

**EXHIBIT J**

**Brown, Nicole (HHS/ASL)**

---

**From:** Frank, Richard (HHS/ASPE)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 09, 2009 2:35 PM  
**To:** Katz, Ruth (HHS/ASPE)  
**Subject:** Fw: update

Fyi

---

**From:** Seshamani, Meena (HHS/IOS)  
**To:** Frank, Richard (HHS/ASPE); Moulds, Donald (HHS/ASPE); Hall, Amy (CMS/OL)  
**Sent:** Wed Sep 09 13:34:11 2009  
**Subject:** update

Hey

Talked to Connie, she is fine with all suggestions and appreciates them. One thing to flag is that groups did not want benefit delineation to be too narrow to enable flexibility to get support the way they need (saw cash and counseling as too medically-oriented and restrictive). Per her conversations with CBO, making use of benefit more narrow would not affect scoring. She thinks some middle ground between current language and cash and counseling would be good.

Per actuarial requests – she has had CBO do lots and lots of runs out to 50 years to ascertain solvency. She is going to send me to forward on. 2 questions in current draft are: changing language for \$5 premium payment for students to “nominal” payment to give more flexibility, and she put an arbitrary % of benefit that person can keep if they go into a nursing home, which can be changed.

She is happy with having you guys look over all the stuff she sends to see if anything further needs to be done for actuarial analysis and is happy to get input.

Did that make sense  
meena

Meena Seshamani, MD, PhD  
Director of Policy Analysis  
Office of Health Reform  
Dept of Health and Human Services  
