



HIV HEALTH SERVICES PLANNING COUNCIL

Milton Marks Conference Center
455 Golden Gate Avenue (Polk & Larkin)
Lower Level, San Diego Rooms
Thursday, August 16th, 2007
9:00 AM – 5:00 PM

MINUTES

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:05am by CM Soto.

II. Roll Call

Roll call was taken, quorum was established.

III. Review and Approval of Agenda

The Agenda was reviewed and approved by consensus.

IV. Review and Approval of *July 23, 2007 Minutes*

The July 23, 2007 Minutes were reviewed and approved by consensus.

V. General Announcements

- ❖ There will be a community summit on Women and HIV on Friday November 30th in the East Bay.

VI. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

VII. Introductions

CARE Council Co-Chairs introduced Susan Strong, Facilitator who gave an overview of activities for the meeting, ground rules and logistics, as well as a review of Prioritization and Allocations. Council members introduced themselves.

A member of the public asked if there was a copy of the legislation. There was no copy of the legislation.

VIII. Conflict of Interest Disclosure by Council Members

Council Members publicly disclosed their individual Conflicts of Interest (Attachment B).

There was no public comment.

IX. Break (there was no break at this time)

X. Goals of the Summit

Susan Strong, Facilitator, went over goals of summit, stating that the goal of the summit was for everyone to leave the meeting with a set of agreed upon priorities for service delivery for Ryan White Treatment Modernization as of 2006 according to 75/25 guidelines that HRSA and Congress have put in place.

There was no public comment.

XI. Counties Funding Allocation Discussion – VOTE

The Counties of Marin and San Mateo presented their allocation decisions for Review and Approval.

❖ *Marin County Allocation Presentation* - CM Spaeth gave a report on Marin County's allocation funding for '08-'09.

➤ A motion to accept Marin's recommendation was made and seconded.

Discussion

There was a concern from a Council Member that the information presented was not provided earlier, thereby, allowing enough time for people to come to a decision on the matter.

Discussion included:

- The difficulty of allocation to keep within limiting factors of 75/25.
- One time funding backfills.
- Service categories that potentially would be discontinued or altered. The use of vouchers implemented to keep track by case managers regarding usage. Vouchers include, but not limited to, Trader Joe's, Safeway etc

Public Comment

There was a public comment regarding the use of vouchers and how people with them aren't misusing them.

Action Item

VOTE

Ayes = 25

Abstentions = 1

Motion Passes. (Attachment A, Item 2)

There was further discussion regarding the definition and meaning of an abstaining vote. The facilitator explained that an abstaining vote counts with regards to establishing quorum, but it is neither a yes vote nor a no vote and are not counted in the vote.

A recusal refers to the act of abstaining from participation in an official action such as a legal proceeding due to a **conflict of interest**.

- ❖ **San Mateo Allocation Presentation** - CM Sweetin gave a report on San Mateo County's allocation funding for '08-'09.

Action -

Motion to accept San Mateo's proposals for allocation funds. Herman/Allgaier

Discussion

- There are three categories that San Mateo was trying to put funds back into.
 - 1) Residential Substance Abuse
 - 2) Emergency Financial Assistance
 - 3) Food (The food category remains high on discussion. It's an important item and high priority item on agenda.).
- Other Discussion Points include:
 - Non-medical case management and consideration of benefit if percentage of '07/'08/'09 went to dental care.
 - Allocation percentage differences between mental health and dental health.
 - What other funding streams are there?
 - Medi-Cal is an example of resource for mental health funding.
- Consistency in future data presentations by the Counties is requested to provide ease in evaluation of data.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Action

VOTE - to accept San Mateo funding allocation as present passes with one abstention.

Ayes = 25

Abstentions = 1

Motion Passes. (Attachment A, Item 3)

The CARE Council took a break at 10:30am.

XII. Trends and Analysis Factors of the EMA (Eligible Metropolitan Area)

The Council reviewed major data information that has been presented during the year. This included epidemiological information, Reggie data, Summary Sheets, etc. Council Members discussed the data and how it applies to their decision making process and any trends seen.

The Trends and Data Review presentation including information regarding:

- Trends in HIV
- Conclusions from EPI Report
- Trends in CARE Clients
- Reggie Summary
- Trends in Identified Needs

- Summary of 2005 Needs Assessment Priorities
- 2005 Needs Assessment Findings
- Trends in Access Issues from Needs Assessment
- Follow-up Needs Assessment: Women of Color and Transgendered Women
 - Recommendations
- Trends in Design Service
- Trends in Resources
- Major Reauthorization Changes
 - Core Medical Services
 - Other Supportive Services
- Political Context
- Questions

Please note that this entire presentation is available by request at the SF HIV Health Services Planning Council Support offices or online at www.sfcarecouncil.org.

