NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

+ + + + +

HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED SERVICES QUALITY COMMITTEE IN-PERSON MEETING

+ + + + +

ADDRESSING PERFORMANCE MEASURE GAPS IN HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED SERVICES TO SUPPORT COMMUNITY LIVING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY APRIL 30, 2015

+ + + + +

The Committee met at the National Quality Forum, 9th Floor Conference Room, 1030 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 9:02 a.m., Joe Caldwell and H. Stephen Kaye, Co-Chairs, presiding.

PRESENT: JOE CALDWELL, PhD, Co-Chair H. STEPHEN KAYE, PhD, Co-Chair ROBERT APPLEBAUM, MSW, PhD, Scripps Gerontology Center, Miami University KIMBERLY AUSTIN-OSER, MS, SEIU Healthcare SUZANNE CRISP, National Resource Center for Participant Directed Services JONATHAN DELMAN, PhD, JD, MPH, University of Massachusetts Medical School CAMILLE DOBSON, MPA, CPHQ, National Association of States United for Aging and Disabilities SARA GALANTOWICZ, MPH, Abt Associates Inc. ARI HOUSER, MA, AARP Public Policy Institute JAMIE KENDALL, MPP, Administration of Community Living

PATTI KILLINGSWORTH, Bureau of TennCare K. CHARLIE LAKIN, PhD, Retired, National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research CLARE LUZ, PhD, Michigan State University SANDRA MARKWOOD, MA, National Association of Area Agencies on Aging BARBARA McCANN, MA, Interim Health Care* SARITA MOHANTY, MD, MPH, MBA, Kaiser Permanente Northern California GERRY MORRISSEY, MEd, MPA, The MENTOR Network ARI NE'EMAN, Autistic Self Advocacy Network ANDREY OSTROVSKY, MD, Care at Hand MIKE OXFORD, Topeka Independent Living Resource Center LORRAINE PHILLIPS, PhD, RN, University of Missouri MARY SMITH, PhD, Illinois Division of Mental Health ANITA YUSKAUSKAS, PhD, Pennsylvania State University NQF STAFF: MARCIA WILSON, PhD, MBA, Senior Vice President, Quality Measurement NADINE ALLEN, Project Analyst ANDREW ANDERSON, Senior Project Manager JULIET FELDMAN, Project Manager, Stakeholder Collaboration

SARAH LASH, Senior Director

ALSO PRESENT: ELLEN BLACKWELL

D.E.B. POTTER

* Present by teleconference

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Review Results and Themes from Day 1 Sarah Lash
Large Group Discussion of Measurement Domains Andrew Anderson
Opportunity for Public Comment
Small Group Work: Defining Measurement Sub-
Domains for Chosen Domains
Opportunity for Public Comment
Committee's Review and Final Refinements to
Conceptual Framework
Sarah Lash
Review the Methodology for Next Steps:
Environmental Scan and Synthesis of Evidence
Juliet Feldman
Round Robin: Identifying Fertile Ground for
Measurement
Adjourn

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	9:02 a.m.
3	MS. LASH: Welcome back, everyone, and
4	good morning. Hope you all got some rest last
5	night. And we thank you for all the work that
6	you've done so far.
7	Our Co-Chairs deserve a special round
8	of applause for staying late with the NQF staff
9	to really hammer out a lot of details and trying
10	to understand what we heard in yesterday's
11	conversation. So I think we'll do a little bit
12	of recapping and summarizing that to re-ground
13	today's discussion. And we've got a really nice
14	down payment on measurement domains that we were
15	able to accomplish during that conversation about
16	characteristics of high-quality HCBS. And so,
17	we'll have some revisions to today's agenda, but
18	I'll sort of preview those for you as I go.
19	Could I have the next slide, please?
20	So HCBS quality, our raison d'etre. The high
21	quality HCBS system is needed to support older
22	adults, people with multiple chronic conditions

4

5

and people with all types of disabilities of all ages. And we know that established frameworks and quality domains for evaluating LTSS and HCBS exist. This project is seeking to build upon that.

We had suggestions of look at this 6 7 framework, look at that framework that sort of bubbled up when we were dialoguing yesterday. 8 9 And one thing that we'll do this morning is 10 crosswalk what we have found in the literature 11 from existing frameworks and efforts to 12 yesterday's conversation. And we can see, I 13 think, a good deal of synergy in where the 14 thinking of this group is and some existing work 15 and quality.

But this project is setting a direction for enhancing what we have right now, because I think most of us agree it's not adequate for what we really need to be confident in the quality of HCBS and make the case for why it's so important, and we're really trying to do that through quality measurement.

1

2

3

4

5

So we know that states are going to be 1 2 important players in quality measurement and that they've already invested quite a bit in certain 3 modes of measuring and ensuring quality. And I 4 5 don't want to send the message that we want to do away with any of that foundational work, but 6 7 rather to sort of raise the bar and set a path forward for the next generation of quality and 8 9 performance measurement.

10 Next slide. So measurement, this sort 11 of arose yesterday as well, is designed to drive 12 quality improvement, inform choice -- whether 13 that's a consumer's choice or other people making 14 decisions about things like contracting -- and 15 potentially influencing payment. And measurement 16 is most meaningful when you can detect meaningful 17 differences in performance. And that gets to 18 something that was discussed yesterday, that we 19 really have a continuum of quality in HCBS just 20 like we have in everything else. And measurement 21 is most effective when there are meaningful 22 differences that are revealed through the act of

1

conducting the measurement.

2	One example that we use here at NQF is
3	if you looked out your window at a thermometer
4	every day and it was always 73 degrees, would you
5	still waste your time checking the thermometer
6	every day to find out that it was still 73
7	degrees? So if we have fluctuation
8	(Laughter)
9	MS. LASH: And it would be a lovely
10	day, wouldn't it? So that we want to think in
11	our work about the measures that will help us
12	find those differences so that low performance
13	can be addressed.
14	And I also want to say that
15	measurement isn't the only way to change quality.
16	Sometimes when we're in a committee like this
17	every when you're the hammer, everything looks
18	like a nail, that sort of cliche. Some aspects
19	of quality care are going to be much better
20	addressed by things like training, accreditation,
21	payment and policy changes, peer review teams,
22	consumer input into program design. So I really

encourage us to think critically about what are quality-improvement opportunities that can be influenced through performance measurement and what we might want to put in another bucket for other quality improvement initiatives.

Yesterday there was such good 6 I wanted to share a few things that I 7 dialoque. heard that we should carry forward today. 8 First 9 and foremost, that consumer outcomes are primary 10 and the system only exists to serve those people 11 and to maximize their inclusion and participation 12 in the community, among other things, and that 13 there is a continuum of quality present in the 14 current system now, that coordination and 15 integration of HCBS with health services is 16 important, but at the same time we need to guard 17 against over-medicalizing home- and community-18 based services.

19And there were several conversations20about high-level concepts like affordability and21safety versus risk that we know are going to be22defined differently based on what perspective a

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

stakeholder group is coming from. So, that consumers and different consumers and providers and different types of providers, various states will have different views on what constitutes affordable or efficient care, or sufficiently safe care or unsafe, or informed by choice.

7 And so, there will be room to measure any one topic from multiple angles and so that we 8 9 don't have to decide just one way to deal with a 10 concept like affordability or risk versus safety, 11 that we in fact probably have an imperative to 12 hold some conflicting philosophies in our heads 13 at the same time so that the measurement 14 framework can adequately meet the different needs 15 of the diverse HCBS consumer population.

And we also talked a lot about certain concepts operating at a systems level, like the triple aim, and it really kind of only works if you're thinking macro and big picture. And other things are only meaningful when you're getting close to individuals and how they are living on a daily basis.

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

So when we think about these levels of 1 2 analysis, measurement can operate at any or all of these different levels and certain topics go 3 4 in one place. They might go in multiple places. 5 And we'll tease out where certain measurement ideas best fit in who's accountable for each of 6 7 these different types of processes, structures and outcomes. 8 9 The last thing we wanted to recap for 10 you this morning are the results of the 11 prioritization exercise on the high-quality HCBS 12 system characteristics. There was, you know, in

13 our long debrief after yesterday's meeting, a 14 thought that we might want to collapse the bottom 15 three categories here into something along the 16 lines of well-being, and we can have a later 17 discussion about what we want to call that, for 18 two reasons: first, that there important concepts 19 here about consumers' judgment of safety, 20 physical and emotional health and well-being and 21 freedom from abuse, neglect, exploitation or 22 avoidable harm. And they do sort of relate.

And we thought that putting them 1 2 together also makes a bullet that's relatively the same level of magnitude or size as some of 3 the other ideas on this list that lump a few 4 5 things together like the many concepts after that follow choice. There's a lot of nuances to that. 6 7 So we'll get back to our domain discussion on these characteristics in just a minute. 8 9 Today's agenda in a new and improved 10 way is we're going to try to do the following 11 things: we just had a recap. We are about to 12 begin a large group discussion of measurement 13 domains that build on what we heard from you 14 yesterday and what the staff had found in our 15 literature review prior to today's meeting. 16 We'll take a quick period for public comment and 17 a break in the morning. And then we are going to 18 break you into small groups to add further 19 specificity to the measurement domains in the 20 form of sub-domains. We'll probably break for 21 lunch after that point.

22

(202) 234-4433

And then after lunch we will tackle

your input on a sketch of a conceptual framework 1 2 that we came up with last evening to see what enhancements you might be able to offer. We will 3 4 review the methodology for the next step in the 5 project, which is environmental scan and synthesis of evidence, and we'll close with a 6 round robin of the full Committee. And we're 7 trying very hard to end the meeting on time at 8 9 3:30 because we know many of you will have travel 10 plans built around that. 11 Are there any quick clarifying 12 questions before we begin the domain discussion? 13 (No response) 14 Okay. To Steve and Drew MS. LASH: 15 then. 16 CO-CHAIR KAYE: I just wanted to first 17 of all thank everybody for sitting in the same 18 seats that you were sitting in yesterday, which 19 makes it easier for the two Co-Chairs to call on 20 you when we need to. And to acknowledge Barbara 21 McCann joined us yesterday. Turns out she was on 22 the phone all day yesterday, but her line was

1	muted and we didn't know that.
2	So I mean, I think you deserve extra
3	credit for managing to remain silent and calm.
4	So could you introduce yourself?
5	MEMBER McCANN: Yes, thank you. I
6	can't say I remained silent or calm, but several
7	people in the Atlanta area know my opinion.
8	(Laughter)
9	MEMBER McCANN: Thank you. I am a
10	medical social worker by training and I work now
11	with a large provider group, Interim Health Care,
12	and 50 percent of our revenue is from home- and
13	community-based services, and has been. We will
14	be 50 years old next year as an organization in
15	many, many states. I've worked with the Joint
16	Commission on measurement. I've worked on PACE
17	measurement and home health measurement. So this
18	is dear to my heart and I am so pleased to be
19	with you because in this country we need this so
20	desperately right now. So, thank you.
21	I know you all by your voices, though.
22	(Laughter)

1	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Thank you, and
2	welcome. Drew, you want to
3	MR. ANDERSON: Yes. So we're going to
4	move into the domain work. I'm just going to go
5	through kind of how the sources were selected for
6	the kind of frequency chart that we put together,
7	if I can bring your attention to that. We handed
8	it out yesterday. So we reviewed more than 200
9	sources, as you guys have seen. From those
10	sources 38 were found to contain domains and sub-
11	domains of quality measurement for HCBS or LTSS.
12	And then we actually have the source selection
13	criteria included and it kind of breaks down what
14	these terms mean as far as relevance, breadths of
15	scope, evidence type, source type and currency.
16	Those 38 sources were evaluated based
17	on these criteria. Essentially breadths of scope
18	was making sure that the source was broad enough
19	to be inclusive since we are taking a very broad
20	approach here. So it wasn't as granular as like
21	looking at specific programs, but it more looked

22

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

at like a system-level perspective. And evidence

We favored like systematic reviews, things 1 type. 2 that were more comprehensive. Source type, we favored things that were maybe a government 3 4 report or something that was published in a 5 research journal or that was peer-reviewed. And then since the body of evidence in this area is 6 7 constantly changing, we favored the sources that were more current, something within the last 10 8 9 But we also recognize that there are years. 10 seminal pieces that are important to the work as 11 well, that are older, right.

12 So from that extraction of domains and 13 sub-domains of quality we pulled the most cited 14 and the most often cited. And as you can see 15 from this list they were seven most cited, and 16 then there I think eight, yes, eight often cited 17 ones. And these are really collapsed up into 18 very high-level buckets. I think I'll just point 19 out that the first two, the consumer and 20 caregiver experience is more about -- from a 21 subjective standpoint. It's more about like 22 person-reported experience. And the access to

supports and services bucket really comprises 1 2 those five facets of access: affordability, accessibility, accommodation, availability of 3 4 services. And I think the rest are pretty self-5 explanatory. And there are those huge buckets like quality of care and quality of life. 6 7 So from this yesterday we pulled together what you guys had come up with and we 8 9 crosswalked it with what we found in the 10 literature. And I think the only ones that we 11 would want to pull out that we didn't find --12 that didn't match up per se, were the equity, 13 which we thought was very important, and then 14 also the participant engagement in planning their 15 program and designing their programs. CO-CHAIR KAYE: Let me point out to 16 17 you that you have a copy of this. 18 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, it's on --19 (Simultaneous speaking) 20 CO-CHAIR KAYE: So you don't have to 21 struggle to read it on the screen. 22 MR. ANDERSON: Yes. So we're going to

open it up to -- we're going to move right into 1 2 discussion and kind of allow you guys to react to this. You can take a moment or so to look at how 3 4 these things matched up and then we can talk 5 about it. And also if you need any clarification 6 7 on what those buckets mean, please feel free to raise your hand. 8 9 MEMBER YUSKAUSKAS: Yes, I do. I'm 10 curious what performance -- how you interpret 11 that. 12 MR. ANDERSON: So the performance 13 looked at performance of the system, performance 14 at the intermediate entity level, like the health 15 plan or the provider. It really is those levels 16 of analysis and measuring performance at those 17 different levels. 18 MEMBER YUSKAUSKAS: So like that would 19 be change from one time to another. 20 MR. ANDERSON: Time to another, yes. 21 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Can I ask 22 who was speaking?

MEMBER YUSKAUSKAS: Anita Yuskauskas. 1 2 COURT REPORTER: Thank you. CO-CHAIR KAYE: Could I just ask for 3 4 a quick clarification as to why performance 5 applied to efficient, well-aligned, wellallocated and not to equitable system fairness? 6 7 MEMBER YUSKAUSKAS: If you're looking 8 it as change, it could almost apply to 9 everything. 10 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, it is a pretty big 11 bucket. If you look at the domain frequency 12 chart, you can kind of see how that bucket was 13 broken down and what would be included in it. 14 CO-CHAIR KAYE: And so that would be 15 this chart, this thing. You should have copies 16 of this. 17 MR. ANDERSON: It's from yesterday. 18 And we have some extra copies. 19 CO-CHAIR KAYE: So the sub-domains for 20 performance were program performance, system 21 performance, performance outcomes, 22 sustainability, descriptive statistics, shared

accountability and transparency. So you could 1 2 put equity in that if you wanted to. I mean, It doesn't -- getting the correspondence right is 3 4 less important than just our understanding of --5 I mean, the object of this is, I think, twofold. We're trying to translate what we came up with 6 7 yesterday as characteristics of the system into domains of quality. And it would be nice if the 8 9 titles of those domains were shorter than our --10 some of these lists are kind of laundry lists. 11 And also it would be nice for us to 12 review what are we missing that Drew found in the 13 literature. And perhaps maybe there are some 14 things that we don't think are that important 15 because they're not in the literature, although I 16 don't feel that way. But I would like us to at 17 least consider are the things that -- for 18 example, I'm looking at this now, I'm saying, 19 wait a minute, care coordination? Somehow we're 20 not explicitly mentioning that? And maybe we 21 are, but I mean, I do think care coordination is

22

(202) 234-4433

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

an important thing. And there is this sort of

www.nealrgross.com

system being integrated, but that may not -- I 1 2 don't know if that's enough. MEMBER MOHANTY: I think we were 3 4 thinking of care coordination maybe under -- as 5 part of coordinated, which was part of I'm trying to --6 integrated. 7 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right, as a system thing. 8 9 MEMBER MOHANTY: Yes. 10 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right? So then do we 11 need a separate thing from the consumer that 12 their care is coordinated? I don't know. I'm a 13 little confused. 14 MEMBER MOHANTY: Yes, I think it's 15 important domain to call out. Right. 16 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes. 17 MEMBER MOHANTY: I would make the 18 recommendation to call it out more specifically. 19 MEMBER McCANN: Or could we perhaps 20 consider the same definition of performance? It's at several different levels. So there's 21 22 care coordination and integration of the system,

but it goes all the way down to the individual
 level.
 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right, although --

4 yes, that's a possibility. Kimberly? MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: The other thing 5 about the care coordination is it kind of begs 6 the question for me, is that really the job of 7 the HCBS system to coordinate and integrate 8 9 everything, or is that just the very nature of 10 HCBS: that it's holistic, it looks at the person, 11 all aspects of the person and it is a connector, or it is maybe something that helps drive the 12 13 connection. But it seems to me if we have a 14 domain about coordination, then it kind of puts 15 the onus on the HCBS system to be the 16 coordinator, which may be something that we think 17 But it seems like a different kind makes sense. 18 of conversation. 19 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes, I think you're

20 making some good points there.

Charlie?

MEMBER LAKIN: I'd just like to know

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

21

22

what were your search terms? How did you delimit 1 2 this? It just seems like 200 references in 100 journals all dealing with home and community in 3 4 some way seems to be relatively few. And I'm 5 just curious what did it take to get into your analysis? 6 MR. ANDERSON: Well, it first had to 7 contain -- the source had to contain domains of 8 9 quality for LTSS or HCBS specifically. So that's 10 how we got down to those 38 sources. 11 It had to mention home-MEMBER LAKIN: 12 and community-based services or long-term 13 services and supports in the --14 Right, to get into that MR. ANDERSON: 15 38, the top 38 sources. I think the other thing 16 that was helpful to me is there's another thing 17 that was in the packet that lays out the 18 different frameworks that were looked at. So 19 like the NCI and the AHRQ, and DREDF for Steve 20 Kaye is in that. So I think this was helpful to 21 me in terms of what they actually looked at, the different frameworks, and then calculated the 22

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

frequency that you see on this chart, which ones 1 2 were highly cited and which ones were often 3 cited. 4 CO-CHAIR KAYE: So to clarify, you say 5 you looked at a lot more than this list of 10 or whatever? 6 Right? 7 MR. ANDERSON: Oh, yes. Right. CO-CHAIR KAYE: So these are sort of 8 9 the main --10 MR. ANDERSON: Right. So those 10 11 were narrowed down from that 38. So there's 12 actually a much longer document, maybe like a 30page, a long document that breaks out all of the 13 domains and sub-domains for each of the 38 14 15 sources. And then from that document we found 16 these 10 to be the most relevant based on the 17 source selection criteria that we provided. 18 MS. LASH: And If I could just add one 19 quick thought to sort of respond to Charlie's 20 thought that maybe this isn't as comprehensive as 21 we need it to be, that this was a first cut and 22 the 200 or so sources that we thought were really

critical to begin with were suggested by a subgroup of this Committee that we checked in with early in the process as advisors, including the Co-Chairs, the HHS team and some of our own knowledge about the documents that have been particularly influential.

And so, it's not everything, but there 7 will be a second iteration of the literature 8 9 review and evidence synthesis guided by the 10 domains and the sub-domains that result from 11 today that will then become search terms for 12 something more systematic. And we'll talk more 13 about that methodology later this afternoon. But this isn't sort of the end-all-be-all, but we 14 15 thought it was enough to get the patterns of what 16 is sort of coming up over and over and the way 17 people are conceptualizing quality.

18 CO-CHAIR KAYE: And I think it's 19 actually -- it's surprising to me the extent to 20 which there is almost a one-to-one correspondence 21 between the stuff that we were talking about 22 yesterday and this list here. I mean, there are

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

some omitted ones on each side and there's a 1 2 little bit of duplication, but without explicitly using Drew's list of domains as source material, 3 4 we pretty much came up with the same thing, which 5 I think is kind of a reality check. I want to take first Lorraine and then 6 7 Andrey and then Bob. MEMBER PHILLIPS: I would recommend an 8 9 X be added to functional status in the last row. 10 Physical health seems to be subsumed under well-11 being, but functional status is a key driver of need for each individual in the program, and to 12 13 hide it under a well-being umbrella seems to 14 minimize its importance. 15 CO-CHAIR KAYE: But I thought you 16 wanted us to put that in there. Didn't you start 17 off by saying you wanted an X for --18 MEMBER PHILLIPS: There's no X under 19 the functional status in the green row. 20 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right. But you want 21 it in the bottom row? 22 MEMBER PHILLIPS: I think if you're

1 going to --2 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Or do you want a 3 separate --MEMBER PHILLIPS: Well, I would love 4 5 to see it in its own row, but --CO-CHAIR KAYE: You think you're not 6 7 going to get that? MEMBER PHILLIPS: -- in the absence of 8 9 that --10 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes. 11 (Laughter) 12 MEMBER PHILLIPS: In the absence of 13 that, I want an X in the functional status column 14 to line up with the well-being row. 15 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes. Okay. I added 16 that on mine, anyway. So everybody add that, 17 please. 18 Andrey? 19 Thank you. MEMBER OSTROVSKY: I want 20 to make a quick comment and maybe a question to 21 the group around the definition of integrated and 22 the definition of care coordination and at which

level they operate. My understanding is when we
 refer to integrated, we refer to systems being
 integrated, including the medical side of
 healthcare, the functional side of healthcare,
 those being integrated. And oftentimes that can
 happen under the umbrella of whomever is paying
 for care, for example.

8 Care coordination, on the other hand, 9 is I think at a more granular level, at the level 10 of where services are actually delivered. And I 11 think we could group them into one bucket, but as 12 long as we clearly address that there may be 13 differences between the two, I don't think we 14 necessarily have to have separate domains.

15 And I think an interesting point from 16 the kind of literature review documentation, 17 under the section around care coordination the 18 sub-domain that's referenced here is transitions 19 of care, and that's it. Now, I do think care 20 transitions are actually one of the most 21 burgeoning areas where home- and community-based 22 services are going to play a critical role, but I

think there's so much more beyond care
 transitions.

And so, I don't know how we should 3 4 handle that, but I do think there's a distinction 5 between integrated care, which is kind of a higher level concept. Effective care 6 7 coordination, also very important, and I would argue maybe even more important because it's 8 9 closer to the patient level. So I don't know 10 what the group thinks about how we address that, 11 but I think we could kind of keep it in the 12 domain as long as it's called out. 13 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes, Bob and then 14 Clare. 15 I don't know how MEMBER APPLEBAUM: 16 this comments fits with yours, Andrey, but I was 17 going to suggest that the line that says services 18 are accessible, appropriate, sufficient, 19 dependable, timely -- I was going to suggest 20 adding coordinated to that line as a way to get 21 at the coordination issue, because we want these 22 services to be all those things plus coordinated.

And so that seemed like one way to deal with it. 1 2 And then I don't know if --CO-CHAIR KAYE: Wait, before you move 3 on, let -- I kind of like that. 4 Is that a -- I 5 see a lot of nods. Okay. Let's do that. So, services. The third from the 6 Services are accessible, appropriate, 7 bottom. sufficient, dependable, timely and coordinated. 8 9 And, I mean, I heard what Kimberly had 10 to say and that resonated with me, but I still 11 think that it is an element of the quality of the 12 services that they are kind of coordinated or 13 integrated or something, or are aligned with 14 acute services. So I think it doesn't quite 15 imply that it's the burden of the HCBS system to 16 do this. It's just are they or are they not? 17 Are you okay with that? 18 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: I'm okay with 19 that. 20 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Good. Okay. Now go 21 on. 22 MEMBER APPLEBAUM: And then I don't

1	know if we're ready to do this yet, but certainly
2	some of the items, particularly in the often
3	cited category like, I'm looking at respect
4	and dignity, which is often examined in the
5	consumer and caregiver experience. I don't know
6	if we're ready to try and collapse categories at
7	this point, but there are several that are
8	collapsible. I don't know if that's premature or
9	if we want to try to do some of that yet.
10	CO-CHAIR KAYE: You're going to
11	collapse the columns. Is that what you're
12	saying?
13	MEMBER APPLEBAUM: Yes.
14	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay.
15	MEMBER APPLEBAUM: Correct.
16	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right. I'm not sure
17	we need to do that unless I mean, I'm not
18	sure. I would rather stick with the rows as the
19	domains, if that's what we want to do, and then
20	maybe use the columns to give us titles for those
21	or something. I don't know. That's how I see
22	the process.

Clare doesn't have her card up. I saw
 Camille first and then Mike.

MEMBER DOBSON: I was heading in the 3 4 same direction as Bob. I mean, I think that a 5 number of the elements that we flagged can be identified through consumer and caregiver 6 7 experience. So I was actually starting to go through and put Xs in extra places next to the 8 9 list that we gave, because I think a lot of those 10 domains about consumer-directed control and 11 dignity can come out of consumer-experience 12 domain. The same thing with community engagement 13 and inclusion. So I started to go through and 14 add more Xs on my page of things that I think the 15 domains across the top could address. I think 16 this is a good start, but it's sparse. 17 CO-CHAIR KAYE: You mean sparse in 18 terms of Xs? Yes. 19 Yes. MEMBER DOBSON: 20 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes. Okay. Right. 21 Mike? 22 It's back on kind of MEMBER OXFORD:

the care coordination, but also the difference or 1 2 the definition of that including the difference between that and case management, which I don't 3 4 like that term either, but it seems like that's 5 really -- it occurs to me that that's something that is really important because HCBS is often 6 really a tool. It's not an end. 7 It's a means to So, and then of course in terms of 8 an end. 9 quality, a lot of the programs, it is the end. 10 So it's just ADL stuff. Transfer, get out of 11 bed, get dressed. That's the end of your life. 12 Whereas, you got to do that stuff right to be 13 able then to pursue your individual goals and get 14 a job or live your dream and so on. 15 So I don't know exactly where that 16 really fits in, but -- I'm sorry the way my brain 17 works, but we really didn't get into that a whole 18 lot and it just seems to me like that's real 19 important. And it occurred to me when we talked 20 about coordination, like how limited is care 21 coordination and what is that compared to, like, 22 making sure that people get all the assistance

and support they need between all sorts of 1 2 things? Transportation has to line up. Where you live. Other kinds of training and supports 3 4 that may not probably be part of HCBS, but there 5 needs to be a connection to it elsewhere. Thanks, Mike. 6 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. 7 So are people generally onboard with the idea of using these characteristics to 8 9 identify our domains of quality, or at least as a 10 starting point for that? 11 (No response) 12 CO-CHAIR KAYE: I'm seeing nods. So 13 if we do that, how about if we go through the 14 list and come up with a phrase or a word for each 15 one of them, if we can? Or maybe we'll decide 16 that we need to divide some into two, or join 17 them or something like that. And maybe we could 18 use the column headers as helpful hints for that. 19 Andrey? 20 MEMBER OSTROVSKY: Maybe a note on 21 process so we don't lose some of the rich 22 granularity we've already established. As we try

1to distill a one-liner brief statement, could we2maybe have bulleted sub-domains, if you will?3CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right. And that's4where we're going next, is to have groups where5we make sub-domains. And, yes, that's exactly6what we're thinking of is that a lot of these are7really sound like to me, lists of sub-domains.8So what we're going to do, I think, is break into9groups and then each group will be assigned a10certain group of these domains and asked to11identify possible sub-domains for that.12Okay. So, Mike, you already spoke.13Camille, do you want to speak again, or you got14 okay.15So, workforce. We already have	
3 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right. And that's 4 where we're going next, is to have groups where 5 we make sub-domains. And, yes, that's exactly 6 what we're thinking of is that a lot of these are 7 really sound like to me, lists of sub-domains. 8 So what we're going to do, I think, is break into 9 groups and then each group will be assigned a 10 certain group of these domains and asked to 11 identify possible sub-domains for that. 12 Okay. So, Mike, you already spoke. 13 Camille, do you want to speak again, or you got 14 okay. 15 So, workforce. We already have	
 where we're going next, is to have groups where we make sub-domains. And, yes, that's exactly what we're thinking of is that a lot of these are really sound like to me, lists of sub-domains. So what we're going to do, I think, is break into groups and then each group will be assigned a certain group of these domains and asked to identify possible sub-domains for that. Okay. So, Mike, you already spoke. Camille, do you want to speak again, or you got okay. So, workforce. We already have 	
5 we make sub-domains. And, yes, that's exactly 6 what we're thinking of is that a lot of these are 7 really sound like to me, lists of sub-domains. 8 So what we're going to do, I think, is break into 9 groups and then each group will be assigned a 10 certain group of these domains and asked to 11 identify possible sub-domains for that. 12 Okay. So, Mike, you already spoke. 13 Camille, do you want to speak again, or you got 14 okay. 15 So, workforce. We already have	
6 what we're thinking of is that a lot of these are 7 really sound like to me, lists of sub-domains. 8 So what we're going to do, I think, is break into 9 groups and then each group will be assigned a 10 certain group of these domains and asked to 11 identify possible sub-domains for that. 12 Okay. So, Mike, you already spoke. 13 Camille, do you want to speak again, or you got 14 okay. 15 So, workforce. We already have	
7 really sound like to me, lists of sub-domains. 8 So what we're going to do, I think, is break into 9 groups and then each group will be assigned a 10 certain group of these domains and asked to 11 identify possible sub-domains for that. 12 Okay. So, Mike, you already spoke. 13 Camille, do you want to speak again, or you got 14 okay. 15 So, workforce. We already have	
 So what we're going to do, I think, is break into groups and then each group will be assigned a certain group of these domains and asked to identify possible sub-domains for that. Okay. So, Mike, you already spoke. Camille, do you want to speak again, or you got okay. So, workforce. We already have 	
9 groups and then each group will be assigned a 10 certain group of these domains and asked to 11 identify possible sub-domains for that. 12 Okay. So, Mike, you already spoke. 13 Camille, do you want to speak again, or you got 14 okay. 15 So, workforce. We already have	þ
<pre>10 certain group of these domains and asked to 11 identify possible sub-domains for that. 12 Okay. So, Mike, you already spoke. 13 Camille, do you want to speak again, or you got 14 okay. 15 So, workforce. We already have</pre>	
11 identify possible sub-domains for that. 12 Okay. So, Mike, you already spoke. 13 Camille, do you want to speak again, or you got 14 okay. 15 So, workforce. We already have	
12 Okay. So, Mike, you already spoke. 13 Camille, do you want to speak again, or you got 14 okay. 15 So, workforce. We already have	
 13 Camille, do you want to speak again, or you got 14 okay. 15 So, workforce. We already have 	
 14 okay. 15 So, workforce. We already have 	
15 So, workforce. We already have	
16 workforce, which seems to me a good name. I	
17 don't know how to label participant engagement in	1
18 the design, implementation, evaluation of the	
19 programming. I mean, it's not engagement because	•
20 engagement could mean community engagement.	
Go ahead, Barbara.	
22 MEMBER McCANN: Perhaps under person-	•

1 centered? 2 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Well, but we have 3 other person -- so this is engagement in the 4 design, implementation, evaluation of the 5 program. MEMBER McCANN: 6 Right. 7 CO-CHAIR KAYE: So it's like do you have consumers on your advisory board? That kind 8 9 of thing. 10 MEMBER McCANN: So it's broader than 11 evaluation of their individual program of 12 services? 13 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes. 14 MEMBER McCANN: Okay. 15 CO-CHAIR KAYE: That would be a 16 separate one. We've got that in a separate one. 17 Mary? 18 MEMBER SMITH: I think it's usually 19 referred to as participation. 20 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Well, in our circles 21 of disability sort of stuff, participation means 22 community participation as opposed to this one,

which means participation in the system, system 1 2 participation. 3 MEMBER McCANN: Okay. 4 CO-CHAIR KAYE: System participation? 5 I don't know. That's not very good. MEMBER McCANN: Well, in our world 6 7 it's really the consumer participation. CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes. Let me call on 8 9 Patti first because she had a -- and then 10 Kimberly. 11 MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: Just a quick 12 thought about that one and also the previous one. 13 So is there an opportunity to make this 14 participant engagement a part of consumer 15 direction, person-driven and understanding in the 16 sub-domain area that it applies at both the 17 systems level and also at the individual level? 18 Just something to think about in terms of 19 collapsing things. 20 CO-CHAIR KAYE: What do people think 21 about that? 22 (No response)
1	CO-CHAIR KAYE: I see one person
2	nodding and a lot of people a couple people
3	nodding and a few people looking unsure.
4	MEMBER OXFORD: Well, I mean, I guess
5	it could be okay, but my fear would be that it
6	would be lost kind of somewhere along the way
7	with the kind of same old, oh, yes, that means
8	that you involved the person in the planning
9	circle when you I mean, and we would lose the
10	sort of
11	CO-CHAIR KAYE: I kind of I see
12	them as
13	MEMBER OXFORD: system level.
14	CO-CHAIR KAYE: kind of yes, I
15	see them as both important and kind of distinct.
16	MEMBER OXFORD: Yes.
17	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Suzanne, did you have
18	a comment on that specific thing?
19	MEMBER CRISP: I did. When I first
20	suggested that, everybody was going, oh, but
21	person-centered planning and that shows that
22	there should be a distinction.

1	CO-CHAIR KAYE: I kind of think so.
2	MEMBER CRISP: Because even we didn't
3	understand what we were referring to, and others
4	won't either.
5	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes, and we keep on
6	trying to conflate them and then we
7	MEMBER CRISP: Yes, it's a very new
8	concept, too.
9	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right.
10	MEMBER CRISP: I mean, it's an old
11	concept in that we've always said, yes, yes, yes,
12	but now we're really we have to demonstrate
13	that we're doing it. And so, that is a new
14	concept within itself.
15	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes. Patti, you're
16	frowning.
17	MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: No, I'm fine
18	with that. The other thing I wanted to mention
19	is with respect to workforce, whether we want to
20	make that provider, slash, workforce, right, so
21	that we're looking at both the provider as a
22	provider and also the workforce as the people who

are actually in the home and providing supports. 1 2 CO-CHAIR KAYE: What do you think? 3 Gerry? 4 MEMBER MORRISSEY: Not on that point. 5 I was still back on this system issue, which maybe the word ownership -- only because I think 6 7 there's a differentiation between -- this one is really talking about systems and how individuals 8 9 can participate and advise about the system of 10 care that he or she is in, right? So I'm just 11 trying to think of the word. It can't be --12 since it's really not about individual 13 engagement, it's about their authority, the 14 individual's authority to have advice or input or 15 direction about the overall system. So I just 16 thought of a word like ownership. That's 17 probably not the best word, but it's --18 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes, I think you're 19 going in an interesting direction. 20 Kimberly? 21 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: So a couple of 22 comments. One, the way I keep seeing it, and I

feel like I keep hearing this as well from other 1 2 folks, is whether they're the same domains or not, and probably they are, I feel like they have 3 4 different faces, one on the system side and one 5 on the consumer side. So if I think about this in terms of like system evaluation, I'm looking 6 7 at it as how is the system performing on the quality metrics, and how are we doing on the 8 9 individual level? And so, I do think that the 10 participant engagement side is on the system 11 side. And then you have a whole participant-12 engagement domain on the individual side. And I 13 see these as having -- here's the domain and 14 underneath it we may have six sub-domains that 15 all have to be addressed so they don't disappear, 16 get folded into something. 17 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right. 18 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: The other thing 19 is I just want to understand a little better, 20 Patti, your comment about provider and the person I guess I'm not sure I understand 21 in the home. 22 the distinction and can't really comment on it

1

unless you -

2	MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: So I think a
3	part of the value of this exercise is to step
4	back and look through the lens of the work that's
5	been done before us and to think about what did
6	we miss or maybe not consider that we should
7	consider? So the domain that I think is most
8	often cited in the literature it says is
9	provider capacity and capabilities. And so we
10	hear a lot about networks, but also about the
11	capacity of providers and how they are operated,
12	if you will, the quality management systems that
13	providers have in place, which is really, really
14	important.
15	But that's very different from the
16	workforce. And is the workforce well-trained?
17	And is the workforce consistently assigned, and
18	those sorts of things? And so, I think there's

18 those sorts of things? And so, I think there's 19 value in looking at that from both levels. And 20 we didn't really talk about providers much. We 21 talked about workforce, which I think needs to be 22 there. I think it's a part of the paradigm

that's really changing that we really need to be 1 2 sure that we're measuring. But I'm not sure that providers shouldn't be there, too. 3 4 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Suzanne, are you going 5 to comment on the worker/provider thing, or 6 you're going to comment on the ownership, the 7 engagement? 8 (No response) 9 CO-CHAIR KAYE: So, let's park that 10 for a moment. 11 And, Kimberly, did you want to say 12 something more? 13 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: Thank you, Patti. 14 That's really helpful, and I would agree with 15 you. 16 CO-CHAIR KAYE: So what if we were to 17 say workforce, slash, providers? Would that 18 satisfy people? Does anybody object to that 19 strenuously? Sandy? 20 MEMBER MARKWOOD: Well, I'm not sure 21 I object, but I just wanted further 22 clarification. So, Patti, when you're talking

about providers, how does that relate to the listing under services? Accessible, appropriate, sufficient, dependable and coordinated. I quess, 4 are we talking about that from a provider system standpoint? And then we have one on efficiency. So I'm trying to figure out how those all meld together, or not.

Well, I think 8 MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: 9 looking first of all at whether there is a 10 sufficient number of providers, but then also how those providers actually operate is critically 11 12 important. The training systems that they have 13 in place, the supports that they have in place 14 for workers, again how they do their quality 15 I think it's important to management systems. 16 look at provider performance as a whole and then 17 also to recognize that, from the person's 18 perspective, the greatest impact is that person 19 who's actually in the home delivering their 20 support, or with them in community delivering 21 their support.

22

1

2

3

5

6

7

And so, I think both of those are

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

important. And I don't think that we capture the importance of provider capacity and capabilities within making sure that there is an efficient system or that services are accessible and dependable. I think those are good measures, but I think there's more about provider capacity than that.

8 I mean, our DD system just became the 9 first system in the country to be accredited for 10 person-center excellence. Those providers have 11 additional capabilities now in terms of how they 12 actually interact with and support people and 13 train staff. And that's above and beyond work 14 force capacity.

15 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. This seems to
16 make sense to me.

17 I'm going to call on Sarita because18 she hasn't said anything yet this morning.

19 MEMBER MOHANTY: Yes, I understand 20 what you're saying. I guess I'm just a little 21 concerned that when we talk about provider, 22 there's going to be some confusion about the

definition of what a provider is. So I think 1 2 unless that's really specified and clarified somewhere in the definition there -- because I 3 4 quess coming from the healthcare side, I think 5 provider, I could think about it as a physician, a nurse, but then I think about community 6 providers as well. And I also think about the 7 home care providers. So I guess I'm still 8 9 struggling a little bit about how to make that 10 distinction or call out provider versus those 11 that are work force in the home. 12 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. Andrey, Ari 13 Ne'eman and Mike. 14 MEMBER OSTROVSKY: I think this is 15 sort of related to that point. Since we're 16 talking about the context of HCBS, I think we 17 kind of default to HCBS providers and kind of 18 keep it -- we can maybe oversimplify it that way. 19 Because I think we may be able to address the 20 issue of the other types of more medical 21 providers when we speak to integration or maybe 22 when we speak to care coordination in whatever

vein we do it. But I think since this is in the
 context of HCBS, that just might already
 constrain how we define that.

4 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okav. Ari? MEMBER NE'EMAN: I definitely agree 5 with the idea of looking at provider quality in 6 7 the context of an adequate network of providers or rates or timeliness, but with respect to 8 9 training, I want to suggest that we differentiate 10 between the availability of training and 11 financial support for training to be made 12 available for workers and workers being paid to 13 go through training and looking at levels of 14 worker training as themselves a measure of 15 quality. Particularly in self-directed systems I 16 think the latter would be of concern given the 17 significant number (A) of family caregivers being 18 paid in self-directed systems, and certainly I 19 think we would probably largely be in agreement 20 that we don't want to be imposing minimum 21 training requirements on people to take care of 22 their own relatives.

But second, also given the significant 1 2 number of consumers who even when they're being supported by people who are not family members 3 have distinct preferences to train their workers 4 5 themselves and not have them subject to an external entity that tells them how to provide 6 7 support prior to them being able to be on the job or as a metric of quality for their work. 8 9 So again, I'm totally in agreement 10 with the idea of provider quality as a measure, 11 and even the availability and funding for 12 training as a measure, but I just strongly 13 caution us against utilizing the existence of the 14 percentage of personnel who have been trained as 15 a measure. All right. 16 CO-CHAIR KAYE: I want to 17 propose two things here: I was thinking since 18 Ari raised this yesterday, I was wondering 19 whether instead of trained we could put 20 appropriately skilled? Does that sound good to 21 people? Is anybody going to object to taking out 22 the word training or trained?

(202) 234-4433

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1	(No response)
2	CO-CHAIR KAYE: All right. So let's
3	change that to
4	MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: Actually I do.
5	MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: I do.
6	CO-CHAIR KAYE: You do? So two people
7	object. All right.
8	MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: Part of the
9	reason why I do is because in I mean, recently
10	we did 18 visits in nine cities across the State
11	of Tennessee and asked people what was most
12	important to them from that person's perspective,
13	their experience of care. How do you measure
14	quality? And can I just tell you training hit
15	the top of the list a lot and it was always near
16	the top of the list. People talked a lot about I
17	don't want someone coming into my home who and
18	doesn't mean that I can't train them on my
19	specific needs, but they ought to be well trained
20	when they walk in the door.
21	They ought to know a lot about
22	providing supports, a lot about person-

There's a lot of things that are 1 centeredness. 2 very -- and I'm not talking so much about consumer direction, although I do think that 3 4 everybody who does consumer direction ought to 5 have some basic life support skills so that you know how to do first-aid and CPR. 6 But beyond 7 that I think for a general work force you want them to be well trained. I do think that's 8 9 important.

10 CO-CHAIR KAYE: All right. I think 11 there's enough objection. I think you're going 12 to have to address this when we get to sub-13 domains and actual measures rather than the 14 actual content of the domain.

15 MEMBER OXFORD: I think, Steve, I 16 mean, I've seen this going on for years and I 17 really -- I worry about that they -- really is a 18 divergence between the self-directed, consumer-19 controlled programs and those that aren't. And 20 furthermore, there's been a whole lot of emphasis 21 I think federally on self-directed means. You 22 learn to be an employer, which when you talk to

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

people, they're not interested in taxes and
 record keeping and that kind of stuff. So,
 there's that piece of it.

But I'm really afraid about developing some of this stuff that actually not only may not apply, but that are going to be barriers in the self-directed world. And at the same time if we try to put self-directed in there too much, it really doesn't fit in with general work force and --

CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right.

MEMBER OXFORD: -- those kind of
liability issues and all sorts of stuff going on
in a different thing.

And so, I don't know if the subgroupings is going to cover it or not, but it really seems like we may really at some point need to kind of diverge the two or we're going to be trying to pound a square peg in a round hole the whole time we try to do this.

21 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. Let's stick to 22 the question which was raised, which is should we

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

11

add providers to the work force? What if we were 1 2 to just change the title of this to HCBS Providers? Would that satisfy people? 3 4 MEMBER OXFORD: It could be 5 individuals or agencies. CO-CHAIR KAYE: 6 Okay. 7 MEMBER OXFORD: I mean, I'm confused about that all the time. I mean, if we could 8 9 just define what that is. 10 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Clair? 11 MEMBER LUZ: I want to speak to 12 Patti's comment, because I agree that -- but I 13 want clarification. I think you're referring to 14 the organizational providers when you say 15 In the context of what you were just providers. 16 saying you were talking about an organizational 17 level? 18 MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: I think when 19 traditional provider agencies are delivering 20 services, they have an absolute obligation to 21 provide training. And honestly, I think state 22 programs have an obligation if they're state-

funded or Medicaid-funded programs to define what 1 2 those minimum training requirements are. MEMBER LUZ: Well, and I know some 3 4 people bristle at the word agency, but maybe if 5 we used the word organization, or organizational. Provider organizations and work force. 6 7 CO-CHAIR KAYE: How about if we just settled on work force/providers? And we'll have 8 9 to clarify it in the description. 10 I'm afraid we're spending too much 11 time on the top of this and we're not going to 12 get through. So let's address this question of 13 -- so for the second one Gerry suggested 14 ownership. I kind of like that. Is there a 15 better suggestion for people participating in the 16 design and implementation and evaluation of the 17 program? 18 (No response) 19 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Let's leave it and 20 then we'll come up with something better, unless 21 Suzanne wants to address that. 22 MEMBER CRISP: I just wanted to say

are we trying to say participant input in 1 2 operations? 3 MEMBER MORRISSEY: I thought the premise was that at a systems level we wanted 4 5 individuals who are the consumers of the services to have a voice, a control, advice and direction. 6 7 CO-CHAIR KAYE: What about consumer 8 voice? 9 MEMBER CRISP: Yes. 10 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Consumer voice? 11 MEMBER CRISP: Do people bristle at the notion of stakeholder --12 13 (Simultaneous speaking) 14 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Stakeholder 15 engagement. 16 (Simultaneous speaking) 17 CO-CHAIR KAYE: No, somebody bristled. Consumer -- what? Go ahead. 18 Okay. 19 MEMBER MORRISSEY: How about 20 individual engagement? 21 MEMBER CRISP: What was that? 22 MEMBER MORRISSEY: Individual. Well,

as long as we don't lose the point, which is I 1 2 don't want to kind of -- I'll use the word respectfully, modulize that. You either believe 3 4 this or you don't believe this. The people that 5 are the consumers of the services have a right to kind of discuss, engage, mediate, negotiate their 6 7 service system. CO-CHAIR KAYE: Sarita? 8 9 MEMBER MOHANTY: Yes, I like the 10 stakeholder engagement piece, and I think because I think that it would include the consumer and it 11 12 could also include -- I mean, and a lot of times 13 you have community based organizations that 14 represent the consumer that should also be 15 partaking in the design. I don't know. Maybe 16 would stakeholder engagement -- I'm just kind of 17 curious as to why maybe folks are not --18 (Simultaneous speaking) 19 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Because Mike wants to 20 make sure it's the consumers that are engaged. 21 MEMBER MOHANTY: Well, yes. Well, no, 22 and I --

1	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Consumer/stakeholder
2	engagement.
3	MEMBER MOHANTY: Yes, I mean, I
4	definitely think consumer. To me consumer falls
5	under the stakeholder.
6	MR. NE'EMAN: I think the issue is
7	that very frequently we see states consult
8	substantially with provider organizations, or
9	sometimes even parent organizations without
10	meaningful consultation with consumer or self-
11	advocate organizations.
12	MEMBER MOHANTY: Then maybe we could
13	call it, like you said, consumer/stakeholder.
14	MR. NE'EMAN: I'm fine with consumer
15	and stakeholder engagement. What do others
16	think?
17	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Consumer and
18	stakeholder engagement.
19	MEMBER OSTROVSKY: Can we cut; it's a
20	small word, but and other stakeholder just so we
21	don't make it sound like consumer is not a
22	stakeholder?

1	(Laughter)
2	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Or something like
3	that. Okay. We can wordsmith these. But at
4	least we have a shorter phrase than that entire
5	long 10-word thing.
6	Moving on to choice. Person-driven
7	focused on achieving individual goals, consumer-
8	directed, controlled dignity of risk. And that
9	one is called person-centeredness.
10	MEMBER DELMAN: Can I comment on the
11	last one?
12	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Sure.
13	MEMBER DELMAN: I'm not going to
14	formally object to anything, but I just wanted to
15	explain why I'm in another committee where the
16	issue has come up. And of course I feel that
17	consumers should have themselves a category to be
18	involved. And one is and this can be
19	consumers or delegates, but one of the reasons
20	services have been so terrible is because
21	consumers have been left out of the discussion.
22	It's been very provider-driven or administrative-

 driven and the outcomes of consumers have been ignored.

