

COMMISSION ON AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE

February 9, 2015, 12:30 – 3:00 PM

Regis University, Claver Hall, Mountain View Room

Meeting Minutes

Commission Members Present: Bill Lindsay (chair), Elisabeth Arenales, Peg Brown (alternate for Marguerite Salazar), Jeff Cain, Rebecca Cordes, Greg D'Argonne, Ira Gorman, Linda Gorman, Steve ErkenBrack, Marcy Morrison (via phone), Dorothy Perry, Rachel Reiter (alternate for Sue Birch), Chris Tholen, Jay Want, Larry Wolk, Dee Martinez

Commission Members Absent: Cindy Sovine-Miller (vice-chair)

Staff Present: Eric Kuhn, Lorez Meinhold, Cally King, Johanna Gibbs

Outcomes:

- Committee chairs confirmed for all three standing committees: Ira Gorman, Research Committee; Jeff Cain, Communications/ Liaison Committee; Bill Lindsay, Planning Committee.
- The Planning Committee was given authority to initiate grants with signatory responsibility given to the chair and vice-chair of the Commission.
- The Commission approved a draft budget, recognizing the need to make revisions as the committees identify additional needs; the Commission will also need to explore additional funding sources.
- Commissioners identified the need for a protocol for disseminating and collecting information from the public that is accessible to Commissioners and shareable with the public.
- Communication with consultants will be directed through committee chairs.

Action/ Follow-up Items:

- Commissioners to bring their own copies of meeting materials to future meetings.
- Planning Committee to revise draft budget, including line items for ADA accessibility.
- Research Committee to identify budget needs.
- Communications/ Liaison Committee to identify budget needs.
- Planning Committee to draft protocols for forming Ad Hoc Committees.
- Planning Committee in partnership with chair of Research Committee to draft framework for prioritizing issues for March Commission meeting.
- Planning Committee and Keystone to propose a schedule for the state-wide meetings to ensure a quorum of Commissioners will be able to attend.
- Bill Lindsay and Larry Wolk to discuss how to include information from State departments on their work/initiatives in cost containment.

Next Meeting:

Monday March 9, 2015 12:30 – 3:00 PM

Regis University, Claver Hall, Mountain View Room

Meeting Notes:

I. Review of the Agenda

- a. Bill Lindsay provided an update on the confirmed chairs for the Commission's three standing committees:
 - i. Ira Gorman, Research Committee chair
 - ii. Jeff Cain, Communications and Outreach Committee chair
 - iii. Bill Lindsay, Planning Committee chair
- b. Commission members were urged to bring their own copies of meeting materials in the future to help manage cost savings.
- c. Bill Lindsay notified the audience of public comment sign-up provided in the back of the room.

II. Approval of the Minutes (Action Item)

- a. Meeting minutes from the January Commission meeting and standing committees were approved unanimously.
- b. Bill Lindsay notified Commission members that the meeting minutes will use a more succinct format going forward.

III. Process for applying for Grants (Action Item)

- a. Bill Lindsay made a motion to the Commission on behalf of the Planning Committee requesting the authorization to initiate grants on behalf of the Commission with signatory responsibility given to the chair and vice-chair of the Commission.
- b. Possible examples of grant funding:
 - i. Grants may be a useful way to help fund state-wide meetings, pay for information sharing materials, or fund other additional costs.
 - ii. The Planning Committee has not outreached to any foundations or funders at this time.
- c. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

IV. Preliminary Budget for period ending 6/16

- a. The preliminary budget was presented to the Commission by Chris Tholen (see budget document shared with Commission).
- b. Going forward, the budget with actuals will be presented to the Commission on a quarterly basis.
- c. The Commission's current appropriation likely will not cover the first year expenses with a projected deficit; the Commission will need to look for additional funding sources.
- d. Comments/Questions from Commission members:
 - i. Food and food service is mentioned twice, is there a specific reason for this?
Answer: There are two separate line item budgets for this; one is for meeting refreshments, the other figure is for Commission member per diem costs (dinner, etc.)
 - ii. With regards to the \$750 for printing and reproduction, what did we talk about in terms of production value for first interim report to the General Assembly? Will this amount cover that expense? Can we do this in house?
 - iii. How did you arrive at the \$50,000 for CIVHC data?
Answer: The line item is mislabeled. Should be for data in general, inclusive of data from CIVHC but would include other data sets.

- iv. ADA Accessibility is not covered in the budget. What if we need sign language or Spanish to English interpreter?

Answer: That is not factored in the budget right now and will be included in the revised draft budget.

- v. How important are in-kind contributions to document? Should they be documented in the budget?

Answer: It does make sense to document this; also important to include from transparency standpoint. We are also empowered under the statute to receive in-kind contributions; we hope to find in-kind contributions to help offset the cost of the state-wide meetings - someone to host meetings, provide refreshments, etc., to help save dollars.

- vi. Did the Planning Committee determine the number of Commissioners to attend each state-wide meeting?

