



AGENDA

Comprehensive Planning Committee

Friday, January 10, 2020
2601 Tulane Ave., Ste. 400
New Orleans, LA 70119
9:00 AM – 10:30 AM

Electronic Courtesy

Please place all electronic devices on manner mode

1. Call to Order (1 minute)
2. Roll Call (1 minute)
3. Welcome/Introductions (3 minutes)
4. Review of Agenda (2 minute)
5. Review of Minutes (3 minutes)
6. Review of Service Standards (30 minutes)
7. Directives Setting Update (20 minutes)
8. Fast Track Cities Update (5 minutes)
9. New/Old Business (20 minutes)
 - a. Set February date for Housing Workgroup
 - b. Open Enrollment Update
 - c. Service Delivery Issues
10. Community Input (5 minutes)
11. Adjourn

Comprehensive Planning Committee

Friday, December 13, 2019
2601 Tulane Ave., Suite 400
9:00 AM – 10:30 AM

CP Members Present: Penny DeNoble, Dietz, Dominique Fisher, Nick Payne
CP Members Absent: Lorna Seybolt, Malaysia Walker, Fabian Ancar, Sy'ria Jackson, Lawrence Love, Edward McDonald
Others Present: Clifford Wilson, Dorian Alexander, Robert Coleman, Laura Finnegan, Linda Parker, Joseph Battiste
OHP Staff Present: Vatsana Chanthala
NORAPC Staff Present: Keshante' Horton, Franny Senkowsky, Tori Tully

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 9:07 AM.
2. Roll Call: Roll was called. Quorum was not met.
3. Welcome/Introductions: Dietz welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked attendees to introduce themselves and state their favorite Christmas/holiday decoration(s).
4. Review of Agenda: The agenda was accepted with adjustments to focus review on the aging directive instead of the directive setting update and updates to Needs and Gaps table.
5. Review of Minutes: The minutes were accepted.
6. Review of Service Standards: Dietz noted the Ryan White Outreach Service document had not been updated by Planning Council (PC) since 2007. Attendees agreed to review the document section by section.

Section I. Definition/Overview was read. Questions were posed about this section's definition of outreach services compared to Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) latest outreach services definition (separate document provided). Those in attendance decided to update this section with the wording of the first two paragraphs of the latest HRSA's outreach services document. Reasoning was for clarity purposes. However, Payne emphasized that implementation would be outlined to be community centered and reflect New Orleans Eligible Metropolitan Areas (NOEMA) needs in a later applicable section.

Section II. Services – Attendees decided to replace the first paragraph of this section with the proceeding language of the HRSA HIV/AIDS Bureau (HAB) Policy Clarification Notice (PCN) 16-02, which outlined what outreach services must include, methodology vs. outreach definition. Also, a decision was reached to keep the current second paragraph of Section II, with one sentence exclusion, in order to address prevention services as not allowable, but risk reduction education as a form of outreach for HIV-negative people and is funded.

Section III. Eligibility was read by Penny DeNoble. Vatsana Chanthala expressed that the current final sentence in this section stating, “Financial verification shall not apply,” went against HRSA definition. Dominique Fisher questioned what does HRSA say about financial eligibility and Chanthala explained HRSA requires an eligibility screening, which in NOEMA covers people whose income is 500% at or/below the federal poverty level. A decision was reached to exclude the final sentence to promote including all persons in the EMA. Also, attendees agreed to update language in this section to be more person-centered. Additional discussion ensued about how providers can possibly determine or account for outreach to HIV-negative people for targeted marketing.

- Review of the remainder of document was tabled and assigned homework was to have additional edits ready for unaddressed sections at next month’s meeting as well as to be prepared to confirm all document changes.

7. Reallocations

Chanthala explained the new financial payment system change over to BRASS playing a part in reallocations in it causing delays of provider payments. Also, Chanthala advised attendees that this is the first major reallocation of 2019 and that the original allocations were based on 75/25 (75% of funding for core services and 25% for supportive services) with some categories being padded to align with these standards and reasons for decreased allocations in these categories listed below.

- Oral healthcare
 - Louisiana Department of Health STD/HIV/Hepatitis C Program (LDH SHHP) new dental plan – GUARDIAN
- Health insurance
 - More SHHP coverage
 - SHHP increased federal poverty level standard up to 400% a few years ago.
- Medications
 - Medicaid, Louisiana Health Access Program (LA HAP), other medical/health insurance assistance

Other factors influencing reallocations were projected expenditures/billing based on units entered in to CAREWare and if agencies have not entered data or had the inability to expand. Reallocations were proposed based on other pressing service category needs. Attendees commented their understanding of why there was a need for reallocations. Also, Dietz expressed a liking to having monies reallocated from above categories to emergency financial assistance services due to PLWH needs.

DeNoble inquired about Level 1 and 2 reallocation differences and which did and did not require PC approval. Chanthala explained that one (Level 1) did not require PC approval but would be presented to PC for informational purposes. She explained only Level 2

and Level 3 changes were being made as a part of this reallocation proposal requiring PC approval.

Dietz specifically wished to get clarity of why the need for Level 2 reallocation of \$39,000 was being moved out of Housing Assistance. Chanthala explained housing funding movement was mainly due to agency capacity and because funding was not being used. Office of Health Policy (OHP) proposed to have unused funds reallocated to case management as a need of next priority. Dietz asked why funding for housing could not be moved from one housing agency to another that did use funds. Chanthala explained that it was because the other housing agency did not request it in the Housing Assistance service category.

DeNoble asked for clarity of why over \$89,000 were being moved from Psychosocial Support and Substance Abuse treatment categories. Chanthala reasoned it was due to an agency closure and these services were being covered through either Medicaid, private insurers or other coverage elsewhere. Dietz reiterated Ryan White funding being used only as a last resort.

Battiste also questioned Other Professional/Legal Services funding reallocations. Chanthala stated there has been more of a need in this category. Dietz testified also having personally received good feedback regarding these services being put to good use and persons receiving SSI approvals.

Dietz thanked Chanthala for explanation and reiterated that items will be further discussed and voted on at later Executive Committee and PC meetings.

8. Fast Track Cities Update: Tully stated Draft Plan has been submitted earlier this month and is currently being combined with Baton Rouge plans. She advised no feedback has been given as this time, but thanked committee for prior years efforts and welcomed future discussion and contributions.
9. New/Old Business: Chanthala reported impressive feedback of OHP and PC collaborative efforts from meeting with the HRSA's Associate Administrator for the HIV/AIDS Bureau, Dr. Laura Cheever. Also, she informed of provider survey rolling out Monday, U=U trainings and client survey are due out in February.
10. Community Input: Dietz informed of Transgender Advisory Committee forum past and future goals and strategies. An invitation was extended to providers and transgender and non-conforming identity community members to provide art, photography, etc. services. at the Jan. 17th event.

Chanthala also reported Project Lazarus is looking for peers to work with their organization. One incentive is that housing would be covered.

11. Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 10:30 AM.

I, Dietz, Chair of the Comprehensive Planning Committee, certify the above minutes are true and accurate.

Signature: _____

Date: _____