And until you get to what the 3 4 consumers outcomes want, then you can get back to 5 processes with consumers. Consumers, at least in mental health, and I think in all disabilities, 6 have been the catalysts for change in any service 7 I consider that for certain in mental 8 system. 9 So you need to clearly place a role for health. 10 consumers. 11 Other stakeholders I'm not so worried 12 about, frankly. They've been there. They 13 typically want more of a traditional thing. 14 You're going to see less change with other 15 stakeholders. Consumers are going to argue for 16 something different, which I think is what we're 17 looking for. 18 Secondarily, consumers are the end 19 And that's the problem with the health users. 20 system overall. And that's why we have something

Care Act. And they place a tremendous amount of

called person-centered care in the Affordable

(202) 234-4433

21

22

1

2

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

emphasis on participants or patient engagement. 1 2 So what I'm suggesting is that I would want to be consistent with the ACA when we do 3 4 these domains. And that's an emphasis not on 5 stakeholder, but on consumer/patient. 6 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Good. Thank you, Jon. 7 All right. So back to this big bucket of choice and everything. Is there one thing we 8 9 can call this? Two things, maybe? 10 Self-determination? MEMBER DELMAN: 11 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Self-determination is 12 Go ahead, Suzanne. proposed. 13 MEMBER CRISP: I mean, in the self-14 directed world we always say choice and control. 15 And then everything else is assumed and would be 16 in a sub-domain. 17 CO-CHAIR KAYE: I like choice and 18 control. You okay with that, Jon? Choice and 19 control? 20 DR. MORRISSEY: Yea. 21 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. So then the 22 next one is privacy, dignity, respect,

freedom/independence and legal rights. I always 1 2 have trouble bucketing this one. Of course I always like independence, but that seems broader. 3 4 MEMBER APPLEBAUM: How about choice 5 and control? 6 CO-CHAIR KAYE: You want to move that 7 into --Well, people could 8 MEMBER APPLEBAUM: 9 talk to me about what the difference is, because 10 I don't see it. 11 CO-CHAIR KAYE: You want to collapse 12 these two? 13 (No response) 14 CO-CHAIR KAYE: No objection to 15 collapsing these? 16 MEMBER OXFORD: The only thing that's 17 going to get left out is going to be the legal 18 rights piece. Otherwise, I think that they are 19 collapsible under choice and control. But that's 20 different, because to me, when I saw that in 21 there, I mean, that was like moving from, oh, 22 it's a program policy, it's a permission that

you're given to actually having a formal right 1 2 over it. And that's something that we want to move towards and have been moving towards. 3 And 4 they're actually different. So the legal rights 5 piece wouldn't fit under the typical choice and I don't know what everyone things about 6 control. doing with that. 7 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Let me first get Ari 8 9 Houser, who's had his hand raised. 10 Yes, I think this is MEMBER HOUSER: 11 a different -- I think we lose a lot of what's in 12 the privacy/dignity/respect if we slide it under 13 choice and control, because I think there's more 14 that -- even if you're not in a self-directed 15 program and perhaps you don't have a choice of 16 provider but you need services, and so you're 17 getting services from someone. Whether or not 18 that was your provider of choice or your provider 19 of convenience or the only provider who's there 20 who can do it, that provider should respect you, 21 uphold your dignity, respect your privacy. 22 That's something that's important whether or not

that service is -- you chose it or you got it
 because you needed it.

MEMBER APPLEBAUM: But that's what 3 4 choice and control means. I mean, it doesn't 5 mean just that you choose a provider -- control over every aspect of your delivery of your 6 7 service. And so, yes, it's respect, it's I mean, all those things. 8 dignity. I mean, 9 obviously we can quibble about definitions, but 10 that is what control over the service system is 11 about. 12 MEMBER HOUSER: I understand that, but 13 I kind of think this is kind of on the other 14 side. The choice is you should have the choice 15 of all these things and then no matter what you 16 chose, the provider should respect 17 privacy/dignity. And it's not your choice that the provider respects your privacy and dignity. 18 19 It's the provider's responsibility. And I think 20 that's more than just your choice. 21 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Clare? 22 MEMBER LUZ: So the language of choice

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

and control is very individual-oriented. 1 2 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes. Somebody who is 3 MEMBER LUZ: 4 competent. Privacy, dignity, respect, freedom, 5 that all applies to people with dementia, who have cognitive difficulties, who have severe 6 mental illness, who don't have the ability to 7 exercise choice and control. 8 9 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes. 10 MEMBER LUZ: So we have to include 11 They deserve dignity, respect, privacy. them. 12 I'm afraid we lose that if we put it under choice 13 and control. 14 CO-CHAIR KAYE: I think given that 15 there's -- I mean, we did separate these and we 16 did vote on them separately, so since there's 17 some objection, I think we should not collapse 18 them. But I think we do need a title for this. 19 And I don't know what that would be. 20 MR. NE'EMAN: I would just refer to 21 them as legal rights. I mean, at the end of the 22 day that's what we're getting at here. As I see

it, the privacy/dignity/respect section roughly 1 2 correlates to the provider on residential requirements and settings rule. 3 4 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Jon is not happy. 5 MEMBER DELMAN: I'm just wondering if you can say human rights, because it's a broader 6 7 term. CO-CHAIR KAYE: Human rights. 8 I like 9 that. 10 MR. NE'EMAN: Yes, I like that, too. 11 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Human rights? 12 MEMBER OXFORD: How about human and 13 legal rights? 14 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Human and legal 15 rights. No, human rights. 16 MEMBER OXFORD: Well, no, because I 17 mean I always differentiate. Legal rights are 18 embodied in law, whereas human rights can be more 19 general and maybe there isn't a law. Like I 20 think that there's a human right to having 21 adequate housing. Well, there's no law, there's 22 no legal right to that. But I think it is a

general human right. And so, some of these 1 2 things are legal. 3 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. Human/legal 4 rights. Okay? 5 Efficient, well-aligned, wellallocated, integrated. And we also have data 6 7 integrity on this. Is this efficiency? I don't know what it is. 8 9 MEMBER OXFORD: I'll just point -- we 10 put it under the domain of performance, so that 11 could be a word. 12 CO-CHAIR KAYE: System performance? 13 Gerry, you like that? 14 MEMBER MORRISSEY: Yes, or 15 organizational performance. Organizational is 16 good. 17 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Organizational is 18 qood. I think system is where it belongs. 19 MEMBER MORRISSEY: System performance. 20 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Is that okay? Yes? 21 (No response) 22 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. System

1

performance for that.

_	
2	Okay. Community engagement, inclusion
3	to the same degree as people not receiving HCBS,
4	participation, employment and productivity,
5	having fun, social connectiveness. Is there an
6	umbrella term for this?
7	DR. MORRISSEY: Inclusion. How about
8	real lives?
9	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Real lives.
10	MEMBER SMITH: I think those things
11	usually fall under the umbrella of quality of
12	life. Even though we have it at the top, when I
13	see those things, that's what I think of.
14	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Could be, but it's
15	just kind of a minefield term. So we'd have to
16	be mindful of the fact that we might cause
17	controversy if we use quality of life. And if we
18	don't, we'll be somewhat safer. But that doesn't
19	mean we shouldn't use it.
20	Sara, you've had your hand up for a
21	while.
22	MEMBER GALANTOWICZ: Sure, just

similar to what Gerry's saying. Something about 1 2 maybe like full community inclusion so we get the 3 notion that it's community inclusion, but it's full or equitable so that we have this notion 4 5 that it's the same level as people without disabilities? 6 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Full inclusion is a 7 phrase from the Americans with Disabilities Act. 8 9 We could use that. 10 Ari is not happy. 11 (Off mic comments) 12 (Laughter) 13 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Oh, you were shooting 14 me a look like you --15 MEMBER HOUSER: I was just going to 16 agree. 17 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Oh. 18 MEMBER HOUSER: Community inclusion. 19 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Full community 20 inclusion or full inclusion? Full community 21 inclusion. Okay. 22 MEMBER OSTROVSKY: Can I ask a quick

question?

1

2	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Sure.
3	MEMBER OSTROVSKY: Would full
4	community inclusion suffice encapsulate having
5	fun? Honestly, I think like if there was a
6	quality measure for having fun, that there
7	maybe should be one, but I feel like it's one
8	thing to be included in the community, it's
9	another thing to have other domains of quantity
10	of life. So I'm thinking maybe quality of life
11	may a nice umbrella term with very clear sub-
12	domains for all of these individual points, each
13	one being quite important I think.
14	MR. NE'EMAN: I would push back on the
15	use of the term quality of life because of its
16	other implications. But what about full
17	community inclusion and participation?
18	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Michael?
19	MEMBER OXFORD: I was actually before
20	the full inclusion came up going to throw out
21	participation. So that might work. Full
22	inclusion and community inclusion and

1

participation.

2 MEMBER SMITH: I don't think it covers the employment piece, personally. 3 4 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Well, I think 5 participation includes -- as I said yesterday, I think participation is economic participation as 6 7 well as social participation. I don't think you'd get 8 MEMBER SMITH: 9 it out of that. 10 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Charlie, are you 11 nodding to that or are you --12 MEMBER LAKIN: Sub-domain. 13 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Sub-domain. 14 MEMBER LAKIN: I think full community 15 inclusion is --16 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Can you use your microphone, please, Charlie? 17 18 (Off mic comments) 19 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Ari Houser? 20 MEMBER HOUSER: I mean, I think most 21 of us, all of us have -- each of these: 22 engagement participation, inclusion really have

precise meanings to us, but to the general public 1 2 they're all approximately synonyms. I think we need to just pick one and then with sub-domains 3 4 we can clarify. Otherwise, we're just listing 5 things that to most people mean the same thing. CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes, I kind of 6 7 wondered about that, too. If you had to pick between inclusion and participation, Ari Ne'eman 8 9 and Mike, which would you pick? 10 Inclusion. MR. NE'EMAN: 11 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Are you okay with 12 inclusion, Mike? 13 MEMBER OXFORD: Yes. 14 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Could you turn Okay. 15 off your microphone now? 16 (Laughter) 17 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Thanks. Okay. So 18 we're back to full community inclusion. Mike and 19 I make fun of each other all the time. 20 All right. So the next one is family 21 caregivers are supported, so should it just be family caregivers? Should it be caregivers? 22

1 Clare? 2 MEMBER LUZ: Can I back up just a second, because I'm okay with full inclusion, but 3 I think there's more to quality of life than 4 5 inclusion in a community. I mean, there are other aspects of quality of life that are very 6 individually-based. And you can have fun by 7 8 yourself. 9 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes. 10 MEMBER LUZ: I mean, there are many 11 ways to have fun by yourself. So I'm advocating 12 for a separate category that does cover other 13 things related to quality of life and having fun 14 besides social integration into a community. 15 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Is there a term that 16 is less fraught than quality of life and yet 17 broader than community inclusion that could apply 18 to this whole thing? 19 MEMBER OSTROVSKY: I mean, not to get 20 too like psychology-literature-based, but like 21 actualized? Like I don't know. It's sort of 22 like really getting too broad, but I don't know.

Self-actualization is really what we're all 1 2 trying to get at, but that's kind of broad. CO-CHAIR KAYE: You agree with that? 3 4 MEMBER OXFORD: Well, I mean, I like 5 the --(Laughter) 6 7 MEMBER OXFORD: No, I like the concept, but I'm afraid we're getting away from 8 9 the plain language sort of directive that we're 10 supposed to be doing. But I mean the concept is 11 on track. 12 MR. NE'EMAN: I would argue that if we 13 do do some kind of self-actualization or whatever 14 we end up calling it, it should be distinct and 15 in addition to full community inclusion. I think 16 we've got at least two distinct concepts here and 17 inclusion needs to be called out in its own 18 right. 19 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Let's revisit this 20 later, if that's okay. I mean, this doesn't have to be the absolute final list. I mean, yesterday 21 22 we went and blended two things together to make

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

this thing, and how we're talking about un-1 2 blending them. It seems like a step backward at this point. 3 So the next one, family caregivers are 4 5 Should we call it family caregivers? supported. Should we call it caregivers? 6 Barbara? 7 MEMBER McCANN: I'd recommend caregiver support since there a variety of 8 9 caregivers who are not family members. 10 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Caregiver support. 11 How about that? 12 (No response) 13 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes? Okay. Good. The next one is effectiveness of 14 15 services, quality of care. What do we want to 16 call that? Effectiveness? Suzanne? 17 MEMBER CRISP: I like quality of care 18 better, because services can be effective, but 19 yet not be high quality. I mean, you can give a 20 person a bath, but maybe not an enjoyable bath. 21 I don't know. I like quality of care better. 22 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Is there agreement on
1 that? 2 MEMBER OXFORD: Well, I just wondered I mean, those to me are sort 3 -- or performance. 4 of like -- I think quality has other things 5 besides those things. CO-CHAIR KAYE: Quality of care? 6 MEMBER OXFORD: 7 Yes. 8 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Except we put quality 9 of care in as a sub-domain of this. 10 MEMBER OXFORD: Right. 11 MEMBER SMITH: Yes, I agree with Mike. 12 I think that effectiveness in -- I think 13 effective performance piece I think is more 14 distinct than just quality of care. 15 CO-CHAIR KAYE: And yet performance we 16 had -- we have another one that said system 17 performance. Efficient, well-aligned, well-18 allocated integrated. Should we blend that with the other one? But isn't quality of care about 19 20 the care that is received and not -- the other 21 one is a system -- yes, I see. The other one is 22 a system performance, and maybe this some other

kind of performance? 1 2 Go ahead, Sandy. Well, that's why 3 MEMBER MARKWOOD: when Patti raised her issue that I circled back, 4 5 because to me this seems like this isn't the This is the performance 6 system performance. 7 that's happening in somebody's home. So I see this as more the individual service level. 8 9 CO-CHAIR KAYE: How do you put that in 10 a two-word or three-word phrase? 11 MEMBER MARKWOOD: I guess I see it as 12 quality of care, but I see it as quality of care 13 at the individual level versus the systems level. 14 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Let's see. Mary, do 15 you still want to say something? Yes, I think I would 16 MEMBER SMITH: 17 prefer to leave it as effectiveness/quality of 18 I mean, I don't think it's too long. care. 19 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. 20 I think effectiveness MEMBER SMITH: 21 says something different. 22 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Is that all right?

Effectiveness/quality of care as a domain? 1 2 MEMBER OXFORD: Well, I just have to throw out that I think care is a marketing term 3 and it sort of means a whole lot. 4 So I don't 5 People probably throw things, but I just know. wonder if quality of service and support wouldn't 6 7 be better. CO-CHAIR KAYE: Now, it's gotten to be 8 9 longer than four words though. 10 MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: Or just quality 11 and effectiveness. 12 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Quality of what? 13 MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: Quality and 14 effectiveness. 15 Quality/effectiveness? CO-CHAIR KAYE: 16 MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: Yes. 17 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Well, but then now we 18 have -- but the whole thing is about HCBS 19 quality. So then it's -- if you don't say 20 quality of what, then you don't -- quality of 21 service. How about quality of services? And 22 supports? No, how about effectiveness/quality of

services or just quality of services? Quality of 1 2 services. I would go with 3 MEMBER SMITH: 4 effectiveness/quality of service. I still think 5 you're losing something by dropping the effectiveness. 6 7 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. Effectiveness/quality of services. 8 9 The next one is services are Okay. 10 accessible, appropriate, sufficient, dependable, 11 timely and coordinated. And this was -- it got 12 X'ed for consumer and caregiver experience and 13 access to supports and services. Is this what we 14 mean by consumer experience? Bob first and then 15 Andrey. 16 MEMBER APPLEBAUM: What's the 17 difference between effectiveness of services quality and services are accessible, et cetera? 18 19 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Should we be 20 collapsing these two domains? Yes? I hear yes. 21 MEMBER OXFORD: I think the --22 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Who wants to say no?

1	MEMBER SMITH: I do.
2	MEMBER OXFORD: I think the only
3	caveat would be if we lose coordination as a very
4	and if it has to be a sub-domain, I think
5	that's fine.
6	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right.
7	MEMBER OXFORD: But as long as it's
8	very clearly called out and measured because
9	if we don't measure the coordination of services,
10	it may very actually it probably it does
11	fall under quality. If it would be
12	CO-CHAIR KAYE: I think so.
13	MEMBER OXFORD: low-quality
14	services if they're not
15	(Simultaneous speaking)
16	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Is not coordinated?
17	MEMBER OXFORD: that would be a
18	great sub-domain. So that's fine if we
19	(Simultaneous speaking)
20	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. Hold on Clare.
21	First Kimberly.
22	MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: So, it feels like

we're conflating again system and individual, and 1 2 I feel like that it does need to be separate. Yesterday we had this whole conversation around 3 service effectiveness in the home versus is the 4 5 HCBS system delivering what it said it was going to deliver and do what it said it was going to 6 To me services are accessible, appropriate, 7 do? sufficient, dependable has both a system side to 8 9 it and an individual side to it. Effectiveness 10 of services and quality of care has a system side 11 and an individual side.

12 And then the efficient, well-aligned, 13 well-allocated, integrated data, integrity, that 14 feels like it also has probably mostly a system 15 side and a little bit of a -- so I feel like I'm 16 not sure why we have to -- is it one system or 17 service quality domain and then it falls out 18 system versus individual? I don't understand why 19 we have to collapse or get rid of things or 20 whatever, because I feel like these have merit. 21 I don't care how we roll it up. I want to make 22 sure they get addressed.

CO-CHAIR KAYE: But the question is 1 2 are they conceptually distinct? MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: I think they are. 3 4 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. And Mary thinks 5 And Clare was going to comment. they are. Well, I certainly think 6 MEMBER LUZ: 7 that accessibility is a distinct concept --CO-CHAIR KAYE: 8 True. 9 MEMBER LUZ: -- different from 10 quality. 11 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Are there some of the 12 items that are under this current one: services 13 are accessible, et cetera, that need to be moved 14 up into quality of care? I mean, can we modify 15 this to make it more conceptually distinct 16 somehow? 17 Ari Houser? 18 MEMBER HOUSER: So, I have an answer 19 to that question, but also I'll took about 10 20 second to digest the family caregivers and we 21 moved on. And I want to push back strongly that 22 we say family caregivers and not caregiver

I think it's pretty well -- that when 1 support. 2 we say family caregivers, most people understand that that means also non-family members, friends, 3 4 neighbors, even though that group is probably 5 about 90 percent family. We also know that when we say 6 caregivers, most people think paid providers. 7 And I think we run a much larger risk of having 8 9 people think that we're ignoring family 10 caregivers if we leave it out. Then we run a 11 risk of having people think we are ignoring neighbor caregivers if we say family. 12 13 I want to say that, but then we can finish the discussion that we're in now. I think 14 15 the, services are accessible, appropriate, 16 sufficient, dependable, timely really speaks to 17 the what of the services that you're getting, 18 that you're getting the services that you need. 19 The effectiveness of services kind of 20 gets to those services that are actually being 21 performed well and they're having the desired 22 outcome. And I might move coordination up into

I'm not certain about that, but I 1 effectiveness. 2 think that coordination is more of a how services are being performed than sort of that they --3 4 it's the right checklist. So, if we were call 5 CO-CHAIR KAYE: this something like appropriateness of services, 6 is that -- that's sort of a different concept 7 than effectiveness. So would that satisfy the 8 9 two different -- I mean, we'll get back to your 10 family caregiver thing, but I want to try to 11 resolve this. Is that going in a reasonable 12 direction? Effectiveness versus appropriateness? 13 MEMBER OXFORD: Yes. 14 CO-CHAIR KAYE: One nod. Okay. Marv? 15 MEMBER SMITH: Are you suggesting 16 leaving effectiveness as it is and then calling 17 the next category appropriateness? 18 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes. 19 I don't think that MEMBER SMITH: 20 appropriate means that the services are timely or 21 that they're accessible. 22 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Do you have another

way of phrasing what is in that bucket? 1 2 MEMBER SMITH: In this bucket? CO-CHAIR KAYE: 3 Yes. 4 MEMBER SMITH: I don't have one word 5 for it, no. Mike does? CO-CHAIR KAYE: 6 7 MEMBER OXFORD: Well, no, I mean, I guess I would say that the more I think about it, 8 9 I think to be effective they'd have to be 10 accessible, appropriate, sufficient, dependable, timely on an individual and a systems level. 11 Ι 12 mean, I don't --13 CO-CHAIR KAYE: So you're arguing for 14 merging the two, right? 15 MEMBER OXFORD: Well, yes. 16 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. Clare? 17 MEMBER LUZ: So I see appropriate, 18 sufficient, dependable, timely as part of the 19 quality measures. I see them under quality. 20 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Of care? 21 MEMBER LUZ: Of care or services. But 22 accessibility is a much different concept. It

includes affordability and just do the service 1 2 even exist, whether they're poor quality or not? CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right. So we could 3 4 move the -- all right. What about sufficiency? 5 That's different from quality of services, right? Accessibility and sufficiency are kind of 6 similar sorts of concepts, right? 7 MEMBER LUZ: But it doesn't address --8 9 what are -- Drew, you mentioned the five points 10 under access/accessibility? 11 MR. ANDERSON: Right, the five facets 12 of access to care, which is availability, 13 affordability, accommodation, accessibility 14 and --15 MEMBER LUZ: So I was suggesting 16 moving everything up under quality except 17 accessibility and figuring out something else to 18 do with 19 that --20 (Simultaneous speaking) 21 CO-CHAIR KAYE: What about 22 sufficiency? Is sufficiency an aspect of

effectiveness and quality of services? 1 2 MEMBER LUZ: Efficiency is part of I would say so. 3 quality? 4 CO-CHAIR KAYE: No, sufficiency. Yes. 5 Kimberly? And then Camille. Sorry. Yes? And Sandy, you still want to say something, 6 hold on. 7 right? 8 MEMBER MARKWOOD: Well, yes. 9 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes, wait a minute. 10 I just want to see -- do all of you who have your 11 things up want to say things? 12 (No response) 13 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. We'll move in 14 that direction after Kimberly. 15 I'm just not sure MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: 16 why we're doing this. I'm really not. 17 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Because there was a 18 motion to collapse the categories and we don't 19 seem to be able to come up with a single concept 20 that captures --21 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: Okay. If that 22 seems to be something that some people need to

do; I don't, but if other people do, then that's 1 2 fine. I guess I'm just wondering, like we had a really long, I thought really good conversation 3 4 about this one. I mean, we had a lot of them, 5 but on this one in particular this is where we addressed right time, right place, right service 6 7 without saying it that way. We actually tried to get to the essence of why that's important. 8 And 9 I feel like we're just kind of deconstructing all 10 of that now, maybe even destroying it. And is 11 there a problem with just saying -- let's come up 12 with a domain and then list these out separately 13 underneath it, or is that -- I don't know. Ι 14 feel like we're destroying something that I 15 thought was really important --16 (Simultaneous speaking) 17 CO-CHAIR KAYE: And Camille is nodding 18 in agreement. Okay. 19 MEMBER DOBSON: Can I just jump in for 20 a second? 21 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Please. 22 Point of order to the MEMBER DOBSON:

staff. I want to understand where we're moving 1 2 next, because we're having a lot of conversations 3 about the measurement is individual or it's a 4 system level. Isn't that what we're going to 5 talk about when we break down? Right? CO-CHAIR KAYE: When we break up we're 6 going to talk about --7 MEMBER DOBSON: But some of these are 8 9 10 CO-CHAIR KAYE: -- sub-domains. 11 -- individual. MEMBER DOBSON: 12 CO-CHAIR KAYE: We're not going to 13 specifically talk about -- well, we could. 14 MEMBER DOBSON: Well, it does. Ι 15 mean, our charts back here show system --16 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right, but we're 17 thinking of not --18 MEMBER DOBSON: -- individual --19 CO-CHAIR KAYE: But I think we decided 20 yesterday we would not go into that. 21 MEMBER DOBSON: Not going to do that? 22 Because the struggle is -- I agree Okay.

completely with Kim. I'm not guite sure I 1 2 understand this exercise either, because all these elements could in fact be sub-domains under 3 4 the title, and I worry that we're losing it by 5 pulling it up in a category title that we don't miss some of these. These all could be sub-6 7 domains. Some at the system level, measure at the system level. Some get measured at the 8 9 individual level. I'm struggling. 10 I would sort offer that MS. LASH: 11 part of the objective for this conversation now 12 is to get the group to have a common 13 understanding of what is in each domain and to 14 make sure that they are conceptually distinct so 15 that when we break into small groups and capture the sub-domains based on this and other 16 17 discussion that you're not overlapping again at 18 that more nuanced level of detail. And there 19 would be room for sub-domains that operate at a 20 system level of measurement. An intermediate 21 accountable entity like a health plan or at a 22 consumer and family level.

87

1 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right. I want to say 2 that I don't think we're going to right now reach consensus on this. So this doesn't have to be 3 4 the final list. But I want to go back up to Ari 5 Houser's comment that he proposed that instead of caregiver support that it just be family 6 7 caregivers. Is there an objection to that? MEMBER OXFORD: Well, I think it begs 8 9 the question, so what about support for non-10 family caregivers? 11 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Barbara is agreeing 12 with that. 13 MEMBER OXFORD: And again it's being 14 more of a mix. I mean, again my experience is of 15 a self-directed world, but it's an in and out and 16 family are paid. They're also volunteering. The 17 same family member is paid and a volunteer. It 18 just depends on day of the week or something. 19 And so, I'd argue that it needs to be broader. 20 MR. NE'EMAN: I would share that 21 concern and add to that host homes and life share 22 as arrangements in which you have similar

intimate relationships with non-family support
 providers.

CO-CHAIR KAYE: Barbara? 3 4 MEMBER McCANN: As a social worker and 5 somebody out in the house, we have fought so hard against the legal definition of family, and that 6 7 with the variety of caregivers it just allows us to say that support can be greater than just 8 9 legal family. 10 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Anita? 11 MEMBER YUSKAUSKAS: I think our focus 12 in the last few years has really been to try and 13 develop natural supports in the community and 14 relationships, and I think by restricting it to 15 family, it becomes too narrow. 16 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right. We can clarify 17 it in the description. I think, Ari, you're 18 being shot down here. 19 All right. So the next to last one is 20 equitable system/fairness and distribution of 21 services that eliminate health disparities. Do 22 we want to say something about equitable or

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

something like equity? Service equity or 1 2 something like that? Is the emphasis of this 3 MR. NE'EMAN: 4 on equity or health disparities? 5 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Two concepts we tried to put together. Well, we certainly can't call 6 7 it health disparities, because it sounds like we're supporting health disparities as a domain. 8 9 MR. NE'EMAN: Well, we could 10 conceivably combine the equity component with efficiency, and then just call this closing 11 12 health disparities. 13 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Fairness. What about 14 fairness? Fairness goes with equity, right? 15 Clare? 16 MEMBER LUZ: My understanding was that 17 the emphasis was on equity and that would in turn 18 lead to reduced health disparities. 19 MR. NE'EMAN: I'm fine with that. 20 Equity and fairness then? 21 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Equity and fairness? 22 (No response)

90

1	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. All right. So
2	then the last one so we haven't yet had a
3	discussion of whether it's appropriate. So what
4	we did last night after you guys left was combine
5	the last three that had the fewest votes because
6	we felt like we didn't want to lose those
7	concepts. And we combined them and then
8	arbitrarily labeled them as well-being, which I
9	suspect is not going to make everybody happy.
10	And under that physical/emotional health, safety
11	from the part of the consumer, freedom from
12	abuse, exploitation, neglect. Is that well-being
13	to people? Physical well-being, but we have
14	emotional health in it.
15	MEMBER APPLEBAUM: how about physical
16	and emotional well-being?
17	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes? Physical and
18	emotional well-being.
19	(No response)
20	CO-CHAIR KAYE: So are we relatively
21	happy with these as domains? I mean, we haven't
22	completely finished the work and not everybody

1 got what they wanted, but, Gerry, are you
2 relatively happy?

MEMBER MORRISSEY: 3 I'm more than 4 relatively happy, but just with one point. I 5 don't mean to wordsmith this, but I'm trying to think about if these are the characteristics of 6 our system for the next 5 to 10 years, because 7 these things don't -- back to participant 8 9 engagement of the system, I think a more powerful 10 word is ownership. It's loaded intentionally so 11 that the individuals actually have a real voice. 12 And you can take stakeholder engagement I guess 13 and make it a sub-domain, but I think you want 14 words that have some power and meaning behind 15 And sometimes fewer words have that effect them. 16 than a lot of words.

17 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Who has a computer 18 open that they can look to see what the synonyms 19 of ownership are?

20 Oh, I know. Because I spilled tea on 21 my computer yesterday I'm afraid of putting it on 22 the table while I'm doing this. Go ahead, Drew.

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

1	MR. ANDERSON: The synonyms are
2	possession, right of possession, freehold,
3	proprietorship, proprietor rights, title.
4	CO-CHAIR KAYE: That's not helpful.
5	MR. ANDERSON: That's not where we're
6	going. Yes, I know.
7	CO-CHAIR KAYE: See, I'm on your side
8	with that, Gerry. We're kind of introducing a
9	kind of new concept. I actually kind of like it.
10	MEMBER OXFORD: By ownership are you
11	thinking more like buy-in?
12	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Buy-in, yes.
13	MEMBER OXFORD: So, it's less than
14	control. We're not saying that I mean, yet
15	that the people that use the services get to
16	control at the system level, but to have buy-in
17	and actually because engagement, right, the
18	problem is, oh, well, the state did a meeting
19	where they did a slide show and there were 500
20	people in the meeting and there was two minutes
21	for questions.
22	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes. No, I mean, I'm

appalled at the stakeholder engagement in 1 2 California --(Simultaneous speaking) 3 4 MEMBER OXFORD: Right. So, but buy-in 5 I think to me means that actually at the system level you said, okay, we're okay with this. 6 7 CO-CHAIR KAYE: All right. Jon, Clare, Bob and Suzanne. 8 9 MEMBER DELMAN: I don't think buy-in 10 is sufficient. When writing about this I've 11 talked about active participation or meaningful participation in this process, meaning given an 12 13 opportunity to participate in a key decision 14 making process in a way that you have impact. So 15 that's my working technical words, active 16 participation or meaningful participation. Buy-17 in is, all right, we'll do it. Okay. I agree. 18 I can't --19 CO-CHAIR KAYE: How do you feel about 20 ownership? 21 MEMBER DELMAN: Well, what does 22 I'm a little confused. I like ownership mean?

control better, but I'm not sure it's necessary. 1 2 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Gerry, keep thinking. (Laughter) 3 4 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Clare? 5 MEMBER LUZ: I'm okay with ownership. I'm not okay with buy-in because I do think the 6 7 situation can exist where somebody decides everything and then gets you to agree to it and 8 9 then calls it buy-in. 10 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. Bob? 11 MEMBER APPLEBAUM: I just would agree 12 with Jon. I really like something like 13 meaningful involvement in the design, or 14 something like that. I think the thing I don't 15 like about ownership is we live in a world where 16 75 percent of nursing homes are for-profit, 60 17 percent of home health agencies are for-profit, 18 and I think ownership can connote something that 19 I think we don't want to communicate here in this 20 particular --21 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Suzanne and Anita and 22 Sarita.

95

1	MEMBER CRISP: I like a forceful
2	statement like participant voice matters. I
3	think that kind of captures it all, that they're
4	part of the process, that they have input, that
5	I don't know.
6	CO-CHAIR KAYE: I mean, I did propose
7	consumer voice earlier, but that didn't get much
8	traction.
9	MEMBER CRISP: Yes, I know. And I
10	like matters, because participant voice that's
11	a little
12	CO-CHAIR KAYE: It matters? In other
13	words, it's not just yelling and screaming. It's
14	that it really
15	MEMBER CRISP: It's not just, hi,
16	we're putting this publication in the newspaper
17	and
18	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right.
19	MEMBER CRISP: you need to read it
20	and react to it. Yes.
21	CO-CHAIR KAYE: Anita?
22	MEMBER YUSKAUSKAS: I think the terms

like meaningful participation are good, but I 1 2 don't think they go far enough, because I think it's the old conception of person-centered 3 4 planning. You slap the label on it and you 5 invite the person to the meeting and then you have a person-centered planning meeting. 6 And we 7 all know that those failed miserably. And I think a word like ownership is really important. 8 9 If we can find a synonym that denotes control and 10 that somehow can fit with the system, I think we 11 need to be much more assertive about how we label 12 this. 13 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Sarita? 14 MEMBER MOHANTY: Yes, actually I was 15 looking up the definition of ownership just so I 16 could kind of understand. And obviously I get 17 the point of kind of the legal aspects and 18 concerns about for-profit, but the other that 19 kind of resonated with me is that if you talk 20 about the formal definition, it's actually 21 accepting responsibility, accountability and 22 obligation, which I think those are important

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

components of ownership, too. I mean, so I think 1 2 I like the word ownership, I guess is what I'm saying, because it also has those aspects of it 3 included in the definition. 4 5 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Well, okay. So could we could flip it and say the system is 6 accountable to consumers? 7 MEMBER MOHANTY: Yes, and that 8 9 consumers in that sense have accountability for 10 the system at hand, too. I think it's both. 11 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Right. 12 MEMBER SMITH: Or accountable to 13 consumer voice. 14 MEMBER MOHANTY: Or you can say 15 accountable to consumer voice. That's another 16 one, too. 17 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Sandy? 18 MEMBER MARKWOOD: We can just say 19 consumer voice/ownership. 20 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Consumer 21 voice/ownership, Sandy is saying. 22 MEMBER MARKWOOD: Yes.

CO-CHAIR KAYE: 1 Consumer 2 voice/ownership. I'm seeing some nods. How many objections are there? 3 4 (No response) 5 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Consumer voice/ownership wins. 6 7 (Laughter) Okay. What should we 8 CO-CHAIR KAYE: 9 Is there public comment? do now? 10 (No response) 11 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Thanks, everybody. 12 MR. ANDERSON: So, we're going to open 13 up the lien for public comment, but first we're 14 going to take comment within the room. 15 MS. BLACKWELL: Steve, could you read 16 back the last one about ownership again? This is 17 Ellen Blackwell. I'm just speaking as a consumer 18 right now. Okay? 19 CO-CHAIR KAYE: So Consumer 20 Voice/Ownership is the title.' MS. BLACKWELL: I'm not crazy about 21 22 that. And what I would just throw out to the

Committee is consumer -- to me it's 1 2 consumer/self-determination. CO-CHAIR KAYE: But this is not the 3 4 service thing. This is the system thing. So 5 it's consumer voice in how the system is 6 organized or not. 7 MS. BLACKWELL: But I guess what worries me a little bit is that I'm hearing a lot 8 9 of talk about systems, but when I think about 10 this project, it goes much beyond state systems 11 into just a person who might be getting services 12 in their own home. And this work crosses payers, 13 so, I mean, I'm just thinking there was a lot of 14 focus on the systems when it could be at the 15 individual level. 16 CO-CHAIR KAYE: We already have a 17 choice and control bucket right under that that 18 has a lot of --19 MS. BLACKWELL: Okay. 20 -- stuff like this CO-CHAIR KAYE: 21 where the --22 MS. BLACKWELL: Okay.

CO-CHAIR KAYE: -- consumer gets to 1 2 control. 3 MS. LASH: Okay. Before we take a break I wanted to read some comments from the Web 4 5 chat since we didn't emphasize those as much as we would have liked to yesterday. 6 7 Jennifer Rosenbaum asked or commented that she's interested in understanding the 8 9 domains from the meta-analysis and if they were 10 comprehensive and mutually exclusive. The short answer to that is no. She was wondering about 11 12 the broader domain identities to capture 13 comprehensively and in a mutually exclusive way; 14 and you all might want to consider these in the 15 sub-domain discussion, family roles, community 16 roles, work force roles, financial independence, 17 physical and emotional health and vital 18 communities. She suggests the domains might be 19 organized together with some of those concepts. 20 Mary Lee Fay also commented there's 21 University of Minnesota data that of the 1.14 22 million people with IDD served by state IDD

agencies, at a date in June 2012, 600,000 or so, 1 2 which is 56 percent, lived in the home of a family member, 10 percent lived in a home they 3 owned or leased, and 5 percent lived with a host 4 5 family or in a family foster home. The remaining 28 percent lived in a group home or facility. 6 And so, individuals providing support to people 7 with IDD is not a small number. 8 9 There were other comments in support 10 of a broad interpretation of caregivers beyond 11 the term family. 12 As an alternative to the term 13 ownership, responsibility. 14 And finally, a comment that the term 15 equitable had some concern unless it is well-16 defined so that we are sure whether we're 17 communicating equitable distribution of services 18 such that everyone with the same level of 19 disability receives the same mix of services, or 20 are we talking about equitable outcomes? 21 Focusing on outcomes would require us to 22 recognize that people come to the table with

different levels of resources and some would 1 2 require more paid support while others would have greater access to family, friends and community 3 4 resources. 5 Thank you all for those comments. We'll reconvene at 11:00. 6 7 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:43 a.m. and resumed at 8 9 11:03 a.m.) 10 MS. LASH: All right, everyone, we'd 11 like to give you some instructions for starting 12 the small group work on sub-domains. Drew will 13 take it away. 14 So, we're going to MR. ANDERSON: 15 break off into four groups of five to six 16 committee members. Each group is going to be 17 comprised of committee members, one NQF staff 18 member and an HHS observer, if they choose. 19 This is really going to be the 20 opportunity to look back at the list of 21 characteristics again along with the domains that 22 you've kind of rolled up into bigger buckets and

(202) 234-4433

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

1	look at them across the different levels of
2	analysis as you can see here and I'll show you
3	this slide.
4	We'll also need you guys to pick
5	somebody to be a facilitator and try to keep
6	notes of the discussion that you guys have so
7	when we come back as a larger group you can
8	share, you know, how you arrived at these domains
9	these sub-domains.
10	And we're going to ask that you guys
11	try to limit it to about five. You can have
12	more, but try to work within getting around five
13	sub-domains for each one of these categories.
14	As you can see from this chart, the
15	domains are listed. Each group is going to have
16	two to three domains. It's going to be listed on
17	the left hand side and you're going to be looking
18	at it across the system, intermediate,
19	accountability level and individual level as
20	we've, you know, been discussing.
21	So, with that, here are the group
22	assignments.

So, take a look at this list. We're 1 2 going to have group one, is going to be in the far left hand corner here to me. Then group two 3 4 will be the far right. Group three will be over 5 here where I am sitting. And group four will be closer to Sarah on that side. 6 7 And we have flip charts on each side of the room. 8 9 And each of you will be -- each group 10 will be looking at these two to three domains that's listed on this slide here. 11 12 Any questions? 13 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Just before we 14 break, during the break, there was some other 15 discussion about one of the domains. So, I 16 wanted to bring back a proposal and just get 17 people's reactions and if people aren't okay with 18 it, then we can sort of put it in the parking 19 lot. 20 But there was still some disagreement 21 about the one domain that says caregiver support. 22 And I think, you know, what Ari Houser raised is

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

sometimes when the general public sees that just 1 2 the word caregiver, they don't think of the unpaid caregiver or the family caregiver. 3 4 So, one potential way to get around 5 that is to say, family and unpaid caregivers. And I wanted to see if that might be okay with 6 people that had issues with that. 7 It would broaden it beyond family but 8 9 it would still put the emphasis that it's 10 primarily, you know, this is the unpaid 11 caregivers because we have a domain on the 12 workforce and the direct care. 13 MEMBER CRISP: So, we're 14 differentiating between paid and nonpaid? So, 15 we're saying that nonpaid family members and 16 other nonpaid caregivers? So, I'm not sure what 17 we're saying here. 18 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Yes, I mean it 19 would be family and unpaid caregivers. The issue 20 of paid family caregivers and where that would 21 go, it could go within this domain, you know, if 22 you see that as a family support mechanism.

MEMBER CRISP: What about the family 1 2 members who are being paid, though? CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: That's what I'm 3 saying. 4 5 MEMBER CRISP: Yes, I mean I don't get it. 6 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Gerry? 7 MEMBER MORRISSEY: Back to Ari's 8 9 point, I do think we should put family in there 10 because family's have a dominate role in all of 11 this work. 12 I thought from yesterday, the whole 13 point of -- we understood some family members do 14 paid and unpaid, and we are recognizing that by 15 putting the word supported. I thought that's the 16 logic of how that occurred yesterday. 17 CO-CHAIR KAYE: So, I thought we were saying -- so, I think we're trying to fudge 18 19 things a bit by saying family which could, 20 potentially, which presumably includes all family 21 members and unpaid and anybody else who's unpaid. 22 So, in other words, not a paid worker

1 who is a stranger. So, that's what I would see 2 this bucket as. 3 MEMBER MORRISSEY: Neighbor, natural 4 supports? CO-CHAIR KAYE: Yes. Right, what do 5 you think, Mike? 6 7 MEMBER OXFORD: Well, I guess my concern is that whether they're paid or not, 8 9 family, defined broadly including sort of social 10 family ideas, it's just a little bit different dynamic than just hiring someone from an agency 11 12 or something like that. 13 So, I don't want to just lose that by 14 saying, oh, we're only talking about family if 15 they're unpaid because I think family has a 16 different dynamic including when it's paid 17 compared to some stranger. 18 MEMBER MORRISSEY: So, to that point, 19 why couldn't we, in the sub-domain differentiate 20 that? CO-CHAIR KAYE: But what is the title 21 22 of the domain then?
Family caregivers. 1 MEMBER MORRISSEY: 2 CO-CHAIR KAYE: But that got rejected by a lot of people last time. 3 4 MEMBER MORRISSEY: Family caregivers, 5 well, we actually compromised on whatever words -- you came to family caregivers as supported 6 7 yesterday as a group, right? 8 CO-CHAIR KAYE: And today, we're 9 calling it caregiver support. 10 And I guess Joe and I said if there 11 was push back, we would just leave it the way it 12 So, I guess that may be what we're going to is. 13 do. 14 MEMBER OXFORD: It seems to me the 15 broad general domain is caregivers and then you 16 break it down family, non-family, paid, unpaid, I mean that's my logic. 17 et cetera. 18 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Although, I think 19 we had most the paid except for maybe family are 20 going to fall into workforce bucket, right? 21 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: I actually am not 22 sure if that's the right distinction. It sounds

logical but we've run into, and I think that 1 2 there's some real merit here, that the paid and unpaid isn't the difference between the natural 3 4 support and the workforce. 5 And so, I think that's what we're getting at here is that that's not the 6 distinction that, you know, family caregivers and 7 other natural supports, unpaid and everything 8 9 else falls into workforce. 10 I actually think there's a middle 11 ground that probably fits better under family and 12 other natural supports kind of a category or 13 whatever you want to call it. 14 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Well, we'll give Ari 15 the last word. 16 MEMBER HOUSER: I guess I would --17 this isn't perfect, but generally, where I might 18 put the break is not whether you're paid or not, 19 but whether you require payment to do the work or 20 not. 21 I think a lot of family caregivers who 22 are, again, and that's how you're faced and it's

not perfect, but probably most family caregivers 1 2 who are paid would be caregivers anyway even if 3 they weren't paid. It's a way of supporting 4 them. 5 There's -- and often what they're paid is not what they would be paid if they were doing 6 7 work for hire, but it sort of a support and it enables them to provide more care than they would 8 9 otherwise be able to. 10 Again, I don't think that's perfect, 11 but I think that's closer to what the dividing 12 line would be. 13 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Yes, I think maybe 14 we could just leave it as it as is now. Go to 15 the sub-domains. It'd be interesting to see what 16 comes out of the sub-domains and maybe that'll, 17 you know, allow us to come back and readdress it. 18 Because, for example, I'm still not 19 sure the paid family caregiver issue, does that 20 go under this or does that go somewhere else like 21 under workforce? 22 So, that might help us if we get the

sub-domains then maybe that'll help. 1 So, go 2 ahead. 3 MEMBER CRISP: Okay, okay. I think 4 what we also have to struggle with within that 5 smaller group is that even paid caregivers provide an enormous amount of unpaid also. 6 So, it, you know, it's going to take some detailed 7 thinking. 8 9 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Okay. Before you go 10 off, I'm more interesting in a list of subdomains than I am in the chart and what the level 11 12 of analysis is. 13 So, if you get bogged down, please 14 think conceptually first rather than how you're 15 going to measure it. All right? So, please try 16 to keep -- I would urge people to try to think 17 more conceptually than anything else. And, remember, we don't have to 18 19 identify measures here, that's a long way off. 20 MS. LASH: Right. And, you could come 21 up with a sub-domain for measurement that fits 22 all three levels of analysis to one.

1But, as Steve is suggesting, try to2crystalize on the five or six sub-domains that3are core to the domain maybe before you try to4sort them across the levels of analysis.5In terms of timing, we wanted to give6you until about noon to work within your small7groups. I'll make an announcement when lunch is8set up and you can all help yourselves to lunch	
3 are core to the domain maybe before you try to 4 sort them across the levels of analysis. 5 In terms of timing, we wanted to give 6 you until about noon to work within your small 7 groups. I'll make an announcement when lunch is	
 4 sort them across the levels of analysis. 5 In terms of timing, we wanted to give 6 you until about noon to work within your small 7 groups. I'll make an announcement when lunch is 	
5 In terms of timing, we wanted to give 6 you until about noon to work within your small 7 groups. I'll make an announcement when lunch is	
6 you until about noon to work within your small 7 groups. I'll make an announcement when lunch is	
7 groups. I'll make an announcement when lunch is	
8 set up and you can all help yourselves to lunch	
9 and continue working, if you need to.	
10 Otherwise, you can use between 12:00	
11 and 12:30 to take a break, catch up on email, et	
12 cetera, et cetera.	
13 Any other questions? Kimberly?	
14 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: Yes, I have a	
15 question.	
16 So, while I care about all of these	
17 domains, I'm not in the one that is probably the	
18 most important to me. Are we going to have some	
19 conversation about this when we come back	
20 MS. LASH: Yes.	
21 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: and be able t	0
22 weigh in on it?	

1 MS. LASH: Yes. 2 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: Okay. 3 MS. LASH: We're going to spend --4 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: More than just 5 reporting out? MS. LASH: -- about 45 minutes or so 6 after lunch sharing our results with the larger 7 committee so that we can have the opportunity for 8 9 10 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: Feedback, okay, 11 great. 12 MS. LASH: -- further dialogue and 13 buy-in. 14 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: Thank you. 15 MS. LASH: We'll do some live editing 16 of sub-domains if we need to. 17 And so, do keep that in mind as you're 18 working together that you'll be sharing your 19 progress at the end. 20 Okay, let's do it. 21 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 22 went off the record at 11:15 a.m. and resumed at

1

1:05 p.m.)

2 During the break time, the following small groups met and upon resumption of the 3 meeting, presented their reports: 4 Group 1 (Consumer Voice/Ownership, 5 Chose and Control, Human and Legal Rights) with 6 7 Juliet Feldman: Joe Caldwell, Kimberly Austin-Oser, Robert Applebaum, Andrey Ostrovsky and Ari 8 9 Houser. 10 Group 2 (Workforce/Providers, System 11 Performance, Equity and Fairness) with Andrew 12 Anderson: Charlie Lakin, Jonathan Delman, Sarita 13 Mohanty, Mary Smith, Anita Yuskauskas and Ari 14 Ne'eman. 15 Group 3 (Physical and Emotional Well-16 being, Caregiver Support, Full Community 17 Inclusion) with Sarah Lash: Stephen Kaye, Suzanne Crisp, Patti Killingsworth, Gerry Morrissey and 18 19 Lorraine Phillips. 20 Group 4 (Effectiveness/Quality of 21 Services, Services Are...) with Nadine Allen: Camille Dobson, Sara Galantowicz, Clare Luz, 22

Sandy Markwood, Barbara McCann and Mike Oxford. 1 2 MS. LASH: Okay, everybody, we have until about 1:45 to hear some debriefing from all 3 4 of the small groups and have some short 5 discussion about what sub-domains people came up with. 6 7 I want to reserve anything about the levels of analysis that you assigned to those 8 sub-domains for an offline exercise that 9 10 essentially we will put down everything from the 11 small groups on paper along with a lot of other 12 products of this meeting including draft 13 definition, so that you can really see the 14 components as a whole and we will give the 15 committee the opportunity to review all of that 16 via email in the next several weeks. 17 That way, you can have some more 18 deliberate think time with everything and obtain 19 any extra input that you might like. 20 In the interest of time, and I'm sorry 21 to rush it because I know that there were such

strong conversations in the small groups, we'll

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

have a representative from each relate the sub-1 2 domains that they established in each domain, they're typed up for you to work from and I will 3 4 try to spend eight to ten minutes per group so 5 that we can move on to the next section. And Joe will be facilitating you if 6 7 you run over. CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Yes, I think just 8 9 to reiterate, on this part, you know, we don't 10 have to reach consensus or anything today on 11 these sub-domains. There'll be a lot more 12 discussion, like Sarah said, there'll be like an 13 electronic or email input and then we have 14 another meeting in August. 15 So, really, today, keep in brief and 16 then present, you know, what the workgroup came 17 up with and then, you know, just peoples initial 18 reactions if there was something controversial or 19 if there's something missing or an important idea 20 that didn't get mentioned. 21 So, I think that's a good way and 22 we'll start with my workgroup which is led by

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

2

3

4

5

Bob.

MEMBER APPLEBAUM: Well, I wouldn't say anything was led by Bob, but Bob got pointed out to be the spokesperson. There was no leading.

Okay, so I guess I would say that this 6 7 was pretty straightforward from what we had talked about yesterday. Probably one of the 8 9 questions that we had was this -- in one of the 10 documents, there was something about shared accountability and we weren't exactly sure what 11 12 that was and assumed it had something to do with 13 the responsibility of the consumer in all of this 14 and we weren't sure exactly how to put that into 15 the choice and control domain.

We did talk a lot about selfdetermination. And so, one of the proposals is to possibly even call this domain choice and control and self-determination which we thought Steve might axe because of the extra long words on it.

