IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ASSOCIATION FOR COMMUNITY AFFILIATED PLANS, ET AL.,)) CV No	o. 18-2133
Plaintiffs,))	ington D.C.
VS.		ington, D.C. per 26, 2018
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, ET AL.,)	P • ·····
Defendants.)))	

TRANSCRIPT OF

MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION HEARING PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD J. LEON

UNITED STATES SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs: Charles A. Rothfeld

Andrew J. Pincus Ankur Mandhania Andrew Lyons-Berg MAYER BROWN PLLC 1999 K Street, NW

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 263-3220

crothfeld@mayerbrown.com apincus@mayerbrown.com amandhania@mayerbrown.com alyons-berg@mayerbrown.com

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

For the Defendants: Serena Maya Schulz Orloff

Bradley P. Humphreys

Jean Lin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Civil Division,

Federal Programs Branch

1100 L Street, NW

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 305-0167

serena.m.orloff@usdoj.gov bradley.humphreys@usdoj.gov

Court Reporter: William P. Zaremba

Registered Merit Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter Official Court Reporter

U.S. Courthouse

333 Constitution Avenue, NW

Room 6511

Washington, D.C. 20001

(202) 354-3249

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 DEPUTY CLERK: All rise. The United States 3 District Court for the District of Columbia is now in 4 session, the Honorable Richard J. Leon presiding. God save 5 the United States and this Honorable Court. Please be 6 seated and come to order. 7 Good afternoon, Your Honor. This afternoon, we 8 have Civil Case 18-2133, the Association for Community 9 Affiliated Plans, et al., versus the United States 10 Department of Treasury, et al. 11 Will counsel for the parties please approach the 12 lectern and identify yourselves for the record and the party 1.3 or parties that you represent, please. 14 MR. ROTHFELD: Charles Rothfeld, Mayer Brown, 15 representing the plaintiffs. 16 MR. PINCUS: Andrew Pincus, Mayer Brown, also 17 representing the plaintiffs. Good afternoon, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Welcome. 19 MR. MANDHANIA: I'm Ankur Mandhania from 20 Mayer Brown also representing the plaintiffs. 2.1 THE COURT: Welcome. 2.2 MR. LYONS-BERG: Andrew Lyons-Berg, Mayer Brown, 23 also plaintiffs. 24 THE COURT: Welcome. 25 MS. ORLOFF: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

```
Serena Orloff for the government.
 1
 2.
               THE COURT:
                           Welcome.
 3
               MR. HUMPHREYS: Bradley Humphreys for the
 4
     government, Your Honor.
 5
               MS. LIN: Jean Lin for the government, Your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT:
                           Welcome.
 7
               All right, Counsel. We're here for argument in
 8
     this case. Each side will have a half hour.
                                                    The plaintiff
 9
     will be able to reserve a portion of its time for rebuttal
10
     argument. Decide as you wish how much you want to leave for
11
     rebuttal.
12
               You may proceed when you're ready.
13
               MR. ROTHFELD: Thank you, Your Honor.
14
               And if I may reserve five minutes for rebuttal?
15
               THE COURT: Sure.
16
               MR. ROTHFELD: Again, I'm Charles Rothfeld of
17
     Mayer Brown representing the plaintiffs.
18
               We are here seeking a preliminary injunction
19
     against the enforcement of the Short-Term, Limited-Duration
20
     Rule, which was issued by the departments here as an
2.1
     interpretation of the Affordable Care Act.
2.2
               We think -- we submit that the Rule is
23
     inconsistent with the structure and purpose of the
24
     Affordable Care Act, it can't be reconciled with the
25
     statutory language that the Rule reports to interpret, and
```

that, therefore, the plaintiffs are likely to prevail on the merits of this litigation.

1.3

2.2

THE COURT: Why isn't that just a correction to return things to the way they were for most of the years that this Rule existed?

MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I think it's not for a couple reasons, Your Honor.

First of all, as a historical matter, before the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, short-term, limited-duration insurance was used exclusively as a transactional form of coverage for people who were between comprehensive plans. And it was a very limited form, very limited aspect of the insurance market at that time, and so people just did not regard it as a significant element of the kind of insurance framework at the time that the ACA was enacted.

I think in evidence of that is when the initial rule that you referred to was promulgated in 1997. There was no explanation given by the Departments as to why they came up with the definition they used. There were just zero comments, public comments, on that rule. It was just simply not taken -- regarded as a very important part of the process.

That changed dramatically with the issuance of the new Rule, the 2018 Rule, because that Rule is designed,

```
clearly and expressly, to create --
 1
 2.
               THE COURT: You skipped over '16.
 3
               MR. ROTHFELD:
                              Well --
 4
               THE COURT:
                           They changed it.
 5
               The Administration that was in power in '16
 6
     changed the Rule from up to 12 months to up to 3, right?
 7
               MR. ROTHFELD: That's quite right.
                           That was an administrative decision
 8
               THE COURT:
 9
     made by President Obama's administration that was the author
10
     of the ACA, right?
11
                              That's right, Your Honor.
               MR. ROTHFELD:
12
               THE COURT: And they did it to accommodate the
1.3
     ACA, did they not?
14
               MR. ROTHFELD: They did it because --
15
               THE COURT: Think carefully before you answer that
16
     question. Think carefully.
17
               Was that not the purpose behind it?
18
               MR. ROTHFELD: The purpose was to ensure that the
19
     interpretation of the Rule was consistent with the statute
20
     that it was designed to implement.
2.1
               The reason that the Rule was issued in 2016 --
2.2
     and, you're right, there was an interpretation issued in
     that time -- but because -- after the enactment of the ACA,
23
24
     for the first time, insurance companies began marketing
25
     short-term, limited-duration policies as comprehensive plans
```

that were a substitute for ACA-compliant insurance, and something that had never been used for before as a primary form of insurance.

2.

2.2

As a consequence of that, as the Departments explained carefully in sort of reasoned explanation of 2016, the reason that they did it at that time, the reason the rule was issued in 2016, was because this change in the use of STLDI was first — because these policies are not subject to the requirements of the Affordable Care Act, they were allowing sort of inadequate forms of insurance to be marketed.

Congress determined, in the ACA, that all forms of insurance should have essential — specified essential benefits, and STLDI insurance is not subject to that, so these new forms of insurance would be marketed without these benefits.

In addition, and maybe more fundamentally, in terms of the purposes of the Affordable Care Act, because they're not subject -- these STLDI plans are not subject to guaranteed issue, which means that people with pre-existing conditions have to get insurance, they're not subject to community rating, which means that insurance companies can't discriminate against people who --

THE COURT: Why didn't they change it at the time that they passed the ACA?

```
Why did they wait until '16?
 1
               MR. ROTHFELD: Because it had not been a problem
 2
 3
     until that time.
 4
               Previously, as I say, before 2010, before the
 5
     enactment of the ACA, insurance had not marketed these plans
 6
     as comprehensive insurance.
 7
               THE COURT: It went into effect in '04, right?
 8
     Excuse me, in '14?
 9
               MR. ROTHFELD: The?
10
               THE COURT: ACA?
11
               MR. ROTHFELD: Yes.
12
               THE COURT: Right.
13
               So there was a two-year -- almost two years when
14
     it was in place. They could have changed it sooner. They
     didn't.
15
16
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I think they -- as they
17
     realized that there was a change in the marketing and the
18
     use of these policies, they investigated it, they studied
19
     it, they asked for public comment on it, and I think
20
     reasonably promptly, as these things go, they issued the
2.1
     rule in 2016.
2.2
               THE COURT: So they were basically doing it to
23
     sort of rejigger the relative competitiveness of the
24
    marketplace?
25
               MR. ROTHFELD: I think that they were concerned
```

that the use --1 2. THE COURT: Agree or disagree? MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I disagree to say that they 3 4 were rejiggered. 5 I think what they were trying to do was maintain 6 the marketplace as it existed at the time of the enactment 7 of the ACA and as Congress intended it to operate when it 8 enacted the ACA. 9 The problem with these policies is that because 10 they're not subject to community-rating quaranteed issue, 11 the central-benefits limitations, they can be marketed --12 they can be much cheaper, and they can be marketed to people 1.3 who are young and who are healthy, and draw them out of the 14 ACA risk pool. 15 The theory of the ACA is that everybody should be 16 in the same -- a single risk pool. That's the thing that 17 makes economically feasibly quaranteed issue. That's what 18 makes it possible to cover people with pre-existing 19 conditions. It's not for that --20 THE COURT: So they were doing it to help save the 21 ACA's conceptual framework? 2.2 MR. ROTHFELD: I think that's a fair way to put 23 it. 24 They were using -- they were doing it to conform 25 the meaning of short-term, limited-duration to its

historical use and to a use that was consistent with the rest of the ACA in which this provision is embodied.

2.2

THE COURT: So they were concerned about the competitive impact it would have on the ACA's insurance framework?

MR. ROTHFELD: Yes, they were concerned about the competitive impact it would have on companies, like plaintiffs here, who were selling ACA-compliant plans.

They are subject to the ACA's requirements, and, therefore, they have to cover people with pre-existing conditions, they have to have community rating, and so their rates are going to have to take into account of that.

The problem with the marketing of these STLDI plans, as primary forms of insurance, is that they're going to attract young, healthy — they're going to be cheaper, they're not going to be as comprehensive, they're going to attract young, healthy people, they're going to draw them out of the ACA-compliant plans.

THE COURT: Well, isn't it good that they be insured?

Because there are a lot of people who fall into the category you've just described, who are not buying insurance right now: They're healthy, they're young, and they're not -- because the penalty and the mandatory requirement of joining in the ACA is no longer in existence.

They're not buying insurance. 1 2. At least this way, they'd have insurance. 3 that, from society's point of view, a net gain, for people 4 who aren't insured are getting insurance or would get 5 insurance? 6 MR. ROTHFELD: I'll give you two responses to 7 that, Your Honor. 8 First of all, Congress has thought about that. 9 Congress thought about that when it enacted the 10 ACA. 11 Congress thought about that when it changed the 12 ACA in 2017 to zero out the penalty that you referred to. 1.3 And Congress thought that the system that works 14 the best, the only way to treat --15 Let me take a step back. 16 The theory of the ACA is that everybody should be 17 able to get adequate health insurance, and that includes 18 people with pre-existing conditions. In order -- and it 19 should be done through a private insurance system, not 20 through a government single-payer program. 2.1 If it's going to be done that way, then the risk 2.2 has to be spread universally; otherwise, it becomes

has to be spread universally; otherwise, it becomes economically unfeasible to provide coverage to people with pre-existing conditions.

23

24

25

And the more that you draw out the young and the

healthy people and put them into these separate plans and you kind of segregate into kind of the high-risk, high-cost plans, people who have pre-existing conditions, it becomes economically impossible to cover them with insurance.

1.3

And so Congress made the determination that you're talking about and said everybody -- there are tradeoffs, but the tradeoff is we're all in this together, everybody has to be in the single risk pool, and that they mean that you got -- I'm sorry, Your Honor, I don't --

THE COURT: Don't we have enough data now to know that people who are healthy and young have already taken themselves out of the game; and that, by adopting this rule, they would at least get back in the game, in the sense that they would have insurance?

These people have voluntary taken themselves out of the game, which has had whatever impact it would have on the spreading of risk, which is your, understandable, concern.

These people are out, they took themselves out.

MR. ROTHFELD: I don't think that's correct,
Your Honor, as a factual matter.

22 Certainly, some people have chosen not to get 23 insurance at all.

THE COURT: Do we need to do discovery on that issue?

```
MR. ROTHFELD: I don't think so.
 1
 2.
               I think that they're --
 3
               THE COURT: Why not?
 4
               MR. ROTHFELD: I don't think that that is a
 5
     factual question for the Court at this time, because I think
 6
     Congress has made this determination.
 7
               Congress said this is the structure we want to put
 8
     in place.
 9
               THE COURT: What if I'm right that the people who
10
     would be attracted to this new rule would be people who have
11
     already taken themselves out of the game?
12
               So, as a result, the people who would be
1.3
     benefiting from this new rule, taking it from up to 3 to up
14
     to 12, would be people who are uninsured and who at least
15
     would have insurance. Wouldn't that be a net gain for
16
     society? If I'm right.
17
               I'm giving you a hypothetical, obviously. But if
18
     I'm right and if the facts bear me out, wouldn't that be a
19
     net positive impact for society that people who are taking
20
     themselves out and are uninsured would have insurance at
2.1
     least?
2.2
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I think that is the
23
     determination that has to be made by Congress.
               I mean, Congress --
24
25
               THE COURT: Well, wait a minute. What about -- we
```

```
do fact-finding all the time around here.
 1
 2.
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well, but I don't think it's a
 3
     fact -- plus, I say, Your Honor, I think that Congress has
 4
     already established the structure in the ACA of how it wants
 5
     it to operate. It wants everybody who has insurance to be
 6
     in the pool, to be in the same pool.
 7
               THE COURT: Well, once they got rid of the
 8
    mandatory requirement, that's a re- -- they reconceptualized
 9
     the whole process, didn't they?
10
               MR. ROTHFELD: I think not for two reasons,
11
     Your Honor.
12
               First off, I think, factually, the fact is, people
1.3
     are continuing to buy insurance, they're continuing to buy
14
     ACA-compliant insurance. They want insurance. And if the
15
     kind of insurance that's available is ACA compliant --
16
               THE COURT: Some people are.
17
               MR. ROTHFELD: Many people are.
18
               THE COURT: Yes.
19
               MR. ROTHFELD: I think that that's --
20
               THE COURT: People with pre-existing conditions
2.1
     are.
2.2
               MR. ROTHFELD: And I think -- and not only -- yes.
23
               THE COURT: Which makes perfect sense; that makes
24
    perfect sense.
25
               But while that's going on on one track, on a
```

different track, people who are healthy and young and who don't want to pay the cost that the insurance markets have been steadily increasing, right, they don't want to pay those costs, they've been taking themselves out of the game.

MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I --

1.3

2.2

THE COURT: They're not in the game; they're not buying insurance.

MR. ROTHFELD: And I'll say two things in response to that, Your Honor.

First of all, I think, factually, I have to respectfully take issue.

Certainly, some people are not buying insurance, but I think many people, many young, healthy people are continuing to buy ACA-compliant insurance because that's what's available and they want to be insured. So I take issue with the factual premise of your statement.

But I think, more fundamentally, for present purposes, you know, we're talking about the validity of a regulation, whether or not it's consistent with the statute that it's purporting to interpret.

Congress had in mind a particular vision, when it enacted the ACA, of people -- of everybody buying minimally adequate insurance, insurance that provides these benefits, and that -- as we've been discussing, that people with pre-existing conditions, community rating, all of that is

part of the package that Congress put in place.

2.

2.2

And if the agencies now think that the system is not working, for reasons that your hypothetical suggests — and it's not for them to say, well, Congress, you missed — you misunderstood, you mispredicted how this was going to work, it's up to Congress to say, well, if the way — the thing that we enacted is wrong —

THE COURT: Well, let me tell you what.

If for 19 out of 21 years the rule was up to three months, why wasn't it up to Congress to change it in the fall of 2016 instead of for the Administration of Obama to change it?

MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I think --

Go back to Congress and let Congress decide to increase it -- excuse me, decrease it --

THE COURT: Why wasn't that the answer then?

MR. ROTHFELD: I think --

THE COURT: -- for three months?

MR. ROTHFELD: In 2016 — the initial regulation that was an interpretation of the HIPAA statute, which initially promulgated in 1997 and then it became a final rule in 2004 — that's the rule that you're referring to — when Congress enacted the ACA, it kind of put the STLDI provision into the ACA, along with a lot of other provisions, and I think the interpretation of 2016 was an

```
interpretation of the ACA use of the term.
 1
 2.
               The ACA has a lot of other things in it, which,
 3
     I think, make very clear Congress had in mind --
 4
               THE COURT: I'll take judicial notice of that.
 5
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well -- I'm sorry, Your Honor?
 6
               THE COURT: I'll take judicial notice of that.
 7
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well --
                           It has a lot of other things in it.
 8
               THE COURT:
 9
               You talk about a hodgepodge.
10
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well -- but among the things that
11
     it has in it --
12
               THE COURT: Right.
13
               MR. ROTHFELD: -- are, A, another term that uses
14
     the word short -- short coverage gap, which is defined in
15
     the ACA as being 90 days, three months, which corresponds
16
     with the 2016 rule.
17
               THE COURT: Right.
18
               MR. ROTHFELD: It also has special enrollment
19
     provision requirements, which assure that nobody will go
20
     without ACA-compliant coverage for more than 90 days.
2.1
               And so the 90-day term that was chosen in 2016 is
2.2
     consistent both with the short coverage gap language and
23
     with the broader structure and operation of the ACA.
24
               So it made perfect sense for the Departments to do
25
     what they did in 2016, particularly when they were looking
```

at the purposes of the ACA and how they were being frustrated by a broader use -- kind of the pre-ACA use -- pre-ACA length of the understanding of short-term, limited-duration insurance.

2.2

So it made perfect sense, in 2016, for the agencies to do what they did, it was completely consistent and, I would say, compelled by the ACA. The problem now is the attempt by the Departments to say, well, never mind, we were wrong in 2016.

But I should say, in saying that they're changing their minds -- they didn't say that the reasoning of the 2016 regulation was wrong. They said nothing about that.

In 2016, the reasoning was, you're drawing people out of the single pool, and that's destructive to the system as a whole. And you're giving people insurance which do not provide the essential — Congress — the benefits that Congress regarded as essential, and that is a bad thing, and we should stop it.

The Departments now don't take issue with that at all, they don't respond to that at all. They simply say, well, this is not putting more people under insurance coverage.

But that was not the purpose of the Rule in 2016. The purpose of the rule was to avoid destruction of the ACA.

And so the problem now is that the Departments

```
have reversed course and have taken an approach, which is
 1
 2
     simply inconsistent with the congressional theory of the
 3
     ACA.
               I think no one denies -- I don't think the
 4
 5
     Departments deny that when Congress enacted the ACA, it had
 6
     in mind this concept it was going to be a single-risk pool.
 7
               THE COURT: Well, the ACA that was adopted in 2010
 8
     is not the ACA that's in existence today, especially in
 9
     light of recent congressional decisions; is that correct?
10
               MR. ROTHFELD: The only change that I think --
11
               THE COURT: Well, it's a pretty substantial one
12
     that the mandate is gone, is it not?
1.3
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well -- I'll say yes.
14
               THE COURT: Wouldn't you say that was the
15
               The keystone to the ACA was the
     linchpin?
16
    mandatory-compliance requirement and that there would be tax
17
    penalties if you didn't comply?
18
               MR. ROTHFELD: I --
19
               THE COURT: Come on. Be candid, Counsel.
20
     candid.
21
               MR. ROTHFELD: I always try to be candid with the
2.2
     Court.
23
               THE COURT: Well, try to be here, because, you
24
    know, that was pretty central, was it not?
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well, at the time of the debate on
25
```

the ACA in 2010, it was thought to be an important part of it. That certainly is true.

But I would say now, when Congress zeroed out the penalty in 2017, it considered these questions, and it was — it got a significant amount of data suggesting that, in fact, the penalty was not the key to people getting ACA—compliant insurance, and that people would continue to buy into this ACA—compliant system, even without the penalty, and, in fact, they have continued to do so. The proof is in the pudding.

And so I think --

1.3

2.2

THE COURT: Is there not substantial data that since the ACA came into existence, that young, healthy people increasingly have not been signing up for it? Isn't there lots of data on that, sir?

MR. ROTHFELD: Frankly, Your Honor, I don't know the answer to that question.

I do know that there's lots of --

THE COURT: You don't know if that's true or you don't believe it's true?

And if you don't believe it's true, tell me -- show me the data that shows the opposite. Tell me where it is.

MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I can tell you that there are many more people who are insured now than were -- or

```
I should put it the other way. There are many fewer
 1
 2.
     uninsured people --
               THE COURT: No, no, no. Let's go back to my
 3
 4
     question. My question -- that wasn't my question.
 5
               I know there are more people insured now.
 6
     not the issue. The issue is the young, healthy people and
 7
     how much loss has been sustained and them signing up for the
 8
    program once it came into existence.
 9
               There's been a decrease, a marked decrease in
10
     their signing up, has there not? That's why the
11
     insurance -- these insurance systems have been failing in
12
     various parts of the country: Not enough young, healthy
1.3
    people have been signing up for it. Come on. You know
14
     that's true. And if it's not true, then show me the data
15
     that says otherwise.
16
              MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I --
17
               THE COURT: Do you have it?
18
              MR. ROTHFELD: I don't have it in front of me.
19
               THE COURT: You don't have it.
20
               MR. ROTHFELD: Frankly, I do not think that's
21
     that's correct. I mean, I think that --
2.2
               THE COURT: You don't think -- what's your basis
23
     for not thinking that's correct?
               MR. ROTHFELD: That --
24
25
               THE COURT: It's been reported on extensively.
```

```
MR. ROTHFELD: That the markets have been
 1
 2
     stabilized; that premiums, actually, this year have come
 3
     down under the ACA.
 4
               And so I think it took a while for --
                           Isn't the big concern of the insurance
 5
 6
     companies here that if this Rule were to stay in place, that
 7
     it would harm their ability to competitively provide
 8
     insurance in the market for people with pre-existing
 9
     conditions?
10
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well, it is -- among my clients who
11
     are insurers, the Acap companies, I mean, yes, that is
12
     right, they're concerned that.
13
               THE COURT:
                           They want those young, healthy people
14
     to offset the expenses and costs of taking care of people
15
     who have pre-existing conditions. I mean, that's basic,
16
     isn't it?
17
               MR. ROTHFELD: Yes. I mean, that's right.
18
               THE COURT: Of course.
19
               MR. ROTHFELD: But I think -- I quess I put it a
     different way.
20
21
               I think what they want, what Congress wanted when
2.2
     it enacted the ACA, which was --
23
               THE COURT: Which Congress wanted?
24
               MR. ROTHFELD: I'm sorry?
25
               THE COURT:
                           The Congress in 2010 or the Congress
```

```
that repealed the mandatory requirement?
 1
 2.
               Which Congress?
 3
               The current Congress?
 4
               MR. ROTHFELD: The Congress that enacted the ACA
 5
     and put in place the current provisions which we're talking
 6
     about being undermined by the expansion, the vast expansion
 7
     of STLDI --
 8
               THE COURT:
                           The Congress that put the ACA in place
 9
     in 2010 believed that the Rule was going to be -- for STLDI
10
     was going to be up to 12 months, not up to 3. That's what
11
     that Congress thought was the playing field.
12
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well --
13
               THE COURT: It was the administration, in its
14
     waning hours, its last two months, that changed the Rule
15
     before the new administration came in, right?
16
               MR. ROTHFELD: I guess I would respectfully
17
     disagree with that, Your Honor.
18
               I don't think that the Congress --
19
               THE COURT: Which part do you disagree with?
20
               MR. ROTHFELD: I don't think Congress that enacted
21
     the ACA in 2010 had in mind a specific length of STLDI --
2.2
               THE COURT: Do you have any basis in legislative
23
     history to show that that's true?
24
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I sort of have a negative,
25
     which is that there was absolutely zero discussion of what
```

STLDI meant, or STLDI at all, at the time of the ACA enactment, because -- and I think there's no doubt about this -- that because historically it was simply not a significant part of the insurance market, as I said at the outset, it was designed as a transitional protection for people who have routine plans, the ACA was designed to give those people protection, because they weren't going to be able to get ACA-compliant plans if they fell within the gap -- if they lost coverage for no reason of their own -- through no fault of their own. And so I think Congress simply did not focus on that specific number.

1.3

And, again, the proof is in the pudding. When the regulation that set the 12-month term was promulgated in 1997, there were no public comments about it, no one took notice of it because it was not a big deal, it was not terribly important.

THE COURT: What was the public commentary like when they changed it from up to 12 to up to 3?

MR. ROTHFELD: In the most recent, there were 12,000 comments, almost all of which were violently opposed.

As we show in our brief, out of 340 comments that were submitted by people, you know, by healthcare providers, by doctors, by hospitals, 338 were opposed to the Rule.

So I think that demonstrates graphically that this is -- this is not a restoration of the system that was in

place before. It was in a radical transformation if the 1 2. Rule goes into effect and operates in the way it's supposed 3 to operate. 4 And I should make clear, there's no doubt about 5 the intended purpose of the new Rule, which is to create an 6 alternative insurance market that is going to compete with 7 ACA-compliant plans. 8 That's what the Rule itself says. It says, an 9 additional choice for consumers that exists side by side 10 with the individual market coverage. It's what the HHS 11 Secretary has been saying repeatedly; that it's designed to 12 provide additional -- bringing of cheap options to 1.3 individuals trapped under the ACA, more affordable options 14 for millions of forgotten men and women. 15 And the idea is --16 THE COURT: Is there any effort underway right now 17 in Congress to change this? 18 This has been in effect how long? 19 How many months? 20 MR. ROTHFELD: I'm sorry, the current Rule? 21 THE COURT: Yeah, the current Rule. Three months, 2.2 four months? 23 MR. ROTHFELD: It goes -- it has just gone into 24 effect.

Frankly, Your Honor, I can't bring up when it was

25

```
initially promulgated but...
 1
 2.
               THE COURT: Of course not. It's been at least a
 3
     number of months, right?
 4
               MR. ROTHFELD: Right.
 5
               THE COURT:
                          Right.
 6
               So you would think by now there would be some kind
 7
     of -- if it's as big a concern as you say it is -- within
 8
     Congress, you would think by now there would be some efforts
 9
     in Congress to try to change it.
10
               MR. ROTHFELD: It's not Congress's responsibility
11
     to step in and correct errors that are made by --
12
               THE COURT: To protect existing legislation?
13
               Are you serious when you say that: It's not
14
     Congress's responsibility?
15
               MR. ROTHFELD: I think it's not Congress's
16
     responsibility to slap down agencies when the agencies
17
    misinterpret --
18
               THE COURT: You like it when the agency rules in
19
     the way you want it to rule, but you don't like it when the
20
     agency doesn't rule in the way you want it to rule.
2.1
               You liked it when they changed it back in 2016,
2.2
    but you don't like it when they change it now.
23
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I --
24
               THE COURT: And, of course, agencies in the case
25
     of this particular discussion here, are being run by
```

administrations of a completely different philosophical 1 approach to ACA, right? 2. 3 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I concede, Your Honor, that I 4 like it when agencies do things that I agree with, that is 5 true. 6 THE COURT: Exactly. 7 MR. ROTHFELD: But I think it is not Congress's --THE COURT: Your candor is refreshing. Thank you. 8 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, thank you. I appreciate 9 10 that, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 MR. ROTHFELD: It is not the responsibility of 1.3 Congress, whenever agencies misinterpret legislation to pass 14 a new law, to correct it. 15 As Your Honor surely knows, the books are full of 16 decisions in which courts have said, agency constructions 17 are inconsistent with what Congress has done, and it's the 18 Court's responsibility, when presented with a case like 19 this, to say --20 THE COURT: Well, let me ask the question more 21 basically: What has been the hue and cry, if any, from 2.2 Congress in response to this change in rule? 23 Can you point me to examples of committees or 24 subcommittees or debate that's been going on to try to get 25 it changed somehow or another by Congress?

```
MR. ROTHFELD: I can't, Your Honor, although,
 1
 2
     frankly, I simply do not know whether there has been --
 3
               THE COURT: Would a silence acquiescence -- is
     silence a favorable reaction?
 4
 5
               MR. ROTHFELD: Absolutely not.
 6
               As, again, I just think it is fundamental that
 7
     when Congress legislates, the agencies interpret; and if the
     agencies get it wrong, people like us come before the Courts
 8
 9
     and say, the agencies got it wrong and you have to measure
10
     the --
11
                           I guess that's like most problems;
               THE COURT:
12
     they want the Courts to fix it, hmm?
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I think, in this case, it's
1.3
14
     not the Congress's responsibility to follow what the
15
     agencies are doing and police them and enact new legislation
16
     when they misinterpret what Congress has done.
17
               As the Court truly knows, that is not historically
18
     how these agency errors have been corrected.
19
               THE COURT: Well, you're coming up on the
20
     25-minute mark.
21
               Do you want to explain to me, in the minute or two
2.2
     you've got left, if you want to preserve five minutes, do
23
     you want to explain to me how there's irreparable harm here?
24
               MR. ROTHFELD: Yes, Your Honor, I'm happy to do
25
     that.
```

```
For the reasons that we've been talking about, the
 1
     rule goes into effect --
 2
 3
               THE COURT: The rates have already been set for
 4
     '19, right?
 5
               How is there going to be any irreparable harm
 6
     if -- look, a PI is an extraordinary remedy, as you well
 7
     know, okay. If you've already filed this lawsuit -- after
 8
     you filed the lawsuit, you came in and filed the PI, okay,
 9
     fine. If you don't get a PI, there's still a lawsuit in
10
     place, obviously.
11
               What's --
12
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well, the irreparable harm,
1.3
     T think --
14
               THE COURT: Where's the harm that's going to
15
     happen between now and the PI going into effect, if you were
16
     to win?
17
               MR. ROTHFELD: It's quite basic, Your Honor.
18
               The point of the Rule is to create a new form of
19
     insurance that's going to compete with my client's
20
     ACA-compliant plans.
2.1
               THE COURT: But we don't know if it will compete
2.2
     successful or not successfully. We have no way of knowing
23
     that. It's premature.
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well, it has been -- well, I guess
24
25
     two things about that, Your Honor.
```

First of all, as a matter of the competitor 1 2 standing doctrine, I don't think it's ever been thought 3 necessary to show that there has been injury that's already 4 occurred. 5 If there's been a new competitor who's been 6 allowed in the market, and there's -- the point of the 7 competition is to take business away from the plaintiff, the 8 D.C. Circuit has said repeatedly, and, I think, very 9 logically, that is sufficient to confer standing per se, 10 that's the end of the matter. 11 I'd also add, even on top of that -- and although 12 I think that's good enough --1.3 THE COURT: I'm not talking about standing. 14 You're mixing apples and oranges. 15 MR. ROTHFELD: Your Honor -- I'm sorry. 16 THE COURT: I'm talking about irreparable harm. 17 MR. ROTHFELD: Yes. 18 THE COURT: The D.C. Circuit happens to be, on the 19 issue of irreparable hard, pretty though, as it should be. 20 MR. ROTHFELD: Let me continue on that, 2.1 Your Honor. 2.2 As a consequence of this new competition, it is, 23 I think, certain that clients are going to be taken away -consumers are going to be --24 25 THE COURT: You think, but you don't know.

```
MR. ROTHFELD: Well, we have --
 1
 2.
               THE COURT: How am I to know?
 3
               MR. ROTHFELD: We have affidavits in the record
 4
     submitted by CHC, one of Acap's members, predicting that
 5
     they'll lose 10,000 customers.
 6
               THE COURT:
                           That's speculation.
 7
               They don't know. That's their best quess.
 8
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I think, Your Honor, whenever
 9
     you make projections, Your Honor, you are making an informed
10
     determination based on the evidence you have before you.
11
               THE COURT: I think the D.C. Circuit requires more
12
     than speculation. They need proof of actual harm that will
    be incurred.
1.3
14
               MR. ROTHFELD: But I think the D.C. Circuit has
15
     said that you assume --
16
               THE COURT: At least the old D.C. Circuit. Maybe
17
    not the current D.C. Circuit.
18
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I think every D.C. Circuit
19
     decision that dealt with this issue, that I'm aware of, has
20
     said --
21
               THE COURT: You dealt with what issue, irreparable
2.2
    harm?
               MR. ROTHFELD: Irreparable harm has said that you
23
24
    presume that economic factors lead to their predictable
25
    results.
```

And the predictable result here is that clients 1 2 are taken away -- customers are taken away from THC; and if 3 they lose their customers, they lose business. That is 4 irreparable injury, because it can't get -- we can't get it 5 back from the government. 6 I mean, as this Court said in the --7 THE COURT: Why wouldn't it make more sense to see 8 how it plays out and then come back with a PI in six months? 9 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, at that point, it's too late. 10 Customers have been lost. We can't get --11 THE COURT: The rates have already been set for 12 next year. 13 MR. ROTHFELD: But if -- I think the issue here is 14 not the rates being set, it's the loss of customers. 15 There's an open-enrollment period going on as of 16 November 1st. 17 THE COURT: Sir, the STLDI right now is only going 18 to be up to 12 months, right? 19 The people who are signing up for it are only for 20 12 months. If we go six months into it, at least we'll have 21 a base of data to see what extent, if any, it's having a 2.2 harmful impact on the rest of the insurance industry. 23 don't have that data right now. 24 MR. ROTHFELD: For our clients, we will have lost 25 their customers and they can't get them back, and they will

- have signed up in the next two months for STLDI insurance.
 They will have left the ACA-compliant policies.
- THE COURT: But, perhaps, on a short-term basis, maybe they'll conclude it's not good.
- 5 MR. ROTHFELD: I mean, they're out for a year at 6 that point.
- They can't -- under the ACA, thy can't enroll in

 ACA-compliant plans, except during a special and

 open-enrollment period.
- And having signed up for these non-ACA-compliant plans, if those plans lapse, they won't be able to get back into the ACA-compliant plans.
- Meanwhile, we've lost the business, and I think
 that is very clearly irreparable injury.
- THE COURT: So it's about holding on to that business, okay.
- MR. ROTHFELD: Well, yes, Your Honor. That's what standing is; that's what irrevocable injury is in this context.
- THE COURT: In the end, this is about the
 insurance industry, that caters to the ACC, being protected,
 right? Protecting their interests, by not allowing
 competition to come in?
- MR. ROTHFELD: Protecting the interest -- my

 clients are nonprofits. They're protecting the interests of

```
their customers, sort of low-income people, who are trying
 1
 2.
     to get --
 3
               THE COURT: Yeah. But the people who are going to
 4
     sustain harm here, by your own admission -- and I might add,
 5
    practically true -- are insurance companies that are doing
 6
     it for profit, right?
 7
               MR. ROTHFELD: Some, yes. But some no.
 8
               As I say, some --
 9
               THE COURT: Well, these are not-for-profit
10
     insurance companies?
11
               MR. ROTHFELD: Yes, the Acap plans are
12
     non-for-profit community plans. So yes, Your Honor.
13
               But if I can reserve whatever time I have left, I
14
     would appreciate it.
15
               THE COURT: One minute.
16
               MR. ROTHFELD: Thank you, Your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: You're welcome.
18
               MS. ORLOFF: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
19
               THE COURT: Good afternoon.
20
               MS. ORLOFF: Serena Orloff for the government.
2.1
               THE COURT: Serena Orloff, all right.
2.2
               MS. ORLOFF: Your Honor, the motion should be
23
     denied because plaintiffs make none of the compelling
24
     showings that they must make to obtain the extraordinary
25
    relief that they seek.
```

And as you finished up with plaintiffs, you were 1 2 discussing irreparable harm. But to take one step back, we 3 think plaintiffs don't have even Article III standing here. 4 THE COURT: Yeah, let's talk about the standing 5 for a minute. 6 MS. ORLOFF: So --7 THE COURT: The D.C. Circuit loves standing. 8 MS. ORLOFF: They do, Your Honor. 9 That is one of their favorite issues. THE COURT: 10 So let's talk about standing. Why don't they have standing, in your judgment? 11 12 MS. ORLOFF: So their main theory of standing is 1.3 the Competitive Standing Doctrine. They invoke it on behalf 14 of CHC. 15 But the D.C. Circuit has been clear that the 16 Competitive Standing Doctrine applies only when the 17 competition is direct and in the same market. 18 And the Competitor Standing Doctrine is not, 19 Your Honor, an exception to the Clapper standard that injury 20 is certainly impending. 2.1 And so the reason that the D.C. Circuit has 2.2 required direct and current competition in the same market 23 is that, without that aspect of the competition, you can't 24 know that if the Court enters the injunctive relief that

plaintiffs seek, that CHC is actually going to be able to

25

```
compete for these customers that may be seeking different
 1
 2.
     products altogether.
 3
               And I think the Court touched on that in its
 4
     discussion earlier, that, in fact, these STLDI products are
 5
     very different products from the ACA-compliant products.
 6
     They're -- they don't offer the essential health benefits.
 7
     They don't offer guaranteed issue and community ratings.
 8
     They don't have the out-of-pocket maximums. There are many,
 9
     many protections.
10
               THE COURT:
                           Indeed, we don't even know, at this
11
     point, to what extent they'll even be attractive to young,
12
     healthy people who otherwise would rather keep their money
1.3
     in their pocket and use it for other purposes.
14
               MS. ORLOFF: Correct.
15
               THE COURT: We have no data. We have no way of
16
     knowing.
17
               If this was, let's say, open season is, what, two
18
     months long, basically?
19
               MS. ORLOFF: I think it's a one month or 35 days.
20
               THE COURT: It's early November to the end of
21
     December, right? So basically, it's two months, okay?
2.2
               If we're a month into open season, at least where
23
     there's some data as to how attractive these potential other
24
     alternatives are -- we have no data right now.
                            I think that's right, Your Honor.
25
               MS. ORLOFF:
```

This is all very --

2.

1.3

2.2

THE COURT: They want me to crystal ball what's going to happen here. I don't have a crystal ball; they don't issue me one with the courtroom.

So how am I supposed to conclude that there's a basis to believe that this is going to be necessarily harmful or injurious to the insurance industry? How do I know that?

MS. ORLOFF: You can't know it, Your Honor.

And that's why we think plaintiffs have not even shown standing, because these people that are going to buy STLDI products — and there was some findings on this in the Rule — are, in large part, people that have dropped insurance altogether, and who are looking at the difference between no insurance or STLDI insurance, and that was the goal of the rule, which was to serve this population.

Plaintiffs also have invoked standing on behalf of consumers and providers. We think those theories are highly speculative and foreclosed by the D.C. Circuit's opinion in the American Freedom Law Center case that we have cited to you in our papers.

And because plaintiffs haven't shown standing, they, obviously, also have not shown irreparable harm.

The Court is correct, the irreparable-harm standard in the D.C. Circuit is extraordinarily high, and

I have never -- I've seen no case applying the Competitor 1 2. Standing Doctrine to irreparable harm. 3 And what the Wisconsin Gas Company --4 THE COURT: That's really -- that Doctrine really 5 applies to a different issue altogether. It applies to 6 standing. It doesn't apply to irreparable harm necessary 7 for a PI. For PI, they want to see real harm that's either 8 9 imminent or actual at the time, certain and pending. 10 MS. ORLOFF: Correct. 11 "Certain and great and immediately impending" is 12 the language that the D.C. Circuit has used. 13 And we just don't have that here. What we have is 14 conjecture and speculation. Plaintiffs have alluded to an affidavit that was 15 16 submitted. Your Honor, speculation in an affidavit, 17 conclusory statements in an affidavit, they're still 18 conclusionary. The Court is not required to accept them 19 just because they're in an affidavit. And, in fact, doing 20 so would run afoul of the D.C. Circuit's standard for 21 irreparable harm. They need to show facts showing that 2.2 they're going to be immediately injured, and that that 23 injury is great. 24 THE COURT: Remind me when this Rule was passed. 25 MS. ORLOFF: I'm sorry, the Rule?

```
THE COURT:
 1
                           Yeah.
 2.
               MS. ORLOFF: In August, Your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: It went into effect in September,
 4
     right?
 5
               MS. ORLOFF: In October.
 6
               THE COURT:
                           In October?
 7
               So it's been in effect for a matter of just a few
 8
     weeks, three weeks --
 9
               MS. ORLOFF: Correct.
10
               THE COURT: -- something like that?
11
               And the sign-up period is early November to the
12
     end of December, as I understand it, roughly.
13
               Okay. So now here we are, next week is the first
14
     week of November, next Wednesday or Thursday or something
15
     like that, right? And you think you're getting an opinion
16
     from this Court in a week on a matter of this complexity and
17
     enormity?
18
               I'm in the middle of an eight-week trial.
19
     I have this little thing called the CVS/Aetna merger that
20
     I'm also wrestling with.
21
               You think you're going to get an opinion in the
2.2
     next week? You'd be lucky to get an opinion out of me in
23
     four to six weeks. Where are we in four to six weeks?
24
     We're almost completely through the sign-up period.
25
               Assume for the sake of discussion that I rule
```

against the plaintiffs, and don't give you the PI, do you think you have time to get me reversed in the D.C. Circuit by the end of the sign-up period? The answer is: No, it's not possible.

