U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

+ + + + +

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HERITABLE DISORDERS IN NEWBORNS AND CHILDREN

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY, MAY 9, 2016

+ + + + +

The Committee met in the Conference Room at NIH Events Management, 5635 Fishers Lane, Suite T500, Rockville, Maryland, at 9:31 a.m., Joseph A. Bocchini, Jr., Chair, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

JOSEPH A. BOCCHINI, JR., Chairperson JEFFREY BOTKIN CARLA CUTHBERT KELLIE B. KELM FRED LOREY\* MICHAEL LU DIETRICH MATERN STEPHEN McDONOUGH KAMILA B. MISTRY JOAN SCOTT CATHERINE Y. SPONG ALEXIS THOMPSON\* CATHERINE A. L. WICKLUND DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL:

DEBI SARKAR, Health Resources and Services Administration

ORGANIZATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT:

JOSEPH R. BIGGIO, JR., M.D., American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists\* NATASHA F. BONHOMME, Genetic Alliance CHRISTOPHER KUS, Association of State & Territorial Health Officials\* CAROL GREENE, Society for Inherited Metabolic Disorders ADAM KANIS, Department of Defense\* EDWARD R. B. McCABE, March of Dimes\* ROBERT OSTRANDER, American Academy of Family Physicians SUSAN M. TANKSLEY, Association of Public Health Laboratories\* BETH TARINI, American Academy of Pediatrics KATE TULLIS, Family Health and Systems Management Delaware Division of Health CATE VOCKLEY, National Society of Genetic Counselors MICHAEL S. WATSON, American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics

ALSO PRESENT:

CHRISTINE BROWN KATHRYN CAMP NANCY GREEN ALEX KEMPER MELISSA KLOR LAURA MARTIN JANA MONACO SPENCER PERLMAN MICHELE PURYEAR SCOTT SHONE RANI SINGH DEAN SUHR\* KIM TUMINELLO TIINA URV HEIDI WALLACE

\* via telephone

## A-G-E-N-D-A

				]	Page
Welcome, Opening Remarks, Committee Correspondence	•	•	•	•	. 5
Medical Foods for Inborn Errors of Metabolism: Issues in Patient Access .	•	•	•	•	.20
Pilot Study Workgroup - Report	•	•	•	•	.99
Public Comment	•	•	•	•	144
Guanidinoacetate methyltransferase deficiency (GAMT) - Update from the Nomination and Prioritization Workgroup	•	•	•	•	180
Vote on whether or not to move GAMT forward to the Condition Review Team	•	•	•	•	254

,	
1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	9:31 a.m.
3	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Good morning,
4	everyone, and welcome to the May 2016 meeting of
5	the Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in
6	Newborns and Children.
7	Before we get started I'd like to
8	introduce a new AMCHP representative, Dr. Kate
9	Tullis. Dr. Tullis is currently the Title 5
10	Children and Youth with Special Health Care Needs
11	director in the State of Delaware.
12	She has a background in genetics and
13	with the state newborn screening program. So,
14	Dr. Tullis, welcome to serve as a representative.
15	First I need to now do a roll call of
16	the committee, members and organizational
17	representatives. So, we'll start with Don
18	Bailey.
19	MEMBER BAILEY: Here.
20	CHAIR BOCCHINI: I'm here. Jeff
21	Botkin.
22	MEMBER BOTKIN: Here.

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

CHAIR BOCCHINI: Coleen Boyle. 1 2 MEMBER BOYLE: Here. CHAIR BOCCHINI: Catherine Spong. 3 MEMBER SPONG: Here. 4 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Kellie Kelm. 5 MEMBER KELM: Here. 6 7 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Fred Lorey should be on the phone. 8 9 MEMBER LOREY: Yes, here. 10 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Thank you. Dieter 11 Matern. MEMBER MATERN: 12 Here. 13 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Steve McDonough. MEMBER MCDONOUGH: 14 Here. 15 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Representing AHRQ, 16 Kamila Mistry has not yet arrived. Michael Lu representing HRSA. 17 18 MEMBER LU: Here. 19 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Alexis Thompson by 20 phone. MEMBER THOMPSON: 21 Here. 22 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Thank you, Alexis.

Cathy Wicklund has not yet arrived. And our DFO 1 2 Debi Sarkar. MS. SARKAR: 3 Here. CHAIR BOCCHINI: Now for the 4 organizational representatives, representing the 5 American Academy of Family Physicians, Robert 6 7 Ostrander. MR. OSTRANDER: Here. 8 9 CHAIR BOCCHINI: American Academy of Pediatrics, Beth Tarini. 10 11 MS. TARINI: Here. 12 CHAIR BOCCHINI: American College of 13 Medical Genetics, Michael Watson. MR. WATSON: 14 Here. 15 CHAIR BOCCHINI: American College of 16 Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Joseph Biggio by 17 phone. 18 And then Association of Maternal and 19 Child Health Programs, Kate Tullis. 20 MS. TULLIS: Here. CHAIR BOCCHINI: Association of Public 21 22 Health Laboratories, Susan Tanksley by phone.

And the Association of State and 1 2 Territorial Health Officials, Chris Kus by phone. MR. KUS: Here. And can I make a 3 comment that I'm not able to get on the visual 4 It just keeps spinning, so there's some 5 webinar. technical difficulty. 6 7 CHAIR BOCCHINI: All right, thank you for making us aware of that. We'll look into it. 8 9 MR. KUS: Thanks. 10 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Department of 11 Defense, Adam Kanis by phone. 12 MR. KANIS: Here. 13 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Genetic Alliance, Natasha Bonhomme. 14 15 MS. BONHOMME: Here. 16 CHAIR BOCCHINI: March of Dimes, Ed McCabe by phone. 17 18 National Society of Genetic 19 Counselors, Cate Walsh Vockley. 20 MS. VOCKLEY: Here. CHAIR BOCCHINI: And the Society of 21 22 Inherited Metabolic Disorders, Carol Greene.

.	
1	MS. GREENE: Here.
2	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Thank you all for
3	being here and being a part of the meeting.
4	As you're aware, shortly after our
5	last meeting we received the correspondence from
6	the Secretary that she approved both our
7	recommendation for MPS I and X-ALD, but she did
8	not accept the proposals we made for funding
9	recommendations.
10	So now the RUSP has been expanded to
11	34 conditions based on her acceptance of our
12	recommendations.
13	Even though she didn't accept the
14	funding recommendations, she did encourage in her
15	response federal agencies to continue to provide
16	technical assistance and support states with
17	existing resources.
18	So, as a result HRSA has developed a
19	funding opportunity, and I'm going to turn this
20	to Debi to make you all aware of what HRSA is
21	doing.
22	MS. SARKAR: Thanks, Dr. Bocchini.

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

1	So, HRSA issued a funding opportunity
2	announcement called the Newborn Screening
3	Implementation Program regarding conditions added
4	to the Recommended Uniform Screening Panel.
5	The purpose of the program is to
6	support states in increasing the number of
7	newborns that are screened, identified and
8	referred for treatment for three conditions -
9	Pompe disease, MPS I and X-linked ALD.
10	The funding amount is for \$2 million
11	per year and it's a two-year project period. And
12	due date for applications is May 27, 2016.
13	If you have any questions about it you
14	can let me know after the meeting. Thanks.
15	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Thank you, Debi. I
16	want to make everybody aware that nominations are
17	open for the 2017 openings that will become
18	available on the committee.
19	They are currently due within a short
20	time, May 16.
21	We want to make everybody aware that
22	this year there's a turnover of two members of
-	

the committee. And in addition we are replacing 1 2 two additional members who needed to leave the committee because they took different positions 3 within the government. 4 The process is underway to complete 5 the applications and acceptance of those four 6 7 individuals, and we hope to have that information available shortly so that they can join the 8 9 committee at our next meeting. 10 On the other hand, we now need 11 additional people to fill the openings for 2017. So, I'd like to remind everybody to be thinking 12 13 about individuals, those of you organizational representatives to think about individuals who 14 15 might be interested and qualified to be members 16 of the committee so that we could have again another robust group of potential nominees to 17 18 consider. 19 So, here on the slide shows the 20 individuals that we need, the background skills that individuals must have to be considered for 21 22 the committee. And so we look forward to having

a large number of nominees from which to pick. 1 2 We now need to have a vote on acceptance of the minutes of the February 3 meeting. Are there any additions or corrections 4 to be made to the minutes that were distributed 5 with the agenda book? Steve. 6 7 MEMBER MCDONOUGH: This is McDonough. I'm not with Sanford Health anymore. I'm 8 9 retired. So that needs to be changed. CHAIR BOCCHINI: Okay, we'll make that 10 correction. 11 Hearing no others we will now vote to 12 13 approve the February 2016 minutes with the one adjustment. Don Bailey? 14 15 MEMBER BAILEY: Approve. 16 CHAIR BOCCHINI: I approve. Jeff Botkin? 17 18 MEMBER BOTKIN: Approve. 19 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Coleen Boyle. 20 Catherine Spong. Kellie Kelm. 21 MEMBER KELM: Approve. 22 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Fred Lorey.

MEMBER LOREY: Approve. 1 2 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Dieter Matern. 3 MEMBER MATERN: Approve. CHAIR BOCCHINI: Steve McDonough. 4 5 MEMBER MCDONOUGH: Approve. CHAIR BOCCHINI: And then Michael Lu. 6 7 MEMBER LU: Approve. CHAIR BOCCHINI: And Alexis Thompson. 8 9 MEMBER THOMPSON: Approve. 10 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Okay, the minutes are 11 approved from the prior meeting. So, this slide shows the priorities 12 13 that the committee set that are underway with 14 three workgroups. 15 The Pilot Study Workgroup will present 16 its report and recommendations today. The Cost Analysis Workgroup continues efforts and we'll 17 18 receive an update from them today. And the 19 Timeliness Workgroup which is a permanent 20 workgroup will provide us with an update as well today. Well, during this meeting. 21 22 Now, I want to make everybody aware

1	that the standing subcommittees will now be
2	termed "workgroups." And so we're just changing
3	the name, we're not changing the responsibilities
4	of each of those subcommittees.
5	We're changing the name to workgroups
6	because this aligns appropriately with the
7	requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee
8	Act, the FACA Act.
9	And by terming them workgroups they
10	allow them to continue their efforts in the way
11	that they are. And so we will now just change
12	the names, but again not change their
13	responsibilities.
14	They will meet this afternoon as
15	scheduled.
16	Just to remind you, the Education and
17	Training Workgroups have prioritized with the
18	approval of the full advisory committee creating
19	a companion piece to the ACT sheets that will
20	provided PCPs with guidance and tips for
21	discussing positive newborn screening results
22	with parents, and do an educational outreach

project in collaboration with Newborn Screening
 Clearinghouse Babies First test.

Follow-up and Treatment Workgroup is looking at promoting the role of clinical quality measures to promote long-term follow-up and examine state infrastructure for long-term follow-up.

The Laboratory Standards and 8 9 Procedures Workgroup is looking at defining and implementing a mechanism for periodic review, an 10 assessment of lab procedures utilized for 11 effective and efficient testing of the conditions 12 13 included in the uniform panel, and defining and implementing a mechanism for periodic review and 14 15 assessment of infrastructure and services needed 16 for effective and efficient screening of the conditions included on the newborn screening 17 18 uniform panel.

19 And just as a reminder our next two 20 meetings, August 25 and 26, will be an in-person 21 meeting and webcast. And then November 3 and 4 22 will be webinar.

(202) 234-4433

1	So, during this meeting we will have
2	a presentation on medical foods impact on patient
3	access. That's to help continue our discussion
4	on long-term follow-up in newborn screening.
5	We had a condition nominated, GAMT,
6	for evaluation for inclusion on the RUSP. You
7	will hear an update from the Nomination and
8	Prioritization Workgroup on review of the packet
9	of information that was presented to us, and
10	discussion by the committee and a vote as to
11	whether the condition is ready to be moved
12	forward for evidence review.
13	We'll have discussion on prenatal
14	education about newborn screening and dried blood
15	spots, and then following this afternoon's
16	discussions the workgroups will provide updates
17	tomorrow on their activities.
18	So, I'm going to turn this over again
19	to Debi to discuss ethics and conflicts of
20	interest.
21	MS. SARKAR: Good morning, everyone.
22	Thank you for joining us today. As usual I have

my standard reminders for the committee members. 1 2 First, the committee is advisory to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. 3 Anyone associated with the committee or due to 4 your membership on the committee if you receive 5 inquiries about the committee or the committee's 6 7 work please let Dr. Bocchini or I know prior to committing to an interview. 8 9 I must also remind committee members 10 that you must recuse yourself from participation in all particular matters likely to affect the 11 financial interests of any organization with 12

which you serve as an officer, director, trustee, or general partner unless you are also an employee of the organization, or unless you have received a waiver from HHS authorizing you to participate.

18 And all of you have been doing this.
19 I appreciate you letting me know prior to a vote
20 if you think that there is a conflict.
21 So, the advisory committee's
22 legislative authority is found in the Newborn

Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 1 2 2014. This legislation established the 3 committee and provides the duties and scope of 4 work for the committee. 5 However, all committee activities are 6 7 governed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act, otherwise known as FACA which sets the standards 8 9 for the establishment, utilization and management of all federal advisory committees. 10 So, according to FACA all of our 11 committee meetings are open to the public. 12 If 13 the public wish to participate in the discussion, the procedures for doing so are published in the 14 15 Federal Register notice and we announce them at 16 the opening of the meeting. For this May meeting we put in the 17 18 FRN, the Federal Register notice, that we would 19 have a public comment period for today for 30 20 minutes. Only with advance approval of the 21 22 chair or DFO public participants may question

committee members or other presenters. 1 2 Public participants may submit written statements. And you'll find we have quite a few 3 They were all included in the public comments. 4 briefing book. 5 The written statements are part of the 6 7 public record and any further public participation will be solely at the discretion of 8 9 the chair or DFO. 10 And as always please remember to state 11 your name and your organization first to ensure proper recording of our transcript and meeting 12 13 minutes. Thank you, Debi. 14 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Now 15 we're ready to begin the meeting with the first 16 presentation on Medical Foods for Inborn Errors of Metabolism: Issues in Patient Access. 17 18 For that, I'm very pleased to 19 introduce Kathryn Camp. Kathryn Camp joined the 20 staff of the Office of Dietary Supplements in September of 2010. 21 22 After 25 years in clinical practice

caring for children with genetic and metabolic conditions she's working with ODS in the Office of Rare Diseases Research in the development of an evidence-based framework for nutrition interventions currently used to treat these rare disorders.

Prior to coming to ODS Ms. Camp
provided staff support to the Secretary's
Advisory Committee on Genetics Health and Society
as a senior policy analyst in the Office of
Biotechnology Activities at NIH.

12 She spent 13 years at Walter Reed Army 13 Medical Center in the Department of Pediatrics 14 providing clinical care to patients and continues 15 to work with pediatric residents and fellows as a 16 Red Cross volunteer.

So, Kathryn, it's good to have you here. We look forward to your presentation. MS. CAMP: Thank you very much. And I do want to thank the organizers, particularly Joe, and Debi, and Joan for inviting me to

22 present today to you.

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

1

2

3

4

5

1And I'd also like to thank, on behalf2of patients and clinical providers, the continued3interest that the committee is taking in this4very vexing issue.5I'm going to hopefully get through6quite a lot of material in the time that I have7so that there will be time for discussion.8So medical foods. Many of you know9this, and if I go over information and data and10such that you're already aware of just consider11it to be a little bit of a reminder. There may12be people listening who don't have all of the13background that many of you have.14They are the only recognized therapy	
<ul> <li>interest that the committee is taking in this</li> <li>very vexing issue.</li> <li>I'm going to hopefully get through</li> <li>quite a lot of material in the time that I have</li> <li>so that there will be time for discussion.</li> <li>So medical foods. Many of you know</li> <li>this, and if I go over information and data and</li> <li>such that you're already aware of just consider</li> <li>it to be a little bit of a reminder. There may</li> <li>be people listening who don't have all of the</li> <li>background that many of you have.</li> <li>They are the only recognized therapy</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>4 very vexing issue.</li> <li>5 I'm going to hopefully get through</li> <li>6 quite a lot of material in the time that I have</li> <li>7 so that there will be time for discussion.</li> <li>8 So medical foods. Many of you know</li> <li>9 this, and if I go over information and data and</li> <li>10 such that you're already aware of just consider</li> <li>11 it to be a little bit of a reminder. There may</li> <li>12 be people listening who don't have all of the</li> <li>13 background that many of you have.</li> <li>14 They are the only recognized therapy</li> </ul>	
5I'm going to hopefully get through6quite a lot of material in the time that I have7so that there will be time for discussion.8So medical foods. Many of you know9this, and if I go over information and data and10such that you're already aware of just consider11it to be a little bit of a reminder. There may12be people listening who don't have all of the13background that many of you have.14They are the only recognized therapy	
6 quite a lot of material in the time that I have 7 so that there will be time for discussion. 8 So medical foods. Many of you know 9 this, and if I go over information and data and 10 such that you're already aware of just consider 11 it to be a little bit of a reminder. There may 12 be people listening who don't have all of the 13 background that many of you have. 14 They are the only recognized therapy	
<ul> <li>7 so that there will be time for discussion.</li> <li>8 So medical foods. Many of you know</li> <li>9 this, and if I go over information and data and</li> <li>10 such that you're already aware of just consider</li> <li>11 it to be a little bit of a reminder. There may</li> <li>12 be people listening who don't have all of the</li> <li>13 background that many of you have.</li> <li>14 They are the only recognized therapy</li> </ul>	
8 So medical foods. Many of you know 9 this, and if I go over information and data and 10 such that you're already aware of just consider 11 it to be a little bit of a reminder. There may 12 be people listening who don't have all of the 13 background that many of you have. 14 They are the only recognized therapy	
9 this, and if I go over information and data and 10 such that you're already aware of just consider 11 it to be a little bit of a reminder. There may 12 be people listening who don't have all of the 13 background that many of you have. 14 They are the only recognized therapy	
10 such that you're already aware of just consider 11 it to be a little bit of a reminder. There may 12 be people listening who don't have all of the 13 background that many of you have. 14 They are the only recognized therapy	
11 it to be a little bit of a reminder. There may 12 be people listening who don't have all of the 13 background that many of you have. 14 They are the only recognized therapy	
12 be people listening who don't have all of the 13 background that many of you have. 14 They are the only recognized therapy	
13 background that many of you have. 14 They are the only recognized therapy	
14They are the only recognized therapy	
15 for many IEM identified on newborn screen and	
16 clinically. We can't forget those who are	
17 clinically diagnosed.	
18 They do reduce morbidity and	
19 mortality. There's been a half a century history	
20 of use. So we always wonder then why aren't they	
21 accessible to all patients of all ages.	
22 What I'm going to talk to you today	

about, I'll give you a little bit of background 2 on the history of medical food statutes in the United States. 3

I think it's important to know where 4 things started in order to understand how we can 5 Why and how they're used, what a move forward. 6 7 medical food is and what it's not. There are a lot of products on the market that want to call 8 9 themselves medical foods and they frankly don't 10 meet the statutory definition.

I'll talk a little bit about barriers 11 to access and reimbursement, some of the previous 12 13 activities that have been undertaken to rectify the problem. And I'll provide a few thoughts on 14 15 a plan moving forward but ultimately the plan 16 moving forward has to come from the community. And I do consult to the federal 17 18 government so frankly I have no disclosures. History of medical food statutes. 19 So, 20 back in 1958 which was when the first medical food came on the market. It was Lofenalac and it 21

was manufactured by Mead Johnson it was

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

22

considered a drug. And up to 1972 this was the 1 2 case when they were then put into the category of foods for special dietary use. Taken out of the 3 drug category and put into a food category. 4 That was because their usefulness was 5 widely accepted. They were limited in number at 6 7 There were probably only two this point. products on the market and they were specifically 8 9 for phenylketonuria. It was considered that if they went 10 11 into this category they would be less costly to They wouldn't have to go through the 12 develop. 13 rigorous evaluation that would be required if they were continued to be used as a drug. 14 15 In 1973 they were taken out of foods 16 for special dietary use and put into their own category of medical foods. But this actually had 17 18 unintended and unforeseen consequences because medical foods at this point lost all regulatory 19 20 oversight because foods do not have premarket review to go into the marketplace. 21 22 In 1988 the Orphan Drug Amendments

created the definition for medical foods. And 1 2 I'm sure most of you can recite this by heart. Maybe not most of you, but some of us. 3 And I'm just going to give you a 4 second to read it because I don't want to 5 actually read it out loud. But I would like to 6 7 highlight a couple of important sections in this. And that is that they are used under 8 9 the supervision of a physician for specific dietary management of a disease or condition in 10 which it is understood that there are distinct 11 nutritional requirements based on recognized 12 13 scientific principles. So you can't just go out there and put something on the market that 14 15 somebody says well, this might work for 16 neurocognitive development. However, this particular definition 17 18 did not provide FDA with an evaluation mechanism to determine what fits in that category and what 19 20 does not fit. So the FDA has struggled with

21 trying to determine this.

So the overall umbrella category for

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

22

www.nealrgross.com

these products is the food category. And under 1 2 this category, and obviously there are conventional foods that are in here as well, 3 foods for special dietary use, medical foods, 4 infant formulas and dietary supplements. 5 And I'm not going to be talking about 6 7 dietary supplements or these other products that are used in IEM because that's another hour and a 8 9 half talk in and of itself. They are still 10 important treatment modalities with their own 11 issues. Medical foods being in this food 12 13 category, this is an inherent conflict because foods cannot be used to diagnose, cure, mitigate, 14 15 or treat disease. Those are the terms that 16 surround the use of a drug. And I'm going to show you that in fact 17 18 that's what we use medical foods for is to treat 19 a specific disease. 20 So, medical foods for phenylalanine hydroxylase deficiency, and of course it's also 21 22 previously and more commonly known as PKU, this

was then, drug looking. 1 2 This is medical foods for inborn errors of metabolism today. 3 And I'm showing you just a few 4 examples of the many products that are available 5 on the market for a variety of different 6 7 disorders. And you can see that they look a 8 9 little nicer, they're not drug-like. Medical food manufacturers have spent inordinate amounts 10 of time and money to produce products that looked 11 a little bit more conventional, that had better 12 13 nutritional composition and that were more 14 palatable. 15 My industry colleagues tell me that as 16 innovation goes up reimbursement goes down because as things start to look more and more 17 18 like a food insurance companies are more and more 19 likely to deny coverage. 20 This right here, this bar is actually a complete -- well, it's not complete, it doesn't 21 22 have phenylalanine in it, but it is a product

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

that an insurance company looks at and says we're not paying for energy bars.

So the categories of medical foods, we need to understand these in order to understand why insurance coverage is so sort of sloppy.

The products with a full complement of 6 7 nutrients except the offending nutrient, for example, in phenylalanine hydroxylase deficiency, 8 9 these products would have all of the nutrition 10 that would be required for growth and development for an infant, a child and an adult except with 11 pH deficiency obviously it would exclude 12 13 phenylalanine.

They come in a variety of forms,
powder to be reconstituted, ready to drink, and
bars.

17 Some state mandates will only cover 18 the powder and not the ready to drink. Others 19 won't cover this, that and the other.

20 And then there are modular products. 21 And these are products that do not contain the 22 full range of nutrients, such as amino acid

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

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

www.nealrgross.com

1

mixtures.

2	There are ready to drink low-volume
3	low-calorie products that are more suitable for
4	adults who have lower energy needs, tablets,
5	sports drinks. This one over here, this Restore
6	is actually glycomacropeptide. And it looks like
7	a power drink. So, a school aged child would
8	probably be okay putting that in their lunch box
9	and taking it to school.
10	And then there is a category called
11	foods modified to be low in protein, or also low-
12	protein foods.
13	And these are baked goods, pasta,
14	rice, et cetera. And they were developed to
15	provide calories, provide extra nutrition in some
16	cases, but primarily calories and variety in
17	diets that are severely limited in protein.
18	And I consider them to fall into the
19	medical food category. It sort of depends on how
20	you actually define them. FDA is not sure
21	whether they fit that category or not.
22	Again, what fits in the category

depends on what the intended use is. 1 2 So, medical foods are management modalities for inborn errors in metabolism that 3 are identified on newborn screen and clinically. 4 But with respect to newborn screened 5 conditions, 19 of the core conditions on the RUSP 6 7 utilize medical foods and/or amino acids, vitamins, or cofactors. So we can't forget them, 8 9 but we are again focusing on medical foods. These conditions wouldn't be on the 10 11 RUSP if it weren't for these treatments, right? I mean, the reason why conditions get to the RUSP 12 13 is because there are treatments available. And in the case of these 19 core 14 15 conditions these are the treatments. 16 Medical foods are required for other IEM diagnosed clinically. 17 18 So this is obviously a table of the 19 core RUSP conditions, and those that are in bold 20 are treated with medical foods and/or single amino acids, amino acid mixtures, vitamins, or 21 22 other cofactors.

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

www.nealrgross.com

<i></i>	
1	And this equates to about slightly
2	less than 500 infants born every year who require
3	a medical food. It's over 600 for those who
4	require if you add on those that require
5	vitamins and cofactors such as biotinidase
6	deficiency obviously utilizes Biotin.
7	So what happens if we don't treat
8	these conditions?
9	It depends on the condition. Some
10	conditions have less horrible outcomes, classic
11	PKU, severe cognitive impairment, autistic-like
12	features.
13	Maternal PKU syndrome is a very, very
14	important and in my opinion neglected concern.
15	Over 50 percent of adults are not being followed
16	in a clinic and we must assume that half of them
17	would be women.
18	If they're not being treated and
19	they're of child-bearing age the risk of maternal
20	PKU syndrome is obviously 100 percent.
21	And this is a condition where fetal
22	exposure to elevated phenylalanine levels causes

microcephaly and poor outcome in the infant. 1 2 Homocystinuria, it varies. MSUD is one of the ones identified on newborn screen that 3 if not treated will result in death. And that's 4 true also for the organic acidemias MMA and PA 5 and VLCADD has their own issues that one can't 6 7 really ignore. So I'm going to briefly go over the 8 9 basic principles of dietary management. I'm 10 going to use phenylalanine hydroxylase deficiency 11 as an example. And this is important because this 12 13 helps us to understand how medical foods are able to be used to treat these conditions. 14 15 So, normal phenylalanine metabolism, 16 food and metabolized tissue are where we get It is an essential amino acid so 17 phenylalanine. 18 our bodies do not make it, although in states of stress and illness our bodies will release 19 20 phenylalanine out of the muscle. So that's another important point is 21 22 that we try to keep patients with these

conditions to not be catabolic.

1

2 So phenylalanine through the help and 3 action of phenylalanine hydroxylase goes to 4 tyrosine.

5 And then tyrosine goes on to make very 6 important neurochemicals that go to the brain. 7 Dopa, norepinephrine, epi, and melanin.

8 So what happens if there is no 9 phenylalanine hydroxylase or little phenylalanine 10 hydroxylase? We get -- obviously phenylalanine 11 builds up in the blood and tyrosine becomes 12 deficient.

13 So those neurochemicals are also going 14 to become deficient. We get side pathways that 15 also make metabolites that build up in the blood.

But another important aspect of this condition, of this problem is that phenylalanine is one of three aromatic amino acids and it will compete at the blood-brain barrier for uptake.

20 And so tryptophan and tyrosine get 21 left out. And tyrosine, the little that's 22 actually there, can't get in. And tryptophan is

of course an important precursor to serotonin. 1 2 And that is a serious condition when you lack sufficient serotonin. And that's 3 probably, along with the dopa, norepinephrine, 4 epi, et cetera, that cause some of the imbalances 5 in the brain in patients with PKU. 6 7 So what do we do? How do we solve this? And this is what we can do with medical 8 9 foods is we restrict the precursor, and that means we restrict the amount of whole natural 10 11 protein that contains phenylalanine. And we try to prevent catabolism as I already mentioned. 12 13 And we supply the product and other essential nutrients. 14 15 And I'm going to show you a little bit 16 about how we do this. Obviously it's done with medical foods. 17 18 They supply a source of protein for 19 body growth and development that's devoid of the 20 offending nutrient and it also contains essential nutrients, carbohydrate and fat. 21 22 And along with the very small amount

of natural protein in a carefully planned diet 1 2 this is the primary intervention. And it will prevent or reduce adverse medical and 3 developmental outcomes. 4 And when it is used early, at or near 5 birth and continued throughout life it can lead 6 7 to normal or near normal health outcomes. And they work. This is a historical 8 9 slide from Georgetown many, many years ago of a 10 young man who was born prior to newborn 11 screening. He has the full phenotypic outcomes of 12 13 PKU. And this is a little girl who was identified on newborn screening. Should she 14 15 continue to follow a carefully planned diet 16 throughout her lifetime we would expect her to have cognitive and developmental normalcy. 17 18 So, I want to just show you very 19 quickly what a sample daily intake is for an 8-20 year-old boy with PKU. And Christine Brown's in the audience and I'm sure that she has great 21 22 experience with these kinds of meal plans.

This is a very simple one because I 1 2 wanted to be able to fit it on one screen. We do include other things that are a little bit more 3 interesting. 4 Those items that are in black are 5 medical foods, and those that are in red are 6 7 natural foods. So, from the natural foods 6 grams of protein and 583 calories. A child 8 9 that's 8 years old cannot live on that. From the medical foods, 43 grams of 10 protein and 825 calories. So what we get from 11 that is a whole meal. 12 13 And please understand that 1 ounce of cheese or 1 ounce of chicken has this child's 14 15 feed tolerance of 350 mgs of phenylalanine. And 16 no one can live on 1 ounce of either one of those 17 things. 18 So this slide is courtesy of Helen 19 McCune, one of our metabolic superstars. This is 20 dinner. And it represents one-third of the phenylalanine allotment for that child. And this 21 22 wouldn't go very far.

This little tiny film of milk is all 1 2 that this kid would get. If we add medical foods we actually have a meal. 3 And this is the gear needed to feed a 4 child with maple syrup urine disease. This looks 5 pretty medical, doesn't it? I mean, you don't 6 7 buy these things at the Babies"R"Us. So, we're going to switch gears now 8 9 and talk a little bit about how statutes define medical foods. 10 They are distinguished from that 11 category of foods for special dietary use. 12 13 Remember we talked about that was where they were originally placed because they are intended for 14 15 the specific dietary management of a disease or 16 condition. Already mentioned that. They meet distinct nutritional 17 18 requirements and they must be used under medical 19 supervision. 20 And specially formulated for the patient who is seriously ill or who requires the 21 22 product as a major treatment modality.

And this is a very important point.
 FDA considers them to be used either orally or
 through tube feeding.
 And it does not pertain to all foods
 fed to sick patients. So if you think about
 those of you who were in clinical care or have

7 tried to boost up the calories and the 8 nutritional intake for a patient who's ill you 9 may use a product that I'm not going to name 10 them, well maybe I am, like Ensure, Boost, 11 PediaSure, et cetera. Those are not medical 12 foods.

So the importance about medical food labeling. Medical food labeling is very specific and the requirements are, as I will show you, they are labeled for management of a specific medical disorder, disease, or condition.

18And you can see there that this19particular can of Phenex-2 has that information20on it.

21 And labeled for use under medical 22 supervision. You do not find these statements on

foods for special dietary use. 1 2 So how are they regulated? They're regulated under the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act 3 and the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act as are 4 dietary supplement, by the way. 5 They are exempt from nutrition 6 7 labeling, health claims and nutrient content claims requirements and you can understand why 8 9 that is, because they do have a health claim which is that they treat a medical condition. 10 And they do not require a nutrition 11 facts label because that would not be applicable 12 13 or appropriate. The ingredients must be approved food 14 15 additives. Obviously they have to comply with 16 general food regulations and certainly the GRAS regulations. 17 18 And they do not require premarket 19 review or approval by FDA. And I'm going to 20 probably say this a hundred times. However, manufacturers must be 21 22 registered with FDA and they must comply with

1	current good manufacturing practices. And they
2	are inspected every two years by the FDA.
3	If the company also manufactures
4	infant formulas they are inspected once a year.
5	And we were asked to find out from FDA
6	the list of medical food products that were
7	available and they don't have one. Because
8	there's no premarket review there would be no
9	reason for them to have a list.
10	However, if anyone's interested
11	Genetic Metabolic Dietitians International does
12	have a very nice list on their website.
13	Infant formulas. Again, this is a
14	little bit of a different category. They are
15	considered to be medical foods, but they are
16	regulated as infant formulas. So they have a
17	little bit more I should say oversight.
18	They are categorized as exempt infant
19	formulas. And the exempt does not mean that they
20	do not have a regulatory structure. It just
21	means that they're exempt from the nutrition
22	labeling because they are not required to contain

the offending nutrient.

They have strict labeling requirements again and new products do require a 90-day premarket notification to FDA. And this is different than medical foods for children and adults.

7 So in 2013 FDA came out with draft 8 guidance for industry. And draft guidance is 9 where we get a lot of information about what FDA 10 is thinking about certain legislation, certain 11 regulations that they're responsible for.

12 So, the definition of medical foods 13 narrowly constrains the types of products that 14 fit in this category. That is what they are 15 thinking.

Medical foods are not this huge
category of things that people can take for a
number of different conditions.

And you can see some of these issues, specifically formulated and processed as opposed to naturally occurring. So, an orange or an apple, for example, would not be considered a

medical food.

2	For partial or exclusive feeding
3	orally, or as enteral tube feeding, and for a
4	patient with limited or impaired capacity whereby
5	dietary management cannot be achieved by
6	modification of the normal diet alone. And this
7	is a very important point. And those italics, I
8	put them in there because I view this as one of
9	the keys to how we determine what a medical food
10	is or isn't.
11	And it is used to manage unique
12	nutrient needs resulting from a specific disease
13	or condition, et cetera.
14	The final guidance has not been
15	released. I'm hopeful that they will figure it
16	out and get it out so that we actually can turn
17	to this thinking as we consider how we move
18	forward.
19	So, what a medical food is not. It is
20	not a prescription drug. There's no premarket
21	review or approval. They do not have NDC codes.
22	They do not require a prescription.

I

But the regulation states that they 1 2 are to be used under medical supervision and most medical food manufacturers require authorization 3 from a healthcare provider before they will 4 provide the product to a patient. 5 They are not products developed for 6 7 pregnancy unless the pregnant woman has PKU because pregnancy is not a disease. Remember, in 8 9 that thinking that FDA has these medical foods are for individuals with a specific disease. 10 And it's not for diabetes because 11 diabetes can be modified with a normal diet. 12 13 What do medical foods cost? Well, they cost a lot compared to regular foods, but a 14 15 whole lot less than Kuvan which is the first drug 16 that was approved by FDA for phenylketonuria, \$200,000 a year for an adult with pH deficiency. 17 18 They don't cost that much, but drugs 19 get covered, and Kuvan gets covered, and medical 20 foods in many cases do not. So, this table came out of a paper 21 22 that was published by Therrell, et al., in 2014.

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

www.nealrgross.com

And what we essentially did was we came up with a couple of categories in order to estimate what it cost above and beyond foods that would be purchased and consumed by an individual without a condition.

And committee members, you have this in your packet and the publication is readily available. I'd just like to focus on this final dark orange column.

You can see that for an infant it's over \$2,000 a year. This is outside a typical expenditure. And it starts to march up. And when you get to an adult male or a pregnant woman it's close to \$25,000.

15 And an adult male who does not have a 16 good job, or does not have insurance is going to 17 be hard-pressed to provide enough medical food 18 for themselves at a cost of \$25,000.

What do medical foods cost to
families? Sue Berry published a paper that was a
combined effort that came out of this committee
that surveyed families asking questions about

1

2

3

4

5

their out-of-pocket expenses.

2	Twenty-one percent of parents paid
3	greater than \$100 a month for formula, and some
4	as high as \$500 a month. Forty-eight percent, so
5	almost half of parents paid greater than \$100 a
6	month for low-protein foods.
7	So, how do patients get medical foods?
8	From a bunch of different ways. This is such a
9	hodgepodge it's just, it's frightening.
10	They purchase out-of-pocket from
11	pharmacies, hospitals, health departments,
12	medical supply companies, medical food companies.
13	Sometimes they're reimbursed by private insurance
14	and sometimes they're not.
15	They do get products through programs
16	administered by states and these include
17	Medicaid, CHIP and WIC. The military provides
18	metabolic formula for dependents with inborn
19	errors of metabolism, but they do not cover low-
20	protein foods.
21	Newborn screening programs or
22	metabolic clinics, some states actually tack an

additional charge onto the newborn screening and then those funds get put into sort of a warehouse in order to provide products for patients in that state.

5 Many patients utilize multiple 6 sources. And this came out of Sue Berry's work. 7 And that means that families are looking in 8 multiple places to find things.

9 And any of you who have tried to 10 advocate even for yourself or your family with 11 respect to reimbursement can understand that this 12 is a problem and most of you are probably not 13 having to do that every single day.

Most medical food companies provide a small supply for newly diagnosed patients and they do cover some formula for pregnancy. But they're not in the business of providing free medical food for patients.

19And while they are very, very good at20filling in little gaps we cannot expect them to21be a source for everyone all the time.

So, who pays? Depends on who you are,

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

22

1

2

3

4

how old you are, what your disorder is, depends 1 2 on where you live, and it depends on what type of health benefits you have. 3 So prior to the Affordable Care Act 38 4 states had passed mandates for state or private 5 payer plan coverage. 6 7 And we talk about state mandates a lot, and there's been another one added. But 8 9 this is how it sort of breaks down on what gets covered and what doesn't. 10

In 10 states formula only was covered. 11 In 28 states actually covered formula and low-12 13 protein foods, so a little bit over half of the PKU only in six states that had 14 states. 15 mandates, so that left all the rest of them out. 16 Sixteen states had select disorders. So they didn't cover for everything, for all inborn 17 18 errors. And 16 states covered all disorders. 19 So you can see that if you had 20 condition A and you needed to move or you wanted to move you'd be having to find out whether your 21 22 state had mandates, whether your insurance

(202) 234-4433

company would cover it. 1 2 I think that Dr. Ostrander is going to say something in a little bit, but it's been 3 difficult for people to even find out what their 4 states do at this point. 5 So, since the Affordable Care Act? 6 7 Well I don't know. I have not seen a formal national survey of state practices. I haven't 8 9 seen one that has been undertaken in order to 10 understand what's going on in every state. The ACA does not specifically address 11 coverage of medical foods for inborn errors, 12 13 although newborn screening is a covered benefit without copay to families. 14 So the essential health benefit 15 16 package included newborn screening, no copay, but was silent on the issue regarding treatment for 17 18 these conditions. 19 So states with mandates may still have 20 these mandates. They still may not apply to self-insured or federal programs. 21 So state 22 mandates do not apply to federal programs because

1 the feds cannot be -- well, if you understand 2 history the feds cannot -- a state does not have 3 to comply with a federal plan. Let me leave it 4 at that. 5 So here's what metabolic dietitians

5 So here's what metabolic dietitians 6 report. And we had the NYMAC, the New York Mid-7 Atlantic regional collaborative did a small 8 survey, very informal, of dietitians in the seven 9 states that comprise that region. And we got a 10 lot of very interesting information.

11 So, a patient with PKU lives in New 12 Hampshire. New Hampshire has a mandate, but this 13 patient has an Illinois insurance plan that does 14 not have a mandate.

15 The patient's Illinois plan rejected 16 coverage for metabolic formula. So it depends on 17 where you live.

A patient living in Maryland which has a mandate has federal Blue Cross Blue Shield which doesn't cover medical foods for patients over age 22 unless it's tube fed or the sole source of nutrition. So, these adults are left untreated.

1

2	There are very few adults with PKU.
3	In fact I would probably say I could count them
4	on one hand who have a gastrostomy tube for their
5	feeding. Patients with PKU do not require
6	gastrostomy tube feedings.
7	New Jersey has a comprehensive
8	mandate, but Medicaid doesn't cover low-protein
9	foods.
10	Patients in Pennsylvania which has a
11	mandate for formula only are not able to get low-
12	protein foods which affects their ability to
13	fully comply with their diets.
14	So, we asked these dietitians how
15	outcomes are affected by state policies. And
16	these are just a couple of comments. I have
17	pages more.
18	New York is losing uninsured adults to
19	care. It's hard to keep a patient motivated to
20	seek care when they do not have a good-paying job
21	that has good insurance, and the copays and
22	coinsurances can be prohibitive. They can be

1	\$2,000 a year. And if you don't have a job
2	\$2,000 a year is a lot of money.
3	This lack of access to medical foods
4	and subsequent need to have multiple jobs to pay
5	out of pocket leads to inconsistent metabolic
6	control.
7	And in Virginia state formula programs
8	have become more restrictive since 2006 expanded
9	newborn screening. And I don't think that that
10	was the intention of the committee and of
11	expanded newborn screening, to make it harder for
12	patients to get their treatments. So, again,
13	unintended consequences.
14	This is another big problem,
15	Healthcare Common Procedure coding system. So
16	this is how services and how products that are
17	provided to patients are coded.
18	They're used by Medicare, monitored by
19	CMS. And this is one of three HCPCS codes that
20	are used for inborn errors. This is B4162.
21	There are two more.
22	And the coding is for enteral formulas

for IEM administered through an enteral feeding 1 tube with 100 calories equals one unit of 2 reimbursement. 3 So, in this case CMS limits the 4 definition of "enteral" to tube feeding. 5 Reimbursement units are based on calories. This 6 7 is a big problem because we calculate diets for inborn errors based on grams of protein. 8 9 Products for older children and adults are high in protein and lower in calories so 10 reimbursement falls way short of needs. 11 Private insurance companies may or may 12 13 not adopt these codes. So what has been done in the past to 14 fix this problem? 15 I think we need to understand 16 this so we can figure out what we need to do different moving forward. 17 18 You all wrote letters to the 19 Secretary. You did a really good job back in the 20 early days. In May of 2009 the committee 21 22 reiterated a 2007 recommendation to address gaps

in coverage and reimbursement.

2 And the request was that there be a more uniform approach to amend Medicaid for 3 uniform coverage by state programs. 4 And five months later you got a 5 response from the Secretary that enacting 6 7 legislation is beyond the department's authority. Okay, so that tells us something. 8 We 9 have to be careful what we ask because if it's 10 beyond the department's authority then this kind 11 of response will be sent back to you. In 2010 the committee recommended that 12 13 health reform, because this was when the Affordable Care Act was being put together, that 14 15 healthcare reform ensure access to medical foods 16 and foods modified to be low in protein -- so that was included in this request -- as essential 17 18 healthcare services irrespective of the source of 19 health coverage. 20 And by this time the Secretary had to turn around a response within 90 days so she did. 21 22 Her interim response was a response

will be forthcoming. I mean, this is a big issue 1 2 and you have to give time to it so they worked on it for a total of five months. 3 And then the final response was I 4 cannot adopt the committee's recommendations at 5 this time. 6 7 The Secretary was awaiting a Department of Labor survey on the impact of this 8 9 essential healthcare package and an IOM public workshop. And I think Christine Brown has a 10 little bit of information about the outcome of 11 this public workshop. There was a report that 12 13 was released in October of this last year. But I don't think the committee's 14 15 heard from her regarding this issue. Is that 16 correct? Yes. So, legislative efforts. 17 There have 18 been a number of those. 19 The Medical Foods Equity Act of 2011 20 which was introduced into the Senate by John Kerry, it's often called the Kerry Act, would 21 22 require federal health programs and private

insurance companies to cover medically necessary 1 2 foods, formulas, pills, capsules and bars. So everything, all of these little possible items 3 were included so that insurance companies 4 couldn't say we don't cover bars. 5 It included foods modified to be low 6 7 in protein and pharmacological doses of vitamins and amino acids as prescribed by a qualified 8 9 medical provider. One of the problems with this is that 10 vitamins and amino acids are not drugs either so 11 pharmacological is a little bit of a misused 12 13 And they are not prescribed because term. they're not drugs. So it's a little bit of 14 15 tweaking of the language that would have to be 16 done as people move forward. And it amended the Social Security Act 17 18 definition of these products specifically for the treatment of conditions as recommended by this 19 committee which left out who? 20 Clinically diagnosed patients. 21

So, I'm just saying that there's some

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

22

things that have to be considered as one moves 1 2 forward. And then in 2013 the Medical Foods 3 Equity Act was again introduced by John Delaney. 4 But in 2013 the requirement for private insurance 5 companies to cover these products was removed. 6 7 The rest of the legislation was very similar. Neither one of these went anywhere. 8 9 American Health Security Act of 2011, '13 and '15 introduced by McDermott would have 10 provided coverage for medical foods and 11 reiterated the 1988 medical foods definition. 12 13 No committee action in any of the congresses for this particular piece of 14 15 legislation. 16 There was a success story I would like to say, and I think on behalf of the National PKU 17 18 Alliance, a Senate resolution designated December 19 3, 2015, as National PKU Awareness Day. 20 There were multiple mentions of medical foods in this resolution. 21 But 22 resolutions do not have any legislative power

So it's simply a statement and it's behind them. 1 2 a yes, it's an important issue, but it doesn't actually make things happen in terms of insurance 3 coverage. 4 Advocacy organizations have worked 5 very, very hard in this arena. And I can tell 6 7 you having been in this business for almost 30 years not just the advocacy organizations. 8 And 9 I'll talk a little bit about some of the other 10 things. The National PKU Alliance has 11 advocated for coverage and reimbursement in a 12 13 number of different ways, position statements. They have great educational information and 14 15 resources on coverage under ACA on their website. 16 And they secure lead sponsors and lead advocacy in efforts for the Medical Foods Equity 17 18 Act. In 2011 the National Organization for

In 2011 the National Organization for
Rare Diseases hosted a big, high-level conference
on medical foods and came up with a number of
things they were going to tackle.

We're still sitting here with the same 1 2 issues. Time goes by, time goes by, and none of these things have changed, frankly. 3 Literature and professional 4 organizations have worked for decades. 5 There are a number of papers that have been published 6 7 regarding this issue. The Society for Inborn Errors of 8 9 Metabolism and Genetic Metabolic Dietitians International have policy statements on medical 10 foods. 11 The American Academy of Pediatrics 12 13 also had policy statements on the use of foods for special dietary uses that included some 14 mention of medical foods. 15 SIMD updated their policy statement in 16 2006. 17 18 I mentioned the Academy of Pediatrics 19 and other organizations have worked on statements 20 and are continuing to work on statements. The PKU management guidelines that 21 22 were published through ACMG made a very strong

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

www.nealrgross.com

statement - treatment for life mandates the need 1 2 for medical insurance coverage for medications and medical foods regardless of age. 3 And GMDI nutrition management 4 guidelines had a similar quote. 5 And then there's the National 6 7 Institutes of Health for whom I work. In 2000 the consensus statement on PKU 8 9 -- I think there's some people in this audience 10 who actually worked on that consensus statement -11 - was pretty strong. Reimbursement should be 12 covered by third party providers. 13 By 2012 NIH was no longer in the business of making recommendations so this 14 15 publication that was the proceedings for the 16 scientific review conference sort of was a little bit wishy-washy because we really couldn't come 17 out and say that we were going to demand 18 19 coverage. 20 We did say that availability for medical foods is inconsistent due to this 21 22 patchwork of state laws and state programs, and

that it impacts access. 1 2 So the players. Who are the players? There are a bunch of them. 3 Congress is responsible for making 4 legislation. And if anything's going to happen 5 we need Congress. 6 7 The FDA interprets and writes the regulations. And they also fund some research in 8 9 this area. 10 CMS of course is responsible for 11 Medicaid, Medicare, the CHIP programs. They review and refine and accept new HCPCS codes. 12 13 HRSA which is obviously the mother of this committee provides health services. 14 15 NIH, we are the largest biomedical 16 research funder in the world, \$30 billion. So our role is more in understanding the science 17 18 behind issues pertaining to medical foods as it relates to medical foods, that's NIH's role, and 19 20 to inform policy. We don't make policy obviously. 21 22 USDA funds states to administer WIC

programs and WIC has formularies that are 1 2 specific to each state.

And then obviously states. 3 State legislation, the way that they provide health 4 services, the way they administer WIC, et cetera. 5 And of most importance is this group 6 7 down here, patients, families, advocacy organizations, professional societies and 8 9 organizations, clinicians and researchers, and medical food and pharmaceutical companies. 10 So it's a big group of people and they 11 12 all have to be involved. And frankly, if 13 Congress is going to do any legislation or move forward with legislation all of these entities 14 15 need to be considered and need to be at the table 16 as discussions move forward on how to solve these dilemmas. 17 18 So, these are my thoughts on where we 19 Inborn errors are screened conditions are now. 20

because treatments are available but not for

21 everyone.

22

Patients and families continue to be

saddled with high costs for medical foods. And when I say high costs for medical foods, it's a tiny amount of money in the broad scope of what society spends on treating diseases in people. Clinicians spend significant time

dealing with coverage and reimbursement which leaves less time for patient care and research. Clinicians spend up to 50 percent of their time advocating for their patients.

10 Families spend significant time dealing with coverage and reimbursement, leaving 11 less time to play with their kids. 12 If you're 13 spending hours every week, or every month, or however, and Christine can probably attest to the 14 15 amount of time that it takes trying to get the 16 care that you need, not to mention the anxiety and the stress on whether you're going to get 17 18 enough for this month, whether you're going to be 19 able to navigate the system.

20 And if we're talking about families 21 that have the wherewithal and the ability to 22 navigate the system then if you're looking at

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

people who don't have that ability to navigate 1 2 the system we have a larger problem. Greater than 50 percent of adults with 3 PKU are not being followed. Again I think this 4 is a public health issue that really needs to be 5 dealt with. 6 7 The effect of the Affordable Care Act on coverage and reimbursement nationally for 8 9 medical foods is frankly not known at this time, at least it's not known to me. I'd love to hear 10 11 from others whether we have some understanding of this national picture. 12 13 And bills introduced, but Congress has taken no action. 14 15 So, the future. Well hey, if we can't 16 get medical foods covered, let's make new treatments. And patients want this. This is 17 18 from the National PKU Alliance survey of patients 19 - 91.4 percent of patients felt that it was very 20 important to get new treatments. But new treatments take decades and 21 22 cost billions of dollars. So meanwhile, almost

500 babies are born each year with an IEM 1 2 requiring medical foods as the primary management modality. 3 This is a small percentage of 4 children, but for these patients and families it 5 is 100 percent. 6 7 So, moving forward we need access for all. I think we need to understand the current 8 9 status of state mandates. We need to understand 10 efforts that are currently being undertaken. 11 But ultimately policymakers at the federal and state level must recognize the 12 13 changes that need to be made. Everyone will need to gather together to chip away at the barriers 14 15 and challenges. 16 And these are not mutually exclusive and there may be other approaches and other ways 17 18 to work on this problem. 19 Regardless, it will take leadership, 20 commitment and persistence to navigate the complexities that lie ahead. We have been 21 22 attempting to navigate these complexities for the

last three decades.

And with that I'm going to close and 2 thank you very much. And I can be reached at 3 these contacts. So I hope I've given enough time 4 for the committee to thoroughly discuss. 5 CHAIR BOCCHINI: I think you have. 6 7 Kathryn, thank you for an excellent presentation and giving us a clear understanding of the state 8 9 as it exists today. 10 So let's open this to the committee members first. 11 Don? MEMBER BAILEY: 12 This is Don Bailey. 13 Thank you very much for that informative and discouraging presentation. 14 15 I have to say when I saw the word 16 "enteral" up there I thought it was "eternal" and that's actually true. You would need the 17 18 treatment throughout their lives. 19 Two questions. One, you mentioned the 20 cost analyses. And I'm wondering if anyone has published any kind of comparative cost-benefit 21 22 analysis of what would be the relative cost of

not treating to society.

2 And then secondly, I know you probably can't fully answer this question, but is there 3 anything you can say about why Congress hasn't 4 moved forward when there have been so many 5 positive directions? 6 7 Is there a lack of willingness to -basically assuming this is a state authority and 8 9 not a federal authority. Are there big lobbying 10 groups that are somehow opposed to this? Are 11 there identifiable reasons why Congress hasn't taken it? 12 13 MS. CAMP: So, let me answer your first question which is there has been no 14 15 published information on the cost-benefit ratio 16 of not treating versus treating because how do you get that information? 17 18 That's what I would really like to 19 Because you can say what it costs to take see. 20 care of a patient with methylmalonic aciduria in There's certainly data about how 21 the ICU. 22 frequently patients with some of these conditions

1 end up in hospital care.

2	But it doesn't mean necessarily that
3	that is because of poor access to medical foods.
4	And that's harder to get at. Are they just
5	having a decompensation because they got sick?
6	Did they get sick because they weren't adequately
7	nourished?
8	We know that the lack of good
9	nutrition can lead to problems with immune
10	function. Kids get sicker, they get in the
11	hospital. But that information is not available.
12	Back in 2013 we tried to figure out a
13	way to get it and we just couldn't. So somebody
14	certainly smarter than I can probably try for
15	that effort.
16	MEMBER BAILEY: It does seem very
17	important.
18	MS. CAMP: Yes, absolutely.
19	MEMBER BAILEY: And it seems like you
20	could model it somehow even without actual data.
21	But again, cost-benefit analyses don't
22	always carry the day. But on the other hand,

they can be powerful mechanisms for arguing if we 1 2 don't do this then we have this kind of problem. Right. But again, it's 3 MS. CAMP: hard to know what patients are taking on a daily 4 basis as well. So yes, that would be fantastic 5 to get that information. 6 7 And I think that's what will ultimately drive the train if we can get it. 8 9 As far as why legislation has not been successful I think it's a host of different 10 But I know that insurance companies are 11 issues. reluctant to allow foods to be covered because 12 13 that opens the door for foods for any kind of condition one can think of. 14 15 And other than that I think it's just 16 this is a small population of people even though it's a huge problem to us. And I don't think 17 18 society views it as this enormous big issue like 19 we do. 20 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Steve? This is McDonough. 21 MEMBER MCDONOUGH: 22 I want to thank you for an outstanding

presentation and very helpful information. 1 2 I have one question and a couple of 3 comments. Does WIC cover medical foods and low-4 protein foods for children with conditions, those 5 19 conditions identified in the RUSP? 6 7 MS. CAMP: So, WIC covers metabolic formulas I believe in most states, in all states. 8 9 But they may have a formulary that only includes a certain formula. 10 For example, for PKU there are a 11 number of different products available, but WIC 12 may only cover one. So if a child doesn't -- if 13 a child moves into a state and they've been on a 14 15 specific formula for years -- or it can't be that 16 long. WIC only covers up to five years of age. So yes, it will take care of the first five 17 18 years, but beyond that, no. 19 You may have to switch a formula. 20 It's not always easy. They do not cover low-protein foods as 21 22 far as I know.

Thank you. MEMBER MCDONOUGH: If you 1 2 go back and look at the history of the Guthrie test and PKU one of the reasons it was marketed 3 to states is that if you screen children for PKU 4 you won't have to pay for the cost of 5 institutionalization. Kids who are severely 6 7 developmentally disabled were in at that time institutions for lots of people who had 8 9 So there was a real developmental delays. 10 benefit to the state taxpayers, a cost saving in 11 addition to helping families and people's lives. 12 And there was a partnership that came 13 out of that where a lot of states helped families with their special formulas for kids with PKU. 14 15 And that's basically been lost. 16 Right now the situation, yes, we're going to screen for all these conditions, but 17 18 you're on your own in a lot of situations. And 19 the burden is placed on the families, and the 20 state taxpayers and federal taxpayers are still benefitting from these children not having 21 22 substantial developmental delays.

And these families have to go through 1 2 this ongoing struggle to help their kids. I'm really happy that you presented 3 the previous Secretary's recommendation and 4 It's nice for the committee to get a 5 response. chance to see that. 6 7 The previous Secretary I think made a very poor decision and it's really unfair that 8 9 the families and kids will face the ongoing 10 burden. 11 There was an opportunity to have medical foods and formulas be considered an 12 13 essential health benefit. And we have a new Secretary, and that 14 15 Secretary may not be as willing to allow children to be treated as second-class citizens and be 16 discriminated against, not getting the treatment. 17 18 So, I'm hopeful that the committee will re-look at this issue. I'm hopeful that the 19 20 Follow-up and Treatment Workgroup will have an opportunity to work on this over the next year or 21 22 so.

And this committee is advisory to the 1 2 Department of Health and Human Services. And if I remember your slide up there, there are a whole 3 lot of agencies who have a stake in this issue 4 that are under the Health and Human Services. 5 And there's no reason that the 6 7 Secretary cannot provide direction to these different federal agencies that these children 8 9 and families need to be treated fairly. Thank 10 you. 11 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Thank you, Steve. Coleen? 12 13 MEMBER BOYLE: Maybe just continuing on that, maybe a little bit different. 14 15 During the talk and remembering how 16 much work we did in the follow-up committee on medical foods. And going back to your slide, 17 18 whatever the slide number was where you were 19 waiting for the response, or she was waiting for 20 something from us, I believe. MS. CAMP: 21 No. 22 MEMBER BOYLE: The survey and the

public workshop.

