

Greater Baltimore HIV Health Services Planning Council
Minutes of the Meeting of April 29, 2010

Vol. VII, No. 1

Final • April 30, 2010

Meeting Attendance

Present	S. Alston C. Brown R. Brisueno (proxy for R. Matens) D. Clark R. Disharoon C. Edmonds J. Fleming B. Fitzsimmons (proxy for P. Hall) C. Gibson R. Gore-Simmons M. Graves P. Hall R. Green N. Guest (Proxy for D. Henson) R. Haden C. Harvey Sr.	T. Hawkins M. Hitch R. Johnson D. Kelson J. Keller (proxy for J. Keruly) C. Massey A. Middleton* M. Moaney M. Reese R. Rubino W. Samuel D. Shamer L. Sowah J. Winslow
Absent	M. Becketts K. Bellesky R. Bradley V. Burrell-Gibson V. Clark P. Hall T. James	J. Keruly A. Leverrette R. Matens L. Servance D. Smith B. Thomas-El
BCHD	A. Ferrari	M. Rucker
Staff	D. Gorham J. Reed	C. Lacanienta N. Slaughter E. Saber E. Martin
Visitors	R. Booker B. Freeman	
Handouts	Meeting agenda (March 16, 2010). FY 2010 MAI Priority Setting binders FY 2010 MAI Grantee Priority Setting Recommendations	

Executive Summary

The meeting convened with quorum at 5:55 p.m.¹

The planning council completed its FY 2010 Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI) priority setting and resource allocation (PSRA) and revisited its reallocation of FY 2010 Part A.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

¹ Quorum is defined as attendance of at least 51 percent of membership.

Proceedings

Introductions

The chair convened the part two of the council's emergency MAI PRSA for FY 2010² at 5:55 p.m. with introductions.

Emergency Planning Council FY 2010 PRSA meeting

The chair explained the reasoning for the emergency planning council meeting, which was to complete MAI PSRA for FY 2010. The chair stated that he wanted to rescind the motion that was approved by the planning council at its last meeting as conflicts of interests were not read and no discussion occurred on the service categories recommended for reallocation.

Comments and questions from the Evaluation Committee were read from the committee's co-chair D. Shamer regarding grantee recommendations for Part A reallocation.

Questions raised included if the grantee had spoken to agencies before recommending a decrease and the funding recommendations for the Counties. The committee asked why there was a negative amount under core medical services category and if it meant that funds would be reprogrammed at a later date.

A member of the Evaluation Committee asked if the council could or should rescind the motion. The facilitator clarified that they could rescind the motion.

R. Brisueno of the grantee stated that a request was made from the chair to hold off on implementing Part A reallocations set at the last meeting to allow the council an opportunity to discuss each recommendation line by line. Also, the council did not take into consideration conflicts of interest. The conflicts need to be accounted for.

A council member noted that packaging directives or motions might cut down on time but is a disservice to the clients.

Motion	To move the grantee recommendations for reallocations to the Evaluation Committee for consideration and recommendations.
Proposed by	R. Disharoon
Seconded by	R.Haden
# Abstentions	4
Opposed	21

² Part one of the PRSA took place on April 20, 2010 at the PC's regularly scheduled April meeting, however, they did not finish and voted to reconvene to complete it April 29.

Action	Failed
--------	--------

The grantee stated that the Executive Committee had approved the recommendations line-by-line. The approval of the reallocations is needed so they can write contracts. It was noted that the council is here for the MAI PRSA but due to the severity of this matter the Part A reallocations need approval tonight.

C. Massey asked how this emergency reallocation and decrease came to be.

At the request of the chair, the grantee provided the council with the following background:

- The Part A formula and MAI award for FY 2010 was received first with an increase in award from FY 2009, to which the council’s increase scenario was applied.
- Since then, the EMA had received its supplemental award but had received a decrease. As a result, the council’s decrease scenario must now be applied, and therefore, a need to reallocate. It took a week to redistribute the award to the total contract.
- The grantee’s office made a request to the planning council for the reallocation of funds in certain categories. The Evaluation Committee meeting had passed and the next meeting was the Executive Committee so the recommendations were presented line by line and the committee approved each one to move to the full body for a vote.

