

Date: Friday, April 26 2019 11:33 AM

Subject: Chat with [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

To: [REDACTED] M. [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>;

26 April 2019

[REDACTED]

So I have an interesting TXGC issue.... 08:31

[REDACTED]

Can I help (scared to ask) 08:31

[REDACTED]

hahahahaha 08:32

[REDACTED]

interesting is a loaded word, lol 08:32

[REDACTED]

LOL oh it is. Especially with this OPO. 08:32

Remember their HR/LU allocation case? Where they allocated the LU separately and so weren't available when a HR recipient needed LU? 08:33

[REDACTED]

yes 08:33

[REDACTED]

They did it again. 08:33

[REDACTED]

didnt they do a CAP? 08:33

[REDACTED]

And it was AFTER we sent the notification letter saying we think it's a policy violation. 08:33

well they think they're doing it right, so their CAP was only that they would put in a different code if the center didn't respond (they put 830 donor age or quality). Their CAP is simply to now put 898 and say the center refused. 08:34

[REDACTED]

wow. 08:34

im looking the case up in the spreadsheet 08:35

[REDACTED]

Yeah. I sent them their notification letter on 3/8. On 3/26, a txp center called the OC to ask about this policy b/c they think they should ahve gotten LU but the OPO had already allocated them. That OPO was TXGC. 08:35

[REDACTED]

Its still out for review, but the two OPO reviewers that responded said give them a notice of nocompliance 08:36

Imcan send this case to the same reviewers 08:37

[REDACTED]

This came to our attention b/c the OC apparently contacted PCR for help in 08:37

how they give guidance about this policy. Somehow [REDACTED] got wind and was like, "what's this now? Um, we need to be invited to this meeting." Then Leah came to me b/c it was my case before.

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Heart goes first, right. With lungs if needed?

08:38

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

I think if the OPO had called the OC for help, we'd just let it go b/c if the OC gave them bad advice then whatever. But b/c it's a transplant center--after we'd told them we think they're doing it wrong--it might be a case.

08:38

Right. Basically the only way to not violate that policy is to exhaust the HR list.

08:38

LU follow HR. If HR needs LU, they get LU.

08:38

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

I'd package it. I'll send to the same reviewers with a note about the repeated nature of the violation.

08:39

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

I think this meeting is on Monday. It'll be interesting to hear more from the OC about their conversation with the TXC.

08:40

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

By the time it goes out, the third reviewer may agree with a NON

08:40

True!

08:40

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Side note--I don't know how NO ONE thought to include MQ in that meeting....you know, a meeting about how to interpret and apply policy

08:41

we're only the department that does exactly that and is responsible for monitoring compliance.

08:41

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Exactly...seems like case investigators would need to know this stuff and provide input...

08:41

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Leah and Nicole are kind of dumbfounded since that meeting is literally their job.

08:41

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Is anyone in the office today to answer baldridge questions?

08:42

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Liiiiiiiike what kind?

08:42

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] is out and [REDACTED] is WFH like me

08:42

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Oh you mean if the interviewers stop by?

08:42


[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

yes

08:42

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

SFC OPTN Hearing
Exhibit J.76

| | |
|---|-------|
| ████ is in. | 08:42 |
| ████ █████ | |
| oh, wonderif he'll get some questions. The office willbe mepty | 08:43 |
| ████ █████ | |
| ████ should be in. | 08:43 |
| ████ █████ | |
| empty | 08:43 |
| ████ █████ | |
| I'll give them a heads up | 08:43 |
| ████ █████ | |
| Just in case, no one may come by | 08:43 |
| Let me know if yu need anything else...and have a great weekend! | 08:44 |
|  | 08:44 |
| ████ █████ | |
| you too!! | 08:44 |