2	MS. CAMP: She was waiting for the
3	Department of Labor to complete their survey and
4	for the IOM report.
5	MEMBER BOYLE: Right.
6	MS. CAMP: And actually the IOM report
7	came out in October of this year.
8	MEMBER BOYLE: So maybe thinking a
9	little bit more about what the so during your
10	talk I was starting to think of what it is that
11	we can do to be helpful in this. Because we did
12	do a lot of work and it did come to a bit of a
13	halt.
14	So, I don't know if you have any
15	specific thoughts on that. It didn't come
16	through at the end.
17	MS. CAMP: Well, because I can't
18	frankly tell you guys what to do.
19	MEMBER BOYLE: Well, you can make
20	suggestions.
21	MS. CAMP: Yes, indeed, but you are
22	constrained by what you can do. And I think

looking at the past and seeing what hasn't worked 1 2 may help to inform what might work in the future. And I think it's not asking her --3 well, I don't know. I mean, asking her to change 4 Medicaid and to change some of these things is 5 going to maybe end up with another "we can't do 6 7 that." So, I think it's going to take working 8 9 with the department to understand what is 10 possible. 11 MEMBER BAILEY: Maybe at the least we could have a formal follow-up from the committee 12 13 saying that now that these surveys and reports are completed the committee would appreciate an 14 15 update, a response from the Secretary. At least 16 to get the ball moving again. So, in working with 17 MEMBER BOYLE: 18 Medicaid in other areas it seems to work best if 19 there are states that have best practices that 20 can be shared. So that might be something very explicit that the committee can do. 21 22 MS. CAMP: So, we've done that, or

tried to do that in the past. And providing best 1 2 practices to states may or may not --But through Medicaid. 3 MEMBER BOYLE: Not us, yes. 4 So again, that's a 5 MS. CAMP: discussion with the department. 6 7 MEMBER BOYLE: Yes. MS. CAMP: I mean, these are things 8 9 that --10 MEMBER BOYLE: Yes. Well, we can make 11 that suggestion. 12 MS. CAMP: Absolutely. I agree 13 totally with that. I guess I would pick 14 MEMBER BOTKIN: 15 up on Don's recommendation. It seems to me that 16 the economic argument is a pretty critical one here to convince a lot of the key players. 17 18 And to the extent that HHS funds a lot 19 of research and analysis, a cost-benefit or cost 20 effectiveness analysis of the provision of these foods seems to me to be something we could 21 22 recommend. Not a short-term solution, but at

least it would provide quite a bit of information 1 2 to help subsequent policymakers guide legislation. 3 MS. CAMP: There are a couple of hands 4 raised behind you. 5 CHAIR BOCCHINI: If there are no 6 7 additional questions from the committee then let's go around the table of the organization 8 9 representatives. 10 There is a microphone that needs to be 11 passed around, please. Identify yourself before 12 you make your comment. 13 Carol Greene, SIMD. MS. GREENE: That was a fabulous presentation. 14 Thank you. 15 It leads to some interesting things 16 like what happens when states have mandates with limits that actually make things on average worse 17 18 for everybody because now everybody can get it, 19 but only part of it. 20 Or the issue of use of prescribed limited to drugs because I can prescribe physical 21 22 therapy.

But I really want to speak to the issue of cost-benefit. I'm having a lot of trouble with cost analysis here.

We don't talk about cost analysis of can you get your insulin. We're talking about the only treatment that is available for these disorders. We don't need to prove that there's a cost-benefit to have access to the only treatment.

With that said, and you can probably hear the passion in my voice, I would also say that there's some very, very interesting problems d to address when we look at cost-benefit.

14 One of them is there is a clean -- we 15 do dollars -- there is a clean benefit to not 16 treating the child with methylmalonic acidemia 17 because it costs you nothing from healthcare. 18 You'd have to do the cost-benefit, the

10 10 1 have to do the cost benefit, the 19 cost of a life lost. Because it will cost you 20 less if you don't treat the child. You don't 21 have to dialyze him, you don't have to readmit 22 him, you don't have to take care of him, you

(202) 234-4433

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

www.nealrgross.com

don't have to put in the G tube.

2	You also have to think about the cost-
3	benefit of a young man or a young woman not
4	treated with PKU. Your cost-benefit there is
5	underemployment, losing your job, moodiness.
6	Then you don't have health insurance. We know
7	about people who are in jail. So lost taxes.
8	The cost analysis of not treating PKU is tricky
9	as Cathy said.
10	But it's also I think fundamentally
11	wrong. It's the only treatment. I don't think
12	we need to prove that there's a benefit.
13	And by the way, there is old
14	literature that shows straight up the benefit of
15	treating. It was at the time something like
16	about \$6 million to \$8 million over a lifetime
17	that we calculated in about nineteen eighties for
18	the lifetime of a person from age 20 to age 60
19	living in an institution with PKU as opposed to
20	at the time about \$7,000 a year for the medical
21	food.
22	So, there are old studies for the cost

,	
1	analysis, but I think fundamentally it's wrong.
2	And I think another example is WIC I
3	believe covers pregnant women for certain things,
4	but not until you're pregnant. Your pregnancy
5	test is positive. The organs have already
6	formed. You've already got the malformations
7	from the PKU.
8	So we've got some real fundamental
9	limits to the only treatment available. I don't
10	think we are asked to prove the cost-benefit of
11	insulin for a diabetic. I don't think we have to
12	prove the cost-benefit for the formula for PKU.
13	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Let's do Beth and
14	then Bob.
15	MS. TARINI: Beth Tarini, AAP. So, on
16	the heels of that comment which I agree with,
17	Carol, to some extent it seems to me that this is
18	a public policy issue at its core, and that there
19	are elements of, sure, there might be data gaps
20	here, data gaps there that you could shore up
21	maybe and help strengthen the argument.
22	But at its core it seems to me that

this is a public policy challenge. And so I'm 1 2 not clear that we necessarily in the committee have not exhausted our expertise in this area. 3 But at the same time that doesn't mean 4 the committee doesn't have the authority to pull 5 together those type of people. 6 7 Because you've gotten pretty close. You've gotten to the Hill. You've gotten bills 8 9 And so the question is are there other ways in. 10 in from a public policy standpoint either at the federal or at the state level. And do you want 11 to just hit that hard. 12 13 I sort of feel like spinning back to the states, talking to Medicaid, it's just sort 14 15 of going back to the beginning and trying to get 16 back up the hill. Where you've gotten almost very close. We just need to get over it. 17 18 So, in short I think it's a public 19 policy issue that needs policy experts. I don't 20 dare say the word lobbyists, but in that type of arena to get through that last step. 21 22 So, I just want to comment MS. CAMP:

on that. I think you're absolutely right, and
 who the policy people will be ultimately I
 certainly don't know, frankly.

I think that it needs to be a federal 4 Because even if states, okay, X state 5 effort. mandates Medicaid but it only covers this much, 6 7 it only covers this much. So you're still working with this patchwork, and you still have 8 9 families having to make a decision on where they 10 can move based on where they will have coverage. 11 MS. TARINI: It's possible if you get

enough states as a critical mass you can move
from the bottom up. You can create a disparity,
for instance, and people can say well, 10 states
Medicaid cover it, why don't these states.

So in other words, another policyangle or potential.

But I do agree with you, it seems ifpossible more efficient top down.

20 MS. CAMP: It's still years getting 21 all of that up to go. And then you get these 22 states that have very poor ability to finance

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

www.nealrgross.com

these kinds of things. They make decisions about 1 2 what they're going to finance. MR. OSTRANDER: Bob Ostrander, 3 American Academy of Family Physicians. 4 I want to talk a minute about some 5 organizations' roles. I've decided to make this 6 7 a bit of a project of mine. In my last report to the academy committee that I answer to I 8 9 recommended that they attend to this and make it 10 AAFP policy. And my intention is introduce a 11 resolution at New York and then at the national 12 13 congress of delegates for the American Academy of Family Physicians which I shared with some of the 14 15 Follow-up and Treatment Subcommittee members, a 16 policy to on the state level seek draft legislation, and on the national level seek 17 18 policy to include medical foods narrowly defined -- I'll talk about in a second why I think that's 19 20 important -- under the Affordable Care Act. In preparation for all this I tried to 21 22 sort out what's covered in New York and no one

(202) 234-4433

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

www.nealrgross.com

seems to know.

2	You told me that you thought the
3	dietitians knew. I contacted a couple of
4	different channels from NYMAC and health
5	department people at the Rural Health Council and
6	they sent the question around.
7	And the best I could get was a policy
8	statement about specifically formulas being
9	covered by Medicaid. And I could get no other
10	information. Nobody even knew what was supposed
11	to be covered or not.
12	I think it's very important that we
13	pursue this as an essential health benefit under
14	the Affordable Care Act because the Affordable
15	Care Act has not made care affordable.
16	We have a lot more people who are
17	insured, but many, many of them as anybody in
18	practice will tell you have these high deductible
19	plans you talked about, especially the most
20	vulnerable folks who have the non-professional
21	jobs.
22	If it's not an essential healthcare

benefit, if it's mandated just to be covered, it's covered under that high deductible and copay.

I agree with Carol, this is a matter of justice and not finance. And I think that should be anybody who's working on this's primary focus.

8 However, on the finance side, forget 9 the cost-benefit analysis. We're talking about 10 500 births per year out of a U.S. birth 11 population of 4 million. This isn't going to 12 move the needle on the total healthcare cost 13 expenditures of this country an iota as long as 14 it is just for medical foods.

I think we have to talk about the taxonomy of medical foods versus drugs. And this is a mess we've gotten ourselves into largely because of the Dietary Supplement Act of 1994 when the vitamin industry wanted all sorts of stuff defined as foods as long as they don't diagnose or treat conditions.

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Hence this supplement enhances joint

1	health, this supplement is natural male
2	enhancement. You don't say it treats arthritis
3	or erectile dysfunction. You can still call it a
4	food and not regulate it.
5	So, I think we have to understand what
6	the pushback is going to be. I think it's going
7	to be from the proponents of the Dietary
8	Supplement Act's protections to not create
9	another category of medical food.
10	But I think realistically that's what
11	we're really saying. I mean, this is artificial
12	to say something is a food not a drug.
13	These are foods that are used to treat
14	conditions, and they're foods.
15	The other side of this is we're going
16	to have to be aware of the bandwagon effect.
17	There's a lot of folks who really have
18	celiac disease, and there's a whole lot of folks
19	who have fad-based gluten intolerance, and
20	they're all going to want their low-gluten
21	modified foods.
22	And the argument will be hard to
Į	

1	counter that low-protein foods should be covered
2	but gluten-free alternatives to things that we
3	eat every day should not be. So I think we have
4	to be aware of that.
5	I think the draft guidance that you
6	presented, and I wasn't aware of that, is really
7	tremendous.
8	I think the other thing that we need
9	to be able to talk about to folks is that plants
10	have carbohydrates.
11	I have a colleague who's a vegan who
12	is a real proponent of that. He says the number
13	one question he always gets is, well, where do
14	you get your protein?
15	Well, plants are full of protein.
16	Just because you're not eating animal products
17	doesn't mean you're not getting protein. They
18	have to be engineered foods if they're plant-
19	based foods.
20	And that's maybe a minor point, but
21	it's a big misconception when we're promoting
22	this.

And I agree with Beth that this needs 1 2 to be on the policy level. And if we can get some organizations that have some credibility 3 that can use their policy experts like I hope the 4 American Academy of Family Physicians can then I 5 think we've got a shot here. 6 7 I certainly would love to see the American Academy of Pediatrics and ACOG do this 8 9 in parallel with my efforts at the moment. And if I can get it made official AAFP 10 11 policy then join with us in a real push. Thanks. CHAIR BOCCHINI: I think that's a 12 13 great comment, Bob, and I think that public policy components of AAFP and the American 14 15 Academy of Pediatrics, March of Dimes, could 16 certainly form a powerful group to promote just what you said. So I think that would be 17 18 certainly one direction towards federal 19 legislation. 20 MEMBER MATERN: Dieter Matern. In the letter that the Secretary sent on February 16 21 22 regarding NPS 1 it states that the Affordable

Care Act requires that most health plans cover 1 2 the evidence-based preventative care and screenings provided for in the comprehensive 3 guidelines supported by HRSA. 4 5 Doesn't it mean preventative care include treatment? 6 7 It's just coverage for MS. SARKAR: the newborn screening test. 8 9 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Comments. Michele, 10 were you interested in saying something? 11 MS. PURYEAR: Michele Puryear. 12 There's already been a cost-benefit analysis. It 13 was done 30 years ago. But that was part of the justification for screening for PKU. 14 There was a cost-benefit analysis for 15 16 newborn screening in general. And they used specific cases or conditions to look at, 17 18 hypothyroidism, PKU were two of them. 19 And I think Christine was probably 20 going to say the other stuff I was going to say. MS. CAMP: Can I just respond to that 21 22 quickly?

A cost-benefit analysis from 30 years 1 2 ago doesn't get to where we are now with adults and with older children, and really what the 3 implications are for undertreatment. It's not 4 just failure to treat, but undertreatment in 5 these populations. 6 7 But I certainly appreciate those older studies. They're very important. 8 9 And I also agree with Carol. It's 10 hard to wrap your arms around continuing to 11 justify a treatment that we know works. MS. PURYEAR: But it really points to 12 13 the need, what Beth said. This is a policy issue. 14 15 MS. CAMP: Yes. 16 MS. PURYEAR: You're sort of skirting around the issue when you're talking about show 17 18 that it works. We know that it works. We know 19 that it's needed. 20 The other thing is I think, Debi, that what Dieter, Dr. Matern just quoted was talking 21 22 about the HRSA guidelines and specifically Bright

Futures.

2	And I don't know whether the treatment
3	guidelines, because that's part of the Affordable
4	Care Act. And I don't know whether or not
5	medical foods and formula are in Bright Futures.
6	But that's one of the things that guides the
7	Affordable Care Act or Bright Futures.
8	MS. SARKAR: This is Debi. So, what
9	the Secretary is quoting in her letter, the HRSA
10	guidelines actually includes the RUSP. And so
11	she's just referring to conditions that are added
12	to the RUSP that the screening test is covered by
13	health insurance.
14	But it is a good question about Bright
15	Futures. I don't know the answer to that.
16	MS. BROWN: Christine Brown with the
17	National PKU Alliance. I just wanted to add some
18	points of information.
19	The IOM report was finalized back in
20	October of 2011. And so that was one of the
21	things that the Secretary said that she couldn't
22	make a decision on until that report was

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

finalized.

2	It was finalized almost five years ago
3	and it actually recommended that the Department
4	of Health and Human Services further evaluate
5	coverage for nutritional supplements and formulas
6	needed for the treatment of inborn errors.
7	So it did ask that the Secretary do
8	that. I think to everybody's best knowledge that
9	evaluation has not occurred.
10	The Department of Labor survey, I
11	wasn't able to find anything last week, but I
12	believe that there was something in there that
13	was very general that said that most private
14	insurance companies did not cover the cost of
15	medical foods to treat inborn errors of
16	metabolism, but that it really depended on state
17	mandates.
18	And then the third thing is there was
19	one state mandate that passed after the
20	Affordable Care Act which was Wyoming. And that
21	covers medical foods and low-protein foods for
22	all conditions through newborn screening. So

that was in addition.

2	And I guess lastly, and I will be
3	doing some public comment during the period after
4	lunch, but I've now received in the last two
5	weeks two examples in California where adults are
6	trying to now get coverage under the exchanges
7	and they're being denied coverage for medical
8	foods even though the State of California has a
9	mandate.
10	So I would say that the little that I
11	know, the little data that I have is that even
12	with people in the exchanges that supposedly
13	those states have to follow state mandates, there
14	are still routine denials.
15	MS. SINGH: Rani Singh. I wanted to
16	highlight a little bit beyond the newborn
17	screening the urgency not to drag our feet on
18	this issue and the impact it's having on PKU
19	women.
20	I've been doing a camp for 25 years
21	and half of the girls who are 18 and older, they
22	have had more than half the girls have had

lack of access to medical foods. 1 2 And when they are giving birth, and it could be more than one birth, the kid is impacted 3 by it. 4 5 Also, these women are being put on a lot of psychiatric drugs which are covered by the 6 7 insurance, but the medical foods are not. So, I want to say we may negate the 8 9 effect of newborn screening if we don't act now and help moving forward. So I just wanted to as 10 11 a clinician bring that urgency and highlight that 12 aspect. 13 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Thank you. Additional comments? 14 This is Chris Kus. 15 MR. KUS: I'd like 16 to make a comment if I get a chance. CHAIR BOCCHINI: Yes, please, Chris. 17 18 Go right ahead. 19 MR. KUS: Sure. I guess there's two 20 points, one for me. It was my impression by virtue of the 21 22 fact that you are on the RUSP that we determined

these are conditions that are worth screening for and hence worth treating.

The second thing is somebody made 3 comments about Bright Futures. And I may be 4 wrong about this, but Bright Futures is really 5 the guidelines for health promotion care and 6 7 doesn't speak specifically to coverage, although the academy does have a policy statement with 8 9 regard to health insurance coverage which I 10 hadn't pulled up yet but we should look at. 11 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Thank you. Don. 12 MEMBER BAILEY: I appreciate the 13 comments about your concerns about whether we really need a cost analysis. And I'm not a cost 14 15 person. 16 But I do think that the consequences of not doing this bear enormous burden on the 17 18 individuals and on society. 19 We've got old data showing that, but 20 it's just with one or two conditions. And if we

had -- numbers and costs are never going to drive
policy, but having been in the early childhood

1

2

world for many years and trying to argue that it's the right thing to do as to what you were saying about medical foods, it's the right thing to do to provide early childhood education for children.

What got the attention was when you 6 7 could show that there was a cost-benefit savings. And so it's just a matter of building 8 9 the case in a comprehensive way. The cost data 10 are certainly not going to drive it, but I think 11 it's just one piece of the puzzle that an update comprehensive cost to society of not acting would 12 13 be important. Thank you, Don. 14 CHAIR BOCCHINI: 15 MS. CAMP: Can I just say really 16 quickly that I think a focus on maternal PKU syndrome would maybe be helpful to have people 17 18 sit up and listen. Because that is a critical 19 health policy issue. And I think it's -- we 20 don't really know. Kathryn, thank you 21 CHAIR BOCCHINI:

22 very much.

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

1

2

3

4

5

1	MS. CAMP: Thank you very much for
2	letting me present to you all.
3	CHAIR BOCCHINI: It's very clear that
4	your presentation generated very significant,
5	important discussion about this topic.
6	And what I think going forward is that
7	it would make sense for the long-term follow-up
8	committee to look at this issue to determine
9	whether rather than a statement to the Secretary,
10	maybe we need to consider going back over the IOM
11	report, seeing if we can find a Department of
12	Labor report, seeing what the current situation
13	is in states which has clearly been outlined.
14	And maybe decide whether we need a
15	policy statement from the committee that might
16	address this issue, at least provide our input
17	into that. So I'd like the long-term follow-up
18	committee to consider looking at the data and
19	maybe within some months kind of chew on this and
20	see what we think might be beneficial going
21	forward.
22	MEMBER MCDONOUGH: This is McDonough.

I can't speak for the full sub-workgroup or 1 2 workgroup, but I would anticipate that there's going to be a lot of interest. 3 There was guite frankly a lot of 4 disappointment in the subcommittee now workgroup 5 that medical foods was not one of charges that 6 7 came out of our last meeting. I also don't see why we can't send 8 9 another letter to the Secretary. I view the 10 previous decision was a mistake. We have a new 11 Secretary. 12 Every person in this room comes to 13 these meetings with different life experiences. And we have different ways of looking at things. 14 15 And just because one previous experience did not 16 want to have this a part of an essential health benefit doesn't mean that the new Secretary would 17 18 feel that way. I think the Institute of Medicine 19 20 report had recommendations to modify essential health benefits as time goes forward. 21 22 There was a mechanism in place and I

think there were some committees recommended to 1 2 be created. And I don't think that they're doing I can't find them when I try to Google 3 that. 4 them. But I think there's a lot of things we 5 can do in this area if we were given the charge 6 7 to do it. But I will be advocating that the 8 9 Secretary get another chance to re-look at this. CHAIR BOCCHINI: Well, I think that 10 may be the eventual conclusion of the work, but 11 I'd like to bring it to the subcommittee, to the 12 13 workgroup, and then let the workgroup kind of discuss, get the background data, and then 14 15 consider going forward what can come back to the committee for full discussion and decisions. 16 17 Dr. Lu? 18 MEMBER LU: This is Michael Lu from 19 HRSA. 20 The way I look at this in terms of moving forward, there are basically two ways to 21 22 do this. One is to do this legislatively and the

other administratively.

I'm certainly not going to comment on
the legislative mechanisms.

But I think as far as administrative
mechanisms go that you can do this through
Medicaid and that mostly has to do with state
Medicaid policies.

You can do it through preventive 8 9 services under the Affordable Care Act. And 10 there are four different types of preventive services that are covered. And that's the 11 preventive services for kids which is Bright 12 13 Futures that we can certainly get more information in terms of what Bright Futures 14 15 stipulates.

16There's preventive services for women.17There's the newborn screening which as Debi says18does address specifically about the screening,19but not necessarily the treatment. And then20there's the immunization.21And then lastly there's -- you can do

it through the essential benefits which really

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

22

kind of goes through our Office of Health Reform 1 2 for HHS. And so we'd certainly be happy to 3 follow up with the long-term follow-up committee 4 and provide some additional information about 5 some of these mechanisms if that would be 6 7 helpful. CHAIR BOCCHINI: Great, thank you. 8 9 All right. Thank you. 10 Let's move to the next item. Dr. 11 Botkin has the Pilot Study Workgroup report or 12 presentation. Jeff? 13 MEMBER BOTKIN: Thanks, Dr. Bocchini. So, the Pilot Study Workgroup was 14 15 created in May of 2014 so it's been two years. 16 So about time that we came forward with our report. So it's been a wonderful opportunity to 17 18 work with a great group of folks. And I'm 19 pleased to see that many of these folks are here 20 with us today in order to back me up when I make statements that perhaps somebody might want to 21 22 expand upon.

So, it's been a good collaborative 1 2 effort, and thanks so much to Debi and Elana too for their support for the committee. 3 You have in your briefing book these 4 slides, but also the report itself. And there's 5 been a flurry of activity over the last couple of 6 7 months to pull this together. So I will not claim that this is a highly refined document. 8 9 But I think one of the questions I'll 10 pose here in a second is how we want to address 11 that report. Hopefully many folks have had a chance 12 13 to read the whole thing. What I'm going to do with this presentation is really just focus on 14 15 the recommendations themselves. 16 Then I guess part of the strategy will be whether we want to as a committee either 17 18 refine and come back at some later time the 19 recommendations, whether we want to vote some of those through now, and then whether we want to 20 vote the whole statement through. 21 22 And I think part of the challenge that

I need to better understand is that many of our 1 2 colleagues who have provided substantial help with this statement are federal employees and 3 have some difficulties with making 4 recommendations themselves back to the federal 5 So exactly how all of that will be 6 government. 7 woven together I'll be looking to Dr. Bocchini. So, a very little background here 8 9 before we dive into the specific recommendations. 10 Obviously the evidence review process depended on 11 quality data. Pilot studies, a variety of different 12 13 steps essentially yield evidence about several different aspects of the newborn screening 14 15 system. 16 The Public Health Service Act recently passed as everybody knows. It very much 17 18 shortened our timeline to come forward with 19 recommendations. 20 So, that has compressed this set of issues for us. And so part of the purpose of the 21 22 Pilot Study's recommendations is to try to make

sure that as recommendations come forward for 1 2 formal evidence review that the data is present so that that review process can be as efficient 3 as possible. 4 So, here's our charge. And I'll be 5 touching back on each of these to categorize the 6 7 recommendations. But first, to recognize and support 8 9 current efforts regarding pilot studies and 10 evaluation. And there's really a lot of 11 excellent work going on now that we intend to 12 support. 13 Identify other resources that could support pilot studies and evaluation. That's a 14 15 little bit more open-ended. We've tried to be 16 creative with that domain. And then identify the information 17 18 required by the committee to move a nominated condition into the evidence review process. 19 That 20 is, define the minimum pilot study data required for a condition to be accepted for evidence 21 22 review.

We've tried to be a little bit more
 specific here and we'll see how our thoughts fly
 with the group.

So, just to emphasize the question is what data are minimally necessary to move a nominated condition to the evidence review process. Not what evidence is necessary to actually approve a condition on the RUSP. So we're in that intermediate category with looking at the data from pilot studies.

11 So, here's what we decided to do with 12 the definition. And I would say we did not 13 really have a great opportunity to review this 14 even among our writing group in great detail. 15 And so we may want to welcome feedback on whether 16 this is the correctly phrased definition. But 17 I'll go ahead and read this.

For the purpose of this report and consistent with previous definitions newborn screening pilot studies are defined as systematic investigations or public health activities that are designed to evaluate the efficacy and safety

of incorporating a new test or condition on a population-based level into state newborn screening programs.

All right, so that's a mouthful. What 4 this intends to say is that many of these, of 5 course, will be categorized as research. But as 6 7 we know in certain circumstances folks have been constrained by the requirements of a research 8 9 agenda, and states have approved conditions on 10 their recommended panels in a mode to collect data to evaluate the outcomes of those public 11 health activities. 12

So I think for the purposes of this definition we also want to include those enterprises where data are being collected but perhaps under the public health rubric rather than under a separate research agenda. Hopefully that will make sense to folks.

And I think we're looking here at
anything that's, again, directed at the public
population-based evaluations.

22

1

2

3

So let me stop here for a second and

just see if anybody has any specific thoughts or 1 2 concerns about this definition. Okay. We certainly can come back to 3 that as we delve in a little bit more detail 4 about the recommendations themselves. 5 So again, here's our first charge, at 6 7 least first charge I'll deal with in organizing these recommendations. 8 9 Identify the information required by the committee to move a nominating condition into 10 11 the evidence review process. 12 So recommendation one. Apologies, 13 I'll go ahead and read this. Data should be available on the 14 15 analytical validation of one or more screening modalities proposed for use in population-based 16 screening in newborns. 17 18 Data should include information on 19 precision, accuracy, the reportable range, detection limits, interference, reference 20 intervals and cost. 21 22 Pilot studies for analytical

validation should include use of dried blood 1 2 spots from a population of newborns including known positive and negative specimens in addition 3 to laboratory-prepared target specimens. 4 So again, that's a mouthful. 5 It includes quite a bit of information to be sought 6 7 on the laboratory phase of the newborn screening system. 8 9 So Dr. Bocchini, I think I'll probably 10 stop with each of these recommendations. We could go through them all and then come back, but 11 that might be too tough for folks to hear. 12 So, 13 thoughts on this. Dieter? As part of the group 14 MEMBER MATERN: 15 I should have brought this up earlier, I guess. 16 You mentioned your use of dried blood But as we know there's other screenings 17 spots. 18 that don't use the blood spot. So we might have 19 to broaden that definition to be whatever you 20 have to test. MEMBER BOTKIN: Very good. We should 21 22 include use of dried blood or other biological

materials or some such thing? No? 1 2 MEMBER MATERN: We have the bedside test now, so I don't know, some physiological or 3 pathology test. 4 5 MEMBER BOTKIN: Okay. Any specific recommendations anybody else has on that? 6 Ι 7 understand the points. The bedside test and to the extent that maybe we're going to go to saliva 8 9 on some tests, or some other -- bilirubin we looked at that was a different modality. Nancy? 10 11 Okay. And I think the key point here is that you want to be dealing with actual 12 13 affected and unaffected babies as opposed to artificially designed test systems. 14 15 MS. GREEN: This is Nancy Green from 16 Columbia University. Thanks, Jeff. And I realize this is very hard so I appreciate the 17 18 work of you and this committee. 19 The issue about the population of 20 Do your recommendations go -- I don't newborns. know what's coming next, but there had previously 21 22 been discussion about diverse populations,

sufficient numbers.

2 I mean, without actual specifics but something about the fact that a population might 3 reflect the heterogeneity of the U.S. or state 4 Something to that effect. 5 populations. MEMBER BOTKIN: Good, and I think 6 7 you'll see that under recommendation three. So hopefully that will address that specific issue. 8 9 MEMBER MATERN: Dieter again. 10 Actually, should we limit this to newborns, or 11 should we just say from a target population in case we want to do some pediatric screen, or 12 13 other screen later in life? 14 MEMBER BOTKIN: Okay. 15 MR. OSTRANDER: Is the point here when 16 you said dried blood spots with Dieter's comments taken into account specimens that are obtained in 17 18 real world circumstances? Because obviously if they're collected 19 20 specifically for a pilot study it may not be with the same degree of -- maybe with more attention 21 22 than those that are collected in real world

circumstances. And I don't know if that was what 1 2 you were implying, that they needed to use real world specimens or not. 3 MEMBER BOTKIN: Yes, and I'll look to 4 Carla perhaps for some thoughts on that issue. 5 MEMBER CUTHBERT: Carla Cuthbert, CDC. 6 7 So, this particular recommendation really is targeted at the analytical validation. 8 9 You'll find that the clinical validation comes 10 next. 11 Analytical validation is really at the point at which the state or the program has done 12 13 developmental work and has come to a stable method and wants to show performance metrics that 14 15 actually show that this method is now ready to be 16 taken into a new population. So with respect to this that's why 17 18 you've got a number of these parameters being identified. 19 20 And yes, Dieter's right, we should really consider what happens with point of care 21 22 testing. But for the dried blood spot tests you

want to be able to do this. CLIA requires it. 1 2 FDA in some form requires it as well. So, these are things that need to be done. 3 With respect to the samples and the 4 populations you'll find that in many states they 5 can actually use the last three months' worth of 6 7 samples that they've identified, or that reflect their own population to see what the actual 8 9 measurement values are for this particular test. 10 Many of the states will also 11 collaborate with physicians who see these patients, get permission to be able to access the 12 13 dried blood spots of affected and be able to go back and also test for that as well. 14

15The clinical validation is something16a little different. But this is more of a17retrospective analysis of blood spots just so18that they can determine these parameters,19determine that the test works and that it's20stable, and have this for a reference. I hope21that's helpful.

22

MEMBER KELM: I can just speak to the

When we're reviewing newborn screening FDA. 1 2 assays most of the time, for example, precision detection limits, interference, they actually use 3 contrived samples, like take adults. Because you 4 need a lot to do that. You can't take enough 5 from a newborn, even dried blood spot. 6 7 And so they'll make dried blood spots. They'll just contrive them, for example, adult 8 9 blood, make them so that you have enough samples. 10 So it depends on the study. 11 And then obviously you want, yes, close to whatever sample type your test is going 12 13 So if it's going to start being point of to use. care whole blood serum plasma then that's a whole 14 15 'nother ball of wax. 16 MEMBER BOTKIN: Okay, good. And I 17 think that last phrase gets to the prepared 18 specimens. 19 Okay, what I have then in terms of 20 revision, and I won't claim that this is too 21 precise yet. 22 So, pilot studies for analytical

validation should include use of biologic or other physiologic assessments from a population of newborns or other target population including known positive and negative specimens in addition to laboratory prepared target specimens. Sound good? Okay.

7 All right, recommendation two. Data should be available on the net benefits of 8 9 clinical interventions following early detection compared to clinical diagnosis. Early detection 10 11 can be achieved through population screening pilot studies, through testing secondary to a 12 13 family history of the condition, or through targeted screening of high-risk groups. 14

15 So the intent here is to say that the 16 pilot study itself need not be the vehicle that 17 you're using to determine whether early detection 18 and intervention is affected.

You can demonstrate efficacy of early
intervention through other modalities. The
population-based screening pilot may demonstrate
the feasibility of the system in other ways, but

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

efficacy per se might be through the populationbased pilot, but it might well be through other measures.

And again, I think the background 4 material within the paper highlighted the SCID 5 experience here as important, that folks had 6 7 identified early intervention, bone marrow transplant as being effective with kids at an 8 9 earlier age with SCID, and that the populationbased pilot was not used to demonstrate that 10 11 efficacy again. So, I think that's the central point with this recommendation. 12

MEMBER WICKLUND: Cathy Wicklund. And
thanks again you guys for working on this.

15 This might be in the report, but I was 16 wondering how to deal with though just the really 17 incredibly small numbers and some of the data 18 just doesn't clearly show the net benefit.

Are we just asking that we've tried to show the net benefit? I mean, this is where it seems like we're really having a hard time making the distinction between what to add to a RUSP or

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

not.

2 MEMBER BOTKIN: Yes, and I guess my response would be to say that as a condition 3 comes forward if it's going to go to an evidence 4 review there has to be some data. 5 Now, whether the evidence review 6 7 process and subsequently the committee will find those data to be compelling or convincing is a 8 9 separate level question.

But there needs to be some data on efficacy and safety, and that can come as stated here from a variety of different types of studies.

Okay, recommendation three. Data
should be available from pilot studies involving
population-based screening of identifiable
newborns. So, not talking the identified blood
spots.

3A, the study should be sufficiently
large to identify at least one true positive
newborn for the condition under consideration.
3B, the population included in the

pilot study and the screening protocol used should be similar to the U.S. population and to state newborn screening programs with respect to known prevalence of the condition, the timing and approach to screening, and the screening modality used.

1

2

3

4

5

6

So, 3A I think is something we've
floated in discussions to the committee in the
past. And this parallels again what we did with
SCID so there's some precedent here.

But I think folks in our discussion raised the question about whether you even need one newborn. If you demonstrate feasibility of other aspects of the population-based program do you even need to identify an affected baby or not.

What we've decided is that one is aminimum number, but I think open to debate.

3B here is an indication of some of
the challenges we've had in the past with studies
done in other countries. And the question is is
the nature of the condition different with

(202) 234-4433

different populations, different perhaps 1 2 ethnic/racial mixes. How do they do newborn screening in those countries. Are they using the 3 same test modality that's being considered in 4 this context, et cetera. 5 So you would want to study, if you're 6 7 going to use it for this purpose, to be sufficiently similar -- what's the term here --8 9 similar. And obviously that's a subjective word, but there it is. 10 11 All right, so let me stop talking and see what thoughts people have on this. 12 13 MS. GREEN: Just a quick question for the recommendations. Are they "and" or "or?" 14 15 MEMBER BOTKIN: They are "and." So 16 maybe there needs to be an "and" between 3A and 3B. 17 18 Yes, yes, point well taken. That's 19 These are all necessary as far as we've right. 20 Michele? qot. MS. PURYEAR: Michele Puryear. 21 I have 22 a question on 3B. What do you mean by "and the

1

screening modality used?"

2 MEMBER BOTKIN: Yes, I'm not sure what I guess we're really thinking 3 we mean there. about -- I mean it's largely written in the 4 context of blood spot screening. 5 Perhaps this came forward -- maybe 6 7 approach to screening would sufficiently capture the idea to the extent that maybe you're looking 8 9 at different ways to do pulse oximetry or that 10 type of thing. So does that allow that 11 MS. PURYEAR: kind of variability, point of care screening? 12 13 MEMBER BOTKIN: It would not. I mean, I think the point is the data ought to be 14 15 collected in a way that is interpretable in the 16 U.S. context where the data would be applied for 17 this purpose. 18 MR. WATSON: Jeff, that came out of 19 the Pompe disease outcomes where Taiwan had used 20 the fluorescence assay and tandem aspect was going to be used in the United States. So the 21 22 screening platform or testing modalities were

different.

1

2 MEMBER BOTKIN: Okay, good. MS. PURYEAR: And that I understand, 3 but would it include point of care testing. 4 Ι mean, is there enough leeway there? 5 MEMBER BOTKIN: Well, I guess 6 7 different types of point of care testing. Is that the question? If you had a different 8 9 approach to pulse oximetry in one study versus 10 others? MS. PURYEAR: The condition that you 11 were putting forth that used point of care 12 13 testing instead of blood spots similar to hearing screening or screening for congenital heart 14 15 disease. 16 MEMBER BOTKIN: Yes, that would. MS. PURYEAR: It would include. 17 18 MEMBER BOTKIN: Yes, I think that's 19 right. Dieter? 20 MEMBER MATERN: Dieter Matern. I'm really sorry, but it really helps to have these 21 22 face-to-face meetings and see that on the screen.

So when it comes to the screening 1 2 modality while I agree what Mike just said, I think -- or what I am concerned about is whether 3 this would prevent innovation in using a 4 completely different technology or approach to 5 screening. 6 7 Because if we say it has to be tandem aspect, or it has to be whatever technology is 8 9 already a part of screening then we might get stuck. So it must be a modality that is -- I 10 11 mean, it has to be high throughput I think. But it shouldn't be seen as a specific technology. 12 13 MEMBER BOTKIN: Well, I guess I would say that as a test comes forward and being 14 15 proposed for inclusion on the RUSP the proposal 16 would include a certain test modality. And if the pilot studies were done 17 18 using a very different test modality then the question would be are those pilot studies 19 sufficient evidence of what's being proposed. 20 And I think you'd probably conclude that they 21 22 were not.

Now, maybe you could make a case by 2 case argument in that respect, but I think it's the mismatch between what's being proposed for 3 inclusion and what the pilot studies collect data 4 on that would be the mismatch that would be 5 problematic here. 6

7 Carol Greene, SIMD. MS. GREENE: It took me just a moment to realize that apparently 8 9 I heard what was just explained. Apparently 10 people are reading this differently, reading 11 what's on the screen to say that the modality used has to be one that's already in use in the 12 13 state health department.

And I assumed this meant that the 14 15 modality used in the pilot has to be the same one 16 that you're proposing to be adopted. And apparently that language is not sufficiently 17 18 clear and it should be made clear that it's not 19 that you have to use tandem aspect that's already 20 being used, but that there has to be a match. 21 MEMBER BOTKIN: Okay. All right, so 22 point well taken. So the language here, I'm

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

1

going to think about how to -- there's not 1 2 necessarily a really easy fix to this problem. But I think -- Dieter. 3 MEMBER MATERN: Dieter again. I just 4 wonder whether we should just state that it must 5 be amenable to high throughput screening. And 6 7 what the exact modality is is irrelevant. As long as you can do it efficiently and effectively 8 9 and cheap. MEMBER BOTKIN: Yes, and I think that 10 11 was perhaps part of the intent of the earlier recommendations, although they do focus primarily 12 13 on accuracy. MS. URV: Because there's been a 14 15 variety. Different states test in different ways 16 for SCID. It's the outcome, or the outcome needs to be similar, and they need to meet the 17 18 requirements of recommendation one. MS. GREEN: 19 You're saying comparable 20 modality. MS. URV: Yes, right. 21 So, comparable modalities would be. And you want your outcome 22

to be the same because for some of the conditions we do have a variety of competing tests that are out there.

MR. WATSON: One true positive. 4 One true positive isn't a whole lot of true 5 We sort of fell back to that with positives. 6 7 SCID because I think it was 600,000 babies or something. I think the committee was at the 8 9 point where just give us one. Because it was supposed to be 1 in 100,000 with that definition. 10

So, I guess a true positive is a clinically effective infant, not somebody who had -- is confirmed to be a waiting, late onset disease or something like that?

15 It's getting increasingly sort of 16 blurry, certainly across the LSDs that are coming 17 into screening now with some of them at 90 18 percent late onset. That's a long wait to see 19 really weather your intervention is going to lead 20 to benefit or not.

21 MEMBER MATERN: Dieter again. I think 22 one true positive in my mind means that you have

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

1

2

3

a patient who based on the diagnostic process has 1 2 the disease. Whether their phenotype is expressed at the time is a different story, but 3 based on everything we know we would expect the 4 patient to become symptomatic. 5 MR. WATSON: It's not an analytical 6 7 pilot that shows you can find people. It's a pilot to find them, intervene, show benefit. 8 9 And I think you have to get all of 10 those together in order to say yes, it's a 11 screening test that's good for newborn screening 12 programs. 13 MEMBER BOTKIN: Well again, you have to have all of those data elements. But I think 14 15 what this is saying is you don't have to have 16 them all in the same study. I'm good with not being 17 MR. WATSON: 18 all in the same study. 19 MEMBER BOTKIN: Don? 20 We might want to go MEMBER BAILEY: back as a group and rethink this particular 21 22 recommendation because you can envision some

1

other odd scenarios.

2	Let's say you did a pilot study for
3	some condition. You found a baby on the first
4	day. Is that then so we're really talking
5	about something more than just identifying one
6	baby. We're talking about enough to show that
7	you can scale up to do this system in a broad
8	way.
9	And so maybe we need to go back and
10	think about that statement in a little bit
11	broader kind of perspective.
12	MEMBER BOTKIN: Well, that would
13	certainly be fine.
14	I would say just to remind folks we're
15	still talking about a threshold criterion to get
16	it up to the evidence review.
17	So the evidence review in that
18	circumstance might say well, okay, you passed our
19	criteria by having an affected baby but you only
20	screened 500 kids so this isn't going to fly.
21	Nancy, I think you had a comment
22	again? Okay, should we try to go ahead?

,	
1	MS. GREEN: Thank you. Nancy Green.
2	So, recall that the concept or the term "true
3	positive" is an ambiguous term because it might
4	mean, as I think Mike is referring to, it might
5	mean a laboratory true positive, but it doesn't
6	necessarily mean a clinically true positive.
7	MEMBER BOTKIN: I'm sorry, say that a
8	little bit louder for me.
9	MS. GREEN: That a true positive might
10	be a laboratory true positive, confirmed by
11	laboratory diagnosis, but not necessarily
12	clinically true positive.
13	So while I understand that you
14	wouldn't have to, you know, I think what the
15	group is saying you wouldn't have to identify a
16	child and then go to treatment and outcome. But
17	that would be data collected from another source.
18	But I think you want to say that the
19	true positive is clinically true positive to
20	discern that from laboratory.
21	MEMBER BOTKIN: So is adding that term
22	sufficient then, one true clinical positive

1

2

5

6

newborn?

MS. GREEN: You might want to ask a newborn screening person specifically about that. 3 You know, like a SCID screen, like a 4

preterm infant would be a true positive, but it's not clinically true positive.

7 MEMBER BOTKIN: No, and I think the other complexity here is it may be one of the 8 9 adult onset forms, say, that would be a true positive but it wouldn't be really what the 10 11 program is designed to identify for clinical intervention. 12

13 MEMBER CUTHBERT: And Jeff, I think that the idea is that it would be a clinically 14 15 identified patient. So you do want to go beyond 16 the screened positive to be able to do the follow-up and verification with the early -- yes, 17 18 sorry, you're correct, it is a clinically 19 verified case.

20 But does clinically MEMBER MATERN: verified mean that the patient must have 21 22 symptoms? Okay.

CHAIR BOCCHINI: So it would be a 1 2 positive confirmatory test that the patient has the condition. 3 MEMBER MCDONOUGH: This is McDonough. 4 I think what you've got there is just fine. 5 Ι think there's enough broad interpretation there 6 7 that gives the committee guidance on what we need to do. 8 9 I'm not sure if wordsmithing this and 10 having it come back again and again is going to 11 add that much. So I really like what you've 12 done. 13 MEMBER BOTKIN: Okay, thank you. All right, so I do have one edit here that I think 14 15 it's worth probably putting in that clinical true 16 positive. Now, whether we want to refine that 17 18 further by saying a true positive for the actual 19 babies that you want to treat, you're trying to 20 find as opposed to other variants of positive I'm 21 not sure yet. 22 I have some proposed language. I'm

not sure who this came from. I'm just jumping in on this.

Population included in the pilot study 3 should be similar to the U.S. population 4 including with respect to prevalence of the 5 condition and the screening protocol used, be 6 7 comparable to that proposed for screening in U.S. states with respect to the timing and approach to 8 9 the screening and the screening modality used. 10 So that could probably use some refinement as 11 well but okay. So, let me spend a little bit of time 12 13 with -- about a revision and then we'll talk to Dr. Bocchini, see whether we can find a short 14

period of time at some other point in the meeting to bring back a revision and see whether that would be acceptable to folks.

18 Other comments about this three? All 19 right.
20 Second charge. Recognize and support 21 current efforts regarding pilot studies and 22 evaluation.

(202) 234-4433

1

2

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC 128

Recommendation four, sustained support 1 2 should be provided by DHHS for the NIH initiatives that support pilot studies in newborn 3 screening including the NBSTRN, NSIGHT, the pilot 4 studies grants, natural history grants, 5 innovative therapies grants, and grants supported 6 7 under the parent announcement. So NIH has been doing a lot to support 8 9 newborn screening in recent years and this is sort of a list of a variety of those activities 10 that are described in more detail in the full 11 12 paper. 13 And so this basically just says that these are important and valuable initiatives and 14 15 HHS ought to continue to support these 16 initiatives. So, thoughts on this? Probably not 17 18 much disagreement but are there additional things 19 to add here perhaps, or other ideas? Tina? 20 I guess I would just be MS. URV: concerned that it sounds like fiscal support, and 21 22 that it shouldn't -- HHS doesn't give us specific

money or earmarked money for this. The institute 1 2 itself earmarks the money for these activities. So, just maybe wordsmith sustain, support to 3 something that doesn't make it sound fiscal. 4 MEMBER BOTKIN: Okay. 5 Recommendations? 6 7 MS. URV: I think it's fine to say continued -- sustain sounds like keep putting 8 9 money into it. And I'm just always cautious of 10 anything we send to HHS that kind of rings with 11 money or dollars. 12 MEMBER BOTKIN: Yes. Continued support. Does that sound a little less fiscal? 13 MS. URV: Yes. 14 15 MEMBER BOTKIN: Okay. Make that 16 Other thoughts on this? revision. Okay. Recommendation five. Sustain or 17 18 continued support should be provided by DHHS to the CDC for its activities relevant to the 19 20 support of pilot studies that address technical training and quality materials for state 21 laboratories, assistance to state programs in 22

obtaining laboratory equipment, the creation and 1 2 distribution of validation test packages, and the fostering of laboratories of excellence. 3 MEMBER SPONG: Just a wordsmithing I 4 think for both this one and the last one. Having 5 "support" twice in the beginning isn't -- doesn't 6 7 read well. I think that too the support of could 8 9 come out of both four and five. So, for the 10 activities relevant to pilot studies that 11 address. And the same with the previous recommendation. 12 13 MEMBER BOTKIN: Okay, very good. All right, I'll make those changes. Other thoughts 14 15 on this. Dieter? Dieter. 16 MEMBER MATERN: I'm just wondering whether it has to be state laboratories 17 and state programs, or just laboratories. 18 19 MEMBER BOTKIN: Okay. So state or 20 regional perhaps, or do you want to just eliminate the geographic aspect? Assistance to 21 programs in obtaining laboratory equipment, et 22

Okay. Nancy? 1 cetera. 2 MS. GREEN: Sorry for so many I'm sorry, but does CDC also do 3 comments. surveillance regarding newborn screening? Would 4 that be part of the sustain support aspect? 5 Maybe it's a question for Coleen. 6 7 MEMBER BOYLE: Yes, we do. I mean, this is specific to laboratories so I think we'd 8 9 have to create a different recommendation, or 10 have a sub. 11 MEMBER BOTKIN: Yes, and this is mostly focused of course on pilot studies. So, 12 13 would surveillance be an element of a pilot 14 study? 15 MEMBER BOYLE: Sure, in terms of 16 trying to understand the outcome, whether or not the program is effective. Be able to evaluate 17 18 and identify both the effectiveness of the screen 19 to identify children with the condition and then 20 to follow them up short-term. MEMBER BOTKIN: Could we just add a 21 22 surveillance term in here, or is it sufficiently

different that we need -- could we say 1 2 distribution and validation of test packages, population surveillance and the fostering of 3 laboratories of excellence? Does that meet the 4 need? 5 Sure, I guess it could. 6 MEMBER BOYLE: 7 I'd have to see it. MEMBER BOTKIN: Okay. 8 9 Hi, Jeff, this is Susan MS. TANKSLEY: 10 Tanksley. Can you hear me? Yes. 11 MEMBER BOTKIN: 12 MS. TANKSLEY: Hi. Just in regards to 13 the comment about taking state away from this recommendation. Isn't the -- so is this for 14 15 after the fact, or continued pilot studies, or is 16 this for the pulling together the evidence prior to it being submitted for evidence review. 17 18 MEMBER BOTKIN: Yes, this is in the 19 broad category of what can we do to recognize and 20 support activities that are already ongoing with respect to relevance to pilot studies. 21 22 And so this is sort of recognizing

what's being done and supporting that that 1 2 continue to be done. Okay. So it doesn't 3 MS. TANKSLEY: have to do with I guess promoting implementation 4 moving forward after a recommendation. 5 Not primarily, no. MEMBER BOTKIN: 6 7 MS. TANKSLEY: Okay. MEMBER BOTKIN: Carla, do you have any 8 9 comment on that? 10 MEMBER CUTHBERT: Susan, removing of 11 the term "state" was just to indicate that CDC would provide materials to any of the 12 13 laboratories that would request. 14 MS. TANKSLEY: Okay. 15 MR. SHONE: I had basically the same 16 comment and question that Susan had about state, especially around the line that says assistance 17 18 to state programs in obtaining laboratory 19 equipment. 20 So, CDC is not providing those types 21 of resources to non-state programs. And I guess 22 it gets back at the question of the charge to CDC

is to assist the states, not necessarily private 1 2 laboratories and commercial programs. So, I kind of am in favor of perhaps 3 wordsmithing it to maintain "state" in there. 4 MEMBER BOTKIN: Could we say state and 5 other laboratories or other programs? 6 7 MEMBER MATERN: That would be fine with me but I don't know why by taking it out it 8 9 wouldn't include the state laboratories. 10 MEMBER BOTKIN: Okay. I'm sorry, 11 Dieter, say that again? 12 MEMBER MATERN: By taking state out 13 doesn't mean you take out the states out of the It's just not limited to state 14 equation. 15 laboratories and state programs. Right. 16 MEMBER BOTKIN: No, and I think -- but folks were a little nervous about I 17 18 think de-highlighting the state connection there. 19 MR. SHONE: My question remains does 20 CDC provide what is in here. I mean, the idea is continued support. So, if it's continuing 21 22 support that exists is that support currently

136

provided outside of the programs.

1

2

MEMBER CUTHBERT: Thanks, Scott. This is Carla again. 3

So, there are some activities that CDC 4 will provide exclusively for state programs. 5 And you're absolutely right. And there are some 6 7 things that we will generously give to other programs who request. 8

9 So, you're correct, we would help as 10 states help with equipment and things like that. 11 Validation packages again is something that's new that we would be able to create specifically for 12 13 And again, if anyone else requests we states. can also make those available. Thank you for 14 15 your clarification.

16 MS. URV: One example that might make sense to you is we might have investigators at 17 18 the NIH who are developing new tests. And 19 they're at a university or a small business. 20 And then they would go to the CDC

because the NIH funding, we ask them to go to the 21 22 CDC and work with them. So it's in the

Washington DC

(202) 234-4433

1

developmental process.

2 MEMBER BOTKIN: So, does it still meet the need then to say state and other? Does that 3 sort of get to both points here? 4 MEMBER CUTHBERT: We can do a little 5 bit of wordsmithing and make sure that we include 6 7 the word "state" and perhaps "other" as well. But we'll do some wordsmithing on that. 8 9 MEMBER BOTKIN: Okay. I'm going to 10 move on then to charge three, identify other resources that could support pilot studies and 11 evaluation. And this is our last recommendation. 12 13 DHHS should support the development of a network of centers of excellence for newborn 14 15 screening pilot studies. 16 This network should be comprised of state-based public health programs, laboratories 17 18 and research centers that would provide a stable, 19 experienced, compliant, efficient and quality 20 infrastructure for the conduct of populationbased pilot studies for newborn screening. 21 22 So this is a pie in the sky, but to

137

(202) 234-4433

1

2

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

www.nealrgross.com

7 this meeting. Dr. Bocchini, is that? CHAIR BOCCHINI: Well, it seems to me 8 9 that the principles that you've elucidated have 10 all been accepted by the committee. Or I don't 11 see anybody who is opposed to the principles, but clearly we need a little wordsmithing for some of 12 13 the things to make these recommendations more clear and to address all of the things that were 14 15 raised. 16 So I would think that if we could --17 well, I guess we would do two things. One, can 18 we as a committee accept the report of the Pilot 19 Study Workgroup and accept the recommendations 20 with the proviso that these recommendations will be wordsmithed and then sent to the committee for 21 22 further comments if necessary.

some extent how folks are already moving in some respects here. So let me just open it up for comments.

3 comments.
4 Okay, terrific. So perhaps we'll see
5 if we can make some revisions and get these done
6 in a way that will perhaps enable a vote during

Is that fair? And then this way we 1 2 don't have to bring it back for a vote. We could provide those if you can tomorrow, but I think we 3 would then be able to address the 4 recommendations. 5 If that's acceptable to the committee 6 7 by a show of hands, approve? Then I think we can Okay. Does that sound fair? qo forward. 8 9 MEMBER BOTKIN: Sounds great. 10 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Okay. Well Jeff, I 11 want to thank you for your leadership in this and all the work that you've done. 12 13 And I want to thank all the committee members because this I think is a very important 14 15 project and it's going to provide the 16 recommendations and guidance for us to go forward in a very effective way as new conditions are 17 18 nominated for inclusion on the RUSP. So I want 19 to thank you all for the work you've done. 20 Steve. Jeff, this is your 21 MEMBER MCDONOUGH: 22 last meeting as a committee member I think. And

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC 139

I just want to say that I have so much enjoyed 1 2 all the work that you've done and the way you present yourself. 3 One of the cool things about coming 4 out here is the chance -- you get to meet a lot 5 of different people that I don't normally 6 7 encounter in North Dakota. I'm just so impressed by so many of 8 9 you on what you've done. And I just want to 10 thank you for your years of service to the I know you'll be involved in ethics 11 committee. and newborn screening in the future. 12 But it's 13 been a real honor to get to know you, and again want to thank you for all you've done. 14 15 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Thank you for that 16 So, this concludes the morning session. comment. We now have from now until 1 o'clock for lunch 17 18 after which we will promptly start at 1 p.m. with 19 the public comment section. Thank you. 20 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter

went off the record at 11:55 a.m. and resumed at 1:06 p.m.)

14.
A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N
(1:06 p.m.)
CHAIR BOCCHINI: Now, we're ready to
start. I'd like to open the session with roll
call. So, Don Bailey?
MEMBER BAILEY: Here.
CHAIR BOCCHINI: I'm here. Jeff
Botkin?
MEMBER BOTKIN: Here.
CHAIR BOCCHINI: Carla Cuthbert for
CDC?
MEMBER CUTHBERT: Here.
CHAIR BOCCHINI: Catherine Spong.
MEMBER SPONG: Here.
CHAIR BOCCHINI: Kellie Kelm.
MEMBER KELM: Here.
CHAIR BOCCHINI: Fred Lorey by phone.
Dieter Matern.
MEMBER MATERN: Here.
CHAIR BOCCHINI: Steve McDonough.
MEMBER MCDONOUGH: Here.
CHAIR BOCCHINI: Kamila Mistry.

,	
1	MEMBER MISTRY: Here.
2	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Michael Lu.
3	MEMBER LU: Here.
4	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Alexis Thompson by
5	phone.
6	MEMBER THOMPSON: I'm here.
7	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Cathy Wicklund.
8	MEMBER WICKLUND: Here.
9	CHAIR BOCCHINI: And Debi Sarkar.
10	MS. SARKAR: Here.
11	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Now for
12	organizational representatives. Bob Ostrander.
13	MR. OSTRANDER: Here.
14	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Beth Tarini.
15	MS. TARINI: Here.
16	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Michael Watson.
17	MR. WATSON: Here.
18	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Joseph Biggio. Kate
19	Tullis.
20	MS. TULLIS: Here.
21	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Susan Tanksley by
22	phone.

