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P R O C E E D I N G S

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Good morning. My name is Don Mitchell. I'm the Presiding Officer over the matter here this morning on July 22nd which is captioned as the matter of Local Government Center, Inc., et al docketed as Case Number C-2011-000036.

Yesterday a formal hearing was suspended or recessed and this morning we have a couple of motions that must be heard first and these are motions offered by the intervenors who have been granted contingent or limited participation in these proceedings. That said and because there's an audio record being kept of these proceedings, I'm going to ask each counselor if there are any witnesses, but first if each counsel would identify themselves for the record. We'll begin with the Bureau of Securities Regulation. Mr. Volinsky.

MR. VOLINSKY: Good morning. My name is Andru Volinsky. I'm with Bernstein Shur and I represent the Bureau of Securities Regulation.

MR. TILSLEY: Roy Tilsley also from Bernstein Shur for the BSR. BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

MR. RAMSDELL: Michael Ramsdell from the Ramsdell Law Firm here on behalf of HealthTrust.

MR. FELMLY: Bruce Felmly from McLane, Graf, Raulerson \& Middleton representing PLT, and together with me today is Patrick Closson.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Could I ask Mr. Closson to introduce himself so we get your voice on the record.

MR. CLOSSON: Patrick Closson from the McLane law firm.

MR. FRYDMAN: David Frydman, general counsel for HealthTrust, Inc.

MR. LEHMANN: Richard Lehmann from Douglas, Leonard \& Garvey representing the intervenors, the towns who have intervened in this matter. I can tell you those towns if you prefer.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you very much. I will recognize you for your amended motion in just a moment, please. Okay. So if you would please rise. I understand that you would like to amend your 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.
(603)669-7922

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 $I$

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Okay. Is there any further amendment on that motion?

MR. LEHMANN: No.
HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Volinsky for the BSR?

MR. VOLINSKY: No objection.
HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Ramsdell?
MR. RAMSDELL: No objection.
HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Felmly?
MR. FELMLY: No objection.
HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: That amendment will be granted. My understanding is that you have filed a second motion that is entitled Intervenors' Motion Proposing Manner of Distributing Funds to Former Members of HealthTrust. Is that correct, sir?

MR. LEHMANN: That's correct, Mr. Mitchell. BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Would you like to address that at this time?

MR. LEHMANN: I would. Thank you very much. My clients' intervention in this matter got rolling when we noticed paragraph 5 of the document that HealthTrust filed. That document is HealthTrust's Notice of Termination Agreement Terminating Settlement Agreement and in paragraph 5 HealthTrust indicates that it will distribute $\$ 17.1$ million dollars to its current members or another identified combination of current and former HealthTrust members. And that is assuming the Presiding Officer and the BSR approve. I wish to propose a manner of identifying a combination of current and former HealthTrust members.

When the previous funds were distributed, they were distributed only to HealthTrust members. And I understand that HealthTrust's bylaws require them to make distributions only to members. My argument for you is that any distribution that is restricted to current members and doesn't include former members is contrary to the order you made previously and that was affirmed by the supreme court. It was very clear from your order that the nature of BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.
(603) 669-7922

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 contributed to it violates New Hampshire law. I would also point out something that is not included in the pleadings and that is to the extent that HealthTrust may argue that my clients entered into a contract with it that required that manner of distribution, it is well settled law that a contract term contravenes public policy whether it means by statute or some other form that is also enforceable, and I would cite BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.
(603) 669-7922

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

21 surplus also out in the cold and that they need to be factored into this as well, and some of them are
former employees of political subdivisions who are not BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.
(603)669-7922

BRAGAN REPORIING ASSOCIAIES, 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 pleading. I inadvertently underlined a section quoting the Supreme Court without attributing it properly. The reference is to page 15 of the Supreme Court decision. I underlined the provision itself for a specific period, but in the Supreme Court decision that section is not underlined, so just for clarity and completeness $I$ wanted to point that out to you, but $I$ do think that that portion of the argument is important and that is essentially this. The earnings and the thing that needs to be returned to the political subdivisions have to be tied to a specific period of time. If they are not tied to a specific period of time as you recognized on page 45 of your order, it would be difficult if not impossible to assure members of political subdivisions that they would be fully and proportionately provided the accurate shares of those funds that I think ultimately is at the heart of this issue as it comes before you. There needs to be proportionality in the manner in which funds are returned to political subdivisions. BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.
(603) 669-7922

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 52003 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 year is adjusted for interest pursuant to the court's interest tables and those two factors together tells us the proportionate amount of the $\$ 17.1$ million dollars that should be returned to each of the political subdivisions. I recognize that this is not the only way and that there may be issues with my calculations. I think it is a rational and defensible way of distributing the funds that reflects the contributions of the people who made it. Yet again, I recognize $I$ am neither an economist nor a mathematician and that there may be other ways to do it. Certainly my clients are interested in a fair and proportionate return more than they are interested in BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 the single specific way they've proposed.

