Monthly Meeting Notes



The following documents the meeting convened on 9/11/2024:

Committee Member Attendees:	CIVHC Staff Attendees:		
Ako Quammie (Contexture)	🛛 Kelsey Foland	🗌 Liz Mooney	
Andy Woster (CCMCN)	Abby Fehler	🛛 Lucía Sanders	
Beth Martin (HCPF)	🗆 Amanda Kim	🛛 Maggie Mueller	
□ Caleb Wright (Elevance Health)	Danielle Evergreen	Martha Meyer	
□ Chris McDowell (Valley Health Alliance)	Darcy Holladay Ford	🛛 Mason Thaxton	
Essey Yirdaw (Colorado Hospital Association)	🛛 Hannah Witting	Pete Sheehan	
Jesse Villines (Craig Hospital)	⊠ Jacque Lewis	□ Sauntice Washington	
Megan Denham (Georgia Tech)	John Francis (counsel)	🗌 Twanisha Parnell	
Nathan Wilkes (Headstorms, Inc.)	🛛 Ken Holtschlag	🛛 Megha Jha	
□ <u>Sheri Herner</u> (Kaiser Permanete)	Kristin Paulson	⊠ Valerie Garrison	

Agenda

<u>10:30 AM</u>	24.41
Requesting Organization:	Rutgers Cancer Institute of New Jersey
Project Title:	Equity in Cancer Care: Exploring Emergency Department Diagnosis, Disparities, and Economic Impact in Gastrointestinal Cancers
<u>11:00 AM</u>	23.72
Requesting Organization:	University of Utah, Department of Psychiatry
Project Title:	Impact of a Mobile Phone Crisis Text Messaging Application on the Spatiotemporal Distribution of Mental Health Outcomes among Adolescents

Monthly Meeting Notes



10:30 AM		24.41			
Extract Type:	:	Limited			
Requesting C	Organization:	Rutgers Cancer Institute of New Jersey			
Project Title:		Equity in Cancer Care: Exploring Emergency Department Diagnosis, Disparities, and Economic Impact in Gastrointestinal Cancers			
CIVHC Prese	nter:	Lucía Sanders, Key Account Manager			
Project Presenter(s):		Dr. Haejin In, Associate Professor of Surgery Dr. Elizabeth Handorf, Associate Professor Brijesh Rana, Research Coordinator Hari Iyer Antoinette Stroup Sara Heinert			
Requested Protected Health Information (PHI):					
Requested	Approved	Data Element			
\boxtimes	\boxtimes	Member 5-Digit Zip Code			
		Member County			
		Member City			
\boxtimes	\boxtimes	Member Dates of Service			
\boxtimes	\boxtimes	Member Eligibility Dates			
		Employer Name			
		Member <u>FIPS Code</u>			
		Member <u>Census Tract</u>			
		Member <u>Census Block</u>			
		Member <u>Census Block Group</u>			
	Available for Identifiable Extracts only:				
		Member Name			
		Member Date of Birth (if requesting more than year only)			
		Member Street Address			
		Member Latitude and Longitude			
Employer Tax ID		Employer Tax ID			