22

But there was a lot of discussion

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

about that self-determination cut across a number 1 2 of these areas. And so, whether it makes it into the title or not, we still wanted to make sure 3 4 that it got there as something that was really 5 important. And then, I think that everything 6 7 else, I think was relatively straightforward. Does anybody from the group want to 8 9 add anything to this one? 10 Okay, so, can we go to the next one? 11 Is that enough detail from your perspective, Joe? 12 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Yes, I think so. 13 MEMBER APPLEBAUM: Okay. 14 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Yes. Would you 15 rather just kind of read through all of them? 16 Maybe you should. 17 MEMBER APPLEBAUM: If there's somebody 18 on the phone, we're screen sharing so they can 19 read it. Okay, so that's not in the interest of 20 time. 21 MEMBER DOBSON: Can I ask -- if we 22 have questions about what the sub-domains mean?

1	Is this not the time to ask?
2	CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Yes, I think this
3	is the time. We probably should do them one by
4	one, do you think, instead of coming back.
5	MEMBER DOBSON: It's up to you.
6	CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: So, I guess do we
7	go back you had the question on the first one?
8	MEMBER DOBSON: Yes, I wanted to know
9	what choice of delivery system model meant.
10	MEMBER APPLEBAUM: Okay, so
11	MEMBER DOBSON: Program delivery
12	models, what that meant.
13	MEMBER APPLEBAUM: Okay, so, in some
14	ways, that was the idea about whether people had
15	actually access to self-direction. But then, as
16	we started talking about it, people thought self-
17	direction was so important they wanted to include
18	it out on its own line as well.
19	But that was sort of in the cases, can
20	you choose to self-direct? And, again, it could
21	have been put self-direction could have been
22	put in that one but then somebody thought, well,

maybe there's some other things that might be
 choice of program and so we left self-direction
 on its own line.

4 MEMBER OXFORD: Well, just real quick. 5 I mean, so, like at home, it's not only self-6 direct or agency direct but also kind of cutting 7 across is if you want to be involved with like 8 what we'll call this work program, if you're 9 interested in like minimum employment and so on 10 and so on.

11 And so, there are really for any one 12 person may be able to pick across three different 13 programs, sometimes more without regard 14 necessarily just to self-direction is what I'm 15 trying to say.

MEMBER HOUSER: I was just going to say that that's broader, sort of the same thing, that even if you're choosing between a handful of service delivery models, none of which are selfdirecting, that's still a choice that you would have relative to just being assigned one.

22

And the presence of actually having

multiple programs to make that choice because 1 2 it's self-choice. Like you could be assigned one of three programs or there could be only one 3 Either way is restricting choice. 4 program. 5 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Okay. Can we move 6 on to the next one? 7 MEMBER APPLEBAUM: Okay, so, this one was -- there was some overlap with the choice 8 9 area, but again, we had decided as a larger group 10 to keep them separate. 11 But probably the one thing that is 12 different from this one than maybe we had started 13 out thinking about was this first item about 14 respectful delivery system also for the 15 workforce. 16 And so, we didn't want to lose the 17 fact that in addition to being respectful to the 18 consumer for a system to be high quality, it also 19 needed to respect the worker and that meant 20 adequate wages, benefits, those kinds of things 21 that have sometimes gotten lost in the system. 22 So, that was the only thing that was

1

really very different.

2 And then, we also included these sense of safety item, recognizing that it might overlap 3 4 with someplace else, but we didn't want them to 5 get lost since there was so much discussion about it. 6 But I think other than that, it's 7 relatively straightforward in terms of the words 8 9 on the page. 10 So, I don't know, group, anybody want 11 to add anything? 12 MEMBER DOBSON: System responsiveness? 13 MEMBER APPLEBAUM: Is that yours? 14 Okay, please. 15 I don't think it MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: 16 was mine per se, but it was a conversation that 17 we had about that when there are maybe human and 18 legal rights violations or there are things in 19 the system that the system is sensitive to it and 20 highly responsive. 21 And so, making sure that when we're 22 looking at a quality system that it has

123

mechanisms in place to address when this goes south.

One of the examples 3 MEMBER APPLEBAUM: 4 that came up was the ombudsman program, which if 5 you think about from a system perspective, we have added no resources to the ombudsman program 6 but we've added tremendous responsibility for 7 home and community based services. And so, that 8 9 was an example of system unresponsiveness, if you 10 will, to the system. 11 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Okay, any other 12 questions on this one? 13 MEMBER LUZ: I had a question. I love 14 that you have that first bullet and this might be 15 picky, but just the wording when you say 16 respectful workforce, to me, in my brain, it 17 means we are requiring that the workforce be 18 respectful. So, I don't know how you --19 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: I had the same 20 thought. If we could change the way that's 21 written, that would be really helpful. Just put 22 maybe parens include respect for the workforce or

1

something like that. We can figure it out later, 1 2 but I think it's good to -- yes. CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: We'll make a note 3 4 of it. MEMBER APPLEBAUM: And we did 5 recognize that this one does overlap with the 6 7 workforce one but we just wanted to get it down there because it was so important to the system 8 9 overall. 10 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: And the other 11 thing I would add, we added freedom abuse and 12 neglect under this even though that was in 13 another domain. So, that's an area where there 14 seemed to be a like a lot of overlap. 15 MEMBER APPLEBAUM: And our third one. 16 Okay, so this one was a little bit tough to 17 articulate because in some ways, the words that 18 kept coming up are meaningful and commitment to 19 people being involved because we think that the 20 system for a long time has paid lip service to 21 consumer involvement or participation, but they 22 weren't really serious about it.

1And so, in some ways, the words2probably aren't all that different and so I think3the conversation this morning about trying to4push ownership in and more forceful words we5think were important.6And we did try to identify the7concepts of both breadth and depth in terms of8participation.9And but, this is one I think we'll10need to do a lot more work on to try and get it11to a domain and then measures because we12recognize this is one that people have talked	
3 the conversation this morning about trying to 4 push ownership in and more forceful words we 5 think were important. 6 And we did try to identify the 7 concepts of both breadth and depth in terms of 8 participation. 9 And but, this is one I think we'll 10 need to do a lot more work on to try and get it 11 to a domain and then measures because we	
4 push ownership in and more forceful words we 5 think were important. 6 And we did try to identify the 7 concepts of both breadth and depth in terms of 8 participation. 9 And but, this is one I think we'll 10 need to do a lot more work on to try and get it 11 to a domain and then measures because we	
5 think were important. 6 And we did try to identify the 7 concepts of both breadth and depth in terms of 8 participation. 9 And but, this is one I think we'll 10 need to do a lot more work on to try and get it 11 to a domain and then measures because we	
 And we did try to identify the concepts of both breadth and depth in terms of participation. 9 And but, this is one I think we'll 10 need to do a lot more work on to try and get it 11 to a domain and then measures because we 	
<pre>7 concepts of both breadth and depth in terms of 8 participation. 9 And but, this is one I think we'll 10 need to do a lot more work on to try and get it 11 to a domain and then measures because we</pre>	
8 participation. 9 And but, this is one I think we'll 10 need to do a lot more work on to try and get it 11 to a domain and then measures because we	
9 And but, this is one I think we'll 10 need to do a lot more work on to try and get it 11 to a domain and then measures because we	
10 need to do a lot more work on to try and get it 11 to a domain and then measures because we	
11 to a domain and then measures because we	
12 recognize this is one that people have talked	
13 about but it probably hasn't ever made it very	
14 well into the measurement world.	
15 So, obviously, we all think it's	
16 important but we've got some work to do on this	
17 one.	
18 Anybody want to add anything to? No?	
19 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Okay. All right,	
20 we'll got to oh, you wanted to say something,	
21 Anita?	
22 MEMBER YUSKAUSKAS: I just have a	

question. Can you explain is this your system, 1 2 consumer owned system? Just a little bit about your discussion on that item? 3 I think it was 4 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: 5 really about that consumers felt involved enough in the system to really participate and take 6 7 ownership in the system itself. And we talked, you know, we went off 8 9 on various tangents including consumers sharing 10 information with other consumers and really having much more of an ownership role in the 11 12 system. 13 When we were doing Cash and Counseling 14 and ran a focus group with self-directed 15 participants, when we were done, they stayed 16 around for like an hour sharing information and 17 talking about resources and those kinds of things 18 and trying to create a system where there's 19 opportunities for sharing of information and for 20 really being able to be a participant in a much 21 different way than the current system. So, that 22 was the idea for it.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

	-
1	CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Okay, I guess
2	we'll go to Group Number 2.
3	MR. NE'EMAN: So, I was asked to speak
4	to this because I have the misfortune of being
5	the only member of the group wearing a tie.
6	We'll start out with equity and
7	fairness and we spent actually a fair amount of
8	time trying to parse whether or not there was a
9	difference between equity and fairness as
10	concepts and reasonably sure they're synonyms.
11	The areas that we highlighted here are
12	reduction and health and service disparities,
13	transparency of resource allocation, and what we
14	mean by that is essentially that the budget for
15	services that you receive or the level of
16	services that you receive is tied to a
17	transparent equitably applied process.
18	The degree to which states have a
19	waiting list or other barriers or few access for
20	services, safe, accessible and affordable housing
21	given the role that housing or lack of housing
22	plays in barriers to access to services,

availability of services, timeliness not only of 1 2 services but of assessment and evaluation for services and, this is a very tricky one, 3 consistency across jurisdictions. 4 In county-based systems, do you 5 suddenly have access to very different levels of 6 service provision when you move across the county 7 You know, with respect to systems, as most 8 line? 9 of our systems are, that are state-based, are 10 there significant disparities from state to state 11 and access to HCBS? And so on and such forth. 12 Any questions here or should we move 13 on to the next one? 14 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Yes, Andrey? 15 MEMBER OSTROVSKY: A quick question 16 about consistency. I think -- did you guys have 17 a discussion about consistency, framing this as 18 consistency versus a minimum standard? Because each locality can be very 19 20 heterogeneous or different from one another 21 appropriately and the reflection of accommodating 22 the populations within that location.

And I don't know if consistency would 1 2 always be a great thing unless it was a minimum amount, sort of minimum standard. 3 4 Did you guys speak to that? MR. NE'EMAN: I think from our 5 standpoint, you know, we saw this less as a 6 7 requirement that we homogenize the system and avoid experimentation or alignment with cultural 8 9 competency and more of an issue of do you have 10 drastically different levels of access to certain 11 kinds of services depending on where you live? 12 And some of this gets into broader 13 conversations on Medicaid portability and other 14 things that are difficult to assess at an 15 individual level but become very clear when 16 looking at things comparatively across 17 jurisdictions. 18 MEMBER OXFORD: I was wondering if 19 maybe that didn't have to do with consistency of 20 like high quality services across political 21 subdivisions or whatever. 22 MR. NE'EMAN: And I think that's good

way of thinking of it. I mean if you look at a 1 2 state just like Ohio, for example, were at least from the DD system, and I think the AD system as 3 well, much of Medicaid is administered at the 4 5 county level. There's a question of equity if you 6 7 had drastically different access to services if you need to move to take a job in Columbus, for 8 9 example, from Cleveland. And ditto, you know, if 10 you're moving from Columbus to Los Angeles or 11 what have you. 12 That's really what we're trying to get 13 at here. 14 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: And Sandy, you 15 wanted? 16 MEMBER MARKWOOD: Just a quick 17 question. I know that you called out housing as 18 part of that. And one of the issues that we see 19 is transportation because if you don't have 20 access, it has a quality and fairness barriers as 21 far as being able to connect to services. 22 MR. NE'EMAN: I would have no

objection if the other members of my group feel 1 2 the same way to adding transportation. I'm seeing nodding heads, so maybe we can make a note 3 4 there. MEMBER HOUSER: I might bundle 5 transportation into that housing bullet point 6 7 often housing is affordable because it's not well-served by transit, that you sort of 8 9 substitute affordability for, you know, 10 transportation accessibility. 11 And so, both are important and so we 12 don't -- but I think to look at housing and 13 transportation together because they're not 14 separate. 15 Any objection to housing MR. NE'EMAN: and transportation in the same bullet point? 16 17 MEMBER SMITH: I think you can do that 18 but because I understand the point you're making, 19 but then I'd probably list transportation 20 separately, because it's going to be much broader 21 than, you know, that variable impacts more than 22 just safe housing. But I get your point.

1	MR. NE'EMAN: Maybe we want to list
2	access to transportation and include safe,
3	accessible and affordable housing with access to
4	community life.
5	CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: I think for now,
6	we'll just make sure to make a note to add
7	transportation, and then we'll figure out if it's
8	a separate thing or not. Let's move on to the
9	next section.
10	MR. NE'EMAN: Wait, Claire had one
11	comment.
12	MEMBER LUZ: When we started this
13	discussion yesterday about equity, my
14	understanding was that it was consistency across
15	populations. So, you can have different
16	populations within a single jurisdiction and some
17	are getting served well and some are not.
18	So, I thought we were sorry, my
19	understanding was that we started this discussion
20	so that we could get consistency across
21	populations, and you have multiple populations
22	within a single jurisdiction and some are getting

services, good services, and some are not. 1 2 And then to Ari's point, do we really want consistency or do we want consistency of 3 access to all of these things? Because, you 4 5 know, some populations don't need certain So, it's more do they have equal 6 services. 7 access? I have no objection to 8 MR. NE'EMAN: 9 adding consistency of access across 10 jurisdictions. That probably makes more sense 11 and I would agree with you that there are certain 12 populations that have more resource intensive 13 needs, and we don't wish to encourage any sense 14 of, you know, resentment because people with more 15 significant levels of impairment are accessing 16 more dollars. Does that address your concern, 17 consistency of access to services across 18 jurisdictions? 19 MEMBER LUZ: I think if you add 20 access, and equal access, and across 21 jurisdictions and populations, that would -- I would feel better about that. 22

CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Isn't that in the 1 2 first bullet? MR. NE'EMAN: I feel like we're 3 4 getting at populations in the first bullet and I 5 am worried about using the term consistency in the context of populations. But let's say 6 consistency of access to services across 7 jurisdictions, does that work? 8 Great. 9 MEMBER YUSKAUSKAS: I'm not sure I 10 agree with just access. And one of the 11 discussion points that we had is that our long 12 term care system in the United States, for all 13 intents and purposes, is not equitable. It 14 varies from state to state, it varies in scope, 15 it varies by population group. I mean there are 16 so many ways that it's inequitable. And that was 17 one of the things that we were trying to get at. 18 So, I think it goes beyond access and I think we 19 just need some additions there, consistent access 20 and --21 MR. NE'EMAN: Eligibility? 22 MEMBER YUSKAUSKAS: Eligibility and

1 scope and --2 MR. NE'EMAN: Scope, I'm not sure -yes, scope. Okay, across jurisdictions. 3 4 MEMBER YUSKAUSKAS: Well, depending on 5 needs, you know. MR. NE'EMAN: Yes, and I think as long 6 7 as we're talking about across jurisdictions rather than across populations, then I think 8 9 consistency in access eligibility and scope of 10 services across jurisdictions. 11 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Well, we don't have 12 time to get all these bullets exactly right. 13 MR. NE'EMAN: Let's move on to the 14 next item. 15 CO-CHAIR KAYE: So, if you're not 16 absolutely -- if you don't really strongly 17 object, I urge you to pass. 18 MR. NE'EMAN: I will not read all of 19 these. But we certainly benefitted from Andrew's 20 ability to write very small, so we appreciated 21 that. So, systems performance, from our 22 standpoint, spoke to a wide variety of issues but

I think just speaking broadly, we had a set of
 issues relating to level of engagement from
 consumers and other stakeholders.

4 We had a set of issues relating to the 5 availability of data and the integrity of data. We had a set of issues relating to equitable 6 resource allocation, they're very similar to the 7 first issue. And we had a set of issues with 8 9 respect to the need to build in quality measures 10 that specifically spoke to financing and service 11 delivery structures.

12 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: I think that's 13 good. I think this one might be one people to 14 think more about. I mean there's a lot of stuff 15 in there, and, you know, when we get more 16 feedback, there might be interesting to look like 17 maybe some of this stuff overlaps with other 18 domains. But that's a good job.

19 MR. NE'EMAN: And I think some of the 20 overlap is inevitable, but I mean we should look 21 at some of these other domains. When the same 22 thing shows up in other domains, we might want to

1	look at it in the individual context and here,
2	the system or the plan context.
3	CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: That's seems
4	what's going on, yes.
5	MR. NE'EMAN: Next?
6	CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Andrey wanted to
7	say something.
8	MR. OSTROVSKY: Just a quick comment.
9	We don't need to modify this here, but when the
10	searching is happening as a takeaway from this
11	meeting, I think interoperability is going to be
12	really important just to specifically search for,
13	because data integrity doesn't really address
14	that, especially with how much emphasis O&C has
15	placed on interoperability and the eLTSS work.
16	And then, also, directly calling out
17	the intersection between traditionally either,
18	you know, Medicare and Medicaid funded types of
19	systems and deliver processes, I think that
20	overlap in and of itself would be interesting and
21	important to explore. But we're not updating
22	this list.

1 MR. NE'EMAN: That's a really good 2 We can just reflect in our notes, not point. only interoperability but coordination across 3 payers, that's I think a point that we should 4 5 have come up with, but I don't think we did. Next section? Workforce, I'll run 6 7 through this somewhat briefly. We started out the most basic issue, provider network adequacy. 8 9 That providers exist in sufficient numbers and 10 are appropriately disbursed, so there's access to 11 providers in rural communities, low income 12 communities and so on. 13 The providers themselves are 14 dependable, they show up on time and so on and 15 such forth. That providers have respect for the 16 boundaries, privacy, values and other preferences of the consumers that they serve. 17 That providers 18 are skilled, and I actually am reasonably certain

19 that what we wrote down was not training and 20 education, but was demonstrated competencies 21 because we had a pretty long discussion about 22 that, where necessary, demonstrated competencies.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

That providers be culturally and
 linguistically competent, sensitive and mindful.
 That providers have adequately compensated
 benefits, or are adequately compensated and have
 access to benefits.

We had a conversation about the safety 6 7 of the worker. I think we also tweaked that language as well. Does anybody remember what we 8 9 came up with? I know we had a long discussion 10 about this. I feel like we might have been 11 working off of an older version of our notes in 12 this.

13 Where appropriate, demonstrated 14 competencies. And we spoke about the importance 15 at the agency level of having a strong culture of 16 collaboration and values-based leadership on the 17 part of agencies. I think the issue of values 18 was something we really wanted to infuse 19 throughout and that was a high priority for us. 20 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Good, any comments 21 or questions on this? Yes? 22 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: So, I probably

will want to have a conversation privately with 1 2 folks. I'm not sure handle this, but I'm a little troubled by some of this. I get, Ari, that you 3 4 don't want to say training and education, you 5 want it to say where appropriate demonstrating I also understand that there were 6 competencies. other people on the group and I would think that 7 there needs to be much more broad conversation 8 9 about the role of training, education and 10 competencies and what that means. 11 MR. NE'EMAN: To be clear, I wasn't 12 reflecting my views. I was reflecting the 13 language that the group as a whole agreed to. If 14 there are any members of the group that feel 15 otherwise, please feel free to express that. 16 My edit was not to reflect my personal 17 opinion, but, in fact, to ensure that the 18 language that we put in our matrix over there was 19 accurately reflected on the slides here. I'm 20 sure we'll have many more discussions on this in

22

21

MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: I would like to

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

the full group.

hear from the other group members, because I also 1 2 think this is consistent with what you have expressed in the past, and I think that it's 3 4 something that, while this isn't necessarily the 5 appropriate venue to hash out certain things, I think that the conversation about training and 6 education and using those terms needs to somehow 7 be remedied. 8 9 MR. NE'EMAN: If there's any concern 10 that I'm not accurately communicating the

11 preferences of the group, then I definitely 12 welcome you to talk to the other group members 13 either now or separately.

14 CO-CHAIR KAYE: All right, so it says 15 demonstrated competencies, it doesn't say 16 anything about training. And what was the other 17 one that you were asking about?

18 MR. NE'EMAN: Safety of the worker.
19 I think we tweaked that language. We reference
20 safety but we put it within in a specific
21 context. I may be wrong about that.

CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: John?

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1	CO-CHAIR KAYE: I'm not seeing
2	anything about safety up here.
3	MEMBER DELMAN: I have a red am I
4	on? Can people hear me? Yes, I don't think
5	that's the most recent version. I think what was
6	critical for us was demonstrating those
7	competencies. And under demonstrating
8	competencies, and I don't remember what we
9	settled on, I think we could how do people get
10	to the point where they have those competencies?
11	I think one is who you hire and how
12	you hire them. I mean I think, in some cases,
13	there is I forget if we eliminated training
14	and education entirely, but I don't think it's
15	I think we're put in an unfair position because
16	it wasn't the thing wasn't reflective of our
17	discussion.
18	So, I don't recall. I mean I think we
19	had what we settled on, or even I just
20	don't recall. But, I don't see training and
21	education as the primary goal, but trying to get
22	people who can work well in the workplace, have

those competencies. And the question is, how do you get there? And I would think training and education is one of the ways you would get there. And at least in the mental health world, part of it's -- more important, I would say is your job description and who you hire.

7 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: I think this is obviously one, you know, we need to keep talking 8 9 And, you know, in some ways, you know, about. 10 the full group hasn't weighed in yet. This was 11 just a subgroup and there's, you know, people 12 with expertise that didn't have a chance to sort 13 of weigh in. So, this is definitely, we'll take 14 note that, you know, we need to talk more about 15 this one.

MEMBER SMITH: Could I just make a comment?
CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Yes.
MEMBER SMITH: I was part of the
workgroup, too. First, I would reorder the
wording a little bit. I don't know if it would

make any difference. I think it was demonstrated

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

22

1

2

3

4

5
145

competencies where appropriate, and we had a long
 conversation and the struggle was, you know,
 we're trying to come up with these terms that cut
 across lots of populations.

5 And there are some populations where 6 you would look at, you know, training, education, 7 skill, abilities, everything, and it might be 8 different for other populations. So, it was, you 9 know, it wasn't settled on lightly. We had a 10 pretty long conversation.

CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Patti?

12 MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: Just a couple 13 of other thoughts for consideration and future discussion. One would be around workforce 14 15 satisfaction, which is pretty important, and the 16 other would be around retention, both from the 17 provider agencies perspective as well as the 18 consistency of staffing from the person's 19 perspective.

20 MR. NE'EMAN: I actually think we had 21 a -- this goes back to the point I was raising 22 earlier that this is not the most recent version

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

of our notes. We had something in there on 1 2 recruitment and retention. CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: 3 Okay. 4 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: Yes, I would echo 5 that that turnover and vacancy rates are -they're not the end all and be all and, you know, 6 7 you can't take the full temperature of a workforce system based on those things, but they 8 9 are really good indicators of, you know, if 10 something's working or not working. 11 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Okay. Let's move 12 Was that -- Ari, was that all yours for your on. 13 group? 14 Unless anybody else from MR. NE'EMAN: 15 my group wants to add anything or feels that 16 anything was left off or inaccurately reported, 17 please. 18 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Andrey? 19 MEMBER OSTROVSKY: Thanks. Just a 20 quick comment. I'll sort of just, perhaps as a side note, I haven't heard anyone speak about 21 22 individual agencies capacities in particular.

For example, we work a lot with area agencies on 1 2 aging and some have demonstrated really incredible capacity to do quality improvement. 3 Some have demonstrated incredible 4 5 capacity to have certain levels of business acumen which translates into sustainability and 6 7 then which translates into, perhaps, broader impact for their populations. I'm not sure 8 9 exactly how do group that within the, you know, 10 provider aspect. But, I think speaking to the 11 ability to measure and compare different agencies and give them almost credit in that regard might 12 13 be something worth looking into. But that could 14 be, you know, at the table. 15 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Okay, well, let's 16 move on to Group 3 then. 17 MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: So, I don't 18 have a tie, but I'm speaking for Group 3. Our 19 first one was full community inclusion. And 20 you'll notice at the very top, we included fun 21 and added the word enjoyment to that. 22 I think what we tried to do was

basically to draw from the original list that we had and then also looked at the domain frequency chart, and then talked those through and be sure that we captured as many of the different aspects as we thought were appropriate. So, most of these, I think, are very intuitive.

7 I notice that choice and setting is 8 now in two places, and we need to figure out 9 where that rightfully belongs. We were trying to 10 get at the notion of, you know, it's important 11 where you live as well as where you work and 12 where you play, and that there are opportunities 13 for inclusion built into all of those things.

Accessible built environment pertains specifically to where you live and not necessarily to the accessibility of the community broadly, which we recognize is probably beyond the purview of the control of the HCBS system specifically.

20 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Okay, looks good.
21 Any comments?
22 MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: I think our

1

2

3

4

5

1

other two are --

2	MEMBER OXFORD: Well, I kind of want
3	to go back on the accessible build environment
4	and I know we touched on it in our group and I've
5	heard it around is that, I think that maybe to
6	get at quality, we're looking beyond just the
7	service system per se, but also the linkages and
8	referrals and things like that.
9	So, every state has a protection and
10	advocacy system, room full of lawyers that can
11	take on the larger built environment and so on an
12	so on. So, to kind of get to quality, you know,
13	are those referrals happening? I don't know. I
14	hope that we look real broadly, because one of
15	the things that I think is missing perhaps is
16	some of how we put things together to make a
17	whole package, as opposed to just looking at the
18	program.
19	MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: Makes sense.
20	CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Okay, we'll go on
21	to the next one.
22	MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: I think we're

actually, back up after the first slide of 1 up, 2 Group 1 maybe, we were way up at the top. I'm not sure how that happened, but we passed it 3 4 earlier. Keep going, there we go. And I think the other one is above 5 this one. We'll do this one first. 6 So, 7 caregiver support, this one was a little bit more of a struggle than I thought it would be. 8 But we 9 decided to keep training and skill building 10 separate and then access to resources as broad 11 really in terms of, you know, different kinds of 12 services and supports that people might need, 13 making sure that assessment and planning is a 14 piece of that and also considering their 15 compensation piece and access, essentially, to 16 financial resources to defray some of the lost 17 opportunities of caregiving. 18 MEMBER HOUSER: I just wanted to --19 I'm not sure what's meant by carryover family 20 assessment and planning. But caregiver

caregivers are assessed on their ability to

assessments are quite common and, usually,

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

21

assist in providing care so that they can 1 2 substitute for care that the state has pay for. But, in order to support caregivers, caregivers 3 4 also need to be assessed for what their own needs 5 are --That's the 6 MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: 7 intent. 8 MEMBER HOUSER: -- and to be supported 9 and so that, ideally, this caregiver assessment 10 is part, and importantly, the caregiver actually 11 has to be talked to in that caregiver assessment, 12 which is not always the case. 13 But ideally, the caregiver assessment 14 and the care recipient assessment would be a 15 single process or together, and services for the 16 care recipient and the caregiver would be 17 determined to support both. So, you know, you 18 might have services given for the care recipient, 19 who's primary purpose is to support the caregiver 20 because that's the best outcome. 21 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Yes, so it sounded 22 like that was the intent.

1 MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: It was. 2 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: So, we'll make a note of that and, Sarita? 3 MEMBER MOHANTY: I just wanted to echo 4 5 That was one of my comments, was on the that. caregiver assessment and making sure we 6 7 incorporate what their needs are. The other thing with compensation, I would also lead to the 8 9 scenarios of compensation and benefits, because 10 one of the things that comes up with caregivers is their ability to access services, for example, 11 12 health care. And, you know, we often see that 13 with all the burdens that they have to, you know, 14 often times managing their own family members, 15 they encounter a lot of physical, mental, social 16 issues. 17 MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: We can probably 18 address Ari's concerns with the caregiver family 19 needs, right? Because it really is about their 20 needs, and not just their abilities to 21 contribute. I don't know, we can work that out 22 later.

MEMBER HOUSER: Yes, I don't think we 1 2 need to develop that language immediately, but I just wanted to make sure that that's where we 3 were going. 4 5 MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: Yes, it was. 6 MEMBER HOUSER: Okay. 7 MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: Okay, and I think our other one is maybe above, yes, physical 8 9 and emotional well-being. So, we wanted to be 10 sure that we both got at functioning or status, 11 as well as health and wellness generally. So, 12 that's sort of the reason that those three 13 categories are defined separately. 14 Here, we have another duplication, 15 actually, two of them, one with safety and one 16 with freedom from abuse, neglect and exploitation 17 which were in different places, so we'll need to 18 work our way through that. 19 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: That's good. Any 20 Okay. We've got the last group, Group comments? 21 4. 22 MEMBER CRISP: So, one of the hazards

1	of going last is that this is going to sound a
2	little duplicative. I think we're realizing
3	these aren't necessarily mutually exclusive
4	domains in some ways.
5	So, our first domain that we worked on
6	was the effectiveness and quality of services.
7	So, we really looked at effectiveness as
8	achieving outcomes and effective a measure of
9	effectiveness is whether or not you accomplish
10	what you set out to accomplish. So, you'll see
11	that we've listed meeting goals, meeting
12	preferences, health outcome achieved.
13	Under quality of services, this was a
14	little bit tricky because this whole exercise is
15	about measuring HCBS quality. So, we tried to
16	think of quality of services somewhat narrowly as
17	technical, quality technical competence of
18	delivering a particular service or support.
19	So, that's why we have sort of
20	technical skills, delivery of technical services,
21	team performance. And then the final comment on
22	rebalancing, and we're not necessarily wedded to

1 that word, but thinking at the system level, is 2 the system effective if people are being served 3 in the least restrictive setting? So, is your 4 system balanced? And that's sort of a system 5 level measure. So, let me see if there are 6 questions or other members of the group want to 7 comment.

8 MEMBER APPLEBAUM: Where is 9 satisfaction of the services? Is that included 10 in the technical services delivery?

11 So, satisfaction as MEMBER CRISP: 12 being an outcome? So, I guess I would say, and 13 others can weigh in, that that's part of 14 preferences being met. You ask someone if their 15 needs are being met, and that includes are they 16 satisfied with what they received. So, it could 17 fall there, it could be called out as its own 18 separate sub-domain, also.

19 MEMBER YUSKAUSKAS: One of topics we 20 talked about in our group was evidence based 21 practices, and the lack thereof. And I'm just 22 wondering how to get something about that on one

of these lists, so that it can be at least be 1 2 acknowledged and hopefully addressed over time? MEMBER GALANTOWICZ: So, I think we've 3 talked about quality of services and ideally, 4 5 that would mean that evidence based practices were being implemented, that best practices were 6 7 being implemented and the absence of best practices or evidence basis for a lot of service 8 9 delivery, it's sort of this notion of technically 10 competent, or technically appropriate services 11 being delivered. But, absolutely, there was a 12 discussion around that. 13 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Yes, I think 14 that's important to note, especially when you do 15 the environmental scan, that evidence base will 16 probably show up more than technical. Any other 17 comments on this one? 18 MEMBER SMITH: Yes, I'd like to go 19 back to not consumer satisfaction, but more like 20 consumer evaluation of services. You know, those

22

21

survey, and the survey is actually more than just

are -- you often seek that information using a

1	saying are you satisfied with services. There's
2	a whole array of things one would ask.
3	CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: So, we're taking
4	note of that. Thanks.
5	MEMBER LUZ: So, we had a long
6	discussion in terms of technical services,
7	technical skills. What does that mean? Because
8	you can deliver something technically, you know,
9	deliver technical service, but did you do it
10	well? Did you do it in a person centered manner?
11	So, it covered not it covered not only
12	the technical skill, but the quality, or the art
13	of the way in which it was delivered. And I
14	don't know that we have that well enough defined
15	there, but that was part of the discussion.
16	MEMBER GALANTOWICZ: I think that's an
17	important point. We struggled with what is
18	quality service to delivery look like? Not just
19	did you do it, but did you do it well? And how
20	do you assess that without evidence based
21	practices? Maybe you only get the participant's
22	perspective on whether it was done well or not.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

But, that's a piece of quality that we struggle 1 2 with how to reflect here. MEMBER LUZ: And we could capture that 3 4 through client evaluation. I said we could 5 capture that through client evaluating their services. 6 7 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Let's go to Lorraine? 8 9 MEMBER PHILLIPS: I have a question 10 and a comment. For team performance, was there 11 any discussion of the professional diversity of 12 the team? And where does that show up? And 13 then, I'm not sure where care coordination fits 14 in here and if it's in this, because I've lost 15 track of the different -- it's in the next one, So, I just go back to the --16 okay. 17 MEMBER MARKWOOD: And I would just 18 raise the point that a lot of the issues that 19 you're bringing up are in the next one, and part 20 of our discussion was whether these should remain 21 separate, or whether these should be combined. 22 MEMBER LUZ: And I'll add that, like

the other group, I think some of our -- we had 1 2 sub-bullets to our sub-bullets, and under team performance, we actually had it split into three 3 4 things, and one was team composition to make sure 5 there was diversity across disciplines and that consumers were involved in all of that. 6 7 And then team function, how well were they functioning as a team? And then team 8 9 outcomes, was the team achieving what they were 10 supposed to be achieving? 11 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Okay, anybody 12 else? Then let's go on to the next one and you 13 mentioned we need to -- there might be some 14 merging here or overlap. 15 Sure, this next MEMBER GALANTOWICZ: 16 one actually set us up nicely for sub-domains 17 because it was written services are and it had 18 five different -- or I think five or six 19 different qualities. So, it considered each of 20 those qualities, the domain and then the subdomains under the sub-domains. 21 22 The first adjective was service -- it

was about service accessibility. So, we parsed
 that out into four different types of
 accessibility with their proximity, geographic
 accessibility, economic accessibility, which
 would include costs, physical accessibility think
 specifically around the ADA and the idea of being
 able to access and use services.

And then this somewhat more vague 8 9 notion that public and private awareness, so just 10 because a service is physically present in an 11 area, if the person or individual or organization 12 that is helping coordinate your care is not aware 13 of that service, or doesn't have any connection 14 to it, in effect, it is not accessible even 15 though it's physically located in the area.

Appropriate services, this was a sort of we split this between, is it aligned with needs? Is the service appropriate because it's aligned with the individual needs? And is it appropriate because it's aligned with preferences? And as part of that, this notion of whether or not goals are being assessed, so that

it's appropriate because there's a goal that 1 2 service is designed to contribute to. Sufficiency, and again, this is where 3 4 I think there's going be some overlap is, you 5 know, sufficiency includes both the scope of what's available as well as the capacity of the 6 service system or the provider network or what 7 have you to meet both existing and future demand. 8 9 So, we didn't want to link sufficiency 10 to just what's being provided. Now, but again, 11 this notion is it going to be sufficient to meet 12 all potential demand? 13 So, we can scroll down, because I 14 think we have three slides on this one. So, the 15 third adjective under services are was this 16 notion of dependability which, I think, was on 17 another slide. Again, we sort of tried to pull 18 out the components of dependability, meaning that 19 from a personal perspective, can you count on 20 coverage? Does someone always come? Is it 21 dependable in terms of being timely? Does the 22 person or the worker show up on time? Is there

1

continuity?

2	And I think someone already mentioned
3	turnover but from the individual perspective, is
4	there consistency in what the individual you're
5	dealing with? Competency in the sense that the -
6	- there's two dimensions of competency that the
7	person the services dependably knows the needs
8	and preferences of the individual, and then
9	there's also just sort of basic competency, the
10	ability to provide what is required.
11	So, we felt like the ability to
12	provide what is required is different than
13	actually that more person-centered notion of
14	knowing what the needs are and the preferences,
15	so that you're competent to serve that
16	individual, as opposed to just generally
17	competent. We had this timely was one component,
18	and because we had worker timeliness under
19	dependability, we created the separate notion of
20	timely initiation of services, which is more of a
21	systems level measure.
22	You know, if you are eligible for a

program, do services start, you know, within the 1 2 desired period of time, or do you have to wait, you know, months to get started? So, that's 3 4 timely not on the day to day basis, but timely in 5 sort of overall initiation. And then we do have this element of coordination which, again, is 6 7 probably duplicative of other areas and we, again, tried to think of this as a process. 8 9 First, is the assessment that you 10 received truly comprehensive, so it brings in all 11 types of needs, not just HCBS, but it sets you up 12 for coordination by identifying other needs like 13 health care needs? Then does that translate into 14 15 development of a plan that's sufficiently 16 comprehensive? Is information exchanged between 17 all members of the care team including the 18 individuals? So, you can't have coordination if 19 people don't even know what they're expected to 20 Is that actually implemented? Having a plan do. 21 is not sufficient. And then it is evaluated? 22 And then we all laughed because really

that last bullet is classic CQI, you know, plan, 1 2 do, check, action. You go back to the beginning and then do all those things and so forth. 3 And 4 I'm not sure if we have any more slides or not. 5 No, that was it. 6 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Any comments on 7 this? I think it's interesting like there's a lot here, and then there was a lot on Ari's like 8 9 systems slide. So, I mean I think that's okay, 10 like some are going to have more sub-domains than 11 others. But I think it also tells you something 12 about, you know, where we might be going with the 13 conceptual framework that we're going to talk 14 So, any comments on this? Okay, so about next. 15 we finished all the sub-domains and now we're 16 going to get into the conceptual --17 MS. LASH: Let's do a quick public 18 comment briefly before we go to the conceptual 19 framework. 20 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Okay. 21 MS. LASH: Since that was a lot of 22 content, maybe there's further reflections out in

the audience. And while we do so, Nadine and 1 2 Drew or Juliet, I emailed you a slide that we need to show of the draft conceptual framework, 3 4 if you could work on bringing that to the screen. 5 No one in the room is moving. Operator, is there anyone on the phone that would like to make a 6 public comment at this time? 7 OPERATOR: At this time, if you would 8 9 like to make a comment, please press star then 10 the number one. There are no public comments at 11 this time. 12 MS. LASH: Thank you. Okay, from the 13 web then? 14 MS. FELDMAN: One commenter submitted 15 a comment through our webinar platform saying, 16 culturally competent is not an accurate term as 17 it denotes a level of mastery. However, this is 18 not attainable. Cultural and linguistic 19 humility, as well as an understanding of 20 historical trauma is the preferred language as it 21 encompasses multiple issues across race and 22 ethnicity.

www.nealrgross.com

This individual also said, training 1 2 and education often do not equate equity process, and restructuring systems is more effective than 3 4 training alone. The approach should be tailored 5 to the needs and/or goals, in parentheses, system change versus service providers versus users. 6 7 MS. LASH: Thank you, Juliet. And thanks to those members of the public. We're 8 9 getting a little bit behind, so I'm not going to give you another break, but do feel free to

10 11 excuse yourself for a couple of minutes if you 12 need to go out into the hall.

13 This is the very first iteration of a 14 conceptual framework so that we would have 15 something to show and share with you all, and get 16 your thoughts about whether you think this 17 represents the thinking of the group. So, we 18 heard yesterday that we would like sort of a 19 nationally relevant framework that is broad and 20 high level enough that it really encompasses 21 quite a bit.

22

Also, that it would be fairly simple

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

and not overly complex, to kind of interpret
 different mechanisms and shapes and things like
 that. We wanted to reflect the primary role of
 consumer outcomes in the conceptual framework,
 and to sort of demonstrate the role of quality in
 all of this.

7 So, in a nutshell, we've taken the domains that we fleshed out today and organized 8 9 them into those that relate primarily, not 10 exclusively perhaps, to system level concepts, 11 service level concepts, and then outcomes, 12 knowing that one influences the other influences 13 the other, and that there very well might be 14 topics in the domains that span all three.

And we might be able to visualize that 15 16 a little differently, but, essentially, there is 17 a kind of a causal, linear relationship from left 18 to right in the diagram. And that what it is 19 intending to really represent is quality home-20 and community-based services, and then the action 21 of measurement increases accountability, 22 transparency and improvement efforts.

So, this is the product of some tired 1 2 Last night we had pyramids, we had brains. circles for a while. We ended up with this 3 4 So, we'd like any concrete suggestions arrow. 5 you have for how this might be able to be enhanced. If it's missing the boat entirely, we 6 7 can probably spend until, it is now going to be 2:30 on this topic, and then this is also 8 9 something that you'll be able to give us written 10 email feedback on after the meeting, since we're just kind of throwing this out at you without too 11 12 much other preparation. Joe and Steve, did I 13 capture that correctly? 14 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Yes, I think, you 15 know, we heard from the discussion to keep it 16 simple, so we tried to do that. You know, 17 personally, I'm not a very visual thinker, so I'm 18 not good at this sort of stuff. There may be 19 people within this group that are better at 20 visually representing things.

And I think we tried to put things in 22 buckets knowing that there is overlap on all this

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

stuff, but tried to come up with some way to kind 1 2 of, instead of having 13 boxes like the scorecard, which I personally like, but instead 3 4 of having the 13 different domains, if there's a 5 better way to try to pull it all together and make it a little more simpler. So, that's what 6 7 I'll share as our thinking. And then we got tired. 8 9 CO-CHAIR KAYE: And also, we were 10 going to point out that NQF has a graphic 11 designer on staff who will make this -- I mean 12 actually, I'm really impressed with how pretty 13 you made it, Sarah. But, you know, it won't --14 the final thing won't necessarily look like this. 15 They might have better ideas about how to visually to represent it. But does it seem like 16 17 does it make sense to you for one thing? 18 MEMBER YUSKAUSKAS: I think it makes 19 sense and I like it for its simplicity. I guess 20 I'm wondering where we're going to go with this? 21 So, is this a foundation for a quality framework, 22 or is it a beginning for us to be able to

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

1

understand HCBS as a construct?

2 MS. LASH: I don't know that it helps us understand HCBS as a construct. That's really 3 4 what the definition I think is designed to do. 5 And this goes next to that as a visualization of the concepts of quality this group has 6 articulated related to HCBS. But if it needs to 7 8 do more, you know, the group can guide us down 9 that path. 10 MEMBER OXFORD: I just have a question 11 and I'm with Joe, I don't think visually or colorfully. Well, colorfully maybe, but not in 12 13 colors. But I guess my question is, so I thought 14 that I kind of heard a pretty common comment 15 around that the main thing was serving people and 16 that's what the programs and services and the 17 quality measurement was all about. But I don't 18 see the people anywhere in this diagram. So, 19 that's the only thing that occurred to me. 20 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: I think that's 21 qood. Like in other iterations we had like this 22 pyramid and the people were at the top and then,

you know, so that's a good observation. We can
 go to Bob and the Andrey.

3 MEMBER APPLEBAUM: So, one of the challenges in thinking about this is what's an 4 5 outcome? And so, when I look at, for example, the services box, things like satisfaction with 6 7 services, to me, is an outcome, and a lot of these things in terms of consumers' experience, 8 9 in terms of if they feel like they're being 10 treated with choice and control, that's an 11 It also is a sort of throughput, and so outcome. 12 I think it does get tricky to figure out which 13 things are outcomes and which things are outputs, 14 or whatever.

But I think, to me, certainly satisfaction with services, satisfaction with the experience, how people are treated, those are outcomes of a home and community based service. And I'm not sure which things got put in the services box, and which things got put in the outcomes box.

22

CO-CHAIR KAYE: What if it were

relabeled as consumers? System services
 consumers, does that help any? And it puts the
 people in it.

4 MEMBER APPLEBAUM: Well, I mean I 5 guess I was trying to sort of put a logic model 6 on to this, and in terms of -- so, from an 7 evaluation, we try to figure what the 8 intervention is that people are getting? What 9 happens to them? And then what are the outcomes?

And somehow, this doesn't quite -because things like satisfaction with services, to me, is a really important outcome of the system, and we spent a lot of time and resources trying to develop measures for that. And so, how is that not an outcome compared to, I mean the same as whether your functional ability is the --

17 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: We can keep18 thinking about it. Go to Ari.

19 MEMBER HOUSER: I was going to suggest 20 something similar but not as creative. But, I 21 agree, I think if we replace outcomes with 22 consumers, then we have three boxes that are not

co-branded with the three boxes of structure, process, and outcome.

3	And I think we might say that the
4	system box tends to lend itself to sort of
5	structural measures and the services box tends to
6	lend itself to process measures and the consumer
7	box tends to lend itself to outcome measures
8	without actually labeling it as so and tying
9	ourselves into that framework. So, I think that
10	would work.
11	CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: That's good.
12	Patti?
13	MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: I don't think
13 14	MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: I don't think in pictures either, but I must admit when I
14	in pictures either, but I must admit when I
14 15	in pictures either, but I must admit when I looked at the picture, I thought where's the
14 15 16	in pictures either, but I must admit when I looked at the picture, I thought where's the arrow going?
14 15 16 17	in pictures either, but I must admit when I looked at the picture, I thought where's the arrow going? So, there was a part of me that wanted
14 15 16 17 18	in pictures either, but I must admit when I looked at the picture, I thought where's the arrow going? So, there was a part of me that wanted to move outcomes to the point of the arrow.
14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>in pictures either, but I must admit when I looked at the picture, I thought where's the arrow going?</pre>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>in pictures either, but I must admit when I looked at the picture, I thought where's the arrow going?</pre>

1

it to consumer or something else. But I think if
 it stays outcomes maybe that's the whole point of
 what we're doing.

CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: And that's a good point. And maybe the arrow isn't the best representation. We had --

7 MS. LASH: You know, we have PowerPoint limitations. 8 I was, you know, it 9 would be better if each of these rectangles had 10 like the angular arrow side and they all fit into 11 one another with, you know, the consumer and 12 family at the end so that they really are present 13 in the framework and it's clear that this is all 14 leading up to -- there are outcomes if we change 15 the purple box to be labeled consumers to be in 16 both places.

17 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: Sara? 18 MEMBER GALANTOWICZ: So, two comments. 19 I think having worked on the group that discussed 20 the effectiveness domain, I think the way we 21 thought about operationalizing the domain really 22 was all about outcomes, that an effective system

is one that realizes the outcomes for
 individuals.

3 So, you know, some of this is going to 4 come down to semantics where we put different 5 domains and, again, it, you know, there's the 6 level of measurement as well. So, we could think 7 about individual outcomes.

And then I just wanted to make a 8 9 comment on satisfaction. Having worked on a 10 couple of different surveys, I think just to make a note that maybe to talk more about experience 11 12 rather than satisfaction because from a quality 13 measurement point of view, experience is 14 actionable, satisfaction is a lot harder to tease 15 out what the correlation to satisfaction are.

But if we ask people about their experience and the things that matters to them then we essentially assess their satisfaction of the system.

20 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: I wonder if Mary's 21 term of consumer evaluation is a little more 22 specific than consumer experience?

Anita? 1 2 MEMBER YUSKAUSKAS: I just have one suggestion and I like what Patti mentioned. 3 If 4 you do move the outcomes it starts to look like a 5 logic model with inputs and outputs. And I think a logic model might be a really good approach to 6 7 something like this. Just a suggestion. CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: 8 Mary? 9 MEMBER SMITH: Yes, I like moving the 10 outcomes to outside of the arrow there so that things are pointing towards it, but I would call 11 12 it consumer outcomes. I mean just to call it 13 consumer seems a little weird to me. I don't 14 know what that would mean. 15 Yes, and if you MEMBER OXFORD: 16 actually read what's in the outcome, physical and 17 emotional well-being, people being served, right, 18 et cetera, et cetera. 19 I would also agree with MEMBER SMITH: 20 21 MEMBER OXFORD: Human legal rights for 22 people being served.

1 MEMBER SMITH: -- moving that 2 effectiveness piece over to outcomes. I'm kind of puzzled why it's in there with services. 3 4 MEMBER OXFORD: I think maybe what the 5 folks who put this together were thinking is that it may be about outcomes but it's really talking 6 about services. 7 Whereas, physical and emotional well-8 9 being, human and legal rights, full community 10 inclusion, those aren't about services. Services can get you there or they can be preventive from 11 12 keeping you from getting there. 13 But there's really nothing 14 intrinsically service based about those. 15 Whereas, everything on the services 16 box are carryover supports, maybe less so. But 17 the other four are all about the actual provision 18 of services. And I can see how that logic flows. And there's certainly there are 19 20 services outcomes and there's outcomes that can 21 be affected services but they're not service 22 outcomes.

CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: That's a good 1 2 Is there anybody else that we didn't get? point. Okay, I think that's good. Yes, I 3 4 think this is really helpful. And we did -- I mean when we were 5 putting it together, it was I think we were 6 7 trying to somehow graphically represent that the consumer was, you know, the main outcome. 8 So, I 9 think we can work on that. 10 MS. LASH: Okay. So, let's see, do 11 people need a break or are you ready to - yes, 12 let's keep going. I know we're all anxious to 13 finish the meeting. 14 The next topic of discussion, since 15 we're through that is Juliet to share with you 16 sort of like a preview of what's coming next in 17 the project in research process so you have a 18 sense of how the products of today will be 19 carried forward. 20 MS. FELDMAN: So, we obviously have 21 quite a few next steps and follow-up to do after 22 this meeting.

