


DR. BOBROWSKI: I want to thank everyone for sharing your Friday afternoon with us. We'll get our meeting started and we'll just run through our list. I think I sent out the agenda. Of course, it inevitably happens that we may have one or two items to add to our list here under the Other of Old Business or the Other of New Business. Some of these things just happened the night before or the morning before, and some of these things $I$ just hate to wait another three or four months to address.

But would you like to do a roll call? I think I saw plenty of names on there that were here for a quorum.

MS. BICKERS: My apologies. Sorry about that. I was trying to get off mute as I was letting some people in.

I've got Dr. Bobrowski.
DR. BOBROWSKI: Here.
MS. BICKERS: Dr. Schuler? I see him. He's still on mute.

Dr. Braun. Sorry, I'm trying to go back and forth between letting you guys in and -- Dr. Petrey is here. So I saw four.
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Am I missing one more?
I see four out of five, Dr. Bobrowski, so you do have a quorum.

DR. BOBROWSKI: Okay. Thank you so much.
Just need to take a vote then to
approve the minutes and the recording from the last meeting, if somebody will make that motion.

MR. PETREY: Make a motion to approve the minutes from our previous meeting.

DR. BOBROWSKI: Second?
DR. SCHULER: I'll second it.
DR. BOBROWSKI: Thank you.
All in favor say aye.
(TAC Members vote unanimously in favor of motion.)

DR. BOBROWSKI: Going to go to our Old Business. Just wanted to check on the status of the Anthem and DentaQuest, Passport, if anyone from Medicaid can tell anything on us there?

COMMISSIONER LEE: Hi, Dr. Bobrowski. This is Lisa Lee. Can you give me just a -refresh my memory on what the issue is, so that I can see if there has been any
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progress?
DR. BOBROWSKI: Well, I believe it was just their overall status of $I$ guess continuing to be an MCO in the state, if I remember right.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Okay. Yeah, so that is still in litigation and nothing to update at this time. They are still a provider, but there is some litigation that's going on right now.

DR. BOBROWSKI: Okay. And then I had a request to ask about -- it seems like they're having some response time issues from Anthem, DentaQuest and Passport, and we just got a few complaints about that and just wanted to ask about -- don't have any particulars on it myself other than taking a long time to hear back from -- I guess it's on prior authorizations.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Well, they do have -the contract does outline the prior authorization timelines that they are to be responded, the timeframe for which they have to respond. So if they are exceeding those timelines, if we can get examples so
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we can make sure that they are meeting their contractual obligations and hold them accountable.

DR. BOBROWSKI: Okay.
COMMISSIONER LEE: And I can -- after this meeting I can pull that specific section of their contract out and send that to Erin so she can send it out to the TAC, so you have documentation on what their response times are supposed to be.

DR. BOBROWSKI: Okay, thank you.
MS. O'BRIEN: Dr. Bobrowski, I believe that this was a complaint the last time.

Lisa, I'm not sure if you were on the last time we had the TAC. But this was a complaint that $I$ think came from Dr. Petrey that was not getting a response on an issue that he had, and I do believe that that has been resolved.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Okay.
MS. O'BRIEN: I can't really talk about Passport, of course. But from the Anthem Medicaid part of it, that is what was coming up at the last meeting. And, Dr. Petrey, I know that you're on and I

[^0]believe that your concern has been resolved. Am I correct on that? MR. PETREY: Yes, we did have -- we did have a meeting with your staff that was helpful. We do still have some issues, not the least of which are patients caught in limbo with -- in the orthodontic -- the way orthodontics pays out. There's a six-month payment after a -- after a time period. Patients that have -- whose insurance has switched from one of the other MCOs, we've had difficulty in getting -- in getting payment at the six months simply because they -- what is being shown on your all's end is that they were approved for the initial. If a patient is approved for the initial, then the -- and the care continues, they are, in essence, approved, or should be paid out, but the new -MS. O'BRIEN: That's correct. MR. PETREY: So we just have a couple of hiccups on getting that. I'm not sure -- I just texted my billing folks. But there is also still an issue with a lack of response on -- from one individual, but we just --
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maybe you and I need to have a conversation and figure out who --

MS. O'BRIEN: Sure.
MR. PETREY: -- we need to be contacting through to get a response on some of these things. I think it's just a lost-in-theweeds type of a situation.

MS. O'BRIEN: Okay. Yeah, I'll be glad to do that, Dr. Petrey. I'll reach out. I'll get your phone number and reach out to you directly, and that way we can take care of these few things. I know there's always a little bit when they switch -- that six months and there's a switchover from MCOs and things like that, sometimes there can be a hiccup with that. But $I$ think your original one we had taken care of. I will definitely reach out to you myself.

MR. PETREY: Thank you very much.
MS. O'BRIEN: You're welcome. Thank you, Dr. Petrey.

DR. BOBROWSKI: Thank you, Ms. Jean, for helping us there on that.

Now, the next item under Old Business was -- we've talked about codes and things
at various meetings and that's why I put this under Old Business. But why has the state -- change was made from moving filling repairs from six months out to 12 months? The $K-A$-- the $K A R$, the $K-A-R$, says nothing about these types of limitations. In my agenda there I also put down, if Medicaid does not pay for a filling repair or breaking the same tooth again within 12 months, does that become a noncovered service that the patient is financially responsible for? You know, you-all got to realize that a lot of these folks have got fillings on top of fillings, and we're doing the best we can to not have to pull a front tooth or something like that, and we repair them. And some of our folks, many of them are bruxers and grinders. And up until this year they did not, on adults, did not cover bite-guards, so -- but $I$ was just wondering why the change was made from six months out to 12 months, if somebody from $D M S$ can help us on that.

MS. KITCHEN: Hi, Dr. Bobrowski. This is Kelly Kitchen. Is there a chance that you
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can give me a code, please, that would identify the specific?

DR. BOBROWSKI: Well, it's probably any of the filling codes, for example, let's see, a D2331, or a D2332, D2335.

MS. LEE: Dr. Bobrowski, this is Lisa, too. Did you-all receive a communication stating that that change was being made, or did you just -- was there just like a billing for that service and then it said -- you received a statement or an EOB saying that it wasn't covered or something? Trying to get to...

