

Planning, Priorities, and Allocations Committee Meeting

Chair: Shelley S. | Vice-Chair: Bryan H.

Minutes

Date: Thursday, March 5, 2026, **Time:** 1:00 PM - 3:00 PM

Physical Location(s)	Remote Address	Landline Access
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACPHD 1100 San Leandro Blvd, Eucalyptus Room, San Leandro, CA 94577 • 2500 Bates Ave. Suite B, Concord 94520, Lassen RM • 2612 Roosevelt Ave., Richmond 94804 • 1001 83rd Ave. Apt.203, Oakland 94621 • 940 Howard St. SF CA 94103 • 1616 Capitol Ave., Sacramento 95814 • 280 Lenox Ave Apt. E Oakland 94610 • 6425 Christie, Emeryville 94608 • 5345 Shafter Ave, Oakland, CA 94618 	<p>Click Here Zoom Meeting ID: 835 5053 4497</p> <p>Passcode: 2026</p>	<p>To call into the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1(408)-961-3928 • 1(408)-961-3929 <p>Zoom Meeting ID: 835 5053 4497</p> <p>Passcode: 2026</p>

Present: Rob N-N. (IP), Bryan H. (R), Leroy B. (R), Aliaa B. (R), Ebony G. (R), April L. (R), Barbara G-A. (IP),

Not Present: Angel D. (NP), Diana D. (NP), Shelley S. (NP)

Staff: Camisha N. (IP), Edgard E. (IP), Luis L (R)

Mission Statement: The OTGA Planning Council will provide comprehensive planning, prioritization, and education regarding HIV services in Alameda and Contra Costa counties that are inclusive, equitable, compassionate, and respectful of human rights.

Planning Council Goals:

- Advance in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties commitment to “Getting to Zero”.
- OTGA meets HRSA mandate to make allocation recommendations that align with the epidemiological data.
- Provide data driven recruitment and retention efforts that are reflective of the epidemiology in the TGA.

- I. **Call to Order - 1:13 PM** **1:00 PM**
 - Welcome with the Moment of Silence
 - Introductions, member check-in, and Quorum confirmation
 - Mission Statement

- II. **Agenda Review & Approval –1:20 PM**

Motion: Bryan
Second: Barbara
Action: Agenda was approved.

- III. **Review and approve the October minutes - 1:21 PM**

Rob asked for clarity regarding the acronym DCAC under item V. LeRoy explained that the acronym was an old phrase that used to stand for how Alameda County Public Health use to describe themselves. He thinks DCAC stood for Department of Communicable Diseases

in Alameda some years ago. The acronym appeared to refer to an older name previously used by Alameda County Public Health. It was agreed that the wording should instead reflect Alameda County Public Health.

Change “euphemizd” to emphasized.

Motion: Bryan

Second: Barbara

Action: Minutes was approved.

IV. Public Comment on Agendized Items

No public comment was offered. No members of the public were present.

V. Nominations - 1:26 PM

Bryan stated that Camisha provided an eligible list for the PPAC members who can be nominated for chair and vice chair for this year. He opened the floor for nominations to begin. Camisha gave an overview of the stipulations to hold the Chair position. She stated that per the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) members would need to have attended six consecutive meetings via the council or the committee meetings. She acknowledged that per the email sent prior to the meeting she made a mistake by referring to the stipulations of Co-Chair per the Bylaws. Meaning in order to be a Co-Chair you must attend the council meetings for six months in order to be eligible for Co-Chair positions. Bryan said he has a full plate and cannot be in any executive position for the Planning Council other than remaining as Vice-Chair of the Planning Council and asked not to get nominated as Chair of PPAC. Aliaa nominated LeRoy as chair. LeRoy thanked and denied Aliaa’s nomination. He stated that he is serving on eight planning councils and commissions and groups in the state and it would be a difficult year for him. LeRoy nominated Aliaa to be Chair. Bryan asked LeRoy if he could be Vice Chair. LeRoy said he could do Vice-Chair but could not do chair. Aliaa said she feels she is still [too] young [to be chair]. LeRoy asked Barbara to be Vice Chair because she’d be great and he would support both Aliaa and Barbara in any way. Barbara stated that she has served three times, and it seems like a hard position to fill. But as long as she receives support from the group then Okay, she will serve as Vice Chair. Bryan asked April if she’d like to be Chair. April replied’ “No, I see it as a conflict of interest, because I am a subrecipient.” Camisha stated most of the members of the council that are chairs are subrecipients as well. April replied’ “I’m not comfortable in that role.” Aliaa expressed she feels like April and asked, “dose that conflict with anything as a subrecipient?” Camisha assured the positions dose conflict with anything as far as voting (during the PSRA) a member may not vote on issues that the member has a conflict of interest regarding funding priorities or allocations, members with a COI may vote on a slate of at least five service categories but not vote on funding decisions for individual categories. April clarified by asking "If you were funded for medical case management, you just wouldn't vote on percentages for medical case management. Is that correct?"

