

## Executive Committee Notes

**Date:** December 7, 2017  
**Time:** 10:00-11:00am  
**Location:** City Hall Conference Room 5214

### Committee Members in Attendance:

- Emily Halcon, Project Director and Homeless Services Coordinator, City of Sacramento
- Daniel Hahn, Chief of Police, City of Sacramento Police Department
- Niko King, Deputy Chief, City of Sacramento Fire Department
- Leyne Milstein, Finance Director, City of Sacramento

### Support Team:

- Lisa Chan-Sawin, Project Lead
- Karen Linkins, Service Delivery Team Lead
- Mark Elson, IT Team Lead
- John Freeman, Project Manager
- Jean-Paul Buchanan, Communications Lead
- Margaux McFetridge, Communications Manager

### Welcome and Introductions

- Lisa welcomed the group and Mark and Jean-Paul introduced themselves.
- Noted that a member representing the Mayor's Office still needed to be filled and the Committee suggested adding Jaycob Bytel, Deputy Communications Director for the Office of the Mayor, as a Committee member.
- For now the Committee will hold Arturo Sanchez's seat empty until position is filled.

### Executive Committee Business

**Action Taken:** The Committee unanimously approved the November 1<sup>st</sup> meeting notes and also approved the addition of two new partners, Sacramento Self-Help Housing and the Salvation Army.

## Update on November 16th Service Delivery Committee Meeting

- The Support Team provided an overview of the Pathways forms and tools developed and being used by the program. Clarified that the Service Delivery Committee was asked to flag any red flags and no issues were raised.
- Support Team noted that in the next Service Delivery Committee meeting, the Shared Care Plan will be discussed — what needs to be in there, what needs to happen electronically, and how to encourage collaboration across sectors.
- Committee members asked several questions about the tools and forms, including whether they are electronic. Support Team noted that they are mixed, both paper and electronic. The universal screening tool is being used in the field with iPads. Screening process takes 10 minutes and captures eligibility, acuity, and need. Acuity piece is critical for the level of case management being tracked by the state. The form was adapted from something that is being used in Oregon. Includes client goals and objectives — patient-centered. The Member Profile/Shared Care Plan allows clients to only tell their stories once and an LCSW signs off on the Member Profiles.
- City inquired whether the client's "score" is made available to the client. Noted that the VI-SPDAT also produces a score and would be shared with clients, resulting in both clients and navigator trying to game the process. Another issue associated with scoring is that the biases of navigators can be reflected in scores; one study found that minorities were disproportionately scored lower. It was recommended that cultural competency and implicit training be offered to ensure that assessment tools are not administered with bias and negatively impact access to services. The Sacramento Police Department has an implicit bias training that can be shared. The Support Team responded that scores will never be shared with clients. City requested that implicit bias training be folded in with the launch of the contracts in April.

**Action Taken:** Executive Committee approved Service Delivery Committee endorsed forms and tools with the caveat that bias training and tracking be implemented.

## Update on November 16th IT Committee Meeting

- The Support Team provided an overview of the IT Committees process for developing the universal consent form and IT Approach for the program. At the last IT Committee meeting the approach and plan for Pathways IT was discussed in detail. The screening tool is accompanied by a consent form. The consent form has been through the IT Committee and shared with Service Delivery Committee. The consent for was adapted from a form used by the Los Angeles County Whole Person Care pilot and is compliant with HIPAA and California law. Consent ends with the end of the program. The Support Team explained that a potential wrinkle is that the County also created a universal consent form that the program may want to use eventually. But until we know more, the program needs to move forward with the consent form developed.
- The City noted that the consent form does not give consent to giving info to the City, but at the same time, the City Manager is signing off reports that have PHI.

- The Support Team clarified that to be enrolled, the individual has to check yes on everything, including sharing data with the City. Forms is as simple as possible, while still being compliant with federal and California law. County form is much more complicated. A core reason that enrollees need to check every box is because Pathways is a medically managed model. If enrollees do not agree to let the program share data, they won't benefit from the services provided. The program cannot commit to making sure certain data is segmented for granular levels of consent, which is why the form adopts this approach. Form does cover sharing data with the City and the Pathways Partners.
- Support Team explained that the City's agreement with the state stated that the pilot would approve an IT approach in 2017. Support Team had numerous discussions with stakeholders. The team looked at an intensive centralized approach, which stakeholders were not supportive of. From that direction, the team developed a hybrid approach where 1) teams will use one shared tool for care management, 2) alerts from hospitals to notify folks on the ground. Per the program model, federally qualified health centers (FQHCs) are going to be hubs of information and will be sharing data between hospitals. This model incorporates the same efforts that the SHIP is looking for and is in sync with using those existing networks. Benefits are that it is built on existing capability. Initial lightweight IT infrastructure will be managed by Sacramento Covered, the Enrollment and Eligibility entity. Support Team is working with them to build additional infrastructure. Approach will allow us to identify where people are not receiving services to identify gaps. Long-term sustainability is supported by this approach and system will be beneficial beyond Whole Person Care. Also allows the program to track outcomes and measures and tie in with the state Health Homes program as we move forward.

