

Philadelphia HIV Integrated Planning Council
Finance Committee
Meeting Minutes of
Thursday, August 4, 2022
2:00-4:00 p.m.

Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th Street, Suite 320, Philadelphia PA 19107

Present: Michael Cappuccilli, Keith Carter, Alan Edelstein (Co-Chair)

Guests: A. McCann-Woods McCann-Woods (AACO)

Staff: Debbie Law, M. Ross-Russell, Sofia Moletteri

Call to Order: A. Edelstein called the meeting to order at 2:12 p.m.

Approval of Agenda: A. Edelstein presented the August 2022 Finance Committee agenda for approval. **Motion:** K. Carter motioned, M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve the August 2022 agenda. **Motion passed:** 2 in favor, 1 abstaining. The August 2022 agenda was approved.

Approval of Minutes: A. Edelstein presented the July 7, 2022 Finance Committee minutes for approval. **Motion:** M. Cappuccilli motioned, K. Carter seconded to approve the July 2022 minutes. **Motion passed:** 2 in favor, 1 abstaining. The July 2022 meeting minutes were approved.

Report of Co-Chair:

A. Edelstein reported that the allocations process was now complete with the assistance of both M. Ross-Russell and her staff as well as A. McCann-Woods and AACO.

Report of Staff:

M. Ross-Russell reported that during the last meeting, the committee asked for a writeup of the OHP budget accompanied by a comparison to last year's budget. She asked where they would like this to go on the agenda. A. Edelstein suggested after the second item: Monitoring the Administrative Mechanism Form.

Motion: K. Carter motioned to add OHP budget review to the agenda, M. Cappuccilli seconded. **Motion passed:** 2 in favor, 1 abstaining.

M. Ross-Russell explained that the allocations were dependent on the response regarding prevalence numbers from the state of PA. OHP had still not received the response. The state was to offer a EPI presentation during a site visit on Monday. A. Edelstein asked if it was via Zoom. M. Ross-Russell said she would check with Dr. Brady. Regardless, AACO had a state site visit on Monday. A. Edelstein asked if it was possible for HIPC to participate in the meeting as observers. M. Ross-Russell said she would ask.

K. Carter asked how far in advance the state was notified about the site visit. M. Ross-Russell said the visit was contractual for monitoring and adherence, but she did not know how far in advance

notice was given. M. Ross-Russell said AACO would bring up the issues regarding the PA data. M. Cappuccilli asked if they should wait for the presentation to occur before drafting the letter. A. Edelstein thought so and suggested that attending the meeting would be beneficial for the letter's content. M. Ross-Russell was unsure of the presenter's knowledge around the prevalence numbers. K. Carter expressed concern for the OHP's workload since they were short-staffed. A. Edelstein explained that the site visit would involve AACO, not OHP.

Action Items:

—FY2023 Budget Review—

A. Edelstein read the NJ budgets decisions from the July 2022 Allocations process:

- **LEVEL:** All funded service categories are to be proportionally increased based on the additional \$80,733 within the New Level Funding budget.
- **5% INCREASE:** All additional money under the 5% increase budget is to be proportionally divided between EFA-Housing, Mental Health, and Transportation; all other services are to be held at the FY2022 Level Funding amounts.
- **5% DECREASE:** All funded service categories are to be proportionally decreased, except for Transportation which is to be held at the FY2022 Level Funding amount.

M. Cappuccilli asked for confirmation about whether they were using they were using the PA 2020 prevalence numbers or not. A. Edelstein said yes.

A. Edelstein read the PA budget decisions from the July 2022 Allocations process:

- **LEVEL:** All funded service categories are to be proportionally decreased based on the reduction of \$267,554 within the New Level Funding budget.
- **5% INCREASE:** Working from the FY2022 Level Funding Budget, all funded service categories are to be proportionally decreased by the 4% decrease of \$124,703.
- **5% DECREASE:** Working from the FY2022 Level Funding Budget, all funded service categories are to be proportionally decreased by the 13.15% decrease of \$410,886.

A. Edelstein suggested reordering the budgets so they read as the level, decrease, and then increase budgets (since this was the order of likelihood).

A. Edelstein read the Philadelphia budget decisions from the July 2022 Allocations process:

- **LEVEL:** All funded service categories are to be proportionally increased based on the additional \$186,821 within the New Level Funding budget.
- **5% INCREASE:** Working from the New Level Funding budget, the 5% increase is to be split evenly between Housing Assistance, Mental Health, and Food Bank.

