NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

+ + + + +

IN-PERSON MEETING MAP MEDICAID ADULT TASK FORCE

+ + + + +

THURSDAY JUNE 11, 2015

+ + + + +

The Task Force met at the National Quality Forum, 9th Floor Conference Room, 1030 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 9:00 a.m., Harold Pincus, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT: HAROLD PINCUS, MD, Chair GEORGE ANDREWS, MD, MBA, CPE, FACP, Humana, Inc. ANNE COHEN, MPH BEVERLY COURT, MHA, PhD, State of Washington Department of Social and Health Services KIRSTIN DAWSON, America's Health Insurance Plan DENISE DOUGHERTY, PhD, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality * NANCY HANRAHAN, PhD, RN, FAAN SUE KENDIG, American Academy of Nurse Practitioners MARC LEIB, MD, JD DANIEL LESSLER, MD, MHA, FACP, National Association of Medicaid Directors LISA PATTON, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration CYNTHIA PELLEGRINI, March of Dimes MARISSA SCHLAIFER, Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy ALVIA SIDDIQI, MD, FAAFP, American Academy of Family Physicians BROCK SLABACH, MPH, FACHE, National Rural Health Association

```
ANN MARIE SULLIVAN, MD
NOF STAFF:
MARCIA WILSON, PhD, MBA, Senior Vice President,
      Quality Measurement
NADINE ALLEN, Project Manager
SEVERA CHAVEZ, Project Analyst
SHACONNA GORHAM, Senior Project Manager
SARAH LASH, Senior Director
ZEHRA SHAHAB, Project Manager
ALSO PRESENT:
WOODY EISENBERG, MD, Pharmacy Quality Alliance
DAVID KELLEY, MD, Chief Medical Officer,
      Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare *
MARSHA LILLIE-BLANTON, DrPH, Chief Quality
      Officer, Center for Medicaid and CHIP
      Services
JUNQING LIU, PhD, National Committee for Quality
      Assurance
```

* present by teleconference

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

2

	PAGE
Welcome Back	4
Overview of Meeting Materials and Key Points from Staff Review of Core Set	27
State Perspectives Panel	81
Public Comment	125
Measure-Specific Recommendations on Strengthening the Adult Core Set	132
Public Comment	251
Prioritizing Remaining Measure Gap Areas	251
Summarize Next Steps	261

ī	
1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(9:02 a.m.)
3	CHAIR PINCUS: I hope everybody had a
4	nice rest yesterday. It was very productive.
5	This morning we have a fairly sort of robust
6	agenda to go through. We're going to be doing
7	what the child group did on Tuesday. So it's a
8	kind of a reversal.
9	Actually, I'm interested about what
10	people thought about having the groups together
11	and do we have thoughts about that? I thought it
12	worked well. I thought that there was some
13	redundancies, things that we have to both go
14	over, but I think it worked out well seeing what
15	they've been doing. Getting a sense of how we
16	can coordinate.
17	We're going to have to today we're
18	going to be going over some stuff though that
19	they went over the first day and we're going to
20	have to do our own voting on particular measures
21	that might be added or eliminated. So we'll go
22	through that.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC 4

Actually, let me clear the first line 1 2 just to talk about what the objectives are. So one of the main things we want to do is we want 3 to understand how states have actually 4 implemented the Medicaid adult core set and get 5 some feedback from CMS and actually from actual 6 7 states about that. And then we're going to want to come back to the issue of looking at specific 8 9 measures and gaps in measures and think about how to address those issues. 10

And then to think about -- actually go through a voting process to actually suggest additions or eliminations of measures. And then to give some more -- continue our discussion and get more specific about the adult core set with regard to overall strategic guidance.

Any questions about the agenda? Okay.
So do we -- for specific highlights from
yesterday, anything we want to bring up?
Everybody was here and conscious? And we don't
have anybody here that wasn't here yesterday.
MS. LASH: I'll just ask if Dr. Ruth

Perry is on the phone? Then the answer is no. 1 2 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. MS. LASH: With the exception, 3 potentially, of Marcia Wilson, our Senior Vice 4 President for Quality Measurement at NQF who was 5 in and out in the audience, but observing a lot 6 7 of yesterday's conversations. CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. So we're going to 8 9 be sharing the staff analysis of the adult core 10 set reporting to see which states reported on 11 which measures. And we're going to look at those measures that had not been highly reported across 12 13 all the states. We're going to consider which measures 14 15 might be available to fill some of the gaps that 16 we've identified in the past and that we identify And then we're going to vote and rank 17 now. 18 measures for potential addition to the set. And 19 then we're going to add and identify other gap 20 areas to report back to CMS. So these are some specific requests 21 22 that CMS asked of us. That they want us to think

about making incremental changes. We don't want 2 to make changes that are too big too quickly because states are just learning how to get 3 involved in this and how to report these 4 So big changes that occur too quickly 5 measures. sort of disrupts the learning process. 6

7 Also to think about how much effort is required to adopt and implement a new measure. 8 9 So think about measures that would have -- if 10 we're going to add new measures, think of measures that would have limited impact or would 11 12 not require big changes in the process of 13 collecting the data that's required by the 14 states.

15 And again, CMS is particularly 16 interested in measures that can fill critical gap areas that we've identified in the past. 17 Which 18 measures that provide limited incremental value. 19 To also try to focus on ways in which it actually 20 incorporates or is incorporated in the CMS measurement quality domains. 21

22

1

And again, the discussion we had

yesterday, it's all about alignment and how we 1 2 can get measures that are well aligned. So, again, it reduces redundancies and inefficiencies 3 in the measurement enterprise or what I sometimes 4 call the quality measurement industrial complex. 5 So first we're going to get an overview of the 6 7 adult Medicaid population. So, Zehra? MS. SHAHAB: Good morning, everyone. 8 9 I am going to be giving the overview of the 10 Medicaid-eligible adult population and then 11 Shaconna will be presenting the key points from the staff review of the 2014 adult Medicaid core 12 13 set. So, first I'll describe the population 14 15 that's eligible for Medicaid. As you already 16 know, adults with Medicaid are both poorer and sicker than low income adults with private health 17 18 insurance. So as you see this figure, it shows selected characteristics of adults who are at 19 20 less than 139 percent of the FPL, federal poverty 21 level. 22 Among these adults, those who have

Medicaid report both worse health and worse mental health compared to those with employersponsored insurance and even those that are And as you see in the chart, adults uninsured. with Medicaid are two times more likely to have poor health than those who are uninsured.

7 And in addition, adults with Medicaid who have more than one chronic condition are at a 8 9 higher percentage compared to those on employersponsored insurance or no insurance. And this is 10 also true of those with any limitation at all. 11

In this next slide, you can see that 12 13 this describes the health status of the current working age adult Medicaid enrollees, 14 15 particularly describing their health conditions 16 and their risks. So this is the segment of the population that's growing most rapidly. 17 An 18 estimated 57 percent of adults age 21 to 64 are 19 covered by Medicaid are overweight, diabetic, 20 hypertensive, have high cholesterol or a combination of these conditions. 21 22

Also for the Medicaid population,

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

overall morbidity is estimated at more than 50 1 2 percent, greater than those that are privately Nearly two of three adult women on 3 insured. Medicaid are in their reproductive years, between 4 the ages of 19 and 44 and an estimated 48 percent 5 of births that were covered by Medicaid in 2010 6 7 were ranging from a high of nearly 70 percent in Louisiana and a low of less than 30 percent in 8 9 New Hampshire and Massachusetts.

Medicaid covers approximately two of every three publically funded family planning services and these can include either prenatal or in postpartum care, gynecological services, and testing or treatment of sexually transmitted infections.

16 So it's also important to note the 17 diversity of the adult Medicaid population. 18 Among the Medicaid enrollees, racial and ethnic 19 minority populations are disproportionately 20 represented among Medicaid enrollees. Also, 21 across geographic regions, approximately 21 22 percent of the population has been enrolled in

1

Medicaid.

2	As of February 2015, an additional
3	11.7 million adults have enrolled in Medicaid.
4	So the Medicaid expansion decisions and
5	eligibility levels as a percentage of FPL varies
6	by states, ranging from 138 percent to 300
7	percent of the FPL. And these eligibility levels
8	for adults remain low in states that have not
9	adopted Medicaid expansion at this time, which
10	results in gaps in coverage.
11	So there's also disparities in the
12	growth of the Medicaid population that are
13	observed between states that have and have not
14	expanded Medicaid coverage, 8 percent versus 27
15	percent. Only half of the states that have a
16	majority rural population are expanding their
17	Medicaid coverage currently.
18	So in the next slide, I will describe
19	in more detail about how many states have adopted
20	the Medicaid expansion. So, as you see, it shows
21	the current status as of 2015 and to date, more
22	than half of the states, exactly 30 states

including D.C. have adopted the expansion. And 1 2 three states are discussing the adoption currently and 18 states are not adopting the 3 expansion at this time. 4 And you can see the ones that are 5 adopted are in blue. Light blue is the three 6 7 that are under discussion and orange is not adopting at this time. So this is -- compared to 8 9 2014, only 27 states including D.C. had adopted 10 the expansion and five were in an open discussion. 11 So there's no deadline for the states 12 13 to expand, but for those states that do expand, the federal government will pay 100 percent of 14 15 Medicaid costs of those newly eligible from 2014 16 to 2016. And the ACA fundamentally reformed Medicaid by establishing eligibility for non-17 18 elderly adults and also putting in place a uniform national minimum income eligibility 19 20 threshold of 139 percent of the FPL for nearly all individuals under age 65. 21 22 So, now that I've described the adult

Medicaid population and the 2015 Medicaid 1 2 expansion, I wanted to review MAP's measurespecific recommendations from fall of 2014. 3 So last year, MAP had recommended that CMS focus in 4 the short term on addressing known challenges in 5 data collection and reporting, and that CMS 6 7 monitor the program's continuing development and also consider the measure-specific 8 9 recommendations.

As you see, MAPs reported the continued use of most measures in the Medicaid adult core set. It recommended that 25 of the 26 measures continue to be used to provide stability in the early years of the program. And also to provide an opportunity to gain additional experience and data.

17 MAP had recommended that number 0063, 18 Comprehensive Diabetes Care, the LDL-C screening, 19 be removed because the clinical guidelines around 20 the lipid management had changed and also because 21 NCQA was retiring it from the original 2015 22 version of HEDIS. So as a replacement for this

,	
1	measure, MAP recommended that there be a phased
2	addition of NQF number 0059, Comprehensive
3	Diabetes Care, Hemoglobin A1c Poor Control,
4	greater than nine percent.
5	And in addition to that Measure, MAP
6	recommended two additional measures, NQF 1799,
7	Medication Management for People with Asthma as a
8	complement to 2083, Asthma in Younger Adults.
9	And NQF number 0647, Transition Record with
10	Specified Elements Received by Discharged
11	Patients. And these are all measures that are
12	included in the Excel sheet for you to look at if
13	you want to look at any of the details.
14	So, this next slide shows CMS's update
15	for the adult core set for 2015 reporting and
16	this was issued in December 30 of 2014. So CMS
17	retired the one measure that was recommended by
18	MAP, the Comprehensive Diabetes Care, LDL-C
19	screening measure. And CMS added the one measure
20	that was suggested as a replacement by MAP, the
21	Comprehensive Diabetes Care Hemoglobin Poor
22	Control.

So there were also two other measures 1 2 that I showed in the slide before this that were not added: 1799 and 0647. These are still an 3 option for continued support, but that's only if 4 the Task Force would like to stress again this 5 year that they be added. And there's additional 6 7 details included for this measure in the Excel. And so we'll ask you a little bit later today to 8 9 rank these along with others that you support for 10 inclusion later today.

So, these next two slides show the list of measures in the current Medicaid adult core set for 2015 and we have provided this on a one pager for you as well. And I'll quickly read each of these measures to refamiliarize you with them.

17 The first one is the Initiation and 18 Engagement of Alcohol and Other Drug Dependence 19 Treatment by NCQA. There is the CAHPS Health 20 Plan Service v 4.0, Adult Questionnaire with 21 CAHPS Health Plan Survey v 5.0. This is by AHRQ. 22 Then there's the Controlling High Blood Pressure

(202) 234-4433

1

measure.

2	There's also Medical Assistance with
3	Smoking and Tobacco Use Cessation, NCQA.
4	Cervical Cancer Screening, NCQA. Chlamydia
5	Screening in Women Ages 21 to 24, NCQA. Flu
6	Vaccinations for Adults Age 18 and Older, NCQA.
7	Comprehensive Diabetes Care Hemoglobin Alc
8	Testing, NCQA. Comprehensive Diabetes Care
9	Hemoglobin Alc Poor Control, NCQA. And
10	Antidepressant Medication Management. PQI,
11	Diabetes Short-Term Complications Admission Rate.
12	PQI 05, Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease or
13	Asthma in Older Adults.
14	And the second page has a few more.
15	Congestive Heart Failure Admission Rate. Adult
16	Asthma Admission Rate, both AHRQ. Screening for
17	Clinical Depression and Follow-Up, CMS. Elective
18	Delivery, Joint Commission. Antenatal Steroids,
19	Joint Commission. Follow-Up Hospital After

Hospitalization for Mental Illness, NCQA. Care
Transition Record Transmitted to Health Care,
AMA-PCPI.

Prenatal and Postpartum Care, 1 2 Postpartum Care Rate, NCQA. Plan All-Cause Readmission Rate, NCQA. HIV Viral Load 3 Suppression, HRSA. And Annual Monitoring for 4 Patients on Persistent Medications, NCQA. 5 The Breast Cancer Screening, NCQA. 6 7 And then the two non-NQF endorsement groups, Adherence to Antipsychotics for 8 9 Individuals with Schizophrenia, NCQA, and Adult 10 Body Mass Index, BMI, Assessment, NCQA. 11 So, as you know, the NA reflects measures that are non-NQF-endorsed and out of the 12 13 26, we have 24 that are NQF-endorsed and two that are non-NQF-endorsed. And there's further 14 details of each of these measures in the Excel 15 16 file. Now, I'm going to turn it over to 17 18 Shaconna to provide more details about the adult 19 core set based on what we observed in the data 20 states submitted. CHAIR PINCUS: Any questions for Zehra? 21 22 Sue?

MS. KENDIG: Are the core sets, are 1 2 these measured across settings or are they only specific to, say, primary care or -- so they're 3 across settings, so because on the demographics 4 we talked about a majority of the -- a large 5 number of the Medicaid beneficiaries being women 6 7 and a large number of women's health services GYN, family planning, and so forth. So if they 8 9 are accessing those services, the tracking on 10 hypertension, diabetes and so forth is still 11 reported from those settings? Is that correct? 12 MS. SHAHAB: Yes. 13 MS. GORHAM: Good morning, welcome back. 14 15 CHAIR PINCUS: I actually had one 16 question. When we say phased addition, what do we mean by that, and how does CMS interpret it? 17 18 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: So, we have had 19 latitude in how we interpret that. And so for --20 we try to understand what makes sense for our state partners and what information would be 21 22 helpful. I can tell you that when the pilot --

when the Child CAHPS was reported as phased, we were concerned that we needed to do pilot testing before we could include it as part of the core set.

So what we like about the phased is 5 that it gives us that latitude to say, what more 6 7 do we need before we would make a decision about including that in the core set. So it's not a 8 9 definite, understood, I think you all have not 10 been precise and I'm not sure, I mean, I think I 11 can ask that question of you as well. Because as I said, we interpret it as giving us the 12 13 latitude.

CHAIR PINCUS: No, I think that, that's 14 15 a good point. It's very helpful. Because I 16 think we'll come back to that, I think, when we hear from the states to think about what kind of 17 18 steps would need to be taken with regard to the 19 addition of new measures to make it more 20 effective in terms of this phasing notion. Okay. 21 Brock? 22 MR. SLABACH: I have a question that

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

1

2

3

4

may be somewhat bigger picture, I suppose. 1 But 2 one of the themes that I hear when I travel around the country about Medicaid expansion in 3 states that haven't expanded is the lack of 4 available physicians and manpower because of 5 people not enrolling, providers not enrolling in 6 7 Medicaid. And this then prevents people from getting access. 8

9 And so if we expand Medicaid, then 10 it's just going to further that burden. This, of 11 course, is important to the discussion because if 12 there's not a primary care physician or 13 practitioner, non-physician practitioner, it 14 impedes our progress in terms of improving the 15 health of the population.

16 I'm wondering about statistics on 17 that. I've not seen any data. I hear people 18 talking about it, but I don't know that there's 19 any evidence. And I'm just curious about that. 20 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: So let me just tell you that while that certainly is a concern 21 22 in a number of states, the main thing that we

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

www.nealrgross.com

have found from the literature is that people who have coverage for Medicaid do better than those who are uninsured. 3

So while certainly there still is a 4 challenge in a number of states, even those that 5 have not expanded, but certainly those that have 6 7 expanded, bringing in the pool of clinicians to serve is a challenge. Our evidence shows that 8 9 having coverage is better than not.

10 There is one study, and there are 11 probably others, but one that the Urban Institute did with colleagues from, I think it's Harvard, 12 13 but it's a Boston school so I'm not sure which one for certain, where they actually looked at 14 15 the impact of the fee increase, or what they call 16 the bump, and basically found that while there were some longer wait times, that the wait times 17 18 weren't very different.

19 And so you did have some similar 20 levels of access in those states where there had been expansions and an increase. And it's not to 21 22 say that the bump was the decisive factor, but

(202) 234-4433

1

2

that was just one of the things they were 1 2 studying. CHAIR PINCUS: So it's something that 3 we may want to come back to when we think about 4 gaps, about issues around access. And to look at 5 what current Measures are actually assessing 6 7 access. MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: I also want to 8 9 mention that I think the difference between 10 primary care and specialty care is a little That's something we're still working 11 different. 12 as best we can on. But there are a few more 13 challenges in the specialty care. CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. 14 Sue? 15 MS. KENDIG: Just in response to the 16 provider question, I think it's important to remember that there are many different provider 17 18 types who are recognized to provide care to 19 Medicaid patients. And there are opportunities 20 to leverage all of those providers. However, at least from the data in the 21 22 state where I work, a lot of where the advance

(202) 234-4433

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

www.nealrgross.com

practice clinicians are working tend to center around the urban areas because that is where the educational programs are located. 3

So one of the underlying causes is 4 also looking at how we are educating 5 professionals and moving them out into the rural 6 7 areas and making that available so that we have the workforce and leverage all of our providers 8 9 working collectively to meet the needs of the 10 population.

CHAIR PINCUS: Thank you.

MR. SLABACH: The other thing I wanted 12 13 to mention is that 63 percent, by my calculation, I did a quick study of this, of physicians in 14 15 rural communities are employed by their 16 hospitals. And the clinics are being absorbed into these systems because of retention. 17

18 And we have now, we're up to 53 hospitals since 2010 that have closed in rural 19 20 communities. And that is expected to go up considerably. So that's going to be another 21 22 exacerbation of issues going forward in terms of

(202) 234-4433

1

2

11

If the employer source for these 1 access. 2 physicians and non-physician practitioners are out of business, then it's going to disrupt that 3 community. 4 The other thing I'll mention quickly 5 is that we have around 4500 rural health clinics 6 7 in the United States currently. And all of those entities are exempted from any quality reporting. 8 9 And I didn't know how that interfaced 10 with Medicaid's efforts to try to collect the 11 data that we're talking about here. Because this is a huge program, now 4500 and growing, that is 12 13 exempted completely from any quality reporting to 14 the government. MS. COURT: So this is Bev Court from 15 16 state of Washington, but we include them, just like we do anyone else. I think one of the 17 18 challenges is that they're paid on an encounter basis and so what we worked on is strengthening 19 20 their reporting of their encounter data. MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: I think 21 22 Washington's experience is similar to most other

states. That as long as our measures can be generated from claims, then the potential to get that information exists if it's reported. And of course, there's sometimes challenges with encounter data.

And that's similar with community 6 7 I mean, we have worked very hard health centers. with HRSA trying to better improve reporting from 8 9 community health centers. Because oftentimes 10 there's a general code about a service encounter, 11 but not specific so that you know what kind of Whether it'd dental or whether it's a 12 encounter. 13 primary care visit.

So we might know that a Medicaid enrollee obtained care, but we don't know what kind of care or what type of provider. And oftentimes, the specifications require you to know one or the other of those.

19 CHAIR PINCUS: So -- oh, Anne?
20 MS. COHEN: This might not be the right
21 time to ask this question, but I'm curious if we
22 could talk about the challenges with the existing

1

2

3

4

5

core set and any particular measures that may not 1 2 have had --CHAIR PINCUS: We're going to get to 3 that. 4 MS. COHEN: Okay. 5 CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. We're going to get 6 7 to that. So, before Shaconna presents some material that actually is pertinent to that 8 9 issue, Lisa, do you want to introduce yourself? 10 MS. PATTON: Thank you, Harold. Good 11 morning, everyone. Hi. I'm Lisa Patton from SAMHSA, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health 12 13 Services Administration. And I apologize for not being able to 14 15 be in the room yesterday, I was able to listen in 16 for much of the discussion, but a couple of things arose on Tuesday that required me to be in 17 18 the office yesterday. 19 And, as you all know, it was a very 20 rich and interesting discussion. And so I really appreciated all the thoughtfulness that went into 21 22 that. And I'm glad to be here today.

CHAIR PINCUS: Thanks. Shaconna, do 1 2 you want to sort of walk us through some of the state reporting of --3 MS. GORHAM: Sure. 4 CHAIR PINCUS: -- the measures so far? 5 MS. GORHAM: So, before I begin, I just 6 7 want to bring your attention to some of the In your meeting materials, you 8 resources. 9 received the CARTS for 2014, adult CARTS report, 10 as it's affectionately named, the one pagers. So that of course is only for the eyes of the core 11 set, I just want to say that again. 12 It is not 13 for public viewing. And then at your seat when you walked 14 15 in, you had an additional handout and that gave 16 you more information about the reporting and the

17 reporting per state so you actually see the 18 numbers. Again, that is only for the eyes of the 19 Task Force. Okay.

20 So while we did our staff review of 21 the 2014 adult CARTS reports, or the one pagers, 22 we gleaned information about the states' uptake

(202) 234-4433

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

www.nealrgross.com

of measures and the patterns apparent in
 technical assistance requests. The data also
 helped us to identify any measures for potential
 removal and revisit priority measure gap areas,
 which we will definitely get into more detail
 later on.

7 So, the adult core set participation Of course, there's room for is strong. 8 9 improvement. As the next slide will illustrate, 10 the most frequently reported measures were 11 focused on postpartum care visits, diabetes care 12 management, and women's preventive health care, 13 cervical cancer screening, breast cancer screening, chlamydia screening. 14

15 The TA requests decreased in 2014.
16 Often there were between zero and five requests
17 per measure.

So on your screen, you have a chart of all of the measures reported by state in 2013 and 20 2014. We wanted to show you a comparison of the two years. The bold red horizontal line divides the 15 measures with high levels of reporting,

(202) 234-4433

the seven measures with moderate levels of 2 reporting, and four measures with relatively low 3 reporting.

The way we divided the high levels, 4 moderate levels, the measures considered high had 5 24 to 34 states reporting. 6 The measures 7 considered moderate had 6 to 23 states reporting. And the measures considered low had zero to five 8 9 states reporting.

10 So, before you, you have the high 11 levels of reporting. The 15 measures that at least 24 states reported. 12 I just want to draw 13 your attention to four measures that showed the most growth with an addition of at least six more 14 15 states reporting in 2014.

16 So the Adult Body Mass Index Assessment had ten more states reporting in 2014 17 18 than 2013. The Chlamydia Screening in Women had 19 seven more states reporting in 2014. And the 20 Initiation and Engagement of Alcohol and Other Drug Dependence Treatment had seven more states 21 22 reporting in 2014. The Antidepressant Medication

1

Management had six more states reporting in 2014. 1 2 The next slide shows the measures with medium levels of reporting. 3 It represents measures with 6 to 23 states reporting. 4 The number of states reporting these measures 5 increased, of course, in 2013 to 2014, with the 6 7 exception of the PC-01, the Elective Delivery. The number of states reporting PC-01 decreased 8 9 from 13 states for 2013 to 11 states in 2014. Do 10 we know why? That's a good question. 11 MS. LASH: We don't know exactly why, but we do know that some states rotate the 12 13 measures that they report on in any given year. So that might be contributing. 14 15 MS. GORHAM: Right. And then also, the 16 one pager gives a good list of reasons why they didn't report and so forth, so I can pull that 17 18 up. CHAIR PINCUS: Just another sort of 19 20 question related to the previous one that looked at the measures that increased reporting. 21 It 22 looked like all of the ones that increased

reporting were largely claims-based measures, 1 2 except for BMI. Is that correct, BMI is not a claims-based measure? 3 MS. LASH: I think it's HEDIS. 4 CHAIR PINCUS: It is a claims-based? 5 How many people actually put in a claim for a BMI 6 7 assessment? MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: It's just the 8 9 assessment. Whether it's --10 CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. 11 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: But I'm not sure, I'd need to check --12 13 MS. COURT: Yes. It's whether --MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: -- my figures. 14 15 MS. COURT: -- or not the doc did it in 16 the office visit. Included a BMI check in the office visit, it's a code. It's --17 18 CHAIR PINCUS: Oh, there's a code for 19 20 MS. COURT: Yes, it's a code. And it's not widely used. 21 22 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. So the question

about the consistency with which it's actually 1 2 being coded? MS. LASH: The measure is in HEDIS, so. 3 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. 4 MS. GORHAM: Thanks, Sarah. These are 5 good questions. I'm going to pull up my one 6 7 pager so I can --MR. SLABACH: I'm new to the Medicaid 8 9 Work Group, so forgive me for some of my 10 educational efforts here at my own understanding. I guess I'm shocked to know that this is optional 11 for states to participate in. Is that historic? 12 13 I mean, this has always been --CHAIR PINCUS: It's the law. 14 15 MR. SLABACH: It's the law? Okay. So 16 I guess there's no question about that then. I'm just curious, are there any correlation between 17 18 the states that are reporting and those that are 19 or are not expanding Medicaid? I mean, is there 20 some trend that we notice? Or is it just random 21 and --22 CHAIR PINCUS: We may be able to get to

that later. 1 2 MR. SLABACH: Oh, okay. CHAIR PINCUS: We can sort of look at 3 Because I think, aren't there some things that. 4 like which states report and which states don't? 5 Oh, George? 6 7 DR. ANDREWS: Yes. In the earlier slides that we looked at in terms of the 8 9 measures, BMI was not NQF-endorsed. And yet, 10 when you look at what we just saw, not only in '13, but in '14, almost -- the states that are 11 reporting the BMI almost doubled. 12 13 Additionally, we know obesity is a major issue in this population. And so, my 14 15 question is, why isn't BMI endorsed by NQF? 16 MS. LASH: It hasn't been submitted by NCQA for endorsement review to my knowledge. 17 And because --18 19 DR. ANDREWS: It is a CMS Star Measure. 20 MS. LASH: It is in HEDIS. It's a --DR. ANDREWS: And so it --21 22 MS. LASH: -- widely used Measure.

DR. ANDREWS: is utilized for the
duals. It is utilized across the board by health
plans. The states obviously like it. So in our
effort to try to simplify and make it easy and
I think it behooves us to question that.
MS. PATTON: Yes. We have the recently
endorsed NQF BMI assessment for an SMI
population. So it is a chart-based measure
though, but it is NQF-endorsed to look at BMI in
people with schizophrenia and bipolar diagnoses.
MS. LASH: We'll be doing that this
afternoon.
MS. COHEN: I'm just curious to go back
to the slide with all the states reporting. The
ones that so towards the bottom, the ones with
fewer states reporting. I'm particularly curious
about the HIV Viral Load. Is there any thoughts?
Oh, it's new.
MS. GORHAM: The one thing that is
important about that is it was first collected in
2014.
MS. COHEN: Oh, okay.

34

1	CHAIR PINCUS: Ann?
2	DR. SULLIVAN: And just on the
3	Screening for Clinic Depression and Follow-Up
4	Plan, is that just a chart measure or is that
5	involves follow-up plan?
6	CHAIR PINCUS: Yes.
7	DR. SULLIVAN: So it's not we can't
8	pull that off claims data?
9	CHAIR PINCUS: Right.
10	DR. SULLIVAN: Right. So, that's why
11	it's probably low.
12	CHAIR PINCUS: I mean, that's obviously
13	the pattern that you see. Is those that are
14	easily accessible through claims are much more
15	likely to be reported than things that require
16	some additional effort. Marsha?
17	MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: I just want to
18	mention on the HIV measure, my understanding: it
19	is very complex. But it is an important measure
20	because it's an outcome, it's viral load.
21	So we only had, I think it's three
22	states, it says two. Does that say two or three?

I think we now have three states that we have the 1 2 data in on. But it's also states that we know recognize this as an important measure. 3 I think it's Louisiana, Delaware and New York. 4 So I think states will put in the 5 extra effort if they realize they have a problem 6 7 that they need to better track. But it is complicated. 8 9 CHAIR PINCUS: Alvia? 10 DR. SIDDIQI: I was just going to add 11 that I know some themes are recurring possibly from the last couple of days, but elective 12 13 deliveries and antenatal steroids I know we discussed sensibly yesterday about whether or not 14 15 they should belong in the PEDS core set and 16 obviously they were new measures, so they still had some low reporting. 17 18 But, again, the folks that are looking 19 at those child core set, those CHIPRA folks or 20 those quality folks that deal with the child core set, I think it would help for them to see these 21 22 two measures on their reporting plan. And so I
was just going to throw it out there again that 1 2 maybe those two go on the PEDS core set. CHAIR PINCUS: Dan? 3 DR. LESSLER: I had a question and then 4 And actually, Bev, you might know 5 a comment. In terms of hypertension reporting -- I'm 6 this. 7 just noting here a lot -- is that a code as well? In terms of provider checking? So a lot of --8 9 okay, so that is distinct from BMI where you can 10 check a code that you actually measured BMI, comes in with the claim, and then you know. 11 So the comment I would just make about 12 13 the BMI measure, and more generically based on my experience, is that to the extent that you're 14 15 collecting data like was BMI checked at a visit 16 and that that's done through a mechanism of coding, typically you find that those are very 17 18 low initially, I would say, as a general 19 principle because if you're busy and it's 20 something else to do, you don't do it. But --21 right. I mean --22 CHAIR PINCUS: BMI assessment or you --

1	DR. LESSLER: No, you do the BMI
2	assessment, but you don't if you're
3	CHAIR PINCUS: Right.
4	DR. LESSLER: in Epic or whatever
5	electronic health record or
6	CHAIR PINCUS: Right.
7	DR. LESSLER: these days they're on
8	paper, you don't do that. And to the extent that
9	anyone feels that such a measure is worth
10	collecting, and it can be something other than
11	BMI, I'm just using that as an example.
12	Again, and in my experience, actually
13	this is more sort of working within a big health
14	system, is that if you begin reporting on it and
15	then tie some sort of incentive, depending it
16	doesn't have to be financial and in this case
17	could be at the plan level because if you really
18	feel this a valuable metric that you want to get,
19	then you can encourage people to report it and it
20	takes time.
21	The first step is getting the data and
22	seeing that only four percent of people are

(202) 234-4433

measuring BMI or something like that. Which you know is not the case. And then the quality improvement efforts are actually initially around getting at the clinician level somebody to actually be capturing the data.

And then you get to a point where you 6 7 can actually use the data, presumably, to truly improve the quality of care. So it's just, I 8 9 think, it's an important point that you have the 10 question Brock, about BMI that -- around metrics 11 that begin to get at, might begin to get to some 12 degree more toward outcome, although that is a 13 process metric, but which are collected through coding and how that might work if one really 14 15 wanted to use that to drive quality improvement. 16 CHAIR PINCUS: Nancy? DR. HANRAHAN: Daniel, that was an 17 18 interesting thought because -- bear with me on 19 this. In the science or the field, BMI is now 20 not being used as much as calculating the amount of activity that, say, a child has. 21 So

22 benchmarking activity levels is what is trending

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

1

2

3

4

5

1

into the future.

2	And is an outcome and not so much a
3	point of process, like an objective measure, BMI.
4	It is objective too, and I've had conversations
5	with Harold and our behavioral health field that
6	where thoughts of quality are going is more
7	towards a wellness perspective, a recovery
8	perspective, a place where we've moved away from
9	focusing on the disease into a more hopeful
10	conceptualization of what kind of outcomes we
11	want.
12	So this is an example of how we would
13	trend away from something like BMI, which is just
14	loaded with all kinds of body image problems and
15	et cetera, et cetera, into a place that is more
16	positive, more wellness-oriented.
17	MS. PELLEGRINI: Thank you. Just
18	looking of course at a couple of the maternal and
19	child health measures here and the chart that we
20	have here, excellent chart, thank you, it's
21	really helpful. And it's always so helpful when
22	we hear directly from the state program managers

40

and I have so many questions about choices that 1 2 just don't seem to make sense to me. And just an example, California isn't 3 doing the elective delivery measure. The 4 California Department of Health was one of the 5 three partners that developed the early elective 6 7 deliveries toolkit with the March of Dimes, right? And there's so much going on in 8 9 California, the private payers were on board, the Department of Health is on board, everybody's 10 pulling in the same direction on this issue. 11 And yet, it is not one of their Medicaid measures. 12 13 So what is going on in situations like that, what's driving some of those choices? 14 And 15 I know that some of it is, for example with 16 antenatal steroids, an incredibly important measure because it has a direct impact on 17 18 premature infant health, they actually went down 19 last year, but I would hypothesize that's because 20 it's a hard measure to collect. 21

We know it's chart reviews, right?
But, some of these other ones, it would be

wonderful to be able to dig deeper. 1 2 MS. COURT: That is a chart review So I think what would've augmented this 3 measure. representation --4 MS. PELLEGRINI: It is, but it's one 5 that everybody's doing. 6 7 MS. COURT: But not --MS. PELLEGRINI: But the data's 8 9 practically sitting there. MS. COURT: No, it's not practically 10 11 sitting there. If you want to do a robust method of collecting the data, then it has to be 12 13 complete. You have to have funding for it. There's no state funding, for example, 14 15 for collecting these measures. We glean this out 16 of our own resources. I'm thinking of having a bake sale, frankly, to meet some of the unfunded 17 18 mandates that we have to collect hybrid measures and medical record based measures for other 19 20 health homes, the dual-eligible project. None of that is funded. 21 22 So, again, I think what would help

this portrayal is showing which are 1 2 administrative based, which are in the purview of a state to be able to collect, and which require 3 either CAHPS survey or medical record extraction. 4 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: Can I just speak 5 to that measure as well? The exclusions in that 6 7 measure is what makes it so problematic to collect. And you really do need charts to make 8 9 sure that you're excluding all the conditions 10 which there's not --11 MS. PELLEGRINI: But I mean, this is in the Medicare IQR right now, right? 12 13 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: Right, yes it is 14 15 MS. PELLEGRINI: So --16 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: It is. MS. PELLEGRINI: -- this is not an --17 18 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: And hospitals --19 MS. PELLEGRINI: -- exotic measures. 20 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: Hospitals are reporting it. Hospitals are reporting it because 21 22

1	MS. PELLEGRINI: Right.
2	MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: they're
3	required through IQR. But that doesn't mean that
4	Medicaid has access to what a hospital reports to
5	the IQR.
6	CHAIR PINCUS: So, Anne?
7	MS. COHEN: So I kind wanted to echo
8	Beverly's comment a little bit that, and I have a
9	couple measures that I want to potentially point
10	out for adding, so I'm going to be as guilty as
11	anybody today.
12	But on things like what you just said
13	about the hospital data, depending on what state
14	you're in, that could be in a different agency
15	that does hospital accreditation. And it seems
16	like no big deal, right, it's within the state.
17	Well, the hospital accreditation unit within the
18	Health and Human Services at a state level, may
19	be on a separate floor and may not even talk to
20	the other unit.
21	And then just to share the data, they
22	need data sharing agreements. They need access

to the data, which is how MMIS maintains theirs, 1 2 so it seems as easy as this stuff seems, it can be a two-year project just to sign off on a data 3 share agreement because the state's IRB review 4 committee has to review the IRB data release. 5 I mean, that's as weedy as you get 6 7 about this stuff. So I think that there's a lot of unintended consequences of measures that we 8 9 don't think about. And so it's -- to be fair to 10 state folks, that's why things can be so 11 complicated. 12 And it does take money, I mean, so to 13 add -- I was in a public health department for a while on a committee that was part of the public 14 15 health department and our committee person sat 16 next to the person responsible for the BRFSS, the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System survey 17 18 that are done by every state, huge, big response 19 And we wanted to add a question on rate. 20 disability. It took our committee six years to get 21 22 a question added and it was something like

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

www.nealrgross.com

\$400,000 per fielding of one question. And that 1 2 was only the cost of the regular fielding the question, let alone all the development and all 3 the other stuff. 4 So, I'm just trying to help people, as 5 ridiculous as it is, how Beverly and the people 6 7 that are doing the quality, folks at the state level are really soldiers for us in this game. 8 9 CHAIR PINCUS: I think it also puts pressure on us to think about when we wanted to 10 11 add a measure, what's the real value in it? And also, to get as much information as possible when 12 13 we consider measures about what are the real costs in implementing the measure? And that's 14 15 why getting feedback from the states is so 16 important. So, Dan and Nancy? Dan? 17 18 DR. LESSLER: Actually Marsha had a 19 question for you. Which has to do with PQRS. So 20 on the Medicare side, a lot of quality information is actually administratively 21 22 collected through PQRS. It's the same as with

BMI.

There are all sorts of additional codes that get used and some of which begin to get more toward outcome measures. They're being recorded by the clinician at the point of service.

7 And just wondering -- and again to Harold's point and everybody's point. I mean, to 8 9 the extent that better data can be collected administratively, it makes it more efficient, 10 11 more possible. And I'm just wondering, and I haven't done the crosswalk between, for example -12 13 --- it's been two years since I've been working in electronic health records and PQRS. 14

But between these measures and the Medicare measures and whether or not there's some way to -- as with BMI and looking at PQRS, where there's some way to more efficiently collect this data in that kind of a way?

20 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: Let me just say, 21 I would say that we are trying to work a lot more 22 closely with our Center for Clinical Standards

and Qualities, CCSQ, which manages the IQRS, the
 Inpatient Quality Reporting System and the
 Physician Quality Reporting Systems, and we
 definitely recognize that getting information on
 duals, those who are both Medicare and Medicaid,
 will come better or more efficiently through
 those systems.

8 What we have not been very successful 9 at doing is getting information segmented from 10 those systems for Medicare only and the duals. I 11 think there's a broader issue, and that is 12 whether or not we can get Medicaid someway added 13 to those systems, which are now almost on 14 automatic pilot.

What I have been told is that those systems are also defined by law to be linked to Medicare. So that, for example, when we had early elective delivery added to the IQR, Inpatient Quality Reporting System, we had to identify the number of Medicare beneficiaries who give birth.

22

(Laughter.)

MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: And that was the 1 2 responsibility I had. So that's how I know that was what we did to document. And there are not a 3 lot, but they are and many of them are 4 individuals with disabilities as opposed to 5 seniors, which makes sense to all of you here in 6 7 this room. But that's what we had to do. And it was largely because there was 8 9 enough push from the top, meaning from our CMS overall for the Partnership for Patients 10 11 initiative, that we were able to make the case, 12 make the point, and get our -- because the Office 13 of General Counsel has to sign off on any changes to those reporting systems because they are 14 defined by law. 15 16 So I do think that's the next generation and as we talk about what more this 17 18 entity can do, it could be that one of the things 19 -- I mean, it's in CMS, we do what's called, and 20 I hate to give acronyms, but A19. I don't know what A19 stands for, but that is what we do when 21 22 we want a change in the law.

And we could initiate a request for a 1 2 change in the law so that Medicaid could be included in those systems. How much effort it 3 would take to get HHS to advance that to Congress 4 because there's so many smaller changes in the 5 law that the agency's trying to move through the 6 7 system that I'm not sure that a change in the law about public reporting or collecting data would 8 9 make it to the top. 10 But that is -- I do think that's something that we should add to the potential 11 discussion of this group and you all should 12 13 decide at some point if you want to make a recommendation. Because anything -- if it comes 14 15 from NQF MAP, it helps us in moving it up our 16 chain. DR. LESSLER: I would just say that --17 18 I mean, in my own personal opinion, I would think this would be an extraordinarily high priority. 19 20 I mean, it should go to the top of the list. CHAIR PINCUS: And maybe at one of the 21 22 breaks, we can maybe talk about how we might

1	formulate a recommendation around this. Okay.
2	Maybe a subgroup might offline go and
3	MS. PELLEGRINI: Because Marsha, you
4	have lots of partners who would love to help you
5	with this. And I think, perhaps, drawing up a
6	bill or drawing up a proposal and sending it up
7	through CMS for clearance may not be the most
8	efficient path. And there may be others
9	available to us.
10	CHAIR PINCUS: Brock?
11	MR. SLABACH: The physician I'm
12	going to have to think about I got sidetracked
13	in my thoughts on that last point. But I think
14	that's an important one and I do agree with that.
15	Let me come back to my question later, I'm sorry.
16	DR. SIDDIQI: That just reminded me of
17	what I was going to say real quick. But we know
18	about the Sunshine Act and now provider data is
19	all being more and more transparent. What
20	physicians are doing in terms of their payments
21	and things like that.
22	So, I think definitely we need to

formulate in our NQF report specific guidelines 1 2 or recommendations saying that public reporting needs to mandatory or required as part of 3 participation. And we talk about how Medicaid is 4 a federal and state partnership, and so I think 5 that's the huge difference between Medicare and 6 7 saying that's completely federal and now we're trying to talk about Medicaid, which every state 8 9 does a little bit different.

10 But if you can somewhat incentivize it, obviously but also kind of require some of 11 these reportings it would help. And, again, 12 13 states are looking to measure their own Medicaid plans against certain measures and HEDIS 14 15 And so as much alignment as we have, I measures. 16 think will make this whole process just flow better, but also more meaningful in terms of that 17 18 vertical integration piece. 19 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. Brock? 20 MR. SLABACH: Thank you. In the SGR

legislation that was just passed in April, there
was the provision to merge the three physician

reporting systems into one. What impact, if any, will that have on any of these discussions? And how will that be changing going forward, the timeline?

MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: Well, we just 5 completed an analysis of the provisions related 6 7 to measurement. And the question you asked is a question that I'm asking. And I'm sending to our 8 9 Office of Legislation and to ASPE to help us. 10 But, yes, we do think that there's provisions 11 that could potentially impact us, but it's not precisely clear at this point. 12

CHAIR PINCUS:

Okay.

Shaconna?

Okay. I believe that we 14 MS. GORHAM: 15 stopped at the levels of low reporting. We 16 talked about the HIV Viral Load Suppression being first collected and reported in 2014. We spoke 17 18 about the antenatal steroids measures. They had 19 less states reporting in 2014 compared to 2013. 20 However, the Care Transition and the Screening for Clinical Depression and Follow-Up 21 22 Plan actually remained the same over 2013 and

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

1

2

3

4

13

1

2014. Okay.

2	I think, Cindy, you asked the question
3	about do we know why states did not report. So
4	the most common reason for states not reporting
5	was data not available, and there are typically
6	zero to five TA requests received per measure.
7	Additional support was provided to the states by
8	CMS's TA team.
9	For example, the TA team developed
10	additional guidance to assist states in reporting
11	measures. They developed a Data Quality
12	Checklist, among other things, and so those are
13	just some examples. Again, the one pagers gave
14	very good summary and detail of why states did
15	not report and the number of states not
16	reporting.
17	While a few measures were pointed out
18	as having relatively low levels of reporting, the
19	staff did not identify any potential removals
20	from the core set. Instead, we believe that more
21	experience and data points are needed for the
22	particular measures.

So with that being said, we had really
good discussion and I've pulled up my nifty Excel
sheet that was also in your bundle of materials.
So if you have any particular questions about any
more of the measures, then we can answer those.
So if no more questions about the
particular measures, then do we have any
potential proposal for measure removal? Oh, I
have questions.
CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. We've got some
people.
DR. LESSLER: I'm trying to figure out
how to formulate a question about this, but I
guess it's more of an observation at this point.
It's just interesting to me the number of states
that did report on hypertension, which is chart
level data.
And I'm wondering, is that well,
from a clinical perspective, I think that's
extraordinarily important. I mean, if I were
just to say from population based standpoint, I
think I can understand why they would want to and

1

its importance.

2	But I'm wondering if there's something
3	about that? It'd be and Bev, I don't know if
4	you have any comment or anybody else has any
5	comment. I mean, I find that encouraging.
6	And actually what it gets me thinking
7	about is whether it'd be worthwhile trying to
8	since the chart level data is hard to get and
9	whether or not there's value in prioritizing and
10	saying, you know, if you're going to go after one
11	chart level data, go after this.
12	I personally I would vote, I think at
13	this moment, for hypertension. Particularly
14	given how much success we're having there. And
15	Bev I don't know if you have or anybody
16	CHAIR PINCUS: But I think this is
17	part of a more general issue. Are there certain
18	counterintuitive kinds of information that we
19	have? Where there's something that seems like it
20	would be hard to collect is highly reported? Or,
21	on the other hand, things that seem to be easy to
22	collect have a very low reporting rate?

MS. COURT: This is Bev. I think you 1 2 also have to look at whether there's complete reporting or there's partial reporting. 3 So for those states that may have integrated EHRs, where 4 they can pull that, then it's achievable. 5 If they're getting reports, for 6 7 example they've embedded that into certain managed care plans. Maybe they have three 8 9 managed care plans, they had one that reported 10 it. They reported the one managed care plan. So I think when you see that the state 11 reported on it, it doesn't mean that they 12 13 reported on it for their entire Medicaid population because there's so much partial 14 15 reporting. I think you take that with a grain of 16 salt. CHAIR PINCUS: Well, the useful thing 17 18 I think to see if there's some way the next time 19 around to get the information about what's the 20 level of reporting by state. That actually is in --21 MS. LASH: 22 MS. GORHAM: It's in the one pager.

MS. LASH: -- the one pager packet --1 2 MS. GORHAM: Yes. -- that looks like this. 3 MS. LASH: There's a lot here, so it's easy to miss. 4 MS. GORHAM: 5 Right. But I'm trying to page that 6 MS. LASH: 7 measure right now. CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. Or some way to 8 9 condense that data so it's easily accessible. MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: And in the 10 11 reports for the child report, because you don't have any detailed state reporting yet on the 12 13 adult measures. That won't happen until this 14 year. 15 But in the child report, the notes at 16 the end of every table give you the specifics on whether it was complete or partial reporting and 17 18 what the state said that was reported. So there 19 was correct on --20 CHAIR PINCUS: Anne? I'd kind of like a MS. COHEN: 21 22 conversation about a specific measure. And

discussing what ---- A, it's highly reported, so 1 2 it may not be worth switching for another And this measure was taken up by the 3 measure. Duals Committee and I believe that this measure 4 that we took up was switched from the other 5 6 measure. 7 So it's the 2371, Annual Monitoring for Patients on Persistent Medication is the one 8 9 that we have now. And reported highly, that's 10 why I'd love to hear from states why it's 11 working. With -- give me one second, 2456, Medication Reconciliation: Number of 12 13 Unintentional Medication Discrepancies Per Patient. 14 So it's a little different. 15 It's 16 getting at a little different issue, but the Duals Committee felt like this was important 17 18 because of medication errors and all kinds of 19 other stuff. So it is --20 MS. LASH: It's a facility level 21 measure. 22 MS. COHEN: It's a facility level

1 measure. 2 MS. LASH: And it would involve chart review, to my knowledge. I can pull up the 3 specifications. 4 DR. SIDDIQI: Do we have access to the 5 one pagers for the adult? I have the child core 6 7 set. MS. GORHAM: Yes. You have ---- it 8 9 should be on your SharePoint page. Alvia, you're on both task force --10 11 DR. SIDDIQI: Yes. MS. GORHAM: -- so you would have to go 12 13 to your committee homepage for adults. MS. COHEN: And NQF staff please feel 14 15 free to shut me down if this an absolutely 16 terrible idea, but I mostly just kind of wanted to discuss the --17 18 MS. LASH: Yes. Let's discuss --MS. COHEN: -- intention of this 19 20 measure and whether it's what we want to get at and whether there's another medication kind of 21 22 errors that might be more valuable.

MS. LASH: So, the measure Anne is suggesting is number 2456. It was developed by the Brigham and it's a rather complex but really important measure of safety as results of medication use.

