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DR. BURCHETT: Hello, Everybody. MS. BICKERS: I count three of you. I see yourself, Caroline and Gary. Did I miss anyone else when they were logging in? DR. BURCHETT: There should be Steve and James.

MS. BICKERS: I don't see them yet. If I they do log in, I'll let you know, but you do have a quorum. I'll turn it over to you.

DR. BURCHETT: Okay, sounds good.
Dr. Burchett here. I guess most of us know each other by now.

So welcome to I guess the last TAC meeting for this year. I'd like to open the meeting up first off and just thank the Department for fixing the limits that were on the lower level 99 codes. I think they were limited to two visits per provider per year. And as we all know, sometimes that's not good for treating various conditions to have those limits, so we thank you for taking care of that for us.

So we'll go on and start the meeting. Let's approve the minutes from the last
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meeting. I hope everyone has had a chance to read them. But with that, I'll entertain a motion to approve.

DR. MUNSON: I make the motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting.

DR. BURCHETT: And do I have a second?
DR. ALBANY: Second.
DR. BURCHETT: Thank you-all.
Any questions on the minutes from the last meeting? Any changes that you-all noticed that might need to be made? DR. MUNSON: No, I don't see any.

I'm going to try to help Steve. He's having some trouble getting on the Zoom. DR. BURCHETT: Yeah, I just saw that. DR. MUNSON: He's going to try again, but let me maybe send him the link again. MS. BICKERS: And I believe James just logged in. He might still be joining. DR. MUNSON: Let's see if Steve can get on then.

DR. BURCHETT: I'll hold for just a second here to see if they can join in real quick. MS. BICKERS: He's logging in now.

DR. BURCHETT: Good, good.

DR. MUNSON: Perfect. MS. BICKERS: All of your TAC members are logged in and on camera.

DR. BURCHETT: Good sounds good. I appreciate that.

James, Steve, just getting ready to approve the minutes from the last meeting. We got a first and a second, and we're talking is there any changes or anything that you-all saw in there from what we discussed last time?

DR. COMPTON: I don't see any changes.
DR. BURCHETT: Okay, good deal.
Well, with no discussion on that, then, we'll go ahead and take a vote. All in favor of approving the minutes from the last meeting say, "Aye." (Members vote saying "Aye.") DR. BURCHETT: And those opposed? (No response.)

DR. BURCHETT: Okay. So approve -- the minutes have been approved.

And let's move on to -- we got a few old business things to look -- like maybe circle back around to. I'll just really

[^0]kind of go down the list here.
First, any word on the availability of the no show report from DMS. MS. BICKERS: I'm trying to see if anyone from policy is on.

MS. KITCHEN: This is Kelly Kitchen. I believe Justin had shared that in the past. I don't -- I'm not sure if they still are, or if they have ran a new report, but we can find out and get back to you. DR. COMPTON: This is Steve Compton. Generally, Justin says we're still working on it and we'll talk about it next month, just to paraphrase.

DR. BURCHETT: I don't think we've ever seen it, and I think that's why we keep asking about it.

MS. KITCHEN: Okay. I know they were creating a new system in order to be able to pull the data, to ensure that it is all the complete data. So that may be why it's taking some time to get it. But I will check with Justin to see where they are with that.

MS. PARKER: This is Angie Parker with
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Medicaid. It is my understanding that they are able to right now to make the no-show report public, but they were working on getting it on Kentucky Health Net. And it may be there. I don't know. But that is the latest that $I$ know about it, but Kelly said she can get with Justin to get all the ins and outs about it.

DR. BURCHETT: And then if we do that is there any way we can get a communication from you-all about that before next TAC meeting?

MS. KITCHEN: Yes, absolutely.
DR. BURCHETT: Okay. Appreciate it.
Then I guess the next one is -- is there any update on communication with the Board of Examiners for electronically sending the license updates?

MS. DUDINSKIE: Good afternoon. This is Jennifer Dudinskie with provider enrollment. We did make contact with the new executive director, Christi LeMay, in August, and she was working on a software update that had to be completed first. They were hoping to have that done by

[^1]October 1st. We haven't had any other contact since that time, so I believe we reached out when I got the notification of the agenda for this meeting. We haven't heard back from them yet, but we will make contact again.

I know you-all are really waiting on this. We -- we're trying. We are prepared to do what we need to do on our end to assist and get this completed, but I think it's -- I think the problem has been the software situation that they have had for some time. They converted a system and then they had a software change, so it just seems like it's a technology issue that's preventing it.

DR. BURCHETT: Right. Okay. Well, if you-all reach back out to them in the near future, just like the first item, is there way any way we can have an update between the TAC meetings?

MS. DUDINSKIE: Certainly. We'll do that meetings.

DR. BURCHETT: Okay, sounds good.
MS. BICKERS: Dr. Burchett, Justin
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Dearinger just joined. He might have an update for you on that first item.

DR. BURCHETT: Yeah. Okay, sure. Yes. MR. DEARINGER: Hello, how are you-all? My computer just died on me, so I had to call in on the phone so I don't have a video. But I wanted to -- I see the first item you talked about, the no-show report, and that report is live and functional. So it's available to all providers to be able to get onto the payment system, the MMIS payment and billing system, and it's under reports and it says -- I think it says no-show report or list of appointments report. You can click on that and then it's a whole little system there that lets you search by provider, by -- it has all the reasons for the missed appointments, all that kind of stuff. So that's available, it's up and running for all providers to be able to search and look on there. And one of the things that we're trying to kind of highlight is that the majority of those reasons, which is, you know, a big part of what we're trying to
determine, is just undetermined or unanswered. And so we're really trying to reach out to providers to say, hey, if we can get more individuals to answer and to find out why, you know, that they didn't show up, we can attack those reasons through Department for Medicaid Services, whether it's transportation, child care, couldn't remember when the appointment was. But that is up and running and available to all providers currently.

DR. COMPTON: This is Steve Compton.
Justin, we have no idea why they don't show up. They just don't show up, and then their phone is disconnected. We can only afford to spend so much timing tracking down reasons. Most of them just don't show up. They'll be here and not show up.

MR. DEARINGER: Yeah, and there's going to be -- you know, we all know that the majority of, you know, is going to be that way. I mean, I don't think there's anything that we can do about that right now. That's kind of a larger issue. But I want -- you know, I'm kind of hoping with
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community health workers services, other things like that, we can do a little more outreach to ones who will respond and can respond and who have actual, you know, issues, reasons why they can't get -- to be able to answer that and maybe we can assist with that.

But I know what you're saying. I understand that's going to be -- it's still probably going to be the majority, but we're hoping we can get at least maybe a larger number.

DR. COMPTON: On the upside -- this is Steve Compton again -- we did have one patient call that Humana had contacted about their no-show history and it seemed to help. I think it was Humana. Right? Yeah, okay. Anyway, that's one out of -MR. DEARINGER: -- issue in all of our MCO meetings, all of our provider meetings, because it's a collaborative group effort to attack the problem. And so hopefully you'll see a lot more of that with all the MCOs.

DR. BURCHETT: Well, it would be good.
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Anybody have anything else on that one? If not, we'll move on. Thanks for the update. Hopefully we can put that to good use and try to remedy some of that problem. DR. MUNSON: Matt, can you hold on just a second?

DR. BURCHETT: Yeah.
DR. MUNSON: Let me ask Justin to repeat where that report is because I'm not able to find it. So can you repeat like from the -- like start to finish how you find that report?

MR. DEARINGER: Sure. Kelly Kitchen is on the call. She just asked me if I wanted her to share her screen and I said -DR. MUNSON: Yes. Like, walk us through from the beginning until you get to that report, because I think that --

MR. DEARINGER: Can you pull up --
DR. MUNSON: -- for members to know this -we are not going to be able to just say, oh, yeah, go on the portal and find it, because it's not going to be conducive to finding that information.

MS. BICKERS: Kelly, you're a cohost now.

[^2]You should be able to share your screen. MS. KITCHEN: Great. Are you able to see my screen?

DR. MUNSON: Yes.
MS. KITCHEN: Okay. So actually when you log in, it is going to look a little bit different for you-all, but when you log in to Kentucky Health Net you're going to see a place that says Missed Appointments Dashboard. It does -- this is for all provider types, so you do have the option to pick for optician or for provider type 77. They are in order by provider type number. You can select the reason code or leave it as All. And as mentioned before, a lot of times you don't know what the reason is going to be, so you can click unknown, but there are other -- other reasons there, you know, no show, no reason provided.

Obviously, when you're entering, you are going to -- you know, you have a Medicaid ID number. But this is just for the actual report itself. You can choose a month or you can do all, and you can choose
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a year. Your chart type, so it's however you want it to come out, if you want a bar chart, column chart, line chart. And then you have an option of a 3D chart or remove grid lines, and then you would just generate the chart.

So let me go ahead and generate -- I guess it's telling me $I$ have to generate -let me see. So this is an actual bar chart that will show you the amounts. You can save it as a PDF also.

Does that help understand a little bit more where to find it?

DR. MUNSON: Absolutely. Yeah, yeah. That's fantastic. Thanks you so much for doing that.

MS. KITCHEN: You're welcome. And let me stop sharing here. Thank you.

DR. BURCHETT: Okay. Well, let's move on then. The next item is the new vision materials benefits from the Department. Just the first one, when are you-all going to release the contact lens fee schedule? MR. DEARINGER: So we're still working on the contact lens fee schedule. I think we

[^3]may be -- did we receive your all's
feedback from that?
DR. BURCHETT: I think probably. I know -DR. COMPTON: I sent mine.

MR. DEARINGER: Yeah --
MS. KITCHEN: Actually, we were waiting on
the feedback on that before we actually added it to the fee schedule, and we haven't received a confirmation.

DR. BURCHETT: I think I sent mine, but I will double check then. That's been more than yesterday.

MR. DEARINGER: -- that we ran, that you-all had a chance to review that before we added it.

DR. BURCHETT: Sure. I think we might have as a group sent responses in to Sarah from the KOA, and she might have sent those in to you, but I will check and make sure. I think that's what $I$ remember, but I -- like I said, it's been more than yesterday.

So with our feedback then, what kind of time frame would we be looking at?

MR. DEARINGER: Once we get that feedback, we'll try to look at that, you know, within

[^4]a few days, and then we have to run that up, you know, just to kind of clear that with management. So maybe, you know, a couple weeks, and we'll probably get back with you-all if we have any questions or anything like that, but no more than a few weeks at most.

DR. BURCHETT: Okay, sounds good. And we'll check and make sure we got that to you. I think that would probably make things go easier, if we haven't, but I think -- I think we might have already sent it. So if not, we can send again.

MS. UNGER: This is Sarah with KOA. We sent an e-mail, I think back on September 25th, Kelly and Justin, and I sent the responses. And I don't think there was any changes. They just had some questions. And so I'm not sure if that's what you-all are looking for still, or if you want more confirmation. But if you don't mind to go back, I can resend our correspondence.

MR. DEARINGER: I may have -- I know I had got something about -- I think it was a

[^5]question on one or two codes, but I wasn't sure if that was the complete feedback on the fee schedule. So just get with me, we'll figure it out.

MS. UNGER: Okay. Thank you.
DR. BURCHETT: Sounds good. The next item then is Medicare patients with Medicaid as a secondary. And just how it states, if the adult patient is covered by Medicaid, non-MCO patients, how does billing for the adult glasses work?

DR. ALBANY: I think that was my --
DR. BURCHETT: Yeah, I think so, too.
DR. ALBANY: So I might want to clarify that for them, so that I don't throw them into the weeds here.

So far on the Medicare patients that -- the way I understood it is if they have Medicare, Medicaid, we have to send the glasses to Medicare first, it has to be denied, and then we send it over to Medicaid. Now I'm talking about -- I'm not talking about MCOs here. Just straight Medicare, medicaid. So far we've tried that. We've not had any that got paid.

[^6]Traditionally, if Medicare denies something, Medicaid is going to deny it, and that's sort of what's been happening. My question on that particular subject was all of the MCO vision plans don't require anything from Medicare because they know Medicare is not going to pay for glasses for Medicaid patients. So I was just wondering if there wouldn't be a way for the straight Medicaid patient -- or not the straight Medicaid patients, but the Medicare with straight Medicaid, why we have to send it to Medicare to be denied to start with. I'm sure that there's a reason for that, but it causes tons of extra work to be done. MS. KITCHEN: This is Kelly Kitchen. We recently added all of the vision codes for the $V$ codes for the glasses and lenses to the bypass list, Medicare bypass list. So if you have a member that is dually covered, Medicare, Medicaid, you do not have to bill Medicare first. You can bill straight Medicaid. Now, if we have QMB, they would not be covered for their glasses, and that's because Medicare is
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primary and has to pay in order to cover those. But we did recently do a bypass list for that.

DR. ALBANY: Excellent. So the information we got the last meeting that the QMB should be covered, they're not; correct?

MS. KITCHEN: That correct. QMB cannot be covered and that's per federal policy. DR. ALBANY: Okay.

MS. KITCHEN: So in order to pay for Medicare QMB, Medicare has to pay, and Medicaid only pays the coinsurance and deductible. So since Medicare doesn't pay, there would be no Medicare insurance or deductible to pay.

DR. ALBANY: Okay, great. The other thing is, is on that -- to my knowledge so far, and I look at most all these claims every day as they come in, we're not getting paid on dispensing on Medicaid adults. Do you know anything about that or is anybody else having that issue?

MR. DEARINGER: If you can send examples, I can look at it and see what's going on with those specific claims.

[^7]DR. ALBANY: Do those examples need to be sent to you directly, Justin?

MR. DEARINGER: Yeah, it would probably be easier.

DR. ALBANY: Okay, we can do that.
The same -- along the same line, and this may have been fixed with the bypass that Kelly was talking about, I don't know. If we billed two lenses, two units on the same line, Medicaid was paying it for the lenses. But a lot of those lenses don't go on the same line because they have different V code -- because of the power difference. So we have to use one unit for one V code, one unit for a different $V$ code. And in those cases on every claim that we've sent, they denied one unit.

MS. KITCHEN: That should be fixed now. If it is not, please send us examples. DR. ALBANY: Okay. So on these that we've gotten denied, do we need to resubmit those Or --

MR. DEARINGER: Again, you can send those to us if they've been denied. They should automatically go back and repay. But if

[^8]you haven't got payment for some, just send them to us. We can look and see what happened with those.