Public Comment

It's important that the council takes a more leadership role in public policy advocacy at the local state and federal level regarding providing services.

There was concern expressed that there's a lack of African American input on the issues.

XIII. Lunch 11:50 am

XIV. Group Discussion

Group discussion and public comments took place in previous section prior to lunch break.

XV. Presentation and Discussion of Recommendations for Priority Setting and Directives to Grantee

A. PLANNING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Action

Motion to accept HRSA categories as they currently exist creating 2 tiers of services in current priority order. Thomas/Simmons

Discussion

CM Thomas explained the reasoning for the recommendations with respect to the current HRSA funding issues with respect to the overall EMA.

Public Comment

Why is Emergency Financial Services so far down the list? It is a very needed service.
Why is Food category #12 on the list?

Action

VOTE

Ayes = 25

Motion Passes. (Attachment A, Item 4)

Core services and priority order is established.

DIRECTIVES TO GRANTEE

- A.) Oral health services: ensure that the focus of funded services is on providing needed dental services to clients rather than on providing education opportunities for dental students.

Action

Motion to accept recommendation A. Thomas/Manley

VOTE

Ayes = 26

Motion Passes. (Attachment A, Item 5)

- B.) Work with Community Behavioral Health Services to ensure that existing residential substance abuse treatment programs for women are accessible to, and can provide appropriate services to, HIV-positive women, and that providers serving positive women are aware of the services and how to enroll women in them.

Action

Motion to amend as follows:

Work with Community Behavioral Health Services to ensure that existing residential substance abuse treatment programs for women are accessible to, and can provide, appropriate services to HIV – Positive women and *that providers serving HIV positive women are aware of these services and how to enroll women in them.*

VOTE (HAND)

Ayes = 24

Abstentions = 1

Motion passes.

Motion - Work with Community Behavioral Health Services to ensure that existing residential substance abuse treatment programs for women are accessible to, and can provide, appropriate services to HIV – Positive women and that providers serving HIV positive women are aware of these services and how to enroll women in them.

CM Siron called the question.

There was an objection.

Herman called the question after discussion.

Public Comment

Do women not know of programs available or are programs not available, what's going on with this issue? (Please note that Council Members do not reply to Public Comment.)

Action

VOTE

Ayes = 26

Motion Passes. (Attachment A, Item 6)

- C.) Report to the Council within three months on the implications of changes in the HRSA service category definitions, especially for case management, including a report on the actions taken to ensure compliance with the new HRSA requirements.
Herman/Thomas

No discussion.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Action

VOTE

Ayes = 27

Motion Passes. (Attachment A, Item 7)

B. PLWHA Caucus Recommendations

CM Allgaier presented the recommendations (Attachment D)

1. In addition to the legislative authority to prioritize and allocate resources for Ryan White Part A and B funds for the San Francisco EMA, the HIV Health Services Planning Council should be given the opportunity to make recommendations to the Department of Public Health on all funding priorities for HIV Health Services funds.
Allgaier/Manley

Discussion

Circumstance of involvement beyond SF County to cover entire EMA.

Action

Motion to amend as noted by underline below. Herman/Kleffner.

In addition to the legislative authority to prioritize and allocate resources for Ryan White Part A and B funds for the San Francisco EMA, the HIV Health Services Planning Council should be given the opportunity to make recommendations to the Department of Public Health on all funding priorities for HIV Health Services funds.

In regard to San Mateo and Marin Counties that their Community Planning Councils be given the opportunity to make advisory recommendations on all dollars spent on HIV services.

Discussion

Questions of difficulty of implementation and information followup regarding other County services.

CM Antonetty and CM Simmons expressed opposition to the amendment against the motion and the amendment was removed by Herman/Kleffner.

Further discussion resumed regarding clarity of the primary motion and next steps if approved by Council occurred.

Discussion

CM Allgaier indicates that the impetus should come from providers.

Public Comment

Issues include:

- Is there a conflict of interest?
- Can Council respond?
- Does Council have the authority?

CM Herman responded that there was no intention to have authority over Dept. of Public Health.