1.3

2.2

I mean, think this through, Counsel. You're coming in here at the eleventh hour and 58th minute, looking for a PI, under circumstances where the period that you're concerned about is going to be certainly almost completely over by the time I issue a ruling.

This isn't practical, and there's all kinds of data that neither side seems to have at its disposal to help the Court decide about this case.

For example, you heard me asking him questions about this data that I'm talking about.

Do you believe the data shows, to the extent it exists, that healthy people have been staying out of the market?

MS. ORLOFF: Yes, Your Honor.

In fact, the data is in the Rule, and the Rule shows that enrollment dropped, I think it was, 20 percent among unsubsidized consumers between 2016 and 2017, even before this Rule was passed.

And so the purpose of the Rule was to provide an option for those people, the people that are not being served by the ACA.

```
So people who otherwise wouldn't be
 1
               THE COURT:
 2
     insured, the hope is, if I understand it correctly, correct
 3
     me if I am wrong, the hope is that people who otherwise
 4
     wouldn't be insured, by their own voluntary conduct, would,
 5
     all of a sudden, have an option that would enable them to be
 6
     insured, because they've made a decision, apparently, on the
 7
     ACA --
               MS. ORLOFF: That's correct.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: -- that they don't want to go that
10
     way?
11
               MS. ORLOFF: That's correct, Your Honor.
12
               THE COURT:
                           So this is a way to fill in the gap
1.3
     for people who are challenged, as opposed to forcing them
14
     either to choose between no insurance or the ACA.
15
               MS. ORLOFF: That's correct.
16
               THE COURT: How is it in the public-policy
17
     interest to do that, to deny them that option? Tell me.
18
     Obviously, you wouldn't agree.
19
               MS. ORLOFF: Well, obviously, we don't think it's
20
     in the public interest to deny people insurance options who
21
     will otherwise go without insurance altogether, and that's
2.2
     what this rule was intended to do.
23
               And to address plaintiff Chevron Step One
24
     argument, there's nothing in the ACA that forecloses this.
25
               First of all, the argument's illogical because the
```

free short-term, limited-duration insurance was a term defined under HIPAA. And in 2010, Congress chose to retain that exemption unchanged at a time when the Departments' regulation was substantially similar to what has been restored by the Rule.

2.

1.3

2.2

Congress undertook an extensive amendment of the public health service act at that time. It could have changed the definition of STLDI had it wanted to. It did not do that.

And under those circumstances, the Court has to presume that Congress knew the regulatory definition and approved of it. It makes no sense to say that Congress enacted the ACA but disapproved of the then-existing definition of STLDI.

Plaintiffs have cited some cases that they believe stand for the opposite conclusion. Those cases are off point because they all refer to congressional inaction as a basis to conclude that Congress has ratified some sort of administrative definition that is contrary to the statute.

We don't have anything that's contrary to the statute here. The phrase "short-term, limited-duration insurance" is ambiguous; the agencies have always asserted the ability to define that ambiguous term, and, for two decades, the 12-month definition was the definition that existed.

Plaintiff's argument that the context of the ACA mandates an alternative definition is also, I think, wrong on every level, really, Your Honor.

1.3

2.1

2.2

There are risk pools for individual health insurance plans and small health insurance plans. Creating risk pools for those markets was just one of many objectives that were in the Affordable Care Act.

The Affordable Care Act is a huge and immensely complicated statute. And while it, on the one hand, tried to create a market for these ACA-compliant products; on the other hand, Congress recognized that there were many other kinds of additional alternative insurance and health coverage options that existed, and it didn't foreclose any type of alternative health insurance option that was not in the ACA-compliant market.

THE COURT: So plaintiff's counsel suggests, without knowing, that there's grave, great -- widespread and great concern about this change in the Rule that's reflective -- reflected in the comments that were submitted in response to the Rule being publicized.

Where is the pushback in Congress? Have you seen any evidence? Can you point to any examples of the relevant health committees in Senate -- House and Senate subcommittees and full committees reacting negatively to this change in the STLDI rule and threatening to amend or

fix the law to take it back to the up-to-three-months

standard that the prior administration had modified it to?

1.3

2.1

2.2

MS. ORLOFF: I'm not aware of any activity in that regard, Your Honor.

But what I do know is that, of course, all regulations have to go through congressional review under the Congressional Review Act, and this Rule did just emerge from congressional review pursuant to that Act, and Congress did not make any changes to the Rule.

Just to get back to the plaintiff's point about the risk pools, that point is also overblown, because 87 percent of consumers in the exchange markets receive subsidies to insulate them from the costs of insurance, and also, importantly, to insulate them from the costs of any increases in insurance premiums.

So this idea that premiums are going to keep going up and up and up, and people are going to fall off the exchanges, I think, ignores that reality, that you have -- that there is a mechanism for keeping people in the exchanges, and the subsidies were the mechanism that Congress chose.

Congress did not foreclose every alternative option that might exist, and we know that because Congress expressly retained the STLDI exemption, and Congress retained a number of other exceptions too, which we have

cited in our paper -- our papers, student health coverage, accepted benefits, religious health-sharing ministries, group health plans. There are just many other types of alternative health coverage options that Congress did not purport to regulate in the ACA, and those have always existed alongside ACA-compliant insurance.

1.3

2.2

THE COURT: I mean, the publicly stated overarching purpose for the ACA has always been to get -- to make sure everyone is insured.

That was, like, the ultimate objective of the ACA, at least as I've always understood it that's been publicly bandied about by politicians on both sides of the aisle and by administrators on both sides of the aisle. Let's make sure everyone has got coverage, let's try to give everyone coverage.

Well, here we have a situation where a group, through its own conduct, is not opting for the ACA option, and the Administration is trying to provide them some form of option in this regard, and they otherwise would go without insurance, because they've already shown, by their conduct, that they're not going to opt for the ACA choice.

I'm having a hard time understanding how that is consistent with the overarching goal of making sure everyone is insured.

Do you see any way that that squares?

MS. ORLOFF: No, Your Honor.

1.3

2.1

2.2

We think providing coverage where someone would otherwise go without coverage altogether is absolutely in the overall interests of the Affordable Care Act. That's what Congress sought to do.

Congress didn't intend to punish people who were not purchasing ACA compliant insurance by taking away all other options and making them go uninsured altogether. We think that's an absurd outcome and an absurd interpretation.

Plaintiffs make some other textual arguments,

Your Honor. One of them is that the Court should interpret
the word "short" in STLDI to mean the same thing as the word

"short" -- in the phrase "short-coverage gap" in the ACA.

There's a couple problems with this argument,

Your Honor. The first is that STLDI is a phrase enacted in

HIPAA, not the ACA, and it makes no sense to look at how a

word was used in the ACA to understand what Congress

intended in HIPAA 14 years earlier.

But, more importantly, the Court should look at what the word "short" qualifies in each instance.

Crest referred to three months as a short coverage gap. That means that Congress understood that there would be longer coverage gaps.

Two, including for periods of unaffordability and hardship that were recognized in the Act.

And there's no indication, as the Court has already acknowledged, that Congress wanted to prevent people from obtaining insurance if they had a coverage gap of longer than three months. That would be an absurd outcome.

1.3

2.2

The plaintiffs have also said that the Rule is arbitrary and capricious because the agencies did not explain why they deviated from the rationale in 2016.

That's just not true, Your Honor.

The agencies explained that the Rule had not succeeded in stabilizing the risk pool, and it had not succeeded in keeping people in the ACA-compliant plans, and, as a result, premiums had continued to rise and people had continued to drop coverage. And so now the agencies were going to provide an option for those people that would allow them to be insured rather than go without insurance altogether.

Plaintiffs also contend that the Departments failed to address a comment, noting that if people had short-term, limited-duration insurance, they might get locked out of coverage if their coverage lapsed and they got some sort of health condition in the meantime that would prevent them from going through underwriting.

As we note in our brief, the Departments did address that concern, and they noted that the problem is far worse if you have an STLDI plan of only three months,

because then, of course, you're subject to re-underwriting

every three months, as opposed to a longer period where you

know you have coverage.

1.3

2.2

THE COURT: Well, if you've got a 12-month limit, as it was before and is now, that basically covers you the period -- from the sign-up period in one year till the sign-up period in the next year.

And if you try it for a year and for whatever reason you don't like it, you can then opt to go into a different plan that's of a short-term duration or you can go with the ACA, if you think it's going to be more protective, but at least you have the choice, right?

MS. ORLOFF: That's right, Your Honor.

And, finally, Your Honor, on the balance of the equities and the public interest, I think we've already touched on many of these.

But I would just note, the markets have anticipated this change, states have begun to use their authority to issue guidance, to the extent they want to, based on their own state's specific concerns.

STLDI issuers have begun to develop these products and apply for regulatory approval to sell them.

ACA-compliant issuers have priced them into their products for 2019.

So there is no benefit to consumers that would

```
come from Your Honor enjoining the rule; and, in fact, it's
 1
 2
     the opposite.
 3
               An injunction would not only cause confusion, but
 4
     it would deprive consumers, who would otherwise go without
 5
     insurance altogether, of an alternative that allows them to
 6
     be insured.
 7
               So for all of these reasons, we think the Court
 8
     must deny the motion.
 9
               THE COURT: Very good.
10
               Thank you.
11
               MS. ORLOFF: Thank you.
12
               THE COURT: You've got a minute.
1.3
               MR. ROTHFELD: Thank you, Your Honor.
14
               I will have four very quick points which I will
15
     try to squeeze into my minute.
16
               First of all, in terms of injury to the plaintiffs
17
     here, the CHC has submitted an affidavit indicating that
18
     it's likely to lose up to 10,000 customers if the Rule goes
19
     into effect. That's clearly irreparable injury, which is
20
     demonstrated in the record.
2.1
               THE COURT: But that's their forecast.
2.2
     their best guess, right?
23
               MR. ROTHFELD: That is their estimate.
24
               And if the Rule works as it is designed to work
25
     and does what it's intended to do, it will draw people out
```

of the ACA-compliant plans.

2.

2.2

Which leads to my second point, which is, the fact is that the government's own figures demonstrate that there are going to be people who leave ACA-compliant plans, go into STLDI plans. There are materials that are submitted by the plaintiffs, affidavits and studies confirming that.

And your question, will healthy people be -- stay in the ACC plans. The fact is, people who will leave the ACC plans for the STLDI necessarily are the young and healthy people, because they are currently in the ACC plans; and if they have pre-existing conditions, they're not going to be accepted into the STLDI plans.

Third, just in terms of -- you asked about discretions of the support for the Rule and recognition that the Rule is destructive, I note that participating in this litigation on our side are the leading groups of physicians like the American Medical Association, leading groups of patient advocacy organizations, like the American Cancer Society, the leading groups of consumers of healthcare, like the AARP, they all say that this is going to be a very destructive rule, that it's going to hurt the healthcare system, it's going to hurt individuals in the healthcare system.

And finally on the timing question which you raised, special enrollment is going to begin on November 1st

and continue well into December, special-enrollment enrollees almost always come en masse towards the end of the process.

2.2

So if there could be a quick ruling, then you asked whether it's possible to affect the way in which people are acting, and the answer to that is yes.

If this Court could rule or if the D.C. Circuit got into it and the determination could be made prior to the end of open enrollment, that would have a significant and immediate impact on what people are doing.

THE COURT: But after the open-enrollment period is over, people who don't have insurance right now who are young and healthy can still sign up for STLDI programs, can they not?

MR. ROTHFELD: They could, but they could not get into the ACA programs.

And so if ultimately --

THE COURT: But, remember now, the question was people who are no -- who are currently without insurance, the young, healthy types in particular, if they don't sign up by the end of the open-enrollment period, they still can join an STLDI program, those kind of people, not people who are in the ACA.

MR. ROTHFELD: That is correct, Your Honor.

But I guess I would emphasize again that there are

```
people who are young and healthy and are now in
 1
 2
     ACA-compliant programs, and they're going to be dragged out
 3
     of those programs --
 4
               THE COURT:
                          What do you meaning "dragged out"?
 5
               MR. ROTHFELD:
                              Dragged --
 6
               THE COURT:
                           That's pretty dramatic language.
 7
               MR. ROTHFELD: Lured out.
 8
               THE COURT: That might be attracted away.
 9
     about attracted away?
10
               MR. ROTHFELD: They will be drawn out one way or
11
     another by the lower prices, and, I think, sometimes by
12
     deceptive marketing, frankly, and there's significant
1.3
     evidence publicly about --
14
               THE COURT: Deceptive marketing?
15
               MR. ROTHFELD: For STLDI plans.
16
               And I think that the bottom line is that there are
17
     some people who are currently in the ACA plans, who are
18
     likely to be attracted by the STLDI as an alternative for
19
     whatever reason because they're cheaper or for whatever
20
     reason, if they find themselves in those plans, and
21
     ultimately, they will not be able to get back into the ACA
2.2
     until the next enrollment period, which is a year away.
23
               THE COURT: Let me ask you a practical question.
24
               Because, you know, there's -- sometimes, we, as
25
     lawyers, have to be practical.
```

Why wouldn't it make more sense to withdraw the PI 1 2 and just litigate this case and get a ruling somewhere near 3 the end of the year? 4 Whichever way I rule, it's going to be appealed. 5 It doesn't matter how I rule. It's going to be appealed. 6 If you win, they appeal; if they win, you appeal. 7 The practical reality is that by the time I rule 8 here, there isn't -- the program -- when I say "rule," let 9 me be very clear to those sitting in the audience who don't 10 know how this works. 11 I have to write an opinion. 12 These are the pleadings. Take a look. Six and a 1.3 half inches. And that doesn't count the amicus. 14 The D.C. Circuit wants an opinion, and they like 15 bows and whistles. They like it nice and neat. They like 16 it all wrapped up for them. 17 For me to crank out an opinion like that while I'm 18 in the middle of an eight-week trial -- take a look, here's 19 the evidence, seven binders six inches thick. 20 And like I said a minute ago, I've got this 21 CVS/Aetna merger going on. 2.2 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I --23 THE COURT: Why? Why are you coming in here 24 looking for a PI under these circumstances, under this time

frame, to me, makes zero sense.

25

```
MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I --
 1
 2
               THE COURT: We can litigate the case in the normal
 3
            I can expedite the briefing. We can do final
 4
     briefing. And you'll get an opinion probably sometime at
 5
     the beginning of the year. Then you take -- whichever side
 6
     loses appeals it, because I know where you're headed.
 7
     You're headed to the Supreme Court. That's what this is all
 8
     about.
 9
               We don't have two of the Supreme Court advocates
10
     in the nation here by accident. Come on. You both have
11
     argued 25 to 35 arguments in the Supreme Court. We know
12
     what's going on here.
13
               What you have done is jump the line by bringing a
14
     PI. But you're bringing it at the eleventh hour and 58th
15
    minute.
             It doesn't make any sense.
16
               And the pressure you're putting on this Court to
17
     turn something out that fast -- and, by the way, I'll have
18
     to write a second opinion later on the merits.
19
               It just doesn't make any sense.
20
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well, if --
2.1
               THE COURT: To me, it makes no sense.
2.2
               I understand you're responding to your client's
23
     wants.
24
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well, Your Honor, if I may,
25
     I guess, three very short points.
```

```
First of all, I sympathize with you; I see the
 1
 2
     binders behind you, and they are kind of alarming, so
 3
     I'm sorry that you're in this position.
 4
               Secondly, I appreciate your --
 5
               THE COURT: Don't be sorry.
 6
               MR. ROTHFELD: I appreciate your reference to our
 7
     litigation background.
 8
               But that's not why we're here. We're here
 9
     because --
10
               THE COURT: You're not being practical.
11
               MR. ROTHFELD: The traditional reason for seeking
12
     a preliminary injunction is that we are facing irreparable
1.3
     injury.
14
               THE COURT: Well, that's a big question.
15
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well --
16
               THE COURT: Believe me, that is a big and open
17
     question.
18
               MR. ROTHFELD: But that --
19
               But your Honor poses the question why are we here
20
     now.
21
               That is why we are here now. There's an
2.2
     open-enrollment process, which is about to start, which is,
23
     for the first time, going to make these STLDI plans
24
     attractive to people who otherwise would be enrolled in the
25
     ACA.
```

```
It's going to draw people out of the ACA-compliant
 1
 2
     plans.
             It's going to injure my clients who market those
 3
            It's going to injure my clients for the benefit
 4
     of --
 5
               THE COURT: But that's your best guess, sir.
 6
     is nothing more than your best guess.
 7
               You and your people, your insurance people,
 8
     whatever, that's what you think is going to happen.
 9
               Why don't we wait and see what happens? Maybe if
10
     we push this hearing back another six weeks, we'll have some
11
     data.
12
               There is no data right now. This is all
1.3
     speculation on your part.
14
               MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I guess I would say,
15
     Your Honor, a couple things, again, Your Honor: People tend
16
     to wait to enroll until the end of the special-enrollment
17
     period, so I think we're not going to know that much until
18
     the special-enrollment period comes to a close, number one.
19
               Number two, if the Rule operates as it's predicted
20
     to work by --
2.1
               THE COURT: Predicted.
2.2
               MR. ROTHFELD: -- not only by my client --
               THE COURT: Good choice of word.
23
24
               MR. ROTHFELD: -- by the actuaries who have
25
     studied it, by the experts who've looked at it; but by the
```

government itself, it is designed to do a particular thing. 1 2 It's designed to take people who are now in the ACA and give 3 them an option to go somewhere else. 4 I mean, you are talking --5 THE COURT: That's not what you just said. 6 Hold on. 7 That is not what the advocate for the government 8 just said. You've misrepresented it. 9 She said it is designed for people who no longer 10 have coverage to have an option of damage. That is what she 11 said. 12 You're misrepresenting what she said. She didn't 1.3 say it's for people who are signed up in the ACA to leave 14 it. 15 MR. ROTHFELD: But --16 THE COURT: That's not what she said. 17 MR. ROTHFELD: -- the government's own figures 18 demonstrate that there are going to be millions of people 19 ultimately who are going to leave ACA-compliant programs and 20 take STLDI plans instead. 2.1 THE COURT: Look, you and your clients don't have 2.2 a right to a PI. It's extraordinary relief. 23 And as she correctly noted, the D.C. Circuit 24 appropriately is very tough and demanding, as it should be, 25 for the extraordinary relief you're asking for here on the

issue of irreparable harm, and it should be that way. 1 2. And what you've got to offer on the 3 irreparable-harm issue is the best guess of the people who 4 work for your clients. Nothing more than that. The best 5 speculative guess as to what's going to happen, and that's 6 what you're basing this on. 7 No-data best quess. 8 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I --9 THE COURT: And so look, you've already made your 10 decision as to what you're going to do. But I'm giving you 11 fair notice right now. If you think I can turn out an 12 opinion on a matter of this complexity and sensitivity and 1.3 national significance in a matter of a few weeks, you're 14 dreaming, dreaming, it can't be done. 15 And, by the way, the Judge who's saying this is 16 the Judge who turned out a 172-page opinion in the AT&T case 17 in six weeks. 18 So I know how this works, and you're not being 19 practical at all. You're doing what you're doing by seeking 20 extreme relief --2.1 MR. ROTHFELD: Well --2.2 THE COURT: -- when you don't have to. 23 You'd get an opinion in the normal course of 24 things, somewhere near the end of the year, beginning of

25

January.

