

Minnesota HIV Services Planning Council Meeting
August 14, 2012
8:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Health Services Building, Room 110
525 Portland Ave S, Minneapolis
Minutes

Council Members Present:

Mary Gulley	Keith Henry
Peter Carr	Bashir Hers
Kris Hammes	Andy Ansell
Antonio Marante	Rob Pioli
Loyal Brooks	David Neller
Amy Schrempp	Shelia Mills
Tom Bichanga	Karin Sabey
Skye Davis	Makeda Norris (Council Co-Chair)
Hank Jensen (Council Co-Chair)	Darin Rowles
Adam Fairbanks	Craig Schmidt
Jonatan Gudino	Al Fredrickson
Shaasha Whitson	

Council Members Absent:

Joan Carchedi	Ami Lazo
Jimmy (JT) Thompson	Monica Yugu

Guests/Consultants:

Debbie Gazett - RAAN	Beth Zemsky - Consultant
Jared Erdmann – City of Minneapolis	Kate Nelson – MAP
Jim McNamara – Viiv Healthcare	

G-HAT:

Thuan Tran - Hennepin County	Jonathan Hanft – Hennepin County
Redwan Hamza – DHS	Kathryn Hansen - Hennepin County
Nick Metcalf – DHS	Sheila Murphy - Hennepin County
Dave Rompa – DHS	Gloria Smith – DHS

Planning Council Staff:

Tim Sullivan	Wendi Johnson (minutes)
--------------	-------------------------

Quorum Present? **Yes**

I. Call to Order

Makéda stated she would be presiding and called the meeting to order at 8:47am.

II. Lighting of the Candle – Darin Rowles

Darin lit the candle in honor of the Planning Council and the work that is about to be done today and in honor of the more than 7000 PLWHA who rely on these service. He hopes that integrity, passion, and commitment are kept in mind when making decisions today.

III. Consideration and Approval of Proposed Agenda and July 10, 2012 Minutes

The minutes and agenda was approved by unanimous consent

IV. Part A, Jonathan Hanft

Jonathan distributed a document titled *Part A Update, August 14, 2012* and the *Impact of Sequestration on Federal HIV/AIDS Discretionary Programs*.

V. Part B, Dave Rompa

- A. Working on the MAI 2011 report that is due at the end of the month.
- B. Dave attended an Indian Health Summit in Cloquet, MN. He attended to find out how DHS can reach the Native American population.
- C. HRSA monitoring standards are being worked on.
- D. A capacity building contract is being put in place with Open Cities.
- E. DHS Town Hall Meetings – start on September 12th in Mankato. Meetings will take place at MAP and West Side that same week. Staff will hold a meeting on October 17th in Detroit Lakes.

VI. Prevention Update, Peter Carr

- A. Grant Writing – A number of grants are due this month and next.
- B. Prevention Proposal Review Process – staff are reviewing prevention proposals.

VII. Committee Reports

A document titled **Committee Report Summaries August 14, 2012** was distributed.

- A. Community Voice –
 - a. Community Forums – There were two forums that took place for the HIV+ community on July 31st and August 1st.
- B. Executive – no verbal update
- C. Needs Assessment & Evaluation –
 - a. Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism – the committee is preparing for the assessment of the Part A and B grantees. Part A uses this feedback in their grant application. Tim walked members through the assessment form and it will be sent to Council members after the meeting to fill out. Once members get the forms members will have two weeks to fill it out and return it to Council staff. Questions/Comments:
 - Hank reminded the Council that this is an expectation for Council members to fill out these forms.
 - Antonio asked if this form is reviewed during orientation. Tim said yes, over the last few orientation sessions staff have spent time going over how to fill out this form. Antonio suggested distributing this form at the beginning of each year so members can consider it at every meeting.
 - Jonatan asked if the form will include the mandated outcomes. Tim said the Needs Assessment committee comes up with what objectives are being measured. The form evaluates how well the grantee followed the plan set forth by the Council.
 - Al asked what happens if grantees have not been able to meet an objective. Tim said the grantee will note if an item was not followed and why.
 - Karin said she has done this form six times and she has never seen an instance where the grantees have been dishonest on the form.
 - Hank let the Council know that feedback is only known, by name, to Council staff so please be honest.
- D. Operations – no meeting
 - a. Committee Co-Chair – Darin has stepped down as committee co-chair.
 - b. Action Item: Membership Recommendations – Debbie Gazett and Winston Cavert are being recommended for Council membership. These two candidates will help to meet the reflectiveness of the Council. Paper ballots were distributed and were counted by Darin Rowles and Sheila Murphy. Winston and Debbie were elected unanimously with a vote of 21-0.
 - c. Action Item: Grievance Committee – The Council is required to have a Grievance committee that meets in the event a grievance is filed against the Council. Al, David, and Shanasha are being recommended for committee appointment. **MOTION:** Hank made a motion to appoint Al, David, and Shansaha to the Grievance Committee. Questions/Comments:
 - Loyal asked for specific information on the Grievance committee. Hank directed Loyal to the bylaws for information on what the committee does.
 - The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 20-0.
- E. Planning & Priorities –
 - a. 2012 Comprehensive Plan – The plan has been finalized. There are printed copies available.