So the description, which I'll read 6 7 aloud from our QPS system, is that it is intended to measure the quality of the reconciliation 8 9 process by identifying errors in admission and 10 discharge medication orders due to problems with 11 the medication reconciliation process. So the target population is any hospitalized adult 12 13 patient and the time frame for measurement is the hospitalization period. 14

So at the time of admission, the 15 16 orders are compared to the pre-admission medication list compiled by a trained pharmacist 17 18 to look for discrepancies and identify which 19 discrepancies were unintentional using brief 20 medical record review. This process is repeated at the time of discharge where the discharge 21 22 medication list is compared to the preadmission

1

2

3

4

5

medication list and the medications ordered 1 2 during the hospitalization. This is a rather newly endorsed 3 Measure from our care coordination project. 4 And it was one of ---- might have been the only new 5 measure endorsed in the care coordination 6 7 project. I do recall the steward making the case at the time that it is rather labor intensive. 8 9 It works much better in a facility that has

10 electronic health records.

But we know medication errors are rampant. So there was an important quality improvement opportunity there. The question I guess to this group would be if this is a quality improvement opportunity the Medicaid agency could influence or --

17DR. LESSLER: What's the number again18Sarah? I just want to --19MS. LASH: Sure. It's 2456.

20DR. LESSLER: 2456.21MS. LASH: Yes.22MS. COHEN: And let me be clear, this

is an example that I had readily at my fingertips. My real question is whether the existing measure, the Annual Monitoring for Patients on Persistent Medication gets at the quality issue we're capturing.

6 So are we wanting to know, okay, if 7 these patients are on persistent medication, why 8 are they on them? And do they need to be 9 reviewed? Is it that we want to deal with 10 polypharmacy issues? Or is it that we want to 11 deal with medication errors? And that's really 12 kind of what I want to get at.

And this measure, the annual monitoring of medications, really to me gets into play for people with disabilities who may be on multiple medications and I want to make sure that this particular measure is the correct one. And whether or not there needs to be others that look at that.

Now, granted, it's highly reported, so let me be clear, this may not be something that needs to even be messed with. But it's just

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

1

2

3

4

5

www.nealrgross.com

something that I kind of wanted us to consider 2 while we're here.

CHAIR PINCUS: Marissa? 3 MS. SCHLAIFER: I'm still looking at 4 the current measure, but I think on the 2456 5 measure, I think it's a great aspirational 6 7 measure and a great -- but, I mean, as far as realistically what's going on today and what the 8 9 state Medicaid programs can influence, I think it's definitely something maybe that hospitals 10 should be measured on, I don't know that it's 11 something that state Medicaid programs should be 12 13 measured on. Because I don't think they have the ability to influence it. 14

15 But as far as an aspirational measure 16 and a measure that should be used to measure the quality of hospitals, I would totally agree with 17 18 it. I'm still looking at the -- I mean, I think, 19 for what you're saying and obviously if the 20 current measure is specific to certain medications and so that I think misses what 21 22 you're looking for.

1

,	
1	Conceptually I think it's probably
2	where you want to be, but you're right, it
3	doesn't hit the disease states and the
4	medications that
5	CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. I mean, the
6	reality is when one has to focus on claims data,
7	you're really identifying sort of opportunities
8	for doing something, but you don't know whether
9	something was actually done.
10	MS. SCHLAIFER: Yes.
11	CHAIR PINCUS: So there's a and so
12	that's one of the problems. That's another
13	problem with sort of screening measures. That
14	even if you know somebody got screened, did
15	somebody do anything about a positive screen?
16	And so that is limited information and
17	a more distal connection to the outcomes. And
18	that's one of the problems we face. And one of
19	the questions I had is are there not just
20	looking at also sort of the incongruities of sort
21	of why is hypertension so well represented and
22	maybe it is because it's mostly only partially

reported, and that may be the case. 1 2 But also, and I don't know if Mathematica has this data, but what are the 3 measures that states complain the most about? 4 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: Of course --5 CHAIR PINCUS: And is that --6 7 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: But let me -- I'm not sure if anyone from our contractor for 8 9 Mathematica is on the phone now? Can you answer 10 that question? Is anyone there? I know Margo said she might have a conflict in timing, but is 11 anyone else there? The phone lines are open, 12 13 right? Or are they open? MS. LASH: If there's a member of the 14 15 Mathematica team, you can signal the operator by 16 pressing Star 6? One? 17 **OPERATOR:** Star, one. 18 MS. LASH: Star, one, and your line 19 can be opened. 20 OPERATOR: Ann Rosemary Bort (phonetic). 21 22 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: Oh, great.

1OPERATOR: One second.2MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: Can you answer3that question?4MS. BORT: I'm sorry. We were trying5to figure out how to get on and I didn't it6was the question about the measure that the7states had the most concerns about?8CHAIR PINCUS: Well, the measures, not9the single measure. But what are the measures10that the states complain the most about?11MS. BORT: Well, I think we do have12that information. I don't have it at my	
3 that question? 4 MS. BORT: I'm sorry. We were trying 5 to figure out how to get on and I didn't it 6 was the question about the measure that the 7 states had the most concerns about? 8 CHAIR PINCUS: Well, the measures, not 9 the single measure. But what are the measures 10 that the states complain the most about? 11 MS. BORT: Well, I think we do have	
 MS. BORT: I'm sorry. We were trying to figure out how to get on and I didn't it was the question about the measure that the states had the most concerns about? CHAIR PINCUS: Well, the measures, not the single measure. But what are the measures that the states complain the most about? MS. BORT: Well, I think we do have 	
to figure out how to get on and I didn't it was the question about the measure that the states had the most concerns about? CHAIR PINCUS: Well, the measures, not the single measure. But what are the measures that the states complain the most about? MS. BORT: Well, I think we do have	
 6 was the question about the measure that the 7 states had the most concerns about? 8 CHAIR PINCUS: Well, the measures, not 9 the single measure. But what are the measures 10 that the states complain the most about? 11 MS. BORT: Well, I think we do have 	
 7 states had the most concerns about? 8 CHAIR PINCUS: Well, the measures, not 9 the single measure. But what are the measures 10 that the states complain the most about? 11 MS. BORT: Well, I think we do have 	
8 CHAIR PINCUS: Well, the measures, not 9 the single measure. But what are the measures 10 that the states complain the most about? 11 MS. BORT: Well, I think we do have	
9 the single measure. But what are the measures 10 that the states complain the most about? 11 MS. BORT: Well, I think we do have	
10 that the states complain the most about? 11 MS. BORT: Well, I think we do have	t
11 MS. BORT: Well, I think we do have	
12 that information. I don't have it at my	
13 fingertips, but we do have kind of we	
14 certainly have TA requests. I don't know that we	e
15 group them by complaints or questions, but we	
16 could get that information.	
17 CHAIR PINCUS: It would be useful to	
18 hear that and just get a sense of what is the	
19 most aggravating.	
20 MS. COURT: States can certainly	
21 provide that in the semi-annual reports. So if	
22 you can hear directly from the states as to how	

they would list those and the reasons why, I 1 2 think then you would actually get representative feedback. 3 CHAIR PINCUS: Can we also get some 4 more -- in terms of data not available. 5 It's --MS. COURT: There's more breakdown than 6 7 that, but I don't know --MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: So, it is. And 8 9 we've said in the future, we will provide more granularity about that one because within that 10 11 other, we break down some of the categories. We just have not provided that to the MAP, but we 12 13 can do that in the future. CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. It could be 14 15 helpful. And then to look at what are the 16 characteristics of measures that are more acceptable or less acceptable. 17 18 And particularly, again, these sort of incongruities that Dan mentioned. Where there 19 20 are things that seem like they would be harder, but they're still highly reported. What's behind 21 22 that?

MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: So can I just say 1 2 though, generally measures ---- and I think we've said this before, so I feel like I'm being 3 redundant, but measures that require chart review 4 are problematic. Or that are hybrid, that 5 require a sampling from the population, are 6 7 problematic. MS. BORT: And Marsha, also I think 8 9 measures that require linking to another data 10 source --11 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: Yes. MS. BORT: -- such as vital records. 12 13 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: Yes. So right --MS. BORT: Those are challenging. 14 15 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: So chart linkage 16 are the two areas that are most problematic. So, for example, the high blood pressure is something 17 18 that you need the medical record and that's 19 something that a state typically would have to 20 either hire or use their external quality review organization to do the chart reviews. 21 And that's one of the reasons I asked 22

the question yesterday about could we make more effective use of the external quality reviews for both managed care but also otherwise. It just means the state would have to cover some of those costs. But anything that's an extra cost to the state becomes a burden.

7 MS. BORT: I think one more challenge 8 is things that states pay a global fee for and so 9 you can't always disaggregate down to figure out 10 what actual service was provided or number of 11 visits or specific content of visits if it's a 12 global fee. And this comes out most commonly in 13 the maternity measures.

14DR. LESSLER: So I just want to really15endorse what you just said in terms of trying to16leverage the external quality review to a greater17degree in terms of collecting these measures18since the states who have managed care have to do19that and we're collecting a lot of this data20anyway.

21 To the extent that it can be 22 coordinated and states could be provided with

1

2

3

4

5

6

technical assistance in terms of particularly how 1 2 to aggregate up to a state level and so forth. I think that would be another opportunity for 3 efficiency. 4 MS. PELLEGRINI: I think it's worth 5 repeating something that we've said in past 6 7 meetings, which I imagine some of you all were in as well. Which is that the future of quality 8 9 measurement is not claims data. Right? Claims data is becoming less and less 10 granular as we're getting into more things like 11 bundled episodes and ACO-type measurement, things 12 13 like that. That data is becoming less and less useful all the time. 14 And meanwhile, the EHRs that are 15 16 coming online, their primary function is clinical care and billing and quality measurement or 17 18 research or things like that are much farther 19 down the development list. 20 So maybe what we could do as a group as part of this report is urge HHS to work more 21 22 closely with EHR developers to kind of raise the

priority of structuring the EHRs so that they're 1 2 more amenable to the data extraction that we're talking about here. Because right now, that 3 seems like it is not a priority and that is going 4 to hamstring this process more and more as time 5 6 goes by. 7 CHAIR PINCUS: George? DR. ANDREWS: Yes. A comment and a 8 9 As it relates to the blood pressure question. 10 under control, recognizing that this requires chart review, there are still codes that are 11 12 used.

13 So, again, I don't know to what extent -- because I know physicians, providers have 14 15 gotten better in terms of using those codes to 16 report blood pressure under control, even the different degrees of where the blood pressure 17 18 range is. And so, again, I'm throwing that out. 19 DR. LESSLER: And that's the whole PQRS 20 piece because Medicare does that. DR. ANDREWS: Right. And then, my 21 22 question ---- and I'm really surprised, is of the
states that are reporting, Florida is not shown. And Florida has a large Medicaid population. And I know they capture data. And I know they stay on top of their providers in terms of -- whether it be penalties or whatever. So do we know why Florida isn't reporting?

7 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: Florida does report for the children's measures and have been 8 9 very consistent over the years. We try to 10 incentivize the reporting for the adult measures 11 with our grantees and that certainly, I think, 12 happened because there were 27 grantees and we 13 had 27 grants to report and three other states that were not grantees that reported. So there's 14 15 a resource challenge.

But the key thing I think you're saying is that Florida has the data. I actually talk a lot about Florida because Florida has one of the most accessible quality reporting systems online for their health plans. There's several states that are already moving forward. And so Florida is one of the states that I use as an

1

2

3

4

5

6

example of the model of a state that is already doing the quality reporting system.

But we've not been able to get them to report on the adult measures. We will work on that, but I want to say, sometimes I'm trying to think of the priorities. I really like the idea about trying to prioritize measures that we can improve reporting on.

9 And then we also have to prioritize 10 states we want to bring into the system. And we 11 have limited resources as well. So, we'll have 12 to think about which of these priorities we're 13 going to prioritize.

Because all of them are on our list. 14 15 You know we talked about goals, so the goal is to 16 increase states reporting and increase measures reporting. And the question is just how can we 17 18 do all of those at the same time. But, yes, to 19 go back to your original question, Florida has 20 lots of data, we just have to get them to report that for the adults. 21

CHAIR PINCUS: Marissa? Oh --

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

22

1

2

MS. LASH: But to quickly make a 1 2 related point. In response to Brock's earlier question about the correlation between states 3 participating in this measurement and those 4 expanding, there are nine states not currently 5 expanding Medicaid who are submitting adult core 6 7 set data. So I don't know that, that's as a powerful of a pattern as I would've expected. 8 9 CHAIR PINCUS: Marissa, then Anne. Then we'll take a break. 10 11 MS. SCHLAIFER: So since we've gone around the room a little bit since, and this may 12 13 be a little late of a comment or answer. But I really like where Anne is trying to go and I just 14 15 wanted to -- yes, no, I think we definitely want 16 to get something in there that says, are we doing an overall assessment of people's medications. 17 18 And I think your question was, we seem to be 19 focusing on some of the hypertension measures 20 within this measure. What I think what's most interesting 21 22 about measure 2371 -- and it does serve a

purpose, I just don't think it serves our 1 2 purpose. I mean, it serves a purpose to be in there, but not the conversation we're having now. 3 It's interesting, it is not in any way 4 a measure of should this person even be on this 5 medication? What it's measuring is, are you 6 7 doing the blood test to make sure that their dose of that medication is appropriate? But it in no 8 9 way looks at, should this person be on this 10 medication at all? CHAIR PINCUS: Anne? 11 MS. COHEN: Which, I mean, thank you 12 13 for looping back to that --MS. SCHLAIFER: Yes. 14 15 MS. COHEN: -- because I would've lost 16 MS. SCHLAIFER: I don't know if it 17 18 should go away, but --19 MS. COHEN: But, so --20 MS. SCHLAIFER: -- it doesn't serve the purpose that we're talking about. 21 22 MS. COHEN: Two things. One is, do we

need a different hypertension measure since this 1 2 is, I think -- no, there's a high blood pressure measure also on here. But, so that's one 3 question. And then I see the polypharmacy issue 4 is on this. 5 MS. SCHLAIFER: I know. She told me to 6 7 put that --MS. COHEN: So, yay, Sarah, thank you. 8 9 But I agree, I take down my measure suggestion 10 because clearly it's not an effective one, but 11 thank you for capturing the spirit. But I wanted to comment on the idea of 12 13 how to creatively get at getting data. Or doing incentivizing about data. There's two thoughts. 14 15 Even though NCQA -- not all plans are NCQA 16 certified by any means, but increasingly a large number are. Why couldn't NCQA encourage plans to 17 18 do a quality improvement project around a 19 specific area that we all know is important? 20 That's part of this set. That's maybe part of 21 other sets. 22 And then kind of -- well, no, but NCQA could provide some financial support maybe. I
 don't know. That's a big huge stretch, sorry for
 anybody NCQA in the room.

But at minimum, they have to do a QIP,
they have to do recertifying every few years.
It's at the plan level. It's just something to
kind of think about.

8 The other thing is that the EHR 9 question that you brought up about pressuring EHR 10 vendors, I actually think the opportunity is not 11 necessarily in the EHR vendors because there's a 12 whole data fight with them right now. But it is 13 with the care management software vendors at the 14 plan level.

Because there's a lot of data that's 15 16 collected in that care management software that never trickles out of the internal plan care 17 18 management. Yes. So there's a large number of vendors that offer that software. Plans use it. 19 20 They have all kinds of data changes they make to They use it for quality improvement project 21 it. 22 internally, and by a large extent, that world is

all managed and run by the plans and the vendors. 1 2 So you could put tickles in the care management software that when care managers talk 3 to a patient, ask them about polypharmacy for 4 instance. And then using that as a reporting out 5 tool for the plan to then report out to the state 6 7 on a quality improvement project. So it's kind of an out of the box, 8 9 creative thing and it would be challenging, but 10 it's something that maybe CMS hasn't thought 11 about. CHAIR PINCUS: So, I think we've had a 12 13 very rich discussion. And it sounds like we're going to be making recommendations about specific 14 15 measures, but there were some more generic kinds 16 of things that we can make recommendations about that go to the issue of reducing disincentives 17 18 and increasing incentives. 19 So thinking about how to break down 20 some of the barriers. So to think about recommendations around facilitating linkage among 21 22 different data sources, things like that.

Facilitating ways by which vendors, whether it's care management or whether it's EHR vendors, can facilitate access to data relevant to quality reporting that are collected in the course of providing care.

To think about how one could make use of registries in this. How one could link to the approach that the PQRS is using. So that -- and to think about ways by which one could also induce incentives.

So for recommendations around NCQA 11 accreditation, for example. Around some kinds of 12 13 more formalized and specific elements of quality improvement projects that would want to be 14 15 incorporated. So these are the kind of things 16 that we can think about and can make recommendations that are not measure specific, 17 18 but really look at the broader set of issues. 19 Okay, so let's take a ten minute 20 break. And reconvene at 20 of. And we'll hear 21 from states. 22 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

went off the record at 10:23 a.m. and resumed at 1 2 10:36 a.m.) MS. LASH: When you arrive back at your 3 seats, you'll have handouts about some additional 4 measures we'll be taking up later this afternoon 5 that weren't in your initial materials. 6 7 So you can set those aside for now and we'll be explaining them after we hear from our 8 9 state panelists. CHAIR PINCUS: So, David, are you on 10 11 the phone? DR. KELLEY: Yes, good morning. 12 I am 13 here. CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. So, we're going 14 15 to hear from David and Beverly. We want to try 16 to move through this briskly because we'd like to start a discussion of the measure by measure 17 18 reviews before lunch. And so, Dave do you want 19 to start? 20 DR. KELLEY: Sure. Thank you. Hopefully everyone can hear me okay. Let me know 21 if --22

CHAIR PINCUS: You're coming through 1 2 loud and clear. DR. KELLEY: Okay, great. So again, 3 from our standpoint within Pennsylvania, to give 4 you a bit of the lay of the land, we are 5 primarily managed care across all of our 6 7 counties. We've been in managed care for 17, 18 8 9 years. We do have a carve-out model of physical health, behavioral health. And we do not include 10 11 at this point in time dual eligibles, except for duals under 21. 12 13 So when it comes to measuring, we have about 1.6 million and growing numbers of 14 individuals in what we call our HealthChoices 15 16 Program. And we are undergoing currently traditional Medicaid expansion. 17 So we expect 18 those numbers to grow significantly over the next 19 three to four months. 20 So what are some of our challenges? Again, I think, having consistency in the adult 21 22 measures across all states so that everybody's

doing the measure exactly the same way. Which 1 2 for us is not that big of a problem. Our plans are NCQA accredited. 3 They do the HEDIS measure set. And for many years 4 we've required them to do what we call 5 Pennsylvania Performance Measures, which are 6 7 measures that are not NCQA, but we have either developed or, in this case, we're actually using 8 9 the adult core measures that are not HEDIS and 10 asking our plans to report on those measures. So, I think that just from our 11 12 standpoint, consistency across all states. And 13 then alignment with both Medicare, but especially with meaningful use of quality metrics. 14 And 15 then, I think earlier there were some comments 16 again about moving away from claims and getting more into electronic extraction. 17 18 I can't make that point enough times 19 that electronic extraction of quality metrics, 20 whether it's through the meaningful use, the

22

21

(202) 234-4433

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

QRDA1, that's patient specific. And I would say

that we definitely need to make the vendors hear

www.nealrgross.com

loud and clearly that they need to be working 1 with our eligible providers to really push out 2 that more robust data set electronically. 3 I would also highly encourage that all 4 of the adult quality measures be converted into 5 e-measures and be reported using the QRDA 6 7 standardized format. I think that would take away many of the barriers around reporting and 8 9 extraction. One of the measures that tend to be 10 reportable on the least are those that require 11 the more robust chart audits. 12 So, for instance, 13 with us, antenatal steroid reporting has been difficult. And that's one that I believe we do 14 not report on because of a whole host of 15 16 So from our standpoint, we really want barriers. to see consistency alignment and then really a 17 18 push on electronic extraction. 19 I there were some comments earlier 20 about care management software, and our managed care plans have care management software. 21 We 22 make them rigorously report on a whole host of

I don't know if there's consistency in things. 1 2 how those things are actually reported in various care management softwares. 3

So I would have some concerns about 4 consistency. How those end up being reported. And I would have concerns that plans would be all 7 over the place in the consistency aspect.

Again, I think in partnership with 8 9 NCQA, and NQF, we really need to be pushing for 10 the acceptance of electronic databases for both HEDIS and adult measures. So that from a health 11 12 plan standpoint, if ---- for instance, we have 13 some projects where we're working with some major health systems to actually electronically extract 14 15 right out of their EHR and then we've been 16 working with NCQA to make sure that those extractions are acceptable for quality metric 17 18 reporting.

19 And then I think the other thing that, 20 I've heard this on some of the comments, that we leverage our EQRO considerably in -- we have 21 22 eight managed care plans and we use them to

(202) 234-4433

5

6

really do weighted averages across all of our 1 2 health plans so that we can report a HealthChoices weighted average measure for all of 3 the HEDIS as well as the adult core measures. 4 We also use them -- because we have a 5 carve-out, there's certain measures like the 6 7 initiation and engagement measure where we actually give them our data set, a validated 8 9 encounter data set, and they help us measure that because of the carve-out situation. We also use 10 11 the EQRO to look at, I believe, it's live births under 2,500 grams and the C-section measures as 12 13 well. So in some instance we use the EQRO to 14 15 actually do the measurement for us because it's 16 just easier than working with all of the plans. So, as you're thinking about new measures ---- or 17 18 adding or subtracting measures, think about what 19 can be electronically extracted now or hopefully

20 in the near future.

21 Think about alignment with meaningful 22 use. Think about ways that there are some states

(202) 234-4433

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

www.nealrgross.com

that have a behavioral health, physical health 1 2 carve-out. Think about sometimes those challenges that states may have in reporting 3 those particular measures. 4 And then I think I'm probably 5 redundant, but again, those measures that do 6 7 require actual chart audit, especially like in the hospital setting or settings that health 8 9 plans typically don't have to go into as part of 10 HEDIS, there are a whole host of barriers to 11 getting and reporting those particular measures. So those are my comments and I think 12 13 we were supposed to talk about some of our notable successes related to quality measurement. 14 15 Again, I think, looking at our initiation and 16 engagement project that we did with the Adult Quality Grants, we've been able to measure 17 18 initiation and engagement. We've actually been 19 able to pilot some programs around quality 20 improvement because we've been able to measure that across physical health and behavioral 21 22 health.

So, again, we also have had some 1 2 notable successes in electronic extraction of certain measures with some of our larger health 3 systems around OB care. 4 And, again, as you're thinking about 5 what measures to add and subtract, think about 6 7 ways in which large providers can actually extract, or large health systems can actually 8 9 extract, these measures and report to our health 10 plans or to us, the state. I'm going to end my comments there and 11 certainly can entertain questions if that's 12 13 appropriate. CHAIR PINCUS: Thank you, David. Let's 14 15 hear from Beverly. 16 MS. COURT: Thank you very much. And I've got some slides here. And I will go through 17 18 these quickly because I think I'll reiterate a 19 lot of points that states have already made. 20 CHAIR PINCUS: Maybe move the mic a little bit closer. 21 22 MS. COURT: Certainly. So first of

all, I want to thank CMS for the opportunity to 2 take part in the grant program, the Adult Quality Measure Grant Program, which really enabled us to 3 do things in Washington state we wouldn't have 4 been able to do. Such as build our staff 5 capacity and in particular have multi-agency, 6 7 cross-agency, collaborative quality improvement projects. 8

9 So I'm going to go through these 10 quickly. I think Washington state, as you can see, we're siloed in our medical and our mental 11 12 health delivery systems. They're in separate 13 capitated programs. Long-term care services is outside of managed care. Duals is mainly fee-14 15 for-service.

16 When we started with the AQM project, our particular interest, because we were also 17 18 entering into a duals project, was looking at 19 those areas that really fell through the cracks. 20 Those intersections between long-term care and the medical. Between medical and behavioral 21 22 health. And so we focused our projects on -- we

1

broke down rehospitalization, I'll get to that in
 a minute.
 So in terms of selecting measures for

reporting, of course you've already heard
administrative based measures are the easiest to
implement.

7 If we're going to suggest dropping a 8 measure, care transitions is a bear. And I think 9 it would move states further if there was an 10 intermediate measure that could be introduced 11 that would -- care transitions is such a huge, 12 very complex array of transactions that have to 13 happen in order to capture that.

I think keeping it on there for a long period of time won't necessarily move the needle. So I would encourage you to look at some interim, even process measures to start getting movement with states on that area.

Another opportunity that the adult measures folks have is in our reporting why we didn't report on a measure, what isn't shown there ---- we don't have the opportunity to

explain is what we are doing. So care
 transitions is a huge effort in Washington state.
 We're not reporting it. But to develop the
 infrastructure, to create that, a huge
 investment.

6 So if there was an open text field, 7 that would be really advantageous in the 8 reporting, and then being able to understand 9 what's happening in states for those measures 10 that aren't reported.

11 So what are some of the data 12 collection barriers? I think we've talked about 13 this already. One of my pet peeves, you may have 14 noticed this already, but CAHPS survey. We know 15 that when we do program evaluation, we get 80 to 16 85 percent response rates.

When we get such a low response rate in CAHPS surveys done at the plan level, you can't tell if those results are spurious or not. So you can pray that there's going to be random variation the next time you measure that. That point estimate that you get from the CAHPS

(202) 234-4433

,	
1	survey, I don't think is very reliable.
2	The other is that it's not actionable.
3	Because the way it's currently structured, you
4	can't narrow down to the practice level in order
5	to make effective changes. Or geographically.
6	So there are ways and, for example,
7	Oregon piloted this in the AQM project, ways of
8	modifying CAHPS surveys so that you can actually
9	do something with those results. So I would
10	encourage that there be a recommendation from
11	this group that the CAHPS survey methodology be
12	enhanced so that it adds the elements of being
13	able to draw down to the practice level.
14	And just beneficiary survey fatigue.
15	Earlier this year we did our QIO, our EQRO did a
16	CAHPS survey, we had the National CAHPS survey
17	that's being fielded now, we're going to have
18	another CAHPS survey shortly for the duals
19	project, so we have the potential of having one
20	Medicaid beneficiary asked or responding to three
21	CAHPS surveys.
22	None of that is shared with the state,

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

I

so the state can't use that in order to meet AQM 1 2 reporting. And so another -- I think, another thought is if you're going to be -- even CMS, if 3 they're going to be fielding these surveys, think 4 of the utility of only hitting that client once 5 with the same question. And being able to share 6 7 that information with the state so that we're not creating this survey fatigue situation. 8

9 Reporting from MMIS systems certainly 10 have their limits. I think we've talked about 11 that. Medical record hybrid, again, people know 12 that those are challenging.

So, I won't go through this -- I've
got some references here, but the two projects we
focused on was reducing psych rehospitalizations.
We found that this was an outcome type based
measure, much preferred than follow-up after
mental health hospitalization.

19 In fielding this ---- in putting this 20 as a performance measure for the capitated mental 21 health plans, we found that there was a lot of 22 argument. Okay, what qualifies as a follow-up?

(202) 234-4433

That you could do follow-up, but it had no 1 2 bearing on the rehospitalization. When we did these projects and we 3 provided provider feedback, we found that 40 4 percent of those that had repeat psych 5 rehospitalizations were not engaged in the mental 6 7 health system. They don't just walk through your door. If you take a public health policy 8 9 approach, we'd have to go search them out. And they're findable. 10 We know from the data that we were 11 already supplying them, for example, they're 12 13 showing up in the ER repeatedly. So, there's some major system -- different ways of thinking 14 15 about how we approach these problems and this has 16 been a big one in Washington state. And so we have actually adopted this psych 17 18 rehospitalization measure as a statewide measure. CHAIR PINCUS: Is that an all-cause 19 20 rehospitalization or specifically a psychiatric? MS. COURT: Psychiatric 21 22 rehospitalization is now one of our outcome

measures that was adopted by the governor. 1 2 MS. COHEN: It's 0576. Follow-Up After Hospitalization for Mental Illness. 3 CHAIR PINCUS: No that's not the --4 this is --5 MS. COHEN: It's not the same? 6 7 CHAIR PINCUS: -- actual rehospitalization. 8 9 MS. COURT: No. Psychiatric 10 rehospitalization, I don't know that, that's a 11 Measures. CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. I don't think 12 13 that's --MS. COHEN: But weren't you saying that 14 15 rather than --16 MS. COURT: Yes. MS. COHEN: -- sort of after mental 17 18 health hospitalization that this was more valuable? 19 20 MS. COURT: Right. It's far more impactful and that's what we want people to focus 21 22 on, reducing rehospitalization. So there's the

<i>*</i>	
1	Follow-Up After Hospitalization for Mental
2	Illness is one of the AQM Measures.
3	CHAIR PINCUS: Right. Yes. I'm not
4	asking about the follow-up one, I'm asking about
5	the rehospitalization one. Why you chose the
6	measure for rehospitalization to be a psychiatric
7	rehospitalization after the index one as compared
8	to a rehospitalization for any reason?
9	MS. COURT: So if you look at any
10	reason, that's so broad. How can you impact
11	that? How can you put together and really,
12	the question is what was failing? What was
13	failing in our system?
14	What was failing in our system was
15	contact between the hospitals and the mental
16	health capitation plans. Between mental health
17	capitation plans and the medical capitation
18	plans. We knew that those were system problems.
19	These are where the systems are supposed to
20	engage, they're not.
21	And we can show that, that is if we
22	drilled down for a rehospitalization, these were

our problem areas. The psych rehospitalizations, 1 2 if we could get a handle on that, a huge impact on our rehospitalization overall rate. 3 Same with reducing rehospitalizations 4 from nursing homes. I mean, 22 percent of people 5 who were discharged from the hospital to a 6 7 nursing home are going to be rehospitalized within 30 days. So it was -- you really want to 8 9 focus on those areas where you think you can, and 10 especially in a quality improvement project, make a difference. 11 And, in fact, in that one we did. 12 13 That pilot looked at increasing communication within the nursing home, documentation, and it 14 15 pays off. That's something that now we're 16 looking at --17 CHAIR PINCUS: Just, Ann and Nancy, 18 this is relevant to this specific issue? 19 DR. SULLIVAN: Yes. 20 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. DR. SULLIVAN: On the psych 21 22 rehospitalization, do you think it was because

you were kind of honing down on a particular --1 2 when you do the measure of after mental health -after hospitalization follow-up, you have a whole 3 panoply of people who have been in the hospitals 4 and come out. But when you're talking about 5 psych rehospitalization, you're often talking 6 7 about a high risk group that kind of comes back. So do you think that's what helped in 8 9 terms of narrowing the group and the focus 10 between the plans and the -- or what do you think 11 worked when you started to use the psych 12 rehospitalization measure versus the other one? 13 MS. COURT: So the other one, you asked the capitated mental health plans, please count 14 15 the follow-up that you did from people --DR. SULLIVAN: Right. 16 MS. COURT: -- who got discharged. 17 18 Okay, so it doesn't have -- they count things 19 that aren't necessarily that effective. 20 DR. SULLIVAN: Okay. MS. COURT: So this is a good process 21 22 measure -- this is one of the process measures

where really the outcome is, did you reduce 1 2 hospitalizations overall for psych for the population and then, particularly, the psych 3 rehospitalization. I mean, this was like 17 4 percent overall rehospitalization of those who 5 were admitted for psych. And that's pretty high. 6 7 And so, I think that we've talked about gradating and having a tier of measures to 8 9 get to a certain outcome. And this is a good 10 example where maybe these are paired. You have follow-up after mental health hospitalization and 11 then -- but your final outcome is ---- I think, 12 13 psych rehospitalization is where you want to focus your attention on that outcome. 14 15 Because if you do the -- you say, hi 16 guy, and you make a phone call or whatever, that may not be good enough. And obviously, it hasn't 17 18 been. We've used that as a quality measure in 19 contracting and it just is not panning out well. 20 CHAIR PINCUS: Nancy? DR. HANRAHAN: Thank you, Beverly. 21 Ι 22 think it's really interesting the work you're

It's great. One of the groups that -- I doing. 1 2 think it was the Behavioral Health Steering Committee, and I think you were on that too 3 Harold, but we reviewed readmissions for psych 4 hospitalization and there was a myriad of reasons 5 why that, that measure really wasn't that useful. 6 7 In the research that we did on looking at the outcome of psychiatric rehospitalization, 8 9 and we studied transitions in care. So we 10 studied an intervention to try to decrease 11 readmissions to psychiatric hospitalizations and what we found was that the various places that 12 13 admit for a psychiatric condition, a psych unit in general hospitals or a free-standing 14 15 psychiatric hospital, each of them had various 16 interpretations of the HIPAA regulations, making it almost impossible to break through the barrier 17 18 to communicate with the providers that were in 19 those settings. Which I think really confounds 20 this study of this variable significantly. So what we did was we shifted to the 21 22 all-cause medical or surgical readmission to

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

www.nealrgross.com

general hospitals, and find that to be a much more -- that the medical side, sector, is much easier to communicate with. Their interpretation of HIPAA regulations is much looser than it is in the behavioral health field.

6 And then also they are so desperate 7 for help with these clients that they don't know 8 what to do with, the behavioral issues, that they 9 were more than willing for us to come in and try 10 to solve this problem and really -- so there was 11 a willingness to participate.

And we found that for adolescents, 12 13 obstetric, maternal age childbearing women, and surgical and medical conditions that all of these 14 15 people had significantly higher rates of 16 readmission than those without serious mental And we defined serious mental illness 17 illness. 18 major depression, bipolar, and schizophrenia. So 19 we really drilled down to that very specific 20 definition.

21 And so, I think that it's a cleaner 22 way to go about looking at readmissions for the

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

population that generally have a huge burden of 1 2 comorbidity medical, as well as psychiatric. But, just some thoughts. 3 MS. COURT: Right. 4 CHAIR PINCUS: Lisa? 5 MS. PATTON: Yes. I was just going to 6 7 make a couple of points. And Nancy made it better than I could. But one of the -- at 8 9 SAMHSA, we really support the use of the allcause readmissions. 10 Because we know that a large number of 11 our SMI population don't really get great medical 12 13 Or if they entered the hospital for a care. behavioral health issue, the underlying physical 14 15 health concerns may not be addressed during that 16 hospitalization. And so we really look at that follow-17 18 up after mental health care as getting at some of 19 And also addressing the need for better that. 20 care coordination and the community networking that goes with that. 21 22 And I think that's part of the intent

of that Measure, is to see how does that care 1 2 coordination happen and who's involved in that But, again, looking at all-cause 3 process. readmissions seems to capture more of some of 4 what's happening with that population. 5 DR. SIDDIQI: I was just going to say, 6 7 I'm glad we have the all plan readmission rate as a Measure. But when we're getting at what 8 9 Beverly's talking about, it sounds like the Measure of follow-up for mental illness is 10 11 basically checking to see if the patient was seen in an outpatient office visit after their 12 13 hospitalization. But does that really impact the 14 15 outcome of do they come back to the hospital? 16 And there are a lot of points that you just made, Lisa, for example community partners, phone 17 18 interventions, group therapy. There's a lot of 19 different ways that you can tackle this issue 20 that can be even primary care focused that doesn't involve an actual follow-up visit within 21 22 a certain set time period that could actually

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC 103

www.nealrgross.com

impact the outcome in terms of is this patient getting better care coordination across the board.

So, I think we should try and see if 4 there is a Measure that is on readmission 5 specifically for mental health. Whether or not 6 7 we want to substitute it with the one from follow-up mental health illness or maybe just to 8 9 add to the set.

Because the all plan readmission rate 10 11 is looking at everything and it's for all-cause, so it's not the same focus that Beverly's talking 12 13 So I'm trying to look at the Measures about. that relate to a readmission for mental health or 14 15 psychiatry, there's like, actually I'm not really 16 seeing on in the Excel.

So I'm not sure if there's any that 17 18 are out there in the pipeline or about to go 19 through NQF endorsement. Or was this a measure 20 that specifically, Beverly, you had formulated for your work? 21

22

1

2

3

MS. COURT: Right. We dreamed this up

as part of our quality improvement project and it
didn't include all psych diagnoses. We did limit
it and target it. I agree that all plan
readmission is important because psych is an
underlying issue on such a high proportion of our
Medicaid population.

7 In this case, we were trying to hold 8 some entities accountable for those things that 9 they were paying for, that we were paying for. 10 And this was an outcome that they could control. 11 So, I think it differs -- when we moved to merge 12 medical and behavioral health contracts, I think 13 then that would be the way to go there.

But, again, if you're trying to -they can say, well, I have no control over what the medical managed care plan, who they admitted. Great. But you do have control over who you admitted.

So this got down to -- it really
opened the arena, I think, of, you're responsible
for a population, not just who showed up to your
door. And I think the 40 percent of those who

had no contact with the mental health system, but 1 2 were repeat rehospitalizations for some extreme psych issues, that pointed out a huge gap in how 3 we contract and how we hold plans responsible. 4 DR. SIDDIQI: Right. Just to follow-5 up, I was just going to ask and encourage if you 6 7 would be able to try and work through the NQF process to perhaps submit a Measure that you've 8 9 already worked on. I know that's a huge ask, but 10 I'm just going to through it out there. 11 CHAIR PINCUS: So, Dan, and then I want 12 to call on myself. 13 DR. LESSLER: Okay. Thanks. So actually -- so this is a siloed measure for a 14 15 siloed system? I think that's --16 MS. COURT: At this point. DR. LESSLER: -- the point. And the --17 18 which given the system today, it probably makes 19 sense and certainly has been helpful in this 20 context. But some of the ideas that are on the 21 22 table, I think, are just really important ideas.

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

www.nealrgross.com

Because one of the things going forward as -- at 1 2 least in Washington, as we look at 2020, full integration and so forth and I think everybody 3 is, New York and others are pursuing this idea of 4 integration of behavioral health and physical 5 Is this idea -- it begs the question of health. 6 7 what are good measures of systems that are integrated? And I don't have the answer to that. 8 9 I actually was thinking a lot about 10 this just yesterday and overnight in anticipation of this meeting. But I think some of the 11 comments might begin to get at that and I think 12 13 it is something that we really need to ask NQF and Measure developers to be working on. 14 But one idea, for example, is for 15 16 people, and I'm putting aside all the difficulties in doing this and so forth, so I'm

17 difficulties in doing this and so forth, so I'm 18 just trying to -- but for people with SMI, what 19 is their hospitalization rate and across psych 20 and medical, what is their rehospitalization 21 rate?

22

In this case, if we had a really

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

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

integrated system, I sort of agree with, I think, what others are saying. That in a fully integrated system, coming out of psych hospital, you would want to look at readmissions regardless 4 of whether it's to a medical admission or psych admission.

7 So, I just think it's a really good conversation. I think we need measures that 8 9 speak to the integration that we're all trying to 10 achieve.

11 CHAIR PINCUS: Let me just comment. 12 First off, I agree with you. And in fact, 13 actually last week, we published in JAMA a viewpoint exactly on this issue that we can 14 15 circulate. And we just recently got a grant from 16 the Commonwealth Fund actually to develop an agenda for quality measurement at the interface 17 18 of behavioral health and general health care. 19 And so that's -- and partly because if 20 you look at the data, actually the majority of healthcare costs for people with severe mental 21 22 illness are not on the mental health side, but

1

2

3

5

6

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

108
it's on the general health side. 1 2 MS. COURT: Right. CHAIR PINCUS: Now, the other point I 3 wanted to make is that these two issues are not 4 mutually exclusive. So that one can have a 5 measure that sort of has the same denominator, 6 7 but two different numerators. So that it's people that are having 8 9 initial index admission for a mental health condition and then looking at their 10 11 rehospitalizations both with regard to psychiatric rehospitalization and for a general 12 13 medical or for any. We do know that among the 14 15 rehospitalization rates across all of Medicaid, 16 that four out of the top ten conditions for rehospitalization are behavioral health 17 18 conditions. Two of which are substance abuse and two of which are mental health. So that is 19 20 clearly an issue. And you can see -- and the incremental 21 22 cost of doing it two ways is actually very low in

terms of the analysis. So that -- and it may be 1 2 useful in terms of what -- in directing quality improvement records to look at the discrepancies 3 and differences. 4 So I think that, that's valuable. 5 And we'll get to later today about sort of thinking 6 7 about how one can do this kind of segmentation. Particularly in the behavioral health side at 8 9 this interface between behavioral health and general health. 10 11 Looking, for example, at performance on general health Measures for this segment of 12 13 people with severe mental illness as like a disparities population kind of thing. So that 14 15 there -- again, these are approaches that we can 16 talk about. MS. COURT: So, are we on --17 18 CHAIR PINCUS: Ann? 19 MS. COURT: Oh, sorry. 20 DR. KELLEY: This is Dave Kelley. I'd like to weigh in if possible. 21 22 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay.

110

,	
1	DR. KELLEY: There's been a lot of work
2	on readmissions in the Medicaid. Medical
3	directors actually published last year in Health
4	Affairs a multi-state project on readmissions.
5	Different states have challenges
6	around looking across physical and behavioral
7	health. And I'll just start with that statement.
8	I'll also agree that if you're not paying
9	attention to individuals with behavioral health
10	conditions and SUD, that you're not going to get
11	the entire picture.
12	I would advocate staying with an all-
13	cause readmissions measure, but then looking at
14	that initial index admission and then looking at
15	what happens subsequently. It gets very
16	difficult because some states do not have the
17	ability to look across both sets of information.
18	And integrated managed care, even
19	though it's supposed to save the world, I can
20	tell you it will not. Because even when you do
21	sub-contracts, a lot of those entities still
22	don't want to share some of the information. And

1

we've done a lot of self-analysis.

2 We report -- and this is back to my initial comment about having consistency in how 3 states report -- the readmission measure, as I 4 understand it, there is not a NCQA and Medicaid 5 readmission measure. This is one of those 6 7 measures where I think there was flexibility in how states reported this. 8 9 We reported an all-cause readmission 10 in our physical health. We do that externally. 11 We use our EQRO to develop that spec, we've been measuring now for several years, it's actually 12 13 part of our MCO-paid performance. Our EQRO also independently looks at 14 15 behavioral health readmission rates independent. 16 And then we also have had them look at -- and again I mentioned earlier the beauty of having an 17 18 EQRO look across those sides of the carve-out, 19 and they actually have dug a lot of analysis for 20 us around looking at the effects of people with behavioral health conditions and then 21 22 specifically the effects of individuals with SUD.

1 And if you don't pay attention to 2 behavioral health conditions and also SUD, you're 3 really going to miss a huge opportunity. So, my 4 comment to the committee is that I would stay 5 with an all-cause readmission with some sub-6 analysis.

7 And then I also would like to advocate 8 that there are increasing number of measures, 9 NCQA has several measures, again, that are 10 looking at integrated care. And I think looking 11 at medication adherence for schizophrenics -- at 12 individuals with schizophrenia. Looking at blood 13 pressure control.

I really want to advocate that there 14 15 are more and more measures that actually get to 16 more integrated care. And again, the initiation and engagement is another example of where we 17 18 need to be paying attention from a quality 19 metrics standpoint in integrating care. 20 CHAIR PINCUS: Anne? MS. COHEN: So, I mean, I think there's 21

a couple problems that we can sort of outline

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

along this. Mental health is so carved out in most states, at the county level, and the bed day availability is so limited, that I think you're really missing a huge percent of the population in the rehospitalization measures.

6 And I would echo the comments from the 7 gentleman from Pennsylvania and I think we have a 8 number of measures before us here that we can 9 take a look at. And one that I think could be 10 really valuable is 2605, which is Follow-Up After 11 the Emergency Department Use for Mental Health 12 Conditions or Alcohol.

13 Because that's when a lot of the mental health patients end up in the ER and the 14 15 primary reason for rehospitalization is 16 medication management issues that have gotten so severe and they can't get appointments and the 17 18 only way the psych doctor can rebalance them is 19 say to get admitted. So, I think that, that 20 captures a large percent of the population. I also like the idea of some of the 21 22 measures that deal with diabetes, A1c 3, and

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

1

2

3

4

blood pressure management for folks that are schizophrenia or bipolar disorder because I think that, that's a huge secondary condition component that we're not tracking that could really avoid some of the hospitalization issues.

CHAIR PINCUS: Nancy and then Beverly. 6 7 DR. HANRAHAN: I want to ask Sarah if she would put all-cause readmissions up there for 8 9 the dual eligible and the Medicaid population. Because I think we're all agreeing that there's 10 something to that, that will add substance to --11 particularly the dual eligible or the SMI 12 13 population that's so costly and so burdened with disease in our society. 14 But I also want David to talk a little 15 16 bit more about engagement and activation.

17Because I know we started speaking about this18among the MAP groups that I've been on as a

19 Measure that we really need to explore.

It's a dimension of quality
improvement that we have not hardly touched. And
it really accesses the patient's perspective and

1

2

3

4

5

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC 115

www.nealrgross.com

the patient's accountability and responsibility 1 2 in that linkage with quality. So can you just talk a little bit more about how in fact you did 3 tackle that, David? 4 Using our quality DR. KELLEY: Sure. 5 grant, we, again, had our EQRO actually report on 6 7 initiation and engagement measure across our carve-out. And as they did, because we had 8 9 behavioral health at the county level that then 10 gets rolled up into five behavioral health MCOs, 11 we also had a to do a county by county sub-12 analysis. 13 And for our quality improvement project that we did in our grant, we actually 14 15 took the large county Allegheny County and the 16 Pittsburgh area out because we really noticed that our results were, shall we say, far from 17 18 optimal. And so we were able to overcome kind of 19 the confidentiality issues. 20 Officially, we have fairly robust encounter data sets from both our physical and 21

behavioral health plans. So we were able to

(202) 234-4433

22

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

www.nealrgross.com

measure initiation and engagement and what we 1 2 found was that many of these individuals were landing in the emergency room, were not really 3 getting appropriate follow-up care. 4 So they really weren't getting even 5 initiated. And then those that were being 6 7 initiated really did not stay actively engaged. And so we used those in Allegheny county to 8 9 really start to build a better care model that 10 we're really just getting off the ground. 11 Actually, we have all of our MCOs in 12 that area participating and actually, even though 13 the grant is over, they've offered to sustain this model of care coordination and navigation 14 15 for two years. So we're in the process of 16 putting in actually an intervention where individuals are seen either in the emergency room 17 18 and/or if they get admitted to the acute care physical health side of the fence, in one health 19 20 system there are social workers that have been trained in Esper and have been linked to our 21 22 managed care plans.

And then in another large health 1 2 system, there are actually peer -- they call them peer recovery specialists, that are again working 3 with those consumers. So we've been able to 4 measure it. We're not happy with the results. 5 And now we're trying to build kind of these 6 7 interventions around better navigation and helping these consumers actually initiate and get 8 9 engaged. But we've done a fair amount of work 10 in looking at individuals with SUD, how they get 11 admitted to the ED over and over again, and how 12 13 they have been readmitted to hospitals, both on the physical and behavioral health side of the 14 15 fence, repeatedly. 16 And it's part of -- if you look at your claims data, some of these individuals will 17 18 come up as dizziness and giddiness or metabolic

your claims data, some of these individuals wi come up as dizziness and giddiness or metaboli poisoning or whatever. There are unique ways that hospitals have of coding these incidents. But when you do a drill down, it

really drives a lot of our medical costs on the

19

20

21

22

www.nealrgross.com

physical and behavioral health side. But again, 1 2 being able to measure it really is helping us to identify where are the issues. 3 CHAIR PINCUS: Beverly. 4 MS. COURT: Okay. Well, I'm glad I got 5 to stir up some discussion. So just to go 6 7 forward then to look at some of the findings that we had. 8 9 Our other focus of rehospitalizations 10 were those that were emanating from nursing We did do a paper looking at our dual 11 homes. population where we merged Medicare and Medicaid 12 13 data, specifically looking at the issue of rehospitalization from nursing homes. A number 14 15 of -- there's a citation to the paper, it's 16 online. So you can read about it. But one of the things that we -- so 17 18 this addresses how do you take these Measures and 19 operationalize them? How do you make them into 20 performance Measures and what's effective and what's not effective? 21 22 And this gets back to the point, I

think, that was made either, the need for risk 2 adjustment. And this just an example. On the vertical axis, we have 90 day inpatient 3 readmission rate. On the horizontal axis, we 4 have a risk score, which is a case mix index of 5 the duals in the nursing homes. This is using 6 7 CDPS, Medicaid Rx, just diagnosis, pharmacy, age, gender. 8

9 But we found it very effective in --10 especially when we used this against the Medicare and Medicaid information together on these duals, 11 to portray a case mix of the nursing homes. 12 And 13 then each of these dots is a nursing facility that had received at least 25 dual eligible 14 15 hospital inpatient discharges in this time 16 period.

So if we were to look at the 17 18 performance of these nursing homes and we were to 19 set, let's say, the average as our performance 20 measure, that would be 36 percent. That's huge. That means that these folks are cycling between 21 22 the nursing home and the hospital.

1

However, there is a relationship between the admission rate and the severity of the patients that the nursing homes are serving. They're not equally distributed. So if we take that into account, then we have a case mix adjusted expected performance.

7 If you lay a -- you relate the 8 expected performance to the severity of the 9 people that they have in their facility. So what 10 does this do? In terms -- if we don't case mix 11 adjust results in our expectations for 12 performance, what happens is that, for example, 13 we have this one facility that gets penalized.