DR. BOBROWSKI: Well, it's on the state's website where all the fees are listed. That's where we noticed the change. It was six months and now it's 12 months.

COMMISSIONER LEE: So we extended from six to 12 months.

DR. BOBROWSKI: Yes. Yeah. And I've had several people ask about it. And even in my office we've -- we see a lot of the traumatic brain injury patients from two different organizations and, bless their hearts, they either have no teeth or they

[^1]have got fillings on top of fillings by the time I get to even see them, and they just break teeth. I'm sorry, just -- but then, you know, some of them could maybe, you know, pay for a filling, but some can't. So do I just smooth it off and tell them to come back in a year? That's what other dentists are asking. Do we just smooth it? Or the other situation is, they say, well, you can go down the road to the other Medicaid dentist and they can fix it and it won't cost you anything.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Well, it's definitely an issue that we need to look into. I know federal requirements do not allow Medicaid providers to bill Medicaid patients for services, so let us look into this particular issue. And I really -- because if another dentist could repair it without cost, it doesn't kind of make sense. Let us go back and take a look at that. Now that Kelly has got the codes, we'll go back and take a look at that policy. DR. BOBROWSKI: Okay. And, of course, I gave you the anterior code, you know, and

[^2]sometimes it's a -- it is a posterior code where they break the side of -- you know, you might have done a filling on the front side of the tooth, then they break the backside of the tooth, but it's the same tooth number and could be the same code, but because it's listed maybe as a threesurface filling and you did the front side and now they broke the backside off and -so, yeah, I appreciate it if you-all can look at that and I'll make a note of that. Now, is there any other Old Business? MR. PETREY: I just wanted to comment. I did get a response back from my team. And, Ms. O'Brien, the question on the six months is with Passport, not with Anthem. So I wanted to take that off of your -- off your list, having the issues of not being able to get the continued care on patients that have switched to Passport, so...

MS. O'BRIEN: All right. I'll cross that one off my list then. Thank you. I appreciate you letting me know. MS. MEDINA: This is Christy, Dr. Petrey, with DentaQuest. We'll go ahead and reach

[^3]out to you guys directly to kind of see what we can do to set up the remainder of those cases like you said, you know, with the remaining codes for the adjustments from -- for whatever is left on treatment on those cases.

MR. PETREY: Thank you. Yeah, it's -- a lot of those cases started with us and their MCO has changed, so it's -- it's the full remaining six months. So it's our contracted fee and we just -- we're finishing the case. We need to be compensated for that finish.

MS. MEDINA: Absolutely, of course. DR. BOBROWSKI: Okay. Any other Old Business? If not, we'll move on to New Business.

One of the things we've been working on is the community health worker and I know many offices have been contacted. I know in my office, you know, we can't use the CPT codes and we've contact -- been over probably a hundred and some offices have been contacted and they cannot -- due to their software, cannot use the CPT codes.

[^4]They can use CDT codes for billing for the community health workers. But in a nice conversation there we had with Commissioner Lee this morning, we've got some ideas on working on that, and one of the ideas was to either contact the ADA, you know, to look for that coding type answer. The only problem is that sometimes to change a code it may take a year or two to get that all the way through the process, but we're looking at that. But I just wanted to bring it out before the TAC that we have been working on that, and that's the -- that's all we found out, that most dental office software won't handle CPT codes.

And, again, just wanted to bring up another item. Now, I guess since we -- I'll adjust this what I had written down, because, like I said, I may have this written out in, you know, one or two weeks ahead of time, and now I've got new information. So a lot of the oral surgeons, and even some pediatric offices, are very limited in large parts of the state. I know even some of the pediatric offices are going
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to 18 and under, or some are even going to only seeing patients 14 and under. A lot -several of the oral surgeons' offices are, you know, either 21 and under or 25 and under. But I did hear a good report that I think there have been some new oral surgeons added to the list of seeing patients in the state. So we've still got an access-to-care situation that we've got to all work on.

And the next item under New Business is Fee Disparity. The -- bring up a few topics under that title. Basically there's been no fee increases for the general practitioners except for, you know, some of the oral surgery codes got a slight bump in the prophy fee for the adults, but still, it's still all under what it actually cost you to provide that service.

And the other situation that I'm hearing is that several more dentists are dropping out of Medicaid. Now, they may not report it to the MCO, they may not report it, you know, Commissioner Lee, to your all's offices. They just stop seeing people.
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Now, within an hour of my office here there's been four other offices that have dropped out of seeing Medicaid patients, or one of them had dropped to just seeing children only. So, you know, my fear is just that when people drop out, for the remaining dentists that stay in, it really -- it really loads your work day down. And I had a dentist a little while ago call and talk to me, said, yeah -- he used the good French word of A-S-S. He said you got to work it off. I said, well, mine can use a little working off, but the -- let me see, what else did I have under there? MR. PETREY: Garth, I just want to reiterate that same point. And we're seeing it across all of our offices from an orthodontic perspective. We discussed the last meeting that a provider was leaving the network, and he did, and as of now from London to Pikeville we're the only provider in East Kentucky. And for folks that aren't as familiar with Kentucky geography, that's quite a long distance, and we're covering all those patients which has been

[^5]a struggle.
But beyond our perspective, the point you make about dentists not coming off of the rolls, but not accepting new patients is becoming extraordinarily challenging. Even the pediatric dentists are not accepting new patients. They are still treating the population. They are still on the rolls for each of the MCOs, which makes it seem as though we have a viable system. But when I have a patient that has active decay that we are trying to get something resolved and I cannot get them a dentist outside of heading to Lexington to the UK Clinic, and even the UK Clinic is a time to get into, it's a problem. And it's more of an issue now for us not having the providers, but also the providers that we have not currently taking new patients. That gets exacerbated when these practices stop accepting, stop accepting, just as we have with the change -- and I don't mean to pick on any MCO , but just facts are facts. The number of providers that have stopped taking patients because their MCO has switched to
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Passport or switched to being run by DentaQuest, and for whatever reason which we've discussed before, they do not -- they no longer want to be a provider for that MCO, those patients are lost in limbo.

