

**Ryan White Planning Council (RWPC) of the Philadelphia Part A (Title I) EMA  
Nominations Committee**

Meeting Minutes of

**Thursday, August 20, 2009**

**1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**

Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 203, Philadelphia, PA 19107

**Present:** William Brawner, Kevin Burns, Emery Troy, Lorrita Wellington

**Staff:** Nicole Johns, Debbie Law, Briana Morgan

D. Law pointed out that #111 had a perfect score. The group agreed to accept this application. They then agreed to approve #112 for PA Counties representation. They also reappointed #116, who had had no attendance issues. They next reviewed #115, a current member that is a representation for a local public health department, and approved this member. They moved on to review #109, a representative from a health planning agency in New Jersey, and accepted this current member.

N. Johns asked if any of those approved so far were consumers. D. Law replied that #111 was. She noted that for every two providers they approved, they would need to put on at least one consumer. She pointed out that they had already agreed to put one consumer and four providers on, so they would need another consumer. She noted that #102 was the next highest-scoring consumer, and that it might be a good idea to should pass that person before other providers. The group agreed to accept #102. D. Law explained that this person would push them to their maximum for New Jersey representation. She explained that they would be over by one person for New Jersey. She then pointed out that #113 and #119 were both from New Jersey as well. L. Wellington asked if they could put a Philadelphia consumer on instead of the New Jersey consumer. D. Law replied that they did not have many consumer members from New Jersey. N. Johns explained that they needed to have consumers from PA and NJ. L. Wellington replied that they already had a consumer from New Jersey. D. Law stated that they needed more than one consumer from New Jersey. N. Johns explained that if they had six members from New Jersey, then one consumer would only be 15% consumer representation, while two consumers would be one third. E. Troy agreed that this would be fairer to consumers. D. Law noted that they had one member from New Jersey with an attendance issue. K. Burns asked if the consumer reapplying had attendance issues. D. Law stated that the reapplicant did not have attendance issues. The group agreed to remove the person with attendance issues, and accept #113.

The group decided to approve #117. K. Burns asked if they had approved #104. D. Law replied that they had not discussed this application yet. She then pointed out that #110 is a Part C representative, and the group approved this applicant. They moved on to discuss #114, a female from the PA Counties that is also a state provider. The group approved this member. The group then decided they needed to approve another consumer, and approved #108 as the next highest scoring consumer. D. Law noted that #108 might need

translation/interpretation, which could be an initial barrier, but pointed out that these services would be provided. The group next reviewed #101, a representative for Hepatitis C. D. Law noted this was a Hispanic male from Philadelphia. The group approved #101. N. Johns asked how many of those remaining were consumers. D. Law replied that most of those remaining were consumers. She noted #104 was a consumer from the PA Counties, and #120 was also a consumer. D. Law then pointed out that #120 may have scored better, but only three people had scored the application since it was new. The group decided to approve both #120 and #104.

N. Johns asked if there were other gaps to be filled. D. Law noted that they had to consider their ability to contact people, as she had tried to get in touch with #106 and #107 and could not. She explained that those that cannot be contacted frequently do not attend the meetings as members. E. Troy stated that it did not make sense to put someone on the Planning Council if they could not contact them. The group decided not to put #106 or #107 on. They then reviewed #106, a representative from the PA Counties, and approved this applicant. They next decided not to put #119 on, due to the over-representation from New Jersey. D. Law then stated that #103 had what appeared to be an incorrect birth year, but that she thought this applicant may have thought they were asking for the date of diagnosis. The group agreed to put #103 on. D. Law reviewed the list of those they had approved, and stated that they had put on many people to fill gaps.

The group moved on to discuss attendance. N. Johns stated they should follow the same rules for everyone. D. Law pointed out that T. Stancil and C. Morales had received letters, but not attended meetings. She then noted that C. Morales was no longer at his organization, and T. Stancil may have moved away. K. Burns noted that they had removed M. Andrews for attendance, and also to make room for consumer representatives from New Jersey. The group then agreed to remove T. Stancil. K. Burns suggested that they have W. Maldonado reach out to C. Morales after her return for vacation in September.

**Old Business:**

None.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:14 p.m. by general consensus.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Briana L. Morgan, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda