1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NATIONAL COMMISSION OF AIDS 8 Working Group of Social/Human lasues 9 10 Westin Hotel-Copley Place Boston, Massachusetts 11 February 16, 1990 12 13 COMMISSION WORKING GROUP 14 Scott Allen, Chair 15 Harlon L. Dalton, Esq. Eunice Diaz, M.S., M.P.H. 16 Donald S. Goldman, Esq. Larry Kessler 17 MEETING FACILLITATOR 18 Marc J. Roberts, Ph.D. 19 20 21 22 23 COPLEY COURT REPORTING 101 Tremont Street 24 Boston, Massachusetts 02108 (617) 423-5841

T	PARTICIPANTS
	Ms. Rona N. Affoumado- Executive Director,
2	Community Health Project, New York
	Hortensia Amaro, Ph.D Assistant Professor,
3	School of Public Health, Boston University
	Mr. Walter F. Batchelor- Director of Research,
4	John Snow, Inc., Research and Training
	Institute; Member, American Psychological
5	Association
	Ms. Mindy Domb- AIDS/HIV Educator,
6	Pittsfield, MA
	Mr. Eric L. Engstrom- Executive Director,
7	National AIDS Network, Washington, D.C.
	Marshall Forstein, M.D Outpatient Psychiatry,
8	Cambriage Hospital
	Jackie Gelfand, M.A., M.F.C.C ATS Project
9	Manager, Los Angeles Gay & Lebbian
	Community Services Center
10	Alan Hinman, M.D., M.P.H Director of Centers
	for Prevention Services, Centers for
11	Disease Control
_	Wayne Johnson, Jr., M.S.P.H School of Public
L 2	Health, University of South Carolina,
	Columbia
13	Mr. Jeff Levi- Consultant,
l 4	Washington, D.C. John F. Mazzuchi, Ph.D Office of Assistant
. 4	Secretary for Health Affairs, Department
1.5	of Defense, Washington, D.C.
	Jim McEvoy- Representative from
16	the National Association of People With
-	AIDS
17	Alvin Novick, M.D Professor of Biology,
	Yale University, Mayor's Task Force on
L 8	AIDS, New Haven, CT
	Joseph O'Neill, M.D., M.P.H Chief Medical
L 9	Director, Division of HIV Services, Health
	Resources and Services Administration
2 0	Alonzo Plough, Ph.D Deputy Commissioner
	for Public Health, City of Boston
21	Ms. Marie St. Cyr- Executive Director.
	Women and AIDS Resource Network, Brocklyn
22	Ronald St. John, M.D., M.P.H National AIDS
23	Program Office, Department of Health and Human Services
د .	Mr. Romeo Sanchez- Human Rights
24	Specialist, New York City Commission on
	Human Rights

1	PARTICIPANTS (CONTINUED)
	H. Denman Scott, M.D Director of Health,
2	Rhode Island Department of Health,
_	President, Association of State &
3	Territorial Health Officials
4	Peter Smith, M.D Department of
	Pediatrics, Rhode Island Hospital, Providence, RI
5	Jill Strawn, R.N., M.S.N Director of Agency
	Outreach, Community Health Education
6	Project, New Haven, CT
	John W. Ward, M.D Special Assistant for
7	Science (HIV), Centers for Disease
	Control, Atlanta, GA
8	Mr. Bob White- Deputy Director,
	BEBASHI, Philadelphia, PA
9	Mr. Wayne S. Wright- Excuctive Director,
	Multicultural AIDS Coalition, Boston, MA
10	
11	
12	
14	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
19	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	

I N D E X SPEAKER PAGE Marshall Forstein, M.D. AFTERNOON SESSION Commission Working Group Meeting 197

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Marshall Forstein is going to share with us some testimony, trying to help us out with the psychosocial issues.

Marshall, just go ahead and speak from there.

DR. FORSTEIN: Thank you. Let me know if you can't hear me.

Thank you for inviting me to participate with you today. I've been told to do in about ten or fifteen minutes the whole psychosocial continuum. So let me be specific in some ways and general in others to set a kind of tone.

I would like to suggest that first of all the place of psychosocial needs that's plagued in the AIDS epidemic has been underexamined, underresearched. There has been a kind of second-class citizenship to the mental health personnel, support services, community resources that have really, from my point of view, sustained any intervention and treatment services that people with AIDS and HIV infection have had. So my bias as a psychiatrist will come quickly through my discussion this morning.

psychological concerns and pragmatic concerns and how they interface with each other briefly.

There are a couple of basic concepts that I think are underlying our discussion. One is that as human beings there is a lot of evidence now both biologically and psychologically that we don't function real well over the long haul; that we are really more crisis-oriented, Baby Jessica Syndrome sort of is our forte. We treat the baby in the well but not the hundred thousand kids who are starving on a chronic basis. Our biological systems are really geared that way.

when we have a crisis our adrenaline rushes and we are great until we accommodate to this level of adrenaline. That conforms, in a sense, how we respond to aspects of the epidemic as a care provider group. But it also conforms to how individuals respond to changes in their environment; such as psychologically, when they hear the news of an HIV positive test. We have to distinguish between acute and chronic psychological and social responses to information that people acquire somewhere in the spectrum.

The other thing is that for individuals it is very hard to tease out knowledge and intrapsychic motivation and defenses against that meaning of knowledge in their lives. We cannot extrapolate from one group of people to another that the way people manage information is necessarily the same.

white middle-class gay male community, which has a very different environment, social structure, support system, to an inner city black or Hispanic community, the research data is essentially useless to making really valid generalizations or recommendations about how we should then mobilize resources. I think there has been a real need to look at the difficulties in studying the meaning of the disease and testing the population.

Likewise, when we hear about women who are infected who have had children and have a second child, how do we begin to understand the intrapsychic or the psychological meaning of disease in peoples' lives because that's what makes people do what they do, not the knowledge

that they have about early intervention or what the test really means today or what it will mean in five years. There has been a kind of frustration on my part that because the psychological component of peoples' lives is so complicated that we tend to simplify our response to the crisis by underplaying its importance.

Let me give you an example. We know that certain people after they get tested mobilize their behaviors because of the test. We also know that the people who are able to do that were probably more able to mobilize their behavior change before the test and that the test was really culminating a series of psychological steps that led them to that capacity.

Well, one of the things that go into mobilizing information in what we might call a pro-life, I hate to use that word, a positive life force, a future orientation, and I think that we really have to look at a series of psychological substraits. One is the capacity in people to believe that they have power to do something with the information that they gather, and that will obviously vary according to

peoples' perception of access to care, access to pay for the care, and whether that in fact is going to be guaranteed over the long haul.

If you think about the HIV continuum, it's possible for someone to get anonymously tested and then maybe have ten to fifteen years of asymptomatic life, but that doesn't mean that there aren't severe disabling psychological components to their life that in fact would be much more expensive to treat with the knowledge that they are positive than with the apprehension that they might be positive and going on negotiating the daily needs of their lives.

who are tested more than a few years out. We don't have data, for instance, what happens to people four, five, six, seven, ten years down the pike. The analogy I would like to use is for those of you who have been on diets before, we are essentially asking people to go on a diet and never cheat for their entire life. Unlike a diet, cheating may be lethal. If you gain a few pounds, you can undo that damage by losing a few pounds. If you stop smoking you can regain your

cardiovascular condition.

But the real terror in peoples' lives that is integrated into the fabric of how they respond to the knowledge of their scropositivity is that it has an acute phenomenon and then it gets changed over time.

there are significant numbers of people who find out that they are seropositive and do very well. They mobilize resources, get their physician on board, go into trials, find out, read more about AIDS than I have. Then a year later they become depressed because the magical thought that somehow what they have done will now rid them of this disease confronts them head on.

this country that effects all socioeconomic stratum, males and females. It's the undertreated illness of our society. 20 percent of Americans will have major depression in their life. Only 2 percent of those people will be treated adequately. People who are at risk for HIV we know have a much higher incidence of depression, anxiety disorders, panic disorders,

all sorts of adjustment disorders. And some research now shows that people with HIV infection have more psychological impairment than people with AIDS/ARC. There is something about the uncertainty of one's life, the unpredictability of the course of the illness that makes it very difficult for people psychologically to manage not necessarily in the acute phase but over the long haul.

So the kind of continuum of care we're talking about has to envision a changing need in an individual and in a community from the beginning of the awareness of testing and its implications throughout the process of trying to access care, maintaining what I would call a positive future orientation.

If we in fact encourage people to test and the first two years they do better and the next eight they do worse then they might have done by not testing, then what have we accomplished? And if in fact someone is scropositive, we then have to go the whole oute of assessing immunological status, besides the access to care, the cost and all of that.

What do people need psychologically to manage the day-to-day awareness that they are now part of a health care system for maybe ten years, but they are not sick? What motivates people to stay -- how many of you go to your cardiologist gist because your heart feels great? We have to look at how people utilize health services, what gets them into them, and what maintains peoples' diets. What is going to keep people psychologically prepared to not just treat the baby falling in the well, but the kids who are starving down the block? And if you turn that in terms of the individual, how do people maintain a long-term positive view of their own life?

Now, I think there are some psychological things that contribute to this. One is that there is a direct corrolation between self esteem, empowerment, and the capacity to maintain what I would call a future orientation, even in the face of potentially dangerous information. I think we cannot talk about HIV positivity, testing, and the emotional needs without looking at the underlying social conditions that are part of peoples' intrapsychic fabric. When I'm

talking to a young black male in Roxbury, and he's telling me that he's more afraid of being shot than of getting AIDS, that's part of his psychological makeup that informs the kinds of behavioral changes that he is able or not able to maintain because sexuality and drugs we know are extraordinarily effective anxietal lifts. We use them to reduce anxiety.

So sif we are going to ask people to participate in a continuum of care, to gather information about their life which makes them more anxious, we then, in order to prevent the behaviors which transmit AIDS from becoming more intensified, we have to provide care that reduces peoples' generalized anxiety about their lives. And that is why I think we haven't been able to pay attention to the psychological needs because we can't talk about testing without talking about violence, poverty, day care, mother/infant mortality, and all those issues.

I think our own anxiety around the table is probably rising as we throw back into the hoop all of the social dilemmas that confront us.

Just a couple of pragmatic issues. Once

we test people, it seems to me we have an ethical responsibility for following through to the natural end of the meaning of that test. For some people, testing will lead to positive changes in their lives; to some lives it won't. Are we prepared to provide the psychological mechanisms to support people over the long haul? I say this with a great deal of cynicism, as in my own state mental health service is being cut back to the point where they are going to be essentially non-existent in any meaningful way. The mental health cost of crisis intervention, long-term care, in different kinds of communities who have different perceptions of what mental health means in their community, has got to be looked at, and I think has got to be a major focus if testing is going to have any real value in forestalling the epidemic, if that is the purpose.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The other issue is just because people have access to care, assuming that doesn't mean that they are able to participate in it. I have had a number of people who have done all the right things based on all the right information,

and a year into their AZT are unable to continue to take it because the meaning of it on a daily basis is that they are facing their mortality in a way that they are not psychologically prepared to do. I think it's very hard to tease these things out.

The other thing I'll say is that from a practical point of view, we have people who come, decide to get tested, and then appropriately realize that, they do that anonymously, but then appropriately realize they have to go the next step to immunological status. So they go and get their T-cells tested. Who pays for that? they put it on their insurance, they are asymptomatic, they may be fine as long as they hold their present jobs. We are finding out that premiums on people who get T-cells tested are going up. We are finding that people are being denied individual group policies because the insurance has paid for an T-cell test. Well, we don't need to fool insurance companies. They are not stupid. They know that people who get T-cell tested in 1990 are at risk for HIV.

What are we going to do in terms of

24

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

guaranteeing that people have access to care and the ability to pay for it? If we have gotten somebody into early intervention and they lose their insurance three years down the line, what about the ethical responsibility to continue to provide care for people over the long haul? I think especially as we move towards earlier intervention, we are really increasing the latency period of when people are going to be needing surveillance for their HTV status, intervention, and then treatment in a more severe form.

Lastly, I want to bring up the notion of suicide because this is not well-researched or documented. There are some studies that have thought that the increased incidence of suicide in people with AIDS, overt AIDS, is probably secondary to organic deliriums and the desire to end extraordinarily painful situations. We need to distinguish between the wish to end pain and the wish to end life, on the terminal end of the spectrum. But early on in the course of HIV infection, the need to have power over one's life is often expressed in terms of suicidal ideation,

which is very common in people with any chronic illness.

There seems to be a much higher incidence of suicide completion in people who get tested who don't have the resources to help manage the information over time, and those suicides do not occur necessarily in the acute phase of testing. So that research that looks at what happens in the first five weeks of testing may not pick up what we have seen from some army studies that the incidence of suicide increases more towards the 6- or 12-month period of time, when again this notion of magical work that I've done is not going to prevent me from being ill.

So long-term studies around suicide and how it's managed is very important. From my perspective, it seems to me that if we are advocating testing for early intervention, early intervention has to include mental health intervention because to separate that out is to put people, I think, at higher risk for significant psychological morbidity.

Let me stop there and lastly just say I think one of the biggest issues we're facing is

is underfunded, underpaid for, \$500 in

Massachusetts is what you get for the year from

Blue Cross. Most insurance companies may be up

to a thousand, and that does not go far enough to

pay for basic mental health services. I think

there is clearly a problem in the community

mental health centers where mental health funding

is totally inadequate for present situations. To

add AIDS is to quickly overwhelm a system that is

not prepared. And additionally, having money to

train people in the specific issues around HIV

mental health issues is not forthcoming. I see

that as a real issue.

The last thing is that self esteem has to do with whether you believe you're wanted in this world. When your government says you are illegal, immoral, you are not entitled to the same rights and privileges as other people, you cannot develop healty self esteem. The psychology of depression for people of color, for gay and lesbian people, for people with disabilities, has got to be addressed or we're dealing with a psychological phenomenon that is

1 larger, I think, than a specific program can 2 manage to make up for. 3 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Thank you. questions? 4 5 MS. AFFOUMADO: I want to say 6 bravo. 7 (General applause). 8 MR. LEVI: It was wonderful, 9 Marshall. I just want to add one thing for the 10 record because I'm not sure that we are going to 11 be discussing this here, and I think it's 12 important, though, that in considering these 13 issues that the Commission at some point address 14 the issue of third-party payors and, 15 particularly, private insurance companies. 16 And I can't underscore strongly enough 17 what Marshall said about the risk, the jeopardy 18 people place themselves in once they are entered 19 into the health care system; that we really have 20 only resolved the very first piece of early 21 intervention and protecting peoples' third-party payor rights, and that's through anonymous 22

correct about once the T-cells are in peoples!

testing where it does exist. And he's absolutely

23

records that insurance companies are going to look for ways to deal with it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

There is also, it is not just that you may be forcing people to stay in a job for the rest of their lives so that they are able to protect their group coverage. When employers change insurance plans, the individual could be staying in that same job, and given how insurance rates are skyrocketing, employers are much more likely now than they used to be to be switching carriers. When they switch, there are INSURANCE pre-existing condition clauses. And, so, you could have been there for ten years, your insurance company switches carriers, and you have to go through a 6-month or 12-month waiting period before you are able to resume coverage for a pre-existing condition. And if you had a T-cell test done during that 6- or 12-month period, or conceivably sought any kind of medical care that ex post facto could be perceived as related to HIV, you know when you start making serious HIV claims, whether it's to get AZT or anything else, that company is going to go looking in your record to find ways to get out of

1 | it.

And your employer may be helping you along because one of the reasons, particularly in small companies where there is already an incidence of AIDS, that is what's going to drive up some of the rates. It's going to cause a switch in plans. And the plan itself may not only deal with pre-existing condition clauses but may try to be sufficiently restrictive so they don't have to deal with the AIDS increases again.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I would hope that we can get into that. I feel uncomfortable because I would like for everyone to be able to respond to that because that is an important issue. I feel like we're kind of stifled here because we're going to be asking him questions.

So we may want to move back into that as we start the group process. Are there any specific questions?

MS. AFFOUMADO: I would like to talk a little bit about a point that you brought up which I think is very important, this whole idea of people taking control and then finding out that this isn't working.

I would like to extend that a little further because I think it also impacts on the providers, the other types of providers that are taking care of these people. And it's this mixed message kind of stuff. We've been trying to form partnerships with patients, between social workers and nurse practitioners and doctors and all of the people that are taking care of these patients. And what happens is that at the point where they feel that it hasn't worked, whatever, it is hasn't worked, there is a tremendous amount of anger between the patient and the other kinds of providers.

It also has a strong impact on the people themselves, the service providers, because it adds to this level of hopelessness and helplessness, and the feelings of burnout, and also makes us feel dishonest because we want to give that hope and want people to start working towards a more positive end, knowing in the back of our minds that maybe this is not going to really work out because we have no way of judging who is going to fall by the wayside and who isn't.

I would also like to suggest that that idea really has to go into the service providers, other than the mental health providers, because doctors, especially traditionally, don't have that kind of training and that kind of ability and support to handle those kinds of encounters between their patients. It's very serious.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I have a question, but we'll go around first.

DR. ST. JOHN: You spoke about the intrapsychic environment a little bit. I was curious to know in the literature and research if what is known about the intrapsychic environment of people after they find out about the test, they may fall into one or two groups, start to do something about it; and then there are the ones who deny, ignore, because of minority. It's not quite that dichotomous.

But what is known about the people who don't seem to respond to this information in the short run and long run? What is the intrapsychic environment, in the background, their personality structure, their life, that allows them not to respond?

DR. FORSTEIN: I think I can make some guesses. But, again, the research on this is very complicated because it's mostly dependent on self-support. We know how it is partly influenced by what they imagined the person getting the information is going to do with it and how it will affect their continued

For instance, in the AZT trials that were going on here in Boston, patients were telling their researchers that they were taking their AZT every four hours. Well, I was working in individual treatment where at least five or six patients, and maybe up to ten of those people during the course of the study were not taking their dose while they were asleep but they were telling their provider that they were because they were afraid they would get kicked out of the study. The providers would therefore tell that they took the medication every night at the same time. But to them, what it was like getting up in the middle of the night and taking a pill, of being reminded of your mortality than sleeping through the night and not taking the pill.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

participation.

If we get back to what goes on in peoples' head who can't respond, we're talking about an extraordinary range of personal capacity in this country. There are people who are very sophisticated and they are creative with anxiety in their life. Others are not. I think it depends upon how much stress they are already experiencing.

When someone is experiencing poverty, ill health, possibly being evicted from their home, to put HIV on top of it is to either overwhelm the capacity to cope, so nothing gets dealt with, or denial has to set in to deal with what is necessary and what is not. We are much better dealing with short-term stuff. The woman who is being battered by the husband because she wants to use condoms is more concerned about being able to put food in her kid's mouth than the possibility of getting AIDS three or five years down the line.

It's this problem of how people look at long-term gratification than short-term means.

The other is basic self esteem and the feeling of whether you have a right to take care

of yourself. And you have a right to do things that others don't want you to do.

And that, I think, we don't have a lot of literature on. Certainly in terms of the addictive population, the whole idea of when you test people. In early sobriety, testing can get people to feel really hopeless and relapse. We have people who are able to act appropriately sexually until they find out they are tested. The knowledge of knowing they are positive as opposed to thinking they are positive, kicks them over the boundaries.

For some people, intellectually what they believe and what they are emotionally able to do doesn't coincide. People tend to handle HIV the way they handled other stuff in their lives. So if we look at a population who has had trouble maintaining a positive self esteem, regard for life, it's unlikely that HIV is going to redo peoples' basic personalities behaviors.

That is what I wanted to say.

MS. GELFAND: I think one of the things that we need to address overall is society's attitudes towards seeking mental health

а

to begin with. If you walk in to any group that we have at the center in L.A., it's predominantly middle class, white gay men. And when the Minority AIDS Project or one of the other communities of color try to put together a support group, they are not well attended; the whole concept of mental health is shunned. Even the women's support groups don't seem to get the bodies that they need to get.

б

So I'm not quite sure how we can address that. But if you're looking at the HIV disease in its totality, including dimentia, that has to be included in the overall picture, financially as well.

MR. GOLDMAN: Dr. Forstein, much of what you had said could be implied with virtually any kind of disease as well as HIV disease in terms of the acute versus the long-term response, in terms of the question of the response based upon whether the inherent levels of family support and psychological support and pre-existing psychological strength of family, and the structure, the changing needs over time, the issues of self esteem and empowerment, could

you identify anything that is specifically 1 2 different with HIV disease that do not apply to any other chronic disease? 3 4 DR. FORSTEIN: Well, I'm not sure 5 6 MR. GOLDMAN: My question is is it a general problem that we deal with HIV disease 7 and we deal with all of the other problems that 8 9 we have in dealing with chronic disease? 10 DR. FORSTEIN: No, I think there 11 are some differences, although they may overlap. One is there may be a considerable period of time 12 13 that people feel absolutely well. That is 14 different from a chronic disease in which there 15 may be acute and intermittent exacerbation of 16 symptoms. It's totally possible for people to be 17 without symptoms for ten years, but know they are 18 carrying this virus and that has day-to-day 19 ramifications. 20 So in that sense this is a very different 21 kind of experience emotionally for people. Another issue would be the stigma attached 22 to carrying the diagnosis and the legal issues. 23

This is especially true for many of the gay men

who have this disease, where acknowledging they have the disease is admitting their legal status in their own states, in many cases; the kind of stigma associated with that, losing their jobs.

People with other chronic diseases are more easily covered by discrimination acts and are more clearly perceived by the general public as being rightfully indignant when their disease becomes a problem in terms of the employee and housing.

I think homophobia, the feeling that society has maintained is still very powerful.

That doesn't only apply to HIV disease, but the interface of HIV and sexuality and drugs make for a particularly powerful triad that is not present completely in that regard in most other chronic diseases.

I think, for instance, we would learn a lot about how to manage other chronic diseases, certainly, for dealing with HIV. But I think there are some special issues.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Eunice had a question and I have one, and then we are going to get Marc in here and we can jump off on that and

much of the dialogue can take place in that foundation.

MS. DIAZ: Yesterday, Alan Hinman from CDC covered with us at the beginning of his talk some of the very basic concepts that are going to be part of the upcoming Centers For Disease Control "America Responds To AIDS", new information campaign to the general public.

In view of what he said and what I've heard you say this morning, I really have some very disquieting concerns now because I'm thinking that perhaps when a message is of such broad-reaching focus in this country, urging people to consider to be tested for early treatment and intervention may in fact cause some of these individuals you've described here some of the anxieties and sequellae that we are just not prepared at this time to handle in this country.

And basically there were about five messages that were rather important for that campaign, but the one I remember the most was something you've dealt with this morning. I'm just wondering, in your opinion, what would be,

what could be the mass effect of something like this if it were to go to the public, general public, such as the previous messages that we've had through the campaign?

DR. FORSTEIN: My biggest fear will be that you will get people -- first of all I think we're overestimating the power of the government to tell people how to live their lives anyway. Even the Public Health Service putting out this directive showing that you should get tested, I'm not as worried about the impact of that as maybe most people are. But for those who do, I think the dangers are real.

I think that the people who want to do the right thing and then find that there are all sorts of reasons why they can't get the early intervention treatment, nobody is going to pay for it, that their families are going to be ostracized, that their children are going to be identified as having to be tested, it's a spiraling effect. I think we are going to see a psychological fallout that is much greater than what we anticipated in a mental health delivery system that is not capable of meeting the present

needs of Americans.

