SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES JAMES L. KISOR,) Petitioner,) v.) No. 18-15 ROBERT WILKIE, SECRETARY OF) VETERANS AFFAIRS,) Respondent.)

Pages: 1 through 73

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: March 27, 2019

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters 1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206 Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 628-4888 www.hrccourtreporters.com

1 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES 2 3 4 JAMES L. KISOR,) Petitioner, 5)) No. 18-15 6 v. 7 ROBERT WILKIE, SECRETARY OF) 8 VETERANS AFFAIRS,) 9 Respondent.) - - - - - - -10 _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ 11 12 Washington, D.C. 13 Wednesday, March 27, 2019 14 15 The above-entitled matter came on for oral argument before the Supreme Court of the 16 17 United States at 10:09 a.m. 18 19 **APPEARANCES:** PAUL W. HUGHES, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; 20 on behalf of the Petitioner. 21 22 GEN. NOEL J. FRANCISCO, Solicitor General, 23 Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; 24 on behalf of the Respondent. 25

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	PAGE:
3	PAUL W. HUGHES, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	
6	GEN. NOEL J. FRANCISCO, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondent	32
8	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF:	
9	PAUL W. HUGHES, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Petitioner	68
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (10:09 a.m.) 3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear 4 argument this morning in Case 18-15, Kisor 5 versus Wilkie, the Secretary of Veterans 6 Affairs. 7 Mr. Hughes. 8 ORAL ARGUMENT OF PAUL W. HUGHES 9 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER 10 MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Chief 11 Justice, and may it please the Court: 12 The government now appears to agree 13 with our principal contention, deference does 14 not apply in this case. The Court should 15 arrive at that result by overturning the doctrine of Seminole Rock and Auer deference in 16 17 its entirety. Agencies may issue a wide array 18 of rules, interpretations, and --19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Even if the best 20 reading of the statute is the SG's in this 21 case? 22 MR. HUGHES: Well, Your Honor, we --23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Making -- making 24 that assumption, why do we need to reach that 25 broader issue?

1 MR. HUGHES: Well, Your Honor, we 2 think we have the best reading of the 3 regulation. Of course --4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I know you think 5 that, but this was a hypothetical. 6 MR. HUGHES: Well, Your Honor, the 7 Federal Circuit below rested its decision on 8 complete reliance on Auer deference, so we 9 think that that is the principal question that 10 was presented by the Federal Circuit. 11 So we think the first order of 12 business is to determine whether or not the 13 Federal Circuit was correct in deciding that 14 Auer deference resolved this case. 15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But the government tells us it's really beside the point because 16 not only -- well, either the regulation is 17 unambiguous or, if there's any ambiguity, the 18 19 Federal Circuit's reading, the -- the Veterans 20 Administration's reading is by far the better 21 reading. 22 MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, the Federal 23 Circuit, though, relied on Auer deference 24 because the government asked the Federal Circuit to do so. The government expressly 25

Heritage Reporting Corporation

1 argued to the Federal Circuit that Auer 2 deference applies in this case, and the Federal 3 Circuit took the government's invitation to 4 rest its decision on Auer deference. 5 So I think this case does squarely 6 present that question because of the 7 government's own argument before the Federal 8 Circuit, which the Federal Circuit adopted. 9 And that is, I believe, both the premise of the 10 petition and the question on which the Court 11 granted was to resolve whether or not Auer 12 deference --

JUSTICE GORSUCH: So could you turn to the government's argument where they -- they -they seem to concede that Auer is wrong but want us to retain some -- some reduced or revised version of it? Why shouldn't we do that?

MR. HUGHES: So, to begin with, Your Honor, we certainly think the government's argument is better than the status quo, and we understand it to be a version of deference under which deference would not apply in this case, in the vast majority of cases coming from the Veterans Court, so we certainly think it's

5

1	superior to what currently exists.
2	We don't think, though, it's the
3	ultimately the right answer for a few reasons.
4	The first is the most important practical and
5	legal problem with Auer deference is it is a
6	circumvention of the notice-and-comment
7	requirements that Congress has imposed
8	generally in the APA, as well as in particular
9	statutory schemes, including this one.
10	The government's rule still allows
11	agencies to put a thumb on the scale without
12	providing
13	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry, but
14	that that's not quite true. It I don't
15	think that here it was an issue of them trying
16	to avoid notice and comment. New legal issues
17	arise normally in adjudications, and that's
18	what happened here.
19	It's not like they should have
20	anticipated that they needed to be more
21	specific about this until the issue presented
22	itself in a case, and they reasoned an answer,
23	and they gave an answer.
24	So the question really is not one of
25	that in all Auer deference cases are we talking

1 about the need to give notice and comment time. 2 MR. HUGHES: Well, Your Honor, I agree 3 with all of that, which is to say the agency 4 can do these things, it can be precedential 5 with respect to the agency, it can bind future 6 agency adjudicators. 7 The only question is, for that agency 8 activity to also subsequently have legal 9 binding effect in court, what did Congress 10 intend the procedures for the agency to undertake for the agency's action to have 11 12 prospective force of law? And, again, I think the agency's, the VA's, own conduct here 13 indicates that when it wishes to have the force 14 of law, it acts through --15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But does it --16 MR. HUGHES: -- notice-and-comment 17 18 rule-making. 19 JUSTICE GINSBURG: -- does it really 20 have the force of law? Because we made it 21 plain that Auer does not call for blind deference. The court must, first of all, agree 22 23 that the regulation is, indeed, ambiguous and 24 that the agency interpretation is a reasonable 25 one.

Heritage Reporting Corporation

1 MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, there's 2 certainly limitations on when Auer deference 3 applies, but the maintenance of Auer deference 4 means that there are a range of cases in which 5 the agency's views that did not go through 6 notice and comment, did not provide the public 7 safeguards, still will have binding effect on 8 the courts.

9 And it's that range of cases that this 10 is one of which we think is -- is the ultimate 11 problem with Auer deference and why the Court 12 should depart from that doctrine.

13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, only --14 only with some degree, and it's a matter of 15 debate how much of a degree, but only with some degree of sanction by -- by the court, right? 16 At least the court has to determine that the 17 18 agency's interpretation is a reasonable one. 19 MR. HUGHES: That's true, Your Honor, 20 but what happens in cases like this is the 21 regulated public is not able to participate in 22 the underlying law-making process that leads to the ultimate rules. And that is not just some 23 speed bump along the administrative process. 24

25 This matters as a practical matter a great

Heritage Reporting Corporation

```
1 degree.
```

2	And I think one example that I can
3	offer is, at Footnote 4 of the government's
4	brief, the government recognizes that just two
5	months ago, the VA made substantial changes to
б	this regulatory scheme via notice-and-comment
7	rule-making. We went back and looked to see
8	what happened in that scheme, and what we found
9	was the VA issued a notice of proposed
10	proposed rule-making in August of 2018.
11	The VA said, here's the existing
12	regulation, here are the several changes that
13	we think we should make to it, here is the text
14	of what those changes will look like.
15	Regulated public, what do you think about this?
16	They got comments from all over,
17	including the Vietnam Veterans of America, the
18	Paralyzed Veterans of America, the National
19	Oursenization of Natawanal Advasatos and
	Organization of Veterans' Advocates, and
20	others. Then, in January, when the VA released
20 21	
	others. Then, in January, when the VA released
21	others. Then, in January, when the VA released its final rule, we went and counted, it made 45
21 22	others. Then, in January, when the VA released its final rule, we went and counted, it made 45 material changes from what it initially

10

1	great deal because the regulated public was
2	able to participate.
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Of course,
4	they didn't
5	JUSTICE ALITO: If we searched
6	through
7	JUSTICE BREYER: But, as a practical
8	matter, you've read the SG's brief, I mean,
9	there are hundreds of thousands, possibly
10	millions of interpretive regulations. I mean,
11	they give an example, one of them, where the
12	Court deferred to the understanding of the FDA
13	that a particular compound should be treated as
14	a single new active moiety, which consists of a
15	previously approved moiety, joined by a
16	non-ester covalent bond to a lysine group. Do
17	you know how much I know about that?
18	(Laughter.)
19	JUSTICE BREYER: Right, exactly. And
20	and that's all over the place, so they're
21	not all like that. Do you know how long it
22	took the FTC to make its first rule under
23	rule-making? I think the answer was seven
24	years, okay? And I think a lot of them were
25	made more quickly.

1	But what you're doing is saying,
2	instead of paying attention to people who know
3	about that, but rejecting it if it's
4	unreasonable, the judges should decide. I
5	mean, I want to parody it, but, I mean, this
6	sounds like the greatest judicial power grab
7	since Marbury versus Madison, which I would say
8	was correctly decided.
9	(Laughter.)
10	MR. HUGHES: Well, a a few
11	responses to that, Your Honor.
12	To begin with, we think that Auer
13	deference forces the agency to ask the wrong
14	question because, under Martin and Pauley, what
15	it allows the agency at that interpretive stage
16	to do is to determine what it thinks the best
17	policy is, rather than what the best reading
18	JUSTICE BREYER: You read also
19	read, everybody cited them here, all these
20	studies that show what you say is a problem can
21	be sometimes a problem, but rarely, and that
22	the judges have a lot of power to reject
23	unreasonable rules, inappropriately considered
24	rules, they didn't think about it, rules that
25	change position, rules that are not clear, all

these interpretations, you don't have to take Auer literally, and later cases have not. And so do you -- what is your real objection to taking those later cases and

1

2

3

4

5 saying, of course, judges are in control; of 6 course, they reject what is unreasonable; of 7 course, they reject what is inadequately 8 considered; of course, they reject things that 9 are just changed without explanation, but, in 10 general, recognize that the FDA knows more about moieties than you do, Judge, and there 11 are 800 judges, and they all think moiety means 12 13 something different.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, the critical shortcoming of that is the lack of notice and comment because I am sure the FDA knows quite a bit about active moieties, but the regulated public may have a --

JUSTICE BREYER: So you want to take seven years on -- or three years or two years on each of the million interpretive rules? By the way, they'll just go to adjudications, where we have even less control.

24 MR. HUGHES: Well, Your Honor, I think 25 what the APA reflects is the balance this Court

12

1 recognized in Perez that agencies have a 2 choice. Agencies can engage in interpretive 3 rules, and interpretive rules have that 4 flexibility and expediency, they're faster to 5 implement, and they bring uniformity to agency 6 actions and consistency to agency decisions. 7 JUSTICE ALITO: Yeah, Mr. Hughes, do 8 you -- do you think the FCC knows a lot more 9 about the meaning of the word "relevant" than 10 federal district judges? 11 MR. HUGHES: No, Your Honor. I think 12 that's a -- a -- a straightforward question of legal interpretation that federal district 13 14 judges are --15 JUSTICE BREYER: Do you know why 56d 16 or 554d, which is the separation of functions provision of the APA, it has an exception for 17 18 rate-making, which is the FDA's job. In other 19 words, somebody who decides they can't consult 20 ex parte with -- with prosecutors in the 21 agency. 22 MR. HUGHES: Well --23 JUSTICE BREYER: But there's an 24 exception. There's an exception for 25 rate-making. And look it up and you will

14

discover why. Do you know why? Because nobody 1 2 in the FCC really knew how to do rate-making 3 and they had to talk to their staff. Okay? 4 So you think the FDA and the judges 5 know about the same amount about that? 6 MR. HUGHES: Well, Your Honor, I think 7 that the exception for rate-making is precisely 8 our point, which is to say, when Congress has 9 provided agencies authorities to act in a 10 particular manner and has given agencies that delegated authorization, we agree that that's 11 12 an area in which agencies can exercise their delegated authority if it's been provided by 13 14 Congress. 15 JUSTICE BREYER: But the individual 16 rates, I mean, and changes in the rates and changes in the conditions of the railroad cars 17 18 and -- and acting under -- there are millions. 19 We know there are millions. 20 So how do you propose to deal with 21 those millions? Every one of them goes through 22 notice-and-comment rate-making? 23 MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I think -well, again, in the rate-making context, as 24 25 Your Honor points out, Congress can establish

1 different specific rules in specific 2 circumstances. 3 What we're discussing are the default 4 rules that generally apply. And that default 5 rule, as I'm saying, is a balance between 6 interpretive rules, that are easier for 7 agencies to promulgate, that have real effect with inside the agency. 8 On the other hand, notice-and-comment 9 10 rule-making, it does require more for the agencies, but it provides important safeguards 11 12 for the regulated public. 13 JUSTICE GORSUCH: If it was --14 JUSTICE ALITO: If Auer were overruled, would an agency's interpretation, 15 16 particularly in areas requiring a great deal of scientific or technical knowledge, be entitled 17 18 to no deference by a court? 19 MR. HUGHES: No, Your Honor, I think 20 if Auer were overturned, Skidmore would apply. 21 And Skidmore, as this Court has articulated, 22 has exceptional importance, particularly in 23 areas where an agency --24 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Well, Skidmore --25 Skidmore deference is -- is really no deference

15

16

1	because it it applies only when it's
2	persuasive, which is true of any argument.
3	MR. HUGHES: Well, in the context of a
4	highly technical or reticulated statutory
5	scheme where it's not the ordinary business of
6	judging like the meaning of relevant, but
7	something like active moiety, and the FDA can
8	explain that it's brought its scientific
9	consensus to bear.
10	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Well, that sounds
11	like State Farm. But Skid Skidmore is
12	really not any you rely on that to say don't
13	worry, but Skidmore deference, as I've seen it
14	applied over many years, is is not much.
15	MR. HUGHES: Well, I think
16	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: If anything.
17	MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, it's to
18	say in one of those technical contexts, if a
19	court is going to arrive at a different result
20	from the agency, the court needs to have a
21	pretty serious reason as to why it's doing so.
22	It has to articulate real rational reasons on
23	the record as to why it is rejecting the
24	agency's admitted authority over particular
25	scientific and technical areas.

1 So Skidmore does show the respect 2 that's due a coordinate branch of government. 3 We think that's the appropriate alternative 4 solution. 5 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mister -- Mr. Hughes, 6 may I ask you about stare decisis, because 7 you're asking us to overrule two decisions, 8 Auer and Seminole Rock, and -- and really 10 or 9 12 more over the past half century where the Court has talked about Auer deference or 10 11 Seminole Rock deference. 12 And -- and -- and what is the basis for that? Congress could have done this at any 13 14 time. Congress knows that this goes on. 15 Congress has repeatedly acted in this sphere 16 and shown no interest whatsoever in reversing

18 So why is it that overruling is the 19 appropriate course here?

17

the rule that the Court has long established.

20 MR. HUGHES: A few answers, Your 21 Honor, but, to begin with, I don't think 22 there's distance with the government on that 23 point because, under the government's test, 24 Auer deference, in the case of Auer, the Court 25 should not have applied deference.

1 Under the government's view, there 2 needs to be a principle of fair notice. 3 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, you know, there 4 might be a problem of a lack of adversarialness 5 here, but I'm asking you -- I can also ask the 6 government -- but I'm asking you. 7 MR. HUGHES: So setting aside the 8 government's position would require overturning 9 a dozen cases on its own. 10 To -- to -- to move to the point, I think stare decisis has substantially less 11 12 effect in circumstances where, first, it was an underlying judge-made rule and not something 13 14 that was a statutory, constitutional 15 interpretation of its origin. 16 And, second --JUSTICE KAGAN: I -- I don't 17 18 understand that. You know, what -- what we 19 look to is could Congress have changed this. 20 If Congress couldn't have changed that, that's 21 a reason for us to change it. But, if Congress 22 could have changed it, which Congress could 23 have done any time within these past however 24 many decades, that's a reason for us to say, 25 you know, we don't think that we should step in

18

19

1 where Congress has not.

2 MR. HUGHES: Well, Your Honor, I think 3 that was true in -- in -- in both Pearson and 4 Wayfair and other cases the Court's decided 5 where the Court recognized that Congress could 6 step in and change the rule, but the Court has 7 repeatedly said in those cases that when the 8 underlying issue stems from a -- a decision of 9 this Court --JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, there aren't 10 very many of those cases. And we take it 11 12 super-seriously when we do and we need a -- I 13 mean, we used to -- and we need a good reason for it. 14 15 So what's your good reason? 16 MR. HUGHES: So -- so good reason, Your Honor, is two-fold. First, stare decisis 17 18 applies with substantially less force because 19 this is not a doctrine under which the public 20 can rely. In fact, it injects considerable 21 instability into the legal system. 22 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, reliance is a 23 kind of plus factor, and we can talk about 24 reliance either way, but, I mean, usually we 25 look to something terrible that's happening:

20

1 This is unworkable. This is an anomaly in the 2 doctrine. It no longer has any support in the surrounding legal landscape, something like 3 4 This is so grievously wrong that we that. 5 can't stand to live with it anymore. 6 Do you think Auer rises to that level? 7 MR. HUGHES: I do, Your Honor. And --8 and to begin with, Auer did not have any 9 underpinning when it was first announced. It's 10 never been reconciled with the APA. 11 And the practical problems --12 JUSTICE KAGAN: It didn't have any underpinning? Its underpinning is obvious. 13 14 Its underpinning is everything that Justice 15 Breyer talked about. Its underpinning is 16 agency expertise. Its underpinning is -- is -is -- is -- is an idea that judges are far less 17 suited to make these kind of minute decisions 18 19 of agency policy than agency decision-makers 20 are. MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I think it's 21 22 just impossible to reconcile Auer deference 23 with the judgment that's reflected in the APA, that when an agency is going to put on its 24 25 policy-making hat, which undoubtedly the agency

1 can do, there's an ability for the public to be 2 3 their views.

4 JUSTICE BREYER: You're right, you're 5 right that it says in the APA, it says, you're 6 absolutely right, that when a judge decides a 7 case, and it has to do with the meaning of the 8 regulation, it says the judge, the reviewing 9 court shall determine the meaning or 10 applicability of the terms of an agency action. 11 That's what you're relying on. And 12 there's just one thing missing, one thing missing, and that is it doesn't say how you do 13 14 it. 15 And, by the way, that isn't just made 16 up out of thin air. They -- the -- it's not Auer. It's Seminole Rock, Auer repeats 17 18 Seminole Rock, decided in 1944, an important 19 case. 20 The APA is written two or three years

21 later. I can't remember exactly when it was 22 adopted. But wouldn't somebody have said something about it if, in fact, those words 23 were meant to change what was pretty well 24 25 established law at the time?

able to participate in that process and provide

Heritage Reporting Corporation

MR. HUGHES: Well, Your Honor, I don't It there's any evidence that the APA

2 think that there's any evidence that the APA 3 somehow silently adopted the -- the doctrine of 4 Seminole Rock. There's no evidence in the 5 history and there's no --6 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, the evidence 7 would be that if the Attorney General's manual 8 that discusses the APA goes through prior cases 9 that they intend to change, I'm not saying 10 perfectly, but to a considerable degree, and, by the way, Seminole Rock is not there. 11 12 And so we have both the language which doesn't say -- it says shall determine, but it 13 14 doesn't say how to determine. And, in 15 addition, you have the report, which I agree 16 with you says nothing, but I'm not sure that 17 that cuts in your favor. 18 MR. HUGHES: But, Your Honor, if we 19 look to the Attorney General's manual of 1947, 20 as you allude, that actually, I think, cuts 21 strongly in our favor because that explains 22 that interpretive rules do not have the 23 prospective force of law. The Court relied on that manual at Footnote 31 --24

25 JUSTICE BREYER: Yeah, that's right.

23

1 MR. HUGHES: -- of its Chrysler Corp 2 decision, which is carried forward to Perez. 3 JUSTICE BREYER: No, I agree with you, 4 you're right about that, but I don't see this 5 being interpreted. This isn't enforceable. 6 We're trying to figure out what the -- what the 7 regulation means. And you read the AG's brief. He has a 8 9 lot of conditions around the judge's authority; 10 that is to say, the judge has a lot of authority to say this reg is no good, but he 11 12 doesn't have to ignore what the agency says. 13 MR. HUGHES: And --14 JUSTICE BREYER: After all, the agency knows about old Lysol, whatever it is, and we 15 don't. 16 MR. HUGHES: And I want to be clear. 17 18 We do not believe that the court needs to 19 ignore what the agency says either. We think 20 it warrants respectful consideration for 21 reasons of interbranch comity and the 22 recognition that agencies do have technical 23 expertise. We don't dispute any of that. 24 The only question --JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I -- you know, 25

24

1 everybody's talking about this being the rule 2 since Seminole Rock and Auer, but I go back to 3 cases in the early 1800s, and -- and one -- I 4 just pick one of 1850, where the Court said the foregoing construction, being the one adopted 5 6 by the Department of Public Lands soon after 7 the Act of 1832 went into operation, we should 8 feel ourselves restrained, unless the error of 9 construction was plainly manifest, from 10 disturbing the practice prescribed by the Commission of the grand Land Office. 11 12 And I have a series of other cases throughout the 1800s where the courts were 13 14 basically talking about you take the 15 interpretation of the agencies unless some 16 manifest error was present. 17 So Sturgeon and Auer are not more 18 recent manifestations. They're based on fairly 19 understandable principles. Number one, 20 agencies have expertise. My colleagues have 21 talked about that. Two, they are also part of 22 an administration and often have a better 23 understanding of what the needs are under that regulation. And, three, in some ways, 24 25 regulated parties need to have a starting point

of understanding how their conduct will be
 viewed.