14 It has quite a severe risk adjusted 15 weight for the clients in their nursing home. 16 Yet they're under what we would expect to be 17 their 90 day readmission rate. If we had just 18 identified the 36 percent, we would have 19 penalized this facility.

20 But if we do risk adjustment, we find 21 in fact that they're probably one of the best 22 performers and we would want to learn from this.

Likewise, we would be rewarding mediocrity if in fact we didn't risk adjust those that are below 36 percent, but they really could do better given what other nursing homes can do with a similarly severe patient population.

So I just wanted to -- when we say, 6 7 okay, well how do we make movement on these measures? It's one thing to measure it. 8 It's 9 another, totally different, set of activities to 10 say, we're going to make improvements in this 11 measure. And so this is an example of what you 12 have to do and how you have to be very careful 13 when you try to implement improvements in these 14 measures.

Gaps, I was just going to throw out, because Washington does a great job of it, we do a lot of long-term care services delivered in the home or community. And so one of the things that hasn't been reflected in the measures is measures of home and community based long-term care use. Just for your consideration.

22

1

2

3

4

5

Lots of barriers that we talked about

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

before, but I'm really glad that we've had the 1 2 opportunity to address it. And Marsha and I are going to be talking later with her folks. 3 Again, the issue of mathematical 4 competency in a sense, that the measure 5 definition not include the partial Medicaid 6 7 coverage in the denominator. And this isn't an issue -- when you look at the NCQA or the HEDIS 8 9 measures, that's for people who are enrolled in 10 plans. They don't have partial Medicaid. They have full Medicaid. They don't have third party 11 They're fully Medicaid. Or else they 12 liability. 13 wouldn't be enrolled in those programs. So it's not an issue if you're basing 14 15 your measures off of the performance of those 16 managed care plans. However, if you are using administrative based, you're looking across the 17 18 state, if you're generating them that way, you 19 get very skewed results. So, again, we have an 20 opportunity to make that refinement in the measure, technical specs. 21 22 Again, things that will encourage

states to continue to -- when you do a state to 1 2 state comparison, there's always going to be winners and there's going to be losers. If you 3 can reformat how you report these measures as a 4 quality improvement, that is you follow a state 5 over time and you also capture what they're doing 6 7 for those measures that they're not being able to capture at this point. What is their process to 8 9 building that infrastructure? I think then you build a reporting

10 11 atmosphere that's conducive to states reporting. 12 But it would be very, very easy at this point to 13 slide into something that's immediately considered unfair, immediately considered winners 14 15 and losers. So I think it need to be handled 16 very carefully about how the data is released and what kind of incentives, disincentives it would 17 18 create.

19So I think I've made all my points.20And I really appreciate the opportunity to21address you.

CHAIR PINCUS: This has been really

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

terrific. I think it really helps to influence 1 2 our thinking in terms of what we add, what we don't add going forward. And I think rather than 3 have more a sense of -- we've already discussed a 4 lot of these issues, why don't we move to having 5 public comment on states' experience. 6 7 And then we can move much more directly right to discussion of measure by 8 9 Measure kinds of issues. Anybody online that would like to comment in the public comment 10 11 period about states' experience in reporting 12 measures? 13 OPERATOR: To request a public comment, 14 please press Star then the number 1 on your 15 telephone keypad. And there are no public 16 comments at this time. 17 CHAIR PINCUS: Thank you. What about 18 in the room? 19 DR. LIU: Hi. This is Junging Liu from 20 NCOA. I would like to use this opportunity to give the Task Force a review of the NCQA's 21 22 behavioral health measures that will be discussed

this afternoon. I think it would be helpful to -1 2 CHAIR PINCUS: Actually, we're going to 3 discuss it right after this public comment 4 So right now. 5 period. DR. LIU: Yes. Great. So, two of the 6 7 measures will be discussed are metabolic screening Measures for people with schizophrenia 8 9 and who are on antipsychotics. Those were are 10 developed and endorsed by NQF three years ago. And that project led us to this recent 11 project that we developed 11 measures, that's a 12 13 set of measures for people with serious mental illness and substance abuse issues. So thanks 14 15 for the committee to consider these measures. 16 So for the recent measures, we heard 17 stakeholders encourage us to develop outcome 18 measures for people with behavioral health conditions. So that's led to this work. 19 So we 20 have seven of the measures that are diabetes indicators for people with SMI. And one of them 21 22 is controlling high blood pressure for people

1

with serious mental illness.

We developed these measures because there is evidence to support that there's higher prevalence and disparities in care for people with serious mental illness for these conditions. And evidence support that people with SMI die 25 years earlier than the general population because of their chronic medical conditions.

9 So we developed these measures to address the medical care and also address an 10 11 integration of behavioral health and the primary 12 care for this population. So the measures are 13 aligned with the general population diabetes and hypertension control measures. But we specified 14 15 them for the SMI population to really emphasize 16 disparities in care and offer us an opportunity to monitor the care for this population. 17

And the reporting of this measure could require over sampling of the general population measures so we can have enough sample of people with SMI to look at the quality of care for that population. And it --

CHAIR PINCUS: By the way, you have this paper before you, so hopefully you don't anything ---

DR. LIU: Yes. So the material that has an overview of this set of measures and high level specification for these measures.

7 And we also have a screening and 8 follow-up measures for people with serious mental 9 illness or alcohol and other drug dependence 10 problems. Those were the BMI screening and 11 follow-up, tobacco screening and follow-up, and 12 alcohol screening and follow-up.

13 So we developed these measures, again, because of the higher prevalence and the comorbid 14 15 behavioral health conditions for this population 16 as well as disparities in care. And we adapted existing general population measures and 17 18 reporting measures for the serious mental health 19 population and the substance abuse population. 20 And also, we stressed into the

numerators of these measures to require twoevents of services, could be counseling or

4

5

6

pharmacotherapy, to really meet the needs of this high-risk population. And the stakeholders

encourage us and supported us to specify the measures this way.

And we tested these measures, the 5 diabetes measures as well as the screening 6 7 measures, and the results really demonstrate large disparities focused across measures. The 8 9 performance rates for the SMI and substance abuse 10 populations were 10 to 40 percentage points lower 11 than the performance rates for the general Medicaid populations. 12

13 So there's clearly disparity and room for improvement. And the last of the measures is 14 15 the follow-up after ED discharge for mental 16 health or substance abuse problems. That measure really captures the continuity of care as we know 17 18 that as evidence support those with follow-up 19 care are much less likely to be readmitted into 20 And also we know that behavioral health an ED. conditions are among the ten top conditions of ED 21 readmits for Medicaid beneficiaries. 22

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

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

www.nealrgross.com

,	
1	So that's our overview of the measure
2	set. And I'm happy to answer any questions you
3	may have during discussion. Thank you.
4	CHAIR PINCUS: Thank you. Are there
5	other public comments?
6	DR. EISENBERG: Hi. My name is Woody
7	Eisenberg. I represent the Pharmacy Quality
8	Alliance. I'd like to introduce three new
9	measures that are not part of your packet, but
10	that I hope that you'll consider this afternoon.
11	These are measures of the use of
12	narcotic overuse. And they were developed to
13	directly address the epidemic of narcotic
14	morbidity and mortality that besets the nation
15	currently.
16	The three measures are the use of
17	narcotics over a certain dose, in this case 120
18	morphine equivalent dose milligrams over a
19	certain period of time. The second measure is
20	the proportion of individuals without cancer
21	receiving prescriptions from opioids from four or

I

more pharmacies. And the third measure is a 1 2 combination of the two, it's the proportion of individuals receiving greater than 120 milligram 3 morphine equivalent dose from four or more 4 prescribers and four or more pharmacies. 5 The description and the 6 7 specifications, although you may not have them, are over on the side table. We've done testing 8 9 of these measures and what we've shown is that 10 there is great variation amongst different health plans in the commercial and in Medicare. 11 We don't yet have specific Medicaid 12 13 testing, although we are pursuing that right now. And we hope that you'll consider these Measures 14 15 during this session because we think it fills a 16 gap in the Medicaid Core Set. Thank you. 17 CHAIR PINCUS: Any other public 18 comment? 19 DR. SIDDIQI: Just a follow-up question 20 to the speaker from PQA. Are any of these going to be going through an NQF endorsement process? 21 22 Or has it been applied? Going to be --

DR. LIU: They are all endorsed by NQF. 1 2 DR. SIDDIQI: Sure. I meant the opioid 3 CHAIR PINCUS: From the PQA, I'm sorry. 4 DR. EISENBERG: The PQA measures were 5 just endorsed by PQA two weeks ago. We're in the 6 7 process of preparing them for NQF submission right now. Thank you. 8 9 DR. SIDDIQI: That's great. CHAIR PINCUS: So can we move ahead 10 11 then? So we're skipping over lunch. 12 (Laughter.) 13 CHAIR PINCUS: No, we're going to come back to lunch later. We're going to come back to 14 15 lunch later. 16 But we want to start the conversation for the measure by measure review. And not 17 focusing right now on measures to remove, but 18 19 focusing more on measures to fill gaps. 20 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: Before we go to that section, I just want to suggest we add 21 22 something from Beverly's presentation to the

board, where she said gaps were home and 1 2 community based services measurement. Just so we don't forget it. I just don't want to lose it. 3 CHAIR PINCUS: Lisa, was there 4 something you wanted to --5 MS. PATTON: We can come back to it 6 7 when we talk about the behavioral health condition Measures. So, I can hold off. 8 9 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. 10 MS. LASH: Okay. So, when this body 11 last met, there were a list of high priority gaps 12 developed. You can see them on your screen here. 13 There was an interest in having more Measures to look at concepts related to access, to both 14 15 primary and specialty care. More outcomes 16 reported directly by the Medicaid enrollees. Care coordination. Cultural competency. 17 18 Efficiency. 19 Long-term supports and services, not 20 specifically home and community based services. Maternal health. Promotion of overall wellness. 21 22 Treatment outcomes for behavioral health

conditions and substance use disorders. And the workforce. So many of these are sort of stubborn measure gaps that have persisted like this for some time. Although there are always new measures in development.

6 And so we're very pleased to be able 7 to bring you potential measures for addition in 8 some, but relatively few of these gap areas. 9 Because that was such a long list, we actually 10 did a prioritization of the gaps at the last 11 meeting and there was a stronger request about 12 action in three gap areas.

13 So first, maternal health relating to 14 risk for poor birth outcomes. I think we really 15 had a lot of that discussion yesterday. And the 16 MAP did vote to support measures relating to that 17 topic.

Second, behavioral health and
substance abuse treatment to prevent readmission.
Very germane to what we had just been discussion.
And then finally, access to primary care.

22

1

2

3

4

5

As I just said, we've been over the

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

perinatal and maternity topic with some good 1 2 success. And right now, we'll dive into measures that we found in behavioral health and access to 3 primary care. Essentially, the rest of the gap 4 areas didn't have strong enough measures for 5 addition at this time or the properties of the 6 7 measures would not make them suitable for this type of state-wide reporting program. 8

For example, there are newly endorsed
measures of readmission to long term care
hospitals and home health, but they only include
Medicare claims. And so you could look at them
for dual eligibles, but that wouldn't be
accessible by the Medicaid agencies.

15 So I want to remind everyone about the 16 voting procedure quickly. We have it looks like 17 12 of you voting members currently in the room. 18 Our federal partners are non-voting as are the 19 states. Harold will plan to recuse himself from 20 some of the voting and I'll ask him to describe 21 that in just a second.

But either way, whether there are --

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

I think Brock was probably coming back, whether 1 2 there are 12 or 13 voting members present, the consensus threshold would be eight people needing 3 to support a particular motion to move forward. 4 And so the options available to you are to fully 5 support a measure for immediate use by CMS. 6 7 To conditionally support use of a measure with some additional requirements that 8 9 the measure potentially achieving NQF 10 endorsement, that there would be a specific 11 change you would request to be made by the measure steward, or if you think CMS needs to do 12 13 further work on confirming the feasibility or potential burden to states before you want to 14 15 throw the whole weight behind that 16 recommendation. I don't think we'll use do not 17 18 support, rather we would probably not vote on a measure that doesn't seem to have the interest of 19 20 the group. CHAIR PINCUS: And let me just say that 21 22 with regard to the behavioral health measures

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

www.nealrgross.com

that are stewarded by NCQA, I served as a advisor 1 2 to that process and sit on their Behavioral Health Measurement Advisory Panel. So that's why 3 I'm recusing myself from the NCQA measures. 4 MS. LASH: Any questions about the 5 voting? 6 Okay. 7 So, in the preparation, in the original bundle of materials, we had pulled out 8 9 some but not all of the newly endorsed NCQA measures on behavioral health. 10 So you'll have to 11 do a little bit of toggling between the Excel sheet, which does contain Measures 2599, 2600, 12 13 and 2605, and the handout that has eight additional measures. 14 15 There are, in this particular topic 16 area, quite a few potential measures available to In the staff review prior to the 17 the group. 18 meeting, the one that emerged as our front 19 runner, which we would propose for discussion, is 20 the measure on Follow-Up After Discharge from the ED for a Mental Health or Alcohol or Drug 21 22 Dependence Condition. It's the bolded one. It's

number 2605 and it comes last, it's on the back 1 2 page of the NCQA handout.

MS. GORHAM: Now, just a bit of clarification. On the screen, it's bolded, but 4 if you're actually looking at your Excel sheet, then it's highlighted in yellow.

7 MS. LASH: Yes. Thank you. And so, the other measures could be worthy, but given the 8 9 way MAP had articulated the particular gap they were interested in filling about care 10 coordination and outcome-oriented measure and so 11 12 on, and that there are already other measures in 13 the Adult Core Set related to cardiovascular disease and diabetes, that is the rationale for 14 15 the staff pick and we would be looking forward to 16 discussion about whether there would be an alternative proposal for one of the other 17 available measures. So, this is the spec in --18 19 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. Just one --20 MS. LASH: Sure. CHAIR PINCUS: -- other, just a process 21 22 question. So we have these measures that are up

3

5

here, plus the additional measures that are on 1 2 the handout --MS. LASH: Right. 3 CHAIR PINCUS: -- from NCQA. What 4 about the measure that came up in the recent 5 discussion? Are we going to get to those? 6 7 MS. LASH: The opioid measures? Sorry. CHAIR PINCUS: Well, the opioid 8 9 measures also. But also the rehospitalization 10 measure, for example. 11 MS. LASH: There is not -- as Beverly described, the psychiatric rehospitalization 12 13 measure that they're using in Washington is homegrown and we don't think we could scale that 14 15 right now to this national program. 16 We could talk, but this might be sort of a separate issue, about the use of the plan 17 18 all-cause readmission that is already, right now in the Adult Core Set and how use of that might 19 20 be strengthened to stratify --CHAIR PINCUS: Right. It could be so 21 22

MS. LASH: -- and identify different 1 2 populations. CHAIR PINCUS: -- could be segmented 3 and stratified in some way. 4 MS. LASH: All right. So, I will 5 quickly review Measure 2605 and we can discuss 6 7 that. And after we have reached a conclusion about the group's feelings on that, sort of ask 8 9 any of you to call out one of the other specific Measures for additional discussion. 10 11 So, this Measure 2605 looks at the percentage of discharges for patients 18 and up 12 13 who visited the emergency department with a primary diagnosis of a mental health, alcohol, or 14 15 other drug dependence condition and who had a 16 follow-up visit with any provider with a corresponding primary diagnosis of mental health, 17 18 alcohol, or drug dependence within seven and also within 30 days of discharge. 19 20 So there are two rates within the It's a claims-based process Measure and 21 Measure. 22 I will actually defer to our NCQA colleagues in

the room to further explain any questions you 1 2 might have about the tech specs. Thoughts? Beverly? 3 MS. COURT: So follow-up wouldn't 4 include audiology, correct? I mean, I'm always 5 fairly shocked when audiology is considered a 6 7 follow-up after hospitalization or other Measures. So when you say any provider, I think 8 9 there is reason to put some parameters around 10 that. 11 MS. LASH: There are some exclusions. It's fairly detailed. 12 13 DR. LIU: Okay. I think I'm on now, So for the provider, we did not 14 thank you. 15 specify the provider type. Rather, we require 16 primary diagnosis of mental illness or substance abuse problem to indicate that the visit is for 17 18 the behavioral health condition. We understand that each state have 19 20 different regulations in terms of who is qualified behavioral health providers. So that's 21 22 the way to get around that.

The measure does have exclusions. 1 2 Those were mainly for people who are directly transferred from the ED to another inpatient 3 The rationale was that those folks are setting. 4 getting the needed care when they are going to 5 another level of care. So this measure is 6 7 focused on people who are discharged to the community. 8 9 DR. HANRAHAN: Just a clarification. 10 A primary diagnosis of mental health, and I know somewhere you detail this out, is that any mental 11 health diagnosis? Does that include, I mean, I'm 12 13 assuming it does, any alcohol or drug ICD-9 Is it ICD-9 codes that you're using? 14 codes? 15 DR. LIU: Yes. So we use the diagnosis 16 codes of these conditions. The mental health diagnosis are very inclusive. Include all the 17 18 common mental health conditions such as 19 schizophrenia, bipolar, major depression, 20 anxiety, et cetera. And to maybe clarify that, this 21 22 Measure has four indicators. Two of them are for

mental health indicators. The other two are for substance abuse indicators.

3 So, for those people that visit the ED 4 with a primary mental health condition, then the 5 measure looks to see if they get follow-up visit 6 for the primary mental health diagnosis. And the 7 same logic for the other two indicators for the 8 substance abuse.

9 DR. HANRAHAN: So it's a primary 10 diagnosis of a mental health condition is what 11 I'm understanding. And is it any mental health 12 condition? I guess what I'm driving at here is 13 that, that's a very, very broad categorization.

A primary diagnosis really helps 14 15 because it narrows the focus a bit because you're 16 not going to get a primary diagnosis unless it's a mental health or drug or alcohol condition. 17 18 But I think that it's far better to carve away at 19 some of the hot spots or the high users rather 20 than do that kind of a broad sweep. And that's just from my experience doing research. 21 22 Beverly's shaking her head too.

(202) 234-4433

1

2

MS. COURT: That's why we refined our psychiatric rehospitalization to really select set of diagnoses.

DR. SIDDIQI: Just a follow-up about 4 the primary diagnoses. So if a provider sees 5 this patient and it's a primary care provider and 6 7 is addressing, let's say, hypertension, diabetes, and some other diagnoses, as long as they put in 8 9 the mental health diagnosis, that would meet Or it has to be the first diagnosis that 10 this? 11 they list?

12 Because that is going to be a huge 13 Because primary care providers challenge. generally like to put the primary diagnoses, even 14 15 if it is a mental health follow-up visit, they 16 often times are going to not primarily put this as their first diagnosis. They would put the 17 18 comorbidities often. So then, would that not 19 capture that follow-up visit?

20 DR. LIU: Yes. These are all very 21 valid concerns and questions. We actually heard 22 those and discussed with our measurement expert
1	panels and technical expert panels. They really
2	encouraged us to open the mental health indicator
3	to people with any mental illness, not to limit
4	it to say a subset of mental illness.
5	Because they think this is a high risk
6	population. If they have an ED visit with a
7	primary mental health diagnosis, they ought to
8	get follow-up care.
9	DR. SIDDIQI: So I agree
10	DR. LIU: And
11	DR. SIDDIQI: I agree with you, but I
12	guess what I'm questioning is when you say
13	primary diagnoses, that's first of all going to
14	limit even your search for administrative claims.
15	If you just say any diagnosis of mental health
16	for that follow-up visit, in other words, it
17	doesn't have to be primary
18	CHAIR PINCUS: Just to clarify your
19	question.
20	DR. SIDDIQI: I'm just clarifying.
21	CHAIR PINCUS: Are you talking about
22	for the denominator or for the numerator?

DR. SIDDIQI: For --1 2 CHAIR PINCUS: Because I think --DR. SIDDIQI: In the description, so 3 I'm thinking it's the denominator. 4 CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. Because for the 5 denominator, it's in the ED, not for primary care 6 7 provider. DR. SIDDIQI: Then it's the numerator 8 9 It's the numerator -then. 10 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. 11 DR. SIDDIQI: -- in terms of -- we should be able to capture any patient that 12 13 follows up in seven or 30 days, that's what it says, seven or 30 days who has a mental health 14 15 diagnosis that was initially seen in the 16 emergency room, it sounds like. And you're not going to capture that 17 18 if you just say primary because the majority of -- first of all, the administrative claims hassle 19 20 is going to be that much more challenging. In administrative claims, to be able to just capture 21 22 whether or not that diagnosis was collected is

very different from saying it's the primary 1 2 diagnosis that was collected in the way that providers bill. So that's where I'm confused. 3 And that technical question that I'm 4 asking about is when you say primary diagnosis, 5 do you really mean to say any diagnosis in that 6 7 visit as long as it was a mental health diagnosis? Because when you're saying primary, 8 9 that's not administrative claims data source. 10 I mean, that goes into much further discussion of how challenging that's going to be 11 in terms of the first diagnosis that a provider 12 13 bills for as number one. DR. LIU: Yes. Let me help to --14 15 that's a good question about sometimes providers 16 may not necessarily code their behavioral health conditions as a primary diagnosis. However, we 17 18 discussed that with our expert panels. 19 They recommend us to really require 20 the primary diagnosis for the numerators because they think that, that's really to ensure the face 21 22 validity of this measure. Because that's the way

to ensure that their follow-up visit is for 1 2 mental health conditions or substance abuse conditions. 3 And also in our testing, we really 4 tested different options of the numerator by 5 requiring or not requiring primary diagnosis. 6 We 7 actually get very similar results. So we are seeing the same population who are getting 8 9 follow-up care. 10 DR. SIDDIQI: But again, you're looking 11 at claims data, so in your testing, are you 12 testing chart reviews? Because if you're doing 13 claims data --CHAIR PINCUS: It's different. 14 15 DR. SIDDIQI: -- and you're trying to 16 pull, you're going to pull all the claims with that diagnosis. 17 18 CHAIR PINCUS: So just to clarify terms 19 Obviously with your claims data, it's not here. 20 necessarily primary diagnosis. It's the billing diagnosis. 21 22 DR. LIU: Yes. We use the -- we test

this measure in Medicaid claims and it's using 1 2 claims that are -- we were able to use that to identify the primary diagnosis. 3 CHAIR PINCUS: So on this specific 4 issue, about the numerator definitions, Marc? 5 DR. LEIB: If we -- restricting the 6 7 definitions to primary diagnosis on claims data for physician billing, hospitals have very 8 9 specific rules on what they list first, second, Physicians can list their diagnoses in --10 third. 11 CHAIR PINCUS: Right. DR. LEIB: -- any order they want and 12 13 most often just do cut and paste from their previous visit. So if they see a patient for 14 15 hypertension commonly, that's going to be the 16 first listed diagnosis. And they'll never see in this measure 17 18 the fact that they were there for their 19 depression, their anxiety, or anything else, 20 because it will not be the primary or first listed. And the term primary by the way is only 21 22 used on a hospital claim.

,	
1	CHAIR PINCUS: Right.
2	DR. LEIB: First listed is used on
3	physician claim. And it's
4	CHAIR PINCUS: So it's
5	DR. LEIB: doing it this way is
6	irrelevant.
7	CHAIR PINCUS: So it's a billed
8	diagnosis. So, Anne and then Dan, on this
9	specific issue. And oh
10	MS. COHEN: So
11	CHAIR PINCUS: Ann too.
12	MS. COHEN: So I would echo that. And
13	it gets a little more complicated than that for
14	mental health for this reason. If you're a
15	primary care physician, you can only treat
16	somebody for their depression for their first 30
17	days. If it's considered a serious mental
18	illness, it then is kicked to the county if it's
19	county carved-out, which it is in most states.
20	So therefore, their physician when a
20 21	So therefore, their physician when a person comes in, even if they have a serious

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

mental illness because they won't get paid. 1 At 2 all for the visit. CHAIR PINCUS: Ann? 3 DR. SULLIVAN: The issue here is 4 though, this is an ED visit. An -- oh, the 5 follow-up. 6 7 MS. COHEN: Thanks. Let me give you an example, okay. Somebody with schizophrenia has 8 9 multiple trips to the ER. Maybe an encounter for 10 a mental health facility. Gets triggered by the 11 plan to go in for a primary care visit. Goes in primary care visit, decides that he has some 12 13 wounds, decides that he has pneumonia, whatever. He won't code for that. 14 15 He's not going to even think about 16 coding for I'm following up with this person because they have a primary diagnosis of 17 18 schizophrenia because he's already carved down to 19 mental health. So then, maybe he will go see 20 county mental health. But probably it will take three months. 21 22 DR. SULLIVAN: Permission of their

provider --1 2 CHAIR PINCUS: I'm not sure why that's 3 a problem. DR. SULLIVAN: -- their after care 4 provider? 5 MS. COHEN: So the problem is, is that 6 7 when you pull the data, they're going to see -well, it would take at the health plan level, 8 9 let's say, how many of the mental health patients have gone to the ER A, and then did they see the 10 11 doctor? So it just depends on how they pull the That's the issue. 12 claims. 13 CHAIR PINCUS: I think it's, I mean, the way I understand it is, how many -- what 14 15 patients have been to the ED and had a --16 MS. COHEN: A mental health diagnosis. CHAIR PINCUS: -- mental health 17 18 diagnosis. 19 MS. COHEN: Maybe that's what it is. 20 CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. That's it. And then say of those, what proportion of them within 21 22 30 days had any encounter that had a --

MS. COHEN: Then it's --1 2 CHAIR PINCUS: -- billing diagnosis? MS. COHEN: Then it's --3 DR. SIDDIQI: Referring to what the 4 steward is saying that the primary diagnosis --5 MS. COHEN: No, no, no --6 7 DR. SIDDIQI: -- has to be --MS. COHEN: Wait, we're wrong. 8 We're 9 So this is why, okay. Sorry, forgive me, wrong. I think finally like the light went on. 10 I'm a health plan administrator, a 11 care manager. I'm going to pull all my ER visits 12 13 in the last 30 days. Of those, because I've had quality project related mental health, I'm going 14 15 to stratify the mental health patients out. Did 16 they go to the doctor, yes or no. DR. SIDDIQI: If that's the way --17 18 MS. COHEN: That's the issue. 19 DR. SIDDIQI: If that's the way it is, 20 that's different from --MS. COHEN: That's what it is. 21 22 DR. SIDDIQI: -- what she's saying

though in terms of their testing was only if it 1 2 was a primary diagnosis. That it counted in the 3 numerator. MS. COHEN: No, no, no, no. The 4 primary diagnosis is only for stratification 5 purposes only. It's not a numerator factor. 6 So 7 if someone with schizophrenia went to the doctor and got a wound check, that counted. Which is 8 9 okay. 10 DR. LEIB: It has to be the primary 11 diagnosis. DR. SIDDIQI: That's where I'm 12 13 concerned. MS. COHEN: The encounter of the ER --14 15 DR. SIDDIQI: The follow-up visit --16 CHAIR PINCUS: No, the encounter follow-up visit, if you read this. 17 18 MS. COHEN: Oh. Then you're --19 CHAIR PINCUS: But for the outpatient, 20 it would be a -- it's not a primary diagnosis, it would be a billing diagnosis. 21 22 DR. LEIB: Well, that's not what it

says though. 1 2 CHAIR PINCUS: Right. DR. LEIB: It says the primary 3 diagnosis. 4 CHAIR PINCUS: So I'm --5 DR. LEIB: So how is this operational? 6 7 DR. LIU: In the claims, I believe there's a field that says primary diagnosis. So 8 9 that's how we capture that. DR. SIDDIQI: You'd have to be able to 10 capture the number one billing diagnosis of the 11 provider. Which makes the administrative claims 12 13 data source that much more complicated. If you had just captured it as a 14 15 diagnosis, in other words, that the provider 16 billed for hypertension, diabetes, and then added wound care, and then added the diagnosis of 17 18 schizophrenia or the diagnosis of depression or a mental health diagnosis, that would be fine with 19 20 But I think the fact that you're saying it's me. a primary diagnosis, you're not going to capture 21 22 all those primary care provider office visits in

the claims data.

2	CHAIR PINCUS: But I think the
3	DR. SIDDIQI: Because it's primary.
4	CHAIR PINCUS: Let me just I think
5	the thinking is that if they were doing wound
6	care and all these other things, they probably
7	were not following up on the fact that the person
8	actually attempted suicide and
9	DR. SIDDIQI: No, we do follow
10	primary care physicians
11	CHAIR PINCUS: the lacerations
12	DR. SIDDIQI: do follow those things
13	up, but mental health diagnoses typically are not
14	billed first by primary care providers. It's the
15	chronic medical conditions that allow your
16	payment, so those are the ones that you're going
17	to primarily bill for.
18	And still secondary, maybe third,
19	fourth diagnosis will be the mental health
20	condition, but it's not typically primary.
21	Because you will not get paid as a primary care
22	provide often.

And it's not just in the carve-out 1 2 states. I'm not just talking about the carve-out Typically mental health conditions 3 states. primarily diagnosed -- if you put it as a primary 4 diagnosis, the patient will come back to you 5 frustrated because there was an issue with co-6 7 payments, there's an issue with payments from the health plans. 8 9 So primary diagnoses typically are not mental health conditions in primary care provider 10 11 offices. Again, you're talking about follow-up in a county mental health facility and mental 12 13 health facilities, certainly that would be the primary diagnosis and you would capture --14 15 CHAIR PINCUS: Anne? 16 DR. SIDDIQI: -- that. But not in the 17 primary care provider office. 18 MS. COHEN: Okay. So, there's -- this 19 is my primary question. What is the purpose of 20 the metric at the end of the day? And the purpose of the measure, right, is do we want them 21 22 seen at all? So that we make sure that they're

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

www.nealrgross.com

okay. Okay. So that would mean no problem,
 wound check or whatever, that's fine. We saw
 them.

Or do we want to have a mental health 4 discussion with this individual? Or alcohol, 5 drug dependency? If it's an alcohol, drug, 6 7 whatever, then we have to know that data. Ιf it's we just want them seen, then it doesn't 8 9 Because in theory, we'll pull the matter. 10 hospital data first, stratify, and then look for 11 the --

DR. SIDDIQI: But the primary care provider's role is always very challenging and there's multiple conditions being addressed. So you're actually addressing both the primary physical --

MS. COHEN: Then that's fine.

 17
 MS. COHEN: Then that's fine.

 18
 DR. SIDDIQI: -- and the mental health.

 19
 MS. COHEN: So I'm asking what is the

 20
 purpose of the measure? What is the intent of

 21
 the measure? What is the follow-up intent? And

 22
 then what are you trying to capture? Do you see

where I'm going Harold? 1 2 CHAIR PINCUS: Yes, I do. Nancy? DR. HANRAHAN: So I think the problem 3 would get solved. If we eliminated after any 4 provider with a corresponding primary diagnosis 5 of mental health or alcohol or other drug 6 7 dependence and left within seven or 30 days. Because what that would say is simply we have a 8 9 percentage of people that went to the ED that had a primary mental disorder diagnosis that then 10 11 were followed up. That's it. 12 DR. SIDDIQI: Yes. 13 DR. HANRAHAN: And that's all the information we're going to get from this. And is 14 15 that adequate? 16 MS. LASH: I want to just clarify. This Measure is NQF endorsed, newly endorsed, so 17 18 we don't want to relitigate that. And so 19 therefore, it's pretty baked. So we will need to 20 make a decision as a group about whether this exact Measure as it is currently specified is 21 22 something we want in the Adult Core Set or not.

I'll just sort of leave there. 1 2 DR. LESSLER: I just had a process question then. Because we're considering this, 3 but there are a number of other mental health 4 measures. And I'm just wondering, are we going 5 to decide on this measure and then move to the 6 7 next. CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. 8 9 DR. LESSLER: So there isn't the ability to sort of think about these in their 10 11 totality and sort of say, of these, this probably would be --12 13 CHAIR PINCUS: No, we will. Actually we will have an opportunity to prioritize. 14 15 DR. LESSLER: Okay. 16 CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. But I think this one, I think, was qualitatively different than 17 18 the bulk of the others. This one is more of a coordination of care one. 19 20 DR. LESSLER: I understand. CHAIR PINCUS: The others are more 21 22 related to dealing with issues of comorbidity and

wellness. 1 2 DR. LESSLER: Right. So it's -- I just was going as long as --3 CHAIR PINCUS: But we can table this 4 until after we look the other ones. 5 MS. SCHLAIFER: To see if there's a 6 7 better one. MS. LASH: You like better? 8 9 MS. SCHLAIFER: Yes. 10 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. 11 MS. LASH: Okay. Other questions, specifically on this measure before we move on. 12 13 Ann? DR. SULLIVAN: I would just the 14 15 developers -- the question for people who tested 16 this. What their opinion is of what they found when they actually ran the data? Did they get a 17 18 significant number of people? Did they get 19 people with this primary diagnosis? Did it come 20 I mean, did they get an extremely small out? percentage? Did they get a significant 21 22 percentage?

,	
1	DR. LIU: That's a good question. We
2	actually rounded the claims that using the
3	different primary versus secondary diagnosis of
4	substance abuse and mental health conditions.
5	We were able to find a sufficient
6	number of people for the measures and we compared
7	the prevalence of the condition using primary
8	diagnosis to the prevalence of this condition in
9	the population. We actually find very similar
10	prevalence rate. So that also adds to our
11	confidence of our definition of this measure.
12	DR. SULLIVAN: You said you ran primary
13	and secondary? What do
14	DR. LIU: Yes.
15	DR. SULLIVAN: For comparison? And
16	you found out that basically you got a good
17	number on the primary?
18	DR. LIU: Yes. We used the primary
19	diagnosis that you find the prevalence rate is
20	very similar to the population prevalence rate
21	that
22	DR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

	- -
1	DR. LIU: is shown in the
2	literature.
3	DR. SULLIVAN: Because I just want to
4	say that I understand all the problems about
5	billing and primary care, but when someone's
6	leaving an ED and goes to see somebody
7	particularly for that ED problem, it still might
8	bump up somewhere in what you see. A lot of them
9	end up not going necessarily, some go to primary
10	care, some don't.
11	But that's your real reason and you're
12	really paying attention to it, and if they found
13	that the secondary primary wasn't that
14	distinguished, maybe the measure's okay the way
15	it's written. That's all I'm saying.
16	DR. SIDDIQI: I just wanted to give
17	feedback that I'm not sure what the sample size
18	of your testing was. But, again, if you're
19	looking at the top three diagnoses, that would
20	make more sense. Recognizing that within
21	Medicaid populations, access to behavioral health
22	providers is an extremely big problem.

And so the majority of follow-ups that 1 2 are happening for these behavioral health patients that are in Medicaid are actually in the 3 primary care provider's office. And many of 4 those are family physicians, pediatricians, 5 internists that are seeing Medicaid patients. 6 So 7 I just think that --CHAIR PINCUS: But I think you want to 8 9 be sensitive to access, actually it's better to 10 have the more restrictive diagnosis. 11 DR. SIDDIQI: But no, not necessarily. 12 Because access to a primary care provider is 13 still very meaningful and very valuable. It doesn't have to be with a behavioral health 14 15 provider who would only bill that top diagnosis 16 for that primary diagnosis that is a mental 17 health condition. That can be a very meaningful 18 visit. 19 In fact, many patients that primary 20 care providers see have mental health conditions. It's, again, just the issue of -- and they are 21 22 addressing the mental health needs of that

patient and trying to do care coordination for 1 2 that patient and work with the health plan. But the point is that you're going to 3 miss those providers who aren't going to, again, 4 put that as the primary diagnosis because of this 5 specific issue with this measure. So I would 6 7 just hope that in our report, that we can put, even though it has gone through NQF endorsement 8 9 and has been fully baked, essentially if we can give that feedback to the measure steward that 10 11 this is an issue. And especially when you talk about, 12 13 again, implementing this measure across the board for states to be able to do this. 14 They're going 15 to want to be able to just report on any follow-16 up visit that happened for that patient that had a mental health diagnosis condition for that 17 18 claim code to have been billed. Not that it was 19 only primary. You're going to select out a huge 20 number of primary care office visits --21 DR. LEIB: I agree. 22 DR. SIDDIQI: -- in follow-up.

1	CHAIR PINCUS: Marc?
2	DR. LEIB: In a number of states,
3	behavioral health is carved out from physical
4	health. And we make this dichotomy like there's
5	two different parts to the human being.
6	And a primary care provider, whether
7	it be family practice, internal medicine, or
8	whatever, while they can sit there and evaluate
9	the patient and write a prescription and keep
10	them going, if they list that as their primary
11	diagnosis, they will not be paid for the visit.
12	So they put that as a third or fourth thing so
13	they capture the fact they did something, it's in
14	the record.
15	But they list their hypertension,
16	their diabetes, their whatever as their main
17	purpose for being there. And that way their
18	office visit is paid for and the patient got
19	their needs met until they get to see the
20	behavioral health specialist in three, four, five
21	months down the road. And that's the reality of

world.

2	CHAIR PINCUS: I think we've hammered
3	this. Does anybody want to say anything that's
4	different than what's been said? Marissa?
5	MS. SCHLAIFER: I have a question.
6	This is as a non-behavioral health specialist or
7	person. Is part of having the measure, if we
8	can't get people in to see a behavioral health
9	specialist, is that some of the purpose of the
10	measure that we're capturing that people aren't
11	getting the care they need?
12	I mean, I realize you don't want to
13	it shouldn't be Medicaid, Medicaid programs
14	shouldn't be dinged for it. But it seems like
15	this is important information that I personally
16	didn't know. And I'm just wondering if there is
17	a purpose for the measure, if not the purpose
18	that we're
19	CHAIR PINCUS: Marsha?
20	MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: I'm going to
21	respond to her question. My concern would be if
22	yes, that's right. Because what we're saying

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

I

167

is that, that individual who needs mental health 1 2 care isn't getting it. And what I hear is, people might be 3 getting it, it's just not being coded as if they 4 got it. And so the performance looks poor, but 5 in fact the person is getting the care. 6 7 MS. SCHLAIFER: So I agree, it's not --CHAIR PINCUS: Lisa, and then we'll 8 9 move on to the next one. 10 MS. PATTON: Yes. I was going to say, just based on the feedback that we're hearing 11 today, clearly this is an imperfect measure. 12 And 13 I think Anne might've been getting at some of this earlier, but it's kind of like well, what is 14 15 the intent and what do we hope to see? 16 And so, not necessarily that this should now be taken up, but if it were then some 17 18 work could be done simultaneously in the 19 background perhaps to address some of these 20 But with the clear indication going concerns. out that this is something important to ensure 21 22 that, that follow-up care happens regardless of

the setting.

2 CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. And I think it 3 would also be useful to maybe recommend that 4 actually your hypothesis about this could be 5 tested. And to see if there's data to test that 6 hypothesis.

7 Just to point out, some years ago I directed a national program on depression and 8 9 primary care for the Arthur E. Johnson Foundation and we worked with the Midwest Business Group on 10 11 Health to actually test the hypothesis that primary care providers would not be billed if 12 13 they had a depression diagnosis. Because they were getting a lot of feedback about that. 14 And 15 so they sent out 100 bills to test it and 99 of 16 them were paid.

Now, things may have changed, but
that's -- so I guess my point is that, and let's
end this discussion just to say that if we're
going to send this back, we should ask that the
assumptions that we made are tested.
DR. SIDDIQI: I think, just one last

point I was going to make, is that these primary care providers do see a certain percentage of Medicaid, but certainly they're seeing the commercial patients, they're certainly seeing the patients in Medicare.

6 And so traditionally, commercial 7 payers and sometimes when you bill for a primary 8 diagnosis as a primary care provider, you do get 9 rejected claims. Patients are upset, providers 10 are upset. And so we've been trained as primary 11 care providers not to bill primarily for that 12 diagnosis for mental health.

So certainly if that's going to change and we are starting to reimburse that better across the spectrum, that's fantastic. But it's going to take years before we're going to see that change for primary diagnosis.

18 CHAIR PINCUS: Move to the next one?
19 MS. LASH: Let's see. So at this
20 point, I would ask if there are other of the
21 behavioral health measures, either what you see
22 on the slide or the additional measures in the

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

,	
1	handout. Not the opioids yet, we'll probably
2	come back to those after lunch. But, NCQA
3	specifically, we can have further discussion.
4	CHAIR PINCUS: Cindy?
5	MS. PELLEGRINI: So a question for the
6	developer. Why were each of these items
7	separated out into an individual measure instead
8	of making a composite or something like that?
9	CHAIR PINCUS: I could answer that.
10	MS. PELLEGRINI: Oh, thank you.
11	CHAIR PINCUS: That actually came up in
12	the and basically according to the rules of
13	NQF, they need to be distinguished as separate
14	measures. Initially there was a thought that you
15	could simply stratify within an existing measure.
16	But they wanted to put it through the separate
17	endorsement process.
18	MS. LASH: I think Cindy's question's
19	a little different actually.
20	CHAIR PINCUS: Oh.
21	MS. LASH: Not that your answer is
22	why we have an SMI specific measure of diabetes

care, for example. But I thought Cindy might've 1 2 been asking why don't we just have a composite measure of chronic condition management for 3 people with mental illness? It would be a 4 different way to lump. Was that -- I don't know, 5 you can clarify, Cindy, what you were getting at. 6 7 MS. PELLEGRINI: Right. That's it. Because I think if you put one of these in and 8 9 not the others, you're giving much greater emphasis to one condition that's going to be 10 11 relevant for some people and not relevant for 12 other people. Right? 13 MS. LASH: Yes. So that's why NCQA developed them as a suite. 14 They, I think, don't 15 want to speak for them too much, but I think that 16 they all really do go together to give the full picture. And it wasn't possible to gain that 17 18 full picture with the use of just one very 19 complex composite measure. 20 CHAIR PINCUS: And I think part of it was also to anchor it with the, I guess, the 21 22 principle measure that's a chronic -- the

diabetes measure. And so to anchor it with that 1 2 so that it simply is another stratification within that measure. Which has marginal 3 additional cost to do. 4 MS. PATTON: Yes. And Hal, this is 5 what I was going to mention at the beginning of 6 7 this discussion. This work originated -- Richard Frank, the current Assistant Secretary for 8 9 Planning and Evaluation, he really pushed this work forward in 2010-2011. And so it's been led 10 11 out of ASPE and funded by SAMHSA. To really try to get at proxies for 12 13 care coordination, as well as really developing a broad suite of measures that would look at the 14 15 health disparities experienced by the SMI 16 population. And so that was really the intent of 17 18 it, was to get at some of these perhaps metabolic conditions that come out of medication issues and 19 20 that sort of thing. So that was really the underlying reason for the work. 21 22 CHAIR PINCUS: Ann and then Anne and

Nancy.

2 DR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Just to get back to that point. I think in the field, most people 3 when they look at trying to follow what they call 4 the metabolic syndrome patients with serious 5 mental illness, they look at diabetes screening 6 7 and diabetes care, they look at hypertension, high blood pressure, and they look at 8 9 cholesterol. 10 And if you look at those as a bundle, which is kind of what you're talking about, like 11 the cholesterol one jumps up here, somehow I 12 13 don't see the cholesterol one here. But I think those are the things that people are looking at 14 15 and saying these are the key things we need to 16 follow in these patients, things we need to screen for and the things we need to treat 17 18 relative to them being underserved and having 19 disparities. 20 So I think most of these would fit in How you form them, whether you bumped 21 with that.

22

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

them all together. The only other one I would

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

say is I'm just curious why you didn't include, 1 2 unless I'm reading this wrong in this one, the cardiovascular, the LDL? 3 MS. LASH: The handout is the newly 4 endorsed measures that came under review in the 5 most recent --6 7 DR. SULLIVAN: Oh, okay. MS. LASH: -- behavioral health 8 9 These ones that start with 19 endorsement. instead of 25 --10 11 DR. SULLIVAN: Okay. MS. LASH: -- or 26, those are older 12 13 But they are still --Measures. DR. SULLIVAN: And then --14 15 MS. LASH: -- NQF endorsed. 16 DR. SULLIVAN: -- just one other question, for state purposes. If you're already 17 18 pulling most of this data for the general 19 population, I'm kind of assuming that to 20 segregate out into the SMI -- now it may vary depending upon whether your SMIs are fee-for-21 22 service or in managed care plans.

But I think it really gets to that 1 2 whole question of disparities. I mean, if you're going to really deal with disparities, you have 3 to start segmenting your data, and you have to 4 look at whether or not a subgroup, because your 5 whole data might look good and your subgroup 6 7 might look really, really, awful and I think that, that's where this could be very, very 8 9 helpful.

10 And we just know that the seriously 11 mentally health are a subgroup that every piece of data shows have all kinds of problems. 12 So to 13 do this would also be a good experiment, I think, at looking at disparities at the same time very 14 15 clearly that you're also looking at trying to get 16 to this whole issue of treating serious mentally ill better. So I think some combination of all 17 18 of these on the medical side I think are critical 19 for the population.

20 CHAIR PINCUS: Anne and Nancy? 21 MS. COHEN: I'm the other Anne. I'm 22 Anne Cohen. My counterpart. My distinguished

2

counterpart from New York.

CHAIR PINCUS: Anne with an E.

MS. COHEN: Anne with an E, yes. So knowing we can only vote for so many, I was kind of thinking the one that I thought could be most valuable. And I had thought the 1932, the diabetes screening, would be quite useful and here's why. If you could figure out a way to get

10 the -- one way obviously is blood draw. So when 11 they're drawing for their medication, if they 12 drew for diabetes at the same time, then you 13 would be able to capture that population fairly 14 easily.

Here's my only concern. We have on our current list under behavioral health, Adherence to Antipsychotics for People with Schizophrenia. So that would make sure you cover one of the populations on the list. But we don't have the other.

21 We actually would need 1880, Adherence 22 to Mood Stabilizers for Individuals with Bipolar.

So we don't have both on the list, whereas both 1 2 are on the list there. Do you see where I'm going with that? 3 MS. SCHLAIFER: You're not saying you 4 couldn't --5 MS. COHEN: I'm not saying that you 6 7 I'm saying that in order for the suite couldn't. to be fully effective, ideally you would have the 8 9 bipolar adherence medication one, too. If we're monitoring for schizophrenia 10 and we're not monitoring for bipolar but then we 11 have other ones in system that are for both 12 13 groups, you can't -- it's more of a balancing thing. Does that make sense? I could be off-14 15 base. 16 CHAIR PINCUS: It's -- I think what you're saying is that it's sort of logical to 17 18 have both an adherence measure and a sort of 19 balance, kind of risk-related measure. But it's 20 not essential; it's just logical. But it's not essential. 21 Yes. 22 I think there are more issues with the

bipolar measure, because it's a more 1 2 heterogeneous condition. And so the issue in which you think about adherence may be different 3 than the way you think about it for 4 schizophrenia. 5 MS. COHEN: I see where you're going. 6 7 That makes more sense. DR. HANRAHAN: So just for perspective 8 9 and build on what Lisa said, is that there -- up 10 until a few years ago there were no behavioral 11 health measures. So this is the beginning of building 12 13 that core set. And a lot of work went into this, I know. And they're not perfect. So just keep 14 15 that in mind as you go forward that we need these 16 measures and they're not perfect. And they've 17 got a ways to go, but we need these measures. 18 MS. LASH: So, Anne has made a case 19 for, was it 1932? Nancy or Ann Sullivan, do you 20 have other specific measures you'd like the group 21 to take up? 22 DR. SULLIVAN: I think you want to go

1	beyond just the screening, you'd want to include
2	the comprehensive care for diabetes as well.
3	Now, I don't know how many measures you can add.
4	But if you're going to really try to
5	help these key issues, then I personally think
6	comprehensive care for diabetes, the
7	hypertension, and the LDL are the things that are
8	really what you should be looking at. The other
9	one which is up there
10	CHAIR PINCUS: Just to say, I mean,
11	right now, we can, I think we can there's not
12	a limit to how much we can add. But then at the
13	end, we're going to have
14	DR. SULLIVAN: Oh, okay.
15	CHAIR PINCUS: a prioritization
16	process.
17	DR. SULLIVAN: Okay. So I would
18	propose the comprehensive care for diabetes and
19	the hypertension and the can I take one from
20	the other? I think the cardiovascular. I would
21	propose those three. So the cardiovascular
22	health screening is
1	MS. LASH: Can you give us the numbers?
----	---
2	DR. SULLIVAN: 1927.
3	CHAIR PINCUS: Ann, can you give us the
4	numbers?
5	DR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Cardiovascular
6	health screening is 1927. The comprehensive
7	care, blood pressure, comprehensive care for
8	diabetes, they have a bunch of things under that,
9	but the comprehensive series that mentions
10	hemoglobin Alc is it doesn't have a
11	CHAIR PINCUS: 2603?
12	DR. SULLIVAN: Yes. And then the
13	controlling high blood pressure.
14	CHAIR PINCUS: 2602?
15	DR. SULLIVAN: Right.
16	CHAIR PINCUS: So 1927, 2603, and 2602?
17	DR. SULLIVAN: Right.
18	DR. HANRAHAN: I agree with Ann
19	completely. But I also want to add to the list
20	engagement and activation. I think it's an area,
21	it's a gap that we can
22	CHAIR PINCUS: Is there a specific

measure? Or is --1 2 DR. HANRAHAN: No, unfortunately. Ι thought Sarah was asking where the gaps were and 3 4 _ _ CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. Okay. So we're 5 going to get to gaps a little bit later. 6 But I 7 guess the question I would have is engagement and activation in what? Treatment for --8 9 DR. HANRAHAN: In health care. In 10 treatment --11 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. DR. HANRAHAN: -- for people --12 13 CHAIR PINCUS: You may want to think about -- when we get to the gaps thing, get more 14 specific. 15 16 DR. HANRAHAN: You want me to get more specific? 17 18 CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. 19 DR. HANRAHAN: All right. 20 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. So Ann, Dan, and 21 Anne. 22 DR. SULLIVAN: I would just like to

,	
1	throw one more into the mix which is
2	CHAIR PINCUS: And Lisa.
3	DR. SULLIVAN: which is the factor
4	use screening.
5	CHAIR PINCUS: And 2605?
6	DR. SULLIVAN: Right. That's it.
7	CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. Dan?
8	DR. LESSLER: So first, just a question
9	about 2603 versus, and maybe I'm just not
10	1932. So both of these are looking at getting an
11	Alc done in slightly different contexts. Is that
12	right?
13	Or am I I'm just wondering the
14	extent to which these sort of potentially
15	comprehensive diabetes care for people with
16	serious mental illness. So hemoglobin Alc
17	testing, that's 2603. And then 1932 is diabetes
18	screening for people with schizophrenia or
19	bipolar disorder who are using an antipsychotic
20	medication.
21	So it's a little bit different in one
22	case. I'm just thinking possibly we want to

think about one or the other if we're thinking
 along diabetes screening. So I just want to call
 that out.