The issue then becomes they're coming to us as orthodontic patients and saying, I no longer have a general dentist, and we don't have anybody taking on those patients. So it's not just that they're not taking new patients, but it's one, two, three, four drop off in taking these patients, it increases the number of need, but we have a lessened number of providers. It only exacerbate the problem.

DR. BOBROWSKI: Well, I just -- and that's what's happening, you know. Dr. Petrey's office is about approximately hour, hour and a half east of me, and I just told you within an hour of around me, kind of south and west of us, or, you know, we got about four more offices, and some of them -- one of them is a bigger city; the other ones are smaller towns. And you lose your one and maybe your only provider for that
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county, where do all these people go, you know?

And I just got a notice earlier this morning that the Ohio, I guess it was from their legislature, passed a fee increase of 93 percent to their Medicaid providers. I just got another report from even South Dakota and Missouri, even comparing it to the Kentucky Medicaid kids, which is, you know, they pay -- the kids' fees are sometimes considerably higher than the adult fees. Just for example, here's a D3- -- I'm sorry -- D2331, which is a front filling, two surface, Missouri's paying 189.60 . Kentucky pays 71.50. And then you just go down the whole list, and sometimes it's over twice what the general dentists are getting paid in Kentucky. But I'm -- let's see... MR. PETREY: Commissioner Lee, a few meetings ago there was a presentation that we had asked for a fee increase, and the response to that was based on a study, for lack of better terms, but a study comparing Kentucky dental fees to other regions, and stating that we had one of the higher

[^6]reimbursements. Now, anything that we have done as attack and as individuals looking at that, comparing it to local states, from Ohio fee increase to Indiana to West Virginia, shows us across the board below that. I'm wondering if you are familiar with what that study was and if we can get access to that so we can have real -- look at real data to understand what these decisions are being based on, because it's being used to say that we have a viable economic situation, and yet everything that we look at does not say that. And so I'd like to understand where those numbers are coming from.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes, thank you,
Dr. Petrey. And if I can get that study and send it out again -- I can send it to Erin -- it will show the methodology behind that study. And, you know, since we have decided to enhance our adult dental benefits, we have been, of course, talking to the provider community, talking to the Dental TAC, and looking at states and comparing ourselves with surrounding states

[^7]and doing a few things.
And one thing that we did notice when we looked at our rates compared to other rates, for example, other states, we noticed that it's very different when you look at what we cover and what other states cover, and I can send some of that information out to you. But I think, again, this is a good conversation when we start talking about rates, about looking at -- and then when we think about reimbursement and increasing reimbursement.

Sometimes when we look across the board and just look at the entire array of services -- I think if we could pick and choose, if we could be very strategic in what we're seeing that needs to be done and focus on prevention first and look at the preventive codes and what -- where are we going to get the biggest bang for our buck that's going to offset costs in the future, you know, and is that the -- is that, you know, the dental cleanings.

I know, for example, Virginia enhanced all of their adult dental and they are
TODD \& ASSOCIATES REPORTING, INC.
www.toddreporting.com
covering three cleanings for adults per year, where we do the two. I know two is pretty much standard, but given that our population is a little bit more challenging with their medical needs because they do live at or below the poverty level, I think that's something that we can do. But I definitely -- long answer, yes, I will get that report to you and I think that, you know, keeping these conversations going and definitely focusing on prevention, because it seems like, you know, in the past we just pulled teeth, which just made everything worse. So what can we do to focus on prevention and allow individuals to keep their teeth and which codes would allow us to do that, I think is what we need to look at.

MR. PETREY: I agree. Thank you. The public health practitioner in me is pining for preventative care and seeing an increase in that. But if we lose the providers, it doesn't matter what the -what we provide. So that's going to be critical.

[^8]DR. BOBROWSKI: This is Dr. Bobrowski. Just an update. On the fee schedule that was reported out of the ADA back, I guess it's maybe two years ago or something when that came out, the Kentucky dentists and the Kentucky Dental Association immediately contacted the ADA and said that's not correct information. And at the time they said, well, yeah, it is. Well, to my understanding they just came out here in the last two to three months or so and said they agree the report that they did was flawed. So I guess I'll give the ADA an applause because at least they admitted they have the problem and are fixing it. And that's all I've heard. I've not seen any data come out of them, but they just said that that report actually was a flawed report.

MR. PETREY: No idea on when that fix will show? Because clearly, Garth, that flawed report is what is being used to make policy.

DR. BOBROWSKI: Yeah, I haven't heard that. I was going to bring up our new KDA
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executive director is Dr. Stephen Robertson, and he is a past Medicaid provider, so he is very well in the knowledge on this, but he is in another meeting this last several days, so he apologized he was not able to be on our TAC meeting today. He thought he might be able to, but he texted me right before lunch, said I'm not going to make it, so -- but we need to check with Dr. Steve there to see if he can find out the actual thing from the ADA.

COMMISSIONER LEE: I did put the link in the chat to that report. And on that first page it talks about child and adult dental services. The first page is for children; the second page is for adults. The second page shows Kentucky at about 68.3 percent of the private insurance reimbursement, and this is as a percentage of the private insurance reimbursement for services. It's not really comparing, $I$ don't think, the Medicaid by Medicaid, but comparing it to private insurance reimbursement. And on that very first page if you click the data table, it will tell you where that
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information came from, and there is also data sources and methods, so it will -that has all the information in that document. So I did put that in the chat. DR. BOBROWSKI: Yeah, I see it. Thank you, Commissioner Lee. I think that's the report that they had out previously, yeah, 2020, and that's what they were talking about was the -- Kentucky almost led the nation, I believe, in reimbursement at 104.8 percent of the comparing Medicaid to insurance. And I think that's the report we're talking about was a flawed report, because that's the 2020 report. So we've got to find out what the new data and statistics are from the ADA unless you're able to get that.

COMMISSIONER LEE: I'll continue to look. I don't know that they updated that report. That's the latest one that I can find, but we definitely keep looking. And, again, that's comparing to the average commercial rate, so, again, it would -- you know, if it's flawed, it's flawed. Let's look for the new one.

[^9]But I think focusing on what we need to do here in Kentucky as far as prevention and shoring up our dental workforce, what can we do not only to keep the providers we have right now and to entice new providers into the program. The reason that our children's fee schedule is different from our adult fee schedule is -- we did this in the past -- we increased all of our fees for children thinking we would get a surge of dentists to come back -- come into the program, and that did not happen when we increased those rates for the child population.