You make your own choice; talk to your clients. 1 2. MR. ROTHFELD: Well --3 THE COURT: But if you lose the PI, if you lose, 4 there will be no chance that you'll get an appellate review 5 of that by the time the end of the enrollment period ends. 6 There just won't be enough time. 7 You know how the D.C. Circuit works, you've argued there what, 100 times, 200 times. You know how they 8 9 operate. Even on expedited briefing. 10 Pincus is smiling. I would be smiling too if I 11 was in his chair. He knows exactly what I'm talking about 12 here. 1.3 Let's be practical here. 14 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, Your Honor, we are sort of 15 prisoners of the calendar. There's a special-enrollment 16 period that's going on --17 THE COURT: No. You're prisoners of your own 18 judgment. 19 MR. ROTHFELD: Well --20 THE COURT: You're prisoners of your own judgment. 21 You've cast your client's fate the way you cast 2.2 That's your choice; you made your decision. You can 23 reverse it, if you wish, if you have the judgment to. 24 you don't, I'm just telling you, if you think I'm going to 25 turn out an opinion in this case in the next few weeks, it's

not possible, no judge could do it. It's too complicated, it's too large, it's too consequential, it can't be done in a matter of a few weeks, especially when I'm in the middle of a trial. So that's just reality. And, by the way, we work nights and weekends every week in my chambers. So be practical, Counsel, think it through, talk to your clients, maybe you'll come to the right decision. We're in recess. DEPUTY CLERK: All rise. This Honorable Court will stand in recess until the return of court. (Proceedings concluded at 4:15 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, William P. Zaremba, RMR, CRR, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-titled matter.

Date: November 1, 2018______/S/_William P. Zaremba______ William P. Zaremba, RMR, CRR

	62
	26 [1] 1/6
DEPUTY CLERK: [2] 3/1 60/9	263-3220 [1] 1/17
MR. HUMPHREYS: [1] 4/2	3
MR. LYONS-BERG: [1] 3/21	
MR. MANDHANIA: [1] 3/18	305-0167 [1] 2/6
	3220 [1] 1/17
MR. PINCUS: [1] 3/15	3249 [1] 2/12
MR. ROTHFELD: [120]	333 [1] 2/10
MS. LIN: [1] 4/4	338 [1] 24/23
MS. ORLOFF: [25] 3/24 34/17 34/19 34/21 35/5 35/7	340 [1] 24/21
35/11 36/13 36/18 36/24 37/8 38/9 38/24 39/1 39/4 39/8	35 [2] 36/19 54/11
40/17 41/7 41/10 41/14 41/18 44/2 45/25 48/12 49/10	354-3249 [1] 2/12
THE COURT: [148]	3:00 [1] 1/6
1	4
'04 [1] 8/7	4:15 [1] 60/13
14 [1] 8/8	5
16 [3] 6/2 6/5 8/1	
<u>'19 [1] 29/4</u>	58th [2] 40/6 54/14
<u>/</u>	6
/S [1] 61/7	6511 [1] 2/11
0	8
0167 [1] 2/6	87 percent [1] 44/12
1	9
10,000 [2] 31/5 49/18	90 [2] 17/15 17/20
100 [1] 59/8	90-day [1] 17/21
1100 [1] 2/5	
12 [6] 6/6 13/14 23/10 24/18 32/18 32/20	A
12,000 [1] 24/20	AARP [1] 50/20
12-month [3] 24/13 42/24 48/4	ability [2] 22/7 42/23
14 [1] 46/18	able [6] 4/9 11/17 24/8 33/11 35/25 52/21
172-page [1] 58/16	about [35] 10/3 10/6 11/8 11/9 11/11 12/6 13/25 15/18 17/9
18-2133 [2] 1/4 3/8	18/12 23/6 24/2 24/14 25/4 29/1 29/25 30/13 30/16 33/15
19 [1] 16/9	33/20 35/4 35/10 40/8 40/12 40/14 40/14 43/18 44/10
1997 [3] 5/18 16/21 24/14	45/12 50/13 52/9 52/13 54/8 55/22 59/11
1999 [1] 1/16	above [1] 61/4
lst [2] 32/16 50/25	above-titled [1] 61/4
	absolutely [3] 23/25 28/5 46/3
2	absurd [3] 46/9 46/9 47/4
20 [1] 40/20	ACA [97]
200 [1] 59/8	ACA's [3] 9/21 10/4 10/9
20001 [1] 2/11	
20005 [1] 2/5	ACA-compliant 25 7/1 10/8 10/18 14/14 15/14 17/20
20005 [1] 2/5	ACA-compliant [25] 7/1 10/8 10/18 14/14 15/14 17/20 20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/12 36/5 43/10
20003 [1] 2/3	20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/12 36/5 43/10
	20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/12 36/5 43/10 43/15 45/6 47/11 48/23 50/1 50/4 52/2 56/1 57/19
20006 [1] 1/17	20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/12 36/5 43/10 43/15 45/6 47/11 48/23 50/1 50/4 52/2 56/1 57/19 Acap [2] 22/11 34/11
20006 [1] 1/17 2004 [1] 16/22	20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/12 36/5 43/10 43/15 45/6 47/11 48/23 50/1 50/4 52/2 56/1 57/19 Acap [2] 22/11 34/11 Acap's [1] 31/4
20006 [1] 1/17 2004 [1] 16/22 2010 [7] 8/4 19/7 20/1 22/25 23/9 23/21 42/2	20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/12 36/5 43/10 43/15 45/6 47/11 48/23 50/1 50/4 52/2 56/1 57/19 Acap [2] 22/11 34/11 Acap's [1] 31/4 ACC [4] 33/21 50/8 50/9 50/10
20006 [1] 1/17 2004 [1] 16/22 2010 [7] 8/4 19/7 20/1 22/25 23/9 23/21 42/2 2016 [18] 6/21 7/5 7/7 8/21 16/11 16/19 16/25 17/16 17/21	20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/12 36/5 43/10 43/15 45/6 47/11 48/23 50/1 50/4 52/2 56/1 57/19 Acap [2] 22/11 34/11 Acap's [1] 31/4 ACC [4] 33/21 50/8 50/9 50/10 accept [1] 38/18
20006 [1] 1/17 2004 [1] 16/22 2010 [7] 8/4 19/7 20/1 22/25 23/9 23/21 42/2 2016 [18] 6/21 7/5 7/7 8/21 16/11 16/19 16/25 17/16 17/21 17/25 18/5 18/9 18/12 18/13 18/23 26/21 40/21 47/7	20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/12 36/5 43/10 43/15 45/6 47/11 48/23 50/1 50/4 52/2 56/1 57/19 Acap [2] 22/11 34/11 Acap's [1] 31/4 ACC [4] 33/21 50/8 50/9 50/10 accept [1] 38/18 accepted [2] 45/2 50/12
20006 [1] 1/17 2004 [1] 16/22 2010 [7] 8/4 19/7 20/1 22/25 23/9 23/21 42/2 2016 [18] 6/21 7/5 7/7 8/21 16/11 16/19 16/25 17/16 17/21 17/25 18/5 18/9 18/12 18/13 18/23 26/21 40/21 47/7 2017 [3] 11/12 20/4 40/21 2018 [3] 1/6 5/25 61/7	20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/12 36/5 43/10 43/15 45/6 47/11 48/23 50/1 50/4 52/2 56/1 57/19 Acap [2] 22/11 34/11 Acap's [1] 31/4 ACC [4] 33/21 50/8 50/9 50/10 accept [1] 38/18 accepted [2] 45/2 50/12 accident [1] 54/10
20006 [1] 1/17 2004 [1] 16/22 2010 [7] 8/4 19/7 20/1 22/25 23/9 23/21 42/2 2016 [18] 6/21 7/5 7/7 8/21 16/11 16/19 16/25 17/16 17/21 17/25 18/5 18/9 18/12 18/13 18/23 26/21 40/21 47/7 2017 [3] 11/12 20/4 40/21 2018 [3] 1/6 5/25 61/7 2019 [1] 48/24	20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/12 36/5 43/10 43/15 45/6 47/11 48/23 50/1 50/4 52/2 56/1 57/19 Acap [2] 22/11 34/11 Acap's [1] 31/4 ACC [4] 33/21 50/8 50/9 50/10 accept [1] 38/18 accepted [2] 45/2 50/12 accident [1] 54/10 accommodate [1] 6/12
20006 [1] 1/17 2004 [1] 16/22 2010 [7] 8/4 19/7 20/1 22/25 23/9 23/21 42/2 2016 [18] 6/21 7/5 7/7 8/21 16/11 16/19 16/25 17/16 17/21 17/25 18/5 18/9 18/12 18/13 18/23 26/21 40/21 47/7 2017 [3] 11/12 20/4 40/21 2018 [3] 1/6 5/25 61/7 2019 [1] 48/24 202 [3] 1/17 2/6 2/12	20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/12 36/5 43/10 43/15 45/6 47/11 48/23 50/1 50/4 52/2 56/1 57/19 Acap [2] 22/11 34/11 Acap's [1] 31/4 ACC [4] 33/21 50/8 50/9 50/10 accept [1] 38/18 accepted [2] 45/2 50/12 accident [1] 54/10 accommodate [1] 6/12 account [1] 10/12
20006 [1] 1/17 2004 [1] 16/22 2010 [7] 8/4 19/7 20/1 22/25 23/9 23/21 42/2 2016 [18] 6/21 7/5 7/7 8/21 16/11 16/19 16/25 17/16 17/21 17/25 18/5 18/9 18/12 18/13 18/23 26/21 40/21 47/7 2017 [3] 11/12 20/4 40/21 2018 [3] 1/6 5/25 61/7 2019 [1] 48/24 202 [3] 1/17 2/6 2/12 21 [1] 16/9	20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/12 36/5 43/10 43/15 45/6 47/11 48/23 50/1 50/4 52/2 56/1 57/19 Acap [2] 22/11 34/11 Acap's [1] 31/4 ACC [4] 33/21 50/8 50/9 50/10 accept [1] 38/18 accepted [2] 45/2 50/12 accident [1] 54/10 accommodate [1] 6/12 account [1] 10/12 acknowledged [1] 47/2
20006 [1] 1/17 2004 [1] 16/22 2010 [7] 8/4 19/7 20/1 22/25 23/9 23/21 42/2 2016 [18] 6/21 7/5 7/7 8/21 16/11 16/19 16/25 17/16 17/21 17/25 18/5 18/9 18/12 18/13 18/23 26/21 40/21 47/7 2017 [3] 11/12 20/4 40/21 2018 [3] 1/6 5/25 61/7 2019 [1] 48/24 202 [3] 1/17 2/6 2/12 21 [1] 16/9 2133 [2] 1/4 3/8	20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/12 36/5 43/10 43/15 45/6 47/11 48/23 50/1 50/4 52/2 56/1 57/19 Acap [2] 22/11 34/11 Acap's [1] 31/4 ACC [4] 33/21 50/8 50/9 50/10 accept [1] 38/18 accepted [2] 45/2 50/12 accident [1] 54/10 accommodate [1] 6/12 account [1] 10/12 acknowledged [1] 47/2 acquiescence [1] 28/3
20006 [1] 1/17 2004 [1] 16/22 2010 [7] 8/4 19/7 20/1 22/25 23/9 23/21 42/2 2016 [18] 6/21 7/5 7/7 8/21 16/11 16/19 16/25 17/16 17/21 17/25 18/5 18/9 18/12 18/13 18/23 26/21 40/21 47/7 2017 [3] 11/12 20/4 40/21 2018 [3] 1/6 5/25 61/7 2019 [1] 48/24 202 [3] 1/17 2/6 2/12 21 [1] 16/9 2133 [2] 1/4 3/8 25 [1] 54/11	20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/12 36/5 43/10 43/15 45/6 47/11 48/23 50/1 50/4 52/2 56/1 57/19 Acap [2] 22/11 34/11 Acap's [1] 31/4 ACC [4] 33/21 50/8 50/9 50/10 accept [1] 38/18 accepted [2] 45/2 50/12 accident [1] 54/10 accommodate [1] 6/12 account [1] 10/12 acknowledged [1] 47/2 acquiescence [1] 28/3 act [12] 4/21 4/24 5/9 7/9 7/18 42/7 43/7 43/8 44/7
20006 [1] 1/17 2004 [1] 16/22 2010 [7] 8/4 19/7 20/1 22/25 23/9 23/21 42/2 2016 [18] 6/21 7/5 7/7 8/21 16/11 16/19 16/25 17/16 17/21 17/25 18/5 18/9 18/12 18/13 18/23 26/21 40/21 47/7 2017 [3] 11/12 20/4 40/21 2018 [3] 1/6 5/25 61/7 2019 [1] 48/24 202 [3] 1/17 2/6 2/12 21 [1] 16/9 2133 [2] 1/4 3/8	20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/12 36/5 43/10 43/15 45/6 47/11 48/23 50/1 50/4 52/2 56/1 57/19 Acap [2] 22/11 34/11 Acap's [1] 31/4 ACC [4] 33/21 50/8 50/9 50/10 accept [1] 38/18 accepted [2] 45/2 50/12 accident [1] 54/10 accommodate [1] 6/12 account [1] 10/12 acknowledged [1] 47/2 acquiescence [1] 28/3

A	also [13] 3/16 3/20 3/23 17/18 30/11 37/17 37/23 39/20
acting [1] 51/6	43/2 44/11 44/14 47/5 47/17
activity [1] 44/3	alternative [8] 25/6 43/2 43/12 43/14 44/22 45/4 49/5
actual [2] 31/12 38/9	52/18
actually [2] 22/2 35/25	alternatives [1] 36/24
actuaries [1] 56/24	although [2] 28/1 30/11
add [2] 30/11 34/4	altogether [8] 36/2 37/14 38/5 41/21 46/3 46/8 47/16
addition [1] 7/17	49/5
additional [3] 25/9 25/12 43/12	always [6] 19/21 42/22 45/5 45/8 45/11 51/2
address [3] 41/23 47/18 47/24	alyons [1] 1/19
adequate [2] 11/17 15/23	alyons-berg [1] 1/19
administration [7] 6/5 6/9 16/11 23/13 23/15 44/2 45/18	am [3] 31/2 37/5 41/3
administrations [1] 27/1	amandnania [1] 1/19
administrative [2] 6/8 42/19	ambiguous [2] 42/22 42/23
administrators [1] 45/13	amend [1] 43/25
admission [1] 34/4	amendment [1] 42/6
adopted [1] 19/7	American [3] 37/20 50/17 50/18
adopting [1] 12/12	amicus [1] 53/13
advocacy [1] 50/18	among [3] 17/10 22/10 40/21
advocate [1] 57/7	amount [1] 20/5
advocates [1] 54/9	Andrew [4] 1/14 1/15 3/16 3/22
Aetna [2] 39/19 53/21	Andrew Pincus [1] 3/16
affect [1] 51/5	Ankur [2] 1/15 3/19
affidavit [5] 38/15 38/16 38/17 38/19 49/17	Ankur Mandhania [1] 3/19
affidavits [2] 31/3 50/6	another [4] 17/13 27/25 52/11 56/10
AFFILIATED [2] 1/4 3/9	answer [5] 6/15 16/14 20/17 40/3 51/6
affordable [9] 4/21 4/24 5/9 7/9 7/18 25/13 43/7 43/8	anticipated [1] 48/18
46/4	any [14] 23/22 25/16 27/21 29/5 32/21 43/13 43/22
afoul [1] 38/20	43/22 44/3 44/9 44/14 45/25 54/15 54/19
after [3] 6/23 29/7 51/11	anything [1] 42/20
afternoon [6] 3/7 3/7 3/17 3/25 34/18 34/19	apincus [1] 1/18
again [5] 4/16 24/12 28/6 51/25 56/15	apparently [1] 41/6
against [3] 4/19 7/23 40/1	appeal [2] 53/6 53/6
agencies [15] 16/2 18/6 26/16 26/16 26/24 27/4 27/13	appealed [2] 53/4 53/5
28/7 28/8 28/9 28/15 42/22 47/6 47/9 47/13	appeals [1] 54/6
agency [4] 26/18 26/20 27/16 28/18	APPEARANCES [2] 1/13 2/1
ago [1] 53/20	appellate [1] 59/4
agree [3] 9/2 27/4 41/18	apples [1] 30/14
aided [1] 2/13	applies [3] 35/16 38/5 38/5
aisle [2] 45/12 45/13	apply [2] 38/6 48/22
al [4] 1/4 1/7 3/9 3/10	applying [1] 38/1
alarming [1] 55/2	appreciate [4] 27/9 34/14 55/4 55/6
all [32] 3/2 4/7 5/8 7/12 11/8 12/7 12/23 14/1 15/10 15/25	approach [3] 3/11 19/1 27/2
18/20 18/20 24/1 24/20 30/1 34/21 37/1 40/10 41/5 41/25	appropriately [1] 57/24
42/17 44/5 46/7 49/7 49/16 50/20 53/16 54/7 55/1 56/12	approval [1] 48/22
58/19 60/10	approved [1] 42/12
All right [1] 4/7	arbitrary [1] 47/6
allow [1] 47/14	are [96]
allowed [1] 30/6	aren't [1] 11/4
allowing [2] 7/10 33/22	argued [2] 54/11 59/7
allows [1] 49/5	argument [5] 4/7 4/10 41/24 43/1 46/14 argument's [1] 41/25
alluded [1] 38/15	arguments [1] 41/23 arguments [2] 46/10 54/11
almost [5] 8/13 24/20 39/24 40/8 51/2	around [1] 14/1
along [1] 16/24	Article [1] 35/3
alongside [1] 45/6	as [61] 4/10 4/20 5/8 5/10 5/14 5/19 5/22 6/25 7/2 7/4
,	7/4 8/4 8/6 8/16 8/20 9/6 9/7 10/14 10/16 12/21 13/12
47/2 48/15 58/9	15/24 17/15 18/15 18/17 24/4 24/5 24/21 26/7 26/7 27/1
	25, 2 , 1, 15 10, 15 10, 11 2 1, 12 1, 15 2 1, 21 20, 1 20, 1 20, 1 20, 1
a a a	lmost [5] 8/13 24/20 39/24 40/8 51/2 long [1] 16/24 longside [1] 45/6 lready [11] 12/11 13/11 14/4 29/3 29/7 30/3 32/11 45/20