The Council took a break and Beth facilitated the remainder of the meeting.

VIII. Introductions and Explanation of Process

Introductions were made.

Kate Nelson and Antonio Marante were thanked for their hard work in the HIV communities and were wished well in their new adventures.

Beth reviewed the meeting rules and norms that are printed on the back of the Council agenda and asked everyone to agree to meet these expectations.

IX. Review of the 2012 Prioritization and Allocations Processes

Tim reviewed the prioritization and allocation process up to this point and moving through the day. The Council has every opportunity today to discuss the allocation proposal. There are breaks built into the meeting for discussion in and out of the formal meeting setting.

Tim then reviewed the 2012 guiding values for the prioritization/allocations processes so everyone would understand the framework of today's discussion.

X. Prioritization Results

Tim distributed forms to each Council member that shows their individual prioritization rankings and the anonymous rankings of the other Council members. This helps members to see how their rankings match up to other member's rankings. Questions/Comments:

- Adam asked what the purple lines are. Tim said the lines in purple are the Council consumers. Tim thought it would

be interesting for members to see if there is a difference in rankings between consumers and non-consumers.

- Loyal asked why some people have repeating number rankings. Tim said this indicates a tie.
- Karin said her ranking sheet does not match what was submitted. Tim said this is probably an error when he developed the individual sheets yesterday and were not used when the overall ranking was determined. Wendi verified her rankings and the correct rankings are in the master sheet.

Tim walked members through the 2012 prioritization rankings on a document titled **Prioritization Rankings**. This document also compares rankings from past years, consumer rankings from past years, and results from the July 31st/August 1st consumer forums. Questions/Comments:

- Karin thinks consumers ranked Oral Health care higher because it is a service that is difficult to get which would indicate that it is a need.
- Andy asked if the consumer rankings can inform the next needs assessment survey so that the language is more user friendly. Karin said the Needs Assessment committee does look at language when developing the survey. She said the Council looks at all aspects of service delivery. When the questions are asked to consumers it is with the framework of "if the services all went away, what would you want back the most?".
- Kris said consumers might rank their services based on the agency where they received the service and that can impact how they ranked it.
- Jonatan asked if there can be relationships made with other agencies to help supplement the gaps in what we can fund. Tim said this discussion takes place at the Needs Assessment committee and are included in the SARS. The Council cannot make sure a particular agency has funding or collaborates with other agencies to provide services. The grantees can suggest this to agencies.
- Jonathan said collaboration among agencies is a big part of discussions because there are a lot of changes that can impact funding and the availability of services.
- Makeda asked about the consumer forum rankings and asked how diverse the attendance was. Tim said there were 4-5 Spanish speaking consumers, men and women, African American, seniors. She hoped that this would be a consideration for future events that all populations are represented. Tim said Program HH always sends out announcements for us to ~1,700 clients, each agency funded by Ryan White receives an email and a flyer to be posted, and all Council members are notified of events like these. Council staff don't have a master list of HIV+ people in MN to invite so the focus is always on getting the word out to agencies who serve diverse populations.
- Karin said if there are suggestions on how to improve this process please email her, Tim, or anyone on the Needs Assessment committee.
- Beth reminded the Council that consumer input at the forums is only one piece of information that helps the Council to make their decisions.
- Keith asked for suggestions and support on how to improve the system so that people are getting into care and staying there.
- Al asked if the new surveillance system reporting is going to capture people who test and do not get into care right away. He asked if that can then be used to do targeted outreach to these particular clients. Peter said yes.
- Amy asked for clarification about the discussion that is taking place because this is the first time she is going through this process. Tim said this discussion is important because if clients are getting missed from the time they are diagnosed until they get into care, then this is important for consideration during the allocation discussion. If this conversation leads people to think more funding is needed for Early Intervention Services then that can be considered.