.	
1	MS. TANKSLEY: I'm here.
2	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Chris Kus by phone.
3	MR. KUS: Here.
4	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Adam Kanis by phone.
5	MR. KANIS: Here.
6	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Natasha Bonhomme.
7	MS. BONHOMME: Here.
8	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Ed McCabe by phone.
9	MR. MCCABE: I'm here.
10	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Cate Walsh Vockley.
11	MS. VOCKLEY: Here.
12	CHAIR BOCCHINI: And Carol Greene.
13	MS. GREENE: Here.
14	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Thank you all. We're
15	going to open this session with public comment.
16	And there are a number of people who have signed
17	up to make public comments.
18	We have a half an hour so I want to be
19	careful about everybody please try and stick to
20	the time allotted so that everyone gets a chance
21	to make their comments.
22	So first we have four persons from the

Association for Creatine Deficiencies who will 1 2 discuss newborn screening for GAMT deficiency. They are Kim Tuminello, Laura Martin, 3 Heidi Wallis and Melissa Klor. So if you'll all 4 come to the microphone and then you can speak one 5 after each other. Welcome. 6 7 Hi. So my name's Laura MS. MARTIN: Martin, and I'm here with the Association for 8 9 Creatine Deficiencies today to tell you a little bit about my son. 10 11 This is Ryan. He'll be five years old So Ryan was diagnosed with GAMT 12 in July. 13 deficiency just before his third birthday on a genetic epilepsy panel. 14 15 He started treatment right away and 16 within two weeks his seizures had completely stopped. His EEG normalized, his coordination 17 18 improved, and, it took awhile, but he is talking now which is a huge relief to us. 19 He's got hundreds of words and he's 20 able to put them together into short sentences. 21 22 He can tell us things like hands cold, Mom, need

1

mittens.

2 He's a happy kid. He's affectionate. He's active and playful. We're very proud of him 3 and excited for his future. 4 Since learning about Ryan's diagnosis 5 I felt kind of torn between two different 6 7 perspectives. I try to live primarily in the first 8 9 which is the one that I just told you about. Ι actually used to work at a home for adults with 10 severe intellectual disabilities, mostly non-11 verbal, and I know what Ryan's future would have 12 13 held had he not been diagnosed at such an early 14 age. 15 But there's another side to this story 16 that I wanted to share with you today, and that has to do with the fact that my son has permanent 17 18 brain damage that could have been prevented by 19 newborn screening. 20 So, Ryan currently attends a special school for multiply handicapped children where he 21 22 gets speech therapy, physical therapy,

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC 145

occupational therapy, music therapy, you name it. 1 2 He's still in diapers, and he scores at less than the first percentile on every 3 standardized test he's ever had across domains. 4 He may never be able to live 5 independently or care for a family of his own. 6 7 So, Ryan also has an older brother, a stepsister and a fraternal twin brother as well. 8 9 And none of my other children have GAMT 10 deficiency. But I want you to know that their 11 lives have been impacted by the diagnosis as well. 12 13 I feel very guilty about all of the time and attention that's been stolen from my 14 15 other kids while I focus so much of my energy on 16 Ryan's care. And coincidentally I happen to be a 17 18 genetic counselor as well which adds to my guilt 19 as you can imagine in so many ways. How could I 20 work in this field and not know for so long that my own son has a treatable genetic disease. 21 22 The truth is that before Ryan's

diagnosis I had never heard of GAMT deficiency, but when he tested positive one of my very first thoughts was how could this not be on the newborn screening. 4

It's the perfect candidate for 5 It's a devastating disease when it's screening. 6 7 left untreated. Treated from birth kids are normal. It has a treatment that is just 8 9 incredibly safe, and it also really couldn't be 10 any less expensive. So Ryan just has creatinine and ornithine supplements. 11

So, ever since Ryan's diagnosis I feel 12 13 like I've just been kind of carrying around this terrible secret because I know that there are 14 15 other kids and adults out there with undiagnosed 16 GAMT who are seizing and wheelchair-bound and unable to communicate. 17

18 And every year that goes by without putting this condition on the newborn screening 19 20 that number is only going to grow.

The first case of GAMT deficiency was 21 22 diagnosed in 1994 which is more than 20 years

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

1

2

3

www.nealrgross.com

So I feel strongly that this has gone on 1 ago. 2 for long enough and I ask that you please vote today to move GAMT forward toward the condition 3 Thank you. review team. 4 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Thank you, Ms. 5 Martin, for presenting your personal story. 6 We 7 appreciate it. Thank you. MS. KLOR: Hi, my name is Missy Klor 8 9 and I'm one of the cofounders of the Association for Creatine Deficiencies. 10 11 And my son was diagnosed at 13 months old with GAMT deficiency. 12 13 He's now eight years old. We went through a lot of tough moments on our journey to 14 15 a diagnosis including being misdiagnosed with 16 cerebral palsy. None of it was easy and it was very 17 18 scary at times, but we were lucky. John only suffered 13 months of brain damage. 19 20 John went through years of costly physical therapy, occupational therapy and speech 21 22 therapy. But after eight years John only has

speech on a consultative basis and occupational therapy once a week. So in terms of a cost analysis you can look at the continued care that he would have received versus how he's doing today.

6 Today John is a typical boy that can 7 run and play. He's eight years old and finishing 8 the first grade. He loves to play with his 9 friends. He takes two hours of gymnastics twice 10 a week and is currently working on front and back 11 hand springs.

That's kind of, you know, when he was 12 13 two the physical therapist told me he no longer needs physical therapy. And as a mom I was 14 15 hesitant to let that go with a kid with brain 16 damage so I may have kind of overkilled taking on that expense myself, but the state, no one ever 17 18 had to pay for any more continued physical 19 therapy for him.

He plays soccer. He gets 100s and sometimes 110s on his spelling tests. He currently likes to read Goosebumps books.

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

Where was a time before John was 1 2 diagnosed where the future did not look good for him. But we were lucky thanks to the doctors at 3 They were knowledgeable about GAMT and Duke. 4 screened him for it. 5 Today he has achieved more than I ever 6 7 dreamed. He had to work hard to overcome his delays, but he did it and I couldn't be prouder. 8 9 John takes three supplements three 10 times a day. Although the treatment can be relatively inexpensive I received approval from 11 federal Blue Cross and Blue Shield to have one of 12 13 his medical foods covered. I have a letter from them stating that we were granted an exception 14 15 for it to be covered under our preferred benefits 16 until John turns age 22. And during the discussion about 17 18 medical foods I actually looked at the letter that I received from them to see how many years 19 20 it took me to get this letter. And John was diagnosed in 2009 and the letter is dated 2013. 21

22 So it was four years of fighting.

(202) 234-4433

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

www.nealrgross.com

John is also on a special diet, but so 1 2 are a lot of kids these days so that really is no big deal at school or at home. 3 This diagnosis will not define John. 4 Unfortunately until GAMT is added to newborn 5 screening not every child and parent will be as 6 7 lucky. Currently many children are either 8 9 undiagnosed or diagnosed at a later age. They have brain damage that causes seizures, 10 difficulty speaking, difficulty walking, and the 11 list of negative outcomes only gets longer. 12 13 I'm asking you to please consider voting for more futures like John's. You get to 14 15 vote for more children to have a future that is 16 not defined by the four letters GAMT, but instead by what they want to make for the future for 17 18 themselves. 19 These children will be able to grow up 20 with a life relatively unaffected by GAMT and will be able to experience life to the fullest. 21 22 They may not realize how lucky they

are to be diagnosed from birth, but that's okay. 1 2 You and I and the other four mothers in the room that I stand here with today will know just how 3 lucky they are. 4 I always tell John that I love him to 5 the Moon and back. This year for Mother's Day he 6 7 gave me a special gift. It was a list of all the things he loves about me, and at the very end it 8 9 said I'd like to tell my mom that I love her from 10 10 galaxies and back. 11 Every parent should get that opportunity to hear those words from their 12 13 children. But unfortunately with late diagnosis that's not always possible. 14 15 Every parent here has a different 16 story to tell, but unfortunately the outcome of that story is ultimately defined by how quickly 17 18 they were able to get the diagnosis of GAMT. 19 All every parent wishes for is a 20 healthy child. Please vote yes to add GAMT to newborn screening. 21 22 MS. TUMINELLO: Hi, my name is Kim

Tuminello and I am a mother of two children with 1 I'm also the president and cofounder for 2 GAMT. the Association for Creatine Deficiencies and I'm 3 here today to represent my family and the entire 4 creatinine deficiency community. 5 I'm hoping that if you didn't know 6 7 about this particular genetic disorder in the past that you now have a better understanding of 8 9 this severe neurological disorder that is 10 devastating in every way. 11 However, GAMT is completely treatable but only if it is caught in the very beginning of 12 13 life. It has been proven in studies that a 14 15 newborn blood spot can detect the elevated 16 guanidinoacetate level. We know from Utah's pilot of newborn 17 screening this past year that there are no gaps 18 in evidence and no false positives. 19 20 We also know through a study at Duke that there are no false negatives and the rate of 21 22 occurrence may be as high as 1 in 120,000 which

would be as many as 33 babies diagnosed each year 1 2 just here in the U.S. There is a safe and viable treatment 3 that is a life-altering therapy. Our children 4 simply drink a cocktail of creatinine, ornithine 5 and sodium benzoate a few times a day along with 6 7 a moderate low-protein diet. This simple therapy saves them from a 8 9 life of hundreds of seizures in a day, the inability to communicate and being strapped to a 10 wheelchair for the rest of their lives. 11 My 10-year-old son Ty was not 12 13 diagnosed until he was 10 months old. I guess we are considered one of the lucky ones because we 14 15 got the earlier diagnosis than most. 16 But Ty has gone through years of physical therapy, occupational therapy, vision 17 18 therapy and today he still continues to be in 19 speech therapy through our school district in San 20 Diego. But because we knew to test for GAMT 21 22 my daughter has been treated since birth and

Paige is now a typical 6-year-old in the first 1 2 grade and has never had a day of therapy or intervention in her life. 3 Last year my daughter's kindergarten 4 did a project in class for her school's open 5 house and was asked to write about something that 6 7 meant more to them than gold. While most kids wrote about their 8 9 puppy or new bike, Paige wrote, "My medicine 10 means more to me than gold because without it I couldn't walk or talk." It's just that simple, 11 isn't it? 12 13 While the value of diagnosing and treating GAMT deficiency from birth truly is far 14 15 greater than gold, the actual cost of this life-16 saving treatment is practically nothing. As a matter of fact, the cost is so 17 18 inexpensive that even if a family didn't have insurance coverage of their own they could 19 20 probably still afford to go to their local Whole Foods and supply their child with creatinine for 21 22 about \$20 a month.

Everything needed to treat this debilitating disorder could literally be ordered off of Amazon.

To think there is a family out there 4 who believes they are just one of the statistics 5 in the autism community, that their child has 6 7 unexplained seizures and slowly or sometimes rapidly continue to watch their child slip away, 8 9 and all they had to do was simply go to their local GNC and pick up something that literally 10 would change the future of their child in every 11 way imaginable. 12

Today labs across the country already have the tandem mass technology needed to start testing for GAMT. Even if second tier testing is needed it's estimated that the cost adds up to only be 49 cents a baby.

18 I'm sure every state will be happy to 19 have this on newborn screening in comparison to 20 the millions of dollars that would be spent over 21 the lifetime of the child in school, special 22 services, and eventually being turned over to the

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

1

2

3

www.nealrgross.com

1

state to receive lifelong care.

2 My fear today is the longer we wait more babies will go untreated. For them it would 3 The damage will be done. And just be too late. 4 with us four moms today we have six children. 5 Well, I have good news. GAMT is 6 7 exactly the type of treatable disorder that RUSP is looking for. All of us here today have had 8 9 many physicians who have said this should be a This should be a no brainer. And I 10 slam dunk. 11 certainly believe that to be true also. But we know that you all have an 12 13 awesome responsibility, but you also have an amazing opportunity to save these children and 14 15 their families from the unnecessary heartbreak of 16 GAMT. The Association for Creatine 17 18 Deficiencies has built a strong patient advocacy 19 network. 20 We help families with resources and programs such as patient grants if they are not 21 able to afford the treatment themselves. 22

And our community knows that they can 1 2 depend on us to get the job done. Each of these mothers you see here today ironically left their 3 families on Mother's Day to drive from the far 4 northeast or fly across the country for this 5 meeting today for just a few minutes to tell you 6 7 about this rare but treatable disorder our children, and most importantly to save the 8 9 countless other children in the future. Thank 10 you for your consideration. MS. WALLIS: Hi, my name is Heidi 11 Wallis and I'm the mother of four children, two 12 13 with GAMT and two without. There are a few things I want to be 14 15 sure you understand about children with GAMT. 16 First is that they do not look They are not instantly recognized at 17 different. 18 birth as having GAMT. I tell you this because the burden of 19 20 diagnosing these kids should not be on their primary care physician. 21 22 Also, not every GAMT child develops

symptoms that are alarming in the first few years 1 2 of life. My oldest daughter Samantha was slow 3 to reach milestones, but for example, she did 4 finally walk at 18 months. This was considered 5 just barely good enough. 6 7 She did not have floppiness or movement disorders, and until she turned five she 8 9 did not have seizures. 10 At three she was diagnosed barely on 11 the autism spectrum and we were given a list of resources to go home and figure out how to live 12 13 with this new diagnosis. We as her parents knew something more 14 15 was going on, but again it was not obvious or alarming enough for anyone to take our feelings 16 seriously. 17 18 Thankfully at five the onset of 19 seizures ended up getting her an MRI along with 20 spectroscopy and that is how her creatinine deficiency was finally noticed. 21 Sheer luck led her to a GAMT diagnosis 22

and treatment, not unique symptoms or dysmorphic 2 features.

Secondly, I would like you to know 3 that treating a GAMT child from birth does not 4 just help them. It does not just make their life 5 a little better, or ease the symptoms. 6 It 7 absolutely saves their life.

My son Louis was diagnosed at birth. 8 9 As I have watched him grow from a tiny baby to the 4 and a half year old preschooler that he is 10 now treatment for him has been nothing short of 11 miraculous. 12

13 He is full of joy, intelligence, creativity, love and affection, imagination and 14 15 music. He scores in the typical range in 16 cognitive testing.

He sticks to a regular RDI of protein 17 18 every day so no over-indulging, and he has to put 19 his playtime on pause four times a day to take a 20 quick syringe full of easily available and affordable powders mixed with water. 21

22

1

Treatment has been simple for him and

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

(202) 234-4433

very successful.

2	Treating a child with GAMT later in
3	life can help them. Samantha went this is my
4	daughter Samantha was diagnosed at five.
5	Samantha went from a 5-year-old that
6	could only approximate a handful of words to
7	having lots of actual speech. She can ride a
8	bike.
9	But here's the problem. Her IQ tests
10	very low. Her speech is not always
11	understandable, not the pronunciation but the
12	content. I don't know what she is trying to say
13	to me. It is often meaningless, or quoting
14	movies.
15	She can ride a bike, but not
16	independently. She crosses lanes without
17	looking. She's reckless and tries to take off on
18	her bike alone and gets lost.
19	She has improved with treatment and
20	I'm grateful that she's come as far as she has.
21	But she will continue to suffer because of her
22	late diagnosis for the rest of her life.

1	The damage has been done. She has a
2	severe intellectual disability.
3	I ask you to please understand that
4	there is not a second option for children with
5	GAMT. They must be diagnosed at birth.
6	Treatment is successful. There is no
7	question about it. Please recommend GAMT for the
8	RUSP. Thank you.
9	CHAIR BOCCHINI: I want to thank all
10	four of you for coming here today and presenting
11	to the committee. We appreciate it. Thank you.
12	Next we have Christine Brown and Jana
13	Monaco who would like to address the importance
14	of access to quality care and treatment.
15	MS. MONACO: Good afternoon. My name
16	is Jana Monaco and I am the parent of two
17	children with isovaleric acidemia.
18	And I wanted to thank you to Kathy
19	Camp for her great presentation this morning,
20	although it was truly disheartening to me as a
21	mom.
22	I'm also the advocacy liaison for the

Organic Acidemia Association.

1

2	Steven, now 18 as many of you know
3	would be graduating from high school next month,
4	but that's not going to happen. As you know, his
5	late diagnosis due to lack of newborn screening
6	paused his metabolic acidosis 15 years ago this
7	month at age 3 and a half, resulting in his
8	significant brain damage and taking away that and
9	countless other dreams.
10	Caroline, now 13, will have that one
11	and many other dreams. The difference is the
12	early detection for her disorder and appropriate
13	treatment with a detailed diet plan, medical
14	formula and supplements. That's a cost-benefit
15	if you really are looking for one.
16	In my 13 years of advocating for
17	expanded newborn screening and follow-up and
18	treatment medical formula and foods has been
19	identified as a critical component of the
20	treatment, though not everyone has access due to
21	the lack of coverage for it.
22	They are costly, but they are

essential, and children like mine and Christine's 1 2 depend on them to thrive. In 2010 during my term on this very 3 committee a letter was sent to the Secretary 4 requesting that they be included as essential 5 health benefits under the Affordable Care Act. 6 7 It didn't happen due to the Secretary's request for more information, 8 9 particularly on insurance plans. 10 The IOM's report in October of 2011 recommended further evaluation of coverage by HHS 11 of nutritional supplements and formulas needed 12 13 for the treatment of inborn errors. There has been no follow-up and no 14 15 further evaluation, but we need you to ask HHS to 16 follow through. Just as bureaucracy caused 17 disparity in state newborn screening programs 18 prior to the expanded recommendation from this committee resulting in kids like Steven so has 19 20 its impact on medical formula and food coverage with NIH, FDA and CMS and others operating under 21 various classifications and definitions, and 22

1

2

5

their own barriers.

We request that you ask the Secretary to end this disparity that has lingered for 3 almost 10 years since we've expanded the newborn 4 screening panel.

We ask that you invite her to initiate 6 7 a joint meeting of these departments and other key players that Cathy mentioned this morning and 8 9 convene and agree to a common definition and solutions to make lifelong access to medical 10 formula and foods available and accessible to 11 each and every child and adult who needs them. 12

13 If treatments are required for conditions to be included on the RUSP then it is 14 15 ethically wrong to allow them to be inaccessible 16 to the very patients that need them.

This committee has a moral 17 18 responsibility to ensure that this component of 19 lifelong treatment be properly identified and 20 available to the population whose lives depend on 21 them.

22

Please stop allowing this elephant in

the room to continue to remain while patients and 1 2 families suffer the consequences. Thank you for your continued work. 3 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Thank you. 4 MS. BROWN: Hi, I'm Christine Brown. 5 I have two children with PKU. I sit on the Long-6 7 Term Follow-up and Treatment Subcommittee and I'm also the executive director of the National PKU 8 9 Alliance. 10 And many of you saw me present to the full committee a few months ago giving a patient 11 perspective on long-term follow-up. 12 13 And you might remember that I put two pictures up of my two children with PKU. 14 And 15 many of you raised your hands when I asked you 16 how many of you have similar pictures of when your children were born and that day. 17 18 And we all had some of those same 19 questions when our children were born. What will 20 they look like? What mark will they make on the world? 21 22 I had additional questions after the

diagnosis of PKU. Will they be able to go to 1 2 school? Will they need an IEP? Will they need a 504 plan? Can they go to college? What are they 3 going to eat on their prom date? Can they go on 4 a business lunch? 5 But never in a million years that 6 7 first week of asking those questions did I think to ask the question am I ever going to have to 8 9 worry about their treatment being covered by an 10 insurance company. 11 As a patient community the National PKU Alliance at our last conference asked adults 12 13 and parents to free write what are their top three concerns in dealing with PKU. 14 15 Number three was the development of a 16 home feed monitor for better management. Number two was new treatments. 17 And 18 you saw from Cathy's presentation and my 19 presentation a few months ago that 91 percent of 20 our community said that new treatments are 21 important. 22 But the number one concern that

trumped everything else was access and coverage to medical foods to treat PKU.

There is a failure here, and I think you all recognize that. We have all failed to accomplish support and access to treatment after the diagnosis is made on that newborn screening test.

As Jana said we believe you have a moral obligation. You have a moral obligation to my children, Connor and Kellen. You have a moral obligation to Jana's children Steven and Caroline, and to the other 475 children born every year with a positive diagnosis that requires medical foods for treatment.

15 I think we've already had some great 16 discussion and some wonderful suggestions 17 including asking the Secretary to follow up now 18 that that Department of Labor survey has been out 19 and the IOM report has been out for more than 20 five years.

21 This issue of medical foods has been 22 punted too many times. In the last seven years

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

www.nealrgross.com

we have been as a patient organization talking with the NIH. We met with CMS. They told us to meet with FDA. We talked to FDA. They said well, our definition of "enteral" is different than CMS.

6 We testified before HHS at the 7 listening sessions on the essential health 8 benefits. We were told to go to the Office of 9 Intergovernmental and External Affairs, who told 10 us to go the Office of the General Surgeon, who 11 told us to go to the National Prevention Council, 12 who told us to go back to HHS.

13 Then when we went to OPM and talked 14 about the federal employee health benefit plans 15 we were told they were going to lift the age 16 limits on medical foods. That didn't happen and 17 they referred us back to HHS and CMS.

18 It's been going around and around for
19 far too long.
20 So again I ask you that same question

I asked you two months ago. What hopes and
dreams did you have for your children when they

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

1

2

3

4

5

1

were born?

2 One of my biggest dreams shouldn't have to be the dream of getting their medical 3 foods covered. 4 I want to set my sights on something 5 bigger and better for them, and in order to do 6 7 this I ask you all to be bold. Thank you. CHAIR BOCCHINI: Christine and Jana, 8 9 thank you both very much. And as you know from this morning's 10 presentation and discussion we have asked the 11 Long-Term Follow-up Committee to review the 12 13 current information from those reports and to kind of come up with some plan to go forward to 14 15 try and improve the situation. So thank you. Next, Carol Greene is going to make us 16 aware of the Society of Inherited Metabolic 17 18 Disorders updated statement on access to care with focus on medical foods. 19 20 Thank you. So I am Carol MS. GREENE: Greene representing today the Society for 21 Inherited Metabolic Disorders which is a 22

professional organization of those who work in
 the area of inborn errors, supports access to
 quality are including medical foods.

And we hope that our updated statement will be a useful tool to those who are working in support of this.

7 And in the interest of keeping to time 8 even though it's only one page I'll just read 9 highlights of our April 2016 statement on medical 10 foods, and ask that the whole of the statement be 11 included in the record.

12 So, the SIMD strongly urges that all 13 private and public systems for healthcare payment 14 be mandated to cover specialized diets including 15 medical foods for treatment of inborn errors of 16 metabolism found by newborn screening or 17 clinically diagnosed.

18Our statement describes what inborn19errors of metabolism are and mentions the Orphan20Drug Act definition of medical foods.

21 And we point out that although medical 22 foods are an essential medically necessary

treatment for many inherited metabolic disorders many healthcare payers deny coverage for medical foods and mandates are not consistent across states.

The complex pattern of healthcare 5 coverage in the United States means that many 6 7 individuals with inborn errors of metabolism are at significant risk of disability or death 8 9 because of lack of access to the medical foods that are a critical part of their medical care. 10 The lack of uniform and consistent 11 coverage of medical foods throughout the United 12 13 States threatens individuals and families. Because medical foods are essential 14 15 treatments for many of the conditions detected by 16 expanded newborn screening failure to provide lifelong access to these treatment modalities 17 18 also threatens the success of public health

20 And that's for PKU, for isovaleric, 21 that's the creatinine for GAMT, and we really 22 hope that you will be able to use this statement

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

policy.

19

1

2

3

4

www.nealrgross.com

which we offer as a tool in the fight to get this 1 2 covered. Thank you, Carol. 3 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Next, Spencer Perlman to talk about newborn 4 screening for spinal muscular atrophy. 5 MR. PERLMAN: Good afternoon and thank 6 7 you for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Spencer Perlman. 8 I am a 9 member of the Cure SMA board of directors though 10 I'm testifying today on behalf of the entire SMA 11 community. Being sensitive to time I will just 12 13 briefly explain our purpose and our request, and ask that the remainder of my comments be 14 submitted for the record. 15 16 As you all know SMA or spinal muscular atrophy is an autosomal recessive genetic 17 18 disorder that occurs in about 1 in every 10,000 live births and is the leading genetic killer of 19 20 children under the age of 2. Today I urge the advisory committee to 21 22 give serious consideration to the forthcoming

nomination and evaluation of SMA for universal newborn screening.

3 SMA families, investigators and 4 clinicians all believe that newborn screening is 5 imperative for ensuring access to effective 6 treatment of this disorder.

7 In the 10 years since I last stood 8 before this committee there have been significant 9 advancements in the development of a treatment 10 for SMA. And indeed this is a really exciting 11 time as we are on the brink of seeing an approved 12 therapy in the foreseeable future.

Of the 18 SMA drugs currently in development 6 are clinical trials including several in phase III. And we expect that one or more of these programs will undergo FDA NDA review in 2017.

18 Therefore it's critical that SMA be 19 added to the recommended uniform screening panel 20 as soon as possible to ensure that patients can 21 obtain access to treatment at the earliest 22 possible moment.

1

2

1	Both human natural history data and
2	animal model data indicate that there is only a
3	very small opportunity after birth for effective
4	intervention in the most common and severe form
5	of SMA type 1 which affects 60 to 70 percent of
6	all SMA individuals and frequently leads to death
7	before the age of 2.
8	Preliminary data in mouse models also
9	indicates that pre-symptomatic drug intervention
10	is far more effective than post symptomatic.
11	And additional studies have also shown
12	that proactive treatment of an infant with SMA in
13	the first few weeks to months of life prolongs
14	survival and improves the quality of life.
15	Furthermore, the technology for
16	newborn screening for SMA has been successfully
17	utilized in several ongoing pilot newborn
18	screening programs including in New York State
19	and in Taiwan.
20	So in conclusion the SMA community
21	strongly urges the advisory committee to take up
22	consideration of the forthcoming SMA RUSP

I	
1	nomination, in particular because of the
2	approaching availability of a treatment for SMA
3	and the demonstrated benefits of early
4	intervention.
5	I thank the committee for the
6	opportunity to address you this afternoon.
7	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Thank you for your
8	comments. We certainly look forward to receiving
9	the nomination packet.
10	Now on the phone we have Mr. Dean Suhr
11	to discuss the RUSP roundtable and California
12	model legislation involving the RUSP. Mr. Suhr?
13	MR. SUHR: Yes, good afternoon. Thank
14	you, Dr. Bocchini and I thank the committee for
15	this time.
16	I wanted to touch on these two
17	particular issues just briefly.
18	The RUSP roundtable is continuing. I
19	spoke about that at the February meeting so I
20	won't provide any more details on that except to
21	say that our next meeting will be Wednesday,
22	August 24, just prior to the next meeting in the

1

D.C. area.

2	On the state legislation I'm involved
3	in a project in California, in basically a study
4	to address the issue of the U.S. having 50 states
5	with 50 policies relative to how a screen is
6	implemented after it's approved and on the
7	Recommended Uniform Screening Panel.
8	As you know, in many cases that
9	involves a legislative action of some kind. And
10	in fact, that legislative action is not
11	necessarily tied to the RUSP. There are, I
12	believe there are states that are mandated by
13	legislative action without being on the RUSP.
14	However, what we're talking about here
15	is what happens after the issue is put onto the
16	RUSP.
17	The legislation that has been proposed
18	and introduced in California is something that
19	I'm participating in cooperation with the rare
20	disease legislative advocate.
21	And it's a one and done we're calling
22	it kind of in the global sense where once a

disease is on the RUSP a legislative action is automatically taken care of. So we would pass a law up front that says anything that is qualified on the RUSP by a thorough evidence review process that you all go through, that that disease is then acceptable to that state to go forward with implementation.

8 We're not requesting any specific 9 timeline, nor are we able to include an 10 appropriation that would allow that addition to 11 be implemented.

I would highlight that in California that the appropriations that cover the expenses relative to newborn screening are actually a matter of law already. So that actually is not an issue in California.

We want to use this legislation as
model legislation in all 50 states, or at least
all states where the legislators are involved in
getting these diseases onto the panels.
We recognize this will not work
everywhere, but we're hoping that we can bring

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

the advocacy and the family groups together to do 1 2 this kind of in a one and done sense. We've run across an issue though that 3 I want to just put in front of the committee. 4 And I'm not sure how you would address this, or 5 it might be just an undercurrent. 6 7 But there are a number of states that implement their screening, they almost replicate 8 9 the entire set of work that the committee goes through in terms of evidence review. 10 11 And we expect some of that because every state's equipment is a little bit 12 13 different, their processes are a little bit different. 14 15 But it appears that there's a varying 16 width of acceptance of the work that the committee is doing. 17 18 And everybody recognizes that it's a baseline, but how much additional work is done on 19 20 top of that is a question we're starting to run So that's something I'd like 21 into across states. 22 to throw back at you to maybe consider a little

different work effort in terms of how can we 1 2 continue to build the credibility of the committee's work and continue to share the 3 breadth and the depth of the work that you're 4 5 doing. So with that, I do thank you for all 6 7 your work, and I thank you for the time. CHAIR BOCCHINI: Thank you very much, 8 9 We appreciate your comments. Mr. Suhr. 10 This will conclude the public comment 11 session for this meeting. So we appreciate the input that we've received from the public 12 13 Thank you. comments. We're now going to go forward with the 14 15 GAMT Nomination and Prioritization Workgroup 16 report. Dr. Matern will present this information. And subsequent to the presentation 17 18 there will be a discussion, decision, and a vote. 19 Dieter? 20 Thank you. So I'll be MEMBER MATERN: talking on behalf of the Nomination and 21 22 Prioritization Workgroup. And I don't have a

slide that actually mentions the members of that 1 2 workgroup, but it includes Dr. Bocchini, and Dr. Cuthbert, and Dr. Scott, and Debi, and Fred 3 Lorey, and probably I'm forgetting someone. 4 So, the nomination was submitted by 5 Dr. Nicola Longo from the University of Utah and 6 7 cosponsored by Dr. Marzia Pasquali also at the University of Utah and also running the biochem 8 9 and genetics lab at ARUP Labs. 10 There was no advocacy group mentioned in their nomination but of course we have heard 11 from the Association from Creatinine Deficiencies 12 13 just before this presentation. There are several questions that we 14 15 had to answer reviewing the nomination package 16 and then checking the literature with other experts that we realized are out there. 17 18 So, the first question of course is the nominated condition medically serious. 19 20 Second, are there prospective pilot data either done in the U.S. or elsewhere from population-21 22 based assessment available for this disorder.

1 2	What about the case definition and the
2	
	spectrum of this disorder. Is it well described?
3	Is there a phenotypic range of children
4	identified on a population-based screening?
5	What about the test's analytic
6	validity? Do we know enough about the test to
7	work analytically, but also has it clinical
8	utility or other concerns with the test?
9	And then about treatment. Is there
10	treatment? Are there medications that are FDA
11	approved available or needed? So what about
12	treatment.
13	First, I'd like to introduce you
14	quickly to creatine deficiency syndromes. And I
15	as a biochem geneticist, I have to show you a
16	metabolic pathway, not so that you pass out, but
17	just so you get an understanding.
18	I think it helps to figure out the
19	approach that is taken to both the testing for
20	the disorder and also the treatment.
21	So as you can see creatine is here
22	located. It's also outside in the blood and

needs to get across cell membranes. But creatine 1 2 first needs to be made unless you obtain it through food intake. 3 The pathway to synthesize creatine 4 starts with arginine and glycine which is 5 produced to guanidinoacetate which is then 6 7 methylated to creatine. And then again it has to cross the cell membranes to get into the brain 8 9 and muscle, and there's a creatine transporter. 10 So there are two enzymes involved, and 11 the enzyme we're talking about is guanidinoacetate methyltransferase which is 12 13 located here. However, any of those enzymes, GAMT, 14 15 AGAT, and then the transporter can be deficient 16 and cause disease. And this is taken from the gene 17 18 reviews that was updated in December 2015 so it 19 should be fairly up to date. 20 You can see there are 110 GAMT patients known in the literature. 21 They present and that is what we heard earlier after a few 22

months of life to up to three years. 1 2 The phenotype is mild to severe intellectual disability. Most patients have 3 epilepsy and the epilepsy is difficult to 4 In half of the patients there is 5 control. movement disorder and then their behavioral 6 7 problems. In AGAT the situation is that this is 8 9 much more rare it appears than GAMT and again has a somewhat similar phenotype, muscle weakness 10 11 being pronounced. And then there is the X-linked 12 13 transporter defect. This is the condition where most patients are identified. Again, onset is 14 15 less than three years in those affected, boys, 16 and similar phenotype to GAMT. Treatment as we heard already from the 17 18 parents is available and it's mostly 19 supplementation of creatine and ornithine, and 20 then restriction of protein and/or arginine and sodium benzoate. And the treatment is also 21 22 established for the other conditions.

Here you see from Scriver's, the
 online metabolic textbook a picture taken from
 the chapter on GAMT deficiency.

And here you see one patient in A, B 4 And you can see the significant hypotonia 5 and C. here, dystonia here at 22 months, and then after 6 7 being put on treatment you see that the patient seems to be doing better but is still having 8 9 And that is of course consistent with symptoms. 10 what we heard from the parents.

11 And this is an untreated patient at 12 four years old.

13 So, important here of course is that 14 the outcome is improved when you treat these 15 patients as early as possible. And of course 16 that is always good reason to think about newborn 17 screening.

What about the biochemical genetic diagnosis? Guanidinoacetate, when you have a defect here is accumulating. And you can measure this in urine, CSF, plasma and now in dried blood spots and it is elevated.

(202) 234-4433

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

www.nealrgross.com

If you look at the other conditions, AGAT deficiency and the transporter defect, GAA is low or up to normal. AGAT deficiency is normal in the other conditions, so GAA alone is not really helpful to identify the other creatine deficiency disorders.

However, you can also measure creatine
and creatinine all at the same time as you do the
GAA. You can do ratios and that kind of helps
you a little bit better differentiating those
different disorders.

12 There is a diagnostic algorithm again 13 from the Gene Reviews article for patients that 14 are presenting with symptoms that are suggestive 15 or could be consistent with GAMT deficiency.

You do as a next step the measurement of GAA, creatine and creatinine in urine or in plasma. And then based on those results you can follow up using different studies including molecular genetic testing for the relevant genes. And if that results in a genotype of uncertain significance you might still have to do a

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

specific enzyme assay for each enzyme to arrive at a diagnosis.

But this is all doable because there are laboratories that offer this test. The only one that is a little bit tricky is the enzyme assay which I believe is only available in Amsterdam.

8 So, creatine, again I mentioned 9 earlier the source of it is either the diet or 10 biosynthesis. And the function is important as 11 you can see here in the regeneration of ATP. And 12 it is also a neurotransmitter in the CNS.

Because of the energy provision through creatine as we also heard from the parents you can obtain creatine in all kinds of stores, not only at Amazon but at Walmart. And since it is not yet reimbursed through health insurance it still is relatively cheap.

19 I always wonder if those costs would 20 go up if health insurance actually would have to 21 pay for it because those providers might think 22 it's a good reason to jack up the price.

(202) 234-4433

1

2

I	-
1	The pathophysiology of GAMT deficiency
2	is basically, again, if you consider that you
3	have this enzyme not working functionally you
4	will have a deficiency of creatine and you will
5	have accumulation of the precursor,
6	guanidinoacetate which is a neurotoxic agent as
7	far as we know.
8	So, the idea then is in treating these
9	patients that you provide creatine at sufficient
10	doses to overcome the blood-brain barrier and
11	also maybe providing S-adenosyl L-methionine to
12	potentially help any residual GAMT activity to be
13	more effective.
14	And also to reduce guanidinoacetate
15	which is accumulating. And you do this by
16	providing ornithine, but also restricting
17	arginine and maybe glycine by providing sodium
18	benzoate.
19	So what are the outcomes of treatment?
20	As we heard very effectively from the parents is
21	that if you identify these patients basically at
22	birth or shortly thereafter they can have a
I	•

normal life.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

The later you make the diagnosis the more severe is the phenotype. So initiation of treatment as early as possible seems to be very important.

Also interesting is that in a paper 7 that was published a couple of years ago there was a patient that was first reported in 2006 by 9 a German group.

They found a patient who was diagnosed 10 in the first few months of life and was doing 11 very well, but apparently the parents then 12 13 decided, well, this is kind of difficult and our child seems to be fine so they stopped treatment. 14 15 And it didn't take long and then the patient had 16 irreversible damage. So it is important that 17 these patients stay on treatment consistently 18 throughout life.

19 So back to our key questions. The 20 nominated condition is medically serious. The answer I think is yes. 21

22

(202) 234-4433

And I think we pretty well know what

the phenotypic spectrum looks like, at least 1 2 based on these 110 patients. What about treatment protocols? 3 Are they defined? Are there FDA approved drugs, and 4 are those all available? 5 So, in a paper by the Utah group they 6 7 talk -- which is called Evidence-based Treatment of Guanidinoacetate Methyltransferase it 8 9 indicates here very clearly that the recommendations for treatment of GAMT deficiency 10 11 are evolving. So it might be that we don't have 12 that nailed down completely. 13 In another paper a year later in 2014 a larger study of 48 patients where they review 14 15 and provide recommendations for diagnosis, 16 treatment and monitoring, one of the conclusions is that overall numerous questions regarding the 17 18 evidence of the described treatment modalities 19 still remain to be answered. 20 So, we might not have yet fully 21 defined treatment protocols. 22 What about newborn screening? Are

there any pilot study data available and how good 2 is the test?

So the proposed newborn screening test 3 is to measure GAA but creatine has also been 4 already mentioned as in use in Utah at least, and 5 you could also measure creatinine along with the 6 7 acylcarnitines and amino acid analysis.

So this is not a separate test. 8 You 9 don't have to buy new equipment. You don't have 10 to add extra people to do the testing. All you have to do is add a few reagents and do a 11 modification to your analysis in mostly the 12 13 So it's really, as the parents software. indicated, fairly cheap. 14

15 Also, the CDC already is providing 16 reference materials for GAA and creatine through their quality assurance program. 17

18 A second tier test is probably a good 19 idea to have as also reported specifically from 20 the proponents from Utah.

And what they basically do, they do 21 22 the analysis for GAA and creatine again by liquid

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

1

chromatography tandem mass spectrometry which is 1 2 not as common as the regular flow injection analysis in newborn screening laboratories, but 3 really any mass spec you can do LC-MS/MS on. 4 So you may but also may not require 5 extra equipment. But it also has many second 6 7 tier tests. They could probably be regionalized. And I think as there are a good number 8 9 of second tier tests out there I would still propose to many screening laboratories to join 10 forces and every screening lab should offer at 11 least one second tier test and work with other 12 13 neighboring states maybe to provide the test to their relevant populations. 14 15 There's also molecular genetic 16 analysis of the GAMT gene available and has been proposed for newborn screening. 17 18 But what you find at the same time is 19 that there are again variants of uncertain 20 significance that are identified and therefore genotypes of uncertain significance. 21 So it's 22 really in my opinion not that helpful.

I		L
1	And it also is not yet typically used	
2	in a wide number of newborn screening programs.	
3	So what is the status of newborn	
4	screening for GAMT deficiency?	
5	Published data from the University of	
6	Utah looking at 10,000 newborn screening samples	
7	retrospectively, they found a false positive rate	
8	by just looking at GAA and the GAA to creatine	
9	ratio of 0.08 percent.	
10	However, they didn't report any false	
11	positives, or any of those out because they have	
12	a second tier test to look at GAA and creatine	
13	again. And so the final false positive rate is	
14	zero percent.	
15	And the true positive, however, is	
16	also zero. They didn't find an affected patient	
17	in those 10,000 samples.	
18	The Baylor Research Institute in	
19	Dallas, Texas, did a study of nearly 20,000	
20	babies of which about 50 percent were from	
21	Mexico. And they did this between 2008 and 2011.	
22	They had a false positive rate of 0.5	

percent just looking at GAA, but with the second 1 tier test which basically means you take the 2 original newborn screening sample, you do not 3 tell anyone about this outside of the screening 4 You do the second tier test and if that is 5 lab. normal then you do not report it out. 6 7 So, in the end the false positive rate is zero which is extremely good. But they also 8 9 didn't find a patient in that study. In British Columbia they looked 10 retrospectively at 3,000 newborn screening 11 samples, had a false positive rate only using GAA 12 13 of 0.13, but could get rid of all false positives with the second tier test. 14 15 They also tested for two common 16 mutations and happened to find two carriers of two novel mutations. So coming back to what does 17 18 this mean now. But those were only carriers so 19 it really is supportive of the conclusion that 20 there was no true positive in their cohort. In Australia they've been actually 21 22 doing prospective newborn screening for GAMT

deficiency since 2002 and have screened more than 1 million babies.

Their report in 2014 included only 3 about 770,000 babies, but I communicated with Dr. 4 Pitt in Australia and he confirmed that they're 5 continuing screening. They have screened about a 6 7 million babies and they didn't find a single true positive. And the false positive rate with 8 9 apparently no second tier test is 0.02 percent. 10 Now, we always wonder if it's international does it reflect a very different 11 population to what we would find in the U.S. 12 13 So I Googled the demographics of Victoria, Australia, and could find that 66 of 14 15 Victorians identify as Australian, and then of 16 Scottish, English, or Irish ancestry and less than 1 percent aboriginal. And most immigrants 17 18 are from the British Isles, China, Italy, 19 Vietnam, Greece and New Zealand. So, more or 20 less like America maybe. In the Netherlands a study that came 21

out only this year, and for those of you who look

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

22

1

2

at what is in the briefing book this is basically 1 2 two versions after what you have in front of you so this slide was not included. 3 They looked at 500 newborn screening 4 samples retrospectively. They did sequencing of 5 the GAMT gene and they measured GAA. 6 7 Through sequencing they found two carriers, one with a known mutation and one with 8 9 a novel mutation. And based on expression 10 studies they feel that it is a pathogenic 11 mutation. And through measurement they found no 12 13 false positives, but also no true positive. So based on this the presumed carrier 14 15 frequency is 1 in 250 which would calculate an 16 incidence of about 1 in 250,000 among the Dutch 17 population. 18 And the Dutch population is described 19 in that paper as consisting of individuals with 20 Dutch, Turkish, Moroccan, Indonesian, German, Surinamese, Latin American, other European and 21 22 Asian ethnic backgrounds. So, very diverse.

(202) 234-4433

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

www.nealrgross.com

<i>,</i>	
1	So, how frequent is GAMT deficiency?
2	So, you can look at this based on calculation and
3	based on prospective newborn screening.
4	So as I just mentioned, the
5	Netherlands, they assume it to be 1 in 250,000.
6	In Utah they looked at the number of
7	patients they had diagnosed over a 10-year period
8	and then calculated it back to the live birth and
9	came up with a calculated incidence of 1 in
10	114,000.
11	In Portugal in 2007 they had a report
12	where they looked at 1,002 newborn screening
13	samples that they tested for one mutation which
14	appears to be common among patients with GAMT
15	deficiency in Portugal and they found eight
16	carriers.
17	So their calculated incidence is 1 in
18	63,000.
19	And based on prospective newborn
20	screening in Australia as I mentioned less than 1
21	in 1 million, and in Utah less than 1 in 50,000.
22	So Utah is currently actually actively

screening for GAMT deficiency. And at this point 1 2 they screened, as Dr. Pasquali mentioned to me earlier today, 50,000 so far. They had one false 3 positive that turned out to be a NICU baby and at 4 this point no true positive. 5 But if you look up here the estimated 6 7 incidence is 1 in 114,000 so they should get there next year. 8 9 So in summary we believe that GAMT deficiency is a serious medical condition. 10 The natural history of GAMT deficiency seems well 11 understood even though there are only 110 12 13 patients known worldwide. The treatment I think is very similar 14 15 to many of the conditions on the RUSP. And I 16 think that if you remember the discussion about PKU this morning I think there's a lot of overlap 17 18 in how we would approach these patients. You 19 need diet maybe, but certainly supplements and 20 you need support. The best outcomes is when treatment is 21 22 started shortly after birth.

Dried blood spot based assays can be 1 adopted for newborn screening quickly and at very 2 low cost so that's new for us. 3

Prospective newborn screening is 4 ongoing in Victoria and apparently in Utah. 5 But again, at least in Australia very low incidence 6 7 apparently. So, the sensitivity, however, of the screening test is also nicer than many of the 8 9 conditions that we have added to the RUSP with a likely 100 percent sensitivity and near zero if 10 11 not zero false positive rate.

So, should one add GAMT to newborn 12 13 screening?

So, one could say well, we understand 14 15 the natural history. Treatment is similar to 16 many classic inborn errors of metabolism. The outcomes are best with early treatment. Newborn 17 18 screening assay is cheap and easily implemented. 19 And the newborn screening strategy has a high sensitivity and low false positive rate. 20 If you didn't want to do it you would 21

say well, we only understand the natural history

Washington DC

22

www.nealrgross.com

on 110 patients. Is that enough? 1 2 There is no agreed upon treatment Metabolic control must be strict. 3 strategy. No FDA approved newborn screening or diagnostic 4 assay. And I don't believe that is really an 5 issue because laboratory developed tests are just 6 7 fine, so that shouldn't be an issue. And, however, no patient has ever been 8 9 identified through prospective newborn screening. 10 So, back to our key questions. 11 Medically serious condition - yes. Prospective 12 pilot study data - yes, not only Australia but 13 also in Utah. Case definition - yes, based on 110 14 15 patients. Analytic validity - yes. Clinical 16 utility - well, the problem is no case identified 17 prospectively yet. 18 And defined treatment protocols, you 19 could argue well, they're not really that 20 defined, so maybe not yet. But I think that is something that could be fixed. 21 22 So, what is the recommendation of the

1 workgroup to the advisory committee? At this
2 point we would say we do not initiate external
3 evidence review because not a single case has
4 been identified prospectively through newborn
5 screening which would really make the evidence
6 review very difficult.
7 And then treatment guidelines appear

to be in development but are not finalized.

9 What I think should also be recommended, or what we think should be 10 11 recommended, that the proponents work with other experts to formalize the treatment guidelines and 12 13 encourage the continuation of newborn screening for GAMT deficiency in Utah and Australia, and 14 15 report ASAP back to us when a patient has been 16 identified prospectively.

So, please we would say, proponents, resubmit a nomination immediately when above has been achieved. That's I think all I have. CHAIR BOCCHINI: Dieter, thank you for that presentation. It was very clear and thorough. Appreciate it.

8

This is now open for discussion and 1 2 questions from the committee and then from the organizational representatives. 3 Don. MEMBER BAILEY: Dieter, could you 4 speak a little bit more about -- I don't 5 understand why treatment guidelines are unclear. 6 7 Maybe I just don't have the information, but can you give me a little bit more information? 8 9 I think what --MEMBER MATERN: 10 basically, and I would agree with do we really Because if you look at conditions 11 need this. that we added only recently for Pompe disease 12 13 there still in the literature you have questions about what is the right immune modulation, et 14 15 So there are no clear guidelines there cetera. 16 either. So I would agree that this is a weak 17 18 argument not to proceed because there is a lot of 19 information out there. And it probably would be 20 one short phone call among the proponents along with people and their colleagues in Canada to fix 21 22 that and write a paper that outlines more exactly

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

www.nealrgross.com

what those guidelines are. 1 2 MEMBER BAILEY: Plus we're not talking about a dangerous treatment. 3 MEMBER MATERN: From what I understand 4 it's not a dangerous treatment. 5 MEMBER BOTKIN: Dieter, thanks, it was 6 7 very helpful. You mentioned that the clinical 8 9 sensitivity of the testing estimated to be 100 percent. Where does that number come from in the 10 11 absence of any real babies identified yet? 12 MEMBER MATERN: So, that comes from 13 the fact that specifically in Australia where you have this large area called Victoria which is 14 15 served by one screening laboratory and one 16 diagnostic laboratory. And the Australians I think are very 17 18 proud in their healthcare system and feel that 19 since they haven't diagnosed a patient with GAMT 20 deficiency since 2002 through their clinical efforts while they were screening that there are 21 22 indeed no false negatives.

And in Utah I think at the same time 1 2 they've been screening now probably for more than a year and didn't make a diagnosis clinically. 3 And again, the laboratory, there's 4 only one biochem genetics lab. And even if 5 another lab did the diagnosis the patient would 6 7 be followed by Dr. Longo. MEMBER MCDONOUGH: Knowing what we 8 9 know now in 2016 about how serious this condition 10 is, and there's effective treatment, and what 11 happens when these children aren't picked up on time, if we knew that back when the tandem mass 12 13 was developed and the RUSP was expanded is it more likely than not that this condition would 14 15 have been part of that panel back then? 16 MEMBER MATERN: At the time there was no screening test so that is one thing. 17 I think 18 if the screening test would have been around I 19 would believe that it would more likely be 20 included than not. So, I'm a little new to 21 MEMBER SPONG: 22 this, but is it -- I'm confused as to why this

wouldn't get moved forward just to the condition
 review team.

Is it just because we haven't identified one case using these prospectives? Is that the reason why? And how long could that take to happen? And what would be the harm in moving it forward while waiting for that one case?

9 MEMBER MATERN: Well, the harm of 10 course is always that a baby will be born in a 11 state that could have screened and will not 12 receive the treatment.

MEMBER SPONG: That's the harm in not moving it forward, or in moving it forward?
What's the harm in moving it forward?

16 MEMBER MATERN: Well, the problem I 17 think for the evidence review, because we're just 18 discussing here whether it should be moved 19 forward to the evidence review. So we're not 20 even talking about should it just be included. 21 I think the harm is that we're asking 22 the evidence review to proceed and come up with

the fact that there was not a single true 1 2 positive. And so they don't really know what to 3 -- well, they're not recommending us anything, 4 but the data they will provide us will probably 5 not add anything new that we don't know right 6 7 now. Yes, we had this discussion. 8 Yes. 9 MEMBER MCDONOUGH: The point I was 10 trying to raise with the question I asked is that there's probably -- I shouldn't say -- is there 11 more information about this condition, the 12 13 benefit of treatment, early detection, that perhaps some of the conditions that were added on 14 15 the RUSP in that expansion? Do you have an 16 opinion on that? MEMBER MATERN: Well, to my counts 17 18 this is a no brainer. Again, this is a condition 19 that's medically serious. There's treatment that 20 seems to be -- well, that is cheap, that can be done, and the screening test is not difficult. 21 22 Does that answer your question?

I	4
1	Steve, do you have a question?
2	MEMBER MCDONOUGH: Well, we have to be
3	careful we don't get too paralyzed by our
4	policies and don't take an opportunity to help
5	some kids.
6	MS. GREENE: Carol Greene, SIMD.
7	Thanks for the excellent review.
8	And while personally I'm not speaking
9	for the SIMD for me obviously it's a slam dunk.
10	I identify the kids and I treat them.
11	I wanted to speak to two points. One
12	is with respect to treatment. I think perhaps
13	because if you don't follow your own guidelines
14	then the next person coming along will of course
15	say well, you've got your guidelines and you went
16	ahead and did it, and why not for me as well.
17	So, the guidelines are meaningful and there's
18	reasons to follow them.
19	With that said I think perhaps we need
20	a little bit more guidance on the interpretation
21	of treatment is not set.
22	Because the treatment, core of
I	

treatment is you give creatine. We're arguing around, you know, we're nibbling around the edges, can we make it better, what do we do with the diet. Do we give sodium benzoate which 4 tastes nasty and nobody wants to drink it anyway. How much ornithine do we give.

7 But we've got a treatment, there's no doubt about it. I think we need to be a little 8 9 careful about over-interpreting.

10 When somebody genuinely and honestly says we need to do better figuring out the best 11 way to treat this that we don't lose sight of --12 13 so I feel very strongly as a clinician, you know, I'm going to go talk to people. Do I give 14 15 ornithine or not. But I'm giving creatine. 16 That's no problem.

So, I think this one gets a yes when 17 18 we have agreement about therapy. We're still 19 trying to make the therapy for PKU better. Ι 20 think this one gets a yes on therapy. With respect to the question of has it 21 22 met the criteria for pilot, I don't think the

1

2

3

5

6

SIMD -- I don't want to represent the SIMD of 1 2 having an opinion, but I will say as the SIMD I think this one gets a yes on treatment. 3 We're working to improve it, but we have a treatment. 4 MEMBER WICKLUND: Okay, so forgive me 5 if you already said this, Dieter. 6 7 So, retrospectively they were able to take dried blood spots and identify affected 8 9 individuals, right? So the limiting factor is 10 identifying a true positive prospectively. Okay. 11 So, once that happens it still won't further delineate the natural history. 12 Because 13 if it's just till they identify a true positive, right, that's just the fact that they've 14 15 identified a true positive. 16 And if they notify us immediately with that how does that add to our level of evidence? 17 18 I guess I'm trying to tease out a little bit 19 versus if we're trying to get more information 20 about if they develop symptoms. I guess I'm just trying to get my head 21 22 wrapped around. Is this coming back to our pilot

recommendations about having to have one true 1 2 positive? Anyway, I'm just a little muddled right now on that. 3 MEMBER MATERN: I think the answer is 4 5 yes, but Jeff is getting ready to say something. MEMBER BOTKIN: Well, it is rather 6 7 ironic that this comes up immediately. But of course, that's the discussion we were having. 8 9 I think it just forces additional 10 thought about what's the value of that one baby. 11 That's not going to tell you anything additional. I guess in my thinking it really 12 13 demonstrates whether in fact you have a program that's effective in identifying affected kids or 14 15 not. 16 Now, everybody seems to think this is a good test, but yet a million babies is a lot of 17 18 babies without a single true positive. 19 And so what's the explanation there. 20 Is it something about Australia? Is it something about these other programs that have yet to 21 22 identify an affected baby? I don't understand

what the alternative explanations might be of 1 2 that failure. So, I have to agree, the rest of the 3 elements seem pretty solid here to move forward, 4 but I have to be disturbed by the failure of 5 public health programs to yield affected kids. 6 7 MEMBER KELM: Well, you know, we obviously focused all of this information on the 8 9 prospective. 10 But I guess one piece that would be 11 great to have is how robust is the, you know, when they retrospectively just even look at their 12 13 method and their cutoffs and have a retrospective sampling. 14 What kind of numbers are we talking 15 16 How well did that look. about. That would probably be helpful for us to understand. 17 18 But there is one thing that I guess I also feel -- wanted to have a little bit more 19 20 flavor from you is, I mean obviously you're saying this can be done, but what sort of 21 22 insights from, I mean if Fred was on your group.

Is this really simple to add in the 1 2 public health labs? I guess that was my question is that we have that public health impact 3 assessment also. So how easy is this to add to a 4 current program? I don't know if somebody can 5 weigh in on that. 6 7 MEMBER MATERN: Yes. Personally I would think it is easy. And again, the CDC at 8 9 least has the materials so they have the test 10 running in their own laboratory. So they could 11 train as they train anyone else on acylcarnitines and amino acids. Just make it part of their 12 13 program. Or not. Fred, if you're on 14 CHAIR BOCCHINI: 15 did you want to make a comment related to that 16 question? 17 No, not at this time. MEMBER LOREY: 18 Thanks. 19 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Okay, thanks. 20 So, I think it's MR. OSTRANDER: fortuitous actually this came right after Jeff's 21 22 talk because I think it gives us food for thought about the difference between rare conditions and
 ultra-rare conditions.

I mean, this is unique in that it has 3 a cheap and safe treatment which has not been one 4 of our previous criteria, but certainly gives one 5 pause about whether we need to be as strict about 6 7 the criteria in that setting as opposed to ones where the treatments are dangerous and of unknown 8 9 efficacy. 10 So, even in your talk, Jeff, there was 11 a comment about the value of having one true 12 positive. 13 I mean, is one much different from Yes, and maybe not. If you can prove that 14 zero? 15 with the existing technology retrospective 16 identified cases test positive I don't know that from a scientific standpoint it's all that 17 18 different in a rare condition like this. 19 And I'm going to chime in with Carol's 20 treatment protocol thing too. If you've only got 110 cases worldwide you're not going to have 21 22 standardized treatment protocols that are going

to be compared in a prospective way from no 1 2 treatment or the standard treatment. So, it may be for ultra rare 3 conditions that the thought process could be 4 modified just a smidgeon, taking into account and 5 weighing not only the criteria for true positives 6 7 through screening and the treatment protocol on the one hand, but also on the other weighing the 8 9 safety and efficacy of the intervention. That might tip the scales and it 10 sounds to me like in this case it might even be 11 reasonable to consider it to have tipped the 12 13 scales. So, I think, Alex, 14 CHAIR BOCCHINI: 15 can you tell us what one positive case means to 16 evidence review? MR. KEMPER: And this is where I 17 18 resolve all the mysteries. 19 So, before I branch out there I just 20 wanted to thank Dieter for doing really an excellent presentation about GAMT deficiency in 21 22 terms of digging up what evidence is out there.

So thank you very much for setting me up. 1 2 You know, this issue of finding one case we've oftentimes talked about as being 3 really important and it's certainly where we came 4 from with SCID. 5 It's a little bit difficult to 6 7 articulate, but what I would say is in addition to finding the one case, we're able to look at 8 9 all the cases that weren't GAMT deficient. So, 10 we're able to look at both the positive 11 predictive value and the negative predictive 12 value. 13 And one of the things that we're supposed to do as part of our evidence review is 14 15 also look at what would happen in the real world 16 as state programs adopt screening. So, it really goes beyond just finding that one case. 17 18 Certainly we in the Evidence Review 19 Workgroup, we serve at the pleasure of the 20 advisory committee so we're happy to do whatever you ask us to do, including looking at things 21 22 like natural history, or what's known presently

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

www.nealrgross.com

about treatment. Perhaps digging a little more 1 2 than Dieter already did in his very nice presentation. 3 But the one part that we would really 4 struggle with is in looking at the implementation 5 side in terms of the burden on the newborn 6 7 screening programs. So, that to me is where the issue is. 8 9 But again, we're happy to do anything you ask us 10 to do. Anything. 11 MEMBER MCDONOUGH: Can you say a little bit more about your concern about the 12 13 burden for programs? MR. KEMPER: Yes. And I'm sensitive 14 15 that the word "burden" as typically used in day 16 to day language is burdensome. So, one of the charges that we have is 17 18 to look at what it would take for state newborn 19 screening programs to adopt screening for the 20 condition we're actually going to be talking at length about, issues of cost. 21 22 But also there are these sort of

broader issues of feasibility and readiness that 1 2 are in our charge. And so with limited data from state 3 health programs it's difficult for us to do that. 4 And so that's where the call for pilot studies 5 came from. 6 7 And so to me it's not just the one positive case, but it's sort of the broader 8 9 issues regarding implementation. 10 Again, we could do the other parts in terms of natural history and treatments and that 11 kind of thing, but we would hit a wall when it 12 13 comes to that one component. And the degree to which that's 14 15 important is up to you all again. 16 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Plus, once the evidence review begins there's really a timeline 17 18 within which it now needs to be completed which 19 also poses a problem. 20 Right. Nine months. MR. KEMPER: It's not just a good idea. 21 It's the law. 22 Carol Greene again, SIMD. MS. GREENE:

Interesting discussion. Of course if 1 2 you really want data from states about implementation then you're going to have to be 3 holding everybody to have multiple pilots in 4 multiple states because this one, you've actually 5 got a pilot in a state. 6 7 What I wanted just to add is that there is, in terms of actually real life there is 8 9 a very good diagnostic test and it's very easy to It's a little hard to collect urine on 10 send. 11 baby girls, but we do it all the time. And it's easy to collect urine on baby boys, and easy to 12 13 collect blood on both sexes. And so we've got a diagnostic test 14 15 available. And we can offer a treatment. 16 What I am a little curious about is if anybody's got enough math to do the sock drawer 17 18 problem. If the true frequency is really 1 in 120 or 1 in 250,000 in Australia what are the 19 20 statistical chances of finding none in a million. And I think that's a reasonably high 21 22 number, but I don't know because at least some of

the frequency is based on DNA on what you presume 1 2 to be carriers, and that assumes that everybody who's a carrier is symptomatic. 3 So, I'm really interested in the 4 numbers and I think that maybe somebody's got 5 that math. 6 7 MS. TARINI: This is Beth Tarini at the American Academy of Pediatrics. 8 9 I agree with Alex and the reason I 10 agree is because if I remember correctly, others please correct me if I'm wrong, in either MPS I, 11 12 I thought it was MPS I, there were two affected 13 individuals, is that right? In Missouri. Or there were two affected I thought found in the 14 15 population that underwent transplant. Am I 16 correct? At any rate, historically it seems 17 18 ongoing conditions have been reviewed and cases 19 have been identified from population-based 20 screening that we have leveraged or leaned very strongly on past evidence of efficacy in studies 21

Washington DC

that involve identification from family history,

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

22

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

not on efficacy of treatment by what is found in the population.

Because I believe of the minor number of children that were found, the small number, one of them died after the treatment. And that was not taken into consideration as affecting the assessment of efficacy of the treatment. We leaned much more heavily on what was the historical studies that were done.

10 That is to say if we have done that in 11 the past when we've actually had cases identified 12 and we've sort of not taken into consideration 13 what the real life outcome was then I don't think 14 it is consistent to use that one person standard 15 here.

16 MR. KEMPER: And just to amplify on 17 what you said too.

18 One of the problems with hinging 19 everything on the case, not for this condition, 20 but for a lot of other conditions is that the one 21 case identified through newborn screening may not 22 develop clinical problems for years down the

1

2

That was the problem with ALD. line. 1 2 But this is really certainly a different thing in that the one case identified, 3 if they were going to develop symptoms you would 4 expect it to happen earlier rather than later. 5 Since this is under CHAIR BOCCHINI: 6 7 discussion we're trying to limit the comments to the committee and the organizational 8 9 representatives. 10 MEMBER BOTKIN: Question back for 11 Alex. And I think Dieter had suggested that if indeed there's an evidence review at this point 12 13 it's unlikely to provide more information than what's been provided by the current review. 14 15 And I guess I wanted to see what your response was to that. Would there be additional 16 avenues of evidence to uncover that might help 17 18 make that decision? 19 Because basically the question would 20 be would the committee be ready today to make a decision about the RUSP if in fact there's not 21 22 any additional information that's going to be

1

forthcoming.

2 MR. KEMPER: I'm going to I guess plead the Fifth in that we haven't looked at what 3 evidence is or is not out there. 4 I do know from conversations I've had 5 with Dieter in the past that it sounds like he 6 7 did a thorough job of looking out there, but I can't comment on what else may be out there. 8 9 This is Beth Tarini, AAP. MS. TARINI: 10 To Jeff's point which Kellie had raised the evidence review process is not just 11 evidence review, am I correct? There's a public 12 13 health impact analysis. So while the evidence may be, and 14 15 again we wouldn't know until you did it, may be 16 not much more than this, there certainly would be this other component to the matrix that would 17 18 have to be done. 19 MR. WATSON: -- things that run 20 counter to what I said before which is when could 21 I accept one case. 22 So if -- I was looking at the

testimony, the public comments. There was a lot of patients from California and New York, or families from California and New York all of whom are in our virtual repository and whose spots could be pulled with consent to see whether or not they would have been detectable on a newborn screen.

And that actually does get you a fair bit along the way. It doesn't get you past having a numerator of zero which makes statistics really hard, but I think there are things that can sort of make you feel a lot more comfortable with retrospective data that could get me to thinking about just one case justifying it.

When you think about the things that you're doing in the public health prospective pilot you really want to make sure that you can find them, get them into treatment, and intervene in time, and get the expected outcome.

You learn about penetrance which isn't
a problem here because you've got a million
babies screened with no screened positives let

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

1

alone true positives.

2	So when you start thinking about what
3	are the things that you get out of the pilot you
4	can really, I think a number of them can be dealt
5	with and reduce the demands on a really ultra
6	rare condition like this if you think about what
7	it is you gain and lose by these different
8	parameters.
9	MEMBER MATERN: So that is
10	something that I haven't pointed out in my
11	presentation is that actually of course our
12	colleagues in Utah and in Canada and in
13	Australia, they have added retrospective,
14	collected actual newborn screening samples from
15	patients and ran them through their test.
16	And that data is out there, and it
17	shows nicely how they have much higher GAA
18	concentrations than normal population.
19	MR. WATSON: Part of the data that you
20	want people to submit is something that is really
21	informative retrospectively when you've got these
22	ultra rare situations.

I mean, this happened in SCID. It got 1 2 really narrowly defined. We must have been around 750,000 babies into SCID when the first 3 I mean, those are my vague one was found. 4 recollections of five, six years ago. 5 If Utah is the only MEMBER MCDONOUGH: 6 7 state that's going to be testing for this it may take several years to get a true positive. 8 9 In the meantime, if the statistics are 10 reasonably accurate there are going to be 20 to 11 45, 40 children born in our country every year who are going to be brain damaged if we aren't 12 13 doing the testing. We've got these rare conditions. 14 We've modified our criteria before. When we had 15 this matrix together we actually approved a B3 16 and the Interagency Coordinating Committee 17 18 approved it. So I think we constantly have to look 19 20 at what our criteria are, what we're presenting with and go from there. 21 22 I'm concerned if we drag this out

(202) 234-4433

1

2

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

www.nealrgross.com

diagnosed. 3 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Well, I think there's 4 no question that based on Dieter's presentation 5 it's pretty clear that the Nomination and 6 7 Prioritization Committee felt very strongly that many of the criteria that are necessary to move 8 9 this nomination forward haven't been met and 10 recognize the seriousness of delay in treatment. On the other hand, it's also 11 recognized that we have a test that hasn't been 12 13 proven to work in a newborn screening situation. And as a result the decision was to 14 15 accept basically the data that was submitted and 16 ask that as soon as we meet that last criteria that we move forward to move this to evidence 17 18 review as quickly as possible. 19 At the same time asking the nominators 20 and the advocacy groups to get together to look at things that might also add additional data. 21 22 And as Mike suggested, that the

there are going to be families and kids who will be definitely impacted because they won't be diagnosed.

possibility of using other things to help make a 1 2 stronger case could be done relatively quickly. And all that is so that when we do get 3 the data that we feel is necessary to move it to 4 evidence review that we would ensure a greater 5 likelihood of success because we would have met 6 7 all of our criteria to go forward. So that's the crux of what we've been 8 9 discussing. And so I think that that's still I 10 think a reasonable approach. 11 MEMBER MCDONOUGH: This is McDonough. Is it possible that it could be during the 12 13 process of the evidence review that a study could be conducted during that nine-month period of the 14 15 blood spots, working with the patients, the 16 identified cases that we would have that information during that nine-month period? 17 18 MEMBER MATERN: So you mean that they 19 take the original blood spots and run them 20 through their system? Yes, but they've done that already. 21 22 So that was part of the retrospective studies

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

www.nealrgross.com

that they interspersed the true positive original 1 2 newborn screening samples that were stored away and run them through the system and could show 3 that their GAA levels are higher. 4 CHAIR BOCCHINI: And remember, this 5 would not be the first time that a nominated 6 7 condition was close to being approved but missed some of the criteria for which we went back to 8 9 the nominating group and asked that that additional data be obtained, and that they only 10 needed to submit the additional data, and then we 11 moved it forward. 12 13 That happened with Pompe, SCID as you heard, it was -- the decision was delayed until a 14 15 positive case was found and so on. So I don't 16 think it's unprecedented that we would use the approach to meet our criteria. 17 18 MEMBER WICKLUND: So, I completely 19 agree with that, but I guess I'm having a hard 20 time with the -- we require the one true positive. 21 I think that if there's additional 22

data, retrospective data, or additional data that can be given to us that provides another level of evidence.

I'm just trying to figure out in my head what additional level of evidence does that one true positive really give us compared to some of the evidence that we have from other sources.

8 So, I -- so this is where I'm 9 struggling by saying, you know, we'll consider it 10 again after one true positive is found. Like 11 that to me seems really narrow and that's the 12 part I'm struggling with right now versus looking 13 at retrospective data in more detail and getting 14 more information that way.

15 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Well, I guess part of 16 it depends on how that influences the ability to 17 prove that a newborn screening program in place 18 can detect a positive on a newborn.

So, I don't know whether people from
the lab might be able to answer that better than
or with more detail than I.

MEMBER CUTHBERT: So, I get the

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

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Dieter's talking about the perspective tension. 1 2 of being a biochemical geneticist and as one myself I understand that. 3 But putting on the public health hat 4 which I have to be concerned about as well coming 5 from CDC and so on it is not only just about the 6 7 test. While this condition does present 8 9 itself in being one of the more positive ones. When it was nominated I breathed very heavily. 10 Ι thought this was fantastic. 11 I think I would be a little bit more 12 13 -- I do support what the Nomination and Prioritization Committee has said. 14 15 It is very important that, again, that 16 we do this for consistency again of the guidelines that we've put forward. 17 18 My concern is whereas this might be a 19 good one to sort of let slip through what does it 20 say for every other one that will come next. If we for every single condition look 21 22 at our guidelines and say, well, this one meets

all of these but not this. We can let that pass. 1 2 It just causes the committee to just not seem consistent. 3 And I think it was brought up that 4 someone was saying that the state programs don't 5 always consider the recommendations of the 6 7 committee as strongly. They go back and they review and they 8 9 say well, we hear what the ACHDNC has said. We're going to do something a little different. 10 We would like to have a little bit more evidence. 11 There is a bit of a disparity between 12 13 what we say we will do and what we do do and there's the rub. 14 15 And again, as a biochemical geneticist 16 this is fantastic. I really want to see this on. But being a public health person and 17 18 just recognizing that the committee has laid out guidance for itself it doesn't bode very well if 19 20 we are not able to stick to our guidance. And there's a lot more. In other 21 22 conditions there's a lot more that you would

identify when you prospectively screen. 1 2 This might seem very simple because my goodness, you find them, you treat them, they're 3 That seems very, very apparent. better. 4 But for other complicated diseases my 5 concern is that it would not be so simple. 6 And 7 that's why there's a great tension with making this decision. 8 9 But again, I still support what the 10 Nomination and Prioritization Committee says. 11 MEMBER MATERN: However, if we don't move it to the evidence review it will -- I mean, 12 13 we're not adding it to the RUSP today. It's just a question whether we're moving it to the 14 15 evidence review. 16 And the evidence review will have to look at everything we discussed today. They will 17 18 have to look at whether the test as it would be 19 implemented in a public health laboratory. 20 One of the things that I'm a little bit concerned about is what is happening in the 21 22 screening labs right now when it comes to X-

adrenoleukodystrophy. You can identify X-ALD by 1 2 using lysophosphatidylcholine with a separate assay, or along with the lysosomal storage 3 disorders, or as has been proposed you can also 4 add long chain acylcarnitines to the 5 acylcarnitine panel and pick it up that way. 6 7 But I don't know how easy it will be to add GAA creatine and the long chain 8 9 acylcarnitines if you use MRMs because at some 10 point there's only so much you can do at a time 11 even with a tandem mass spec. So that is a thing that I don't know. 12 13 I don't know if anyone from Perk & Elmer is here who can tell us what their plans are, those kind 14 15 of questions. 16 MEMBER CUTHBERT: So, I can't speak for Perk & Elmer. This is Carla Cuthbert 17 18 speaking again. 19 I can't speak for Perk & Elmer 20 particularly, but I do know that Perk & Elmer is coming out with a modified neobased kit soon. 21 22 They did a presentation earlier this

year at the APHL newborn screening symposium. And they did indicate that they are including several new markers specifically to address X-ALD, SIMD ADA and GAMT is specifically not on

6 Now, perhaps they were not given a 7 heads up about this so they had been working on 8 what they knew had been added to the Recommended 9 Uniform Screening Panel and that they recognized 10 -- they're also looking to improve the detection 11 of succinylacetone which has been a problem 12 historically.

So, when we did ask them about GAMT they said that they were not planning on doing this again. They're listening to this presentation. Perhaps they will consider differently.

How that additional marker performs with their current expansion which they are working at to try to get to a sufficient level of acceptability before they roll that out is anybody's guess.

1

2

3

4

5

that.

I don't know that, you know, we can 1 2 ask them whether or not they can put this in, but that would be a hard request. 3 MEMBER LOREY: This is Fred. I spoke 4 to them last week and it seemed they're not 5 working on it. 6 7 MEMBER BAILEY: So I'm going to recommend we take a chance and move it forward to 8 9 evidence review. I feel like we have a very 10 strong evidence for benefit for these babies. The low cost of screening and relative to a lot 11 of the other conditions we've got a pretty strong 12 13 case already. I actually don't think we'll learn 14 15 much more from the evidence review, frankly, but 16 in the meantime I think what we'll get is the APHL review of state capabilities. 17 18 We can ask the advocates to come 19 together quickly and pull together some consensus 20 guidelines for treatment. These pilot studies are already 21 22 ongoing. We'll potentially have more data. And

we'll know in nine months whether we can make a
 decision or not.

I mean, I realize we're going to pay 3 Alex the big bucks to do the review, but I 4 frankly think in -- okay, the small bucks -- I 5 frankly think in this case that we've got a 6 7 strong candidate here and that we should take a chance and move forward with the evidence review, 8 9 recognizing that it may fail at the end, but I'm 10 willing to take a chance on it myself. 11 MEMBER BOTKIN: Second. 12 MEMBER SPONG: So, Don has actually 13 answered a couple of -- part of the question that And again, some of it is education for 14 I had. 15 me. 16 If I understand correctly the pilot criteria that we went through before lunch was 17 18 the first time we kind of outlined what that was. 19 So that isn't even really final yet, although one 20 of those comments was that you needed to have a positive in order to move forward. But we 21

22 haven't totally hammered those all out.

So, say this was the last meeting. 1 2 What would be the harm in going ahead and moving this forward, getting that information? 3 I appreciate that you're not going to 4 get a whole lot as Don just kind of reinforced to 5 me, at least not from the evidence-based review. 6 7 But maybe while that process is going on and getting everything else that you would get 8 9 in that nine-month period you would get other information that would be helpful rather than 10 waiting for that one case and delaying the whole 11 thing by not moving forward. 12 13 So, education is what I'm after here to understand and make an informed decision. 14 15 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Yes, the only 16 difficulty is if we get out nine months out and we don't have the key data that's necessary a 17 18 decision will have to be made to reject the 19 packet. 20 So then could you not MEMBER SPONG: reconsider it at a later date if something 21 22 positive did come up?

Right, but that's the CHAIR BOCCHINI: 1 2 same thing as doing it -- by following our own criteria for including it. 3 But I understand your point. Cathy? 4 MEMBER WICKLUND: I was just going to 5 say that I wonder if that would set us back even 6 7 farther. Like if you move it forward through evidence review, you go through that process. 8 9 I'm just trying to think about time-wise, but I don't know if we'd save time or not. Or if you 10 11 would just almost set back the whole process even 12 further. I don't know. 13 MEMBER BOTKIN: Jeff Botkin. A couple of thoughts. 14 15 And I think as the pilot group sort of 16 thought about this identify one baby, I think that really was intended for a couple of things 17 18 that may be worth unpacking here. 19 One was just to try to give some ball 20 park for the sort of size of study we're talking about. As we talked a little bit earlier, it 21 22 wouldn't be appropriate to say you have to have a

prospective population-based study, but you're 1 2 done after the first thousand babies. Or on the other hand it wouldn't be 3 appropriate to say well, we kind of like 20 or 30 4 affected babies followed over 5 years because 5 that would really give us some excellent data to 6 7 make a decision. You have to find something in the middle. 8 9 So, I wouldn't necessarily personally consider that to be a hard and fast condition and 10 be a deal-breaker in this situation when there's 11 other information. 12 13 But the question I would have is whether there's other information that might be 14 15 fostered by a recommendation to look for more 16 data before formally going forward. One's sort of the natural history. 17 18 And I do think the fact that you've got lots of negatives with a million babies without false 19 20 positives is very helpful. If you had had 40 false positive 21 22 babies in the first 100,000 kids that would be

very informative. So the fact that we've got 1 2 zero, that too is informative in a good way. I don't have a good feel for 3 population prevalence at this point. You know, 4 at 110 babies in the literature there's got to be 5 lots of babies out there that never made it to 6 7 the literature. Is there a way to collect information from clinicians who are likely at the 8 9 bottom of the referral pattern for these kids to 10 get a better estimate on what the population frequency is for this condition. 11 And then it sounds like with Nicole's 12 13 other publication there's additional information that might be reviewed in terms of the test 14 15 performance as well as potentially some short-16 term fairly quick studies that could be done retrospectively with blood spots. 17 18 So I guess my question is would an ask for more data decision by the committee at this 19 20 point prompt that additional data to come together in a way that a going to evidence review 21 decision wouldn't. 22

This is McDonough. MEMBER MCDONOUGH: 1 2 Second Don's motion. MEMBER MATERN: Just one comment. 3 MEMBER BAILEY: I didn't really make 4 a formal motion, but I will eventually. When 5 it's time I'll be glad to. 6 7 MEMBER MCDONOUGH: I thought I --That's my fault. When he does I'll second okay. 8 9 it. 10 MEMBER MATERN: While you find the microphone if I might just point out that in the 11 paper here there is also a mention of this kind 12 13 of registry that they wanted to implement. Now, this was published in 2014 and if 14 15 you click on this it will not get you anywhere. 16 I sent an email to Dr. Stuckler and asked her whether this is close to being live and 17 18 I didn't get a response yet. 19 MS. GREENE: Carol Greene, SIMD. Two 20 The quicker one first. things. To contribute I hope to the 21 22 committee's discussion about whether or not to

accept the recommendation of the review committee.

1

2

And that is the recommendation had two 3 parts to it. One was based on the judgment that 4 treatment was not yet. And I really do feel 5 strongly that there needs to be some further 6 7 guidance about what's meant by that because I really do think, and I think all the clinicians 8 9 would say treatment is a yes on that one. 10 So that the recommendation wouldn't be 11 based on something to do with the pilot and having guidance for treatment, but I would take 12 13 off that for the treatment. I think there is enough to go forward 14 15 with treatment. That's just speaking as SIMD 16 trying to offer that for the discussion of the committee. 17 18 The second thing is that perhaps what 19 I'm hearing people trying to do with the studies 20 should have at least one positive, but yes, of course if your positive is in the first thousand 21 22 you can't stop there.

That maybe if the language of that was 1 2 perhaps rewritten to say something like that the sample size should be sufficient, should be twice 3 the expected prevalence or something so that 4 you'd have a good chance of picking up at least 5 one, and you'd know something about the false 6 7 positives. And I think what are the chances in 8 9 the first million you don't pick out one of the four in that million that would be affected? 10 Ι 11 don't know the number, but it's a reasonable number. 12 13 So maybe if instead of sticking with the first positive you say that the pilot study 14 15 size should be roughly twice your expected 16 prevalence. And then you will have data, and you combine it with the historic and you'll have that 17 18 data. 19 And the reason that I put that forward 20 in this context is because I really want to support those who have said if you don't stick 21 22 with your own guidelines you're going to lose the

credibility and the sense that you are -- I 1 2 forget which group came and said that we're going to depend on you to do our evidence review. 3 If we don't stick to our own 4 guidelines you lose that. And that's why states 5 don't accept it. They want to do their own 6 7 evidence review because we don't follow our own rules. 8 9 Beth Tarini, AAP. MS. TARINI: Quick 10 question. The previous examples where there were 11 no children identified from prospective 12 13 screening, was that vote for evidence review? Dieter brought this up I thought, but wanted 14 15 clarification. 16 Were those votes for evidence review, or were those votes for nomination to the RUSP? 17 18 The reason I ask is because if it's 19 the latter then this is not necessarily a 20 deviation from procedure that we're voting to add to the RUSP when those votes said come back after 21 22 you find a case.

MEMBER MATERN: I think it's all about 1 2 determining whether we send it forward to the evidence review. 3 MS. TARINI: My point is the 4 conversation here is about concern about 5 deviation from protocol. And I'm trying to 6 7 determine if this actually matches the protocol we think we're deviating from. 8 9 In the past when there was no case and 10 we said no, come back when there's a case, were 11 we saying no to evidence review, or were we 12 saying no to addition to the RUSP? 13 MS. SARKAR: So, this is Debi. For X-ALD it was no to move it for evidence review. 14 15 MS. BONHOMME: Natasha Bonhomme, 16 Genetic Alliance. My comments kind of go to some of the 17 18 things that have already been said. More so not 19 whether this should be in, or whether this should 20 move forward or not, but really the issue of communicating this out. 21 22 I think the fact that we've had about,

what, a 30-minute or so conversation about is this consistent or is it not is something that should be noted.

And that whatever the communication is that goes back to the nominators and back out to the public around this clearly lays out why this does or does not go, and clearly the next steps.

Because this is an issue that has come 8 9 up with other conditions that have gone through 10 the process. And to have the parents and the 11 public become really frustrated with this process because it seems very convoluted and not clear 12 13 when you have people who say this seems like a slam dunk, or this seems like a go, but it isn't. 14

15 I think we just need to be really 16 careful about the communication that goes along with this because I think there could be an 17 18 opportunity for clarity, but also clearly an opportunity for more confusion out to the public 19 20 in terms of what is this process in terms of adding conditions to the RUSP. 21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

And then also our having conversations

of why are advocates going straight to states to 2 get these things. Shouldn't they go through the RUSP. 3

But clearly that's -- even for a 4 condition that some would say is very obvious 5 it's not clear. 6

7 And so I just really want whatever the communication is that goes back out to the world 8 9 around this that there's just real attention to 10 clarity in terms of why you choose what you 11 choose to do, and the right next steps for families to follow up, or for the nominators to 12 13 follow up.

I guess this will come 14 MEMBER LU: 15 down -- this decision to move it forward will 16 come down to whether or not there is a case of true positive. 17

18 And I'm getting increasingly concerned 19 whether that is misplaced.

20 I guess the argument I hear, one is that it helps -- having a true positive helps 21 22 establish prevalence and predictive value. And

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

1

if you think about it, how valid is it to have 1 2 one case as a numerator to help you establish that population prevalence, or predictive value. 3 And then the second is to establish 4 that in terms of treatment efficacy and what 5 Carol's saying. Again, I'm not sure how much 6 7 information treatment efficacy from one case will tell you versus all the other information that we 8 9 already have. So again I think, I know that's the 10 11 guidelines that we have around pilot studies, but I'm wondering whether we're placing too much 12 13 confidence in waiting for that one case of true positive. 14 15 CHAIR BOCCHINI: So, I guess the 16 important thing is would everybody be comfortable to approve something to be placed on the RUSP 17 18 without having any baby identified by newborn 19 screening? 20 I mean, to me that's the crux of the And I think that was part of the 21 argument. 22 argument for SCID as to why it wasn't recommended

1	for the RUSP until that positive occurred.
2	I think that's the one question we
3	need to feel comfortable with if you're going
4	forward and then don't have that.
5	MEMBER MCDONOUGH: This is McDonough.
6	Yes, I would be. And if we have to eventually
7	get to the point with such conditions that are so
8	rare to say, okay, we think the evidence looks
9	good. We're going to try this. We're going to
10	give it three years. And if we haven't picked up
11	any cases then we'll stop doing it.
12	I would rather that this committee
13	work on identifying cases to help these kids and
14	families out, and err maybe on the side of, well,
15	maybe we shouldn't have done this. As long as
16	it's not causing harm.
17	Again, if California was doing the
18	pilot study, was doing their state we would
19	probably have evidence pretty quickly where there
20	are a large number of births. But if it's just
21	going to be Utah it's going to take a long time.
22	So, I would answer yes to that.

Looking at the preponderance of information that we have with these rare conditions that we need to take that leap forward, that we have faith in our public health labs that they can do the testing appropriately.

And if we did it wrong and we didn't pick up cases that we can back off from that. But that's better than letting these kids not be diagnosed and being damaged because that's the thing we don't -- the longer we wait, we don't have these families coming back.

12 And you're taking a look at the kids 13 and saying okay, we didn't do this and this is 14 what happened. We don't see that.

MEMBER BAILEY: So, just to follow upon that a little bit.

And this shows how complicated these
decisions are for us really, and especially again
for rare conditions.

If you think about some of the other conditions we've reviewed. So if this disorder had a very expensive laboratory test, if it made

1

2

3

4

5

a lot of errors in the test, if the treatment had 1 2 to be a stem cell transplant or some other particularly dangerous treatment, or if it 3 identified children with many different severity 4 types that we didn't know whether to treat a 5 child or not treat a child, having to make all 6 7 those complicated decisions, then I would say yes, we need more -- I would feel less confident 8 9 about screening for a condition, adding a condition that we never had. 10 But we're not talking about that here. 11 12 So I would feel, and I'm not voting to put it on 13 the RUSP yet, because I think we still need to go through this process and get a little bit more 14 15 data. 16 But I still feel what I said earlier that I'm willing to take that chance and move 17 18 forward for the evidence review. 19 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Well, I think if 20 we've completed the discussion then we are open to take a -- if someone wants to make a motion. 21 MEMBER BAILEY: Well, does the 22

recommendation of the nominating committee not 1 2 constitute a motion? CHAIR BOCCHINI: It does not. It 3 opens the opportunity for discussion. The 4 nomination needs to come from the committee. I'm 5 sorry, the motion needs to come from the 6 7 committee. MEMBER BOTKIN: Yes, Jeff Botkin. Ι 8 9 just recognized how very difficult this is for 10 everybody. I'm going to move to support the recommendation of the Nomination Committee. 11 12 MEMBER KELM: Second. 13 CHAIR BOCCHINI: Moved and seconded that the recommendations of the Nomination and 14 15 Prioritization Committee be accepted. We'll now do a -- no, no, there is 16 time for discussion before vote. 17 18 MEMBER WICKLUND: Is this implying also that there has to be an identified case? 19 Ι 20 mean, what I'm saying is that in order to move it forward is this recommending that there has to be 21 22 an identified case before they can bring it back

to us?

2	CHAIR BOCCHINI: It does. But in
3	addition, I think based on the discussion we
4	certainly can add that additional information can
5	be brought forward. If there is a repository
6	that has blood spots that can be looked at
7	retrospectively and other things that were
8	mentioned, that that can come forward as well.
9	Dieter?
10	MEMBER MATERN: Well, I think we know
11	already now that there is a repository, so what
12	are they supposed to tell us? As you've just
13	heard already at the meeting there is a
14	repository.
15	CHAIR BOCCHINI: So, the
16	recommendation does certainly continue to include
17	the finding of a case.
18	MEMBER BAILEY: Call the question.
19	CHAIR BOCCHINI: So, the motion is to
20	accept the recommendation of the Nomination and
21	Prioritization Committee that we do not initiate
22	external evidence review, but that we recommend

I

1 that the proponents work with other experts to 2 formalize treatment guidelines. And that 3 certainly doesn't mean that treatment guidelines 4 -- I mean, it would certainly just improve the 5 consensus, but it doesn't mean that treatment is 6 not appropriate. But we can discuss that.

7 And encourage continuation of newborn 8 screening prospective studies in Utah and 9 Australia, and then report as soon as possible 10 when a patient has been identified prospectively. 11 And that the plan would be to move, if that's 12 accepted, then move that forward to evidence 13 review upon achievement of that milestone.

14 MEMBER MATERN: One more. So, if you 15 were against it does it mean automatically if 16 there was a majority to vote against this motion that it would motion towards the evidence review? 17 No, it would mean 18 CHAIR BOCCHINI: 19 there would need to be a second motion for that. 20 So, Don Bailey. MEMBER BAILEY: 21 No. 22 CHAIR BOCCHINI: So, I'm going to vote

,	
1	yes. Dr. Botkin?
2	MEMBER BOTKIN: Yes.
3	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Carla Cuthbert.
4	MEMBER CUTHBERT: Yes.
5	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Catherine Spong.
6	MEMBER SPONG: No.
7	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Kellie Kelm.
8	MEMBER KELM: Yes.
9	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Fred Lorey.
10	MEMBER LOREY: Yes.
11	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Dieter Matern.
12	MEMBER MATERN: No.
13	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Steve McDonough.
14	MEMBER MCDONOUGH: No.
15	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Kamila Mistry.
16	MEMBER MISTRY: Yes.
17	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Michael Lu.
18	MEMBER LU: No.
19	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Alexis Thompson.
20	MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.
21	CHAIR BOCCHINI: And Cathy Wicklund.
22	MEMBER WICKLUND: I'm going to say no.

<i>,</i>	
1	CHAIR BOCCHINI: Okay. Well, thank
2	you all very much. I know that was a very
3	important but very difficult and complicated
4	decision to make.
5	I have seven yes and five no so the
6	outcome is that six, I'm sorry. All right,
7	just to be sure, seven yes. Okay.
8	So, I think the important thing is
9	that we all feel this is a strong nomination and
10	that we would like to have the data necessary to
11	move forward as soon as possible. So thank you
12	all very much for that.
13	And we want to thank the families for
14	being here to make the case of how important this
15	is for us.
16	So with that that will conclude this
17	session. We do have the workgroups meeting. And
18	Debi, do you want to go through where the
19	location is of each of the meetings for the
20	workgroup?
21	MS. SARKAR: Just before, do you want
22	to just clarify what the final vote is?

Okay, so the final CHAIR BOCCHINI: 1 2 vote was in favor of the recommendation of the Nomination and Prioritization Committee to -- not 3 to initiate external evidence review at this 4 5 time. MS. SARKAR: And we will follow up 6 7 with the nominators with next steps. CHAIR BOCCHINI: Right. 8 9 MS. SARKAR: So, we will have our 10 three standing workgroups meeting this afternoon 11 until 5 p.m. The Education and Training Workgroup 12 13 will be meeting here in this building. The Follow-up and Training Workgroup and the 14 15 Laboratory Standards and Procedures Workgroup, if 16 we could all meet upstairs by the café within the next 10 minutes we need to walk across the street 17 18 to 5600 Fishers Lane. 19 You'll need your driver's license, a 20 You'll have to sign in, go through picture ID. security. We will have HRSA staff there to 21 22 escort you to the meeting rooms.

I		2
1	So, Laboratory Workgroup and Follow-up	
2	and Training Workgroup members, please meet us	
3	upstairs in 10 minutes. Thank you.	
4	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter	
5	went off the record at 3:09 p.m.)	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
•		

Α	19:17 22:12 50:3	action 32:3 55:13	166:22 175:11
A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N	52:15 59:1 63:7	62:14 177:9,10,13	179:19 210:9,11
141:1	66:3 76:8 92:1	178:1	221:16,22 226:21
<b>A-G-E-N-D-A</b> 4:1	110:12 162:14	active 145:3	228:10,11,22
<b>a.m</b> 1:13 5:2 140:21	163:20 165:10	actively 197:22	229:1,5 234:18
<b>AAFP</b> 81:10 86:10	168:1,5 170:18	activities 16:17	240:13,20 253:4
86:14	171:2 172:9,17	18:6 20:11 22:13	additions 12:4
<b>AAP</b> 78:15 222:9	174:5,21	103:21 104:12	additives 38:15
244:9	accessible 21:21	129:10 130:2,19	address 47:11
ability 49:12 61:21	165:11	131:10 133:20	51:22 76:13 95:1
62:1 80:22 229:16	accomplish 168:5	136:4	98:18 100:10
<b>able</b> 8:4 31:13 35:2	account 108:17	activity 100:6	108:8 130:20
49:11 61:19 85:9	214:5	188:12	131:11 138:14
	accumulating	actual 66:20 107:12	139:4 162:13
90:11 110:1,12,13 126:16 132:17	185:20 188:15	108:2 110:8	176:6 177:4 179:
	accumulation	127:18 155:15	234:3
136:12 139:4	188:5	161:7 224:14	adds 146:18 156:1
144:21 146:5	accuracy 105:19	acylcarnitine 233:6	adequately 66:6
151:19,21 152:18	121:13	acylcarnitines	adjustment 12:14
157:22 167:1	accurate 225:10	191:7 212:11	administer 59:22
172:22 178:9	<b>ACHDNC</b> 231:9	233:5,9	60:5
209:7 215:8,10	achieved 41:5	<b>ADA</b> 234:4	administered 44:1
229:20 231:20	112:11 150:6	Adam 2:8 8:11	51:1
aboriginal 195:17	201:19	143:4	Administration 1:3
above-entitled	achievement	add 30:4 36:2 89:17	2:2
140:20 258:4	254:13	113:22 127:11	administrative 98:
absence 203:11	acid 27:22 29:21	129:19 132:21	administratively
absolutely 66:18	31:17 191:7	152:20 191:10,11	98:1
74:12 80:1 136:6	acidemia 76:16	199:12 206:6	adopt 51:13 53:5
160:7	162:17 163:1	209:17 212:1,4	215:16 216:19
ACA 47:11 56:15	acidemias 31:5	218:7 226:21	adopted 120:16
academy 2:9,11 7:6	acidosis 163:6	233:5,8 244:20	199:2
7:9 57:12,18 81:4	acids 29:7,21 32:18	253:5,8 244.20	adrenoleukodyst.
81:8,13 86:5,8,15	54:8,11 212:12	added 10:3 46:8	233:1
93:8 219:8	aciduria 65:20	89:11 151:5	adult 27:11 42:17
accept 9:8,13 59:12	<b>ACMG</b> 57:22	174:19 199:9	43:13,15 111:8
138:18,19 222:21	ACWG 37.22 ACOG 86:8	202:12 206:14	126:9 165:12
226:15 242:1	act 14:8,8,19 18:1,7	202.12 200.14	adults 28:4 30:15
244:6 253:20	38:3,4 46:4 47:6		40:6 48:22 49:2
acceptability	•	adding 125:21	49:18 51:9 62:3
234:21	52:14 53:19,21	232:13 246:21 251:9	
acceptable 128:17	54:17 55:4,9 56:18 62:7 81:20		88:2 91:5 111:4 145:10 147:15
139:6 178:6		addition 11:1 69:11	
acceptance 9:11	82:14,15 83:18	91:1 106:3 112:4	167:12
•	87:1 89:4,7 90:20	178:10 215:7 245:12 253:3	advance 18:21
11:6 12:3 179:16	02.0 00.0 101.10		advancements
11:6 12:3 179:16 accepted 23:6	92:9 98:9 101:16		
11:6 12:3 179:16 accepted 23:6 102:21 138:10	164:6 171:20	additional 11:2,11	174:9
11:6 12:3 179:16 accepted 23:6			

			200
14:7,18 17:2,21	90:2 148:1 163:6	America 195:20	anybody 82:17 83:6
18:7,10 20:9 71:1	166:11 167:19	American 2:5,9,11	105:1 107:6
173:21 175:21	169:21 189:7	2:14 7:6,9,12,15	138:11
201:1 215:20	225:5	55:9 57:12 81:4	
			anybody's 218:17 234:22
advocacy 56:5,8,17	agree 74:12 78:16	81:13 86:5,8,14	-
60:7 157:18	80:18 83:4 86:1	196:21 219:8	anymore 12:8
162:22 179:1	88:9 119:2 165:9	amino 27:22 29:7	anyone's 39:10
181:10 226:20	202:10,17 211:3	29:21,21 31:17	anything's 59:5
advocate 45:10	219:9,10 228:19	32:18 54:8,11	<b>anyway</b> 208:5
177:20	agreed 200:2	191:7 212:12	210:2
advocated 56:12	agreement 208:18	amount 10:10	APHL 234:1 235:17
advocates 235:18	ahead 63:21 92:18	33:10,22 61:3,15	<b>Apologies</b> 105:12
247:1	103:17 105:13	amounts 26:10	apparent 232:4
advocating 61:9	124:22 207:16	amplify 220:16	apparently 120:8,9
97:8 163:16	237:2	Amsterdam 187:7	120:17 189:12
Affairs 169:9	<b>AHRQ</b> 6:15	<b>analyses</b> 64:20	195:9 199:5,7
affect 17:11	<b>al</b> 42:22	66:21	appear 201:7
affection 160:14	alarming 159:1,16	analysis 13:17	<b>appears</b> 179:15
affectionate 145:2	ALD 10:9 221:1	64:22 74:19,20	184:9 197:14
afford 155:20	234:4 245:14	76:3,4 77:8 78:1	<b>apple</b> 40:22
157:22	Alex 2:18 214:14	83:9 87:12,15	applicable 38:12
affordable 46:4	219:9 221:11	88:1 93:14 110:17	applications 10:12
47:6 52:14 62:7	236:4	149:3 191:7,12,22	11:6
81:20 82:14,14,15	Alexis 1:21 6:19,22	192:3,16 222:13	applied 117:16
86:22 89:3,7	13:8 142:4 255:19	analyst 20:10	apply 47:20,22
90:20 98:9 160:21	algorithm 186:12	analytic 182:5	appreciate 17:19
164:6	aligns 14:6	200:15	73:14 88:7 93:12
afternoon 14:14	Alliance 2:6 8:13	analytical 105:15	107:17 148:7
162:15 173:6	55:18 56:11 62:18	105:22 109:8,11	162:11 180:9,11
176:6,13 257:10	89:17 166:9	111:22 123:6	201:22 237:4
afternoon's 16:15	167:12 245:16	analytically 182:7	approach 52:3
<b>AGAT</b> 183:15 184:8	allotment 35:21	ancestry 195:16	115:5 117:7 118:9
186:2,3	allotted 143:20	and/or 29:7,20	119:5 128:8
age 30:19 48:21	allow 14:10 67:12	184:20	182:19 198:18
58:3 68:16 77:18	70:15 117:11	angle 80:17	227:10 228:17
77:18 113:9	165:15 178:10	animal 85:16 175:2	approaches 63:17
145:14 150:16	allowing 165:22	announce 18:15	approaching 176:2
151:9 163:7	alternative 211:1	announcement	appropriate 38:13
169:15 173:20	alternatives 85:2	10:2 129:7	163:12 238:22
175:7	amazing 157:14	answer 65:3,13	239:4 254:6
aged 28:7	<b>Amazon</b> 156:3	81:8 89:15 181:15	appropriately 14:6
agencies 9:15 71:4	187:16	189:21 206:22	250:5
-	ambiguous 125:3	210:4 229:20	appropriation
/1:8		249:22	178:10
71:8 agenda 12:6 104:9	AMCHP 5.8		
agenda 12:6 104:9	AMCHP 5:8 amenable 121:6		
agenda 12:6 104:9 104:17	amenable 121:6	answered 190:19	appropriations
<b>agenda</b> 12:6 104:9 104:17 <b>agent</b> 188:6	amenable 121:6 amend 52:3	answered 190:19 236:13	appropriations 178:13
agenda 12:6 104:9 104:17	amenable 121:6	answered 190:19	appropriations

			201
150:11	205:21 226:19	201:14 203:13	195:2,4,7 203:11
approve 12:13,15	aspect 32:16 92:12	210:20 218:19	210:17,18 223:22
12:16,18,21 13:1	117:20 119:8	224:13 254:9	225:3 235:10
13:3,5,7,9 103:8	120:19 131:21	Australian 195:15	
139:7 248:17	132:5	Australians 203:17	239:2,5,19,22
			240:5,6
approved 9:6 13:11	aspects 101:14	authority 17:22	Babies"R"Us 36:7
38:14 42:16 104:9	115:14	52:7,10 65:8,9	<b>baby</b> 115:15 124:3
174:11 177:6	assay 117:20 187:1	79:5	124:6,19 156:17
182:11 190:4	187:6 199:18	authorization 42:3	160:9 198:4
200:4 225:16,18	200:5 233:3	authorizing 17:16	205:10 210:10,22
228:7	assays 111:2 199:1	autism 156:6	218:11,12 238:16
approximate 161:6	assessment 15:11	159:11	248:18
<b>April</b> 171:9	15:15 181:22	autistic-like 30:11	back 22:20 51:19
area 59:9 79:3 97:6	212:4 220:7	automatically	52:11 66:12 69:2
171:2 177:1	assessments 112:2	178:2 254:15	71:17 79:13,15,16
203:14	assist 135:1	autosomal 173:17	89:19 95:10 97:15
areas 73:18	assistance 9:16	availability 58:20	99:20 100:18
arena 56:6 79:21	130:22 131:21	176:2	101:5 102:6 105:3
arginine 183:5	134:17	available 10:18	106:11 110:14
184:20 188:17	associated 17:4	11:8 26:5 29:13	122:6 123:21
argue 94:1 200:19	Association 2:6,10	39:7 43:8 60:20	124:9 127:10
arguing 67:1 208:1	7:18,21 8:1 144:1	66:11 68:12 76:6	128:16 134:22
argument 74:16	144:8 148:9 153:3	78:9 105:14 112:8	139:2 149:10
78:21 84:22 120:2	157:17 163:1	114:15 136:14	152:6,10 169:12
202:18 247:20	181:12	160:20 165:11,20	169:17 179:22
248:21,22	<b>assume</b> 30:16	181:22 182:11	189:19 194:17
<b>arms</b> 88:10	197:5	184:18 187:6	197:8 200:10
<b>Army</b> 20:12	assumed 120:14	190:5 191:1	201:15 204:12,15
aromatic 32:18	assumes 219:2	192:16 218:15	209:22 221:10
<b>arrive</b> 187:1	assuming 65:8	avenues 221:17	228:8 231:8 238:6
arrived 6:16 7:1	assurance 191:17	average 75:17	238:11 244:21
arthritis 84:2	Atlantic 48:7	awaiting 53:7	245:10 246:5,5
<b>article</b> 186:13	<b>ATP</b> 187:11	aware 8:8 9:4,20	247:8 250:7,11
articulate 215:7	atrophy 173:5,17	-	252:22
artificial 84:11		10:16,21 13:22	
	attempting 63:22	21:10 84:16 85:4	background 5:12
artificially 107:14	attend 81:9	85:6 170:17	11:20 21:13 22:1
<b>ARUP</b> 181:9	attends 145:20	Awareness 55:19	97:14 101:8 113:4
<b>ASAP</b> 201:15	attention 94:6	awesome 157:13	backgrounds
<b>Asian</b> 196:22	108:21 146:14	awhile 144:18	196:22
asked 39:5 49:14	247:9	В	Bailey 5:18,19
78:10 155:6	attest 61:14		12:14,15 64:12,12
166:15 167:12	audience 34:21	<b>B</b> 1:17,20 2:9 185:4	66:16,19 73:11
169:21 170:11	58:9	<b>B3</b> 225:16	93:12 123:20
206:10 228:9	August 15:20	<b>B4162</b> 50:20	141:5,6 202:4
241:17	176:22	babies 15:2 63:1	203:2 235:7 241:4
asking 43:22 73:3,4	Australia 194:21	107:13 122:7	250:15 251:22
113:19 151:13	195:5,14 197:20	127:19 154:1	253:18 254:20,21
	-	4	
167:7 168:17	199:6 200:12	157:3 193:20	baked 28:13

Ш			202
<b>ball</b> 73:16 111:15	69:10 70:13 76:15	182:15 204:5	111:6,7,9,14
238:19	77:3,12,14 82:13	biochemical	114:17 117:5
bandwagon 84:16	83:1 96:17 113:18	185:18 230:2	118:13 153:15
bar 26:20	113:20 122:20	231:15	182:22 185:21
barely 159:6,10	123:8 169:14	biologic 112:1	199:1 209:8
barrier 32:19	206:13 235:10	biological 106:22	218:13 227:15,19
188:10	benefits 46:3 96:21	biomedical 59:15	240:17 253:6
barriers 22:11	98:22 112:8	biosynthesis	blood-brain 32:19
63:14 165:1	150:15 164:6	187:10	188:10
bars 27:2,16 54:2,5	169:8 176:3	Biotechnology	Blue 48:19,19
based 9:11 24:12	benefitting 69:21	20:11	150:12,12
51:6,8 80:10	benzoate 154:6	<b>Biotin</b> 30:6	blurry 122:16
85:19 113:2,10	184:21 188:18	biotinidase 30:5	board 173:9
123:1,4 137:21	208:4	birth 34:6 83:10	<b>Bob</b> 78:14 81:3
181:22 186:18	<b>Berry</b> 43:20	92:2,3 147:7	86:13 142:12
190:2 196:9,14	Berry's 45:6	152:1 154:22	Bocchini 1:13,16
197:2,3,19 199:1	<b>best</b> 73:18,19 74:1	155:14 158:18	5:3,20 6:1,3,5,7
200:14 219:1	82:7 90:8 198:21	160:4,8 162:5	6:10,13,15,19,22
226:5 242:4,11	199:17 208:11	175:3 188:22	7:4,9,12,15,21 8:7
253:3	Beth 2:11 7:10	197:8 198:22	8:10,13,16,21 9:2
baseline 179:19	78:13,15 86:1	birthday 144:13	9:22 10:15 12:10
basic 31:9	88:13 142:14	births 83:10 173:19	12:16,19,22 13:2
basically 65:8	219:7 222:9 244:9	249:20	13:4,6,8,10 17:7
69:15 97:21	<b>better</b> 26:12 101:1	<b>bit</b> 21:11 22:1,11	19:14 64:6 67:20
129:13 134:15	153:8 160:6	26:12 33:15 35:3	71:11 75:6 78:13
177:3 188:2,21	167:16 170:6	36:9 39:14,17	86:12 87:9 92:13
191:21 194:2	185:8 186:10	46:13 47:3 53:11	92:17 93:11 94:14
196:1 202:10	208:3,11,19	54:12,14 56:9	94:21 95:3 97:10
221:19 226:15	229:20 232:4	58:17 71:14 72:9	99:8,13 101:7
basis 67:5 149:1	240:10 250:8	72:12 75:1 81:7	106:9 127:1
Baylor 193:18	beyond 43:3 52:7	91:16 102:15	128:14 138:7,8
<b>bear</b> 93:17	52:10 68:18 91:16	103:1 105:4 106:6	139:10 140:15
bedside 107:2,7	126:15 215:17	124:10 125:8	141:3,7,10,13,15
beginning 79:15	big 50:14 51:7 53:1	128:12 137:6	141:17,20,22
131:6 153:12	56:20 60:11 65:9	144:10 179:12,13	142:2,4,7,9,11,14
begins 217:17	67:18 85:21 151:3	186:10 187:5	142:16,18,21
behalf 21:1 55:17	236:4	202:5,8 207:20	143:2,4,6,8,10,12
173:10 180:21	<b>bigger</b> 170:6	209:18 211:19	143:14 148:5
behavioral 184:6	biggest 170:2	215:6 216:12	162:9 166:4 170:8
believe 68:8 71:20	<b>Biggio</b> 2:5 7:16	223:9 230:12	173:3 176:7,14
78:3 90:12 157:11	142:18	231:11,12 232:21	180:8 181:2
168:8 174:4	<b>bike</b> 155:9 161:8,15	238:21 250:16	201:20 212:14,19
177:12 187:6	161:18	251:14	214:14 217:16
198:9 200:5	bilirubin 107:9	<b>black</b> 35:5	221:6 226:4 228:5
204:19 220:3	<b>billion</b> 59:16	blood 16:14 32:11	229:15 237:15
<b>believes</b> 156:5	billions 62:22	32:15 106:1,16,18	238:1 248:15
beneficial 95:20	<b>bills</b> 62:13 79:8	106:22 108:16	251:19 252:3,13
benefit 47:13,15	biochem 181:8	109:22 110:13,17	253:2,15,19