And if you tell the world agencies are 3 4 going to receive this generalized Skidmore 5 deference that Justice Kavanaugh spoke about as 6 no deference, essentially, persuasiveness 7 really isn't, then they don't really have a 8 starting point to understand how to conform 9 their conduct because they have to wait until 10 13 circuit courts rule on an interpretation of a statute before really understanding what they 11 12 have to do.

13 That last point is one that troubles 14 me, which is regulated parties should know 15 where to start, and the best people who can 16 tell them is the agency who's responsible to 17 the public for having sound interpretations or 18 reasonable interpretations.

MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Your Honor.
I'd like to respond both to the point about the
history as well as the stability point.

To begin with -- with Your Honor's initial point about the underlying history, I agree if we look prior to the APA, there are cases that suggest in the statutory context

1 that a department or agency's interpretation of 2 the statute deserves binding deference. But, in the APA, Congress decided that 3 4 there needed to be procedural protections to 5 safequard the interests of the public through 6 notice-and-comment rule-making to provide the 7 public the ability to participate in that 8 law-making function that happens within the 9 agency. That was one of the critical 10 innovations of the APA that imposed on past 11 practice as a matter of congressional 12 13 direction, and we think that's what's lacking 14 here. But --15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, to 16 get back to the -- a little bit to the stare decisis question, I -- I think the issue 17 18 depends at least in part about how much of a 19 change you're making. 20 And one of the things I have trouble 21 getting my -- my arms around is, if you start 22 with Auer and recognizing the limitations on 23 Auer that -- you know, that have accumulated

25 Skidmore deference, which I find hard to get my

24

over the years and you're changing from that to

Heritage Reporting Corporation

1 hands around too -- I think I know more what a 2 moiety is than I know what Skidmore deference 3 is. 4 (Laughter.) CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And I -- I 5 6 just wonder exactly how much of a change at the 7 end of the day you're talking about. 8 MR. HUGHES: Well, once we take into 9 account SmithKline Beecham and Gonzales and the 10 Court's consistent narrowing of Auer, I -- I think Your Honor is right that Auer has been 11 12 narrowed to the point where it does have substantially less practical effects today than 13 14 it does previously. 15 But I will say Auer is still used in a 16 way that injects inconsistencies and instability into the legal system that I -- I 17 18 believe also responds to Justice Sotomayor's --19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, I 20 suppose it depends -- I mean, it depends on the 21 agency. It depends on the rule. It depends on 22 the -- the -- the court. I mean, at some 23 point, you're applying Auer -- you -- you 24 consider the range of reasonableness and, you 25 know, the confidence that a court has that the

Heritage Reporting Corporation

agency is, you know, not found itself within
 those bounds is going to vary greatly from case
 to case.

4 The courts are going to take a more 5 careful look in some cases than they are in 6 others. And maybe that's -- that's part of the 7 problem. But I -- I guess I'm not quite sure 8 that I understand what you're saying when the 9 -- the rules have the force and effect of law 10 when they're subject to judicial review within a particular range and it's really quite 11 12 imprecise what the range is.

MR. HUGHES: Well, I -- I think -CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And as I say,
maybe that's the problem, but --

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I do think 16 17 that imprecision is guite the problem, but as 18 long as Auer and Seminole Rock remain, that 19 suggests that there will be a range of rules, I 20 think a narrowed set of rules, but some rules 21 that, if they make it through the gauntlet of Auer and Seminole Rock, do have the prospective 22 23 force of law without going through the procedures that Congress identified that need 24 25 -- that the agencies should undertake to have

Heritage Reporting Corporation

1 that force and effect of law. 2 And I think this case is an example. 3 I'd point the Court to another case recently 4 that -- that highlights the instability. It's 5 a decision -- an en banc decision of the Ninth 6 Circuit, the Marsh case, that was decided in 7 September of 2018 about the Fair Labor 8 Standards Act and how the tip credit works for 9 employees that sometimes work under a tips job 10 and sometimes don't. 11 Well, the -- the en banc Ninth Circuit 12 decided that case on the basis of Auer 13 deference in reliance on the then-binding 14 Department of Labor interpretation. It was not 15 six weeks or seven weeks later that the Department of Labor rescinded the 16 interpretation that the Ninth Circuit en banc 17 18 rested on, and now the lower courts are having 19 to figure out is the Ninth Circuit's en banc 20 decision still binding interpretation of that 21 regulation when --22 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And what about --23 JUSTICE ALITO: On the question --24 JUSTICE GINSBURG: -- what about the 25 lower courts? Let's -- let's say your argument

is accepted and Auer is overruled. There may
 have been a dozen or so cases, Auer cases in
 this Court, but there are probably hundreds in
 the lower courts.

5 So do all of those cases -- what 6 happens to all of those cases where there was 7 reliance on Auer in the lower courts? 8 MR. HUGHES: So I think from this 9 Court's cases, we still have stare decisis, but 10 to Your Honor's question about the lower courts, I -- I think the courts would have to 11 12 wrestle to see if -- whether or not Auer was 13 the rule of decision. But, as the Marsh case I 14 just referenced underscored, those cases lack the kind of stability that interpretations of 15 16 statutes and regulations hold because they are 17 constantly subject to revision overnight by any 18 _ _

JUSTICE GINSBURG: But are you saying that there would be wholesale cases before the lower courts, lower courts that had relied on Auer, and the losing party then says, Court, vacate that decision because you premised it on Auer, and Auer is not good law? MR. HUGHES: I think parties could

Heritage Reporting Corporation

31

1 potentially advance arguments along those 2 lines, Your Honor, but I don't think that 3 increases instability any more than exists in 4 the status quo, when those decisions are 5 already subject to revision by the agency. Ι 6 don't think --7 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Your -- your 8 argument is that notice and comment solves 9 everything, right? I mean --MR. HUGHES: Well, I think notice and 10 comment is the scheme that Congress implemented 11 12 into the APA as the one --JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: In other words, 13 14 this issue would go away if the agency did 15 notice and comment for the guidance that --16 MR. HUGHES: Well, prospectively, what our argument would -- would lead to is an area 17 18 where there is far more prospective stability 19 because once the -- a court decides the meaning 20 of a regulation, that has durability, unless 21 the agency changes the reliability --22 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Can I get your 23 reaction to the -- the thought that the lower 24 courts have made notice-and-comment rule-making 25 too difficult through various requirements,

1 requiring detailed explanations, making it hard 2 to change regulations that have gone through 3 notice and comment? Do you have a reaction to 4 Because that may be one of the reasons that? 5 that has pushed them into the more guidance 6 rather than notice and comment in the first 7 place. 8 MR. HUGHES: Well, Your Honor, I think 9 notice and comment is what Congress required, 10 and that's what the Court should adopt. If the Court is of the view that notice and comment 11 12 has become more onerous than Congress intended, I think the solution would be to address that 13 14 issue of notice-and-comment overreach, not to allow agencies to circumvent it. 15 16 If I may reserve my time. 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, 18 counsel. 19 General Francisco. 20 ORAL ARGUMENT OF GEN. NOEL J. FRANCISCO 21 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT 22 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Mr. Chief Justice, 23 and may it please the Court: 24 Seminole Rock deference raises some problems in some applications, but it's been on 25

1 the books for decades, it has significant 2 practical benefits, its practical problems can 3 be addressed by reinforcing reasonable 4 limitations on the doctrine. 5 I'd therefore like to address two key 6 points. First, in its core applications, like Seminole Rock itself, where the agency provided 7 8 public notice of its consistent interpretation, 9 it has significant practical benefits. Ιt 10 promotes national uniformity, predictability, and political accountability because, if a rule 11 12 is subject to multiple reasonable interpretations, the choice of which one to 13 14 adopt is made by a single more politically 15 accountable agency, rather than in dozens and perhaps hundreds of district -- different 16 17 district courts across the country. 18 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Mr. Francisco, as I 19 understand it, nobody left before us alive is 20 willing to take Auer literally and it's just a matter of how -- how much revision to it we've 21 22 already made. Is it enough? How much further 23 should we go? Or should we just give up on it altogether? 24 25 And -- and you're asking us to keep on

1	going.
2	And, as I understand it, there are six
3	elements of your test. We have to decide
4	whether the the regulation is ambiguous,
5	whether the interpretation's reasonable,
б	whether it's consistent, whether it was made by
7	someone at a high level, whether there was fair
8	notice, and whether it was made by somebody
9	with expertise.
10	Is that a a recipe for stability
11	and predictability in the law, or is that a
12	recipe for the opposite?
13	GENERAL FRANCISCO: No, I absolutely
14	think it is and it's a workable standard, Your
15	Honor. I think our principal limitations are
16	are consistent with existing law, though
17	perhaps not not identical to it.
18	The requirement of genuine ambiguity
19	is really what we think this Court's cases have
20	always required, although there is language
21	that we think ought to be replaced with the
22	genuine ambiguity language.
23	JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well, people fight
24	over whether there's ambiguity and what
25	ambiguity means. They fight over what

35

1 reasonableness means. 2 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Right. 3 JUSTICE GORSUCH: They fight over how 4 consistent is consistent. And for the life of me, I don't know how high a level a person has 5 6 to be before we're going to defer to him, or 7 how much notice is fair, or how much expertise 8 counts. 9 I'm -- I'm with Justice Breyer on 10 moieties, but the people I think have the most expertise on what relevant evidence is, is 11 12 probably John Kane, a federal district judge of 13 about 40 years --14 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Well --15 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- not -- not -- not 16 an agency. 17 And under the rule you propose, every 18 agency could define relevant evidence 19 differently. 20 GENERAL FRANCISCO: No. 21 JUSTICE GORSUCH: What is -- what is 22 -- well, if they have enough expertise, we're 23 going to -- we're going to go down that road. 24 And I -- I -- I guess I'm just wondering, at 25 what point does this whole edifice just fall

1 upon itself? 2 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Sure. Well, Your 3 Honor --4 JUSTICE GORSUCH: And lawyers will --5 will enrich themselves and do well with this 6 kind of test. But how are regulated people 7 supposed to behave? 8 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Sure. And, Your 9 Honor, there's a lot built into that question. 10 But what I'd like to bring the focus on in -in answering it is our strong interest in 11 preserving Seminole Rock in its core 12 applications where we actually think it has a 13 14 significant amount of benefit to regulated 15 parties. 16 Because you are right, there is a lot 17 of disagreement amongst judges as to what a 18 reasonable interpretation is. 19 As the Court said earlier this term, 20 reasonable jurists can look at the language 21 and, acting in good faith, come to different 22 interpretations. 23 One of the virtues of Seminole Rock is 24 that when you're facing multiple reasonable 25 interpretations, you vest the decision-making

37

authority -- excuse me -- in a single party rather than multiple courts. And that's actually of a benefit to regulated parties because they don't actually have to litigate that thing in multiple courts across the country.

7 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well, on that --8 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: The government --9 GENERAL FRANCISCO: They can rely on 10 the agency.

11 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- on that -- on 12 that, and I'm sorry, but, you know, you say -you keep saying how much of a benefit it is for 13 14 regulated parties and their reliance interests, 15 private reliance interests. And I must say I 16 cast a skeptical eye when the government is -is -- is worried about private reliance 17 18 interests.

And every private party before us says their interests in stability would be better served by -- by eliminating this rule altogether. And it's not just the Chamber of Commerce. It's -- it's the Farm Bureau. It's the national lawyers engaged with the immigration system every day and are faced with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

claims of Auer deference for single-member decisions from the BIA that are unreasoned. And it's the veterans before us, the American Legion, the lawyers who represent veterans every day before the veterans' courts who are outraged by Auer and who say it doesn't serve their reliance interests and it provides highly unstable rules that they have to guess at all the time. Why should I credit the government's protestations that it is serving private reliance interests? GENERAL FRANCISCO: Well, Your Honor, I think that it benefits both those private

It is think that it benefits both those private reliance interests, and there are a lot of private reliance interests that aren't represented here before the Court, as well as interests in stability and political accountability.

But, if I could sort of use an example to illustrate the point, suppose you've got a rule that is genuinely ambiguous. It's subject to multiple reasonable interpretations.

24There are a couple of ways to go. You25could do notice-and-comment rule-making. That

Heritage Reporting Corporation

1 takes a very long period of time. In the 2 meantime, there are two things to do. 3 You can litigate the case in dozens of 4 district courts across the country and hope 5 that you can convince all the courts to reach 6 the same conclusion, or you can defer to the 7 agency's reasonable choice amongst what is, by 8 definition, reasonable alternative definitions. 9 And we think that is the benefit to 10 Seminole Rock. In the face of those multiple reasonable interpretations, you're vesting 11 12 decision-making authority in a single, more politically-accountable party. 13 14 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Judges -- judges disagree all the time, though, on the threshold 15 question of whether something's ambiguous to 16 begin with. And that creates a whole sideshow 17 18 here. And -- and one of my broader questions 19 20 is why can't the government just do notice and 21 comment? You said it takes a long time, and 22 that may be a problem with some lower court 23 impediments to notice and comment, I -- I share

24 that concern, but if notice and comment were 25 more efficient, why not just do notice and

Heritage Reporting Corporation

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

comment?

not ambiguous.

GENERAL FRANCISCO: So there are two parts to that question. First, on the reasonableness and degree, I completely take your point, that judges can come to a different conclusion as to what is ambiguous and what is JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: It happens all the time, all the time. GENERAL FRANCISCO: And that's not a problem that Seminole Rock creates or a problem that Seminole Rock can solve. It's something that's just endemic to this process.

14 But what Seminole Rock does do, is 15 there's going to be a lot more agreement on 16 whether something is subject to a range of reasonable readings than there is on 17 18 pinpointing the precise, accurate, 19 theoretically correct reasoning. So Seminole 20 Rock reduces a large amount of uncertainty in 21 that respect. 22 As to notice and comment, look, we --23 we take the law as it is, as it's handed down to us by this Court and other courts. And as 24 it's handed down, notice-and-comment 25

1 rule-making is a cumbersome procedure. That 2 doesn't mean it doesn't have benefits. It has 3 extraordinary benefits. 4 That being said, when you're looking 5 at a -- a rule that is by definition subject to 6 multiple reasonable readings --7 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Do you agree from 8 your study of this issue that the impediments 9 to efficient notice-and-comment rule-making 10 have pushed the government into doing more 11 things in this manner? 12 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Your Honor, I'm not prepared to -- to -- to say I agree or 13 14 disagree with that. I certainly understand 15 Your Honor's point. 16 But I guess the simpler point that I'm trying to make is that, given that it is what 17 it is --18 19 JUSTICE KAGAN: Do you happen to know 20 what the average notice-and-comment rule-making 21 is, how long it takes? 22 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Your Honor, I 23 don't know the answer to that question. I apologize. But I --24 25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I haven't seen a

Heritage Reporting Corporation

1 large decrease in notice and proposed rules --2 GENERAL FRANCISCO: No, Your Honor, I 3 haven't. 4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- in the Federal 5 Register. 6 GENERAL FRANCISCO: I -- I haven't. 7 And -- and -- and, again, though, the --8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Your -- your --9 your opposite -- your colleague on the other 10 side talked about one notice and comment that received 45 changes. So the rule is still 11 12 being used. Notice and comment is still being 13 used. 14 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Oh, it's 15 definitely still being used, Your Honor. And 16 -- and it -- it is a very important process, but it doesn't undermine the benefits of 17 18 Seminole Rock because, while you're going 19 through that period, you're -- you're facing a 20 rule that, by definition, is ambiguous, and 21 you've got to figure out what to do with it. 22 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I -- I -- I do 23 think that --24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, one 25 of -- as a practical matter, one of two things

42

43

1	happens: The judge gets deeply into the
2	question before him or her and does the work
3	and comes up with something that looks like the
4	right answer. And once you've done that,
5	everything else looks pretty unreasonable. Or
6	the judge just starts looking at it and
7	flipping through it and says, boy, there's a
8	wide range here, could be this, could be that,
9	and you defer to the agency.
10	Now, if I think that that's what
11	happens as a practical matter, which rule
12	should I adopt?
13	GENERAL FRANCISCO: Your Honor, I
14	think you ought to adopt ours, because we
15	(Laughter.)
16	GENERAL FRANCISCO: because we
17	actually place an
18	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Ours, you mean
19	yours, or Auer the case?
20	(Laughter.)
21	GENERAL FRANCISCO: The the
22	position of the United States, Your Honor. And
23	that's because we really do put a lot of
24	emphasis on that first requirement of genuine
25	ambiguity.

1	We do think that courts should do
2	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So you think
3	what the judge ought to do is do all
4	extensive amount of work and come up what looks
5	to him or her as the right answer?
б	GENERAL FRANCISCO: I think what the
7	judge needs to do is an extensive amount of
8	work at the front end to determine if there is,
9	in fact, genuine ambiguity within the language
10	of the rule itself, much as like it's required
11	to do under Chevron. You look at the
12	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: But the problem is
13	the problem is that the judge, or judges,
14	could come up with an interpretation that says
15	the agency's interpretation of the regulation
16	is wrong, and this is a really important
17	interpretation, it has real effects on many
18	people, and it's wrong, but, nonetheless, rule
19	for the agency under your theory because and
20	under the Chief Justice's question because
21	there's some ambiguity in it and, therefore,
22	defer to the agency, even though the judges
23	might unanimously think it's wrong. And
24	doesn't that trouble you?
25	GENERAL FRANCISCO: No, Your Honor,

1

2

because, again, I don't think that is quite the nature of the inquiry. I think that there are

3 lots of statutes --4 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: I think that -- I think that I disagree. I think that's what 5 6 happens in judicial conference rooms. 7 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Okay. And I'm not 8 going to obviously question you on that. 9 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Which is the point 10 I don't think this is the -- I don't think the government's reading is the best reading, but 11 12 it's sufficiently ambiguous that I'll rule for the government. That happens --13 14 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Yeah. So -- so I 15 quess I --16 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- on big cases. 17 GENERAL FRANCISCO: So I quess I have 18 a couple of responses to that. 19 First of all, in our search for what 20 the best reading is, I think that often the 21 agency's interpretation is highly relevant to 22 understanding what the best reading is of a 23 complicated regulatory regime. 24 Secondly, I think it is often the case

25 that there is -- it is not clear what, in fact,

Heritage Reporting Corporation

the best reading is when you are facing
 multiple reasonable constructions.

