

# Deposition of: Long-Term Care Hearing

February 19, 2020

In the Matter of:

Long Term Care Hearing

Veritext Legal Solutions 800-734-5292 | calendar-dmv@veritext.com |

	Page 1
1	MARYLAND INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION
2	LONG-TERM CARE HEARING
3	OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ACTUARY
4	Wednesday, February 19, 2020
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	The hearing in Re: MARYLAND LONG-TERM CARE
12	was held on Wednesday, February 19, 2020, at 9:00 a.m.,
13	at the Maryland Insurance Administration, 200 St. Paul
14	Place, Suite 2700, Baltimore, Maryland 21202, before
15	Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, Notary Public.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	Reported by: Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks

	Page 2	Page 4
1 APPEARANCES:	1	1 PROCEEDINGS
2	2	2 MR. SWITZER: Good morning, everyone.
3 MARYLAND INSURANCE ADMINISTRATI	ION STAFF:	3 Welcome to our first quarterly long-term care hearing.
4 TODD SWITZER, Chief Actuary	2	4 The year is off to a good start. We have on the phone
5 ADAM ZIMMERMAN, Actuary	4	5 a representative from CMFG and also some of our
6 DAVID COONEY, Associate Commissioner	6	6 Maryland seniors, Mr. and Mrs. Martin Fairclough.
7 JEFF JI, Actuary		7 Before we get into the five companies that are here
8 ZACK PETERS, Chief of Staff	5	8 today, I'll introduce who is up here. First I have
9	ç	9 glad to be able to introduce him for the first time,
10	10	10 Mr. Jay Coon our new deputy commissioner who started or
11 COMPANY REPRESENTATIVES:	12	11 January 29th, very talented guy. Enjoying the meeting
12 JOHN SVEDBERG, CMFG Life Insurance Con	mpany (via phone)	12 so far. Most recently from Traveler's also has worked
13 XIAOYAN SONG, Lincoln Benefit Life Comp	any (via 13	13 at The Hanover and USF&G as well as Aetna Life and
14 telephone.)	14	14 Casualty. So, really glad to have him with us.
15 JONATHAN TREND, Metropolitan Life Insura	ance 15	15 Mr. Jeff Ji, colleague of mine in the
16 AARON BALL, JEFF BELIGOTTI, New York	Life Insurance 16	16 office of the actuary, senior actuary. Adam Zimmerman,
17 Company	17	17 colleague of mine, senior actuary, office of the
18 BRIAN PIETSCH, CHARLES CASWELL, Riv	verSource Life 18	18 actuary. Dave Cooney, our associate commissioner, life
19 Insurance Company	19	19 and health. So, those are here today. We have our
20	20	20 chief actuary commissioner, couldn't be here due to a
21	23	21 very important family matter that he is attending to.
	Page 3	Page 5
1 INDEX	1	1 So, that's why he's not here today.
2	2	2 So, we have for individual long-term care,
3		3 stand alone insurance, CMFG, requesting a 52% increase
4 Long-Term Care Public Informati	ional Hearing	4 via a series of three 15% increases headquartered in
5 February 19, 2020	4	5 Iowa and affecting about 1600 Marylanders. We also
6	6	6 have RiverSource Life Insurance Company proposing 12.7
7 Speakers: Pa	age:	7 to 15, depending on the form and benefit period.
8 Mr. Svedberg	13 8	8 RiverSource based in Minnesota. These filings today
9 Ms. Song	21	9 affect 2500 Maryland. Lincoln Benefit, Nebraska,
10 Mr. Trend	29 10	10 requesting zero to 27% depending on the benefit period
11 Mr. Ball	40 11	11 and inflation coverage and affecting 287 Marylanders.
12 Mr. Pietsch	53 12	12 New York Life Insurance Company, New York, New York
13 Mrs. Fairclough	64 13	13 proposing increases of zero to 80% affecting 2700
14	14	14 Marylanders, and that's on the individual side. I'll
15	15	15 let New York Life speak to their approach, but I want
16	16	16 to mention that they do have a unique approach
17	17	17 guaranteeing that if we reach agreement on what they
18	18	18 have asked for rate wise, then no more increases and it
19	19	19 piqued our interest and, again, I'll leave it to them
20	20	20 to unfold what they will put before us.
21	22	21 In the group market, we have MetLife with

Page 6	Page 8
1 us asking for a 7.1% increase, also New York, and	1 appreciate this opportunity to speak with all of you.
2 affecting 55 Marylanders. So, all together from what	2 We have a few comments. First, my colleague, Adam
3 I've just gone through, we're just talking about	3 Zimmerman has a few and then I'll have a few before we
4 impacts to 7100 Maryland seniors.	4 ask the carriers to go.
5 The goal of the hearing is for	5 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Good morning. Thanks to
6 transparencies, having the company representatives	6 everybody for attending. As Todd pointed out, my name
7 explain the reasons for their rate increase. We'll	7 is Adam Zimmerman in the actuary's office here at the
8 listen to comments from consumers and interested	8 MIA. Just a few things I wanted to point out mainly
9 parties. So, it's to foster a dialogue on important	9 about the 2019 in 2019 the MIA approved rate
10 issues, a complicated issue.	10 increases for seven long-term care companies. That
11 A few procedural things: There is a	11 affected 18,000 Marylanders. And from the requested to
12 handout with all of our contact information, Adam,	12 approved, those seven companies requested approval for
13 Jeff, I. Everyone is very interested in your thoughts	13 a 37.8% rate increase and the average approval was
14 if you care to take the time to share them with us. We	14 9.7%.
15 also have Mary Kwei for complaints. Ms. Muehlberger	15 Following up on that, just some costs for
16 works for me and Craig Prem all have open ears to your	16 2019. Cost of care in Maryland and how they compare to
17 thoughts. So, you pick one up and they're on the table	17 national data. So, in 2019, in Maryland, the median
18 over there. And, please, if you'd like to speak, sign	18 cost for a home health aid was \$54,900. And the median
19 up and you're welcome to speak and share whatever	19 cost for an assisted living facility was \$51,600. On a
20 thoughts you have. But, you need to RSVP. People to	20 national basis for the home health aid, the cost was
21 RSVP or you need to sign up in order to speak.	21 52,600 and for the assisted living facility, it was
Page 7	Page 9
1 Just, again, it's not an open question and	1 48,600. Similarly in 2019, for a private room in a
2 answer forum. We can ask questions from the table up	2 nursing home, the median cost in Maryland was \$120,000
3 here. We will keep the public record open until about	3 compared to \$102,000 national. So, just something we
4 a week from today, Wednesday, February 26th, so you can	4 look at to keep in consideration when we are reviewing
5 submit written testimony. You can react to this	5 rate filings here in Maryland.
6 hearing and you can submit that on the MIA website. I	6 MR. SWITZER: Thanks, Adam. Just to
7 forget, so I'll remind you, you get to it by clicking	7 accentuate the value of the benefit of for anybody
8 on the long-term care tab and there's quick links area,	8 on the phone, appreciate you being on the phone. If
9 so two clicks and you can get there. We have a court	9 you can put it on hold mute, not hold, I'd
10 reporter. Thank you. So, keep that in mind. I'll try	10 appreciate it. Thanks.
11 to speak slower and more clearly.	11 The value of the benefit, we saw some
12 For anyone calling in, anyone else, please	12 statistics, national statistics, of some companies,
13 mute your phones. Don't put us on hold. As you know,	13 some of the claims they have paid, and one that just
14 then we'll hear music and it's really hard to proceed.	14 caught my attention was a claim that lasted for 19
15 So, I'd really appreciate your paying attention to	15 years and the payout was \$2.6 million. So, those
16 that. When you do speak, please restate your name and	16 claims are out there, and again, accentuate why people
17 your organization. It's helpful. We'll get a	17 buy the coverage and when it really comes through for
18 transcript in about three to six weeks and it will be	18 people.
19 available on the website as well and it helps to have a	19 For the carriers, for my part, since we
20 record of everything that we share here.	20 last met in November, we had several comments from
21 So, those of us in the actuary's office	21 seniors who have come in to give all sides of the

Page 10	_
Page 10	
1 vantage points, just wanted to read a few excerpts from	1 a big difference, as you know, between a two year
2 a couple of them. One was from a couple in Odenton,	2 benefit and ten year unlimited or no inflation and 5%
3 Maryland. One of the things they said is, "we're a	3 inflation and it's kind of concerning to see that 57%
4 retired couple in our late seventies living on a fixed	4 of Marylanders still have 5% inflation which may be a
5 income." The most recent premium increase, and their	5 little more than they need.
6 increase, and they bought in 2002, as most recently	6 We're also asking carriers, as you know
7 over 19 years the premiums started at \$4,000. It's up	7 what we have heard from seniors is that these 15s after
8 to about 10,000. So, 150% increase. "The most recent	8 15s, kind of relentless 15s, is there a way that we can
9 increase is a challenge for us financially and leaves	9 work with carriers to reach agreement on rates and then
10 us wondering if the rate of increase of these policies	10 stop, have an end in sight to the increases, maybe a
11 will continue and ultimately result in a cost beyond	11 five year hiatus, ten year. We'll talk about that
12 our reach before the time occurs that we may need the	12 more. We're also trying to stay apprised of what's
13 care. This concern occurs at a time when we are	13 happening nationally. Adam has joined an American
14 retired and living on a fixed income." I know we have	14 Academy of Actuary work group looking at innovation in
15 heard this, but it helps me to remind what these	15 LTC, trying to stay knowledgeable of what other states
16 filings how they impact people directly.	16 are doing. There have been some proposals both in an
17 Another one, "the company has increased my	17 Annapolis and nationally for tax exempt incentives for
18 premiums, an amount inhospitable to my modest fixed	18 LTC for the ability to withdraw from 401-K or IRAs to
19 income." It affects his physical health and in	19 pay for long-term care without a penalty to have health
20 parentheses, mental wellbeing and earnestly asks us to	20 savings accounts for long-term care. Efforts to
21 consider that.	21 educate better, hybrid plans, you know, what is being
Page 11	Page
1 MS. SONG: Last one, "we're in our	1 done in states like Washington and Maine. We're
2 seventies. We are retired with no pensions and very	2 attempting to do that in Maine. We're talking about at
3 modest savings. Like so many other families in	3 what point when members get to a small level that the
4 Maryland in our situation, we are supporting our two	4 financial benefit of the premium becomes relatively in
5 grown sons who have developmental disabilities. The	
	5 actuarial terms small dollars and just to let it go if
	<ul><li>5 actuarial terms small dollars and just to let it go if</li><li>6 we're down to a very small number of members.</li></ul>
6 choices before us reduce our ability to take care of	6 we're down to a very small number of members.
<ul><li>6 choices before us reduce our ability to take care of</li><li>7 ourselves and each other especially when there's no</li></ul>	<ul><li>6 we're down to a very small number of members.</li><li>7 That's just an excerpt of what we're trying</li></ul>
<ul><li>6 choices before us reduce our ability to take care of</li><li>7 ourselves and each other especially when there's no</li><li>8 family to help to fray the cost. We ask you to</li></ul>	<ul> <li>6 we're down to a very small number of members.</li> <li>7 That's just an excerpt of what we're trying</li> <li>8 to work on and thank you. We have by no means found</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>6 choices before us reduce our ability to take care of</li> <li>7 ourselves and each other especially when there's no</li> <li>8 family to help to fray the cost. We ask you to</li> <li>9 seriously consider the consequences of this rate</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 we're down to a very small number of members.</li> <li>7 That's just an excerpt of what we're trying</li> <li>8 to work on and thank you. We have by no means found</li> <li>9 the answer. But, we're still looking. So, with that,</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>6 choices before us reduce our ability to take care of</li> <li>7 ourselves and each other especially when there's no</li> <li>8 family to help to fray the cost. We ask you to</li> <li>9 seriously consider the consequences of this rate</li> <li>10 increase." So, some of the ways we're responding to</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 we're down to a very small number of members.</li> <li>7 That's just an excerpt of what we're trying</li> <li>8 to work on and thank you. We have by no means found</li> <li>9 the answer. But, we're still looking. So, with that,</li> <li>10 I appreciate the carriers being here and ask them to</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>6 choices before us reduce our ability to take care of</li> <li>7 ourselves and each other especially when there's no</li> <li>8 family to help to fray the cost. We ask you to</li> <li>9 seriously consider the consequences of this rate</li> <li>10 increase." So, some of the ways we're responding to</li> <li>11 our dialogue with you and these comments are, one,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 we're down to a very small number of members.</li> <li>7 That's just an excerpt of what we're trying</li> <li>8 to work on and thank you. We have by no means found</li> <li>9 the answer. But, we're still looking. So, with that,</li> <li>10 I appreciate the carriers being here and ask them to</li> <li>11 come up. I believe Mr. John Svedberg of CMFG is on the</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>6 choices before us reduce our ability to take care of</li> <li>7 ourselves and each other especially when there's no</li> <li>8 family to help to fray the cost. We ask you to</li> <li>9 seriously consider the consequences of this rate</li> <li>10 increase." So, some of the ways we're responding to</li> <li>11 our dialogue with you and these comments are, one,</li> <li>12 we're asking all companies to provide a full 50 year</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 we're down to a very small number of members.</li> <li>7 That's just an excerpt of what we're trying</li> <li>8 to work on and thank you. We have by no means found</li> <li>9 the answer. But, we're still looking. So, with that,</li> <li>10 I appreciate the carriers being here and ask them to</li> <li>11 come up. I believe Mr. John Svedberg of CMFG is on th</li> <li>12 phone; is that right?</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>6 choices before us reduce our ability to take care of</li> <li>7 ourselves and each other especially when there's no</li> <li>8 family to help to fray the cost. We ask you to</li> <li>9 seriously consider the consequences of this rate</li> <li>10 increase." So, some of the ways we're responding to</li> <li>11 our dialogue with you and these comments are, one,</li> <li>12 we're asking all companies to provide a full 50 year</li> <li>13 financial proforma including investment income so we</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 we're down to a very small number of members.</li> <li>7 That's just an excerpt of what we're trying</li> <li>8 to work on and thank you. We have by no means found</li> <li>9 the answer. But, we're still looking. So, with that,</li> <li>10 I appreciate the carriers being here and ask them to</li> <li>11 come up. I believe Mr. John Svedberg of CMFG is on th</li> <li>12 phone; is that right?</li> <li>13 MR. SVEDBERG: That's correct.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>6 choices before us reduce our ability to take care of</li> <li>7 ourselves and each other especially when there's no</li> <li>8 family to help to fray the cost. We ask you to</li> <li>9 seriously consider the consequences of this rate</li> <li>10 increase." So, some of the ways we're responding to</li> <li>11 our dialogue with you and these comments are, one,</li> <li>12 we're asking all companies to provide a full 50 year</li> <li>13 financial proforma including investment income so we</li> <li>14 can assess the financial impact, financial damage, and</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 we're down to a very small number of members.</li> <li>7 That's just an excerpt of what we're trying</li> <li>8 to work on and thank you. We have by no means found</li> <li>9 the answer. But, we're still looking. So, with that,</li> <li>10 I appreciate the carriers being here and ask them to</li> <li>11 come up. I believe Mr. John Svedberg of CMFG is on th</li> <li>12 phone; is that right?</li> <li>13 MR. SVEDBERG: That's correct.</li> <li>14 MR. SWITZER: Great. Then you're up.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>6 choices before us reduce our ability to take care of</li> <li>7 ourselves and each other especially when there's no</li> <li>8 family to help to fray the cost. We ask you to</li> <li>9 seriously consider the consequences of this rate</li> <li>10 increase." So, some of the ways we're responding to</li> <li>11 our dialogue with you and these comments are, one,</li> <li>12 we're asking all companies to provide a full 50 year</li> <li>13 financial proforma including investment income so we</li> <li>14 can assess the financial impact, financial damage, and</li> <li>15 have the same approach for each company and to find</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 we're down to a very small number of members.</li> <li>7 That's just an excerpt of what we're trying</li> <li>8 to work on and thank you. We have by no means found</li> <li>9 the answer. But, we're still looking. So, with that,</li> <li>10 I appreciate the carriers being here and ask them to</li> <li>11 come up. I believe Mr. John Svedberg of CMFG is on th</li> <li>12 phone; is that right?</li> <li>13 MR. SVEDBERG: That's correct.</li> <li>14 MR. SWITZER: Great. Then you're up.</li> <li>15 MR. SVEDBERG: Thank you and good morning</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>6 choices before us reduce our ability to take care of</li> <li>7 ourselves and each other especially when there's no</li> <li>8 family to help to fray the cost. We ask you to</li> <li>9 seriously consider the consequences of this rate</li> <li>10 increase." So, some of the ways we're responding to</li> <li>11 our dialogue with you and these comments are, one,</li> <li>12 we're asking all companies to provide a full 50 year</li> <li>13 financial proforma including investment income so we</li> <li>14 can assess the financial impact, financial damage, and</li> <li>15 have the same approach for each company and to find</li> <li>16 exactly what break even means. Because it means a</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 we're down to a very small number of members.</li> <li>7 That's just an excerpt of what we're trying</li> <li>8 to work on and thank you. We have by no means found</li> <li>9 the answer. But, we're still looking. So, with that,</li> <li>10 I appreciate the carriers being here and ask them to</li> <li>11 come up. I believe Mr. John Svedberg of CMFG is on th</li> <li>12 phone; is that right?</li> <li>13 MR. SVEDBERG: That's correct.</li> <li>14 MR. SWITZER: Great. Then you're up.</li> <li>15 MR. SVEDBERG: Thank you and good morning</li> <li>16 My name is John Svedberg, director and actuary</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>6 choices before us reduce our ability to take care of</li> <li>7 ourselves and each other especially when there's no</li> <li>8 family to help to fray the cost. We ask you to</li> <li>9 seriously consider the consequences of this rate</li> <li>10 increase." So, some of the ways we're responding to</li> <li>11 our dialogue with you and these comments are, one,</li> <li>12 we're asking all companies to provide a full 50 year</li> <li>13 financial proforma including investment income so we</li> <li>14 can assess the financial impact, financial damage, and</li> <li>15 have the same approach for each company and to find</li> <li>16 exactly what break even means. Because it means a</li> <li>17 different thing, as we said before, to different</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 we're down to a very small number of members.</li> <li>7 That's just an excerpt of what we're trying</li> <li>8 to work on and thank you. We have by no means found</li> <li>9 the answer. But, we're still looking. So, with that,</li> <li>10 I appreciate the carriers being here and ask them to</li> <li>11 come up. I believe Mr. John Svedberg of CMFG is on th</li> <li>12 phone; is that right?</li> <li>13 MR. SVEDBERG: That's correct.</li> <li>14 MR. SWITZER: Great. Then you're up.</li> <li>15 MR. SVEDBERG: Thank you and good morning</li> <li>16 My name is John Svedberg, director and actuary</li> <li>17 representing product management for CMFG Life's</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>6 choices before us reduce our ability to take care of</li> <li>7 ourselves and each other especially when there's no</li> <li>8 family to help to fray the cost. We ask you to</li> <li>9 seriously consider the consequences of this rate</li> <li>10 increase." So, some of the ways we're responding to</li> <li>11 our dialogue with you and these comments are, one,</li> <li>12 we're asking all companies to provide a full 50 year</li> <li>13 financial proforma including investment income so we</li> <li>14 can assess the financial impact, financial damage, and</li> <li>15 have the same approach for each company and to find</li> <li>16 exactly what break even means. Because it means a</li> <li>17 different thing, as we said before, to different</li> <li>18 companies and approach it from that perspective. We're</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 we're down to a very small number of members.</li> <li>7 That's just an excerpt of what we're trying</li> <li>8 to work on and thank you. We have by no means found</li> <li>9 the answer. But, we're still looking. So, with that,</li> <li>10 I appreciate the carriers being here and ask them to</li> <li>11 come up. I believe Mr. John Svedberg of CMFG is on th</li> <li>12 phone; is that right?</li> <li>13 MR. SVEDBERG: That's correct.</li> <li>14 MR. SWITZER: Great. Then you're up.</li> <li>15 MR. SVEDBERG: Thank you and good morning</li> <li>16 My name is John Svedberg, director and actuary</li> <li>17 representing product management for CMFG Life's</li> <li>18 long-term care block of business. First of all, I want</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>6 choices before us reduce our ability to take care of</li> <li>7 ourselves and each other especially when there's no</li> <li>8 family to help to fray the cost. We ask you to</li> <li>9 seriously consider the consequences of this rate</li> <li>10 increase." So, some of the ways we're responding to</li> <li>11 our dialogue with you and these comments are, one,</li> <li>12 we're asking all companies to provide a full 50 year</li> <li>13 financial proforma including investment income so we</li> <li>14 can assess the financial impact, financial damage, and</li> <li>15 have the same approach for each company and to find</li> <li>16 exactly what break even means. Because it means a</li> <li>17 different thing, as we said before, to different</li> <li>18 companies and approach it from that perspective. We're</li> <li>19 asking companies to break the expense into benefit</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 we're down to a very small number of members.</li> <li>7 That's just an excerpt of what we're trying</li> <li>8 to work on and thank you. We have by no means found</li> <li>9 the answer. But, we're still looking. So, with that,</li> <li>10 I appreciate the carriers being here and ask them to</li> <li>11 come up. I believe Mr. John Svedberg of CMFG is on th</li> <li>12 phone; is that right?</li> <li>13 MR. SVEDBERG: That's correct.</li> <li>14 MR. SWITZER: Great. Then you're up.</li> <li>15 MR. SVEDBERG: Thank you and good morning</li> <li>16 My name is John Svedberg, director and actuary</li> <li>17 representing product management for CMFG Life's</li> <li>18 long-term care block of business. First of all, I want</li> <li>19 to make sure everyone can hear me.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>6 choices before us reduce our ability to take care of</li> <li>7 ourselves and each other especially when there's no</li> <li>8 family to help to fray the cost. We ask you to</li> <li>9 seriously consider the consequences of this rate</li> <li>10 increase." So, some of the ways we're responding to</li> <li>11 our dialogue with you and these comments are, one,</li> <li>12 we're asking all companies to provide a full 50 year</li> <li>13 financial proforma including investment income so we</li> <li>14 can assess the financial impact, financial damage, and</li> <li>15 have the same approach for each company and to find</li> <li>16 exactly what break even means. Because it means a</li> <li>17 different thing, as we said before, to different</li> <li>18 companies and approach it from that perspective. We're</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 we're down to a very small number of members.</li> <li>7 That's just an excerpt of what we're trying</li> <li>8 to work on and thank you. We have by no means found</li> <li>9 the answer. But, we're still looking. So, with that,</li> <li>10 I appreciate the carriers being here and ask them to</li> <li>11 come up. I believe Mr. John Svedberg of CMFG is on th</li> <li>12 phone; is that right?</li> <li>13 MR. SVEDBERG: That's correct.</li> <li>14 MR. SWITZER: Great. Then you're up.</li> <li>15 MR. SVEDBERG: Thank you and good morning</li> <li>16 My name is John Svedberg, director and actuary</li> <li>17 representing product management for CMFG Life's</li> <li>18 long-term care block of business. First of all, I want</li> </ul>