But I guess from an epidemiologic 4 standpoint in looking at some of the data we've 5 seen, I mean, what's most important in these 6 7 people, actually is hypertension control. Because that's what really kills people --8 9 CHAIR PINCUS: It's 2606. 10 DR. LESSLER: -- kills people with 11 diabetes. And the other I would say is the 12 tobacco measurement. 13 So, and with respect to hypertension, again, I would note that there are -- it seems 14 15 like there are a lot of states, and I know 16 they're partial reporting and with all those caveats, I think maybe there's some opportunity 17 18 here to build on the fact that states have 19 demonstrated some ability to report on an actual 20 outcome measure, which is blood pressure control. Which is what ultimately, particularly 21 22 with people with diabetes, probably contributes

in large part to the fact that this population 1 2 dies in its 50s of cardiovascular disease. So I just want to make a strong case, and I know this 3 is pushing on an outcome measure for that 4 hypertension control, and I think it's the same 5 for tobacco. 6 7 I mean, those are -- if there are two things, and a lot of this is important, but I 8 9 think those are the ones that I would really 10 advocate for. 11 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. So Anne and then Okay 12 Sue. Okay, Sue? And then Marsha. 13 MS. KENDIG: No. I just wanted to bring up, in listening to this conversation, I 14 15 would definitely agree with Ann's recommendation 16 around diabetes, hypertension, and so forth. But what strikes me is what we're 17 18 talking about is very similar to some of the measures that were used in the health homes in 19 20 some states with the SPA amendments. And I actually have pulled up the reports from the 21 22 early adopters and I think New York was one of

the early adopters that has reports in here. 1 2 And those measures seem to be useful. So my question is number one -- and I guess 3 you're the only one here, Ann, from the early 4 adopter states. I mean, I had worked this in our 5 state, so I know what our experience was. 6 But I 7 think one of the questions is, when you are collecting on all of those Measures, how much of 8 9 an additional burden was that? And then the other thing I would say 10 11 is one of the reports I'm looking at does have 12 some questions that were, and I wish Nancy were 13 in here, that actually was getting to some of the patient engagement and activation information. 14 15 So, that might be something that is helpful. 16 Maybe at lunch if anyone wants to take a look at this, I'll keep it up. 17 18 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. 19 MS. KENDIG: But that might something 20 that's helpful. Because we do have some experience with exactly what we're talking about. 21 22 So, Ann, I'm going to defer to you if you can --

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

www.nealrgross.com

DR. SULLIVAN: I would've deferred to 1 2 Foster Gesten if he was here because he's the guy who does all our data on the Department of Health 3 side, but I don't know that New York can be as 4 comparable to some other states because they have 5 a pretty robust way that they can look at all 6 7 this data. But my understanding was while it 8 9 became a little cumbersome, that they were able 10 to get it without too much difficulty. But, 11 again, I can't speak for other states. But, I mean, we could ask into the future exactly how 12 13 much it added to try to get this out of the health home. 14 15 But I know we're very strong on making 16 sure that we get the right data out of the health homes and that we're really trying to do it. 17 He 18 could probably -- he would've been able to speak 19 much better to how much it added to the burden --20 MS. KENDIG: Yes. DR. SULLIVAN: -- to the state. 21 22 MS. KENDIG: I know we spent a

significant amount of time aligning the measures so that we weren't asking our providers to report in three or four different ways. But I know that took a significant amount up front and I just haven't had a chance to go through the report while I was sitting here listening to you all. But, again, I think it gives us at least some experience.

9 CHAIR PINCUS: Anne and then Cindy. MS. COHEN: I just wanted to kind of 10 talk to what Lessler said that the tobacco use I 11 think is really critical. It's historically been 12 13 used as behavioral modification tool or behavioral control tool for that population, just 14 15 like the DD population. And the DD population, 16 the rates have dropped dramatically and that's been the focus and that hasn't been the case for 17 18 mental health.

So that being said, can I throw before
I forget two measures that aren't related to
these out on table? Just to add to the list?
So, since we have all-cause readmission measures,

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

I would be neglectful to my community if I didn't 1 bring up the all-cause rehab and all-cause LTC 2 admissions. 3 So those Measures are 2502, so All-4 Cause Follow-Up after Rehabilitation Admissions. 5 And then 2512, All-Cause Follow-Up after 6 7 Readmission for Long-Term Care Facilities. CHAIR PINCUS: And are you suggesting 8 9 a stratified version of that measure? 10 MS. COHEN: Yes. 11 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. MS. LASH: I think we had found and 12 13 eliminated those measures from consideration because they're based on Medicare claims. 14 15 MS. COHEN: Oh, see, I thought they Okay. Never mind. Because I looked at 16 weren't. them and I thought that was one --17 18 CHAIR PINCUS: There is no --MS. COHEN: -- of the exclusions. 19 20 CHAIR PINCUS: There is no Medicaid --MS. COHEN: No, there is no Medicare 21 22 for those, so it would have to be on Medicaid.

Right? 1 2 MS. LASH: Sorry, Anne, you said --MS. COHEN: 2502 and 2512. And it 3 might not be stratification. I mean, maybe you 4 want to know who's in the rehab facility and the 5 long-term care facility. Anyway, I don't know. 6 7 I'm just throwing them out there. They can totally be eliminated, but they were just ones 8 9 that I'm thinking of --CHAIR PINCUS: No, I was just thinking 10 about it from a point of behavioral, we're 11 looking at behavioral measures. 12 13 MS. COHEN: Oh, no, no, no, no. Well, yes, you could, but I was thinking --14 15 CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. MS. COHEN: -- about this for the whole 16 population. 17 18 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. MS. COHEN: But for behavioral health, 19 20 it would be more interesting. CHAIR PINCUS: For this batch, we're 21 22 batching the behavioral health Measures. Because

1 2 MS. COHEN: Okay. Never mind then. CHAIR PINCUS: But it's --3 MS. COHEN: But for behavioral health, 4 it could be interesting, too, actually. 5 CHAIR PINCUS: While they're looking, 6 7 Cindy? MS. PELLEGRINI: So I'm going to state 8 9 up front that I know my blood sugar's getting a little low. So I might be a little cranky. 10 But I appreciate Daniel's comment 11 about the fact that people with these conditions 12 13 tend to die right around or not long after age 50 because of heart disease and tobacco related 14 15 illnesses, right? And I think that's 16 compelling. But in general, as a lay person on 17 18 these issues, I'm really struggling to figure out why we should add one more than another out of 19 20 this half a dozen or so. And if it's hard to pick among them, do you just put in all of them? 21 22 At which point we're adding a huge

number of measures. We're basically almost 50 1 2 percent of the core set. I mean, the core set's only 25 measures right now, 26? 3 Sorry, I miscounted. And then if you add none of them, 4 then you're still left with the gaps that you had 5 before. 6

7 So if there are people who have views about this to help me figure out why, like Daniel 8 9 did, some of these are more important than others 10 in general, I would appreciate that. Because I 11 think some of them are going to be very important to certain people and not others. 12 And so --13

CHAIR PINCUS: So let me --

MS. PELLEGRINI: -- choosing among them 14 15 is difficult.

16 CHAIR PINCUS: -- maybe suggest something that might help you. One is that these 17 18 are all sort of stratified measures, so the incremental effort to collect the data is small. 19 20 Because they're basically off of already existing So that's part of the argument why 21 measures. 22 that is simply looking at it from a stratified

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

www.nealrgross.com

1

point of view.

2	From my perspective, I think Dan's
3	right on track. I mean, it's cardiovascular
4	disease and tobacco use that's underlying it.
5	And then all of which is sort of undergirded by a
6	failure of coordination of care. So I don't know
7	if that helps you, but that's so any other
8	nominations?
9	MS. COHEN: This isn't, I know this
10	isn't a specific measure, but I have to add the
11	concept to the list. So we talked a lot
12	yesterday about trauma-driven care and I think
13	for this group that's pretty critical, so I think
14	that needs to be captured somewhere. And then
15	the idea of quality of life also.
16	I do have a measure, but it's not very
17	well loved, so I'll throw it up there anyway just
18	so you have a number. But it's the 0260. It's
19	the quality of life measurement tool, instrument,
20	whatever. Actually this will go for behavioral
21	health. For that subpopulation.
22	CHAIR PINCUS: So just what exactly

1 2 is that Measure? What's the --

2 MS. COHEN: So it's -- let me pull it 3 up.

MS. SHAHAB: So 0260 is Assessment of 4 Health-Related Quality of Life Physical and 5 Mental Functioning. And it's by the RAND 6 7 The description is percentage of Corporation. dialysis patients who receive a quality of life 8 9 assessment during the KDQOL-36 question survey 10 that assesses patient's functioning and well 11 being at least once per year. Yes.

MS. COHEN: 0260. Now, we use this for this group because we wanted to look at social deterrents of health as like sort of the pacer. But we kind of eliminate the concept of diabetes care.

And it's the idea that you're trying to get at -- we're a little rebellious in the duals group. Yes. But we wanted some way in the report to capture that you need to look at certain determinants of the health other than the specific health stuff.

CHAIR PINCUS: Let me just take my 1 2 Chairman's hat just to speak against that. Because I think it's -- number one, it's kind of 3 distal to actually improving quality of life. 4 And it may be particularly burdensome both at a 5 clinician level and at a health plan level. 6 So I 7 would put it lower on my priority --Now, I would agree MS. COHEN: Yes. 8 9 that it's not necessarily something that we're going to add today. But I think that we need to 10 11 put somewhere in the report that there needs to be consideration for other things other than pure 12 13 health-related quality. CHAIR PINCUS: Right. And I think 14 15 that's something that when we get to gaps, that's 16 something you can --17 MS. COHEN: Okay. 18 CHAIR PINCUS: -- sort of --19 MS. COHEN: Maybe that's a gap. 20 CHAIR PINCUS: -- maybe rather than having it -- so really what we're putting up here 21 22 are measures that we would actually vote on.

1	MS. COHEN: Okay. So then I would
2	agree; eliminate it from the list and Sarah can
3	add it to gaps.
4	CHAIR PINCUS: Okay.
5	MS. COHEN: And also the trauma care
6	would be helpful. Thanks.
7	CHAIR PINCUS: And Zehra, did we find
8	the Measure about rehospitalization?
9	MS. SHAHAB: Were you talking about the
10	readmissions ones? The two readmissions ones
11	that Anne had mentioned? Yes, they're for
12	Medicare beneficiaries.
13	CHAIR PINCUS: So is that would the
14	specifications be different for Medicaid?
15	Because there is AHRQ puts out these reports
16	on Medicaid readmission rates, so it must be
17	available.
18	MS. LASH: So the measure 2502 about
19	inpatient rehab, the denominator and the data
20	source was constructed around Medicare fee-for-
21	service. I think it's probably too much of a
22	stretch.

1	CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. So this would
2	also go in as an example in the gap area? Of
3	looking at rehospitalization rates both overall
4	as well as with these different numerators? And
5	denominators actually.
6	MS. LASH: I also think that the type
7	of facility is not a mental health facility in
8	general.
9	CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. But that was, I
10	think there were two.
11	MS. LASH: Okay.
12	CHAIR PINCUS: One was the general
13	hospital, one was
14	MS. LASH: Got it.
15	CHAIR PINCUS: the sub-acute one.
16	So we'll put that in the gaps as something that,
17	again, looking at overall readmission rates and
18	readmission rates for people with a mental
19	disorder, both within a both for a mental
20	disorder as well as for other conditions. Okay?
21	So we have how many measures? One,
22	two, three, four, five, six, seven measures to

Should we vote on these before or after 1 vote on. 2 lunch? DR. SIDDIQI: I was just going to 3 propose -- but can we do a work through lunch to 4 just kind of go through the voting? So we grab 5 our food --6 7 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. So --DR. SIDDIQI: -- and then -- just in 8 9 the interest of traveling today and --CHAIR PINCUS: I think that's a great 10 idea. 11 DR. SIDDIQI: -- getting out on time. 12 13 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. MS. SCHLAIFER: (Off mic comment) --14 15 help us to prioritize? I mean, otherwise we 16 could just vote yes on everything. And I think, I don't know, it seems like --17 18 MS. LASH: Let me put out some 19 parameters --20 MS. SCHLAIFER: Yes. MS. LASH: -- around what CMS has been 21 22 able to do in the past in terms of a level of

The most recent annual update had one 1 change. 2 measure removed and one measure added. Although MAP had recommended we elect three measures. 3 We already, yesterday, picked out two that we liked 4 related to the maternal and perinatal care. 5 And 6 7 MS. SCHLAIFER: And we've got more going on besides mental health. 8 9 MS. LASH: -- we still have the access 10 to primary and specialty care subject area to go through after this. And we also haven't 11 discussed the opiate measures from PQA. 12 So it 13 would probably behoove the group to pick out no more than two, three at the very most of these 14 15 behavioral health measures. 16 CHAIR PINCUS: Beverly? MS. COURT: It would be helpful to 17 18 states to know of these other emerging measures, 19 that if they can tie them into, for example, 20 existing quality improvement projects or if they feel that there's a particular issue in their 21 22 Because when we look at -- when people state.

say, okay, well what do you want to measure? 1 2 Well, we kind of, let's just grapple around and see what's out there. 3 I mean, there's usually 170, I think 4 we, I forget how large our list was, but it was 5 excruciatingly long. But if it looks like these 6 7 are emerging, then we can start building that infrastructure. 8 9 CHAIR PINCUS: So I -- as much as I 10 hate to disagree with my colleague, Sarah, I 11 agree with you, Beverly. I think that we're supposed to give our opinions, so we might as 12 13 well give our opinion. And CMS doesn't have to 14 listen to us. 15 But I think alerting people that these measures exist, that they may be useful, and CMS 16 could look at the priority -- we will then later 17 18 prioritize these and CMS can look at our 19 priorities and decide whether they agree or not. 20 MS. LASH: Right. We describe these --CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. And I don't see a 21 22 need --

MS. LASH: -- all 11 of these measures 1 2 3 CHAIR PINCUS: -- to pre-censor ourselves before we prioritize. Okay. So why 4 don't we get lunch. Is it out there? 5 MS. LASH: Yes. 6 7 CHAIR PINCUS: Why don't we get lunch and come back in ten minutes? Okay. 8 Yes. 9 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:39 p.m. and resumed at 10 11 12:49 p.m.) CHAIR PINCUS: If everybody could 12 13 please be seated. We want to go through the voting process before we lose a quorum. 14 And 15 people will be pardoned if they speak with their 16 mouths full. MS. LASH: Yes. Okay. So we will take 17 18 a vote on each of these Measures individually. 19 And if they gain the support of eight or more of 20 you, they will be --CHAIR PINCUS: We're missing somebody. 21 22 MS. LASH: Yes. George has left for

,	
1	the day, I believe. Kirstin I just saw, so she
2	must be in the ladies. So we'll give her a
3	moment. And then
4	CHAIR PINCUS: If George has left for
5	the day, does that change the voting?
6	MS. LASH: Yes.
7	CHAIR PINCUS: No, we're going to
8	prioritize later.
9	MS. LASH: So, we've heard a lot of
10	discussion about the importance of this body of
11	measures broadly and notifying state partners
12	that there are these additional things they might
13	want to look at above and beyond core set
14	requirements. I think that would be part of the
15	discussion.
16	And yet, the final product that we
17	deliver to CMS will involve a one, two, three,
18	four, and so on ranked list of measures. The
19	vote right now is about whether you want these
20	indicators behind me to make it onto that ranked
21	list.
22	And the last thing we will do today,
I	

hopefully in the next hour, is to give you all 1 2 stickers and you can do what you saw the Child Task Force doing yesterday, where you can 3 indicate what priority order you would like CMS 4 to address the measures in. 5 The list can be fairly long, but the 6 7 bottom of that list is rather unrealistic for action within the next year. Does that make 8 9 Can you use your mic Marissa? sense? MS. SCHLAIFER: I asked before in a 10 11 different way. I mean, is there a point -- CMS is having us do this because they need advice on 12 what we -- if the list gets too long, does it 13 become like, why did we even bring you together 14 15 because you like everything? I just, I mean, I 16 just feel like that's --MS. LASH: No. I think, I will speak 17 18 for CMS in saying they find the whole discussion 19 very valuable. There are some short-term and

long-term actions that they will be taking to strengthen the measure set.

The most immediate and short-term is

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

20

21

22

the addition of some small number of measures. 1 2 And that determination of the number is up to But just as last year we discussed asthma 3 them. medication and another care transition measure 4 that didn't make it, MAP still signaled the 5 emphasis for those two measures. 6 7 CHAIR PINCUS: So Sue and then Beverly, and then we'll begin voting. 8 9 MS. KENDIG: I just have a clarifying 10 question. So some of these Measures are available without the behavioral health or the 11 mental health qualifier, like diabetes screening 12 13 and so forth, right? So if those are already available, is there anything to -- I guess that 14 15 would be reported as discrete indicators, so a 16 state would have to run both those Measures and then overlay them and look at them. Correct? 17 18 CHAIR PINCUS: Correct. 19 MS. KENDIG: Okay. 20 CHAIR PINCUS: Beverly? MS. COURT: There's already -- in the 21 22 AQM reporting, there is reporting for

subpopulations. It's looking at disparity 1 2 analysis. So for example, disabled non-disabled by ethnicity group, by race. So just that may be 3 where you could implant a stratification of SMI/ 4 non-SMI that might be helpful. And, again, for 5 those states that can do that kind of 6 7 bifurcation, that may get you --CHAIR PINCUS: I mean --8 9 MS. COURT: -- a long ways to what 10 you're looking for. 11 CHAIR PINCUS: That's basically what these are or some of them are. And that was the 12 13 intention was to actually to not necessarily have them be separate measures. But apparently by NQF 14 15 rules, they had to go through and be separate 16 measures. 17 MS. COURT: Oh. 18 MS. LASH: I think some of them are 19 slightly different from the original. 20 CHAIR PINCUS: Yes. A couple are 21 slightly -- most of them. So, okay. Why don't 22 we get started and --

MS. COHEN: Wait, wait, wait. One more quick thing.

3 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. MS. COHEN: So, sorry, Beverly, but I 4 have a little challenge with that. So in most 5 states, they have display aid codes, but they 6 7 don't have any more information other than the aid code. And in many states, they're not even 8 9 able to talk to the mental health carve-out to find out who actually is in mental health. 10 So I don't know how that would work without a separate 11 measure that triggers them to actually do it. 12 13 MS. COURT: So the stratification is voluntary reporting. Breakdown, for example, 14 15 between disabled non-disabled populations. I'm 16 just suggesting that where states are capable of doing it, and we are, in Washington state for 17 18 example, that, that might be an easy win, rather 19 than imposing a new measure is use the 20 stratification which is already voluntary. There's already a place, and dear God, I love 21 22 entering all that information into CARTS, but

that is one more that I could do. So, I'm just 1 2 offering that as an option. MS. COHEN: I totally get where you're 3 coming from. I totally agree. That would be my 4 only caveat is that I don't know how for a 5 particular sub-disability group that 6 7 stratification could happen. Only because there's no indicator. Do you see where I'm 8 9 going? 10 MS. LASH: So we need now seven votes, 11 with the Chair being recused, to pass the 12 measure. 13 CHAIR PINCUS: So let's move through these quickly. First one up is 1932, which is 14 15 the Diabetes Screening for People with 16 Schizophrenia or Bipolar Disorder who are Using Antipsychotic Medications. How many voting to 17 18 support this measure? It's up there, it's on the 19 Okay. Nine. Okay. screen. Bev? 20 MS. COURT: All I ever hear is the numerator, not the denominator, so I don't know 21 22 what nine means.

MS. LASH: We need seven or more. 1 2 MS. COURT: Okay. Thank you. CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. 3 1927, Cardiovascular Health Screening for People with 4 Schizophrenia or Bipolar Disorder who are 5 Prescribed Antipsychotic Medication. 6 What? 7 MS. DAWSON: Can we give recommendations to the measure steward on this as 8 9 well? Or is this just as is for the measure? CHAIR PINCUS: This is an already 10 11 endorsed measure. MS. DAWSON: Right. 12 I think our 13 question would be, because of the age range, it's 25 to 64, to making sure that it aligns with the 14 15 other age ranges for the other HEDIS measures. 16 For the 1932, that's the age range of 18 to 64. That would just be my only caveat. 17 18 DR. LIU: If I could help with that. 19 We actually intentionally did not align that 20 during the development process because expert panels advised us to raise the age range for the 21 22 cardiovascular screening measure because they

think the health risk for that condition needs to
be at the older populations. And that's the
recommendation, the rationale for that.
CHAIR PINCUS: So I'm voting on 1927.
All in support, raise your hand.
MS. LASH: Seven.
CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. Next is 2602,
which is Blood Pressure Control for the Seriously
Mentally Ill, which is actually on the handout
from NCQA. Okay. All in favor of that one?
MS. SHAHAB: 2602 is seven votes, so it
passes.
CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. The next one is
2603, which is Alc testing, which is also on your
handout.
MS. COHEN: So, can you forgive me
because now I'm getting them all confused.
Between 1932, 2603, what's the difference? And
what's the and I assume 2603 and 2608, they're
obviously very different, right?
CHAIR PINCUS: 2608 is Alc control.
MS. COHEN: Yes. I understand that.

1	So that's newly diagnosed, and that's already
2	diagnosed? The 2603?
3	DR. SULLIVAN: One's for testing and
4	the other is controlled.
5	MS. COHEN: Okay.
6	MS. LASH: The top measure looks to see
7	if someone needs to be diagnosed with diabetes.
8	The next measure of Alc testing, once you are
9	identified to have diabetes, is your Alc tested?
10	And the control is an intermediate outcome
11	measure of how well it's being managed.
12	MS. COURT: Do we want to quickly
13	identify which are admin, which are survey, and
14	which are hybrid?
15	CHAIR PINCUS: No, I don't think so.
16	It's a lab testing. It is a survey?
17	MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: Unfortunately it
18	is. It's from the CAHPS survey.
19	DR. LIU: It's not a this is Junqing
20	Liu from NCQA. The 2603 measure is a hybrid
21	measure, so it's not using survey.
22	CHAIR PINCUS: In the current data set.

2

3

4

1932?

DR. LIU: That one is a claims-based measure. The test are -- it has codes for the tests.

5 CHAIR PINCUS: So we were on -- so 6 we're just going back to where we were on the 7 voting. So Alc testing for people with comorbid 8 diabetes and serious mental illness. Yes. So 9 we're taking a vote. So all in support of that 10 measure?

No, this is 2603. Yes. Yes. It's not on antipsychotics; it's -- and mental illness. So what was the number? Okay. We're voting now on 2603. Everybody raise your hand high.

16MS. SHAHAB: So 2603, there were six17votes. It does not pass.

18 CHAIR PINCUS: The next one is Follow-19 Up After Emergency Department. That's 2605, as 20 it is currently defined. All in favor of that, 21 in support of that, raise your hand.

MS. SHAHAB: 2605, three votes, does

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

22

1

2

3

4

5

not pass.

CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. 2600, which is Tobacco Use Screening and Follow-Up for People with Serious Mental Illness or Alcohol or Other Drug Dependence.

6 DR. SIDDIQI: Can I get clarification 7 from the measure steward? What is the follow-up 8 that is counted in this measure? How do you 9 capture that with the claims? For follow-up for 10 tobacco screening? I understand the tobacco 11 screening part, but it's the follow-up that's 12 unclear.

DR. LIU: The follow-up requires two events of services. That could be two events of counseling or psychotherapy. So this is also a hybrid measure. You can meet the numerator by claims codes or medical record review.

DR. SIDDIQI: Right. So it would require hybrid? It can't be just all claims? DR. LIU: Right. CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. All in support of that measure?

MS. SHAHAB: 2600, four votes, does not 1 2 pass. CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. Next one is 2608, 3 Alc control. All in favor of that? 4 MS. SHAHAB: 2608, six votes, does not 5 6 pass. 7 CHAIR PINCUS: Actually, I'm just curious as to why this more outcomes measure did 8 9 not pass as compared to the one that was more of 10 a process measure? 11 (Laughter.) 12 CHAIR PINCUS: I was just wondering 13 what the difference was. Okay. MS. LASH: Okay. Let's move on. 14 All 15 right. The next measure for your consideration 16 was to address the previously identified gap area of access to primary and/or specialty care. 17 18 There is an NCQA stewarded, but not NQF endorsed measure titled Adults' Access to 19 20 Preventative/Ambulatory Health Services: Percentage of Members 20 Years and Older Who had 21 22 an Ambulatory or Preventative Care Visit.

1	So it's a fairly straightforward
2	indicator of utilization as a proxy for access.
3	And the details of the Measure are in your Excel
4	file.
5	MS. SCHLAIFER: It's not endorsed?
6	MS. LASH: It is not endorsed or under
7	consideration. I don't believe NCQA has
8	submitted it. They're I'm not positive. You
9	might know.
10	DR. LIU: That's correct. We haven't
11	submitted this measure yet.
12	MS. LASH: Do you think you're going
13	to?
14	DR. LIU: It's in HEDIS. It's reported
15	by health plans.
16	CHAIR PINCUS: Do you plan to submit
17	it?
18	DR. LIU: I think that's a good
19	question. This measure's in a different domain,
20	that's utilization domain. We may consider that,
21	but we also have to weigh all the other measures
22	to go through the process.

1		Ζ.
1	MS. LASH: There might be a potential	
2	for it not to pass because it is more of a	
3	utilization indicator than a performance or	
4	outcome indicator. Alvia?	
5	DR. SIDDIQI: I was just going to state	
6	that I do think states are looking at this.	
7	Illinois definitely looks at this one in	
8	particular as a HEDIS measure. And I think	
9	pending NQF endorsement and saying that I think	
10	to NCQA and giving that feedback may help move	
11	things along on this one.	
12	When we're talking about ACA	
13	expansion, access to care is going to be a huge	
14	issue and already is an issue. I think this is	
15	one that states can hold plans accountable to and	
16	I think it's something that could be useful to	
17	the state, in terms of trying to address care	
18	coordination and access issues. So I do support	
19	this one.	
20	CHAIR PINCUS: Other comments on this?	
21	Marissa?	
22	MS. SCHLAIFER: I was just going to	
•		

say, I think based on the conversation rather 1 2 than just having the discussion to support or not support it, it sounds like we might want to throw 3 the conditional support into this. 4 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. 5 Dan? DR. LESSLER: Yes. I just, I mean, it 6 7 is sort of a useful utilization measure. It's hard to --- as a quality measure or process 8 9 measure, it's harder to wrap my head around. I wonder though if -- one of the 10 11 things with respect to access and not to dig up our earlier conversation here, but the idea that 12 13 certain people coming out of an emergency room visit should be seen in follow-up, I mean, people 14 15 with chronic illness and so forth and in a timely 16 manner. And that strikes me, I mean, I know 17 18 that's something we're struggling with, with our 19 ED utilization work in Washington right now. And 20 that strikes me as the kind of measure of access that would be helpful and that might be more 21 22 reflective of quality.
And I don't know if there is such a, 1 2 and I didn't have a chance to really go searching around, such a, either NCQA or NQF. But it just 3 strikes me as a bit more helpful in this access 4 realm. 5 CHAIR PINCUS: Cindy? 6 7 MS. PELLEGRINI: Maybe it's just because I had lunch and I'm perking up now. 8 But 9 I'm really kind of liking this measure. And for two main reasons. 10 The first is that with Medicaid 11 expansion, I think we could potentially have a 12 13 different profile of people going into preventive And seeing how those rates change over 14 care. 15 time could be very useful. 16 The second is, coincidentally, today the White House launched a new campaign called 17 18 Healthy Self where they're trying to encourage 19 people who have health care to utilize the 20 preventive health benefits available. So this is sort of consistent with some of those concepts 21 22 where we're really trying hard to promote

preventive care and this would give us a way to 1 2 track that over time. So it's kind of -- it's a little bit 3 It's not terribly granular, but it would crude. 4 give us some basic information to point us in the 5 right direction I think. 6 7 CHAIR PINCUS: Beverly? MS. COURT: I would encourage people to 8 9 look at the specs for this if this is the 10 ambulatory care in the current -- HEDIS 2015. 11 For example, exclusions of principle diagnosis of mental health or chemical dependency, that's 12 13 excluded. There's also the actual reporting of the Measure is extensively -- there's all sorts 14 15 of breakdowns, age, by member months, outpatient 16 visits, ED visits. So anyways, I think it would be useful 17 18 to look and I believe this one also includes 19 audiology. That's my pet peeve. Can you tell? 20 Thinking that audiology is somehow indicative that someone has preventative care. 21 22 MS. PELLEGRINI: Where can we --

MS. COURT: So I guess I would look at 1 2 this -- it would be helpful to look at the specs. Because it's more limited than you may think. 3 MS. PELLEGRINI: Where can we see 4 Because the grid that I'm looking at here 5 those? that we got says there are no exclusions in the 6 7 denominator. MS. LASH: We have incomplete 8 9 information because this isn't endorsed. So 10 that's an error. CHAIR PINCUS: Alvia? 11 DR. SIDDIQI: I was just going to add 12 13 that we already look at this measure through the Illinois health care program on our profiles that 14 15 we send to primary care providers. And the 16 wellness visit is essentially what this is getting at. Your preventative annual physical 17 18 maintenance visit. 19 And, again, when we're talking about 20 access to care, this is a really big one because it's an issue about your general Medicaid adult 21 22 population, are they getting in to actually see

the doc once a year, the provider office for the 1 2 preventive visit? And that's where you address all the other preventive screening issues. 3 Your mammograms, your breast cancer screening, 4 cervical cancer, et cetera, et cetera. 5 So, just wanted to clarify that the 6 7 claims data -- this is one that can be done through claims. It's pretty easy to do and 8 9 So I just wanted to echo that again. report on. 10 CHAIR PINCUS: I just wanted to call on 11 myself on this one. I guess I'm generally not 12 disposed towards utilization measures per se, 13 unless they're useful from the point of view of being kind of a balance measure. 14 15 So for example, one of the problems I 16 have with our initiation and engagement measures for substance abuse is that it's highly dependent 17 18 upon utilization of substance abuse. So that --19 and whether there's a screening program in place. 20 So that if you are screening, you're going to identify people that are less highly motivated to 21 22 follow-up as compared to just taking people who

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

www.nealrgross.com

1

come in without any screening.

2	And so, in some studies we've done,
3	we've shown that places that actually screen,
4	like the VA, does much more poorly on those
5	Measures as compared to private plans that don't
6	screen at all. And so having a utilization
7	measure of looking at utilization of substance
8	abuse services would make sense as kind of a
9	balancing thing. What would this be balancing?
10	DR. SIDDIQI: I think you're balancing
11	well, you're also talking about alignment with
12	the Pediatric Core Set, so the adolescent well
13	visit, the well-child visits. Again, the
14	emphasis on preventative visits where you can
15	address, as a primary care provider, all of the
16	preventative screening measures that are needed
17	for preventative health care maintenance. And
18	then the other part about this one, is this is an
19	access measure, so if we're talking about a gap
20	area in the Adult Core Set right now, there isn't
21	really a good access measure.

CHAIR PINCUS: But is there a

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

22

recommendation that there should be an annual 1 2 health care visit? For everybody? MS. COHEN: I'm almost positive, and I 3 could be wrong, but there's --4 CHAIR PINCUS: I can't hear, you got to 5 6 put on your --7 MS. COHEN: I'm almost positive that it's required under the conduct standard for the 8 9 plans --10 DR. LEIB: For children, but not for adults. 11 MS. COHEN: I think it is for adults. 12 13 DR. LEIB: Well, maybe in your state. I don't think it's required in ours. 14 15 MS. COHEN: I thought that there was a 16 federal requirement, but maybe I'm wrong. Maybe it's just a well-child visit then. 17 18 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. Ann and then 19 Marc. 20 DR. SULLIVAN: That was also my question, that there is a requirement in those 21 22 younger years for an annual health visit that

people are supposed to -- in their early 20s? 1 2 That was my first question. My second is, what's being excluded in mental health? Is it a mental 3 health visit that you're excluding? Or what was 4 the --5 DR. LIU: Let me help here. 6 This 7 measure does not have exclusion as it's shown on the screen. So the mental health population is 8 9 included. 10 DR. SULLIVAN: So when you say 11 ambulatory, you're not -- if someone had a mental health visit, but not a visit to a primary care 12 13 doctor, that would be counted? Or that wouldn't be counted? 14 15 DR. LIU: It's a wellness visit. 16 DR. SULLIVAN: It doesn't say that, 17 though. 18 DR. LEIB: But that's not what it says. 19 DR. SULLIVAN: That's not what it says. 20 So that's why I'm just asking. It says ambulatory or preventative care visit. 21 It 22 doesn't just say a wellness visit.

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

www.nealrgross.com

DR. LEIB: The way this is worded, 1 2 going to your orthopod for knee pain would satisfy this without ever having anyone listen to 3 your heart, your lungs, do a lab, basic lab tests 4 or anything else. This is not going to get the 5 equivalent of a child wellness, a well-child exam 6 7 that we have specifically in the Child Core Set. This is not the same. 8 9 CHAIR PINCUS: Well, I mean, first of 10 all, you guys got to use the microphones, number 11 one. 12 (Laughter.) 13 CHAIR PINCUS: Number two, we actually have the steward here. 14 15 DR. LIU: The question of whether 16 screening and well care visit are included in the measure, is that the --17 18 CHAIR PINCUS: Are specialist visits 19 and any kind of ambulatory visit included in the 20 measure? DR. LIU: Yes. 21 22 CHAIR PINCUS: So it's not purely a

wellness visit? That's -- so, any more comments? 1 2 Do we want to vote on this? Oh, Marsha? MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: I know I can't 3 vote on this, but, to me, this measure is similar 4 to what we get with MEPS, Medical Expenditure 5 Panel Survey. And so, to me, there are trade-6 7 offs in our core set. And so while I think this will give us 8 9 some measure of the proportion who made any 10 visit, I'm not quite sure what else you get from 11 Because, like, with children, we do have that. 12 requirements -- not requirements, excuse me --13 guidance that encourages pediatricians to use the AAP Bright Futures Guidelines for visits per 14 15 year, or at least for the first maybe five or six 16 years of life. And then there's guidance. And 17 then after six years, it's maybe once a year. 18 But before then, it's more than once a year. 19 So I'm not quite sure what we get from 20 this other than proportion with a visit. And that's not bad to have. But we do have, in the 21 22 CAHPS, measures that talk about unmet needs. Ι

mean, whether or not you needed care and didn't 1 2 get it. And the problem, of course, with CAHPS 3 is that it's a survey data. But at least you 4 have a sense of was there a need and was your 5 need fulfilled. So, this one I'm on the fence, 6 7 but I'll defer to the MAP, of course. CHAIR PINCUS: Marc, do you still want 8 9 to comment? DR. LEIB: For me, maybe it's the 10 lawyer hat on me sometimes, that words matter in 11 12 how I interpret these things. And I look at what 13 it actually says when I try and figure out if it's the kind of measure we want. And I just 14 15 don't think this one gets to the data we'd want 16 to have or need. CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. 17 Alvia? 18 DR. SIDDIQI: Just in the record, if we 19 could give feedback to the measure steward about 20 Really we're trying to get at the this one. preventative care visit and I think that would be 21 22 more meaningful for access.

CHAIR PINCUS: So is there a motion to 1 2 support with or without conditions for this? Okay. 3 Let's move on. MS. LASH: I think that brings us to 4 opioids, where we do not have any slides. 5 CHAIR PINCUS: So then we refer you to 6 7 MS. LASH: So we are -- yes, looking at 8 9 our PQA handouts. CHAIR PINCUS: Actually there are two 10 11 handouts that everybody got? MS. LASH: They have two. 12 They're 13 about the same measure set. One is a little bit more detailed than the other. It was most 14 15 helpful to look at the section in the middle of 16 the page where there are numerators described for Measures 1, 2, and 3. 17 18 CHAIR PINCUS: Alvia? 19 DR. SIDDIQI: So, I just wanted to 20 clarify. But since this hasn't even been submitted for NQF endorsement, we're talking at 21 22 least a year-long process. So I'm thinking these

are measures that may be able to come back to the MAP next year rather than this year for our purview.

MS. LASH: That would be possible. 4 CHAIR PINCUS: Right. But we can also 5 -- one of the options is to support conditional 6 7 upon NQF endorsement, is one of the options. DR. SIDDIQI: But if it's not ready 8 9 before the next MAP meeting, then it wouldn't be Correct? Like, it's not going to go 10 submitted. 11 through the process and be ready before the next MAP meeting, I would assume. 12 13 MS. LASH: It would likely not be endorsed by the time CMS is issuing their update 14 15 for 2016 reporting. But that recommendation 16 could stand into the following year. Additionally, this group could decide you would 17 18 not like to take a vote on it at this time and 19 that we would like to re-review it at a later

21 CHAIR PINCUS: So is there a motion on 22 the floor to either support this measure, or to

date.

20

1

2

3

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

www.nealrgross.com

.	
1	support it conditionally pending NQF endorsement,
2	or support it conditionally pending other issues?
3	MS. SCHLAIFER: I would say that this
4	is a measure that I think is very needed and does
5	need to move forward. I get the sense from both
6	the questions and the kind of look on some
7	people's that I think the guidance of the NQF
8	I think there's certain measures where we just
9	look at it and go, even though it hasn't been NQF
10	endorsed, we want just the reactions, I feel
11	like there is a sense that we want to see the NQF
12	process.
13	This is a measure that is very
14	important in the Medicaid population, as well as
15	the Medicare population and the commercial
16	population. But that from a pharmacy benefit
17	management point of view, it is a measure that is
18	definitely needed. Whether I get the sense that
19	
20	CHAIR PINCUS: There's no harm in
21	nominating
22	MS. SCHLAIFER: Well, I think, at least

the sense I'm getting, and maybe I'm not getting 1 2 the sense, is that whether you need a measure and whether this measure is perfect, is what the 3 question seems to be. But I would advocate that 4 5 we definitely need a measure in this area. I mean, in concept, I think we all 6 7 would endorse it -- I cannot speak for anyone else -- that we'd want to endorse it. We talked 8 9 several years ago about getting away from I think that's something 10 endorsing in concept. 11 that if that was still an option, I'd want to do. But I think that conditional support 12 13 with saying that as soon as it's NQF endorsed --I think your question is, you want more 14 15 information about how it does in the NOF. I'm 16 just trying to translate what I think you're trying to say. 17 Yeah, I think 18 DR. SIDDIQI: Right. 19 that if it's still going to go through NQF 20 submission, it's going to go through a whole review process, it's going to be tweaked, it may 21 22 look very different from what it's being

presented today. And I think, for the record, we 1 2 should state that we do think that this is a very important topic. This is a topic where there is 3 a gap that we do need measures for this topic. 4 But I just think that, looking at 5 timing, I think next year's MAP will be able to 6 7 actually address whether or not to include some of these measures. And then, of course, staff 8 9 would review them at that time and then it 10 would've gone through the whole NOF endorsement 11 process. Whereas some of the other measures 12 13 were actually on track and through the NQF process, they were just closer, at least on path. 14 15 This one's a little too premature, I think, for 16 us. MS. LASH: And I think this is in a 17 18 similar place as some of the measures not 19 endorsed that were recommended in the Child Core 20 So, the development is complete, but there Set. has not yet been an opportunity to have a 21 22 matching endorsement project. Although there

might be in the coming year.

1

2	DR. LESSLER: So, if I could comment.
3	Actually it's interesting, tomorrow I'm in an all
4	day meeting in Washington state where we have the
5	updated Agency Medical Directors' guideline for
6	opiate prescribing that is being released and
7	presented in a CMA that has gotten very wide
8	recognition and utilization.
9	I think this is an extraordinarily
10	important area to have measurement in and
11	especially in the Medicaid population. And I
12	think the idea of going through NQF endorsement
13	is important.
14	I'm a little bit concerned about these
15	particular measures. I mean, I think they're
16	trying to get at the right thing. But, for
17	example, the 120 milligram equivalent of morphine
18	you know, I think increasingly people are very
19	unclear what sort of that high dose limit should
20	be. And it's the kind of thing where I think
21	people are realizing that it's sort of like
22	unsafe at any speed. And there are a lot of

people who -- I mean, it's not just the people on 1 2 120 mil equivalents that are at risk and so forth. 3 So I really, I mean, I endorse the 4 concept, I guess, as somebody was saying. 5 But I do have concerns that these measures are getting 6 7 at what really needs to be -- the best way of getting at what we need to be able to measure 8 9 with respect to opiate use. 10 CHAIR PINCUS: So, a couple of points, 11 maybe to summarize. So, on the one hand, there's a concern about, are these the ideal measures? 12 13 Do we wait for NQF endorsement? The other side of it is that it's kind 14 15 of at the same level as some of the child 16 measures, which were supported, but conditional. One of the issues that comes up is the process by 17 18 which such a measure would be taken up for NQF 19 endorsement. 20 And it's unclear to me what the -because NQF starts these endorsement processes 21 22 based upon some kind of, I guess, contract from

HHS, and so I don't know if -- are any of those 1 2 trains going to be running over the next year? MS. LASH: We are expecting to start a 3 variety of projects. I couldn't say for sure 4 which would be the best opportunity to review 5 this measure. 6 7 CHAIR PINCUS: But I guess one question is -- Marissa if you want to recommend it --8 9 MS. SCHLAIFER: Well, based on -- that 10 the child first did this yesterday or the day 11 before yesterday --12 MS. LASH: Could you use your 13 microphone? MS. SCHLAIFER: I'm sorry. Based on 14 15 the other comment that the other task group did 16 do this yesterday, then I would recommend that these move forward. I think I'm reflecting on 17 18 some of the conversations that have gone on in the Coordinating Committee and the discomfort 19 20 with the Coordinating Committee by doing that. So, if I don't have to subject that on 21 22 top of it, I would recommend that they move

I just think -forward. 1 2 CHAIR PINCUS: So you're --MS. SCHLAIFER: I'm making the 3 recommendation. I'm changing --4 CHAIR PINCUS: You're making the 5 motion? 6 7 MS. SCHLAIFER: Yes. Based on the fact 8 that --9 CHAIR PINCUS: So you're making the 10 motion. Okay. Is there a second? 11 MS. LASH: Actually, can I pause? There's actually three measures here. Are you 12 13 suggesting conditional support of all three 14 measures? 15 MS. SCHLAIFER: I've lost it in all my 16 papers. MS. PATTON: Sarah, can I just ask a 17 18 quick question? Sorry. Are there other already 19 NQF-endorsed measures that get at elements of 20 this? MS. LASH: I've been searching through 21 22 and there's nothing that says opioid or drug

abuse.
MS. PATTON: Yes. Okay. Thanks.
CHAIR PINCUS: There's nothing that's
come up that I know of.
MS. PATTON: Okay.
MS. LASH: Yeah, I did just search.
DR. SIDDIQI: Just to clarify, Sarah.
The pediatric concurrent antipsychotic multiple
medication one, wasn't that at least being
submitted through NQF though? It's just
starting? Or is it so when it's complete, it
doesn't even mean that it's submitted? I see.
So even though we may make the
recommendation, the likeliness of CMS accepting
that one, I think, would be pretty low then,
perhaps. That's just okay.
CHAIR PINCUS: So, is there a second?
DR. SULLIVAN: Second.
CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. Any further
discussion? Okay. So do we want to vote on each
of these separately?
MS. LASH: I think we should vote on

them separately. 1 2 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. MS. LASH: Could you use your 3 microphone, Marc? 4 DR. LEIB: I'd like to make an 5 amendment to the motion. I have no problem if it 6 7 gets NQF endorsement substantially as it's written, that's one thing. If it's modified 8 9 significantly, I think we'd want to re-see the 10 new measure, or the modified measure, to determine whether it still answers the questions 11 we want to know. 12 13 MS. LASH: So, we will take individual votes to conditionally support the measure if it 14 15 gains NQF endorsement in its current form without 16 material changes. DR. LEIB: Essentially its current 17 18 form, yes. 19 MS. LASH: Yes. 20 DR. LEIB: If you modify a few words --MS. LASH: Yeah, I don't mean a few 21 22 codes here and there.

DR. LEIB: Yes. 1 2 MS. LASH: Okay. So there are three I'll quickly name them. First is 3 measures here. a measure of high dosage opioid use, the 4 proportion of individuals without cancer who are 5 on a daily dose of opioids greater than 120 6 7 milligram morphine equivalent dose for 90 days or longer. 8 9 The second measure will be the proportion of individuals without cancer 10 receiving prescriptions for opioids from four or 11 more prescribers and four or more pharmacies. 12 13 And the third is the proportion of individuals without cancer receiving 14 15 prescriptions for opioids greater than the 16 equivalent dose of 120 milligrams and for 90 consecutive days or longer and who are going to 17 18 four prescribers and four pharmacies. So it's a composite of the first two. 19 Show of hands, please, for members in 20 favor of conditional support for Measure Number 1 21 22 of high dosage? That's nine votes, so it passes.

Did you vote for it? Then that's ten. Okay. 1 2 Second measure, multiple prescribers and multiple pharmacies. Show of hands? 3 Eleven, Nancy raised hers up at the last minute. That 4 5 also passes. And the composite measure of multi-6 7 providers and high dosage. Show of hands? That's ten. That also passes. 8 9 CHAIR PINCUS: Are there any other nominations? 10 11 MS. LASH: Yes, are there additional measures on any topic the Task Force members 12 13 would like to consider at this time? Anne? MS. COHEN: Two I previously brought up 14 15 CHAIR PINCUS: Mic? 16 MS. LASH: Marc, you'll need to turn 17 Marc, off, so Anne can turn on. 18 yours off. 19 MS. COHEN: The two I previously 20 brought up, the all new admissions, readmissions measures for long-term care and rehab facilities. 21 22 I mean, if we're going to consider all admission

ones, can we like cover those as a group? 1 Ι 2 don't know if we are. I have them if you need it. 3 CHAIR PINCUS: For Medicaid? 4 MS. COHEN: Oh, never mind. I forgot. 5 It's the end of the afternoon. Forgive me. 6 7 Strike that. MS. LASH: It's unfortunate that 8 9 they're not that flexible. Sorry, I'm 10 editorializing. Any other additional measures? 11 CHAIR PINCUS: But we will include 12 13 those in the gap area. Medicaid all-cause readmission. 14 15 MS. LASH: Okay, I think we're now at 16 the point of prioritization. And to finish defining the universe of the measures supported 17 18 that we want to prioritize. 19 Last year, there were two that were 20 supported: 1799, Medication Management for People with Asthma, and 0647, Transition Record With 21 22 Specified Elements Received by Discharged

,	
1	Patients. Which is very similar to a care
2	transition measure currently
3	CHAIR PINCUS: Which was the most
4	annoying one.
5	MS. LASH: Which we got some negative
6	feedback on. Especially for that reason, I think
7	we need to take a vote on whether these should
8	continue to carry over on the list of measures to
9	CMS for this annual update.
10	The information on these two is in
11	your Excel file in the tab titled 2014
12	Recommendations by MAP. Beverly said it was
13	difficult to report.
14	CHAIR PINCUS: It was among the least
15	reported measures and the one that caused the
16	most consternation amongst state officials
17	reporting.
18	MS. LASH: Yeah, she recommended a
19	different type of care transition measure for
20	which we could not find an appropriate
21	substitute. Alvia?
22	DR. SIDDIQI: I was just going to say

241

that it looks like, at least if we look in the past, that CMS, when they added a measure, they took out a measure. And it's possible that we're making all these recommendations, that measures may have to go as well.