1	One of the major buckets of work that
2	NQF staff will be undergoing over the next
3	several months is a deeper dive into the evidence
4	and the existing measures that are in use or have
5	been used or out there.
6	So, just some overarching
7	considerations, our research approach will
8	emphasize the factors shared across the facets of
9	HCBS and acknowledge the distinctions.
10	We'll be devoting specific attention
11	to understanding previous efforts to measure and
12	improve HCBS quality. We know that there has
13	been a number of efforts that have measures in
14	use and that have done existing scans. So, we
15	don't want to reinvent the wheel and we want to
16	build off of what work has been done.
17	And at the very end of this project,
18	which concludes September of 2016, a final list
19	of measures that staff has identified all
20	throughout the process will be accompanied by the
21	formal report narrative.
22	So, this just is a visual

representation of our research efforts. 1 So, we 2 can kind of put a checkmark next to our Phase I which was really preparing for this meeting in 3 4 terms of scanning the existing definitions and 5 frameworks for HCBS. In the spring/summer or 2015, our 6 first draft report is due which will be focused 7 on the operational definition and framework. 8 9 Our environmental scan and synthesis 10 of evidence will continue through the fall of 11 2015 with our second draft report due on the 12 environmental scan in November. 13 The committee will then reconvene next 14 March of 2016 to do -- what NOF staff will share 15 with you where we are to date and really focus on 16 the prioritization piece and discussing where the 17 -- of all we found, where should the priorities 18 be? What are the recommendations? And what are 19 the surrounding issues in terms of feasibility 20 and data that needs to be considered. 21 So, a lot more to come. 22 So, just -- this slide just shares
that our approach is going to be iterative. 1 We 2 will be providing continual updates to the committee and to the public. 3 We will -- after each report is 4 5 released, there will be a 30-day public commenting period and we will also be working 6 with various outreach to stakeholders and relying 7 on you to help us put us in touch with the right 8 9 people we need to speak to. 10 So, the synthesis of evidence, it 11 directly informed the development of the 12 operational definition and conceptual framework 13 and will now support the scan for measures by 14 identifying the concept and ideas that should be 15 measured based on the literature. 16 I'm going to keep going. 17 So, for Phase I, NQF consulted a 18 predefined list of sources that were identified 19 by HHS, the committee and members of the public. 20 This was the list of 200-some sources that we've 21 been referring to. 22 For our next phase, we will be

1	conducting an organized literature review guided
2	by the HCBS definition and framework and domains
3	and sub-domains that we've been discussing over
4	the last two days.
5	Phase 2 may also include key informant
6	interviews if information is sought isn't likely
7	to be published and we'll be seeking the
8	committee's input on that piece as well.
9	For the environmental scan, our
10	objectives are to identify existing measures
11	applicable to HCBS with an emphasis on those that
12	map to the conceptual frameworks, domains and
13	sub-domains.
14	We will identify promising examples of
15	HCBS quality measures to guide the committee's
16	discussion of implementation barriers and
17	mitigation strategies as well as identify measure
18	concepts and ideas that should be further
19	developed into future performance measurement.
20	So, similar to the synthesis of
21	evidence, NQF has collected and compiled various
22	predefined measure sources with input from the

committee. We are going to continue to scan 1 2 based on the framework domains and sub-domains and the measures will be organized for the 3 4 committee's later review. So, in terms of next or more broadly 5 in terms of our next steps, NQF is going to begin 6 7 Phase 2 of the research efforts based on the domains and sub-domains we've been discussing. 8 9 The committee is set to reconvene via 10 webinar in August on August 28th. At that time, 11 we will provide the committee an update on where 12 we are with the research and we'll, at that time, 13 we'll also have a draft definition and framework 14 that will be just finished going through public 15 So, we'll be able to provide the comment. 16 committee updates on those pieces as well. 17 And then, as I mentioned, our second 18 draft report is due in November of 2015 and then 19 there will be a 30-day public comment period on 20 each of those reports. 21 So, that was really just intended to 22 share with the committee kind of where NQF staff

is going with this work and there'll be, I mean, 1 2 continuous touchpoints with the committee. Ι think that's important to emphasize. 3 4 (Off mic comments) 5 Thanks, Juliet. MS. LASH: So let's just launch right into our 6 closing round-robin. We'd like to hear from each 7 of you one at a time on some closing discussion 8 9 thoughts and any other parting thoughts you think 10 are really critical to voice, although we don't 11 need you to recap, you know, every point that 12 you've made over the course of the meeting or 13 anything like that. That's why we have the court 14 reporter. 15 So if we could go to those questions, 16 they really are intended to inform where we go 17 from here. And because there were so many 18 domains and sub-domains that surfaced out of the 19 discussion, you can imagine that the volume of 20 paper we might, or Google results we will find 21 using all of those as search terms, to be 22 completely massive. So we are actually looking

to you as experts in all of this to help point us
 to resources you know are valuable and relevant
 and relate to the topics we've discussed,
 especially not related to quality measurement.
 You know, that's the real heart of what we're
 trying to get after.

7 So any observations you want to share now about quality measurement activities you know 8 9 that are promising and should be taken into 10 further account, where you think measurement is 11 going to be feasible to operationalize in the 12 next couple years, where we have the most 13 evidence or where is it growing most rapidly that 14 sort of demonstrates the importance of a new set 15 of emerging quality HCBS, and then as I said, 16 anything else you wish to share. 17 Let's see. Yes, we'll go around. 18 Maybe Ari, are you comfortable starting at this 19 end or do you need a minute?

20 MEMBER HOUSER: Sure. Why not?
21 MS. LASH: Thank you.
22 MEMBER HOUSER: So I think the major

thing that comes to mind in terms of next steps is thinking about what kinds of measures might make sense to operationalize these domains and sub-domains.

In the past I've been very positive 5 about the National Core Indicators Project, and I 6 7 still think that survey measures of that type bring a lot of value and should be incorporated 8 9 into state quality management systems. But it 10 seems clear to me that with some of the domains 11 and sub-domains that we've articulated we also 12 need measures that can be directly tied to claims 13 data and we'll be less dependent on the vagaries 14 of how questions are asked and things of that 15 nature.

16 In the past, you know, there's been 17 good use of claims data to differentiate between 18 institutional and HCBS LTSS. And now we're 19 beginning to see better articulation of core 20 service definitions of different kinds of HCBS as 21 well. So my hope is as the staff compiles 22 information about existing quality measures that

1

2

3

there's also some consideration given to what 1 2 kinds of quality measures could be constructed utilizing the more specific service definitions 3 4 that are emerging around residential employment 5 and day services in the context of HCBS. Thank you. 6 MS. LASH: I quess we're 7 going counterclockwise. Joe, do you want to? I'll weigh in. 8 CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: 9 You know, in the short term I really 10 think the most feasible are some of the systems 11 and the process measures, particularly what is 12 happening in the MLTSS world. And there's been, 13 you know, there was an environmental scan that is 14 a couple years old that I think that was looking 15 at, you know, what was out there in terms of HCBS 16 quality. But since then there's probably more 17 states, and Tennessee keeps coming up with good 18 measures and things. So I think really trying to 19 get some of those from the states would be really 20 helpful. 21 And then on the, you know, the

consumer outcome, the quality alliance, I think

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

22

www.nealrgross.com

1 there's obviously like Ari said, NCI I think is,
2 I know other folks have mentioned that, but I
3 think that's fruitful ground. And the HCBS
4 experience survey, that is getting close to
5 being, you know, at a point where it could come
6 for endorsement in the near future.

7 CO-CHAIR KAYE: I'm only the third 8 person to speak, and yet almost everything I have 9 to say has been said.

10 I'm impressed with how much progress 11 there's been lately in survey -- development of 12 surveys for consumers. The more recent trial 13 version of the National Core Indicators, the one 14 for people with physical disabilities and elderly 15 people is -- Well, no, I'll compliment you guys 16 on it. I mean it's a big improvement to me over 17 the original DD version of it. And the HCBS 18 Experience Survey is a big improvement over the 19 Personal Experience Survey that came before it. 20 And there are a couple of other tools 21 that I like. The Money Follows the Person

Survey, you know, follow-up surveys is quite

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

And there are different sets of domains 1 qood. 2 and such that I think are really, are I don't think anybody is there. 3 interesting. 4 Certainly, you know, we came up with an 5 exhaustive list of things we want to measure and 6 those surveys are not, do not span the whole 7 space even just on the ones that are very consumer relevant. 8

9 I agree with Ari Ne'eman that we need 10 other sources of data other than consumer 11 surveys. And, you know, so I've got people in my 12 center who spend time emailing and calling people 13 up in state government and asking them, you know, 14 program administrators, and asking them how many 15 people they serve. And I think that's kind of 16 ridiculous, you know, and what the policies are 17 at the state level. And that's, you know, and 18 they write and publish papers on that and I use that data. I mean I just did an analysis of 19 20 trends in HCBS participants and, you know, LTSS 21 participants over time.

22

So I really want a comprehensive data

system that, you know, lets us do much more of 1 2 the stuff they want. And I don't think it's really -- it's more than claims data. 3 It's a It's bigger than claims data I think. 4 lot. MEMBER McCANN: Probably will involve 5 the perspective of health, if I might. 6 One of 7 the most imperfect things that is happening on the health measurement side now is the concept of 8 9 harmonizing. We cannot speak to each other 10 across settings. 11 The concept of harmonizing has been 12 very helpful in health because we can't speak to 13 each other across settings. So just the idea of 14 if you're going to look at well-being, function, 15 whatever, to make it broad enough so that you can 16 ask those questions or assess it regardless of 17 the types of services people are receiving, just 18 start out that way instead of unique as often as 19 possible to make it similar. 20 IMPACT is an act that people are

to be. Bu

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

involved in, probably more than they ever wanted

But that's part of that: how do we

21

assess disability, function? So I think there's so much wonderful work going out there that if you can take advantage of that, how great to do that.

It would be interesting to look at an 5 analysis of claims or see if it's even possible 6 7 because the Medicaid systems vary so much from state to state. I'm not sure that they even have 8 9 the standardization of HIPAA codes or such other 10 policies. It gets a little bit crazy. However, 11 the long-term care measure on using payroll to 12 look at staffing, accessibility, a lot of that 13 capacity and who does what, payroll systems are 14 already talking to CMS about doing that. And so 15 that may be a way to get that for the variety of 16 folks out there.

17 In all the DUALss contracts, we work
18 in most of the DUALss states, they have specific
19 outcome measures in there.

HETUS and NQQA for managed care to see if there's anything that can be pulled considering the populations, look at the variety

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

of health plans. And PCORI, I mean they just do incredible research on person-centered.

So I guess what I'm saying is there's 3 4 so much out there and there is, as we talked, 5 such similarity regardless of different services. So not to throw the health side out because of 6 They may have processes that 7 the word health. they painfully had to go through under the 8 9 Affordable Care Act for five years that might 10 actually be of help in this process. They have 11 many scars to share, so. My comments.

12 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: Yes, this has all 13 been good stuff. I mean I don't have a lot to 14 add as far as like the broader bodies of 15 knowledge. I think those have, you know, already 16 been pretty adequately identified.

But one of the things I do want to say is something about some pockets of innovations that are going on around the country that may not be, you know, I think we can try to bring some of that to the surface to be looked at, but that may not be a part of, for instance, CMMI grant. Some

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

1

of them are, some of them aren't.

2 But a lot of things that are happening, especially around work force and 3 4 looking at this concept of job quality and work 5 force quality, which aren't the same thing, job quality and work force quality, and the impact 6 7 on, for instance, the triple aim, so the impact on health, you know, improved health outcomes, 8 9 just improved outcomes let's say for people-10 effective training or, excuse me, effective 11 service delivery, greater levels of satisfaction 12 and experience of care and then lower cost. 13 I think there are some really 14 interesting things going on out there in how we 15 could look at, especially when we get to the work 16 force side of it. You know, what do we need to 17 look at and what makes sense, and actually 18 looking at the job quality, not just the quality 19 of the work force, looking at those two things. 20 So I think there are -- I just want to 21 throw that out that there are some things that 22 may not be widely known but that we probably want

to bring up and say, hey, these have been 1 2 successful. Are there measures here that we need to elevate? 3 MS. LASH: And if you have particular 4 5 communities in mind you want to email us about we can make more specific note of that. 6 7 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: Thanks. MS. LASH: And that sort of goes 8 9 universally to everyone. 10 Anita? 11 MEMBER YUSKAUSKAS: Yes. Some 12 promising measurements activities that are taking 13 place now have to do with some things I was 14 working on, so I'm going to bring them up. 15 Under the TEFT grant there are two 16 measurement initiatives, and I think Joe 17 mentioned one, which is the Experience Survey for 18 HCBS which is going to eventually have 19 endorsement and a CAHPS trademark, hopefully. 20 The other one is the CARE Functional 21 Assessment. And we were looking at the CARE as -22 - testing it across not just post-acute care

populations but also folks in LTSS, so that as people move in and out of different environments we can begin to make some comparisons. So that's gone through some changes; I'm not quite sure where it is.

6 But as we develop a truly person-7 centered system I think we're going to have to be 8 able to look at ways that we can compare measures 9 across settings.

10 The most feasible I would say, I would 11 really concur with Ari, administrative data 12 capabilities are a really important area. D.E.B. 13 Potter who is over there did probably the first 14 real study that highlighted administrative data 15 in long-term service and support. And CMS has a 16 lot of information. I don't think it's even been 17 closely -- I don't think we've begun to tap it. 18 And I think there's a lot of information we can 19 learn. 20 There's also state-collected

21 information on quality. And I'm thinking 22 primarily of the 1915 waivers. While we're not

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

going to be able to do a pure comparison because 1 those measures differ, from an indicator 2 perspective we'll at least be able to look across 3 4 And that is all -- well, no it's not. states. 5 In the design phase it's electronic Never mind. but it's not in the back-end, so that will have 6 7 some challenges.

I think some of the areas that are 8 9 going to be most interesting will be to take a 10 look at larger managed care organizations that 11 truly have the capacity to do integrated person-12 centered care. Once a person has all of their 13 services coordinated then they are truly person-14 centered, then I think we really start to look at 15 long-term services and supports with a different 16 set of glasses.

Sarita and I were talking about that
in relation to Kaiser, who is really just
starting to touch the tip of the iceberg with
that. I think that's going to be something very
interesting to watch.

22

And finally, I think the area that has

been keeping me up at night for a very long time 1 2 is the fact that we really don't have true evidence-based practices in long-term services 3 4 and supports. And that's because we have no 5 standard interventions. We have no standard service definitions in order to even begin to 6 7 look at causality. And I think that's something we have to do because that's one thing we have 8 9 not even talked about here. Other than labeling 10 it as services and supports we haven't drilled 11 down on that issue at all. 12 We've talked about who and we've 13 talked about for what purpose, but we have not 14 talked about that elephant in the room. And I 15 think that that's really important. 16 So that's it. 17 MEMBER GALANTOWICZ: I just wanted to 18 offer a couple of comments and caveats based on 19 personal experience with some of the initiatives 20 that have been described so far. 21 First the compendium of HCBS measures 22 that Potter and I worked on now many years ago

because it's been more than just a few. 1 2 Thinking from a methodological point of view, when you do your scan we found the vast 3 4 majority of what's included in that compendium 5 not by doing the literature review but more looking at the gray literature, doing web 6 searches, but really what we did was reach out to 7 all of our contacts in the states and ask them 8 9 what they were doing. And so I think if you look 10 just narrowly at what's been published you'll 11 miss all the richness of what's going on. 12 When I think of the 200-plus measures 13 in that compendium, most of them came from the 14 So I think that's the first suggestion. states. 15 With regard to experience surveys, I 16 worked on the original PES, I worked on the HCBS experience survey before I switched jobs. 17 I feel 18 very strongly about the importance of getting 19 participant feedback. I think so many things 20 we've been talking about can only be measured by 21 talking to people who receive services. But it 22 is really feasible. I think they're the source;

I think we have to be honest about that. 1 It's 2 very expensive to collect that data. It was harder than you think to come 3 4 up with a consensus list of things that should be 5 asked. And for some of that work we started with asking with individuals in programs what they 6 thought we should measure. And I think we're 7 coming at it from one lens of what we think needs 8 9 to be measured but a good consumer survey starts 10 with what people say is important as far as the 11 So I would just add that. research. 12 On the whole care, LTSS, I was on that 13 project for a little while too. 14 MEMBER AUSTIN-OSER: You were on all 15 And I apologize for not bringing that of them. 16 up. I really do. 17 MEMBER GALANTOWICZ: No, no, no. And 18 I also, and I'm working on IMPACT Act measures 19 So I think standardization is really now. 20 important but we can't lose sight of how 21 different HCBS is from some of the other post-22 acute care settings. So we can only standardize

so much. On that care project it was, at least at the beginning, just getting people to understand how HCBS is different and what you assess was a real challenge. So that's the caveat for that.

And finally, on the claims issue I 6 7 agree that there is an incredible amount of administrative data out there. I'm working with 8 9 one state right now where we are trying to use 10 their claims data to look at HCBS participants. 11 Months of discussion of even which HIPAA codes we 12 use on the claims to even flag someone as an HCBS 13 user.

14 So I would just echo what Anita said, 15 there is no standard definition of what's in 16 HCBS, and that's just one state that's trying to 17 come to consensus for what services we put in the 18 HCBS bucket for the purpose of profiling HCBS 19 And I think it only gets exponentially users. 20 more complicated when you're talking about all 21 the different programs.

22

1

2

3

4

5

So not to be a downer, but those are

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

1

all the caveats.

2 MEMBER MOHANTY: I appreciate what Sara just said because just in our own system to 3 code HCBS as a new benefit for Kaiser Permanente 4 5 was a bear. And so I can -- and this was just in certain little pieces of the benefit. 6 I mean we 7 haven't even expanded it in California yet, so more to come; it is quite complicated. 8 9 You know, I think some of, a lot of, 10 I think pretty much all the things, the themes 11 have been mentioned. But some of the things I'd 12 like to highlight that I also believe that the 13 claims, data there's more than just the claims 14 data. But you can glean some important 15 information from the claims data. 16 In our system, for example, what we're 17 finding is that in our care planning we have 18 integrated the care plan within our HealthConnect 19 or Epic system, and there are certain elements of 20 that care plan that can be pulled out and offer 21 some information about the long-term services 22 supports, for example, and some of the home- and

community-based service needs or the care 1 2 experience. So there's some opportunities there. And, you know, one of the things I, 3 4 you know, I think everybody kind of mentioned is 5 that there are so many assessments, so many care plans, so many definitions of how things are 6 7 measured. What we're trying to do in our own organization is try to take all that information 8 9 from the external entities and trying to 10 incorporate into one master care plan or trying 11 to come up with some master assessments. 12 And so it gets back to that comment of 13 harmonizing. How do we do that? So that I think 14 going to what I think also Sara said is talking 15 to some of the delivery systems that are working 16 on this and exploring with them some of the 17 approaches they've taken. And I think that will 18 be very useful in how we, you know, start to think through measurement a little bit more 19 20 carefully. 21 The other thing I just wanted to

highlight is also the use of vendors. There has

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

22

www.nealrgross.com

been a lot of use of vendors in a lot of systems 1 2 to help with the LTSS or home- and communitybased service delivery or assessment base. 3 And 4 I've noticed that some systems have not actually 5 fully leveraged that information from their Their vendors will do these assessments 6 vendors. and then maybe come up with some key themes: oh, 7 here are some, you know, here is a care plan we 8 9 developed for you.

But sometimes there's that back-end data that the vendors have that the system hasn't necessarily, you know, utilized to the best of the ability. So I think just another piece of, another source of information I think is what I'm getting at.

And, you know, I think the other, the last thing I would probably say, I mean the one thing, HETUS and NCQA I think is important but it's lack -- you know, right now we know it's limited. So it will give us some of our physical health measures and some access issues but not fully -- it will be comprehensive.

(202) 234-4433

1	And then, you know, I had a
2	conversation I guess a few days ago. And I think
3	pretty much everybody knows that, or most people
4	know that SCAN Foundation is also working on some
5	home- and community-based measurements. And so
6	to the extent that we're partnering or working
7	closely with the entities that are also embarking
8	on this process I think will be important.
9	Thank you.
10	MEMBER CRISP: Well, this is a tough
11	act to follow.
12	Of course I agree with everything that
13	everyone has said. And in an effort to come up
14	with something new, one of the most promising
15	quality measure activities, measurement
16	activities I see is that we're disembarking on
17	person-centered planning and what that means and
18	what is the thinking behind that and what kind of
19	changes are being made, how participants are
20	going to be educated on person-centeredness. And
21	then what are the measurable items that we can
22	look at and analyze to see is that really

happening, how is it happening, and is it a good thing?

I know a lot of people are working on this. Michael Small, SCAN, I know our division, our center is working on this. We're in the process of interviewing service coordinators now as to what it used to be and what it is now and where do you hope it's going to go. So that's a promising measurement for us.

10 The most feasible in the short term is 11 data collection, as everyone has said, in 12 particular service utilization. What services 13 are being purchased? Who are purchasing those 14 services? And what happens when they purchase 15 those services?

I think there's a lot of not only data collection that can happen but also a lot of analysis, synthesis, and a lot of assumptions can be drawn from that levy of data.

20 Strongest, of course, in the realm of 21 personal outcomes; that's a thing that we've been 22 talking about for years and never quite achieved

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

Certainly with the core indicator project 1 it. 2 for disabled and elderly, that's going to be a huge step in the right direction. 3 4 I also think that there is strong 5 evidence growing in looking at coordinating not just care but integrating systems and getting 6 7 Medicare to talk to Medicaid, and the Elder Americans Act to talk to everybody else, and 8 9 So I look forward to that being strong whatnot. 10 in the future. 11 Thank you. 12 MEMBER LAKIN: Well, thanks for 13 inviting me. I've had an interesting and good 14 time. 15 You know, when we, when we presented 16 our system effectiveness list one of the things 17 that got buried in there and not mentioned was 18 that, you know, whether we're talking systems 19 level or intermediary levels we really need to 20 base our analysis on individual outcomes 21 whenever, whenever possible. And to not do that 22 sort of gets us caught up in process measures

which I think have at times some connection to outcomes but not the kinds of connections that we would like.

4 I guess rather than give answers to 5 the questions I'd really like to kind of ask other questions because I'm, I'm really, I'm 6 aware that we're going to have so many measures 7 that map up really well with the domains and sub-8 9 domains we've created. And some of them are very 10 lightly used. But few come anywhere near meeting 11 the quality that the NQF applies in its standing committees to other, to the other measures that 12 13 are submitted for review.

14 And it is for me a real challenge to 15 think about how we're going to get to that 16 standard of quality from where we are today. And 17 I think we can but it's going to take a very 18 major investment. And I don't know where that 19 investment's going to come from but it will need 20 to be made if any of this will be realized at the 21 standards that the NQF has applied to other 22 measures.

1

2

3

1	I'm excited about the widespread use
2	of measures. I'm excited about the communities
3	of practice that have developed around the NCI
4	and other instrumentation. I think when data is
5	something raised, entities, states, providers get
6	together to talk about what they're doing, why
7	they're getting the results they are, what they
8	can do to improve, it gives you a reason to
9	collect all this stuff. And I think that's
10	happening in really important ways.
11	But as Sara mentioned, all of this
12	stuff is so expensive. And there's a
13	methodological complexity to it that I think we
14	often fail to appreciate. We have respondent
15	problems. We have proxies answering the same
16	question as we have people with disabilities
17	answering for themselves. We have response
18	biases that we know exist, particularly among
19	people with cognitive limitations. We have
20	different kinds of interviewers doing these
21	surveys in different places. They have different
22	levels of training, if any. And rarely have they

(202) 234-4433

been tested to meet some sort of criterion for 1 2 the effective implementation of those interviews. So there's just a lot to do. 3 And I 4 hope that rather than just kind of move items 5 from all these instruments into boxes, we really get into the technical quality of what we're 6 7 doing. I'm really I'm concerned about people using claims data without understanding what's 8 9 underneath them. 10 I just had an experience in a state 11 using claims data where I said, Great, this 12 variable says it measures this and we can use it 13 for this court-ordered assessment. And they 14 said, Well, it doesn't really, doesn't really 15 mean that. 16 And so, you know, just to grab claims data and think that the HIPAA code is going to 17 18 tell you what's happening is really not used. 19 And so we need to be careful. 20 But anyway, I think we're off to a 21 qood start. I hope we will be serious about the 22 complexity of what we're taking on.

(202) 234-4433

1	MEMBER KILLINGSWORTH: Wow, so there's
2	no one who has spoken thus far that I've not
3	wanted to say, Yes, I agree with that. And so
4	lots of great ideas already. So I'll probably
5	just be reemphasizing a few things.
6	One, I agree with Sara that there is
7	a lot of information to be gleaned from states
8	and work that states have done. I think it would
9	be interesting to look at the domains most
10	frequently measured by the states. So I do think
11	that would be really an interesting exercise as
12	well.
13	I do, and I think echoing some of the
14	things that Ari said and Steve said, I think I
15	never want us to move far away from the
16	experience of the consumer. And I think that's
17	one of the richest areas for development and
18	exploration. I think we're getting there with
19	some of the things that are happening. There are
20	a lot of good tools. That standardization and
21	this harkens back to what Sara said as well is
22	just it's so important for us to be able to

compare performance across health plans, across states, across programs, so I encourage us to do that.

I think, and this is probably jumping 4 5 ahead of Andrey just a little bit, there is so much opportunity with technology. We are -- I 6 7 don't even think we can conceive the potential that is there for us to leverage technology. 8 We 9 will begin later this fall to collect real-time 10 quality data from members at the conclusion of 11 every in-home service that they receive. That's 12 just such a rich source of data that we'll have 13 at our fingertips.

14 So I think, you know, we need to, even 15 though we think it's all expensive, and it's not 16 always expensive, right? There are, especially 17 if we design systems with the measurements in 18 mind -- and we've done that -- it can be 19 relatively inexpensive to build quality into 20 something that we're doing anyway, and to be sure 21 that we can actually measure performance on the 22 back-end of that.

1

2

In addition, I think, as Suzanne said, 1 2 there are great opportunities with respect to beginning to measure community inclusion in new 3 4 ways and with new expectations. And so even 5 though it's something that we've often looked at, I'm not sure that we're looking at it in the same 6 7 way every day, as we always have. And I think the same is true for care giver supports, 8 9 whatever we want to call them. I think we've 10 looked at them for a long time but we're beginning to look at them differently. So those 11 12 are all rich areas for us to explore as we move 13 forward. 14 MEMBER HOUSER: I can probably echo 15 what a lot of, a lot of people have said. A few 16 things that were, that I want to sort of add some 17 emphasis to. I think the most expensive part of 18 this is data collection. So, as much as we can, 19 it's useful to use sources of data that are 20 already, that already exist. I know there is 21 incredibly rich state data.

22

I can't count the number of

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

presentations I've been to where someone 1 2 presented some very, very rich state data. And it seems like the bottom line was, you know, we 3 4 now have 45,000, you know, people receiving 5 services in our state and, you know, one or two other top-line items. It seems that's all the 6 7 capacity that this under-staffed state agency had to analyze this data source. But there's a lot 8 9 more that could possibly be done.

10 A number of people I've talked to are 11 very optimistic about the capacity of T-MSIS to provide, you know, high quality claims experience 12 13 data that could be used. I know second-hand of at least one effort to link claims data to 14 15 functional assessment data so that you can have a 16 measure of, imperfect perhaps, of services and 17 some information about the recipient of that 18 service, which is not in the claims data, 19 typically.

20 And then the last thing that I would 21 mention is to keep in mind what the goals of 22 quality measurements are. And so fertile -ground

for measurement can be: where do we think we can find the data set to measure? And also, the other question would be is: where is it important to have measures for positive impacts on the system?

And an analogy would be do we want to look where the light is, or do we want to look where we dropped our keys? And where the light is is where the data is. And where we dropped our keys is where we can actually effect positive change. And those are probably different places, and yes, just another way of thinking about it.

13 MEMBER SMITH: So I guess ditto for a 14 lot of things that folks have said. But I have a 15 couple of things that I'd like to mention. And I 16 think I've mentioned this a couple of times and 17 keep struggling with the fact that, you know, 18 this area is so broad and there are so many 19 populations that are subsumed under it. And 20 there's a lot of work going on in some of those 21 other areas that I think we might not pick up 22 here.

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

You might pick it up. You know, I thought I heard folks say that you were going to cast a broader net. You know, instead of looking at HCBS, perhaps you would look at some of the domains that we came up with. And so that may bring in some more initiatives.

You know, but it's not lost on me that 7 in mental health, you know, we've been working 8 9 probably for the last 20 years -- maybe more, God 10 only knows, might be 30 -- but we've been, you 11 know, putting together our own performance 12 measurement framework. And, you know, the really 13 interesting thing is many of the measures that we 14 talked about here today and the domains, they're 15 the same ones that we've been looking at in 16 mental health. And I don't want to speak for 17 substance abuse because I've been more focused on 18 mental health.

But, you know, not that you would use the exact same measure across all populations, but I think that we've come up with definitions for safety, you know, for well-being, for looking

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

at employment. So I would direct us to look at some of the things like, you know, at one point we, there we brought together a large group of stakeholders.

They were providers, policy makers, 5 consumers, family members, folks from managed 6 7 care companies. And we actually put together something called the Mental Health Quality 8 9 Report, which has been around for guite a while. 10 It had, we actually started doing this kind of 11 stuff back in '98, when we were looking at like 12 something called the MHSP Report Card. And then 13 that kind of rolled into the Mental Health 14 Quality Report, which was an updated version.

15 So I think we should look at things 16 like that. Also many of the, well, all of the 17 states and U.S. territories have been working 18 with census, mental health, let's see, mental 19 health services, Center for Mental Health 20 Services and others to come up with performance 21 measures. And pretty much every state mental 22 health authority is reporting what are called

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3
National Outcome Measures. You know, they're not
 perfect, but they do include a lot of the domains
 that we talked about here.

And the substance abuse folks are 4 5 doing the same kind of reporting. You know, and it's not like somebody plucked the measures out 6 7 of the air. You know, I can tell you that, you know, if you think these last two days had a lot 8 9 of detail, you know, sometimes we spent like a 10 year talking about how to get to one measure. So 11 I guess I'm just saying I hope that we can look 12 at some of those other things.

13 The evidence, I think Mike talked 14 about, you know, the evidence that one looks at 15 before adopting NQF measure, I think that's going 16 to be a challenge. But what we're talking about 17 are measures that the states already collect, 18 and that people have spent a lot of time 19 developing.

In terms of consumer evaluation of care, you know, again I think that is of critical importance. And, you know, the struggle here for

me, even back in Illinois, is that folks have
 adopted the CAHPS Survey. And, you know, that's
 not particularly a good survey for our
 population. You know, we developed a survey in
 mental health. You know, again that probably
 tracks back to ten years. There's an inpatient
 version that was endorsed by NQF already.

So, you know, I'm wondering why if we 8 9 are -- you know, if we care to look at some 10 specific populations, why don't we look at some 11 of these surveys that the states have adopted and 12 are in use? You know, because some of them those 13 are some of the same populations. Let's see, 14 there might be one other point. No, I think 15 those are the major things. Thanks. Thanks for 16 inviting me. I enjoyed this.

MEMBER MARKWOOD: Well, I'd like to thank the group as well, and say that through the robust discussion that we've had over the past two days, you know, I've learned a lot from different perspectives that I really value. But I think from my perspective in representing

community-based organizations in this area is 1 2 just to reiterate their excitement about measuring quality, and their commitment to doing 3 4 this to the best degree that they can. And I say 5 that because, echoing Sara and Charlie's comment about the fact that in an already overstretched 6 7 system this is important work, but it also needs to be invested in. 8

9 And that being said, recognizing that 10 the states are doing a lot in this arena, I also 11 wanted to raise the point though, too, that 12 especially with the evolution of managed care 13 that there are also some information lessons that 14 can be learned both in the managed care front and 15 also in the care transitions front that are not 16 necessarily at the state level but more regional 17 or locally specific. And those, some of the 18 champions that are leading those efforts, I'd be 19 happy to forward to you.

Additionally, I think that, as Patti said, that I think that there are things at the local level that we're trying to do and would

welcome more guidance in doing with the resources that we have. But again, when you're looking at IT through the ACL business collaborative that we're doing with the aging and disability community, that the investment in IT has been raised as one of the greatest barriers in moving forward in this regard.

So I just think that that needs to be 8 9 a recognition as we're looking at collecting more 10 comprehensive data and being able to analyze and 11 use it. But that being said, I think that, 12 again, the commitment on the part of the 13 community-based organizations is that this is 14 where they know they need to go, this is where 15 they want to go, they just need some help in 16 getting there.

17 MEMBER DOBSON: I echo what Sandy 18 said. I learned a lot from different 19 perspectives. It's extremely useful. As --20 representing states who are, you know, in the 21 middle of this, I think there are a couple of 22 things that I would share that are of importance.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC 220

One, I can't stress enough the use of consumer surveys, obviously. Steve and Ari already mentioned NCI, NCIAD which is going into -- is going live June 1st with 13 states on our first year. That's not public but I will make the survey available to the staff so that you have it.

8 And so we're excited to see how that 9 goes. And it really does reflect the nuances of 10 individuals with physical disabilities and the 11 elderly that are slightly different, in many 12 cases very different than individuals with IDD.

13I would tell you if you're not aware14-- I'm sure you all are aware that, you know, 2015states now are using capitated health plans to16deliver most, if not all, of their HCBS services17to individuals. And so that raises opportunities18and complexities, I think, I would say on both19sides.

It is very clear that, I echo Sara
about the level of intensity and the cost for
person-reported outcomes and how hard those are,

and so the need to find administrative -- I'd go 1 2 beyond claims -- but administrative data, ways to use administrative data to extract information 3 4 from care plans, for example, to assess 5 timeliness of services. That is a critical part, or the system will collapse under the weight of 6 7 the measurements, I think is really the concern 8 that we've got. 9 So I would -- I know you're already 10 pulling out what all the states are doing, so I 11 don't need to say that already. But I think a place where maybe you, maybe if you haven't 12 13 started is to talk to the health plans themselves. A number of them even if the states 14 15 don't have rigorous quality members around HCBS 16 performance, that's part of their standard QM 17 activities, and so I think there are a number of 18 the duals plans, obviously, several national 19 health plans, and very significantly, a number of 20 small, locally-based plans who have been in HCBS 21 for a long time I think could provide some 22 lessons.

So I can provide those contacts for 1 2 some of those national folks that would be useful to provide you some data. And yes, I think 3 4 that's it. I don't have anything else to say. 5 Other people have stuff to add I'm sure. Well, I think I'm --6 MEMBER PHILLIPS: 7 I've really been outdone. I'm not sure I have a lot more to add about specific measures. 8 But I 9 would like to see -- and we haven't talked about 10 the populations of persons with dementia living 11 in the community and promoting their tenure in 12 the community. 13 Building dementia-friendly communities 14 is not quite here yet. There are countries in 15 Europe who are doing better jobs of that. And 16 I'm not sure how it's being measured, obviously. 17 Eliminate or preventing nursing home admission or 18 other institutionalization. So I would like to 19 suggest that at some point we explore that 20 Along with people ageing with physical avenue. 21 and, you know, mental cognitive disabilities and 22 keeping them in the community rather than moving

(202) 234-4433

1

to higher levels of care.

2 MEMBER OSTROVSKY: Thank you very much I have a couple of points to 3 for having me here. One is that my line of work focuses almost 4 make. 5 exclusively on home- and community-based service providers getting reimbursed for the outcomes 6 7 that they produce. And this is predominantly through new lines of service outside of 8 9 traditional home- and community-based services, 10 care transitions being one of them, use of 11 chronic disease self-management outside of just, 12 you know, having a CPT code or with having a CPT 13 code and other ways. 14 Transportation can be, can be a very 15 valuable service for a managed care entity when a return on investment can be proven. And I think 16 17 it's incredibly challenging to watch particularly 18 area agencies on ageing now where we're working

19 with more and more Meals On Wheels programs where 20 they're really doing -- they're working really 21 hard to try to show their return on investment. 22 But the only data they have available is the data

that, say, my technology provides which, 1 2 fortunately, is getting them closed deals, but I don't think my technology is going to be great 3 4 for every single ACBS provider in the country. So it would be really powerful in 5 having a way for health systems' preparers to be 6 able to have a common way to evaluate ACBS 7 providers in an ROI that is relevant to the payer 8 9 and the provider. I know we want to be consumer-10 centric here but I think for sustainability 11 purposes our quality measurement really needs to 12 take into account how will we demonstrate value 13 for payers and providers. 14 The other notion I think is really 15 important is I, as a for-profit technology 16 vendor, I just hired three salespeople. And I 17 hired three salespeople because I have to get the 18 word out. And when I hire people, I hire them 19 based on their ability to educate rather than to 20 sell. And I think we need to move away from 21 salesmanship in the vendor, technology vendor community and more into how does the technology 22

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

contribute to improving a validated quality measure?

I think that would take away from the, you know, the big rah-rah, like, how much money do you have to spend in marketing, and rather focus on how does the technology really improve the quality of home- and community-based services. So I think that would equalize what we in the vendor community do.

10 And then the final thing is ONC, I 11 really commend them because in their language, 12 and I mentioned this earlier, in their language 13 in a few of their recent publications they have 14 specifically called out home- and community-based 15 services. They have specifically called out 16 harmonization of quality measurement.

17 I think we need to really heavily 18 harmonize with those efforts, because if we can 19 enable data integration to facilitate quality 20 measurement, not just what an EMR can do but 21 rather what any other technology, especially 22 with more innovation, technology innovation

1

2

hopefully coming to our space, I think that will facilitate that alignment of where the keys are and where the light is shining, to borrow Ari's metaphor.

5 And then I'd like to propose just one thing that a colleague of mine Mike Doyle says: 6 7 return on information. How can we, through quality measurement, not just show a return on 8 9 cash investment, but a return on how many 10 megabytes do we have to spend of data to actually 11 get meaningful quality measurement. So, happy to 12 elaborate on that.

13 MEMBER APPLEBAUM: So, in 1982 when I 14 was evaluating the Channeling demonstration I did 15 some interviews as part of the evaluation. And 16 several people, many people said, we think this 17 home- and community-based service stuff is a good 18 idea but we're kind of worried about quality of what's going on inside the home. 19

20 And if you think about the many 21 billions of dollars we now spend on something 22 that we were worried about in 1982, I think

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

obviously the importance of this activity is
 quite obvious.

I was thinking back as people went 3 around the room to the book that some of us read, 4 5 some of us who were born before 1982, A Tale of Two Cities that we used to have to read in high 6 7 school and that starts out with It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, and your 8 9 English teacher teaches you about what a paradox 10 So as I sat here listening to what people is. 11 said I was listening to the many paradoxes.

12 So we talked about the innovations in 13 measurement and the excitement about that. And 14 then I sort of thought about, okay, well what's 15 one of the oldest measures we have? Sid Katz 16 came up with the ADL score in 1963. And I can 17 tell you that that measure actually is not very 18 good for doing and measuring functioning. Ι 19 can't tell you how many times I sat in the homes 20 of individuals who are getting service and they 21 ask Can you dress independently? And the one 22 that lives with her daughter says no, and the

1 person who lives alone says yes. They have 2 exactly the same functional impairment. So we think we know how to do that. 3 4 That's in the books, and it's not. So at one 5 level we have all these exiting new measures and at another level this is still hard, which I 6 7 think reflects some of the things that Charlie said. 8 9 Claims data: we were talking about the 10 importance of administrative data and claims data 11 which I use them a lot. It's great. But I will 12 tell you, and we've mentioned the integrated care 13 demonstrations, right now at least the data that 14 we're getting from integrated care 15 demonstrations, everybody who's in the Medicaid 16 integrated claims data, they all look the same. 17 They have the capitated rate, there's no 18 encounter data, there's nothing. 19 And so the claims data has just gotten 20 way worse in any of the states doing integrated 21 care. Now maybe the plans will develop their own 22 data systems and there will be some way of

sharing those data systems with everybody else.
 But right now that isn't happening.

And then finally, we were talking 3 4 about nationally unifying measures. But long-5 term care and long-term services is a state And at one level it is great to go after 6 system. 7 what states are doing. I've been working on a 22-year longitudinal study for the state of Ohio. 8 9 We have lots of great data but it's very 10 difficult to get those centralized all together. 11 So I think we have some challenges.

12 And that leads me to my two, maybe, 13 final pieces of this. One is that -- and I 14 really like what Patti said about being creative 15 about how we collect data, because the fact of 16 the matter is that we can think differently about 17 how we collect data, particularly if we recognize 18 that this is a state-driven system.

And so one example, we had one of the area agencies that we were working with who wanted to be able to collect satisfaction data on all of their 5,000 participants. And if they did

a random sample survey of independent data
 collection, they couldn't get much sample. And
 they wanted to be able to compare across
 providers.

5 So what we did was we went in and trained care managers who were going into the 6 7 home anyway and trained them to collect data. And then we actually validated that with 8 9 independent research interviews. And we said, 10 hey, looks pretty much the same. And that agency 11 now collects data every time the care manager 12 walks in the door. And they have tremendous 13 amounts of quality data that they can use to be 14 able to compare across providers.

15 So I think in general we have to be way more creative about how we think about 16 17 collecting data. We designed something some 18 years ago, it was kind of like a Nielsen family 19 Everybody knows the Nielsens for rating. 20 television. We had consumers keep a log of 21 something as simple as home delivery meals. Did 22 they show up on time? Were the meals good?

It was very inexpensive to do. 1 And 2 people liked doing it. I mean when they didn't 3 send out -- didn't get their logs they were like 4 calling up and saying, Hey, where's my log? 5 Nielsen pays people a dollar to fill out their little Nielsen form out for two weeks of 6 recording their T.V. watching every, you know, 7 half hour. 8 9 And then finally I just wanted to say 10 that this is an evolutionary process, and 11 whatever measures we come up with today, in five 12 years we'll be going like, Wow, can you believe 13 we used to measure it that way? And so I think 14 we have to always remember that this is an ever-15 evolving process. Thank you. 16 MEMBER LUZ: I would like to say thank 17 you, too. I think it's a privilege to be among 18 this group and to be able to be in active dialog 19 with you. And I appreciate the staff and the 20 consensus process. It's really fun and 21 interesting. Learning a lot. 22 I'm not going to try to add.

Everybody has said things very eloquently about HCBS in general. I'm going to focus just on one aspect of it which is near and dear to my heart, which is the work force issues, particularly the PCAs.

In terms of process, I just want to 6 7 make sure that, you know, there is a way between now and our next meeting that we are able to sort 8 9 of revisit some of these areas where we weren't -10 - maybe didn't have consensus. If there's a way 11 for us to be in communication and carry on the 12 dialog before we meet again, that would be really 13 helpful.

14 And with respect to the, really full 15 respect for the full range of thoughts and 16 feelings about training and education of PCAs, 17 there are some of us in the room who are really 18 excited about the fact that it's even being 19 discussed in this meeting. And if we talk about, 20 you know, identifying fertile ground for 21 measurement, this is really it. Because right 22 now there are absolutely zero federal training

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

requirements for PCAs. And so this is a huge 1 2 step forward and I am excited about it. And I hope that we have an opportunity 3 4 to just really reach some consensus around it 5 that satisfies everybody and how to measure it. And it's going to help us establish, you know, a 6 7 lot of what everybody else has been talking this association between work force 8 about: 9 development and training, and the goals of the 10 triple aim, and the goals of this group. 11 And it's not just about, it's not just a work force issue, I think it's a social justice 12 13 issue and an economic development issue. So, you 14 know, we're touching on a lot of ground that 15 hasn't been measured to date at all. So I'm 16 excited about this. And I had one question. Ι 17 don't know if anybody is interested in this, or 18 maybe it's already available, but sharing each 19 other's contact information. 20 MEMBER DELMAN: Well, I'm honored to be 21 here too. I'm really happy to be at a frontier. 22 I prefer being at the frontier than at the

stayed-at-home, typical place. It's where I'm most comfortable. And I think we have a lot of great thinkers here, and everybody is on the right path.

5 And I have very little to add. So instead, I did some research and the IOM came up 6 7 on a Report on Long-Term Quality care in 2001. Ι don't know if people are familiar with that. 8 9 Apparently made a lot of great recommendations 10 that moved the field forward. But of about the 11 18 or so people, brilliant people, a third of the 12 people dissented on one point. And I just want 13 to read from their dissent: If quality of life is 14 seen as a legitimate goal of long-term care, --15 this will be brief, not the whole dissent. 16 (Laughter) 17 MEMBER DELMAN: -- the consumer's view

of quality may sometimes involve conditions and circumstances that professionals view as a threat to health or safety. This tradeoff and the possibility that consumers might knowingly assume risks in order to maximize other benefits were

not expressed in the final version of the report,
 yet it is an important reality.

Moving on: Consumer-centered care calls for the consumer, or his or her agent, to be involved to the extent desired and practical in all goal-setting and planning for care, and to have direct input into the evaluation of his or her care.

9 One more part from this dissent. The 10 report marginalizes 'consumer-centered care,' 11 stating that it is not for all people. This, we 12 believe, is a misunderstanding of the concept. 13 The principle of consulting consumer preferences 14 directly or through their agents has widespread 15 applicability to people of all ages in all 16 settings, including nursing homes. It has been 17 applied to people with cognitive impairment, 18 including Alzheimer's disease, and developmental 19 disability. The emergence of new models of care, 20 including client-directed home and community 21 assisted living is a direct result of consumer 22 choice about how they want to live while needing

www.nealrgross.com

1

care.

2	And this was written by smart people,
3	and I think their view has prevailed. My only,
4	and just referring to what Bob said, people
5	technology really is cheap. And I work with a
6	lot of young adults. Think text messaging. I
7	mean that's people are knocking data all over
8	the place. And we have things available. And
9	the young people, you know, half the people, or
10	more, of age groups use the internet now. And I
11	see a lot of people here text messaging so, you
12	know, think about it.
13	MEMBER MORRISSEY: Jon, that's because
14	we're young too. I'll, like everybody, just
15	maybe add a few points. So I appreciate being
16	part of the group and learning and listening.

And to the NQF staff, thank you very much for facilitating 25 individuals who have a lot of different views and converging that into arrows and pie charts and pretty cool things.

I guess in terms of adding a couple of things, I'd just say one is the best practices

21

22

really occur at the state level in the state
 systems. And I really think that we, we believe
 we know where those best practices are, but I
 think we need to figure out really using the
 state, the national state organizations, I think,
 could help facilitate some of that discovery in
 terms of best practices, number one.

Number two would be the NCI. I think 8 9 you know I'm a pretty big fan of that. Been 10 around for 18 years. And this gets to there's an 11 awful lot of quality frameworks and measures that 12 are already under way. So I hope we're not 13 starting with, you know, whole cloth. I think 14 we, to do something for 18 years it's evolved. 15 And there's, you know, many, many states involved 16 now. And with the seniors now joining I think 17 the beauty of that is that we're all about 18 relationships and partnerships, and everybody 19 working together. And I think that gets to 20 alignment.

Third is while we can come up with maybe 152 domains and sub-domains, I think one of

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

www.nealrgross.com

the things it really is about the people we 1 2 It's about relationships. It's about -serve. I'll use my word -- safety. It's about health 3 4 and safety and relationships and living in the 5 community in a very thoughtful way and in a 6 prosperous way. So we are not very good at investing 7 in those kinds of things as much as we need to. 8 9 And I'm very concerned about our zeal for 10 technology without financing some of that 11 technology. 12 And then I think we're building, we're 13 trying to build an architecture for 10 to 15 14 years from now, not today. So I think we need to 15 be bold and we need to kind of really think about 16 what is the system for individuals and families

17 and providers and the work force 10 to 15 years 18 from today, not think about it in terms of 19 today's view.

20 And then I think I didn't hear much,
21 I know we didn't talk much about certain
22 populations, but the ABI population in the

veterans are an emerging population. And I think 1 2 we need to be thinking from the representation point of view, if not seeking out some 3 4 information about the emergence of the ABI waiver 5 and how the veterans in the company are going to be supported in the community long term. 6 So 7 those would be my additional thoughts. Thank 8 you.

9 MEMBER OXFORD: Yes, well I don't know 10 what I would add after all that. But I do want 11 to thank everybody for working with me and I 12 appreciate being here. I particularly want to 13 thank the staff who have worked hard behind the 14 scenes and so on. And I know, speaking 15 personally, they, you know, did some extra stuff 16 to accommodate me and help me out. And I 17 appreciate that very much.

Just some random thoughts. I mean I'm not a researcher, I'm an advocate. So just some perhaps random thoughts -- but I also am a provider; I run a program in my agency -- is I hope we think about whatever we do and as this

work goes forward, which is incredibly important, 1 2 to think about utility for hands-on, kind of, onthe-ground application so that people that are 3 4 perhaps running a program, providing services 5 and, you know, providers, and I mean agencies, are so varied these days, little bitty company 6 7 serving just their family, to just a few people, to just a certain area, and so on. 8

9 And I know across all these different 10 kinds of providers there is a lot of interest I 11 think, genuine interest in doing the best job 12 possible. And quality is important. And so 13 tools, ideas, information that can be useful at 14 that level, I think, would be very much a good 15 idea and needed.

I appreciate, you know, in terms of being an advocate how, you know, it wasn't that long ago that there would have been quite an uproar over consumer control and, you know, some of these things. But now it's like ho-hum, yes, yes, you know, everybody's in agreement. And that's, that's definitely rewarding to see over

1

time.