255:7,9,11,13,15       boy         255:17,19,21       brain         256:1 257:1,8       14         bode 231:19       14         bodies 31:18,19       16         body 33:19       22         bold 29:19 170:7       brain         bone 113:7       20         Bonhomme 2:6       8:14,15 143:6,7         8:14,15 143:6,7       245:15,15         books 149:22       19         books 149:22       19         books 149:22       19         boots 37:7,10       brie         born 30:2 34:10       17         63:1 166:17,19       168:12 170:1         168:12 170:1       89         205:10 225:11       98         Botkin 1:16 5:21,22       brin         107:5 108:6,14       17         107:5 108:6,14       brin         109:4 111:16       14         114:2 116:15       19         117:2,13 118:2,6       17         118:16,18 119:13       12         120:21 121:10       brox         123:13,19 124:12       brox         130:15 131:13,19       12         132:11,21 133:8       135:5,10,16 137:2         133:11,18 134:6,8 <th>3:6 5 184:15 218:12 n 32:6 33:6 5:18 148:19 9:15 151:10 3:8 183:8 5:12 ner 157:10 6:18 nch 214:19 ndth 180:4 nks 46:9 nthed 230:10 fing 19:5 100:4 6:1</th> <th>216:6,13,15 burdensome 216:16 bureaucracy 164:16 business 45:17 56:7 58:14 136:19 167:5 buy 36:7 191:9 <u>C</u> C 185:5 café 257:16 calculate 51:7 196:15</th> <th>capture 117:7 carbohydrate 33:21 carbohydrates 85:10 care 5:10 20:14 37:6 46:4 47:6 49:19,20 52:14 61:7,16 62:7 65:20 66:1 68:17 76:22 81:20 82:14 82:15,15 87:1,2,5 89:4,7 90:20 93:6</th>	3:6 5 184:15 218:12 n 32:6 33:6 5:18 148:19 9:15 151:10 3:8 183:8 5:12 ner 157:10 6:18 nch 214:19 ndth 180:4 nks 46:9 nthed 230:10 fing 19:5 100:4 6:1	216:6,13,15 burdensome 216:16 bureaucracy 164:16 business 45:17 56:7 58:14 136:19 167:5 buy 36:7 191:9 <u>C</u> C 185:5 café 257:16 calculate 51:7 196:15	capture 117:7 carbohydrate 33:21 carbohydrates 85:10 care 5:10 20:14 37:6 46:4 47:6 49:19,20 52:14 61:7,16 62:7 65:20 66:1 68:17 76:22 81:20 82:14 82:15,15 87:1,2,5 89:4,7 90:20 93:6
255:7,9,11,13,15       boy         255:17,19,21       256:1 257:1,8         bode 231:19       14         bodies 31:18,19       16         body 33:19       22         bold 29:19 170:7       brai         bone 113:7       20         Bonhomme 2:6       brai         8:14,15 143:6,7       245:15,15         book 12:6 19:5       brea         100:4 196:1       brie         boots 37:7,10       brie         born 30:2 34:10       17         63:1 166:17,19       168:12 170:1         168:12 170:1       89         205:10 225:11       98         Botkin 1:16 5:21,22       brin         107:5 108:6,14       17         107:5 108:6,14       brin         109:4 111:16       12         114:2 116:15       19         117:2,13 118:2,6       bro         118:16,18 119:13       12         120:21 121:10       bro         123:13,19 124:12       bro         130:15 131:13,19       12         130:15 131:13,19       12         132:11,21 133:8       135:5,10,16 137:2         137:9 139:9 141:8       89         141:9 203:6	a 184:15 218:12 n 32:6 33:6 5:18 148:19 9:15 151:10 3:8 183:8 5:12 ner 157:10 6:18 nch 214:19 ndth 180:4 nks 46:9 nthed 230:10 fing 19:5 100:4 6:1	burdensome 216:16 bureaucracy 164:16 business 45:17 56:7 58:14 136:19 167:5 buy 36:7 191:9 <u>C</u> C 185:5 café 257:16 calculate 51:7	carbohydrate 33:21 carbohydrates 85:10 care 5:10 20:14 37:6 46:4 47:6 49:19,20 52:14 61:7,16 62:7 65:20 66:1 68:17 76:22 81:20 82:14 82:15,15 87:1,2,5
255:17,19,21       brain         256:1 257:1,8       14         bode 231:19       14         bodies 31:18,19       16         body 33:19       22         bold 29:19 170:7       brain         bone 113:7       26         Bonhomme 2:6       brain         8:14,15 143:6,7       245         245:15,15       bread         books 149:22       bread         books 149:22       bread         boost 37:7,10       brief         born 30:2 34:10       17         63:1 166:17,19       Brief         168:12 170:1       89         205:10 225:11       98         Botkin 1:16 5:21,22       brind         107:5 108:6,14       brind         109:4 111:16       114:2         114:2 116:15       19         117:2,13 118:2,6       brood         118:16,18 119:13       12         120:21 121:10       brood         123:13,19 124:12       brood         130:15 131:13,19       12         130:15 131:13,19       12         132:11,21 133:8       135:5,10,16 137:2         137:9 139:9 141:8       89         141:9 203:6 210:6	n 32:6 33:6 5:18 148:19 9:15 151:10 3:8 183:8 5:12 ner 157:10 6:18 nch 214:19 ndth 180:4 nks 46:9 nthed 230:10 fing 19:5 100:4 6:1	216:16 <b>bureaucracy</b> 164:16 <b>business</b> 45:17 56:7 58:14 136:19 167:5 <b>buy</b> 36:7 191:9 <u>C</u> C 185:5 café 257:16 calculate 51:7	33:21 carbohydrates 85:10 care 5:10 20:14 37:6 46:4 47:6 49:19,20 52:14 61:7,16 62:7 65:20 66:1 68:17 76:22 81:20 82:14 82:15,15 87:1,2,5
256:1 257:1,8       14         bode 231:19       14         bodies 31:18,19       16         body 33:19       22         bold 29:19 170:7       brain 16         bone 113:7       20         Bonhomme 2:6       brain 13:7         Bonhomme 2:6       brain 13:7         Bonhomme 2:6       brain 13:7         book 149:22       brain 100:4 196:1         books 149:22       19         books 149:22       19         books 149:22       19         boots 37:7,10       brief         born 30:2 34:10       17         63:1 166:17,19       Brief         168:12 170:1       89         205:10 225:11       98         Botkin 1:16 5:21,22       brin         107:5 108:6,14       brin         109:4 111:16       17         117:2,13 118:2,6       18         118:16,18 119:13       12         120:21 121:10       broin         123:13,19 124:12       broin         130:15 131:13,19       12         131:1,18 134:6,8       25         133:11,18 134:6,8       25         137:9 139:9 141:8       89         141:9 203:6 210:6 <td>5:18 148:19 9:15 151:10 3:8 183:8 5:12 ner 157:10 6:18 nch 214:19 ndth 180:4 nks 46:9 nthed 230:10 fing 19:5 100:4 6:1</td> <td>bureaucracy 164:16 business 45:17 56:7 58:14 136:19 167:5 buy 36:7 191:9 <u>C</u> C 185:5 café 257:16 calculate 51:7</td> <td>carbohydrates 85:10 care 5:10 20:14 37:6 46:4 47:6 49:19,20 52:14 61:7,16 62:7 65:20 66:1 68:17 76:22 81:20 82:14 82:15,15 87:1,2,5</td>	5:18 148:19 9:15 151:10 3:8 183:8 5:12 ner 157:10 6:18 nch 214:19 ndth 180:4 nks 46:9 nthed 230:10 fing 19:5 100:4 6:1	bureaucracy 164:16 business 45:17 56:7 58:14 136:19 167:5 buy 36:7 191:9 <u>C</u> C 185:5 café 257:16 calculate 51:7	carbohydrates 85:10 care 5:10 20:14 37:6 46:4 47:6 49:19,20 52:14 61:7,16 62:7 65:20 66:1 68:17 76:22 81:20 82:14 82:15,15 87:1,2,5
bode 231:19         14           bodies 31:18,19         12           body 33:19         22           bold 29:19 170:7         brained stress           bone 113:7         20           bonk 12:6 19:5         breader           100:4 196:1         breader           books 149:22         19           books 149:22         19           boost 37:7,10         bride           born 30:2 34:10         17           63:1 166:17,19         Bride           168:12 170:1         89           205:10 225:11         98           Botkin 1:16 5:21,22         brin           107:5 108:6,14         12           109:4 111:16         Bride           114:2 116:15         19           117:2,13 118:2,6         brode           118:16,18 119:13         12           120:21 121:10         brode           122:17,21 126:7         21           130:15 131:13,19 <td< td=""><td>9:15 151:10 3:8 183:8 5:12 <b>ner</b> 157:10 6:18 <b>nch</b> 214:19 <b>ndth</b> 180:4 <b>nks</b> 46:9 <b>nthed</b> 230:10 <b>fing</b> 19:5 100:4 6:1</td><td>164:16 <b>business</b> 45:17 56:7 58:14 136:19 167:5 <b>buy</b> 36:7 191:9 <u>C</u> C 185:5 café 257:16 calculate 51:7</td><td>85:10 care 5:10 20:14 37:6 46:4 47:6 49:19,20 52:14 61:7,16 62:7 65:20 66:1 68:17 76:22 81:20 82:14 82:15,15 87:1,2,5</td></td<>	9:15 151:10 3:8 183:8 5:12 <b>ner</b> 157:10 6:18 <b>nch</b> 214:19 <b>ndth</b> 180:4 <b>nks</b> 46:9 <b>nthed</b> 230:10 <b>fing</b> 19:5 100:4 6:1	164:16 <b>business</b> 45:17 56:7 58:14 136:19 167:5 <b>buy</b> 36:7 191:9 <u>C</u> C 185:5 café 257:16 calculate 51:7	85:10 care 5:10 20:14 37:6 46:4 47:6 49:19,20 52:14 61:7,16 62:7 65:20 66:1 68:17 76:22 81:20 82:14 82:15,15 87:1,2,5
bodies 31:18,19         16           body 33:19         22           bold 29:19 170:7         brain total to	3:8 183:8 5:12 ner 157:10 6:18 nch 214:19 ndth 180:4 nks 46:9 nthed 230:10 fing 19:5 100:4 6:1	business 45:17 56:7 58:14 136:19 167:5 buy 36:7 191:9 <u>C</u> C 185:5 café 257:16 calculate 51:7	care 5:10 20:14 37:6 46:4 47:6 49:19,20 52:14 61:7,16 62:7 65:20 66:1 68:17 76:22 81:20 82:14 82:15,15 87:1,2,5
body 33:19         22           bold 29:19 170:7         brain           bone 113:7         20           Bonhomme 2:6         brain           8:14,15 143:6,7         245           245:15,15         brain           book 12:6 19:5         brain           100:4 196:1         brain           books 149:22         19           books 149:22         19           boots 37:7,10         bride           born 30:2 34:10         17           63:1 166:17,19         168:12 170:1           205:10 225:11         98           Botkin 1:16 5:21,22         brine           12:17,18 74:14         12           99:11,13 106:21         17           107:5 108:6,14         brine           109:4 111:16         Brit           114:2 116:15         19           117:2,13 118:2,6         broin           118:16,18 119:13         12           120:21 121:10         broin           123:13,19 124:12         broin           130:15 131:13,19         12           132:11,21 133:8         135:5,10,16 137:2           137:9 139:9 141:8         84           141:9 203:6 210:6         16	5:12 ner 157:10 6:18 nch 214:19 ndth 180:4 nks 46:9 nthed 230:10 fing 19:5 100:4 6:1	56:7 58:14 136:19 167:5 <b>buy</b> 36:7 191:9 <b>C</b> C 185:5 café 257:16 calculate 51:7	37:6 46:4 47:6 49:19,20 52:14 61:7,16 62:7 65:20 66:1 68:17 76:22 81:20 82:14 82:15,15 87:1,2,5
bold 29:19 170:7braibone 113:720bone 113:720Bonhomme 2:6brai8:14,15 143:6,7245:15,15book 12:6 19:5brai100:4 196:1braibooks 149:2219books 149:2219books 149:2219boots 37:7,10brieborn 30:2 34:101763:1 166:17,19Brig168:12 170:189205:10 225:1198Botkin 1:16 5:21,22brin12:17,18 74:141299:11,13 106:2117107:5 108:6,14brin109:4 111:16Brit114:2 116:1519117:2,13 118:2,6brod118:16,18 119:1312120:21 121:10brod123:13,19 124:12brod130:15 131:13,1913132:11,21 133:823133:11,18 134:6,825137:9 139:9 141:889141:9 203:6 210:616221:10 236:11238:13,13 252:8,8255:1,2buil	ner 157:10 6:18 nch 214:19 ndth 180:4 nks 46:9 nthed 230:10 fing 19:5 100:4 6:1	167:5 buy 36:7 191:9 <u>C</u> C 185:5 café 257:16 calculate 51:7	49:19,20 52:14 61:7,16 62:7 65:20 66:1 68:17 76:22 81:20 82:14 82:15,15 87:1,2,5
bone 113:7         20           Bonhomme 2:6         brain	6:18 <b>ach</b> 214:19 <b>adth</b> 180:4 <b>iks</b> 46:9 <b>ithed</b> 230:10 <b>fing</b> 19:5 100:4 6:1	buy 36:7 191:9 <u>C</u> C 185:5 café 257:16 calculate 51:7	61:7,16 62:7 65:20 66:1 68:17 76:22 81:20 82:14 82:15,15 87:1,2,5
Bonhomme 2:6         brain           8:14,15 143:6,7         245:15,15         brain           book 12:6 19:5         100:4 196:1         brain           books 149:22         19         brain           boots 37:7,10         brian         brian           born 30:2 34:10         17         63:1 166:17,19         Brian           168:12 170:1         89         168         120:21:10         Brain           205:10 225:11         98         17         17         17           168:12 170:1         89         12         17           107:5 108:6,14         12         12         17           107:5 108:6,14         12         12         12           114:2 116:15         19         12         12           117:2,13 118:2,6         18         14         12           120:21 121:10         12         12         12         12           120:7,21 126:7         24         12         12 <td< td=""><td>ch 214:19 dth 180:4 ks 46:9 thed 230:10 fing 19:5 100:4 6:1</td><td><b>C</b> <b>C</b> 185:5 <b>café</b> 257:16 <b>calculate</b> 51:7</td><td>65:20 66:1 68:17 76:22 81:20 82:14 82:15,15 87:1,2,5</td></td<>	ch 214:19 dth 180:4 ks 46:9 thed 230:10 fing 19:5 100:4 6:1	<b>C</b> <b>C</b> 185:5 <b>café</b> 257:16 <b>calculate</b> 51:7	65:20 66:1 68:17 76:22 81:20 82:14 82:15,15 87:1,2,5
8:14,15       143:6,7       bread         245:15,15       bread       bread         book       12:6       19:5       bread         100:4       196:1       bread       bread         books       149:22       19         books       149:22       19         books       149:22       19         books       149:22       19         boost       37:7,10       brid         born       30:2       34:10         63:1       166:17,19       Brid         168:12       170:1       89         205:10       225:11       98         Botkin       1:16       521,22         brin       109:4       117         107:5       108:6,14       brin         109:4       111:16       Brid         114:2       116:15       19         117:2,13       118:2,6       broad         118:16,18       119:13       12         120:21       121:10       broad         123:13,19       124:12       broad         130:15       131:13,19       12         132:11,21       133:8       135:5,10,16       137:2	dth 180:4 Iks 46:9 Ithed 230:10 fing 19:5 100:4 6:1	C 185:5 café 257:16 calculate 51:7	76:22 81:20 82:14 82:15,15 87:1,2,5
245:15,15       bread         book 12:6 19:5       100:4 196:1         books 149:22       19         books 149:22       19         boots 37:7,10       brid         born 30:2 34:10       17         63:1 166:17,19       Brid         168:12 170:1       89         205:10 225:11       98         Botkin 1:16 5:21,22       brin         12:17,18 74:14       12         99:11,13 106:21       17         107:5 108:6,14       brin         109:4 111:16       Brid         114:2 116:15       19         117:2,13 118:2,6       brod         118:16,18 119:13       12         120:21 121:10       brod         123:13,19 124:12       brod         130:15 131:13,19       12         130:15 131:13,19       13         132:11,21 133:8       23         133:11,18 134:6,8       25         137:9 139:9 141:8       89         141:9 203:6 210:6       16         221:10 236:11       23         238:13,13 252:8,8       255:1,2	<b>ks</b> 46:9 t <b>hed</b> 230:10 fi <b>ng</b> 19:5 100:4 6:1	C 185:5 café 257:16 calculate 51:7	82:15,15 87:1,2,5
book 12:6 19:5 100:4 196:1bread bridbooks 149:2219books 149:2219boots 37:7,10bridborn 30:2 34:101763:1 166:17,19Brig168:12 170:189205:10 225:1198Botkin 1:16 5:21,22brin12:17,18 74:141299:11,13 106:2117107:5 108:6,14brin109:4 111:16Brit114:2 116:1519117:2,13 118:2,6brod118:16,18 119:1312120:21 121:10brod123:13,19 124:12brod130:15 131:13,19132130:15 131:13,19brod132:11,21 133:823133:11,18 134:6,825137:9 139:9 141:889141:9 203:6 210:616221:10 236:11238:13,13 252:8,8255:1,2built	t <b>hed</b> 230:10 fi <b>ng</b> 19:5 100:4 6:1	<b>café</b> 257:16 <b>calculate</b> 51:7	
100:4 196:1       brie         books 149:22       19         boost 37:7,10       brie         born 30:2 34:10       17         63:1 166:17,19       168:12 170:1         168:12 170:1       89         205:10 225:11       98         Botkin 1:16 5:21,22       brin         12:17,18 74:14       12         99:11,13 106:21       17         107:5 108:6,14       brin         109:4 111:16       Brit         114:2 116:15       19         117:2,13 118:2,6       brod         118:16,18 119:13       12         120:21 121:10       brod         123:13,19 124:12       brod         130:15 131:13,19       132         132:11,21 133:8       23         133:11,18 134:6,8       25         137:9 139:9 141:8       89         141:9 203:6 210:6       16         221:10 236:11       80         238:13,13 252:8,8       55:1,2	f <b>ing</b> 19:5 100:4 6:1	calculate 51:7	09.4.7 90 20 95 0
books 149:22         19           boost 37:7,10         brie           born 30:2 34:10         17           63:1 166:17,19         18           168:12 170:1         89           205:10 225:11         98           Botkin 1:16 5:21,22         brin           12:17,18 74:14         12           99:11,13 106:21         17           107:5 108:6,14         brin           109:4 111:16         Brit           114:2 116:15         19           117:2,13 118:2,6         bron           118:16,18 119:13         12           120:21 121:10         bron           123:13,19 124:12         bron           130:15 131:13,19         13           132:11,21 133:8         135:5,10,16 137:2           137:9 139:9 141:8         14:9 203:6 210:6           21:10 236:11         238:13,13 252:8,8           255:1,2         buil	6:1		
boost 37:7,10         brie           born 30:2 34:10         17           63:1 166:17,19         Brig           168:12 170:1         98           205:10 225:11         98           Botkin 1:16 5:21,22         brin           12:17,18 74:14         12           99:11,13 106:21         17           107:5 108:6,14         17           109:4 111:16         Brit           114:2 116:15         19           117:2,13 118:2,6         brox           117:2,13 118:2,6         brox           118:16,18 119:13         12           120:21 121:10         brox           123:13,19 124:12         brox           130:15 131:13,19         132           132:11,21 133:8         133:11,18 134:6,8           135:5,10,16 137:2         Brox           137:9 139:9 141:8         89           141:9 203:6 210:6         16           221:10 236:11         238:13,13 252:8,8           255:1,2         buil	-		98:9 109:21 111:14 117:12
born 30:2 34:101763:1 166:17,19Brig168:12 170:189205:10 225:1198Botkin 1:16 5:21,22brin12:17,18 74:141299:11,13 106:2117107:5 108:6,14brin109:4 111:16114:2 116:15117:2,13 118:2,618:16,18 119:13120:21 121:10brod123:13,19 124:1212125:7,21 126:721130:15 131:13,19brod132:11,21 133:823135:5,10,16 137:2Brod137:9 139:9 141:889141:9 203:6 210:616221:10 236:11238:13,13 252:8,8255:1,2built		calculated 77:17	
63:1 166:17,19 168:12 170:1 205:10 225:11Bright 89 98 98 98 99:11,13 106:21 107:5 108:6,14 109:4 111:16 114:2 116:15 117:2,13 118:2,6 118:16,18 119:13 120:21 121:10 123:13,19 124:12 125:7,21 126:7 130:15 131:13,19 132:11,21 133:8 133:11,18 134:6,8 135:5,10,16 137:2 137:9 139:9 141:8 141:9 203:6 210:6 221:10 236:11 238:13,13 252:8,8 255:1,2Bright 89 89 100	fly 31:8 173:13		118:4,7,12 146:6
168:12 170:1       89         205:10 225:11       98         Botkin 1:16 5:21,22       brin         12:17,18 74:14       12         99:11,13 106:21       17         107:5 108:6,14       brin         109:4 111:16       Brit         114:2 116:15       19         117:2,13 118:2,6       brox         118:16,18 119:13       12         120:21 121:10       brox         123:13,19 124:12       brox         130:15 131:13,19       brox         132:11,21 133:8       23         133:11,18 134:6,8       25         137:9 139:9 141:8       89         141:9 203:6 210:6       16         221:10 236:11       38         238:13,13 252:8,8       buil	6:17	197:8,9,17 calculation 197:2	146:16 149:3
205:10 225:1198Botkin 1:16 5:21,22brin12:17,18 74:141299:11,13 106:2117107:5 108:6,14brin109:4 111:16114:2 116:15114:2 116:1519117:2,13 118:2,6brod118:16,18 119:1312120:21 121:10brod123:13,19 124:12brod130:15 131:13,19132:11,21 133:8133:11,18 134:6,825137:9 139:9 141:889141:9 203:6 210:616221:10 236:1138:13,13 252:8,8255:1,2built	ht 88:22 89:5,7	-	157:1 158:21
Botkin 1:16 5:21,22brin12:17,18 74:141299:11,13 106:2117107:5 108:6,1417107:5 108:6,14brin109:4 111:1618114:2 116:1519117:2,13 118:2,6brod118:16,18 119:1312120:21 121:10brod123:13,19 124:12brod125:7,21 126:721130:15 131:13,19brod132:11,21 133:823135:5,10,16 137:2Brod137:9 139:9 141:889141:9 203:6 210:616221:10 236:11238:13,13 252:8,8255:1,2built	:14 93:4,5	<b>California</b> 91:5,8	162:14 164:6
12:17,18 74:14       12         99:11,13 106:21       17         107:5 108:6,14       brin         109:4 111:16       brin         114:2 116:15       19         117:2,13 118:2,6       bron         118:16,18 119:13       12         120:21 121:10       bron         123:13,19 124:12       bron         127:13 130:5,12       bron         130:15 131:13,19       bron         132:11,21 133:8       23         133:11,18 134:6,8       25         137:9 139:9 141:8       89         141:9 203:6 210:6       16         221:10 236:11       38:13,13 252:8,8         255:1,2       built	:12,14	176:11 177:3,18	170:18 172:10
99:11,13 106:21       17         107:5 108:6,14       brin         109:4 111:16       Brit         114:2 116:15       19         117:2,13 118:2,6       broid         117:2,13 118:2,6       broid         118:16,18 119:13       12         120:21 121:10       broid         123:13,19 124:12       broid         125:7,21 126:7       21         130:15 131:13,19       broid         132:11,21 133:8       23         133:11,18 134:6,8       25         135:5,10,16 137:2       Broid         137:9 139:9 141:8       89         141:9 203:6 210:6       16         221:10 236:11       238:13,13 252:8,8         255:1,2       built	<b>g</b> 92:11 97:12	178:12,16 223:2,3	178:2
107:5 108:6,14       brin         109:4 111:16       Brit         114:2 116:15       19         117:2,13 118:2,6       brod         118:16,18 119:13       12         120:21 121:10       brod         123:13,19 124:12       brod         125:7,21 126:7       21         130:15 131:13,19       brod         132:11,21 133:8       133:11,18 134:6,8         135:5,10,16 137:2       Brod         137:9 139:9 141:8       89         141:9 203:6 210:6       16         221:10 236:11       Brod         238:13,13 252:8,8       bud         255:1,2       bud	8:16 139:2	249:17	careful 52:9 143:19
109:4 111:16       Brit         114:2 116:15       19         117:2,13 118:2,6       brod         117:2,13 118:2,6       brod         118:16,18 119:13       12         120:21 121:10       brod         123:13,19 124:12       brod         125:7,21 126:7       21         130:15 131:13,19       brod         132:11,21 133:8       133:11,18 134:6,8         135:5,10,16 137:2       Brod         137:9 139:9 141:8       89         141:9 203:6 210:6       16         221:10 236:11       Brod         238:13,13 252:8,8       bud         255:1,2       bud	8:22 252:22	call 5:15 22:8 84:3	207:3 208:9
114:2 116:15       19         117:2,13 118:2,6       browners         117:2,13 118:2,6       browners         118:16,18 119:13       12         120:21 121:10       browners         123:13,19 124:12       browners         123:13,19 124:12       browners         125:7,21 126:7       21         127:13 130:5,12       browners         130:15 131:13,19       browners         132:11,21 133:8       23         133:11,18 134:6,8       25         135:5,10,16 137:2       Browners         137:9 139:9 141:8       89         141:9 203:6 210:6       16         221:10 236:11       Browners         238:13,13 252:8,8       built         255:1,2       built	<b>k</b> 174:11	141:5 202:20	246:16
117:2,13 118:2,6broad118:16,18 119:1312120:21 121:10broad123:13,19 124:12broad123:7,21 126:721125:7,21 126:721127:13 130:5,12broad130:15 131:13,19broad132:11,21 133:823135:5,10,16 137:2Broad137:9 139:9 141:889141:9 203:6 210:616221:10 236:11Broad238:13,13 252:8,8buc255:1,2built	<b>sh</b> 194:10	217:5 253:18	carefully 34:1,15
118:16,18 119:1312120:21 121:10brown123:13,19 124:12brown125:7,21 126:721127:13 130:5,12brown130:15 131:13,19brown132:11,21 133:823133:11,18 134:6,825137:9 139:9 141:8141:9 203:6 210:6221:10 236:11238:13,13 252:8,8255:1,2built	5:18	called 10:2 28:10	caring 20:1
120:21 121:10brow123:13,19 124:12brow125:7,21 126:721127:13 130:5,12brow130:15 131:13,19brow132:11,21 133:823133:11,18 134:6,825135:5,10,16 137:2Brow137:9 139:9 141:889141:9 203:6 210:616221:10 236:11Brow238:13,13 252:8,8buc255:1,2built	<b>d</b> 61:3 124:7	53:21 190:7	Carla 1:17 109:5,6
123:13,19124:12broad125:7,21126:721127:13130:5,12broad130:15131:13,19broad132:11,21133:823133:11,18134:6,825135:5,10,16137:2Broad137:9139:9141:8141:9203:6210:6221:10236:11Broad238:13,13252:8,8buc255:1,2built	7:6 133:19	203:14	134:8 136:3
125:7,21126:721127:13130:5,12bro130:15131:13,19bro132:11,21133:823133:11,18134:6,825135:5,10,16137:2Bro137:9139:9141:8141:9203:6210:6221:10236:11Bro238:13,13252:8,8buc255:1,2buil	i <b>den</b> 106:19	calling 177:21	141:10 233:17
127:13130:5,12130:15131:13,19132:11,21133:8133:11,18134:6,8135:5,10,16137:2137:9139:9141:9203:621:10236:11238:13,13252:8,8255:1,2built	124:11	calories 28:15,16	255:3
130:15131:13,19bro132:11,21133:823133:11,18134:6,825135:5,10,16137:2Bro137:9139:9141:8141:9203:6210:6221:10236:11Bro238:13,13252:8,8buc255:1,2buil	7:1,8	35:8,11 37:7 51:2	Carol 2:7 8:22
132:11,21133:823133:11,18134:6,825135:5,10,16137:2Bro137:9139:9141:8141:9203:6210:6221:10236:11Bro238:13,13252:8,8buc255:1,2buil	<b>her</b> 146:7,8	51:6,10	75:13 78:17 83:4
133:11,18134:6,825135:5,10,16137:2Bro137:9139:9141:8141:9203:6210:6221:10236:11Bro238:13,13252:8,8buil255:1,2buil	<b>ight</b> 106:15	camp 2:17 19:19,19	88:9 120:7 143:12
135:5,10,16137:2Bro137:9139:9141:889141:9203:6210:616221:10236:11Bro238:13,13252:8,8buc255:1,2buil	1:4 244:14	20:7,19 65:13	170:16,20 173:3
137:9139:9141:889141:9203:6210:616221:10236:11Bro238:13,13252:8,8buc255:1,2buil	3:5	66:18 67:3 68:7	207:6 217:22
141:9 203:6 210:616221:10 236:11Bro238:13,13 252:8,8buc255:1,2buil	<b>vn</b> 2:17 53:10	71:21 72:2,6,17	241:19
221:10 236:11Bro238:13,13 252:8,8buc255:1,2buil	:16,16 162:12	72:21 73:22 74:5	Carol's 213:19
238:13,13 252:8,8 buc 255:1,2 buil	10,10 102.12	74:8,12 75:4	248:6
255:1,2 buil	6:5,5	79:22 80:20 87:21	Caroline 163:10
,	•	88:15 91:20 94:15	168:12
hottom 80.13 2/0.0 huil	6:5,5	95:1 162:19	carrier 196:14
<b>DOLLOIN</b> 00.15 240.3   <b>DU</b>	6:5,5 <b>wn's</b> 34:20	<b>Canada</b> 202:21	219:3
	6:5,5 <b>vn's</b> 34:20 <b><s< b=""> 236:4,5</s<></b>		carriers 194:16,18
boy 34:20 149:6 buil	6:5,5 <b>vn's</b> 34:20 <b><s< b=""> 236:4,5 d 32:15 180:2</s<></b>	224:12	196:8 197:16
Boyle 6:1,2 12:19 buil	6:5,5 wn's 34:20 ks 236:4,5 d 32:15 180:2 ding 94:8	candidate 147:5	219:2
-	6:5,5 wn's 34:20 ks 236:4,5 d 32:15 180:2 ding 94:8 7:13		<u> </u>
	6:5,5 wn's 34:20 ks 236:4,5 d 32:15 180:2 ding 94:8 7:13 ds 32:11	candidate 147:5	carry 66:22
74:7,10 132:7,15 93	6:5,5 wn's 34:20 ks 236:4,5 d 32:15 180:2 ding 94:8 7:13 ds 32:11 :157:18	<b>candidate</b> 147:5 236:7	
	6:5,5 wn's 34:20 ks 236:4,5 d 32:15 180:2 ding 94:8 7:13 ds 32:11 : 157:18 ch 44:8 59:3	candidate 147:5 236:7 capabilities 235:17	carry 66:22

11	1	1	1
51:4 94:9 108:12	151:10 231:2	127:1 138:8	191:14 199:18
120:1,2 126:19	causing 249:16	139:10 140:15	206:20 213:4
147:21 182:1	cautious 130:9	141:3,7,10,13,15	checking 181:16
200:14,16 201:3	CDC 109:6 130:19	141:17,20,22	<b>cheese</b> 35:14
205:4,8 214:11,15	132:3 134:11,20	142:2,4,7,9,11,14	<b>chew</b> 95:19
215:3,8,17 217:8	134:22 135:20	142:16,18,21	chicken 35:14
220:19,21 221:3	136:4,20,22	143:2,4,6,8,10,12	child 7:19 27:11
222:21 223:14	141:11 191:15	143:14 148:5	28:7 35:8,21 36:5
227:2 228:15	212:8 230:6	162:9 166:4 170:8	68:13,14 76:16,20
235:13 236:6	<b>celiac</b> 84:18	173:3 176:7 180:8	125:16 151:6
237:11 244:22	<b>cell</b> 183:1,8 251:2	201:20 212:14,19	152:20 155:21
245:9,10 247:16	<b>Center</b> 20:13	214:14 217:16	156:6,8,11,21
248:2,7,13 252:19	centers 137:14,18	221:6 226:4 228:5	158:22 160:4
252:22 253:17	central 113:11	229:15 237:15	161:2 165:12
256:14	<b>cents</b> 156:17	238:1 248:15	189:14 251:6,6
<b>cases</b> 28:16 42:20	<b>century</b> 21:19	251:19 252:3,13	child's 35:14
87:17 177:8	cerebral 148:16	253:2,15,19	child-bearing 30:19
213:16,21 215:9	certain 40:10,10	254:18,22 255:3.5	childhood 93:22
219:18 220:11	68:10 78:3 104:7	255:7,9,11,13,15	94:4
227:16 249:11,13	119:16	255:17,19,21	<b>children</b> 1:5 5:6,10
250:7	certainly 38:16	256:1 257:1,8	20:1 40:5 51:9
catabolic 32:1	65:21 66:14 80:3	Chairperson 1:16	63:5 68:5 69:4,21
catabolism 33:12	86:7,16,18 88:7	challenge 79:1	70:15 71:8 88:3
Cate 2:13 8:19	94:10 98:2,13	100:22	94:5 132:19
143:10	99:3 105:3 122:16	challenges 63:15	145:21 146:9
categories 27:3	124:13 157:11	115:20	151:8,15,19
43:2	176:8 198:19	chance 70:6 92:16	152:13 153:1
categorize 102:6	213:5 215:4,18	97:9 100:12 140:5	154:4 157:5,14
categorized 39:18	221:2 222:16	143:20 235:8	158:8,9,12,15
104:6	253:4,16 254:3,4	236:8,10 243:5	162:4,17 164:1
category 23:2,4,4	<b>cetera</b> 28:14 33:5	251:17	166:6,14,17,19
23:11,17 24:19,22	37:11 41:13 60:5	chances 218:20	168:10,11,12
25:1,2,13 28:10	116:5 132:1	243:8	169:22 173:20
28:19,21,22 36:12	202:15	change 14:11,12	182:3 204:11
39:14 40:14,17	chain 233:5,8	73:4,5 156:11	220:4 225:11
84:9 103:9 133:19	<b>chair</b> 1:13 5:3,20	changed 12:9 57:3	244:12 251:4
Catherine 1:21,22	6:1,3,5,7,10,13,15	<b>changes</b> 63:13	chime 213:19
6:3 12:20 141:13	6:19,22 7:4,9,12	131:14	<b>China</b> 195:18
255:5	7:15,21 8:7,10,13	changing 14:2,3,5	chip 44:17 59:11
Cathy 7:1 77:9	8:16,21 9:2 10:15	channels 82:4	63:14
113:13 142:7	12:10,16,19,22	chapter 185:3	<b>choose</b> 247:10,11
165:8 238:4	13:2,4,6,8,10	charge 45:1 97:6	Chris 8:2 92:15,17
255:21	18:22 19:9,14	102:5 105:6,7	143:2
<b>Cathy's</b> 167:18	64:6 67:20 71:11	128:20 134:22	Christine 2:17
caught 153:12	75:6 78:13 86:12	137:10 217:2	34:20 53:10 61:14
cause 33:5 183:16	87:9 92:13,17	charges 96:6	87:19 89:16
caused 164:16	93:11 94:14,21	216:17	162:12 166:5
causes 30:22	95:3 97:10 99:8	<b>cheap</b> 121:9 187:18	170:8
		•	
11			

Christine's 164:1	122:12 125:6,12	108:19,22 117:15	108:16 128:18
CHRISTOPHER 2:6	125:19 126:6,14	125:17 224:14	132:3 138:3,22
chromatography	126:18,20 171:17	college 2:5,14 7:12	143:17,21 173:14
192:1	204:3	7:15 167:3	176:8 180:9,13
circumstance	clinician 92:11	Columbia 107:16	221:7 223:1
124:18	208:13	194:10	236:20 245:17
circumstances	clinicians 60:9 61:5	<b>column</b> 43:9	commercial 135:2
104:7 108:18	61:8 174:4 240:8	combine 243:17	commitment 63:20
109:1	242:8	combined 43:21	committee 1:5,12
citizens 70:16	<b>clinics</b> 44:22	come 22:16 27:14	4:3 5:5,16 10:18
claim 38:9 100:8	<b>close</b> 43:14 64:2	58:17 72:12,15	11:1,3,9,16,22
111:20	79:7,17 111:12	97:15 100:18	13:13 14:7,18
claims 38:7,8	228:7 241:17	101:18 102:1	16:10 17:1,2,4,5,6
clarification 136:15	<b>CMS</b> 50:19 51:4	105:3 106:11	17:9 18:4,5,6,7,12
244:15	59:10 164:21	109:13 114:11	19:1 20:9 21:3
clarify 256:22	169:2,5,17	127:10 131:9	43:6,21 50:10
clarity 246:18	<b>CNS</b> 187:12	144:5 161:20	51:21 52:12 54:20
247:10	cocktail 154:5	170:14 203:10	55:13 59:14 64:5
<b>class</b> 155:5	coded 50:17	205:22 230:20	64:10 70:5,18
classic 30:10	codes 41:21 50:19	235:18 237:22	71:1,16 73:12,14
199:16	51:13 59:12	240:20 244:21	73:21 75:7 79:2,5
classifications	coding 50:15,22	245:10 246:8	81:8 95:8,15,18
164:22	<b>cofactors</b> 29:8,22	247:14,16 252:5,6	97:16 99:4 100:3
<b>clean</b> 76:14,15	30:5	253:8	100:17 102:18
clear 64:8 79:2 95:3	cofounder 153:2	<b>comes</b> 96:12 109:9	105:10 107:18
120:18,18 138:14	cofounders 148:9	114:4 119:1,14	114:7 115:8 122:8
201:21 202:15	<b>cognitive</b> 30:11	203:12 210:7	127:7 138:10,18
226:6 246:12	34:17 160:16	217:13 232:22	138:21 139:6,13
247:6	cohort 194:20	<b>comfortable</b> 223:12	139:22 140:11
Clearinghouse		248:16 249:3	162:11 164:4,19
15:2	146:17	coming 20:7	165:17 166:11
clearly 95:13	coinsurances	107:21 122:16 140:4 162:10	170:12 173:21
113:18 138:12	49:22		174:8 175:21
190:9 246:6,7,18	<b>cold</b> 144:22	194:17 207:14	176:5,14 179:4,9 179:17 201:1
247:4	<b>Coleen</b> 6:1 12:19	209:22 230:5	202:2 215:20
CLIA 110:1	71:12 132:6	233:21 250:11	
click 241:15 clinic 30:16	collaborate 110:11 collaboration 15:1	<b>comment</b> 4:7 8:4	221:8,20 225:17
clinical 15:4 19:22	collaborative 48:7	18:19 75:12 78:16 79:22 86:13 91:3	226:7 230:14
	100:1		231:2,7,18 232:10
20:14 21:2 37:6 109:9 110:15		92:16 98:2 124:21 133:13 134:9,16	240:19 242:2,17 249:12 252:1,5,7
	colleague 85:11 colleagues 26:15	,	
112:9,10 125:22 126:11 127:15	101:2 202:21	140:16,19 143:15 180:10 212:15	252:11,15 253:21 257:3
174:14 182:7	224:12	213:11 222:8	<b>committee's</b> 17:6
200:15 203:8,20	<b>collect</b> 104:10	241:3	17:21 53:5,14
200.15 203.8,20	120:4 218:10,12	<b>comments</b> 19:4	180:3 241:22
clinically 21:16,17	218:13 240:7	49:16 68:3 87:9	committees 18:10
29:4,17 54:20	<b>collected</b> 104:15	92:14 93:4,13	97:1
		37.14 30.4.10	- 311

			200
committing 17:8	250:17 251:7	148:3 181:19	65:11 81:13
<b>common</b> 50:15	256:3	184:13 189:20	congresses 55:14
165:9 175:4 192:2	comply 38:15,22	198:10 200:11	connection 135:18
194:15 197:14	48:3 49:13	204:9,14 205:1	<b>Connor</b> 168:10
commonly 25:22	<b>component</b> 163:19	206:12,18 213:18	<b>consensus</b> 58:8,10
communicate	165:18 217:13	216:20 220:19	235:19 254:5
147:17 154:10	222:17	224:6 228:7 230:8	<b>consent</b> 223:5
communicated	components 86:14	230:21 239:10	consequences
195:4	composition 26:13	240:11 247:5	23:18 50:13 93:16
communicating	comprehensive	251:9,10	166:2
245:21	49:7 87:3 94:9,12	conditions 9:11	<b>consider</b> 11:18
communication	compressed	10:3,8 15:12,17	21:10 28:18 41:17
246:4,16 247:8	101:20	20:2 29:6,6,10,12	95:10,18 97:15
community 22:16	comprise 48:9	29:15,19 30:8,10	109:21 151:13
153:5 156:6 158:1	comprised 137:16	31:14 32:1 40:18	179:22 188:2
167:11,20 173:11	concentrations	47:18 54:19 60:19	214:12 229:9
175:20	224:18	65:22 68:5,6	231:6 234:16
companies 26:18	concept 125:2	69:17 83:21 84:14	239:10
44:12,12 45:14	concern 30:14	87:17 89:11 90:22	consideration
51:12 54:1,4 55:6	167:22 216:12	93:1,20 104:9	114:21 158:10
60:10 67:11 90:14	230:18 232:6	122:1 139:17	173:22 175:22
<b>companion</b> 14:19	245:5	165:14 172:15	220:6,12
company 27:1 39:3	concerned 119:3	184:22 186:1,4	considered 11:21
47:1 167:10	129:21 225:22	198:15 199:9	23:1,10 39:15
<b>comparable</b> 121:19	230:5 232:21	202:11 206:14	40:22 55:1 60:15
121:21 128:7	247:18	213:1,2 214:4	70:12 116:4
<b>comparative</b> 64:21	<b>concerns</b> 93:13	219:18 220:20	154:14 159:5
compared 42:14	105:2 167:14	225:14 231:22	<b>considers</b> 37:2
112:10 214:1	182:8	235:12 246:9,21	consistency
229:6	conclude 119:21	249:7 250:2,19,21	230:16
<b>comparison</b> 156:19	180:10 256:16	<b>conduct</b> 137:20	consistent 103:19
compelling 114:8	concludes 140:16	conducted 227:14	172:3.11 185:9
<b>compete</b> 32:19	conclusion 97:11	conference 1:12	186:15 220:14
competing 122:2	175:20 194:19	56:20 58:16	231:3 246:2
complement 27:6	conclusions	167:12	consistently
complete 11:5	190:16	<b>confidence</b> 248:13	189:17
26:21,21 72:3	condition 4:10 16:5	confident 251:8	consisting 196:19
<b>completed</b> 73:14	16:11 24:10 30:9	confirmatory 127:2	constantly 225:19
217:18 251:20	30:21 32:17 33:2	confirmed 122:13	constitute 252:2
completely 119:5	36:16 37:17 38:10	125:10 195:5	constrained 72:22
144:16 153:11	41:13 43:5 46:20	conflict 17:20	104:8
190:12 228:18	67:14 102:19,21	25:13	constrains 40:13
<b>complex</b> 172:5	103:6,8 104:1	conflicts 16:19	consult 22:17
complexities 63:21	105:10 112:13	confused 204:22	consultative 149:1
63:22	114:3,21 115:4,22	confusion 246:19	consumed 43:4
complexity 126:8	118:11 124:3	congenital 118:14	contacted 82:3
compliant 137:19	127:3 128:6	congress 59:4,6	contacts 64:4
complicated 232:5	132:19 147:19	60:13 62:13 65:4	contain 27:21
	-		
п			

			207
39:22	<b>copays</b> 49:21	116:3	creatine 144:1,9
contains 33:11,20	core 29:6,14,19	<b>country</b> 83:13	148:10 153:3
<b>content</b> 38:7	78:18,22 207:22	156:13 158:5	157:17 182:14,21
161:12	<b>correct</b> 53:16	225:11	183:1,4,7,9
-			
<b>context</b> 116:5	126:18 136:9	counts 206:17	184:19 186:5,7,17
117:5,16 243:20	219:11,16 222:12	couple 24:7 43:2	187:8,14,15 188:4
continuation	correction 12:11	49:16 68:2 75:4	188:9 191:4,16,22
201:13 254:7	corrections 12:4	82:3 100:6 189:7	193:8,12 208:1,15
continue 9:15	correctly 103:16	236:13 238:13,17	233:8
14:10 16:3 34:15	219:10 236:16	course 25:21 33:1	creating 14:18
60:22 129:15	correspondence	59:10 104:6	creatinine 147:10
134:2 156:8	4:3 9:5	132:12 181:11,18	153:5 154:5
161:21 166:1	Cosmetic 38:3	185:9,13,15	155:21 159:20
180:2,3 253:16	cosponsored 181:7	205:10 207:14	172:21 181:12
continued 21:2	<b>cost</b> 13:16 42:13,14	210:8 218:1	186:8,17 191:6
23:14 34:6 130:8	42:18 43:3,18,19	224:11 242:21	creation 131:1
130:12,18 133:15	62:22 64:20,22	courtesy 35:18	creative 102:16
135:21 149:3,18	69:5,10 74:19	cover 27:17,19	creativity 160:14
166:3	76:3,4,19,19 77:8	44:19 45:16 46:17	credibility 86:3
continues 13:17	77:22 83:12 90:14	47:1 48:20 49:8	180:2 244:1
20:14 154:18	93:14,14 94:9,12	54:1,5 55:6 68:4	criteria 124:19
continuing 57:20	105:21 149:2	68:13,21 80:15	208:22 213:5,7
71:13 88:10	155:15,17 156:16	87:1 90:14 171:14	214:6 225:15,20
135:21 176:18	199:3 216:21	178:13	226:8,16 227:7
195:6	235:11	coverage 26:19	228:8,17 236:17
contribute 241:21	<b>cost-</b> 77:2	27:5 46:6 47:12	238:3
contrive 111:8	cost-benefit 64:21	48:16 52:1,4,19	criterion 124:15
contrived 111:4	65:15 66:21 74:19	55:11 56:4,12,15	critical 74:16 80:12
control 50:6 184:5	76:2,8,13,18 77:4	58:2,19 61:6,11	94:18 163:19
200:3	78:10,12 83:9	62:8 80:10 87:7	172:10 174:18
<b>convene</b> 165:9	87:12,15 88:1	90:5 91:6,7 93:7,9	cross 20:16 48:19
conventional 25:3	94:7 163:14	155:19 163:21	150:12 183:8
26:12	<b>costly</b> 23:11 148:20	164:11,20 168:1	crosses 161:16
conversation 245:5	163:22	172:2,6,12	crux 227:8 248:20
246:1	<b>costs</b> 61:1,2 65:19	<b>covered</b> 42:19,19	<b>CSF</b> 185:21
conversations	76:17 93:21	46:10,11,12,18	cure 25:14 173:9
222:5 246:22	187:19	47:13 58:12 62:16	curious 218:16
convince 74:17	<b>Council</b> 82:5	67:12 81:22 82:9	current 39:1 63:8
convincing 114:8	169:11	82:11 83:1,2 85:1	95:12 102:9
-	counselor 146:18	-	128:21 170:13
convoluted 246:12		89:12 92:6 98:11	
<b>cool</b> 140:4	Counselors 2:13	150:13,15 167:9	212:5 221:14
cooperation 177:19	8:19	170:4 173:2	234:19
Coordinating	count 49:3	<b>covers</b> 68:7,16 78:3	currently 5:9 10:19
225:17	<b>counter</b> 85:1	80:6,7 90:21	20:5 63:10 135:22
	222:20	create 80:13 84:8	145:20 149:10,22
coordination	450.0		
coordination 144:17	countless 158:9	132:9 136:12	151:8 174:13
coordination	countless 158:9 163:9 countries 115:21	132:9 136:12 created 24:1 97:2 99:15	151:8 174:13 197:22 <b>Cuthbert</b> 1:17

			268
109:6,6 126:13	dated 150:21	decisions 81:1	164:22
134:10 136:2	daughter 154:22	97:16 250:18	degree 108:21
137:5 141:10,12	159:3 161:4	251:7	217:14
181:3 229:22	daughter's 155:4	decompensation	Delaney 55:4
233:16,17 255:3,4	day 45:13 55:19	66:5	<b>Delaware</b> 2:12 5:11
cutoffs 211:13	66:22 85:3 124:4	deductible 82:18	delay 226:10
	150:10 152:6	83:2	delayed 228:14
D	154:6,9 155:2	defect 184:13	delaying 237:11
<b>D.C</b> 177:1	158:4 160:18,19	185:20 186:2	delays 69:9,22
daily 34:19 67:4	166:17 216:15,16	<b>Defense</b> 2:8 8:11	150:8
<b>Dakota</b> 140:7	days 51:20 52:21	Deficiencies 144:1	delegates 81:13
Dallas 193:19	151:2	144:9 148:10	delineate 209:12
damage 145:18	de-highlighting	153:3 157:18	<b>delve</b> 105:4
148:19 149:16	135:18	181:12	demand 58:18
151:10 157:4	deal 105:7 113:16	deficiency 4:8	demands 224:5
162:1 163:8	151:3	25:21 27:8,12	demographics
189:16	deal-breaker	30:6 31:10 42:17	195:13
damaged 225:12	239:11	144:2,13 146:10	demonstrate
250:9	dealing 61:6,11	147:1,21 148:12	112:19,21 113:10
dangerous 203:3,5	107:12 167:14	153:5 155:14	115:13
213:8 251:3	dealt 62:6 224:4	159:21 182:14	demonstrated
dare 79:20	<b>Dean</b> 3:1 176:10	185:3 186:2,3,6	176:3
dark 43:9	death 31:4 172:8	186:15 188:1,4	demonstrates
data 21:9 65:21	175:6	190:10 193:4	210:13
66:20 78:19,20	debate 115:18	195:1 197:1,15	denials 91:14
91:11 93:19 94:9	<b>Debi</b> 2:2 7:2 9:20	198:1,10,11	denied 91:7
95:18 97:14	10:15 16:19 19:14	201:14 203:20	deny 26:19 172:2
101:11 102:2,20	20:21 88:20 89:8	214:21	department 1:1 2:8
103:5,10 104:11	98:17 100:2 142:9	deficient 32:12,14	8:10 20:13 53:8
104:15 105:14,18	181:3 245:13	183:15 215:9	71:2 72:3 73:9
112:7 113:17	256:18	define 28:20 36:9	74:6 82:5 90:3,10
114:5,8,10,14	debilitating 156:2	102:20 151:4	95:11 120:13
117:14,16 120:4	decades 57:5 62:21	defined 81:18	168:18
123:14 125:17	64:1	83:20 103:20	department's 52:7
175:1,2,8 181:20	December 55:18	151:16 152:17	52:10
191:1 193:5	183:18	190:4,21 200:18	departments 44:11
200:12 206:5	decide 95:14	200:20 225:2	165:7
217:3 218:2	decided 81:6	defining 15:9,13	depend 158:2
223:13 224:16,19	103:11 115:17	definitely 226:2	164:2 165:20
226:15,21 227:4	189:13	definition 22:10	244:3
228:10,11 229:1,1	decision 70:8 80:9	24:1,17 40:12	depended 90:16
229:1,13 235:22	89:22 96:10	51:5 54:18 55:12	101:10
237:17 239:6,16	180:18 221:18,21	103:12,16 104:14	dependents 44:18
240:19,20 243:16	226:14 228:14	105:2 106:19	depends 28:19
243:18 251:15	232:8 236:2	122:10 165:9	29:1 30:9 45:22
256:10	237:14,18 239:7	169:4 171:20	46:1,2 48:16
date 10:12 167:4	240:19,22 247:15	182:1 200:14	111:10 229:16
183:19 237:21	256:4	definitions 103:19	<b>depth</b> 180:4

	1000 40	00 00 00 04	000 04 045 0
described 129:11	devoid 33:19	86:20 88:21	206:21 215:6
182:2 190:18	<b>DFO</b> 7:1 18:22 19:9	106:13 108:9	217:4 252:9 256:
196:18	DHHS 129:2 130:18	118:19,20 121:3,4	difficulties 101:4
describes 171:18	137:13	122:21 131:15,16	difficulty 8:6
designated 2:1	diabetes 42:11,12	135:11 141:18	151:11,11 237:10
55:18	diabetic 78:11	180:19 201:20	digging 214:22
designed 103:22	diagnose 25:14	202:4 203:6 209:6	216:1
107:14 126:11	83:21	214:20 216:2	dilemmas 60:17
detail 103:14 105:4	diagnosed 21:17	221:11 222:6	Dimes 2:9 8:16
129:11 229:13,21	29:17 45:15 54:21	244:14 253:9	86:15
detailed 163:13	144:12 145:13	255:11	dinner 35:20
<b>details</b> 176:20	147:22 148:11	Dieter's 108:16	directed 104:20
detect 153:15	150:2,21 151:9	109:20 226:5	direction 71:7
229:18	152:1 154:1,13	230:1	86:18
detectable 223:6	159:10 160:8	dietitians 39:11	directions 65:6
detected 172:15	161:4 162:5	48:5,8 49:14 57:9	director 5:11 17:1
detection 105:20	171:17 189:10	82:3	166:8
111:3 112:9,10,17	197:7 203:19	DIETRICH 1:19	directors 173:9
163:12 206:13	226:3 250:9	diets 28:17 49:13	disabilities 145:17
234:10	diagnosing 155:13	51:7 171:14	disability 162:2
determine 24:19,21	158:20	difference 163:11	172:8 184:3
41:9 95:8 110:18	diagnosis 112:10	213:1	disabled 69:7
110:19 112:17	125:11 145:5	different 11:3 26:6	disagreement
245:7	146:11 147:1,12	39:14 40:5,18	129:18
determined 92:22	148:15 151:4	44:8 51:17 56:13	disappointment
determining 245:2	152:13,18 154:15	67:10 68:12 71:8	96:5
devastating 147:6	159:13,22 161:22	71:14 82:4 96:13	discern 125:20
153:10	163:5 167:1 168:6	96:14 98:10	disclosures 22:18
develop 23:12	168:13 185:19	101:12,14 107:10	discouraging 64:
209:20 220:22	187:2 189:2	110:16 114:12	discretion 19:8
221:4	190:15 204:3,6	115:22 116:1,1	discriminated
developed 9:18	diagnostic 123:1	117:9 118:1,7,8	70:17
28:14 42:6 200:6	186:12 200:4	119:5,18 121:15	discuss 16:19 64:
204:13	203:16 218:9,14	121:15 123:3	97:14 144:2
developing 136:18	dialyze 76:21	132:9 133:1 140:6	176:11 254:6
development 20:3	diapers 146:2	145:6 152:15	discussed 232:17
24:16 27:10 33:19	died 220:5	158:17 169:4	discussing 14:21
137:13 167:15	<b>Diego</b> 154:20	179:13,14 180:1	205:18 227:9
174:9,14 201:8	diet 34:1,15 41:6	186:11,19 195:11	discussion 16:3,1
developmental	42:12 151:1 154:7	213:13,18 221:3	16:13 18:13 21:7
34:4,17 69:9,22	163:13 187:9	224:7 231:10	74:6 95:5 97:16
109:13 137:1	198:19 208:4	251:4	107:22 115:11
developmentally	dietary 19:20 23:3	differentiating	150:17 168:16
69:7	23:16 24:10 25:4	186:10	170:11 180:18
develops 158:22	25:5,7 31:9 36:12	differently 120:10	198:16 202:1
deviating 245:8	36:15 38:1,5 41:5	234:17	206:8 210:8 218
<b>uevialiny</b> 240.0		Í.	
deviating 245.8 deviation 244:20	57:14 83:18 84:7	difficult 47:4 184:4	221:7 241:22

252:4,17 253:3	doable 187:3	111:6,7 185:21	199:18
discussions 16:16	doctors 150:3	199:1 209:8	easy 68:20 121:2
60:16 115:8	document 100:8	drink 27:15,18 28:2	148:17 212:4,8
disease 10:9 24:10			
	doing 9:21 17:18	28:7 154:5 208:5	218:9,12,12 233:
25:15,19 36:5,15	18:14 91:3,20	drinks 28:5	eat 85:3 167:4
37:17 41:12 42:8	93:17 97:2 129:8	drive 67:8 93:21	eating 85:16
42:10 84:18	149:4 179:17	94:10 158:4	economic 74:16
117:19 118:15	180:5 185:8	driver's 257:19	Ed 8:16 143:8
122:14 123:2	189:11 194:22	drug 23:1,4,14,22	edges 208:3
146:21 147:6	214:20 223:16	25:16 26:1 38:3	edit 127:14
177:20 178:1,5	225:13 234:14	41:20 42:15 84:12	education 14:16
183:16 202:12	238:2 249:11,17	171:20 175:9	16:14 94:4 236:1
diseases 20:3	249:18	drug-like 26:9	237:13 257:12
56:20 61:4 178:20	dollars 62:22 76:15	drugs 42:18 54:11	educational 14:22
232:5	130:11 156:20	54:14 75:21 83:16	56:14
disheartening	domain 102:16	92:6 174:13 190:4	EDWARD 2:9
162:20	domains 146:4	due 10:12,19 17:4	<b>EEG</b> 144:17
disorder 37:17 46:1	<b>Don</b> 5:17 12:14	58:21 163:5,20	effect 62:7 84:16
153:7,9 156:2	64:11,12 93:11	164:7	92:9 108:5
157:7 158:7	94:14 123:19	Duke 150:4 153:20	effective 15:12,16
163:12 173:18	141:5 202:3	dunk 157:10 207:9	113:8 122:12
174:6 181:22	236:12 237:5	246:14	132:17 139:17
182:2,20 184:6	254:20	Dutch 196:16,18,20	174:5 175:3,10
250:21	Don's 74:15 241:2	duties 18:4	188:13 204:10
disorders 1:5 2:8	door 67:13	dysfunction 84:3	210:14
5:5 8:22 20:6 26:7	dopa 32:7 33:4	dysmorphic 160:1	effectively 121:8
46:16,18 76:7	doses 54:7 188:10	dystonia 185:6	188:20
159:8 170:18,22	doubt 208:8		effectiveness
		E	
172:1 186:6.11	Dr 5 8 9 14 9 22	<b>b</b>	74:20 132:18
172:1 186:6,11 233:4	<b>Dr</b> 5:8,9,14 9:22 17:7 47:2 88:21		74:20 132:18 efficacy 103:22
233:4	17:7 47:2 88:21	earlier 106:15	efficacy 103:22
233:4 disparity 80:13	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3 231:12	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9 128:14 138:7	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22 187:9 198:3 221:5	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9 214:9 219:21
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3 231:12 distinct 24:11	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9 128:14 138:7 176:14 180:16	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22 187:9 198:3 221:5 233:22 238:21	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9 214:9 219:21 220:1,7 248:5,7
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3 231:12 distinct 24:11 36:17	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9 128:14 138:7 176:14 180:16 181:2,2,3,6,7	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22 187:9 198:3 221:5 233:22 238:21 251:16	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9 214:9 219:21 220:1,7 248:5,7 efficient 15:12,16
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3 231:12 distinct 24:11 36:17 distinction 113:22	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9 128:14 138:7 176:14 180:16 181:2,2,3,6,7 195:4 198:2 204:7	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22 187:9 198:3 221:5 233:22 238:21 251:16 earliest 174:21	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9 214:9 219:21 220:1,7 248:5,7 efficient 15:12,16 80:19 102:3
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3 231:12 distinct 24:11 36:17 distinction 113:22 distinguished	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9 128:14 138:7 176:14 180:16 181:2,2,3,6,7 195:4 198:2 204:7 241:16 255:1	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22 187:9 198:3 221:5 233:22 238:21 251:16 earliest 174:21 early 34:5 51:20	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9 214:9 219:21 220:1,7 248:5,7 efficient 15:12,16 80:19 102:3 137:19
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3 231:12 distinct 24:11 36:17 distinction 113:22 distinguished 36:11	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9 128:14 138:7 176:14 180:16 181:2,2,3,6,7 195:4 198:2 204:7 241:16 255:1 <b>draft</b> 40:7,8 81:16	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22 187:9 198:3 221:5 233:22 238:21 251:16 earliest 174:21 early 34:5 51:20 93:22 94:4 112:9	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9 214:9 219:21 220:1,7 248:5,7 efficient 15:12,16 80:19 102:3 137:19 efficiently 121:8
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3 231:12 distinct 24:11 36:17 distinction 113:22 distinguished 36:11 distributed 12:5	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9 128:14 138:7 176:14 180:16 181:2,2,3,6,7 195:4 198:2 204:7 241:16 255:1 draft 40:7,8 81:16 85:5	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22 187:9 198:3 221:5 233:22 238:21 251:16 earliest 174:21 early 34:5 51:20 93:22 94:4 112:9 112:10,17,19	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9 214:9 219:21 220:1,7 248:5,7 efficient 15:12,16 80:19 102:3 137:19 efficiently 121:8 effort 43:21 66:15
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3 231:12 distinct 24:11 36:17 distinction 113:22 distinguished 36:11 distributed 12:5 distribution 131:2	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9 128:14 138:7 176:14 180:16 181:2,2,3,6,7 195:4 198:2 204:7 241:16 255:1 draft 40:7,8 81:16 85:5 drag 91:17 225:22	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22 187:9 198:3 221:5 233:22 238:21 251:16 earliest 174:21 early 34:5 51:20 93:22 94:4 112:9 112:10,17,19 113:7 126:17	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9 214:9 219:21 220:1,7 248:5,7 efficient 15:12,16 80:19 102:3 137:19 efficiently 121:8 effort 43:21 66:15 80:5 100:2 180:1
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3 231:12 distinct 24:11 36:17 distinction 113:22 distinguished 36:11 distributed 12:5 distribution 131:2 133:2	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9 128:14 138:7 176:14 180:16 181:2,2,3,6,7 195:4 198:2 204:7 241:16 255:1 draft 40:7,8 81:16 85:5 drag 91:17 225:22 drawer 218:17	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22 187:9 198:3 221:5 233:22 238:21 251:16 earliest 174:21 early 34:5 51:20 93:22 94:4 112:9 112:10,17,19 113:7 126:17 145:13 163:12	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9 214:9 219:21 220:1,7 248:5,7 efficient 15:12,16 80:19 102:3 137:19 efficiently 121:8 effort 43:21 66:15 80:5 100:2 180:1 efforts 13:17 14:10
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3 231:12 distinct 24:11 36:17 distinction 113:22 distinguished 36:11 distributed 12:5 distribution 131:2 133:2 district 154:19	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9 128:14 138:7 176:14 180:16 181:2,2,3,6,7 195:4 198:2 204:7 241:16 255:1 draft 40:7,8 81:16 85:5 drag 91:17 225:22 drawer 218:17 dream 170:3	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22 187:9 198:3 221:5 233:22 238:21 251:16 earliest 174:21 early 34:5 51:20 93:22 94:4 112:9 112:10,17,19 113:7 126:17 145:13 163:12 176:3 185:15	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9 214:9 219:21 220:1,7 248:5,7 efficient 15:12,16 80:19 102:3 137:19 efficiently 121:8 effort 43:21 66:15 80:5 100:2 180:1 efforts 13:17 14:10 53:17 56:17 63:1
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3 231:12 distinct 24:11 36:17 distinction 113:22 distinguished 36:11 distributed 12:5 distribution 131:2 133:2 district 154:19 disturbed 211:5	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9 128:14 138:7 176:14 180:16 181:2,2,3,6,7 195:4 198:2 204:7 241:16 255:1 draft 40:7,8 81:16 85:5 drag 91:17 225:22 drawer 218:17 dream 170:3 dreamed 150:7	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22 187:9 198:3 221:5 233:22 238:21 251:16 earliest 174:21 early 34:5 51:20 93:22 94:4 112:9 112:10,17,19 113:7 126:17 145:13 163:12 176:3 185:15 189:4 199:17	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9 214:9 219:21 220:1,7 248:5,7 efficient 15:12,16 80:19 102:3 137:19 efficiently 121:8 effort 43:21 66:15 80:5 100:2 180:1 efforts 13:17 14:10 53:17 56:17 63:1 86:9 102:9 128:2
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3 231:12 distinct 24:11 36:17 distinction 113:22 distinguished 36:11 distributed 12:5 distribution 131:2 133:2 district 154:19 disturbed 211:5 dive 101:9	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9 128:14 138:7 176:14 180:16 181:2,2,3,6,7 195:4 198:2 204:7 241:16 255:1 draft 40:7,8 81:16 85:5 drag 91:17 225:22 drawer 218:17 dream 170:3 dreamed 150:7 dreams 163:9,11	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22 187:9 198:3 221:5 233:22 238:21 251:16 earliest 174:21 early 34:5 51:20 93:22 94:4 112:9 112:10,17,19 113:7 126:17 145:13 163:12 176:3 185:15 189:4 199:17 206:13	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9 214:9 219:21 220:1,7 248:5,7 efficient 15:12,16 80:19 102:3 137:19 efficiently 121:8 effort 43:21 66:15 80:5 100:2 180:1 efforts 13:17 14:10 53:17 56:17 63:1 86:9 102:9 128:2 203:21
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3 231:12 distinct 24:11 36:17 distinction 113:22 distinguished 36:11 distributed 12:5 distribution 131:2 133:2 district 154:19 disturbed 211:5 dive 101:9 diverse 107:22	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9 128:14 138:7 176:14 180:16 181:2,2,3,6,7 195:4 198:2 204:7 241:16 255:1 draft 40:7,8 81:16 85:5 drag 91:17 225:22 drawer 218:17 dream 170:3 dreamed 150:7 dreams 163:9,11 169:22 170:2	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22 187:9 198:3 221:5 233:22 238:21 251:16 earliest 174:21 early 34:5 51:20 93:22 94:4 112:9 112:10,17,19 113:7 126:17 145:13 163:12 176:3 185:15 189:4 199:17 206:13 earmarked 130:1	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9 214:9 219:21 220:1,7 248:5,7 efficient 15:12,16 80:19 102:3 137:19 efficiently 121:8 effort 43:21 66:15 80:5 100:2 180:1 efforts 13:17 14:10 53:17 56:17 63:1 86:9 102:9 128:2 203:21 eight 148:13,22
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3 231:12 distinct 24:11 36:17 distinction 113:22 distinguished 36:11 distributed 12:5 distribution 131:2 133:2 district 154:19 disturbed 211:5 dive 101:9 diverse 107:22 196:22	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9 128:14 138:7 176:14 180:16 181:2,2,3,6,7 195:4 198:2 204:7 241:16 255:1 draft 40:7,8 81:16 85:5 drag 91:17 225:22 drawer 218:17 dream 170:3 dreamed 150:7 dreams 163:9,11 169:22 170:2 dried 16:14 106:1	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22 187:9 198:3 221:5 233:22 238:21 251:16 earliest 174:21 early 34:5 51:20 93:22 94:4 112:9 112:10,17,19 113:7 126:17 145:13 163:12 176:3 185:15 189:4 199:17 206:13 earmarked 130:1 earmarks 130:2	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9 214:9 219:21 220:1,7 248:5,7 efficient 15:12,16 80:19 102:3 137:19 efficiently 121:8 effort 43:21 66:15 80:5 100:2 180:1 efforts 13:17 14:10 53:17 56:17 63:1 86:9 102:9 128:2 203:21 eight 148:13,22 149:7 197:15
233:4 disparity 80:13 164:17 165:3 231:12 distinct 24:11 36:17 distinction 113:22 distinguished 36:11 distributed 12:5 distribution 131:2 133:2 district 154:19 disturbed 211:5 dive 101:9 diverse 107:22	17:7 47:2 88:21 97:17 99:10,13 101:7 106:9 128:14 138:7 176:14 180:16 181:2,2,3,6,7 195:4 198:2 204:7 241:16 255:1 draft 40:7,8 81:16 85:5 drag 91:17 225:22 drawer 218:17 dream 170:3 dreamed 150:7 dreams 163:9,11 169:22 170:2	earlier 106:15 113:9 121:11 154:15 183:22 187:9 198:3 221:5 233:22 238:21 251:16 earliest 174:21 early 34:5 51:20 93:22 94:4 112:9 112:10,17,19 113:7 126:17 145:13 163:12 176:3 185:15 189:4 199:17 206:13 earmarked 130:1	efficacy 103:22 112:19 113:1,11 114:11 213:9 214:9 219:21 220:1,7 248:5,7 efficient 15:12,16 80:19 102:3 137:19 efficiently 121:8 effort 43:21 66:15 80:5 100:2 180:1 efforts 13:17 14:10 53:17 56:17 63:10 86:9 102:9 128:2 203:21 eight 148:13,22

54:11 79:10	187:1,1,5 188:3	eternal 64:16	253:22 254:12,17
100:17 151:8	enzymes 183:10,14	ethically 165:15	257:4
181:20 187:9	<b>epi</b> 32:7 33:5	ethics 16:19 140:11	evidence-based
202:16 219:11	epilepsy 144:14	ethnic 196:22	20:4 87:2 190:7
Elana 100:2	184:4,4	ethnic/racial 116:2	237:6
element 132:13	equals 51:2	European 196:21	evolving 190:11
elements 78:19	equates 30:1	evaluate 90:4	exact 121:7
123:14 211:4	equation 135:14	103:22 104:11	exactly 101:6 157:7
elephant 165:22	equipment 131:1	132:17	202:22
elevated 30:22	131:22 134:19	evaluation 16:6	examine 15:6
153:15 185:22	136:10 179:12	23:13 24:18 90:9	example 27:8 31:11
eliminate 131:21	_191:9 192:6	102:10,14 128:22	40:22 68:11 78:2
Elmer 233:13,17,19	Equity 53:19 55:4	137:12 164:11,15	111:2,8 136:16
233:20	56:17	174:1	159:4
elucidated 138:9	erectile 84:3	evaluations 104:21	examples 26:5 91:5
email 241:16	<b>err</b> 249:14	Events 1:12	244:11
emphasize 103:4	errors 4:4 19:16	eventual 97:11	excellence 131:3
employee 17:15	26:3 29:3 44:19	eventually 156:22	133:4 137:14
169:14	46:18 47:12 50:20	241:5 249:6	excellent 64:7
employees 101:3	51:8 57:8 60:19	everybody 10:16	102:11 207:7
enable 138:6	90:6,15 164:13	10:21 11:12 13:22	214:21 239:6
enacting 52:6	171:2,15,19 172:7	75:18,18 101:17	exception 150:14
encounter 140:7	199:16 251:1	143:19 179:18	<b>exchanges</b> 91:6,12
encourage 9:14	escort 257:22	210:16 218:4	excited 145:4
201:13 254:7	especially 82:19	219:2 248:16	exciting 174:10
ended 159:19	134:17 250:18	252:10	exclude 27:12
energy 27:2 28:4	essential 31:17	everybody's 90:8	exclusive 41:2
146:15 187:13	33:14,20 47:15	evidence 16:12	63:16
engineered 85:18	52:17 53:9 70:13	101:10,13 102:2	exclusively 136:5
English 195:16	82:13,22 96:16,20	102:19,21 103:6,7	executive 166:8
enhancement 84:2	98:22 164:1,5	105:11 114:4,6	exempt 38:6 39:18
enhances 83:22	169:7 171:22 172:14	119:20 124:16,17	39:19,21
enjoyed 140:1		133:16,17 153:19	exhausted 79:3
enormous 67:18 93:17	essentially 43:1 101:13	178:4 179:10 190:18 201:3,5	existing 9:17 213:15
ensure 19:11 37:10	establish 247:22	205:17,19,22	exists 64:9 135:22
52:15 165:18	248:2,4	209:17 214:16,22	expand 99:22
174:20 227:5	established 18:3	215:14,18 217:17	expanded 9:10
ensuring 174:5	184:22	219:21 221:12,17	50:8,11 163:17
enteral 41:3 50:22	establishment 18:9	222:4,11,12,14	164:18 165:4
51:1,5 64:16	estimate 43:2	226:17 227:5,13	172:16 204:13
169:4	240:10	229:3,5,7 231:11	expansion 206:15
enterprises 104:15	estimated 156:16	232:12,15,16	234:19
entire 153:4 173:10	198:6 203:9	235:9,10,15 236:8	expect 34:16 45:20
179:9	et 28:14 33:5 37:11	238:8 240:21	123:4 174:15
entities 60:14	41:13 42:22 60:5	244:3,7,13,16	179:11 221:5
envision 123:22	116:5 131:22	245:3,11,14 249:8	expected 223:19
enzyme 183:11	202:14	249:19 251:18	243:4,15
			,
11	•	'	'

			212
expenditure 43:12	factor 209:9	favor 135:3 257:2	field 146:20
•			
expenditures 83:13	facts 38:12	<b>FDA</b> 24:18,20 28:20	Fifth 222:3
<b>expense</b> 149:17	fad-based 84:19	37:2 38:19,22	<b>fight</b> 173:1
expenses 44:1	fail 236:9	39:2,5 40:4,7,9	fighting 150:22
178:13	failed 168:4	42:9,16 59:7	figure 41:15 51:16
expensive 147:10	failure 88:5 168:3	110:2 111:1	66:12 159:12
250:22	172:16 211:2,5	164:21 169:3,3	182:18 229:4
experience 34:22	fair 38:4 139:1,8	174:16 182:10	figuring 208:11
96:15 113:6	223:8	190:4 200:4	fill 11:11
151:21	fairly 71:9 183:19	fear 157:2	filling 45:20
experienced	191:14 240:16	feasibility 112:22	<b>film</b> 36:1
137:19	faith 250:3	115:13 217:1	final 41:14 43:8
experiences 96:13	fall 28:18	features 30:12	53:4 193:13
expertise 79:3	falls 51:11	160:2	236:19 256:22
experts 79:19 86:4	false 153:19,21	February 12:3,13	257:1
181:17 201:12	193:7,10,13,22	86:21 176:19	finalized 89:19 90:1
254:1	194:7,12,13 195:8	fed 37:5 48:21	90:2 201:8
<b>explain</b> 173:13	196:13 198:3	federal 2:1 9:15	finally 159:5,21
explained 120:9	199:11,20 203:22	14:7 18:7,10,15	finance 80:22 81:2
explanation 210:19	239:19,21 243:6	18:18 22:17 47:21	83:5,8
explanations 211:1	families 43:20,22	47:22 48:3,19	financial 17:12
explicit 73:21	45:7 47:14 60:7	53:22 63:12 65:9	find 19:3 37:22 39:5
exposure 30:22	60:22 61:10,20	69:20 71:8 79:11	45:8 46:21 47:4
expressed 123:3	63:5 69:11,13,19	80:4 86:18 101:3	90:11 95:11 97:3
expression 196:9	70:1,9 71:9 80:9	101:5 150:12	109:9 110:5 114:7
extent 74:18 78:17	157:15,20 158:4	169:14	123:7,8 127:20
107:8 117:8 138:1	166:2 172:13	feds 48:1,2	128:14 192:18
external 169:9	174:3 223:3 226:1	feed 35:15 36:4	193:16 194:9,16
201:2 253:22	247:12 249:14	167:16	195:7,12,14
257:4	250:11 256:13	feedback 103:15	223:18 232:3
extra 28:15 191:10	family 2:9,12 7:6	feeding 37:3 41:2,3	239:7 241:10
192:6	45:10 81:4,14	49:5 51:1,5	244:22
extremely 194:8	86:5 112:13 146:6	feedings 49:6	finding 215:2,8,17
	153:4 155:18	feel 79:13 96:18	218:20 253:17
F	156:4 179:1	146:13 147:12	fine 124:13 127:5
<b>F</b> 2:6	219:22	148:1 196:10	130:7 135:7
fabulous 75:14	fantastic 67:5	203:18 208:13	189:14 200:7
FACA 14:8 18:8,11	230:11 231:16	211:19 223:12	finishing 149:7
face 70:9	far 35:22 67:9	227:4 235:9 240:3	first 5:15 15:2 17:2
face-to-face 118:22	68:22 98:4 116:19	242:5 249:3 251:8	19:11,15 22:20
fact 25:17 49:3	155:14 158:4	251:12,16 256:9	42:15 64:11 65:14
92:22 108:3	161:20 169:19	feelings 159:16	68:17 102:8 105:6
133:15 145:17	175:10 188:7	feet 91:17	105:7 124:3
155:17 177:10	198:3	fell 122:6	143:22 145:8
203:13 206:1	farther 238:7	fellows 20:15	146:3 147:2,21
209:14 210:13	fast 239:10	felt 62:19 145:6	149:8 155:1
221:21 239:18	fat 33:21	226:7	158:16 159:1
240:1 245:22	fault 241:8	fetal 30:21	167:7 175:13
	1	1	1

			2/3
181:18 182:13	186:19 207:13,18	67.12 60.4 5 21	fortuitous 212:21
		67:13 68:4,5,21 70:12 71:17 74:21	
183:2 189:8,11	244:7 247:12,13	-	Forty-eight 44:4
225:3 228:6	250:15 257:6	81:18 83:14,16,20	forward 4:10 11:22
236:18 239:2,22	follow-up 15:3,5,7	84:13,14,21 85:1	16:12 20:18 22:6
241:20 242:21	16:4 70:20 71:16	85:18,19 89:5	22:15,16 41:18
243:9,14	73:12 81:15 95:7	90:15,21,21 91:8	51:17 54:16 55:2
fiscal 129:21 130:4	95:17 99:4 126:17	92:1,7 94:3 96:6	60:14,16 63:7
130:13	163:17 164:14	150:13,18 155:21	65:5 92:10 95:6
Fishers 1:12	166:7,12 170:12	163:18 165:11	95:21 96:21 97:15
257:18	257:14 258:1	168:2,14,21	97:21 99:16
fit 24:20 28:21 35:2	followed 30:15	169:16 170:4,19	101:18 102:1
40:14	62:4 204:7 239:5	171:3,10,15,20,22	114:4 117:6
fits 24:19 28:22	following 16:15	172:3,9,12,14	119:14 134:5
five 52:5 53:3 68:16	112:9 238:2	forces 192:11	139:8,16 148:3
68:17 90:2 130:17	food 22:2,7,19,21	210:9	170:14 176:8
131:9 144:11	23:4 25:1,12	foreseeable 174:12	178:6 180:14
159:8,18 161:4	26:10,18 28:19	forget 21:16 29:8	205:1,7,14,14,15
168:20 225:5	30:3 31:16 37:13	83:8 244:2	205:19 211:4
256:5	37:14 38:3,14,16	forgetting 181:4	226:9,17 227:7
fix 51:15 121:2	39:6 41:1,9,19	forgive 209:5	228:12 230:17
202:21	42:3 43:17 44:12	form 86:16 110:2	235:8 236:8,21
fixed 200:21	45:14,18 60:10	175:4	237:3,12 238:7
flavor 211:20	77:21 84:4,9,12	formal 47:7 73:12	239:16 242:14
floated 115:8	164:20 183:3	102:2 241:5	243:19 245:2,20
floppiness 159:7	212:22	formalize 201:12	247:15 249:4
flow 192:2	foods 4:4 16:2	254:2	250:3 251:18
fluorescence	19:16 21:8 22:9	formally 239:16	252:21 253:5,8
117:20	23:3,15,17,19,20	formed 78:6	254:12 256:11
flurry 100:6	24:1 25:3,4,4,12	forms 27:14 126:9	fostered 239:15
fly 103:2 124:20	25:14,18,20 26:2	formula 44:3,18	fostering 131:3
158:5	27:3 28:11,12	45:16 46:11,12	133:3
focus 43:8 83:7	29:2,7,9,16,20	48:16 49:11 50:7	found 17:22 124:3
94:16 100:14	31:13 33:9,17	68:10,15,19 78:12	171:16 189:10
121:12 146:15	35:6,7,7,10 36:2	89:5 163:14,18	193:7 196:7,12
170:19	36:10,12 37:4,12	164:20 165:11	197:15 219:14
focused 132:12	38:1 39:15 40:5	formularies 60:1	220:1,4 225:4
211:8	40:12,16 42:9,13	formulary 68:9	228:15 229:10
		1011101a1 y 00.3	
		formulas 25.5 30.1	four 11.6 08.10
focusing 29:9	42:14,20 43:3,19	formulas 25:5 39:4	four 11:6 98:10
focusing 29:9 folks 82:20 84:17	42:14,20 43:3,19 44:6,7,20 46:13	39:13,16,19 50:22	129:1 131:9
focusing 29:9 folks 82:20 84:17 84:18 85:9 99:18	42:14,20 43:3,19 44:6,7,20 46:13 47:12 48:20 49:9	39:13,16,19 50:22 54:2 68:8 69:14	129:1 131:9 143:22 150:22
focusing 29:9 folks 82:20 84:17 84:18 85:9 99:18 99:19 100:12	42:14,20 43:3,19 44:6,7,20 46:13 47:12 48:20 49:9 49:12 50:3 52:15	39:13,16,19 50:22 54:2 68:8 69:14 70:12 82:8 90:5	129:1 131:9 143:22 150:22 151:16 152:2
focusing 29:9 folks 82:20 84:17 84:18 85:9 99:18 99:19 100:12 104:7,18 106:12	42:14,20 43:3,19 44:6,7,20 46:13 47:12 48:20 49:9 49:12 50:3 52:15 52:16 53:19 54:2	39:13,16,19 50:22 54:2 68:8 69:14 70:12 82:8 90:5 164:12	129:1 131:9 143:22 150:22 151:16 152:2 157:5 158:12
focusing 29:9 folks 82:20 84:17 84:18 85:9 99:18 99:19 100:12 104:7,18 106:12 113:6 115:11	42:14,20 43:3,19 44:6,7,20 46:13 47:12 48:20 49:9 49:12 50:3 52:15 52:16 53:19 54:2 54:6 55:3,11,12	39:13,16,19 50:22 54:2 68:8 69:14 70:12 82:8 90:5 164:12 formulated 36:20	129:1 131:9 143:22 150:22 151:16 152:2 157:5 158:12 160:19 162:10
focusing 29:9 folks 82:20 84:17 84:18 85:9 99:18 99:19 100:12 104:7,18 106:12 113:6 115:11 124:14 128:17	42:14,20 43:3,19 44:6,7,20 46:13 47:12 48:20 49:9 49:12 50:3 52:15 52:16 53:19 54:2 54:6 55:3,11,12 55:21 56:17,21	39:13,16,19 50:22 54:2 68:8 69:14 70:12 82:8 90:5 164:12 formulated 36:20 40:20	129:1 131:9 143:22 150:22 151:16 152:2 157:5 158:12 160:19 162:10 185:12 243:10
focusing 29:9 folks 82:20 84:17 84:18 85:9 99:18 99:19 100:12 104:7,18 106:12 113:6 115:11 124:14 128:17 135:17 138:1	42:14,20 43:3,19 44:6,7,20 46:13 47:12 48:20 49:9 49:12 50:3 52:15 52:16 53:19 54:2 54:6 55:3,11,12 55:21 56:17,21 57:11,13,15 58:3	39:13,16,19 50:22 54:2 68:8 69:14 70:12 82:8 90:5 164:12 formulated 36:20 40:20 forth 118:12	129:1 131:9 143:22 150:22 151:16 152:2 157:5 158:12 160:19 162:10 185:12 243:10 framework 20:4
focusing 29:9 folks 82:20 84:17 84:18 85:9 99:18 99:19 100:12 104:7,18 106:12 113:6 115:11 124:14 128:17 135:17 138:1 follow 34:15 91:13	42:14,20 43:3,19 44:6,7,20 46:13 47:12 48:20 49:9 49:12 50:3 52:15 52:16 53:19 54:2 54:6 55:3,11,12 55:21 56:17,21 57:11,13,15 58:3 58:21 59:18,19	39:13,16,19 50:22 54:2 68:8 69:14 70:12 82:8 90:5 164:12 formulated 36:20 40:20 forth 118:12 forthcoming 53:1	129:1 131:9 143:22 150:22 151:16 152:2 157:5 158:12 160:19 162:10 185:12 243:10 framework 20:4 frankly 22:9,18
focusing 29:9 folks 82:20 84:17 84:18 85:9 99:18 99:19 100:12 104:7,18 106:12 113:6 115:11 124:14 128:17 135:17 138:1	42:14,20 43:3,19 44:6,7,20 46:13 47:12 48:20 49:9 49:12 50:3 52:15 52:16 53:19 54:2 54:6 55:3,11,12 55:21 56:17,21 57:11,13,15 58:3	39:13,16,19 50:22 54:2 68:8 69:14 70:12 82:8 90:5 164:12 formulated 36:20 40:20 forth 118:12	129:1 131:9 143:22 150:22 151:16 152:2 157:5 158:12 160:19 162:10 185:12 243:10 framework 20:4

235:15 236:5,6	174:12	generated 95:4	global 177:22
fraternal 146:8	futures 89:1,5,7,15	generously 136:7	<b>gluten</b> 84:19
Fred 1:18 6:7 12:22	93:4,5 98:13,14	genes 186:20	gluten-free 85:2
141:17 181:3	151:14	genetic 2:6,13 8:13	glycine 183:5
211:22 212:14		8:18 20:1 39:11	188:17
235:4 255:9	G	57:9 144:14	glycomacropepti
free 45:17 167:13	<b>G</b> 77:1	146:18,21 153:7	28:6
frequency 196:15	<b>GAA</b> 186:2,4,9,17	173:17,19 185:18	<b>GMDI</b> 58:4
218:18 219:1	191:4,16,22 193:8	186:20 192:15	<b>GNC</b> 156:10
240:11	193:8,12 194:1,12	245:16	go 21:9 23:12,21
frequent 197:1	196:6 224:17	geneticist 182:15	24:13 31:8 32:6
frequently 65:22	228:4 233:8	230:2 231:15	35:22 69:2 70:1
175:6	gain 224:7	genetics 2:14 5:12	75:8 80:21 92:18
friends 149:9	galaxies 152:10	7:13 20:9 181:9	98:5 103:17
	<b>GAMT</b> 4:8,10 16:5		
frightening 44:9	144:2,12 146:9	204:5	105:13 106:11
FRN 18:18	147:1,16,21 148:3	Genomics 2:14	107:8,20 110:13
front 149:10 178:3	148:12 150:4	genotype 186:21	114:4 123:20
179:4 196:2		genotypes 192:21	124:9,22 125:16
frustrated 246:11	151:5,16,20	genuinely 208:10	126:15 136:20,21
full 14:18 27:6,22	152:18,20 153:2	geographic 131:21	139:8,16 149:15
34:12 85:15 96:1	153:11 154:21	Georgetown 34:9	155:20 156:9
97:16 129:11	155:14 156:15	German 189:9	157:3 159:12
160:13,20 166:11	157:6,16 158:13	196:20	167:1,3,4 169:8
fullest 151:21	158:15,18,22	getting 70:17 80:20	169:10,11,12
fully 49:13 65:3	159:22 160:4	85:17 122:15	170:14 178:5,6
190:20	161:2 162:5,7	159:19 170:3	180:14 187:20
function 66:10	172:21 180:15	178:20 210:5	208:14 225:21
187:10	183:14,20 184:9	229:13 237:3,8	227:7 231:8 238:8
functionally 188:3	184:16 185:3	247:18	242:14 245:17
<b>fund</b> 59:8	186:15 188:1,12	<b>gift</b> 152:7	246:7,14 247:2
fundamental 78:8	190:10 192:16	girl 34:13	251:13 256:18
fundamentally	193:4 194:22	girls 91:21,22	257:20
77:10 78:1	196:6 197:1,14	218:11	goes 26:16,16 32:3
funder 59:16	198:1,9,11 199:12	give 22:1 24:4 53:2	32:5 57:2,2 96:21
funding 9:8,14,19	201:14 203:19	122:9 129:22	99:1 147:18 179:9
10:1,10 136:21	214:21 215:9	136:7 173:22	215:17 246:5,16
funds 45:2 59:22	234:4,13	202:8 208:1,4,6	247:8
74:18	gaps 45:20 51:22	208:14 229:6	going 9:19 16:18
further 19:7 90:4	78:19,20 153:18	238:19 239:6	21:5,22 24:4 25:6
127:18 138:22	gastrostomy 49:4,6	249:10	25:17 31:8,10
164:11,15 209:12	gather 63:14	given 64:4 97:6	32:13 33:15 36:8
238:12 242:6	<b>gear</b> 36:4	159:11 229:2	37:9 38:19 43:16
Furthermore	<b>gears</b> 36:8	234:6	47:2,10 56:22
175:15	gene 183:17 186:13	gives 127:7 212:22	58:18 59:5 60:13
future 62:15 73:2	192:16 196:6	213:5	61:17,18 64:2
140:12 145:4,12	general 17:14	giving 64:8 92:2	69:17 71:17 73:6
150:2 151:15,17	38:16 87:16 90:13	166:11 208:15	73:8 79:15 81:2
156:11 158:9	169:10	glad 241:6	83:11 84:6,6,15
100.11 100.3		giau 271.0	00.110+.0,0,10

		l	
84:20 87:20,20	<b>Google</b> 97:3	growth 27:10 33:19	184:5
93:21 94:10 95:6	<b>Googled</b> 195:13	guanidinoacetate	halt 72:13
95:10,20 96:3	Goosebumps	4:8 153:16 183:6	hammered 236:22
97:15 98:2 100:13	149:22	183:12 185:19	Hampshire 48:12
102:11 107:8	gotten 79:7,8,8,16	188:6,14 190:8	48:12
111:12,13 114:4	83:17	guess 74:14 91:2	hand 11:10 49:4
116:7 117:21	governed 18:7	92:19 100:16	66:22 149:11
121:1 122:19	government 11:4	106:15 114:2	214:8 226:11
124:20 127:10	22:18 101:6	117:3 118:6	239:3
137:9 139:15	grade 149:8 155:2	119:13 122:11	handful 161:6
143:15 147:20	graduating 163:3	129:20 133:6	handicapped
159:15 163:4	grams 35:8,10 51:8	134:4,21 138:17	145:21
167:4,8 169:15,18	granted 150:14	154:13 209:18,21	hands 75:4 139:7
170:16 180:14	grants 129:5,5,6,6	210:12 211:10,18	144:22 166:15
208:14 210:11	157:21	212:2 221:15	happen 56:3 59:5
213:19,21,22	<b>GRAS</b> 38:16	222:2 228:19	146:17 163:4
216:20 218:3	grateful 161:20	229:15 234:22	164:7 169:16
221:4,22 222:2	great 34:21 56:14	240:18 247:14,20	205:6 215:15
225:7,10,12 226:1	86:13 99:8,18	248:15	200:0 210:10
231:10 235:7	103:13,14 139:9	guidance 14:20	happened 194:16
236:3 237:2,4,7	162:19 168:15	40:8,8 41:14 85:5	225:1 228:13
238:5 239:16	211:11 232:7	127:7 139:16	250:14
240:21 243:22			
244:2 247:1 249:3	greater 44:3,5 62:3	207:20 231:19,20	happening 232:21
	155:15 227:5	242:7,12	happens 30:7 32:8
249:9,9,21,21	<b>Greece</b> 195:19	guide 75:2	75:16 109:21
252:10 254:22	Green 2:18 107:15	guidelines 57:21	177:15 204:11
255:22	107:15 116:13	58:5 87:4 88:22	209:11
<b>gold</b> 155:7,10,15	121:19 125:1,1,9	89:3,10 93:6	happy 70:3 99:3
<b>good</b> 5:3 16:21	126:2 132:2	201:7,12 202:6,15	145:2 156:18
20:17 39:1 43:16	Greene 2:7 8:22 9:1	203:1 207:13,15	215:20 216:9
45:19 49:21 51:19	75:13,13 120:7,7	207:17 230:17,22	hard 49:19 56:6
66:8 89:14 100:1	143:12,13 170:16	235:20 243:22	67:4 79:12 84:22
106:21 108:6	170:20,21 207:6,6	244:5 248:11	88:10 107:17
111:16 112:6	217:22,22 241:19	254:2,3	113:21 150:7
118:2 123:11,17	241:19	guides 89:6	218:10 223:11
131:13 150:2	group 11:17 60:6	guilt 146:18	228:19 235:3
157:6 159:6	60:11 86:16 99:18	guilty 146:13	239:10
162:15 173:6	103:3,14 106:14	Guthrie 69:2	hard-pressed
176:13 185:16	123:21 125:15	<b>guys</b> 72:18 113:14	43:17
187:22 191:1,18	181:10 189:9	gymnastics 149:9	harder 50:11 66:4
192:8 194:8	190:6 211:22	Gynecologists 2:5	harm 205:6,9,13,15
210:17 217:21	228:9 238:15	7:16	205:21 237:2
218:9 230:19	244:2		249:16
240:2,3 243:5	<b>groups</b> 65:10	H	hat 230:4
249:9	112:14 179:1	half 21:19 25:9	HCPCS 50:19 59:12
good-paying 49:20	226:20	30:16 44:5 46:13	He'll 144:11
goodness 232:3	<b>grow</b> 147:20	91:21,22 143:18	head 209:21 229:5
goods 28:13	151:19 160:9	160:10 163:7	heads 234:7
••			

П

Helen 35:18	historic 243:17	hundred 38:20
•	historical 34:8	hundreds 144:20
	220:9	154:9
92:10 101:2 136:9	historically 219:17	hydroxylase 25:21
136:10 157:20	234:12	27:8 31:10 32:3,9
160:5 161:3	history 21:19 22:2	32:10
188:12 207:4	22:19 48:2 69:2	hypothyroidism
221:17 227:1	112:13 129:5	87:18
248:2 249:13	175:1 198:11	hypotonia 185:5
helped 69:13	199:15,22 209:12	
helpful 68:1 72:11	215:22 217:11	<b>I</b>
94:17 99:7 110:21	219:22 239:17	ICU 65:21
186:5 192:22	hit 79:12 217:12	<b>ID</b> 257:20
203:7 211:17	hodgepodge 44:9	idea 117:8 126:14
237:10 239:20	holding 218:4	135:20 188:8
helping 69:11	home 145:10 151:3	191:19 217:21
helps 31:13 118:21	159:12 167:16	ideas 129:19
182:18 186:9	Homocystinuria	identifiable 65:11
247:21,21	31:2	114:16
Heritable 1:5 5:5	honestly 208:10	identification
hesitant 149:15	honor 140:13	219:22
heterogeneity	hope 11:7 64:4 86:4	identified 10:7
108:4	110:20 171:4	21:15 29:4 31:3
hey 62:15	172:22 241:21	34:14 68:6 109:19
HHS 17:16 74:18	hopeful 41:15	110:7 113:7
99:2 129:15,22	70:18,19	114:17 126:15
130:10 164:11,15	hopefully 21:5	163:19 165:19
169:6,12,17	100:12 104:17	182:4 184:14
<b>Hi</b> 133:9,12 144:7	108:8	192:20 200:9,16
148:8 152:22	hopes 169:21	201:4,16 203:11
158:11 166:5	hoping 153:6	205:4 209:15
high 44:4 51:10	178:22	213:16 219:19
61:1,2 82:18 83:2	horrible 30:10	220:11,21 221:3
119:11 121:6	hospital 66:1,11	227:16 244:12
153:22 163:3	hospitals 44:11	248:18 251:4
199:19 218:21	host 67:10	252:19,22 254:10
high-level 56:20	hosted 56:20	identify 75:11
•	hour 25:8 143:18	102:13,17 105:9
-		114:20 115:15
228:4	house 155:6	125:15 126:11
highlight 24:7		132:18,19 137:10
91:16 92:11	10:1 59:13 87:4	186:5 188:21
178:12	88:22 89:9 97:19	195:15 207:10
	257:21	209:8,13 210:22
		232:1 233:1
	144:19	238:16
	human 1:1 17:3	identifying 124:5
hinging 220:18	71:2,5 90:4 175:1	209:10 210:14
	help 16:3 32:2 70:2 73:2 75:2 78:21 92:10 101:2 136:9 136:10 157:20 160:5 161:3 188:12 207:4 221:17 227:1 248:2 249:13 helped 69:13 helpful 68:1 72:11 94:17 99:7 110:21 186:5 192:22 203:7 211:17 237:10 239:20 helping 69:11 helps 31:13 118:21 182:18 186:9 247:21,21 Heritable 1:5 5:5 hesitant 149:15 heterogeneity 108:4 hey 62:15 HHS 17:16 74:18 99:2 129:15,22 130:10 164:11,15 169:6,12,17 Hi 133:9,12 144:7 148:8 152:22 158:11 166:5 high 44:4 51:10 61:1,2 82:18 83:2 119:11 121:6 153:22 163:3 199:19 218:21 high-level 56:20 high-risk 112:14 higher 224:17 228:4 highlight 24:7 91:16 92:11	help 16:3 32:2 70:2historical 34:873:2 75:2 78:2192:10 101:2 136:992:10 101:2 136:9220:9136:10 157:20136:10 157:20160:5 161:3historically 219:17188:12 207:4234:12188:12 207:422:19 48:2 69:2221:17 227:1112:13 129:5248:2 249:13175:1 198:11helped 69:13199:15,22 209:12helpful 68:1 72:11215:22 217:1194:17 99:7 110:21219:22 239:17186:5 192:22hit 79:12 217:12203:7 211:17103:20helping 69:11hodgepodge 44:9holding 218:4home 145:10 151:3helping 69:11home 145:10 151:3182:18 186:9247:21,21247:21,21home 145:10 151:3heterogeneity108:4108:4110:20 171:4199:2 129:15,2270:18,19130:10 164:11,15hope 11:7 64:4 86:4108:4110:20 171:4199:2 129:15,2270:18,19130:10 164:11,15hope 11:9 11:25169:6,12,17100:12 104:17Hi 133:9,12 144:7108:8148:8 152:22hopes 169:21high 44:4 51:10178:2261:1,2 82:18 83:2hopes 169:21high-risk 112:14hospital 66:1,11high-risk 112:14hous 61:13 149:9house 155:6HRSA 6:17 9:18,2010:1 59:13 87:488:22 89:9 97:19228:4house 155:6Highlight 24:710:1 59:13 87:491:16 92:1113:5highlights 171:9huge

H			211
249:13	33:1 37:1 41:7	includes 68:9 89:10	informal 48:8
<b>IEM</b> 21:15 25:8	56:2 62:20 66:17	106:6 181:2	information 11:7
29:17 51:1 63:1	81:20 82:12 88:8	including 106:2	16:9 21:9 37:19
<b>IEP</b> 167:2	94:13 95:5 113:6	112:3 128:5 129:4	40:9 48:10 53:11
<b>ignore</b> 31:7	129:14 139:14	148:15 168:17	56:14 65:15,17
<b>III</b> 174:15	167:21 185:13	171:3,14 174:14	66:11 67:6 68:1
ill 36:21 37:8	187:10 189:5,16	175:18 186:19	75:1 82:10 89:18
Illinois 48:13,15	215:4 217:15	215:21 234:2	98:14 99:5 102:17
<b>illness</b> 31:19	230:15 248:16	238:3	105:9,18 106:6
imaginable 156:12	256:3,8,14	<b>inclusion</b> 16:6	164:8 170:13
imagination 160:14	<b>importantly</b> 158:8	119:15 120:4	180:17 202:7,8,19
imagination 160.14 imagine 146:19	importantly 158.8	139:18	206:12 209:19
imbalances 33:5	impression 92:21	inconsistent 50:5	211:8 221:13,22
immediately	improve 170:15	58:21	227:17 229:14
201:18 209:16	209:4 234:10	incorporating	237:3,10 239:12
210:7	254:4	104:1	239:14 240:8,13
immigrants 195:17	improved 144:18	increasing 10:6	248:7,8 250:1
immune 66:9	161:19 185:14	increasingly	253:4
202:14	improves 175:14	122:15 247:18	informative 64:13
immunization	<b>in-person</b> 15:20	incredibly 113:17	224:21 240:1,2
98:20	inability 154:10	147:9	informed 237:14
impact 16:2 53:8	inaccessible	independently	infrastructure 15:6
91:18 164:20	165:15	146:6 161:16	15:15 137:20
212:3 222:13	<b>inborn</b> 4:4 19:16	indicate 134:11	ingredients 38:14
impacted 92:3	26:2 29:3 44:18	175:2 234:2	inherent 25:13
146:11 226:2	46:17 47:12 50:20	indicated 191:14	inherited 2:7 8:22
impacts 59:1	51:8 57:8 60:19	indicates 175:9	170:17,22 172:1
impaired 41:4	90:6,15 164:13	190:9	initiate 165:6 201:2
impairment 30:11	171:2,15,18 172:7	indication 115:19	253:21 257:4
imperative 174:5	199:16	individual 43:4	initiation 189:3
implement 179:8	incidence 196:16	individuals 11:7,13	<b>initiatives</b> 129:3,14
241:13	197:9,17 198:7	11:14,20,21 42:10	129:16
implementation	199:6	93:18 172:7,13	injection 192:2
10:3 134:4 178:7	include 35:3 44:16	175:6 196:19	innovation 26:16
216:5 217:9 218:3	81:18 87:6 104:14	209:9 219:13	119:4
implemented 177:6	105:18 106:1,22	Indonesian 196:20	innovative 129:6
178:11 199:18	112:1 118:4,17	industry 26:15 40:8	inordinate 26:10
232:19	119:16 135:9	83:19	input 95:16 180:12
implementing	137:6 178:9	inexpensive 150:11	inquiries 17:6
15:10,14	253:16	155:18	insights 211:22
implications 88:4	included 15:13,17	infant 25:5 27:11	inspected 39:2,4
implying 109:2	19:4 47:16 52:17	31:1 39:4,13,16	instance 80:14
252:18	54:4,6 57:14	39:18 43:10	instantly 158:17
importance 37:13	114:22 128:3	122:12 126:5	institute 96:19
60:6 162:13	164:5 165:14	175:12	130:1 193:18
important 22:4 24:7	171:11 195:3	infants 30:2	Institutes 58:7
25:10 30:14 31:12	196:3 204:20	influences 229:16	institution 77:19
31:21 32:6,16	205:20	inform 59:20 73:2	institutionalization

69:6	interspersed 228:1	62:5 67:18 70:19	149:6 150:1,9,16
institutions 69:8	intervals 105:21	71:4 75:20 76:2	150:20 151:1,4
insulin 76:5 78:11	intervene 123:8	78:18 79:19 88:14	152:5
insurance 26:18	223:18	88:17 91:18 94:19	John's 151:14
27:1,5 43:16	intervention 34:2	95:8,16 107:19	Johnson 22:22
44:13 46:22 48:13	112:18,20 113:7	108:8 109:5	join 11:8 86:11
49:21 51:12 54:1	122:19 126:12	168:21 177:4,15	192:10
54:4 55:5 56:3	155:3 175:4,9	178:16 179:3	joined 19:19
58:2 67:11 77:6	176:4 214:9	200:6,7 215:2	joining 16:22
89:13 90:14 92:7	interventions 20:5	216:8 245:20	joint 83:22 165:7
93:9 155:19 164:9	112:9	246:8	Joseph 1:13,16 2:
167:10 187:18,20	interview 17:8	<b>issued</b> 10:1	7:16 142:18
<b>insured</b> 82:17	intolerance 84:19	<b>issues</b> 4:5 19:17	journey 148:14
intake 34:19 37:8	introduce 5:8 19:19	25:11 31:6 40:19	<b>journey</b> 148.14 <b>joy</b> 160:13
183:3	81:11 182:13	57:2 59:18 67:11	<b>Jr</b> 1:13,16 2:5
intellectual 145:11	introduced 53:20	101:21 176:17	judgment 242:4
162:2 184:3			
	55:4,10 62:13 177:18	216:21 217:1,9	<b>July</b> 144:12
intelligence 160:13 intend 102:11		italics 41:7	jumping 128:1 justice 83:5
	investigations 103:21	Italy 195:18 item 99:10	
intended 29:1			justification 87:14
36:14 238:17	investigators	items 35:5 54:3	justify 88:11
intends 104:5	136:17 174:3	J	justifying 223:14
intent 112:15	invite 165:6	jack 187:22	ĸ
121:11	inviting 20:21	jail 77:7	Kamila 1:20 6:16
intention 50:10	involve 219:22	Jana 2:20 162:12	141:22 255:15
81:11	involved 60:12	162:16 168:8	Kanis 2:8 8:11,12
Interagency 225:17	140:11 177:2	170:8	143:4,5
interest 16:20 21:3	178:19 183:10	Jana's 168:11	<b>Kate</b> 2:12 5:8 7:19
96:3 171:7	involves 177:9	<b>Jeff</b> 5:20 12:16	142:18
interested 11:15	involving 114:15		
39:10 87:10 219:4	176:12	99:12 107:16 117:18 126:13	Kathryn 2:17 19:1 19:19 20:17 64:7
interesting 35:4	<b>IOM</b> 53:9 72:4,6		
48:10 75:15 76:12	89:19 95:10	133:9 139:10,21	94:21
189:6 218:1	168:19	141:7 210:5	Kathy 162:18
interests 17:12	<b>IOM's</b> 164:10	213:10 238:13	<b>keep</b> 31:22 49:19
interference 105:20	iota 83:13	252:8	130:8
111:3	<b>IQ</b> 161:9	<b>Jeff's</b> 212:21	keeping 171:7
Intergovernmental	<b>Irish</b> 195:16	222:10	<b>keeps</b> 8:5
169:9	<b>ironic</b> 210:7	JEFFREY 1:16	Kellen 168:10
interim 52:22	ironically 158:3	Jersey 49:7	Kellie 1:17 6:5
	irral avant 101.7	<b>Joan</b> 1:20 20:21	12:20 141:15
intermediate 103:9	irrelevant 121:7		
intermediate 103:9 international 39:11	irrespective 52:18	<b>job</b> 43:16 49:20	222:10 255:7
intermediate 103:9 international 39:11 57:10 195:11	irrespective 52:18 irreversible 189:16	<b>job</b> 43:16 49:20 50:1 51:19 77:5	Kelm 1:17 6:5,6
intermediate 103:9 international 39:11 57:10 195:11 interpretable	irrespective 52:18 irreversible 189:16 Isles 195:18	<b>job</b> 43:16 49:20 50:1 51:19 77:5 158:2 222:7	Kelm 1:17 6:5,6 12:20,21 110:22
intermediate 103:9 international 39:11 57:10 195:11 interpretable 117:15	irrespective 52:18 irreversible 189:16	<b>job</b> 43:16 49:20 50:1 51:19 77:5 158:2 222:7 <b>jobs</b> 50:4 82:21	Kelm 1:17 6:5,6 12:20,21 110:22 141:15,16 211:7
intermediate 103:9 international 39:11 57:10 195:11 interpretable 117:15 interpretation	irrespective 52:18 irreversible 189:16 Isles 195:18 isovaleric 162:17 172:20	job 43:16 49:20 50:1 51:19 77:5 158:2 222:7 jobs 50:4 82:21 Joe 20:21	Kelm 1:17 6:5,6 12:20,21 110:22 141:15,16 211:7 252:12 255:7,8
intermediate 103:9 international 39:11 57:10 195:11 interpretable 117:15	irrespective 52:18 irreversible 189:16 Isles 195:18 isovaleric 162:17	<b>job</b> 43:16 49:20 50:1 51:19 77:5 158:2 222:7 <b>jobs</b> 50:4 82:21	Kelm 1:17 6:5,6 12:20,21 110:22 141:15,16 211:7

			2/5
217:20 220:16	68:22 72:14 73:4	192:11 194:5	Laura 2:19 144:3,7
222:2	77:6 80:3 82:1	204:5,6 229:20	law 178:3,15
Kerry 53:21,21	88:11,18,18 89:2	label 38:12	217:21
key 74:17 107:11	89:4,15 91:11	labeled 37:16,21	laws 58:22
165:8 189:19	94:20 104:7	labeling 37:14,14	lays 246:6
200:10 237:17	106:17 107:3,21	38:4,7 39:22 40:2	LC-MS/MS 192:4
keys 41:9	109:1 123:4	Labor 53:8 72:3	lead 34:6 56:16,16
kid 36:2 92:3 145:2	125:14 126:4	90:10 95:12	66:9 122:19
149:15	135:8 140:11,13	168:18	leadership 63:19
<b>kids</b> 61:12 66:10	145:12 146:10,20	laboratories 2:11	139:11
69:6,14 70:2,9	147:14 149:12	7:22 130:22 131:3	leading 173:19
98:12 113:8	152:3 153:6,17,20	131:17,18 132:8	leads 50:5 75:15
124:20 146:15	157:12 160:3	133:4 134:13	175:6
147:7,15 151:2			leaned 219:20
155:8 158:20	161:12 163:2,4	135:2,6,9,15	
	170:10 173:16	137:17 187:4	220:8
164:19 207:5,10	177:8 182:6 188:7	192:3,10	leap 250:3
210:14 211:6	189:22 204:9	laboratory 15:8	learn 223:20
226:1 239:22	206:3,6 208:2,13	106:7 112:5 125:5	235:14
240:9 249:13	211:7,11 212:5	125:10,11,20	learning 145:5
250:8,12	213:16 215:2	131:1,22 134:18	leave 11:2 48:3
killer 173:19	218:22 222:5,15	200:6 203:15,16	leaves 61:7
<b>Kim</b> 3:1 144:3	229:9,19 233:7,12	204:4 212:10	leaving 61:11
152:22	233:13,20 235:1,1	232:19 250:22	led 159:22
kind 52:10 64:21	236:1 238:10,12	257:15 258:1	leeway 118:5
67:2,13 95:19	240:4 243:6,11	laboratory-prepa	left 32:21 46:15
97:13 99:1 117:12	248:10 251:5	106:4	48:22 54:20 147:7
124:11 130:10	253:10 256:2	labs 156:13 181:9	158:3
135:3 145:6	Knowing 204:8	212:2 232:22	legislation 18:3
147:13 149:12,16	knowledge 90:8	250:4	40:10 52:7 55:7
170:14 177:9,22	knowledgeable	lack 33:3 50:3 65:7	55:15 59:5 60:4
179:2 186:9	150:4	66:8 92:1 163:5	60:13,14 67:9
189:13 211:15	known 18:8 25:22	163:21 172:9,11	75:3 81:17 86:19
217:12 233:14	62:9,10 106:3	laid 231:18	176:12 177:2,17
236:18 237:5	112:4 115:4	Lane 1:12 257:18	178:17,18
239:4 241:12	183:21 196:8	lanes 161:16	legislative 17:22
245:17	198:13 215:22	language 54:15	53:17 55:22 98:3
kindergarten 155:4	<b>knows</b> 101:17	120:17,22 127:22	177:9,10,13,20
kinds 34:22 81:1	158:1	216:16 243:1	178:1
187:15	Kus 2:6 8:2,3,9	large 12:1 114:20	legislatively 97:22
kit 233:21	92:15,15,19 143:2	203:14 249:20	legislators 178:19
Klor 2:19 144:4	143:3	largely 83:17 117:4	length 216:21
148:8,8	Kuvan 42:15,19	larger 62:2 190:14	let's 62:16 64:10
140.0,0		largest 59:15	75:8 78:13 99:10
knew 82:3,10		largest 59.15	
	L	lastly 91:2 98:21	124:2
<b>knew</b> 82:3,10	L L 1:22	•	124:2 letter 86:21 89:9
knew 82:3,10 154:21 159:14 204:12 234:8		lastly 91:2 98:21	letter 86:21 89:9
knew 82:3,10 154:21 159:14	L 1:22	lastly 91:2 98:21 late 122:13,18	
knew 82:3,10 154:21 159:14 204:12 234:8 know 10:14 17:7,19	L 1:22 L-methionine	lastly 91:2 98:21 late 122:13,18 152:13 157:4	letter 86:21 89:9 96:9 150:13,18,20

151:16	litoroturo 57:4	146.20 149.2	less 209:12 224:7
	literature 57:4	146:20 148:2	lose 208:12 224:7
letting 17:19 95:2	77:14 181:16	169:19 189:15	243:22 244:5
250:8	183:21 202:13	205:5 233:5,8	losing 49:18 77:5
level 63:12 79:11	240:5,7	249:15,21	lost 23:19 69:15
81:16,17 86:2	little 21:11 22:1,11	Long- 166:6	76:19 77:7 161:18
104:2 114:9	26:9,12 32:9,21	long-term 15:5,6	lot 21:6 22:8 40:9
153:16 209:17	33:15 34:13 35:3	16:4 95:7,17 99:4	42:14,15 46:8
229:2,5 234:20	36:1,9 39:14,17	166:12 170:12	48:10 50:2 69:13
levels 30:22 228:4	45:20 46:13 47:3	longer 58:13	69:18 71:4 72:12
leveraged 219:20	53:11 54:3,12,14	149:13 151:12	74:17,18 76:2
liaison 162:22	56:9 58:16 71:14	157:2 250:10	82:16 84:17,18
license 257:19	72:9 91:10,11,16	Longo 181:6 204:7	92:6 96:3,4 97:5
<b>lie</b> 63:21	101:8 102:15	look 8:8 11:22	102:10 111:5
life 34:6 58:1 76:19	103:1 105:4	20:18 26:8,17	122:5 129:8 140:
96:13 108:13	110:16 124:10	69:2 76:13 87:17	148:14 151:2
151:20,21 153:13	125:8 128:12	93:10 95:8 97:20	198:17 202:18
154:9 155:3 159:2	130:13 135:17	109:4 149:3 150:2	210:17 220:20
160:5,7 161:3,22	137:5 138:12	158:16 166:20	223:1,12 231:21
175:13,14 184:1	144:9 160:6	176:8 186:1	231:22 235:11
189:1,11,18 218:8	179:12,13,22	193:12 195:22	237:5 251:1
220:13	186:10 187:5	197:2 198:6	lots 69:8 161:7
<b>life-</b> 155:15	202:5,8 204:21	202:11 211:12,16	239:18 240:6
life-altering 154:4	207:20 208:8	215:8,10,15	loud 24:6
lifelong 157:1	209:18 210:2	216:18 225:19	louder 125:8
165:10,19 172:17	211:19 215:6	226:20 230:21	<b>Louis</b> 160:8
lifetime 34:16 77:16	216:1,12 218:10	232:17,18 239:15	love 62:10 86:7
77:18 156:21	218:16 230:12	250:12	152:5,9 160:14
lift 169:15	231:10,11 232:20	looked 26:11	loves 149:8 152:8
likelihood 227:6	238:21 250:16	107:10 150:18	low 28:11 52:16
likes 149:22	251:14	194:10 196:4	54:6 161:10 186:
limit 108:10 221:7	live 35:9,16 46:2	197:6,12 222:3	199:3,6,20 235:1 <sup>-</sup>
limited 23:6 28:17	48:17 145:8 146:5	253:6	low- 28:11 44:19
41:4 75:21 135:14	159:12 173:19	looking 15:4,9 26:1	46:12 49:11 68:4
217:3	197:8 241:17	45:7 61:22 73:1	low-calorie 28:3
limiting 209:9	lives 18:1 48:11	95:18 96:14 101:7	low-gluten 84:20
limits 51:4 75:17	64:18 69:11	103:9 104:19	low-protein 44:6
78:9 105:20 111:3	146:11 154:11	117:8 157:8	49:8 68:21 85:1
169:16	165:20	161:17 163:15	90:21 154:7
line 134:17 221:1	living 48:18 77:19	193:6,8 194:1	low-volume 28:2
lingered 165:3	lobbying 65:9	215:21 216:5	lower 28:4 51:10
liquid 191:22	lobbyists 79:20	222:7,22 229:12	LSDs 122:16
list 39:6,9,12	local 155:20 156:10	234:10 250:12	Lu 1:18 6:16,18
129:10 151:12	located 182:22	looks 27:1 28:6	13:6,7 97:17,18
152:7 159:11	183:13	36:5 190:1 249:8	97:18 142:2,3
listen 94:18	location 256:19	Lorey 1:18 6:7,9	247:14 255:17,18
listening 21:12	<b>Lofenalac</b> 22:21	12:22 13:1 141:17	luck 159:22
169:7 234:15	long 68:16 83:13,20	181:4 212:17	lucky 148:18 150:3
literally 156:2,10	121:8 122:18	235:4 255:9,10	151:7,22 152:4
ILCIANY 100.2,10	121.0 122.10	200.4 200.9.10	101.7.22 102.4

154:14	marker 234:18	143:8,9	measures 15:5
lunch 28:8 91:4	markers 234:3	<b>McCune</b> 35:19	113:3
140:17 167:5	market 22:8,21	McDermott 55:10	mechanism 15:1
236:17	23:8 24:14 26:6	McDONOUGH 1:19	15:14 24:18 96:
lysophosphatidy	marketed 69:3	6:13,14 12:7,7	mechanisms 67:
233:2	marketplace 23:21	13:4,5 67:21,21	98:3,5 99:6
lysosomal 233:3	marrow 113:7	69:1 95:22,22	Medicaid 44:17
	Martin 2:19 144:3,7	127:4,4 139:21	49:8 52:3 59:11
M	144:8 148:6	141:20,21 204:8	73:5,18 74:3
<b>M</b> 2:10	Maryland 1:13	206:9 207:2	79:14 80:6,15
<b>M.D</b> 2:5	48:18	216:11 225:6	82:9 98:6,7
maintain 135:4	Marzia 181:7	227:11,11 241:1,1	medical 2:14 4:4
major 36:22	mass 80:12 156:14	241:7 249:5,5	7:13 16:2 19:16
majority 254:16	192:1,4 204:12	255:13,14	20:13 21:8 22:2
making 8:8 58:14	233:11	Mead 22:22	22:9,19,20 23:1
59:4 101:4 113:21	match 120:20	meal 34:22 35:12	23:19 24:1 25:4
232:7	matches 245:7	36:3	25:12,18,20 26:
male 43:13,15 84:1	material 21:6 113:5	mean 29:12 36:6	26:9 27:3 28:19
malformations	materials 107:1	39:19 53:1 66:2	29:2,7,9,16,20
78:6	130:21 134:12	73:4 74:8 79:4	30:3 31:13 33:8
man 34:10 77:3	191:16 212:9	84:11 85:17 87:5	33:17 34:3 35:6
manage 41:11	Matern 1:19 6:11	96:17 108:2	35:10 36:2,6,10
management 1:12	6:12 13:2,3 86:20	113:20 116:22	36:18 37:11,13,
2:12 18:9 24:10	86:20 88:21	117:3,4,13 118:5	37:17,21 38:10
29:2 31:9 36:15	106:14 107:2	119:11 125:4,5,6	39:6,15 40:5,12
37:16 41:5 57:21	108:9 118:20,20	126:21 132:7	40:16 41:1,9,19
58:4 63:2 167:16	121:4 122:21	135:13,20 194:18	42:2,3,9,13,19
mandate 48:12,14	126:20 131:16	211:20,22 213:3	43:17,19 44:7,1
48:19 49:8,11	135:7,12 141:18	213:13 225:1,4	44:12 45:14,18
90:19 91:9	141:19 180:16,20	227:18 232:12	47:12 48:20 50:
mandated 83:1	202:9 203:4,12	236:3 248:20	52:15 53:19 54:
171:14 177:12	204:16 205:9,16	252:20 254:3,4,5	55:3,11,12,21
mandates 27:17	206:17 210:4	254:15,18	56:17,21 57:10,
46:5,7,15,22	212:7 224:9	meaningful 207:17	58:2,3,21 59:18
47:19,20,22 58:1	227:18 232:11	meaningless	59:19 60:10 61:
63:9 75:16 80:6	241:3,10 245:1	161:13	61:2 62:9,16 63
90:17 91:13 172:3	253:10 254:14	means 33:10 39:21	66:3 68:4 70:12
manufactured	255:11,12	45:7 122:22	71:17 77:20 81:
22:22	maternal 7:18	155:10 172:6	83:14,16 84:9
manufacturers	30:13,19 94:16	194:2 214:15	89:5 90:15,21
26:10 38:21 42:3	math 218:17 219:6	meant 120:14 155:7	91:7 92:1,7 94:3
manufactures 39:3	matrix 222:17	242:7	96:6 150:13,18
manufacturing	225:16	measure 185:20	163:13,18 164:2
39:1	matter 83:4 94:8		165:10 168:2,14
maple 36:5	140:20 155:17	186:7 191:4,6 measured 196:6	168:21 169:16
march 2:9 8:16			
43:12 86:15	178:15 258:4	measurement	170:3,19 171:3,
mark 166:20	matters 17:11	110:9 186:16	171:15,20,21
1101 K 100.20	McCABE 2:9 8:17	196:12	172:2,9,10,12,1