- **5% DECREASE:** Working from the FY2022 Level Funding Budget, all funded service categories are to be proportionally decreased.

A. Edelstein asked for a motion to bring the budget decisions to the Planning Council with recommendation for approval.

Motion: M. Cappuccilli motioned to bring the three regions' budget scenarios to the HIPC with recommendation for approval by the Finance Committee, K. Carter seconded.

Vote:

K. Carter: in favor
M. Cappuccilli: in favor
A. Edelstein: abstaining

Motion passed: The motion to bring the three regions' budget scenarios to the HIPC with recommendation for approval by the Finance Committee was approved.

A. Edelstein read the directives for each of the three regions. Please refer to the meeting packet for directive language.

He noted that many of the directives were carried over from year's allocation process since the council had not yet received any reports back from AACO. M. Ross-Russell said that A. McCann-Woods would be providing an update on the directives at the upcoming HIPC meeting. She was currently on vacation and therefore she was not here today. A. Edelstein said, in the meantime, they had decided it would be wise to continue with the existing directives.

A. Edelstein asked for a motion to bring forward the regional directives to the Planning Council with recommendation for approval.

Motion: M. Cappuccilli motioned to bring the three regions' directives to the HIPC with recommendation for approval by the Finance Committee, K. Carter seconded.

Vote:

K. Carter: in favor
M. Cappuccilli: in favor
A. Edelstein: abstaining

Motion passed: The motion to bring the three regions' directives to the HIPC with recommendation for approval by the Finance Committee was approved.

—Monitoring the Administrative Mechanism—

M. Ross-Russell noted that the administrative mechanism language had resurfaced because the recipient responded to some of the notes. The PO (Project Officer) and supervisor wanted to ensure that HIPC had specified dates on the form and that the form ensured follow-up if there had been any

problems. They felt the report lacked clarity. M. Ross-Russell felt the form presented today would be the final version and noted that all the sections had been completed. M. Ross-Russell read the third paragraph within the form's introduction. Please refer to the form for the language.

A. Edelstein asked if anything within the form was different. M. Ross-Russell said that prior to this final version, some of the items had not been completed. The contracting section had changed, specifying that the contracts were conformed within 90 days. Additionally, the last page had changed which contained information on directives. She read this portion of the form.

A. Edelstein asked if there was explanation for a lack of follow-up on directives. M. Ross-Russell said the report back got lost during the transition between old and new directors. A. Edelstein asked to add a clause about staff transitions so as to offer explanation instead of solely stating that it did not occur. K. Carter suggested that an explanation not dismiss a need for accountability. A. Edelstein said such language would still consider accountability, it would only offer an explanation as to why. A. Edelstein also noted that the box needed to be checked "no" under this item.

A. Edelstein asked what type of action the committee would need to take for the form. M. Ross-Russell said it would go to the HIPC if Finance Committee was okay with it. Since it was the final version, HIPC would just offer any questions or concerns. Any additional responses would be provided by the recipient. A. Edelstein asked if Finance Committee had to present this to HIPC, and M. Ross-Russell said that it would need to be presented in conjunction with the report that A. McCann-Woods would offer on the directives from FY2021. A. Edelstein explained that the form/presentation was purely informational—therefore, the committee would not need to vote on it. He asked if this should go before or after A. McCann-Woods's presentation, and M. Ross-Russell said it would be informational and related to A. McCann-Woods's presentation, so it would likely go before her.

—OHP Budget Review and Explanation—

M. Ross-Russell explained that the last time they reviewed the OHP budget, there was no FY2021-22 budget for comparison. She added this column so they could see the differences between the 21-22 and the 22-23 budgets. The major changes, mentioned within the writeup, was the consultant line. OHP periodically use people to assist with the website. They also they had budgeted for an Epidemiology PHD student to perform advanced analysis for the Consumer Survey, but AACO offered to do this, so this amount was reduced.

She explained that the rent line had gone up, as mentioned before. Utilities would likely need to go up since cost of living and other increases would increase. Utilization may also increase if people were in-office more. The projected amounts were based on historic data. M. Ross-Russell said phone bill and internet provider went up slightly which was shown there. A. Edelstein asked if phone was included under utilities or communication. M. Ross-Russell said it was included in the communication line. K. Carter asked if the Comcast contract was fixed or if it increased, M. Ross-Russell said they were listed as a business, so rates were based on that. Courier service and some meeting supplies, she said, decreased. Postage also went down since they were done with pretty much completed with the Consumer Survey process.

