are constantly vigilant about that.
9	If we were to have a material loss
10	in enrollment, then reserves presumably would
11	go down in absolutely dollars. Whether the
12	reserve goes down in relative terms as
13	measured by RBC is a different issue.
14	Typically usually the smaller you are the
15	higher the RBC because the smaller, the more
16	likely you are subject to volatile changes,
17	particularly if you're a one product company
18	the way we are.
19	And so they are related, but those
20	would be our observations in answer to your
21	question.
22	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: How does

your company's reserve of surplus compare to 1 your competitors, to your knowledge? 2 MR. BURRELL: Our competitors in 3 this market are all large, for-profit, and in 4 5 one case one large not-for-profit that do business on a national basis, and so you know, 6 7 they are the names that everybody knows: Aetna, Signa Humana, United, and in the case 8 9 of the nonprofit, Kaiser. They're all 10 national players. It's very hard for us to know 11 fully what their RBCs are. They tend to have 12 13 RBCs in a region, but they tend to put minimal in the region and roll it up to the parent, 14 not fully disclosed to us. It's not possible 15 to fully know. 16 And the important point I think 17 about that is that they have the ability 18 usually with multiple lines and multiple 19 20 regions they serve to be somewhat more 21 flexible on pricing. If they wanted to 22 underprice for a while in a given market, they

1 could.

2	We're in one market, only here,
3	with only one line, and so we do not deal with
4	a series of, in any major way, local small
5	plan competitors. We deal with the large
6	national competitors, all of whom view the
7	greater Washington-Baltimore market as a prime
8	market. So they are here in force, and they
9	compete intensely, and they do so with
10	resources that are not limited simply to this
11	region nor income streams that are limited to
12	health care.
13	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: I want to
14	touch on the issue of allocation for a moment.
15	In your opinion, what's the appropriate method
16	for allocating surplus in order to determine
17	the amount of surplus that's attributable to
18	the district?
19	MR. BURRELL: Well, we looked at
20	this issue carefully, and first we would
21	observe that there is no place anywhere in the
22	
22	country that we could find that allocated a

portion of a reserve based on a geographic
 distinction. There's no model for this.
 It is not within an accepted
 regulatory framework. There's nothing in RBC
 calculations or in the NAIC rules and
 standards that deals with attribution based on
 geography. So it becomes a complex exercise.

But if you think of it this way, 8 9 attribute, the dictionary meaning of 10 "attribute" mean to be owned by, to be caused 11 by. So if you took that as a starting point and you said, well, who caused the reserve, 12 13 one of the things that we would observe goes back to the way GHMSI is positioned. Ninety 14 percent of its enrollment is in Maryland, 15 Virginia and out of area, 44 percent of it in 16 Maryland alone. 17

So we actually did a claims run. We looked at where people live on the thought that where people live is where they get care, and where they get care influences their claims, what their claims look like and what

1 those claims cost. So we looked at that. And we found out that there was 2 some support to the idea that the claims 3 4 pattern of GHMSI reflects where people live, 5 and when you compare then what claims experience is with what premium is, it's the 6 7 difference that built the reserve. So our conclusion was that 8 9 residency was the best way to determine who a 10 reserve belongs to if you're forced to do it. 11 We're not saying we would recommend it be done, but that's what the law requires. 12 13 So if you're forced to do it, do it on residency, and if you do it that way, 14 and we had Milliman do this independent of us, 15 what you come up with is what common sense 16 would tell you, which is that ten percent of 17 the enrollment of GHMSI is in the District, 18 lives and resides in the District, probably 19 20 therefore seeks care in the District, and lo and behold based on residency, about 11.6 21 22 percent of reserve is attributable to the

District by that methodology, and we'd be 1 happy to explain that further, but that's the 2 logic, and it starts with this notion of who 3 4 does it belong to and who caused it. 5 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: And that's a 6 snapshot of right now. 7 MR. BURRELL: It's a snapshot of -- actually it's meant to accumulate. Yeah, go 8 ahead. 9 10 MR. DOBSON: The actual calculation of the 11.6 percent is not a 11 12 snapshot. We actually started with a surplus 13 as of 12/31/98, and we allocated based on results, underwriting results and other 14 results over the ten-year period from the end 15 of '98 through the end of 2008, and then we 16 brought that initial surplus forward at the 17 same percentage as the last ten years' 18 experience. So it's a fairly complicated 19 20 calculation, but recognizing time value money, the value of that surplus at the beginning, 21 22 and the residency as subscribers over that

period of time, which is why it doesn't equate 1 2 exactly to the ten percent, which may be a snapshot. I'm not exactly sure how the 3 4 company determined that ten percent. 5 MR. BURRELL: But cumulative effect of how it was built over time. 6 7 MR. RECTOR: I've got a series of questions. I don't know if we want to start 8 just with the attributable or I don't know 9 10 what your plan is relative to a break. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: 11 We can continue on with the attributable issue. 12 13 MR. RECTOR: Okay. We had some questions, I think, just in, I think, the 14 mechanics of what you did. I mean, I know you 15 talked about looking at the residence of the 16 certificate holders, and you've got at least 17 four major blocks of business. You've got the 18 individual business. You've got the non-FEP 19 20 group business. You've got the FEP business, and you've got the ASO business. 21 22 Did you look to the residence of

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

Page 176

the individuals in each of those? 1 2 So you did on the individual policies, at who the individual is. 3 You looked at the certificate holders on the non-4 5 FAP group. You looked at the federal employees on the FEP business, and you looked 6 7 at the employees on the administrative services? 8 9 MR. DOBSON: All based on residence, yes. 10 11 MR. RECTOR: Okay. And how did 12 you -- did you then consider each person as 13 one person based on the plan design, the premium benefit levels, those kinds of things? 14 So two different employees for two 15 different plans, one of which may have had a 16 contribution of \$1,500 a month and the other 17 one was \$1,000 a month, did they get equal 18 treatment or did you try to make weighting 19 differences between the two? 20 21 I'm not suggesting one is better 22 than the other. I'm just trying to find out

1 what you did.

2	MR. DOBSON: There were various
3	data limitations over the period and various
4	things we had to allocate by premium in
5	different manners and members in different
6	manners. So I'm not sure I can give a
7	comprehensive answer to that question without
8	actually looking at our work papers.
9	In general, the intent was to take
10	the underwriting gains for a given year,
11	allocate it by residency, which generally
12	would have been a premium in proportion to
13	membership. I think premium might have been
14	the premium we had by jurisdiction, but
15	members, we had to get special runs by
16	residence because, of course, it was not
17	tabulated that way for group business for,
18	say, Schedule T of the annual statement.
19	So there were a lot of interim
20	steps where we were allocating things. I
21	probably sitting here can't give you a
22	comprehensive answer, but I believe the short

Pao	ie	1	7	9

answer to your question is that we would have 1 done it in proportion to members and the 2 premium for the members. 3 4 So, yes, we would not have been 5 reflecting differences in plan probably in a very refined manner just because of 6 7 limitations of the data. MR. RECTOR: Okay. Did you look 8 9 at underwriting results by product line 10 differently? So you looked at the percentage that led to the individual, the percentage for 11 the non-FEP group, and did that and built that 12 13 up over time? 14 MR. DOBSON: Yes. MR. RECTOR: Did you consider 15 investment income or only underwriting results 16 or how did investment income play into it? 17 MR. DOBSON: We considered all of 18 it, but underwriting results drove things and 19 20 then we allocated the investment income by various --21 22 MR. RECTOR: With the same

percentages. Do you developed the percentages 1 2 using underwriting results, but then you still 3 factored the investment income into the ultimate. 4 5 MR. DOBSON: And the investment 6 income got split between investment income on 7 the existing surplus from previous years being brought forward and on the underwriting 8 9 results for that given year. 10 MR. RECTOR: Okay. How did you allocate or to what extent did you allocate 11 the residence of the subscribers for the 12 13 subsidiaries, the direct and then the indirect subsidiaries? 14 MR. DOBSON: The Carefirst/Blue 15 16 Choice, the largest subsidiary, we did in 17 exactly the same manner as we did for GHMSI, the parent. 18 19 MR. RECTOR: And took -- I'm 20 sorry. 21 MR. DOBSON: The predecessor, 22 actually what's referred to as CCI, I believe,

we did the same thing for the period that that 1 2 entity existed. The other subsidiaries that were 3 smaller, I believe we treated as separate 4 5 investments. 6 MR. RECTOR: Okay. For an 7 individual who is a subscriber of the Carefirst/Blue Choice, for that person did you 8 9 count 40 percent of -- that's the way it 10 worked up, so you did that? 11 MR. DOBSON: Yes. So to be clear 12 on that, we would do exactly the same analysis 13 like we did for GHMSI, and take 40 percent of the results and add it into the GHMSI. 14 Okay. I understand 15 MR. RECTOR: 16 the logic and read the materials of the logic as to why you believe the residence of the 17 subscribers is the appropriate test. I know 18 that MIA statute also sets out other factors 19 20 that were required to at least consider, the first of which is the number of policies. Do 21 22 we have any data as to the number of policies

Page 181

1 by jurisdiction?

2	So if we looked to, for example,
3	the number of individual policy holders, not
4	necessarily I mean, for individuals it may
5	be where they reside, but for the group
6	there's going to be a policy holder that may
7	be in Maryland or in the District, and the
8	certificate holders could reside in North
9	Carolina or Virginia or, you know, wherever.
10	MR. DOBSON: We weren't exactly
11	sure how policy would be defined, and we did
12	not look at that. I don't know if you guys
13	MR. BURRELL: We have that data,
14	but we did not because of what Bob just
15	said.
16	MR. RECTOR: I'm having difficulty
17	understanding why at least for some
18	categories. I mean, for an individual policy
19	I think it would be pretty clear what the
20	policy is, I would think, and for the non-FEP
21	group, I would think it would be pretty clear
22	what the policy is. Is that am I missing

1 something?

2 Maybe I should just ask the question what makes it difficult to know what 3 the policy is. 4 5 MR. DOBSON: I would just say we didn't do a lot of work trying to follow that 6 7 line of reasoning because we weren't sure what the definition would be, and it's not just not 8 9 a place we went in the analysis. We certainly could, but we did not. 10 MR. RECTOR: Okay. I think, based 11 on discussions we've collectively had, I think 12 13 it would be helpful in the materials that you submit at the end of September or, you know, 14 whenever the next date is, to get us data on 15 -- and we can describe what we mean by 16 "policies," but for individuals it would be 17 the insurance contract. For the non-FEP 18 group, it would be the master group policy, 19 not the certificates. 20 21 MR. DOBSON: No. 22 MR. RECTOR: For the FEP, I think

that's going to be the contract which you sign 1 2 onto, and for the ASO it would be the administrative services agreement document, 3 and we may or may not think that some of those 4 5 latter portions work into the calculations. We don't know, but we're required to at least 6 7 consider those factors according to the MIAC. MR. HOGAN: Mr. Rector, could I 8 9 ask you --10 MR. RECTOR: Yes. MR. HOGAN: -- where in the MIA 11 12 you're pointing to? You're talking about 13 Subsection F, about determining surplus to the corporation? 14 15 MR. RECTOR: No, I'm sorry. It's 16 the reg. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: 17 It's actually in the regs. 18 19 MR. RECTOR: It's 4699.2. 20 MR. HOGAN: Okay. So it's not in 21 the statement. 22 MR. RECTOR: It's in the reg. I'm 1 sorry. Yeah, 4699.2.

2	In that same reg, there's also a
3	requirement that we look at and consider as a
4	factor, as a factor, the number of health care
5	providers under contract and, again, I'm
6	presuming that isn't something we have data on
7	here today, but do we have questions as to
8	what data we might need?
9	MR. BURRELL: We have data on that
10	that we could certainly provide.
11	MR. RECTOR: Okay. Another
12	factor, the reg indicates that the department
13	can consider other factors, too. One of the
14	other factors that has come into play is there
15	has been this discussion of, you know, what
16	caused the surplus, what generated the
17	surplus, who paid it. Obviously subscribers,
18	individual subscribers through reimbursement
19	to their employer, through deductions, pay a
20	portion of premium, but in most group contexts
21	employers also pay a portion of the premium.
22	Do we have any data that shows the

1 split between what an employer pays versus an 2 employee?

3 MR. BURRELL: We have the data 4 that I referenced earlier, but that's general 5 data. What we don't gather is data employer 6 by employer, what exactly the employer paid 7 and what did the subscriber pay.

MR. RECTOR: Yeah, that doesn't 8 9 surprise me. So when we're looking to say, 10 you know, what person or entity generated the premium that then led to the surplus, we don't 11 know whether it's 100 percent of the employer, 12 13 wherever the employer may be located, or 100 percent of the employees regardless of where 14 they may be located. We just don't know other 15 than in a generic sense. 16

17MR. BURRELL: We know in a general18way.

19 MR. RECTOR: Yeah.

20 MR. BURRELL: And given our market 21 share and the size of our subscriber base, 22 it's probably not likely that we look a whole

lot different than the general trend. 1 2 MR. RECTOR: Perhaps you could then -- I know you indicated some of this in 3 your testimony -- but if you could share again 4 5 what those general -- perhaps over the last five to ten years and current since the data 6 7 Mr. Dobson would have. MR. BURRELL: Well, it's in my 8 9 testimony. 10 MR. RECTOR: Yeah. MR. BURRELL: And so if we find 11 the right page here, let's see. The number of 12 13 employers who offer coverage is going to 50 --14 MR. RECTOR: Page? 15 MR. BURRELL: -- 60 percent, and 16 the --MR. RECTOR: Sir, the bottom of 17 page 5? 18 19 MR. BURRELL: The bottom of page 5. Yeah, well, on page 6, the portion of 20 premiums -- the decline has reached the point 21 22 where the portion of premium paid by small and medium employers is now at about the 50
 percent mark.

3 MR. RECTOR: Okay. So if we're trying to think through, again, coming back to 4 5 Mr. Dobson where he looked at data for like the last ten years, it's likely that 50 6 7 percent or more of the premium would have been paid by the employer as opposed to by the 8 9 employee. Is that a fair statement? 10 MR. BURRELL: Probably so if the 11 region looks like the general --12 MR. RECTOR: Which, again, we 13 don't know. MR. BURRELL: yes. 14 15 MR. RECTOR: That's a good clarifying question. This data I'm assuming 16 is for the non-FEP group. 17 18 MR. BURRELL: Yes. 19 MR. RECTOR: Do we -- and this 20 shows my ignorance -- do we know what split there is in the FEP? 21 22 MR. BURRELL: We do.

1	MR. RECTOR: Okay. What's that?
2	MR. BURRELL: Seventy-two percent
3	of FEP premiums are paid by the federal
4	government, on average.
5	MR. RECTOR: On average. Okay.
б	Mr. Burrell, in your testimony you talked
7	about what attributable to means, ownership or
8	causation. Again, we've been trying to sort
9	through this difficult attribution process,
10	which I think we all agree is a difficult
11	thing to do.
12	For ownership, and again, we're
13	looking at the non-FEP group business, I think
14	my general understanding is that master group
15	policy holders are frequently thought of as
16	the owner of those contracts because they're
17	the ones who technically pay the premium.
18	They're the ones that have the only ability to
19	enter into the contract, to amend the
20	contract, to negotiate policy terms, to do all
20 21	contract, to negotiate policy terms, to do all of those things; is that

employer group typically is the arranger of
 and the part payer of the coverage.

MR. RECTOR: Okay, and on 3 causation, again, there are two sides to what 4 5 causes surplus. One is the premium coming in. The other, claims going out. It sounds like 6 7 we've got good data on the claims going out. I think, Mr. Dobson, it sounds like your work 8 9 was done based on claim runs so that we kind 10 of know where claims were paid.

MR. DOBSON: -- base things on underwriting gains or loss we're taking claims into account, yeah.

MR. RECTOR: Okay. So the money going out the door, we have a pretty good idea where that money went out the door in Virginia or Maryland or D.C. or some other place; is that --

MR. DOBSON: Well, we didn't actually allocate in our analysis claims by jurisdiction. We allocate the member accounts and then the proportion of underwriting gained

Ρ	aq	e	1	9	1
_	<u> </u>	-	_	-	_

and lost to that. So indirectly we're 1 2 reflecting claims not really based on where the provider is located or where the service 3 is rendered. 4 5 MR. RECTOR: Okay. So if a person 6 lived in D.C. you would count them as a D.C. 7 resident even if they were serviced by a doctor in Virginia or vice versa? 8 9 MR. DOBSON: Sure. 10 MR. RECTOR: Okay. MR. BURRELL: But we did do a 11 12 separate claim run to verify the thought 13 that --That's fine. 14 MR. RECTOR: 15 MR. BURRELL: -- they tend to get 16 care near where they live. MR. RECTOR: Okay. It would be 17 helpful, I think, if you include in your next 18 submission some information about that, trying 19 20 to show the correlation between where people live and where the claims are generated. 21 22 MR. BURRELL: Yes, yes.

1 The flip side of that MR. RECTOR: obviously is what caused them to even 2 participate as a subscriber in the first 3 4 place, and obviously on the non-FEP group the 5 commonality is the fact that they are employed by the master group policy holder as opposed 6 7 to where they live. I mean, we're assuming most of these people live in Virginia, D.C. or 8 9 Maryland, but in theory someone could live in West Virginia or Pennsylvania. 10 11 MR. BURRELL: And in fact, they A number of them do. 12 do. 13 MR. RECTOR: Okay. I guess the 14 last question that I had on the attribution part is when we took a look at Schedule T of 15 the annual statement where premiums are 16 allocated by state, obviously it's a radically 17 different distribution than either Mr. 18 Dobson's or yours, where it shows that if you 19 20 exclude the FEP business it's about 26 percent in the District. If you include the FEP 21 22 business it's about 63 percent.

1	I wonder if you could just help
2	explain to us the difference between the
3	allocation you have here and how you get the
4	ten percent or the 11.6.
5	MR. BURRELL: Well, I think the
6	essence of the point is that if you take the
7	situs of the group, like take FEP, it's a
8	district contract, group contract. but like
9	the rest of the enrollment of the company,
10	most of the people, 90 percent of the people
11	actually live in Virginia or Maryland.
12	The same thing is true with other
13	groups. Most of the membership is actually
14	residing in the other jurisdictions, and the
15	claims experience that emerges for them is
16	mostly related to where they live, and so the
17	reason we thought residency was a better
18	measure is it reflects that fact, and if one
19	is to try to get to the most equitable
20	split
21	MR. RECTOR: Right.
22	MR. BURRELL: which is what the

1 law requires.

2 MR. RECTOR: Okay. So it's the claim side, again, the policy side. It sounds 3 like more than 50 percent of the premium in 4 5 the group context, whether FEP or non-FEP, is going to arise based on where --6 7 MR. BURRELL: The group is. MR. RECTOR: -- the group is. 8 9 MR. BURRELL: But the group's 10 members are more typically in the pattern of 11 9010. 12 MR. RECTOR: Yeah. I think we 13 understand that distinction that you're 14 making. I appreciate that. Commissioner, that's all I have on 15 the attributable. 16 17 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Okay. Thank you. 18 I think we're going to take a 19 20 break, and we'll resume with this panel after the break, a 20 minute break. So if everyone 21 22 could reconvene at 1:30.

1 Thank you. 2 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 1:14 p.m. 3 and went back on the record at 4 5 1:35 p.m.) 6 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Okay. 7 We're going to reconvene. I just want to mention again if 8 9 there's anyone in the room who wasn't here for 10 my initial opening and is a witness and would like to testify, please fill out a card and 11 pass it to the transcriber so that we can make 12 13 sure to have you on our list. And so at 1:33 I will reconvene 14 this hearing. Neil, I'll turn it over to you. 15 16 MR. RECTOR: Thank you, Commissioner. 17 One of the other areas I think 18 we've really had some difficulty reconciling 19 20 the reports and the statute or regulation, depending on which it is at the relevant 21 22 moment, is the what I call the standard. Ι

mean the Milliman report and the reports from 1 2 Carefirst have gone through a series of calculations to come up with a, quote, optimal 3 4 surplus target range, unquote, and of course, 5 that phrase isn't in the statute or the regulation, and we're trying to measure 6 7 something that may be the same; it may be different. We're trying to get some idea of 8 9 how you view the numbers you've calculated relative to the statute. 10 Obviously, one of the factors 11 that's in the statute is financial soundness 12 13 because you've got the obligation to make a contribution to the maximum extent consistent 14 with financial soundness, soundness and 15 efficiency. 16 You've come up with your optimal 17 range of 750 to 1050 RBC. Is that in your 18 19 mind, is that the same range as the range of 20 financial soundness so that if you fall below 21 750 you're financially unsound or is financial

22 soundness a different number, a different

method, a different calculation? 1 2 I'm just trying to get some sense on how those two things reconcile. 3 MR. BURRELL: Well --4 5 MR. RECTOR: It's kind of for the I'm not sure who's the appropriate 6 panel. 7 one. MR. BURRELL: Go ahead. 8 9 MR. DOBSON: Optimal surplus 10 studies were not done in view of this specific statute at all. So I would defer that to the 11 company, but our definition of optimal surplus 12 13 range is defined in the report, and I kind of mentioned it today, and it's based on the 14 considerations for the company and its board 15 and not directly related to the statute. 16 Our work on the attribution, of 17 course, was in relation to a statute, but our 18 19 surplus was not. MR. BURRELL: Yeah, I think in 20 21 some ways I would echo that, that without regard to the statute first, the fundamental 22

Page 197

question the company would have to ask or the 1 2 board would have to ask is what range ought we as a company to be in, and from the standpoint 3 of what would a healthy company -- how would 4 5 a healthy company want to position itself, optimum is the answer to that. Be within a 6 7 certain range. It's neither too high nor too low. 8 9 At times you may be at different 10 points in the range or you may even be below the range. We have never been above it, but 11 you strive to be in a certain place. 12 That's 13 on the company as a whole. I think an important point is that 14 regardless of how attribution is done, it's a 15 piece of a whole, and the smaller the piece, 16 then the higher typically the range. 17 18 So if optimum of 750 to 1050 is on the company as a whole, what's optimum on the 19 20 piece that happens to be attributable to the District? How much higher would that have to 21 22 be is a fundamental question.

1 We didn't posit an answer on that, 2 but we did offer the thought that it has to be higher, and it depends on the final 3 methodology that is chosen as to how you 4 5 develop an attribution. 6 But if you took our situation, the 7 one that we proposed, it comes out with an 11.6 percent of the total GHMSI reserve. 8 9 That's a very small piece. It is 10 proportionate generally to the membership where they reside. 11 We did not ask Milliman -- we 12 13 could, but we did not ask Milliman to advise us on what RBC range ought to apply to 11.6 14 percent of the total reserve. 15 16 MR. RECTOR: Have you asked Milliman or have you conducted any internal 17 studies on what you consider to be a range 18 that equals financial soundness of the company 19 as a whole? 20 MR. BURRELL: Well, i think you 21 22 would say in all honesty there are different

Page 199

1 definitions of financial soundness, right? 2 Right. Could be. MR. RECTOR: MR. BURRELL: Is it sound to be 3 4 above a regulatory level? Yes. 5 Is it sound to be above the Blue Cross level? Yes. 6 7 Is it sound to be in what you ought to be in is a optimum range? Of course. 8 9 So there's a subjectivity to that 10 judgment of what is soundness. Our point was somewhat different, which was that the 11 alternate uses of a reserve, particularly in 12 13 light of the command in the charter to benefit the subscribers, had to be taken into account. 14 If subscribers are struggling to 15 16 afford, how do you use your resources to help them afford their coverage? And so we were 17 trying to bring that to light, but in the end 18 soundness is judgmental. 19 Our board chose that on the 20 21 aggregate, that the company ought to be just 22 from a sound business operation standpoint in

an optimum range, within an optimum range, and 1 2 therefore, they sought the best possible advice as to what that optimum range ought to 3 4 be, and we have been consistently, as we said, 5 in the bottom third of it or the bottom half We would consider that to be 6 of it. 7 financially sound. The more you drive lower, the more 8 9 you go down towards control levels, these are 10 things not to be sought after, but to be

11 avoided. They are not optimum, and so we
12 looked at it and I think in that context.

13 And then if you try to struggle through all of the complexities of how do you 14 do attribution, whatever it is you come out 15 with as a conclusion, it's going to be a 16 subpart of, a piece of a larger hole. So if 17 the optimum on the whole is 750 to 1050, it's 18 going to have to be higher on the part. 19 20 MR. RECTOR: Yeah, I'm sorry. Ι 21 may not be asking the question well. I'm

22 trying to figure out, again, on the whole with

the company if there is a range that you 1 believe or if there is a number or a 2 methodology you believe as to what constitutes 3 financial soundness of the whole. 4 5 MR. BURRELL: I think the simple 6 answer to that is the range we have. 7 MR. RECTOR: So if the company, if GHMSI were to fall to 700 percent RBC, you 8 9 would consider GHMSI to be financially 10 unsound? MR. BURRELL: Again, it's not 11 optimum, and soundness is such a judgmental 12 13 thing. The purpose of the policy of the board was basically to say what range ought we be in 14 and if we slip below it to gradually bring 15 ourselves back as moderately as possible to be 16 within it, and if we're too high, to bring 17 ourselves back down so that we are within it 18 again. 19 And so that's what I think it's 20 21 the statute that used the term "soundness," 22 "financial soundness." We were looking at it

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

Page 202

from the standpoint of how would you sensibly 1 run a business with these characteristics. 2 MR. RECTOR: yeah, I understand 3 the difference in approach, which is, I think 4 5 why we're trying to figure out how the information Milliman has is relevant to the 6 7 task that we have, which is a different task. MR. HOGAN: Could I speak to that, 8 9 too? 10 MR. RECTOR: Please. I think that the 11 MR. HOGAN: beginning point, we are mixing two different 12 13 issues here. There is a two-step analysis under the statute that you're required to go 14 through. One is, and I think that this was 15 lost in the Appleseed, and Covington analysis 16 mixes these issues. The first decision you 17 have to make or that the Commissioner has to 18 make is whether we have an unreasonably large 19 20 surplus. And the regs define that as two 21 22 one, whether we're above the NAIC Blue parts:

Cross level and then the amount of surplus
 needed by the corporation to meet its expected
 and unanticipated contingencies.

I think that what Milliman has done here and what the company has done is looked at the first element of that, and the report goes to whether our surplus is unreasonably large. I think the conclusion has to be in reading the analysis that it isn't unreasonably large.

You don't get to the second part of the analysis of whether we are meeting our community health reinvestment obligation and the associated issue of financial soundness until you make a determination that the surplus is unreasonably large.

And so I think if we look at it through the prism of that as a two-step process that the Milliman report goes to the first part of that issue. It is unreasonably large? No, it isn't is the answer based on where Milliman was, what they recommended, and

1 where the actual surplus is.

2	The second part of it, if you get
3	to that, if there's a finding of unreasonable
4	largeness of the surplus, then you get to the
5	issue of what Mr. Burrell spent a significant
6	amount of time talking about: rate
7	moderation, contributions to the community,
8	long-term investments to benefit our
9	subscribers.
10	So I think it's really critical to
11	keep those two things separate when we're
12	analyzing the approach to the decision that
13	the Commissioner has to make.
14	MR. RECTOR: Okay.
15	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Is it
16	possible though and has the company considered
17	operating outside of that optimum range?
18	We're not talking down at RBC levels, but
19	we're talking at a range that is not in the
20	optimum range that Milliman has come up with
21	and that the company has subscribed to, but
22	perhaps just short of that or somewhere in

between the two that is still a sound position 1 2 to be in financially. MR. BURRELL: i think the board 3 4 has taken the vie that the place to be is 5 within the range, and if we were to fall below the range, to try over time to get back to the 6 7 range and to follow the best expert advice they were given. 8 9 So, no. If you were going to do, I think, what you described you would lower 10 11 the range. 12 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: So the 13 board is not willing to operate outside of

15 saying. That's the range that has been

that optimum range is basically what you're

16 professionally suggested to you, and that's

17 the range you subscribe to and you're not

18 willing at this point --

19MR. BURRELL: Not a matter of20policy to operate outside the range. As a21matter of choice.

22

14

That would be basically the board

saying we have obtained the best advice we 1 2 could get. We have had it multiply confirmed, and we won't follow it, and I think from the 3 standpoint of the fiduciary responsibility of 4 5 the board, they don't want to be in that 6 position. 7 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: But where in that decision do you weigh your community 8 9 obligation? 10 MR. BURRELL: It's part of it. 11 It's part of it because as I said before, the 12 giving that the company provides every year 13 that is growing is part of that. 14 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: So you've struck that balance you believe. 15 16 MR. BURRELL: Yes. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: 17 Appropriately. 18 19 MR. BURRELL: Yes, I believe so. MR. RECTOR: 20 Mr. Hogan, I just 21 want to repeat back what I think I heard to make sure I understand it, that when you look 22

to the statute -- and, again, I'm looking at 1 31-3506(e)(2), which is the after the hearing 2 portion -- "after the hearing is the 3 4 Commissioner determines that the surplus is 5 unreasonably large and inconsistent with the corporation's obligation." 6 7 I think I'm hearing you say that the Milliman test of optimal surplus target 8 9 range is the functional equivalent of the 10 words "unreasonably large" in the statute. Well, I believe that 11 MR. HOGAN: 12 the Milliman report goes to the issue of whether the reserves of the company are 13 unreasonably large or not, and they've come to 14 the opinion that our range should be between 15 16 750 and 1050 RBC. In applying the facts that are in the world that we know, the RBC in 2008 17 was at 845. I think that answers the question 18 19 of whether we have an unreasonably large 20 reserve or not. 21 MR. BURRELL: Well, stated alternatively, can you have an unreasonably 22

large reserve when you are within the bottom 1 half of an optimal range that was 2 professionally advised based on all your 3 facts? 4 5 MR. RECTOR: That was actually 6 going to be my next question. And the answer 7 in your judgment? MR. BURRELL: I would say no. 8 9 Now, it's possible, and Milliman's second 10 analysis of the company's reserves set a slightly lower range than the first one did. 11 The first one was 800 to 1100. The second one 12 13 was 750 to 1050. It is theoretically possible that in the real world, I guess, as well, that 14 if the characteristics of risk for the company 15 changed materially, that you would readjust 16 the range based on those characteristics and 17 18 facts. And that's why the company does 19 20 this every three years. So you could envision a situation where the risk characteristics 21 22 were different, up or down, and we would

expect that the professional advice would be to answer the question, what's the optimal range given the risk characteristics and other things that need to be considered. What's the optimum range we ought to be in, given the then current understanding of the facts?

And so we would expect that the 7 range would possibly be modified over time, 8 9 but based on sound actuarial advice. That's 10 why we had them come back and do it again, and we will have them come back and have them do 11 it yet again at least every three years if not 12 13 more frequently, given the scrutiny that this issue seems to evoke. 14

MR. RECTOR: 15 So we've got testimony from Milliman which goes toward, in 16 your judgment, toward whether the surplus is 17 unreasonably large. I think I'm hearing you 18 say we don't really have testimony on what 19 level constitutes financial soundness for the 20 21 company because in your judgment we didn't 22 need to get there because we haven't made

1 the --

2	MR. BURRELL: Can the surplus be
3	unreasonably large that is found to be in the
4	middle or lower end of an optimal range.
5	MR. RECTOR: Yeah, I'm sorry. I'm
6	dealing with the second half or second part of
7	the standard. Is there any testimony as to
8	what constitutes the level of financial
9	soundness or unsoundness of this?
10	MR. BURRELL: No, but I'd just
11	make one other point here. The optimal range,
12	to state the obvious again, that Milliman came
13	to was on the whole. We think it is
14	conceptually, mechanically and every other way
15	impossible to conclude that a part would be
16	lower than the whole, the range on the part
17	would be lower than the whole. It is
18	somewhere higher.
19	And so the test in the law is on
20	only the portion that is attributable to the
21	District after you get finished with the
22	conclusion about whether the whole is

1 unreasonable.

2	MR. HOGAN: And if I could
3	supplement that answer, the statute says a
4	corporate this is the definition of the
5	community health reinvestment. "A corporation
6	shall engage in community health reinvestment
7	to the maximum and consistent with
8	financial soundness and efficiency."
9	I think there's been a significant
10	amount of testimony today by Mr. Burrell and
11	others talkinga bout exactly what our
12	community health reinvestment is, the board
13	decision of how they set it, particular
14	numbers, \$46 million, for instance for this
15	year, about what the reinvestment in the
16	community would be in light of the current
17	financial circumstances of the company.
18	There's been significant testimony
19	about the board committee and the staff that
20	comes to the board committee to analyze that,
21	and I think it's fair to characterize all of
22	that testimony to say that those decisions are

1 driven by what can we give to the community 2 consistent with our charter and in light of the current financial situation of the company 3 and our board's commitment to being a 4 5 participant in this community and assisting the community and are subscribers to the 6 7 extent that it can. So to answer your question, I do 8 9 think we deal with both elements of the 10 inquiry that the Commissioner has to undertake 11 here. 12 I have two MR. RECTOR: Okay. 13 very specific questions and I know there are a couple of questions on the community 14 investment and then we've got some actuarial 15 16 things. Well, actually three. 17 The first is, I mean, Mr. Burrell, you've talked 18 extensively about the thin margins, the one to 19 20 two percent, the .2 percent. I just want to make sure I understand. We're talking there 21 22 about underwriting margins, not including

1 investment income or does that include
2 investment?

3 MR. BURRELL: It does not. 4 MR. RECTOR: Okay. The second is 5 on page 3 of your testimony where we're 6 talking about the charter and you go back to 7 the language. It's the second full paragraph. It's only one sentence. GHMSI "shall not be 8 9 conducted for profit, but shall be conducted for the benefit of the" -- there's an 10 ellipsis. Do we -- I don't know if you have 11 to read it into the record, but I'd just like 12 13 to make sure we get a copy of what was omitted. 14 15 MR. BURRELL: We can tell you what that is. 16 MR. RECTOR: Okay. What is it? I 17 don't know if it's long or short. 18 19 MR. BURRELL: It's short. 20 MR. RECTOR: Okay. 21 MR. BURRELL: I think. MR. HOGAN: You are talking about 22

1 this?

MR. BURRELL: "Shall not be 2 3 conducted for profit." MR. RECTOR: "But shall be 4 5 conducted for the benefit of the" and there were some words. 6 7 MR. BURRELL: "Aforesaid." MR. RECTOR: "Of the aforesaid"? 8 9 Okay. 10 MR. BURRELL: That's the only word that's taken out. 11 12 MR. RECTOR: Okay. 13 (Laughter.) MR. RECTOR: I'm confident the 14 department has a copy of the charter, but 15 16 could you make sure we get a copy for the record? 17 18 MR. BURRELL: Certainly. 19 MR. RECTOR: And I guess the last 20 question that I've got is for Mr. Dobson. On page 3 of your testimony, you talk about the 21 22 criteria that you used in developing your

models, the first one being that you provide 1 a "very high likelihood" that you're going to 2 exceed the 375, and then second, that you're 3 going to have "virtual certainty" that you're 4 5 going to stay over the 200 percent. 6 MR. DOBSON: Right. 7 MR. RECTOR: And I know you believe both criteria are important, and I 8 9 know that your charge from the company was with respect to both criteria, but if the only 10 criterion had been the second one, the 200 11 percent of RBC, do you know what your range 12 13 would have been? Not as I sit here I 14 MR. DOBSON: 15 don't, no. I don't know whether 16 MR. RECTOR: that's something we know or can figure out or 17 if we would like to have them. 18 I do recall that the 19 MR. DOBSON: 20 upper bound, the 1050 is driven by the 375, but I don't know exactly what the range would 21 22 be just driven by that second criteria.

1 MR. RECTOR: Do you know if the 2 lower bound would be altered or was the lower bound determined solely by --3 The lower bound would 4 MR. DOBSON: 5 not be altered. MR. RECTOR: So it would be 750 to 6 7 some number that -- your belief is that if you only had the second criterion that the range 8 9 would be 750 to some number probably less than 10 1050, but 750 to some --11 MR. DOBSON: That's my recollection, not that I would agree with 12 13 that, but --I understand that. 14 MR. RECTOR: -- if that were the 15 MR. DOBSON: 16 only criteria, yes. 17 MR. RECTOR: Okay. Jim, I just want to make sure we either get from them 18 information where we know that or that if we 19 don't think we have that, then that they at 20 least provide that information with respect to 21 22 their -- yeah, if you can go ahead and --

1 MR. DOBSON: We may even have it in some of the documentation that you have, 2 but we can talk about it. 3 MR. RECTOR: Okay. I think that's 4 5 all the questions I have, Commissioner. 6 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Jim -- oh, 7 sorry. MS. SCHROEDER: I'm sorry. 8 I just 9 had a few quick questions on the community 10 health reinvestment expenditures issue. The definition in the statute of those 11 12 expenditures are those that promote and 13 safeguard the public health or that benefit current or future subscribers, including 14 premium rate reductions. 15 Some of the documents that were on 16 I know the District's Website included your 17 community care initiatives reports. Would you 18 say that all of those kinds of charitable 19 20 givings you would include within that definition? 21 22 MR. BURRELL: Yes.

1 There's MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. 2 also a number of places where there's 3 different references to numbers contributed 4 either by the Carefirst organization or by 5 GHMSI specifically. I think you mentioned today in your testimony, I think, a \$14 6 7 million figure, and then also a \$46 million range in the region. 8 9 MR. BURRELL: Which is the company 10 as a whole. 11 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. 12 MR. BURRELL: CFI. 13 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm having trouble finding though in what we have the specific 14 numbers of those total expenditures both for 15 2008 and thus far or projected in 2008. 16 MR. BURRELL: There is detail on 17 that, and we can certainly supply that ot you. 18 MS. SCHROEDER: That would be 19 20 wonderful. Okay. MR. RECTOR: I think the reason 21 22 Sarah asked that first question is because as

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

we started looking through the numbers here,
 we saw things at least on their surface that
 didn't necessarily look like they met the
 promote the public health thing.
 I mean, for example there's, you

7 Representatives' Christmas party or the Howard8 University Office of the President.

know, the sponsorship was to the House of

6

9 MR. BURRELL: Right, right. There 10 are a lot of things that we do as a corporate 11 good citizen that you could say are not going 12 to be things that promote the public health. 13 The vast majority of what we do -- and we can 14 break it down -- we think does.

Those categories that you just 15 mentioned are tiny, little pieces of our total 16 community spending, but we can break it down, 17 and that's the whole essence of the triangle 18 that I mentioned earlier. 19 The tip of that 20 triangle are for things like what you described. They're the smallest, most 21 22 inconsequential piece of our whole community

1 relations efforts.

2	Where the big dollars are are in
3	subsidies, catalytic giving, that kind of
4	programmatic initiatives that we do think have
5	a direct bearing on public health.
6	MR. RECTOR: Okay. I guess our
7	question or our request would be when you
8	submit materials in a couple of weeks if you
9	could just scrutinize these lists to just see
10	what and you don't have to worry down to
11	the penny. Again, it's the big dollars we're
12	concerned about, but just make sure that in
13	your view that your belief is that the numbers
14	that you're submitting are numbers that you
15	believe meet that statutory or regulatory
16	test.
17	MR. BURRELL: We can do that.
18	MS. SCHROEDER: And one quick
19	question. On this report when there's a
20	reference to NCA, what
21	MR. BURRELL: National Capital
22	Area, which is often used as synonymous with

1 GHMSI.

2	MS. SCHROEDER: But not
3	necessarily in this report. That might
4	include contributions by other corporate
5	entities?
б	MR. BURRELL: no.
7	MS. SCHROEDER: It will just be
8	GHMSI. Okay, great. thank you.
9	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Jim.
10	MR. TOOLE: Good afternoon. I've
11	got some broad questions, and then some more
12	specific questions about the model and also
13	following up with some questions for Mr.
14	Carlson.
15	Okay. Could you describe the
16	pricing margins over the last few years and
17	kind of how you come at a range and byproduct,
18	how they varied?
19	MR. CHANEY: Certainly. Our long-
20	term model was to target margins that we
21	thought were actuarially sound, taking into
22	consideration the risk of a particular segment

and the need to maintain our surplus at certain levels. So those levels are approximately for the individual products in the four to five percent range, for the small group in the three to four percent, and for the risk business, let's say, 51 plus, more in the two to three percent range.

8 We have, because of the economy, 9 because of the competitive marketplace and 10 because of trying to maintain an affordable 11 position, not included margins at that level 12 in recent years. I think somebody asked 13 earlier what happened since 2005, since the 14 last hearing.

One of the things if you look at 15 some of the charts that we provided in our 16 filings, you can see that our margins have 17 come down significantly, that our underwriting 18 margins had been much closer to one to two 19 20 percent than they were previously, which was 21 generally over two percent, and our bottom 22 line margins have been in the one to three

1 percent range.

So we're basically taking each of those products and considering the dynamics in the marketplace and coming off that longer term profile, and on average I would say each of those margins has been reduced by a point or two.

8 MR. TOOLE: So when you price you 9 don't expect to come out with an underwriting 10 margin of zero. You do expect, if everything 11 goes as planned and risk volatility, you would 12 expect to earn money.

13 MR. CHANEY: For all of our Carefirst companies, we've targeted for 2009 14 one-half of one percent underwriting margin 15 In our longer term planning we hope 16 for 2009. to be able to grow that back closer to one, 17 one and a half percent subject to where the 18 surplus is, the market, the economy and health 19 care trends because the affordability balance 20 of this is always premier, right at the top of 21 22 our list in making this decision.

1	MR. TOOLE: At the end of each
2	year and end of each quarter you have to set
3	IB&R reserves. Can you describe your
4	philosophy? Are you trying to hit that
5	exactly or do you have a margin in that
б	reserve, or what has your experience been in
7	the last few years
8	MR. CHANEY: In recent years it
9	has been somewhat different than it was for,
10	let's say, going back three to five.
11	Typically we've tried to put best estimate
12	plus some margin for deviations of
13	approximately eight to ten percent dependent
14	upon the particular product line and the
15	volatility that we've seen in that.
16	Up until the 2007-2008 time
17	frames, we were pretty good in our estimates.
18	that has since changed, and we proved the
19	point that you need those margins in some
20	years because we had, as many others in our
21	insurance, as the trend started spiking up in
22	late 2007, going into 2008, some run-on claims

1 that we didn't expect.

2	MR. TOOLE: But if you set a
3	reserve with margin and you don't need it,
4	where do those margins go?
5	MR. CHANEY: As long as one keeps
6	the same level of margin year over year, it
7	balances out, and therefore, the run rate of
8	a particular year really reflects the premiums
9	and costs of that year, subject to enrollment
10	growth that might require some additional
11	margin on top of your best estimate.
12	MR. TOOLE: You mentioned the
13	underwriting cycle, and if you could for those
14	of us in the room who maybe might not
15	understand it, if you could explain that to
16	people, including myself.
17	MR. DOBSON: Well, historically,
18	for many years the health insurance industry
19	had a three year up and three year down cycle
20	that was well documented by both commercial
21	carriers and notably the Blues. That has
22	definitely changed over recent history.

There's no doubt about the change in the
 cycle.

3 So I would characterize the work 4 that we do now as looking at adverse loss 5 cycles that could occur as opposed to thinking 6 it's going to be any sort of regular 7 recurring, you know, three years up or three 8 years down.

9 But we still strongly believe in 10 the possibility of an adverse loss cycle that 11 could, as we model it, take into account two 12 or two and a half rating cycles and thus be 13 experienced financially over a three or a 14 four-year financial period.

MR. TOOLE: So after an adverse 15 loss cycle, what would you expect? 16 MR. DOBSON: After the adverse 17 loss cycle, you would normally expect some 18 sort of recovery going forward from there. 19 20 MR. TOOLE: Okay. In your 375 21 percent Blue Cross/Blue Shield scenario, I 22 guess we assume that GHMSI is a going concern.

You're still solvent, right? 1 Well, test just as a 2 MR. DOBSON: gift to the 375. We really don't go beyond 3 that. 4 5 MR. TOOLE: Okay. So they're a 6 solvent, going concern. 7 MR. DOBSON: Right. MR. TOOLE: 8 Okay. 9 MR. DOBSON: Right. 10 MR. TOOLE: So how are the up 11 cycle gains in the future taken into account in your model? 12 MR. DOBSON: Well, the expectation 13 would be that if they survive that, they then 14 build back hopefully to the optimal range. 15 The modeling is just looking at the adverse 16 cycle and the probability of what happens to 17 get them down to that adverse position. 18 MR. TOOLE: And during the down 19 20 cycle, how do you handle the tax implications? MR. DOBSON: The tax implications 21 22 during the down cycle are that we assume that

any loss carry-forwards or deferred tax assets 1 2 will not be recoverable because they're currently in a loss cycle, and beyond that I 3 guess I'm not positive of the intricacies of 4 5 the model. MR. TOOLE: So in the future when 6 7 there are gains, those losses, they would be of value. 8 9 Certainly, depending MR. DOBSON: 10 on timing and the tax laws and things like 11 that. 12 Okay. This is more of MR. TOOLE: 13 a -- I don't know -- speculative question. The 2008 RBC calculations include 14 approximately nine percent for the non-FEP, 15 two percent for FEP premium, and one percent 16 for ASC premium. That's in that underwriting 17 portion, H1, of the RBC calculation. Do you 18 think those ratios properly reflect the risk 19 attributes of those lines of business? 20 MR. DOBSON: I'm not sure I follow 21 22 the question. You're talking about the actual

1 NAIC prescribed --2 MR. TOOLE: That's correct. 3 MR. DOBSON: -- calculations. MR. TOOLE: 4 Yes. 5 MR. DOBSON: And the intent of that is to reflect the mix of business of the 6 7 company in establishing minimum regulatory surplus levels. 8 MR. TOOLE: And in that 9 calculation --10 MR. DOBSON: The two and the one 11 are proper reflection of the relative risk 12 13 between the two. MR. RECTOR: Yeah, for this 14 company I is really the question. It's does 15 the NAIC model percentages in your view 16 accurately show the risk. I think that's your 17 question. 18 19 MR. TOOLE: Yes. 20 MR. RECTOR: He's not asking for 21 general judgments on the NAIC model, but does the NAIC model in its numbers and its relative 22

risk positions and relative risk charges, does
 that seem to match up to the risks that you've
 seen in this companY?

We don't believe that 4 MR. DOBSON: 5 the NAIC prescribed RBC calculation can 6 reflect the risk totally accurately. It's a 7 rough tool to be used by regulators, and we understand the purpose and the intent of it. 8 9 That's why we don't just say there's a 10 prescribed percentage of RBC that every company ought to hold, and that's why we do 11 our own analysis of the particular risk 12 13 characteristic.

14 So I'm not sure that the 15 particular question, although I think I 16 understand it, is relevant to our analysis 17 because we don't really do that. We look at 18 what the surplus needs to be and then just for 19 convenience we measure that as a percentage of 20 RBC.

21 MR. TOOLE: Can you briefly22 describe the history of your model and how it

1 evolved?

2	MR. DOBSON: It goes back. I
3	mean, the initial surplus work that the firm
4	has done goes back preceding that technical
5	advisory committee that I mentioned chairing
б	in the late '70s or early '80s. So I think
7	our work probably started in the early '70s.
8	At that point, of course, there
9	was essentially no computing capabilities. We
10	tended to do more of a scenario approach,
11	which was not as statistically based, much the
12	currently out of vogue method of, you know,
13	stacking probabilities on top of each other
14	without really doing the convolutions or
15	combined simulations.
16	That evolved over the years and,
17	in fact, that that technical advisory
18	committee presented two possible alternatives
19	of how to do it, one being computer based
20	model, and so things were just evolving during
21	that period.
22	In the early '80s, I was involved

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

in a study for the Illinois Blue Cross plan 1 2 where the Insurance Department of Illinois requested that I be hired to do that because 3 of my chairmanship of the technical advisory 4 5 committee, and that's when we joked about it the other, day, but we actually developed a 6 7 model that shut down the company's computers over New Year's Day weekend because the 8 9 computing power even using their mainframe 10 just still wasn't there to do the sorts of things we do now. 11 then I left the firm for a while 12 13 in the '80s --14 MR. TOOLE: I'm sorry. MR. DOBSON: -- probably when most 15 of the current method evolved. So I think the 16 current modeling probably developed through 17 the '80s and '90s. I wasn't directly involved 18 in a lot of that until these recent Carefirst 19 20 assignments. And even there with the high mark 21 22 work that the Milliman Philadelphia office

did, I wasn't personally involved in that. 1 2 There were certain criticisms made by the Commissioner that we did reflect in later 3 versions of the model. So we continue to 4 5 refine is what I'm getting at. We continue to make changes as people look at it and give us 6 7 suggestions or as we find things that don't really meet the client's needs or the 8 9 regulator's needs. 10 MR. TOOLE: Can you describe how you modeled the three what I would call lines 11 of business and how the income streams for 12 13 each were handled? Well, that's all 14 MR. DOBSON: based on the company's pro forma financial 15 So we established the three 16 projection. different risk cells, one being the non-FEP 17 risk, FEP by itself, and then the ASC risk, 18 and we're using the company's financial 19 20 projections and looking at that, but we make a simpler model to be used for our purposes 21 22 that reproduces that in their instance and

then that we can put our probability 1 2 distributions in the adverse loss cycles into that kind of model. 3 MR. TOOLE: Briefly describe the 4 5 different risks. I know that you have the seven risks, which I affectionately call the 6 7 seven sisters, and you have the FEP and the ACS. Can you describe how the FEP was modeled 8 9 in the pro forma and the ASC and how that's different than these others? 10 MR. DOBSON: Well, in terms of our 11 assumptions, the FEP is treated totally 12 13 differently because we don't have the -- we don't apply the rating risk, which is the big 14 driver. This is that number one risk, the 15 rating risk, which is partially medical trend, 16 but it can be other factors in the rating 17 formula, any sort of mistake that the company 18 makes or any sort of fact that the assumed 19 20 results don't occur gets reflected in that 21 first one. That does not apply to FEP. That 22 does not apply to ASC.

1 MR. TOOLE: So let me stop there 2 because if there's no rating risk, it feels to me that the RBC calculation might put too 3 much weight on FEP in their analysis, thereby 4 5 driving up RBC ratios to levels which may not be necessary for the singular company GHMSI, 6 7 which has the bulk of the FEP risk. MR. DOBSON: I see where you're 8 I don't think that would 9 going with that. 10 affect our results. It might affect the 11 percentage. For example, if you change the 12 13 NAIC prescribed formula and made that .1 percent instead of one percent, it will have 14 a much lower RBC. The recommended ranges 15 16 would then be much higher ranges. 17 MR. TOOLE: Okay. 18 MR. RECTOR: I'm sorry. Just to follow up on that, so if they had done that, 19 20 the companies reported RBC you're saying might be lower, but the Milliman recommended ranges 21 22 even would stay the same or would even be

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

Page 237 1 higher. Is that the point? 2 MR. DOBSON: We develop it as a 3 chance of getting to the various levels. MR. RECTOR: But I think if the 4 5 NAIC changed so that they went from line one percent to ...1, what it would change from the 6 7 NAICs would be the authorized control level That would go down. 8 RBC. 9 MR. DOBSON: Yes, but --MR. RECTOR: So I think the 10 11 multiple would actually be a higher multiple. 12 MR. RECTOR: -- change in itself, 13 too. 14 MR. RECTOR: Is that --MR. DOBSON: Yes, I would have to 15 look at that. That could have some impact. 16 I'm not sure about that now that you mention 17 18 it. 19 MR. RECTOR: You haven't thought 20 of that. That's --MR. DOBSON: I see a different 21 22 aspect of it I wasn't think though.

MR. TOOLE: Okay. That's why I'm 1 2 here. 3 You have really a rich history in your model, but can you talk about some 4 5 limitations that you see in the approach both from the standpoint of your company's specific 6 7 assumptions and maybe in model design? What are your strengths and your weaknesses? 8 9 MR. DOBSON: The strengths? 10 MR. TOOLE: Yeah. I think we've 11 heard the strengths. It's the standard, but 12 what maybe does it not capture? 13 MR. DOBSON: Well, not model is 14 perfect. 15 MR. TOOLE: Right. 16 MR. DOBSON: There's always simplifying assumptions, of course. I'm sure 17 there could be a lot of things one could look 18 at and think, well, gee, we could do this a 19 little bit better or that a little bit better. 20 21 The biggest thing I can think of 22 offhand that we might want to refine going

1 forward is the reflection of size. We have 2 introduced reflection of size now, but it's still not very sensitive to size. So that 3 might be something that we look at changing in 4 5 future iterations. 6 MR. TOOLE: How does your model --7 well, as it stands, it's my understanding that the model is independent of management 8 9 actions. So can you describe specific 10 interventions that management could take to mitigate losses or discretionary during a down 11 cycle? 12 13 MR. DOBSON: I'm not sure I would have described it as independent of management 14 interventions, but I can see you describing it 15 that way because in the loss cycle we assume 16 that that loss cycle is going to occur, and it 17 may be in spite of management's intentions and 18 various interventions that management might 19 20 do. The other thing that counters that 21 22 a little bit is if management is not actually

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

getting the margins that we assume, we do 1 assume that those margins are being built in 2 the rates. So to the extent that those aren't 3 into it going in, you know, maybe there's a 4 5 lack of conservatism to that element. So that may counter that just a little bit. 6 7 Again, it's impossible for a model to exactly replicate what would happen in 8 9 reality. 10 MR. TOOLE: Then I guess I'd throw out to management then if we're in a down or 11 an adverse cycle, what sorts of investments in 12 13 infrastructure can be delayed. MR. BURRELL: Well, you're talking 14 about administrative things? 15 Well, I know that 16 MR. TOOLE: you're in your long-term plan. You have quite 17 a bit of plan investments in infrastructure, 18 and they do contribute to the down cycle. So 19 20 I guess --21 MR. BURRELL: Well, it has a very, 22 very minor --

1 MR. TOOLE: I mean, management has 2 to matter. So what steps can you take during an adverse loss cycle to mitigate that? 3 4 MR. BURRELL: Let me just put it 5 in perspective. Our admin as a percentage of 6 our revenue last year was 10.8 percent. It 7 might vary a fraction of a percent year to year as we go forward. It's not a very big 8 9 difference year to year, will never have by 10 itself a huge impact on the cycle. Things that relate more to the 11 cost of care, what care actually costs and 12 13 what trends are actually in the market, I mean, we are always looking at ways to improve 14 the way we contract with providers, provide 15 incentives for high quality, cost effective 16 care, ability to measure it, see it, reward 17 it. 18 But in terms of the actual 19 20 administrative expense, it's a small piece of 21 the total equation, and even minor foreseeable 22 changes in that don't have much impact on the

MR. TOOLE: Sixty million dollars. 2 3 MR. BURRELL: Well, and billions. 4 MR. TOOLE: I recognize that, but 5 that's the difference between --6 MR. BURRELL: -- over a period of 7 years it's capitalized. It's not all in one period. 8 9 MR. TOOLE: And your long-term 10 plan and in this year there were specific expenditures for \$60 million. 11 12 MR. BURRELL: It's counteracting 13 forces. By making the investment we become more efficient. The net off that we're trying 14 to get if you just look at just the 15 administrative dollar is to cut the 16 administrative dollar, not add to it. 17 So the investment is almost always in that context. 18 MR. TOOLE: Okay. One of the 19 20 drivers of the range was the amount of growth that was assumed in a down cycle. Can growth 21 22 be managed?

1

whole.

1	MR. BURRELL: Do you mean
2	enrollment growth or premium growth?
3	MR. TOOLE: Correct.
4	MR. BURRELL: Well, it goes to the
5	heart of our mission. We put ourselves out
6	there for the community, to attract
7	subscribers because we offer products that
8	they perceive having value. We don't say to
9	people, "We attracted you and we'll turn you
10	away in order for us to limit our growth."
11	That is antithetical to our mission.
12	So we take the growth we get, and
13	we seek to manage that, the costs of that
14	growth, by constantly becoming more efficient,
15	which comes to the investment question.
16	With regard to the yields in our
17	revenue, we have consistently in recent years
18	produced less revenue than our rating formulas
19	would indicate because employer groups buy
20	down their benefits. They reduce their
21	benefits.
22	So just as an example, to pick a

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433 simple example, if a group had a ten percent rate increase and didn't want to pay a ten percent rate increase, they would increase their deductible or introduce other limits in their benefit plan design to cut that increase down.

7 And the biggest thing that has happened, as I mentioned in my testimony, in 8 9 recently years, and it has been very fast, I think unprecedented, is the movement towards 10 high deductible health plans. As I mentioned 11 three years ago there was virtually none of 12 13 it, and today more than half the market in Maryland in the small group market has a high 14 deductible health plan, and that's what's 15 happening now by degrees in the District, same 16 pattern, just a slight stagger later. 17

18 So what happens is the premium is 19 quoted. The groups reduce the scope of their 20 benefit, and they don't have the rate increase 21 that they would have had otherwise, but 22 they're also offering to their members less

benefits, and that has had an effect on the 1 growth of the company's revenue for sure, and 2 that has been the biggest single factor is 3 that buy-down process, and that is not in any 4 5 way unique to us. That's basically going on 6 all over the country. 7 And it's a response, the first wave of response, if you will, to the high, 8 9 unaffordable price of health care coverage. 10 MR. TOOLE: thank you. 11 How many companies have you advised with regard to their surplus levels do 12 13 you think, Milliman, using this model? We've tallied that up 14 MR. DOBSON: at one point. I don't know if I recall the 15 exact number. I think it would be somewhere 16 between ten and 20. 17 MR. TOOLE: And are all of them in 18 a public hearing situation or some of them 19 20 just --21 MR. DOBSON: No, some of those are 22 non-public.

rage 210	Page	246
----------	------	-----

1	MR. TOOLE: Okay.
2	MR. DOBSON: And did you put a
3	time frame on that?
4	MR. TOOLE: No, I really didn't.
5	MR. DOBSON: Okay. Because I was
6	speaking over a number of years.
7	MR. TOOLE: Yeah. Have you been
8	in a situation where you've had to talk to a
9	company where their surplus was too little,
10	below the range?
11	MR. DOBSON: Oh, that they had
12	MR. TOOLE: That you advised,
13	below their advised range.
14	MR. DOBSON: I'm sorry. That
15	their surplus was below the
16	MR. TOOLE: Outside of the range.
17	MR. DOBSON: Outside of the range?
18	Not that I've personally been involved in.
19	I'm certain that's happened. I've certainly
20	been in situations where companies had too
21	little surplus.
22	MR. TOOLE: True. Have you been

in situations where you have advised companies 1 2 where there surplus is too high? 3 MR. DOBSON: I think there have been some situations, none that I can recall. 4 5 I couldn't point you to a single one, but I certainly concede that that could have 6 7 happened, yes. MR. TOOLE: It would be wonderful 8 9 to have that sort of information if it's available. 10 MR. DOBSON: Yeah, I can try to 11 find out certainly. 12 13 MR. TOOLE: So what are some potential downsides to accompany having too 14 much surplus in a market where they have a 15 dominant position? 16 MR. DOBSON: Are you addressing 17 that to me or to the company? 18 19 MR. TOOLE: I guess it's to the 20 panel. MR. BURRELL: Downside of too 21 22 much?

1	MR. TOOLE: Are there any
2	downsides to competitiveness for a company
3	having too much surplus when they are the
4	controlling force in the market?
5	MR. BURRELL: I don't know that
6	there's any controlling force in a market.
7	MR. TOOLE: Well, let's call it a
8	monopoly status where you've got 80 to 90
9	percent of the market.
10	MR. BURRELL: Okay. As I
11	explained earlier, every group comes to us
12	pass through extensive filters, if you will,
13	consultants who advise, who tell them what
14	their best value is, they don't listen to us
15	entirely. We make our case. They decide with
16	expert advice, without exception on the big
17	end, and on the small end we are always
18	virtually spreadsheet against the competition.
19	MR. TOOLE: Okay.
20	MR. BURRELL: Our value compared
21	to every other competitor. No market is
22	perfect, but to say that that is a control

situation, I think, is not the right way to 1 look at it. One thing about holding a reserve 2 that has been helpful and helpful to 3 subscribers is that the earnings on the 4 5 reserve itself are available so that you don't have to get those from the premiums 6 themselves, and that has a moderating effect 7 on premium. 8

9 We do have a substantial portion 10 of our bottom line come from the earnings on our reserve, and we return that, in effect, in 11 the form of lower premiums than we otherwise 12 13 would have charged because we don't need to get it from premium because we're getting it 14 from the earnings on the reserve itself, and 15 so that helps the subscriber. It helps make 16 it more affordable. The lower the reserve 17 gets, the lower the earnings go and the less 18 it helps. 19 20 MR. TOOLE: but there's no 21 situation where you talked about large

22 companies trying to enter the market and they

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

support lower rates coming in which are not 1 supportable on the other side of the equation 2 where you lower rates which are not 3 4 supportable in order to prevent competition. 5 MR. BURRELL: Again, we are, in terms of our connection to this community, 6 7 seeking to be the most stable continuous force here. We're not in the business of buying 8 9 business. 10 I would put something in In the small group market, and 11 perspective. I don't know that it is in the District off 12 13 the top of my head, but I do know what it is in the region overall. We cover 41,000 small 14 employer groups, and we cover another couple 15 of thousand groups that are between 51 and 16 199, and you could say those are medium size 17 groups, and we cover the jumbo groups that 18 have tens of thousands of people in them. 19 20 And the consequence of that is that we also offer flexibility in benefit 21 22 design. So for 41,000 small employer groups,

there are literally hundreds of benefit
combinations that they could pick, and at any
point in time, depending on the need of the
group, the advice of the consultant or the
broker, they're picking different combinations
of those things. It's a very complex market.

7 What we try to do in the light of that complex market is to say all things 8 9 considered, take all of that complexity, all 10 of the changes in the benefits, 45 percent of our groups change benefits on renewal. 11 So you take all of the complexity and the benefit 12 13 designs, all of the churn in the market, all of the changes in the membership, all of the 14 changes in the medical care trends, and you 15 16 try to say as a company can we get that right 17 within one percent.

And last year we had two-tenths of a percent, and this year we aspire to the lofty number of between half a percent and one percent. And the consequence of these millions of transactions that are going on is

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

1 such that it's hard to pin it down precisely, 2 but that's as precise as human beings can do 3 it, and we try to do that consistently over a 4 period of time so that it's not just one year. 5 It's multiple years. 6 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: A couple of

7 times in your testimony and in answer to, I think, that last question, you seem to imply 8 9 there's a relationship between the level of 10 surplus that you have and the pricing of your Is there an explicit component of 11 products. the pricing of your products that's related to 12 13 the amount of surplus that you have or --14 MR. BURRELL: No. COMMISSIONER BARLOW: -- it's --15 16 MR. BURRELL: No, I think it's the whole idea. If you take what we have said, we 17 try to establish on the best professional 18 advice we can get what an optimal range ought 19 20 to be. We try to stay within that range, which is the net of all the things I just 21 described. 22

COMMISSIONER BARLOW: And an
 optimal range of --

3 MR. BURRELL: The reserve.
4 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay, but
5 I'm trying to understand how that impacts
6 pricing.

7 MR. BURRELL: Pricing policy is affected by that because if you're below that, 8 9 you try to come back into it as moderately as 10 you can, which means you put a little more 11 margin in, and if you are in the range, you 12 don't have to put so much in. If you were at 13 the top of the range, you wouldn't put it in at all or you would put very little in so that 14 you would come back down. 15

16 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. So the way that the level of your surplus impacts 17 the pricing of your products is in the level 18 of the margin that you include in the pricing. 19 20 MR. BURRELL: Yes. 21 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay, and so there's not like a direct relation. 22 You look

1 at your surplus and you --

2	MR. BURRELL: With all of the
3	product designs that we have, in all of the
4	group sizes that we have, with all of the
5	individuals we have, it's the net effect of
6	how all of that is interplaying against each
7	other. It's a complex situation.
8	MR. TOOLE: Bob. Sorry. Mr.
9	Dobson. We're going to go into some
10	assumptions. I don't want to bore everybody
11	in the room, but I want to get some stuff on
12	the record. Recognizing that each assumption
13	is different in those seven groups, can you
14	explain the general process that you went
15	through and company specific factors?
16	I know you had some stuff that's
17	general for the Blue Cross/Blue Shield and
18	then some stuff that's company specific. Talk
19	about how you did that.
20	MR. DOBSON: The assumptions
21	themselves are the series of distributions of
22	the contingencies around those risks that we

shared with you and went through. 1 Most of 2 that is based on the experience of the consultants doing it and looking at and 3 considering the individual characteristics of 4 5 the company. I wouldn't say at least none of it I can think of offhand is based directly on 6 Blue Cross as a whole, other than the fact 7 that it affects our experience, I guess, 8 9 because we've worked with lots of Blue Cross 10 plans. But the actual setting of each of 11 those is based on considering the company 12 13 we're working for at the time and what we see from the experience and various analyses we 14 look at, you know, some of which I think we 15 discussed with you when you were in our 16

17 office.