Answer: By statute, the state-wide meetings are required to be commission meetings, so they will require a quorum. We are working on getting dates to the Commission to figure out schedules and will then ask Commissioners to make a formal commitment to ensure there will be a quorum.

- e. Bill Lindsay motioned to accept the draft budget as a draft with recognition there are items that still need to be included.
 - i. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously with a caveat that the revised draft budget needed to include Spanish translation and sign language, and approved by the Commission.

V. Standing Committee Reports

- a. Ira Gorman provided an update on the Research Committee:
 - i. The committee met on January 29th and established a meeting schedule of twice a month - once before the full Commission meeting and once in-between.
 - ii. The Research Committee views their role as a subcommittee of the whole Commission; providing information sent up to the Commission to make final decisions. Their charge is to analyze and obtain data, discuss and interpret information, and provide final recommendations to the full Commission.
 - iii. The contractor, Colorado Health Institute, will serve as an ex-officio member of the Research Committee.
 - iv. The Research Committee will be drafting a subcommittee budget.
 - v. The committee's first meetings focused on the type of framework needed to do their work:
 - 1. Outline created to start direction
 - 2. Developed concepts:
 - a. Cost, access, and quality model as part of outcomes
 - b. Financing and delivery models
 - c. Address multiple points-of-views and multiple models, pressures of individuals and market approach
 - d. Review what other states and commissions have done
 - e. Review what Colorado has done - present regulation structure, market over last 20 years, other organizations and programs.
 - vi. Questions and comments from Commission members included:
 - 1. How is data/information shared? There is a need for a repository of information sent to Commissioners; an organized way to accept and access info. Maybe Keystone could help with this?

Answer: The Planning Committee recommended creating a repository where information can be logged, and put in categories to be more easily searchable.

2. How do Commissioners want to receive value of input; what are best ways to process?
 - a. Responsibility for documents could be delegated to the Research Committee with the ability for other Commissioners to look at and access those documents.
 - b. This should be a responsibility of staff; there needs to be a filtering mechanism that is not the Research Committee. A protocol on how information will be received and delegated to appropriate committee will be developed by the Planning Committee. Information also needs to be made public.
 - c. There is a need for a central email address to receive information. The classification of documents should also be viewed as “channeling” instead of “filtering.”
 - d. There needs to be a practical process to prioritize documents and information.
 - e. Would a website be best place for this information?

Answer: It would be appropriate; The State has a series of protocols for their website and they typically don’t deal with the volume of documents that we are talking about. We are working through how to best do this given constraints.

3. Questions to the preliminary draft minutes from the Research Committee (document provided to Commission members):
 - a. The Commission is looking at a lot of external reaction to what cost drivers are, entities who know the most about cost drivers are providers (doctors, hospitals, pharmacists, etc.) - this should be reflected in the document.

Answer: This was a draft document from this morning’s meeting. It is still very preliminary and will be revised.

- b. Jeff Cain provided an update from the Communication and Liaison Committee:
 - i. The committee met on January 30th and decided to meet on a monthly basis, likely telephonically with the ability for public to join in conference calls. The logistics still need to be worked out for this, including costs to manage the conference line.
 - ii. Goals for the first meeting:
 1. Review Charter
 2. Proactive messaging and education – want public to understand who the Commission is and receive input from community members.
 3. Look at how to meet in future
 4. Election of chair
 - iii. Current website on CDPHE host: It is hard to find information on the Commission from a public perspective; when you do get to the website it looks like the Commission is a subset of CDPHE. Want to be easily findable as a Cost Containment Commission.
 - iv. Administrative support: The committee would like to work closely with Keystone on the website.
 - v. Questions and comments from Commission members:

1. Will the Communications Committee develop a budget (for things like website development, etc.)?
Answer: Yes.
 2. It will be important for this committee to establish relationships early-on with the Legislature and Governor's office, and use proactive messaging.
- c. Bill Lindsay provided an update on the Planning Committee:
- i. The Planning Committee discussed process for grants, in-kind, and other funding sources. The committee would like to vet in advance, well intentioned offers for funding to avoid conflicts of interest or perceptions of conflict; Plan to establish guidelines on case-by-case basis.
 - ii. Eric Kuhn, Attorney General's Office, has developed and is finalizing contracts with Keystone and CHI.
 - iii. Discussed the potential paths for ad hoc committee formation. The Planning Committee will create protocols on how to form ad hoc committees.
 - iv. Questions and comments from Commission members:
 1. Does the statute allow ad hoc committees?
Answer: The statute requires committees but is permissive to the formation of ad hoc committees.
 2. Has the Planning Committee thought about time frames?
Answer: The committee plans to put together a protocol to bring back at next meeting.