Monthly Meeting Notes



Committee Discussion and Questions

- Lucía provides overview of project prior to PI team joining the call
- PI team joins the call and shares their materials
- Megan Denham: with race/ethnicity data not so readily available, do you have more information about how you will be tracking that down, or if you can complete the research without that data?
 - Dr. In: the nice thing about the linkages between databases is how much they supplement each other. In conjunction with the Cancer Registry, we are confident we will get good data
 - Antoinette Stroup: in Colorado, goal certification has been reached for many years for these databases, which requires a very high standard of validated race/ethnicity data
- Beth Martin: who will be handling the matching work? Will CIVHC be matching to the registry and sending IDs back and forth?
 - Lucía notes that this will be handled the same way as prior projects with linkages with CDPHE. We have codes for the cancer types of interest, which will be identified in the CO APCD and sent to the Cancer Registry. The Registry will match and return findings via a crosswalk so the PI team can review the matches
- Megan Denham: noticed that Pharmacy data was not requested. Will that impact that ability to identify other treatments that occurred prior to admission?
 - Dr. In: because we are linking with the Cancer Registry, who collects a lot of details including diagnosis points and was created to identify new cancers, there will be more information available than if this was a study that didn't include linkages. We are relying on the Registry data matches to tell us if there are new cancers in the data set
- Caleb Wright: there's a lot of focus on demographics, but all the fields around cost are selected. There is not much detail in the request around economic impact
 - Elizabeth Handorf: we are definitely interested in what type of insurance they have, but individual charges or amount paid is probably not necessary and could be amended. We want to see claims for different treatments through ICD and CPT codes to see various charges for quality of care. Paid amounts are likely not required, we can adjust if needed
 - Ako Quammie: if there was a dollar figure, or some level of dollar associated with PCP visits, that could be helpful for the study
- Ako Quammie: for place of service, obviously ED vs. office setting, age ranges dictate which cancer tests are considered standard preventative medicine. Are any of those preventative codes included?





- Elizabeth Handorf: we are looking a year prior to see if the patients had comorbidities. In terms of identifying primary care doctors, we are planning on quantifying some measure of regular contact with the healthcare system prior to their diagnosis. If so, it seems probable that they will have different cancer pathways to their diagnosis
- Ako Quammie: there are certain visit codes for things like screenings suggested at the age of 55, etc. If you are looking at those codes, are there specific preventative maintenance codes that go beyond what was selected last time
- Elizabeth Handorf: we are aiming for everything we can see due to such a broad population
- Lucía: confirming this is the case. We will be filtering by age 18 at time of service, and then directing down from there via taxonomy codes and place of service so we can see where they are going
- PI team drops from call and Kelsey requests further questions from the Committee
- Megan Denham: the study duration runs to 2030, with no anticipated publications until 2031. Are there concerns around that longer timeline? What is considered a normal time period?
 - Lucía notes that they will not be receiving data until 2025 from all states and sources
 - Kelsey: while the 6 years is on the upper range of what we typically approve, CIVHC is comfortable with the timeline due to the different data sources and their arrival throughout the 2025 calendar year to the PI team
- Kelsey: checks with Caleb around limiting cost
 - Caleb: doesn't get the sense that this PI group will be disclosing anything to the payer space, which is nice to see in place. There isn't excellent confidence that all elements are needed though-- it doesn't seem like they will plan to use all the data elements in that category
 - Megan: they didn't put it in their objectives, but there is definitely value in that comparison if they are planning on doing it
 - Ako: it seems that they are more interested in the clinical side of things, not so much the cost side of things. There are correlation points that would be interesting to see, such as where cost variations occur depending on diagnosis and later stages
 - Lucía notes that we often request the limit to charge amount, total liability, and plan paid amount. CIVHC is happy to make that recommendation if the Committee prefers
 - Kelsey: it is reasonable to ask them to scale back since they expressed not firmly needing those elements and see where we can go from there

Monthly Meeting Notes



DRRC Recommendation

Does the DRRC recommend this project for production? 🛛 🛛 Yes 🗌 No					
First Motion to Recommend:	Beth Martin (HCPF)				
Second Motion to Recommend:	Megan Denham (Georgia Tech)				
Production condition(s):	Data Release Application and Data Element Selection Form correction or modification All claim cost data elements are being requested, but the research team states they do not need them all. To meet the minimum necessary standard, request documentation needs adjustments to remove the unnecessary elements. Production is recommended when this is completed.				
Are there objections to this project's	s production? 🗌 Yes 🛛 No				
Production is not recommended if three (3) or more Committee members object.					
DRRC Objector:	Basis for Objection:				

