

Executive Committee Meeting Notes

Date: July 30, 2020

Time: 10:00am - 11:00am

Location: Via Zoom

Committee Members in Attendance

- Chad Augustin, Deputy Fire Chief, Sacramento Fire Department
- Jaycob Bytel, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of the Mayor, City of Sacramento
- Chris Conlin, Assistant City Manager, City of Sacramento
- Bridget Dean, Social Service Administrator, Sacramento Police Department
- Emily Halcon, Homeless Services Manager, City of Sacramento
- Leyne Milstein, Assistant City Manager, City of Sacramento

Pathways Support Team in Attendance

- Lisa Chan-Sawin, Transform Health
- Ron Spingarn, Transform Health
- Gretchen Schroeder, Transform Health
- Alexis Sabor, Transform Health
- Rochelle Mulondo, Transform Health

Exec Committee Business

1. Action Item: Approve 4/30/20 Meeting Minutes
 - Emily Halcon moved to approve the minutes from 4/30/20. Approved by board.

Program Updates (please refer to meeting handout)

2. Info Item: Dashboard
 - Lisa: All of our numbers are ticking up. We have over 200 enrollments, initially we were unsure that we would reach goal of 2000 by 2020. The number of people we are housing is continuing to grow, we think those numbers will continue to grow as housing partners use One-time Housing funds.
3. Info Item: Pathways COVID-19 Impacts
 - Lisa: We reached out to partners to offer support due to COVID-19.

In-Reach Strategy

- Lisa: We implemented a targeted approach of mining referral list and matched this with eligibility criteria. This was a successful intervention the Pathways

support team was able to refine a list of 400 to 57 for people for the Pathways program. The Pathways support team worked with Kyle to place patients from motels and trailers. The team housed 26 clients in two and a half weeks, there was a low error rate, only three people declined enrollment, and only 3 were ineligible.

- Emily: 125 pathways enrollments, there are other programs with the same target population, such as the Veterans program, but we are housing the largest percentage of patients. Our success is dependent on the motels, if motels close, we will stay in contact with this population, but it would disrupt the process.
- Lisa: The Pathways support team is regrouping with Sacramento Covered to get updated data and report back, might do another round of data collection. This intervention creates space in COVID shelters.

4. Info Item: Re-Housing Funds Update

- Lisa: Rehousing funds have been distributed to three housing partners. We are working through invoicing issues, unclear if we can spend all 3 million rehousing dollars by December.
- Jaycob: Do these funds expire?
- Emily: No, these funds can be extended so we will not let the money go unspent. If the Whole Person Care ends, we will have to renegotiate and distribute the money to other programs.
- Lisa: These funds are available through 2025 and we are tracking the spend down for programmatic purposes. The Pathways support team only has a few months of invoices so need more data to report on this.

5. Info Item: July IGT Update

- Lisa: There is an IGT gap of 266,000 dollars, State wants us to spend these dollars that we have earned, but we have not been able to find local match to match the funds yet. If the city finds a local match, we can spend this money.

6. Info Item: WPC Augmentation Application

- Lisa: We are working with Jaycob and Emily on augmentation.
- Emily: Got approval from State, we can add 10 million dollars to the Whole Person Care program with a 5-million-dollar match. The funds received from this will not be tied up.
- Lisa: Bridgette is building out policies and procedures defining how we will use these funds to double down. We are being incredibly careful and thoughtful; we are not expecting a lot of dollars to build out these 5 items. (See slide 10)

7. Info Item: PY4 Pay-for-Outcome Measures

- Lisa: The past two years have shown us that our data collection method is not aligned with the State. Historically, Pathways has not generated data the way the State does. To better align our data sets we aim to remove three out of four measures because our baseline rate was so slow, Department of Health Care Services urged us to do this so we can draw down the funds as much as possible.