DR. ALBANY: Okay. All right. I
appreciate it. I think that you-all have answered my questions. I did talk with my insurance biller today, though, and just recently within the last week we have -they have denied some of our adult Medicaid saying that we have to have it denied by Medicare first. So you're sure Kelly, that that -- do you know when that was fixed? MS. KITCHEN: Yes, I'm sure that the bypass list has been put in. I can go back and verify the date for you and send that to you.

DR. ALBANY: All right. Thank you so much. I appreciate it.

DR. BURCHETT: Well, I think that answers all of the other questions there on the glasses and things that we had for Old Business. So let's move on I guess to New Business.

Once again, we'll just go down the list, just some one-off items. The first

[^9]one, for the Eyequest Group. And I think the code on there is wrong. I think the code is 83516, not 95930. But it's a test for inflammation for dryness in dry eye testing. And I understand that you-all have it as a once-per-lifetime occurrence. And my question is why can't we -- why is the limit once per lifetime?

DR. DAVIS: My name is John Davis. I'm clinical director for Eyequest, if I could offer to opine on that, give you our rationale.

DR. BURCHETT: Sure.
DR. DAVIS: So you're correct, the code is 83516. That's just a typo you guys can correct on your minutes.

So this particular test, it's called an inflammadry. It's basically a test looking, as Dr. Burchett has said, it looks for inflammatory cells in the tear film. Basically, it's an analysis of the tears. And we feel like our guideline that limits that to once per eye per lifetime is reasonable. Mainly, the main reason we feel it's reasonable is because this particular
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test is a form of a diagnostic test, meaning you do this test to determine if the underlying cause of the dry eye is possibly inflammatory, or autoimmune mediated maybe is a better term for that, versus what we they an aqueous-deficient dry eye, which the doctors want to know that so that they can decide which kind of mode of treatment they might want to go with. Right?

You should also recognize too that most dry eye management is done based on symptomatology, though. Once it's diagnosed, you treat it, there's only a certain number of things you treat with. There's a bunch of things now. But it's managed based on symptomatic relief. You try this drop, or this procedure, or this whatever, and you -- and you find out if the patient feels better.

I will say, too, that this test is not really that commonly used nationally for us, for our clients. It is potentially abused a little bit by certain rare optometrists in the country. We don't see that in Kentucky at all. But it can be abused and it's
TODD \& ASSOCIATES REPORTING, INC.
www.toddreporting.com
because everybody over 60 years old, every woman in particular, probably has dry eyes. So pretty much they test everybody and we catch -- we identify those doctors, explain to them why that's not appropriate.

But anyway, back to this question, specific question is -- so we feel like it's a diagnostic test. So you determine whether the etiology is either inflammatory or is aqueous-deficient, or at least you have a guide, a little bit more of a guide to go with to start your management. But we don't feel like it's a monitoring test. That's what the osmolarity test -- there's another lab that's commonly done at the same time by most doctors who do the 83516. They do the 838, I think it's 61, which is -- which is another tear film analysis that sort of helps monitor how the eye is doing, how the tear film is doing, is it getting better. And so that test doesn't have that same limitation. That's a management test or a monitoring test that we feel can be allowed much more frequently to help monitor the patient's condition, resolution, or their

[^10]symptoms, whatever.
But I say that -- I say, look, there are always going to be extenuating circumstances, too. Right? There are patients where it's appropriate to do that test again somewhere along the way, more than once per lifetime. And that's what the PA process is about, it's to identify those one-off cases. So it shouldn't be done on a routine basis, meaning everybody gets that test every six months just as part of their follow-up visits just to do it. We feel like that's very wasteful and potentially abusive. So that's our premise.

Again, the bottom line is if you have extenuating circumstances, those are the cases to present to us. I will say one more thing quickly that's, I think, germane to this particular group, is that you-all are tuned into this stuff pretty well. We are -- we do our -- our clinical guideline policies, they are always annually reviewed and sometimes more often. If you have literature that supports the premise that doing this test on an ongoing basis is

[^11]somehow contributory, we'd like to see that literature, that peer-reviewed literature, because we are always willing to change our guidelines. We do all the time anyway, and based on, you know, medical studies that are done that are not equivocal, meaning they are evidence based.

Dr. Burchett, do you got any questions about that, or do you disagree?

DR. BURCHETT: Well, mildly, but in general I don't disagree with you. What I'm looking at it is patients that maybe got tested, and a couple years down the road they come back and, you know, they -- we decide to retest because maybe something's changed. Maybe they developed arthritis or something like that, that could lead to an inflammatory issue. And so I just, you know, don't want to waste my time testing if I'm not going to get reimbursed for it, but it's in the best interest of the patient at that point to retest.

DR. DAVIS: Right. Okay. That's, you know, a simple, great example right there; right? So what we -- we have a peer review

[^12]committee every couple of months, and we're going to -- if you don't mind, I would like to put this on the agenda for one of our -we look at guidelines every time we meet as a peer review committee. The peer review committee is made up of optometrists -practicing optometrists and practicing ophthalmologists.

So we talk about -- again, we have about 90 clinical guidelines that are -that we deal with. So every year they all get evaluated one way or the other. I -since I saw this item, I have one of my members, who's big on looking at literature and going to all the sites for ophthalmology, et cetera, or just the trade peer-reviewed literature. And there's not a lot on this inflammadry anymore going on out there right now, and there's nothing real current that he has told me. But we're going to relook at it, and I'm going to cite that example you just presented and we -- we can look at that.

In the meantime, though, you're welcome to, though, when you have patients

[^13]you feel like there's an extenuating circumstance for approval, send that in. Say, this is what we feel. Monitor in your chart, or get a peer review directly with one of our clinicians that looks at this stuff. We have people you can call if you have a -- if you want reconsideration of a denial.

DR. BURCHETT: Sure. I would propose one other instance to think about in your discussions then.

DR. DAVIS: Okay.
DR. BURCHETT: You know, somebody that we test and they're positive, so we start them on a Restasis eye -- or whatever, you know, we decide to treat with. And, you know, we're treating, following, treating and following, and then, you know, a year into treatment they're saying, well, I don't notice any difference. Well, $I$ think it's incumbent upon us to maybe recheck for the inflammatory markers to see how that's working.

DR. DAVIS: To see if you had a false positive possibly? Maybe?

DR. BURCHETT: Yeah.
DR. DAVIS: Yeah, maybe reasonable. Right. And, again, I think that policy was really designed around what we see is we see everybody gets both tests all the time. They come back in six months, they get an osmolarity test, they get another inflammadry test. And, again, this is optometry, period. I don't even have corneal specialists that use this test that treat dry eye. They don't do it. They just treat these things more empirically based on symptoms. But I think your statement is not unreasonable. I'm going to cite that as well.

You know, we don't want to make it harder on you, and we don't even want to do the PAs for this kind of thing, but it's an area where we have to basically based on the -- what's happening in the industry. It's just one of those things.

So -- but I think that those are not unreasonable and I will certainly -- and, again, I think our next peer review committee is I think around the 15th, middle

[^14]of December. I think the 15th actually. So I'll have results for you for the next TAC, which I believe is going to be in maybe February. Can't remember the date. Is that okay?

DR. BURCHETT: That's fine.
DR. DAVIS: Okay, good.
DR. BURCHETT: I appreciate it.
DR. DAVIS: Thanks for the -- I like those -- thanks for those two kind of examples or representative examples that do make sense to me as a clinician. Okay.

DR. BURCHETT: Okay.
DR. DAVIS: I might still be up on that next item.

DR. BURCHETT: I think the next two, they are both from Steve, and I'm going to let him talk about them because he's got more direct knowledge of them.

And I will tell you-all this. I may drop. I just realized my iPad is on about two percent. So I may have to switch over to the phone in just a minute. So if I drop off, I'll be right back on.

DR. COMPTON: Okay. This is Steve --
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DR. BURCHETT: Steve, you want to go ahead? DR. COMPTON: Yes. And Dr. Davis called our office this week, and it's my understanding that both of these things have been remedied. The different plans with different benefits for Medicaid members -- somebody on the frontline on the phone and I guess didn't know what they were talking about.

And then the $90-d a y$ waiting period for replacement glasses, I think, Dr. Davis, that's fixed?

DR. DAVIS: Yes, that was -- that was removed a long time ago. I think the specific situation was that -- had to do with billing directly for 92370, versus when the glasses are made the replacement -- there's no waiting period at all for that anymore, of course. I think we resolved that a couple years back.

But I was worried about that. That's why I called. I go, wait a minute, we don't have that in place anymore, what else is happening. And you have excellent staff. I mean, you guys have experienced people that

[^15]know what they're talking about. And I think that's what we determined, it was this one particular thing where they were billing us directly for this code versus having it become automatically generated based on the supply of the eyewear. Like, there was no limit to getting the eyewear. I'm talking about replacements for your members, for your patients. Yeah, that's not a real issue though.

DR. COMPTON: Okay. But the limits on the dispensing fee, is that what I'm -DR. DAVIS: Yeah, there is no limit. If you make -- if you dispense them today and the patient comes back tomorrow, says I already lost my glasses, you get a dispensing fee paid again tomorrow. And I think the way we understand that is if you're doing the work -- I mean, replacements require work, too. You have staff involved, whatever, and that was -we felt like that was a reasonable premise, which is why, again, going back about almost two years now that 90-day waiting period was removed.

[^16]DR. COMPTON: Well, thank you for your -all your hard work. And I'm one of those guys that's maybe using inflammadry too much, so I'm going to reassess my -DR. DAVIS: I don't think -- we don't -those tests don't come up on my outlier report for anybody in Kentucky, so you're not -- otherwise you would show up.

DR. COMPTON: All right.
DR. DAVIS: But, obviously, you're saying, you know, you like to practice as prudently as you can, for sure, like the standard of care.

Okay. So I think we're clear on that one.

DR. COMPTON: Thank you.
DR. DAVIS: And the other one I think you already mentioned, Dr. Compton, maybe was also miscommunication about the different plans. It had something to do with the adult contact lens benefit versus the child contact lens benefit, I think was the misinterpretation. We consider them exactly the same now. Adults and kids, they both get contact lenses based on

[^17]medical necessity, period. No different between the two, the way we understand it.

DR. COMPTON: All right. Okay.
DR. DAVIS: Good questions.
DR. COMPTON: There was a hiccup somewhere along the line, so that's why we --

DR. DAVIS: That's okay. It's good.
DR. BURCHETT: Thank you, Dr. Davis, for all of that.

DR. DAVIS: Sure.
DR. BURCHETT: Steve, I think the next one might be yours too, if I'm not mistaken. DR. COMPTON: Cindy is sitting in the room with me, because she may have to help me explain this.

This is Avesis. We had a patient in the middle of the month -- back in June. You know, we understand that the MCOs don't have their portal updated for a few days because Medicaid is month by month. But this was the middle of the month. We checked eligibility on the patient. Got paid. And then a few months later they recouped it, in September, saying the patient wasn't eligible, and told us that at

[^18]least that month or some months it takes 30 days to update. 30 days is what they told her. Well, that didn't work. It was the next month by then. And if their portal said they're eligible, I don't think we should have the money recouped. So we checked both -- you know, we checked both Medicaid and MCO website and appealed it, but it's still been denied.

ASSISTANT: KCI rep, she's supposedly fixing it for me, and taking care of it this week.

DR. COMPTON: So supposedly our rep is taking care of that, but it's something that shouldn't happen and we've spent a lot more money on chasing it than we got paid. Well, we haven't been paid. They took it back.

It just needs -- if it's taking 30 days to update the website, it's the next month by then.

MS. GRAY: Hi, Dr. Compton. This is Kim Gray. I'm strategic client partner from Avesis. Just wanted to address your concerns there.

[^19]So in regard to the eligibility files, we do receive monthly eligibility files from the MCO, and then we receive daily change files and updates from DMS. So we load that information into our Avesis portal within one business day. In regard to what you're talking about, that has to do with, I guess, a loss of eligibility for the member and then they were reinstated. So we -- we should be making those changes within a few days. It shouldn't take 30 days, like what you have discussed. And so -- and then we would retrospective -- retrospectively move their start date back to the first of the month.

So this issue has been brought to our attention by yourself and a couple other providers, so we have put a halt on any retro -- I'm sorry, any recoupment activity until we get the eligibility situation fixed. So I appreciate that you have reached out to Casey. Casey is looking into this concern for you and we will get this remediated immediately.

DR. COMPTON: Okay. Thank you.
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MS. GRAY: Sure. Thank you for bringing it to our attention.

DR. BURCHETT: Thanks for all that clarification there. That definitely can be a problem for sure.

The next -- I'm going to throw in -- I was going to have this for a general discussion topic, but it's an Avesis-based question as well. We have had some comments from several providers about needing a prior authorization for prism when it's put into a glasses prescription. And I was just wanting to ask Avesis if that is truly the case, if we have to prior authorize prism in glasses, because that seemed like it's part of the prescription, just like a plus or minus lens power would be part of the prescription.

MS. GRAY: Hi, Dr. Compton. So according to the KAR regulations, which it looks like we are currently following, it states that that would need to be a medically-necessary item. So that's currently what we're following in this case.

DR. BURCHETT: It seems to me that if it's
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prescribed, it's going to be medically necessary. We don't prescribe prism like we would transition lenses or antiglare coating. Prism comes because there's an eye concern or double vision.

MS. GRAY: Is there anyone else on with Avesis that can help explain this in more detail?

MS. VERNIER: Kim, this is Dani. So I'm going to go back and check the KAR again just to make sure that $I$ do have it listed correctly. But $I$ do believe that it is listed under the non-covered section, unless it is medically necessary. DR. BURCHETT: I believe that just the need of the prism in the prescription makes it medically necessary.

DR. COMPTON: It's always medically necessary.

DR. BURCHETT: We don't prescribe prism because they have glare issues like we would a transition lens, things like that, tint for a lens, per se. If they're seeing double or they've got an eye turn, that's medical necessity and that's where a prism

[^20]comes in.
MS. GRAY: So do you currently submit those to Avesis as a prior auth request to review for medical necessity?

DR. BURCHETT: That's a question I don't have the answer to for what $I$ do, for my billing staff. I would assume they do, because they would know that it has to be, but $I$ just don't know that it should be a prior auth because it's always medically necessary when you prescribe prism. MS. GRAY: Okay. We can certainly take that question back to our clinical staff here at Avesis and talk through that in more detail. Would it be okay if we followed up with you on that one?