And that, again, is the virtue of 3 4 Seminole Rock. In those core cases when you're 5 facing multiple reasonable constructions, and 6 you have the benefit of the views of an agency 7 that's administering a complicated regulatory scheme, you vest the choice on which one to 8 9 pick in a more politically-accountable agency, 10 rather than having to fight it out in different courts across the country, because different 11 12 judges are going to come to different conclusions as to what the most reasonable or 13 14 theoretically best understanding of a 15 particular rule or regulation is.

JUSTICE ALITO: Should we be concerned 16 about the effect that either overruling Auer 17 and Seminole Rock or taking your position will 18 19 have on cases in which courts have interpreted 20 regulations based on those principles and now, whichever course we take, those will be thrown 21 22 into doubt? And if that's a real concern, is 23 it more of a concern -- is it much less of a concern if we take your proposed route than if 24 we overrule Auer and Seminole Rock completely? 25

1	GENERAL FRANCISCO: I think it's far			
2	less of a concern under our rule because			
3	under under the United States' rule,			
4	because, under my friend on the other side's			
5	position, every single regulation that's			
б	currently on the books whose interpretation has			
7	been established under Seminole Rock now has to			
8	be relitigated anew. So I think			
9	JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well, I guess I			
10	don't I don't understand that response,			
11	because it seems to me you've made the point			
12	that there are going to be a great many			
13	regulations where the outcome would be the same			
14	with or without Auer. You make that argument			
15	in this case.			
16	GENERAL FRANCISCO: Uh-huh.			
17	JUSTICE GORSUCH: So we'd have to know			
18	how many of those there are. We'd have to know			
19	how many would be problematic even under your			
20	your modified test, and we don't know that.			
21	A lot of these regulations get supplanted and			
22	statutes disappear and get modified, and those			
23	would have to be accounted for too.			
24	So, at the end of the day, I I			
25	didn't see anything in the briefs other than			

48

1 rank speculation on this point.

2 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Well, I think that 3 one thing that doesn't require speculation is 4 to know that their position would be more 5 disruptive than ours, because theirs would 6 require everything to be revisited. Even under 7 the most aggressive interpretation of our view, 8 it wouldn't require everything to be 9 interpreted.

10 But, if you look at this Court's cases, and -- and I'm not representing them as 11 12 a random sample, but, if you look at them as a sample, I don't think our rule would be 13 14 particularly disruptive of -- at all, if you 15 focus on our requirement of inconsistency. We've identified three of this Court's cases 16 that arguably applied Seminole Rock in the face 17 18 of inconsistent interpretations.

19 In each three of those cases, the 20 application of Seminole Rock appeared to be 21 makeweight; in other words, the Court first 22 explained why the agency's interpretation was 23 likely the best one but then applied Seminole 24 Rock in order to confirm that decision.

25 So I think our position would be

significantly less disruptive than my friend's
 on the other side.

3 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, when you say --4 JUSTICE KAGAN: General, a similar --JUSTICE BREYER: I mean, "best" has 5 6 come up about 50 times, and I'm a little 7 curious about that. Jerome P. Frank thought 8 there are no cases like Justice Kavanaugh 9 described, and I believe Justice Kavanaugh was 10 closer to it, and so I think he's probably But which is the best? 11 right. 12 I mean, we know one thing: We know that democratically speaking, agencies aren't 13 14 very democratic, but there is some 15 responsibility and there are one group of people who are still less democratic, and 16 they're called judges. 17 So if, in fact, you believe that the 18 19 best solution -- where there's real ambiguity, 20 and you just don't know, the best solution is, 21 in our country, a democratic solution, well, 22 maybe the agency is the institution that's 23 closer to it. 24 Now you're just supposed to say yes. 25 (Laughter.)

50

1	GENERAL FRANCISCO: Certainly, I would
2	say yes certainly, I would say yes in the
3	context of Seminole Rock itself because that
4	really does underscore our key point. Seminole
5	Rock only applies when a rule is genuinely
6	ambiguous and that after applying
7	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Do you
8	GENERAL FRANCISCO: all of the
9	ordinary after applying all of the ordinary
10	tools of construction, it's subject to multiple
11	reasonable readings.
12	And in that context, we do think it
13	promotes democratic accountability by vesting
14	it in a more politically-accountable agency.
15	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That's why I have
16	a problem with Justice Kavanaugh's use of the
17	word "bad" interpretation, because bad
18	interpretation sounds to me like an
19	unreasonable interpretation. It can only be
20	bad if it's unreasonable. And that already is
21	taken care of by the Auer standard.
22	GENERAL FRANCISCO: By the requirement
23	that it be genuinely ambiguous, like
24	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: A, genuinely
25	ambiguous and, B, reasonable.

1 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Reasonableness. 2 Yes, Your Honor. 3 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Reasonableness 4 can't, I don't think, mean a bad interpretation 5 that's not consistent with the statute or -- or 6 not consistent with either the text, the 7 context, et cetera. 8 So, if it's reasonable, then there has 9 to be a basis for the interpretation in the 10 statute. 11 GENERAL FRANCISCO: I -- I think I generally agree with that, Your Honor. And to 12 13 that I would add two points. I think that when 14 you're talking about interpreting complicated 15 regulatory regimes, the agency's understanding 16 of it often is going to be highly relevant to determining what the -- and I'm going to put it 17 18 in quotes -- "best" interpretation is, and as 19 I've already said, if you poll 50 judges on a 20 complicated regulatory regime, you're often 21 going to come up with multiple different best 22 interpretations. And that, again, underscores 23 the benefit of Seminole Rock in those core

24 applications.

25 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: You agree -- you

Heritage Reporting Corporation

1 agree, I think, with taking Footnote 9 of 2 Chevron, using all the tools of statutory 3 construction, and -- before you conclude that 4 the ambiguity remains in this context? I think 5 you've said that a few times. 6 GENERAL FRANCISCO: I -- I absolutely 7 think that is part of the -- the genuine --8 determining genuine ambiguity. 9 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: And when you do 10 that, you usually eliminate or greatly reduce the number of cases where there remains an 11 12 ambiguity. Do you agree with that? 13 GENERAL FRANCISCO: And not only that, 14 but you also reduce the range of ambiguity, 15 because a reasonable interpretation has to fall 16 within the zone of ambiguity that remains in the rule after you apply those ordinary tools 17 18 of construction. 19 And so that's why -- and I know my 20 friend on the other side didn't really get into 21 the separation of powers issue, but that's why 22 we don't think that there's any substantial

23 separation of powers question here, because the 24 agencies are, in fact, subject to substantial 25 control by both Congress and by the courts.

Heritage Reporting Corporation

1	JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well, that's			
2	JUSTICE KAGAN: General, can I ask			
3	about a slightly broader version of Justice			
4	Alito's question? He asked about reliance, but			
5	thinking about all the stare decisis factors,			
6	when I started asking Mr. Hughes about them, he			
7	immediately said: Well, the government has			
8	just as big a problem on those factors.			
9	So does it?			
10	GENERAL FRANCISCO: Absolutely not,			
11	Your Honor, because what we're arguing for is			
12	that Seminole Rock be retained in its core			
13	applications, which, frankly, we think are the			
14	areas where it is the the most important,			
15	both to regulated parties and to agencies.			
16	And it is always more faithful to			
17	to stare decisis principles to retain a			
18	doctrine at its core, while perhaps imposing			
19	limitations on the edge that simply recognize			
20	that, in the course of practical application,			
21	practical issues have been identified.			
22	And that's why we think that you ought			
23	to reinforce the requirement of genuine			
24	ambiguity, you ought to reinforce the the			
25	requirement that you wouldn't apply it to			

54

1 inconsistent interpretations, and we don't 2 think the agency should get Seminole Rock 3 deference for secret, private interpretations. 4 It ought to give public notice of its 5 interpretation, as it did in Seminole Rock 6 itself. 7 But we think that when you have those 8 principal limitations, you've largely addressed 9 the practical problems of Seminole Rock, and what you're left with, in our view, are the 10 practical benefits of Seminole Rock. 11 12 So even if you think it was wrongly

decided as an original matter, it's got 13 14 significant practical benefits, its practical 15 problems are manageable, it's been on the books for decades, and this is something that 16 Congress could fix if it believed that this 17 18 Court has misgauged legislative intent in 19 adopting the Seminole Rock doctrine. 20 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: You -- you said 21 give public notice. That's one of the 22 requirements, right? 23 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Yes. 24 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: I think the other 25 side would say just add "and comment."

55

1 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Your Honor, and I 2 think that's exactly their position. The 3 seminal feature --4 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: And what's -- and 5 what's wrong with that? 6 GENERAL FRANCISCO: The seminal 7 feature of Seminole Rock is, of course, that 8 you don't require notice and comment. And I 9 think that your -- your question gets back to 10 the colloguy that we had before. 11 While you're going through that 12 notice-and-comment process, you're simply left 13 with an enormous amount of uncertainty because 14 you're left with a rule that everyone has 15 already concluded is on its face subject to 16 multiple reasonable interpretations. 17 And to say that the alternative is to 18 have multiple courts across the country struggle with that is --19 20 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well, Mr. Francisco, 21 you keep telling us about the benefits of that, 22 but the benefits of notice and comment are, 23 among other things, people will know 24 prospectively what rules govern them --25 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Yes.

JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- and not be 1 2 sideswiped later by a bureaucracy. You can 3 call it democratically accountable if you wish. 4 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Right. 5 JUSTICE GORSUCH: I don't know, people 6 might disagree. At any rate, a bureaucracy 7 coming up with an amicus brief or a 8 single-member opinion in a BIA decision 9 involving an immigrant or, in this case, a 10 veteran seeking benefits, who in the middle of a case is confronted with a new interpretation 11 12 never seen before, all right, those -- that's 13 the reality. 14 And I'm not sure how that serves 15 democratic processes or the separation of 16 powers, as opposed to having an independent 17 judge. The one thing you're going to know is 18 you're going to have an independent judge 19 decide what the law is in your case, consistent 20 with the statute that says an independent judge 21 shall decide all questions of law. 22 That seems to me a significant 23 promise, especially to the least and most vulnerable among us, like the immigrant, like 24

25 the veteran, who may not be the most popular or

57

1 able to capture an agency the way many 2 regulated entities can today. 3 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Well, Your Honor, 4 there's a -- there's a -- there are a few 5 things built into that. Let me start by saying 6 that I think that our public notice requirement 7 ensures that regulated parties -- that the 8 agency can't rely on secret interpretation. So 9 it makes sure that its interpretation is out 10 there in the public and members of regulated 11 parties --12 JUSTICE GORSUCH: So Auer is gone 13 then. You've -- you are asking us to overrule Auer itself. 14 15 GENERAL FRANCISCO: I --16 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Because that's what 17 happened in Auer. 18 GENERAL FRANCISCO: No. 19 JUSTICE GORSUCH: It was an amicus brief. 20 GENERAL FRANCISCO: No, Your Honor. I 21 22 guess -- I guess I would probably argue that I 23 think an amicus brief filed in this Court, 24 given the high-profile nature of litigation in 25 this Court --

1 JUSTICE GORSUCH: That's good enough? 2 GENERAL FRANCISCO: -- satisfies the 3 public notice requirement, because it puts the 4 world on notice that this is, in fact, the 5 agency's position. 6 But, to go to your larger point, I 7 think, as this Court held in the Martin case, 8 Seminole Rock deference reflects a --9 JUSTICE GORSUCH: A person who 10 litigates against the government for years, for his disability benefits as a veteran of the 11 12 United States, is on public notice when the 13 case arrives here and you file an amicus brief? 14 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Well, Your Honor, 15 we are much less concerned with the outcome of 16 this particular case than we are with 17 preserving Seminole Rock in its core 18 applications. 19 But, to go to this particular case, 20 remember, the VA has a system where the VA 21 itself is charged with assisting veterans 22 through what can sometimes be a complex 23 process. 24 And, here, it was the VA itself that 25 identified the potential reconsideration

1 pathway that would have provided the -- the 2 veteran with the benefit of retroactive 3 benefits and the VA itself that also explained 4 why it didn't apply to the veteran. 5 So I think, in this particular context 6 of this case, this -- this was a very fair 7 process. That being said, we aren't particularly concerned with this specific case 8 9 as we are with preserving Seminole Rock 10 deference in its core applications, where we do think it has the most significant amount of 11 12 benefits. 13 JUSTICE ALITO: If we were --14 GENERAL FRANCISCO: And if --15 JUSTICE ALITO: -- if we were writing 16 on a clean slate, what would you say is the basis for any version of Auer or Seminole Rock? 17 18 Is it based on some kind of delegation theory, 19 or what is its -- what is its conceptual basis? 20 GENERAL FRANCISCO: I think the best 21 conceptual basis is what this Court gave it in the Martin case, and that's where it said that 22 23 Seminole Rock rests on a presumption of

25 courts would defer to an agency's reasonable

24

Heritage Reporting Corporation

legislative intent, that Congress presumed that

1 interpretation of its otherwise ambiguous rules 2 as part of its delegated rule-making authority. Now I think that members of this Court 3 4 may debate whether that was or wasn't an 5 accurate understanding of legislative intent, 6 but this late in the day, I don't think that's 7 any longer the relevant question because it's 8 been on the books for decades. 9 JUSTICE KAGAN: And -- and usually 10 those kinds of presumed legislative intent are based on other views, right? They're based on 11 12 a view -- of course, Congress is presumed to want the agencies to do this because -- fill in 13 14 the blanks. Is it expertise? Is it political accountability? Is it uniformity? Is it a 15 16 combination of those things? GENERAL FRANCISCO: I think that's 17 I think all -- all -- all of the above 18 fair. are -- are fair considerations of what those 19 20 types of presumptions are often based on. And it also reflects the fact -- and 21 22 this was the second portion of the point I was 23 going to be making on the separation of powers issue -- is that when an agency acts pursuant 24

Heritage Reporting Corporation

to a lawful delegation from Congress -- and we

25

61

1	can fight over what that means but, as long			
2	as you've got a lawful delegation from			
3	Congress, at the end of the day, it doesn't			
4	really matter if what the agency is doing looks			
5	adjudicative, looks executive, or looks			
6	legislative because, in every one of those			
7	instances, the agency is effectuating executive			
8	power.			
9	It has to be effectuating executive			
10	power, as			
11	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: General			
12	GENERAL FRANCISCO: Justice Scalia			
13				
14	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: you may not			
15	GENERAL FRANCISCO: has made clear.			
16	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: you may not			
17	care about the outcome of this case, but we're			
18	going to have to at some point. And if we			
19	overrule Auer, we can just kick it back, okay,			
20	but, if we don't, let's assume we were to			
21	accept your approach. What did the district			
22	court what did the court below, not the			
23	district court what did the court below do			
24	wrong? How would you correct it?			
25	GENERAL FRANCISCO: Uh-huh.			

1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: How would you 2 advise us to advise judges to approach the Auer 3 question? 4 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Sure. 5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Write my opinion 6 for me on that. 7 (Laughter.) 8 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Right. So --9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Okay? 10 GENERAL FRANCISCO: -- a couple of points, Your Honor. And if I could first say I 11 12 didn't mean to say that we don't care about the 13 outcome of this case, because we deeply care 14 about the rights of our veterans and we do care 15 about the outcome of -- of all of these types 16 of cases. 17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: By the way --18 GENERAL FRANCISCO: But the -- the 19 graver issue here --20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- the biggest 21 argument that your adversary has is that the 22 agency didn't take into account the -- the 23 assumption that interpretations should favor 24 veterans. 25 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Uh-huh.

63

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So deal with all
 of that.

3 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Sure. Sure. So 4 we do care about how the specific case comes 5 out. But, in terms of how it would apply to 6 this case, at the end of the day, I actually 7 don't think the Federal Circuit should have 8 applied Seminole Rock deference to the VA 9 Board's decision in this case for two reasons. 10 First -- and this is one you might well disagree with us on -- we think we had the 11 12 better interpretation of the regulation, and so 13 we don't think you ever get to Seminole Rock. 14 But, if you disagreed with us on that, one of 15 the key questions and under Seminole Rock and 16 under Chevron --JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Do you think their 17 18 reading is unreasonable or not? 19 GENERAL FRANCISCO: We do. And -- and -- and, secondly, as under Seminole Rock and --20 21 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Let's say we 22 disagree with you on that because it is the 23 usual interpretation of relevant evidence found 24 in the Federal Rules of Evidence, so it's not 25 crazy.

1	GENERAL FRANCISCO: So so I'm going
2	to my that would my second point would
3	be help address that.
4	Assuming you've got some ambiguity and
5	it would otherwise trigger Seminole Rock, under
6	Seminole Rock and Chevron, you only defer if
7	the determination reflects the considered
8	judgment of the agency as a whole.
9	And given the way the VA Board is
10	structured, there are something like 98 members
11	of the VA Board. They issue, I think, over
12	80,000 decisions a year. Their proceedings are
13	ex parte. They're all individual member
14	decisions. They're not made in panels. And I
15	think and none of them have any precedential
16	value.
17	Given that suite of factors, we don't
18	think that any individual Board decision by the
19	VA Board reflects the considered judgment of
20	the agency as a whole
21	JUSTICE GORSUCH: Wow.
22	GENERAL FRANCISCO: as a
23	JUSTICE GORSUCH: So you would have
24	this Court and and and courts across the
25	country judge agency decisions as to how

65

1 considered they are? 2 GENERAL FRANCISCO: No, Your Honor. 3 That's simply --4 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Isn't that a --5 isn't that a bit -- asking a -- a bit of 6 inter-branch disrespect? GENERAL FRANCISCO: I don't think so 7 8 at all, Your Honor. It's exactly what this 9 Court said that the rule was in the Mead case 10 when you're -- when you're undertaking Chevron 11 deference. 12 JUSTICE GORSUCH: No, in Mead --13 GENERAL FRANCISCO: It's actually --14 JUSTICE GORSUCH: No, in Mead, we said 15 that if -- if Congress didn't delegate it in 16 those cases. Here, we're -- we're pay past that. We're on factor four or five of your 17 18 six-part test. 19 GENERAL FRANCISCO: But I think both 20 _ _ JUSTICE GORSUCH: And -- and -- and a 21 22 judge has to decide how considered --23 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Yeah. 24 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- the agency 25 decision is.

66

GENERAL FRANCISCO: Right. But I 1 2 think, in Mead, both the majority and the 3 dissent agreed that you wouldn't get to Chevron 4 deference unless the decision reflect the considered views of the agency as a whole. 5 6 They just disagreed over whether or 7 not the particular decision issued in that case, the customs letter, reflected that 8 9 considered judgment. So I don't think that's an innovation 10 that we're asking for. That's simply an 11 12 elemental aspect of it. But, to go to your -- the other parts 13 14 of your question, Your Honor, when you get down to the application of the veterans canon, the 15 16 Court, of course, didn't grant certiorari on 17 the application of the veterans canon, but 18 assuming that it applies in the context of 19 regulations, we don't think that it would apply in Petitioner's favor here because we believe 20 21 that that is a tie-breaking canon that only 22 applies when two interpretations are equally 23 plausible. 24 And, here, we think that our

Heritage Reporting Corporation

interpretation, even if you don't think it is

the theoretically best one, we think that it is 1 2 more plausible than Petitioner's and, 3 therefore, you wouldn't get to the application 4 of the veteran's canon. 5 But, again, our principal concern on 6 behalf of both the VA and the other agencies 7 throughout the United States is in preserving 8 Seminole Rock in its core applications because 9 that is an issue that transcends the facts of 10 this case. JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So, if I'm 11 12 understanding your views, in answer to Justice Gorsuch, you're basically saying a decision by, 13 14 let's assume, a BIA court is not enough, unless 15 a BIA what? 16 GENERAL FRANCISCO: No, not --17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Unless the agency 18 heads --19 GENERAL FRANCISCO: No -- yeah, not --20 not at all. 21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Tell me when they 22 count --23 GENERAL FRANCISCO: Sure. 24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- and when they 25 don't.