A council member asked the grantee if the recommendations are the recommendations in keeping with the decrease scenario? The grantee stated that it was.

Motion	Rescind previous motion by PC regarding executive committee recommendations..
Proposed by	R.Haden
Seconded by	D. Kelson
Action	Passed, 0 abstention, 0 objections

The chair next turned the meeting over to facilitator, D.Munro of IGS to continue with the scheduled MAI PRSA.

D Munro reviewed housekeeping items, the council’s PSRA agenda and gave a recap of the Counties PSRA that was scheduled, held and completed on Tuesday, April 27, 2010. The facilitator reviewed the Counties Committee’s recommended allocation for Counties Mental Health Services and explained the accompanying spreadsheets for their exercises.

- Counties Committee began its MAI PSRA with the \$116,735 allocate to it by the council in the council’s first exercise on April 20, 2010. The Counties Committee agreed to keep the allocations for the Counties set-aside the same. They ended up with \$78,100 and moved some of the money to Medical. The full council must approve what the counties did.

Motion	Approve the Counties allocation of \$78,100 to medical and \$38,635 to support
Proposed by	M. Reese
Seconded by	D. Kelson
Action	Passed, 0 abstention, 0 objections

Round Four

Category: Mental Health.

Conflicts read

L. Ferrari of the grantee presented the grantee recommendations to the council.

Grantee requested to revisit the Mental Health category the grantee recommended that the category needed to have \$111,000 so the category can read \$0.

The facilitator explained how this correction would affect the current allocations and bring the allocation to 0. It was stated that another motion was not needed to correct the allocation amount.

The council discussed the following:

- How would this change would affect providers and would the grantee got to this point? The grantee stated that the change would fully fund the programs within the category
- A \$0 allocation is what the grantee originally wanted.

Motion	Rescind the previous motion from the last PC meeting regarding Mental Health allocation
Proposed by	R. Rubino
Seconded by	W.Samuel
Action	Passed, 0 abstention, 0 objections

The facilitator explained the issue regarding the funding of \$ 34,561 to oral health. It was explained how recommendations in the planning council’s chart are different than initial recommendations. If funding changes, the council will be in balance of \$0. Counties Committee has already approved \$34,561 but the committee understands that this may change pending a planning council vote.

Category: Outreach

Grantee: Recommend adding \$78,201 to category

Conflicts read

The council discussed the following:

- If is there was a targeted age or youth targeted program? The grantee noted that this was a planning council recommendation but they have not indicated a specific age group yet. The specifics are needed.
- One council member had a concern for the lack of data for this category and that more data is needed before the council shifts money. Grantee sated that they still in the process of indentifying provider that would be interested in the program for the amount offered. The grantee stated that there is data from 2009 available but that is not the data we produced.
- It was clarified that under Part A funds youth is considered 18-24.

Conflicts read again and the category was voted on.

Motion	Accept the grantee recommendation of \$78,201 for Outreach
Proposed by	D. Kelson
Seconded by	R.Rubino
# Abstentions	2
Opposed	0
Action	Passed

Category: Medical Transportation

Conflicts read

The grantee recommended funding this category at \$27,828

The planning council discussed the following:

- Some council members questioned the performance of the category. The grantee stated that category exceeded it projections. One council member questioned if other agencies asked the grantee for transportation money. The grantee stated that there were no requests this year.
- If the grantee should recommend an increase to funding especially in the counties? Grantee stated that they are trying to stay on top of the issue so no complications occur again.
- Questions from a planning council member on the subtractions the planning council made to Medical Transportation in the first round. It was clarified by the PCSO that the subtractions that were made in the first round were for the executive committee initiatives.