٦

Page 14	Page 16
1 thank Commissioner Redmer and his team for this	1 within the long-term care industry; mortality,
2 opportunity to discuss our current long-term Care rate	2 policyholder lapse rates and morbidity. Any portfolio
3 filings pending with the Maryland Insurance	3 interest rate assumption relies upon the regulatory
4 Administration.	4 statutory valuation rate used for active life
5 CMFG Life has submitted two rate requests;	5 policyholder reserves and therefore does not
6 one for the 2002 product version and one for the 2006	6 specifically rely upon the company's portfolio interest
7 product version. The 2002 product covers policies sold	7 rates. Company experience was used to the extent it
8 between 2003 and 2008 and will impact 814 policyholders	8 was statistically credible and supplemented by fitting
9 in force as of December 31, 2018. The 2006 product	9 with industry data.
10 covers policies sold between 2007 and 2010 and will	10 Overall mortality and lapse rates have
11 impact 761 policyholders also in force as of December	11 consistently been lower than original pricing
12 31, 2018. We are currently requesting a series of	12 assumptions. This results in more policyholders
13 three 15% rate increases for Maryland policies to be	13 available to initiate claims and drive aggregate claim
14 implemented annually over the next three years. We	14 costs higher. Morbidity experience has been higher
15 have received prior rate increases for these products.	15 than original pricing assumptions for the 2002 products
16 The 2002 product received 15% increase effective in	16 and lower than original pricing assumptions for the
17 2016 and an 8.7% increase effective in 2019.	17 2006 product. As more experience emerges, we continue
18 Our current rate request decision did not	18 to see increases in the slope of the claim cost curve,
19 come lightly and we understand the difficulties these	19 so as policyholders grow older, incidence and claim
20 rate increases can be to our policyholders. It is	20 costs increase which ultimately drives increases in the
21 important to note that CMFG Life is not trying to get	21 expected lifetime loss ratios.
Page 15	Page 17
Page 15 1 back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss	Page 17 1 Finally, we are committed to working with
1 back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss	1 Finally, we are committed to working with
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> </ol>	1 Finally, we are committed to working with 2 policyholders faced with these rate increases to make
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> <li>increases needed to bring target ratios at or near</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> <li>increase letter has been improved to proactively</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> <li>increases needed to bring target ratios at or near</li> <li>100%. We annually review our assumptions and augment</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> <li>increase letter has been improved to proactively</li> <li>provide a table of common options available to manage</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> <li>increases needed to bring target ratios at or near</li> <li>100%. We annually review our assumptions and augment</li> <li>our experience with industry experience when it is not</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> <li>increase letter has been improved to proactively</li> <li>provide a table of common options available to manage</li> <li>their premium. Additional options can be quoted by</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> <li>increases needed to bring target ratios at or near</li> <li>100%. We annually review our assumptions and augment</li> <li>our experience with industry experience when it is not</li> <li>fully credible. We have begun tracking Maryland</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> <li>increase letter has been improved to proactively</li> <li>provide a table of common options available to manage</li> <li>their premium. Additional options can be quoted by</li> <li>contacting our customer care center. we are now making</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> <li>increases needed to bring target ratios at or near</li> <li>100%. We annually review our assumptions and augment</li> <li>our experience with industry experience when it is not</li> <li>fully credible. We have begun tracking Maryland</li> <li>reserves released as a result of policyholder actions</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> <li>increase letter has been improved to proactively</li> <li>provide a table of common options available to manage</li> <li>their premium. Additional options can be quoted by</li> <li>contacting our customer care center. we are now making</li> <li>the regulatory contingent benefit upon lapse</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> <li>increases needed to bring target ratios at or near</li> <li>100%. We annually review our assumptions and augment</li> <li>our experience with industry experience when it is not</li> <li>fully credible. We have begun tracking Maryland</li> <li>reserves released as a result of policyholder actions</li> <li>from the most recent rate increases. This will serve</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> <li>increase letter has been improved to proactively</li> <li>provide a table of common options available to manage</li> <li>their premium. Additional options can be quoted by</li> <li>contacting our customer care center. we are now making</li> <li>the regulatory contingent benefit upon lapse</li> <li>nonforfeiture benefit option available to all</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> <li>increases needed to bring target ratios at or near</li> <li>100%. We annually review our assumptions and augment</li> <li>our experience with industry experience when it is not</li> <li>fully credible. We have begun tracking Maryland</li> <li>reserves released as a result of policyholder actions</li> <li>from the most recent rate increases. This will serve</li> <li>as another source to help mitigate any future rate</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> <li>increase letter has been improved to proactively</li> <li>provide a table of common options available to manage</li> <li>their premium. Additional options can be quoted by</li> <li>contacting our customer care center. we are now making</li> <li>the regulatory contingent benefit upon lapse</li> <li>nonforfeiture benefit option available to all</li> <li>policyholders faced with rate increases.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> <li>increases needed to bring target ratios at or near</li> <li>100%. We annually review our assumptions and augment</li> <li>our experience with industry experience when it is not</li> <li>fully credible. We have begun tracking Maryland</li> <li>reserves released as a result of policyholder actions</li> <li>from the most recent rate increases. This will serve</li> <li>as another source to help mitigate any future rate</li> <li>increases.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> <li>increase letter has been improved to proactively</li> <li>provide a table of common options available to manage</li> <li>their premium. Additional options can be quoted by</li> <li>contacting our customer care center. we are now making</li> <li>the regulatory contingent benefit upon lapse</li> <li>nonforfeiture benefit option available to all</li> <li>policyholders faced with rate increases.</li> <li>We feel that even with the rate increases,</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> <li>increases needed to bring target ratios at or near</li> <li>100%. We annually review our assumptions and augment</li> <li>our experience with industry experience when it is not</li> <li>fully credible. We have begun tracking Maryland</li> <li>reserves released as a result of policyholder actions</li> <li>from the most recent rate increases. This will serve</li> <li>as another source to help mitigate any future rate</li> <li>increases.</li> <li>We want to be transparent to both the</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> <li>increase letter has been improved to proactively</li> <li>provide a table of common options available to manage</li> <li>their premium. Additional options can be quoted by</li> <li>contacting our customer care center. we are now making</li> <li>the regulatory contingent benefit upon lapse</li> <li>nonforfeiture benefit option available to all</li> <li>policyholders faced with rate increases.</li> <li>We feel that even with the rate increases,</li> <li>our long-term care product continues to provide needed</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> <li>increases needed to bring target ratios at or near</li> <li>100%. We annually review our assumptions and augment</li> <li>our experience with industry experience when it is not</li> <li>fully credible. We have begun tracking Maryland</li> <li>reserves released as a result of policyholder actions</li> <li>from the most recent rate increases. This will serve</li> <li>as another source to help mitigate any future rate</li> <li>increases.</li> <li>We want to be transparent to both the</li> <li>Insurance Administration as well as the policyholders.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> <li>increase letter has been improved to proactively</li> <li>provide a table of common options available to manage</li> <li>their premium. Additional options can be quoted by</li> <li>contacting our customer care center. we are now making</li> <li>the regulatory contingent benefit upon lapse</li> <li>nonforfeiture benefit option available to all</li> <li>policyholders faced with rate increases.</li> <li>We feel that even with the rate increases,</li> <li>our long-term care product continues to provide needed</li> <li>benefits at a reasonable cost to the policyholder. I</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> <li>increases needed to bring target ratios at or near</li> <li>100%. We annually review our assumptions and augment</li> <li>our experience with industry experience when it is not</li> <li>fully credible. We have begun tracking Maryland</li> <li>reserves released as a result of policyholder actions</li> <li>from the most recent rate increases. This will serve</li> <li>as another source to help mitigate any future rate</li> <li>increases.</li> <li>We want to be transparent to both the</li> <li>Insurance Administration as well as the policyholders.</li> <li>We know that everyone wants to know what to expect and</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> <li>increase letter has been improved to proactively</li> <li>provide a table of common options available to manage</li> <li>their premium. Additional options can be quoted by</li> <li>contacting our customer care center. we are now making</li> <li>the regulatory contingent benefit upon lapse</li> <li>nonforfeiture benefit option available to all</li> <li>policyholders faced with rate increases.</li> <li>We feel that even with the rate increases,</li> <li>our long-term care product continues to provide needed</li> <li>benefits at a reasonable cost to the policyholder. I</li> <li>would like to thank commissioner Redmer for this</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> <li>increases needed to bring target ratios at or near</li> <li>100%. We annually review our assumptions and augment</li> <li>our experience with industry experience when it is not</li> <li>fully credible. We have begun tracking Maryland</li> <li>reserves released as a result of policyholder actions</li> <li>from the most recent rate increases. This will serve</li> <li>as another source to help mitigate any future rate</li> <li>increases.</li> <li>We want to be transparent to both the</li> <li>Insurance Administration as well as the policyholders.</li> <li>We know that everyone wants to know what to expect and</li> <li>when rate increases will stop. And we understand that</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> <li>increase letter has been improved to proactively</li> <li>provide a table of common options available to manage</li> <li>their premium. Additional options can be quoted by</li> <li>contacting our customer care center. we are now making</li> <li>the regulatory contingent benefit upon lapse</li> <li>nonforfeiture benefit option available to all</li> <li>policyholders faced with rate increases.</li> <li>We feel that even with the rate increases,</li> <li>our long-term care product continues to provide needed</li> <li>benefits at a reasonable cost to the policyholder. I</li> <li>would like to thank commissioner Redmer for this</li> <li>opportunity to participate in today's hearing. I will</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> <li>increases needed to bring target ratios at or near</li> <li>100%. We annually review our assumptions and augment</li> <li>our experience with industry experience when it is not</li> <li>fully credible. We have begun tracking Maryland</li> <li>reserves released as a result of policyholder actions</li> <li>from the most recent rate increases. This will serve</li> <li>as another source to help mitigate any future rate</li> <li>increases.</li> <li>We want to be transparent to both the</li> <li>Insurance Administration as well as the policyholders.</li> <li>We know that everyone wants to know what to expect and</li> <li>when rate increases will stop. And we understand that</li> <li>the 15% rate cap allows manageable incremental</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> <li>increase letter has been improved to proactively</li> <li>provide a table of common options available to manage</li> <li>their premium. Additional options can be quoted by</li> <li>contacting our customer care center. we are now making</li> <li>the regulatory contingent benefit upon lapse</li> <li>nonforfeiture benefit option available to all</li> <li>policyholders faced with rate increases.</li> <li>We feel that even with the rate increases,</li> <li>our long-term care product continues to provide needed</li> <li>benefits at a reasonable cost to the policyholder. I</li> <li>would like to thank commissioner Redmer for this</li> <li>opportunity to participate in today's hearing. I will</li> <li>be happy to take your questions.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> <li>increases needed to bring target ratios at or near</li> <li>100%. We annually review our assumptions and augment</li> <li>our experience with industry experience when it is not</li> <li>fully credible. We have begun tracking Maryland</li> <li>reserves released as a result of policyholder actions</li> <li>from the most recent rate increases. This will serve</li> <li>as another source to help mitigate any future rate</li> <li>increases.</li> <li>We want to be transparent to both the</li> <li>Insurance Administration as well as the policyholders.</li> <li>We know that everyone wants to know what to expect and</li> <li>when rate increases will stop. And we understand that</li> <li>the 15% rate cap allows manageable incremental</li> <li>increases.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> <li>increase letter has been improved to proactively</li> <li>provide a table of common options available to manage</li> <li>their premium. Additional options can be quoted by</li> <li>contacting our customer care center. we are now making</li> <li>the regulatory contingent benefit upon lapse</li> <li>nonforfeiture benefit option available to all</li> <li>policyholders faced with rate increases.</li> <li>We feel that even with the rate increases,</li> <li>our long-term care product continues to provide needed</li> <li>benefits at a reasonable cost to the policyholder. I</li> <li>would like to thank commissioner Redmer for this</li> <li>opportunity to participate in today's hearing. I will</li> <li>be happy to take your questions.</li> <li>MR. SWITZER: One question that I had is</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>back to original life time loss ratios or minimum loss</li> <li>ratios under rate stabilization. Rather, we intend to</li> <li>share the product risk, hoping to achieve only the rate</li> <li>increases needed to bring target ratios at or near</li> <li>100%. We annually review our assumptions and augment</li> <li>our experience with industry experience when it is not</li> <li>fully credible. We have begun tracking Maryland</li> <li>reserves released as a result of policyholder actions</li> <li>from the most recent rate increases. This will serve</li> <li>as another source to help mitigate any future rate</li> <li>increases.</li> <li>We want to be transparent to both the</li> <li>Insurance Administration as well as the policyholders.</li> <li>We know that everyone wants to know what to expect and</li> <li>when rate increases will stop. And we understand that</li> <li>the 15% rate cap allows manageable incremental</li> <li>increases to give a clearer indication of our</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Finally, we are committed to working with</li> <li>policyholders faced with these rate increases to make</li> <li>the decision that is appropriate to them. Our rate</li> <li>increase letter has been improved to proactively</li> <li>provide a table of common options available to manage</li> <li>their premium. Additional options can be quoted by</li> <li>contacting our customer care center. we are now making</li> <li>the regulatory contingent benefit upon lapse</li> <li>nonforfeiture benefit option available to all</li> <li>policyholders faced with rate increases.</li> <li>We feel that even with the rate increases,</li> <li>our long-term care product continues to provide needed</li> <li>benefits at a reasonable cost to the policyholder. I</li> <li>would like to thank commissioner Redmer for this</li> <li>opportunity to participate in today's hearing. I will</li> <li>be happy to take your questions.</li> <li>MR. SWITZER: One question that I had is</li> <li>for the 1600 members in these filings, that's all of</li> </ol>

	Page 18		Page 20
1	all of the business in Maryland is sold through these	1	entire block of business, we've seen that under current
2	two products.	2	assumptions, targeting toward 150% rate increase
3	MR. SWITZER: Thank you. One of the things	3	cumulative would give the block in total at or near the
4	that I was wondering if you would be open to talking	4	100% target loss ratio. We were filing through 50
5	about is as we looked at the experience broken into	5	states. Not all 50 states we don't have products in
6	some pieces, we have noticed that the policies with no	6	some states, however, we are, you know, we're trying to
7	inflation, there's 43 of them on one of the forms and	7	do that and as you well know, there are certain
8	63 members on the other, the experience is a lot	8	challenges across certain states.
9	different, better and would you be open to discussing a	9	MR. SWITZER: Appreciate it. Thank you.
10	different rate action there? Perhaps no rate action?	10	One thing, again, we'll be engaging you about is if
11	Happy to discuss that?	11	there is a scenario where we could talk about a series
12	MR. SVEDBERG: We are certainly open to	12	of increases that would maybe meet in the middle and
13	discuss that. I know that we've typically taken the	13	then not have a year after year 15% increase. But,
14	approach to doing blankets because the product was	14	that's just advanced notice.
15	priced kind of through an expected distribution of	15	MR. SVEDBERG: All right. That's
16	claims or product features. So, whenever we've	16	interesting. We've had discussions with other states
17	asked for rate increases, we've typically asked for	17	at times for a similar I'll call it moratorium of a
18	that. But, it is something that we are interested in	18	period of not coming back to allow experience to
19	entertaining.	19	continue to accumulate. So, we're willing to think
20	MR. SWITZER: I appreciate that. Anything	20	about that scenario.
21	else up here?	21	MR. SWITZER: Thank you. Last chance.
	Page 19		Page 21
1	MR. JI: I have a question. This is Jeff.	1	Anybody else? Thank you very much. Appreciate it.
2	So, referring to your response to one of our	2	MR. SVEDBERG: Thank you.
3	objections, you mentioned the company is seeking 150%	3	MR. SWITZER: Next we have Lincoln Benefit,
4	cumulative increase. Is that 150% rate increase based	4	Ms. Xiaoyan, are you on the phone? I'm sorry. You're
5			
5	on the 100% loss ratio?		in California and this is so early for you. We will
5 6	on the 100% loss ratio? MR. SWITZER: Excuse me just a moment.	5	in California and this is so early for you. We will consider that next time. But, feel free to start.
6		5	
6 7	MR. SWITZER: Excuse me just a moment.	5 6 7	consider that next time. But, feel free to start.
6 7 8	MR. SWITZER: Excuse me just a moment. Anybody who is own the phone, we can hear somebody.	5 6 7 8	consider that next time. But, feel free to start. MS. SONG: Good morning. Thank you for the
6 7 8	MR. SWITZER: Excuse me just a moment. Anybody who is own the phone, we can hear somebody. So, if you could, please put it on mute. We'd appreciate it. Thanks. Did you get that Mr. Svedberg.	5 6 7 8 9	consider that next time. But, feel free to start. MS. SONG: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss this long-term care rate
6 7 8 9 10	MR. SWITZER: Excuse me just a moment. Anybody who is own the phone, we can hear somebody. So, if you could, please put it on mute. We'd appreciate it. Thanks. Did you get that Mr. Svedberg.	5 6 7 8 9 10	consider that next time. But, feel free to start. MS. SONG: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss this long-term care rate increase filing by Lincoln Benefit Life Insurance
6 7 8 9 10	MR. SWITZER: Excuse me just a moment. Anybody who is own the phone, we can hear somebody. So, if you could, please put it on mute. We'd appreciate it. Thanks. Did you get that Mr. Svedberg. MR. SVEDBERG: Maybe if you could repeat	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	consider that next time. But, feel free to start. MS. SONG: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss this long-term care rate increase filing by Lincoln Benefit Life Insurance Company. My name is Xiaoyan Song, spelled as
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. SWITZER: Excuse me just a moment. Anybody who is own the phone, we can hear somebody. So, if you could, please put it on mute. We'd appreciate it. Thanks. Did you get that Mr. Svedberg. MR. SVEDBERG: Maybe if you could repeat it, that would be great.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	consider that next time. But, feel free to start. MS. SONG: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss this long-term care rate increase filing by Lincoln Benefit Life Insurance Company. My name is Xiaoyan Song, spelled as X-I-A-O-Y-A-N S-O-N-G. I'm a member of the American
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. SWITZER: Excuse me just a moment. Anybody who is own the phone, we can hear somebody. So, if you could, please put it on mute. We'd appreciate it. Thanks. Did you get that Mr. Svedberg. MR. SVEDBERG: Maybe if you could repeat it, that would be great. MR. JI: The question is, in your response	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	consider that next time. But, feel free to start. MS. SONG: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss this long-term care rate increase filing by Lincoln Benefit Life Insurance Company. My name is Xiaoyan Song, spelled as X-I-A-O-Y-A-N S-O-N-G. I'm a member of the American Academy of Actuaries and a Fellow of the Society of
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. SWITZER: Excuse me just a moment. Anybody who is own the phone, we can hear somebody. So, if you could, please put it on mute. We'd appreciate it. Thanks. Did you get that Mr. Svedberg. MR. SVEDBERG: Maybe if you could repeat it, that would be great. MR. JI: The question is, in your response to one of our objections, you mentioned that the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	consider that next time. But, feel free to start. MS. SONG: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss this long-term care rate increase filing by Lincoln Benefit Life Insurance Company. My name is Xiaoyan Song, spelled as X-I-A-O-Y-A-N S-O-N-G. I'm a member of the American Academy of Actuaries and a Fellow of the Society of Actuaries. I am a consulting actuary who has been
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. SWITZER: Excuse me just a moment. Anybody who is own the phone, we can hear somebody. So, if you could, please put it on mute. We'd appreciate it. Thanks. Did you get that Mr. Svedberg. MR. SVEDBERG: Maybe if you could repeat it, that would be great. MR. JI: The question is, in your response to one of our objections, you mentioned that the company is seeking 150% cumulative rate increase in	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	consider that next time. But, feel free to start. MS. SONG: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss this long-term care rate increase filing by Lincoln Benefit Life Insurance Company. My name is Xiaoyan Song, spelled as X-I-A-O-Y-A-N S-O-N-G. I'm a member of the American Academy of Actuaries and a Fellow of the Society of Actuaries. I am a consulting actuary who has been authorized by Lincoln Benefit Life Insurance Company to
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. SWITZER: Excuse me just a moment. Anybody who is own the phone, we can hear somebody. So, if you could, please put it on mute. We'd appreciate it. Thanks. Did you get that Mr. Svedberg. MR. SVEDBERG: Maybe if you could repeat it, that would be great. MR. JI: The question is, in your response to one of our objections, you mentioned that the company is seeking 150% cumulative rate increase in both states. I'm wondering, is that based on the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	consider that next time. But, feel free to start. MS. SONG: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss this long-term care rate increase filing by Lincoln Benefit Life Insurance Company. My name is Xiaoyan Song, spelled as X-I-A-O-Y-A-N S-O-N-G. I'm a member of the American Academy of Actuaries and a Fellow of the Society of Actuaries. I am a consulting actuary who has been authorized by Lincoln Benefit Life Insurance Company to file the rate increase on its behalf.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. SWITZER: Excuse me just a moment. Anybody who is own the phone, we can hear somebody. So, if you could, please put it on mute. We'd appreciate it. Thanks. Did you get that Mr. Svedberg. MR. SVEDBERG: Maybe if you could repeat it, that would be great. MR. JI: The question is, in your response to one of our objections, you mentioned that the company is seeking 150% cumulative rate increase in both states. I'm wondering, is that based on the hundred percent loss ratio?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	consider that next time. But, feel free to start. MS. SONG: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss this long-term care rate increase filing by Lincoln Benefit Life Insurance Company. My name is Xiaoyan Song, spelled as X-I-A-O-Y-A-N S-O-N-G. I'm a member of the American Academy of Actuaries and a Fellow of the Society of Actuaries. I am a consulting actuary who has been authorized by Lincoln Benefit Life Insurance Company to file the rate increase on its behalf. The company is currently requesting a
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SWITZER: Excuse me just a moment. Anybody who is own the phone, we can hear somebody. So, if you could, please put it on mute. We'd appreciate it. Thanks. Did you get that Mr. Svedberg. MR. SVEDBERG: Maybe if you could repeat it, that would be great. MR. JI: The question is, in your response to one of our objections, you mentioned that the company is seeking 150% cumulative rate increase in both states. I'm wondering, is that based on the hundred percent loss ratio? MR. SWITZER: So far in Maryland, the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	consider that next time. But, feel free to start. MS. SONG: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss this long-term care rate increase filing by Lincoln Benefit Life Insurance Company. My name is Xiaoyan Song, spelled as X-I-A-O-Y-A-N S-O-N-G. I'm a member of the American Academy of Actuaries and a Fellow of the Society of Actuaries. I am a consulting actuary who has been authorized by Lincoln Benefit Life Insurance Company to file the rate increase on its behalf. The company is currently requesting a 15% rate increase to the premium rate charged for
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SWITZER: Excuse me just a moment. Anybody who is own the phone, we can hear somebody. So, if you could, please put it on mute. We'd appreciate it. Thanks. Did you get that Mr. Svedberg. MR. SVEDBERG: Maybe if you could repeat it, that would be great. MR. JI: The question is, in your response to one of our objections, you mentioned that the company is seeking 150% cumulative rate increase in both states. I'm wondering, is that based on the hundred percent loss ratio? MR. SWITZER: So far in Maryland, the increases have been 25 to 45% so far. Ultimate goal is	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	consider that next time. But, feel free to start. MS. SONG: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss this long-term care rate increase filing by Lincoln Benefit Life Insurance Company. My name is Xiaoyan Song, spelled as X-I-A-O-Y-A-N S-O-N-G. I'm a member of the American Academy of Actuaries and a Fellow of the Society of Actuaries. I am a consulting actuary who has been authorized by Lincoln Benefit Life Insurance Company to file the rate increase on its behalf. The company is currently requesting a 15% rate increase to the premium rate charged for the policy form LB-6301, LB-6302, and LB-6303.

	Page 22		Page 24
1	request would impact the premiums for the 287	1	data), are too high and actual earned interest is
2	policies, 409 policy holders, in force as of the end	2	lower, usually because of an economic decline, the
3	of 2018.	3	premiums charged for a policy will become insufficient.
4	These policy forms were available for	4	Claim costs: Claim costs are the
5	purchase in Maryland between 1999 and 2004 under the	5	combination of how many people go on claim each year,
6	product name Senior Linc. They were priced to meet the	6	referred to as incidence rates, multiplied by the
7	minimum loss ratio requirements. The increase is being	7	length of time the stay on claim, referred to as
8	requested because actual experience on this block has	8	continuance rates. While incidence rates have been
9	been less favorable than originally anticipated at the	9	approximately what was expected, continuance rates have
10	time the product was designed. The original	10	been longer than anticipated resulting in claims costs
11	anticipated lifetime loss ratio was 68%. Without the	11	slightly higher than originally forecast. These items
12	current requested rate increase, and under current best	12	have contributed to an insufficiency of the original
13	estimate assumptions, the lifetime loss ratio is	13	premiums charged by all companies across the LTCi
14	expected to be well above a hundred percent.	14	industry. The combination of these has resulted in the
15	Rate Increase Rationale: These policy	15	need for the company to file for and implement rate
16	forms were originally developed in the late 1990s using	16	increases.
17	assumptions which seemed reasonable for their time.	17	Rate Increase Impact: There is a
18	However, the reality has turned out to be quite	18	significant impact for the policyholders. Policies
19	different. Here I am going to talk about major	19	were sold with the possibility that premiums could
20	assumptions and what happened with them over time:	20	increase, but with expectations that the premiums would
21	Lapse rates, each year, a certain percentage of people	21	remain the same over the life of the policy. Thus,
	Page 23		Page 25
1	Page 23 stop paying premiums for their policy, either because	1	Page 25 when policyholders receive a notice that their rates
	-		-
2	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because	2	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates
2 3	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because	2 3	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best
2 3 4	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the	2 3	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has
2 3 4 5	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the excess early year premiums, which were set aside in	2 3 4 5	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has happened and what can be done about it.
2 3 4 5 6	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the excess early year premiums, which were set aside in reserves, are available to prefund expected costs for	2 3 4 5 6	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has happened and what can be done about it. Fortunately, there are some options to help
2 3 4 5 6 7	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the excess early year premiums, which were set aside in reserves, are available to prefund expected costs for continuing policyholders. This creates what is	2 3 4 5 6 7	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has happened and what can be done about it. Fortunately, there are some options to help minimize the impact. Policyholders can reduce their
2 3 4 5 6 7	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the excess early year premiums, which were set aside in reserves, are available to prefund expected costs for continuing policyholders. This creates what is referred to as a lapse supported policy. The greater the number of policyholders who stop paying their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has happened and what can be done about it. Fortunately, there are some options to help minimize the impact. Policyholders can reduce their coverage to keep their premiums about the same by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the excess early year premiums, which were set aside in reserves, are available to prefund expected costs for continuing policyholders. This creates what is referred to as a lapse supported policy. The greater the number of policyholders who stop paying their premiums, the lower the premiums will be for remaining	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has happened and what can be done about it. Fortunately, there are some options to help minimize the impact. Policyholders can reduce their coverage to keep their premiums about the same by changing benefits, the daily benefit, the maximum
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the excess early year premiums, which were set aside in reserves, are available to prefund expected costs for continuing policyholders. This creates what is referred to as a lapse supported policy. The greater the number of policyholders who stop paying their premiums, the lower the premiums will be for remaining	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has happened and what can be done about it. Fortunately, there are some options to help minimize the impact. Policyholders can reduce their coverage to keep their premiums about the same by changing benefits, the daily benefit, the maximum benefit period, or the inflation protection level, or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the excess early year premiums, which were set aside in reserves, are available to prefund expected costs for continuing policyholders. This creates what is referred to as a lapse supported policy. The greater the number of policyholders who stop paying their premiums, the lower the premiums will be for remaining policyholders. Thus, if the assumption of how many	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has happened and what can be done about it. Fortunately, there are some options to help minimize the impact. Policyholders can reduce their coverage to keep their premiums about the same by changing benefits, the daily benefit, the maximum benefit period, or the inflation protection level, or they can choose to keep their coverage at the full
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the excess early year premiums, which were set aside in reserves, are available to prefund expected costs for continuing policyholders. This creates what is referred to as a lapse supported policy. The greater the number of policyholders who stop paying their premiums, the lower the premiums will be for remaining policyholders. Thus, if the assumption of how many people will stop paying is too high, there will not be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has happened and what can be done about it. Fortunately, there are some options to help minimize the impact. Policyholders can reduce their coverage to keep their premiums about the same by changing benefits, the daily benefit, the maximum benefit period, or the inflation protection level, or they can choose to keep their coverage at the full level and pay the higher premium. Or they can take the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the excess early year premiums, which were set aside in reserves, are available to prefund expected costs for continuing policyholders. This creates what is referred to as a lapse supported policy. The greater the number of policyholders who stop paying their premiums, the lower the premiums will be for remaining policyholders. Thus, if the assumption of how many people will stop paying is too high, there will not be enough premiums collected to pay all the claims and a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has happened and what can be done about it. Fortunately, there are some options to help minimize the impact. Policyholders can reduce their coverage to keep their premiums about the same by changing benefits, the daily benefit, the maximum benefit period, or the inflation protection level, or they can choose to keep their coverage at the full level and pay the higher premium. Or they can take the CBUL benefit, which is automatically provided to all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the excess early year premiums, which were set aside in reserves, are available to prefund expected costs for continuing policyholders. This creates what is referred to as a lapse supported policy. The greater the number of policyholders who stop paying their premiums, the lower the premiums will be for remaining policyholders. Thus, if the assumption of how many people will stop paying is too high, there will not be enough premiums collected to pay all the claims and a rate increase will be become necessary later.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has happened and what can be done about it. Fortunately, there are some options to help minimize the impact. Policyholders can reduce their coverage to keep their premiums about the same by changing benefits, the daily benefit, the maximum benefit period, or the inflation protection level, or they can choose to keep their coverage at the full level and pay the higher premium. Or they can take the CBUL benefit, which is automatically provided to all Maryland policyholders with no consideration of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the excess early year premiums, which were set aside in reserves, are available to prefund expected costs for continuing policyholders. This creates what is referred to as a lapse supported policy. The greater the number of policyholders who stop paying their premiums, the lower the premiums will be for remaining policyholders. Thus, if the assumption of how many people will stop paying is too high, there will not be enough premiums collected to pay all the claims and a rate increase will be become necessary later. Interest rates: Long-term care premiums are collected over many years. The majority of those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has happened and what can be done about it. Fortunately, there are some options to help minimize the impact. Policyholders can reduce their coverage to keep their premiums about the same by changing benefits, the daily benefit, the maximum benefit period, or the inflation protection level, or they can choose to keep their coverage at the full level and pay the higher premium. Or they can take the CBUL benefit, which is automatically provided to all Maryland policyholders with no consideration of triggering point.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the excess early year premiums, which were set aside in reserves, are available to prefund expected costs for continuing policyholders. This creates what is referred to as a lapse supported policy. The greater the number of policyholders who stop paying their premiums, the lower the premiums will be for remaining policyholders. Thus, if the assumption of how many people will stop paying is too high, there will not be enough premiums collected to pay all the claims and a rate increase will be become necessary later. Interest rates: Long-term care premiums are collected over many years. The majority of those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has happened and what can be done about it. Fortunately, there are some options to help minimize the impact. Policyholders can reduce their coverage to keep their premiums about the same by changing benefits, the daily benefit, the maximum benefit period, or the inflation protection level, or they can choose to keep their coverage at the full level and pay the higher premium. Or they can take the CBUL benefit, which is automatically provided to all Maryland policyholders with no consideration of triggering point. In order to improve communication with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the excess early year premiums, which were set aside in reserves, are available to prefund expected costs for continuing policyholders. This creates what is referred to as a lapse supported policy. The greater the number of policyholders who stop paying their premiums, the lower the premiums will be for remaining policyholders. Thus, if the assumption of how many people will stop paying is too high, there will not be enough premiums collected to pay all the claims and a rate increase will be become necessary later. Interest rates: Long-term care premiums are collected over many years. The majority of those premiums are set aside in reserves and invested until	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has happened and what can be done about it. Fortunately, there are some options to help minimize the impact. Policyholders can reduce their coverage to keep their premiums about the same by changing benefits, the daily benefit, the maximum benefit period, or the inflation protection level, or they can choose to keep their coverage at the full level and pay the higher premium. Or they can take the CBUL benefit, which is automatically provided to all Maryland policyholders with no consideration of triggering point. In order to improve communication with our policyholders about their options in connection
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the excess early year premiums, which were set aside in reserves, are available to prefund expected costs for continuing policyholders. This creates what is referred to as a lapse supported policy. The greater the number of policyholders who stop paying their premiums, the lower the premiums will be for remaining policyholders. Thus, if the assumption of how many people will stop paying is too high, there will not be enough premiums collected to pay all the claims and a rate increase will be become necessary later. Interest rates: Long-term care premiums are collected over many years. The majority of those premiums are set aside in reserves and invested until such time, usually decades later, as they are needed to pay claims. The amount of interest earned on those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has happened and what can be done about it. Fortunately, there are some options to help minimize the impact. Policyholders can reduce their coverage to keep their premiums about the same by changing benefits, the daily benefit, the maximum benefit period, or the inflation protection level, or they can choose to keep their coverage at the full level and pay the higher premium. Or they can take the CBUL benefit, which is automatically provided to all Maryland policyholders with no consideration of triggering point. In order to improve communication with our policyholders about their options in connection with the rate increase, we invite the policyholders
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	stop paying premiums for their policy, either because they voluntarily discontinue their policy or because they die. When this happens, the policy lapses and the excess early year premiums, which were set aside in reserves, are available to prefund expected costs for continuing policyholders. This creates what is referred to as a lapse supported policy. The greater the number of policyholders who stop paying their premiums, the lower the premiums will be for remaining policyholders. Thus, if the assumption of how many people will stop paying is too high, there will not be enough premiums collected to pay all the claims and a rate increase will be become necessary later. Interest rates: Long-term care premiums are collected over many years. The majority of those premiums are set aside in reserves and invested until such time, usually decades later, as they are needed to pay claims. The amount of interest earned on those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	when policyholders receive a notice that their rates will increase, tensions can run high and we do our best responding to calls and letters asking why this has happened and what can be done about it. Fortunately, there are some options to help minimize the impact. Policyholders can reduce their coverage to keep their premiums about the same by changing benefits, the daily benefit, the maximum benefit period, or the inflation protection level, or they can choose to keep their coverage at the full level and pay the higher premium. Or they can take the CBUL benefit, which is automatically provided to all Maryland policyholders with no consideration of triggering point. In order to improve communication with our policyholders about their options in connection with the rate increase, we invite the policyholders to call our dedicated customer service team to