110:22 111:16 113:13 114:2 116:15 117:2,13 118:2,6,16,18,20 119:13 120:21 121:4,10 122:21 123:13,19,20 124:12 125:7,21 126:7,13,20 127:4 127:13 130:5,12 130:15 131:4,13 131:16,19 132:7 132:11,15,21 133:6,8,11,18	258:2 membership 17:5 membranes 183:1 183:8 mention 57:15 61:16 241:12 mentioned 33:12 36:16 57:18 64:19 106:16 165:8 181:10 187:8 191:5 197:4,20 198:2 203:8 253:8	microcephaly 31:1 microphone 75:10 144:5 241:11 Mid- 48:6 middle 239:8 Mike 119:2 125:4 226:22 mild 184:2 milestone 254:13 milestones 159:4 military 44:17 milk 36:1
113:13 114:2 116:15 117:2,13 118:2,6,16,18,20 119:13 120:21 121:4,10 122:21 123:13,19,20 124:12 125:7,21 126:7,13,20 127:4 127:13 130:5,12 130:15 131:4,13 131:16,19 132:7 132:11,15,21	membership 17:5 membranes 183:1 183:8 mention 57:15 61:16 241:12 mentioned 33:12 36:16 57:18 64:19 106:16 165:8 181:10 187:8 191:5 197:4,20 198:2 203:8 253:8	microphone 75:10 144:5 241:11 Mid- 48:6 middle 239:8 Mike 119:2 125:4 226:22 mild 184:2 milestone 254:13 milestones 159:4 military 44:17
116:15 117:2,13 118:2,6,16,18,20 119:13 120:21 121:4,10 122:21 123:13,19,20 124:12 125:7,21 126:7,13,20 127:4 127:13 130:5,12 130:15 131:4,13 131:16,19 132:7 132:11,15,21	membranes 183:1 183:8 mention 57:15 61:16 241:12 mentioned 33:12 36:16 57:18 64:19 106:16 165:8 181:10 187:8 191:5 197:4,20 198:2 203:8 253:8	144:5 241:11 Mid- 48:6 middle 239:8 Mike 119:2 125:4 226:22 mild 184:2 milestone 254:13 milestones 159:4 military 44:17
118:2,6,16,18,20 119:13 120:21 121:4,10 122:21 123:13,19,20 124:12 125:7,21 126:7,13,20 127:4 127:13 130:5,12 130:15 131:4,13 131:16,19 132:7 132:11,15,21	183:8 mention 57:15 61:16 241:12 mentioned 33:12 36:16 57:18 64:19 106:16 165:8 181:10 187:8 191:5 197:4,20 198:2 203:8 253:8	Mid- 48:6 middle 239:8 Mike 119:2 125:4 226:22 mild 184:2 milestone 254:13 milestones 159:4 military 44:17
119:13 120:21 121:4,10 122:21 123:13,19,20 124:12 125:7,21 126:7,13,20 127:4 127:13 130:5,12 130:15 131:4,13 131:16,19 132:7 132:11,15,21	mention 57:15 61:16 241:12 mentioned 33:12 36:16 57:18 64:19 106:16 165:8 181:10 187:8 191:5 197:4,20 198:2 203:8 253:8	middle 239:8 Mike 119:2 125:4 226:22 mild 184:2 milestone 254:13 milestones 159:4 military 44:17
121:4,10 122:21 123:13,19,20 124:12 125:7,21 126:7,13,20 127:4 127:13 130:5,12 130:15 131:4,13 131:16,19 132:7 132:11,15,21	61:16 241:12 mentioned 33:12 36:16 57:18 64:19 106:16 165:8 181:10 187:8 191:5 197:4,20 198:2 203:8 253:8	Mike 119:2 125:4 226:22 mild 184:2 milestone 254:13 milestones 159:4 military 44:17
123:13,19,20 124:12 125:7,21 126:7,13,20 127:4 127:13 130:5,12 130:15 131:4,13 131:16,19 132:7 132:11,15,21	mentioned 33:12 36:16 57:18 64:19 106:16 165:8 181:10 187:8 191:5 197:4,20 198:2 203:8 253:8	226:22 mild 184:2 milestone 254:13 milestones 159:4 military 44:17
124:12 125:7,21 126:7,13,20 127:4 127:13 130:5,12 130:15 131:4,13 131:16,19 132:7 132:11,15,21	36:16 57:18 64:19 106:16 165:8 181:10 187:8 191:5 197:4,20 198:2 203:8 253:8	mild 184:2 milestone 254:13 milestones 159:4 military 44:17
126:7,13,20 127:4 127:13 130:5,12 130:15 131:4,13 131:16,19 132:7 132:11,15,21	106:16 165:8 181:10 187:8 191:5 197:4,20 198:2 203:8 253:8	milestone 254:13 milestones 159:4 military 44:17
127:13 130:5,12 130:15 131:4,13 131:16,19 132:7 132:11,15,21	181:10 187:8 191:5 197:4,20 198:2 203:8 253:8	milestones 159:4 military 44:17
130:15 131:4,13 131:16,19 132:7 132:11,15,21	191:5 197:4,20 198:2 203:8 253:8	military 44:17
131:16,19 132:7 132:11,15,21	198:2 203:8 253:8	•
132:11,15,21		<b>11111K</b> 30.1
	montione 66.20	million 10:10 77:16
	mentions 55:20 171:19 181:1	77:16 83:11 167:6
134:6,8,10 135:5	mess 83:17	195:2,7 197:21
		210:17 218:20
		223:21 239:19
		243:9,10
	-	millions 156:20
		mind 122:22
		mine 81:7 164:1
		minimally 103:5
		minimum 102:20
		115:18
•		minor 85:20 220:3
		minute 81:5
•		minutes 12:3,5,13
,		13:10 18:20 19:13
		158:6 257:17
		258:3
		miraculous 160:12
		misconception
		85:21
•		misdiagnosed
	-	148:15
	•	mismatch 120:3,5
		misplaced 247:19
	-	missed 228:7
		<b>Missouri</b> 219:13
•		<b>Missy</b> 148:8
		mistake 96:10
	•	Mistry 1:20 6:16
255:18,20,22		141:22 142:1
	6:16 7:13 13:6	255:15,16
10:22 11:2,15	97:18 142:2,16	misused 54:12
17:1,9 19:1 43:6	255:17	mitigate 25:14
64:11 81:15	Michele 2:21 87:9	mittens 145:1
139:14 181:1	87:11 116:20,21	<b>mixed</b> 160:21
	members 1:15 5:16 10:22 11:2,15 17:1,9 19:1 43:6 64:11 81:15	136:2 137:2,5,9208:22 226:9139:9,21,22 141:6227:6141:9,12,14,16,19227:6141:21 142:1,3,6142:8 173:9142:8 173:9201 35:19 39:11142:8 173:944:18,22 48:5,16180:20 202:4,950:5 57:9 68:7203:2,4,6,12163:6 170:17,22204:8,16,21 205:9172:1 182:16205:13,16 206:9185:2 200:3206:17 207:2172:1 182:16209:5 210:4,619:17 26:3 29:3211:7 212:7,1731:15 44:19 57:9216:11 221:1090:16 171:16,19224:9 225:6172:7 199:1629:22 232:11metabolites 32:15238:5,13 241:1,3method 109:14,1524:1,4,7,10 245:1211:1324:4,7,10 245:124:14,7,10 245:1247:14 249:525:2,8,12,18252:8,12,1825:20 76:16255:18,20,22methyltransferase4:8 183:12 190:8metrics 109:14Mexico 193:21mgs 35:15Michael 1:18 2:146:16 7:13 13:610:22 11:2,1577:18 142:2,1617:1,9 19:1 43:664:11 81:15

			205
mixes 116:2	163:3,7	252:10,20 254:11	narrowly 40:13
mixtures 28:1	months 52:5 53:3	254:12 256:11	81:18 225:2
29:21	95:19 100:7	moved 16:11 65:5	nasty 208:5
<b>MMA</b> 31:5	148:11,19 154:13	205:1,18 228:12	Natasha 2:6 8:14
modalities 25:10	159:5 166:11	252:13	143:6 245:15
29:3 105:16	167:19 169:21	movement 159:8	national 2:13 8:18
112:20 117:22	175:13 184:1	184:6	47:8 55:17,19
121:22 172:17	185:6 189:11	moves 55:1 68:14	56:11,19 58:6
190:18	217:20 236:1	movies 161:14	62:12,18 81:12,17
modality 36:22	237:16	moving 22:15,16	89:17 166:8
63:3 107:10 115:5	months' 110:6	51:17 63:7 73:16	167:11 169:11
116:4 117:1 119:2	moodiness 77:5	92:10 97:21 134:5	nationally 62:8
119:10,16,18	Moon 152:6	138:1 205:7,14,14	natural 33:10 34:1
120:11,15 121:7	moral 165:17 168:9	205:15 232:14	35:7,7 84:1 129:5
121:20 128:9	168:9,10	237:2,12	175:1 198:11
<b>mode</b> 104:10	morbidity 21:18	MPS 9:7 10:9	199:15,22 209:12
model 66:20 175:2	morning 5:3 16:21	219:11,12	215:22 217:11
176:12 178:18	140:16 162:19	<b>MRI</b> 159:19	239:17
models 175:8	165:8 198:17	MRM 139.19 MRMs 233:9	naturally 40:21
moderate 154:7	morning's 170:10	<b>MSUD</b> 31:2	<b>nature</b> 115:22
modification 41:6	<b>Moroccan</b> 196:20	muddled 210:2	navigate 61:19,22
191:12	mortality 21:19	multiple 45:5,8	62:1 63:20,22
modified 28:11	mother 59:13 153:1	50:4 55:20 218:4	NBSTRN 129:4
42:12 52:16 54:6	158:12	218:5	<b>NDA</b> 174:16
84:21 214:5	Mother's 152:6	multiply 145:21	NDC 41:21
225:15 233:21	158:4	muscle 31:20 183:9	near 34:5,7 199:10
modify 96:20	mothers 152:2	184:10	nearly 193:19
modular 27:20	158:3	muscular 173:5,16	necessarily 66:2
modulation 202:14	motion 241:2,5	<b>music</b> 146:1 160:15	79:2 98:19 121:2
molecular 186:20	251:21 252:2,6	mutation 196:8,9	125:6,11 135:1
192:15	253:19 254:16,17	196:11 197:13	177:11 239:9
mom 144:22 149:14	254:19	mutations 194:16	244:19
152:9 162:21	motivated 49:19	194:17	necessary 54:1
moment 86:9 120:8	<b>mouse</b> 175:8	mutually 63:16	103:5,7 116:19
174:22	mouthful 104:4	mysteries 214:18	138:22 171:22
moments 148:14	106:5		226:8 227:4
<b>moms</b> 157:5	move 4:10 22:6	<u> </u>	237:17 256:10
<b>Monaco</b> 2:20	41:17 46:20,21	nailed 190:12	need 5:15 11:10,20
162:13,15,16	54:16 60:13,16	name 14:3,5 19:11	12:2 27:4 50:4
MONDAY 1:9	80:10,12 83:12	37:9 146:1 148:8	51:15,16 58:1
	99:10 102:18	152:22 158:11	59:6 60:15,15
money 26:11 50:2	00.10 102.10		64.46 60.7 0 0 40
61:3 130:1,1,2,9	103:5 105:10	162:15 173:8	61:16 63:7,8,9,13
61:3 <sup>°</sup> 130:1,1,2,9 130:11	103:5 105:10 137:10 148:3	name's 144:7	63:13 64:17 71:9
61:3 130:1,1,2,9 130:11 <b>monitor</b> 167:16	103:5 105:10 137:10 148:3 211:4 226:8,17,17	name's 144:7 names 14:12	63:13 64:17 71:9 76:7 77:12 79:17
61:3 130:1,1,2,9 130:11 <b>monitor</b> 167:16 <b>monitored</b> 50:18	103:5 105:10 137:10 148:3 211:4 226:8,17,17 227:4 232:12	name's 144:7 names 14:12 Nancy 2:18 107:10	63:13 64:17 71:9 76:7 77:12 79:17 85:8 88:13 93:14
61:3 130:1,1,2,9 130:11 monitor 167:16 monitored 50:18 monitoring 190:16	103:5 105:10 137:10 148:3 211:4 226:8,17,17 227:4 232:12 235:8 236:8,21	name's 144:7 names 14:12 Nancy 2:18 107:10 107:15 124:21	63:13 64:17 71:9 76:7 77:12 79:17 85:8 88:13 93:14 95:10,14 101:1
61:3 130:1,1,2,9 130:11 monitor 167:16 monitored 50:18	103:5 105:10 137:10 148:3 211:4 226:8,17,17 227:4 232:12	name's 144:7 names 14:12 Nancy 2:18 107:10	63:13 64:17 71:9 76:7 77:12 79:17 85:8 88:13 93:14

			284
404.47 404.0	neurotevie 100.0	000.4 0 004.4 40	040.5 047.40
121:17 124:9	neurotoxic 188:6	200:4,9 201:4,13	246:5 247:12
127:7 133:1,5	neurotransmitter	216:6,18 220:21	257:7
137:3 138:12	187:12	223:6 224:14	nominees 11:17
144:22 164:15	never 93:21 146:5	226:13 228:2	12:1
165:16 167:2,2	147:1 155:2 167:6	229:17,18 234:1	<b>non-</b> 145:11
198:19,20 202:11	240:6 251:10	248:18 254:7	non-professional
207:19 208:8,11	<b>new</b> 5:8 40:3 48:6	newborns 1:5 5:6	82:20
213:6 246:15	48:11,12 49:7,18	10:7 105:17 106:2	non-state 134:21
249:3 250:2 251:8	59:12 62:16,20,21	107:20 108:10	norepinephrine
251:13 254:19	70:14 81:12,22	112:3 114:17	32:7 33:4
257:17,19	96:10,17 104:1	<b>newly</b> 45:15	normal 31:15 34:7
needed 11:2 15:15	109:16 136:11,18	<b>news</b> 157:6	34:7 41:6 42:12
36:4 46:20 88:19	139:17 155:9	nibbling 208:2	147:8 186:3,4
90:6 109:2 156:1	159:13 167:17,20	nice 39:12 70:5	189:1 194:6
156:14,16 164:12	175:18 191:9	216:2	224:18
182:11 228:11	195:19 199:3	nicely 224:17	normalcy 34:17
236:20	204:21 206:6	nicer 26:9 199:8	normalized 144:17
needle 83:12	223:2,3 234:3	Nicola 181:6	normally 140:6
needs 5:10 12:9	<b>newborn</b> 5:13 10:2	Nicole's 240:12	North 140:7
28:4 41:12 51:11	14:21 15:1,17	NICU 198:4	northeast 158:5
62:5 75:10 79:19	16:4,14 17:22	<b>NIH</b> 1:12 20:11	noted 246:3
80:4 86:1 114:10	21:15 29:4,5 31:3	58:13 59:15 129:2	nother 111:15
116:16 121:16			
	34:10,14 44:21	129:8 136:18,21	notice 18:15,18
149:14 165:12	45:1 47:13,16	164:21 169:2	noticed 159:21
183:1,2 217:18	50:9,11 87:8,16	<b>NIH's</b> 59:19	notification 40:4
242:6 252:5,6	90:22 91:16 92:9	nine 217:20 236:1	notify 209:16
negate 92:8	98:17 101:14	237:16	nourished 66:7
negative 106:3	103:19 104:2	nine-month 227:14	novel 194:17 196:9
112:4 151:12	106:7 111:1,6	227:17 237:9	November 15:21
215:11	114:21 115:3,13	nineteen 77:17	NPS 86:22
negatives 153:21	116:2 123:11	nominated 16:5	NSIGHT 129:4
203:22 239:19	126:1,3 129:3,9	102:18 103:6	number 10:6 12:1
neglected 30:14	132:4 137:14,21	139:18 181:19	23:6 40:18 53:18
neighboring	140:12 144:2	189:20 228:6	56:13,21 57:6
192:13	145:19 147:3,19	230:10	68:12 71:18 85:12
Neither 55:8	151:5 152:21	nominating 105:10	109:18 115:18
neobased 233:21	153:15,17 156:19	228:9 252:1	143:16 147:20
nervous 135:17	163:5,17 164:17	nomination 4:9	167:15,17,22
<b>net</b> 112:8 113:18,20	165:4 168:6	16:7 174:1 176:1	179:7 192:8 193:2
Netherlands	171:16 172:16	176:9 180:15,21	197:6 203:10
195:21 197:5	173:4 174:2,4	181:5,11,15	218:22 220:3,4
<b>network</b> 137:14,16	175:16,17 178:14	201:18 226:6,9	224:4 243:11,12
157:19	185:16 190:22	230:13 232:10	249:20
neurochemicals	191:3 192:3,17	244:17 252:5,11	numbers 93:21
32:6,13	193:2,3,6 194:3	252:14 253:20	108:1 113:17
neurocognitive	194:11,22 196:4	256:9 257:3	211:15 219:5
24:16	197:3,12,19 199:2	nominations 10:16	numerator 223:10
neurological 153:9	199:4,12,17,19	nominators 226:19	248:2
l			

			20:
numerous 190:17	offending 27:7	235:22	organizations 56:5
nutrient 27:7 33:20	33:20 40:1	online 185:2	56:8 57:5,19 60:8
38:7 40:1 41:12	offer 173:1 187:4	onset 122:13,18	60:9 86:3
nutrients 27:7,22	192:11 218:15	126:9 159:18	organizations' 81:
33:14,21	242:16	184:14	organizers 20:20
nutrition 20:4 27:9	Office 19:20 20:2	open 10:17 18:12	organizing 105:7
28:15 38:6,11	20:10 99:1 169:8	64:10 115:18	organs 78:5
39:21 48:22 58:4	169:10	138:2 141:4	original 194:3
66:9	officer 17:13	143:15 155:5	227:19 228:1
nutritional 24:12	official 2:1 86:10	202:1 251:20	originally 36:14
26:13 36:17 37:8	Officials 2:7 8:2	open-ended 102:15	ornithine 147:11
90:5 164:12	oftentimes 215:3	opening 4:3 18:16	154:5 184:19
NYMAC 48:6 82:4	okay 12:10 13:10	openings 10:17	188:16 208:6,15
N I WAC 40.0 02.4	28:8 52:8 80:5	11:11	<b>Orphan</b> 23:22
0			171:19
o'clock 140:17	105:3 107:5,11	opens 67:13 252:4 operating 164:21	-
<b>obligation</b> 168:9,9	108:14 111:16,19 112:6 114:14	operating 164.21 opinion 30:14	<b>Ostrander</b> 2:9 7:7,
168:11		•	47:2 81:3,3
Obstetricians 2:5	118:2 120:21	192:22 206:16	108:15 142:12,13
7:16	124:18,22 126:22	209:2	212:20
obtain 174:21	127:13 128:11	<b>OPM</b> 169:13	ought 117:14
183:2 187:15	130:5,15,16	opportunity 9:19	129:15
	131:13,19 132:1	10:1 70:11,21	ounce 35:13,14,16
obtained 108:17	133:8 134:3,7,14	99:17 103:13	out-of-pocket 44:1
228:10	135:10 137:9	152:12 157:14	44:10
obtaining 131:1,22	138:4 139:8,10	173:7 175:3 176:6	outcome 31:1
134:18	152:1 209:5,10	207:4 246:18,19	53:11 121:16,16
obvious 159:15	212:19 236:5	252:4	121:22 125:16
247:5	241:8 249:8	opposed 40:20	132:16 152:16
<b>obviously</b> 25:2	250:13 256:1,7	65:10 77:19	185:14 220:13
27:12 29:18 30:6	257:1	107:13 127:20	223:19 256:6
30:20 32:10 33:16	old 35:9 46:1 77:13	138:11 213:7	outcomes 30:10
38:15 59:13,21	77:22 93:19	<b>option</b> 162:4	34:4,7,12 49:15
60:3 101:10	144:11 148:12,13	orally 37:2 41:3	104:11 117:19
108:19 111:11	149:7 154:13	orange 40:21 43:9	151:12 188:19
116:9 207:9 211:8	160:10 185:12	order 22:5 27:4	198:21 199:17
211:20	older 51:9 88:3,7	43:2 45:3 47:9	outlined 95:13
occupational 146:1	91:21 146:7	99:20 123:10	236:18
148:21 149:1	oldest 159:3	170:6 236:21	outlines 202:22
154:17	once 39:4 149:2	252:20	outreach 14:22
occurred 90:9	177:22 209:11	ordered 156:2	outside 43:11
249:1	217:16	organic 31:5 163:1	136:1 182:22
occurrence 153:22	<b>One's</b> 239:17	organization 17:12	194:4
occurring 40:21	one-third 35:20	17:15 19:11 56:19	outstanding 67:22
occurs 173:18	ones 31:3 154:14	75:8 169:1 171:1	over-indulging
October 53:13 72:7	213:7 230:9	organizational 2:4	160:18
89:20 164:10	ongoing 70:2,9	5:16 7:5 11:13	over-interpreting
odd 124:1	133:20 175:17	142:12 202:3	208:9
		-	
<b>ODS</b> 20:2,7	199:5 219:18	221:8	overall 24:22

			280
190:17	parent 129:7 151:6	passion 76:11	236:3
overcome 150:7	152:11,15,19	pasta 28:13	<b>payer</b> 46:6
188:10	162:16	pasta 20.15 patchwork 58:22	payers 172:2
overkilled 149:16	parents 14:22 44:2	80:8	paying 27:2
	•		
overlap 198:17	44:5 159:14	pathogenic 196:10	payment 171:13
oversight 23:20	167:13 184:18	pathology 107:4	pays 45:22
39:17	185:10 187:15	pathophysiology 188:1	PCPs 14:20
<b>oximetry</b> 117:9	188:20 189:12		PediaSure 37:11
118:9	191:13 246:10	pathway 182:16	pediatric 20:15
P	park 238:20	183:4	108:12
P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I	part 9:3 19:6 75:19	pathways 32:14	Pediatrics 2:11
5:1	87:13 89:3 96:16	patient 4:5 16:2	7:10 20:13 57:12
•••	100:16,22 101:21	19:17 36:21 37:8	57:18 86:8,15
<b>p.m</b> 140:18,22	106:14 119:9	41:4 42:5 48:11	219:8
141:2 257:11	121:11 132:5	48:13,18 49:19	penetrance 223:20
258:5	172:10 204:15	61:7 65:20 123:1	Pennsylvania
<b>PA</b> 31:5	212:12 215:14	123:5 126:15,21	49:10
package 47:16 53:9	216:4 224:19	127:2 157:18,21	people 11:11 21:12
181:15	227:22 229:12,15	166:11 167:11	40:17 47:4 54:16
packages 131:2	236:13 248:21	169:1 185:4,7,11	58:9 60:11 61:4
133:2 136:11	partial 41:2	189:8,10,15	62:1 67:16 69:8
Packaging 38:4	participants 18:22	193:16 194:9	77:7 79:6 80:2,14
packet 16:8 43:7	19:2	200:8 201:15	82:5,16 91:12
176:9 237:19	participate 17:17	203:19 204:6	94:17 116:12
page 4:2 171:8	18:13	254:10	120:10 123:7
pages 49:17	participating	patient's 48:15	140:6 143:16
paid 44:2,5	177:19	patients 20:14 21:2	191:10 202:21
<b>Paige</b> 155:1,9	participation 17:10	21:21 31:22 33:6	208:14 224:20
palatable 26:14	19:8	37:5 44:7 45:3,5	229:19 242:19
<b>palsy</b> 148:16	particular 17:11	45:15,18 48:20	246:13
panel 10:4 15:13,18	24:17 37:19 55:14	49:5,10 50:12,17	people's 69:11
144:14 165:5	109:7 110:9	54:21 60:7,22	percent 30:15,20
174:19 177:7	123:21 153:7	61:9 62:17,18,19	44:2,4 61:8 62:3
204:15 233:6	176:1,17	63:5 65:22 67:4	62:19 63:6 122:18
234:9	particularly 20:20	110:12 165:16	167:19 175:5
panels 104:10	164:9 233:20	166:1 174:20	193:9,14,20 194:1
178:20	251:3	183:21 184:3,5,14	195:9,17 199:10
paper 42:21 43:20	partner 17:14	185:15 186:13	203:10
113:5 129:12	partnership 69:12	188:9,21 189:17	percentage 63:4
189:6 190:6,13	parts 217:10 242:4	190:2,14 197:7,14	percentile 146:3
196:19 202:22	party 58:12	198:13,18 200:1	perfect 147:5
241:12	Pasguali 181:7	200:15 223:2	, performance
papers 57:6	198:2	224:15 227:15	109:14 240:15
parallel 86:9	pass 178:2 182:16	pattern 172:5 240:9	performs 234:18
parallels 115:9	231:1	pause 160:19 213:6	period 10:11 18:19
•	passed 46:5 75:11	paused 163:6	91:3 128:15 197:7
paralyzed 207:3			00001.1
paralyzed 207:3 parameters 109:18	•	pay 50:4 69:5	227:14.17 237:9
	90:19 101:17 124:18	<b>pay</b> 50:4 69:5 149:18 187:21	227:14,17 237:9 periodic 15:10,14

п			207
Perk 233:13,17,19	physical 75:21	248:11 249:18	201:17 219:11
233:20	145:22 148:21	pilots 218:4	258:2
Perlman 2:20 173:4	149:13,14,18	<b>Pitt</b> 195:5	pleased 19:18
173:6,8	154:17	<b>PKU</b> 25:22 30:11,13	99:19
		30:20 33:6 34:13	pleasure 215:19
permanent 13:19 145:17	physician 24:9 158:21	34:20 42:7 46:14	<b>Plus</b> 203:2 217:16
-	physicians 2:10 7:6		
permission 110:12	81:4,14 86:5	48:11 49:2,5 55:17,19 56:11	<b>pocket</b> 50:5
<b>persistence</b> 63:20 <b>person</b> 77:18 93:15	110:11 157:9	57:21 58:8 62:4	point 23:7,19 31:21 37:1 41:7 47:5
96:12 126:3		62:18 68:11 69:3	85:20 107:11
207:14 220:14	physiologic 112:2	69:4,14 77:4,8,19	108:15 109:12,21
231:17	physiological 107:3	78:7,12 87:14,18	111:13 113:12
-	<b>pick</b> 12:1 74:14	89:17 91:18 94:16	
personal 148:6 personally 207:8	156:10 233:6	166:6,8,14 167:1	116:18 117:12,14 118:4,7,12 120:22
212:7 239:9	243:9 250:7	167:12,14 168:2	122:9 128:15
	<b>picked</b> 204:11	172:20 198:17	
persons 143:22 perspective 124:11	249:10	208:19	171:21 198:1,5 201:2 206:9
166:12 230:1	<b>picking</b> 243:5	place 96:22 229:17	201.2 200.9
perspectives 145:7	<b>picture</b> 62:12 185:2	placed 36:14 69:19	233:10 238:4
pertain 37:4	257:20	248:17	240:4,20 241:11
pertaining 59:18	<b>pictures</b> 166:14,16	places 45:8	245:4 249:7
<b>pH</b> 27:12 42:17	pie 137:22	places 45.8 placing 248:12	pointed 224:10
pharmaceutical	<b>piece</b> 14:19 55:14	plan 22:15,15 46:6	points 88:12 89:18
60:10	94:11 211:10	48:3,13,15 163:13	92:20 107:7 137:4
pharmacies 44:11	<b>pills</b> 54:2	167:3 170:14	207:11
pharmacological	pilot 4:6 13:15	254:11	policies 49:15 98:7
54:7,12	99:11,14 101:12	planned 34:1,15	177:5 207:4
<b>phase</b> 106:7 174:15	101:22 102:9,14	planning 234:14	policy 20:10 57:10
Phenex-2 37:19	102:20 103:10,20	plans 34:22 82:19	57:13,16 59:20,20
phenotype 123:2	105:22 108:20	87:1 164:9 169:14	78:18 79:1,10,19
184:2,10,16 189:3	111:22 112:12,16	233:14	79:19 80:2,16
phenotypic 34:12	112:21 113:2,10	plant- 85:18	81:10,16,18 82:7
182:3 190:1	114:15 115:1	plants 85:9,15	86:2,4,11,14
phenylalanine	119:17,19 120:4	plasma 111:14	88:13 93:8,22
25:20 26:22 27:8	120:15 123:7,8	185:21 186:18	94:19 95:15
27:13 30:22 31:10	124:2 128:3,21	platform 117:22	172:19
31:15,17,20 32:2	129:3,4 130:20	play 61:12 149:7,8	policymakers
32:3,9,9,10,17	131:10 132:12,13	players 59:2,2	63:11 75:2
33:11 35:15,21	133:15,21 137:11	74:17 165:8	Pompe 10:9 117:19
phenylketonuria	137:15,21 138:18	playful 145:3	202:12 228:13
23:9 42:16	153:17 175:17	<b>plays</b> 149:20	poor 31:1 66:3 70:8
phone 6:8,20 7:17	181:20 191:1	playtime 160:19	80:22
7.00 0.0 44 47	200:12 208:22	plead 222:3	population 67:16
7:22 8:2,11,17	1	<b>place 17:7</b> 10:10	83:11 106:2
141:17 142:5,22	209:22 217:5	<b>please</b> 17:7 19:10	05.11100.2
	209:22 217:5 218:6 223:17	35:13 75:11 92:17	107:19 108:3,11
141:17 142:5,22		35:13 75:11 92:17 143:19 148:2	
141:17 142:5,22 143:2,4,8 176:10	218:6 223:17	35:13 75:11 92:17	107:19 108:3,11
141:17 142:5,22 143:2,4,8 176:10 202:20	218:6 223:17 224:3 235:21	35:13 75:11 92:17 143:19 148:2	107:19 108:3,11 109:16 110:8

			200
133:3 165:20	224:1 239:20	preponderance	preventive 98:8,10
195:12 196:17,18	243:7	250:1	98:12,16
219:15 220:2	possibility 227:1	preschooler 160:10	previous 22:12
224:18 240:4,10	possible 54:3 73:10	prescribe 75:21	70:4,7 96:10,15
248:3	80:11,19 102:4	prescribed 54:8,13	103:19 131:11
<b>population-</b> 113:1,9	152:14 174:20,22	75:20	213:5 244:11
137:20 181:21	185:15 189:4	prescription 41:20	previously 25:22
population-based	226:18 227:12	41:22	107:21
104:2,21 105:16	254:9 256:11	present 1:15 2:4,16	price 187:22
112:21 114:16	post 175:10	13:15 20:22 95:2	primarily 28:16
115:14 182:4	potential 11:17	102:2 140:3	121:12 134:6
219:19 239:1	80:17	166:10 180:16	145:8
populations 88:6	potentially 188:12	183:21 230:8	primary 34:2 63:2
107:22 108:5	235:22 240:15	presentation 16:2	83:6 158:21
110:5 116:1	powder 27:15,18	19:16 20:18 64:7	principles 24:13
192:14	powder 27:13,10 powders 160:21	64:14 68:1 75:14	31:9 138:9,11
<b>Portugal</b> 197:11,15	power 28:7 55:22	95:4 99:12 100:14	<b>prior</b> 13:11 17:7,19
<b>pose</b> 100:10	power 20.7 55.22 powerful 67:1	162:19 167:18,19	20:7 34:10 46:4
poses 217:19	86:16	170:11 180:17	133:16 164:18
position 56:13	practically 155:16	181:13 201:21	176:22
positions 11:3	practice 19:22	214:21 216:3	priorities 13:12
positive 14:21 65:6	82:18	224:11 226:5	Prioritization 4:9
78:5 106:3 112:4		233:22 234:16	
	practices 39:1 47:8 73:19 74:2		16:8 180:15,22
114:20 122:4,5,11		presented 16:9	226:7 230:14
122:22 125:3,5,6	pre-symptomatic	70:3 85:6	232:10 252:15
125:9,10,12,19,19	175:9	presenters 19:1	253:21 257:3
125:22 126:5,6,10	precedent 115:10	presenting 148:6	prioritized 14:17
126:16 127:2,16	precise 111:21	162:10 186:14	private 44:13 46:5
127:18,20 147:2	precision 105:19	225:20	51:12 53:22 55:5
168:13 193:7,13	111:2	presently 215:22	90:13 135:1
193:15,22 194:7	precursor 33:1,9	president 153:2	171:13
194:12,20 195:8,8	188:5	presiding 1:13	proactive 175:12
196:13 198:4,5	predictive 215:11	presume 219:1	probably 23:7 28:8
199:11,20 206:2	215:11 247:22	presumed 196:14	33:4 38:20 45:12
209:10,13,15	248:3	preterm 126:5	49:3 61:14 65:2
210:2,18 213:12	preferred 150:15	pretty 36:6 58:11	66:14 76:10 87:19
213:16 214:15	pregnancy 42:7,8	74:16 79:7 189:22	106:9 119:21
215:10 217:8	45:16 78:4	211:4 226:6	127:15 128:10
225:8 228:1,15,21	pregnant 42:7	235:12 249:19	129:17 155:20
229:6,10,18 230:9	43:13 78:3,4	prevalence 115:4	181:4 191:18
236:21 237:22	Preliminary 175:8	128:5 240:4 243:4	192:7 202:19
239:21 242:20,21	premarket 23:20	243:16 247:22	204:2 206:5,11
243:14 247:17,21	38:18 39:8 40:4	248:3	211:17 249:19
248:14 249:1	41:20	prevent 33:12 34:3	problem 22:14
positives 122:6	prenatal 16:13	119:4	32:17 45:12 50:14
153:19 193:11	preparation 81:21	preventative 87:2,5	51:7,15 62:2
194:13 196:13	prepared 111:17	prevented 145:18	63:18 67:2,17
214:6 223:22	112:5	Prevention 169:11	121:2 161:9
214:6 223:22	112:5	Prevention 169:11	121:2 161:9

			209
200:16 205:16	50:7 52:4 53:22	223:16 239:1	44:17 59:14 229:2
208:16 217:19	58:22 59:11 60:1	244:12 254:8	
218:18 221:1	104:3 115:3		providing 20:14 45:17 74:1 134:20
223:21 234:11		prospectively	
	123:12 130:22	200:17 201:4,16	188:11,16,17
problematic 120:6	131:18,22 134:18	209:10 232:1	191:15
problems 54:10	134:21 135:2,6,15	254:10	<b>provision</b> 74:20
66:9 76:12 184:7	136:1,5,8 137:17	prospectives 205:4	187:13
220:18,22	157:21 164:17	protections 84:8	proviso 138:20
procedure 50:15 244:20	174:16 175:18 193:2 210:21	protein 28:11,12,17	psychiatric 92:6 public 2:10 4:7 7:21
		33:11,18 34:1	•
procedures 15:9,11 18:14 257:15	211:6 215:16	35:8,11 44:20 46:13 49:12 51:8	18:12,13,19,22
	216:7,13,19 217:4 231:5	51:10 52:16 54:7	19:2,4,7,7 53:9,12 62:5 72:1 78:18
proceed 202:18 205:22	prohibitive 49:22		
	•	68:5 85:14,15,17 160:17 184:20	79:1,10,18 86:13
proceedings 58:15 process 11:5	project 10:11 15:1 81:7 139:15 155:5		91:3 101:16 103:21 104:11,16
101:10 102:3,19	177:3	protocol 115:1 128:6 213:20	103:21 104:11,16
103:7 105:11	prolongs 175:13	214:7 245:6,7	140:19 143:15,17
114:7 123:1 137:1	prom 167:4	protocols 190:3,21	171:13 172:18
178:4 214:4	promote 15:5 86:16	200:18 213:22	180:10,12 211:6
222:11 227:13	promoting 15:4	proud 145:3 203:18	212:2,3 222:12
237:7 238:8,11	85:21 134:4	prouder 150:8	223:1,16 230:4
246:10,11,20	promotion 93:6	prove 76:7 77:12	231:17 232:19
251:14	prompt 240:20	78:10,12 213:14	246:6,11,19 250:4
processed 40:20	promptly 140:18	229:17	publication 43:7
processes 179:13	pronounced	proven 153:14	58:15 240:13
produce 26:11	184:11	226:13	published 18:14
produced 183:6	pronunciation	provide 9:15 13:20	42:22 43:20 57:6
product 26:22	161:11	16:16 22:14 24:18	57:22 64:21 65:15
33:13 36:22 37:9	proper 19:12	28:15,15 42:5	189:7 193:5
42:5	properly 165:19	43:17 45:3,14	241:14
products 22:8 23:8	proponent 85:12	60:4 71:7 75:1	<b>pull</b> 79:5 100:7
25:1,7 26:5,11	proponents 84:7	94:4 95:16 99:5	235:19
27:6,9,20,21 28:3	191:20 201:11,17	134:12 135:20	pulled 93:10 223:5
39:6 40:3,13 42:6	202:20 254:1	136:5 137:18	pulling 133:16
44:15 45:3 50:16	proposal 119:15	139:3,15 172:16	pulse 117:9 118:9
51:9 54:18 55:6	proposals 9:8	176:20 188:9	punted 168:22
68:12 85:16	propose 192:10	190:15 192:13	<b>puppy</b> 155:9
professional 57:4	proposed 105:16	206:5 221:13	purchase 44:10
60:8 171:1	119:15,20 120:3	provided 14:20	purchased 43:4
program 5:13 10:3	127:22 128:7	20:8 50:17 55:11	<b>purpose</b> 10:5
10:5 109:12	177:17 191:3	87:3 101:2 129:2	101:21 103:18
115:14 126:11	192:17 233:4	130:18 136:1	116:7 117:17
132:17 191:17	proposing 120:16	221:14	173:13
210:13 212:5,13	prospective 181:20	<b>provider</b> 42:4 54:9	purposes 104:13
229:17	194:22 197:3,19	providers 21:2	<b>pursue</b> 82:13
			<b>D</b>
programs 7:19	199:4 200:9,11	58:12 187:21	Puryear 2:21 87:11
programs 7:19 44:15,21 47:21,22	199:4 200:9,11 211:9 214:1	58:12 187:21 provides 18:4	87:11 88:12,16

			290
116:21,21 117:11	233:15	readily 43:7	239:6 241:4 242:5
118:3,11,17	quick 116:13	readiness 217:1	242:8 243:20
<b>push</b> 86:11	160:20 240:16	reading 120:10,10	245:20 246:11,15
pushback 84:6	244:9	readmit 76:21	247:7 250:18
put 18:17 23:2,4,16	quicker 241:20	ready 16:11 19:15	<b>reason</b> 29:12 39:9
24:14 41:8 45:2	quickly 34:19 87:22	27:15,18 28:2	71:6 185:16
52:14 77:1 92:5	94:16 152:17	109:15 141:3	187:22 205:5
144:21 160:18	182:14 199:2	210:5 221:20	219:9 243:19
166:13 177:15	226:18 227:2	reagents 191:11	244:18
179:4 185:7	235:19 249:19	real 69:9 78:8 85:12	<b>reasonable</b> 214:12
			227:10 243:11
230:17 235:2	quite 19:3 21:6 75:1	86:11 108:18,22	
243:19 251:12	96:4 106:6	109:2 140:13	reasonably 218:21
putting 28:8 118:12	<b>quote</b> 58:5	203:11 215:15	225:10
127:15 130:8	quoted 88:21	218:8 220:13	reasons 65:11 69:3
147:19 230:4	quoting 89:9	247:9	207:18
<b>puzzle</b> 94:11	161:13	realistically 84:10	Reauthorization
Q	R	realize 107:17	18:1
		120:8 151:22	recall 125:2
qualified 11:15	<b>R</b> 2:5,9	236:3	receive 13:18 17:5
54:8 178:3	raise 206:10	realized 181:17	157:1 205:12
quality 15:4 101:11	raised 75:5 115:12	really 31:7 51:19	received 9:5 17:16
130:21 137:19	138:15 166:15	58:17 62:5 65:18	91:4 149:4 150:11
162:14 171:3	222:11	70:3,8 76:1 84:11	150:19 180:12
175:14 191:17	ran 224:15	84:17 85:6 88:3	receiving 176:8
question 18:22	range 27:22 105:19	88:12 90:16 93:5	recessive 173:17
65:3,14 68:2 79:9	160:15 182:3	93:14 94:15,20	recite 24:2
82:6 85:13 89:14	Rani 2:22 91:15	98:22 100:14	reckless 161:17
103:4 114:9	<b>rapidly</b> 156:8	102:10 103:13	recognize 63:12
115:12,21 116:13	rare 20:3,5 56:20	109:8,11,21	102:8 128:20
116:22 118:8	158:7 177:19	113:16,21 117:3	133:19 168:4
119:19 132:6	184:9 213:1,18	118:21,21 121:2	178:21 226:10
134:16,22 135:19	214:3 224:6,22		
	214.0 224.0,22	122:19 124:4	recognized 21:14
162:7 167:8	225:14 249:8	122:19 124:4 126:10 127:11	recognized 21:14 24:12 158:17
162:7 167:8 169:20 179:20	225:14 249:8 250:2,19		5
162:7 167:8 169:20 179:20 181:18 206:10,22	225:14 249:8 250:2,19 <b>rate</b> 153:21 193:7	126:10 127:11	24:12 158:17
162:7 167:8 169:20 179:20 181:18 206:10,22 207:1 208:21	225:14 249:8 250:2,19	126:10 127:11 147:9 151:2	24:12 158:17 226:12 234:9
162:7 167:8 169:20 179:20 181:18 206:10,22	225:14 249:8 250:2,19 <b>rate</b> 153:21 193:7	126:10 127:11 147:9 151:2 163:15 172:21	24:12 158:17 226:12 234:9 252:9 recognizes 179:18
162:7 167:8 169:20 179:20 181:18 206:10,22 207:1 208:21	225:14 249:8 250:2,19 <b>rate</b> 153:21 193:7 193:13,22 194:7	126:10 127:11 147:9 151:2 163:15 172:21 174:10 186:5 191:13 192:4,22	24:12 158:17 226:12 234:9 252:9 recognizes 179:18
162:7 167:8 169:20 179:20 181:18 206:10,22 207:1 208:21 212:2,16 221:10	225:14 249:8 250:2,19 rate 153:21 193:7 193:13,22 194:7 194:12 195:8	126:10 127:11 147:9 151:2 163:15 172:21 174:10 186:5 191:13 192:4,22 194:19 200:5,19	24:12 158:17 226:12 234:9 252:9 recognizes 179:18 recognizing 133:22 231:18 236:9
162:7 167:8 169:20 179:20 181:18 206:10,22 207:1 208:21 212:2,16 221:10 221:19 226:5	225:14 249:8 250:2,19 rate 153:21 193:7 193:13,22 194:7 194:12 195:8 199:11,20 219:17	126:10 127:11 147:9 151:2 163:15 172:21 174:10 186:5 191:13 192:4,22 194:19 200:5,19 201:5 202:10	24:12 158:17 226:12 234:9 252:9 recognizes 179:18 recognizing 133:22 231:18 236:9 recollections 225:5
162:7 167:8 169:20 179:20 181:18 206:10,22 207:1 208:21 212:2,16 221:10 221:19 226:5 232:14 236:13	225:14 249:8 250:2,19 rate 153:21 193:7 193:13,22 194:7 194:12 195:8 199:11,20 219:17 ratio 65:15 193:9	126:10 127:11 147:9 151:2 163:15 172:21 174:10 186:5 191:13 192:4,22 194:19 200:5,19 201:5 202:10 206:3 210:12	24:12 158:17 226:12 234:9 252:9 recognizes 179:18 recognizing 133:22 231:18 236:9 recollections 225:5 recommend 74:22
162:7 167:8 169:20 179:20 181:18 206:10,22 207:1 208:21 212:2,16 221:10 221:19 226:5 232:14 236:13 239:13 240:18	225:14 249:8 250:2,19 rate 153:21 193:7 193:13,22 194:7 194:12 195:8 199:11,20 219:17 ratio 65:15 193:9 ratios 186:9	126:10 127:11 147:9 151:2 163:15 172:21 174:10 186:5 191:13 192:4,22 194:19 200:5,19 201:5 202:10 206:3 210:12 212:1 214:20	24:12 158:17 226:12 234:9 252:9 recognizes 179:18 recognizing 133:22 231:18 236:9 recollections 225:5
162:7 167:8 169:20 179:20 181:18 206:10,22 207:1 208:21 212:2,16 221:10 221:19 226:5 232:14 236:13 239:13 240:18 244:10 249:2	225:14 249:8 250:2,19 rate 153:21 193:7 193:13,22 194:7 194:12 195:8 199:11,20 219:17 ratio 65:15 193:9 ratios 186:9 RDI 160:17	126:10 127:11 147:9 151:2 163:15 172:21 174:10 186:5 191:13 192:4,22 194:19 200:5,19 201:5 202:10 206:3 210:12 212:1 214:20 215:4,16 216:4	24:12 158:17 226:12 234:9 252:9 recognizes 179:18 recognizing 133:22 231:18 236:9 recollections 225:5 recommend 74:22 162:7 235:8 253:22
162:7 167:8 169:20 179:20 181:18 206:10,22 207:1 208:21 212:2,16 221:10 221:19 226:5 232:14 236:13 239:13 240:18 244:10 249:2 253:18	225:14 249:8 250:2,19 rate 153:21 193:7 193:13,22 194:7 194:12 195:8 199:11,20 219:17 ratio 65:15 193:9 ratios 186:9 RDI 160:17 re-look 70:19 97:9	126:10 127:11 147:9 151:2 163:15 172:21 174:10 186:5 191:13 192:4,22 194:19 200:5,19 201:5 202:10 206:3 210:12 212:1 214:20 215:4,16 216:4 217:17 218:2,18	24:12 158:17 226:12 234:9 252:9 recognizes 179:18 recognizing 133:22 231:18 236:9 recollections 225:5 recommend 74:22 162:7 235:8 253:22 recommendation
162:7 167:8 169:20 179:20 181:18 206:10,22 207:1 208:21 212:2,16 221:10 221:19 226:5 232:14 236:13 239:13 240:18 244:10 249:2 253:18 <b>questions</b> 10:13 43:22 64:19 75:7	225:14 249:8 250:2,19 rate 153:21 193:7 193:13,22 194:7 194:12 195:8 199:11,20 219:17 ratio 65:15 193:9 ratios 186:9 RDI 160:17 re-look 70:19 97:9 reach 159:4 reached 64:3	126:10 127:11 147:9 151:2 163:15 172:21 174:10 186:5 191:13 192:4,22 194:19 200:5,19 201:5 202:10 206:3 210:12 212:1 214:20 215:4,16 216:4 217:17 218:2,18 219:4 221:2	24:12 158:17 226:12 234:9 252:9 recognizes 179:18 recognizing 133:22 231:18 236:9 recollections 225:5 recommend 74:22 162:7 235:8 253:22 recommendation 9:7 51:22 70:4
162:7 167:8 169:20 179:20 181:18 206:10,22 207:1 208:21 212:2,16 221:10 221:19 226:5 232:14 236:13 239:13 240:18 244:10 249:2 253:18 <b>questions</b> 10:13 43:22 64:19 75:7 100:9 166:19,22	225:14 249:8 250:2,19 rate 153:21 193:7 193:13,22 194:7 194:12 195:8 199:11,20 219:17 ratio 65:15 193:9 ratios 186:9 RDI 160:17 re-look 70:19 97:9 reach 159:4	126:10 127:11 147:9 151:2 163:15 172:21 174:10 186:5 191:13 192:4,22 194:19 200:5,19 201:5 202:10 206:3 210:12 212:1 214:20 215:4,16 216:4 217:17 218:2,18 219:4 221:2 223:11,17 224:4,5	24:12 158:17 226:12 234:9 252:9 recognizes 179:18 recognizing 133:22 231:18 236:9 recollections 225:5 recommend 74:22 162:7 235:8 253:22 recommendation 9:7 51:22 70:4 74:15 105:12
162:7 167:8 169:20 179:20 181:18 206:10,22 207:1 208:21 212:2,16 221:10 221:19 226:5 232:14 236:13 239:13 240:18 244:10 249:2 253:18 <b>questions</b> 10:13 43:22 64:19 75:7 100:9 166:19,22 167:7 181:14	225:14 249:8 250:2,19 rate 153:21 193:7 193:13,22 194:7 194:12 195:8 199:11,20 219:17 ratio 65:15 193:9 ratios 186:9 RDI 160:17 re-look 70:19 97:9 reach 159:4 reached 64:3 read 24:5,6 100:13 103:17 105:13	126:10 127:11 147:9 151:2 163:15 172:21 174:10 186:5 191:13 192:4,22 194:19 200:5,19 201:5 202:10 206:3 210:12 212:1 214:20 215:4,16 216:4 217:17 218:2,18 219:4 221:2 223:11,17 224:4,5 224:20 225:2	24:12 158:17 226:12 234:9 252:9 recognizes 179:18 recognizing 133:22 231:18 236:9 recollections 225:5 recommend 74:22 162:7 235:8 253:22 recommendation 9:7 51:22 70:4 74:15 105:12 108:7 109:7 112:7
162:7 167:8 169:20 179:20 181:18 206:10,22 207:1 208:21 212:2,16 221:10 221:19 226:5 232:14 236:13 239:13 240:18 244:10 249:2 253:18 <b>questions</b> 10:13 43:22 64:19 75:7 100:9 166:19,22	225:14 249:8 250:2,19 rate 153:21 193:7 193:13,22 194:7 194:12 195:8 199:11,20 219:17 ratio 65:15 193:9 ratios 186:9 RDI 160:17 re-look 70:19 97:9 reach 159:4 reached 64:3 read 24:5,6 100:13	126:10 127:11 147:9 151:2 163:15 172:21 174:10 186:5 191:13 192:4,22 194:19 200:5,19 201:5 202:10 206:3 210:12 212:1 214:20 215:4,16 216:4 217:17 218:2,18 219:4 221:2 223:11,17 224:4,5	24:12 158:17 226:12 234:9 252:9 recognizes 179:18 recognizing 133:22 231:18 236:9 recollections 225:5 recommend 74:22 162:7 235:8 253:22 recommendation 9:7 51:22 70:4

290

			291
129:1 130:17	refine 59:12 100:18	related 212:15	reported 190.9
		related 212:15	reported 189:8
131:12 132:9	127:17	relates 59:19	191:19
133:14 134:5	refined 100:8	relative 64:22 177:5	reports 73:13
137:12 164:18	refinement 128:10	178:14 235:11	170:13
200:22 239:15	reflect 108:4 110:7	relatively 150:11	repository 223:4
242:1,3,10 252:1	195:11	151:20 187:18	253:5,11,14
252:11 253:16,20	reform 52:13,15	227:2	represent 153:4
257:2	99:1	release 31:19	209:1
recommendations	<b>regard</b> 93:9	released 41:15	representative 5:8
9:9,12,14 13:16	regarding 10:3	53:13	5:14
53:5 58:14 96:20	47:17 53:15 57:7	relevance 133:21	representatives 2:4
100:15,19 101:5,9	86:22 102:9	relevant 130:19	5:17 7:5 11:14
101:19,22 102:1,7	128:21 132:4	131:10 186:20	75:9 142:12 202:3
105:5,8 106:10	190:17 217:9	192:14	221:9
107:6,20 116:14	regardless 58:3	relief 144:19	representing 6:15
121:12 130:6	63:19	reluctant 67:12	6:17 7:5 170:21
138:13,19,20	regards 133:12	remain 166:1	represents 35:20
139:5,16 190:10	regeneration	190:19	request 52:2,17
190:15 210:1	187:11	remainder 173:14	134:13 136:8
231:6 252:14	region 48:9	remains 135:19	164:8 165:2
recommended 10:4	regional 48:7	Remarks 4:3	173:13 235:3
52:12 54:19 81:9	131:20	remember 19:10	requesting 164:5
90:3 97:1 104:10	regionalized 192:7	36:13 42:8 71:3	178:8
164:11 174:19	Register 18:15,18	166:13 198:16	requests 136:13
177:7 201:10,11	registered 38:22	219:10 228:5	require 30:2,4,4
234:8 248:22	registry 241:13	remembering	38:11,18 40:3
recommending	regular 42:14	71:15	41:22 42:3 49:5
206:4 252:21	160:17 192:2	remind 11:12 14:16	53:22 192:5
reconsider 237:21	regulate 84:4	17:9 124:14	228:20
reconstituted	regulated 38:2,3	reminder 15:19	required 23:13
27:15	39:16	21:11	27:10 29:16 39:22
record 19:7 140:21	regulation 42:1	reminders 17:1	102:18,20 105:9
171:11 173:15	regulations 38:16	removed 55:6	165:13
258:5	38:17 40:11 59:8	removing 134:10	requirement 55:5
recording 19:12	regulatory 23:19	replacing 11:1	requirements 14:7
rectify 22:13	39:20	replicate 179:8	24:12 36:18 37:15
<b>recuse</b> 17:10	reimbursed 44:13	report 4:6 13:16	38:8 40:2 104:8
red 20:16 35:6	187:17	48:6 53:12 72:4,6	121:18
reduce 21:18 34:3	reimbursement	81:7 89:19,22	requires 36:21 87:1
188:14 224:5	22:12 26:16 45:11	95:11,12 96:20	110:1,2 168:14
<b>Reed</b> 20:12	51:3,6,11 52:1	99:11,17 100:5,11	requiring 63:2
reference 105:20	56:12 58:11 61:6	103:18 113:15	research 20:3 59:8
110:20 191:16	61:11 62:8	138:18 164:10	59:16 61:7 74:19
referral 240:9	reinforced 237:5	168:19 180:16	104:6,8,17 137:18
referred 10:8	reiterated 51:22	193:10 194:6	193:18
169:17	55:12	195:3 197:11	researchers 60:9
		201:15 254:9	residents 20:15
referring 89:11	reject 237:18		
123.4	1 <b>ejecieu</b> 40.10	1eportable 105.19	100.12
125:4	rejected 48:15	reportable 105:19	residual 188:12

