THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

BUREAU OF SECURITIES REGULATION

* * * * * * * * * *

*

IN THE MATTER OF:

* Case Number:

LOCAL GOVERNMENT CENTER, * C-2011-000036

INC., ET AL

*

* * * * * * * * *

HEARING ON PENDING MOTIONS

Hearing held at the New Hampshire Division of
Archives and Records Management Complex, 71 South
Fruit Street, Concord, New Hampshire on Tuesday,
July 21, 2014 commencing at 9:00 a.m.

,		Page	2
1			
2	APPEARANCES:		
3			
4	For the New Hampshire Bureau of Securities		
5	Regulation:		
6	NEW HAMPSHIRE BUREAU OF SECURITIES REGULATION:		
7	By: *Andru H. Volinsky, Esquire *Roy W. Tilsley, Jr., Esquire		
8	Adrian S. Larochelle, Esquire 107 North Main Street		
9	State House - Room 204 Concord, NH 03301		
	603-271-1463		
10	adrian.larochelle@sos.nh.gov *of Bernstein Shur		
11	For the Respondent HealthTrust, Inc.:		
12			
13	RAMSDELL LAW FIRM By: Michael D. Ramsdell, Esquire		
14	46 South Main Street Concord, NH 03301		
	603-856-7489		
15	mramsdell@ramsdelllawfirm.com		
16	LAW OFFICE OF: DAVID I. FRYDMAN		
17	By: David I. Frydman, Esquire		
18	25 Triangle Park P.O. Box 617		
19	Concord, NH 03302 603-230-3373		
20	dfrydman@healthtrustnh.org		
21	For the Respondent Property Liability Trust:		
22	McLANE, GRAF, RAULERSON & MIDDLETON, P.A.		
23	By: Bruce W. Felmly, Esquire 900 Elm Street PRACAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.		

,			Page 3
1		City Hall Plaza Manchester, NH 03101	
2		603-625-6464 bruce.felmly@mclane.com	
4	For the Intervenor	Towns of Auburn, Bennington, Meredith, Northfield,	
5		Peterborough, Plainfield, Salem and Temple:	
6		DOUGLAS, LEONARD & GARVEY, P.C. By: Richard J. Lehmann, Esquire	
7		14 South Street - Suite 5 Concord, NH 03301	
8		603-224-1988 richard@nhlawoffice.com	
10	Hearings Officer:	Donald Mitchell, Esquire	
11	Court Reporter:	Laurie A. Gelinas, CSCR, RPR	
12			
13			
14			
15 16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23	BRAGAN	REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC. (603)669-7922	
	BRAGAN	REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.	

1 PROCEEDINGS

2

- 3 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Good morning. My
- 4 name is Don Mitchell. I'm the Presiding Officer over
- 5 the matter here this morning on July 22nd which is
- 6 captioned as the matter of Local Government Center,
- 7 Inc., et al docketed as Case Number C-2011-000036.
- 8 Yesterday a formal hearing was suspended or
- 9 recessed and this morning we have a couple of motions
- 10 that must be heard first and these are motions offered
- 11 by the intervenors who have been granted contingent or
- 12 limited participation in these proceedings. That said
- 13 and because there's an audio record being kept of
- 14 these proceedings, I'm going to ask each counselor if
- 15 there are any witnesses, but first if each counsel
- 16 would identify themselves for the record. We'll begin
- 17 with the Bureau of Securities Regulation. Mr.
- 18 Volinsky.
- 19 MR. VOLINSKY: Good morning. My name is
- 20 Andru Volinsky. I'm with Bernstein Shur and I
- 21 represent the Bureau of Securities Regulation.
- 22 MR. TILSLEY: Roy Tilsley also from Bernstein
- 23 Shur for the BSR.

BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 MR. RAMSDELL: Michael Ramsdell from the
- 2 Ramsdell Law Firm here on behalf of HealthTrust.
- MR. FELMLY: Bruce Felmly from McLane, Graf,
- 4 Raulerson & Middleton representing PLT, and together
- 5 with me today is Patrick Closson.
- 6 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Could I ask Mr.
- 7 Closson to introduce himself so we get your voice on
- 8 the record.
- 9 MR. CLOSSON: Patrick Closson from the McLane
- 10 law firm.
- 11 MR. FRYDMAN: David Frydman, general counsel
- 12 for HealthTrust, Inc.
- MR. LEHMANN: Richard Lehmann from Douglas,
- 14 Leonard & Garvey representing the intervenors, the
- 15 towns who have intervened in this matter. I can tell
- 16 you those towns if you prefer.
- 17 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you very
- 18 much. I will recognize you for your amended motion in
- 19 just a moment, please. Okay. So if you would please
- 20 rise. I understand that you would like to amend your
- 21 initial Motion to Intervene.
- MR. LEHMANN: That's correct, Mr. Mitchell.
- I would like to amend the initial Motion to Intervene BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 to ensure that all eight towns that I represent are
- 2 included in the intervention into this action and are
- 3 represented by my representations and arguments that I
- 4 will be making to this tribunal. The eight towns that
- 5 I represent should be as follows. Auburn, Bennington,
- 6 Meredith, Northfield, Peterborough, Plainfield, Salem
- 7 and Temple.
- 8 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Okay. Is there
- 9 any further amendment on that motion?
- MR. LEHMANN: No.
- 11 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Volinsky for
- 12 the BSR?
- MR. VOLINSKY: No objection.
- 14 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Ramsdell?
- MR. RAMSDELL: No objection.
- 16 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Felmly?
- 17 MR. FELMLY: No objection.
- 18 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: That amendment
- 19 will be granted. My understanding is that you have
- 20 filed a second motion that is entitled Intervenors'
- 21 Motion Proposing Manner of Distributing Funds to
- 22 Former Members of HealthTrust. Is that correct, sir?
- MR. LEHMANN: That's correct, Mr. Mitchell.
 BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.
 (603) 669-7922

- 1 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Would you like to
- 2 address that at this time?
- 3 MR. LEHMANN: I would. Thank you very much.
- 4 My clients' intervention in this matter got rolling
- 5 when we noticed paragraph 5 of the document that
- 6 HealthTrust filed. That document is HealthTrust's
- 7 Notice of Termination Agreement Terminating Settlement
- 8 Agreement and in paragraph 5 HealthTrust indicates
- 9 that it will distribute \$17.1 million dollars to its
- 10 current members or another identified combination of
- 11 current and former HealthTrust members. And that is
- 12 assuming the Presiding Officer and the BSR approve. I
- 13 wish to propose a manner of identifying a combination
- of current and former HealthTrust members.
- 15 When the previous funds were distributed,
- 16 they were distributed only to HealthTrust members.
- 17 And I understand that HealthTrust's bylaws require
- 18 them to make distributions only to members. My
- 19 argument for you is that any distribution that is
- 20 restricted to current members and doesn't include
- 21 former members is contrary to the order you made
- 22 previously and that was affirmed by the Supreme Court.
- It was very clear from your order that the nature of BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 the returns or that anything that isn't part of the
- 2 cost of administration, cost of claims reserves or
- 3 cost of reinsurance needs to be returned to the
- 4 political subdivisions that made the contributions.
- 5 Our view is that that \$17 million dollar surplus that
- 6 you identified for return didn't only spring from the
- 7 subdivisions that are currently members but that it
- 8 sprang from subdivisions that had been members in the
- 9 past as well and that they should have received
- 10 returns going back to the time of their contribution.
- 11 As I identified in the pleadings under corporations
- 12 law, corporations are allowed to adopt bylaws that are
- 13 consistent with New Hampshire law. I submit that a
- 14 bylaw that includes a provision that does not require
- 15 the return of excess surplus to the members who
- 16 contributed to it violates New Hampshire law. I would
- 17 also point out something that is not included in the
- 18 pleadings and that is to the extent that HealthTrust
- 19 may argue that my clients entered into a contract with
- 20 it that required that manner of distribution, it is
- 21 well settled law that a contract term contravenes
- 22 public policy whether it means by statute or some
- other form that is also enforceable, and I would cite BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 the case of Harper versus Healthsource that is found
- 2 at 140 New Hampshire 770 and that was in 1996. Again,
- 3 it is well established law that a contract term or a
- 4 bylaw that violates public policy or statute is
- 5 unenforceable, and yet it would seem to the extent
- 6 that HealthTrust is asking you to make a distribution
- 7 solely to current members as opposed to the members
- 8 who contributed to the surplus, you would be violating
- 9 public policy or any such distribution would violate
- 10 public policy. I would also point out that doing that
- 11 leaves aside an important consideration which is that
- 12 there are individuals who made contributions all
- 13 throughout the period of time that I've identified who
- 14 also would lose out because, as you are almost
- 15 certainly aware, some retirees of the political
- 16 subdivisions pay for health insurance through their
- 17 former employers through a deduction that happens from
- 18 the Retirement System pension checks that they
- 19 receive, so a distribution that pays only current
- 20 members leaves those contributors to the excess or
- 21 surplus also out in the cold and that they need to be
- 22 factored into this as well, and some of them are
- former employees of political subdivisions who are not BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 members, so they would effectively be denied their
- 2 right to receive the return of excess funds as well.
- I need to point out something about my
- 4 pleading. I inadvertently underlined a section
- 5 quoting the Supreme Court without attributing it
- 6 properly. The reference is to page 15 of the Supreme
- 7 Court decision. I underlined the provision itself for
- 8 a specific period, but in the Supreme Court decision
- 9 that section is not underlined, so just for clarity
- 10 and completeness I wanted to point that out to you,
- 11 but I do think that that portion of the argument is
- 12 important and that is essentially this. The earnings
- 13 and the thing that needs to be returned to the
- 14 political subdivisions have to be tied to a specific
- 15 period of time. If they are not tied to a specific
- 16 period of time as you recognized on page 45 of your
- 17 order, it would be difficult if not impossible to
- 18 assure members of political subdivisions that they
- 19 would be fully and proportionately provided the
- 20 accurate shares of those funds that I think ultimately
- 21 is at the heart of this issue as it comes before you.
- 22 There needs to be proportionality in the manner in
- 23 which funds are returned to political subdivisions.

 BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 In my pleading I've proposed one manner of doing that
- 2 that I think is consistent. Well, it certainly is a
- 3 combination of current and former HealthTrust members.
- 4 It simply looks at the contributions from the years
- 5 2003 to 2010 which were the years that were involved
- 6 in your calculation of the \$17.1 million dollar
- 7 surplus, at least as I understand it, and for each
- 8 political subdivision that made a contribution it
- 9 looks to -- I calculated the percentage of the
- 10 political subdivision's contribution to that year, the
- 11 year is adjusted for interest pursuant to the court's
- 12 interest tables and those two factors together tells
- 13 us the proportionate amount of the \$17.1 million
- 14 dollars that should be returned to each of the
- 15 political subdivisions. I recognize that this is not
- 16 the only way and that there may be issues with my
- 17 calculations. I think it is a rational and defensible
- 18 way of distributing the funds that reflects the
- 19 contributions of the people who made it. Yet again, I
- 20 recognize I am neither an economist nor a
- 21 mathematician and that there may be other ways to do
- 22 it. Certainly my clients are interested in a fair and
- 23 proportionate return more than they are interested in BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 the single specific way they've proposed.
- 2 I'm happy to answer any questions you may
- 3 have, but that is the gist of my presentation.
- 4 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Why don't we hear
- 5 from the other parties that wish to respond to your
- 6 argument first before any questions I may have. Thank
- 7 you. Mr. Volinsky, do you have anything to say in
- 8 response?
- 9 MR. VOLINSKY: Yes, Mr. Mitchell. Our
- 10 position is not to take a position with respect to Mr.
- 11 Lehmann's motion but with two comments. The first
- 12 comment is the Bureau certainly agrees with the
- 13 general statement of law that Mr. Lehmann cites to the
- 14 effect that contracts with provisions that violate
- 15 public policy or that violate the law are not
- 16 enforceable. That is clearly the law of the state.
- 17 The second is to underscore the concern for the
- 18 individuals who paid for their benefits directly.
- 19 Persons who are retired from state or municipal
- 20 service are able to obtain medical benefits and those
- 21 benefits are paid for by deductions from their
- 22 retirement benefits directly so that it's not flowing
- 23 through the municipality. Similarly, those who have BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 separated from government service often take advantage
- 2 of Cobra benefits which allows them to pay directly
- 3 for their health insurance. I do not know whether
- 4 that payment goes directly from the individual to
- 5 HealthTrust or through the municipality to
- 6 HealthTrust, so I would ask them to clarify that, but
- 7 I am concerned and the Bureau is concerned that
- 8 individuals be considered in this equation for
- 9 reimbursements.
- 10 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Be considered?
- MR. VOLINSKY: Yes.
- 12 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you. Mr.
- 13 Ramsdell.
- 14 MR. RAMSDELL: Mr. Mitchell, the first thing
- 15 I would ask you to do is to inquire of the intervenors
- 16 about the breadth of their motion for this reason. My
- 17 understanding on behalf of my client and I think
- 18 everyone's else's understanding here is that the
- 19 intervenors were allowed to intervene in this matter
- 20 for a limited purpose. That limited purpose is to
- 21 address the issue of the distribution of the \$17.1
- 22 million dollars to be repaid from PLT to HealthTrust
- 23 and then HealthTrust's distribution of that. However, BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 when I read paragraph 8 of the intervenors' motion, it
- 2 says that the intervenors ask you to find that at
- 3 least as to the cumulatively retained surplus
- 4 identified in the final order. I would suggest to you
- 5 that a plain reading of that paragraph, and I'm not
- 6 suggesting this is what the intervenors meant, but I
- 7 would ask you to inquire of them whether the plain
- 8 reading of this would reach past the \$17.1 million
- 9 dollars. I believe it can be read to include the
- 10 distribution of the \$33.3 million and the \$3.1 million
- 11 that were made in 2013 by both HealthTrust and PLT.
- 12 While PLT's distribution is not specifically raised in
- 13 here, HealthTrust certainly would be implicated, and
- 14 so I would ask that you inquire of the intervenors as
- 15 to whether in fact the apparent breadth of paragraph 8
- 16 means they are seeking something other than to address
- 17 the \$17.1 million dollars because I believe that would
- 18 be improper.
- 19 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Ramsdell, let
- 20 me interrupt your presentation and have him do that so
- 21 that your following remarks might be better focused.
- Mr. Lehmann, could you please come forward
- for record purposes. You've heard the inquiry from BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 your brother counsel.
- 2 MR. LEHMANN: I have. The proposal relates
- 3 solely to the \$17.1 million and nothing else. And the
- 4 reason it was framed the way, in terms of the
- 5 cumulative surplus I was referring to the cumulative
- 6 \$17.1 million dollars simply because what I'm not
- 7 proposing is any kind of prospective relief. I'm only
- 8 talking about the cumulative \$17 million that was part
- 9 of the order that is about to be distributed that was
- 10 referenced. It has nothing to do with how things are
- 11 going forward.
- 12 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: So you're waiving
- 13 claim to the previous distributions?
- MR. LEHMANN: Well, we're litigating the
- 15 previous distribution in another forum, so I'm not
- 16 waiving anything, but I'm not making a claim for it
- 17 here.
- 18 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you. Is
- 19 that sufficient, Mr. Ramsdell?
- 20 MR. RAMSDELL: It is, Mr. Mitchell. Thank
- 21 you.
- 22 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Would you please
- 23 continue, then.

BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 MR. RAMSDELL: Thank you. The argument has
- 2 been made to you by the intervenors that distributing
- 3 the \$17.1 million dollars to current HealthTrust
- 4 members would be inconsistent with public policy and
- 5 indeed inconsistent with your final order. I would
- 6 suggest to you that's not true. Your final order
- 7 expressly said that the previous distributions would
- 8 be distributed to current HealthTrust members and PLT
- 9 members and so distributing the \$17.1 million dollars
- 10 to current members would not be inconsistent with your
- 11 final order at all nor would it be inconsistent with
- 12 public policy.
- 13 The intervenors have conceded that their
- 14 participation agreements separate the bylaws, the
- 15 bylaws that they were contractually obligated under,
- and to say that any distributions that are made will
- 17 go to current members, why is it not against public
- 18 policy? It's not against public policy because it is
- 19 consistent with RSA 5-B, but you also don't have to
- 20 look any further than what I submitted to you in the
- 21 prior proceeding, and they are still operative today,
- 22 and that is the Risk Pool Practices Agreements reached
- 23 by the other risk pools with the Bureau of Securities BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 Regulation. One is Primex and one is SchoolCare. I
- 2 will represent to you, and these are already in
- 3 evidence in the prior proceeding but we will submit
- 4 additional copies, that the Bureau agreed with both of
- 5 the other risk pools that regarding surplus, surplus
- 6 shall be returned to eligible members as soon as
- 7 practicable but not earlier than December 31, 2013 or
- 8 not later than September 30, 2012. We agreed that
- 9 those distributions would go to current members of
- 10 those risk pools, not former members, but current
- 11 members, so the Bureau doesn't find it to be against
- 12 public policy to make the distributions consistent
- 13 with your final order and consistent with exactly what
- 14 we've suggested and inconsistent with what the
- 15 intervenors have asked you to do.
- 16 The only other thing I would say about the
- 17 intervenors' proposal is their professed concern that
- 18 absent a recalculation, if you will, there will be
- 19 shortfalls to some and windfalls to others, but their
- 20 calculation does exactly the same thing. All they've
- 21 done is an arithmetic calculation of, we paid
- 22 individually this much money in 2004, in 2005, in
- 23 2006, et cetera, and that the aggregate for those BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 years is X number of dollars and so if you take our
- 2 percentage of each of those years, that's what we
- 3 should get plus interest. There's nothing in the Risk
- 4 Pool Agreements with the Bureau about accumulated
- 5 interest. There's nothing in your final order about
- 6 accumulated interest. But the methodology they've
- 7 used also gives windfalls to some and shortfalls to
- 8 some because it presumes that annually there was an
- 9 equal amount of surplus for a ten-year period. That
- 10 fact hasn't been established nor has it even been
- 11 alleged anywhere, and so the methodology itself calls
- into question what they've asked for, but more
- 13 importantly it is inconsistent with your final order,
- 14 it is inconsistent with their participation agreements
- 15 and the bylaws that they agreed to and it is
- 16 inconsistent with the existing operating Risk Pool
- 17 Agreements between the Bureau and the other risk
- 18 pools.
- 19 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Ramsdell, if
- 20 you could, could you restate your argument that you
- 21 recently mentioned with respect to the amount of
- 22 surplus being consistent or inconsistent over the
- 23 years? I missed that. I'm sorry.

BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 MR. RAMSDELL: Because the intervenors have
- 2 done a straight mathematical calculation, i.e., we've
- 3 paid this much in this year and there was total
- 4 contribution of this much that same year, if you
- 5 divide the \$17.1 million dollars by those
- 6 corresponding percentages on an annual basis and then
- 7 add interest to them, that's what we're entitled to,
- 8 but in that straight arithmetic calculation what
- 9 they're saying is that there was an equal surplus in
- 10 each of the ten years and that is simply not the case.
- 11 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you.
- MR. RAMSDELL: Thank you.
- 13 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Felmly, would
- 14 you like to respond?
- MR. FELMLY: I have nothing further to add.
- 16 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Could I ask you
- 17 to come forward if you have anything to add though?
- 18 MR. FELMLY: All I'm going to add is on
- 19 behalf of PLT I join in the arguments that Mr.
- 20 Ramsdell just made and I have nothing further to say.
- 21 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Very good. I
- just wanted to get you clearly on the record.
- Mr. Lehmann, you've heard, if you will, the BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC. (603) 669-7922

- 1 integrated responses and you're up for rebuttal, sir.
- 2 MR. LEHMANN: First of all, I just want to be
- 3 clear that we're not asking for interest to accrue to
- 4 the benefit of anybody. The interest calculation in
- 5 the formula does nothing more than recognize in the
- 6 distribution of the math that you have identified that
- 7 should be distributed, it allocates greater value to
- 8 surplus that existed in 2003 than the same dollar in
- 9 2010. The money accumulated over all those years. I
- 10 just want to be clear. We're not asking for a dime
- 11 more than \$17.1 million dollars to be distributed.
- 12 The only role interest plays in the calculation is in
- 13 figuring out the amount that should be attributed to
- 14 each town's contribution for each year, and what that
- 15 really ends up doing, because I did the calculations
- 16 without interest as well and they're almost identical
- 17 really simply because of the way the interest works,
- 18 mostly because we're talking about distribution of a
- 19 constant amount, not an amount that expands. It's
- 20 \$17.1 million. The only question is where it goes.
- 21 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Is there a term
- 22 of art in your profession that addresses that type of
- 23 retrograde assignment of value to dollars?

 BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

 (603)669-7922

- 1 MR. LEHMANN: There may be. I don't know it.
- 2 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Okay. All right.
- 3 Is there anything else you would like to say in
- 4 rebuttal?
- 5 MR. LEHMANN: Point two is I recognize that
- 6 your prior order authorized distributions to current
- 7 members. The reason we have an adversarial system in
- 8 which all represented parties pull in their direction
- 9 and the fact finder and decision maker then renders
- 10 the best decision they can is because that's what we
- 11 believe best ensures that all sides are represented.
- 12 You didn't have the benefit of somebody representing
- 13 the position I'm taking in the earlier proceedings. I
- 14 don't find any failure in that. I don't think anybody
- 15 did anything wrong. I think for the same reason the
- 16 Supreme Court requires that lower courts be presented
- 17 with arguments in order to preserve an argument, that
- 18 was effectively not an argument that was presented to
- 19 you, so I recognize that I'm presenting an argument
- 20 that's somewhat different than what you did previously
- 21 in the order that authorized the return of the
- 22 \$33 million dollars to current members, and I'm
- 23 bringing to your attention the best that I am able the BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 fact that there are these towns that are not current
- 2 members but that did contribute to the growth of the
- 3 surplus as well as the employees of the towns who
- 4 contributed and the retirees and the people who were
- 5 Cobra beneficiaries. These people all contributed to
- 6 their growth of the surplus that's been ordered to be
- 7 refunded and they should be put in the position of
- 8 receiving some of their return.
- 9 Finally, HealthTrust raises the argument of
- 10 the contracts that were entered into, but again, I
- 11 reemphasize that the provision that would have allowed
- 12 HealthTrust to retain the excess surplus for that long
- 13 period of years and use it for their own purposes
- 14 before returning it I submit does violate public
- 15 policy and does violate the notion that these risk
- 16 pools are confidential conglomerations of communities
- 17 that get together to decide to pool their resources to
- 18 insure themselves over time. Allowing the money to
- 19 pool and grow and continue to sit there without
- 20 returning it is the core thing that violates public
- 21 policy.
- 22 Finally, I would go back to the first
- 23 question you asked me. When Mr. Ramsdell made his BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 opening remarks in reference to the cumulative amount,
- 2 Mr. Ramsdell argued that the BSR has authorized
- 3 distributions. I'm not familiar with what those
- 4 distributions are, but when I referenced the
- 5 cumulative nature of 2003 to 2010, I was strictly
- 6 talking about things that happened in the past,
- 7 accumulations that happened over long periods of time.
- 8 If returns are being done every year or every two
- 9 years, I'm really not privy to that, as to how they're
- 10 going to do business going forward, so I'm not
- 11 entirely in a position to fully address the argument
- of what the BSR agreed to with the other risk pools,
- 13 but I would submit that the sole accumulated amount of
- 14 money that we're talking about on behalf of the
- 15 intervenors is the amounts from 2003 to 2010 which
- 16 were sufficiently long ago that it is appropriate to
- 17 figure out a way to distribute the money to the ones
- 18 who made the contributions. To the extent that
- 19 HealthTrust argues that we didn't do a calculation
- 20 that incorporated the amount of the surplus
- 21 attributable to each year under the assumption that
- 22 that amount is different, I'm happy to try and
- 23 retrieve the data and put that in. HealthTrust got BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 this ball rolling by asking you to bless the
- 2 distribution and I'm here proposing an alternate way
- 3 to do it.
- 4 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Could you restate
- 5 that last statement for me?
- 6 MR. LEHMANN: From where I stand, HealthTrust
- 7 got this ball rolling on this conversation for this
- 8 part of the hearing concerning the distribution of the
- 9 \$17.1 million dollars when they put in a pleading that
- 10 they were going to distribute it to the members unless
- 11 you or the BSR said something different.
- 12 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you for
- 13 clarifying that. We'll go around again. Any further
- 14 comment, Mr. Volinsky?
- MR. VOLINSKY: No.
- 16 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Ramsdell, any
- 17 further comment?
- MR. RAMSDELL: Only to point out that as I'm
- 19 sure you will either recall or in looking at the Risk
- 20 Pool Agreements that exist, those distributions had to
- 21 do with a surplus that existed at the time of the
- 22 agreements and also had been built up over the years,
- 23 so we're not talking about prospective relief at all.
 BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 We're talking about exactly the situation that the
- 2 intervenors suggested.
- I guess the last thing I would say is why did
- 4 HealthTrust put in its pleading to you that it will
- 5 distribute it to members or some other identifiable
- 6 group either as you order us to or consistent with the
- 7 BSR? Because that is exactly what we'll do. It
- 8 should go to the current members, but as we did with
- 9 the final order, we're going to comply with whatever
- 10 it is that you order.
- 11 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you.
- 12 Anything further, Mr. Felmly?
- MR. FELMLY: No, sir.
- 14 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you. All
- 15 right. I have a couple questions, Mr. Lehmann, so
- 16 could I ask you to come forward. Mr. Lehmann, I
- 17 issued my final order on August 16th of 2012 and
- 18 you've made reference to that final order. At what
- 19 point in time, sir, do you believe that my order
- 20 becomes effective?
- MR. LEHMANN: Well, I suppose it becomes
- 22 effective on the day you issued it.
- HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Okay. With BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC. (603)669-7922