	Page 26		Page 28
1	We look forward to continued dialogue	1	insured and the company to see whether this is
2	with Maryland Insurance Administration in the rate	2	something that the company can accept.
3	increase process. I welcome any questions you may	3	MR. SWITZER: So, we can bring the
4	have.	4	reinsurer into our correspondence? I would expect so?
5	MR. SWITZER: Thank you. So, I see that	5	Or you will? But, they can be brought into the
6	for these policies increases so far, 67%. It's 287	6	discussion?
7	members affected by this filing. Policy issued in	7	MS. SONG: Right. Because 100% I'm
8	1999, first issued, also saw new modeling that at its	8	sorry, the rate being 100% on the reinsurer, actually,
9	height, that the membership was up to about 546	9	the reinsurer will have the performance of this block
10	members. So, my question is, we expect enrollment,	10	and the one that trigger is the one that initiated the
11	it's closed block to only decline, and as members go on	11	rate increase request.
12	claim and stop paying premium, in order for on the life	12	MR. SWITZER: Sure. I saw that in Surf. I
13	of the policy to hit some financial targets, even the	13	appreciate the detail in Surf. Just as an advanced
14	lifetime loss ratio of a hundred, as the number of	14	notice, as we're working with the carriers, we moved
15	members dwindled, numerically, the increase that can be	15	again, as you know, from a loss ratio basis to a
16	needed can will just get higher and it's already	16	lifetime net income basis, and for some carriers the
17	very large. Yet, the revenue from this relatively few	17	100% loss ratio corresponds to a break even. We had
18	number of people, I estimate a 15% increase for one	18	another recently where with significantly higher than
19	year on these 287 members, about 173 grand a year, so	19	100, when you brought in investment income, came to a
20	my question is, is there openness to discussing if,	20	break even. So, our conversation will be along those
21	once we agree on what's to be done with this filing,	21	lines. Any other questions up here?
	Page 27		Page 29
1	Page 27 any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five	1	Page 29 MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to
	č	_	
2	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five	2	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to
2	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing	2	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two
2 3 4	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that?	2 3 4	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future?
2 3 4 5	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that? MS. SONG: Okay. First I want to make a	2 3 4 5	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future? MS. SONG: Yes. These are for the catch up
2 3 4 5 6	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that? MS. SONG: Okay. First I want to make a correction on the 287 policyholders in Maryland. That	2 3 4 5	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future? MS. SONG: Yes. These are for the catch up rate increase because Maryland is not approving the
2 3 4 5 6 7	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that? MS. SONG: Okay. First I want to make a correction on the 287 policyholders in Maryland. That would be 287 policies because our policies we have	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future? MS. SONG: Yes. These are for the catch up rate increase because Maryland is not approving the full amount requested on this block.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that? MS. SONG: Okay. First I want to make a correction on the 287 policyholders in Maryland. That would be 287 policies because our policies we have individual policies and joint policies. And one joint	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future? MS. SONG: Yes. These are for the catch up rate increase because Maryland is not approving the full amount requested on this block. MR. JI: Okay. After that, what are the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that? MS. SONG: Okay. First I want to make a correction on the 287 policyholders in Maryland. That would be 287 policies because our policies we have individual policies and joint policies. And one joint policy covers two insured. So, 287 policies may have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future? MS. SONG: Yes. These are for the catch up rate increase because Maryland is not approving the full amount requested on this block. MR. JI: Okay. After that, what are the target lifetime loss ratio looks like after two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that? MS. SONG: Okay. First I want to make a correction on the 287 policyholders in Maryland. That would be 287 policies because our policies we have individual policies and joint policies. And one joint policy covers two insured. So, 287 policies may have more than 287 policyholders. I looked at the number.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future? MS. SONG: Yes. These are for the catch up rate increase because Maryland is not approving the full amount requested on this block. MR. JI: Okay. After that, what are the target lifetime loss ratio looks like after two additional 15% rate increases?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that? MS. SONG: Okay. First I want to make a correction on the 287 policyholders in Maryland. That would be 287 policies because our policies we have individual policies and joint policies. And one joint policy covers two insured. So, 287 policies may have more than 287 policyholders. I looked at the number. It's 409 policyholders in Maryland. And this block is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future? MS. SONG: Yes. These are for the catch up rate increase because Maryland is not approving the full amount requested on this block. MR. JI: Okay. After that, what are the target lifetime loss ratio looks like after two additional 15% rate increases? MS. SONG: That is over 100%. We will need
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that? MS. SONG: Okay. First I want to make a correction on the 287 policyholders in Maryland. That would be 287 policies because our policies we have individual policies and joint policies. And one joint policy covers two insured. So, 287 policies may have more than 287 policyholders. I looked at the number. It's 409 policyholders in Maryland. And this block is 100% able to reinsure. So, any future climb for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future? MS. SONG: Yes. These are for the catch up rate increase because Maryland is not approving the full amount requested on this block. MR. JI: Okay. After that, what are the target lifetime loss ratio looks like after two additional 15% rate increases? MS. SONG: That is over 100%. We will need additional two more rounds of 15% rate increase
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that? MS. SONG: Okay. First I want to make a correction on the 287 policyholders in Maryland. That would be 287 policies because our policies we have individual policies and joint policies. And one joint policy covers two insured. So, 287 policies may have more than 287 policyholders. I looked at the number. It's 409 policyholders in Maryland. And this block is 100% able to reinsure. So, any future climb for the new round of rate increase has to be initiated by this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future? MS. SONG: Yes. These are for the catch up rate increase because Maryland is not approving the full amount requested on this block. MR. JI: Okay. After that, what are the target lifetime loss ratio looks like after two additional 15% rate increases? MS. SONG: That is over 100%. We will need additional two more rounds of 15% rate increase requests.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that? MS. SONG: Okay. First I want to make a correction on the 287 policyholders in Maryland. That would be 287 policies because our policies we have individual policies and joint policies. And one joint policy covers two insured. So, 287 policies may have more than 287 policyholders. I looked at the number. It's 409 policyholders in Maryland. And this block is 100% able to reinsure. So, any future climb for the new round of rate increase has to be initiated by this reinsured. Currently, I mean, we do not have any plan	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future? MS. SONG: Yes. These are for the catch up rate increase because Maryland is not approving the full amount requested on this block. MR. JI: Okay. After that, what are the target lifetime loss ratio looks like after two additional 15% rate increases? MS. SONG: That is over 100%. We will need additional two more rounds of 15% rate increase requests. MR. JI: Okay. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that? MS. SONG: Okay. First I want to make a correction on the 287 policyholders in Maryland. That would be 287 policies because our policies we have individual policies and joint policies. And one joint policy covers two insured. So, 287 policies may have more than 287 policyholders. I looked at the number. It's 409 policyholders in Maryland. And this block is 100% able to reinsure. So, any future climb for the new round of rate increase has to be initiated by this reinsured. Currently, I mean, we do not have any plan for the new population increase nationwide. But, not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future? MS. SONG: Yes. These are for the catch up rate increase because Maryland is not approving the full amount requested on this block. MR. JI: Okay. After that, what are the target lifetime loss ratio looks like after two additional 15% rate increases? MS. SONG: That is over 100%. We will need additional two more rounds of 15% rate increase requests. MR. JI: Okay. Thank you. MR. SWITZER: Last chance for anybody?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that? MS. SONG: Okay. First I want to make a correction on the 287 policyholders in Maryland. That would be 287 policies because our policies we have individual policies and joint policies. And one joint policy covers two insured. So, 287 policies may have more than 287 policyholders. I looked at the number. It's 409 policyholders in Maryland. And this block is 100% able to reinsure. So, any future climb for the new round of rate increase has to be initiated by this reinsured. Currently, I mean, we do not have any plan for the new population increase nationwide. But, not enough approval, what we have requested historically	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future? MS. SONG: Yes. These are for the catch up rate increase because Maryland is not approving the full amount requested on this block. MR. JI: Okay. After that, what are the target lifetime loss ratio looks like after two additional 15% rate increases? MS. SONG: That is over 100%. We will need additional two more rounds of 15% rate increase requests. MR. JI: Okay. Thank you. MR. SWITZER: Last chance for anybody? Thanks again, Ms. Song. Thanks for starting your day
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that? MS. SONG: Okay. First I want to make a correction on the 287 policyholders in Maryland. That would be 287 policies because our policies we have individual policies and joint policies. And one joint policy covers two insured. So, 287 policies may have more than 287 policyholders. I looked at the number. It's 409 policyholders in Maryland. And this block is 100% able to reinsure. So, any future climb for the new round of rate increase has to be initiated by this reinsured. Currently, I mean, we do not have any plan for the new population increase nationwide. But, not enough approval, what we have requested historically between 155 and a cap. So, while we anticipate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future? MS. SONG: Yes. These are for the catch up rate increase because Maryland is not approving the full amount requested on this block. MR. JI: Okay. After that, what are the target lifetime loss ratio looks like after two additional 15% rate increases? MS. SONG: That is over 100%. We will need additional two more rounds of 15% rate increase requests. MR. JI: Okay. Thank you. MR. SWITZER: Last chance for anybody? Thanks again, Ms. Song. Thanks for starting your day early for us too. MetLife. Mr. Trend? You're up.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that? MS. SONG: Okay. First I want to make a correction on the 287 policyholders in Maryland. That would be 287 policies because our policies we have individual policies and joint policies. And one joint policy covers two insured. So, 287 policies may have more than 287 policyholders. I looked at the number. It's 409 policyholders in Maryland. And this block is 100% able to reinsure. So, any future climb for the new round of rate increase has to be initiated by this reinsured. Currently, I mean, we do not have any plan for the new population increase nationwide. But, not enough approval, what we have requested historically between 155 and a cap. So, while we anticipate requesting two more rounds of 15% catch up rate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future? MS. SONG: Yes. These are for the catch up rate increase because Maryland is not approving the full amount requested on this block. MR. JI: Okay. After that, what are the target lifetime loss ratio looks like after two additional 15% rate increases? MS. SONG: That is over 100%. We will need additional two more rounds of 15% rate increase requests. MR. JI: Okay. Thank you. MR. SWITZER: Last chance for anybody? Thanks again, Ms. Song. Thanks for starting your day early for us too. MetLife. Mr. Trend? You're up. MR. TREND: Good morning to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	any kind of hiatus for these 287 members? Maybe a five year break or any would you be open to discussing something like that? MS. SONG: Okay. First I want to make a correction on the 287 policyholders in Maryland. That would be 287 policies because our policies we have individual policies and joint policies. And one joint policy covers two insured. So, 287 policies may have more than 287 policyholders. I looked at the number. It's 409 policyholders in Maryland. And this block is 100% able to reinsure. So, any future climb for the new round of rate increase has to be initiated by this reinsured. Currently, I mean, we do not have any plan for the new population increase nationwide. But, not enough approval, what we have requested historically between 155 and a cap. So, while we anticipate requesting two more rounds of 15% catch up rate increase to reach the level compatible to the state	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. JI: This is Jeff. I would like to know, so you mentioned you may not seek additional two 15% rate increase in the future? MS. SONG: Yes. These are for the catch up rate increase because Maryland is not approving the full amount requested on this block. MR. JI: Okay. After that, what are the target lifetime loss ratio looks like after two additional 15% rate increases? MS. SONG: That is over 100%. We will need additional two more rounds of 15% rate increase requests. MR. JI: Okay. Thank you. MR. SWITZER: Last chance for anybody? Thanks again, Ms. Song. Thanks for starting your day early for us too. MetLife. Mr. Trend? You're up. MR. TREND: Good morning to the representatives of the MIA, MetLife long-term care

			Ç , ,
	Page 30		Page 32
1	actuary at Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. I have	1	expected to remain materially worse than initially
2	oversight responsibility for the actuarial memoranda	2	anticipated. This is also my professional opinion.
3	and accompanying documents that support the	3	I believe that the proposed premium
4	applications. I am a fellow of the Society of	4	schedules are not excessive, nor unfairly
5	Actuaries, a member of the American Academy of	5	discriminatory and the benefits provided are
6	Actuaries and have over 20 years of experience with	6	reasonable in relation to the proposed premiums
7	long-term care insurance and the risks, assumptions and	7	based on the lifetime loss ratio being in excess of
8	benefits that are characteristic of the coverage.	8	the minimum requirement set by Maryland insurance
9	I welcome the opportunity to present	9	law.
10	my views on MetLife's long-term insurance rate	10	Background: As background to the filing, I
11	filing currently before the Maryland Insurance	11	think it will be helpful to briefly explain the scope
12	Administration and to answer your questions. Thank	12	of the application that is the subject of today's
13	you also for providing this forum for Maryland	13	hearing. MetLife is seeking approval of 7.06% on a
14	citizens including our valued customers to express	14	single group policy form issued to members of AARP.
15	their views and comments on the filing. My brief	15	Approximately 55 insureds from this business may be
16	presentation will include a description of the steps	16	impacted by this rate increase.
17	we have taken to mitigate the impact of the proposed	17	Review of application: As previously
18	increases. I also hope to provide a greater	18	mentioned, MetLife believes that the application
19	understanding of why the increase is necessary and	19	demonstrates that the requested increase is justified
20	the process MetLife uses to evaluate the underlying	20	and meets all Maryland requirements for approval. To
21	assumptions and risks that we are required to assess	21	assist you with your review, I will briefly speak to
	Page 31		Page 33
1	before filing for an increase with the	1	the application and why we believe the requested
2	Administration.	2	increase is reasonable. I will start by referring you
3	Please keep in mind that this	3	to specific portions of the filing that demonstrates
4	presentation will highlight and expound upon certain	4	that the loss ratio on the Maryland policies after
5	areas relating to MetLife's filing made with the	5	application of the requested increase will remain far
6	Administration on October 1st, 2019. The filing	6	in excess of the minimum loss ratio required for rate
7	presents the full and complete actuarial basis for	7	revisions under Maryland insurance law.
8	the requested rate increase and constitute MetLife's	8	Loss ratios: The term loss ratio used
9		9	throughout our testimony is here defined as the ratio
10	MetLife's decision to file for a rate	10	of incurred claims, the monies paid to claimants, to
11	increase was made only after careful and in-depth		earned premium, the monies we collect from
	analysis of the experience relating to the policies		policyholders. References to past, future and lifetime
	that are the subject of these filings. We are		loss ratio or similar qualifiers indicate the inclusion
	proposing this increase in light of the information		of interest, time value of money, in the calculations
	that has emerged over the years the policy has been		which is a required and accepted actuarial practice.
	in force, including claim experience and persistency	16	As part of the in force management of the
17			business, MetLife monitors the performance of the
	since it was first issued. MetLife believes that		business by completing periodic analyses of persistency
1			
19	the rate filing made with the Administration clearly	19	rates, how many policyholders keep their policies.
19 20	e ,		rates, how many policyholders keep their policies, mortality rates, how long policyholders live, and
20		20	rates, how many policyholders keep their policies, mortality rates, how long policyholders live, and morbidity rates, the frequency and severity of claims.

Page 34	Page 36
1 The findings from these analyses were used in	1 response to a rate increase can still maintain some
2 projecting the future performance of in force business	2 paid-up coverage. This means that for those policies,
3 to determine the effect of experience on the projected	3 every premium dollar previously paid, minus any
4 lifetime loss ratio. The reason we study these	4 benefits already received, will be available as a
5 parameters is because they bear directly on projected	5 benefit if the insured goes into claim.
6 levels of claims and premiums over the lifetime of the	6 In closing, I feel the value provided
7 policies.	7 by this coverage is significant and we are proud of
8 As explained in the memorandum, overall	8 the service we have provided to MetLife
9 actual persistency rates have been higher than that	9 policyholders, especially at the time of claim.
10 assumed when the policies were priced. Mortality rates	10 Since entering the long-term care insurance market,
11 have been lower than that assumed in pricing and	11 MetLife has paid out approximately \$5 billion in
12 morbidity levels have been generally higher than that	12 claims.
13 assumed in pricing.	13 Thank you for the opportunity to testify in
14 The combined result of past experience and	14 support of MetLife's application. We respectfully
15 future projections based on current assumptions,	15 request that the administration approve the filing as
16 without a rate increase, is a loss ratio that far	16 submitted. This concludes my prepared remarks.
17 exceeds the minimum requirements. In fact, the current	17 MR. SWITZER: Thank you. Thank you for
18 projected lifetime loss ratios in Maryland is 103%.	18 your reply in Surf. We have had some discussions, as
19 This means that our current rate basis has us paying	19 you know, about the certain number of years after where
20 out \$103 in benefits for every \$100 we collect in	20 once we reach agreement on this filing that there be no
21 premium. Even after rate increases at the level	21 more increases and you mentioned a uniformity with the
Page 35	Page 37
Page 35 1 requested in our application, the loss ratio for the	Page 37 1 other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I
1 requested in our application, the loss ratio for the	1 other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> <li>Closing: Please be assured that while</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> <li>MR. TREND: Many. I don't have a number</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> <li>Closing: Please be assured that while</li> <li>MetLife believes the requested increase is necessary,</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> <li>MR. TREND: Many. I don't have a number</li> <li>before me, but significant. This particular filing is</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> <li>Closing: Please be assured that while</li> <li>MetLife believes the requested increase is necessary,</li> <li>justified and permitted under Maryland's insurance laws</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> <li>MR. TREND: Many. I don't have a number</li> <li>before me, but significant. This particular filing is</li> <li>one of our smaller policy forms from the bulk of the</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> <li>Closing: Please be assured that while</li> <li>MetLife believes the requested increase is necessary,</li> <li>justified and permitted under Maryland's insurance laws</li> <li>and regulations, we also understand that any approved</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> <li>MR. TREND: Many. I don't have a number</li> <li>before me, but significant. This particular filing is</li> <li>one of our smaller policy forms from the bulk of the</li> <li>Maryland policies remain under what we call our</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> <li>Closing: Please be assured that while</li> <li>MetLife believes the requested increase is necessary,</li> <li>justified and permitted under Maryland's insurance laws</li> <li>and regulations, we also understand that any approved</li> <li>increase may cause some policyholders to consider</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> <li>MR. TREND: Many. I don't have a number</li> <li>before me, but significant. This particular filing is</li> <li>one of our smaller policy forms from the bulk of the</li> <li>Maryland policies remain under what we call our</li> <li>originally IP group policy that we issued in about</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> <li>Closing: Please be assured that while</li> <li>MetLife believes the requested increase is necessary,</li> <li>justified and permitted under Maryland's insurance laws</li> <li>and regulations, we also understand that any approved</li> <li>increase may cause some policyholders to consider</li> <li>canceling their coverage. MetLife's experience shows</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> <li>MR. TREND: Many. I don't have a number</li> <li>before me, but significant. This particular filing is</li> <li>one of our smaller policy forms from the bulk of the</li> <li>Maryland policies remain under what we call our</li> <li>originally IP group policy that we issued in about</li> <li>1998. The vast majority.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> <li>Closing: Please be assured that while</li> <li>MetLife believes the requested increase is necessary,</li> <li>justified and permitted under Maryland's insurance laws</li> <li>and regulations, we also understand that any approved</li> <li>increase may cause some policyholders to consider</li> <li>canceling their coverage. MetLife's experience shows</li> <li>that the vast majority of policyholders choose to</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> <li>MR. TREND: Many. I don't have a number</li> <li>before me, but significant. This particular filing is</li> <li>one of our smaller policy forms from the bulk of the</li> <li>Maryland policies remain under what we call our</li> <li>originally IP group policy that we issued in about</li> <li>1998. The vast majority.</li> <li>MR. SWITZER: I think I understood from</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> <li>Closing: Please be assured that while</li> <li>MetLife believes the requested increase is necessary,</li> <li>justified and permitted under Maryland's insurance laws</li> <li>and regulations, we also understand that any approved</li> <li>increase may cause some policyholders to consider</li> <li>canceling their coverage. MetLife's experience shows</li> <li>that the vast majority of policyholders choose to</li> <li>maintain their coverage even in the face of rate</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> <li>MR. TREND: Many. I don't have a number</li> <li>before me, but significant. This particular filing is</li> <li>one of our smaller policy forms from the bulk of the</li> <li>Maryland policies remain under what we call our</li> <li>originally IP group policy that we issued in about</li> <li>1998. The vast majority.</li> <li>MR. SWITZER: I think I understood from</li> <li>Surf that if there were to be any openness to any kind</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> <li>Closing: Please be assured that while</li> <li>MetLife believes the requested increase is necessary,</li> <li>justified and permitted under Maryland's insurance laws</li> <li>and regulations, we also understand that any approved</li> <li>increase may cause some policyholders to consider</li> <li>canceling their coverage. MetLife's experience shows</li> <li>that the vast majority of policyholders choose to</li> <li>maintain their coverage even in the face of rate</li> <li>increases. For all policyholders, including those who</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> <li>MR. TREND: Many. I don't have a number</li> <li>before me, but significant. This particular filing is</li> <li>one of our smaller policy forms from the bulk of the</li> <li>Maryland policies remain under what we call our</li> <li>originally IP group policy that we issued in about</li> <li>1998. The vast majority.</li> <li>MR. SWITZER: I think I understood from</li> <li>Surf that if there were to be any openness to any kind</li> <li>of guarantee for no more increases, it would be</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> <li>Closing: Please be assured that while</li> <li>MetLife believes the requested increase is necessary,</li> <li>justified and permitted under Maryland's insurance laws</li> <li>and regulations, we also understand that any approved</li> <li>increase may cause some policyholders to consider</li> <li>canceling their coverage. MetLife's experience shows</li> <li>that the vast majority of policyholders choose to</li> <li>maintain their coverage even in the face of rate</li> <li>increases. For all policyholders, including those who</li> <li>may consider ending their coverage because of any</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> <li>MR. TREND: Many. I don't have a number</li> <li>before me, but significant. This particular filing is</li> <li>one of our smaller policy forms from the bulk of the</li> <li>Maryland policies remain under what we call our</li> <li>originally IP group policy that we issued in about</li> <li>1998. The vast majority.</li> <li>MR. SWITZER: I think I understood from</li> <li>Surf that if there were to be any openness to any kind</li> <li>of guarantee for no more increases, it would be</li> <li>something that AARP would have to be engaged or you</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> <li>Closing: Please be assured that while</li> <li>MetLife believes the requested increase is necessary,</li> <li>justified and permitted under Maryland's insurance laws</li> <li>and regulations, we also understand that any approved</li> <li>increase may cause some policyholders to consider</li> <li>canceling their coverage. MetLife's experience shows</li> <li>that the vast majority of policyholders choose to</li> <li>maintain their coverage even in the face of rate</li> <li>increases. For all policyholders, including those who</li> <li>may consider ending their coverage because of any</li> <li>approved rate increase, we will offer them multiple</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> <li>MR. TREND: Many. I don't have a number</li> <li>before me, but significant. This particular filing is</li> <li>one of our smaller policy forms from the bulk of the</li> <li>Maryland policies remain under what we call our</li> <li>originally IP group policy that we issued in about</li> <li>1998. The vast majority.</li> <li>MR. SWITZER: I think I understood from</li> <li>Surf that if there were to be any openness to any kind</li> <li>of guarantee for no more increases, it would be</li> <li>something that AARP would have to be engaged or you</li> <li>would engage AARP? They would have to be involved in</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> <li>Closing: Please be assured that while</li> <li>MetLife believes the requested increase is necessary,</li> <li>justified and permitted under Maryland's insurance laws</li> <li>and regulations, we also understand that any approved</li> <li>increase may cause some policyholders to consider</li> <li>canceling their coverage. MetLife's experience shows</li> <li>that the vast majority of policyholders choose to</li> <li>maintain their coverage even in the face of rate</li> <li>increases. For all policyholders, including those who</li> <li>may consider ending their coverage because of any</li> <li>approved rate increase, we will offer them multiple</li> <li>options where available to modify their coverage to</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>2 understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>3 there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> <li>4 MR. TREND: Many. I don't have a number</li> <li>5 before me, but significant. This particular filing is</li> <li>6 one of our smaller policy forms from the bulk of the</li> <li>7 Maryland policies remain under what we call our</li> <li>8 originally IP group policy that we issued in about</li> <li>9 1998. The vast majority.</li> <li>10 MR. SWITZER: I think I understood from</li> <li>11 Surf that if there were to be any openness to any kind</li> <li>12 of guarantee for no more increases, it would be</li> <li>13 something that AARP would have to be engaged or you</li> <li>14 would engage AARP? They would have to be involved in</li> <li>15 that type of decision? Do I have that right or no?</li> <li>16 MR. TREND: We would certainly discuss any</li> <li>17 proposal with them. In terms of authority, it's our</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> <li>Closing: Please be assured that while</li> <li>MetLife believes the requested increase is necessary,</li> <li>justified and permitted under Maryland's insurance laws</li> <li>and regulations, we also understand that any approved</li> <li>increase may cause some policyholders to consider</li> <li>canceling their coverage. MetLife's experience shows</li> <li>that the vast majority of policyholders choose to</li> <li>maintain their coverage even in the face of rate</li> <li>increases. For all policyholders, including those who</li> <li>may consider ending their coverage because of any</li> <li>approved rate increase, we will offer them multiple</li> <li>options where available to modify their coverage to</li> <li>keep their premiums at a level similar to their current</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> <li>MR. TREND: Many. I don't have a number</li> <li>before me, but significant. This particular filing is</li> <li>one of our smaller policy forms from the bulk of the</li> <li>Maryland policies remain under what we call our</li> <li>originally IP group policy that we issued in about</li> <li>1998. The vast majority.</li> <li>MR. SWITZER: I think I understood from</li> <li>Surf that if there were to be any openness to any kind</li> <li>of guarantee for no more increases, it would be</li> <li>something that AARP would have to be engaged or you</li> <li>would engage AARP? They would have to be involved in</li> <li>that type of decision? Do I have that right or no?</li> <li>MR. TREND: We would certainly discuss any</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> <li>Closing: Please be assured that while</li> <li>MetLife believes the requested increase is necessary,</li> <li>justified and permitted under Maryland's insurance laws</li> <li>and regulations, we also understand that any approved</li> <li>increase may cause some policyholders to consider</li> <li>canceling their coverage. MetLife's experience shows</li> <li>that the vast majority of policyholders choose to</li> <li>maintain their coverage even in the face of rate</li> <li>increases. For all policyholders, including those who</li> <li>may consider ending their coverage because of any</li> <li>approved rate increase, we will offer them multiple</li> <li>options where available to modify their coverage to</li> <li>keep their premiums at a level similar to their current</li> <li>premiums. In addition, we are extending the use of the</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>2 understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>3 there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> <li>4 MR. TREND: Many. I don't have a number</li> <li>5 before me, but significant. This particular filing is</li> <li>6 one of our smaller policy forms from the bulk of the</li> <li>7 Maryland policies remain under what we call our</li> <li>8 originally IP group policy that we issued in about</li> <li>9 1998. The vast majority.</li> <li>10 MR. SWITZER: I think I understood from</li> <li>11 Surf that if there were to be any openness to any kind</li> <li>12 of guarantee for no more increases, it would be</li> <li>13 something that AARP would have to be engaged or you</li> <li>14 would engage AARP? They would have to be involved in</li> <li>15 that type of decision? Do I have that right or no?</li> <li>16 MR. TREND: We would certainly discuss any</li> <li>17 proposal with them. In terms of authority, it's our</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>requested in our application, the loss ratio for the</li> <li>Maryland policies will be 100%. Again, well in excess</li> <li>of the minimum requirement.</li> <li>Closing: Please be assured that while</li> <li>MetLife believes the requested increase is necessary,</li> <li>justified and permitted under Maryland's insurance laws</li> <li>and regulations, we also understand that any approved</li> <li>increase may cause some policyholders to consider</li> <li>canceling their coverage. MetLife's experience shows</li> <li>that the vast majority of policyholders choose to</li> <li>maintain their coverage even in the face of rate</li> <li>increases. For all policyholders, including those who</li> <li>may consider ending their coverage because of any</li> <li>approved rate increase, we will offer them multiple</li> <li>options where available to modify their coverage to</li> <li>keep their premiums at a level similar to their current</li> <li>premiums. In addition, we are extending the use of the</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 other AARP policies. So, do you have a rough idea, I</li> <li>2 understand if you don't, how many other AARP policies</li> <li>3 there are in Maryland besides this 55 in this filing?</li> <li>4 MR. TREND: Many. I don't have a number</li> <li>5 before me, but significant. This particular filing is</li> <li>6 one of our smaller policy forms from the bulk of the</li> <li>7 Maryland policies remain under what we call our</li> <li>8 originally IP group policy that we issued in about</li> <li>9 1998. The vast majority.</li> <li>10 MR. SWITZER: I think I understood from</li> <li>11 Surf that if there were to be any openness to any kind</li> <li>12 of guarantee for no more increases, it would be</li> <li>13 something that AARP would have to be engaged or you</li> <li>14 would engage AARP? They would have to be involved in</li> <li>15 that type of decision? Do I have that right or no?</li> <li>16 MR. TREND: We would certainly discuss any</li> <li>17 proposal with them. In terms of authority, it's our</li> </ul>

Page 38	Page 40
1 In my testimony when I spoke to policyholders, I was	1 on a projection basis we do expect needing more. And,
2 being a bit colloquial or technical certificate holders	2 in fact, just full disclosure, we have filed in other
3 for this group policy for this morning. But, to answer	3 jurisdictions on that basis including the jurisdiction
4 your question, we would discuss that with them. But,	4 in Washington, D.C.
5 it would ultimately be our decision.	5 MR. ZIMMERMAN: I have just one question.
6 MR. SWITZER: Thank you. So, your	6 Are the 55 certificate holders in Maryland, do you know
7 expectation is that after this 7.1, no more may be	7 how many of them are in claim currently?
8 needed, but you still want to have the openness to	8 MR. TREND: I do not.
9 examine experience?	9 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Okay.
10 MR. TREND: Yes. However, we, as you know,	10 MR. TREND: I could guess like zero or one.
11 annually revisit our we do an experience study every	11 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Okay. Thank you.
12 year, reset all our assumptions and recalculate our	12 MR. SWITZER: Anything else? One more
13 justifiable actuarially justifiable rate increase	13 time. Thanks again. Next we have Mr. Ball, senior VP
14 and that process typically concludes around October.	14 and Mr. Beligotti, VP and actuary from New York Life.
15 And for this policy form, and actually other AARP	15 MR. BALL: Good morning. On behalf of New
16 policy forms, we have concluded we do need further rate	16 York Life, I would like to thank the Maryland Insurance
17 increases and do expect to file those shortly.	17 Administration for the opportunity to participate in
18 MR. SWITZER: Based on your October 2019	18 this hearing on long-term care insurance premium
19 study, you determined that more will be needed after	19 increases. In addition, we appreciate the opportunity
20 the 7.1?	20 to address attendees on this important topic.
21 MR. TREND: Yes and on the other AARP	21 My name is Aaron Ball and I am a senior
Page 39	Page 41
1 policy forms as well.	1 vice president and CEO of New York Life's long-term
2 MR. SWITZER: Thanks. Anything else at the	2 care insurance business. I'd like to start by
3 table?	3 providing a brief overview on New York Life. As the
4 MR. JI: I just want to catch up with	4 nation's third largest life insurance company and the
5 this	5 largest mutual life insurance company, New York Life
6 MR. SWITZER: Go ahead, Jeff.	6 has been in the life insurance business for 175 years.
7 MR. JI: You are anticipating another round	7 Today, no U.S. life insurer has a higher financial
8 of rate increase?	8 strength rating than New York Life. We have been in
9 MR. TREND: I'm sorry. What	9 the long-term care insurance business for more than 30
10 MR. JI: What condition you were	10 years. Today, we are the third largest writer of
11 anticipating another round of rate increase? So, like	11 standalone long-term care insurance and remain
12 the loss ratio? How much worse	12 committed to helping to protect our policyowners and
13 MR. TREND: Yes. So, the evolving	13 their families by offering the most comprehensive suite
14 assumptions, when we made this application for this	14 of long-term care solutions available in the market.
15 current filing, was based on information from about	15 The decision to request a premium increase
16 three years ago. As you'll recall, we applied for	16 on certain older blocks of long-term care insurance was
17 about a 23% rate increase. You granted us 15%	17 a difficult decision. As a mutual insurance company,
18 approximately two years ago. This is the remainder of	18 New York Life is accountable to our policyowners rather
19 that original application, is the 7.1%. So, in the	19 than outside investors and we understand the impact
	L
20 three years of experience that has emerged since that	20 that a premium increase will have on our policyowners.
<ul><li>20 three years of experience that has emerged since that</li><li>21 original application, combined with our current views</li></ul>	<ul><li>20 that a premium increase will have on our policyowners.</li><li>21 That is why we have given this special consideration</li></ul>