Leased equipment decreased because they were not printing hardcopy documents as much as they had in prior years. Meeting expenses went also decreased. Both of these were due to the nature of virtual meeting environments.

Equipment software, network backup, etc., were annual subscriptions, so they were consistent costs. She explained that subscriptions for various publications decreased since they were performing virtual meetings. Advertisements was about the same because OHP had to post for open positions.

In the past, OHP used Clean Net, but they were not currently using this cleaning service.

The largest change in the budget was the inclusion of the indirect cost of 9.2%. Last year's budget it was not listed, but this year's budget now included the expense.

A. Edelstein asked what they needed to do as a committee. She said they just had to review it, not vote on it. He asked if this would go to the full HIPC. M. Ross-Russell said yes, the HIPC also needed to review the budget. M. Ross-Russell explained that they voted to approve the budget amount already within the allocations process— they did not need to approve each line item. K. Carter said it would be beneficial to include the budget explanation within the meeting packet.

A. Edelstein said that in the interest of time, they could ask people to read the budget review in the meeting packet.

Discussion Items:

—PA counties Letter from HIPC—

A. Edelstein asked to hold off writing the letter until after the Monday site visit. M. Ross-Russell explained that S. Moletteri included the PA information and surveillance reports in the meeting reminder. The data included prevalence numbers for the years 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020.

M. Cappuccilli asked why the numbers given to HIPC was so different than the numbers within the surveillance reports. M. Ross-Russell said this question would be part of the discussion. Additionally, the surveillance reports did not contain suppressed information which could possibly indicate a breach of confidentiality law. A. Edelstein agreed, noting that it was mandatory to suppress numbers under a certain amount. M. Ross-Russell added that suppression of data was usually done if the number was less than six. Suppressed data was typically indicated by the use of an asterisk. M. Cappuccilli suggested this be brought up during the EPI presentation at the site visit.

M. Ross-Russell highlighted the PA4 PLWH totals for each of the years. She noted that these numbers for each of the years was different for what they reported in the surveillance data, and she figured that the numbers were reported with the same end date of December 31st. For 2019 where there was supposedly a jump in PA Counties, they had conflicting numbers reported in the surveillance report which was listed as 4,435 PLWH.

M. Ross-Russell added that formula funding was based on prevalence numbers, so if the number was significantly lower the formula would change. K. Carter said if they can show that dollar amount was affected, concern may raise. M. Ross-Russell said they may be getting the EMA totals from the CDC and not the various states, so this may not be a concern. However, the non-competing continuation funding application would include state numbers. The impact of all of this was unsure.

A. Edelstein asked about methodology for collecting prevalence data and if they ever received an explanation. M. Ross-Russell said the surveillance report did not show a big shift from one year to

the next. The prevalence numbers with the large shift from year to year were the numbers provided the OHP/HIPC. K. Carter asked where the MMP (Medical Monitoring Project) data came from. M. Ross-Russell said MMP data was different in that it was jurisdictional and was a series of surveys and client file review.

M. Ross-Russell said all infectious diseases had some reporting requirement, so this was likely part of the method for prevalence data collection. M. Cappuccilli asked if the drastic change in prevalence data had already impacted funding/allocation and if they could still receive an explanation. M. Ross-Russell said yes, unfortunately, they had to use this data for the allocations process. The question now was how they could go forward to ensure accuracy.

K. Carter asked if the individuals responsible for surveillance for PA Counties were being audited. M. Ross-Russell said yes, they were, as this was routine. The reason it has not been realized was because the surveillance reports online were consistent—it was the numbers given to HIPC/OHP that were inconsistent.

K. Carter suggested they receive an explanation from the PA Counties in writing. This would likely be achievable if they sent their letter and awaited a response. M. Ross-Russell agreed, saying that consistently clean data would be important for them to receive, since such data directly affects funding. Overall, they were making a request, A. Edelstein noted, to attend the data meeting on Monday.

Other Business:

None.

Announcements:

None.

Adjournment: A. Edelstein called for a motion to adjourn. **Motion:** M. Cappuccilli motioned, K. Carter seconded to adjourn the August 4, 2022 Finance Committee meeting. **Motion passed:** All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 3:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Sofia M. Moletteri, staff

Handouts distributed:

- August 2022 Finance Committee Meeting Agenda
- July 2022 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes
- FY2023 Draft Decisions
- Monitoring the Administrative Mechanism Form
- PA Prevalence Numbers and Surveillance Reports