68

1	GENERAL FRANCISCO: Not at all			
2	necessarily, Your Honor. But I think what this			
3	Court's decisions have been clear about across			
4	the board is that whoever is whoever issues			
5	the decision on which we are seeking deference			
6	has to be able to speak for the agency as a			
7	whole. And different agencies have different			
8	ways of doing that.			
9	We don't think that, given the suite			
10	of factors at issue specifically with respect			
11	to the VA Board, meets that standard because			
12	there are so many different indicia suggesting			
13	that an individual Board decision doesn't			
14	reflect the considered views of the VA as a			
15	whole as to the meaning of its regulations.			
16	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,			
17	General.			
18	Three minutes, Mr. Hughes.			
19	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF PAUL W. HUGHES			
20	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER			
21	MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Chief			
22	Justice.			
23	And I'd like to begin, and we thank			
24	the General for the clear recognition here that			
25	deference does not apply in this case or other			

cases like it. We certainly agree with that conclusion.

1

2

But we still believe that the 3 4 appropriate resolution of this case is to 5 overturn Seminole Rock and Auer in their whole 6 because it's critical to restore the importance 7 of notice-and-comment rule-making that Congress 8 thought was a critical check to bring 9 democratic accountability to the agencies. 10 We certainly agree that agencies have a very substantial role to play in 11 12 policy-making, but Congress made the judgment that the way that that is done in a democratic 13 14 way accountable to the population is through 15 notice-and-comment rule-making, such that the regulated public can provide their views. 16 17 And that also accounts with the 18 theoretical underpinnings of how this Court has 19 explained that deference can be appropriate to 20 agencies. 21 There are two things that are 22 required: first, a delegation of the subject 23 matter but, second, that the agency acts in the particular manner that Congress has delegated 24 25 the agency to -- to act within.

Heritage Reporting Corporation

1 In this context, as we've explained, 2 the particular manner that the agency 3 identified was through rule-making that 4 provides the public that ability to 5 participate. And that's the fundamental 6 problem. 7 My -- my second --8 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What do you -- what 9 is your answer to the delay? And -- and what 10 do we do in the interim, one year, two years, 11 three years? 12 MR. HUGHES: Well, a few things about the delay, Your Honor. That's part of the 13 14 balance the APA struck. If the agency wants to 15 move faster, it can use interpretive rules that bring consistency to the agency but don't have 16 binding effect in law -- in courts. They would 17 have the -- the -- the effect of Skidmore. 18 19 In the event that there is some sort 20 of emergency situation, the APA contemplates 21 that for allowing for regulations pursuant to 22 the good cause exception, if the agency can 23 show that there is something that is akin to an 24 emergency that would warrant something like a 25 preliminary injunction in court.

71

1	So Congress has provided for those			
2	sorts of emergency situations when the delay in			
3	in the regulatory process would actually			
4	pose some kind of practical problem.			
5	But, to turn additionally to the			
6	practical problems that exist in Auer			
7	deference, as the Chief Justice was explaining,			
8	I think you get a non-satisfactory result			
9	regardless of how courts apply it.			
10	If courts apply it as they did in this			
11	case to say we don't have to to really do			
12	much statutory or or textual construction to			
13	determine if both sides have an argument that			
14	looks plausible on the page, that we then we			
15	defer, that is not a particularly satisfactory			
16	answer.			
17	By contrast, if courts go far down the			
18	road of step one and do the interpretation but			
19	then ultimately decide, as many courts have had			
20	to do, that although we think the the agency			
21	has it wrong, as a matter of of			
22	interpretation, we still have to defer to the			
23	agency because it's close enough, that's also			
24	not a satisfactory answer.			
25	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: By the way, your			

72

1 -- the General said, if we adopt your 2 interpretation and rescind Auer deference in 3 total, that every case that relied on Auer 4 deference would be subject to new litigation. MR. HUGHES: Well, Your Honor, I 5 6 think, as I explained with the Marsh example 7 earlier, all of those cases are already 8 fundamentally --9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No --10 MR. HUGHES: -- unstable --11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- but they're 12 still going to come to court for courts to 13 decide if that's true or not. Every losing 14 party under prior Auer deference litigation is 15 going to come to court to argue that it -under its reading it has the better reading. 16 It could be shot down, but it's going to still 17 18 argue it. 19 MR. HUGHES: If I may, Your Honor? 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Yes. MR. HUGHES: I don't think that 21 22 increases any instability in the aggregate 23 because the existing circumstance is completely 24 unstable. 25 However, if prospectively Auer does

1	not apply, that is what ultimately leads to
2	stability, because interpretations of
3	regulations would just be like interpretations
4	of statutes that would have binding effect
5	absent the agency or Congress going through the
6	process that's constitutionally and statutorily
7	prescribed for amending the underlying text.
8	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
9	counsel, General. The case is submitted.
10	(Whereupon, at 11:10 a.m., the case
11	was submitted.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Official - Subject to Final Review

1	acted [1] 17:15	allowing [1] 70:21	arguments [1] 31:1	
	acting [2] 14:18 36:21	allows [2] 6:10 11:15	arise [1] 6:17	
10 [1] 17: 8		allude [1] 22:20	arms [1] 26:21	
10:09 [2] 1:17 3:2	action [2] 7:11 21:10			
	actions [1] 13:6	already [6] 31:5 33:22 50:20 51:19	around [3] 23:9 26:21 27:1	
11:10 [1] 73: 10	active [3] 10:14 12:17 16:7	55: 15 72: 7	array [1] 3:17	
12 [1] 17: 9	activity [1] 7:8	alternative [3] 17:3 39:8 55:17	arrive [2] 3:15 16:19	
13 [1] 25 :10	acts [3] 7:15 60:24 69:23	although [2] 34:20 71:20	arrives [1] 58:13	
18-15 [1] 3:4				
1800s [2] 24: 3,13	actually [8] 22:20 36:13 37:3,4 43:	altogether [2] 33:24 37:22	articulate [1] 16:22	
1832 [1] 24 :7	17 63 :6 65 :13 71 :3	ambiguity [16] 4:18 34:18,22,24,	articulated [1] 15:21	
	add [2] 51:13 54:25	25 43 :25 44 :9,21 49 :19 52 :4,8,12,	aside [1] 18:7	
1850 [1] 24 :4	addition [1] 22:15	14,16 53: 24 64: 4	aspect [1] 66:12	
1944 [1] 21: 18	additionally [1] 71:5	ambiguous [12] 7:23 34:4 38:22	assisting [1] 58:21	
1947 [1] 22: 19	address [3] 32:13 33:5 64:3	39 :16 40 :6,7 42 :20 45 :12 50 :6,23,	assume [2] 61:20 67:14	
2	addressed [2] 33:3 54:8	25 60 :1	Assuming [2] 64:4 66:18	
2018 ^[2] 9:10 29:7	adjudications [2] 6:17 12:22	amending [1] 73:7	assumption [2] 3:24 62:23	
2019 [1] 1:13	adjudicative [1] 61:5	America [2] 9:17,18	attention [1] 11:2	
27 [1] 1 :13	adjudicators [1] 7:6	American [1] 38:4	Attorney [2] 22:7,19	
	administering [1] 46:7	amicus [4] 56:7 57:19,23 58:13	Auer [65] 3:16 4:8,14,23 5:1,4,11,	
3	administration [1] 24:22	among [2] 55:23 56:24	15 6 :5,25 7 :21 8 :2,3,11 11 :12 12 :	
3 [1] 2:4	Administration's [1] 4:20	amongst [2] 36:17 39:7	2 15 :14,20 17 :8,10,24,24 20 :6,8,	
31 [1] 22 :24	administrative [1] 8:24	amount [7] 14:5 36:14 40:20 44:4,	22 21: 17,17 24: 2,17 26: 22,23 27:	
32 [1] 2 :7	admitted [1] 16:24	7 55: 13 59: 11	10,11,15,23 28: 18,22 29: 12 30: 1,2,	
4	adopt 5 32:10 33:14 43:12,14 72:	anew [1] 47:8	7,12,22,24,24 33:20 38:1,6 43:19	
4	1	announced [1] 20:9	46 :17,25 47 :14 50 :21 57 :12,14,17	
4 [1] 9 :3	adopted [4] 5:8 21:22 22:3 24:5	anomaly [1] 20:1	59 :17 61 :19 62 :2 69 :5 71 :6 72 :2,3,	
40 [1] 35: 13	adopting [1] 54:19	another [1] 29:3		
45 [3] 9 :21,25 42 :11			14,25	
	advance [1] 31:1	answer [11] 6:3,22,23 10:23 41:23	August [1] 9:10	
5	adversarialness [1] 18:4	43: 4 44: 5 67: 12 70: 9 71: 16,24	authorities [1] 14:9	
FO [2] 40+0 F 4+40	adversary [1] 62:21	answering [1] 36:11	authority [7] 14:13 16:24 23:9,11	
50 [2] 49 :6 51 :19	advise [2] 62:2,2	answers [1] 17:20	37 :1 39 :12 60 :2	
554d [1] 13:16	Advocates [1] 9:19	anticipated [1] 6:20	authorization [1] 14:11	
56d [1] 13:15	AFFAIRS [2] 1:8 3:6	APA [15] 6:8 12: 25 13: 17 20: 10,23		
6			average [1] 41:20	
0	AG's [1] 23:8	21: 5,20 22: 2,8 25: 24 26: 3,11 31:	avoid [1] 6:16	
68 [1] 2 :10	Agencies [24] 3:17 6:11 13:1,2 14:	12 70 :14,20	away [1] 31:14	
	9,10,12 15: 7,11 23: 22 24: 15,20	apologize [1] 41:24	В	
8	25 :3 28 :25 32 :15 49 :13 52 :24 53 :	APPEARANCES [1] 1:19	B	
80,000 [1] 64: 12	15 60 :13 67 :6 68 :7 69 :9,10,20	appeared [1] 48:20	back [5] 9:7 24:2 26:16 55:9 61:19	
800 [1] 12 :12			bad [4] 50:17,17,20 51:4	
	agency [65] 7:3,5,6,7,10,24 11:13,	appears [1] 3:12	balance [3] 12:25 15:5 70:14	
9	15 13: 5,6,21 15: 8,23 16: 20 20: 16,	applicability [1] 21:10		
9 [1] 52:1	19,19,24,25 21 :10 23 :12,14,19 25 :	application [5] 48:20 53:20 66:15,	banc [4] 29:5,11,17,19	
	16 26 :9 27 :21 28 :1 31 :5,14,21 33 :	17 67: 3	based [6] 24:18 46:20 59:18 60:11,	
98 [1] 64: 10	7,15 35:16,18 37:10 43:9 44:19,	applications [8] 32:25 33:6 36:13	11,20	
A	22 46 :6,9 49 :22 50 :14 54 :2 57 :1,8	51 :24 53 :13 58 :18 59 :10 67 :8	basically [2] 24:14 67:13	
			basis [6] 17:12 29:12 51:9 59:17,	
a.m [3] 1:17 3:2 73:10	60 :24 61 :4,7 62 :22 64 :8,20,25 65 :	applied 5 16:14 17:25 48:17,23	19,21	
ability [3] 21:1 26:7 70:4	24 66:5 67:17 68:6 69:23,25 70:2,	63 :8	bear [1] 16:9	
able [5] 8:21 10:2 21:2 57:1 68:6	14,16,22 71: 20,23 73: 5	applies [7] 5:2 8:3 16:1 19:18 50:5		
above [1] 60:18	agency's [14] 7:11,13 8:5,18 15:	66: 18,22	become [1] 32:12	
above-entitled [1] 1:15	15 16:24 26:1 39:7 44:15 45:21	apply [13] 3:14 5:23 15:4,20 52:17	Beecham [1] 27:9	
	48: 22 51: 15 58: 5 59: 25	53 :25 59 :4 63 :5 66 :19 68 :25 71 :9,	begin [7] 5:19 11:12 17:21 20:8 25:	
absent [1] 73:5		10 73 :1	22 39:17 68:23	
absolutely [4] 21:6 34:13 52:6 53:			behalf [9] 1:21,24 2:4,7,10 3:9 32:	
10	aggressive [1] 48:7	applying [3] 27:23 50:6,9	21 67 :6 68 :20	
accept [1] 61:21	ago [1] 9:5	approach [2] 61:21 62:2		
accepted [1] 30:1	agree [15] 3:12 7:2,22 14:11 22:15	appropriate [4] 17:3,19 69:4,19	behave [1] 36:7	
account [2] 27:9 62:22	23: 3 25: 24 41: 7,13 51: 12,25 52: 1,	approved [1] 10:15	believe [7] 5:9 23:18 27:18 49:9,	
accountability [5] 33:11 38:19 50:	40.00 4.40	area [2] 14:12 31:17	18 66: 20 69: 3	
-	agreed [1] 66:3	areas [4] 15:16,23 16:25 53:14	believed [1] 54:17	
13 60 :15 69 :9		-	below [3] 4:7 61:22,23	
accountable [3] 33:15 56:3 69:14	agreement [1] 40:15	aren't [4] 19:10 38:16 49:13 59:7	benefit [7] 36:14 37:3,13 39:9 46:	
accounted [1] 47:23	air [1] 21:16	arguably [1] 48:17	6 51 :23 59 :2	
	akin [1] 70.00	argue [3] 57:22 72:15,18		
accounts [1] 69:17	akin [1] 70:23			
	ALITO [7] 10:5 13:7 15:14 29:23	argued [1] 5:1	benefits [14] 33:2,9 38:14 41:2,3	
accumulated [1] 26:23	ALITO [7] 10:5 13:7 15:14 29:23		42 :17 54 :11,14 55 :21,22 56 :10 58 :	
accumulated [1] 26:23 accurate [2] 40:18 60:5	ALITO [7] 10:5 13:7 15:14 29:23 46:16 59:13,15	arguing [1] 53:11	42 :17 54 :11,14 55 :21,22 56 :10 58 :	
accumulated [1] 26:23 accurate [2] 40:18 60:5 across [7] 33:17 37:5 39:4 46:11	ALITO [7] 10:5 13:7 15:14 29:23 46:16 59:13,15 Alito's [1] 53:4	arguing ^[1] 53:11 argument ^[18] 1:16 2:2,5,8 3:4,8 5:	42 :17 54 :11,14 55 :21,22 56 :10 58 :	
accumulated [1] 26:23 accurate [2] 40:18 60:5 across [7] 33:17 37:5 39:4 46:11 55:18 64:24 68:3	ALITO [7] 10:5 13:7 15:14 29:23 46:16 59:13,15 Alito's [1] 53:4 alive [1] 33:19	arguing [1] 53:11 argument [18] 1:16 2:2,5,8 3:4,8 5: 7,14,21 16:2 29:25 31:8,17 32:20	42 :17 54 :11,14 55 :21,22 56 :10 58 : 11 59 :3,12 beside [1] 4 :16	
accumulated [1] 26:23 accurate [2] 40:18 60:5 across [7] 33:17 37:5 39:4 46:11	ALITO [7] 10:5 13:7 15:14 29:23 46:16 59:13,15 Alito's [1] 53:4	arguing ^[1] 53:11 argument ^[18] 1:16 2:2,5,8 3:4,8 5:	42: 17 54: 11,14 55: 21,22 56: 10 58: 11 59: 3,12	

