



Meeting of the
PRIORITY SETTING & RESOURCE ALLOCATION COMMITTEE

Monday, August 5, 2013
Cicatelli Assoc., 505 Eighth Avenue, 19th Floor
1:15 – 5:00 pm

MINUTES

Members Present: Sam Rivera (Co-Chair), Randall Bruce, Felicia Carroll, Sharen Duke, Joan Edwards, Graham Harriman, Peter Laqueur, Amanda Lugg, Deb Marcano, Hilda Mateo, Jan Carl Park, Tom Petro, Allan Vergara, Leonardo Vicente III, Dorella Walters

Members Absent: Nancy Cataldi, Robert Cordero, Marya Gilborn, Tracy Douglas Neil, Dena Rakower

Staff Present: David Klotz, Rafael Molina, Anna Thomas (DOHMH); Bettina Carroll, Gucci Kaloo (Public Health Solutions)

Agenda Item #1: Welcome/Introductions/Moment of Silence/Minutes

Mr. Rivera opened the meeting followed by introductions. *Ms. Marcano* led the moment of silence. The amended draft minutes of the July 29, 2013 meeting were approved a correction to clarify the decision on ranking the new non-Medical Case Management (nMCM) service directive. The PSRA discussed the directive to clarify that the service model will be scored as two separate lines in the ranking sheet with two separate lines in the spending plan: one for the current Riker's Island program, expanded to include case management services for releasees from upstate prisons, and one for low threshold, low intensity case management for the general population.

Agenda Item #2: FY 2014 Priority Setting Tool and Service Category Ranking

The PSRA continued its process of ranking the service categories for the FY 2014 application. Below are highlights of the discussion on the Consumer Priority and Specific Gaps/Emerging Needs criteria:

- Data demonstrates on-going food insecurity issues for PLWHA. CHAIN also shows very high consumer need for this service.
- While inmates have not been part of CHAIN or consumer surveys, former inmates who participate in consumer advisory boards continue to express a high need for case management.
- There needs to be more data in general to help assess consumer priority.
- The move to fund a higher percentage of supportive services is an indication of a high need for case management.

- While the percentage of PLWHA who express a need for mental health and substance use services is not as high as food and nutrition, for those who need those services, they are a very high priority.
- The “consumers” of Early Intervention Services (EIS) are the untested, there are no surveys of this general population on this service, no indication that testing is a high priority in that population, and testing is increasingly widely available.
- The consistent over-performance of Legal Services is evidence of high consumer need.
- Health Homes will have no major impact on MCM this year.
- The data presented on July 15th by John Rojas demonstrate growing gaps in housing services.
- The aging of the HIV population could mean emerging need for home-based services.

The following motions were made, seconded and approved by the PSRA:

Consumer Priority: Re-affirm the scores for ADAP, ADAP+, FNS, nMCM (Rikers/releasees), MCM, HOU, MH, SCF, Legal, HERR, HOM. Score nMCM (General population) 8. Raise the score of Harm Reduction from 5 to 8. Lower the score of EIS from 5 to 3.

Specific Gaps/Emerging Needs: Re-affirm the scores for ADAP, ADAP+, FNS, nMCM (Rikers/releasees), MCM, MH, Harm Reduction, SCF, Legal and HERR. Score nMCM (General Pop) a 5. Lower the score of EIS from 5 to 1. Raise the score of HOM from 1 to 3.

Agenda Item #3: FY 2014 Application Spending Plan

Mr. Kaloo gave an overview of the draft spending plan, based on the ideas discussed at the July 29th PSRA meeting. \$911,739 for ADAP+ was shifted from base to MAI to account for the uncoupling of the combined plan (no net change in total allocation to ADAP+). \$3M was reduced from EIS, with \$2M redistributed to nMCM (General Pop) and \$1M to HERR. There were minor adjustments to the carrying costs totaling \$1,620. There is a restoration of the upfront cut to ADAP (\$2.76M). Finally, all service categories were increased by 5%, based on their FY 2012 amount as a request to undo the portion of the cut to the award from sequestration. The total additional for programs was \$6,394,822. The additional amount for programs, when backed into the overall award, meant increases for administration and Tri-county, and a restoration of the \$150,000 reduced in Quality Management for FY 2013.

Mr. Park reported that the Mayor’s Washington, DC representative expects sequestration to continue next year, and for the hold harmless provision to end, and so a request for additional funds is optimistic.

There was a discussion on the funds allocated to the 2 nMCM categories. Additional concerns were expressed concerning the model in the service directive and its associated costs. For example, how releasees from upstate prisons will find their way to case management providers, as similar successful programs begin coordinating services prior to release. *Ms. Duke* reported that a similar SAMHSA-funded program costs about \$2,000/year per client. She proposed a program that serves 250 clients to start and moved that \$400,000 of the nMCM allocation be set aside for the expansion of the service to releasees, with the remaining \$1.6M for nMCM (General Pop). **The motion was seconded and approved.**

A motion was made, seconded and approved to cap the HERR allocation at \$1M, as this was the amount suggested by the grantee at the July 19th meeting for 4 programs at \$250,000/each.

A motion was made, seconded and approved to allocate the remaining \$435,969 evenly between FNS and Housing.

A motion was made, seconded and approved to accept the revised FY 2014 application base and MAI spending plans and forward them to the full Council for approval.

The staff thanked the entire Committee for their time and dedication in the year's challenging planning process.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.