

Quality Services Committee Meeting

Megan C. & Damon P. | Chair and Co-Chair

Minutes

Date: August 17, 2026

Time: 1:00 PM - 3:00 PM

Physical Location(s)	Remote Address	Landline Access
- ACPHD 1100 San Leandro Blvd, Oak Room, San Leandro, CA 94577 2500 Bates, Suite B, Concord, 94520- Lassen RM	Click Here Zoom Meeting ID: 817 3687 1155 Passcode: 2026	To call into the meeting: 1(408)-961-3929 1(408)-961-3927 Zoom Meeting ID: 817 3687 1155# Passcode: 2026#

Mission: The Oakland Transitional Grant Area 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.

- I. **Call to Order – 1:06 PM** **1:00 PM**
- a. Moment of Silence
 - b. Roll Call
 - c. Read Mission Statement

- II. **Review and Approve Agenda – 1:08 PM** **1:10 PM**

Members reviewed the agenda and identified a correction to the Member Spotlight schedule. Damon remained listed for the July Member Spotlight but was not present at the meeting. Ji-Sook confirmed that she was comfortable completing her scheduled August Member Spotlight, and members tentatively moved Damon's spotlight to September.

Motion: Rob

Second: Megan

Action: The agenda was approved with the correction to the Member Spotlight schedule.

- III. **Review and approve July minutes – 1:10 PM** **1:15 PM**

Megan noted that the revised format was less focused on identifying each individual speaker while still providing a thorough summary of the discussion. She suggested that future minutes clearly



www.oaklandtga.org/planningcouncil

Quality Services Committee Meeting

Megan C. & Damon P. | Chair and Co-Chair

highlight action items or assignments, such as when a member agrees to complete a task before the next meeting, so members can easily identify their follow-up responsibilities.

No corrections to the July minutes were identified.

Motion: Ilana

Second: Rob

Action: The July meeting minutes were approved as written.

IV. Service Directive Presentation – 1:13 PM

Rob presented an overview of Service Directives developed through the People Living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA) Committee. He explained that Service Directives identify system-level issues and communicate improvements the Planning Council would like the Recipient to address within the Ryan White System of Care. Unlike Standards of Care, which establish expectations for how services are delivered, Service Directives identify specific system improvements while allowing the Recipient flexibility in determining how they can be implemented.

Rob provided a high-level overview of the five proposed directives addressing Digital Exclusion and Access, Warm Handoffs and Referral Tracking, Reducing Late HIV Diagnosis, Dental Care Access, and Equitable Access for Women. QSC will have primary review responsibility for the Digital Exclusion and Warm Handoffs directives and a secondary review role for the remaining three. PPAC and Executive Committee will also review directives based on their respective responsibilities.

Members discussed coordinating the reviews across committees and using Office of HIV Care expertise to determine whether proposed actions and timelines are realistic. Rob proposed standardized language requesting an initial written response from the Recipient within approximately 90 days of Planning Council approval, outlining planned actions, timelines, responsible parties, and operational or funding considerations. He clarified that this would not require full implementation within 90 days.

The five directives will be provided to QSC before the September meeting for substantive review. Possible outcomes include recommending a directive as written, recommending revisions, returning it for additional development, or determining that it should not move forward. Review may continue into October depending on available agenda time.

Action Item: Rob will add the proposed implementation-timeline language and provide all five Service Directives to QSC before the September meeting.

V. Assessment of Administrative Mechanism (AAM) - 1:32 PM

1:30 PM

a. Finalize Sub-recipient Survey

Quality Services Committee Meeting

Megan C. & Damon P. | Chair and Co-Chair

The committee continued reviewing the Subrecipient Survey from where it left off at the July meeting. Megan noted that the revised survey was significantly shorter than previous versions and reiterated the goal of keeping questions focused on information that is required for the AAM or useful to Planning Council decision-making. The committee's goal was to finalize both surveys so staff could program and distribute them and have responses available for review at the September meeting.

Members returned to the question regarding how potential reductions in Ryan White Part A funding could affect services. The committee agreed that asking agencies to identify a specific percentage reduction would be difficult and could result in inconsistent responses because agencies may receive Part A funding for multiple services and have different funding structures. Members supported allowing agencies to identify affected service categories and provide an open-ended explanation of potential impacts rather than requiring a percentage.

The committee clarified several additional questions carried over from July. Members agreed to remove the question regarding current vacancies in Part A-funded positions, noting that staffing vacancies are already discussed through utilization and other monitoring processes and do not directly assess the administrative mechanism. Members also discussed wait times for new clients and agreed that, although access and wait times are important, the information is monitored elsewhere and is not directly related to the purpose of the AAM.

Members reviewed questions concerning contracting and reimbursement and revised the follow-up language to avoid assuming that the contracting process negatively affects agencies. The committee supported wording that asks whether the contracting process impacts an agency's ability to provide services and, if so, how. Members also retained questions concerning grievances because they provide information relevant to how administrative issues between the recipient and subrecipients are addressed.

The committee completed its review of the Subrecipient Survey and moved to the Recipient Survey.

Action Items: Staff will incorporate the approved Subrecipient Survey revisions, including removing the staffing-vacancy question and updating the contracting-impact language. Staff will also prepare the finalized survey for programming and distribution.

b. Recipient Survey

The committee reviewed the Recipient Survey and agreed that its title should follow the same format as the Subrecipient Survey for consistency. Members reviewed the previous year's questions alongside the revised 2026 draft and continued the effort to shorten the survey while retaining information directly relevant to assessing the administrative mechanism.