I can't sit here now and tell you
exactly what we looked at for each one of
those unfortunately. I'd need the rest of the
team with me to be able to do that justice.
MR. TOOLE: There's a lot of

1 detail. Can you quickly describe -- you've already mentioned it -- how prior industry and 2 the GHMSI prior underwriting cycles impacted 3 your future underwriting cycle loss 4 5 distribution? Well, we don't 6 MR. DOBSON: 7 actually set the loss distribution based on those past ones. We look at those after the 8 9 fact as I described in my testimony. I would 10 say that this was going through the assumptions related to the seven risks. 11 We're considering what happened in prior times, in 12 13 past adverse experiences. That's more subjective in terms of setting those 14 assumptions about what might happen in the 15 future. 16 For example, on the trend or 17 rating factor miss, you know, we assign 18 probabilities that are literally within two 19 20 percent each way, you know, X percent 21 probability that within two percent each way 22 of expected, you know, Y percent that it will

be five percent deviation, and those are based 1 2 on our collective experience of all the different operations we've seen over the years 3 4 and what we know about the company's pricing. 5 MR. TOOLE: Could you explain how the margin that we just discussed is used in 6 7 your model, the pricing margins? MR. DOBSON: Yes. The margins go 8 9 in, the assumed margins, and that does have an 10 impact because that directly goes into that calculation of the trend. For example, if we 11 12 assume the company is going to be three 13 percent off on the trend, but we know they build a three percent margin in, then that 14 financial impact of that is zero. 15 So we directly take that into account, and that's 16 why if the company increases or decreases that 17 margin it directly affects our results. 18 19 MR. RECTOR: Can I ask a quick 20 follow-up on that? In the adverse cycles, did 21 you take the margins down to zero or --22 MR. DOBSON: No.

1 MR. RECTOR: -- I mean, the 2 adverse cycles I guess you'd increase the margin, pricing margin. 3 If you think about 4 MR. DOBSON: 5 margin perhaps the way Mr. Burrell is looking at it of what they achieve, of course, that 6 7 can go to zero; that can go negative. MR. RECTOR: Right. 8 9 MR. DOBSON: But the intended 10 pricing margin we give credit for. So if we say the company is off by five points in the 11 rating factors, well, we know they've built in 12 13 a three percent margin. Then we say the underwriting loss is going to be two percent. 14 Yeah, I flipped it. 15 MR. RECTOR: 16 In the model as you're going through the adverse cycles, and I'm coming back maybe to 17 Jim's earlier questions on management 18 In the model as you start going 19 intervention. in the adverse cycle, did you increase the 20 21 intended pricing margin? 22 No, we don't. MR. DOBSON: We use

1 the same one. One of the things I mentioned in the testimony was we look at the adverse 2 loss cycle that are over two or two and a half 3 4 rating cycles, and then we use a three or a 5 four-year financial period, and awe assume that there's going to be three years of 6 7 positive margin in the three-year cycle, four years of positive margin in the four-year 8 9 cycle. 10 So the four-year actually gives less severe bottom line results because we've 11 got four years of margin coming in. 12 13 MR. RECTOR: Margin. 14 MR. DOBSON: Right. MR. RECTOR: What's the standard 15 margin that you use throughout in the model, 16 if you recall? 17 MR. DOBSON: Is that considered 18 19 proprietary to the company? Well --20 MR. RECTOR: 21 MR. BURRELL: I mean the actual 22 margin we achieve is --

1 MR. RECTOR: No, I'm talking about 2 in the model. 3 MR. BURRELL: In the model I 4 don't. 5 MR. RECTOR: You don't? Okay. 6 That's --7 MR. DOBSON: Yeah, I think that's considered proprietary to the company, and I 8 9 would be hesitant to answer that without their 10 permission, but that has been shared with Jim, 11 yeah. 12 MR. TOOLE: So I'd like to change 13 over to Mr. Carlson, get you involved. You mentioned in your statement what you based 14 your opinion on, and I marked up something 15 that based on our understanding of their model 16 and consideration of their assumptions. 17 What sort of access to their assumptions did you 18 have that you were able to review? 19 20 MR. CARLSON: We had the report 21 that was publicly available, and we also have similar models that we run ourselves. 22 So

based on their report, we interpreted, you 1 know, what we would have put into our similar 2 models based on the publicly available report. 3 4 MR. TOOLE: In the publicly 5 available report, there was no information on 6 any of the seven risk assumptions. 7 MR. CARLSON: Right. MR. TOOLE: So you gave an opinion 8 9 without even looking at their risk 10 assumptions? 11 MR. CARLSON: We gave an opinion based on what we felt were a reasonable range 12 13 of what we would expect for these types of assumptions, and then we tested these ranges, 14 the high end and the low end, and we did not 15 run a Monte Carlo simulation as referenced in 16 the paper, but we were doing tests on the high 17 and low end. 18 19 So we were sort of testing the 20 extremes to see if we thought that our results would have been in line with their results. 21 22 MR. TOOLE: So you took a somewhat

different approach in that you didn't really 1 have any assumptions, and you didn't run any 2 simulations. I'm having a hard time 3 4 understanding what your report -- how it --5 MR. CARLSON: Well, you're 6 correct. We took a very different approach. 7 MR. TOOLE: Okay. MR. CARLSON: And that is true. 8 9 And our approach was, you know, coming in at 10 a very high level and examining what we -based on, you know, previous models that 11 we've run for previous Blues plans and some of 12 13 the basic, publicly available information on GHMSI if we felt that the results that were 14 coming out of Milliman's model were in line 15 with results we've seen in other Blues plans 16 and, you know, modified for assumptions that 17 may be applicable to GHMSI or assumptions that 18 would be sort of on the, like I mentioned, on 19 20 the testing the edges of what would be a 21 reasonable assumption. 22 MR. TOOLE: So about how many

companies has your firm been involved in in 1 2 doing this sort of analysis? 3 MR. CARLSON: In the last ten years it's been about five companies. 4 5 MR. TOOLE: Okay. Have any of 6 those companies been found to be outside on 7 the excess? MR. CARLSON: 8 Yes. 9 MR. TOOLE: Okay. 10 MR. CARLSON: Yes. MR. TOOLE: That also would be of 11 12 great interest to us. 13 MR. CARLSON: Okay, and you know, a lot of this is proprietary. 14 15 MR. TOOLE: I know. 16 MR. CARLSON: Or not in the public So we can look into what -- we can 17 forum. describe this in more detail. 18 19 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: I have one 20 question for Mr. Carlson. On page five of 21 your testimony you state at the bottom of the 22 third paragraph, second full paragraph, there

are a number of additional risk factors and
 individual market considerations that should
 be considered when comparing surplus needs.

4 Can you detail or just summarize
5 what some of those are in distinguishing
6 Pennsylvania's example from the current GHMSI
7 issue?

8 MR. CARLSON: Sure. Well, I think 9 the one issue that really stands out at GHMSI 10 is the FEP contracts. GHMSI has the largest 11 FEP contract of the Blues plans, and the 12 Pennsylvania plans, you know, are certainly 13 much smaller in their federal business.

14 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Okay. I 15 just was curious as to what those were since 16 you made the example.

Were there any other questions?
MR. RECTOR: I had one quick
question for Mr. Burrell. If the company -I think you said you were on the Blue Cross
board and on the early monitoring board. If
a company, if a Blue Cross plan breaches the

375 percent threshold, is that public? 1 I mean obviously their RBC, 2 somebody could look at the financial 3 statements, but is there some sort of 4 5 announcement or anything that's --MR. BURRELL: Not from the 6 7 association, but all of the company's reports are obviously public as they have been filed. 8 9 MR. RECTOR: Okay, and I know you 10 talked about there being a 500 percent Is there any trigger between the 200 11 trigger. and the 375 or is it -- so it's 200, 375, 500, 12 13 are the three triggers? MR. BURRELL: I think that's the 14 way to think of it, yeah. 15 MR. RECTOR: Thanks. 16 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: 17 Okay, I think with that we will dismiss this 18 great. Mr. Hogan, Mr. Burrell, Mr. Chaney, 19 panel. 20 Mr. Dobson, and Mr. Carlson, thank you. We're going to deviate slightly 21 22 from the witness list because of a scheduling

Page 265

```
issue, and, Mr. Smith, thank you for pausing
1
     for one moment. We're going to hear from the
 2
     Maryland Insurance Commissioner, Mr. Ralph
 3
 4
     Tyler.
 5
                 MS. JOHNSON: Mr. Tyler, would you
     raise your right hand, please?
 6
 7
                 Do you swear or affirm to tell the
     truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
 8
 9
     truth, so help you?
10
                 Thank you.
11
                 COMMISSIONER PURCELL:
                                         Good
     afternoon, Ralph.
12
13
                 MR. TYLER: Good afternoon,
     Commissioner, and my thanks first for being
14
     allowed to be here today to participate in
15
     this important hearing and, secondly and not
16
     insignificantly, I appreciate your taking me
17
     out of turn, and I promise not to abuse that
18
     privilege, and I will be brief because I know
19
20
     there are others from whom you wish to hear.
                 My name is Ralph Tyler, and I'm
21
     the Insurance Commissioner for the State of
22
```

Maryland, a position I've held since September 1 2 of 2007. I've submitted written testimony, which I would propose to summarize and not to 3 read in the interest of time. 4 5 The first and perhaps most important thing that I would like to say is 6 7 that we in Maryland are keenly aware and appreciative of the importance of the hearing 8 9 in the matters you are considering. These are 10 matters in which we have a deeply shared common interest because as you well know and 11 certainly confirm by the earlier testimony, 12 13 one of the unique features of the company you're looking at, GHMSI, is that it operates 14 in three jurisdictions, including 15 significantly and importantly in Maryland. 16 We also share your interest in 17 insuring that the company meets its public 18 purpose obligations. We take those 19 20 obligations seriously in Maryland as you do 21 here. 22 We take no position on the

question of whether GHMSI has excessive 1 2 surplus. It's not because we're not interested in that question. We are very 3 4 interested in that question. We take no 5 position on it for the reason that we are ourselves in the midst of an examination of 6 7 that question. We've hired a consulting firm, the Invotex firm that is working on that 8 9 question, and we expect to have a report from 10 them within approximately 45 days of now.

11 And what I wanted to specifically say is we want to work with you and cooperate 12 13 with you throughout this. We certainly want to make that report available to you. 14 Obviously the schedule you're on and the one 15 we are on don't match up perfectly, and 16 whatever might be done to accommodate that, 17 and whether you might consider issuing an 18 interim report so that you'd have the benefit 19 20 of the Invotex work, I mean, of course, I 21 leave that up to you. 22 But what I want to stress is that

we do want to cooperate and we are also
 looking at these questions.

Now, there was a lot of discussion 3 4 from the earlier panel about the question of 5 attribution, and that, of course, is important, and it's important to Maryland as 6 7 it is to you. The statute calls upon the Commissioner here to review the portion of the 8 9 surplus of the corporation that is attributable to the District, and I believe 10 that the questions that were asked by Mr. 11 Rector as well as others, we would associate 12 13 ourselves with that; that that is a difficult question with considerably greater complexity 14 than the papers acknowledge, and we, too are 15 interested in that question, and that is one 16 of the questions upon which we expect to be 17 getting advice from the Invotex firm, and I 18 think that that is a difficult question, and 19 that it's important, again to all of us and to 20 our shared interest. 21

22

The final point I would like to

discuss is this, and that is the question of the remedy, if you will, if the surplus is determined to be excessive. Again, and for present purposes I assume that such a determination is made, albeit we don't take a position on that because we are waiting advice on that question.

And the District statute, and I 8 9 say this with no chauvinistic sense. Tt. 10 happens to be true. The District statute here 11 was modeled on an existing Maryland law. Again, I'm proud of Maryland, but it's a small 12 13 point, but it happens to be true. The Maryland statute upon which the District 14 statute is modeled is Section 14-117(e) of the 15 insurance article of the Maryland code. 16

And the Maryland statute like the District statute calls upon if in the event that there's a determination that the surplus is excessive and calls upon the corporation to develop a plan, and then as to the plan, the language in the District statute is as

It says, "A plan submitted pursuant 1 follows. to Paragraph 1 of this subsection may consist 2 entirely of expenditures for the benefit of 3 current subscribers of the corporation." 4 5 The Maryland statute is not 6 permissive in that regard. The District 7 statute says the corporation plan may consist entirely. The Maryland statute, by contrast, 8 9 is mandatory. It says the distribution 10 ordered under Paragraph 2 of this subsection may be made only to subscribers who are 11 covered by the corporation's nonprofit health 12 13 plan. But my point would be this, that 14

in the event that there is a determination 15 16 that there is an excessive surplus, I think this remedial provision is a very thoughtful 17 and correct one, that any excess exists 18 because subscribers paid, experience showed, 19 20 excessive rates, and so the appropriate plan for distribution of any excess would be for 21 22 rate reductions or some other way to return it

1	to the subscribers, and that that importantly
2	answers concerns that the regulatory system
3	and the integrity of decision making would be
4	distorted by thinking that a finding of excess
5	would be a source of revenue for general use.
6	The corporation would have it
7	within its rights, again, under the plain
8	language of the statute to come forward with
9	a plan consisting entirely of expenditures for
10	the benefit of current subscribers, and we
11	would suggest that that would be an
12	appropriate plan and, indeed, the only
13	appropriate plan.
14	With that, I will stop and I would
15	be happy to answer any questions. And, again,
16	I thank you for allowing me to be here.
17	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Thank you
18	for your testimony.
19	And it's inspired that you speak
20	of that because my question to you was going
21	to be your thoughts on that distinction in the
22	Maryland law, that restriction of distribution

which we don't have as clearly written in
 ours.

3 I will say I'm not patently averse to your suggestions in terms of working 4 5 together, collaborating. I've expressed to you that's something I'm willing and able to 6 7 I will definitely take into consideration do. the suggestions you made about possibly doing 8 interim order. Of course I'm limited and 9 restricted to the duties that I've been 10 assigned, but I will certainly keep you 11 informed as I hope I have been doing. 12 13 MR. TYLER: You surely have. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: I don't 14 have any specific questions for you. I think 15 that we will talk a lot over the next few 16 weeks hopefully. I am interested in seeing 17 the suggestions that come in your report from 18 I'm in the information gathering 19 Invotex. 20 stage right now, and so I think to the extent you're willing to make that part of the 21 22 record, we are on board and would appreciate

1 that. 2 MR. TYLER: Certainly. 3 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Any 4 questions from the panel? 5 (No response.) 6 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: No. Thank 7 you, Mr. Tyler, very much. MR. TYLER: Again, thanks to all 8 9 of you. Thank you very much. 10 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Thank you. At this time we will proceed by 11 calling Mr. Walter Smith, Executive Director 12 13 for D.C. Appleseed Center for Law and Justice and his witness panel. 14 Good afternoon. After we've sworn 15 you in, if you could just introduce yourself 16 and let me know in what order you'll be 17 providing your testimony. 18 19 Thank you. 20 MS. JOHNSON: Would you all raise 21 you right hands to be sworn in, please? Do 22 you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the

Page 274

whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help
you?

3	WITNESSES: I do.
4	MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.
5	MR. SMITH: Good afternoon. I'm
6	Walter Smith, the Director of D.C. Appleseed.
7	I have with me here Deborah Challet at my far
8	left from Mathematica. This is Mr. Cory Zass
9	from ARM. This is Mr. Mark Shaw, also from
10	ARM, and this is Kurt Calia from Covington $\&$
11	Burling.
12	As you know, we have filed both a
13	prehearing report and are submitting testimony
14	today, and it's the collective effort of all
15	of these folks at the table, but because we
16	only have 20 minutes what we're going to try
17	
	to do, Madam Commissioner, is I'm going to
18	to do, Madam Commissioner, is I'm going to speak for just a few minutes about some
18 19	
	speak for just a few minutes about some
19	speak for just a few minutes about some overall points that we want to make, and I'm

1 prepared testimony.

2 And then I want you to hear from our actuarial experts who we engaged to try to 3 4 assist you in this process. 5 And I should say at the beginning 6 the reason why we engaged actuarial experts was because when we read the submission from 7 Carefirst, as we interpreted it, the whole of 8 9 their case comes down to Milliman range. 10 Everything they're asking you to do comes down to them asking you to accept the Milliman 11 range, and that thought was confirmed further 12 13 by what I heard here today because they believe, I think that the range that Milliman 14 has urged them to adopt equates to financial 15 soundness, drives their position that they're 16 meeting the maximum feasible, and has driven 17 where they set the community reinvestment. 18 I think in an exchange with you, 19 Madam Commissioner, Mr. Burrell said they know 20 how much to spend on community reinvestment 21 22 once they know how much is available given

1 their surplus range.

2 The reason why we think it is so critical to scrutinize the Milliman range, 3 since that's their whole defense, is that it 4 5 is in the interest of the public that they get that range right and that you get that range 6 7 right because if you don't, the twin requirements of the statute can't be served, 8 9 that is, financial soundness, on the one hand, and maximum feasible, on the other. 10 If you don't get the range right, you're not going to 11 serve the public's dual interest in those two 12 13 somewhat competing policies because if you don't give them enough for financial 14 soundness, you threaten their solvency, of 15 course, but if they don't meet maximum 16 feasible, here's what happens, and especially 17 if they've been following the surplus range to 18 set maximum feasible. 19 20 It means, as they candidly admit 21 in their documents, they are overcharging 22 subscribers because the source of the surplus

is revenues that came from the subscribers,
 and as they say, if they've got a surplus,
 they've overcharged them and they should
 refund it.

5 And the longer they're in a 6 surplus range that may be inappropriate, the 7 longer they're overcharging. Now, here's why 8 it's important though for an additional 9 reason.

10 Another exchange that Mr. Burrell 11 had with you, and he invoked the President from last night, I'd like to do the same 12 13 thing. We live in an economy right now where a lot of people are having difficulty getting 14 access to affordable health care, and as 15 16 premiums go up, it's harder for them to get that health care. One of the tremendous 17 things that this company could do if it has 18 excess surplus is, in fact, make it easier for 19 20 the people Mr. Burrell is solicitous about to get access to affordable health care. 21 Because 22 if he continues to have low community

reinvestment, and if he continues to have a surplus range that is too high, he is to that extent not using the company's ability to assist people to get access to affordable health care.

6 Some people are under insured. 7 Some people are uninsured, but the net at the end of the day is this public asset, our D.C. 8 9 Attorney General has told us, this company is 10 an asset of the public, and it could be used, if there's excess surplus here, to help the 11 public get access to more affordable health 12 13 care.

And in our view, that is why it is so important that you get this right, and it is why, since we saw their whole position is based on Milliman, we engaged actuarial experts.

19 Now, let me say -- let me see how 20 much have I used up. I'm going to take three 21 or four more minutes.

22

When we submitted the report from

our actuarial experts, I apologize to you and 1 to Carefirst and to Milliman and to Lewin. 2 Τf they read any disrespect toward their 3 professional judgments, none was intended. 4 We 5 realize though, and I can say this as a nonactuarial expert, these are difficult and 6 7 complex judgments being made where professionals can reasonably disagree, and the 8 9 smallest shift in an assumption produces movements of millions of dollars, millions of 10 dollars that if they made an unsound 11 assumption would have been available to bring 12 13 to more people affordable health care. 14 So that's why we wanted you to have the benefit of our actuarial experts 15 thinking about, and the primary purpose of 16 what they did was to show how three or four 17 assumptions that seemed to us to drive the 18 Milliman report produced differences of 19 hundreds of millions of dollars with regard to 20 21 a permissible range. Let me say one thing about Lewin. 22

I have great respect for Lewin. At the beginning of this project we tried to see if we could hire them. We couldn't afford them, but there's a very important sentence in the Lewin report. I'm sure you caught it, but I just want to bring it to your attention.

7 I do not believe the Lewin report should be read as a second opinion validating 8 9 the particular ranges that have been produced 10 by Milliman. If you read pages 45 and 47 of 11 the Lewin report, they are very careful to 12 say, and the Lewis Group are very careful 13 people, that they cannot endorse the specific ranges that were produced by Milliman. 14

15 They endorse the methodology, if 16 used correctly. So would we. They endorse 17 the proposition that you would have ranges. 18 So would we. But I do not believe it is so 19 that Lewin endorses the particular ranges.

I want to say one last thing. At the beginning of Mr. Burrell's comments there was quite, I would say, complimentary attack

on D.C. Appleseed. Let me tell you that we're 1 not so powerful that we have produced the 2 statute in front of you. In our view what has 3 4 produced the statute in front of you is a long 5 string of decisions by the Insurance Commissioner in this jurisdiction, the 6 7 Insurance Commissioner in Maryland, the legislature in Maryland, the legislature in 8 9 the District of Columbia, the Attorney General 10 in Maryland, the Attorney General in the District of Columbia, all of them questioning 11 whether or not this publicly owned asset is 12 13 being managed in the public interest. That is why we've been engaged in this process, and I 14 believe that's why the legislation you have in 15 front of you was passed. 16 The council finally said they 17

18 needed to have a system of accountability for 19 this company, and that is what you are about 20 here.

I am going to make one more point.Much was said at the beginning in Carefirst's

1	presentation that D.C. Appleseed and other
2	have in mind taking money from subscribers to
3	give it to non-subscribers so that we can set
4	up a dual between them. Nothing could be
5	further from the truth.
6	As you know, the statute, if you
7	find excess surplus, authorizes the company to
8	develop the plan, and as was point out by Mr.
9	Tyler, in fact, to spend all of the excess
10	surplus found for subscribers.
11	The truth of the matter though is,
12	as the D.C. Attorney General has made clear
12 13	as the D.C. Attorney General has made clear and as Commissioner Burrell made clear, they
13	and as Commissioner Burrell made clear, they
13 14	and as Commissioner Burrell made clear, they have the discretion to spend money on other
13 14 15	and as Commissioner Burrell made clear, they have the discretion to spend money on other than for subscribers, and they have been doing
13 14 15 16	and as Commissioner Burrell made clear, they have the discretion to spend money on other than for subscribers, and they have been doing it for years, in our view to their credit.
13 14 15 16 17	and as Commissioner Burrell made clear, they have the discretion to spend money on other than for subscribers, and they have been doing it for years, in our view to their credit. So there's a contradiction in what
13 14 15 16 17 18	and as Commissioner Burrell made clear, they have the discretion to spend money on other than for subscribers, and they have been doing it for years, in our view to their credit. So there's a contradiction in what they're saying. They label money that they
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and as Commissioner Burrell made clear, they have the discretion to spend money on other than for subscribers, and they have been doing it for years, in our view to their credit. So there's a contradiction in what they're saying. They label money that they would spend on other than subscribers of
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and as Commissioner Burrell made clear, they have the discretion to spend money on other than for subscribers, and they have been doing it for years, in our view to their credit. So there's a contradiction in what they're saying. They label money that they would spend on other than subscribers of confiscation, but on the other hand, I think

public service mission, but at the end of the 1 2 day it will be their choice. They will develop the plan for your review. So neither 3 we nor anyone else is going to force them to 4 5 spend money on other than subscribers, although the statute does authorize it, and as 6 7 the work we have done throughout this long issue that we've been working on, we believe 8 9 that the federal charter likewise contemplates 10 that money can be spent on past subscribers, current subscribers, and for the benefit of 11 future subscribers. 12 13 But that is not nearly as important, as I said at the beginning, as the 14 If you proceed to review their work 15 range. based on the Milliman range, then that drives 16 everything the company has asked you to do, 17 and that is why we have engaged the folks that 18 we have, and I want you to speak to them next. 19 20 Thank you very much. 21 Thank you. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: 22 MR. ZASS: Good afternoon. My

1 name is Corwin Zass.

2	First I'd like to make a quick
3	comment. I know we're given a limitation on
4	time. So my written testimony will be
5	obviously a little different than what I'm
6	going to verbally talk about here.
7	I'm a principal and consulting
8	actuary of Actuarial Risk Management. I'm an
9	associate of the Society of Actuaries, a
10	member of the American Academy of Actuaries,
11	and a Fellow of the Conference of Consulting
12	Actuaries.
13	I'd also like to welcome my astute
14	colleague Mark Shaw who joins me in being
15	available to help explain our conclusions.
16	Mark is a Fellow of the society, a charter
17	enterprise risk analyst with the Society of
18	Actuaries, a member of the academy as well.
19	Both I and Mr. Shaw are actuaries
20	in good standing with the American Academy of
21	
	Actuaries, and we conducted this assessment in

1 followed actuarial standards of practice in providing our August 31st, 2009 report, and 2 honor any code of professional conduct in 3 which we conduct this expert testimony. 4 5 To echo Walter's comments, I agree a difference of opinion does not imply 6 7 unprofessionalism. Actuarial Risk Management is a 8 9 global actuarial risk provider and independent 10 member of the BDO Seidman Alliance Program. We provide BDO, the fifth largest global 11 accounting firm, with audit and non-audit 12 13 support across very similar practice areas as Milliman. 14 ARM's business model relies on a 15 deep resource pool which currently consists of 16 approximately 50 well tenured and technically 17 savvy, qualified actuaries, risk managers, and 18 benefit specialists. Many of the ARM experts 19 available to us have previously held practice 20 21 leader positions with accounting firms, other

22 large national and international consulting

firms, as well as chief actuary roles in
 insurance arenas.

I must admit that Mr. Burrell's 3 adds to some of the confusion with his 4 5 interchange on labeling reserves and surplus. This is not a discussion, in my opinion, on 6 7 reserve adequacy. It's a question or a comment on the excess or the deemed excess of 8 9 surplus, not reserves. 10 In this engagement we assessed and reported our findings in an objective manner. 11 Before I make any comments specific on 12 13 Milliman, I'd like to make a couple of general comments on a model review and assessment that 14 we conduct. 15 Specifically, a good model can be 16 very useful in managing future unknowns only 17 if -- and I stress "only if" -- a model's 18 methods are sound and the assumptions 19 20 reasonably combine the past knowns with common 21 sense and educated expectations and, finally, 22 have model approaches and results conveyed in

1 a very transparent manner.

2	Models have been the backbone of
3	the actuarial professional for many centuries
4	and will continue well into the future. I
5	instill in every ARM engagement that we must
6	enter a project with healthy skepticism. This
7	cautious approach engages ARM to identify
8	situations in the models that are simply wrong
9	where others might take for granted as not
10	being possibly wrong. Our approach to models
11	in general includes the asking of questions
12	like this:
13	How well does the model predict
14	the future?
15	Another question, how many
16	variables or assumptions are used in a model?
17	This gives a model reviewer some
18	sense of complexities using the model. Over
19	the years I've witnessed some very simple
20	models that were very useful, but on the other
21	hand, I've seen some complex models simply
22	missing the mark.

1	This leads to the next question.
2	Yet another inquiry would be are those models
3	and the assumptions used correctly? Again, to
4	reiterate, transparent models, when properly
5	constructed by experts, with the
6	understandable and defendable assumptions, are
7	very important in the management of the future
8	unknowns.
9	Now I'll give you some insight
10	into the models, the modeling, the modelers.
11	I will, albeit briefly, discuss our findings
12	of our assessment of GHMSI's surplus position.
13	Before I do this, I must stress
14	that ARM requested a comprehensive list of
15	items we needed to thoroughly assess GHMSI's
16	surplus. However, we received little other
17	than the GHMSI's public financial statements
18	along with any information we garnered from
19	simple searches.
20	Using these sources, we conducted
21	our assessment. As previously discussed,
22	transparency is key. We deemed the lack of

transparency in the model as a black box
 characteristic. That's why we used that
 throughout our report.

We identified four key Milliman assumptions which we believe distorted the Milliman model and, thus, the results which overstated the needs of GHMSI's surplus. As described in our submission, the following points were submitted in written testimony and summarized our findings.

I will now take a few minutes I first to comment on Carefirst testimony. On page 1 and 2 of Mr. Dobson's testimony, he discussed the information relevant to the model. However, this was information available to Milliman internally only.

We also note that Mr. Carlson of Lewin said on page 3 of his report, akin to what Mr. Toole had raised, that there was really no review of the assumptions themselves, nor was there any performance of extensive modeling. We do note that.

Page 2	9	1
--------	---	---

1We wanted to comment on some black2box aspects, or what we've deemed as non-3transparent assumptions in the Milliman4report. These are just simply examples and5submitted in the written testimony.6On page 46, they discuss the range7of possible values for each risk in contingent8categories, but there is really no explanation9on the breakdowns or what those were.10Page 46 to 49, the complete range11of Monte Carlo results before application of12pro forma modeling, again, there's no real13information here other than providing some14insight.15The assumptions in the pro forma16on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative17to the FAP. Again, there is no real18information on the pro formas, which as we19have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's20own internal models.21Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's22submission, which it specifically does mention			P
 transparent assumptions in the Milliman report. These are just simply examples and submitted in the written testimony. On page 46, they discuss the range of possible values for each risk in contingent categories, but there is really no explanation on the breakdowns or what those were. Page 46 to 49, the complete range of Monte Carlo results before application of pro forma modeling, again, there's no real information here other than providing some insight. The assumptions in the pro forma on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative to the FAP. Again, there is no real information on the pro formas, which as we have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's own internal models. 	1	We wanted to comment on some black	
 report. These are just simply examples and submitted in the written testimony. On page 46, they discuss the range of possible values for each risk in contingent categories, but there is really no explanation on the breakdowns or what those were. Page 46 to 49, the complete range of Monte Carlo results before application of pro forma modeling, again, there's no real information here other than providing some insight. The assumptions in the pro forma on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative to the FAP. Again, there is no real information on the pro formas, which as we have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's own internal models. 	2	box aspects, or what we've deemed as non-	
 submitted in the written testimony. On page 46, they discuss the range of possible values for each risk in contingent categories, but there is really no explanation on the breakdowns or what those were. Page 46 to 49, the complete range of Monte Carlo results before application of pro forma modeling, again, there's no real information here other than providing some insight. The assumptions in the pro forma on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative to the FAP. Again, there is no real information on the pro formas, which as we have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's own internal models. 	3	transparent assumptions in the Milliman	
6 On page 46, they discuss the range 7 of possible values for each risk in contingent 8 categories, but there is really no explanation 9 on the breakdowns or what those were. 10 Page 46 to 49, the complete range 11 of Monte Carlo results before application of 12 pro forma modeling, again, there's no real 13 information here other than providing some 14 insight. 15 The assumptions in the pro forma 16 on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative 17 to the FAP. Again, there is no real 18 information on the pro formas, which as we 19 have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's 20 own internal models. 21 Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's	4	report. These are just simply examples and	
 of possible values for each risk in contingent categories, but there is really no explanation on the breakdowns or what those were. Page 46 to 49, the complete range of Monte Carlo results before application of pro forma modeling, again, there's no real information here other than providing some insight. The assumptions in the pro forma on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative to the FAP. Again, there is no real information on the pro formas, which as we have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's own internal models. 	5	submitted in the written testimony.	
 8 categories, but there is really no explanation 9 on the breakdowns or what those were. 10 Page 46 to 49, the complete range 11 of Monte Carlo results before application of 12 pro forma modeling, again, there's no real 13 information here other than providing some 14 insight. 15 The assumptions in the pro forma 16 on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative 17 to the FAP. Again, there is no real 18 information on the pro formas, which as we 19 have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's 20 own internal models. 21 Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's 	6	On page 46, they discuss the range	
 9 on the breakdowns or what those were. 10 Page 46 to 49, the complete range 11 of Monte Carlo results before application of 12 pro forma modeling, again, there's no real 13 information here other than providing some 14 insight. 15 The assumptions in the pro forma 16 on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative 17 to the FAP. Again, there is no real 18 information on the pro formas, which as we 19 have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's 20 own internal models. 21 Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's 	7	of possible values for each risk in contingent	
10Page 46 to 49, the complete range11of Monte Carlo results before application of12pro forma modeling, again, there's no real13information here other than providing some14insight.15The assumptions in the pro forma16on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative17to the FAP. Again, there is no real18information on the pro formas, which as we19have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's20own internal models.21Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's	8	categories, but there is really no explanation	
of Monte Carlo results before application of pro forma modeling, again, there's no real information here other than providing some insight. The assumptions in the pro forma on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative to the FAP. Again, there is no real information on the pro formas, which as we have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's own internal models. Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's	9	on the breakdowns or what those were.	
 pro forma modeling, again, there's no real information here other than providing some insight. The assumptions in the pro forma on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative to the FAP. Again, there is no real information on the pro formas, which as we have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's own internal models. Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's 	10	Page 46 to 49, the complete range	
 information here other than providing some insight. The assumptions in the pro forma on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative to the FAP. Again, there is no real information on the pro formas, which as we have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's own internal models. Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's 	11	of Monte Carlo results before application of	
 14 insight. 15 The assumptions in the pro forma 16 on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative 17 to the FAP. Again, there is no real 18 information on the pro formas, which as we 19 have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's 20 own internal models. 21 Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's 	12	pro forma modeling, again, there's no real	
15 The assumptions in the pro forma 16 on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative 17 to the FAP. Again, there is no real 18 information on the pro formas, which as we 19 have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's 20 own internal models. 21 Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's	13	information here other than providing some	
16 on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative 17 to the FAP. Again, there is no real 18 information on the pro formas, which as we 19 have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's 20 own internal models. 21 Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's	14	insight.	
17 to the FAP. Again, there is no real 18 information on the pro formas, which as we 19 have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's 20 own internal models. 21 Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's	15	The assumptions in the pro forma	
18 information on the pro formas, which as we 19 have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's 20 own internal models. 21 Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's	16	on page 53 to 54 discuss the modeling relative	
19 have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's 20 own internal models. 21 Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's	17	to the FAP. Again, there is no real	
20 own internal models. 21 Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's	18	information on the pro formas, which as we	
21 Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's	19	have found out was really the basis of GHMSI's	
	20	own internal models.	
22 submission, which it specifically does mention	21	Speaking further on Mr. Dobson's	
	22	submission, which it specifically does mention	

1	on page 3, we find out for the first time that
2	Milliman did use GHMSI's internal models for
3	the pro forma model. We asked did Milliman
4	validate those models.
5	Secondly, on page 5, we see no
6	evidence that Milliman offset the potential
7	underwriting losses. Again, we have
8	transparency concerns. For us to be able to
9	ascertain that that was offset, we'd actually
10	like to see it.
11	On top of page 6, the comment with
12	respect to considering the growth of First
13	Care Blue Choice, we certainly see this as
14	being an irrelevant statement and bears no
15	meaning to what this assessment was and the
16	surplus of GHMSI.
17	Also on number five, Milliman has
18	not disclosed before that they tested this
19	eight percent growth rate. They said that
20	they would not change the lower end of the
21	range. What did change would be our kind of
22	comment there.

1 Furthermore, Mr. Dobson under 2 further testimony stated that Milliman takes the company's pro forma models and converts it 3 4 to a simple model. We talk about complexity 5 of the models, and then we hear a comment about simple models. I'm not sure which one 6 7 it is. Speaking of another comment, there 8 was a statement in reference to earnings. 9 Ι do note that GHMSI did lose about \$6 million 10 in underwriting loss for year to date 2009, 11 but ended up showing a bottom line income of 12 13 \$16 million positive. 14 But I also note that the surplus dropped \$2 million, and primarily driven by a 15 change of \$20 million in the not admitted 16 assets. Again, we have made comments in the 17 past about the non-admitted assets in our 18 submission. 19 We'd also like to point out on 20 Carefirst's filings, it's their consolidated 21 financial statements and other financial 22

1	information for 2008 with the report of the
2	independent auditors. On page 37 they quote,
3	"Management has determined based on the
4	company's long-term history of operating
5	earnings and its expectation for the future
6	that income of the company will more likely
7	than not be sufficient."
8	This simply implies positive
9	earnings into the future.
10	In closing, given the fact that we
11	have not had access to much other than public
12	information, financial statements and so forth
13	that we could garner from the Carefirst
14	Website and from the DISB Website as well, we
15	are confident that adjusting the four
16	assumptions that we have submitted will
17	produce a more realistic range of 400 to 525
18	percent RBC.
19	We do have a desire to look under
20	the hood of Milliman's model, but in the
21	interim, we have assessed the methods and
22	assumptions in a very independent fashion with

a healthy dose of skepticism. 1 2 Thank you very much. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: I'm going 3 4 to give everyone an opportunity just to make 5 a brief statement even in light of the time since we're here. 6 7 MR. SMITH: All right. Well, thank you very much. 8 9 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Who's next? 10 MS. CHELLET: Thank you very much, Commissioner. 11 12 I don't have a prepared statement 13 for today, but I would like to make a few points. 14 Number one, I think the importance 15 of this hearing is obvious, and I agree with 16 Mr. Smith that the range of the surplus is 17 critical. I think there is ample reason to be 18 doubtful about the high level of this surplus 19 20 range that Milliman has produced, and that 21 relates largely to the ranges of its clear 22 competitors in the D.C. area and other

companies that are similarly situated with
 similar ACL levels and the ranges in which
 they operate.

It has always struck me, and I speak as an economist, not as an actuary, but it always has struck me that somebody has to be right; that if this company is so much more heavily reserved than other companies, then other companies must be under reserved because they face similar risks.

11 And I say that simply as an 12 empirical observation.

13 The other thing that I'd like to 14 point to is with respect to the research that I and Mathematica have done with respect to 15 16 community needs. A number of years ago, and this was a report that was commissioned by 17 D.C. Appleseed, we went to community leaders 18 in Maryland, the District and Virginia and 19 asked them about the role of a dominant 20 insurer, like GHMSI, and what an insurer like 21 this could do that would benefit not only 22

their subscribers, but also the general public
 and the community at large.
 And my written statement lists
 some of those items that I think are certainly
 within the role of a community leader like
 GHMSI and certainly would be of value to its
 subscribers and the community that the company

8 serves more broadly.

9 Thank you.

10COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Thank you.11MR. SHAW: Thank you for the12opportunity to speak, Commissioner.

Again, my name is Mark Shaw, and I will just comment briefly on the attachment to Walter Smith's testimony that goes into our review, ARM's review, of potential attribution of surplus if there is a finding that there is excess surplus.

Again, not having the benefit of some of the information that perhaps Milliman looked at in addition to what is available publicly, we based our report and looked at

it, a couple of different approaches based on
 publicly available data, and most of it coming
 directly from the statutory annual statement
 that GHMSI is required to file with the
 District on a regular basis.

6 We believe that the way insurance 7 is regulated, that is, the District of Columbia regulates insurance contracts entered 8 9 into the District as opposed to the insurance 10 owned by persons that reside in the District is the way to look at things, and it is also 11 12 the way that GHMSI's annual statements I would 13 point out summarizes the way that premiums are allocated by jurisdiction. 14

So as we looked at the way that 15 the annual statement addresses the premiums 16 17 that GHMSI reports on an annual basis by jurisdiction, I will just describe to you 18 what's on pages 5 and 6 of the attachment, 19 20 basically take you through the ARM methodology looking at it not only by residence approach, 21 22 but by looking at the data that's reported in

1 the annual statements of GHMSI from 1999 to 2008, the same time period, I would point out, 2 that Milliman looked at by looking at 3 different data. 4 5 I would point out, first of all, that 23 percent of the current surplus of 6 7 GHMSI existed at the beginning of this period and 77 percent of the surplus emerged during 8 9 this period as it grew from what it was at 12/31/98, but we took the data from the annual 10 statements as follows. 11 12 We took from the five-year 13 historical page, data page, in the annual filing the total surplus, the change in 14 surplus, net underwriting gain, net investment 15 income. 16 We took from Schedule T total 17 premium income, District non-FEP premium, and 18 District FEP premium, and from the analysis of 19 operations by line of business exhibit of the 20 statement, we took net underwriting gain for 21 22 FEP and net underwriting gain for all other

1 lines of business as our key input.

2	From that data we calculated the
3	D.C. total profit for a given year as the sum
4	of the net underwriting gain for FEP and with
5	a percentage of the net underwriting gain for
6	all other lines of business, that percentage
7	of use being the proportion of non-FEP premium
8	in D.C. versus all non-FEP premium in all
9	jurisdictions.
10	We also calculated the D.C. net
11	investment income for a given year as GHMSI's
12	total net investment income for the year
13	multiplied by the proportion of all GHMSI
14	premiums in D.C. for the year to the total of
15	all GHMSI premium in all jurisdictions for
16	that year, and then we calculated the D.C.
17	percentage of the surplus change for a given
18	year as a sum of D.C. total profit and D.C.
19	net investment income for a given year divided
20	by the sum of total profit and total net
21	investment income for the year.
22	Following these steps, we

calculate that the percentage of surplus attributable for D.C. for the years 1999 through 2008 is 56.7 percent, and as reported by GHMSI, D.C. premium was 78.8 percent of all premium for GHMSI during this time period, and even 31.7 percent of all non-FEP premium during this time period.

We point out again that this 8 9 calculation, the 56.7 percent, is almost 77 10 percent of the surplus that has emerged since 12/31/98. If the prior surplus arose more 11 akin to the way that the premiums were in 1999 12 13 and 2000, that is, approximately 70 percent of it from the District, then we would calculate 14 in total that approximately 60 percent of the 15 total surplus in the District, total surplus 16 of GHMSI, is attributable to the district. 17 18 Then, as a second approach to determining the appropriate amount of 19 20 attribution to the District, we looked at an exhibit that has appeared in the annual 21 statements of GHMSI since 2002. We would have 22

1 looked at it before that if it had existed, but it didn't, and it's called the exhibits of 2 premiums, enrollment, and utilization, and 3 what this exhibit lists is the total member 4 5 months of insurance by jurisdiction, and there are separate pages for Maryland, Virginia, and 6 7 D.C., and we looked at that and looked at what it was over the time period, and 63.4 percent 8 9 of the member months during the time period from 1999 to 2008 were for D.C. member months. 10 So our conclusion in looking at 11 12 these two approaches is that roughly 60 13 percent, since they're fairly consistent, that roughly 60 percent of the surplus that is 14 currently held by GHMSI is attributable to the 15 District. 16 17 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Thank you. MR. CALIA: Good afternoon, 18 Commissioner Purcell. I appreciate the 19 20 opportunity to speak. I am Kurt Calia of Covington & 21 22 Burling, and like Ms. Chellet, I didn't

1 actually have any prepared remarks.

2 But I did want to speak briefly to the issue of the legal obligation that has 3 arisen here because there has been some 4 5 discussion about that in the context of the charter, in the context of the act that's at 6 7 issue here today and otherwise. So I wanted to very quickly see if I could address some of 8 9 the statements that were made with the earlier 10 panel. It was charged that the theories 11 12 that D.C. Appleseed has espoused with regard 13 to the legal obligation in characterizing GHMSI as a charitable and benevolent 14 institution and saying that their assets 15 belong to the public and saying that the 16 assets or that GHMSI exists to serve the 17 public is a D.C. Appleseed theory, that's not 18 Mr. Burrell got that wrong. 19 correct. 20 That language flows directly from opinions from the D.C. Attorney General and is 21 entirely consistent with observations that 22

1 have been made by prior Insurance

2 Commissioners.

But what I'd like to do in looking 4 at that legal obligation is actually start 5 with the charter, and I know that, I guess, a 6 copy of the charter is going to be provided to 7 this group.

8 Section 8 of the GHMSI charter 9 declares it to be a charitable and benevolent 10 institution. In his remarks Mr. Burrell said 11 that was for the purpose of establishing the 12 company as a tax exempt organization.

We disagree with that reading of the charter and, indeed, Congress has plenary power over taxation and has created tax exempt status for organizations without also taking the step of declaring them to be charitable and benevolent organizations.

We don't think that's a correct
reading of the charter. Indeed, in Section 8
of the charter itself, there are some margin
notes, and there is pretty clear case law that

1	says the margin notes in a congressional
2	charter make clear Congress' intent, and in
3	the margin notes in Section 8 it says,
4	"Purposes declared."
5	So Congress intended to declare
6	this company as a charitable and benevolent
7	institution. Well, what does that mean? And
8	I think the charter actually sheds some light
9	on that, in addition to some other things that
10	I'll talk about.
11	So Section 3, which was the
12	subject in some earlier discussion refers to
13	the corporation being conducted for the
14	benefit of certificate holders.
15	In addition to the fact that
16	there's case law, that means that the
17	obligation applies not to just current
18	certificate holders, but prospective policy
19	holders or certificate holders, and indeed, we
20	cite some of that authority in the 2004,
21	December 2004, D.C. Appleseed report in
22	Section 2, page 17, and I believe that's part

of this record, but if not, we will certainly
 provide it.

But also the precise language of 3 Section 3 of the charter itself supports this 4 5 view that the obligation doesn't exist only with regard to current subscribers. 6 So 7 Section 3 refers to, as I stated, the obligations of the corporation extending to 8 9 certificate holders. 10 Actually the language is "aforesaid certificate holders." So in order 11 to understand who the aforesaid certificate 12 13 holders are, you actually have to look to Section 2 of the charter, and that refers to 14 groups or persons including those with whom 15 GHMSI is empowered to enter into contract into 16 the future. 17

In other words, it's prospective.
Specifically Section 2(c) of the charter
states that GHMSI is authorized to "cooperate,
consolidate, or contract with individuals or
groups or organizations interested in

1 promoting and safeguarding the public health,"

2 in other words, prospective certificate3 holders as well as actual.

There is further case law which we cite in the December 2004 report, Section 2 on page 24, a Supreme Court case, the Jones case and the Geisinger Health Plan case, and I commend those to you.

9 Now, beyond the charter there are, 10 as has been discussed, some legal opinions from the Attorney General and from the 11 Insurance Commissioner that bear on this issue 12 13 about the scope of the obligation, and I wanted to make sure that we had clarity in the 14 record as to some of the statements that have 15 been made. 16

17 In March 2005, then Attorney 18 General for the District was looking into this 19 issue about the legal obligation, and in an 20 opinion published on March 4th of that year 21 stated that D.C. Appleseed is correct in 22 concluding that GHMSI, which was chartered by Congress as a charitable and benevolent
 institution, has an obligation to pursue a
 public health mission, and that this
 obligation is not inconsistent with its
 obligation to operate for the benefit of its
 subscribers.

7 At page 2, the Attorney General went on to state, "GHMSI cannot simply fulfill 8 9 its mission simply by allocating its 10 percentage of specified premium to charitable activities. GHMSI is to devote its entire 11 operation to serving directly or indirectly 12 13 the purposes for which it was chartered." 14 He then goes on to write on page 4, "It is true that under both District and 15 common law GHMSI's assets belong to the 16 public, and unlike a for-profit company, GHMSI 17 exists to serve the public." 18 There was also a hearing --19 20 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: If I may, 21 Mr. Calia, I apologize, but I'd like to enter 22 the question and answering period just in

light of the time. 1 That's fine. 2 MR. CALIA: 3 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: And perhaps we'll touch on some of the issues that you 4 5 were going to summarize. Speaking on allocation, what in 6 7 your opinion -- and this is to the panel -- is the appropriate method for allocating surplus 8 9 to the extent it is determined to be 10 unreasonably large? What is the appropriate method for 11 allocating the amount that's attributable to 12 the District? 13 MR. CALIA: Sure, and I can speak 14 Let me first and foremost preface my 15 to that. comments about the allocation or attribution 16 17 method, however you want to characterize it, by saying at the outset that we agree with the 18 comments that Commissioner Tyler made, and I 19 think, Commissioner Purcell, that you made 20 earlier, that I think under the circumstances 21 22 it really does make sense for the

jurisdictions that would be affected by the
 evaluation of any excess surplus to coordinate
 their efforts in looking at this issue. It is
 a complicated one.

5 Having said that, as we look at the attribution method, there are really two 6 7 aspects to it. The first is that there has to be initially obviously a determination that 8 9 the surplus is, indeed, excessive. That is independent really of figuring out what the 10 attribution is. The attribution goes to what 11 the remedy is and how the remedy associated 12 13 with the spending down of any excess surplus is to be implemented. 14

15 It's our view that the attribution 16 method should be based on where the contracts 17 are written, where the insurance contracts are 18 written, and there are really three reasons 19 for this.

First, in defining the remedy, the act itself states that in the event that there is excess surplus and GHMSI does not dedicate to community health reinvestment in a fair and equitable manner in a manner to address that excess surplus, that the Commissioner "shall deny for 12 months all premium rate increases for subscriber policies written in the District."

7 So I think within the act itself 8 there is support for the notion that it's 9 really the jurisdiction where the policies are 10 written that help define the remedy that's at 11 issue.

12 Secondly, I think there was some 13 discussion about Schedule T. I'm not sure that there was clarity in terms of how it has 14 been used. The fact of the matter is that 15 GHMSI, in fact, allocates revenue based on 16 where contracts are written, where the 17 policies are written. Attached to their 18 annual report, they have this Schedule T, 19 which breaks out by jurisdiction the 20 21 percentages and the amounts of policies based 22 on where they're written, not based on where

the ultimate insured reside, but where the
 policies themselves are written.

What this means, we believe is for 3 group plans, it's the location of the 4 5 principal place of where the employer is, and for individual plans it would be the 6 7 residence, which presumably for individual plans is information that's readily 8 9 ascertainable. 10 The third reason why we think the touchstone here is really where the contract 11 is written, is based on what we've observed in 12 13 our neighboring jurisdiction, Maryland. So there was a discussion earlier about how in 14 Maryland there is a premium tax imposed. 15 That premium tax is on revenues that are reasonably 16 attributable to business conducted within the 17 That's the language of the statute. 18 state. 19 Now, there is an exemption, which was also referred to earlier, equal to the 20 21 amount that is spent in a manner that serves 22 the public interest, and I believe it was said 1 that it was capped at two percent.

2 Well, in late 2008, the Maryland Insurance Commissioner was evaluating that 3 4 very issue about whether GHMSI has complied 5 with the Maryland law related to premium tax, and in so doing, the Commissioner relied on 6 7 Schedule T in making the determination about what falls within the scope of a business 8 9 within the state. 10 Thus, certainly at least implicitly, if not explicitly, the Maryland 11 Insurance Commissioner had embraced this 12 13 notion of Schedule T and the fact that it's where the contract is written for purposes of 14 attribution at least in the context of 15 evaluating this exemption to the premium tax. 16 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: 17 Thank you. 18 Mr. Smith, I just want to keep 19 going. 20 MR. CALIA: Surely. 21 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Mr. Calia, 22 we'll get back to that.

Page 3	1	4
--------	---	---

1	The whole issue of surplus and
2	Carefirst's statement that their duty extends
3	to their subscribers, and so if a
4	determination was made that this reinvestment
5	plan needed to be formulated and approved,
б	that I think what I heard was that they would
7	concede that it would extend to the
8	subscribers only, present subscribers only.
9	What are your thoughts on that?
10	Do you feel that the reinvestment obligation
11	extends past present subscribers only?
12	MR. SMITH: Well, under the
13	statute they are permitted to develop a plan
14	that would spend the surplus only on the
15	subscribers. So, I mean, that's within the
16	prerogative of the company, I believe
17	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Okay.
18	MR. SMITH: under the statute.
19	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Right.
20	MR. SMITH: I would add that I
21	think they under the statute again have the
22	prerogative to extend it beyond just current

1 subscribers.

2	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: And are you
3	rooting that in the charter interpretation
4	that we just heard or in the community
5	mission, benevolent status generally, or
6	MR. SMITH: I believe the statute
7	is controlling here. I mean, different people
8	may have differed as to whether or not they
9	thought it was good to authorize a spend down
10	plan that was limited only to current
11	subscribers, but that is what the statute
12	says, and I think I heard Mr. Burrell say this
13	morning that if they were to develop a plan,
14	they indeed would limit it to current
15	subscribers.
16	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: In your
17	report you suggested a range, a surplus range.
18	MR. SMITH: I did.
19	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Could you
20	explain the rationale in determining a broad
21	range for reasonable surplus but then
22	requiring GHMSI to exist just at the bottom of

1 that range?

2	MR. SMITH: Yes, I'd be happy to
3	do that. There was a lot of conversation
4	earlier about how one applies the maximum
5	feasible standard, and we have argued in part
6	that one way to apply the maximum feasible
7	standard is first to develop reasonable ranges
8	for the surplus, which I assume you may do.
9	I don't know how you'll proceed. That's what
10	Milliman did, and in adjusting Milliman's
11	work, that's what we did.
12	But we believe once you've
13	developed a reasonable range of surplus on the
14	assumption that any number within the range
15	would be sufficient to insure financial
16	soundness and I think that's what Mr.
17	Burrell said was the case therefore, the
18	only say you can meet the maximum feasible
19	standard is to pick a number toward the lower
20	end of the surplus range that you've
21	developed.
22	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Okay.

1	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: So but I
2	think as was mentioned earlier the first step
3	in the process would be to determine if the
4	surplus was unreasonably large.
5	MR. SMITH: Right.
б	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: So if the
7	surplus fell within the range, do you think it
8	would fail that first test and would still be
9	forced to be moved down to the low end of that
10	range?
11	MR. SMITH: I get your question.
12	My answer is yes. Our view is that the only
13	way to insure compliance with the statute with
14	regard to the maximum feasible requirement is
15	if you go the route of picking ranges first.
16	I think that the company needs to be toward
17	the lower end of the range in order to meet
18	the maximum feasible.
19	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: But again,
20	that, I believe, is the second part. The
21	first part is determining if the surplus is
22	unreasonably large. So if we determine a

reasonable range of surplus and the company 1 2 falls within that range, it sounds like you are arguing that if they fall in the high end 3 of that range, it's unreasonably large even 4 5 though it falls within the reasonable range. I think there are two 6 MR. SMITH: 7 ways to look at that, but I think you get the same result either way. You can say first 8 9 we'll see whether it's unreasonably large. Ιt 10 has to be within the range. If you do that without looking also at the same time to the 11 maximum feasible. 12 13 I think the unreasonably large 14 range has to be computed in light of the maximum feasible, but if you do it as a two-15 step process, you could first compute what you 16 think the reasonable range is and then apply 17 the maximum feasible as a second requirement, 18 and if you do it that way, I think you'd have 19 to conclude that in order to meet maximum 20 feasible, they need to be toward the lower end 21 22 of whatever range you develop.

1 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. Ι 2 guess I could try asking that question again, but I don't guess I'd get a different answer, 3 4 but you --5 MR. SMITH: I'm sorry. I do want 6 to be responsive. 7 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Well, I All right. You've suggested that a way 8 know. 9 to do this would be to determine a range of 10 surplus. 11 MR. SMITH: Yes. 12 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: -- that's 13 appropriate. MR. SMITH: 14 Right. 15 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: If the 16 company falls within that range, then you still want to say if they're at the high end 17 of that range, you still want to say that 18 their surplus is unreasonably large. 19 Either that or it has 20 MR. SMITH: to in addition meet the maximum feasible. 21 22 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: But if it's

not unreasonably large, then the second 1 criteria ceases to exist as an issue. 2 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: What would 3 4 need to happen is the range would be 5 established, and then we would evaluate and discover that they are, in fact, over that 6 7 range. Then we have a finding. MR. SMITH: Ah, if they're above 8 9 the range. Is that the hypothetical? 10 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: No. If they're within the range, if they are within 11 the range, if they're within the range of 12 13 surplus that we have determined. 14 MR. SMITH: Yes. 15 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: So my understanding of that range would be that 16 that's a reasonable range of surplus for the 17 company to have. 18 19 MR. SMITH: At least before you 20 apply the maximum feasible. 21 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: But if my 22 understanding of the laws are -- I'm not

lawyer -- but if we do not determine they have 1 unreasonably large surplus, then the second 2 part doesn't come into play. 3 MR. SMITH: Oh, I see. 4 Now I 5 understand. Then I have an alternative 6 answer. 7 (Laughter.) MR. SMITH: I think, as I said 8 9 before, in determining the appropriate range, 10 that range needs to be determined in light of the maximum feasible requirement. 11 12 Let me give you an example of what 13 I'm talking about. The Pennsylvania Insurance Commissioner noted that at some point there's 14 a tradeoff as you try to further limit 15 marginal risk by increasing surplus when you 16 could make alternative uses of the surplus and 17 not increase it. 18 I believe as you develop the range 19 20 that you think is a reasonable range, the assumptions you make in determining that range 21 need to be informed by the maximum feasible 22

requirement. I think you need to give life to
 that requirement of the statute.

One of the reasons why we think some of the assumptions in the Milliman work should be deemed unreasonable is they seem to have taken no account whatever of the maximum feasible requirement. There is a tradeoff here. There is a balancing going on.

9 That's why I didn't mean to be 10 unresponsive, but you can do this in one step or two. You can first compute a reasonable 11 range irrespective of maximum feasible, and 12 13 then if I had my way, you'll pick the lower end of the range in Step 2, or you'll develop 14 the reasonable range as informed by the 15 maximum feasible. You may get to the same 16 place on either approach. 17 18 I hope I'm making better sense 19 now. 20 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: I don't 21 believe you would get to the same place on

22 both of those things.

1	MR. SMITH: Okay. Maybe you
2	wouldn't.
3	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: If it was
4	determined that the company had an
5	unreasonably large surplus and a portion is
6	attributable to the D.C., it's determined, and
7	it's detailed in a reinvestment plan, and it's
8	given back or however that proceeds, if it
9	happens, and then the company finds itself in
10	financial trouble, how can the company rebuild
11	its surplus without harming District
12	residents, District subscribers, in your
13	opinion? What would happen and how would we
14	proceed once that happened?
15	MR. SMITH: You're envisioning a
16	situation where you got it wrong or later
17	there was a development that so
18	COMMISSIONER PURCELL:
19	Theoretically, yes.
20	MR. SMITH: the company?
21	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Yes, yes.
22	MR. SMITH: What would you do

1 then?

2 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: I'm saying 3 what are your thoughts on how to proceed at 4 that point in light of the position we now 5 find ourselves in, the determination to be 6 made. It's made. Something is drastically 7 wrong.

I'm assuming that the 8 MR. SMITH: 9 company would take steps on its own to remedy 10 the situation and would take it before it got to the point that you're talking about. 11 Ι mean, certainly what Milliman has in mind is 12 13 that you'll have a lot of advanced notice that you may have a decline in service. They have 14 tried to develop a formula that I believe is 15 so unduly conservative that the risk of ever 16 going down to 200 and 375 is very, very 17 remote, but it might happen. That's your 18 hypothetical. 19 20 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Right. 21 MR. SMITH: I suppose the company 22 would take steps, and you would be working

1 with the company as it took steps.

2 I mean, can I add one other thing 3 though?

COMMISSIONER PURCELL: 4 Sure. 5 MR. SMITH: I believe it is a 6 hypothetical that is extremely remote, but if 7 you permit them to develop their surplus range based on really remote contingencies. 8 It is 9 certain that in the meanwhile it will continue 10 to charge premium rates at the level that they are, and it is certain they will have no funds 11 available to give back to the community to 12 13 address what they have acknowledge here today is a very difficult situation for a lot of 14 people in the National Capital Area. 15 16 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: I quess what I'm trying to solicit or get at is the 17 balance that Mr. Burrell discussed. What in 18 your opinion -- is there room for that 19 20 balance? What is your opinion on where that balance sits right now? Has it been struck at 21 the right --22

1	MR. SMITH: Oh, our view is it
2	won't surprise you to learn, is that they're
3	woefully out of balance right now, that
4	they're required to balance two things:
5	financial soundness and maximum feasibility.
б	I don't believe they've ever taken maximum
7	feasibility into account at all. Not a single
8	witness this morning in their presentations to
9	you described to you how it is either they or
10	the board weighed these two very important,
11	sometimes competing policies.
12	They simply and I mean no
12 13	They simply and I mean no disrespect to Milliman they simply used an
13	disrespect to Milliman they simply used an
13 14	disrespect to Milliman they simply used an analysis that Milliman put in place without
13 14 15	disrespect to Milliman they simply used an analysis that Milliman put in place without ever looking at the statute at all, without
13 14 15 16	disrespect to Milliman they simply used an analysis that Milliman put in place without ever looking at the statute at all, without taking any account of maximum feasibility, in
13 14 15 16 17	disrespect to Milliman they simply used an analysis that Milliman put in place without ever looking at the statute at all, without taking any account of maximum feasibility, in fact, use an analysis they used in 2005
13 14 15 16 17 18	disrespect to Milliman they simply used an analysis that Milliman put in place without ever looking at the statute at all, without taking any account of maximum feasibility, in fact, use an analysis they used in 2005 essentially before the Commissioner. So I
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	disrespect to Milliman they simply used an analysis that Milliman put in place without ever looking at the statute at all, without taking any account of maximum feasibility, in fact, use an analysis they used in 2005 essentially before the Commissioner. So I don't believe the balance has been fairly

1 the District of Columbia believes that maximum 2 feasible is important. I don't think they've acknowledged that yet. 3 They said we picked a surplus 4 5 range, and so long as we're within that surplus range we're done. 6 7 I don't hear any balance being struck in that analysis at all. 8 9 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: What are 10 some examples of additional activities that you think they should be engaging in? 11 12 MR. SMITH: They're listed in the 13 statute, but there are a lot of them. Mr. Burrell fairly described them. There are a 14 lot of people in the National Capital Area who 15 are having more and more difficulty paying for 16 insurance, and he told you that they're losing 17 people trying to get insurance. 18 It's a very difficult time out 19 20 there for a lot of people, and as you know, the council is trying to work with the company 21 22 to further expand the open enrollment program

to let more people have an opportunity to get
 coverage.

And I have to tell you every time 3 Mr. Burrell talks about how much money they 4 5 will lose by meeting their primary mission. It reminds me that they haven't struck the 6 7 balance yet. If what you're supposed to be primarily about is delivering insurance to 8 9 people, particularly those who have difficulty 10 getting insurance, then that ought to be the thing at the top of his list. 11 12 Right now for this company it is a 13 complete afterthought. So long as they get their surplus range, if that allows for any 14

15 money for investment in the community, they
16 will do it. If it doesn't, they're done.

17 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: And in your 18 opinion is there a difference between maximum 19 feasible and maximum feasible consistent with 20 financial soundness and efficiency? Because 21 you use them interchangeably in your report. 22 MR. SMITH: I mean, I think they

1 have to be taken together. Don't
2 misunderstand me. I acknowledge to you that
3 those are two things to be balanced, but
4 they're both important. They are both
5 important.

We are Carefirst subscribers, we 6 7 at D.C. Appleseed. Okay? I care about both parts of what the council has put into the 8 9 I want this company to be able to meet law. 10 claims, but I also want this company to be what I believe the federal charter envisioned 11 12 them to be: someone with a public service 13 mission, and I think they're not doing it. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Well, how 14 does financial efficiency and capital adequacy 15 then fit into your analysis, your rationale? 16 I mean, are they to operate at that slim 17

18 margin right above RBC or perhaps even --

MR. SMITH: Well, no.
COMMISSIONER PURCELL: -- a few
hundred percent above RBC?
MR. SMITH: No, not necessarily.

COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Are they to
 be every year --

3 MR. SMITH: I think there are a lot of different ways that this could have 4 5 been analyzed, but what we did at least for purposes of this hearing, because we didn't 6 7 have a lot of time, was to take the Milliman approach, and Milliman offered that approach 8 9 to Commissioner Mirel, as you know, in 2005. 10 They offered it to the Pennsylvania Insurance Commissioner, who did a lot of additional 11 analysis of her own, but I think the idea of 12 13 coming up with a reasonable surplus range that's based on a number of reasonable 14 assumptions about what might happen in the 15 future to give you reasonable assurance that 16 you'll be able to make claims, I think that's 17 a sensible way to go about it. 18 I do not think it's sensible, as 19

20 the Pennsylvania Insurance Commissioner to go 21 about this in planning for every conceivable 22 contingency no matter how remote. She rejected that, and Milliman's work was based on that proposition, and even though you heard earlier that the Pennsylvania Insurance Commissioner didn't reject the Milliman work, I urge you to look at that opinion and see if that is not so.