DR. BURCHETT: That would be great. Much appreciated.

DR. COMPTON: Dani, this is Dr. Compton again. We will a lot of times give it away because it is less expensive to give it away than it is to jump through all the hoops.

DR. BURCHETT: That is true, too.
DR. COMPTON: Writing prism, it's like a
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bifocal or anything else. It's part of the prescription and it's necessary, so...

DR. ALBANY: I think if you will confer with Dr. Worth, he will agree that prism is always medically necessary when it's prescribed.

MS. GRAY: Absolutely. That's exactly who I was going to confer with. I believe he had to jump to another call today. So let me connect with him offline and then get back to you-all with an update.

DR. ALBANY: Thank you.
DR. BURCHETT: Much appreciated.
MS. GRAY: Thank you.
DR. BURCHETT: So the next item comes from the Department, and we would like for you-all to add some codes to the vision fee schedule for the coming year. These are codes that our Board of Examiners have determined that are appropriate for optometrists to use and bill for. And I don't think that they're found on the vision fee schedule, so we would like for that to be updated.

MR. DEARINGER: Yes, sir. I received those
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codes and we will do the research if we can add them.

DR. BURCHETT: Okay. Which brings up another point real quick for me to ask. I know in this we always talk about the vision fee schedule, and it's appropriate because we're in the eye care business. But also we are deemed physicians under Medicaid in Kentucky, and as such, I think, if I'm not mistaken, we are allowed to bill for codes out of the vision fee schedule that are on just the regular physicians' fee schedule if our Board of Examiners deems them appropriate to us, because I know some of these codes are already on that fee schedule. And I think the next item is another example of that. It was on the physicians' fee schedule, but not on the vision. And when optometrists bill for it, we get denied because it comes back to the vision fee schedule. But I think by law in Kentucky, as us being recognized as physicians and our Board of Examiners saying that these codes are appropriate for optometry to use and bill for, then I think
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that we are allowed to use other codes besides the vision fee schedule codes. MR. DEARINGER: So some codes are set up to bill for -- it just depends on the code in particular and the provider in particular whether they're able to bill off the physicians' fee schedule or not. So it will have to be particular code. So I looked down at 92066. That is a code that we are adding to the vision fee schedule in 2024. I thought I had requested that, or somebody had sent that in on your all's behalf, and so we are going to add that for 2024 .

The other ones, you know, like I said, we are going to research and see if we can add those to the vision fee schedule. But as far as billing off the physicians' fee schedule. It depends on your licensure type, the particular code, and how it's set up in the system. So you kind of have to ask, you know, individually on those, so we can look those up and see what edits and audits are in place on there and what we can do to -- if we -- you know, if we needed to
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research it to make a change to that and put that on the vision...

DR. BURCHETT: Okay. So then how many times a year can we update the vision fee schedule if codes come up that we're not aware of, or new codes come out, per se? MR. DEARINGER: We only update any fee schedule once a year. That's my official answer. However, if we find that there are, you know, opportunities and options, if we feel like it's something that's needed immediately where we can change it at any time in the year. And you-all have seen that, you know, with the changes that we have done so far in 2023. I don't know how many times we've updated the fee schedule, the vision fee schedule in particular, in 2023, but it's been several.

So officially we do it once a year and we -- you know, that's how it kind of has to work. But all year long we're reviewing codes. So when you-all send us stuff, we immediately start researching, looking into it, and seeing if it's something we can add, do we have the budget for it, how does it
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impact, what are other states are doing, all that kind of stuff. And then once we make a decision, if it's something we feel like is impactful, you-all feel like is impactful, something that needs to happen, we always have that option to be able to add it immediately if we have to. But in general, it's once per year.

DR. BURCHETT: Okay. Any questions on any of that?

MS. GRAY: Yeah, this is Sarah from -- oh, sorry.

DR. MUNSON: That's okay. You go ahead, Sarah.

MS. UNGER: Well, I was going to say the same thing.

Well, I just had a question because I sent -- this is Sarah with the KOA. I sent e-mails back in February of 2023, asking for the 92066 to be added, and told that you-all -- that the Department has the -you know, would not add the code all during that time, that you only add it once a year. But from what you're saying, Justin, I mean, it's kind of like you-all are picking which
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codes to add. So I don't understand how you-all can pick codes what you want to add, what you don't want to add when it's been requested. And that actually now that I have found out that that code was put on the physician fee schedule, but that the Department did not put it on the vision fee schedule.

So it kind of goes back to what Dr. Burchett is saying, if it's on there, why can an optometrist then not bill for the code even though it's not on the vision fee schedule? If you-all are not going to add it to the vision fee schedule, could you have not gone in and put on the physicians' side that the optometrist provider type could still bill that code for this year until it was added to the 2024 fee schedule? MR. DEARINGER: That's a great question. So if we had the opportunity to add codes freely and then that would be a much easier process for us to do, and we wouldn't have to do any kind of -- you know, there wouldn't be any thought process in it. Once we approved that, the request, we

[^21]could go ahead and add it.
The unfortunate part is that every time we add a code on the fee schedule, that is a change order that we have to put in with our billing providers, and it goes through a whole set of systems that charges us money, right. And it's not cheap. It's expensive. Every time we add a code, it's very expensive because all the programmers have to go in and rewrite the program, reput in limitations, and edits and audits, and all that stuff.

So it's really a money issue. There's -- financially we have to evaluate on, you know, based on a lot of factors based on, you know, how much it's going to cost to make that change versus the impact to members and providers.

DR. MUNSON: But here's a question that I have. This is Carolyn, Dr. Munson. We have in Kentucky what's called a pay peri (phonetic) law, which says that we as optometrists are able to bill and be paid at the same rate for a service as an ophthalmologist that's within our scope of

[^22]practice. So if you have this 92066 on the physician fee schedule, which an ophthalmologist can be bill and be paid for, then by our statutes, by our state laws, then that is something then as optometrists that we should have been able to bill for since the beginning of the year when this was added to the physician fee schedule. And so I'd like for you to speak to that or help me understand how Medicaid is able to have this in direct contradiction to a law that has been passed?

MR. DEARINGER: Sure. So I think the contradiction would be if we had the same code on the physicians' fee schedule and the same code on the vision fee schedule, and we paid one price for one and one price for the other. The difference is there are certain codes that are -- ophthalmologists are able to bill that optometrists are not, and so that's kind of the difference.

We have to, you know, vet that, make sure that's okay to be able to put on the vision fee schedule, and then that's, you
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know, the way we are able to do that and to put that on there. So it's not that you-all are being paid a different rate for a code. It's just you're not able to bill that code. We have to make sure that, you know, that it goes through the process of making sure it's okay and going through all the licensure -all that kind of stuff to be able to put on that -- that vision fee schedule. DR. MUNSON: Right. But what you're telling me is this code -- and I understand that you know these numbers, these codes. You don't actually know what that means in a practice setting as a doctor's perspective. You can't pay ophthalmology for something that is within our scope of practice. So the law states that if it's within our scope of practice as optometrists, as decided by the Kentucky Board of Optometric Examiners, then that has to be paid -- number one, paid, but, number two, paid equally to optometrists. So I understand the point that you're saying about if there were two different fees that were being paid, but it's paying
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period. I can't bill cataract surgery because I can't do that within my scope of practice, but I can bill a visual field because I can do that within my scope of practice. So this code, this 92066, is within the scope of practice of an optometrist and an ophthalmologist. But the way that these fee schedules are out are discriminatory against optometrists for something that they legally are able to do and licensed to be able to do.

So that's I think where my question is. It's not about the amount of reimbursement. It's the fact that we are being discriminated against and have been this entire calendar year.

MR. DEARINGER: Well, $I$ think it's a valid argument. I think it's a good point. I need to research it a little more. So let me get back with you on that, and maybe we can figure something out. I definitely don't want anything that we do to be discriminatory. We value all of our providers equally. So, you know, let's have some more conversation about it. Let

[^23]me look into it just a little bit more and I'll get back with you-all. Maybe we can figure something out. You know, it's not done intentionally, I can promise you that. DR. MUNSON: Well, and it's not a high-dollar code and it's not something that is done in every office. It's actually quite specific. And so for those few providers that this does affect, that is something that since it's been on the fee schedule since beginning of the year, if we could get that, $A$, changed and, B, have those few providers back-paid for that discriminatory period, that would be a fantastic solution. So I look forward to your response to that.
MR. DEARINGER: All right. Thank you for bringing that up. Like I said, it's -- you know, for sure we already added it to the 2024 fee schedule, but let's keep talking about, you know, looking at the 2023, when we only added it to the physicians as well.

DR. MUNSON: Absolutely. That sounds fantastic. Thank you.

MS. UNGER: And this is Sarah with KOA

[^24]again. I guess then my follow-up question to this is -- you know, it was added January 21st, 2023 to the physician -- is there a way that the Department goes through -- I mean, I know we're not the only other -- I know there's lots of different fee schedules. So how does the Department determine like what other fee schedule that code should go to? Are they waiting on the provider groups, or does the Department go through and say, oh, this code could be billed here, here, and here on these different fee schedules, or how does that work exactly?

MR. DEARINGER: So the process goes both ways. There are multi-faceted levels of review. You know, whenever we get a -there's two ways we add codes. So the first way we add codes is when CMS makes their updates, federal Medicaid, they send those updates to us, and we can add codes that way. The other way we add codes is if a provider reaches out and asks for a code to be added. In that case the -- that code is researched. We have to look at federal

[^25]Medicaid standards, we have to -- and it goes to different groups of people to do different research to all come back.

So we look at what federal Medicaid's doing. We look at what surrounding states are doing, because not only do we have to look at and determine the -- I'm sorry, did I go on mute there for a minute? Can you-all hear me?
DR. BURCHETT: Yes.
MR. DEARINGER: I'm sorry. So I'm not sure what you-all heard and what you didn't, so I'll kind of start back from the beginning. So when we get those codes from a provider, we look at federal CMS, Medicaid rules. Then it goes out to other different individuals to do research for other states. We look at the licensure for those codes, who can bill for those codes, who can't bill for those codes. We look at all the different limitations, how it impacts all the different provider types. And so there are a lot of different layers to it before a code is added.

And then once all that information is
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gathered back in, we have to do a fiscal analysis to see how that -- you know, if we have the money to add it, what rate should be on the code, what limitations, all those different types of things, before we do recommendation on whether to add the code or not. And if management approves that, then it gets added to the fee schedule in the next year.

And, again, if it's something that they feel like is impactful immediately to the health and would be worth the extra money to add before the first of the year, you know, we have the ability to do that. Not that we like to do that very much because, like I said, it's very expensive and that's extra funds, taxpayer funds, we are spending to add that sooner. DR. THERIOT: Justin, this is Dr. Theriot. Would a good example of that be the RSV codes, because they don't come out in a timely manner, so because we needed them on the vaccination schedule it needed to be done off cycle?

MR. DEARINGER: That's exactly right. So
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we added -- you know, we had -- and Dr. Theriot can probably speak better than I could about it. We had RSV codes. They are vaccines that came out late. And so there was a public health, you know, possible -- you know, some large public health implications to be able to cover those vaccines, because for -- in the vaccine world, a lot of times a vaccine code will only last a year or two years and they will replace it with a different vaccine code. So then you don't have any coverage for vaccines for that particular illness or disease. And so in order to cover that, you know, we have to do that outside of the normal annual timeframe to make sure that everybody gets those in the appropriate season when you would normally get -- same way with the flu vaccine or Covid vaccine. And most of the time those come out in a timely manner and we can add those the first of the year.

But Dr. Theriot is exactly right. We had to do that with the RSV vaccines this year. And in that case it was worth the

[^26]extra money we had to pay to get those added outside of the normal yearly fee updates. It's definitely -- it's not cheap.

DR. BURCHETT: Justin, this is
Dr. Burchett --
MR. DEARINGER: Really quick. You know, a lot of times fiscal will come back and say this is going to cost this amount to add the code and this is the amount that it's going to cost if we don't add the code. And so in the case of the RSV vaccines, you know, there was data from some other states that showed an increase in emergency room visits, an increase in hospital stays, an increase in individuals on respirators. And so that code -- that cost greatly exceeded the cost of adding the codes. So that's -- I mean, that's another -- you know, fiscal always gives us that report of the cost of adding them outside of that annual update versus the cost of not adding it.

DR. BURCHETT: Dr. Burchett here again, Justin. My question then is -- maybe I misheard. If I did, please -- please tell

[^27]me. But you said that, you know, each year new codes and things come out and you-all review them and you kind of look at licensure type and you look at what surrounding states are doing, things like that, before we decide to add or not add codes to fee schedules. Was that a correct synopsis?

MR. DEARINGER: Yes.
DR. BURCHETT: Make sure I understood that correctly.

So then in my mind what you're telling me is the Department is trying to set the scope of practice for each profession by not allowing them to bill certain codes that they use in that profession.

MR. DEARINGER: No. I mean, that's absolutely not the case. It's -- you know, any code that is, you know, billed in the traditional course of providing care for our recipients, you know, we try to make sure is added on our fee schedule. We get -- I guess you -- you know, when you're talking about -- and I think right now you and I are talking about codes that are

[^28]requested by providers. And so when we look at codes that are requested by providers, those codes come through -there's a lot of codes out there. And so some of those codes come through of cases where a provider would -- you know, has never billed before, no other states cover that, private insurance doesn't cover it. You know, those codes aren't covered at all under any insurance. And so we get those requests, and we have to look at is that something that is just new and innovative and maybe Kentucky can be a leader in adding those codes, or is that something that is just not covered under insurance for whatever reason.

But as far as what provider types can do what codes, as long as it's in their licensure, it goes on the fee schedule. I'm sure there are times where maybe we've left a code off by mistake from one fee schedule to another preventive -- one clinician or another of doing that, and that's kind of when we rely on you-all to be able to tell us, hey, this is in our scope of practice,

[^29]too, you-all didn't add this. And maybe that's the case with the, you know, 92066. I don't know.

MS. UNGER: And I guess -- this is Sarah with KOA. So what you're saying, though, that is what's happened in the past. If there is a code that is added, because the 92066 was a new code starting in 2023, as of January 1st. So when we found out that it had not been added to the vision fee schedule, you would think that Medicaid, when CMS has added it, all MCOs, all insurances are adding it, that you-all would go back and add it, because it does affect the office that is billing it because it has changed the way -- because in the past the code was a 92065 and the doctor or their staff, they could bill that code. Well, now it's been restricted and they split the code into the 92065 can be billed one way, or the 92066.

