Called to order at 12:01 p.m., by Planning Committee Chair, Brenda Knapp.

PLANNING COMMITTEE* AND BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Brenda Knapp*, Max Mertz*, Kenny Solomon-Gross, Deb Johnston, Hal Geiger and Iola Young

ALSO PRESENT: David Keith, Bob Tyk, Kim McDowell, Dallas Hargrave, Sara Dodd, Nate Rumsey, Nathan Overson, Jeanne Rynne, and Anita Moffitt

APPROVAL OF AGENDA – Mr. Mertz made a MOTION to approve the agenda as written. Mr. Solomon-Gross seconded. There being no objections, agenda approved.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – None

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – Mr. Mertz made a MOTION to approve the minutes from the August 9, 2022 Planning Committee meeting. Mr. Solomon-Gross seconded. There being no objections, minutes approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

Family Practice Building Update – Mr. Keith reported the purchase of the Family Practice building will be presented for public comment at the September 12th Assembly meeting. Staff continues to discuss the strategic value of the Family Practice Building.

Catholic Community Services (CCS) – Mr. Keith reported having met with CCS two times about Hospice and Home Health Services (HHHS). A list of questions is being compiled by the attorneys, program officials and BRH staff to help with our due diligence. This questionnaire will be shared with CCS by Wednesday of next week and they will share their questions with BRH. This process will allow us to find out everything on the front end, not on the tail end. CCS is not one business model, it’s three. We are trying to differentiate our interest, which is HHS, from the other two. We need to understand their funding streams and discern why HHHS is not profitable. Information will be shared with the Board. Ms. Knapp stated CCS has been around a long time and used to be very viable. HHHS are very important to have to help keep people out of the hospital. Making this work could be one way to expand or enhance our service lines. Mr. Keith stated we don’t know what we will be able to take on or offer until we get more information.

Master Facility Plan and Timeline – Ms. Rynne reported the facility plan and timeline, included in the packet, are up to date. Mr. Keith reported that he has requested a meeting of BRH and CBJ staff to validate the cost and timelines of these projects. This facility plan may need a refresh and to be tweaked with regard to our revenue stream and support for it. Ms. Knapp thanked Mr. Keith for taking this step.

Current Projects Update – Ms. Rynne provided an overview of the project update list included in the packet. The site improvements are nearly done. Carver Construction has been hired to conduct investigatory work for the window replacement of the Administration building. The problem is not with the windows, it’s with the vapor barrier. A rain screen system and new vapor barrier will probably be put on the building. We should have more detail with cost estimates by next month’s meeting. Bids for the MRI/CT Scanner replacement came in 65-70% higher than estimated. It is believed that the higher rates are due to lack of competition. The Board did approve an appropriation of funds for this...
project to be presented to the Assembly on September 12\textsuperscript{th} for approval. This project should be complete by November 2023. Mr. Mertz asked if Mr. Keith has been able to focus on these projects. Mr. Keith stated this is incredibly important to him and he is just now getting his hands around it. BRH has issues with its project planning process; construction management and costs are critical to our success in what we can and can’t afford. Mr. Mertz wants to make sure BRH is not continuing with projects just because they are on the list. Mr. Keith stated SLT, engineers and staff will have discussions to make sure things line up with our strategic priorities and the strategic plan will be realigned. In the next 30-45 days, he said he and the team will be well versed on the projects. Because of cost escalations and logistic challenges, we need to make sure our revenue streams are strong enough to support our strategic and capital initiatives. We will be very strategic in our approach and will be able to articulate why we’ve made our decisions. Mr. Solomon-Gross reported that he and Mr. Keith have already discussed Mr. Keith’s plans.

**Bops / Crisis Stabilization Project Update** – Ms. Rynne reported construction is moving along and still on schedule for completion by March of 2023. Mr. Mertz asked Mr. Keith what his view is on the program for this building and how we can best move forward based on our budget. Mr. Keith reported he has not yet seen pro-forma for this project. Mr. Tyk and Ms. Dompeling are working to complete one. We have made a commitment to the program, which is great for the community, but we do need to know what the impact is. Mr. Geiger asked if we wanted to repurpose this building, are we locked into the building by grants. Ms. Rynne is unable to answer about the grants, but stated that architectural changes were made to the plans to use steel instead of wood and added extra fire proofing to allow flexibility of use in the future. Ms. Knapp observed that grants were not usually for buildings themselves but for reimbursable services. She and Mr. Mertz encourage Mr. Tyk to look into this. Mr. Mertz questions whether this building is going to solve the behavioral health problems in the community. Ms. Knapp stated we need to work collaboratively with JAMHI, Juneau Youth Services and other organizations to address the needs of the community and to ensure we are not duplicating services. Mr. Keith responded that a program assessment will be conducted and if we haven’t established a mental health consortium in the community, we should have. Ms. Knapp feels that BRH should be the leader in a mental health consortium. Mr. Tyk reported a CON was not needed for the Crisis Stabilization Center because we were one of the first in the state to build one. There were grants associated with this program, but not the building. He cautioned that a lot of things had been promised that may not come to pass and that a proformas had not been conducted. If we decide to not use this building for a Crisis Stabilization Center, it may cause a problem from the state’s standpoint and is a concern we would have to pay attention to. Mr. Keith agrees the Board and Committee should demand a review of the program and have an understanding of the financial implications and its impact but asks the committee not get too far ahead of what staff is already doing. He and Ms. Dompeling will bring a full program review to the Board when it is completed, hopefully within the next 60 days. Mr. Keith is to bring an update on where we are at the October Planning Committee meeting.