7 And by the way, may I add also that Commissioner Mirel also effectively 8 9 rejected the Milliman work when it was 10 presented to him. He said in the opinion -you didn't hear this quoted before, and this 11 is back when their surplus was around 500 12 13 million -- he determined in 2005 that they ought to be spending that surplus down. 14 He said there as no doubt that there was plenty 15 of room for them to be investing more in the 16 community than they were doing so. 17

Since then they have decreased the amount they're investing in the community and increased their surplus.

21 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: In your22 report on page 1, you indicated that a surplus

Page 3	3	2
--------	---	---

1	in the range of 325 to 427,000, million would
2	put GHMSI in line with competitors and other
3	comparably situated nonprofits. I'm not sure
4	I understand comparably situated nonprofits.
5	Are you talking about other insurance
6	companies or non-insurance company nonprofits?
7	MS. CHELLET: We were talking
8	about other insurance company nonprofits.
9	That would include the comparable companies
10	that I listed in my written testimony. It
11	would include Kaiser Foundation Health Plan in
12	the District.
12 13	the District. COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. Now,
13	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. Now,
13 14	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. Now, I mean, referring to the companies that you
13 14 15	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. Now, I mean, referring to the companies that you I mean, you identified, I think, kind of two
13 14 15 16	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. Now, I mean, referring to the companies that you I mean, you identified, I think, kind of two groups of companies. You I think it was
13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. Now, I mean, referring to the companies that you I mean, you identified, I think, kind of two groups of companies. You I think it was you who identified two groups of companies,
13 14 15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. Now, I mean, referring to the companies that you I mean, you identified, I think, kind of two groups of companies. You I think it was you who identified two groups of companies, one set of competitors where in the D.C.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. Now, I mean, referring to the companies that you I mean, you identified, I think, kind of two groups of companies. You I think it was you who identified two groups of companies, one set of competitors where in the D.C. metropolitan area, where you said that

1	But if put GHMSI down at the range
2	that you proposed in the report, GHMSI would
3	be at the bottom of those companies. I mean,
4	so could you explain if near the top is no
5	good, why is near the bottom better?
б	MR. SMITH: Go ahead.
7	MS. CHELLET: Well, I think my
8	answer will be and Walter will no doubt
9	elaborate on this, that GHMSI has a unique
10	mission. It has a difference in its charter,
11	and a difference, I think that is very
12	material relative to especially his for-profit
13	competitors.
14	I also want to say that in the
15	2005 report that I also conducted for D.C.
16	Appleseed, I went and interviewed a number of
17	nonprofits. It included Harvard Pilgrim
18	Health Plan, Kaiser Foundation Health Plan,
19	High Mark Blue Cross/Blue Shield, and
20	especially with respect to entities like
21	Harvard Pilgrim and Kaiser Foundation Health
22	Plan.

1 The language of their mission was very different than what you heard today. 2 The language about how they approached their 3 mission was that it was a preeminent concern 4 5 for them, that it was a balanced concern, and so the discussion we had today reminded me of 6 7 those conversations, and I think Walter Smith's comment that the company hasn't made 8 9 the balance also harkens to that. The 10 language is different, the sense of the balance of the mission is different, and 11 that's why I think GHMSI should be held to a 12 13 very high standard in terms of how it serves its mission. 14 Just to add a couple 15 MR. SMITH: of points, one is that only GHMSI, to my 16 knowledge, has this maximum feasible 17 requirement right in the statute, and I think 18 it needs to be given teeth, and if that means 19 as you balance the need for protecting against 20 marginal additional risk, which may or may not 21 22 occur, but today having the opportunity to

1 invest in the community, I think this statute 2 directs that the balance be towards investing 3 in the community, and I think that's 4 important.

5 The other point that I would make though is that, as both of our actuarial 6 7 experts have said, what they did was because of the lack of access to the kind of data that 8 9 they would want it to have, they simply took 10 Milliman's methodology and made four corrections that they thought needed to be 11 made, and the range that produced is what came 12 13 out of that mathematical computation, is what 14 we've produced here. We didn't do it to try to line up 15 the RBC range with other companies. We simply 16 took Milliman, made the corrections, and 17 wanted to show to you for purposes of your 18

19 work how big a difference you get based on
20 what assumptions you make when you use this

21 methodology.

22

COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. So if

I understand what you're saying then, it
 sounds like when determining where you believe
 GHMSI's surplus should be, you are focusing
 more on the maximum feasible than the
 unreasonably large.

No, I think that's 6 MS. CHELLET: 7 not true. I think this is the issue of the balance. Do you make the most conservative 8 9 assumptions possible for this company or do you make -- in which case there is almost no 10 surplus that's too large, and these very 11 conservative assumptions lead them to surplus 12 13 levels that are much higher than most of the companies in the National Capital Area and 14 also some comparable companies outside that 15 have similar ACL levels outside of the 16 National Capital Area. 17 18 So do you retain these very

19 conservative assumptions or do you balance
20 those assumptions against the maximum feasible
21 standard?

22

So I think there is no one on this

panel who would say this company should be in a vulnerable position, and I think the statute doesn't envision that, but it does as we've stated envision a balance.

5 MR. RECTOR: Philip, I think I'm sure during the rebuttal time tomorrow, which 6 7 will probably be we'll hear some feedback on it, but I think what I'm hearing the 8 9 difference as they're articulating the 10 standards, I think Mr. Hogan was saying you first look to see whether it's unreasonably 11 large. If the answer is no, that stops your 12 13 inquiry. If the answer is yes, then you look to see, you know, whether they've done the 14 maximum feasible consistent with financial 15 soundness. 16

17 I think D.C. Appleseed is saying 18 there are two things operating. So it's a 19 two-step process, as Mr. Hogan said, but it's 20 a sequential thing. You do the first step and 21 then after the first step you decide whether 22 to take the second step.

1 I think I'm hearing D.C. Appleseed 2 say there are two steps you're supposed to be taking and two analyses you're supposed to be 3 taking simultaneously, and that either they 4 5 inform each other so that as you're trying to determine what is reasonable, you try to 6 7 figure out. You have a simultaneous obligation to do what's the most you can so 8 9 long as you're financially unsound or somehow 10 you have to deal with the two as side-by-side So I think that's the difference in 11 steps. philosophy. I think that's what I understand 12 13 the difference in philosophy to be. 14 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. In -again, I believe this is your report, Exhibit 15 16 C -- you took issue. Maybe that's too strong a word, but you raised concerns about the non-17 admitted assets of GHMSI and thought it might 18 be proper to add them back into surplus. 19 20 MS. CHELLET: I think that the 21 salient point is it might be. I don't have a 22 position that it would be, but in looking at

the reduction in surplus that occurred in 2008 one has to ask where did the money go, and that is the most obvious place that the money went.

5 So then I went to look at other 6 companies to see what they were holding in 7 non-admitted assets, and it's very small, if 8 anything, holding a non-admitted asset.

9 So my conclusion was that, number 10 one, I think that that should be looked at, 11 and number two, it appears that GHMSI is using 12 accounting conventions at least that are very 13 different from its competitors.

Well, I 14 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: mean, as I understood it from what GHMSI 15 explained earlier, the bigger of the two big 16 changes in non-admitted assets was the 17 deferred tax asset, and that was a change that 18 impacted both the assets and the liabilities. 19 20 So the net impact on surplus was zero for 21 that. So --22 MS. CHELLET: I would have to

1 confirm that. I'm not saying that they're 2 misstating it, but I did not look to see the liabilities drop by the same amount. 3 4 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: And also, 5 again, it does not seem unreasonable that one might make a contribution to a defined 6 7 benefit pension plan in light of what happened in the financial markets in 2008. 8 9 MS. CHELLET: That certainly is reasonable, but I will tell you that their 10 competitors did not. 11 12 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. 13 MS. CHELLET: Not in the same way, not with the same effect on their financial 14 15 statement. 16 MR. TOOLE: I'm sorry. You introduced yourself as an economist? 17 18 MS. CHELLET: Yes. 19 MR. TOOLE: Are you a CPA as well? 20 MS. CHELLET: No, I am not. 21 MR. TOOLE: Okay. 22 MR. ZASS: I'd like to comment

Page 340

2 GHMSI's NAIC filings, the \$186 million change 3 in the non-admitted assets flows directly to 4 the bottom line of the surplus. So I really 5 was taken back by the comment that there was 6 no impact on the financial statements by such 7 change in non-admitted assets between one 8 period and the next. 9 Thank you. 10 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. I 11 have just a couple of questions for Mr. Zass. 12 Now, have you done this kind of 13 analysis in other similar situations? 14 MR. ZASS: Have I conducted 15 similar assessments of companies' capital 16 requirements? Yes, I have. 17 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I 18 mean, have you done it for a third party in a 19 setting like this or something else? 20 MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a	1	there. If I look at the June 30th, 2009
4 the bottom line of the surplus. So I really 5 was taken back by the comment that there was 6 no impact on the financial statements by such 7 change in non-admitted assets between one 8 period and the next. 9 Thank you. 10 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. I 11 have just a couple of questions for Mr. Zass. 12 Now, have you done this kind of 13 analysis in other similar situations? 14 MR. ZASS: Have I conducted 15 similar assessments of companies' capital 16 requirements? Yes, I have. 17 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I 18 mean, have you done it for a third party in a 19 setting like this or something else? 20 MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a	2	GHMSI's NAIC filings, the \$186 million change
5 was taken back by the comment that there was 6 no impact on the financial statements by such 7 change in non-admitted assets between one 8 period and the next. 9 Thank you. 10 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. I 11 have just a couple of questions for Mr. Zass. 12 Now, have you done this kind of 13 analysis in other similar situations? 14 MR. ZASS: Have I conducted 15 similar assessments of companies' capital 16 requirements? Yes, I have. 17 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I 18 mean, have you done it for a third party in a 19 setting like this or something else? 20 MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a	3	in the non-admitted assets flows directly to
 no impact on the financial statements by such change in non-admitted assets between one period and the next. Thank you. COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. I have just a couple of questions for Mr. Zass. Now, have you done this kind of analysis in other similar situations? MR. ZASS: Have I conducted similar assessments of companies' capital requirements? Yes, I have. COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I mean, have you done it for a third party in a setting like this or something else? MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a 	4	the bottom line of the surplus. So I really
7 change in non-admitted assets between one 8 period and the next. 9 Thank you. 10 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. I 11 have just a couple of questions for Mr. Zass. 12 Now, have you done this kind of 13 analysis in other similar situations? 14 MR. ZASS: Have I conducted 15 similar assessments of companies' capital 16 requirements? Yes, I have. 17 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I 18 mean, have you done it for a third party in a 19 setting like this or something else? 20 MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a	5	was taken back by the comment that there was
 8 period and the next. 9 Thank you. 10 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. I 11 have just a couple of questions for Mr. Zass. 12 Now, have you done this kind of 13 analysis in other similar situations? 14 MR. ZASS: Have I conducted 15 similar assessments of companies' capital 16 requirements? Yes, I have. 17 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I 18 mean, have you done it for a third party in a 19 setting like this or something else? 20 MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a 	6	no impact on the financial statements by such
 9 Thank you. 10 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. I 11 have just a couple of questions for Mr. Zass. 12 Now, have you done this kind of 13 analysis in other similar situations? 14 MR. ZASS: Have I conducted 15 similar assessments of companies' capital 16 requirements? Yes, I have. 17 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I 18 mean, have you done it for a third party in a 19 setting like this or something else? 20 MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a 	7	change in non-admitted assets between one
10COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. I11have just a couple of questions for Mr. Zass.12Now, have you done this kind of13analysis in other similar situations?14MR. ZASS: Have I conducted15similar assessments of companies' capital16requirements? Yes, I have.17COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I18mean, have you done it for a third party in a19setting like this or something else?20MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a	8	period and the next.
11 have just a couple of questions for Mr. Zass. Now, have you done this kind of analysis in other similar situations? MR. ZASS: Have I conducted Similar assessments of companies' capital requirements? Yes, I have. COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I mean, have you done it for a third party in a setting like this or something else? MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a	9	Thank you.
Now, have you done this kind of analysis in other similar situations? MR. ZASS: Have I conducted similar assessments of companies' capital requirements? Yes, I have. COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I mean, have you done it for a third party in a setting like this or something else? MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a	10	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. I
13 analysis in other similar situations? 14 MR. ZASS: Have I conducted 15 similar assessments of companies' capital 16 requirements? Yes, I have. 17 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I 18 mean, have you done it for a third party in a 19 setting like this or something else? 20 MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a	11	have just a couple of questions for Mr. Zass.
14 MR. ZASS: Have I conducted 15 similar assessments of companies' capital 16 requirements? Yes, I have. 17 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I 18 mean, have you done it for a third party in a 19 setting like this or something else? 20 MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a	12	Now, have you done this kind of
<pre>15 similar assessments of companies' capital 16 requirements? Yes, I have. 17 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I 18 mean, have you done it for a third party in a 19 setting like this or something else? 20 MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a</pre>	13	analysis in other similar situations?
<pre>16 requirements? Yes, I have. 17 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I 18 mean, have you done it for a third party in a 19 setting like this or something else? 20 MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a</pre>	14	MR. ZASS: Have I conducted
17 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I 18 mean, have you done it for a third party in a 19 setting like this or something else? 20 MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a	15	similar assessments of companies' capital
18 mean, have you done it for a third party in a 19 setting like this or something else? 20 MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a	16	requirements? Yes, I have.
19setting like this or something else?20MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a	17	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Really? I
20 MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a	18	mean, have you done it for a third party in a
	19	setting like this or something else?
	20	MR. ZASS: Certainly not in a
21 hearing. I can confirm that has not happened	21	hearing. I can confirm that has not happened
22 in the past.	22	in the past.

1 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: And not as a 2 third party to the --3 MR. ZASS: Me personally or the 4 firm? The firm that I'm associated with has

5 in the past done this kind of review.

6 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay, and do 7 you tend to get access to company models when 8 you are acting as a third party in this kind 9 of analysis?

10 MR. ZASS: I'm not sure if that 11 can be completely stated as 100 percent. Yes, 12 we do not get what I would deem as proprietary 13 information. In some cases you may be deemed depending if it was more of an M&A type of 14 arrangement, as Mr. Toole would probably 15 acknowledge, but from the standpoint of a 16 third party independently coming in and 17 looking at someone else's financials and the 18 surplus and so forth of the organization, no, 19 20 you have to use what you've been given. Right, and 21 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: 22 so would it be safe to say that, I mean, some

of the concerns you raised about the Milliman 1 model being a black box is not necessarily a -2 - I mean, there shouldn't be a negative 3 4 implication to that. It's just that you don't 5 have access to the same information that they have? 6 7 MR. ZASS: Well, I think what I would want to comment on that is that any time 8 9 you look at a third party or another actuary's 10 work product that there are certain levels of

communication standards and the level of

transparency and assumptions that are going

into the actual model and the results of those

11

12

13

models that are used for that firm or that 14 entity's conclusions. 15 So such that in my opinion when 16 there is vagueness in and around model 17 assumptions, it gives you apprehension on the 18 bottom line results. 19 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: 20 But 21 apprehension is just you don't know, not you

22 have information that there's something wrong.

1 It's you just don't know.

2	MR. ZASS: Well, based on the
3	information that was in the report, we can
4	definitely state that there are some
5	assumptions that were used that we would
6	question, and we've made that clear.
7	Is there a smoking gun in the
8	Milliman black box? You know, I have no idea.
9	Again, based on our assessment, we can simply
10	only go on the information we're provided.
11	The vagueness of the report for us to reach
12	our conclusions.
13	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay, and, I
14	mean, it's certainly an appropriate thing to
15	question. I'm just trying to make sure that
16	there's not an implication or anything like
17	that that because you did not see their model
18	that there is something inherently wrong in
19	their model. It's just you have questions
20	about their model that if you had more access
21	to their model you might be able to answer,
1	

1 think we ought to look into with the model. 2 Well, I think any time MR. ZASS: you provide further insight to someone in and 3 4 about the report or a model and the results 5 thereof should be enough ammunition, so to speak, for the deciding party, which in this 6 7 case is you, to make your own determination whether the things that we brought up are, 8 9 indeed, valid or not. 10 In essence, the things that we brought up in this report we believe those 11 12 four items materially impacted the surplus 13 range to the tune of what discussed in the report itself, in the submission. 14 15 COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay. MR. ZASS: Had we have looked 16 under the hood, would we have thought that the 17 smoking gun would have refuted their range? 18 We don't think that if you would have looked 19 20 under the hood and looked at the assumptions themselves, it is our opinion that we believe 21 22 that the range may even be lower.

1	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: Okay, and I
2	mean, we have taken seriously the issues that
3	you raised, and we are looking at them with
4	respect to the Milliman model.
5	MR. SMITH: Can I just add one
6	thought on this line of inquiry, please? No
7	one meant to suggest wrongdoing by Milliman
8	with regard to things we hadn't seen and
9	couldn't work out. We were simply
10	identifying the ways in which the thing wasn't
11	as transparent as one would have liked if one
12	was trying to replicate their work.
13	But I'll say this. I think the
14	Insurance Commissioner ought to be as
15	interested as possible in making what Milliman
16	did as transparent as possible, which is why
17	we said in our pleadings we are eager to take
18	them up on their invitation to meet with us
19	and to walk us through what they did so we can
20	have a better understanding of what it is they
21	did.
22	I mean, I took them at their word.

They meant that genuinely. They didn't want 1 it put it all up for all to see, but we're 2 doing our best to be a little bit of a 3 4 surrogate for the public here. We're not 5 perfect, but that is what we're trying to do, and we would like to see more of what Milliman 6 7 did if you can help arrange that. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: 8 Have you 9 asked and been refused this information? 10 MR. SMITH: No, we did that in our 11 pleading because we didn't know they were open to that till we saw their pleading. 12 13 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Right. MR. SMITH: But if that's 14 something you can facilitate and you think is 15 16 proper, I know that these two gentlemen would be eager to look further under the black box. 17 18 MR. SHAW: May I add to Mr. Zass' 19 response, as the co-author of the report? As actuaries, we often look at 20 confidential assumptions and do it in the 21 22 context of confidentiality agreements. That's Page 347

202-234-4433

a very common process, whether it's an M&A 1 work, whether it is being hired by a client 2 simply that doesn't want their particular 3 4 assumption shared with anybody else. 5 And so to suggest that the 6 assumptions that have been used in the model, 7 you know, can't be exposed to other peer reviewers with the expertise needed to make an 8 9 intelligent review, I think, is out of step 10 with how actuarial practice actually happens. Secondly, I think what I would say 11 as someone experienced in these matters is 12 13 that the model description that they have put in their actuary report that is creating a 14 Monte Carlo method and then doing some pro 15 forma reports is a very generic type of 16 description, and you will notice that we 17 didn't criticize that in our report. 18 What really makes a difference is 19 20 the assumptions that go into that type of That's where all the action is, and as 21 model. 22 some of the questions that were asked earlier

to Mr. Dobson were, for example, the fact that 1 the model does not appear based on his 2 response to be dynamic such that if there's a 3 4 loss period that it assumes that the amount of 5 surplus margin in the pricing goes up, which 6 is the normal response, would be of concern to 7 us. Those are the types of issues that 8 9 we'd like to look at in the report to be able to form a more full opinion as to the 10 appropriateness of their results. 11 12 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Well, I 13 will go on records as saying I'm happy to

is willing and you are able. It could even 15 occur at our offices if necessary, although 16 I'm sure there may be some travel involved, 17 and if it could happen before the end of the 18 record so you could do some sort of analysis 19 and submit that, that would be great as well. 20 21 Thank you very much. MR. SMITH: COMMISSIONER PURCELL: 22 Is there

assist in having this done to the extent GHMSI

14

1 any further? Yes, Neil.

2	MR. RECTOR: I have just a couple
3	of questions. Mr. Shaw, you went through
4	pretty quickly today the if I have the term
5	and make sure I have the right report the
6	one that deals with the attribution.
7	MR. SHAW: Yes.
8	MR. RECTOR: I just have a couple
9	of questions. We've not looked at this. I
10	think this is new material. I don't think we
11	had this before; is that right?
12	MR. SHAW: You did not.
13	MR. SMITH: It was filed today.
14	This was part of our testimony today.
15	MR. RECTOR: Okay. On Approach 1
16	that you have, when you're determining the
17	percentages, are the percentages based on the
18	location of the master group policy holder for
19	the group business?
20	MR. SHAW: I believe that's the
21	case. We used Schedule T information, which
22	is how the company reported it to the

insurance department, and that is typically 1 done based on the location of the contract. 2 MR. RECTOR: Okay. So your 3 Approach 1, the numbers that you have are 4 5 based off of Schedule T in terms of 6 determining the percentages? 7 MR. SHAW: Yes. MR. RECTOR: Okay. For Approach 8 9 2, the numbers are on the D.C. and the other 10 member months. Haven't really looked back at that schedule in a while. Do you know if 11 that's also based on the location of the group 12 13 policy holder for -- do you know how the member months are determined or calculated? 14 I believe it is also 15 MR. SHAW: consistent with Schedule T and that it's based 16 off of the location of the group if it's a 17 group contract or the location of the 18 individual if it's an individual contract. 19 20 MR. RECTOR: Okay. I had a couple 21 of questions for Ms. Chellet; is that? 22 MS. CHELLET: Yes.

1	MR. RECTOR: You had, and I think
2	Philip referred to these before; I think it's
3	pages 5 and also 8 of your report. On page 5
4	you talk about some other Blue Cross plans and
5	their RBC levels, and on page 8, I think you
6	go to competitors.
7	One of the things Mr. Burrell
8	talked about in his testimony was comparing
9	GHMSI's surplus to the surplus of the
10	companies that were the four Blue Cross plans
11	in Pennsylvania. Have you done any analysis?
12	I mean, he matched up one and said
13	he thought GHMSI's closest brother-sister was,
14	I think, the Capital Blue Cross/Blue Shield
15	Plan. Have you done any analysis to say
16	whether you agree with that, disagree with
17	that or
18	MS. CHELLET: I was actually very
19	surprised at that because I would place GHMSI
20	somewhere between Highmark and Independence,
21	Blue Cross/Blue Shield, Highmark serving the
22	Pittsburgh area and Independence serving the

Philadelphia area, as much more likely
 equivalent firms.

My understanding of Capital Blue Cross, and I'll have to go back and look at it, is that it serves a largely rural central Pennsylvania area. So I just would not see that as a company that would have similar risks to a company like GHMSI which serves a large metropolitan area.

10 MR. RECTOR: Okay. I think it could be helpful for us if -- I think you are 11 also submitting materials in September and I 12 13 think you have another chance to. If there's something that you could put together with 14 thoughts one way or the other regarding those 15 companies, and again, I'm sure that GHMSI will 16 do that as well. 17

I guess the last question I have is for the lawyer from Covington & Burling. You know, you heard a lot of discussion this morning about or this afternoon about the standard and what the standard is and we've had a lot of discussion here, including
 whether it's a two step, one step, and all
 that stuff.

4 But I'm interested if you have 5 anything more to add without just repeating what someone has already said as to what D.C. 6 7 Appleseed thinks is according to not what the standard should be, you know, because everyone 8 9 can have their own public policy judgments, 10 but to what the standard actually is under the 11 MIA statute.

12 MR. CALIA: Yeah, I guess the only 13 thing I would add to what's been said is that the maximum feasible extent part of the 14 standard is unique, and I think there has to 15 be just as a point of statutory construction 16 some life given to that part of the statute. 17 I think it's clear that the council had 18 something in mind when that became part of the 19 20 statute. I think it has to be given full force and effect by purposes of this 21 22 evaluation of surplus.

1	I think the concept as I heard it
2	expressed from the folks from GHMSI was they
3	made their own determination of what they
4	thought was the optimal surplus range, and as
5	I understood what they said earlier, it was
6	without regard to that legal standard.
7	I think that legal standard has to
8	be the overriding principle that drivers the
9	analysis here. Otherwise it's surplus in the
10	statute and it has no meaning.
11	MR. RECTOR: Well, where I would
12	challenge you or at least challenge the
13	question is when you look at the statute, I
13 14	question is when you look at the statute, I mean, it says the Commissioner determines that
14	mean, it says the Commissioner determines that
14 15	mean, it says the Commissioner determines that the surplus is unreasonably large and
14 15 16	mean, it says the Commissioner determines that the surplus is unreasonably large and inconsistent. I mean the statutory words make
14 15 16 17	mean, it says the Commissioner determines that the surplus is unreasonably large and inconsistent. I mean the statutory words make it look like it has to be both unreasonably
14 15 16 17 18	mean, it says the Commissioner determines that the surplus is unreasonably large and inconsistent. I mean the statutory words make it look like it has to be both unreasonably large and inconsistent, which I think comes
14 15 16 17 18 19	mean, it says the Commissioner determines that the surplus is unreasonably large and inconsistent. I mean the statutory words make it look like it has to be both unreasonably large and inconsistent, which I think comes back then to Philip's question of if you've

But if you have a range, if you're within the range, somehow to meet the statute you have to say, I think that it is both unreasonably large as well as inconsistent, and I'm trying to figure out how you read that.

7 MR. CALIA: Yeah, the structure of 8 the statute actually refers to the maximum 9 feasible extent consistent with financial 10 soundness and efficiency. It really is before 11 you get to the unreasonably large aspects. So 12 as I read it, it's the overarching principle 13 that really drives the whole analysis here.

In view of that standard, when one 14 is evaluating what the appropriate surplus 15 range, if it is clear that in the face of that 16 standard it is unreasonably large, then this 17 statute sets forth steps that must be taken in 18 order to address that, in order to provide 19 20 essentially remedial measures for that. 21 I'm hoping I've answered your

22 question.

```
Page 357
```

1	COMMISSIONER BARLOW: I think
2	maybe what we should do is ask anybody who's
3	willing to provide us their legal analysis.
4	I think I'm going to guess people understand
5	the question, and so if people would provide
6	us their legal analysis on that during the
7	period.
8	MR. RECTOR: I agree. That would
9	be very helpful.
10	MR. CALIA: We would be very happy
11	to do that.
12	MR. SMITH: We'll look further at
13	this.
14	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Thank you,
15	Mr. Smith.
16	Mr. Calia and Mr. ARM Mr. Shaw,
17	rather
18	(Laugher.)
19	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Mr.
20	Smith, Mr. Zass and Ms. Chellet, thank you
21	very much. Thank you.
22	MR. SMITH: Thank you very much.

		Page	358
1	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Okay.		
2	We're going to keep plugging away. Next on		
3	the list, Ms. Sondra Roberto from Consumers		
4	Union.		
5	Thank you for your patience. Good		
б	afternoon.		
7	MS. ROBERTO: Good afternoon. My		
8	name is Sondra Roberto and		
9	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: One moment.		
10	I just want to swear you in first.		
11	MS. ROBERTO: Sorry.		
12	MS. JOHNSON: Do you swear or		
13	affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and		
14	nothing but the truth so help you?		
15	MS. ROBERTO: I swear.		
16	MS. JOHNSON: thank you.		
17	MS. ROBERTO: Okay. My name is		
18	Sondra Roberto, and I'm a staff attorney with		
19	Consumers Union in San Francisco.		
20	I thank you for giving me the		
21	opportunity to speak to you today about GHMSI		
22	surplus. I've come a long way to be here, and		

it is because the question of whether a
 particular health plan is holding too much
 surplus is an important issue for health care
 consumers.

5 I may deviate from my written 6 comments given everything that has gone on 7 already, but I would first like to start with 8 some background and a discussion of why these 9 proceedings are so important to our nation's 10 goal of making health care coverage affordable 11 for everyone.

12 CU views these surplus proceedings 13 as part of a widespread and ongoing effort by 14 regulators, advocates, and consumers to hold 15 nonprofit health care corporations accountable 16 to their missions.

For example, for more than a decade CU and other groups have worked to protect and redirect the charitable assets of nonprofit insurers when they converted to forprofit corporations to insure that these assets continue to benefit communities and

1 help meet their health care needs.

2 This work is based on established 3 legal principles that hold that the assets 4 generated by a nonprofit corporation must 5 further the nonprofit's charitable mission and 6 purpose.

7 The same principles apply to the surplus of a nonprofit plan. The plan's 8 9 surplus is an asset which must be used 10 primarily to fulfill the plan's mission as a charitable and benevolent institution. 11 Maintaining adequate surplus is no doubt 12 13 important for the solvency of the plan and fulfillment of its charitable mission, but we 14 have seen that for some nonprofit plans, 15 surplus has become excessive, to the point 16 where it no longer serves the best interest of 17 the plan's policy holders and the community in 18 which the plan operates. 19 20 CU supports your effort to determine whether GHMSI has reached that 21

point. At a time when all of America is

22

1 debating how we can hold health plans 2 accountable, how we can extend coverage to those in need and how we can make health care 3 more affordable, your proceedings here are an 4 5 extremely valuable contribution. We welcome the attention that D.C. 6 7 is giving to the issue of excessive surplus, and I think the value of this hearing is 8 9 already self-evident. 10 On this subject I note that GHMSI has used considerable space in its prehearing 11 reports and its testimony today expressing 12 13 regret that D.C. has undertaken this effort. For example, the company stated that it is 14

15 important to note -- and this is a quote --16 "It is important to note that the usual 17 posture of regulators in the health insurance

18 field has been to focus on the solvency and

19 financial strength of insurers."

It has also stated, "In essence,
the most important question for the regulator
from the standpoint of protecting the

consumers who purchase insurance coverage is 1 whether come what may the company has the 2 solid financial footing necessary to meet its 3 obligations to pay claims." 4 5 GHMSI also believes that "the notion that an insurer can offer its 6 7 subscribers too much in the way of financial protection is at odds with historical concepts 8 9 of insurance regulation." 10 We agree that a regulatory focus on health plan financial stability is critical 11 and must continue, but it need not be to the 12 13 exclusion of other consumer protections. Our state insurance departments should exercise 14 their authority to the fullest extent possible 15 to increase the numbers of consumers getting 16 access to care and to make sure people are 17 getting their money's worth from their health 18 insurance. 19 We believe that more states should 20 21 and will begin to focus on excessive surplus 22 as premiums continue to escalate and community

health care needs go unmet. Other states will
 look to D.C. as a precedent setting
 jurisdiction to evaluate how you have
 approached this problem. By adhering to
 values of transparency, fairness, and
 thoroughness, you will provide guidance for
 similar proceedings to come.

We also disagree with GHMSI's 8 9 suggestion that an insurer can never have too 10 much surplus. Much of this has been touched on, but if I may, for one, surplus that is 11 two, three, four, or more times greater than 12 the authorized control level for risk based 13 capital can indicate that the insurer is not 14 meeting its obligations as a charitable 15 That's why scrutiny is 16 institution. 17 important.

Excess funds held in surplus can and should be redirected toward more affordable premiums for existing and prospective policy holders, subscribers, and for charitable giving to programs that help 1 the uninsured or under insured.

2	In addition, rapid growth in
3	surplus such as we have seen in the past
4	decade among many plans means that policy
5	holders and employers may be paying too much
6	in premiums. When surplus reaches a
7	comfortable level where insolvency is a very
8	remote possibility, subscribers should not
9	have to pay contributions to surplus.
10	Regulatory review of surplus is
11	important for these reasons. Moreover, surplus
12	review along with rate review is necessary to
13	make health insurance markets function as
14	efficiently as possible. Studies have shown
15	that most local health insurance markets
16	across the nation are concentrated with one or
17	two health plans holding a majority of market
18	share.
19	In D.C., as we've already
20	discussed, GHMSI is the dominant player. In
21	theory nonprofit plans with sufficient surplus
22	should be able to price aggressively. This

drives fiercer competition with for-profits
and leads to more competitive pricing for all
purchasers, but dominant insurers with market
power have little incentive to price
aggressively. Regulatory surplus and rat
review benefit everyone by helping to address
the problem of concentrated markets.

8 We also disagree with GHMSI's 9 argument that that any distribution of excess 10 surplus to public programs would mean that 11 existing GHMSI subscribers can be made to 12 shoulder not only their own costs, but those 13 of others who are not subscribers.

In reality, GHMSI subscribers are 14 already shouldering that burden. The federal 15 government estimates that right now hospitals 16 and doctors in the District of Columbia lose 17 more than \$141 million in uncompensated care, 18 which they often pass along to insured 19 families in the form of a hidden tax on 20 premiums, and again, this was discussed by the 21 22 President last night.

Page	3	б	б
------	---	---	---

1	Remarkably, Milliman itself
2	conducted a recent study which found that in
3	2008 families across the nation paid an
4	average of more than \$1,000 in higher premiums
5	to cover more than \$42 billion in
6	uncompensated care.
7	Therefore, any community health
8	reinvestments that directly provide charitable
9	care or subsidize low cost insurance for those
10	who need it will benefit GHMSI's existing
11	policy holders or subscribers by helping to
12	alleviate the hidden tax.
13	Of course, for-profit health plans
14	also must be regulated and held accountable if
15	we are to make health care available and
16	affordable for everyone. But here in D.C.
17	where GHMSI has the highest market share, it
18	is best positioned to play the leader in
19	providing community health reinvestments.
20	These reinvestments can and should include
21	rate relief or cost sharing relief for
22	existing subscribers, low cost coverage for
1	

prospective subscribers, and public health 1 programs that benefit the community at large. 2 The notion that the plan's 3 community health reinvestment requirement 4 5 benefits nonsubscribers to the detriment of subscribers is false. The plan, along with 6 7 the Commissioner, can work to identify the most important community needs and develop the 8 9 right mix of programs or products to address those needs. 10 Now I'd like to turn to some 11 specifics about GHMSI's adopted optimal 12 13 surplus range of 750 percent to 1,050 percent of risk-based capital authorized control 14 level. As stated in my pre-hearing letter, CU 15 urges you to reject this range for several 16 I don't intend to go into all of 17 reasons. those reasons here, but I will point out some 18 glaring shortcomings. 19 In the first instance I want to 20 21 agree with the prior testimony that we found 22 the Milliman report to be what they call the

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

1	black box, and one of our goals here today was
2	to urge you to seek more information from
3	Milliman about what assumptions and
4	probabilities that they used.
5	We gave the report to an expert in
б	health plan management, and he told us he
7	could not test or evaluate Milliman's analysis
8	because Milliman did not disclose its
9	underlying assumptions.
10	So what we want to say is that we
11	hope you would not accept that range as
12	optimal without learning the assumptions and
13	probabilities used to achieve the outcome.
14	Our expert also questioned among
15	other aspects of the report why Milliman used
16	growth rates of 12 percent to 14 percent when
17	GHMSI's growth rate has averaged about eight
18	percent with only one year above 12 percent.
19	The higher growth rates lead to the need for
20	more surplus.
21	Further, when questioned about
22	excessive surplus, nonprofit health plans,

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

Page 368

1 including GHMSI, repeatedly argue that they 2 need larger stores of capital for improvements, new products or the ability to 3 4 respond to market changes. They suggest that 5 it is easier for their for-profit competitors to raise money because they can sell stock. 6 However, neither GHMSI or any 7 other nonprofit that we know of has put forth 8

9 evidence showing that for-profit health plans 10 regularly sell stock to raise capital. In fact, in a surplus proceeding in Pennsylvania 11 which we've discussed, the Insurance 12 13 Commissioner cast doubt on this argument when she pointed out that it misleadingly implies 14 that selling stock is a cheaper source of 15 funding than other forms of borrowing. 16

17 In addition to the questions 18 raised by our expert, Milliman's range is 19 simply too high. It would allow GHMSI to 20 maintain surplus up to five times higher than 21 RBC ACL. We don't see how GHMSI can maintain 22 surplus at these high levels and comply with D.C.'s requirement that it engage in community
 reinvestment to the maximum feasible extent
 consistent with financial soundness and
 efficiency.

5 On that note I want to deviate and 6 just address one of the issues that you had 7 brought up, and that was the question of how can we rebuild surplus if something does 8 9 happen and it falls below the recommended 10 range. I just wanted to point out that in Pennsylvania the Commissioner there sort of 11 looked at it as having two ranges. One she 12 13 identified as an efficient range, and one she identified as a sufficient range. 14

The efficient range which started 15 at -- she said she really wouldn't identify a 16 lower level, but if we assume that it's 200 17 percent where there would be regulatory 18 intervention, then she said between that range 19 20 and 500 percent is an efficient range where there is no risk of insolvency. 21 22 And then she said the sufficient

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

range at 550 to 750, and she said that if you 1 2 fall below that range and you're in the efficient range, you're still not in danger of 3 insolvency, but what you can do is start 4 5 rebuilding your surplus. So the idea is that you set a 6 7 range where if you go below it you can gradually rebuild so there is no dramatic 8 9 premium increases in order to rebuild the 10 range, and I think that's a good approach, is having sort of a cushion and then a range. 11 12 And I also wanted to reiterate 13 that the Commissioner rejected Milliman's recommended optimal range in that case. 14 So if Milliman's range is too 15 high, what is an appropriate surplus range for 16 And is GHMSI's surplus unreasonably 17 GHMSI? large right now? 18 To conclude my testimony, I would 19 like to urge the Commissioner to take the 20 21 following steps to answer these questions. 22 First, seek more information from

1 As noted, we don't know how Milliman GHMSI. reached its optimal range or why it used 2 certain assumptions. 3 Also, more information is needed 4 5 about GHMSI's other risk protection mechanisms. For example, the Blue Cross/Blue 6 7 Shield Association requires all of its licensees to participate in a guaranty fund 8 9 using alternate mechanisms such as a 10 subscriber protection account or in the absence of either of these conditions, 11 maintain surplus at 800 percent of ACL. 12 They 13 require this as an additional protection for subscribers. 14 We would like to know how GHMSI 15 has satisfied this requirement. 16 Is that component of surplus or is there an additional 17 subscriber protection account out there that 18 would be used in the event of solvency? 19 20 We urge the Commissioner to 21 require GHMSI to annually report all activities that meet the definition of 22

1 community health reinvestments and how much 2 money was used for each activity. This report should be clear, comprehensive and made 3 4 public. Consumers need to be able to see 5 exactly how GHMSI is meeting the statutory requirements. 6 7 We understand that the Commissioner has hired independent actuaries 8 9 to determine an appropriate surplus range, and 10 we applaud you for that. We hope that that surplus range will take into account the 11 requirement that GHMSI contribute to community 12 13 health reinvestment to the maximum extent feasible. 14 After determining a sufficient 15 surplus range, the Commissioner should limit 16 contributions to surplus while GHMSI is 17 operating within the range. 18 19 We also urge you to use your 20 authority under D.C.'s prior approval statute to consider surplus when reviewing rate 21

22 increase requests for individuals and small

groups. Rhode Island, for example, has
 rejected requested increases based on the
 amount of surplus held by that state's Blue
 plan.

5 Rate approval should not be a rubber stamp. Going forward we urge the 6 7 Commissioner to carefully consider in light of GHMSI's surplus its need for increases or the 8 9 need for other measures imposing hardship on 10 its existing and prospective subscribers, such as tightening underwriting requirements for 11 12 pregnant women and newborns as it did in July 13 2008, and that was at a time when it held over \$780 million in surplus. 14

I'll conclude with a final comment 15 regarding the determination of surplus that is 16 attributable to the District. We believe that 17 using a residency standard as GHMSI believes 18 you should would lead to an unfair result. 19 After all D.C. employers paid for large 20 portions of the premiums that funded GHMSI's 21 22 surplus.

1	The Commissioner should work with
2	all jurisdictions involved to create a more
3	appropriate standard for this determination,
4	taking into account several factors, including
5	revenue and subscribers in each jurisdiction,
6	the contracting entities, the providers, and
7	the needs of the relevant communities.
8	Thank you for having me here today
9	and for engaging in this important process.
10	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Thank you.
11	Thank you for coming and thank you for coming
12	across the country. I think it's important to
13	hear the voice of consumers, and I thank you
14	for representing them here today.
15	I did have one question for you.
16	The balance that we've been speaking of all
17	day, the notion that there is a prudent
18	balance to be reached between financial
19	stability and additional community
20	reinvestment, particularly in this situation.
21	What are your thoughts on this
22	from a consumer's standpoint? Is the consumer

care that businesses are required to strike 1 this balance and maintain this balance 2 ultimately they say for their own benefit? 3 4 Do you have an opinion on that? 5 MS. ROBERTO: Yes, and I think I hinted to this in my testimony. I think that 6 7 consumers are very concerned about the affordability and the increases that they've 8 9 seen, and to the extent that community health 10 reinvestments benefit everyone in the community by making health care more 11 affordable, it becomes more affordable for 12 13 people who are already insured. We don't seem to realize the impact that the uninsured have 14 on what we're paying right now, the cost that 15 16 they add to the system. And so that these community health 17 reinvestments are beneficial to everyone. 18 19 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Okay. 20 Thank you. And one final question. 21 In your 22 experience are there any similarly situated

Page 376

nonprofit health insurers that perhaps are 1 2 doing a better job of striking that balance? 3 I know GHMSI is very specific in 4 the region that it operates and other factors, 5 but generally speaking. MS. ROBERTO: Yes, I'm aware of 6 7 other nonprofits that are doing a great deal more for community benefits, and there are 8 9 others who are not and who are in similar 10 positions as far as holding what we would view as too much surplus. 11 12 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: If you 13 would be willing to provide a list or even a short summary of both of those, those who are 14 doing it right, in your opinion, and those who 15 are not, I would be interested in seeing that. 16 17 MS. ROBERTO: Absolutely. 18 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Thank you. Thank you for coming. 19 20 Oh, I apologize. Hold tight. 21 Jim. 22 MR. TOOLE: At the top of page 8

1 of your prepared response you appear to have skipped a paragraph, and I was just wondering 2 if there's a reason behind that or I was 3 4 briefly narcoleptic or --5 MS. ROBERTO: No, I skipped it because I felt we had gone over it a bit, but 6 7 I can read it to you if you'd like. MR. TOOLE: Well, it says more 8 9 than I think --MS. ROBERTO: Well, I wanted to 10 11 agree that -- the top of Paragraph 8 you're 12 talking about -- I wanted to agree that 13 bringing Lewin here today and having them do another report really doesn't add much to the 14 debate or to the conversation. Lewin simply 15 said that, quote, that their review does not 16 allow us to comment as to whether we would 17 have produced the same range of surplus 18 requirements as shown in the Milliman report. 19 20 And I also wanted to note that in 21 reference to the Pennsylvania Commissioner's decision Lewin decided that she had "set 22

```
Page 379
     reasonable bounds on the Pennsylvania Blue
 1
    plan's accumulation of surplus that were
 2
     unlikely to disrupt the Pennsylvania insurance
 3
     market.
 4
 5
                 So I'm not sure by having this
 6
     other huge player in this field come in really
 7
     added much to support Milliman's
 8
    recommendations.
 9
                 Anything else?
10
                 COMMISSIONER PURCELL:
                                        Thank you.
11
                 MS. ROBERTO: Thank you.
12
                 COMMISSIONER PURCELL:
                                        Next we
13
    will call Cheryl Fish-Parcham from Families
14
    USA.
                 Ms. Parcham, you're allotted 20
15
    minutes. Our timekeeper has stepped out. Oh,
16
     here he is. You may begin.
17
18
                 MS. FISH-PARCHAM: Thank you.
                 And I --
19
20
                 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Oh, one
21
    moment. I apologize. Swear you in.
22
                 MS. JOHNSON: Would you raise your
```

right hand, please? 1 2 Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the 3 4 truth so help you? 5 MS. FISH-PARCHAM: T do. MS. JOHNSON: 6 Thank you. 7 MS. FISH-PARCHAM: Thank you. I've submitted my prehearing 8 9 statement, and I don't have an additional written statement, but I'd like to summarize 10 some of the concerns in light of the testimony 11 12 that we heard today. 13 I'm Cheryl Fish-Parcham, and I'm 14 the Deputy Director of Health Policy at Families USA. We are a national, nonprofit 15 health care advocacy organization. We work on 16 both national and state issues, and in D.C. we 17 have worked both on behalf of Medicaid 18 consumers and on behalf of uninsurable 19 So it's in light of those concerns 20 consumers. 21 that I'm speaking today. 22 First, I am hoping that my

1 testimony will inform both you and the company 2 on what might be appropriate community reinvestment if you find that there be excess 3 surplus, and I am not an actuary or an 4 5 economist, but just in reading the Carefirst reports even if you take their assumptions, 6 7 they have defined a range that is an optimal level. It's not minimum level for financial 8 9 solvency. It is an optimal level, and it 10 seems to me that the statute is requiring that they spend the maximum feasible consistent 11 with remaining financially stable. 12 13 So even if you were to take their assumptions, I don't understand why they would 14 above the minimum optimal level, and so that 15 seems to me already requires some spending on 16 behalf of the community, and I defer to 17 Appleseed and others about whether that range 18 should be lower. 19

But I want to talk about some of
the subscriber needs that Carefirst mentions,
making premiums affordable to subscribers is

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

among their primary missions, and I want to
 talk about ways that they could better target
 assistance to consumers.

And first, in my testimony, the last page is a chart that I hope is accurate. It was our best understanding of the rate filings that are on the Website, and I want to point out some of the rate increases that appear to have occurred that seem inconsistent with keeping premiums affordable.

The first is in conversion 11 policies. As I understand it, conversion 12 13 policies are the policies that must be sold to people when their former group policies, their 14 former employers go bankrupt, stop offering 15 plans, and they must be offered instead in the 16 District a conversion policy to an individual 17 policy and maintain some coverage for them. 18 And it looks to me from the 19 20 filings that those policies increased 14 21 percent in January '08 or 24 percent in April 22 '09. I'm not quite sure what the two

1	different conversion policies are that are
2	listed here, but in either case, those are
3	very big increases to consumers who have just
4	lost their source of employer based coverage
5	at a time that the economy is tanking.
6	So that would be one way that
7	Carefirst could really help consumers, is by
8	lowering those premiums.
9	Small business premiums according
10	to page 7 of the last filing that's on the
11	Website have a different rate of offer than of
12	renewal that they are charging 414 per month
13	to new subscribers, but 572 a month to
14	businesses that are renewing their premiums.
15	So relooking at those policies are ways that
16	consumers could make or Carefirst could make
17	policies more affordable to businesses.
18	But now I want to turn to open
19	enrollment, which is an issue that I've been
20	tracking for a few years, and this is the
21	policy that is supposed to make coverage
22	available and affordable to individuals who

1	have preexisting conditions and cannot
2	otherwise get policies in the market, and
3	those policies increased. In one instance one
4	consumer wrote us about an increase from \$478
5	a month to \$591 this July.
6	Another consumer wrote to us about
7	a 41 percent increase in their couple
8	coverage. They're now paying over \$18,000 a
9	year in premiums.
10	There have been hearings over the
11	past year about what is an appropriate
12	enrollment obligation, and Carefirst says that
13	it anticipates spending \$5 million for that
14	product now. This is above what the premiums
15	earn for that product.
16	Yet their statements show that
17	whatever the premiums are that are
18	attributable to that product in the individual
19	market lying all together, they are earning
20	and underwriting gain. So it appears that
21	they're not dipping into their surplus to
22	subsidize premiums substantially. They are
1	

instead using the conglomerate of how they
 array their individual premiums, still earn a
 profit for them.

The discussion over the past year 4 5 or so has been should other insurers share this risk, and sure, we're all for other 6 7 insurers sharing this risk, and should Carefirst be permitted to just spend \$5 8 9 million on this product or should they instead 10 put \$5 million into some other public-private partnership that was going to serve people, 11 but my fundamental question is why is it just 12 13 \$5 million. Why isn't there money to increase the commitment to help uninsurable residents 14 15 get coverage?

Another part of this product has been the debate, has been how many people should be served. So an appropriate use of surplus would be to expand the number of people that are served under this product. And another big concern has been benefit caps. These are the sickest D.C. residents who cannot get coverage elsewhere.
 They're denied coverage by definition, yet
 they face a \$1,500 annual cap in their
 prescription drug coverage.

5 We heard testimony this fall from a consumer who testified in the city council 6 7 hearings about losing his job where he had full drug coverage and now he had a disease 8 9 for which there are no generic equivalents. 10 His annual drug bills are \$20,000 of which Carefirst was paying 1,500. And this is a 11 true unmet need of a current subscriber. 12

Just to mention quickly the one assumption that I do know something about in terms of risk, Carefirst lists one of the variables in the coming year as being national health reform, and I really question whether they should be building reserves to deal with national health reform.

20 As you know, national health 21 reform may help actually people who have 22 preexisting conditions to get coverage and

maintain coverage, but that is, in the bills 1 that we've seen so far, several years down the 2 line and there will be many measures taken 3 nationally to offset any potential losses to 4 5 insurers from that measure. There is risk adjustment that is 6 7 built in. There is a larger insurance pool created, perhaps an individual mandate, 8 subsidies, and for an insurer to be building 9 10 surplus now in anticipation of health reform 11 just does not seem appropriate to us. 12 And finally I'd like to comment 13 briefly on this distinction that's been talked about between current subscribers and 14 community benefit. I think it's really an 15 artificial distinction. We heard testimony 16 from Consumers Union that we agree with about 17 the cost of uncompensated care to subscribers, 18 but moreover in the District there's really 19 20 very little distinction because the people who 21 might be served by public programs are the 22 same people who are not getting open

enrollment now because the premiums are too
 high.

3 So as you make premiums -- you can 4 make premiums more reasonable or you can give 5 to public programs. You're still trying to 6 accommodate the same universe of people who 7 are uninsured and uninsurable.

And as this is played out with 8 9 Healthy D.C. and the Alliance and other 10 programs that the city has thought about constructing, a big question has been sort of 11 what benefits will premiums support, and we 12 13 have concerns still about whether the sickest residents will well be served by products that 14 are being created. 15

16 So one possible look at a 17 community giving obligation for Carefirst in 18 the future is to provide funding for 19 catastrophic benefits that are not covered by 20 their insurance plans, be they public or 21 private, to help fill in some of these gaps, 22 the gaps in prescription drug coverage that

1	Carefirst now has, the gap in mental health
2	coverage that the D.C. Alliance leaves, and
3	many other gaps that are yet to be determined.
4	So thank you.
5	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Thank you,
6	Ms. Fish-Parcham.
7	I don't have any questions for
8	you. Your testimony is very thorough. We'll
9	certainly consider it. It's included in the
10	record as you know, in addition to the one
11	that was submitted before, and perhaps
12	Carefirst will respond to some of your
13	concerns in their rebuttal statement tomorrow.
14	Thank you.
15	MS. FISH-PARCHAM: Thank you.
16	COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Okay.
17	Continuing on, we have to be out of this room
18	by 5:00 p.m. So we have about 15 minutes. So
19	we could take another panel of three if the
20	next three on the witness list would like to
21	come up all at one time. We're going to stick
22	very strictly to our three minute time period

and hopefully have some time for a few 1 2 questions. So JoAnn Lamphere, David Wilmot 3 and Ms. Barbara Lang. Good afternoon. 4 5 MS. JOHNSON: Please raise your 6 right hands to be sworn in, please. 7 Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the 8 9 truth, so help you? 10 WITNESSES: I do. 11 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: And, Ms. Lamphere, you may proceed. 12 13 MS. LAMPHERE: Commissioner Purcell, distinguished panel members, good 14 afternoon. 15 I know we're standing between you 16 and dinner. So I'll make my remarks short. 17 18 My name is JoAnn Lamphere, and I serve as Director of AARP's State Government 19 20 Relations Health and Long-term Care Team. I'm honored to testify in behalf of AARP's 91,000 21 members in the District of Columbia who are 22

concerned about excess reserve funds held by
 Carefirst's D.C. affiliate GHMSI and its
 inadequate community health reinvestment.

4 AARP appreciates your leadership 5 and the opportunity to participate in this hearing. AARP believes that it's important 6 7 for the District of Columbia to insure that Carefirst is fulfilling its public mission to 8 9 provide quality, affordable, and accessible 10 products and services to its customers and the 11 community.

We believe such reasonable
standards can be accomplished by Carefirst in
a viable and invigorated way.

15 It appears the amount of reserves that Carefirst GHMSI holds in its possession 16 is unreasonably large based on information 17 that's publicly available. If you determine 18 that this surplus is excessive, we commend 19 20 that a portion of these excess funds be used 21 first to invest in proven health initiatives 22 to improve the overall health of the

District's population; also provide affordable health coverage choices for the District's socalled uninsurable adults; and third, constrain rising health premiums for current policy holders who are struggling under rate increases.

7 Resources are needed more than ever to assist struggling residents in the 8 9 District. As I listened to the sophisticated testimony of Carefirst this morning, I was 10 struck by the effort of the company that it 11 has made to defend both its level of reserves 12 13 and community investments. I can only imagine the millions of dollars that have been spent 14 securing expert consultation to advance this 15 perspective and how much health care coverage 16 these millions of dollars could have 17 supported. 18 I dream of a different kind of not 19

20 for profit insurance company serving the
21 District of Columbia and neighboring states
22 that does not view the idea of community

reinvestment in opposition to the idea of 1 2 benefit for subscribers. It seems Carefirst is hampered by its 20th Century perspective 3 that is unable to envision how to meet 21st 4 5 Century community health commitments. Meeting a not-for-profit community benefit obligation 6 7 means more than charitable contributions and giving to worthy causes. 8

9 Indeed, many health insurance 10 companies across the United States have figured out how to commit passionately to 11 filling in the cracks and service needs of a 12 13 broken health care system, to invest in prevention and care management especially for 14 at risk populations, and third, to adopt 15 communities, actually adopt communities and 16 work in partnership to make them healthy. 17 These innovations have been found 18

19 to benefit these communities and the company's 20 bottom lines.

21 Most of us in the room value the 22 innovation that the private sector can

1 deliver. It is proper that this innovation and creativity be harnessed by government on 2 occasion for the social good. While this 3 4 hearing by necessity has focused on financial 5 accounting details, we should not lose sight of the overall community objectives that the 6 7 NEA legislation sought to achieve. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: 8 Ms. 9 Lamphere, could you please sum up? 10 MS. LAMPHERE: Okay. 11 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Thank you. 12 MS. LAMPHERE: We believe 13 Carefirst should be required to devote more resources to the health and coverage needs of 14 the Washington area community to the maximum 15 extent possible. Serious multiple chronic 16 conditions are harming the District, and 17 through a greater investment of evidence-based 18 community programs by Carefirst improved 19 20 assurances of health care and coverage can be 21 provided to members of our local community. 22 And we are happy -- we would be

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

delighted to work with you to further that 1 2 vision. 3 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Thank you. Thank you. 4 5 Ms. Lang. 6 MS. LANG: Thank you. 7 Good afternoon, Commissioner Purcell and members of the department. I am 8 9 Barbara Lang, and I am pleased to be president and CEO of the District of Columbia Chamber of 10 11 Commerce. 12 I'd like to thank you for allowing 13 me to testify on the determination of the Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, 14 Inc. surplus. 15 I'm coming at this from an 16 entirely different perspective. I'm not going 17 to talk about charters or actuarial tables or 18 legal opinions. I am speaking purely in 19 20 support of a robust business community in the District of Columbia. 21 22 The Chamber of Commerce would like

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

to urge that you leave the decision about the appropriateness of GHMSI's reserves where it rightfully belongs, with its board of directors. Our concerns are similar to those expressed at a hearing in 2005 when we testified before Council Member Graham on this same very issue.

And I will say that I've testified 8 9 several times on this very same issue. In 10 expressing our concerns, the Chamber recognizes that the Medical Insurance 11 Empowerment Amendment Act of 2008 was narrowly 12 13 drafted such that it would apply to only one 14 corporate entity operating in D.C. The corporate entity identified in the law that 15 Carefirst-Blue Cross/Blue Shield through its 16 Washington area affiliate GHMSI is an 17 important member of this business community in 18 D.C., so much so that we plan to honor them at 19 the Chamber's annual gala this October in 20 21 front of 1,200-plus guests. So we think very highly of this business in D.C. 22

Not only are they an exemplary
 member of this business community for its
 sound management and strong financial
 position, but it is also one of the largest
 financial givers in the city. It's our
 opinion that this company lives up to its
 mission.

8 In fact, by all rights District 9 officials should be commending Carefirst and 10 GHMSI for their exemplary contributions to the 11 community instead of continuing to drag it 12 through burdensome regulatory and over sight 13 reviews, legislative mandates and lawsuits. 14 The lion's share of Carefirst's

members are individuals and small employers, 15 almost 5,000 businesses in total, nearly 70 16 percent of which have fewer than nine 17 employees. The reserves that are the subject 18 of this review were built by those premiums, 19 20 paid by those individuals and businesses and those reserves are maintained for their 21 22 protection.

		P
1	Any attempt to redirect some share	
2	of those reserves for other purposes would	
3	impair the company's ability to moderate	
4	future premiums and insure that it will always	
5	be there for its members no matter what.	
6	For small employers, the decision	
7	to provide health insurance is both a	
8	necessity and a sacrifice. We believe that	
9	any determined excess reserves should be	
10	returned to the employers, employees, and	
11	individuals who helped to create it.	
12	GHMSI's board is charged with the	
13	following major duties, and I see my time is	
14	up. So it's in the written testimony.	
15	But let me just say in closing	
16	because I know we are out of time, is this is	
17	a very slippery slope. While this legislation	
18	is geared to Carefirst and their nonprofit	
19	status, if we go down this pathway, we are	
20	going to what other for-profit company are	
21	we now going to go after? And that impairs	
22	the ability to attract businesses and to	

1 retain them in the District of Columbia. 2 Many times when I testify on the Hill looking for more money I say being the 3 4 nation's Capitol is an honor and a privilege, 5 albeit a very expensive one. One of the things that I do when we compare to 6 7 surrounding jurisdictions, it is almost 30 percent more to do business in this District 8 9 of Columbia than in Maryland and Virginia. So 10 why would anybody want to be here? And so today I had a phone call 11 from CNN wanting me to do an interview on why 12 13 I want to bring business in D.C. and why it's so great to be in the District. I am 14 considering not doing that interview because 15 it's very difficult to extol the virtues. 16 So I implore all of you not to 17 burden this company. We need them and their 18 1,500 people that they employ just in the 19 District of Columbia. 20 And so I thank you for the 21 22 opportunity to be here today.

1 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Thank you. 2 MS. LANG: The other part of my 3 testimony is written. COMMISSIONER PURCELL: And it will 4 5 be entered into the record. Thank you very much. 6 MS. LANG: 7 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Thank you, Ms. Lang. 8 9 Mr. Wilmot. MR. WILMOT: Good afternoon. 10 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: 11 Good 12 afternoon. 13 MR. WILMOT: Commissioner Purcell, 14 can you hear me? Thank you. I'm Dave Wilmot. I'm the 15 Executive Director of the District of Columbia 16 Association of Health Maintenance 17 Organizations. 18 19 Our association consists of seven managed care organizations, and at the time 20 that I took over, there were 19 such 21 22 organizations operating in the District of

Page 400

Columbia, many of whom are no longer here 1 2 today, and it's directly related to the conversations that will happen with respect to 3 their reserves. 4 5 They can't hear me? 6 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: Sorry. 7 Yes, just put the mic right in front of -- oh, is it engaged? Push the green. 8 9 MR. WILMOT: Can you hear me now? 10 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: There you 11 go. thank you. 12 MR. WILMOT: Okay. Directly 13 related to the conversation that we're having 14 today. You have my testimony. So what 15 I'd like to do is I'd like to turn to the 16 highlights. The association member plans 17 believe that it's important to maintain a 18 strong and competitive health insurance 19 20 industry in the District of Columbia. It's something that I believe that you agree with. 21 22 At one time, the DCHMO Association

Page 401

had as many as 19 member plans. As you're
 aware, several of those companies had to cease
 operations because they did not have adequate
 reserves.

5 Carefirst affiliate, Group 6 Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc. is 7 one of the largest insurers in the city, and it is essential that the company remain 8 9 financially strong. We recognize that you are mandated to conduct a review of the company's 10 reserves and to make a determination on 11 whether those reserves are excessive. 12

13 Specifically the Commissioners are 14 required to assess the reserves that are attributable to the District. Typically 15 companies establish reserves based on their 16 entire business obligation. A number of our 17 member plans are concerned that a policy with 18 the stated objective to divide reserves based 19 on an individual's jurisdictions could weaken 20 the entire company as well as have an adverse 21 22 effect on other member plans as well.

		Page 4
1	In the health industry, the risk-	
2	based capital standards set by the National	
3	Association of Insurance Commissioners	
4	establishes a minimum threshold to measure the	
5	financial solvency. It is in no way the	
6	standard that should measure excess.	
7	If a company is operating at that	
8	level, it should send off an alarm bell and	
9	result in an intervention by the Insurance	
10	Commissioner.	
11	Health insurers and other	
12	companies establish reserves to make sure that	
13	they can effectively meet both expected and	
14	unexpected business obligations. Establishing	
15	an appropriate level of reserves is going to	
16	be different for each company. The DCHMO	
17	Association believes that it is the role of	
18	the company's board of directors and its	
19	management to make that determination.	
20	We urge you to give careful	
21	consideration to the important decisions you	
22	have to make. As the Insurance Commissioner,	

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

Page 403

you have an obligation to protect insurance 1 2 consumers and to make sure insurance companies provide quality service in accordance with the 3 4 law. 5 In order for an insurance company 6 to meet the obligation to its customers, the 7 company has to be effectively managed and financially strong. That is where Carefirst 8 9 is now. 10 We hope that the first decision you make in your role as Commissioner sets the 11 right balance. 12 13 Thank you for giving us the opportunity to testify on this issue, and I 14 remain available for any questions that you 15 might have. 16 COMMISSIONER PURCELL: 17 Thank you. 18 Thank you, Mr. Wilmot, and thank you all for your testimony today. 19 20 I do not have any questions for 21 you. You all have very compelling and very clear testimony. It will be entered into the 22

1 record and considered fully.