So when Medicaid didn't add the code since it was a new code, but you added it to the physician fee schedule, then the optometrists have been left out all year.

[^30]Does that -- I mean, I understand what you're saying, your explanations, but to me this is one way of saying it should be added from what you're explaining, because it wouldn't be on any other fee schedule. MR. DEARINGER: It's very possible. I mean, I have to, again, go back and look to make sure, like we said earlier, but that absolutely is possible. We do that all the time where we backdate codes and add codes. Not all the time. We try not to make mistakes all the time, but those things do happen. This is case where that could have happened.

Like I said, I have to just kind of go back and look just a little bit more at it, but we are always open to your all's -- you know, you-all are the ones that catch that. You know, we can't catch that. We have -- I have at least 10 to 20 code requests a day from providers. So, you know, if we add something to a fee schedule, but it relates to another group and we've forgotten to add it to that fee schedule, then that's something that, you know, we definitely need
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your all's help to reach out to us and say, hey, this should have been on the vision and not just the physicians to get added, so... MS. UNGER: Okay. Well, this is Sarah. I'll forward my email request that I started back in February asking for this. So I'll send it after this. Thank you so much. I appreciate it.

MR. DEARINGER: Thank you. I appreciate it.

DR. BURCHETT: I'll jump back into asking the TAC, is there anything else that you-all have to discuss that we might not have touched on here?

DR. COMPTON: Matt, Dr. Compton. This happened yesterday. And maybe this is still a policy and I'm mistaken. Avesis. Once we finally got through to a representative, they tell us they can only help with three claims at a time. I know that was a policy at one time. I thought that had been rescinded, but $I$ can't remember. But it takes a while to get to them and then you get cut off after three and you got to get back in line.
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MS. GRAY: Hi, this is Kim Gray again with Avesis. I will have to check on that for you. I'm not exactly sure what the process is as far as, you know, how many claims that they will look at at a time. I can certainly get back to you.

DR. COMPTON: Okay. Thank you. This guy was named Danny. I don't know if they use their real names. I wouldn't.

MS. GRAY: I'm sorry, what was the name? DR. COMPTON: Danny, I think is what I'm hearing. Yeah.

Maybe he's misinformed or I don't know. It'd be nice if we didn't have to call at all, if there weren't so many -MS. GRAY: And are you calling to check on claims or eligibility or both?

DR. COMPTON: All the above. It was claims yesterday, denied claims.

MS. GRAY: Okay. There shouldn't be a limit, but $I$ will certainly check on that for you and get back.

DR. COMPTON: (Speaking to assistant.)
Yeah. Did you hear that? She asked why. He said, well, there's other people waiting

[^31]in line, so...
MS. GRAY: Yeah, I understand that. If there is a limit, I will certainly share that with you.

DR. COMPTON: If there is, there is. You know, we'll learn to deal with it.

MS. GRAY: And then you also have a provider relations rep. I think you had mentioned Casey that you are working with. So Casey is always available any time you need assistance.

DR. COMPTON: I'm going to strongly disagree. She's hard to get ahold of. We don't get a very prompt response. Is that correct, Cindy? We've had to go over her head more than once to get some answers. So nothing against Casey, but we get the "out of the office" -- you know, the auto reply and all that sort of thing and it takes a while before they get back.

MS. GRAY: Yeah, I believe she is out in the field more often now, which is why you're probably receiving that. But I appreciate the feedback and I will certainly connect with our provider

[^32]relations leadership team to share that feedback.

DR. COMPTON: -- if you need her, how long it takes before she got back.

MS. GRAY: I'm sorry, I missed that last part.

DR. COMPTON: We have the dates we've contacted and the dates she got back to us if you need those dates.

MS. GRAY: Yeah, I will certainly have her get in touch with you. If you've got some unresolved issues that need addressed, I will ask her to give you a call tomorrow if that's okay.

DR. COMPTON: Except we won't be here.
MS. GRAY: Will you be in on Monday?
DR. COMPTON: Be here on Monday.
MS. GRAY: Okay. I will have her call you on Monday.

DR. COMPTON: Thank you so much.
MS. GRAY: Yeah. No problem. Thank you.
I'll get back to you with the claims
information or the customer service number.
DR. BURCHETT: Any other discussion from
the TAC?

[^33]DR. COMPTON: Are the meeting dates for next year -- were those all suitable? Erin sent out, I think.

DR. BURCHETT: Yeah, for me they are, but, you know, I don't know what I'm doing tomorrow, Steve. So they're fine for me. We'll make them work.

DR. COMPTON: We're staying with the Zoom for the year like that said?

DR. BURCHETT: Well, that's another question. I mean, I think we now have the ability to come face-to-face if you want to. You are the ones that have to travel. I mean, Caroline and I are fairly close to Frankfort.

DR. COMPTON: I feel the same way about the MAC. Zoom is certainly more convenient and doesn't take as much time out of my daily schedule. I think face-to-face is more effective sometimes. So I don't know if we need a -- I'm okay either way, but, you know, just face-to-face sometimes, it seems like we can get more done, but I'll... DR. BURCHETT: Let me ask this question to the Department people. If we -- do we have

[^34]to make that decision now or can we make that kind of as we go to say, hey, this TAC meeting we would prefer to be in person? Would there be any kind of time that we would have to let you know before the TAC meeting started?

MS. BICKERS: This is Erin with the Department. You absolutely have the right to meet in person if you'd like. You don't have to make that decision right now. The only thing I ask is that you give me more than a few weeks' heads up. One, I do have to let the public know on the website that we are doing that in person, and also too, our building is under construction, and so I would just need a little more time to make sure we have a meeting space that can accommodate as many people that would like to show up.

LRC no longer lets us use their recording equipment, so we can't use the Capitol Annex anymore, but I've been given some information for our local public library, and we do -- I'm reaching out to Public Health. About six, eight months ago
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they had water pipes burst in all of their big conference rooms, but they should be getting closer to being functional again. So I just ask you to give me a couple weeks' heads up so that I can make sure that we have a secure location.

DR. BURCHETT: Sure, sure. So then we can do that at any time. So say the next one in February, if we let you know mid January that we wanted to meet in person, that would be fine?

MS. BICKERS: Yes, sir.
DR. BURCHETT: Okay, okay. Sounds good. DR. COMPTON: At one time we said we'd follow the lead of the MAC, but that was back during the pandemic. I don't know if the MAC is going to return to in person or not.

Erin, you may have some indication of that.

MS. BICKERS: So far they have stayed with Zoom. Now, we do have a meeting at the end of the month and they may decide one day next year they want to meet in person.

A lot of the TACs have stated they
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feel kind of like you, Dr. Compton, they don't have to travel, it makes a little bit easier for them to attend. But we do have a couple of TACs about once a year -- the physicians' TAC I believe this past July, I believe met in person for once a year. So it's really up to what the TAC would like. And as long as you give me a couple weeks' notice so I can work on getting a room and, you know, kind of put it out on the website so people do realize -- and it can also be hybrid.

If, say, Dr. Compton and everybody else wants to meet in person, but you can't make it into town, there will always still be the Zoom link, so I just find a room that I can accommodate as many folks as possible. DR. COMPTON: I just thought I'd throw it out there. I'm good either way.

DR. BURCHETT: Okay. I don't disagree, Steve. Sometimes in person is a little easier to accomplish some things. We'll just take it meeting by meeting and see what we think.

DR. COMPTON: All right. Thank you.
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DR. BURCHETT: Sounds good. Any other discussion?

Well, and, Steve, you will be at the -- attending the next MAC meeting at the end of the month?

DR. COMPTON: I will by Zoom. And we have no recommendations; is that correct?

DR. BURCHETT: Well, that's what I was getting ready to say. If you're going to attend, is there any recommendations that the TAC has that we might want to take to the MAC?

DR. COMPTON: I think since DMS is looking at all these codes, I think we're good. You're chairman for the MAC too, so... DR. BURCHETT: So I think waiting to hear some of the answers on some of these things we've asked is fine for now to hold on recommendations, unless somebody else feels different.

DR. MUNSON: Yeah, Matt, this is Carolyn. The only thing that $I$ would definitely think about recommending, depending on the resolution of these codes, is that if they -- if there are codes that are added

[^35]to the physician fee schedule that are within our scope of practice, that they are automatically added to the vision fee schedule, so this debacle does not happen again and our patients don't lose out on care because a code is not added, or inadvertently left off. But we'll see how the resolution goes. But I think that the next meeting we have we may consider making that recommendation to the MAC to make that a more seamless process.

DR. BURCHETT: That sounds good to me. We'll see how the resolution is.

DR. COMPTON: The MAC will meet twice before the TAC meets again. So it would be March.

DR. BURCHETT: Well, and what we can do, you know -- and I think we can have a special-called TAC meeting any time we need to. So if we run into any issues, then we might consider that option if need be before the MAC meets again. Does that sound fair to everyone?

DR. MUNSON: Absolutely.
DR. COMPTON: Yes.
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DR. ALBANY: Yes.
DR. BURCHETT: Good deal. Well, I think like you said, the next meeting will be in February. I don't have the date right off, but I think Erin has sent that out to us so we all have that.

And then if nobody has anything else, I will take a motion to adjourn. MS. BICKERS: February 1st. If you didn't get the invite, let me know and I can resend it to everybody.

DR. BURCHETT: February 1st you said? MS. BICKERS: Yes, sir.

DR. BURCHETT: Okay. Good deal.
So unless something comes up before then, we'll see you-all February 1st. And, like I said, I'll take a motion to adjourn. DR. MUNSON: I make the motion we adjourn. DR. COMPTON: Second.

DR. BURCHETT: All in favor, "Aye." (All Members vote "Aye.")

DR. BURCHETT: You-all have a good afternoon. Talk to you later.

