



**HIV HEALTH SERVICES PLANNING COUNCIL
SFLGBT Community Center
1800 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
Monday, January 28th, 2008
4:30 - 7:30 PM**

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:40 PM by Co-Chair Molnar.

2. Roll Call

Roll was called and quorum was established.

3. Review and Approval of Agenda – VOTE

The agenda was reviewed and approved by consensus.

4. Review and Approval of November 26th, 2007 Minutes - VOTE

The November 26th, 2007 Minutes were reviewed and approved by consensus.

5. General Announcements

There were no general announcements.

6. Public Comment

There was a public comment announcing that Council Member Flores was currently hospitalized.

**7. Steering Committee Report
*Council Co-Chairs***

Co-Chair Manley reported that the main topics of the Steering Committee were the establishment of the Policy and Evaluation Work Group relating to the restructuring plans of the council and the Needs Assessment Work Group.

- Cultural Competency Update
Jack Newby, Director, SF HIV Health Services Planning Council
 - The consultant gave a report to the Policy and Evaluation Committee and she will be presenting her findings to the Full Council. Some of her findings will be taken into consideration at the Policy and Evaluation Committee Work Group when they discuss changes and restructuring of the Council.

Public Comment on this item.

There was no public comment on this item.

**8. Council Membership Interviews -
*George Stevens and Mary Lawrence Hicks, Membership Committee Co-Chairs***

➤ *The Membership Committee will interview the following applicants at the February committee meeting.*

- *Ronald Jewell*
- *Paul Margolis*

Public Comment on this item.

There was no public comment on this item.

➤ *The Applications for review at the February Membership meeting include but are not limited to:*

- *Robert Oropeza*

Public Comment on this item.

There was no public comment on this item.

9. Introduction / Remarks from Scott Boule, Senior Policy Advisor to Speaker Nancy Pelosi's Office

Mr. Boule announced that he handles appropriations for the Speaker and he discussed the reauthorization of the Ryan White Act and some of the misconceptions. Discussion included:

- San Francisco relies heavily on the hold harmless provision.
- The 95% hold harmless provision was defined no EMA would get anything less than 95% of the previous year's award. For a number of reasons in the way HRSA implemented the reauthorization, San Francisco ended up with a 31% cut and not a 5% cut. Admittedly, the hold harmless provision was only from the formula side and not the entire award.
- In the Energy and Commerce Committee which has jurisdiction over the Ryan White reauthorization the Speaker came up with the stop-loss language that basically capped the loss for fiscal year 2007 at 8.4%. This number was arrived at by taking the 5% hold harmless and acknowledging that this only affected the formula. Hence a larger number had to be used to cover the entire award. The average cut of all 51 EMAs was 3.4%. This number added to the 5% making hold harmless provision 8.4%. Therefore, this was the number that the Speaker came up with to put before the Committee. The Speaker recognized that this would deduct money from the increase for Title 1. At the same time that she advocated for the stop-loss, she advocated for an increase in Ryan White.
- The House bill ended up with an increase of \$32.3 million and that no EMA ended up with a cut of more than 8.4% and that no TGA ended up with a cut of more than 13.4%. The cost of these cuts was \$9.3 million. With the \$32.3 million increase and the cuts of \$9.3 million there still was an increase of \$23 million-the largest increase in the CARE Act in 7 years. However, President Bush vetoed the bill and a veto override was missed by 2 votes.

- When asked what exactly San Francisco will receive for this fiscal year, the Senior Policy Advisor from the Speaker's office answered that \$4.8 Million is what the San Francisco EMA will receive for this fiscal year. There is also an earmark for the Department of Public Health of just over \$1 Million.

Public Comment on this item.

Questions raised included:

- How much money goes to San Mateo?
- What type of education was being referred to as far as HIV/AIDS was concerned?

Co-Chair Molnar stated that public comment is not a question and answer session so the questions could not be answered at that time.

**10. Review/Discuss Roberts Rules of Order
David Mezzera, Registered Parliamentarian**

Discussion included:

- Robert's Rules are neither a consensus nor an autocracy.
- The will of the majority wins but the rights and privileges of the minority are protected.
- A quorum is defined in an organization's bylaws or articles of incorporation- in our case a majority of voting members. Quorum is used to make sure that enough voting members of the body are present so that the body is represented adequately.
- Motions are ways to challenge an idea or introduce an item of business. A main motion introduces basic business.

Questions asked included:

- What is the procedure for "calling a question"?
- What does the term "point of order" mean?

The parliamentarian's responses included:

- It takes a member to move to call the question and another member to second the motion and then 2/3 of the members must vote to approve the calling of the question.
- A point of order call means that a member feels that a mistake in parliamentary procedure has been made; a member can call a point of order and have the chair decide if such action was indeed a mistake.