There is going to be damage. To what extent? Even if it's 2 percent, if you take, you go and test 50 million Americans and you have 2 percent who are going to have some acute untoward sequellae, that is a significant blow on an understaffed, underfunded mental health system.

I think I wouldn't be surprised if we see an increase in simple dysfunction, which shows up as job problems, unemployment, people taking sick time. The cost of it is, I don't know how to begin to estimate it. I think we have enough data to suggest that without the access to ongoing care, the damage will be worse, even with the best system in place.

Let's not be naive about this. There will be casualties of war, in a sense, even if we put in the best possible mental health system because of what some of the issues are that some people can't make use of. Ethically, from my perspective, we have to have things in place that allow people access to the treatment they need.

MS. DIAZ: From your mental health perspective, how could the need of informing

people that there is a test available, how could that be reframed so that individuals would know where to go for the next step? Might that be a message indicating that they should enter counseling or seek out a counselor?

DR. FORSTEIN: Absolutely. I think anonymous testing sites are being advised to spend less and less time with more people.

Twenty minutes of pre-counseling is not sufficient. I wrote the program for Massachusetts. It was a half hour. I regret the day I wrote that. My learing since then has told me that you cannot in a half hour cover the details of the test much less the long-term ramifications.

I think if we are going to advocate that people get tested, we have to look at early intervention psychologically as just as legitimate and provide them. What we have devised here in Boston is the recommendation that people understand what they need to manage the information, decide if they have that in place or not before going to get tested, and, if not, perhaps to work towards putting that stuff in

place before. I think ethically we need to tell people as we do with a surgical procedure that HIV testing is not a benign procedure, that it has long-term consequences as well as short-term, and people need to realize that there is a potential for long-term psychological effects.

I do not think that HIV testing is benign, even though it can be very helpful for testing.

And we need to see it as intervention that carries with it the same kind of potential untoward effects as telling people you only have a 3 percent chance of dying on an open-heart surgery table, but it's a 3 percent chance.

People who are in mental hospitals, people who are wards of the state, people who are in acute medical crises, people who are in addiction treatment centers, how do we begin to estimate what informed consent is in people who are already feeling psychologically stressed? I don't think someone in the middle of addiction treatment can give informed consent about testing. When the test is done is almost as important as whether it's done, how it is done.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: One of the

questions I have is the issue of dimentia, and something we need to look at and I would like your insight into that progression.

To the individual, I know that many people that I've talked to say I don't mind dying, it's just I don't want to lose my mind, that fear and that anxiety and that slowness of the progression, and the markers that frighten people and all of that.

Could you address some of that?

DR. FORSTEIN: Sure. Again, I think it's difficult to separate out the individual psychological response from the context that the person perceives he or she is living in.

As an example, I think since KIV tends to strike mostly young people who are not accustomed to thinking about losing their mind, it raises terrors that developmental periods of time would normally begin to prepare people to accommodate one to the realities of the world. But that is in a social setting in which we as a nation have abandoned people in their clderly years. We overmedicate people instead of treating them for

mild dimentia, so that people who are young say I have seen what my grandmother has gone through, I know she's not well cared for in the nursing home, I'm not going to get that dependent.

Our culture has said it's okay to be dependent as an infant, but not at the other end

dependent as an infant, but not at the other end of life. There are strong prohibitions about dependency, about losing control over one's life, and personal reasons for not going into a home, like wiping out your family's resources. There are many reasons why people would prefer to end their life prematurely. I think that's complicated by the real fears people have of losing cognitive function. That is terrifying.

I can't say it any other way, but it's simply a terrifying experience for any human being to find they are losing control over one's life.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Do you find that in increments, in the physiological station of the dimentia?

DR. FORSTEIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: In that progression, the intensity of that, what happens

1 to the individual? Do they disengage from life?

DR. FORSTEIN: It's variable. I

3 think unlike Alzheimer's disease, many people

4 with Alzheimer's get very anxious about the

5 diagnosis, have a period where they are disturbed

6 by it, but because Alzheimer's quickly damages

7 | cortical functions the patient often becomes

unaware of their own environment.

This is a far more disturbing disease for the family than it is for the patient. It's far more disturbing emotionally for people who care for Alzheimer's patients than the patient itself. With HIV dimentia, in those in which it develops slowly and chronically, people maintain high levels of intellectual function, although specific areas of cortical involvement, including good memory, slowness in thinking, changing sets from one kind of discussion from another. But the person is often mostly aware that this is a slow degenerating -- it's like watching someone chop off a finger and then another finger, but you know what's happening to you. I think that's a much more terrifying situation.

Again, medical problems intervene and

precipitate changes in the cognitive impairment, too. So it's unpredictable.

I think another issue is that most people do not have access to psychiatrists who can, I think, medicate and help with the dimentia. There are things we can do to forestall the dimentia and to make people work at a higher level, but the access to that care isn't forthcoming as well.

And lastly, I think there is a real clear message from society for people who have HIV infection that if we are not taking care of them really in their best state, what can they expect us to do when they are impaired.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: One of the concerns that I have, especially around the testing issue, one of the arguments, and you get down and dirty here, is because you need to test certain occupations due to the dimentia. I would like for you to address that.

But there is also the other side of an individual that is into denial or at least living with the secret agony of this progressive loss due to the fact that I'm scared I will lose my

- job, even if I'm protected to a certain degree.
- 2 Of course, you have the bona fide job
- 3 qualifications and the law, and so forth; that
- 4 that's frightening as well.
- 5 But I would like for you to address this
- 6 mentality of testing for protection gather than
- 7 | prevention, actually.
- 8 DR. FORSTEIN: I think you are
- 9 raising what has been an ongoing debate for a few
- 10 | years now and carries much emotional baggage with
- 11 it. There are some very good studies that have
- 12 shown over the last few years coming out of Los
- 13 | Angeles, Chicago, New York, that when a person is
- 14 HIV infected, we used to think that early in the
- 15 infection there was a higher incidence of
- 16 | cognitive impairment.
- 17 Now, the neuropsychological studies that
- 18 | corrolate cognitive functioning with
- 19 immunological status, T-cell levels, and basic
- 20 | neurocognitive motor tasks, have shown that when
- 21 | somebody is immunologically competent, meaning
- 22 until the T-cells are probably below 400, there
- 23 | is very little likelihood of HIV dimentia. It
- 24 doesn't mean it can't happen, but it's much

rarer. In fact, the notion that 10 to 20 percent of people when they got infected wouldn't have cognitive problems right away is probably not going to be borne out. I have seen patients with T counts of 800 who have cognitive impairment. It's not clear whether is that HIV, is that the pre-existing drug history, is that brain damage.

Ą

В

Most of the people we test, we don't have base line data from five years before they were infected. But even in the sample, with the history of drug abuse, people did not show up to have significant neurocognitive involvement until they began to have more immunological decline.

Mow, it seems to me that there is a difference between screening for HIV and helping people to create job performance screening. When I'm flying on an airline, I would prefer to have my pilot have to do a performance evaluation on the plane than what he does on a paper test in somebody's kitchen. He is not going to become demented and fly. I'm not worried about that. He might become drunk and fly; that I'm worried about. Or he might have had a fight in the morning with somebody who cares about him. That

I'm worried about. But I'm not worried about acute dimentia. That's not how the process works.

able to monitor peoples' performance according to criteria that makes sense. Instead of drawing HIV tests on school bus drivers, we should do breatholizer admissions. That is a performance monitor of something that is important. So the test itself is in no way, I think, helpful in discerning whether or not people have consequences of HIV infection. I think the fact that HIV is in the brain probably early on does not mean that it's clinically relevant to performance impairment.

So I would like to distinguish between neurocognitive testing, not knowing what the base line is, and also what we know about in terms of performance criteria for people accomplishing certain tasks. HIV testing doesn't accomplish that.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: That's very

MR. GOLDMAN: You would agree that

helpful.

in the context of paid blood donors, that would be an appropriate employment screen?

DR. FORSTEIN: Absolutely. You call it employment.

MR. GOLDMAN: If somebody is paid for it.

DR. FORSTEIN: I think what we're screening blood for is very different from screening airline pilots to see if they could fly. We are testing for the virus, not for job performance.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I would like to bring in Marc at this point. Thank you very much, Marshall. I'm pleased you're going to be able to be here through this conversation.

about something that we would hope to get out of this day today is to looking at that kind of continuum of care and the patterns of needs and to look at this not in a compartmentalized situation but to look at it as a whole entity of this progression through the process from the individual, perhaps, from the individual's point of view and how that individual interacts with

the social structures. So it would be helpful for us.

That's just a jumpoff point. What we would like to come out of this with is to get an overview and clear picture of this whole process from the beginning to end, if possible. For instance, one of the issues that came up when Marshall was speaking was what about the anxiety level of an individual, when does that override the anxiety of finding out that they may be positive? How do you interact with someone through basic education to sensitize that individual to the possible need to go for testing? And sensitize the individual to what the test means and so forth, as you are doing it all the way to the final stages. So that's kind of a hope.

Some other Commissioners may want to speak up to some of their desires in this.

MR. GOLDMAN: The only thing in that context, we ought to make it clear, as I understand it, we're talking about the psychosocial continuum, psychosocial needs, that we're talking about the person who is, who we're

about being treated. There may be a whole different set of needs for the members of that person's family, seronegative sexual partner of that person, with other people in the community with whom that person may deal, and a whole different set of psychosocial issues.

I don't have any problem talking about them, but we ought to be clear when we're talking about psychosocial needs and concerns as to whose psychosocial needs and concerns we're talking about.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Okay. Any other comments? Do you all have a clear goal or desire? That would be helpful to us.

DR. ROBERTS: I thought we would start with a slight expansion of what Kate [Cauley] suggested, who is no longer with us, but suggested yesterday toward the end of the session where she talked about how testing was an intermediary point in a continuum. And we had been talking both about various outreach mechanisms that brought people in to testing, and various community education and prevention

efforts which were not necessarily tied to testing.

And in keeping with what Don just said, both for people who are positive, you find medical and psychological, which we've just talked about, and social and prevention sorts of things, and for people who are not positive, either contacts or individual prevention. And Deborah Cotton yesterday talked about particularly the continuum of medical care and at what point it made sense to switch people among various sites and circumstances of care.

T want to say two things I heard in our conversation yesterday that I want to offer to all of you as some feedback as we proceed this morning. One, I sense some unwillingness for some of you to disagree with each other. There were some real disagreements, and interesting ones yesterday, but there is a little bit of a reluctance to disagree because there is the Commission and here you are, and you're all trying to influence them. And there is some sense of wanting to maintain a united front in the face of the Commission.

I want to urge you where you really disagree to expose those disagreements to the Commission because I think it will be more helpful to them to see the variety of opinions and perspectives in the room.

The other thing that I urge is, I think it would be more helpful if we tried to stay more focused on one thing at a time. I know it's very tempting. There are eight things I want to say to the Commission and I have air time, but I think it would be more helpful to them if we stay on one topic at the time because there's always the possibility of written admissions and other arenas in which you can submit your views on.

I have been told both that some people feel that some people talk too much and they haven't gotten enough air time, and other people, including people who talk a lot, who feel I've been too controlling and not letting them have enough air time. We have a broad spectrum of responses about how we ought to modify what we do today.

I thought that just to begin, we could start thinking about this continuum and begin to

talk about the question of which of these things are we doing relatively well and badly. In terms of providing -- and on this part here, we talked about case management, team management, the fact that this is a multifunctional set of interventions and assistance that's needed all the way from group support to finding people money, whatever it is.

а

1.5

1.6

I wonder what peoples' reactions are as you think about the spectrum of services that people at different stages of the disease need and different client groups need, as Don said.

What should the Commission hear about where the real priorities are, the real problems?

MS. GELFAND: I think one thing that really needs to be taken a look at is the fact that testing has always been separate and apart from anything to the right of your little squiggle there, separate from the medical, the psychological, the social, whatever, separate from the outreach and the education and prevention, there has been this testing. And I think that we really need to look at testing as

an entry point into that whole system to the right and stop separating it out, stop separating the services and the people who are doing it and the agencies who are doing it.

I think the agencies can connect in a much better way than they are in each city.

DR. ROBERTS: Say more about this connection among agencies.

MS. GELFAND: My own personal example is we are doing testing and beating our heads against the wall because we can't outreach to communities of color. I think it's a wonderful idea because the AIDS Project is going to be testing. Instead of our agency getting all uptight about it being taken out of our hands, we need to allow that to happen in different places in the city and not just take it all on ourselves to be the end all.

AIDS Project-Los Angeles is talking about putting case managers in alternate test sites.

I'm not entirely sure I think this is a great idea, but the idea of working with AIDS Project-Los Angeles instead of against them or in competition with them needs to be locked at. I

б

think that's what brought up the corroboration effort.

DR. ROBERTS: I hear you saying something that I heard some of yesterday that the I thought we were sort of wandering around a little bit; namely, that as the epidemic shifts, the nature of the agencies and kinds of voluntary groups that need to take the leads shift, and that one agency that can function in a gay community can't necessarily operate effectively in communities of color.

MR. LEVI: We almost need something added to that chart. I think what Jackie said is really accurate, that we've dealt with one side and not the other. But there is a reason why the testing originally was placed outside the traditional system. And it is both an obstacle to people seeking testing, but it's also an obstacle to people seeking the related care that they need, and that is the insurance issue we taiked about, the issue of mandatory reporting, the issue of partner notification, assuming all those things were in place, which they are not, on both sides of where testing is.

There are other obstacles that society, government, the economy, or whatever, have placed that prevent dealing with this issue in a rational way. It is not irrational for someone to seek testing outside of the care system if they think they are going to lose their job or their insurance or whatever. And so society or the government or whatever needs to do something to rationalize the process.

DR. ROBERTS: So if we are going to satisfy Jackie's concern, there are other things that need to be done to allow this to happen in the real world.

MR. LEVI: Yes.

MS. DOMB: One thing I would add, following that, in terms of what needs to be done in the real world, in areas you have physicians who would much prefer to send a patient to an ATS program because they know they are incompetent in it, they have no experience, they've had bad experience, maybe they told someone over the phone they had AIDS when they got a positive test result. So testing definitely, I think, now is an entry point to that entire system, but it's a

1	system that this area is not equipped.
2	Government has funded the ATS program but the
3	psychosocial medical case management parts of the
4	system are not; there, they are there but not
5	prepared for it.
. б	CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Just a question
7	for you all. Should testing be an entry point?
8	MR. BATCHELOR: No.
9	CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I think that's
10	something we need to look at.
11	DR. ROBERTS: Could you be more
12	clear, Scott? Do you mean should testing
13	necessarily be an entry point or an optional
14	point?
15	CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Should it be an
16	instrument of entry into the system?
17	DR. ROBERTS: Jackie, ão you want
18	to respond?
19	MS. GELFAND: Yes. Personally, if
20	we're going to have testing the way it exists
21	today, then it needs to be an entry point to a
22	system. I don't necessarily mean the big bad
23	boogeyman health care system, but obviously a
24	compassion at health care system. When I think

of it at my site, I give the test, I give the positive test result, I have the luxury of being able to take this client over to a nurse in my AIDS clinic, turn them over, give them an appointment and then take them upstairs to a counseling department person who can deal with their immediate crisis needs and hook them up with a support group. And that is the kind of system I'm talking about. It's sort of a comprehensive kind of system as opposed to turn them out to county USC Hospital, which is a scary thought.

A

no?

DR. ROBERTS: Somepody who said

MR. BATCHELOR: I feel very strongly. I think for most people testing is not the entry. And the system to the right of the squiggle is really the AIDS system, the AIDS care system, very broadly defined.

I think most people with entry to the AIDS system is public education. I think that should be the entry point to the AIDS system. People should not get tested as their first entry in understanding what AIDS means to them

personally. In fact, few people do, only people who give blood find out, women who give birth, for instance. And, yet, most people choose to get tested based on their understanding of AIDS or their fear of AIDS, or their fear about their own personal risk behaviors in the past.

MS. GELFAND: Can I respond for one second? I think you're right in terms of education, but I think most people enter the system when they get sick. I think the majority of people enter the system when they find themselves in the emergency room at County Hospital and not from the educational point or not even from the testing system.

MR. BATCHELOR: I think Reverend

Allen's question was should that be the entry

point. That's why I say firmly it should not

be. As I say, the system we have now I don't

think works well. I think people are quite alone

when they find out -- the answer to your

question, Mr. Goldman, about why this is

different --

DR. ROBERTS: Could I interrupt? We're all on a first name basis.

MR. BATCHELOR: The system is in place to respond to peoples' needs after they are tested are for the vast majority of people not appropriate. The vast majority of people do not have T-cells below 500 or below 200, the vast majority. Medical interventions are irrelevant. The vast majority of people are not willing to face the social stigma, the political stigma, the economic, the insurance, the medical and the self-imposed stigma to tell other people that they are HIV positive.

I got tested in 1984 as part of an NIH project right after they discovered the virus. I didn't tell a soul for several years; partly at the beginning I didn't know anybody to tell. I thought I was one of eleven in the country who knew. It's taken me until last year to tell people, five years to tell people. I feel immensely better now, but I was facing death every day for five years because there wasn't any system in place. I've been getting better. My T-cells are going up. I'm healty as can be. But the system says I'm sick, I need medical intervention, I'm crazy, but for the vast

majority of people it's not there.

In Boston, we don't have enough intervention programs. Social support is very, very important. It's only when you can tell other people that you're positive that you can really get that social support.

DR. ROBERTS: Thinking about this,

I hear you saying two things, and maybe we can

disentangle them and be helpful.

One thing I hear you saying is that it's much better if people get contacted and enter into the system out here as opposed to enter in directly through the testing.

The other thing I heard you saying was that particularly at the early stages of infection you think that the social and psychological dimensions are far more important than the medical dimensions.

From your experience, would you say that those are particularly unavailable? Is that what I hear you saying? The social and psychological assistance?

MR. BATCHELOR: Social, I mean, there is virtually no social support outside of

AIDS service organizations. And the rare physician who has got, you're not sick, the physician doesn't need to see you. But to get a physician is really helpful and caring is just exceptionally wonderful. But the social support is not there, the social stigma within any community, gay, black, white, men, women, that's irrelevant. There is no social support for saying, Hi, I'm HIV positive, do you want to go out for a date. That don't work.

DR. ST. JOHN: I think what Walter is saying is very nice. And we addressed some of this yesterday. We do not have a wellness-oriented system; we have an illness-oriented system. And it seems to show no tendency toward any major, major change.

It would be nice if the first point of entry was when you got up in the morning and you felt really great and you said, gee, maybe I should go in to see my health care provider so I can tell him how great I feel so I can get positive reinforcement. For most people, regardless of socioeconomic status, they tend to have their first entry into a system when they

1 feel bad.

DR. ROBERTS: I wonder if one of the people from CDC could help us interpret the data we saw yesterday about the question that Jackie was raising and Ronald just raised. To what extent now, leaving aside the issue of what would be desirable, to what extent now do we think people are coming in as a consequence, Alan, of illness as opposed to outreach?

DR. HINMAN: Well, it's not only one of, it is the one from CDC who is here today.

DR. ROBERTS: I keep getting you and Joe confused since he's wearing his uniform still.

DR. HINMAN: Well, I had raised my hand because I wanted to point out, as you talk about entry into the system and testing as the entry point into the system, that basically focuses on the all alternate test site, the anonymous test site; whereas, in the period January 1988 through September 1989, publicly funded testing, 60 percent of the testing was carried out in sites other than alternate test

sites. 40 percent was in alternate test sites; the remainder was carried out as a part of other services that people were obtaining, the majority of these being STD clinics attendees.

Again, this was not an issue of someone deciding I want to go in and get tested and going to an ATS site. This was primarily a person who was in an STD clinic or family planning clinic or some other setting who was offered the prospect of testing and who decided to be tested.

I should say that in most of these clinics, fewer than 50 percent of the people who are talked to decide to be tested.

MR. LEVI: I have to ask a factual question about that because --

DR. ROBERTS: Go ahead.

MR. LEVI: Alan, I have to ask a factual follow-up because I completely believe you that those statistics are true. The question I have is was that driven by funding cycles? In other words, did the funding made available to alternative testing sites remain level or decline in how states chose to use their testing and counseling money while money was being pumped

into the STD system and other clinics to make sure that the counseling and testing was offered?

In other words, did this just happen or was there a conscious decision at the CDC that we wanted to shift some of the testing and, therefore -- for example, did funds increase at alternative testing sites?

DR. HINMAN: The answer is that there was a conscious decision to try to extend counseling and testing to sites other than alternate testing.

MR. LEVI: So while it is accurate to conclude that more and more testing was occurring at these other sites, it is not necessarily accurate to conclude that this occurred because it's a better way of doing it or that there was diminishing interest in alternative testing sites.

MS. AFFOUMADO: I think we have to understand how it was done because I think that that also has to play into the psychological and the social issues of this disease for the people who go to STD clinics. In New York City, for

example, if somebody went to a public health clinic to get tested for syphilis or gonorrhea and they had a positive test for syphilis, it was strongly suggested to the point of almost coercion that they should get an HIV antibody test because this positive syphilis pointed up that they might have a life-threatening illness.

People who have tested positive for TB in New York City have also had this strongly suggested request made of them. Now you're talking about people who are terrified of people who may appear to know more than they do because they are wearing white coats and little nurse's caps in STD clinics, so they have gotten tested with very poor counseling and very poor follow-up.

And I think that this model now in New York, for example, is being even further expanded to look at the possibility of doing T-cell testings in STD clinics because that's the "appropriate" place to do this, and Pentamadine and early diagnosis and treatment, which only means AZT, and that's all it means. So we're talking about this impact on the psychosocial and

the manner of which testing is suggested, in quotes, and I think that that's a real important issue that you have to understand.

DR. ROBERTS: So what I hear you saying is that the notion of integrating testing into the care system from your point of view that's less important, mainly, whether it's integrated or not, than how it's done; and that doing it in one site or another doesn't guarantee whether you really get client-centered care.

It's perfectly possible inside a health care facility that's not AZT-oriented to do a really bad job.

MS. AFFOUMADO: But you've got to understand that STD clinics are not health care models. I keep wanting to bring you back to this because we are looking at this as a treatment specific disease, and it is not treatment specific. It has a wide, wide range of things that have to be done for it.

And AZT, one more point, -- I'm very scared that we are going to look for a cheap fix, and this is not TB and it's not syphilis; it's HIV.

One other real brief thing. When you start talk about giving AZT to people who feel healthy, then you also say that maybe they're sick. And I think that maybe we have to look again, going back to Marshall's excellent psychosocial overview of the sense of telling people that they have to swallow a pill which then indicates to them that they are not healthy.

DR. ROBERTS: What I hear you saying is that to provide medical intervention without moving in the other dimensions, you think, is very inappropriate. And you're not convinced that the STD clinic is a cite that will do anything other than move them down the medical line.

MS. AFFOUMADO: They can't.

MR. DALTON: Several things on the table, but it really has to do, I hear Alan saying that 60 percent of the people, 70 percent who know they are HIV positive found out through publicly-funded testing sites.

DR. HINMAN: In the year, nine months I talked about 60 percent of the testing was done in sites other than ATS, but 50 percent

of positives during that period were found in alternate testing sites.

MR. DALTON: In any event, what it triggered in my mind, and the additional piece of information in response to Jeff's question is that through conscious choice backed up by funding, people can funnel in the direction of STD clinics, that raises the question of what happens in STD clinics. Implicit in what Rona said is it's her view that STD clinics do a less good job of counseling or referral, of follow-up.