THEREUPON, the TAC Meeting was concluded.
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|  | 7 | 55/23 59/7 61/1 66/3 69/5 69/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ASSISTANT: [1] 35/10 | 77 [1] 13/13 | agenda [2] $8 / 427 / 3$ |
| $19 / 9 \text { 19/16 20/1 20/5 20/20 21/4 21/17 }$ | 8 | ago [2] 31/14 65/25 |
| 40/3 40/12 70/1 | 83516 [3] 22/3 22/15 24/16 | $\begin{array}{\|ll} \hline \text { agree [1] } & 40 / 4 \\ \text { ahead [5] } & 5 / 15 \\ 14 / 7 & 31 / 1 \\ 44 / 13 & 46 / 1 \end{array}$ |
| DR. BURCHETT: [74] | 838 [1] 24/17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ahead [5] } 5 / 15 \quad 14 / 731 / 144 / 1346 / 1 \\ & \text { ahold [1] } 62 / 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{cccccc}\text { DR. COMPTON: } \begin{array}{llllll}\text { D2 }\end{array} \text { 5/12 } & 6 / 11 & 10 / 12 \\ 11 / 13 & 15 / 4 & 30 / 25 & 31 / 2 & 32 / 11 & 33 / 1\end{array} 33 / 9$ | 9 | all [103] |
| 33/16 34/3 34/5 34/13 35/13 36/25 38/18 | 90 [1] 27/10 | all's [4] 15/1 42/12 59/17 60/1 <br> allowed [3] 24/23 41/10 42/1 |
| 39/19 39/25 60/15 61/7 61/11 61/18 61/23 | 90-day [2] 31/10 32/24 | allowing [1] 56/15 |
| 62/5 62/12 63/3 63/7 63/15 63/17 63/20 | 92065 [2] 58/17 58/20 | $\text { almost [1] } 32 / 24$ |
| 64/1 64/8 64/16 66/14 67/18 67/25 68/6 | 92066 [7] 42/9 44/20 47/1 49/5 58/2 58/8 | along [3] 20/6 25/6 34/6 |
| 68/13 69/14 69/25 70/19 DR. DAVIS: [17] 22/9 22/14 26/23 28/12 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 58 / 21 \\ \mathbf{9 2 3 7 0} \end{array}$ | already [5] 16/12 32/16 33/18 41/15 50 |
| 28/24 29/2 30/7 30/9 30/14 31/13 32/13 | 95930 [1] 22/3 | also [7] 14/11 23/10 33/19 41/8 62/7 65/ |
| 33/5 33/10 33/17 34/4 34/7 34/10 | 99 [1] 3/18 | $16$ |
| DR. MUNSON: [19] 4/4 4/12 4/16 4/20 <br> 5/1 12/5 12/8 12/16 12/20 13/4 14/14 | A | 40/5 41/5 44/5 55/19 59/17 62/10 67/15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 44 / 1346 / 1948 / 1050 / 550 / 2368 / 2169 / 24 \\ & 70 / 18 \end{aligned}$ | ability [2] 53/14 64/12 <br> able [23] 6/19 7/2 9/10 9/21 11/6 12/9 | amount [3] 49/13 55/8 55/9 <br> amounts [1] 14/10 <br> analysis [3] 22/21 24/18 53/2 |
| DR. THERIOT: [1] 53/19 | 12/21 13/1 13/2 42/6 44/6 46/23 47/6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { analysis [3] } 22 / 21 \quad 24 / 1853 \text { in } \\ & \text { Angie [1] } 6 / 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| MR. DEARINGER: [28] 9/4 10/19 11/19 | 47/11 47/21 47/24 48/1 48/4 48/8 49/10 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} \text { Angie [1] } & 6 / 25 \\ \text { Annex [1] } & 65 / 22 \end{array}\right.$ |
|  | 49/11 54/7 57/24 <br> about [40] 6/13 6/17 7/6 7/8 7/11 9/8 | Annex [1] [2] 54/16 55/21 |
| 47/14 49/17 50/17 51/15 52/11 53/25 55/6 | 10/23 11/16 16/25 17/22 17/23 19/21 20/8 | annually [1] 25/22 <br> another [11] 24/14 24/18 29/7 40/9 41/4 |
| 56/9 56/17 59/6 60/9 | 25/8 26/9 27/9 27/10 28/10 30/18 30/21 |  |
| MS. BICKERS: [13] 3/2 3/7 4/18 4/24 5/2 6/4 8/25 12/25 65/7 66/12 66/21 70/9 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 31 / 9 & 31 / 21 & 32 / 1 & 32 / 8 & 32 / 23 \\ 33 / 19 & 36 / 7 \\ 37 / 10 & 41 / 5 & 48 / 24 & 49 / 13 & 49 / 25 \\ 50 / 21 & 54 / 3 \end{array}$ | answer [4] 10/4 11/6 39/6 43/9 |
| $5 / 2$ $70 / 13$ | 56/24 56/25 64/16 65/25 67/4 68/23 | answered [1] 21/6 |
| MS. DUDINSKIE: [2] 7/19 8/22 | above [1] 61/18 | answers [3] 21/19 62/16 68/17 <br> antiglare [1] 38/3 |
| MS. GRAY: [21] $35 / 22$ 37/1 37/19 38/6 $39 / 239 / 12 ~ 40 / 7 ~ 40 / 14 ~ 44 / 11 ~ 61 / 1 ~ 61 / 10 ~$ | absolutely [8] 7/13 14/14 40/7 50/23 56/18 59/9 65/8 69/24 |  |
| 39/2 39/12 40/7 40/14 44/11 61/1 61/10 | 56/18 59/9 65/8 69/24 | 7/16 8/1 8/20 16/5 16/18 17/25 26/8 28/20 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 61/16 61/20 62/2 62/7 62/21 63/5 63/10 } \\ 63 / 16 ~ 63 / 18 ~ 63 / 21 ~ \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { abused [2] } 23 / 222 \\ \text { abusive [1] } \\ 25 / 14 \end{array}$ | 36/18 36/19 43/7 43/13 44/9 44/9 45/23 |
| MS. KITCHEN: [12] 6/6 6/18 7/13 13/2 | accommodate [2] 65/18 67/17 | 45/24 54/12 56/19 57/10 59/5 62/10 63/2 |
| 13/5 14/17 15/6 18/16 19/7 19/10 20/18 | accomplish [1] 67/22 | 65/4 66/8 68/1 68/10 69/19 69/20 |
| 21/13 | according [1] 37/19 | anybody [3] 12/1 19/21 33/7 |
| MS. PARKER: [1] 6/25 | accurate [1] 71/10 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { anymore [4] } & 27 / 18 & 31 / 19 & 31 / 23 ~ 65 / 22\end{array}$ |
| MS. UNGER: [6] 16/14 17/5 44/15 50/25 | activity [1] 36/19 | anyone [3] 3/4 6/4 38/6 <br> anything [10] 5/9 10/23 12/1 16/6 18/6 |
| 58/4 60/4 | actual [3] 11/4 13/24 14/9 | anything [10] 5/9 10/23 12/1 16/6 18/6 19/21 40/1 49/22 60/12 70/7 |
| MS. VERNIER: [1] 38/9 | actually [7] 13/5 15/6 15/7 30/1 45/4 | anyway [3] 11/18 24/6 26 |
| 1 | add [35] 40/17 41/2 42/13 42/17 43/24 | appealed [1] 35/8 |
| 10 [1] 59/20 | 44/6 44/22 44/23 45/1 45/2 45/3 45/13 | appointment [1] 10/9 <br> appointments [3] 9/14 9/18 13/9 |
| 15th [2] 29/25 30/1 | 45/20 46/1 46/3 46/8 51/18 51/19 51/21 | appointments [3] $9 / 14$ 9/18 $13 / 9$ appreciate [9] $5 / 5 \quad 7 / 1421 / 5 \quad 21 / 18 \quad 30 / 8$ |
| 1:00 [1] 1/16 | 51/22 53/3 53/6 53/13 53/18 54/21 55/8 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { appreciate [9] } \\ 36 / 5167 / 1 \\ 30 / 8 \\ 60 / 9 \\ 62 / 24 \end{gathered}\right.$ |
| 1st [5] 8/1 58/9 70/9 70/12 70/16 | 55/10 56/6 56/6 58/1 58/14 58/22 59/10 | appreciated [2] 39/18 40/13 |
| 2 | added [24] $15 / 8$ 15/15 18/17 44/20 45/18 | appropriate [7] 24/5 25/5 40/20 41 |
| 20 [1] 59/20 | 47/8 50/19 50/22 51/2 51/24 52/24 53/8 | 41/14 41/24 54/18 |
| 2023 [8] $1 / 15$ 43/15 43/18 44/19 50/21 | 54/1 55/1 56/22 58/7 58/10 58/12 58/23 59/3 60/3 68/25 69/3 69/6 | approval [1] $28 / 2$ <br> approve [5] 3/25 4/3 4/4 5/7 5/21 |
| 2024 [5] 42/11 42/14 45/18 50/20 71/17 | adding [6] 42/10 55/17 55/20 55/21 57/14 | approved [2] 5/22 45/25 |
| 21st [1] 51/3 | 58/13 | approves [1] 53/7 |
| 24 [1] 71/13 |  | approving [1] 5/16 |
| 25th [1] 16/16 | addressed [1] 63/12 | aqueous [2] 23/6 24 |
| 3 | adjourn [3] 70/8 70/17 70/18 | are [83] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30 [4] } 35 / 135 / 235 / 1936 / 11 \\ & \text { 3D [1] } 14 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | adults [2] 19/20 33/24 <br> Advisory [1] 71/11 | $\begin{array}{\|ll} \text { area [1] } & 29 / 19 \\ \text { aren't [1] } & 57 / 9 \end{array}$ |
| 5 | $\left.\right\|_{a} ^{a}$ | around [3] 5/25 29/4 29/2 |
| 5th [1] 71/16 | after [2] 60/7 60/24 | arthritis [1] 26/16 <br> as [43] $3 / 20 \quad 13 / 1513 / 1514 / 1115 / 1717 / 7$ |
| 6 | afternoon [2] 7/19 70/23 <br> again [26] 4/16 4/17 8/6 11/14 16/13 | 19/19 22/6 22/19 25/11 27/4 29/15 30/12 |
| 60 [1] 24/1 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 20 / 23 & 21 / 24 & 25 / 6 & 25 / 15 & 27 / 9 \\ 29 / 3 & 29 / 8\end{array}$ | 33/11 33/12 37/9 39/3 41/9 41/22 41/2 |
| 61 [1] 24/17 | 29/24 32/17 32/23 38/10 39/20 51/1 53/10 | 42/18 42/18 46/22 46/24 47/5 48/14 48/18 48/19 50/22 57/17 57/17 57/18 57/18 58/8 |


| A | $40 / 862 / 2167$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| as... [9] 61/4 61/4 64/18 65/2 65/18 67/8 | benefits [2] 14/21 31/6 | chance [2] 4/1 15/14 |
|  | besides [1] $42 / 2$ | change [7] 8/14 26/3 36/3 43/1 43/12 46 |
| $65 / 1166 / 4$ | best [1] 26/21 | 46 |
| asked [3] 12/14 61/24 68/18 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \mathrm{bc} \\ \mathrm{be} \end{array}$ |  |
| asking [4] 6/17 44/19 60/6 60/11 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \mathbf{b e} \\ & \mathbf{b i} \end{aligned}\right.$ | $43 / 14$ |
| $\gamma_{a}$ | big [3] | charges [1] $46 / 6$ |
| assistance [1] 62/1 | bill [21] 18/22 18/22 40/21 41/10 | chart [8] 14/1 14/3 14/3 $14 / 314 / 414 / 6$ |
| assistant [1] 61/23 | 41/25 42/4 42/6 45/11 45/17 46/23 47 | 14/9 28/4 |
| assume [1] 39/7 | 56/15 58/18 | chasing [1] $35 / 16$ cheap [2] $46 / 755 / 3$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { attack [2] } & 10 / 6 & 11 / 22 \\ \text { attend [2] } & 67 / 3 & 68 / 10\end{array}$ | billed [5] 20/9 51/12 56/19 57/7 58/21 |  |
|  | biller [1] 21/7 | 61/2 61/16 61/21 |
| attention [2] 36/17 | billing [8] 9/12 17/10 31/16 32/3 39/7 | checked [3] 34/22 35/7 35 |
| audits [2] 42/24 46/11 | 8 46/5 58/15 | child [2] 10 |
| August [2] 7/23 71/13 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { bit [7] } \\ 67 / 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { choose [2] } & 13 / 24 \\ \text { Christi [1] } & 7 / 22\end{array}$ |
| auth [2] 39/3 39/10 | Board [5] 7/17 40/19 41/13 41/23 48/20 |  |
| $\text { authorize [1] } 37 / 14$ | both [8] 29/5 30/17 31/4 33/25 35/7 35/7 | circle [1] 5/25 |
| auto [1] 62/18 | 51/15 61/17 | circumstance [1] 28 |
| autoimmune [1] 23/4 | bo | circumstances [2] 25/4 25/ |
| automatically [3] |  | 11 |
| availability [1] 6/2 | br | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { claim [1] } \\ \text { claims [8] } & \text { 20/16 } \\ \text { 19/18 19/25 60/20 61/4 61/17 }\end{array}$ |
| available [4] 9/10 9/20 10/10 62/10 | brought [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { claims [8] 19/18 19/25 60/20 } 61 \\ & 61 / 1861 / 1963 / 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| Avesis [10] 34/16 35/24 36/5 37/8 37/13 | building [1] $65 / 1$ | clarification [1] 37/4 |
| 38/7 39/3 39/14 60/17 6 | $\text { bunch [1] } 23 / 15$ | $\text { clarify [1] } 17 / 14$ |
| Avesis-based [1] 37/8 aware [1] 43/6 |  | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { clear [2] } & 16 / 2 & 33 / 14\end{array}$ |
| away [2] 39/20 39/22 | 45/10 55/5 55/2 | click [2] 9/15 13/17 |
| Aye [4] 5/17 5/18 70/20 70/21 | burst [1] 66/1 | client [1] 35/23 |
| B | bypass [5] 18/19 18/19 19/2 20/7 21/13 | [4] 22/10 25/21 27/10 39/1 |
| back [45] | C | [2 |
| 16/22 20/25 21/14 24/6 26/14 29/6 30/2 | CA | close [1] 64/14 |
| 31/20 32/15 32/23 34/17 35/18 36/14 | calendar [1] 49/16 | closer [1] 66/3 |
| $38 / 1039 / 1340 / 1141 / 2044 / 1945 / 949 / 20$ | call [8] 9/5 11/15 12/14 28/6 40/9 61/15 | CMS [3] 51/19 52/15 58/12 |
| 50/2 50/13 52/3 52/13 53/1 55/7 58/14 <br> 59/7 59/16 60/6 60/11 60/25 61/6 61/22 | 63/13 63/18 | coating [1] 38/4 |
| 62/20 63/4 63/8 63/22 66/16 | called [5] 22/17 31/2 31/22 46/21 69/19 | code [48] 13/14 20/13 20/14 20/15 22/2 |
| back-paid [1] 50/13 | calling [1] 61/ | /4 42/8 42/9 |
| backdate [1] 59/10 | came [1] 54/4 | /22 45/5 45/12 45/17 46/3 46/8 47/1 |
| bar [2] 14/2 14/9 | camera [1] 5/3 | 48/11 49/5 50 |
| based [11] 23/11 23/16 26/5 26/7 29/13 | can [80] | 51/12 51/23 51/24 52/24 53/4 53/6 54/10 |
| 29/19 32/5 33/25 37/8 46/15 46/16 | can't [11] 11/5 22/7 30/4 48/15 49/1 49/2 | 4/12 55/9 55/10 |
| lell $\begin{aligned} & \text { basically [3] } 22 / 1822 / 2129 / 19\end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52 / 19 \text { 59/19 60/22 65/21 67/12 } \\ & \text { cannot [1] 19/7 } \end{aligned}$ | 58/8 58/17 58/19 58/20 58/22 58/23 59/20 $69 / 6$ |
| basis [2] 25/10 25/25 | Capitol [1] 65/22 | codes [48] 3/18 17/1 18/17 18/18 40/17 |
|  | care [8] 3/23 10/8 33/13 35/11 35/14 41/7 | 40/19 41/1 41/11 41/15 41/24 42/1 42/2 |
|  | 56/20 69/6 | 42/3 43/5 43/6 43/22 45/1 45/2 45/20 |
| $30 / 1834 / 1434 / 2037 / 1538 / 438 / 213$ | Caroline [2] 3/3 64/14 | 47/20 48/12 51/18 51/19 51/2 |
| 39/10 39/21 41/7 41/14 41/2 | Carolyn [2] 46/20 68/21 | 52/14 52/18 52/19 52/20 53/21 54/3 55/17 |
| 49/2 49/4 52/6 53/16 53/21 53/22 54/8 | case [8] 37/14 37/24 51/24 54/25 55/11 | 56/2 56/7 56/15 56/25 57/2 57/3 57/4 57/ |
| 58/7 58/14 58/16 58/16 59/4 69/6 | 56/18 58/2 59/13 | 57/9 57/14 57/18 59/10 59/10 68/14 68/2 |
| become [1] 32/5 | cases [4] 20/16 25/9 | 68/2 |
| been [24] 5/22 8/11 15/11 15/21 18/3 20/7 | cataract [1] 49/1 | coinsurance [1] 19/12 |
| 20/24 21/14 31/5 35/9 35/17 36/16 43/18 | catch [3] 24/4 59/18 59/19 | coinsurance [1] 19/12 collaborative [1] 11/21 |
| 45/3 47/6 47/12 49/15 50/10 58/10 58/19 58/25 60/2 60/22 65/22 | cause [1] 23/3 | column [1] $14 / 3$ |
| before [15] 7/11 13/15 | causes [1] 18/15 | come [15] 14/2 19/19 26/14 29/6 33/6 43/5 |
| 53/5 53/13 56/6 57/7 62/20 63/4 65/5 | CCR [1] 71/20 | 43/6 52/3 53/21 54/21 55/7 56/2 57/3 57/5 |
| 69/15 69/22 70/15 | cells [1] 22/20 | 64/12 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { certain [4] } 23 / 14 \text { 23/23 } 47 / 2056 / 15 \\ & \text { certainly [9] } 8 / 22 \quad 29 / 2339 / 1261 / 661 / 21 \\ & 62 / 362 / 2563 / 1064 / 17 \\ & \text { certify [1] } 71 / 9 \\ & \text { cetera [1] } 27 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | ```comes [6] 32/15 38/4 39/1 40/15 41/20 70/15 coming [1] 40/18 comments [1] 37/9 commission [1] 71/13``` |