- 1 respect to the Pooled Risk Agreements, do you
- 2 understand that I've taken official notice of the
- 3 prior proceedings exhibits in this matter?
- 4 MR. LEHMANN: Mm-hmm.
- 5 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: And among those
- 6 exhibits are a copy of one of those. I had it as a
- 7 User Agreement. Do you know if that's the same term
- 8 of art User Agreement and Risk Pool Agreement?
- 9 MR. LEHMANN: I do.
- 10 MR. VOLINSKY: I'm not sure it is.
- 11 MR. RAMSDELL: I have copies of them.
- 12 They're entitled Risk Pool Practices Agreement. I'm
- 13 happy, and I assume no one will object, to give you
- 14 these copies.
- 15 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: It's just the
- 16 title. My recollection is that there were two
- 17 different types of agreements and that's not what I
- 18 was getting from Mr. Lehmann.
- 19 MR. RAMSDELL: They're both entitled Risk
- 20 Pool Practices Agreement.
- 21 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: We'll make a copy
- 22 after the argument. Thank you.
- Mr. Lehmann, are you familiar with my prior BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC. (603) 669-7922

- 1 order as to earlier prospective intervenors in name?
- 2 There's several unions representing public employees.
- 3 MR. LEHMANN: Yes, I am.
- 4 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: And do you recall
- 5 in that that I denied their participation?
- 6 MR. LEHMANN: Yes.
- 7 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: And are you
- 8 familiar with that decision?
- 9 MR. LEHMANN: Yes.
- 10 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Do you believe
- 11 that --
- MR. LEHMANN: I hope I'm not going to be
- 13 quizzed about it, but I'm familiar with it.
- 14 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: I don't intend to
- 15 quiz you, but do you believe that has any legal effect
- 16 with respect to the relief you're asking or with
- 17 respect to the basis you're using for support of some
- 18 type of pass-through to employees?
- 19 MR. LEHMANN: No, I don't think that it
- 20 legally affects the right of people. It affected
- 21 their right to come in and be heard in this forum. I
- 22 don't think it affects their legal right to a portion
- of the State refund, and I guess I would point out BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 they stand one step removed from the position my
- 2 clients are in. My clients are former members of the
- 3 organization. The unions represent people who are
- 4 employees of my client or people similarly situated.
- 5 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: My recollection
- 6 of the record is that they represented their members
- 7 which were both active employees and retired or
- 8 terminated or otherwise removed from public service.
- 9 That's my recollection, so I will ask you to accept
- 10 that. I will also ask you to accept that as part of
- 11 the rationale for denying the issue of the individual
- 12 contributions and though those contributions therefore
- 13 the stated claim of a right to receive something was
- 14 addressed, and so I'll just refer you to the writing
- 15 as to whether or not that particular facet of your
- 16 argument has been addressed.
- 17 Mr. Lehmann, with respect to the reference to
- 18 the two types of agreements that have just been
- 19 mentioned, do you know if they were in effect in 1987
- 20 when the Pooled Risk Management program was put in
- 21 place by the Legislature?
- 22 MR. LEHMANN: I don't know the nature of the
- 23 agreements that were in effect in 1987.

BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Okay. In your
- 2 pleading before me you intervene on behalf of now
- 3 eight communities, correct?
- 4 MR. LEHMANN: That's correct.
- 5 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: And so I'm going
- 6 to presume that the -- if I can find it -- bear with
- 7 me -- that the calculation in your paragraph 19 is the
- 8 only relief you're seeking.
- 9 MR. LEHMANN: That's correct.
- 10 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Okay. Only
- 11 because from time to time I get sensitive, you made
- 12 reference to the word failure in the prior
- 13 proceedings, that it was not the failure of anyone not
- 14 to address the issue of prior members. Was that
- 15 essentially the representation?
- MR. LEHMANN: Well, okay. Something to that
- 17 effect, yes.
- 18 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: And so I took an
- 19 inference from that that there was no consideration of
- 20 members other than current members in the conduct of
- 21 those proceedings and in the writing of that decision.
- 22 Is that a fair inference to take?
- MR. LEHMANN: No, I think that I made those BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 remarks in the context of the importance in an
- 2 adversarial system of there being somebody in the room
- 3 whose job it was to advocate forcefully and zealously
- 4 on behalf of a person's position and that our system
- 5 recognizes that the best way to make all the strongest
- 6 arguments on behalf of those parties is to have
- 7 somebody representing their interests and their
- 8 interests alone. I'm simply indicating that there was
- 9 no advocate whose job it was to represent those
- 10 limited particular interests, and I guess I would
- 11 point out, I think it's just a fact that there wasn't
- 12 somebody whose job it was to do that the way it is my
- 13 job to do that in this hearing today, so I'm not
- 14 finding fault with anything that anybody did.
- 15 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: That's not my
- 16 implication. I was just asking you to clarify that
- 17 and you've clarified it. I'm now asking you,
- 18 irrespective of whether someone was in the room,
- 19 whether you think that the hearings as you understand
- 20 them to have been conducted and the breadth of the
- 21 order did not address which political subdivision
- 22 members would receive funds, if any, and then we found
- 23 by the order that they would receive.

BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 MR. LEHMANN: The order addresses who
- 2 receives funds.
- 3 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: And the order
- 4 said which members.
- 5 MR. LEHMANN: Well, I believe one portion of
- 6 the order says current members and another portion I
- 7 believe says consistent with RSA 5-B. I may have that
- 8 wrong. Paragraph 14 of the order says that funds
- 9 shall be returned to members consistent with 5B:I,C.
- 10 If I'm not mistaken, that's what we're talking about
- 11 here, and my contention is that 5B:I,C and the way you
- 12 laid it out in the order very clearly and that the
- 13 Supreme Court affirmed suggests that the reasonable
- 14 way to determine that is to return it to the people
- 15 who contributed to the surplus. That's our position.
- 16 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: One last question
- 17 I believe. I don't mean to be helping you too much by
- 18 filling in the record, but I need to for the record
- 19 upon which I can make a decision. You have said that
- 20 you make no claim for prospective funds. Can I infer
- 21 from that that any claim for funds on behalf of the
- 22 intervenors ceases with the previous agreement of the
- 23 BSR and the respondents to try the case on financial BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 statements concluding with December 31st of 2010?
- 2 MR. LEHMANN: Yes.
- 3 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Have I stirred
- 4 anything up?
- 5 MR. LEHMANN: Can I just fill that in a
- 6 little bit? My understanding, and again, I wasn't
- 7 here, but my understanding is that you got to the
- 8 \$17.1 million dollar figure by using those years. And
- 9 I'm not interested in changing the \$17.1 million
- 10 dollar number. I'm only talking about how that gets
- 11 distributed out. I'm not taking issue with anything
- 12 that went on before other than the manner of
- 13 distribution.
- 14 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Well, I won't
- 15 fill it in any further, but have I stirred anything up
- 16 with you, Mr. Volinsky?
- 17 MR. VOLINSKY: No, sir.
- 18 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Ramsdell?
- MR. RAMSDELL: No.
- 20 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Felmly?
- MR. FELMLY: No, sir.
- 22 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you very
- 23 much. Your first motion is granted and the second one BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 I will take under advisement.
- 2 Are there any further motions at this time or
- 3 issues that should be brought to my attention?
- 4 MR. TILSLEY: Mr. Mitchell, just as matter of
- 5 housekeeping, I think the PLT has a pending motion
- 6 which I believe was going to be withdrawn pending
- 7 completion of the discussions we had yesterday.
- 8 HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you for
- 9 reminding me of that housekeeping matter. I would
- 10 remind counsel that I made an order for you to retain
- 11 all transmissions of -- I think I characterized it as
- 12 social media that had emanated from this courtroom,
- 13 this hearing room, during the proceedings in April and
- 14 May of 2012, and I'm sure that you will be happy to
- 15 know that I have released that hold as of this time.
- 16 Thank you for your cooperation in that regard as we
- 17 all go forward with the new media and uses and
- 18 purposes. If you will recall, we had a technical crew
- 19 here that was live streaming. I will just represent
- 20 that the concern of the Presiding Officer at that time
- 21 was that there was interference or there was the
- 22 possibility of interference with the live streaming
- 23 and so exercising on the side of caution, that's why I BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 asked for those to be preserved. That matter has been
- 2 resolved and no implications will be taken from that
- 3 one way or the other. So you don't have to keep all
- 4 that stuff anymore.
- 5 All right. We're going to suspend these
- 6 proceedings at this time. My understanding is that
- 7 there are discussions among the parties' counsel that
- 8 are going to continue. We will reconvene no later
- 9 than noon to make decisions at that time as to how
- 10 these proceedings may go forward. There being nothing
- 11 further, this matter is in recess. The record is
- 12 suspended.
- 13 (Whereupon, the hearing was suspended at 9:48 a.m.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC. (603) 669-7922