Experience of people around the table about the relative provision of those kinds of services in STD clinics as compared with alternate test sites? My question for Alan is whether the government in fact has minimum standards for any of the above in terms of things like the amount of time spent on counseling, the kind of things covered in counseling, and whether those standards are the same for STD clinics as for --

DR. ROBERTS: Alan, Go you want to start? Are there standards for the non-medical

DR. HINMAN: The counseling, in theory, should be comparable in alternate test sites and in STD clinics. I cannot guarantee that it is.

1.7

From the point of view of standards -
MR. DALTON: You say you can't

guarantee. Are you saying that there are steps

you could take that would tend to drive people in

that direction? Or that you in fact have taken

steps --

DR. HINMAN: We have guidelines for training of counselors. We carry out training sessions for counselors, and we train trainers for counseling, both counselors in alternate test sites, in STD clinics and other sites. So we are attempting to assure that counseling is comparable.

In practice, I cannot guarantee that it
is. I do not have basically a counseling cop in
every alternate test site or in every STD

clinic. I can say that one of the problems in
trying to bring counseling and testing into STD

clinics and, particularly, into drug treatment

clinics, for example, is that most of these clinics are already overburdened, as was mentioned about mental health facilities, and particularly in IV drug treatment centers where they know there is a long waiting line of people to get into the program. There may not be a lot of enthusiasm about devoting space. We do not promote that the IV drug treatment center employees give the time, but they may not feel they have the space to give. So there may not be as much as enthusiasm.

Я

MR. DALTON: The conscious decision to tilt testing in the direction of STD clinics, drug treatment sites and the like as against ATSs, was that premised on the assumption that the counseling and referral services would be the same in both sites? Was there a premise in judgment about the capacity of those institutions to be able to do what you want them to do?

DR. HINMAN: The premise was to try to bring counseling and testing to people who might benefit and those who might be at greater risk of being infected. The dynamics of who goes to an alternate test site versus being tested in

some other site are difficult to really manage.

We have seen, for example, in persons tested in alternate test sites a declining positivity rate since the alternate test sites were first established reflecting presumably the fact that the test sites that were initially put in place, the people who were at greatest risk of being infected or who were most concerned about being infected went to use those sites. And over time, this is, the positivity rate declined and more or less stabilized, reflecting presumably, then, a not exhaustion, but at least a completion of some of the backlog of concerned infected individuals.

MR. LEVI: You mentioned yesterday, if you could just remind us, yesterday the return rate for HIV test results and ATSs versus other sites because I believe there was a significant difference.

DR. HINMAN: There is. The return rate for ATS sites is about 76 percent. And it varies in other testing sites as low as 30 to 40 percent.

MR. LEVI: Do you think that has

something to do with STD clinics being so overwhelmed you literally have to spend the entire day there before you can get an appointment to see someone? Some inner city sites are saying if you're not there by 9:30 you're not going to get in that day.

DR. HINMAN: That may be a part of it. I think, also, there is a different motivation. The person who goes to an alternate test site is saying on the face of it. I want to get tested and I want to find out about the results; whereas, the person who is in an STD clinic because of gonorrhea may not be as enthusiastic. We see this obviously with lower test rates of the people who are --

DR. ROBERTS: Could we get some experience from other people around the country? Rona offered us her view about the empirical comparison. Jackie, do you want to say something or Jill?

MS. STRAWN: Having worked in an alternative test site, when the shift was happening from focusing on anonymous testing to doing testing in the STD clinics, it was my

2.0

experience and most of the AIDS community
experience that what they were interested in was
testing, not testing and counseling. So, in
fact, the additional responsibilities of the STD
staff who were hired for one thing and trained
for one thing suddenly became, and you also have
to do AIDS counseling and testing, in addition.

We haven't talked yet about what is counseling, and that's a whole large conversation; and then also what kind of people can do this counseling well. And it often is not the people that have been hired to do something else. So a lot of testing has gotten done, but I really wonder how much counseling has gotten done.

MS. DOMB: That's been the case in Massachusetts. When I started working in the alternative test site in western Massachusetts, I was called to āo counseling in the STD clinic because the nurses wouldn't do it. Boston knew that even if they said they were doing it, they probably weren't. Massachusetts did, though, started recruiting people for the STD/HIV component from the ATS program, so that they were

getting the people who were enthusiastic about counseling about the HIV antibody test into the STD clinics.

I think your point about who applies for the STD job and who applies for ATS job is key.

People who are doing STD don't want to be doing HIV counseling.

DR. ROBERTS: Do you want to say a

word about Seattle?

of working at the same time as a testing counselor at an alternative test site as well as attending in the sexually-transmitted disease clinic at the County Hospital. I was doing these things simultaneously.

I think one of the things that strikes me, it may be only specific to Seattle, not only are there different populations of patients using the facilities, but different populations of providers working in the facilities. The motivation level, both among the users as well as among the people working there, was very much more oriented towards counseling and support, of which a piece of that was the test.

There was a different feeling at the STD clinic in terms of. I think you just articulated it very well, saying this is one more thing to be done on a long checklist of things needed to be done as an appropriate workup of a sexually-transmitted disease.

to say about that. We have kind of tried to stay away from the racism and the prejudice, but do you find or is there a possibility of making the hypothesis that there is a greater potential when there is an individual that looks like you, that perhaps you're from the community that that's from, to have more empathy and that greater sense of counseling enthusiasm for the job, and in an STD clinic where someone comes in that is impoverished, that you may not feel that much empathy for? There seems to be a big difference.

As we see the shift, maybe we should start talking about the indiginous type of needs of the community, to have folks that are sensitive to your own plight. So you're talking about the difference, I think that needs to be taken into

account. And we also need to consider the expanding, not shifting, but the expanding needs.

A.

DR. O'NEILL: I think a way of putting it in a positive light is saying what worked well about the alternative test site was precisely that sensitivity towards the community, at least at the time I was working there, was directed towards the major users of the facility.

very briefly what my experience has been in New York, and that is that the STDs are located in poor communities and in communities of people of color. The history of STDs is very poor. The counseling is inadequate. They are receiving five minutes of pre-test counseling, five minutes. That is what people are getting in New York in STDs. They are receiving prossure by counselors to report their partners.

So it's a major concern to me, when I hear the promoting of STDs and the volume of people who are being tested in those clinics. And I just hope that it's not just discussion, but that something is actually done to upgrade the quality of services and treatment.

MR. WHITE: One of the things that we are experiencing, and I think, if I'm correct, all testing has gone under STD, is that we, in January, were told we were going to be put under a quota system of 160 per week, which means then that we have to meet this quota to retain our funding. We are resisting that.

MS. DIAZ: What funding?

They are saying that we are spending too much time being empathetic. You're laughing, but this is what we have actually been told because we want to spend time with our clients, making sure they understand what's going on with them. What are we supposed to do? Because the STDs are doing that, and we are supposed to be the alternative to them, and you're taking that from the community and from the people who really need it.

MS. AFFOUMADO: You could even extend that to the public health clinics who have certain productivity levels to meet utilization, and it's the same thing. They lose funding for that, too.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I have a question 1 for Bob. Is there a waiting list that you have? 3 MR. WHITE: No. CHAIRMAN ALLEN: So that's not an 4 5 issue? MR. WHITE: It's not an issue. 6 7 What's happening is they are saying we are not Я utilizing the money appropriately because the 9 numbers are not representing what they want, the number of clients that we are interacting with to 10 11 represent for the amount of money they are giving 12 us. 13 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: That was my 14 question. 15 DR. ROBERTS: Alvin? 16 DR. NOVICK: I think this reflects 17 something that I said yesterday, the "called" 18 people as opposed to the people who are forced to provide services. So I want to go further. 19 20 are hearing over and over again the undercurrent 21 that we don't have enough people that are 22 properly trained in both the factual stuff and 23 the sensitivity and the depth and the compassion,

the whole set, and that training is lacking. I

think it's what we're saying is lacking in the system; that it doesn't have the proper counselors. Jill spoke of that. The same lack is in the other sets.

A

We had the little fight about doctors. We don't have training systems in America for HIV.

The first such college program, as far as we know, is going to be implemented in Connecticut in the fall. It's going to offer a certificate in HIV care at the graduate level for community workers and for social workers and others. And we need those because without them we either depend on the identified committed people, or we have STD employees who couldn't care less.

So we have to have a new set of STD employees who get into that because they're trained and have a certificate.

DR. ROBERTS: I just want to suggest, Alvin, I heard a fairly complicated description of the problem that was certainly not just training; that is, there is the issue of self selection and the issue of funding and productivity standards as well as the issue of

training that determines the quality. So I 1 didn't hear that it's not just the training. DR. NOVICK: But we do not have 3 4 enough trained people in America to provide the 5 services we require. 6 MS. GELFAND: I want to say that in 7 the California example, when I think of STD antibody testing and alternate test site antibody 9 testing, it's the same in my mind. The reason is because there is no one in an STD clinic that has 10 11 not been given the same counselor training that 12 an alternative test site counselor has gone 13 through, or they won't be doing training. It's 14 the same that goes on in any test site, whether 15 in our STD clinics or confidential test sites, as 16 opposed to an anonymous test sites. There is an 17 extensive training. 18 DR. NOVICK: That's three days of training, trivial training. 19 20 MS. GELFAND: But ongoing three or 21 four times a year. It is ongoing. 22 DR. NOVICK: It's imposed on them, 23 too, rather than voluntary. 24 DR. ROBERTS: What I hear, there is

no reason for us to have disagreements based on geographic variety because what I hear is that there is a lot of geographic variety; that the relative effectiveness of different sites in different parts of the country as a function of funding and productivity is very different.

б

You talked about how counselors in STD sites were selected from the alternate test sites and they were self-selected and so on. So there is no need to come to a consensus because America is a big country, and it's three thousand miles.

MR. GOLDMAN: The discussion has been interesting, but let's go back to Scott saying, he started off asking whether or not testing should be an entry point. Harlon asked a question of Doctor Hinman relative to whether or not the decision to shift was based upon some determination that at one point was a better entry point than another point. And Alan's response that the issue of entry point had nothing to do with it, that it was purely epidimiological, and what happened to the person that was tested in terms of their care afterward was really an irrelevant care in the process.

1 DR. HINMAN: I hope I did not say 2 that. MR. GOLDMAN: Well, I don't know 3 4 what happened to the person afterwards, but in 5 terms of using that criteria in terms of which 6 was the most important entry point into the 7 health care delivery system, then I don't think that most of the people who deal in terms of 8 9 setting up programs for HIV testing other than 10 those in the field look at it in terms of what's 11 the most effective point of getting somebody 12 entered into the health care delivery system. 13 There are a whole bunch of other issues 14 involved, largely involving issues of protection 15 of others and modifying sexual behaviors. And if 16 somebody went crazy but was impotent as part of that process, that would be deemed a success. 17 18 MR. DALTON: Could you say that 19 again? 20 MR. GOLDMAN: If as a result of 21 testing somebody became crazy but became impotent 22 23 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Physically. 24 MR. GOLDMAN: Physically impotent,

1	that that would be deemed a public health
2	success.
3	DR. ROBERTS: Whose position are
4	you characterizing as that? What I didn't
5	understand and I think other people don't, you
6	are saying some people take the following
7	position. Who is the some people?
8	MR. GOLDMAN: I think those who are
9	involved in public policy who have nothing to do
10	with AIDS or HIV infection, and our state
11	legislators and other federal and state
12	government in many respects.
13	DR. ST. JOHN: I disagree because I
14	work at that level, and I know a lot of people
15	who are very concerned about these kinds of
16	issues. So I disagree with you completely.
17	MR. GOLDMAN: You disagree that
18	DR. ST. JOHN: You're outlining a
19	whole position that sounds very cold, very
20	scientific, and doesn't take into account human
21	values. I don't think that's true.
22	MR. LEVI: But think about it,
23	Ronald. He may have put it in an extreme form.
24	MR. GOLDMAN: I did.

MR. LEVI: Which is useful because 1 2 it was provocative. DR. ST. JOHN: It provoked me. 3 MR. LEVI: But think about it. 4 Within the CDC alone, the "America Responds To 5 б AIDS" program, as Eunice pointed out before, is 7 going to be encouraging people to be tested. 8 Yet, within the CDC, has a corrolation been made 9 between increasing the demand for testing and 10 expanding the level of funding dramatically for 11 alternative testing sites? No. And that is 12 within, well, the budget numbers don't reflect 13 dt. CDC doesn't 14 DR. ST. JOHN: 15 funding. MR. LEVI: Or the Public Health 16 17 Service did not request sufficiently larger increments of funding for testing and counseling 18 19 to reflect the demand that their pregram is going 20 to create. The numbers don't lie. 21 So within one agency, you already have a 22 dissidence. You have one message being put out to create a demand and no commitment of resources 23 24 to meet that demand.

second. The really Machiavellian view is that by 2 testing a lot of people who are then positive, 3 you will then create the demand for service. 4 MR. LEVI: No, not even meeting the 5 testing demand. 6 7 MS. BYRNES: I wouldn't just blame 8 the CDC. The federal government does this over 9 and over again. Money goes into the treatment 10 and there are no structures or slots to be 11 provided. 12 MR. LEVI: I'm just saying --13 DR. ROBERTS: You're saying this is 14 the characteristic inefficiency of the federal 15 government. 16 MR. LEVI: You work for NAPO, which 17 is supposed to be coordinating all the different 18 agencies. Let's say CDC did what it should have done, where are the additional funds at HRSA to 19 support the mental health services and the care 20 21 services and all the other things that people are 22 going to need? They are not there. 23 In fact, when you look at the care budget proposed for fiscal 1991, it is dramatically 24

DR. ROBERTS: Excuse me one

1 lower rather than higher for those services.

DR. ROBERTS: Let's let Alan have a chance to respond.

DR. HINMAN: I would just remind everyone briefly about how budgets are prepared and submitted, just to reflect a little bit. At the programatic level, there are people who are advocates as strong as anyone in this room or in any other room who propose what they think absolutely must be done. There are people in similar positions for every range of activity at CDC. These people each put together a proposal for what they think needs to be done and now much it would take to do it.

The next level looks at all of these great ideas and says there is no way in hell all of that money is going to be available. So some choices are made at that point as to things that might not be requested at all, or what level. This goes to the next level and next level and finally gets to the CDC level.

CDC decides based on indications they have gotten from the Office of Management and Budget

and indications they have got to read my lips about whether there is likely to be any increased revenues available, and make some choices as to what it will propose be recommended for the Public Health Service.

This then goes to the Public Health
Service where the Secretary is trying to decide
between the request from CDC, request from NIH,
et cetera, and makes some choices, submits this
to the Department. The Secretary decides what he
thinks, given, again, the same budget deficit
targets and OMB targets, what is likely to be
saleable, and this gets sent to the Office of
Management and Budget, which has the final cut.

There are appeals back and forth at each one of these levels. These then end up in one way or another in the President's budget submission to Congress.

Now, what the people at the working level think is required to carry out X program, and what appears in the Presidential budget submission to Congress may have very little relation. I think one has to recognize that this is not at any stage a unilateral decision; it is

influenced by Congress, the general economy, the administration, et cetera.

DR. ROBERTS: Alan, what would you say, though, leaving aside the question of who is responsible and one of the problems with the budget system is that --

DR. HINMAN: We are all responsible.

DR. ROBERTS: But what I heard the thrust of Jeff's substantive point was the publicity program and the budget requests are conceptually and logically inconsistent, regardless of who has produced the inconsistency. That I heard, and I wondered how you respond to that point as opposed to the question of whether its CDC's fault or the Secretary's fault.

What do you say to that point? You can take a pass, if you wish.

DR. HINMAN: I would say that there is some tension between those goals. But I also have to say that it is unlikely that additional support will be provided by Congress in absence of clear demand.

COPLEY COURT REPORTING

DR. ST. JOHN: I know if you look in the fiscal '90 budget, the 1.9 billion, that's not what came up through the system. The request that came up was somewhere between 2 and a half to 3 billion dollars.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Just a couple of comments. Clearly, the walk doesn't match the talk when it comes to the advertising of early intervention and the resources theze. And that is a big concern we have.

I would also like to take up for the public health votes in that I know some people that are anguishing over that aspect right now, three of whom are right here. And it is a terrible situation to be in.

The concern that I have is who is testing really for? Is it for the society or is it for the individual? And I think the testing was born out of protection of the blood and it has continued on in that mentality of the protection issue.

And we have added on the sense, well, now it can help the individual but I'm not so sure.

And that's something I'm struggling with is who

б

will, and this is part of the sociological phenomenon; it runs deeper than that. It's the capacity for compassion that we have as a society. And I don't think we care. I don't think as a society we care. So we are asking people, we don't have that sense of compassion.

б

So it's not just the people at Public

Health Service; it's the people that vote, the

people that are out that simply don't care.

That's what disturbs me. If we want to do some

educating, we can't negate to the need for

general education for sensitivity to the issues

and the tragedy that is happening on a collective

sense. But I am just very concerned that we are

walking down this road with a pack of lies.

DR. AMARO: I am Hortensia Amaro and I am at the Boston University School of Public Health and on the staff at Boston City Hospital.

I think the whole issue of testing is really irrelevant when we have no system for any kind of continuum of care. The women that I work with, we have a project here within the NIDA

pregnant women at high risk of infection. The question of whether testing should be the entry point for medical care is really irrelevant for this group of women because these women are totally disconnected from any kind of health care. Testing is not going to be the entry point for them. There is going to have to be a lot of outreach and education before they will get to the point of testing, and they are going to need a lot of support.

A lot of these women are homeless, don't have access to drug treatment, have a whole set of issues around child welfare concerns. Unless those issues are addressed, they will never get to a point of considering testing. In fact, if they do get tested, they probably, it will probably be of no benefit to them occause the connection between that and the kind of services, the level of services they need doesn't exist.

So I really want to support, you said "the

So I really want to support, you said "the walk doesn't fit the talk", because we continue to focus on testing instead of on how can we set up a continuum of care. A whole set of services

that will really connect people to the services that they need, and I really would hope that we could focus this discussion more on that than on whether testing should be in STD clinics or in alternative testing sites because I think for some populations, the framing of the issue in that way is irrelevant. It doesn't get to what they are facing as a barrier.

1 4

DR. ROBERTS: Don?

MR. GOLDMAN: How many of us at some point in time have been told that the role with CDC is just reduction and not health care delivery? I've been told that at least on half a dozen occasions. And I'm not being critical of it. On how many occasions has the GAO been critical of the CDC in terms of its willingness to allow the use of funds ostensibly for "right reduction", when in fact it's being used for kinds of counseling and treatment, much to CDC's credit risk and putting its ass on the line subject to those kinds of criticisms.

So all I'm trying to say is that here we are people who are involved in HIV health care delivery, and there are a lot of people out there

who have different agendas other than HIV health care delivery in mind. And to talk in terms of that is the agenda and that is the only purpose of testing and testing is an entry into the health care delivery system, therefore we are talking about the health care delivery system as a form of masturbation.

1.4

DR. ROBERTS: Marshall?

my premise of why testing becomes the lightening rod, I agree with Hortensia, testing is the least common denominator of where money begins to make sense because you can hire people, do a service measure what you've done. But there is a magical thought by the government underlying all of this that if you test people and you tell them that they are positive or negative, people will do the right thing. What this means is that people will stop sharing needles and stop having sex. That's the most primitive psychology underneath why we want to test people.

We want to believe fundamentally, although there is no data in any scientific way that supports this, that if you tell people they are

positive they will stop doing what we don't want them to be doing. If they find out they are negative, they will avoid getting into trouble. We have this unbelievably primitive and magical belief that people always do what's best for them.

MS. AFFOUMADO: "Just say no".

DR. FORSTEIN: That's why testing sparks the lightening rod because to fund a program which really speaks to the needs of divergent changing communities is much more expensive and much more complicated in its design.

MS. AFFOUNADO: And you have to care to do it. And you talk about creating demand, by your advertising, there has been a demand for health care services in this country since the Sixties, since the Seventies. The reason we have a health care crisis in New York City and every other urban center in the United States is because the Feds and other public agencies have pulled apart the primary care system in this country that we fought so hard to put together in the Sixties and Seventies, and

Д

all of a sudden it's been pulled out from under us.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So of course we don't have a health care system. We don't have anything to build on anymore, it's been so completely dismantled by the funding structures.

DR. ROBERTS: One of the interesting themes that Marshall mentioned and Bob mentioned because I want to raise it briefly is this whole question of the pressure of managers to find measurable outputs in the use of productivity standards and what that does to the quality of care. At some point, it seems to me, it's at least worth people thinking about what an alternative to that mentality as a control and management system is. It seems to me that is a serious problem if one is going to advocate complex community-based services. There will always be a GAO and there will always be an OMB looking over peoples' shoulders with regard to the question of productivity and quality and so And there is, I think, a history of on. suspicion of community-based organizations with regard to those sorts of issues.

So at some point I would be really interested in having people who are on the front lines talk about their experience and how to respond to those kinds of pressures.

We have talked a lot about this squiggle.

And to go back to it, Marshall talked a lot about the psychological aspects. Hortensia started to talk about the social aspects, about housing and homelessness, for example.

In terms of the populations that we are discussing, what are the key social aspects because this is psychosocial; it's not just mental health and psychological. Where are the big gaps in terms of social services?

example which we are dealing with in Cambridge very concretely. For a person who is undocumented to go to the ATS to get results of the test is safer to come to an STD clinic who then documents and opens up a medical chart and the person becomes vulnerable to issues around documentation, deportation, so forth. The medical care system doesn't have a way to get people from the ATS into medical treatment unless

we can in a sense subvert all of the structures which would require things like recording, contact tracing, that kind of stuff to the partners.

б

That's one example of how the difference between testing and different sites can mean something different from different people.

People who have addictive behaviors, people who hold jobs that are sensitive, are unlikely to go to places whereby identifying themselves as a risk for HIV then cascades a whole series of different things, like getting people homes, people losing their jobs, losing Medicaid, being eligible for Medicaid.

DR. AMARO: I will tell you about an example of the pregnant women we are working with. We have women coming in, some of who are seropositive, some of whom are at high risk, they are pregnant. Through the course of education, we talked to them about, we counseled them about testing, and they may or may not get tested. But we've had women who test positive. They are homeless. We can't get them into any shelters because shelters don't take people who are

actively using drugs. We even have some women on methadone who won't be accepted into shelters.

positive and if as part of her behavior change effort decides she wants to get into treatment, we can't get her into treatment. She then finds herself homeless, still using drugs, goes to deliver, and a 51(A) will be filed because she is still using drugs and because she may not have a place to take her child. So chances are her child will be taken away from her.

Now that she doesn't have a child maybe she has a better shot of getting into treatment because she's not pregnant, but even then the beds are limited. So I think there are obstacles for different groups of people, and the particular population I'm talking about, treatment for women, especially, is very difficult. For pregnant women it's almost non-existent.

So I think drug treatment and housing, shelter, and also for women there are child care issues that come into play when women are infected or begin to get ill.

on that. If you're saying there is a potential for the woman to lose her child or have the child taken away, and presumably since we don't know the positivity of the child, what happens in the progression of the child?

DR. AMARO: When a woman delivers?

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Yes.

DR. AMARO: Well, if there is an investigation, then there is some assessment made by the social workers in charge, whether this person is able to take care of the child or not, whether they are able to find a home for her or some kind of shelter. If not, the child will be put into foster care.