A	beginning [2] 54/5 58/24
	begun [2] 48/18 48/21
as [30] 28/6 28/17 29/6 30/1 30/19 30/22 32/6 32/15 34/8 35/1 36/23 39/12 41/13 42/17 45/11 46/12 46/21 47/1	bobalf [2] 25/12 27/17
47/12 47/23 48/2 48/5 49/24 52/18 52/24 56/19 57/23	behind [2] 6/17 55/2
57/24 58/5 58/10	being [10] 17/15 18/1 23/6 26/25 32/14 33/21 40/24
ask [2] 27/20 52/23	43/20 55/10 58/18
asked [3] 8/19 50/13 51/5	believe [6] 20/20 20/21 37/6 40/15 42/15 55/16
asking [2] 40/13 57/25	believed [1] 23/9
aspect [2] 5/13 35/23	benefit [2] 48/25 56/3
asserted [1] 42/22	benefiting [1] 13/13
ASSOCIATION [3] 1/3 3/8 50/17	benefits [7] 7/14 7/16 9/11 15/23 18/16 36/6 45/2
assume [2] 31/15 39/25	berg [3] 1/15 1/19 3/22
assure [1] 17/19	best [8] 11/14 31/7 49/22 56/5 56/6 58/3 58/4 58/7
attempt [1] 18/8	between [5] 5/11 29/15 37/15 40/21 41/14
attract [2] 10/15 10/17	big [5] 22/5 24/15 26/7 55/14 55/16
attracted [4] 13/10 52/8 52/9 52/18	binders [2] 53/19 55/2
attractive [3] 36/11 36/23 55/24	books [1] 27/15
audience [1] 53/9	both [4] 17/22 45/12 45/13 54/10
August [1] 39/2	bottom [1] 52/16
author [1] 6/9	bows [1] 53/15
authority [1] 48/19	Bradley [2] 2/2 4/3
available [2] 14/15 15/15	Bradley Humphreys [1] 4/3
Avenue [1] 2/10	bradley.humphreys [1] 2/7
avoid [1] 18/24	Branch [1] 2/4
aware [2] 31/19 44/3	brief [2] 24/21 47/23
away [8] 30/7 30/23 32/2 32/2 46/7 52/8 52/9 52/22	briefing [3] 54/3 54/4 59/9 bring [1] 25/25
B	bringing [3] 25/12 54/13 54/14
	broader [2] 17/23 18/2
back [14] 11/15 12/13 16/15 21/3 26/21 32/5 32/8 32/25 33/11 35/2 44/1 44/10 52/21 56/10	BROWN [6] 1/16 3/14 3/16 3/20 3/22 4/17
background [1] 55/7	business [4] 30/7 32/3 33/13 33/16
bad [1] 18/17	buy [5] 14/13 14/13 15/14 20/8 37/11
balance [1] 48/14	buying [5] 10/22 11/1 15/7 15/12 15/22
ball [2] 37/2 37/3	С
bandied [1] 45/12	
base [1] 32/21	calendar [1] 59/15
based [2] 31/10 48/20	called [1] 39/19
basic [2] 22/15 29/17	came [5] 5/20 20/13 21/8 23/15 29/8
basically [5] 8/22 27/21 36/18 36/21 48/5	can [17] 9/11 9/12 9/12 20/24 27/23 34/13 43/22 48/9
basing [1] 58/6	48/10 51/13 51/13 51/21 54/2 54/3 54/3 58/11 59/22
basis [5] 21/22 23/22 33/3 37/6 42/18	can't [14] 4/24 7/22 25/25 28/1 32/4 32/4 32/10 32/25 33/7 33/7 35/23 37/9 58/14 60/2
be [90]	33/1 33/2 37/9 36/14 00/2 Cancer [1] 50/18
bear [1] 13/18	candid [3] 19/19 19/20 19/21
became [1] 16/21	candor [1] 27/8
because [35] 5/25 6/14 6/23 7/7 7/8 7/18 8/2 9/9 10/21	capricious [1] 47/6
10/24 13/5 15/14 19/23 24/2 24/3 24/7 24/15 32/4 34/23	care [9] 4/21 4/24 5/9 7/9 7/18 22/14 43/7 43/8 46/4
37/11 37/22 38/19 41/6 41/25 42/17 44/11 44/23 45/20	carefully [3] 6/15 6/16 7/5
47/6 48/1 50/10 52/19 52/24 54/6 55/9	case [13] 3/8 4/8 26/24 27/18 28/13 37/20 38/1 40/12
becomes [2] 11/22 12/3	53/2 54/2 54/3 58/16 59/25
been [34] 7/2 8/2 15/3 15/4 15/24 20/14 21/7 21/9 21/11	cases [2] 42/15 42/16
21/13 21/25 22/1 25/11 25/18 26/2 27/21 27/24 28/2	cast [2] 59/21 59/21
28/18 29/1 29/3 29/24 30/2 30/3 30/5 30/5 32/10 32/11 25/15 30/7 40/16 42/4 45/19 45/11	category [1] 10/22
35/15 39/7 40/16 42/4 45/8 45/11 hafara [12] 1/11 5/9 6/15 7/2 8/4 8/4 22/15 25/1 28/8	caters [1] 33/21
before [12] 1/11 5/8 6/15 7/2 8/4 8/4 23/15 25/1 28/8	cause [1] 49/3
31/10 40/22 48/5	Center [1] 37/20
began [1] 6/24	central [2] 9/11 19/24
begin [1] 50/25	central-benefits [1] 9/11

С	competitively [1] 22/7
	competitiveness [1] 8/23
certain [3] 30/23 38/9 38/11	competitor [4] 30/1 30/5 35/18 38/1
certainly [5] 12/22 15/12 20/2 35/20 40/8 Certified [1] 2/9	completely [4] 18/6 27/1 39/24 40/8
	complexity [2] 39/16 58/12
certify [1] 61/2	compliance [1] 19/16
chair [1] 59/11	compliant [28] 7/1 10/8 10/18 14/14 14/15 15/14 17/20
challenged [1] 41/13	20/7 20/8 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/2 33/8 33/10 33/12 36/5
chambers [1] 60/6 chance [1] 59/4	43/10 43/15 45/6 46/7 47/11 48/23 50/1 50/4 52/2 56/3
change [13] 7/7 7/24 8/17 16/10 16/12 19/10 25/17 26/9	57/19
26/22 27/22 43/18 43/25 48/18	complicated [2] 43/9 60/1
changed [10] 5/24 6/4 6/6 8/14 11/11 23/14 24/18 26/21	comply [1] 19/17
27/25 42/8	comprehensive [4] 5/12 6/25 8/6 10/16
changes [1] 44/9	computer [1] 2/13
changing [1] 18/10	computer-aided [1] 2/13
Charles [3] 1/14 3/14 4/16	concede [1] 27/3
Charles Rothfeld [2] 3/14 4/16	concept [1] 19/6
CHC [4] 31/4 35/14 35/25 49/17	conceptual [1] 9/21
cheap [1] 25/12	concern [5] 12/18 22/5 26/7 43/18 47/24
cheaper [3] 9/12 10/15 52/19	concerned [5] 8/25 10/3 10/6 22/12 40/8
Chevron [1] 41/23	concerns [1] 48/20
choice [6] 25/9 45/21 48/12 56/23 59/1 59/22	conclude [3] 33/4 37/5 42/18
choose [1] 41/14	concluded [1] 60/13
chose [2] 42/2 44/21	conclusion [1] 42/16
chosen [2] 12/22 17/21	conclusionary [1] 38/18
Circuit [17] 30/8 30/18 31/11 31/14 31/16 31/17 31/18 35/7	conclusory [1] 38/17
35/15 35/21 37/25 38/12 40/2 51/7 53/14 57/23 59/7	condition [1] 47/21
Circuit's [2] 37/19 38/20	conditions [11] 7/21 9/19 10/11 11/18 11/24 12/3 14/20
circumstances [3] 40/7 42/10 53/24	15/25 22/9 22/15 50/11
cited [3] 37/20 42/15 45/1	conduct [3] 41/4 45/17 45/21
Civil [2] 2/4 3/8	confer [1] 30/9
Clapper [1] 35/19	confirming [1] 50/6
clear [4] 17/3 25/4 35/15 53/9	conform [1] 9/24
clearly [3] 6/1 33/14 49/19	confusion [1] 49/3
client [1] 56/22	Congress [64]
client's [3] 29/19 54/22 59/21	Congress's [5] 26/10 26/14 26/15 27/7 28/14
clients [11] 22/10 30/23 32/1 32/24 33/25 56/2 56/3	congressional [6] 19/2 19/9 42/17 44/6 44/7 44/8
57/21 58/4 59/1 60/8	conjecture [1] 38/14
close [1] 56/18	consequence [2] 7/4 30/22 consequential [1] 60/2
COLUMBIA [2] 1/2 3/3	considered [1] 20/4
come [11] 3/6 19/19 21/13 22/2 28/8 32/8 33/23 49/1	consistent [6] 6/19 10/1 15/19 17/22 18/6 45/23
51/2 54/10 60/8	Constitution [1] 2/10
comes [1] 56/18	constructions [1] 27/16
coming [3] 28/19 40/6 53/23	consumers [8] 25/9 30/24 37/18 40/21 44/12 48/25
comment [2] 8/19 47/18	49/4 50/19
commentary [1] 24/17	contend [1] 47/17
comments [6] 5/21 5/21 24/14 24/20 24/21 43/19	context [2] 33/19 43/1
committees [3] 27/23 43/23 43/24	continue [3] 20/7 30/20 51/1
community [8] 1/3 3/8 7/22 9/10 10/11 15/25 34/12 36/7	continued [4] 2/1 20/9 47/12 47/13
community-rating [1] 9/10	continuing [3] 14/13 14/13 15/14
companies [7] 6/24 7/22 10/7 22/6 22/11 34/5 34/10	contrary [2] 42/19 42/20
Company [1] 38/3	correct [16] 12/20 19/9 21/21 21/23 26/11 27/14 36/14
compelled [1] 18/7	37/24 38/10 39/9 41/2 41/8 41/11 41/15 51/24 61/3
compelling [1] 34/23	corrected [1] 28/18
compete [4] 25/6 29/19 29/21 36/1	correction [1] 5/3
competition [6] 30/7 30/22 33/23 35/17 35/22 35/23	correctly [2] 41/2 57/23
competitive [4] 10/4 10/7 35/13 35/16	corresponds [1] 17/15

С	deceptive [2] 52/12 52/14
	decide [3] 4/10 16/15 40/12
cost [2] 12/2 15/2	decision [6] 6/8 31/19 41/6 58/10 59/22 60/8
costs [4] 15/4 22/14 44/13 44/14 could [8] 8/14 42/7 51/4 51/7 51/8 51/15 51/15 60/1	decisions [2] 19/9 27/16
counsel [6] 3/11 4/7 19/19 40/5 43/16 60/7	decrease [3] 16/16 21/9 21/9
count [1] 53/13	Defendants [2] 1/8 2/2
	define [1] 42/23
country [1] 21/12	defined [2] 17/14 42/2
couple [3] 5/6 46/14 56/15	definition [8] 5/20 42/8 42/11 42/14 42/19 42/24 42/24
course [7] 19/1 22/18 26/2 26/24 44/5 48/1 58/23	43/2
court [27] 1/1 2/8 2/9 3/3 3/5 13/5 19/22 28/17 32/6 35/24 36/3 37/24 38/18 39/16 40/12 42/10 46/11 46/19	demanding [1] 57/24
47/1 49/7 51/7 54/7 54/9 54/11 54/16 60/11 60/12	demonstrate [2] 50/3 57/18
	demonstrated [1] 49/20
Court's [1] 27/18	demonstrates [1] 24/24
Courthouse [1] 2/10	denied [1] 34/23
courtroom [1] 37/4	denies [1] 19/4
courts [3] 27/16 28/8 28/12	deny [4] 19/5 41/17 41/20 49/8
cover [3] 9/18 10/10 12/4	DEPARTMENT [3] 1/7 2/3 3/10
coverage [24] 5/11 11/23 17/14 17/20 17/22 18/22 24/9 25/10 43/13 45/1 45/4 45/14 45/15 46/2 46/3 46/13	departments [10] 4/20 5/19 7/4 17/24 18/8 18/19 18/25
	19/5 47/17 47/23
46/21 46/23 47/3 47/13 47/20 47/20 48/3 57/10	Departments' [1] 42/3
covers [1] 48/5	deprive [1] 49/4
crank [1] 53/17	described [1] 10/22
create [4] 6/1 25/5 29/18 43/10	designed [9] 5/25 6/20 24/5 24/6 25/11 49/24 57/1 57/2
Creating [1] 43/5	57/9
Crest [1] 46/21	destruction [1] 18/24
crothfeld [1] 1/18	destructive [3] 18/14 50/15 50/21
CRR [2] 61/2 61/8	determination [5] 12/5 13/6 13/23 31/10 51/8
cry [1] 27/21	determined [1] 7/12
crystal [2] 37/2 37/3	develop [1] 48/21
current [6] 23/3 23/5 25/20 25/21 31/17 35/22	deviated [1] 47/7
currently [3] 50/10 51/19 52/17	did [16] 5/14 6/12 6/13 6/14 7/6 8/1 17/25 18/6 24/11
customers [9] 31/5 32/2 32/3 32/10 32/14 32/25 34/1	42/8 44/7 44/9 44/22 45/4 47/6 47/23
36/1 49/18	didn't [8] 7/24 8/15 14/9 18/11 19/17 43/13 46/6 57/12
CV [1] 1/4	difference [1] 37/14
CVS [2] 39/19 53/21	different [7] 15/1 22/20 27/1 36/1 36/5 38/5 48/10
CVS/Aetna [2] 39/19 53/21	direct [2] 35/17 35/22
D	disagree [4] 9/2 9/3 23/17 23/19
	disapproved [1] 42/13
D.C [5] 1/5 1/17 2/5 2/11 35/7	discovery [1] 12/24
D.C. [18] 30/8 30/18 31/11 31/14 31/16 31/17 31/18 35/15	discretions [1] 50/14
35/21 37/19 37/25 38/12 38/20 40/2 51/7 53/14 57/23	discriminate [1] 7/23
59/7	1: : [2] 15/24 25/2
D.C. Circuit [16] 30/8 30/18 31/11 31/14 31/16 31/17 31/18	discussion [4] 23/25 26/25 36/4 39/25
35/15 35/21 37/25 38/12 40/2 51/7 53/14 57/23 59/7	disposal [1] 40/11
D.C. Circuit's [2] 37/19 38/20	DISTRICT [5] 1/1 1/2 1/12 3/3 3/3
damage [1] 57/10	Division [1] 2/4
data [18] 12/10 20/5 20/12 20/15 20/22 21/14 32/21	do [34] 9/5 12/24 12/24 14/1 17/24 18/6 18/15 20/9 20/18
32/23 36/15 36/23 36/24 40/11 40/14 40/15 40/19 56/11	21/17 21/20 23/19 23/22 27/4 28/2 28/21 28/22 28/24
56/12 58/7	35/8 37/7 40/1 40/15 41/17 41/22 42/9 44/5 45/25 46/5
Date [1] 61/7	49/25 52/4 54/3 57/1 58/10 60/1
day [1] 17/21	Do you believe [1] 40/15
days [3] 17/15 17/20 36/19	Do you have [2] 21/17 23/22
deal [1] 24/15	
dealt [2] 31/19 31/21	Do you see [1] 45/25
debate [2] 19/25 27/24	doctors [1] 24/23
decades [1] 42/24	doctrine [6] 30/2 35/13 35/16 35/18 38/2 38/4
December [3] 36/21 39/12 51/1	does [1] 49/25
	doesn't [6] 26/20 38/6 53/5 53/13 54/15 54/19
1	1

D	enough [4] 12/10 21/12 30/12 59/6
doing [9] 8/22 9/20 9/24 28/15 34/5 38/19 51/10 58/19	enroll [2] 33/7 56/16
58/19	enrolled [1] 55/24
don't [51] 12/9 12/10 12/20 13/1 13/4 14/2 15/2 15/3 18/19	enrollees [1] 51/2
18/20 19/4 20/16 20/19 20/20 20/21 21/18 21/19 21/22	enrollment [15] 17/18 32/15 33/9 40/20 50/25 51/1 51/9
23/18 23/20 26/19 26/22 29/9 29/21 30/2 30/25 31/7	51/11 51/21 52/22 55/22 56/16 56/18 59/5 59/15
32/23 35/3 35/11 36/6 36/7 36/8 36/10 37/3 37/4 38/13	ensure [1] 6/18
40/1 41/9 41/19 42/20 48/9 51/12 51/20 53/9 54/9 55/5	enters [1] 35/24
56/9 57/21 58/22 59/24	equities [1] 48/15
done [7] 11/19 11/21 27/17 28/16 54/13 58/14 60/2	errors [2] 26/11 28/18
doubt [2] 24/2 25/4	especially [2] 19/8 60/3
down [2] 22/3 26/16	essential [5] 7/13 7/13 18/16 18/17 36/6
dragged [3] 52/2 52/4 52/5	established [1] 14/4
dramatic [1] 52/6	estimate [1] 49/23
dramatically [1] 5/24	et [4] 1/4 1/7 3/9 3/10
draw [5] 9/13 10/17 11/25 49/25 56/1	et al [1] 3/9
drawing [1] 18/13	even [8] 20/8 30/11 35/3 36/10 36/11 37/10 40/21 59/9
drawn [1] 52/10	ever [1] 30/2
dreaming [2] 58/14 58/14	every [5] 31/18 43/3 44/22 48/2 60/5
drop [1] 47/13	everybody [6] 9/15 11/16 12/6 12/7 14/5 15/22
dropped [2] 37/13 40/20	everyone [4] 45/9 45/14 45/14 45/23
duration [9] 4/19 5/10 6/25 9/25 18/4 42/1 42/21 47/19	evidence [5] 5/17 31/10 43/22 52/13 53/19
48/10	exactly [2] 27/6 59/11
during [1] 33/8	example [1] 40/13
	examples [2] 27/23 43/22
<u>E</u>	except [1] 33/8
each [2] 4/8 46/20	exception [1] 35/19
earlier [2] 36/4 46/18	exceptions [1] 44/25
early [2] 36/20 39/11	exchange [1] 44/12
economic [1] 31/24	exchanges [2] 44/18 44/20
economically [3] 9/17 11/23 12/4	exclusively [1] 5/10
effect [9] 8/7 25/2 25/18 25/24 29/2 29/15 39/3 39/7	excuse [2] 8/8 16/16
49/19	exemption [2] 42/3 44/24
effort [1] 25/16	exist [1] 44/23
efforts [1] 26/8	existed [5] 5/5 9/6 42/25 43/13 45/6
eight [2] 39/18 53/18	existence [4] 10/25 19/8 20/13 21/8
eight-week [2] 39/18 53/18	existing [13] 7/20 9/18 10/10 11/18 11/24 12/3 14/20
either [2] 38/8 41/14	15/25 22/8 22/15 26/12 42/13 50/11
element [1] 5/14	exists [2] 25/9 40/16
eleventh [2] 40/6 54/14	expansion [2] 23/6 23/6
else [1] 57/3	expedite [1] 54/3
embodied [1] 10/2	expedited [1] 59/9
emerge [1] 44/7	expenses [1] 22/14
emphasize [1] 51/25	experts [1] 56/25
en [1] 51/2	explain [3] 28/21 28/23 47/7 explained [2] 7/5 47/9
enable [1] 41/5	
enact [1] 28/15	explanation [2] 5/19 7/5
enacted [12] 5/16 9/8 11/9 15/22 16/7 16/23 19/5 22/22	expressly [2] 6/1 44/24
23/4 23/20 42/13 46/15	extensive [1] 42/6
enactment [5] 5/9 6/23 8/5 9/6 24/2	extensively [1] 21/25 extent [4] 32/21 36/11 40/15 48/19
end [12] 30/10 33/20 36/20 39/12 40/3 51/2 51/9 51/21	extraordinarily [1] 37/25
53/3 56/16 58/24 59/5	
ends [1] 59/5	extraordinary [4] 29/6 34/24 57/22 57/25 extreme [1] 58/20
ENERGY [1] 1/7	
enforcement [1] 4/19	F
enjoining [1] 49/1	facing [1] 55/12
enormity [1] 39/17	fact [11] 14/1 14/3 14/12 20/6 20/9 36/4 38/19 40/19 49/