And I just think that the care 6 7 transition measure is one that I would still kind of recommend that, if CMS was to consider 8 9 removing one, that would be one to consider 10 removing. Because it is such a challenging one 11 to do, even with hybrid chart reviews and claims It could be very challenging. And not to 12 units. 13 add another measure that would be like that, that would be really challenging to do, again, for 14 15 Medicaid patients.

16 The Medication Management for People 17 with Asthma, I remember serving on this MAP Task 18 Force last year and really supporting it, but I 19 do think there's some concerns again about 20 unintended consequences of picking a measure. 21 And for this one, some of the literature suggests 22 that providers may then overly prescribe

1

2

3

4

5

controlled medications for patients that may even not have chronic asthma to try and meet this measure.

1

2

3

They're concerned that it was 4 capturing data that the patient had asthma and 5 now needs the medication, actually causing 6 7 increases in morbidity and sometimes mortality from improper medication use. So I just think it 8 9 is important to think about our measures and what 10 we're selecting and what we're recommending. So, I would not recommend either one to be added. 11

MS. LASH: We can take a vote on the removal of the care transition measure once we're finished with this aspect of the discussion. Any other questions or comments on last year's recommended measures?

I will also note that the Medication Management for People with Asthma is also in the Child Core Set. So this would be an area of alignment. And I think that was one of the reasons the prior group favored it. It's, essentially, I think --

(202) 234-4433

CHAIR PINCUS: If we fail to resupport 1 2 it, it just goes away. MS. LASH: It goes away. 3 CHAIR PINCUS: Marissa? 4 MS. SCHLAIFER: I will make a motion 5 that we resupport the medication management 6 7 measure. MS. LASH: All in favor, raise your 8 9 hands. 10 CHAIR PINCUS: I'd like to actually see 11 the --MS. LASH: This is 1799. I'll read the 12 13 description since I know not everyone has this This measures the percentage of 14 file open. 15 patients 5 to 64 years -- so, in the Adult Core 16 Set it would be some subset of that -- who are identified as having persistent asthma and were 17 18 dispensed appropriate medications that they 19 remained on during the treatment period. 20 There are two subrates, the percentage of patients who remained on a controller 21 22 medication for at least 50 percent of their

treatment period and the percentage of patients 1 2 who remained on the controller for 75 percent of the treatment period. 3 CHAIR PINCUS: Given the fact that it's 4 undergoing annual update, that's what it says 5 here, Marissa, would you consider changing the 6 7 recommendation to be conditionally support pending renewal of this annual update? 8 9 MS. SCHLAIFER: Definitely. 10 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. MS. LASH: Are we ready for the vote? 11 All in favor of conditional support pending 12 13 completion of the annual update and no significant changes, please raise your hand. 14 That's ten and it passes. 15 16 Now for Measure 0647, Transition Record with Specified Elements Received by 17 18 Discharged Patients. Any discussion? Is there a motion to renominate the measure? 19 20 CHAIR PINCUS: I think this is a chart review. 21 22 MS. LASH: This requires chart review.

.	
1	And has only three to five states reporting at
2	this time. Or the similar measure. Okay. I'm
3	not hearing a motion. We will remove 0647 from
4	the list of support.
5	MS. SHAHAB: So, just because we voted
6	on a lot of measures, I just wanted to say the
7	numbers, the measure number, and then the votes
8	for the people who aren't in the room as well.
9	So today we voted on 1932, with nine votes, it
10	passes. 1927
11	CHAIR PINCUS: Can you give the title
12	also?
13	MS. SHAHAB: I don't have all those.
14	CHAIR PINCUS: Aren't they on there?
15	MS. SHAHAB: So, 1932 is diabetes
16	screening antipsychotics. 1927, cardiovascular
17	screening and antipsychotics. And that's seven
18	votes, so it does pass. 2602, blood pressure
19	control for persons with serious mental illness.
20	And seven votes, it does pass. Those are all the
21	ones that passed. And then the three opiate
22	ones. But there's a few that did not pass.

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

www.nealrgross.com

1799, there was ten votes, which made it pass 1 2 with conditional support pending NQF update from annual review. 3 (Pause.) 4 MS. SHAHAB: So we're all still here. 5 We're just writing the list of measures to 6 7 prioritize in the room. And then the Task Force will prioritize those accordingly. 8 9 MS. SCHLAIFER: We haven't talked about 10 the gap list, about if we have measures to hit 11 the gap list. Is that going to happen before we vote? Or is that --12 13 MS. LASH: We had planned to take the prioritization vote and then talk about gaps, but 14 15 16 CHAIR PINCUS: Do we want people to go 17 and --18 MS. LASH: In a moment. We're still 19 compiling. There was, I believe, a total of nine 20 measures supported. CHAIR PINCUS: Are you including the 21 22 ones from yesterday?

247

1	MS. LASH: Including yesterday's. And
2	so we will give folks five votes, six?
3	CHAIR PINCUS: That many?
4	MS. LASH: Four?
5	CHAIR PINCUS: Yeah, four.
6	MS. LASH: Four. Each of you will get
7	four stickers to indicate your preferences.
8	CHAIR PINCUS: Maybe five. We should
9	give five out. When you vote, you can use your
10	five dots for a single measure or spread it
11	around to five. Or whatever combination in
12	between. Okay. Everybody let's get up, and then
13	sit right down to talk about gaps. Okay.
14	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
15	went off the record at 1:46 p.m. and resumed at
16	1:52 p.m.)
17	CHAIR PINCUS: So, Avlia, we're now
18	going to take any motions on removing any
19	measures from the existing set.
20	DR. SIDDIQI: So, I would make a motion
21	to remove the transition of care record measure
22	from the Adult Core Set.

CHAIR PINCUS: So is there discussion 1 2 on that? Dan, did you want to? DR. LESSLER: I would second it. 3 CHAIR PINCUS: You were going to second 4 5 it? And can you maybe state more explicitly what the problem is? 6 7 DR. SIDDIQI: Sure. So, I think the problem with that one is, although it's very, 8 9 very important, it's extremely challenging to do 10 in terms of linkages of data. We've talked about 11 even getting vitals data to link with claims data 12 is so challenging. 13 So this one really requires multiple different sites and facilities that you have to 14 check in with to see if the transition of care 15 16 record has actually been received throughout the process of care coordination. And although it is 17 18 important and it is something that I think states 19 and plans and providers are all striving towards, 20 and I think maybe even certain health systems even measure it on their own or they have their 21 22 own ways of looking at it, I think from a state

perspective, reporting this for Medicaid across 1 2 the board for the Adult Core Set is really challenging. 3 And I think we have so many other 4 measures that we've recommended, I think it's 5 time to actually give CMS some feedback about a 6 7 measure that we could potentially remove as well. MS. GORHAM: So, Alvia, just for the 8 9 record, you're referring to Measure 0648? 10 DR. SIDDIQI: That's correct. 11 MS. LASH: 0647 was recommended last 12 year, is not in the core set. 13 CHAIR PINCUS: Right. MS. LASH: It's a vote to remove a 14 15 similar measure entitled Timely Transmission of 16 Transition Record, and that is, I believe, 0648. MS. GORHAM: 0648. 17 18 MS. LASH: So the slide is somewhat 19 confusing. Just listen to, yes, what Alvia has 20 just said. Are we ready for the vote? CHAIR PINCUS: All in favor? 21 MS. LASH: Show of hands? That's 11, 22

1

the motion passes.

2 CHAIR PINCUS: So now we can go on to 3 gaps. Or do you want to have public comment first? 4 MS. LASH: It's been a while since we 5 took comments. It might be prudent to stop here 6 7 for a public comment. Operator, could you give the 8 9 instructions for anyone on the phone while people 10 in the room go to the microphone? OPERATOR: And at this time if you 11 12 would like to make a public comment, please press 13 star then the number 1 on your telephone keypad. And there are no public comments at this time. 14 15 MS. LASH: Thank you. No one in the 16 Great, we'll move on to prioritizing or in room? general refining remaining gap areas in the core 17 18 set. Zehra? 19 MS. SHAHAB: So, obviously, MAP has 20 identified gaps in the measure set so that NQF and CMS can search for measures in those topic 21 22 And this year's recommendations may have areas.

changed the landscape of which gaps remain. 1 2 So, others will need to be carried over to the next annual review because we don't 3 have measures on certain topics, such as the 4 Medicaid funded long-term support services. 5 And so, from your perspective, you can see this list 6 7 of the gap areas here. Access to primary and specialty care. 8 9 Beneficiary reported outcomes. Care 10 coordination. Cultural competency of private 11 providers. Efficiency. Long-term supports and services. Maternal health. Promotion of 12 13 wellness. Treatment outcomes for behavioral health conditions and substance abuse disorders. 14 15 And workforce. 16 So, those are from last year's gap list, but we have additional ones that we noted 17 18 from this year. And those are the new chronic 19 opiate use. Polypharmacy. Psychiatric 20 rehospitalization. All-cause readmission. Homeand community-based services. 21 Engagement 22 activation in healthcare. Trauma-informed care.
1

And health-related QOL.

2 So, from your perspective, have any of the gap areas been satisfied? Are there others 3 that need to be added? And I'll turn it over the 4 Harold to lead the discussion of the Task Force. 5 CHAIR PINCUS: So are there any other 6 7 -- actually, exactly what Zehra said, anything that we can remove off the previous list? 8 9 Anything that we need to add to either list? And 10 thirdly, anything that we need to refine to be 11 more specific about? Anne? MS. COHEN: I would just say, and it 12 13 sounds like some of the states are already doing this, but stratification for at-risk populations 14 15 to look for health disparities. 16 CHAIR PINCUS: Okay. Any comments, thoughts about that? I actually have two 17 18 refinements and sort of -- actually, three 19 refinements to make. Sue, do you want to go? 20 MS. KENDIG: I don't know guite how to phrase this, but when I look at this list, I 21 22 think they're all important. But there are some

-- we've talked a lot about the burden on the 1 2 states in terms of collecting data. What we haven't talked about is the 3 burden on the provider in implementing processes 4 that would actually support appropriate outcomes 5 in the care coordination piece, the cultural 6 7 competency pieces, and so forth. And those are very important issues. 8 9 I wonder if there would be a way in 10 the report to just sort of recognize that when 11 measures -- that to get the outcomes we want, we need to recognize that there may be a burden on 12 13 providers also and figure out how we are going to address that. So if that concept could somehow 14 15 be included, I think that would be important to 16 get us all going down the same path. Thank you. 17 CHAIR PINCUS: Other suggestions, 18 comments, refinements? So I have a couple of 19 things just in terms of refinements. One is I 20 think there's a specific issue in terms of the access issue with regard to access to specialty 21 22 behavioral health care. And I think some

(202) 234-4433

creative thinking about how to deal with that. 1 2 We published a paper last year in JAMA Psychiatry showing that 40 percent of 3 psychiatrists take no form of insurance. And 4 it's much more so with regard to Medicaid. 5 And there are pockets of the country where, more than 6 7 half the counties in the country, have no behavioral health providers. And so I would 8 9 suggest that refinement to that one. 10 I think, around care coordination, I 11 think another refinement there is, again, what I 12 mentioned earlier today, care coordination 13 between and among mental health, substance abuse, and general healthcare as a specific area of 14 15 focus for care coordination. 16 And number three is, I might refine the psychiatric rehospitalization and all-cause 17 18 readmission. I think the psychiatric 19 rehospitalization one is, in a sense, a 20 subsidiary of all-cause readmission, but also is different, and we talked about looking at it from 21 22 two points of view.

One is for people with psychiatric 1 2 conditions who are hospitalized, people who are hospitalized with a psychiatric condition or a 3 behavioral health condition, to what extent are 4 they rehospitalized within 30 days for that 5 condition or for a behavioral health condition? 6 7 And to what extent are they rehospitalized for any condition? So it needs to be a bit more 8 9 refined about that. Any comments or --10 DR. SIDDIQI: And this will be my last 11 comment as I go to catch a cab to the airport. So thank you so much for this experience and this 12 13 opportunity. But I was just going to refine that 14 15 first one. I agree, Harold, that we need to say 16 access to primary care, specialty care, and behavioral health services or providers. 17 Because 18 what's happening is, for example, the opioid 19 measure, that looks promising. But the challenge 20 with that for providers and plans is, where do you want us to send these patients to that have 21 22 these issues with chronic opioid dependence and

1

substance abuse issues?

2 The networks aren't there. A lot of the plans are being held accountable now to 3 improve those networks. And so, again, we've 4 talked about CMS's proposed rules on Medicaid 5 managed care and trying to improve oversight of 6 7 some of the care coordination that takes place. But I do think that's where we need to 8 9 find some measures that can actually talk about 10 access to the network in terms of specialty 11 network adequacy, but also behavioral health services and network adequacy there. 12 Because 13 primary care providers are really struggling with seeing Medicaid patients with these issues. And 14 15 they want to do the right thing, but they're 16 really struggling. Thank you. Thank you for this experience. 17 18 CHAIR PINCUS: And I think we have to 19 get beyond the carve-out situation and really 20 sort of instantiate this within the contracts on both sides of the issue. 21 22 Other suggestions for additions or

refinements? Do you have enough to write this 1 2 up? MS. LASH: I think so. The next 3 question is, are there gaps you want to emphasize 4 on the very long list of gaps at this point? 5 Perhaps not, but always being more precise in 6 7 this feedback is of benefit to CMS. Marsha? MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: Before we move on 8 9 to how to fill it --10 MS. LASH: Could you get a little 11 closer to the microphone? 12 MS. LILLIE-BLANTON: Oh, I'm sorry. 13 Before we move on, I just want to make sure that that list gets added to that? Okay. 14 It does. 15 CHAIR PINCUS: Any bright ideas? 16 MS. SCHLAIFER: Can I ask a question? The new chronic opioid use, what exactly was 17 18 that? 19 MS. LASH: That's a good reminder for 20 It was a suggestion that came out of a state us. presentation on the first day of the meeting 21 22 during the Child Task Force that there's sort of

a critical period right around 45 days where 1 2 someone might have had an orthopedic injury, gets a short term prescription, and then a 30-day 3 refill on top of that. And Jeff Schiff from 4 Minnesota described that they have, I think, 5 between 30,000 and 40,000 people a year in their 6 7 Medicaid program who sort of hit this 45-day window where they could very easily become long-8 9 term addicted and at risk for later heroin use. 10 So I think that the opioid measures 11 that PQA brought forward maybe partially address 12 this issue. But also perhaps not. So it would 13 be more an early intervention for people who could go on to have long-term, chronic painkiller 14 15 16 CHAIR PINCUS: So, anything else that 17 people want to add? Any other comments? I think 18 we're done. 19 MS. LASH: We should share, for the 20 record and for everyone's information, the results of our prioritization. And then we'll 21 22 wrap up.

,	
1	MS. SHAHAB: So, the number one
2	prioritized measure was the non-NQF-endorsed use
3	of contraceptive methods by women aged 21 to 44
4	years. And there were 13 votes for that.
5	Number two, three, and four tied with
6	nine votes each were the non-NQF-endorsed
7	Effective Postpartum Contraception Access, 1932
8	and 1927. They each got nine votes. Sorry,
9	those were three, four, and five. So, the second
10	recommended was 2602. And that got 11 votes.
11	MS. LASH: That's Blood Pressure
12	Control for People with Serious Mental Illness.
13	Okay. We shared these yesterday, but
14	just to remind you, we're expecting a 30-day
15	public comment period to begin in early July and
16	end in early August. Task Force members are
17	welcome to comment at that point to help refine
18	the voice of the report, or also to leverage your
19	larger stakeholder networks in engaging with this
20	work.
21	At a date in mid- to late August that
22	we have yet to pin down, the MAP Coordinating

Committee will meet to review these 1 2 recommendations, the recommendations from the Child Task Force, and additionally our annual 3 input to the CMS duals office from another 4 component of the MAP. 5 The final report on Adult Core Set 6 7 recommendations is due to CMS on August 31 and will be publically available after that point. 8 9 CHAIR PINCUS: So, I just want to thank 10 all of you for really your terrific participation 11 in this. It's been a really good discussions. Ι think we all learned a lot. Hopefully CMS has 12 13 learned from this and NQF. I want to thank Marsha and the CMS 14 15 staff. It's been terrific to have this 16 partnership evolve as it has. And I especially want to thank Sarah and the NQF staff. 17 It's just 18 really remarkable how effective they are in 19 providing staff support to this incredibly 20 complicated set of issues that we're dealing with, weighing so many different issues at the 21 22 same time. And somehow we are able to come with

,	
1	a reasonable consensus. So, thank you all for
2	that.
3	MS. LASH: And thank you to our Chair.
4	Travel safe, everyone.
5	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
6	went off the record at 2:08 p.m.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

Δ \$400,000 46:1 **a.m** 1:9 4:2 81:1,2 A19 49:20,21 **A1c** 14:3 16:7,9 114:22 181:10 183:11,16 209:14,21 210:8,9 211:7 213:4 AAP 225:14 ability 64:14 111:17 160:10 184:19 able 26:14,15 32:22 42:1 43:3 49:11 74:3 87:17,19,20 89:5 91:8 92:13 93:6 106:7 116:18,22 118:4 119:2 124:7 134:6 146:12,21 149:2 155:10 162:5 165:14 165:15 177:13 187:9 187:18 198:22 206:9 228:1 231:6 233:8 261:22 above-entitled 80:22 201:9 248:14 262:5 absolutely 60:15 absorbed 23:16 abuse 1:18 26:12 109:18 126:14 128:19 129:9,16 134:19 141:17 143:2.8 148:2 162:4 220:17.18 221:8 236:1 252:14 255:13 257:1 ACA 12:16 215:12 Academy 1:16,20,21 acceptable 68:17,17 85:17 acceptance 85:10 accepting 236:14 access 20:8 21:20 22:5 22:7 24:1 44:4,22 60:5 80:3 133:14 134:21 135:3 163:21 164:9,12 166:22 199:9 213:17,19 214:2 215:13,18 216:11,20 217:4 219:20 221:19,21 226:22 252:8 254:21 254:21 256:16 257:10 260:7 accesses 115:22 accessible 35:14 58:9 73:19 135:14 accessing 18:9 account 121:5 accountability 116:1

accountable 105:8 215:15 257:3 accreditation 44:15,17 80:12 accredited 83:3 achievable 57:5 **achieve** 108:10 achieving 136:9 **ACO-type** 71:12 acronyms 49:20 Act 51:18 action 134:12 203:8 actionable 92:2 actions 203:20 activation 115:16 181:20 182:8 186:14 252:22 actively 117:7 activities 122:9 activity 39:21,22 actual 5:6 70:10 87:7 95:7 103:21 184:19 218:13 acute 117:18 adapted 128:16 add 6:19 7:10 36:10 45:13,19 46:11 50:11 88:6 104:9 115:11 125:2,3 132:21 180:3 180:12 181:19 188:21 191:19 192:4 193:10 195:10 196:3 219:12 242:13 253:9 259:17 added 4:21 14:19 15:3 15:6 45:22 48:12,18 155:16,17 187:13,19 199:2 242:2 243:11 253:4 258:14 addicted 259:9 adding 44:10 86:18 191:22 addition 6:18 9:7 14:2,5 18:16 19:19 29:14 134:7 135:6 204:1 additional 11:2 13:15 14:6 15:6 27:15 35:16 47:2 54:7,10 81:4 136:8 137:14 139:1 140:10 170:22 173:4 186:9 202:12 239:11 240:11 252:17 additionally 33:13 228:17 261:3 additions 5:13 257:22 address 5:10 123:2 124:21 127:10,10 130:13 168:19 203:5 213:16 215:17 220:2 221:15 231:7 254:14

259:11 addressed 102:15 158:14 addresses 119:18 addressing 13:5 102:19 144:7 158:15 164:22 adds 92:12 162:10 adequacy 257:11,12 adequate 159:15 adherence 17:8 113:11 177:17,21 178:9,18 179:3 adjust 121:11 122:2 adjusted 121:6,14 adjustment 120:2 121:20 admin 210:13 Administration 1:19 26:13 administrative 43:2 90:5 123:17 145:14 146:19,21 147:9 155:12 administratively 46:21 47:10 administrator 153:11 admission 16:11,15,16 61:9,15 108:5,6 109:9 111:14 121:2 239:22 admissions 189:3,5 239:20 admit 100:13 admitted 99:6 105:16 105:18 114:19 117:18 118:12 adolescent 221:12 adolescents 101:12 adopt 7:8 adopted 11:9,19 12:1,6 12:9 94:17 95:1 adopter 186:5 adopters 185:22 186:1 adopting 12:3,8 adoption 12:2 adult 1:3 3:15 5:5,15 6:9 8:7,10,12 9:14 10:3,17 12:22 13:12 14:15 15:12,20 16:15 17:9,18 27:9,21 28:7 29:16 58:13 60:6 61:12 73:10 74:4 75:6 82:21 83:9 84:5 85:11 86:4 87:16 89:2 90:19 138:13 139:19 159:22 219:21 221:20 244:15 248:22 250:2 261:6 adults 8:16,17,19,22 9:4,7,18 11:3,8 12:18 14:8 16:6,13 60:13

74:21 213:19 222:11 222:12 advance 22:22 50:4 advantageous 91:7 advice 203:12 advised 208:21 advisor 137:1 Advisory 137:3 advocate 111:12 113:7 113:14 185:10 230:4 Affairs 111:4 affectionately 27:10 afternoon 34:12 81:5 126:1 130:10 240:6 age 9:14,18 12:21 16:6 101:13 120:7 191:13 208:13,15,16,21 218:15 aged 260:3 agencies 135:14 agency 1:14 44:14 62:15 232:5 agency's 50:6 agenda 4:6 5:17 108:17 ages 10:5 16:5 aggravating 67:19 aggregate 71:2 ago 126:10 132:6 169:7 179:10 230:9 agree 51:14 64:17 77:9 105:3 108:1,12 111:8 145:9,11 165:21 168:7 181:18 185:15 195:8 196:2 200:11 200:19 207:4 256:15 agreeing 115:10 agreement 45:4 agreements 44:22 ahead 132:10 AHRQ 15:21 16:16 196:15 aid 206:6,8 airport 256:11 alcohol 15:18 29:20 114:12 128:9,12 137:21 140:14,18 142:13 143:17 158:5 158:6 159:6 212:4 alerting 200:15 align 208:19 aligned 8:2 127:13 aligning 188:1 alignment 8:1 52:15 83:13 84:17 86:21 221:11 243:20 aligns 208:14 all-cause 17:2 94:19 100:22 103:3 104:11 112:9 113:5 115:8

139:18 188:22 189:2 189:2.6 240:13 252:20 255:17,20 Allegheny 116:15 117:8 **ALLEN** 2:3 Alliance 2:7 130:8 allow 156:15 aloud 61:7 alternative 138:17 Alvia 1:21 36:9 60:9 215:4 219:11 226:17 227:18 241:21 250:8 250:19 AMA-PCPI 16:22 ambulatory 213:22 218:10 223:11,21 224:19 amenable 72:2 amendment 237:6 amendments 185:20 America's 1:14 American 1:16,21 amount 39:20 118:10 188:1.4 analysis 6:9 53:6 110:1 112:19 113:6 116:12 205:2 Analyst 2:4 anchor 172:21 173:1 and/or 117:18 213:17 **ANDREWS** 1:12 33:7 33:19,21 34:1 72:8,21 Ann 2:1 35:1 66:20 97:17 110:18 150:11 151:3 161:13 173:22 179:19 181:3,18 182:20 186:4,22 222:18 Ann's 185:15 Anne 1:12 25:19 44:6 58:20 61:1 75:9,14 76:11 113:20 150:8 157:15 168:13 173:22 176:20,21,22 177:2,3 179:18 182:21 185:11 188:9 190:2 196:11 239:13,18 253:11 annoying 241:4 annual 17:4 59:7 63:3 63:13 199:1 219:17 222:1,22 241:9 245:5 245:8,13 247:3 252:3 261:3 answer 6:1 55:5 66:9 67:2 75:13 107:8 130:2 171:9.21 answers 237:11 antenatal 16:18 36:13 41:16 53:18 84:13

anticipation 107:10 Antidepressant 16:10 29:22 antipsychotic 183:19 207:17 208:6 236:8 antipsychotics 17:8 126:9 177:17 211:12 246:16,17 anxiety 142:20 149:19 anybody 5:21 44:11 56:4,15 78:3 125:9 167:3 anyway 70:20 190:6 193:17 anyways 218:17 apologize 26:14 apparent 28:1 apparently 205:14 applied 131:22 appointments 114:17 appreciate 124:20 191:11 192:10 appreciated 26:21 approach 80:8 94:9,15 approaches 110:15 appropriate 76:8 88:13 117:4 241:20 244:18 254.5approximately 10:10 10:21 April 52:21 AQM 89:16 92:7 93:1 96:2 204:22 area 77:19 90:18 116:16 117:12 137:16 181:20 197:2 199:10 213:16 221:20 230:5 232:10 240:13 243:19 255:14 areas 3:19 6:20 7:17 23:2,7 28:4 69:16 89:19 97:1,9 134:8,12 135:5 251:17,22 252:7 253:3 arena 105:20 argument 93:22 192:21 arose 26:17 array 90:12 arrive 81:3 Arthur 169:9 articulated 138:9 aside 81:7 107:16 asked 6:22 53:7 54:2 69:22 92:20 98:13 203:10 asking 53:8 83:10 96:4 96:4 147:5 158:19 172:2 182:3 188:2 223:20 ASPE 53:9 173:11

aspect 85:7 243:14 aspirational 64:6,15 **assesses** 194:10 assessing 22:6 assessment 17:10 29:17 31:7.9 34:7 37:22 38:2 75:17 194:4.9 assist 54:10 assistance 16:2 28:2 71:1 Assistant 173:8 Association 1:18.22 **assume** 209:19 228:12 **assuming** 142:13 175:19 assumptions 169:21 Assurance 2:12 asthma 14:7,8 16:13,16 204:3 240:21 242:17 243:2,5,18 244:17 at-risk 253:14 atmosphere 124:11 attempted 156:8 attention 27:7 29:13 99:14 111:9 113:1,18 163:12 audience 6:6 audiology 141:5,6 218:19,20 audit 87:7 audits 84:12 augmented 42:3 August 260:16,21 261:7 automatic 48:14 availability 114:3 available 6:15 20:5 23:7 51:9 54:5 68:5 136:5 137:16 138:18 196:17 204:11,14 217:20 261:8 average 86:3 120:19 averages 86:1 Avlia 248:17 avoid 115:4 awful 176:7 axis 120:3,4 В back 3:5 5:8 6:20 18:14 19:16 22:4 34:13 51:15 74:19 76:13 81:3 98:7 103:15 112:2 119:22 132:14 132:14 133:6 136:1 138:1 157:5 169:20 171:2 174:2 201:8 211:6 228:1

background 168:19 bad 225:21 bake 42:17 baked 159:19 165:9 balance 178:19 220:14 balancing 178:13 221:9 221:9.10 barrier 100:17 barriers 79:20 84:8,16 87:10 91:12 122:22 base 178:15 based 17:19 37:13 42:19 43:2 55:21 90:5 93:16 122:20 123:17 133:2,20 168:11 189:14 216:1 233:22 234:9.14 235:7 basic 218:5 224:4 basically 21:16 103:11 162:16 171:12 192:1 192:20 205:11 basing 123:14 basis 24:19 batch 190:21 batching 190:22 bear 39:18 90:8 bearing 94:2 beauty 112:17 becoming 71:10,13 bed 114:2 beginning 173:6 179:12 begs 107:6 behavioral 40:5 45:17 82:10 87:1,21 89:21 100:2 101:5,8 102:14 105:12 107:5 108:18 109:17 110:8,9 111:6 111:9 112:15,21 113:2 116:9,10,22 118:14 119:1 125:22 126:18 127:11 128:15 129:20 133:7,22 134:18 135:3 136:22 137:2,10 141:18,21 147:16 163:21 164:2 164:14 166:3,20,22 167:8 170:21 175:8 177:16 179:10 188:13 188:14 190:11,12,19 190:22 191:4 193:20 199:15 204:11 252:13 254:22 255:8 256:4,6 256:17 257:11 **behoove** 199:13 behooves 34:5 **believe** 53:14 54:20 59:4 84:14 86:11 155:7 202:1 214:7 218:18 247:19 250:16

belong 36:15 benchmarking 39:22 beneficiaries 18:6 48:20 129:22 196:12 **beneficiary** 92:14,20 252:9 benefit 229:16 258:7 benefits 217:20 **besets** 130:14 best 22:12 121:21 233:7 234:5 better 21:2,9 25:8 36:7 47:9 48:6 52:17 62:9 72:15 102:8,19 104:2 117:9 118:7 122:3 143:18 161:7,8 164:9 170:14 176:17 187:19 Bev 24:15 37:5 56:3,15 57:1 207:19 Beverly 1:13 46:6 81:15 88:15 99:21 104:20 115:6 119:4 139:11 141:3 199:16 200:11 204:7,20 206:4 218:7 241:12 Beverly's 44:8 103:9 104:12 132:22 143:22 beyond 180:1 202:13 257:19 bifurcation 205:7 big 7:2,5,12 38:13 44:16 45:18 78:2 83:2 94:16 163:22 219:20 bigger 20:1 bill 51:6 147:3 156:17 164:15 170:7,11 **billed** 150:7 155:16 156:14 165:18 169:12 billing 71:17 148:20 149:8 153:2 154:21 155:11 163:5 **bills** 147:13 169:15 **bipolar** 34:10 101:18 115:2 142:19 177:22 178:9,11 179:1 183:19 207:16 208:5 birth 48:21 134:14 births 10:6 86:11 **bit** 15:8 44:8 52:9 75:12 82:5 88:21 115:16 116:3 137:11 138:3 143:15 182:6 183:21 217:4 218:3 227:13 232:14 256:8 blood 15:22 69:17 72:9 72:16,17 76:7 77:2 113:12 115:1 126:22 174:8 177:10 181:7 181:13 184:20 191:9

209:8 246:18 260:11 blue 12:6.6 **BMI** 17:10 31:2,2,6,16 33:9,12,15 34:7,9 37:9,10,13,15,22 38:1 38:11 39:1,10,19 40:3 40:13 47:1,17 128:10 board 34:2 41:9,10 104:3 133:1 165:13 250:2 **body** 17:10 29:16 40:14 133:10 202:10 **bold** 28:21 **bolded** 137:22 138:4 Bort 66:20 67:4,11 69:8 69:12,14 70:7 **Boston** 21:13 **bottom** 34:15 203:7 **box** 79:8 break 68:11 75:10 79:19 80:20 100:17 breakdown 68:6 206:14 breakdowns 218:15 breaks 50:22 breast 17:6 28:13 220:4 **BRFSS** 45:16 brief 61:19 Brigham 61:3 bright 225:14 258:15 bring 5:19 27:7 74:10 134:7 185:14 189:2 203:14 bringing 21:7 brings 227:4 briskly 81:16 broad 96:10 143:13,20 173:14 broader 48:11 80:18 broadly 202:11 Brock 1:22 19:21 39:10 51:10 52:19 136:1 Brock's 75:2 broke 90:1 brought 78:9 239:14,20 259:11 build 89:5 117:9 118:6 124:10 179:9 184:18 **building** 124:9 179:12 200:7 bulk 160:18 bump 21:16,22 163:8 bumped 174:21 **bunch** 181:8 bundle 55:3 137:8 174:10 bundled 71:12 burden 20:10 70:6 102:1 136:14 186:9 187:19 254:1,4,12

burdened 115:13 burdensome 195:5 business 24:3 169:10 **busy** 37:19 С C-section 86:12 cab 256:11 CAHPS 15:19,21 19:1 43:4 91:14,18,22 92:8 92:11,16,16,18,21 210:18 225:22 226:3 calculating 39:20 calculation 23:13 California 41:3,5,9 call 8:5 21:15 82:15 83:5 99:16 106:12 118:2 140:9 174:4 184:2 220:10 called 49:19 217:17 campaign 217:17 cancer 16:4 17:6 28:13 28:13 130:20 220:4,5 238:5,10,14 capable 206:16 capacity 89:6 capitated 89:13 93:20 98:14 capitation 96:16,17,17 capture 73:3 90:13 103:4 124:6,8 144:19 146:12,17,21 155:9 155:11,21 157:14 158:22 166:13 177:13 194:20 212:9 captured 155:14 193:14 captures 114:20 129:17 capturing 39:5 63:5 77:11 167:10 243:5 cardiovascular 138:13 175:3 180:20,21 181:5 185:2 193:3 208:4,22 246:16 care 1:20 10:13 13:18 14:3,18,21 16:7,8,20 16:21 17:1,2 18:3 20:12 22:10,10,13,18 25:13,15,16 28:11,11 28:12 39:8 53:20 57:8 57:9,10 62:4,6 70:3 70:18 71:17 78:13,16 78:17 79:2,3 80:2,5 82:6,8 84:20,21,21 85:3,22 88:4 89:13,14 89:20 90:8,11 91:1 100:9 102:13,18,20 103:1,20 104:2 105:16 108:18 111:18 113:10,16,19 117:4,9

117:14.18.22 122:17 122:20 123:16 127:4 127:10,12,16,17,21 128:16 129:17,19 133:15,17 134:21 135:4,10 138:10 142:5,6 144:6,13 145:8 146:6 148:9 150:15 151:11,12 152:4 153:12 155:17 155:22 156:6,10,14 156:21 157:10,17 158:12 160:19 163:5 163:10 164:4,12,20 165:1,20 166:6 167:11 168:2,6,22 169:9.12 170:2.8.11 172:1 173:13 174:7 175:22 180:2,6,18 181:7,7 182:9 183:15 189:7 190:6 193:6,12 194:16 196:5 199:5 199:10 204:4 213:17 213:22 215:13,17 217:14,19 218:1,10 218:21 219:14,15,20 221:15,17 222:2 223:12,21 224:16 226:1,21 239:21 241:1,19 242:6 243:13 248:21 249:15 249:17 252:8,9,22 254:6,22 255:10,12 255:15 256:16,16 257:6,7,13 careful 122:12 carefully 124:16 carried 252:2 carry 241:8 CARTS 27:9,9,21 206:22 carve 143:18 carve-out 82:9 86:6,10 87:2 112:18 116:8 157:1,2 206:9 257:19 carved 114:1 151:18 166:3 carved-out 150:19 case 38:16 39:2 49:11 62:7 66:1 83:8 105:7 107:22 120:5,12 121:5,10 130:17 179:18 183:22 185:3 188:17 catch 256:11 categories 68:11 categorization 143:13 cause 102:10 111:13

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC 189:5

caused 241:15 causes 23:4 causing 243:6 caveat 207:5 208:17 caveats 184:17 CCSQ 48:1 **CDPS** 120:7 center 2:9 23:1 47:22 centers 25:7,9 certain 21:14 52:14 56:17 57:7 64:20 86:6 88:3 99:9 103:22 130:17,19 170:2 192:12 194:21 216:13 229:8 249:20 252:4 certainly 20:21 21:4,6 67:14.20 73:11 88:12 88:22 93:9 106:19 157:13 170:3,4,13 certified 77:16 cervical 16:4 28:13 220:5 Cessation 16:3 cetera 40:15,15 142:20 220:5,5 chain 50:16 Chair 1:10,11 4:3 6:2,8 17:21 18:15 19:14 22:3,14 23:11 25:19 26:3,6 27:1,5 30:19 31:5,10,18,22 32:4,14 32:22 33:3 35:1,6,9 35:12 36:9 37:3,22 38:3,6 39:16 44:6 46:9 50:21 51:10 52:19 53:13 55:10 56:16 57:17 58:8,20 64:3 65:5,11 66:6 67:8,17 68:4,14 72:7 74:22 75:9 76:11 79:12 81:10,14 82:1 88:14,20 94:19 95:4,7 95:12 96:3 97:17,20 99:20 102:5 106:11 108:11 109:3 110:18 110:22 113:20 115:6 119:4 124:22 125:17 126:3 128:1 130:4 131:17 132:4,10,13 133:4,9 136:21 138:19,21 139:4,8,21 140:3 145:18,21 146:2,5,10 148:14,18 149:4,11 150:1,4,7,11 151:3 152:2,13,17,20 153:2 154:16,19 155:2,5 156:2,4,11 157:15 159:2 160:8 160:13,16,21 161:4

161:10 164:8 166:1 167:2.19 168:8 169:2 170:18 171:4,9,11,20 172:20 173:22 176:20 177:2 178:16 180:10 180:15 181:3.11.14 181:16,22 182:5,11 182:13,18,20 183:2,5 183:7 184:9 185:11 186:18 188:9 189:8 189:11,18,20 190:10 190:15,18,21 191:3,6 192:13,16 193:22 195:1,14,18,20 196:4 196:7,13 197:1,9,12 197:15 198:7,10,13 199:16 200:9.21 201:3,7,12,21 202:4,7 204:7,18,20 205:8,11 205:20 206:3 207:11 207:13 208:3,10 209:4,7,13,21 210:15 210:22 211:5,18 212:2,21 213:3,7,12 214:16 215:20 216:5 217:6 218:7 219:11 220:10 221:22 222:5 222:18 224:9,13,18 224:22 226:8,17 227:1,6,10,18 228:5 228:21 229:20 233:10 234:7 235:2,5,9 236:3 236:17,19 237:2 239:9,16 240:4,12 241:3,14 244:1,4,10 245:4,10,20 246:11 246:14 247:16,21 248:3,5,8,17 249:1,4 250:13.21 251:2 253:6,16 254:17 257:18 258:15 259:16 261:9 262:3 Chairman's 195:2 challenge 21:5,8 70:7 73:15 144:13 206:5 256:19 challenges 13:5 22:13 24:18 25:4,22 82:20 87:3 111:5 challenging 69:14 79:9 93:12 146:20 147:11 158:13 242:10,12,14 249:9,12 250:3 chance 188:5 217:2 change 49:22 50:2,7 136:11 170:13,17 199:1 202:5 217:14 changed 13:20 169:17 252:1

changes 7:1,2,5,12 49:13 50:5 78:20 92:5 237:16 245:14 **changing** 53:3 235:4 245:6 characteristics 8:19 68:16 chart 9:4 28:18 35:4 40:19,20 41:21 42:2 55:16 56:8,11 60:2 69:4,15,21 72:11 84:12 87:7 148:12 242:11 245:20.22 chart-based 34:8 **charts** 43:8 **CHAVEZ** 2:4 check 31:12.16 37:10 154:8 158:2 249:15 checked 37:15 checking 37:8 103:11 Checklist 54:12 chemical 218:12 Chief 2:7.8 child 4:7 19:1 36:19,20 39:21 40:19 58:11,15 60:6 203:2 224:6,7 231:19 233:15 234:10 243:19 258:22 261:3 childbearing 101:13 children 222:10 225:11 children's 73:8 **CHIP** 2:9 **CHIPRA** 36:19 chlamydia 16:4 28:14 29:18 choices 41:1,14 cholesterol 9:20 174:9 174:12,13 choosing 192:14 chose 96:5 chronic 9:8 16:12 127:8 156:15 172:3,22 216:15 243:2 252:18 256:22 258:17 259:14 Cindy 54:2 171:4 172:1 172:6 188:9 191:7 217:6 **Cindy's** 171:18 circulate 108:15 citation 119:15 claim 31:6 37:11 149:22 150:3 165:18 claims 25:2 35:8,14 65:6 71:9,10 83:16 118:17 135:12 145:14 146:19,21 147:9 148:11,13,16,19 149:1,2,7 152:12 155:7,12 156:1 162:2

170:9 189:14 212:9 212:17,19 220:7,8 242:11 249:11 claims-based 31:1,3,5 140:21 211:2 clarification 138:4 142:9 212:6 clarify 142:21 145:18 148:18 159:16 172:6 220:6 227:20 236:7 clarifying 145:20 204:9 cleaner 101:21 clear 5:1 53:12 62:22 63:21 82:2 168:20 clearance 51:7 clearly 77:10 84:1 109:20 129:13 168:12 176:15 **client** 93:5 clients 101:7 121:15 Clinic 35:3 clinical 13:19 16:17 47:22 53:21 55:19 71:16 clinician 39:4 47:5 195:6 clinicians 21:7 23:1 clinics 23:16 24:6 closed 23:19 closely 47:22 71:22 closer 88:21 231:14 258:11 CMA 232:7 **CMS** 5:6 6:20,22 7:15 7:20 13:4,6 14:16,19 16:17 18:17 33:19 49:9,19 51:7 79:10 89:1 93:3 136:6,12 198:21 200:13,16,18 202:17 203:4,11,18 228:14 236:14 241:9 242:2,8 250:6 251:21 258:7 261:4,7,12,14 **CMS's** 14:14 54:8 257:5 code 25:10 31:17,18,20 37:7,10 147:16 150:22 151:14 165:18 206:8 coded 32:2 168:4 codes 47:3 72:11,15 142:14,14,16 206:6 211:3 212:17 237:22 coding 37:17 39:14 118:20 151:16 Cohen 1:12 25:20 26:5 34:13,22 44:7 58:21 59:22 60:14,19 62:22 76:12,15,19,22 77:8 95:2,6,14,17 113:21

150:10.12 151:7 152:6,16,19 153:1,3,6 153:8,18,21 154:4,14 154:18 157:18 158:17 158:19 176:21.22 177:3 178:6 179:6 188:10 189:10,15,19 189:21 190:3,13,16 190:19 191:2,4 193:9 194:2,12 195:8,17,19 196:1,5 206:1,4 207:3 209:16,22 210:5 222:3,7,12,15 239:14 239:19 240:5 253:12 coincidentally 217:16 collaborative 89:7 colleague 200:10 colleagues 21:12 140:22 **collect** 24:10 41:20 42:18 43:3,8 47:18 56:20,22 192:19 collected 34:20 39:13 46:22 47:9 53:17 78:16 80:4 146:22 147:2 collecting 7:13 37:15 38:10 42:12,15 50:8 70:17,19 186:8 254:2 collection 13:6 91:12 collectively 23:9 combination 9:21 131:2 176:17 248:11 come 5:8 19:16 22:4 48:6 51:15 98:5 101:9 103:15 118:18 132:13 132:14 133:6 157:5 161:19 171:2 173:19 201:8 221:1 228:1 236:4 261:22 comes 37:11 50:14 70:12 82:13 98:7 138:1 150:21 233:17 coming 71:16 82:1 108:3 136:1 207:4 216:13 232:1 comment 3:12,17 37:5 37:12 44:8 56:4,5 72:8 75:13 77:12 108:11 112:3 113:4 125:6,10,10,13 126:4 131:18 191:11 198:14 226:9 232:2 234:15 251:3,7,12 256:11 260:15,17 comments 83:15 84:19 85:20 87:12 88:11 107:12 114:6 125:16 130:5 215:20 225:1

243:15 251:6.14 253:16 254:18 256:9 259:17 commercial 131:11 170:4,6 229:15 **Commission** 16:18.19 committee 2:11 45:5,14 45:15,21 59:4,17 60:13 100:3 113:4 126:15 234:19,20 261:1 common 54:4 142:18 commonly 70:12 149:15 Commonwealth 108:16 communicate 100:18 101.3 communication 97:13 communities 23:15,20 community 24:4 25:6,9 102:20 103:17 122:18 122:20 133:2,20 142:8 189:1 community-based 252:21 comorbid 128:14 211:7 comorbidities 144:18 comorbidity 102:2 160:22 comparable 187:5 compared 9:2,9 12:8 53:19 61:16,22 96:7 162:6 213:9 220:22 221:5 comparison 28:20 124:2 162:15 compelling 191:16 competency 123:5 133:17 252:10 254:7 compiled 61:17 compiling 247:19 complain 66:4 67:10 complaints 67:15 complement 14:8 complete 42:13 57:2 58:17 231:20 236:11 completed 53:6 completely 24:13 52:7 181:19 completion 245:13 complex 8:5 35:19 61:3 90:12 172:19 complicated 36:8 45:11 150:13 155:13 261:20 Complications 16:11 component 115:3 261:5 composite 171:8 172:2 172:19 238:19 239:6

comprehensive 13:18 14:2,18,21 16:7,8 180:2,6,18 181:6,7,9 183:15 concept 193:11 194:15 230:6.10 233:5 254:14 concepts 133:14 217:21 conceptualization 40:10 Conceptually 65:1 concern 20:21 167:21 177:15 233:12 concerned 19:2 154:13 232:14 243:4 concerns 67:7 85:4.6 102:15 144:21 168:20 233:6 242:19 conclusion 140:7 concurrent 236:8 condense 58:9 condition 9:8 100:13 109:10 115:3 133:8 137:22 140:15 141:18 143:4,10,12,17 156:20 162:7,8 164:17 165:17 172:3 172:10 179:2 209:1 256:3,4,6,6,8 conditional 216:4 228:6 230:12 233:16 235:13 238:21 245:12 247:2 conditionally 136:7 229:1,2 237:14 245:7 conditions 9:15,21 43:9 101:14 109:16,18 111:10 112:21 113:2 114:12 126:19 127:5 127:8 128:15 129:21 129:21 134:1 142:16 142:18 147:17 148:2 148:3 156:15 157:3 157:10 158:14 162:4 164:20 173:19 191:12 197:20 227:2 252:14 256:2 conducive 124:11 conduct 222:8 Conference 1:9 confidence 162:11 confidentiality 116:19 confirming 136:13 conflict 66:11 confounds 100:19 confused 147:3 209:17 confusing 250:19 Congestive 16:15 Congress 50:4

connection 65:17 conscious 5:20 consecutive 238:17 consensus 136:3 262:1 consequences 45:8 242:20 consider 6:14 13:8 46:13 64:1 126:15 130:10 131:14 214:20 239:13,22 242:8,9 245:6 considerably 23:21 85:21 consideration 122:21 189:13 195:12 213:15 214:7 considered 29:5.7.8 124:14,14 141:6 150:17 considering 160:3 consistency 32:1 82:21 83:12 84:17 85:1,5,7 112:3 consistent 73:9 217:21 consternation 241:16 constructed 196:20 **consumers** 118:4,8 contact 96:15 106:1 contain 137:12 content 70:11 CONTENTS 3:1 context 106:20 contexts 183:11 continue 5:14 13:13 124:1 241:8 continued 13:11 15:4 continuing 13:7 continuity 129:17 Contraception 260:7 contraceptive 260:3 contract 106:4 233:22 contracting 99:19 contractor 66:8 contracts 105:12 257:20 contributes 184:22 contributing 30:14 **control** 14:3,22 16:9 72:10,16 105:10,15 105:17 113:13 127:14 184:7,20 185:5 188:14 209:8,21 210:10 213:4 246:19 260:12 controlled 210:4 243:1 controller 244:21 245:2 controlling 15:22 126:22 181:13 conversation 58:22

76:3 108:8 132:16 113:22 205:20 233:10 185:14 216:1.12 254:18 course 20:11 25:4 conversations 6:7 40:4 234:18 27:11 28:8 30:6 40:18 converted 84:5 66:5 80:4 90:4 226:3 coordinate 4:16 226:7 231:8 coordinated 70:22 **Court** 1:13 24:15,15 31:13,15,20 42:2,7,10 Coordinating 234:19 234:20 260:22 57:1 67:20 68:6 88:16 coordination 62:4.6 88:22 94:21 95:9,16 102:20 103:2 104:2 95:20 96:9 98:13,17 117:14 133:17 138:11 98:21 102:4 104:22 160:19 165:1 173:13 106:16 109:2 110:17 193:6 215:18 249:17 110:19 119:5 141:4 252:10 254:6 255:10 144:1 199:17 204:21 255:12,15 257:7 205:9,17 206:13 core 3:8,15 5:5,15 6:9 207:20 208:2 210:12 8:12 13:12 14:15 218:8 219:1 15:13 17:19 18:1 19:3 cover 70:4 177:18 19:8 26:1 27:11 28:7 240:1 36:15,19,20 37:2 coverage 11:10,14,17 54:20 60:6 75:6 83:9 21:2,9 123:7 86:4 131:16 138:13 covered 9:19 10:6 139:19 159:22 179:13 covers 10:10 192:2,2 202:13 **CPE** 1:12 221:12,20 224:7 cracks 89:19 225:7 231:19 243:19 cranky 191:10 244:15 248:22 250:2 create 91:4 124:18 250:12 251:17 261:6 creating 93:8 Corporation 194:7 creative 79:9 255:1 correct 18:11 31:2 creatively 77:13 58:19 63:17 141:5 critical 7:16 176:18 204:17,18 214:10 188:12 193:13 259:1 228:10 250:10 cross-agency 89:7 correlation 32:17 75:3 crosswalk 47:12 corresponding 140:17 crude 218:4 cultural 133:17 252:10 159:5 cost 46:2 70:5 109:22 254:6 173:4 cumbersome 187:9 costly 115:13 curious 20:19 25:21 costs 12:15 46:14 70:5 32:17 34:13,16 175:1 108:21 118:22 213:8 current 9:13 11:21 Counsel 49:13 counseling 128:22 15:12 22:6 64:5,20 212:15 173:8 177:16 210:22 count 98:14,18 218:10 237:15,17 counted 154:2,8 212:8 currently 11:17 12:3 223:13,14 24:7 75:5 82:16 92:3 counterintuitive 56:18 130:15 135:17 159:21 counterpart 176:22 211:20 241:2 177:1 cut 149:13 counties 82:7 255:7 cycling 120:21 **CYNTHIA** 1:19 country 20:3 255:6,7 county 114:2 116:9,11 D 116:11,15,15 117:8 150:18,19 151:20 **D.C** 1:9 12:1,9 157:12 daily 238:6 couple 26:16 36:12 Dan 37:3 46:17,17 40:18 44:9 102:7 68:19 106:11 150:8