Sometimes at a later point, that whole situation will be reassessed. But a lot of the times, these women lose their kids and are not able, sometimes a lot of them never regain custody again. Some of them are able to regain custody after they have been through treatment and are able to show that in fact they are able to take care of the kids and their lives have stabilized. Because there are so many barriers

for them to get into treatment and for their
lives to stabilize, that becomes a really
difficult thing to achieve.

MR. SANCHEZ: May I just say that at the Commission we have had cases and situations where we have had to intervene on behalf of women who are HIV positive, we have had to educate the judges, basically, and inform them of their violating the human rights law, just based on the fact of the woman being HIV positive, not being symptomatic or to the progression of the disease, just the fact that she is HIV positive. They have been real close to special services for children taking the child away from the mother.

DR. AMARO: I want to add one thing. That is even to get women to get tested, to get them to a point to where they want to or are ready to get tested takes an ongoing relationship, developing a relationship of rapport and trust with the AIDS or health educator that is part of the program. So that a lot of the women will come in wanting AIDS education, thinking they might be positive, but

they will not want to be tested until three or four or six months down the line after they really have a sense of trust.

DR. RCBERTS: This will be a good time to take a break.

make one announcement. I know there's been some frustration because you want to speak. If you have something that you would like to share with us, you can put it in written form and give it to us. That will not be lost. So don't feel like this is your only shot. We do want to hear from you.

(Recessed at 11:15 a.m.)

(Resumed at 11:35 a.m.)

DR. ROBERTS: During the break,

Larry Kessler said to me that he thought there

were some other aspects of this list of social

problems and needed social services that we

hadn't yet addressed. I asked him if he would

lead us off at this point and help us as to this

list.

MR. KESSLER: One of the things that occurred to me in terms of talking the walk

A

and so on is that it hasn't come up here a lot. but I know it's in the minds of everyone, but I think for the record it would be good to state. When we talk about access issues, that certain groups who are considered in need of the test or certainly in need of medical care and so on, have greater access to things like crack, cocaine, marijuana, ice, than they do to AZT and aerosolized Pentamadine, and other things that would be part of the continuum of care. And when we butt that up against the kind of plan, the Bush-Bennett drug plan, for instance, which hardly mentions AIDS and doesn't deal with the intersection of the two epidemics of addiction, we have a problem. It's more than just no drug treatment; it's easy access to some of the other things that lead to drug addiction.

1

2

3

Δ

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It easily moves into the whole question of crime prevention and so on. But also, I think, on the flip side talks about the legalization issue and, again, the whole priorities of where we put our money and what we invest in. And we're more interested in investing in prisons than we are in neighborhood health centers.

We're more interested in investing in helicopters and security forces at borders than breaking down the barriers that keep people from understanding that AZT or AP is available or should be available.

Hortensia reminded me of some of the studies that came out recently that show quite clearly that people of color and the poor have a different longevity rate after diagnosis than those who live on the other side of town or have access to insurance.

But in the mix of that are all of the other things that are enabling, that are tempting, that contribute to the deterioration of one's health, the social fabric, and so on. And that piece, I think, just needs to be on the table so we pay attention to that; specifically, in addition to things like poverty and unemployment. But the whole drug phenomenon is out of control, and we need to look at that when we're talking about controlling AIDS; that it is a public health issue, not a criminal issue.

MS. DOMB: I think that's interesting because driving in this morning they

were talking about the Summit and the South
American issue. South America looks at it as a
drug issue. The United States looks at it as a
law enforcement issue. I was saying what
happened to health in that whole discussion. I
think that trickles down to how we don't fund
programs that are accessible and available to
people not only in the cities but in non-cities
as well.

DR. ROBERTS: Mindy, I just want to push you and push Larry a little bit on this question because I think after lunch we're going to want to talk a little bit more about the funding issue. But at this point, it does seem to me that we at least have to think about the question of priority setting, admitting that not all the money is going to be available out of any budget process that we would like. And where would you, if you had an extra \$10 million, this is the easy form of the question. The nasty form of the question is where would you take \$10 million?

MS. AFFOUMADO: The first question is who would give it to her?

1	DR. ROBERTS: William Bennett gives
2	her \$10 million. Seriously, what would your
3	priorities be about where we ought to be spending
4	additional monies?
5	MS. DOMB: The first one is
6	treatment on demand.
7	MR. GOLDMAN: For drugs, before
8	AZT?
9	MS. DOMB: Drug treatment,
10	rehabilitation programs, before AZT, definitely.
11	In fact, where I'm from in Pittsfield, the
12	physicians who are administering AZT to drug
13	users are finding that drug users are having
14	actually a harder time taking AZT. They are
1.5	having a harder time taking the treatment, and
16	it's also ruining their recovery. They don't
17	quite understand why that's happening.
18	MR. LEVI: Because no one has done
19	the clinical trials because they exclude people
20	who are active.
21	MS. DOMB: And they don't have the
22	necessary psychosocial supports that are
23	necessary for taking the pill. So I think
24	treatment on demand.

MR. GOLDMAN: Why is that more important than providing housing for people with AIDS that are homeless?

MS. DOMB: Because I'm using \$10 million specifically to deal with drugs. Bennett gave me the money. I mean, granted, it's always hard to make a priority, and who is more needy is probably the toughest decisions that people have to make. But now I think IV drug users are leading the fight in trying to get some kind of handle on the epidemic and it has to address some kind of issues in drug treatment. If we don't, then we are basically putting up our whole finger to that whole population and saying you are dispensable, you don't have a lobby group we can listen to; goodbye, see you later.

MR. GOLDMAN: But people with IV drug use, large portions of those people may not in fact be infected with HIV.

MS. DOMB: They are all at risk.

You look at a place like Pittsfield,

Massachusetts, and you say, there are no IV drug

users in Pittsfield. But they are there. Where

they go for drugs is the major urban areas.

1 MR. GOLDMAN: But you could provide care more targetedly if you could find the two 2 3 persons already infected with MIV and who are in need of care. 4 MS. DOMB: But if you fund 5 6 treatment programs, they are able to provide quality AIDS HIV education. Then you are 7 reaching those people and more in that setting. 8 9 MS. STRAWN: I was struck by Don's 10 question about why not housing. In New Haven we 11 are struggling with people for housing for IV 12 drug users with AIDS. The model we borrowed our 13 housing program from was the Los Angeles Shonte 14 housing model based for people, gay men, who 15 don't have the behavior that goes along with drug 16 use. 17 DR. ROBERTS: 18 explicitly excludes drug users. 19 MS. STRAWN: And most programs do. 20 It requires a level of staffing and licensing and 21 regulating that the Shonte program doesn't. It's 22 much more costly and takes much longer to put 23 into place.

DR. ROBERTS: So the point being

that the cost per case, as it were, of social services is going to be very different for different populations because some populations are particularly difficult to serve.

б

MS. STRAWN: And particularly needy and no care that's available now really knows what to do with these folks, no system knows what to do with these folks, active substance abusers with HIV infection with all their needs.

DR. ROBERTS: I'm just struck by the point we were talking about yesterday about how to get people in. And in a sense, the further out people are in terms of their connectedness to the society, the harder it is to get them in. As we do outreach, there's sort of widening circles in terms of peoples' centrality to the social system.

MS. STRAWN: If you could get people into a housing program, that's such a basic need and it gives you a captive audience, then you can bring services in to them where they live.

MR. BATCHELOR: I would like to say, with part of me as the academic social

psychologist as well as public policy advocate for people with HIV, the issue, the social issue which covers IV drug users, gay men, women, on and on, care providers, housing, drug use, and it's been shown through research studies to make a significant difference in peoples' lives and peoples' health is the issue of social support. It's also an issue where the federal government, our 10 million points of light can make a difference as well. This man here is from the Boston Living Center which provides social support and other activities for people with HIV. Social support has been a major difference in getting gay men to change their sexual behavior.

DR. ROBERTS: Could you say more about what you mean by social support in that context because I don't think everybody understands your reference.

MR. BATCHELOR: Social support is either the reality or the perception that other people believe what you believe. That is perceived social support. If I want to go to bed with you and you are my friend and you were my

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

friend and we've talked about it or I think that you believe in safe sex, that's what you do, that is just what you do. So that when you and I negotiate going to bed, we don't negotiate safe sex. It is perceived, there is the theory that people talk about sex when they go to bed, but my friends here say, well, this is what you do, then that's what we will do, he and I. If he doesn't want to do it, I'm much more likely to say, well, I'm sorry, I don't want to have a sexual relationship with you because my friends say this is what we shall do.

In the same way, people who are on the street shooting drugs, whether homeless or have homes or if they work at IBM or they are on the street, if other people in their system, their social support system, their network, whether it's close friends or just acquaintances, if they say you clean your needle or you have a clean one, if that's what they say and that's what the belief system is, then that's what people tend to do. That is something that the Feds can support directly and/or indirectly by promoting systems to get people together.

A recent study from Connecticut showed that gay men who feit part of the gay community and, therefore, had a source of social support were much more likely to do safe sex, which is difficult for the folks like Senator Helms who don't want to recognize the gay community as a community.

б

for IV drug users that allow them to get together and relate to one another and don't say you're a bad person but say respect yourself, respect others, can support that kind of social support network. And it's also the best way to get over the psychological crisis of HIV positivity. It's not psychotherapy. It's not drugs. It's generally short-term social support groups so that people get over their fear of being alone, find out other people are in the same situation, learn to cope as others cope, and then go on to live their life and develop other social networks that are supportive of positive change and positive living.

MR. KESSLER: I just want to stay back where we were for a brief moment in terms of

the \$10 million, and I want to remind us to be careful that when we talk about, it's been interesting to hear people say IV drug abuse.

What we need to say is drug abuse because AIDS is

not just transmitted through IV needles.

In fact, the reason I inserted crack and ice and cocaine is that they have other factors associated with them in terms of economics, prostitution, dealing, running, addiction to the drug itself, which tends to encourage more sexuality, sometimes sexuality, or usually sexuality that is unsafe, sexual practices that are unsafe, and so on.

And so when we, when Bennett or Bush talk about drugs, they often talk about the needles. And I'm also advocating at the same time for clean needle exchange programs and changing the laws that prohibit the sale of clean needles, but we need to remember that people who do drugs are also sexually active. And the new drug in the gay community that everyone is using now is Ecstacy, which is also leading to a lots of unsafe sexual behavior. And the biggest drug that's influencing more sexual misbehavior than

a

anything is alcohol, and that has to be 1 confronted. Not only in every community, but when you, I would do the same thing with 10 million but I would phrase it slightly differently, and that is put it into a variety of treatment options that are marketed and positioned for the various types of communities

that need treatment.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. ROBERTS: Could I push you another step, Larry, because before when someone made a sardonic comment about "just say no", do we know, do you think there's anything about the prevention of drug addiction as opposed to the treatment of drug addiction? And what is it, I mean prevention other than shooting down the planes over the Caribbean. And what leads you to think that it's more important to treat the people who are already addicted than to, again I'm not taking a position, I'm just acking you a question, about why not go further down and say, gee, I would spend it on preventing people from being addicted.

MR. KESSLER: I believe if you put all your money into the future cases, in terms of prevention, you're going to write off all the present users because they are going to die of AIDS. They are going to get AIDS. The rate of infection among users of various drugs is going up significantly. So we need to do both.

But if I had a limited pool of money, I guess I would go after those people who are currently users and try to get them into treatment. Then at some point down the pike when they are fully in recovery, talk about testing for HIV.

MS. DOMB: Are you talking about drug use prevention?

DR. ROBERTS: Drug use prevention.

MS. DIAZ: I wanted to add something to Walter's comment about creating the social climate among the people that are users, particularly so that something becomes acceptable. I've been very fascinated with one particular educational intervention, largely funded by the CDC, and that is street outreach. There are so many programs across the nation that I visit and are doing street outreach in different ways.

I understand that recently there was a small meeting of people who were doing street outreach which is not the same thing as getting people into residential care. But there is a lot of merit into that type of approach because it is doing the very same type of thing Waxter is saying, at least for the users, of creating a climate of this is what you should do if you're going to use drugs.

I can tell you from some people that I've actually seen doing the work in New York,

Phildadelphia, State of Washington, that the same push to try to get support within the habit,

people that are using, is very essential because at least that kind of parallel comparison that you brought out is reaching people outside of us not having full residential treatment facilities.

MR. BATCHELOR: Those same programs are getting more people to decide to go into drug treatment. It seems to be the most effective way to get people to individually decide to go into drug treatment.

MR. McEVOY: We opened in October. We are seeing a lot of IV drug users coming in.

What's really quite interesting is most of these people really want to separate and get out of the drug culture. They are having a very difficult time. We have got a support group. In fact, after they come in after their urine tests and say we've been clean for a week and are able to give them that support, it's something they shoot for.

DR. ROBERTS: You mean different from the other shoot.

MR. McEVOY: In fact, you can see the evidence of having that support and the fact that these people now, although they are at best intentions, they in fact want to move out of the drug culture. In fact, some of them are in drug treatment programs but they still need that support which isn't there and they are flailing. And in fact with the social support that they are now getting in such an establishment, you can see that it's direly needed in the fact that it encourages them to get going.

DR. AMARO: You said what do we know about prevention. There is a lot in the scientific literature on prevention of drug

б

abuse. So this is not something we don't know anything about. But, guess what, the answers aren't simple, and they are expensive, and we don't like to hear that.

The same thing for drug treatment. I really think that sometimes, we've been framing here do we do this or do we do that. Do we do prevention or intervention, housing or drug treatment. I really think we need to start acknowledging the complexity of the solutions that are involved here because we keep going for the economically feasible within the current framework and we end up getting in trouble.

An example of that is the turn to our methadone treatment because people think it's going to take care of it, it's going to bring people into contact on a daily basis with providers. I think it's a real mistake because we know that people who are on methadone are using other drugs for the most part. We know it does not create the kind of changes in the social network and the skills that an individual needs to rehabilitate and to really become an active and valued member of this society. But we keep

going for the cheap answer. And I think we really need to stop falling into the pit of framing questions, treatment or housing, prevention or intervention.

The fact is that you have a continuum of services that are needed. If you don't do intervention, not only are those people going to die, like Larry said, but chances are that they in the process will infect other people. So this is not a self-contained set of individuals.

So you are going to be doing yourself in by trying to have such a myoptic view of the issue that you end up really not addressing it.

MR. WHITE: I would like to echo the comments made by Larry and by Walter. One is I wish we would stop saying IV drug users and say substance abusers or drug users. In Phildadelphia the drug of choice is crack. We are losing a whole generation of black females because they are having 10 to 20 sex partners a day for three to five dellars a sex partner. So you can imagine what would happen if one person who happened to be administrating or happened to be doing some other things, infected ten people

COPLEY COURT REPORTING

in one day. And that could possibly happen.

Also, one of the things we are doing is a lot of street outreach. We think that we are successful when we go into a crack house or shooting gallery, and the house lady has a bottle of bleach there. Our outreach workers believe they accomplished something because you don't use if you don't clean your works. So there is some benefit in the social aspects of this prospect of trying to educate and get people involved.

We have noticed that with our peer counseling with high school kids, they are beginning to use condoms. And we're seeing something other than just the prevention of AIDS. We're seeing a decline in the pregnancy among teenagers because of that.

The social grouping of people who we have identified as being people who probably will be high risk, the earlier we can get to them, the better.

DR. FORSTEIN: I would like to comment on what I hear is a problem in the way we think about choice. You say what would you do with \$10 million. You know, if there were a

fireball that were coming from a galaxy headed towards earth that we needed to fight off, we wouldn't argue about should we build another bridge or should we put \$10 million towards the fireball. It would be a clear sense that either we destroy the fireball or we all die regardless of how we decide to spend the \$10 million.

There is a sense of the Hoover Dam is cracking. There is one hole and we're putting our finger in it, but the cracks are becoming so great that the \$10 million is not acceptable.

And when you start to think about taking \$10 million for a problem in this country like substance abuse and poverty, we feed into the hopelessness that people really feel that there is nothing you can do. If the question weren't what would you do with \$10 million but rather if we think about what we need to do, how much money would it take and how do we fund that over the next decade.

We need a national army corps of health educators, of drug prevention people. We need a national corps of people, enough people to really get into the communities. We need to look, and

1 this is what is being said, it's very expensive.

2 But if we think about the cost per case, you

3 think about how many cases, what would a

4 treatment be for someone with substance abuse,

5 what would a treatment be for women with

6 children, a gay men with X. Then you begin to

7 see what the tradeoffs are going to be in our

8 | society, I really believe what paralyzes us is

9 it's astronomically high, and someone high up

10 knows that. Let's pick out something that for

11 | tomorrow is going to feet like we're doing

12 | something, even though we know that the rest of

13 the dam is cracking around us.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And how we as people talk about that dichotomy between what we can do for the moment and what we really need to do long term for the dam that's cracking, how to put up a grid in front of the whole dam to keep it in place long enough to rebuild it is, I think, a very serious dilemma.

DR. ROBERTS: Since metaphors, obviously, are very important in this, do you think that the fireball aimed at earth or the cracking dam is the right metaphor? I just raise

COPLEY COURT REPORTING

that question because one of the things that I perceive, we talked yesterday about the changes in the epidemic. One of the things that I perceive is that average heterosexual white American no longer perceives themselves as living below the dam; and that this has an impact on the politics of the funding that you're raising. I

wonder if you could talk more about that.

DR. FORSTEIN: I think you're absolutely right. I think it's the same issue with poverty and homelessness, that for most people it's not a fireball. The problem is we can't rely on most people's perception of the world to tell us what to do. We have to have some leadership that says even though you personally are not likely to get HIV infected, the capacity for this society to continue to provide for you the standard of living that you want is going, you are an extinguishable species because the rest of it is going to come crashing down around you, and you are going to be the aftershock. How we get people to perceive the connectedness to each other is really the problem.

1

2

3

Ą

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DR. ROBERTS: Let's just push this 1 a second because the classic response is, first 2 3 of all, in a democracy what most people believe does wind up mattering, either before or after 4 leadership, depending how the democracy is. 5 6 The second issue I want to push you on is 7 there is one thing to argue for leadership on the grounds that if we don't deal with the dam you 8 9 will be hurt by the aftershock. And there's 10 another thing to argue for leadership on the grounds that it's a moral obligation as members 11 12 of the common community. 13 I mean, the first is a sort of selfish 14 appeal and the second is a community solidarity-15 based appeal. I just wonder, it's still not 16 clear to me which line or both. 17 DR. FORSTEIN: I think they are 18 inseparable. 19 MR. LEVI: And it's already 20 happening. It depends where you live, it's 21 already happening. 22 DR. ROBERTS: What's the it? 23 MR. LEVI: The system collapsing 24 around them. My aunt just died. She needed to

go to a hospital in a hurry. She had to wait eleven hours to get a bed in a hospital, white, elderly, middle class woman, absolutely no connection with AIDS.

DR. ROBERTS: She lived in New York?

MR. LEVI: New York. The connection with AIDS was that one of the reasons that hospital, one of, granted not the only, one of the reasons that hospital couldn't find a bed for her was because they were overwhelmed with some of the burden associated with AIDS.

Now, the problem is that there is no leadership in this country from the White House or wherever making those connections that these are indeed, that the impact, yes, you may think you'll never get HIV but the systemic issues associated with HIV are going to directly affect your life when you least want them to affect your life.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: But you're also looking at the backlash of anger. Be careful there because what you're looking at, this is affecting my life and we're going to push you

COPLEY COURT REPORTING

away. You are a throwaway person. You're acting like people are going to respond lovingly to that.

MR. LEVI: Ministers of our society are supposed to teach people to be loving.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I know my profession would enter this.

MS. ST. CYR: Our sense of complacency is going to end up where Scott is talking about right now because there is a general sense of more homelessness around AIDS at this point. What it will end up is we will have that backlash regardless. But on these issues, we are looking at survival factors all morning, dealing with different populations at different stages of their lives. The fact of the matter is whether we want to be blunt or not about it. If wish to be blunt.

We have not been morally responsible to the population in terms of these factors of survival, along the whole list that Larry brought forth. It is sobering as we talk about psychosocial factors that we still don't even hear --

MS. AFFOUMADO: But we all think, clearly what's happened, there's so many myths that have abounded in the epidemic. One myth which comes to mind right away when we talk about abuses and substance abuse is that people who have abusive behavior with chemical dependency are not treatment compliant patients; they don't care.

And we have found in New York City, for example, in many of the programs which have really been designed and put together to really look at the needs of these populations, that they have been better in terms of compliance than some gay, middle class white men. There is a study at Montefer that is a very good study to look at.

I think we also have to look at disspelling a lot of the myths about population in quite that we didn't want to take care of.

I think in terms of money and the economy. If we, to use our capitalistic side which I really am not comfortable with, but I can sort of pull it out of my head a little bit at this point, if we looked at this as a business, we would have to invest a large sum of money in

our business so that at the end we would be able to have a benefit. And we don't think of it in those terms. What I hear around this table is there is a whole idea of incremental planning and reactive planning and crisis intervention. And what I said yesterday about the value that we don't place on prevention and sustaining the good qualities of life, whatever those are in our ethical and moral fiber, and so we don't invest in those things. Somehow we are afraid to put a dollar value on these very gray mythical kinds of concepts.

We have double agendas in this country, for example. All men are created equal.

Bullshit. We all know that that's just words.

All men are not created equal in this country.

This is not a democracy in the sense of that kind of equality.

So we really have to look at what we're talking about and what our value system is and where it takes us in terms of understanding what the needs are and how many of the myths have got to be disspelled before we really can go on and really look at what has to be done; and that

these things are really complete systems, not just hit and miss quick fixes. We can't just give people AZT when they are still doing drugs.

That is unethical in my point of view. We don't know what we're doing to them, so we have to talk about treatment.

I could go on, but I don't want to. But I think the message is that we have to rebuild.

I want to play devil's advocate for a minute because obviously the practical problem is is the great the enemy of the good. It's one thing to say, gee, we need complete systems, it's very complicated, we need housing, we need drug treatment, we need this population and that population, and the democracy isn't perfect, and if we had leadership from the White Mouse. But given what Scott said and what Marie said, a cynic would say the politics are such that you are likely not to get all the money you would like to have for your ideal system. And the question I guess I'm trying to ask you is how do you respond to that?

MS. AFFOUMADO: I think maybe what

we have to do is play the game. Maybe the game is that we start talking the business entity kind of idea. If that's what comfortable in terms of the people that are holding this money and making decisions about how it gets spent, and I'm not comfortable with that, but maybe we have to look at it.

DR. ROBERTS: I don't understand what you mean.

MS. AFFOUMADO: Maybe Jeff's example of his grandmother, I've heard this story a million times already about emergency rooms and people not getting care.

DR. ROBERTS: There aren't enough votes in the Congress out of New York City.

MS. AFFOUMADO: I know what you're saying, that maybe that comes out of the backlash.

MR. LEVI: But you're turning the question around in a way. It's a way of putting it. Since you're not going to get everything except whatever it is that we're going to give you. Particularly, in the business of meeting to the National Commission on AIDS, which we are, I

б

think it's important to point out that if we don't start looking at it systematically, if we say we can only deal with the homeless system and not the rest, you're guaranteeing failure because the entire problem of AIDS or drug abuse or whatever it may be will not be solved by addressing one piece of the puzzle.

If you don't take a systematic approach and if this Commission doesn't advise the nation to take a systematic approach, then by putting all that pressure on one piece of it, that will fail, and George Bush will say, hey, we gave you what you asked for and it failed.

