



2020 West El Camino Avenue, Suite 800
Sacramento, CA 95833
hcai.ca.gov



NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING
HEALTH CARE PAYMENTS DATA PROGRAM (HPD)
DATA RELEASE COMMITTEE (DRC)

Date:

May 20, 2026
Draft Meeting Minutes

Members Attending: Janet Coffman, Professor, Institute for Health Policy Studies, University of California, San Francisco (UCSF); Miranda Dietz, Project Director, California Simulation of Insurance Markets, UC Berkeley Labor Center; Genia Fick, Vice President, Quality, Inland Empire Health Plan (IEHP); Cora Han, Chief Health Data Officer, University of California (UC) Health, UC Office of the President; Koh Kerd Sri, Chief Information Officer, Clever Care Health Plan; Julie Lai, Associate Director of Data Science and Technology, RAND Corporation; Joshua Morgan, Director of Behavioral Health, Unicare Community Health Center; and Eleanor B. Schwarz, Chief, Division of General Internal Medicine, San Francisco General Hospital.

Members not in attendance: Paul Bouganim, Executive Director, Finance Operations, Cedars-Sinai; Nuriel Moghavem, Neurologist, Los Angeles General Medical Center; and Daniel Ruiz, Vice President, Operations Quality, AltaMed Health Services.

HCAI Presenters: Olivia Burdon, HPD Policy Lead; Chris Krawczyk, PhD, Chief Analytics Officer; Jasmine Neeley, Health Care Payments Data Unit Manager; Mayra Vega, Deputy Director, Communications and Planning; and James Yi, Attorney.

Public Attendance: 48

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Meeting Minutes

Miranda Dietz, DRC Vice Chair

Miranda Dietz, DRC Vice Chair called the meeting to order across the Sacramento, Los Angeles, and Rancho Cucamonga locations. She introduced Deputy Director Mayra Vega, who administered the oath of office to new members Julie Lai, Joshua Morgan, and Eleanor Schwarz. After the oath, Miranda Dietz conducted roll call and reviewed the meeting participation rules under the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act.

Miranda Dietz then reviewed the HPD program goals and reflected on the value of public reporting, especially data on out-of-pocket costs. She explained that such transparency informs policy decisions and supports equitable, affordable healthcare.

The committee approved the minutes from the November 2024 meeting. A motion to approve was made by Genia Fick and seconded by Koh Kerd Sri.

The committee reviewed and approved the meeting minutes from the November 20, 2024, DRC Meeting. The motion to approve was made by Genia Fick and seconded by Koh Kerd Sri.

The following members voted to approve the minutes: Cora Han, Janet Coffman, Genia Fick, Koh Kerd Sri, and Miranda Dietz, DRC Vice Chair.

The following members abstained from voting: Eleanor Schwarz, Julie Lai, and Joshua Morgan.

The motion to approve the minutes was carried by a vote of five in favor.

Questions and comments from the committee:

There were no comments from the committee.

Public comment:

There was no public comment.

Agenda Item 2: HPD Program Updates and November Meeting Recap

Miranda Dietz, DRC Vice Chair

Chris Krawczyk, Chief Analytics Officer, HCAI

Jasmine Neeley, Health Care Payments Data Unit Manager, HCAI

Miranda Dietz provided a brief recap of the November 2024 meeting, which included public reporting updates, improvements in race and ethnicity data, discussions on finalized regulations, and presentations from Arkansas and Connecticut All Payer Claims Databases (APCDs). She also noted a presentation on federal price transparency rules and their relevance to HPD.

Chris Krawczyk delivered an extensive set of program updates covering the 18 months since the data release program opened.

Jasmine Neeley provided updates on data collection, including the adoption of Common Data Layout (CDL) 4.0.1, progress on dental data submission, onboarding of remaining dental submitters, development of non-claims payment files, and early regulatory work to collect PBM data.

The next HPD Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for July 23, 2026, from 9:00 AM to 12:30 PM. The topic of the agenda is data collection.

Questions and comments from the committee:

Committee members engaged in a detailed discussion focused on several operational, analytic, and procedural aspects of the HPD program. Members expressed interest in understanding how Medi-Cal evaluates whether a data request benefits the Medi-Cal program, noting that the statutory requirement for demonstrating such benefit can be broad and may be difficult for requesters to interpret. The committee emphasized the importance of making Medi-Cal's priorities more explicit so that applicants can clearly articulate how their work aligns with Medi-Cal's expectations. The committee asked how "completed" data requests are defined and sought clarification on average processing timelines, prompting HCAI to explain that completed requests include those actively accessing data, and that median review times currently exceed the regulatory 120-day target, often reaching approximately 180 days due to complexities involving applicant responsiveness, Medi-Cal review cycles, or administrative processes.