2	I want to thank you all for coming
3	today, all of the witnesses. Please note
4	again that the record will remain open until
5	September 25th, and I have one additional
6	request, an that is that you send an E-mail or
7	forward it to the attention of Leslie Johnson,
8	but also to my Executive Assistant Carmelita
9	Snowden either by mail or E-mail, and just to
10	insure that we have it.
11	And with that I will adjourn this
12	hearing. This hearing will resume tomorrow
13	morning at 10:00 a.m. in this room, and thank
14	you all again. Have a good evening.
15	(Whereupon, at 5:01 p.m., the
16	hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 10:00
17	a.m., Friday, September 11, 2009.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

				Page 400
A	148:1 268:17	372:12	373:8	287:7 329:15
	388:6	ACS 235:8	actuary 52:19 67:5	adequate 6:12
AARP 2:14 391:4,6	accompany 247:14	act 3:18,18,20,20	67:11 68:8 285:8	57:20 58:9 84:5
AARP's 390:19,21	accompanying	5:10,21 6:19 7:7	287:1 296:5	360:12 402:3
aback 83:16	24:8	15:18 16:1 17:16	348:14 381:4	adequately 100:18
abated 130:14	accomplish 59:13	21:6 23:8 85:8	actuary's 343:9	adhering 363:4
abatement 33:9	accomplished	91:1 114:21 115:2	add 37:19 100:5	adjourn 2:22 11:9
abilities 164:13	391:13	155:6 303:6	128:4 133:17	405:11
ability 48:4 84:10	account 38:10 74:1	310:21 311:7	142:14 149:3	adjusting 294:15
87:17 171:18	100:18 102:19	396:12	181:14 242:17	316:10
189:18 241:17	147:5 190:13	acted 49:20	314:20 325:2	adjustment 387:6
279:3 369:3 398:3	200:14 227:11	acting 1:16,18 3:9	331:7 334:15	adjustments 58:9
398:22	228:11 257:16	342:8	338:19 346:5	158:20 160:10
able 18:17 48:18	322:6 326:7,16	action 85:19 86:1	347:18 354:5,13	admin 241:5
224:17 255:21	372:10,18 373:11	88:21 136:5	376:16 378:14	administered 121:5
260:19 273:6	375:4	348:21	added 37:22 379:7	Administration
292:8 329:9				56:15
330:17 344:21	accountability 282:18	actions 49:8 85:1,2 239:9	adding 39:20 43:11 addition 32:5 37:15	administrative
349:9,15 364:22	accountable 359:15		42:14 56:22 67:15	
373:4	361:2 366:14	actively 16:4 69:11 88:11 120:2		45:2 58:13,22
absence 372:11			68:5 70:1 87:20	139:21 177:7
absolute 18:7 69:19	accounting 159:11	activities 24:17	142:18 151:13	184:3 240:15
absolutely 170:11	159:12 160:9,12	26:18 46:8 77:15	297:21 305:9,15	241:20 242:16,17
377:17	286:12,21 339:12	308:11 327:10	319:21 364:2	Administratively
abuse 266:18	394:5	372:22	369:17 389:10	140:11
academic 96:8,13	accounts 165:19	activity 24:14	additional 9:7	admit 277:20 287:3
96:16	190:21	153:5 373:2	24:16,22 43:10	admitted 159:22
academy 67:8,19	accredited 67:5	actual 24:7 55:16	72:4,19 80:2 90:8	293:16 338:18
67:22 285:10,18	accumulate 175:8	57:11 150:11	111:9 226:10	adopt 276:15
285:20	accumulation 86:1	175:10 205:1	264:1 278:8	393:15,16
accelerate 149:15	88:12 90:18 92:6	229:22 241:19	327:10 330:11	adopted 26:21
accept 276:11	379:2	255:11 259:21	334:21 372:13,17	44:14 48:14 65:5
368:11	accuracy 75:22	307:3 343:13	375:19 380:9	103:6 106:9
acceptable 89:2	accurate 157:21,22	actuarial 4:22 9:3	405:5	367:12
accepted 173:3	158:1 382:5	67:17 69:17 70:8	Additionally 5:2	adopting 105:19
access 47:18 66:10	accurately 230:17	83:13 107:4 210:9	46:12	adults 392:3
77:7 94:9 96:2	231:6	213:15 276:3,6	address 28:22	advance 20:10
102:2 110:9	achieve 258:6	279:17 280:1,6,15	55:21 102:22	24:18 392:15
116:19 139:7	259:22 368:13	285:8 286:1,8,9	303:8 311:2	advanced 324:13
141:3 142:13	394:7	288:3 335:6	325:13 356:19	advances 283:22
260:18 278:15,21	achieved 34:22	348:10 395:18	365:6 367:9 370:6	advantage 36:16
279:4,12 294:11	acknowledge	actuarially 222:21	addressed 11:19	166:3
335:8 342:7 343:5	269:15 325:13	actuaries 67:7,8,19	57:3	advantages 165:21
344:20 362:17	329:2 342:16	68:1,19 69:7 70:8	addresses 298:16	166:5 168:6,20
accessibility 25:19	acknowledged	83:7 104:16,17,19	addressing 13:7	advent 48:6 112:13
accessible 124:10	327:3	111:10 285:9,10	78:7 126:2 247:17	adversarial 74:20
391:9	ACL 161:14 296:2	285:12,18,19,21	adds 287:4	adverse 60:11 61:1
accommodate	336:16 369:21	286:18 347:20	adequacy 57:10	79:4,14 84:7
L				

92:15 227:4,10,15 227:17 228:16,18afford 28:15 31:7 48:16 86:11 94:20 200:16,17 281:3 affordbility 28:11 257:20 258:2,17 402:21290:16,17 281:3 affordbility 28:11 118:2 168:3allotted 12:2 63:3 379:15 allow 69:14 131:14 369:19 378:17 69:16 217:12 allow ed 91:8 369:19 378:17 369:19 31 248:16 248:13 249:17 278:15,21 249:13 249:13 249:13 249:14 229:10 248:16 248:13 249:14 229:10 248:16 248:13 249:17 278:15,21 249:13 249:14 229:10 361:4 249:13 249:17 278:15,21 249:13 223:10 249:14 229:13 249:14 229:14 249:14 229:13 249:14 229:14 249:151:22 175:9 216:210 248:14 248:13 249:14 247:1 249:13 247:1 249:13 247:1 249:13 247:1 249:13 247:1 249:13 247:1 249:14 247:1 240:12 349:19 322:1 240:12 349:19 322:1 240:12 349:19 322:1 240:12 349:19 322:1 240:12 349:19 322:1 240:13 247:1 240:13 247:1 240:14 67:14 240:13 322:10 383:17,22 240:12 333:6 241 240:13 247:1 240:13 247:1 240:13 247:1 240:1
235:2 240:12200:16,17 281:3agree 35:9 115:3,7allow 69:14 131:1463:17 70:19 73:12241:3 256:13affordability 28:11118:2 168:3369:19 378:1775:19 76:9 81:19257:20 258:2,1729:15,22 34:7189:10 217:12allowed 91:890:15 92:11258:20 259:288:6 94:9 109:19286:5 295:16266:15123:11 146:5,12402:21116:14 117:4,6309:18 352:16allowing 60:16181:12 183:9advice 44:21122:18 123:16357:8 362:1061:6 272:16190:20 203:13,16104:21 108:9162:10,14 224:20367:21 378:11,12395:12204:9,12 209:10109:16 124:3376:8387:17 401:21allows 36:11,16231:12,16 236:4206:7 207:1 210:128:20 30:14 47:18agreed 45:12 64:651:15 62:16263:2 299:19251:4 252:19117:11 122:12,14141:4,9 144:7altered 217:2,5341:13 342:9248:13249:17 278:15,21347:22agreements 145:16372:9355:9 356:13248:13249:17 278:15,21347:22alternative 159:5357:3,6 368:7advised 108:11279:4,12 280:13Ah 320:8321:5,17analyse 285:17209:3 245:12359:10 361:4ahead 151:22 175:9208:22analyze 212:20advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22333:6alternativelyanalyze 61:8advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22333:6alternatives 66:20analyzed 61:8advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22aimed 77:1akin 290:18 301:12amend 189:19
241:3 256:13 257:20 258:2,17 258:20 259:2affordability 28:11 29:15,22 34:7 88:6 94:9 109:19 162:10,14 217:46118:2 168:3 189:10 217:12 286:5 295:16 309:18 352:16369:19 378:17 266:15 266:1575:19 76:9 81:19 90:15 92:11advice 44:21 402:21116:14 117:4,6 116:14 117:4,6309:18 352:16 309:18 352:16allowing 60:16 61:6 272:16181:12 183:9 190:20 203:13,16advice 44:21 109:16 124:3 109:16 124:3122:18 123:16 376:8357:8 362:10 387:17 401:21 allows 36:11,16 agreed 45:12 64:661:6 272:16 51:15 62:16190:20 203:13,16 204:9,12 209:10109:16 124:3 206:7 207:1 210:1 251:4 252:19affordable 25:18 28:20 30:14 47:18 210:9 248:16 26:1 96:3 102:1 251:4 252:19affordable 25:18 117:11 122:12,14 141:4,9 144:7 141:4,9 144:7 agreements 145:16 347:22all's 158:18 alternative 159:5 357:3,6 368:7 321:5,17 349:19 352:11,15 357:3,6 368:7 321:5,17 347:22alternative 159:5 357:3,6 368:7 321:5,17 analyst 285:17 analyst 285:17 analyst 285:17 analyst 285:17 analyst 285:17 analyst 285:17 analyst 285:17 analyst 281:10 333:6alternatives 66:20 analyzed 61:8 330:5 analyzed 61:8 330:5
257:20 258:2,1729:15,22 34:7189:10 217:12allowed 91:890:15 92:11258:20 259:288:6 94:9 109:19286:5 295:16266:15123:11 146:5,12402:21116:14 117:4,6309:18 352:16allowing 60:16181:12 183:9advice 44:21122:18 123:16357:8 362:1061:6 272:16190:20 203:13,16104:21 108:9162:10,14 224:20367:21 378:11,12395:12204:9,12 209:10109:16 124:3376:8387:17 401:21allows 36:11,16231:12,16 236:4169:10 201:3affordable 25:18agreed 45:12 64:651:15 62:16263:2 299:19206:7 207:1 210:128:20 30:14 47:18108:16 160:15128:20 328:14326:14,17 327:8210:9 248:1686:15 96:3 102:1agreement 89:19all's 158:18329:16 330:12advise 199:13164:13 223:10agreements 145:16372:9349:19 352:11,15248:13249:17 278:15,21347:22347:22321:5,17analyst 285:17advised 108:11279:4,12 280:13Ah 320:8321:5,17analyst 285:17advised 108:11279:4,12 280:13Ah 320:8321:5,17analyst 285:17advisen 70:1376:12,12 381:22333:6alternatively208:22advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22333:688:14 232:18330:5advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22aimed 77:188:14 232:18330:5advisor 46:13391:9 392:1akin 290:18 301:12amend 189:19analyzing 77:11
258:20 259:288:6 94:9 109:19286:5 295:16266:15123:11 146:5,12402:21116:14 117:4,6309:18 352:16allowing 60:16181:12 183:9advice 44:21122:18 123:16357:8 362:1061:6 272:16190:20 203:13,16104:21 108:9162:10,14 224:20367:21 378:11,12395:12204:9,12 209:10109:16 124:3376:8387:17 401:21allows 36:11,16231:12,16 236:4169:10 201:3affordable 25:18agreed 45:12 64:651:15 62:16263:2 299:19206:7 207:1 210:128:20 30:14 47:18108:16 160:15128:20 328:14326:14,17 327:8210:9 248:1686:15 96:3 102:1agreement 89:19all's 158:18329:16 330:12251:4 252:19117:11 122:12,14141:4,9 144:7altered 217:2,5341:13 342:9269:18 270:7124:9 154:17163:3 184:3alternate 200:12349:19 352:11,15advise 199:13164:13 223:10agreements 145:16372:9355:9 356:13248:13249:17 278:15,21347:22alternative 159:5357:3,6 368:7advised 108:11279:4,12 280:13Ah 320:8321:5,17analyst 285:17209:3 245:12359:10 361:4ahead 151:22 175:9alternativelyanalytical 46:2246:12,13 247:1363:20 366:16197:8 217:22208:22analyze 212:20advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22333:6alternatives 66:20analyzed 61:8advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22aimed 77:188:14 232:18330:5advisor 46:5391:9 39
402:21116:14 117:4,6309:18 352:16allowing 60:16181:12 183:9advice 44:21122:18 123:16357:8 362:1061:6 272:16190:20 203:13,16104:21 108:9162:10,14 224:20367:21 378:11,12395:12204:9,12 209:10109:16 124:3376:8387:17 401:21allows 36:11,16231:12,16 236:4169:10 201:3affordable 25:18agreed 45:12 64:651:15 62:16263:2 299:19206:7 207:1 210:128:20 30:14 47:18108:16 160:15128:20 328:14326:14,17 327:8210:9 248:1686:15 96:3 102:1agreement 89:19all's 158:18329:16 330:12251:4 252:19117:11 122:12,14141:4,9 144:7altered 217:2,5341:13 342:9269:18 270:7124:9 154:17163:3 184:3alternate 200:12349:19 352:11,15advise 199:13164:13 223:10agreements 145:16372:9355:9 356:13248:13249:17 278:15,21347:22alternative 159:5357:3,6 368:7advised 108:11279:4,12 280:13Ah 320:8321:5,17analyst 285:17209:3 245:12359:10 361:4ahead 151:22 175:9alternativelyanalytical 46:2246:12,13 247:1363:20 366:16197:8 217:22208:22analyze 212:20advisor 70:1376:12,12 381:22333:6alternatives 66:20analyze 61:8advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22aimed 77:188:14 232:18330:5advisor 46:5391:9 392:1akin 290:18 301:12amend 189:19analyzing 77:11
advice 44:21122:18 123:16357:8 362:1061:6 272:16190:20 203:13,16104:21 108:9162:10,14 224:20367:21 378:11,12395:12204:9,12 209:10109:16 124:3376:8387:17 401:21allows 36:11,16231:12,16 236:4169:10 201:3affordable 25:18agreed 45:12 64:651:15 62:16263:2 299:19206:7 207:1 210:128:20 30:14 47:18108:16 160:15128:20 328:14326:14,17 327:8210:9 248:1686:15 96:3 102:1agreement 89:1911's 158:18329:16 330:12251:4 252:19117:11 122:12,14141:4,9 144:7altered 217:2,5341:13 342:9269:18 270:7124:9 154:17163:3 184:3alternate 200:12349:19 352:11,15advise 199:13164:13 223:10agreements 145:16372:9355:9 356:13248:13249:17 278:15,21347:22341:22 175:9321:5,17analyst 285:17advised 108:11279:4,12 280:13Ah 320:8321:5,17analyst 285:17advising 70:1376:12,12 381:22333:6alternativel 59:5357:3,6 368:7advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22333:6alternatives 66:20analyze 12:20advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22333:6amend 189:19analyze 61:8advisor 46:5391:9 392:1akin 290:18 301:12amend 189:19analyzing 77:11
104:21 108:9162:10,14 224:20367:21 378:11,12395:12204:9,12 209:10109:16 124:3376:8387:17 401:21allows 36:11,16231:12,16 236:4169:10 201:3affordable 25:18agreed 45:12 64:651:15 62:16263:2 299:19206:7 207:1 210:128:20 30:14 47:18108:16 160:15128:20 328:14326:14,17 327:8210:9 248:1686:15 96:3 102:1agreement 89:19all's 158:18329:16 330:12251:4 252:19117:11 122:12,14141:4,9 144:7altered 217:2,5341:13 342:9269:18 270:7124:9 154:17163:3 184:3alternate 200:12349:19 352:11,15advise 199:13164:13 223:10agreements 145:16372:9355:9 356:13248:13249:17 278:15,21347:22alternative 159:5357:3,6 368:7advised 108:11279:4,12 280:13Ah 320:8321:5,17analyst 285:17209:3 245:12359:10 361:4197:8 217:22208:22analyst 285:17advising 70:1376:12,12 381:22333:6alternativels66:20advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22aimed 77:188:14 232:18330:5advisor 46:5391:9 392:1akin 290:18 301:12amend 189:19analyzing 77:11
109:16 124:3 169:10 201:3376:8 affordable 25:18 28:20 30:14 47:18387:17 401:21 agreed 45:12 64:6allows 36:11,16 51:15 62:16231:12,16 236:4 263:2 299:19206:7 207:1 210:1 210:9 248:1628:20 30:14 47:18 86:15 96:3 102:1 117:11 122:12,14108:16 160:15 agreement 89:19 141:4,9 144:7128:20 328:14 all's 158:18326:14,17 327:8 329:16 330:12209:18 270:7 269:18 270:7124:9 154:17 164:13 223:10164:13 223:10 347:22agreements 145:16 372:9372:9 355:9 356:13advise 199:13 248:13164:13 223:10 249:17 278:15,21agreements 145:16 347:22372:9 321:5,17 alternative 159:5357:3,6 368:7 analyst 285:17 analyst 285:17 analyst 285:17 analyst 285:17 analyze 212:20 analyze 212:20 analyze 212:20advising 70:1 advisor 46:13 advisor 46:13 advisor 46:5391:9 392:1333:6 akin 290:18 301:12alternatives 66:20 88:14 232:18 amend 189:19analyzing 77:11
169:10 201:3 206:7 207:1 210:1affordable 25:18 28:20 30:14 47:18agreed 45:12 64:6 108:16 160:1551:15 62:16 128:20 328:14263:2 299:19 326:14,17 327:8210:9 248:16 251:4 252:1986:15 96:3 102:1 117:11 122:12,14agreement 89:19 141:4,9 144:7all's 158:18 attered 217:2,5329:16 330:12 341:13 342:9269:18 270:7 269:18 270:7124:9 154:17 164:13 223:10164:13 223:10 347:22agreements 145:16 372:9372:9 355:9 356:13advise 199:13 248:13164:13 223:10 249:17 278:15,21agreements 145:16 347:22372:9 314:13 342:9advised 108:11 209:3 245:12 246:12,13 247:1279:4,12 280:13 359:10 361:4Ah 320:8 ahead 151:22 175:9 333:6321:5,17 alternatively 208:22analyst 285:17 analyst 285:17 analyst 285:17advising 70:1 advisor 46:13 advisor 46:13 382:10 383:17,22333:6 aimed 77:1 akin 290:18 301:12alternatives 66:20 88:14 232:18 amend 189:19analyzed 61:8 330:5
206:7 207:1 210:128:20 30:14 47:18108:16 160:15128:20 328:14326:14,17 327:8210:9 248:1686:15 96:3 102:1agreement 89:19all's 158:18329:16 330:12251:4 252:19117:11 122:12,14141:4,9 144:7altered 217:2,5341:13 342:9269:18 270:7124:9 154:17163:3 184:3alternate 200:12349:19 352:11,15advise 199:13164:13 223:10agreements 145:16372:9355:9 356:13248:13249:17 278:15,21347:22alternative 159:5357:3,6 368:7advised 108:11279:4,12 280:13Ah 320:8321:5,17analyst 285:17209:3 245:12359:10 361:4ahead 151:22 175:9alternativelyanalytical 46:2246:12,13 247:1363:20 366:16197:8 217:22208:22analyze 212:20advising 70:1376:12,12 381:22333:6alternatives 66:20analyzed 61:8advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22aimed 77:188:14 232:18330:5advisory 46:5391:9 392:1akin 290:18 301:12amend 189:19analyzing 77:11
210:9 248:1686:15 96:3 102:1agreement 89:19all's 158:18329:16 330:12251:4 252:19117:11 122:12,14141:4,9 144:7altered 217:2,5341:13 342:9269:18 270:7124:9 154:17163:3 184:3alternate 200:12349:19 352:11,15advise 199:13164:13 223:10agreements 145:16372:9355:9 356:13248:13249:17 278:15,21347:22alternative 159:5357:3,6 368:7advised 108:11279:4,12 280:13Ah 320:8321:5,17analyst 285:17209:3 245:12359:10 361:4ahead 151:22 175:9alternativelyanalytical 46:2246:12,13 247:1363:20 366:16197:8 217:22208:22analyze 212:20advising 70:1376:12,12 381:22333:6alternatives 66:20analyzed 61:8advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22aimed 77:188:14 232:18330:5advisory 46:5391:9 392:1akin 290:18 301:12amend 189:19analyzing 77:11
251:4 252:19117:11 122:12,14141:4,9 144:7altered 217:2,5341:13 342:9269:18 270:7124:9 154:17163:3 184:3alternate 200:12349:19 352:11,15advise 199:13164:13 223:10agreements 145:16372:9355:9 356:13248:13249:17 278:15,21347:22alternative 159:5357:3,6 368:7advised 108:11279:4,12 280:13Ah 320:8321:5,17analyst 285:17209:3 245:12359:10 361:4ahead 151:22 175:9alternativelyanalyst 285:17246:12,13 247:1363:20 366:16197:8 217:22208:22analyze 212:20advisor 70:1376:12,12 381:22333:6alternatives 66:20analyzed 61:8advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22aimed 77:188:14 232:18330:5advisor 46:5391:9 392:1akin 290:18 301:12amend 189:19analyzing 77:11
269:18 270:7124:9 154:17163:3 184:3alternate 200:12349:19 352:11,15advise 199:13164:13 223:10agreements 145:16372:9355:9 356:13248:13249:17 278:15,21347:22alternative 159:5357:3,6 368:7advised 108:11279:4,12 280:13347:22alternative 159:5357:3,6 368:7209:3 245:12359:10 361:4ahead 151:22 175:9321:5,17analyst 285:17246:12,13 247:1363:20 366:16197:8 217:22208:22analyze 212:20advising 70:1376:12,12 381:22333:6alternatives 66:20analyzed 61:8advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22aimed 77:188:14 232:18330:5advisory 46:5391:9 392:1akin 290:18 301:12amend 189:19analyzing 77:11
advise 199:13164:13 223:10agreements 145:16372:9355:9 356:13248:13249:17 278:15,21347:22alternative 159:5357:3,6 368:7advised 108:11279:4,12 280:13Ah 320:8321:5,17analyst 285:17209:3 245:12359:10 361:4ahead 151:22 175:9alternativelyanalytical 46:2246:12,13 247:1363:20 366:16197:8 217:22208:22analyze 212:20advising 70:1376:12,12 381:22333:6alternatives 66:20analyzed 61:8advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22aimed 77:188:14 232:18330:5advisory 46:5391:9 392:1akin 290:18 301:12amend 189:19analyzing 77:11
248:13249:17 278:15,21347:22alternative 159:5357:3,6 368:7advised 108:11279:4,12 280:13Ah 320:8321:5,17analyst 285:17209:3 245:12359:10 361:4ahead 151:22 175:9alternativelyanalytical 46:2246:12,13 247:1363:20 366:16197:8 217:22208:22analyze 212:20advising 70:1376:12,12 381:22333:6alternatives 66:20analyzed 61:8advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22aimed 77:188:14 232:18330:5advisory 46:5391:9 392:1akin 290:18 301:12amend 189:19analyzing 77:11
advised 108:11279:4,12 280:13Ah 320:8321:5,17analyst 285:17209:3 245:12359:10 361:4ahead 151:22 175:9alternativelyanalytical 46:2246:12,13 247:1363:20 366:16197:8 217:22208:22analyze 212:20advising 70:1376:12,12 381:22333:6alternatives 66:20analyzed 61:8advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22aimed 77:188:14 232:18330:5advisory 46:5391:9 392:1akin 290:18 301:12amend 189:19analyzing 77:11
209:3 245:12 246:12,13 247:1359:10 361:4 363:20 366:16ahead 151:22 175:9 197:8 217:22alternatively 208:22analytical 46:2 analyze 212:20advising 70:1 advisor 46:13 advisor 46:5382:10 383:17,22 391:9 392:1333:6 aimed 77:1 akin 290:18 301:12alternatively 88:14 232:18 amend 189:19analytical 46:2 analyze 61:8 330:5
246:12,13 247:1363:20 366:16197:8 217:22208:22analyze 212:20advising 70:1376:12,12 381:22333:6alternatives 66:20analyzed 61:8advisor 46:13382:10 383:17,22aimed 77:188:14 232:18330:5advisory 46:5391:9 392:1akin 290:18 301:12amend 189:19analyzing 77:11
advising 70:1 advisor 46:13 advisory 46:5376:12,12 381:22 382:10 383:17,22333:6 aimed 77:1 akin 290:18 301:12alternatives 66:20 88:14 232:18 amend 189:19analyzed 61:8 330:5 analyzing 77:11
advisor 46:13 advisor 46:5382:10 383:17,22 391:9 392:1aimed 77:1 akin 290:18 301:1288:14 232:18 amend 189:19330:5 analyzing 77:11
advisory 46:5 391:9 392:1 akin 290:18 301:12 amend 189:19 analyzing 77:11
v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v
$1 - 64 \cdot 16 \cdot 67 \cdot 16 \cdot 70 = 1 - 647 \cdot 67 \cdot 10 \cdot 70 \cdot 10 \cdot 10 \cdot 10 \cdot 10 \cdot 10 \cdot 1$
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
232:5,17 233:4 aforesaid 215:7,8 alarm 403:8 Amendment 3:20 and/or 60:12
advocacy 16:14 306:11,12 alarming 30:3 396:12 announced 69:4
380:16 afternoon 222:10 albeit 270:5 289:11 America 360:22 announcement
advocates 359:14 266:12,13 274:15 399:5 American 22:14 265:5
Aetna 171:8275:5 284:22alike 84:367:7,19,22 285:10annual 42:15 91:21
AFC 62:10 302:18 353:21 allegations 75:4 285:20 122:1,1 178:18
Affairs 99:2 358:6,7 390:4,15 alleviate 366:12 ammunition 345:5 192:16 298:3,12
affect 125:16 145:4 395:7 400:10,12 Alliance 77:1 amount 24:21 45:7 298:16,17 299:1
236:10,10afterthought286:10 388:979:11 85:3 87:7299:10,13 301:21
affectionately 328:13 389:2 88:20 107:8 123:7 311:19 386:3,10
235:6 after-the-fact 66:5 allocate 54:20 123:12,13 125:10 396:20
affiliate 14:15 53:3age 64:16178:4,11 180:11127:8 130:9annually 39:3 41:3
80:14 162:3 391:2 agencies 75:20 180:11 190:20,21 172:17 204:1 41:9 372:21
396:17 402:5 76:15 allocated 172:22 205:6 212:10 anomaly 41:19
affiliated 141:11 agency 26:19 175:13 179:20 242:20 252:13 answer 37:12 81:4
affiliates 162:11 163:16 192:17 298:14 301:19 309:12 109:17 111:14
164:10 aggregate 18:20 allocates 311:16 312:21 331:19 124:16 145:2
affiliation 10:7 200:21 allocating 172:16 340:3 349:4 374:3 147:3 161:16
11:18 141:13 aggressively 73:7 178:20 308:9 391:15 170:20 178:7,22
163:3 364:22 365:5 309:8,12 amounts 15:10 179:1 198:6 199:1
affirm 266:7 ago 19:2 24:1 49:18 allocation 160:4 60:2 79:6 311:21 202:6 204:21
274:22 358:13 85:10,20 148:14 172:14 193:3 ample 295:18 209:6 210:2 212:3
380:2 390:7 168:9 244:12 309:6,16 analyses 81:8 213:8 252:7 260:9

070 15 017 10	254 7 201 10	200 1 202 12	222 10 226 14 17	1. (2.10
272:15 317:12	354:7 381:18	298:1 302:12	332:19 336:14,17	asking 63:19
319:3 321:6 333:8	Appleseed's 16:21	appropriate 4:19	352:22 353:1,6,9	123:12,13 201:21
337:12,13 344:21	17:14 20:10 23:14	5:4 6:3,15 21:16	394:15 396:17	230:20 276:10,11
371:21	26:22 29:9 34:18	48:20 65:12,15	areas 195:18	288:11 319:2
answered 9:21 11:6	35:7 45:20 47:9	74:4,10 75:11	286:13	ASO 176:21 184:2
356:21	48:13 49:16	79:12 80:21,22	arena 83:13	aspect 237:22
answering 308:22	apples-to-apples	82:22 92:1,19	arenas 287:2	aspects 144:22
answers 82:13,15	37:17	98:3 103:2 157:15	argue 369:1	291:2 310:7
208:18 272:2	applicable 23:10	168:18 172:15	argued 86:12 316:5	356:11 368:15
anticipated 148:15	59:7 262:18	181:18 197:6	argues 17:9 18:4	aspiration 132:20
149:2	application 12:15	271:20 272:12,13	arguing 318:3	aspire 135:17
anticipates 384:13	291:11	301:19 309:8,11	argument 365:9	251:19
anticipation 387:10	applied 59:14	319:13 321:9	369:13	Assemblies 77:12
antithetical 243:11	74:14 82:17 83:22	344:14 356:15	arguments 16:16	Assembly's 46:6
anybody 112:10	85:9	371:16 373:9	arisen 303:4	assertions 70:10
113:14 138:1	applies 305:17	375:3 381:2	ARM 43:22 45:6	assess 62:16 79:9
348:4 357:2	316:4	384:11 385:18	70:9 71:13,16	289:15 402:14
399:10	apply 82:12 199:14	387:11 403:15	72:8,15 275:9,10	assessed 287:10
apologize 280:1	235:14,21,22	Appropriately	286:19 288:5,7	294:21
308:21 377:20	316:6 318:17	207:18	289:14 298:20	assessing 80:22
379:21	320:20 360:7	appropriateness	357:16	92:19
apparent 16:9	396:13	349:11 396:2	ARM's 286:15 297:16	assessment 9:4
appear 349:2 378:1 382:9	applying 208:16	approval 13:2	arose 301:11	77:17 80:15 81:6 285:21 287:14
	appreciate 3:7 93:1 150:16 194:14	120:4,4 135:1 143:10 160:18		
appearance 161:13 appeared 103:12	266:17 273:22	161:5 162:21	arrange 32:16 347:7	289:12,21 292:15 344:9
301:21	302:19	373:20 374:5	arrangement	assessments 341:15
appears 43:7 71:12	appreciates 391:4	approve 91:13	342:15	asset 58:1 142:16
339:11 384:20	appreciative 267:8	126:16	arranger 190:1	148:16 159:8,15
391:15	appreciative 207.0	approved 44:12,19	array 385:2	159:16 160:4
applaud 373:10	343:18,21	103:6 122:2	arrived 98:11	279:8,10 282:12
Appleseed 2:8 8:22	approach 16:6 46:3	161:16 314:5	article 270:16	339:8,18 360:9
10:13 16:13,14	48:13,22 55:1,20	approximately	articulating 337:9	assets 17:4 45:8
17:3,9,20 18:2,4	57:5 80:19 82:5	10:21 14:18,19	artificial 387:16	54:10 55:18
18:12,16,19 19:1	82:18 92:17	38:2 39:13,20	artificially 156:4	137:20 138:10
23:9,18 24:4,6	103:21 160:15	40:19 160:6 223:3	156:15	157:17 159:9,22
25:6 26:10 27:7	167:11 203:4	225:13 229:15	ASC 58:13 229:17	229:1 293:17,18
27:22 36:7 42:10	205:12 232:10	268:10 286:17	234:18 235:9,22	303:15,17 308:16
43:22 44:11 49:13	238:5 262:1,6,9	301:13,15	ascertain 292:9	338:18 339:7,17
55:22 70:8 72:15	288:7,10 298:21	April 382:21	ascertainable	339:19 341:3,7
73:10,13,18	301:18 322:17	area 14:22 17:8	312:9	359:19,22 360:3
203:16 274:13	330:8,8 350:15	24:15 25:14 35:17	asked 78:17 99:6	assign 44:15
275:6 282:1 283:1	351:4,8 371:10	38:14 81:3 84:21	105:6,12 199:16	256:18
296:18 303:12,18	approached 65:16	96:5 103:4 124:10	219:22 223:12	assigned 273:11
305:21 307:21	334:3 363:4	168:21 173:16	269:11 284:17	assignments 63:9
329:7 333:16	approaches 94:22	221:22 295:22	292:3 296:20	64:10 233:20
337:17 338:1	169:18 287:22	325:15 327:15	347:9 348:22	assist 3:22 4:18
	-	-	-	-

٦

				005 10 001 10
78:2 276:4 279:4	261:6,10,14 262:2	46:21 50:16 55:4	available 19:4	325:12 331:12
349:14 392:8	262:17,18 280:18	55:9 172:17	53:13 63:4 81:12	338:19 341:5
assistance 52:4	287:19 288:16	174:22 176:9,12	81:15 88:15 109:2	351:10 353:4
78:7 382:3	289:3,6 290:5,20	189:7 194:16	137:10 158:12,15	355:19
Assistant 405:8	291:3,15 294:16	198:20 211:20	162:18 165:11	backbone 48:10
assisted 77:11	294:22 321:21	269:10 301:2,17	247:10 249:5	288:2
assisting 76:22	322:4 330:15	302:15 309:12	260:21 261:3,5	background 16:19
77:6 213:5	335:20 336:9,12	312:17 323:6	262:13 268:14	64:12 67:3 68:16
associate 1:19 4:7	336:19,20 343:12	374:17 384:18	276:22 280:12	88:9 359:8
269:12 285:9	343:18 344:5	402:15	285:15 286:20	backing 142:2
associated 58:2	345:20 347:21	attribute 43:17	290:16 297:21	backs 37:16
158:1 204:14	348:6,20 368:3,9	173:9,10	298:2 325:12	backup 141:18,21
310:12 342:4	368:12 372:3	attributes 229:20	366:15 383:22	balance 14:22
Associates 1:24,25	381:6,14	attributing 81:2	391:18 404:15	28:15 109:9,15
1:25 4:15 144:15	assurance 40:6	92:20	average 31:9 39:21	114:12,14 115:13
association 2:20	330:16	attribution 53:9	40:1 41:9 189:4,5	116:5 118:4
6:6,8 22:14 60:8	assurances 394:20	54:18,21 84:20	224:5 366:4	207:15 224:20
64:18 68:9 72:17	assure 15:11 21:22	173:6 189:9	averaged 111:20	325:18,20,21
79:20,21 80:6	60:20 102:19	192:14 197:17	368:17	326:3,4,19,22
134:17 135:10,20	assuring 91:16	198:15 199:5	averaging 32:22	327:7 328:7 334:9
137:2,5 163:20	astute 285:13	201:15 269:5	averse 273:3	334:11,20 335:2
265:7 372:7	Attached 311:18	297:16 301:20	avoided 201:11	336:8,19 337:4
400:17,19 401:17	attachment 297:14	309:16 310:6,11	award 140:10	375:16,18 376:2,2
401:22 403:3,17	298:19	310:11,15 313:15	awards 140:12	377:2 404:12
assume 98:9	attachments 8:19	350:6	aware 145:3 160:3	balanced 329:3
155:10 227:22	attack 281:22	at-large 23:13	169:16 267:7	334:5
228:22 239:16	attacks 58:18 74:3	28:16 66:12	377:6 402:2	balances 226:7
240:1,2 257:12	74:21	audit 45:13 286:12	awe 259:5	balancing 322:8
259:5 270:4 316:8	attempt 63:1	audited 158:8,9	A-C 9:1	bank 142:15
370:17	100:14 398:1	auditors 45:12	a.m 1:15 3:2 11:2	165:16
assumed 235:19	attention 12:8 36:6	159:2,18 160:14	405:13,17	Banking 1:5,15
242:21 257:9	75:10 103:4 281:6	161:3 294:2		3:12 56:17 81:16
assumes 349:4	361:6 405:7	audits 161:6	<u> </u>	bankrupt 66:7
assuming 188:16	attorney 24:9 25:3	August 8:14,16,20	back 64:15 100:13	382:15
192:7 324:8	28:13 49:18	43:14 67:6 286:2	104:1 105:11,12	bankruptcy 66:1
assumption 64:5	115:16 279:9	authority 305:20	117:8,17 126:4,19	66:17
72:12,14 254:12	282:9,10 283:12	362:15 373:20	131:6 141:14	Barbara 2:15
262:21 280:9,12	303:21 307:11,17	authorize 284:6	145:22 155:12	390:4 395:9
316:14 348:4	308:7 358:18	315:9	156:11 163:4	Barlow 1:19 4:7
386:14	attract 69:14 243:6	authorized 21:11	173:14 188:4	53:11,17 124:17
assumptions 56:10	398:22	27:4 54:11 161:9	195:4 202:16,18	124:22 126:6,12
57:12 59:12 71:2	attracted 19:8	237:7 306:20	206:6 207:21	127:2 129:22
71:11 72:10 73:17	100:6 243:9	363:13 367:14	210:10,11 214:6	130:16 133:2,22
74:11 82:9,14	attractive 170:3	authorizes 283:7	224:17 225:10	134:5,8 137:9
235:12 238:7,17	attributable 4:2	authors 52:22	228:15 232:2,4	157:13 159:20
254:10,20 256:11	5:6 6:21 7:1,11	68:11	253:9,15 258:17	160:16 161:1,7
256:15 260:17,18	8:18 12:18 15:21	automated 59:9	313:22 323:8	162:16 164:20
	1		1	1

			_	_
165:20 168:16	262:13	134:19 158:12	109:3,4 113:1	134:1 165:2
175:5 252:6,15	basically 104:7	159:22 178:22	115:20,21 138:6	166:17 177:21
253:1,4,16,21	110:6 116:10	180:22 181:4,17	152:17 153:4,10	193:17 238:20,20
317:1,6,19 319:1	141:11 202:14	202:2,3 207:15,19	155:16 157:5,8	322:18 333:5
319:7,12,15,22	206:14,22 224:2	208:11 216:8	177:14 200:13	346:20 377:2
320:10,15,21	245:5 298:20	221:15 227:9	205:8 214:10	382:2
322:20 331:21	basis 18:17 45:18	231:4 269:10	215:5 218:13	beyond 84:4
332:13 335:22	45:21 50:9 69:19	276:14 281:7,18	244:5,20 250:21	132:13 228:3
338:14 339:14	81:10 122:1 135:5	282:15 284:8	251:1,12 268:19	229:3 307:9
340:4,12 341:10	154:5 155:1 159:9	290:5 298:6	271:3 272:10	314:22
341:17 342:1,6,21	167:7 171:6	305:22 312:3,22	280:15 284:11	big 148:16 159:21
343:20 344:13	291:19 298:5,17	314:16 315:6	286:19 296:22	221:2,11 235:14
345:15 346:1	battle 34:6	316:12 317:20	297:19 305:14	241:8 248:16
357:1	BCBS 77:20	321:19 322:21	308:5 340:7	335:19 339:16
base 95:20,20	BCBSA 72:17 73:6	324:15 325:5	359:22 365:6	383:3 385:21
156:6 186:21	BDO 286:10,11	326:6,19,20	366:10 367:2	388:11
190:11	bear 29:2 49:5	329:11 336:2	376:3,10 385:22	bigger 339:16
based 43:8 51:8	307:12	338:15 345:11.21	387:15 393:2,6,19	biggest 96:5 99:20
54:15,20 59:16	bearing 221:5	350:20 351:15	benefits 20:22	162:1,7 238:21
61:17 62:5 82:7	bears 292:14	362:20 374:17	25:12,18 68:13	244:7 245:3
82:13 96:10 107:3	becoming 243:14	391:12 394:12	90:1 118:9 121:3	billings 149:15
109:12 127:10	began 133:14	398:8 401:18,21	141:13,14 155:7	billion 366:5
130:5,6 161:6	beginning 11:2	believed 22:18	169:19 170:6	billions 242:3
173:1,6 174:21	97:17 135:19	100:9	243:20,21 245:1	bills 102:20 149:12
,	167:19 175:21	believes 43:16	243:20,21 243:1 251:10,11 367:5	386:10 387:1
175:13 177:9,13 183:11 190:9	203:12 276:5	49:17 134:21	377:8 388:12,19	bit 35:18 238:20,20
191:2 194:6		327:1 362:5	benevolent 16:22	
191:2 194:0	281:2,21 282:22 284:14 299:7		22:8,11 23:6 25:8	239:22 240:6,18 347:3 378:6
		374:18 391:6	26:13 303:14	
209:3,17 210:9	begins 136:7 behalf 4:12 13:14	403:17 bell 403:8		black 56:1 290:1
232:11,19 234:15			304:9,18 305:6	291:1 343:2 344:8
255:2,6,12 256:7	29:4 33:19 76:20	belong 17:4 108:17	308:1 315:5	347:17 368:1
257:1 260:14,16	77:22 78:4 81:8	175:4 303:16	360:11	blocks 176:18
261:1,3,12 262:11	137:21 163:17	308:16	best 47:14,16 69:15	Blue 5:8 6:7 20:17
279:17 284:16	380:18,19 381:17	belongs 174:10	96:12 99:18	20:17,20 36:9,10
294:3 297:22	390:21	396:3	104:21 105:2	44:18,18 46:11
298:1 310:16	behold 174:21	bending 121:18	109:15 110:10	53:2,2 60:8 61:10
311:16,21,22	beholding 69:9	beneficial 95:16	112:2 115:17	64:21,22 65:19,19
312:12 325:8	beings 252:2	376:18	124:3 134:15	65:22 67:2,2,13
330:14 331:1	belief 49:21 135:5	beneficiaries 26:1	162:12,14 174:9	67:14,21 68:8
335:19 344:2,9	217:7 221:13	35:9	201:2 206:7 207:1	69:20,21 71:15
349:2 350:17	believe 10:5 16:18	benefit 5:16 17:7	225:11 226:11	72:16 73:6 77:15
351:2,5,12,16	18:12 20:1,10	18:14,19 21:9	248:14 252:18	78:5 79:17,19
360:2 363:13	27:10 28:11 47:8	26:7 27:12,15,17	347:3 360:17	80:5 85:4,15 86:5
374:2 383:4	47:20,22 50:14	27:20 29:21 33:17	366:18 382:6	86:12 88:22 89:3
391:17 402:16,19	65:16 69:13 72:13	33:21 34:5,20	better 25:10,14	89:8,8,20 90:4,5
403:2	99:12 105:1,4	35:11 46:8 47:15	29:3 96:17 120:13	90:14,17 91:4,5,6
basic 109:17	108:18 126:7	77:15 94:7 108:20	120:21 129:6	91:11 92:3,13

134:2,9,17,20,20	borrow 142:22	broker 251:5	113:13,18 114:8	283:13 303:19
136:14,14,17	borrowing 369:16	broker-driven	114:11,14 115:1,9	304:10 315:12
137:6,6 165:15	bottom 32:22 38:1	169:11	115:12 118:3	316:17 325:18
200:5 203:22	106:16 108:7	brother-sister	119:19 120:2	327:14 328:4
227:21 233:1	112:6,18 187:17	352:13	122:7 123:17,20	352:7
254:17 255:7,9	187:19 201:5,5	brought 95:13	124:21 125:8	Burrell's 281:21
264:20,22 292:13	209:1 223:21	175:17 180:8	126:11,15 127:13	287:3
333:19 352:4,10	249:10 259:11	345:8,11 370:7	130:11 131:5	business 12:4 22:3
352:14,21 353:3	263:21 293:12	budget 19:6 46:6	132:10 133:5	37:1 43:2 45:3
372:6 374:3 379:1	315:22 333:3,5	77:13 88:13 97:10	134:4,7,14 137:12	47:15 58:7,11
Blues 36:18 46:8	341:4 343:19	97:17 98:2 125:15	139:4,9,12 140:20	62:11 66:9 70:21
86:6 89:21 90:22	393:20	budgetary 88:3	141:5,8 142:10	76:7 79:4,13 92:9
92:9 143:1,5	bound 216:20	budgeted 110:16	143:16 145:17	128:18,20 138:13
151:7,17 226:21	217:2,3,4	build 103:14 106:2	146:14 147:12	138:16 139:2
262:12,16 264:11	bounds 90:17	122:11 132:13,20	150:21 153:17,21	156:18 163:14
board 22:2 24:20	379:1	132:21 228:15	154:2 155:8,18	166:22 168:5
27:4,13,17 28:14	bout 212:11	257:14	166:2 168:22	171:6 176:18,19
33:3 50:11 63:13	box 56:1 290:1	building 132:8	171:3 172:19	176:20,20,21
94:2,3 95:4,8,14	291:2 343:2 344:8	386:18 387:9	175:7 176:5	177:6 178:17
97:5 98:8,13,17	347:17 368:1	built 34:19 47:2	182:13 185:9	189:13 192:20,22
99:10,13,15	brands 73:8	131:21 174:7	186:3,17,20 187:8	200:22 203:2
100:22 101:2	breaches 264:22	176:6 179:12	187:11,15,19	223:6 229:20
102:11,11,22	break 10:20 140:3	240:2 258:12	188:10,14,18,22	230:6 234:12
103:5,9,13 104:9	156:12 176:10	387:7 397:19	189:2,6,22 191:11	250:8,9 264:13
104:12 105:13,14	194:20,21,21	bulk 95:19 139:18	191:15,22 192:11	286:15 299:20
105:16 106:9,18	220:14,17	236:7	193:5,22 194:7,9	300:1,6 312:17
107:12 109:15	breakdowns 291:9	burden 29:2,12	197:4,8,20 199:21	313:8 350:19
113:2 116:8 121:20 122:2	breaks 311:20 brief 55:19 266:19	33:16 41:16 42:3 43:11 49:9 131:20	200:3 202:5,11	383:9 395:20
121:20 122:2 131:12 133:9	295:5	43:11 49:9 131:20 365:15 399:18	205:5 206:3,19	396:18,22 397:2
		burdens 31:20 42:1	207:10,16,19 208:21 209:8	399:8,13 402:17 403:14
136:18 143:3,5 148:6 150:2	briefly 24:10 103:8 231:21 235:4	burdensome	208:21 209:8 211:2,10 212:10	businesses 376:1
148.0 150.2 197:15 198:2	289:11 297:14	397:12	213:18 214:3,15	383:14,17 397:16
200:20 202:13	303:2 378:4	Burling 9:2 275:11	213.18 214.3,15 214:19,21 215:2,7	397:20 398:22
206:3,13,22 207:5	387:13	302:22 353:19	214.19,21 213.2,7 215:10,18 218:22	buy 135:5 243:19
212:12,19,20	bring 103:17	Burrell 2:4 13:20	219:9,12,17 220:9	buying 250:8
264:21,21 273:22	107:11 200:18	14:3,4,13 52:12	221:17,21 222:6	buy-down 245:4
326:10 396:3	202:15,17 280:12	93:10,22 95:7	240:14,21 241:4	byproduct 222:17
398:12 403:18	281:6 399:13	96:22 97:11,18	240:14,21 241.4	byproduct 222.17
board's 108:12	bringing 378:13	98:15,19 99:1,9	243:4 247:21	С
115:4 213:4	broad 26:6 101:22	99:12 100:2 101:9	248:5,10,20 250:5	C 1:22 338:16
Bob 52:19 83:13	222:11 315:20	101:13,17,19	252:14,16 253:3,7	calculate 301:1,14
146:15 147:7	broader 23:12	102:13 103:3	253:20 254:2	calculated 196:9
182:14 254:8	42:22	102:10 105:5	258:5 259:21	300:2,10,16
body 11:20	broadest 102:1	108:18 109:7	260:3 264:19	351:14
bore 254:10	broadly 297:8	110:5,14,21 111:3	265:6,14,19	calculation 83:19
borne 42:1	broken 393:13	111:6,13 113:10	276:20 278:10,20	161:16 162:15

175.11 20 107.1	appning 00.10	201.16 202.10	226.10 245.7	Contury 202.2 5
175:11,20 197:1	capping 88:19	391:16 392:10	336:10 345:7	Century 393:3,5
229:18 230:10	caps 385:22	393:2 394:13,19	350:21 371:14	CEO 14:5,14 94:14
231:5 236:3	capsulize 103:8	397:9 398:18	383:2	100:10 395:10
257:11 301:9	capture 238:12	402:5 404:8	cases 26:9 64:8	certain 118:5,7
calculations 55:1	card 10:7 11:15	Carefirst's 282:22	96:12,12 100:16	127:8 128:2
69:3 83:21 157:22	195:11	293:21 314:2	342:13	129:14 131:5
173:5 184:5 196:3	cards 10:4	391:2 397:14	cash 165:6	147:14 154:10
229:14 230:3	care 4:4 8:3 14:10	Carefirst-Blue	cast 369:13	156:3,4 160:10
Calia 2:11 275:10	14:14 15:1 21:14	396:16	casual 137:3	198:7,12 223:2
302:18,21 308:21	30:12,17 31:8	Carefirst/Blue	catalytic 94:21	234:2 246:19
309:2,14 313:20	32:14,18 37:4	162:5 180:15	96:6 133:13 221:3	325:9,11 343:10
313:21 354:12	52:2,21 53:3 63:9	181:8	catastrophic 58:16	372:3
356:7 357:10,16	71:15 76:13 80:13	careful 156:20	144:2 146:4 147:4	certainly 34:11
call 10:20 13:10	80:14 81:14 94:10	281:11,12 403:20	147:17 151:14	49:9 75:4 106:20
79:21 94:21 95:18	96:9,18 120:14,22	carefully 43:20	152:3,7,11 388:19	117:16 121:22
120:5 195:22	120:22 148:19	81:19 136:9 150:3	categories 37:19	132:5 135:4
234:11 235:6	168:1 172:12	172:20 374:7	57:9 59:3 182:18	155:19 157:19
248:7 367:22	173:20,21 174:20	Carlo 261:16	220:15 291:8	168:3 183:9
379:13 399:11	185:4 191:16	291:11 348:15	caught 19:6 281:5	185:10 215:18
called 13:22 15:17	218:18 224:20	Carlson 2:5 13:21	causation 189:8	219:18 222:19
302:2 392:3	241:12,12,17	75:13,14 222:14	190:4	229:9 246:19
calling 123:6	245:9 251:15	260:13,20 261:7	cause 18:12,15 39:2	247:6,12 264:12
274:12	278:15,17,21	261:11 262:5,8	40:16 41:1 118:6	267:12 268:13
calls 17:12 158:14	279:5,13 280:13	263:3,8,10,13,16	caused 32:6 173:10	273:11 274:2
269:7 270:18,20	292:13 329:7	263:20 264:8	173:12 175:4	292:13 297:4,6
candidly 277:20	332:21 359:3,10	265:20 290:17	185:16 192:2	306:1 313:10
cap 85:7,9 386:3	359:15 360:1	Carlston 14:7	causes 19:19 21:1	324:12 340:9
capabilities 96:14	361:3 362:17	Carmelita 405:8	94:5 118:14	341:20 344:14
232:9	363:1 365:18	Carolina 85:22	127:17 128:1,3	389:9
capital 6:4,5 44:18	366:6,9,15 376:1	182:9	129:12 190:5	certainty 60:21
54:12 60:13 65:3	376:11 380:16	carried 22:1 43:18	393:8	216:4
69:2 78:22 79:12	387:18 390:20	50:1 73:13	cautious 288:7	certificate 21:10
89:3,8,12 90:5,14	392:16 393:13,14	carriers 87:12,13	CBC 90:5	29:21 114:17
91:5 102:18 139:8	394:20 400:20	226:21	CCI 180:22	176:17 177:4
142:9,13 160:3	career 75:2	carry 20:8 51:15	cease 402:2	182:8 305:14,18
164:7 165:5	Carefirst 144:19	62:3 115:17	ceases 320:2	305:19 306:9,11
167:22 221:21	162:11,19,22	carry-forwards	cells 234:17	306:12 307:2
325:15 327:15	163:5,12,14	229:1	center 2:8 8:22	certificates 21:16
329:15 336:14,17	164:10,16 196:2	case 41:17 51:18	10:13 16:13 96:8	183:20
341:15 352:14	219:4 224:14	64:2 74:22 104:12	96:16 163:19	certified 107:4
353:3 363:14	233:19 276:8	108:10 125:16	274:13	159:18
367:14 369:2,10	280:2 290:12	127:14 135:9	centers 76:16 96:13	CFI 97:14 219:12
403:2	294:13 329:6	162:5 164:19	central 18:22 28:21	CFMI 95:9 141:9
capitalized 163:2	381:5,21 383:7,16	171:5,8 248:15	51:16 353:5	144:11 145:13
242:7	384:12 385:8	276:9 304:22	cents 143:21,22	CFO 14:10
capitol 6:15 399:4	386:11,15 388:17	305:16 307:4,6,6	144:1	chaired 64:14
capped 313:1	389:1,12 391:8,13	307:7 316:17	centuries 288:3	133:4
	•	•	•	•

chairing 67:15	characteristics	315:3 329:11	307:5	closest 352:13
232:5	48:21 62:8 65:13	333:10	cited 23:22 26:9	closing 51:1 93:1
chairmanship	203:2 209:15,17	chartered 5:19	87:4 116:20	294:10 398:15
233:4	209:21 210:3	307:22 308:13	citing 71:13	CMS 76:17
challenge 109:8	255:4	charters 395:18	citizen 220:11	CNN 399:12
119:12 121:9,10	characterize 72:16	charts 223:16	citizens 75:7	code 3:15 270:16
124:7,14 355:12	101:6 212:21	chauvinistic 270:9	city 40:4,10 49:9	286:3
355:12	227:3 309:17	cheaper 369:15	386:6 388:10	collaborating
Challet 2:10 275:7	characterizing	check 165:17	397:5 402:7	273:5
Chamber 2:17	303:13	Chellet 295:10	claim 55:21 57:16	colleague 83:8
395:10,22 396:10	charge 216:9	302:22 332:7	190:9 191:12	285:14
Chamber's 396:20	325:10	333:7 336:6	194:3	collect 149:12
chance 237:3	charged 50:11	338:20 339:22	claims 15:12 18:19	collection 58:15
353:13	249:13 303:11	340:9,13,18,20	29:17 47:3 57:11	collective 156:13
Chaney 13:20	398:12	351:21,22 352:18	57:21 58:14 73:13	257:2 275:14
14:10 141:7	charges 231:1	357:20	122:9 138:9	collectively 183:12
142:12 143:18	charging 383:12	Cheryl 2:13 379:13	173:18,22,22	color 100:15
151:2 157:15,19	charitable 16:22	380:13	174:1,3,5 190:6,7	Columbia 1:2,14
160:2,21 161:2,15	22:8,10 23:5	Chet 2:4 13:20 14:4	190:10,12,20	3:10 4:2 5:7 6:22
162:20 163:10	24:13,17,22 25:8	14:13 164:12	191:2,21 193:15	7:21 8:2,22 10:13
164:5 165:1	25:15 26:11,13,17	Chet's 162:10	225:22 329:10	14:21 15:4 24:18
167:14 222:19	99:11 117:18	167:15	330:17 362:4	37:9 53:4 55:5
224:13 225:8	127:8 130:3	chief 67:13 104:13	clarifying 188:16	56:16 76:11,21
226:5 265:19	152:17 218:19	287:1	clarity 307:14	118:21 282:9,11
CHANG 1:23	303:14 304:9,17	children's 77:7	311:14	298:8 327:1
change 4:16 45:11	305:6 308:1,10	choice 71:15 82:20	class 152:14 153:8	365:17 390:22
72:11 91:14 227:1	359:19 360:5,11	120:5 162:5	153:12	391:7 392:21
236:12 237:6,12	360:14 363:15,22	180:16 181:8	clear 18:11 21:7	395:10,21 399:1,9
251:11 260:12	366:8 393:7	206:21 284:2	23:20 27:3 63:12	399:20 400:16
292:20,21 293:16	chart 382:5	292:13	99:10,13 114:16	401:1,20
299:14 300:17	charter 5:12,12	choices 167:4,5	129:2 160:18	combination 39:11
339:18 341:2,7	20:13,19 21:5,18	392:2	181:11 182:19,21	74:6 149:5,17
changed 100:19	22:6,12 23:7	choose 25:15	283:12,13 295:21	combinations
209:16 225:18	25:21 26:8,22	chose 91:3 200:20	304:22 305:2	59:11 148:11
226:22 237:5	28:3,5 29:5 34:15	chosen 199:4	344:6 354:18	149:7 251:2,5
changes 54:15	47:13,21 48:1	Christmas 220:7	356:16 373:3	combine 287:20
61:22 86:18 96:6	50:3 51:9,12,16	chronic 120:8	404:22	combined 38:4,20
124:5 133:3	93:12 109:22	394:16	clearly 30:6 273:1	40:17 41:16 45:15
151:22 156:3	114:16 124:15	churn 251:13	client 52:21 83:9	50:9 164:7 232:15
164:15 170:16	152:15 155:6	Cindy 1:23 4:16	348:2	come 15:11 16:20
234:6 241:22	157:7 200:13	circling 117:17	clients 76:2	33:11,12 42:22
251:10,14,15	213:2 214:6	circumstance	client's 234:8	105:12 123:11,13
339:17 369:4	215:15 284:9	51:10 109:10	climbing 98:6	144:10 147:21
changing 239:4	285:16 303:6	circumstances	close 12:4 70:5	155:9 156:11
Chapter 5:22	304:5,6,8,14,20	105:17 212:17	326:21	167:2 174:16
characteristic	304:21 305:2,8	309:21	closer 223:19	185:14 196:3,17
231:13 290:2	306:4,14,19 307:9	cite 161:20 305:20	224:17	201:15 205:20

208:14 210:10,11	281:21 286:5	172:13 175:5	376:19 377:12,18	community 7:5
222:17 223:18	287:12,14 293:17	176:11 184:17	379:10,12,20	13:3 17:3,12,17
224:9 249:10	309:16,19 359:6	194:15,17 195:6	389:5,16 390:11	27:14 28:16,19
253:9,15 272:8	Commerce 2:17	195:17 203:18	390:13 394:8,11	29:10 34:11 35:19
273:18 321:3	395:11,22	205:13,15 206:12	395:3,7 400:1,4,7	35:22 36:8,12,13
326:21 358:22	commercial 22:19	207:7,14,17 208:4	400:11,13 401:6	36:20 37:5,11,20
362:2 363:7 379:6	36:15 128:18	213:10 218:5,6	401:10 403:10,22	41:6,15 43:2
389:21	165:16 226:20	222:9 234:3 252:6	404:11,17	47:20 48:11 49:5
comes 136:14	Commission 2:7	252:15 253:1,4,16	Commissioners	50:6,7,12 77:14
139:19 143:1,7	commissioned	253:21 263:19	1:17 6:7 64:18	89:19 90:1 93:19
150:6 168:19	296:17	264:14 265:17	66:19 78:1 304:2	94:4,12,18 95:15
169:17 199:7	Commissioner	266:3,11,14,22	402:13 403:3	95:17 96:9,13
212:20 243:15	1:16,18,19 3:3,10	269:8 272:17	Commissioner's	97:22 99:2,19
248:11 276:9,10	4:8 6:10 15:19,19	273:14 274:3,6,10	90:16 162:21	100:1,9 104:10
355:18	24:2,7,11 28:12	275:17 276:20	378:21	106:7 109:3
comfortable 150:9	43:14 46:17 49:18	282:6,7 283:13	commit 393:11	110:15 113:2,17
364:7	50:18 51:19 52:8	284:21 295:3,9,11	commitment 213:4	113:19,19 114:4
coming 3:8 188:4	52:11,16 53:11,15	297:10,12 302:17	385:14	115:7,10,20,21
190:5 224:4 250:1	53:17,19 54:1	302:19 307:12	commitments	116:6 117:18,21
258:17 259:12	55:8 73:12,14,16	308:20 309:3,19	393:5	118:14 121:15
262:9,15 298:2	73:22 74:12 75:6	309:20 311:3	Committed 133:8	122:3,16,16 123:1
330:13 342:17	75:12 87:1 90:22	313:3,6,12,17,21	committee 46:7	125:4,13 127:4,18
375:11,11 377:19	91:3 93:7 95:3	314:17,19 315:2	64:17 67:16 77:13	128:2,16 130:18
386:16 395:16	96:21 97:9,15	315:16,19 316:22	88:14 95:5,8,14	131:4 133:10
405:2	98:7,18,22 99:8	317:1,6,19 319:1	97:5,10 98:14,15	157:11 166:16,17
command 28:5	99:21 101:5,11,15	319:7,12,15,22	98:20,20 99:4,6	168:14 204:13
29:19 47:12,14	101:18 102:8,21	320:3,10,15,21	101:3 116:7	205:7 207:8 212:5
51:16 114:15,19	106:22 107:17,20	321:14 322:20	136:18 151:8	212:6,12,16 213:1
200:13	108:4,15 109:5	323:3,18,21 324:2	212:19,20 232:5	213:5,6,14 218:9
commands 28:3	110:2,12,18 111:1	324:20 325:4,16	232:18 233:5	218:18 220:17,22
51:12	111:5,8 113:6,11	326:18 327:9	common 86:3	243:6 250:6
commence 9:14	113:16 114:1,10	328:17 329:14,20	118:22 174:16	276:18,21 278:22
13:9	114:13,20 115:6	330:1,9,11,20	267:11 287:20	296:16,18 297:2,5
commend 307:8	115:11,16 117:5	331:4,8,21 332:13	308:16 348:1	297:7 311:1 315:4
391:19	119:16 120:1	335:22 338:14	commonality 192:5	325:12 328:15
commending 397:9	122:4 123:2,19	339:14 340:4,12	commonly 59:14	331:17,19 335:1,3
comment 78:17,17	124:17,22 126:6	341:10,17 342:1,6	79:8 146:7	360:18 362:22
83:6 144:6 285:3	126:12 127:2	342:21 343:20	Commonwealth	366:7,19 367:2,4
287:8 290:12	129:22 130:16	344:13 345:15	36:13 44:12 78:20	367:8 370:1 373:1
291:1 292:11,22	132:6 133:2,4,22	346:1,14 347:8,13	88:15 89:18	373:12 375:19
293:5,8 297:14	134:5,8 137:9	349:12,22 355:14	Commonwealth's	376:9,11,17 377:8
334:8 340:22	143:10 145:14,18	355:21 357:1,14	91:18	381:2,17 387:15
341:5 343:8	157:13 159:20	357:19 358:1,9	communication	388:17 391:3,11
374:15 378:17	160:16 161:1,7	367:7 369:13	343:11	392:13,22 393:5,6
387:12	162:16 163:8,21	370:11 371:13,20	communities	394:6,15,19,21
commentary 83:17	164:20 165:20	372:20 373:8,16	359:22 375:7	395:20 396:18
comments 53:6	168:16 170:22	374:7 375:1,10	393:16,16,19	397:2,11
	I		I	I

٦

companies 14:17	193:9 197:12,15	company-specific	280:7 288:21	135:10 140:16
69:22 70:2 75:21	198:1,3,4,5,13,19	74:7	complexities	151:20 221:12
85:4 111:18	199:19 200:21	comparable 16:7	201:14 288:18	376:7 391:1
138:14,15 141:11	202:1,7 204:5	332:9 336:15	complexity 56:4	402:18
224:14 236:20	205:16,21 207:12	comparably 332:3	104:20 251:9,12	concerns 23:15
245:11 246:20	208:13 209:15,19	332:4	269:14 293:4	78:8 272:2 292:8
247:1 249:22	210:21 212:17	compare 41:7	compliance 317:13	338:17 343:1
263:1,4,6 296:1,8	213:3 216:9 219:9	121:15 171:1	complicated 148:9	344:22 380:11,20
296:9 332:6,9,14	230:7,15 231:3,11	174:5 399:6	175:19 310:4	388:13 389:13
332:16,17 333:3	235:18 236:6	compared 169:20	complied 313:4	396:4,10
335:16 336:14,15	246:9 247:18	248:20 332:20	complimentary	conclude 93:8
339:6 341:15	248:2 251:16	comparing 90:10	281:22	211:15 318:20
352:10 353:16	254:15,18 255:5	264:3 352:8	comply 369:22	371:19 374:15
393:10 402:2,16	255:12 257:12,17	comparison 37:18	component 156:6	concluded 61:21
403:12 404:2	258:11 259:19	40:15 61:10,17	252:11 372:17	74:3 90:16 146:18
company 5:16 17:6	260:8 264:19,22	90:3	composed 95:8	concluding 307:22
17:9 18:6 19:14	267:13,18 278:18	compelling 404:21	comprehensive	conclusion 24:7
22:2,3,5,7 23:11	279:9 282:19	compete 172:9	68:12 159:14	46:1 47:8 64:5
23:12,21 27:11	283:7 284:17	competence 83:11	178:7,22 289:14	65:4 74:9 174:8
28:1 29:11,17	294:6 296:7 297:7	competency 104:18	373:3	201:16 204:8
35:10 36:3 45:9	304:12 305:6	competing 277:13	comprise 20:5	211:22 302:11
46:8 49:1,20	308:17 314:16	326:11	computation	339:9
50:14 51:11 73:3	317:16 318:1	competition 248:18	335:13	conclusions 26:10
79:3 84:6 87:7,16	319:16 320:18	250:4 365:1	compute 318:16	73:11 78:19
94:3,12,16,16	323:4,9,10,20	competitive 91:10	322:11	285:15 343:15
97:13,14 100:3,5	324:9,21 325:1	91:17 223:9 365:2	computed 162:5	344:12
100:13,17,19,20	326:20 327:21	401:19	318:14	concrete 18:16
101:21 102:6,14	328:12 329:9,10	competitiveness	computer 232:19	118:20
102:15,18,20	332:6,8 334:8	248:2	computers 233:7	condition 81:11
103:9,13,19 104:4	336:9 337:1 342:7	competitor 30:16	computing 232:9	conditions 79:4,14
104:7 105:7,18	350:22 353:7,8	83:8 169:5 248:21	233:9	84:11 372:11
106:1,2,9,16,19	361:14 362:2	competitors 168:12	concede 247:6	384:1 386:22
108:19,20 112:1	381:1 392:11,20	171:2,3 172:5,6	314:7	394:17
112:19 122:9,13	397:6 398:20	295:22 332:2,18	conceivable 330:21	conduct 6:19 47:14
122:15,21 123:4	399:18 402:8,21	333:13 339:13	concentrated	81:6 135:13 286:3
123:15,20,22	403:7,16 404:5,7	340:11 352:6	364:16 365:7	286:4 287:15
124:14 125:12	company's 23:2,5	369:5	concept 29:15 36:8	402:10
128:7 129:20	26:22 30:21 33:3	complete 44:5	36:22 81:2 115:2	conducted 9:16
131:7 132:1,8	34:19 49:4 62:8	116:4 291:10	115:7 355:1	21:8,9 29:20
133:6 135:1,6	106:11,14 112:18	328:13	concepts 362:8	76:19 81:7 199:17
138:20 141:10	158:17 171:1	completed 53:9	conceptually	214:9,9 215:3,5
145:15 152:10	209:10 233:7	158:19	211:14	285:21 289:20
153:2 154:3	234:15,19 238:6	completely 95:22	concern 21:2	305:13 312:17
156:14 158:14	245:2 257:4 265:7	134:21 164:19	119:10 227:22	333:15 341:14
160:5 163:1,5,17	279:3 293:3 294:4	342:11 355:21	228:6 334:4,5	366:2
165:10 166:1	393:19 398:3	complex 75:8 173:7	349:6 385:21	conducts 26:7
170:17 176:4	402:10 403:18	251:6,8 254:7	concerned 51:17	Conference 285:11
1,011, 1,011	102110 100.10	20110,0 20 117		2 5 1101 01100 200.111
	l	l	I	I