	6
F	fundamental [1] 28/6
fact [2] 50/2 50/8	fundamentally [2] 7/17 15/17
fact-finding [1] 14/1	G
factors [1] 31/24	
facts [2] 13/18 38/21	gain [2] 11/3 13/15
factual [3] 12/21 13/5 15/16	game [6] 12/12 12/13 12/16 13/11 15/4 15/6
factually [2] 14/12 15/10	gap [7] 17/14 17/22 24/9 41/12 46/13 46/22 47/3
failed [1] 47/18	gaps [1] 46/23
failing [1] 21/11	Gas [1] 38/3
fair [2] 9/22 58/11	get [27] 7/21 11/4 11/17 12/13 12/22 24/8 27/24 28/8 29/9
fall [3] 10/21 16/11 44/17	32/4 32/4 32/10 32/25 33/11 34/2 39/21 39/22 40/2 44/10 45/8 47/19 51/15 52/21 53/2 54/4 58/23 59/4
far [1] 47/24	getting [3] 11/4 20/6 39/15
fast [1] 54/17	give [5] 11/6 24/6 40/1 45/14 57/2
fate [1] 59/21	given [1] 5/19
fault [1] 24/10	giving [3] 13/17 18/15 58/10
favorable [1] 28/4	go [17] 8/20 16/15 17/19 21/3 32/20 41/9 41/21 44/6
favorite [1] 35/9	45/19 46/3 46/8 47/15 48/9 48/10 49/4 50/4 57/3
feasibly [1] 9/17	goal [2] 37/16 45/23
Federal [1] 2/4	God [1] 3/4
fell [1] 24/8	goes [4] 25/2 25/23 29/2 49/18
few [4] 39/7 58/13 59/25 60/3	going [61] 10/12 10/14 10/15 10/16 10/16 10/17 11/21 14/25
fewer [1] 21/1	16/5 19/6 23/9 23/10 24/7 25/6 27/24 29/5 29/14 29/15
field [1] 23/11	29/19 30/23 30/24 32/15 32/17 34/3 35/25 37/3 37/6
figures [2] 50/3 57/17	37/11 38/22 39/21 40/8 44/16 44/16 44/17 45/21 47/14
filed [3] 29/7 29/8 29/8	47/22 48/11 50/4 50/11 50/20 50/21 50/22 50/25 52/2
fill [1] 41/12	53/4 53/5 53/21 54/12 55/23 56/1 56/2 56/3 56/8 56/17
final [2] 16/21 54/3	57/18 57/19 58/5 58/10 59/16 59/24
finally [2] 48/14 50/24 find [1] 52/20	gone [2] 19/12 25/23
finding [1] 14/1	good [10] 3/7 3/17 3/25 10/19 30/12 33/4 34/18 34/19
findings [1] 37/12	49/9 56/23
fine [1] 29/9	Good afternoon [1] 3/25
finished [1] 35/1	got [12] 12/9 14/7 20/5 28/9 28/22 45/14 47/20 48/4
first [13] 5/8 6/24 7/8 11/8 14/12 15/10 30/1 39/13 41/25	49/12/51/8/53/20/58/2
46/15 49/16 55/1 55/23	government [8] 4/1 4/4 4/5 11/20 32/5 34/20 57/1 57/7
five [2] 4/14 28/22	government's [2] 50/3 57/17
fix [2] 28/12 44/1	graphically [1] 24/24
focus [1] 24/11	grave [1] 43/17 great [4] 38/11 38/23 43/17 43/18
follow [1] 28/14	group [2] 45/3 45/16
forcing [1] 41/13	groups [3] 50/16 50/17 50/19
forecast [1] 49/21	guaranteed [4] 7/20 9/10 9/17 36/7
foreclose [2] 43/13 44/22	guess [14] 22/19 23/16 28/11 29/24 31/7 49/22 51/25
foreclosed [1] 37/19	54/25 56/5 56/6 56/14 58/3 58/5 58/7
forecloses [1] 41/24	guidance [1] 48/19
foregoing [1] 61/3	
forgotten [1] 25/14	H
form [5] 5/11 5/12 7/3 29/18 45/18	had [16] 7/2 8/2 8/5 12/16 15/21 17/3 19/5 23/21 42/8
forms [4] 7/10 7/12 7/15 10/14	44/2 47/3 47/9 47/10 47/12 47/12 47/18
four [4] 25/22 39/23 39/23 49/14	half [2] 4/8 53/13
frame [1] 53/25	hand [2] 43/9 43/11
framework [3] 5/15 9/21 10/5	happen [4] 29/15 37/3 56/8 58/5
frankly [5] 20/16 21/20 25/25 28/2 52/12	happens [2] 30/18 56/9
free [1] 42/1 Freedom [1] 27/20	happy [1] 28/24
Freedom [1] 37/20 front [1] 21/18	hard [2] 30/19 45/22
front [1] 21/18 frustrated [1] 18/2	hardship [1] 46/25
full [2] 27/15 43/24	harm [19] 22/7 28/23 29/5 29/12 29/14 30/16 31/12
1411 [2] 2(/12 T)/2T	31/22 31/23 34/4 35/2 37/23 37/24 38/2 38/6 38/8 38/21

52/8 53/5 53/10 58/18 59/7 59/8 \mathbf{H} hue [1] 27/21 harm... [2] 58/1 58/3 huge [1] 43/8 harmful [2] 32/22 37/7 Humphreys [2] 2/2 4/3 has [37] 11/8 11/22 12/7 12/16 13/6 13/23 14/3 14/5 17/2 hurt [2] 50/21 50/22 17/8 17/11 17/18 21/7 21/10 25/11 25/18 25/23 27/17 27/21 hypothetical [2] 13/17 16/3 28/2 28/16 29/24 30/3 30/8 31/14 31/19 31/23 35/15 35/21 38/12 42/4 42/10 42/18 45/8 45/14 47/1 49/17 have [111] I can [3] 20/24 54/3 58/11 haven't [1] 37/22 I can't [2] 25/25 28/1 having [3] 32/21 33/10 45/22 I don't have [1] 21/18 He [1] 59/11 I don't know [1] 20/16 headed [2] 54/6 54/7 I don't think [7] 12/20 13/4 14/2 19/4 23/18 23/20 30/2 health [13] 11/17 36/6 42/7 43/4 43/5 43/12 43/14 43/23 I guess [5] 22/19 23/16 28/11 54/25 56/14 45/1 45/2 45/3 45/4 47/21 I have [4] 15/10 38/1 39/19 53/11 health-sharing [1] 45/2 I just [1] 28/6 healthcare [4] 24/22 50/19 50/21 50/22 I know [1] 54/6 healthy [19] 9/13 10/15 10/17 10/23 12/1 12/11 15/1 15/13 I mean [6] 13/24 22/11 22/15 22/17 32/6 40/5 20/13 21/6 21/12 22/13 36/12 40/16 50/7 50/10 51/13 I should [2] 18/10 21/1 51/20 52/1 I think [42] 5/17 8/16 8/19 8/25 9/5 9/22 13/5 13/22 heard [1] 40/13 14/10 14/22 15/10 15/13 15/17 16/13 16/17 16/25 17/3 19/4 hearing [2] 1/11 56/10 19/10 22/19 24/2 24/24 26/15 27/7 28/13 29/13 30/8 help [2] 9/20 40/11 30/12 30/23 31/8 31/11 31/14 31/18 32/13 36/3 36/19 here [31] 4/7 4/18 4/20 10/8 14/1 19/23 22/6 26/25 36/25 40/20 43/2 44/18 52/11 52/16 28/23 32/1 32/13 34/4 35/3 37/3 38/13 39/13 40/6 42/21 I understand [2] 39/12 54/22 45/16 49/17 53/8 53/23 54/10 54/12 55/8 55/8 55/19 I'd [1] 30/11 55/21 57/25 59/12 59/13 I'll [6] 11/6 15/8 17/4 17/6 19/13 54/17 here's [1] 53/18 I'm [28] 3/19 4/16 12/9 13/9 13/16 13/17 13/18 17/5 22/24 HHS [1] 25/10 25/20 28/24 30/13 30/15 30/16 31/19 38/25 39/18 39/20 high [3] 12/2 12/2 37/25 40/14 44/3 45/22 53/17 55/3 58/10 59/11 59/24 59/24 high-cost [1] 12/2 60/3high-risk [1] 12/2 I'm not [1] 30/13 highly [1] 37/18 I'm sorry [3] 25/20 30/15 55/3 him [1] 40/13 I've [3] 38/1 45/11 53/20 HIPAA [4] 16/20 42/2 46/16 46/18 idea [2] 25/15 44/16 his [1] 59/11 identify [1] 3/12 historical [2] 5/8 10/1 ignores [1] 44/18 historically [2] 24/3 28/17 III [1] 35/3 history [1] 23/23 illogical [1] 41/25 hmm [1] 28/12 immediate [1] 51/10 hodgepodge [1] 17/9 immediately [2] 38/11 38/22 Hold [1] 57/6 immensely [1] 43/8 holding [1] 33/15 imminent [1] 38/9 Honor [58] 3/7 3/17 3/25 4/4 4/5 4/13 5/7 6/11 11/7 12/9 impact [6] 10/4 10/7 12/16 13/19 32/22 51/10 12/21 14/3 14/11 15/9 17/5 20/16 23/17 25/25 27/3 27/10 impending [2] 35/20 38/11 27/15 28/1 28/24 29/17 29/25 30/15 30/21 31/8 31/9 implement [1] 6/20 33/17 34/12 34/16 34/18 34/22 35/8 35/19 36/25 37/9 important [3] 5/22 20/1 24/16 38/16 39/2 40/18 41/11 43/3 44/4 46/1 46/11 46/15 47/8 importantly [2] 44/14 46/19 48/13 48/14 49/1 49/13 51/24 54/24 55/19 56/15 56/15 impossible [1] 12/4 inaction [1] 42/17 HONORABLE [4] 1/11 3/4 3/5 60/11 inadequate [1] 7/10 hope [2] 41/2 41/3 inches [2] 53/13 53/19 hospitals [1] 24/23 includes [1] 11/17 hour [3] 4/8 40/6 54/14 including [1] 46/24 hours [1] 23/14 income [1] 34/1 House [1] 43/23 inconsistent [3] 4/23 19/2 27/17 how [24] 4/10 14/4 16/5 18/1 21/7 25/18 25/19 28/18 increase [1] 16/16 28/23 29/5 31/2 32/8 36/23 37/5 37/7 41/16 45/22 46/16 increases [1] 44/15

I	41/19 48/11 49/1 49/18 49/25 50/21 50/22 51/5 53/4 53/5
increasing [1] 15/3	56/1 56/2 56/3 56/19 57/2 57/13 57/22 59/25 60/1 60/2
increasingly [1] 20/14	60/2
incurred [1] 31/13	it's likely [1] 49/18
Indeed [1] 36/10	its [7] 4/9 9/25 23/13 23/14 36/3 40/11 45/17
indicating [1] 49/17	itself [2] 25/8 57/1
indicating [1] 47/1	ī
individual [2] 25/10 43/4	<u>J</u>
individuals [2] 25/13 50/22	January [1] 58/25
industry [3] 32/22 33/21 37/7	Jean [2] 2/3 4/5
informed [1] 31/9	Jean Lin [1] 4/5
initial [2] 5/17 16/19	join [1] 51/22
initially [2] 16/21 26/1	joining [1] 10/25
injunction [4] 1/11 4/18 49/3 55/12	judge [4] 1/12 58/15 58/16 60/1
injunctive [1] 35/24	judgment [4] 35/11 59/18 59/20 59/23
injure [2] 56/2 56/3	judicial [2] 17/4 17/6
injured [1] 38/22	jump [1] 54/13
injurious [1] 37/7	just [24] 5/3 5/14 5/20 5/21 10/22 25/23 28/6 38/13
injury [9] 30/3 32/4 33/14 33/18 35/19 38/23 49/16	38/19 39/7 43/6 44/7 44/10 45/3 47/8 48/17 50/13 53/2
49/19 55/13	54/19 57/5 57/8 59/6 59/24 60/4
instance [1] 46/20	JUSTICE [1] 2/3
instead [2] 16/11 57/20	K
insulate [2] 44/13 44/14	
insurance [80]	keep [2] 36/12 44/16
insured [12] 10/20 11/4 15/15 20/25 21/5 41/2 41/4 41/6	keeping [2] 44/19 47/11
45/9 45/24 47/15 49/6	key [1] 20/6
insurers [1] 22/11	keystone [1] 19/15
intend [1] 46/6	kind [9] 5/15 12/2 12/2 14/15 16/23 18/2 26/6 51/22 55/2
intended [5] 9/7 25/5 41/22 46/18 49/25	kinds [2] 40/10 43/12
interest [4] 33/24 41/17 41/20 48/15	knew [1] 42/11
interests [3] 33/22 33/25 46/4	know [30] 12/10 15/18 19/24 20/16 20/18 20/19 21/5
interpret [4] 4/25 15/20 28/7 46/11	21/13 24/22 28/2 29/7 29/21 30/25 31/2 31/7 35/24 36/10
interpretation [7] 4/21 6/19 6/22 16/20 16/25 17/1 46/9	37/8 37/9 44/5 44/23 48/3 52/24 53/10 54/6 54/11 56/17
investigated [1] 8/18	58/18 59/7 59/8
invoke [1] 35/13	knowing [3] 29/22 36/16 43/17
invoked [1] 37/17	knows [3] 27/15 28/17 59/11
irreparable [19] 28/23 29/5 29/12 30/16 30/19 31/21	L
31/23 32/4 33/14 35/2 37/23 37/24 38/2 38/6 38/21	language [4] 4/25 17/22 38/12 52/6
49/19 55/12 58/1 58/3	lapse [1] 33/11
irreparable-harm [2] 37/24 58/3	lapsed [1] 47/20
irrevocable [1] 33/18	large [2] 37/13 60/2
is [150]	last [1] 23/14
is that correct [1] 19/9	late [1] 32/9
is there [3] 20/12 25/16 29/5	later [1] 54/18
isn't [8] 5/3 10/19 11/2 20/14 22/5 22/16 40/10 53/8	law [3] 27/14 37/20 44/1
issuance [1] 5/24	lawsuit [3] 29/7 29/8 29/9
issue [20] 7/20 9/10 9/17 12/25 15/11 15/16 18/19 21/6	lawyers [1] 52/25
21/6 30/19 31/19 31/21 32/13 36/7 37/4 38/5 40/9 48/19	lead [1] 31/24
58/1 58/3	leading [3] 50/16 50/17 50/19
issued [5] 4/20 6/21 6/22 7/7 8/20	leads [1] 50/2
issuers [2] 48/21 48/23	least [10] 11/2 12/13 13/14 13/21 26/2 31/16 32/20 36/22
issues [1] 35/9	45/11 48/12
it [177]	leave [5] 4/10 50/4 50/8 57/13 57/19
it's [57] 5/6 9/19 11/21 14/2 15/19 15/20 16/4 16/6 19/11	lectern [1] 3/12
20/20 20/21 21/14 21/25 25/2 25/10 25/11 26/2 26/7	left [3] 28/22 33/2 34/13
26/10 26/13 26/15 27/17 28/13 29/17 29/23 30/2 32/9	legislates [1] 28/7
32/14 32/21 33/4 33/15 36/19 36/20 36/21 39/7 40/3	legislates [1] 20/1 legislation [3] 26/12 27/13 28/15
	10Sistemation [5] 20/12 21/13 20/13

mandate [1] 19/12 mandates [1] 43/2 legislative [1] 23/22 mandatory [4] 10/24 14/8 19/16 23/1 length [2] 18/3 23/21 mandatory-compliance [1] 19/16 LEON [2] 1/11 3/4 Mandhania [2] 1/15 3/19 let [7] 11/15 16/8 16/15 27/20 30/20 52/23 53/8 many [12] 14/17 15/13 15/13 20/25 21/1 25/19 36/8 36/9 let's [7] 21/3 35/4 35/10 36/17 45/13 45/14 59/13 43/6 43/11 45/3 48/16 level [1] 43/3 mark [1] 28/20 light [1] 19/9 marked [1] 21/9 like [21] 10/7 24/17 26/18 26/19 26/22 27/4 27/18 28/8 market [12] 5/13 22/8 24/4 25/6 25/10 30/6 35/17 35/22 28/11 39/10 39/15 45/10 48/9 50/17 50/18 50/19 53/14 40/17 43/10 43/15 56/2 53/15 53/15 53/17 53/20 marketed [5] 7/11 7/15 8/5 9/11 9/12 liked [1] 26/21 marketing [5] 6/24 8/17 10/13 52/12 52/14 likely [3] 5/1 49/18 52/18 marketplace [2] 8/24 9/6 limit [1] 48/4 markets [5] 15/2 22/1 43/6 44/12 48/17 limitations [1] 9/11 masse [1] 51/2 limited [10] 4/19 5/10 5/12 5/13 6/25 9/25 18/4 42/1 materials [1] 50/5 42/21 47/19 matter [11] 5/8 12/21 30/1 30/10 39/7 39/16 53/5 58/12 limited-duration [8] 4/19 5/10 6/25 9/25 18/4 42/1 58/13 60/3 61/4 42/21 47/19 maximums [1] 36/8 Lin [2] 2/3 4/5 may [4] 4/12 4/14 36/1 54/24 linchpin [1] 19/15 Maya [1] 2/2 line [2] 52/16 54/13 maybe [5] 7/17 31/16 33/4 56/9 60/8 litigate [2] 53/2 54/2 MAYER [6] 1/16 3/14 3/16 3/20 3/22 4/17 litigation [3] 5/2 50/16 55/7 Mayer Brown [1] 3/20 little [1] 39/19 mayerbrown.com [4] 1/18 1/18 1/19 1/19 locked [1] 47/20 me [29] 8/8 11/15 13/18 16/8 16/16 20/21 20/22 20/22 logically [1] 30/9 21/14 21/18 27/20 27/23 28/21 28/23 30/20 37/2 37/4 long [2] 25/18 36/18 38/24 39/22 40/2 40/13 41/3 41/17 52/23 53/9 53/17 longer [5] 10/25 46/23 47/4 48/2 57/9 53/25 54/21 55/16 look [7] 29/6 46/16 46/19 53/12 53/18 57/21 58/9 mean [12] 12/8 13/24 21/21 22/11 22/15 22/17 32/6 33/5 looked [1] 56/25 40/5 45/7 46/12 57/4 looking [4] 17/25 37/14 40/6 53/24 meaning [2] 9/25 52/4 lose [6] 31/5 32/3 32/3 49/18 59/3 59/3 means [3] 7/20 7/22 46/22 loses [1] 54/6 meant [1] 24/1 loss [2] 21/7 32/14 meantime [1] 47/21 lost [4] 24/9 32/10 32/24 33/13 Meanwhile [1] 33/13 lot [4] 10/21 16/24 17/2 17/8 measure [1] 28/9 lots [2] 20/15 20/18 mechanical [1] 2/13 loves [1] 35/7 mechanism [2] 44/19 44/20 low [1] 34/1 Medical [1] 50/17 low-income [1] 34/1 members [1] 31/4 lower [1] 52/11 men [1] 25/14 lucky [1] 39/22 merger [2] 39/19 53/21 Lured [1] 52/7 Merit [1] 2/8 Lyons [2] 1/15 3/22 merits [2] 5/2 54/18 Lyons-Berg [2] 1/15 3/22 middle [3] 39/18 53/18 60/3 might [4] 34/4 44/23 47/19 52/8 millions [2] 25/14 57/18 made [11] 6/9 12/5 13/6 13/23 17/24 18/5 26/11 41/6 51/8 mind [5] 15/21 17/3 18/8 19/6 23/21 58/9 59/22 minds [1] 18/11 main [1] 35/12 minimally [1] 15/22 maintain [1] 9/5 ministries [1] 45/2 make [15] 17/3 25/4 31/9 32/7 34/23 34/24 44/9 45/9 minute [10] 13/25 28/20 28/21 34/15 35/5 40/6 49/12 45/13 46/10 53/1 54/15 54/19 55/23 59/1 49/15 53/20 54/15 makes [8] 9/17 9/18 14/23 14/23 42/12 46/16 53/25 minutes [2] 4/14 28/22 54/21 misinterpret [3] 26/17 27/13 28/16 making [3] 31/9 45/23 46/8 mispredicted [1] 16/5