- Emily: This is better matched to what the State is doing. We will get data from all health plans; in the future we will get more helpful data.
 - Lisa: State acknowledged their data was flawed, for instance they had 0% for Sacramento County which was inaccurate. They have conflict with their data set and our data set is so much more difference. Their internal policies align more with our data than with the State data.
8. Info Item: E&U Report Issues
- Lisa: Uncovered Issues with Sac Covered, our totals were not aligned due to underbilling the State by 620 member months and underreporting, this is part of the reason why we had such a large IGT gap. We believe that discrepancy was due to an error in one of the algorithms and Sacramento Covered is working on this issue. We have asked them to document what they have done to fix those issues and report back. (Action Item)

Discussion Items:

1. DHCS Policy Updates

WPC Extension

- Lisa: The State is seeking a straight one-year extension for the 1115 waiver; this would include a 16 million dollar and 8 million dollar local and federal match. They have asked the federal government to include COVID populations in target population. Whole Person Care can serve anyone who is at risk for COVID. Other pilots are looking at using Whole Person Care funds to cover all COVID service costs. Programs can opt out and if there are unspent funds they can redistribute.
- Lisa: All public comments have to be recorded, so this is an opportunity for the city to weigh in. There will be another comment forum for the federal government in which the city can also participate. Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services is delaying their review, we may hear the results of this in December or January 2021, this is concerning because of time to ramp down or ramp up depending on whether the extension is granted or not. Questions?
- Emily: If it were budget neutral, we would like to do an extension. But the timing makes its hard. I already started talking to Jaycob and Consuela. We should get input from this group to see if it is a good idea to elevate these issues.
- Chris: Where are we getting the idea that the decision will not be made until December and January? And is this part of the legislation package?
- Lisa: Separate from legislation, it is specific to the waiver.
- Emily: This timeline and decision will be heavily impacted by the current federal leadership, and who is in office after November.
- Lisa: Currently, the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services is unfriendly to New York and California and other liberal states, reality is that getting approval from the current administration is really hard so there is a lot riding on the

election. Department of Healthcare Services leadership conversations are hard, this extension request should have been done six months ago.

- Chris: This must not be a big budget priority for the State, or we would already been included.
- Emily: We would not modify our target population that much; we cannot wait until December to make our decision.
- Lisa: Expanding our target population to the COVID population, this could allow the city to modify eligibility to include more than chronically homeless and include other homeless populations.

Cal AIM Implementation On-Hold

- The State budget did not include any funding for CalAIM, Department of Healthcare Services is continuing to develop this program. Since CalAIM is not an option in 2020 it increases concern about how to transition our patients. Health Homes funding is only available until end of June 30, 2021, that creates additional challenges, if we move people into Health Homes then they will experience two program transitions.

2. Transition Planning Scenarios

Changes to referral approach

- Lisa: Last November this was our game plan (slide 16) I want to flag that in our original plan we were unable to work with shelters. We are planning for this transition in a time of uncertainty. We are experiencing a surge of COVID cases and we do not know if COVID will still have an impact later this year. There is a threshold question, if there is a waiver extension does the city want to extend? We would have to consider local match, there are social and political implications, it is not good timing, there are questions about the administrative infrastructure we built and what will happen to it if the program end prematurely.
- Lisa: We have to create housing transition plans and ways to have data sharing plans or people who cannot fit into another program easily will be left without care.
- Emily: Does anyone have any initial thoughts?
- Jaycob: Mayor has to answer these questions, better decided by the elected.
- Chris: We need a dose of reality from Leyne, I do not know how lucrative this is because of delayed timeline.
- Leyne: We need to know the financial impacts on the city and partners before a decision is made. The reality is if we fund one thing, we have to cut another. Coronavirus Relief Funds will only go so far, we have to have a few more answers before we present this to counsel.

