



Meeting of the
Priority Setting & Resource Allocation Committee
Hilda Mateo & Joe Pressley, Co-Chairs

Friday, January 14, 2005, 3:00 PM–5:00 PM
APICHA, 150 Lafayette Street, 6th Floor

Members Present: Joe Pressley (Co-Chair), Rafael Abadia, Bruce Agins MD, S.J. Avery, Felicia Carroll, Ryan Chavez, Julie Lehane PhD, Laviniva Morrison, Darry Ng, Joshua Sippin LCSW, Edward Telzak MD

Members Not Present: Hilda Mateo (Co-Chair), Eduardo Baez, Kenneth Butler, Eli Camhi LMSW, Brenda Lee Curry, Daliah Heller, Steve Hemraj, JoAnn Hilger, Phil Hogan, Walter Okoroanyanwu MD MPH, Mary Sedlacek, Rev. Terry Troia

OAPC Staff Present: Grace Moon, Beth Cohen Barusek, Ingrid Gonzalez

MHRA Staff Present: Rachel Miller, Gucci Kaloo

Guests: Guillermo Goldwyn, Terri Smith–Coronia, Orbit Clanton, Nestor Vazquez

Materials Distributed:

- Meeting Agenda
- December 10, 2004 Meeting Minutes
- Planning Principles for Year 15 Scenario Planning
- *Request for Funding:* Request to MHRA for funding for remaining costs on the Asians and Pacific Islanders Community Needs Assessment
- Memo to Priority Setting & Resource Allocation Committee from Hilda Mateo and Joe Pressley (Co-Chairs) re: Scenario Planning for the Title I Year 15 Award
- Spending Plan (Base & MAI)
- 2005 New Priorities and Reallocations
- Article VII Planning Council By-Laws: Conflicts of Interest
- Data Day 1 *Save the Date/Draft Agenda*
- Scenario Planning Spreadsheet
- Press Release: *Scott E. Kellerman, MD, MPH, Named Assistant Commissioner for HIV/AIDS Services for the New York City Health Department*

I. Welcome/Introductions

Co-Chair Joe Pressley opened the meeting with a moment of silence. Introductions were made. Grace Moon reviewed the contents of the meeting packet (*see above*). The minutes were passed.

II. Public Comment

No public comments.

III. Scenario Planning for Year 15

Mr. Pressley asked the Committee to review the scenario planning spreadsheet and Planning Principles. He reminded the committee that a recommendation to the Executive Committee should be submitted in Feb/March 2005. He described the scenario planning spreadsheet as

prepared for 3 different scenarios: For both Base/MAI: 1) Across the board cut by 5%, 10% and 15%; 2) Tiered matrix for programs in Tier 1 to be held harmless; and 3) Tiered matrix for a proportionate cut from bottom up.

Ms. Avery expressed concern regarding the tiered matrix. She stated that when services were ranked in last year's planning cycle, they were not ranked in the context of scenario planning for spending cuts. Mr. Pressley stated that the tiers could be redefined. Mr. Chavez stated that scenario planning take into account not funding new RFPs. Mr. Pressley stated that this would be applied to any scenario planning. Ms. Miller explained that MHRA's RFP has three programs that are new and three that are being re-bid. The new programs are: 1) Outstationed Medical Care Teams in Commercial SRO Hotels and Homeless Shelters; 2) Housing Referral Coordination for PLWHAs in Commercial SRO Hotels and in Need of Harm Reduction; and 3) Assessment Teams in Emergency Care and Harm Reduction Service Centers. The 3 that are being re-bid are: 1) Treatment Adherence Support; 2) Supportive Counseling and Family Support; and 3) Legal Services.

There was an extensive discussion about the need to have information on Title I contracts both in terms of underspending and poor performance. Mr. Ng stated that a first step in scenario planning would be to examine contractors that are underperforming, both in terms of spending down and contract deliverables. Ms. Miller stated that it would be difficult to evaluate current programs in that they are nine months into the contract year, and a review would happen in April. Mr. Ng asked if there was a ballpark estimate in terms of dollars that can be incorporated into the scenario planning discussion. Ms. Miller responded that this would be difficult. Ms. Avery stated that it would be valuable to have information about contract evaluation in scenario planning. Dr. Agins agreed, stating that performance as well as importance of programming be taken into account. He stated that "problem performers" be evaluated in terms of under-spending and poor performance. Dr. Lehane stated that while it may be difficult to get current year's contract performance information, a historical look would be valuable to the process.

Ms. Miller stated that MHRA has taken down 30 contracts based on under-spending and that few contracts are taken down for performance. Dr. Telzak asked whether MHRA could provide data in terms of a consistent pattern of either underspending or poor performance. Mr. Kaloo explained the complexity of providing data, given the historical nature of the Ryan White award, in that in year 13 there was a drastic cut and in year 14, there was a large grant award. Mr. Ng ask that MHRA do a best estimate analysis on contract underspending and poor performance and bring it back to the Committee. Ms Miller stated that they could try to achieve this. Mr. Abadia raised the concern that contract monitoring is not in the purview of the Planning Council or the PS &RA Committee.

Ms. Avery reiterated her concern about the tiered matrixes in the scenario plans and stated that when last year's rankings took place, decisions were not based in the context of a dollar significance should there be cutbacks. Dr. Agins agreed, further stating that the categories are broad and there needs to be an examination of actual program performance and need. Mr. Chavez agreed, stating that the Committee should perform an analysis of the rankings.

Dr. Agins stated that this would be a long and difficult process and put forth a motion that the scenario planning be based on the magnitude of the cut. The motion stated was “With 1-5% cut, we examine the 3 scenarios; with a 5.1% cut – 10% cut, we examine the 3 scenarios and with a 10.1% - 15% cut, we examine the 3 scenarios. The motion was seconded and consensus was gained to pass the motion. Ms. Moon said that she would bring back to the Committee this revision of scenario planning. Mr. Pressley asked MHRA to bring back to the Committee a best-guess analysis of contract underspending and poor performance.

IV. Next Steps

The next meeting scheduled for January 26, 2005 will need to be rescheduled due to a schedule conflict.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.