	1	1		
confidence 80:7	164:1 177:12	consisting 272:9	containment 32:19	189:16 264:10
83:1,3 92:14	179:15 181:20	consists 286:16	contains 38:22	298:8 310:16,17
confident 215:14	184:7 185:3,13	400:19	contemplates 284:9	311:17
294:15	199:18 201:6	consolidate 306:21	CONTENTS 2:1	contradiction
confidential 347:21	202:9 268:18	consolidated	context 16:19 18:1	283:17
confidentiality	373:21 374:7	293:21	49:22 73:20	contrast 271:8
347:22	389:9	constantly 109:10	106:11 115:13	contribute 29:12
confirm 267:12	considerable	154:20 170:8	194:5 201:12	33:15 37:5 240:19
340:1 341:21	361:11	243:14	242:18 303:5,6	373:12
confirmed 207:2	considerably	constituted 73:21	313:15 347:22	contributed 139:2
276:12	269:14	constitutes 202:3	contexts 185:20	153:2 219:3
confiscation 283:20	consideration 7:13	210:20 211:8	contingencies 5:2	contributes 38:7
confrontation	12:14 28:18 82:9	constrain 392:4	91:7 204:3 254:22	contributing 38:8
49:15	163:6 222:22	constrained 155:6	325:8	contribution 42:15
confusion 287:4	260:17 273:7	constraints 162:17	contingency 64:19	160:1 177:17
conglomerate	403:21	constructed 289:5	89:14 91:14	196:14 340:6
385:1	considerations	constructing	330:22	361:5
Congress 5:10	90:9 145:6 197:15	388:11	contingent 291:7	contributions
20:19 21:1,2,6	264:2	construction	continue 11:1 33:4	24:22 25:2 39:15
22:1 23:7 50:11	considered 55:4	354:16	50:6 53:22 54:2	40:17 48:8 127:9
110:1 304:14	57:8 75:9 85:19	constructive 167:6	94:17 117:13	127:9 130:4 205:7
305:2,5 308:1	85:22 90:10	consultant 251:4	162:8 176:12	222:4 364:9
congressional 5:12	103:11 145:4	consultants 56:12	234:4,5 288:4	373:17 393:7
20:13 34:15 47:12	179:18 205:16	56:14 57:4 64:7	325:9 359:22	397:10
305:1	210:4 251:9	69:7 83:7 169:9	362:12,22	control 54:12 95:1
Congressionally	259:18 260:8	248:13 255:3	continues 278:22	138:15 161:10
23:20	264:3 405:1	consultation	279:1	168:2 201:9 237:7
connecting 96:15	considering 29:7	392:15	continuing 20:22	248:22 363:13
connection 28:6	61:22 111:2 224:3	consulted 68:2	93:21 119:10	367:14
52:5 96:8 121:2	255:4,12 256:12	consulting 52:19	389:17 397:11	controlled 164:19
250:6	267:9 292:12	65:18 67:10 68:8	continuity 154:8	controlling 248:4,6
consciously 133:7	399:15	75:18 169:10	continuous 250:7	315:7
consequence 156:7	considers 57:18	268:7 285:7,11	continuously 18:15	controversial 84:16
250:20 251:21	consist 271:2,7	286:22	contorted 29:4	convened 1:15
consequences	consistent 17:19	consumer 39:14	contours 43:6	convenes 3:21
51:18 66:7 84:17	18:3 50:3 71:11	362:13 375:22	contract 120:16	convenience
156:2	82:17 84:1 97:7	384:4,6 386:6	140:9,10 183:18	231:19
conservatism 240:5	99:22 122:5 123:8	consumers 2:12	184:1 185:5	conventions 339:12
conservative	153:15 196:14	358:3,19 359:4,14	189:19,20 193:8,8	conversation
324:16 336:8,12	212:7 213:2	362:1,16 373:4	241:15 264:11	275:21 316:3
336:19	302:13 303:22	375:13 376:7	306:16,21 312:11	378:15 401:13
conservatively	328:19 337:15	380:19,20 382:3	313:14 351:2,18	conversations
138:4 148:17	351:16 356:9	383:3,7,16 387:17	351:19	334:7 401:3
consider 7:16	370:3 381:11	404:2	contracting 121:2	conversion 382:11
29:16 71:14 82:18	consistently 50:7	consumer's 375:22	375:6	382:12,17 383:1
99:17 105:16	106:17 201:4	consuming 31:13	contracts 5:13	converted 359:20
144:18 153:7	243:17 252:3	contained 70:14	21:12,17 139:22	converts 293:3
			,_,_,	
	1	1	1	I

aanway 114.0 11	59:4 119:4 121:19	269:5 273:9	arostivity 201.2	71:7 72:2 176:5
convey 114:9,11 125:9			creativity 394:2	
	146:19 152:1	277:16 366:13	credentials 68:20	curious 264:15
conveyed 287:22	154:3 174:1	court 11:16 307:6	credit 164:22 165:3	current 18:20 26:2
convinced 150:1,2	241:12,16 366:9	courtrooms 66:14	258:10 283:16	44:13 88:3 113:10
convincing 121:8	366:21,22 376:15	cover 29:17 42:4	creditable 45:21	113:12,13,15
convolutions	387:18	58:8 60:15 61:4	105:3	114:6 152:20
232:14	costs 29:17 31:9,10	111:15 115:19	credits 160:13	153:4 155:17,20
cooperate 268:12	31:11,19 33:7	250:14,15,18	crisis 28:11 30:1	156:1 159:3 187:6
269:1 306:20	86:9 95:2 96:19	366:5	32:13 88:4 117:6	210:6 212:16
coordinate 52:6	109:20 111:16	coverage 5:15	criteria 60:3,4	213:3 218:14
120:21 310:2	116:17 117:13	21:20 30:2,9,12	215:22 216:8,10 216:22 217:16	233:16,17 264:6
coordinated 120:14	118:11,15 119:1	30:13,15,18 31:2		271:4 272:10
copies 53:12,13 56:21	148:19 226:9	31:7,16 48:9	320:2	284:11 299:6
	241:12 243:13 365:12	66:10 73:3 76:12 77:2 86:15 02:12	criterion 216:11 217:8	305:17 306:6
copy 214:13 215:15		77:2 86:15 93:13		314:22 315:10,14
215:16 304:6 core 28:2 121:10	council 40:4,10	94:9,20 102:1	critical 51:21	386:12 387:14 392:4
	49:9 75:6 282:17 326:22 327:21	117:10 129:17	205:10 277:3 295:18 362:11	
corporate 4:21 212:4 220:10	329:8 354:18	154:16,17 187:13 190:2 200:17	criticism 99:22	currently 44:20 52:8 69:1 77:5
212.4 220.10	386:6 396:6	245:9 328:2	criticisms 44:22	85:3,11 90:12
corporation 3:17	counsel 1:22 4:10	359:10 361:2	45:15 70:6 234:2	229:3 232:12
4:20 5:19 29:20	75:19	362:1 366:22	criticize 348:18	286:16 302:15
65:8 66:6 184:14	count 111:3 181:9	382:18 383:4,21	criticizes 71:18	curve 121:19
204:2 212:5 269:9	191:6	384:8 385:15	Cross 20:17 36:9	cushion 371:11
270:20 271:4,7	counter 240:6	386:1,2,4,8,22	44:18 53:2 64:22	customers 79:3
270:20 271:4,7 272:6 305:13	counteracting	387:1 388:22	65:19 67:2,14	92:4,8 149:11
306:8 360:4	242:12	389:2 392:2,16	69:21 89:8,8 90:5	391:10 404:6
corporations 64:21	counters 239:21	394:14,20	90:14 91:4,5,6	cut 117:2 242:16
359:15,21	country 16:4 41:13	covered 32:2	134:20 136:14	244:5
corporation's 5:5	136:11 172:22	113:21 271:12	137:6 200:6 204:1	cutting 116:18
208:6 271:12	245:6 375:12	388:19	233:1 255:7,9	118:8
correct 44:10 45:1	counts 38:11	covering 22:21	264:20,22 352:4	cycle 61:14 62:18
101:18 110:20	couple 124:18	Covington 9:1	352:10 353:4	71:1,1 82:12
230:2 243:3 262:6	134:1 138:21	203:16 275:10	Cross/Blue 5:9 6:8	86:19 98:2 117:8
271:18 303:19	145:22 168:9	302:21 353:19	60:8 61:10 65:22	151:14,15,22
304:19 307:21	213:14 221:8	co-author 347:19	68:8 72:16 77:15	152:7 167:17
corrections 335:11	250:15 252:6	CPA 340:19	78:6 79:17,20	226:13,19 227:2
335:17	287:13 298:1	cracks 393:12	80:5 85:4,16 86:6	227:10,16,18
corrective 136:5	334:15 341:11	crafted 20:9	86:13 134:2,9,17	228:11,17,20,22
correctly 98:3	350:2,8 351:20	crash 148:15	136:17 227:21	229:3 239:12,16
125:6 134:19	384:7	create 45:20 375:2	254:17 333:19	239:17 240:12,19
281:16 289:3	course 63:4,5 65:2	398:11	352:14,21 372:6	241:3,10 242:21
correlation 191:20	90:7 152:21 157:3	created 5:10	396:16	256:4 258:20
Corwin 285:1	178:16 196:4	304:15 387:8	CU 359:12,18	259:3,7,9
Cory 2:9 275:8	197:18 200:8	388:15	360:20 367:15	cycles 60:16 61:5,9
cost 30:13 32:5,19	232:8 238:17	creates 19:16 156:3	culmination 16:11	61:18,21 62:15
39:6 42:4 48:6	258:6 268:20	creating 348:14	cumulative 59:17	71:3,6 227:5,12
		-		
	1			

			1	
235:2 256:3	104:8 111:19	deductions 185:19	394:1	225:3 231:22
257:20 258:2,17	166:9 359:18	deem 19:19 116:11	delivered 8:3 75:18	234:10 235:4,8
259:4	364:4	342:12	76:9	239:9 256:1
	decades 162:13	deemed 7:1 89:12	delivering 328:8	263:18 298:18
	December 6:14	287:8 289:22	demand 19:20	described 56:7,20
daily 30:5	8:10 81:13 305:21	291:2 322:5	136:3	61:16 114:5 117:7
damage 165:9	307:5	342:13	demanded 125:11	206:10 220:21
danger 371:3	decide 126:14	deep 43:3 286:16	demands 43:6	239:14 252:22
dangerous 19:17	248:15 337:21	deeply 51:17	116:21	256:9 290:8 326:9
data 121:6 154:18	decided 148:1	267:10	demographic 33:6	327:14
178:3 179:7	159:13 378:22	default 58:12	demonstrate 71:10	describing 153:21
181:22 182:13	decides 113:3	defend 74:17	demonstrated 71:4	158:11 239:15
183:15 185:6,8,9	deciding 345:6	392:12	demonstration	description 55:20
185:22 186:3,5,5	decision 51:21 52:3	defendable 289:6	162:14	57:2 68:16 113:7
187:6 188:5,16	52:7 66:20 98:16	defense 19:13	denied 386:2	348:13,17
190:7 298:2,22	99:7 100:16	76:17 277:4	deny 311:4	design 124:8
299:4,10,13 300:2	121:21 203:17	defer 197:11	denying 87:3	177:13 238:7
335:8	205:12 207:8	381:17	department 1:4,15	244:5 250:22
date 183:15 293:11	212:13 224:22	deferred 159:8,9	3:11,21 4:7,8,9,11	designation 25:8
Dave 400:15	272:3 378:22	229:1 339:18	4:11,13,18 5:3,20	designations 67:6
David 2:19 390:3	396:1 398:6	define 6:2 78:21	6:19 8:9 9:8,18	designed 83:20
day 22:4 233:8	404:10	107:13 203:21	11:10 24:12,19	121:4
279:8 284:2	decisions 27:5	311:10	56:16 76:17,22	designs 32:3,6
375:17	98:10,12 167:2	defined 6:16 79:1	77:19 81:15 89:2	251:13 254:3
days 268:10	212:22 282:5	89:2 131:19	91:12 164:1	desire 19:18 156:22
DC 2:8	403:21	182:11 197:13	185:12 215:15	294:19
DCHMO 401:22	declare 66:16	340:6 381:7	233:2 351:1 395:8	DESMOND 13:21
403:16	305:5	defining 310:20	departments 68:3	despite 38:15
DCR 5:22 7:22 8:3	declared 22:7	definitely 147:10	362:14	detail 56:3,20
dead 151:16	305:4	226:22 273:7	Department's 8:6	74:18 85:13
deal 28:10 66:21	declares 304:9	344:4	9:21 11:6 46:10	219:17 256:1
119:15 172:3,5	declaring 304:17	definition 183:8	dependent 225:13	263:18 264:4
213:9 338:10	decline 32:9 87:14	197:12 212:4	dependents 31:21	detailed 56:9,13
377:7 386:18	187:21 324:14	218:11,21 372:22	depending 195:21	63:17 323:7
dealing 121:18	declined 86:20	386:2	229:9 251:3	details 57:1 394:5
211:6 depts 172:6 250:6	declining 30:9	definitions 200:1	342:14	detect 170:6
deals 173:6 350:6	decrease 58:7	degree 35:5 37:4	depends 140:20	determination 3:22
dealt 74:12 119:17	decreased 331:18	56:3 92:14 100:18	199:3	6:13 7:10 12:16
dear 99:17 debate 378:15	decreases 257:17	119:4 148:22	depressing 156:5	12:19 77:18
385:17	dedicate 310:22	degrees 244:16	Deputy 380:14	153:10 155:11
debating 361:1	dedicated 95:10	delayed 240:13	derivative 137:20	169:6 204:15
debits 160:13	100:11 104:9	deliberate 129:14	derived 23:15	270:5,19 271:15
Deborah 2:10	dedication 13:2	133:15	26:10	310:8 313:7 314:4
275:7	deductible 31:18	deliberately 40:4	derives 137:13	324:5 345:7 355:3
debt 165:16	32:6 48:7 117:1	133:6	Des 14:11	374:16 375:3
decade 16:12 33:2	119:9 244:4,11,15	delighted 395:1	describe 60:3 98:11	395:13 402:11
uccauc 10.12 33.2	deductibles 119:9	deliver 10:7 11:7	183:16 222:15	403:19
	l		l	l

determine 5:5 6:20	developing 120:3	257:3 262:1,6	Director 14:8	305:12 311:13
12:21 15:22 24:21	215:22	285:5 298:1 299:4	274:12 275:6	312:14 334:6
55:10 103:1	development 8:12	315:7 319:3 330:4	380:14 390:19	353:20 354:1
104:14 130:9	58:19 59:1 82:4	334:2,10,11	400:16	359:8 385:4
172:16 174:9	323:17	339:13 355:22	directors 24:20	discussions 183:12
317:3,22 319:9	develops 165:6	383:1,11 392:19	102:12 136:18	disease 120:8 121:1
321:1 338:6	deviate 265:21	395:17 403:16	396:4 403:18	386:8
360:21 373:9	359:5 370:5	differently 179:10	directs 335:2	disenfranchising
391:18	deviation 257:1	235:13	disadvantaged	116:18
determined 4:22	deviations 225:12	difficult 108:22	66:13	disinterested 41:4
6:13 50:12 84:22	devote 308:11	121:17 122:20	disadvantages	dismiss 265:18
97:10 102:11	394:13	137:1 147:19	165:22	disposable 31:14
126:7 176:4 217:3	devoting 25:16	152:5 183:3 189:9	disagree 74:1 280:8	disposition 88:16
270:3 294:3 309:9	diabetes 120:9	189:10 269:13,19	304:13 352:16	disrespect 280:3
320:13 321:10	dictates 20:8	280:6 325:14	363:8 365:8	326:13
323:4,6 331:13	dictionary 173:9	327:19 399:16	disagreed 73:17	disrupt 87:19
351:14 389:3	died 153:1	difficulties 142:22	disaster 58:18	90:19 379:3
398:9	diet 120:10	difficulty 65:20	DISB 1:17,21,22,22	disrupted 91:9
determines 43:15	differ 57:12 82:15	136:12 151:5	6:10 12:8 13:5	disruption 87:6
130:6 208:4	82:19	182:16 195:19	45:13 56:17 79:16	92:5
355:14	differed 315:8	278:14 327:16	158:13,19 294:14	disservice 75:5
determining 83:22	difference 36:19	328:9	disclose 368:8	distinct 41:19
88:20 168:17	39:22 54:10 55:17	diligently 70:4	disclosed 171:15	distinction 130:15
184:13 301:19	127:11 128:11	dinner 390:17	292:18	147:13 173:2
315:20 317:21	130:10 138:8	dip 167:8	discount 153:22	194:13 272:21
321:9,21 336:2	159:10 174:7	dipped 144:20	discounted 117:11	387:13,16,20
350:16 351:6	193:2 203:4 241:9	dipping 384:21	discourage 87:12	distinguish 114:2
373:15	242:5 286:6	dire 66:7	148:21	distinguished
detriment 367:5	328:18 333:10,11	direct 21:22 26:1	discouraging 43:1	390:14
develop 60:2	335:19 337:9	27:16 93:16	discover 320:6	distinguishing
120:22 146:16	338:11,13 348:19	111:14 126:13	discretion 283:14	264:5
154:22 199:5	differences 177:20	180:13 221:5	discretionary	distorted 272:4
237:2 270:21	179:5 280:19	253:22	114:18 239:11	290:5
283:8 284:3	different 44:14	directed 70:7	discuss 80:12 84:18	distress 43:4
314:13 315:13	46:2 51:4 59:11	directing 127:7	85:2,12 161:12	distributed 66:18
316:7 318:22	68:3 126:3 139:14	direction 121:9	270:1 289:11	distribution 19:21
321:19 322:14	159:18 161:17,19	125:14 145:10	291:6,16	59:6 192:18 256:5
324:15 325:7	161:22 170:13	directly 23:8 29:3	discussed 64:6	256:7 271:9,21
367:8	177:15,16 178:5,5	33:12 36:3 61:12	82:10 83:13 92:5	272:22 365:9
developed 45:22	187:1 192:18	68:14 70:18,22	255:16 257:6	distributions 59:12
59:5 61:14 62:4	196:8,22,22 197:1	164:14 197:16	289:21 290:14	147:11 235:2
62:13 65:12,15	198:9 199:22	233:18 255:6	307:10 325:18	254:21
68:22 82:6 84:2	200:11 203:7,12	257:10,16,18	345:13 364:20	district 1:2,14 3:10
95:17,18 99:10,13	209:22 219:3	283:22 298:3	365:21 369:12	4:2 5:7 6:21 7:1
103:6 132:7 150:3	225:9 234:17	303:20 308:12	discussion 57:4	7:12,21 8:1,21
180:1 233:6,17	235:5,10 237:21	341:3 366:8 401:2	185:15 269:3	10:13 12:18 14:15
316:13,21	251:5 254:13	401:12	287:6 303:5	14:20 15:3,17,21
1	•	-	•	-

	I	I	I	1
19:4,7 20:3,4 24:2	137:22 162:18	81:14 218:16	dramatically	79:14,16 80:13
24:17 32:3 37:9	163:7	277:21	156:11 167:21,22	81:15 142:2
37:15 38:4,7,14	diving 78:20	DOD 76:17	drastically 324:6	190:17 191:6,6
39:9,11 40:3	Dobson 2:5 13:20	Doe 125:16	draw 86:2 141:20	192:8 274:13
41:19 42:3 43:3	14:6 52:13,15,18	doing 18:8 28:3,17	166:17	275:6 279:8 282:1
46:14,21 47:5,11	52:19 53:12,22	34:21 50:4 52:4	drawn 141:20	283:1,12 295:22
47:22 48:11 50:17	54:3 144:17 145:2	94:8 105:18 118:7	165:2,12	296:18 300:3,8,10
50:21 53:4 55:5,9	146:16 147:9	118:17 150:4,22	dream 392:19	300:14,16,18,18
56:16 75:6,7	175:10 177:9	150:22 167:16,16	drew 23:7	301:2,4 302:7,10
76:10,20 77:5	178:2 179:14,18	232:14 255:3	drive 131:2 201:8	303:12,18,21
96:4 118:21	180:5,15,21	261:17 263:2	280:18	305:21 307:21
125:17 129:2,10	181:11 182:10	273:8,12 283:15	driven 48:14 213:1	323:6 329:7
172:18 174:18,19	183:5,21 187:7	313:6 329:13	216:20,22 276:17	332:18 333:15
174:20 175:1	188:5 190:8,11,19	331:17 347:3	293:15	337:17 338:1
182:7 192:21	191:9 197:9	348:15 377:2,7,15	driver 235:15	351:9 354:6 361:6
193:8 198:21	215:20 216:6,14	399:15	drivers 161:21	361:13 363:2
211:21 244:16	216:19 217:4,11	dollar 29:1,3 38:6	162:7 242:20	364:19 366:16
250:12 269:10	217:15 218:1	112:1 127:22,22	355:8	370:1 373:20
270:8,10,14,18,22	226:17 227:17	143:22 242:16,17	drives 162:15	374:20 380:17
271:6 282:9,11	228:2,7,9,13,21	dollars 18:22 94:6	276:16 284:16	385:22 388:9
296:19 298:5,7,9	229:9,21 230:3,5	170:11 221:2,11	356:13 365:1	389:2 391:2
298:10 299:18,19	230:11 231:4	242:2 280:10,11	driving 236:5	396:14,19,22
301:14,16,17,20	232:2 233:15	280:20 392:14,17	drop 60:17 61:6	399:13
302:16 307:18	234:14 235:11	dollar-for-dollar	103:20 340:3	
308:15 309:13	236:8 237:2,9,15	36:17 128:6,21	dropped 30:14	<u> </u>
311:6 323:11,12	237:21 238:9,13	domiciled 53:4	152:22 293:15	e 3:16
327:1 332:12	238:16 239:13	dominant 247:16	dropping 31:16	eager 346:17
365:17 374:17	245:14,21 246:2,5	296:20 364:20	drops 79:15	347:17
382:17 387:19	246:11,14,17	365:3	drove 179:19	earlier 20:4 67:16
390:22 391:7	247:3,11,17 254:9	door 190:15,16	drug 386:4,8,10	186:4 220:19
392:9,21 394:17	254:20 256:6	dose 295:1	388:22	223:13 248:11
395:10,21 397:8	257:8,22 258:4,9	double 31:10 40:22	dual 277:12 283:4	258:18 267:12
399:1,8,14,20	258:22 259:14,18	119:3	due 39:4 45:7 51:6	269:4 303:9
400:16,22 401:20	260:7 265:20	doubled 32:19	92:4 128:12	305:12 309:21
402:15	293:1 349:1	doubt 189:22 227:1	duly 14:1	312:14,20 316:4
District's 16:7 19:6	Dobson's 192:19	331:15 333:8	duties 273:10	317:2 331:3
26:20 47:6 218:17		360:12 369:13	398:13	339:16 348:22
392:1,2	doctor 191:8	doubtful 295:19	duty 21:20 93:14	355:5
District-only 50:13	doctors 66:8	Downside 247:21	101:7,20 114:2,6	early 60:9,17 64:15
diversified 91:19	365:17	downsides 247:14	314:2	67:12 72:17 232:6
139:6	document 184:3	248:2	dynamic 349:3	232:7,22 264:21
divert 26:16	documentation	downstream 156:4	dynamics 224:3	earn 138:2 224:12
diverted 27:6	56:9,13,21 57:3	162:3	D.C 1:13 2:17,20	384:15 385:2
divide 402:19	218:2	drafted 22:14	3:15 8:18 12:10	earning 384:19
divided 300:19	documented	396:13	16:12 25:6 26:9	earnings 33:16
dividend 33:20	226:20	drag 397:11	30:7 55:7,21 70:7	42:19 79:2 86:8
dividends 17:11,12	documents 81:12	dramatic 371:8	76:21,22 77:1,2	138:5,10 168:4
	l	l	l	

	•	•	•	
249:4,10,15,18	364:14	62:10 68:9 70:16	276:3,6 279:17	337:3,4 393:4
293:9 294:5,9	effort 275:14	140:6 186:2 188:9	282:14 284:18	envisioned 329:11
earns 112:20	359:13 360:20	employees 31:20	401:8	envisioning 323:15
earth 149:20	361:13 392:11	66:9 68:12 177:6	engagement 287:10	ENY's 158:17
ease 33:15	efforts 16:16 32:19	177:7,15 186:14	288:5	epidemic 149:4
easier 278:19 369:5	66:3 153:3 221:1	397:18 398:10	engagements 83:9	152:3
easily 84:22	310:3	employer 30:18	engages 288:7	epidemics 58:17
easy 109:9	eight 133:20,21	32:1,16 34:2	engaging 327:11	equal 177:18
echo 167:15 197:21	225:13 292:19	119:6 185:19	375:9	312:20
286:5	368:17	186:1,5,6,6,12,13	enroll 26:4	equally 68:19
economic 43:4 88:4	either 63:7 78:7	188:8 190:1	enrollment 37:8,22	equals 199:19
149:11	86:1 140:2 144:18	243:19 250:15,22	39:1,5 40:5,11	equate 176:1
economically 146:8	144:22 145:10	312:5 383:4	90:7,12 129:15	equates 35:15
economist 296:5	192:18 217:18	employers 30:8,12	162:9,12 170:7,10	276:15
340:17 381:5	219:4 318:8	31:15 32:7,11	173:15 174:18	equation 116:14
economy 34:21	319:20 322:17	48:8 80:7 116:1,1	193:9 226:9 243:2	147:6 150:18
86:8 115:22 223:8	326:9 338:4	116:22,22 121:8	302:3 327:22	241:21 250:2
224:19 278:13	372:11 383:2	135:4 139:22	383:19 384:12	equitable 193:19
383:5	405:9	185:21 187:13	388:1	311:2
edges 262:20	elaborate 333:9	188:1 364:5	entail 126:21	equities 160:6
editorial 76:8	elected 86:17	374:20 382:15	enter 5:13 21:11	equivalent 17:10
educated 287:21	electronic 96:8	397:15 398:6,10	189:19 249:22	208:9 353:2
education 77:8	electronically	empowered 21:11	288:6 306:16	equivalents 386:9
effect 33:20 35:7	96:15	306:16	308:21	error 44:1
36:18 39:9 91:15	element 83:22	Empowerment	entered 298:8	errors 70:12
99:20,20 100:9	204:6 240:5	3:19 15:18 396:12	400:5 404:22	escalate 362:22
125:11,15 126:22	elements 17:14	empowers 5:12	entering 87:13	escalates 131:22
146:9 148:16	213:9	enabled 96:10	enterprise 285:17	escalating 48:3
156:4 176:6 245:1	ellipsis 214:11	enabling 20:18	entire 7:14 12:14	esoteric 19:12
249:7,11 254:5	else's 342:18	96:15	16:10 33:2 97:13	especially 19:22
340:14 354:21	email 12:10	enacted 85:7	104:8 308:11	43:8 73:4 122:14
402:22	embraced 313:12	encounter 83:7	402:17,21	277:17 333:12,20
effective 146:19	emerged 299:8	encountered 65:20	entirely 248:15	393:14
241:16	301:10	encourage 95:1	271:3,8 272:9	espoused 303:12
effectively 62:14	emerges 150:11	120:7	303:22 395:17	essence 30:3 103:7
331:8 403:13	154:19 193:15	ended 293:12	entities 64:22 65:17	129:18 193:6
404:7	emerging 30:1	endorse 281:13,15	222:5 333:20	220:18 345:10
effects 169:2	32:13	281:16	375:6	361:20
efficiency 17:20	emphasis 116:4	endorses 281:19	entitled 8:11	essential 15:9
122:6 123:9	emphasize 62:19	ends 116:1	entitles 17:10	20:11 34:10,14
196:16 212:8	emphasizing 46:16	endure 84:6	entity 65:14 181:2	124:13 166:5
328:20 329:15	empirical 296:12	enforce 85:3,11	186:10 396:14,15	402:8
356:10 370:4	employ 59:13	enforcement 26:20	entity's 343:15	essentially 46:1
efficient 242:14	399:19	engage 17:17 24:13	environment 62:2	47:5 49:19 95:21
243:14 370:13,15	employed 69:11	24:16 93:19 212:6	68:7 149:11 166:20	101:22 123:21
370:20 371:3	192:5	370:1	166:20	141:18 232:9
efficiently 74:5	employee 20:21	engaged 52:9 88:12	envision 209:20	326:18 356:20
			l	I

				0.5.4.12
establish 79:11	evidencing 21:17	279:11 283:7,9	existing 180:7	256:13
104:11 151:8	evoke 210:14	287:8,8 297:18	270:11 363:20	expert 78:2 108:8
165:3 252:18	evolved 232:1,16	310:2,13,22 311:3	365:11 366:10,22	109:16 206:7
402:16 403:12	233:16	363:18 365:9	374:10	248:16 280:6
established 16:10	evolving 232:20	381:3 391:1,20	exists 17:5 47:13	286:4 368:5,14
20:18 21:5 46:11	exact 245:16	398:9 403:6	114:21 125:9	369:18 392:15
104:6 105:3 133:9	exactly 22:5 143:18	excessive 4:5 6:22	271:18 303:17	expertise 148:3
164:6 234:16	176:2,3 180:17	7:2,12 12:18	308:18	348:8
320:5 360:2	181:12 182:10	15:22 18:21 19:20	expand 153:8	experts 4:12 9:18
establishes 5:11	186:6 212:11	46:19 55:11 268:1	327:22 385:19	96:16 148:2 276:3
37:2 403:4	216:21 225:5	270:3,20 271:16	expect 82:20	276:6 279:18
establishing 78:9	240:8 255:19	271:20 310:9	109:18,20 210:1,7	280:1,15 286:19
230:7 304:11	373:5	360:16 361:7	224:9,10,12 226:1	289:5 335:7
403:14	examination	362:21 368:22	227:16,18 261:13	explain 9:12 78:15
estimate 225:11	158:20 268:6	391:19 402:12	268:9 269:17	102:10 127:11
226:11	examine 88:14	exchange 276:19	expectation 228:13	130:22 134:6
estimates 57:17,19	examined 14:1	278:10	294:5	157:16 161:8
72:8 225:17	Examiner 4:9 12:9	exchanges 169:14	expectations	164:21 175:2
365:16	examining 262:10	exclude 70:16	287:21	193:2 226:15
ethical 285:22	example 59:21 96:7	192:20	expected 5:1	254:14 257:5
evaluate 59:8 61:13	96:20 112:10,14	excluded 45:2	148:20 204:2	285:15 315:20
78:12 320:5 363:3	142:20 182:2	exclusion 362:13	256:22 403:13	333:4
368:7	220:5 236:12	Excuse 53:11	expend 18:13 50:18	explained 121:7
evaluated 65:14	243:22 244:1	executed 89:18	expenditures	248:11 339:16
evaluating 77:10	256:17 257:11	executive 98:12	218:10,12 219:15	explanation 150:16
78:3 313:3,16	264:6,16 321:12	274:12 400:16	242:11 271:3	291:8
356:15	349:1 359:17	405:8	272:9	explicit 252:11
evaluation 8:17	361:14 372:6	executives 81:14	expends 38:13	explicitly 36:8
57:7 145:12 310:2	374:1	exemplary 397:1	expense 58:5 117:2	40:10 313:11
354:22	examples 44:2	397:10	138:9 241:20	exposed 348:7
evaluations 70:1	70:12 119:22	exempt 22:10	expenses 22:21	exposure 152:9
evening 405:14	291:4 327:10	152:16 153:8,15	57:11	exposures 5:1
event 72:12 144:3	exceed 41:2 216:3	155:14 304:12,15	expensive 399:5	expressed 38:12
151:14 152:11	exceeded 49:2 50:8	exemption 23:2	experience 71:1,12	273:5 355:2 396:5
270:18 271:15	exception 67:11	312:19 313:16	76:14 77:10 78:10	expressing 361:12
310:21 372:19	248:16	exercise 173:7	81:7 83:6,10,15	396:10
events 58:16 73:4	excess 5:6 9:4	362:14	84:7 91:20 92:16	expression 17:15
74:2 105:9 147:4	12:22 13:2 25:17	exercises 82:12	93:5 150:11	extend 314:7,22
152:3,7	50:15 51:3,7,13	exhibit 8:16 299:20	156:14 174:6	361:2
eventually 168:11	81:2 84:21 87:10	301:21 302:4	175:19 193:15	extended 92:15
everybody 171:7	107:6,7,13,14	338:15	225:6 255:2,8,14	extending 306:8
254:10	124:2 125:10	exhibits 9:1 302:2	257:2 271:19	extends 314:2,11
ever-larger 31:13	126:1,8,17 148:21	exist 114:17 142:19	376:22	extensive 76:14
evidence 292:6	153:11 155:11,13	306:5 315:22	experienced 37:8	77:10 81:17 99:5
369:9	155:22 157:1,1	320:2	61:2 227:13	248:12 290:22
evidence-based	263:7 271:18,21	existed 181:2 299:7	348:12	extensively 213:19
394:18	272:4 278:19	302:1	experiences 100:13	extent 17:18 18:8

	1		1	
29:6 127:16	185:4,12 245:3	favorable 40:7 59:7	264:10,11 299:19	104:13 122:5
128:10 164:9	256:18	feasibility 326:5,7	299:22 300:4	123:9 142:21
180:11 196:14	factored 180:3	326:16	fewer 397:17	148:15 157:14,18
213:7 240:3	factors 69:1 89:14	feasible 17:19 18:9	fiduciary 108:12	158:6,8,8,9 159:4
273:20 279:3	90:8 91:14 147:10	122:5,8 123:6,8	207:4	160:20 164:15
309:9 349:14	161:19 181:19	123:15 276:17	field 105:2,4	196:12,15,20,21
354:14 356:9	184:7 185:13,14	277:10,17,19	109:14 361:18	199:19 200:1
362:15 370:2	196:11 235:17	316:5,6,18 317:14	379:6	202:4,22 204:14
373:13 376:9	254:15 258:12	317:18 318:12,15	fiercer 365:1	210:20 211:8
394:16	264:1 375:4 377:4	318:18,21 319:21	fifth 286:11	212:8,17 213:3
external 45:12	facts 20:11 33:10	320:20 321:11,22	figure 201:22 203:5	227:14 234:15,19
externally 104:22	35:20 47:9 51:4	322:7,12,16 327:2	216:17 219:7	257:15 259:5
extol 399:16	51:10 208:16	328:19,19 334:17	338:7 356:5	265:3 276:15
extra 15:7	209:4,18 210:6	336:4,20 337:15	figured 393:11	277:9,14 289:17
extremely 32:20	fail 317:8	354:14 356:9	figuring 310:10	293:22,22 294:12
33:8 111:21	failed 71:14 100:14	370:2 373:14	file 298:4	316:15 323:10
112:19 122:19	fails 18:6 24:6 25:6	381:11	filed 19:1 83:17	326:5 328:20
138:4 143:2,8	failure 65:10	feature 40:12	265:8 275:12	329:15 337:15
169:8 325:6 361:5	fair 44:10,22 188:9	features 267:13	350:13	340:8,14 341:6
extremes 261:20	212:21 311:1	February 89:1	filing 158:22	356:9 361:19
eye 19:6	fairly 99:4 175:19	federal 20:21 43:6	299:14 383:10	362:3,7,11 370:3
E-mail 405:6,9	302:13 326:19	62:9 67:6 68:9,12	filings 45:14	375:18 381:8
	327:14	70:16 76:15 140:5	103:17 158:2,8	394:4 397:3,5
F	fairness 363:5	159:6 168:7 177:5	161:18 223:17	403:5
f 3:16 184:13	faithful 25:7	189:3 264:13	293:21 341:2	financially 29:13
face 19:10 296:10	fall 196:20 202:8	284:9 329:11	382:7,20	67:1 73:3 122:8
356:16 386:3	206:5 318:3 371:2	365:15	fill 11:15 34:8	196:21 201:7
faces 57:7 104:9	386:5	federally 117:15	195:11 388:21	202:9 206:2
105:7	falls 313:8 318:2,5	fee 120:19	filling 393:12	227:13 338:9
facilitate 347:15	319:16 370:9	feedback 337:7	filters 248:12	381:12 402:9
facility 165:16	false 367:6	feel 98:8 99:9	final 7:10 11:8	404:8
facing 151:21	families 2:13	314:10	12:13,16,19 199:3	financials 342:18
fact 20:16 38:15	365:20 366:3	feels 131:12 236:2	269:22 374:15	find 17:15 20:7
39:4 45:10 66:11	379:13 380:15	fees 43:10	376:21	27:13 41:21 43:22
68:21 71:19 75:5	family 31:12 39:21	fell 317:7	finally 76:19 81:11	48:8 126:1 143:11
91:19 104:4 110:1	44:11 118:20,22	Fellow 9:6 285:11	143:14 282:17	143:19 169:6
111:21 158:4	162:11	285:16	287:21 387:12	172:22 177:22
192:5,11 193:18	FAP 177:5 291:17	felt 261:12 262:14	Finance 46:6 77:13	187:11 234:7
232:17 235:19	far 16:3 23:12	378:6	88:13	247:12 283:7
255:7 256:9	30:11 44:12 49:6	FEP 45:2 140:5,8	financial 17:19	292:1 324:5 381:3
278:19 283:9	49:10,11 219:16	163:18 176:20	18:3 21:3 29:11	finding 7:2 122:11
294:10 305:15	275:7 377:10	177:6 183:22	29:14 43:4 45:14	125:10 163:22
311:15,16 313:13	387:2	188:21 189:3	56:4 59:8,15 62:6	205:3 219:14
320:6 326:17	fashion 294:22	192:20,21 193:7	62:7 63:17 65:10	272:4 297:17
349:1 369:11	fast 244:9	194:5 229:16	65:20 67:13 69:14	320:7
397:8	faster 48:4 149:16	234:18 235:7,8,12	72:21 80:9 81:9	findings 78:16
factor 144:22 185:4	favor 154:15	235:21 236:4,7	81:11 97:12,12	80:11,13,17 82:2
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	

158:21 161:6	404:10	87:14 156:16	161:17 164:7	four-year 71:17,21
287:11 289:11	First's 80:13	286:1	235:18 236:13	227:14 259:5,8,10
290:10	first-hand 66:22	following 12:12	324:15	fraction 33:2 241:7
finds 24:12,19	fiscal 25:20 97:17	32:4 44:7 63:7,7	formulas 56:10	frame 246:3
323:9	Fish-Parcham 2:13	222:13 277:18	69:1 243:18	frames 225:17
fine 52:15,17	379:13,18 380:5,7	290:8 300:22	formulated 314:5	framework 16:7,10
191:14 309:2	380:13 389:6,15	371:21 398:13	forth 7:6 21:6	99:10,14 121:21
finished 112:9	fit 20:12 27:7 47:9	follows 14:2 51:2	80:20 82:4 89:20	147:22 173:4
211:21	329:16	57:9 82:3 271:1	90:21 294:12	Francisco 358:19
firm 14:12 69:4,10	fitness 120:10	299:11	342:19 356:18	frankly 106:15
69:12,18 75:18	five 31:12 39:3	follow-up 56:22	369:8	frequent 147:14,16
83:12 107:5 232:3	58:11 64:3 72:6	138:22 257:20	fortunes 109:13	frequently 149:7
233:12 263:1	133:19 161:17,21	foothold 169:7	forum 263:17	189:15 210:13
268:7,8 269:18	187:6 223:4	footing 362:3	forward 40:13	Friday 405:17
286:12 342:4,4	225:10 257:1	footnotes 158:10	59:20 93:3 175:17	front 10:8 282:3,4
343:14	258:11 263:4,20	force 42:4 86:2	180:8 227:19	282:16 396:21
firms 286:21 287:1	292:17 369:20	119:14 130:19	239:1 241:8 272:8	401:7
353:2	five-year 299:12	172:8 248:4,6	374:6 405:7	FSA 75:14
first 4:4 8:4 10:9	fixed 160:7	250:7 284:4	for-profit 17:6	fulfill 25:15 26:12
13:10 14:1,10,14	flat 45:5 118:18	354:21	100:8 111:17	118:1 308:8
15:1 24:20 30:12	fledged 30:1	forced 174:10,13	138:15 166:1,9	360:10
30:17 32:12,18	flexibility 250:21	317:9	171:4 308:17	fulfilling 391:8
37:4 52:21 53:3	flexible 171:21	forces 33:6 242:13	333:12 366:13	fulfillment 131:13
57:9 60:5 63:9	flip 192:1	forecasting 62:6	369:5,9 398:20	360:14
64:13 65:4 67:8	flipped 258:15	forefront 117:14	for-profits 151:7	fulfills 47:14
70:15 71:15 80:15	flow 160:11	foregoing 195:2	365:1	full 11:18 30:1
81:6,14 82:3 86:5	flows 303:20 341:3	foremost 309:15	fostering 94:22	128:10 214:7
103:18 105:11	flu 112:13 149:4	foreseeable 33:5	found 30:22 51:4	263:22 349:10
113:4 138:22	152:2	49:7 241:21	61:17 72:10 90:18	354:20 386:8
	fluctuation 57:10		91:11 92:2 126:18	
141:3 151:17		form 84:8 128:12		fullest 362:15
172:20 181:21	fluctuations 58:1	129:12 155:22	174:2 211:3 263:6	fully 64:1,3 67:5
192:3 197:22	focus 29:18 87:21	249:12 349:10	283:10 291:19	68:18 156:8
203:17 204:6,20	88:2 99:18 133:10	365:20	366:2 367:21	171:12,15,16
209:11,12 213:17	168:5 361:18	forma 62:5 234:15	393:18	405:1
216:1 219:22	362:10,21	235:9 291:12,15	Foundation 332:11	function 95:5
235:21 245:7	focused 133:14	292:3 293:3	333:18,21	152:16,17 153:8
266:14 267:5	394:4	348:16	Founded 69:3	153:15 155:15
285:2 290:12	focuses 88:18	formal 103:6	four 46:8 49:17	364:13
292:1,12 299:5	focusing 153:3	formally 103:1	58:5 64:8 71:18	functional 208:9
309:15 310:7,20	336:3	105:19	71:19 77:15 85:20	fund 125:16,17
316:7 317:2,8,15	folks 275:15 284:18	formas 291:18	89:20 92:12	144:12 372:8
317:21 318:8,16	355:2	formed 69:19	118:22 176:18	fundamental
322:11 337:11,20	follow 19:13	former 6:9 382:14	223:4,5 259:7,12	119:11 197:22
337:21 358:10	156:21 183:6	382:15	279:21 280:17	198:22 385:12
359:7 367:20	206:7 207:3	forms 129:11	290:4 294:15	funded 19:5 374:21
371:22 380:22	229:21 236:19	139:14 369:16	335:10 345:12	funding 95:11,12
382:4,11 391:21	followed 55:20	formula 64:5	352:10 363:12	97:6,6 143:8

369:16 388:18	gaps 388:21,22	84:21 92:21 173:1	164:2,3,11,16,19	289:17 290:7
funds 19:18 20:2	389:3	geography 173:7	173:14 174:4,18	291:19 292:2
22:9 27:16,19	garner 294:13	getting 108:8	180:17 181:13,14	298:12 300:11
51:8 62:12 70:18	garnered 289:18	142:15 234:5	199:8 202:8,9	308:16 336:3
79:2 108:20 109:1	gather 5:3 186:5	237:3 240:1	214:8 219:5 222:1	341:2 352:9,13
109:21 110:4	gathering 4:18	249:14 269:18	222:8 227:22	363:8 365:8
143:6 325:11	273:19	278:14 328:10	236:6 256:3	366:10 367:12
363:18 391:1,20	geared 129:15,16	362:16,18 387:22	262:14,18 264:6,9	368:17 371:17
further 7:2 19:13	398:18	GHMSI 1:8,14 2:3	264:10 267:14	372:5 374:8,21
41:11,22 42:18	gee 238:19	4:4 5:8,13,18 6:20	268:1 292:16	396:2 398:12
43:10,12 44:4	Geisinger 307:7	7:11 8:9,9,14,15	293:10 296:21	GHMSI-specific
48:15 74:18	general 1:22 4:10	8:18 9:4 10:9,10	297:6 298:4,17	81:18
146:16 175:2	9:13 17:2,22	11:7 12:17 13:1	299:1,7 300:13,15	gift 228:3
276:12 283:5	19:21 24:9 25:3	13:11 14:4,5,10	301:4,5,17,22	give 64:12 67:3
291:21 293:2	26:11 27:6,21	14:16,19,19 16:21	302:15 303:14,17	86:14 101:21
307:4 321:15	28:8,13 34:11	17:5,5,8,17,21	304:8 306:16,20	106:4,10 113:19
327:22 345:3	35:4 46:5 49:19	18:2,13,17 20:15	307:22 308:8,11	114:4 118:13
347:17 350:1	77:12 97:8 99:19	21:4,7,10 22:17	308:17 310:22	119:22 127:1,16
357:12 360:5	102:9 115:17,20	24:12,15 25:7,13	311:16 313:4	128:1,3,4,4,9
368:21 395:1	123:1 124:10,19	25:14,20 26:5,12	315:22 332:2,20	130:3,12,13
furtherance 275:20	146:15 147:3	26:15 27:1,13,19	333:1,2,9 334:12	133:16 146:14
Furthermore 73:5	178:9 186:4,17	28:15 29:1 30:17	334:16 338:18	178:6,21 213:1
92:2 293:1	187:1,5 188:11	31:2 33:16 35:16	339:11,15 349:14	234:6 258:10
future 26:2 33:6	189:14 230:21	36:3,5 37:1,5,8,14	352:19 353:8,16	277:14 283:3
42:19 57:8 86:19	254:14,17 272:5	37:18 38:1,3,6,13	355:2 358:21	289:9 295:4
89:14 113:8,9	279:9 282:9,10	38:19 39:2,7,14	360:21 361:10	321:12 322:1
121:1 218:14	283:12 287:13	40:6,9,17,20 41:7	362:5 364:20	325:12 330:16
228:11 229:6	288:11 297:1	42:11,15 43:14	365:11,14 366:17	388:4 403:20
239:5 256:4,16	303:21 307:11,18	44:17,20 45:6	369:1,7,19,21	given 29:7 33:10
284:12 287:17	308:7	47:12 48:2,19	371:17 372:1,15	36:6 38:3 49:8
288:4,14 289:7	generally 79:1,10	49:11,14 50:17	372:21 373:5,12	73:4 88:2 95:12
294:5,9 306:17	79:21 82:7 178:11	53:2 54:8 55:16	373:17 374:18	105:6 116:11
330:16 388:18	199:10 223:21	56:5,8 57:7 58:14	377:3 391:2,16	126:13 128:8,13
398:4	315:5 377:5	60:7 61:9 63:10	396:17 397:10	149:22 171:22
	generate 138:16,17	63:14,14 65:17,21	GHMSI's 7:5 15:6	178:10 180:9
G	generated 26:16	68:7 74:14 75:6	15:20 17:4,11	186:20 206:8
gain 138:20 140:3	62:9,11 185:16	78:16 80:12,14,16	18:20 19:19 20:5	210:3,5,13 276:22
162:2 299:15,21	186:10 191:21	84:12 90:4,6,11	20:13 21:5,19	285:3 294:10
299:22 300:4,5	360:4	95:9 103:2 108:17	23:7 27:3 33:11	300:3,11,17,19
384:20	generic 97:4	109:11 110:20	38:16,17 39:10	323:8 334:19
gained 190:22	186:16 348:16	114:3 117:9	41:1,6 42:1 43:13	342:20 354:17,20
gains 70:16 151:16	386:9	130:20 133:3	43:21 44:13 45:12	359:6
178:10 190:12	generously 27:17	137:10 141:10	45:13 46:19 47:2	givers 397:5
228:11 229:7	Gennet 1:15,18 3:9	142:21 144:8,12	52:9 54:15 55:3,8	gives 27:17 29:1
gala 396:20	gentlemen 347:16	144:19,21,21	59:5 62:6 71:15	94:4 148:5 161:13
galleries 66:15,15	genuinely 347:1	145:13 151:18	81:11 87:21 93:12	259:10 288:17
gap 389:1	geographic 81:3	162:18 163:9	101:6 289:12,15	343:18
			7 -	
	I	I	I	1

٦

11 10 27 11	22 6 28 14	142 16 142 12	22.10.24.0.50.02	110.11
giving 11:18 37:11	goes 22:6 38:14	142:16 143:12	33:18 34:2 52:22	guess 112:11
37:14,20 39:12	66:7 99:5 112:22	160:3 162:8 167:7	58:15 64:14 67:20	134:10 144:17
40:18 41:15 42:16	126:4 131:10	188:15 190:7,15	68:22 75:15,16	164:21 192:13
50:7,12 89:4,6	138:2 164:18	220:11 222:10	76:3,5,6 119:6	209:14 215:19
94:12,18,21 95:18	170:12 173:13	225:17 266:11,13	140:21,22,22	221:6 227:22
95:19 96:6 97:19	204:7,19 208:12	274:15 275:5	169:16 176:20	229:4 240:10,20
97:22 99:14	210:16 224:11	284:22 285:20	177:5 178:17	247:19 255:8
110:22 111:1	232:2,4 243:4	287:16 302:18	179:12 182:5,21	258:2 304:5 319:2
113:3 114:3	257:10 297:15	315:9 333:5 358:5	183:19,19 185:20	319:3 325:16
115:18 116:6,9	308:14 310:11	358:7 371:10	188:17 189:13,14	353:18 354:12
122:2 128:18	349:5	390:4,14 394:3	190:1 192:4,6	357:4
129:4,10,11,12	going 30:15 40:13	395:7 400:10,11	193:7,8 194:5,7,8	guests 396:21
131:20 133:13,13	57:2 60:20 62:22	405:14	223:5 244:1,14	guidance 50:10
168:13 207:12	93:9 96:17 100:13	gotten 140:12	248:11 250:11	78:3 106:4 363:6
221:3 358:20	119:1,6 142:15	governed 20:18	251:4 254:4	guide 22:15 105:21
361:7 363:22	149:22 150:13	governing 6:2 8:13	281:12 304:7	105:22 106:7
388:17 393:8	151:21 152:9	government 1:1	312:4 350:18,19	guided 99:14 124:4
404:13	154:11 155:13	19:7 34:8 48:18	351:12,17,18	gun 344:7 345:18
givings 218:20	182:6 184:1	50:20 74:6 125:5	382:14 395:14	guys 182:12
glaring 367:19	187:13 190:6,7,15	125:14 129:5	402:5	
global 286:9,11	194:6,19 195:7	151:22 189:4	groups 5:14 21:12	H
go 31:6 39:11 83:2	201:16,19 206:9	365:16 390:19	30:19,20,22 31:2	H 1:23
83:4 98:20 106:19	209:6 216:2,4,5	394:2	32:2,3 33:14	half 14:21 31:1
112:22 121:8	220:11 225:10,22	gradually 103:22	34:13,17 35:16	32:1 106:16,20
126:19 131:6	227:6,19,22 228:6	103:22 106:4	37:14 58:13	201:5 209:2 211:6
138:5 143:20	236:9 238:22	202:15 371:8	139:16 140:17	224:18 227:12
146:19 148:2	239:17 240:4	graduate 67:4	154:13 169:8	244:13 251:20
169:4 170:11	245:5 251:22	Graham 396:6	193:13 243:19	259:3
175:8 197:8 201:9	254:9 256:10	granted 288:9	244:19 250:15,16	halfway 10:21
203:14 214:6	257:12 258:14,16	grapple 132:19	250:18,18,22	hampered 393:3
217:22 226:4	258:19 259:6	great 20:22 222:8	251:11 254:13	Hampton 6:10
228:3 237:8 241:8	265:21 266:2	263:12 265:18	306:15,22 332:16	hand 13:17 35:1
249:18 254:9	272:20 275:16,17	281:1 349:20	332:17 359:18	77:9 79:2 103:19
257:8 258:7,7	275:20 277:11	377:7 399:14	374:1	118:11,13 266:6
278:16 317:15	279:20 282:21	greater 6:3,4,14	group's 45:22	277:9 283:20
330:18,20 333:6	284:4 285:6 295:3	34:22 61:19 85:17	80:11 194:9	288:21 380:1
339:2 344:10	304:6 309:5	172:7 269:14	grow 224:17	handful 41:13
348:20 349:13	313:19 322:8	363:12 394:18	growing 207:13	handle 228:20
352:6 353:4 363:1	324:17 343:12	greatest 95:16	growth 58:20 71:11	handled 234:13
367:17 371:7	357:4 358:2 374:6	greatly 48:3	71:13,14 72:7,14	hands 274:21 390:6
382:15 398:19,21	385:11 389:21	green 401:8	91:7,16 226:10	happen 18:15
401:11	395:17 398:20,21	greets 117:17	242:20,21 243:2,2	96:10 131:15
goal 60:14 61:3	403:15	grew 299:9	243:10,12,14	148:13 149:1,6
101:20 106:15	good 3:3 13:11	gross 159:14	245:2 292:12,19	152:11 156:10
115:17 140:21	22:20 34:10,22	gross-up 159:15	364:2 368:16,17	240:8 256:15
359:10	48:17 80:5 92:9	group 4:3 6:11	368:19	320:4 323:13
goals 368:1	125:12 134:22	14:15 16:14 33:13	guaranty 372:8	324:18 330:15
0			0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	
	1	I	1	1

349:18 370:9	41:6 43:7 48:7	116:17,19 117:13	heavily 296:8	261:15,17 262:10
401:3	49:5 58:18 62:1	118:11,15 119:1	held 3:14 15:10	279:2 295:19
happened 133:17	65:1 68:13,19	124:9	24:2 27:12,19	318:3 319:17
159:1 223:13	69:21 75:17 76:11	healthier 120:7,12	35:10 49:13	332:20 333:19
244:8 246:19	76:12,18,22 78:5	healthy 89:17	108:20 267:1	334:13 369:19,22
247:7 256:12	79:6,12 81:8 85:8	120:5 198:4,5	286:20 302:15	371:16 388:2
323:14 340:7	86:15 87:19 88:5	288:6 295:1 388:9	334:12 363:18	higher 33:7 38:11
341:21	88:17 89:19 93:19	393:17	366:14 374:3,13	41:20,22 49:10,11
happening 244:16	95:15 106:7 117:1	health-based 69:2	391:1	61:4 71:8,8 89:7
happens 66:13	117:9 121:15	health-related	Hello 52:18	91:22 111:12
134:6 149:18	127:4 128:16	46:14	help 33:18 86:14	128:8 132:21,21
198:20 228:17	133:10 139:13	hear 10:9,12,16	95:1 97:1 109:21	133:19,20,20,21
244:18 270:10,13	148:19 165:10,22	11:2 66:16 116:21	110:4,8 193:1	136:6 150:22
277:17 323:9	166:13 167:4	140:17 266:2,20	200:16 266:9	170:15 198:17,21
348:10	168:1 172:12	276:2 293:5 327:7	275:1 279:11	199:3 201:19
happy 63:5 75:10	185:4 204:13	331:11 337:7	285:15 311:10	211:18 236:16
175:2 272:15	212:5,6,12 218:10	375:13 400:14	347:7 358:14	237:1,11 332:22
316:2 349:13	218:13 220:4,12	401:5,9	360:1 363:22	336:13 366:4
357:10 394:22	221:5 224:19	heard 9:20 11:5	380:4 383:7	368:19 369:20
hard 149:11 156:7	226:18 244:11,15	120:17 207:21	385:14 386:21	highest 31:3 49:6
171:11 252:1	245:9 271:12	238:11 276:13	388:21 390:9	101:21 366:17
262:3	278:15,17,21	314:6 315:4,12	helped 34:22	highlighted 164:13
harder 86:11	279:5,12 280:13	331:2 334:2	157:10 398:11	highlights 401:17
278:16	307:1,7 308:3	353:20 355:1	helpful 167:15	highly 54:5 56:1
hardship 374:9	311:1 332:11,21	380:12 386:5	183:13 191:18	83:12 396:22
harkens 334:9	333:18,18,21	387:16	249:3,3 353:11	Highmark 352:20
harm 42:17 48:19	359:2,3,10,15	hearing 1:7,12,14	357:9	352:21
87:11	360:1 361:1,3,17	1:21 3:13,14,22	helping 365:6	Hill 399:3
harmed 34:17	362:11,18 363:1	4:9,17 6:20 7:8,19	366:11	hinted 376:6
harming 323:11	364:13,15,17	7:20 8:6,21 9:13	helps 115:22	hire 140:1 281:3
394:17	366:7,13,15,19	9:16 10:3 11:1,9	249:16,16,19	hired 233:3 268:7
harnessed 394:2	367:1,4 368:6,22	11:13,20 12:8,12	hesitant 260:9	348:2 373:8
Hartson 14:12	369:9 373:1,13	13:6,16 15:14	Hi 75:13	historic 32:12
Harvard 333:17,21	376:9,11,17 377:1	16:9 19:1 23:20	hidden 365:20	historical 61:8,11
Hawaii 85:8	380:14,16 386:17	44:7 63:8 133:4	366:12	61:18 71:3 299:13
head 28:1 250:13	386:19,20 387:10	158:3 195:15	high 31:17 32:6	362:8
heading 41:21	389:1 390:20	208:2,3,7 210:18	48:6 60:6,14 74:2	historically 226:17
103:14 health 5:15 7:5	391:3,21,22 392:2	223:14 245:19 266:16 267:8	89:6 90:3 91:5	history 226:22
health 5:15 7:5 13:3 17:2,12,18	392:4,16 393:5,9 393:13 394:14,20	295:16 308:19	92:14 106:12 111:11 115:18	231:22 238:3 294:4
13:3 17:2,12,18	398:7 400:17		117:1 121:1 143:2	hit 112:17 225:4
24:18 25:9,10,12	401:19 403:1,11	330:6 337:8 338:1 341:21 361:8	143:8 146:2	hits 160:8
25:14,19,22 26:7	healthcare 21:19	391:6 394:4 396:5	145:8 146:2 150:18 169:7	HMO 163:12
26:14,17 29:10	33:7 34:6 47:19	405:12,12,16	198:7 202:17	HMO 103.12 HMOs 2:20 65:1
30:2,9 31:8,18	69:17 77:8 86:9	hearings 24:1	216:2 233:21	66:1
32:6,14,14 35:19	88:6 93:13 95:2	384:10 386:7	241:16 244:11,14	HMSCR 3:18 5:21
36:1,9,12,14,21	96:3 97:2,4 110:9	heart 47:17 243:5	245:8 247:2	7:7
50.1,7,12,17,21	<i>уб.3 ут.2</i> , т 110. <i>у</i>	nou (T / . 1 / 2T J . J	27J.0 271.2	/./
			I	I

H agan 12,21 14,11	200.1	270.14 206.15	16.19 20.20 25.5	in aligned 40.7
Hogan 13:21 14:11	390:1	370:14 396:15	16:18 20:20 25:5	inclined 40:7
14:12 184:8,11,20	hopes 5:3	identify 13:13	28:18 35:6 57:15	include 7:14 29:14
203:8,11 207:20	hoping 356:21	128:2 288:7 367:7	60:20 63:10 75:8	91:13 113:8 118:8
208:11 212:2	380:22	370:16	78:21 80:6 93:5	163:15 191:18
214:22 265:19	hospital 3:17 4:3	identifying 346:10	105:20 118:16	192:21 214:1
337:10,19	5:18 14:15 22:14	ignorance 188:20	171:17 198:14	218:20 222:4
hold 85:5 87:7	64:20 66:9	ill 102:3	216:8 266:16	229:14 253:19
103:9 140:7	hospitalization	Illinois 233:1,2	267:6 269:6,6,20	332:9,11 366:20
156:22 157:1	6:11 21:13 22:21	illuminates 16:18	278:8 279:15	included 77:17
231:11 359:14	53:1 395:14 402:6	illustrate 30:6	281:4 284:14	218:17 223:11
360:3 361:1	hospitals 22:22	ill-advised 112:4	289:7 326:10	333:17 389:9
377:20	96:10,14 365:16	imagine 392:13	327:2 329:4,5	includes 42:5 64:21
holder 182:6 192:6	hours 63:17	immediate 14:9	335:4 359:3,9	288:11
350:18 351:13	House 220:6	impact 26:6 45:11	360:13 361:15,16	including 23:15,19
holders 21:10	Housekeeping	87:17 95:16 99:18	361:21 363:17	25:16 46:9 52:1
29:21 33:13 113:2	134:22	112:16,16 159:16	364:11 367:8	62:9 65:21 76:15
113:7,9 114:17	Howard 220:7	159:17 161:19,22	375:9,12 391:6	84:12 85:21 88:1
126:4 176:17	huge 31:20 115:19	164:2,3 237:16	396:18 401:18	89:13 140:13
177:4 182:3,8	115:21 116:2,4	241:10,22 257:10	403:21	159:19 160:14
189:15 305:14,18	241:10 379:6	257:15 339:20	importantly 267:16	213:22 218:14
305:19,19 306:9	human 75:17 76:18	341:6 376:14	272:1	226:16 267:15
306:11,13 307:3	252:2	impacted 164:14	impose 17:16	306:15 354:1
360:18 363:21	Humana 171:8	167:21,22 256:3	imposed 49:12	369:1 375:4
364:5 366:11	hundred 329:21	339:19 345:12	79:19 312:15	inclusion 72:20
392:5	hundreds 18:21	impacts 162:2,4	imposes 37:10	income 31:12,14
holding 67:5 91:22	26:3,5 95:11	253:5,17	imposing 374:9	39:13 45:4 62:11
157:3 163:1 249:2	251:1 280:20	impair 398:3	impossible 63:2	70:17 96:1 127:21
339:6,8 359:2	hypothetical 320:9	impairs 398:21	211:15 240:7	137:20 138:17
364:17 377:10	324:19 325:6	implemented 51:15	impression 45:19	159:6 168:7,12
holdings 27:7	H1 229:18	65:3 77:20 310:14	improperly 73:20	172:11 179:16,17
holds 18:2 50:14		implementing 5:22	improve 96:19 97:1	179:20 180:3,6,6
391:16	I	6:17	241:14 391:22	214:1 234:12
hole 201:17	IB&R 225:3	implication 343:4	improved 394:19	293:12 294:6
honesty 199:22	ICU 96:12,17	344:16	improvements	299:16,18 300:11
honor 286:3 396:19	idea 19:3,9,15	implications 58:3,6	369:3	300:12,19,21
399:4	22:12 27:1 96:11	59:8 228:20,21	improving 25:11	incomes 48:4 160:7
honored 390:21	168:3 174:3	implicitly 313:11	77:7 79:17	inconsequential
hood 294:20	190:15 196:8	implies 294:8	inability 58:7	220:22
345:17,20	252:17 330:12	369:14	inadequate 391:3	inconsistent 7:4
hope 51:14 97:1	344:8 371:6	implore 399:17	inadequately 148:8	208:5 308:4
112:2 142:5	392:22 393:1	imply 15:7 252:8	inappropriate	355:16,18 356:4
224:16 273:12	ideas 133:12	286:6	72:22 278:6	382:9
322:18 368:11	identical 44:20	implying 45:8	incentive 19:19	Incorporated 9:6
373:10 382:5	identification 57:6	72:20	125:22 365:4	incorporating 8:10
404:10	identified 37:6	importance 267:8	incentives 19:22	8:16 9:1
hopefully 96:18	59:17 60:1 290:4	295:15	120:21 241:16	increase 31:12 49:8
228:15 273:17	332:15,17 370:13	important 7:9 16:2	incipient 121:1	104:1 105:22
		•	•	
	1		1	1