	-
1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, Laurie A. Gelinas, RPR, a Certified
4	Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public of the State of
5	New Hampshire, do hereby certify that the foregoing is
6	a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic
7	notes of the Hearing on Pending Motions in the matter
8	of Local Government Center, Inc., et al, taken at the
9	place and on the date hereinbefore set forth.
10	I further certify that I am neither
11	attorney nor counsel for, nor related to or employed
12	by any of the parties to the action in which this
13	deposition was taken, and further that I am not a
14	relative or employee of any attorney or counsel
15	employed in this case, nor am I financially interested
16	in this action.
17	THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF THIS
18	TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE
19	SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL
20	AND/OR DIRECTION OF THE CERTIFYING REPORTER.
21	
22	LAURIE A. GELINAS, CSCR, RPR
23	BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC. (603) 669-7922

BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC. (603) 669-7922

	allocates 20:7	ASSOCIATES	benefits 12:18,20	
A 1.16.24.12	allowed 8:12 13:19	2:23 3:23,23 4:23	12:21,22 13:2	
a.m 1:16 34:13	22:11	4:23 5:23,23 6:23	Bennington 3:3 6:5	C 4:1 35:1,1
able 12:20 21:23	Allowing 22:18	6:23 7:23,23 8:23	Bernstein 2:10 4:20	C-2011-000036 1:8
absent 17:18	allows 13:2	8:23 9:23,23 8:23 9:23,23	4:22	4:7
accept 28:9,10		,		calculated 11:9
accrue 20:3	alternate 24:2	10:23,23 11:23,23 12:23,23 13:23,23	best 21:10,11,23	calculation 11:6
accumulated 18:4	amend 5:20,23	,	30:5	17:20,21 19:2,8
18:6 20:9 23:13	amended 5:18	14:23,23 15:23,23	better 14:21	20:4,12 23:19
accumulations	amendment 6:9,18	16:23,23 17:23,23	bit 32:6	29:7
23:7	amount 11:13 18:9	18:23,23 19:23,23	bless 24:1	calculations 11:17
accurate 10:20	18:21 20:13,19,19	20:23,23 21:23,23	Box 2:18	20:15
35:6	23:1,13,20,22	22:23,23 23:23,23	BRAGAN 2:23	calls 18:11
action 6:2 35:12,16	amounts 23:15	24:23,23 25:23,23	3:23,23 4:23,23	captioned 4:6
active 28:7	AND/OR 35:20	26:23,23 27:23,23	5:23,23 6:23,23	case 1:7 4:7 9:1
add 19:7,15,17,18	Andru 2:6 4:20	28:23,23 29:23,23	7:23,23 8:23,23	19:10 31:23 35:15
additional 17:4	annual 19:6	30:23,23 31:23,23	9:23,23 10:23,23	caution 33:23
address 7:2 13:21	annually 18:8	32:23,23 33:23,23	11:23,23 12:23,23	ceases 31:22
14:16 23:11 29:14	answer 12:2	34:23,23 35:23,23	13:23,23 14:23,23	Center 1:8 4:6 35:8
30:21	anybody 20:4	assume 26:13	15:23,23 16:23,23	certainly 9:15 11:2
addressed 28:14,16	21:14 30:14	assuming 7:12	17:23,23 18:23,23	11:22 12:12 14:13
addresses 20:22	anymore 34:4	assumption 23:21	19:23,23 20:23,23	CERTIFICATI
31:1	apparent 14:15	assure 10:18	21:23,23 22:23,23	35:17
adjusted 11:11	APPEARANCES	attention 21:23	23:23,23 24:23,23	Certified 35:3
administration 8:2	2:2	33:3	25:23,23 26:23,23	certify 35:5,10
adopt 8:12	APPLY 35:18	attorney 35:11,14	27:23,23 28:23,23	CERTIFYING
Adrian 2:7	appropriate 23:16	attributable 23:21	29:23,23 30:23,23	35:20
adrian.larochelle	approve 7:12	attributed 20:13	31:23,23 32:23,23	cetera 17:23
2:10	April 33:13	attributing 10:5	33:23,23 34:23,23	changing 32:9
advantage 13:1	Archives 1:14	Auburn 3:3 6:5	35:23,23	characterized
adversarial 21:7	argue 8:19	audio 4:13	breadth 13:16	33:11
30:2	argued 23:2	August 25:17	14:15 30:20	checks 9:18
advisement 33:1	argues 23:19	authorized 21:6,21	bringing 21:23	cite 8:23
advocate 30:3,9	argument 7:19	23:2	brother 15:1	cites 12:13
affirmed 7:22	10:11 12:6 16:1	aware 9:15	brought 33:3	City 3:1
31:13	18:20 21:17,18,19		Bruce 2:23 5:3	claim 15:13,16
aggregate 17:23	22:9 23:11 26:22	B	bruce.felmly@m	28:13 31:20,21
ago 23:16	28:16	back 8:10 22:22	3:2	claims 8:2
agreed 17:4,8	arguments 6:3	ball 24:1,7	BSR 4:23 6:12 7:12	clarified 30:17
18:15 23:12	19:19 21:17 30:6	basis 19:6 27:17	23:2,12 24:11	clarify 13:6 30:16
agreement 7:7,8	arithmetic 17:21	bear 29:6	25:7 31:23	clarifying 24:13
26:7,8,8,12,20	19:8	behalf 5:2 13:17	built 24:22	clarity 10:9
31:22	art 20:22 26:8	19:19 23:14 29:2	Bureau 1:3 2:4,5	clear 7:23 20:3,10
agreements 16:14	aside 9:11	30:4,6 31:21	4:17,21 12:12	clearly 12:16 19:22
16:22 18:4,14,17	asked 17:15 18:12	believe 14:9,17	13:7 16:23 17:4	31:12
24:20,22 26:1,17	22:23 34:1	21:11 25:19 27:10	17:11 18:4,17	client 13:17 28:4
28:18,23	asking 9:6 20:3,10	27:15 31:5,7,17	business 23:10	clients 8:19 11:22
agrees 12:12	24:1 27:16 30:16	33:6	bylaw 8:14 9:4	28:2,2
al 1:9 4:7 35:8	30:17	beneficiaries 22:5	bylaws 7:17 8:12	28.2,2 clients' 7:4
	assignment 20:23	benefit 20:4 21:12	16:14,15 18:15	
alleged 18:11			10.17,10 10.10	Closson 5:5,7,9,9
	I		I	