| C | Davis [4] 22/9 31/2 31/11 34/8 | 65/12 65/24 66/8 66/22 67/3 67/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| committee [5] 27/1 27/5 27/6 29/25 71/11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { day [7] 19/19 31/10 32/24 36/6 59/20 } \\ & 66 / 23 \text { 71/16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { doctor [1] 58/18 } \\ \text { doctor or [1] } 58 / 18 \end{array}$ |
| COMMONWEALTH [1] $1 / 2$ | days [7] 16/1 34/19 35/2 35/2 35/20 36/11 | doctor's [1] 48/14 |
| $\text { communication [2] } 7 / 107 / 16$ | 36/1 | doctors [3] 23/7 24/4 24/16 |
| community [1] 11/1 | deal [5] 5/13 27/11 $62 / 670 / 270 / 14$ <br> Dearinger [1] | does [12] 13/10 14/12 17/10 43/25 50/9 51/7 51/10 51/14 58/14 59/1 69/4 69/22 |
| complete [2] 6/21 17/2 | debacle [1] 69/4 | doesn't [4] 19/13 24/21 57/8 64/18 |
| Compton [11] 2/8 6/11 10/12 | December [1] 30/1 | doing [12] 14/16 24/19 24/20 25/25 32/19 |
| 35/22 37/19 39/19 60/15 67/1 67/13 | decide [5] 23/8 26/15 28/16 56/6 66/2 <br> decided [1] 48/19 | 44/1 52/5 52/6 56/5 57/23 64/5 65/14 |
| computer [1] 9/5 | decision [3] 44/3 65/1 65/10 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \text { dollar [1] } & 50 / 6 \\ \text { don't [59] } & 3 / 7 & 4 / 12 & 5 / 126 / 86 / 15 & 7 / 5 \\ 9 / 6 \end{array}$ |
| concern [2] $36 / 2338 / 5$ concerns [1] $35 / 25$ |  |  |
| concerns [1] 35/25 | deemed [1] 41/8 | 16/22 17/15 18/5 20/8 20/11 23/24 |
| concluded [1] 70/25 | deems [1] 41/14 | 26/11 26/19 27/2 28/19 29/9 29/11 29/16 |
|  | deficient [2] 23/6 24/10 | 29/17 31/22 33/5 33/5 33/6 34/18 35/5 |
| conducive [1] $12 / 23$ | definitely [5] 37/4 49/21 55/3 59/25 68/22 | 38/2 38/20 39/5 39/9 40/22 43/15 45/1 |
| confer [2] 40/3 40/8 | denial [1] 28/8 | 45/3 48/13 49/22 53/21 54/12 55/10 58/3 |
| conference [1] 66/2 | denied [10] 17/21 18/13 20/17 20/21 | 61/8 61/13 62/14 64/5 64/20 65/9 66/1 |
| confirmation [2] 15/9 16/21 | 20/24 21/9 21/10 35/9 41/20 61/19 denies [1] 18/1 | 67/2 67/20 69/5 70/4 done [11] $7 / 25$ 18/15 23/11 24/15 $25 / 9$ |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { connect [2] } & 40 / 10 & 62 / 25\end{array}$ | denies [1] 18/1 deny [1] 18/2 | done [11] $7 / 25$ 18/15 23/11 24/15 $25 / 9$ 26/6 43/15 50/4 50/7 53/24 64/23 |
| consider [3] 33/23 69/9 69/21 construction [1] 65/15 | Department [12] 3/17 10/7 14/21 40/1 | double [3] 15/11 38/5 38/24 |
|  | 44/21 45/7 51/4 51/8 51/11 56/13 64/25 | down [5] 6/1 10/16 21/24 26/13 42/9 |
| $33 / 2233 / 25$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 65 / 8 \\ \text { depending [1] } 68 / 23 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dr [9] } 2 / 62 / 7 \text { 2/8 } 2 / 92 / 1035 / 22 \text { 54/1 } \\ & 54 / 23 \text { 55/5 } \end{aligned}$ |
| contacted [2] 11/15 63/8 | depends [2] 42/4 42/19 | Dr. [18] 3/12 8/25 22/19 26/8 31/2 31/11 |
| contradiction [2] | designed [1] 29/4 | 33/18 34/8 37/19 39/19 40/4 45/10 46/20 |
| convenient [1] 64/17 | detail [2] 38/8 39/15 | 53/19 55/23 60/15 67/1 67/13 |
| conversation [1] 49/25 | determine [5] 10/1 23/2 24/8 51/8 52 | Dr. Burchett [6] 3/12 8/25 22/19 26/8 |
| converted [1] 8/13 | determined [2] | 45/10 55/23 |
| corneal [1] 29/10 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { developed [1] } \\ \text { diagnosed [1] } 26 / 16 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Dr. Compto } \\ 67 / 167 / 13 \end{array}$ |
| correct [7] 19/6 19/7 22/14 22/16 56/7 | diagnostic [2] 23/1 24/8 | Dr. Davis [3] 31/2 31/11 34/8 |
| correctly [2] 38/12 56/11 | did [10] 3 3/3 7/21 11/14 15/1 19/2 21/6 | Dr. Munson [1] 46/20 |
| correspondence [1] 16/23 | 45/7 52/7 55/25 61/24 | Dr. Theriot [1] 53/19 |
| $\text { cost [7] } 46 / 1755 / 855 / 1055 / 1655 / 17$ | didn't [8] 10/5 31/8 35/3 52/12 58/1 58/22 | Dr. Worth [1] 40/4 |
| $55 / 2055 / 21$ | 61/14 70/9 | drop [3] 23/17 30/21 30/23 |
| could [10] 22/10 26/17 45/14 45/17 46/1 | died [1] 9/5 | dry [6] 22/4 23/3 23/6 23/11 24/2 29/11 |
| 50/12 51/12 54/3 58/18 59/13 | difference [4] | dually [1] 18/20 |
| couldn't [1] 10/9 | different [20] 13/7 20/12 20/15 31/5 31/6 | dually [1] 18/20 |
| count [1] 3/2 | $52 / 352 / 1652 / 2152 / 2252 / 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dudinskie [1] 7/20 } \\ & \text { during [2] 44/22 66/16 } \end{aligned}$ |
| country [1] 23/24 | $68 / 20$ |  |
| COUNTY [1] 71/5 | direct | E |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { couple [8] 16/4 26/13 27/1 } 31 / 2036 / 17 \\ & 66 / 4 \text { 67/4 67/8 } \end{aligned}$ | directly [4] 20/2 28/4 31/16 32/4 | e-mail [1] 16/15 |
| course [2] 31/19 56/20 | director [2] 7/22 22/10 | e-mails [1] 44/19 |
|  | disagree [4] 26/9 26/11 62/13 67/20 | each [3] 3/13 56/1 56/14 |
| coverage [1] 54/13 | disconnected [1] 10/15 | earlier [1] 59/8 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { coverage [1] } & 54 / 13 \\ \text { covered [8] } & 17 / 9 \end{array}$ | discriminated [1] 49/15 | easier [5] 16/11 20/4 45/21 67/3 67/22 |
| $38 / 1357 / 957 / 15$ | discriminatory [3] 49/9 49/23 50/14 | edits [2] 42/23 46/11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Covid [1] 54/20 } \end{aligned}$ | discuss [1] 60/13 | effective [1] 64/20 |
| creating [1] 6/19 | discussed [2] 5/11 36/12 | effort [1] 11/21 |
| current [1] 27/20 | discussion [4] 5/14 37/8 63/24 68/2 discussions [1] 28/11 discussions [1] 28/11 | either [3] 24/9 64/21 67/19 |
| ently [4] 10/11 37/21 37/23 39/2 | disease [1] 54/14 | electronically [1] 7/17 |
| tomer [1] <br> [1] 60/24 | dispense [1] 32/14 | eligibility [6] 34/22 36/1 36/2 36/8 36/20 |
| $\text { cycle [1] } 53 / 24$ | dispensing [3] 19/20 32/12 32/1 | 61/17 |
| D | do [71] 3/8 3/9 4/6 7/9 8/9 8/9 8/22 10/23 | else [10] 3/4 12/1 19/21 31/23 38/6 40/1 |
|  | $\begin{array}{lll}11 / 2 & 13 / 11 & 13 / 2518 / 21 ~ 19 / 2 ~ 19 / 20 ~\end{array} 20$ | /12 67/14 68/19 70/7 |
| Dani [2] 38 | 20/5 20/21 21/12 23/2 24/16 24/16 $25 /$ | email [1] 60/5 |
| $\text { Danny [2] } 61 / 861 / 11$ | 25/12 25/21 26/4 26/8 26/9 29/11 29/17 | emergency [1] 55/13 |
| Dashboard [1] 13/10 | 30/11 31/15 33/20 36/2 36/7 38/11 38/1 | empirically [1] 29/12 |
| $\text { data [3] } 6 / 206 / 2155 / 12$ | 39/2 39/6 39/7 41/1 42/25 43/19 43/25 | end [3] 8/9 66/22 68/5 |
| $\text { date [5] } 1 / 1421 / 15 \quad 30 / 436 / 1470 / 4$ | 45/22 45/23 48/1 | enrollment [1] 7/21 |
| dates[4] 63/7 63/8 63/9 64/1 | $\begin{aligned} & 49 / 2252 / 252 / 652 / 1753 / 153 / 553 / 14 \\ & 53 / 1554 / 1554 / 2457 / 1859 / 959 / 1264 / 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { ensure [1] } 6 / 20 \\ \text { entering [1] } 13 / 21 \end{array}$ |


| E | 43/7 43/16 43/17 45/6 45/7 45/12 45/14 | getting [9] 4/14 5/6 7/4 19/19 24/20 32/7 66/3 67/9 68/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| entertain [1] 4/2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 45/18 46/3 47/2 47/8 47/16 47/17 47/25 } \\ & 48 / 949 / 850 / 1150 / 2051 / 751 / 851 / 13 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 53 / 855 / 256 / 756 / 2257 / 1957 / 2158 / 10 \\ & 58 / 2459 / 559 / 2259 / 24 \quad 69 / 169 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { give [7] 22/11 39/20 39/21 63/13 65/11 } \\ & 66 / 467 / 8 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | given [1] 65/22 |
|  |  |  |
| Erin [4] 64/2 65/7 66/19 7 |  |  |  |
|  | 25/12 28/1 28/3 43/11 44/3 44/4 53/11$64 / 16$ 67/1 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 21 / 21 & 31 / 11 & 31 / 17 & 32 / 16 & 37 / 12 & 37 / 15 \\ \text { go [27] } & 3 / 24 & 5 / 15 & 6 / 1 & 12 / 22 & 14 / 7 \\ 16 / 11 \end{array}$ |
| et cetera [1] etiology [1] 219 |  |  |
|  | feels [2] 23/19 68/19 |  |
| 1 | fees [1] $48 / 25$ $31 / 1 ~ 31 / 22 ~ 38 / 10 ~ 44 / 13 ~ 46 / 1 ~ 46 / 10 ~ 51 / 9 ~$ <br> felt [1] $32 / 22$ $51 / 1152 / 8 ~ 58 / 14 ~ 59 / 7 ~ 59 / 15 ~ 62 / 15 ~ 65 / 2 ~$ |  |
| [3] 29/ |  |  |  |
| ever [1] 6/15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { few [9] } 5 / 23 \quad 16 / 1 \quad 16 / 634 / 19 \quad 34 / 23 \quad 36 / 10 \\ & 50 / 950 / 13 \quad 65 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { goes [9] 45/9 46/5 48/6 51/4 51/15 52/2 } \\ & 52 / 1657 / 1969 / 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| every [10] 19 | field [2] 49/3 62/22 | going [44] 4/13 4/16 10/19 10/21 11/9 |
|  | figure [3] 17/4 49/21 5 | 11/10 12/21 12/23 13/6 13/8 13/17 13/22 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1] 2 | finally [1] 60/18 | $\begin{array}{ll} 32 / 23 & 33 / 4 \\ 42 / 13 & 42 / 16 \\ 44 / 15 & 37 / 7 \\ 45 / 13 & 36 / 1 \\ 46 / 16 & 48 / 7 \\ 55 / 8 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |
|  | find [9] 6 6/10 10/5 12/10 12/11 12/22 14/13 | $55 / 1062 / 12 \quad 66 / 1768 / 9$ <br> gone [1] 45/15 |
| Examiners [5] |  |  |
|  | finding [1] | gone [1] 45/15 |
|  | fine [4] 30/6 64/6 66/11 68/18 $7 / 19$ $8 / 24$ $11 / 25$ $12 / 3$ $16 / 8$ $17 / 6$ $30 / 7$ $34 / 4$ <br> finish [1] $12 / 11$ $34 / 7$ $49 / 18$ $53 / 20$ $66 / 13$ $67 / 19$ $68 / 1$ $68 / 14$  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| ex |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 34/7 49/18 53/20 66/13 67/19 68/1 68/14 } \\ 69 / 1270 / 270 / 14 ~ 70 / 22 \end{array}$ |
|  |  | got [19] 5/8 5/23 8/3 16/9 16/25 17/25 |
| [1] | $\begin{array}{\|llll} 14 / 22 & 17 / 20 & 18 / 22 & 21 / 11 \\ 51 / 19 & 53 / 13 & 54 / 22 \\ 56 / 14 \end{array}$ | le/5 21/1 26/8 26/12 30/18 34/22 35/16 63 63/11 |
|  |  |  |
| Except [1] 63/15 | fiscal [3] $53 / 1$ $55 / 7$ $55 / 19$  <br> fixed [5] $20 / 7$ $20 / 18$ $21 / 12$ $31 / 12$ <br> $36 / 21$     | gotten [1] 20/2 |
|  | fixed [5] 20/7 20/18 21/12 31/12 36/21 |  |
|  | flu [1] 54/19 | great [5] 13/2 19/16 26/24 39/17 45/19greatly [1] 55/16 |
| $\text { expires [1] } 71 / 13$ | folks [1] 67/1 |  |
| expires [1] explain [3] $24 / 4$ | follow [3] 25/12 51/1 66follow-up [2] $25 / 1251 / 1$ | grid [1] |
|  |  |  |
| explanations [1] | followed [1] 39/16 | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { groups [2] } & 51 / 10 & 5 / 2 \\ \text { guess [10] } & 3 / 12 & 3 / 14 \\ 7 / 15\end{array}$ |
| ating | following [4] 28/17 28/18 37/21 37/24 forgotten [1] 59/23 | guess [10] 3/12 3/14 7/15 14/8 21/22 3 |
| [4] | form [1] 23/1 |  |
| eye [11] $22 / 42$ | forward [2] 50/15 60/5found [3] 40/22 45/5 5 | eline [2] 22/22 25/2 |
| 28/15 29/11 38/5 38/2 |  | guideline [2] 22 guidelines [3] 2 |
| Eyequest [2] 22/1 22/10 | found [3] 40/22 $45 / 558$ ( ${ }^{\text {frame [1] 15/23 }}$ | $\begin{array}{\|lll} \text { guy [1] } & 61 / 7 \\ \text { guys [3] } & 22 / 15 & 31 / 25 \\ 33 / 3 \end{array}$ |
|  | Frankfort [1] 64/1 |  |
|  | freely [1] 45/21frequently [1] $24 / 2$ | H |
| F |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { face [6] } 64 / 1264 / 1264 / 1964 / 1964 / 2 \\ & 64 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | frontline [1] 31/7 | had [33] 4/1 6/7 7/24 8/1 8/12 8/14 9/5 |
|  | functional [2] 9/9 66/3funds [2] 53/17 53/17 | $\begin{array}{llll} 11 / 15 & 15 / 14 & 16 / 18 & 16 / 24 \\ 28 / 24 & 17 / 25 & 21 / 21 \\ 33 / 20 & 34 / 16 & 37 / 9 & 40 / 9 \\ 42 / 11 \end{array}$ |
| faceted |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { funds [2] } 53 / 1753 / 17 \\ & \text { future [1] } 8 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | 42/12 44/17 45/20 47/15 54/1 54/3 54/24 55/1 58/10 60/22 62/8 62/15 66/1 |
| factors [1] 46/15 | G | $\begin{aligned} & \text { halt [1] } 36 / 18 \\ & \text { hand [1] } 71 / 16 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | ```Gary [2] 2/10 \(3 / 3\) gathered [1] 53/1 general [3] 26/10 37/7 44/7 Generally [1] 6/12 generate [3] 14/5 14/7 14/8 generated [1] \(32 / 5\) germane [1] 25/18 get [50] 4/20 6/10 6/22 7/7 7/7 7/10 8/10 9/11 10/4 11/5 11/11 12/17 15/24 16/4 17/3 26/20 27/12 28/4 29/6 29/7 32/16 33/25 36/20 36/23 40/10 41/20 49/20 50/2 50/12 51/17 52/14 54/19 55/1 56/23 57/10 60/3 60/23 60/24 60/25 61/6 61/22 62/13 62/14 62/16 62/17 62/20 63/11 63/22 64/23 70/10 gets [4] 25/10 29/5 53/8 54/17``` |  |
|  |  | happen [4] 35/15 44/5 59/13 69/4 <br> happened [4] 21/3 58/6 59/14 60/16 <br> happening [3] 18/3 29/20 31/24 <br> hard [2] 33/2 62/13 <br> harder [1] 29/17 <br> has [23] 4/1 8/11 9/17 17/20 19/1 19/11 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| far [8] $17 / 1$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| favor [2] 5/16 |  |  |
| FAYETTE [1] 7 |  |  |
|  |  | 43/20 44/21 47/12 48/21 57/6 58/12 58/16 |
|  |  | 68/11 70/5 70/7 |
|  |  | have [140] |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { haven't [6] } 8 / 18 / 4 \quad 15 / 9 \quad 16 / 11 \quad 21 / 135 / 17 \\ & \text { having [3] } 4 / 1419 / 2232 / 4 \\ & \text { he [6] } 4 / 199 / 127 / 2040 / 440 / 861 / 25 \\ & \text { he's [5] } 4 / 134 / 164 / 2430 / 1861 / 13 \\ & \text { head [1] } 62 / 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| fee [54] 14/23 14/25 15/8 17/3 32/12 32/17 |  |  |
| 40/17 40/23 41/6 41/11 41/13 41/16 4 |  |  |
| 41/21 42/2 42/7 42/10 42/17 42/18 43/4 |  |  |