	U		
	Page 42		Page 44
1	and developed a proposal that we believe is unique and	1	increases can materially affect the decision making of
2	we believe limits the impact of the increase on our	2	a policyowner. For example, policyowners faced with a
3	policyowners. Before I discuss our proposal, however,	3	current premium increase, in addition to the potential
4	I thought it would be helpful to provide an overview of	4	for future premium increases, need to determine whether
5	our proposed premium increase.	5	they pay the increased premium, reduce their benefits
6	We determined that a premium increase was	6	or keep the policy altogether. Our goal was to
7	necessary on certain older blocks of long-term care	7	eliminate the concern about future premium increases
8	insurance as a result of both our prior and projected	8	for our policyowners that own policies under these
9	experience on these policies. As a result, we have	9	policies series.
10	requested a nationwide increase on two policy series,	10	As such, we have proposed a lifetime
11	LTC Select policy series 4.0 and LTC Select Premier	11	premium guarantee on these two blocks of business in
12	policy series 5.0. In Maryland, the LTC Select 4.0	12	the event that Maryland approves the premium increase
13	policy series was issued from 1997 to 2003 while the	13	we have requested. We believe that we are the first
14	LTC Select Premier 5.0 policy series was issued from	14	carrier to offer this type of lifetime guarantee. This
15	2002 to 2012. In 2013, we requested an average premium	15	means that any policyowner that owns these policy
16	increase in Maryland of 27.1% for the LTC Select 4.0	16	series would never have to worry about another premium
17	product and 23% for the LTC Select Premier 5.0 product.	17	increase again in the future on their New York Life
18	Premium increases of 15% for the LTC Select 4.0 product	18	policy. If experience on these policies continue to
19	and 13.4% for the LTC Select Premier 5.0 product were	19	deteriorate in the future, new York Life has made the
20	granted. These have been the only premium increases	20	decision to assume this risk on behalf of our
21	requested on these products. Despite using what we	21	policyowners.
	Page 43		Page 45
1	believed were reasonable assumptions at the time these	1	If the full increase is granted, we ill
2	products were originally priced, which was almost 20 to	2	provide all policyowners with a policy endorsement that
3	25 years ago, our experience on these blocks of	3	guarantees that their premium will not increase again
4		1	8
	business is materially worse than we expected. The		in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a
5	business is materially worse than we expected. The current lifetime loss ratio is much higher than our	4	
		4	in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a
6	current lifetime loss ratio is much higher than our	4 5 6	in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a change to their policy to add additional benefits.
6 7	current lifetime loss ratio is much higher than our original pricing loss ratio. Even after the requested	4 5 6 7	in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a change to their policy to add additional benefits. Again, we believe it is important to share
6 7 8	current lifetime loss ratio is much higher than our original pricing loss ratio. Even after the requested increase, the lifetime loss ratios will remain higher	4 5 6 7 8	in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a change to their policy to add additional benefits. Again, we believe it is important to share in adverse experience with our policyowners and give
6 7 8 9	current lifetime loss ratio is much higher than our original pricing loss ratio. Even after the requested increase, the lifetime loss ratios will remain higher than the initial pricing target, in some cases,	4 5 6 7 8 9	in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a change to their policy to add additional benefits. Again, we believe it is important to share in adverse experience with our policyowners and give them the certainty they need to make an informed
6 7 8 9 10	current lifetime loss ratio is much higher than our original pricing loss ratio. Even after the requested increase, the lifetime loss ratios will remain higher than the initial pricing target, in some cases, significantly higher. In fact, it is important to note	4 5 6 7 8 9	in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a change to their policy to add additional benefits. Again, we believe it is important to share in adverse experience with our policyowners and give them the certainty they need to make an informed decision with respect to our current premium increase
6 7 8 9 10 11	current lifetime loss ratio is much higher than our original pricing loss ratio. Even after the requested increase, the lifetime loss ratios will remain higher than the initial pricing target, in some cases, significantly higher. In fact, it is important to note that the requested premium increase is not intended to	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a change to their policy to add additional benefits. Again, we believe it is important to share in adverse experience with our policyowners and give them the certainty they need to make an informed decision with respect to our current premium increase requests.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	current lifetime loss ratio is much higher than our original pricing loss ratio. Even after the requested increase, the lifetime loss ratios will remain higher than the initial pricing target, in some cases, significantly higher. In fact, it is important to note that the requested premium increase is not intended to recoup past losses. Rather, the increase will help	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a change to their policy to add additional benefits. Again, we believe it is important to share in adverse experience with our policyowners and give them the certainty they need to make an informed decision with respect to our current premium increase requests. Second, New York Life has proposed that all
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	current lifetime loss ratio is much higher than our original pricing loss ratio. Even after the requested increase, the lifetime loss ratios will remain higher than the initial pricing target, in some cases, significantly higher. In fact, it is important to note that the requested premium increase is not intended to recoup past losses. Rather, the increase will help mitigate a portion of the future losses we expect on	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a change to their policy to add additional benefits. Again, we believe it is important to share in adverse experience with our policyowners and give them the certainty they need to make an informed decision with respect to our current premium increase requests. Second, New York Life has proposed that all policyowners aged 74 or older as of January 1, 2020 be
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	current lifetime loss ratio is much higher than our original pricing loss ratio. Even after the requested increase, the lifetime loss ratios will remain higher than the initial pricing target, in some cases, significantly higher. In fact, it is important to note that the requested premium increase is not intended to recoup past losses. Rather, the increase will help mitigate a portion of the future losses we expect on these blocks of business.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a change to their policy to add additional benefits. Again, we believe it is important to share in adverse experience with our policyowners and give them the certainty they need to make an informed decision with respect to our current premium increase requests. Second, New York Life has proposed that all policyowners aged 74 or older as of January 1, 2020 be excluded from the premium increase. As policyowners
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	current lifetime loss ratio is much higher than our original pricing loss ratio. Even after the requested increase, the lifetime loss ratios will remain higher than the initial pricing target, in some cases, significantly higher. In fact, it is important to note that the requested premium increase is not intended to recoup past losses. Rather, the increase will help mitigate a portion of the future losses we expect on these blocks of business. As I mentioned previously, we believe that	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a change to their policy to add additional benefits. Again, we believe it is important to share in adverse experience with our policyowners and give them the certainty they need to make an informed decision with respect to our current premium increase requests. Second, New York Life has proposed that all policyowners aged 74 or older as of January 1, 2020 be excluded from the premium increase. As policyowners age, their ability to pay the increased premiums while
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	current lifetime loss ratio is much higher than our original pricing loss ratio. Even after the requested increase, the lifetime loss ratios will remain higher than the initial pricing target, in some cases, significantly higher. In fact, it is important to note that the requested premium increase is not intended to recoup past losses. Rather, the increase will help mitigate a portion of the future losses we expect on these blocks of business. As I mentioned previously, we believe that we submitted several proposals, both nationwide and to the Maryland Insurance Administration, that we believe	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a change to their policy to add additional benefits. Again, we believe it is important to share in adverse experience with our policyowners and give them the certainty they need to make an informed decision with respect to our current premium increase requests. Second, New York Life has proposed that all policyowners aged 74 or older as of January 1, 2020 be excluded from the premium increase. As policyowners age, their ability to pay the increased premiums while on a fixed income is increasingly difficult and we want
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	current lifetime loss ratio is much higher than our original pricing loss ratio. Even after the requested increase, the lifetime loss ratios will remain higher than the initial pricing target, in some cases, significantly higher. In fact, it is important to note that the requested premium increase is not intended to recoup past losses. Rather, the increase will help mitigate a portion of the future losses we expect on these blocks of business. As I mentioned previously, we believe that we submitted several proposals, both nationwide and to the Maryland Insurance Administration, that we believe	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a change to their policy to add additional benefits. Again, we believe it is important to share in adverse experience with our policyowners and give them the certainty they need to make an informed decision with respect to our current premium increase requests. Second, New York Life has proposed that all policyowners aged 74 or older as of January 1, 2020 be excluded from the premium increase. As policyowners age, their ability to pay the increased premiums while on a fixed income is increasingly difficult and we want to ensure that policyowners keep their policies in
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	current lifetime loss ratio is much higher than our original pricing loss ratio. Even after the requested increase, the lifetime loss ratios will remain higher than the initial pricing target, in some cases, significantly higher. In fact, it is important to note that the requested premium increase is not intended to recoup past losses. Rather, the increase will help mitigate a portion of the future losses we expect on these blocks of business. As I mentioned previously, we believe that we submitted several proposals, both nationwide and to the Maryland Insurance Administration, that we believe will help mitigate the impact of the premium increase	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a change to their policy to add additional benefits. Again, we believe it is important to share in adverse experience with our policyowners and give them the certainty they need to make an informed decision with respect to our current premium increase requests. Second, New York Life has proposed that all policyowners aged 74 or older as of January 1, 2020 be excluded from the premium increase. As policyowners age, their ability to pay the increased premiums while on a fixed income is increasingly difficult and we want to ensure that policyowners keep their policies in force, especially as they age and become closer to a
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	current lifetime loss ratio is much higher than our original pricing loss ratio. Even after the requested increase, the lifetime loss ratios will remain higher than the initial pricing target, in some cases, significantly higher. In fact, it is important to note that the requested premium increase is not intended to recoup past losses. Rather, the increase will help mitigate a portion of the future losses we expect on these blocks of business. As I mentioned previously, we believe that we submitted several proposals, both nationwide and to the Maryland Insurance Administration, that we believe will help mitigate the impact of the premium increase on our policyowners. First, we recognize the impact that a	4 5 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	in the future unless the policyowner elects to make a change to their policy to add additional benefits. Again, we believe it is important to share in adverse experience with our policyowners and give them the certainty they need to make an informed decision with respect to our current premium increase requests. Second, New York Life has proposed that all policyowners aged 74 or older as of January 1, 2020 be excluded from the premium increase. As policyowners age, their ability to pay the increased premiums while on a fixed income is increasingly difficult and we want to ensure that policyowners keep their policies in force, especially as they age and become closer to a potential claim for benefits. For that same reason,

Page 46	Page 48	
1 is absorbing past and future projected losses on those	1 well as the other proposals I've outlined to help	
2 policies excluded from our request or where we have	2 mitigate the impact of the premium increase, we will be	
3 requested a reduced premium. Our younger policyowners	3 providing policyowners with customized policy benefit	
4 are not subsidizing the losses we expect on behalf of	4 reduction options that are designed to keep premiums	
5 our policyowners aged 69 or older.	5 approximately the same as their current premiums. In	
6 Third, we have proposed a contingent	6 addition, with over 10,000 New York Life agents	
7 non-forfeiture benefit that will be available to all	7 available nationwide, our policyowners will have the	
8 policyowners regardless of age or the amount of the	8 option of either meeting with an agent directly to	
9 premium increase.	9 discuss options or contacting our dedicated call	
10 In terms of our requested premium increase,	10 center. All impacted policyowners will be given	
11 we are requesting an 80% increase on the LTC Select 4.0	11 written notice 90 days in advance of the premium	
12 policy series for insureds aged 68 and younger as of	12 increase and will have up to 60 days following the	
13 January 1, 2020. This is an estimated average of	13 effective date to either pay the new premium or elect a	
14 monthly increase of \$76 per policy.	14 benefit reduction option. And while we don't recommend	
15 For insureds aged 69 to 73 as of January 1,	15 that our policyowners lapse this important coverage,	
16 2020, we are requesting a 45% increase with an	16 any policyowner that does decide to terminate their	
17 estimated average monthly increase of \$66 per policy.	17 policy in response to the premium increase will receive	
18 As mentioned previously, we are requesting	18 a paid-up policy equal to the premiums they have paid	
19 a 0% increase on insureds aged 74 and older as of	19 into the policy through the termination date, less any	
20 January 1, 2020.	20 claims paid.	
21 On the LTC Select Premier 5.0 policy	21 Thank you again for the opportunity to be	
Page 47	Page 49	
1 series, the request is tiered by issue age and attained	1 here today and I'm happy to address any questions.	
2 age. For insureds with an issue age of 60 and younger,	2 MR. SWITZER: Thank you. These filings	
3 who are aged 68 or younger as of January 1, 2020, we	3 that we're discussing today affect about 80% of your	
4 are requesting a 80% increase which is estimated to be	4 members in Maryland. So, for the remaining 20% or	
5 a \$117 per month average increase. For insureds with	5 about 700 members, at this point in time, are you able	
6 an issue age of 60 and younger, who are aged 69 to 73	6 to relay your expectation of whether increases will be	
7 as of January 1, 2020, we are requesting a 45% increase	7 needed there?	
8 which is estimated to be an \$81 per month average	8 MR. BALL: We do not have any intent or	
9 increase.	9 plan to request any subsequent rate increases at this	
10 For insureds with an issue age of 61 and	10 time.	
11 older, who are aged 73 or younger as of January 1,	11 MR. SWITZER: I know we started in the	
12 2020, we are requesting a 45% increase which is	12 market in the late seventies or so with 38 stand alone	
13 estimated to be a \$109 per month average increase. And	13 companies and you're one of four still selling to do	
14 for any insured aged 74 and older as of January 1,	14 business. Curious, do you offer hybrid products?	
15 2020, we are not requesting an increase.	15 MR. BALL: We do. We offer stand alone	
16 Overall, the average increase that is being	16 products, hybrid products and then acceleration	
17 requested on LTC Select Premier 5.0 policy series is	17 products.	
18 54.5%.	18 MR. SWITZER: Are the hybrid products	
19 We appreciate that any increase in premium	19 available on a single premium basis?	
20 can be difficult for our policyowners. Therefore, in	20 MR. BALL: They're available in a single	
21 addition to the proposed lifetime premium guarantee, as	21 premium as well as recurring premium basis.	

	Page 50		Page 52
1	MR. SWITZER: Last one from me is, so as we	1	MR. BALL: We can follow-up. It's
2	have talked to our lawyers and assessed things, one we	2	approximately a dozen approved the rate increase thus
3	have asked, as you know, through Surf, talked about for	3 far.	
4	the 80% increase, just a scenario where it's graded in	4	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Okay, and then the second
5	over five years and for the 45% scenario graded in over	5	question I have relays off of what Todd asked earlier
6	three years, the yearly increases range from 14% to	6	about you had touched briefly on it in your
7	11.5, as we're evaluating this proposal you've put	7	testimony, but if we approve it and the rates become
8	forward and the modeling you've given us, appreciate	8	noncancelable, as know, you can't raise premium rates
9	your statement about not to recoup past losses, in	9	in the future, so has a sensitivity test been performed
10	assessing the kind of the financial impact and	10	for like worse case scenarios where experience like
11	implications and consequences of this proposal, like	11	lapses are zero and utilization is like every
12	you said, you're sharing in the adverse experience, can	12	policyholders utilizes benefits to see like how
13	you try to quantify that? It looks like over the life	13	would you feel comfortable, I guess, absorbing those
14	of these forms that the net income present value is	14	losses without putting the rest of the company in
15	less than 1% which we take as less than 1% all in,	15	financial jeopardy?
16	including investment income, which sounds to us like a	16	MR. BELIGOTTI: We did sense, not
17	break even. I'm not intending to put you on the spot,	17	specifically what you mentioned, 0 lapses and 100%
18	does that sound like in the vein of your thoughts	18	utilization, but we did do a couple of sensitivities
19	financially of what this implies?	19 where we assumed a morbidity gap significantly worse	
20	MR. BELIGOTTI: I don't have those numbers	20	over a period of time and the losses were large, but
21	exactly in front of me. On the 5.0 product, that	21	relative to the total size of New York Life's surplus,
	Page 51		Page 53
		1	Page 53 it was manageable especially considering that those
1	Page 51		
1 2	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that	2	it was manageable especially considering that those
1 2 3	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older	2	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades
1 2 3 4	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still	2 3	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately.
1 2 3 4 5	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still significant. When we kind of do our analysis of	2 3 4 5	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure.
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still significant. When we kind of do our analysis of combining the two of them together, it looks like New	2 3 4 5 6	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. MR. BELIGOTTI: During which New York
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still significant. When we kind of do our analysis of combining the two of them together, it looks like New York Life is absorbing a little bit more than 50% of	2 3 4 5 6	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. MR. BELIGOTTI: During which New York Life's surplus would potentially continue to grow as
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still significant. When we kind of do our analysis of combining the two of them together, it looks like New York Life is absorbing a little bit more than 50% of the lifetime losses. We're happy to share that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. MR. BELIGOTTI: During which New York Life's surplus would potentially continue to grow as well.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still significant. When we kind of do our analysis of combining the two of them together, it looks like New York Life is absorbing a little bit more than 50% of the lifetime losses. We're happy to share that analysis.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. MR. BELIGOTTI: During which New York Life's surplus would potentially continue to grow as well. MR. BALL: Just maybe to add to that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still significant. When we kind of do our analysis of combining the two of them together, it looks like New York Life is absorbing a little bit more than 50% of the lifetime losses. We're happy to share that analysis. MR. SWITZER: That helps. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. MR. BELIGOTTI: During which New York Life's surplus would potentially continue to grow as well. MR. BALL: Just maybe to add to that comment, the long-term care reserves represent only
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still significant. When we kind of do our analysis of combining the two of them together, it looks like New York Life is absorbing a little bit more than 50% of the lifetime losses. We're happy to share that analysis. MR. SWITZER: That helps. Thank you. Anything else up front?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. MR. BELIGOTTI: During which New York Life's surplus would potentially continue to grow as well. MR. BALL: Just maybe to add to that comment, the long-term care reserves represent only about 1% of total company reserves. So, we're
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still significant. When we kind of do our analysis of combining the two of them together, it looks like New York Life is absorbing a little bit more than 50% of the lifetime losses. We're happy to share that analysis. MR. SWITZER: That helps. Thank you. Anything else up front? MR. JI: This lifetime rate guarantee, is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. MR. BELIGOTTI: During which New York Life's surplus would potentially continue to grow as well. MR. BALL: Just maybe to add to that comment, the long-term care reserves represent only about 1% of total company reserves. So, we're extremely well capitalized.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still significant. When we kind of do our analysis of combining the two of them together, it looks like New York Life is absorbing a little bit more than 50% of the lifetime losses. We're happy to share that analysis. MR. SWITZER: That helps. Thank you. Anything else up front? MR. JI: This lifetime rate guarantee, is this nationwide approach or just for Maryland?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. MR. BELIGOTTI: During which New York Life's surplus would potentially continue to grow as well. MR. BALL: Just maybe to add to that comment, the long-term care reserves represent only about 1% of total company reserves. So, we're extremely well capitalized. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still significant. When we kind of do our analysis of combining the two of them together, it looks like New York Life is absorbing a little bit more than 50% of the lifetime losses. We're happy to share that analysis. MR. SWITZER: That helps. Thank you. Anything else up front? MR. JI: This lifetime rate guarantee, is this nationwide approach or just for Maryland? MR. BALL: We have proposed this nationwide	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. MR. BELIGOTTI: During which New York Life's surplus would potentially continue to grow as well. MR. BALL: Just maybe to add to that comment, the long-term care reserves represent only about 1% of total company reserves. So, we're extremely well capitalized. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you. MR. SWITZER: Anything else? Thanks again.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still significant. When we kind of do our analysis of combining the two of them together, it looks like New York Life is absorbing a little bit more than 50% of the lifetime losses. We're happy to share that analysis. MR. SWITZER: That helps. Thank you. Anything else up front? MR. JI: This lifetime rate guarantee, is this nationwide approach or just for Maryland? MR. BALL: We have proposed this nationwide in any state that approves the full amount of our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. MR. BELIGOTTI: During which New York Life's surplus would potentially continue to grow as well. MR. BALL: Just maybe to add to that comment, the long-term care reserves represent only about 1% of total company reserves. So, we're extremely well capitalized. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you. MR. SWITZER: Anything else? Thanks again. RiverSource? Speaking is Mr. Caswell, reinsurance
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still significant. When we kind of do our analysis of combining the two of them together, it looks like New York Life is absorbing a little bit more than 50% of the lifetime losses. We're happy to share that analysis. MR. SWITZER: That helps. Thank you. Anything else up front? MR. JI: This lifetime rate guarantee, is this nationwide approach or just for Maryland? MR. BALL: We have proposed this nationwide in any state that approves the full amount of our request.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. MR. BELIGOTTI: During which New York Life's surplus would potentially continue to grow as well. MR. BALL: Just maybe to add to that comment, the long-term care reserves represent only about 1% of total company reserves. So, we're extremely well capitalized. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you. MR. SWITZER: Anything else? Thanks again. RiverSource? Speaking is Mr. Caswell, reinsurance officer and VP actuary. Mr. Pietsch, I apologize.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still significant. When we kind of do our analysis of combining the two of them together, it looks like New York Life is absorbing a little bit more than 50% of the lifetime losses. We're happy to share that analysis. MR. SWITZER: That helps. Thank you. Anything else up front? MR. JI: This lifetime rate guarantee, is this nationwide approach or just for Maryland? MR. BALL: We have proposed this nationwide in any state that approves the full amount of our request. MR. JI: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. MR. BELIGOTTI: During which New York Life's surplus would potentially continue to grow as well. MR. BALL: Just maybe to add to that comment, the long-term care reserves represent only about 1% of total company reserves. So, we're extremely well capitalized. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you. MR. SWITZER: Anything else? Thanks again. RiverSource? Speaking is Mr. Caswell, reinsurance officer and VP actuary. Mr. Pietsch, I apologize. Senior vice president and VP of community relations.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still significant. When we kind of do our analysis of combining the two of them together, it looks like New York Life is absorbing a little bit more than 50% of the lifetime losses. We're happy to share that analysis. MR. SWITZER: That helps. Thank you. Anything else up front? MR. JI: This lifetime rate guarantee, is this nationwide approach or just for Maryland? MR. BALL: We have proposed this nationwide in any state that approves the full amount of our request. MR. JI: Thank you. MR. ZIMMERMAN: To follow-up on Jeff's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. MR. BELIGOTTI: During which New York Life's surplus would potentially continue to grow as well. MR. BALL: Just maybe to add to that comment, the long-term care reserves represent only about 1% of total company reserves. So, we're extremely well capitalized. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you. MR. SWITZER: Anything else? Thanks again. RiverSource? Speaking is Mr. Caswell, reinsurance officer and VP actuary. Mr. Pietsch, I apologize. Senior vice president and VP of community relations. MR. PIETSCH: Good morning everyone. My
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 51 sounds pretty close. After the rate increase, that would be very close to break even. On the older product, the 4.0, I think the losses are still significant. When we kind of do our analysis of combining the two of them together, it looks like New York Life is absorbing a little bit more than 50% of the lifetime losses. We're happy to share that analysis. MR. SWITZER: That helps. Thank you. Anything else up front? MR. JI: This lifetime rate guarantee, is this nationwide approach or just for Maryland? MR. BALL: We have proposed this nationwide in any state that approves the full amount of our request. MR. JI: Thank you. MR. ZIMMERMAN: To follow-up on Jeff's question, can you provide details as to how many	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	it was manageable especially considering that those losses would be incurred over a period of decades rather than immediately. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. MR. BELIGOTTI: During which New York Life's surplus would potentially continue to grow as well. MR. BALL: Just maybe to add to that comment, the long-term care reserves represent only about 1% of total company reserves. So, we're extremely well capitalized. MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you. MR. SWITZER: Anything else? Thanks again. RiverSource? Speaking is Mr. Caswell, reinsurance officer and VP actuary. Mr. Pietsch, I apologize. Senior vice president and VP of community relations. MR. PIETSCH: Good morning everyone. My name is Brian Pietsch, spelled P-I-E-T-S-C-H, and I'm