XI. Presentation and Discussion of Pre-Award Allocations Proposal

Jonathan presented the pre-award allocation proposal and distributed two documents **FY2013 Application Allocations Proposal** and **FY2013 Part A, Part B and ADAP Rebate Pre-Award Allocations (August 2012)**. Jonathan asked if members have general questions about the proposal. Questions/Comments:

- Jonatan asked what rebate funds are. Dave said they are from the purchase of drugs. Jonatan asked if the rebate funds have to be spent on the repurchase of drugs. Dave said the federal portion of rebate has to be spent on drugs while the state rebate funding can be used to purchase drugs or insurance.
- Al asked if the rebate ADAP line is a mix of federal and state. Dave said this total is a combination of federal and state dollars.
- Jonatan asked if the Council can have a say in how rebate funds are allocated and spent. Dave said the law does not give authority of rebate funds to the Council. However, the Council can make suggestions on how they can be spent and the Part B grantee can take that into consideration as they are planning for services.
- Keith commented on the administrative amount. It is a very small amount in the grant world. Some grants he manages take 50-60% for administrative costs. Jonathan added that the administrative costs are less than 15% and the cap is 15% (10% admin which includes Planning Council and 5% for quality management).

Jonathan walked members through the specific line items. The proposal is based on flat funding from last year, which reflects a \$70,000 decrease that happened last year. Questions/Comments:

- Loyal asked why there is a separate Health Insurance service area. Jonathan said this service was created when GAMC went away and clients had a premium to pay that could not be covered by Program HH.

- Jonathan said the ADAP amount is in red because it cannot be changed by the Council. This is a fixed amount that is determined by HRSA and can only be spent on ADAP.
- Antonio asked how the priority ranking matches up with the allocation amount. Jonathan said this has to do with what the need is for a service which is based on past utilization and other sources of funding. He gave an example of Housing Services which receives no funding because there are other sources of funding and would be too expensive for the Council to fund.
- Craig asked how he would know what other funding sources are available. Jonathan said the SARS contain some of this information. Dave added that there are a number of different ways that clients get their needs met for a service.
- Hank said there is a tool on the Council website that shows the other funding streams available.
- Beth asked the Council to ask any clarifying questions about the proposal now. After lunch there will be a lot of discussion about how to move funds around and discuss if the proposal is right.
- Tim clarified the changes that were made to the document that was emailed vs. the form distributed today. The total lines were not capturing the Greater MN Set Aside funding.
- Jonatan asked about MAI funding. Jonathan said this is funded by both Part A and B funding. Jonatan asked why it is such a small amount if we know there are disparities among people of color. Jonathan said this is not the only funding that is going to serve people of color, this amount is just set aside to specifically address minority needs. Tim added that MAI funding is based on a formula.

The Council broke for lunch and to talk about the proposal

XII. Public Comments

Karin announced that HCMC and Children's Hospital were funded for Part D which supports the perinatal program. This could affect decisions today discussion because there is some Medical Case Management (MCM) and consultation with other doctors, and perinatal services provided by nurses. This is a replacement funding from the loss of Part D funding at West Side. Jonathan added that this funding is for pregnant HIV+ women to support their care. This funding and focus is part of the reason that so few children are born HIV+. Questions/comments:

- Adam asked how long this grant is for. Karin said it is a three year grant.
- Dave asked that this be put on a future agenda to have Dr. Hoyt to attend a meeting to talk about how the program will look.

XIII. Continued Discussion of Pre-Award Allocation Proposal

Beth asked if there are further general questions about the proposal before the Council moves to consider the proposal. Questions/Comments:

- Jonatan asked if there is data on what program areas were effective in getting people diagnosed early and into care right away. Dave said there are a number of programs that have been effective and the specifics of contracts are negotiated between the grantees and the providers.
- Darin asked about MCM – Adult Foster Care. He knows the overall allocation proposal is based on flat funding. He said that there has been a reduction in capacity for this service from six houses to four houses. He wondered why we are not looking to decrease funding because of the reduced capacity. Jonathan said there were 24 spots and is now 16 spots. The funding is a small amount which covers the salary of a case manager to assist clients in finding alternatives to get this need met.
- Craig asked if the need for MCM – Adult Foster Care is less and the houses are closing because of funding decreases or if there is no need. Karin said the need still exists but the funding was cut.
- Karin stated her conflict as a provider and asked for clarification that Jonathan made that the case manager is helping clients get placement elsewhere. Jonathan said the hope is that the case manager would help clients get their needs met through other funding sources if Ryan White resources are not available.
- Kris asked for clarification that the need for MCM – Adult Foster Care is the same even though there has been a reduction in spots. Dave said the Legislature made the cut based on the huge state deficit and not based on the need.
- Hank asked if flat funding was based on our procedure or if underspending/underutilization was taken into consideration. Jonathan said underutilization was taken into consideration in May when the Council reallocated funding. Hank clarified his question that the 2011 final spending was used to influence this proposal. Jonathan said yes.
- Adam asked if these 16 clients who utilize MCM – Adult Foster Care also have another case manager. Jonathan said these clients might have a medical case manager at an agency. He further clarified that there used to be a social worker at Hennepin County to help clients get into the Adult Foster Care system. When that position went away a need to fill that staff gap was identified.
- Tom asked about rebate going to ADAP and if it is the same amount every year. Dave said they project the same amount from year to year. He added that the Council does sometimes allocate underspending to rebate and some rebate has been used to supplement other service area needs but rebate is mostly used to cover the gap between the ADAP allocation and the actual cost to keep the program funded throughout the year.
- Jonathan thinks a good place to look to answer some of the questions that have come up today can be found in the Comprehensive Plan.