Members discussed questions regarding the Request for Proposals (RFP) and bidder conferences. The committee agreed that information about the number of bidder conferences and participation

Quality Services Committee Meeting

Megan C. & Damon P. | Chair and Co-Chair

by currently funded and external agencies should be collected separately rather than combined into one multi-part question, making the responses easier to complete and analyze.

The committee also reviewed questions concerning invoice processing. Members discussed the distinction between invoices that are received, approved, and ultimately paid, noting that an invoice may be delayed because corrections are required before approval rather than because of a County payment delay. Members supported asking what percentage of received invoices were paid within 30 days, with a follow-up question allowing OHC to explain reasons when invoices were not paid within that timeframe.

Members reviewed questions concerning grievances and agreed to retain them because the Planning Council does not otherwise regularly receive this information from OHC. The grievance questions were simplified to ask how many client grievances OHC received and reviewed during the fiscal year and how those grievances were resolved. Members also continued removing or simplifying questions that were duplicative, overly detailed, or more appropriately addressed through other OHC monitoring processes.

The committee completed its review of the Recipient Survey and agreed that both AAM surveys should be prepared for distribution. Staff stated that the surveys will first be programmed and shared with committee members for a brief test/review before being sent to respondents. The goal is to distribute the surveys promptly so results can be reviewed during the September QSC meeting and used to begin preparing the AAM presentation for the Planning Council.

Action Items: Staff will incorporate the final edits into both AAM surveys, program the surveys, and send a test version to committee members for review before distribution. Survey responses will be compiled for QSC review in September, when the committee will begin developing the AAM presentation.

VI. Review Utilization Data – 2:41 PM

2:40 PM

The committee reviewed the latest utilization data and noted that several service categories had improved since the previous month. Members continued to focus on significant differences between Unduplicated Clients (UDC) and Units of Service (UOS) and requested additional context when utilization substantially exceeded or fell below projected goals.

Members discussed MAI Non-Medical Case Management, where UDC utilization exceeded 200 percent while UOS remained closer to the expected level. Rob requested clarification regarding why the number of clients was more than double the projection and whether changes such as Medi-Cal coverage or increased navigation needs may have contributed. Stephanie recalled that a new provider and an underestimated client projection may explain some of the difference. Members suggested that substantially inaccurate projections could be updated so future utilization can be measured against more realistic goals.

Quality Services Committee Meeting

Megan C. & Damon P. | Chair and Co-Chair

The committee also reviewed Outpatient/Ambulatory Health Services. Stephanie reported that previously low MAI utilization was partly related to an agency falling behind on data entry and that staff had worked with the agency to address the issue. Members remained interested in the low UOS for non-MAI outpatient services, particularly because outpatient and oral health services are billed fee-for-service. Expenditure data was not yet available, but members noted that comparing spending with utilization could provide additional context once the information becomes available.

Action Items: OHC will provide additional context for significant utilization outliers when available, particularly the high MAI Non-Medical Case Management UDC and low Outpatient/Ambulatory UOS. Members also requested consideration of whether significantly inaccurate UDC projections should be updated to provide a more meaningful benchmark for the remainder of the year.

VII. Review Workplan – 2:49 PM

2:50 PM

The committee reviewed the Workplan and updated activities completed during August. Members confirmed completion of the Part A utilization-data review and the Subrecipient and Recipient AAM questionnaires.

Members identified outdated language in the AAM Workplan item that still referenced a Planning Council questionnaire and agreed that the reference should be removed because the committee previously decided not to administer a separate Planning Council AAM survey this year.

The committee also reviewed the activity to support staff with assembling the AAM presentation. Members agreed that this work would not begin in August and should instead remain scheduled for September and October, with November retained as needed for presentation-related responsibilities even if QSC does not hold a regular November meeting. Members confirmed that QSC remains on track with its Workplan.

Action Items: Staff will remove the outdated reference to the Planning Council AAM questionnaire from the Workplan and update the AAM presentation-support timeline to reflect September, October, and November as appropriate.

VIII. Member Spotlight Discussion – 2:51 PM

2:55 PM

- August: Ji Sook
- September: Damon

Ji-Sook completed the August Member Spotlight and shared information about her personal and professional background and her connection to HIV-related work. She discussed her experience working in public health and community-based services and how those experiences have informed her interest in the Planning Council and Quality Services Committee.

Action Item: Add Damon's deferred Member Spotlight to the September QSC agenda.

Quality Services Committee Meeting

Megan C. & Damon P. | Chair and Co-Chair

IX. Announcements, Evaluation [link](#) - 2:56 PM

Ilana announced that she will not attend the September QSC meeting due to Yom Kippur. She stated that she will review the Service Directives in advance and submit any feedback by email for the committee to consider.

X. Adjourn – 2:58 PM

3:00 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. Step up Step back.
7. Active, intentional, attentive, listening/eyes, ears, head, & heart.
8. No retribution for what gets said here.
9. Be present, prepared and engaged.
10. No judgement/Take a breath & set it aside.
11. Everyone's effort & time is valued.
12. Encourage clarifying questions
13. Be creative & efficient in deliberations.
14. Be on time.
15. Be mindful of your actions and assume good intentions.
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.