



TASK FORCE ON UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE

Attendees	Glendora Claybrooks, Dwight Dill, Bruce Goldberg, Zeenia Junkeer, Ed Junkins, Sam Metz, Cheryl Ramirez, Les Rogers, John Santa, Chuck Sheketoff, Chad Chadwick
Absent	Rep. Hayden, Sen. Manning, Rep. Wilde, Claire Hall, Michael Collins, Director Allen, TK Keen
Date/Time	September 9, 2021; 1pm-4pm (recording)

Meeting Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and discuss key considerations around community engagement including draft proposals. Review proposed work plan and outline for the financial analysis. Consider and agree on a process for the Task Force to respond to external communications.
Discussion of Key Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members discussed logistical consideration of in-person and virtual community forums. Clarify the purpose of a two-phased approach which would involve in-person and remote meetings in different geographic regions. Also, clarify what elements of the June interim progress report should be used to develop content for the community engagement meetings. The two-phased approach is intended to allow communities to participate more than once, and offers the task force an opportunity to share its financial plan, which won't be available until the spring of 2022. Community-based organizations (CBO) would be organizations that represent the specific communities referenced in Senate Bill 770 (2019). Important to prioritize CBOs that support populations in SB 770. Members discussed CBO stipends and the role of CBOs in the proposed engagement work. Members expressed interest in partnering with multiple organizations in a particular geographic community. Interest in multiple provider forums as there are many different provider types on Oregon. Members raised several additional questions: how many forums, how many attendees per forum, will these forums be open to the public; will the task force be able to use traditional media and social media to communicate with different participants. Staff shared the number of community participants will be impacted on whether participants are offered a financial stipend, and if yes, how much funding is available to support participant stipends. Different costs for in-person forums vs. remote engagement; consideration if certain communities do not have adequate broadband to participate. Members expressed caution around remote engagement forums and ensuring all Oregon residents can participate as there are challenges with virtual meeting platforms. Several members shared their perspective that remote meetings cannot substitute for in-person meetings. Clarify that "cities" identified by staff more broadly refer to "regions" in Oregon. Suggestion to include communities in the Northwest (e.g., Astoria) and Southeast (e.g., Klamath Falls) portions in the state. Members expressed a preference to define regions, first, not cities.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member suggestion is to prepare a range for the revenue estimates to help with scoping out the work. • Members voiced the need to carefully consider assumptions that are needed to complete the financial analysis work. Several assumptions identified are federal waivers for Medicaid and Medicare, ERISA, provider payments, potential cost savings. One proposal might be to ask the actuarial experts to model more than one plan: (1) plan A, all waivers, (2) plan B, no Medicare, and (3) plan C, no ERISA. • Members discussed their response to the Editorial by the Bend Bulletin. Task force discussed guidance and agreement in terms of how to respond going forward. Members agreed they have different perspectives and are able to respond, independent of one another, as long it is clear a member is speaking on their own behalf and is not representing the views of the task force. • Agreements among members: need to transparent in its responses, be able to respond quickly and not wait to review written responses as monthly meetings; type of member forum to review and prepare external communications; members that prepare individual communications, coordinate with other task force members.
<p>Action Items</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff to develop draft communication tools (content) for members to use at community engagement forums, including a list of FAQs for members to use. • Whether and how to use social media and online forums to share the work of the task force. • Request of staff to identify low-costs technological options to support remote participation even for in-person meetings (e.g., hybrid meetings). • Expediting process for the chair, vice-chair, and another member to be able to quickly respond to external communications.
<p>Follow-up Questions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many meetings with employers and health care stakeholders? • Which community-based organizations (CBOs) would be selected, and how would CBOs be selected, and by whom? What criteria will be used as part of the CBO selection process, ensure the selection process is transparent. • Request for staff to consider sequencing for the financial analysis and developing the revenue estimates.
<p>Revisit Later (Parking Lot)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite task force members to participate in a “dress rehearsal” prior to any community engagement forum.
<p>Meeting Materials</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda (link) • Presentation slide deck (link) • Financial analysis – scope of work proposal (link) • Bend Bulletin editorial (link) • Draft member response to Bend Editorial (link)