Page 54	Page 56	
1 First I want to take this opportunity to thank the	1 are living longer and holding onto their policies	
2 department and the commissioner specifically for making	2 longer than expected. Additionally, actual claim	
3 the time for this important opportunity to participate	3 experience is worse than expected especially for older	
4 in the hearing. Thank you also for providing a form	4 attained ages. Now, we'd like to point out that these	
5 for the Maryland citizens including our valued	5 policy forms, even with the requested rate increases,	
6 policyholders to express their views and comments on	6 provide better benefits with lower premiums than	
7 our filings.	7 products available in the current long-term marketplace	
8 First, all of RiverSource's long-term care	8 today.	
9 policies were distributed by its affiliated network of	9 The company has worked with the Maryland	
10 financial advisers. the goal of the company is that	10 Insurance Administration since 2005 to address the	
11 each of the policyholders has a life long comprehensive	11 losses on this business as implemented rate increases	
12 financial planning relationship with their financial	12 in the past. Cumulative increase amounts vary by	
13 advisor. I'm here today to address our five long-term	13 policy form and range from 15% to 136%. Typically at	
14 care premium rate increase filings currently pending	14 most, a 15% for any given rate increase. The average	
15 before the administration.	15 cumulative past increase for Maryland policyholders	
16 The company is currently requesting a 15%	16 weighted by original premium is 79.8%. At the most	
17 rate increase on each of its Maryland nursing home only	17 recent rate increase of 15% was implemented on these	
18 and comprehensive long-term care policies. Except for	18 policy forms in February of 2016. In the filings for	
19 the policies with nonlifetime benefits on one form,	19 the rate increases that the time, the company stated	
20 we're requesting a 12.7% increase. The filings were	20 unless emerging experiences improve, we believe it is	
21 submitted on October of 2019. The request would impact	21 likely that additional rate increases will be requested	
Page 55	Page 57	
Page 55 1 the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of	Page 57 1 in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences	
1 the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of	1 in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> <li>1989 and 2002. The same time frame, the company</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> <li>this time. Much larger rate increases are currently</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> <li>1989 and 2002. The same time frame, the company</li> <li>offered long-term care policies nationwide. These</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> <li>this time. Much larger rate increases are currently</li> <li>justified, but not only does the company respect the</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> <li>1989 and 2002. The same time frame, the company</li> <li>offered long-term care policies nationwide. These</li> <li>policies provide richer benefits than many policies</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> <li>this time. Much larger rate increases are currently</li> <li>justified, but not only does the company respect the</li> <li>Maryland statute limiting rate increases to 15% a year,</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> <li>1989 and 2002. The same time frame, the company</li> <li>offered long-term care policies nationwide. These</li> <li>policies provide richer benefits than many policies</li> <li>sold today. About 58% of the policies have life time</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> <li>this time. Much larger rate increases are currently</li> <li>justified, but not only does the company respect the</li> <li>Maryland statute limiting rate increases to 15% a year,</li> <li>the company also historically typically pursues smaller</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> <li>1989 and 2002. The same time frame, the company</li> <li>offered long-term care policies nationwide. These</li> <li>policies provide richer benefits than many policies</li> <li>sold today. About 58% of the policies have life time</li> <li>benefits and about 95% of the policies offer 5%</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> <li>this time. Much larger rate increases are currently</li> <li>justified, but not only does the company respect the</li> <li>Maryland statute limiting rate increases to 15% a year,</li> <li>the company also historically typically pursues smaller</li> <li>more frequent rate increases around 15% rather than</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> <li>1989 and 2002. The same time frame, the company</li> <li>offered long-term care policies nationwide. These</li> <li>policies provide richer benefits than many policies</li> <li>sold today. About 58% of the policies have life time</li> <li>benefits and about 95% of the policies offer 5%</li> <li>inflation benefits.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> <li>this time. Much larger rate increases are currently</li> <li>justified, but not only does the company respect the</li> <li>Maryland statute limiting rate increases to 15% a year,</li> <li>the company also historically typically pursues smaller</li> <li>more frequent rate increases around 15% rather than</li> <li>substantial one time rate increases in an effort to</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> <li>1989 and 2002. The same time frame, the company</li> <li>offered long-term care policies nationwide. These</li> <li>policies provide richer benefits than many policies</li> <li>r sold today. About 58% of the policies have life time</li> <li>benefits and about 95% of the policies offer 5%</li> <li>inflation benefits.</li> <li>These policies were designed and filed</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> <li>this time. Much larger rate increases are currently</li> <li>justified, but not only does the company respect the</li> <li>Maryland statute limiting rate increases to 15% a year,</li> <li>the company also historically typically pursues smaller</li> <li>more frequent rate increases around 15% rather than</li> <li>substantial one time rate increases in an effort to</li> <li>help mitigate the impacts on the policyholders at least</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> <li>1989 and 2002. The same time frame, the company</li> <li>offered long-term care policies nationwide. These</li> <li>policies provide richer benefits than many policies</li> <li>sold today. About 58% of the policies have life time</li> <li>benefits and about 95% of the policies offer 5%</li> <li>inflation benefits.</li> <li>These policies were designed and filed</li> <li>prior to the October 1st, 2002 effective date of the</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> <li>this time. Much larger rate increases are currently</li> <li>justified, but not only does the company respect the</li> <li>Maryland statute limiting rate increases to 15% a year,</li> <li>the company also historically typically pursues smaller</li> <li>more frequent rate increases around 15% rather than</li> <li>substantial one time rate increases in an effort to</li> <li>help mitigate the impacts on the policyholders at least</li> <li>if we can.</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> <li>1989 and 2002. The same time frame, the company</li> <li>offered long-term care policies nationwide. These</li> <li>policies provide richer benefits than many policies</li> <li>sold today. About 58% of the policies have life time</li> <li>benefits and about 95% of the policies offer 5%</li> <li>inflation benefits.</li> <li>These policies were designed and filed</li> <li>prior to the October 1st, 2002 effective date of the</li> <li>rate stability requirements of Maryland. Meaning, they</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> <li>this time. Much larger rate increases are currently</li> <li>justified, but not only does the company respect the</li> <li>Maryland statute limiting rate increases to 15% a year,</li> <li>the company also historically typically pursues smaller</li> <li>more frequent rate increases around 15% rather than</li> <li>substantial one time rate increases in an effort to</li> <li>help mitigate the impacts on the policyholders at least</li> <li>if we can.</li> <li>Now, without the requested rate increase,</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> <li>1989 and 2002. The same time frame, the company</li> <li>offered long-term care policies nationwide. These</li> <li>policies provide richer benefits than many policies</li> <li>sold today. About 58% of the policies have life time</li> <li>benefits and about 95% of the policies offer 5%</li> <li>inflation benefits.</li> <li>These policies were designed and filed</li> <li>prior to the October 1st, 2002 effective date of the</li> <li>rate stability requirements of Maryland. Meaning, they</li> <li>were priced to satisfy the minimum loss ratio</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> <li>this time. Much larger rate increases are currently</li> <li>justified, but not only does the company respect the</li> <li>Maryland statute limiting rate increases to 15% a year,</li> <li>the company also historically typically pursues smaller</li> <li>more frequent rate increases around 15% rather than</li> <li>substantial one time rate increases in an effort to</li> <li>help mitigate the impacts on the policyholders at least</li> <li>if we can.</li> <li>Now, without the requested rate increase,</li> <li>the expected lifetime loss ratios with interest for</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> <li>1989 and 2002. The same time frame, the company</li> <li>offered long-term care policies nationwide. These</li> <li>policies provide richer benefits than many policies</li> <li>sold today. About 58% of the policies have life time</li> <li>benefits and about 95% of the policies offer 5%</li> <li>inflation benefits.</li> <li>These policies were designed and filed</li> <li>prior to the October 1st, 2002 effective date of the</li> <li>rate stability requirements of Maryland. Meaning, they</li> <li>were priced to satisfy the minimum loss ratio</li> <li>requirement of 60% in effect at that time. The</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> <li>this time. Much larger rate increases are currently</li> <li>justified, but not only does the company respect the</li> <li>Maryland statute limiting rate increases to 15% a year,</li> <li>the company also historically typically pursues smaller</li> <li>more frequent rate increases around 15% rather than</li> <li>substantial one time rate increases in an effort to</li> <li>help mitigate the impacts on the policyholders at least</li> <li>if we can.</li> <li>Now, without the requested rate increase,</li> <li>the expected lifetime loss ratios with interest for</li> <li>each of these policy forms for Maryland policyholders</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> <li>1989 and 2002. The same time frame, the company</li> <li>offered long-term care policies nationwide. These</li> <li>policies provide richer benefits than many policies</li> <li>sold today. About 58% of the policies have life time</li> <li>benefits and about 95% of the policies offer 5%</li> <li>inflation benefits.</li> <li>These policies were designed and filed</li> <li>prior to the October 1st, 2002 effective date of the</li> <li>rate stability requirements of Maryland. Meaning, they</li> <li>were priced to satisfy the minimum loss ratio</li> <li>requirement of 60% in effect at that time. The</li> <li>originally priced anticipated loss ratios were</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> <li>this time. Much larger rate increases are currently</li> <li>justified, but not only does the company respect the</li> <li>Maryland statute limiting rate increases to 15% a year,</li> <li>the company also historically typically pursues smaller</li> <li>more frequent rate increases around 15% rather than</li> <li>substantial one time rate increases in an effort to</li> <li>help mitigate the impacts on the policyholders at least</li> <li>if we can.</li> <li>Now, without the requested rate increase,</li> <li>the expected lifetime loss ratios with interest for</li> <li>each of these policy forms for Maryland policyholders</li> <li>is over 100%. The overall lifetime loss ratio with</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> <li>1989 and 2002. The same time frame, the company</li> <li>offered long-term care policies nationwide. These</li> <li>policies provide richer benefits than many policies</li> <li>sold today. About 58% of the policies have life time</li> <li>benefits and about 95% of the policies offer 5%</li> <li>inflation benefits.</li> <li>These policies were designed and filed</li> <li>prior to the October 1st, 2002 effective date of the</li> <li>rate stability requirements of Maryland. Meaning, they</li> <li>were priced to satisfy the minimum loss ratio</li> <li>requirement of 60% in effect at that time. The</li> <li>originally priced anticipated loss ratios were</li> <li>developed using the best data available at the time for</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> <li>this time. Much larger rate increases are currently</li> <li>justified, but not only does the company respect the</li> <li>Maryland statute limiting rate increases to 15% a year,</li> <li>the company also historically typically pursues smaller</li> <li>more frequent rate increases around 15% rather than</li> <li>substantial one time rate increases in an effort to</li> <li>help mitigate the impacts on the policyholders at least</li> <li>if we can.</li> <li>Now, without the requested rate increase,</li> <li>the expected lifetime loss ratios with interest for</li> <li>each of these policy forms for Maryland policyholders</li> <li>is over 100%. The overall lifetime loss ratio with</li> <li>interest in 123.7%.</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> <li>1989 and 2002. The same time frame, the company</li> <li>offered long-term care policies nationwide. These</li> <li>policies provide richer benefits than many policies</li> <li>sold today. About 58% of the policies have life time</li> <li>benefits and about 95% of the policies offer 5%</li> <li>inflation benefits.</li> <li>These policies were designed and filed</li> <li>prior to the October 1st, 2002 effective date of the</li> <li>rate stability requirements of Maryland. Meaning, they</li> <li>were priced to satisfy the minimum loss ratio</li> <li>requirement of 60% in effect at that time. The</li> <li>originally priced anticipated loss ratios were</li> <li>developed using the best data available at the time for</li> <li>anticipated persistency and morbidity that ranged</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> <li>this time. Much larger rate increases are currently</li> <li>justified, but not only does the company respect the</li> <li>Maryland statute limiting rate increases to 15% a year,</li> <li>the company also historically typically pursues smaller</li> <li>more frequent rate increases around 15% rather than</li> <li>substantial one time rate increases in an effort to</li> <li>help mitigate the impacts on the policyholders at least</li> <li>if we can.</li> <li>Now, without the requested rate increase,</li> <li>the expected lifetime loss ratios with interest for</li> <li>each of these policy forms for Maryland policyholders</li> <li>is over 100%. The overall lifetime loss ratio with</li> <li>interest in 123.7%.</li> <li>In 2018, the company received \$4.7 million</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>the premiums of 2,452 policyholders as of</li> <li>December 31st, 2018. The policy form subject to these</li> <li>filings were available for purchase in Maryland between</li> <li>1989 and 2002. The same time frame, the company</li> <li>offered long-term care policies nationwide. These</li> <li>policies provide richer benefits than many policies</li> <li>sold today. About 58% of the policies have life time</li> <li>benefits and about 95% of the policies offer 5%</li> <li>inflation benefits.</li> <li>These policies were designed and filed</li> <li>prior to the October 1st, 2002 effective date of the</li> <li>rate stability requirements of Maryland. Meaning, they</li> <li>were priced to satisfy the minimum loss ratio</li> <li>requirement of 60% in effect at that time. The</li> <li>originally priced anticipated loss ratios were</li> <li>developed using the best data available at the time for</li> <li>anticipated persistency and morbidity that ranged</li> <li>between 60 and 68%.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in the future. Unfortunately, claim experiences</li> <li>continue to deteriorate since that time and the company</li> <li>believes an additional 15% increase is necessary at</li> <li>this time. Much larger rate increases are currently</li> <li>justified, but not only does the company respect the</li> <li>Maryland statute limiting rate increases to 15% a year,</li> <li>the company also historically typically pursues smaller</li> <li>more frequent rate increases around 15% rather than</li> <li>substantial one time rate increases in an effort to</li> <li>help mitigate the impacts on the policyholders at least</li> <li>if we can.</li> <li>Now, without the requested rate increase,</li> <li>the expected lifetime loss ratios with interest for</li> <li>each of these policy forms for Maryland policyholders</li> <li>is over 100%. The overall lifetime loss ratio with</li> <li>interest in 123.7%.</li> <li>In 2018, the company received \$4.7 million</li> <li>in premium and incurred \$5.5 million of claims on its</li> </ol>	

Page 58	Page 60	
1 Of course we acknowledge that the rate	1 answer any questions the Administration might have.	
2 increase can be difficult for our policyholders and so	2 I'll give the tough ones to my colleague, the actuary.	
3 we offer a variety of options for our policyholders to	3 MR. SWITZER: Thanks. So, the 2500	
4 adjust the benefits to mitigate the impact of the rate	4 Maryland policies that you currently filed, that's 100%	
5 increase. The options include reducing the currently	5 of your business in Maryland?	
6 daily benefit, shortening the benefit period,	6 MR. PIETSCH: That's correct.	
7 lengthening the elimination period or adjusting the	7 MR. SWITZER: In similar question to other	
8 amount of home care coverage. In addition, if the	8 carriers, notice that nationwide, about 2% of the	
9 requested premium rate increases are approved, the	9 enrollment in the two year benefit period?	
10 company will offer all policyholders a contingent	10 MR. CASWEL: Right.	
11 nonforfeiture benefit consistent with the requirement	11 MR. SWITZER: Ask if you'd be open to	
12 set forth through Maryland regardless of the cumulative	12 discussing perhaps a different tact for that benefit?	
13 increase amount or the date of issue or the issue age	13 MR. CASWEL: Yes.	
14 of the policy.	14 MR. SWITZER: Thank you. So, I may have	
15 Now, these options are highlighted in the	15 missed it. I apologize if I did. If you file for a	
16 premium increase notification letter sent to our	16 single 15, do you expect to need to file for more 15s	
17 clients about 60 days before the effective date of the	17 in Maryland?	
18 premium increase along with sample premiums for several	18 MR. CASWEL: Yes.	
19 possible adjustment benefits. We also provide a toll	19 MR. SWITZER: Is there a scenario with this	
20 free customer service number with a dedicated specially	20 filing where we could work with you to a scenario where	
21 trained representative answering as well as contact	21 there could be a ten year, just to pick a number,	
Page 59	Page 61	
1 information for the policy's individual financial	1 moratorium, hiatus on rate increases? Beyond the	
	2 single 15, just a scenario, I use scenario	
2 advisor. Both the customer representative and the	2 single 15, just a scenario, I use scenario	
<ul><li>2 advisor. Both the customer representative and the</li><li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li></ul>	<ol> <li>2 single 15, just a scenario, I use scenario</li> <li>3 MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like</li> </ol>	
3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the	3 MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like	
<ul><li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li><li>4 computational tool that allows the customized benefit</li></ul>	3 MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like 4 that if several, depending on the policy form, several	
<ul> <li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li> <li>4 computational tool that allows the customized benefit</li> <li>5 options and premiums for all policyholders to best meet</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like</li> <li>4 that if several, depending on the policy form, several</li> <li>5 15% increases were approved, maybe could be spread out</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li> <li>4 computational tool that allows the customized benefit</li> <li>5 options and premiums for all policyholders to best meet</li> <li>6 their needs.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like</li> <li>4 that if several, depending on the policy form, several</li> <li>5 15% increases were approved, maybe could be spread out</li> <li>6 over a couple of years.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li> <li>4 computational tool that allows the customized benefit</li> <li>5 options and premiums for all policyholders to best meet</li> <li>6 their needs.</li> <li>7 The company has shared in the losses</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like</li> <li>4 that if several, depending on the policy form, several</li> <li>5 15% increases were approved, maybe could be spread out</li> <li>6 over a couple of years.</li> <li>7 MR. SWITZER: Not holding you to it, but do</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li> <li>4 computational tool that allows the customized benefit</li> <li>5 options and premiums for all policyholders to best meet</li> <li>6 their needs.</li> <li>7 The company has shared in the losses</li> <li>8 incurred in the block of business. Indeed the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like</li> <li>4 that if several, depending on the policy form, several</li> <li>5 15% increases were approved, maybe could be spread out</li> <li>6 over a couple of years.</li> <li>7 MR. SWITZER: Not holding you to it, but do</li> <li>8 you have any sense of how many several you need?</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li> <li>4 computational tool that allows the customized benefit</li> <li>5 options and premiums for all policyholders to best meet</li> <li>6 their needs.</li> <li>7 The company has shared in the losses</li> <li>8 incurred in the block of business. Indeed the</li> <li>9 company's long-term care block of business has</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like</li> <li>4 that if several, depending on the policy form, several</li> <li>5 15% increases were approved, maybe could be spread out</li> <li>6 over a couple of years.</li> <li>7 MR. SWITZER: Not holding you to it, but do</li> <li>8 you have any sense of how many several you need?</li> <li>9 MR. CASWEL: Might vary between benefit</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li> <li>4 computational tool that allows the customized benefit</li> <li>5 options and premiums for all policyholders to best meet</li> <li>6 their needs.</li> <li>7 The company has shared in the losses</li> <li>8 incurred in the block of business. Indeed the</li> <li>9 company's long-term care block of business has</li> <li>10 accumulated distributable earning losses of</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like</li> <li>4 that if several, depending on the policy form, several</li> <li>5 15% increases were approved, maybe could be spread out</li> <li>6 over a couple of years.</li> <li>7 MR. SWITZER: Not holding you to it, but do</li> <li>8 you have any sense of how many several you need?</li> <li>9 MR. CASWEL: Might vary between benefit</li> <li>10 types? You know, I would say most of our business has</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li> <li>4 computational tool that allows the customized benefit</li> <li>5 options and premiums for all policyholders to best meet</li> <li>6 their needs.</li> <li>7 The company has shared in the losses</li> <li>8 incurred in the block of business. Indeed the</li> <li>9 company's long-term care block of business has</li> <li>10 accumulated distributable earning losses of</li> <li>11 approximately \$200 million over the past 11 years and</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like</li> <li>4 that if several, depending on the policy form, several</li> <li>5 15% increases were approved, maybe could be spread out</li> <li>6 over a couple of years.</li> <li>7 MR. SWITZER: Not holding you to it, but do</li> <li>8 you have any sense of how many several you need?</li> <li>9 MR. CASWEL: Might vary between benefit</li> <li>10 types? You know, I would say most of our business has</li> <li>11 inflation which is pretty painful. More than half of</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li> <li>4 computational tool that allows the customized benefit</li> <li>5 options and premiums for all policyholders to best meet</li> <li>6 their needs.</li> <li>7 The company has shared in the losses</li> <li>8 incurred in the block of business. Indeed the</li> <li>9 company's long-term care block of business has</li> <li>10 accumulated distributable earning losses of</li> <li>11 approximately \$200 million over the past 11 years and</li> <li>12 the company provided additional capital to the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like</li> <li>4 that if several, depending on the policy form, several</li> <li>5 15% increases were approved, maybe could be spread out</li> <li>6 over a couple of years.</li> <li>7 MR. SWITZER: Not holding you to it, but do</li> <li>8 you have any sense of how many several you need?</li> <li>9 MR. CASWEL: Might vary between benefit</li> <li>10 types? You know, I would say most of our business has</li> <li>11 inflation which is pretty painful. More than half of</li> <li>12 our policies have lifetime benefits which, again, is</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li> <li>4 computational tool that allows the customized benefit</li> <li>5 options and premiums for all policyholders to best meet</li> <li>6 their needs.</li> <li>7 The company has shared in the losses</li> <li>8 incurred in the block of business. Indeed the</li> <li>9 company's long-term care block of business has</li> <li>10 accumulated distributable earning losses of</li> <li>11 approximately \$200 million over the past 11 years and</li> <li>12 the company provided additional capital to the</li> <li>13 long-term block of business in the form of \$200 million</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like</li> <li>4 that if several, depending on the policy form, several</li> <li>5 15% increases were approved, maybe could be spread out</li> <li>6 over a couple of years.</li> <li>7 MR. SWITZER: Not holding you to it, but do</li> <li>8 you have any sense of how many several you need?</li> <li>9 MR. CASWEL: Might vary between benefit</li> <li>10 types? You know, I would say most of our business has</li> <li>11 inflation which is pretty painful. More than half of</li> <li>12 our policies have lifetime benefits which, again, is</li> <li>13 fairly painful. But, I would think that depending on</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li> <li>4 computational tool that allows the customized benefit</li> <li>5 options and premiums for all policyholders to best meet</li> <li>6 their needs.</li> <li>7 The company has shared in the losses</li> <li>8 incurred in the block of business. Indeed the</li> <li>9 company's long-term care block of business has</li> <li>10 accumulated distributable earning losses of</li> <li>11 approximately \$200 million over the past 11 years and</li> <li>12 the company provided additional capital to the</li> <li>13 long-term block of business in the form of \$200 million</li> <li>14 in asset adequacy reserves. The amount is reviewed</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like</li> <li>4 that if several, depending on the policy form, several</li> <li>5 15% increases were approved, maybe could be spread out</li> <li>6 over a couple of years.</li> <li>7 MR. SWITZER: Not holding you to it, but do</li> <li>8 you have any sense of how many several you need?</li> <li>9 MR. CASWEL: Might vary between benefit</li> <li>10 types? You know, I would say most of our business has</li> <li>11 inflation which is pretty painful. More than half of</li> <li>12 our policies have lifetime benefits which, again, is</li> <li>13 fairly painful. But, I would think that depending on</li> <li>14 the benefit types it, could be three to four. We're</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li> <li>4 computational tool that allows the customized benefit</li> <li>5 options and premiums for all policyholders to best meet</li> <li>6 their needs.</li> <li>7 The company has shared in the losses</li> <li>8 incurred in the block of business. Indeed the</li> <li>9 company's long-term care block of business has</li> <li>10 accumulated distributable earning losses of</li> <li>11 approximately \$200 million over the past 11 years and</li> <li>12 the company provided additional capital to the</li> <li>13 long-term block of business in the form of \$200 million</li> <li>14 in asset adequacy reserves. The amount is reviewed</li> <li>15 annually as part of our in depth review of emerging</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like</li> <li>4 that if several, depending on the policy form, several</li> <li>5 15% increases were approved, maybe could be spread out</li> <li>6 over a couple of years.</li> <li>7 MR. SWITZER: Not holding you to it, but do</li> <li>8 you have any sense of how many several you need?</li> <li>9 MR. CASWEL: Might vary between benefit</li> <li>10 types? You know, I would say most of our business has</li> <li>11 inflation which is pretty painful. More than half of</li> <li>12 our policies have lifetime benefits which, again, is</li> <li>13 fairly painful. But, I would think that depending on</li> <li>14 the benefit types it, could be three to four. We're</li> <li>15 certainly happy to work with the Administration on</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li> <li>4 computational tool that allows the customized benefit</li> <li>5 options and premiums for all policyholders to best meet</li> <li>6 their needs.</li> <li>7 The company has shared in the losses</li> <li>8 incurred in the block of business. Indeed the</li> <li>9 company's long-term care block of business has</li> <li>10 accumulated distributable earning losses of</li> <li>11 approximately \$200 million over the past 11 years and</li> <li>12 the company provided additional capital to the</li> <li>13 long-term block of business in the form of \$200 million</li> <li>14 in asset adequacy reserves. The amount is reviewed</li> <li>15 annually as part of our in depth review of emerging</li> <li>16 experience and updated assumptions.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like</li> <li>4 that if several, depending on the policy form, several</li> <li>5 15% increases were approved, maybe could be spread out</li> <li>6 over a couple of years.</li> <li>7 MR. SWITZER: Not holding you to it, but do</li> <li>8 you have any sense of how many several you need?</li> <li>9 MR. CASWEL: Might vary between benefit</li> <li>10 types? You know, I would say most of our business has</li> <li>11 inflation which is pretty painful. More than half of</li> <li>12 our policies have lifetime benefits which, again, is</li> <li>13 fairly painful. But, I would think that depending on</li> <li>14 the benefit types it, could be three to four. We're</li> <li>15 certainly happy to work with the Administration on</li> <li>16 various options. But to go anything resembling ten</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li> <li>4 computational tool that allows the customized benefit</li> <li>5 options and premiums for all policyholders to best meet</li> <li>6 their needs.</li> <li>7 The company has shared in the losses</li> <li>8 incurred in the block of business. Indeed the</li> <li>9 company's long-term care block of business has</li> <li>10 accumulated distributable earning losses of</li> <li>11 approximately \$200 million over the past 11 years and</li> <li>12 the company provided additional capital to the</li> <li>13 long-term block of business in the form of \$200 million</li> <li>14 in asset adequacy reserves. The amount is reviewed</li> <li>15 annually as part of our in depth review of emerging</li> <li>16 experience and updated assumptions.</li> <li>17 We humbly ask for these rate increases and</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like</li> <li>4 that if several, depending on the policy form, several</li> <li>5 15% increases were approved, maybe could be spread out</li> <li>6 over a couple of years.</li> <li>MR. SWITZER: Not holding you to it, but do</li> <li>8 you have any sense of how many several you need?</li> <li>MR. CASWEL: Might vary between benefit</li> <li>10 types? You know, I would say most of our business has</li> <li>11 inflation which is pretty painful. More than half of</li> <li>12 our policies have lifetime benefits which, again, is</li> <li>13 fairly painful. But, I would think that depending on</li> <li>14 the benefit types it, could be three to four. We're</li> <li>15 certainly happy to work with the Administration on</li> <li>16 various options. But to go anything resembling ten</li> <li>17 years for a single 15% increase, we would</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>3 affiliated financial advisers have access to the</li> <li>4 computational tool that allows the customized benefit</li> <li>5 options and premiums for all policyholders to best meet</li> <li>6 their needs.</li> <li>7 The company has shared in the losses</li> <li>8 incurred in the block of business. Indeed the</li> <li>9 company's long-term care block of business has</li> <li>10 accumulated distributable earning losses of</li> <li>11 approximately \$200 million over the past 11 years and</li> <li>12 the company provided additional capital to the</li> <li>13 long-term block of business in the form of \$200 million</li> <li>14 in asset adequacy reserves. The amount is reviewed</li> <li>15 annually as part of our in depth review of emerging</li> <li>16 experience and updated assumptions.</li> <li>17 We humbly ask for these rate increases and</li> <li>18 we believe that even with the increases, the policies</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CASWEL: There could be a scenario like</li> <li>4 that if several, depending on the policy form, several</li> <li>5 15% increases were approved, maybe could be spread out</li> <li>6 over a couple of years.</li> <li>7 MR. SWITZER: Not holding you to it, but do</li> <li>8 you have any sense of how many several you need?</li> <li>9 MR. CASWEL: Might vary between benefit</li> <li>10 types? You know, I would say most of our business has</li> <li>11 inflation which is pretty painful. More than half of</li> <li>12 our policies have lifetime benefits which, again, is</li> <li>13 fairly painful. But, I would think that depending on</li> <li>14 the benefit types it, could be three to four. We're</li> <li>15 certainly happy to work with the Administration on</li> <li>16 various options. But to go anything resembling ten</li> <li>17 years for a single 15% increase, we would</li> <li>18 MR. SWITZER: I wasn't tying it to a</li> </ul>	