17:9,12 21:6 23:3 entitled 6:20 19:7 Cobra 13:2 22:5 contrary 7:21 D contravenes 8:21 23:4 24:20 26:12.19 cold 9:21 **D** 2:13 4:1 combination 7:10 contribute 22:2 divide 19:5 equal 18:9 19:9 data 23:23 7.13 11.3 **Division** 1:13 equation 13:8 contributed 8:16 date 35:9 come 14:22 19:17 9:8 22:4,5 31:15 docketed 4:7 **Esquire** 2:6,7,7,13 David 2:16,17 5:11 25:16 27:21 contribution 8:10 document 7:5,6 2:17,23 3:6,9 day 25:22 **comes** 10:21 11:8,10 19:4 doing 9:10 11:1 essentially 10:12 December 17:7 commencing 1:16 20:14 20:15 29:15 32:1 dollar 8:5 11:6 20:8 established 9:3 comment 12:12 contributions 8:4 **decide** 22:17 24:14,17 9:12 11:4,19 32:8,10 18:10 decision 10:7,8 comments 12:11 23:18 28:12,12 dollars 7:9 11:14 et 1:9 4:7 17:23 21:9.10 27:8 contributors 9:20 communities 22:16 13:22 14:9,17 35:8 29:21 31:19 29:3 CONTROL 35:19 15:6 16:3,9 18:1 everyone's 13:18 decisions 34:9 completeness 10:10 conversation 24:7 19:5 20:11,23 evidence 17:3 deduction 9:17 completion 33:7 cooperation 33:16 21:22 24:9 exactly 17:13,20 deductions 12:21 Complex 1:14 copies 17:4 26:11 **Don** 4:4 25:1,7 defensible 11:17 comply 25:9 26:14 Donald 3:9 excess 8:15 9:20 denied 10:1 27:5 conceded 16:13 copy 26:6,21 **Douglas** 3:6 5:13 10:2 22:12 denving 28:11 concern 12:17 core 22:20 exercising 33:23 **DEPARTMENT** E **exhibits** 26:3,6 17:17 33:20 corporations 8:11 E 4:1,1 35:1,1 concerned 13:7,7 8.12 exist 24:20 deposition 35:13 earlier 17:7 21:13 concerning 24:8 correct 5:22 6:22 existed 20:8 24:21 determine 31:14 27:1 concluding 32:1 6:23 29:3,4,9 existing 18:16 dfrydman@healt... earnings 10:12 Concord 1:15 2:9 corresponding expands 20:19 2.19 economist 11:20 expressly 16:7 2:14,18 3:7 19:6 different 21:20 effect 12:14 27:15 conduct 29:20 cost 8:2,2,3 extent 8:18 9:5 23:22 24:11 26:17 28:19,23 29:17 conducted 30:20 counsel 4:15 5:11 23:18 difficult 10:17 **effective** 25:20,22 confidential 22:16 15:1 33:10 34:7 dime 20:10 F effectively 10:1 conglomerations 35:11.14 **DIRECT** 35:19 F 35:1 21:18 22:16 counselor 4:14 direction 21:8 eight 6:1,4 29:3 facet 28:15 consideration 9:11 **couple** 4:9 25:15 35:20 either 24:19 25:6 fact 14:15 18:10 29:19 Court 3:11 7:22 directly 12:18,22 eligible 17:6 21:9 22:1 30:11 considered 13:8,10 10:5,7,8 21:16 13:2,4 Elm 2:23,23 factored 9:22 consistent 8:13 31:13 discussions 33:7 else's 13:18 factors 11:12 11:2 16:19 17:12 court's 11:11 34:7 failure 21:14 29:12 emanated 33:12 17:13 18:22 25:6 courtroom 33:12 distribute 7:9 **employed** 35:11,15 29:13 31:7.9 **courts** 21:16 23:17 24:10 25:5 employee 35:14 fair 11:22 29:22 constant 20:19 crew 33:18 distributed 7:15,16 employees 9:23 familiar 23:3 26:23 **CSCR** 3:11 35:22 contention 31:11 15:9 16:8 20:7,11 22:3 27:2,18 28:4 27:8.13 context 30:1 cumulative 15:5.5 32:11 28:7 fault 30:14 15:8 23:1,5 contingent 4:11 distributing 6:21 employers 9:17 Felmly 2:23 5:3,3 continue 15:23 cumulatively 14:3 11:18 16:2,9 ends 20:15 6:16,17 19:13,15 current 7:10,11,14 22:19 34:8 distribution 7:19 enforceable 8:23 19:18 25:12,13 contract 8:19,21 7:20 9:7,19 11:3 8:20 9:6,9,19 12:16 32:20,21 9:3 16:3,8,10,17 17:9 13:21,23 14:10,12 ensure 6:1 figure 23:17 32:8 contracts 12:14 17:10 21:6,22 15:15 20:6,18 **figuring** 20:13 ensures 21:11 22:1 25:8 29:20 22:10 24:2,8 32:13 **filed** 6:20 7:6 **entered** 8:19 22:10 contractually 31:6 distributions 7:18 entirely 23:11 **fill** 32:5,15 16:15 currently 8:7 15:13 16:7,16

filling 31:18	Garvey 3:6 5:14	24:6 25:4	impossible 10:17	7:4
final 14:4 16:5,6,11	Gelinas 3:11 35:3	HealthTrust's 7:6	improper 14:18	introduce 5:7
17:13 18:5,13	35:22	7:17 13:23	inadvertently 10:4	involved 11:5
25:9,17,18	general 5:11 12:13	hear 12:4	include 7:20 14:9	irrespective 30:18
		heard 4:10 14:23		issue 10:21 13:21
Finally 22:9,22	getting 26:18	19:23 27:21	included 6:2 8:17	28:11 29:14 32:11
financial 31:23	gist 12:3		includes 8:14	
financially 35:15	give 26:13	hearing 1:12,13 4:8	inconsistent 16:4,5	issued 25:17,22
find 14:2 17:11	gives 18:7	24:8 30:13 33:13	16:10,11 17:14	issues 11:16 33:3
21:14 29:6	go 16:17 17:9 22:22	34:13 35:7	18:13,14,16,22	-
finder 21:9	24:13 25:8 33:17	hearings 3:9 4:3	incorporated 23:20	$\overline{\mathbf{J}3:6}$
finding 30:14	34:10	5:6,17 6:8,11,14	indicates 7:8	job 30:3,9,12,13
firm 2:12 5:2,10	goes 13:4 20:20	6:16,18 7:1 12:4	indicating 30:8	join 19:19
first 4:10,15 12:6	going 4:14 8:10	13:10,12 14:19	individual 13:4	Jr 2:7
12:11 13:14 20:2	15:11 19:18 23:10	15:12,18,22 18:19	28:11	July 1:16 4:5
22:22 32:23	23:10 24:10 25:9	19:11,13,16,21	individually 17:22	July 1.10 4.3
flowing 12:22	27:12 29:5 33:6	20:21 21:2 24:4	individuals 9:12	K
focused 14:21	34:5,8	24:12,16 25:11,14	12:18 13:8	keep 34:3
following 14:21	good 4:3,19 19:21	25:23 26:5,15,21	infer 31:20	kept 4:13
follows 6:5	government 1:8 4:6	27:4,7,10,14 28:5	inference 29:19,22	kind 15:7
forcefully 30:3	13:1 35:8	29:1,5,10,18	initial 5:21,23	know 13:3 21:1
foregoing 35:5,17	Graf 2:22 5:3	30:15,19 31:3,16	inquire 13:15 14:7	26:7 28:19,22
form 8:23	granted 4:11 6:19	32:3,14,18,20,22	14:14	33:15
formal 4:8	32:23	33:8	inquiry 14:23	
former 6:22 7:11	greater 20:7	heart 10:21	insurance 9:16	L
7:14,21 9:17,23	group 25:6	held 1:13	13:3	laid 31:12
11:3 17:10 28:2	grow 22:19	helping 31:17	insure 22:18	Larochelle 2:7
formula 20:5	growth 22:2,6	hereinbefore 35:9	integrated 20:1	Laurie 3:11 35:3
forth 35:9	guess 25:3 27:23	hold 33:15	intend 27:14	35:22
forum 15:15 27:21	30:10	hope 27:12	interest 11:11,12	law 2:12,16 5:2,10
forward 14:22	H	House 2:8	18:3,5,6 19:7 20:3	8:12,13,16,21 9:3
15:11 19:17 23:10 25:16 33:17 34:10	H 2:6	housekeeping 33:5	20:4,12,16,17	12:13,15,16
	Hall 3:1	33:9	interested 11:22,23	leaves 9:11,20
found 9:1 30:22	Hampshire 1:1,13	Ţ	32:9 35:15	legal 27:15,22
framed 15:4	1:15 2:4,5 8:13,16	i.e 19:2	interests 30:7,8,10	legally 27:20
Fruit 1:15	9:2 35:5	identical 20:16	interference 33:21	Legislature 28:21
Frydman 2:16,17	happened 23:6,7	identifiable 25:5	33:22	Lehmann 3:6 5:13
5:11,11	happens 9:17	identified 7:10 8:6	interrupt 14:20	5:13,22 6:10,23
fully 10:19 23:11	happy 12:2 23:22	8:11 9:13 14:4	intervene 5:21,23 13:19 29:2	7:3 12:13 14:22
funds 6:21 7:15	26:13 33:14	20:6		15:2,14 19:23
10:2,20,23 11:18	Harper 9:1	identify 4:16	intervened 5:15 Intervenor 3:3	20:2 21:1,5 24:6
30:22 31:2,8,20	health 9:16 13:3	identifying 7:13	intervenor 3:3	25:15,16,21 26:4
31:21 further 6:9 16:20	Healthsource 9:1	implicated 14:13	5:14 13:15,19	26:9,18,23 27:3,6
	HealthTrust 2:11	implication 30:16		27:9,12,19 28:17
19:15,20 24:13,17 25:12 32:15 33:2	5:2,12 6:22 7:6,8	implications 34:2	14:2,6,14 16:2,13 17:15 19:1 23:15	28:22 29:4,9,16
	7:11,14,16 8:18	importance 30:1		29:23 31:1,5 32:2
34:11 35:10,13	9:6 11:3 13:5,6,22	important 9:11	25:2 27:1 31:22	32:5
G	14:11,13 16:3,8	10:12	intervenors' 6:20 14:1 17:17	Lehmann's 12:11
$\overline{\mathbf{G}}$ 4:1	22:9,12 23:19,23	importantly 18:13	intervention 6:2	Leonard 3:6 5:14
3 1.1		importantly 10.13	mitervention 6.2	Liability 2:21
	l		l	·