Aliaa accepted Chair position and Barabara accepted Co-Chair. Camisha agreed. The member cannot be a part of the voting but can participate in the discussion.

Motion: Rob

Second: Leroy

Action: Approved.

VI. Review WorkPlan

1:38 PM - The committee reviewed the 2026 workplan, and Camisha explained that item e is new and that the Client Satisfaction Survey will be added to the PLWHA's workplan. Rob included that it is part of the Ryan White best practices for the survey to be housed under the PLWHA to lead the data collection process for both the consumer satisfaction survey, priority setting, and the Needs Assessment processes. The PLWHA will present the priorities report to the PPAC. The result would be that PLWHA would report to PPAC in June, so that everyone will have the information from PLWHA prior to the Priority Setting process. Barbara acknowledged that the PLWHA will also compose the survey questions for PPAC to review. Barbara also pointed out that during the PLWHA committee, it was discussed that the PLWHA should not be consulted on this work, but the leaders.

Item g. refers to the PPAC presenting the Priority Setting Presentation to the PLWHA in June. After the last data presentation in June, the PPAC will then present the Priority Setting Presentation to the full council with the category discussion in July. Rob stated that discussing the service categories (at the committee level) should be added as an agenda item for the PLWHA's meeting in the next few months. Priority Setting final recommendations would go to the full council in August, and allocation recommendations would be presented to the full council in September for acceptance or denial.

Motion: Bryan

Second: Rob

Action: The workplan was approved.

VII. **Compose Post Evaluation of PSRA Survey**

2:01 PM - The committee discussed the post-evaluation survey for the Priority Setting Resource and Allocation (PSRA) process of last year, noting that it had not yet been distributed. Members agreed it could still be sent out as a pilot, though response rates and accurate understanding of responses may be limited due to the lapse of time. Camisha stated that the survey does not record members' names. The members rearranged the questions, revised question 3, and added "Slightly Satisfied" as an option. Don't make the questions required. Question 4 was suggested, with an "Unsure" option added and a final feedback question included. Staff will revise and distribute the survey as an optional feedback tool. Members agreed to use this survey tool this PSRA season as well.

VIII. **Discuss PSRA Process**

- 2:09 PM - Materials & Staff Support
- Priority Setting Formula

The committee discussed the need for greater clarity and support regarding the priority setting formula and ranking process. Members noted that the process was not fully clear and expressed interest in reviewing Ryan White's best practices to better understand the methodology. They agreed that more clarity is needed before the next PSRA cycle. Barbara said she will look up the formula used last year, as Natalie Wilson said the Alchemer used (which is $\rho=1-n(n-1)\sum di^2$). Rob said he will research Ryan White's best practices and bring that information back. LeRoy stated that Alchemer may be using the Ranked Choice Voting method to produce the data.