٦

106:5 124:5	182:3,18 185:18	inherently 344:18	101:14,16 111:17	81:1 92:20
137:10 157:16	223:3 255:4 264:2	initial 175:17	117:9 139:15	insuring 22:22 88:5
244:2,3,3,5,20	312:6,7 351:19,19	195:10 232:3	143:14 146:8	267:18
258:2,20 321:18	382:17 384:18	initialized 62:4	163:16,17 166:1	integrity 69:19
362:16 373:22	385:2 387:8	initially 310:8	166:12,13 183:18	76:6 272:3
384:4,7 385:13	individuals 5:14,14	initiate 97:6	225:21 226:18	intelligent 348:9
increased 45:8	21:12,13,14,16	initiatives 74:8	233:2 266:3,22	intend 45:17 50:6
86:10 331:20	32:15 33:12,17	218:18 221:4	270:16 282:5,7	367:17
382:20 384:3	34:13,16 35:16	391:21	287:2 298:6,8,9	intended 23:21
increases 33:19	37:13 120:11	innovation 393:22	302:5 304:1	110:1 258:9,21
86:7 87:3 89:16	139:17 154:12	394:1	307:12 310:17	280:4 305:5
156:17 162:1,4,7	177:1 182:4	innovations 393:18	313:3,12 321:13	intends 74:16
162:8,9 257:17	183:17 254:5	input 82:14 300:1	327:17,18 328:8	94:17
311:4 371:9 374:2	306:21 373:22	inquiry 213:10	328:10 330:10,20	intense 16:12
374:8 376:8 382:8	383:22 397:15,20	289:2 337:13	331:3 332:5,8	135:19
383:3 392:6	398:11	346:6	346:14 351:1	intensely 172:9
increasing 103:13	individual's 402:20	insight 76:10 141:7	361:17 362:1,9,14	intensive 96:9
159:16 321:16	induce 110:8 120:6	289:9 291:14	362:19 364:13,15	intent 34:14 84:4
increasingly 30:22	induced 120:11	345:3	366:9 369:12	131:2 157:1,7
135:11 136:16	industry 69:17	insignificantly	379:3 387:7	178:9 230:5 231:8
incurring 47:2	83:15 151:4	266:17	388:20 392:20	305:2
independence 76:1	226:18 256:2	insolvency 66:21	393:9 396:11	intentions 239:18
76:8 89:6 91:6	401:20 403:1	364:7 370:21	398:7 401:19	interchange 287:5
352:20,22	industry-wide 74:6	371:4	403:3,9,22 404:1	interchangeably
independent 69:8	influences 173:21	inspired 272:19	404:2,5	328:21
		-	,	
80:15 81:20 105:4	inform 338:5 381:1	instance 24:21	insure 316:15	intercompany
159:2 161:3	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17 indicate 243:19	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18 290:14,15 291:13	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22 22:8 26:13 303:15	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13 insurer 16:5 42:2	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12 267:4,11,17
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17 indicate 243:19 363:14	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18 290:14,15 291:13 291:18 294:1,12	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22 22:8 26:13 303:15 304:10 305:7	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13 insurer 16:5 42:2 79:15 83:21 85:16	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12 267:4,11,17 269:21 277:5,12
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17 indicate 243:19 363:14 indicated 187:3	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18 290:14,15 291:13 291:18 294:1,12 297:20 312:8	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22 22:8 26:13 303:15 304:10 305:7 308:2 360:11	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13 insurer 16:5 42:2 79:15 83:21 85:16 87:2,22 119:14	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12 267:4,11,17 269:21 277:5,12 282:13 312:22
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17 indicate 243:19 363:14 indicated 187:3 331:22	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18 290:14,15 291:13 291:18 294:1,12 297:20 312:8 342:13 343:5,22	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22 22:8 26:13 303:15 304:10 305:7 308:2 360:11 363:16	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13 insurer 16:5 42:2 79:15 83:21 85:16 87:2,22 119:14 296:21,21 362:6	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12 267:4,11,17 269:21 277:5,12 282:13 312:22 360:17
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17 indicate 243:19 363:14 indicated 187:3 331:22 indicates 185:12	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18 290:14,15 291:13 291:18 294:1,12 297:20 312:8 342:13 343:5,22 344:3,10 347:9	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22 22:8 26:13 303:15 304:10 305:7 308:2 360:11 363:16 insurance 1:4,15	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13 insurer 16:5 42:2 79:15 83:21 85:16 87:2,22 119:14 296:21,21 362:6 363:9,14 387:9	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12 267:4,11,17 269:21 277:5,12 282:13 312:22 360:17 interested 7:16
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17 indicate 243:19 363:14 indicated 187:3 331:22 indicates 185:12 indicating 123:3	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18 290:14,15 291:13 291:18 294:1,12 297:20 312:8 342:13 343:5,22 344:3,10 347:9 350:21 368:2	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22 22:8 26:13 303:15 304:10 305:7 308:2 360:11 363:16 insurance 1:4,15 2:7 3:11,19 4:8	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13 insurer 16:5 42:2 79:15 83:21 85:16 87:2,22 119:14 296:21,21 362:6 363:9,14 387:9 insurers 43:10	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12 267:4,11,17 269:21 277:5,12 282:13 312:22 360:17 interested 7:16 10:16 106:19
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17 indicate 243:19 363:14 indicated 187:3 331:22 indicates 185:12 indicating 123:3 indicating 32:13	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18 290:14,15 291:13 291:18 294:1,12 297:20 312:8 342:13 343:5,22 344:3,10 347:9 350:21 368:2 371:22 372:4	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22 22:8 26:13 303:15 304:10 305:7 308:2 360:11 363:16 insurance 1:4,15 2:7 3:11,19 4:8 5:15 6:6 15:8,17	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13 insurer 16:5 42:2 79:15 83:21 85:16 87:2,22 119:14 296:21,21 362:6 363:9,14 387:9 insurers 43:10 78:11 80:10 81:9	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12 267:4,11,17 269:21 277:5,12 282:13 312:22 360:17 interested 7:16 10:16 106:19 268:3,4 269:16
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17 indicate 243:19 363:14 indicated 187:3 331:22 indicates 185:12 indicating 123:3 indicia 32:13 indicia 32:13	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18 290:14,15 291:13 291:18 294:1,12 297:20 312:8 342:13 343:5,22 344:3,10 347:9 350:21 368:2 371:22 372:4 391:17	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22 22:8 26:13 303:15 304:10 305:7 308:2 360:11 363:16 insurance 1:4,15 2:7 3:11,19 4:8 5:15 6:6 15:8,17 19:14 22:13 24:15	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13 insurer 16:5 42:2 79:15 83:21 85:16 87:2,22 119:14 296:21,21 362:6 363:9,14 387:9 insurers 43:10 78:11 80:10 81:9 84:3,5,12 85:10	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12 267:4,11,17 269:21 277:5,12 282:13 312:22 360:17 interested 7:16 10:16 106:19 268:3,4 269:16 273:17 306:22
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17 indicate 243:19 363:14 indicated 187:3 331:22 indicates 185:12 indicates 185:12 indicating 123:3 indicia 32:13 indirect 180:13 indirectly 191:1	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18 290:14,15 291:13 291:18 294:1,12 297:20 312:8 342:13 343:5,22 344:3,10 347:9 350:21 368:2 371:22 372:4 391:17 informed 40:10	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22 22:8 26:13 303:15 304:10 305:7 308:2 360:11 363:16 insurance 1:4,15 2:7 3:11,19 4:8 5:15 6:6 15:8,17 19:14 22:13 24:15 32:14 46:10 52:7	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13 insurer 16:5 42:2 79:15 83:21 85:16 87:2,22 119:14 296:21,21 362:6 363:9,14 387:9 insurers 43:10 78:11 80:10 81:9 84:3,5,12 85:10 86:17 88:6,17	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12 267:4,11,17 269:21 277:5,12 282:13 312:22 360:17 interested 7:16 10:16 106:19 268:3,4 269:16 273:17 306:22 346:15 354:4
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17 indicate 243:19 363:14 indicated 187:3 331:22 indicates 185:12 indicating 123:3 indicating 123:3 indicet 180:13 indirectly 191:1 308:12	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18 290:14,15 291:13 291:18 294:1,12 297:20 312:8 342:13 343:5,22 344:3,10 347:9 350:21 368:2 371:22 372:4 391:17 informed 40:10 273:12 321:22	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22 22:8 26:13 303:15 304:10 305:7 308:2 360:11 363:16 insurance 1:4,15 2:7 3:11,19 4:8 5:15 6:6 15:8,17 19:14 22:13 24:15 32:14 46:10 52:7 55:7 56:15,17	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13 insurer 16:5 42:2 79:15 83:21 85:16 87:2,22 119:14 296:21,21 362:6 363:9,14 387:9 insurers 43:10 78:11 80:10 81:9 84:3,5,12 85:10 86:17 88:6,17 146:7 359:20	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12 267:4,11,17 269:21 277:5,12 282:13 312:22 360:17 interested 7:16 10:16 106:19 268:3,4 269:16 273:17 306:22 346:15 354:4 377:16
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17 indicate 243:19 363:14 indicated 187:3 331:22 indicates 185:12 indicating 123:3 indicia 32:13 indirect 180:13 indirectly 191:1 308:12 individual 34:1	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18 290:14,15 291:13 291:18 294:1,12 297:20 312:8 342:13 343:5,22 344:3,10 347:9 350:21 368:2 371:22 372:4 391:17 informed 40:10 273:12 321:22 322:15	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22 22:8 26:13 303:15 304:10 305:7 308:2 360:11 363:16 insurance 1:4,15 2:7 3:11,19 4:8 5:15 6:6 15:8,17 19:14 22:13 24:15 32:14 46:10 52:7 55:7 56:15,17 64:18 66:18 68:3	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13 insurer 16:5 42:2 79:15 83:21 85:16 87:2,22 119:14 296:21,21 362:6 363:9,14 387:9 insurers 43:10 78:11 80:10 81:9 84:3,5,12 85:10 86:17 88:6,17 146:7 359:20 361:19 365:3	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12 267:4,11,17 269:21 277:5,12 282:13 312:22 360:17 interested 7:16 10:16 106:19 268:3,4 269:16 273:17 306:22 346:15 354:4 377:16 interesting 142:1
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17 indicate 243:19 363:14 indicated 187:3 331:22 indicates 185:12 indicates 185:12 indicating 123:3 indica 32:13 indirect 180:13 indirectly 191:1 308:12 individual 34:1 74:7 90:8 119:8	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18 290:14,15 291:13 291:18 294:1,12 297:20 312:8 342:13 343:5,22 344:3,10 347:9 350:21 368:2 371:22 372:4 391:17 informed 40:10 273:12 321:22 322:15 infrastructure	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22 22:8 26:13 303:15 304:10 305:7 308:2 360:11 363:16 insurance 1:4,15 2:7 3:11,19 4:8 5:15 6:6 15:8,17 19:14 22:13 24:15 32:14 46:10 52:7 55:7 56:15,17 64:18 66:18 68:3 69:22 73:2,11	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13 insurer 16:5 42:2 79:15 83:21 85:16 87:2,22 119:14 296:21,21 362:6 363:9,14 387:9 insurers 43:10 78:11 80:10 81:9 84:3,5,12 85:10 86:17 88:6,17 146:7 359:20 361:19 365:3 377:1 385:5,7	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12 267:4,11,17 269:21 277:5,12 282:13 312:22 360:17 interested 7:16 10:16 106:19 268:3,4 269:16 273:17 306:22 346:15 354:4 377:16 interesting 142:1 interim 178:19
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17 indicate 243:19 363:14 indicated 187:3 331:22 indicates 185:12 indicates 185:12 indicating 123:3 indica 32:13 indirect 180:13 indirect 180:13 indirectly 191:1 308:12 individual 34:1 74:7 90:8 119:8 135:5 139:16	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18 290:14,15 291:13 291:18 294:1,12 297:20 312:8 342:13 343:5,22 344:3,10 347:9 350:21 368:2 371:22 372:4 391:17 informed 40:10 273:12 321:22 322:15 infrastructure 240:13,18	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22 22:8 26:13 303:15 304:10 305:7 308:2 360:11 363:16 insurance 1:4,15 2:7 3:11,19 4:8 5:15 6:6 15:8,17 19:14 22:13 24:15 32:14 46:10 52:7 55:7 56:15,17 64:18 66:18 68:3 69:22 73:2,11 76:12 77:2,11,19	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13 insurer 16:5 42:2 79:15 83:21 85:16 87:2,22 119:14 296:21,21 362:6 363:9,14 387:9 insurers 43:10 78:11 80:10 81:9 84:3,5,12 85:10 86:17 88:6,17 146:7 359:20 361:19 365:3 377:1 385:5,7 387:5 402:7	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12 267:4,11,17 269:21 277:5,12 282:13 312:22 360:17 interested 7:16 10:16 106:19 268:3,4 269:16 273:17 306:22 346:15 354:4 377:16 interesting 142:1 interim 178:19 268:19 273:9
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17 indicate 243:19 363:14 indicated 187:3 331:22 indicates 185:12 indicating 123:3 indicia 32:13 indirect 180:13 indirectly 191:1 308:12 individual 34:1 74:7 90:8 119:8 135:5 139:16 176:19 177:2,3	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18 290:14,15 291:13 291:18 294:1,12 297:20 312:8 342:13 343:5,22 344:3,10 347:9 350:21 368:2 371:22 372:4 391:17 informed 40:10 273:12 321:22 322:15 infrastructure 240:13,18 infrequent 149:5	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22 22:8 26:13 303:15 304:10 305:7 308:2 360:11 363:16 insurance 1:4,15 2:7 3:11,19 4:8 5:15 6:6 15:8,17 19:14 22:13 24:15 32:14 46:10 52:7 55:7 56:15,17 64:18 66:18 68:3 69:22 73:2,11 76:12 77:2,11,19 78:1 81:16 86:11	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13 insurer 16:5 42:2 79:15 83:21 85:16 87:2,22 119:14 296:21,21 362:6 363:9,14 387:9 insurers 43:10 78:11 80:10 81:9 84:3,5,12 85:10 86:17 88:6,17 146:7 359:20 361:19 365:3 377:1 385:5,7 387:5 402:7 403:11	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12 267:4,11,17 269:21 277:5,12 282:13 312:22 360:17 interested 7:16 10:16 106:19 268:3,4 269:16 273:17 306:22 346:15 354:4 377:16 interesting 142:1 interim 178:19 268:19 273:9 294:21
159:2 161:3 174:15 239:8,14 286:9 294:2,22 310:10 373:8 independently 342:17 indicate 243:19 363:14 indicated 187:3 331:22 indicates 185:12 indicates 185:12 indicating 123:3 indica 32:13 indirect 180:13 indirect 180:13 indirectly 191:1 308:12 individual 34:1 74:7 90:8 119:8 135:5 139:16	inform 338:5 381:1 information 4:19 5:3 7:17 57:1 81:5 191:19 203:6 217:19,21 247:9 261:5 262:13 273:19 289:18 290:14,15 291:13 291:18 294:1,12 297:20 312:8 342:13 343:5,22 344:3,10 347:9 350:21 368:2 371:22 372:4 391:17 informed 40:10 273:12 321:22 322:15 infrastructure 240:13,18	instance 24:21 86:16 212:14 234:22 367:20 384:3 instances 86:18,22 instill 288:5 institution 16:22 22:8 26:13 303:15 304:10 305:7 308:2 360:11 363:16 insurance 1:4,15 2:7 3:11,19 4:8 5:15 6:6 15:8,17 19:14 22:13 24:15 32:14 46:10 52:7 55:7 56:15,17 64:18 66:18 68:3 69:22 73:2,11 76:12 77:2,11,19	insure 316:15 317:13 359:21 391:7 398:4 405:10 insured 15:2 279:6 312:1 364:1 365:19 376:13 insurer 16:5 42:2 79:15 83:21 85:16 87:2,22 119:14 296:21,21 362:6 363:9,14 387:9 insurers 43:10 78:11 80:10 81:9 84:3,5,12 85:10 86:17 88:6,17 146:7 359:20 361:19 365:3 377:1 385:5,7 387:5 402:7	intercompany 141:4,9,18 144:7 144:16 interest 12:1 21:1 42:7 57:22 86:4 87:22 142:3 156:18 263:12 267:4,11,17 269:21 277:5,12 282:13 312:22 360:17 interested 7:16 10:16 106:19 268:3,4 269:16 273:17 306:22 346:15 354:4 377:16 interesting 142:1 interim 178:19 268:19 273:9

Г

٦

100 17 201 20		200 4 2 4 4 22		1. 1105 1 0 107 6
199:17 291:20	invigorated 391:14	309:4 344:22	jumbo 250:18	kind 125:1,3 127:6
292:2	invitation 346:18	346:2 349:8 370:6	jumped 161:11	134:10 138:19
internally 290:16	invoked 278:11	380:17	June 341:1	147:1 148:4 190:9
international	involve 63:22	issuing 268:18	jurisdiction 19:8	197:5,13 221:3
286:22	involved 51:22	item 159:21	41:21 49:13	222:17 235:3
interplaying 254:6	55:2 63:16 64:4	items 57:21 70:18	127:15 130:21	292:21 332:15
interpret 125:7	66:3 68:1 74:20	159:4 289:15	178:14 182:1	335:8 341:12
interpretation	122:3 232:22	297:4 345:12	190:21 282:6	342:5,8 392:19
17:15 47:21 50:2	233:18 234:1	iterations 239:5	298:14,18 302:5	kinds 95:14 141:22
315:3	246:18 260:13	J	311:9,20 312:13	149:1 177:14
interpreted 261:1	263:1 349:17		363:3 375:5	218:19
276:8	375:2	January 382:21	jurisdictions 20:3	knit 121:6
interruptions 3:7	involves 56:1 57:6	Jersey 85:22	36:5,22 37:18	know 15:5 16:3
intervention 84:8	involving 56:2 58:1	Jim 1:24 4:13	39:16,18 40:2,21	34:1 99:18 100:22
258:19 370:19	Invotex 268:8,20	217:17 218:6	41:1,12,14 42:8	101:1,3 104:10
403:9	269:18 273:19	222:9 260:10	47:1 49:11 51:1	107:21 114:8
interventions	in-depth 52:9	377:21	52:2 127:7 162:21	117:15 118:5,11
239:10,15,19	ire 19:10	Jim's 258:18	193:14 267:15	120:8,9 129:6
interview 399:12	irrelevant 292:14	JoAnn 2:14 390:3	300:9,15 310:1	131:19 133:12,13
399:15	irrespective 322:12	390:18	375:2 399:7	136:22 140:21
interviewed 333:16	Island 78:1 85:21	job 31:3 377:2	402:20	141:6 143:20
interviewing 63:18	86:22 374:1	386:7	justice 2:8 8:22	146:3,7 148:9
intricacies 229:4	issue 6:11 7:9 21:15	Johnson 1:21 4:9	10:14 16:13 63:3	150:19 155:13
introduce 14:3	28:10 29:22 55:15	12:8 266:5 274:20	255:21 274:13	165:4 171:6,11,16
244:4 274:16	77:9 93:3,5 146:1	275:4 358:12,16	justification 146:2	176:8,9,15 181:18
introduced 239:2	158:11 170:13	379:22 380:6	justified 23:1,5	182:9,12 183:3,14
340:17	172:14,20 176:12	390:5 405:7	92:13 107:5	184:6 185:15
invent 108:13	204:14,20 205:5	joined 67:8	justifies 27:15	186:10,12,15,17
invest 28:15 335:1	208:12 210:14	joins 285:14	justify 23:11	187:3 188:13,20
391:21 393:13	218:10 264:7,9	jointly 71:15	K	190:10 208:17
invested 137:21	266:1 284:8 303:3	163:12		213:13 214:11,18
138:3,3 148:17	303:7 307:12,19	joked 233:5	Kaiser 171:9	216:7,9,12,16,17
investing 118:5	310:3 311:11	Jones 307:6	332:11 333:18,21	216:21 217:1,19
331:16,19 335:2	313:4 314:1 320:2	JR 1:23	keenly 267:7	218:17 220:6
investment 45:4	336:7 338:16	Juan 69:5	keep 18:6 80:6	227:7 229:13
58:2,21 62:11	359:3 361:7	judge 46:18 66:16	111:9,11 119:1	232:12 235:5
70:17 79:5 100:1	383:19 396:7,9	judged 145:5	131:22 152:9	240:4,16 245:15
121:11,12,18	404:14	judgment 121:17	154:16 205:11	248:5 250:12,13
179:16,17,20	issued 8:9,15,21	200:10 209:7	273:11 313:18 358:2	254:16 255:15
180:3,5,6 213:15	12:20 23:18 24:8	210:17,21		256:18,20,22
214:1,2 242:13,18	25:4 77:18 148:20	judgmental 200:19	keeping 31:4 34:9	257:4,13 258:12
243:15 299:15	issues 11:21 16:19	202:12	110:5 382:10 keeps 226:5	261:2 262:9,11,17
300:11,12,19,21	24:3 46:15 49:15	judgments 230:21	keeps 226:5	263:13,15 264:12
328:15 394:18	51:21 68:2 70:2	280:4,7 354:9	key 43:19 72:21	265:9 266:19
investments 118:12	76:11,13 102:22	July 6:9 7:22 8:2,4	80:18,18 100:16	267:11 274:17
181:5 205:8	142:1 144:11	8:4,8 43:13	130:15 289:22	275:12 276:20,22
240:12,18 392:13	146:3 203:13,17	374:12 384:5	290:4 300:1	283:6 285:3 304:5

316:9 319:8	163:22 169:3,8	307:4 308:16	letter 367:15	336:13,16 343:10
327:20 330:9	171:4,5 172:5	313:5 329:9	let's 28:9,10 102:8	352:5 369:22
337:14 343:21	203:19 204:8,10	396:15 404:4	118:13 150:18	Lewin 14:8 45:22
344:1,8 347:11,16	204:16,21 208:5	laws 12:15 229:10	153:10 155:10	46:4,12,13 75:15
348:7 351:11,13	208:10,14,19	320:22	187:12 223:6	75:16,16 76:2,5
353:20 354:8	209:1 210:18	lawsuits 397:13	225:10 248:7	77:10 80:11,14,17
369:8 372:1,15	211:3 249:21	lawyer 321:1	level 18:20 35:22	81:4 88:12 108:11
377:3 386:14,20	286:22 297:2	353:19	39:16,17 40:21	150:8 280:2,22
389:10 390:16	309:10 317:4,22	lead 84:16 336:12	54:12 60:1,7,16	281:1,5,7,11,19
398:16	318:4,9,13 319:19	368:19 374:19	61:6 65:11 72:18	290:18 378:13,15
knowing 152:1	320:1 321:2 323:5	leader 286:21	79:9 80:4 89:3	378:22
knowledge 106:17	336:5,11 337:12	297:5 366:18	90:3 94:11 98:13	Lewin's 78:15
171:2 334:17	353:9 355:15,18	leaders 296:18	100:1 102:11,14	80:12 88:18 90:15
known 43:7 67:9	356:4,11,17 367:2	leadership 391:4	103:2,10 104:15	Lewis 281:12
83:14 129:13	371:18 374:20	leads 289:1 365:2	113:3 116:11	liabilities 54:10
knowns 287:20	391:17	learn 326:2	122:2 123:7	55:18 57:17,19
knows 171:7	largely 128:17	learning 368:12	128:14,18,19	159:10 339:19
Kurt 2:11 275:10	140:7,9 295:21	leave 268:21 396:1	131:3 132:7	340:3
302:21	353:5	leaves 389:2	134:11,12 135:16	liability 128:7,9,10
	largeness 205:4	leaving 58:14	135:19 136:6	142:17
L	larger 45:10 48:12	led 68:22 86:4	137:4 143:8	liberally 24:4
label 283:18	115:9 142:7 167:4	179:11 186:11	161:10 168:18	license 134:19
labeling 287:5	201:17 369:2	left 10:6 14:11	200:4,6 204:1	135:22
lack 70:11 120:10	387:7	30:12,13 31:2	210:20 211:8	licensee 53:2 79:22
240:5 289:22	largest 44:16 89:5	40:5 47:4 122:22	223:11 226:6	135:22
335:8	142:20 163:10	233:12 275:8	237:7 252:9	licensees 372:8
laid 33:4	168:20 180:16	legal 9:2 24:13 27:1	253:17,18 262:10	licensor 135:9
Lamphere 2:14	264:10 286:11	303:3,13 304:4	295:19 325:10	lies 16:15
390:3,12,13,18	397:4 402:7	307:10,19 355:6,7	343:11 363:13	lieu 127:15 128:15
394:9,10,12	Larry 24:3	357:3,6 360:3	364:7 367:15	129:9 130:14
landscape 91:10	lastly 158:16	395:19	370:17 381:8,8,9	life 163:16,17 322:1
Lang 2:15 390:4	late 32:8 64:15	legislation 20:9	381:15 392:12	354:17
395:5,6,9 400:2,6	225:22 232:6	40:12 54:21 55:6	403:8,15	lifestyles 120:7,12
400:8	313:2	59:2 282:15 394:7	leveled 74:21	light 7:9 89:17
language 22:11,15	latitude 90:22	398:17	levels 4:19 30:3	93:17 105:17
23:10 27:10 214:7	Laugher 357:18	legislative 46:6	41:22 43:16 46:7	113:4 117:12,14
270:22 272:8	Laughter 215:13	77:13 88:13	58:4 59:17 62:17	200:13,18 212:16
303:20 306:3,10	321:7	397:13	63:18 71:9 77:14	213:2 251:7 295:5
312:18 334:1,3,10	law 2:8 8:22 10:13	legislature 44:14	80:3 83:2,4 86:3	305:8 309:1
large 7:4,13 12:19	14:12 15:16 16:13	282:8,8	86:18,20,20 88:8	318:14 321:10
12:22 19:9 33:14	26:20 36:11 37:2	legitimate 51:3	89:17 97:19	324:4 340:7 374:7
35:1 45:7,7 46:20	47:11,22 85:15	legitimately 126:18	109:12 134:9	380:11,20
58:12 86:7 91:8	114:22 126:7	lengthy 54:4	135:12,15 136:9	lightening 31:17
107:7 125:10	174:12 194:1	Leslie 1:21 4:9 12:8	177:14 201:9	lightly 63:15
135:4 139:22	211:19 270:11	405:7	205:18 223:2,2	liked 346:11
140:17 146:22	272:22 274:13	Leslie.Johnson@	230:8 236:5 237:3	likelihood 60:6
149:6 156:16	304:22 305:16	12:11	245:12 296:2	145:10 155:21

216.2	11 14 227 12		220 10 245 15 12	
216:2	11:14 327:12	282:4 284:7 327:5	339:10 345:16,19	60:12,13 61:2,14
likewise 284:9	332:10 383:2	328:13 338:9	345:20 350:9	62:18 70:20 91:21
limit 29:10 83:20	listen 7:15 248:14	358:22	351:10 370:12	129:14 131:19,19
86:1 243:10	listened 392:9	longer 30:14	looking 59:20	151:14,18 165:8
315:14 321:15	listing 44:5	166:21 224:4,16	120:20 147:3	229:7 239:11
373:16	lists 221:9 297:3	278:5,7 360:17	154:20 155:21	292:7 387:4
limitation 285:3	302:4 386:15	401:1	176:16 178:8	lost 31:3 191:1
limitations 162:17	literally 251:1	long-established	186:9 189:13	203:16 383:4
178:3 179:7 238:5	256:19	15:15 63:21	202:22 208:1	lot 22:20 62:20
limited 66:17 86:19	little 35:18 41:5	long-term 76:12	220:1 227:4	94:18 96:12,13
142:13 172:10,11	103:12 143:12	92:7 95:1 167:12	228:16 234:20	145:5 178:19
273:9 315:10	220:16 238:20,20	205:8 240:17	241:14 255:3	183:6 187:1
limits 12:2 16:5	239:22 240:6	242:9 294:4	258:5 261:9	220:10 233:19
78:18 81:1 85:3,6	246:9,21 253:10	390:20	267:14 269:2	238:18 255:22
85:11,19 86:17	253:14 285:5	look 28:10 93:3	298:21,22 299:3	263:14 269:3
87:5,6,14 88:11	289:16 347:3	95:14 118:12	302:11 304:3	273:16 278:14
91:2,18 92:7,20	365:4 387:20	150:7,8 167:3,7	307:18 310:3	316:3 324:13
244:4	live 14:21 30:5 47:3	170:2 173:22	318:11 326:15	325:14 327:13,15
line 32:22 38:1	120:7,11 173:19	176:22 179:8	338:22 342:18	327:20 330:4,7,11
108:8 112:6,18	173:20 174:4	182:12 185:3	346:3 399:3	353:20 354:1
120:6 164:22	191:16,21 192:7,8	186:22 192:15	looks 97:5 142:4	lots 255:9
165:3 172:3 179:9	192:9 193:11,16	204:17 207:22	158:6 169:5	loud 99:22
183:7 223:22	278:13	220:3 223:15	188:11 382:19	low 32:12 34:9 74:2
225:14 237:5	lived 191:6	231:17 234:6	lose 34:6 39:2	95:22 106:12
249:10 259:11	lives 174:19 397:6	237:16 238:18	66:10 154:11,11	110:6 150:19
261:21 262:15	living 15:2	239:4 242:15	168:10 170:7	156:15 198:8
293:12 299:20	LLP 4:16 9:2	249:2 253:22	293:10 328:5	261:15,18 278:22
332:2 335:15	lo 174:20	255:15 256:8	365:17 394:5	317:9 366:9,22
341:4 343:19	loan 142:15	259:2 263:17	loses 129:21	lower 31:18 44:15
346:6 387:3	local 19:14 36:4	265:3 294:19	losing 87:8 327:17	48:7 71:3 72:11
lines 45:3 138:12	48:17 172:4	298:11 306:13	386:7	87:11 89:4 132:3
138:16 139:1,13	364:15 394:21	310:5 318:7 331:5	loss 35:4 60:1,16,22	132:14 133:1
139:13 154:10	located 10:4 186:13	337:11,13 339:5	61:5,7,9,18,21	201:8 206:10
171:19 229:20	186:15 191:3	340:2 341:1 343:9	62:1,15 64:19	209:11 211:4,16
234:11 300:1,6	location 312:4	345:1 347:17,20	71:1,1,6,7,17,20	211:17 217:2,2,4
393:20	350:18 351:2,12	349:9 353:4	71:21 72:2,5,7	236:15,21 249:12
linger 100:15	351:17,18	355:13,17 357:12	74:2 82:12 140:4	249:17,18 250:1,3
linkage 164:17	lockstep 31:8	363:2 388:16	140:18,22 146:4,8	292:20 316:19
lion's 397:14	lofty 251:20	looked 98:1 145:8	152:7 170:9	317:17 318:21
liquidate 165:7	logic 35:7 175:3	152:5 172:19	190:12 227:4,10	322:13 332:22
list 9:9 10:1,6 11:15	181:16,16	173:19 174:1	227:16,18 229:1,3	345:22 370:17
44:21 118:8	logo 137:7	177:4,5,6 179:10	235:2 239:16,17	381:19
195:13 224:22	logos 134:21	182:2 188:5	241:3 256:4,7	lowering 87:9
265:22 289:14	long 44:21 97:2	201:12 204:6	258:14 259:3	118:14 383:8
328:11 358:3	108:19 132:22	255:19 297:21,22	293:11 349:4	low-income 94:19
377:13 389:20	154:4 214:18	298:15 299:3	losses 37:8,21	low-risk 45:3
listed 9:9 10:1	222:19 226:5	301:20 302:1,7,7	59:18,20,22 60:12	lying 384:19

M	258:18 285:8	222:16,20 223:11	42:6 52:8 56:15	267:9,10 348:12
Madam 275:17	286:8 289:7 294:3	223:17,19,22	96:4 127:6,15	maximizing 25:17
276:20	368:6 393:14	224:6 225:19	130:2,12,13	maximum 17:18
magnitude 65:7	397:3 403:19	226:4 240:1,2	141:10 142:1,2	18:8 29:6 88:7
147:15	management's	257:7,8,9,21	144:20 163:12	122:5 123:6,8,15
mail 405:9	112:12 158:5	Maria 99:2	164:11,16 173:15	196:14 212:7
main 151:12	239:18	mark 2:10 13:20	173:17 182:7	276:17 277:10,16
mainframe 233:9	managers 286:18	14:9 32:11 49:19	190:17 192:9	277:19 316:4,6,18
maintain 18:3	managing 14:8	89:6 91:5 104:13	193:11 244:14	317:14,18 318:12
79:22 80:4 85:17	87:2 90:21 287:17	134:18 135:7	266:3 267:1,7,16	318:15,18,20
92:14 146:9 223:1	mandate 46:17	143:17 146:15	267:20 269:6	319:21 320:20
223:10 369:20,21	48:1 93:18 115:8	188:2 233:21	270:11,12,14,16	321:11,22 322:6
372:12 376:2	387:8	275:9 285:14,16	270:17 271:5,8	322:12,16 326:5,6
382:18 387:1	mandated 42:3	288:22 297:13	272:22 282:7,8,10	326:16 327:1
401:18	402:10	333:19	296:19 302:6	328:18,19 334:17
maintained 397:21	mandates 397:13	marked 260:15	312:13,15 313:2,5	336:4,20 337:15
maintaining 25:20	mandatory 271:9	market 22:19	313:11 399:9	354:14 356:8
76:6 84:9 360:12	manner 25:1	31:22 60:13 84:10	Massachusetts	370:2 373:13
maintains 48:20	145:16 179:6	87:6,12,13,17	88:1	381:11 394:15
83:10	180:17 285:22	90:9,20 91:17	master 183:19	mean 6:4 39:20
maintenance 65:1	287:11 288:1	92:5 109:13 155:1	189:14 192:6	51:5,7 97:13
400:17	311:2,2 312:21	156:3 160:8	350:18	122:6 123:12
major 57:7,9 63:1	manners 178:5,6	168:18,20 169:1,3	match 231:2	126:12 130:8
103:4 165:18	Manning 1:23,23	169:7,11,15,21	268:16	139:14 147:12
172:4 176:18	4:16	170:6 171:4,22	matched 352:12	168:19 173:10
398:13	March 25:4 307:17	172:2,7,8 186:20	material 140:15	176:15 182:4,18
majority 30:18	307:20	224:19 241:13	142:3 170:3,9	183:16 192:7
69:20 220:13	margin 72:4 84:5	244:13,14 247:15	333:12 350:10	196:1 213:18
364:17	84:13 112:3,6	248:4,6,9,21	materially 61:19	220:5 232:3 241:1
makers 100:16	137:16 146:20	249:22 250:11	209:16 345:12	241:14 243:1
making 3:22 28:12	154:9 166:18	251:6,8,13 264:2	materials 9:7	258:1 259:21
90:3 194:14	224:10,15 225:5	364:17 365:3	181:16 183:13	265:2 268:20
224:22 242:13	225:12 226:3,6,11	366:17 369:4	221:8 353:12	305:7 314:15
272:3 313:7	253:11,19 257:6	379:4 384:2,19	Mathematica 9:5	315:7 322:9
322:18 346:15	257:14,18 258:3,3	marketplace 32:15	43:22 275:8	324:12 325:2
359:10 376:11	258:5,10,13,21	73:2 84:18 156:8	296:15	326:12 328:22
381:22	259:7,8,12,13,16	223:9 224:4	mathematical	329:17 332:14,15
manage 243:13	259:22 304:21	markets 160:4	335:13	333:3 339:15
managed 242:22	305:1,3 329:18	165:5 167:22	Mathis 1:22 4:11	341:18 342:22
282:13 400:20	349:5	340:8 364:13,15	matter 12:3 20:12	343:3 344:14
404:7	marginal 321:16	365:7	45:10 75:8 94:11	346:2,22 352:12
management 9:3	334:21	marks 135:22	104:4 118:4 142:4	355:14,16 365:10
63:18 68:15 70:9	margins 32:21 33:5	Martin 1:23,23	195:2 206:19,21	meaning 29:19
102:4 104:15	72:3 111:21	4:16	241:2 283:11	30:10 42:11 173:9
167:17 239:8,10	112:20,21 146:22	Maryland 2:7	311:15 330:22	292:15 355:10
239:14,19,22	157:4 166:6	14:21 15:2 32:2	398:5	means 15:7 17:21
240:11 241:1	167:10 213:19,22	37:2,4 38:6,9,17	matters 13:7 86:21	37:14 42:18 47:18

57:10 59:21	116:1	55:17 67:16 88:10	14:7 44:4,21 45:1	97:21,22 98:4,6
101:13,22 114:5	meet 4:20 25:20	197:14 219:5	45:16,22 46:2	106:10 110:16,19
122:7,10 123:14	60:3,13 61:3	220:16,19 226:12	52:14,20,22 54:7	110:22 112:18
135:1 189:7	116:2 122:19	232:5 244:8,11	56:12 63:11,21	116:9 124:12
253:10 277:20	204:2 221:15	256:2 259:1	64:8,13 67:4,9,9	125:20 142:22
305:16 312:3	234:8 277:16	260:14 262:19	68:18 69:4,6 70:7	157:10 161:10,12
334:19 364:4	316:18 317:17	317:2	71:16 72:22 73:13	168:8 212:14
393:7	318:20 319:21	mentions 28:7	73:18 74:1,16	219:7,7 242:2,11
meant 125:9 175:8	329:9 346:18	381:21	80:16,21 82:5,17	293:10,13,15,16
346:7 347:1	356:2 360:1 362:3	merely 73:17	83:6,8,10 105:5,6	331:13 332:1
measure 41:15	372:22 393:4	message 30:4 43:2	105:6,11 107:4	341:2 365:18
79:10 193:18	403:13 404:6	met 220:3	132:8 139:1 147:5	374:14 384:13
196:6 231:19	meeting 18:9 28:16	method 172:15	148:2 150:3	385:9,10,13
241:17 387:5	98:21 121:22	197:1 232:12	174:15 196:1	millions 18:21
403:4,6	122:21,22 136:22	233:16 309:8,11	199:12,13,17	59:10 115:19
measured 55:14	204:12 276:17	309:17 310:6,16	203:6 204:4,19,22	148:11 251:22
84:14 170:13	328:5 363:15	348:15	205:20 208:8,12	280:10,10,20
measurement	373:5 393:5	methodology 59:14	210:16 211:12	392:14,17
72:21	meetings 56:18,19	71:21 73:15 74:13	233:22 236:21	mind 16:15 27:18
measures 356:20	meets 24:12 267:18	175:1 199:4 202:3	245:13 276:9,11	93:21 124:15
374:9 387:3	member 35:15 67:7	281:15 298:20	276:14 277:3	196:19 283:2
measuring 55:15	67:21 75:16	335:10,21	279:17 280:2,19	324:12 354:19
mechanically	100:22 113:17,18	methods 56:10	281:10,14 284:16	mindful 12:1
211:14	148:6 190:21	287:19 294:21	286:14 287:13	mine 68:20 102:5
mechanics 176:15	285:10,18 286:10	metropolitan	290:4,6,16 291:3	123:18
mechanism 80:22	302:4,9,10 351:10	332:19 353:9	292:2,3,6,17	minimal 79:11
84:15 92:19	351:14 396:6,18	MIA 56:16 181:19	293:2 295:20	132:18 140:2
142:19	397:2 401:17	184:11 354:11	297:20 299:3	159:6 171:13
mechanisms 87:2	402:1,18,22	MIAC 184:7	316:10 322:4	minimally 29:17
372:6,9	members 7:17 10:2	mic 401:7	324:12 326:13,14	33:15
media 93:17	10:10 14:17,18,19	Michelle 1:22 4:11	330:7,8 331:4,9	minimize 65:9
Medicaid 76:11,16	31:1,6 39:19 42:6	Michigan 85:12,14	335:17 343:1	136:12
77:3 380:18	98:17 101:2 178:5	microphone 11:17	344:8 346:4,7,15	minimum 6:5 18:7
medical 3:17,19 4:3	178:15 179:2,3	middle 125:1 211:4	347:6 366:1	64:7 83:22 107:16
5:18 6:12 14:16	194:10 244:22	midpoint 49:3	367:22 368:3,8,15	124:1 135:15
15:17 21:14 53:1	390:14,22 394:21	104:5	372:1 378:19	230:7 381:8,15
64:20 96:9 109:14	395:8 397:15	midst 268:6	Milliman's 44:22	403:4
235:16 251:15	398:5	MIEAA 3:20 4:5	71:20 73:15 81:13	minimums 107:14
395:14 396:11	membership 20:6	6:18 15:18 16:8	81:20,22 92:17	Minnesota 85:6,21
402:6	38:16,18 47:7	16:11 17:16 18:1	209:9 262:15	minor 240:22
Medicare 36:16	178:13 193:13	20:9 38:22 40:6	294:20 316:10	241:21
67:20 76:16	199:10 251:14	40:11 43:17 46:18	331:1 335:10	minute 64:13 102:9
128:20	mental 389:1	49:22 50:3 51:14	368:7 369:18	139:10 194:21
medium 30:20	mention 24:6 64:14	114:21 115:2	371:13,15 379:7	389:22
32:11 33:13 188:1	195:8 237:17	MIEAA's 5:21	million 14:17,18	minutes 10:11,14
250:17	291:22 386:13	6:16 29:9	18:18 35:14 38:7	10:17,18 11:7
medium-sized	mentioned 27:9	Milliman 8:10,17	38:9,9 39:2 41:3	275:16,18 279:21
L	•	•	•	-

	•		•	
290:11 379:16	36:7 49:13 55:22	moderately 106:6	Morris 1:23,23	national 6:6 30:7
389:18	62:5,7 82:8,13,17	202:16 253:9	4:16	64:17 75:17 171:6
Mirel 24:3,8,11	85:8 147:20	moderating 249:7	move 117:1	171:10 172:6
28:13 115:16	148:10 173:2	moderation 35:6	moved 317:9	221:21 286:22
133:4 330:9 331:8	222:12,20 227:11	156:21 205:7	movement 244:10	325:15 327:15
mirrors 30:7	228:12 229:5	modest 40:15	movements 280:10	336:14,17 380:15
mischaracterizat	230:16,21,22	modified 210:8	moving 31:17	380:17 386:16,19
44:1	231:22 232:20	262:17	multi 59:17 152:6	386:20 403:2
mischaracterizat	233:7 234:4,21	modify 47:22	multiple 171:19,19	nationally 387:4
70:13	235:3 238:4,7,13	moment 53:16	237:11,11 252:5	nation's 359:9
mischaracterizes	239:6,8 240:7	172:14 195:22	394:16	399:4
73:10	245:13 257:7	266:2 358:9	multiplied 300:13	natural 58:17
misleading 45:19	258:16,19 259:16	379:21	multiply 207:2	naturally 19:3
misleadingly	260:2,3,16 262:15	money 20:14 27:5	multi-billion	125:2
369:14	286:15 287:14,16	29:13 50:21,22	111:22	nature 11:22 65:6
missing 182:22	287:22 288:13,16	66:10 99:17	multi-year 60:11	83:17 140:21
288:22	288:17,18 290:1,6	112:21 125:11,19	61:2 151:14	141:17 167:9,12
mission 17:1 21:7	290:15 292:3	126:2,4,5 142:1,2	Myers 1:23 4:15	NCA 221:20
21:19,22 25:15	293:4 294:20	149:16 175:20	145:21 150:15	NEA 394:7
93:12 95:4 99:11	343:2,13,17	190:14,16 224:12	152:12 153:20	near 135:17 191:16
100:7,8,21 101:2	344:17,19,20,21	283:2,14,18,21	154:1 155:3,9	333:4,5
116:7 117:18	345:1,4 346:4	284:5,10 328:4,15	157:12	nearly 14:21 16:11
133:8 167:11	348:6,13,21 349:2	339:2,3 369:6	M&A 342:14 348:1	31:21 39:14
243:5,11 284:1	modeled 139:2	373:2 385:13		284:13 397:16
308:3,9 315:5	234:11 235:8	399:3	N	necessarily 120:14
328:5 329:13	270:11,15	money's 362:18	NAIC 6:7 64:17	182:4 220:3 222:3
333:10 334:1,4,11	modelers 289:10	monies 109:17	65:6 67:15 68:4	329:22 343:2
334:14 360:5,10	modeling 56:1	monitor 16:4 136:8	69:2 158:7,22	necessary 4:20
360:14 391:8	59:15 62:4 81:18	monitoring 60:9,17	161:16 164:6	62:17,22 137:11
397:7	144:18 145:1,5	72:18 80:2 135:20	173:5 203:22	236:6 349:16
missions 359:16	147:4 148:4	136:3 264:21	230:1,16,21,22	362:3 364:12
382:1	228:16 233:17	monopoly 248:8	231:5 236:13	necessity 394:4
misstating 340:2	289:10 290:22	Monte 261:16	237:5 341:2	398:8
mistake 235:18	291:12,16	291:11 348:15	NAICs 237:7	need 8:11 13:7
misunderstand	models 81:21 82:11	month 22:4 39:21	NAIC's 85:8	27:14 33:22 43:18
329:2	83:14 107:4 216:1	119:4 154:18	name 10:6 11:18	52:4 102:6,10
misunderstanding	260:22 261:3	177:17,18 383:12	14:13 52:19 75:13	108:3,6 111:9
44:2	262:11 288:2,8,10	383:13 384:5	134:18 135:7	131:1 132:17,21
misunderstandin	288:20,21 289:2,4	monthly 39:21	136:13 137:7	154:15 165:4,6
70:13	289:10 291:20	months 94:13	266:21 285:1	185:8 210:4,22
MIT 67:5	292:2,4 293:3,5,6	100:4 151:17	297:13 358:8,17	223:1 225:19
mitigate 239:11	342:7 343:14	302:5,9,10 311:4	390:18	226:3 249:13
241:3	model's 287:18	351:10,14	names 171:7	251:3 255:20
mix 230:6 367:9	moderate 33:19	morning 3:4 11:1	narcoleptic 378:4	318:21 320:4
mixes 203:17	42:18 103:16	13:6,11 315:13	narrowly 396:12	321:22 322:1
mixing 203:12	110:8 167:5 398:3	326:8 353:21	nation 49:7 73:9	334:20 361:3
model 22:15 23:8	moderated 89:16	392:10 405:13	364:16 366:3	362:12 366:10
	•		•	-

٦

	1		1	
368:19 369:2	241:9 363:9	183:18 188:17	nuances 165:14	306:5 307:13,19
373:4 374:8,9	Nevertheless 20:7	189:13 192:4	number 30:8 58:11	308:2,4,5 314:10
386:12 399:18	56:8	194:5 229:15	80:21 90:7 98:3	338:8 384:12
needed 88:21 107:9	new 15:16 51:20	234:17 299:18	108:13 119:2	388:17 393:6
141:19 144:11	58:21 59:1 85:22	300:7,8 301:6	136:10 143:3	402:17 404:1,6
204:2 282:18	87:13 88:2 93:20	non-insurance	161:19 167:20	obligations 18:9
289:15 314:5	153:9,12 154:18	332:6	181:21,22 182:3	23:13 26:12
335:11 348:8	155:17 233:8	non-obvious 169:2	185:4 187:12	128:21 267:19,20
372:4 392:7	350:10 369:3	non-profit 5:16	192:12 196:22	306:8 362:4
needs 27:6 28:17	383:13	23:1,6 25:9,11,22	202:2 217:7,9	363:15 403:14
29:8 35:3 37:19	newborns 374:12	50:8 75:20 85:9	219:2 235:15	observation 35:22
58:21 79:5 90:10	news 42:21	111:16	245:16 246:6	296:12
105:8 113:4	night 30:4 43:9	non-public 245:22	251:20 264:1	observations
116:12 231:18	116:16 129:19	non-subscribers	292:17 295:15	170:20 303:22
234:8,9 264:3	166:14 169:13	283:3	296:16 316:14,19	observe 15:13
290:7 296:16	278:12 365:22	non-taxable 23:6	330:14 333:16	150:10 172:21
317:16 321:10	nimbly 84:10	normal 349:6	339:9,11 385:19	173:13
334:19 360:1	nine 133:21 229:15	normally 227:18	402:17	observed 66:22
363:1 367:8,10	397:17	North 85:22 182:8	numbers 31:5	90:5 312:12
375:7 381:21	Ninety 173:14	Northeastern 89:9	41:11 86:10 196:9	observer 41:5
393:12 394:14	NMA 75:14	91:4	212:14 219:3,15	obtain 19:18
negative 258:7	non 159:21 177:4	Northern 15:3	220:1 221:13,14	obtained 19:11
343:3	280:5 291:2	notably 41:14	230:22 351:4,9	207:1
negotiate 189:20	338:17	226:21	362:16	obvious 111:15
negotiations 40:8	nonprofit 148:7	note 11:10 16:2	numerous 69:22	211:12 295:16
neighboring 41:14	165:22 166:4	55:6 143:9 290:17	N.E 12:9	339:3
49:10 50:22 127:14 312:13	171:9 271:12	290:22 293:10,14	N.W 1:12	obviously 98:1 135:15 142:14
392:21	359:15,20 360:4,8 360:15 364:21	361:10,15,16 370:5 378:20	0	185:17 192:2,4,17
Neil 1:25 4:13	368:22 369:8	405:3	obesity 120:10	196:11 265:2,8
144:15 195:15	377:1 380:15	noted 20:4,16	object 18:11	268:15 285:5
350:1	398:18	40:14 46:4 321:14	160:19	310:8
neither 16:6 103:11	nonprofits 332:3,4	372:1	objective 75:19	occasion 394:3
198:7 284:3 369:7	332:6,8 333:17	notes 142:9,20	76:9 287:11	occur 227:5 235:20
net 112:6 144:21	377:7	304:22 305:1,3	402:19	239:17 334:22
159:8 242:14	nonprofit's 360:5	noteworthy 23:17	objectives 394:6	349:16
252:21 254:5	nonsubscribers	notice 7:20 8:1,3,5	objectivity 76:1	occurred 42:14
279:7 299:15,15	367:5	136:8 324:13	obligation 7:6	119:5 339:1 382:9
299:21,22 300:4,5	non-admitted 45:8	348:17	17:17 24:13 25:21	occurrence 150:20
300:10,12,19,20	157:17 159:16	noting 28:4	26:16 27:1 28:2	occurring 43:5
339:20	293:18 339:7,8,17	notion 175:3 311:8	36:12,14 49:6	147:17
network 102:2	341:3,7	313:13 362:6	93:20,21 108:12	October 396:20
169:19 170:4	non-audit 286:12	367:3 375:17	117:19 127:4	odds 362:8
networks 120:15	non-Blues 143:7	not-for-profit	154:6 196:13	offer 30:8 48:9 52:3
never 28:7 49:2,14	non-FEB 70:20	166:4,20 171:5	204:13 207:9	122:12 164:13
83:20 106:2 161:4	non-FEP 176:19	393:6	208:6 303:3,13	187:13 199:2
165:2,4,12 198:11	179:12 182:20	novel 22:13 36:22	304:4 305:17	243:7 250:21
	•	1	•	

Г

			1	
362:6 383:11	185:11 188:3	operate 54:9,17	303:21 307:10	318:20 356:19,19
offered 44:3 330:8	189:1,5 190:3,14	111:20 112:19	395:19	371:9 404:5
330:10 382:16	191:5,10,17	123:22 131:7	opportunity 93:2	ordered 42:12
offering 47:15	192:13 194:2,17	135:21 154:8	140:8 150:20	271:10
170:5 244:22	195:6 205:14	156:18 166:6	295:4 297:12	organization 56:5
382:15	213:12 214:4,17	206:13,20 296:3	302:20 328:1	219:4 304:12
offerings 30:21,22	214:20 215:9,12	308:5 329:17	334:22 358:21	342:19 380:16
offers 90:21	217:17 218:4	operated 16:15	391:5 399:22	organizational
offhand 238:22	219:1,20 221:6	32:20 104:5	404:14	79:7
255:6	222:8,15 227:20	operates 22:5 36:5	opposed 166:1	organizations
office 1:11 68:15	228:5,8 229:12	267:14 360:19	188:8 192:6 227:5	22:16 50:8 65:1
69:5 220:8 233:22	236:17 238:1	377:4	298:9	66:2 67:18 75:20
255:17	242:19 246:1,5	operating 25:9	opposition 393:1	77:7 138:11,12
Officer 1:21 9:16	248:10,19 253:4	32:20 42:2 60:12	optimal 8:12 53:7,8	143:19 304:16,18
13:16 67:13	253:16,21 260:5	62:1 68:6 76:8	54:6,14 55:12	306:22 400:18,20
104:14	262:7 263:5,9,13	77:16,21 85:16	57:5 64:2 71:5	400:22
offices 56:18	264:14 265:9,17	108:19 112:5	74:14 88:20	oriented 95:21,22
349:16	314:17 316:22	137:16 140:3,17	103:10,21 104:11	120:18
official 3:15 7:19	319:1 323:1 329:7	205:17 294:4	106:13 123:22	original 84:4
11:13 12:3 26:21	332:13 335:22	337:18 373:18	131:8,8,11,17,18	os 156:4
officials 19:7 397:9	338:14 340:12,21	396:14 400:22	132:1,7,22 150:6	ot 155:13 219:18
offset 36:11,17 37:7	341:10 342:6	403:7	157:2 196:3,17	other,day 233:6
37:11 41:17 48:18	344:13 345:15	operation 20:21	197:9,12 208:8	ought 105:15 106:5
70:19 72:5 127:22	346:1 350:15	25:22 58:9 62:8	209:2 210:2 211:4	121:8 123:22
128:7,21 129:3	351:3,8,20 353:10	163:19 200:22	211:11 228:15	124:2,3,5 135:12
159:15 292:6,9	358:1,17 376:19	308:12	252:19 253:2	135:13 198:2
387:4	389:16 394:10	operational 84:9	355:4 367:12	199:14 200:8,21
offsetting 159:9	401:12	operations 56:4	368:12 371:14	201:3 202:14
oh 218:6 246:11	old 155:16	79:13 163:1 257:3	372:2 381:7,9,15	210:5 231:11
321:4 326:1	omitted 214:14	299:20 402:3	optimum 105:10	252:19 328:10
377:20 379:16,20	once 11:4 276:22	opined 54:19	198:6,18,19 200:8	331:14 345:1
401:7	316:12 323:14	opinion 24:8 25:4	201:1,1,3,11,18	346:14
Okay 13:8 52:12,18	ones 23:19 128:3	93:12 99:9 107:1	202:12 205:17,20	our's 113:22
53:21 98:18,22	135:4 189:17,18	108:10 109:6	206:14 210:5	outcome 40:8 42:9
111:5,8 114:10,13	256:8	117:8,12,22 123:7	option 169:12,21	84:22 368:13
115:11 123:19	one-half 224:15	158:17,17,18,18	options 78:3,13	outcomes 59:6,9
126:6 127:2	ongoing 108:19	172:15 208:15	88:14	82:19,22 96:18
130:16 133:2,22	359:13	260:15 261:8,11	order 7:10 13:1,14	outline 57:2
139:14 141:2	on-site 56:18	281:8 286:6 287:6	33:18 46:10 50:17	outlined 11:21
145:19 152:12	open 12:4 37:7,21	307:20 309:7	60:13 61:3 62:3	outlines 43:6
157:13 159:20	38:22 39:4 40:5	323:13 325:19,20	77:18 92:13	output 82:14
160:16 161:7	40:11 129:15	328:18 331:5,10	121:12 124:2	outputs 81:22
162:16 165:20	327:22 347:11	343:16 345:21	126:1 131:22	outset 15:13 309:18
168:16 176:13	383:18 387:22	349:10 376:4	156:11 172:16	outside 69:9 103:15
177:11 179:8	405:4	377:15 397:6	243:10 250:4	106:21 108:9
180:10 181:6,15	opening 69:4	opinions 49:17	273:9 274:17	109:16 148:2
183:11 184:20	195:10	69:18 100:15	306:11 317:17	205:17 206:13,20

	1	1	1	1
246:16,17 263:6	299:13,13 305:22	207:10,11,13	passionately	Pennsylvania 36:7
336:15,16	307:6 308:7,14	211:6,15,16	393:11	36:10 41:18 44:9
outstanding 70:3	331:22 352:3,5	273:21 305:22	passive 119:14	44:13 46:5,9
overall 32:21 43:15	377:22 382:5	316:5 317:20,21	patently 273:3	48:22 49:12 73:11
60:7 62:7 79:13	383:10	321:3 350:14	pathway 398:19	73:14,16,19,22
98:2 147:6 250:14	pages 281:10	354:14,17,19	patience 358:5	74:12 77:12,16,19
275:19 391:22	298:19 302:6	359:13 385:16	pattern 174:4	78:20 85:12,13
394:6	352:3	400:2	194:10 244:17	88:9,10,22 89:1,9
overarching	paid 15:12 17:11	partial 37:7	patterns 62:1	90:4,13,14,15,20
356:12	32:10 34:2 36:18	partially 32:16	pause 53:15	91:4 92:12 127:5
overcharged 51:6	42:5 47:4 109:3	235:16	pausing 266:1	128:16 192:10
278:3	109:17 110:20	participant 213:5	pay 32:8,17 36:19	264:12 321:13
overcharging	185:17 186:6	participants	36:20 37:13 42:12	330:10,20 331:3
277:21 278:7	187:22 188:8	151:10	48:3,5 58:14	352:11 353:6
overhead 58:5,8	189:3 190:10	participate 192:3	102:20 119:6,8	369:11 370:11
overly 73:1	271:19 366:3	266:15 372:8	122:9 127:18	378:21 379:1,3
override 48:1	374:20 397:20	391:5	128:11 130:4	Pennsylvania's
overriding 355:8	pandemics 58:17	particular 27:14	131:18 137:15	88:13 264:6
oversee 22:3	panel 9:14,22 10:10	68:5 148:3,4	144:1 149:12	penny 221:11
oversees 136:19	10:10 53:21 67:21	161:21 212:13	159:5 162:18	pension 160:1,4,9
oversight 50:10	194:20 197:6	222:22 225:14	168:7 169:20	340:7
88:16 95:4 101:3	247:20 265:19	226:8 231:12,15	185:19,21 186:7	people 22:21 66:8
116:7 133:8	269:4 274:4,14	281:9,19 348:3	189:17 244:2	94:19 96:1 100:16
overstated 290:7	303:10 309:7	359:2	362:4 364:9	104:10 111:22
overstatement	337:1 389:19	particularly 34:5	payer 190:2	115:19 116:18
66:12	390:14	34:13 50:15 60:11	payers 33:18 34:12	120:6,22 122:10
overwhelmingly	panel's 9:17	100:7 109:18	37:16 42:2,17,21	124:12 129:16
20:2	paper 261:17	116:13 135:3	76:15	135:3 143:4,8
owned 69:10 71:15	papers 178:8	138:11 166:12	paying 26:2,3,15	157:10 168:6
163:12 173:10	269:15	170:17 200:12	28:20 106:13	173:19,20 174:4
282:12 298:10	paragraph 125:2	328:9 375:20	113:22 137:22	191:20 192:8
owner 189:16	214:7 263:22,22	parties 7:16 9:9	138:1 153:18	193:10,10 226:16
owners 66:9	271:2,10 378:2,11	10:16 11:4	157:4 163:7	234:6 243:9
ownership 69:9,13	Paralegal 1:22 4:12	partner 14:11	168:11 327:16	250:19 278:14,20
162:3 163:11	parameters 82:14	partners 68:22	364:5 376:15	279:4,6,7 280:13
189:7,12	97:8	partnership 39:8	384:8 386:11	281:13 315:7
P	Parcham 379:15	40:9,16 385:11	payment 21:14	325:15 327:15,18
	parent 76:5 97:14	393:17	120:19	327:20 328:1,9
pace 97:21 page 71:4 124:22	145:15 171:14	parts 203:22 329:8	payments 27:2	357:4,5 362:17
127:3 130:17	180:18	party 153:18 220:7	34:3 37:20 38:19	376:13 382:14
127:5 150:17 187:12,14,18,19	part 7:18 11:12	341:18 342:2,8,17	40:20 48:16	385:11,17,20
187:20 214:5	15:15 16:12 41:6	343:9 345:6	pays 37:12 159:7	386:21 387:20,22
215:21 263:20	65:6 98:1 108:12	pass 42:22 155:10	186:1 DCDSA (0.22	388:6 399:19
290:13,18 291:6	134:12 147:2	195:12 248:12	PCBSA 60:22	people's 93:21
290.13,18 291.0	154:6 190:2	365:19	peer 63:20 348:7	perceive 139:5
291:10,10 292:1,3	192:15 201:19	passed 85:14	pending 49:8	243:8
	204:11,20 205:2	282:16	penetration 31:22	percent 14:20 15:1
			I	l