N 4:1 25:23 29:1,10,16 **limited** 4:12 13:20 31:6,9 percentage 11:9 mentioned 18:21 name 4:4,19 27:1 13:20 30:10 ones 23:17 18:2 litigating 15:14 28:19 nature 7:23 23:5 opening 23:1 percentages 19:6 period 9:13 10:8,15 **Meredith** 3:4 6:6 **little 32:6** 28:22 operating 18:16 live 33:19,22 methodology 18:6 need 9:21 10:3 operative 16:21 10:16 18:9 22:13 **Local** 1:8 4:6 35:8 18:11 31:18 opposed 9:7 periods 23:7 long 22:12 23:7,16 Michael 2:13 5:1 needs 8:3 10:13.22 order 7:21,23 **person's** 30:4 look 16:20 **Middleton** 2:22 5:4 neither 11:20 35:10 10:17 14:4 15:9 Persons 12:19 million 7:9 8:5 11:6 **looking** 24:19 new 1:1,13,15 2:4,5 16:5,6,11 17:13 Peterborough 3:4 looks 11:4,9 11:13 13:22 14:8 8:13,16 9:2 33:17 18:5,13 21:6,17 6:6 lose 9:14 14:10,10,17 15:3 21:21 25:6,9,10 **place** 28:21 35:9 35:5 lower 21:16 15:6,8 16:3,9 19:5 **NH** 2:9,14,18 3:1,7 25:17,18,19 27:1 **plain** 14:5,7 20:11,20 21:22 noon 34:9 30:21,23 31:1,3,6 Plainfield 3:4 6:6 M 24:9 32:8,9 North 2:8 31:8,12 33:10 plays 20:12 Main 2:8,13 missed 18:23 Northfield 3:4 6:6 ordered 22:6 Plaza 3:1 maker 21:9 mistaken 31:10 Notary 35:4 organization 28:3 **pleading** 10:4 11:1 making 6:4 15:16 24:9 25:4 29:2 Mitchell 3:9 4:3,4 **notes** 35:7 P Management 1:14 5:6,17,22 6:8,11 notice 7:7 26:2 **pleadings** 8:11,18 **P** 4:1 28:20 6:14,16,18,23 7:1 noticed 7:5 please 5:19,19 Manchester 3:1 **P.A** 2:22 12:4,9 13:10,12 **notion** 22:15 14:22 15:22 manner 6:21 7:13 **P.C** 3:6 13:14 14:19 15:12 **number** 1:7 4:7 PLT 5:4 13:22 **P.O** 2:18 8:20 10:22 11:1 15:18,20,22 18:19 18:1 32:10 14:11 16:8 19:19 32:12 page 10:6,16 19:11,13,16,21 33:5 0 math 20:6 paid 12:18,21 20:21 21:2 24:4 PLT's 14:12 **O** 4:1 17:21 19:3 mathematical 19:2 24:12,16 25:11,14 **plus** 18:3 **object** 26:13 mathematician paragraph 7:5,8 25:23 26:5,15,21 **point** 8:17 9:10 **objection** 6:13,15 14:1,5,15 29:7 11:21 27:4,7,10,14 28:5 10:3,10 21:5 matter 1:6 4:5,6 6:17 31:8 29:1,5,10,18 24:18 25:19 27:23 5:15 7:4 13:19 obligated 16:15 Park 2:17 30:15 31:3,16 30:11 26:3 33:4,9 34:1 **obtain** 12:20 part 8:1 15:8 24:8 policy 8:22 9:4,9,10 32:3,14,18,20,22 34:11 35:7 offered 4:10 28:10 12:15 16:4,12,18 33:4.8 McLANE 2:22 5:3 **OFFICE 2:16** participation 4:12 **Mm-hmm** 26:4 16:18 17:12 22:15 5:9 **Officer** 3:9 4:3,4 16:14 18:14 27:5 moment 5:19 22:21 mean 31:17 5:6,17 6:8,11,14 particular 28:15 money 17:22 20:9 **political** 8:4 9:15 means 8:22 14:16 6:16,18 7:1,12 30:10 22:18 23:14.17 9:23 10:14,18,23 35.19 12:4 13:10,12 parties 12:5 21:8 morning 4:3,5,9,19 11:8,10,15 30:21 meant 14:6 14:19 15:12,18,22 30:6 35:12 motion 5:18,21,23 **pool** 16:22 18:4,16 media 33:12,17 18:19 19:11,13,16 parties' 34:7 6:9,20,21 12:11 22:17,19 24:20 medical 12:20 19:21 20:21 21:2 pass-through 27:18 13:16 14:1 32:23 26:8,12,20 members 6:22 7:10 24:4,12,16 25:11 Patrick 5:5,9 33:5 **Pooled** 26:1 28:20 7:11,14,16,18,20 25:14,23 26:5,15 pay 9:16 13:2 motions 1:12 4:9 pools 16:23 17:5,10 26:21 27:4,7,10 payment 13:4 7:21 8:7,8,15 9:7 4:10 33:2 35:7 18:18 22:16 23:12 9:7,20 10:1,18 27:14 28:5 29:1,5 pays 9:19 **portion** 10:11 mramsdell@ram... 11:3 16:4,8,9,10 29:10,18 30:15 pending 1:12 33:5 27:22 31:5,6 2:15 16:17 17:6,9,10 31:3,16 32:3,14 33:6 35:7 municipal 12:19 **position** 12:10,10 17:11 21:7,22 32:18,20,22 33:8 pension 9:18 21:13 22:7 23:11 municipality 12:23 people 11:19 22:4,5 22:2 24:10 25:5,8 33:20 13:5 28:1 30:4 31:15 28:2.6 29:14.20 official 26:2 27:20 28:3,4 possibility 33:22 N 29:20 30:22 31:4 okay 5:19 6:8 21:2 31:14 practicable 17:7

provision 8:14 10:7 Practices 16:22 recalculation 17:18 removed 28:1,8 responses 20:1 26:12,20 recall 24:19 27:4 renders 21:9 restate 18:20 24:4 22:11 prefer 5:16 provisions 12:14 33:18 **repaid** 13:22 restricted 7:20 public 8:22 9:4,9 receive 9:19 10:2 **Reporter** 3:11 35:4 presentation 12:3 retain 22:12 33:10 14:20 9:10 12:15 16:4 28:13 30:22,23 35:20 retained 14:3 **presented** 21:16,18 16:12,17,18 17:12 received 8:9 **REPORTING 2:23** retired 12:19 28:7 presenting 21:19 22:14,20 27:2 3:23,23 4:23,23 retirees 9:15 22:4 receives 31:2 preserve 21:17 28:8 35:4 receiving 22:8 5:23,23 6:23,23 retirement 9:18 **pull** 21:8 7:23,23 8:23,23 preserved 34:1 recess 34:11 12.22 retrieve 23:23 **Presiding** 4:4 7:12 purpose 13:20,20 9:23,23 10:23,23 recessed 4:9 purposes 14:23 11:23,23 12:23,23 33:20 recognize 5:18 retrograde 20:23 presume 29:6 22:13 33:18 11:15,20 20:5 13:23,23 14:23,23 return 8:6,15 10:2 11:23 21:21 22:8 presumes 18:8 pursuant 11:11 21:5,19 15:23,23 16:23,23 17:23,23 18:23,23 previous 7:15 put 22:7 23:23 24:9 recognized 10:16 31:14 recognizes 30:5 19:23,23 20:23,23 15:13,15 16:7 25:4 28:20 returned 8:3 10:13 31:22 recollection 26:16 21:23,23 22:23,23 10:23 11:14 17:6 O previously 7:22 28:5.9 23:23,23 24:23,23 31:9 question 18:12 21:20 25:23,23 26:23,23 returning 22:14,20 reconvene 34:8 20:20 22:23 31:16 returns 8:1,10 23:8 Primex 17:1 record 4:13,16 5:8 27:23,23 28:23,23 questions 12:2,6 29:23,23 30:23,23 prior 16:21 17:3 14:23 19:22 28:6 **Richard** 3:6 5:13 25:15 21:6 26:3,23 31:18,18 34:11 31:23,23 32:23,23 richard@nhlawo... quiz 27:15 29:12,14 Records 1:14 33:23,23 34:23,23 3:8 quizzed 27:13 **privy** 23:9 reemphasize 22:11 35:23,23 **right** 10:2 21:2 quoting 10:5 proceeding 16:21 refer 28:14 represent 4:21 6:1 25:15 27:20,21,22 **reference** 10:6 23:1 6:5 17:2 28:3 17:3 28.13 34.5 R proceedings 4:12 25:18 28:17 29:12 30:9 33:19 rise 5:20 R 4:1 35:1 representation 4:14 21:13 26:3 referenced 15:10 risk 16:22,23 17:5 raised 14:12 29:13,21 33:13 23:4 29:15 17:10 18:3,16,17 raises 22:9 34:6.10 referring 15:5 22:15 23:12 24:19 representations 6:3 **Ramsdell** 2:12,13 professed 17:17 reflects 11:18 represented 6:3 26:1,8,12,19 5:1,1,2 6:14,15 profession 20:22 refund 27:23 21:8,11 28:6 28.20 13:13,14 14:19 program 28:20 refunded 22:7 representing 5:4,14 role 20:12 15:19,20 16:1 properly 10:6 **regard** 33:16 21:12 27:2 30:7 **rolling** 7:4 24:1,7 18:19 19:1,12,20 Property 2:21 regarding 17:5 REPRODUCTI... room 2:8 30:2,18 22:23 23:2 24:16 proportionality Regulation 1:3 2:4 33:13 35.18 24:18 26:11,19 10:22 2:6 4:17,21 17:1 require 7:17 8:14 Roy 2:7 4:22 32:18.19 proportionate reimbursements required 8:20 RPR 3:11 35:3,22 rational 11:17 11:13,23 13.9 requires 21:16 **RSA** 16:19 31:7 rationale 28:11 reinsurance 8:3 proportionately reserves 8:2 **Raulerson** 2:22 5:4 S 10:19 related 35:11 resolved 34:2 reach 14.8 S 2:7 4:1 proposal 15:2 relates 15:2 resources 22:17 reached 16:22 **Salem** 3:4 6:6 17:17 relative 35:14 respect 12:10 18:21 read 14:1.9 **saving** 19:9 propose 7:13 released 33:15 26:1 27:16,17 **reading** 14:5,8 says 14:2 31:6,7,8 proposed 11:1 12:1 relief 15:7 24:23 28:17 really 20:15,17 SchoolCare 17:1 proposing 6:21 27:16 29:8 respond 12:5 19:14 23:9 second 6:20 12:17 Respondent 2:11 15:7 24:2 remarks 14:21 23:1 reason 13:16 15:4 32:23 30:1 2:21 prospective 15:7 21:7,15 **section** 10:4.9 24:23 27:1 31:20 **remind** 33:10 respondents 31:23 reasonable 31:13 **Securities** 1:3 2:4,5 provided 10:19 reminding 33:9 response 12:8 rebuttal 20:1 21:4