2 One of the things that I'm worried about that I noticed is, you know, access to data 3 4 and need for data. And I am concerned with 5 moving around into different kinds of environments that we're getting into with 1115 6 7 waivers and so on, about transparency of data, about privatization of data and so on and that 8 9 that needs to be addressed so advocates, 10 researchers and so on have access to the same level of information that, you know, that they 11 12 need, whether the state is ultimately providing 13 this service, or that's been to privatized. 14 And thinking ahead about perhaps some 15 of the political outcomes that are being tossed 16 around here in this town, that may be even more 17 important but that we don't, you know, we don't 18 want to block grant and privatize data. 19 Just another thought that Let's see. 20 I heard kind of addressed that I think is real, 21 real important in terms of, you know, ultimate 22 goals around quality is that other environmental

issues really, really are going to need to be addressed. They need to be considered, or we're never going to get to where we want to go. And those came up in several places I just kind of want to kind of reiterate in particular: housing and transportation.

7 I mean unless those are addressed on a real systematic basis, you know, we can have 8 9 the most self-directed, best training, best 10 services in the world and people are just going 11 to be stuck, you know, in their house and not 12 being able to get where they want to go. And it seems to me like a lot of the goals that we're 13 14 all trying to achieve are not going to be met 15 unless these real critical linkages are also 16 addressed along the way.

Finally, I just want to say and just remind everyone, this is not a scold, just a reminder, that I appreciate the sensitivity that people have shown around the fact that at the end of the day these programs, you know, these are real people with real lives and people with

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

1

2

3

4

5

6

disabilities, and there's all sorts of curve 1 2 balls and stressors and things that you go through in dealing with a disability and that, 3 4 you know, people, you know, aren't experiments 5 and don't need to be objects of anything. And, you know, again that's kind of another thing that 6 7 I think, you know, folks are sensitive to and I appreciate hearing that. 8 That's it. 9 MS. LASH: Thank you, Mike, and thank 10 I want to ask Jamie, since she you, everyone. 11 has been listening so intently over the course of 12 this meeting but not said much, as one of our 13 project sponsors, if she'd like to add anything. 14 MEMBER KENDALL: Thank you, Sarah. So 15 I have a few things to say. First and foremost 16 is thank you, everyone for coming here and 17 showing up and actually being present and focused 18 and committed and engaged throughout these two 19 days. And I know that you all have very busy 20 lives and multiple competing priorities in our 21 work life.

22

And to have all of you here as part of

the stakeholder committee and really bringing 1 2 your subject matter expertise is just extremely valuable to the Department of Health and Human 3 4 Services. So we were very thoughtful with the 5 approach and structure of this stakeholder group, because all of you bring a very unique, valuable 6 7 contribution. And with that said, the whole is greater than the sum of our parts. And I think 8 9 that throughout this couple days it's been a 10 little messy. Collaboration, when you do it and 11 do it in a genuine way, usually is. And very 12 thoughtful.

And so to the stakeholder, thank you very much. I'd also like to thank NQF. You have kept us organized and on track and worked to really create a great structure for the stakeholder group to thrive. So I really appreciate all those efforts.

19And then I also want to say thank you20to my federal colleagues. So we have a great21group. There has been multiple federal staff in22listening mode. We are listening to you

throughout this couple days. So D.E.B. Potter 1 2 and Ellen Blackwell, Mike Smith, Shawn Terrell, 3 thank you for being here throughout the meeting 4 and being here to listen and engage. And we will 5 take all of this back and continue to think through how to support this task order most 6 7 appropriately. I know the NQF is going to be sending 8 9 you out some documents that reflect this 10 conversation. I just want to encourage you all 11 to comment on them. I don't think that will be a 12 problem, given this group. 13 (Laughter) 14 But we really do want to hear from 15 So with that I will turn it back over to you. 16 the co-chairs and to Sarah. 17 CO-CHAIR KAYE: Just to add my thanks 18 to everyone for their very thoughtful 19 presentation and contributions. We got off to a 20 kind of slow and rocky start I thought, but in 21 the end we've pretty much done what we were --22 what was on the agenda, which is pretty amazing.

1	I think we forgot to say that we				
2	decided not to show you the definition again				
3	today, but the staff are going to try to combine				
4	some of those really terse basic HCBS definitions				
5	and then use our characteristics, our now 11				
6	characteristics and write them up as, you know,				
7	with actual verbs in them, and circulate that				
8	along with a list of domains and sub-domains,				
9	whatever else, and the picture. And so there				
10	will be lots of stuff to comment on.				
11	And as Jamie said, I don't think we				
12	really need to encourage you to do that. But I				
13	really appreciate everybody's very thoughtful				
14	participation.				
15	CO-CHAIR CALDWELL: I'd just echo				
16	that. I've just really enjoyed the last two days				
17	and just being with all of you and hearing all				
18	these ideas. And, amazingly, I think we did meet				
19	our objectives. If you look, you know, at the				
20	objectives of the meeting at the outset, somehow				
21	we got there and we've got a lot more work to do,				
22	so. So thank you.				

	⊿
1	MEMBER OXFORD: Joe or maybe staff, is
2	there I forget who said it, I think it's a
3	good idea, is there any way, I mean what do we
4	need to do to get a list of contact information?
5	MS. LASH: We have that, definitely
6	your emails, and I don't know if you want to
7	exchange phone numbers as well. I think we
8	collected most of those through the nomination
9	process. So we'll quickly pull that together and
10	put it up on your SharePoint site
11	MEMBER OXFORD: Super.
12	MS. LASH: where you downloaded
13	today's meeting materials.
14	MEMBER OXFORD: Thank you.
15	MS. LASH: You can look for that next
16	week some time.
17	MEMBER OXFORD: All righty.
18	MS. LASH: Thank you all.
19	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
20	went off the record at 3:34 p.m.)
21	
22	

Α a.m 1:12 4:2 103:8,9 114:22 **AARP** 1:21 ABI 239:22 240:4 abilities 145:7 152:20 ability 62:7 136:20 147:11 150:22 152:11 162:10,11 172:16 203:13 225:19 able 4:15 12:3 32:13 45:19 47:7 84:19 111:9 113:21 121:12 127:20 131:21 160:7 167:15 168:5,9 169:22 183:15 195:8 196:1,3 210:22 220:10 225:7 230:21 231:3,14 232:18 233:8 243:12 above-entitled 103:7 114:21 248:19 absence 26:8,12 156:7 absolute 51:20 71:21 absolutely 136:16 156:11 233:22 **Abt** 1:20 abuse 10:21 91:12 125:11 153:16 215:17 217:4 ACA 58:3 ACBS 225:4,7 accepting 97:21 access 15:22 16:2 76:13 83:12 103:3 120:15 128:19,22 129:6,11 130:10 131:7,20 133:2,3 134:4,7,9,17,20,20 135:7,10,18,19 136:9 139:10 140:5 150:10 150:15 152:11 160:7 203:21 242:3,10 access/accessibility 83:10 accessibility 16:3 79:7 82:22 83:6.13.17 132:10 148:16 160:1 160:3,4,4,5 191:12 accessible 28:18 29:7 43:2 44:4 76:10,18 78:7 79:13 80:15 81:21 82:10 128:20 133:3 148:14 149:3 160:14 accessing 134:15 accommodate 240:16 accommodating

129:21 accommodation 16:3 83:13 accompanied 179:20 accomplish 4:15 154:9 154:10 account 185:10 225:12 accountability 19:1 97:21 98:9 104:19 118:11 167:21 accountable 10:6 87:21 98:7,12,15 accreditation 7:20 accredited 44:9 accurate 165:16 accurately 141:19 142:10 achieve 243:14 achieved 154:12 205:22 achieving 56:7 154:8 159:9,10 acknowledge 12:20 179:9 acknowledged 156:2 ACL 220:3 act 6:22 57:22 66:8 190:20 192:9 199:18 204:11 206:8 action 164:2 167:20 actionable 175:14 active 94:11.15 232:18 activities 185:8 194:12 204:15,16 222:17 activity 228:1 actual 49:13,14 177:17 247:7 actualized 70:21 acumen 147:6 acute 29:14 199:22 **AD** 131:3 ADA 160:6 add 11:18 23:18 26:16 31:14 51:1 88:21 119:9 123:11 125:11 126:18 133:6 134:19 146:15 158:22 192:14 199:11 212:16 223:5 223:8 232:22 235:5 237:15 240:10 244:13 246:17 added 25:9 26:15 124:6 124:7 125:11 147:21 adding 28:20 132:2 134:9 237:21 addition 71:15 122:17 212:1 additional 44:11 240:7

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

Additionally 219:20 additions 135:19 address 27:12 28:10 31:15 45:19 49:12 52:12,21 83:8 124:1 134:16 138:13 152:18 addressed 7:13,20 40:15 78:22 85:6 156:2 242:9,20 243:2 243:7,16 ADDRESSING 1:5 adequacy 139:8 adequate 5:19 46:7 63:21 122:20 adequately 9:14 140:3 140:4 192:16 adjective 159:22 161:15 Adjourn 3:22 ADL 32:10 228:16 administered 131:4 Administration 1:21 administrative 56:22 195:11,14 200:8 222:1,2,3 229:10 administrators 189:14 admission 223:17 admit 173:14 adopted 218:2,11 adopting 217:15 adults 4:22 237:6 advantage 191:3 advice 39:14 53:6 advise 39:9 advisors 24:3 advisory 35:8 advocacy 2:6 149:10 advocate 55:11 240:19 241:17 advocates 242:9 advocating 70:11 affordability 8:20 9:10 16:2 83:1,13 132:9 affordable 9:5 57:21 128:20 132:7 133:3 192:9 afraid 50:4 52:10 62:12 71:8 92:21 afternoon 24:13 age 237:10 ageing 223:20 224:18 agencies 2:4 51:5,19 95:17 102:1 140:17 145:17 146:22 147:1 147:11 224:18 230:20 241:5 agency 52:4 108:11 121:6 140:15 213:7

231:10 240:21 agenda 4:17 11:9 246:22 agent 236:4 agents 236:14 ages 5:2 236:15 aging 1:19 2:4 147:2 220:4 ago 197:22 204:2 231:18 241:18 agree 5:18 42:14 46:5 51:12 66:16 71:3 73:11 86:22 94:17 95:8,11 134:11 135:10 172:21 176:19 189:9 200:7 204:12 210:3,6 agreed 141:13 agreeing 88:11 agreement 46:19 47:9 72:22 85:18 241:21 ahead 34:21 53:18 58:12 74:2 92:22 112:2 211:5 242:14 AHRQ 22:19 aim 9:18 193:7 234:10 air 217:7 aligned 29:13 160:17 160:19,20 alignment 130:8 227:2 238:20 Allen 2:14 115:21 alliance 187:22 allocated 18:6 64:6 73:18 allocation 128:13 137:7 allow 17:2 111:17 allows 89:7 alternative 102:12 Alzheimer's 236:18 amazing 246:22 amazingly 247:18 Americans 66:8 206:8 amount 57:22 112:6 128:7 130:3 200:7 amounts 231:13 analogy 214:6 analysis 10:2 17:16 22:6 104:2 112:12.22 113:4 116:8 189:19 191:6 205:18 206:20 Analyst 2:14 analyze 204:22 213:8 220:10 and/or 166:5 Anderson 2:14 3:4 14:3 16:18,22 17:12,20 18:10,17 22:7,14 23:7

23:10 83:11 93:1,5 99:12 103:14 115:12 Andrew 2:14 3:4 115:11 Andrew's 136:19 Andrey 2:7 25:7 26:18 28:16 33:19 45:12 76:15 115:8 129:14 138:6 146:18 171:2 211:5 Angeles 131:10 angles 9:8 angular 174:10 Anita 2:10 18:1 89:10 95:21 96:21 115:13 126:21 176:1 194:10 200:14 announcement 113:7 answer 79:18 101:11 answering 208:15,17 answers 207:4 anxious 178:12 anybody 42:18 47:21 107:21 119:8 123:10 126:18 140:8 146:14 159:11 178:2 189:3 234:17 anyway 26:16 111:2 209:20 211:20 231:7 **apologize** 199:15 appalled 94:1 Apparently 235:9 applause 4:8 **Applebaum** 1:15 28:15 29:22 30:13,15 59:4,8 61:3 76:16 91:15 95:11 115:8 118:2 119:13,17 120:10,13 122:7 123:13 124:3 125:5,15 155:8 171:3 172:4 227:13 applicability 236:15 applicable 182:11 application 241:3 applied 18:5 128:17 207:21 236:17 applies 36:16 62:5 207:11 apply 18:8 50:6 70:17 appreciate 201:2 208:14 232:19 237:15 240:12,17 241:16 243:19 244:8 245:18 247:13 appreciated 136:20 approach 14:20 166:4 176:6 179:7 181:1 245:5 approaches 202:17

appropriate 28:18 29:7 43:2 76:10 78:7 80:15 81:20 82:10,17 91:3 140:13 141:5 142:5 145:1 148:5 156:10 160:16,18,20 161:1 appropriately 47:20 129:21 139:10 246:7 appropriateness 81:6 81:12,17 approximately 69:2 **APRIL** 1:9 arbitrarily 91:8 architecture 239:13 area 2:4 13:7 15:6 36:16 122:9 125:13 147:1 160:11,15 195:12 196:22 214:18 219:1 224:18 230:20 241:8 areas 27:21 119:2 128:11 163:7 196:8 210:17 212:12 214:21 233:9 arena 219:10 argue 28:8 57:15 71:12 88:19 arguing 82:13 Ari 1:21 2:6 45:12 46:4 47:18 60:8 66:10 68:19 69:8 79:17 88:4 89:17 105:22 110:14 115:8,13 141:3 146:12 172:18 185:18 188:1 189:9 195:11 210:14 221:2 Ari's 107:8 134:2 152:18 164:8 227:3 arose 6:11 arrangements 88:22 array 157:2 arrived 104:8 arrow 168:4 173:16,18 174:5,10 176:10 arrows 237:19 art 157:12 articulate 125:17 articulated 170:7 186:11 articulation 186:19 asked 34:10 48:11 101:7 128:3 186:14 199:5 asking 142:17 189:13 189:14 199:6 aspect 61:6 83:22 147:10 233:3 aspects 7:18 21:11

70:6 97:17 98:3 148:4 assertive 97:11 assess 130:14 157:20 175:18 190:16 191:1 200:4 222:4 assessed 150:22 151:4 160:22 assessment 129:2 150:13,20 151:9,11 151:13,14 152:6 163:9 194:21 203:3 209:13 213:15 assessments 150:21 202:5,11 203:6 assigned 34:9 41:17 116:8 121:21 122:2 assignments 104:22 assist 151:1 assistance 32:22 assisted 236:21 Associates 1:20 association 1:19 2:3 234:8 assume 235:21 assumed 58:15 118:12 assumptions 205:18 Atlanta 13:7 attainable 165:18 attention 14:7 179:10 audience 165:1 August 117:14 183:10 183:10 Austin 115:7 AUSTIN-OSER 1:16 21:5 29:18 39:21 40:18 42:13 48:4 77:22 79:3 84:15,21 109:21 113:14,21 114:2,4,10,14 123:15 124:19 140:22 141:22 146:4 192:12 194:7 199:14 authority 39:13,14 216:22 Autistic 2:6 availability 16:3 46:10 47:11 83:12 129:1 137:5 available 46:12 161:6 221:6 224:22 234:18 237:8 avenue 223:20 avoid 130:8 avoidable 10:22 aware 160:12 207:7 221:13,14 awareness 160:9 awful 238:11

axe 118:20 В back 4:3 11:7 31:22 39:5 41:4 57:4 58:7 67:14 69:18 70:2 74:4 79:21 81:9 86:15 88:4 92:8 99:16 103:20 104:7 105:16 107:8 109:11 111:17 113:19 120:4,7 145:21 149:3 150:1 156:19 158:16 164:2 202:12 210:21 216:11 218:1,6 228:3 246:5,15 back-end 196:6 203:10 211:22 backward 72:2 balanced 155:4 balls 244:2 bar 6:7 Barbara 2:4 12:20 34:21 72:6 88:11 89:3 116:1 barriers 50:6 128:19,22 131:20 182:16 220:6 base 156:15 203:3 206:20 based 8:18.22 14:16 23:16 54:13 87:16 124:8 146:8 155:20 156:5 157:20 171:18 177:14 181:15 183:2 183:7 197:18 203:3 225:19 basic 49:5 139:8 162:9 247:4 basically 148:1 basis 9:22 156:8 163:4 243:8 bath 72:20,20 bear 201:5 beauty 238:17 bed 32:11 **beginning** 164:2 169:22 186:19 200:2 212:3 212:11 begs 21:6 88:8 begun 195:17 **believe** 54:3,4 201:12 232:12 236:12 238:2 belongs 64:18 148:9 benefit 201:4,6 benefits 122:20 140:4,5 152:9 235:22 benefitted 136:19 best 10:6 39:17 151:20 156:6,7 174:5 203:12

	1	1	1
219:4 228:7 237:22	86:5,6 87:15 101:4	buried 206:17	229:17
238:3,7 241:11 243:9	103:15 105:14,14	business 147:5 220:3	capture 44:1 87:15
243:9	109:16 110:18 113:11	busy 244:19	101:12 158:3,5
better 7:19 40:19 52:15	115:2 166:10 178:11	Buy 94:16	168:13
52:20 72:18,21 75:7	breaks 14:13 23:13	buy-in 93:11,12,16 94:4	captured 148:4
95:1 110:11 134:22	brief 34:1 117:15	94:9 95:6,9 114:13	captures 84:20 96:3
168:19 169:5,15	235:15		card 31:1 216:12
174:9 186:19 223:15	briefly 139:7 164:18		care 2:4,7 7:19 9:5,6
beyond 28:1 44:13 49:6	brilliant 235:11	C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S 3:1	13:11 16:6 19:19,21
100:10 102:10 106:8	bring 14:7 105:16 186:8	CAHPS 194:19 218:2	20:4,12,22 21:6 26:22
135:18 148:17 149:6 222:2	192:20 194:1,14 215:6 245:6	calculated 22:22	27:7,8,17,19,19 28:1
biases 208:18	bringing 158:19 165:4	Caldwell 1:12,14	28:5,6 32:1,20 39:10 45:8,22 46:21 48:13
big 9:19 18:10 58:7	199:15 245:1	105:13 106:18 107:3 107:7 109:18 111:13	57:21,22 72:15,17,21
188:16,18 226:4	brings 163:10	115:7 117:8 119:12	73:6,9,14,19,20 74:12
238:9	bristle 52:4 53:11	119:14 120:2,6 122:5	74:12,18 75:1,3 78:10
bigger 103:22 190:4	bristled 53:17	124:11 125:3,10	78:21 79:14 82:20,21
billions 227:21	broad 14:18,19 70:22	126:19 127:4 128:1	83:12 106:12 111:8
bit 4:11 6:3 25:2 45:9	71:2 102:10 109:15	129:14 131:14 133:5	113:16 135:12 151:1
78:15 100:8 107:19	141:8 150:10 166:19	135:1 137:12 138:3,6	151:2,14,16,18
108:10 125:16 127:2	190:15 214:18	140:20 142:22 144:7	152:12 158:13 160:12
144:21 150:7 154:14	broaden 106:8	144:18 145:11 146:3	163:13,17 191:11,20
166:9,21 191:10	broader 35:10 59:3	146:11,18 147:15	192:9 193:12 194:20
202:19 211:5	63:6 70:17 88:19	148:20 149:20 151:21	194:21,22 196:10,12
bitty 241:6	101:12 121:17 130:12	152:2 153:19 156:13	199:12,22 200:1
Blackwell 2:18 99:15	132:20 147:7 192:14	157:3 158:7 159:11	201:17,18,20 202:1,5
99:17,21 100:7,19,22	215:3	164:6,20 168:14	202:10 203:8 206:6
246:2	broadly 108:9 137:1	170:20 172:17 173:11	212:8 216:7 217:21
blend 73:18	148:17 149:14 183:5	174:4,17 175:20	218:9 219:12,14,15
blended 71:22	broken 18:13	176:8 178:1 187:8	222:4 224:1,10,15
blending 72:2	brought 216:3	247:15	229:12,14,21 230:5
block 242:18 board 35:8	bubbled 5:8	California 2:5 94:2	231:6,11 235:7,14
boat 168:6	bucket 8:4 16:1 18:11 18:12 27:11 58:7 82:1	201:7 call 10:17 12:19 20:15	236:3,6,8,10,19 237:1 careful 209:19
Bob 25:7 28:13 31:4	82:2 100:17 108:2	20:18 36:8 44:17	carefully 202:20
76:14 94:8 95:10	109:20 200:18	45:10 55:13 58:9 72:5	caregiver 15:20 30:5
118:1,3,3 171:2 237:4	bucketing 59:2	72:6,16 81:5 90:6,11	31:6 72:8,10 76:12
bodies 192:14	buckets 15:18 16:5	110:13 118:18 121:8	79:22 81:10 88:6
body 15:6	17:7 103:22 168:22	176:11,12 212:9	105:21 106:2,3,3
bogged 112:13	179:1	called 28:12 56:9 57:21	109:9 111:19 115:16
bold 239:15	budget 128:14	71:17 77:8 131:17	150:7,20 151:9,10,11
book 228:4	build 5:4 11:13 137:9	155:17 216:8,12,22	151:13,16,19 152:6
books 229:4	149:3 179:16 211:19	226:14,15	152:18
born 228:5	239:13	calling 71:14 81:16	caregivers 46:17 69:21
borrow 227:3	building 150:9 223:13	109:9 138:16 189:12	69:22,22 72:4,5,6,9
bottom 10:14 25:21	239:12	232:4	79:20,22 80:2,7,10,12
29:7 213:3	built 12:10 148:13,14	calls 95:9 236:4	88:7,10 89:7 102:10
boundaries 139:16	149:11	calm 13:3,6	106:5,11,16,19,20
box 171:6,20,21 173:4	bullet 11:2 124:14	Camille 1:19 31:2 34:13	109:1,4,6,15 110:7,21
173:5,7 174:15	132:6,16 135:2,4	84:5 85:17 115:22	111:1,2 112:5 150:22
177:16	164:1	capabilities 41:9 44:2	151:3,3 152:10
boxes 169:2 172:22	bulleted 34:2	44:11 195:12	caregiving 150:17
173:1 209:5 brain 32:16 124:16	bullets 136:12 bundle 132:5	capacities 146:22	carried 178:19 carry 8:8 233:11
brains 168:2	burden 29:15	capacity 41:9,11 44:2,6 44:14 147:3,5 161:6	carryover 150:19
breadth 126:7	burdens 152:13	191:13 196:11 213:7	177:16
breadths 14:14,17	Bureau 2:1	213:11	case 5:20 32:3 151:12
break 11:17,18,20 34:8	burgeoning 27:21	capitated 221:15	cases 120:19 143:12
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
11			

221:12 cash 127:13 227:9 cast 215:3 catalysts 57:7 catch 113:11 categories 10:15 30:6 84:18 104:13 153:13 category 30:3 56:17 70:12 81:17 87:5 110:12 caught 206:22 causal 167:17 causality 197:7 cause 65:16 caution 47:13 caveat 77:3 200:5 caveats 197:18 201:1 census 216:18 center 1:16,17 2:8 189:12 205:5 216:19 centered 35:1 157:10 195:7 196:12,14 centeredness 49:1 centralized 230:10 centric 225:10 certain 6:3 9:16 10:3.5 34:10 57:8 81:1 130:10 134:5,11 139:18 142:5 147:5 201:6,19 239:21 241:8 certainly 30:1 46:18 79:6 90:6 136:19 171:15 177:19 189:4 206:1 cetera 76:18 79:13 109:17 113:12,12 176:18,18 challenge 200:4 207:14 217:16 challenges 171:4 196:7 230:11 challenging 224:17 champions 219:18 chance 144:12 change 7:15 17:19 18:8 48:3 51:2 57:7,14 124:20 166:6 173:22 174:14 214:11 changes 7:21 195:4 204:19 changing 15:7 42:1 Channeling 227:14 characteristics 4:16 10:12 11:8 19:7 33:8 92:6 103:21 247:5.6 Charlie 2:1 21:21 68:10 68:17 115:12 229:7

Charlie's 23:19 219:5 **chart** 14:6 18:12,15 23:1 104:14 112:11 148:3 charts 86:15 105:7 237:20 chat 101:5 cheap 237:5 check 25:5 164:2 checked 24:2 checking 7:5 checklist 81:4 **checkmark** 180:2 choice 6:12,13 9:6 11:6 56:6 58:8,14,17,18 59:4,19 60:5,13,15,18 61:4,14,14,17,20,22 62:8,12 100:17 118:15,18 120:9 121:2,20 122:1,4,8 148:7 171:10 236:22 choose 61:5 103:18 120:20 choosing 121:18 chose 61:1,16 115:6 Chosen 3:7 chronic 4:22 224:11 circle 37:9 circled 74:4 circles 35:20 168:3 circulate 247:7 circumstances 235:19 **cited** 15:13,14,15,16 23:2,3 30:3 41:8 cities 48:10 228:6 claims 186:12,17 190:3 190:4 191:6 200:6,10 200:12 201:13,13,15 209:8,11,16 213:12 213:14,18 222:2 229:9,10,16,19 Clair 51:10 Claire 133:10 Clare 2:3 28:14 31:1 61:21 70:1 77:20 79:5 82:16 90:15 94:8 95:4 115:22 clarification 17:6 18:4 42:22 51:13 clarified 45:2 clarify 23:4 52:9 69:4 89:16 clarifying 12:11 classic 164:1 clear 67:11 130:15 141:11 174:13 186:10 221:20 clearly 27:12 57:9 77:8

Cleveland 131:9 cliche 7:18 **client** 158:4,5 client-directed 236:20 close 9:21 12:6 188:4 closed 225:2 closely 195:17 204:7 closer 28:9 105:6 111:11 closing 90:11 184:7,8 **cloth** 238:13 **CMMI** 192:22 CMS 191:14 195:15 co-branded 173:1 Co-Chair 1:14,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6,10,15 28:13 29:3,20 30:10 30:14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3 35:2,7 35:13,15,20 36:4,8,20 37:1,11,14,17 38:1,5 38:9,15 39:2,18 40:17 42:4.9.16 44:15 45:12 46:4 47:16 48:2.6 49:10 50:11,21 51:6 51:10 52:7,19 53:7,10 53:14,17 54:8,19 55:1 55:17 56:2,12 58:6,11 58:17,21 59:6,11,14 60:8 61:21 62:2,9,14 63:4,8,11,14 64:3,12 64:17,20,22 65:9,14 66:7,13,17,19 67:2,18 68:4,10,13,16,19 69:6 69:11,14,17 70:9,15 71:3,19 72:10,13,22 73:6,8,15 74:9,14,19 74:22 75:8,12,15,17 76:7,19,22 77:6,12,16 77:20 79:1,4,8,11 81:5,14,18,22 82:3,6 82:13,16,20 83:3,21 84:4,9,13,17 85:17,21 86:6,10,12,16,19 88:1 88:11 89:3,10,16 90:5 90:13,21 91:1,17,20 92:17 93:4,7,12,22 94:7,19 95:2,4,10,21 96:6,12,18,21 97:13 98:5,11,17,20 99:1,5 99:8,11,19 100:3,16 100:20 101:1 105:13 106:18 107:3,7,17 108:5,21 109:2,8,18 110:14 111:13 112:9

117:8 119:12.14 120:2,6 122:5 124:11 125:3,10 126:19 127:4 128:1 129:14 131:14 133:5 135:1 136:11,15 137:12 138:3,6 140:20 142:14,22 143:1 144:7,18 145:11 146:3,11,18 147:15 148:20 149:20 151:21 152:2 153:19 156:13 157:3 158:7 159:11 164:6,20 168:14 169:9 170:20 171:22 172:17 173:11 174:4 174:17 175:20 176:8 178:1 187:8 188:7 246:17 247:15 co-chairs 1:12 4:7 12:19 24:4 246:16 code 201:4 209:17 224:12,13 codes 191:9 200:11 cognitive 62:6 208:19 223:21 236:17 collaboration 2:15 140:16 245:10 collaborative 220:3 collapse 10:14 30:6,11 59:11 62:17 78:19 84:18 222:6 collapsed 15:17 collapsible 30:8 59:19 collapsing 36:19 59:15 76:20 colleague 227:6 colleagues 245:20 collect 199:2 208:9 211:9 217:17 230:15 230:17,21 231:7 collected 182:21 248:8 collecting 220:9 231:17 collection 205:11,17 212:18 231:2 collects 231:11 **colorfully** 170:12,12 colors 170:13 **Columbus** 131:8,10 column 26:13 33:18 **columns** 30:11,20 combine 90:10 91:4 247:3 combined 91:7 158:21 come 16:8 31:11 33:14 52:20 56:16 84:19 85:11 102:22 104:7 111:17 112:20 113:19
139:5 145:3 161:20 169:1 175:4 180:21 188:5 199:3 200:17 201:8 202:11 203:7 204:13 207:10,19 215:21 216:20 232:11 238:21 comes 111:16 152:10 186:1 comfortable 185:18 235:2 coming 9:1 24:16 45:4 48:17 120:4 125:18 178:16 187:17 199:8 227:1 244:16 commend 226:11 comment 3:5,9 11:16 26:20 37:18 40:20,22 42:5,6 51:12 56:10 79:5 88:5 99:9,13,14 102:14 133:11 138:8 144:17 146:20 154:21 155:7 158:10 164:18 165:7,9,15 170:14 175:9 183:15,19 202:12 219:5 246:11 247:10 **commented** 101:7,20 commenter 165:14 commenting 181:6 comments 28:16 39:22 66:11 68:18 101:4 102:9 103:5 140:20 148:21 152:5 153:20 156:17 164:6,14 165:10 174:18 184:4 192:11 197:18 Commission 13:16 commitment 125:18 219:3 220:12 committed 244:18 committee 1:3,11 7:16 12:7 24:2 56:15 100:1 103:16,17 114:8 116:15 180:13 181:3 181:19 183:1,9,11,16 183:22 184:2 245:1 committee's 3:11 182:8 182:15 183:4 committees 207:12 common 87:12 150:21 170:14 225:7 communicate 95:19 communicating 102:17 142:10 communication 233:11 communities 101:18 139:11,12 194:5

208:2 223:13 **community** 1:6,21 8:12 8:17 22:3 31:12 34:20 35:22 43:20 45:6 54:13 65:2 66:2,3,18 66:19,20 67:4,8,17,22 68:14 69:18 70:5,14 70:17 71:15 89:13 101:15 103:3 115:16 124:8 133:4 147:19 148:16 171:18 177:9 203:2 212:3 220:5 223:11,12,22 225:22 226:9 236:20 239:5 240:6 community-based 1:3 1:6 13:13 22:12 27:21 167:20 202:1 204:5 219:1 220:13 224:5,9 226:7,14 227:17 companies 216:7 company 240:5 241:6 comparatively 130:16 compare 147:11 195:8 211:1 231:3,14 compared 32:21 108:17 172:15 comparison 196:1 comparisons 195:3 compendium 197:21 198:4.13 compensated 140:3,4 compensation 150:15 152:8.9 competence 154:17 competencies 139:20 139:22 140:14 141:6 141:10 142:15 143:7 143:8,10 144:1 145:1 competency 130:9 162:5,6,9 competent 62:4 140:2 156:10 162:15,17 165:16 competing 244:20 compiled 182:21 compiles 186:21 completely 87:1 91:22 184:22 complex 167:1 complexities 221:18 complexity 208:13 209:22 complicated 200:20 201:8 compliment 188:15 component 90:10 162:17

components 98:1 116:14 161:18 composition 159:4 comprehensive 15:2 23:20 101:10 163:10 163:16 189:22 203:22 220:10 comprehensively 101:13 comprised 103:17 comprises 16:1 compromised 109:5 computer 92:17,21 conceivably 90:10 conceive 211:7 concept 9:10 28:6 38:8 38:11,14 71:8,10 79:7 81:7 82:22 84:19 93:9 181:14 190:8,11 193:4 236:12 conception 97:3 concepts 8:20 9:17 10:18 11:5 71:16 83:7 90:5 91:7 101:19 126:7 128:10 167:10 167:11 170:6 182:18 conceptual 3:12 12:1 164:13,16,18 165:3 166:14 167:4 181:12 182:12 conceptualizing 24:17 conceptually 79:2,15 87:14 112:14,17 concern 46:16 88:21 102:15 108:8 134:16 142:9 222:7 concerned 44:21 209:7 239:9 242:4 concerns 97:18 152:18 concludes 179:18 conclusion 211:10 concrete 168:4 concur 195:11 conditions 4:22 235:18 conducting 7:1 182:1 Conference 1:11 confident 5:19 conflate 38:6 conflating 78:1 conflicting 9:12 confused 20:13 51:7 94:22 confusion 44:22 connect 131:21 connection 21:13 33:5 160:13 207:1 connections 207:2 connectiveness 65:5

connector 21:11 connote 95:18 consensus 88:3 117:10 199:4 200:17 232:20 233:10 234:4 consider 19:17 20:20 41:6,7 57:8 101:14 consideration 145:13 187:1 considerations 179:7 considered 159:19 180:20 243:2 considering 150:14 191:22 **consistency** 129:4,16 129:17,18 130:1,19 133:14,20 134:3,3,9 134:17 135:5,7 136:9 145:18 162:4 consistent 58:3 135:19 142:2 consistently 41:17 constantly 15:7 constitutes 9:4 constrain 46:3 construct 170:1.3 constructed 187:2 consult 55:7 consultation 55:10 consulted 181:17 consulting 236:13 consumer 7:22 8:9 9:15 15:19 20:11 30:5 31:6 36:7,14 40:5 49:3,4 49:18 53:7,10,18 54:11,14 55:4,4,10,14 55:17,21 56:7 76:12 76:14 87:22 91:11 96:7 98:13,15,19,20 99:1,5,17,19 100:1,5 101:1 115:5 118:13 122:18 125:21 127:2 156:19,20 167:4 173:6 174:1,11 175:21,22 176:12,13 178:8 187:22 189:8 189:10 199:9 210:16 217:20 221:1 225:9 236:4,13,21 241:19 consumer's 6:13 235:17 consumer-centered 236:3,10 consumer-directed 31:10 consumer-experience 31:11 consumer/patient 58:5

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

consumer/self-deter... 100:2 consumer/stakeholder 55:1,13 consumers 9:2,2 10:19 35:8 47:2 53:5 54:5 54:20 56:17,19,21 57:1,4,5,5,10,15,18 98:7,9 127:5,9,10 137:3 139:17 159:6 171:8 172:1,2,22 174:15 188:12 216:6 231:20 235:21 contact 234:19 248:4 contacts 198:8 223:1 contain 14:10 22:8,8 content 49:14 164:22 context 45:16 46:2,7 51:15 135:6 138:1,2 142:21 187:5 continual 181:2 continue 113:9 180:10 183:1 246:5 continuity 162:1 continuous 184:2 **continuum** 6:19 8:13 contracting 6:14 contracts 191:17 contribute 152:21 161:2 226:1 contribution 245:7 contributions 246:19 control 31:10 53:6 58:14,18,19 59:5,19 60:6,13 61:4,5,10 62:1,8,13 93:14,16 95:1 97:9 100:17 101:2 115:6 118:15 118:19 148:18 171:10 241:19 controlled 49:19 56:8 controversial 117:18 controversy 65:17 convenience 60:19 converging 237:19 conversation 4:11,15 5:12 21:18 78:3 85:3 87:11 113:19 123:16 126:3 140:6 141:1,8 142:6 145:2,10 204:2 246:10 conversations 8:19 86:2 116:22 130:13 cool 237:20 coordinate 21:8 160:12 coordinated 20:5,12 28:20,22 29:8,12 43:3 76:11 77:16 196:13

coordinating 206:5 coordination 8:14 19:19,21 20:4,22 21:6 21:14 26:22 27:8,17 28:7,21 32:1,20,21 45:22 77:3,9 80:22 81:2 139:3 158:13 163:6,12,18 coordinator 21:16 coordinators 205:6 copies 18:15,18 copy 16:17 core 113:3 186:6,19 188:13 206:1 corner 105:3 Correct 30:15 correctly 168:13 correlates 63:2 correlation 175:15 correspondence 19:3 24:20 cost 193:12 221:21 costs 160:5 Counseling 127:13 count 161:19 212:22 counterclockwise 187:7 countries 223:14 **country** 13:19 44:9 192:19 225:4 county 129:7 131:5 county-based 129:5 couple 37:2 39:21 145:12 166:11 175:10 185:12 187:14 188:20 197:18 214:15,16 220:21 224:3 237:21 245:9 246:1 course 32:8 56:16 59:2 184:12 204:12 205:20 244:11 court 17:21 18:2 184:13 court-ordered 209:13 cover 50:16 70:12 coverage 161:20 covered 157:11,11 covers 68:2 **CPHQ** 1:19 **CPR** 49:6 **CPT** 224:12,12 **CQI** 164:1 crazy 99:21 191:10 create 127:18 245:16 created 162:19 207:9 creative 172:20 230:14 231:16 credit 13:3 147:12 Crisp 1:17 37:19 38:2,7

38:10 52:22 53:9.11 53:21 58:13 72:17 96:1,9,15,19 106:13 107:1,5 112:3 115:18 153:22 155:11 204:10 criteria 14:13,17 23:17 criterion 209:1 critical 24:1 27:22 143:6 184:10 217:21 222:5 243:15 critically 8:1 43:11 crosses 100:12 crosswalk 5:10 crosswalked 16:9 crystalize 113:2 cultural 130:8 165:18 culturally 140:1 165:16 culture 140:15 curious 17:10 22:5 54:17 currency 14:15 current 8:14 15:8 79:12 127.21 curve 244:1 cut 23:21 55:19 119:1 145:3 cutting 121:6 D d'etre 4:20 **D.C** 1:12 **D.E.B** 2:19 195:12 246:1 daily 9:22 data 64:6 78:13 101:21 137:5,5 138:13 180:20 186:13,17 189:10,19,22 190:3,4 195:11,14 199:2 200:8,10 201:13,14 201:15 203:11 205:11 205:16,19 208:4 209:8,11,17 211:10 211:12 212:18,19,21 213:2,8,13,14,15,18 214:2,9 220:10 222:2 222:3 223:3 224:22 224:22 226:19 227:10 229:9,10,10,13,16,18 229:19,22 230:1,9,15 230:17,21 231:1,7,11 231:13,17 237:7 242:3,4,7,8,18 date 102:1 180:15 234:15 daughter 228:22 day 3:2 7:4,6,10 12:22 62:22 88:18 163:4,4

187:5 212:7 243:21 days 182:4 204:2 217:8 218:20 241:6 244:19 245:9 246:1 247:16 DD 44:8 131:3 188:17 deal 5:13 9:9 29:1 dealing 22:3 162:5 244:3 deals 225:2 dear 13:18 233:3 debrief 10:13 debriefing 116:3 decide 9:9 33:15 decided 86:19 122:9 150:9 247:2 decides 95:7 decision 94:13 decisions 6:14 deconstructing 85:9 deeper 179:3 default 45:17 define 46:3 51:9 52:1 defined 8:22 102:16 108:9 153:13 157:14 Defining 3:6 **definitely** 46:5 55:4 142:11 144:13 241:22 248:5 definition 20:20 26:21 26:22 32:2 45:1,3 89:6 97:15.20 98:4 116:13 170:4 180:8 181:12 182:2 183:13 200:15 247:2 definitions 61:9 180:4 186:20 187:3 197:6 202:6 215:21 247:4 defray 150:16 degree 65:3 128:18 219:4 degrees 7:4,7 delegates 56:19 deliberate 116:18 delimit 22:1 deliver 78:6 138:19 157:8,9 221:16 delivered 27:10 156:11 157:13 delivering 43:19,20 51:19 78:5 154:18 delivery 61:6 120:9,11 121:19 122:14 137:11 154:20 155:10 156:9 157:18 193:11 202:15 203:3 231:21 **Delman** 1:18 56:10,13 58:10 63:5 94:9,21 115:12 143:3 234:20

235:17 demand 161:8,12 dementia 62:5 223:10 dementia-friendly 223:13 demonstrate 38:12 167:5 225:12 demonstrated 139:20 139:22 140:13 142:15 144:22 147:2,4 demonstrates 185:14 demonstrating 141:5 143:6.7 demonstration 227:14 demonstrations 229:13 229:15 denotes 97:9 165:17 **Department** 245:3 dependability 161:16 161:18 162:19 dependable 28:19 29:8 43:3 44:5 76:10 78:8 80:16 82:10,18 139:14 161:21 dependably 162:7 dependent 186:13 depending 130:11 136:4 depends 88:18 depth 126:7 described 197:20 description 52:9 89:17 144:6 descriptive 18:22 deserve 4:7 13:2 62:11 design 7:22 34:18 35:4 52:16 54:15 95:13 196:5 211:17 designed 6:11 161:2 170:4 231:17 designer 169:11 designing 16:15 desired 80:21 163:2 236:5 desperately 13:20 destroying 85:10,14 detail 87:18 119:11 217:9 detailed 112:7 details 4:9 detect 6:16 determination 118:17 determined 151:17 develop 89:13 153:2 172:14 195:6 229:21 developed 182:19 203:9 208:3 218:4 developing 50:4 217:19

development 163:15 181:11 188:11 210:17 234:9,13 developmental 236:18 devoting 179:10 diagram 167:18 170:18 dialog 232:18 233:12 dialogue 8:7 114:12 dialoguing 5:8 **differ** 196:2 difference 32:1,2 59:9 76:17 110:3 128:9 144:22 differences 6:17,22 7:12 27:13 different 9:2,3,4,14 10:3,7 17:17 20:21 21:17 22:18,22 40:4 41:15 50:14 57:16 59:20 60:4,11 74:21 79:9 81:7,9 82:22 83:5 103:1 104:1 108:10,16 121:12 122:12 123:1 126:2 127:21 129:6,20 130:10 131:7 133:15 145:8 147:11 148:4 150:11 153:17 158:15 159:18,19 160:2 162:12 167:2 169:4 175:4,10 186:20 189:1 192:5 195:2 196:15 199:21 200:3 200:21 208:20,21,21 214:11 218:21 220:18 221:11,12 237:19 241:9 242:5 differentiate 46:9 63:17 108:19 186:17 differentiating 106:14 differentiation 39:7 differently 8:22 167:16 212:11 230:16 difficult 130:14 230:10 difficulties 62:6 digest 79:20 dignity 30:4 31:11 56:8 58:22 60:21 61:8,18 62:4.11 dimensions 162:6 direct 106:12 121:6,6 216:1 236:7,21 directed 1:17 56:8 58:14 directing 121:20 direction 5:17 31:4 36:15 39:15,19 49:3,4 53:6 81:12 84:14

120:17 206:3 directive 71:9 directly 138:16 181:11 186:12 236:14 Director 2:16 disabilities 1:20 5:1 57:6 66:6,8 188:14 208:16 221:10 223:21 244:1 disability 2:2 35:21 102:19 191:1 220:4 236:19 244:3 disabled 206:2 disagreement 105:20 disappear 40:15 disbursed 139:10 disciplines 159:5 discovery 238:6 discuss 54:6 discussed 6:18 174:19 185:3 233:19 discussing 104:20 180:16 182:3 183:8 discussion 3:3 4:13 10:17 11:7,12 12:12 17:2 56:21 80:14 87:17 91:3 101:15 104:6 105:15 116:5 117:12 118:22 123:5 127:3 129:17 133:13 133:19 135:11 139:21 140:9 143:17 145:14 156:12 157:6,15 158:11,20 168:15 178:14 182:16 184:8 184:19 200:11 218:19 discussions 141:20 disease 224:11 236:18 disembarking 204:16 disparities 89:21 90:4,7 90:8,12,18 128:12 129:10 dissent 235:13,15 236:9 dissented 235:12 distill 34:1 distinct 37:15 47:4 71:14,16 73:14 79:2,7 79:15 87:14 distinction 28:4 37:22 40:22 45:10 109:22 110:7 distinctions 179:9 distribution 89:20 102:17 ditto 131:9 214:13 dive 179:3 diverge 50:18

divergence 49:18 diverse 9:15 diversity 158:11 159:5 divide 33:16 dividing 111:11 division 2:9 205:4 **Dobson** 1:19 31:3,19 85:19,22 86:8,11,14 86:18,21 115:22 119:21 120:5,8,11 123:12 220:17 document 23:12,13,15 documentation 27:16 documents 24:5 118:10 246:9 doing 38:13 40:8 60:7 71:10 84:16 92:22 111:6 127:13 173:19 174:3 191:14 198:5,6 198:9 208:6,20 209:7 211:20 216:10 217:5 219:3,10 220:1,4 222:10 223:15 224:20 228:18 229:20 230:7 232:2 241:11 dollar 232:5 dollars 134:16 227:21 domain 11:7 12:12 14:4 18:11 20:15 21:14 28:12 31:12 40:12,13 41:7 49:14 64:10 75:1 78:17 85:12 87:13 90:8 101:12 105:21 106:11,21 108:22 109:15 113:3 117:2 118:15,18 125:13 126:11 148:2 154:5 159:20 174:20,21 domains 3:3,7,7 4:14 5:3 11:13,19 14:10,11 15:12 19:8,9 22:8 23:14 24:10 25:3 27:14 30:19 31:10,15 33:9 34:10 40:2 49:13 58:4 67:9,12 76:20 87:7 91:21 101:9,18 103:21 104:8,15,16 105:10,15 112:11 113:17 117:2 137:18 137:21,22 154:4 159:21 167:8,14 169:4 175:5 182:2,12 183:2,8 184:18 186:3 186:10 189:1 207:8,9 210:9 215:5,14 217:2 238:22 247:8 dominate 107:10 door 48:20 231:12

downer 200:22 downloaded 248:12 **Doyle** 227:6 DR 58:20 65:7 draft 116:12 165:3 180:7,11 183:13,18 drastically 130:10 131:7 draw 148:1 drawn 205:19 dream 32:14 **DREDF** 22:19 dress 228:21 dressed 32:11 Drew 12:14 14:2 19:12 83:9 92:22 103:12 165:2 Drew's 25:3 drilled 197:10 drive 6:11 21:12 driven 57:1 driver 25:11 dropped 214:8,9 dropping 76:5 duals 222:18 DUALss 191:17.18 due 180:7,11 183:18 duplication 25:2 153:14 duplicative 154:2 163:7 dynamic 108:11,16 Ε earlier 96:7 145:22 150:4 226:12 early 24:3 easier 12:19 echo 146:4 152:4 200:14 212:14 220:17 221:20 247:15 echoing 210:13 219:5 economic 68:6 160:4 234:13 edit 141:16 editing 114:15 educate 225:19 educated 204:20 education 139:20 141:4 141:9 142:7 143:14 143:21 144:3 145:6 166:2 233:16 effect 92:15 160:14 214:10 effective 6:21 28:6 72:18 73:13 82:9 154:8 155:2 166:3 174:22 193:10,10 209:2

73:12 74:20 75:11.14 76:6,17 78:4,9 80:19 81:1,8,12,16 84:1 154:6,7,9 174:20 177:2 206:16 effectiveness/quality 74:17 75:1,22 76:4,8 115:20 efficiency 43:5 64:7 84:2 90:11 efficient 9:5 18:5 44:3 64:5 73:17 78:12 effort 204:13 213:14 efforts 5:11 167:22 179:11,13 180:1 183:7 219:18 226:18 245:18 eight 15:16,16 117:4 either 32:4 38:4 54:3 87:2 122:4 138:17 142:13 173:14 elaborate 227:12 Elder 206:7 elderly 188:14 206:2 221:11 electronic 117:13 196:5 element 29:11 163:6 elements 31:5 87:3 201:19 elephant 197:14 **elevate** 194:3 eligibility 135:21,22 136:9 eligible 162:22 eliminate 89:21 223:17 eliminated 143:13 Ellen 2:18 99:17 246:2 eloquently 233:1 eLTSS 138:15 email 113:11 116:16 117:13 168:10 194:5 emailed 165:2 emailing 189:12 emails 248:6 embarking 204:7 embodied 63:18 emergence 236:19 240:4 emerging 185:15 187:4 240:1 emotional 10:20 91:14 91:16,18 101:17 115:15 153:9 176:17 177:8 emphasis 49:20 58:1,4 90:3,17 106:9 138:14 182:11 212:17 emphasize 101:5 179:8

184:3 employer 49:22 employment 65:4 68:3 121:9 187:4 216:1 EMR 226:20 enable 226:19 enables 111:8 encapsulate 67:4 encompasses 165:21 166:20 encounter 152:15 229:18 encourage 8:1 134:13 211:2 246:10 247:12 end-all-be-all 24:14 ended 168:3 endorsed 218:7 endorsement 188:6 194:19 engage 54:6 246:4 engaged 54:20 244:18 engagement 16:14 31:12 34:17,19,20,20 35:3 36:14 39:13 40:10,12 42:7 53:15 53:20 54:10.16 55:2 55:15.18 58:1 65:2 68:22 92:9,12 93:17 94:1 137:2 **English** 228:9 enhanced 168:6 enhancements 12:3 enhancing 5:17 enjoyable 72:20 enjoyed 218:16 247:16 enjoyment 147:21 enormous 112:6 ensure 141:17 ensuring 6:4 entire 56:4 entirely 143:14 168:6 entities 202:9 204:7 208:5 entity 17:14 47:6 87:21 224:15 environment 148:14 149:3,11 environmental 3:16 12:5 156:15 180:9.12 182:9 187:13 242:22 environments 195:2 242:6 Epic 201:19 equal 134:6,20 equalize 226:8 equate 166:2 equitable 18:6 66:4 89:20,22 102:15,17