I'm happy to answer any questions you may have, but that is the gist of my presentation.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Why don't we hear from the other parties that wish to respond to your argument first before any questions I may have. Thank you. Mr. Volinsky, do you have anything to say in

MR. VOLINSKY: Yes, Mr. Mitchell. Our position is not to take a position with respect to Mr . Lehmann's motion but with two comments. The first comment is the Bureau certainly agrees with the general statement of law that Mr. Lehmann cites to the effect that contracts with provisions that violate public policy or that violate the law are not enforceable. That is clearly the law of the state. The second is to underscore the concern for the individuals who paid for their benefits directly. Persons who are retired from state or municipal service are able to obtain medical benefits and those benefits are paid for by deductions from their retirement benefits directly so that it's not flowing through the municipality. Similarly, those who have BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.
(603)669-7922

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
11
12
13
14
15

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Be considered?
MR. VOLINSKY: Yes.
HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you. Mr. Ramsdell.

MR. RAMSDELL: Mr. Mitchell, the first thing I would ask you to do is to inquire of the intervenors about the breadth of their motion for this reason. My understanding on behalf of my client and I think everyone's else's understanding here is that the intervenors were allowed to intervene in this matter for a limited purpose. That limited purpose is to address the issue of the distribution of the $\$ 17.1$ million dollars to be repaid from PLT to HealthTrust and then HealthTrust's distribution of that. However, BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.
(603)669-7922

BRAGAN REPORIING ASSOCIAIES, 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 be improper.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Ramsdell, let me interrupt your presentation and have him do that so 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.
(603)669-7922

BRAGAN REPORIING ASSOCIAIES, INC.

1 your brother counsel.

MR. LEHMANN: I have. The proposal relates solely to the $\$ 17.1$ million and nothing else. And the reason it was framed the way, in terms of the cumulative surplus I was referring to the cumulative \$17.1 million dollars simply because what I'm not proposing is any kind of prospective relief. I'm only talking about the cumulative $\$ 17$ million that was part of the order that is about to be distributed that was referenced. It has nothing to do with how things are going forward.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: So you're waiving claim to the previous distributions?

MR. LEHMANN: Well, we're litigating the previous distribution in another forum, so I'm not waiving anything, but I'm not making a claim for it here.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you. Is that sufficient, Mr. Ramsdell?

MR. RAMSDELL: It is, Mr. Mitchell. Thank you.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Would you please continue, then. BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

MR. RAMSDELL: Thank you. The argument has been made to you by the intervenors that distributing the $\$ 17.1$ million dollars to current HealthTrust members would be inconsistent with public policy and indeed inconsistent with your final order. I would suggest to you that's not true. Your final order expressly said that the previous distributions would be distributed to current HealthTrust members and PLT members and so distributing the $\$ 17.1$ million dollars to current members would not be inconsistent with your final order at all nor would it be inconsistent with public policy.

The intervenors have conceded that their participation agreements separate the bylaws, the bylaws that they were contractually obligated under, and to say that any distributions that are made will go to current members, why is it not against public policy? It's not against public policy because it is consistent with RSA 5-B, but you also don't have to look any further than what I submitted to you in the prior proceeding, and they are still operative today, and that is the Risk Pool Practices Agreements reached 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 with your final order and consistent with exactly what we've suggested and inconsistent with what the intervenors have asked you to do.

The only other thing I would say about the intervenors' proposal is their professed concern that absent a recalculation, if you will, there will be shortfalls to some and windfalls to others, but their calculation does exactly the same thing. All they've done is an arithmetic calculation of, we paid individually this much money in 2004, in 2005, in 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
12 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 pools.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Ramsdell, if you could, could you restate your argument that you recently mentioned with respect to the amount of surplus being consistent or inconsistent over the years? I missed that. I'm sorry. BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

MR. RAMSDELL: Because the intervenors have done a straight mathematical calculation, i.e., we've paid this much in this year and there was total contribution of this much that same year, if you divide the $\$ 17.1$ million dollars by those corresponding percentages on an annual basis and then add interest to them, that's what we're entitled to, but in that straight arithmetic calculation what they're saying is that there was an equal surplus in each of the ten years and that is simply not the case.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you.
MR. RAMSDELL: Thank you.
HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Felmly, would you like to respond?

MR. FELMLY: I have nothing further to add. HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Could I ask you to come forward if you have anything to add though?