	Official - Subjec	t to Final Review	
45: 11,20,22 46: 1,14 48: 23 49: 5,	century [1] 17:9	concluded [1] 55:15	23 36:19 38:17 39:22 40:24 48:21
11,19,20 51 :18,21 59 :20 67 :1	certainly [8] 5:20,25 8:2 41:14 50:	conclusion [3] 39:6 40:6 69:2	54:18 57:23,25 58:7 59:21 60:3
better [6] 4:20 5:21 24:22 37:20	1,2 69: 1,10	conclusions [1] 46:13	61: 22,22,23,23 64: 24 65: 9 66: 16
63 :12 72 :16	certiorari [1] 66:16	conditions [2] 14:17 23:9	67:14 69:18 70:25 72:12,15
between [1] 15:5	cetera [1] 51:7	conduct [3] 7:13 25:1,9	Court's [7] 19:4 27:10 30:9 34:19
BIA [4] 38:2 56:8 67:14,15	Chamber [1] 37:22	conference [1] 45:6	48: 10,16 68: 3
big [2] 45 :16 53 :8	change [8] 11:25 18:21 19:6 21:24	confidence [1] 27:25	courts [33] 8:8 24:13 25:10 28:4
biggest [1] 62:20	22 :9 26 :19 27 :6 32 :2	confirm [1] 48 :24	29: 18,25 30: 4,7,11,11,21,21 31: 24
bind [1] 7:5	changed [4] 12:9 18:19,20,22	conform [1] 25:8	33 :17 37 :2,5 38 :5 39 :4,5 40 :24 44 :
binding [6] 7:9 8:7 26:2 29:20 70:	changes [9] 9:5,12,14,22,25 14:16,		1 46 :11,19 52 :25 55 :18 59 :25 64 :
17 73:4	17 31: 21 42: 11	Congress [31] 6:7 7:9 14:8,14,25	24 70 :17 71 :9,10,17,19 72 :12
bit [4] 12:17 26:16 65:5,5	changing [1] 26:24	17 :13,14,15 18 :19,20,21,22 19 :1,5	covalent [1] 10:16
blanks [1] 60:14	charged [1] 58:21	26 :3 28 :24 31 :11 32 :9,12 52 :25	crazy [1] 63:25
blind [1] 7:21	check [1] 69:8	54 :17 59 :24 60 :12,25 61 :3 65 :15	creates [2] 39:17 40:11
Board [7] 64:9,11,18,19 68:4,11,13	Chevron ^[6] 44:11 52:2 63:16 64:	69 :7,12,24 71 :1 73 :5	credit [2] 29:8 38:10
Board's [1] 63:9	6 65 :10 66 :3	congressional [1] 26:12	critical [4] 12:14 26:10 69:6,8
bond [1] 10:16	CHIEF [19] 3:3,10 8:13 10:3 26:15	consensus [1] 16:9	cumbersome [1] 41:1
books [4] 33:1 47:6 54:15 60:8	27 :5,19 28 :14 32 :17,22 42 :24 43 :	consider [1] 27 :24	curious [1] 49:7
both [11] 5:9 19:3 22:12 25:20 38:	18 44 :2,20 68 :16,21 71 :7 72 :20	considerable [2] 19:20 22:10	
	, ,		currently [2] 6:1 47:6
14 52 :25 53 :15 65 :19 66 :2 67 :6	73:8	consideration [1] 23:20	customs [1] 66:8
71:13	choice [4] 13:2 33:13 39:7 46:8	considerations [1] 60:19	cuts ^[2] 22:17,20
bounds [1] 28:2		considered [9] 11:23 12:8 64:7,	D
boy [1] 43:7	Circuit ^[14] 4 :7,10,13,23,25 5 :1,3,8,		D.C [3] 1 :12,20,23
branch [1] 17:2	8 25 :10 29 :6,11,17 63 :7	consistency [2] 13:6 70:16	day [7] 27:7 37:25 38:5 47:24 60:6
BREYER [16] 10:7,19 11:18 12:19	Circuit's [2] 4:19 29:19	consistent [9] 27:10 33:8 34:6,16	61:3 63: 6
13 :15,23 14 :15 20 :15 21 :4 22 :6,	circumstance [1] 72:23	35: 4,4 51: 5,6 56: 19	deal [4] 10:1 14:20 15:16 63:1
25 23 :3,14 35 :9 49 :3,5	circumstances [2] 15:2 18:12	consists [1] 10:14	debate [2] 8:15 60:4
brief [7] 9:4 10:8 23:8 56:7 57:20,	circumvent [1] 32:15	constantly [1] 30:17	decades [4] 18:24 33:1 54:16 60:8
23 58 :13	circumvention [1] 6:6	constitutional [1] 18:14	decide [7] 11:4 34:3 56:19,21 65:
briefs [1] 47:25	cited [1] 11:19	constitutionally [1] 73:6	22 71 :19 72 :13
bring [4] 13:5 36:10 69:8 70:16	claims [1] 38:1	construction 6 24:5,9 50:10 52:	decided [7] 11:8 19:4 21:18 26:3
broader [3] 3:25 39:19 53:3	clean [1] 59:16	3,18 71: 12	
brought [1] 16:8	clear [6] 11:25 23:17 45:25 61:15	constructions [2] 46:2,5	29:6,12 54:13 decides [3] 13:19 21:6 31:19
built [2] 36:9 57:5	68: 3,24	consult [1] 13:19	
bump [1] 8:24	close [1] 71:23	contemplates [1] 70:20	deciding [1] 4:13
Bureau [1] 37:23	closer [2] 49:10,23	contention [1] 3:13	decision [19] 4:7 5:4 19:8 23:2 29:
bureaucracy [2] 56:2,6	colleague [1] 42:9	context [10] 14:24 16:3 25:25 50:3,	5,5,20 30 :13,23 48 :24 56 :8 63 :9
business [2] 4:12 16:5	colleagues [1] 24:20	12 51 :7 52 :4 59 :5 66 :18 70 :1	64 :18 65 :25 66 :4,7 67 :13 68 :5,13
<u>с</u>	colloquy [1] 55:10	contexts [1] 16:18	decision-makers [1] 20:19
	combination [1] 60:16	contrast [1] 71:17	decision-making [2] 36:25 39:12
call [2] 7:21 56:3	come [9] 36:21 40:5 44:4,14 46:12	control [3] 12:5,23 52:25	decisions [9] 13:6 17:7 20:18 31:
called [1] 49:17	49:6 51:21 72:12,15	convince [1] 39:5	4 38 :2 64 :12,14,25 68 :3
came [1] 1:15	comes [2] 43:3 63:4	coordinate [1] 17:2	decisis [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:17
canon [4] 66:15,17,21 67:4	coming [2] 5:24 56:7	core [9] 33:6 36:12 46:4 51:23 53:	30: 9 53: 5,17
capture [1] 57:1	comity [1] 23:21	12,18 58: 17 59: 10 67: 8	decrease ^[1] 42:1
care [6] 50:21 61:17 62:12,13,14	comment [21] 6:16 7:1 8:6 12:16	Corp [1] 23:1	deeply [2] 43:1 62:13
63 :4	31:8,11,15 32:3,6,9,11 39:21,23,	correct [3] 4:13 40:19 61:24	default [2] 15:3,4
careful [1] 28:5	24 40 :1,22 42 :10,12 54 :25 55 :8,	correctly [1] 11:8	defer [8] 35:6 39:6 43:9 44:22 59:
carried [1] 23:2	22	couldn't [1] 18:20	25 64: 6 71: 15,22
cars [1] 14:17	comments [2] 9:16,24	Counsel [4] 26:15 32:18 42:24 73:	deference [47] 3:13,16 4:8,14,23
Case [46] 3:4,14,21 4:14 5:2,5,24 6:	Commerce [1] 37:23	9	5: 2,4,12,22,23 6: 5,25 7: 22 8: 2,3,
22 17: 24 21: 7,19 28: 2,3 29: 2,3,6,	Commission [1] 24:11	count [1] 67:22	11 11: 13 15: 18,25,25 16: 13 17: 10,
12 30:13 39:3 43:19 45:24 47:15	complete [1] 4:8	counted [1] 9:21	11,24,25 20: 22 25: 5,6 26: 2,25 27:
56: 9,11,19 58: 7,13,16,19 59: 6,8,	completely ^[3] 40:4 46:25 72:23	country [7] 33:17 37:6 39:4 46:11	2 29: 13 32: 24 38: 1 54: 3 58: 8 59:
22 61:17 62:13 63:4,6,9 65:9 66:8	complex [1] 58:22	49 :21 55 :18 64 :25	10 63 :8 65 :11 66 :4 68 :5,25 69 :19
67:10 68:25 69:4 71:11 72:3 73:9,	complicated [4] 45:23 46:7 51:14,		71: 7 72: 2,4,14
10	20	couple [3] 38:24 45:18 62:10	deferred [1] 10:12
cases [36] 5:24 6:25 8:4,9,20 12:2,	compound [1] 10:13	course ^[12] 4:3 10:3 12:5,6,7,8 17:	define [1] 35:18
4 18 :9 19 :4,7,11 22 :8 24 :3,12 25 :	concede [1] 5:15	19 46: 21 53: 20 55: 7 60: 12 66: 16	definitely [1] 42:15
25 28 :5 30 :2,2,5,6,9,14,20 34 :19			definition [3] 39:8 41:5 42:20
45: 16 46: 4,19 48: 11,16,19 49: 8	conceptual [2] 59:19,21	COURT [59] 1:1,16 3:11,14 5:10, 25 7:0 22 8:11 16 17 10:12 12:25	definitions [1] 39:8
52: 11 62: 16 65: 16 69: 1 72: 7	concern [6] 39:24 46:22,23,24 47:	25 7:9,22 8:11,16,17 10:12 12:25	degree [6] 8:14,15,16 9:1 22:10
cast [1] 37:16	2 67:5 concerned [3] 46:16 58:15 59:8	15: 18,21 16: 19,20 17: 10,17,24 19:	40 :4
cause [1] 70:22	conclude [1] 52:3	5,6,9 21 :9 22 :23 23 :18 24 :4 27 :22, 25 29 :3 30 :3,22 31 :19 32 :10,11,	delay [3] 70:9,13 71:2
	CONCIUME 1992.0	20 23.0 30.0,22 31.13 32.10,11,	- ·

	Official - Subjec	t to Final Review	
delegate [1] 65:15	effectuating [2] 61:7,9	explains [1] 22:21	7,14,17 47:1,16 48:2 50:1,8,22 51
delegated [4] 14:11,13 60:2 69:24	efficient [2] 39:25 41:9	explanation [1] 12:9	1,11 52: 6,13 53: 10 54: 23 55: 1,6,
delegation [4] 59:18 60:25 61:2	either 5 4:17 19:24 23:19 46:17	explanations [1] 32:1	20,25 56:4 57:3,15,18,21 58:2,14
69: 22	51 :6	expressly [1] 4:25	59 :14,20 60 :17 61 :12,15,25 62 :4,
democratic [7] 49:14,16,21 50:13	elemental [1] 66:12	extensive [2] 44:4,7	8,10,18,25 63:3,19 64:1,22 65:2,7
56: 15 69: 9,13	elements [1] 34:3	extraordinary [1] 41:3	13,19,23 66: 1 67: 16,19,23 68: 1
democratically [2] 49:13 56:3	eliminate [1] 52:10	eye [1] 37:16	Frank [1] 49:7
depart [1] 8:12	eliminating [1] 37:21	-	frankly [1] 53:13
Department [5] 1:23 24:6 26:1 29:	emergency ^[3] 70:20,24 71:2	F	friend ^[2] 47:4 52:20
14.16	emphasis [1] 43 :24	face [3] 39:10 48:17 55:15	friend's [1] 49:1
depends [5] 26:18 27:20,20,21,21	employees [1] 29:9	faced [1] 37:25	front [1] 44:8
described [1] 49:9	en [4] 29:5,11,17,19	facing [4] 36:24 42:19 46:1,5	FTC [1] 10:22
deserves [1] 26:2	end [5] 27:7 44:8 47:24 61:3 63:6	fact [8] 19:20 21:23 44:9 45:25 49:	function [1] 26:8
detailed [1] 32:1	endemic [1] 40:13	18 52 :24 58 :4 60 :21	functions [1] 13:16
determination [1] 64:7	enforceable [1] 23:5	factor [2] 19:23 65:17	fundamental [1] 70:5
		factors [4] 53:5,8 64:17 68:10	
determine ^[8] 4:12 8:17 11:16 21:	engage [1] 13:2	facts [1] 67:9	fundamentally [1] 72:8
9 22 :13,14 44 :8 71 :13	engaged [1] 37:24	fair [7] 18:2 29:7 34:7 35:7 59:6 60:	further [1] 33:22
determining [2] 51:17 52:8	enormous [1] 55:13	18,19	future [1] 7:5
different [13] 12:13 15:1 16:19 33:	enough [5] 33:22 35:22 58:1 67:	fairly ^[1] 24 :18	G
16 36 :21 40 :5 46 :10,11,12 51 :21	14 71 :23	faith [1] 36:21	gauntlet [1] 28:21
68: 7,7,12	enrich [1] 36:5	faithful [1] 53:16	gave [2] 6:23 59:21
differently [1] 35:19	ensures [1] 57:7		GEN [3] 1:22 2:6 32:20
difficult [1] 31:25	entirety [1] 3:17	fall [2] 35:25 52:15	
direction [1] 26:13	entities [1] 57:2	far [5] 4:20 20:17 31:18 47:1 71:17	General [81] 1:22 12:10 32:19,22
disability [1] 58:11	entitled [1] 15:17	Farm [2] 16:11 37:23	34 :13 35 :2,14,20 36 :2,8 37 :9 38 :
disagree [6] 39:15 41:14 45:5 56:	equally [1] 66:22	faster [2] 13:4 70:15	13 40: 2,10 41: 12,22 42: 2,6,14 43:
6 63: 11,22	error [2] 24:8,16	favor [4] 22:17,21 62:23 66:20	13,16,21 44: 6,25 45: 7,14,17 47: 1,
disagreed [2] 63:14 66:6	especially [1] 56:23	FCC [2] 13:8 14:2	16 48:2 49:4 50:1,8,22 51:1,11 52
disagreement [1] 36:17	ESQ [4] 1:20 2:3,6,9	FDA [5] 10:12 12:10,16 14:4 16:7	6,13 53: 2,10 54: 23 55: 1,6,25 56: 4
disappear [1] 47:22	essentially [1] 25:6	FDA's [1] 13:18	57: 3,15,18,21 58: 2,14 59: 14,20
discover [1] 14:1	establish [1] 14:25	feature [2] 55:3,7	60:17 61:11,12,15,25 62:4,8,10,18
discusses [1] 22:8	established [3] 17:17 21:25 47:7	Federal ^[16] 4:7,10,13,19,22,24 5:	25 63: 3,19 64: 1,22 65: 2,7,13,19,
discussing [1] 15:3	et [1] 51:7	1,2,7,8 13: 10,13 35: 12 42: 4 63: 7,	23 66 :1 67 :16,19,23 68 :1,17,24
dispute [1] 23:23	Even [7] 3:19 12:23 44:22 47:19	24	72 :1 73 :9
disrespect [1] 65:6	48 :6 54 :12 66 :25	feel [1] 24:8	General's [2] 22:7,19
disruptive [3] 48:5,14 49:1	event [1] 70:19	few [6] 6:3 11:10 17:20 52:5 57:4	generalized [1] 25:4
dissent [1] 66:3	everybody [1] 11:19	70 :12	generally [3] 6:8 15:4 51:12
distance [1] 17:22	everybody's [1] 24:1	fight 5 34:23,25 35:3 46:10 61:1	genuine [7] 34:18,22 43:24 44:9
	everyone [1] 55:14	figure [3] 23:6 29:19 42:21	52 :7,8 53 :23
district [8] 13:10,13 33:16,17 35:		file [1] 58:13	genuinely ^[4] 38:22 50:5,23,24
12 39 :4 61 :21,23	everything [5] 20:14 31:9 43:5 48:	filed [1] 57:23	gets [2] 43:1 55:9
disturbing [1] 24:10	6,8	fill [1] 60:13	getting [1] 26:21
doctrine [8] 3:16 8:12 19:19 20:2	evidence [7] 22:2,4,6 35:11,18 63:	final [1] 9:21	GINSBURG [7] 4:15 7:16,19 29:
22: 3 33: 4 53: 18 54: 19	23,24	find [1] 26:25	22,24 30 :19 70 :8
doing 5 11:1 16:21 41:10 61:4 68:			,
8	exactly [5] 10:19 21:21 27:6 55:2	first [16] 4:11 6:4 7:22 10:22 18:12	give [5] 7:1 10:11 33:23 54:4,21
done [4] 17:13 18:23 43:4 69:13	65 :8	19 :17 20 :9 32 :6 33 :6 40 :3 43 :24	given [6] 14 :10 41 :17 57 :24 64 :9,
doubt [1] 46:22	example [5] 9:2 10:11 29:2 38:20	45 :19 48 :21 62 :11 63 :10 69 :22	17 68:9
down [6] 35:23 40:23,25 66:14 71:	72 :6	five [1] 65:17	Gonzales [1] 27:9
17 72: 17	exception [5] 13:17,24,24 14:7 70:	fix [1] 54:17	GORSUCH [30] 5:13 15:13 33:18
dozen [2] 18:9 30:2	22	flexibility [1] 13:4	34 :23 35 :3,15,21 36 :4 37 :7,11 47 :
dozens [2] 33:15 39:3	exceptional [1] 15:22	flipping [1] 43:7	9,17 53 :1 55 :20 56 :1,5 57 :12,16,
due [1] 17:2	excuse [1] 37:1	focus [2] 36:10 48:15	19 58: 1,9 63: 21 64: 21,23 65: 4,12
durability [1] 31:20	executive [3] 61:5,7,9	Footnote [3] 9:3 22:24 52:1	14,21,24 67: 13
	exercise [1] 14:12	force [8] 7:12,14,20 19:18 22:23	got [6] 9:16 38:21 42:21 54:13 61:
E	exist [1] 71:6	28: 9,23 29: 1	2 64: 4
each [2] 12:21 48:19	existing [3] 9:11 34:16 72:23	forces [1] 11:13	govern [1] 55:24
earlier [2] 36:19 72:7	exists [2] 6:1 31:3	foregoing [1] 24:5	government [15] 3:12 4:15,24,25
early [1] 24:3	expediency [1] 13:4	forward [1] 23:2	9:4 17:2,22 18:6 37:8,16 39:20 41
easier [1] 15:6		found [3] 9:8 28:1 63:23	10 45 :13 53 :7 58 :10
edge [1] 53:19	expertise [8] 20:16 23:23 24:20	four [1] 65:17	government's [11] 5:3,7,14,20 6:
0	34: 9 35: 7,11,22 60: 14	FRANCISCO [77] 1:22 2:6 32:19,	10 9:3 17:23 18:1,8 38:10 45:11
equice 11 35.75			
edifice [1] 35:25 effect [10] 7:9 8:7 15:7 18:12 28:9	explain [1] 16:8		
effect [10] 7:9 8:7 15:7 18:12 28:9	explained [5] 48:22 59:3 69:19 70:	20,22 33 :18 34 :13 35 :2,14,20 36 :	grab [1] 11:6

