



Meeting of the
NEEDS ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

H. Daniel Castellanos, Dr.PH & Carrie Davis, Co-Chairs

May 11, 2017, 9:30AM -11:30AM

Cicatelli Training Center, 505 8th Ave, Sky Blue Room

By Conference Call – 1-866-213-1863, Access Code 3587454#

Members Present: H. Daniel Castellanos, DrPH (Co-Chair), Carrie Davis (Co-Chair), Fay Barrett, Lisa Best, Randall Bruce (Consumer At Large), Timothy Frasca, Guillermo Garcia-Goldwyn (phone), Jennifer Irwin, Frank Machlica, Jan Carl Park, John Schoepp, Angela Arias for Marcy Thompson

Members Absent: Angela Aidala, PhD, Pedro Carneiro, PhD, Sabina Hirshfield, PhD, Julie Lehane PhD, Rosemary Lopez, David Martin, Glen Phillip, Robert Steptoe,

Planning Council Members Present: Lisa Best, Paul Carr, Maria A. Diaz, Billy Fields

NYC DOHMH/PHS Staff Present:, Ashley Azor, M. Bari Khan, Nagla Bayoumi (PHS), Jose Colon-Berdecia, Laura Hernandez, David Klotz, Melanie Lawrence, Katherine Penrose, Darryl Wong, Maiko Yomogida, PhD

Others Present: Angel Soto (GMHC)

Materials Distributed:

- Meeting Agenda
- 4/13/17 Meeting Minutes
- Community Briefing Evaluation & Feedback
- Planning Council By-Laws: Needs Assessment Section

WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS/MOMENT OF SILENCE/REVIEW OF THE MEETING PACKET/REVIEW OF THE MINUTES:

Co-Chair Carrie Davis opened the meeting with introductions. *Ms. Diaz* led us in a moment of silence. *Ms. Lawrence* reviewed the meeting packet with the committee. The minutes were approved. *Ms. Davis* noted the date of the upcoming full council meeting.

**2017 COMMUNITY BRIEFING FEEDBACK & EVALUATION:
PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ms. Lawrence led us through compiled feedback and evaluation from surveys distributed during the Community Briefing. The survey asked attendees to rate Panels 1 through 4 on the following two questions: “How valuable was the educational content of the panel” on a

scale of 1-5, and “How useful was this panel to your work” on a scale of 1-5. A comment box was also provided for Comments/Concerns/Suggestions.

The number of surveys completed for panel 4 was significantly smaller than the number completed for panel 3 (Panel 3 had 61, Panel 4 had 45 data entries). This was likely due to late timing with which the 4th panel was publicized and the fact that all of the presenters were not able to stay for the 4th panel. Comments were categorized into themes based on their main subject.

The discussion was then opened up to the committee for general feedback. *Mr. Frasca* asked the organizers and moderators to give their feedback first to start the conversation since they were present in the room throughout the event. The discussion noted the following points: good attendance; high caliber of people in attendance; seems like we are on the right track in terms of who was invited and who attended; the need for more of a dialogue – difficult to get presenters to build on sometimes disparate topics; the need for the committee to engage presenters much earlier; the suggestion to host a conference call to get presenters on the same page; the need to survey the panelists about the event; the difficulty created when people asked questions that were outside of the scope of the panel and the panelists; a suggestion that the format should change to reflect the needs of audience; that the time limitations were challenging in terms of getting everything in; that people appreciated the variety of perspectives around policy; that there is a need for more of a town hall type of event on the subject of housing; and that even though we tried to make this event tighter – we failed – and we may need to have even fewer presenters so that we can dig deeper - we held the line on the number of panelists – but we did not focus our scope.

Mr. Park noted that a broad range of issues were presented – so many challenges, not just for homeless/unstably housed, but that considered the pressures of real estate development; panelists were asked to limit number of slides and we did better with this; putting on an event like this is a science and an art; there was redundancy in the panelist’s talks; the audience seemed to speak freely – we heard a lot of stories and concerns; good people were asked to present, but time restraints meant that reps from HASA could not stay.

The attendance at the Community Briefing raised an important issue: Planning Council committees are not in full communication – as is also illustrated by the current scenario planning happening in PSRA that is looking to cut care coordination (Transitional Care Coordination (TCC)) for persons who are unstably housed/homeless.

Ms. Best would like to have seen a city council member in attendance; she also noted that the info was repetitive and the briefing could have benefited from better instruction for the audience to limit comment time on the mics.