DR. ROBERTS: Let me push Mindy's area a further step, when you say if we don't take a systemic approach. The question is what is the system? Is it the AIDS system? Is it HIV plus drug abuse, is that the systemic approach? Is it HIV plus drug abuse plus poverty and homelessness?

When you say we need a systemic approach, I just want to know how broadly you're drawing the boundary.

MR. LEVI: When this Commission is

looking at it, it has to be how HIV fits into 1 each of them: How HIV relates to homelessness, 2 how it relates to health care financing, how it 3 A relates to drug abuse. And perhaps year by year you whittle away at each of those aspects and 5 you're not going to get them all legislated or б 7 changed in one year, but you do it with a broader vision in mind. And when you do something about 8 9 HIV and homelessness, you don't say the problem is solved but this is all we can do, but you say 10 11 this is the first of many steps that we are going 12 to take.

MS. DOME: I was going to say that it's not only how does HIV fit into each of those, but it also is historically, since the epidemic was first recognized, AIDS has kind of illustrated the failures in the whole system. So you can go beyond that.

It's the conflict that I think we all face when we're involved with AIDS or HIV is which one do we take on. You put it beautifully,

Marshall. We all know that AIDS is sort of the epitome for every failure that we've turned away from in the past two or three decades, but at the

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with the systematic crisis that allows for an HIV epidemic to get out of control, to some degree, and then at the same time how do you deal with the system? I think we have to do both.

I think that Jeff's point is well taken, that you kind of have to sit back and say swallow your gut, and say I can't take on the whole thing and I've got to get a shelter because they have no other place to go. And being on the street that night is going to be worse than not being with a roof over their heads. But at the same time they are not the only ones entitled to a shelter. There are people who are dying from frostbite who aren't HTV infected.

So we build coalitions. And one of the coalitions was for the disability act, where many people of different communities join together to get a disability rights law on the books, people who are involved with other kinds of physical disabilities, so we extend our reach systematically.

MR. KESSLER: One of the words that was used, it's almost becoming a buzz word

because it comes up at every Commission hearing, and that's the whole issue of leadership. But I want to add to that buzz word the whole concept of advocacy.

B,

б

What part of the problem is, when we talk about increasing the pie or enlarging the funds that will deal with all these social issues, legislators, governors, mayors say you've got to go back to educate my constituents. You've got to educate the population of Massachusetts, the City of Boston, so that they will support this tax increase that you're advocating. I think that's ass backwards. I mean, they are elected to help educate the public about the needs, the social needs, the health needs, whatever.

It's not my -- I can't do both, run an agency, and the people who work for me can't also care for people, and at the same time be at the State House eight hours a day, educating them but then having them come back and say you have to throw a protest up here to make it look like we're really screwing you so that we can get the angst level up if the Globe covers it. And all of that is such a twist on how we build a climate

of compassion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. DOMB: I don't want to seem like I'm disagreeing with a Commission member, necessarily, particularly since we're from the same state, but I'm not so sure if that's ass backwards. The health education programs that are in many countries, it's proven that when they come from the top down they don't work, and when they come from the bottom up, they do work. from the bottom up, I think it's sort of sad that we look at people from the bottom, but as an AIDS educator pretty much out in the boonies. I have to educate people in politics otherwise I'm not doing my job. I have to educate people on the history of the epidemic so they will understand the context of AIDS, that we're not really learning about how HIV relates to the T-cell. We're learning about how long it took the government to fund anything.

I think that does become an AIDS educato's job to do that. It's just as much as to be forced upon touching on homophobia in discussion groups, and other issues that aren't technically AIDS related, but in the context that AIDS

CHERSHI

1 happens.

MR. KESSLER: What I'm trying to say is they want us to educate about AIDS, but they also want us to educate about why taxes should be raised. So we're now doing two things. We're educating people about taxes and educating them about human suffering.

DR. ROBERTS: But let me again push you from the devil's advocate point of view. If people who believe, presumably if we had Governor Dukakis in the room, he would say to you if people who believe strongly about the desirability of expanded services don't go out and make the case for expanded taxes, I can't get it through the legislature, and I've lost, George Keverian and I have now lost this four times. And if George Bush is successful with no new taxes, read my lips, then that has an impact on the amount. Why is it not the responsibility of the advocacy community to urge tax increases?

MR. KESSLER: I think it's a dual responsibility. When we talk about readership, when George Bush did his August talk on drugs, he didn't do what Rona advocated, and that is use

some flow charts that showed the connection 1 2 between this war on drugs, the eighth annual war 3 on drugs, and the connection between that and AIDS and the investment in the future. He talks 4 about investment in our children because that's a 5 6 neat phrase, but the investment really is much 7 broader than whether the five-year olds --DR. ROBERTS: The question isn't . 8 9 he's not doing his job --10 MR. KESSLER: It's a loadership 11 issue. Helping people see the connections. 12 DR. ROBERTS: But what's your part 13 of the job? MR. KESSLER: Our part is to 14 15 deliver some of the services, if we were 16 adequately funded, and to help build the climate from the bottom up. It has to be built from both 17 18 directions so that there is a climate of 19 compassion, that there are adequate services, 20 that the social fabric and the safety net meet. 21 DR. ROBERTS: So you don't disagree 22 with Minday saying that people in the delivery arena do have a responsibility to advocate for 23

expanded funding and for higher taxes?

Ą.

ნ

MR. KESSLER: No. But I don't want that to become the full-time job of my agency or the Dimmock Health Center or any other place that has another mission. We are, in the last two years we have been called in so many times and told the only way we can get this amount of money is if you guys go out and raise some hell, if you hit the streets or do a sit-in or do something else. And yet that now is beginning to fail now, too, because there's a certain skepticism about those activities.

MR. LEVI: There is also a fundamental conflict that you're imposing on groups like Larry's which get state and federal money. And at the same time those same state and federal officials are saying go lobby and go advocate, and if they do too much lobbying and advocating they'll lose their 5013(C) status and eligibility for federal funds.

Clearly there is a responsibility for that kind of advocacy, and I assume you know how much advocacy has come out of the AIDS and gay communities around these issues both out of the local and national level. But that is not solely

the responsibility. I mean, it is as much the responsibility of academics at Harvard University who see what's going on and probably have more access than the rest of us do to decision-makers to sit down with investors and congressman and say this is screwed up and you should be doing it and it doesn't matter whether it's the bottom percent of the population or the top, you need to be doing it because I sitting in my ivory tower see the systemic issues.

DR. ROBERTS: Let's just be clear.

I am playing devil's advocate, Jeff, and taking that position seriously --

MR. GOLDMAN: I would like to ask

Jeff or anybody else, are you suggesting that the

Commission would deal with the whole systemic

problem, is there an implication or suggestion

that the topic that this meeting is called for

here today, namely HIV testing, is too segmented

and too small a portion for the Commission to

deal with as a matter of your recommendation, to

deal with at all without having, outside of the

context of those larger issues, which might be a

more significant job to deal with?

MS. DOMB: Can you repeat that?

services.

MR. GOLDMAN: Is it appropriate to deal with such a small segment of the whole global issues that clearly are so important to deal with in terms of HIV testing? And is it something that perhaps the Commission ought to defer dealing with until it first deals with all of those other issues? And it may be the answer to the question that what recommendations ought the Commission come out with in terms of HIV testing, or the Commission ought not deal with the issue of HIV testing until it first deals with the issue of poverty and jobs and social

And is it too fragmented an issue outside of that whole larger --

MR. BATCHELOR: You're trying to make AIDS the cure, and AIDS is the disease.

AIDS may point out some of these problems but also points out a lot of the strength in the system, and in human nature and democratic process and on and on. And yet, community health centers and agencies dealing with strange diseases and unusual diseases have always had to

advocate and do sit-ins. 1 MR. GOLDMAN: But HIV testing, not AIDS --3 MR. BATCHELOR: Genetic testing 4 5 before AIDS testing was bringing up very similar 6 problems. Problems have always been there. AIDS 7 has pointed some of them out. But if we wait to 8 cure all of the other problems before we deal with addressing some idea of cure or whatever, 9 10 prevention of AIDS, then this is the President's 11 Commission on the World's problems. This is the 12 President's Commission on AIDS, and you can focus 13 14 DR. HINMAN: The National 15 Commission, not the President's Commission. 16 MR. BATCHELOR: But to address the 17 issue of AIDS and what we can do about solving it is something this Commission can do because we 18 19 have been talking problems for many hours. 20 think we need to talk about some solutions. 21 DR. ROBERTS: Marshall and then 22 Larry and then we break for lunch. When we come

back we are going to take Walter's injunction

seriously about talking about positive

23

recommendations.

1

3

4

5

б

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. FORSTEIN: I would like to suggest that they are not necessarily mutually exclusive to do both at the same time. In fact, if the Commission can serve no more purpose than to get people in leadership positions to see the complexity of the problems and to then figure out a strategic way to begin to approach some of those problems that are doable in the short term but which don't by doing in the short term undermine the long term, if we can get the Commission in a sense to take HIV testing as a paradramatic problem that can be both addressed in and of itself but also points out the connectedness with other social issues which have to be addressed in order for HIV testing to have any benefit in the whole spectrum of discase. The Commission can teach people how to think as much as they can teach people how to do.

That is a major problem that I see is the way in which we dichotomize and simplify as opposed to expand and connect. We only have so much money in one particular area to start with and we need to argue where to do that. But if

you're taking \$10 million, if that's all you've got, and you're putting it X but you realize if you put it in X this way, it doesn't five years from now undermine, but if you put it in Y it may help, that's a very different way of thinking about the short-term connectedness to the long term.

MR. KESSLER: I think Marshall said most of what I was going to say, and that is the people around this table have seen the interconnectedness element in this meeting, and we've just been able to articulate it better. I think that's kind of helpful to keep finding the new words to describe our frustration as well as our vision.

But in terms of Walter's remarks, too, I think one of the things we could easily do, almost, is simply take the report and insert AIDS because it's the same sort of conditions are still there except that the new problem that's ripping the society apart, an additional problem to racism, poverty, is AIDS. But there, too, the intersection is real clear.

So we haven't learned much from the mid

1 and late Sixties about how communities fall apart and respond and react, and now we have this other thing, this new drop of oil on this scalding 3 caldron here, and it's AIDS. And the other big 4 5 drop is addiction. And the two of them, you 6 know, are intersecting, and the metaphor on the 7 dam or the earthquake metaphor is the gridlock metaphor that I often use, and that is that these 9 two epidemics are leading the gridlock. What 10 happens when you have gridlock is it doesn't 11 matter whether you have a driver's license or 12 not; you can't move. We are approaching the 13 point where you can't move. We don't have many options but to sit 14 15 there and become frustrated, more hopeless, 16 despondent and more hopeless, and the car is

running out of gas.

DR. ROBERTS: All right. We will reconvene in exactly one hour. There is not much time for the aftersoon session so let's try to actually make it an hour, if we could.

(Recessed for lunch at

12:30 p.m.)

24

17

18

19

20

21

22

AFTERNOON SESSION

(Resumed at 1:35 p.m.)

DR. ROBERTS: Walter isn't here. I was going to let him lead off since he told us that we ought to begin with the question of solutions as opposed to problems. But I wondered if any of you would like to lead us off and say from your perspective what the real priorities are about the directions in which the Commission ought to go. Important points of industries and emphasis in terms of psychosocial services, places where you think the system is really failing.

MS. STRAWN: One of the things that we talked a lot about was access to services and pointed up the problems with that. But one of the things we didn't talk about, and T'd be interested in Marshall's response, but anyway, I'm not sure the mental health folks are ready to deal with AIDS. In fact, the psychiatric/psychological profession has been really reluctant to embrace AIDS, more reluctant than the medical profession.

DR. ROBERTS: Even more reluctant.

MS. STRAWN: So there's beefing up services, but then important training needs that we did mention this morning, particularly for mental health folks.

MR. GOLDMAN: I want to ask a question along those lines. There has always been an almost, in a lot of different arenas, conflicts in terms of allocation of resources between outreach on one hand, provision of access to services on the other hand, and then what I would call training problems on the other hand.

In other words, what's the point of doing outreach if there isn't access to facilities, and what's the point of access to facilities, if there aren't people to do it. Therefore, logically speaking, what you ought to spend your first dollars on is training people so there's access when you do your outreach. And one could argue that's the way to do it.

I think what ends up happening is that there is a balance between those and that at various points along the line and at various times and perhaps in various localities there are

different kinds of bottlenecks that at one point in time the bottleneck might be the lack of facilities. And at another point there are plenty of facilities but no professionals there to operate the facilities, and at other times there may be plenty of facilities but you need outreach programs to bring more people into it.

One question that I would have is are Shring there any generalizations that one can make, Output should each locality make its own determination with respect to how to balance between those? Is there something that ought to be done at a national level to deal with that? Or is it more simply a local issue, or is there one place along that continuum that the Commission wants to make recommendations on for both?

MS. DIAZ: I'm sorry Joe isn't here because I thought that was the very essence of the HRSA AIDS service demonstration projects,

Don. All the work is not in on the first set of projects, which were four, as he described yesterday, but with 25 additional pilots around the country we ought to have a pretty good idea within the next year of that triad of facilities

and resources and personnel and needs of the

population to get them to those services.

So I really think that a lot is resting on that particular issue.

DR. ROBERTS: What I heard Don saying was where do we perceive the real limits are in terms of providing additional services, and are those limits the same in different parts of the country or different in different parts of the country.

MS. DIAZ: That's what those demonstration projects are, the four initial ones. The report is almost in. We're talking Miami, New York, Los Angeles and San Francisco. That is just about in. The HRSA Advisory, AIDS Advisory Committee is going to be reviewing this because that material is coming in from those first four.

But in addition to that, there's 25 pilot areas studying the very thing, providing the answer to his question.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Are you sure HRSA has an evaluation mechanism?

MS. DIAZ: To those, yes.

1 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Have you seen it?

MS. DIAZ: Yes, for a couple of

3 areas. And I understand that that's how they

4 | funded the others with an evaluation component.

But a heavy common thread to all of those is an

6 establishment of a community-based case

management system that looks after not letting

8 people fall between the cracks.

DR. ROBERTS: Other views and following Walter's proposed program about what it is we need to do? We could end this meeting early and let the Commission meet, and we could all go fight the ice and snow.

MR. LEVI: Well, we really haven't grappled with the care financing part of this.

Even if we come up with a model, we still have to figure out a way to pay for it. I think one of the issues that the Commission certainly has to face, and it comes back to the whole question as to whether we create something around HIV or we deal with some of the systemic issues, is do we resolve those access to this perfect system that we have now created through traditional financing mechanisms or something that is unique to HIV?

And my bias would be that if we are trying to create the precedent of a commitment to providing for this range of services and treatment and whatever it may be for anyone with a serious illness like HIV, then we need to be trying, even putting aside the issue of whether you have an AIDS specific or HIV specific site, you try to integrate at least the financing into the existing system.

A.

I'm going to get myself in a lot of trouble saying this on the record, but I'm going to say it anyway, an example of how we've done it wrong and how we could do it right, that came up earlier. When the funding for AZT is, and I plead guilty because I supported it and it was right to do it and it's right to continue it, but had we to do it all over again, I think I would do it differently if we could. The special program for AZT and related drugs now is not logical. The logical thing to have done is to create some sort of system within the Mcdicaid program so people would, so that it is truly integrated into the system that we have in this

country for dealing with poverty issues

associated with medical care. And that's what I

think.

I know people in Congress are looking at it, and I hope this Commission will look at it as well, is the notion of creating special access, creating access to HIV-related care through the Medicaid system.

about the financing. Do you feel that the proportion of financing in regards to testing and early intervention, if that is the correct proportion? We could ask for more money, but we can also say this is a correct way to spend what we've got. I want to know your opinion.

MR. DALTON: There is a separate working group here that is dealing with bigger health care financing. I think what Scott is trying to do is to figure out how we can feed into the kinds of concerns we've been talking about for the last couple of days. If there are distortions in the proportions in the way mency is being spent from the perspective of the people in this room, that's certainly something we've

got to do. But this is not the place to take --1 2 MR. LEVI: But the beauty of putting care in Medicaid, that doesn't come out 3 of the 1.6 billion dollars. 4 5 MS. GELFAND: It just seems to me 6 that the bulk of the money is going into testing 7 and it's not linked to the concept of early 8 intervention; and that totally simplistic way, I 9 think that we have to stop testing until we can 10 guarantee everybody walking through that site 11 testing positive, who wants it, a medical 12 evaluation. We can't do that. We can't do that 13 in Los Angeles, for sure. And until we can do 14 that, I think --15 DR. ROBERTS: What do you mean by a 16 medical evaluation? 17 MS. GELFAND: Base line medical 18 evaluation including T-cells. As basic as that. 19 And a physical exam. 20 MR. BATCHELOR: A follow-up to save 21 money in the long run would be just to do T-celi 22 testing. 23 MS. GELFAND: It really scares me

when I hear yesterday this America Responds To

AIDS is get tested. I'm willing to close the doors of a test site unless they're going to give us more funds because it's not fair. It's not fair.

DR. ROBERTS: What's unethical,

Rona?

a

MS. AFFOUMADO: I think again to go back to some of the comments that I've made and other people have made, we can't do treatment specific. We can't do service specific. We are looking at continuums, looking at coordinated services to tell somebody that they are HIV positive and, yes, they have 200 T-cells and send them away is worse than being done to begin with.

I think, again, to go one step further and say you're HIV positive, you have 200 T-cells and we're going to do a physical exam on you and then send them away again is still inappropriate. I think we've got to get through the notion of this longer-term comprehensive care model that includes medical, psychosocial, concrete social services and all of that. And, again, to get back -- which is a big problem, but we have to,

if we keep talking about little pieces of this pie, then that's what we're going to keep going after. And if we keep saying, well, it's this as opposed to this, then that's what we're going to keep going after.

B

1.5

All of us who are working in this and all of us who are trying to learn and understand this have to keep saying comprehensive, total packages. I know it's almost Pollyanna because of the funding issues, but if we don't, then what we're going to do is what we've done in the past. We all have to take responsibility for what we have done in the past because we have in some ways, all of us who have worked in these kinds of issues before, have created the kind of system we have now.

MS. GELFAND: But in the meantime, this has already started.

MS. AFFOUMADO: I think it's our job to say stop. Before you do this --

DR. ROBERTS: Do you agree with

Jackie? You ought to close the doors of the test

sites until you have comprehensive medical and

social services for everybody that tests

1 | positive?

MS. DOMB: No. That's what we had in western Massachusetts. The only people doing AIDS work were federally funded ATS counselors, who then got involved in trying to create services. It was sort of a bandaid approach, but it at least got things moving.

MR. BATCHELOR: There certainly are an awful lot of people who don't have health insurance or don't have eligibility for Medicare or Medicaid or for various reasons cannot find care, but yet this is not the worst system in the whole world we have in the United States. The vast majority of people do have health insurance. People do have access to a network of community health services. Community health centers don't generally provide services for HIV because their focus is on chronic and mentally ill. But the vast majority of people can get care. That doesn't diminish the needs of people who can't.

DR. ROBERTS: The vast majority of people can get care. Now we have a real disagreement on the table.

MS. ST. CYR: I don't think you're talking about vast majority. What concentration of majorities are you talking about? In all seriousness, the vast majority of people in my community can't get care. It took us a year to get medical coverage as workers. We couldn't even get medical coverage from an insurance company for lack of ability to pay. And when we were able to pay, just because our names were in an AIDS resource it was difficult.

So when you're talking, you need to put it in perspective. Even when you are considering the strategies and solutions, you need to put in perspective what people, what majorities, what groups that you are talking about. And I don't think we do that very well.

MR. DALTON: At least eight or nine people came in after I did. Just so people know what we're talking about, can you go back?

DR. ROBERTS: I propose that we, as I said, that we start with the agenda Walter put to us on the question of positive suggestions of what we ought to do. And we, Jeff said that we have to deal with the issue of financing and that

thought harder about finding a way to finance AZT that was integrated with the rest of the health care financing system. And I think that is really sort of what provoked the current conversation.

The question I want to put back to Jeff, and it's one that you and I discussed briefly yesterday, and maybe you can push further, what do you think about going back to what people said this morning about the need to solve the system problems, including points that you, yourself, made, what do you think about categorical versus general funding?

MR. LEVI: Well, define your terms better in terms of categorical and general funding. Are you talking about the \$10 million?

DR. ROBERTS: No. In general, we had a brief discussion yesterday about the relevance of the ESRD model or whatever, and you mentioned again the question of whether AIDS should be distinctly funded and, therefore, whether people with some diseases should have access to services that other people in

comparable circumstances but with different diseases.

We have the situation now that if your kidney fails you are covered, and if your pancreas fails, you're not, which is arguably a little bizarre.

MR. LEVI: Unfortunately, end stage renal disease is sort of this strong arm of not the way to do things. I guess it depends on what part of the HIV problem we're talking about, as to whether I would talk about categorical or discretionary funds.

I think in the context of care financing, particularly, I would look towards categorical funds for both systemic reasons and very practical political reasons. The systemic reasons are the degree to which care financing is a problem for HIV as related to peoples' level of income, and it's a larger part of the poverty issue, and, therefore, we should solve it within a poverty structure; and that is Medicaid.

There is a second reason for doing it that way because all you need is one vote to vote it in. And if you do it through a discretionary

program, you have to refund it every single
year. And once people discover how much it's
going to cost over the long term, they may become
increasingly reluctant to fund it.

A.

б

So when you do it through the Medicaid program. I think the right will be there indefinitely unless Congress votes to remove it.

The second -- but there are parts of the HIV problem that belong as discretionary programs because they are so AIDS specific and because that is also the way the system deals with disease prevention and control efforts. Whether it's some of the testing, whether it's the prevention and education program, whether it's the model demonstration care programs, whether it's some of the support for the community health centers that are providing a lot of the care for poor people, those happen through discretionary programs. So it's going to be a mix. It's going to be a mix of discretionary and categorical programs. It's going to be a mix of HIV specific and general ones.

DR. ROBERTS: If we could, just so that we get the issue clearly on the table, the

argument over ESRD is in part an argument over whether or not you ought to be eligible for Medicaid if you have a certain medical condition --

MR. LEVI: Medicare.

DR. ROBERTS: Regardless of income tests that would ordinarily apply. So the question to you is, is that a model one should look for to HIV; that is, HIV also ought to be exempt from the income tests which ordinarily apply as ESRD is, or is it just a question of strengthening Medicare generally?

When you talk about using categorical money, it wasn't clear to me what you were saying.

MR. DALTON: Before you answer, my concern is that we have very little time with this group together. There is another working group which is going to be working for the better part of two years on these subjects. We can tell them what information we got in an hour, half an hour, on a nice Friday in Boston, but my sense is they are not going to be moved by what we have to say.

So insofar as this is connected to the 1 2 issues we have been discussing for the last two 3 days --DR. ROBERTS: Fine. Let's move on. 4 MR. WHITE: What's ESRD? 5 6 DR. ROBERTS: End stage renal 7 disease. CHAIRMAN ALLEN: My original 8 9 question was are we correctly distributing 10 funds? Should we focus on the redistribution of 11 funds? I suggest that as a Commission in light 12 of the fact that there is not sufficient early 13 intervention, either support it with more money or let's look at the way we are dealing with this 14 15 issue because here we are. We are about to walk 16 into early intervention. What do you think the 17 Commission should say? This is what this whole 18 thing is about, testing and early intervention. 19 I'm not saying that we should avoid 20 testing. There are other reasons to test. But 21 we should not advertise those as testing for early intervention if it's not there. So is this 22 23 really helping?

