RPC Meeting Summary – December 1, 2015

Welcome and Opening Remarks
Myel Jenkins, Program Officer, Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management opened the meeting with a welcome.

Michelle Saeteurn, RPC Co-Chair, welcomed the group, reviewed ground rules, led a round of introductions, welcomed guest Richard Carrillo of the Asian Pacific Islander Queer Sacramento Coalition (APIQSC) and reviewed meeting goals:
- Review the supplemental information from the Sacramento LGBT Center to determine release of 20% of Q-Spot funding
- Review and discuss Un/Underserved Progress Report #2
- Support planning for the January 26th Community Stakeholder Meeting
- Determine RPC’s role in the implementation of the Communication Plan

Evaluation of November RPC Meeting
Members reviewed the evaluation of November’s meeting. Things that stood out are:
- A suggestion to change the meeting’s beginning to 2 p.m. instead of 3 p.m.
- The group decided to conduct an on-line survey for the February through June meetings.

Membership
Members inquired about the status of and efforts to bring on new members.
- From July through September, two new members have joined each month.
- Donald Clark has only attended one meeting in the past three months. Myel has reached out to him but has not heard back. She will try again.

Planning Committee
The planning committee has identified core values to guide the rest of their work: learning and growth, relationships/ collaboration/ teamwork, integrity, commitment, and justice.

The next planning committee meeting will be December 17 at 11 a.m. for the February meeting, and is open to all RPC members.

Review of Grantee Learning Community Meeting
Michelle reviewed the Grantee Learning Community meeting outcomes and feedback. The next Grantee Learning Community meeting is February 18, 2016. All RPC members are encouraged to attend.

Updates
Round 1 and 2 Grantees Update
Round one and two contracts have ended and they are no longer part of the respite project funded by the RPC. They are transitioning to be contractors with DBHS.
MHSA Steering Committee

*Jane Ann LeBlanc, RPC member representing DBHS,* reported on the MHSA Steering Committee. Round 3 grantees attended the Steering Committee meeting in November and introduced their programs. The Steering Committee will begin discussion about transitioning round 3 grantees, as funding is available at their next meeting. Members are encouraged to attend to support grantees.

Follow Up and Review

*Sacramento LGBT Center Teens and TAY Report and Red Dress Response*

*Iffat Hussain, RPC Member-at-Large,* reminded members that when they reviewed the Sacramento LGBT Center’s report in November, the RPC determined there was not enough data provided to release funds. At that time, the RPC wanted to see demonstrations of accurate data collection in a follow-up report and response to the two identified actions in regard to the Red Dress event. The RPC had requested that the LGBT Center provide a follow-up report for the period from September and October and respond to the request put forth by representatives from the APIQSC.

Discussion:
The LGBT Center’s updated report received, which was composed of a compilation of past reports and the new specific report from September through October, was reviewed. Data reflected that they were close to their targets but additional clarity regarding the way in which the number of unduplicated clients was determined was desired. Members then reviewed responses to the Red Dress event. Guest Richard Carrillo also shared APIQSC’s communications with the LGBT Center including APIQSC’s attempts to plan a community meeting. One comment noted the needs of the population that the LGBT Center serves.

Straw poll:
Are we ready to vote?
3 maybe
5 yes

Further Discussion:
Members voiced continued concerns about the lack of evidence that the LGBT Center had responded to the second of the two requests from APIQSC and the level of response.

Decision: Do we want to fund either the Teens and TAY and the Un and Underserved?
8 no (unanimous)

Final decision:
The group voted unanimously to discontinue funding for the LGBT Center. The group further decided that the LGBT Center will have to refund the amount that hasn’t been spent yet, or show how much they have already spent.

Review and Action: Un and Underserved 2nd Progress Reports

*Alexis Bernard, RPC Co-chair,* opened the discussion by reviewing the goal: to review the reports that if approved will release the final 10% of funds. These are 13-month contracts.
Round 3 funding is the first time that respite drop-in is being tested. There are an unexpected high number of duplicated visits.

She asked the group to keep these six points in mind during the review and discussion:

- Are targets being met and context of program implementation?
- What progress or changes have been made since the last meeting?
- Demographics of people receiving services
- What happens if the grantee is not meeting targets?
- Are there extenuating circumstances that have been described in the narrative that can inform the action to be taken?
- Are they looking to the collaborative for support in addressing challenges?

The RPC was also asked to consider the consequences of decisions not to release funding.

**Gender Health Center Report**

(Kay left the room due to a conflict of interest).

- GHC is open two days a week for a total of 10 hours.
- They are not on track to meet their projected targets but have highlighted unexpected successes. Targets may have been too ambitious.
- They are being responsive to what is happening in the program and making adjustments, they have a story telling and narrative component to capture more stories from their clients and the potential of the program.
- They are seeing an increase in the transgender community that is experiencing insecure housing and mental health crisis.

The RPC members then reviewed the reports, discussed and made decisions on release of funds.

Decision: Should funding be released?

4 voted yes
1 stand aside

The group agrees to release funding for Gender Health Center with a discussion at the site visit on either improving outreach or adjusting their unduplicated target numbers.

**A Church for All Report**

- They are open six days a week for a total of 36 hours per week
- The number of duplicated clients has been a challenge because there is less space for new clients. They have addressed this by designating five slots a day to new clients.
- They are serving a high number of clients who are experiencing housing insecurity that is leading to another challenge. They have lines outside the door before they open, which has been a challenge for their host. They are working on this issue with their host and hope to have a solution soon.
The RPC members then reviewed the reports, discussed and made decisions on release of funds.

Decision: Should funding be released?
6 voted yes

The group unanimously voted to release the final 10% of funding with follow-up questions about the role of the phone assessments moving forward and if they see it as a respite service or a means to respite.

Discussion and Decision: What to do with funds left from the LGBT Center
Iffat led a discussion about what should be done with the funds not allocated to the LGBT Center. Due to the members’ vote, Sierra Health Foundation Center for Health Program Management will terminate the contract. An RPC member suggested that the group use the precedent of using the funding for the same population being served by the grant that will be discontinued. Discussion regarding timeline occurred so that grantees would have enough time to use the funding.

Decision: Will we distribute unspent funds from LGBT Center to the other grantees in each of the two funding categories?

Teens and TAY
6 voted yes

Un/Underserved
5 voted yes
1 abstained

The group decided to give unspent Teens/TAY funding to Wind Youth Services and to split Un/Underserved between Gender Health Center and A Church For All with the possibility of extending the contract period.

Communication Plan
Regarding informational materials for key stakeholders, the RPC will:

- Write, copy, edit
- Place grantees’ information at ER and include respite information into the discharge packet

Regarding the public awareness media campaign, the RPC will:

- Tweet
- Provide media support

Regarding the RPC website, the RPC will:

- Provide quotes or testimonial
Planning of the January Stakeholder Meeting  
It was intended to discuss this and get input from RPC. With the revision of the agenda, the group agreed to have an ad-hoc committee conference call instead.

Next Steps and Adjournment  
Alexis led the closing of the meeting.

*Agenda items for next meeting:*  
- Updates on discussion with the existing three respite organizations on how they will move forward with additional money  
- Communications plan  
- MHSA Steering Committee and other sustainability funds

**Future Meetings:**

- **Planning Committee Meeting**  
  December 17, 2015, 11-12:30

- **Stakeholder Meeting**  
  January 26, 2016

- **RPC Meeting**  
  February 2, 2016

- **Grantee Learning Community Meeting**  
  February 18, 2016