	Official - Subjec	t to Final Review	
granted [1] 5:11	immigrant [2] 56:9,24	invitation [1] 5:3	kind [6] 19:23 20:18 30:15 36:6 59:
graver [1] 62:19	immigration [1] 37:25	involving [1] 56:9	18 71 :4
great ^[4] 8:25 10:1 15:16 47:12	impediments [2] 39:23 41:8	isn't [5] 21:15 23:5 25:7 65:4,5	kinds [1] 60:10
greatest [1] 11:6	implement [1] 13:5	issue [¹⁵] 3 :17,25 6 :15,21 19 :8 26 :	KISOR [2] 1:4 3:4
greatly [2] 28:2 52:10	implemented [1] 31:11	17 31 :14 32 :14 41 :8 52 :21 60 :24	knowledge [1] 15:17
	-		5
grievously [1] 20:4	importance [2] 15:22 69:6	62 :19 64 :11 67 :9 68 :10	knows 5 12:10,16 13:8 17:14 23:
group [2] 10:16 49:15	important [6] 6:4 15:11 21:18 42:	issued [2] 9:9 66:7	15
guess [9] 28:7 35:24 38:8 41:16	16 44: 16 53: 14	issues [3] 6:16 53:21 68:4	L
45 :15,17 47 :9 57 :22,22	imposed [2] 6:7 26:11	itself [11] 6:22 28:1 33:7 36:1 44:	Labor [3] 29:7,14,16
guidance [2] 31:15 32:5	imposing [1] 53:18	10 50 :3 54 :6 57 :14 58 :21,24 59 :3	
Н	impossible [1] 20:22	J	lack [3] 12:15 18:4 30:14
	imprecise [1] 28:12		lacking [1] 26:13
half [1] 17:9	imprecision [1] 28:17	JAMES [1] 1:4	Land [1] 24:11
hand [1] 15:9	inadequately [1] 12:7	January [1] 9:20	Lands [1] 24:6
handed [2] 40:23,25	inappropriately [1] 11:23	Jerome [1] 49:7	landscape [1] 20:3
hands [1] 27:1		job [2] 13:18 29:9	language [5] 22:12 34:20,22 36:
happen [1] 41:19	including ^[2] 6:9 9:17	John [1] 35:12	20 44:9
happened [3] 6:18 9:8 57:17	inconsistencies [1] 27:16	joined [1] 10:15	large [2] 40:20 42:1
	inconsistency [1] 48:15	-	•
happening [1] 19:25	inconsistent [2] 48:18 54:1	Judge [15] 12:11 21:6,8 23:10 35:	largely [1] 54:8
happens [8] 8:20 26:8 30:6 40:8	increases [2] 31:3 72:22	12 43: 1,6 44: 3,7,13 56: 17,18,20	larger [1] 58:6
43 :1,11 45 :6,13	indeed [1] 7:23	64 :25 65 :22	last [1] 25:13
hard [2] 26:25 32:1	independent [3] 56:16,18,20	judge's [1] 23:9	late [1] 60:6
hat [1] 20:25	indicates [1] 7:14	judge-made [1] 18:13	later [5] 12:2,4 21:21 29:15 56:2
heads [1] 67:18	indicia [1] 68:12	judges [18] 11:4,22 12:5,12 13:10,	Laughter [7] 10:18 11:9 27:4 43:
hear [1] 3:3		14 14 :4 20 :17 36 :17 39 :14,14 40 :	15.20 49: 25 62: 7
held [1] 58:7	individual [4] 14:15 64:13,18 68:	5 44: 13,22 46: 12 49: 17 51: 19 62:	law [15] 7:12,15,20 21:25 22:23 28:
help [1] 64:3	13	2	9,23 29 :1 30 :24 34 :11,16 40 :23
high [2] 34:7 35:5	initial [1] 25:23	judging [1] 16:6	56 :19,21 70 :17
	initially [1] 9:22		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
high-profile [1] 57:24	injects [2] 19:20 27:16	judgment [5] 20:23 64:8,19 66:9	law-making [2] 8:22 26:8
highlights [1] 29:4	injunction [1] 70:25	69: 12	lawful [2] 60:25 61:2
highly [4] 16:4 38:8 45:21 51:16	innovation [1] 66:10	judicial [3] 11:6 28:10 45:6	lawyers [3] 36:4 37:24 38:4
history [3] 22:5 25:21,23	innovations [1] 26:11	jurists [1] 36:20	lead [1] 31:17
hold [1] 30:16	inguiry [1] 45:2	Justice [145] 1:23 3:3,11,19,23 4:4,	leads [2] 8:22 73:1
Honor [55] 3:22 4:1,6,22 5:20 7:2	inside [1] 15:8	15 5: 13 6: 13 7: 16,19 8: 13 10: 3,5,	least [3] 8:17 26:18 56:23
8 :1,19 11 :11 12 :14,24 13 :11 14 :6,		7,19 11 :18 12 :19 13 :7,15,23 14 :	left [4] 33:19 54:10 55:12,14
23,25 15 :19 16 :17 17 :21 19 :2,17	instability 5 19:21 27:17 29:4 31:	15 15 :13,14,24 16 :10,16 17 :5 18 :	legal [7] 6:5,16 7:8 13:13 19:21 20:
20 :7,21 22 :1,18 25 :19 27 :11 28 :	3 72:22	3,17 19 :10,22 20 :12,14 21 :4 22 :6,	3 27: 17
	instances [1] 61:7		-
16 31 :2 32 :8 34 :15 36 :3,9 38 :13	instead [1] 11:2	25 23 :3,14,25 25 :5 26 :15 27 :5,18,	Legion [1] 38:4
41 :12,22 42 :2,15 43 :13,22 44 :25	institution [1] 49:22	19 28 :14 29 :22,23,24 30 :19 31 :7,	legislative [5] 54:18 59:24 60:5,
51 :2,12 53 :11 55 :1 57 :3,21 58 :14	intend [2] 7:10 22:9	13,22 32: 17,22 33: 18 34: 23 35: 3,	10 61: 6
62: 11 65: 2,8 66: 14 68: 2 70: 13 72:	intended [1] 32:12	9,15,21 36: 4 37: 7,8,11 39: 14 40: 8	less [10] 12:23 18:11 19:18 20:17
5,19	intent [4] 54:18 59:24 60:5,10	41 :7,19,25 42 :4,8,22,24 43 :18 44 :	27:13 46:23 47:2 49:1,16 58:15
Honor's [3] 25:22 30:10 41:15	inter-branch [1] 65:6	2,12 45: 4,9,16 46: 16 47: 9,17 49: 3,	
hope [1] 39:4		4,5,8,9 50 :7,15,16,24 51 :3,25 52 :9	level [3] 20:6 34:7 35:5
however [2] 18:23 72:25	interbranch [1] 23:21	53 :1,2,3 54 :20,24 55 :4,20 56 :1,5	life [1] 35:4
HUGHES [57] 1 :20 2 :3,9 3 :7,8,10,	interest [2] 17:16 36:11	57: 12,16,19 58: 1,9 59: 13,15 60: 9	likely [1] 48:23
	interests [10] 26:5 37:14,15,18,20		-
22 4 :1,6,22 5 :19 7 :2,17 8 :1,19 11 :	38: 7,12,15,16,18	61 :11,12,14,16 62 :1,5,9,17,20 63 :	limitations [6] 8:2 26:22 33:4 34:
10 12 :14,24 13 :7,11,22 14 :6,23	interim [1] 70:10	1,17,21 64: 21,23 65: 4,12,14,21,24	15 53 :19 54 :8
15 :19 16 :3,15,17 17 :5,20 18 :7 19 :	interpretation [38] 7:24 8:18 13:	67: 11,12,17,21,24 68: 16,22 70: 8	lines [1] 31:2
2,16 20: 7,21 22: 1,18 23: 1,13,17	13 15:15 18:15 24:15 25:10 26:1	71: 7,25 72: 9,11,20 73: 8	literally [2] 12:2 33:20
25 :19 27 :8 28 :13,16 30 :8,25 31 :	29 :14,17,20 33 :8 36 :18 44 :14,15,	Justice's [1] 44:20	litigate [2] 37:4 39:3
10,16 32 :8 53 :6 68 :18,19,21 70 :	17 45: 21 47: 6 48: 7,22 50: 17,18,		litigates [1] 58:10
12 72: 5,10,19,21		<u>К</u>	litigation [3] 57:24 72:4,14
hundreds [3] 10:9 30:3 33:16	19 51 :4,9,18 52 :15 54 :5 56 :11 57 :	KAGAN ^[10] 17: 5 18: 3,17 19: 10,22	little [2] 26:16 49:6
hypothetical [1] 4:5	8,9 60 :1 63 :12,23 66 :25 71 :18,22	20 :12 41 :19 49 :4 53 :2 60 :9	live [1] 20:5
	72 :2	Kane [1] 35:12	
	interpretation's [1] 34:5	KAVANAUGH [23] 15: 24 16: 10,16	long [7] 10:21 17:17 28:18 39:1,21
idea [1] 20:17	interpretations [19] 3:18 12:1 25:	25 :5 31 :7,13,22 37 :8 39 :14 40 :8	41 :21 61 :1
	17,18 30: 15 33: 13 36: 22,25 38: 23		longer [2] 20:2 60:7
identical [1] 34:17	39 :11 48 :18 51 :22 54 :1,3 55 :16	41 :7 44 :12 45 :4,9,16 49 :8,9 50 :7	look [12] 9:14 13:25 18:19 19:25
identified [5] 28:24 48:16 53:21	62 :23 66 :22 73 :2,3	51 :25 52 :9 54 :20,24 55 :4	22 :19 25 :24 28 :5 36 :20 40 :22 44 :
58 :25 70 :3	interpreted [3] 23:5 46:19 48:9	Kavanaugh's [1] 50:16	11 48: 10,12
ignore [2] 23:12,19		keep [3] 33:25 37:13 55:21	looked [1] 9:7
illustrate [1] 38:21	interpreting [1] 51:14	key [3] 33:5 50:4 63:15	looking [2] 41:4 43:6
immediately [1] 53:7	interpretive [8] 10:10 11:15 12:21	kick [1] 61:19	looks [7] 43:3,5 44:4 61:4,5,5 71:
	13: 2,3 15: 6 22: 22 70: 15		

	Official - Subjec		
14	most [8] 6:4 35:10 46:13 48:7 53:	23:24 50:5,19 52:13 64:6 66:21	paying [1] 11:2
losing [2] 30:22 72:13	14 56: 23,25 59: 11	operation [1] 24:7	Pearson [1] 19:3
lot [11] 10:24 11:22 13:8 23:9,10	move [2] 18:10 70:15	opinion [2] 56:8 62:5	people [9] 11:2 25:15 34:23 35:10
36: 9,16 38: 15 40: 15 43: 23 47: 21	much [14] 8:15 10:17 16:14 26:18	opposed [1] 56:16	36 :6 44 :18 49 :16 55 :23 56 :5
lots [1] 45:3	27:6 33:21,22 35:7,7 37:13 44:10	opposite [2] 34:12 42:9	Perez [2] 13:1 23:2
lower [9] 29:18,25 30:4,7,10,21,21	46:23 58:15 71:12	oral [5] 1:16 2:2,5 3:8 32:20	perfectly [1] 22:10
31: 23 39: 22	multiple [13] 33:12 36:24 37:2,5	order [2] 4:11 48:24	perhaps [3] 33:16 34:17 53:18
lysine [1] 10:16	38:23 39:10 41:6 46:2,5 50:10 51:	ordinary [4] 16:5 50:9,9 52:17	period [2] 39:1 42:19
Lysol [1] 23:15	21 55: 16,18	Organization [1] 9:19	person [2] 35:5 58:9
-	must [2] 7:22 37:15	origin [1] 18:15	persuasive [1] 16:2
M		original [1] 54:13	persuasiveness [1] 25:6
made [14] 7:20 9:5,21 10:25 21:15	N	other [18] 13:18 15:9 19:4 24:12	petition [1] 5:10
31 :24 33 :14,22 34 :6,8 47 :11 61 :	narrowed [2] 27:12 28:20	31 :13 40 :24 42 :9 47 :4,25 48 :21	Petitioner [6] 1:5,21 2:4,10 3:9 68:
15 64 :14 69 :12	narrowing [1] 27:10	49 :2 52 :20 54 :24 55 :23 60 :11 66 :	20
Madison [1] 11:7	National [3] 9:18 33:10 37:24	13 67 :6 68 :25	Petitioner's [2] 66:20 67:2
maintenance [1] 8:3	nature [2] 45:2 57:24	others [2] 9:20 28:6	pick [2] 24:4 46:9
majority [2] 5:24 66:2	necessarily [1] 68:2	otherwise [2] 60:1 64:5	pinpointing [1] 40:18
makeweight [1] 48:21	need [6] 3:24 7:1 19:12,13 24:25	ought [6] 34:21 43:14 44:3 53:22,	place [3] 10:20 32:7 43:17
manageable [1] 54:15	28 :24	24 54: 4	plain [1] 7:21
manifest [2] 24:9,16	needed [2] 6:20 26:4	24 54.4 ourselves [1] 24:8	
manifestations [1] 24:18	needs [5] 16:20 18:2 23:18 24:23		plainly [1] 24:9
manner [4] 14:10 41:11 69:24 70:	44:7	out ^[8] 14:25 21:16 23:6 29:19 42:	plausible [3] 66:23 67:2 71:14
2	never [2] 20:10 56:12	21 46 :10 57 :9 63 :5	play [1] 69:11
manual [3] 22:7,19,24	New [4] 6:16 10:14 56:11 72:4	outcome 5 47:13 58:15 61:17 62:	
many [10] 16:14 18:24 19:11 44:17	Ninth [4] 29:5,11,17,19	13,15	plus [1] 19:23
47 :12,18,19 57 :1 68 :12 71 :19	nobody [2] 14:1 33:19	outraged [1] 38:6	point [26] 4:16 14:8 17:23 18:10
Marbury [1] 11:7	NOEL [3] 1:22 2:6 32:20	over [12] 9:16 10:20 16:14,24 17:9	24 :25 25 :8,13,20,21,23 27 :12,23
March [1] 1:13	non-ester [1] 10:16	26 :24 34 :24,25 35 :3 61 :1 64 :11	29: 3 35: 25 38: 21 40: 5 41: 15,16
Marsh [3] 29:6 30:13 72:6	non-satisfactory [1] 71:8	66 :6	45 :9 47 :11 48 :1 50 :4 58 :6 60 :22
Martin [3] 11:14 58:7 59:22	none [1] 64:15	overnight [1] 30:17	61 :18 64 :2
material [1] 9:22	nonetheless [1] 44:18	overreach [1] 32:14	points [4] 14:25 33:6 51:13 62:11
		overrule [4] 17:7 46:25 57:13 61:	policy [2] 11:17 20:19
matter [12] 1:15 8:14,25 10:8 26:	normally ^[1] 6:17	19	policy-making [2] 20:25 69:12
12 33 :21 42 :25 43 :11 54 :13 61 :4	nothing [1] 22:16	overruled [2] 15:15 30:1	political [3] 33:11 38:18 60:14
69 :23 71 :21	notice [32] 6:16 7:1 8:6 9:9 12:15	overruling [2] 17:18 46:17	politically [1] 33:14
mattered [1] 9:25	18 :2 31 :8,10,15 32 :3,6,9,11 33 :8	overturn [1] 69:5	politically-accountable [3] 39:
matters [1] 8:25	34 :8 35 :7 39 :20,23,24,25 40 :22	overturned [1] 15:20	13 46: 9 50 :14
Mead [4] 65:9,12,14 66:2	42: 1,10,12 54: 4,21 55: 8,22 57: 6	overturning [2] 3:15 18:8	poll [1] 51:19
mean [16] 10:8,10 11:5,5 14:16 19:	58 :3,4,12	own [3] 5:7 7:13 18:9	popular [1] 56:25
13,24 27 :20,22 31 :9 41 :2 43 :18	notice-and-comment [15] 6:6 7:	P	population [1] 69:14
49 :5,12 51 :4 62 :12	17 9 :6 14 :22 15 :9 26 :6 31 :24 32 :		portion [1] 60:22
meaning [6] 13:9 16:6 21:7,9 31:	14 38 :25 40 :25 41 :9,20 55 :12 69 :	PAGE [2] 2:2 71:14	pose [1] 71:4
19 68 :15	7,15	panels [1] 64:14	position [9] 11:25 18:8 43:22 46:
means [6] 8:4 12:12 23:7 34:25 35:	Number [2] 24:19 52:11	Paralyzed [1] 9:18	18 47 :5 48 :4,25 55 :2 58 :5
1 61: 1	0	parody [1] 11:5	possibly [1] 10:9
meant [1] 21:24		part [6] 24:21 26:18 28:6 52:7 60:2	potential [1] 58:25
meantime [1] 39:2	objection [1] 12:4	70: 13	potentially [1] 31:1
meets [1] 68:11	obvious [1] 20:13	parte [2] 13:20 64:13	power [4] 11:6,22 61:8,10
member [1] 64:13	obviously [1] 45:8	participate [5] 8:21 10:2 21:2 26:	powers [4] 52:21,23 56:16 60:23
members [3] 57:10 60:3 64:10	offer [1] 9:3	7 70 :5	practical [18] 6:4 8:25 10:7 20:11
middle [1] 56:10	Office [1] 24:11	particular [12] 6:8 10:13 14:10 16:	27: 13 33: 2,2,9 42: 25 43: 11 53: 20,
might [4] 18:4 44:23 56:6 63:10	often [6] 24:22 45:20,24 51:16,20	24 28:11 46:15 58:16,19 59:5 66:	21 54 :9,11,14,14 71 :4,6
million [1] 12:21	60 :20	7 69 :24 70 :2	practice [2] 24:10 26:12
millions [4] 10:10 14:18,19,21	okay [5] 10:24 14:3 45:7 61:19 62:	particularly [5] 15:16,22 48:14 59:	precedential [2] 7:4 64:15
minute [1] 20:18	9	8 71 :15	precise [1] 40:18
minutes [1] 68:18	old [1] 23:15	parties [9] 24:25 25:14 30:25 36:	precisely [1] 14:7
misgauged [1] 54:18	once [3] 27:8 31:19 43:4	15 37 :3,14 53 :15 57 :7,11	
missing [2] 21:12,13	one [39] 6:9,24 7:25 8:10,18 9:2 10:	parts [2] 40:3 66:13	predictability [2] 33:10 34:11
Mister [1] 17:5	11 14: 21 16: 18 21: 12,12 24: 3,4,5,	party [5] 30:22 37:1,19 39:13 72:	preliminary [1] 70:25
modified [2] 47:20,22	19 25: 13 26: 10,20 31: 12 32: 4 33:	14	premise [1] 5:9
moieties [3] 12:11,17 35:10	13 36: 23 39: 19 42: 10,24,25 46: 8	past [4] 17:9 18:23 26:11 65:16	premised [1] 30:23
molety [5] 10:14,15 12:12 16:7 27:	48:3,23 49:12,15 54:21 56:17 61:	pathway [1] 59:1	prepared [1] 41:13
2	6 63 :10,14 67 :1 70 :10 71 :18	PAUL 51:20 2:3,9 3:8 68:19	prescribed [2] 24:10 73:7
months [1] 9:5	onerous [1] 32:12	Pauley [1] 11:14	present [2] 5:6 24:16
	only [12] 4:17 7:7 8:13,14,15 16:1		presented [2] 4:10 6:21
morning ^[1] 3:4	· · · · · · · · · · · ·	pay [1] 65: 16	preserving [4] 36:12 58:17 59:9
L		ting Corporation	1

67 :7	17 45: 1
presumed [3] 59:24 60:10,12	quo [2] 5
presumption [1] 59:23	quotes
presumptions [1] 60:20	
pretty [3] 16:21 21:24 43:5	railroad
previously [2] 10:15 27:14 principal [5] 3:13 4:9 34:15 54:8	raises [
67:5	random
principle [1] 18:2	range [9
principles [3] 24:19 46:20 53:17	40: 16 4
prior [3] 22:8 25:24 72:14	rank [1] 4
private [7] 37:15,17,19 38:11,14,	rarely [1
16 54 :3	rate [1] 5
probably [4] 30:3 35:12 49:10 57:	rate-ma
22	22,24
problem [17] 6:5 8:11 11:20,21 18:	rates [2]
4 28 :7,15,17 39 :22 40 :11,11 44 :	rather # 46:10
12,13 50 :16 53 :8 70 :6 71 :4	rational
problematic [1] 47:19	reach [2
problems [6] 20:11 32:25 33:2 54:	reaction
9,15 71: 6	read [4]
procedural ^[1] 26:4 procedure ^[1] 41:1	reading
procedures [2] 7:10 28:24	17 45 :1
proceedings [1] 64:12	16,16
process [10] 8:22.24 21:2 40:13	reading
42 :16 55 :12 58 :23 59 :7 71 :3 73 :6	real [6] 1
processes [1] 56:15	22 49: 1
promise [1] 56:23	reality [
promotes [2] 33:10 50:13	really [1
promulgate [1] 15:7	25 16: 1
propose [2] 14:20 35:17	19 43 :2 71:11
proposed [5] 9:9,10,23 42:1 46:24	reason
prosecutors [1] 13:20	15,16
prospective [4] 7:12 22:23 28:22 31:18	reason
prospectively [3] 31:16 55:24 72:	33: 3,12
25	39: 7,8,1
protections [1] 26:4	11,25 5
protestations [1] 38:11	reason
provide [4] 8:6 21:2 26:6 69:16	40 :4 51
provided [5] 14:9,13 33:7 59:1 71:	reason
1	reason
provides [3] 15:11 38:7 70:4	63:9
providing [1] 6:12 provision [1] 13:17	REBUT
provision [1] 13:17 public [22] 8:6,21 9:15,24 10:1 12:	receive
18 15 :12 19 :19 21 :1 24 :6 25 :17	receive
26: 5,7 33: 8 54: 4,21 57: 6,10 58: 3,	recent (
12 69 :16 70 :4	recently
pursuant [2] 60:24 70:21	recipe [
pushed [2] 32:5 41:10	recogn
put [4] 6:11 20:24 43:23 51:17	recogn
puts [1] 58:3	recogn
Q	recogni
question [24] 4:9 5:6,10 6:24 7:7	reconci
11 :14 13 :12 23 :24 26 :17 29 :23 30 :	reconci
10 36 :9 39 :16 40 :3 41 :23 43 :2 44 :	reconsi
20 45 :8 52 :23 53 :4 55 :9 60 :7 62 :3	record
66: 14	reduce
questions [3] 39:19 56:21 63:15	reduce
quickly [1] 10:25	reduces

