

# **End the HIV Epidemic (EtHE) Planning Committee**

**Meeting Minutes: Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2020, 3:00 pm-5:00 pm**

*Ninth and Jefferson Building (NJB), Room 707*

*908 Jefferson Street, Seattle, WA 98104*

**EPC Members Present:** Kathy Brown, Susan Buskin, Lisa Carlson, April Gerard, Matt Golden, Lydia Guy-Ortiz, Katie Hara, Karen Hartfield, Vanessa Leja, Madi McPadden, Chante Stubbs, Fred Swanson, Raleigh Watts, Ro Yoon

**EtHE Staff Present:** Liz Meacham, Audrey Brezak, Emily Rowlinson and Tennishia Williams (minutes)

**I. Welcome and EtHE Planning Committee (EPC) Member Introductions**

**II. Review National EtHE Initiative, Project Goals and Timeline** *(see slides for details)*

Liz presented on the EtHE goals, four pillars of the initiative, funding and planning timeline (October 2019 – September 2020).

**III. Overview and Discussion of the Proposed EtHE Planning Process** *(see slides for details)*

**EPC:** Liz reviewed the proposed EtHE Planning Committee (EPC) role and expectations. Briefly the proposal is that the EPC would: identify gaps in the situational analysis and epi profile; assist with revising the situational analysis and epi profile; plan and prioritize EtHE activities; review draft plan and provide feedback; and provide concurrence on the plan.

- Committee members discussed the role of the EPC. Raleigh raised the issue of the EPC becoming a “rubber stamp” committee, or approving body, with work done by subcommittees. Committee discussed reducing redundancy across committees without idea loss or taking credit for work done by others.
- Recommendations:
  - EPC responsible for most of the planning with input from other committees.
  - EPC members to join one subcommittee and assist with reporting back.
  - Select a platform (ex: Sharepoint, website or other) to share notes, files and keep transparency between committees. Raised that training may be needed so all feel comfortable accessing shared files.

**Steering Group:** Liz reviewed the proposed Steering Group role and expectations. Briefly proposal is for approximately nine EPC members to volunteer to meet more frequently and be responsible for writing the plan, informed by EPC planning and subcommittee technical input. Committee discussed role of the steering group in relation to EPC and avoiding the

EPC becoming just an approving body. **Please email Liz if you are interesting joining the Steering Group.**

**Subcommittees:** Liz reviewed the proposed subcommittee roles and expectations. Briefly the proposal is to have three subcommittees: provider, community and social determinants. Proposed that subcommittees would meet less frequently and provide technical feedback on gaps in situational analysis and epi profile and feedback on proposed EtHE activities. Proposed that subcommittees help develop a resource inventory of services available for people living with HIV. **Decision on subcommittee structure was not made, discussion to continue online. Suggestions/ideas still welcome.**

- Lisa raised question about how community member is defined. No definition, thinking broadly about affected persons (PLWH, family members, etc).
- Committee discussed subcommittee size (which has not been predefined) and structure, including defining subcommittees based on what we currently do versus “what we want to do”. Raleigh and Lisa proposed organizing subcommittees by geographical area. Group discussed this approach:
  - Concern raised about how to engage health care organizations and providers in this structure, especially those covering most of the county. Proposal to consider a health system/provider committee. It was noted that that community members often seek medical care outside of regions they reside.
  - Question of how to engage jails in a regional structure.
  - Ro asked about development of the resource inventory when resources may not exist. We envision this activity is to map out what is currently available and identify gaps in resources.

**Schedule:** Liz reviewed proposed committee schedule by month. Committee discussed engagement with other planning bodies and community engagement.

- Vanessa noted HPSG and TGA Planning Council don’t meet in May or August. Calendar will be adjusted to engage with these councils on months they meet.
- Discussed having one public community forum in August would be too late in the process and would not be adequate community engagement. Discussed ideas for improving transparency of the EtHE process and expanding engagement to tailored to specific communities. In the planning grant, money is available to support engagement activities, such as incentives.
- Decisions on specific engagement activities were not made, a few themes were:
  - start early and continue engagement through the planning process
  - use different strategies for different communities: **tailor engagement**

- learn from previous experience, what do we know works. (several examples mentioned/discussed, including HEP engagement with incentives, surveys at point of care and North Seattle outreach needs assessment work)

#### IV. Next Meetings:

- Discussed preference for meeting times and locations:
  - Lisa suggested meeting at different sites, around King County, to be closer to communities we are trying to serve with the EtHE plan. Offer from Lisa to meet at Aurora Commons for the second EPC meeting in February.
  - Raleigh raised the question of opening meetings to the public. Concern was raised about this delaying decision processes.
  - Consider having the first 15-30 minutes open to public or using this time for activities such as a neighborhood walk to improve understanding of communities this plan will aim to serve.
- **Epidemiology Profile Review Meeting:** We will send a SurveyMonkey to schedule.
  - In-person attendance is optional, can join remotely or review recording on your own.
- **2nd EPC Meeting:** We will send a doodle poll to schedule.