Motion	Accept grantee recommendation to fund Medical transportation for \$27,828
Proposed by	C. Massey

Seconded by	R.Rubino
Action	Passed

Category: Substance abuse residential

The grantee recommended allowing substance abuse residential as a funded category for \$25,000

No conflicts

The council discussed the following:

- If there are providers established. The grantee stated that there would be providers.

Motion	Accept grantee recommendation for allowing substance abuse residential as a funded category for \$25,000
Proposed by	D.Kelson
Seconded by	L.Sowah
Passes?	Yes

Category: Psychosocial Services

No conflicts

The grantee recommended neither the addition nor subtraction of funds equaling to \$43,389

Motion	Accept grantee recommendation for 43,389
Proposed by	R.Johnson
Seconded by	D.Kelson
Passes?	Yes

Category: Food Bank

The grantee recommended to increase the food bank category by \$10,000.

Motion	Accept grantee recommendation for \$10,000 allocation
Proposed by	D. Keslon
Seconded by	R. Disharoon
Passes?	Yes

The council discussed the following:

- One council member wanted to know why the grantee made this recommendation. The grantee stated that they were making the recommendation to support bags of groceries with an average value of \$50 per bag supporting 200 units of service.

Category: Child Care

Grantee: Add \$4,928 to category to support off-site child care services

Conflicts read

The council discussed the following:

Motion	Accept grantee recommendation
Proposed by	C.Brown
Seconded by	D.Kelson
Passes?	Yes

Conflicts read

D.Munro explained what happens to the counties surplus of \$34,561 allocation that was mentioned at the beginning of the meeting if they distribute the funds to the counties and what happens if they want to close round 4 and go to round 5. He explained that the planning council does not need to be exactly at 75%. The PC can be a little below. They must be above the final core medical number

Motion	Close round 4 and move to round 5
Proposed by	C. Edmonds
Seconded by	R. Haden
Passes?	Yes

Round Five

Motion	Take \$34,561 and allocate to the counties for oral health
Proposed by	C.Massey
Seconded by	D.Kelson
Passes?	Yes

No conflicts

Motion	Close round five and PRSA
Proposed by	D.Kelson
Seconded by	R. Haden
Passes?	yes

The council concluded its MAI FY 2010 PRSA at 7:35 p.m. and preceded with reviewing Part A FY 2010 reallocation recommendations.

Part A Reallocations Recommendations

At the request of the chair, R. Brisueno led the planning council through the grantee's recommendations; as proxy for planning council member R.Matens, R. Brisueno abstained from voting on all motions for reallocation of Part A.

Category: Primary Medical Care (counties)

Conflicts read

Motion	Reduce PMC category by \$59,728
Proposed by	R.Disharoon
Seconded by	J.Fleming
Passes?	yes

Category: OAHS-EFA (counties)

Conflicts read

The grantee recommended reducing OAHS-EFA by \$14,705

Motion	Reduce OAHS-EFA by \$14,705
Proposed by	R.Disharoon
Seconded by	C.Harvey
# Abstent	yes
Passes?	Yes

Category: Medical Case Management (counties)

Conflicts read

Grantee recommended reducing Medical Case Management by \$36,138

Motion	Reduce Medical Case Management by \$36,138
Proposed by	D.Shamer
Seconded by	J.Winslow
Passes?	yes

Category: Oral Health (counties)

Conflicts read

The council discussed the following:

- Grantee stated that this allocation will bring to current level, which is \$155,342. All dollars need to be properly accounted for in EFA category.