	Page 64	
1 once every five years?	1 something like that. So, we do have fairly high	
2 MR. CASWEL: Every year.	2 targets, but again many of these policies have been out	
3 MR. SWITZER: Annually?	3 there for 30 years and if you look at the annual	
4 MR. CASWEL: Certainly as part of our gap	4 increase of the incidence, it's still fairly low single	
5 unlocking process each year, we go into extreme depth	5 digits.	
6 on our assumptions.	6 MR. JI: Thank you.	
7 MR. SWITZER: Just because I might	7 MR. SWITZER: Anything else? Thanks again.	
8 follow-up with you if I could, is there a timing to it?	8 That's all the carriers. Is there anyone on the phone	
9 Is it fourth quarter?	9 who would like to speak? Please, Mr. and	
10 MR. CASWEL: It's third quarter. So, our	10 Ms. Fairclough? You're more than welcome if you'd	
11 company traditionally unlocks in the third quarter.	11 like.	
12 Third quarter is a very busy time with respect to	12 MRS. FAIRCLOUGH: Thank you, yes. I'm	
13 analyzing.	13 speaking on behalf of my husband and myself and would	
14 MR. SWITZER: Thank you. Anything else	14 like to thank the Maryland Insurance Administration	
15 here?	15 commissioners and their staff for this opportunity to	
16 MR. JI: This is Jeff. From the one	16 address our concerns regarding rate increases requested	
17 response to one of our objections, looks like your	17 by MetLife long-term care policyholders.	
18 company seek much higher, a hundred percent cumulative	18 My husband has had as a policy with MetLife	
19 rate increase. One form, you even say 295% for nonlife	19 since 2002. The policy was taken out at that time	
20	20 because father had a stroke in 1998, but did not have	
21 MR. CASWEL: Not in Maryland.	21 any long-term care policy in place. And after four	
Page 63	Page 65	
1 MR. JI: Not in Maryland? Okay.	1 years of inhome care, mother was on the edge of	
2 MR. CASWEL: That was	2 bankruptcy. It was just the most horrific family	
<ul> <li>2 MR. CASWEL: That was</li> <li>3 MR. JI: Nationwide?</li> </ul>	<ul><li>2 bankruptcy. It was just the most horrific family</li><li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li></ul>	
<ul><li>3 MR. JI: Nationwide?</li><li>4 MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've</li></ul>	<ul><li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li><li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li></ul>	
3 MR. JI: Nationwide?	3 situation and we could not help. We're in our	
<ul><li>3 MR. JI: Nationwide?</li><li>4 MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've</li></ul>	<ul><li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li><li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>MR. JI: Nationwide?</li> <li>MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've</li> <li>had challenges over time with this block and until</li> <li>recently, until the last few years, we sought generally</li> <li>15% increases every couple of years across the country</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li> <li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li> <li>5 Maryland, we are retired on a fixed income, social</li> <li>6 security and very modest savings.</li> <li>7 We received a letter from MetLife in</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>MR. JI: Nationwide?</li> <li>MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've</li> <li>had challenges over time with this block and until</li> <li>recently, until the last few years, we sought generally</li> <li>15% increases every couple of years across the country</li> <li>because our policy we believe this is valuable</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li> <li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li> <li>5 Maryland, we are retired on a fixed income, social</li> <li>6 security and very modest savings.</li> <li>7 We received a letter from MetLife in</li> <li>8 February 2019 saying that they had received a 32.25%</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>MR. JI: Nationwide?</li> <li>MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've</li> <li>had challenges over time with this block and until</li> <li>recently, until the last few years, we sought generally</li> <li>15% increases every couple of years across the country</li> <li>because our policy we believe this is valuable</li> <li>coverage for our policyholders and we wanted to share</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li> <li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li> <li>5 Maryland, we are retired on a fixed income, social</li> <li>6 security and very modest savings.</li> <li>7 We received a letter from MetLife in</li> <li>8 February 2019 saying that they had received a 32.25%</li> <li>9 increase and authority to implement a 12.5 increase on</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>MR. JI: Nationwide?</li> <li>MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've</li> <li>had challenges over time with this block and until</li> <li>recently, until the last few years, we sought generally</li> <li>15% increases every couple of years across the country</li> <li>because our policy we believe this is valuable</li> <li>coverage for our policyholders and we wanted to share</li> <li>in the pain and we wanted to make sure people weren't</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li> <li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li> <li>5 Maryland, we are retired on a fixed income, social</li> <li>6 security and very modest savings.</li> <li>7 We received a letter from MetLife in</li> <li>8 February 2019 saying that they had received a 32.25%</li> <li>9 increase and authority to implement a 12.5 increase on</li> <li>10 my husband's policy by the Insurance Administration and</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>MR. JI: Nationwide?</li> <li>MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've</li> <li>had challenges over time with this block and until</li> <li>recently, until the last few years, we sought generally</li> <li>15% increases every couple of years across the country</li> <li>because our policy we believe this is valuable</li> <li>coverage for our policyholders and we wanted to share</li> <li>in the pain and we wanted to make sure people weren't</li> <li>scared way from the policies because they think they</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li> <li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li> <li>5 Maryland, we are retired on a fixed income, social</li> <li>6 security and very modest savings.</li> <li>7 We received a letter from MetLife in</li> <li>8 February 2019 saying that they had received a 32.25%</li> <li>9 increase and authority to implement a 12.5 increase on</li> <li>10 my husband's policy by the Insurance Administration and</li> <li>11 that went into effect in 2019. So, let us say that</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>MR. JI: Nationwide?</li> <li>MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've</li> <li>had challenges over time with this block and until</li> <li>recently, until the last few years, we sought generally</li> <li>15% increases every couple of years across the country</li> <li>because our policy we believe this is valuable</li> <li>coverage for our policyholders and we wanted to share</li> <li>in the pain and we wanted to make sure people weren't</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li> <li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li> <li>5 Maryland, we are retired on a fixed income, social</li> <li>6 security and very modest savings.</li> <li>7 We received a letter from MetLife in</li> <li>8 February 2019 saying that they had received a 32.25%</li> <li>9 increase and authority to implement a 12.5 increase on</li> <li>10 my husband's policy by the Insurance Administration and</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>MR. JI: Nationwide?</li> <li>MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've</li> <li>had challenges over time with this block and until</li> <li>recently, until the last few years, we sought generally</li> <li>15% increases every couple of years across the country</li> <li>because our policy we believe this is valuable</li> <li>coverage for our policyholders and we wanted to share</li> <li>in the pain and we wanted to make sure people weren't</li> <li>scared way from the policies because they think they</li> <li>provide good coverage and we know that large increases</li> <li>might cause policyholders to lapse, you know. Might</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li> <li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li> <li>5 Maryland, we are retired on a fixed income, social</li> <li>6 security and very modest savings.</li> <li>7 We received a letter from MetLife in</li> <li>8 February 2019 saying that they had received a 32.25%</li> <li>9 increase and authority to implement a 12.5 increase on</li> <li>10 my husband's policy by the Insurance Administration and</li> <li>11 that went into effect in 2019. So, let us say that</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>MR. JI: Nationwide?</li> <li>MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've</li> <li>had challenges over time with this block and until</li> <li>recently, until the last few years, we sought generally</li> <li>15% increases every couple of years across the country</li> <li>because our policy we believe this is valuable</li> <li>coverage for our policyholders and we wanted to share</li> <li>in the pain and we wanted to make sure people weren't</li> <li>scared way from the policies because they think they</li> <li>provide good coverage and we know that large increases</li> <li>might cause policyholders to lapse, you know. Might</li> <li>not be in their best interest.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li> <li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li> <li>5 Maryland, we are retired on a fixed income, social</li> <li>6 security and very modest savings.</li> <li>7 We received a letter from MetLife in</li> <li>8 February 2019 saying that they had received a 32.25%</li> <li>9 increase and authority to implement a 12.5 increase on</li> <li>10 my husband's policy by the Insurance Administration and</li> <li>11 that went into effect in 2019. So, let us say that</li> <li>12 MetLife intended to request additional increases that</li> <li>13 if authorized would be implemented the following year</li> <li>14 which is 2020.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>MR. JI: Nationwide?</li> <li>MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've</li> <li>had challenges over time with this block and until</li> <li>recently, until the last few years, we sought generally</li> <li>15% increases every couple of years across the country</li> <li>because our policy we believe this is valuable</li> <li>coverage for our policyholders and we wanted to share</li> <li>in the pain and we wanted to make sure people weren't</li> <li>scared way from the policies because they think they</li> <li>provide good coverage and we know that large increases</li> <li>might cause policyholders to lapse, you know. Might</li> <li>not be in their best interest.</li> <li>More recently we realized that experience</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li> <li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li> <li>5 Maryland, we are retired on a fixed income, social</li> <li>6 security and very modest savings.</li> <li>7 We received a letter from MetLife in</li> <li>8 February 2019 saying that they had received a 32.25%</li> <li>9 increase and authority to implement a 12.5 increase on</li> <li>10 my husband's policy by the Insurance Administration and</li> <li>11 that went into effect in 2019. So, let us say that</li> <li>12 MetLife intended to request additional increases that</li> <li>13 if authorized would be implemented the following year</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>MR. JI: Nationwide?</li> <li>MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've</li> <li>had challenges over time with this block and until</li> <li>recently, until the last few years, we sought generally</li> <li>15% increases every couple of years across the country</li> <li>because our policy we believe this is valuable</li> <li>coverage for our policyholders and we wanted to share</li> <li>in the pain and we wanted to make sure people weren't</li> <li>scared way from the policies because they think they</li> <li>provide good coverage and we know that large increases</li> <li>might cause policyholders to lapse, you know. Might</li> <li>not be in their best interest.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li> <li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li> <li>5 Maryland, we are retired on a fixed income, social</li> <li>6 security and very modest savings.</li> <li>7 We received a letter from MetLife in</li> <li>8 February 2019 saying that they had received a 32.25%</li> <li>9 increase and authority to implement a 12.5 increase on</li> <li>10 my husband's policy by the Insurance Administration and</li> <li>11 that went into effect in 2019. So, let us say that</li> <li>12 MetLife intended to request additional increases that</li> <li>13 if authorized would be implemented the following year</li> <li>14 which is 2020.</li> <li>15 We anticipated their request for increases,</li> <li>16 but we do not understand why we along with so many</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>MR. JI: Nationwide?</li> <li>MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've</li> <li>had challenges over time with this block and until</li> <li>recently, until the last few years, we sought generally</li> <li>15% increases every couple of years across the country</li> <li>because our policy we believe this is valuable</li> <li>coverage for our policyholders and we wanted to share</li> <li>in the pain and we wanted to make sure people weren't</li> <li>scared way from the policies because they think they</li> <li>provide good coverage and we know that large increases</li> <li>might cause policyholders to lapse, you know. Might</li> <li>not be in their best interest.</li> <li>More recently we realized that experience</li> <li>does just keep getting worse and worse and especially</li> <li>as we see over age, morbidities come to play. So, we</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li> <li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li> <li>5 Maryland, we are retired on a fixed income, social</li> <li>6 security and very modest savings.</li> <li>7 We received a letter from MetLife in</li> <li>8 February 2019 saying that they had received a 32.25%</li> <li>9 increase and authority to implement a 12.5 increase on</li> <li>10 my husband's policy by the Insurance Administration and</li> <li>11 that went into effect in 2019. So, let us say that</li> <li>12 MetLife intended to request additional increases that</li> <li>13 if authorized would be implemented the following year</li> <li>14 which is 2020.</li> <li>15 We anticipated their request for increases,</li> <li>16 but we do not understand why we along with so many</li> <li>17 other residents of the State of Maryland are held</li> </ul>	
3MR. JI: Nationwide?4MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've5had challenges over time with this block and until6recently, until the last few years, we sought generally715% increases every couple of years across the country8because our policy we believe this is valuable9coverage for our policyholders and we wanted to share10in the pain and we wanted to make sure people weren't11scared way from the policies because they think they12provide good coverage and we know that large increases13might cause policyholders to lapse, you know. Might14not be in their best interest.15More recently we realized that experience16does just keep getting worse and worse and especially17as we see over age, morbidities come to play. So, we18started seeking again during by form, much larger	<ul> <li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li> <li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li> <li>5 Maryland, we are retired on a fixed income, social</li> <li>6 security and very modest savings.</li> <li>7 We received a letter from MetLife in</li> <li>8 February 2019 saying that they had received a 32.25%</li> <li>9 increase and authority to implement a 12.5 increase on</li> <li>10 my husband's policy by the Insurance Administration and</li> <li>11 that went into effect in 2019. So, let us say that</li> <li>12 MetLife intended to request additional increases that</li> <li>13 if authorized would be implemented the following year</li> <li>14 which is 2020.</li> <li>15 We anticipated their request for increases,</li> <li>16 but we do not understand why we along with so many</li> <li>17 other residents of the State of Maryland are held</li> <li>18 responsible year after year to pay increase policy</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>MR. JI: Nationwide?</li> <li>MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've</li> <li>had challenges over time with this block and until</li> <li>recently, until the last few years, we sought generally</li> <li>15% increases every couple of years across the country</li> <li>because our policy we believe this is valuable</li> <li>coverage for our policyholders and we wanted to share</li> <li>in the pain and we wanted to make sure people weren't</li> <li>scared way from the policies because they think they</li> <li>provide good coverage and we know that large increases</li> <li>might cause policyholders to lapse, you know. Might</li> <li>not be in their best interest.</li> <li>More recently we realized that experience</li> <li>does just keep getting worse and worse and especially</li> <li>as we see over age, morbidities come to play. So, we</li> <li>started seeking again during by form, much larger</li> <li>increases on the lifetime benefits policies nationwide,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li> <li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li> <li>5 Maryland, we are retired on a fixed income, social</li> <li>6 security and very modest savings.</li> <li>7 We received a letter from MetLife in</li> <li>8 February 2019 saying that they had received a 32.25%</li> <li>9 increase and authority to implement a 12.5 increase on</li> <li>10 my husband's policy by the Insurance Administration and</li> <li>11 that went into effect in 2019. So, let us say that</li> <li>12 MetLife intended to request additional increases that</li> <li>13 if authorized would be implemented the following year</li> <li>14 which is 2020.</li> <li>15 We anticipated their request for increases,</li> <li>16 but we do not understand why we along with so many</li> <li>17 other residents of the State of Maryland are held</li> <li>18 responsible year after year to pay increase policy</li> <li>19 premiums to offset the costs of their actuarial</li> </ul>	
3MR. JI: Nationwide?4MR. CASWEL: That was nationwide. We've5had challenges over time with this block and until6recently, until the last few years, we sought generally715% increases every couple of years across the country8because our policy we believe this is valuable9coverage for our policyholders and we wanted to share10in the pain and we wanted to make sure people weren't11scared way from the policies because they think they12provide good coverage and we know that large increases13might cause policyholders to lapse, you know. Might14not be in their best interest.15More recently we realized that experience16does just keep getting worse and worse and especially17as we see over age, morbidities come to play. So, we18started seeking again during by form, much larger	<ul> <li>3 situation and we could not help. We're in our</li> <li>4 seventies now. Like so many other families in</li> <li>5 Maryland, we are retired on a fixed income, social</li> <li>6 security and very modest savings.</li> <li>7 We received a letter from MetLife in</li> <li>8 February 2019 saying that they had received a 32.25%</li> <li>9 increase and authority to implement a 12.5 increase on</li> <li>10 my husband's policy by the Insurance Administration and</li> <li>11 that went into effect in 2019. So, let us say that</li> <li>12 MetLife intended to request additional increases that</li> <li>13 if authorized would be implemented the following year</li> <li>14 which is 2020.</li> <li>15 We anticipated their request for increases,</li> <li>16 but we do not understand why we along with so many</li> <li>17 other residents of the State of Maryland are held</li> <li>18 responsible year after year to pay increase policy</li> </ul>	

	ŭ		<b>.</b>
	Page 66		Page 68
1	pay. Each year premiums have increased. MetLife	1	was a top ten company in Maryland in terms of how many
2	offers options that reduce premiums by reducing	2	Maryland seniors they cover, where the loss ratio was
3	coverage. Whatever it selected will significantly	3	much more than a hundred percent that they agreed to.
4	decrease funds available for us to pay for future	4	It was 150%. And with their investment income, the
5	affordable care and the rising health care costs.	5	losses in Maryland were significant. They were a big
6	These choices meaningfully reduce our	6	company that were in a position to absorb losses. But,
7	ability to take care of ourselves, each other,	7	the company we're balancing your real hardship,
8	especially when there is no family to help to fray the	8	which is unequivocally a hardship with we're taking
9	cost of care. And with all due respect to the	9	on significant risks the companies do, maybe the most
10	compelling actuarial arguments as resulting requested	10	risky product that's out there over half a century,
11	increase based on the company's cost ratio loss ratio,	11	what is reasonable return for taking on that risk and
12	MetLife is a \$47.6 billion company accountable to their	12	we're trying to find that answer and a lot of companies
13	shareholders who receive dividends. Policyholders are	13	are have stepped up and shouldered some.
14	real people. the continued rate increases affects the	14	I understand that more needs to be done. I
15	physical health and wealth mental health of us, of	15	mentioned that we're looking at what other states are
16	people in Maryland. Not the profits.	16	doing because we read these comments because if you
17	So, we urge this board to seriously	17	have to put a face to the problem, and we are trying to
18	consider the adverse consequences of rate increases	18	find that balance of accountability, and I wish I had
19	requested and minimize amounts authorized. We thank	19	more to offer you than that, but that's what comes to
20	you again for holding this hearing and we cannot	20	mind from what you said. If you have any other
21	express the importance enough of this commission and	21	thoughts, share with anyone else, please do. But,
	Page 67		Page 69
1	what you do. Thank you.	1	that's kind of we're still pressing for what the
2	MR. SWITZER: Thank you very much, Mr. and	2	right answer is and what the right balance is and I
3	Mrs. Fairclough. I just wanted to let you know that	3	don't think nationally anyone's found it yet.
4	when we get these filings, we take them with a lot of	4	Any other comments, Mrs. Fairclough or Mr.
5	gravitas and go over every page. We share we pull	5	Fairclough?
6	from the transcript some quotes, share those with the	6	MRS. FAIRCLOUGH: No. I appreciate what
7	companies, we share them with legislators to try to get	7	you're doing, how you are considering and understanding
8	as much attention as possible to this long-term care	8	the gravity and the actual impact this has on
9	issue that is every much as troublesome as the	9	families people, real people. So, thank you again
10	affordability care problems we are tackling. You're	10	for the opportunity for us to present what's real to
11	right, in looking at MetLife, we look and all the	11	us.
12	companies, we looked at the risk based capital, the	12	MR. SWITZER: Thank you for taking the
13	amount of capital and surplus they have. We know that	13	time. I wish more people did. Please contact us any
14	2019 was a good year. You're right 148 million	14	time, e-mail if you want an update on filings or any
15	dividends were paid in 2018. We're also trying to find	15	other information or anything else we can provide. Any
			other comments on the phone please? Anybody at all?
16	the right balance. When we say we look at net income,	16	1 1 5 5
	the right balance. When we say we look at net income, some of the carriers aren't as anxious to they		Anybody in the room have any questions or thoughts?
17		17	
17 18	some of the carriers aren't as anxious to they	17 18	Anybody in the room have any questions or thoughts?
17 18 19	some of the carriers aren't as anxious to they try they bring the conversation back to claims and	17 18 19	Anybody in the room have any questions or thoughts? Okay. I will remind you that the next hearing is
17 18 19 20	some of the carriers aren't as anxious to they try they bring the conversation back to claims and income, but we are we very much see the investment	17 18 19 20	Anybody in the room have any questions or thoughts? Okay. I will remind you that the next hearing is next quarterly hearing is Wednesday of May 13th.

	Page 70
1	Wednesday, the 26th. Thank you for all the effort and
2	time and thoughtfulness put into this and we welcome
3	dialogue going forward. Thanks again and thanks on the
4	phone. Bye.
5	(Hearing adjourned at 10:23 a.m.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
	Page 71
1	
1	State of Maryland
	State of Maryland City of Baltimore, to wit:
	-
2 3	City of Baltimore, to wit:
2 3 4	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public
2 3 4 5	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do
2 3 4 5	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do hereby certify that the within-named proceedings tool
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do hereby certify that the within-named proceedings tool place before me at the time and place herein set out. I further certify that the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and this transcript
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do hereby certify that the within-named proceedings tool place before me at the time and place herein set out. I further certify that the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and this transcript is a true record of the proceedings.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do hereby certify that the within-named proceedings tool place before me at the time and place herein set out. I further certify that the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and this transcript is a true record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do hereby certify that the within-named proceedings tool place before me at the time and place herein set out. I further certify that the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and this transcript is a true record of the proceedings.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do hereby certify that the within-named proceedings tool place before me at the time and place herein set out. I further certify that the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and this transcript is a true record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel to any of the parties, nor an employee of counsel, nor related to any of the parties, nor in any way
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do hereby certify that the within-named proceedings tool place before me at the time and place herein set out. I further certify that the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and this transcript is a true record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel to any of the parties, nor an employee of counsel,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do hereby certify that the within-named proceedings tool place before me at the time and place herein set out. I further certify that the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and this transcript is a true record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel to any of the parties, nor an employee of counsel, nor related to any of the parties, nor in any way
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do hereby certify that the within-named proceedings tool place before me at the time and place herein set out. I further certify that the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and this transcript is a true record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel to any of the parties, nor an employee of counsel, nor related to any of the parties, nor in any way interested in the outcome of this action.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do hereby certify that the within-named proceedings tool place before me at the time and place herein set out. I further certify that the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and this transcript is a true record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel to any of the parties, nor an employee of counsel, nor related to any of the parties, nor in any way interested in the outcome of this action. As witnessed my hand and notarial seal this 10th day of March, 2020.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do hereby certify that the within-named proceedings tool place before me at the time and place herein set out. I further certify that the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and this transcript is a true record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel to any of the parties, nor an employee of counsel, nor related to any of the parties, nor in any way interested in the outcome of this action. As witnessed my hand and notarial seal this 10th day of March, 2020. <i>Haim for forther forther</i>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do hereby certify that the within-named proceedings tool place before me at the time and place herein set out. I further certify that the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and this transcript is a true record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel to any of the parties, nor an employee of counsel, nor related to any of the parties, nor in any way interested in the outcome of this action. As witnessed my hand and notarial seal this 10th day of March, 2020.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do hereby certify that the within-named proceedings tool place before me at the time and place herein set out. I further certify that the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and this transcript is a true record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel to any of the parties, nor an employee of counsel, nor related to any of the parties, nor in any way interested in the outcome of this action. As witnessed my hand and notarial seal this 10th day of March, 2020. <i>Haim for forder</i>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do hereby certify that the within-named proceedings tool place before me at the time and place herein set out. I further certify that the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and this transcript is a true record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel to any of the parties, nor an employee of counsel, nor related to any of the parties, nor in any way interested in the outcome of this action. As witnessed my hand and notarial seal this 10th day of March, 2020. <i>Haining Marther forder</i> Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	City of Baltimore, to wit: I, Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, Anne Arundel County, do hereby certify that the within-named proceedings tool place before me at the time and place herein set out. I further certify that the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and this transcript is a true record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not of counsel to any of the parties, nor an employee of counsel, nor related to any of the parties, nor in any way interested in the outcome of this action. As witnessed my hand and notarial seal this 10th day of March, 2020. <i>Haining Marther forder</i> Louisa B. McIntire-Brooks

[0 - 761]

February 19, 2020

Page 1

0	<b>155</b> 27:16	47:3,7,12,15	<b>5.0.</b> 42:12
0	<b>15s</b> 12:7,8,8 60:16	65:14 71:15	<b>5.5</b> 57:18
<b>0</b> 46:19 52:17	<b>1600</b> 5:5 17:18	<b>2023</b> 71:21	<b>50</b> 11:12 20:4,5
1	<b>173</b> 26:19	<b>202</b> 3 71.21 <b>21</b> 3:9	51:6
<b>1</b> 45:12 46:13,15	<b>175</b> 20:17 <b>175</b> 41:6	<b>21202</b> 1:14	<b>51,600</b> 8:19
46:20 47:3,7,11	<b>17781</b> 71:17	<b>23</b> 39:17 42:17	<b>52</b> 5:3
47:14 50:15,15	<b>18</b> 65:21	<b>25</b> 19:18 43:3	<b>52,600</b> 8:21
53:10	<b>18,000</b> 8:11	<b>2500</b> 5:9 60:3	<b>53</b> 3:12
<b>10,000</b> 10:8 48:6	<b>19</b> 1:4,12 3:5 9:14	<b>26th</b> 7:4 70:1	<b>54,900</b> 8:18
<b>100</b> 15:5 19:5 20:4	10:7	27 5:10	<b>54.5</b> 47:18
27:11 28:7,8,17	<b>1989</b> 55:4	<b>27.1</b> 42:16	<b>546</b> 26:9
28:19 29:10 34:20	<b>1990s</b> 22:16	<b>2700</b> 1:14 5:13	<b>55</b> 6:2 32:15 37:3
35:2 52:17 57:15	<b>1997</b> 17:21 42:13	<b>287</b> 5:11 22:1 26:6	40:6
60:4	<b>1998</b> 37:9 64:20	26:19 27:1,5,6,8,9	<b>57</b> 12:3
<b>102,000</b> 9:3	<b>1999</b> 22:5 26:8	<b>29</b> 3:10	<b>58</b> 55:7
<b>103</b> 34:18,20	<b>1st</b> 31:6 55:11	<b>295</b> 62:19	6
<b>109</b> 47:13	2	<b>29th</b> 4:11	<b>60</b> 47:2,6 48:12
<b>10:23</b> 70:5	2 60:8	3	55:14,18 58:17
<b>10th</b> 71:15	<b>2,452</b> 55:1	<b>30</b> 41:9 64:3	<b>61</b> 47:10
<b>11</b> 59:11	<b>2.6</b> 9:15	<b>31</b> 14:9,12	<b>63</b> 18:8
<b>11.5</b> 50:7	<b>20</b> 17:21 30:6 43:2	<b>31st</b> 55:2	<b>6301</b> 21:18,19
<b>116.7</b> 57:20	49:4	<b>32.25</b> 65:8	<b>6302</b> 21:18,20
<b>117</b> 47:5	200 1:13 59:11,13	<b>37.8</b> 8:13	<b>6303</b> 21:18,21
<b>12.5</b> 65:9 <b>12.7</b> 5:6 54:20	<b>2002</b> 10:6 14:6,7	<b>38</b> 49:12	<b>64</b> 3:13
<b>12.7</b> 5:6 54:20 <b>120,000</b> 9:2	14:16 16:15 42:15	4	<b>66</b> 46:17
<b>120,000</b> 9.2 <b>123.7</b> 57:16	55:4,11 64:19	<b>4,000</b> 10:7	<b>67</b> 26:6
<b>123.7</b> 37.10 <b>13</b> 3:8 71:21	<b>2003</b> 14:8 42:13	<b>4.0</b> 42:11,12,16,18	<b>68</b> 22:11 46:12
<b>13 3</b> .6 71.21 <b>13.4</b> 42:19	<b>2004</b> 22:5	46:11 51:3	47:3 55:18
<b>13.</b> 42.19 <b>136</b> 56:13	<b>2005</b> 56:10	<b>4.7</b> 57:17	<b>69</b> 45:20 46:5,15
<b>13th</b> 69:19	<b>2006</b> 14:6,9 16:17	<b>40</b> 3:11	47:6
<b>14</b> 50:6	<b>2007</b> 14:10	<b>401</b> 12:18	7
<b>148</b> 67:14	<b>2008</b> 14:8	<b>409</b> 22:2 27:10	7.06 32:13
<b>15</b> 5:4,7 14:13,16	<b>2010</b> 14:10	<b>43</b> 18:7	<b>7.1</b> 6:1 38:7,20
15:16 20:13 21:17	<b>2012</b> 42:15	<b>45</b> 19:18 46:16	39:19
26:18 27:17 29:3	<b>2013</b> 42:15	47:7,12 50:5	<b>700</b> 49:5
29:9,11 39:17	<b>2016</b> 14:17 56:18	<b>47.6</b> 66:12	<b>7100</b> 6:4
42:18 54:16 55:19	<b>2018</b> 14:9,12 22:3	<b>48,600</b> 9:1	<b>73</b> 45:20 46:15
56:13,14,17 57:3	55:2 57:17 67:15	5	47:6,11
57:6,8 60:16 61:2	<b>2019</b> 8:9,9,16,17	<b>5</b> 12:2,4 36:11	<b>74</b> 45:12 46:19
61:5,17 63:7,21	9:1 14:17 31:6	55:8	47:14
<b>150</b> 10:8 19:3,4,14	38:18 54:21 65:8	<b>5.0</b> 42:14,17,19	<b>76</b> 46:14
19:19 20:2 68:4	65:11 67:14 2020 1:4 12 3:5	46:21 47:17 50:21	<b>761</b> 14:11
	<b>2020</b> 1:4,12 3:5	+0.21 +7.17 JU.21	
	45:12 46:13,16,20		

#### Febru

## [79.8 - appreciate]

February 19, 2020

Page 2

70.9 56.16	a alter arrilada a 59.1	56.10 60.1 61.15	50.14 67.12
<b>79.8</b> 56:16	acknowledge 58:1	56:10 60:1 61:15	59:14 67:13
8	action 18:10,10	64:14 65:10	amounts 56:12
<b>8.7</b> 14:17	71:13	advance 48:11	66:19
<b>80</b> 5:13 46:11 47:4	actions 15:8	<b>advanced</b> 20:14	analyses 33:18
49:3 50:4	active 16:4	28:13	34:1
<b>81</b> 47:8	actual 22:8 24:1	adverse 45:7	analysis 31:12
<b>814</b> 14:8	34:9 56:2 69:8	50:12 66:18	51:4,8
9	actuarial 13:5	advisers 54:10	<b>analyze</b> 61:21
<b>9.7</b> 8:14	30:2 31:7 33:15	59:3	analyzing 62:13
<b>90</b> 48:11	65:19 66:10	<b>advisor</b> 54:13 59:2 <b>aetna</b> 4:13	annapolis 12:17 anne 71:4
<b>95</b> 55:8	actuarially 38:13	<b>affairs</b> 53:20	
<b>9:00</b> 1:12	actuaries 21:12,13		<b>annual</b> 64:3
	30:5,6	<b>affect</b> 5:9 44:1	<b>annually</b> 14:14
a	actuary 1:3 2:4,5	49:3	15:5 38:11 59:15
<b>a.m.</b> 1:12 70:5	2:7 4:16,16,17,18 4:20 12:14 13:16	<b>affiliated</b> 54:9 59:3	62:3 <b>answer</b> 7:2 13:9
<b>aaron</b> 2:16 40:21	4:20 12:14 13:16 21:13 30:1 40:14		30:12 38:3 60:1
<b>aarp</b> 32:14 37:1,2		affordability 67:10	
37:13,14 38:15,21	53:15,21 60:2		68:12 69:2
<b>ability</b> 11:6 12:18	actuary's 7:21 8:7 adam 2:5 4:16	<b>affordable</b> 66:5	answering 58:21
45:14 66:7		<b>age</b> 45:14,17 46:8	anticipate 27:16
<b>able</b> 4:9 27:11	6:12 8:2,7 9:6 12:13	47:1,2,2,6,10	<b>anticipated</b> 22:9 22:11 24:10 32:2
49:5 65:20	add 45:5 53:8	58:13 63:17	
absorb 68:6		<b>aged</b> 45:12,20	55:15,17 65:15
absorbing 46:1	<b>addition</b> 35:17 40:19 44:3 47:21	46:5,12,15,19	<b>anticipating</b> 39:7 39:11
51:6 52:13	40:19 44:5 47:21 48:6 58:8	47:3,6,11,14	<b>anxious</b> 67:17
academy 12:14	<b>additional</b> 17:6	agent 48:8	
21:12 30:5		<b>agents</b> 48:6	<b>anybody</b> 9:7 19:7 21:1 29:14 69:16
acceleration 49:16	29:2,9,11 45:5 56:21 57:3 59:12	<b>ages</b> 56:4 <b>aggregate</b> 16:13	69:17
accentuate 9:7,16	65:12	<b>ago</b> 39:16,18 43:3	<b>anyone's</b> 69:3
accept 28:2		agree 26:21	· ·
accepted 33:15	additionally 56:2 address 40:20	agreed 68:3	<b>apologize</b> 53:15 60:15
access 59:3	49:1 54:13 56:10	agreement 5:17	· · -
accompanying	64:16	12:9 36:20	appearances 2:1 application 32:12
30:3	adequacy 59:14	<b>ahead</b> 39:6	32:17,18 33:1,5
accountability	adjourned 70:5	aid 8:18,20	35:1 36:14 39:14
68:18	adjust 58:4	<b>allow</b> 20:18 25:19	39:19,21
accountable 41:18	adjusting 58:7	<b>allows</b> 15:16 59:4	applications 30:4
66:12	adjustment 58:19	altogether 44:6	applied 39:16
accounts 12:20	administration	american 12:13	appreciate 7:15
accumulate 20:19	1:1,13 2:3 14:4	21:11 30:5	8:1 9:8,10 13:10
accumulated	15:13 26:2 30:12	<b>amount</b> 10:18	18:20 19:9 20:9
59:10	31:2,6,19 36:15	23:18 29:6 46:8	21:1 28:13 40:19
achieve 15:3	40:17 43:16 54:15	51:14 58:8,13	47:19 50:8 69:6
	40.17 43.10 34.13	51.14 50.0,15	41.17 JU.0 07.0