MR. FELMLY: All I'm going to add is on behalf of PLT I join in the arguments that Mr. Ramsdell just made and $I$ have nothing further to say.

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.

1 integrated responses and you're up for rebuttal, sir.

MR. LEHMANN: First of all, I just want to be clear that we're not asking for interest to accrue to the benefit of anybody. The interest calculation in the formula does nothing more than recognize in the distribution of the math that you have identified that should be distributed, it allocates greater value to surplus that existed in 2003 than the same dollar in 2010. The money accumulated over all those years. I just want to be clear. We're not asking for a dime more than $\$ 17.1$ million dollars to be distributed. The only role interest plays in the calculation is in figuring out the amount that should be attributed to each town's contribution for each year, and what that really ends up doing, because I did the calculations without interest as well and they're almost identical really simply because of the way the interest works, mostly because we're talking about distribution of a constant amount, not an amount that expands. It's $\$ 17.1$ million. The only question is where it goes.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Is there a term of art in your profession that addresses that type of retrograde assignment of value to dollars? BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

MR. LEHMANN: There may be. I don't know it. HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Okay. All right. Is there anything else you would like to say in rebuttal?

MR. LEHMANN: Point two is I recognize that your prior order authorized distributions to current members. The reason we have an adversarial system in which all represented parties pull in their direction and the fact finder and decision maker then renders the best decision they can is because that's what we believe best ensures that all sides are represented. You didn't have the benefit of somebody representing the position I'm taking in the earlier proceedings. I don't find any failure in that. I don't think anybody did anything wrong. I think for the same reason the Supreme Court requires that lower courts be presented with arguments in order to preserve an argument, that was effectively not an argument that was presented to you, so I recognize that $I$ 'm presenting an argument that's somewhat different than what you did previously in the order that authorized the return of the \$33 million dollars to current members, and I'm bringing to your attention the best that $I$ am able the BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.
(603) 669-7922

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

8 receiving some of their return.

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
12 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.
(603) 669-7922

1 this ball rolling by asking you to bless the
2 distribution and I'm here proposing an alternate way 3 to do it.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Could you restate that last statement for me?

MR. LEHMANN: From where I stand, HealthTrust got this ball rolling on this conversation for this part of the hearing concerning the distribution of the $\$ 17.1$ million dollars when they put in a pleading that they were going to distribute it to the members unless you or the BSR said something different.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you for clarifying that. We'll go around again. Any further comment, Mr. Volinsky?

MR. VOLINSKY: No.
HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Ramsdell, any further comment?

MR. RAMSDELL: Only to point out that as I'm sure you will either recall or in looking at the Risk Pool Agreements that exist, those distributions had to do with a surplus that existed at the time of the agreements and also had been built up over the years, 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 HealthTrust put in its pleading to you that it will distribute it to members or some other identifiable group either as you order us to or consistent with the BSR? Because that is exactly what we'll do. It should go to the current members, but as we did with the final order, we're going to comply with whatever it is that you order.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you. Anything further, Mr. Felmly?

MR. FELMLY: No, sir.
HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you. All
right. I have a couple questions, Mr. Lehmann, so could I ask you to come forward. Mr. Lehmann, I issued my final order on August 16th of 2012 and you've made reference to that final order. At what point in time, sir, do you believe that my order becomes effective?

MR. LEHMANN: Well, I suppose it becomes 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

MR. LEHMANN: Mm-hmm.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: And among those exhibits are a copy of one of those. I had it as a User Agreement. Do you know if that's the same term of art - User Agreement and Risk Pool Agreement?

MR. LEHMANN: I do.
MR. VOLINSKY: I'm not sure it is.
MR. RAMSDELL: I have copies of them. They're entitled Risk Pool Practices Agreement. I'm happy, and I assume no one will object, to give you these copies.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: It's just the title. My recollection is that there were two different types of agreements and that's not what I was getting from Mr. Lehmann.

MR. RAMSDELL: They're both entitled Risk Pool Practices Agreement.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: We'll make a copy after the argument. Thank you.

Mr. Lehmann, are you familiar with my prior BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 order as to earlier prospective intervenors in name?
2 There's several unions representing public employees.

MR. LEHMANN: Yes, I am.
HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: And do you recall in that that $I$ denied their participation?

MR. LEHMANN: Yes.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: And are you
familiar with that decision?
MR. LEHMANN: Yes.
HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Do you believe
that --

MR. LEHMANN: I hope I'm not going to be quizzed about it, but I'm familiar with it.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: I don't intend to quiz you, but do you believe that has any legal effect with respect to the relief you're asking or with respect to the basis you're using for support of some type of pass-through to employees?

