HIV Collaborative Planning Work Group
Wednesday, September 18th 2013
25 Van Ness, Conference Room 330
1:00-4:00 pm

Work Group Members Present: Richard Bargetto, Jackson Bowman, Ed Chitty, Dean Goodwin, Jose Luis Guzman, Ron Hernandez, Kenneth Hornby, Kevin Hutchcroft, Lee Jewell, Andrew Lopez, Eileen Loughran, Matthew Miller, Mark Molnar, Tracey Packer, Maritza Penagos, Laura Thomas, Channing Wayne

Work Group Members Absent: David Gonzalez, Charles Siron

Others Present: Bill Ledford, Oscar Macias, Gabriel Ortega

Support Staff Present: Ali Cone, Michael Demayo, T.J. Lee

Draft Minutes

1. **Welcome, Introductions & Announcements – VOTE**
   The meeting was called to order at 1:11 pm by Co-Chair Thomas. Everyone introduced themselves and quorum was established.
   - The September 18th 2013 DRAFT Agenda was reviewed and approved by consensus.
   - The August 8th 2013 DRAFT Minutes were reviewed and approved by consensus.

2. **Public Comment**
   - None.

3. **Evaluation Review**
   - The work group reviewed the evaluation results from the September 18th 2013 Collaborative Work Group meeting.

4. **Review of Revised Models for Joint Council Meeting – VOTE**
   - The work group discussed pre-meeting feedback from CPW members
   - Michael Demayo walked through "What will HHSPC and HPPC members want to know?"
     - Maritza Penagos- how will this impact people at risk and living with HIV?
     - Kenneth Hornby- What is the benefit of the merger on the HIV pos. community as a whole> were there consumers on both sides participating?
     - Richard Bargetto- how will the consumer voice be protected?
   - Model 1:
     - Mark Molnar- Executive committee for Prevention is significantly smaller than the Care Council's Steering Committee. How would this work for the joint Executive Committee in the Pre-Planning phase? We haven't talked addressed the logistics of this.
       - Jackson Bowman suggested that this type of detailed logistics would get addressed during the pre-planning phase. The purpose of this is to build a framework without giving so much of the details.
       - Dean Goodwin- if there's concern about disparity in numbers, we could look at having a higher percentage required to make a decision.
       - Tracey Packer suggested we edit the box on pre-planning phase to head off these type of questions during the presentation.
       - Laura Thomas proposed that the presenters give a disclaimer at the beginning that this is a framework and that some details are intentionally left TBD.

- - Matthew Miller expressed concern that it could be a problem if the models are too vague.
  - o Mark Molnar brought up the amending of each Council's by-laws.
  - o Tracey Packer- the Executive Committee would develop implementation plan for integration.
  - o Mark Molnar- is it assumed that the Executive Committee will be body reviewing and accepting/rejecting membership applications? Is it assumed that the membership of the Executive Committee is automatically on this new council?
    - Lee Jewell noted that the Prevention Council has already gone through this process and asked them to weigh in.
    - Jose Luis Guzman gave context for how prevention approached new membership.
    - Jackson Bowman- this is not the conversation we want to have now. When we recreate the by-laws this will happen.
    - Tracey Packer suggested that the dissolution of both councils happen last in the list. By-laws might not take care of the inception of new council.
    - Bill Ledford emphasized the importance of the application process to many council members.
  - o Integration Phase
    - Lee Jewell noted that there is a rationale for not being so specific now- so that we can be responsive to changing landscape.
    - Tracey Packer noted that Prevention doesn't have a membership committee.
    - There was a robust conversation around whether or not to keep the examples of committee structures- e.g. Cascade or community.
      - Tracey Packer spoke in favor of keeping cascade or community committees. Provides an example for how councils work overlaps.
      - Tracey Packer also expressed concern that we are tinkering with something we already voted to approve.
      - Dean Goodwin suggested we present it as potential examples.
  - o Strengths/weaknesses
    - Laura Thomas- there are strengths and weaknesses to collaboration/integration in general. She suggested we pull out the shared ones and for each model, pull out how Model A and Model B are different. What are their *unique* strengths/weaknesses?
    - The work group discussed the unique strengths and weaknesses of each model.
    - There was a robust conversation around the use of the phrase "community speaking with multilingual unified voice".
    - **Matt Miller moved to remove "multilingual" from the phrase "community speaking with multilingual unified voice". Lee Jewell seconded.**
      - Gabriel Ortega emphasized the importance of multilingual competency.
      - Jackson Bowman- we haven't done anything in either of these models that increases multilingual voice. This is not a strength of this model. This is not part of what we're talking about right now.
      - Matt Miller suggested that this is more of a guiding principle than a strength.
      - **Matt Miller amended his previous motion- we remove the phrase "community speaking with unified voice" from the strengths section and add it to guiding principles for both models. Ed Chitty seconded.**
        - o **VOTE – motion passes.**
    - Discussion of stewardship of money- reducing duplication of services and administrative costs.
    - Mark Molnar noted that potential loss of expertise could be a weakness.
  - o Technical/Adaptive Challenges
    - Matt Miller proposed adding "Council Members will have new responsibilities and will need to learn about each other's activities in the midst of transition."