As Marshall said earlier, does the test

really help or does it drive people to despair?

And, actually, convolute the whole issues. I

would like to get back to that.

MR. DALTON: I don't want to narrow it to that. It seems there are any number of issues that people may have that are connected.

DR. MOVICK: I want to address that in a sense. I see the number one issue in the global sense is health care planning for each of the different communities. It's become obvious to us that we represent very different communities. All of our patients are indigent; all of them, or almost all, are involved in substance abuse. And our city as a result of having such a large indigent and substance abusing population is very poor, so it has few resources and so on. Each of us has a community that has those special features. So for me, drug abuse issues are very important.

But, anyway, what I'm saying is that I think the top priority is locality health care planning because this kind of health care, early intervention is delivered in a locality with its own special problems. And most of our cities and

most of our counties and most of our states have not opened that door. That is, I would say there may be twenty cities in the country that have opened the door.

DR. ROBERTS: So your answer to Scott in part is the priorities will vary from community to community so it's hard to make a generalization.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I have a question for HRSA at that point. Hasn't the budget been eliminated for health care planning?

DR. O'NEILL: The health care planning program, there was no request in the '91 budget.

MS. AFFOUMADO: A point of information on the health planning. Many of the HSAs across the country have been dismantled. There are very few of them that have full staff in operation. There has been no new funding for health planning activities. I would say that's in the last four or five years.

In New York state recently the AIDS

Institute gave the local clinic \$150,000 to put
together a coordinated health plan for New York

City and the greater metropolitan area, but in some ways it's a very bad attempt and a very minimal attempt at trying to do a real health plan. So it's a real issue.

MS. DOMB: I have a couple of things I would like to put on the table before the Commission. I appreciate being called. I am unfortunately going to have to leave early today.

Though it sounded like I was disagreeing with what Jackie was saying, I share her concern that by talking about early intervention and testing before we have the network in place, the most minimal way of saying is we're putting the cart before the horse, but it carries much more serious ramifications. So I would personally urge the Commission to oppose any offerts to promote early intervention or to link early intervention and testing without also giving some equal time to the need for resources into developing a health care system that can receive, and a whole network for training needs and other kinds of reimbursement needs that can accept the whole pool of people that are going to be turned

down.

б

I, also, and I'm just going to put these out and maybe they'll serve as discussion. I think the Commission should oppose any effort on the part of the Centers For Disease Control and Public Health Service to promote testing without counseling. I think that is going to do the most harm to any ATDS education effort going on anywhere in the country because it's going to promote the idea that testing is prevention when it's not. It's going to make AIDS education experts' jobs harder because it's going to circumvent any effort of counseling we put in. Where people who have maybe shared a drink with somebody are going to be flooding alternative test sites saying I thought I could get AIDS.

In response to that, Walter had said earlier that education is really the entry into the system. For many places in the country, testing is the first time they are getting education because they are getting counseling. If think we have to realize that we can be AIDS educators but counselors can also be AIDS educators on a one-on-one basis. I think

anything the Commission can do to support the morale of the counselors will be helpful.

1

2

3

A,

5

б

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I think that you should urge all physicians to do counseling before testing. I know from New York and Los Angeles, it seems like a very basic thing. Well, of course, every physician is counseling a patient. That's not true. Many doctors don't know anything about the test. We have to counsel them.

I also think in line with the issue of not supporting any program that emphasizes testing at the expense of counseling that we should lend a little hand to support Bob's group in Phildadelphia and oppose any efforts to promote quotas for blood samples and not quotas for counseling hours. I think epidimiological surveys are important to finding out the scope of the epidemic. I can give you the whole paragraph description of the program, but I think that's horrendous that we should tie or link that a counseling program's funding is going to be restricted if they don't get enough blood on the That's not the point of a counseling table. program. That's the point of the family

1 surveys. There should be a difference.

If the family surveys are for the public, that's what they are for. Counseling programs are for the individual.

MR. GOLDMAN: Are you willing to forego the funding from the sources that require the kind of epidimiological survey as the handle to justify their funding --

MS. DOMB: We talked about that earlier today. No, I think funding should be made available to both.

MR. BATCHELOR: I would like to emphasize even more what you said about the issue of training. We appear to be talking psychosocial in particular. We need more funds for training psychosocial workers, and that does not mean only psychiatrists, psychologists; that means the full range of people from street outreach, people who work with family systems, people that work in hospitals, social workers particularly working in hospitals, both with staff and with people as they leave the hospital.

There's really money from the National

Ą

1.5

Institute of Mental Health to train health officials, and APA has the grant to do that. But it's not enough. It's getting less and less and less. And, yet, the need is growing more and more and more. As we talked about more counseling needs, more testing plans, of cetera, we train a lot in our program, a lot of people have gone through the CDC test counselor training. And they acknowledge that that's not enough. You're so cruel, Al, just to call it the minimal training. But that's cruel but true. They want more. They don't have an understanding, and they recognize they don't have enough time in those fifteen minutes.

d.

б

We all know if we look at health care professional practices that fifteen minutes out of a physician's time to give counseling is not going to happen. The physician is going to say I maybe can save a life in fifteen minutes, I'm not that great a counselor, even though I'm supposed to do everything and I'm licensed to do everything, that's not what I can do.

MS. DOMB: In fifteen minutes you might get a person who has no AIDS education

1 except hearing the government's message on TV.

MR. BATCHELOR: I think the issue of training is very important. HRSA's training for health care professionals, which tends to be not the greatest training in the world because it's based on the medical model and most of the trainees are not physicians. And this is not a factual disease; this is a very psychosocial disease, even though there are factual germs and factual infections.

And let me add one short personal thing, not to apologize, but to explain some of my points of views where I seem to be Pollyanna.

I've been living with HIV for a long time, and I was focusing on my death for a long, long time.

I decided I better turn that around and decide that this glass is half full. That comes across in other things, and I tend to see the positive in things, and I hope that makes me live longer. That doesn't acknowledge the fact that half of this glass is empty, and I don't mean to offend anybody.

MS. STRAWN: The thing around counseling, besides emphasizing that testing

need to say what counseling is, and what are the qualities of people who can do this.

DR. ROBERTS: Why don't you say that?

relationship. I think the difference between what people call counseling and what they are really doing has to do with power. I think that anyone, if they shut the door and sit down and talk with a person and say they are doing Onse counseling, but I don't buy that. I think that we talk at people. I think that a lot of health care professionals talk at people and call that counseling.

In counseling, the job of the counselor is to help the person have enough information to make an informed decision for their own lives, what's good for their own life. So I would like to see more standards of counseling in force.

Working in an alternative test site, I was doing the quarterly reports. Nobody ever asked me in order to get my money what were the qualifications of the counselors and how much

and what kind of referral sources Gid they have for the folks who test positive. So there are some standards that have to be locked into some kind of enforcement or quality control.

б

MS. DOMB: And goals for different pre- and post-test counseling.

DR. ROBERTS: I just suggest when we get to the question of what is the best way to insure that minimum quality standards are met in the counseling system, that is another whole complicated question about whether or not enforcement or incentives, what's the best way to think of this as a quality management problem. I just don't want to resume that regulation is the only alternative way to meet that.

DR. FORSTEIN: Two simple points.

One is that in Massachusetts when we devised the alternative test site system we had a fairly extensive plan for counseling and supervision of counseling which ensured that since most counseling was going to be done by non-mental health trained people there still needed to be some people who had clinical expertise and

experience to help sort out the difference

between counseling and more severe problems that

could occur in that acute setting. That was cut

from the budget because it was too expensive.

I think if we talk about standards of care, there needs to be an emphasis on the kind of soft scientific stuff that goes in support of counselors monitoring, not just of what is being said, but whether the counselors are getting sufficiently trained and supervised, sorting out who is really going to have trouble and who is not. The problem with that is that needs to then go to people who have experience and who are trained to teach the supervisors.

I would suggest one of the major things the Commission could do is to be a very strong voice that every level of governmental intervention, that every task force, that every conference have some emphasis on psychosocial issues. You are fighting an uphill battle which is anti-mental health. How many mental health professionals on the Commission? How many mental health professionals are in each of the governmental agencies that are determining which

grants get funded or not? There is an intrinsic bias. The mental health people just complicate the waters, and we do. But somebody has to. And it seems to me that there is a bias from the top that mental health people confuse the issue.

I think Walter's designation is right, that they are not all psychiatrists, social workers. But it seems to me people on the street dealing with people in real crisis can't be expected to do street outreach work and not have support so that if somebody needs to be hospitalized, if somebody needs to have suicidal stuff contained, that they are not out there alone. There needs to be a continuum of care for people who are doing the front line mental health work, which is really taking place on the streets.

There can be no stronger voice than from this Commission to keep hammering away for the need for every conference, for instance. We just submitted a proposal, NIMH is now taking money which the American Psychiatric Association had as a grant to teach mental health professionals.

That has now gone from a grant to being hooked up

to medical ECTs, where training is done for medical purposes, all psychosocial training has to be done now in the context of medical conferences. So we now get in a two-day conference an hour of psychosocial training for medical training. That is what is happening to funding and resources. There is a wearing down of the funding and the RP is for purely psychosocial neuropsychiatric stuff. That could do the same thing with drug addiction, substance abuse and whole addictionology which we need to keep very much focused on here.

DR. ROBERTS: Other views because as Mindy said we're getting towards closing time. We have about 40 or 45 minutes. Things people feel strongly about that they would like the Commission to hear?

MR. KESSLER: This is a slight diversion and it's coming back to a few of the things we talked about this morning about financing, but it's the will and the way issue. We always dance around the information or the knowledge that it is going to cost a lot of money. And it's important, as leaders in our

1 community, and important to support the leaders 2 at a higher level, that to enable them to talk 3 about how much money it really is going to cost. 4 Not to nickel and dime us to death and to stop putting those little tiny bandaids on here and 5 6 there. 7 Another metaphor is we've got a Frankenstein that's covered with those little 8 9 tiny bandages, and he's lumbering around trying 10 to stay upright. But the glue is drying out on 11 those bandaids. It's getting soft and 12 wishy-washy. 13 I brought over --14 DR. ROBERTS: Larry, that is the 15 most mixed metaphor. 16 MR. KESSLER: The San Francisco 17 model and the collapse of the San Francisco model 18 is a perfect lesson in terms of the kinds of 19 dollars. They just finished their task force 20 report, and their estimate is that they need \$310 21 million for the City of San Francisco. 22 DR. ROBERTS: When you say the 23 collapse of the San Francisco model --

MR. KESSLER: In the sense that

1 it's not meeting the needs of the growing numbers, the diverse populations, the burnout of 2 staff, volunteers, other human resource 3 4 questions, and so on. And, yet, here is a city that has done, relatively speaking, a lot more 5 6 than most other cities. To take \$310 million for 7 San Francisco and butt it up against Boston which 8 has one-fifth the number of cases but 1/35 the 9 funds. And that's what New York is doing and 10 other places. They are not committing enough 11 bucks so that there they are never off of home 12 plate. They never even get to first, let alone 13 second base, because they never even plan, they 14 didn't conceptualize, they didn't cover all the 15 laundry lists in some way or another. They didn't figure out how the circles intersect with 16 17 one another and overlap.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But this is the kind of example of even when you try to do more, it isn't enough. It won't do it, either. The \$310 million for San Francisco probably is inadequate, if they ever found the money, and they are actually very close. They're only 137 million short. But that is more than most states are spending on AIDS.

DR. ROBERTS: And what's the implication, Larry?

MR. KESSLER: The magnitude. We really aren't addressing the magnitude here in terms of actual dollars. Yet, we don't seem to have a problem talking about the magnitude of the defense dollars. If there is a new weapon system, we throw around those numbers like they were nothing. But when it comes to saving peoples' lives or leading to prevention, or creating a defense model around AIDS, we can't afford that, there's no way. And we've heard it on the trail. The Commission has heard from county commissioners, from mayors, from city council people, we can't talk in those numbers.

DR. ROBERTS: Are you suggesting that --

MR. KESSLER: We have got to also stir that caldron and put some fires under peoples' butts to get on with finding the dollars, or at least understanding that bandaids aren't working because the tendency always is, and we fed it, as Jeff said, we all made those mistakes for settling for less because even in

our own minds we always thought this would go
away by 1985 or surely will go away by 1990 and
those bandaids would have paid off, but it hasn't

А

б

and they haven't.

And we have to sort of deal with that in a kind of -- we need our own level of conversion here to say let's convert the money tables, too, and really talk about those big bucks. That's very difficult because that means more doors get slammed in our face even faster. But it's part of the planning and part of the consciousness raising that isn't taking place. It's the other side of the compassion, the cash side of it is fairly high. Very, very high.

MR. BATCHELOR: And the human, from the health care worker's side of it, so many of us, honest to God, well, this has got to be over soon; surely they'll find something. We make tremendous progress medically on AIDS, and, yet, we don't have these great cures or preventions yet. And people are just getting so overwhelmed, I'm sure the Commissioners have heard that all over the country, too, but those of us who thought surely this would be done by now are on

the down side. People get burned out. That's a great number of people to draw from, but we die.

You can't count on these AIDS victims to stand up when you need them.

It puts a tremendous pressure on the system of volunteers and workers, people who are working at rotten wages and stuff like that, to provide necessary mandatory services.

DR. ROBERTS: I hear one of the things you're saying is to some extent it's been the people with the calling who have, to some extent, buffered the federal government from the consequences of its own underfunding?

MR. DALTON: Subsidized it.

MR. BATCHELOR: Those thousand points of light.

MS. DIAZ: That was one of my concerns in bringing up, Joe, you were out, the demonstration projects because really the real cry around this country, not only of the four that are just about to come in with the results, but of the new ones that are funded, is what happens after the demonstration? Where are the bucks that will support the systems that these

Ą,

people identify in terms of gaps and resources
and the balance of professionals that we need?

And the answers aren't there. And some of us are
getting pressure not only locally, but in the
horizon when we say what is the real commitment
of the Public Health Service of this country for

7 service delivery around AIDS. It's just not

8 there.

MS. AFFOUMADO: I think it's amazing that we're still talking about it.

MR. McEVOY: I had a real fundamental question, using the word early intervention, we do it because maybe we can extend life. We also hear the fact that there are some very interesting things we are shooting for which in fact five or six years down the road that people actually have a chance to live through this crisis. The question of where is our obligation to keep quiet and not allow people to take an interest and maybe giving them the opportunity of survival. Do we keep quiet and we basically discard them? As a human being, where is my obligation to another individual to keep quiet because it's a sensitive issue because

maybe people don't want to fund it.

And we talked about the Machiavellian model, but maybe what we should do is create such an overwhelming demand that we bring the whole country to its knees. And it's the other extreme. I think for somebody who is affected by it personally, some of it, it's nice to sit here and talk about the crisis that looms, but what about the immediacy, sure I can talk about my life, but the empathy of really sceing what's happening to other people about me. Do I just close my eyes and say, well, again, the system isn't there to advise you, so I'm not going to advise you to get a test which might basically be the opportunity for survival? What obligation do we have knowing what we have today to the American people?

There are many people we talked about, whatever course of action we take, there are going to be people who are unfortunately not going to survive this, any route that we take.

What obligations do we have?

DR. ROBERTS: To those who are at risk?

1

2

3

A

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Ą

MR. McEVOY: Knowing what we have today, in many cases, carly detection, early intervention, there are things that can extend life, and why would we be wanting to extend life because there is a possibility of getting through this crisis because scientific evidence is telling us that maybe in five or six years there is hope.

Knowing what we do know, what obligation do we have to people to informing them that there is a possibility that you can survive this if you go through the various processes? Part of that is we talked about the social model, not always do you need necessarily to be tested to start doing things for yourself that will help. Good nutrition, reducing drug intake, reducing stress, without taking the test. Those things put you in a good line to extending your life.

The other thing is -- and that's part of the social model before you go through testing. The other issue is, one, you have been tested and your T-cells are in a certain range, it's proven the possibility you can extend it even more. What obligation do we have to put back in place

for people, or do we have none?

Q.

DR. O'NEILL: There is an attitude

I hear not in this room but I hear it sort of out

there and have for awhile is that when you talk

about early intervention, early intervention is

discussed, when you talk about the medical

aspects, actual just medical aspects of early

intervention, there is a sense that someone that

is HIV positive does not, is not, does not really

have a medical condition.

In other words, we think of medical conditions that we are morally compelled to treat, we tend to think, it's easier for us to think of things that are very obvious, like pneumocystis pneumonia or broken leg or something we can see. When we're talking about a medical condition that's just diagnosed on the basis of a serologic test, in some minds that's a fuzzier condition. And I think there can be a sense that because that's a fuzzier condition, we may not have the same moral obligation to treat it as if it was clearly a treatable, clearly something that was an obvious, diagnosable to the visible eye condition.

make no mistake about it, that with what we know now medically, that the condition of being seropositive for the virus, for some people, is a medically treatable condition no different than any other medical condition. And the analogy I would make, I think that we have a tendency and compensity to go around and say AIDS is like this disease, AIDS is like that disease. That clouds our thinking.

б

But if you take the example of syphilis, for example, when you talk about treating syphilis, we treat syphilis on the basis of a serologic test. And somebody comes into my office with a positive serologic test for syphilis, that is a treatable condition, whether or not they have an obvious disease.

DR. ROBERTS: Let me push you one second. Given what's happened in Arizona and Oregon in recent years where state funding for organ transplants or other treatable conditions has been withdrawn under the state Medicaid programs, is it, where do you reach the conclusion that society accepts the obligation to

1 treat every medically treatable condition?

I mean, it seems to me that was the premise in your argument, that at least some of society's behavior is inconsistent with.

position to make necessarily an argument. But I want to be clear that this is just speaking as a physician, that this is a medically treatable condition. If we as a society elect not to do that, we ought to be clear about what we're electing not to do.

DR. FORSTEIN: I think Jim raises a very fundamental question. It has to do with the difference between being able to help people learn what there is that they can do to treat themselves and get treatment for a condition that is a medical condition but for which there are other than medical treatments. And what it would mean in terms of the long-term ethics of holding out a test as the entrance to a system that then for many of the people does not follow through with what it would take to do what we would like them to do.

I think if you're talking about the

testing, I'm not opposed to continuing to offer testing when it leads to treatment and, in fact, one of the things that we do best is to help people use the test to generate treatment and all that. But I think it's also unethical to say to somebody, since you're pregnant, go get maternal infant care to increase the likelihood of your baby surviving, but there being no place for that person to go. I think the dichotomy between what we ethically have to do in one moment and what we ethically do down the road have got to be consistent in some long-term vision.

people go get tested, and then if you're positive, we'll pay for the first T-cell test to tell you that you'll be eligible for the AZT that we won't pay for, and this is not for people without insurance. I have patients that have enough insurance to cover their T-cells and doctor's visits, but only 80 percent of their AZT, none of their psychotropic medications that they need, and they can't afford treatment, even with health insurance.

Is it ethical for me to encourage a test

б

which leads to a recognition of a condition for which we have some treatments for some people? I think that rather than take a kind of yes or no view of testing, we need to always put in the context of does the test enable a person to get the kind of care that would facilitate prolonging life, both in medical and psychological way.

DR. ROBERTS: Isn't the irenic implication of that, however, that you wind up urging testing for middle class people who have insurance and who can afford care, not urging testing for non-middle class people who don't have coverage and can't afford care?

DR. FORSTEIN: That's exactly what we have done as a society, but no different from what we have done for every other medical condition. I am suggesting we have a greater ethical responsibility to put in place basic health care delivery system.

DR. ROBERTS: I was asking a slightly different question. You had said is it ethical to urge people to have tests in the absence of care. And I'm saying to you until we take care of getting a different kind of delivery

system in place, if you answer yes to the

question you asked, it's unethical to urge people

to have tests if they can't get care, doesn't

that imply that we limit testing to the middle

class who can then afford to get care?

DR. FORSTEIN: I think that's exactly what's happening. I think that's why the emphasis on testing is a misplaced emphasis. I think it should be on basic health care delivery so everyone can benefit for testing.

MR. DALTON: The problem isn't just testing. If you look at any given early intervention, there is something about allocation, AZT, clinical trials, for those who can get into them. Insofar as we have the tools, how do we make them available to everyone? But assuming that Jim's point really was a little different, it wasn't at the level of politics, it was the level of an individual, I'm sorry I can't do anything to help you, help yourself until we have X number of systems in place, are you going to say to an individual, I'm sorry, you have a full-blown AIDS diagnosis. As long as you're walking around seemingly well, we can't help

you. Or are you going to help them help themselves?

I think there is a very concrete

illustration that Rona talked about yesterday and
today. Except we're talking about people who are
somewhere in between those things, people who are
HIV positive but asymptomatic. We don't know
what to call them, ill or well.

Joe talks in terms of treatments available, but that is sort of true or not true. Maybe there is for a given person treatment like Pentamadine until their T-cell count is below 200, but Jim says there are other things you can do for them to help them deal with things, like maybe their nutrition, or having to think about dying, or not having to think about that alone. We want to in a medical kind of frame call that treatment, otherwise we don't care about it.

This gets played out in the law, of all things. People can't get Medicaid in various states unless they have an AIDS diagnosis. You can't get into certain parts of the social service system until you have an AIDS diagnosis. It was a very kind of restricted image. There

are a number of things we can do for people short of an AIDS diagnosis, some of which may help them from getting an AIDS diagnosis, even if the results are being Pollyannic.

MS. AFFOUMADO: Could I just add something to what you're saying because I think there is another piece of this. For many of the populations that we are trying to provide "early diagnosis and treatment", there are also populations that you must remember have not had access to health care. So they come to us with many other medical problems that are not HIV related, that have nothing to do with HIV.

For example, women have scrious gynecological problems that are not, that are exacerbated by HIV but have been present as a medical problem for them before they were infected with HIV. For example, chronic PID and candidiasis infections that are not HIV related.

Just to give you an anecdote to point up something very interesting that happened at Community Health Project, when we began providing medical assessments in 1985 of underinsured and uninsured gay men and gay and bisexual men of

color who also were underinsured and uninsured from New York City, for many of them it was the first time that they had a comprehensive physical exam. And we diagnosed early conditions for example, like multiple myeloma, which would probably not have shown up in these people until they were 40 or 50. And cardiac conditions, hypertension, diabetes, forget about the dental problems.

Now, a lot of this is really a symptom of not having access to health care. And I'm not minimizing what Jim is saying because I clearly believe in holistic health care and alternative ways of delivering services and self-help and all of these things that you're talking about. But, again, I want to try to bring you back to the fact that these are populations that have not had health care, and they are coming with a lot of medical problems, not just HIV.

So you may not want to treat them early for HIV, but you've got to treat them early for malnutrition and endocarditis, and hepatitis, and chronic gonorrhea that hasn't been treated, and PID in women, because your therapy, your

1 alternative therapies are not going to do a lot 2 of good for them if they don't get treatment for some of the things that have disseminated them 3 health-wise that are not HIV specific. 4 MR. DALTON: That's part of where I 5 6 was going. 7 MS. AFFOUMADO: Please forgive me for being so strong on this "medical model", but I think you have to understand that all of these 9 things fit into this package that the 10 11 psychosocial and all of these things fit into, 12 also "your body is a temple" kind of idea. 13 DR. ROBERTS: I hear you in some 14 ways saying that whatever we do about the 15 financing system, we have to do it in a way that 16 allows these multiple needs to be met. 17 MS. AFFOUMADO: Absolutely. 18 not just say early diagnosis and treatment for 19 HIV because even though AIDS clearly is the subject of this Commission, but that is only a 20 21 piece of it. It's again, this total comprehensive thing that we've been trying to 22

DR. ROBERTS: Other points?