M	noting [1] 47/18
misrepresented [1] 57/8	November [6] 32/16 36/20 39/11 39/14 50/25 61/7
misrepresenting [1] 57/12	November 1st [1] 32/16
missed [1] 16/4	now [29] 3/3 10/23 12/10 16/2 18/7 18/19 18/25 20/3
misunderstood [1] 16/5	20/25 21/5 25/16 26/6 26/8 26/22 29/15 32/17 32/23
mixing [1] 30/14	36/24 39/13 47/13 48/5 51/12 51/18 52/1 55/20 55/21
modified [1] 44/2	56/12 57/2 58/11
money [1] 36/12	number [5] 24/11 26/3 44/25 56/18 56/19
month [5] 24/13 36/19 36/22 42/24 48/4	NW [3] 1/16 2/5 2/10
months [22] 6/6 16/10 16/18 17/15 23/10 23/14 25/19	О
25/21 25/22 26/3 32/8 32/18 32/20 32/20 33/1 36/18	
36/21 44/1 46/21 47/4 47/25 48/2	Obama [1] 16/11
more [16] 7/17 11/25 15/17 17/20 18/21 20/25 21/5 25/13	Obama's [1] 6/9
27/20 31/11 32/7 46/19 48/11 53/1 56/6 58/4	objective [1] 45/10
most [3] 5/4 24/19 28/11	objectives [1] 43/6
motion [3] 1/11 34/22 49/8	obtain [1] 34/24
much [4] 4/10 9/12 21/7 56/17	obtaining [1] 47/3
must [2] 34/24 49/8	obviously [5] 13/17 29/10 37/23 41/18 41/19 occurred [1] 30/4
my [12] 21/3 21/4 21/4 22/10 29/19 33/24 49/15 50/2	
56/2 56/3 56/22 60/6	October [3] 1/6 39/5 39/6
NT T	off [3] 14/12 42/16 44/17 offer [3] 36/6 36/7 58/2
N	Official [1] 2/9
nation [1] 54/10	offset [1] 22/14
national [1] 58/13	okay [5] 29/7 29/8 33/16 36/21 39/13
near [2] 53/2 58/24	old [1] 31/16
neat [1] 53/15	once [2] 14/7 21/8
necessarily [2] 37/6 50/9	one [17] 14/25 19/4 19/11 24/14 31/4 34/15 35/2 35/9
necessary [2] 30/3 38/6	36/19 37/4 41/23 43/6 43/9 46/11 48/6 52/10 56/18
need [3] 12/24 31/12 38/21	only [9] 11/14 14/22 19/10 32/17 32/19 35/16 47/25 49/3
negative [1] 23/24	56/22
negatively [1] 43/24	only yes [1] 14/22
neither [1] 40/11	open [9] 32/15 33/9 36/17 36/22 51/9 51/11 51/21 55/16
net [3] 11/3 13/15 13/19	55/22
never [3] 7/2 18/8 38/1 new [11] 5/25 7/15 13/10 13/13 23/15 25/5 27/14 28/15	open-enrollment [5] 32/15 33/9 51/11 51/21 55/22
29/18 30/5 30/22	operate [4] 9/7 14/5 25/3 59/9
next [8] 32/12 33/1 39/13 39/14 39/22 48/7 52/22 59/25	operates [2] 25/2 56/19
nice [1] 53/15	operation [1] 17/23
nights [1] 60/5	opinion [13] 37/19 39/15 39/21 39/22 53/11 53/14 53/17
no [35] 1/4 5/19 10/25 19/4 21/3 21/3 21/3 24/2 24/9	54/4 54/18 58/12 58/16 58/23 59/25
24/10 24/14 24/14 25/4 29/22 34/7 36/15 36/15 36/24	opposed [4] 24/20 24/23 41/13 48/2
37/15 38/1 40/3 41/14 42/12 46/1 46/16 47/1 48/25 51/19	opposite [3] 20/22 42/16 49/2
54/21 56/12 57/9 58/7 59/4 59/17 60/1	opt [2] 45/21 48/9
No-data [1] 58/7	opting [1] 45/17
nobody [1] 17/19	option [10] 40/24 41/5 41/17 43/14 44/23 45/17 45/19
non [2] 33/10 34/12	47/14 57/3 57/10
non-ACA-compliant [1] 33/10	options [6] 25/12 25/13 41/20 43/13 45/4 46/8
non-for-profit [1] 34/12	oranges [1] 30/14
none [1] 34/23	order [2] 3/6 11/18
nonprofits [1] 33/25	organizations [1] 50/18 Orloff [4] 2/2 4/1 34/20 34/21
normal [2] 54/2 58/23	other [12] 16/24 17/2 17/8 21/1 36/13 36/23 43/11 43/11
not [102]	44/25 45/3 46/8 46/10
not-for-profit [1] 34/9	otherwise [10] 11/22 21/15 36/12 41/1 41/3 41/21 45/19
note [3] 47/23 48/17 50/15	46/3 49/4 55/24
noted [2] 47/24 57/23	our [8] 24/21 32/24 37/21 45/1 45/1 47/23 50/16 55/6
nothing [4] 18/12 41/24 56/6 58/4	out [33] 9/13 10/18 11/12 11/25 12/12 12/15 12/19 12/19
notice [4] 17/4 17/6 24/15 58/11	13/11 13/18 13/20 15/4 16/0 18/14 20/3 24/21 32/8 33/5

0	34/11 34/12 43/5 43/5 45/3 47/11 50/1 50/4 50/5 50/8
out [15] 36/8 39/22 40/16 47/20 49/25 52/2 52/4 52/7	50/9 50/10 50/12 52/15 52/17 52/20 55/23 56/2 56/3
52/10 53/17 54/17 56/1 58/11 58/16 59/25	57/20
out-of-pocket [1] 36/8	playing [1] 23/11
outcome [2] 46/9 47/4	plays [1] 32/8
outset [1] 24/5	pleadings [1] 53/12
over [3] 6/2 40/9 51/12	please [3] 3/5 3/11 3/13
overall [1] 46/4	PLLC [1] 1/16
overarching [2] 45/8 45/23	plus [1] 14/3
overblown [1] 44/11	pocket [2] 36/8 36/13
own [11] 24/9 24/10 34/4 41/4 45/17 48/20 50/3 57/17	point [12] 11/3 27/23 29/18 30/6 32/9 33/6 36/11 42/17
59/1 59/20	43/22 44/10 44/11 50/2
	points [2] 49/14 54/25
P	police [1] 28/15
p.m [2] 1/6 60/13	policies [5] 6/25 7/8 8/18 9/9 33/2
package [1] 16/1	policy [1] 41/16
page [1] 58/16	politicians [1] 45/12
paper [1] 45/1	pool [8] 9/14 9/16 12/8 14/6 14/6 18/14 19/6 47/10
papers [2] 37/21 45/1	pools [3] 43/4 43/6 44/11
part [7] 5/22 16/1 20/1 23/19 24/4 37/13 56/13	population [1] 37/16
participating [1] 50/15	portion [1] 4/9
particular [4] 15/21 26/25 51/20 57/1	poses [1] 55/19
particularly [1] 17/25	position [1] 55/3
parties [2] 3/11 3/13	positive [1] 13/19
parts [1] 21/12	possible [4] 9/18 40/4 51/5 60/1
party [1] 3/12	potential [1] 36/23
pass [1] 27/13	power [1] 6/5
passed [3] 7/25 38/24 40/22	practical [8] 40/10 52/23 52/25 53/7 55/10 58/19 59/1
patient [1] 50/18	60/7
pay [2] 15/2 15/3	practically [1] 34/5
payer [1] 11/20	pre [13] 7/20 9/18 10/10 11/18 11/24 12/3 14/20 15/25
penalties [1] 19/17	18/2 18/3 22/8 22/15 50/11
penalty [5] 10/24 11/12 20/4 20/6 20/9	pre-ACA [2] 18/2 18/3
pending [1] 38/9	pre-existing [11]
people [95]	
per [1] 30/9	predictable [2] 31/24 32/1
percent [2] 40/20 44/12	predicted [2] 56/19 56/21 predicting [1] 31/4
perfect [4] 14/23 14/24 17/24 18/5	
perhaps [1] 33/3	preliminary [3] 1/11 4/18 55/12
period [17] 32/15 33/9 39/11 39/24 40/3 40/7 48/2 48/6	premature [1] 29/23 premise [1] 15/16
48/6 48/7 51/11 51/21 52/22 56/17 56/18 59/5 59/16	premiums [4] 22/2 44/15 44/16 47/12
periods [1] 46/24	present [1] 15/17
philosophical [1] 27/1	presented [1] 27/18
phrase [3] 42/21 46/13 46/15	preserve [1] 28/22
physicians [1] 50/16	President [1] 6/9
PI [14] 29/6 29/8 29/9 29/15 32/8 38/7 38/8 40/1 40/7	presiding [1] 3/4
53/1 53/24 54/14 57/22 59/3	pressure [1] 54/16
Pincus [3] 1/14 3/16 59/10	presume [2] 31/24 42/11
place [8] 8/14 13/8 16/1 22/6 23/5 23/8 25/1 29/10	pretty [4] 19/11 19/24 30/19 52/6
plaintiff [3] 4/8 30/7 41/23	prevail [1] 5/1
plaintiff's [3] 43/1 43/16 44/10	prevent [2] 47/2 47/22
plaintiffs [24] 1/5 1/14 3/15 3/17 3/20 3/23 4/17 5/1 10/8 34/23 35/1 35/3 35/25 37/10 37/17 37/22 38/15 40/1	Previously [1] 8/4
42/15 46/10 47/5 47/17 49/16 50/6	priced [1] 48/23
plan [2] 47/25 48/10	prices [1] 52/11
plans [39] 1/4 3/9 5/12 6/25 7/19 8/5 10/8 10/14 10/18	primary [2] 7/2 10/14
12/1 12/3 24/6 24/8 25/7 29/20 33/8 33/11 33/11 33/12	prior [2] 44/2 51/8
12/112/2/27/027/(22/20/20/20/11/22/11/22/11/22/11/22/12/20/27/11/22/11/22/11/22/11/22/11/22/12/20/22/11/22/11/22/11/22/11/22/12/22/12/22/2	prisoners [3] 59/15 59/17 59/20

P	rates [4] 10/12 29/3 32/11 32/14
private [1] 11/19	rather [2] 36/12 47/15
probably [1] 54/4	ratified [1] 42/18
problem [6] 8/2 9/9 10/13 18/7 18/25 47/24	rating [4] 7/22 9/10 10/11 15/25
problems [2] 28/11 46/14	ratings [1] 36/7
proceed [1] 4/12	rationale [1] 47/7
proceedings [4] 1/11 2/13 60/13 61/4	re [2] 14/8 48/1
process [4] 5/23 14/9 51/3 55/22	re-underwriting [1] 48/1
produced [1] 2/13	reacting [1] 43/24
products [8] 36/2 36/4 36/5 36/5 37/12 43/10 48/21	reaction [1] 28/4
48/24	ready [1] 4/12
	real [1] 38/8
profit [3] 34/6 34/9 34/12	reality [3] 44/18 53/7 60/4
program [4] 11/20 21/8 51/22 53/8	realized [1] 8/17
programs [6] 2/4 51/13 51/16 52/2 52/3 57/19	really [3] 38/4 38/4 43/3
projections [1] 31/9	Realtime [1] 2/9
promptly [1] 8/20	reason [9] 6/21 7/6 7/6 24/9 35/21 48/9 52/19 52/20
promulgated [4] 5/18 16/21 24/13 26/1	55/11
proof [3] 20/10 24/12 31/12	reasonably [1] 8/20
protect [1] 26/12	reasoned [1] 7/5
protected [1] 33/21	reasoning [2] 18/11 18/13
protecting [3] 33/22 33/24 33/25	reasons [5] 5/7 14/10 16/3 29/1 49/7
protection [2] 24/5 24/7	rebuttal [3] 4/9 4/11 4/14
protections [1] 36/9	receive [1] 44/12
protective [1] 48/11	recent [2] 19/9 24/19
provide [7] 11/23 18/16 22/7 25/12 40/23 45/18 47/14	recess [2] 60/9 60/11
providers [2] 24/22 37/18	recognition [1] 50/14
provides [1] 15/23	recognized [2] 43/11 46/25
providing [1] 46/2	reconceptualized [1] 14/8
provision [3] 10/2 16/24 17/19	reconciled [1] 4/24
provisions [2] 16/25 23/5	record [4] 3/12 31/3 49/20 61/3
public [8] 5/21 8/19 24/14 24/17 41/16 41/20 42/7 48/15	recorded [1] 2/13
public-policy [1] 41/16	refer [1] 42/17
publicized [1] 43/20	reference [1] 55/6
publicly [3] 45/7 45/11 52/13	referred [3] 5/18 11/12 46/21
pudding [2] 20/10 24/12	referring [1] 16/22
punish [1] 46/6	reflected [1] 43/19
purchasing [1] 46/7	reflective [1] 43/19
purport [1] 45/5	refreshing [1] 27/8
purporting [1] 15/20	regard [3] 5/14 44/4 45/19
purpose [8] 4/23 6/17 6/18 18/23 18/24 25/5 40/23 45/8	regarded [2] 5/22 18/17
purposes [4] 7/18 15/18 18/1 36/13	Registered [1] 2/8
pursuant [1] 44/8	regulate [1] 45/5
push [1] 56/10	regulation [5] 15/19 16/19 18/12 24/13 42/4
pushback [1] 43/21	regulations [1] 44/6
put [9] 9/22 12/1 13/7 16/1 16/23 21/1 22/19 23/5 23/8	regulatory [2] 42/11 48/22
putting [2] 18/21 54/16	rejigger [1] 8/23
Q	rejiggered [1] 9/4
qualifies [1] 46/20	relative [1] 8/23
question [14] 6/16 13/5 20/17 21/4 21/4 21/4 27/20 50/7	relevant [1] 43/22
50/24 51/18 52/23 55/14 55/17 55/19	relief [5] 34/25 35/24 57/22 57/25 58/20
questions [2] 20/4 40/13	religious [1] 45/2
quick [2] 49/14 51/4	remedy [1] 29/6
quite [2] 6/7 29/17	remember [1] 51/18
, , , ,	Remind [1] 38/24
R	repealed [1] 23/1
radical [1] 25/1	repeatedly [2] 25/11 30/8
raised [1] 50/25	reported [1] 21/25

R	says [3] 21/15 25/8 25/8
Reporter [4] 2/8 2/8 2/9 2/9	Schulz [1] 2/2
reports [1] 4/25	se [1] 30/9
represent [1] 3/13	season [2] 36/17 36/22
representing [4] 3/15 3/17 3/20 4/17	seated [1] 3/6
required [2] 35/22 38/18	second [2] 50/2 54/18
requirement [4] 10/25 14/8 19/16 23/1	Secondly [1] 55/4
requirements [3] 7/9 10/9 17/19	Secretary [1] 25/11
requires [1] 31/11	see [6] 32/7 32/21 38/8 45/25 55/1 56/9
reserve [3] 4/9 4/14 34/13	seek [2] 34/25 35/25
respectfully [2] 15/11 23/16	seeking [4] 4/18 36/1 55/11 58/19
respond [1] 18/20	seems [1] 40/11
responding [1] 54/22	seen [2] 38/1 43/21
response [3] 15/8 27/22 43/20	segregate [1] 12/2
responses [1] 11/6	sell [1] 48/22
responsibility [6] 26/10 26/14 26/16 27/12 27/18 28/14	selling [1] 10/8
rest [2] 10/2 32/22	Senate [2] 43/23 43/23
restoration [1] 24/25	SENIOR [1] 1/12
restored [1] 42/5	sense [13] 12/13 14/23 14/24 17/24 18/5 32/7 42/12 46/1
result [3] 13/12 32/1 47/12	53/1 53/25 54/15 54/19 54/21
results [1] 31/25	sensitivity [1] 58/12
retain [1] 42/2	separate [1] 12/1
retained [2] 44/24 44/25	September [1] 39/3
return [2] 5/4 60/12	Serena [4] 2/2 4/1 34/20 34/21
reverse [1] 59/23	Serena Orloff [3] 4/1 34/20 34/21
reversed [2] 19/1 40/2	serena.m.orloff [1] 2/6
review [4] 44/6 44/7 44/8 59/4	serious [1] 26/13
RICHARD [2] 1/11 3/4	serve [1] 37/16
rid [1] 14/7	served [1] 40/25
right [43] 4/7 6/6 6/7 6/10 6/11 6/22 8/7 8/12 10/23 13/9	service [1] 42/7
13/16 13/18 15/3 17/12 17/17 22/12 22/17 23/15 25/16 26/3	session [1] 3/4
26/4 26/5 27/2 29/4 32/17 32/18 32/23 33/22 34/6 34/21	set [4] 24/13 29/3 32/11 32/14
36/21 36/24 36/25 39/4 39/15 48/12 48/13 49/22 51/12	seven [1] 53/19
56/12 57/22 58/11 60/8	sharing [1] 45/2
rise [3] 3/2 47/12 60/10	she [6] 57/9 57/10 57/12 57/12 57/16 57/23
risk [11] 9/14 9/16 11/21 12/2 12/8 12/17 19/6 43/4 43/6	short [19] 4/19 5/9 6/25 9/25 17/14 17/14 17/22 18/3 33/
44/11 47/10	42/1 42/21 46/12 46/13 46/13 46/20 46/21 47/19 48/10
RMR [2] 61/2 61/8	54/25
Room [1] 2/11	short-coverage [1] 46/13
Rothfeld [3] 1/14 3/14 4/16	short-term [10] 4/19 5/9 6/25 9/25 18/3 33/3 42/1 42/2
roughly [1] 39/12	47/19 48/10 should [14] 7/12 0/15 11/16 11/10 19/10 19/19 21/1 25/4
routine [1] 24/6	should [14] 7/13 9/15 11/16 11/19 18/10 18/18 21/1 25/4 30/19 34/22 46/11 46/19 57/24 58/1
rule [68]	
rules [1] 26/18	show [6] 20/22 21/14 23/23 24/21 30/3 38/21 showing [1] 38/21
ruling [3] 40/9 51/4 53/2	showing [1] 38/21 showings [1] 34/24
run [2] 26/25 38/20	shown [4] 37/11 37/22 37/23 45/20
S	shows [3] 20/22 40/15 40/20
	side [6] 4/8 25/9 25/9 40/11 50/16 54/5
said [18] 12/6 13/7 18/12 24/4 27/16 30/8 31/15 31/20	sides [2] 45/12 45/13
31/23 32/6 47/5 53/20 57/5 57/8 57/9 57/11 57/12 57/16	sign [7] 39/11 39/24 40/3 48/6 48/7 51/13 51/20
sake [1] 39/25	sign-up [5] 39/11 39/24 40/3 48/6 48/7
same [5] 9/16 14/6 35/17 35/22 46/12	signed [3] 33/1 33/10 57/13
save [2] 3/4 9/20	significance [1] 58/13
say [25] 8/4 9/3 14/3 15/8 16/4 16/6 18/7 18/8 18/10 18/11	significant [5] 5/14 20/5 24/4 51/9 52/12
18/20 19/13 19/14 20/3 26/7 26/13 27/19 28/9 34/8 36/17	signing [5] 20/14 21/7 21/10 21/13 32/19
42/12 50/20 53/8 56/14 57/13	silence [2] 28/3 28/4
saying [3] 18/10 25/11 58/15	similar [1] 42/4