- Project to Organize Needs Assessment

Rob proposed a three-pronged data collection plan from the PLWHA Committee for the digital

Planning, Priorities, and Allocations Committee Meeting

Chair: Shelley S. | Vice-Chair: Bryan H.

surveys, along with a set of three to four community listening sessions before June. He added that the plan would be to host them at funded agencies, in groups of 10 or 20 people, for 90-minute sessions, during which they would complete the entire survey, discuss service categories and priority ranking, and engage in outreach to recruit individuals to participate in the Planning Council. And this would also be a place to ask qualitative questions to gather data for the priorities report, as well as to conduct flash surveys at community events to gather quick feedback.

It was explained that a single survey tool could collect information on consumer satisfaction, needs assessment, and priority setting. The data collected would be used to produce three reports: a consumer satisfaction report, a needs assessment report identifying service gaps and barriers, and a PLWHA priorities report to inform the PPAC priority-setting process.

Additional discussion noted that funding will be needed to support incentives, refreshments, and the implementation of listening sessions. A request for budget support has already been submitted to Dot Theodore and Shelley Stinson on March 4, 2026. April suggests that Rob preface the data by noting that it comes from focus groups conducted by agencies in Alameda County, except for one region, once the work is completed and advertised. She continued by stating that Contra Costa County (CCC) will send out its own Satisfaction Client Survey for fiscal year 2026-2027, and she will take those exact questions and incorporate them into CCC's survey so they can be part of the ranking and allocation process, too. Rob stated he is not sure what April is referring to when she says specific regions. April stated that there would not be equal focus groups in both counties. Rob stated that would be the goal, and there is no final decision yet on where they will conduct the survey. Barbara clarified that CCC is conducting the same survey and asked Rob to share his survey questions with her. April agreed and stated it would ease Rob's burden and ensure the results are skewed toward one proportion; for example, 89% of residents are in Alameda County and equal the representation, and it would be the least amount of burden on her as well. CCC already collects over 100 [surveys]. Rob stated he has the 137 responses for the Office of HIV Care and asked for access to the CCC surveys from last year. April replied that, in the past, CCC has always presented its own results each year. Now the Transitional Grant Area (TGA) does it jointly. Rob asked for the 2025 data because he has the OHC data for 2025. April responded that the question may not match the OHC's survey questions. She asked him to give her his list of what he would like to ask, and she will make sure to include it in the new survey and provide him with the 2026- 2027 draft survey. Rob stated that it would still be helpful to have CCC's data from last year, regardless of whether the questions are similar. April stated she does not answer to Rob, so no. Rob exclaimed, " Where is this coming from? The members continued the banter. Camisha stated that this conversation can be discussed offline and muted the room. The members regrouped. Bryan suggested returning to the meeting's agenda to wrap up.

IX. General Public Comment

2:25 PM No public comment was given.

X. Announcements

2:25 PM

Planning, Priorities, and Allocations Committee Meeting

Chair: Shelley S. | Vice-Chair: Bryan H.

Ebony stated she doesn't have an announcement, but it would be helpful to understand which satisfactions have occurred in whichever county, so we can identify gaps for everybody and ensure services and allocations are equitable across both counties. She thinks that we each would find it important to understand what people are saying.

XI. Adjourned at 2:28 PM



GROUP NORMS:

1. Be a welcoming body to all.
2. Respect each other as leaders.
3. Exhibit patience with each other.
4. Be anchored in our mission.
5. Agree to disagree.
6. Active, intentional, attentive, listening/eyes, ears, head, & heart.
7. No retribution for what gets said here.
8. Be present in call to service/Be prepared & ongoing.
9. No judgement/Take a breath & set it aside.
10. Everyone's effort & time is valued.
11. Consciously arrive on same agenda as others.
12. Encourage clarifying questions/Do not assume lack of preparation.
13. Be more creative & efficient in deliberations.
14. Be on time.
15. Do not take things personally.
16. Avoid using acronyms and abbreviations or explain what they stand for.

The **Vibe Monitor** (Chairs and/or Planning Council Staff) can enforce the above ground rules in situations of disruptive behavior. Pursuant to the OTGA Bylaws members can be removed from the meeting and/or council for disruptive conduct or conduct affecting the council's integrity of the community's confidence.