When we did notice an increase in dentists coming into the Medicaid program was when we expanded Medicaid. And I had a couple of dentists tell me that they joined the Medicaid program at that time back in 2014, because they had been seeing individuals and they just didn't have a payer source. So when we expanded to that adult population, we saw, you know, a little bit of an increase in our dental population.

So, again, hopefully, you know, we
TODD \& ASSOCIATES REPORTING, INC.
www.toddreporting.com
have a workforce study, workforce report that's going under final reviews and will be out shortly. And there is a section on dental, dental providers in that report. So hopefully it will be useful to this Technical Advisory Committee to look at that report and see -- you know, identify issues, make recommendations based on how we can increase not only the work, dental workforce for our Medicaid population, but across the state. Because we know that as Medicaid dental providers you don't only see Medicaid patients; you see the entire population. So the shoring up the Medicaid dental workforce is going to help the entire state.

So, again, just noticing that, you know, these conversations are conversations that we haven't had in the past, and very excited about some of the opportunities that we're going to be able to look at as we start getting more information. And I know, for example, the Dental TAC has requested reports. I think those are ready to distribute, if they haven't been distributed also, or already, which will, you know, give

[^10]you more information on where we might want to look at where some actual policy levers can be pulled to help improve the dental services provided to Medicaid members.

DR. BOBROWSKI: Thank you.
MR. PETREY: We have not received those reports, so thank you for the update on that. Look forward to seeing those. DR. BOBROWSKI: And I stand corrected on the -- because I thought in the past if a patient broke something and that they -- it fell in that time period, they cannot go to another dentist. It is a per member, not per member per provider. So they can't go to another dentist and get that same procedure done. But it's kind of like I wonder -- the dentists may not know that it had been fixed within the six or 12-month time period if the patient didn't tell them that. So the dentist may fix it, expecting to get paid, and not knowing that it had been done. So that's one of those issues. But I'm going to move on. I want to invite folks to -- there is going to be a -at the Kentucky Dental Association Annual
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Meeting, it's at the Galt House in Louisville, on August 25th, 26th and 27th, and we're going to have a Medicaid forum, and the topic is Kentucky Oral Health-49thA Road Map to Change. And basically I'd kind of like for this to be a -- more of like even a brainstorming-type session of ideas, either from individuals, from individual dentists, from the MCOs, anybody from the state, you know, if you got ideas, on what can we do to move Kentucky from the 49th position of oral health, start moving us up that ladder. So that's what that forum is.

And I want to thank -- Avesis is going to supply a luncheon for us. It's going to be a two-hour course. And I want to thank Dr. Caudill and Avesis for providing that luncheon. And it starts at 11:30 Eastern Time at the Galt House in Louisville.

Let's see here. Now, I just wanted to report also from -- on telehealth the communication platforms that are legally acceptable. And I know I -- you know, people we know, or our children,

[^11]grandchildren, go to school with, or they have bumps and bruises and get hit in the mouth and stuff, and the first thing they do is take a picture of it and send it to you, or they'll call you on FaceTime and, you know, technically these are not HIPAA compliant. And there's a partial list of compliant platforms when you're doing telehealth, and I'll just read these what I've got here, and there's more out there. But Webex, Teams, Amazon Chime, Doxy.me, Skype for business, MS Teams, Updox, VSee -which is V-S-E-E -- Zoom for healthcare, Google G Suite, and Hangouts Meet. So that's just a partial list of, you know, for any of the dentists that are doing telehealth that -- you know, to be I guess legally compliant with HIPAA to be asking patients to get on those sites with you. Now, on Other there's for years been a situation with the Code D0140, which is a problem-focused code, you know, or a limited exam is another term for that code. In our regulations, which is 907 KAR 1:126 Section 6, Paragraph 2, No. 1, it has a definition

[^12]in there that this code can only be used for trauma or acute infection. And what I was asking about would the mechanism -- I know there's in the process right now in the legislature of changing, or from the E-reg to the regular reg, would this be a good time to adjust the wording on that, you know, because at the time that's a very limited code and that may have been the intent, but so many times we don't know what a patient has or what the problem truly is until we get them in the office and look at it. And so many times it comes up that, you know, their problem that we have to check on has no code to fit the visit. So I'm just asking about a revision to that regulation.

And, Commissioner Lee, or if anybody else has any ideas on how to handle it, or does Medicaid not want to do anything. I just -- that's been brought up numerous times in various meetings and, you know, I guess we never have really done anything about it, but I just thought I'd bring it up today.

COMMISSIONER LEE: I'm sorry,
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Dr. Bobrowski, I missed some of that conversation. Is this the issue where -are you specifically talking about children or are you talking about other procedures that don't have codes?

DR. BOBROWSKI: This was that D0140 code. It's a problem-focused exam code, but when you read into the, oh, the background for the code, it can only be used for a trauma or an acute infection. Sometimes -- see, there's a difference between the 911 code, which is basically for pain, and the D0140 code is used for trauma or an acute infection. But there's several times that this D0140 code is the only method that -or Medicaid patients have a chance of getting the visit covered.

MR. SCOTT: Hello, Dr. Bobrowski, I'm Johnson Scott. I'm the reg coordinator for DMS. We have submitted a statement of consideration and an amendment to some of the regs, but unfortunately our window to amend them via that method has closed. We had to send all that in earlier this month. So we would be looking at an agency

[^13]amendment or an amendment at the committee meeting at this point.

So, you know, it's technically
possible at this point. You know, we still don't know kind of what will happen with those regs next month anyway, so, you know, if they find everything deficient again. Since it's the O Regs we really -- you know, we could try to amend them, but, you know, we still really don't know what's going to happen at this point, you know. I just did want to emphasize that those regs are still very much up in the air.