4:17,21 16:23	statements 32:1	T 35:1,1	towns 3:3 5:15,16	
seeking 14:16 29:8	statute 8:22 9:4	tables 11:12	6:1,4 22:1,3	
sensitive 29:11	stenographic 35:6	take 12:10 13:1	transcript 35:6,18	W 2:7,23
separate 16:14	stenographic 33.0	18:1 29:22 33:1	transmissions	waiving 15:12,16
separated 13:1	stirred 32:3,15	taken 26:2 34:2	33:11	want 20:2,10
September 17:8	straight 19:2,8	35:8,13	Triangle 2:17	wanted 10:10 19:22
service 12:20 13:1	streaming 33:19,22	talking 15:8 20:18	tribunal 6:4	wasn't 30:11 32:6
28:8	Street 1:15 2:8,13	23:6,14 24:23	true 16:6 35:6	way 11:16,18 12:1
set 35:9	2:23,23 3:7	25:0,14 24:23	Trust 2:21	15:4 20:17 23:17
settled 8:21	strictly 23:5	technical 33:18	try 23:22 31:23	24:2 30:5,12
Settlement 7:7	strongest 30:5	tell 5:15	Tuesday 1:15	31:11,14 34:3
shares 10:20	stuff 34:4	tells 11:12	two 11:12 12:11	ways 11:21
shares 10.20 shortfalls 17:19	subdivision 11:8	Temple 3:5 6:7	21:5 23:8 26:16	we'll 4:16 24:13
18:7	30:21	ten 19:10	28:18	25:7 26:21
Shorthand 35:4	subdivision's 11:10	ten-year 18:9	type 20:22 27:18	we're 15:14 19:7
Shur 2:10 4:20,23	subdivisions 8:4,7	ten-year 18.9 term 8:21 9:3 20:21	types 26:17 28:18	20:3,10,18 23:14
side 33:23	8:8 9:16,23 10:14	26:7	types 20.1 / 20.10	24:23 25:1,9
sides 21:11	10:18,23 11:15	terminated 28:8	U	31:10 34:5
similarly 12:23	submit 8:13 17:3	Terminating 7:7	ultimately 10:20	we've 17:14 19:2
28:4	22:14 23:13	Terminating 7.7	underlined 10:4,7	went 32:12
simply 11:4 15:6	submitted 16:20	terms 15:4	10:9	windfalls 17:19
19:10 20:17 30:8	sufficient 15:19	Thank 5:17 7:3	underscore 12:17	18:7
single 12:1	sufficiently 23:16	12:6 13:12 15:18	understand 5:20	wish 7:13 12:5
sir 6:22 20:1 25:13	suggest 14:4 16:6	15:20 16:1 19:11	7:17 11:7 26:2	withdrawn 33:6
25:19 32:17,21	suggested 17:14	19:12 24:12 25:11	30:19	witnesses 4:15
sit 22:19	25:2	25:14 26:22 32:22	understanding	word 29:12
situated 28:4	suggesting 14:6	33:8,16	6:19 13:17,18	works 20:17
situation 25:1	suggests 31:13	thing 10:13 13:14	32:6,7 34:6	writing 28:14 29:21
social 33:12	Suite 3:7	17:16,20 22:20	unenforceable 9:5	wrong 21:15 31:8
sole 23:13	support 27:17	25:3	unions 27:2 28:3	X
solely 9:7 15:3	suppose 25:21	things 15:10 23:6	use 22:13	X 18:1
somebody 21:12	Supreme 7:22 10:5	think 10:11,20 11:2	User 26:7,8	
30:2,7,12	10:6,8 21:16	11:17 13:17 21:14	uses 33:17	Y
somewhat 21:20	31:13	21:15 27:19,22		year 11:10,11 19:3
soon 17:6	sure 24:19 26:10	29:23 30:11,19	<u>V</u>	19:4 20:14 23:8
sorry 18:23	33:14	33:5,11	value 20:7,23	23:21
South 1:14 2:13 3:7	surplus 8:5,15 9:8	tied 10:14,15	versus 9:1	years 11:4,5 18:1,2
specific 10:8,14,15	9:21 11:7 14:3	Tilsley 2:7 4:22,22	view 8:5	18:23 19:10 20:9
12:1	15:5 17:5,5 18:9	33:4	violate 9:9 12:14,15	22:13 23:9 24:22
specifically 14:12	18:22 19:9 20:8	time 7:2 8:10 9:13	22:14,15	32:8
sprang 8:8	22:3,6,12 23:20	10:15,16 22:18	violates 8:16 9:4	yesterday 4:8 33:7
spring 8:6	24:21 31:15	23:7 24:21 25:19	22:20	
stand 24:6 28:1	suspend 34:5	29:11,11 33:2,15	violating 9:8	$\left \frac{\mathbf{Z}}{\mathbf{Z}} \right $
state 1:1,2 2:8	suspended 4:8	33:20 34:6,9	voice 5:7	zealously 30:3
12:16,19 27:23	34:12,13	title 26:16	Volinsky 2:6 4:18	0
35:4	system 9:18 21:7	today 5:5 16:21	4:19,20 6:11,13	03101 3:1
stated 28:13	30:2,4	30:13	12:7,9 13:11	03101 3.1 03301 2:9,14 3:7
statement 12:13		total 19:3	24:14,15 26:10	03301 2.9,14 3.7 03302 2:18
24:5	T	town's 20:14	32:16,17	UJJU2 2.10

T			1 agc 42
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
1 1072.0	6		
107 2:8	603-224-1988 3:8		
143:731:8	603-230-3373 2:19		
140 9:2	603-271-1463 2:9		
15 10:6	603-625-6464 3:2		
16th 25:17	603-856-7489 2:14		
17 8:5 15:8	603)669-7922 2:23		
17.1 7:9 11:6,13	3:23 4:23 5:23		
13:21 14:8,17	6:23 7:23 8:23		
15:3,6 16:3,9 19:5			
20:11,20 24:9	12:23 13:23 14:23 15:23 16:23 17:23		
32:8,9 10 20:7			
19 29:7 1987 28:19,23	18:23 19:23 20:23 21:23 22:23 23:23		
198 7 28:19,23 1996 9:2	24:23 25:23 26:23		
1770 7.4	27:23 28:23 29:23		
2	30:23 31:23 32:23		
2003 11:5 20:8 23:5	33:23 34:23 35:23		
23:15	617 2:18		
2004 17:22	017 2.10		
2005 17:22	7		
2006 17:23	71 1:14		
2010 11:5 20:9 23:5	770 9:2		
23:15 32:1			
2012 17:8 25:17	8		
33:14	8 14:1,15		
2013 14:11 17:7	9		
2014 1:16	9:00 1:16		
204 2:8	9:48 34:13		
21 1:16	900 2:23,23		
22nd 4:5	700 2.23,23		
25 2:17			
3			
3.1 14:10			
30 17:8			
31 17:7			
31st 32:1			
33 21:22			
33.3 14:10			
4			
45 10:16			
46 2:13			
5			
5 3:7 7:5,8			
5-B 16:19 31:7			
5B:I, C 31:9,11			
	-	<u> </u>	