Healthy Sacramento Coalition Meeting  
November 19, 2014  
Meeting Summary

Meeting Outcomes:
- To reach consensus on elements that will inform criteria guidelines for selecting priority neighborhoods
- To review proposed timeline moving forward

_The Healthy Sacramento Coalition Envisions a County that is Healthy, Safe and Thriving._

Welcome and Overview  
Ramona Mosley, Facilitator, Health Education Council, welcomed everyone and began the meeting by having everyone introduce themselves and provided a brief overview of the meeting agenda.

Review Approved Framework  
Monica Hernandez, Chair, Healthy Eating Active Living Workgroup, provided a brief overview of the approved framework and principles that the coalition reached consensus on during the October coalition meeting. She also described the definition of the social determinants of health as a reminder of the lens through which the coalition operates. For more information refer to presentation titled: HSC Presentation online at [http://www.sierrahealth.org/assets/HSC/HSC_Presentation_111914.pdf](http://www.sierrahealth.org/assets/HSC/HSC_Presentation_111914.pdf).

C: UCLA unveiled their dataset called CHIS. This information is available by zip code, city, and legislative district. There are many health and mental health factors listed. It’s called AskCHIS can be accessed at [http://ask.chis.ucla.edu/main/default.asp](http://ask.chis.ucla.edu/main/default.asp).

Discussion of Neighborhood Selection and Criteria Recommendation  
Connie Chan Robison, Chair, Steering Committee, stated that the coalition will continue building on the conversation and consensus work that took place during the last meeting to move the group forward. Connie expressed her appreciation of the transparency and openness with which everyone has been thinking about moving forward. Subsequent to the Community Transformation Grant, the coalition is faced with an opportunity and a good challenge simultaneously. The opportunity allows the coalition to think beyond the confines of the CTG requirements and the challenge is to specifically redefine the future direction of the coalition, given the conversations around principles, framework and values of the coalition, and what it represents.

The coalition must select a targeted number of neighborhoods and begin to take action soon because time is of the essence. The Steering Committee presented the three-tiered neighborhood selection and criteria recommendation to help the coalition choose priority zip codes that the coalition will focus on. The specific details of what the selected neighborhoods will do are to be determined at a later time.

The Steering Committee recommends that priority zip codes for consideration meet the following two criteria:

1) Neighborhoods that are close to being “better” (possibility of immediate impact by HSC)
2) Neighborhoods that do not have a lot of investment or attention (HSC can provide assistance in building capacity)

Connie shared examples of the types of zip codes that would meet the recommended criteria (listed above) for selection of prioritization by the coalition. It was clarified that the zip codes are only examples, and a vetting process will take place with the coalition to reach consensus on a final decision on the selected zip codes and neighborhoods.

Q: Was geography or whether the areas were contiguous included when developing selection considerations? 
A: The issue around contiguous certainly came up during the Steering Committee’s discussion. This is an important point that will be put into consideration. The areas that are included in the example neighborhoods represent north and south areas of Sacramento.

Q: The discussion is from the point of view of the neighborhood. Did the Steering Committee discuss this from the point of view of what the coalition is good at doing?
A: This will be determined by what the coalition will do in the selected neighborhoods. This will be an important criterion. Form follows function.

C: The Steering Committee chose five really great zip codes. The sample zip codes align well with other organization’s priorities and, if selected using the criteria as outlined, this would put the coalition on the right track.

C: Sacramento City Unified School District had a clinic at the Freeport site school that closed down last year. It would be nice if we can help areas that have resources that people could benefit from being aware of and accessing.

C: A majority of the zip codes listed are within the limits of the City of Sacramento and this would be beneficial to pursue policy and advocacy efforts as the coalition moves forward.

C: These five zip codes are five of the six zip codes in the city with the highest concentration of African-Americans.

Connie reviewed the neighborhood selection considerations that can be utilized to identify and select priority zip codes. Monica clarified what the Cap and Trade state program is and about the CalEnviroScreen, a tool used to designate California communities as disadvantaged pursuant to Senate Bill 535. The CalEnviroScreen is a tool for targeting specific neighborhoods; it will not be used as a framework. The group engaged in a robust discussion.