## [apprised - bye]

February 19, 2020

Page 3

apprised 12:12	assumptions 15:5	52:1 53:8	<b>better</b> 12:21 18:9
<b>approach</b> 5:15,16	15:20,21 16:12,15	baltimore 1:14	56:6 59:19
11:15,18 18:14	16:16 20:2 22:13	71:2	<b>beyond</b> 10:11 61:1
51:12	22:17,20 23:20	bankruptcy 65:2	<b>big</b> 12:1 68:5
appropriate 17:3	30:7,21 31:17	<b>based</b> 5:8 19:4,15	<b>billion</b> 36:11
<b>approval</b> 8:12,13	34:15 38:12 39:14	23:19,21 32:7	66:12
27:15 32:13,20	43:1 59:16 62:6	34:15 38:18 39:15	<b>bit</b> 38:2 51:6
<b>approve</b> 36:15	assured 35:4	66:11 67:12	blankets 18:14
52:7	<b>attained</b> 47:1 56:4	basically 27:20	<b>block</b> 13:18 20:1,3
approved 8:9,12	attempting 13:2	<b>basis</b> 8:20 28:15	22:8 26:11 27:10
27:19 35:7,14	attendees 40:20	28:16 31:7 34:19	28:9 29:6 59:8,9
51:20 52:2 58:9	attending 4:21 8:6	40:1,3 49:19,21	59:13 63:5
61:5	attention 7:15	<b>bear</b> 34:5	<b>blocks</b> 41:16 42:7
approves 44:12	9:14 67:8	<b>begun</b> 15:7	43:3,13 44:11
51:14	augment 15:5	<b>behalf</b> 21:15 40:15	<b>board</b> 66:17
approving 29:5	authority 37:17	44:20 46:4 64:13	<b>bought</b> 10:6
approximately	65:9	<b>believe</b> 13:11 32:3	break 11:16,19
24:9 32:15 36:11	authorized 21:14	33:1 42:1,2 43:14	27:2 28:17,20
39:18 48:5 52:2	35:19 65:13 66:19	43:16 44:13 45:6	50:17 51:2
59:11	automatically	56:20 59:18 63:8	brian 2:18 53:18
area 7:8	25:12	believed 43:1	<b>brief</b> 30:15 41:3
areas 31:5	available 7:19	believes 31:18	briefly 32:11,21
arguments 66:10	16:13 17:5,9 22:4	32:18 35:5 57:3	52:6
arundel 71:4	23:5,21 35:15	beligotti 2:16	bring 15:4 28:3
<b>aside</b> 23:4,16	36:4 41:14 46:7	40:14 50:20 52:16	67:18
<b>asked</b> 5:18 18:17	48:7 49:19,20	53:5	<b>broken</b> 18:5
18:17 50:3 52:5	55:3,16 56:7	<b>benefit</b> 2:13 5:7,9	brooks 1:15,21
asking 6:1 11:12	59:20 66:4	5:10 9:7,11 11:19	71:3,17
11:19 12:6 25:3	average 8:13	12:2 13:4 17:8,9	brought 28:5,19
<b>asks</b> 10:20	42:15 46:13,17	21:3,9,14 25:8,9	<b>bulk</b> 37:6
assess 11:14 30:21	47:5,8,13,16	25:12 35:20 36:5	business 13:18
assessed 50:2	56:14	46:7 48:3,14 58:6	18:1 20:1 32:15
assessing 50:10	b	58:6,11 59:4 60:9	33:17,18 34:2
<b>asset</b> 59:14	<b>b</b> 1:15,21 71:3,17	60:12 61:9,14	37:18 41:2,6,9
assist 32:21	<b>back</b> 15:1 20:18	benefits 17:13	43:4,13 44:11
assisted 8:19,21	67:18	25:8 30:8 32:5	49:14 56:11 59:8
<b>associate</b> 2:6 4:18	background 32:10	34:20 36:4 44:5	59:9,13 60:5
<b>assume</b> 44:20	32:10	45:5,18 52:12	61:10
<b>assumed</b> 34:10,11	<b>balance</b> 67:16,21	54:19 55:6,8,9	<b>busy</b> 62:12
34:13 52:19	68:18 69:2	56:6 58:4,19	<b>buy</b> 9:17
assuming 51:19	<b>balancing</b> 68:7	61:12 63:19	<b>bye</b> 70:4
assumption 16:3	<b>ball</b> 2:16 3:11	<b>best</b> 22:12 25:2	
23:10	40:13,15,21 49:8	55:16 59:5 63:14	
	49:15,20 51:13		
	77.13,20 31.13		

## [c - concern]

February 19, 2020

Page 4

c	caught 9:14	33:21 34:6 36:12	committed 17:1
<b>c</b> 53:18	<b>cause</b> 35:8 63:13	48:20 57:18,20	41:12
calculations 33:14	<b>cbul</b> 25:12	67:18	<b>common</b> 17:5
california 21:5	<b>center</b> 17:7 48:10	<b>clear</b> 61:19	communication
call 20:17 25:18	<b>century</b> 68:10	clearer 15:18	25:15
37:7 48:9	<b>ceo</b> 41:1	clearly 7:11 31:19	community 53:16
calling 7:12	<b>certain</b> 20:7,8	clicking 7:7	53:19
calls 25:3	22:21 31:4 36:19	clicks 7:9	companies 4:7
canceling 35:9	41:16 42:7	clients 58:17	8:10,12 9:12
cap 15:16 27:16	certainly 18:12	<b>climb</b> 27:11	11:12,18,19 24:13
capital 59:12	37:16 61:15 62:4	<b>close</b> 51:1,2	49:13 67:7,12
67:12,13	certainty 45:8	<b>closed</b> 26:11	68:9,12
<b>capitalized</b> 53:11	certificate 38:2	<b>closer</b> 45:17	<b>company</b> 2:11,12
care 1:2,11 3:4 4:3	40:6	<b>closing</b> 35:4 36:6	2:13,17,19 5:6,12
<b>care</b> 1.2,11 3.4 4.5 5:2 6:14 7:8 8:10	<b>certify</b> 71:5,7,10	<b>cmfg</b> 2:12 4:5 5:3	6:6 10:17 11:15
8:16 10:13 11:6	challenge 10:9	13:11,17 14:5,21	16:7 19:3,14
12:19,20 13:18	challenges 20:8	colleague 4:15,17	21:10,14,16 24:15
14:2 16:1 17:7,12	63:5	8:2 53:21 60:2	28:1,2 30:1 41:4,5
21:8,21 23:14	<b>chance</b> 20:21	<b>collect</b> 33:11	41:17 52:14 53:10
29:18 30:7 36:10	29:14	34:20	54:10,16 55:4
40:18 41:2,9,11	change 45:5	<b>collected</b> 23:12,15	56:9,19 57:2,5,7
41:14,16 42:7	changes 31:17	colloquial 38:2	57:17 58:10 59:7
53:9 54:8,14,18	changing 25:8	combination 24:5	59:12 62:11,18
55:5 57:19 58:8	characteristic	24:14 55:20	66:12 67:21 68:1
59:9 64:17,21	30:8	combined 34:14	68:6,7
65:1,21 66:5,5,7,9	charged 21:17	39:21	company's 16:6
67:8,10	24:3,13	combining 51:5	59:9 66:11
<b>careful</b> 31:11	<b>charles</b> 2:18 53:21	<b>come</b> 9:21 13:11	compare 8:16
<b>carrier</b> 44:14	<b>chief</b> 1:3 2:4,8	14:19 63:17	compared 9:3
<b>carriers</b> 8:4 9:19	4:20	<b>comes</b> 9:17 68:19	compatible 27:18
12:6,9 13:10	<b>choices</b> 11:6 66:6	comfortable 52:13	compelling 66:10
28:14,16 60:8	<b>choose</b> 25:10	coming 20:18	complaints 6:15
64:8 67:17	35:10,21	comment 53:9	complete 31:7
case 52:10	<b>citizens</b> 30:14 54:5	comments 6:8 8:2	completing 33:18
cases 43:8	<b>city</b> 71:2	9:20 11:11 30:15	complicated 6:10
	<b>claim</b> 9:14 16:13	54:6 68:16 69:4	comprehensive
<b>casualty</b> 4:14 <b>caswel</b> 60:10,13	16:18,19 24:4,4,5	69:16,20	21:20 41:13 54:11
	24:7 26:12 31:16	commission 66:21	54:18
60:18 61:3,9,20	36:5,9 40:7 45:18	71:20	computational
62:2,4,10,21 63:2 63:4	56:2 57:1	commissioner 2:6	59:4
<b>caswell</b> 2:18 53:14	claimants 33:10	4:10,18,20 14:1	concentrated
53:21	<b>claims</b> 9:13,16	17:14 54:2	11:21
<b>catch</b> 27:17 29:4	16:13 18:16 23:12	commissioners	<b>concern</b> 10:13
	23:18 24:10 33:10	64:15	44:7
39:4			

## [concerning - discussing]

Page 5

10.0	1. 07 C		1 4 4 10
concerning 12:3	correction 27:5	54:16 57:4 58:5	deputy 4:10
concerns 64:16	correspondence	59:20 60:4	description 30:16
concluded 38:16	28:4	<b>curve</b> 16:18	designed 22:10
concludes 36:16	corresponds	customer 17:7	48:4 55:10
38:14	28:17	25:18 58:20 59:2	despite 42:21
condition 39:10	<b>cost</b> 8:16,18,19,20	customers 30:14	<b>detail</b> 28:13
connection 25:16	9:2 10:11 11:8	customized 48:3	details 51:18
consequences	16:18 17:13 66:9	59:4	deteriorate 44:19
11:9 50:11 66:18	66:11	d	57:2
consider 10:21	<b>costs</b> 8:15 16:14	<b>d.c.</b> 40:4	determine 15:20
11:9 21:6 35:8,13	16:20 23:5 24:4,4	daily 25:8 58:6	34:3 44:4
66:18	24:10 65:19 66:5	damage 11:14	determined 38:19
consideration 9:4	<b>counsel</b> 71:10,11	data 8:17 16:9	42:6
25:13 41:21	country 63:7	24:1 55:16	developed 22:16
considering 53:1	county 71:4	date 48:13,19	42:1 55:16
69:7	<b>couple</b> 10:2,2,4	55:11 58:13,17	developmental
consistent 58:11	52:18 61:6 63:7	<b>dave</b> 4:18	11:5
consistently 16:11	course 58:1	david 2:6	dialogue 6:9 11:11
constitute 31:8	court 7:9	day 29:15 71:15	26:1 70:3
consulting 21:13	<b>cover</b> 68:2	days 48:11,12	<b>die</b> 23:3
consumers 6:8	coverage 5:11	58:17	difference 12:1
<b>contact</b> 6:12 58:21	9:17 21:19,20,21	<b>decades</b> 23:17	different 11:17,17
69:13	25:7,10,20 30:8	53:2	18:9,10 22:19
contacting 17:7	35:9,11,13,15	<b>december</b> 14:9,11	60:12
48:9	36:2,7 48:15 58:8	55:2	difficult 41:17
contingent 17:8	63:9,12 66:3	<b>decide</b> 48:16	45:15 47:20 58:2
46:6 58:10	<b>covers</b> 14:7,10	decision 14:18	difficulties 14:19
continuance 24:8	27:8	17:3 31:10 37:15	digits 64:5
24:9	<b>craig</b> 6:16	38:5 41:15,17	directly 10:16
continue 10:11	creates 23:6	44:1,20 45:9	34:5 48:8
16:17 20:19 44:18	credible 15:7 16:8	<b>decline</b> 24:2 26:11	<b>director</b> 13:16
53:6 57:2,21	cumulative 19:4	<b>decrease</b> 66:4	disabilities 11:5
continued 26:1	19:14 20:3 56:12	dedicated 25:18	disclosure 40:2
66:14	56:15 58:12 62:18	48:9 58:20	discontinue 23:2
continues 17:12	<b>curious</b> 49:14	<b>defined</b> 33:9	discriminatory
continuing 23:6	current 14:2,18	demonstrates	32:5
contract 37:21	20:1 22:12,12	31:20 32:19 33:3	<b>discuss</b> 14:2 18:11
contributed 24:12	34:15,17,19 35:16	department 35:19	18:13 21:8 25:19
conversation	39:15,21 43:5	54:2	37:16 38:4 42:3
28:20 67:18	44:3 45:9 48:5		48:9
<b>coon</b> 4:10	56:7 57:19	<b>depending</b> 5:7,10 61:4,13	discussing 18:9
<b>cooney</b> 2:6 4:18	currently 14:12	,	26:20 27:2 49:3
<b>correct</b> 13:13	21:16 23:21 27:13	<b>depth</b> 31:11 59:15 62:5	60:12
17:19 60:6	30:11 40:7 54:14	02.3	

Page 6

r			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
discussion 28:6	eliminate 44:7	excessive 32:4	facility 8:19,21
discussions 20:16	elimination 58:7	excluded 45:13	21:19
36:18	emerged 31:15	46:2	<b>fact</b> 34:17 40:2
distributable	39:20	excuse 19:6	43:9
59:10	emerges 16:17	<b>exempt</b> 12:17	fairclough 3:13
distributed 54:9	emerging 56:20	<b>expect</b> 15:14	4:6 64:10,12 67:3
distribution 18:15	59:15	26:10 28:4 38:17	69:4,5,6
dividends 66:13	employee 71:11	40:1 43:12 46:4	fairly 61:13 64:1,4
67:15	endorsement	60:16	families 11:3
documents 30:3	35:18,19 45:2	expectation 38:7	41:13 65:4 69:9
doing 12:16 18:14	<b>engage</b> 37:14	49:6	family 4:21 11:8
68:16 69:7	engaged 37:13	expectations	65:2 66:8
dollar 36:3	engaging 20:10	24:20	far 4:12 19:17,18
dollars 13:5	enjoying 4:11	<b>expected</b> 15:19,21	26:6 33:5 34:16
<b>dozen</b> 52:2	enrollment 26:10	16:21 18:15 22:14	51:20 52:3
<b>drive</b> 16:13	60:9	23:5,19 24:9 32:1	<b>father</b> 64:20
drives 16:20	<b>ensure</b> 45:16	43:4 56:2,3 57:13	favorable 22:9
<b>due</b> 4:20 55:20	entering 36:10	57:21	features 18:16
66:9	entertaining	expense 11:19	february 1:4,12
dwindled 26:15	18:19	experience 15:6,6	3:5 7:4 56:18 65:8
e	entire 20:1	16:7,14,17 18:5,8	<b>feel</b> 17:11 21:6
	equal 48:18	20:18 22:8 30:6	36:6 52:13
e 53:18 69:14	especially 11:7	31:12,16,21 34:3	<b>fellow</b> 21:12 30:4
<b>earlier</b> 52:5	36:9 45:17 53:1	34:14 35:9 38:9	<b>file</b> 21:15 24:15
<b>early</b> 21:5 23:4 29:16	56:3 63:16 66:8	38:11 39:20 42:9	31:10 38:17 60:15
	estimate 22:13	43:3 44:18 45:7	60:16
earned 23:18 24:1	26:18	50:12 52:10 56:3	<b>filed</b> 40:2 55:10
33:11	estimated 46:13	59:16 61:21 63:15	60:4
earnestly 10:20	46:17 47:4,8,13	experiences 56:20	filing 20:4 21:9
earning 59:10	evaluate 30:20	57:1	26:7,21 30:11,15
ears 6:16	evaluating 50:7	expires 71:20	31:1,5,6,19 32:10
economic 24:2	<b>event</b> 44:12	<b>explain</b> 6:7 32:11	33:3 36:15,20
edge 65:1	everybody 8:6	explained 34:8	37:3,5 39:15
educate 12:21	evolving 39:13	expound 31:4	51:19 60:20
effect 34:3 55:14	exactly 11:16,21	express 30:14 54:6	<b>filings</b> 5:8 9:5
65:11	50:21	66:21	10:16 14:3 17:18
effective 14:16,17	examine 38:9	extending 35:17	31:13 49:2 54:7
48:13 55:11 58:17	example 44:2	extent 16:7	54:14,20 55:3
effort 57:9 70:1	exceeds 34:17	extreme 62:5	56:18 67:4 69:14
efforts 12:20	excerpt 13:7	extremely 53:11	finally 17:1
either 23:1 48:8	excerpts 10:1	f	<b>financial</b> 11:13,14
48:13	excess 23:4 32:7		11:14 13:4 25:20
elect 48:13	33:6 35:2	<b>face</b> 35:11 68:17	26:13 41:7 50:10
elects 45:4		<b>faced</b> 17:2,10 44:2	52:15 54:10,12,12

## [discussion - financial]

## [financial - hoping]

Page 7

	1	1	1
59:1,3	<b>found</b> 13:8 69:3	29:17 40:15 53:17	21:21 66:5,15,15
financially 10:9	<b>four</b> 49:13 61:14	63:12 67:14	hear 7:14 13:19
50:19	64:21	<b>graded</b> 50:4,5	19:7
<b>find</b> 11:15 67:15	fourth 62:9	grand 26:19	heard 10:15 12:7
68:12,18	frame 55:4	granted 39:17	hearing 1:2,11 3:4
findings 34:1	fray 11:8 66:8	42:20 45:1	4:3 6:5 7:6 17:15
first 4:3,8,9 8:2	<b>free</b> 21:6 58:20	gravitas 67:5	32:13 40:18 54:4
13:18 26:8 27:4	frequency 33:21	gravity 69:8	66:20 69:18,19,21
31:18 43:19 44:13	frequent 57:8	great 13:14,21	70:5
54:1,8 55:21	<b>front</b> 50:21 51:10	19:11	height 26:9
fitting 16:8	<b>full</b> 11:12 25:10	greater 23:7 30:18	<b>held</b> 1:12 65:17
<b>five</b> 4:7 12:11 27:1	27:19 29:6 31:7	group 5:21 12:14	help 11:8 15:10
27:20 50:5 54:13	40:2 45:1 51:14	32:14 37:8,20,21	25:5 43:11,17
62:1	<b>fully</b> 15:7	38:3	48:1 57:10 65:3
<b>fixed</b> 10:4,14,18	<b>funds</b> 66:4	grow 16:19 53:6	66:8
45:15 65:5	<b>further</b> 38:16 71:7	57:21	<b>helpful</b> 7:17 32:11
focus 11:20	71:10	grown 11:5	42:4
<b>follow</b> 51:17 52:1	<b>future</b> 15:10 23:19	guarantee 37:12	helping 41:12
62:8	27:11 29:3 33:12	44:11,14 47:21	helps 7:19 10:15
following 8:15	34:2,15 43:12,21	51:11,21	51:9
48:12 65:13	44:4,7,17,19 45:4	guaranteed 27:20	hiatus 12:11 27:1
<b>force</b> 14:9,11 22:2	46:1 52:9 57:1	guaranteeing 5:17	61:1
31:16 33:16 34:2	66:4	guarantees 45:3	high 23:11 24:1
45:17	g	guess 40:10 52:13	25:2 64:1
forecast 24:11	<b>g</b> 21:11	<b>guy</b> 4:11	higher 16:14,14
forfeiture 35:18	<b>g</b> 21.11 <b>gap</b> 52:19 62:4	h	24:11 25:11 26:16
35:20 46:7	generally 34:12	<b>h</b> 53:18	28:18 34:9,12
forget 7:7	63:6	half 61:11 68:10	41:7 43:5,7,9
form 5:7 21:18,19	getting 63:16	hand 71:14	62:18
32:14 38:15 54:4	0 0	handout 6:12	highlight 31:4
54:19 55:2 56:13	<b>give</b> 9:21 15:18 20:3 45:7 60:2	hanover 4:13	highlighted 58:15
59:13 61:4 62:19	<b>given</b> 41:21 48:10		historically 27:15
63:18	50:8 56:14	happened 22:20 25:4	57:7
forms 18:7 22:4	glad 4:9,14	happening 12:13	<b>hit</b> 26:13
22:16 37:6 38:16	<b>go</b> 8:4 13:5 24:5	happens 23:3	hold 7:13 9:9,9
39:1 50:14 56:5	26:11 39:6 61:16	happy 17:16 18:11	holders 22:2 38:2
56:18 57:14	62:5 67:5	49:1 51:7 59:21	40:6
<b>forth</b> 58:12	<b>goal</b> 6:5 19:18	61:15	holding 56:1 61:7
fortunately 25:5	<b>goal</b> 0.3 19.18 44:6 54:10	hard 7:14	66:20
<b>forum</b> 7:2 30:13	<b>goes</b> 36:5	hardship 68:7,8	home 8:18,20 9:2
<b>forward</b> 26:1 50:8	going 22:19 65:20	headquartered	21:21 54:17 58:8
70:3	70:3	5:4	<b>hope</b> 30:18
foster 6:9	<b>good</b> 4:2,4 8:5	health 4:19 8:18	hoping 15:3
	13:15,20 21:7	8:20 10:19 12:19	
	13.13,20 21.7	0.20 10.19 12.19	

# [horrific - ip]

February 19, 2020

Page 8

horrific 65:2	40:3 50:16 54:5	16:18,20 17:2,10	insufficiency
<b>humbly</b> 59:17	inclusion 33:13	17:11 18:17 19:18	24:12
<b>hundred</b> 19:16	<b>income</b> 10:5,14,19	20:12 24:16 26:6	insufficient 24:3
22:14 26:14 62:18	11:13 28:16,19	29:9 30:18 34:21	insurance 1:1,13
68:3	45:15 50:14,16	35:12 36:21 37:12	2:3,12,15,16,19
husband 64:13,18	65:5 67:16,19,20	38:17 40:19 42:18	5:3,6,12 14:3
husband's 65:10	68:4	42:20 44:1,4,7	15:13 21:9,14
<b>hybrid</b> 12:21	<b>increase</b> 5:3 6:1,7	49:6,9 50:6 56:5	26:2 30:1,7,10,11
49:14,16,18	8:13 10:5,6,8,9,10	56:11,19,21 57:4	32:8 33:7 35:6
i	11:10 14:16,17	57:6,8,9 58:9	36:10 40:16,18
<b>idea</b> 37:1	16:20 17:4 19:4,4	59:17,18 61:1,5	41:2,4,5,6,9,11,16
immediately 53:3	19:14 20:2,13	63:7,12,19,21,21	41:17 42:8 43:16
impact 10:16	21:9,15,17 22:7	64:16 65:12,15	56:10 64:14 65:10
11:14 14:8,11	22:12,15 23:13	66:14,18	<b>insured</b> 27:8 28:1
22:1 24:17,18	24:17,20 25:2,17	increasingly 45:15	36:5 47:14
25:6 30:17 41:19	26:3,15,18 27:12	incremental 15:16	insureds 32:15
42:2 43:17,19	27:14,18,19 28:11	incurred 33:10	46:12,15,19 47:2
48:2 50:10 54:21	29:3,5,11 30:19	53:2 57:18 59:8	47:5,10
58:4 69:8	31:1,8,11,14,20	index 3:1	insurer 41:7
<b>impacted</b> 32:16	32:16,19 33:2,5	indicate 33:13	intend 15:2
48:10	34:16 35:5,8,14	indication 15:18	intended 43:10
impacts 6:4 57:10	36:1 38:13 39:8	individual 5:2,14	65:12
implement 24:15	39:11,17 41:15,20	27:7 59:1	intending 50:17
65:9	42:2,5,6,10,16	<b>industry</b> 15:6 16:1	intent 49:8
implemented	43:7,10,11,17,20	16:9 24:14	<b>interest</b> 5:19 16:3
14:14 56:11,17	44:3,12,17 45:1,3	inflation 5:11	16:6 23:14,18,19
65:13	45:9,13,20 46:9	11:20,20 12:2,3,4	23:20,21 24:1
implications 50:11	46:10,11,14,16,17	18:7 25:9 55:9	33:14 57:13,16
implies 50:19	46:19 47:4,5,7,9	61:11	63:14
importance 66:21	47:12,13,15,16,19	information 6:12	interested 6:8,13
important 4:21	48:2,12,17 50:4	31:14 39:15 59:1	18:18 29:19 71:13
6:9 14:21 40:20	51:1 52:2 54:14	69:15	interesting 20:16
43:9 45:6,21	54:17,20 55:20	informational 3:4	introduce 4:8,9
48:15 54:3	56:12,14,15,17	informed 45:8	invested 23:16
<b>importantly</b> 29:20	57:3,12 58:2,5,13	inhome 65:1	investment 11:13
importantly 25:20 improve 25:15	58:16,18 61:17	inhospitable	28:19 50:16 67:19
56:20	62:19 64:4 65:9,9	10:18	68:4
<b>improved</b> 17:4	65:18 66:11	initial 43:8	investments 23:19
incentives 12:17	increased 10:17	initially 32:1	investors 41:19
incidence 16:19	44:5 45:14 66:1	initiate 16:13	<b>invite</b> 25:17
24:6,8 64:4	increases 5:4,13	initiated 27:12	involved 37:14
<b>include</b> 30:16 58:5	5:18 8:10 12:10	28:10	iowa 5:5
including 11:13	14:13,15,20 15:4	innovation 12:14	<b>ip</b> 37:8
0	15:9,11,15,17,18		
30:14 31:16 35:12			

<b>iras</b> 12:18	<b>key</b> 15:21	levels 34:6,12	54:18 55:5 56:7
<b>issue</b> 6:10 47:1,2,6	kind 12:3,8 18:15	life 2:12,13,15,16	57:19 59:9,13
47:10 58:13,13	27:1 37:11 50:10	2:18 4:13,18 5:6	64:17,21 65:21
67:9	51:4 69:1	5:12,15 14:5,21	67:8
issued 26:7,8	<b>know</b> 7:13 10:14	15:1 16:4 21:9,14	longer 24:10 56:1
31:18 32:14 37:8	12:1,6,21 15:14	24:21 26:12 30:1	56:2
42:13,14	15:14 18:13 20:6	40:14,16 41:3,4,5	look 9:4 26:1 64:3
<b>issues</b> 6:10	20:7 28:15 29:2	41:5,6,7,8,18	67:11,16
items 24:11 55:21	36:19 38:10 40:6	44:17,19 45:11,19	looked 18:5 19:21
:	49:11 50:3 52:8	45:21 48:6 50:13	27:9 67:12
J	61:10 63:12,13,21	51:6 54:11 55:7	looking 12:14 13:9
january 4:11	67:3,13	life's 13:17 41:1	67:11 68:15
45:12 46:13,15,20	knowledgeable	52:21 53:6	looks 29:8 50:13
47:3,7,11,14	12:15	lifetime 16:21	51:5 62:17
<b>jay</b> 4:10	<b>kwei</b> 6:15	22:11,13 26:14	loss 15:1,1,21
<b>jeff</b> 2:7,16 4:15		28:16 29:8 32:7	16:21 19:5,16
6:13 19:1 29:1	l	33:12 34:4,6,18	20:4 22:7,11,13
39:6 62:16	lapse 16:2,10 17:8	43:5,7 44:10,14	26:14 28:15,17
<b>jeff's</b> 51:17	22:21 23:7 48:15	47:21 51:7,11	29:8 32:7 33:4,6,8
jeopardy 52:15	63:13	57:13,15 61:12	33:8,13 34:4,16
<b>ji</b> 2:7 4:15 19:1,12	lapses 23:3 52:11	63:19	34:18 35:1 39:12
19:20 29:1,7,13	52:17	<b>light</b> 31:14	43:5,6,7 55:13,15
39:4,7,10 51:11	large 26:17 52:20	lightly 14:19	57:13,15,19 66:11
51:16 62:16 63:1	63:12	limiting 57:6	68:2
63:3 64:6	larger 57:4 63:18	limits 42:2	losses 43:11,12
<b>john</b> 2:12 13:11	largest 41:4,5,10	<b>linc</b> 22:6	46:1,4 50:9 51:3,7
13:16	lasted 9:14	lincoln 2:13 5:9	52:14,20 53:2
<b>joined</b> 12:13	late 10:4 22:16	21:3,9,14	56:11 59:7,10
joint 27:7,7	49:12	<b>lines</b> 28:21	68:5,6
jonathan 2:15	law 32:9 33:7	links 7:8	<b>lot</b> 18:8 67:4 68:12
29:21	laws 35:6	listen 6:8	louisa 1:15,21
jurisdiction 40:3	<b>lawyers</b> 50:2	<b>little</b> 12:5 51:6	71:3,17
jurisdictions 40:3	<b>lb</b> 21:18,18,18,19	<b>live</b> 33:20 53:20	<b>low</b> 64:4
<b>justifiable</b> 38:13 38:13	21:20,21 leave 5:19	living 8:19,21 10:4	lower 16:11,16
justified 32:19	leaves 10:9	10:14 56:1	23:9 24:2 34:11
35:6 57:5		<b>long</b> 1:2,11 3:4 4:3	56:6
	legislators 67:7 length 24:7	5:2 7:8 8:10 12:19	<b>ltc</b> 12:15,18 42:11
k	U	12:20 13:18 14:2	42:11,12,14,16,17
<b>k</b> 12:18	lengthening 58:7 letter 17:4 58:16	16:1 17:12 21:8	42:18,19 46:11,21
<b>keep</b> 7:3,10 9:4	65:7	23:14 29:18 30:7	47:17
25:7,10 31:3	letters 25:3	30:10 33:20 36:10	<b>ltci</b> 24:13
33:19 35:16 44:6	level 13:3 25:9,11	40:18 41:1,9,11	
45:16 48:4 63:16	27:18 34:21 35:16	41:14,16 42:7	
	27.10 57.21 55.10	53:9 54:8,11,13	
		1	1