182:20 183:7 216:5 249:2 Dan's 193:2 Daniel 1:17 39:17 192:8 Daniel's 191:11 data 7:13 13:6.16 17:19 20:17 22:21 24:11,20 25:5 28:2 35:8 36:2 37:15 38:21 39:5,7 42:12 44:13,21,22 45:1,3,5 47:9,19 50:8 51:18 54:5,11,21 55:17 56:8,11 58:9 65:6 66:3 68:5 69:9 70:19 71:9,10,13 72:2 73:3,17 74:20 75:7 77:13.14 78:12.15.20 79:22 80:3 84:3 86:8 86:9 91:11 94:11 108:20 116:21 118:17 119:13 124:16 147:9 148:11,13,19 149:7 152:7 155:13 156:1 158:7,10 161:17 169:5 175:18 176:4,6 176:12 184:5 187:3,7 187:16 192:19 196:19 210:22 220:7 226:4 226:15 243:5 249:10 249:11,11 254:2 data's 42:8 databases 85:10 date 11:21 228:20 260:21 Dave 81:18 110:20 David 2:7 81:10,15 88:14 115:15 116:4 DAWSON 1:14 208:7,12 day 4:19 114:2 120:3 121:17 157:20 202:1 202:5 232:4 234:10 258:21 days 36:12 38:7 97:8 140:19 146:13,14 150:17 152:22 153:13 159:7 238:7,17 256:5 259:1 **DD** 188:15,15 deadline 12:12 deal 36:20 44:16 63:9 63:11 114:22 176:3 255:1 dealing 160:22 261:20 dear 206:21 **December** 14:16 decide 50:13 160:6 200:19 228:17 decides 151:12,13 decision 19:7 159:20

decisions 11:4 decisive 21:22 decrease 100:10 decreased 28:15 30:8 deeper 42:1 defer 140:22 186:22 226:7 deferred 187:1 defined 48:16 49:15 101:17 211:20 defining 240:17 definite 19:9 **definitely** 28:5 48:4 51:22 64:10 75:15 83:22 185:15 215:7 229:18 230:5 245:9 definition 101:20 123:6 162:11 definitions 149:5,7 degree 39:12 70:17 degrees 72:17 Delaware 36:4 deliver 202:17 delivered 122:17 deliveries 36:13 41:7 delivery 16:18 30:7 41:4 48:18 89:12 demographics 18:4 demonstrate 129:7 demonstrated 184:19 **DENISE** 1:14 denominator 109:6 123:7 145:22 146:4,6 196:19 207:21 219:7 denominators 197:5 dental 25:12 department 1:13 2:8 41:5,10 45:13,15 114:11 140:13 187:3 211:19 dependence 15:18 29:21 128:9 137:22 140:15,18 159:7 212:5 256:22 dependency 158:6 218:12 dependent 220:17 depending 38:15 44:13 175:21 depends 152:11 depression 16:17 35:3 53:21 101:18 142:19 149:19 150:16 155:18 169:8,13 describe 8:14 11:18 135:20 200:20 described 12:22 139:12 227:16 259:5 describes 9:13

describing 9:15 description 61:6 131:6 146:3 194:7 244:13 desperate 101:6 detail 11:19 28:5 54:14 142:11 detailed 58:12 141:12 227:14 details 14:13 15:7 17:15,18 214:3 determinants 194:21 determination 204:2 determine 237:11 deterrents 194:14 develop 91:3 108:16 112:11 126:17 developed 41:6 54:9.11 61:2 83:8 126:10,12 127:2,9 128:13 130:12 133:12 172:14 developer 171:6 developers 71:22 107:14 161:15 developing 173:13 development 13:7 46:3 71:19 134:5 208:20 231:20 diabetes 13:18 14:3,18 14:21 16:7,8,11 18:10 28:11 114:22 126:20 127:13 129:6 138:14 144:7 155:16 166:16 171:22 173:1 174:6,7 177:7,12 180:2,6,18 181:8 183:15,17 184:2,11,22 185:16 194:15 204:12 207:15 210:7,9 211:8 246:15 diabetic 9:19 diagnosed 157:4 210:1 210:2,7 diagnoses 34:10 105:2 144:3,5,8,14 145:13 149:10 156:13 157:9 163:19 diagnosis 120:7 140:14 140:17 141:16 142:10 142:12,15,17 143:6 143:10,14,16 144:9 144:10,17 145:7,15 146:15,22 147:2,5,6,8 147:12,17,20 148:6 148:17,20,21 149:3,7 149:16 150:8 151:17 152:16,18 153:2,5 154:2,5,11,20,21 155:4,8,11,15,17,18 155:19,21 156:19 157:5,14 159:5,10

161:19 162:3.8.19 164:10,15,16 165:5 165:17 166:11 169:13 170:8,12,17 218:11 dialysis 194:8 dichotomy 166:4 die 127:6 191:13 dies 185:2 difference 22:9 52:6 97:11 209:18 213:13 differences 110:4 different 21:18 22:11 22:17 44:14 52:9 59:15,16 72:17 77:1 79:22 94:14 103:19 109:7 111:5 122:9 131:10 140:1 141:20 147:1 148:5,14 153:20 160:17 162:3 166:5 167:4 171:19 172:5 179:3 183:11 183:21 188:3 196:14 197:4 203:11 205:19 209:20 214:19 217:13 230:22 241:19 249:14 255:21 261:21 differs 105:11 difficult 84:14 111:16 192:15 241:13 difficulties 107:17 difficulty 187:10 dig 42:1 216:11 dimension 115:20 Dimes 1:19 41:7 dinged 167:14 direct 41:17 directed 169:8 directing 110:2 direction 41:11 218:6 directly 40:22 67:22 125:8 130:13 133:16 142:2 Director 2:5 directors 1:18 111:3 232:5 disabilities 49:5 63:15 disability 45:20 disabled 205:2 206:15 disaggregate 70:9 disagree 200:10 discharge 61:10,21,21 129:15 137:20 140:19 discharged 14:10 97:6 98:17 142:7 240:22 245:18 discharges 120:15 140:12 discomfort 234:19 discrepancies 59:13

61:18.19 110:3 discrete 204:15 discuss 60:17,18 126:4 140.6discussed 36:14 125:4 125:22 126:7 144:22 147:18 199:12 204:3 discussing 12:2 59:1 discussion 5:14 7:22 12:7,11 20:11 26:16 26:20 50:12 55:2 79:13 81:17 119:6 125:8 130:3 134:15 134:20 137:19 138:16 139:6 140:10 147:11 158:5 169:19 171:3 173:7 202:10.15 203:18 216:2 236:20 243:14 245:18 249:1 253:5 discussions 53:2 261:11 disease 16:12 40:9 65:3 115:14 138:14 185:2 191:14 193:4 disincentives 79:17 124:17 disorder 115:2 159:10 183:19 197:19,20 207:16 208:5 disorders 134:1 252:14 disparities 11:11 110:14 127:4,16 128:16 129:8 173:15 174:19 176:2,3,14 253:15 disparity 129:13 205:1 dispensed 244:18 display 206:6 disposed 220:12 disproportionately 10:19 disrupt 24:3 disrupts 7:6 distal 65:17 195:4 distinct 37:9 distinguished 163:14 171:13 176:22 distributed 121:4 dive 135:2 diversity 10:17 divided 29:4 divides 28:21 dizziness 118:18 doc 31:15 220:1 doctor 114:18 152:11 153:16 154:7 223:13 document 49:3 documentation 97:14

doing 4:6,15 34:11 41:4 42:6 46:7 48:9 51:20 65:8 74:2 75:16 76:7 77:13 83:1 91:1 100:1 107:17 109:22 124:6 143:21 148:12 150:5 156:5 203:3 206:17 234:20 253:13 domain 214:19,20 domains 7:21 door 94:8 105:22 dosage 238:4,22 239:7 dose 76:7 130:17,18 131:4 232:19 238:6,7 238:16 dots 120:13 248:10 doubled 33:12 DOUGHERTY 1:14 dozen 191:20 Dr 5:22 33:7,19,21 34:1 35:2,7,10 36:10 37:4 38:1,4,7 39:17 46:18 50:17 51:16 55:12 60:5,11 62:17,20 70:14 72:8,19,21 81:12,20 82:3 97:19 97:21 98:16,20 99:21 103:6 106:5,13,17 110:20 111:1 115:7 116:5 125:19 126:6 128:4 130:6 131:19 132:1,2,5,9 141:13 142:9,15 143:9 144:4 144:20 145:9,10,11 145:20 146:1,3,8,11 147:14 148:10,15,22 149:6,12 150:2,5 151:4,22 152:4 153:4 153:7,17,19,22 154:10,12,15,22 155:3,6,7,10 156:3,9 156:12 157:16 158:12 158:18 159:3,12,13 160:2,9,15,20 161:2 161:14 162:1,12,14 162:15,18,22 163:1,3 163:16 164:11 165:21 165:22 166:2 169:22 174:2 175:7,11,14,16 179:8,22 180:14,17 181:2,5,12,15,17,18 182:2,9,12,16,19,22 183:3,6,8 184:10 187:1,21 198:3,8,12 208:18 210:3,19 211:2 212:6,13,18,20 214:10,14,18 215:5 216:6 219:12 221:10 222:10,13,20 223:6

223:10.15.16.18.19 224:1,15,21 226:10 226:18 227:19 228:8 230:18 232:2 236:7 236:18 237:5,17,20 238:1 241:22 248:20 249:3,7 250:10 256:10 dramatically 188:16 draw 29:12 92:13 177:10 drawing 51:5,6 177:11 dreamed 104:22 drew 177:12 drill 118:21 drilled 96:22 101:19 drive 39:15 drives 118:22 driving 41:14 143:12 dropped 188:16 dropping 90:7 **DrPH** 2:8 drug 15:18 29:21 128:9 137:21 140:15,18 142:13 143:17 158:6 158:6 159:6 212:5 235:22 dual 82:11 115:9,12 119:11 120:14 135:13 dual-eligible 42:20 duals 34:2 48:5,10 59:4 59:17 82:12 89:14,18 92:18 120:6,11 194:19 261:4 due 61:10 261:7 dug 112:19 Ε E 169:9 177:2,3 e-measures 84:6 earlier 33:7 75:2 83:15 84:19 92:15 112:17 127:7 168:14 216:12 255:12 early 13:14 41:6 48:18 185:22 186:1,4 223:1 259:13 260:15,16 easier 86:16 101:3 easiest 90:5 easily 35:14 58:9 177:14 259:8 easy 34:4 45:2 56:21 58:4 124:12 206:18 220:8 echo 44:7 114:6 150:12 220:9 ED 118:12 129:15,20,21

152:15 159:9 163:6.7 216:19 218:16 editorializing 240:10 educating 23:5 educational 23:3 32:10 effective 19:20 70:2 77:10 92:5 98:19 119:20,21 120:9 178:8 260:7 261:18 effects 112:20,22 efficiency 71:4 133:18 252:11 efficient 47:10 51:8 efficiently 47:18 48:6 effort 7:7 34:4 35:16 36:6 50:3 91:2 192:19 efforts 24:10 32:10 39:3 EHR 71:22 78:8,9,11 80:2 85:15 EHRs 57:4 71:15 72:1 eight 85:22 136:3 137:13 201:19 Eisenberg 2:7 130:6,7 132:5 either 10:12 43:4 69:20 83:7 117:17 120:1 135:22 170:21 217:3 228:22 243:11 253:9 elderly 12:18 elect 199:3 elective 16:17 30:7 36:12 41:4,6 48:18 electronic 38:5 47:14 62:10 83:17,19 84:18 85:10 88:2 electronically 84:3 85:14 86:19 elements 14:10 80:13 92:12 235:19 240:22 245:17 Eleven 239:3 eligibility 11:5,7 12:17 12:19 eligible 8:15 12:15 84:2 115:9,12 120:14 eligibles 82:11 135:13 eliminate 194:15 196:2 eliminated 4:21 159:4 189:13 190:8 eliminations 5:13 emanating 119:10 embedded 57:7 emerged 137:18 emergency 114:11 117:3,17 140:13 146:16 211:19 216:13 emerging 199:18 200:7 emphasis 172:10 204:6 221:14

emphasize 127:15 258:4 employed 23:15 employer 9:2,9 24:1 **enabled** 89:3 encounter 24:18.20 25:5,10,12 86:9 116:21 151:9 152:22 154:14,16 encourage 38:19 77:17 84:4 90:16 92:10 106:6 123:22 126:17 129:3 217:18 218:8 encouraged 145:2 encourages 225:13 encouraging 56:5 endorse 70:15 230:7,8 233:4 endorsed 33:15 34:7 62:3,6 126:10 132:1,6 135:9 137:9 159:17 159:17 175:5,15 208:11 213:18 214:5 214:6 219:9 228:14 229:10 230:13 231:19 endorsement 17:7 33:17 104:19 131:21 136:10 165:8 171:17 175:9 215:9 227:21 228:7 229:1 231:10 231:22 232:12 233:13 233:19,21 237:7,15 endorsing 230:10 engage 96:20 engaged 94:6 117:7 118:9 engagement 15:18 29:20 86:7 87:16,18 113:17 115:16 116:7 117:1 181:20 182:7 186:14 220:16 252:21 engaging 260:19 enhanced 92:12 enrolled 10:22 11:3 123:9.13 enrollee 25:15 enrollees 9:14 10:18,20 133:16 enrolling 20:6,6 ensure 147:21 148:1 168:21 entered 102:13 entering 89:18 206:22 enterprise 8:4 entertain 88:12 entire 57:13 111:11 entities 24:8 105:8 111:21 entitled 250:15

entity 49:18 **Epic** 38:4 epidemic 130:13 epidemiologic 184:4 episodes 71:12 EQRO 85:21 86:11.14 92:15 112:11,14,18 116:6 equally 121:4 equivalent 130:18 131:4 224:6 232:17 238:7.16 equivalents 233:2 **ER** 94:13 114:14 151:9 152:10 153:12 154:14 error 219:10 errors 59:18 60:22 61:9 62:11 63:11 especially 83:13 87:7 97:10 120:10 165:12 232:11 241:6 261:16 Esper 117:21 essential 178:20,21 essentially 135:4 165:9 219:16 237:17 243:22 establishing 12:17 estimate 91:22 estimated 9:18 10:1.5 et 40:15,15 142:20 220:5.5 ethnic 10:18 ethnicity 205:3 evaluate 166:8 evaluation 91:15 173:9 events 128:22 212:14 212:14 everybody 4:3 5:20 107:3 201:12 211:14 222:2 227:11 248:12 everybody's 41:10 42:6 47:8 82:22 everyone's 259:20 evidence 20:19 21:8 127:3,6 129:18 evolve 261:16 exacerbation 23:22 exact 159:21 exactly 11:22 30:11 83:1 108:14 186:21 187:12 193:22 253:7 258:17 exam 224:6 example 38:11 40:12 41:3,15 42:14 47:12 48:17 54:9 57:7 63:1 69:17 74:1 80:12 92:6 94:12 99:10 103:17 107:15 110:11 113:17 120:2 121:12 122:11

137:21 142:3 143:3

145:6 146:6 151:5

135:9 139:10 151:8 172:1 197:2 199:19 205:2 206:14,18 218:11 220:15 232:17 256:18 examples 54:13 **Excel** 14:12 15:7 17:15 55:2 104:16 137:11 138:5 214:3 241:11 excellent 40:20 exception 6:3 30:7 excluded 218:13 223:3 excluding 43:9 223:4 exclusion 223:7 exclusions 43:6 141:11 142:1 189:19 218:11 219:6 **exclusive** 109:5 excruciatingly 200:6 excuse 225:12 exempted 24:8,13 exist 200:16 existing 25:22 63:3 128:17 171:15 192:20 199:20 248:19 exists 25:3 exotic 43:19 expand 12:13,13 20:9 expanded 11:14 20:4 21:6,7 expanding 11:16 32:19 75:5.6 expansion 11:4,9,20 12:1,4,10 13:2 20:3 82:17 215:13 217:12 expansions 21:21 expect 82:17 121:16 expectations 121:11 expected 23:20 75:8 121:6.8 expecting 234:3 260:14 Expenditure 225:5 experience 13:16 24:22 37:14 38:12 54:21 125:6,11 143:21 186:6,21 188:8 256:12 257:17 experienced 173:15 experiment 176:13 expert 144:22 145:1 147:18 208:20 explain 91:1 141:1 explaining 81:8 explicitly 249:5 explore 115:19 extensively 218:14 extent 37:14 38:8 47:9 70:21 72:13 78:22 183:14 256:4,7

external 69:20 70:2.16 externally 112:10 extra 36:6 70:5 extract 85:14 88:8,9 extracted 86:19 **extraction** 43:4 72:2 83:17,19 84:9,18 88:2 extractions 85:17 extraordinarily 50:19 55:20 232:9 extreme 106:2 extremely 161:20 163:22 249:9 eyes 27:11,18 F **FAAFP** 1:21 **FAAN** 1:15 face 65:18 147:21 **FACHE** 1:22 facilitate 80:3 facilitating 79:21 80:1 facilities 157:13 189:7 239:21 249:14 facility 59:20,22 62:9 120:13 121:9,13,19

151:10 157:12 190:5 190:6 197:7.7 FACP 1:12,17 fact 97:12 108:12 116:3 121:21 122:2 149:18 155:20 156:7 164:19 166:13 168:6 184:18 185:1 191:12 235:7 245:4 factor 21:22 45:17 154:6 183:3 fail 244:1 failing 96:12,13,14 failure 16:15 193:6 fair 45:9 118:10 fairly 4:5 116:20 141:6 141:12 177:13 203:6 214:1 fall 13:3 family 1:21 10:11 18:8 164:5 166:7 fantastic 170:15 far 27:5 64:7,15 95:20 116:17 143:18 farther 71:18 fatigue 92:14 93:8 favor 209:10 211:20 213:4 238:21 244:8 245:12 250:21 favored 243:21 feasibility 136:13 February 11:2

federal 8:20 12:14 52:5 52:7 135:18 222:16 fee 21:15 70:8,12 89:14 fee-for 175:21 196:20 feedback 5:6 46:15 68:3 94:4 163:17 165:10 168:11 169:14 215:10 226:19 241:6 250:6 258:7 feel 38:18 60:14 69:3 199:21 203:16 229:10 feelings 140:8 feels 38:9 fell 89:19 felt 59:17 fence 117:19 118:15 226:6 fewer 34:16 field 39:19 40:5 91:6 101:5 155:8 174:3 fielded 92:17 fielding 46:1,2 93:4,19 fight 78:12 figure 8:18 55:12 67:5 70:9 177:9 191:18 192:8 226:13 254:13 figures 31:14 file 17:16 214:4 241:11 244:14 fill 6:15 7:16 132:19 258:9 filling 138:10 fills 131:15 final 99:12 202:16 261:6 finally 134:21 153:10 financial 38:16 78:1 find 37:17 56:5 101:1 121:20 162:5,9,19 196:7 203:18 206:10 241:20 257:9 findable 94:10 findings 119:7 fine 155:19 158:2,17 fingertips 63:2 67:13 finish 240:16 finished 243:14 first 4:19 5:1 8:6,14 15:17 34:20 38:21 53:17 88:22 108:12 134:13 144:10.17 145:13 146:19 147:12 149:9,16,20 150:2,16 156:14 158:10 183:8 207:14 217:11 223:2 224:9 225:15 234:10 238:3,19 251:4 256:15 258:21 **fit** 174:20

five 12:10 28:16 29:8 54:6 116:10 166:20 197:22 225:15 246:1 248:2,8,9,10,11 260:9 flexibility 112:7 flexible 240:9 floor 1:9 44:19 228:22 Florida 73:1,2,6,7,17,18 73:18,22 74:19 flow 52:16 Flu 16:5 focus 7:19 13:4 65:6 95:21 97:9 98:9 99:14 104:12 119:9 143:15 188:17 255:15 focused 28:11 89:22 93:15 103:20 129:8 142:7 focusing 40:9 75:19 132:18,19 folks 36:18,19,20 45:10 46:7 90:20 115:1 120:21 123:3 142:4 248:2 follow 102:17 106:5 124:5 156:9,12 165:15 174:4,16 211:18 follow-up 16:17,19 35:3 35:5 53:21 93:17,22 94:1 95:2 96:1,4 98:3 98:15 99:11 103:10 103:21 104:8 114:10 117:4 128:8,11,11,12 129:15,18 131:19 137:20 140:16 141:4 141:7 143:5 144:4,15 144:19 145:8,16 148:1,9 151:6 154:15 154:17 157:11 158:21 165:22 168:22 189:5 189:6 212:3,7,9,11,13 216:14 220:22 follow-ups 164:1 followed 159:11 following 151:16 156:7 228:16 follows 146:13 food 198:6 for-service 89:15 force 1:3,8 15:5 27:19 60:10 125:21 203:3 239:12 242:18 247:7 253:5 258:22 260:16 261:3 forget 133:3 188:20 200:5 forgive 32:9 153:9 209:16 240:6

forgot 240:5 form 174:21 237:15,18 255:4 formalized 80:13 format 84:7 formulate 51:1 52:1 55:13 formulated 104:20 forth 18:8,10 30:17 71:2 107:3,17 185:16 204:13 216:15 233:3 254:7 Forum 1:1.9 forward 23:22 53:3 73:21 107:1 119:7 125:3 136:4 138:15 173:10 179:15 229:5 234:17 235:1 259:11 **Foster** 187:2 found 21:1,16 93:16,21 94:4 100:12 101:12 117:2 120:9 135:3 161:16 162:16 163:12 189:12 Foundation 169:9 four 29:2,13 38:22 82:19 109:16 130:21 130:22 131:4,5 142:22 166:20 188:3 197:22 202:18 213:1 238:11,12,18,18 248:4,5,6,7 260:5,9 fourth 156:19 166:12 FPL 8:20 11:5,7 12:20 frame 61:13 Frank 173:8 frankly 42:17 free 60:15 free-standing 100:14 frequently 28:10 front 137:18 188:4 191:9 frustrated 157:6 fulfilled 226:6 full 107:2 123:11 172:16,18 201:16 fully 108:2 123:12 136:5 165:9 178:8 function 71:16 functioning 194:6,10 Fund 108:16 fundamentally 12:16 funded 10:11 42:21 173:11 252:5 funding 42:13,14 further 17:14 20:10 90:9 136:13 141:1 147:10 171:3 236:19 future 40:1 68:9,13 71:8

86:20 187:12 Futures 225:14 G gain 13:15 172:17 201:19 gains 237:15 game 46:8 gap 3:19 6:19 7:16 28:4 106:3 131:16 134:8 134:12 135:4 138:9 181:21 195:19 197:2 213:16 221:19 231:4 240:13 247:10,11 251:17 252:7,16 253:3 gaps 5:9 6:15 11:10 22:5 122:15 132:19 133:1,11 134:3,10 182:3,6,14 192:5 195:15 196:3 197:16 247:14 248:13 251:3 251:20 252:1 258:4,5 gender 120:8 general 25:10 37:18 49:13 56:17 100:14 101:1 108:18 109:1 109:12 110:10,12 127:7,13,19 128:17 129:11 175:18 191:17 192:10 197:8,12 219:21 251:17 255:14 generally 69:2 102:1 144:14 220:11 generated 25:2 generating 123:18 generation 49:17 generic 79:15 generically 37:13 gentleman 114:7 geographic 10:21 geographically 92:5 George 1:12 33:6 72:7 201:22 202:4 germane 134:20 Gesten 187:2 getting 4:15 20:8 38:21 39:4 46:15 48:4,9 57:6 59:16 71:11 77:13 83:16 87:11 90:17 102:18 103:8 104:2 117:4,5,10 130:22 142:5 148:8 167:11 168:2,4,6,13 169:14 172:6 183:10 186:13 191:9 198:12 209:17 219:17,22 230:1,1,9 233:6,8 249:11

giddiness 118:18 give 5:14 48:21 49:20 58:16 59:11 82:4 86:8 125:21 151:7 163:16 165:10 172:16 181:1 181:3 200:12.13 202:2 203:1 208:7 218:1,5 225:8 226:19 246:11 248:2,9 250:6 251:8 given 30:13 56:14 106:18 122:3 138:8 245.4 gives 19:6 30:16 188:7 giving 8:9 19:12 172:9 215:10 alad 26:22 103:7 119:5 123:1 glean 42:15 gleaned 27:22 global 70:8,12 go 4:6,13,21 5:11 23:20 34:13 37:2 50:20 51:2 56:10,11 60:12 74:19 75:14 76:18 79:17 87:9 88:17 89:9 93:13 94:9 101:22 104:18 105:13 119:6 132:20 151:11,19 153:16 163:9 172:16 179:15 179:17,22 188:5 193:20 197:2 198:5 199:10 201:13 205:15 214:22 217:2 228:10 229:9 230:19,20 242:5 247:16 251:2 251:10 253:19 256:11 259:14 goal 74:15 goals 74:15 God 206:21 goes 72:6 102:21 147:10 151:11 163:6 244:2,3 going 4:6,17,18,18,19 5:7 6:8,11,14,17,19 7:10 8:6,9 17:17 20:10 23:21,22 24:3 26:3,6 32:6 36:10 37:1 40:6 41:8,13 44:10 51:12,17 53:3 56:10 64:8 72:4 74:13 79:14 81:14 88:11 89:9 90:7 91:20 92:17 93:3,4 97:7 102:6 103:6 106:6,10 107:1 111:10 113:3 122:10 122:15 123:3 124:2,3 125:3 126:3 131:20

131:21.22 132:13.14 139:6 142:5 143:16 144:12,16 145:13 146:17,20 147:11 148:16 149:15 151:15 152:7 153:12.14 155:21 156:16 159:1 159:14 160:5 161:3 163:9 165:3,4,14,19 166:10 167:20 168:10 168:20 169:20 170:1 170:13,16,16 172:10 173:6 176:3 178:3 179:6 180:4,13 182:6 186:22 191:8 192:11 195:10 198:3 199:8 202:7 207:9 211:6 214:12 215:5.13.22 217:13 219:12 220:20 224:2,5 228:10 230:19,20,21 232:12 234:2 238:17 239:22 241:22 247:11 248:18 249:4 254:13,16 256:14 good 8:8 18:13 19:15 26:10 30:10,16 32:6 54:14 55:2 81:12 98:21 99:9,17 107:7 108:7 135:1 147:15 162:1,16 176:6,13 214:18 221:21 258:19 261:11 GORHAM 2:4 18:13 27:4,6 30:15 32:5 34:19 53:14 57:22 58:2,5 60:8,12 138:3 250:8.17 gotten 72:15 114:16 232:7 government 12:14 24:14 governor 95:1 grab 198:5 gradating 99:8 grain 57:15 grams 86:12 grant 89:2,3 108:15 116:6,14 117:13 granted 63:20 grantees 73:11,12,14 grants 73:13 87:17 granular 71:11 218:4 granularity 68:10 grapple 200:2 great 64:6,7 66:22 82:3 100:1 102:12 105:17 122:16 126:6 131:10 132:9 198:10 251:16

greater 10:2 14:4 70:16 131:3 172:9 238:6,15 grid 219:5 **ground** 117:10 group 4:7 32:9 50:12 62:14 67:15 71:20 92:11 98:7,9 103:18 136:20 137:17 159:20 169:10 179:20 193:13 194:13,19 199:13 205:3 207:6 228:17 234:15 240:1 243:21 group's 140:8 groups 4:10 17:8 100:1 115:18 178:13 grow 82:18 growing 9:17 24:12 82:14 growth 11:12 29:14 guess 32:11,16 55:14 62:14 143:12 145:12 169:18 172:21 182:7 184:4 186:3 204:14 219:1 220:11 233:5 233:22 234:7 guidance 5:16 54:10 225:13,16 229:7 quideline 232:5 quidelines 13:19 52:1 225:14 guilty 44:10 guy 99:16 187:2 quys 224:10 **GYN** 18:8 gynecological 10:13 н Hal 173:5 half 11:15,22 191:20 255:7 hammered 167:2 Hampshire 10:9 hamstring 72:5 hand 56:21 209:5 211:14,21 233:11 245:14 handle 97:2 handled 124:15 handout 27:15 137:13 138:2 139:2 171:1 175:4 209:9,15 handouts 81:4 227:9,11 hands 238:20 239:3,7 244:9 250:22 HANRAHAN 1:15 39:17 99:21 115:7 142:9 143:9 159:3,13 179:8 181:18 182:2,9,12,16 182:19

happen 58:13 90:13 103:2 207:7 247:11 happened 73:12 165:16 happening 91:9 103:5 164:2 256:18 happens 111:15 121:12 168:22 happy 118:5 130:2 hard 25:7 41:20 56:8,20 191:20 216:8 217:22 harder 68:20 216:9 harm 229:20 Harold 1:9,11 26:10 40:5 100:4 135:19 159:1 253:5 256:15 Harold's 47:8 Harvard 21:12 hassle 146:19 hat 195:2 226:11 hate 49:20 200:10 head 143:22 216:9 health 1:13,14,18,22 8:17 9:1,2,6,13,15 15:19,21 16:21 18:7 20:15 24:6 25:7,9 26:12 28:12 34:2 38:5 38:13 40:5,19 41:5,10 41:18 42:20 44:18 45:13,15 47:14 62:10 73:20 82:10,10 85:11 85:14 86:2 87:1,1,8 87:21,22 88:3,8,9 89:12,22 93:18,21 94:7,8 95:18 96:16,16 98:2,14 99:11 100:2 101:5 102:14,15,18 104:6,8,14 105:12 106:1 107:5,6 108:18 108:18,22 109:1,9,17 109:19 110:8,9,10,12 111:3,7,9 112:10,15 112:21 113:2 114:1 114:11,14 116:9,10 116:22 117:19,19 118:1,14 119:1 125:22 126:18 127:11 128:15,18 129:16,20 131:10 133:7,21,22 134:13,18 135:3,11 136:22 137:3,10,21 140:14,17 141:18,21 142:10,12,16,18 143:1,4,6,10,11,17 144:9,15 145:2,7,15 146:14 147:7,16 148:2 150:14 151:10 151:19,20 152:8,9,16 152:17 153:11,14,15 155:19 156:13,19

157:3,8,10,12,13 158:4,18 159:6 160:4 162:4 163:21 164:2 164:14,17,20,22 165:2,17 166:3,4,20 166:22 167:6.8 168:1 169:11 170:12,21 173:15 175:8 176:11 177:16 179:11 180:22 181:6 182:9 185:19 187:3,14,16 188:18 190:19,22 191:4 193:21 194:14,21,22 195:6 197:7 199:8,15 204:11,12 206:9,10 208:4 209:1 213:20 214:15 217:19.20 218:12 219:14 221:17 222:2,22 223:3,4,8,12 249:20 252:12,14 253:15 254:22 255:8 255:13 256:4,6,17 257:11 health-related 194:5 195:13 253:1 healthcare 1:14 108:21 252:22 255:14 HealthChoices 82:15 86:3 Healthy 217:18 hear 19:17 20:2,17 40:22 59:10 67:18,22 80:20 81:8,15,21 83:22 88:15 168:3 207:20 222:5 heard 85:20 90:4 126:16 144:21 202:9 hearing 168:11 246:3 heart 16:15 191:14 224:4 HEDIS 13:22 31:4 32:3 33:20 52:14 83:4,9 85:11 86:4 87:10 123:8 208:15 214:14 215:8 218:10 held 257:3 help 36:21 42:22 46:5 51:4 52:12 53:9 86:9 101:7 147:14 180:5 192:8,17 198:15 208:18 215:10 223:6 260:17 helped 28:3 98:8 helpful 18:22 19:15 40:21,21 68:15 106:19 126:1 176:9 186:15,20 196:6 199:17 205:5 216:21 217:4 219:2 227:15

helping 118:8 119:2 helps 50:15 125:1 143:14 193:7 hemoglobin 14:3,21 16:7,9 181:10 183:16 heroin 259:9 heterogeneous 179:2 HHS 50:4 71:21 234:1 hi 26:11 99:15 125:19 130:6 high 9:20 10:7 15:22 28:22 29:4,5,10 50:19 69:17 77:2 98:7 99:6 105:5 126:22 128:5 133:11 143:19 145:5 174:8 181:13 211:15 232:19 238:4,22 239:7 high-risk 129:2 higher 9:9 101:15 127:3 128:14 highlighted 138:6 highlights 5:18 highly 6:12 56:20 59:1 59:9 63:20 68:21 84:4 220:17,21 HIPAA 100:16 101:4 hire 69:20 historic 32:12 historically 188:12 hit 65:3 247:10 259:7 hitting 93:5 HIV 17:3 34:17 35:18 53:16 hold 105:7 106:4 133:8 215:15 home 97:7,14 120:22 121:15 122:18,20 133:1,20 135:11 187:14 252:20 homegrown 139:14 homepage 60:13 homes 42:20 97:5 119:11,14 120:6,12 120:18 121:3 122:4 185:19 187:17 honing 98:1 hope 4:3 130:10 131:14 165:7 168:15 hopeful 40:9 hopefully 81:21 86:19 128:2 203:1 261:12 horizontal 28:21 120:4 hospital 16:19 44:4,13 44:15,17 87:8 97:6 100:15 102:13 103:15 108:3 120:15,22 149:22 158:10 197:13 hospitalization 16:20

61:14 62:2 93:18 95:3 95:18 96:1 98:3 99:11 100:5 102:16 103:13 107:19 115:5 141:7 hospitalizations 99:2 100:11 hospitalized 61:12 256:2.3 hospitals 23:16,19 43:18,20,21 64:10,17 96:15 98:4 100:14 101:1 118:13.20 135:11 149:8 host 84:15,22 87:10 hot 143:19 hour 203:1 House 217:17 **HRSA** 17:4 25:8 huge 24:12 45:18 52:6 78:2 90:11 91:2,4 97:2 102:1 106:3,9 113:3 114:4 115:3 120:20 144:12 165:19 191:22 215:13 human 44:18 166:5 Humana 1:12 hybrid 42:18 69:5 93:11 210:14,20 212:16,19 242:11 hypertension 18:10 37:6 55:16 56:13 65:21 75:19 77:1 127:14 144:7 149:15 155:16 166:15 174:7 180:7,19 184:7,13 185:5,16 hypertensive 9:20 hypothesis 169:4,6,11 hypothesize 41:19 ICD-9 142:13,14 idea 60:16 74:6 77:12 107:4,6,15 114:21 193:15 194:17 198:11 216:12 232:12 ideal 233:12 ideally 178:8 ideas 106:21,22 258:15 identified 6:16 7:17 121:18 210:9 213:16 244:17 251:20 identify 6:16,19 28:3 48:20 54:19 61:18 119:3 140:1 149:3 210:13 220:21 identifying 61:9 65:7

Illinois 215:7 219:14 **illness** 16:20 95:3 96:2 101:17,17 103:10 104:8 108:22 110:13 126:14 127:1,5 128:9 141:16 145:3.4 150:18,22 151:1 172:4 174:6 183:16 211:8,13 212:4 216:15 246:19 260:12 **illnesses** 191:15 illustrate 28:9 image 40:14 imagine 71:7 immediate 136:6 203:22 immediately 124:13,14 impact 7:11 21:15 41:17 53:1,11 96:10 97:2 103:14 104:1 impactful 95:21 impedes 20:14 imperfect 168:12 **implant** 205:4 **implement** 7:8 90:6 122:13 implemented 5:5 implementing 46:14 165:13 254:4 importance 56:1 202:10 important 10:16 20:11 22:16 34:20 35:19 36:3 39:9 41:16 46:16 51:14 55:20 59:17 61:4 62:12 77:19 105:4 106:22 167:15 168:21 184:6 185:8 192:9,11 229:14 231:3 232:10,13 243:9 249:9,18 253:22 254:8,15 imposing 206:19 impossible 100:17 improper 243:8 improve 25:8 39:8 74:8 257:4.6 **improvement** 28:9 39:3 39:15 62:13,15 77:18 78:21 79:7 80:14 87:20 89:7 97:10 105:1 110:3 115:21 116:13 124:5 129:14 199:20 improvements 122:10 122:13 improving 20:14 195:4 **IN-PERSON** 1:3 incentive 38:15

incentives 79:18 80:10 124:17 incentivize 52:10 73:10 incentivizing 77:14 incidents 118:20 include 10:12 19:3 24:16 82:10 105:2 123:6 135:11 141:5 142:12,17 175:1 180:1 231:7 240:12 included 14:12 15:7 31:16 50:3 223:9 224:16,19 254:15 includes 218:18 including 12:1,9 19:8 247:21 248:1 inclusion 15:10 inclusive 142:17 income 8:17 12:19 incomplete 219:8 incongruities 65:20 68:19 incorporated 7:20 80:15 incorporates 7:20 increase 21:15,21 74:16,16 increased 30:6,21,22 increases 243:7 increasing 79:18 97:13 113:8 increasingly 77:16 232:18 incredibly 41:16 261:19 incremental 7:1,18 109:21 192:19 independent 112:15 independently 112:14 index 17:10 29:16 96:7 109:9 111:14 120:5 indicate 141:17 203:4 248:7 indication 168:20 indicative 218:20 indicator 145:2 207:8 214:2 215:3,4 indicators 126:21 142:22 143:1,2,7 202:20 204:15 individual 158:5 168:1 171:7 237:13 individually 201:18 individuals 12:21 17:9 49:5 82:15 111:9 112:22 113:12 117:2 117:17 118:11,17 130:20 131:3 177:22 238:5,10,14 induce 80:10

industrial 8:5 inefficiencies 8:3 infant 41:18 infections 10:15 **influence** 62:16 64:9,14 125.1 information 18:21 25:3 27:16,22 46:12,21 48:4,9 56:18 57:19 65:16 67:12,16 93:7 111:17,22 120:11 159:14 167:15 186:14 206:7,22 218:5 219:9 230:15 241:10 259:20 infrastructure 91:4 124:9 200:8 initial 81:6 109:9 111:14 112:3 initially 37:18 39:3 146:15 171:14 initiate 50:1 118:8 initiated 117:6,7 initiation 15:17 29:20 86:7 87:15,18 113:16 116:7 117:1 220:16 initiative 49:11 injury 259:2 inpatient 48:2,19 120:3 120:15 142:3 196:19 input 261:4 instance 79:5 84:12 85:12 86:14 instantiate 257:20 Institute 21:11 instructions 251:9 instrument 193:19 insurance 1:14 8:18 9:3 9:10,10 255:4 insured 10:3 integrated 57:4 107:8 108:1,3 111:18 113:10,16 integrating 113:19 integration 52:18 107:3 107:5 108:9 127:11 intended 61:7 intensive 62:8 intent 102:22 158:20,21 168:15 173:17 intention 60:19 205:13 intentionally 208:19 interest 89:17 133:13 136:19 198:9 interested 4:97:16 138:10 interesting 26:20 39:18 55:15 75:21 76:4 99:22 190:20 191:5 232:3

ill 176:17 209:9

interface 108:17 110:9 interfaced 24:9 interim 90:16 intermediate 90:10 210:10 internal 78:17 166:7 internally 78:22 internists 164:6 interpret 18:17,19 19:12 226:12 interpretation 101:3 interpretations 100:16 intersections 89:20 intervention 100:10 117:16 259:13 interventions 103:18 118:7 introduce 26:9 130:8 introduced 90:10 investment 91:5 involve 60:2 103:21 202:17 involved 7:4 103:2 involves 35:5 **IQR** 43:12 44:3,5 48:18 **IQRS** 48:1 **IRB** 45:4.5 irrelevant 150:6 issue 5:8 26:9 33:14 41:11 48:11 56:17 59:16 63:5 77:4 79:17 97:18 102:14 103:19 105:5 108:14 109:20 119:13 123:4,8,14 139:17 149:5 150:9 151:4 152:12 153:18 157:6,7 164:21 165:6 165:11 176:16 179:2 199:21 215:14,14 219:21 254:20,21 257:21 259:12 issued 14:16 **issues** 5:10 22:5 23:22 63:10 80:18 101:8 106:3 109:4 114:16 115:5 116:19 119:3 125:5,9 126:14 160:22 173:19 178:22 180:5 191:18 215:18 220:3 229:2 233:17 254:8 256:22 257:1 257:14 261:20,21 issuing 228:14 it'd 25:12 56:3,7 items 171:6 **JAMA** 108:13 255:2

JD 1:17 **Jeff** 259:4 job 122:16 Johnson 169:9 **Joint** 16:18,19 July 260:15 jumps 174:12 **JUNE** 1:6 Junging 2:11 125:19 210:19 Κ KDQOL-36 194:9 keep 166:9 179:14 186:17 keeping 90:14 Kelley 2:7 81:12,20 82:3 110:20,20 111:1 116:5 KENDIG 1:16 18:1 22:15 185:13 186:19 187:20,22 204:9,19 253:20 key 3:7 8:11 73:16 174:15 180:5 keypad 125:15 251:13 kicked 150:18 kills 184:8,10 kind 4:8 19:17 25:11,16 40:10 44:7 47:19 52:11 58:21 60:16,21 63:12 64:1 67:13 71:22 77:22 78:7 79:8 80:15 98:1,7 110:7,14 116:18 118:6 124:17 143:20 168:14 174:11 175:19 177:4 178:19 188:10 194:15 195:3 198:5 200:2 205:6 216:20 217:9 218:3 220:14 221:8 224:19 226:14 229:6 232:20 233:14,22 242:7 kinds 40:14 56:18 59:18 78:20 79:15 80:12 125:9 176:12 Kirstin 1:14 202:1 knee 224:2 knew 96:18 know 8:16 17:11 20:18 24:9 25:11,14,15,18 26:19 30:10,11,12 32:11 33:13 36:2,11 36:13 37:5,11 39:2 41:15,21 49:2,20 51:17 54:3 56:3,10,15 62:11 63:6 64:11 65:8 65:14 66:2,10 67:14 68:7 72:13,14 73:3,3

73:5 74:15 75:7 76:17 77:6.19 78:2 81:21 85:1 91:14 93:11 94:11 95:10 101:7 102:11 106:9 109:14 115:17 129:17.20 142:10 158:7 167:16 172:5 176:10 179:14 180:3 184:15 185:3 186:6 187:4,15,22 188:3 190:5,6 191:9 193:6,9 198:17 199:18 206:11 207:5 207:21 214:9 216:17 217:1 225:3 232:18 234:1 236:4 237:12 240:2 244:13 253:20 **knowing** 177:4 knowledge 33:17 60:3 known 13:5 lab 210:16 224:4,4 labor 62:8 lacerations 156:11 lack 20:4 ladies 202:2 land 82:5 landing 117:3 landscape 252:1 large 18:5,7 73:2 77:16 78:18,22 88:7,8 102:11 114:20 116:15 118:1 129:8 185:1 200:5 largely 31:1 49:8 larger 88:3 260:19 LASH 2:5 5:22 6:3 30:11 31:4 32:3 33:16 33:20,22 34:11 57:21 58:1,3,6 59:20 60:2 60:18 61:1 62:19,21 66:14,18 75:1 81:3 133:10 137:5 138:7 138:20 139:3,7,11 140:1,5 141:11 159:16 161:8,11 170:19 171:18,21 172:13 175:4,8,12,15 179:18 181:1 189:12 190:2 196:18 197:6 197:11,14 198:18,21 199:9 200:20 201:1,6 201:17,22 202:6,9 203:17 205:18 207:10 208:1 209:6 210:6 213:14 214:6,12 215:1 219:8 227:4,8 227:12 228:4,13

231:17 234:3.12 235:11,21 236:6,22 237:3,13,19,21 238:2 239:11,17 240:8,15 241:5,18 243:12 244:3,8,12 245:11,22 247:13,18 248:1,4,6 250:11,14,18,22 251:5,15 258:3,10,19 259:19 260:11 262:3 late 75:13 260:21 latitude 18:19 19:6,13 Laughter 48:22 132:12 213:11 224:12 launched 217:17 law 32:14,15 48:16 49:15,22 50:2,6,7 lawyer 226:11 lay 82:5 121:7 191:17 LDL 175:3 180:7 LDL-C 13:18 14:18 lead 253:5 learn 121:22 learned 261:12,13 learning 7:3,6 leave 160:1 leaving 163:6 led 126:11,19 173:10 left 159:7 192:5 201:22 202:4 legislation 52:21 53:9 **LEIB** 1:17 149:6,12 150:2,5 154:10,22 155:3,6 165:21 166:2 222:10,13 223:18 224:1 226:10 237:5 237:17,20 238:1 Lessler 1:17 37:4 38:1 38:4,7 46:18 50:17 55:12 62:17,20 70:14 72:19 106:13,17 160:2,9,15,20 161:2 183:8 184:10 188:11 216:6 232:2 249:3 let's 60:18 80:19 88:14 120:19 144:7 152:9 169:18 170:19 200:2 207:13 213:14 227:3 248:12 level 8:21 38:17 39:4 44:18 46:8 55:17 56:8 56:11 57:20 59:20,22 71:2 78:6,14 91:18 92:4,13 114:2 116:9 128:6 142:6 152:8 195:6.6 198:22 233:15 levels 11:5,7 21:20 28:22 29:1,4,5,11

30:3 39:22 53:15 54:18 leverage 22:20 23:8 70:16 85:21 260:18 liability 123:12 life 193:15,19 194:5,8 195:4 225:16 light 12:6 153:10 liked 199:4 likeliness 236:14 Likewise 122:1 liking 217:9 LILLIE-BLANTON 2:8 18:18 20:20 22:8 24:21 31:8,11,14 35:17 43:5,13,16,18 43:20 44:2 47:20 49:1 53:5 58:10 66:5,7,22 live 86:11 67:2 68:8 69:1,11,13 53:16 69:15 73:7 132:20 167:20 210:17 225:3 258:8,12 limit 105:2 145:3,14 180:12 232:19 limitation 9:11 limited 7:11,18 65:16 74:11 114:3 219:3 limits 93:10 line 5:1 28:21 66:18 259:8 lines 66:12 link 80:7 249:11 linkage 69:15 79:21 116:2 linkages 249:10 linked 48:16 117:21 linking 69:9 lipid 13:20 Lisa 1:18 26:9,11 102:5 103:17 133:4 168:8 179:9 183:2 list 15:12 30:16 50:20 61:17,22 62:1 68:1 71:19 74:14 133:11 134:9 144:11 149:9 149:10 166:10,15 177:16,19 178:1,2 181:19 188:21 193:11 196:2 200:5 202:18 202:21 203:6,7,13 241:8 246:4 247:6,10 247:11 252:6,17 253:8,9,21 258:5,14 listed 149:16,21 150:2 listen 26:15 200:14 224:3 250:19 listening 185:14 188:6 literature 21:1 163:2 242:21 little 15:8 22:10 44:8

52:9 59:15.16 75:12 75:13 88:21 115:15 116:3 137:11 150:13 171:19 182:6 183:21 187:9 191:10,10 194:18 206:5 218:3 227:13 231:15 232:14 258:10 Liu 2:11 125:19,19 126:6 128:4 132:1 141:13 142:15 144:20 145:10 147:14 148:22 155:7 162:1,14,18 163:1 208:18 210:19 210:20 211:2 212:13 212:20 214:10,14,18 223:6,15 224:15,21 load 17:3 34:17 35:20 **loaded** 40:14 located 23:3 logic 143:7 logical 178:17,20 long 25:1 90:14 134:9 135:10 144:8 147:7 161:3 191:13 200:6 203:6,13 205:9 258:5 long-term 89:13,20 122:17,20 133:19 189:7 190:6 203:20 239:21 252:5,11 259:14 longer 21:17 238:8,17 look 6:11 14:12,13 22:5 33:3,10 34:9 57:2 61:18 63:18 68:15 80:18 86:11 90:16 96:9 102:17 104:13 107:2 108:4,20 110:3 111:17 112:16,18 114:9 118:16 119:7 120:17 123:8 127:21 133:14 135:12 158:10 161:5 173:14 174:4,6 174:7,8,10 176:5,6,7 186:16 187:6 194:13 194:20 199:22 200:17 200:18 202:13 204:17 218:9,18 219:1,2,13 226:12 227:15 229:6 229:9 230:22 242:1 253:15,21 looked 21:14 30:20,22 33:8 97:13 189:16 looking 5:8 23:5 36:18 40:18 47:17 52:13 64:4,18,22 65:20