**Emergency Department (ED) Expansion Project Update** - Ms. Rynne reported progress since the last meeting. She, Ms. Koester and Mr. Overson met with the City Attorney to discuss the GC/CM (General Contractor/Construction Manager) ordinance. It will go before the Assembly on September 12\textsuperscript{th} for its first reading and for public hearing and adoption on October 24\textsuperscript{th}. The project is moving into the design development phase. This should be complete and ready for review and updated cost estimates in late September. It will be good timing for soliciting an RFP for a GC/CM. Mr. Mertz asked Mr. Keith if he has had time to dive into this project. Mr. Keith has and reported there is concern about the CON for the project and if we don’t get a determination from the state within two weeks, we will begin working on the application to have it ready for submission. There is a dollar threshold associated with a CON and since there’s a lot of cost creep in this project, we have to be cautious. Mr. Overson reported a conversation with Mr. Palmer, Ms. Rynne and Ms. Koester. Mr. Palmer agreed with a plan that addressed legal concerns about the regulatory CON rules and moving forward with the GC/CM process. If we do have to move forward with the CON application, we would conservatively have an answer by January 2023. Ms. Rynne reported we should be at the end of the construction document phase by early January. We can get through this document phase without exceeding the $1.5 Million threshold but would definitely have to stop until we have a CON before moving into construction phase if one is required. She noted there is a difference of opinion on the interpretation of the expenditure cap. Mr. Overson has a meeting this afternoon to get clarification from the state as to whether we have the ability to move ahead with construction activities, such as turning dirt, up to the $1.5 Million. He stated he has no concern that they are going to deny our request but we are working on the application at the same time we are asking for a determination. He doesn’t see any regulation concerns with the CON at this point. Ms.
Knapp expressed concern about the public comment phase of a CON and wondered if we might encounter objections from SEARHC. Mr. Overson reported conversations with the state about what it would look like if SEARHC did object. SEARHC is Indian Health Services through the federal government and are not required to follow the state’s CON process. Mr. Mertz stated that if SEARHC is serving members outside of their beneficiaries, they should be held to the same CON requirements and we should not set down on this. Mr. Keith noted this is a legitimate concern being discussed by the Alaska Hospital and Healthcare Association (AHHA), has been reported to Senator Sullivan and will probably become an issue on Senator Murkowski’s desk. Mr. Mertz stated this is more than a political question, the Board needs to deliberate this with our legal counsel to determine if it’s something we should pursue as the sole community provider hospital for Juneau. Ms. Knapp and Mr. Solomon-Gross agree that we need to push this matter. Ms. Johnston stated she does not want us to lose sight of the risk of costs for the expansion escalating while we are waiting if we have a protracted CON process. We should potentially expect requests for additional funding for the project.

**Strategic Goal Initiatives** – Mr. Rumsey provided an update on the strategic initiatives and the development of a comprehensive the strategic plan. Strategic initiatives were forwarded to the management team and directors. Mr. Keith met with managers and directors to discuss the importance of aligning departmental work plans with the strategic initiatives. Working with senior leadership, directors and managers, Mr. Rumsey is to facilitate the creation of long and short term objectives, tactics and priorities. Strategic initiatives are currently at varying levels of work activity and progress towards completion. Once we determine specific measurable tactics to advance the initiatives and clearly identify responsibilities and timelines, we will be better suited to report out the status to the Board. He provided an overview of a Gantt chart, included in the packet, showing what has been done so far and the plans for moving ahead. He noted this is conceptual at this point and will take a couple of months to get some of these work plans in order. His intent is to strengthen the organizational ownership and buy in of the strategic planning process through a combination of advocacy, coordination, training and support to create a more robust planning cycle. He recommends a one-year refresh cycle, working through the Board of Directors and Planning Committee, to adjust, adapt and streamline our strategic initiatives. He also recommends a 3 year reimagine cycle where we would have a complete revisiting of the strategic thinking and strategy developing process. His goal is to thoroughly create a shared vision of Bartlett’s future, instill a sense of ownership of the strategic initiatives across the organization, provide a systematic means of communicating responsibility, accountability and urgency. This would free the Board and the Planning Committee to focus on strategic thinking and desired outcomes for the organization into the future. Ms. Knapp expressed her appreciation for the work put into this plan. Mr. Mertz expressed his appreciation and said he really wants to focus on communications about how this ties into the operational plan and looking at it again after a year. BRH needs to improve community engagement by making sure Juneau understands the importance of this independent hospital through marketing, advertising and community events. Ms. Knapp agreed and stated that our strength is going to depend on our alliances and cooperation in working with and supporting other healthcare entities in the community. We need to move towards those alliances as soon as possible. Mr. Rumsey’s response to Mr. Mertz is that once work plans are identified at the functional level in the organization, we are going to have to prioritize which elements we are going to tackle in any given year. This is not just about the strategic plan, it’s about strategic planning that needs to be a continuous process for it to add value to the organization. Ms. Knapp thanked Mr. Rumsey for his presentation.

**Comments** – Ms. Knapp thanked everyone for their questions and input. Mr. Mertz said it was an excellent meeting. Mr. Solomon-Gross thanked Mr. Rumsey and told him he’s glad to have him on board.

**Next Meeting** – 12:00 p.m., October 7, 2022

**Adjourned** – 1:12 p.m.