## [mail - needed]

February 19, 2020

Page 10

	1 1 7 7	26 11 64 17 10	1.1.1.
m	marylanders 5:5	36:11 64:17,18	morbidities 63:17
<b>mail</b> 69:14	5:11,14 6:2 8:11	65:7,12 66:1,12	morbidity 16:2,14
<b>maine</b> 13:1,2	12:4	67:11	33:21 34:12 52:19
maintain 35:11	materially 32:1	metlife's 30:10	55:17
36:1	43:4 44:1	31:5,8,10 35:9	morning 4:2 8:5
<b>major</b> 22:19	matter 4:21	36:14	13:15 21:7 29:17
majority 23:15	maximum 25:8	metropolitan 2:15	38:3 40:15 53:17
35:10 37:9	<b>mcintire</b> 1:15,21	30:1	mortality 16:1,10
making 17:7 44:1	71:3,17	mia 7:6 8:8,9	33:20 34:10
54:2	mean 27:13	29:18	mother 65:1
manage 17:5	meaning 55:12	<b>middle</b> 20:12	<b>moved</b> 28:14
manageable 15:16	meaningfully 66:6	<b>million</b> 9:15 57:17	muehlberger 6:15
53:1	means 11:16,16	57:18 59:11,13	multiple 35:14
management	13:8 34:19 36:2	67:14	multiplied 24:6
13:17 33:16	44:15	<b>mind</b> 7:10 31:3	<b>music</b> 7:14
march 71:15	<b>median</b> 8:17,18	68:20	<b>mute</b> 7:13 9:9 19:8
<b>market</b> 5:21 36:10	9:2	<b>mine</b> 4:15,17	<b>mutual</b> 41:5,17
41:14 49:12	<b>meet</b> 20:12 22:6	minimize 25:6	n
marketplace 56:7	25:20 59:5	66:19	<b>n</b> 21:11,11
59:20	meeting 4:11 48:8	minimum 15:1	<b>name</b> 7:16 8:6
martin 4:6	<b>meets</b> 32:20	22:7 32:8 33:6	13:16 21:10 22:6
mary 6:15	<b>member</b> 21:11	34:17 35:3 55:13	29:20 40:21 53:18
maryland 1:1,11	30:5	minnesota 5:8	named 71:5
1:13,14 2:3 4:6	<b>members</b> 13:3,6	<b>minus</b> 36:3	nation's 41:4
5:9 6:4 8:16,17	17:18,19 18:8	miscalculations	<b>national</b> 8:17,20
9:2,5 10:3 11:4	26:7,10,11,15,19	65:20	9:3,12
14:3,13 15:7	27:1 29:19 32:14	<b>missed</b> 60:15	nationally 12:13
17:19 18:1 19:17	49:4,5	mitigate 15:10	12:17 69:3
22:5 25:13 26:2	membership 26:9	30:17 43:12,17	nationwide 27:14
27:5,10 29:5	memoranda 30:2	48:2 57:10 58:4	42:10 43:15 48:7
30:11,13 32:8,20	memorandum	modeling 26:8	51:12,13,19 55:5
33:4,7 34:18 35:2	34:8	50:8	60:8 63:3,4,19
37:3,7 40:6,16	mental 10:20	<b>modest</b> 10:18 11:3	near 15:4 20:3
42:12,16 43:16	66:15	65:6	nebraska 5:9
44:12 49:4 51:12	mention 5:16	<b>modify</b> 35:15	necessary 23:13
54:5,17 55:3,12	mentioned 19:3	moment 19:6	30:19 35:5 42:7
56:9,15 57:6,14	19:13 29:2 32:18	<b>money</b> 33:14	57:3
57:19 58:12 60:4	36:21 43:14 46:18	<b>monies</b> 33:10,11	<b>need</b> 6:20,21
60:5,17 62:21	52:17 68:15	monitors 33:17	10:12 12:5 24:15
63:1 64:14 65:5	<b>met</b> 9:20	<b>month</b> 47:5,8,13	29:10 38:16 44:4
65:17 66:16 68:1	metlife 5:21 29:16	<b>monthly</b> 46:14,17	45:8 60:16 61:8
68:2,5 71:1,4	29:18,20 30:20	moratorium 20:17	needed 15:4 17:12
maryland's 35:6	31:18 32:13,18	61:1	23:17 26:16 31:20
	33:17 35:5 36:8		38:8,19 49:7
			50.0,17 77.7

[needing - piqued]

Page 11

nooding 40.1	accurred 57.20	50.5 61.16 66.2	noving 7.15 22.1 9
<b>needing</b> 40:1	occurred 57:20	59:5 61:16 66:2	<b>paying</b> 7:15 23:1,8
<b>needs</b> 25:21 59:6	occurs 10:12,13	order 6:21 25:15	23:11 26:12 34:19
68:14	october 31:6	26:12	35:21
<b>net</b> 28:16 50:14	38:14,18 54:21	organization 7:17	payout 9:15
67:16	55:11	original 15:1	penalty 12:19
network 54:9	odenton 10:2	16:11,15,16 22:10	pending 14:3
<b>never</b> 44:16	offer 35:14 44:14	24:12 39:19,21	54:14
<b>new</b> 2:16 4:10	49:14,15 55:8	43:6 55:21 56:16	pensions 11:2
5:12,12,12,15 6:1	58:3,10 68:19	originally 22:9,16	<b>people</b> 6:20 9:16
26:8 27:12,14	offered 55:5	24:11 37:8 43:2	9:18 10:16 22:21
40:14,15 41:1,3,5	offering 41:13	55:15	23:11 24:5 26:18
41:8,18 44:17,19	offers 66:2	outcome 71:13	55:21 63:10 66:14
45:11,19,21 48:6	office 1:3 4:16,17	outlined 48:1	66:16 69:9,9,13
48:13 51:5 52:21	7:21 8:7	outside 41:19	<b>percent</b> 19:16
53:5	<b>officer</b> 53:15	overall 15:19	22:14 62:18 68:3
<b>non</b> 35:18,20 46:7	official 31:9	16:10 34:8 47:16	percentage 22:21
noncancelable	<b>offset</b> 65:19	57:15	performance 28:9
52:8	okay 27:4 29:7,13	oversight 30:2	33:17 34:2
nonforfeiture	40:9,11 52:4 63:1	overview 41:3	performed 52:9
17:9 58:11	69:18	42:4	<b>period</b> 5:7,10
<b>nonlife</b> 62:19	<b>older</b> 16:19 41:16	owns 44:15	11:20 20:18 25:9
nonlifetime 54:19	42:7 45:12 46:5	р	52:20 53:2 58:6,7
notarial 71:14	46:19 47:11,14	<b>p</b> 53:18	60:9
<b>notary</b> 1:15 71:3	51:2 56:3	page 3:7 67:5	periodic 33:18
71:18	<b>once</b> 26:21 36:20	paid 9:13 33:10	permitted 35:6
<b>note</b> 14:21 43:9	62:1	36:2,3,11 48:18	persistency 31:16
45:21	<b>ones</b> 60:2	48:18,20 67:15	33:18 34:9 55:17
<b>notice</b> 20:14 25:1	<b>open</b> 6:16 7:1,3	pain 63:10	personalized
28:14 48:11 60:8	18:4,9,12 27:2	<b>painful</b> 61:11,13	25:19
noticed 18:6	60:11 69:20,21	parameters 34:5	perspective 11:18
notification 58:16	openness 26:20	parentheses 10:20	peters 2:8
november 9:20	37:11 38:8	part 9:19 33:16	<b>phone</b> 2:12 4:4 9:8
71:21	opinion 32:2	59:15 62:4	9:8 13:12 19:7
<b>number</b> 13:6 23:8	opportunity 8:1	participate 17:15	21:4 64:8 69:16
26:14,18 27:9	14:2 17:15 21:8	40:17 54:3	70:4
36:19 37:4 58:20	30:9 36:13 40:17	particular 37:5	phones 7:13
60:21	40:19 48:21 54:1	<b>parties</b> 6:9 71:11	physical 10:19
numbers 50:20	54:3 59:21 64:15	71:12	66:15
numerically 26:15	69:10	<b>paul</b> 1:13	<b>pick</b> 6:17 60:21
nursing 9:2 54:17	<b>option</b> 17:9 48:8	paul 1.13 pay 12:19 23:12	<b>pieces</b> 18:6
0	48:14	23:18 25:11 44:5	<b>pietsch</b> 2:18 3:12
<b>o</b> 21:11,11	<b>options</b> 17:5,6	45:14 48:13 65:18	53:15,17,18 60:6
objections 19:3,13	25:5,16,19 35:15	65:20 66:1,4	piqued 5:19
62:17	48:4,9 58:3,5,15	05.20 00.1,7	
02.17			

[place - proposing]

Page 12

	1		1
<b>place</b> 1:14 64:21	policy's 59:1	47:17	43:6,8 55:21
71:6,6	policyholder 15:8	premium 10:5	<b>prior</b> 14:15 42:8
<b>plan</b> 15:19 27:13	16:2,5 17:13	13:4 17:6 21:17	55:11
49:9	37:21	25:11 26:12 32:3	private 9:1
planning 54:12	policyholders	33:11 34:21 36:3	proactively 17:4
<b>plans</b> 12:21	14:8,11,20 15:13	40:18 41:15,20	<b>problem</b> 68:17
<b>play</b> 63:17	16:12,19 17:2,10	42:5,6,15,18,20	problems 11:21
<b>please</b> 6:18 7:12	17:21 23:6,8,10	43:10,17,20 44:3	67:10
7:16 19:8 31:3	24:18 25:1,6,13	44:4,5,7,11,12,16	procedural 6:11
35:4 64:9 68:21	25:16,17 27:5,9	45:3,9,13,19 46:3	proceed 7:14
69:13,16	27:10 29:19,20	46:9,10 47:19,21	proceedings 4:1
<b>point</b> 8:8 13:3	33:12,19,20 35:8	48:2,11,13,17	71:5,7,9
25:14 49:5 56:4	35:10,12,21 36:9	49:19,21,21 52:8	<b>process</b> 26:3 30:20
pointed 8:6	38:1 52:12 54:6	54:14 55:20 56:16	38:14 62:5
points 10:1	54:11 55:1 56:15	57:18 58:9,16,18	<b>product</b> 13:17
<b>policies</b> 10:10 14:7	57:10,14 58:2,3	<b>premiums</b> 10:7,18	14:6,7,7,9,16 15:3
14:10,13 18:6	58:10 59:5 63:9	22:1 23:1,4,9,9,12	16:17 17:12,20,21
22:2 24:18 26:6	63:13 64:17 66:13	23:14,16 24:3,13	18:14,16 22:6,10
27:6,6,7,7,8 31:12	policyowner 44:2	24:19,20 25:7	23:21 42:17,17,18
33:4,19 34:7,10	44:15 45:4 48:16	32:6 34:6 35:16	42:19 50:21 51:3
35:2 36:2 37:1,2,7	policyowners	35:17,21 43:21	67:20 68:10
42:9 44:8,9,18	41:12,18,20 42:3	45:14 48:4,5,18	products 14:15
45:16 46:2 54:9	43:18,20 44:2,8	55:1 56:6 57:21	16:15 18:2 20:5
54:18,19 55:5,6,6	44:21 45:2,7,12	58:18 59:5 65:19	42:21 43:2 49:14
55:7,8,10 56:1	45:13,16,20 46:3	65:21 66:1,2	49:16,16,17,18
57:19 59:18,19	46:5,8 47:20 48:3	prepared 36:16	56:7
60:4 61:12 63:11	48:7,10,15	<b>present</b> 30:9 50:14	professional 32:2
63:19 64:2 65:21	population 27:14	69:10	<b>profits</b> 66:16
policy 21:18,19	portfolio 16:2,6	presentation	proforma 11:13
22:2,4,15 23:1,2,3	portion 43:12	30:16 31:4	projected 34:3,5
23:7 24:3,21	portions 33:3	presents 31:7	34:18 42:8 46:1
25:20 26:7,13	position 68:6	president 29:21	projecting 34:2
27:8 31:15,17,21	possibility 24:19	41:1 53:16,19,21	projection 40:1
32:14 37:6,8 38:3	43:21	pressing 69:1	projections 34:15
38:15,16 39:1	possible 58:19	pretty 51:1 61:11	proposal 37:17
42:10,11,12,13,14	67:8	previously 32:17	42:1,3 50:7,11
44:6,15,18 45:2,5	potential 44:3	35:18 36:3 43:14	proposals 12:16
46:12,14,17,21	45:18	46:18	43:15 48:1
47:17 48:3,17,18	potentially 53:6	<b>price</b> 23:20	proposed 30:17
48:19 55:2 56:5	practice 33:15	<b>priced</b> 18:15 22:6	32:3,6 42:5 44:10
56:13,18 57:14	prefund 23:5	34:10 43:2 55:13	45:11,19 46:6
58:14 61:4 63:8	<b>prem</b> 6:16	55:15	47:21 51:13
64:18,19,21 65:10	premier 42:11,14	pricing 16:11,15	proposing 5:6,13
65:18	42:17,19 46:21	16:16 34:11,13	31:14

## [protect - reply]

February 19, 2020

Page 13

protect 41:12	<b>quoted</b> 17:6	39:12 43:5,6	references 33:12
protection 25:9	quotes 67:6	55:13 57:15,19,20	<b>referred</b> 23:7 24:6
proud 36:7	r	66:11,11 68:2	24:7
provide 11:12		rationale 22:15	referring 19:2
17:5,12 30:18	raise 52:8	<b>ratios</b> 15:1,2,4,21	33:2
35:20 42:4 45:2	range 50:6 56:13	16:21 33:8 34:18	regarding 64:16
51:18 55:6 56:6	<b>ranged</b> 55:17	43:7 55:15 57:13	regardless 46:8
58:19 63:12 69:15	rate 5:18 6:7 8:9	<b>reach</b> 5:17 10:12	58:12
provided 25:12	8:13 9:5 10:10	12:9 27:18 36:20	regulations 35:7
32:5 36:6,8 59:12	11:9 14:2,5,13,15	react 7:5	regulatory 16:3
59:19	14:18,20 15:2,3,9	<b>read</b> 10:1 68:16	17:8
provides 21:19,20	15:10,15,16,18	<b>real</b> 66:14 68:7	reinsurance 53:14
21:21	16:3,4 17:2,3,10	69:9,10	reinsure 27:11
providing 30:13	17:11 18:10,10,17	reality 22:18	reinsured 27:13
41:3 48:3 54:4	19:4,14 20:2 21:8	realized 63:15	reinsurer 28:4,8,9
<b>public</b> 1:15 3:4	21:15,17,17 22:12	<b>really</b> 4:14 7:14	<b>related</b> 71:12
7:3 29:19 53:20	22:15 23:13,21	7:15 9:17	<b>relating</b> 31:5,12
69:20 71:3,18	24:15,17 25:17	<b>reason</b> 34:4 45:18	31:21
<b>pull</b> 67:5	26:2 27:12,17,19	55:19	relation 32:6
purchase 22:5	28:8,11 29:3,5,9	reasonable 17:13	<b>relations</b> 53:16,19
55:3	29:11 30:10 31:8	22:17 32:6 33:2	relationship 54:12
pursues 57:7	31:10,19 32:16	43:1 68:11	relative 52:21
<b>put</b> 5:20 7:13 9:9	33:6 34:16,19,21	reasons 6:7	55:21
19:8 50:7,17	35:11,14 36:1	recalculate 38:12	relatively 13:4
68:17 70:2	38:13,16 39:8,11 39:17 49:9 51:1	<b>recall</b> 39:16	26:17
putting 52:14	51:11,21 52:2	<b>receive</b> 25:1 48:17	relay 49:6
q	54:14,17 55:12,19	66:13	relays 52:5
qualifiers 33:13	56:5,11,14,17,19	received 14:15,16	released 15:8
quantify 50:13	56:21 57:4,6,8,9	36:4 57:17 65:7,8	relentless 12:8
<b>quarter</b> 62:9,10	57:12 58:1,4,9	recognize 43:19	<b>relies</b> 16:3
62:11,12	59:17 61:1 62:19	recommend 48:14	<b>rely</b> 16:6
quarterly 4:3	64:16 66:14,18	<b>record</b> 7:3,20 71:9	remain 24:21 32:1
69:19	rates 12:9 16:2,7	recorded 71:8	33:5 37:7 41:11
question 7:1 17:17	16:10 22:21 23:14	recoup 43:11 50:9	43:7
19:1,12 26:10,20	23:19,20 24:6,8,8	recurring 49:21	remainder 39:18
27:21 38:4 40:5	24:9 25:1 33:19	redmer 14:1 17:14	remaining 23:9
51:18 52:5 60:7	33:20,21 34:9,10	reduce 11:6 25:6	49:4
questions 7:2	52:7,8	44:5 66:2,6	remarks 36:16
17:16 26:3 28:21	rating 41:8	reduced 45:19	remind 7:7 10:15
30:12 49:1 60:1	<b>ratio</b> 19:5,16 20:4	46:3	69:18
69:17	22:7,11,13 26:14	reducing 58:5	reminder 37:21
quick 7:8	28:15,17 29:8	66:2	repeat 19:10
quite 22:18	32:7 33:4,6,8,9,13	<b>reduction</b> 48:4,14	<b>reply</b> 36:18
-	34:4,16 35:1		

## February 19, 2020

## [reported - significantly]

Page 14

	Ι	Ι	
reported 1:21	respect 45:9 57:5	<b>rough</b> 37:1	sense 52:16 61:8
reporter 7:10	62:12 66:9	round 27:12 39:7	sensitivities 52:18
represent 53:9	respectfully 36:14	39:11	sensitivity 52:9
representative 4:5	responding 11:10	<b>rounds</b> 27:17	<b>sent</b> 58:16
58:21 59:2	25:3	29:11	series 5:4 14:12
representatives	<b>response</b> 19:2,12	<b>rsvp</b> 6:20,21	15:17 20:11 42:10
2:11 6:6 29:18	36:1 48:17 62:17	<b>run</b> 25:2	42:11,12,13,14
representing	responsibility	S	44:9,16 46:12
13:17	30:2	<b>s</b> 21:11 53:18	47:1,17
request 14:18 22:1	responsible 65:18		seriously 11:9
27:19 28:11 31:9	<b>rest</b> 52:14	sample 58:18	66:17
36:15 41:15 46:2	restate 7:16	satisfy 55:13	serve 15:9
47:1 49:9 51:15	result 10:11 15:8	savings 11:3 12:20	service 25:18 36:8
54:21 65:12,15	34:14 42:8,9	65:6	58:20
requested 8:11,12	resulted 24:14	saw 9:11 26:8	set 23:4,16 32:8
15:17 22:8,12	resulting 24:10	28:12	58:12 71:6
27:15 29:6 31:8	66:10	saying 65:8	seven 8:10,12
32:19 33:1,5 35:1	results 16:12	scared 63:11	seventies 10:4
35:5 42:10,15,21	retired 10:4,14	scenario 20:11,20	11:2 49:12 65:4
43:6,10 44:13	11:2 65:5	50:4,5 60:19,20	severity 33:21
46:3,10 47:17	return 68:11	61:2,2,3	share 6:14,19 7:20
55:19 56:5,21	revenue 26:17	scenarios 52:10	15:3 45:6 51:7
57:12 58:9 64:16	review 15:5 32:17	schedules 32:4	63:9 67:5,6,7
66:10,19	32:21 59:15	scope 32:11	68:21
requesting 5:3,10	reviewed 15:20	seal 71:14	<b>shared</b> 59:7
14:12 21:16 27:17	59:14	second 45:11 52:4	shareholders
46:11,16,18 47:4	reviewing 9:4	security 65:6	66:13
47:7,12,15 54:16	revisions 33:7	<b>see</b> 12:3 16:18	sharing 50:12
54:20	revisit 38:11	26:5 28:1 52:12	shortening 58:6
requests 14:5	<b>richer</b> 55:6	63:17 67:19,20	shortly 38:17
29:12 45:10	right 13:12 20:15	seek 29:2 62:18	shouldered 68:13
required 30:21	28:7 37:15 60:10	seeking 19:3,14	shows 35:9
33:6.15	67:11,14,16,21	32:13 63:18	side 5:14
requirement 32:8	69:2,2	seen 20:1	sides 9:21
35:3 55:14 58:11	rising 66:5	<b>select</b> 42:11,11,12	sight 12:10
requirements 22:7	<b>risk</b> 15:3 44:20	42:14,16,17,18,19	sign 6:18,21
32:20 34:17 55:12	67:12 68:11	46:11,21 47:17	0
		selected 66:3	signature 71:17
<b>resembling</b> 61:16	<b>risks</b> 30:7,21 68:9	selling 49:13	<b>significant</b> 24:18 36:7 37:5 51:4
<b>reserves</b> 15:8 16:5	risky 68:10 riversource 2:18	<b>senior</b> 4:16,17	
23:5,16 53:9,10		22:6 29:21 40:13	68:5,9
59:14	5:6,8 53:14,20	40:21 53:16,19	significantly
reset 38:12	riversource's 54:8	<b>seniors</b> 4:6 6:4	28:18 43:9 52:19
residents 65:17	<b>room</b> 9:1 69:17	9:21 12:7 68:2	66:3

			4
similar 20:17	<b>spelled</b> 21:10 53:18	submit 7:5,6	tact 60:12
33:13 35:16 60:7		<b>submitted</b> 14:5	take 6:14 11:6
similarly 9:1	spoke 38:1	36:16 43:15 54:21	17:16 25:11 50:15
single 32:14 49:19	<b>spot</b> 50:17	subsequent 49:9	54:1 66:7 67:4
49:20 60:16 61:2	spread 61:5 63:20	subsidizing 46:4	taken 18:13 30:17
61:17,19 64:4	spreading 63:20	substantial 57:9	64:19
situation 11:4	st 1:13	suite 1:14 41:13	talented 4:11
65:3	stability 55:12	supplemented	talk 12:11 20:11
six 7:18	stabilization 15:2	16:8	22:19 27:21
size 52:21	staff 2:3,8 64:15	<b>support</b> 30:3 36:14	talked 50:2,3
slightly 24:11	stand 5:3 49:12,15		talking 6:3 13:2
<b>slope</b> 16:18	standalone 41:11	supported 23:7	18:4
slower 7:11	standard 15:21	<b>supporting</b> 11:4	target 15:4 20:4
small 13:3,5,6	start 4:4 21:6 33:2	<b>sure</b> 13:19 28:12	29:8 43:8
smaller 37:6 57:7	41:2	53:4 63:10	targeting 20:2
social 65:5	started 4:10 10:7	<b>surf</b> 28:12,13	targets 26:13 64:2
society 21:12 30:4	49:11 63:18	36:18 37:11 50:3	tax 12:17
sold 14:7,10 18:1	starting 29:15	<b>surplus</b> 52:21 53:6	team 14:1 25:18
24:19 55:7	state 27:18 51:14	67:13	technical 38:2
solutions 41:14	65:17 71:1,4	svedberg 2:12 3:8	telephone 2:14
somebody 19:7	stated 56:19	13:11,13,15,16,21	ten 12:2,11 60:21
song 2:13 3:9 11:1	statement 50:9	17:20 18:12 19:9	61:16 68:1
21:7,10 27:4 28:7	states 12:15 13:1	19:10,21 20:15	tensions 25:2
29:4,10,15	19:15 20:5,5,6,8	21:2	term 1:2,11 3:4
sons 11:5	20:16 51:19,20	switzer 2:4 4:2 9:6	4:3 5:2 7:8 8:10
sorry 21:4 28:8	68:15	13:14,20 17:17	12:19,20 13:18
39:9	statistically 16:8	18:3,20 19:6,17	14:2 16:1 17:12
sought 63:6	statistics 9:12,12	20:9,21 21:3 26:5	21:8 23:14 29:18
sound 50:18	statute 57:6	28:3,12 29:14	30:7,10 33:8 36:10 40:18 41:1
sounds 50:16 51:1	statutory 16:4	36:17 37:10,19	
source 15:10	stay 12:12,15 24:7	38:6,18 39:2,6	41:9,11,14,16 42:7 53:9 54:8,13
<b>speak</b> 5:15 6:18 6:19,21 7:11,16	stenographically 71:8	40:12 49:2,11,18 50:1 51:9 53:13	42.7 55.9 54.8,15 54:18 55:5 56:7
8:1 32:21 59:21		60:3,7,11,14,19	57:19 59:9,13
64:9	stepped 68:13		64:17,21 65:21
	steps 30:16	61:7,18,21 62:3,7	67:8
speakers 3:7	<b>stop</b> 12:10 15:15	62:14 64:7 67:2	<b>terminate</b> 48:16
<b>speaking</b> 53:14 64:13	23:1,8,11 26:12 35:21	69:12	terminate 48:16 termination 48:19
		t	terms 13:5 37:17
special 41:21	<b>strength</b> 41:8 <b>stroke</b> 64:20	t 53:18	46:10 68:1
specially 58:20 specific 33:3		tab 7:8	<b>test</b> 52:9
specifically 16:6	<b>study</b> 34:4 38:11 38:19	table 6:17 7:2 17:5	test 52:9 testify 36:13
52:17 54:2		39:3	•
32.17 34.2	<b>subject</b> 31:13 32:12 55:2	tackling 67:10	<b>testimony</b> 7:5 33:9 38:1 52:7
	52.12 55.2		50.1 52.1

## [thank - website]

February 19, 2020

Page 16

<b>thank</b> 7:10 13:8	71:6	29:2,8,11 39:18	utilization 52:11
13:15 14:1 17:14	times 20:17	42:10 44:11 51:5	52:18
		42.10 44.11 51.5 60:9	utilizes 52:12
18:3 20:9,21 21:1 21:2,7 26:5 29:13	timing 62:8		
	today 4:8,19 5:1,8	tying 61:18	V
30:12 36:13,17,17 38:6 40:11,16	7:4 41:7,10 49:1,3 51:20 54:13 55:7	<b>type</b> 37:15 44:14 <b>types</b> 61:10,14	valuable 63:8
48:21 49:2 51:9		• •	valuation 16:4
48.21 49.2 51.9 51:16 53:12 54:1	56:8 59:21	<b>typically</b> 18:13,17 38:14 56:13 57:7	<b>value</b> 9:7,11 33:14
54:4 59:20 60:14	today's 17:15 32:12	38:14 30:13 37:7	36:6 50:14 59:19
		u	valued 30:14 54:5
62:14 64:6,12,14	todd 2:4 8:6 52:5 toll 58:19	<b>u.s.</b> 41:7	vantage 10:1
66:19 67:1,2 69:9 69:12 70:1	tool 59:4	ultimate 19:18	variety 58:3
		ultimately 10:11	various 55:20
thanks 8:5 9:6,10	top 68:1	16:20 38:5	61:16
19:9 29:15,15 39:2 40:13 53:13	topic 40:20	underlying 30:20	vary 56:12 61:9
	total 20:3 52:21 53:10	31:17	vast 35:10 37:9
60:3 64:7 70:3,3		underpinning	<b>vein</b> 50:18
thing 11:17 20:10	touched 52:6	67:20	<b>version</b> 14:6,7
things 6:11 8:8	tough 60:2	understand 14:19	vice 29:21 41:1
10:3 18:3 50:2	tracking 15:7	15:15 35:7 37:2	53:16,19,21
think 20:19 32:11	traditionally	41:19 43:21 65:16	<b>views</b> 30:10,15
37:10 51:3 61:13	62:11	68:14	39:21 54:6
63:11 69:3	trained 58:21	understanding	virtually 17:21
<b>third</b> 41:4,10 46:6	transcript 7:18	30:19 69:7	voluntarily 23:2
62:10,11,12	67:6 71:8	understood 37:10	<b>vp</b> 40:13,14 53:15
thought 42:4	transparencies 6:6	37:19	53:16
thoughtfulness 70:2		unequivocally	W
	transparent 15:12	68:8	want 5:15 13:18
<b>thoughts</b> 6:13,17 6:20 50:18 68:21	<b>traveler's</b> 4:12 <b>trend</b> 2:15 3:10	unfairly 32:4	15:12 27:4 38:8
69:17	29:16,17,21 37:4	<b>unfold</b> 5:20	39:4 45:15 54:1
three 5:4 7:18	37:16,20 38:10,21	unfortunately	63:20 69:14
14:13,14 39:16,20	39:9,13 40:8,10	57:1	wanted 8:8 10:1
50:6 61:14 63:21	trigger 28:10	uniformity 36:21	63:9,10 67:3
<b>tiered</b> 47:1	triggering 25:14	<b>unique</b> 5:16 42:1	wants 15:14
time 4:9 6:14	troublesome 67:9	unlimited 12:2	washington 13:1
10:12,13 15:1	true 71:9	unlocking 62:5	40:4
21:6 22:10,17,20		<b>unlocks</b> 62:11	way 12:8 63:11
23:17 24:7 33:14	<b>try</b> 7:10 50:13 67:7,18	<b>update</b> 69:14	71:12
	trying 12:12,15	updated 59:16	ways 11:10
36.0 10.12 12.1		<b>urge</b> 66:17	_
36:9 40:13 43:1		0	we've 18.13.16.17
49:5,10 52:20	13:7 14:21 20:6	<b>use</b> 35:17 61:2	<b>we've</b> 18:13,16,17 20:1 16 63:4
49:5,10 52:20 54:3 55:4,7,14,16	13:7 14:21 20:6 67:15 68:12,17	0	20:1,16 63:4
49:5,10 52:20 54:3 55:4,7,14,16 56:19 57:2,4,9	13:7 14:21 20:6 67:15 68:12,17 <b>turned</b> 22:18	<b>use</b> 35:17 61:2	20:1,16 63:4 wealth 66:15
49:5,10 52:20 54:3 55:4,7,14,16	13:7 14:21 20:6 67:15 68:12,17	use 35:17 61:2 uses 30:20	20:1,16 63:4

## [wednesday - zimmerman]

wednesday 1:4,12	57:6 60:9,21 62:2
7:4 69:19 70:1	62:5 65:13,18,18
week 7:4 69:21	66:1 67:14
weeks 7:18	yearly 50:6
weighted 56:16	years 9:15 10:7
welcome 4:3 6:19	14:14 23:15 27:20
26:3 30:9 64:10	30:6 31:15 36:19
70:2	39:16,18,20 41:6
wellbeing 10:20	41:10 43:3 50:5,6
<b>went</b> 65:11	59:11 61:6,17
<b>willing</b> 20:19	62:1 63:6,7 64:3
<b>wise</b> 5:18	65:1,21
wish 68:18 69:13	<b>york</b> 2:16 5:12,12
<b>wit</b> 71:2	5:12,15 6:1 40:14
withdraw 12:18	40:16 41:1,3,5,8
witnessed 71:14	41:18 44:17,19
wondering 10:10	45:11,19,21 48:6
18:4 19:15	51:6 52:21 53:5
work 12:9,14 13:8	<b>younger</b> 46:3,12
60:20 61:15	47:2,3,6,11
worked 4:12 56:9	Z
working 17:1	zack 2:8
28:14	<b>zero</b> 5:10,13 40:10
works 6:16	52:11
worry 44:16	zimmerman 2:5
worse 32:1 39:12	4:16 8:3,5,7 40:5
43:4 52:10,19	40:9,11 51:17
56:3 63:16,16	52:4 53:4,12
writer 41:10	52.4 55.4,12
written 7:5 48:11	
X	
<b>x</b> 21:11	
<b>x</b> 21.11 <b>xiaoyan</b> 2:13 21:4	
21:10	
<b>y</b>	
<b>y</b> 21:11	
yeah 13:20 19:21	
61:20	
<b>year</b> 4:4 11:12	
12:1,2,11,11	
20:13,13 22:21	
23:4 24:5 26:19	
26:19 27:2 38:12	