| H | individually [1] 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| heads [2] 65/12 66/5 <br> health [8] $1 / 3$ 7/4 $11 / 113 / 8$ 53/12 54/5 <br> 54/7 65/25 <br> hear [3] 52/9 61/24 68/16 <br> heard [2] $8 / 552 / 12$ <br> hearing [1] $61 / 12$ <br> HELD [1] 1/11 <br> Hello [2] 3/1 9/4 <br> help [9] 4/13 11/17 14/12 24/24 34/14 <br> 38/7 47/10 60/1 60/20 | individuals [3] 10/4 52/17 55/15 <br> industry [1] 29/20 <br> inflammadry [4] 22/18 27/18 29/8 33/3 <br> inflammation [1] 22/4 <br> inflammatory [5] 22/20 23/4 24/9 26/18 <br> 28/22 <br> information [6] 12/24 19/4 36/5 52/25 $63 / 2365 / 23$ <br> innovative [1] 57/12 <br> ins [1] 7/8 |  |
| helps [1] 24/19 | insurance [5] 19/14 21/7 57/8 57/10 57/15 | L |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { her [8] 12/15 } 12 / 1535 / 362 / 1563 / 363 / \\ 63 / 1363 / 18 \end{array}$ | insurances [1] 58/13 <br> intentionally [1] 50/4 | lab [1] 24/15 |
| here [15] 3/12 4/23 6/1 10/18 14/18 17/16 17/23 39/14 51/12 51/12 51/12 55/23 | interest [1] 26/21 | larger [2] |
| 60/14 63/15 63/17 | invite [1] 70/10 involved [1] $32 / 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { last [11] } 3 / 143 / 254 / 54 / 105 / 75 / 115 / \\ & 19 / 521 / 854 / 1063 / 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| here's [1] 46/19 | iPad [1] 30/21 | late [1] 54/4 |
| $\text { hey [4] } 10 / 3$ | is [182] | later [2] 34/23 70/2 |
| Hi [3] 35/22 37/19 61/1 | is month [1] 34/20 issue [8] 8/15 l | latest [1] 7/6 <br> law [4] 41/22 46/22 |
| hiccup [1] 34/5 | 32/10 36/16 46/13 | laws [1] 47/5 |
| high [1] 50/6 | issues [4] 11/5 38/21 63/12 69/20 | layers [1] 52/2 |
| highlight [1] | it [164] | lead [2] 26/17 66/1 |
| him [3] 4/17 30/18 | It'd [1] 6 | [1] |
| history [1] 11/16 | it's [89] <br> item [10] | 1] $62 / 6$ |
| hold [3] 4/22 12/5 68/18 | $30 / 1537 / 2340 / 1541 / 17$ | least [4] 11/11 24/10 35/1 59/20 |
| $\text { hoops [1] } 39$ hope [1] 4/1 | items [1] 21/25 | leave [1] 13/15 |
|  | itself [1] 13/ | left [3] 57/20 58 |
| hoping [3] 7/25 10/25 11/1 | J | LeMay [1] 7/22 |
| hospital [1] 55/14 <br> how [23] 9/4 12/11 17/8 17/10 24/19 | James [4] 2/9 3/6 4/18 5/6 <br> January [4] 51/3 58/9 66/9 71/17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lens [7] } 14 / 23 \quad 14 / 25 \quad 33 / 21 \quad 33 / 2237 / 17 \\ & 38 / 2238 / 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 45 / 146 / 1647 / 1051 / 751 / 1352 / 2153 / 2 \\ & 61 / 463 / 369 / 769 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | January 1st [1] 58/9 <br> January 21st [1] 51/3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lenses [6] } 18 / 18 \text { 20/9 20/11 } 20 / 1133 / 25 \\ & 38 / 3 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Jennifer [1] 7/20 | less [1] 39 |
| Humana [2] 11/15 11/17 | John [1] 22/9 | let [15] 3/8 4/17 |
| hybrid [1] 67/12 | join [1] 4/23 $\text { joined [1] } 9 / 1$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 30/17 40/9 49/1 } \\ 66 / 970 / 10 \end{array}$ |
| I | joining [1] 4/1 | let's [7] 3/25 4/20 5/23 14/19 21/22 49/24 |
| I'd | JOLINDA [2] 71/7 71/20 | 50/2 |
| I'll [15] 3/8 3/9 4/2 4/22 5/25 30/2 30/24 | $\begin{array}{\|lll} \begin{array}{l} \text { July [1] } \\ \text { jump [3] } \end{array} & 37 / 5 \\ \hline 9 / 22 & 40 / 9 & 60 / 11 \end{array}$ | lets [2] 9/16 6 level [1] 3/18 |
| $50 / 252 / 1360 / 560 / 760 / 1163 / 2264 / 23$ $70 / 17$ | June [1] 34/17 | levels [1] 51/1 |
| I'm [40] $4 / 13$ 6/4 6/8 10/25 12/9 16/19 | just [63] 3/16 4/15 4/18 4/22 5/6 5/25 | library [1] 65/24 |
|  | 8/14 8/19 9/1 9/5 10/1 10/14 10/17 | license [1] 7/18 |
| 27/21 29/14 30/17 32/7 32/12 33/2 33/4 | 12/14 12/21 13/23 14/5 14/22 16/2 16/18 | licensed [1] 49/11 <br> licensure [5] 42/19 48/7 52/18 56/4 57/19 |
| 34/12 35/23 36/19 37/6 38/9 41/10 52/7 | $21 / 25 \quad 22 / 15 \quad 25 / 11 \quad 25 / 12 \quad 26 / 1827 / 16$ | $\text { lifetime [4] } 22 / 622 / 8 \quad 22 / 23 \quad 25 / 7$ |
| 52/11 52/11 57/19 60/17 61/3 61/10 61/11 |  | like[55] 3/15 5/24 8/15 8/19 11/2 12/10 |
| I've [1] 65/22 | 35/24 37/12 37/16 38/11 38/15 39/9 41/12 | 12/11 12/16 15/20 16/6 22/22 24/7 24/13 |
| ID [1] $13 / 23$ | 42/4 44/17 48/4 50/1 57/12 57/15 59/15 | 13 26/1 26/17 27/2 28/1 30/9 32 |
| idea [1] 10/13 | $\begin{aligned} & 59 / 16 \\ & 67 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | $37 / 2038 / 238 / 2138 / 2239 / 2540 / 1640 / 23$ |
| identify [2] $24 / 425 / 8$ | Justin [13] 6/7 6/12 6/23 7/7 8/25 10/13 | 42/15 43/11 44/3 44/4 44/25 47/9 50/18 |
| immediately [5] 36/24 43/12 43/23 44/7 | 12/8 16/16 20/2 44/24 53/19 55/4 55/24 | 51/8 53/11 53/15 53/16 56/5 59/8 59/1 |
|  | K | $70 / 17$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { impactful [3] } 44 / 4 \text { 44/4 53/11 } \\ & \text { impacts [1] 52/21 } \\ & \text { implications [1] 54/7 } \\ & \text { inadvertently [1] } 69 / 7 \\ & \text { increase [3] 55/13 } 55 / 1455 / 15 \\ & \text { incumbent [1] } 28 / 21 \\ & \text { indication [1] } 66 / 19 \end{aligned}$ |  | ```limit [5] 22/8 32/7 32/13 61/21 62/3 limitation [1] 24/22 limitations [3] 46/11 52/21 53/4 limited [1] 3/19 limits [4] 3/17 3/22 22/22 32/11 line [8] 14/3 20/6 20/10 20/12 25/15 34/6 60/25 62/1 lines [1] 14/5``` |


|  | MCO [5] 11/19 17/10 18/5 35/8 36/3 MCOs [4] 11/24 17/23 34/18 58/12 me [33] 4/17 9/5 12/8 12/14 14/7 14/8 14/9 14/17 17/3 27/20 30/12 34/14 34/14 35/11 37/25 40/10 41/4 47/10 48/11 49/20 50/1 52/9 56/1 56/13 59/2 64/4 64/6 64/24 65/11 66/4 67/8 69/12 70/10 mean [11] 10/22 31/25 32/19 44/24 51/5 55/18 56/17 59/1 59/7 64/11 64/14 meaning [3] 23/1 25/10 26/6 means [1] 48/13 meantime [1] 27/24 mediated [1] 23/4 medicaid [30] $1 / 4$ 7/1 $10 / 7$ 13/23 17/7 17/9 17/19 17/22 17/24 18/2 18/8 18/10 18/11 18/12 18/21 18/23 19/12 19/20 20/10 21/9 31/6 34/20 35/8 41/9 47/10 51/20 52/1 52/15 58/11 58/22 <br> Medicaid's [1] 52/4 medical [4] 26/5 34/1 38/25 39/4 medically [7] 37/22 38/1 38/14 38/17 38/18 39/10 40/5 medically-necessary [1] 37/22 Medicare [19] 17/7 17/17 17/19 17/20 17/24 18/1 18/6 18/7 18/11 18/13 18/19 18/21 $18 / 22$ 18/25 19/11 19/11 19/13 19/14 21/11 meet [6] 27/4 65/9 66/10 66/24 67/14 69/14 meeting [24] 3/15 3/16 3/24 4/1 4/5 4/10 5/7 5/17 7/12 8/4 19/5 64/1 65/3 65/6 65/17 66/22 67/23 67/23 68/4 69/9 69/19 70/3 70/25 71/11 <br> meetings [4] $8 / 218 / 2311 / 2011 / 20$ meets [2] 69/15 69/22 member [2] 18/20 36/8 members [8] 5/2 5/18 12/20 27/14 31/7 32/8 46/18 70/21 mentioned [3] 13/15 33/18 62/9 met [1] 67/6 mid [1] 66/9 middle [3] 29/25 34/17 34/21 might [13] 4/11 4/19 9/1 15/16 15/18 16/12 17/14 23/9 30/14 34/12 60/13 68/11 69/21 <br> mildly [1] 26/10 <br> mind [3] $16 / 22$ 27/2 56/12 <br> mine [2] $15 / 415 / 10$ <br> minus [1] 37/17 <br> minute [3] 30/23 31/22 52/8 <br> minutes [7] 3/25 4/5 4/9 5/7 5/16 5/22 22/16 <br> miscommunication [1] 33/19 <br> misheard [1] 55/25 <br> misinformed [1] 61/13 <br> misinterpretation [1] 33/23 <br> miss [1] 3/3 <br> missed [3] 9/18 13/9 63/5 <br> mistake [1] 57/21 <br> mistaken [3] 34/12 41/1060/17 <br> mistakes [1] 59/12 <br> MMIS [1] 9/11 <br> mode [1] 23/8 <br> Monday [3] 63/16 63/17 63/19 <br> money [7] 35/6 35/16 46/7 46/13 53/3 53/13 55/1 <br> monitor [3] 24/19 24/24 28/3 <br> monitoring [2] 24/13 24/23 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| link [2] 4/17 67/16 |  |  |
| list [7] 6/1 |  | months [6] 25/11 27/1 29/6 34/23 35/1 |
|  |  |  |
| literature [5] 25/24 26/2 26/2 27/14 27/17 |  |  |
| little [12] 9/16 |  |  |
| 24/11 49/19 50/1 59/16 65/16 67/2 67/2 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | most [7] 3/12 10/17 16/7 19/18 23/11 |
| [1] |  |  |
| [1] |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| logging [2] |  | much [14] 10/16 14/15 21/17 24/3 24/24 |
| long[5] 31/14 43/21 5 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| look [27] 5/24 9/21 13/6 15/25 19/18 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 50/15 51/25 52/4 52/5 52/7 |  | [2] |
| 52/20 56/3 56/4 57/2 57/11 59/7 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | 31/3 32/16 33 |
| looking [9] |  | 49/12 51/1 55/24 |
|  |  |  |
| lose [1] 69/5 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| lost [1] |  |  |
| lot [12] $39 / 204$ |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |
| lower [1] |  |  |
| LRC [1] |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| [3] 4/11 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| m |  |  |
| Mainly [1] |  |  |
| majority [3] |  |  |
| make [30 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 46/17 47/23 48/5 54/17 56/10 56/21 59/8 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 67/15 69/10 70 |  |  |
| m |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| managed [1] |  |  |
| management [5] 16/3 $23 / 1$ $53 / 7$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| many [7] $2 / 1543 / 3$ 43/1 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| $\text { may [11] } 6 / 21$ |  |  |
| $30 / 2234 / 1466 / 19$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |



|  | ```recoupment [1] 36/19 regard [2] 36/1 36/6 Registered [1] 71/7 regular [1] 41/12 regulations [1] 37/20 reimbursed [1] 26/20 reimbursement [1] 49/14 reinstated [1] 36/9 relates [1] 59/22 relations [2] 62/8 63/1 release [1] 14/23 relief [1] 23/16 relook [1] 27/21 rely [1] 57/24 remediated [1] 36/24 remedied [1] 31/5 remedy [1] 12/4 remember [4] 10/9 15/20 30/4 60/23 remove [1] 14/4 removed [2] 31/14 32/25 rep [3] 35/10 35/13 62/8 repay [1] 20/25 repeat [2] 12/8 12/10 replace [1] 54/11 replacement [2] 31/11 31/18 replacements [2] 32/8 32/20 reply [1] 62/19 report [13] 6/3 6/9 7/3 9/8 9/9 9/14 9/15 12/9 12/12 12/18 13/24 33/7 55/19 Reporter [1] 71/8 reports [1] 9/13 representative [2] 30/11 60/19 reput [1] 46/10 request [3] 39/3 45/25 60/5 requested [4] 42/11 45/4 57/1 57/2 requests [2] 57/11 59/20 require [2] 18/5 32/20 rescinded [1] 60/22 research [6] 41/1 42/16 43/1 49/19 52/3 52/17 researched [1] 51/25 researching [1] 43/23 resend [2] 16/22 70/11 resolution [4] 24/25 68/24 69/8 69/13 resolved [1] 31/20 respirators [1] 55/15 respond [2] \(11 / 3\) 11/4 response [3] 5/20 50/16 62/14 responses [2] 15/17 16/17 Restasis [1] 28/15 restricted [1] 58/19 resubmit [1] 20/21 results [1] 30/2 retest [2] 26/15 26/22 retro [1] 36/19 retrospective [1] 36/13 retrospectively [1] 36/13 return [1] 66/17 review [9] 15/14 26/25 27/5 27/5 28/4 29/24 39/3 51/17 56/3 reviewed [3] 25/22 26/2 27/17 reviewing [1] 43/21 rewrite [1] 46/10 right [26] 7/2 8/17 10/23 11/17 21/4 21/17 23/9 25/4 26/23 26/24 26/25 27/19 29/2 30/24 33/9 34/3 46/7 48/10 50/17 53/25 54/23 56/24 65/8 65/10 67/25 70/4 road [1] 26/13``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| reaching [ read [1] 4 ready [2] real [5] 4/23 realize [1] realized [1] really [8] $55 / 667 / 7$ reason [6] $57 / 16$ reasonable reasons [6 $13 / 19$ |  |  |



| T |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```things... [5] 56/2 56/5 59/12 67/22 68/17 think [74] this [97]``` |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{U}$ | want [18] $10 / 25$ 14/2 $14 / 2$ 16/21 17/14 |
|  | unanswered [1] 10/2 <br> under [6] 9/12 38/13 41/8 57/10 57/15 |  |
| 0/1 |  | wanted [4] 9/7 12/14 35/24 66/10 |
|  | underlying [1] 23/3 <br> understand [12] $11 / 9$ 14/12 22/5 32/18 | wanted [4] 9/7 12/14 35/24 66/10 |
| 33/2 33/6 36/10 39/2 40/25 42/17 42/22 |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 34 / 2 \text { 34/18 45/1 47/10 48/11 48/23 59/1 } \\ & 62 / 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 52/20 53/4 54/8 54/17 54/20 54/22 55/1 |  |  |
| 6 | understanding [2] 7/1 31/4 <br> understood [2] 17/18 56/10 |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | understood [2] 17/18 56/10 <br> undetermined [1] 10/1 | 37/7 37/12 40/8 41/17 44/15 45/5 45/18 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} 45 / 1258 / 5 \\ \text { thought [4] } 42 / 1145 / 2460 / 2167 / 18 \\ \text { three [3] 3/2 60/20 60/24 } \\ \text { through [12] } 10 / 7 \quad 12 / 1639 / 1439 / 2246 / 6 \end{array}$ | unfortunate [1] 46/2 $47 / 8$ 51/2 54/5 54/25 55/12 56/7 58/8 <br> unit [3] 20/14 20/15 20/17 $58 / 17$ 58/23 60/21 61/8 61/10 61/18 66/15 |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | unknown [1] 13/18 | wasn't [2] |
| $\begin{aligned} & 48 / 648 / 751 / 551 / 1157 / 357 / 560 / 18 \\ & \text { throw [3] } 17 / 1537 / 667 / 18 \end{aligned}$ |  | waste [1] 26/1 |
|  | unreasonable [2] 29/14 29/23 wasteful [1] $25 / 13$ <br> unresolved [1] 63/12 water [1] 66/1 |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 60/21 61/5 62/10 64/18 65/4 65/16 66/8 66/14 69/19 | up [28] 3/16 9/20 10/6 10/10 10/14 10/14 | 25/6 27/12 32/18 34/2 48/1 49/8 51/4 |
|  | 10/17 10/18 12/19 16/2 25/12 27/6 30/14 | 19 51/22 |
|  | 33/6 33/8 39/16 41/3 42/3 42/21 42/23 <br> 43/5 50/18 51/1 65/12 65/19 66/5 67/7 70/15 |  |
|  |  | 16 |
|  |  |  |
|  | Upchurch [1] 2/10 <br> update [11] 7/16 7/24 8/20 9/2 12/3 35/2 | we'd [2] |
| timing [1] $10 / 16$ tint [1] 38/23 |  | 6/9 |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|ll} 35 / 20 & 40 / 11 \\ \text { updated [3] } & 43 / 4 \\ 34 / 19 & 43 / 7 \\ \text { un } \end{array}$ | 69/13 70/1 |
| today [3] 21/7 32/1TODD [2] 71/7 | updates [5] 7/18 36/4 51/20 51/21 55/2 upon [1] 28/21 | we're [20] |
|  |  | 11/10 14/24 19/19 27/1 27/20 28/17 3 |
| TODD [2] 71/7 71/20 | upon [1] 28/21 <br> upside [1] 11/13 | 23 41/7 43/5 43/21 51/5 64/8 68/14 |
| tomorrow [4] 32/15 32/17 63/13 64/6tons [1] 18/15 | $\text { us [24] } 3 / 123 / 2312 / 16 \text { 20/19 20/24 } 21 / 2$ | we've [12] 6/15 17/24 17/25 20/16 20/20 |
|  | 23/21 25/17 28/21 32/4 34/25 41/14 41/22 |  |
| tons [1] $18 / 15$too [11] $17 / 1323 / 1023 / 2025 / 432 / 20$$33 / 334 / 1239 / 2458 / 165 / 1468 / 15$ | 43/22 45/22 46/7 51/21 55/19 57/25 60/1 | website [4] |
|  | 60/19 63/8 65/20 70/5 | weeds [1] 17/16 |
| 33/3 34/12 39/24 58/1 65/14 68/15 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { use }\left[\begin{array}{llll} 10] & 12 / 4 & 20 / 14 ~ 29 / 1040 / 2141 / 25 \\ 42 / 1 & 56 / 16 & 61 / 8 & 65 / 2065 / 21 \end{array}\right. \\ \hline \end{array}$ | week [3] 21/8 31/3 |
| topic [1] 37/8 |  | weeks [2] 16/4 16/ |
| touch [1] 63/1 | $\text { used [1] } 23 / 21$ | weeks'[3] 65/12 66/4 67 |
|  |  | ome [3] 3/14 14/17 |
|  | V |  |
|  |  |  |
| Traditionally [1] 18/1 |  |  |
| Traditionally [1] 18/ | vaccines [5] 54/4 54/8 54/13 54/24 55/11 | $70 / 2$ |
|  | valid [1] 49/17 | were [14] $2 / 153 / 43 / 173 / 196 / 187 / 37 / 25$ |
|  | value [1] 49/23 | 5/6 31/9 32/3 36/9 48/24 48/25 6 |
|  | various [1] 3/21 | weren't [1] |
|  |  | what [57] 5/10 8/9 9/25 11/8 13/16 15/ |
| [5] 23/13 23/14 28/16 29/11 29/1 | verify [1] $21 / 15$ <br> versus [6] 23/5 31/16 32/4 33/21 46/17 | 15/22 16/20 21/2 23/5 24/14 25/7 26/1 |
|  | versus [6] $55 / 21$ 23/5 31/16 32/4 33/21 46/17 | 26/25 28/3 29/4 31/8 31/23 32/1 32/2 |
|  | very [6] 25/13 46/9 53/15 53/16 59/6 | 6/6 |
|  |  | 42/24 44/1 44/24 45/2 45/3 45/9 48/10 |
|  | vet [1] 47 | 52 |
|  | VIA [1] 1/11 | 61/12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{try}[7] \\ & 59 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | vision [25] 14/20 18/5 18/17 38/5 40/17 | /3 61/10 61/1 |
|  |  | 68/8 69/17 |
| trying [6] 6/4 8/8 9/23 9/25 10/2 56/13 <br> tuned [1] 25/20 | 40/23 41/6 41/11 41/19 41/21 42/2 42/10 | what's [5] 18/3 19/24 29/20 46/21 58/6 whatever [5] 23/18 25/1 28/15 32/21 57/16 <br> when [27] 3/4 8/3 10/9 13/5 13/7 13/21 14/22 21/12 27/25 31/17 37/11 39/11 40/5 41/19 43/22 45/3 47/8 50/21 51/19 52/14 54/18 56/23 57/1 57/24 58/9 58/12 58/22 whenever [1] 51/17 <br> where [13] 6/23 12/9 14/13 25/5 29/19 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 42 / 1743 / 243 / 443 / 1745 / 745 / 1245 / 14 \\ & 47 / 1747 / 2548 / 958 / 1060 / 269 / 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| [2] | $4 / / 1 / 4 / / \angle J 48 / 958 / 1000 / \angle 09 / 3$ |  |
| [13] 3/19 17 | visual [1] 49/3 |  |
| 13] 3/19 17 |  |  |
| e [6] 13/12 13/13 14/1 42/20 45/16 | W |  |
|  | wait [1] 31/22 |  |


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```where... [8] 32/3 38/25 43/12 49/12 57/6 57/20 59/10 59/13 WHEREOF [1] 71/15 whether [4] \(10 / 8\) 24/8 \(42 / 653 / 6\) which [13] 9/24 23/6 23/8 24/17 24/17 30/3 32/23 37/20 41/3 44/25 46/22 47/2 62/22 while [2] 60/23 62/20 who [6] 11/3 11/4 24/16 40/7 52/19 52/19 who's [1] 27/14 whole [2] 9/16 46/6 why [15] 6/16 6/21 10/5 10/13 11/5 18/12 22/7 22/7 24/5 31/22 32/23 34/6 45/11 61/24 62/22 will [34] \(6 / 22\) 8/5 11/3 14/10 \(15 / 1115 / 19\) 23/20 25/17 29/23 30/20 36/23 39/20 40/3 40/4 41/1 42/8 54/10 54/11 55/7 61/2 61/5 61/21 62/3 62/24 63/10 63/13 63/16 63/18 67/15 68/3 68/6 69/14 70/3 70/8 will make [1] \(8 / 5\) willing [1] 26/3 within [11] \(15 / 25\) 21/8 36/5 36/10 46/25 48/16 48/18 49/2 49/4 49/6 69/2 woman [1] \(24 / 2\) won't [1] 63/15 wondering [1] \(18 / 8\) word [1] \(6 / 2\) work [10] 17/11 18/15 32/19 32/20 33/2 35/3 43/21 51/14 64/7 67/9 workers [1] 11/1 working [6] 6/12 7/3 7/23 14/24 28/23 62/9 world [1] 54/9 worried [1] 31/21 worth [3] 40/4 53/12 54/25 would [40] \(11 / 25\) 14/5 15/23 16/10 \(18 / 24\) 19/14 20/3 27/2 28/9 33/8 36/13 37/17 37/22 38/3 38/22 39/7 39/8 39/15 39/17 \(40 / 1640 / 2344 / 22\) 45/21 47/15 50/14 53/12 53/20 54/18 57/6 58/11 58/14 65/3 65/4 65/5 65/16 65/18 66/11 67/7 68/22 69/15 wouldn't [5] 18/9 45/22 45/24 59/5 61/9 Writing [1] 39/25 wrong [1] \(22 / 2\)``` |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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