5:21 31:4 ^[1] **51:**18 R d [1] **14:**17 1] 32:24 n [1] 48:12 9 8:4,9 27:24 28:11,12,19 3:8 52:14 **48:**1 1] **11:21** 5**6**.6 aking [6] 13:18,25 14:2,7, 14:16.16 5] **11**:17 **32**:6 **33**:15 **37**:2 I [1] 16:22 ^{2]} **3:**24 **39:**5 n [2] 31:23 32:3 10:8 11:18,19 23:8 **a** [14] **3:**20 **4:**2,19,20,21 **11:** 1,11,20,22 46:1 63:18 72: as [3] 40:17 41:6 50:11 2:3 15:7 16:22 44:17 46: 9 ^[1] 56:13 ^{8]} **4**:16 **6**:24 **7**:19 **14**:2 **15**: 2 17:8 25:7,7,11 28:11 34: 3 44:16 50:4 52:20 61:4 [6] **16**:21 **18**:21,24 **19**:13, able [24] 7:24 8:18 25:18 34:5 36:18.20.24 38:23 11 40:17 41:6 46:2.5.13 50: 1:8 52:15 55:16 59:25 ableness [5] 27:24 35:1 :1.3 ed [1] 6:22 ing [1] 40:19 s [5] 6:3 16:22 23:21 32:4 TAL [2] 2:8 68:19 [1] 25:4 d [1] 42:11 [1] 24:18 y [1] 29:3 ^[2] **34:**10.12 ition [2] 23:22 68:24 ize [2] 12:10 53:19 ized [2] 13:1 19:5 izes [1] 9:4 izing [1] 26:22 ile [1] 20:22 iled [1] 20:10 ideration [1] 58:25 [1] 16:23 [2] 52:10,14 **d** [1] **5**:16 s [1] 40:20 referenced [1] 30:14 responds [1] 27:18

reflect [2] 66:4 68:14 reflected [2] 20:23 66:8 reflects [5] 12:25 58:8 60:21 64:7, 19 req [1] 23:11 regardless [1] 71:9 regime [2] 45:23 51:20 regimes [1] 51:15 Register [1] 42:5 regulated [16] 8:21 9:15 10:1 12: 17 15:12 24:25 25:14 36:6.14 37: 3.14 53:15 57:2.7.10 69:16 regulation [14] 4:3,17 7:23 9:12 **21**:8 **23**:7 **24**:24 **29**:21 **31**:20 **34**:4 **44:**15 **46:**15 **47:**5 **63:**12 regulations [11] 9:24 10:10 30:16 **32:**2 **46:**20 **47:**13,21 **66:**19 **68:**15 70.21 73.3 regulatory [6] 9:6 45:23 46:7 51: 15,20 71:3 reinforce [2] 53:23,24 reinforcing [1] 33:3 reject [4] 11:22 12:6,7,8 rejecting [2] 11:3 16:23 released [1] 9:20 relevant [8] 13:9 16:6 35:11.18 45: 21 51:16 60:7 63:23 reliability [1] 31:21 reliance [13] 4:8 19:22,24 29:13 **30:**7 **37:**14,15,17 **38:**7,12,15,16 53:4 relied [4] 4:23 22:23 30:21 72:3 relitigated [1] 47:8 rely [4] 16:12 19:20 37:9 57:8 relving [1] 21:11 remain [1] 28:18 remains [3] 52:4.11.16 remember [2] 21:21 58:20 repeatedly [2] 17:15 19:7 repeats [1] 21:17 replaced [1] 34:21 report [1] 22:15 represent [1] 38:4 represented [1] 38:17 representing [1] 48:11 require [6] 15:10 18:8 48:3,6,8 55: 8 required [4] 32:9 34:20 44:10 69: 22 requirement [8] 34:18 43:24 48: 15 50:22 53:23,25 57:6 58:3 requirements [3] 6:7 31:25 54:22 requiring [2] 15:16 32:1 rescind [1] 72:2 rescinded [1] 29:16 reserve [1] 32:16 resolution [1] 69:4 resolve [1] 5:11 resolved [1] 4:14 respect [4] 7:5 17:1 40:21 68:10 respectful [1] 23:20 says [12] 21:5,5,8 22:13,16 23:12, respond [1] 25:20 19 30:22 37:19 43:7 44:14 56:20 Respondent [4] 1:9,24 2:7 32:21

response [2] 9:24 47:10 responses [2] 11:11 45:18 responsibility [1] 49:15 responsible [1] 25:16 rest [1] 5:4 rested [2] 4:7 29:18 restore [1] 69:6 restrained [1] 24:8 rests [1] 59:23 result [3] 3:15 16:19 71:8 retain [2] 5:16 53:17 retained [1] 53:12 reticulated [1] 16:4 retroactive [1] 59:2 reversing [1] 17:16 review [1] 28:10 reviewing [1] 21:8 revised [1] 5:17 revision [3] 30:17 31:5 33:21 revisited [1] 48:6 riahts [1] 62:14 rises [1] 20:6 road [2] 35:23 71:18 **ROBERT** [1] 1:7 **ROBERTS** [14] 3:3 8:13 10:3 26: 15 27:5.19 28:14 32:17 42:24 43: 18 44:2 68:16 72:20 73:8 Rock [50] 3:16 17:8,11 21:17,18 22:4,11 24:2 28:18,22 32:24 33:7 36:12,23 39:10 40:11,12,14,20 42: 18 **46:**4,18,25 **47:**7 **48:**17,20,24 50:3,5 51:23 53:12 54:2,5,9,11,19 **55:**7 **58:**8,17 **59:**9,17,23 **63:**8,13, 15 20 64:5 6 67:8 69:5 role [1] 69:11 rooms [1] 45:6 route [1] 46:24 rule [30] 6:10 9:21 10:22 15:5 17: 17 18:13 19:6 24:1 25:10 27:21 30:13 33:11 35:17 37:21 38:22 41: 5 **42:**11,20 **43:**11 **44:**10,18 **45:**12 **46**:15 **47**:2,3 **48**:13 **50**:5 **52**:17 **55**: 14 65:9 rule-making [15] 7:18 9:7,10 10: 23 15:10 26:6 31:24 38:25 41:1,9, 20 60:2 69:7 15 70:3 rules [23] 3:18 8:23 11:23.24.24.25 **12:**21 **13:**3.3 **15:**1.4.6 **22:**22 **28:**9. 19.20.20 38:8 42:1 55:24 60:1 63: 24 **70**:15 S safeguard [1] 26:5 safeguards [2] 8:7 15:11 same [3] 14:5 39:6 47:13 sample [2] 48:12,13 sanction [1] 8:16 satisfactory [2] 71:15,24 satisfies [1] 58:2 saying [9] 11:1 12:5 15:5 22:9 28: 8 30:19 37:13 57:5 67:13

scale [1] 6:11

quite [7] 6:14 9:25 12:16 28:7,11,

	0111 0 101 5 000 J 0 0	t to Final Review	
Scalia [1] 61:12	six-part [1] 65:18	step [3] 18:25 19:6 71:18	though [6] 4:23 6:2 34:16 39:15
scheme [5] 9:6,8 16:5 31:11 46:8	skeptical [1] 37:16	still [13] 6:10 8:7 27:15 29:20 30:9	42 :7 44 :22
schemes [1] 6:9	Skid [1] 16:11	42: 11,12,15 49: 16 69: 3 71: 22 72:	thousands [1] 10:9
			three [7] 12:20 21:20 24:24 48:16,
scientific [3] 15:17 16:8,25	Skidmore [11] 15:20,21,24,25 16:	12,17	
search [1] 45:19	11,13 17 :1 25 :4 26 :25 27 :2 70 :18	straightforward [1] 13:12	19 68 :18 70 :11
searched [1] 10:5	slate [1] 59:16	strong [1] 36:11	threshold [1] 39:15
second [5] 18:16 60:22 64:2 69:23	slightly [1] 53:3	strongly [1] 22:21	throughout [2] 24:13 67:7
70 :7	SmithKline [1] 27:9	struck [1] 70:14	thrown [1] 46:21
Secondly [2] 45:24 63:20	Solicitor [1] 1:22	structured [1] 64:10	thumb [1] 6:11
secret [2] 54:3 57:8	solution [5] 17:4 32:13 49:19,20,	struggle [1] 55:19	tie-breaking [1] 66:21
SECRETARY [2] 1:7 3:5	21	studies [1] 11:20	tip [1] 29:8
	solve [1] 40:12	study [1] 41:8	
see [4] 9:7 23:4 30:12 47:25		5	tips [1] 29:9
seeking [2] 56:10 68:5	solves [1] 31:8	Sturgeon [1] 24:17	today [2] 27:13 57:2
seem [1] 5:15	somebody [3] 13:19 21:22 34:8	subject [12] 28:10 30:17 31:5 33:	took [2] 5:3 10:22
seems [2] 47:11 56:22	somehow [1] 22:3	12 38:22 40:16 41:5 50:10 52:24	tools [3] 50:10 52:2,17
seen [3] 16:13 41:25 56:12	someone ^[1] 34:7	55:15 69:22 72:4	total [1] 72:3
seminal [2] 55:3,6	something's [1] 39:16	submitted [2] 73:9,11	transcends [1] 67:9
Seminole [50] 3:16 17:8,11 21:17,	sometimes [4] 11:21 29:9,10 58:	subsequently [1] 7:8	treated [1] 10:13
18 22 :4,11 24 :2 28 :18,22 32 :24	22	substantial [4] 9:5 52:22,24 69:11	trigger [1] 64:5
33 :7 36 :12,23 39 :10 40 :11,12,14,	soon [1] 24 :6	substantially [3] 18:11 19:18 27:	trouble [2] 26:20 44:24
		2	
19 42: 18 46: 4,18,25 47: 7 48: 17,	sorry [2] 6:13 37:12	13	troubles [1] 25:13
20,23 50 :3,4 51 :23 53 :12 54 :2,5,9,	sort [2] 38:20 70:19	sufficiently [1] 45:12	true [5] 6:14 8:19 16:2 19:3 72:13
11,19 55 :7 58 :8,17 59 :9,17,23 63 :	sorts [1] 71:2	suggest [1] 25:25	trying ^[3] 6:15 23:6 41:17
8,13,15,20 64: 5,6 67: 8 69: 5	SOTOMAYOR [29] 3:19,23 4:4 6:	suggesting [1] 68:12	turn [2] 5:13 71:5
separation [5] 13:16 52:21,23 56:	13 23:25 41:25 42:4,8,22 50:15,	suggests [1] 28:19	two [14] 9:4 12:20 17:7 21:20 24:
15 60:23	24 51: 3 61: 11,14,16 62: 1,5,9,17,	suite [2] 64:17 68:9	21 33 :5 39 :2 40 :2 42 :25 51 :13 63 :
September [1] 29:7	20 63 :1,17 67 :11,17,21,24 71 :25	suited [1] 20:18	9 66 :22 69 :21 70 :10
series [1] 24:12	72: 9,11	super-seriously [1] 19:12	two-fold [1] 19:17
serious [1] 16:21	· ·		
	Sotomayor's [1] 27:18		types [2] 60:20 62:15
serve [1] 38:7	sound [1] 25:17	supplanted [1] 47:21	U
served [1] 37:21	sounds [3] 11:6 16:10 50:18	support [1] 20:2	ultimate [2] 8:10,23
serves [1] 56:14	speaking [1] 49:13	suppose [2] 27:20 38:21	
serving [1] 38:11	specific [5] 6:21 15:1,1 59:8 63:4	supposed [2] 36:7 49:24	ultimately [4] 6:3 9:23 71:19 73:1
set [1] 28:20	specifically [1] 68:10	SUPREME [2] 1:1,16	unambiguous [1] 4:18
set [1] 28:20 setting [1] 18:7	specifically ^[1] 68:10 speculation ^[2] 48:1,3	SUPREME [2] 1:1,16 surrounding [1] 20:3	unanimously [1] 44:23
	speculation [2] 48:1,3	surrounding [1] 20:3	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58:	unanimously [1] 44:23
setting ^[1] 18:7 seven ^[3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several ^[1] 9:12	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58:	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35:
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34:	surrounding ^[1] 20:3 system ^[4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 <u>T</u> talked ^[4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2	surrounding ^[1] 20:3 system ^[4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked ^[4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical ^[5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23:	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25:
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3	surrounding ^[1] 20:3 system ^[4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked ^[4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical ^[5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14,
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65:	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 30:14
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65:	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 30:14
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [0] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17 sideswiped [1] 56:2	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5 started [1] 53:6	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18 text [3] 9:13 51:6 73:7	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscores [1] 51:22
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17 sideswiped [1] 56:2 significant [6] 33:1,9 36:14 54:14	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5 started [1] 53:6 starting [2] 24:25 25:8	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18 text [3] 9:13 51:6 73:7 textual [1] 71:12 theirs [1] 48:5	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscores [1] 51:22 understand [8] 5:22 18:18 25:8 28:8 33:19 34:2 41:14 47:10
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17 sideswiped [1] 56:2 significant [6] 33:1,9 36:14 54:14 56:22 59:11	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5 started [1] 53:6 starting [2] 24:25 25:8 starts [1] 43:6	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18 text [3] 9:13 51:6 73:7 textual [1] 71:12 theirs [1] 48:5 themselves [1] 36:5	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscores [1] 51:22 understand [8] 5:22 18:18 25:8 28:8 33:19 34:2 41:14 47:10 understandable [1] 24:19
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17 sideswiped [1] 56:2 significant [6] 33:1,9 36:14 54:14 56:22 59:11 significantly [1] 49:1	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 7:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5 started [1] 53:6 starting [2] 24:25 25:8 starts [1] 43:6 State [1] 16:11	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18 text [3] 9:13 51:6 73:7 textual [1] 71:12 theirs [1] 48:5 themselves [1] 36:5 then-binding [1] 29:13	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscores [1] 51:22 understand [8] 5:22 18:18 25:8 28:8 33:19 34:2 41:14 47:10 understandable [1] 24:19 understanding [9] 10:12 24:23
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17 sideswiped [1] 56:2 significant [6] 33:1,9 36:14 54:14 56:22 59:11 significantly [1] 49:1 silently [1] 22:3	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 7:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5 started [1] 53:6 starting [2] 24:25 25:8 starts [1] 43:6 State [1] 16:11 STATES [5] 1:1,17 43:22 58:12 67:	surrounding ^[1] 20:3 system ^[4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked ^[4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical ^[5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells ^[1] 4:16 term ^[1] 36:19 terms ^[2] 21:10 63:5 terrible ^[1] 19:25 test ^[5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18 text ^[3] 9:13 51:6 73:7 textual ^[1] 71:12 theirs ^[1] 48:5 themselves ^[1] 36:5 then-binding ^[1] 29:13 theoretical ^[1] 69:18	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscores [1] 51:22 understand [8] 5:22 18:18 25:8 28:8 33:19 34:2 41:14 47:10 understandable [1] 24:19 understanding [9] 10:12 24:23 25:1,11 45:22 46:14 51:15 60:5
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17 sideswiped [1] 56:2 significant [6] 33:1,9 36:14 54:14 56:22 59:11 significantly [1] 49:1 silently [1] 22:3 similar [1] 49:4	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 7:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5 started [1] 53:6 starting [2] 24:25 25:8 starts [1] 43:6 State [1] 16:11 STATES [5] 1:1,17 43:22 58:12 67: 7	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18 text [3] 9:13 51:6 73:7 textual [1] 71:12 theirs [1] 48:5 themselves [1] 36:5 then-binding [1] 29:13 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 69:18	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscores [1] 51:22 understand [8] 5:22 18:18 25:8 28:8 33:19 34:2 41:14 47:10 understandable [1] 24:19 understanding [9] 10:12 24:23 25:1,11 45:22 46:14 51:15 60:5 67:12
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17 sideswiped [1] 56:2 significant [6] 33:1,9 36:14 54:14 56:22 59:11 significantly [1] 49:1 silently [1] 22:3 similar [1] 49:4 simpler [1] 41:16	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5 started [1] 53:6 starting [2] 24:25 25:8 starts [1] 43:6 State [1] 16:11 STATES [5] 1:1,17 43:22 58:12 67: 7 States' [1] 47:3	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18 text [3] 9:13 51:6 73:7 textual [1] 71:12 theirs [1] 48:5 themselves [1] 36:5 then-binding [1] 29:13 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [3] 40:19 46:14 67:1 theory [2] 44:19 59:18	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 51:22 understand [8] 5:22 18:18 25:8 28:8 33:19 34:2 41:14 47:10 understandable [1] 24:19 understandable [1] 24:23 25:1,11 45:22 46:14 51:15 60:5 67:12 undertake [2] 7:11 28:25
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17 sideswiped [1] 56:2 significant [6] 33:1,9 36:14 54:14 56:22 59:11 significantly [1] 49:1 silently [1] 22:3 similar [1] 49:4	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 7:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5 started [1] 53:6 starting [2] 24:25 25:8 starts [1] 43:6 State [1] 16:11 STATES [5] 1:1,17 43:22 58:12 67: 7	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18 text [3] 9:13 51:6 73:7 textual [1] 71:12 theirs [1] 48:5 themselves [1] 36:5 then-binding [1] 29:13 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 9:18 theoretical [1] 9:13 theoretical [1] 40:19 46:14 67:1 theory [2] 44:19 59:18 theore's [19] 4:18 8:1 13:23,24 17:	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscores [1] 51:22 understand [8] 5:22 18:18 25:8 28:8 33:19 34:2 41:14 47:10 understandable [1] 24:19 understanding [9] 10:12 24:23 25:1,11 45:22 46:14 51:15 60:5 67:12 undertake [2] 7:11 28:25 undertaking [1] 65:10
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17 sideswiped [1] 56:2 significant [6] 33:1,9 36:14 54:14 56:22 59:11 significantly [1] 49:1 silently [1] 22:3 similar [1] 49:4 simpler [1] 41:16	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5 started [1] 53:6 starting [2] 24:25 25:8 starts [1] 43:6 State [1] 16:11 STATES [5] 1:1,17 43:22 58:12 67: 7 States' [1] 47:3	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 $\hline T$ talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18 text [3] 9:13 51:6 73:7 textual [1] 71:12 theirs [1] 48:5 themselves [1] 36:5 then-binding [1] 29:13 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 9:13 theoretical [1] 40:19 46:14 67:1 theory [2] 44:19 59:18 there's [19] 41:8 8:1 13:23,24 17: 22 21:1,12 22:2,4,5 34:24 36:9 40:	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 51:22 understand [8] 5:22 18:18 25:8 28:8 33:19 34:2 41:14 47:10 understandable [1] 24:19 understandable [1] 24:23 25:1,11 45:22 46:14 51:15 60:5 67:12 undertake [2] 7:11 28:25 undertaking [1] 65:10 undoubtedly [1] 20:25
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17 sideswiped [1] 56:2 significant [6] 33:1,9 36:14 54:14 56:22 59:11 significantly [1] 49:1 silently [1] 22:3 similar [1] 49:4 simpler [1] 41:16 simply [4] 53:19 55:12 65:3 66:11 since [2] 11:7 24:2	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5 started [1] 53:6 starting [2] 24:25 25:8 starts [1] 43:6 State [1] 16:11 STATES [5] 1:1,17 43:22 58:12 67: 7 States' [1] 47:3 status [2] 5:21 31:4	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 $\hline T$ talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18 text [3] 9:13 51:6 73:7 textual [1] 71:12 theirs [1] 48:5 themselves [1] 36:5 then-binding [1] 29:13 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 9:13 theoretical [1] 40:19 46:14 67:1 theory [2] 44:19 59:18 there's [19] 41:8 8:1 13:23,24 17: 22 21:1,12 22:2,4,5 34:24 36:9 40: 15 43:7 44:21 49:19 52:22 57:4,4	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 51:22 understand [8] 5:22 18:18 25:8 28:8 33:19 34:2 41:14 47:10 understandable [1] 24:19 understandable [1] 24:23 25:1,11 45:22 46:14 51:15 60:5 67:12 undertake [2] 7:11 28:25 undertaking [1] 65:10 undoubtedly [1] 20:25 uniformity [3] 13:5 33:10 60:15
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17 sideswiped [1] 56:2 significant [6] 33:1,9 36:14 54:14 56:22 59:11 significantly [1] 49:1 silently [1] 22:3 similar [1] 49:4 simpler [1] 41:16 simply [4] 53:19 55:12 65:3 66:11 since [2] 11:7 24:2 single [5] 10:14 33:14 37:1 39:12	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5 started [1] 53:6 starting [2] 24:25 25:8 starts [1] 43:6 State [1] 16:11 STATES [5] 1:1,17 43:22 58:12 67: 7 States' [1] 47:3 status [2] 5:21 31:4 statute [6] 3:20 25:11 26:2 51:5, 10 56:20	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 $\hline T$ talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18 text [3] 9:13 51:6 73:7 textual [1] 71:12 theirs [1] 48:5 themselves [1] 36:5 then-binding [1] 29:13 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 9:13 theoretical [1] 40:19 46:14 67:1 theory [2] 44:19 59:18 there's [19] 41:8 8:1 13:23,24 17: 22 21:1,12 22:2,4,5 34:24 36:9 40:	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 51:22 understand [8] 5:22 18:18 25:8 28:8 33:19 34:2 41:14 47:10 understandable [1] 24:19 understandable [1] 24:23 25:1,11 45:22 46:14 51:15 60:5 67:12 undertake [2] 7:11 28:25 undertaking [1] 65:10 undoubtedly [1] 20:25
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17 sideswiped [1] 56:2 significant [6] 33:1,9 36:14 54:14 56:22 59:11 significantly [1] 49:1 silently [1] 22:3 similar [1] 49:4 simpler [1] 41:16 simply [4] 53:19 55:12 65:3 66:11 since [2] 11:7 24:2 single [5] 10:14 33:14 37:1 39:12 47:5	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5 started [1] 53:6 starting [2] 24:25 25:8 starts [1] 43:6 State [1] 16:11 STATES [5] 1:1,17 43:22 58:12 67: 7 States' [1] 47:3 status [2] 5:21 31:4 statute [6] 3:20 25:11 26:2 51:5, 10 56:20 statutes [4] 30:16 45:3 47:22 73:4	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 $\hline T$ talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18 text [3] 9:13 51:6 73:7 textual [1] 71:12 theirs [1] 48:5 themselves [1] 36:5 then-binding [1] 29:13 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 9:13 theoretical [1] 40:19 46:14 67:1 theory [2] 44:19 59:18 there's [19] 41:8 8:1 13:23,24 17: 22 21:1,12 22:2,4,5 34:24 36:9 40: 15 43:7 44:21 49:19 52:22 57:4,4	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 51:22 understand [8] 5:22 18:18 25:8 28:8 33:19 34:2 41:14 47:10 understandable [1] 24:19 understandable [1] 24:23 25:1,11 45:22 46:14 51:15 60:5 67:12 undertake [2] 7:11 28:25 undertaking [1] 65:10 undoubtedly [1] 20:25 uniformity [3] 13:5 33:10 60:15
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17 sideswiped [1] 56:2 significant [6] 33:1,9 36:14 54:14 56:22 59:11 significantly [1] 49:1 silently [1] 22:3 similar [1] 49:4 simpler [1] 41:16 simply [4] 53:19 55:12 65:3 66:11 since [2] 11:7 24:2 single [5] 10:14 33:14 37:1 39:12 47:5 single-member [2] 38:1 56:8	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5 started [1] 53:6 starting [2] 24:25 25:8 starts [1] 43:6 State [1] 16:11 STATES [5] 1:1,17 43:22 58:12 67: 7 States' [1] 47:3 status [2] 5:21 31:4 statute [6] 3:20 25:11 26:2 51:5, 10 56:20 statutes [4] 30:16 45:3 47:22 73:4 statutorily [1] 73:6	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 $\hline T$ talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18 text [3] 9:13 51:6 73:7 textual [1] 71:12 theirs [1] 48:5 themselves [1] 36:5 then-binding [1] 29:13 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 40:19 46:14 67:1 theory [2] 44:19 59:18 there's [19] 4:18 8:1 13:23,24 17: 22 21:1,12 22:2,4,5 34:24 36:9 40: 15 43:7 44:21 49:19 52:22 57:4,4 therefore [3] 33:5 44:21 67:3	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscores [1] 51:22 understand [8] 5:22 18:18 25:8 28:8 33:19 34:2 41:14 47:10 understandable [1] 24:19 understandable [1] 24:23 25:1,11 45:22 46:14 51:15 60:5 67:12 undertake [2] 7:11 28:25 undertaking [1] 65:10 undoubtedly [1] 20:25 uniformity [3] 13:5 33:10 60:15 UNITED [6] 1:1,17 43:22 47:3 58:
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17 sideswiped [1] 56:2 significant [6] 33:1,9 36:14 54:14 56:22 59:11 significantly [1] 49:1 silently [1] 22:3 similar [1] 49:4 simpler [1] 41:16 simply [4] 53:19 55:12 65:3 66:11 since [2] 11:7 24:2 single [5] 10:14 33:14 37:1 39:12 47:5 single-member [2] 38:1 56:8 situation [1] 70:20	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5 started [1] 53:6 starting [2] 24:25 25:8 starts [1] 43:6 State [1] 16:11 STATES [5] 1:1,17 43:22 58:12 67: 7 States' [1] 47:3 status [2] 5:21 31:4 statute [6] 3:20 25:11 26:2 51:5, 10 56:20 statutes [4] 30:16 45:3 47:22 73:4 statutorily [1] 73:6 statutory [6] 6:9 16:4 18:14 25:25	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 T talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18 text [3] 9:13 51:6 73:7 textual [1] 71:12 theirs [1] 48:5 themselves [1] 36:5 then-binding [1] 29:13 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 40:19 46:14 67:1 theory [2] 44:19 59:18 there's [19] 4:18 8:1 13:23,24 17: 22 21:1,12 22:2,4,5 34:24 36:9 40: 15 43:7 44:21 49:19 52:22 57:4,4 therefore [3] 33:5 44:21 67:3 they'll [1] 12:22 thin [1] 21:16	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 30:14 underscores [1] 51:22 understand [8] 5:22 18:18 25:8 28:8 33:19 34:2 41:14 47:10 understandable [1] 24:19 understandable [1] 24:23 25:1,11 45:22 46:14 51:15 60:5 67:12 undertake [2] 7:11 28:25 undertaking [1] 65:10 undoubtedly [1] 20:25 uniformity [3] 13:5 33:10 60:15 UNITED [6] 1:1,17 43:22 47:3 58: 12 67:7
setting [1] 18:7 seven [3] 10:23 12:20 29:15 several [1] 9:12 SG's [2] 3:20 10:8 shall [3] 21:9 22:13 56:21 share [1] 39:23 shortcoming [1] 12:15 shot [1] 72:17 shouldn't [1] 5:17 show [3] 11:20 17:1 70:23 shown [1] 17:16 side [4] 42:10 49:2 52:20 54:25 side's [1] 47:4 sides [1] 71:13 sideshow [1] 39:17 sideswiped [1] 56:2 significant [6] 33:1,9 36:14 54:14 56:22 59:11 significantly [1] 49:1 silently [1] 22:3 similar [1] 49:4 simpler [1] 41:16 simply [4] 53:19 55:12 65:3 66:11 since [2] 11:7 24:2 single [5] 10:14 33:14 37:1 39:12 47:5 single-member [2] 38:1 56:8	speculation [2] 48:1,3 speed [1] 8:24 sphere [1] 17:15 spoke [1] 25:5 squarely [1] 5:5 stability [7] 25:21 30:15 31:18 34: 10 37:20 38:18 73:2 staff [1] 14:3 stage [1] 11:15 stand [1] 20:5 standard [3] 34:14 50:21 68:11 Standards [1] 29:8 stare [7] 17:6 18:11 19:17 26:16 30:9 53:5,17 start [3] 25:15 26:21 57:5 started [1] 53:6 starting [2] 24:25 25:8 starts [1] 43:6 State [1] 16:11 STATES [5] 1:1,17 43:22 58:12 67: 7 States' [1] 47:3 status [2] 5:21 31:4 statute [6] 3:20 25:11 26:2 51:5, 10 56:20 statutes [4] 30:16 45:3 47:22 73:4 statutorily [1] 73:6	surrounding [1] 20:3 system [4] 19:21 27:17 37:25 58: 20 $\hline T$ talked [4] 17:10 20:15 24:21 42:10 technical [5] 15:17 16:4,18,25 23: 22 tells [1] 4:16 term [1] 36:19 terms [2] 21:10 63:5 terrible [1] 19:25 test [5] 17:23 34:3 36:6 47:20 65: 18 text [3] 9:13 51:6 73:7 textual [1] 71:12 theirs [1] 48:5 themselves [1] 36:5 then-binding [1] 29:13 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 69:18 theoretical [1] 40:19 46:14 67:1 theory [2] 44:19 59:18 there's [19] 4:18 8:1 13:23,24 17: 22 21:1,12 22:2,4,5 34:24 36:9 40: 15 43:7 44:21 49:19 52:22 57:4,4 therefore [3] 33:5 44:21 67:3 they'll [1] 12:22	unanimously [1] 44:23 uncertainty [2] 40:20 55:13 under [26] 5:23 10:22 11:14 14:18 17:23 18:1 19:19 24:23 29:9 35: 17 44:11,19,20 47:2,3,3,4,7,19 48: 6 63:15,16,20 64:5 72:14,16 underlying [5] 8:22 18:13 19:8 25: 23 73:7 undermine [1] 42:17 underpinning [6] 20:9,13,13,14, 15,16 underpinnings [1] 69:18 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 50:4 underscore [1] 30:14 underscores [1] 51:22 understand [8] 5:22 18:18 25:8 28:8 33:19 34:2 41:14 47:10 understandable [1] 24:19 understandable [1] 24:19 understanding [9] 10:12 24:23 25:1,11 45:22 46:14 51:15 60:5 67:12 undertake [2] 7:11 28:25 undertaking [1] 65:10 undoubtedly [1] 20:25 uniformity [3] 13:5 33:10 60:15 UNITED [6] 1:1,17 43:22 47:3 58: 12 67:7 unless [6] 24:8,15 31:20 66:4 67:

