

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)  
Strategies and Interventions Meeting  
*Thursday, July 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006*

**Minutes**

**Members Present:** Emalie Hurliaux, Abbie Zimmerman, Weihaur Lau, Alix Lutnick, Dave Hook, Dee Hampton, Joani Marinoff, Chandra Sivakumar, Michael Cooley

**Members Absent:** John Tighe, Mike Discepola, Maria Ortega

**Professional Staff:** Clare Nolan (Harder & Co.), Dara Coan (HPS), Israel Nieves (HPS), John Melichar (HPS), Naomi Forsberg (note taker), Vincent Fuqua (HPS)

**Guests:** Dan Wohlfeiler

1. Welcome and Announcements

- Emalie opened the meeting at 4:11pm.
- Abbie announced that will not be attending next month's committee meeting.
- Mike suggested that increasing funding for HIV testing for youth by 20% would be a good priority.
- Clare made an announcement about the satisfaction survey that went out a month ago and that it will be going out to the group again. She would like people to pay attention and respond to it.

2. Public Comment

No public comments were offered.

3. Approval of June 1, 2006 minutes

- Mike made a motion to approve minutes; motion was seconded and approved.

4. Committee Business

- Emalie talked about the Roberts Rules training and it was agreed that the information in the presentation was good but the trainer wasn't useful for HPPC. The group agreed that HPS staff should lead the Robert's Rules presentation next year.
- Council updates - POI did a presentation at California HIV Planning Group (CHPG) conference on the "Thinking Big" document. SFLI is brainstorming on the topic of "Documenting our Success".

## 5. Examples of Effective Structural Interventions

- Dan, today's presenter, talked about structural interventions that have been done in the past. He talked about the definition of structural interventions and gave some examples of different structural interventions. He talked about the different kinds of interventions such as behavioral interventions and community-level interventions. He noted that when environments are left intact, it can be difficult for people to change their behavior. As an example, he talked about John Snow's pump and how it was one of the first examples of a structural intervention. An example of a successful structural change is needle exchange as evidenced by success rates which he presented to the group. In addition, he talked about a study of condom distribution programs in two different cities in the Dominican Republic. The study showed that enforcement of condom use in brothels led to lower incidence of STIs.
- Dan talked about one of the most controversial structural interventions in SF, which were bathhouses. San Francisco decided that there could not be any private spaces and decided that you needed a "clean, well lighted place for sex." By 1990 in SF there were no bathhouses. There were sex clubs. The guidelines were established in 1991, and in 1993, we trained volunteers to go into the sex clubs and see if the sex clubs were meeting the guidelines i.e., entry procedures, rules made explicit at the door, no alcohol or drugs, etc. and we then published the names of those sex clubs which did and did not meet the guidelines. But this was NOT a survey of clients' behavior. The sex clubs were rated to see how well they were adhering to the guidelines and published who were and weren't obeying the guidelines. It was decided that there was a reduced risk within the bathhouses. In another study, Bill Woods

and Diane Binson looked at survey data from men who reported attending clubs in SF, LA, Chicago and NY. They found that men overall reported the same level of risk behavior in all four cities. But men in SF reported less of it in the venues. One reasonable interpretation is that the policies in effect moved the risky behavior elsewhere (outside).

- Dan also talked about the negative side of structural interventions which is that structural interventions can be very broad and can require a long process and time before it is successful. He also talked about the idea that "unintended consequences" are an excuse that people use a lot and that you have to balance the pros and cons and that if you leave the status quo or environments intact the consequences that the status quo brings are still intact.
- Israel noted the distinction between bathhouses and sex clubs because bathhouses were shut down and sex clubs just had the structural intervention. Bathhouses also have private rooms and sex clubs are in a public space.
- Joani wanted to know about the difference between a community-based intervention and structural interventions. Dan noted that structural interventions require community support. Generally community interventions are about behavior and structural interventions are more about changing the environments.
- Dan ended the discussion by suggesting that all ideas be kept on the table, paying attention to who gets the profit from the structural intervention and also if it is ethically acceptable.

#### 6. Brainstorm on Possible Structural Interventions for SF

Goal: Continue the process of thinking about some ideas for structural interventions

- Mike talked about how when he was looking over the brainstorm from last week he noticed how they seemed a little too vague and if some of the ideas were related enough to HIV prevention in SF.
- Israel talked about how we should be thinking about late-testers, disclosure, and linkages from testing to care. Israel also talked about the four objectives we have been thinking about for the next few years in SF.

- Abbie talked about how it's possible that there are populations within the goals we have that we might not have talked about.
- Israel gave the example of how SFLI has been talking about having a trans clinic in the prisons as an example of a structural intervention related to a specific community. Abbie noted that it seems like it would be a good idea for the SFLI and Strategies & Interventions committees to work together and coordinate on similar issues and topics.
- Mike wanted an idea of the goals that we have for this and if we should limit what we talk about so that we can remain focused. He also wondered how we can encourage structural interventions and make sure that language and ideas on structural interventions are included in the HIV Prevention Plan.
- Continuing with the brainstorming, Dee mentioned that there are a lot of missed places where information for IDUs would be important and suggested that information about needle exchanges should be provided to everyone at clinics or to individuals who are recently released from jail.
- It was suggested that there be social marketing for immigrants that emphasizes that you don't need an ID or money to get HIV testing or health care.
- Social marketing focusing on the decriminalization of sex work (e.g, not having to be worried about people getting your name and reporting you). Related to sex workers, it was suggested that a grievance committee be established for sex workers to report things that have been going on.
- Other ideas for structural interventions that the group brainstormed included:
  - Banning alcohol sales at street fairs; it was recently banned at Washington Square Park in North Beach.
  - Banning circuit parties in SF
  - Israel said that someone came up to him and suggested opening up bathhouses again because by banning them it has sent people to the internet rendering these people unreachable.
  - Requiring websites pay money towards testing
  - Increasing outreach to methadone clinics and the access of Buprenorpene.

- Follow up and monitoring during the testing wait period
- Follow up for everyone who is tested as negative; it was suggested that the counseling protocol be looked at.
- Dan W. suggested that when you go into a sex club you get tested for recent meth use and you put down a deposit; if you are negative you get the money back and if it is positive the money goes to funding meth prevention.
- Distributing condoms should be a condition that goes along with having an alcohol license.
- Tax breaks for businesses that work with implementing interventions.
- Condom distribution or HIV testing at circuit parties

## 7. Concept Mapping for Possible Structural Interventions in SF

Goal: Begin the process of prioritization

- Israel talked about concept mapping and gave an example with 2 of the brainstormed ideas. He suggested looking at each idea separately and not in comparison to each other. He asked if we should do this at the next meeting together or individually online via SurveyMonkey first and then talk about it at the next meeting after it is narrowed down. The group agreed to complete a SurveyMonkey survey to begin prioritization of the groups brainstorm.
- Joani also suggested organizing things into time frames so that we can deal with the big issues like social discrimination in the long run.
- Mike made the suggestion of this subcommittee being made into a permanent committee and asked that this suggestion be submitted to the Planning committee.

## 8. Next Steps, Evaluation, and Closure

- Emalie asked that everyone complete the SurveyMonkey and Zoomerang evaluations when they are received.
- The meeting was closed at 5:35.

Minutes prepared by: Naomi Forsberg

Minutes reviewed by: Dara Coan, Emalie Hurliaux, and Abbie Zimmerman

Next meeting is scheduled for August 3, 2006 from 4:00-5:30 PM.