Action

VOTE

Ayes = 27

Motion Passes. (Attachment A, Item 8)

2. Each Center of Excellence should develop a Consumer Advisory Board consisting of no fewer than 5 individuals who represent the diversity of the clients served. The Consumer Advisory Board will work with the COE Coordinator in order to facilitate the inclusion of the consumer voice in the continuing goal of integrating COE services in a way that is consumer focused and consumer friendly. Allgaier/Herman.

Discussion

Discussion included issues regarding:

- Whether the mandates are realistic and importance of working closer with community outreach.
- It's a basic need to have that for any service provider.
- It is important that a client has the ability to sit on a board and provide feedback to provider.
- Concern that advisory groups tend to wane a bit, administratively their already taxed, there are other ways for obtaining input. Would this motion take care of the dissatisfaction of consumer advisory boards.

Action

Motion - table the vote on recommendations until we get the information we need and assess it and vote on it at that time. Herman/Newell.

Discussion

What is the timeline?

Action

Motion - table the vote to table until Bill Blum makes a presentation to Council at next council meeting in September. Herman/Allgaier

Action
VOTE (HAND)
Ayes = 20
Nays = 4
Abstentions = 1 (Molnar)
Motion Passes.

3. That there should be written HIV/AIDS resource guide that can be distributed to consumers. The guide can also be online, but should be in printed format. Allgaier/Herman.

Discussion
Included:

- Inclusion of grievance process.
- Inclusion of information regarding the Advocacy Project Office and is available for distribution to care providers, doctors offices and AIDS Service Providers (i.e. STOPAIDS).
- Who is going to be in charge of doing this and the cost of doing it?
- Production should be annual.

Action
CM Antonetty called question as it stands with no objection.

Public Comment
There was no public comment.

Action
VOTE (HAND)
Ayes = 25
Motion Passes.

XVI. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Unfunds

The Council discussed and voted on recommendations for the allocation of unfunds. Proposals for unfunds were presented.

Action
Motion (Attachment E). Thomas/Allgaier

Bill Blum responded to motion. Suggests that we the council put a range on amounts. Suggestions included:

- More vouchers for toiletries
- Computer training and software not tied to UDC

Action
Motion – Amendment that item 5 and item 3 (exhibit B), computer equipment should be based on demonstrated needs. Byers/Antonetty

Discussion

Spreading money evenly to all COEs has not worked well in the past.

Public Comment

Mike Smith, HAPN opposed the amendment.

Raymond Banks, favored the amendment.

Naomi Prochovnik favored the amendment.

CM Pearce requested clarification on the amendment.

Original motion is to have the entire unfunds amount available tied to UDC. Amendment wants part of distribution to be based on need and not UDC.

Action

VOTE (Hand)

Ayes = 8

Nays = 17

Recusals = 2

Amendment Failed.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Action

VOTE (Hand) – On original motion

Ayes = 24

Recusals = 3

Motion Passes (Attachment A, Item 9).

XVII. MAI Funding Report and Decisions

Bill Blum, SF DPH HHS, presented the Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI) Funding Report and recommendations.

Herman/Thomas-motion on recommendations.

Discussion

CM Spaeth feels that it's inappropriate that Marin has been excluded from process they previously had participated in.

Motion -First fully fund the COE targeted to serve Latino/as (including monolingual Spanish speakers. This CoE was previously MAI funded and is currently funded by Ryan White Part A (\$500,000). This MAI funded CoE would also incorporate Marin and San Mateo clients in these services. Kleffner/Thomas

Public Comment

Bill Blum suggests that MAI dollars are tied to the people of color living in a certain area. Re: Marin, there's a small amount of dollars involved.

Naomi Prochovnick is opposed to amendment.

Action

VOTE to amendment (Hand)

Ayes = 5

Nayes = 21

Amendment proposal fails

Original motion (see handout)

Herman called question. There was opposition to calling question.

Further discussion occurred.

Public Comment.

There was no public comment.

Action

VOTE - MAI recommendations as presented.

Ayes = 27

Motion Passes. (Attachment A, Item 10)

XVIII. Break

XIX. Resource Allocation Discussion

Council members reviewed and discussed resource allocations considerations.

• **Planning Committee Recommendations**

Planning Committee presented resource allocations considerations for San Francisco Part A and Part B funding.

Action

Motion - to accept Planning committee recommendations. Herman/Soto

The reasoning of the recommendations presented were discussed considering the recent HRSA guidelines established. Also, this reflects the work the Council did in May 2007.