Public Comment on this item.

There was no public comment on this item.

11. Dinner Break

Meeting Evaluation Forms will be distributed to Council Members during the Dinner Break.

Co-Chair Ballots will be collected at the end of the Dinner Break.

- Council Members will have an opportunity to complete Meeting Evaluation Forms.

12. Introduction / Remarks from the Director, State Office of AIDS, Michelle Roland, MD.

Dr. Roland gave a presentation regarding what is going on at the state level. The discussion regarding legislative reductions included:

- We are looking at a 10% cut in the state budget across the board. The State Office of AIDS is actually taking a smaller reduction mostly as a concern to meet HRSA requirements in order to continue to receive Ryan White CARE funds. The State Office of AIDS is looking at a 6% cut. Our total budget this fiscal year is \$428 million- an \$11 million reduction in the state budget which is 6% of the state budget and not the overall budget.
- A \$7 million reduction in ADAP.
- \$3.6 million reduction in services such as epidemiology research, surveillance, education and prevention funds, counseling and testing, CARE programs including early intervention, therapeutic monitoring program, case management, and housing.
- Reduction of \$400,000 in support budget-such as travel, hiring consultants, etc, but the office was able to prevent staff reductions.
- The staffing levels of the Office have been reduced by about 25 positions in the last 5 years.
- One of the things the office is doing is looking at the different options in the governor's budget and deciding what will definitely be impacted versus what can be avoided.
- One of the principles of the governor's budget is to not change the eligibility requirements for ADAP and to not change the client's co-pays.
- The proposal is to eliminate some drug classes covered by ADAP such as the anti-depressant class.
- All redirected money will go back to ADAP.

A question arose as to whether California was reporting names of HIV positive individuals.

- The Director responded that California required reporting HIV/AIDS names in 2006 so that we would not lose federal money. There were concerns about people's confidentiality; however the State Office has done its part to prevent outside agencies from getting this information.

The director then proceeded to speak of some of the new things coming from the State Office of AIDS.

- A CDC grant to start doing HIV testing in emergency rooms. Questions arose as to how to pay for it and how to support the people who test positive.

- Also part of this grant was awarded to 2 East Bay hospitals and to SF General to link the patient to the clinic related to the hospital to get them into services immediately after testing positive.

Public Comment on this item.

There was comment about the fact that names would be reported for HIV/AIDS cases.

There was a comment about the concern of identity theft with names reporting and fears of people's privacy being violated.

**13. Unexpended FY 2007 Part A Funds-VOTE
HIV Health Services Staff**

There are unexpended funds in the budget that have not been spent for this fiscal year and there are motions to spend them as follows:

- To reallocate \$195,162 from the San Francisco budget to purchase vouchers as prescribed on the fact sheet provided by SF DPH HHS.
- To reallocate \$100,000 from the San Mateo Budget to move \$75,000 to health care and \$25,000 into the food bank and home delivered meals.

Action: Motion to spend the \$195,162 on vouchers for San Francisco (Thomas/Andrews).

Discussion included:

- The vouchers are for groceries, fast food, taxi scripts, MUNI, and Goodwill.
- The vouchers only have to be purchased, not used by the end of the fiscal year.
- There was concern of people abusing the voucher system; especially people struggling with substance abuse problems.

Public Comment on this Item.

The people with HIV are entitled to the vouchers and how they use them is up to them.

Vote: Motion passes unanimously.

Action: Motion to decrease Dental Services by \$100,000 and increase health care by \$75,000 and food by \$25,000 for San Mateo County (Thomas/Newell).

Discussion included:

- The fact that the dental service allocation always comes in under budget.
- San Mateo changed dental contractors this year and contracted with the county operating dental program. The county is able to serve more patients with fewer Ryan White dollars.

Vote: Motion passes unanimously.

14. Review/Discuss Comprehensive Plan Update

Donald Soto, Planning Committee Co-Chair, Jack Newby, Director HIV Health Services Planning Council

This item was not discussed.

Public Comment on this item.

There was no public comment on this item.

15. New Business/Next Agenda

- *Please Note: The next full council meeting date is tentatively scheduled for Monday, February 25th, 2008, 4:30-7:30 p.m. at the State Building, Milton Marks Conference Center, 455 Golden Gate, Lower Level, San Francisco, CA, 94102.*

Public Comment on this item.

There was no Public Comment on this item.

16. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:20 by Co-Chair Molnar.

Action Items:

Motion to spend the \$195,162 on vouchers (Thomas/Andrews)

Vote: Motion passes unanimously.

Motion to decrease Dental Services by 100,000 and increase health care by 75k and food by 25k. (Thomas/Newell)

Vote: Motion passes unanimously.