87:15 89:18 97:16 100:7 101:22 103:3 104:11 109:10 110:11 111:6,13,14 112:20 113:10,10,12 118:11 119:11.13 123:17 138:5,15 148:10 163:19 174:14 176:14 176:15 180:8 183:10 184:5 186:11 190:12 191:6 192:22 197:3 197:17 205:1,10 215:6 219:5 221:7 227:8 231:5 249:22 255:21 looks 58:3 76:9 112:14 135:16 140:11 143:5 168:5 200:6 210:6 215:7 242:1 256:19 looping 76:13 **looser** 101:4 lose 133:3 201:14 losers 124:3.15 lost 76:15 235:15 lot 6:6 22:22 37:7,8 45:7 46:20 47:21 49:4 58:4 70:19 73:18 78:15 88:19 93:21 103:16,18 107:9 111:1,21 112:1,19 114:13 118:22 122:17 125:5 134:15 163:8 169:14 179:13 184:15 185:8 193:11 202:9 232:22 246:6 254:1 257:2 261:12 lots 51:4 74:20 122:22 loud 82:2 84:1 Louisiana 10:8 36:4 love 51:4 59:10 206:21 loved 193:17 low 8:17 10:8 11:8 29:2 29:8 35:11 36:17 37:18 53:15 54:18 56:22 91:17 109:22 191:10 236:15 lower 129:10 195:7 LTC 189:2 lump 172:5 lunch 81:18 132:11,14 132:15 171:2 186:16 198:2,4 201:5,7 217:8 lungs 224:4 Μ main 5:3 20:22 166:16 217:10

maintenance 219:18 221:17 major 33:14 85:13 94:14 101:18 142:19 majority 11:16 18:5 108:20 146:18 164:1 making 7:1 23:7 62:7 79:14 100:16 171:8 187:15 208:14 235:3 235:5,9 242:4 mammograms 220:4 managed 1:20 57:8,9 57:10 70:3,18 79:1 82:6,8 84:20 85:22 89:14 105:16 111:18 117:22 123:16 175:22 210:11 257:6 management 13:20 14:7 16:10 28:12 30:1 78:13,16,18 79:3 80:2 84:20,21 85:3 114:16 115:1 172:3 229:17 240:20 242:16 243:18 244:6 manager 2:3,4,5 153:12 managers 40:22 79:3 manages 48:1 mandates 42:18 mandatory 52:3 manner 216:16 manpower 20:5 MAP 1:3 13:4,17 14:1,5 14:18,20 50:15 68:12 115:18 134:16 138:9 199:3 204:5 226:7 228:2,9,12 231:6 241:12 242:17 251:19 260:22 261:5 MAP's 13:2 MAPs 13:10 Marc 1:17 149:5 166:1 222:19 226:8 237:4 239:17,18 March 1:19 41:7 Marcia 2:2 6:4 marginal 173:3 Margo 66:10 **MARIE** 2:1 Marissa 1:20 64:3 74:22 75:9 167:4 203:9 215:21 234:8 244:4 245:6 Marsha 2:8 35:16 46:18 51:3 69:8 123:2 167:19 185:12 225:2 258:7 261:14 Mass 17:10 29:16 Massachusetts 10:9 matching 231:22

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

maintains 45:1

			21
	00:01 01:01 00:17 00	74.0 40 47 75.4 00.45	244-24 220-42 40
material 26:8 128:4	90:21 91:21 93:17,20	71:9,12,17 75:4 86:15	214:21 220:12,16
237:16	94:18,18 96:6 98:2,12	87:14 108:17 133:2	221:5,16 225:22
materials 3:7 27:8 55:3	98:22 99:18 100:6	137:3 144:22 184:12	227:17 228:1 229:8
81:6 137:8	103:1,8,10 104:5,19	193:19 232:10	231:4,8,12,18 232:15
maternal 40:18 101:13	106:8,14 107:14	measures 4:20 5:9,9,13	233:6,12,16 235:12
133:21 134:13 199:5	109:6 111:13 112:4,6	6:11,12,14,18 7:5,9	235:14,19 238:3
252:12	115:19 116:7 117:1	7:10,11,16,18 8:2	239:12,21 240:11,17
maternity 70:13 135:1	118:5 119:2 120:20	13:11,13 14:6,11 15:1	241:8,15 242:4 243:9
Mathematica 66:3,9,15	122:8,11 123:5,21	15:12,15 17:12,15	243:16 244:14 246:6
mathematical 123:4	125:8,9 127:18	19:19 22:6 25:1 26:1	247:6,10,20 248:19
matter 80:22 158:9	129:16 130:1,19	27:5 28:1,3,10,19,22	250:5 251:21 252:4
201:9 226:11 248:14	131:1 132:17,17	29:1,2,5,6,8,11,13	254:11 257:9 259:10
262:5	134:3 136:6,8,9,12,19	30:2,4,5,13,21 31:1	measuring 39:1 76:6
MBA 1:12 2:2	137:20 138:11 139:5	33:9 36:16,22 40:19	82:13 112:12
MCO-paid 112:13	139:10,13 140:6,11	41:12 42:15,18,19	mechanism 37:16
MCOs 116:10 117:11	140:21,21 142:1,6,22	43:19 44:9 45:8 46:13	Medicaid 1:3,18 2:9 5:
MD 1:11,12,17,17,21	143:5 147:22 149:1	47:4,15,16 52:14,15	8:7,12,15,16 9:1,5,7
2:1,7,7	149:17 157:21 158:20	53:18 54:11,17,22	9:14,19,22 10:4,6,10
mean 18:17 19:10 25:7	158:21 159:17,21	55:5,7 58:13 65:13	10:17,18,20 11:1,3,4
32:13,19 35:12 37:21	160:6 161:12 162:11	66:4 67:8,9 68:16	11:9,12,14,17,20
43:11 44:3 45:6,12	165:6,10,13 167:7,10	69:2,4,9 70:13,17	12:15,17 13:1,1,11
47:8 49:19 50:18,20	167:17 168:12 171:7	73:8,10 74:4,7,16	15:12 18:6 20:3,7,9
55:20 56:5 57:12 64:7	171:15,22 172:3,19	75:19 79:15 81:5	21:2 22:19 25:14 32:
64:18 65:5 76:2,12	172:22 173:1,3	82:22 83:6,7,9,10	32:19 41:12 44:4 48
97:5 99:4 113:21	178:18,19 179:1	84:5,10 85:11 86:4,6	48:12 50:2 52:4,8,13
141:5 142:12 147:6	182:1 184:20 185:4	86:12,17,18 87:4,6,11	57:13 62:15 64:9,12
147:10 152:13 158:1	189:9 193:10,16	88:3,6,9 90:3,5,17,20	73:2 75:6 82:17 92:2
161:20 167:12 176:2	194:1 196:8,18 199:2	91:9 95:1,11 96:2	105:6 109:15 111:2
180:10 184:6 185:7	199:2 200:1 203:21	98:22 99:8 104:13	112:5 115:9 119:12
186:5 187:12 190:4	204:4 206:12,19	107:7 108:8 110:12	120:7,11 123:6,10,1
192:2 193:3 198:15	207:12,18 208:8,9,11	112:7 113:8,9,15	123:12 129:12,22
200:4 203:11,15	208:22 210:6,8,11,20	114:5,8,22 119:18,20	131:12,16 133:16
205:8 216:6,14,17	210:21 211:3,10	122:8,14,19,19 123:9	135:14 149:1 163:21
224:9 226:1 230:6	212:7,8,16,22 213:8	123:15 124:4,7	164:3,6 167:13,13
232:15 233:1,4	213:10,15,19 214:3	125:12,22 126:7,8,12	170:3 189:20,22
236:12 237:21 239:22	214:11 215:8 216:7,8	126:13,15,16,18,20	196:14,16 217:11
meaning 49:9	216:9,20 217:9	127:2,9,12,14,20	219:21 229:14 232:1
meaningful 52:17 83:14	218:14 219:13 220:14	128:5,6,8,13,17,18,21	240:4,13 242:15
83:20 86:21 164:13	221:7,19,21 223:7	129:4,5,6,7,8,14	250:1 252:5 255:5
164:17 226:22	224:17,20 225:4,9	130:9,11,16 131:9,14	257:5,14 259:7
means 70:4 77:16	226:14,19 227:13	132:5,18,19 133:8,13	Medicaid's 24:10
120:21 207:22			
	228:22 229:4,13,17	134:5,7,16 135:2,5,7	Medicaid-eligible 8:10
meant 132:2	230:2,3,5 233:8,18	135:10 136:22 137:4	medical 2:7 16:2 42:19
measure 3:19 7:8 13:2	234:6 237:10,10,14	137:10,12,14,16	43:4 61:20 69:18
14:1,5,17,19,19 15:7	238:4,9,21 239:2,6	138:8,12,18,22 139:1	89:11,21,21 93:11
16:1 28:4,17 31:3	241:2,19 242:2,3,7,13	139:7,9 140:10 141:8	96:17 100:22 101:2
32:3 33:19,22 34:8	242:20 243:3,13	160:5 162:6 170:21	101:14 102:2,12
35:4,18,19 36:3 37:13	244:7 245:16,19	170:22 171:14 173:14	105:12,16 107:20
38:9 40:3 41:4,17,20	246:2,7 248:10,21	175:5,13 179:11,16	108:5 109:13 111:2
42:3 43:6,7 46:11,14	249:21 250:7,9,15	179:17,20 180:3	118:22 127:8,10
52:13 54:6 55:8 58:7	251:20 256:19 260:2	185:19 186:2,8 188:1	156:15 176:18 212:1
58:22 59:3,3,4,6,21	measure's 163:14	188:20,22 189:4,13	225:5 232:5
60:1,20 61:1,4,8 62:4	214:19	190:12,22 192:1,3,18	Medicare 43:12 46:20
62:6 63:3,13,17 64:5	measure-specific 3:14	192:21 195:22 197:21	47:16 48:5,10,17,20
64:6,7,15,16,16,20	13:8	197:22 199:3,12,15	52:6 72:20 83:13
67:6,9 75:20,22 76:5	measured 18:2 37:10	199:18 200:16 201:1	119:12 120:10 131:1
77:1,3,9 80:17 81:17	64:11,13	201:18 202:11,18	135:12 170:5 189:14
	maggurament 2.2 6.5	203-5 204-1 6 10 16	180.21 106.12 20
81:17 83:1,4 86:3,7,9 87:17,20 89:3 90:8,10	measurement 2:3 6:5 7:21 8:4,5 53:7 61:13	203:5 204:1,6,10,16 205:14,16 208:15	189:21 196:12,20 229:15

medication 14:7 16:10 29:22 59:8.12.13.18 60:21 61:5,10,11,17 61:22 62:1,11 63:4,7 63:11 76:6.8.10 113:11 114:16 173:19 177:11 178:9 183:20 204:4 208:6 236:9 240:20 242:16 243:6 243:8,17 244:6,22 medications 17:5 62:1 63:14,16 64:21 65:4 75:17 207:17 243:1 244:18 medicine 166:7 mediocrity 122:1 medium 30:3 meet 23:9 42:17 93:1 129:1 144:9 212:16 243:2 261:1 meeting 1:3 3:7 27:8 107:11 134:11 137:18 228:9.12 232:4 258:21 meetings 71:7 member 66:14 218:15 members 135:17 136:2 213:21 238:20 239:12 260:16 mental 1:18 9:2 16:20 26:12 89:11 93:18,20 94:6 95:3,17 96:1,15 96:16 98:2,14 99:11 101:16,17 102:18 103:10 104:6,8,14 106:1 108:21,22 109:9,19 110:13 114:1,11,14 126:13 127:1,5 128:8,18 129:15 137:21 140:14 140:17 141:16 142:10 142:11,16,18 143:1,4 143:6,10,11,17 144:9 144:15 145:2,3,4,7,15 146:14 147:7 148:2 150:14,17,22 151:1 151:10,19,20 152:9 152:16,17 153:14,15 155:19 156:13,19 157:3,10,12,12 158:4 158:18 159:6,10 160:4 162:4 164:16 164:20,22 165:17 168:1 170:12 172:4 174:6 183:16 188:18 194:6 197:7,18,19 199:8 204:12 206:9 206:10 211:8,12 212:4 218:12 223:3,3

223:8.11 246:19 255:13 260:12 **mentally** 176:11,16 209:9 mention 22:9 23:13 24:5 35:18 173:6 mentioned 68:19 112:17 196:11 255:12 mentions 181:9 **MEPS** 225:5 merge 52:22 105:11 merged 119:12 messed 63:22 met 1:8 133:11 166:19 metabolic 118:18 126:7 173:18 174:5 method 42:11 methodology 92:11 methods 260:3 metric 38:18 39:13 85:17 157:20 metrics 39:10 83:14,19 113:19 MHA 1:13,17 mic 88:20 198:14 203:9 239:16 microphone 234:13 237:4 251:10 258:11 microphones 224:10 mid 260:21 middle 227:15 Midwest 169:10 might've 168:13 172:1 mil 233:2 milligram 131:3 232:17 238:7 milligrams 130:18 238:16 million 11:3 82:14 mind 179:15 189:16 191:2 240:5 minimum 12:19 78:4 Minnesota 259:5 minority 10:19 minute 80:19 90:2 239:4 minutes 201:8 miscounted 192:4 misses 64:21 missing 114:4 201:21 mix 120:5,12 121:5,10 183:1 MMIS 45:1 93:9 model 74:1 82:9 117:9 117:14 moderate 29:1.5.7 modification 188:13 modified 237:8,10 modify 237:20

modifying 92:8 moment 56:13 202:3 247:18 money 45:12 monitor 13:7 127:17 **monitoring** 17:4 59:7 63:3,14 178:10,11 months 82:19 151:21 166:21 218:15 Mood 177:22 morbidity 10:1 130:14 243:7 morning 4:5 8:8 18:13 26:11 81:12 morphine 130:18 131:4 232:17 238:7 mortality 130:14 243:7 motion 136:4 227:1 228:21 235:6,10 237:6 244:5 245:19 246:3 248:20 251:1 motions 248:18 motivated 220:21 mouths 201:16 move 50:6 81:16 88:20 90:9,15 125:5,7 132:10 136:4 160:6 161:12 168:9 170:18 207:13 213:14 215:10 227:3 229:5 234:17 234:22 251:16 258:8 258:13 moved 40:8 105:11 movement 90:17 122:7 moving 23:6 50:15 73:21 83:16 **MPH** 1:12,22 multi 239:6 multi-agency 89:6 multi-state 111:4 multiple 63:16 151:9 158:14 236:8 239:2,3 249:13 mutually 109:5 myriad 100:5 Ν **N.W** 1:9 **NADINE** 2:3 name 130:6 238:3 named 27:10 Nancy 1:15 39:16 46:17 97:17 99:20 102:7 115:6 159:2 174:1 176:20 179:19 186:12

narrow 92:4 narrowing 98:9 narrows 143:15 nation 130:14 national 1:1,8,17,22 2:11 12:19 92:16 139:15 169:8 navigation 117:14 118:7 NCQA 13:21 15:19 16:3 16:4,5,6,8,9,20 17:2,3 17:5,6,9,10 33:17 77:15,15,17,22 78:3 80:11 83:3,7 85:9,16 112:5 113:9 123:8 125:20 137:1,4,9 138:2 139:4 140:22 171:2 172:13 209:10 210:20 213:18 214:7 215:10 217:3 NCQA's 125:21 near 86:20 nearly 10:3,7 12:20 necessarily 78:11 90:15 98:19 147:16 148:20 163:9 164:11 168:16 195:9 205:13 need 19:7,18 31:12 36:7 43:8 44:22.22 51:22 63:8 69:18 77:1 83:22 84:1 85:9 102:19 107:13 108:8 113:18 115:19 120:1 124:15 159:19 167:11 171:13 174:15,16,17 177:21 179:15,17 194:20 195:10 200:22 203:12 207:10 208:1 226:5,6,16 229:5 230:2,5 231:4 233:8 239:17 240:2 241:7 252:2 253:4,9,10 254:12 256:15 257:8 needed 19:2 54:21 142:5 221:16 226:1 229:4,18 needing 136:3 needle 90:15 needs 23:9 52:3 63:18 63:22 129:1 136:12 164:22 166:19 168:1 193:14 195:11 209:1 210:7 225:22 233:7 243:6 256:8 negative 241:5 neglectful 189:1 network 257:10,11,12 networking 102:20 networks 257:2,4

239:4

narcotic 130:12,13

narcotics 130:17

			21
260:19	18:6,7 20:22 21:5	offs 225:7	operational 155:6
never 78:17 149:17	30:5,8 48:20 54:15	oftentimes 25:9,17	operationalize 119:19
189:16 191:2 240:5	55:15 59:12 61:2	oh 25:19 31:18 33:2,6	operator 66:15,17,20
new 7:8,10 10:9 19:19	62:17 70:10 77:17	34:18,22 55:8 66:22	67:1 125:13 251:8,1
32:8 34:18 36:4,16	78:18 102:11 113:8	74:22 110:19 150:9	opiate 199:12 232:6
			233:9 246:21 252:19
62:5 86:17 107:4	114:8 119:14 125:14	151:5 154:18 171:10	
130:8 134:4 177:1	138:1 147:13 155:11	171:20 175:7 180:14	opinion 50:18 161:16
185:22 187:4 206:19	160:4 161:18 162:6	189:15 190:13 205:17	200:13
217:17 237:10 239:20	162:17 165:20 166:2	225:2 240:5 258:12	opinions 200:12
252:18 258:17	186:3 192:1 193:18	okay 5:17 6:2,8 19:20	opioid 132:2 139:7,8
newly 12:15 62:3 135:9	195:3 204:1,2 211:13	22:14 26:5 27:19	235:22 238:4 256:18
137:9 159:17 175:4	224:10,13 238:21	31:22 32:4,15 33:2	256:22 258:17 259:
210:1	246:7 251:13 255:16	34:22 37:9 51:1 52:19	opioids 130:21 171:1
nice 4:4	260:1,5	53:13,14 54:1 55:10	227:5 238:6,11,15
nifty 55:2	numbers 27:18 82:14	63:6 68:14 80:19	opportunities 22:19
nine 14:4 75:5 207:19	82:18 181:1,4 246:7	81:14,21 82:3 93:22	65:7
207:22 238:22 246:9	numerator 145:22	97:20 98:18,20	opportunity 13:15
247:19 260:6,8	146:8,9 148:5 149:5	106:13 110:22 119:5	62:13,15 71:3 78:10
nominating 229:21	154:3,6 207:21	122:7 133:9,10 137:6	89:1 90:19,22 113:3
nominations 193:8	212:16	138:19 141:13 146:10	123:2,20 124:20
239:10	numerators 109:7	151:8 153:9 154:9	125:20 127:16 160:
non 12:17	128:21 147:20 197:4	157:18 158:1,1	184:17 231:21 234:
non-behavioral 167:6	227:16	160:15 161:10,11	256:13
non-disabled 205:2	Nurse 1:16	163:14 175:7,11	opposed 49:5
206:15	nursing 97:5,7,14	180:14,17 182:5,11	optimal 116:18
non-NQF 17:7	119:10,14 120:6,12	182:20 183:7 185:11	option 15:4 207:2
non-NQF-endorsed	120:13,18,22 121:3	185:12,12 186:18	230:11
17:12,14 260:2,6	121:15 122:4	189:11,16 190:18	optional 32:11
non-physician 20:13		191:2 195:17 196:1,4	options 136:5 148:5
24:2	0	197:1,11,20 198:7,13	228:6,7
non-SMI 205:5	OB 88:4	200:1 201:4,8,17	orange 12:7
non-voting 135:18	obesity 33:13	204:19 205:21 206:3	order 90:13 92:4 93:1
notable 87:14 88:2			149:12 178:7 203:4
	objective 40:3,4	207:19,19 208:2,3	
note 10:16 184:14	objectives 5:2	209:7,10,13 210:5	ordered 62:1
243:17	observation 55:14	211:13 212:2,21	orders 61:10,16
noted 252:17	observed 11:13 17:19	213:3,13,14 216:5	Oregon 92:7
notes 58:15	observing 6:6	222:18 226:17 227:3	organization 69:21
notice 32:20	obstetric 101:13	235:10 236:2,5,16,19	original 13:21 74:19
noticed 91:14 116:16	Obstructive 16:12	236:20 237:2 238:2	137:8 205:19
notifying 202:11	obtained 25:15	239:1 240:15 245:10	originated 173:7
noting 37:7	obviously 34:3 35:12	246:2 248:12,13	orthopedic 259:2
notion 19:20	36:16 52:11 64:19	253:16 258:14 260:13	orthopod 224:2
NQF 2:2 6:5 14:2,6,9		older 16:6,13 175:12	ought 145:7
	99:17 148:19 177:10		
33:15 34:7 50:15 52:1	209:20 251:19	209:2 213:21	outcome 35:20 39:12
60:14 85:9 104:19	occur 7:5	once 93:5 194:11 210:8	40:2 47:4 93:16 94:
106:7 107:13 126:10	offer 78:19 127:16	220:1 225:17,18	99:1,9,12,14 100:8
131:21 132:1,7 136:9	offered 117:13	243:13	103:15 104:1 105:1
159:17 165:8 171:13	offering 207:2	one's 210:3 231:15	126:17 184:20 185:
175:15 205:14 213:18	office 26:18 31:16,17	ones 12:5 30:22 34:15	210:10 215:4
215:9 217:3 227:21	49:12 53:9 103:12	34:15 41:22 156:16	outcome-oriented
228:7 229:1,7,9,11	155:22 157:17 164:4	161:5 175:9 178:12	138:11
230:13,15,19 231:10	165:20 166:18 220:1	185:9 190:8 196:10	outcomes 40:10 65:1
231:13 232:12 233:13	261:4	196:10 240:1 246:21	133:15,22 134:14
233:18,21 236:10	Officer 2:7,9	246:22 247:22 252:17	213:8 252:9,13 254
237:7,15 247:2	offices 157:11	online 71:16 73:20	254:11
251:20 261:13,17	Officially 116:20	119:16 125:9	outline 113:22
201120201110,11		open 12:10 66:12,13	outpatient 103:12
NQF-endorsed 17:13	officials 241:16		
NQF-endorsed 17:13	officials 241:16 offline 51:2		-
-	offline 51:2	91:6 145:2 244:14 opened 66:19 105:20	154:19 218:15 outside 89:14

overall 5:16 10:1 49:10 75:17 97:3 99:2,5 133:21 197:3,17 overcome 116:18 overlay 204:17 overly 242:22 overnight 107:10 oversight 257:6 overuse 130:12 overview 3:7 8:6,9 128:5 130:1 overweight 9:19
<u></u> Р
P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
4:1 p.m 201:10,11 248:15
248:16 262:6
pacer 194:14
packet 58:1 130:9
page 3:3 16:14 58:6 60:9 138:2 227:16
pager 15:14 30:16 32:7
57:22 58:1
pagers 27:10,21 54:13
60:6 paid 24:18 151:1
156:21 166:11,18
169:16
pain 224:2
painkiller 259:14
paired 99:10 Panel 3:10 137:3 225:6
panelists 81:9
panels 145:1,1 147:18
208:21
panning 99:19
panoply 98:4
paper 38:8 119:11,15 128:2 255:2
papers 235:16
parameters 141:9
198:19
pardoned 201:15
part 19:3 45:14 52:3 56:17 71:21 77:20,20
87:9 89:2 102:22
105:1 112:13 118:16
130:9 167:7 172:20
185:1 192:21 202:14 212:11 221:18
partial 57:3,14 58:17
123:6,10 184:16
partially 65:22 259:11
participate 32:12
101:11 participating 75:4
117:12

participation 28:7 52:4 261:10 particular 4:20 26:1 54:22 55:4,7 63:17 87:4,11 89:6,17 98:1 136:4 137:15 138:9 199:21 207:6 215:8 232:15 particularly 7:15 9:15 34:16 56:13 68:18 71:1 99:3 110:8 115:12 163:7 184:21 195:5 partly 108:19 partners 18:21 41:6 51:4 103:17 135:18 202:11 partnership 49:10 52:5 85:8 261:16 parts 166:5 party 123:11 pass 207:11 211:17 212:1 213:2,6,9 215:2 246:18,20,22 247:1 passed 52:21 246:21 passes 209:12 238:22 239:5,8 245:15 246:10 251:1 paste 149:13 path 51:8 231:14 254:16 patient 59:14 61:13 79:4 83:21 103:11 104:1 122:5 144:6 146:12 149:14 157:5 165:1,2,16 166:9,18 186:14 243:5 patient's 115:22 116:1 194:10 patients 14:11 17:5 22:19 49:10 59:8 63:4 63:7 114:14 121:3 140:12 152:9,15 153:15 164:3,6,19 170:4,5,9 174:5,16 194:8 241:1 242:15 243:1 244:15,21 245:1,18 256:21 257:14 pattern 35:13 75:8 patterns 28:1 Patton 1:18 26:10,11 34:6 102:6 133:6 168:10 173:5 235:17 236:2,5 pause 235:11 247:4 pay 12:14 70:8 113:1 payers 41:9 170:7 paying 105:9,9 111:8

113:18 163:12 payment 156:16 payments 51:20 157:7 157:7 pays 97:15 PC-01 30:7.8 pediatric 221:12 236:8 pediatricians 164:5 225:13 **PEDS** 36:15 37:2 peer 118:2,3 peeve 218:19 peeves 91:13 PELLEGRINI 1:19 40:17 42:5.8 43:11.15 43:17,19 44:1 51:3 71:5 171:5.10 172:7 191:8 192:14 217:7 218:22 219:4 penalized 121:13,19 penalties 73:5 pending 215:9 229:1,2 245:8,12 247:2 Pennsylvania 2:8 82:4 83:6 114:7 people 4:10 14:7 20:6,7 20:17 21:1 31:6 34:10 38:19,22 46:5,6 55:11 63:15 93:11 95:21 97:5 98:4,15 101:15 107:16,18 108:21 109:8 110:13 112:20 121:9 123:9 126:8,13 126:18,21,22 127:4,6 127:21 128:8 136:3 142:2,7 143:3 145:3 159:9 161:15,18,19 162:6 167:8,10 168:3 172:4,11,12 174:3,14 177:17 182:12 183:15 183:18 184:7,8,10,22 191:12 192:7,12 197:18 199:22 200:15 201:15 207:15 208:4 211:7 212:3 216:13 216:14 217:13,19 218:8 220:21,22 223:1 232:18,21 233:1,1 240:20 242:16 243:18 246:8 247:16 251:9 256:1,2 259:6,13,17 260:12 people's 75:17 229:7 percent 8:20 9:18 10:2 10:5,7,8,22 11:6,7,14 11:15 12:14,20 14:4 23:13 38:22 91:16 94:5 97:5 99:5 105:22 114:4,20 120:20

121:18 122:3 192:2 244:22 245:2 255:3 percentage 9:9 11:5 129:10 140:12 159:9 161:21,22 170:2 194:7 213:21 244:14 244:20 245:1 perfect 179:14,16 230:3 performance 83:6 93:20 110:11 112:13 119:20 120:18,19 121:6,8,12 123:15 129:9,11 168:5 215:3 performers 121:22 perinatal 135:1 199:5 period 61:14 90:15 103:22 120:16 125:11 126:5 130:19 244:19 245:1,3 259:1 260:15 perking 217:8 Permission 151:22 **Perrv** 6:1 persisted 134:3 persistent 17:5 59:8 63:4,7 244:17 person 45:15,16 76:5,9 150:21 151:16 156:7 167:7 168:6 191:17 personal 50:18 personally 56:12 167:15 180:5 persons 246:19 perspective 40:7,8 55:19 115:22 179:8 193:2 250:1 252:6 253:2 Perspectives 3:10 pertinent 26:8 pet 91:13 218:19 pharmacies 131:1,5 238:12,18 239:3 pharmacist 61:17 pharmacotherapy 129:1 pharmacy 1:20 2:7 120:7 130:7 229:16 phased 14:1 18:16 19:1 19:5 phasing 19:20 **PhD** 1:13,14,15 2:2,11 phone 6:1 66:9,12 81:11 99:16 103:17 251:9 phonetic 66:21 phrase 253:21 physical 82:9 87:1,21 102:14 107:5 111:6 112:10 116:21 117:19 118:14 119:1 158:16

			281
		1	
166:3 194:5 219:17	180:15 181:3,11,14	88:10 93:21 96:16,17	229:15,16 232:11
physician 20:12 48:3	181:16,22 182:5,11	96:18 98:10,14 106:4	populations 10:19
51:11 52:22 149:8	182:13,18,20 183:2,5	116:22 117:22 123:10	129:10,12 140:2
150:3,15,20	183:7 184:9 185:11	123:16 131:11 157:8	163:21 177:19 206:15
physicians 1:21 20:5	186:18 188:9 189:8	175:22 214:15 215:15	209:2 253:14
23:14 24:2 51:20	189:11,18,20 190:10	221:5 222:9 249:19	portray 120:12
72:14 149:10 156:10	190:15,18,21 191:3,6	256:20 257:3	portrayal 43:1
164:5	192:13,16 193:22	play 63:15	positive 40:16 65:15
pick 138:15 191:21	195:1,14,18,20 196:4	please 60:14 98:14	214:8 222:3,7
199:13	196:7,13 197:1,9,12	125:14 201:13 238:20	possible 46:12 47:11
picked 199:4	197:15 198:7,10,13	245:14 251:12	110:21 172:17 228:4
picking 242:20	199:16 200:9,21	pleased 134:6	242:3
picture 20:1 111:11	201:3,7,12,21 202:4,7	plus 139:1	possibly 36:11 183:22
172:17,18	204:7,18,20 205:8,11	pneumonia 151:13	postpartum 10:13 17:1
piece 52:18 72:20	205:20 206:3 207:13	pockets 255:6	17:2 28:11 260:7
176:11 254:6		point 19:15 39:6,9 40:3	potential 6:18 25:2 28:3
	208:3,10 209:4,7,13 209:21 210:15,22		-
pieces 254:7		44:9 47:5,8,8 49:12	50:11 54:19 55:8 92:19 134:7 136:14
pilot 18:22 19:2 48:14	211:5,18 212:2,21 213:3,7,12 214:16	50:13 51:13 53:12	
87:19 97:13		55:14 75:2 82:11	137:16 215:1
piloted 92:7	215:20 216:5 217:6	83:18 91:22 106:16	potentially 6:4 44:9
pin 260:22	218:7 219:11 220:10	106:17 109:3 119:22	53:11 136:9 183:14
Pincus 1:10,11 4:3 6:2	221:22 222:5,18	124:8,12 165:3 169:7	217:12 250:7
6:8 17:21 18:15 19:14	224:9,13,18,22 226:8	169:18 170:1,20	poverty 8:20
22:3,14 23:11 25:19	226:17 227:1,6,10,18	174:3 190:11 191:22	powerful 75:8
26:3,6 27:1,5 30:19	228:5,21 229:20	193:1 203:11 218:5	PQA 131:20 132:4,5,6
31:5,10,18,22 32:4,14	233:10 234:7 235:2,5	220:13 229:17 240:16	199:12 227:9 259:11
32:22 33:3 35:1,6,9	235:9 236:3,17,19	258:5 260:17 261:8	PQI 16:10,12
35:12 36:9 37:3,22	237:2 239:9,16 240:4	pointed 54:17 106:3	PQRS 46:19,22 47:14
38:3,6 39:16 44:6	240:12 241:3,14	points 3:8 8:11 54:21	47:17 72:19 80:8
46:9 50:21 51:10	244:1,4,10 245:4,10	88:19 102:7 103:16	practically 42:9,10
52:19 53:13 55:10	245:20 246:11,14	124:19 129:10 233:10	practice 23:1 92:4,13
56:16 57:17 58:8,20	247:16,21 248:3,5,8	255:22	166:7
64:3 65:5,11 66:6	248:17 249:1,4	poisoning 118:19	practitioner 20:13,13
67:8,17 68:4,14 72:7	250:13,21 251:2	policy 94:8	practitioners 1:16 24:2
74:22 75:9 76:11	253:6,16 254:17	polypharmacy 63:10	pray 91:20
79:12 81:10,14 82:1	257:18 258:15 259:16	77:4 79:4 252:19	pre-admission 61:16
88:14,20 94:19 95:4,7	261:9	pool 21:7	pre-censor 201:3
95:12 96:3 97:17,20	pipeline 104:18	poor 9:6 14:3,21 16:9	preadmission 61:22
99:20 102:5 106:11	Pittsburgh 116:16	134:14 168:5	precise 19:10 258:6
108:11 109:3 110:18	place 12:18 40:8,15	poorer 8:16	precisely 53:12
110:22 113:20 115:6	85:7 206:21 220:19	poorly 221:4	preferences 248:7
119:4 124:22 125:17	231:18 257:7	population 8:7,10,14	preferred 93:17
126:3 128:1 130:4	places 100:12 221:3	9:17,22 10:17,22	premature 41:18
131:17 132:4,10,13	plan 1:14 15:20,21 17:2	11:12,16 13:1 20:15	231:15
133:4,9 136:21	35:4,5 36:22 38:17	23:10 33:14 34:8	prenatal 10:12 17:1
138:19,21 139:4,8,21	53:22 57:10 78:6,14	55:21 57:14 61:12	preparation 137:7
140:3 145:18,21	78:17 79:6 85:12	69:6 73:2 99:3 102:1	preparing 132:7
146:2,5,10 148:14,18	91:18 103:7 104:10	102:12 103:5 105:6	prescribe 242:22
149:4,11 150:1,4,7,11	105:3,16 135:19	105:21 110:14 114:4	Prescribed 208:6
151:3 152:2,13,17,20	139:17 151:11 152:8	114:20 115:9,13	prescribers 130:22
153:2 154:16,19	153:11 165:2 195:6	119:12 122:5 127:7	131:5 238:12,18
155:2,5 156:2,4,11	214:16	127:12,13,15,17,20	239:2
157:15 159:2 160:8	planned 247:13	127:22 128:15,17,19	prescribing 232:6
160:13,16,21 161:4	planning 10:11 18:8	128:19 129:2 145:6	prescription 166:9
161:10 164:8 166:1	173:9	148:8 162:9,20	259:3
167:2,19 168:8 169:2	plans 34:3 52:14 57:8,9	173:16 175:19 176:19	prescriptions 130:21
170:18 171:4,9,11,20	73:20 77:15,17 78:19	177:13 185:1 188:14	238:11,15
172:20 173:22 176:20	79:1 83:3,10 84:21	188:15,15 190:17	present 1:11 2:6,20
177:2 178:16 180:10	85:6,22 86:2,16 87:9	219:22 223:8 229:14	136:2
П			

presentation 132:22 258:21 presented 231:1 232:7 presenting 8:11 presents 26:7 **President** 2:2 6:5 presiding 1:10 press 125:14 251:12 pressing 66:16 pressure 15:22 46:10 69:17 72:9,16,17 77:2 113:13 115:1 126:22 174:8 181:7.13 184:20 209:8 246:18 260:11 pressuring 78:9 presumably 39:7 pretty 99:6 159:19 187:6 193:13 220:8 236.15 prevalence 127:4 128:14 162:7,8,10,19 162:20 prevent 134:19 preventative 213:22 218:21 219:17 221:14 221:16,17 223:21 226:21 Preventative/Ambula... 213:20 preventive 28:12 217:13,20 218:1 220:2.3 prevents 20:7 previous 30:20 149:14 253:8 previously 213:16 239:14,19 primarily 82:6 144:16 156:17 157:4 170:11 primary 18:3 20:12 22:10 25:13 71:16 103:20 114:15 127:11 133:15 134:21 135:4 140:14,17 141:16 142:10 143:4,6,9,14 143:16 144:5,6,13,14 145:7,13,17 146:6,18 147:1,5,8,17,20 148:6 148:20 149:3,7,20,21 150:15 151:11,12,17 153:5 154:2,5,10,20 155:3,8,21,22 156:3 156:10,14,20,21 157:4,9,10,14,17,19 158:12,15 159:5,10 161:19 162:3,7,12,17 162:18 163:5,9,13 164:4,12,16,19 165:5

165:19.20 166:6.10 169:9,12 170:1,7,8,10 170:17 199:10 213:17 219:15 221:15 223:12 252:8 256:16 257:13 principle 37:19 172:22 218:11 prior 137:17 243:21 **priorities** 74:6,12 200:19 prioritization 134:10 180:15 240:16 247:14 259.21 prioritize 74:7,9,13 160:14 198:15 200:18 201:4 202:8 240:18 247:7.8 prioritized 260:2 prioritizing 3:19 56:9 251:16 priority 28:4 50:19 72:1 72:4 133:11 195:7 200:17 203:4 private 8:17 41:9 221:5 252:10 privately 10:2 probably 21:11 35:11 65:1 87:5 106:18 121:21 136:1,18 150:22 151:20 156:6 160:11 171:1 184:22 187:18 196:21 199:13 problem 36:6 65:13 83:2 97:1 101:10 141:17 152:3,6 158:1 159:3 163:7,22 226:3 237:6 249:6,8 problematic 43:7 69:5 69:7,16 problems 40:14 61:10 65:12,18 94:15 96:18 113:22 128:10 129:16 163:4 176:12 220:15 procedure 135:16 process 5:12 7:6,12 39:13 40:3 52:16 61:9 61:11,20 72:5 90:17 98:21,22 103:3 106:8 117:15 124:8 131:21 132:7 137:2 138:21 140:21 160:2 171:17 180:16 201:14 208:20 213:10 214:22 216:8 227:22 228:11 229:12 230:21 231:11,14 233:17 249:17 processes 233:21 254:4 product 202:16

productive 4:4 professionals 23:6 profile 217:13 **profiles** 219:14 program 13:14 24:12 40:22 82:16 89:2,3 91:15 135:8 139:15 169:8 219:14 220:19 259:7 program's 13:7 programs 23:3 64:9,12 87:19 89:13 123:13 167.13 progress 20:14 project 2:3,4,4,5 42:20 45:3 62:4,7 77:18 78:21 79:7 87:16 89:16,18 92:7,19 97:10 105:1 111:4 116:14 126:11,12 153:14 231:22 projects 80:14 85:13 89:8,22 93:14 94:3 199:20 234:4 promising 256:19 promote 217:22 **Promotion** 133:21 252:12 properties 135:6 proportion 105:5 130:20 131:2 152:21 225:9,20 238:5,10,13 proposal 51:6 55:8 138:17 propose 137:19 180:18 180:21 198:4 proposed 257:5 provide 7:18 13:13,15 17:18 22:18 67:21 68:9 78:1 156:22 provided 15:13 54:7 68:12 70:10,22 94:4 provider 22:16,17 25:16 37:8 51:18 94:4 140:16 141:8,14,15 144:5,6 146:7 147:12 152:1,5 155:12,15,22 157:10,17 159:5 164:12,15 166:6 170:8 220:1 221:15 254:4 provider's 158:13 164:4 providers 20:6 22:20 23:8 72:14 73:4 84:2 88:7 100:18 141:21 144:13 147:3,15 156:14 163:22 164:20 165:4 169:12 170:2,9 170:11 188:2 219:15

239:7 242:22 249:19 252:11 254:13 255:8 256:17,20 257:13 providing 80:5 261:19 provision 52:22 provisions 53:6.10 proxies 173:12 proxy 214:2 prudent 251:6 **psych** 93:15 94:5,17 97:1,21 98:6,11 99:2 99:3,6,13 100:4,13 105:2,4 106:3 107:19 108:3,5 114:18 psychiatric 94:20,21 95:9 96:6 100:8,11,13 100:15 102:2 109:12 139:12 144:2 252:19 255:17,18 256:1,3 psychiatrists 255:4 psychiatry 104:15 255:3 psychotherapy 212:15 public 2:8 3:12,17 27:13 45:13,14 50:8 52:2 94:8 125:6,10,13 125:15 126:4 130:5 131:17 251:3,7,12,14 260:15 publically 10:11 261:8 published 108:13 111:3 255:2 pull 30:17 32:6 35:8 57:5 60:3 148:16,16 152:7,11 153:12 158:9 194:2 pulled 55:2 137:8 185:21 pulling 41:11 175:18 Pulmonary 16:12 pure 195:12 purely 224:22 purpose 76:1,2,2,21 157:19,21 158:20 166:17 167:9,17,17 purposes 154:6 175:17 pursuing 107:4 131:13 purview 43:2 228:3 **push** 49:9 84:2,18 pushed 173:9 pushing 85:9 185:4 put 31:6 36:5 77:7 79:2 96:11 115:8 141:9 144:8,14,16,17 157:4 165:5,7 166:12 171:16 172:8 191:21 195:7,11 197:16 198:18 222:6 puts 46:9 196:15

putting 12:18 93:19 107:16 117:16 195:21 Q **QIO** 92:15 **QIP** 78:4 QOL 253:1 QPS 61:7 **QRDA** 84:6 QRDA1 83:21 gualified 141:21 qualifier 204:12 qualifies 93:22 qualitatively 160:17 Qualities 48:1 quality 1:1,8,15 2:3,7,8 2:11 6:5 7:21 8:5 24:8 24:13 36:20 39:2,8,15 40:6 46:7,20 48:2,3 48:19 54:11 61:8 62:12,14 63:5 64:17 69:20 70:2,16 71:8,17 73:19 74:2 77:18 78:21 79:7 80:3,13 83:14,19 84:5 85:17 87:14,17,19 89:2,7 97:10 99:18 105:1 108:17 110:2 113:18 115:20 116:2,5,13 124:5 127:21 130:7 153:14 193:15,19 194:5,8 195:4,13 199:20 216:8,22 question 18:16 19:11 19:22 22:16 25:21 30:10,20 31:22 32:16 33:15 34:5 37:4 39:10 45:19,22 46:1,3,19 51:15 53:7,8 54:2 55:13 62:13 63:2 66:10 67:3,6 70:1 72:9,22 74:17,19 75:3 75:18 77:4 78:9 93:6 96:12 107:6 131:19 138:22 145:19 147:4 147:15 157:19 160:3 161:15 162:1 167:5 167:21 171:5 175:17 176:2 182:7 183:8 186:3 194:9 204:10 208:13 214:19 222:21 223:2 224:15 230:4 230:14 234:7 235:18 258:4,16 question's 171:18 questioning 145:12 Questionnaire 15:20 questions 5:17 17:21 32:6 41:1 55:4,6,9

65:19 67:15 88:12 130:2 137:5 141:1 144:21 161:11 186:7 186:12 229:6 237:11 243:15 auick 23:14 51:17 206:2 235:18 quickly 7:2,5 15:14 24:5 75:1 88:18 89:10 135:16 140:6 207:14 210:12 238:3 quite 121:14 137:16 177:7 225:10,19 253.20quorum 201:14 R race 205:3 racial 10:18 raise 71:22 208:21 209:5 211:14,21

244:8 245:14 raised 239:4 rampant 62:12 ran 161:17 162:12 **RAND** 194:6 random 32:20 91:20 range 72:18 208:13,16 208:21 ranges 208:15 ranging 10:7 11:6 rank 6:17 15:9 ranked 202:18,20 rapidly 9:17 rate 16:11,15,16 17:2,3 45:19 56:22 91:17 97:3 103:7 104:10 107:19,21 120:4 121:2,17 162:10,19 162:20 rates 91:16 101:15 109:15 112:15 129:9 129:11 140:20 188:16 196:16 197:3,17,18 217:14 rationale 138:14 142:4 209:3 re-review 228:19 re-see 237:9 reached 140:7 reactions 229:10 read 15:14 61:6 119:16 154:17 244:12 readily 63:1 reading 175:2 readmission 17:3 100:22 101:16 103:7 104:5,10,14 105:4 112:4,6,9,15 113:5

120:4 121:17 134:19 135:10 139:18 188:22 189:7 196:16 197:17 197:18 240:14 252:20 255:18.20 readmissions 100:4.11 101:22 102:10 103:4 108:4 111:2,4,13 115:8 196:10,10 239:20 readmits 129:22 readmitted 118:13 129:19 ready 228:8,11 245:11 250:20 real 46:11,13 51:17 63:2 163:11 166:22 realistically 64:8 reality 65:6 166:21 realize 36:6 167:12 realizing 232:21 really 26:20 38:17 39:14 40:21 43:8 46:8 55:1 61:3 63:11,14 65:7 70:14 72:22 74:6 75:14 80:18 84:2,16 84:17 85:9 86:1 89:3 89:19 91:7 96:11 97:8 99:1,22 100:6,19 101:10,19 102:9,12 102:17 103:14 104:15 105:19 106:22 107:13 107:22 108:7 113:3 113:14 114:4.10 115:4,19,22 116:16 117:3,5,7,9,10 118:22 119:2 122:3 123:1 124:20,22 125:1 127:15 129:1,7,17 134:14 143:14 144:2 145:1 147:6,19,21 148:4 163:12 172:16 173:9,12,13,17,20 176:1,3,7,7 180:4,8 184:8 185:9 187:17 188:12 191:18 195:21 217:2,9,22 219:20 221:21 226:20 233:4 233:7 242:14,18 249:13 250:2 257:13 257:16,19 261:10,11 261:18 realm 217:5 **reason** 54:4 96:8,10 114:15 141:9 150:14 163:11 173:21 241:6 reasonable 262:1 reasons 30:16 68:1 69:22 100:5 217:10

243:21 **rebalance** 114:18 rebellious 194:18 recall 62:7 receive 194:8 received 14:10 27:9 54:6 120:14 240:22 245:17 249:16 receiving 130:21 131:3 238:11,14 recertifying 78:5 recognition 232:8 recognize 36:3 48:4 254:10,12 recognized 22:18 recognizing 72:10 163:20 recommend 147:19 169:3 234:8.16.22 242:8 243:11 recommendation 50:14 51:1 92:10 136:16 185:15 209:3 222:1 228:15 235:4 236:14 245:7 recommendations 3:14 13:3,9 52:2 79:14,16 79:21 80:11,17 208:8 241:12 242:4 251:22 261:2,2,7 recommended 13:4,12 13:17 14:1,6,17 199:3 231:19 241:18 243:16 250:5,11 260:10 recommending 243:10 reconciliation 59:12 61:8,11 reconvene 80:20 record 14:9 16:21 38:5 42:19 43:4 61:20 69:18 81:1 93:11 166:14 201:10 212:17 226:18 231:1 240:21 245:17 248:15,21 249:16 250:9,16 259:20 262:6 recorded 47:5 records 47:14 62:10 69:12 110:3 recovery 40:7 118:3 recurring 36:11 recuse 135:19 recused 207:11 recusing 137:4 red 28:21 reduce 99:1 reduces 8:3 reducing 79:17 93:15 95:22 97:4

redundancies 4:13 8:3 redundant 69:4 87:6 refamiliarize 15:15 refer 227:6 references 93:14 referring 153:4 250:9 **refill** 259:4 refine 253:10 255:16 256:14 260:17 **refined** 144:1 256:9 refinement 123:20 255:9.11 refinements 253:18,19 254:18,19 258:1 refining 251:17 reflected 122:19 reflecting 234:17 **reflective** 216:22 reflects 17:11 reformat 124:4 reformed 12:16 regard 5:16 19:18 109:11 136:22 254:21 255.5 regardless 108:4 168:22 regions 10:21 registries 80:7 regular 46:2 regulations 100:16 101:4 141:20 rehab 189:2 190:5 196:19 239:21 Rehabilitation 189:5 rehospitalization 90:1 94:2,18,20,22 95:8,10 95:22 96:5,6,7,8,22 97:3,22 98:6,12 99:4 99:5,13 100:8 107:20 109:12,15,17 114:5 114:15 119:14 139:9 139:12 144:2 196:8 197:3 252:20 255:17 255:19 rehospitalizations 93:15 94:6 97:1,4 106:2 109:11 119:9 rehospitalized 97:7 256:5,7 reimburse 170:14 reiterate 88:18 rejected 170:9 relate 104:14 121:7 related 30:20 53:6 75:2 87:14 133:14 138:13 153:14 160:22 188:20 191:14 199:5 relates 72:9 relating 134:13,16

relationship 121:1 relative 174:18 relatively 29:2 54:18 134:8 **release** 45:5 released 124:16 232:6 relevant 80:3 97:18 172:11,11 reliable 92:1 relitigate 159:18 remain 11:8 252:1 remained 53:22 244:19 244:21 245:2 remaining 3:19 251:17 remarkable 261:18 remember 22:17 242:17 remind 135:15 260:14 reminded 51:16 reminder 258:19 removal 28:4 55:8 243:13 removals 54:19 remove 132:18 246:3 248:21 250:7,14 253:8 removed 13:19 199:2 removing 242:9,10 248:18 **renewal** 245:8 renominate 245:19 repeat 94:5 106:2 repeated 61:20 repeatedly 94:13 118:15 repeating 71:6 replacement 13:22 14:20 report 6:20 7:4 9:1 27:9 30:13,17 33:5 38:19 52:1 54:3,15 55:16 58:11,15 71:21 72:16 73:8,13 74:4,20 79:6 83:10 84:15,22 86:2 88:9 90:21 112:2,4 116:6 124:4 165:7,15 184:19 188:2,5 194:20 195:11 220:9 241:13 254:10 260:18 261:6 reportable 84:11 reported 6:10,12 13:10 18:11 19:1 25:3 28:10 28:19 29:12 35:15 53:17 56:20 57:9,10 57:12,13 58:18 59:1,9 63:20 66:1 68:21 73:14 84:6 85:2,5 91:10 112:8,9 133:16