102:20 135:13 137:6 equitably 128:17 equity 16:12 19:2 90:1 90:1,4,10,14,17,20,21 115:11 128:6,9 131:6 133:13 166:2 especially 138:14 156:14 185:4 193:3 193:15 211:16 219:12 226:21 essence 85:8 essentially 14:17 116:10 128:14 150:15 167:16 175:18 establish 234:6 **established** 5:2 33:22 117:2 et 76:18 79:13 109:17 113:11,12 176:18,18 ethnicity 165:22 **Europe** 223:15 evaluate 225:7 evaluated 14:16 163:21 evaluating 5:3 158:5 227:14 evaluation 34:18 35:4 35:11 40:6 52:16 129:2 156:20 158:4 172:7 175:21 217:20 227:15 236:7 evening 12:2 eventually 194:18 everybody 12:17 26:16 37:20 49:4 91:9,22 99:11 116:2 202:4 204:3 206:8 229:15 230:1 231:19 233:1 234:5,7 235:3 237:14 238:18 240:11 everybody's 241:21 247:13 evidence 3:16 12:6 14:15,22 15:6 24:9 155:20 156:5.8.15 157:20 179:3 180:10 181:10 182:21 185:13 206:5 217:13,14 evidence-based 197:3 evolution 219:12 evolutionary 232:10 evolved 238:14 evolving 232:15 exact 215:20 exactly 32:15 34:5 118:11,14 136:12 147:9 229:2 examined 30:4 example 7:2 19:18 27:7

effectiveness 72:14,16

111:18 124:9 131:2.9 147:1 152:11 171:5 201:16,22 222:4 230:19 examples 124:3 182:14 excellence 44:10 exchange 248:7 exchanged 163:16 excited 208:1,2 221:8 233:18 234:2,16 excitement 219:2 228:13 exclusive 101:10,13 154:3 exclusively 167:10 224:5 excuse 166:11 193:10 exercise 10:11 41:3 62:8 87:2 116:9 154:14 210:11 exhaustive 189:5 exist 5:4 83:2 95:7 139:9 208:18 212:20 existence 47:13 existing 5:11,14 161:8 179:4.14 180:4 182:10 186:22 exists 8:10 exiting 229:5 expanded 201:7 expectations 212:4 expected 163:19 expensive 199:2 208:12 211:15,16 212:17 **experience** 15:20,22 30:5 31:7 48:13 76:12 76:14 88:14 171:8,17 175:11,13,17,22 188:4,18,19 193:12 194:17 197:19 198:15 198:17 202:2 209:10 210:16 213:12 experimentation 130:8 experiments 244:4 expertise 144:12 245:2 experts 185:1 explain 56:15 127:1 explanatory 16:5 explicitly 19:20 25:2 exploitation 10:21 91:12 153:16 exploration 210:18 explore 138:21 212:12 223:19 exploring 202:16 exponentially 200:19 express 141:15

expressed 142:3 236:1 extent 24:19 204:6 236:5 external 47:6 202:9 extra 13:2 18:18 31:8 116:19 118:20 240:15 extract 222:3 extraction 15:12 extremely 220:19 245:2 F faced 110:22 faces 40:4 facets 16:2 83:11 179:8 facilitate 226:19 227:2 238:6 facilitating 117:6 237:18

facilitator 104:5 facility 102:6 fact 9:11 65:16 87:3 122:17 141:17 197:2 214:17 219:6 230:15 233:18 243:20 factors 179:8 fail 208:14 failed 97:7 fair 128:7 fairly 166:22 fairness 18:6 90:13.14 90:14,20,21 115:11 128:7,9 131:20 fall 65:11 77:11 109:20 155:17 180:10 211:9 falls 55:4 78:17 110:9 familiar 235:8 families 239:16 family 46:17 47:3 69:20 69:22 72:4,5,9 79:20 79:22 80:2,5,9,12 81:10 87:22 88:6,10 88:16,17 89:6,9,15 101:15 102:3,5,5,11 103:3 106:3,5,8,15,19 106:20,22 107:1,9,13 107:19,20 108:9,10 108:14,15 109:1,4,6 109:16,19 110:7,11 110:21 111:1,19 150:19 152:14,18 174:12 216:6 231:18 241:7 family's 107:10 fan 238:9 far 4:6 14:14 97:2 105:3 105:4 131:21 192:14 197:20 199:10 210:2 210:15

favored 15:1,3,7 Fay 101:20 fear 37:5 feasibility 180:19 feasible 185:11 187:10 195:10 198:22 205:10 federal 233:22 245:20 245:21 federally 49:21 feedback 114:10 137:16 168:10 198:19 feel 17:7 19:16 40:1,3 56:16 67:7 78:2,15,20 85:9,14 94:19 132:1 134:22 135:3 140:10 141:14,15 166:10 171:9 198:17 feelings 233:16 feels 77:22 78:14 146:15 Feldman 2:15 3:17 115:7 165:14 178:20 felt 91:6 127:5 162:11 fertile 3:19 213:22 233:20 fewer 92:15 fewest 91:5 field 235:10 figure 43:6 125:1 133:7 148:8 171:12 172:7 238:4 figuring 83:17 fill 232:5 final 3:11 71:21 88:4 154:21 169:14 179:18 226:10 230:13 236:1 finally 102:14 196:22 200:6 230:3 232:9 243:17 financial 46:11 101:16 150:16 financing 137:10 239:10 find 7:6.12 16:11 97:9 184:20 214:2 222:1 finding 201:17 fine 38:17 55:14 77:5 77:18 85:2 90:19 fingertips 211:13 finish 80:14 178:13 finished 91:22 164:15 183:14 first 8:8 10:18 12:16 15:19 22:7 23:21 25:6 31:2 36:9 37:19 43:9 44:9 60:8 76:14 77:21 99:13 112:14 120:7 122:13 124:14 135:2

135:4 137:8 144:20 147:19 150:1,6 154:5 159:22 163:9 166:13 180:7 195:13 197:21 198:14 221:4 244:15 first-aid 49:6 fit 10:6 50:9 60:5 97:10 174:10 fits 28:16 32:16 110:11 112:21 158:13 **five** 16:2 83:9,11 103:15 104:11,12 113:2 159:18,18 192:9 232:11 flag 200:12 flagged 31:5 fleshed 167:8 flip 98:6 105:7 Floor 1:11 flows 177:18 fluctuation 7:7 focus 89:11 100:14 127:14 180:15 226:6 233:2 focused 56:7 180:7 215:17 244:17 focuses 224:4 Focusing 102:21 folded 40:16 folks 40:2 54:17 141:2 177:5 188:2 191:16 195:1 214:14 215:2 216:6 217:4 218:1 223:2 244:7 follow 11:6 204:11 follow-up 178:21 188:22 following 11:10 115:2 Follows 188:21 for-profit 95:16,17 97:18 225:15 force 44:14 45:11 49:7 50:9 51:1 52:6 101:16 193:3,5,6,16,19 233:4 234:8,12 239:17 force/providers 52:8 forceful 96:1 126:4 foremost 8:9 244:15 forget 143:13 248:2 forgot 247:1 form 11:20 232:6 formal 60:1 97:20 179:21 formally 56:14 forth 129:11 139:15 164:3 fortunately 225:2 Forum 1:1,11

forward 6:8 8:8 178:19 206:9 212:13 219:19 220:7 234:2 235:10 241:1 foster 102:5 fought 89:5 found 5:10 11:14 14:10 16:9 19:12 23:15 180:17 198:3 foundation 169:21 204:4 foundational 6:6 four 75:9 103:15 105:5 160:2 177:17 framework 3:12 5:7,7 9:14 12:1 164:13,19 165:3 166:14,19 167:4 169:21 173:9 174:13 180:8 181:12 182:2 183:2,13 215:12 frameworks 5:2,11 22:18,22 180:5 182:12 238:11 framing 129:17 frankly 57:12 fraught 70:16 free 17:7 141:15 166:10 freedom 10:21 62:4 91:11 125:11 153:16 freedom/independen... 59:1 freehold 93:2 frequency 14:6 18:11 23:1 148:2 frequently 55:7 210:10 friends 80:3 103:3 front 219:14,15 frontier 234:21,22 frowning 38:16 fruitful 188:3 fudge 107:18 full 12:7 66:2,4,7,19,20 66:20 67:3,16,20,21 68:14 69:18 70:3 71:15 115:16 141:21 144:10 146:7 147:19 149:10 177:9 233:14 233:15 fully 203:5,22 fun 65:5 67:5,6 69:19 70:7,11,13 147:20 232:20 function 159:7 190:14 191:1 functional 25:9,11,19 26:13 27:4 172:16 194:20 213:15 229:2

functioning 153:10 159:8 228:18 funded 52:1 138:18 **funding** 47:11 further 11:18 42:21 114:12 164:22 182:18 185:10 furthermore 49:20 future 145:13 161:8 182:19 188:6 206:10 G **Galantowicz** 1:20 65:22 115:22 156:3 157:16 159:15 174:18 197:17 199:17 **GAPS** 1:5 general 49:7 50:9 63:19 64:1 69:1 106:1 109:15 231:15 233:2 generally 33:7 110:17 153:11 162:16 generation 6:8 genuine 241:11 245:11 geographic 160:3 Gerontology 1:15 Gerry 2:6 39:3 52:13 64:13 92:1 93:8 95:2 107:7 115:18 Gerry's 66:1 getting 9:20 19:3 60:17 62:22 70:22 71:8 80:17,18 100:11 104:12 110:6 133:17 133:22 135:4 166:9 172:8 177:12 188:4 198:18 200:2 203:15 206:6 208:7 210:18 220:16 224:6 225:2 228:20 229:14 242:6 give 30:20 72:19 103:11 110:14 113:5 116:14 147:12 166:10 168:9 203:20 207:4 given 46:16 47:1 60:1 62:14 94:12 128:21 151:18 187:1 246:12 giver 212:8 gives 208:8 glasses 196:16 glean 201:14 gleaned 210:7 **go** 4:18 10:3,4 14:4 29:20 31:7,13 33:13 34:21 46:13 53:18 58:12 74:2 76:3 86:20 88:4 92:22 97:2 106:21,21 111:14,20

111:20 112:1,9 119:10 120:7 128:2 149:3,20 150:4 156:18 158:7,16 159:12 164:2,18 166:12 169:20 171:2 172:18 184:15,16 185:17 192:8 205:8 220:14,15 222:1 230:6 243:3,12 244:2 goal 143:21 161:1 235:14 goal-setting 236:6 goals 32:13 56:7 154:11 160:22 166:5 213:21 234:9,10 242:22 243:13 God 215:9 goes 21:1 90:14 100:10 124:1 135:18 145:21 170:5 194:8 221:9 241:1 going 6:1 7:19 8:21 11:10,17 14:3,4 16:22 17:1 26:1,7 27:22 28:17,19 30:10 34:4,8 37:20 39:19 42:4,6 44:17,22 47:21 49:11 49:16 50:6,13,16,18 52:11 56:13 57:14,15 59:17,17 66:15 67:20 78:5,6 79:5 81:11 86:4,7,12,21 88:2 91:9 93:6 99:12,14 103:14,16,19 104:10 104:15,16,17 105:2,2 109:12,20 112:7,15 113:18 114:3 121:16 132:20 138:4,11 150:4 153:4 154:1,1 161:4,11 164:10,12 164:13,16 166:9 168:7 169:10,20 172:19 173:16 175:3 178:12 181:1,16,16 183:1,6,14 184:1 185:11 187:7 190:14 191:2 192:19 193:14 194:14,18 195:7 196:1,9,20 198:11 202:14 204:20 205:8 206:2 207:7,15,17,19 209:17 214:20 215:2 217:15 221:3,4 225:3 227:19 231:6 232:12 232:22 233:2 234:6 240:5 243:1,3,10,14 246:8 247:3

good 4:4 5:13 8:6 21:20 29:20 31:16 34:16 36:5 44:5 47:20 58:6 64:16,18 72:13 85:3 97:1 117:21 125:2 130:22 134:1 137:13 137:18 139:1 140:20 146:9 148:20 153:19 168:18 170:21 171:1 173:11 174:4 176:6 178:1,3 186:17 187:17 189:1 192:13 199:9 205:1 206:13 209:21 210:20 218:3 227:17 228:18 231:22 239:7 241:14 248:3 Google 184:20 gotten 75:8 122:21 229:19 government 15:3 189:13 grab 209:16 grant 192:22 194:15 242:18 granular 14:20 27:9 granularity 33:22 graphic 169:10 graphically 178:7 gray 198:6 great 77:18 114:11 130:2 135:8 191:3 209:11 210:4 212:2 225:3 229:11 230:6,9 235:3,9 245:16,20 greater 89:8 103:3 193:11 245:8 greatest 43:18 220:6 green 25:19 ground 3:19 110:11 188:3 213:22 233:20 234:14 group 3:3,6 5:14 9:1 11:12 13:11 26:21 27:11 28:10 34:9,10 80:4 87:12 102:6 103:12,16 104:7,15 104:21 105:2,3,4,5,9 109:7 112:5 115:5,10 115:15,20 117:4 119:8 122:9 123:10 127:14 128:2,5 132:1 135:15 141:7,13,14 141:21 142:1,11,12 144:10 146:13,15 147:9,16,18 149:4 150:2 153:20,20 155:6,20 159:1 166:17 168:19 170:6

170:8 174:19 216:3 218:18 232:18 234:10 237:16 245:5,17,21 246:12 groupings 50:16 groups 11:18 34:4,9 87:15 103:15 113:7 115:3 116:4,11,22 237:10 growing 185:13 206:5 guard 8:16 guess 37:4 40:21 43:3 44:20 45:4,8 74:11 82:8 85:2 92:12 98:2 100:7 108:7 109:10 109:12 110:16 118:6 120:6 128:1 155:12 169:19 170:13 172:5 187:6 192:3 204:2 207:4 214:13 217:11 237:21 quidance 220:1 guide 170:8 182:15 guided 24:9 182:1 guys 14:9 16:8 17:2 91:4 104:4.6.10 129:16 130:4 188:15 н H 1:12.15 half 232:8 237:9 hall 166:12 hammer 4:9 7:17 hand 2:7 17:8 27:8 60:9 65:20 98:10 104:17 105:3 handed 14:7 handful 121:18 handle 28:4 141:2 hands-on 241:2 happen 27:6 205:17 happened 150:3 happening 74:7 138:10 149:13 187:12 190:7 193:3 205:1,1 208:10 209:18 210:19 230:2 happens 172:9 205:14 happy 63:4 66:10 91:9 91:21 92:2,4 219:19 227:11 234:21 hard 12:8 89:5 221:22 224:21 229:6 240:13 harder 175:14 199:3 harkens 210:21 harm 10:22 harmonization 226:16 harmonize 226:18 harmonizing 190:9,11

202:13 hash 142:5 hazards 153:22 **HCBS** 4:16,20,21 5:3,20 6:19 8:15 9:15 10:11 14:11 21:8,10,15 22:9 29:15 32:6 33:4 45:16 45:17 46:2 51:2 65:3 75:18 78:5 129:11 148:18 154:15 163:11 170:1,3,7 179:9,12 180:5 182:2,11,15 185:15 186:18,20 187:5,15 188:3,17 189:20 194:18 197:21 198:16 199:21 200:3 200:10,12,16,18,18 201:4 215:4 221:16 222:15,20 233:2 247:4 headers 33:18 heading 31:3 heads 9:12 132:3 health 2:4,10 8:15 10:20 13:11,17 17:14 25:10 57:6,9,19 87:21 89:21 90:4,7,8,12,18 91:10,14 95:17 101:17 128:12 144:4 152:12 153:11 154:12 163:13 190:6,8,12 192:1,6,7 193:8,8 203:21 211:1 215:8 215:16,18 216:8,13 216:18,19,19,22 218:5 221:15 222:13 222:19 225:6 235:20 239:3 245:3 healthcare 1:16 27:4,4 45:4 HealthConnect 201:18 hear 41:10 76:20 116:3 142:1 143:4 184:7 239:20 246:14 heard 4:10 8:8 11:13 29:9 146:21 149:5 166:18 168:15 170:14 215:2 242:20 hearing 40:1 100:8 244:8 247:17 heart 13:18 185:5 233:3 heavily 226:17 help 7:11 111:22 112:1 113:8 172:2 181:8 185:1 192:10 203:2 220:15 234:6 238:6 240:16 helpful 22:16,20 33:18

42:14 93:4 124:21 178:4 187:20 190:12 233:13 helping 160:12 helps 21:12 170:2 heterogeneous 129:20 HETUS 191:20 203:18 hey 194:1 231:10 232:4 **HHS** 24:4 103:18 181:19 hi 96:15 hide 25:13 high 4:20 72:19 122:18 130:20 140:19 166:20 213:12 228:6 high-level 8:20 15:18 high-quality 4:16 10:11 higher 28:6 224:1 highlight 201:12 202:22 highlighted 128:11 195:14 highly 23:2 123:20 hints 33:18 HIPAA 191:9 200:11 209:17 hire 111:7 143:11.12 144:6 225:18,18 hired 225:16,17 hiring 108:11 historical 165:20 hit 48:14 ho-hum 241:20 hold 9:12 77:20 84:6 hole 50:19 holistic 21:10 home 1:3,6 8:17 13:12 13:17 22:3,11 27:21 39:1 40:21 43:19 45:8 45:11 48:17 74:7 78:4 95:17 100:12 102:2,3 102:5,6 121:5 124:8 167:19 171:18 201:22 203:2 204:5 223:17 224:5,9 226:7,14 227:17,19 231:7,21 236:20 homes 88:21 95:16 228:19 236:16 homogenize 130:7 honest 199:1 honestly 51:21 67:5 honored 234:20 hope 4:4 149:14 186:21 205:8 209:4,21 217:11 234:3 238:12 240:22 hopefully 156:2 194:19 227:1

host 88:21 102:4 hour 127:16 232:8 house 89:5 243:11 Houser 1:21 60:9,10 61:12 66:15,18 68:19 68:20 79:17,18 105:22 110:16 115:9 121:16 132:5 150:18 151:8 153:1,6 172:19 185:20,22 212:14 Houser's 88:5 housing 63:21 128:20 128:21,21 131:17 132:6,7,12,15,22 133:3 243:5 huge 16:5 206:3 234:1 human 63:6,8,11,12,14 63:15,18,20 64:1 115:6 123:17 176:21 177:9 245:3 Human/legal 64:3 humility 165:19 iceberg 196:19 **IDD** 101:22,22 102:8 221:12 idea 33:8 46:6 47:10 117:19 120:14 127:22 160:6 190:13 227:18 241:15 248:3 ideally 151:9,13 156:4 ideas 10:6 11:4 108:10 169:15 181:14 182:18 210:4 241:13 247:18 identified 31:6 179:19 181:18 192:16 identify 33:9 34:11 112:19 126:6 182:10 182:14,17 identifying 3:19 163:12 181:14 233:20 identities 101:12 ignored 57:2 ignoring 80:9,11 Illinois 2:9 218:1 illness 62:7 imagine 184:19 immediately 153:2 impact 43:18 94:14 147:8 190:20 193:6,7 199:18 impacts 132:21 214:4 impairment 134:15 229:2 236:17 imperative 9:11 imperfect 190:7 213:16 implementation 34:18

35:4 52:16 182:16 209:2 implemented 156:6,7 163:20 implications 67:16 imply 29:15 importance 25:14 44:2 140:14 185:14 198:18 217:22 220:22 228:1 229:10 important 5:21 6:2 8:16 10:18 15:10 16:13 19:4,14,22 20:15 28:7 28:8 32:6,19 37:15 41:14 43:12,15 44:1 48:12 49:9 60:22 67:13 85:8,15 97:8,22 113:18 117:19 119:5 120:17 125:8 126:5 126:16 132:11 138:12 138:21 144:5 145:15 148:10 156:14 157:17 172:12 184:3 195:12 197:15 199:10,20 201:14 203:18 204:8 208:10 210:22 214:3 219:7 225:15 236:2 241:1,12 242:17,21 **importantly** 151:10 imposing 46:20 **impressed** 169:12 188:10 improve 179:12 208:8 226:6 **improved** 11:9 193:8.9 improvement 6:12 8:5 147:3 167:22 188:16 188:18 improving 226:1 in-home 211:11 **IN-PERSON** 1:3 inaccurately 146:16 include 54:11,12 62:10 120:17 124:22 133:2 160:5 182:5 217:2 included 14:13 18:13 67:8 98:4 123:2 147:20 155:9 198:4 includes 68:5 83:1 107:20 155:15 161:5 including 24:3 27:3 32:2 108:9,16 116:12 127:9 163:17 236:16 236:18,20 inclusion 8:11 31:13 65:2,7 66:2,3,7,18,20 66:20,21 67:4,17,20 67:22,22 68:15,22

69:8,10,12,18 70:3,5 70:17 71:15,17 115:17 147:19 148:13 177:10 212:3 inclusive 14:19 income 139:11 incorporate 152:7 202:10 incorporated 186:8 increases 167:21 incredible 147:3,4 192:2 200:7 incredibly 212:21 224:17 241:1 independence 59:3 101:16 independent 2:7 231:1 231:9 independently 228:21 indicator 196:2 206:1 indicators 146:9 186:6 188:13 individual 21:1 25:12 32:13 35:11 36:17 39:12 40:9.12 53:20 53:22 56:7 67:12 74:8 74:13 78:1.9.11.18 82:11 86:3,11,18 87:9 100:15 104:19 130:15 138:1 146:22 160:11 160:19 162:3,4,8,16 166:1 175:7 206:20 individual's 39:14 individual-oriented 62:1 individually-based 70:7 individuals 9:21 39:8 51:5 53:5 92:11 102:7 163:18 175:2 199:6 221:10,12,17 228:20 237:18 239:16 inequitable 135:16 inevitable 137:20 inexpensive 211:19 232:1 influenced 8:3 influences 167:12,12 influencing 6:15 influential 24:6 inform 6:12 184:16 informant 182:5 information 127:10,16 127:19 156:21 163:16 182:6 186:22 195:16 195:18,21 201:15,21 202:8 203:5,14 210:7 213:17 219:13 222:3 227:7 234:19 240:4

241:13 242:11 248:4 informed 9:6 181:11 **infuse** 140:18 initial 117:17 initiation 162:20 163:5 initiatives 8:5 194:16 197:19 215:6 innovation 226:22,22 innovations 192:18 228:12 inpatient 218:6 input 7:22 12:1 39:14 53:1 96:4 116:19 117:13 182:8,22 236:7 **inputs** 176:5 inside 227:19 instance 192:22 193:7 Institute 1:21 2:2 institutional 186:18 institutionalization 223:18 instructions 103:11 instrumentation 208:4 instruments 209:5 integrate 21:8 integrated 20:1,6 26:21 27:2,3,5 28:5 29:13 64:6 73:18 78:13 196:11 201:18 229:12 229:14,16,20 integrating 206:6 integration 8:15 20:22 45:21 70:14 226:19 integrity 64:7 78:13 137:5 138:13 intended 183:21 184:16 intending 167:19 intensity 221:21 intensive 134:12 intent 151:7,22 intentionally 92:10 intently 244:11 intents 135:13 interact 44:12 interest 116:20 119:19 241:10,11 interested 50:1 101:8 121:9 234:17 interesting 27:15 39:19 111:15 112:10 137:16 138:20 164:7 189:3 191:5 193:14 196:9 196:21 206:13 210:9 210:11 215:13 232:21 Interim 2:4 13:11 intermediary 206:19 intermediate 17:14

87:20 104:18 internet 237:10 interoperability 138:11 138:15 139:3 interpret 17:10 167:1 interpretation 102:10 intersection 138:17 intervention 172:8 interventions 197:5 interviewers 208:20 interviewing 205:6 interviews 182:6 209:2 227:15 231:9 intimate 89:1 intrinsically 177:14 introduce 13:4 introducing 93:8 intuitive 148:6 invested 6:3 219:8 investing 239:7 investment 207:18 220:5 224:16,21 227:9 investment's 207:19 invite 97:5 inviting 206:13 218:16 involve 190:5 235:18 involved 37:8 56:18 121:7 125:19 127:5 159:6 190:21 236:5 238:15 involvement 95:13 125:21 **IOM** 235:6 issue 28:21 39:5 45:20 55:6 56:16 74:4 106:19 111:19 130:9 137:8 139:8 140:17 197:11 200:6 234:12 234:13,13 issues 50:13 106:7 131:18 136:22 137:2 137:4,6,8 152:16 158:18 165:21 180:19 203:21 233:4 243:1 It'd 111:15 item 122:13 123:3 127:3 136:14 items 30:2 79:12 204:21 209:4 213:6 iteration 24:8 166:13 iterations 170:21 iterative 181:1 J Jamie 1:21 244:10 247:11 **JD** 1:18

	1	1	1
Jennifer 101:7	67:2,18 68:4,10,13,16	38:1 45:17,17 50:2,12	201:9 202:3,4,18
job 21:7 32:14 47:7	68:19 69:6,11,14,17	50:18 52:14 54:2,6,16	203:8,12,16,19,19
131:8 137:18 144:5	70:9,15 71:3,19 72:10	61:13,13 65:15 69:6	204:1,4 205:3,4
193:4,5,18 241:11	72:13,22 73:6,8,15	71:2,13 74:1 80:19	206:15,18 207:18
jobs 198:17 223:15	74:9,14,19,22 75:8,12	83:6 85:9 93:8,9,9	208:18 209:16 211:14
Joe 1:12,14 109:10	75:15,17 76:7,19,22	96:3 97:16,17,19	212:20 213:3,4,5,12
115:7 117:6 119:11	77:6,12,16,20 79:1,4	103:22 110:12 119:15	213:13 214:17 215:1
168:12 170:11 187:7	79:8,11 81:5,14,18,22	121:6 149:2,12 167:1	215:3,7,8,11,12,19,22
194:16 248:1	82:3,6,13,16,20 83:3	167:17 168:11 169:1	216:2 217:1,5,7,8,9
John 142:22	83:21 84:4,9,13,17	170:14 177:2 180:2	217:14,21,22 218:2,4
join 33:16	85:17,21 86:6,10,12	183:22 189:15 202:4	218:5,8,9,12,20
joined 12:21	86:16,19 88:1,11 89:3	204:18 207:5 209:4	220:14,20 221:14
joining 238:16	89:10,16 90:5,13,21	216:10,13 217:5	222:9 223:21 224:12
Joint 13:15	91:1,17,20 92:17 93:4	227:18 231:18 239:15	225:9 226:4 229:3
Jon 58:6,18 63:4 94:7	93:7,12,22 94:7,19	241:2 242:20 243:4,5	232:7 233:7,20 234:6
95:12 237:13	95:2,4,10,21 96:6,12	244:6 246:20	234:14,17 235:8
Jonathan 1:18 115:12	96:18,21 97:13 98:5	kinds 33:3 122:20	237:9,12 238:3,9,13
journal 15:5	98:11,17,20 99:1,5,8	127:17 130:11 150:11	238:15 239:21 240:9
journals 22:3	99:11,19 100:3,16,20	186:2,20 187:2 207:2	240:14,15 241:5,9,16
judgment 10:19	101:1 107:17 108:5	208:20 239:8 241:10	240.14,15 241.3,9,10
Juliet 2:15 3:17 115:7	108:21 109:2,8	242:5	242:11,17,21 243:8
165:2 166:7 178:15	110:14 112:9 115:17	knocking 237:7	
			243:11,21 244:4,4,6,7
184:5	136:11,15 142:14	know 5:2 6:1 8:21 10:12	244:19 246:8 247:6
jump 85:19	143:1 169:9 171:22	12:9 13:1,7,21 20:2	247:19 248:6
jumping 211:4	188:7 246:17	20:12 21:22 28:3,9,15	knowing 162:14 167:12
June 102:1 221:4	keep 28:11 38:5 39:22	29:2 30:1,5,8,21	168:22
jurisdiction 133:16,22	40:1 45:18 95:2 104:5	32:15 34:17 36:5	knowingly 235:21
jurisdictions 129:4	112:16 114:17 117:15	48:21 49:6 50:15 52:3	knowledge 24:5 192:15
130:17 134:10,18,21	122:10 144:8 150:4,9	54:15 60:6 62:19 64:8	known 193:22
135:8 136:3,7,10	168:15 172:17 178:12	70:21,22 72:21 75:5	knows 162:7 204:3
135:8 136:3,7,10 justice 234:12	181:16 213:21 214:17	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6	knows 162:7 204:3 215:10 231:19
justice 234:12	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20	
justice 234:12	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21	215:10 231:19 L
justice 234:12 K K 2:1	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7	215:10 231:19
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7 116:21 117:9,16,17	215:10 231:19 <u>L</u> label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7 116:21 117:9,16,17 120:8 123:10 124:18	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7 116:21 117:9,16,17 120:8 123:10 124:18 127:8 129:8 130:1,6	215:10 231:19 <u>L</u> label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7 116:21 117:9,16,17 120:8 123:10 124:18 127:8 129:8 130:1,6 131:9,17 132:9,21	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7 116:21 117:9,16,17 120:8 123:10 124:18 127:8 129:8 130:1,6 131:9,17 132:9,21 134:5,14 136:5	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7 116:21 117:9,16,17 120:8 123:10 124:18 127:8 129:8 130:1,6 131:9,17 132:9,21 134:5,14 136:5 137:15 138:18 140:9	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7 116:21 117:9,16,17 120:8 123:10 124:18 127:8 129:8 130:1,6 131:9,17 132:9,21 134:5,14 136:5	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7 116:21 117:9,16,17 120:8 123:10 124:18 127:8 129:8 130:1,6 131:9,17 132:9,21 134:5,14 136:5 137:15 138:18 140:9 144:8,9,9,11,14,21 145:2,6,9 146:6,9	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7 116:21 117:9,16,17 120:8 123:10 124:18 127:8 129:8 130:1,6 131:9,17 132:9,21 134:5,14 136:5 137:15 138:18 140:9 144:8,9,9,11,14,21	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7 116:21 117:9,16,17 120:8 123:10 124:18 127:8 129:8 130:1,6 131:9,17 132:9,21 134:5,14 136:5 137:15 138:18 140:9 144:8,9,9,11,14,21 145:2,6,9 146:6,9 147:9,14 148:10 149:4,12,13 150:11	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3 29:20 30:10,14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3 35:2,7,13,15,20 36:4	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5 48:8 51:18 75:10,13	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7 116:21 117:9,16,17 120:8 123:10 124:18 127:8 129:8 130:1,6 131:9,17 132:9,21 134:5,14 136:5 137:15 138:18 140:9 144:8,9,9,11,14,21 145:2,6,9 146:6,9 147:9,14 148:10	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9 140:8 141:13,18
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3 29:20 30:10,14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3 35:2,7,13,15,20 36:4	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5 48:8 51:18 75:10,13 75:16 115:18 145:12	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7 116:21 117:9,16,17 120:8 123:10 124:18 127:8 129:8 130:1,6 131:9,17 132:9,21 134:5,14 136:5 137:15 138:18 140:9 144:8,9,9,11,14,21 145:2,6,9 146:6,9 147:9,14 148:10 149:4,12,13 150:11	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9 140:8 141:13,18 142:19 153:2 165:20
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3 29:20 30:10,14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5 48:8 51:18 75:10,13 75:16 115:18 145:12 147:17 148:22 149:19	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7 116:21 117:9,16,17 120:8 123:10 124:18 127:8 129:8 130:1,6 131:9,17 132:9,21 134:5,14 136:5 137:15 138:18 140:9 144:8,9,9,11,14,21 145:2,6,9 146:6,9 147:9,14 148:10 149:4,12,13 150:11 151:17 152:12,13,21	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9 140:8 141:13,18 142:19 153:2 165:20 226:11,12
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3 29:20 30:10,14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3 35:2,7,13,15,20 36:4 36:8,20 37:1,11,14,17	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5 48:8 51:18 75:10,13 75:16 115:18 145:12 147:17 148:22 149:19 149:22 151:6 152:1	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7 116:21 117:9,16,17 120:8 123:10 124:18 127:8 129:8 130:1,6 131:9,17 132:9,21 134:5,14 136:5 137:15 138:18 140:9 144:8,9,9,11,14,21 145:2,6,9 146:6,9 147:9,14 148:10 149:4,12,13 150:11 151:17 152:12,13,21 156:20 157:8,14	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9 140:8 141:13,18 142:19 153:2 165:20 226:11,12 large 3:3 11:12 13:11
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3 29:20 30:10,14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3 35:2,7,13,15,20 36:4 36:8,20 37:1,11,14,17 38:1,5,9,15 39:2,18	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5 48:8 51:18 75:10,13 75:16 115:18 145:12 147:17 148:22 149:19 149:22 151:6 152:1 152:17 153:5,7	80:6 85:13 92:20 93:6 96:5,9 97:7 104:8,20 105:22 106:10,21 110:7 111:17 112:7 116:21 117:9,16,17 120:8 123:10 124:18 127:8 129:8 130:1,6 131:9,17 132:9,21 134:5,14 136:5 137:15 138:18 140:9 144:8,9,9,11,14,21 145:2,6,9 146:6,9 147:9,14 148:10 149:4,12,13 150:11 151:17 152:12,13,21 156:20 157:8,14 161:5 162:22 163:1,3	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9 140:8 141:13,18 142:19 153:2 165:20 226:11,12 large 3:3 11:12 13:11 216:3
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3 29:20 30:10,14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3 35:2,7,13,15,20 36:4 36:8,20 37:1,11,14,17 38:1,5,9,15 39:2,18 40:17 42:4,9,16 44:15	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5 48:8 51:18 75:10,13 75:16 115:18 145:12 147:17 148:22 149:19 149:22 151:6 152:1 152:17 153:5,7 173:13 210:1	$\begin{array}{c} 80:6\ 85:13\ 92:20\ 93:6\\ 96:5,9\ 97:7\ 104:8,20\\ 105:22\ 106:10,21\\ 110:7\ 111:17\ 112:7\\ 116:21\ 117:9,16,17\\ 120:8\ 123:10\ 124:18\\ 127:8\ 129:8\ 130:1,6\\ 131:9,17\ 132:9,21\\ 134:5,14\ 136:5\\ 137:15\ 138:18\ 140:9\\ 144:8,9,9,11,14,21\\ 145:2,6,9\ 146:6,9\\ 147:9,14\ 148:10\\ 149:4,12,13\ 150:11\\ 151:17\ 152:12,13,21\\ 156:20\ 157:8,14\\ 161:5\ 162:22\ 163:1,3\\ 163:19\ 164:1,12\\ \end{array}$	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9 140:8 141:13,18 142:19 153:2 165:20 226:11,12 large 3:3 11:12 13:11 216:3 largely 46:19
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3 29:20 30:10,14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3 35:2,7,13,15,20 36:4 36:8,20 37:1,11,14,17 38:1,5,9,15 39:2,18 40:17 42:4,9,16 44:15 45:12 46:4 47:16 48:2	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5 48:8 51:18 75:10,13 75:16 115:18 145:12 147:17 148:22 149:19 149:22 151:6 152:1 152:17 153:5,7 173:13 210:1 Kim 87:1	$\begin{array}{c} 80:6\ 85:13\ 92:20\ 93:6\\ 96:5,9\ 97:7\ 104:8,20\\ 105:22\ 106:10,21\\ 110:7\ 111:17\ 112:7\\ 116:21\ 117:9,16,17\\ 120:8\ 123:10\ 124:18\\ 127:8\ 129:8\ 130:1,6\\ 131:9,17\ 132:9,21\\ 134:5,14\ 136:5\\ 137:15\ 138:18\ 140:9\\ 144:8,9,9,11,14,21\\ 145:2,6,9\ 146:6,9\\ 147:9,14\ 148:10\\ 149:4,12,13\ 150:11\\ 151:17\ 152:12,13,21\\ 156:20\ 157:8,14\\ 161:5\ 162:22\ 163:1,3\\ 163:19\ 164:1,12\\ 168:15,16\ 169:13\\ \end{array}$	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9 140:8 141:13,18 142:19 153:2 165:20 226:11,12 large 3:3 11:12 13:11 216:3 largely 46:19 larger 80:8 104:7 114:7
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3 29:20 30:10,14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3 35:2,7,13,15,20 36:4 36:8,20 37:1,11,14,17 38:1,5,9,15 39:2,18 40:17 42:4,9,16 44:15 45:12 46:4 47:16 48:2 48:6 49:10 50:11,21 51:6,10 52:7,19 53:7	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5 48:8 51:18 75:10,13 75:16 115:18 145:12 147:17 148:22 149:19 149:22 151:6 152:1 152:17 153:5,7 173:13 210:1 Kim 87:1 Kimberly 1:16 21:4	$\begin{array}{c} 80:6\ 85:13\ 92:20\ 93:6\\ 96:5,9\ 97:7\ 104:8,20\\ 105:22\ 106:10,21\\ 110:7\ 111:17\ 112:7\\ 116:21\ 117:9,16,17\\ 120:8\ 123:10\ 124:18\\ 127:8\ 129:8\ 130:1,6\\ 131:9,17\ 132:9,21\\ 134:5,14\ 136:5\\ 137:15\ 138:18\ 140:9\\ 144:8,9,9,11,14,21\\ 145:2,6,9\ 146:6,9\\ 147:9,14\ 148:10\\ 149:4,12,13\ 150:11\\ 151:17\ 152:12,13,21\\ 156:20\ 157:8,14\\ 161:5\ 162:22\ 163:1,3\\ 163:19\ 164:1,12\\ 168:15,16\ 169:13\\ 170:2,8\ 171:1\ 174:7,8\\ \end{array}$	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9 140:8 141:13,18 142:19 153:2 165:20 226:11,12 large 3:3 11:12 13:11 216:3 largely 46:19 larger 80:8 104:7 114:7 122:9 149:11 196:10
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3 29:20 30:10,14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3 35:2,7,13,15,20 36:4 36:8,20 37:1,11,14,17 38:1,5,9,15 39:2,18 40:17 42:4,9,16 44:15 45:12 46:4 47:16 48:2 48:6 49:10 50:11,21 51:6,10 52:7,19 53:7 53:10,14,17 54:8,19	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5 48:8 51:18 75:10,13 75:16 115:18 145:12 147:17 148:22 149:19 149:22 151:6 152:1 152:17 153:5,7 173:13 210:1 Kim 87:1 Kimberly 1:16 21:4 29:9 36:10 39:20	$\begin{array}{c} 80:6\ 85:13\ 92:20\ 93:6\\ 96:5,9\ 97:7\ 104:8,20\\ 105:22\ 106:10,21\\ 110:7\ 111:17\ 112:7\\ 116:21\ 117:9,16,17\\ 120:8\ 123:10\ 124:18\\ 127:8\ 129:8\ 130:1,6\\ 131:9,17\ 132:9,21\\ 134:5,14\ 136:5\\ 137:15\ 138:18\ 140:9\\ 144:8,9,9,11,14,21\\ 145:2,6,9\ 146:6,9\\ 147:9,14\ 148:10\\ 149:4,12,13\ 150:11\\ 151:17\ 152:12,13,21\\ 156:20\ 157:8,14\\ 161:5\ 162:22\ 163:1,3\\ 163:19\ 164:1,12\\ 168:15,16\ 169:13\\ 170:2,8\ 171:1\ 174:7,8\\ 174:11\ 175:3,5\end{array}$	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9 140:8 141:13,18 142:19 153:2 165:20 226:11,12 large 3:3 11:12 13:11 216:3 largely 46:19 larger 80:8 104:7 114:7 122:9 149:11 196:10 Lash 2:16 3:2,13 4:3
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3 29:20 30:10,14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3 35:2,7,13,15,20 36:4 36:8,20 37:1,11,14,17 38:1,5,9,15 39:2,18 40:17 42:4,9,16 44:15 45:12 46:4 47:16 48:2 48:6 49:10 50:11,21 51:6,10 52:7,19 53:7 53:10,14,17 54:8,19 55:1,17 56:2,12 58:6	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5 48:8 51:18 75:10,13 75:16 115:18 145:12 147:17 148:22 149:19 149:22 151:6 152:1 152:17 153:5,7 173:13 210:1 Kim 87:1 Kimberly 1:16 21:4 29:9 36:10 39:20 42:11 77:21 84:5,14 113:13 115:7	$\begin{array}{c} 80:6\ 85:13\ 92:20\ 93:6\\ 96:5,9\ 97:7\ 104:8,20\\ 105:22\ 106:10,21\\ 110:7\ 111:17\ 112:7\\ 116:21\ 117:9,16,17\\ 120:8\ 123:10\ 124:18\\ 127:8\ 129:8\ 130:1,6\\ 131:9,17\ 132:9,21\\ 134:5,14\ 136:5\\ 137:15\ 138:18\ 140:9\\ 144:8,9,9,11,14,21\\ 145:2,6,9\ 146:6,9\\ 147:9,14\ 148:10\\ 149:4,12,13\ 150:11\\ 151:17\ 152:12,13,21\\ 156:20\ 157:8,14\\ 161:5\ 162:22\ 163:1,3\\ 163:19\ 164:1,12\\ 168:15,16\ 169:13\\ 170:2,8\ 171:1\ 174:7,8\\ 174:11\ 175:3,5\\ 176:14\ 178:8,12\\ \end{array}$	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9 140:8 141:13,18 142:19 153:2 165:20 226:11,12 large 3:3 11:12 13:11 216:3 largely 46:19 larger 80:8 104:7 114:7 122:9 149:11 196:10 Lash 2:16 3:2,13 4:3 7:9 12:14 23:18 87:10 101:3 103:10 112:20
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3 29:20 30:10,14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3 35:2,7,13,15,20 36:4 36:8,20 37:1,11,14,17 38:1,5,9,15 39:2,18 40:17 42:4,9,16 44:15 45:12 46:4 47:16 48:2 48:6 49:10 50:11,21 51:6,10 52:7,19 53:7 53:10,14,17 54:8,19 55:1,17 56:2,12 58:6 58:11,17,21 59:6,11	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5 48:8 51:18 75:10,13 75:16 115:18 145:12 147:17 148:22 149:19 149:22 151:6 152:1 152:17 153:5,7 173:13 210:1 Kim 87:1 Kimberly 1:16 21:4 29:9 36:10 39:20 42:11 77:21 84:5,14 113:13 115:7 kind 9:18 14:5,6,13	$\begin{array}{c} 80:6\ 85:13\ 92:20\ 93:6\\ 96:5,9\ 97:7\ 104:8,20\\ 105:22\ 106:10,21\\ 110:7\ 111:17\ 112:7\\ 116:21\ 117:9,16,17\\ 120:8\ 123:10\ 124:18\\ 127:8\ 129:8\ 130:1,6\\ 131:9,17\ 132:9,21\\ 134:5,14\ 136:5\\ 137:15\ 138:18\ 140:9\\ 144:8,9,9,11,14,21\\ 145:2,6,9\ 146:6,9\\ 147:9,14\ 148:10\\ 149:4,12,13\ 150:11\\ 151:17\ 152:12,13,21\\ 156:20\ 157:8,14\\ 161:5\ 162:22\ 163:1,3\\ 163:19\ 164:1,12\\ 168:15,16\ 169:13\\ 170:2,8\ 171:1\ 174:7,8\\ 174:11\ 175:3,5\\ 176:14\ 178:8,12\\ 179:12\ 184:11\ 185:2\\ 185:5,8\ 186:16\ 187:9\end{array}$	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9 140:8 141:13,18 142:19 153:2 165:20 226:11,12 large 3:3 11:12 13:11 216:3 largely 46:19 larger 80:8 104:7 114:7 122:9 149:11 196:10 Lash 2:16 3:2,13 4:3 7:9 12:14 23:18 87:10 101:3 103:10 112:20 113:20 114:1,3,6,12
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3 29:20 30:10,14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3 35:2,7,13,15,20 36:4 36:8,20 37:1,11,14,17 38:1,5,9,15 39:2,18 40:17 42:4,9,16 44:15 45:12 46:4 47:16 48:2 48:6 49:10 50:11,21 51:6,10 52:7,19 53:7 53:10,14,17 54:8,19 55:1,17 56:2,12 58:6 58:11,17,21 59:6,11 59:14 60:8 61:21 62:2	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5 48:8 51:18 75:10,13 75:16 115:18 145:12 147:17 148:22 149:19 149:22 151:6 152:1 152:17 153:5,7 173:13 210:1 Kim 87:1 Kimberly 1:16 21:4 29:9 36:10 39:20 42:11 77:21 84:5,14 113:13 115:7 kind 9:18 14:5,6,13 17:2 18:12 19:10 21:6	$\begin{array}{c} 80:6\ 85:13\ 92:20\ 93:6\\ 96:5,9\ 97:7\ 104:8,20\\ 105:22\ 106:10,21\\ 110:7\ 111:17\ 112:7\\ 116:21\ 117:9,16,17\\ 120:8\ 123:10\ 124:18\\ 127:8\ 129:8\ 130:1,6\\ 131:9,17\ 132:9,21\\ 134:5,14\ 136:5\\ 137:15\ 138:18\ 140:9\\ 144:8,9,9,11,14,21\\ 145:2,6,9\ 146:6,9\\ 147:9,14\ 148:10\\ 149:4,12,13\ 150:11\\ 151:17\ 152:12,13,21\\ 156:20\ 157:8,14\\ 161:5\ 162:22\ 163:1,3\\ 163:19\ 164:1,12\\ 168:15,16\ 169:13\\ 170:2,8\ 171:1\ 174:7,8\\ 174:11\ 175:3,5\\ 176:14\ 178:8,12\\ 179:12\ 184:11\ 185:2\\ 185:5,8\ 186:16\ 187:9\\ 187:13,15,21\ 188:2,5\\ \end{array}$	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9 140:8 141:13,18 142:19 153:2 165:20 226:11,12 large 3:3 11:12 13:11 216:3 largely 46:19 larger 80:8 104:7 114:7 122:9 149:11 196:10 Lash 2:16 3:2,13 4:3 7:9 12:14 23:18 87:10 101:3 103:10 112:20 113:20 114:1,3,6,12 114:15 115:17 116:2
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3 29:20 30:10,14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3 35:2,7,13,15,20 36:4 36:8,20 37:1,11,14,17 38:1,5,9,15 39:2,18 40:17 42:4,9,16 44:15 45:12 46:4 47:16 48:2 48:6 49:10 50:11,21 51:6,10 52:7,19 53:7 53:10,14,17 54:8,19 55:1,17 56:2,12 58:6 58:11,17,21 59:6,11 59:14 60:8 61:21 62:2 62:9,14 63:4,8,11,14	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5 48:8 51:18 75:10,13 75:16 115:18 145:12 147:17 148:22 149:19 149:22 151:6 152:1 152:17 153:5,7 173:13 210:1 Kim 87:1 Kimberly 1:16 21:4 29:9 36:10 39:20 42:11 77:21 84:5,14 113:13 115:7 kind 9:18 14:5,6,13 17:2 18:12 19:10 21:6 21:14,17 25:5 27:16	$\begin{array}{c} 80:6\ 85:13\ 92:20\ 93:6\\ 96:5,9\ 97:7\ 104:8,20\\ 105:22\ 106:10,21\\ 110:7\ 111:17\ 112:7\\ 116:21\ 117:9,16,17\\ 120:8\ 123:10\ 124:18\\ 127:8\ 129:8\ 130:1,6\\ 131:9,17\ 132:9,21\\ 134:5,14\ 136:5\\ 137:15\ 138:18\ 140:9\\ 144:8,9,9,11,14,21\\ 145:2,6,9\ 146:6,9\\ 147:9,14\ 148:10\\ 149:4,12,13\ 150:11\\ 151:17\ 152:12,13,21\\ 156:20\ 157:8,14\\ 161:5\ 162:22\ 163:1,3\\ 163:19\ 164:1,12\\ 168:15,16\ 169:13\\ 170:2,8\ 171:1\ 174:7,8\\ 174:11\ 175:3,5\\ 176:14\ 178:8,12\\ 179:12\ 184:11\ 185:2\\ 185:5,8\ 186:16\ 187:9\\ 187:13,15,21\ 188:2,5\\ 188:22\ 189:4,11,13\end{array}$	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9 140:8 141:13,18 142:19 153:2 165:20 226:11,12 large 3:3 11:12 13:11 216:3 largely 46:19 larger 80:8 104:7 114:7 122:9 149:11 196:10 Lash 2:16 3:2,13 4:3 7:9 12:14 23:18 87:10 101:3 103:10 112:20 113:20 114:1,3,6,12 114:15 115:17 116:2 164:17,21 165:12
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3 29:20 30:10,14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3 35:2,7,13,15,20 36:4 36:8,20 37:1,11,14,17 38:1,5,9,15 39:2,18 40:17 42:4,9,16 44:15 45:12 46:4 47:16 48:2 48:6 49:10 50:11,21 51:6,10 52:7,19 53:7 53:10,14,17 54:8,19 55:1,17 56:2,12 58:6 58:11,17,21 59:6,11 59:14 60:8 61:21 62:2 62:9,14 63:4,8,11,14 64:3,12,17,20,22 65:9	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5 48:8 51:18 75:10,13 75:16 115:18 145:12 147:17 148:22 149:19 149:22 151:6 152:1 152:17 153:5,7 173:13 210:1 Kim 87:1 Kimberly 1:16 21:4 29:9 36:10 39:20 42:11 77:21 84:5,14 113:13 115:7 kind 9:18 14:5,6,13 17:2 18:12 19:10 21:6 21:14,17 25:5 27:16 28:5,11 29:4,12 31:22	$\begin{array}{c} 80:6\ 85:13\ 92:20\ 93:6\\ 96:5,9\ 97:7\ 104:8,20\\ 105:22\ 106:10,21\\ 110:7\ 111:17\ 112:7\\ 116:21\ 117:9,16,17\\ 120:8\ 123:10\ 124:18\\ 127:8\ 129:8\ 130:1,6\\ 131:9,17\ 132:9,21\\ 134:5,14\ 136:5\\ 137:15\ 138:18\ 140:9\\ 144:8,9,9,11,14,21\\ 145:2,6,9\ 146:6,9\\ 147:9,14\ 148:10\\ 149:4,12,13\ 150:11\\ 151:17\ 152:12,13,21\\ 156:20\ 157:8,14\\ 161:5\ 162:22\ 163:1,3\\ 163:19\ 164:1,12\\ 168:15,16\ 169:13\\ 170:2,8\ 171:1\ 174:7,8\\ 174:11\ 175:3,5\\ 176:14\ 178:8,12\\ 179:12\ 184:11\ 185:2\\ 185:5,8\ 186:16\ 187:9\\ 187:13,15,21\ 188:2,5\\ 188:22\ 189:4,11,13\\ 189:16,17,20\ 190:1\\ \end{array}$	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9 140:8 141:13,18 142:19 153:2 165:20 226:11,12 large 3:3 11:12 13:11 216:3 largely 46:19 larger 80:8 104:7 114:7 122:9 149:11 196:10 Lash 2:16 3:2,13 4:3 7:9 12:14 23:18 87:10 101:3 103:10 112:20 113:20 114:1,3,6,12 114:15 115:17 116:2 164:17,21 165:12 166:7 170:2 174:7
justice 234:12 K K 2:1 Kaiser 2:5 196:18 201:4 Katz 228:15 Kaye 1:12,15 12:16 14:1 16:16,20 18:3,14 18:19 20:7,10,16 21:3 21:19 22:20 23:4,8 24:18 25:15,20 26:2,6 26:10,15 28:13 29:3 29:20 30:10,14,16 31:17,20 33:6,12 34:3 35:2,7,13,15,20 36:4 36:8,20 37:1,11,14,17 38:1,5,9,15 39:2,18 40:17 42:4,9,16 44:15 45:12 46:4 47:16 48:2 48:6 49:10 50:11,21 51:6,10 52:7,19 53:7 53:10,14,17 54:8,19 55:1,17 56:2,12 58:6 58:11,17,21 59:6,11 59:14 60:8 61:21 62:2 62:9,14 63:4,8,11,14	181:16 213:21 214:17 231:20 keeping 50:2 177:12 197:1 223:22 keeps 187:17 KENDALL 1:21 244:14 kept 125:18 245:15 key 25:11 94:13 182:5 203:7 keys 214:8,10 227:2 Killingsworth 2:1 36:11 38:17 41:2 43:8 48:5 48:8 51:18 75:10,13 75:16 115:18 145:12 147:17 148:22 149:19 149:22 151:6 152:1 152:17 153:5,7 173:13 210:1 Kim 87:1 Kimberly 1:16 21:4 29:9 36:10 39:20 42:11 77:21 84:5,14 113:13 115:7 kind 9:18 14:5,6,13 17:2 18:12 19:10 21:6 21:14,17 25:5 27:16	$\begin{array}{c} 80:6\ 85:13\ 92:20\ 93:6\\ 96:5,9\ 97:7\ 104:8,20\\ 105:22\ 106:10,21\\ 110:7\ 111:17\ 112:7\\ 116:21\ 117:9,16,17\\ 120:8\ 123:10\ 124:18\\ 127:8\ 129:8\ 130:1,6\\ 131:9,17\ 132:9,21\\ 134:5,14\ 136:5\\ 137:15\ 138:18\ 140:9\\ 144:8,9,9,11,14,21\\ 145:2,6,9\ 146:6,9\\ 147:9,14\ 148:10\\ 149:4,12,13\ 150:11\\ 151:17\ 152:12,13,21\\ 156:20\ 157:8,14\\ 161:5\ 162:22\ 163:1,3\\ 163:19\ 164:1,12\\ 168:15,16\ 169:13\\ 170:2,8\ 171:1\ 174:7,8\\ 174:11\ 175:3,5\\ 176:14\ 178:8,12\\ 179:12\ 184:11\ 185:2\\ 185:5,8\ 186:16\ 187:9\\ 187:13,15,21\ 188:2,5\\ 188:22\ 189:4,11,13\end{array}$	215:10 231:19 L label 34:17 97:4,11 labeled 91:8 174:15 labeling 173:8 197:9 lack 128:21 155:21 203:19 Lakin 2:1 21:22 22:11 68:12,14 115:12 206:12 language 61:22 71:9 140:8 141:13,18 142:19 153:2 165:20 226:11,12 large 3:3 11:12 13:11 216:3 largely 46:19 larger 80:8 104:7 114:7 122:9 149:11 196:10 Lash 2:16 3:2,13 4:3 7:9 12:14 23:18 87:10 101:3 103:10 112:20 113:20 114:1,3,6,12 114:15 115:17 116:2 164:17,21 165:12