Robert Phillips, Director of Health Programs, Sierra Health Foundation, made a point of clarification for the group around confusion related to Sierra Health Foundation funding of the coalition. Sierra Health Foundation will fund the infrastructure to support the coalition. He stated that Sierra Health would support the functioning of the coalition. If there were priority issues within the coalition that match up with Sierra Health’s efforts they would be considered for funding as well by the foundation. Sierra Health does not want the coalition to be beholden to funding considerations of the foundation as it thinks about its work going forward.

Richard Dana, Vice Chair, Steering Committee, reminded everyone that there are two items that the coalition needs to reach consensus on by the end of the meeting.

The Healthy Sacramento Coalition is made possible by funding from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Sierra Health Foundation.
Using the gradients of agreements, coalition members voted on the recommended two criteria for prioritizing zip codes that the coalition will focus on:

1) Neighborhoods that are close to being “better” (possibility of immediate impact by HSC)
2) Neighborhoods that do not have a lot of investment or attention (HSC can provide assistance in building capacity)

| Poll Results from Gradients of Agreements |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|               | 1              | 2              | 3              | 4              | 5              |
| Whole-heartedly endorse | Agree with minor reservations | Agree with major reservations | Abstain | Don’t agree but will support it |
| 30 responses | 2 responses | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Responses from members who voted in gradient 2:
- We should consider political boundaries in addition to geographic boundaries. City and county and special districts should be considered because access to resources is influenced by such boundaries (this will be included with the additional considerations).
- Neighborhoods that do not have a lot of investment or attention need it the most and they should be the main focus. The coalition should focus on improving areas that need help more than anywhere else. Two is more important.

Dialogue on the gradients of agreements:
- While criteria number two is important, the coalition should also keep the first criterion in order to maintain momentum and to gain some small wins. If we can have a few small wins, this will energize and motivate the coalition to pursue the second criterion.
- In order to create equitable places, the second criterion will be most important; building the capacity of the neighborhoods that do not have anything and using existing tools like CalEnviroScreen to identify communities that are disadvantaged.

Richard reviewed the neighborhood selection considerations and asked the group to provide additional items.

Additional Neighborhood Selection Considerations
- What the coalition is good at doing.
- Consider including the zip code 95820.
- Move beyond city jurisdiction and consider boundaries beyond the city to include other jurisdictions such as the county.
- Focus on policy change.
- Remember the health disparities we have already identified in our assessments.
- Be mindful of any resident organization or engagement in those neighborhoods that can be supported. It’s important to get the grassroots – the people that live there and have a stake in the neighborhood.
- Identify language access needs and access to medical coverage (those that do not have access).
- Neighborhood resident leaders to be leveraged.
- The Sacramento Tree Foundation just submitted an application for Cap and Trade funding and it is aligned with the targeted neighborhoods. Align with potential funding opportunities (e.g., urban forestry).
- Connect with all of the city council members in the neighborhoods to educate, raise awareness, and hold public officials accountable.
- Eventually engage all 15 zip codes but develop timeline and pilot to focus immediate resources. Start with the areas with greatest needs and engage in pilots.

Using the gradients of agreements, coalition members voted on the neighborhood selection considerations as presented today:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whole-heartedly endorse</th>
<th>Agree with minor reservations</th>
<th>Agree with major reservations</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Don’t agree but will support it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 responses</td>
<td>3 responses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses from members who voted in gradient 2:**
- Some considerations conflict with each other and there are too many.
- Some can be integrated with what was already presented in the slides.

Richard informed the group that the list will be reviewed and consolidated by the Steering Committee and a running list will be prepared for distribution at the next coalition meeting.

**Proposed Timeline Moving Forward**
Richard reviewed the coalition’s timeline between now and spring of 2015.

**C:** In January, it will be critical when the Steering Committee comes back to the coalition, that they have had a good discussion about are we good at doing.

**Next Meeting**
Please note, there is no coalition meeting in December.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 28, 2015. Time is subject to change, please see website for more information. Registration is required. Visit the Healthy Sacramento Coalition web page at [www.sierrahealth.org/healthysacramento](http://www.sierrahealth.org/healthysacramento) and register today.