- Bill Ledford expressed concern about the potential for reduced consumer voice.

Public Comment: None.

5. **Break**

6. **Review of Revised Models for Joint Council Meeting, Continued – VOTE**
    - Model 2: Shared Leadership
      o Andrew Lopez clarified that each council will still have their own exec/steering committee.
      o Channing Wayne expressed concern that we are getting too bogged down in details. We already voted on this model.
      o Andrew Lopez suggested we remove "vote limited to 5 for each council" and replace with "balanced voting".
      o The work group decided to remove "3 hour meeting"- too specific.
      o There was a conversation around the idea of "shared responsibility for deliverables".
        - Mark Molnar suggested we change this to "increased communication regarding deliverables".
      o Strengths/weaknesses
        - There was a discussion of what we are comparing the models to- whether we are comparing them to what is happening now or whether we are comparing them to each other.
          - Michael Demayo clarified that in this section, we are comparing them to what is currently happening, not comparing them to each other.
          - Richard Bargetto suggested that the strengths of the first model are weaknesses of the second model, and vice versa.

7. **Presentation – Joint Council Full Presentation Draft**
    - Presenter for Care
      o **Lee Jewell nominated Laura Thomas**
        - **Miller seconded.**
      o **Bill Ledford nominated Ken Hornby.**
        - **No second.**
      o **VOTE on Laura Thomas' nomination – motion passes.**
    - Bill Ledford spoke against Laura Thomas as a Care presenter- expressed concern that it could be a conflict of interest since she is here as a Prevention representative.
      o Matt Miller and Lee Jewell both expressed disagreement with this idea- spoke in favor of having Laura as presenter for Care.
      o Matt Miller asked if anyone who is a voting work group member for care has any objections to having Laura present? No one expressed objections.
        - Gabriel Ortega spoke in favor of having Laura present.
      o Tracey Packer noted that we didn't vote last time. Suggested we invite other people to participate in the presentation for more representation.
      o **Andrew Lopez moved that the Council vote. Richard Bargetto seconded.**
        - **VOTE – motion passes.**
      o **Lee Jewell nominated Laura Thomas. Matt Miller seconded.**
      o **Ed Chitty nominated Andrew Lopez. Jose Luis Guzman seconded.**
        - **VOTE – none opposed, motion passes. Laura Thomas and Andrew Lopez will be presenters at October's joint council meeting.**
      o Laura Thomas requested that people who participated in the work group be active participants in the presentation- to help give context to the extent to which the work group dug through the details.

- Michael Demayo suggested that the presenters be able to defer some questions to members of the work group as they arise during the discussion after models are presented.

Public Comment: None.

8. **Discussion – Resolution of HPPC/HHSPC Vote Outcome**
   - The work group discussed what to do if there is a discordant vote.
     - Mark Molnar clarified that this work group is putting forward a recommendation so there will be a recommendation on the floor. If the vote for this recommended model fails, someone could recommend model 2.
     - There were several questions raised about this: do we have a role? Is it up to each Council?
       - Ken Hornby- it should be left up to the Councils.
       - Tracey Packer, Lee Jewell, and Richard Bargetto expressed a desire to see it come back to this work group. Reconvene the work group in the event of a discordant vote.

9. **Evaluation and Closing**

10. **Adjournment**
    The meeting was adjourned at 4:01 pm by Co-Chair Thomas.