	Official - Subjec
5 50 :19,20 63 :18	wholesale [1] 30:20
unreasoned [1] 38:2	wide [2] 3:17 43:8
unstable [3] 38:8 72:10,24	WILKIE [2] 1:7 3:5
until [2] 6:21 25:9	will [11] 8:7 9:14 13:25 25:1 27:15
unworkable [1] 20:1	28 :19 36 :4,5 46 :18,21 55 :23
up [9] 13:25 21:16 33:23 43:3 44:4.	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	willing [1] 33:20
14 49 :6 51 :21 56 :7	wish [1] 56:3
using [1] 52:2	wishes [1] 7:14
usual [1] 63:23	within [7] 18:23 26:8 28:1,10 44:9
V V	52 :16 69 :25
	without [4] 6:11 12:9 28:23 47:14
VA [15] 9 :5,9,11,20 58 :20,20,24 59 :	wonder [1] 27:6
3 63:8 64:9,11,19 67:6 68:11,14	wondering [1] 35:24
VA's [1] 7 :13	word [2] 13:9 50:17
vacate [1] 30:23	words [4] 13:19 21:23 31:13 48:21
value [1] 64:16	work [4] 29:9 43:2 44:4,8
various [1] 31:25	workable [1] 34:14
vary [1] 28:2	works [1] 29:8
vast [1] 5:24	world [2] 25:3 58:4
version [4] 5:17,22 53:3 59:17	worried [1] 37:17
versus [2] 3:5 11:7	worry [1] 16:13
vest [2] 36:25 46:8	
vesting [2] 39:11 50:13	Wow [1] 64:21
veteran [5] 56:10,25 58:11 59:2,4	wrestle [1] 30:12
veteran's [1] 67:4	Write [1] 62:5
VETERANS [13] 1:8 3:5 4:19 5:25	writing [1] 59:15
9 :17,18 38 :3,5 58 :21 62 :14,24 66 :	written [1] 21:20
	wrongly [1] 54:12
15,17	Y
Veterans' [2] 9:19 38:5	
via [1] 9:6	year [2] 64:12 70:10
Vietnam [1] 9:17	years [11] 10:24 12:20,20,20 16:14
view [5] 18:1 32:11 48:7 54:10 60:	21:20 26:24 35:13 58:10 70:10,11
12	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5	
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 W	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 <u>W</u> wait [1] 25:9	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 \boxed{W} wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 \boxed{W} wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14 warrant [1] 70:24	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 \boxed{W} wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14 warrant [1] 70:24 warrants [1] 23:20	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 \boxed{W} wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14 warrant [1] 70:24 warrants [1] 23:20 Washington [3] 1:12,20,23	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 \boxed{W} wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14 warrant [1] 70:24 warrants [1] 23:20 Washington [3] 1:12,20,23 way [11] 12:22 19:24 21:15 22:11	Z
$\begin{array}{c} 12\\ \textbf{viewed [1] 25:2}\\ \textbf{views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5}\\ \textbf{67:12 68:14 69:16}\\ \textbf{virtue [1] 46:3}\\ \textbf{virtues [1] 36:23}\\ \textbf{vulnerable [1] 56:24}\\ \hline \\ \hline$	Z
$\begin{array}{c} 12\\ \textbf{viewed [1] 25:2}\\ \textbf{views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5}\\ \textbf{67:12 68:14 69:16}\\ \textbf{virtue [1] 46:3}\\ \textbf{virtues [1] 36:23}\\ \textbf{vulnerable [1] 56:24}\\ \hline \\ \hline$	Z
$\begin{array}{c} 12\\ \textbf{viewed [1] 25:2}\\ \textbf{views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5}\\ \textbf{67:12 68:14 69:16}\\ \textbf{virtue [1] 46:3}\\ \textbf{virtues [1] 36:23}\\ \textbf{vulnerable [1] 56:24}\\ \hline \\ \hline$	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 W wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14 warrant [1] 70:24 warrants [1] 23:20 Washington [3] 1:12,20,23 way [11] 12:22 19:24 21:15 22:11 27:16 57:1 62:17 64:9 69:13,14 71:25	Z
$\begin{array}{c} 12\\ \textbf{viewed [1] 25:2}\\ \textbf{views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5}\\ \textbf{67:12 68:14 69:16}\\ \textbf{virtue [1] 46:3}\\ \textbf{virtues [1] 36:23}\\ \textbf{vulnerable [1] 56:24}\\ \hline \\ \hline$	Z
$\begin{array}{c} 12\\ \textbf{viewed [1] 25:2}\\ \textbf{views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5}\\ \textbf{67:12 68:14 69:16}\\ \textbf{virtue [1] 46:3}\\ \textbf{virtue [1] 36:23}\\ \textbf{vulnerable [1] 56:24}\\ \hline \\ \hline$	Z
$\begin{array}{c} 12\\ \textbf{viewed [1] 25:2}\\ \textbf{views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5}\\ \textbf{67:12 68:14 69:16}\\ \textbf{virtue [1] 46:3}\\ \textbf{virtue [1] 36:23}\\ \textbf{vulnerable [1] 56:24}\\ \hline \\ \hline$	Z
$\begin{array}{c} 12\\ \textbf{viewed [1] 25:2}\\ \textbf{views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5}\\ 67:12 68:14 69:16\\ \textbf{virtue [1] 46:3}\\ \textbf{virtue [1] 36:23}\\ \textbf{vulnerable [1] 56:24}\\ \hline \\ \hline$	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 W wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14 warrant [1] 70:24 warrants [1] 23:20 Washington [3] 1:12,20,23 way [11] 12:22 19:24 21:15 22:11 27:16 57:1 62:17 64:9 69:13,14 71:25 Wayfair [1] 19:4 ways [3] 24:24 38:24 68:8 Wednesday [1] 1:13 weeks [2] 29:15,15 whatever [1] 23:15 whatsoever [1] 17:16	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 W wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14 warrants [1] 23:20 Washington [3] 1:12,20,23 way [11] 12:22 19:24 21:15 22:11 27:16 57:1 62:17 64:9 69:13,14 71:25 Wayfair [1] 19:4 ways [3] 24:24 38:24 68:8 Wednesday [1] 1:13 weeks [2] 29:15,15 whatever [1] 23:15 whatsoever [1] 17:16 Whereupon [1] 73:10	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 W wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14 warrants [1] 23:20 Washington [3] 1:12,20,23 way [11] 12:22 19:24 21:15 22:11 27:16 57:1 62:17 64:9 69:13,14 71:25 Wayfair [1] 19:4 ways [3] 24:24 38:24 68:8 Wednesday [1] 1:13 weeks [2] 29:15,15 whatever [1] 23:15 whatsoever [1] 17:16 Whereupon [1] 73:10 whether [14] 4:12 5:11 30:12 34:4,	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 W wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14 warrants [1] 23:20 Washington [3] 1:12,20,23 way [11] 12:22 19:24 21:15 22:11 27:16 57:1 62:17 64:9 69:13,14 71:25 Wayfair [1] 19:4 ways [3] 24:24 38:24 68:8 Wednesday [1] 1:13 weeks [2] 29:15,15 whatsoever [1] 17:16 Whereupon [1] 73:10 whether [14] 4:12 5:11 30:12 34:4, 5,6,6,7,8,24 39:16 40:16 60:4 66:	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 \boxed{W} wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14 warrants [1] 23:20 Washington [3] 1:12,20,23 way [11] 12:22 19:24 21:15 22:11 27:16 57:1 62:17 64:9 69:13,14 71:25 Wayfair [1] 19:4 ways [3] 24:24 38:24 68:8 Wednesday [1] 1:13 weeks [2] 29:15,15 whatsoever [1] 17:16 Whereupon [1] 73:10 whether [14] 4:12 5:11 30:12 34:4, 5,6,6,7,8,24 39:16 40:16 60:4 66: 6	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 W wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14 warrants [1] 23:20 Washington [3] 1:12,20,23 way [11] 12:22 19:24 21:15 22:11 27:16 57:1 62:17 64:9 69:13,14 71:25 Wayfair [1] 19:4 ways [3] 24:24 38:24 68:8 Wednesday [1] 1:13 weeks [2] 29:15,15 whatsoever [1] 17:16 Whereupon [1] 73:10 whether [14] 4:12 5:11 30:12 34:4, 5,6,6,7,8,24 39:16 40:16 60:4 66: 6 whichever [1] 46:21	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 W wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14 warrants [1] 23:20 Washington [3] 1:12,20,23 way [11] 12:22 19:24 21:15 22:11 27:16 57:1 62:17 64:9 69:13,14 71:25 Wayfair [1] 19:4 ways [3] 24:24 38:24 68:8 Wednesday [1] 1:13 weeks [2] 29:15,15 whatsoever [1] 17:16 Whereupon [1] 73:10 whether [14] 4:12 5:11 30:12 34:4, 5,6,6,7,8,24 39:16 40:16 60:4 66: 6 whichever [1] 46:21 who's [1] 25:16	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 W wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14 warrants [1] 23:20 Washington [3] 1:12,20,23 way [11] 12:22 19:24 21:15 22:11 27:16 57:1 62:17 64:9 69:13,14 71:25 Wayfair [1] 19:4 ways [3] 24:24 38:24 68:8 Wednesday [1] 1:13 weeks [2] 29:15,15 whatever [1] 23:15 whatsoever [1] 17:16 Whereupon [1] 73:10 whether [14] 4:12 5:11 30:12 34:4, 5,6,6,7,8,24 39:16 40:16 60:4 66: 6 whichever [1] 46:21 who's [1] 25:16 whoever [2] 68:4,4	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 W wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14 warrants [1] 23:20 Washington [3] 1:12,20,23 way [11] 12:22 19:24 21:15 22:11 27:16 57:1 62:17 64:9 69:13,14 71:25 Wayfair [1] 19:4 ways [3] 24:24 38:24 68:8 Wednesday [1] 1:13 weeks [2] 29:15,15 whatsoever [1] 17:16 Whereupon [1] 73:10 whether [14] 4:12 5:11 30:12 34:4, 5,6,6,7,8,24 39:16 40:16 60:4 66: 6 whichever [1] 46:21 who's [1] 25:16 whoever [2] 68:4,4 whole [8] 35:25 39:17 64:8,20 66:	Z
12 viewed [1] 25:2 views [8] 8:5 21:3 46:6 60:11 66:5 67:12 68:14 69:16 virtue [1] 46:3 virtues [1] 36:23 vulnerable [1] 56:24 \boxed{W} wait [1] 25:9 wants [1] 70:14 warrants [1] 23:20 Washington [3] 1:12,20,23 way [11] 12:22 19:24 21:15 22:11 27:16 57:1 62:17 64:9 69:13,14 71:25 Wayfair [1] 19:4 ways [3] 24:24 38:24 68:8 Wednesday [1] 1:13 weeks [2] 29:15,15 whatever [1] 23:15 whatsoever [1] 17:16 Whereupon [1] 73:10 whether [14] 4:12 5:11 30:12 34:4, 5,6,6,7,8,24 39:16 40:16 60:4 66: 6 whichever [1] 46:21 who's [1] 25:16 whoever [2] 68:4,4	Z