23

24

talk about.

think a lot of this does come back to financing, but when we do keep talking about we need all these services out there, something even more basic is we need our Public Health Service to acknowledge that even if they don't have enough money to do all these things that somewhere along the line this is their responsibility. And when we have an Assistant Secretary for Health who tells the Congressional subcommittee that providing care services is not the responsibility of the Public Health Service, I think we have a Health Resources and Service Administration that does fund community health centers.

If it is not the responsibility of the Public Health Service to make sure that adequate services are in place, not necessarily financing those individual patients' care, but at least making sure that the structures and services are in place, then I don't know whose responsibility it is. And I think that certainly one thing that the Commission can try to do is remind the Public Health Service of what its original intent and

1 | charter is.

2 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Well, they'll say
3 it's the state's responsibility and the state
4 will say it's the county's responsibility.

5 MR. LEVI: I know that's what they 6 say.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: And there is no entitlement to health care in the United States of America, period.

MR. LEVI: And that's a problem.

But there is a responsibility on the part of the Public Health Service to help provide care services for those who are impoverished.

MS. BYRNES: And the legislative branch believes the executive branch has that responsibility because the legislative branch has been the one that's been piecemealing the response together that the Public Health Service implements, but it's been coming from the Hill, not from the Executive Branch. That's partly why it's so disconnected.

MR. BATCHELOR: It's a long history. I worked in Public Health Service ages ago. When they started dismantling the PHS

hospitals, Bureau of Health Care Delivery, it just got the Feds out of the role of delivering health care. It was in the Nixon administration that this edict came down, "thou shalt not deal with direct patient care". It is not a delivery organization, not the Feds out of -- we're not going to turn that around, I don't think, in the lifetime of this Commission, or maybe the lifetime of the people here. But under the Constitution, basically it ends up being the counties with the responsibility to deliver health care. Ultimately, it follows down --

DR. ROBERTS: I hear Scott was saying to you there is nothing in the Constitution which requires it.

MR. BATCHELOR: But the responsibility ends up basically at the county level. And so if that's where the responsibility is going to be, maybe that's one of the places we need to place special focus on for the services area. If that's where the needs are and if that's where counseling and testing and early intervention may be an entry point, that's a place to put special focus.

DR. ROBERTS: We have about 20, 25

minutes left. Other points that people feel

strongly they want to put before us this

afternoon?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I assume that you guys, if we end ten minutes early, you would just as soon start ten minutes early.

MR. BATCHELOR: I can say something else. I think an important additional issue, the issue is that people with HIV disease and AIDS, the spectrum, can contribute a lot to the public policy issues, the direct service issues, et cetera, et cetera. It's always unfortunate, to use the kindest of terms, when people with AIDS, as broadly defined, are the last to enter the public policy arena and the first to be told that they are not invited, et cetera. They need to be the first to be invited because we have a perspective, while not the sole handle on the truth by any means, is a valuable, necessary perspective. Without the inclusion of people with AIDS and other people at highest risk groups, then the picture gets distorted.

When CDC came up with its counseling

1 guidelines, which is an important issue for you, CDC is not regulations, but guidelines for how to 2 3 train and how to do counseling. Those aren't a regulations, but they have had a profound impact 5 nationwide on what states or city or county 6 decides to use and include in their training of 7 counselors and what their requirements are for the job, in fact. People don't know. How are

they going to find out?

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So those guidelines are very important. They have changed over the years somewhat, but the early emphasis which came mostly from CDC, I gather, was focused on sexual behavior change. You just found out that you're tested, Mr. Jones. Now I want to tell you about safe sex. All Mr. Jones is thinking about is I think I'm going to kill myself. His penis is not going to arise for quite sometime. That penis represents death to him. So now the counseling is changed to focus a little more on living, on taking care of yourself, on feeling the behavior change, and on dealing with the shock. But had people with HIV disease and AIDS been included in developing those guidelines, we would have said, safe sex is not the issue today; surviving this news and learing to live with it is the issue.

So people with AIDS and HIV need to be included in the policy and development process.

Statement. There is a person with AIDS on our Commission. I think there has been a real attempt to do that. But as part of the counseling, I'm humored by the fact that somebody comes in and tests positive, one of the first things they tell you is to try to lower your stress level. I think that's classic.

MR. DALTON: I have one other response. A lot of people put this meeting together. The person who did the most is probably Jason Heffner.

But one point in talking about the invitees, someone in the conference called and said what about persons with AIDS. I guess there was a talk about having somebody specific. And Jason basically said that at the table there would be plenty of people with AIDS who will be here in their capacity like yours. I think that's what is important. There are plenty of

people with AIDS working throughout every system that we've been concerned about, and they do need to be involved. In their professional capacities, which are very much --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BATCHELOR: In response to that, since I am the gay man, I will speak to that issue, too. There has been many, many gay men in positions of power and authority and responsibility dealing with health care issues and dealing with AIDS who were very, very fearful about disclosing the fact that they were gay men and, therefore, could not tell what they know would be the whole truth. Many people, I have sat in many rooms with many of the people here for years and they didn't know I was HIV positive because I was very reasonably scared to death to tell anybody. People who are finally out of the HIV closet, whether or not whatever other closet they might or might not have been in, but people who are out of that closet get a perspective and say it like no other people really can.

DR. ROBERTS: I would suggest that Walter has provided us with a very sobering note, and I think a useful note in which to come to

closure on this part of the meeting because I think it's always risky when one talks policy, financing, systems, institutions, to lose that orientation that Jim also tried to stress for us on the individuals and what it's like for people to move through the process. And to remember that that's ultimately what the system is about, is the way in which it impacts peoples' individual experience with their own lives and coping with it.

Just a brief word of thanks to all of you for your extreme good humor and patience and tolerance over the last two days. I've had a very interesting time, and I thank you for your patience in putting up with my occasional attempts to produce a slightly higher rate of order.

Mr. Chairman, it's all yours.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Thank you.

DR. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, so much of this discussion in the last two days has centered on our health care system in the United States, many people might be interested in a book called the "Right To Health In The Americas",

which is a comparative study of health
legislation in Latin American and North American
societies. I think you might find it a very
interesting book. I'm sure it's available at a
nominal price from the Pan American Mealth

Organization.

much. I do want to thank you for your time and what you've shared with us. It's quite a bit.

We feel, at least I feel very overwheimed by our task, but you've helped clarify some of the issues for us and that was our goal. And when we get together, we're going to talk about it and see what we need to take back to the full Commission.

Everything you said is making a difference, and everything you do makes a difference. And, again, thank you for your calling, again, as you go out among the people. It means a lot to us because it makes a difference to us that we know that you're out there caring. It helps our task, and we do care, too.