- Amy asked about Health Insurance Premium/Cost Sharing Assistance. She asked if this is covered under the Healthy Minnesota program. Dave said right now this program is not covered under this service. Amy asked if ADAP can be used to pay for this program and Dave said yes.
- Hank asked about the case management capacity issue that was brought up in a previous Council meeting. He thinks there might be a stress on the system and thinks it warrants more discussion. Dave said some case management funding is currently under RFP and some programs received increase FTE funding.
- Dave said the grantees have been looking at appropriate caseloads for case managers and how to get people into and out of case management services.
- Craig asked if the state has guidelines for the case management caseload. Dave said it is a max of 50 and guidelines are posted on the DHS website.
- Skye has concern that there are no Housing Services funding. There are a number of reasons that clients cannot use existing programs and asked if it is possible to pull money from other services to help with emergency rent situations. Dave said rental assistance is available through the Emergency Financial Assistance. Jonathan said there are HOPWA funds available and are not part of HUD.
- Amy asked if the funding for MCM – Adult Foster Care serving 16 clients who may also have another case manager while regular MCM can have a case load of 50. Jonathan said this funding covers 1/3 of an FTE to serve these clients.
- Sky suggested allocating \$100,000 to Housing Services to meet the gap she sees in this service.
- Loyal asked Skye how funding Housing Services at \$100,000 was determined and how it will help clients. Skye said it was based on helping a client with rent or mortgage for one month and not an ongoing help.
- Loyal thinks maybe MCM services are being over utilized by clients who don't need it because they are too afraid to let go of having case management.

Beth asked the Council to consider specific questions or changes to the proposal currently being presented.

Questions/Comments:

- Shanasha asked why Every Penny Counts cannot be used to cover mortgage payments. Jonathan said it is a federal guideline that Ryan White funds cannot be used to pay for assets.
- Skye suggested reallocating \$44,000 from Emergency Financial Assistance (EFA), \$30,000 from Referral for Healthcare, \$10,000 from Legal Services, and \$16,000 from Health Education/Risk Reduction to be put into Housing Services.
Discussion:
 - Jonatan asked what the \$100,000 will cover and how it will be sustainable. Skye said assistance programs have a cap on how often it can be used and there are situations where clients cannot make their rent.
 - Jonatan thinks offering assistance when all other capped resources have been exhausted won't be sustainable.
 - Karin said, based on data, three of the services proposed to remove money from were fully utilized in recent years.
 - Antonio thinks putting \$100,000 into Housing Services will not solve the problem and will only put a band-aid on the problem and create gaps in other services.
 - Dave R. thanked Skye for proposing a change to the proposal. He thinks, however, that this suggestion will create a need in the services where funding is proposed to be reduced.
 - Dave R. said there could be a discussion that funding follows a client as they move through the system. He asked that Skye be involved in that discussion.
 - Shanasha said there is a lot of data that shows housing is an issue.
 - After discussion Skye decided to withdraw her proposal.
- Adam asked if it is possible to reduce the FPG cap of 300% for some services to allow more clients to access it. Dave said that the FPG cap can be changed but it creates problems for clients who need the service and are currently getting it.
- Andy said there is never going to be enough funding to meet the need for every service funded by Ryan White. There are some services, like EFA, where clients will always say there is a need. Other services, like Housing Services, are kept on the prioritization list because it was noted by consumers as a need. Because there are other funding sources available, and would use up more Ryan White money than is possible, they will never be able to meet that need.
- Karin made a proposal to move \$5,000 from Adult Foster Care (a 14% reduction) and move it to Legal Services which was cut at the post-award allocation. This service has always been 100% spent and is the best “bang for the buck” service Ryan White funds. Discussion:
 - Redwan said there used to be 100% utilization for a service that is no longer offered through the Legal Services program.
 - Karin said this change would put core medical services at 77.5%.
 - Shanasha asked what is covered under Legal Services. Darin stated his conflict as a provider. He does not have a breakdown of the percentage of services. They deal with immigration, social security, or work discrimination related to HIV.
 - Beth took a read of the room on Karin's proposal.
 - Adam asked the supervisors of case managers and staff how they feel about the reduction of MCM – Adult Foster Care funding Karin is proposing.