187:6 194:4.8 244:9 248:5,12,15,18 late 4:8 lately 188:11 laughed 163:22 Laughter 7:8 13:8,22 26:11 56:1 66:12 69:16 71:6 95:3 99:7 235:16 246:13 launch 184:6 laundry 19:10 law 63:18,19,21 lawyers 149:10 lays 22:17 lead 90:18 152:8 leadership 140:16 leading 118:5 174:14 219:18 leads 230:12 learn 49:22 195:19 learned 218:20 219:14 220:18 learning 232:21 237:16 leased 102:4 leave 52:19 74:17 80:10 109:11 111:14 leaving 81:16 led 117:22 118:3 Lee 101:20 left 56:21 59:17 91:4 104:17 105:3 121:2 146:16 167:17 legal 59:1,17 60:4 62:21 63:13,14,17,22 64:2 89:6,9 97:17 115:6 123:18 176:21 177:9 legitimate 235:14 **lend** 173:4,6,7 lens 41:4 199:8 lessons 219:13 222:22 let's 29:5 42:9 48:2 50:21 52:12,19 71:19 74:14 85:11 114:20 133:8 135:6 136:13 146:11 147:15 158:7 159:12 164:17 178:10 178:12 184:6 185:17 193:9 216:18 218:13 242:19 level 9:17 11:3 17:14 21:2 27:1,9,9 28:6,9 36:17,17 37:13 40:9 51:17 53:4 66:5 74:8 74:13,13 82:11 86:4 87:7,8,9,18,20,22 93:16 94:6 100:15 102:18 104:19,19 112:11 128:15 130:15

131:5 137:2 140:15 155:1,5 162:21 165:17 166:20 167:10 167:11 173:20,20 175:6 189:17 206:19 219:16,22 221:21 229:5,6 230:6 238:1 241:14 242:11 levels 10:1,3 17:15,17 20:21 41:19 46:13 103:1 104:1 112:22 113:4 116:8 129:6 130:10 134:15 147:5 193:11 206:19 208:22 224:1 leverage 211:8 leveraged 203:5 levy 205:19 liability 50:13 lien 99:13 life 16:6 32:11 49:5 65:12,17 67:10,10,15 70:4,6,13,16 88:21 133:4 235:13 244:21 light 214:7,8 227:3 liahtly 145:9 207:10 liked 101:6 232:2 limit 104:11 limitations 174:8 208:19 limited 32:20 203:20 line 12:22 26:14 28:17 28:20 33:2 111:12 120:18 121:3 129:8 213:3 224:4 linear 167:17 lines 10:16 224:8 linguistic 165:18 linguistically 140:2 link 161:9 213:14 linkages 149:7 243:15 lip 125:20 list 11:4 15:15 23:5 24:22 25:3 31:9 33:14 48:15,16 71:21 85:12 88:4 103:20 105:1 112:10 128:19 132:19 133:1 138:22 148:1 179:18 181:18.20 189:5 199:4 206:16 247:8 248:4 listed 104:15,16 105:11 154:11 listen 246:4 listening 228:10,11 237:16 244:11 245:22 245:22 listing 43:2 69:4

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

lists 19:10,10 34:7 156:1 literature 5:10 11:15 16:10 19:13,15 24:8 27:16 41:8 181:15 182:1 198:5,6 little 4:11 20:13 25:2 40:19 44:20 45:9 78:15 94:22 96:11 100:8 108:10 125:16 127:2 141:2 144:21 150:7 154:2,14 166:9 167:16 169:6 175:21 176:13 191:10 199:13 201:6 202:19 211:5 232:6 235:5 241:6 245:10 live 32:14 33:3 95:15 114:15 130:11 148:11 148:15 221:4 236:22 **lived** 102:2,3,4,6 lives 65:8,9 173:21 228:22 229:1 243:22 244:20 living 1:6,22 2:7 9:21 223:10 236:21 239:4 loaded 92:10 local 219:22 **locality** 129:19 locally 219:17 locally-based 222:20 located 160:15 location 129:22 log 231:20 232:4 **logic** 107:16 109:17 172:5 176:5,6 177:18 logical 110:1 logs 232:3 long 10:13 23:13 27:12 28:12 54:1 56:5 74:18 77:7 85:3 112:19 118:20 125:20 135:11 136:6 139:21 140:9 145:1,10 157:5 197:1 212:10 222:21 230:4 240:6 241:18 long-term 22:12 191:11 195:15 196:15 197:3 201:21 230:5 235:7 235:14 longer 23:12 75:9 longitudinal 230:8 look 5:6,7 17:3 18:11 41:4 43:16 66:14 92:18 103:20 104:1 105:1 131:1 132:12 137:16,20 138:1 145:6 149:14 157:18

169:14 171:5 176:4 190:14 191:5,12,22 193:15,17 195:8 196:3,10,14 197:7 198:9 200:10 204:22 206:9 210:9 212:11 214:7,7 215:4 216:1 216:15 217:11 218:9 218:10 229:16 247:19 248:15 looked 7:3 14:21 17:13 22:18,21 23:5 148:2 154:7 173:15 192:21 212:5,10 looking 14:21 18:7 19:18 30:3 37:3 38:21 40:6 41:19 43:9 46:6 46:13 57:17 97:15 104:17 105:10 123:22 130:16 147:13 149:6 149:17 184:22 187:14 193:4,18,19 194:21 198:6 206:5 212:6 215:3,15,22 216:11 220:2.9 looks 7:17 21:10 148:20 217:14 231:10 Lorraine 2:8 25:6 115:19 158:8 Los 131:10 lose 33:21 37:9 54:1 60:11 62:12 77:3 91:6 108:13 122:16 199:20 losing 76:5 87:4 lost 37:6 122:21 123:5 150:16 158:14 215:7 lot 4:9 9:16 11:6 23:5 29:5 31:9 32:9,18 34:6 37:2 41:10 48:15 48:16,21,22 49:1,20 54:12 60:11 75:4 85:4 86:2 92:16 100:8,13 100:18 105:19 109:3 110:21 116:11 117:11 118:16,22 125:14 126:10 137:14 147:1 152:15 156:8 158:18 164:7,8,21 171:7 172:13 175:14 180:21 186:8 190:4 191:12 192:13 193:2 195:16 195:18 201:9 203:1,1 205:3,16,17,18 209:3 210:7,20 212:15,15 213:8 214:14,20 217:2,8,18 218:20 219:10 220:18 223:8 229:11 232:21 234:7

234:14 235:2.9 237:6 237:11,18 238:11 241:10 243:13 247:21 lots 145:4 210:4 230:9 247:10 love 26:4 124:13 lovely 7:9 low 7:12 139:11 low-quality 77:13 lower 193:12 LTSS 5:3 14:11 22:9 186:18 189:20 195:1 199:12 203:2 **lump** 11:4 lunch 11:21,22 113:7,8 114:7 Luz 2:3 51:11 52:3 61:22 62:3,10 70:2,10 79:6,9 82:17,21 83:8 83:15 84:2 90:16 95:5 115:22 124:13 133:12 134:19 157:5 158:3 158:22 232:16 Μ **MA** 1:21 2:3,4 macro 9:19 magnitude 11:3 main 23:9 170:15 178:8 maior 179:1 185:22 207:18 218:15 majority 198:4 makers 216:5 making 6:13 14:18 21:20 32:22 44:3 94:14 123:21 132:18 150:13 152:6 managed 191:20 196:10 216:6 219:12 219:14 224:15 management 32:3 41:12 43:15 186:9 manager 2:14,15 231:11 managers 231:6 managing 13:3 152:14 manner 157:10 map 182:12 207:8 March 180:14 **MARCIA** 2:13 marginalizes 236:10 marketing 75:3 226:5 Markwood 2:3 42:20 74:3,11 84:8 98:18,22 116:1 131:16 158:17 218:17 Mary 2:9 35:17 74:14 79:4 81:14 101:20

115:13 176:8 Mary's 175:20 Massachusetts 1:18 massive 184:22 master 202:10,11 mastery 165:17 match 16:12 matched 17:4 material 25:3 materials 248:13 matrix 141:18 matter 61:15 103:7 114:21 230:16 245:2 248:19 matters 96:2,10,12 175:17 maximize 8:11 235:22 **MBA** 2:5,13 McCANN 2:4 12:21 13:5,9 20:19 34:22 35:6,10,14 36:3,6 72:7 89:4 116:1 190:5 MD 2:5,7 meals 224:19 231:21,22 mean 13:2 14:14 17:7 19:2,5,21 24:22 29:9 30:17 31:4,17 34:19 34:20 37:4,9 38:10 44:8 48:9,18 49:16 51:7,8 54:12 55:3 58:13 59:21 61:4,5,8 61:8 62:15,21 63:17 65:19 68:20 69:5 70:5 70:10,19 71:4,10,20 71:21 72:19 73:3 74:18 76:14 79:14 81:9 82:7,12 85:4 86:15 88:14 91:21 92:5 93:14,22 94:22 96:6 98:1 100:13 106:18 107:5 109:17 119:22 121:5 128:14 131:1 135:15 137:14 137:20 143:12.18 156:5 157:7 164:9 169:11 172:4,15 176:12,14 178:5 184:1 188:16 189:19 192:1,13 201:6 203:17 209:15 232:2 237:7 240:18 241:5 243:7 248:3 meaning 92:14 94:12 161:18 meaningful 6:16,16,21 9:20 55:10 94:11,16 95:13 97:1 125:18 227:11

means 32:7 35:21 36:1 37:7 49:21 61:4 75:4 80:3 81:20 94:5 124:17 141:10 204:17 meant 120:9,12 122:19 150:19 measurable 204:21 measure 1:5 9:7 46:14 47:10,12,15 48:13 67:6 77:9 87:7 112:15 147:11 154:8 155:5 162:21 179:11 182:17 182:22 189:5 191:11 199:7 204:15 211:21 212:3 213:16 214:2 215:20 217:10,15 226:2 228:17 232:13 234:5 measured 77:8 87:8 181:15 198:20 199:9 202:7 210:10 223:16 234:15 measurement 2:13 3:3 3:6,20 4:14 5:22 6:2,9 6:10,15,20 7:1,15 8:3 9:13 10:2,5 11:12,19 13:16,17,17 14:11 86:3 87:20 112:21 126:14 167:21 170:17 175:6,13 182:19 185:4,8,10 190:8 194:16 202:19 204:15 205:9 214:1 215:12 225:11 226:16.20 227:8,11 228:13 233:21 measurements 194:12 204:5 211:17 213:22 222:7 measures 7:11 44:5 49:13 82:19 112:19 126:11 137:9 172:14 173:5,6,7 179:4,13,19 181:13 182:10,15 183:3 186:2,7,12,22 187:2,11,18 191:19 194:2 195:8 196:2 197:21 198:12 199:18 203:21 206:22 207:7 207:12,22 208:2 209:12 214:4 215:13 216:21 217:1,6,17 223:8 228:15 229:5 230:4 232:11 238:11 measuring 6:4 17:16 42:2 154:15 219:3 228:18

meanings 69:1

mechanism 106:22 mechanisms 124:1 167:2 **MEd** 2:6 mediate 54:6 Medicaid 130:13 131:4 138:18 191:7 206:7 229:15 Medicaid-funded 52:1 medical 1:18 13:10 27:3 45:20 Medicare 138:18 206:7 meet 9:14 161:8,11 209:1 233:12 247:18 meeting 1:3 10:13 11:15 12:8 93:18,20 97:5,6 115:4 116:12 117:14 138:11 154:11 154:11 168:10 178:13 178:22 180:3 184:12 207:10 233:8,19 244:12 246:3 247:20 248:13 megabytes 227:10 **meld** 43:6 member 13:5.9 17:9.18 18:1,7 20:3,9,14,17 20:19 21:5,22 22:11 25:8,18,22 26:4,8,12 26:19 28:15 29:18,22 30:13,15 31:3,19,22 33:20 34:22 35:6,10 35:14,18 36:3,6,11 37:4,13,16,19 38:2,7 38:10,17 39:4,21 40:18 41:2 42:13,20 43:8 44:19 45:14 46:5 48:4,5,8 49:15 50:12 51:4,7,11,18 52:3,22 53:3,9,11,19,21,22 54:9,21 55:3,12,19 56:10,13 58:10,13 59:4,8,16 60:10 61:3 61:12,22 62:3,10 63:5 63:12,16 64:9,14,19 65:10,22 66:15,18,22 67:3,19 68:2,8,12,14 68:20 69:13 70:2,10 70:19 71:4,7 72:7,17 73:2,7,10,11 74:3,11 74:16,20 75:2,10,13 75:16 76:3,16,21 77:1 77:2,7,13,17,22 79:3 79:6,9,18 81:13,15,19 82:2,4,7,15,17,21 83:8,15 84:2,8,15,21 85:19,22 86:8,11,14 86:18,21 88:8,13,17

		400 47 400 0 404 47
	89:4,11 90:16 91:15	183:17 188:2 194:17
	92:3 93:10,13 94:4,9	201:11 202:4 206:17
	94:21 95:5,11 96:1,9	208:11 214:16 221:3
	96:15,19,22 97:14	226:12 229:12
	98:8,12,14,18,22	mentioning 19:20
	102:3 103:18 106:13	MENTOR 2:6
	107:1,5,8 108:3,7,18	merging 82:14 159:14
	109:1,4,14,21 110:16	merit 78:20 110:2
	112:3 113:14,21	message 6:5
	114:2,4,10,14 118:2	messaging 237:6,11
	119:13,17,21 120:5,8	messy 245:10
	120:10,11,13 121:4	met 1:11 115:3 155:14
	121:16 122:7 123:12	155:15 243:14
	123:13,15 124:3,13	meta-analysis 101:9
	124:19 125:5,15	metaphor 227:4
	126:22 128:5 129:15	methodological 198:2
	130:18 131:16 132:5	208:13
	132:17 133:12 134:19	methodology 3:15 12:4
	135:9,22 136:4	24:13
	140:22 141:22 143:3	metric 47:8
	144:16,19 145:12	metrics 40:8
	146:4,19 147:17	MHSP 216:12
	148:22 149:2,19,22	Miami 1:16
	150:18 151:6,8 152:1	mic 66:11 68:18 184:4
	152:4,17 153:1,5,6,7	Michael 67:18 205:4
	153:22 155:8,11,19	Michigan 2:3
	156:3,18 157:5,16	microphone 68:17
	158:3,9,17,22 159:15	69:15
	169:18 170:10 171:3	middle 110:10 220:21
	172:4,19 173:13	Mike 2:7 31:2,21 33:6
	174:18 176:2,9,15,19	34:12 45:13 54:19
	176:21 177:1,4	
		69:9,12,18 73:11 82:6
	185:20,22 190:5	108:6 116:1 217:13
	192:12 194:7,11	227:6 244:9 246:2
	197:17 199:14,17	million 101:22
	201:2 204:10 206:12	mind 114:17 186:1
	210:1 212:14 214:13	194:5 196:5 211:18
	218:17 220:17 223:6	213:21
	224:2 227:13 232:16	mindful 65:16 140:2
	234:20 235:17 237:13	mine 26:16 123:16
	240:9 244:14 248:1	227:6
	248:11,14,17	minefield 65:15
	members 47:3 72:9	minimize 25:14
	80:3 103:16,17	minimum 46:20 52:2
	106:15 107:2,13,21	121:9 129:18 130:2,3
	132:1 141:14 142:1	Minnesota 101:21
	142:12 152:14 155:6	minute 11:8 19:19 84:9
	163:17 166:8 181:19	185:19
	211:10 216:6 222:15	minutes 93:20 114:6
	mental 2:9 57:6,8 62:7	117:4 166:11
	144:4 152:15 215:8	miserably 97:7
	215:16,18 216:8,13	misfortune 128:4
	216:18,18,19,21	missing 19:12 117:19
	218:5 223:21	149:15 168:6
	mention 22:11 38:18	Missouri 2:9
	213:21 214:15	misunderstanding
	mentioned 83:9 117:20	236:12
	159:13 162:2 176:3	mitigation 182:17
		l

mix 88:14 102:19 MLTSS 187:12 **mode** 245:22 **model** 120:9 172:5 176:5.6 models 120:12 121:19 236:19 modes 6:4 modify 79:14 138:9 modulize 54:3 Mohanty 2:5 20:3,9,14 20:17 44:19 54:9,21 55:3,12 97:14 98:8,14 115:13 152:4 201:2 moment 17:3 42:10 money 188:21 226:4 months 163:3 179:3 200:11 morning 4:4 5:9 10:10 11:17 44:18 126:3 Morrissey 2:6 39:4 53:3 53:19,22 58:20 64:14 64:19 65:7 92:3 107:8 108:3,18 109:1,4 115:18 237:13 motion 84:18 move 14:4 17:1 29:3 59:6 60:3 80:22 83:4 84:13 117:5 122:5 129:7,12 131:8 133:8 136:13 146:11 147:16 173:18 176:4 195:2 209:4 210:15 212:12 225:20 moved 79:13,21 235:10 moving 56:6 59:21 60:3 83:16 86:1 131:10 165:5 176:9 177:1 220:6 223:22 236:3 242:5 **MPA** 1:19 2:6 **MPH** 1:18,20 2:5 **MPP** 1:21 **MSW** 1:15 multiple 4:22 9:8 10:4 122:1 133:21 165:21 244:20 245:21 muted 13:1 mutually 101:10,13 154:3 Ν **N.W** 1:12 Nadine 2:14 115:21 165:1 nail 7:18 name 34:16

narrow 89:15 narrowed 23:11 narrowly 154:16 198:10 **national** 1:1,11,17,19 2:1,3 186:6 188:13 217:1 222:18 223:2 238:5 nationally 166:19 230:4 natural 89:13 108:3 110:3,8,12 nature 21:9 186:15 NCI 22:19 188:1 208:3 221:3 238:8 NCIAD 221:3 NCQA 203:18 Ne'eman 2:6 45:13 46:5 55:6,14 62:20 63:10 67:14 69:8,10 71:12 88:20 90:3,9,19 115:14 128:3 130:5 130:22 131:22 132:15 133:1,10 134:8 135:3 135:21 136:2,6,13,18 137:19 138:5 139:1 141:11 142:9.18 145:20 146:14 189:9 near 48:15 188:6 207:10 233:3 necessarily 27:14 121:14 142:4 148:16 154:3.22 169:14 203:12 219:16 necessary 95:1 139:22 need 5:19 8:16 12:20 13:19 17:6 20:11 23:21 25:12 30:17 33:1,16 42:1 50:18 57:9 60:16 62:18 69:3 78:2 79:13 80:18 84:22 96:19 97:11 104:4 113:9 114:16 126:10 131:8 134:5 135:19 137:9 138:9 144:8.14 148:8 150:12 151:4 153:2 153:17 159:13 165:3 166:12 178:11 181:9 184:11 185:19 186:12 189:9 193:16 194:2 206:19 207:19 209:19 211:14 220:14,15 222:1,11 225:20 226:17 238:4 239:8 239:14,15 240:2 242:4,12 243:1,2 244:5 247:12 248:4 needed 4:21 61:2 122:19 241:15

narrative 179:21

needing 236:22 needs 9:14 33:5 41:21 48:19 71:17 88:19 134:13 136:5 141:8 142:7 151:4 152:7,19 152:20 155:15 160:18 160:19 162:7,14 163:11,12,13 166:5 170:7 180:20 199:8 202:1 219:7 220:8 225:11 242:9 neglect 10:21 91:12 125:12 153:16 negotiate 54:6 neighbor 80:12 108:3 neighbors 80:4 net 215:3 network 2:6,6 46:7 139:8 161:7 **networks** 41:10 never 196:5 205:22 210:15 243:3 new 11:9 38:7,13 93:9 185:14 201:4 204:14 212:3.4 224:8 229:5 236:19 newspaper 96:16 nice 4:13 19:8,11 67:11 nicely 159:16 Nielsen 231:18 232:5,6 Nielsens 231:19 night 4:5 91:4 168:2 197:1 nine 48:10 nod 81:14 nodding 37:2,3 68:11 85:17 132:3 nods 29:5 33:12 99:2 nomination 248:8 non 88:9 non-family 80:3 89:1 109:16 nonpaid 106:14,15,16 noon 113:6 Northern 2:5 note 33:20 125:3 132:3 133:6 144:14 146:21 152:3 156:14 157:4 175:11 194:6 notes 104:6 139:2 140:11 146:1 notice 147:20 148:7 noticed 203:4 242:3 notion 53:12 66:3,4 148:10 156:9 160:9 160:21 161:11.16 162:13,19 225:14 **November** 180:12

183:18 NQF 2:12 4:8 7:2 103:17 169:10 179:2 180:14 181:17 182:21 183:6,22 207:11,21 217:15 218:7 237:17 245:14 246:8 NQQA 191:20 nuanced 87:18 nuances 11:6 221:9 number 31:5 43:10 46:17 47:2 102:8 119:1 128:2 165:10 179:13 212:22 213:10 222:14,17,19 238:7,8 numbers 139:9 248:7 nurse 45:6 nursing 95:16 223:17 236:16 nutshell 167:7 0

O-F 3:1 **O&C** 138:14 object 19:5 42:18,21 47:21 48:7 56:14 136:17 objection 49:11 59:14 62:17 88:7 132:1,15 134:8 objections 99:3 objective 87:11 objectives 182:10 247:19,20 objects 244:5 **obligation** 51:20,22 97:22 observation 171:1 observations 185:7 observer 103:18 obtain 116:18 obvious 228:2 obviously 61:9 97:16 126:15 144:8 178:20 188:1 221:2 222:18 223:16 228:1 occur 238:1 occurred 32:19 107:16 170:19 occurs 32:5 offer 12:3 87:10 197:18 201:20 offline 116:9 oftentimes 27:5 oh 23:7 37:7,20 59:21 66:13,17 92:20 93:18 108:14 126:20 203:7 Ohio 131:2 230:8

okay 12:14 26:15 29:5 29:17,18,20 30:14 31:20 33:6 34:12,14 35:14 36:3 37:5 44:15 45:12 46:4 50:21 51:6 53:18 56:3 58:18,21 64:3,4,20,22 65:2 66:21 69:11,14,17 70:3 71:20 72:13 74:19 76:7,9 77:20 79:4 81:14 82:16 84:13,21 85:18 86:22 91:1 94:6,6,17 95:5,6 95:10 98:5 99:8,18 100:19,22 101:3 105:17 106:6 112:3,3 112:9 114:2,10,20 116:2 118:6 119:10 119:13,19 120:10,13 122:5,7 123:14 124:11 125:16 126:19 128:1 136:3 146:3.11 147:15 148:20 149:20 153:6,7,20 158:16 159:11 164:9,14,20 165:12 178:3.10 228:14 old 13:14 37:7 38:10 97:3 187:14 older 4:21 15:11 140:11 oldest 228:15 ombudsman 124:4,6 omitted 25:1 onboard 33:7 **ONC** 226:10 **Once** 196:12 one-liner 34:1 one-to-one 24:20 ones 15:17 16:10 23:1 23:2 25:1 189:7 215:15 onus 21:15 open 17:1 92:18 99:12 operate 10:2 27:1 43:11 87:19 operated 41:11 operating 9:17 operational 180:8 181:12 operationalize 185:11 186:3 operationalizing 174:21 operations 53:2 **Operator** 165:5,8 opinion 13:7 141:17 opportunities 8:2 127:19 148:12 150:17

202:2 212:2 221:17 opportunity 3:5,9 36:13 94:13 103:20 114:8 116:15 211:6 234:3 opposed 35:22 149:17 162:16 optimistic 213:11 order 85:22 151:3 197:6 235:22 246:6 organization 13:14 52:5 160:11 202:8 organizational 51:14 51:16 52:5 64:15,15 64:17 organizations 52:6 54:13 55:8,9,11 196:10 219:1 220:13 238:5 organized 100:6 101:19 167:8 182:1 183:3 245:15 original 148:1 188:17 198:16 **Oser** 115:8 Ostrovsky 2:7 26:19 33:20 45:14 55:19 66:22 67:3 70:19 115:8 129:15 138:8 146:19 224:2 other's 234:19 ought 48:19,21 49:4 outcome 80:22 151:20 154:12 155:12 171:5 171:7,11 172:12,15 173:2.7 176:16 178:8 187:22 191:19 217:1 outcomes 8:9 10:8 18:21 57:1,4 102:20 102:21 154:8 159:9 167:4,11 171:13,18 171:21 172:9,21 173:18,21 174:2,14 174:22 175:1,7 176:4 176:10,12 177:2,6,20 177:20,22 193:8,9 205:21 206:20 207:2 221:22 224:6 242:15 outdone 223:7 outputs 171:13 176:5 outreach 181:7 outset 247:20 outside 176:10 224:8 224:11 over-medicalizing 8:17 overall 39:15 57:20 125:9 163:5 overarching 179:6 overlap 122:8 123:3

125:6.14 137:20 138:20 159:14 161:4 168:22 overlapping 87:17 overlaps 137:17 overly 167:1 oversimplify 45:18 overstretched 219:6 owned 102:4 127:2 ownership 39:6,16 42:6 52:14 92:10,19 93:10 94:20,22 95:5,15,18 97:8,15 98:1,2 99:16 102:13 126:4 127:7 127:11 Oxford 2:7 31:22 37:4 37:13,16 49:15 50:12 51:4,7 59:16 63:12,16 64:9 67:19 69:13 71:4 71:7 73:2,7,10 75:2 76:21 77:2,7,13,17 81:13 82:7,15 88:8,13 93:10,13 94:4 108:7 109:14 116:1 121:4 130:18 149:2 170:10 176:15.21 177:4 240:9 248:1,11,14,17 Ρ P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 4:1 **p.m** 115:1 248:20 **PACE** 13:16 package 149:17 packet 22:17 page 23:13 31:14 123:9 paid 46:12,18 80:7 88:16,17 103:2 106:14,20 107:2,14 107:22 108:8,16 109:16,19 110:2,18 111:2,3,5,6,19 112:5 125:20 painfully 192:8 paper 116:11 184:20 papers 189:18 paradigm 41:22 paradox 228:9 paradoxes 228:11 parens 124:22 parent 55:9 parentheses 166:5 park 42:9 parking 105:18 parse 128:8 parsed 160:1 part 20:5,5 33:4 36:14 41:3,22 48:8 82:18

(202) 234-4433

84:2 87:11 91:11 96:4 117:9 131:18 140:17 144:4,19 151:10 155:13 157:15 158:19 160:21 173:17 190:22 192:22 212:17 220:12 222:5,16 227:15 236:9 237:16 244:22 partaking 54:15 participant 1:17 16:14 34:17 36:14 40:10,11 53:1 92:8 96:2,10 127:20 198:19 participant's 157:21 participants 58:1 127:15 189:20,21 200:10 204:19 230:22 participate 39:9 94:13 127:6 participating 52:15 participation 8:11 35:19,21,22 36:1,2,4 36:7 65:4 67:17,21 68:1,5,6,6,7,22 69:8 94:11,12,16,16 97:1 125:21 126:8 247:14 particular 85:5 95:20 146:22 154:18 194:4 205:12 243:5 particularly 24:6 30:2 46:15 187:11 208:18 218:3 224:17 230:17 233:4 240:12 parting 184:9 partnering 204:6 partnerships 238:18 parts 245:8 pass 136:17 passed 150:3 path 6:7 170:9 235:4 patient 28:9 58:1 patterns 24:15 Patti 2:1 36:9 38:15 40:20 42:13,22 74:4 115:18 145:11 173:12 176:3 219:20 230:14 Patti's 51:12 pay 151:2 payer 225:8 payers 100:12 139:4 225:13 paying 27:6 payment 4:14 6:15 7:21 110:19 payroll 191:11,13 pays 232:5 PCAs 233:5,16 234:1 PCORI 192:1

peer 7:21 peer-reviewed 15:5 peg 50:19 Pennsylvania 2:10 people 4:22 5:1 6:13 8:10 13:7 24:17 32:22 33:7 36:20 37:2,2,3 38:22 42:18 44:12 46:21 47:3,21 48:6,11 48:16 50:1 51:3 52:4 52:15 53:11 54:4 59:8 62:5 65:3 66:5 69:5 75:5 80:2,7,9,11 84:22 85:1 91:13 93:15,20 101:22 102:7,22 105:17 106:7 109:3 112:16 116:5 120:14.16 125:19 126:12 134:14 137:13 141:7 143:4,9 143:22 144:11 150:12 155:2 163:19 168:19 170:15,18,22 171:17 172:3,8 175:16 176:17,22 178:11 181:9 188:14.15 189:11,12,15 190:17 190:20 193:9 195:2 198:21 199:10 200:2 204:3 205:3 208:16 208:19 209:7 212:15 213:4,10 217:18 223:5,20 225:18 227:16,16 228:3,10 232:2,5 235:8,11,11 235:12 236:11,15,17 237:2,4,7,9,9,11 239:1 241:3,7 243:10 243:20,22,22 244:4 people's 105:17 173:21 peoples 117:17 percent 13:12 80:5 95:16,17 102:2,3,4,6 percentage 47:14 perfect 110:17 111:1,10 217:2 performance 1:5 6:9,17 7:12 8:3 17:10,12,13 17:13,16 18:4,20,20 18:21,21 20:20 43:16 64:10,12,15,19 65:1 73:3,13,15,17,22 74:1 74:6,6 115:11 136:21 154:21 158:10 159:3 182:19 211:1,21 215:11 216:20 222:16 performed 80:21 81:3 performing 40:7

period 11:16 163:2 181:6 183:19 Permanente 2:5 201:4 permission 59:22 person 21:10,11 34:22 35:3 37:1,8 40:20 43:18 48:22 72:20 97:5 100:11 121:12 157:10 160:11 161:22 162:7 188:8,21 195:6 196:11,12,13 229:1 person's 43:17 48:12 145:18 person-center 44:10 person-centered 37:21 57:21 97:3,6 162:13 192:2 204:17 person-centeredness 56:9 204:20 person-driven 36:15 56:6 person-reported 15:22 221:22 personal 141:16 161:19 188:19 197:19 205:21 personally 68:3 168:17 169:3 240:15 personnel 47:14 persons 223:10 perspective 8:22 14:22 43:18 48:12 119:11 124:5 145:17,19 157:22 161:19 162:3 190:6 196:3 218:22 perspectives 218:21 220:19 pertains 148:14 **PES** 198:16 phase 180:2 181:17,22 182:5 183:7 196:5 **PhD** 1:14,15,15,18 2:1,3 2:8,9,10,13 **Phillips** 2:8 25:8,18,22 26:4,8,12 115:19 158:9 223:6 philosophies 9:12 phone 12:22 119:18 165:6 248:7 phrase 33:14 56:4 66:8 74:10 phrasing 82:1 physical 10:20 25:10 91:13,15,17 101:17 115:15 152:15 153:8 160:5 176:16 177:8 188:14 203:20 221:10 223:20 physical/emotional

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

91:10 **physically** 160:10,15 physician 45:5 **pick** 69:3,7,9 104:4 121:12 214:21 215:1 picky 124:15 picture 9:19 173:15 247:9 pictures 173:14 pie 237:20 piece 50:3 54:10 59:18 60:5 68:3 73:13 150:14,15 158:1 177:2 180:16 182:8 203:13 pieces 15:10 183:16 201:6 230:13 place 10:4 41:13 43:13 43:13 57:9,22 85:6 124:1 194:13 222:12 235:1 237:8 placed 138:15 places 10:4 31:8 148:8 153:17 174:16 208:21 214:11 243:4 plain 71:9 plan 17:15 87:21 138:2 163:15,20 164:1 201:18,20 202:10 203:8 planning 16:14 37:8,21 97:4,6 150:13,20 201:17 204:17 236:6 plans 12:10 192:1 202:6 211:1 221:15 222:4,13,18,19,20 229:21 platform 165:15 play 27:22 148:12 players 6:2 plays 128:22 please 4:19 17:7 26:17 68:17 85:21 112:13 112:15 123:14 141:15 146:17 165:9 pleased 13:18 plucked 217:6 plus 28:22 pockets 192:18 point 11:21 15:18 16:16 27:15 30:7 33:10 39:4 45:15 50:17 54:1 64:9 72:3 85:22 92:4 97:17 107:9,13 108:18 132:6,16,18,22 134:2 139:2,4 143:10 145:21 157:17 158:18 169:10 173:18 174:2

174:5 175:13 178:2 184:11 185:1 188:5 198:2 216:2 218:14 219:11 223:19 235:12 240:3 pointed 118:3 pointing 176:11 points 21:20 67:12 83:9 135:11 224:3 237:15 policies 189:16 191:10 policy 1:21 7:21 59:22 216:5 political 130:20 242:15 poor 83:2 population 9:15 135:15 218:4 239:22 240:1 populations 129:22 133:15,16,21,21 134:5,12,21 135:4,6 136:8 145:4,5,8 147:8 191:22 195:1 214:19 215:20 218:10,13 223:10 239:22 portability 130:13 **position** 143:15 **positive** 186:5 214:4,10 possession 93:2,2 possibility 21:4 235:21 possible 34:11 190:19 191:6 206:21 241:12 **possibly** 118:18 213:9 post 199:21 **post-acute** 194:22 potential 106:4 161:12 211:7 potentially 6:15 107:20 **Potter** 2:19 195:13 197:22 246:1 pound 50:19 power 92:14 powerful 92:9 225:5 PowerPoint 174:8 practical 236:5 practice 208:3 practices 155:21 156:5 156:6,8 157:21 197:3 237:22 238:3,7 precise 69:1 predefined 181:18 182:22 predominantly 224:7 prefer 74:17 234:22 preferences 47:4 139:16 142:11 154:12 155:14 160:21 162:8 162:14 236:13 preferred 165:20 premature 30:8

premise 53:4 preparation 168:12 preparers 225:6 preparing 180:3 presence 121:22 present 1:14 2:17,21 8:13 117:16 160:10 174:12 244:17 presentation 246:19 presentations 213:1 presented 115:4 206:15 213:2 President 2:13 presiding 1:13 press 165:9 presumably 107:20 pretty 16:4 18:10 25:4 80:1 118:7 139:21 145:10,15 169:12 170:14 192:16 201:10 204:3 216:21 231:10 237:20 238:9 246:21 246:22 prevailed 237:3 preventing 223:17 preventive 177:11 preview 4:18 178:16 previous 36:12 179:11 primarily 106:10 167:9 195:22 primary 8:9 143:21 151:19 167:3 principle 236:13 prior 11:15 47:7 priorities 180:17 244:20 prioritization 10:11 180:16 priority 140:19 privacy 58:22 60:21 61:18 62:4,11 139:16 privacy/dignity 61:17 privacy/dignity/respect 60:12 63:1 private 160:9 privately 141:1 privatization 242:8 privatize 242:18 privatized 242:13 privilege 232:17 probably 9:11 11:20 33:4 39:17 40:3 46:19 75:5 77:10 78:14 80:4 110:11 111:1 113:17 118:8 120:3 122:11 126:2,13 132:19 134:10 140:22 148:17 152:17 156:16 163:7

168:7 187:16 190:5 190:21 193:22 195:13 203:17 210:4 211:4 212:14 214:11 215:9 218:5 problem 57:19 85:11 93:18 246:12 problems 208:15 process 24:3 30:22 33:21 94:12,14 96:4 128:17 151:15 163:8 166:2 173:2,6 178:17 179:20 187:11 192:10 204:8 205:6 206:22 232:10,15,20 233:6 248:9 processes 10:7 57:5 138:19 192:7 produce 224:7 product 168:1 productivity 65:4 **products** 116:12 178:18 professional 158:11 professionals 235:19 profiling 200:18 program 7:22 16:15 18:20 25:12 35:5,11 52:17 59:22 60:15 120:11 121:2,8 122:4 124:4,6 149:18 163:1 189:14 240:21 241:4 programming 34:19 programs 14:21 16:15 32:9 49:19 51:22 52:1 121:13 122:1.3 170:16 199:6 200:21 211:2 224:19 243:21 progress 114:19 188:10 project 2:14,14,15 5:4 5:16 12:5 100:10 178:17 179:17 186:6 199:13 200:1 206:1 244:13 promising 182:14 185:9 194:12 204:14 205:9 promoting 223:11 proposal 105:16 proposals 118:17 propose 47:17 96:6 227:5 proposed 58:12 88:5 proprietor 93:3 proprietorship 93:3 prosperous 239:6

protection 149:9

proven 224:16 provide 47:6 51:21 111:8 112:6 162:10 162:12 183:11,15 213:12 222:21 223:1 223:3 provided 23:17 161:10 provider 13:11 17:15 38:20,21,22 40:20 41:9 43:4,16 44:2,6 44:21 45:1,5,10 46:6 47:10 51:19 52:6 55:8 60:16,18,18,19,20 61:5,16,18 63:2 139:8 145:17 147:10 161:7 225:4,9 240:21 provider's 61:19 provider-driven 56:22 providers 9:2,3 41:11 41:13,20 42:3,17 43:1 43:10,11 44:10 45:7,8 45:17,21 46:7 51:1,3 51:14,15 80:7 89:2 139:9,11,13,15,17 140:1,3 166:6 208:5 216:5 224:6 225:8,13 231:4,14 239:17 241:5,10 provides 225:1 providing 39:1 48:22 102:7 151:1 181:2 241:4 242:12 provision 129:7 177:17 proxies 208:15 proximity 160:3 psychology-literatur... 70:20 **public** 1:21 3:5,9 11:16 69:1 99:9,13 106:1 160:9 164:17 165:7 165:10 166:8 181:3,5 181:19 183:14,19 221:5 publication 96:16 publications 226:13 publish 189:18 published 15:4 182:7 198:10 pull 16:11 161:17 169:5 248:9 pulled 15:13 16:7 191:21 201:20 pulling 87:5 222:10 purchase 205:14 purchased 205:13 purchasing 205:13 pure 196:1 purple 174:15

purpose 151:19 197:13 200:18 purposes 135:13 225:11 pursue 32:13 purview 148:18 push 67:14 79:21 109:11 126:4 put 8:4 14:6 19:2 25:16 31:8 47:19 50:8 62:12 64:10 73:8 74:9 90:6 105:18 106:9 107:9 110:18 116:10 118:14 120:21,22 124:21 141:18 142:20 143:15 149:16 168:21 171:19 171:20 172:5 175:4 177:5 180:2 181:8 200:17 216:7 248:10 puts 21:14 172:2 putting 11:1 92:21 96:16 107:15 178:6 215:11 puzzled 177:3 pyramid 170:22 pyramids 168:2

Q QM 222:16 qualities 159:19.20 quality 1:1,3,11 2:13 4:20,21 5:3,15,20,22 6:2,4,8,12,19 7:15,19 8:5,13 14:11 15:13 16:6,6 19:8 22:9 24:17 29:11 32:9 33:9 40:8 41:12 43:14 46:6 46:15 47:8,10 48:14 65:11,17 67:6,10,15 70:4,6,13,16 72:15,17 72:19,21 73:4,6,8,14 73:19 74:12,12 75:6 75:10,12,13,19,20,20 75:21 76:1,1,18 77:11 78:10,17 79:10,14 82:19,19 83:2,5,16 84:1,3 122:18 123:22 130:20 131:20 137:9 147:3 149:6,12 154:6 154:13,15,16,17 156:4 157:12,18 158:1 167:5,19 169:21 170:6,17 175:12 179:12 182:15 185:4,8,15 186:9,22 187:2,16,22 193:4,5,6 193:6,18,18 195:21 204:15 207:11,16

209:6 211:10.19 213:12,22 216:8,14 219:3 222:15 225:11 226:1,7,16,19 227:8 227:11,18 231:13 235:7,13,18 238:11 241:12 242:22 quality-improvement 8:2 Quality/effectiveness 75:15 quantity 67:9 question 21:7 26:20 50:22 52:12 67:1 79:1 79:19 88:9 113:15 120:7 124:13 127:1 129:15 131:6,17 144:1 158:9 170:10 170:13 208:16 214:3 234:16 questions 12:12 93:21 105:12 113:13 118:9 119:22 124:12 129:12 140:21 155:6 184:15 186:14 190:16 207:5 207:6 **auibble** 61:9 quick 11:16 12:11 18:4 23:19 26:20 36:11 66:22 121:4 129:15 131:16 138:8 146:20 164:17 quickly 248:9 quite 6:3 29:14 67:13 87:1 150:21 166:21 172:10 178:21 188:22 195:4 201:8 205:22 216:9 223:14 228:2 241:18 R race 165:21 rah-rah 226:4 raise 6:7 17:8 158:18 219:11 raised 47:18 50:22 60:9 74:4 105:22 208:5 220:6 raises 221:17 raising 145:21 **raison** 4:20 ran 127:14 random 231:1 240:18 240:20 range 233:15 rapidly 185:13 rarely 208:22 rate 229:17

rates 46:8 146:5 rating 231:19 re-ground 4:12 reach 88:2 117:10 198:7 234:4 react 17:2 96:20 reactions 105:17 117:18 read 16:21 96:19 99:15 101:4 119:15,19 136:18 176:16 228:4 228:6 235:13 readdress 111:17 ready 30:1,6 178:11 real 32:18 65:8,9 92:11 110:2 121:4 149:14 185:5 195:14 200:4 207:14 242:20,21 243:8,15,22,22 real-time 211:9 reality 25:5 236:2 realized 207:20 realizes 175:1 realizing 154:2 really 4:9,13 5:19,21 6:19 7:22 9:18 15:17 16:1 17:15 21:7 23:22 32:5,6,7,16,17 34:7 36:7 38:12 39:8,12 40:22 41:13,13,20 42:1,1,14 45:2 49:17 49:17 50:4,9,17,17 68:22 70:22 71:1 80:16 84:16 85:3,3,15 89:12 95:12 96:14 97:8 103:19 116:13 117:15 119:4 121:11 123:1 124:21 125:22 127:5,6,10,20 131:12 134:2 136:16 138:12 138:13 139:1 140:18 146:9 147:2 150:11 152:19 154:7 163:22 166:20 167:19 169:12 170:3 172:12 173:20 174:12,21 176:6 177:6,13 178:4 180:3 180:15 183:21 184:10 184:16 187:9,18,19 189:2,22 190:3 193:13 195:11,12 196:14,18 197:2,15 198:7,22 199:16,19 204:22 206:19 207:5 207:6,8 208:10 209:5 209:7,14,14,18 210:11 215:12 218:21 221:9 222:7 223:7

224:20,20 225:5,11 225:14 226:6,11,17 230:14 232:20 233:12 233:14,17,21 234:4 234:21 237:5 238:1,2 238:4 239:1,15 243:1 243:1 245:1,16,17 246:14 247:4,12,13 247:16 realm 205:20 reason 48:9 153:12 208:8 reasonable 81:11 reasonably 128:10 139:18 reasons 10:18 56:19 rebalancing 154:22 recall 143:18,20 recap 10:9 11:11 184:11 recapping 4:12 **receive** 128:15,16 198:21 211:11 received 73:20 155:16 163:10 receives 102:19 receiving 65:3 190:17 213:4 recipient 151:14,16,18 213:17 recognition 220:9 recognize 15:9 43:17 102:22 125:6 126:12 148:17 230:17 recognizing 107:14 123:3 219:9 recommend 25:8 72:7 recommendation 20:18 recommendations 180:18 235:9 **reconvene** 103:6 180:13 183:9 record 50:2 103:8 114:22 248:20 recording 232:7 recruitment 146:2 rectangles 174:9 red 143:3 reduced 90:18 reduction 128:12 reemphasizing 210:5 refer 27:2,2 62:20 reference 142:19 referenced 27:18 references 22:2 **referrals** 149:8,13 referred 35:19 referring 38:3 51:13

