

# Ryan White EMA Planning Council

New Haven and Fairfield Counties



Heidi Jenkins & Joanne Montgomery, Co-Chairs

---

## Strategic Planning & Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

**Meeting Date:** Thursday, October 3, 2013  
**Start Time:** 10:05am  
**End Time:** 12:00pm  
**Location:** Burrough's Community Center  
**Presiding Chair:** Heidi Jenkins  
**Recorder:** Sara Seaburg

---

### Summary of Committee Business Votes

- Approval of Minutes from the September 5, 2013 meeting

### Council Member Assignments

- Attend Committee/Council meetings as outlined in the Council Bylaws
- Provide ideas for 2013 PCAT for Strategic Planning & Assessment Committee

### Staff Member Assignments

#### (1.0) Moment of Silence

Heidi Jenkins called the meeting to order at 10:05am. A moment of silence was observed in recognition of all who have been affected by HIV/AIDS.

#### (2.0) Welcome and Introduction

All participants introduced themselves.

#### (3.0) Co-Chair Announcements

There were none.

#### (4.0) Approval of September 5, 2013 Meeting Minutes

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Brian Kuerze and seconded by Heather Garofalo.

**For: (5)** Garofalo, Stewart, Montgomery, Jenkins, Torres

**Against:**

**Abstain: (1)** Kuerze

#### (5.0) New Business/Old Business

##### a. Review the Strategic Planning and Assessment Planning Council Activity Timeline

- The Committee reviewed the Planning Council Activity Timeline and determined that everything was on track.

##### b. Determine 2013 Directives to Ryan White Office

###### Directive 1.1:

- Jeff began with a presentation on New Haven and Fairfield Counties Town Regional Allocation and explained the data that was displayed. The committee reviewed data provided by Jeff from eHARS of cases reported through 2012 and Heidi's data from eHARS of cases reported through September 25, 2013.



*Heidi Jenkins & Joanne Montgomery, Co-Chairs*

---

- There was a discussion regarding using the unduplicated client counts by region that CAREWare can report which may be less reliable due to the data entry aspect. Also possibly using service utilization data as well was considered.
- Comments were heard from attendees regarding the positive and negative outcomes that could occur with changing the calculation method.
- The activity where the committee went through all the data collected and was presented in April when discussing the regional allocation calculations was brought up. The feeling was that we've looked at this methodology in depth in many different ways and the regional calculation percentages seem to be right on.
- Roberta brought attention to one of Heidi's table showing trending data and the possibility to look at these numbers.
- Jeff also mentioned using cost data by region may be a calculation to look at as well.
- The outcome was a discussion having standardized cost per client throughout all service categories.
- The committee accepted the regional allocations based on Heidi's data which is the most current.
- Regarding the MAI funds and EIS – the decision was made to leave this the way it is because there is still a great deal of data that would be helpful to look at before making a change in where the MAI funds get allocated.

**Directive 1.2**

- It was decided to leave this directive the same

**Directive 1.3**

- It was decided to leave this directive the same

**Directive 2.1**

- A discussion took place regarding the idea that regional leads should be required to attend Planning Council in order to be a part of the process. Tom explained that this directive is dealing directly with the regions and their monthly meetings to discuss services and funding. This is a program level directive, not a policy level directive. A suggestion was made that perhaps Planning Council members report back to their regions at their monthly meetings. Committee attendees expressed emphatically that regional leads should be a part of Planning Council. There was adversity to this from the Grantee. It was also discussed that perhaps the regional leads could appoint someone from their region to become a Planning Council member in order to report information back to the region. The overall feeling that there needs to be more of a connection between the regions and the Planning Council in order to bridge the gap of communication. There also needs to be specific details about what the regional leads are expected to achieve.
- It was decided to leave this directive the same for now. The hope is that we can move towards more participation from the region leads with specific goals defined.

**Directive 2.2**

- It was decided to leave this directive the same



**Directive 2.3**

- It was decided to leave this directive the same

A motion was made to accept the FY2014 Directives with regional allocation percentage changes by Roberta Stewart and seconded by Brian Datcher.

**For: (7)** Garofalo, Stewart, Montgomery, Kuerze, Torres, Lee, Datcher

**Against:**

**Abstain: (1)** Jenkins

**(6.0) Parking Lot Items**

- When discussing Directives, please look at the following: “Agencies providing Ryan White services must be financially capable of offering services even without waiting for reimbursement” – A discussion took place regarding the response to this from Region 1. Committee attendees spoke about what is happening in the regions they are in. Tom also spoke about this and the process that is happening in his office which is working properly. This parking lot item is closed.
- When discussing Directives also look at how we deliver services, what does Ryan White funding provide. Financial eligibility may require Ryan White moves to a closed system where every person has a MCM to better determine client counts and eligibility. The feeling about this that was expressed that there may a small percentage of clients who are incapable of a relationship with a MCM but they are receiving RW care and this as a directive may restrict care. The question is how we create a system that follows the HRSA guidelines for eligibility every 6 months without having a MCM defined. This will stay on as a parking lot item.
- From the Membership/Finance Committee: When talking about directives to consider having region leads have a mechanism to formally follow up on all potential Planning Council members. This item was addressed when speaking about Directive 2.1. This item is closed but will be modified to speak to more specific goals of communication. Trying to determine the best way to make sure there is a flow of communication between the information and processes that occur in Planning Council committee meetings and the (5) regional leads.
- When discussing MAI funds, we need to collect more data in order to determine if EIS is the most effective area for these funds. This item will stay on
- Regarding the allocation calculations. Is there data that we can evaluate to better determine the allocation amounts in all service categories?

**(8.0) Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:00pm.

**Ryan White EMA Planning Council**  
*New Haven and Fairfield Counties*



*Heidi Jenkins & Joanne Montgomery, Co-Chairs*

**Attendance Record – 2013**

	<b>Council Member</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>Feb</b>	<b>Mar</b>	<b>April</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>Jul</b>	<b>Aug</b>	<b>Sept</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>
1.	Ric Browne	A	A	A	A	A	X	A	X	A	
2.	Brian Datcher	X	X	A	X	X	X	A	X	X	
3.	Heather Garofalo	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
4.	<b>Heidi Jenkins Co-Chair</b>	A	X	A	X	X	X	X	X	X	
5.	Tom Kidder	A	X	X	X	X	X	A	X	A	
6.	Brian Kuerze	X	X	A	X	X	A	A	A	X	
7.	<i>Beverly Leach PC Co-Chair</i>	A	A	X	A	X	A	X	X	A	
8.	Ronald Lee	X	X	X	A	X	A	A	A	X	
9.	Caesar Moffett, Jr.	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
10.	<b>Joanne Montgomery Co-Chair</b>	X	X	A	X	A	X	X	X	X	
11.	Alex Ortiz	A	A	A	A	A	X	A	A	A	
12.	Christine Romanik	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	X	A	
13.	Poonam Sharma	-	-	-	-	-	A	A	A	A	
14.	Robert Sideleau	A	A	A	A	A	X	A	X	A	
15.	Roberta Stewart	A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
16.	Dennis Torres	A	A	A	X	X	X	A	X	X	
	Ryan White Office	X	X	X	X	X	X	A	X	X	
	Planning Council Staff	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
	% of Council present:	35%	45%	33%	50%	56%	61%	28%	69%	50%	

**Guests: Lauren Tierney, Arvil Alcea**