Motion	Increase Oral Health by \$49,091
Proposed by	C.Edmonds
Seconded by	R.Dishroon
Passes?	Yes

Category: Core medical service (counties)

Conflicts read

Motion	Reduce core medical (counties) by \$61,480
Proposed by	D. Shamer
Seconded by	J. Winslow
Passes?	Yes

Category: Medical Transportation (counties)

Conflicts read

Grantee recommended reducing Medical Transportation (counties) by \$25,770

The council discussed the following:

- The grantee stated that not a single provider made request for additional funds

Motion	Reduce Medical Transportation (counties) by \$25,770
Proposed by	D.Shamer
Seconded by	M.Reese
Passes?	Yes

Category: Food Bank (counties)

Conflicts read

The grantee recommended an increase in the Food and Nutrition (Food Bank) by \$13,937.

The council discussed the following:

- A council member expressed their displeasure at the lack of data that was presented by the grantee.
- Another council felt that the recommendations that were made during the summer were being changed.

Motion	Increase Food and Nutrition by \$13,937
Proposed by	D.Kelson
Seconded by	R.Dishroon
Passes?	Yes

Category: Psychosocial (counties)

No conflicts

The grantee recommends the allocation of \$30,000 under decrease scenario to the psychosocial category.

Motion	Recommend allocation of \$30,000 under decrease scenario to psychosocial.
Proposed by	R.Discharon
Seconded by	M.Graves
Passes?	Yes

Category: STSC supoprt services

The grantee recommended to increase to supportive services allocate \$18,167 from STSC core medical

Conflicts read

Motion	Increase to supportive services allocate \$18,167 from STSC core medical
Proposed by	C.Edmonds
Seconded by	D.Kelson
Passes?	Yes

The chair noted that the council was running out of time and may have to extend the meeting.

Motion	Extend the meeting by 30 mins.
Proposed by	D.Shamer
Seconded by	M.Reese
Passes?	Yes

Category: STSC allocation

The grantee recommended an overall reduction to STSC allocation by \$43,313.

Conflicts read

The council discussed the following:

- A planning council member expressed their displeasure with the lack of data from the grantee. They also disagreed with everything that was going on, stating that the priority setting feels rushed.

Motion	Overall reduction to STSC allocation by 43,313
Proposed by	D.Kelson
Seconded by	C.Harvey
# Abstent	1
# Opposed	0
Passes?	yes

Category: Non-Medical Case Management (EMA-Wide)

The grantee recommended a reduction of 59,597 to Medical Case Management (EMA-wide)

Conflicts read

The council discussed the following:

- A planning council member questioned the need of only \$218,269 dollars to this category.

Motion	Reduction of 59,597 to Non-Medical Case Management
Proposed by	L.Sowah
Seconded by	C.Harvey
# Abstent	5
# Opposed	1
Passes?	yes

Category: Childcare (EMA-wide)

The grantee recommended a reduction of \$51,646 to Childcare

Conflicts read

The council discussed the following:

- A council member noted that childcare services have never had an issue with meeting its goals.
- An issue regarding a continuation application in the RFP there were no instructions from HRSA on what to apply for in the RFP. The grantee stated that there is no continuation application in the RFP. They have not heard that particular complaint from any provider. Provide office the Ryan White office with documentation of this.

Motion	Reduction of \$51,646 to Childcare
Proposed by	C.Massey
Seconded by	D.Shamer
# Abstent	5
# Opposed	2
Passes?	yes

Category: STSC

The grantee recommended shifting \$18,167 from STSC to core medical in the EMA

Conflict read

Motion	To shift STSC \$18,167 to core medical services in the EMA
Proposed by	D.Kelson
Seconded	R.Disharoon
Passes?	yes

Category: Medical Case Management (EMA-wide)

The grantee recommended **to** increase the Medical Case management category by \$154,555

Conflict read

Motion	Increase Medical Case management by \$154,555
Proposed by	D.Shamer
Seconded by	C.Harvey
# Abstent	5
# Opposed	0
Passes?	yes
Adjourn	Adjourn meeting
Proposed by	R.Haden
Seconded by	D.Kelson
Passes?	Yes

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Walter Samuel

Walter Samuel
Chair
Planning Council

May 18, 2010