

North Sound Accountable Community of Health

Pre-Planning Group Meeting

July 7, 2014

9:00am – 11:00am

NSMHA Office, Mt. Vernon

ATTENDANCE

Present

1. David Jefferson, SCAHA
2. Joe Valentine, NSMHA
3. Federico Cruz-Uribe, SeaMar
4. Scott Forslund, Sno Co Ldrshp Coalition, Premera
5. Regina Delahunt, Whatcom Co Health Department
6. Dan Murphy, NWRC
7. Connie Davis, Skagit Valley Hospital
8. Ken Stark, Sno Co Human Services
9. Gary Goldbaum, Snohomish Co Health Department
10. Mark Tompkins, San Juan Co Health Department
11. Larry Thompson, WAHA

Staff

Elya Moore, Liz Jones

Apologies

1. Jennifer Kingsley
2. Frank James
3. Jackie Henderson
4. Keith Higman

MINUTES

Agenda Topic	Conclusions
1. Welcome and Review Meeting Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All present introduced themselves 	
2. Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We got the grant, the contract has been executed, and the first meeting of all the ACH grantees is a webinar this Thursday • One thing they are asking for is a letter of support for Innovation Grant for which the State is applying • The State has hired a staff person to oversee the ACH process • The Health Philanthropy Partnership convened a meeting, and a summary of that was included in the packet. It was attended by everyone who submitted an ACH Planning grant, and the heart of the meeting was a discussion by legislators (Rep Harris from Clark County and Rep Cody) of the 2572 legislation and the potential to expand to more than two pilots. An HCA rep stated that they expect the ACHs to align with Medicaid purchasing and regional service areas. Another point that was clear was that all counties should include and communicate with their legislators in the planning process • What is the timeline of the federal money flowing? October. There are only 12 grants to be had and 15-16 applicants. The plan is to implement the first two pilots in January 2015, and a second wave would happen in April 2015 if the expansion is allowed. The amount of money on the table went from \$57M to \$100M for the State of WA 	WAHA will continue to update the group about the hiring process and other relevant information

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are hiring a Facilitator- the ad hoc committee to interview is Dan, Regina, and Joe. We have received a number of good applications so far. There will also be a designated staff person to do the work Elya and Liz have been doing. All the ACHs are hiring up 	
<p>3. Financing the Planning Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scott gave an overview of the financing process- Because of the speed with which some pledges were identified, we were over-pledged in some places early on, so there was some discussion regarding what to do with that. The group decided to stick with the original budget amount we agreed to, not build in overflow. The group decided to spread funds based on population. All funders will be named, to ensure transparency Going forward we will share a spreadsheet of the status of invoicing, to promote transparency and accountability We have received the \$50,000 from the State, so we have funds to start Direct transfer to WAHA is easiest way to send funds. 	<p>Going forward, WAHA will share a spreadsheet with invoicing status</p>
<p>4. Steering Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elya gave an overview of the Discussion Paper on Steering Committee (SC) Organization. She clarified that “governance” is intended here in the generic sense of structures that enable people to work together to get things done, highlighted the relevant sections of the legislation, and laid out the key areas/issues the group needs to discuss Goal for today: come up with a structure for the Steering Committee, now called “Organizing Committee”, and a process to get it stocked. There was a discussion around local perspective versus the regional perspective. The local should not sabotage the ability to work at a regional level, as we are going to be held accountable for a response. However the local perspective is critical, and each of five counties should have one member speaking to the County perspective. Beyond that, it should be representation by the disciplines, because that is where the action will be (not at the government or jurisdiction level) Consensus that it should be done in a workable size group. By disciplining the number of seats at the table, it drives you to a compromise There will be a potential struggle to get certain sectors engaged- one principle is that we should not lose the engagement of entities that got us this far What additional sectors need to be at the table. From that, work into the number who need to be at the table. Hospitals and health plans need to be at the table, but they might be challenging to engage Discussion around whether it has to be every piece of a given sector, or one person representing a sector (i.e., a rep from every health plan, or someone who represents the health plans). General consensus around the latter We need to build something attractive, that will increase desire to be involved Most Apple Health plans will be in most counties with ACHs- the plans will be challenged to think about how many staff to sit on all the different groups. They meet with the HCA and should be coordinating with the RSNs, so we need to recognize that we are not the only ones trying to add expectations on their time 	<p>Key conclusions/principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~We will call the next iteration of governance (i.e., for the Planning process) the Organizing Committee ~We will start with the existing Pre-Planning group and add or subtract from this group to develop the Organizing Committee ~To form the Organizing Committee, we will work towards having membership from the categories in section 4.2.b of the legislation ~We will focus more on ‘sector’ representation than ‘geographic’ representation, though each County will have at least one representative who can speak specifically to the County interests ~While we will work