Mr. Wong explained that HASA was asked to stay for the entire event but could not commit to the entire briefing; that the briefing should be expanded, and possibly include a town hall. Last year’s recommendation to keep it to two presenters was ignored.

Other feedback from the committee: panelists did not answer questions with regard to what is needed in the future; we learned a lot about what info needs to be gathered to best do the work of the Needs Assessment committee; and we did not give panelists enough time to prepare and that hurt the quality of the briefing.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (NAC): MOVING FORWARD

Considering that reductions to the Ryan White budget may require more drastic cuts than we have seen in the past, the PSRA is looking at cutting entire service categories. *Mr. Castellanos* noted that the NAC has not looked at the entire portfolio in the time he has been with the committee, even though it is in our bylaws.

NAC is in charge of identifying service needs and gaps – this is important work. It could be a good time to start looking at those service categories. If there is redundancy in the service categories, we should consider eliminating categories. Information must be gathered first, including a review of the report card for any category up for elimination.

Mr. Castellano wanted the focus on next steps to look beyond the issue of the TCC service category elimination in the PSRA, since the majority of the committee was not at that meeting. *Mr. Carr* suggested that NAC needs a better presence in those meetings.

It is necessary to recognize that some of this work has come up because the funding landscape had drastically changed. The TCC, Health Education and MCM scorecards will be ready by at the end of June. Often, those scorecards are very outdated, much like the TCC data that was presented at the PSRA. Data presented to the PSRA should also be presented to NAC.

Last year's community briefing did result in changes in funding. In looking at redundancy and cuts – need to consider the larger picture as well – if we experience funding cuts, other programs that serve this population are also going to hemorrhage. Taking on the whole portfolio might distract us from our focus as a committee.

The impression given at the PSRA was that cutting of the TCC service category was going to a vote – this is what was worrisome. Shelters are not the answer – they can exacerbate mental and social stress on people already dealing with a lot. . NAC should push to understand how this redundancy is defined and what it looks like, because a lot of these programs are not available to all people.

The community briefing has emphasized the need to better look at and understand the housing portfolio. How does accessing one service disqualify a person for other services? Do the service categories need to be reorganized rather than eliminated?

Category elimination should work through NAC first, before it goes to PSRA. The grantee is closest to the data, but motivation for cutting these categories is unclear.

Three interconnected tasks for the NAC: 1. Follow through on community briefing; 2. Examine the portfolio, especially housing, transitional care coordination and health education; 3. Integration of prevention and treatment. These should be our agenda for the next year as proposed by *Mr. Castellano*.

Integrated Care and Treatment Plan is in effect and will be a year old in the fall – bylaws require the committee to look at how it is being actualized.

The NAC would like the grantee and council staff to collaborate on making a presentation to the committee on these 3 categories.

Chairs of the NAC and IOC have traditionally sat on the PSRA committee, but this has not been the practice for the past couple of planning cycles. Not necessarily possible, but a method of ensuring good communication is necessary.

In looking at the Integrated Care and Treatment Plan – the committee will need a summary and presentation. It is not reasonable to expect the committee members to read 300 pages.

A good approach is to look at the Community Briefing in relationship to the discussion of the elimination of the TCC. This can be done in conjunction with PSRA.

Mr. Schoepp indicated that he was made to feel unwelcome at the PSRA meeting. *Mr. Park* responded that council members should be welcomed at every meeting and that that is the responsibility of staff and the chairs.

Mr. Castellano put the following to vote: 1. Continue action steps for community briefing; 2. Review the portfolio, with an emphasis on MCM and TCC, Health Education and Housing; 3. Engage the NYS DOH with an update as to the roll-out of the Integrated Prevention and Care Plan. The committee voted unanimously in agreement. *Mr. Castellano* noted that Tri-County needs also need to come to the fore.

The next meeting will be used to strategically plan how to address these issues. *Ms. Best* asked how the information and recommendations for Tri-County will be distributed to providers.

Mr. Wong asked the committee to read the Executive Summary of the Integrated Prevention & Care Plan. He noted that the only work that has taken place with regard to the plan has been each region prioritizing needs for their area. They are now tasked with coming up with goals. They have not gotten to the issue of evaluation which could be a good angle for the NAC to address/influence

NEW BUSINESS

The Planning Council in it's May meeting will discuss Safe Consumption Sites. The following month HIV care for undocumented individuals will be discussed.

Mr. Castellano mentioned that the retreat findings should be discussed at the next Executive Committee. The discussion on cross committee work came up during the retreat.

The Mexican Gov't Consul is now providing birth certificates for Mexican citizens.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:30AM