- Jaycob: The city council has to weigh in to see if there are other options or if they want to end this program.
- Emily: This program is funded by outside partners, so this is all contingent on if these external partners agree to come to the table with the same financial commitment that would be interesting to the city.
- Chris: Where do the partners stand on this? I believe a lot of the hospitals for instance, have lost money due to COVID restrictions correct?
- Jaycob: Hospitals love Whole Person Care and will most likely match.
- Emily: We basically give hospitals back all their money, so it is a good deal.
- Lisa: Hospitals have taken a hit, but there will be additional relief funds and the Whole Person Care money will come from their community benefit funds so this money will most likely not reduce drastically.
- Lisa: There may be costs related to Pathways that could be decreased by running it through Whole Person Care. 10-million-dollar augmentation we gave can be used. We are planning to use Whole Person Care funds to pay for GIS. The State is interested in supporting that kind of activity.
- Chris: When does council have to make that decision?
- Emily: Jaycob and I can meet separately to talk through timing because we have to go through SHRA item. Lisa has outlined the various timelines in this presentation and there are so many unknowns. Is this a good strategy because I do not think, we can make this decision today.
- *Everyone agrees to move to SHRA item and table transition discussion.*

3. SHRA Update & Program's Use of HCVs

- Emily: In 2017, the council directed SHRA to allocate vouchers to Pathways participants. It took us a long time to get our Pathways program aligned with SHRA and able to access vouchers for our clients. There were a few snags due to bureaucratic processes, lack of staffing from SHRA, and COVID also exasperated this situation. We have been trying to engage the SHRA on ways to improve this process, we are completely blind on the process once an application is submitted.
- Emily: SHRA has changed their process due to COVID and this has created a system where you need technology or there are barriers to care which is a problem for our target population, last week we got data from SHRA to compare where we are and where they rare and there were massive discrepancies.
- Emily: The big picture is we do not have a lot of time to house people and there is no capacity to continue to submit vouchers though SHRA, potentially thinking about stopping this process through SHRA.
- Chris: If we do not do it through SHRA where will Pathways participants go for vouchers?

- Emily: There are other options, if we continue with the SHRA application it would be hard for us to house anyone by the program end date since we only have six months.
- Lisa: Lost applications have been a problem, and some people who have been waiting four months have actually been waiting eight months. There are also issues regarding the way data is presented, we have proposed solutions to them, their response was to pass work to the partners to correct issues and find duplications.
- Ron: The footnotes on this slide get into the weeds, overall, there were 40 lost applications, 10 clients who died were still on the SHRA roster, clients housed in other programs were on the roster. There are a lot of problems with the data.
- Lisa: It is taking six to nine months for applications to process and patients dying before they get into the program.
- Emily: County voucher program has the same issue.
- Chris: Has council asked for report back on this because they are the ones who originally asked for this. If we are not meeting performance metrics on vouchers the council needs to fix this issue.
- Emily: Does not have to be a big public thing because we do not have time. We will not withdraw applications, but we do not aim to submit new ones, and we ask that SHRA should expedite the 200-300 applications we already submitted.
- Chris: We can mechanically slow down the flow of SHRA applications while they process the submitted applications.
- Leyne: How can we do this without public scorn?
- Chris: Emily can work with the Mayor on this.
- Emily: We need to have a larger conversation with Mayor and city council.
- Chris: We are not considering stopping applications we are only slowing down applications to allow the system to catch up.
- Bridgette: Do we have data sharing between the three partners, are they all using the same application system?
- Emily: SHRA uses Dropbox for applications so there is no notification system, we do not have any way of verifying that they received application. Some partners follow up, but others do not have the bandwidth to follow up which results in a lot of lost applications.
- Lisa: We could not report the exact impact on our program because our program's data was combined with other programs, we had to get a separate report. We presented this data to Emily with recommendations.
- Ron: Partners have their own issues, and SHRA has their own issues. SHRA is sending two weekly reports and one monthly report so that is fixing some of the feedback issues.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

- Emily: Talk with Jaycob and Scott about timing with Mayor and City council.
- Lisa: Send a copy of dashboard to everyone.