Could you tell me if you know if any other states are using -- you know, have a broader interpretation of that code? You know, is this a very limited -- is this a Kentucky specific limitation that we're using here or is this kind of a -DR. BOBROWSKI: Well, I know a lot of insurance companies don't have that limitation, you know, if -- if the patient calls and says, well, I just -- you know, I bumped this tooth or I bit into something and, you know, it hurt for a couple days,
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but it took it a week to get even better. It's starting to feel better by the time they get in, but they just want it checked. So, you know, they're not in pain, so I can't use the D0911 code. Then you X-ray it, and they're not infected, nothing's broken. Sometimes they just bit on a popcorn kernel or an almond a little bit too hard or a little sideways that's strained the tooth, so it's not technically -- and they're not in pain, they're not infected. You know, maybe you could stretch it and say it was trauma. But then on the other hand, sometimes people that, you know, just grit their teeth or brux or clench their treat, yeah, I guess that could be considered a trauma. That's what I mean. There's different interpretations of the trauma and acute infection.

I just know most insurance companies don't have that stipulation of just a trauma or acute infection, and I haven't researched other states on that particular issue, on their -- their laws on it.

[^14]DR. CAUDILL: Dr. Bobrowski?
DR. BOBROWSKI: Yes.
DR. CAUDILL: Yeah, this is Dr. Caudill. As you know, Avesis administers plans in multiple states, and Kentucky is the only state we've ever seen that limitation. It seems to be Kentucky only.

DR. BOBROWSKI: Okay. Thank you,
Dr. Caudill.
COMMISSIONER LEE: You know, that could have been, you know, an oversight when we previously did not cover, you know, prior to January lst of this year, when we didn't cover those enhanced dental benefits for adults. We could have had that limitation there for that reason. But now that we have those enhanced services, I think, as Jonathan said, it may be too late to change that regulation now, but definitely not too late to kind of consider -- you know, the MCOs definitely don't have to -- you know, they have the flexibility to not apply that limitation, I believe. So let us take that back and see what we can do with that particular code.
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DR. BOBROWSKI: Okay. Thank you so much. Okay. Let's see, is there any other new business that a TAC member may have gotten phone calls about?

Okay. Moving on, is there any other topic as a TAC that we want to bring up? MR. PETREY: I don't think so, Garth. I think I'm still -- I'm still concerned and interested in finding out on that -- on the report from the $A D A$ because, again, that's -- that's been used multiple times, and I think erroneously. And the question that I had for Commissioner Lee was I wanted to get that and look at that and compare that, but you may have answered the question that it was a faulty study to begin with, but unfortunately it's the one that's out there and the one that is being used. So more information on that and a resolution to correcting that is probably paramount for me.

DR. BOBROWSKI: Okay. Well, and, Commissioner Lee, this is -- please don't think we are trying to blame you on this or nothing, because it was -- it was a study

[^15]by a reputable organization and it was out there, and free to you. So we're not -please don't think we're harping on you about it. It was just a -- it was a flawed report and the Kentucky Dental Association and other dentists called the ADA about it and they said this is not right.

But anyway, at first they said yes, it was, but $I$ think just here in the last few months they have, I guess, kept researching it and they found out, well, no, it wasn't right, but we are just kind of waiting to see what they say on that their fix for that.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Well, we all know if it's on the internet it's true; right?

DR. BOBROWSKI: That's right. That's right.

COMMISSIONER LEE: But typically we will not use -- you know, we don't use just any citations. But as you said, it was from a reputable firm, it was from ADA, so we -you know, that's why we have been using that in looking, because -- but, again, it shows that we are listening to our dentists
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and we are doing our research and we are trying to understand everything that we can about our reimbursement methodology and what policies we can make to change this program so we are addressing the healthcare needs of our members and taking care of our providers.

MR. PETREY: I think multiples of us have heard from our representatives, including the leadership that have looked at that, and said that, well, we're already doing better than everybody else and we -- we don't see a need to ever increase reimbursement, and that's -- that's a difficult position from our perspective and from your side to see that the leadership and policymakers are using that same information that is added -- it's dictating their opinion on what the reimbursement is and thus the system itself.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes, thank you for that. And I think, too, right before -- I'm going to have to hop off in a second. But I think Rachel put in the chat the Dental TAC did yesterday receive a report and it was
previously asked about billings and denials and et cetera. So that report may give you a little bit of information. I reviewed it maybe yesterday myself, and I think it was a very good report, laid out easy to read. So once you-all review that and you have any questions, you know, please let us know, and I think it will be something, you know, definitely that you-all can review maybe on your next Dental TAC.

But it has some real good information in there, and I'd like to thank Rachel for pulling that together in that format that made it so easy to read. I know if it's easy for me to read, anybody can read it. So you-all should have gotten that yesterday, and probably no time to look at that before this meeting. So look for that in your inbox, and if you have questions, please reach out.

MR. PETREY: Absolutely. And my comment that we haven't received -- we have to my knowledge, we have received two reports of the -- of the -- I think it was six that we requested. So, yes, we appreciate them

[^16]coming in and understand the time that it takes to get them together, and look forward to seeing the rest. So thank you for that and thank you for the work to get them together.

DR. BOBROWSKI: Well, I wanted to -- again, I thanked Commissioner Lee earlier today for, you know, all the things, and her staff, you know, for all the work that they do. This is a -- you know, I guess even myself sometimes, we don't realize the work and the commitment that our folks in Frankfort do put into their jobs, you know, in trying to help. And I know there's limitations.

And it's just sad that the governor and the legislatures are at odds and, well, who gets to do this and who gets to do that. And, you know, in the long run it just hurts our patients. So I hope they can work this out, because it puts us providers in a bind. It's like just now come, you know, like November and December, we're -- we're starting a denture for somebody. Well, can I get my teeth before Christmas? You know,
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well, we better get it before Christmas because in January we don't know what's going to happen. And we really don't know what's going to happen in January once the legislators get back in session.

So there could be a lull in, you know, dentures and partials and things like that, crowns, whatever, of the expanded codes, but then it may just flow right on. I'm not trying to be Mr. Negativity, but it just -we just have to wait and see what happens.

All right. Any other topics? But I do -- I do want to reiterate a big thank you to Commissioner Lee and all the staff that work on the reports we ask and, you know, even helping set up meetings and -- big help, big help.

Are there any MAC recommendations that the TAC needs to send on? Hearing none, I'll be at the next MAC meeting. We just recently had one, so I'll be -- I'll be at the next one.