We'll do what we can to help stop this

```
epidemic, as I know you all will, too. Thank
 1
 2
      you.
 3
                              (Recessed at 3:00 p.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

COMMISSION WORKING GROUP MEETING

(Resumed at 3:30 p.m.)

શ

wrap-up, we want to hear what we feel are the issues that could be helpful to Jeff in putting together some notes. And this desire is to be comprehensive so he can put together some notes, but our initial impressions of where we would like to see some emphasis. And also what we did not hear, Don's suggestion was excellent over lunch. We also need to talk about what we didn't hear and what needs to be incorporated into the report.

So anyone can start to say what their impressions of what we need to incorporate into this is.

MR. KESSLER: It's a complex issue.

MS. DIAZ: I heard the discussion of testing outside of the context of a continuum of services or a delivery system is just not in the best interest of our public. And that was repeated a number of times throughout the last two days. And that actually, I think, according

1 to the gentleman this morning, may do more damage 2 than the benefit we expect. 3 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Are you saying 4 that, is it testing or testing for early intervention? 5 6 MS. DIAZ: No, no. Just plain 7 testing. CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Where do you place 8 9 the epidimiological test and the blind studies 10 and the home studies, family studies. 11 MR. GOLDMAN: Or even tests 12 designed -- one area we didn't cover which is 13 testing solely and simply not for the purpose of 14 helping the person being tested, but for the 15 purpose of changing or affecting that person's 16 behavior to prevent HIV infection to a third 17 party. It's really not focused on that person. 18 MR. KESSLER: Testing without 19 notification, either, we didn't talk about that. 20 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Let's work --21 MR. DALTON: One thing that was 22 said today, in relation to Don's point, I think 23 it was said by the keynote person, Marshall

Forstein, is that there is this sort of a sense

of testing that is somehow magical when they take a test and then they change their behavior, or they get positive results and do the right thing. They get a negative result and increase the vigilence, which is going in the other direction. People have a license to run.

And his suggestion was that's not true.

The testing in and of itself is not magical and doesn't alter behaviors.

We certainly can't walk away from here talking about testing, it seems to me, as a way of changing peoples' behavior toward third parties. In fact there is really no basis in the literature for even believing that that happens.

We also did not talk today particularly about testing for persons as far as blood supply. I think there are some issues that we need to address around that, including what kind of counseling ought the Red Cross to be doing, for example, and notifying the people who test positive. What kind of referrals should they be making? That's another issue we didn't deal with here today.

I think the basic feeling was we didn't

б

1	talk about testing for cpidimiological purposes,
2	particularly over family studies. But if we can
3	at least set those to the side, and there are any
4	number of issues around that, also, like whether
5	one should unblind studies, when in fact you
6	should find out when someone is HIV positive,
7	putting those to the side, now talking about
8	testing ostensibly for the benefit of the person
9	being tested. I did hear a strong message from a
10	lot of people, it came in different forms, that
11	that kind of testing didn't make a whole lot of
12	sense.
13	CHAIRMAN ALLEN: What you're
14	saying, for the benefit of the person in regards
15	to early intervention?
16	MR. DALTON: In regards to
17	anything.
18	CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Sometimes there is
19	a benefit just knowing.
20	MR. GOLDMAN: Why?
21	MR. DALTON: Ali I'm saying is
22	CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Specifically,
23	
23	there are people that just simply want to know

MR. DALTON: Well, I'm just talking about what I heard. I did hear people say, I heard you ask, are you talking about giving people options. But in terms of a program designed to say out there to the world at large, go get tested, or in terms of having priorities, create incentives for testing where there are some other ways to use money, don't do that unless you have in place a system of options for people that includes not only medical kinds of

things, but social and support.

MR. GOLDMAN: I walked into this meeting with a conclusion on that issue that nothing in this meeting changed. I don't know whether that's because the ideology of the fixedness of the conclusions or whether or not, whatever.

But if you look at the triad of outreach, and I'm going to call for the sake of argument, I'm going to call HIV testing a form of outreach, I think it is, and you talk about access to care or services, and you talk about what I'll call training or personnel or staff, let's call it facilities, represent a triad. And there has to

be maintained a balance between that triad; that the balance between that triad is going to change over time.

At certain points in time in history, and it could be a year thing, but essentially what you have to deal with is within a hundred dollar pot, how do you allocate that hundred dollars between efforts at providing facilities, of insuring access, and of doing outreach. If you put it all in facilities, then the facilities are sitting there and nobody is utilizing them. If you put it all into outreach, then you have a tremendous demand but no facilities and you have to balance it, and there has to be an analysis of where the adequacies are over periods of time in different communities, and within either, A, periods of time and, B, different communities, there have to be different allocations.

There ought to be somebody sitting around making a decision, that, gee, the problem this year or the next two years is we really have a problem in terms of access. We ought to scale down our outreach efforts until such time as we beef up the system to be able to provide

sufficient access. When we do that or have it sufficiently in the pipe so that we can see in six months it will be available, then we ought to go back, and so that maybe in year one you're talking about allocations of 20, 20 and 60, and as that system builds up, then you move the allocations around in terms of the dollars.

about two things, at least I heard, but distribution of funds, a justifiable distribution of funds, and that also includes planning, and what the health care planning is what Al said, we need health care planning and locals, and then the distribution of funds.

MR. GOLDMAN: Right. What the problem is, as I see it, in terms of the federal government is that the CDC is sitting there with a function of prevention and outreach and surveillance, and that just deals -- access isn't my problem, it says. Then you have an AIDS program office that I thought theoretically is supposed to deal with all of the different agencies dealing with AIDS and HIV infection and it's being able to say to CDC, hey, there is an

access problem this year or in the next year or two; some of the monies ought to be shifted from CDC's outreach efforts in order to be shifted to HRSA to provide the additional functing for this.

In a rational system, that's the way it ought to work. And I see no reason that we as a Commission shouldn't be advocating that.

Ievel because the federal government can't say in LA this is the case and in Connecticut that's the case. The local communities need to be saying this year access is a real problem for us. We want to use our dollars that way and we'll make determinations about the allocation within that total pie. No monies go to the the localities as a total pot for communities to identify what their particular needs or priorities are, and testing should clearly be one thing they might want to consider, but in terms of where that community is at and where the predominance should go.

MR. DALTON: But if the dollars come from CDC, then it's going to be tilted.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: And testing has

been federally driven and services have been locally or state driven.

A

MR. DALTON: Just a piece of what Don said, which is whether or not testing is an aspect of outreach. It seems to me there was a fair amount of talk about that today, and certainly a fair number of people took the position that it's probably a mistake to think of testing as a form of outreach.

every community at every time. Some people said education is outreach. Some people said, no, outreach is when you're talking about something that matters to them, and as part of your effort you also talk about HIV testing. I think it varies somewhat from subpopulation to subpopulation.

Apart from that, I think that testing is a dangerous form of outreach because it tends to put people in a position of having a potential record, assuming it's not anonymous, of HIV status without necessarily attending to the social consequences of that. It particularly puts people in a position of having the psychic

fallout of having been tested without necessarily having in place counseling and support groups and that sort of thing.

a

And what I heard a lot of people say here is what's important is counseling. That sort of testing without counseling is not a good thing. If the only way to get counseling is, with testing linked with it, then that's the case, buy you still have to be careful that the point of the testing is not just to get the blood to do epidimiological studies or in order to track partners, which is back to Don's point. So far as this is driven by CDC, it's driven by the desire to track partners and count bodies.

And what I heard people say today is, hey, let's talk about counseling.

standards for that counseling because CDC today, would not tell you that they really have absolutely excellent ways of disseminating some kind of counseling resources. But as Jill said, she's never been asked what is the quality of that counseling, who is doing that counseling, how much time is being spent on that counseling.

Someone mentioned briefly today there's 1 2 probably more control in terms of productivity standards within the 330 community-based 4 centers. So I think that if you just came out and said, our recommendation has said we really 5 6 think counseling was basically an essential 7 component of any program where testing might be given, that doesn't do enough in terms of the 8 9 quality of that counseling, who is doing it, and 10 what are the minimal standards for it. MR. DALTON: They can go to things
Phildadelphia and see how many people you reviewed,
seeing. If wow! 11 12 13 seeing. If you're spending too much time, they 14 ought to be equally able to create mechanisms for 15 assuring quality of time. 16 MR. GOLDMAN: I think that HIV 17 testing is in fact a form of outreach. You 18 certainly don't want to give AZT to people who are not HIV positive. 19 20 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Form of outreach 21 for what purpose? 22 MR. GOLDMAN: Access to care. And the other point I wanted to make is that when 23

anybody is talking about counseling, what the

devil are they talking about about counseling?

What they are talking about counseling is risk reduction counseling.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. DALTON: No, not true.

MS. DIAZ: No.

MR. DALTON: That's what maybe CDC is talking about.

MR. GOLDMAN: That's what CDC is talking about. And the kinds of things you're talking about in terms of the social, legal discrimination kinds of responses are nothing more, I think, or can be effectively analogized to simply side effects sequellae of the process of access to the system that the system, if it's done right, must include within it the capacity to help alleviate, ameliorate or climinate. And that's of the system, which means the system would include that you're talking about access to the kind of psychosocial care that a person who is advised that they are infected with the virus needs and requires, whether it be assistance in obtaining some form of otherwise available public benefit or in obtaining AZT or in obtaining appropriate counseling, if you're looking at it

from the perspective of the patient in terms of that.

And who are you going to provide all that bevy of services to? The services of making sure they are on Medicaid if Medicaid is available, or making sure they have access to housing, how are you going to define the population that that system is going to serve, except those who are infected with the virus and how are you going to determine who is infected by the virus without doing a test? So in that sense it's part of outreach.

MS. BYRNES: It seems to me that there is an agreement of that, and could be one of the things that the group could say is that maybe people always initially thought that it was outreach, but that clearly among the group of people who were here, there wasn't agreement on the fact that testing was the first step of outreach. In fact, it was step 4, 5 and 6 for some people, and that outreach would be telling people, A, this is where you go for basic health care services; B, did you know that in fact there even are therapies or treatments for HIV, that

it's not a pure death sentence; C, why would you want to consider getting tested or do you know what the tests are.

I mean, I don't disagree with your point at all. You clearly feel strongly about it. So did other people. I think an interesting outcome of the meeting was there was not agreement on that.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: And I would like to go with D, and that's where outreach begins, consideration of the test.

MR. DALTON: I think all of this is what people mean by counseling, not to CDC, but that's why it's important to put some content of what we think counseling should mean and the kind of counseling that must attend all testing.

Outreach is obviously a mischievous term because outreach for what?

So in terms of our own tarking about the subject in our reports, we need to be rather clearer about what we mean by terms like outreach, which have multiple meanings and are ambiguous, and terms like counseling. Whatever conflict appears would dissolve if we just took

1 the time and sort of specify.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: So would you suggest Jeff work on a glossary of some sort?

MR. DALTON: No. All I mean is maybe we'll use words other than that. What often happens in the law is you ditch the terms that become encrusted and ambiguous and find new terms.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: So what would you suggest our recommendation be, this isn't hard and fast, but the direction of our recommendation for the counseling?

MR. DALTON: Actually, I thought that Mindy Domb had a wonderful thing. I could take it right off of the court reporter's tape.

MS. BYRNES: And Jill. too.

articulated about four or five things.

MS. DIAZ: I think one important thing I heard, particularly yesterday, is that counseling and systems of support for those that choose to be tested or not to be tested need to be locally and community-based driven and may represent a whole variety of configurations and are not necessarily tied to structures but rather

to supportive mechanisms or microcosms within each community.

I think I heard in respect to counseling that necessarily we're not talking about counseling that would occur at a specific site connected to testing, but that counseling about the test might be available in numerous different settings and not necessarily needs to be tied to a facility that is testing.

MR. DALTON: Right. They talked about going to galleries.

MS. DIAZ: Or street.

MR. GOLDMAN: I think, may I suggest that I've always thought in my mind and maybe that's not a good way of describing it, but I've always thought in my mind the difference between health education and counseling is that health education is directed at a wider audience, whereas counseling is essentially one-on-one kind of thing when you're talking about giving intervention.

If what you're suggesting is that before we talk about to be talking about health

education, then I think that you're absolutely right.

MS. DIAZ: As a health educator, may I speak about the virtues of health education? Basically what we intend to do in health education is behavior change. We have identified a positive behavior change. For example, stopping smoking. The health educator in whiter audiences would give you the benefits as well as the detriments of continuing to smoke and so forth.

Within the arena of counseling, basically we heard today and yesterday that the person might be presented with the options and consequences, as you said, for, in this case, being tested and not tested. So we are not in any way pushing it, a desired outcome, which in health education we are, because we are trying necessarily to change behavior. That is how I see the difference.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: In the scheme of all that we heard today, what proportion of the energies that our working group wants to concentrate on counseling, and for Jeff's

COPLEY COURT REPORTING

understanding, do you see that as one component?

What are the other issues?

MR. STRYKER: You might sort of look at some models of counseling. Someone was speaking of genetic counseling. When Eunice was speaking I was thinking of the notion of value free counseling in genetics, that a counselor can just present all the numerical information and let the couples sort out between themselves what kind of choices to make. It used to be a fairly fetching model.

I think people more and more realize that there is a lot more to the counseling dynamic.

And there was some talk around the table about offering testing as an option versus a coercive setting for doing that.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: But do you see that happening now? We don't counsel like that with giving the person the option of how to live their life in this issue.

MR. DALTON: What --

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I'm saying the mentality of the counseling, of the behavioral change, these are the options. It's not value

1 free.

A

MR. GOLDMAN: But that's because the purpose of the counseling is not to help the affected individual but to change that affected individual's behavior for the benefit of a third party.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Exactly.

MR. GOLDMAN: And I'm not saying that that is necessarily wrong, but I'm saying that's not what's advertised.

MR. DALTON: Let me add to that.

It's either to have that individual change his or her behavior for the benefit of a third party, or to put the "counselors" in a position of informing some third party. It seems to me that's what CDC and some others mean by counseling.

Now, in terms of the folks around this room who do counseling, that's not what they mean. I guess my thought, Jeff, is rather than starting from models down, there is writing out there about what people who are counselors are doing. I mean, that is very HIV specific, what do you do when someone walks through your door.

And in --

£.

MR. STRYKER: I was particularly disturbed by what the CDC official had to say about "we can't have a counseling cop", as if we needed a Fed in the room with the two people to know what's going on.

empirical indicators. I hear a lot of people still getting their test results by mail, and there's this old saw by now with CDC, of course we're in favor of pre- and post-test counseling. Well, no one has quite set out in terms of what that means, do you get your tests three weeks later, in person?

When I was tested and counscied, our pretest counseling was in a group of 75 people. You came back a week later, you got your results.

They read out your date of birth, which is horrifying, to use as a number so that everyone knew how old you were, which is worse than whether you were positive or not, and then you went down and got your results. And you could tell, it's a small town, and you could tell whether people were positive or negative by how

quickly they came out of the counselor's room and in what shape.

So here is a model of an ATS anonymous system where everyone knows each other, and anonymity is out the window. But there are certain benchmarks, in terms of being counseled, they could be telling us as the test moves out into a test system into an STD and family planning clinics, how is this working.

MR. DALTON: There are many number of things we could say explicitly about that, or maybe we want to create a mechanism for someone else saying that. I think we need to find out what the CDC's counseling guidelines are insofar as some exist.

MS. DIAZ: For both.

MR. DALTON: For both STD clinics and alternate test site clinics and see if they are the same, and see if some of them are at a level of generality that it allows up this range of what happens.

MS. DIAZ: It's a state decision and a local county decision as to how that is implemented because there are actually places in

video, small ten-minute videos.

б

MR. DALTON: One step is to find out what the CDC is requiring at the federal level and what their explanation is for the division between them and state and local in terms of who dictates counseling, to look at what's happening in the sort of better and worse programs and make some recommendations about what the guidelines ought to be that can be implemented at the federal level.

It seems to me that the CDC can condition its money for ATSs and STD money on counseling that meets certain standards.

MS. BYRNES: So, Karlon, I'll write to you and say, yes, I did it.

MR. DALTON: I agree, and we ought to focus a bit on monitoring. The bit about the cop, they have cops in Chicago, apparently. I mean, in Philadelphia, seeing whether people are spending too much time on counseling. It seems to me they can have the same kind of cop, if you want to call it that, figuring out whether counselors have been trained. Certainly you can

have the verification of that, and what kind of training.

0.

CHAIRMAN ALLEM: I also think, I don't know if that passed us by, but when we write CDC to ask that question, I have some others for CDC, but your point was well made of ATSs and STD clinics. What is happening in the ATSs, but what are your standards in STDs for HIV counseling because we're shifting the money.

ask them what was the basis and what was the information base on which they made the decisions to start pushing in the direction of STD clinics. Was that based upon evidence of the capacity of those clinics to do counseling?

MR. GOLDMAN: I think they said that was the basis of a belief that they would have a higher head rate there.

MS. DIAZ: It's deeper than that.

Something that didn't come up is that much of the AIDS program money within CDC has shifted in the last year under STD. I think that you have to understand that that in some way could be tied to a decision to beef up the particular HTV service

within STD clinics and other --

б

MR. DALTON: Insofar as we got an answer and it was implicit, it was that we will get a higher rate of people who are HIV positive there and presumably then we can locate more partners and somehow encourage people to modify their behavior to protect third parties. But it had nothing to do with the fact that STD clinics could provide counseling or referral.

All I'm saying is that I think we need to get from CDC, to have them document their perspective on what this money should be spent for, so if we say it should be something different, we can articulate different from what.

DR. ROBERTS: I heard them say something a little different. I heard them say there were different populations which were accessed through the different groups. So it's not simply the total number of people, but it's sort of spreading the testing around so that we hit different, I'm not defending it, I'm just saying if we're going to characterize their point of view, it wasn't just the hit rate, but it was who you hit.

MR. KESSLER: It was also a siting citing issue. When they needed to expand the ATS, the next layer that was obvious were the STD clinics. And they didn't have the siting problems that they did have on the first round of ATS sites.

MR. DALTON: Let me toll you where my concern comes from. Jill mentioned she had set up an ATS system and it was there when pressure came to switch HIV testing into STD clinics. In New Haven, Connecticut the STD clinic and alternate test site clinic were in the same building, two doors apart, in the Health Department, I might add. We're not talking about siting issues, we're not talking about different populations particularly. And in the STD clinic, there was virtually no pre-test counseling essentially, and truly minimal post-test counseling, no referrals.

The people doing the work were not people who came over from the alternate test site or people who were trained other than a day's training roughly on HIV, and it was just an additional thing to the laundry list.

1.1

So that at least in that particular concrete example, it seems to me that the justifications, that we are teasing out what was said by this CDC representative, couldn't possibly have played out. So it leaves me, not that one example alone, willing to be skeptical, shall we say, about the rationale.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Just to stop for a second and say we've got about thirty minutes until we need to close. I know some of you have planes.

We have concentrated a lot on the counseling issue. I want to make sure we get everything we want, to emphasize it.

DR. ROBERTS: I have to leave. I just want to thank everybody particularly for putting up with my efforts to simultaneously give you as much of the time you wanted and to tell you how much I enjoyed this.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: We have talked about the counseling and CDC.

MS. BYRNES: And I assume that's like Section No. 2 of whatever the size of this report is that we talk about the dicagreement or

2.0

1	at least different points of view about whether
2	to test, where tests faults on the continuum,
3	whether or not it's the first step or third
4	step. But if you choose to test or in any
5	setting where testing services are provided or
6	where HIV or AIDS services are provided, this is
7	what we understand counseling should entail.
8	These are the components and these are the
9	standards that should be in there. Does that
10	sound
11	MS. DIAZ: A bit, except don't
12	negate the fact that it was said that counseling
13	about the test can occur outside of the agency.
14	MS. BYRNES: I agree with you
15	completely on that.
16	CHAIRMAN ALLEN: That's good.
17	MS. BYRNES: Separate from the
18	test.
19	CHAIRMAN ALLEN: And we've got
20	Don's triad.
21	MS. BYRNES: Outreach access
22	facilities?
23	MR. GOLDMAN: Yes, and I don't mean
24	the kind of education outreach. I mean by

1 outreach patient identification in terms of who was going to be provided the broad outray of services. 3 MS. DIAZ: In religious terms, 4 evangelism. 5 6 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: One of the things, 7 I'll just chime in one of my concerns, is that of HRSA and the defunding of HRSA. Their evaluation 8 9 component of their demonstration grants, what are 10 they evaluating, whether they worked, whether the 11 money was spent properly, whether the HIV 12 infection rate decreased? I would like to see 13 that --14 MR. DALTON: What is it that's being defunded, what kinds of --15 16 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Well, I don't know 17 if we can do it outside of agency terms. 18 MR. DALTON: I'm asking, they can switch around what HRSA does as against any other 19 20 agency. But implicit in what you're saying is 21 that there are certain kinds of services or 22 certain kinds of something that's being devalued. 23 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Case management is being devalued, health planning. So all of these 24

1 | --

2 MR. DALTON: What else?

3 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Home care, AZT.
4 What else? There's some others. I'll have to
5 think back. But I want to get the point across

6 that here we are without substance with early

7 intervention, and we're coming up with this

message. I think we need to ask HRSA some

9 questions.

I've got some questions I'm going to send to them and their staff. If you have some questions for them, maybe we can get back and incorporate into some type of format for recommendations. But also in relation to CDC.

MS. DIAZ: One of the things I recommended to our newly-formed HRSA advisory group is that we might want to look at the results of the first four demonstration projects and some other mutual issues of concern between the HRSA advisory group and this subgroup of the Commission, and they were very much in favor of doing that. So we don't have to go through some of the same --

MS. BYRNES: What is the time line

1 on that? When do they expect that ongoing evaluation to be completed? 2 MS. DIAZ: The three years are up. 3 MR. STRYKER: There are case 4 studies, and we provided the LA case study before 5 б the hearings. Those are available for all four 7 cities. They tend to be descriptive rather than 8 analytical. 9 MS. BYRNES: Is that it? MR. STRYKER: That's all that I've 10 11 seen. 12 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I don't think it's 13 there. MS. DIAZ: No, there are certain 14 15 common denominators. For example, what Don is 16 asking about is how a community has been able to be integrated in ongoing planning for HIV is 17 definitely an evaluative part of those 18 19 demonstration projects. 20 In other words, a community that was given 21 a HRSA demonstration grant and was not able to 22 get their act together and coming and identifying 23 needs, identified gaps and what it needs in terms

of future financing has simply not done the job.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Well, from what I understand, Larry, you may have some insight into this, first off I do know this: That ERSA is now going to fund 16 to 18 out of the 25 they started. And there is not really a clear understanding of who or what criteria they are going to use for that funding; and that many of the demonstration money that went out has not been that effective.

It seems that -- have you heard this?

MR. KESSLER: No.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Like some of the RWJ grant money that went out that tried to get up case management around the country, some of those were dismal in the response. But I'm curious of the evaluation tool. I'm curious, along with moving in the HRSA questions, is what are they going to do for states. If they are backing off with this demonstration money, who is going to pick up the ball? Who is going to be the technical advisors to the states and the local governments? The person coming in from Missouri that is head of HRSA, before he got there was state that said HRSA needs to get

1	involved with states, but HRSA says, no, that's
2	not our job.
3	MR. DALTON: Just what is
4	CHAIRMAN ALLEN: The
5	community-based organizations that are going to
6	be funded, they are backing off. Who is going to
7	pick up that ball? Who is going to make sure
8	that's going in when there are block grants going
9	to the states and counties? There's not any
10	strings attached to that, but there isn't any
11	technical assistance to advise them or help them
12	assume the HIV leads. You can't monitor block
13	grants because it's given to the states.
14	Can you monitor it?
15	MS. BYRNES: You should be able to.
16	CHAIRMAN ALLEN: You should be able
17	to, but you don't.
18	MS. BYRNES: We don't do it in any
19	block grant program, but it's certainly possible.
20	CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Exactly. That's
21	where the problem is there.
22	MR. GOLDMAN: I think theoretically
23	it's a requirement on the part of the state to
24	give the Feds a plan as to what they are going to

be doing with the money but there's ne way the 1 state and the Feds have any authority to say we 2 3 don't like what you're doing. I guess I count health care monies to build, for the state to 4 build a space --5 6 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: But how that's 7 utilized. HIV is not a part of that planning 8 process. So that is some of the things that I 9 think that I would like as a working group for the Commission to write HRSA and say we would 10 11 like some answers to these questions. 12 And I think that we also have to ask some 13 questions to CDC, not only about counseling but 14 do you feel that this is an ethical response to, 15 an ethical endeavor to advertise carly 16 intervention if the services aren't there. 17 MR. DALTON: That seems to me like 18 a profoundly unproductive thing to do. Let me tell you why. I think asking somebody whether 19 20 their response is ethical, nobody is going to say 21 my response is unethical. 22 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Okay. Let's

MR. DALTON: Secondly, I think it's

rephrase the question.

23

1 a mistake to try to get CDC to criticize itself,

2 however you frame it. If we find from CDC what

3 they are doing, we are in a position of making a

4 judgment about whether it's good or bad. That

5 is, we are perfectly capable of saying that

6 advertising early intervention without having

7 | services in place is a bad thing. We don't need

8 | them to say it.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I stand corrected. I feel like a sense of urgency that they are about to come out with this in two months. So there is that sense of wait, stop,

look and listen. But you're right.

MR. DALTON: Let's talk about how we do that, but I'm suggesting your particular procedure is not the way to do it. Let's talk specifically about that. Maybe as far as the 1990 America Responds To AIDS campaign we should ask the relevant government officials to come to our meeting in March, the full Commission meeting, and to show us and to have an exchange there which is pretty quick in the scheme of things. And Maureen hasn't fallen over yet, so

it seems to be within the realm of possibility.

It seems to me the questions put to CDC are much narrower than that, like what are your standards for the following. For example, earlier on in this meeting we started talking about standards for labs, the different kinds of tests. One thing that I would at least like to know is is there a role that CDC can perform better in monitoring what it is that labs do.

MS. BYRNES: I think Doctor

Konigsberg wants to look at that issue when he
looks at all of this stuff in the public health

context. So you may want to ask the CDC -- this
is an informational thing.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I just want to, as a point of clarification, you're not disagreeing with the content; you're disagreeing with the strategy, is that what I hear you saying? The content of saying we've got to deal with the America Responds To AIDS and the early intervention message, you agree with the content. You're saying the strategy you would like to see different. I agree. Instead of a letter, you want to say --

MR. DALTON: Well, if we're going

to write a letter, I think it should be different than that, but I think we should bring it before the Commission.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Anything else?
Those are my issues.

MR. KESSLER: In terms of we started out earlier about listing some questions we didn't deal with, did anybody say that we didn't deal with the whole question of testing in the military? I see that is being different than testing in the civilian population, slightly different because of the reasons, the actual stated reason is different than prevention.

MR. GOLDMAN: We really only discussed at this meeting instances in which the stated reason for the testing was in a context of care of patient being tested. And all the other issues involved in testing, whether it be blood, military, prisoners, immigration, prevention, risk reduction, behavior changes, partner notification, issues of name reporting for purposes of partner notification, we never discussed.

MR. STRYKER: I have a little bit

of concern because we had some people who weren't able to come, we did not try and stack who was around the table. But it seems like part of the consensus that what our moderator was nervous about was an artifact of people from urban centers who had a lot of agreement about what they were up to.

My sense is that the testing juggernaut is really picking up speed, whether it's the test moving out of ATS into other sites, or physicians wanting the test to be incorporated more as a standard battery of tests and treated more like CBC or other normal blood assays, and partner notification. I think Marshall, of all the many metaphors we were treated to. I think Marshall's one of the test as a lightening rod I think is something we have to face as a reality because it's certainly a focus of a lot of legislative action, and it's a focus of a lot of public health strategies and some stuff we didn't get on the table.

I think some of them are already loose issues. Whatever the rationale behind the military issue is, it's underweighed and there's

B

1	not much you can do about it except to learn from
2	it, maybe. But there are other features of
3	testing that we weren't able to take up.
4	MS. BYRNES: Again, those things
5	will be helpful, I think, to some of the issues
6	that Doctor Konigsberg wants to look at in
7	helping him identify what are the issues that
8	perhaps could be discussed or looked at in
9	another context.
10	MR. DALTON: Could you tell me?
11	CHAIRMAN ALLEN: In what form?
12	MS. BYRNES: Doctor Konigsberg very
13	much wanted the participation and presence of
14	public health officers so that you got the view
15	and the perspective of the local and state public
16	health officers. And I think
17	MR. DALTON: To deal with what
18	issues?
19	MS. BYRNES: Testing would be one,
20	a big one.
21	CHAIRMAN ALLEN: The one?
22	MS. BYRNES: Big one, there are
23	others.
24	MR. DALTON: Diane Ahrens' group, I

1 | thought hers ~-

<u>a</u>

MS. BYRNES: We looked at mayors, county officials, and at the entire epidemic, not just particular issues that public health officers most recently and historically have been

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: But explain what form. Are you talking about a full Commission meeting?

MS. BYRNES: It's not clear. He's talked to the Chairman about the possibility of another working group looking at, among others, testing as an issue with a variety of public health officers.

MR. DALTON: It seems to me to talk about testing or any of the other activities, in a context of which the meeting is predominantly or solely public health officers is absurd. It seems to me if we are worried about having a meeting addressing the same issues that is dominated by, let's say, community-based scrvice organizations, it seems to me it's the same phenomenon.

MS. BYRNES: But, Harlon --

1	MR. DALTON: Which is why we wanted
2	Konigsberg to be here at this meeting.
3	MS. BYRNES: And planned on being
4	here, and so did Fred Wolf. For whatever reason,
5	some of those people were not able to be here.
6	MR. DALTON: Fine. I'm saying that
7	to simply have public health officers talking
8	about what policies should be with respect to
9	reporting or epidimiological concerns or testing
10	is absurd.
11	MS. BYRNES: My suggestion would be
12	that this may be a discussion you want to have
13	with Doctor Konigsberg and the rest of the
14	Commission in March when you report on what
15	happened here, what's the outcome, what do the
16	rest of the Commissioners feel what needs to be
17	done.
18	MR. GOLDMAN: Why is it absurd?
19	What's absurd?
20	MR. DALTON: What is absurd about
21	it is
22	MR. GOLDMAN: What is it that's
23	absurd?
24	MR. DALTON: I was going to say it

1 is absurd because --

1.1

2 MR. GOLDMAN: No, what is it that's 3 absurd? What are you referring to?

MR. DALTON: Having a meeting, having a working group of just public health officers.

MS. BYRNES: I don't want to misrepresent him. He may also think it may be appropriate to have other people there as well.

(Off the record).

MR. DALTON: Putting together Don's comment and Maureen's comment, it seems to me when we report to the full Commission what we ought to say is we wanted a meeting in which people with different perspectives on the problem were in fact represented; that -- and indeed we invited people with that in mind; that people who bowed out seemed to have different perspectives, that we want to fill in that perspective. But our sense of these issues that they are ones that we have to need to hear people from a variety of perspectives on, which is the point I'm making.

MS. BYRNES: I'm with you. I don't want you to feel that I'm suggesting something

1 different.

MR. DALTON: I'm saying I think we can reflect that in our report; that is, indicating the shortcomings of this meeting is taking on ourselves the very same point I'm making.

MR. KESSLER: I don't think it was necessarily a mistake that they weren't here. I think in part those who were here, there were a couple of public health people here, don't like dealing with the menu that we dealt with. They like to simplify it. Their focus is much more easily put and simplified by saying we're protecting the public health, and they talk about transmission or whatever.

issues. How many public health people talk about psychosocial issues of testing? They talk about prevention and epidemiology and surveillance.

And you can read it on the face of Denman Scott, that this was superfluous as far as he was concerned. At Plough got in because he's a planner and public health person.

MR. DALTON: I'm glad you mentioned

that, that we did have some public health people here, including ASTHO.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: And John Ward is of the public health realm. He's been a public health officer for a long time.

MS. BYRNES: And Joe O'Neill.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: If they want another meeting, that would be redundant.

MS. DIAZ: A focus on another task force may be very devisive. It certainly could put us in a situation of this Commission having a public health task force with a view on testing. I think if this same group has to hear additional input from the CDC and public health officials, it would be very interesting and complimentary in many ways.

MR. GOLDMAN: I think we can effectively say, and if we carefully limit what we say, I think we can effectively say that where and in those circumstances that the primary purpose, thrust, advertised goal and everything else of testing is in fact to provide an avenue for access to services, that it is a mistake to do so and to set up a program without first

insuring that there is some kind of reasonable access; that that has a certain basis both in terms of fairness and equity as well as in terms of common sense. It's silly to put resources into an effort that's designed to promote access. if in fact the facilities aren't there to access.

And, so, whatever perspective you may look at it from, if that's where you're coming from, then you have to insure that there has to be some reasonable levels of access before you use that as the basis.

MR. KESSLER: I would like to amend that a bit in that using your appreach, you can also, in addition, then do surveillance and epidemiology.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Sure.

MR. KESSLER: Whereas sometimes it's reversed. But when you reverse it, you don't necessarily do the other.

MS. DIAZ: I think we ought to get into the final record that a couple of people made statements about their desire or wish that by creating a greater demand for testing that

COPLEY COURT REPORTING

Ą

this might drive a creation of a system of delivery and response. And I think that has to be mentioned because we can't just close the door to that particular option.

б

Some people believe that by creating such a large demand for testing services, that that in fact may drive government, local groups and health systems to develop. It was said and I think it has to be represented. I'm reflecting what was said. I'm not necessarily saying that's my point of view, but I don't want that to get lost.

MR. GOLDMAN: My response to that is that given limited resources, that it seems to me a higher level of priority to insure the access, to put money into and to improve access to facilities for those who you are in fact testing rather than to seek to test more and create more and deliberately not putting money into the services that are provided to those who in fact were tested. And that that as a -- and that it is a cruel and inhuman political use of people to use them in that way as a political device which is simply wrong and, as far as I'm

concerned, immoral.

δ

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: But we need to address what I hear Eunice saying, and that can be a response, but that needs to be at least addressed.

MS. DIAZ: I'm saying there were a number of people here, and I heard it over the two days, and they said it not only publicly but also separately to us that they are hoping that the hope is that by creating a great demand for testing services, this might push the whole program of early intervention or access points through the health delivery and a response system at the local level for deliverance of that, or meeting that demand.

MR. DALTON: And there are a difference of opinions among people around the round table about whether that was a good idea, bad idea, a workable or not workable idea. There was a fair amount of discussion around that, and we certainly need to reflect that.

I just want to say one other thing that doesn't follow from that. It was suggested earlier, I think by Larry, that we never got to

issues like partner notification. I'm not sure that's true.

Jeff, you should take a look when you look through the many volumes of the record of this meeting, the extent to which people talked about that explicitly. But it seems to me it was certainly implicit in a lot of what people had to say; that is to say, people were saying in effect, we don't think testing should be used simply to drive something like partner notification; we think testing should be used to, as an access point for care, for psychosocial care and medical care.

I think that this working group needs to tease that out and to talk more explicitly and at greater length about partner notification and HIV, mandatory HIV reporting. But I think this is part of the same set of issues that we've been talking about for the same two days, somewhat buried, but somewhat there and implicit. I don't think this is an issue that gets split off from the issues we've been talking about and should be dealt with solely by public health officers looking through that single perspective.

CHAIRMAN ALLEN: I think that we 1 2 can tap into that with Alan Hinman's testimony and Jeff's questioning about the funding and how 3 4 much is going into partner notification as 5 opposed to other services. 6 MR. DALTON: Which is, by the way, one of the questions we should follow up on. 7 8 MR. GOLDMAN: I think, Harlon, the 9 objections that we heard to the partner 10 notification was not that partner notification 11 was inherently bad, but rather that partner 12 notification ought not to be viewed as being a counseling service to the HIV positive person who 13 14 is under care. 15 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Or driving the 16 system. 17 MR. GOLDMAN: And that there may be 18 a different purpose involved, a different 19 function involved, and it is just simply not part of that care and service. 20 21 MR. DALTON: You're right. And I 22 was much to imprecise. My only purpose for the comment was that we were talking about partner 23

notification, at least its relationship to the

other things we were talking about. And I don't
want to give up partner notification and
mandatory HIV testing as our concern simply
because we didn't deal fully with the issue this

5 time.

MS. DIAZ: I have one thought before I go, but I don't think we've said anything for the final record about the concern expressed by Marie and Romeo and others about what testing may mean by the government or encouraged by the government to disenfranchised and minority, racial and ethnic populations, who are many times living from day to day, looking at how they can survive, in terms of poverty, food needs, child care, and other kinds of priorities that a person in a certain socioeconomic status in this society may have to just for the sake of survival be concerned about many other things. Testing may not be a priority or may not be viewed with the same emphasis.

And the fact that the government is encouraging that person or looking over to see that they get tested actually may send even more resistent signals or put up many barriers, this

is what we're interested in, are you going to be tested, versus you don't have food on your table, or there is no place to take your children to go to a clinic yourself.

So there are many other priorities in terms of disenfranchised populations in viewing the whole test. I think Marie said that.

MR. GOLDMAN: I think the important thing that was said there, or that I got cut of it, was that it ought to be those communities that make the decisions as to what to do. And it may well be that a given community may well make a decision but the most important thing is not to do any HIV testing or minimally or unaggressively or only on request, and all of its resources ought to be put in terms of child care or health care facilities in that area.

MR. DALTON: It seems there's another practical consequence of this. Insofar as we are accustomed to thinking about putting AIDS money or HIV money into AIDS-specific organizations or institutions, that may not be an altogether sensible strategy in communities of color or other places as well.

It may, for example, make sense that the organizations within a given community that do HIV counseling would be the Head Start Program or the program that works in other social needs as conceived of and experienced by that community so that someone sitting down to talk to people about their food needs or child care needs or whatever, during the course of developing a relationship with somebody, then may counsel about HIV as well and get some HIV money because they in fact are the ones who are in the best position to get the ear of that person because they are talking about HIV in the context of a social --

MR. GOLDMAN: But I think the minority communities may have a difficult decision to make. But I don't think they can say, on one hand, that we want our fair share of the AIDS money; and, B, once we get it, we want to have the right to decide how to spend it, including spending it on areas that are remote from AIDS -- because those are the areas --

MR. DALTON: That wasn't my point.

My point was if a Head Start center or a church

day care center or an organization that has

1	traditionally been involved in a set of other
2	concerns that are of importance to different
3	communities says we want some AIDS money because
4	we're going to fold that into cur other
5	activities, that should be something that merits
6	respect, and not simply say are you an AIDS
7	organization.
8	MS. DIAZ: In other words,
9	integrating it into an existing structure?
10	MR. DALTON: Yes.
11	MS. BYRNES: I am Mauroen Byrnes,
12	Executive Director of the Full National
13	Commission on AIDS, and I now adjourn this
14	meeting.
15	(Whereupon the meeting
16	adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2.4	

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
4	SUFFOLK, SS.
5	I, LISA W. STARR, a Notary Public in and
6	for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby certify:
7	That the said proceeding was taken before
8	me as a Notary Public at the said time and place and was taken down in stenotype writing by me; That I am a Certified Shorthand Reporter
9	for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, that the said proceeding was thereafter transcribed into
10	computer-assisted transcription, and that the foregoing transcript constitutes a full, true,
11	and correct report of the proceedings which then and there took place, transcribed to the best of
1.2	my skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hexeunto set my
13	hand and Notarial Seal this 20th day of February 1990.
14	
15	$A \sim \rho \rho_0$
16	LISA W. STARR
۱7	Notary Public
1 8	Mr. Commicular Ferrimon Mars 12 1004
19	My Commission Expires: May 13, 1994.
0 2	
21	
22	
23	