181:21 237:4 Refinements 3:11 reflect 139:2 141:16 158:2 167:3 221:9 246:9 reflected 141:19 **reflecting** 141:12,12 reflection 129:21 reflections 164:22 reflective 143:16 reflects 229:7 regard 121:13 147:12 198:15 220:7 regardless 190:16 192:5 regional 219:16 Rehabilitation 2:2 reimbursed 224:6 reinvent 179:15 reiterate 117:9 219:2 243:5 rejected 109:2 relabeled 172:1 relate 10:22 43:1 117:1 167:9 185:3 related 45:15 70:13 170:7 185:4 relating 137:2,4,6 relation 196:18 relationship 167:17 relationships 89:1,14 238:18 239:2,4 relative 121:21 **relatively** 11:2 22:4 91:20 92:2.4 119:7 123:8 211:19 relatives 46:22 **released** 181:5 relevance 14:14 relevant 23:16 166:19 185:2 189:8 225:8 relying 181:7 remain 13:3 158:20 remained 13:6 remaining 102:5 remedied 142:8 remember 112:18 140:8 143:8 232:14 remind 243:18 reminder 243:19 reorder 144:20 replace 172:21 report 15:4 179:21 180:7,11 181:4 183:18 216:9,12,14 235:7 236:1,10 **reported** 146:16 **reporter** 17:21 18:2

184:14 reporting 114:5 216:22 217:5 **reports** 115:4 183:20 represent 54:14 167:19 169:16 178:7 representation 174:6 180:1 240:2 representative 117:1 representing 168:20 218:22 220:20 represents 166:17 require 102:21 103:2 110:19 required 162:10,12 requirement 130:7 requirements 46:21 52:2 63:3 234:1 requiring 124:17 research 2:2 15:5 178:17 179:7 180:1 183:7,12 192:2 199:11 231:9 235:6 researcher 240:19 researchers 242:10 resentment 134:14 reserve 116:7 residential 63:2 187:4 resolve 81:11 resonated 29:10 97:19 resource 1:17 2:7 128:13 134:12 137:7 **resources** 103:1,4 124:6 127:17 150:10 150:16 172:13 185:2 220:1 respect 30:3 38:19 46:8 58:22 60:20,21 61:7 61:16 62:4,11 122:19 124:22 129:8 137:9 139:15 212:2 233:14 233:15 respectful 122:14,17 124:16,18 respectfully 54:3 **respects** 61:18 respond 23:19 respondent 208:14 response 12:13 33:11 36:22 42:8 48:1 52:18 59:13 64:21 72:12 84:12 90:22 91:19 99:4,10 208:17 responsibility 61:19 97:21 102:13 118:13 124:7 responsive 123:20 responsiveness 123:12

rest 4:4 16:4 restricting 89:14 122:4 restrictive 155:3 restructuring 166:3 result 24:10 236:21 results 3:2 10:10 114:7 184:20 208:7 resumed 103:8 114:22 resumption 115:3 retention 145:16 146:2 Retired 2:1 return 224:16,21 227:7 227:8,9 revealed 6:22 revenue 13:12 review 3:2,11,15 7:21 11:15 12:4 19:12 24:9 27:16 116:15 182:1 183:4 198:5 207:13 reviewed 14:8 reviews 15:1 revisions 4:17 revisit 71:19 233:9 rewarding 241:22 rich 33:21 211:12 212:12.21 213:2 richest 210:17 richness 198:11 **rid** 78:19 **ridiculous** 189:16 right 5:17 13:20 15:11 17:1 19:3 20:7,10,16 21:3 22:14 23:6,7,10 25:20 30:16 31:20 32:12 34:3 35:6 38:9 38:20 39:10 40:17 47:16 48:2,7 49:10 50:11 54:5 58:7 60:1 63:20,22 64:1 69:20 71:18 73:10 74:22 77:6 81:4 82:14 83:3 83:4,5,7,11 84:7 85:6 85:6,6 86:5,16 88:1,2 89:16,19 90:14 91:1 93:2,17 94:4,7,17 96:18 98:11 99:18 100:17 103:10 105:4 108:5 109:7,20,22 112:15,20 126:19 136:12 142:14 152:19 167:18 173:19 176:17 181:8 184:6 200:9 203:19 206:3 211:16 229:13 230:2 233:21 235:4 rightfully 148:9 **rights** 59:1,18 60:4 62:21 63:6,8,11,13,15

			270
			I
63:15,17,18 64:4 93:3	Sarah 2:16 3:2,13 105:6	117:5 133:9 139:6	244:7
115:6 123:18 176:21	115:17 117:12 169:13	see 5:12 12:2 15:14	sensitivity 243:19
177:9	244:14 246:16	18:12 23:1 26:5 29:5	separate 20:11 26:3
righty 248:17	Sarita 2:5 44:17 54:8	30:21 37:1,11,15	27:14 35:16,16 62:15
rigorous 222:15	95:22 97:13 115:12	40:13 55:7 57:14	70:12 78:2 122:10
risk 8:21 9:10 56:8 80:8	152:3 196:17	59:10 62:22 65:13	132:14 133:8 150:10
80:11	sat 228:10,19	73:21 74:7,11,12,14	155:18 158:21 162:19
risks 235:22	satisfaction 145:15	82:17,19 84:10 92:18	separately 62:16 85:12
RN 2:8	155:9,11 156:19	93:7 104:2,14 106:6	132:20 142:13 153:13
Robert 1:15 115:8	171:6,16,16 172:11	106:22 108:1 111:15	September 179:18
robin 3:19 12:7	175:9,12,14,15,18	116:13 131:18 143:20	serious 125:22 209:21
robust 218:19	193:11 230:21	152:12 154:10 155:5	serve 8:10 139:17
rocky 246:20	satisfied 155:16 157:1	170:18 177:18 178:10	162:15 189:15 239:2
ROI 225:8	satisfies 234:5	185:17 186:19 191:6	served 101:22 133:17
role 27:22 57:9 107:10	satisfy 42:18 51:3 81:8	191:20 204:16,22	155:2 176:17,22
127:11 128:21 141:9	saw 31:1 59:20 130:6	216:18 218:13 221:8	service 54:7 57:7 61:1
167:3,5	saying 19:18 25:17	223:9 237:11 241:22	61:7,10 74:8 75:6,21
roles 101:15,16,16	30:12 44:20 51:16	242:19	76:4 78:4,17 83:1
roll 78:21	66:1 85:7,11 93:14	seeing 33:12 39:22	85:6 90:1 100:4
rolled 103:22 216:13	98:3,21 106:15,17	99:2 132:3 143:1	121:19 125:20 128:12
room 1:11 9:7 87:19	107:4,18,19 108:14	seek 156:21	129:7 137:10 149:7
	157:1 165:15 192:3	seeking 5:4 182:7	154:18 156:8 157:9
99:14 105:8 149:10	217:11 232:4	240:3	157:18 159:22 160:1
165:5 197:14 228:4 233:17		seen 14:9 49:16 235:14	
Rosenbaum 101:7	says 28:17 41:8 74:21 105:21 142:14 209:12	sees 106:1	160:10,13,18 161:2,7 166:6 167:11 171:18
	227:6 228:22 229:1	SEIU 1:16	
roughly 63:1			177:14,21 186:20 187:3 193:11 195:15
round 3:19 4:7 12:7 50:19	scan 3:16 12:5 156:15 180:9,12 181:13	selected 14:5 selection 14:12 23:17	197:6 202:1 203:3
round-robin 184:7	-	self 2:6 16:4 55:10	
	182:9 183:1 187:13 198:3 204:4 205:4	58:13 118:16 120:16	205:6,12 211:11
row 25:9,19,21 26:5,14			213:18 224:5,8,15 227:17 228:20 242:13
rows 30:18 rule 63:3	scanning 180:4	121:5,19 self-actualization 71:1	
run 80:8,10 110:1 117:7	scans 179:14 scars 192:11	71:13	services 1:3,6,17 8:15
139:6 240:21			8:18 13:13 16:1,4
running 241:4	scenarios 152:9	self-choice 122:2	22:12,13 27:10,22
	scenes 240:14	self-determination	28:17,22 29:6,7,12,14
rural 139:11 rush 116:21	school 1:18 228:7 scold 243:18	58:10,11 118:19 119:1	35:12 43:2 44:4 51:20
Tush 110.21			53:5 54:5 56:20 60:16
S	scope 14:15,17 135:14	self-direct 120:20	60:17 72:15,18 75:21
	136:1,2,3,9 161:5	self-directed 46:15,18	76:1,1,2,8,9,13,17,18
safe 9:6 128:20 132:22	score 228:16	49:18,21 50:7,8 60:14	77:9,14 78:7,10 79:12
133:2	scorecard 169:3	88:15 127:14 243:9	80:15,17,18,19,20
safer 65:18	screaming 96:13	self-direction 120:15	81:2,6,20 82:21 83:5
safety 8:21 9:10 10:19	screen 16:21 119:18	120:21 121:2,14	84:1 89:21 93:15
91:10 123:3 140:6	165:4 Seriene 1:15	self-management 224:11	100:11 102:17,19
142:18,20 143:2	Scripps 1:15		115:21,21 124:8
153:15 215:22 235:20	scroll 161:13	sell 225:20	128:15,16,20,22
239:3,4	se 16:12 123:16 149:7	semantics 175:4	129:1,2,3 130:11,20
salesmanship 225:21	search 22:1 24:11	seminal 15:10	131:7,21 134:1,1,6,17
salespeople 225:16,17	138:12 184:21	send 6:5 232:3	135:7 136:10 150:12
sample 231:1,2	searches 198:7	sending 246:8	151:15,18 152:11
SANDRA 2:3	searching 138:10	Senior 2:13,14,16	154:6,13,16,20 155:9
Sandy 42:19 74:2 84:6	seats 12:18	seniors 238:16	155:10 156:4,10,20
98:17,21 116:1	second 24:8 47:1 52:13	sense 21:17 44:16 98:9	157:1,6 158:6 159:17
131:14 220:17	70:3 79:20 85:20	123:2 134:10,13	160:7,16 161:15
Sara 1:20 65:20 115:22	180:11 183:17	149:19 162:5 169:17	162:7,20 163:1
174:17 201:3 202:14	second-hand 213:13	169:19 178:18 186:3	167:20 170:16 171:6
208:11 210:6,21	Secondarily 57:18	193:17	171:7,16,20 172:1,11
219:5 221:20	section 27:17 63:1	sensitive 123:19 140:2	173:5,20 177:3,7,10
II	1	1	1

177:10,15,18,20,21 187:5 190:17 192:5 196:13,15 197:3,10 198:21 200:17 201:21 205:12,14,15 213:5 213:16 216:19,20 221:16 222:5 224:9 226:8,15 230:5 241:4 243:10 245:4 serving 170:15 241:7 set 6:7 113:8 137:1,4,6 137:8 154:10 159:16 183:9 185:14 196:16 214:2 sets 163:11 189:1 setting 5:16 148:7 155:3 settings 63:3 190:10,13 195:9 199:22 236:16 **settled** 52:8 143:9,19 145:9 seven 15:15 severe 62:6 shapes 167:2 share 8:7 88:20,21 104:8 166:15 169:7 178:15 180:14 183:22 185:7,16 192:11 220:22 shared 18:22 118:10 179:8 SharePoint 248:10 shares 180:22 sharing 114:7,18 119:18 127:9,16,19 230:1 234:18 Shawn 246:2 she'd 244:13 shining 227:3 shooting 66:13 short 101:10 116:4 187:9 205:10 shorter 19:9 56:4 shot 89:18 show 86:15 93:19 104:2 139:14 156:16 158:12 161:22 165:3 166:15 224:21 227:8 231:22 247:2 showing 244:17 shown 243:20 shows 37:21 137:22 Sid 228:15 side 25:1 27:3,4 40:4,5 40:10,11,12 45:4 61:14 78:8,9,10,11,15 93:7 104:17 105:6,7 146:21 174:10 190:8

192:6 193:16 sides 221:19 sight 199:20 significant 46:17 47:1 129:10 134:15 significantly 222:19 silent 13:3,6 similar 66:1 83:7 88:22 137:7 172:20 182:20 190:19 similarity 192:5 simple 166:22 168:16 231:21 simpler 169:6 simplicity 169:19 Simultaneous 16:19 53:13,16 54:18 77:15 77:19 83:20 85:16 94:3 single 84:19 133:16,22 151:15 225:4 site 248:10 sitting 12:17,18 105:5 situation 95:7 six 40:14 103:15 113:2 159:18 size 11:3 sketch 12:1 **skill** 145:7 150:9 157:12 skilled 47:20 139:18 skills 49:5 154:20 157:7 **slap** 97:4 slash 38:20 42:17 **slide** 4:19 6:10 60:12 93:19 104:3 105:11 150:1 161:17 164:9 165:2 180:22 slides 141:19 161:14 164:4 slightly 221:11 slow 246:20 small 3:6 11:18 55:20 87:15 102:8 103:12 113:6 115:3 116:4.11 116:22 136:20 205:4 222:20 smaller 112:5 smart 237:2 Smith 2:9 35:18 65:10 68:2,8 73:11 74:16,20 76:3 77:1 81:15,19 82:2,4 98:12 115:13 132:17 144:16,19 156:18 176:9,19 177:1 214:13 246:2 social 13:10 65:5 68:7 70:14 89:4 108:9 152:15 234:12

somebody 53:17 62:3 89:5 95:7 104:5 119:17 120:22 217:6 somebody's 74:7 someplace 123:4 something's 146:10 somewhat 65:18 139:7 154:16 160:8 sorry 17:21 32:16 84:5 116:20 133:18 sort 4:18 5:7 6:7,10 7:18 10:22 19:22 23:8 23:19 24:14,16 35:21 37:10 45:15 70:21 71:9 73:3 75:4 81:3,7 87:10 105:18 108:9 111:7 113:4 120:19 121:17 130:3 132:8 144:12 146:20 153:12 154:19 155:4 156:9 160:16 161:17 162:9 163:5 166:18 167:5 168:18 171:11 172:5 173:4 178:16 185:14 194:8 206:22 209:1 212:16 228:14 233:8 sorts 33:1 41:18 50:13 83:7 244:1 sought 182:6 sound 34:7 47:20 55:21 154:1 sounded 151:21 sounds 90:7 109:22 **source** 14:12,15,18 15:2 22:8 23:17 25:3 198:22 203:14 211:12 213:8 sources 14:5,9,10,16 15:7 22:10,15 23:15 23:22 181:18.20 182:22 189:10 212:19 south 124:2 space 189:7 227:1 span 167:14 189:6 **sparse** 31:16,17 speak 34:13 45:21,22 51:11 128:3 130:4 146:21 181:9 188:8 190:9,12 215:16 speaking 16:19 17:22 53:13,16 54:18 77:15 77:19 83:20 85:16 94:3 99:17 137:1 147:10,18 240:14 **speaks** 80:16 special 4:7 specific 14:21 37:18 48:19 142:20 175:22

179:10 187:3 191:18 194:6 218:10 219:17 223:8 specifically 20:18 22:9 86:13 137:10 138:12 148:15,19 160:6 226:14,15 specificity 11:19 specified 45:2 spend 114:3 117:4 168:7 189:12 226:5 227:10,21 spending 52:10 spent 128:7 172:13 217:9,18 spilled 92:20 split 159:3 160:17 **spoke** 34:12 136:22 137:10 140:14 spoken 210:2 spokesperson 118:4 sponsors 244:13 spring/summer 180:6 square 50:19 staff 2:12 4:8 11:14 44:13 86:1 103:17 169:11 179:2.19 180:14 183:22 186:21 221:6 232:19 237:17 240:13 245:21 247:3 248:1 staffing 145:18 191:12 stakeholder 2:15 9:1 53:12,14 54:10,16 55:5,15,18,20,22 58:5 92:12 94:1 245:1,5,13 245:17 stakeholders 57:11,15 137:3 181:7 216:4 standard 129:18 130:3 197:5,5 200:15 207:16 222:16 standardization 191:9 199:19 210:20 standardize 199:22 standards 207:21 standing 207:11 standpoint 15:21 43:5 130:6 136:22 star 165:9 start 25:16 31:16 117:22 128:6 163:1 190:18 196:14 202:18 209:21 246:20 started 31:13 120:16 122:12 133:12,19 139:7 163:3 199:5 216:10 222:13

starting 31:7 33:10 103:11 185:18 196:19 238:13 starts 176:4 199:9 228:7 state 2:3,10 48:10 51:21,22 93:18 100:10 101:22 129:10 129:10 131:2 135:14 135:14 149:9 151:2 186:9 189:13,17 191:8,8 200:9,16 209:10 212:21 213:2 213:5,7 216:21 219:16 230:5,8 238:1 238:1,5,5 242:12 state-based 129:9 state-collected 195:20 state-driven 230:18 statement 34:1 96:2 states 1:19 6:1 9:3 13:15 55:7 128:18 135:12 187:17,19 191:18 196:4 198:8 198:14 208:5 210:7.8 210:10 211:2 216:17 217:17 218:11 219:10 220:20 221:4,15 222:10,14 229:20 230:7 238:15 stating 236:11 statistics 18:22 status 25:9,11,19 26:13 153:10 stayed 127:15 stayed-at-home 235:1 staying 4:8 stays 174:2 step 12:4 41:3 72:2 206:3 234:2 Stephen 1:12,15 115:17 steps 3:15 178:21 183:6 186:1 Steve 12:14 22:19 49:15 99:15 113:1 118:20 168:12 210:14 221:2 stick 30:18 50:21 straightforward 118:7 119:7 123:8 stranger 108:1,17 strategies 182:17 Street 1:12 strenuously 42:19 stress 221:1 stressors 244:2 strong 116:22 140:15 206:4,9

Strongest 205:20 strongly 47:12 79:21 136:16 198:18 structural 173:5 structure 173:1 245:5 245:16 structures 10:7 137:11 struggle 16:21 86:22 112:4 145:2 150:8 158:1 217:22 struggled 157:17 struggling 45:9 87:9 214:17 stuck 243:11 study 195:14 230:8 stuff 24:21 32:10,12 35:21 50:2,5,13 100:20 137:14,17 168:18 169:1 190:2 192:13 208:9,12 216:11 223:5 227:17 240:15 247:10 sub 3:6 14:10 49:12 50:15 67:11 87:6 112:10 117:1 159:20 207:8 sub-bullets 159:2.2 sub-domain 27:18 36:16 58:16 68:12,13 73:977:4,1892:13 101:15 108:19 112:21 155:18 sub-domains 11:20 15:13 18:19 23:14 24:10 34:2,5,7,11 40:14 69:3 86:10 87:3 87:16,19 103:12 104:9,13 111:15,16 112:1 113:2 114:16 116:5,9 117:11 119:22 159:16,21 164:10,15 182:3,13 183:2,8 184:18 186:4 186:11 238:22 247:8 subdivisions 130:21 subgroup 24:2 144:11 subject 47:5 245:2 subjective 15:21 submitted 165:14 207:13 substance 215:17 217:4 substantially 55:8 substitute 132:9 151:2 subsumed 25:10 214:19 successful 194:2 suddenly 129:6

suffice 67:4 sufficiency 83:4,6,22 83:22 84:4 161:3,5,9 sufficient 28:18 29:8 43:3,10 76:10 78:8 80:16 82:10,18 94:10 139:9 161:11 163:21 sufficiently 9:5 163:15 suggest 28:17,19 46:9 172:19 223:19 suggested 24:1 37:20 52:13 suggesting 58:2 81:15 83:15 113:1 suggestion 52:15 176:3 176:7 198:14 suggestions 5:6 168:4 suggests 101:18 sum 245:8 summarizing 4:12 Super 248:11 support 1:6 4:21 33:1 43:20,21 44:12 46:11 47:7 49:5 72:8,10 75:6 80:1 88:6,9 89:1 89:8 102:7.9 103:2 105:21 106:22 109:9 110:4 111:7 115:16 150:7 151:3,17,19 154:18 173:21 181:13 195:15 246:6 supported 47:3 69:21 72:5 107:15 109:6 151:8 240:6 supporting 90:8 111:3 supports 16:1 22:13 33:3 39:1 43:13 48:22 75:22 76:13 89:13 108:4 110:8,12 150:12 177:16 196:15 197:4,10 201:22 212:8 supposed 71:10 159:10 sure 14:18 30:16,18 32:22 40:21 42:2,2,20 44:3 54:20 56:12 65:22 67:2 78:16,22 84:15 87:1,14 95:1 102:16 106:16 109:22 111:19 118:11,14 119:3 123:21 128:10 133:6 135:9 136:2 141:2,20 147:8 148:3 150:3,13,19 152:6 153:3,10 158:13 159:4,15 164:4 171:19 185:20 191:8 195:4 211:20 212:6

221:14 223:5,7,16 233:7 surface 192:21 surfaced 184:18 surprising 24:19 surrounding 180:19 survey 156:22,22 186:7 188:4,11,18,19,22 194:17 198:17 199:9 218:2,3,4 221:6 231:1 surveys 175:10 188:12 188:22 189:6,11 198:15 208:21 218:11 221:2 suspect 91:9 sustainability 18:22 147:6 225:10 Suzanne 1:17 37:17 42:4 52:21 58:12 72:16 94:8 95:21 115:17 212:1 switched 198:17 synergy 5:13 synonym 97:9 synonyms 69:2 92:18 93:1 128:10 synthesis 3:16 12:6 24:9 180:9 181:10 182:20 205:18 system 4:21 8:10,14 10:12 17:13 18:6,20 19:7 20:1,7,22 21:8 21:15 29:15 36:1,1,4 37:13 39:5,9,15 40:4 40:6,7,10 43:4 44:4,8 44:9 54:7 57:8,20 61:10 64:12,18,19,22 73:16,21,22 74:6 78:1 78:5,8,10,14,16,18 86:4,15 87:7,8,20 92:7,9 93:16 94:5 97:10 98:6,10 100:4,5 104:18 115:10 120:9 122:14,18,21 123:12 123:19,19,22 124:5,9 124:10 125:8,20 127:1,2,6,7,12,18,21 130:7 131:3,3 135:12 138:2 146:8 148:18 149:7,10 155:1,2,4,4 161:7 166:5 167:10 172:1,13 173:4,20 174:22 175:19 190:1 195:7 201:3,16,19 203:11 206:16 214:5 219:7 222:6 230:6,18 239:16 system-level 14:22

system/fairness 89:20 systematic 15:1 24:12 243:8 systems 9:17 27:2 36:17 39:8 41:12 43:12,15 46:15,18 53:4 74:13 82:11 100:9,10,14 129:5,8,9 136:21 138:19 162:21 164:9 166:3 186:9 187:10 191:7,13 202:15 203:1,4 206:6 206:18 211:17 225:6 229:22 230:1 238:2 т T-A-B-L-E 3:1 T-MSIS 213:11 T.V 232:7 table 92:22 102:22 147:14 tackle 11:22 tailored 166:4 take 11:16 17:3 22:5 25:6 46:21 92:12 99:14 101:3 103:13 105:1 112:7 113:11 127:6 131:8 144:13 146:7 149:11 191:3 196:9 202:8 207:17 225:12 226:3 246:5 takeaway 138:10 taken 167:7 185:9 202:17 Tale 228:5 talk 17:4 24:12 41:20 44:21 49:22 59:9 86:5 86:7,13 97:19 100:9 118:16 142:12 144:14 164:13 175:11 206:7 206:8 208:6 222:13 233:19 239:21 talked 9:16 32:19 41:21 48:16 94:11 118:8 126:12 127:8 148:3 151:11 155:20 156:4 192:4 197:9,12,13,14 213:10 215:14 217:3 217:13 223:9 228:12 talking 24:21 39:8 42:22 43:4 45:16 49:2 51:16 72:1 102:20 108:14 120:16 127:17 136:7 144:8 177:6 191:14 196:17 198:20 198:21 200:20 202:14 205:22 206:18 217:10 217:16 229:9 230:3

234:7 tangents 127:9 tap 195:17 task 246:6 taxes 50:1 tea 92:20 teacher 228:9 teaches 228:9 team 24:4 154:21 158:10,12 159:2,4,7,8 159:8,9 163:17 teams 7:21 tease 10:5 175:14 technical 94:15 154:17 154:17,20,20 155:10 156:16 157:6,7,9,12 209:6 technically 156:9,10 157:8 technology 211:6,8 225:1,3,15,21,22 226:6,21,22 237:5 239:10,11 TEFT 194:15 teleconference 2:21 television 231:20 tell 48:14 209:18 217:7 221:13 228:17,19 229:12 tells 47:6 164:11 temperature 146:7 ten 117:4 218:6 tends 173:4,5,7 TennCare 2:1 Tennessee 48:11 187:17 tenure 223:11 term 32:4 63:7 65:6,15 67:11,15 70:15 75:3 102:11,12,14 135:5 135:12 165:16 175:21 187:9 205:10 230:5 240:6 terms 14:14 22:1.21 24:11 31:18 32:8 36:18 40:6 44:11 96:22 113:5 123:8 126:7 142:7 145:3 150:11 157:6 161:21 171:8,9 172:6 180:4 180:19 183:5,6 184:21 186:1 187:15 217:20 233:6 237:21 238:7 239:18 241:16 242:21 **Terrell** 246:2 terrible 56:20 territories 216:17

terse 247:4 tested 209:1 testing 194:22 text 237:6,11 thank 4:5 12:17 13:5,9 13:20 14:1 18:2 26:19 42:13 58:6 103:5 114:14 165:12 166:7 185:21 187:6 204:9 206:11 218:18 224:2 232:15,16 237:17 240:7,11,13 244:9,9 244:14,16 245:13,14 245:19 246:3 247:22 248:14,18 thanks 33:6 69:17 99:11 146:19 157:4 166:8 184:5 194:7 206:12 218:15,15 246:17 the-ground 241:3 themes 3:2 201:10 203.7 thereof 155:21 thermometer 7:3,5 thev'd 82:9 thing 5:9 10:9 18:15 19:22 20:8,11 21:5 22:15,16 25:4 31:12 35:9 37:18 38:18 40:18 42:5 50:14 56:5 57:13 58:8 59:16 67:8 67:9 69:5 70:18 72:1 75:18 81:10 95:14 100:4,4 121:17 122:11,22 125:11 130:2 133:8 137:22 143:16 152:8 169:14 169:17 170:15,19 186:1 193:5 197:8 202:21 203:17,18 205:2,21 213:20 215:13 226:10 227:6 244:6 things 6:14 7:20 8:7,12 9:20 11:5,11 15:1,3 17:4 19:14,17 28:22 31:14 33:2 36:19 41:18 47:17 49:1 58:9 60:6 61:8,15 64:2 65:10,13 69:5 70:13 71:22 73:4,5 75:5 78:19 84:11,11 92:8 107:19 121:1 122:20 123:18 127:17 130:14 130:16 134:4 135:17 142:5 146:8 148:13 149:8,15,16 152:10

157:2 159:4 164:3 167:2 168:20,21 171:6,8,13,13,19,20 172:11 175:17 176:11 186:14 187:18 189:5 190:7 192:17 193:2 193:14,19,21 194:13 198:19 199:4 201:10 201:11 202:3.6 206:16 210:5,14,19 212:16 214:14,15 216:2,15 217:12 218:15 219:21 220:22 229:7 233:1 237:8,20 237:22 239:1,8 241:20 242:2 244:2 244:15 think 4:11 5:13,18 7:10 8:1 10:1 13:2 15:16 15:18 16:4,10 19:5,14 19:21 20:3,14 21:16 21:19 22:15,20 24:18 25:5,22 26:6 27:9,11 27:13,15,19 28:1,4,11 29:11,14 31:4,9,14,15 34:8 35:18 36:18.20 38:1 39:2.6.11.18 40:5,9 41:2,5,7,18,21 41:22 43:8,15,22 44:1 44:5,6 45:1,4,5,6,7,14 45:16,19 46:1,16,19 49:3,7,8,10,11,15,21 51:13,18,21 54:10,11 55:4,6,16 57:6,16 59:18 60:10,11,13 61:13,19 62:14,17,18 63:20,22 64:18 65:10 65:13 67:5,13 68:2,4 68:6,8,14,20 69:2 70:4 71:15 73:4,12,12 73:13 74:16,18,20 75:3 76:4,21 77:2,4 77:12 79:3,6 80:1,7,8 80:9,11,14 81:2,19 82:8,9 86:19 88:2,8 89:11,14,17 92:6,9,13 94:5,9 95:6,14,18,19 96:3,22 97:2,2,8,10 97:22 98:1,10 100:9 105:22 106:2 107:9 107:18 108:6,15 109:18 110:1,5,10,21 111:10,11,13 112:3 112:14,16 116:18 117:8,21 119:6,7,12 120:2,4 123:7,15 124:5 125:2,19 126:2 126:5,9,15 127:4

129:16 130:5.22 131:3 132:12,17 133:5 134:19 135:18 135:18 136:6,8 137:1 137:12,13,14,19 138:11,19 139:4,5 140:7,17 141:7 142:2 142:3,6,19 143:4,5,9 143:11,12,14,15,18 144:2,7,22 145:20 147:10,22 148:6,22 149:5,15,22 150:5 153:1,8 154:2,16 156:3,13 157:16 159:1,18 160:5 161:4 161:14,16 162:2 163:8 164:7,9,11 166:16 168:14,21 169:18 170:4,11,20 171:12,15 172:21 173:3,9,13 174:1,19 174:20 175:6,10 176:5 177:4 178:3,4,6 178:9 184:3,9 185:10 185:22 186:7 187:10 187:14,18,22 188:1,3 189:2,3,15 190:2,4 191:1 192:15,20 193:13,20 194:16 195:7,16,17,18 196:8 196:14.20.22 197:7 197:15 198:9,12,14 198:19,22 199:1,3,7,8 199:19 200:19 201:9 201:10 202:4.13.14 202:17,19 203:13,14 203:16,18 204:2,8 205:16 206:4 207:1 207:15,17 208:4,9,13 209:17,20 210:8,10 210:13,14,16,18 211:4,7,14,15 212:1,7 212:9,17 214:1,16,21 215:21 216:15 217:8 217:13,15,21 218:14 218:22 219:20,21 220:8,11,21 221:18 222:7,11,17,21 223:3 223:6 224:16 225:3 225:10,14,20 226:3,8 226:17 227:1,16,20 227:22 229:3,7 230:11,16 231:15,16 232:13,17 234:12 235:2 237:3,6,12 238:2,4,5,8,13,16,19 238:22 239:12,14,15 239:18,20 240:1,22

241:2,11,14 242:20 244:7 245:8 246:5,11 247:1,11,18 248:2,7 thinker 168:17 thinkers 235:3 thinking 5:14 9:19 20:4 34:6 47:17 67:10 86:17 93:11 95:2 100:13 112:8 122:13 131:1 155:1 166:17 169:7 171:4 172:18 177:5 186:2 195:21 198:2 204:18 214:12 228:3 240:2 242:14 thinks 28:10 79:4 third 29:6 125:15 161:15 188:7 235:11 238:21 thought 10:14 11:1 16:13 23:19,20,22 24:15 25:15 36:12 39:16 53:3 85:3,15 107:12,15,17 118:19 120:16,22 124:20 133:18 148:5 150:8 170:13 173:15 174:21 199:7 215:2 228:14 242:19 246:20 thoughtful 239:5 245:4 245:12 246:18 247:13 thoughts 145:13 166:16 184:9,9 233:15 240:7,18,20 threat 235:19 three 10:15 91:5 104:16 105:4,10 112:22 121:12 122:3 153:12 159:3 161:14 167:14 172:22 173:1 225:16 225:17 three-word 74:10 thrive 245:17 throughput 171:11 throw 67:20 75:3.5 99:22 192:6 193:21 throwing 168:11 THURSDAY 1:8 tie 128:5 147:18 tied 128:16 186:12 time 7:5 8:16 9:13 12:8 17:19,20 50:7,20 51:8 52:11 69:19 85:6 109:3 115:2 116:18 116:20 119:20 120:1 120:3 125:20 128:8 136:12 139:14 156:2 161:22 163:2 165:7,8 165:11 172:13 183:10

183:12 184:8 189:12 189:21 197:1 206:14 212:10 217:18 222:21 231:11,22 242:1 248:16 timeliness 46:8 129:1 162:18 222:5 timely 28:19 29:8 76:11 80:16 81:20 82:11,18 161:21 162:17,20 163:4,4 times 54:12 152:14 207:1 214:16 228:8,8 228:19 timing 113:5 tip 196:19 tired 168:1 169:8 title 51:2 62:18 87:4,5 93:3 99:20 108:21 119:3 titles 19:9 30:20 today 8:8 24:11 109:8 117:10,15 167:8 178:18 207:16 215:14 232:11 239:14,18 247:3 today's 4:13,17 11:9,15 239:19 248:13 tool 32:7 tools 188:20 210:20 241:13 top 22:15 31:15 48:15 48:16 52:11 65:12 147:20 150:2 170:22 top-line 213:6 Topeka 2:7 topic 9:8 168:8 178:14 topics 10:3 155:19 167:14 185:3 tossed 242:15 totally 47:9 touch 181:8 196:19 touched 149:4 touching 234:14 touchpoints 184:2 tough 125:16 204:10 town 242:16 track 71:11 158:15 245:15 tracks 218:6 traction 96:8 trademark 194:19 tradeoff 235:20 traditional 51:19 57:13 224:9 traditionally 138:17 train 44:13 47:4 48:18 trained 47:14,19,22

48:19 49:8 231:6,7 training 7:20 13:10 33:3 43:12 46:9,10,11,13 46:14,21 47:12,22 48:14 51:21 52:2 139:19 141:4,9 142:6 142:16 143:13,20 144:2 145:6 150:9 166:1,4 193:10 208:22 233:16,22 234:9 243:9 Transfer 32:10 transit 132:8 transitions 27:18,20 28:2 219:15 224:10 translate 19:6 163:14 translates 147:6,7 transparency 19:1 128:13 167:22 242:7 transparent 128:17 transportation 33:2 131:19 132:2,6,10,13 132:16,19 133:2,7 224:14 243:6 trauma 165:20 travel 12:9 treated 171:10.17 tremendous 57:22 124:7 231:12 trends 189:20 trial 188:12 tricky 129:3 154:14 171:12 tried 85:7 90:5 147:22 154:15 161:17 163:8 168:16,21 169:1 triple 9:18 193:7 234:10 trouble 59:2 troubled 141:3 true 79:8 197:2 212:8 truly 163:10 195:6 196:11,13 try 11:10 30:6,9 33:22 50:8,20 81:10 89:12 104:5,11,12 112:15 112:16 113:1,3 117:4 126:6,10 169:5 172:7 192:20 202:8 224:21 232:22 247:3 trying 4:9 5:21 12:8 19:6 20:6 38:6 39:11 43:6 50:19 53:1 71:2 92:5 107:18 121:15 126:3 127:18 128:8 131:12 135:17 143:21 145:3 148:9 172:5,14 178:7 185:6 187:18 200:9,16 202:7,9,10

219:22 239:13 243:14 turn 69:14 90:17 246:15 turnover 146:5 162:3 Turns 12:21 tweaked 140:7 142:19 two 10:18 12:19 15:19 27:13 33:16 47:17 48:6 50:18 58:9 59:12 71:16,22 76:20 81:9 82:14 90:5 93:20 104:16 105:3,10 148:8 149:1 153:15 162:6 174:18 182:4 193:19 194:15 213:5 217:8 218:20 228:6 230:12 232:6 238:8 244:18 247:16 two-word 74:10 twofold 19:5 tying 173:8 type 14:15,15 15:1,2 186:7 typed 117:3 types 5:1 9:3 10:7 45:20 138:18 160:2 163:11 190:17 typical 60:5 235:1 typically 57:13 213:19 U U.S 216:17 ultimate 242:21 ultimately 242:12 umbrella 25:13 27:6 65:6.11 67:11 un 72:1 under-staffed 213:7 undergoing 179:2 underneath 40:14 85:13 209:9 understand 4:10 38:3 40:19,21 44:19 61:12 78:18 80:2 86:1 87:2 97:16 132:18 141:6 170:1,3 200:3 understanding 19:4 27:1 36:15 87:13 90:16 101:8 133:14 133:19 165:19 179:11 209:8 understood 107:13 unfair 143:15 unifying 230:4 **unique** 190:18 245:6 **United** 1:19 135:12 universally 194:9 University 1:16,18 2:3 2:8,11 101:21

unpaid 106:3,5,10,19 107:14,21,21 108:15 109:16 110:3,8 112:6 unresponsiveness 124:9 unsafe 9:6 unsure 37:3 update 183:11 updated 216:14 updates 181:2 183:16 updating 138:21 uphold 60:21 uproar 241:19 urge 112:16 136:17 use 7:2 30:20 33:18 54:2 65:17,19 66:9 67:15 68:16 93:15 113:10 160:7 179:4 179:14 186:17 189:18 200:9,12 202:22 203:1 208:1 209:12 212:19 215:19 218:12 220:11 221:1 222:3 224:10 229:11 231:13 237:10 239:3 247:5 useful 202:18 212:19 220:19 223:2 241:13 user 200:13 users 57:19 166:6 200:19 usually 35:18 65:11 150:21 245:11 utility 241:2 utilization 205:12 utilized 203:12 utilizing 47:13 187:3 V vacancy 146:5 vagaries 186:13 vague 160:8 validated 226:1 231:8 valuable 185:2 224:15 245:3.6 value 41:3,19 186:8 218:21 225:12 values 139:16 140:17 values-based 140:16 variable 132:21 209:12

varied 241:6

182:21

vary 191:7

vast 198:3

vein 46:1

varies 135:14,14,15

136:22 191:15,22

various 9:3 127:9 181:7

variety 72:8 89:7

vendors 202:22 203:1,6 203:6,11 venue 142:5 verbs 247:7 version 140:11 143:5 145:22 188:13,17 216:14 218:7 236:1 versus 8:21 9:10 45:10 74:13 78:4,18 81:12 129:18 166:6,6 veterans 240:1,5 Vice 2:13 view 175:13 198:3 235:17,19 237:3 239:19 240:3 views 9:4 141:12 237:19 violations 123:18 **visits** 48:10 visual 168:17 179:22 visualization 170:5 **visualize** 167:15 visually 168:20 169:16 170:11 vital 101:17 **voice** 53:6,8,10 92:11 96:2,7,10 98:13,15 100:5 184:10 voice/ownership 98:19 98:21 99:2,6,20 115:5 voices 13:21 volume 184:19 **volunteer** 88:17 volunteering 88:16 vote 62:16 votes 91:5 W wages 122:20 wait 19:19 29:3 84:9 133:10 163:2 waiting 128:19 waiver 240:4 waivers 195:22 242:7 walk 48:20 walks 231:12 want 6:5,5 7:10,14 8:4 10:14,17 14:2 16:11 25:6,20 26:2,13,19 28:21 30:9,19 34:13 38:19 40:19 42:11 46:9,20 47:16 48:17

49:7 51:11,13 54:2

60:2 72:15 74:15

78:21 79:21 80:13

57:4,13 58:3 59:6,11

vendor 225:16,21,21

226:9

81:10 84:6.10.11 86:1 88:1.4 89:22 91:6 92:13 95:19 101:14 108:13 110:13 116:7 119:8 121:7 122:16 123:4,10 126:18 133:1 134:3,3 137:22 141:1,4,5 149:2 155:6 161:9 179:15,15 185:7 187:7 189:5,22 190:2 192:17 193:20 193:22 194:5 210:15 212:9,16 214:6,7 215:16 220:15 225:9 233:6 235:12 236:22 240:10,12 242:18 243:3,5,12,17 244:10 245:19 246:10,14 248:6 wanted 8:7 10:9 12:16 19:2 25:16,17 38:18 42:21 52:22 53:4 56:14 92:1 101:4 105:16 106:6 113:5 119:3 120:8,17 125:7 126:20 131:15 138:6 140:18 150:18 152:4 153:3,9 167:3 173:17 175:8 190:21 197:17 202:21 210:3 219:11 230:21 231:3 232:9 wants 52:21 54:19 76:22 146:15 Washington 1:12 wasn't 14:20 141:11 143:16,16 145:9 241:17 waste 7:5 watch 196:21 224:17 watching 232:7 way 7:15 9:9 11:10 19:16 21:1 22:4 24:16 28:20 29:1 32:16 37:6 39:22 45:18 82:1 85:7 94:14 101:13 106:4 109:11 111:3 112:19 116:17 117:21 122:4 124:20 127:21 131:1 132:2 150:2 153:18 157:13 169:1,5 174:20 190:18 191:15 212:7 214:12 225:6,7 229:20,22 231:16 232:13 233:7,10 238:12 239:5,6 243:16 245:11 248:3 ways 70:11 120:14 125:17 126:1 135:16

	1	I	I
144:3,9 154:4 195:8	198:20 205:21 207:9	words 75:9 92:14,15,16	144:4 187:12 243:10
208:10 212:4 222:2	211:18 212:5,9 215:8	94:15 96:13 107:22	worried 57:11 135:5
224:13	215:10,15,21 218:19	109:5 118:20 123:8	227:18,22 242:2
we'll 4:11,17 5:9 10:5	222:8 229:12 246:21	125:17 126:1,4	worries 100:8
11:7,16,20 12:6 24:12	247:21	wordsmith 56:3 92:5	worry 49:17 87:4
33:15 52:8,20 65:18	wearing 128:5	work 3:6 4:5 5:14 6:6	worse 229:20
81:9 84:13 94:17	web 101:4 165:13 198:6	7:11 13:10 14:4 15:10	worst 228:8
103:6 104:4 110:14	webinar 165:15 183:10	41:4 44:13 45:11 47:8	worth 147:13
114:15 116:22 117:22	wedded 154:22	49:7 50:9 51:1 52:6,8	wouldn't 7:10 60:5 75:6
121:8 125:3 126:9,20	week 88:18 248:16	67:21 91:22 100:12	118:2
128:2,6 133:6,7	weeks 116:16 232:6	101:16 103:12 104:12	Wow 210:1 232:12
141:20 144:13 149:20	weigh 113:22 144:13	107:11 110:19 111:7	write 136:20 189:18
150:6 152:2 153:17	155:13 187:8	113:6 117:3 121:8	247:6
179:10 182:7 183:12	weighed 144:10	126:10,16 135:8	writing 94:10
183:13,15 185:17	weight 222:6	138:15 143:22 147:1	written 124:21 159:17
186:13 196:3 211:12	weird 176:13	148:11 152:21 153:18	168:9 237:2
232:12 248:9	welcome 4:3 14:2	165:4 173:10,22	wrong 142:21
we're 5:21 7:16 11:10	142:12 220:1	178:9 179:1,16 184:1	wrote 139:19
12:7 14:3 16:22 17:1	well-aligned 18:5 64:5	191:2,17 193:3,4,6,15	widte 139.19
19:6,19 30:1,6 34:4,6	73:17 78:12	193:19 199:5 210:8	X
34:8 38:12,13,21 42:2	well-allocated 78:13	214:20 219:7 224:4	X 25:9,17,18 26:13
45:15 50:18 52:10,11	well-being 10:16,20	233:4 234:8,12 237:5	X'ed 76:12
57:16 62:22 69:4,18	25:13 26:14 91:8,12	239:17 241:1 244:21	Xs 31:8,14,18
71:1,8,9 72:1 78:1	91:13,16,18 153:9	247:21	X3 51.0, 14, 10
80:9,14 84:16 85:9,14	176:17 190:14 215:22	worked 13:15,16 154:5	Y
86:1,2,4,6,12,16 87:4	well-served 132:8	174:19 175:9 197:22	Yea 58:20
88:2 90:8 93:5,8,14	well-trained 41:16	198:16,16 240:13	
94:6 96:16 99:12,13	wellness 153:11	245:15	year 13:14 217:10 221:5
102:16 103:14 104:10	went 71:22 103:8	worker 13:10 46:14	years 13:14 15:9 49:16
105:1 106:13,15,17	114:22 127:8 228:3	89:4 107:22 122:19	-
107:18 108:14 109:8	231:5 248:20	140:7 142:18 161:22	89:12 92:7 185:12
109:12 110:5 114:3	weren't 111:3 118:11	162:18	187:14 192:9 197:22
119:18 123:21 131:12	118:14 125:22 233:9	worker/provider 42:5	205:22 215:9 218:6 231:18 232:12 238:10
135:3 136:7 138:21	whatnot 206:9	workers 43:14 46:12,12	
143:15 145:3 149:6	wheel 179:15	47:4	238:14 239:14,17
149:22 154:2,22	Wheels 224:19	workforce 34:15,16	yelling 96:13
157:3 164:13,15	wide 136:22	38:19,20,22 41:16,16	yesterday 5:8 6:11,18
166:8 168:10 169:20	widely 193:22	41:17,21 42:17	8:6 11:14 12:18,21,22 14:8 16:7 18:17 19:7
173:19 174:3 178:12	widespread 208:1	106:12 109:20 110:4	24:22 47:18 68:5
178:15 185:5 186:18	236:14	110:9 111:21 122:15	
187:6 195:7,22 199:7	WILSON 2:13	124:16,17,22 125:7	71:21 78:3 86:20
201:16 202:7 204:6	window 7:3	139:6 145:14 146:8	92:21 101:6 107:12
201:10 202:7 204:0	wins 99:6	Workforce/Providers	107:16 109:7 118:8
207:7,15 209:6,20,22	wins 99.0 wish 134:13 185:16	115:10	133:13 166:18
210:18 211:20 212:6	wonder 75:6 175:20	workgroup 117:16,22	yesterday's 4:10 5:12
210.18 211.20 212.8	wondered 69:7 73:2	144:20	10:13 young 237:6,9,14
220:4,9 221:8 224:18	wonderful 191:2	working 94:15 113:9	Yuskauskas 2:10 17:9
227:18 229:14 234:14	wondering 47:18 63:5	114:18 140:11 146:10	
237:14 238:12,17	85:2 101:11 130:18	146:10 181:6 194:14	17:18 18:1,1,7 89:11 96:22 115:13 126:22
239:12,12 242:6	155:22 169:20 218:8	199:18 200:8 202:15	
243:2,13	word 33:14 39:6,11,16	204:4,6 205:3,5 215:8	135:9,22 136:4 155:19 169:18 176:2
we've 4:13 33:22 35:16	39:17 47:22 52:4,5	216:17 224:18,20	194:11
38:11 71:16 104:20	54:2 55:20 64:11 82:4	230:7,20 238:19	134.11
110:1 124:7 126:16	92:10 97:8 98:2 106:2	240:11	Z
153:20 154:11 156:3	107:15 110:15 147:21	workplace 143:22	zeal 239:9
167:7 181:20 182:3	155:1 192:7 225:18	works 9:18 32:17	zero 233:22
183:8 185:3 186:11	239:3	world 36:6 50:7 58:14	2010 200.22
195:17 197:12,12	wording 124:15 144:21	88:15 95:15 126:14	0
100.17 107.12,12		00.10 00.10 120.14	č
1			

$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c }\hline 1 & 3:2 & 115:5 & 150:2 \\\hline 1.14 & 101:21 \\\hline 1:05 & 115:1 \\\hline 1:45 & 116:3 \\\hline 10 & 15:8 & 23:5,10,16 \\\hline 79:19 & 92:7 & 102:3 \\\hline 239:13,17 \\\hline 10-word & 56:5 \\\hline 10:43 & 103:8 \\\hline 100 & 22:2 \\\hline 1030 & 1:11 \\\hline 11 & 247:5 \\\hline 11:00 & 103:6 \\\hline 11:03 & 103:9 \\\hline 11:15 & 114:22 \\\hline 1115 & 242:6 \\\hline 115 & 3:7 \\\hline 12:00 & 113:10 \\\hline 12:30 & 113:11 \\\hline 13 & 169:2,4 & 221:4 \\\hline 14 & 3:4 \\\hline 15 & 239:13,17 \\\hline 152 & 238:22 \\\hline 15th & 1:11 \\\hline 165 & 3:9 \\\hline 166 & 3:13 \\\hline 179 & 3:17 \\\hline 18 & 48:10 & 235:11 & 238:10 \\\hline & 238:14 \\\hline 187 & 3:20 \\\hline 1915 & 195:22 \\\hline \end{tabular}$	30 1:9 23:12 215:10 30-day 181:5 183:19 38 14:10,16 22:10,15,15 23:11,14 4 4 4 3:2 115:20 153:21 45 114:6 45,000 213:4 5 5 92:7 102:4 5,000 230:22 50 13:12,14 500 93:19 56 102:2 6 60 95:16 600,000 102:1 7 73 7:4,6 75 95:16 8 9
1963 228:16 1982 227:13,22 228:5 1st 221:4 2 115:10 128:2 182:5 183:7 2:30 168:8 20 215:9 221:14 200 14:8 22:2 23:22 200-plus 198:12 200-some 181:20 2001 235:7 2012 102:1 2015 1:9 180:6,11 183:18 2016 179:18 180:14 22-year 230:8 25 237:18 28 102:6 28th 183:10 3 115:15 147:16,18 3:30 12:9 3:34 248:20	

4	
:2 115:20 153:21	
114:6	
000 213:4	
E	
5	
2:7 102:4 00 230:22	
13:12,14	
0 93:19	
102:2	
6	
95:16	
0,000 102:1	
7	
7:4,6	
95:16	
8	
9	
y	
	I
Neal R. Gross	sand
Washing	

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Home and Community-Based Services Quality Committee in-Person Meeting

Before: NQF

Date: 04-30-15

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

near Rans &

Court Reporter

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com