	_	_	_	
20:5 30:10,10	301:9,10,13,15	permitted 11:7	place 43:9 75:22	36:10,18 37:4
31:9 32:11 33:1,3	302:8,13,14 313:1	314:13 385:8	76:2 80:8 107:19	46:9,11 48:7
36:14,15 37:3,10	329:21 342:11	persist 148:18	160:8 172:21	61:11 64:22 65:20
38:2,5,6,14,15,17	367:13,13 368:16	person 177:12,13	183:9 190:17	69:21 73:7 77:16
38:18 39:13 40:1	368:16,18,18	181:8 186:10	192:4 198:12	77:21 78:5,6
40:2,19,19 41:9	370:18,20 372:12	191:5	206:4 312:5	79:18 86:2,6,13
41:16 42:5,15	382:21,21 384:7	personal 11:22	322:17,21 326:14	88:22 89:3,5,8,10
54:11,18 55:3	397:17 399:8	personally 63:11	339:3 352:19	89:11,13,20 90:4
59:22 60:10,15,18	percentage 55:14	101:1 234:1	placed 22:1 143:4	90:17 91:11,20
61:1,5 71:13 72:7	175:18 179:10,11	246:18 342:3	places 219:2	92:13 101:14,16
72:9,13,18 79:15	231:10,19 236:11	Personnel 68:15	placing 87:5	117:2 120:22
80:1,4 83:1,2,3,4	241:5 300:5,6,17	persons 298:10	plain 27:10 272:7	135:12 136:3,10
85:18 89:4,22	301:1 308:10	306:15	plan 13:1 19:20	136:19,21 137:1
109:12 111:19,20	percentages 36:19	perspective 35:13	20:18,20 25:12	143:1,5 144:9
111:20 112:1,3,7	41:7 82:16 180:1	39:19 40:8 41:12	26:14,17 32:6	145:11 151:17
112:15 118:7	180:1 230:16	43:12 78:12 79:6	33:4 44:16,17	177:16 244:11
119:2,7 127:19,21	311:21 350:17,17	95:13 107:11	48:21 54:8,17	255:10 262:12,16
127:21 128:18,19	351:6	241:5 250:11	62:1 65:22 67:2	264:11,12 312:4,6
129:3,7 130:3	percentile 59:19,21	392:16 393:3	79:12,16 86:6	312:8 352:4,10
132:11 134:3	perception 47:10	395:17	87:19 90:11 92:3	360:15 361:1
137:17 139:17	100:3,12	perversion 19:17	97:12 106:9 116:9	364:4,17,21
151:16 154:9,9	perfect 238:14	Phil 4:7	122:1 126:9,21	366:13 368:22
159:5,7 160:6,6	248:22 347:5	Philadelphia	136:4 153:1	369:9 382:16
163:11 166:8	perfectly 268:16	233:22 353:1	165:15 172:5	388:20 401:17
168:10 173:15,16	perform 69:22	Philip 1:19 337:5	176:10 177:13	402:1,18,22
174:17,22 175:11	80:15 81:17	352:2	179:5 233:1	plan's 26:1 79:7
176:2,4 181:9,13	performance	Philip's 355:19	240:17,18 242:10	89:15 360:8,10,18
186:12,14 187:15	290:21	philosophy 102:5	244:5,15 264:22	367:3 379:2
188:2,7 189:2	performed 68:14	225:4 338:12,13	270:21,21 271:1,7	play 167:5 168:19
192:20,22 193:4	period 60:11 61:2	phone 399:11	271:13,20 272:9	179:17 185:14
192.20,22 193.4 193:10 194:4	-	-	272:12,13 283:8	321:3 366:18
	71:17,21 72:1,8 79:14 92:15 97:2	phones 3:5 phrase 6:16 123:8	284:3 307:7 314:5	
199:8,15 202:8		196:5		played 388:8
213:20,20 216:5	156:5,15 175:15		314:13 315:10,13	player 364:20
216:12 223:4,5,7	176:1 178:3 181:1	pick 243:22 251:2	323:7 332:11	379:6
223:20,21 224:1	227:14 232:21	316:19 322:13	333:18,18,22 340:7 352:15	players 171:10
224:15,18 225:13	242:6,8 252:4	picked 327:4		pleading 347:11,12
227:21 229:15,16	259:5 299:2,7,9	picking 251:5	359:2 360:8,13,19	pleadings 346:17
229:16 236:14,14	301:5,7 302:8,9	317:15	362:11 367:6	please 3:5 10:6
237:6 241:6,7	308:22 341:8	picture 140:15	368:6 374:4	11:10,15,16 12:1
244:1,3 248:9	349:4 357:7	piece 163:13	396:19	13:18 53:16 120:1
251:10,17,19,20	389:22	198:16,16,20	planned 37:21	166:3 195:11
251:21 256:20,20	periods 71:20 84:6	199:9 201:17	224:11	203:10 266:6
256:21,22 257:1	permanent 40:12	220:22 241:20	planning 133:15	274:21 346:6
257:13,14 258:13	permissible 280:21	pieces 220:16	167:17 224:16	380:1 390:5,6
258:14 265:1,10	permission 260:10	Pilgrim 333:17,21	330:21	394:9 405:3
292:19 294:18	permissive 271:6	pin 252:1	plans 5:9 25:9,19	pleased 395:9
299:6,8 301:3,4,6	permit 325:7	Pittsburgh 352:22	25:22 31:18,22	pledged 89:21
			l	

plenary 304:14	182:3,6,11,18,20	337:2 338:22	powerful 33:8	153:13,19 156:17
plenty 331:15	182:22 183:4,19	397:4	282:2	162:1,3,8 168:13
plugging 358:2	189:15,20 192:6	positioned 173:14	practice 34:18	174:6 177:14
plus 92:7 131:19,20	194:3 202:13	366:18	63:21 286:1,13,20	178:4,12,13,14
168:13 223:6	206:20 253:7	positions 231:1	348:10	179:3 185:20,21
225:12	305:18 350:18	286:21 377:10	practices 76:7	186:11 187:22
point 32:9 36:2	351:13 354:9	positive 26:6 99:20	pre 8:20 18:22	188:7 189:17
44:3 45:18,18	360:18 363:21	100:8 229:4 259:7	precedent 363:2	190:5 194:4
100:14 109:19	364:4 366:11	259:8 293:13	preceding 232:4	218:15 229:16,17
134:16 149:22	380:14 382:17,18	294:8	precipitously	243:2 244:18
162:10 167:15	383:21 392:5	possession 391:16	156:16	249:8,14 299:18
171:17 173:11	402:18	possibilities 105:8	precise 82:16 252:2	299:18,19 300:7,8
187:21 193:6	political 19:22	148:10 149:21	306:3	300:15 301:4,5,6
198:14 200:10	pool 151:8,11	152:2	precisely 34:16	308:10 311:4
203:12 206:18	286:16 387:7	possibility 19:16	149:21 252:1	312:15,16 313:5
203.12 200.18	poor 120:10	58:20 149:4,5,10	precluded 89:13	313:16 325:10
225:19 232:8	pop 156:10	149:14 227:10	predecessor 180:21	371:9
237:1 245:15	population 15:2	364:8	predict 149:21	premiums 21:15
247:5 251:3	34:7 392:1	possible 18:14	288:13	28:20 31:7 32:8
269:22 270:13	populations 393:15	25:13 34:9 36:1,2	preeminent 334:4	32:17 34:9 36:15
271:14 282:21	populations 353.15 portfolio 32:22	47:16 59:9,11,19	preexisting 384:1	36:16 37:13 42:19
283:8 293:20	58:1,3 165:8	101:21 102:1,3	386:22	47:4 48:3,14
296:14 298:13	portion 4:1 5:5 7:3	104:1,21 106:6	preface 309:15	87:11 96:2 104:1
299:2,5 301:8	15:20 32:8,10	110:6,10 148:7	pregnant 374:12	118:6 131:21,22
321:14 324:4,11	35:2 39:10 42:12	149:7,17 171:15	prehearing 275:13	137:14 138:8
335:5 338:21	43:17 46:20 47:4	201:2 202:16	361:11 380:8	187:21 189:3
354:16 360:16,22	47:6 50:16,18	205:16 209:9,13	preliminary 13:7	192:16 226:8
367:18 370:10	55:8 110:19 165:7	232:18 291:7	premier 69:17	249:6,12 278:16
382:8	173:1 185:20,21	336:9 346:15,16	75:17 224:21	298:13,16 300:14
pointed 369:14	187:20,22 208:3	362:15 364:14	premium 27:2	301:12 302:3
pointing 184:12	211:20 229:18	388:16 394:16	32:10 33:18,19	362:22 363:20
points 43:19 63:1	249:9 269:8 323:5	possibly 210:8	34:2,12 36:4,11	364:6 365:21
198:10 258:11	391:20	273:8 288:10	36:17 37:3,7,10	366:4 374:21
275:19 290:9	portions 86:14	posted 8:6	37:10,16,20 38:2	381:22 382:10
295:14 334:16	184:5 374:21	posture 361:17	39:10,13,21 42:2	383:8,9,14 384:9
policies 36:4 177:3	pose 9:18	post-hearing 74:18	42:17,21 48:16	384:14,17,22
181:21,22 183:17	posit 199:1	potential 26:4	57:13 58:14 71:11	385:2 388:1,3,4
277:13 311:5,9,18	position 9:5 31:21	58:12 59:4,6	71:14 80:8 87:3,9	388:12 392:4
311:21 312:2	46:22 72:22	66:21 70:20 82:6	89:22 90:6,12	397:19 398:4
326:11 382:12,13	106:14 112:12,12	82:21 87:5,8 92:5	91:6,8,13,15	preparation 99:5
382:13,14,20	131:9 165:6 198:5	144:8,8,19,20	110:19 111:11,15	prepared 23:19
383:1,15,17 384:2	206:1 207:6	247:14 292:6	113:22 118:20	53:20 56:8,9 74:5
384:3	223:11 228:18	297:16 387:4	119:7,7 124:5	93:8 276:1 295:12
policy 9:5 33:13	247:16 267:1,22	potentially 147:16	127:10,18,20,21	303:1 378:1
49:1 78:13 91:14	268:5 270:6	power 126:16	127:22 128:13,19	prerogative 314:16
92:10 103:7 113:1	276:16 279:16	233:9 304:15	129:6 130:3,4,5	314:22
113:7,9,22 126:4	289:12 324:4	365:4	131:18 140:7	prescribed 230:1
	-	-	-	-

001 5 10 006 10		(0, 4, 00, 4, 1, 5,	276 4 202 14	70 7 00 4 5
231:5,10 236:13	pre-hearing 8:15	pro 62:4 234:15	276:4 282:14	79:7 224:5
prescription 386:4	24:5 27:9 367:15	235:9 291:12,15	317:3 318:16	profit 21:8 87:15
388:22	price 143:1 146:6	291:18 292:3	337:19 348:1	111:17,18 138:12
present 1:17,20	150:21 152:8	293:3 348:15	375:9	146:20 151:6
51:5 79:16 124:11	154:3 156:5	proactive 119:14	processes 56:20	157:4 162:22
126:8 270:4 314:8	169:20 170:5	probabilities	58:22	166:12,15 214:9
314:11	224:8 245:9	232:13 256:19	produce 82:13	215:3 300:3,18,20
presentation 9:17	364:22 365:4	368:4,13	137:16 294:17	359:21 385:3
10:11,15,19 155:5	prices 156:15	probability 74:2	produced 59:12	392:20
159:14 160:15	pricing 72:3 155:1	82:21 147:11	61:20 80:17	profits 17:6 25:17
283:1	171:21 222:16	228:17 235:1	243:18 280:19	26:16 62:9 91:21
presentations	252:10,12 253:6,7	256:21	281:9,14 282:2,4	138:13 167:1,8
159:3 326:8	253:18,19 257:4,7	probably 118:15	295:20 335:12,14	program 20:22
presented 43:15	258:3,10,21 349:5	121:11 145:6	378:18	34:8 36:21 37:8
56:14 65:5 75:5	365:2	151:2 174:19	produces 71:22	39:1 48:18 62:10
232:18 331:10	primarily 70:7	178:21 179:5	138:13 280:9	68:10,13 70:17
presently 18:5	78:5 293:15 328:8	186:22 188:10	producing 11:11	77:1 89:21 140:6
preserve 137:8	360:10	217:9 232:7	product 32:21 39:5	286:10 327:22
president 43:8	primary 17:1 23:12	233:15,17 337:7	117:11 118:22	programmatic
67:17,18 99:2	280:16 328:5	342:15	120:5 138:19	221:4
116:16 129:18	382:1	probing 63:19	154:10 170:17	programs 19:4
166:14 169:13	prime 172:7	problem 104:8	179:9 225:14	37:6 125:16
220:8 278:11	principal 14:6	363:4 365:7	254:3 343:10	363:22 365:10
365:22 395:9	68:11 100:6	problems 67:1	384:14,15,18	367:2,9 387:21
President's 30:4	101:20 139:12	procedure 9:13	385:9,16,20	388:5,10 394:19
presiding 1:16	285:7 312:5	proceed 9:22 13:15	productively	project 281:2 288:6
press 120:18	principally 102:16	274:11 284:15	118:10	projected 60:15
pressing 86:21	principals 69:11	316:9 323:14	products 37:22	61:5 219:16
pressures 167:2	principle 115:2	324:3 390:12	59:1 63:22 101:8	projecting 132:11
presumably 125:12	355:8 356:12	proceeding 42:8	101:10 122:11,14	168:1
128:11 129:5	principles 26:11	369:11	124:8 129:14,15	projection 62:5
170:10 312:7	360:3,7	proceedings 6:2	148:20 223:3	72:2 132:12
presuming 185:6	prior 68:10 71:1,6	8:14 10:22 11:9	224:3 243:7	234:16
pretty 125:20	72:3 98:5 100:14	11:12 74:20 359:9	252:11,12 253:18	projections 234:20
159:7 182:19,21	115:15 131:3	359:12 361:4	367:9 369:3	projects 76:20 77:4
190:15 225:17	152:21 153:5	363:7	388:14 391:10	97:7
304:22 350:4	160:18 161:5	proceeds 66:17	professional 67:6	prolonged 43:4
prevail 42:11	256:2,3,12 301:11	323:8	210:1 252:18	87:14
prevalent 122:15	304:1 367:21	process 15:16	280:4 285:22	promise 266:18
prevent 146:8	373:20	19:12,18 22:16	286:3 288:3	promote 17:2,21
250:4	priorities 76:18	31:19 50:13 56:2	professionalism	25:13 218:12
prevention 393:14	prism 204:18	56:6,11 59:10	83:11	220:4,12
previous 161:8	private 75:21 76:14	61:15 74:19 90:20	professionally	promoting 25:10
180:7 262:11,12	77:6 78:5 388:21	92:22 99:5 133:7	206:16 209:3	307:1
previously 88:10	393:22	133:16 169:22	professionals 64:1	proper 131:13
223:20 286:20	privilege 266:19	189:9 204:19	64:4 280:8	230:12 338:19
289:21	399:4	245:4 254:14	profile 45:3 54:15	347:16 394:1
	1		1	1

				Page 44
properly 229:19	391:9 392:1 398:7	282:13 284:1	207:17 218:6	pursue 51:11 308:2
289:4	404:3	289:17 294:11	222:9 263:19	Push 401:8
property 22:9	provided 56:20,22	297:1 303:16,18	264:14 265:17	pushing 33:6
proportion 169:1	143:5 223:16	307:1 308:3,17,18	266:11 272:17	put 18:15 27:18
178:12 179:2	304:6 344:10	312:22 329:12	273:14 274:3,6,10	34:18 35:13 41:8
190:22 300:7,13	394:21	347:4 354:9	284:21 295:3,9	41:11 115:15
proportionate 47:5	provider 121:2	365:10 367:1	297:10 302:17,19	116:3 118:19
199:10	191:3 286:9	373:4 387:21	308:20 309:3,20	131:9 133:7
propose 267:3	providers 66:16	388:5,20 391:8	313:17,21 314:17	149:19,19 150:5
proposed 40:15	87:17 102:2	publicly 81:12,15	314:19 315:2,16	165:5 171:13
199:7 333:2		-		
	120:15,21 149:15	260:21 261:3,4	315:19 316:22	225:11 235:1
proposition 100:11	185:5 241:15	262:13 282:12	320:3 323:3,18,21	236:3 241:4 243:5
281:17 331:2	375:6	297:22 298:2	324:2,20 325:4,16	246:2 250:10
proprietary 259:19	provides 37:7	391:18	327:9 328:17	253:10,12,13,14
260:8 263:14	78:11 207:12	public's 17:22 27:6	329:14,20 330:1	261:2 326:14
342:12	providing 25:11	35:4 277:12	347:8,13 349:12	329:8 332:2 333:1
prospective 305:18	30:13 47:18 55:19	public-private	349:22 357:14,19	347:2 348:13
306:18 307:2	77:2 110:7 274:18	385:10	358:1,9 375:10	353:14 369:8
363:21 367:1	286:2 291:13	public/private 39:8	376:19 377:12,18	385:10 401:7
374:10	366:19	40:9,16	379:10,12,20	P-R-O-C-E-E-D
protect 70:4 73:7	provision 5:15	published 7:21 8:1	389:5,16 390:11	3:1
79:3 149:8 359:19	24:14 26:14 39:6	307:20	390:14 394:8,11	p.m 10:22 195:3,5
404:1	40:5 57:20 58:19	Puerto 69:6	395:3,8 400:1,4,7	389:18 405:15
protecting 334:20	65:9 163:7 271:17	Purcell 1:16,18 3:3	400:11,13 401:6	
361:22	prudent 92:6	3:9 51:19 52:11	401:10 404:17	Q
protection 15:10	375:17	52:16 53:15,19	purchase 101:7,9	qualifications
27:12 35:5 102:16	prudently 91:1	54:1 75:12 93:7	362:1	68:17
142:6 362:8 372:5	public 1:7,14 3:13	95:3 96:21 97:9	purchasers 365:3	qualified 64:1,3
372:10,13,18	6:20 7:17,20 8:5	97:15 98:7,18,22	purchases 169:9	68:19 69:7 286:18
397:22	9:10 10:2,17 11:4	99:8,21 101:5,11	purely 395:19	qualifying 77:3
protections 362:13	13:6 17:2,4,5,10	101:15,18 102:8	purpose 4:17 5:11	quality 25:18
proud 64:9 270:12	18:10,14,19 19:12	102:21 106:22	7:8 23:21 25:10	241:16 391:9
proved 225:18	19:21 22:20 23:13	107:17,20 108:4	40:13 47:17 84:2	404:3
proven 391:21	24:18 25:10 26:6	108:15 109:5	164:21 202:13	quantitative 92:11
provide 6:1 11:15	27:3,21 28:8 29:7	110:2,12,18 111:1	231:8 267:19	quarter 225:2
18:18 21:13,19	35:8,12 42:13	111:5,8 113:6,11	280:16 304:11	quarterly 167:1,7
30:18 60:6 65:18	58:17 63:5,15	113:16 114:1,10	360:6	168:4
74:18 78:2 79:6	66:12 75:20 77:1	114:13,20 115:6	purposes 38:4,8,13	question 28:22
84:5 93:2,13 98:9	77:6 78:13 92:9	115:11 117:5	38:19 39:15 40:20	29:5 35:20,21
117:9,10 120:20	113:15 120:18	119:16 120:1	41:2 44:15 50:21	74:8 80:19 108:2
155:6 185:10	124:10 134:20	122:4 123:2,19	125:13 234:21	124:7 126:20
216:1 217:21	156:19 158:12	132:6 145:14,18	270:4 305:4	132:16,19 142:8
241:15 286:11	218:13 220:4,12	163:8,21 170:22	308:13 313:14	142:11 144:16
306:2 345:3	221:5 245:19	172:13 176:11	330:6 335:18	150:16 152:13,19
356:19 357:3,5	263:16 265:1,8	184:17 194:17	354:21 398:2	153:7 170:21
363:6 366:8	267:18 277:5	195:6 205:15	pursuant 3:15 6:18	178:7 179:1 183:3
377:13 388:18	279:8,10,12	206:12 207:7,14	8:13 13:3 271:1	188:16 192:14
577.15 500.10	277.0,10,12	200.12 201.1,14	0.13 13.3 2/1.1	
	I	I	I	I

100 1 00 001 01	264 10 205 2		44.0.10.14	DDG 44 0 10 54 10
198:1,22 201:21	264:18 285:2	198:2,7,10,11,17	ranges 44:9,12,14	RBC 44:9,12 54:12
208:18 209:6	quickly 170:6	199:14,18 200:8	46:11 55:13 72:9	54:18 55:14,14
210:2 213:8	256:1 303:8 350:4	201:1,1,3 202:1,6	77:20 89:2 111:18	60:10 61:1 72:18
215:20 219:22	386:13	202:14 205:17,19	236:15,16,21	78:22 79:8,10,15
221:7,19 229:13	quite 55:2 240:17	205:20 206:5,6,7	261:14 281:9,14	79:19,22 80:16,20
229:22 230:15,18	281:22 382:22	206:11,14,15,17	281:17,19 295:21	80:22 82:16 83:2
231:15 243:15	quote 196:3 294:2	206:20 208:9,15	296:2 316:7	83:4,19,21 84:4
252:8 263:20	361:15 378:16	209:2,11,17 210:3	317:15 370:12	84:13,15 85:8,17
264:19 268:1,3,4	quoted 73:19	210:5,8 211:4,11	ranks 31:6	89:5 92:18 107:21
268:7,9 269:4,14	244:19 331:11	211:16 216:12,21	rapid 364:2	107:22 109:11
269:16,19 270:1,7	quotes 73:19	217:8 219:8	rapidly 32:3,7	132:11 157:22
272:20 287:7	115:15	222:17 223:4,7	116:17	159:17 161:10,16
288:15 289:1		224:1 228:15	rarely 23:21	162:4,7,15 167:17
308:22 317:11	<u> </u>	242:20 246:10,13	rat 365:5	170:13,15 173:4
319:2 344:6,15	radically 192:17	246:16,17 252:19	rate 31:9,10 34:12	196:18 199:14
353:18 355:13,19	raise 13:17 266:6	252:20 253:2,11	35:6 40:22 57:22	202:8 205:18
356:22 357:5	274:20 369:6,10	253:13 261:12	71:13 72:7,14	208:16,17 216:12
359:1 361:21	379:22 390:5	276:9,12,14 277:1	87:3 89:14,16	229:14,18 231:5
370:7 375:15	raised 19:9 49:15	277:3,6,6,11,18	92:7 103:17	231:10,20 236:3,5
376:21 385:12	290:19 338:17	278:6 279:2	105:22 111:10	236:15,20 237:8
386:17 388:11	343:1 344:22	280:21 284:15,16	117:11 159:6	265:2 294:18
questioned 74:11	346:3 369:18	291:6,10 292:21	168:10 205:6	329:18,21 335:16
368:14,21	raises 141:22	294:17 295:17,20	218:15 226:7	352:5 369:21
questioning 104:18	Ralph 266:3,12,21	315:17,17,21	244:2,3,20 271:22	RBCs 171:12,13
282:11	Ralphy 2:6	316:1,13,14,20	292:19 311:4	reach 51:20 344:11
questions 9:19,21	ran 111:22 141:16	317:7,10,17 318:1	364:12 366:21	reached 7:3 24:7
11:6 56:22 63:6	range 8:13 40:19	318:2,4,5,10,14	368:17 373:21	30:2 32:9 187:21
63:19 75:3,11	44:13,16,19,20	318:17,22 319:9	374:5 382:6,8	360:21 372:2
78:16 80:18,19	45:22 48:20 49:3	319:16,18 320:4,7	383:11 392:5	375:18
81:4 93:4 124:18	49:4 54:11,17	320:9,11,12,12,16	rates 21:15 42:4,5	reaches 364:6
124:20 134:1	62:14,15 65:15	320:17 321:9,10	57:13 87:10 91:13	read 65:6 109:22
138:22 145:22	72:11 76:18 80:20	321:19,20,21	103:13 106:5	160:17 181:16
157:14 176:8,14	82:1,6,13 89:4,7	322:12,14,15	110:5 111:11,15	214:12 267:4
185:7 213:13,14	89:11 90:14 92:18	325:7 327:5,6	130:19 131:2	275:22 276:7
218:5,9 222:11,12	98:5,6 103:10,15	328:14 330:13	132:17,18 156:10	280:3 281:8,10
222:13 258:18	103:16,20 104:2,2	332:1 333:1	240:3 250:1,3	356:5,12 378:7
264:17 269:2,11	104:3,6,11 105:10	335:12,16 345:13	271:20 325:10	readily 56:7 312:8
269:17 272:15	105:13,15,19	345:18,22 355:4	368:16,19	reading 29:4 62:21
273:15 274:4	106:13,15,17,20	355:20,22 356:1,2	rating 57:10	125:6 204:9
288:11 341:11	106:21 124:1,4	356:16 367:13,16	227:12 235:14,16	304:13,20 381:5
344:19 348:22	131:8,8,11,17,18	368:11 369:18	235:17 236:2	readjust 209:16
350:3,9 351:21	132:1,3,5,5,7,15	370:10,13,14,15	243:18 256:18	reads 23:17
369:17 371:21	132:22 133:1	370:19,20 371:1,2	258:12 259:4	ready 52:3
389:7 390:2	147:22 148:5	371:3,7,10,11,14	ratio 79:22 85:17	real 19:16 29:19
404:15,20	149:19 150:5,6	371:15,16 372:2	rationale 315:20	35:8 66:8 96:11
quick 68:16 218:9	157:2 196:4,18,19	373:9,11,16,18	329:16	133:9 150:12
221:18 257:19	196:19 197:13	378:18 381:7,18	ratios 229:19 236:5	209:14 291:12,17

	1		1	
realistic 154:22	reasonableness	49:2 94:11 195:3	353:10 355:11	refused 347:9
294:17	61:14	195:4 214:12	357:8	refuted 345:18
reality 240:9	reasonably 91:16	215:17 254:12	recurring 227:7	reg 184:16,22
365:14	147:22 280:8	273:22 306:1	redirect 359:19	185:2,12
realize 280:5	287:20 312:16	307:15 349:19	398:1	regard 28:4 36:9
376:14	reasoning 183:7	389:10 400:5	redirected 363:19	41:20 44:8 50:16
really 102:15 108:3	reasons 100:4	405:1,4	reduce 59:5 72:8	73:12 77:9 80:3
108:5 109:7 115:5	105:14 156:22	records 31:4	243:20 244:19	197:22 243:16
117:3 122:16	310:18 322:3	349:13	reduced 42:20 45:7	245:12 271:6
132:4 135:14	364:11 367:17,18	recoverable 229:2	224:6	280:20 303:12
144:4,17 166:16	rebuild 323:10	recovery 58:5	reducing 32:8	306:6 317:14
169:4 191:2	370:8 371:8,9	227:19	reduction 339:1	346:8 355:6
195:19 205:10	rebuilding 371:5	Rector 1:24,25,25	reductions 91:9	regarding 5:4
210:19 226:8	rebuttal 11:3,8	1:25 4:14,14	218:15 271:22	43:21 78:16 80:12
228:3 230:15	12:6 337:6 389:13	144:14,15,15	refer 25:5 53:6	80:13 85:1 88:21
231:17 232:14	recall 216:19	176:7,13 177:11	54:8	353:15 374:16
234:8 238:3 246:4	245:15 247:4	179:8,15,22	reference 221:20	regardless 130:20
262:1 264:9	259:17	180:10,19 181:6	293:9 378:21	186:14 198:15
290:20 291:8,19	received 7:18	181:15 182:16	referenced 186:4	region 15:4 30:19
309:22 310:6,10	289:16	183:11,22 184:8	261:16	31:13 34:21 43:3
310:18 311:9	receives 38:18	184:10,15,19,22	references 219:3	48:12 92:21 97:21
312:11 325:8	recessed 405:16	185:11 186:8,19	referred 23:22	115:22 116:15,20
341:4,17 348:19	recognize 25:7	187:2,10,14,17	180:22 312:20	124:12 171:13,14
351:10 356:10,13	51:19 242:4	188:3,12,15,19	352:2	172:11 188:11
370:16 378:14	283:21 402:9	189:1,5 190:3,14	referring 332:14	219:8 250:14
379:6 383:7	recognized 65:8	191:5,10,14,17	refers 24:4 305:12	377:4
386:17 387:15,19	69:16 73:8	192:1,13 193:21	306:7,14 356:8	regional 50:9 51:17
rear 10:5	recognizes 50:4	194:2,8,12 195:16	refine 234:5 238:22	97:14
reason 87:4 100:6	396:11	197:5 199:16	refined 179:6	regions 171:20
115:14 143:13	recognizing 175:20	200:2 201:20	refinements 74:13	Register 7:21 8:2
161:13 164:21	254:12	202:7 203:3,10	reflect 59:4 91:19	regret 361:13
193:17 219:21	recollection 217:12	205:14 207:20	229:19 230:6	regs 184:18 203:21
268:5 276:6 277:2	recommend 55:13	209:5 210:15	231:6 234:3	regular 15:15
278:9 295:18	174:11	211:5 213:12	reflected 70:19	227:6 298:5
312:10 378:3	recommendations	214:4,17,20 215:4	76:1 235:20	regularly 369:10
reasonable 54:19	379:8	215:8,12,14,19	reflecting 179:5	regulate 83:20
61:22 72:13 81:3	recommended 54:7	216:7,16 217:1,6	191:2	regulated 298:7
82:1,7 90:17 92:7	54:16 82:16 90:13	217:14,17 218:4	reflection 230:12	366:14
92:18 261:12	204:22 236:15,21	219:21 221:6	239:1,2	regulates 298:8
262:21 315:21	370:9 371:14	230:14,20 236:18	reflects 56:3 58:6	regulating 78:3,13
316:7,13 318:1,5	reconcile 93:20	237:4,10,12,14,19	58:20 62:7 174:4	regulation 87:6
318:17 320:17	197:3	257:19 258:1,8,15	193:18 226:8	88:16,19 195:20
321:20 322:11,15	reconciling 195:19	259:13,15,20	reform 43:7 76:12	196:6 362:9
330:13,14,16	reconvene 194:22	260:1,5 264:18	386:17,19,21	regulations 5:22
338:6 340:10	195:7,14 405:16	265:9,16 269:12	387:10	6:17 8:13 12:16
379:1 388:4	record 7:14,19	337:5 350:2,8,15	reforms 43:9	regulator 78:8 79:8
391:12	11:11,13 12:3,14	351:3,8,20 352:1	refund 278:4	120:4 361:21

٦

		11 1 0 5 1 1 5	001 5 5 11 00 5 0	
regulators 63:15	reiterate 46:22	remedial 271:17	281:5,7,11 286:2	requested 57:1
78:10 79:11 84:3	289:4 371:12	356:20	290:3,18 291:4	233:3 289:14
231:7 359:14	reject 331:4 367:16	remedy 51:11	294:1 296:17	374:2
361:17	rejected 26:22	270:2 310:12,12	297:22 305:21	requests 89:15
regulatory 3:18 6:1	73:14 331:1,9	310:20 311:10	307:5 311:19	95:11,12 97:6
19:12,17 50:13	371:13 374:2	324:9	315:17 328:21	106:1 158:13
68:1 84:1,8,15	rejection 73:21	remember 33:11	331:22 333:2,15	373:22
102:22 107:14	relate 241:11	98:3 145:7,9	338:15 344:3,11	require 41:15 92:3
135:16 144:10	related 55:12 63:6	reminded 334:6	345:4,11,14	226:10 372:13,21
173:4 200:4	76:11,13 158:3	reminds 328:6	347:19 348:14,18	required 5:21 6:19
221:15 230:7	163:18 170:19	remote 324:18	349:9 350:5 352:3	8:8 39:5 78:6
272:2 362:10	193:16 197:16	325:6,8 330:22	367:22 368:5,15	79:16 80:3 123:4
364:10 365:5	252:12 256:11	364:8	372:21 373:2	123:4 152:16
370:18 397:12	313:5 401:2,13	remotely 16:6	378:14,19	158:7 163:4
regulator's 234:9	relates 55 :16	removed 136:1	reported 57:18	181:20 184:6
reimbursed 87:18	295:21	rendered 49:17	58:3 158:22	203:14 298:4
reimbursement	relation 197:18	191:4	236:20 287:11	326:4 376:1
185:18	253:22	renewal 251:11	298:22 301:3	394:13 402:14
reinsurance 146:1	relations 221:1	383:12	350:22	requirement 15:9
146:7,10,21	390:20	renewed 87:21	reporter 11:16	39:1 40:11 43:16
150:17 151:8	relationship 163:19	renewing 383:14	reporting 72:19	72:1 130:2,5,6,12
152:4	252:9	repayment 143:9	80:2 135:18 137:4	134:3 185:3
reinsure 143:20	relative 170:12	repealed 85:6,6,8	reports 19:1 23:18	317:14 318:18
151:13 152:6	176:10 196:10	repeat 43:19	43:13 44:11 45:6	321:11 322:1,2,7
reinsurer 143:17	230:12,22 231:1	207:21	45:20 52:22 54:4	334:18 367:4
144:4 146:18	291:16 333:12	repeatedly 28:2	55:12 62:19 63:4	370:1 372:16
reinvest 117:20,21	relevance 68:6	108:9 369:1	63:6 81:12 107:6	373:12
reinvestment 7:5	relevant 11:20	repeating 354:5	195:20 196:1	requirements 4:22
13:3 17:13,18	12:13,15 151:3	replete 44:1	218:18 265:7	6:4,5,15 49:22
29:10 35:19 36:1	195:21 203:6	replicate 240:8	298:17 348:16	72:20 79:19,21
36:9,12,14,21	231:16 290:14	346:12	361:12 381:6	136:22 277:8
41:6 49:5 89:19	375:7	report 8:9,11,15,17	represent 59:18	341:16 373:6
93:19 106:8 115:8	reliable 148:5	8:21 9:2,3,4 24:5	representation	374:11 378:19
121:16 125:4	relied 81:5,6 313:6	27:9 45:1,16 56:7	73:1 158:5	requires 15:18 26:8
127:4 128:16	relief 366:21,21	65:5 70:14 71:5	representative	54:21 55:7 117:19
130:19 131:4	relies 286:15	73:19 80:17,21	46:12	120:4 121:5
133:11 204:13	relooking 383:15	81:13,20 82:5,10	representatives	160:10 174:12
212:5,6,12,15	rely 145:15	88:18 93:4 136:8	95:9 220:7	194:1 372:7
218:10 276:18,21	remain 12:4 60:7	139:1 166:22	representing 4:6	381:16
279:1 311:1 314:4	60:21 402:8	168:4 196:1	375:14	requiring 315:22
314:10 323:7	404:15 405:4	197:13 204:7,19	represents 15:10	381:10
367:4 370:2	remaining 11:2	208:12 221:19	reproduces 234:22	research 9:6 81:18
373:13 375:20	381:12	222:3 260:20	reputable 107:5	296:14
381:3 391:3 393:1	remains 136:13	261:1,3,5 262:4	reputation 70:3	researched 41:12
reinvestments	Remarkably 366:1 remarks 303:1	268:9,14,19	105:2 request 52:20	reserve 18:3,5,20
95:15 366:8,19,20	304:10 390:17	273:18 275:13	request 52:20	27:19 35:14 43:15
373:1 376:10,18	304.10 390.17	279:22 280:19	221:7 405:6	89:17 91:22
	I	l	l	

Г

٦

103:10,17,20	residents 14:20	332:22	56:12 77:17 81:10	273:20 274:21
106:12,14 112:22	17:8 20:2,3,5	restore 131:2	81:19 82:2,3	277:6,7,11 278:13
122:11 124:1	28:19 47:1 77:3	restrain 118:10	161:3 165:18	279:15 295:7
135:12 138:2,3	101:7 323:12	restrict 114:6	260:19 269:8	296:7 314:19
139:19 147:19	385:14 386:1	restricted 273:10	284:3,15 287:14	317:5 319:8,14
149:19 169:1	388:14 392:8	restriction 272:22	290:20 297:16,16	324:20 325:21,22
170:12 171:1	resides 174:19	result 55:2 133:3	342:5 348:9	326:3 328:12
173:1,12 174:7,10	residing 193:14	318:8 374:19	364:10,12,12	329:18 334:18
174:22 199:8,15	resist 19:15	403:9	365:6 378:16	342:21 347:13
200:12 208:20	resolve 66:3	resulting 55:1	397:19 402:10	350:5,11 365:16
209:1 225:6 226:3	resolves 56:10	63:22 71:8 87:11	reviewed 43:20	367:9 371:18
249:2,5,11,15,17	resort 142:4	results 48:19 54:5	63:20 145:3	376:15 377:15
253:3 287:7 391:1	resource 286:16	61:12 96:19	reviewer 288:17	380:1 390:6 401:7
reserved 148:8	resources 17:21	175:14,14,15	reviewers 348:8	404:12
296:8,9	18:14 25:16	179:9,16,19 180:2	reviewing 46:7	rightfully 396:3
reserves 18:7,13	172:10 200:16	180:9 181:14	77:14 160:20	rights 272:7 397:8
27:11 33:11,15,17	392:7 394:14	235:20 236:10	373:21	rigorous 56:11
34:19 35:2,10	respect 51:20 88:15	257:18 259:11	reviews 95:10	rise 19:13 39:12
41:8 42:12,13,20	90:6 91:20 216:10	261:20,21 262:14	397:13	117:14 118:10
43:13,17,21 45:10	217:21 281:1	262:16 287:22	revised 8:1,5	119:9 120:8,9
46:19,21 47:2	292:12 296:14,15	290:6 291:11	reward 241:17	risen 49:3 117:13
48:19 50:15,19	333:20 346:4	343:13,19 345:4	RFPs 165:14,18	rising 31:8,11
64:19,20 88:17	401:3	349:11	Rhode 78:1 85:21	94:13,14,15
91:12 102:14	respected 73:8	resume 194:20	86:22 374:1	109:20 116:17
103:7,10 122:9	83:12,14	405:12	Ribbon 67:21	392:4
140:8 170:10	respectfully 74:8	retain 69:15 336:18	rich 238:3	risk 4:22 9:3 54:15
208:13 209:10	respectively 59:19	399:1	Rico 69:6	57:7,9,11,18 58:6
225:3 287:5,9	respond 45:17 63:6	retained 79:2 80:14	rid 87:10	65:7,8,10 69:2
386:18 391:15	75:10 84:10 87:9	105:5 112:21	right 10:9 13:17	70:9 79:7,9 89:14
392:12 396:2	139:9 165:13	retrospectively	14:7,9 50:4,5	90:8 91:7,13
397:18,21 398:2,9	369:4 389:12	161:4	96:21 97:15	112:2 121:1
401:4 402:4,11,12	responded 56:21	return 51:7,12 92:4	101:12 107:17,20	139:15,17 140:1,6
402:14,16,19	152:18	155:22 249:11	108:1,4 109:9	144:19 147:1,3
403:12,15	response 32:18	271:22	114:14,20 116:11	148:7 150:18
reside 42:6 182:5,8	59:1 80:18 146:15	returned 398:10	118:21 129:22	166:15,17 209:15
199:11 298:10	245:7,8 274:5	revenue 37:11 38:3	136:21 139:4	209:21 210:3
312:1	347:19 349:3,6	39:10 127:22	145:7 151:5 154:1	222:22 223:6
residence 176:16	378:1	129:7 149:13	155:8 161:1,18,20	224:11 229:19
176:22 177:10	responsibilities	241:6 243:17,18	168:9 170:4,5,5	230:12,17 231:1,1
178:16 180:12	51:20 63:13	245:2 272:5	175:6 187:12	231:6,12 234:17
181:17 298:21	responsibility	311:16 375:5	193:21 200:1,2	234:18,18 235:14
312:7	24:16,19 73:6	revenues 89:22	216:6 219:11	235:15,16 236:2,7
residency 54:22	108:13 115:5	278:1 312:16	220:9,9 224:21	261:6,9 264:1
174:9,14,21	131:14 207:4	reverse 38:16	228:1,7,9 238:15	285:8,17 286:8,9
175:22 178:11	responsive 319:6	review 1:8,14 5:20	249:1 251:16	286:18 291:7
193:17 374:18	rest 53:20 128:12	12:13 15:20 46:1	258:8 259:14	321:16 324:16
resident 191:7	193:9 255:20	46:9 52:6,9 55:8	261:7 266:6	334:21 363:13
	-	-	-	-

	1			
370:21 372:5	ruling 90:16,19	315:12 355:14	305:22 306:4,7,14	self-evident 361:9
385:6,7 386:15	run 111:18 129:20	378:8 384:12	306:19 307:5	self-imposed
387:6 393:15	136:11 140:22	scarcely 42:21 43:1	sector 393:22	123:10
403:1	173:18 191:12	scenario 49:8	securing 392:15	self-insure 33:14
risks 57:14 58:2,11	203:2 226:7	227:21 232:10	Securities 1:4,15	sell 163:17 369:6
105:7 147:14	260:22 261:16	scenarios 71:7	3:11 81:16	369:10
161:17,22 162:1	262:2,12	schedule 178:18	security 56:17	selling 369:15
231:2 235:5,6	running 148:7	192:15 268:15	136:14	send 136:4 158:7
254:22 256:11	168:5	299:17 311:13,19	see 20:12 30:20	403:8 405:6
296:10 353:8	runs 178:15 190:9	313:7,13 350:21	33:8 96:16 119:9	Senior 9:6 99:1
risk-based 6:3,5,15	run-on 225:22	351:5,11,16	121:10 134:20	sense 42:22 107:15
54:12 65:2 78:22	rural 353:5	scheduling 265:22	155:3 169:7,10	123:5 131:6
164:7 367:14		scheme 140:14	187:12 221:9	153:18 174:16
road 156:20	<u> </u>	SCHROEDER	223:17 236:8	186:16 197:2
Robert 1:23 2:5	s 370:1 373:20	1:25 218:8 219:1	237:21 238:5	270:9 287:21
4:15 13:20 14:6	sacrifice 398:8	219:11,13,19	239:15 241:17	288:18 309:22
24:9 52:13	safe 69:16 134:22	221:18 222:2,7	255:13 261:20	322:18 334:10
Roberto 2:12 358:3	342:22	scope 244:19	279:19 281:2	sensible 330:18,19
358:7,8,11,15,17	safeguard 218:13	307:13 313:8	292:5,10,13 303:8	sensibly 203:1
358:18 376:5	safeguarding 307:1	scrutinize 221:9	318:9 321:4	sensitive 239:3
377:6,17 378:5,10	safeguards 76:6	277:3	326:21 331:5	sensitivity 73:2
379:11	safety 84:6,14	scrutiny 88:5	337:11,14 339:6	sentence 114:16
Robertson 67:10	144:21	210:13 363:16	340:2 344:17	214:8 281:4
robust 395:20	sake 51:22	seal 134:22	347:2,6 353:6	separate 44:6
role 20:22 95:5	salient 338:21	searches 289:19	369:21 373:4	45:13 76:7 162:4
115:10 119:13	San 69:5 358:19	season 112:14	398:13	181:4 191:12
146:21 167:3,6	Sarah 1:25 4:14	seated 13:11	seeing 86:7 273:17	205:11 302:6
296:20 297:5	219:22	second 57:16 60:19	377:16	separately 145:13
403:17 404:11	sat 66:14,18	70:22 81:9 83:19	seek 16:4 45:20	September 1:10
roles 287:1	satisfaction 151:10	86:8 96:5 108:10	50:2 131:9 132:4	12:5,21 183:14
roll 120:3 171:14	satisfied 372:16	137:13 139:7,21	132:13 243:13	267:1 353:12
rolls 164:10	savvy 286:18	147:2 166:11	368:2 371:22	405:5,17
room 1:12 10:5,6,8	saw 107:6 220:2	204:11 205:2	seeking 250:7	sequential 337:20
195:9 226:14	279:16 347:12	209:9,12 211:6,6	seeks 17:16 33:20	series 25:5 95:11
254:11 325:19	saying 70:5 114:15	214:4,7 216:3,11	39:7 41:7 103:9	172:4 176:7 196:2
331:16 389:17	116:10 125:3	216:22 217:8	131:7 174:20	254:21
393:21 405:13	129:5,19 152:19	263:22 281:8	seen 23:3 75:1	Serious 394:16
rooting 315:3	157:20 164:18	301:18 317:20	87:21 121:12	seriously 101:4
rough 231:7	174:11 206:15	318:18 320:1	148:13,15,18	267:20 346:2
roughly 161:10,11	207:1 236:20	321:2 337:22	162:13 225:15	seriousness 100:20
302:12,14	283:18 303:15,16	secondary 35:3	231:3 257:3	137:5
round 24:1	309:18 324:2	secondly 266:16	262:16 288:21	serve 14:17 17:5
route 317:15	336:1 337:10,17	292:5 311:12	346:8 360:15	47:13,19 114:17
routine 15:14	340:1 349:13	348:11	364:3 376:9 387:2	125:15 139:19
rubber 374:6	says 18:6 21:18	section 3:15 7:6	segment 222:22	157:8 166:15
rule 65:11	157:7 212:3 271:1	23:7 270:15 304:8	Seidman 286:10	171:20 277:12
rules 173:5	271:7,9 305:1,3	304:20 305:3,11	selected 62:15	303:17 308:18

$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		1	1		
67:1968:7277:8159:18169:1864:22 $signal$ 23:8184:1262:3385:18,20387:1181:19356:1867:2,1468:2172:1677:163ignal10:2simultaneous38:7388:1440:1169:2172:1677:1656:257:14158:21signal10:2simultaneous38:749:11297:888:78:20147:1980:685:4,1686:656:257:14158:21sigle98:20119:2133:5,8360:17341:1936:2134:21136:15,17212:9,18139:24139:2432:7724:1525:1435:1758:1973:10119:2254:1733:1923:1823:8single-most 20:2038:1464:21102:133:19,2125:67352:14,2137:17signalsignal36:7724:1525:1435:1758:1973:19119:426:210:33:615it16:12,1140:3severely 61:1109:1120:6220:33:613it16:12,1240:336:17.1739:12severely 61:1109:1120:5221:34:1353:7713:6116:77.1722:1923:26:14shat11:4720:5221:4138:1616:15.1335:7739:1019:1316:1530:1436:1633:16.1616:1533:16.1618:1610:1519:14109:1120:5221:1433:16.1616:1533:16.16 </td <td>385:11 390:19</td> <td>403:2</td> <td>20:17 36:10 44:18</td> <td>side-by-side 338:10</td> <td>simulations 59:16</td>	385:11 390:19	403:2	20:17 36:10 44:18	side-by-side 338:10	simulations 59:16
385:18,20181:19356:1867:2,1468:9Signel 171:8simultaneous 338:7388:14404:1175:1278:679:18,20signel 10.2simultaneouslysignel 10.2signel 10.2 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td></t<>				0	
388:14404:11 $69:21$ 72:16 77:16 $signed 10:2$ $signultaneously$ $serves 15:1$ 37:19 $setting 22:16$ 57:12 $78:6$ 79:18,20 $significant 31:16$ $338:4$ $49:11$ 297:8 $88:7$ 89:20 147:19 $80:6$ 85:4,16 86:6 $5:2:5$ 71:14 158:21 $sigle 98:20$ 119:21 $312:21$ 334:13 $255:11$ 25:6:14 $86:13$ 134:2,9,17 $163:13$ 20:5:5 $133:17$ 163:10 $35:58$ 360:17 $34:19$ 36:2 $134:21$ 136:15,17 $212:9,18$ $169:5$ 245:3 247:5 $service 17:1,8$ $seven 31:10$ 57:8 $137:7$ 227:21 $significant 98:19$ $32:6.7$ $38:14$ 64:21 102:3 $133:19.21$ 235:6.7 $35:2:42:37:27$ $signs 30:4$ $118:16$ $110:11$ 120:19 $24:13$ 25:6.11 $39:616$ $simalar$ 64:22 66:2 $single-most$ 20:20 $34:13$ 24:14 $Seventy-two 189:2$ $119:4$ 20:9:9 $17:6$ 260:22 $sisters$ 23:7 $329:12$ 393:12 $severe 259:11$ $shifting 31:20$ $261:2$ 286:13 sit 116:21,21 $40:3$ $severety$ 61:1 $109:11$ $296:2,10$ 33:6.16 $125:16$ 136:7,17 $serviced 121:7$ $severety$ 61:1 $205:22$ 214:18,19 $sit 165:13$ 32:5:18 $services 3:17$ 4:3 $share$ 31:14 47:6 $shortcomings$ $similar-sized$ 90:11 $178:21$ $26:17$ 45:2 53:1 $169:1,3$ 186:21 $short 24:13$ 88:3 $sit 161:520:25$ $siz 23:6:14$ $51:9$ 6:12 4:16 $share 43:14,47:6$ $shorteomings$ $similar-sized$ 90:11 $178:21$ $26:17$ 45:2 53:1 $169:1,3$ 186:21 $short 43:158:35$ $sit 161:520:25$,	0	
serves setting 22:16 57:12 78:6 79:18,20 significant 31:16 338:4 49:11 297:8 88:7 89:20 147:19 80:6 56:2 57:14 158:21 312:21 33:41:3 32:55 30:17 163:13 32:55 169:5 24:51 25:11 25:11 25:11 25:11 25:11 25:11 33:17 163:13 30:55 169:5 24:55 33:17 163:13 20:55 32:17 163:10 110:11 22:19 23:13 25:11 36:16 30:11 30:16 30:17 32:10 32:17 32:10 32:17 32:10 32:17 32:10 32:17 32:10 32:17 32:17 32:17 32:17 32:17 33:17 163:13 32:17	· ·		-	0	
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$				0	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		0	,		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,		0
$\begin{array}{l lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,			0	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					-
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $, , ,		0	- · -
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					0
$329:12\ 393:12$ severe $259:11$ shifting $31:20$ $261:2\ 286:13$ sit $116:21,21$ $404:3$ severely $61:1$ $109:11$ $296:2,10\ 336:16$ $125:16\ 136:7,17$ serviced $121:7$ severity $61:19$ short $54:13\ 58:8$ $341:13,15\ 353:7$ $136:18\ 167:18$ $191:7$ $150:18$ $145:2\ 178:22$ $363:7\ 377.9\ 396:4$ $126:14\ 255:18$ services $3:17\ 4:3$ shalt $114:17$ $205:22\ 214:18,19$ similarly $296:1$ sits $165:13\ 325:21$ $5:19\ 6:12\ 14:16$ share $31:14\ 47:6$ shortcomingssimilar-sized $90:11$ $178:21$ $26:17\ 45:2\ 53:1$ $146:13\ 168:18,20$ $367:19$ similar-sized $90:11$ $178:21$ $58:13\ 65:18\ 75:18$ $169:1,3\ 186:21$ shortfalls $88:3$ $161:15\ 202:5$ $332:3,4\ 376:22$ $98:9\ 10.7.9,13$ $364:18\ 366:17$ shoulder $365:12$ $289:19\ 293:4,6$ $126:3\ 127:16$ $110:15\ 124:8$ $385:5\ 397:14$ shoulder $365:12$ simplifying $238:17$ $158:6\ 199:6$ $391:10\ 395:14$ $260:10\ 267:10$ $335:18\ 384:16$ simplifying $238:17$ $158:6\ 199:6$ $391:10\ 395:14$ $260:10\ 267:10$ $351:18\ 384:16$ simplifying $238:17$ $128:19\ 246:8$ $402:6$ $269:21\ 348:4$ showed $271:19$ $54:6,9\ 55:17$ $249:1,21\ 254:7$ $serving\ 410:2$ shareholder $157:7$ $showing\ 64:15$ $70:10\ 73:15$ $323:16\ 324:10$ $serving\ 410:2$ shareholder $17:7$ $29:12\ 39:17$ $356:21\ 335:16\ 344:9$ $352:14\ 375:20$ $67:13\ 308:12$ 17					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		v			
serviced 121:7severity 61:19short 54:13 58:8341:13,15 353:7136:18 167:18191:7150:18145:2 178:22363:7 377:9 396:4216:14 255:18services 3:17 4:3shalt 114:17205:22 214:18,19363:7 377:9 396:4216:14 255:185:19 6:12 14:16share 31:14 47:6shortcomingssimilar-sized 90:11178:2122:19 23:3 26:14146:13 168:18,20367:19simular-sized 90:11178:2158:13 65:18 75:18169:1,3 186:21shortcomingssintration 119:15situated 296:158:13 65:18 75:18169:1,3 186:21shortfalls 88:3161:15 202:5332:3,4 376:2276:16,18 87:18187:4 267:17shorterm 167:2244:1 288:19situation 119:1598:9 1107,9,13364:18 366:17shouldering 365:15simple 23:21126:3 127:16139:22 164:14398:1show 191:20simplifying 238:17158:6 199:6177:8 184:3shared 255:1230:17 280:17simplifying 238:17158:6 199:639:10 395:14260:10 267:10335:18 384:16simply 27:18 51:2245:19 246:8402:6269:21 348:4shown 64:1570:10 73:15323:16 324:10serving 4:12 28:6shareholder 157:5showing 64:1570:10 73:15323:16 324:10set 3:5 7:6 36:13sharing 366:21shown 364:14122:8 135:18situations 66:4352:21,22 392:20167:8showi 185:22172:10 288:8,21288:8 341:1351:4 61:10 80:20385:7188:20 192:19291:4 294:8situs 193:7 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>8</td><td></td><td>,</td></td<>			8		,
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,	· · · · · ·
services 3:17 4:3 5:19 6:12 14:16shalt 114:17 shaped 47:10205:22 214:18,19 377:14 390:17similarly 296:1 376:22sits 165:13 325:21 sitting 98:1322:19 23:3 26:14 26:17 45:2 53:1146:13 168:18,20 16:13 168:18,20367:19similar-sized 90:11 376:19178:21 situated 296:158:13 65:18 75:18 98:9 110:7,9,13169:1,3 186:21 364:18 366:17shortfalls 88:3 short1erm 167:2161:15 202:5 289:19 293:4,6332:3,4 376:22 322:44:1 288:1998:9 110:7,9,13 98:9 110:7,9,13364:18 366:17 364:18 366:17shoulder 365:12 shoulder 365:12289:19 293:4,6 simplifying 238:17 simplifying 238:17126:3 127:16 128:15 156:12110:15 124:8 139:22 164:14 402:6398:1 260:10 267:10335:18 384:16 showed 271:19simplifying 238:17 54:6,9 55:17128:15 156:12 249:1,21 254:7serving 40:2 serving 41:2 28:6 402:6shareholder 157:5 shareholder 157:5showing 64:15 378:1970:10 73:15 122:8 135:18323:16 324:10 322:14 375:20351:4 61:10 80:20 88:11 90:16,21385:7 shareholder 157:9188:20 192:19 shows 185:22172:10 288:8,21 122:8 135:18 335:16 324:10335:16 344:9 335:16 344:951:4 61:10 80:20 88:11 90:16,21 42:20385:7 sicket 385:22326:12,13 335:9 335:16 344:9335:16 74:13 335:16 344:9335:16 74:13 335:16 344:951:4 61:10 80:20 153:6 162:22 153:6 162:22285:14,19 297:11 297:13 347:18 285:14 375:16335:12 335:9 335:17335:16 344:9 335:1751:4 61:10 80:20 153:6 162:22285:14,19 297:11 297:13 347:18 205:13 335:1				-	
5:19 6:12 14:16 22:19 23:3 26:14shaped 47:10 share 31:14 47:6377:14 390:17 short 21:11376:22 sitting 98:1326:17 45:2 53:1 76:16,18 87:18146:13 168:18,20 169:1,3 186:21367:19 short 48:18simple 21:21 93:15 367:19situated 296:1 situated 296:176:16,18 87:18 98:9 110:7,9,13187:4 267:17 364:18 366:17short erm 167:2 shoulder 365:12289:19 293:4,6 122 124:1 288:19situation 119:15 situation 119:1598:9 110:7,9,13 98:9 110:7,9,13364:18 366:17 short erm 167:2shoulder 365:12 simplifying 238:17situation 119:15 128:19 120110:15 124:8 139:22 164:14398:1 398:1show 191:20 simplifying 238:17simplifying 238:17 158:6 199:6177:8 184:3 402:6shared 255:1 shareholder 157:5 shareholder 157:5230:17 280:17 shown 64:15simplifying 238:17 70:10 73:15158:6 199:6 245:19 246:8402:6 402:6269:21 348:4 showed 271:19showed 271:19 shown 364:14simply 27:18 51:2 122:8 135:18245:19 246:8 325:14 375:2067:13 308:12 51:4 61:10 80:20 88:11 90:16,21 97:16 116:8 151:7179: 69:10 167:1 shown 366:21 42:20shows 185:22 shows 185:22172:10 288:8,21 291:4 294:8 situs 193:7 326:12,13 335:9six 58:16 72:15 six 58:16 72:1597:16 116:8 151:7 97:16 116:8 151:7Sharing 366:21 sharply 41:22 220 153:6 162:22 225:17Showe 207:13 six 21:13 235:2335:16 344:9 335:16 344:992:12 13 225:2 153:6 162:22 226:7 226:7 226:7 251:7251:7,15 357:16 317:15 357:16336:12 335:9 336:12 336:91 9378:15<					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,	•	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		1			
58:13 65:18 75:18169:1,3 186:21shortfalls 88:3161:15 202:5332:3,4 376:2276:16,18 87:18187:4 267:17short-term 167:2244:1 288:19situation 119:1598:9 110:7,9,13364:18 366:17shoulder 365:12289:19 293:4,6126:3 127:16110:15 124:8385:5 397:14shoulder 365:15simpler 234:21128:15 156:12139:22 164:14398:1show 191:20simplifying 238:17158:6 199:6177:8 184:3shared 255:1230:17 280:17simplifying 238:17158:6 199:6309:10 395:14260:10 267:10335:18 384:16simply 27:18 51:2245:19 246:8402:6269:21 348:4showed 271:1954:6,9 55:17249:1,21 254:7serving 4:12 28:6shareholder 157:5showing 64:1570:10 73:15323:16 324:10325:221,22 392:20167:8378:19136:2 137:3246:20 247:1,451:4 61:10 80:20385:7188:20 192:19291:4 294:8situations 66:435:24 85:19 86:17sharing 366:21shows 185:22172:10 288:8,21288:8 341:1351:4 61:10 80:20385:7188:20 192:19291:4 294:8situs 193:788:11 90:16,2142:20shure 23:7326:12,13 335:9333:19,20 151:1797:16 116:8 151:7Shaw 2:10 275:9sick 130:314:3369:19 378:1548:21 143:20163:3 209:10297:13 347:18388:13369:19 378:1548:21 143:20212:13 225:2350:3,7,12,20side 106:3 114:3369:19 378:1548:21 143:20226:2 256:7351:7			9		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,		-	
98:9 110:7,9,13364:18 366:17shoulder 365:12289:19 293:4,6126:3 127:16110:15 124:8385:5 397:14385:5 397:14shouldering 365:15simpler 234:21128:15 156:12139:22 164:14398:1show 191:20simplifying 238:17158:6 199:6177:8 184:3shared 255:1230:17 280:17simplistic 73:1209:21 213:3391:10 395:14260:10 267:10335:18 384:16simply 27:18 51:2245:19 246:8402:6269:21 348:4showed 271:1954:6,9 55:17249:1,21 254:7serving 4:12 28:6shareholders 17:7293:12 369:9104:15,16 119:13325:14 375:2067:13 308:1217:9 69:10 167:1shows 364:14122:8 135:18situations 66:4352:21,22 392:20167:8378:19136:2 137:3246:20 247:1,4set 3:5 7:6 36:13sharing 366:21shows 185:22172:10 288:8,21288:8 341:1351:4 61:10 80:20385:7188:20 192:19291:4 294:8situs 193:782:4 85:19 86:17sharply 41:22Shroeder 4:14296:11 308:8,9six 58:16 72:1588:11 90:16,2142:20shut 233:7326:12,13 335:9133:19,20 151:1797:16 116:8 151:7Shaw 2:10 275:9sick 120:13351:6 344:9Sixty 242:2153:6 162:22250:13,37,12,20side 106:3 114:3369:19 378:1548:21 143:20212:13 225:2350:3,7,12,20side 106:3 114:3simulate 59:10160:5 186:21226:2 256:7351:7,15 357:16121:18 159:15simulate 59:22239:1,2,3 250:17<		,			
110:15 124:8385:5 397:14shouldering 365:15simpler 234:21128:15 156:12139:22 164:14398:1show 191:20simplifying 238:17158:6 199:6177:8 184:3shared 255:1230:17 280:17simplistic 73:1209:21 213:3391:10 395:14260:10 267:10335:18 384:16simply 27:18 51:2245:19 246:8402:6269:21 348:4showed 271:1954:69 55:17249:1,21 254:7servicing 140:2shareholder 157:5showing 64:1570:10 73:15323:16 324:10serving 4:12 28:6shareholders 17:7293:12 369:9104:15,16 119:13325:14 375:2067:13 308:1217:9 69:10 167:1shown 364:14122:8 135:18situations 66:4352:21,22 392:20167:8378:19136:2 137:3246:20 247:1,4set 3:5 7:6 36:13sharing 366:21shows 185:22172:10 288:8,21288:8 341:1351:4 61:10 80:20385:7188:20 192:19291:4 294:8situs 193:782:4 85:19 86:17sharyly 41:22Shreder 4:14296:11 308:8,9situs 193:797:16 116:8 151:7Shaw 2:10 275:9sick 120:13355:16 344:9Sity 242:2153:6 162:22285:14,19 297:11sikest 385:22346:9 348:3size 23:15 44:18163:3 209:10297:13 347:18388:13369:19 378:1548:21 143:20212:13 225:2350:3,7,12,20side 106:3 114:3simulate 59:10160:5 186:21226:2 256:7351:7,15 357:16121:18 159:15simulate 59:22239:1,2,3 250:17276:18 277:19<	,				
139:22 164:14398:1show 191:20simplifying 238:17158:6 199:6177:8 184:3shared 255:1230:17 280:17simplifying 238:17158:6 199:6391:10 395:14260:10 267:10335:18 384:16simplistic 73:1209:21 213:3402:6269:21 348:4showed 271:1954:6,9 55:17249:1,21 254:7serving 140:2shareholder 157:5showing 64:1570:10 73:15323:16 324:10serving 4:12 28:6shareholders 17:7293:12 369:9104:15,16 119:13325:14 375:2067:13 308:1217:9 69:10 167:1shown 364:14122:8 135:18situations 66:4352:21,22 392:20167:8378:19136:2 137:3246:20 247:1,4set 3:5 7:6 36:13sharing 366:21shows 185:22172:10 288:8,21288:8 341:1351:4 61:10 80:20385:7188:20 192:19291:4 294:8situs 193:782:4 85:19 86:17sharply 41:22Shroeder 4:14296:11 308:8,9six 58:16 72:1588:11 90:16,2142:20shut 233:7326:12,13 335:9133:19,20 151:1797:16 116:8 151:7Shaw 2:10 275:9sickest 385:22346:9 348:3size 23:15 44:18163:3 209:10297:13 347:18388:13369:19 378:1548:21 143:20212:13 225:2350:3,7,12,20side 106:3 114:3simulate 59:10160:5 186:21226:2 256:7351:7,15 357:16121:18 159:15simulate 59:22239:1,2,3 250:17276:18 277:19shed 305:8250:2simulation 59:13skepticism 288:6					
177:8 184:3 391:10 395:14shared 255:1 260:10 267:10230:17 280:17 335:18 384:16simplistic 73:1 simply 27:18 51:2209:21 213:3 245:19 246:8402:6269:21 348:4 269:21 348:4showed 271:19 54:6,9 55:1754:6,9 55:17 249:1,21 254:7249:1,21 254:7 323:16 324:10serving 140:2 serving 4:12 28:6shareholder 157:5 shareholders 17:7showing 64:15 293:12 369:970:10 73:15 104:15,16 119:13 325:14 375:20323:16 324:10 325:14 375:2067:13 308:12 352:21,22 392:20167:8 167:8378:19136:2 137:3 188:20 192:19246:20 247:1,4 288:8,21set 3:5 7:6 36:13 81:1 90:16,21 97:16 116:8 151:7sharing 366:21 sharply 41:22shows 185:22 Shroeder 4:14 296:11 308:8,9situations 66:4 situs 193:782:4 85:19 86:17 97:16 116:8 151:7sharply 41:22 Shaw 2:10 275:9 297:13 347:18 212:13 225:2Shroeder 4:14 388:13 369:19 378:15Sixty 242:2 Sixty 242:2153:6 162:22 226:2 256:7 276:18 277:19 283:3 332:18290:10 297:13 305:8297:13 114:3 192:1 194:3,3 250:2simulate 59:10 61:21 sizes 254:4 sizes 254:4			6	-	
391:10 395:14 402:6260:10 267:10 269:21 348:4335:18 384:16 showed 271:19 showing 64:15simply 27:18 51:2 54:6,9 55:17245:19 246:8 249:1,21 254:7servicing 140:2 serving 4:12 28:6shareholder 157:5 shareholders 17:7showing 64:15 293:12 369:950:10 73:15 104:15,16 119:13325:14 375:2067:13 308:12 352:21,22 392:2017:9 69:10 167:1 167:8shown 364:14 378:19122:8 135:18 136:2 137:3situations 66:4 246:20 247:1,4set 3:5 7:6 36:13 81:1 90:16,21sharing 366:21 42:20shows 185:22 shut 233:7 sick 120:13172:10 288:8,21 291:4 294:8288:8 341:13 situs 193:797:16 116:8 151:7 97:16 116:8 151:7Shaw 2:10 275:9 297:13 347:18 212:13 225:2Shick 233:7 350:3,7,12,20335:16 344:9 sike 106:3 114:3 212:18 159:15size 23:15 44:18 48:21 143:20212:13 225:2 26:2 256:7 276:18 277:19 283:3 332:18297:13 347:18 shed 305:8388:13 250:2369:19 378:15 61:21 simulation 59:1348:21 143:20 239:1,2,3 250:17 61:21 size 254:4					
402:6269:21 348:4showed 271:1954:6,9 55:17249:1,21 254:7serving 140:2shareholder 157:5showing 64:1570:10 73:15323:16 324:10serving 4:12 28:6shareholders 17:7293:12 369:9104:15,16 119:13325:14 375:2067:13 308:1217:9 69:10 167:1shown 364:14122:8 135:18situations 66:4352:21,22 392:20167:8378:19136:2 137:3246:20 247:1,4set 3:5 7:6 36:13sharing 366:21shows 185:22172:10 288:8,21288:8 341:1351:4 61:10 80:20385:7188:20 192:19291:4 294:8situs 193:782:4 85:19 86:17sharply 41:22Shroeder 4:14296:11 308:8,9six 58:16 72:1588:11 90:16,2142:20shut 233:7326:12,13 335:9133:19,20 151:1797:16 116:8 151:7Shaw 2:10 275:9sick 120:13355:16 344:9Sixty 242:2153:6 162:22285:14,19 297:11sikest 385:22346:9 348:3size 23:15 44:18163:3 209:10297:13 347:18388:13369:19 378:1548:21 143:20212:13 225:2350:3,7,12,20side 106:3 114:3simulate 59:10160:5 186:21226:2 256:7351:7,15 357:16121:18 159:15simulate 59:12239:1,2,3 250:17276:18 277:19shed 7:9192:1 194:3,361:21sizes 254:4283:3 332:18sheds 305:8250:2simulation 59:13skepticism 288:6					
servicing 140:2 serving 4:12 28:6 67:13 308:12 352:21,22 392:20shareholder 157:5 shareholders 17:7 17:9 69:10 167:1 167:8 sharing 366:21 385:7showing 64:15 293:12 369:9 shown 364:14 378:1970:10 73:15 104:15,16 119:13 325:14 375:20323:16 324:10 325:14 375:20set 3:5 7:6 36:13 set 3:5 7:6 36:13 51:4 61:10 80:20 82:4 85:19 86:17 97:16 116:8 151:7167:8 sharply 41:22378:19 shows 185:22 188:20 192:19136:2 137:3 291:4 294:8246:20 247:1,4 246:20 247:1,488:11 90:16,21 97:16 116:8 151:7 153:6 162:22 212:13 225:2 225:2shar210 275:9 285:14,19 297:11 297:13 347:18 388:13Sheets 385:22 sick 120:13 388:13 388:13369:19 378:15 369:19 378:15Sixty 242:2 Sixty 242:2212:13 225:2 225:2 225:6:7 276:18 277:19 283:3 332:18351:7,15 357:16 shed 7:9 shed 7:9 250:2121:18 159:15 192:1 194:3,3 250:2Simulation 59:13160:5 186:21 239:12 249:12				1 0	
serving 4:12 28:6 67:13 308:12shareholders 17:7 17:9 69:10 167:1293:12 369:9 shown 364:14104:15,16 119:13 122:8 135:18325:14 375:20 situations 66:4352:21,22 392:20167:8shown 364:14 378:19122:8 135:18 136:2 137:33246:20 247:1,4set 3:5 7:6 36:13 51:4 61:10 80:20sharing 366:21 385:7shows 185:22 188:20 192:19172:10 288:8,21 291:4 294:8288:8 341:1351:4 61:10 80:20 82:4 85:19 86:17 88:11 90:16,21sharply 41:22 42:20Shroeder 4:14 shut 233:7296:11 308:8,9 326:12,13 335:9situs 193:7 six 58:16 72:1597:16 116:8 151:7 153:6 162:22 212:13 225:2Shaw 2:10 275:9 285:14,19 297:11 297:13 347:18 350:3,7,12,20sickest 385:22 side 106:3 114:3 388:13369:19 378:15 simulate 59:10Sixty 242:2 239:1,2,3 250:17 size 23:15 44:18 48:21 143:20226:2 256:7 276:18 277:19 283:3 332:18sheds 305:8250:2simulate 59:13size 23:14 43:20 simulation 59:13				,	,
67:13 308:1217:9 69:10 167:1shown 364:14122:8 135:18situations 66:4352:21,22 392:20167:8378:19136:2 137:3246:20 247:1,4set 3:5 7:6 36:13sharing 366:21shows 185:22172:10 288:8,21288:8 341:1351:4 61:10 80:20385:7188:20 192:19291:4 294:8situs 193:782:4 85:19 86:17sharply 41:22Shroeder 4:14296:11 308:8,9sits 58:16 72:1588:11 90:16,2142:20shut 233:7326:12,13 335:9133:19,20 151:1797:16 116:8 151:7Shaw 2:10 275:9sick 120:13335:16 344:9Sixty 242:2153:6 162:22285:14,19 297:11sickest 385:22346:9 348:3size 23:15 44:18163:3 209:10297:13 347:18388:13369:19 378:1548:21 143:20226:2 256:7351:7,15 357:16121:18 159:15simulate 59:10160:5 186:21276:18 277:19shed 7:9192:1 194:3,361:21size 254:4283:3 332:18sheds 305:8250:2simulation 59:13skepticism 288:6	-		0		
352:21,22 392:20167:8378:19136:2 137:3246:20 247:1,4set 3:5 7:6 36:13sharing 366:21shows 185:22172:10 288:8,21288:8 341:1351:4 61:10 80:20385:7188:20 192:19291:4 294:8situs 193:782:4 85:19 86:17sharply 41:22Shroeder 4:14296:11 308:8,9six 58:16 72:1588:11 90:16,2142:20shut 233:7326:12,13 335:9133:19,20 151:1797:16 116:8 151:7Shaw 2:10 275:9sick 120:13355:16 344:9Sixty 242:2153:6 162:22285:14,19 297:11sickest 385:22346:9 348:3size 23:15 44:18163:3 209:10297:13 347:18388:13369:19 378:1548:21 143:20212:13 225:2350:3,7,12,20side 106:3 114:3simulate 59:10160:5 186:21276:18 277:19shed 7:9192:1 194:3,361:21sizes 254:4283:3 332:18sheds 305:8250:2simulation 59:13skepticism 288:6					
set 3:5 7:6 36:13 51:4 61:10 80:20 82:4 85:19 86:17 97:16 116:8 151:7 153:6 162:22 226:2 256:7 276:18 277:19 283:3 332:18sharing 366:21 385:7 sharply 41:22 42:20shows 185:22 188:20 192:19 Shows 185:22 shows 185:22 188:20 192:19172:10 288:8,21 291:4 294:8 291:4 294:8 296:11 308:8,9 326:12,13 335:9288:8 341:13 situs 193:7 situs 193:7 situs 193:7 326:12,13 335:997:16 116:8 151:7 97:16 116:8 151:7Shaw 2:10 275:9 285:14,19 297:11 297:13 347:18 297:13 347:18 212:13 225:2 226:2 256:7 276:18 277:19sharing 366:21 42:20172:10 288:8,21 291:4 294:8 326:12,13 335:9288:8 341:13 situs 193:7 326:12,13 335:997:16 116:8 151:7 97:16 116:8 151:7Shaw 2:10 275:9 285:14,19 297:11 297:13 347:18 388:13sick 120:13 388:13351:6 344:9 369:19 378:15sixty 242:2 Sity 242:2160:5 186:21 297:13 347:18 296:11 21:18 159:15simulate 59:10 160:5 186:21 239:1,2,3 250:17160:5 186:21 239:1,2,3 250:17276:18 277:19 283:3 332:18sheds 305:8250:2simulation 59:13skepticism 288:6					
51:4 61:10 80:20385:7188:20 192:19291:4 294:8situs 193:782:4 85:19 86:17sharply 41:22Shroeder 4:14296:11 308:8,9six 58:16 72:1588:11 90:16,2142:20shut 233:7326:12,13 335:9133:19,20 151:1797:16 116:8 151:7Shaw 2:10 275:9sick 120:13335:16 344:9Sixty 242:2153:6 162:22285:14,19 297:11sickest 385:22346:9 348:3size 23:15 44:18163:3 209:10297:13 347:18388:13369:19 378:1548:21 143:20212:13 225:2350:3,7,12,20side 106:3 114:3simulate 59:10160:5 186:21226:2 256:7351:7,15 357:16121:18 159:15simulate 59:22239:1,2,3 250:17276:18 277:19shed 7:9192:1 194:3,361:21sizes 254:4283:3 332:18sheds 305:8250:2simulation 59:13skepticism 288:6	,	sharing 366:21	shows 185:22		
88:11 90:16,2142:20shut 233:7326:12,13 335:9133:19,20 151:1797:16 116:8 151:7Shaw 2:10 275:9sick 120:13335:16 344:9Sixty 242:2153:6 162:22285:14,19 297:11sickest 385:22346:9 348:3size 23:15 44:18163:3 209:10297:13 347:18388:13369:19 378:1548:21 143:20212:13 225:2350:3,7,12,20side 106:3 114:3simulate 59:10160:5 186:21226:2 256:7351:7,15 357:16121:18 159:15simulate 59:22239:1,2,3 250:17276:18 277:19shed 7:9192:1 194:3,361:21sizes 254:4283:3 332:18sheds 305:8250:2simulation 59:13skepticism 288:6	51:4 61:10 80:20	e	188:20 192:19		situs 193:7
88:11 90:16,2142:20shut 233:7326:12,13 335:9133:19,20 151:1797:16 116:8 151:7Shaw 2:10 275:9sick 120:13335:16 344:9Sixty 242:2153:6 162:22285:14,19 297:11sickest 385:22346:9 348:3size 23:15 44:18163:3 209:10297:13 347:18388:13369:19 378:1548:21 143:20212:13 225:2350:3,7,12,20side 106:3 114:3simulate 59:10160:5 186:21226:2 256:7351:7,15 357:16121:18 159:15simulate 59:22239:1,2,3 250:17276:18 277:19shed 7:9192:1 194:3,361:21sizes 254:4283:3 332:18sheds 305:8250:2simulation 59:13skepticism 288:6	82:4 85:19 86:17	sharply 41:22	Shroeder 4:14	296:11 308:8,9	six 58:16 72:15
153:6 162:22285:14,19 297:11sickest 385:22346:9 348:3size 23:15 44:18163:3 209:10297:13 347:18388:13369:19 378:1548:21 143:20212:13 225:2350:3,7,12,20side 106:3 114:3simulate 59:10160:5 186:21226:2 256:7351:7,15 357:16121:18 159:15simulated 59:22239:1,2,3 250:17276:18 277:19shed 7:9192:1 194:3,361:21sizes 254:4283:3 332:18sheds 305:8250:2simulation 59:13skepticism 288:6	88:11 90:16,21	- ·	shut 233:7	326:12,13 335:9	133:19,20 151:17
163:3 209:10297:13 347:18388:13369:19 378:1548:21 143:20212:13 225:2350:3,7,12,20side 106:3 114:3simulate 59:10160:5 186:21226:2 256:7351:7,15 357:16121:18 159:15simulated 59:22239:1,2,3 250:17276:18 277:19shed 7:9192:1 194:3,361:21sizes 254:4283:3 332:18sheds 305:8250:2simulation 59:13skepticism 288:6		Shaw 2:10 275:9	sick 120:13	,	,
212:13 225:2350:3,7,12,20side 106:3 114:3simulate 59:10160:5 186:21226:2 256:7351:7,15 357:16121:18 159:15simulated 59:22239:1,2,3 250:17276:18 277:19shed 7:9192:1 194:3,361:21sizes 254:4283:3 332:18sheds 305:8250:2simulation 59:13skepticism 288:6	153:6 162:22	285:14,19 297:11	sickest 385:22	346:9 348:3	size 23:15 44:18
226:2 256:7 276:18 277:19 283:3 332:18351:7,15 357:16 shed 7:9 sheds 305:8121:18 159:15 192:1 194:3,3 250:2simulated 59:22 61:21 simulation 59:13239:1,2,3 250:17 sizes 254:4 skepticism 288:6	163:3 209:10	297:13 347:18	388:13	369:19 378:15	48:21 143:20
276:18 277:19 283:3 332:18shed 7:9 sheds 305:8192:1 194:3,3 250:261:21 simulation 59:13sizes 254:4 skepticism 288:6	212:13 225:2	350:3,7,12,20	side 106:3 114:3	simulate 59:10	160:5 186:21
283:3 332:18 sheds 305:8 250:2 simulation 59:13 skepticism 288:6		351:7,15 357:16	121:18 159:15	simulated 59:22	
			,		
371:6 378:22 Shield 5:9 6:8 sides 190:4 61:15 261:16 295:1					-
	371:6 378:22	Shield 5:9 6:8	sides 190:4	61:15 261:16	295:1