Hank stated he would be presiding for the remainder of the meeting.

XIV. Motion of Pre-Award Allocation Proposal

MOTION: Kris made a motion to approve the allocations proposal as presented by the grantees. A second is assumed because it came from the committee. Questions/Comments:

- Kris said this proposal was discussed and approved in the Planning & Priorities meeting.
- Loyal said the information on MCM – Adult Foster Care and Legal Services were not known at the Planning & Priorities meeting.
- **AMENDMENT:** Karin made an amendment to move \$5,000 from Adult Foster Care and move it to Legal Services and David N. seconded the motion. Discussion:
 - Craig asked for clarification if a client moves to Adult Foster Care they are automatically assigned a case worker. Amy said if a client has a CADI waiver they are assigned a waiver manager. Karin said this is offered through the county.
 - Adam thinks the clients are being well taken care of.
 - Dave said most county workers are not HIV specialists so they may not understand the complexity of the HIV case system.
 - Shanasha asked if we know the funding utilization will drop. Karin said we don't know that.
 - Amy asked for clarification that even though the number of beds will be reduced the staff person will still be responsible to place these clients in another house. Jonathan said it could be. Karin said that does not currently happen.
 - A vote was called on the amendment and it passed by majority with a vote of 13-4 with Andy, Darin, and Shelia abstaining (Yes votes: M. Gulley, P. Carr, K. Hammes, A. Marante, R. Pioli, S. Davis, K. Sabey, T. Bichanga, A. Fairbanks, A. Schrempp, L. Brooks, D. Neller, A. Fredrickson. No votes: S. Whitson, B. Hers, J. Gudino, C. Schmidt. Abstaining – A. Ansel, D. Rowles, S. Mills).

Further discussion of the original motion with Karin's amendment

- The motion was called to approve the allocations proposal as presented with the approved amendment to move \$5,000 from Adult Foster Care to Legal Services. The proposal was approved unanimously with a vote of 20-0 (Yes votes: M. Gulley, P. Carr, K. Hammes, A. Marante, R. Pioli, S. Davis, K. Sabey, T. Bichanga, A. Fairbanks, A. Schrempp, L. Brooks, D. Neller, A. Fredrickson, S. Whitson, B. Hers, J. Gudino, C. Schmidt, A. Ansel, D. Rowles, S. Mills)

XV. Final Consideration on Pre-Award Allocation

None.

XVI. Wrap Up and Evaluation

None.

XVII. Announcements From the Floor

- A. Peter is retiring at the end of November. He will maintain Council membership through November and will work to identify a new Prevention grantee representative.
- B. Hank said MCHA includes in their welcome packet an option to get gift cards from retailers. Contact him for more information.
- C. Andy thanked everyone for support of the Red Ribbon Ride. There were 19 more riders this year and \$35,000 more raised this year than last.
- D. Tim said the assessment of the administrative mechanism will be coming out in the next couple of weeks.
- E. An evaluation of this process will be sent to Council members via email.
- F. The Positive Care Center is doing a hockey tournament fundraiser.
- G. AIDSLine now has texting capacity. New materials are available.
- H. Adam said August 31st is the Overdose Awareness Vigil at Loring Park.

XVIII. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 pm

Meeting Summary:

- Winston Cavert and Debbie Gazett were elected to sit on the Council.
- Al, Shanasha, and David were appointed to sit on the Grievance Committee.
- The Council reviewed the prioritization process and received individual, anonymous, and combined rankings. The Council provided comments on the prioritization process to improve it for next time and discussed the allocations process from here forward.
- The allocations proposal was approved as presented with a reduction of \$5,000 in Adult Foster Care and an increase of \$5,000 to Legal Services.

Documents Distributed Before the Meeting:

- Agenda
- Minutes from June 12, 2012

- Committee Report Summaries August 14, 2012

–
Documents Distributed/Available At the Meeting:

- Part A Update, August 14, 2012
- Impact of Sequestration on Federal HIV/AIDS Discretionary Programs
- Prioritization Rankings
- FY2013 Application Allocations Proposal
- FY2013 Part A, Part B and ADAP Rebate Pre-Award Allocations (August 2012)

–
WJ/tds