204:15 214:14 241:15 252:9 reporting 6:10 13:6 14:15 24:8,13,20 25:8 27:3,16,17 28:22 29:2 29:3,6,7,9,11,15,17 29:19,22 30:1,3,4,5,8 30:21 31:1 32:18 33:12 34:14,16 36:17 36:22 37:6 38:14 43:21,21 48:2,3,19 49:14 50:8 52:2 53:1 53:15,19 54:4,10,16 54:18 56:22 57:3,3,15 57:20 58:12,17 73:1,6 73:10,19 74:2,8,16,17 79:5 80:4 84:8.13 85:18 87:3,11 90:4,20 91:3,8 93:2,9 124:10 124:11 125:11 127:18 128:18 135:8 184:16 204:22,22 206:14 218:13 228:15 241:17 246:1 250:1 reportings 52:12 reports 27:21 44:4 57:6 58:11 67:21 185:21 186:1,11 196:15 represent 130:7 representation 42:4 representative 68:2 represented 10:20 65:21 represents 30:3 reproductive 10:4 request 50:1 125:13 134:11 136:11 requests 6:21 28:2,15 28:16 54:6 67:14 require 7:12 25:17 35:15 43:3 52:11 69:4 69:6,9 84:11 87:7 127:19 128:21 141:15 147:19 212:19 required 7:8,13 26:17 44:3 52:3 83:5 222:8 222:14 requirement 222:16,21 requirements 136:8 202:14 225:12,12 requires 72:10 212:13 245:22 249:13 requiring 148:6,6 research 1:15 71:18 100:7 143:21 resource 73:15 resources 27:8 42:16 74:11 respect 184:13 216:11

233:9 respond 167:21 responding 92:20 response 22:15 45:18 75:2 91:16,17 responsibility 49:2 116:1 responsible 45:16 105:20 106:4 rest 4:4 135:4 restricting 149:6 restrictive 164:10 results 11:10 61:4 91:19 92:9 116:17 118:5 121:11 123:19 129:7 148:7 259:21 resumed 81:1 201:10 248:15 resupport 244:1,6 retention 23:17 retired 14:17 retiring 13:21 reversal 4:8 review 3:8 8:12 13:2 27:20 33:17 42:2 45:4 45:5 60:3 61:20 69:4 69:20 70:16 72:11 125:21 132:17 137:17 140:6 175:5 212:17 230:21 231:9 234:5 245:21,22 247:3 252:3 261:1 reviewed 63:9 100:4 reviews 41:21 69:21 70:2 81:18 148:12 242:11 revisit 28:4 rewarding 122:1 rich 26:20 79:13 **Richard** 173:7 ridiculous 46:6 right 25:20 30:15 35:9 35:10 37:21 38:3,6 41:8,21 43:12,12,13 44:1,16 58:5,7 65:2 66:13 69:13 71:9 72:3 72:21 78:12 85:15 95:20 96:3 98:16 102:4 104:22 106:5 109:2 125:8 126:4,5 131:13 132:8,18 135:2 139:3,15,18,21 140:5 149:11 150:1 155:2 157:21 161:2 167:22 172:7,12 180:11 181:15,17 182:19 183:6,12 187:16 190:1 191:13 191:15 192:3 193:3

			1
195:14 200:20 202:19	saying 52:2,7 56:10	223:2 235:10 236:17	separa
204:13 208:12 209:20	64:19 73:17 95:14	236:18 238:9 239:2	139:1
212:18,20 213:15	108:2 147:1,8 153:5	249:3,4 260:9	205:1
216:19 218:6 221:20	153:22 155:20 163:15	secondary 115:3	separa
228:5 230:18 232:16	167:22 174:15 178:4	156:18 162:3,13	separa
248:13 250:13 257:15	178:6,7,17 203:18	163:13	237:1
259:1	215:9 230:13 233:5	Secretary 173:8	series
rigorously 84:22	says 35:22 75:16	section 132:21 227:15	serious
risk 45:17 98:7 120:1,5	146:14 155:1,3,8	sector 101:2	126:1
121:14,20 122:2	219:6 223:18,19,20	see 6:10 8:18 9:4,12	128:1
134:14 145:5 209:1	226:13 235:22 245:5	11:20 12:5 13:10	174:5
233:2 259:9	scale 139:14	27:17 35:13 36:21	211:8
risk-related 178:19	Schiff 259:4	57:11,18 77:4 84:17	260:1
risks 9:16	schizophrenia 17:9	89:11 103:1,11 104:4	serious
RN 1:15	34:10 101:18 113:12	109:21 133:12 143:5	serve 2
r oad 166:21	115:2 126:8 142:19	149:14,17 151:19	served
robust 4:5 42:11 84:3	151:8,18 154:7	152:7,10 158:22	serves
84:12 116:20 187:6	155:18 177:18 178:10	161:6 163:6,8 164:20	service
r ole 158:13	179:5 183:18 207:16	166:19 167:8 168:15	47:6
r olled 116:10	208:5	169:5 170:2,16,19,21	196:2
room 1:9 26:15 28:8	schizophrenics 113:11	174:13 178:2 179:6	service
49:7 75:12 78:3 117:3	SCHLAIFER 1:20 64:4	189:15 200:3,21	10:12
117:17 125:18 129:13	65:10 75:11 76:14,17	207:8 210:6 219:4,22	44:18
135:17 141:1 146:16	76:20 77:6 161:6,9	229:11 236:12 244:10	128:2
216:13 246:8 247:7	167:5 168:7 178:4	249:15 252:6	212:1
251:10,16	198:14,20 199:7	seeing 4:14 38:22	252:5
Rosemary 66:20	203:10 214:5 215:22	104:16 148:8 164:6	257:1
otate 30:12	229:3,22 234:9,14	170:3,4 217:14	serving
rounded 162:2	235:3,7,15 244:5	257:14	sessio
r ules 149:9 171:12	245:9 247:9 258:16	seen 20:17 103:11	set 3:8,
205:15 257:5	school 21:13	117:17 146:15 157:22	6:18
r un 79:1 204:16	science 39:19	158:8 184:6 216:14	15:13
r unner 137:19	score 120:5	sees 144:5	26:1
running 234:2	screen 28:18 65:15	segment 9:16 110:12	36:19
rural 1:22 11:16 23:6,15	133:12 138:4 174:17	segmentation 110:7	60:7
23:19 24:6	207:19 221:3,6 223:8	segmented 48:9 140:3	81:7
Ruth 5:22	screened 65:14	segmenting 176:4	103:2
Rx 120:7	screening 13:18 14:19	segregate 175:20	122:9
	16:4,5,16 17:6 28:13	select 144:2 165:19	130:2
S	28:14,14 29:18 35:3	selected 8:19	139:1
safe 262:4	53:21 65:13 126:8	selecting 90:3 243:10	179:1
safety 61:4	128:7,10,11,12 129:6	Self 217:18	203:2
sale 42:17	174:6 177:7 180:1,22	self-analysis 112:1	221:2
salt 57:16	181:6 183:4,18 184:2	semi-annual 67:21	227:1
SAMHSA 26:12 102:9	204:12 207:15 208:4	send 169:20 219:15	244:1
173:11	208:22 212:3,10,11	256:21	250:2
	220:3,4,19,20 221:1	sending 51:6 53:8	261:6
sample 127:20 163:17		Senior 2:2,4,5 6:4	set's 19
	221:16 224:16 246:16	Senior 2.2,4,5 0.4	361313
sampling 69:6 127:19	221:16 224:16 246:16 246:17	seniors 49:6	
sampling 69:6 127:19			sets 18
sampling 69:6 127:19 Sarah 2:5 32:5 62:18	246:17 se 220:12 search 94:9 145:14	seniors 49:6	sets 18 116:2
sampling 69:6 127:19 Sarah 2:5 32:5 62:18 77:8 115:7 182:3	246:17 se 220:12	seniors 49:6 sense 4:15 18:20 41:2	sets 18 116:2 setting
sampling 69:6 127:19 Sarah 2:5 32:5 62:18 77:8 115:7 182:3 196:2 200:10 235:17 236:7 261:17	246:17 se 220:12 search 94:9 145:14	seniors 49:6 sense 4:15 18:20 41:2 49:6 67:18 106:19	sets 18 116:2 setting 169:1
sampling 69:6 127:19 Sarah 2:5 32:5 62:18 77:8 115:7 182:3 196:2 200:10 235:17 236:7 261:17 sat 45:15	246:17 se 220:12 search 94:9 145:14 236:6 251:21	seniors 49:6 sense 4:15 18:20 41:2 49:6 67:18 106:19 123:5 125:4 163:20	sets 18 116:2 setting 169:1 setting
sampling 69:6 127:19 Sarah 2:5 32:5 62:18 77:8 115:7 182:3 196:2 200:10 235:17 236:7 261:17 sat 45:15 satisfied 253:3	246:17 se 220:12 search 94:9 145:14 236:6 251:21 searching 217:2 235:21	seniors 49:6 sense 4:15 18:20 41:2 49:6 67:18 106:19 123:5 125:4 163:20 178:14 179:7 203:9	sets 18 116:2 setting 169:1 setting 100:1
sampling 69:6 127:19 Sarah 2:5 32:5 62:18 77:8 115:7 182:3 196:2 200:10 235:17 236:7 261:17 sat 45:15 satisfied 253:3 satisfy 224:3	246:17 se 220:12 search 94:9 145:14 236:6 251:21 searching 217:2 235:21 seat 27:14	seniors 49:6 sense 4:15 18:20 41:2 49:6 67:18 106:19 123:5 125:4 163:20 178:14 179:7 203:9 221:8 226:5 229:5,11	sets 18 116:2 setting 169:1 setting 100:1 seven 2
196:2 200:10 235:17	246:17 se 220:12 search 94:9 145:14 236:6 251:21 searching 217:2 235:21 seat 27:14 seated 201:13	seniors 49:6 sense 4:15 18:20 41:2 49:6 67:18 106:19 123:5 125:4 163:20 178:14 179:7 203:9 221:8 226:5 229:5,11 229:18 230:1,2	set 3 18 sets 18 116:2 setting 169:1 setting 100:1 seven 2 126:2 146:1
sampling 69:6 127:19 Sarah 2:5 32:5 62:18 77:8 115:7 182:3 196:2 200:10 235:17 236:7 261:17 sat 45:15 satisfied 253:3 satisfy 224:3 save 111:19	246:17 se 220:12 search 94:9 145:14 236:6 251:21 searching 217:2 235:21 seat 27:14 seated 201:13 seats 81:4	seniors 49:6 sense 4:15 18:20 41:2 49:6 67:18 106:19 123:5 125:4 163:20 178:14 179:7 203:9 221:8 226:5 229:5,11 229:18 230:1,2 255:19	sets 18 116:2 setting 169:1 setting 100:1 seven 2 126:2

ate 44:19 89:12 17 171:13,16 14,15 206:11 ated 171:7 ately 236:21 1 181:9 **IS** 101:16,17 :13 127:1,5 128:8 18 150:17,21 5 176:16 183:16 8 212:4 246:19 :12 ISIY 176:10 209:8 21:8 75:22 76:20 **d** 137:1 s 76:1.2 e 15:20 25:10 70:10 175:22 21 es 1:13,19 2:10 2,13 18:7,9 26:13 8 89:13 122:17 22 133:2,19,20 :14 213:20 221:8 5,12,21 256:17 :12 **g** 121:3 242:17 on 131:15 ,15 5:5,15 6:10 8:13 13:12 14:15 3 17:19 19:4,8 27:12 28:7 36:15 9,21 37:2 54:20 75:7 77:20 80:18 83:4 84:3 86:8,9 22 104:9 120:19 9 126:13 128:5 2 131:16 138:13 :19 144:3 159:22 :13 192:2 202:13 21 210:22 221:12 20 224:7 225:7 13 231:20 243:19 16 248:19,22 2,12 251:18,20 6,20 92:2 8:1 77:21 111:17 21 **g** 87:8 142:4 1 gs 18:2,4,11 87:8 19 29:1,19,21 20 140:18 146:13 :14 159:7 197:22 10 208:1 209:6 11 246:17,20

285

SEVERA 2:4 severe 108:21 110:13 114:17 121:14 122:5 severity 121:2,8 sexually 10:14 SGR 52:20 Shaconna 2:4 8:11 17:18 26:7 27:1 53:13 **SHAHAB** 2:5 8:8 18:12 194:4 196:9 209:11 211:16,22 213:1,5 246:5,13,15 247:5 251:19 260:1 shaking 143:22 share 44:21 45:4 93:6 111:22 259:19 shared 92:22 260:13 SharePoint 60:9 sharing 6:9 44:22 sheet 14:12 55:3 137:12 138:5 **shifted** 100:21 shocked 32:11 141:6 short 13:5 259:3 short-term 16:11 203:19,22 shortly 92:18 show 15:11 28:20 96:21 238:20 239:3,7 250:22 showed 15:2 29:13 105:21 showing 43:1 94:13 255:3 shown 73:1 90:21 131:9 163:1 221:3 223:7 shows 8:18 11:20 14:14 21:8 30:2 176:12 shut 60:15 sicker 8:17 **SIDDIQI** 1:21 36:10 51:16 60:5,11 103:6 106:5 131:19 132:2,9 144:4 145:9,11,20 146:1,3,8,11 148:10 148:15 153:4,7,17,19 153:22 154:12,15 155:10 156:3,9,12 157:16 158:12,18 159:12 163:16 164:11 165:22 169:22 198:3 198:8,12 212:6,18 215:5 219:12 221:10 226:18 227:19 228:8 230:18 236:7 241:22 248:20 249:7 250:10 256:10 side 46:20 101:2 108:22

109:1 110:8 117:19 118:14 119:1 131:8 176:18 187:4 233:14 sides 112:18 257:21 sidetracked 51:12 sian 45:3 49:13 signal 66:15 signaled 204:5 **significant** 161:18,21 188:1,4 245:14 significantly 82:18 100:20 101:15 237:9 siloed 89:11 106:14,15 similar 21:19 24:22 25:6 148:7 162:9,20 185:18 225:4 231:18 241:1 246:2 250:15 similarly 122:4 simplify 34:4 simply 159:8 171:15 173:2 192:22 simultaneously 168:18 single 67:9 248:10 sit 137:2 166:8 248:13 sites 249:14 sitting 42:9,11 188:6 situation 86:10 93:8 257:19 situations 41:13 **six** 29:14 30:1 45:21 197:22 211:16 213:5 225:15,17 248:2 size 163:17 skewed 123:19 skipping 132:11 SLABACH 1:22 19:22 23:12 32:8,15 33:2 51:11 52:20 slide 9:12 11:18 14:14 15:2 28:9 30:2 34:14 124:13 170:22 250:18 slides 15:11 33:8 88:17 227:5 slightly 183:11 205:19 205:21 small 161:20 192:19 204:1 smaller 50:5 SMI 34:7 102:12 107:18 115:12 126:21 127:6 127:15,21 129:9 171:22 173:15 175:20 205:4 SMIs 175:21 Smoking 16:3 social 1:13 117:20 194:13 society 115:14 software 78:13,16,19

79:3 84:20.21 softwares 85:3 soldiers 46:8 **solve** 101:10 **solved** 159:4 somebody 39:4 65:14 65:15 150:16 151:8 163:6 201:21 233:5 **someone's** 163:5 **someway** 48:12 somewhat 20:1 52:10 250:18 soon 230:13 sorry 51:15 67:4 78:2 110:19 132:4 139:7 153:9 190:2 192:3 206:4 234:14 235:18 240:9 258:12 260:8 sort 4:5 7:6 27:2 30:19 33:3 38:13,15 65:7,13 65:20,20 68:18 95:17 108:1 109:6 110:6 113:22 134:2 139:16 140:8 160:1,10,11 173:20 178:17,18 183:14 192:18 193:5 194:14 195:18 216:7 217:21 232:19,21 253:18 254:10 257:20 258:22 259:7 sorts 47:2 218:14 sounds 79:13 103:9 146:16 216:3 253:13 source 24:1 69:10 147:9 155:13 196:20 sources 79:22 **SPA** 185:20 speak 43:5 108:9 172:15 187:11,18 195:2 201:15 203:17 230:7 speaker 131:20 speaking 115:17 spec 112:11 138:18 specialist 166:20 167:6 167:9 224:18 specialists 118:3 specialty 22:10,13 133:15 199:10 213:17 252:8 254:21 256:16 257:10 specific 5:8,15,18 6:21 13:3 18:3 25:11 52:1 58:22 64:20 70:11 77:19 79:14 80:13,17 83:21 97:18 101:19 131:12 136:10 140:9 149:4,9 150:9 165:6 171:22 179:20 181:22

182:15.17 193:10 194:22 253:11 254:20 255:14 **specifically** 94:20 104:6 104:20 112:22 119:13 133:20 161:12 171:3 224:7 specification 128:6 specifications 25:17 60:4 131:7 196:14 specifics 58:16 specified 14:10 127:14 159:21 240:22 245:17 specify 129:3 141:15 **specs** 123:21 141:2 218:9 219:2 spectrum 170:15 speed 232:22 spent 187:22 spirit 77:11 spoke 53:17 sponsored 9:3,10 spots 143:19 spread 248:10 **spurious** 91:19 stability 13:13 Stabilizers 177:22 staff 2:2 3:8 6:9 8:12 27:20 54:19 60:14 89:5 137:17 138:15 231:8 261:15,17,19 stakeholder 260:19 stakeholders 126:17 129:2 stand 228:16 standard 222:8 standardized 84:7 Standards 47:22 standpoint 55:21 82:4 83:12 84:16 85:12 113:19 184:5 stands 49:21 star 33:19 66:16,17,18 125:14 251:13 start 81:17,19 90:17 111:7 117:9 132:16 175:9 176:4 200:7 234:3 started 89:16 98:11 115:17 205:22 starting 170:14 236:11 starts 233:21 state 1:13 3:10 18:21 22:22 24:16 27:3,17 28:19 40:22 42:14 43:3 44:13,16,18 45:10,18 46:7 52:5,8 57:11,20 58:12,18 64:9,12 69:19 70:4,6

71:2 74:1 79:6 81:9 88:10 89:4,10 91:2 92:22 93:1,7 94:16 123:18 124:1,2,5 141:19 175:17 186:6 187:21 191:8 199:22 202:11 204:16 206:17 215:5,17 222:13 231:2 232:4 241:16 249:5,22 258:20 state's 45:4 state-wide 135:8 statement 111:7 states 5:4,7 6:10,13 7:3 7:14 11:6,8,13,15,19 11:22,22 12:2,3,9,12 12:13 17:20 19:17 20:4,22 21:5,20 24:7 25:1 27:22 29:6,7,9 29:12,15,17,19,21 30:1,4,5,8,9,9,12 32:12,18 33:5,5,11 34:3,14,16 35:22 36:1 36:2,5 46:15 52:13 53:19 54:3,4,7,10,14 54:15 55:15 57:4 59:10 65:3 66:4 67:7 67:10,20,22 70:8,18 70:22 73:1,13,21,22 74:10,16 75:3,5 80:21 82:22 83:12 86:22 87:3 88:19 90:9,18 91:9 111:5,16 112:4,8 114:2 124:1,11 125:6 125:11 135:19 136:14 150:19 157:2,3 165:14 166:2 184:15 184:18 185:20 186:5 187:5,11 199:18 205:6 206:6,8,16 215:6,15 246:1 249:18 253:13 254:2 statewide 94:18 statistics 20:16 status 9:13 11:21 stay 73:3 113:4 117:7 staying 111:12 Steering 100:2 step 38:21 steps 3:21 19:18 steroid 84:13 steroids 16:18 36:13 41:16 53:18 steward 62:7 136:12 153:5 165:10 208:8 212:7 224:14 226:19 stewarded 137:1 213:18 stickers 203:2 248:7

stir 119:6 stop 251:6 **stopped** 53:15 straightforward 214:1 strategic 5:16 stratification 154:5 173:2 190:4 205:4 206:13,20 207:7 253:14 stratified 140:4 189:9 192:18,22 stratify 139:20 153:15 158:10 171:15 Street 1:9 strengthen 203:21 strengthened 139:20 strengthening 3:15 24:19 stress 15:5 stressed 128:20 stretch 78:2 196:22 Strike 240:7 strikes 185:17 216:17 216:20 217:4 striving 249:19 strong 28:8 135:5 185:3 187:15 stronger 134:11 structured 92:3 structuring 72:1 struggling 191:18 216:18 257:13,16 stubborn 134:2 studied 100:9.10 studies 221:2 study 21:10 23:14 100:20 studying 22:2 stuff 4:18 45:2,7 46:4 59:19 194:22 sub 113:5 116:11 sub-acute 197:15 sub-contracts 111:21 sub-disability 207:6 subgroup 51:2 176:5,6 176:11 subject 199:10 234:21 submission 132:7 230:20 submit 106:8 214:16 submitted 17:20 33:16 214:8,11 227:21 228:10 236:10,12 submitting 75:6 subpopulation 193:21 subpopulations 205:1 subrates 244:20 subsequently 111:15 subset 145:4 244:16

subsidiary 255:20 substance 1:18 26:12 109:18 115:11 126:14 128:19 129:9,16 134:1,19 141:16 143:2.8 148:2 162:4 220:17,18 221:7 252:14 255:13 257:1 substantially 237:7 substitute 104:7 241:21 subtract 88:6 subtracting 86:18 success 56:14 135:2 successes 87:14 88:2 successful 48:8 SUD 111:10 112:22 113:2 118:11 Sue 1:16 17:22 22:14 185:12,12 204:7 253:19 sufficient 162:5 sugar's 191:9 suggest 5:12 90:7 132:21 192:16 255:9 suggested 14:20 suggesting 61:2 189:8 206:16 235:13 suggestion 77:9 258:20 suggestions 254:17 257:22 suggests 242:21 suicide 156:8 suitable 135:7 suite 172:14 173:14 178:7 Sullivan 2:1 35:2,7,10 97:19,21 98:16,20 151:4,22 152:4 161:14 162:12,15,22 163:3 174:2 175:7,11 175:14,16 179:19,22 180:14,17 181:2,5,12 181:15,17 182:22 183:3,6 187:1,21 210:3 222:20 223:10 223:16,19 236:18 summarize 3:21 233:11 summary 54:14 Sunshine 51:18 supplying 94:12 support 15:4,9 54:7 78:1 102:9 127:3,6 129:18 134:16 136:4 136:6,7,18 201:19 207:18 209:5 211:9 211:21 212:21 215:18 216:2,3,4 227:2 228:6 228:22 229:1,2 230:12 235:13 237:14

238:21 245:7.12 246:4 247:2 252:5 254:5 261:19 supported 129:3 233:16 240:17,20 247:20 supporting 242:18 supports 133:19 252:11 suppose 20:1 supposed 87:13 96:19 111:19 200:12 223:1 Suppression 17:4 53:16 sure 19:10 21:13 27:4 31:11 43:9 50:7 62:19 63:16 66:8 76:7 81:20 85:16 104:17 116:5 132:2 138:20 152:2 157:22 163:17 177:18 187:16 208:14 225:10 225:19 234:4 249:7 258:13 surgical 100:22 101:14 surprised 72:22 Surveillance 45:17 survey 15:21 43:4 45:17 91:14 92:1,11 92:14,16,16,18 93:8 194:9 210:13,16,18 210:21 225:6 226:4 surveys 91:18 92:8,21 93:4 sustain 117:13 sweep 143:20 switched 59:5 switching 59:2 syndrome 174:5 system 38:14 45:17 48:2,19 50:7 61:7 74:2,10 94:7,14 96:13 96:14,18 106:1,15,18 108:1,3 117:20 118:2 178:12 systems 23:17 48:3,7 48:10,13,16 49:14 50:3 53:1 73:19 85:14 88:4,8 89:12 93:9 96:19 107:7 249:20 т **TA** 28:15 54:6,8,9 67:14 tab 241:11 table 3:1 58:16 106:22 131:8 161:4 188:21 tackle 103:19 116:4 take 45:12 50:4 57:15 75:10 77:9 80:19 84:7 89:2 94:8 114:9

119:18 121:4 151:20 152:8 170:16 179:21 180:19 186:16 195:1 201:17 228:18 237:13 241:7 243:12 247:13 248:18 255:4 taken 19:18 59:3 168:17 233:18 takes 38:20 257:7 talk 5:2 25:22 44:19 49:17 50:22 52:4,8 73:18 79:3 87:13 110:16 115:15 116:3 133:7 139:16 165:12 188:11 206:9 225:22 247:14 248:13 257:9 talked 18:5 53:16 74:15 91:12 93:10 99:7 122:22 193:11 230:8 247:9 249:10 254:1,3 255:21 257:5 talking 20:18 24:11 72:3 76:21 98:5,6 103:9 104:12 123:3 145:21 157:2,11 174:11 185:18 186:21 196:9 215:12 219:19 221:11,19 227:21 target 61:12 105:3 task 1:3,8 15:5 27:19 60:10 125:21 203:3 234:15 239:12 242:17 247:7 253:5 258:22 260:16 261:3 team 54:8,9 66:15 tech 141:2 technical 28:2 71:1 123:21 145:1 147:4 teleconference 2:20 telephone 125:15 251:13 tell 18:22 20:21 91:19 111:20 218:19 ten 29:17 80:19 109:16 129:21 201:8 239:1,8 245:15 247:1 tend 23:1 84:10 191:13 term 13:5 135:10 149:21 259:3,9 terms 19:20 20:14 23:22 33:8 37:6,8 51:20 52:17 68:5 70:15,17 71:1 72:15 73:4 90:3 98:9 104:1 110:1,2 121:10 125:2 141:20 146:11 147:12 148:18 154:1 198:22 215:17 249:10 254:2 254:19,20 257:10

terrible 60:16 terribly 218:4 terrific 125:1 261:10,15 test 76:7 148:22 169:5 169:11,15 211:3 tested 129:5 148:5 161:15 169:5,21 210:9 testing 10:14 16:8 19:2 131:8,13 148:4,11,12 154:1 163:18 183:17 209:14 210:3,8,16 211:7 tests 211:4 224:4 text 91:6 thank 23:11 26:10 40:17.20 52:20 76:12 77:8,11 81:20 88:14 88:16 89:1 99:21 125:17 130:3,4 131:16 132:8 138:7 141:14 171:10 208:2 251:15 254:16 256:12 257:16,16 261:9,14 261:17 262:1,3 thanks 27:1 32:5 106:13 126:14 151:7 196:6 236:2 theirs 45:1 themes 20:2 36:11 theory 158:9 therapy 103:18 thing 20:22 23:12 24:5 34:19 57:17 73:16 78:8 79:9 85:19 110:14 122:8 166:12 173:20 178:14 182:14 186:10 202:22 206:2 221:9 232:16,20 237:8 257:15 things 4:13 5:3 22:1 26:17 33:4 35:15 44:12 45:10 49:18 51:21 54:12 56:21 68:20 70:8 71:11,12 71:18 76:22 79:16,22 80:15 85:1,2 89:4 98:18 105:8 107:1 119:17 122:18 123:22 156:6,12 169:17 174:14,15,16,17 180:7 181:8 185:8 195:12 202:12 215:11 216:11 226:12 254:19 think 4:14 5:9,11 6:22 7:7,9,10 19:9,10,14 19:16,16,17 21:12 22:4,9,16 24:17,21 31:4 33:4 34:5 35:21

36:1.3.5.21 39:9 42:3 42:22 45:7,9 46:9,10 48:11 49:16 50:10,18 51:5,12,13,22 52:5,16 53:10 54:2 55:19,22 56:12,16 57:1,11,15 57:18 64:5,6,9,13,18 64:21 65:1 67:11 68:2 69:2,8 70:7 71:3,5 73:11,16 74:6,12 75:15,18,21 76:1 77:2 78:7,10 79:12,20 80:6 80:9,16 82:21 83:11 83:15 84:7 85:8,19 86:18,21,22 87:2,5,12 87:15 88:6,18 89:10 90:8.14 91:12 92:1 93:2,4,10 95:12 97:9 97:22 98:8,10 99:7,12 99:22 100:2,3,19 101:21 102:22 104:4 105:11,12,20,22 106:15,22 107:3,11 107:12 108:1,7,8 110:5 112:7 113:10 113:21 114:3,7,9,19 115:2,10 120:1 124:10,15,19 125:1,3 126:1 131:15 134:14 136:1,12,17 139:14 141:8,13 143:18 145:5 146:2 147:21 151:15 152:13 153:10 155:20 156:2,4 159:3 160:10,16,17 164:7,8 167:2 168:13 169:2 169:22 171:18 172:8 172:14,15,20 174:3 174:13,20 176:1,7,13 176:17,18 178:16,22 179:3,4,22 180:5,11 180:20 181:20 182:13 184:1,17 185:5,9,22 186:7 188:7,12 189:12 191:15 192:11 193:2,12,13 195:3,10 195:14 196:21 197:6 197:10 198:10,16 200:4,11,15 202:14 203:17 205:18 208:12 209:1 210:15 214:12 214:18 215:6,8,9,14 215:16 216:1 217:12 218:6,17 219:3 221:10 222:12,14 225:8 226:15,21 227:4 229:4,7,8,22 230:6,10,12,14,16,18 231:1,2,5,6,15,17

232:9.12.15.18.20 234:17 235:1 236:15 236:22 237:9 240:15 241:6 242:6,19 243:8 243:9,20,22 245:20 249:7.18.20.22 250:4 250:5 253:22 254:15 254:20,22 255:10,11 255:18 257:8,18 258:3 259:5,10,17 261:12 thinking 42:16 56:6 79:19 86:17 88:5 94:14 107:9 110:6 125:2 146:4 156:5 177:5 183:22 184:1 190:9.10.14 218:20 227:22 255:1 third 123:11 131:1 149:10 156:18 166:12 238:13 thirdly 253:10 thought 4:10,11,12 39:18 79:10 93:3 171:14 172:1 177:5,6 182:3 189:15,17 222:15 thoughtfulness 26:21 thoughts 4:11 34:17 40:6 51:13 77:14 102:3 141:2 253:17 three 10:3,11 12:2,6 35:21,22 36:1 41:6 52:22 57:8 73:13 82:19 92:20 126:10 130:8,16 134:12 151:21 163:19 166:20 180:21 188:3 197:22 199:3,14 202:17 211:22 235:12,13 238:2 246:1,21 253:18 255:16 260:5 260:9 threshold 12:20 136:3 throw 37:1 122:15 136:15 183:1 188:19 193:17 216:3 throwing 72:18 190:7 THURSDAY 1:5 tickles 79:2 tie 38:15 199:19 tied 260:5 tier 99:8 time 11:9 12:4,8 25:21 38:20 57:18 61:13,15 61:21 62:8 71:14 72:5 74:18 82:11 90:15 91:21 103:22 120:15 124:6 125:16 130:19

134:4 135:6 176:14 177:12 188:1 198:12 217:15 218:2 228:14 228:18 231:9 239:13 246:2 250:6 251:11 251:14 261:22 timeline 53:4 timely 216:15 250:15 times 9:5 21:17,17 83:18 144:16 timing 66:11 231:6 title 246:11 titled 213:19 241:11 tobacco 16:3 128:11 184:12 185:6 188:11 191:14 193:4 212:3 212:10.10 today 4:17 15:8,10 26:22 44:11 64:8 106:18 110:6 168:12 195:10 198:9 202:22 217:16 231:1 246:9 255:12 toggling 137:11 told 48:15 77:6 tomorrow 232:3 tool 79:6 188:13,14 193:19 toolkit 41:7 top 49:9 50:9,20 73:4 109:16 129:21 163:19 164:15 210:6 234:22 259:4 topic 134:17 135:1 137:15 231:3,3,4 239:12 251:21 topics 252:4 total 247:19 totality 160:11 totally 64:17 122:9 190:8 207:3,4 touched 115:21 track 36:7 193:3 218:2 231:13 tracking 18:9 115:4 trade 225:6 traditional 82:17 traditionally 170:6 trained 61:17 117:21 170:10 trains 234:2 transactions 90:12 transferred 142:3 transition 14:9 16:21 53:20 204:4 240:21 241:2,19 242:7 243:13 245:16 248:21 249:15 250:16 transitions 90:8,11

91:2 100:9 translate 230:16 Transmission 250:15 transmitted 10:14 16:21 transparent 51:19 trauma 196:5 trauma-driven 193:12 Trauma-informed 252:22 travel 20:2 262:4 traveling 198:9 treat 150:15 174:17 treating 176:16 treatment 10:14 15:19 29:21 133:22 134:19 182:8.10 244:19 245:1,3 252:13 trend 32:20 40:13 trending 39:22 trickles 78:17 triggered 151:10 triggers 206:12 trips 151:9 true 9:11 truly 39:7 try 7:19 18:20 24:10 34:4 73:9 81:15 100:10 101:9 104:4 106:7 122:13 173:12 180:4 187:13 226:13 243:2 trying 25:8 46:5 47:21 50:6 52:8 55:12 56:7 58:6 67:4 70:15 74:5 74:7 75:14 104:13 105:7,14 107:18 108:9 118:6 148:15 158:22 165:1 174:4 176:15 187:17 194:17 215:17 217:18,22 226:20 230:16,17 232:16 257:6 **Tuesday** 4:7 26:17 turn 17:17 239:17,18 253:4 tweaked 230:21 **two** 9:5 10:3,10 14:6 15:1,11 17:7,13 28:21 35:22,22 36:22 37:2 47:13 69:16 76:22 77:14 93:14 109:4,7 109:18,19,22 117:15 126:6 128:21 131:2 132:6 140:20 142:22 143:1,7 166:5 185:7 188:20 196:10 197:10 197:22 199:4,14 202:17 204:6 212:13

212:14 217:10 224:13 227:10.12 238:19 239:14,19 240:19 241:10 244:20 253:17 255:22 260:5 **two-vear** 45:3 type 25:16 93:16 135:8 141:15 197:6 241:19 types 22:18 typically 37:17 54:5 69:19 87:9 156:13,20 157:3.9 U ultimately 184:21 unclear 212:12 232:19 233:20 undergirded 193:5 undergoing 82:16 245:5 underlying 23:4 102:14 105:5 173:21 193:4 underserved 174:18 understand 5:4 18:20 55:22 91:8 112:5 141:19 152:14 160:20 163:4 209:22 212:10 understanding 32:10 35:18 143:11 187:8 understood 19:9 unfair 124:14 unfortunate 240:8 unfortunately 182:2 210:17 unfunded 42:17 **uniform** 12:19 uninsured 9:4,6 21:3 unintended 45:8 242:20 unintentional 59:13 61:19 **unique** 118:19 unit 44:17,20 100:13 United 24:7 units 242:12 universe 240:17 unmet 225:22 unrealistic 203:7 unsafe 232:22 update 14:14 199:1 228:14 241:9 245:5,8 245:13 247:2 updated 232:5 upset 170:9,10 uptake 27:22 urban 21:11 23:2 urge 71:21 use 13:11 16:3 39:7,15 61:5 69:20 70:2 73:22

78:19.21 80:6 83:14 83:20 85:22 86:5.10 86:14,22 93:1 98:11 102:9 112:11 114:11 122:20 125:20 130:11 130:16 134:1 136:6.7 136:17 139:17,19 142:15 148:22 149:2 172:18 183:4 188:11 193:4 194:12 203:9 206:19 212:3 224:10 225:13 233:9 234:12 237:3 238:4 243:8 248:9 252:19 258:17 259:9 260:2 useful 57:17 67:17 71:14 100:6 110:2 169:3 177:7 186:2 200:16 215:16 216:7 217:15 218:17 220:13 users 143:19 usually 200:4 utility 93:5 utilization 214:2,20 215:3 216:7,19 220:12,18 221:6,7 232:8 utilize 217:19 utilized 34:1,2 V v 15:20,21 VA 221:4 Vaccinations 16:6 valid 144:21 validated 86:8 validity 147:22 valuable 38:18 60:22 95:19 110:5 114:10 164:13 177:6 203:19 value 7:18 46:11 56:9 variable 100:20 variation 91:21 131:10 varies 11:5 variety 234:4 various 85:2 100:12,15 vary 175:20 vendors 78:10,11,13,19 79:1 80:1,2 83:22 version 13:22 189:9 versus 11:14 98:12 162:3 183:9 vertical 52:18 120:3 Vice 2:2 6:4 view 193:1 220:13 229:17 255:22

views 192:7	80:14 81:15,18 84:16	249:22	222:17 224:6
viral 17:3 34:17 35:20	89:1 95:21 97:8 99:13	we'll 4:21 15:8 19:16	wellness 40:7 133:21
53:16	104:7 106:11 108:4	34:11 74:11 75:10	161:1 219:16 223:15
visit 25:13 31:16,17	111:22 113:14 115:7	80:20 81:5,8 110:6	223:22 224:6 225:1
37:15 103:12,21	115:15 121:22 132:16	135:2 136:17 158:9	252:13
140:16 141:17 143:3	132:21 133:3 135:15	168:8 171:1 197:16	wellness-oriented
143:5 144:15,19	136:14 149:12 157:21	202:2 204:8 251:16	40:16
145:6,16 147:7 148:1	158:4,8 159:16,18,22	259:21	went 4:19 26:21 41:18
149:14 151:2,5,11,12	163:3 164:8 165:15	we're 4:6,17,17,19 5:7	81:1 153:10 154:7
154:15,17 164:18	167:3,12 172:15	6:8,11,14,17,19 7:10	159:9 179:13 201:10
165:16 166:11,18	179:22 180:1 181:19	8:6 22:11 23:18 24:11	248:15 262:6
213:22 216:14 219:16	182:13,16 183:22	26:3,6 52:7 56:14	weren't 21:18 81:6
219:18 220:2 221:13	184:2 185:3 190:5	63:5 64:2 70:19 71:11	95:14 117:5 188:2
222:2,17,22 223:4,12	200:1 201:13 202:13	72:2 74:12 76:3,21	189:16
223:12,15,21,22	202:19 210:12 216:3	79:13 81:14 83:8	White 217:17
224:16,19 225:1,10	225:2 226:8,14,15	85:13 89:11 90:7 91:3	wide 232:7
225:20 226:21	229:10,11 230:8,11	92:17 93:7 97:15	widely 31:21 33:22
visited 140:13	230:14 234:8 236:20	103:8 108:9 115:4,10	willing 101:9
visits 28:11 70:11,11	237:9,12 240:18	117:10,15 118:5,6	willingness 101:11
153:12 155:22 165:20	247:16 249:2 251:3	122:10 126:3 132:6	Willson 2:2 6:4
218:16,16 221:13,14	253:19 254:11 256:21	132:11,13,14 134:6	win 206:18
224:18 225:14	257:15 258:4,13	153:8,8 159:14 160:3	window 259:8
vital 69:12	259:17 261:9,14,17	167:10,18,22 168:11	winners 124:3,14
vitals 249:11	wanted 13:2 23:12	169:19 170:16 178:10	wish 186:12
voice 260:18	28:20 39:15 44:7	178:11 180:13 182:5	women 10:3 16:5 18:0
voluntary 206:14,20	45:19 46:10 60:16	184:1 185:17 186:21	29:18 101:13 260:3
vote 6:17 56:12 134:16	64:1 75:15 77:12	187:15,17 190:11,21	women's 18:7 28:12
136:18 177:4 195:22	109:4 122:6 133:5	191:22 192:1 194:18	wonder 216:10 254:9
198:1,1,16 201:18	163:16 171:16 185:13	195:9,21 200:11	wonderful 42:1
202:19 211:9 225:2,4	188:10 194:13,19	201:21 202:7 211:6,9	wondering 20:16 47:
228:18 236:20,22	220:6,9,10 227:19	211:13 215:12 216:18	47:11 55:18 56:2
239:1 241:7 243:12	246:6	217:22 219:19 221:19	160:5 167:16 183:13
245:11 247:12,14	wanting 63:6	226:20 227:21 239:22	213:12
248:9 250:14,20	wants 186:16	240:15 242:3 243:10	Woody 2:7 130:6
voted 246:5,9	Washington 1:9,13	243:10,13 247:5,6,18	worded 224:1
votes 207:10 209:11	24:16 89:4,10 91:2	248:17 259:18 260:14	words 145:16 155:15
211:17,22 213:1,5	94:16 107:2 122:16	261:20	226:11 237:20
237:14 238:22 246:7	139:13 206:17 216:19	we've 6:16 7:17 40:8	work 22:22 32:9 39:14
246:9,18,20 247:1	232:4	55:10 68:9 69:2 71:6	47:21 71:21 74:4
248:2 260:4,6,8,10	Washington's 24:22	74:3 75:11 79:12 82:8	99:22 104:21 106:7
voting 4:20 5:12 135:16	wasn't 5:21 100:6	83:5 85:15 87:17,18	111:1 118:10 126:19
135:17,20 136:2	163:13 172:17 236:9	87:20 91:12 93:10	136:13 165:2 168:18
137:6 198:5 201:14	way 29:4 47:17,18,19	99:7,18 112:1,11	173:7,10,21 179:13
202:5 204:8 207:17	57:18 58:8 76:4,9	118:4,10 123:1 125:4	198:4 206:11 216:19
209:4 211:7,14	83:1 92:3 101:22	131:8,9 134:22 167:2	260:20
	105:13 114:18 123:18	170:10 184:5 199:7	worked 4:12,14 24:19
W	128:1 129:4 135:22	202:9 221:2,3 249:10	25:7 98:11 106:9
wait 21:17,17 153:8	138:9 140:4 141:22	250:5 254:1 257:4	169:10 186:5
206:1,1,1 233:13	147:2,22 149:21	weedy 45:6	workers 117:20
walk 27:2 94:7	150:5 152:14 153:17	week 108:13	workforce 23:8 134:2
walked 27:14	153:19 163:14 166:17	weeks 132:6	252:15
want 5:3,3,7,19 6:22 7:1	172:5 177:9,10 179:4	weigh 110:21 214:21	working 9:14 22:11
14:13 22:4,8 26:9	187:6 194:19 203:11	weighing 261:21	23:1,9 38:13 47:13
27:2,7,12 29:12 35:17	218:1 224:1 233:7	weight 121:15 136:15	59:11 84:1 85:13,16
	254:9	weighted 86:1,3	86:16 107:14 118:3
38:18 40:11 42:11			
44:9 49:22 50:13	ways 7:19 80:1,9 86:22	welcome 3:5 18:13	works 62:9
55:22 60:20 62:18	88:7 92:6,7 94:14	260:17	world 78:22 111:19
	103:19 109:22 118:19	Welfare 2:8	167:1
63:9,10,12,16 65:2 70:14 74:5,10 75:15	179:17 188:3 205:9	well-child 221:13	worse 9:1,1

worth 38:9 59:2 71:5 worthwhile 56:7 worthy 138:8 would've 42:3 75:8 76:15 187:1,18 231:10 wouldn't 89:4 123:13 135:13 141:4 223:13 228:9 wound 154:8 155:17 156:5 158:2 wounds 151:13 wrap 216:9 259:22 write 166:9 258:1 writing 247:6 written 163:15 237:8 wrong 153:8,9 175:2 222:4,16 Х Y yay 77:8 Yeah 230:18 236:6 237:21 241:18 248:5 year 13:4 15:6 30:13 41:19 58:14 92:15 111:3 194:11 203:8 204:3 220:1 225:15 225:17,18 228:2,2,16 232:1 234:2 240:19 242:18 250:12 252:18 255:2 259:6 year's 231:6 243:15 251:22 252:16 year-long 227:22 years 10:4 13:14 28:21 45:21 47:13 73:9 78:5 82:9 83:4 112:12 117:15 126:10 127:7 169:7 170:16 179:10 213:21 222:22 225:16 225:17 230:9 244:15 260:4 yellow 138:6 yesterday 4:4 5:19,21 8:1 26:15,18 36:14 70:1 107:10 134:15 193:12 199:4 203:3 234:10,11,16 247:22 260:13 yesterday's 6:7 248:1 York 36:4 107:4 177:1 185:22 187:4 younger 14:8 222:22 7 Zehra 2:5 8:7 17:21

196:7 251:18 253:7 zero 28:16 29:8 54:6 0 0059 14:2 **0063** 13:17 0260 193:18 194:4,12 **05** 16:12 0576 95:2 **0647** 14:9 15:3 240:21 245:16 246:3 250:11 0648 250:9,16,17 1 **1** 125:14 227:17 238:21 251:13 1.6 82:14 1:46 248:15 1:52 248:16 **10** 129:10 10:23 81:1 10:36 81:2 **100** 12:14 169:15 **1030** 1:9 **11** 1:6 30:9 126:12 201:1 250:22 260:10 11.7 11:3 **12** 135:17 136:2 12:39 201:10 12:49 201:11 **120** 130:17 131:3 232:17 233:2 238:6 238:16 125 3:12 **13** 30:9 33:11 136:2 260:4 132 3:15 138 11:6 139 8:20 12:20 14 33:11 15 28:22 29:11 15th 1:9 17 82:8 99:4 **170** 200:4 1799 14:6 15:3 240:20 244:12 247:1 **18** 12:3 16:6 82:8 140:12 208:16 1880 177:21 **19** 10:5 175:9 **1927** 181:2,6,16 208:3 209:4 246:10,16 260:8 1932 177:6 179:19 183:10,17 207:14 208:16 209:18 211:1 246:9,15 260:7

2 **2** 227:17 2,500 86:12 2:08 262:6 **20** 80:20 213:21 2010 10:6 23:19 **2010-2011** 173:10 **2013** 28:19 29:18 30:6,9 53:19,22 **2014** 8:12 12:9,15 13:3 14:16 27:9,21 28:15 28:20 29:15,17,19,22 30:1,6,9 34:21 53:17 53:19 54:1 241:11 2015 1:6 11:2,21 13:1 13:21 14:15 15:13 218:10 2016 12:16 228:15 **2020** 107:2 2083 14:8 20s 223:1 **21** 9:18 10:21 16:5 82:12 260:3 **22** 97:5 **23** 29:7 30:4 **2371** 59:7 75:22 **24** 16:5 17:13 29:6.12 2456 59:11 61:2 62:19 62:20 64:5 **25** 13:12 120:14 127:6 175:10 192:3 208:14 **2502** 189:4 190:3 196:18 251 3:17,19 **2512** 189:6 190:3 2599 137:12 **26** 13:12 17:13 175:12 192:32600 137:12 212:2 213:1 **2602** 181:14.16 209:7 209:11 246:18 260:10 **2603** 181:11.16 183:9 183:17 209:14,18,19 210:2,20 211:11,14 211:16 **2605** 114:10 137:13 138:1 140:6,11 183:5 211:19.22 **2606** 184:9 2608 209:19,21 213:3,5 **261** 3:21 **27** 3:8 11:14 12:9 73:12 73:13 3 3 114:22 227:17 **30** 10:8 11:22 14:16

97:8 140:19 146:13 146:14 150:16 152:22 153:13 159:7 256:5 **30-day** 259:3 260:14 30,000 259:6 **300** 11:6 31 261:7 **34** 29:6 **36** 120:20 121:18 122:3 4 43:5 **4.0** 15:20 **40** 94:4 105:22 129:10 255:3 40.000 259:6 44 10:5 260:3 45 259:1 45-day 259:7 4500 24:6,12 **48** 10:5 5 **5** 244:15 5.0 15:21 50 10:1 191:13 192:1 244:22 50s 185:2 **53** 23:18 **57** 9:18 6 **6** 29:7 30:4 66:16 63 23:13 **64** 9:18 208:14,16 244:15 65 12:21 7 70 10:7 **75** 245:2 8 811:14 80 91:15 **81** 3:10 **85** 91:16 9 9:00 1:9 9:02 4:2 **90** 120:3 121:17 238:7 238:16 **99** 169:15 9th 1:9

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: In-Person Meeting Map Medicaid Adult Task Force

Before: NOF

Date: 06-11-2015

Place: Washington, D.C.

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

near A Guis &

Court Reporter

NEAL R. GROSS

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

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433