VI. Discussion of plans for state-wide meetings – Lorez Meinhold, The Keystone Center

- a. The potential timeframe for the state-wide meetings would be Mid-August to Mid-September 2015. July tends to be a bad month for public attendance at meetings.
- b. Questions and comments from Commission members:
 - i. It seems daunting to do them all the meetings in such a short timeframe. Is there a reason for this?
Answer: To maximize attendance and receive public input/feedback that can be reviewed in meaningful way across all the communities. A timeframe will be provided to the Commission members with recognition that the timeframe may have to be adjusted if it cannot secure a quorum.
 - ii. An advantage of the shorter timeframe is to get a snapshot; however it also might not be bad to get different input from the meetings.
Answer: It depends on the purpose/goal of the meetings and how the Commission wants to use state-wide meetings to inform work of Research Committee.
 - iii. The state-wide meetings are based on congressional districts; there are really only two or three "out-state" meetings where it would require an overnight (for the majority of Commissioners).
 1. For this reason, the Commission should not restrict itself to seven meetings. The impact of costs on the Eastern Plains is very important to receive. Even though four meetings could be in the Denver metro area, there are other areas to touch.
Answer: Each meeting does not need to be a formal commission meeting; the statute allows for the purpose of the Commission meeting to be gather public input.

- iv. When scheduling the state-wide meetings, it is important to recognize that Pueblo is very different than La Junta, Lamar, etc.

Answer: Keystone's experience and suggestions can help guide this process. The important thing now is to get Commissioners dates and locations to figure out what is possible.

VII. Public Comment:

- a. Victor Ducay: Is the document from the Research Committee on website? How can we get copies if not?

Answer: It is not on the website, there are copies here.

- b. Victor Ducay: Confused with regards to what the research questions are that the Commission is going to look at. Can you explain broad set of questions you are looking at? Do other Commissioners agree these are questions you should be addressing?

Answer: Have not decided that. The Research Committee has had two meetings where we talked about organization. This is a preliminary document that was just proposed one hour ago.

- c. Victor Ducay: Once the Research Committee decides what the overall questions will be, are you bringing that back to full commission?

Answer: Yes.

- d. Victor Ducay: Will the Research Committee meetings be open to the public?

Answer: The committee meetings will be open, but first few will be non-public, working meetings for efficiency and organization.

- e. Richard Passoth: Will there be opportunity for people to testify and dialogue with the Commission or does the public just turn in reports?

Answer: The Commission will provide the opportunity for comment and to provide perspective; this can happen at Research Committee meetings or during the full Commission. Any decisions made in terms of direction and focus will be Commission meeting decisions, not just the committee decisions. The Commission will also have the state-wide meetings for public input and may create ad hoc committees open to public involvement.

VIII. Coordination of communications with Commission Consultants

- a. Bill Lindsay on behalf of the Planning Committee has identified the need of coordination of communication with the consultants. There is a concern if this process is unfettered a situation may be created where consultants are receiving different direction from different people. The Commission is contracting with consultants on a fixed-budget, retainer model and needs to be careful of increasing costs. If Commissioners have questions they want addressed or questions on process, these should go through the committee chairs.

- i. Need a clearer understanding of what exactly the consultants' scope of work is going to be; need to understand their expectations and what the Commission has hired them to do.

Answer: Once contracts are signed, we will be developing more specific scopes of work.

IX. Preparation for the March Commission meeting; discussion of priorities

- a. The Commission members brainstormed topics and had a conversation on what the focus of the Commission should be:

- i. What are the key areas the Commission should be thinking about? Where should the Commission seek specific information? Testimony?
 - ii. What's the model/framework the Commission wants to use to get answers to questions and then make decisions? What's the role of market? What's the role of state regulations and how do they affect cost?
- b. This is an important conversation to decide how to make this process manageable.
- c. There needs to be more information and data before the Commission can take on specific topics.
 - i. The Commission should be careful to not pre-judge the issues.
 - ii. It will be helpful to think of costs to health care in broad terms; the Commission should start with a broad look at first and then narrow.
 - iii. The Commission should have information available on the cost of all the different health care areas including end of life care and convalescent care.
 - iv. After the broad discussion to get context, the Commission can then go back to more detailed/data driven discussions on specific topics.
- d. The Commission needs to do some prioritization. What are key things the Commission ought to suggest that could really make a difference and ensure are actionable?
 - i. There will probably be a longer list of cost drivers that the Commission will have to narrow and prioritize.
 - ii. Look at systems approaches.
- e. Should take a more holistic/"diagnostician" approach
- f. Next Steps: Planning Committee will work with Research Committee chair on how to frame the discussion for the March meeting.
 - i. It would be helpful to know what the state's departments and agencies are working on in this particular area; could be important as part of priority setting conversation. Larry Wolk offered to work with Bill Lindsay to pull this together.

X. Public Comment:

- a. Richard Passoth: When people use the word "research" we tend to think about data collection but research to me is much broader than that. One thing we need to look at is people's underlying values and beliefs. If we don't understand what drives judgments and beliefs we won't understand how we got there.
- b. Janet Wojniak, MNP, Regis: "Think first of horses, not zebras..." There is already evidence based research that can be used to help identify problems that are common to communities. Identify what is common in communities to understand how treatment can go; look at preventative measures to help contain costs. Focus on education.

XI. Other Business

- a. March meeting will have two components:
 - i. Updates from standing committees
 - ii. Planning and Research Committee chair will put together framework for discussion

The Commission adjourned at 2:20pm.