**Action Taken:** Executive Committee approved the consent form and IT approach.

### Early Engagement Updates

- Support Team provided an update on Early Engagement program implementation, going over the most recent Pathways Dashboard from Sacramento Covered. Program has enrolled 149 individuals as of December 1, with 29 pending enrollment. Majority of enrollees are from IMPACT Team referrals.
- City inquired on the status of Fire referrals. Support Team responded that they are very close to finalizing the process. BAA needs to be signed and it is being sorted this afternoon.
- City noted that it will be interesting to see how many of the Police Department top 30 utilizers are the same as Fire. It may be close and it will be important for the City to have this information. Support Team noted that Sacramento Covered will be able to pull that data.
- SSF has started mining the queue (HMIS) for data and 160 individuals were identified as having visited the hospital, of which, 14 were already in Pathways. Need to do the analysis of where individuals overlap between systems.
- Health Coverage: Uninsured individuals are Medi-Cal eligible. For individuals with "out of county" insurance, Sacramento Covered contacts the County and gets them enrolled in Sacramento County coverage.
- City asked whether they track how many people are not eligible. Support Team responded they do and we can request that they add that number to the dashboard.

- Demographics: Majority of individuals are over 50, need to have long-term care connections, e.g. connect with the Area Agency on Aging. City noted that mirrors what we found when we opened last year's winter shelter. We are touching people that are off the radar.
- City asked whether there are individuals that are under 18 who are enrolled and the procedures for children and youth. Support Team clarified that there has not been enrollee under 18 yet. If they are very, very sick they would qualify for EPSDT. Noted that the program would likely refer them to CPS or DHA if they are under 18 and not emancipated.
- Support Team brought up that there have been some concerns from HIV + population about the confidentiality issues with signing up and it will be critical to have a provider that works with this population on board.
- Geography: City asked whether the zip codes represent where the outreach workers are. Noted that the zip codes represent the Winter Triage Center areas. Program has 50 people ready for the shelter that are all Pathways clients. Noted that there are some districts that are missing where there are many homeless people.
- Support Team shared that Pathways Care Teams had launched and referral pathways planning with partners has been initiated.

#### **Update on RFQ Release**

- RFQ was released on December 1st to solicit organizations to provide services in three areas starting April 1st:
  - Pathways Hub Entities that serve as "Health Homes" for enrollees and manage 1-2 Pathways Care Teams
  - Pathways Assertive Outreach and Referral Entities
  - Pathways Housing Services Entities
- A mandatory pre-submittal conference for responders was held on December 6th with more than 60 representatives for organizations in attendance.
- Responses are due January 5, 2018 and selected providers will be submitted to the Executive Committee for approval on January 18, 2017 (note: this date is in between meetings and will require a decision by email or phone, unless the Committee prefers to meet in-person).

#### **Update on Data-Sharing and Incentive Agreements**

- An Incentive Agreement Template for PY2 (2017) was approved by City Council on November 21st and agreements have been distributed to the Managed Care Plan and Hospital Partners. The deadline for these partners to submit signed Incentive Agreements is December 15th.
- Community Organization Partners will be receiving finalized Incentive Agreements this week with a December 19th deadline to submit a signed agreement. A webinar explaining the Incentive Agreement provisions, requirements, tracking, and invoicing and payment process was held for Managed Care Plan and Hospital partners, and is scheduled for Community Organization Partners.
- All partners are required to sign Data-Sharing Agreements as a condition to receiving incentive payments.
- Data-Sharing Agreements have been drafted, reviewed by Sacramento Covered, and are in the process of being reviewed by the City's IT team. Anticipate having the agreements to partners for review by the

end of the month with the goal of having the agreements finalized and approved by City Council on February 6, 2018.