And our next TAC meeting will be November 3rd, from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. Eastern Time, and it will be a Zoom meeting.

[^17]And does anybody else have anything we need to bring before the TAC? Hearing none, I'll just entertain a motion to adjourn. MR. PETREY: Make a motion to adjourn.

DR. BOBROWSKI: Second?
DR. SCHULER: I'll second.
DR. BOBROWSKI: Thank you.
All in favor say aye.
(TAC Members vote unanimously in favor of motion.)

DR. BOBROWSKI: And have a great weekend. Thanks, Everybody.

DR. SCHULER: Bye.
MR. PETREY: Thank you, Garth.
DR. BOBROWSKI: Thank you.

*     *         *             *                 *                     *                         * 

THEREUPON, the meeting was concluded.

*     *         *             *                 *                     *                         * 
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|  | about [29] 3/16 5/12 5/15 5/16 6/21 8/25 | anything [6] 4/21 11/12 20/1 31/19 31/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COMMISSIONER LEE: [15] 4/22 5/6 | $9 / 610 / 2117 / 318 / 1818 / 2121 / 921 / 10$ $21 / 11 \quad 24 / 1424 / 1725 / 925 / 1327 / 1931 / 3$ | $42 / 1$ anyway [2] $33 / 637 / 8$ |
| 5/20 6/5 6/20 10/18 11/13 20/16 24/12 | $31 / 1631 / 2332 / 332 / 436 / 437 / 437 / 638 / 3$ | apologies [1] $3 / 16$ |
| 25/18 31/25 35/10 37/15 37/19 38/21 | $39 / 1$ | apologized [1] 24/5 |
| DR. BOBROWSKI: [34] 3/1 3/20 4/4 <br> 4/11 4/13 4/17 5/2 5/11 6/4 6/11 8/22 10/3 | Absolutely [2] 13/14 39/21 | applause [1] 23/14 |
|  | acceptable [1] 29/24 | apply [1] 35/22 |
| 25/5 28/5 28/9 32/6 33/20 35/2 35/8 36/1 | accepting [4] 17/4 17/6 17/20 17/21 <br> access [2] 15/8 20/8 | appreciate [3] 12/10 12/23 39/25 <br> approve [2] 4/6 4/9 |
| 36/22 37/17 40/6 42/5 42/7 42/11 42/15 DR. CAUDILL: [2] $35 / 135 / 3$ | accountable [1] $6 / 3$ | approved [3] 7/15 7/16 7/18 |
| DR. SCHULER: [3] 4/12 42/6 42/13 | accurate [1] 43/9 | approximately [1] 18/18 |
| MR. PETREY: [17] 4/9 7/3 7/21 8/4 8/19 | across [4] 16/17 20/5 21/13 27/10 | are [49] |
| 12/13 13/7 16/15 19/19 22/19 23/20 28/6 | active [1] 17/11 | ar |
| 36/7 38/8 39/21 42/4 42/14 | actual [2] 24/10 28/2 | around [1] 18/20 |
| MR. SCOTT: [1] 32/18 | actually [2] 15/17 23/18 | array [1] 21/14 |
| MS. BICKERS: [2] 3/16 3/21 | acute [5] 31/2 32/10 32/13 34/19 34/23 | $\text { as [18] } 3 / 1712 / 716 / 20 \quad 16 / 2317 / 917 / 2$ |
| MS. KITCHEN: [1] 9/24 | ADA [9] 14/6 23/3 23/7 23/13 24/11 25/16 <br> 36/10 37/6 37/22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18/7 20/2 20/2 24/19 26/2 26/2 27/11 } \\ & \text { 27/20 35/4 35/17 36/6 37/21 } \end{aligned}$ |
| MS. LEE: [1] 10/6 | add [1] 3/7 | ask [4] 5/12 5/16 10/21 41/15 |
| MS. MEDINA: [2] 12/24 13/14 | added [2] 15/7 38/18 | asked [2] 19/21 39/1 |
| MS. O'BRIEN: [7] 6/12 6/21 7/20 8/3 8/8 8/20 12/21 | address [1] 3/12 | asking [4] 11/8 30/18 31/3 31/16 |
| 1 | adjourn [2] 42/3 42/4 | attack [1] 20/2 |
| 104.8 percent [1] 25/11 | adjust [2] 14/18 31/7 | AUGUST [3] 1/15 29/2 43/13 |
| 10th [1] 43/16 | adjustments [1] 13/4 | August 25th [1] 29/2 |
| 11 [1] 1/15 | $\text { admitted [1] } 23 / 14$ | $\text { authorizations [1] } 5 / 19$ |