Members also raised questions about data completeness, particularly regarding race and ethnicity fields, and asked how requesters are informed of limitations in the underlying data. The committee asked whether missing data affects the viability of certain research questions, leading staff to clarify that requesters are proactively informed of known limitations and directed requestors to documentation on the HPD website. The committee requested more detail about import and export activities within the Enclave—specifically what types of external data requesters are seeking to bring in and how HCAI ensures those data align with approved project scopes. HCAI noted increasing volume in import requests and described scenarios where requests introduce new external files that require supplemental review. The committee inquired about roadblocks encountered in moving projects from application to active data use, prompting discussion about organizational administrative policies, payment processing delays, and complexities surrounding data use agreements. They also inquired about user experience within the Enclave, and HCAI reported generally positive feedback, with occasional requests for improvements in directory structure or documentation consistency.

Public Comment:

A member of the public asked about completeness and timelines for dental data submission; to which HCAI provided updates on the onboarding progress.

Agenda Item 3: HPD Data Access and Release: Lessons Learned

Miranda Dietz, DRC Vice Chair;

Chris Krawczyk, PhD, Chief Analytics Officer, HCAI

Olivia Burdon, HPD Policy Lead, HCAI

Chris Krawczyk presented operational lessons learned across the full lifecycle of data requests, including communication needs, internal review coordination, complexities in Medi-Cal review, challenges with bundled project scopes, delays caused by payment or DUA processes, and supplemental request processing. Olivia Burdon presented a proposed formalized process for assigning two primary reviewers to each request requiring DRC action. She described two models—assignment by meeting or by subject-matter expertise. .

Questions and comments from the committee:

Members focused particularly on challenges related to project scope, request timelines, and administrative processes. The committee asked whether HCAI had considered implementing a floating start date for data use agreements, noting that many researchers are required to demonstrate data access for federal funding applications but may not receive project funding for several months. HCAI responded that while funding delays often affect payment timing rather than access start dates, the program is exploring mechanisms to tie the project start date to an actionable event—such as notification that the Enclave is configured—so that all parties have a clear, legally recognized reference point. The committee emphasized that clearer alignment between funding cycles and access windows would assist applicants in planning their projects effectively.

The committee followed by raising questions about bundled or multi-part projects, observing that applied research often evolves as initial findings generate new questions. They asked whether HCAI has seen real-world cases where multiple objectives were combined in ways that challenged the definition of a single project. HCAI confirmed that such scenarios have already occurred and explained that distinguishing between a single project and multiple linked projects is increasingly important because project scope affects review pathways, dataset types, and compliance requirements. The committee highlighted the value of developing criteria to help applicants understand when expanded objectives trigger the need for supplemental review or new applications.

The committee returned to the topic of data use agreements, referencing experiences at UCSF where legal teams requested modifications to DUA language. They asked whether similar issues were arising with other institutions. HCAI confirmed that they have received modification requests from multiple organizations and emphasized the importance of providing boilerplate DUA language early in the process to allow legal review before final approval stages. This, they noted, reduces delays that occur when substantive DUA negotiations take place after project approval.

The committee asked about timelines and the current process for supplemental requests, particularly how long they take and what types of changes trigger the supplemental pathway. HCAI explained that supplemental reviews vary based on complexity, and while some are straightforward—such as adding a user or requesting a new year of data—others require substantial re-review, especially when new external datasets alter the scope of an approved project. The committee also asked about user experience within the Enclave, prompting HCAI to report positive feedback with occasional requests for improvements to documentation and directory structures.

Members discussed the practical implications of chair assignment process, noting that while the Chair and Vice Chair would not evaluate the scientific or analytic merits of the proposal, they would determine which committee members were best suited to review it based on expertise and the anticipated workload. Committee members weighed the benefits of matching requests to subject-matter expertise against the need to maintain workload equity across reviewers. The committee observed that an expertise-based model would improve review quality but acknowledged it could result in uneven distribution of assignments if certain project types recur frequently. The committee also emphasized the importance of flexibility, noting that the Chair should retain discretion to assign reviewers based on availability and topic alignment. Committee members agreed that the proposed reviewer assignment process was reasonable and would support consistent, transparent operations. They also endorsed the idea that the Chair and Vice Chair could rely on polling tools to avoid serial communications and that assignment decisions should be made in a predictable window to allow reviewers adequate preparation time.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

Agenda Item 4: DRC Data Request Recommendation Resolutions and Letters

James Yi, Attorney, HCAI

James Yi recommended that the committee adopt written resolutions for each data-request decision for clarity, recordkeeping, and legal defensibility. He explained that draft resolutions could be prepared by the two primary reviewers using a standardized template.