Public Comment

There was no public comment

Action

VOTE

Ayes = 26

Motion Passes. (Attachment A, Item 11)

XX. Development of Funding Scenarios

• **Planning Committee Recommendations**

1) **Level funding**

Action

VOTE

Ayes = 26

Recusals = 1

Motion Passes (Attachment A, Item 12)

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

2) **Increased funding (up to 5% increase)**

Motion - to accept recommendation. Thomas-Allgaier- motion (see handout)

Public comment

There was no public comment.

Action

VOTE

Ayes = 27

Motion Passes (Attachment A, Item 13)

3) **Decreased funding (up to 5% decrease) see handout**

Action

**VOTE (Hand) to accept either Option A or Option B.
Option B was selected.**

Motion – to select Option B (see handout). Siron/Simmons

There were discussions on motion for Option B.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Action

VOTE

Ayes = 16

Nayes = 11

Motion failed. (Attachment A, Item 14)

Action

Motion for Option A (see handout). Herman/Molnar

Discussion

There was no discussion.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Action

VOTE

Ayes = 10

Nayes = 17

Motion Failed. (Attachment A, Item 15)

4) **Decreased funding (up to 10% decrease) see handout**

Motion – to accept proposed Decreased Funding scenario (5.01-10% decrease).
Herman/Kleffner

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Action

VOTE

Ayes = 27

Motion Passed. (Attachment A, Item 16)

5) **Decreased funding (up to 5% decrease) Option A**

Motion - to cut other support service categories proportionally for decreasing funding scenario (up to 5% decrease). Siron/Manley

Public Comment

Raymond Banks no longer sees these cuts as financially feasible.

Action

VOTE

Ayes = 16

Nayes = 10

Motion Failed. (Attachment A, Item 17)

6) **Decreased funding (up to 5% decrease) Option B**

Action

Motion – to table decreased funding scenario (up to 5% decrease) Option B.
Allgaier/Spaeth

Discussion

There was no discussion.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Action

VOTE (hand)

Discussion is tabled by unanimous consent to September meeting.

7) **Acceptance of decisions made regarding funding allocations including, part B, the former Title II dollars, and planning council support line item.**

CM Thomas explained the Allocation spreadsheet for the final funding allocation Vote to include:

The vote will be to approve columns AV and AX which totals AY. This includes all the prior allocation votes of the day plus the part B, the former Title II dollars and approving what they were last year and in particular the Planning Council Support line item which is staying the same. This vote is saying “yes” and would be validating all the decisions made so far.

Action

Motion to accept all decisions made re: funding allocations including, part B, the former Title II dollars, and planning council support line item staying the same.

Thomas/Herman

Discussion

There was no discussion.

Public Comment

There was no public comment

Action

Vote

Ayes = 26

Motion Passes. (Attachment A, Item 18)

XXI. Nominations for Council Co-Chair

The Council opened nominations for the Council Co-Chair Seats (Female, Person of Color)

CM Nominating	Nominee
Siron	Thomas
Allgaier	Molnar
Herman	Soto

Nominations will remain open until closed at the September 24th SF HIV Health Services CARE Council Meeting.

XXII. Council Membership Application Recommendations

The Membership Committee recommended five (5) applicants for Council Membership.

- Raymond Banks
- Donald Frazier
- Naim Harrison
- Cynthia Hoffman
- Marcus Mabry

Action

Vote

The following were voted (by hand) on individually and accepted by unanimous consent with no discussion or public comment:

- Raymond Banks
- Cynthia Hoffman
- Marcus Mabry

Action

Vote

The following were voted (by hand) on individually and accepted with 1 opposed. There was no discussion or public comment:

- Naim Harrison

Action

To accept recommendation of Donald Frazier for Council Member

Discussion

CM Herman voted “No” to forward application to Full Council and votes “No” with explanation to CARE Council.

CM Siron is voting in favor.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Action

Vote (hand)
Ayes = 20
Nays = 6
Motion Passes.

XXIII. Membership Term Renewals – VOTE

The Council discussed the membership renewals for Council Member Byers, Pearce and Soto for September 1, 2007 deadline; Council Members Brown and Flores for October 1, 2007 deadline.

Action - Motion to accept reappointment of these 5 individuals.

Discussion

There was no discussion.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Action -

Vote (Hand)

All accepted unanimously.

XXIV. Next Meeting and Agenda Items

The next full council meeting date is tentatively scheduled for Monday, September 24th, 2007, 4:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m. at the State Building, Milton Marks Conference Center, San Diego Rooms (lower level), 455 Golden Gate, San Francisco.

XXV. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58pm