| 11:30 [1] 29/19 | adult [6] 19/11 20/21 21/25 24/14 26/8 | average [1] 25/22 |
| 12 [5] 9/4 9/9 9/22 10/17 10/19 <br> 12-month [1] 28/18 | $26 / 23$ | Avesis [3] 29/15 29/18 35/4 |
| $14 \text { [1] } 15 / 2$ | adults [5] 9/19 15/16 22/1 24/16 35/15 | aye [2] 4/14 42/8 |
| 18 [1] 15/1 | Advisory [2] 27/6 43/10 after [3] 6/5 7/9 7/9 | B |
| 189.60 [1] 19/14 | afternoon [1] 3/2 | back [11] 3/24 5/18 11/7 11/21 11/22 |
| 1:126 [1] 30/24 | again [12] 9/9 14/16 20/18 21/8 25/21 | 12/14 23/3 26/11 26/19 35/24 41/5 |
| 1st [1] 35/13 | 25/23 26/25 27/16 33/7 36/10 37/24 40/6 | background [1] 32/8 |
| 2 | agency [1] 32/25 | backside [2] 12/5 12/9 |
| 2014 [1] 26/20 | agenda [2] 3/5 9/7 | bang [1] 21/20 <br> based [3] 19/22 20/10 27/8 |
| 2020 [2] 25/8 25/14 | ago [3] 16/10 19/20 23/4 agree [2] 22/19 23/12 |  |
| 2023 [2] 1/15 43/17 | $\begin{array}{lll} \text { agree [2] } & 22 / 19 & 23 / 12 \\ \text { ahead [2] } & 12 / 25 & 14 / 21 \end{array}$ | $\text { be [39] } 5 / 45 / 226 / 107 / 198 / 48 / 88 / 16$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{2 0 2 7} \text { [1] } 43 / 13 \\ & \mathbf{2 1}[1] \quad 15 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | ahead [2] air [1] 33/13 | 12/6 13/12 18/4 21/16 21/17 22/24 24/5 |
| 24 [1] $43 / 13$ | all [27] 4/14 9/12 10/7 10/15 12/10 12/21 | 24/7 27/2 27/5 27/20 28/3 28/24 29/6 |
| 25 [1] 15/4 | 14/9 14/14 15/9 15/17 16/17 16/25 19/1 | 29/17 30/17 30/18 31/1 31/6 32/9 32/25 |
| 25th [1] 29/2 | 21/25 23/16 25/3 26/9 32/24 37/15 39/6 | 34/17 35/7 35/18 39/8 41/6 41/10 41/20 |
| 26th [1] 29/2 | 39/9 39/16 40/8 40/9 41/12 41/14 42/8 | $41 / 2141 / 2141 / 23$ |
| 27th [1] 29/2 | alls [2] 7/14 15/24 | because [20] 7/13 11/18 12/7 14/19 17/25 |
| 2:00 [2] 1/16 41/24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { allow [3] } 11 / 1522 / 1522 / 16 \\ & \text { almond [1] } 34 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | $27 / 1128 / 1031 / 836 / 1036 / 2537 / 2440 / 21$ |
| 3 | almost [1] 25/9 | 41/2 |
| 3rd [1] 41/24 | already [2] 27/25 38/1 | become [1] 9/10 |
| 4 | always [1] 8/12 | becoming [1] 17/5 |
| 49th [2] 29/4 29/12 | Am [2] 4/1 7/2 <br> Amazon [1] 30/11 | been [23] $4 / 25$ 6/19 $7 / 113 / 18 \quad 13 / 20 \quad 13 / 22$ |
| 4:00 p.m [1] 41/24 |  | $13 / 24$ $14 / 12$ $15 / 6$ $15 / 13$ $16 / 2$ $16 / 25$ $20 / 22$ <br> $26 / 20$ $27 / 24$ $28 / 18$ $28 / 22$ $30 / 20$ $31 / 9$ $31 / 20$ |
| 6 | amendment [3] 32/21 33/1 33/1 | 35/11 36/11 37/23 |
| 68.3 percent [1] 24/17 | Annual [1] 28/25 | before [10] $3 / 103 / 1014 / 1218 / 324 / 8$ |
| 7 | 28/13 28/15 30/23 | begin [1] 36/17 |
| 71.50 [1] 19/15 | answer [2] 14/7 22/8 | behind [1] 20/19 |
| 9 | anterior [1] 11/25 | $20 / 1123 / 2236 / 18$ |
| 907 [1] 30/24 | Anthem [4] 4/19 5/14 6/22 12/16 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 911[1] 32 / 11 \\ & \mathbf{9 3} \text { percent [1] } 19 / 6 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { below [2] } \\ \text { benefits [2] } \\ \text { [2] } \end{array} 20 / 22 \quad 35 / 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| A | $\begin{array}{ccccl}\text { anybody [5] [5] } & 18 / 9 & 29 / 9 & 31 / 17 & 39 / 15\end{array}$ |  |
| able [5] 12/18 24/5 24/7 25/17 27/20 | anyone [1] 4/20 | between [2] 3/24 32/11 |