Questions and comments from the committee:

Committee members engaged in a focused discussion on how this process would operate in practice. Members generally agreed that creating standardized resolutions would enhance clarity, support consistent recordkeeping, and provide a reliable reference in the event of future audits or legal challenges. Members expressed support for adopting a resolution framework and emphasized the importance of having boilerplate language prepared in advance to ensure consistency across meetings and ease the burden on reviewers. They also noted that access to a standard template would help streamline the process and reduce uncertainty for members when drafting decision language. In response, HCAI confirmed that a draft template had already been provided and that staff could assist during meetings to refine or finalize resolution language as needed. The committee raised questions about logistics, asking whether both primary reviewers should draft separate versions of resolutions or whether one reviewer should be designated to prepare the draft. HCAI explained that either approach could work, and that the committee could adapt its process based on efficiency and member preference. HCAI also reassured members that resolutions could be modified during meetings and that not every outcome—particularly decisions to table a request—would necessarily require a written resolution.

Public comment:

There was no public comment.

Agenda Item 5. Establishment of DRC Administrative Subcommittee

Miranda Dietz, DRC Vice Chair

James Yi, Attorney, HCAI;

The committee discussed creating an advisory subcommittee to support the HPD DRC between formal public meetings.

Questions and comments from the committee:

Members acknowledged that the HPD program has matured to a point where issues frequently arise that require timely input from committee members, yet do not necessitate convening the full DRC under Bagley-Keene requirements. They agreed that an advisory subcommittee would provide a useful mechanism for HCAI to obtain feedback on emerging topics such as defining project scope, managing supplemental request processes, improving reviewer assignment procedures, and refining operational workflows tied to the data release program.

The committee emphasized the importance of flexibility, suggesting that the subcommittee be organized on an ad-hoc, volunteer basis rather than as a standing group. They noted that this approach would ensure both relevance and availability, allowing HCAI to identify members whose expertise best aligns with the topic at hand. Members voiced support for this model and agreed that HCAI could send a request for volunteers when a discussion is needed, using tools such as polls to coordinate schedules while avoiding serial communications.

HCAI provided clarification on Bagley-Keene implications, noting that an advisory subcommittee may meet entirely virtually but must maintain fewer than five members to avoid creating a quorum of the full DRC. They explained that if a fifth committee member chooses to attend, they may do so only as an observer and may not participate in the discussion. This constraint ensures compliance with Bagley-Keene rules while still enabling efficient collaboration. Committee members concurred that the subcommittee's role should remain advisory only, with all formal decisions continuing to be made by the full DRC during public meetings.

Public comment:

There was no public comment.

Agenda Item 6: HPD DRC Public Meeting Schedule and Content

Olivia Burdon, HPD Policy Lead, HCAI

Olivia Burdon presented scheduling constraints related to Medi-Cal (DHCS) and CPHS review cycles.

Questions and comments from the committee:

Committee members engaged in a detailed discussion regarding the proposal to shift the DRC's meeting schedule to even-numbered months. HCAI explained that because the majority of data requests requiring DRC review include Medi-Cal data, the committee's workflow is closely tied to the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) Data Review Committee schedule. Since DHCS accepts applications only in odd months and holds its meetings in even months, the DRC frequently cannot take action until DHCS review is complete, making odd-month DRC meetings largely unproductive. Members agreed that moving to a predictable even-month meeting schedule would reduce the occurrence of canceled meetings and better align with review timelines. Members noted that afternoon meetings were preferable due to travel requirements, with both Bay Area and Southern California members expressing that arriving after morning traffic was beneficial. The committee also agreed that while the third Wednesday of even months had historically been used, a brief scheduling survey would help determine whether another afternoon in even months might better accommodate member availability. Members appreciated this coordination and expressed support for maintaining flexibility through ad-hoc meetings when necessary.

Public comment:

A DHCS representative provided additional clarification, noting that DHCS has a final internal approval step that occurs after their committee meeting, which may influence when a case becomes ready for DRC review. The public also expressed appreciation for the coordination .

Agenda Item 7. Next Meeting Topics

Miranda Dietz, DRC Vice Chair

Miranda Dietz noted that the next meeting is expected for August 2026, subject to the availability of data requests requiring review. She also confirmed that Janet Coffman volunteered to read the program goals at the next meeting.

Questions and comments from the committee:

There were no comments from the committee.

Public comment:

There was no public comment.

Agenda Item 8: Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Miranda Dietz, DRC Vice Chair

There was no public comment.

Agenda Item 9: Adjournment

Miranda Dietz, DRC Vice Chair

The meeting was adjourned at 3:34 p.m.