MR. LEHMANN: No, I don't think that it legally affects the right of people. It affected their right to come in and be heard in this forum. I 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 employees of my client or people similarly situated.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: My recollection of the record is that they represented their members which were both active employees and retired or terminated or otherwise removed from public service. That's my recollection, so I will ask you to accept that. I will also ask you to accept that as part of the rationale for denying the issue of the individual contributions and though those contributions therefore the stated claim of a right to receive something was addressed, and so I'll just refer you to the writing as to whether or not that particular facet of your argument has been addressed.

Mr. Lehmann, with respect to the reference to the two types of agreements that have just been mentioned, do you know if they were in effect in 1987 when the Pooled Risk Management program was put in place by the Legislature?

MR. Lehmann: I don't know the nature of the agreements that were in effect in 1987. BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC. (603) 669-7922

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Okay. In your pleading before me you intervene on behalf of now eight communities, correct?

MR. LEHMANN: That's correct.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: And so I'm going to presume that the -- if I can find it -- bear with me -- that the calculation in your paragraph 19 is the only relief you're seeking.

MR. LEHMANN: That's correct.
HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Okay. Only
because from time to time $I$ get sensitive, you made reference to the word failure in the prior proceedings, that it was not the failure of anyone not to address the issue of prior members. Was that essentially the representation?

MR. LEHMANN: Well, okay. Something to that effect, yes.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: And so I took an inference from that that there was no consideration of members other than current members in the conduct of those proceedings and in the writing of that decision. 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

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.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: That's not my implication. I was just asking you to clarify that and you've clarified it. I'm now asking you, irrespective of whether someone was in the room, whether you think that the hearings as you understand them to have been conducted and the breadth of the order did not address which political subdivision members would receive funds, if any, and then we found by the order that they would receive. BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

MR. LEHMANN: The order addresses who receives funds.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: And the order said which members.

MR. LEHMANN: Well, I believe one portion of the order says current members and another portion I believe says consistent with RSA 5-B. I may have that wrong. Paragraph 14 of the order says that funds shall be returned to members consistent with 5B:I,C. If I'm not mistaken, that's what we're talking about here, and my contention is that 5B:I,C and the way you laid it out in the order very clearly and that the Supreme Court affirmed suggests that the reasonable way to determine that is to return it to the people who contributed to the surplus. That's our position.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: One last question I believe. I don't mean to be helping you too much by filling in the record, but $I$ need to for the record upon which I can make a decision. You have said that you make no claim for prospective funds. Can I infer from that that any claim for funds on behalf of the intervenors ceases with the previous agreement of the BSR and the respondents to try the case on financial BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.
statements concluding with December 31st of 2010?
MR. LEHMANN: Yes.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Have I stirred anything up?

MR. LEHMANN: Can $I$ just fill that in a little bit? My understanding, and again, I wasn't here, but my understanding is that you got to the $\$ 17.1$ million dollar figure by using those years. And I'm not interested in changing the $\$ 17.1$ million dollar number. I'm only talking about how that gets distributed out. I'm not taking issue with anything that went on before other than the manner of distribution.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Well, I won't fill it in any further, but have I stirred anything up with you, Mr. Volinsky?

MR. VOLINSKY: No, sir.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Ramsdell?
MR. RAMSDELL: No.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Mr. Felmly?
MR. FELMLY: No, sir.
HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you very
much. Your first motion is granted and the second one BRAGAN REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.
(603) 669-7922

1 I will take under advisement.

Are there any further motions at this time or issues that should be brought to my attention?

MR. TILSLEY: Mr. Mitchell, just as matter of housekeeping, I think the PLT has a pending motion which I believe was going to be withdrawn pending completion of the discussions we had yesterday.

HEARINGS OFFICER MITCHELL: Thank you for reminding me of that housekeeping matter. I would remind counsel that $I$ made an order for you to retain all transmissions of -- I think I characterized it as social media that had emanated from this courtroom, this hearing room, during the proceedings in April and May of 2012, and I'm sure that you will be happy to know that $I$ have released that hold as of this time. Thank you for your cooperation in that regard as we all go forward with the new media and uses and purposes. If you will recall, we had a technical crew here that was live streaming. I will just represent that the concern of the Presiding Officer at that time was that there was interference or there was the possibility of interference with the live streaming 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.

12 suspended.
13 (Whereupon, the hearing was suspended at 9:48 a.m.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
All right. We're going to suspend these proceedings at this time. My understanding is that there are discussions among the parties' counsel that are going to continue. We will reconvene no later than noon to make decisions at that time as to how these proceedings may go forward. There being nothing further, this matter is in recess. The record is
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