| H | 26/24 27/9 38/13 | know [98] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| harping [1] $37 / 3$        <br> has $[18]$ $4 / 25$ $6 / 18$ $7 / 1$ $7 / 10$ $9 / 2$ $11 / 22$ $13 / 9$ <br> $16 / 25$ $17 / 11$ $17 / 25$ $25 / 3$ $27 / 22$ $30 / 25$ $31 / 11$   | increased [2] 26/9 26/13 increases [2] 15/13 18/13 increasing [1] 21/11 | knowing [1] 28/21 <br> knowledge [2] 24/3 39/23 <br> KY [1] 43/20 |
| $31 / 15$ 31/18 32/23 39/11 hate [1] $3 / 11$ | individual [2] 7/25 29/9 | L |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { hate [1] 3/11 } \\ & \text { have [75] } \end{aligned}$ | individuals [4] 20/2 22/15 26/21 29/8 inevitably [1] $3 / 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { lack [2] } 7 / 24 \text { 19/23 } \\ & \text { ladder [1] } 29 / 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|llll} \text { haven't [5] } & 23 / 24 & 27 / 18 & 27 / 24 \\ \text { having [3] } & 5 / 13 & 12 / 18 & 17 / 17 \end{array}$ | infected [2] 34/6 34/12 <br> infection [5] 31/2 32/10 32/14 34/20 34/23 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { laid [1] } 39 / 5 \\ \text { large [3] } \quad 14 / 24 \quad 43 / 843 / 20 \end{array}$ |
| he [13] $6 / 18$ 16/10 16/11 16/20 24/2 24/2 24/3 24/5 24/5 24/6 24/6 24/7 24/10 | information [11] 14/22 21/7 23/8 25/1 25/3 27/21 28/1 36/19 38/18 39/3 39/11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { last [8] } 4 / 76 / 136 / 156 / 24 \quad 16 / 19 \quad 23 / 11 \\ & 24 / 437 / 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| He's [1] 3/22 heading [1] | initial [2] 7/16 7/17 | late [2] 35/18 35/20 |
| $\text { health [6] } \begin{array}{llllllll} 6 & 1 / 2 & 13 / 19 & 14 / 2 & 22 / 20 & 29 / 4 \end{array}$ | injury [1] 10/23 | latest [1] 25/20 |
| Health-49th [1] 29/4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { insurance [7] } 7 / 10 \text { 24/18 24/20 24/23 } \\ & 25 / 1233 / 2134 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | laws [1] 34/25 <br> leadership [2] 38/10 38/16 |
| healthcare [2] 30/13 38/5 <br> hear [2] <br> $5 / 18$ <br> $15 / 5$ | intent [1] 31/10 | $\text { least [2] } 7 / 623 / 14$ |
| heard [3] | interested [1] 36/9 | leaving [1] 16/19 |
| hearing [3] 15/20 41/19 42/2 | internet [1] 37/16 <br> interpretation [1] 33/16 | led [1] 25/9 <br> Lee [10] 4/23 14/4 15/23 19/19 25/6 31/17 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { hearts [1] } & 10 / 25 \\ \text { HELD [1] } & 1 / 11\end{array}$ | interpretation [1] 33/16 | $36 / 1336 / 2340 / 741 / 14$ |
|  | invite [1] 28/24 | left [1] 13/5 |
| $\begin{array}{\|llll} \text { Hello [1] } \\ \text { help [6] } 9 / 22 & 27 / 15 & 28 / 3 & 40 / 14 \\ 41 / 17 \end{array}$ | is [84] | legally [2] 29/23 30/18 |
| $41 / 17$ | issue [9] 4/24 6/17 7/24 11/14 11/18 17/16 | legislators [1] 41/5 |
| helpful [1] 7/5 | 18/6 32/2 34/24 | legislature [2] 19/5 |
| helping [2] 8/23 41/16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { issues [5 } \\ & \text { it [103] } \end{aligned}$ | lessened [1] 18/14 |
| her [1] 40/8 | it's [40] 5/19 8/6 10/3 10/14 10/17 11/13 | let [5] 11/17 $11 / 20$ 16/13 35/23 39/7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { here [11] } 3 / 73 / 153 / 20 \quad 3 / 25 \quad 16 / 123 / 10 \\ & 26 / 229 / 21 \quad 30 / 1033 / 1937 / 9 \end{aligned}$ | 12/1 12/5 12/7 13/7 13/9 13/9 13/10 15/17 | let's [5] 10/4 19/18 25/24 29/21 36/2 |
| here's [1] 19/12 | 17/15 17/16 18/10 18/11 19/16 20/10 21/5 | letting [3] 3/18 3/24 12/23 |
| hereunto [1] 43/ | 23/4 24/20 25/24 25/24 28/16 29/1 29/6 | level [1] 22/6 |
| Hi [2] 4/22 9/24 | $32 / 733 / 333 / 834 / 2$ 34/10 36/17 $37 / 1638 / 1839 / 1440 / 1640 / 22$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { levers [1] 28/2 } \\ \text { Lexington [1] 17/14 } \end{array}$ |
| hiccup [1] 8/16 | item [3] 8/24 14/17 15/10 | like [16] 3/13 5/12 8/15 9/16 10/9 13/3 |
| higher [2] 19/11 19/25 | items [1] 3/6 | 14/19 20/14 22/12 28/16 29/6 29/7 39/1 |
| $\operatorname{him}[1] 3 / 21$ | itself [1] 38/20 | 40/22 40/22 41/7 |
| HIPAA [2] 30/6 30/18 | J |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { hit [1] } \\ \text { hold [1] } \end{array}$ | January [3] 35/13 41/2 41/4 | 35/23 |
| hop [1] | January 1st [1] 35 | limitations [2] 9/6 40/1 |
| hope [1] 40/20 | Jean [1] 8/22 | limited [4] 14/24 30/22 31/9 33/1 |
| hopefully [2] 26/25 27/5 | jobs [1] 40/13 | link [1] 24/12 |
|  | Joe [1] 2/10 | Lisa [3] 4/23 6/14 10 |
| House [2] 29/1 29/20 | John [1] 2/11 <br> Johnson [1] 32/19 |  |
|  | joined [1] 26/18 | listed [2] 10/15 12/7 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { hundred [1] } 13 / 23 \\ \text { hurt [1] } 33 / 25 \end{array}$ | JOLINDA [2] 43/6 43/20 | listening [1] 37/25 |
| $\begin{array}{\|ll} \text { hurt [1] } & 33 / 25 \\ \text { hurts [1] } & 40 / 19 \end{array}$ | Jonathan [1] 35/18 | litigation [2] 5/7 5/9 |
|  |  | 34/9 |
| I'd [4] 20/13 29/5 31/23 39/12 |  | live [1] 22/6 |
|  | K-A [1] | loads [1] 16/8 |
| 23/13 25/18 30/9 41/20 41/21 41/21 42/3 | KAR [2] 9/5 30 | local [1] 20/3 |
| 42/6 | KDA [1] 23/25 | London [1] 16/21 |
| I'm [18] 3/23 6/14 7/22 11/3 15/19 19/12 | keep [3] | long [4] 5/18 16/2 |
| 19/18 20/6 24/8 28/23 31/15 31/25 32/18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Keeping [1] } \\ & \text { Kelly [2] } \\ & 9 / 25 \\ & \hline 11 / 22 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| [192/19 36/8 36/8 $38 / 2241 / 9$ | KENTUCKY [21] $1 / 1$ 16/22 16/23 19/9 | 14/6 20/8 20/13 21/5 21/13 21/14 21/18 |
| Ive [6] $3 / 19$ 10/20 14/21 23/16 $30 / 10$ | 19/15 19/18 19/24 23/5 23/6 24/17 25/9 | 22/17 25/18 25/24 27/6 27/20 28/2 28/8 |
| idea [1] 23/20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26/2 28/25 29/4 29/11 33/18 35/5 35/7 } \\ & 37 / 543 / 343 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{llllll} 31 / 12 & 36 / 14 & 39 / 17 & 39 / 18 & 40 / 2 \\ \text { looked [2] } & 21 / 3 & 38 / 10 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ |
| identify [2] 10/2 27/7 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { looking [7] } 14 / 11 \quad 20 / 2 \text { 20/24 21/10 25/21 } \\ & 32 / 2537 / 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| immediately [1] 23/6 | kids [1] 19/9 | lose [2] 18/24 22/2 |
| inbox [1] 39/19 | kids' [1] 19/10 | lost [2] 8/6 18/5 |
| including [1] 38/9 <br> increase [8] 19/5 19/21 20/4 22/22 26/15 | kind [9] 11/20 13/1 18/20 28/16 29/6 33/5 33/19 35/20 37/12 | lot [6] $9 / 13$ 10/22 13/8 $14 / 22$ 15/2 $33 / 20$ <br> Louisville [2] 29/2 29/20 |
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