			23
resolution 55:18,21	229:1,13	109:20 112:7	176:18 177:11,1
81:12	retrospectively	116:11,19 118:19	177:16 178:1,4
resolutions 55:22	193:7 194:11	120:21 121:21	198:15 199:9
resolve 214:18	196:5 209:7	127:14 128:19	204:13 206:15
resources 1:3 2:2	211:12 224:21	131:14 135:16	221:21 232:13
9:17 56:15 102:13	240:17 253:7	136:6 144:15	244:17,21 245:1
134:21 137:11	review 4:10 15:10	202:14 206:6	246:21 247:3
157:20 159:12	15:14 16:8,12	209:9,14 210:3	248:17 249:1
respect 29:5 45:11	23:21 38:19 39:8	212:21 217:20	251:13
109:17 110:4	41:21 58:16 59:12	219:13 229:12	<b>Ryan</b> 144:11,12
115:3 120:2 128:5	101:10 102:2,3,19	232:22 238:1	145:20 146:7
128:8 133:21	102:22 103:6,13	247:11 256:6	147:10
207:12 208:21	105:11 114:5,6	257:8	<b>Ryan's</b> 145:5,12
			-
respects 138:2	124:16,17 133:17	rigorous 23:13	146:16,22 147:1
respond 87:21	148:4 170:12	rings 130:10	S
response 9:15 52:6	174:17 178:4	risk 30:19 172:8	<b>S</b> 2:14
52:11,21,22,22	179:10 190:14	<b>Robert</b> 2:9 7:6	-
53:4 70:5 71:19	201:3,6 205:2,17	robust 11:17	S-adenosyl 188:1
73:15 114:3	205:19,22 207:7	211:11	S-E-S-S-I-O-N
221:16 241:18	214:16 215:14,18	Rockville 1:13	141:1
responsibilities	217:17 221:12,14	role 15:4 59:17,19	saddled 61:1
14:3,13	222:11,12 226:18	roles 81:6	safe 147:9 154:3
responsibility	227:5,13 231:8	<b>roll</b> 5:15 141:4	213:4
157:13 165:18	232:12,15,16	234:21	safety 103:22
responsible 40:11	235:9,15,17 236:4	room 1:12 96:12	114:11 214:9
59:4,10	236:8 237:6 238:8	152:2 166:1	<b>saliva</b> 107:8
rest 46:15 55:7	240:21 242:1	rooms 257:22	Samantha 159:3
154:11 161:22	244:3,7,13,16	roughly 243:15	161:3,4,5
211:3	245:3,11,14	roundtable 176:11	sample 34:19
Restore 28:5	251:18 253:22	176:18	111:12 194:3
restrict 33:9,10	254:13,17 257:4	routine 91:14	243:3
restricting 188:16	reviewed 219:18	rub 231:14	samples 110:4,7
restriction 184:20	240:14 250:21	rubric 104:16	111:4,9 193:6,17
restrictive 50:8	reviewing 111:1	rules 244:8	194:12 196:5
resubmit 201:18	181:15	run 149:7 179:3,20	197:13 224:14
result 9:18 31:4	reviews 183:18	222:19 227:19	228:2
226:14	186:13	228:3	sampling 211:14
resulting 41:12	revision 111:20	running 181:8	<b>San</b> 154:19
163:7 164:19	128:13,16 130:16	212:10	Sanford 12:8
results 14:21	revisions 138:5	Rural 82:5	Sarkar 2:2 7:2,3
186:18,21	rewritten 243:2	<b>RUSP</b> 9:10 16:6	9:22 16:21 87:7
resumed 140:21			89:8 142:9,10
rethink 123:21	rice 28:14	29:6,11,12,19	245:13 256:21
	rid 194:13	68:6 89:10,12	257:6,9
retired 12:9	ride 161:7,15	92:22 103:8	save 157:14 158:8
retrospective	right 8:7 26:20	113:22 119:15	238:10
110:17 211:13	29:11 67:3 69:16	139:18 157:7	
213:15 223:13	72:5 80:1 92:18	162:8 165:14	<b>saves</b> 18:1 154:8 160:7
224:13 227:22	94:2,3 99:9 104:4	175:22 176:11,12	

saving 69:10 155:16 savings 94:7 saw 64:15 166:10 167:18	screened 10:7 29:5 60:19 124:20 126:16 150:5	214:7 215:16 216:7,19,19	95:20 96:8 99:19 103:2 105:1 108:7
155:16 savings 94:7 saw 64:15 166:10 167:18	60:19 124:20		
savings 94:7 saw 64:15 166:10 167:18			
<b>saw</b> 64:15 166:10 167:18		219:20 220:21	110:8,11 116:12
167:18	195:1,6 198:2	224:14 226:13	118:22 122:18
	205:11 223:22,22	228:2 229:17	128:14,16 133:7
covina 6/1.00 /2.12	screening 5:13	232:22 234:1,9	138:4,11 150:19
saying 54:22 73:13 84:11 87:10 94:3	10:2,4 14:21 15:1	235:11 244:13	158:3 182:21
121:19 123:15	15:16,17 16:4,14	248:19 251:9	183:20 185:1,4,5
125:15 127:18	18:1 34:11,14	254:8	185:7 187:11
211:21 229:9	44:21 45:1 47:13	screenings 87:3	221:15 223:5
231:5 245:11,12	47:16 50:9,11	106:17	231:16 250:14
248:6 250:13	87:8,14,16 89:12	Scriver's 185:1	seeing 73:1 95:11
252:20	90:22 91:17 92:9	se 113:1	95:12 174:11
		-	
says 24:15 27:1	93:1 98:17,18	second 24:5 81:19	seek 49:20 81:16
85:12 98:17	101:14 103:20	93:3 100:10	81:17
129:13 134:17	104:3 105:15,17	104:22 128:20	seen 47:7,9 119:12
178:3 208:11	106:7 111:1	156:15 162:4	seizing 147:16
232:10	112:11,14,21	181:20 191:18	<b>seizures</b> 144:16
scale 124:7	114:16 115:1,3,5	192:6,9,12 193:12	151:10 154:9
scales 214:10,13	115:5 116:3 117:1	194:1,5,14 195:9	156:7 159:9,19
scary 148:18	117:5,7,12,22	236:11 241:2,8	select 46:16
scenarios 124:1	118:14,14 119:1,6	242:18 248:4	self-insured 47:21
scheduled 14:15	119:9 121:6	252:12 254:19	Senate 53:20 55:18
<b>school</b> 28:7,9	122:17 123:11,11	second-class	send 96:8 130:10
145:21 151:3	126:3 128:6,7,9,9	70:16	218:10 245:2
154:19 156:21	129:4,9 132:4	secondary 112:12	senior 20:10
163:3 167:2	137:15,21 140:12	seconded 252:13	sense 95:7 104:18
<b>school's</b> 155:5	144:2 145:19	secondly 65:2	136:17 177:22
<b>SCID</b> 113:5,9	147:4,6,19 151:6	160:3	179:2 244:1
115:10 121:16	152:21 153:18	secret 147:14	sensitive 173:12
122:7 126:4 215:5	156:19 163:5,17	Secretary 9:6 17:3	216:14
225:1,3 228:13	164:17 165:5	51:19 52:6,20	sensitivity 199:7,10
248:22	168:6 171:16	53:7 70:7,14,15	199:20 203:9
science 59:17	172:16 173:5	71:7 73:15 86:21	sent 52:11 82:6
scientific 24:13	174:2,4,19 175:16	89:9,21 90:7 95:9	86:21 138:21
58:16 213:17	175:18 177:7	96:9,11,17 97:9	164:4 241:16
scope 18:4 61:3	178:14 179:8	164:4 165:2	sentences 144:21
scores 146:2	182:4 185:17	168:17	separate 104:17
160:15	190:22 191:3	Secretary's 20:8	114:9 191:8 233:2
Scott 1:20 2:21	192:3,10,11,17	70:4 164:8	September 19:21
136:2 181:3	193:2,4,6 194:3,4	section 140:19	sequencing 196:5
Scottish 195:16	194:11,22 195:6	sections 24:7	196:7
screen 21:15 29:4	196:4 197:3,12,20	secure 56:16	serious 33:2
31:3 35:2 69:4,17	198:1 199:2,4,8	security 54:17 55:9	173:22 181:19
108:12,13 118:22	199:13,18,19	257:21	189:20 198:10
120:11 126:4	200:4,9 201:5,13	see 26:8 37:18	200:11 204:9
132:18 177:5	203:15,21 204:2	40:19 43:10 46:19	206:19
223:7 232:1	204:17,18 206:21	65:19 70:6 86:7	seriously 36:21

450.47	ah ant (anna 74.00	450.0	0.04.00.0.57.0
159:17	<b>short-term</b> 74:22	156:9	8:21 20:9 57:8
seriousness	132:20	<b>Singh</b> 2:22 91:15	61:4 65:1 67:18
226:10	shortened 101:18	91:15	93:18 94:12
serotonin 33:1,3	shortly 9:4 11:8	single 29:20 45:13	170:17,21
serum 111:14	188:22 198:22	195:7 201:3 206:1	sock 218:17
serve 5:14 17:13	shot 86:6	210:18 230:21	<b>sodium</b> 154:6
215:19	<b>show</b> 25:17 33:15	sit 94:18 166:6	184:21 188:17
served 203:15	34:18 37:15 88:17	sitting 57:1	208:4
service 1:3 101:16	94:7 109:14,15	situation 69:16	software 191:13
140:10	113:18,20 123:8	95:12 170:15	<b>sole</b> 48:21
services 1:1 2:2	124:6 139:7	184:8 226:13	solely 19:8
15:15 17:3 50:16	182:15 228:3	239:11	<b>solid</b> 211:4
52:18 59:14 60:5	showing 26:4	situations 69:18	solution 74:22
71:2,5 90:4 98:9	93:19	224:22	<b>solutions</b> 165:10
98:11,12,16	shown 175:11	<b>six</b> 46:14 157:5	solve 33:7 60:16
156:22	shows 11:19 13:12	225:5 256:6	somebody 24:15
session 140:16	77:14 123:7	Sixteen 46:16	66:13 93:3 99:21
141:4 143:15	224:17 250:17	size 238:20 243:3	122:12 208:10
180:11 256:17	<b>sick</b> 37:5 66:5,6	243:15	212:5
sessions 169:7	sicker 66:10	<b>skills</b> 11:20	somebody's 219:5
set 13:13 101:20	side 32:14 83:8	<b>skirting</b> 88:16	somewhat 184:10
170:5 179:9	84:15 145:15	<b>sky</b> 137:22	son 144:10 145:17
207:21 238:6,11	216:6 249:14	slam 157:10 207:9	146:21 148:11
sets 18:8	sight 208:12	246:14	154:12 160:8
setting 213:7 215:1	sights 170:5	slide 11:19 13:12	soon 174:20 226:16
seven 48:8 168:22	<b>sign</b> 257:20	34:9 35:18 71:3	233:21 254:9
256:5,7	signed 143:16	71:17,18 181:1	256:11
severe 30:11	significance	196:3	sorry 118:21 125:7
145:11 153:9	186:22 192:20,21	slides 100:5	126:18 132:2,3
162:2 175:4 184:2	significant 61:5,10	slightly 30:1	135:10 252:6
189:3	95:4 163:8 172:8	<b>slip</b> 156:8 230:19	256:6
severely 28:17 69:6	174:8 185:5	sloppy 27:5	sort 27:5 28:19
severity 251:4	silent 47:17	<b>slow</b> 159:3	45:2 46:9 58:16
sexes 218:13	<b>SIMD</b> 57:16 75:13	<b>slowly</b> 156:7	79:13,14 81:22
share 145:16 180:3	120:7 171:12	<b>SMA</b> 173:9,10,16	88:16 122:6,15
shared 73:20 81:14	207:6,9 209:1,1,2	174:1,3,10,13,18	129:10 133:22
Sheer 159:22	217:22 234:4	175:5,6,12,16,20	137:4 211:21
sheets 14:19	241:19 242:15	175:22 176:2	216:22 217:8
<b>Shield</b> 48:19	similar 55:7 58:5	small 33:22 45:15	220:12 223:12
150:12	115:2 116:8,9	48:7 63:4 67:16	230:19 238:15,20
<b>SHONE</b> 2:21	118:13 121:17	113:17 136:19	239:17
134:15 135:19	128:4 166:16	175:3 220:4 236:5	sorts 83:19
shore 78:20	184:10,16 198:14	smarter 66:14	sought 106:6
short 10:19 51:11	199:15	smidgeon 214:5	sound 112:5 130:4
79:18 128:14	simple 35:1 154:8	<b>soccer</b> 149:20	130:13 139:8
144:21 160:11	155:11 160:22	Social 54:17	sounds 129:21
202:20	212:1 232:2,6	societies 60:8	130:8 139:9
<b>short-</b> 240:15	<b>simply</b> 56:1 154:5	society 2:7,13 8:18	214:11 222:6

			29
240:12	spelling 149:21	141:4 156:14	22:3 31:18 42:1
source 33:18 45:21	Spencer 2:20 173:4	224:2	44:16,22 46:5,11
48:22 52:18	173:8	started 5:7 22:5	46:12,14,14,16,18
125:17 187:9		144:15 198:22	47:5,19 48:9
	spend 61:5,8,10 128:12		
sources 45:6 229:7		starting 72:10	59:22 60:3 68:8,8
speak 76:1 93:7	spending 61:13	179:20	69:4,13 73:19
96:1 110:22 144:5	spends 61:4	starts 43:12 183:5	74:2 75:16 79:14
202:5 207:11	spent 20:12 26:10	state 2:6 5:11,13	80:5,12,14,15,22
233:16,19	156:20	8:1 15:6 19:10	86:22 91:13 95:13
speaking 151:11	spinal 173:5,16	27:17 45:4 46:5,7	104:9 110:5,10
207:8 233:18	<b>spinning</b> 8:5 79:13	46:22 47:8,10,21	117:21 121:15
242:15	<b>spoke</b> 176:19 235:4	48:2 49:15 50:7	128:8 135:1,13
spec 192:4 233:11	<b>Spong</b> 1:21 6:3,4	52:4 58:22,22	136:10,13 172:4,
special 5:10 23:3	12:20 131:4	60:2,3 63:9,12	172:13 177:4,12
23:16 25:4 36:12	141:13,14 204:21	64:8 65:8 68:14	178:18,19 179:7
38:1 57:14 69:14	205:13 236:12	69:10,20 79:11	179:21 192:13
145:20 151:1	237:20 255:5,6	80:5 81:16 90:16	218:2,5 244:5
152:7 156:21	<b>sponsors</b> 56:16	90:19 91:8,13	247:1
specialized 171:14	<b>sports</b> 28:5	98:6 104:2 108:4	stating 150:14
specially 36:20	<b>spot</b> 106:18 109:22	109:12 115:3	statistical 218:20
<b>specific</b> 24:9 25:19	111:6 117:5	120:13 121:5	statistics 156:5
36:15 37:14,16	153:15 199:1	130:21,22 131:17	223:10 225:9
41:12 42:10 60:2	spots 16:15 106:2	131:18,19 133:13	status 63:9 193:3
68:15 72:15 87:17	106:17 108:16	134:11,16,18	statutes 22:2,19
101:9 103:2 105:1	110:13,17 111:7	135:4,5,9,12,14	36:9
107:5 108:8	114:18 118:13	135:15,18 136:5	statutory 22:10
119:12 129:22	185:22 209:8	137:3,7 149:17	stay 189:17
132:8 178:8 187:1	223:4 227:15,19	156:18 157:1	stem 251:2
specifically 23:8	240:17 253:6	164:17 175:18	step 79:21 186:16
40:20 47:11 54:18	springs 149:11	177:2 178:6	<b>STEPHEN</b> 1:19
82:8 88:22 93:7	stable 109:13	205:11 215:16	steps 101:13 246:
98:18 108:20	110:20 137:18	216:18 217:3	247:11 257:7
126:3 136:12	staff 19:20 20:8	218:6 225:7 231:5	stepsister 146:8
191:19 203:13	257:21	235:17 249:18	Steve 6:13 12:6
234:3,4	stake 71:4	state's 179:12	13:4 67:20 71:11
specifics 108:2	stand 152:3	state-based 137:17	139:20 141:20
specimens 106:3,4	standard 17:1	stated 114:11	207:1 255:13
108:17 109:3	214:2 220:14	statement 56:1	<b>Steven</b> 163:2
111:18 112:4,5	standardized 146:4	57:16 58:1,8,10	164:19 168:11
spectrometry	213:22	82:8 93:8 95:9,15	stick 143:19 231:2
192:1	standards 15:8	100:21 101:3	243:21 244:4
spectroscopy	18:8 257:15	124:10 170:18	sticking 243:13
159:20	standing 14:1	171:4,9,10,18	sticks 160:17
spectrum 159:11	257:10	172:22	stipulates 98:15
182:2 190:1	standpoint 79:10	<b>statements</b> 19:3,6	stolen 146:14
speech 145:22	213:17	37:22 56:13 57:10	stood 174:7
•	start 5:17 26:17	57:13,19,20 99:21	stop 104:22 106:10
1/18:21 1/10:1			1 JIVH 104.22 100.10
148:21 149:1 154:19 161:7,10	111:13 140:18	states 9:16 10:6	116:11 165:22

			290
242:22 249:11	242:19 248:11	suffered 148:19	supporting 134:1
stopped 144:17	254:8	sufficient 33:3	supportive 194:19
189:14			
	study 4:6 13:15	108:1 119:20	supports 171:2
storage 233:3	99:11,14 102:20	125:22 188:9	supposed 82:10
stored 228:2	108:20 111:10	234:20 243:3	122:10 215:14
stores 187:16	112:16 114:19	sufficiently 114:19	253:12
story 55:16 123:3	115:1 116:6 118:9	116:8 117:7	supposedly 91:12
145:15 148:6	123:16,18 124:2	120:17 132:22	sure 24:2 28:20
152:16,17	128:3 132:14	suggested 221:11	34:21 78:19 92:19
straight 77:14	138:19 153:20	226:22	102:1 117:2 127:9
247:1	177:3 190:14	suggestion 74:11	127:21 128:1
strapped 154:10	191:1 193:19	suggestions 72:20	132:15 133:6
strategy 100:16	194:9 195:21	168:16	137:6 156:18
199:19 200:3	200:12 227:13	suggestive 186:14	158:15 179:5
street 257:17	238:20 239:1	<b>Suhr</b> 3:1 176:10,12	223:17 248:6
strengthen 78:21	243:14 249:18	176:13 180:9	256:7
stress 31:19 61:17	Study's 101:22	suitable 28:3	Surgeon 169:10
strict 40:2 200:3	stuff 83:20 87:20	Suite 1:13	Surinamese 196:27
213:6	<b>sub</b> 132:10	summary 198:9	surround 25:16
strong 57:22 58:11	sub-workgroup	superstars 35:19	surveillance 132:4
157:18 235:10,12	96:1	supervision 24:9	132:13,22 133:3
236:7 256:9	subcommittee	36:19 37:22 42:2	survey 47:8 48:8
stronger 227:2	81:15 96:5 97:12	supplement 38:5	53:8 62:18 71:22
strongly 148:1	166:7	83:18,22 84:1,8	72:3 90:10 168:18
171:12 175:21	subcommittees	supplementation	surveyed 43:22
208:13 219:21	14:1,4	184:19	surveys 73:13
226:7 231:7 242:6	subjective 116:9	supplements 19:20	survival 175:14
structure 39:20	submit 19:2 224:20	25:5,7 90:5	Susan 2:10 7:22
struggle 70:2 216:5	228:11	147:11 150:9	133:9 134:10,16
struggled 24:20	submitted 133:17	163:14 164:12	142:21
struggling 229:9,12	173:15 181:5	198:19	sustain 130:3,8,17
	226:15		
stuck 119.10		<b>SUDDIV</b> 33:13:18	132.5
		supply 33:13,18 44:12 45:15	132:5 sustained 129 <sup>.</sup> 1
Stuckler 241:16	subsequent 50:4	44:12 45:15	sustained 129:1
Stuckler 241:16 studies 77:22 88:8	subsequent 50:4 75:2 180:17	44:12 45:15 155:21	sustained 129:1 switch 36:8 68:19
Stuckler 241:16 studies 77:22 88:8 101:12 102:9,14	subsequent 50:4 75:2 180:17 subsequently	44:12 45:15 155:21 support 9:16 10:6	<b>sustained</b> 129:1 <b>switch</b> 36:8 68:19 <b>symposium</b> 234:1
Stuckler 241:16 studies 77:22 88:8 101:12 102:9,14 103:10,20 105:22	<b>subsequent</b> 50:4 75:2 180:17 <b>subsequently</b> 114:7	44:12 45:15 155:21 support 9:16 10:6 20:8 100:3 102:8	sustained 129:1 switch 36:8 68:19 symposium 234:1 symptomatic 123:5
Stuckler 241:16 studies 77:22 88:8 101:12 102:9,14 103:10,20 105:22 111:22 112:12	subsequent 50:4 75:2 180:17 subsequently 114:7 substantial 69:22	44:12 45:15 155:21 support 9:16 10:6 20:8 100:3 102:8 102:12,14 128:20	sustained 129:1 switch 36:8 68:19 symposium 234:1 symptomatic 123:5 175:10 219:3
Stuckler 241:16 studies 77:22 88:8 101:12 102:9,14 103:10,20 105:22 111:22 112:12 114:13,15 115:20	<b>subsequent</b> 50:4 75:2 180:17 <b>subsequently</b> 114:7 <b>substantial</b> 69:22 101:2	44:12 45:15 155:21 support 9:16 10:6 20:8 100:3 102:8 102:12,14 128:20 129:1,3,8,15,21	sustained 129:1 switch 36:8 68:19 symposium 234:1 symptomatic 123:5 175:10 219:3 symptoms 126:22
Stuckler 241:16 studies 77:22 88:8 101:12 102:9,14 103:10,20 105:22 111:22 112:12 114:13,15 115:20 119:17,19 120:4	<b>subsequent</b> 50:4 75:2 180:17 <b>subsequently</b> 114:7 <b>substantial</b> 69:22 101:2 <b>success</b> 55:16	44:12 45:15 155:21 support 9:16 10:6 20:8 100:3 102:8 102:12,14 128:20 129:1,3,8,15,21 130:3,13,18,20	sustained 129:1 switch 36:8 68:19 symposium 234:1 symptomatic 123:5 175:10 219:3 symptoms 126:22 159:1 160:1,6
Stuckler 241:16 studies 77:22 88:8 101:12 102:9,14 103:10,20 105:22 111:22 112:12 114:13,15 115:20 119:17,19 120:4 128:21 129:3,5	<b>subsequent</b> 50:4 75:2 180:17 <b>subsequently</b> 114:7 <b>substantial</b> 69:22 101:2 <b>success</b> 55:16 172:18 227:6	44:12 45:15 155:21 support 9:16 10:6 20:8 100:3 102:8 102:12,14 128:20 129:1,3,8,15,21 130:3,13,18,20 131:6,8 132:5	sustained 129:1 switch 36:8 68:19 symposium 234:1 symptomatic 123:5 175:10 219:3 symptoms 126:22 159:1 160:1,6 185:9 186:14
Stuckler 241:16 studies 77:22 88:8 101:12 102:9,14 103:10,20 105:22 111:22 112:12 114:13,15 115:20 119:17,19 120:4 128:21 129:3,5 130:20 131:10	subsequent 50:4 75:2 180:17 subsequently 114:7 substantial 69:22 101:2 success 55:16 172:18 227:6 successful 67:10	44:12 45:15 155:21 support 9:16 10:6 20:8 100:3 102:8 102:12,14 128:20 129:1,3,8,15,21 130:3,13,18,20 131:6,8 132:5 133:20 135:21,22	sustained 129:1 switch 36:8 68:19 symposium 234:1 symptomatic 123:5 175:10 219:3 symptoms 126:22 159:1 160:1,6 185:9 186:14 209:20 221:4
Stuckler 241:16 studies 77:22 88:8 101:12 102:9,14 103:10,20 105:22 111:22 112:12 114:13,15 115:20 119:17,19 120:4 128:21 129:3,5 130:20 131:10 132:12 133:15,21	subsequent 50:4 75:2 180:17 subsequently 114:7 substantial 69:22 101:2 success 55:16 172:18 227:6 successful 67:10 161:1 162:6	44:12 45:15 155:21 support 9:16 10:6 20:8 100:3 102:8 102:12,14 128:20 129:1,3,8,15,21 130:3,13,18,20 131:6,8 132:5 133:20 135:21,22 135:22 137:11,13	sustained 129:1 switch 36:8 68:19 symposium 234:1 symptomatic 123:5 175:10 219:3 symptoms 126:22 159:1 160:1,6 185:9 186:14 209:20 221:4 syndrome 30:13,20
Stuckler 241:16 studies 77:22 88:8 101:12 102:9,14 103:10,20 105:22 111:22 112:12 114:13,15 115:20 119:17,19 120:4 128:21 129:3,5 130:20 131:10 132:12 133:15,21 137:11,15,21	subsequent 50:4 75:2 180:17 subsequently 114:7 substantial 69:22 101:2 success 55:16 172:18 227:6 successful 67:10 161:1 162:6 successfully	44:12 45:15 155:21 support 9:16 10:6 20:8 100:3 102:8 102:12,14 128:20 129:1,3,8,15,21 130:3,13,18,20 131:6,8 132:5 133:20 135:21,22 135:22 137:11,13 168:5 171:6	sustained 129:1 switch 36:8 68:19 symposium 234:1 symptomatic 123:8 175:10 219:3 symptoms 126:22 159:1 160:1,6 185:9 186:14 209:20 221:4 syndrome 30:13,20 94:17
Stuckler 241:16 studies 77:22 88:8 101:12 102:9,14 103:10,20 105:22 111:22 112:12 114:13,15 115:20 119:17,19 120:4 128:21 129:3,5 130:20 131:10 132:12 133:15,21 137:11,15,21 153:14 175:11	subsequent 50:4 75:2 180:17 subsequently 114:7 substantial 69:22 101:2 success 55:16 172:18 227:6 successful 67:10 161:1 162:6 successfully 175:16	44:12 45:15 155:21 support 9:16 10:6 20:8 100:3 102:8 102:12,14 128:20 129:1,3,8,15,21 130:3,13,18,20 131:6,8 132:5 133:20 135:21,22 135:22 137:11,13 168:5 171:6 198:20 230:13	sustained 129:1 switch 36:8 68:19 symposium 234:1 symptomatic 123:5 175:10 219:3 symptoms 126:22 159:1 160:1,6 185:9 186:14 209:20 221:4 syndrome 30:13,20 94:17 syndromes 182:14
Stuckler 241:16 studies 77:22 88:8 101:12 102:9,14 103:10,20 105:22 111:22 112:12 114:13,15 115:20 119:17,19 120:4 128:21 129:3,5 130:20 131:10 132:12 133:15,21 137:11,15,21 153:14 175:11 186:19 196:10	subsequent 50:4 75:2 180:17 subsequently 114:7 substantial 69:22 101:2 success 55:16 172:18 227:6 successful 67:10 161:1 162:6 successfully 175:16 succinylacetone	44:12 45:15 155:21 support 9:16 10:6 20:8 100:3 102:8 102:12,14 128:20 129:1,3,8,15,21 130:3,13,18,20 131:6,8 132:5 133:20 135:21,22 135:22 137:11,13 168:5 171:6 198:20 230:13 232:9 243:21	sustained 129:1 switch 36:8 68:19 symposium 234:1 symptomatic 123:8 175:10 219:3 symptoms 126:22 159:1 160:1,6 185:9 186:14 209:20 221:4 syndrome 30:13,20 94:17 syndromes 182:14 synthesize 183:4
103:10,20 105:22 111:22 112:12 114:13,15 115:20 119:17,19 120:4 128:21 129:3,5 130:20 131:10 132:12 133:15,21 137:11,15,21 153:14 175:11 186:19 196:10 217:5 219:21	subsequent 50:4 75:2 180:17 subsequently 114:7 substantial 69:22 101:2 success 55:16 172:18 227:6 successful 67:10 161:1 162:6 successfully 175:16 succinylacetone 234:11	44:12 45:15 155:21 support 9:16 10:6 20:8 100:3 102:8 102:12,14 128:20 129:1,3,8,15,21 130:3,13,18,20 131:6,8 132:5 133:20 135:21,22 135:22 137:11,13 168:5 171:6 198:20 230:13 232:9 243:21 252:10	sustained 129:1 switch 36:8 68:19 symposium 234:1 symptomatic 123:5 175:10 219:3 symptoms 126:22 159:1 160:1,6 185:9 186:14 209:20 221:4 syndrome 30:13,20 94:17 syndromes 182:14 synthesize 183:4 syringe 160:20
Stuckler 241:16 studies 77:22 88:8 101:12 102:9,14 103:10,20 105:22 111:22 112:12 114:13,15 115:20 119:17,19 120:4 128:21 129:3,5 130:20 131:10 132:12 133:15,21 137:11,15,21 153:14 175:11 186:19 196:10	subsequent 50:4 75:2 180:17 subsequently 114:7 substantial 69:22 101:2 success 55:16 172:18 227:6 successful 67:10 161:1 162:6 successfully 175:16 succinylacetone	44:12 45:15 155:21 support 9:16 10:6 20:8 100:3 102:8 102:12,14 128:20 129:1,3,8,15,21 130:3,13,18,20 131:6,8 132:5 133:20 135:21,22 135:22 137:11,13 168:5 171:6 198:20 230:13 232:9 243:21	sustained 129:1 switch 36:8 68:19 symposium 234:1 symptomatic 123:5 175:10 219:3 symptoms 126:22 159:1 160:1,6 185:9 186:14 209:20 221:4 syndrome 30:13,20 94:17 syndromes 182:14 synthesize 183:4

296

			237
61:22 62:2 101:15	238:21	253:12	testifying 173:10
106:8 112:22	talking 25:6 61:20	tells 52:8	testimony 223:1
124:7 203:18	76:5 79:14 83:9	tension 230:1	testing 15:12
227:20 228:3	88:17,21 114:17	232:7	109:22 112:12
systematic 103:20	116:11 124:4,6,15	term 54:13 116:8	117:22 118:4,7,13
systems 2:12	144:18 169:1	125:2,3,21 132:22	156:15,15 160:16
107:14 171:13	177:14 180:21	134:11 164:3	182:19 186:20
107.14 171.13	183:11 203:2	166:7 240:16	191:10 203:9
т	205:20 211:15	termed 14:2	225:7,13 250:5
<b>T500</b> 1:13	216:20 230:1	terming 14:9	tests 107:9 109:22
table 29:18 42:21	238:20 251:11	terms 25:15 56:3	122:2 136:18
60:15 75:8			
tablets 28:4	tandem 117:20	97:20 98:14	149:21 161:9
tack 44:22	119:7 120:19	111:19 132:15	192:7,9 200:6
tackle 56:22	156:14 192:1	149:2 179:10	<b>Texas</b> 193:19
	204:12 233:11	180:1 214:22	textbook 185:2
Taiwan 117:19	Tanksley 2:10 7:22	216:6 217:11	thank 6:10,22 8:7
175:19	133:9,10,12 134:3	218:8 240:14	9:2 10:15 16:22
take 40:17 62:21	134:7,14 142:21	246:20,20 247:10	19:14 20:19,20
63:19 65:19 68:17	143:1	248:5	21:1 64:3,7,13
73:8 76:22 111:4	target 106:4 108:11	terrible 147:14	67:22 69:1 71:9
111:5 135:13	112:3,5	terrific 138:4	71:11 75:14 92:13
159:16 160:19	targeted 109:8	Territorial 2:7 8:2	93:11 94:14,21
161:17 175:21	112:14	test 15:2 69:3 78:5	95:1 99:8,9 125:1
189:15 194:2	Tarini 2:11 7:10,11	87:8 89:12 104:1	127:13 136:14
205:6 207:4 209:8	78:15,15 80:11	106:20 107:3,4,7	139:11,13,19
216:18 225:8	142:14,15 219:7,7	107:14 110:9,14	140:10,14,15,19
227:19 235:8	222:9,9 244:9,9	110:19 111:12	143:14 148:4,5,7
236:7,10 242:12	245:4	116:4 119:14,16	158:9 162:8,9,11
249:21 250:3	tastes 208:5	119:18 121:15	162:18 166:2,4
251:17,21	taxes 77:7	123:11 127:2	170:7,9,15,20
taken 23:3,15 62:14	taxonomy 83:16	131:2 133:2 146:4	173:3,6 176:5,7
65:12 108:17	taxpayers 69:10,20	154:21 168:7	176:13,14 180:6,7
109:16 116:18	69:20	182:6,8 187:4	180:8,13,20
120:22 178:2	team 4:10 148:4	191:2,3,8,18	201:20 214:20
182:19 183:17	205:2	192:12,13 193:12	215:1 256:1,11,13
185:2 220:6,12	tease 209:18	194:2,5,14 195:9	258:3
takes 61:15 149:9	technical 8:6 9:16	199:8 204:17,18	Thankfully 159:18
150:9	130:20	206:21 210:17	thanks 8:9 9:22
talk 21:22 22:11	technology 119:5,8	212:9 213:16	10:14 86:11 99:13
25:9 36:9 46:7	119:12 156:14	218:9,14 224:15	100:2 107:16
56:9 71:15 72:10	175:15 213:15	226:12 230:7	113:14 136:2
76:4 81:5,19	telephone 3:4	232:18 240:14	150:3 203:6 207:7
83:15 85:9 128:13	tell 26:15 56:6	250:22 251:1	212:18,19
155:11 173:4	72:18 82:18 144:9	test's 182:5	therapies 129:6
190:7 208:14	144:22 152:5,9,16	tested 147:2 194:15	therapist 149:13
	158:6,19 194:4	197:13	therapy 21:14
212.22 213.10		131.13	uiciaµy∠1.14
212:22 213:10 talked 36:13 82:19		tostified 160.6	75.00 1/5.00 00
212:22 213:10 talked 36:13 82:19 169:3,13 215:3	210:11 214:15 233:14 248:8	testified 169:6 testify 173:7	75:22 145:22,22 146:1,1 148:21,21

			290
148:22 149:2,14	88:20 90:8 93:16	40:10,15 41:17	time 10:20 21:6,7
149:19 154:4,8,17	94:10,16,19 95:6	42:9 72:8 117:3	26:11 45:21 52:20
154:17,18,19	95:20 96:19 97:1	210:12 223:14	53:2,6 57:2,2 61:5
155:2 174:12	97:2,5,10 98:4	224:2	61:7,8,10,12,15
208:18,19,20	100:9,22 104:13	third 58:12 90:18	62:9 64:4 69:7
<b>Therrell</b> 42:22	104:19 106:9	144:13	77:15,20 79:4
thing 85:8 88:20	107:11 108:6	this's 83:6	96:21 99:16
90:18 93:3 94:2,3	111:17 113:4,11	<b>Thompson</b> 1:21	100:18 111:2
100:13 107:1	115:7,11,18	6:19,21 13:8,9	113:21 123:3
117:10 204:17	117:14 118:18	142:4,6 255:19,20	128:12,15 143:20
211:18 213:20			146:14 150:1
	119:3,11,21 120:2	thorough 178:4	
217:12 221:3	121:1,3,10 122:7	201:22 222:7	171:7 173:12
233:12 237:12	122:8,21 123:9,14	thoroughly 64:5	174:11 176:15
238:2 242:18	124:10,21 125:4	thought 64:16 82:2	180:7 186:8
248:16 250:10	125:14,18 126:7	210:10 212:22	192:18 204:1,12
256:8	126:13 127:5,6,14	214:4 219:12,14	204:16 212:17
things 22:5 26:17	130:7 131:5,8	230:11 238:16	218:11 223:19
35:3,17 36:7	132:8 135:17,18	241:7 244:14	226:19 228:6,20
40:17 45:8 55:1	138:16 139:3,7,14	thoughts 22:14	233:10 236:18
56:3,10,22 57:3	139:22 156:4	60:18 72:15 103:2	238:10 241:6
73:5 74:8 75:15	167:7 168:3,15	105:1 106:13	249:21 252:17
75:17 78:3 81:1	182:18 185:16	109:5 116:12	257:5
85:2 89:6,21	187:21 189:21,22	129:17 130:16	time-wise 238:9
96:14 97:5 110:3	192:8 198:14,16	131:14 147:3	timeline 101:18
129:18 136:7,10	198:17 200:20	238:14	178:9 217:17
138:13,14,17	201:9,10,19 202:9	thousand 239:2	Timeliness 13:19
140:4 144:22	203:17 204:1,17	242:21	times 38:20 148:18
152:8 158:14	205:17,21 207:12	threatens 172:13	150:10 154:6
215:13,21 222:19	207:19 208:8,17	172:18	160:19 168:22
223:11,15 224:3	208:20,22 209:3	three 10:8 13:14	timing 115:4 128:8
226:21 227:1	210:4,9,16 212:8	32:18 50:19 64:1	Tina 129:19
232:20 238:17	212:20,22 214:14	108:7 110:6	tiny 36:1 61:3 160:9
241:20 245:18	218:21 219:5	114:14 128:18	tip 214:10
247:2 253:7	220:13 221:11	137:10 150:9,9	tipped 214:12
think 11:14 17:20	223:11,15 224:4,6	159:10 167:14,15	tips 14:20
22:4 37:5 47:2	225:19 226:4	184:1,15 249:10	tissue 31:16
50:9 51:15 53:10	227:9,10 228:16	257:10	<b>Title</b> 5:9
53:14 55:17 58:9	228:22 230:12	threshold 124:15	today 13:16,18,21
62:4 63:8 64:6	231:4 235:14,16	thrive 164:2	16:22 18:19 20:22
67:7,10,14,15,17	236:5,6 238:9,15	throughput 119:11	21:22 26:3 64:9
70:7 72:10,22	238:16 239:18	121:6	99:20 144:9
73:3,8 77:2,10,11	242:8,8,14 243:8	throw 179:22	145:16 148:3
78:1,2,10,11	245:1,8,22 246:15	tied 177:11	149:5,6 150:6
	246:17 248:1,10	tier 156:15 191:18	152:3 153:4
/9:18 80:1.4			
79:18 80:1,4 81:19 82:12 83:5	248:21 249:2.8	192:7.9.12 193:12	154:18 156:13
81:19 82:12 83:5	248:21 249:2,8 250:20 251:13.19	192:7,9,12 193:12 194:2.5.14 195:9	154:18 156:13 157:2.5.8 158:3.6
81:19 82:12 83:5 83:15 84:5,6,10	250:20 251:13,19	194:2,5,14 195:9	157:2,5,8 158:3,6
81:19 82:12 83:5			

			299
221.20 222.12 17	tractmont 10:0 15:2	66.10 74.1 01.01	150.1
221:20 232:13,17	treatment 10:8 15:3	66:12 74:1 81:21	153:1 Turkich 100:20
told 82:2 145:9	25:10 36:22 47:17 54:19 58:1 64:18	102:15 103:1	<b>Turkish</b> 196:20
149:13 169:2,8,9		113:19	turn 9:19 16:18
169:11,12,15	70:17,20 76:6,9	tries 161:17	41:16 52:21
tolerance 35:15	77:11 78:9 81:15	trouble 76:3	turned 156:22
tomorrow 16:17	87:6 88:11 89:2	true 31:5 64:17	159:8 198:4
139:3	90:6 98:19 125:16	114:20 122:4,5,5	turnover 10:22
tool 171:5 173:1	144:15 147:8	122:11,22 125:2,5	turns 150:16
top 80:19 167:13	150:10 154:3	125:6,9,10,12,19	tweaking 54:15
179:20	155:16 157:22	125:19,22 126:5,6	Twenty-one 44:2
topic 95:5	160:1,11,22	126:9 127:15,18	twice 131:6 149:9
torn 145:6	161:19 162:6,14	157:11 193:15	243:3,15
total 53:3 83:12	163:13,18,20	194:20 195:7	<b>twin</b> 146:8
totally 74:13 236:22	164:13 165:19	196:13 198:5	<b>two</b> 10:22 11:2
<b>touch</b> 176:16	166:7 167:9 168:5	206:1 209:10,13	15:19 23:7 39:2
touching 102:6	168:14 171:15	209:15 210:1,18	50:21 64:19 87:18
tough 106:12	172:1,17 174:6,9	213:11 214:6	91:4,5 92:19
148:14	174:21 175:12	218:18 224:1	93:20 97:21 99:15
train 67:8 212:11	176:2 182:9,10,12	225:8 228:1,20	112:7 138:17
212:11	182:20 184:17,21	229:6,10 247:17	144:16 145:6
training 14:17	185:7 188:19	247:21 248:13	149:9,13 153:1
130:21 257:12,14	189:4,14,17 190:3	truly 155:14 162:20	158:12,13 162:16
258:2	190:7,10,16,18,21	trumped 168:1	166:6,13,14
transcript 19:12	198:14,21 199:15	trustee 17:13	167:17 169:21
transplant 113:8	199:17 200:2,18	truth 146:22	176:16 183:10
219:15 251:2	201:7,12 202:6	try 31:22 33:11	194:15,16,17
transporter 183:9	203:3,5 204:10	66:14 97:3 101:22	196:2,7 207:11
183:15 184:13	205:12 206:13,19	124:22 143:19	219:12,14 241:19
186:2	207:12,21,22	145:8 170:15	242:3
treat 20:5 25:15,18	208:1,7 209:3,4	234:20 238:19	two-year 10:11
30:7 31:14 38:10	213:4,20,22 214:2	249:9	<b>Ty</b> 154:12,16
76:20 83:21 84:13	214:2,7 216:1	trying 24:21 61:15	type 46:2 79:6,20
88:5 90:15 127:19	218:15 220:1,5,7	79:15 91:6 94:1	111:12 117:10
156:1 168:2	223:18 226:10	127:19 132:16	157:7 175:5
185:14 207:10	235:20 242:5,9,12	161:12 206:10	types 40:13 98:10
208:12 232:3	242:13,15 248:5,7	208:19 209:18,19	114:12 118:7
251:5,6	251:1,3 254:2,3,5	209:21 221:7	134:20 251:5
treatable 146:21	treatments 29:11	229:4 238:9	typical 43:11 149:6
153:11 157:7	29:13,15 50:12	242:16,19 245:6	155:1 160:15
158:7	60:20 62:17,20,21	tryptophan 32:20	typically 193:1
treated 29:20 30:18	165:13 167:17,20	32:22	216:15
31:4 70:16 71:9	172:15 213:8	tube 37:3 41:3	tyrosine 32:4,5,11
77:4 147:7 154:22	217:11	48:21 49:4,6 51:2	32:20,21
treating 61:4 65:1	treats 84:2	51:5 77:1	
65:16,16 76:16	tremendous 85:7	<b>Tullis</b> 2:12 5:9,9,14	U
77:8,15 93:2	trials 174:14	7:19,20 142:19,20	<b>U.S</b> 1:1 83:10 108:4
155:14 160:4	tricky 77:8 187:5	<b>Tuminello</b> 3:1	115:2 117:16
161:2 188:8	tried 37:7 45:9	144:3 152:22	128:4,7 154:2
101.2 100.0		177.0 102.22	
l		1	I

			_
177:4 181:21	147:15 151:9	186:17 218:10,12	value 155:13
195:12	unexplained 156:7	<b>URV</b> 3:2 121:14,21	210:10 213:11
ultimately 22:15	unfair 70:8	129:20 130:7,14	215:11,12 247:22
63:11 67:8 80:2	unforeseen 23:18	136:16	248:3
152:17	unfortunately	<b>USDA</b> 59:22	values 110:9
ultra 214:3 224:5	151:5 152:13,16	<b>use</b> 21:20 23:3,16	variability 117:12
224:22	uniform 10:4 15:13	25:4,16,18 29:1	variants 127:20
ultra-rare 213:2	15:18 52:3,4	31:10 36:12 37:9	192:19
umbrella 24:22	172:11 174:19	37:21 38:1 57:13	varies 31:2
unable 147:17	177:7 234:9	75:20 86:4 105:16	variety 26:6 27:14
unaffected 107:13	uninsured 49:18	106:1,16,18,22	28:16 101:12
151:20	unintended 23:18	109:2 110:6 111:3	114:12 121:15
uncertain 186:21	50:13	111:13 112:1	122:2 129:10
192:19,21	unique 41:11 160:1	116:7 120:12,19	various 164:22
unclear 202:6	213:3	128:10 172:22	varying 179:15
uncover 221:17	unit 51:2	178:17 191:5	<b>vegan</b> 85:11
undercurrent 179:6	United 22:3 117:21	220:14 228:16	vehicle 112:16
underemployment	172:6,12	233:9	verbal 145:12
77:5	<b>units</b> 51:6	<b>useful</b> 171:5	verification 126:17
undergo 174:16	universal 174:1	usefulness 23:5	verified 126:19,21
understand 22:5	university 107:16	uses 57:14	versions 196:2
27:4,4 31:13	136:19 181:6,8	<b>usual</b> 16:22	versus 65:16 83:16
35:13 38:8 45:11	193:5	Utah 181:6,8 190:6	118:9 149:4
47:10 48:1 51:15	<b>unknown</b> 213:8	191:5,20 193:6	209:19 229:12
63:8,9 73:9 84:5	unnecessary	197:6,21,22 199:5	248:8
101:1 107:7 118:3	157:15	200:13 201:14	vexing 21:4
125:13 132:16	unpacking 238:18	204:1 224:12	viable 154:3
158:15 162:3	unprecedented	225:6 249:21	Victoria 195:14
199:14,22 202:6	228:16	254:8	199:5 203:14
203:4 210:22	untreated 49:1	Utah's 153:17	Victorians 195:15
211:17 230:3 236:16 237:14	147:7 157:3 185:11	utility 182:8 200:16 utilization 18:9	Vietnam 195:19
			view 41:8 96:9
238:4 understandable	update 4:8 13:18 13:20 16:7 73:15	utilize 29:7 45:5 utilized 15:11	views 67:18 Virginia 50:7
161:11	94:11	175:17	virtual 223:4
understanding	updated 57:16	utilizes 30:6	virtue 92:21
59:17 62:11 64:8	170:18 171:4	utilizes 50.0	vision 154:17
153:8 182:17	183:18	V	visual 8:4
understood 24:11	updates 16:16	vague 225:4	vitamin 83:19
198:12	upstairs 257:16	valid 248:1	vitamins 29:8,21
undertaken 22:13	258:3	validation 105:15	30:5 54:7,11
47:9 63:10	uptake 32:19	106:1 109:8,9,11	<b>VLCADD</b> 31:6
undertreatment	urge 173:21	110:15 112:1	Vockley 2:13 8:19
88:4,5	urgency 91:17	131:2 133:2	8:20 143:10,11
underway 11:5	92:11	136:11	<b>voice</b> 76:11
13:13	urges 171:12	validity 182:6	volunteer 20:16
underwent 219:15	175:21	200:15	vote 4:10 12:2,12
undiagnosed	urine 36:5 185:21	valuable 129:14	16:10 17:19
andiagnosed			10.10 17.13
II	1	1	1

Н			201
100:19,21 138:6	209:1 212:15	235:14,16,22	149:2,10 167:7
139:2 148:2	218:2 223:17	236:1 249:11	235:5
151:15 152:20	224:20 231:16	252:16	weeks 91:5 144:16
			175:13
180:18 244:13	243:20 244:6	we're 14:2,3,5	
252:17 254:16,22	247:7 256:13,18	19:15 27:1 36:8	weigh 212:6
256:22 257:2	256:21	57:1 61:20 69:16	weighing 214:6,8
<b>votes</b> 244:16,17,21	wanted 35:2 46:20	76:5 83:9 84:11	welcome 4:3 5:4,14
voting 151:14	83:19 89:17 91:15	84:15 85:21 103:9	103:15 144:6
244:20 251:12	92:10 145:16	104:19 107:8	went 23:10 55:8
vulnerable 82:20	162:18 176:16	111:1 113:21	140:21 148:13,20
w	207:11 211:19	117:3 124:4,6,14	161:3,5 169:13
	214:20 218:7	141:3 143:14	207:15 228:8
wait 122:18 157:2	221:15 241:13	145:3 177:14,21	236:17 258:5
250:10	244:14	178:8,22 179:20	weren't 29:11 66:6
waiting 71:19,19	wants 109:14 208:5	180:14 183:11	215:9
72:2 122:13 205:7	251:21	203:2 205:17,19	wheelchair 154:11
237:11 248:13	warehouse 45:2	205:21 208:1,2,18	wheelchair-bound
waiver 17:16	wasn't 85:6 90:11	209:3,19 215:8,10	147:16
walk 155:11 159:5	248:22	215:13,20 216:9	wherewithal 61:21
257:17	watch 156:8	216:20 221:7	WIC 44:17 59:22
walking 151:11	watched 160:9	225:20 231:10	60:1,5 68:4,7,12
wall 217:12	water 160:21	232:13,14 236:3	68:16 78:2
WALLACE 3:2	Watson 2:14 7:13	238:20 244:2,20	Wicklund 1:22 7:1
Wallis 144:4 158:11	7:14 117:18 122:4	245:8 248:12	113:13,13 142:7,8
158:12	123:6,17 142:16	249:9,9 251:11	209:5 228:18
Walmart 187:16	142:17 222:19	we've 73:22 78:8	238:5 252:18
Walsh 8:19 143:10	224:19	83:17 86:6 93:19	255:21,22
Walter 20:12	<b>wax</b> 111:15	102:15 103:1	wide 193:2
want 10:16,21	way 14:10 38:5	113:19 115:7,17	widely 23:6
13:22 20:20 22:8	51:11 60:4,5	115:20 116:19	width 179:16
24:5 34:18 62:17	66:13 77:13 94:9	165:4 168:15	willing 70:15
67:22 76:1 79:11	96:18 97:20	179:3 180:12	236:10 251:17
79:22 81:5 84:20	117:15 124:8	208:7 215:3	willingness 65:7
92:8 96:16 99:21	138:6 139:1,17	218:14 220:11,12	<b>wish</b> 18:13
100:10,17,19,20	140:2 153:10	225:14,15 227:8	wishes 152:19
103:15 104:14	156:12 208:12	230:17 235:12	wishy-washy 58:17
107:12 108:12	214:1 223:9	236:6 240:1	woman 42:7 43:13
110:1 111:11	229:14 233:6	245:22 250:21	77:3
116:6 121:22	240:2,7,21	251:20	women 30:17 78:3
123:20 125:18	ways 44:8 56:13	weak 202:17	91:19 92:5 98:16
126:2,15 127:17	63:17 79:9 96:14	weakness 184:10	wonder 21:20
127:19 131:20	97:21 112:22	weather 122:19	121:5 187:19
139:11,13,18	117:9 121:15	webcast 15:21	195:10 238:6
140:1,9,14 143:18	146:19	webinar 8:5 15:22	wonderful 99:17
146:10 151:17	we'll 5:17 8:8 12:10	website 39:12	168:16
158:14 162:9	13:17 16:13 103:2	56:15	wondering 64:20
170:5 178:17	128:13 137:8	Wednesday 176:21	113:16 131:17
179:4 199:21	138:4 229:9	week 61:13 90:11	248:12
II		•	•

word 64:15 79:20	227:15 234:7,20	<b>Y</b> 1:21	<b>0.5</b> 193:22
116:9 137:7	235:6	year 10:11,22 30:2	
216:15	works 88:11,18,18	39:4 42:17 43:11	1
words 80:16	110:19	50:1,2 53:13 63:1	<b>1</b> 35:13,14,16 86:2
144:20 152:12	workshop 53:10,12	70:21 72:7 77:20	122:10 140:17,18
161:6	72:1	83:10 147:18	153:22 173:18
wordsmith 130:3	world 59:16 94:1	152:6 153:18	175:5 195:2,17
wordsmithed	108:18,22 109:3	154:1 155:4	196:15,16 197:5,
138:21	166:21 215:15	160:10 168:13	197:17,20,21,21
	247:8	190:13 195:22	198:7 218:18,19
wordsmithing			<b>1,002</b> 197:12
127:9 131:4 135:4	worldwide 198:13	198:8 204:3	<b>1:06</b> 140:22 141:2
137:6,8 138:12	213:21	225:11 234:1	
work 17:7 18:5	worry 167:9	year-old 34:20	<b>10</b> 46:11 80:14
20:15 24:15 34:8	worse 75:17	years 19:22 20:12	152:10 154:13
45:6 57:20 58:7	worth 93:1,2 110:6	34:9 35:9 39:2	165:4 174:7
63:18 70:21 71:16	127:15 238:18	56:8 68:15,16,18	257:17 258:3
72:12 73:2,18	wouldn't 23:12	80:20 87:13 88:1	<b>10-year</b> 197:7
97:11 99:18	29:10 35:22	90:2 91:20 94:1	10-year-old 154:12
102:11 107:18	125:14,15 126:10	99:15 129:9	<b>10,000</b> 173:18
109:13 136:22	135:9 205:1	140:10 144:11	193:6,17
139:12,19 140:2	222:15 238:22	147:22 148:13,20	<b>100</b> 30:20 44:3,5
145:10 146:20	239:3,9 240:22	148:22 149:7	51:2 63:6 199:10
150:7 166:3 171:1	242:10	150:19,22 154:16	203:9
178:21 179:9,16	woven 101:7	159:1 163:6,16	<b>100,000</b> 122:10
179:19 180:1,3,4	wrap 88:10	165:4 167:6	239:22
180:7 182:7	wrapped 209:22	168:20,22 174:7	<b>100s</b> 149:20
192:12 201:11	write 155:6 167:13	184:1,15 185:12	<b>11:55</b> 140:21
226:13 249:13	202:22	189:7 220:22	<b>110</b> 183:20 190:2
254:1	writes 59:7	225:5,8 239:5	198:12 200:1,14
worked 53:2 56:5	writing 103:14	249:10	213:21 240:5
	-		<b>110s</b> 149:21
57:5,19 58:10	written 19:2,6	yield 101:13 211:6	<b>114,000</b> 197:10
73:1	117:4	York 48:6 49:18	,
workgroup 4:6,9	wrong 77:11 78:1	81:12,22 175:18	198:7
13:15,17,19,20	93:5 165:15	223:2,3	<b>120</b> 218:19
15:3,9 16:8 70:20	219:11 250:6	young 34:10 77:3,3	<b>120,000</b> 153:22
96:2,5 97:13,13	wrote 51:18 155:8	<b>Youth</b> 5:10	<b>13</b> 20:12 55:10
99:11,14 138:19	155:9		148:11,19 163:10
180:15,22 181:2	Wyoming 90:20	<u>Z</u>	163:16
201:1 215:19		Zealand 195:19	<b>144</b> 4:7
256:20 257:12,14	<u> </u>	<b>zero</b> 193:14,16	<b>15</b> 55:10 163:6
257:15 258:1,2	<b>X</b> 80:5	194:8 199:10,11	<b>16</b> 10:20 46:18
workgroups 13:14	<b>X-</b> 232:22 234:3	213:14 223:10	86:21
14:2,5,9,17 16:16	245:13	240:2	<b>18</b> 91:21 159:5
256:17 257:10	X-ALD 9:7 233:1		163:2 174:13
working 20:2 73:8	X-linked 10:9	0	<b>180</b> 4:9
73:17 80:8 83:6	184:12	<b>0.02</b> 195:9	<b>19</b> 29:6,14 68:6
113:14 149:10		<b>0.08</b> 193:9	<b>1958</b> 22:20
	Y	<b>0.13</b> 194:13	

<b>1973</b> 23:15	<b>28</b> 46:12	<b>600</b> 30:3
<b>1988</b> 23:22 55:12		<b>600,000</b> 122:7
<b>1994</b> 83:18 147:22	3	<b>63,000</b> 197:18
2	<b>3</b> 15:21 55:19 163:7	<b>66</b> 195:14
	<b>3,000</b> 194:11	7
<b>2</b> 10:10 173:20	<b>3:09</b> 258:5	-
175:7	<b>30</b> 18:19 56:7 59:16	<b>7,000</b> 77:20
<b>2,000</b> 43:11 50:1,2	87:13 88:1 239:4	<b>70</b> 175:5
<b>20</b> 4:5 77:18 147:22		<b>750,000</b> 225:3
155:22 225:10	<b>33</b> 154:1	<b>770,000</b> 195:4
239:4	<b>34</b> 9:11 <b>350</b> 35:15	8
<b>20,000</b> 193:19 <b>200,000</b> 42:17	<b>38</b> 46:4	<b>8</b> 35:9 77:16
<b>200,000</b> 42.17 <b>2000</b> 58:8	<b>38</b> 40.4 <b>3A</b> 114:19 115:7	<b>8-</b> 34:19
<b>2000</b> 38.8 <b>2002</b> 195:1 203:20	116:16	<b>825</b> 35:11
<b>2002</b> 195.1 203.20 <b>2006</b> 50:8 57:17	<b>3B</b> 114:22 115:19	
189:8	116:17,22	9
<b>2007</b> 51:22 197:11	110.17,22	<b>9</b> 1:10
<b>2008</b> 193:21	4	<b>9:31</b> 1:13 5:2
<b>2009</b> 51:21 150:21	<b>4</b> 15:21 83:11	<b>90</b> 52:21 122:17
<b>2010</b> 19:21 52:12	160:10	<b>90-day</b> 40:3
164:3	<b>40</b> 225:11 239:21	<b>91</b> 167:19
<b>2011</b> 53:19 55:9	<b>43</b> 35:10	<b>91.4</b> 62:19
56:19 89:20	<b>45</b> 225:11	<b>99</b> 4:6
164:10 193:21	<b>475</b> 168:12	
<b>2012</b> 58:13	<b>48</b> 190:14	
<b>2013</b> 40:7 55:3,5	<b>49</b> 156:17	
66:12 150:21		
<b>2014</b> 18:2 42:22	5	
99:15 190:13	<b>5</b> 4:3 5:9 239:5	
195:3 241:14	257:11	
<b>2015</b> 55:19 183:18	5-year-old 161:5	
<b>2016</b> 1:10 5:4 10:12	<b>50</b> 30:15 61:8 62:3	
12:13 171:9 204:9	177:4,5 178:18	
<b>2017</b> 10:17 11:11	193:20 <b>50,000</b> 197:21	
174:17	198:3	
<b>22</b> 48:21 150:16	<b>500</b> 30:2 44:4 63:1	
185:6	83:10 124:20	
<b>24</b> 176:22	196:4	
<b>25</b> 15:20 19:22	<b>504</b> 167:3	
91:20	<b>5600</b> 257:18	
<b>25,000</b> 43:14,18	<b>5635</b> 1:12	
<b>250</b> 196:15	<b>583</b> 35:8	
<b>250,000</b> 196:16 197:5 218:19		
<b>254</b> 4:10	6	
<b>254</b> 4.10 <b>26</b> 15:20	<b>6</b> 35:7 77:16 174:14	
<b>27</b> 10:12	6-year-old 155:1	
	<b>60</b> 77:18 175:5	1

## <u>CERTIFICATE</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: The Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children

Before: HHS Health Resources & Service Administration

Date: 05-09-16

Place: Rockville, Maryland

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

near A Guis &

Court Reporter

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433