- One approach might be to structure a stakeholder conversation with health plans- explore and dialogue about what the relationship could be between the community and health plans
- How is the group feeling about geographic representation? Every county has their own unique feel, so it will be important to have representation from each county. The sectors are represented in all jurisdictions, so they do not necessarily need to be County specific
- At the Organizing Committee level, we need to find people who can hear the overlap- someone with health plan perspective, someone with public health perspective, someone with government perspective. People who can get out of their own individual focus
 - If we had a health plan, we should have one dealing with the private market and one dealing with the public market
- We must distinguish the eventual ACH Board from this planning Organizing Committee. For the OC we ask them to commit to representing their sector, and to commit to thinking broadly to what will achieve success for our region. Ask each person to step back from their provincial priorities to serve the broader goals
- Part of the six month process is to engage with all the sectors. They do not all have to be at the table from the start
- Do we need additional people on the organizing group? If yes, who needs to be added?
 - The group went through the domains of interest listed in the discussion paper to see where there are gaps
 - During the planning process we need to develop 1 and 3 year priorities, so that will enable people to opt in or out based on interest
 - Everyone in this group has ongoing contact with people in multiple sectors
 - Focus on the domains listed in the legislation and determining whether we have enough representation
- Larry asked for a vote of between starting with the existing group and adding to it- all agreed; and whether to drive towards membership being based on 4.2.b- all agreed
- There could be ways to have advisory councils that feed into the broader group
- Elya asked- do we agree that we should focus more on the sectors than geography, but having a least one person who can speak to each county on the OC
 - Larry summarized that the job of anyone who comes on this group is to represent the greater good. They may be from San Juan, but their job is not exclusively to protect the interests of San Juan. They are about moving the whole ship forward, and making sure the perspectives of San Juan are not ignored
 - Scott did not fully agree with this, believing that the greater good is a necessary but not sufficient approach. His view is that it needs to start with local priorities and then seek common ground/greater good that aligns with these local projects
 - Gary said that the perspective has to be how to incorporate all the voices, while also keeping to a given person's interest
- Overview of the discussion the WAHA Board had in response to these questions

towards a manageable size group, we will start with ensuring the necessary voices are at the table, rather than setting a specific size

~The key responsibilities of the Organizing Committee will be to administer the grant funds, set the NSACH budget, select priority projects, ensure adequate input from all sectors, and determine the relationship between local entities and the ACH

WAHA will send out matrix of the categories that need representation, and everyone will nominate individuals to fill the blank spots. The group will then discuss the nominations

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the relationship is between the regional entity and the local groups? Should this be left to be decided in the six-month planning process, as it is one of the key decisions to be made • Consensus to include fire districts/departments or EMS at the table in the ultimate governance structure • Elya noted that when we convened this group it was noted that it was a time-limited group, so there should be an option to opt-out for anyone currently here • What about size? Start with who we want on the OC and back into size • What about responsibilities of the OC? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The five that are listed in the discussion document- separate out 4 and 5 as responsibilities of the eventual Board, not the Steering Committee ○ One additional one of the organizing group is to ensure there has been adequate input from all sectors ○ Define relationships between the NSACH and local entities • How do we decide who to select when there are more nominations than slots? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bring nominations forward in this setting and discuss together ○ Consider note only who would be good on the committee but who has the time to do so • Did we decide something definitive on geography? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will try to get someone from every County, but not as a County rep, but to speak for their County as well as their other perspective ○ Be aware of the language we use when discussing this with the provider community, as it can come across as “you haven’t done your job so we are taking this away from you” 	
<p>5. Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elya introduced the idea of initiatives and getting a preliminary prioritization of the various categories/themes, along a variety of dimensions (e.g., most important to my community, most likely to succeed, most likely to be looked at favorably by the State, and most cost effective) • General consensus that this is not the place to start. We should start with outcomes we want to achieve, and then one of the focuses for the grant be to say something like, “we’re putting together a community coalition that will (for example) improve the rate of preventable deaths, reduce unnecessary hospitalizations etc.” • Scott suggested starting with the Prevention Framework, which is used at the State level • Federico shared his perspective of how the NSACH planning process compares to the RHA board in Vancouver, which has a strong focus on payment reform. “ • Elya will write a letter of support for the State’s Innovation grant, and she will send that to everyone to get support • Larry asked how we get to priority areas- what he heard in the conversation is that we could try another attempt at a survey mechanism focused around outcomes using the Prevention Framework- is this right? • Goal: Have categories in place within a month, and then put a date out there to decide on specific initiatives 	<p>WAHA will use existing Frameworks to develop a list of potential outcomes we could work towards, and each individual will prioritize these along a variety of dimensions. The group would like to see these outcomes set within one month</p> <p>Elya will write a letter of support for the State’s Innovation grant and send it around for everyone to sign</p>

6. Adjourn	
-------------------	--