Τ

S	statement [1] 15/16
simply [6] 5/21 18/20 19/2 24/3 24/11 28/2	statements [1] 38/17
since [1] 20/13	states [7] 1/1 1/7 1/12 3/2 3/5 3/9 48/18
single [5] 9/16 11/20 12/8 18/14 19/6	statute [6] 6/19 15/19 16/20 42/19 42/21 43/9
single-payer [1] 11/20	statutory [1] 4/25
single-risk [1] 19/6	stay [2] 22/6 50/7
sir [3] 20/15 32/17 56/5	staying [1] 40/16
sitting [1] 53/9	steadily [1] 15/3
situation [1] 45/16	stenography [1] 2/13
six [8] 32/8 32/20 39/23 39/23 53/12 53/19 56/10 58/17	step [4] 11/15 26/11 35/2 41/23
skipped [1] 6/2	still [4] 29/9 38/17 51/13 51/21
slap [1] 26/16	STLDI [32] 7/8 7/14 7/19 10/13 16/23 23/7 23/9 23/21
small [1] 43/5	24/1 24/1 32/17 33/1 36/4 37/12 37/15 42/8 42/14 43/25
smiling [2] 59/10 59/10	44/24 46/12 46/15 47/25 48/21 50/5 50/9 50/12 51/13
so [48] 5/13 7/14 8/13 8/22 9/20 10/3 10/11 12/5 13/1	51/22 52/15 52/18 55/23 57/20
13/12 15/15 17/21 17/24 18/5 18/25 20/9 20/11 22/4 24/10	stop [1] 18/18
24/24 26/6 33/15 34/12 35/6 35/10 35/12 35/21 36/21	Street [2] 1/16 2/5
37/5 38/20 39/7 39/13 40/23 41/1 41/12 43/16 44/16	structure [4] 4/23 13/7 14/4 17/23
47/13 48/25 49/7 51/4 51/17 55/2 56/17 58/9 58/18 60/4	student [1] 45/1
60/7	studied [2] 8/18 56/25
so I think [1] 56/17	studies [1] 50/6
So this idea [1] 44/16	subcommittees [2] 27/24 43/24
So this is [1] 41/12	subject [8] 7/8 7/14 7/19 7/19 7/21 9/10 10/9 48/1
society [3] 13/16 13/19 50/19	submit [1] 4/22
society's [1] 11/3	submitted [6] 24/22 31/4 38/16 43/19 49/17 50/5
some [17] 12/22 14/16 15/12 26/6 26/8 34/7 34/7 34/8	subsidies [2] 44/13 44/20
36/23 37/12 42/15 42/18 45/18 46/10 47/21 52/17 56/10	substantial [2] 19/11 20/12
somehow [1] 27/25	substantially [1] 42/4
someone [1] 46/2	substitute [1] 7/1
something [4] 7/2 39/10 39/14 54/17	succeeded [2] 47/10 47/11
sometime [1] 54/4	successful [1] 29/22
sometimes [2] 52/11 52/24	successfully [1] 29/22
somewhere [3] 53/2 57/3 58/24	sudden [1] 41/5
sooner [1] 8/14	sufficient [1] 30/9
sorry [8] 12/9 17/5 22/24 25/20 30/15 38/25 55/3 55/5	suggesting [1] 20/5
sort [8] 7/5 7/10 8/23 23/24 34/1 42/18 47/21 59/14	suggests [2] 16/3 43/16
sought [1] 46/5	support [1] 50/14
special [7] 17/18 33/8 50/25 51/1 56/16 56/18 59/15	supposed [2] 25/2 37/5
special-enrollment [4] 51/1 56/16 56/18 59/15	Supreme [3] 54/7 54/9 54/11
specific [3] 23/21 24/11 48/20	Supreme Court [3] 54/7 54/9 54/11
specified [1] 7/13	sure [4] 4/15 45/9 45/14 45/23
speculation [5] 31/6 31/12 38/14 38/16 56/13	surely [1] 27/15
speculative [2] 37/19 58/5	sustain [1] 34/4
spread [1] 11/22	sustained [1] 21/7
spreading [1] 12/17	sympathize [1] 55/1
squares [1] 45/25	system [8] 11/13 11/19 16/2 18/14 20/8 24/25 50/22
squeeze [1] 49/15	50/23
stabilized [1] 22/2	systems [1] 21/11
stabilizing [1] 47/10	Т
stand [2] 42/16 60/11	
standard [4] 35/19 37/25 38/20 44/2	take [15] 10/12 11/15 15/11 15/15 17/4 17/6 18/19 30/7 35/2
standing [18] 30/2 30/9 30/13 33/18 35/3 35/4 35/7	44/1 53/12 53/18 54/5 57/2 57/20
35/10 35/11 35/12 35/13 35/16 35/18 37/11 37/17 37/22	taken [8] 5/22 12/11 12/15 13/11 19/1 30/23 32/2 32/2
38/2 38/6	taking [5] 13/13 13/19 15/4 22/14 46/7
start [1] 55/22	talk [5] 17/9 35/4 35/10 59/1 60/7
state's [1] 48/20	talking [9] 12/6 15/18 23/5 29/1 30/13 30/16 40/14 57/4
stated [1] 45/7	59/11
	tax [1] 19/16

T	though [1] 30/19
-	thought [7] 11/8 11/9 11/11 11/13 20/1 23/11 30/2
tell [5] 16/8 20/21 20/22 20/24 41/17	threatening [1] 43/25
telling [1] 59/24	three [11] 16/9 16/18 17/15 25/21 39/8 44/1 46/21 47/4
tend [1] 56/15	47/25 48/2 54/25
term [16] 4/19 5/9 6/25 9/25 17/1 17/13 17/21 18/3 24/13	through [9] 11/19 11/20 24/10 39/24 40/5 44/6 45/17
33/3 42/1 42/1 42/21 42/23 47/19 48/10	47/22 60/7
terms [3] 7/18 49/16 50/13	Thursday [1] 39/14
terribly [1] 24/16	thy [1] 33/7
textual [1] 46/10	till [1] 48/6
than [7] 17/20 20/25 31/12 47/4 47/15 56/6 58/4	time [25] 4/9 5/13 5/15 6/23 6/24 7/6 7/24 8/3 9/6 13/5
thank [8] 4/13 27/8 27/9 27/11 34/16 49/10 49/11 49/13	14/1 19/25 24/1 34/13 38/9 40/2 40/9 42/3 42/7 45/22
Thank you [5] 4/13 34/16 49/10 49/11 49/13	53/7 53/24 55/23 59/5 59/6
that [322]	times [2] 59/8 59/8
that's [68]	
THC [1] 32/2	timing [1] 50/24
their [25] 10/11 18/11 21/10 22/7 24/9 24/10 31/7 31/24	titled [1] 61/4
32/3 32/25 33/22 34/1 35/9 35/12 36/12 36/13 41/4	today [1] 19/8
45/20 47/20 48/18 48/20 48/23 49/21 49/22 49/23	together [1] 12/7
them [24] 9/13 10/17 12/1 12/4 16/4 21/7 28/15 32/25	too [6] 32/9 44/25 59/10 60/1 60/2 60/2
38/18 41/5 41/13 41/17 44/13 44/14 45/18 46/8 46/11	took [3] 12/19 22/4 24/14
47/15 47/22 48/22 48/23 49/5 53/16 57/3	top [1] 30/11
themselves [7] 12/12 12/15 12/19 13/11 13/20 15/4 52/20	touched [2] 36/3 48/16
then [10] 11/21 16/14 16/21 21/14 32/8 42/13 48/1 48/9	tough [1] 57/24
51/4 54/5	towards [1] 51/2
then-existing [1] 42/13	track [2] 14/25 15/1
theories [1] 37/18	tradeoff [1] 12/7
theory [4] 9/15 11/16 19/2 35/12	tradeoffs [1] 12/6
there [42] 5/18 5/20 6/22 8/13 8/17 10/21 12/6 19/16	traditional [1] 55/11
20/12 20/15 20/24 21/1 21/5 21/10 23/25 24/14 24/19	transactional [1] 5/11
25/16 26/6 26/8 28/2 29/5 30/3 36/8 37/12 43/4 43/11	transcript [3] 1/10 2/13 61/3
44/19 45/3 46/22 48/25 50/3 50/5 51/4 51/25 52/16	transcription [1] 2/13
53/8 56/12 57/18 59/4 59/6 59/8	transformation [1] 25/1
there's [20] 20/18 21/9 24/2 25/4 28/23 29/9 30/5 30/6	transitional [1] 24/5
32/15 36/23 37/5 40/10 41/24 43/17 46/14 47/1 52/12	trapped [1] 25/13
52/24 55/21 59/15	Treasury [1] 3/10
therefore [2] 5/110/10	treat [1] 11/14
these [29] 7/8 7/15 7/19 8/5 8/18 8/20 9/9 10/13 12/1	trial [3] 39/18 53/18 60/4
12/15 12/19 15/23 20/4 21/11 28/18 33/10 34/9 36/1 36/4	tried [1] 43/9
36/23 37/11 43/10 48/16 48/21 49/7 53/12 53/24 55/23	true [10] 20/2 20/19 20/20 20/21 21/14 21/14 23/23 27/5
	34/5 47/8
they [115]	truly [1] 28/17
they'd [1] 11/2	try [7] 19/21 19/23 26/9 27/24 45/14 48/8 49/15
they'll [3] 31/5 33/4 36/11	trying [3] 9/5 34/1 45/18
they're [28] 7/19 7/21 9/10 10/14 10/15 10/16 10/16 10/17	turn [3] 54/17 58/11 59/25
10/23 10/23 10/24 11/1 13/2 14/13 15/6 15/6 18/10 22/12	turned [1] 58/16
33/5 33/25 36/6 38/17 38/19 38/22 45/21 50/11 52/2	two [15] 8/13 8/13 11/6 14/10 15/8 23/14 28/21 29/25
52/19	33/1 36/17 36/21 42/23 46/24 54/9 56/19
they've [3] 15/4 41/6 45/20	two-year [1] 8/13
thick [1] 53/19	type [1] 43/14
thing [6] 9/16 16/7 18/17 39/19 46/12 57/1	types [2] 45/3 51/20
things [10] 5/4 8/20 15/8 17/2 17/8 17/10 27/4 29/25	
56/15 58/24	U
think [89]	U.S [2] 2/3 2/10
thinking [1] 21/23	ultimate [1] 45/10
Third [1] 50/13	ultimately [3] 51/17 52/21 57/19
this [79]	unaffordability [1] 46/24
those [16] 15/4 22/13 24/7 33/11 37/18 40/24 42/10	unchanged [1] 42/3
42/16 43/6 45/5 47/14 51/22 52/3 52/20 53/9 56/2	under [10] 18/21 22/3 25/13 33/7 40/7 42/2 42/10 44/6

37/20 38/13 38/13 39/13 39/23 41/19 42/20 44/23 44/25 45/16 46/2 46/8 47/23 49/7 52/24 54/2 54/3 54/9 54/11 under... [2] 53/24 53/24 55/12 55/19 55/21 56/9 56/10 59/14 60/5 undermined [1] 23/6 we'll [2] 32/20 56/10 understand [4] 39/12 41/2 46/17 54/22 we're [10] 4/7 12/7 15/18 23/5 36/22 39/24 55/8 55/8 understandable [1] 12/17 56/17 60/9 understanding [2] 18/3 45/22 we've [4] 15/24 29/1 33/13 48/15 understood [2] 45/11 46/22 Wednesday [1] 39/14 undertook [1] 42/6 week [7] 39/13 39/14 39/16 39/18 39/22 53/18 60/6 underway [1] 25/16 weekends [1] 60/5 underwriting [2] 47/22 48/1 weeks [9] 39/8 39/8 39/23 39/23 56/10 58/13 58/17 unfeasible [1] 11/23 59/25 60/3 uninsured [4] 13/14 13/20 21/2 46/8 welcome [6] 3/18 3/21 3/24 4/2 4/6 34/17 UNITED [6] 1/1 1/7 1/12 3/2 3/5 3/9 well [61] 5/6 6/3 8/16 9/3 10/19 13/22 13/25 14/2 14/7 United States [1] 3/9 15/5 16/4 16/6 16/8 16/13 17/5 17/7 17/10 18/8 18/21 19/7 universally [1] 11/22 19/11 19/13 19/23 19/25 20/24 21/16 22/10 23/12 23/24 unsubsidized [1] 40/21 26/23 27/3 27/9 27/20 28/13 28/19 29/6 29/12 29/24 until [6] 8/1 8/3 52/22 56/16 56/17 60/11 29/24 31/1 31/8 31/18 32/9 33/17 34/9 41/19 45/16 48/4 up [37] 5/20 6/6 6/6 13/13 13/13 16/6 16/9 16/10 20/14 51/1 53/22 54/1 54/20 54/24 55/14 55/15 56/14 58/8 21/7 21/10 21/13 23/10 23/10 24/18 24/18 25/25 28/19 58/21 59/2 59/14 59/19 32/18 32/19 33/1 33/10 35/1 39/11 39/24 40/3 44/1 44/17 went [2] 8/7 39/3 44/17 44/17 48/6 48/7 49/18 51/13 51/21 53/16 57/13 were [34] 5/4 5/11 5/20 7/1 7/9 8/22 8/25 9/4 9/5 9/20 up-to-three-months [1] 44/1 9/24 9/24 10/3 10/6 10/8 17/25 18/1 18/9 20/25 22/6 us [1] 28/8 24/14 24/19 24/20 24/22 24/23 29/15 35/1 43/7 43/11 usdoj.gov [2] 2/6 2/7 43/19 44/20 46/6 46/25 47/13 use [10] 7/7 8/18 9/1 10/1 10/1 17/1 18/2 18/2 36/13 48/18 weren't [1] 24/7 used [5] 5/10 5/20 7/2 38/12 46/17 what [50] 9/5 9/17 13/9 13/25 16/8 17/25 18/6 22/21 uses [1] 17/13 22/21 23/10 23/25 24/17 25/8 25/10 27/17 27/21 28/14 using [1] 9/24 28/16 31/21 32/21 33/17 33/18 36/11 36/17 38/3 38/13 V 41/22 42/4 44/5 46/5 46/17 46/20 49/25 51/10 52/4 54/7 54/13 56/8 56/9 57/5 57/7 57/10 57/12 57/16 58/2 validity [1] 15/18 58/6 58/10 58/19 59/8 59/11 various [1] 21/12 what's [6] 15/15 21/22 29/11 37/2 54/12 58/5 vast [1] 23/6 whatever [6] 12/16 34/13 48/8 52/19 52/19 56/8 versus [1] 3/9 when [31] 4/12 5/17 8/13 9/7 11/9 11/11 15/21 16/23 17/25 very [14] 5/12 5/12 5/22 17/3 30/8 33/14 36/5 37/1 49/9 19/5 20/3 22/21 24/12 24/18 25/25 26/13 26/16 26/18 49/14 50/20 53/9 54/25 57/24 26/19 26/21 26/22 27/4 27/18 28/7 28/16 35/16 38/24 view [1] 11/3 42/3 53/8 58/22 60/3 violently [1] 24/20 whenever [2] 27/13 31/8 vision [1] 15/21 where [9] 20/22 36/22 39/23 40/7 43/21 45/16 46/2 voluntary [2] 12/15 41/4 48/2 54/6 W Where's [1] 29/14 whether [3] 15/19 28/2 51/5 wait [4] 8/1 13/25 56/9 56/16 which [34] 4/20 7/20 7/22 10/2 12/16 12/17 14/23 16/20 waning [1] 23/14 17/2 17/14 17/15 17/19 18/15 19/1 22/22 22/23 23/2 23/5 want [18] 4/10 13/7 14/14 15/2 15/3 15/15 22/13 22/21 23/19 23/25 24/20 25/5 27/16 37/16 44/25 49/14 49/19 26/19 26/20 28/12 28/21 28/22 28/23 37/2 38/8 41/9 50/2 50/2 50/24 51/5 52/22 55/22 55/22 48/19 whichever [2] 53/4 54/5 wanted [4] 22/21 22/23 42/8 47/2 while [4] 14/25 22/4 43/9 53/17 wants [4] 14/4 14/5 53/14 54/23 whistles [1] 53/15 was [79] who [54] 5/11 7/23 9/13 9/13 10/8 10/21 10/22 11/4 12/3 Washington [4] 1/5 1/17 2/5 2/11 12/11 13/9 13/10 13/12 13/14 13/14 13/19 14/5 15/1 15/1 wasn't [3] 16/10 16/14 21/4 20/25 22/10 22/15 24/6 32/19 34/1 34/3 36/12 37/14 41/1 way [24] 5/4 9/22 11/2 11/14 11/21 16/6 21/1 22/20 25/2 41/3 41/13 41/20 46/6 49/4 50/4 50/8 51/12 51/12 51/19 26/19 26/20 29/22 36/15 41/10 41/12 45/25 51/5 52/10 51/19 51/22 52/1 52/17 52/17 53/9 55/24 56/2 56/24 57/2 53/4 54/17 58/1 58/15 59/21 60/5 57/9 57/13 57/19 58/3 58/16 we [54] 3/7 4/18 4/22 4/22 12/10 12/24 13/7 13/25 16/7 who's [2] 30/5 58/15 18/8 18/18 24/21 29/21 29/22 31/1 31/3 32/4 32/10 32/20 who've [1] 56/25 32/22 32/24 35/2 36/10 36/15 36/15 36/24 37/10 37/18

W whole [2] 14/9 18/15 why [19] 5/3 5/19 7/24 8/1 13/3 16/10 16/14 21/10 32/7 35/11 37/10 47/7 53/1 53/23 53/23 55/8 55/19 55/21 56/9 widespread [1] 43/17 will [19] 3/11 4/8 4/9 17/19 29/21 31/12 32/24 32/25 33/2 41/21 49/14 49/14 49/25 50/7 50/8 52/10 52/21 59/4 60/11 William [4] 2/8 61/2 61/7 61/8 win [3] 29/16 53/6 53/6 Wisconsin [1] 38/3 wish [2] 4/10 59/23 withdraw [1] 53/1 within [2] 24/8 26/7 without [11] 7/15 17/20 20/8 35/23 41/21 43/17 45/20 46/3 47/15 49/4 51/19 women [1] 25/14 won't [2] 33/11 59/6 word [6] 17/14 46/12 46/12 46/17 46/20 56/23 work [5] 16/6 49/24 56/20 58/4 60/5 working [1] 16/3 works [5] 11/13 49/24 53/10 58/18 59/7 worse [1] 47/25 would [45] 7/15 10/4 10/7 11/4 12/13 12/14 12/16 13/10 13/10 13/12 13/14 13/15 13/20 18/7 19/16 20/3 20/7 22/7 23/16 26/6 26/6 26/8 26/8 28/3 34/14 36/12 38/20 41/4 41/5 45/19 46/2 46/22 47/4 47/14 47/21 48/17 48/25 49/3 49/4 49/4 51/9 51/25 55/24 56/14 59/10 wouldn't [8] 13/15 13/18 19/14 32/7 41/1 41/4 41/18 53/1 wrapped [1] 53/16 wrestling [1] 39/20 write [2] 53/11 54/18

Y Yeah [4] 25/21 34/3 35/4 39/1 year [11] 8/13 22/2 32/12 33/5 48/6 48/7 48/8 52/22 53/3 54/5 58/24 years [4] 5/4 8/13 16/9 46/18 yes [15] 8/11 10/6 14/18 14/22 19/13 22/11 22/17 28/24 30/17 33/17 34/7 34/11 34/12 40/18 51/6 you [133] you don't [1] 26/22 you know [1] 15/18 You'd [2] 39/22 58/23 you'll [3] 54/4 59/4 60/8 you're [31] 4/12 6/22 12/5 16/22 18/13 18/15 28/19 30/14 34/17 39/15 39/21 40/5 40/7 48/1 54/6 54/7 54/14 54/16 54/22 55/3 55/10 57/12 57/25 58/6 58/10 58/13 58/18 58/19 58/19 59/17 59/20 you've [10] 10/22 28/22 29/7 48/4 49/12 57/8 58/2 58/9 59/7 59/21 young [17] 9/13 10/15 10/17 10/23 11/25 12/11 15/1 15/13 20/13 21/6 21/12 22/13 36/11 50/9 51/13 51/20 52/1 your [85] your Honor [57] 3/7 3/17 3/25 4/4 4/5 4/13 5/7 6/11 11/7 12/21 14/3 14/11 15/9 17/5 20/16 23/17 25/25 27/3 27/10

wrong [7] 16/7 18/9 18/12 28/8 28/9 41/3 43/2

27/15 28/1 28/24 29/17 29/25 30/15 30/21 31/8 31/9 33/17 34/12 34/16 34/18 34/22 35/8 35/19 36/25 37/9 38/16 39/2 40/18 41/11 43/3 44/4 46/1 46/11 46/15 47/8 48/13 48/14 49/1 49/13 51/24 54/24 55/19 56/15 56/15 59/14 yourselves [1] 3/12

Zaremba [4] 2/8 61/2 61/7 61/8 zero [4] 5/20 11/12 23/25 53/25 zeroed [1] 20/3