Monthly Meeting Notes



11:00 AM		23.72		
Extract Type:		Limited		
Requesting Organization:		University of Utah, Department of Psychiatry		
Project Title:		Impact of a Mobile Phone Crisis Text Messaging Application on the Spatiotemporal Distribution of Mental Health Outcomes among Adolescents		
CIVHC Prese	nter:	Mason Thaxton, Health Data Consultant		
Project Prese	enter(s):	Brent Kious, MD, PhD		
Requested Protected Health Information (PHI):				
Requested	Approved	Data Element		
\boxtimes	\boxtimes	Member 5-Digit Zip Code		
		Member County		
		Member City		
\boxtimes	\boxtimes	Member Dates of Service		
		Member Eligibility Dates		
		Employer Name		
		Member <u>FIPS Code</u>		
		Member <u>Census Tract</u>		
		Member <u>Census Block</u>		
		Member <u>Census Block Group</u>		
	Available for Identifiable Extracts only:			
		Member Name		
		Member Date of Birth (if requesting more than year only)		
		Member Street Address		
		Member Latitude and Longitude		
	Employer Tax ID			

Monthly Meeting Notes



Committee Discussion and Questions

- Mason provides overview of project prior to PI team joining the call
- Brent Kious joins the call and shares their materials
- Megan Denham: noticed that one of the research questions is also looking at overdose deaths, but pharmacy data is not being requested. Can you explain a little why you aren't requesting data around details like prescriptions and high-risk overdose medications?
 - Dr. Kious: we are approaching this study from the angle of diagnosis codes in the hospital, but this is a fantastic angle that would be valuable for a future study
- Ako Quammie: thinking of overlaps in Utah and Colorado, Colorado does have a program called Safe2Tell
 - Dr. Kious: we are hoping to account for all mental health services to the extent that we can control for them. The understanding of the Colorado app is that it was introduced later than the Utah app, so hopefully there will be some good overlap to look at
- Beth and Megan voice excitement to see the outcomes of this study and how that could capture a better view of initiatives making impacts
- Nathan Wilkes: appreciates the reference to the pandemic. Was the Utah app launched in 2016? Adoption rates among the target audience is such a key factor. The DRA mentions a significant change in 2020—how are you accounting for that and economic differences across states?
 - Dr. Kious: the legislation started in 2015, with a full live launch in 2017, but saturation across the state wasn't seen until late 2018 thanks to a gradual rollout in schools. We are now up to about 2,500 contacts per month which has been steady for a few years. Economic downturns and impacts of the pandemic will be entered into the statistic models which will be looking at concentrated areas. We have seen that kids in high-rate areas of the pandemic and low-income areas are the ones utilizing the services most frequently
- Dr. Kious drops from call and Kelsey requests further questions from the Committee
- Caleb Wright: compliments the presenter, this was one of the most articulate requests that Caleb has seen in almost 8 years of reviewing these requests
 - Ako seconds this, and notes that the inclusion of data in his slides gives the Committee high confidence
- Megan Denham: any concerns about the patient groups getting too small during analysis? It could get pretty finite depending on the breakout

Monthly Meeting Notes



- Mason: during analysis, no concerns. But there will be a CIVHC review prior to publication or release to ensure suppression and cell count standards are in place
- Ako Quammie: as a limited data set, will they be getting socioeconomic data from census data?
 - Mason: imaging it will be census data, since he is only looking at the 5-digit zip level.
 Happy to follow up on this piece and see if methodology has already been developed for this
 - Kelsey: they are requesting rural/urban flags, which will indicate some of that detail
- Nathan: small piece of data missing would be death information—suicides seem to be checked in Utah with the medical examiner, but it doesn't look like there is an equivalent in Colorado accounted for in the request at this time
 - o Beth: suggests Vital Records matching if they need a Colorado equivalent
 - Mason will check in with the PI to confirm if matching is needed for this project (might be an interest point for overdose studies down the road)

Does the DRRC recommend this project for production? 🛛 🛛 Yes 🗌 No				🗆 No
First Motion to Recommend:	Nathan Wilkes (Headstorms, Inc.)			
Second Motion to Recommend:	Chris McDowell (Valley Health Alliance			
Production condition(s):	No conditions			
Are there objections to this project's production? \[Yes \] Yes Production is not recommended if three (3) or more Committee members object. \]				
DRRC Objector:	Basis for Objection:			

DRRC Recommendation