		I	1		
skewed 20:1	329:19,22 330:3	180:20 184:15	277:22 369:15	276:21 283:9,14	
skim 166:15	333:6 334:15	185:1 201:20	383:4	283:19 284:5	
skinny 111:21	346:5 347:10,14	211:5 218:7,8	sources 81:5 137:9	314:14 315:9	
157:3	349:21 350:13	233:14 236:18	138:7,17 289:20	381:11 385:8	
Skip 145:20	357:12,15,20,22	246:14 254:8	South 1:12	spending 41:2	
skipped 378:2,5	Smith's 297:15	319:5 340:16	space 361:11	125:5 220:17	
slight 244:17	334:8	358:11 401:6	Spagnoletti 24:9	283:21 310:13	
slightly 209:11	smoking 344:7	sort 98:11 123:10	25:3 28:13	331:14 381:16	
265:21	345:18	189:8 227:6,19	speak 11:16 20:13	384:13	
slim 329:17	snapshot 175:6,7	235:18,19 247:9	35:18 44:4 147:8	spent 29:3 67:12	
slip 202:15	175:12 176:3	260:18 261:19	203:8 272:19	94:7 110:17 205:5	
slippery 398:17	Snowden 405:9	262:19 263:2	275:18 284:19	284:10 312:21	
slope 398:17	social 394:3	265:4 349:19	296:5 297:12	392:14	
slow 91:6	societal 74:7	370:11 371:11	302:20 303:2	spike 161:13	
slowing 91:15	society 23:4 67:7	388:11	309:14 345:6	spiking 225:21	
small 30:8,12,20	119:21 122:20	sorts 144:10 160:7	358:21	spite 239:18	
31:2,15 32:1,10	285:9,16,17	233:10 240:12	speakers 14:4	split 180:6 186:1	
32:20 33:5,12,18	softened 86:8	sought 19:15 34:12	speaking 14:5	188:20 193:20	
34:13 35:16 37:13	sold 39:6 382:13	49:14 103:1	121:13 246:6	spoke 116:16	
115:22 119:6	solely 24:14 217:3	141:12 201:2,10	291:21 293:8	166:14	
135:3 139:16,16	solicit 325:17	394:7	309:6 375:16	sponsored 96:7,22	
154:12 166:7	solicitous 278:20	sound 29:13 92:8	377:5 380:21	sponsoring 94:22	
169:10,16 172:4	solid 135:2,21	200:3,5,7,22	395:19	sponsorship 220:6	
187:22 199:9	154:7 362:3	201:7 206:1 210:9	special 21:2 178:15	spreadsheet 248:18	
223:4 241:20	solidity 135:6	222:21 287:19	Specialist 1:22	spreadsheeted	
244:14 248:17	solidly 64:10	397:3	specialists 96:11	169:17	
250:11,14,22	solvency 67:22	soundness 17:19	286:19	spreadsheets	
270:12 339:7	84:1 87:15 88:5	18:4 25:20 29:11	specialties 69:8	169:11	
373:22 383:9	277:15 360:13	29:14 72:21 122:6	specific 65:13	stability 80:9	
397:15 398:6	361:18 372:19	123:9 196:12,15	92:21 97:3 197:10	362:11 375:19	
smaller 71:22 89:7	381:9 403:5	196:15,20,22	213:13 219:14	stabilization 92:8	
170:14,15 181:4	solvent 152:10	199:19 200:1,10	222:12 238:6	stable 67:1 250:7	
198:16 264:13	228:1,6	200:19 202:4,12	239:9 242:10	381:12	
smallest 220:21	somebody 113:21	202:21,22 204:14	254:15,18 273:15	stacking 232:13	
280:9	136:20 223:12	210:20 211:9	281:13 287:12	staff 9:18 95:10	
Smith 2:9 266:1	265:3 296:6	212:8 276:16	377:3	99:3 104:16	
274:12 275:5,6	somewhat 89:21	277:9,15 316:16	specifically 82:22	212:19 358:18	
295:7,17 313:18	91:7 166:21	326:5 328:20	93:18 101:1 163:4	stage 119:5 273:20	
314:12,18,20	171:20 200:11	337:16 356:10	219:5 268:11	stagger 244:17	
315:6,18 316:2	225:9 261:22	370:3	287:16 291:22	stakeholders 86:12	
317:5,11 318:6	277:13	sounds 190:6,8	306:19 402:13	stamp 374:6	
319:5,11,14,20	Sondra 2:12 358:3	194:3 318:2 336:2	specifics 367:12	stand 45:19 52:3	
320:8,14,19 321:4	358:8,18	source 20:1 35:6	specified 21:15	64:10 72:12 74:17	
321:8 323:1,15,20	soon 120:3	102:17 137:13,14	308:10	144:5 146:21	
323:22 324:8,21	sophisticated 121:6	137:18,19 138:20	speculative 229:13	standard 195:22	
325:5 326:1	150:4 169:8 392:9	141:19,19 143:7	speed 31:17	211:7 238:11	
327:12 328:22	sorry 53:12 144:14	144:8 272:5	spend 143:22	259:15 316:5,7,19	

		I	I	
334:13 336:21	367:15 402:19	271:8 272:8 277:8	stop 132:8 146:8	197:10 199:18
353:22,22 354:8	statement 9:6 11:8	282:3,4 283:6	236:1 272:14	364:14
354:10,15 355:6,7	157:18 178:18	284:6 312:18	382:15	study 53:8,8,9 54:7
356:14,17 374:18	184:21 188:9	314:13,18,21	stops 337:12	54:14,19 64:3
375:3 403:6	192:16 260:14	315:6,11 317:13	stores 369:2	68:12,13 71:5
standards 6:1	292:14 293:9	322:2 326:15	story 38:22	74:15 233:1 366:2
173:6 286:1	295:5,12 297:3	327:13 334:18	straightforward	stuff 254:11,16,18
337:10 343:11	298:3,16 299:21	335:1 337:2	84:22 92:22	354:3
391:13 403:2	314:2 340:15	354:11,17,20	strategic 75:19	subject 5:20 53:6
standing 80:5	380:9,10 389:13	355:10,13 356:2,8	strategy 92:9 121:3	57:19 64:19
144:12 285:20	statements 12:7	356:18 373:20	streams 172:11	143:10 170:16
390:16	25:5 43:21 44:8	381:10	234:12	224:18 226:9
standpoint 198:3	81:10 158:9,10	statutory 4:21 8:11	Street 1:12 12:9	305:12 361:10
200:22 203:1	159:4 160:20	81:9 157:20,21	strength 164:16	397:18
207:4 238:6	265:4 289:17	158:8,20,22	361:19	subjected 56:11
342:16 361:22	293:22 294:12	159:11,17 160:9	strengths 238:8,9	subjective 256:14
375:22	298:12 299:1,11	160:11 161:18	238:11	subjectivity 200:9
stands 239:7 264:9	301:22 303:9	164:8 221:15	stress 62:14 268:22	submission 44:6
start 16:17 20:11	307:15 341:6	298:3 354:16	287:18 289:13	74:19 191:19
35:21 93:9 157:20	384:16	355:16 373:5	strictly 389:22	276:7 290:8
166:2 170:7 176:8	states 5:9 16:3	stay 131:16,17	strike 109:8 376:1	291:22 293:19
258:19 304:4	22:15 28:1 68:14	132:14 151:10	striking 377:2	345:14
359:7 371:4	71:16 75:21 76:10	163:5 216:5	string 282:5	submissions 7:15
started 3:4 13:8	78:18 81:8 85:1,2	236:22 252:20	stringent 79:18	12:13
31:4 86:7 175:12	85:2,5,10,18,20	stayed 106:16	strings 145:10	submit 12:6,7 13:1
220:1 225:21	86:16 87:22 88:11	132:2	strive 70:3 198:12	183:14 221:8
232:7 370:15	88:19 93:6 306:20	steadily 30:9 32:7	strong 19:19 68:20	349:20
starting 134:16	310:21 362:20	94:15	73:3 338:16 397:3	submitted 9:8
173:11	363:1 392:21	steady 157:3	401:19 402:9	267:2 271:1
starts 125:2 175:3	393:10	stenographic 11:11	404:8	279:22 290:9
state 36:18 37:6,9	state's 16:6 374:3	step 34:8 304:17	stronger 68:20	291:5 294:16
44:16 68:3 77:21	statistically 232:11	317:2 318:16	strongest 102:2	380:8 389:11
79:8 85:14,17	statistics 30:6	322:10,14 337:20	strongly 52:5 227:9	submitting 221:14
86:5,13 88:2	116:20	337:21,22 348:9	struck 207:15	275:13 353:12
128:2,22 143:4	status 22:12 23:1,6	354:2,2	296:4,6 325:21	subpart 201:17
192:17 211:12	23:10 248:8	Stephen 1:22 4:10	326:20,22 327:8	subscribe 206:17
263:21 266:22	304:16 315:5	stepped 144:21	328:6 392:11	subscribed 205:21
308:8 312:18	398:19	379:16	structure 69:14	subscriber 27:5,15
313:9 344:4	statute 13:4 117:21	steps 178:20 241:2	79:8 356:7	29:16 38:11 50:20
362:14 380:17	181:19 195:20	300:22 324:9,22	struggle 201:13	50:22 99:17
390:19	196:5,10,12	325:1 338:2,11	struggling 48:2,9	113:15,21 118:6
stated 28:21 51:2	197:11,16,18,22	356:18 371:21	154:16 200:15	119:8 123:16
93:11 123:18,18	202:21 203:14	stick 55:15 389:21	392:5,8	153:17 156:6
123:21 208:21	208:1,10 212:3	stipulates 85:15	studied 65:14 66:4	181:7 186:7,21
293:2 306:7	218:11 269:7	stock 137:5 369:6	studies 53:5 54:4	192:3 249:16
307:21 337:4	270:8,10,14,15,17	369:10,15	54:16 55:13 57:6	311:5 372:10,18
342:11 361:14,20	270:18,22 271:5,7	stockholders 138:1	62:20 63:2,16	381:21 386:12
L	•	•	•	-

	1	1		
subscribers 5:17	366:11,22 367:1,6	315:17 319:8	213:21 214:13	90:13,18,21 91:2
15:11 21:20,21	372:14 374:10	suggesting 160:21	215:16 217:18	91:18 92:4,6,20
23:3 25:12 26:2,4	375:5 381:22	177:21	221:12 229:21	92:21 102:9,10,13
26:8,15 27:2,13	383:13 387:14,18	suggestion 363:9	231:14 237:17	103:2,14 106:3
27:16,20 28:7,12	393:2	suggestions 234:7	238:17 239:13	107:2,8 108:16,17
28:17,21 29:2,8	subsection 184:13	273:4,8,18	245:2 264:8 281:5	111:9,10 127:10
29:12,18 33:22	271:2,10	suggests 30:19 82:5	293:6 307:14	130:7 131:3,10
35:2,8,11 41:8	Subsections 3:16	92:11	309:14 311:13	132:9 136:9
43:11 47:13,16,19	subsidiaries 163:9	suit 32:4	325:4 332:3 337:6	137:10 139:3
48:2,10,15 49:4	163:11,15 164:2,4	sum 300:3,18,20	342:10 344:15	140:18 142:9,14
50:5,19 51:6,13	164:8 180:13,14	394:9	349:17 350:5	142:18,20 143:15
52:1 54:22 63:14	181:3	summarize 16:17	353:16 362:17	146:3 153:2,11
66:8,15 75:7 80:8	subsidiary 4:4	24:10 63:1 264:4	379:5 382:22	155:12,14 157:21
87:19 88:7 89:16	71:16 76:4 163:18	267:3 309:5	385:6 403:12	157:22 158:21
93:14,15 94:7,10	180:16	380:10	404:2	159:17 160:11
97:3 102:17	subsidies 37:21	summarized 54:6	surely 273:13	163:22 168:18
108:21 109:2,18	39:12 40:18 42:16	290:10	313:20	171:1 172:16,17
110:4,7,10 113:4	95:22 96:2 129:13	summarizes 298:13	surface 220:2	175:12,17,21
113:8,8,10,12,14	131:20 221:3	summary 92:17	surplus 1:7,14 4:1	180:7 184:13
114:7 115:18	387:9	123:14 377:14	4:20,21 5:6,20	185:16,17 186:11
116:12 117:10	subsidize 366:9	sums 19:3,9	6:12,13,21,22 7:3	190:5 196:4 197:9
123:5 124:11,11	384:22	supplement 212:3	7:11 8:11,12,18	197:12,19 203:20
126:19,22 130:20	subsidy 153:22	supplemental	9:4 12:17,22 15:6	204:1,7,16 205:1
137:15,22 138:6,8	substantial 31:5	125:15	15:7,21,22 16:5	205:4 208:4,8
142:2 152:14,18	94:17,18 121:19	supply 219:18	17:11 19:20 23:16	210:17 211:2
152:20,22 153:4,5	249:9	support 20:21 24:5	25:17 27:11 45:6	223:1 224:19
153:9,9,12 155:7	substantially 38:10	79:5,13 99:3,11	45:11 46:7,11	230:8 231:18
155:16,17,20	41:20 71:2 384:22	110:10 174:3	52:7,10 53:7,8	232:3 245:12
156:1,19 157:6,8	substitute 125:4	250:1 286:13	54:7,9,14,17,20	246:9,15,21 247:2
165:9 175:22	sub-specialties	311:8 379:7	55:3,9,10,13,13	247:15 248:3
180:12 181:18	68:21	388:12 395:20	55:16 57:6 58:4	252:10,13 253:17
185:17,18 200:14	succeed 47:17	supportable 250:2	59:5 60:2,7,14,16	254:1 264:3 268:2
200:15 205:9	succinct 21:7	250:4	60:21 61:3,6 62:3	269:9 270:2,19
213:6 218:14	sudden 156:17	supported 51:9	62:12,13,16,17	271:16 277:1,18
243:7 249:4 271:4	suffer 35:4 66:8	121:7 392:18	64:3,20 65:12,15	277:22 278:2,6,19
271:11,19 272:1	suffers 122:17	supports 306:4	70:1,17 71:5,8,22	279:2,11 283:7,10
272:10 277:22	sufficiency 82:21	360:20	72:9 74:14 77:11	287:5,9 289:12,16
278:1 283:2,10,15	sufficient 89:12	suppose 324:21	77:14,20 78:4,8,9	290:7 292:16
283:19,22 284:5	90:22 91:12 294:7	supposed 328:7	78:12,14,18,21	293:14 295:17,19
284:10,11,12	316:15 364:21	338:2,3 383:21	79:1,5,17 80:3	297:17,18 299:6,8
297:1,7 306:6	370:14,22 373:15	Supreme 307:6	81:1,3 82:4 83:1,3	299:14,15 300:17
308:6 314:3,8,8	sufficiently 61:4	sure 22:6 124:21	83:21 84:21 85:4	301:1,10,11,16,16
314:11,15 315:1	suggest 52:6 73:20	139:11 144:4	85:6,7,11,19 86:2	302:14 309:8
315:11,15 323:12	156:14 272:11	176:3 178:6	86:3,18,19,20	310:2,9,13,22
329:6 362:7	346:7 348:5 369:4	182:11 183:7	87:2,5,7,8,21,22	311:3 314:1,14
363:21 364:8	suggested 80:16	191:9 195:13	88:8,12,19,20,21	315:17,21 316:8
365:11,13,14	111:11 206:16	197:6 207:22	88:22 89:3 90:10	316:13,20 317:4,7

217.01 219.1		227.00 246.17	4	240.10.259.12
317:21 318:1	swear 266:7 274:22	337:22 346:17	targeted 35:9	340:10 358:13
319:10,19 320:13	358:10,12,15	371:20 373:11	224:14	380:2 390:7
320:17 321:2,16	379:21 380:2	381:6,13 389:19	targets 33:16 60:2	telling 35:21
321:17 323:5,11	390:7	taken 35:2,14 51:8	78:9 82:4,6	121:16
325:7 327:4,6	swearing 9:15	56:13 83:16	task 203:7,7	temporarily 39:7
328:14 330:13	swelled 86:9	126:22 161:18	tax 22:11 23:10	87:10 154:4
331:12,14,20,22	sworn 13:12,17	200:14 206:4	36:4,11 37:3,7,10	tempting 125:21
332:20 336:3,11	14:1 274:15,21	215:11 228:11	37:12,15 41:17	ten 174:17 175:18
336:12 338:19	390:6	322:6 326:6 329:1	110:19 111:4,6	176:2,4 187:6
339:1,20 341:4	synonymous 135:7	341:5 346:2	127:18,18,20,21	188:6 193:4
342:19 345:12	136:13 221:22	356:18 387:3	128:7,9,10,12,13	225:13 244:1,2
349:5 352:9,9	system 96:7 97:2,4	takes 100:20	128:14,21 129:3	245:17 263:3
354:22 355:4,9,15	120:19 167:4	121:11 140:18	130:4,13,14	tend 154:11,12
356:15 358:22	272:2 282:18	147:5 293:2	131:18 159:6,6,8	156:10 171:12,13
359:3,12 360:8,9	376:16 393:13	talent 69:15	159:9,11 228:20	191:15 342:7
360:12,16 361:7	systems 58:22	talk 15:6 102:8	228:21 229:1,10	tended 232:10
362:21 363:10,11	121:6	127:3,5 130:17	304:12,15 312:15	tends 112:19
363:18 364:3,6,9	T	141:2 215:21	312:16 313:5,16	156:10
364:10,11,21		218:3 238:4 246:8	339:18 365:20	tens 59:10 250:19
365:5,10 367:13	T 178:18 192:15	254:18 273:16	366:12	tension 154:18
368:20,22 369:11	299:17 311:13,19	285:6 293:4	taxation 22:10	tenured 286:17
369:20,22 370:8	313:7,13 350:21	305:10 352:4	304:15	ten-year 175:15
371:5,16,17	351:5,16	381:20 382:2	taxes 23:2 36:17,20	term 58:8 123:3
372:12,17 373:9	table 2:1 14:9	395:18	37:20 39:11 40:18	166:21 202:21
373:11,16,17,21	275:15	talked 152:15	42:16 43:10 168:8	222:20 224:5,16
374:3,8,14,16,22	tables 71:4 395:18	159:2 169:13	168:12,12,13	350:4
377:11 378:18	tabulated 178:17	176:16 189:6	taxpayer 19:11	terms 6:18 18:16
379:2 381:4	take 7:13 23:9 39:9	213:18 249:21	Taylor 1:22 4:10	21:7 38:6 90:11
384:21 385:19	52:2 63:12 99:16	265:10 352:8	team 102:4 255:21	102:9 118:20
387:10 391:19	100:18 101:4	387:13	390:20	139:7 168:15,17
395:15	102:19 103:21	talking 125:18,19	teams 136:4	170:12 189:20
surpluses 17:7	112:1,14 126:16	140:11 161:2	technical 54:5 56:2	235:11 241:19
86:14 88:17 92:12	127:14 129:7	184:12 205:6,18	64:16 67:20 76:7	250:6 256:14
164:8	136:7 139:17	205:19 213:21	83:11 142:11	273:4 311:14
surplus-related	140:1 147:1 152:9	214:6,22 229:22	160:12 232:4,17	334:13 351:5
70:2	165:9 166:21	240:14 260:1	233:4	386:15
surprise 186:9	167:12 178:9	321:13 324:11	technically 189:17	terrorism 150:19
326:2	181:13 193:6,7	332:5,7 378:12	286:17	terrorist 58:18
surprised 352:19	194:19 227:11	talkinga 212:11	technology 138:14	74:3
surprising 88:2	239:10 241:2	talks 146:2 328:4	teeth 334:19	test 29:9 122:13,18
surrogate 347:4	243:12 251:9,12	tallied 245:14	tell 46:13 95:4	122:18,19 181:18
surrounding 39:18	252:17 257:16,21	tanking 383:5	105:13 154:19	208:8 211:19
40:22 399:7	267:19,22 268:4	target 8:12 33:20	165:21 168:17	221:16 228:2
survive 228:14	270:5 273:7	60:14 61:3 62:14	174:17 214:15	317:8 368:7
suspended 39:7	279:20 288:9	71:8 72:9 77:20	248:13 255:18	tested 72:6 148:10
sustained 18:17	290:11 298:20	97:20 196:4 208:8	266:7 274:22	261:14 292:18
154:5 155:1	324:9,10,22 330:7	222:20 382:2	282:1 328:3	testified 14:1 386:6

				_
396:6,8	194:18 195:1,16	166:11,19 181:1	134:19 143:11,18	321:8,20 322:1,3
testify 9:10 10:3	222:8 245:10	189:11 193:12	147:2,12 150:1	327:2,11 328:22
195:11 390:21	265:20 266:1,10	202:13 220:4	151:1,15 155:4,18	329:13 330:3,12
395:13 399:2	272:16,17 274:6,9	238:21 239:21	157:6 160:18	330:17,19 332:15
404:14	274:10,19 275:4	244:7 249:2 267:6	161:15 162:13	332:16,21 333:7
testifying 13:13	284:20,21 295:2,8	278:13 280:22	164:5,12,17,22	333:11 334:7,12
testimonies 10:19	295:10 297:9,10	281:20 296:13	166:3 167:13	334:18 335:1,3
testimony 7:15	297:11 302:17	325:2 328:11	168:7.22 171:17	336:6,7,22 337:2
9:20 10:12,15	313:17 341:9	337:20 344:14	173:8 176:14,14	337:5,8,10,17
11:3,17,19 12:2,6	349:21 357:14,20	346:10 354:13	178:13 182:19.20	338:1,11,12,20
44:5 53:13,20	357:21,22 358:5	things 20:15 21:3	182:21 183:11,12	339:10 343:7
63:7 84:19 93:2,8	358:16,20 375:8	35:13 105:22	182:22 183:11,12	345:1,2,19 346:13
93:11 94:2 108:22	375:10,11,11,13	118:7,9 127:12	188:4 189:10,13	347:15 348:9,11
117:7 124:18	376:20 377:18,19	135:8 147:18	190:8 191:18	350:10,10 352:1,2
125:1 126:17	379:10,11,18	148:4,13 149:1,6	190.8 191.18	352:5,14 353:10
127:3 129:2	380:6,7 389:4,5	149:6 160:19	195:18 197:20	353:11,13 354:15
130:17 146:1	389:14,15 394:11	165:17 166:21	195.18 197.20	354:18,20 355:1,7
152:15 160:17	395:3,4,6,12	173:13 177:14	201:12 202:5,20	355:18 356:3
187:4,9 189:6	399:21 400:1,6,7	178:4,20 179:19	203:4,11,15 204:4	357:1,4 361:8
210:16,19 211:7	400:14 401:11	189:21 190:11	203.4,11,15 204.4 204:8,17 205:10	371:10 375:12
210:10,19 211.7 212:10,18,22	404:13,17,18,18	197:3 201:10	206:3,10 207:3,21	376:5,6 378:9
212:10,18,22 214:5 215:21	404.13,17,18,18	205:11 210:4	208:7,18 210:18	387:15 396:21
219:6 244:8 252:7	thanks 265:16	213:16 220:2,10	211:13 212:9,21	thinking 34:3
256:9 259:2	266:14 274:8	220:12,20 223:15	213:9 214:21	145:9 227:5 272:4
263:21 267:2,12	theirs 130:5	229:10 232:20	217:20 218:4	280:16
272:18 274:18	theme 155:4	233:11 234:7	219:5,6,21 220:14	thinks 107:12
275:13 276:1	themes 18:22 65:11	238:18 240:15	221:4 223:12	354:7
285:4 286:4 290:9	86:3 155:5	241:11 251:6,8	229:19 230:17	third 57:22 84:20
290:12,13 291:5	theoretically	252:21 259:1	231:15 232:6	166:19 201:5
293:2 297:15	209:13 323:19	278:18 298:11	233:16 236:9	263:22 312:10
332:10 350:14	theories 303:11	305:9 322:22	237:4,10,22	341:18 342:2,8,17
352:8 361:12	theory 16:15,17	326:4 329:3	238:10,19,21	343:9 392:3
367:21 371:19	17:15 18:2,12	337:18 345:8,10	244:10 245:13,16	393:15
376:6 380:11	20:10,12 24:6	346:8 352:7 399:6	247:3 249:1 252:8	Thomas 2:5 6:10
381:1 382:4 386:5	27:8 34:18 42:11	think 53:14 66:11	252:16 255:6,15	13:21
387:16 389:8	47:9,10 49:16,21	69:15 93:15,22	258:4 260:7 264:8	thorough 62:21
392:10 398:14	51:9 144:11 192:9	99:15 100:2 104:8	264:20 265:14,15	389:8
400:3 401:15	303:18 364:21	107:10,12,21	265:18 269:19	thoroughly 63:20
404:19,22	thereof 345:5	108:3,5,22 111:13	271:16 273:15,20	289:15
testing 62:14 81:21	thin 112:19 167:10	112:3,8 115:3,4	276:14,19 277:2	thoroughness
261:19 262:20	213:19	117:7 118:1,3,17	283:20 295:15,18	363:6
tests 150:12 261:17	thing 28:3 34:11	123:17 124:14,15	297:4 304:19	Thou 114:16
thank 3:8 13:15	51:5 109:1,9	125:8 126:22	305:8 309:20,21	thought 94:1
52:10,11 53:21	118:16 127:6	127:13 129:5	311:7,12 312:10	105:20,21 125:9
54:3 75:9,12 93:7	128:17 129:1	130:11,12,14	314:6,21 315:12	141:12 148:20,22
93:9 145:21	130:8 131:14	131:12 132:19	316:16 317:2,7,16	150:13 155:19
152:12 157:12	139:15 151:12	133:5 134:15,16	318:6,7,13,17,19	173:19 189:15
		-		

191:12 193:17	throw 240:10	16:20 20:8 53:6	255:22 257:5	transparency
199:2 222:21	thumb 65:11	93:2 120:17	260:12 261:4,8,22	289:22 290:1
237:19 261:20	Thursday 1:9	151:21 165:5	262:7,22 263:5,9	292:8 343:12
276:12 315:9	ties 144:10	185:7 197:14	263:11,15 290:19	363:5
335:11 338:18	tight 377:20	212:10 219:6	340:16,19,21	transparent 288:1
345:17 346:6	tightening 374:11	244:13 266:15	342:15 377:22	289:4 291:3
352:13 355:4	Tilden 99:2	275:14 276:13	378:8	346:11,16
388:10	till 347:12	295:13 303:7	tools 81:21 83:14	travel 349:17
thoughtful 271:17	tilt 154:14	325:13 334:2,6,22	top 26:20 111:6	treat 159:8
thoughts 153:16	time 11:9 12:1,2	350:4,13,14	129:4,10 149:3	treated 137:4 181:4
272:21 314:9	22:12 32:12 36:2	358:21 361:12	224:21 226:11	235:12
324:3 353:15	43:3 47:3 51:22	368:1 375:8,14	232:13 250:13	treatment 62:10
375:21	53:16 63:3 75:9	378:13 380:12,21	253:13 292:11	66:11 78:18
thousand 250:16	75:11 86:9 97:2	399:11,22 401:2	328:11 333:4	177:19
thousands 26:3,5	118:18 136:11,11	401:14 404:19	377:22 378:11	treatments 160:13
250:19	145:6,12 149:12	405:3	toss 155:12	tremendous 278:17
threat 135:21	149:22 156:5,16	today's 4:17 7:8	total 10:18 15:1	tremendously
threaten 277:15	175:20 176:1,6	9:13 10:21 144:3	32:22 38:2,5	157:11
threatened 87:16	179:13 205:6	151:3	40:17 46:19 47:7	trend 118:15 187:1
three 5:1 10:18	206:6 210:8	told 105:14 279:9	131:20 140:14	225:21 235:16
31:11 37:18,19,22	225:16 246:3	327:17 368:6	163:13 199:8,15	256:17 257:11,13
38:3,8,13,19	251:3 252:4	Tom 14:7 75:13	219:15 220:16	trends 30:7 109:13
39:16 40:21 41:2	255:13 262:3	tomorrow 11:1	241:21 299:14,17	110:8 148:18
53:5,7 63:16	267:4 274:11	337:6 389:13	300:3,12,14,18,20	168:1 224:20
67:12 71:10,18,19	285:4 292:1 295:5	405:12	300:20 301:15,16	241:13 251:15
80:18 81:2 85:20	299:2 301:5,7	tool 84:13 143:15	301:16 302:4	triangle 95:19,20
89:11,13 139:1,12	302:8,9 309:1	231:7	397:16	220:18,20
161:9 166:5	318:11 327:19	Toole 1:24 4:13	totally 231:6	tried 108:21 225:11
209:20 210:12	328:3 330:7 337:6	138:21 139:5,11	235:12	281:2 324:15
213:17 223:5,7,22	343:8 345:2	140:16 141:2,6	touch 172:14 309:4	tries 109:15
225:10 226:19,19	360:22 374:13	142:8 143:14	touched 363:10	trigger 91:8 265:11
227:7,7,13 234:11	383:5 389:21,22	222:10 224:8	touchstone 312:11	265:11
234:16 244:12	390:1 398:13,16	225:1 226:2,12	tough 135:11 137:2	triggering 84:7
257:12,14 258:13	400:20 401:22	227:15,20 228:5,8	TPA 163:16	triggers 265:13
259:4,6 265:13	timekeeper 379:16	228:10,19 229:6	track 49:2	triple 39:17
267:15 279:20	times 31:12 34:6	229:12 230:2,4,9	tracking 383:20	trouble 136:19,20
280:17 310:18	151:3 198:9 252:7	230:19 231:21	trade 137:6	136:21 141:16
363:12 389:19,20	256:12 363:12	233:14 234:10	trademark 60:22	145:11 219:13
389:22	369:20 396:9	235:4 236:1,17	61:7	323:10
three-quarters	399:2	238:1,10,15 239:6	tradeoff 116:3	true 38:16 70:15
30:11	timing 229:10	240:10,16 241:1	321:15 322:7	96:3,4 116:15
three-year 72:1,7	tiny 220:16	242:2,4,9,19	traditional 87:1	131:6 193:12
167:16 259:7	tip 220:19	243:3 245:10,18	transactions	246:22 262:8
threshold 60:9,18	title 6:1 11:19	246:1,4,7,12,16	251:22	270:10,13 308:15
60:22 61:7 80:1	titled 8:17 9:3	246:22 247:8,13	transcriber 10:8	336:7 386:12
265:1 403:4	today 4:6 7:18 9:11	247:19 248:1,7,19	195:12	truly 152:10
thresholds 62:16	10:3,22 15:5,14	249:20 254:8	translates 167:13	trust 26:11 76:2
	, ,			
	1	1	1	1

				Page 45
80:7	67:17 80:21 85:2	typically 33:14	understandable	unidentified 58:19
trustees 22:2 27:4	85:5,10 86:3	111:18 137:16	289:6	uninformed 75:4
28:14,18,22 33:4	88:11 89:5,7	140:12 143:6	understanding	uninsurable 380:19
50:11 63:13 94:3	105:21 127:12,19	158:5 162:6 169:3	26:21 54:20 68:6	385:14 388:7
truth 266:8,8,9	127:20,21 129:3,7	170:14 190:1	70:11 82:8 107:1	392:3
274:22 275:1,1	129:11 130:3	194:10 198:17	134:2 182:17	uninsured 31:6
283:5,11 358:13	135:14 137:17	225:11 351:1	189:14 210:6	86:10 279:7 364:1
358:13,14 380:3,3	138:7 148:14	402:15	239:7 260:16	376:14 388:7
380:4 390:8,8,9	158:10 159:18		262:4 320:16,22	unintended 84:17
try 9:12 109:15	160:13 162:6,9	U	346:20 353:3	Union 2:12 358:4
117:2 119:15	164:10 166:5,7	ultimate 55:15	382:6	358:19 387:17
143:6 156:21	177:15,15,20	65:10 122:13,17	understood 43:20	unique 5:8 20:16
177:19 193:19	190:4 197:3	180:4 312:1	64:6 107:21	78:11 245:5
201:13 206:6	203:12,21 205:11	ultimately 46:18	150:15 339:15	267:13 333:9
247:11 251:7,16	206:1 213:12,20	63:14 125:14	355:5	354:15
252:3,18,20 253:9	223:7,19,21 224:7	135:20 164:6	undertake 213:10	United 5:9 68:14
275:16,20 276:3	227:11,12 229:16	376:3	undertaken 361:13	75:21 171:8
319:2 321:15	230:11,13 232:18	unable 48:16 94:20	underway 77:5	332:21 393:10
335:15 338:6	256:19,21 258:14	393:4	underwriting	UnitedHealth 76:5
trying 34:5 114:9	259:3,3 277:12	unaffordability	32:21 33:1 60:12	units 96:9
114:11 127:1	302:12 310:6	30:2	61:9 70:20 86:19	universe 388:6
129:1,18 142:14	313:1 318:6,15	unaffordable 31:1	87:15 92:16 112:6	universities 94:19
146:6 155:4	322:11 326:4,10	118:19 245:9	151:15,18 162:2	University 220:8
177:22 183:6	329:3 332:15,17	unanticipated 5:2	175:14 178:10	unknowns 287:17
188:4 189:8	337:18 338:2,3,10	58:21 204:3	179:9,16,19 180:2	289:8
191:19 196:6,8	339:11,16 347:16	uncertainty 57:20	180:8 190:12,22	unmet 363:1
197:2 200:18	354:2 363:12	117:16	213:22 223:18	386:12
201:22 203:5	364:17 370:12	uncompensated	224:9,15 226:13	unneeded 15:8
223:10 225:4	382:22	365:18 366:6	229:17 256:3,4	unpaid 57:16,21
242:14 249:22	two-step 203:13	387:18	258:14 292:7	unprecedented
253:5 275:22	204:18 337:19	underestimate 73:5	293:11 299:15,21	244:10
325:17 326:21	two-tenths 112:7	underlying 368:9	299:22 300:4,5	unproductive 92:3
327:18,21 338:5	251:18	undermine 26:10	374:11 384:20	unprofessional
344:15 346:12	two-thirds 39:14	underprice 171:22	underwritten	75:1 83:16
347:5 356:5 388:5	Tyler 2:6 266:4,5	understand 62:22	153:13	unprofessionalism
tune 163:2 168:8	266:13,21 273:13	130:1,1 134:11,15	undesirable 66:20	286:7
345:13	274:2,7,8 283:9	147:21 156:7	unduly 324:16	unquote 196:4
turn 3:6 27:1 28:9	309:19	165:14 181:15	unexpected 403:14	unquote 190.4 unreasonable
52:13 195:15	type 56:7 66:6	194:13 203:3	unfair 374:19	205:3 212:1 322:5
243:9 266:18	144:2 152:10	207:22 213:21	unfavorable 59:7	340:5
367:11 383:18	163:5 342:14	217:14 226:15	unfolding 84:10	unreasonably 7:4
401:16	348:16,20	231:8,16 253:5	unforeseen 105:8	7:12 12:19,22
turned 143:3	types 96:6 110:13	306:12 321:5	unfortunately	46:20 163:22
turns 27:22	147:14 261:13	332:4 336:1	47:11 119:20	203:19 204:8,10
twin 277:7	349:8	338:12 357:4	255:20	203.19 204.8,10 204:16,20 208:5
two 4:22 16:3 40:1	typical 142:12	373:7 381:14	unfounded 45:16	204.10,20 208.3
54:16 64:1,7	160:5 169:22	382:12	75:1	210:18 211:3
57.10 07.1,/	100.3 107.22		13.1	210.10 211.3
	-	-		l

٦

200 10 215 4 22	221.17	10 < 1 000 0	0044400545	270 10 12 20
309:10 317:4,22	321:17	186:1 300:8	224:11 225:15	378:10,12,20
318:4,9,13 319:19	usual 361:16	viability 21:3 22:22	volume 127:10	wanting 399:12
320:1 321:2 323:5	usually 41:16 169:9	viable 155:2 391:14	vulnerable 337:2	wants 107:15
336:5 337:11	170:14 171:19	vibrate 3:6	W	143:21
355:15,17 356:4	utilization 302:3	vice 67:18 99:1		warning 60:9,17
356:11,17 371:17	utilize 126:9	141:10 191:8	waiting 66:16	72:17
391:17	utmost 137:4	vie 206:4	270:6	Washington 1:13
unresponsive	U.S 20:19	view 16:21 23:11	waives 37:3	12:9 78:2 85:21
322:10	V	23:14 29:14 51:1	walk 346:19	88:1 394:15
unsound 196:21	·	119:13 123:18	Walter 2:9 274:12	396:17
202:10 280:11	vagueness 343:17	126:16,19 129:11	275:6 297:15	Washington-Balt
338:9	344:11	157:11 166:21	333:8 334:7	172:7
unsoundness 211:9	valid 345:9	167:12 172:6	Walter's 286:5	Washington-based
upper 16:5 81:1	validate 292:4	196:9 197:10	want 63:11 64:14	16:14
83:20 85:3,11,19	validates 48:22	221:13 230:16	70:5 84:5 99:15	wasn't 93:16 97:3
86:17 91:2 92:19	validating 281:8	279:14 282:3	99:16 104:13	104:17 129:19
103:15 106:20	valuable 361:5	283:16 306:5	111:15 131:16,17	160:21 195:9
132:4 216:20	value 23:4 27:14	310:15 317:12	132:14 133:11	233:10,18 234:1
upstream 163:7	30:20 47:16 58:1	326:1 356:14	136:12 141:20	237:22 346:10
urge 52:2 331:5	73:7 75:22 101:22	377:10 392:22	143:9 148:9	watch 117:1
368:2 371:20	115:18 116:2,5	views 7:16 359:12	149:16 151:12	wave 245:8
372:20 373:19	137:8 167:13	vigilant 135:11	157:2 161:5 164:1	way 5:4 22:5 28:9
374:6 396:1	175:20,21 229:8	136:17 170:8	165:7 167:3	28:21 29:5 31:18
403:20	243:8 248:14,20	vigilantly 154:20	172:13 176:8	38:12 41:5 42:10
urged 276:15	297:6 361:8	vigorously 74:16	195:8 198:5 207:5	51:15 54:19 64:14
urges 367:16	393:21	violated 28:2	207:21 213:20	66:1 102:5 107:12
USA 2:13 379:14	values 148:16	Virginia 14:22 15:3	217:18 238:22	109:20,22 117:12
380:15	160:8 291:7 363:5	37:6 38:5,10 42:6	244:2 254:10,11	118:6 119:10,21
usage 33:7	variables 148:12	173:16 182:9	268:12,13,22	121:3,4 125:7
use 17:21 23:16	288:16 386:16	190:16 191:8	269:1 275:19	134:15 139:18
55:15 61:11 70:22	varied 222:18	192:8,10 193:11	276:2 281:6,20	146:19 148:4
71:18 72:6 79:8	variety 46:14 68:21	296:19 302:6	284:19 303:2	150:4,8,13,22
84:13,14 96:20	94:5 127:17	399:9	309:17 313:18	155:22 156:18
110:9 129:8	various 23:18 36:4	virtual 60:20 216:4	319:5,17,18 329:9	167:11 169:4
133:11 141:22	114:5 128:1 134:9	virtually 44:19	329:10 333:14	170:3,18 172:4
144:9 146:7	159:3 178:2,3	45:16 121:22	335:9 343:8 347:1	173:8,14 174:9,14
148:21 150:17	179:21 237:3	169:16 244:12	348:3 358:10	178:17 181:9
155:13,15 200:16	239:19 255:14	248:18	367:20 368:10	186:18 211:14
258:22 259:4,16	vary 65:7 141:1	virtue 98:8	370:5 381:20	239:16 241:15
272:5 292:2 300:7	241:7	virtues 399:16	382:1,7 383:18	245:5 249:1
326:17 328:21	vast 220:13	vision 395:2	399:10,13 405:2	253:17 256:20,21
335:20 342:20	vendors 80:9	vitality 84:9	wanted 60:5 106:2	258:5 265:15
373:19 385:18	verbally 285:6	vogue 232:12	152:13 171:21	271:22 298:6,11
useful 287:17	verify 81:22 191:12	voice 127:1 375:13	268:11 280:14	298:12,13,15
288:20	versa 141:10 191:8	void 34:9	291:1 303:7	301:12 316:6
uses 28:5 36:8	versions 234:4	volatile 170:16	307:14 335:18	317:13 318:8,19
44:20 200:12	versus 94:6 168:10	volatility 91:20	370:10 371:12	319:8 322:13

220.19 221.7	walna 60.20 60.9 8	260.12 275.16	64.0 11 65.17	wound 105.19
330:18 331:7	we're 60:20 69:8,8	369:12 375:16	64:9,11 65:17	wound 105:18
340:13 353:15	111:16 112:9,10	387:2	69:20 74:17 75:3	write 308:14
358:22 362:7	120:20 125:19	wholesale 73:21	75:14 76:21 78:19	writing 12:7,20
383:6 391:14	127:1 132:11	wide 76:17	136:4 178:8 183:6	written 9:7 12:6
403:5	150:22 154:11,20	widely 22:18	184:5 190:8	53:20 267:2 273:1
ways 110:3 119:17	160:2 161:2	widespread 359:13	197:17 227:3	285:4 290:9 291:5
119:19 120:6,11	166:22 167:16	willing 206:13,18	232:3,7 233:22	297:3 310:17,18
120:13,20 137:6	168:9 169:16	273:6,21 349:15	268:12,20 284:7	311:5,10,17,18,22
166:13 197:21	172:2 174:11	357:3 377:13	284:15 316:11	312:2,12 313:14
241:14 318:7	184:6 186:9 188:3	Wilmot 2:19 390:3	322:4 327:21	332:10 359:5
330:4 346:10	189:12 190:12	400:9,10,13,15	331:1,4,9 335:19	380:10 398:14
382:2 383:15	191:1 192:7	401:9,12 404:18	343:10 346:9,12	400:3
weaken 402:20	194:19 195:7	wind 155:21	348:2 360:2 367:7	wrong 45:5 70:10
weaknesses 238:8	196:6,8 202:17	wise 104:20 110:8	375:1 380:16	288:8,10 303:19
website 8:7 81:16	203:5,22 205:11	156:17 167:4	393:17 395:1	323:16 324:7
218:17 294:14,14	205:18,19 213:21	wish 43:19 45:18	worked 77:22 78:4	343:22 344:18
382:7 383:11	214:5 221:11	50:9 137:7 266:20	181:10 255:9	wrongdoing 346:7
week 19:1	224:2 234:19	wishing 12:5	359:18 380:18	wrote 24:11 28:13
weekend 233:8	240:11 242:14	withstand 62:18	workflow 98:10	384:4,6
weeks 51:22 221:8	249:14 250:8	92:15	working 34:7 48:10	X
273:17	254:9 255:13	witness 3:7 9:9,14	56:14 76:14 78:10	
weigh 94:3,8	256:11 265:21	9:14,15,22 10:1,4	93:5 102:18 151:5	X 256:20
121:20 147:20	266:2 268:2	10:17 11:14 13:22	255:13 268:8	Y
207:8	275:16 282:1	195:10 265:22	273:4 284:8	Y 256:22
weighed 121:21	285:3 295:6 327:5	274:14 326:8	324:22	yeah 134:14 142:12
326:10	327:6 344:10	389:20	world 15:9 144:3	175:8 185:1 186:8
weighs 147:6	347:2,4,5 358:2	witnessed 288:19	150:12 166:9,12	186:19 187:10,20
weight 236:4	376:15 385:6	witnesses 2:2 9:10	208:17 209:14	190:13 194:12
weighting 177:19	389:21 390:16	9:19 11:3,5,14,16	worldwide 69:5	190:13 194:12 197:20 201:20
welcome 3:12 13:5	401:13	13:10 275:3	worried 112:10	
75:4 285:13 361:6	we've 64:9 78:4	390:10 405:3	117:3	203:3 211:5 217:22 230:14
Wendel 69:3	123:17 132:2	woefully 326:3	worries 116:22	
went 183:9 190:16	148:13,22 152:5	women 374:12	worrisome 116:13	238:10 246:7
195:3,4 237:5	165:1,12 166:8	wonder 193:1	worry 112:13 117:6	247:11 258:15
254:14 255:1	183:12 189:8	wonderful 219:20	167:6 221:10	260:7,11 265:15
296:18 308:8	190:7 195:19	247:8	worse 32:15 42:21	354:12 356:7
333:16 339:4,5	210:15 213:15	wondering 378:2	48:5 50:21 66:22	year 18:18 31:10
350:3	224:14 225:11,15	word 15:6 28:5,7	worth 28:4 46:16	33:3 41:9 59:18
weren't 170:5	238:10 245:14	117:20 215:10	97:22 152:8	71:20 72:4 73:4
182:10 183:7	255:9 257:3	338:17 346:22	362:18	95:12 97:17,17
West 192:10	259:11 262:12,16	words 21:18 26:19	worthy 37:5 94:5	98:1,4 110:17
we'll 9:13 10:16	268:7 274:15	70:6 89:15 101:6	118:13 127:17	112:5,7,9 116:9
11:1 168:10	282:14 284:8	133:12 208:10	129:12 393:8	119:2,3 131:10
194:20 243:9	291:2 312:12	215:6 306:18	wouldn't 126:13	132:12 133:17
309:4 313:22	335:14 337:3	307:2 355:16	142:6 148:19	140:13 152:7
318:9 337:7	344:6 350:9	work 16:12 39:8	253:13 255:5	154:9 167:19,21
357:12 389:8	353:22 364:19	44:22 63:15,20	323:2 370:16	178:10 180:9
				207:12 212:15

	l	1	1	I
225:2 226:6,6,8,9	\$	1	14-117(e) 270:15	85:7 89:1 90:1
226:19,19 241:6,7	\$1,000 177:18	1 33:1,2 36:15	15 68:10 389:18	105:11 115:17
241:8,9,9 242:10	366:4	89:22 112:2,7,8	17 305:22	133:3,18 223:13
251:18,19 252:4	\$1,500 177:17	112:15 118:7	17th 6:9	307:17 326:17
293:11 300:3,11	386:3	236:13 237:6	19 400:21 402:1	330:9 331:13
300:12,14,16,18	\$1,800 39:22	271:2 290:13	1939 21:6	333:15 396:5
300:19,21 307:20	118:20	331:22 350:15	1947 69:3	2007 157:20 161:9
330:2 368:18	\$10,000 119:8	351:4	1970 75:22	161:11 162:12
384:9,11 385:4	\$10.3 38:9	1st 12:9	1973 67:10	225:22 267:2
386:16	\$100 35:14 39:20	1,000 85:18	1980s 67:12	2007-2008 225:16
years 22:4 23:19	125:19	1,050 367:13	199 250:17	2008 3:20 6:14 8:10
24:1 31:11 39:3	\$14 38:7 219:6	1,100 69:6	1996 3:18	15:18 53:8 54:14
49:17 65:21 67:12	\$141 365:18	1,200-plus 396:21	1998 163:4	64:2 71:5 74:14
68:2,4,10 71:19	\$16 293:13	1,500 386:11	1999 299:1 301:2	81:13 105:12
74:21 84:3 85:10	\$18,000 384:8	399:19	301:12 302:10	132:11 157:17,21
85:20 90:1 109:11	\$186 341:2	1-2 41:9		159:13 160:3
118:18 119:2	\$2 293:15	1.6 36:14 128:17	$\frac{2}{2}$	161:11 162:12
148:14 161:9	\$20 293:16	1.7 38:5	2 33:1 37:2,10	175:16 208:17
162:9 168:9	\$20,000 386:10	1:14 195:3	39:22 41:16	219:16,16 225:22
175:18 180:7	\$20-30 39:2	1:30 194:22	111:20 118:7	229:14 294:1
187:6 188:6	\$23 41:3	1:33 195:14	124:22 154:9	299:2 301:3
209:20 210:12	\$3,600 119:3	1:35 195:5	213:20 271:10	302:10 313:2
222:16 223:12	\$300 35:15	10 1:10 11:2 14:20	290:13 305:22	339:1 340:8 366:3
225:7,8,20 226:18	\$40 98:4 168:8	20:5 31:9 38:15	306:14 307:5	374:13 396:12
227:7,8 232:16	\$42 366:5	109:11 111:19	308:7 322:14	2009 1:10 6:9,11
242:7 243:17	\$46 97:20,22	119:2	351:9	7:22 8:2,4,5,8,14
244:9,12 246:6	106:10 110:15,19	10.8 241:6	2(c) 306:19	8:17,20 12:5,21
252:5 257:3 259:6	110:21 116:9	10:00 1:15 405:13	2.3 38:5	30:11 53:10 97:20
259:8,12 263:4	212:14 219:7	405:16	20 10:14,17 94:13	106:9 151:18
283:16 288:19	\$478 384:4	10:01 3:2	100:4 159:5 168:9	224:14,16 286:2
296:16 301:2	\$5 384:13 385:8,10	100 112:1 139:17	194:21 245:17	293:11 341:1
383:20 387:2	385:13	186:12,13 342:11	275:16 379:15 20th 393:3	405:17
Year's 233:8	\$50 112:18	1050 196:18 198:18	20th 393:3 20-minute 10:20	2010 90:2
yields 243:16	\$500,000 163:2	201:18 208:16	200 60:22 68:18	21st 393:4
Z	\$591 384:5	209:13 216:20	79:15 83:4 134:11	22 38:18
$\overline{\mathbf{Zaas}2:9}$	\$6 293:10	217:10	135:16 216:5,11	22.5 72:9
Zass 2.9 Zass 275:8 284:22	\$6.9 38:8	11 405:17	265:11,12 324:17	220 1:12
285:1 340:22	\$60 142:22 242:11	11.6 55:3 174:21	370:17	23 299:6
341:11,14,20	\$60-100 18:18	175:11 193:4	2000 301:13	24 307:6 382:21
342:3,10 343:7	\$780 374:14	199:8,14	2000 301.13 20002 12:10	24th 7:22 8:4
344:2 345:2,16		1100 209:12	20002 12:10 2002 301:22	25th 12:5 405:5
347:18 357:20	$\frac{0}{0050(7.7.22)}$	12 68:3 311:4	2002 301.22 2003 85:15	26 6:1 72:9 192:20 266 2:7
zero 224:10 257:15	005967 7:22	368:16,18	2003 85:15 2004 305:20,21	200 2:7 274 2:9
257:21 258:7	006000 8:3	12/31/98 175:13	307:5	274 2:9 28th 8:16
339:20	08 382:21	299:10 301:11	2005 25:4 28:14	28th 8:16 284 2:9
Zoning 1:11	09 382:22	14 2:4 368:16	31:22 53:7 54:6	284 2:9 295 2:10
2.51111 <u>6</u> 1.11		382:20	51.22 55.7 57.0	473 2.10
		l	I	

		I		
297 2:10	44 38:17 173:16	7	98th 59:19	
2	441 1:12	7 42:14 71:13 72:13		
$\frac{3}{2214521521}$	45 15:1 38:14	127:3 383:10		
3 214:5 215:21	251:10 268:10	7.5 39:13 40:2		
290:18 292:1	281:10	70 22:4 143:21,22		
305:11 306:4,7	46 5:22 291:6,10	161:10 301:13		
3.3 38:2	4699.2 184:19	397:16		
3.4 14:17 124:12	185:1	70s 64:15 232:6,7		
157:9	47 281:10	700 202:8		
30 11:7 98:5 143:22	49 291:10	71 2:5		
399:7		750 89:4,7 91:5		
30th 12:21 341:1	5	196:18,21 198:18		
300 69:10	5 10:22 42:14 118:7	201:18 208:16		
302 2:11	187:18,20 292:5	209:13 217:6,9,10		
31 6:14	298:19 352:3,3	367:13 371:1		
31st 8:2,5,8,14,20	5,000 397:16	750-1,050 54:18		
43:14,14 286:2	5.5 40:18	77 299:8 301:9		
31-3506(e)(2) 208:2	5:00 389:18	78.8 301:4		
31.3506 3:16	5:01 405:15			
31.7 301:6	50 2:5 32:11 40:19	8		
325 332:1	109:12 151:16	8 71:13 72:6,13		
35 159:7 168:10	187:13 188:1,6	304:8,20 305:3		
358 2:12	194:4 286:17	352:3,5 377:22		
37 294:2	50th 69:5	378:11		
375 60:9,18 72:18	500 136:7 265:10	80 161:12 248:8		
80:1,4 83:2 134:3	265:12 331:12	80s 64:15 232:6,22		
134:11 135:18	370:20	233:13,18		
144:20,22 216:3	51 71:4 223:6	800 209:12 372:12		
216:20 227:20	250:16	800-1,100 54:11		
228:3 265:1,12,12	525 294:17	810 12:9		
324:17	53 291:16	825 132:12		
379 2:13	54 291:16	845 132:10 208:18		
39 76:10	550 89:4 371:1			
390 2:14	56 7:22 8:2	9		
395 2:17	56.7 301:3,9	9 130:17		
4	572 383:13	9/11 151:5		
	6	90 10:10 42:5 59:21		
4 81:13 308:15		83:1 193:10 248:8		
4th 1:12 8:10 25:4	6 111:18 187:20	90s 233:18		
307:20	292:11 298:19	90th 59:18,21		
40 30:10 160:6	6A 7:6	90-95 60:15		
163:11 181:9,13	60 30:10 119:7	9010 194:11		
40-year 75:2	125:19 160:6	91,000 390:21		
400 2:20 294:17	187:15 301:15	95 83:1		
41 384:7	302:12,14	95th 59:18		
41,000 250:14,22	63 192:22	950 89:7 91:3		
414 383:12	63.4 302:8	98 61:4 83:3 175:16		
427,000 332:1				
	•	-	- I	