

MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, October 1, 2020

2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Call to Order

Welcome/Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes (*August 6, 2020*)

Report of Co-Chairs

Report of Staff

Discussion Item:

- Quarterly Underspending Report – *Ameenah McCann-Woods*

Old Business

New Business

Announcements

Adjournment

Please contact the office at least 5 days in advance if you require special assistance.

The next Finance Committee meeting is

TBD

Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12TH Street, Suite 320, Philadelphia, PA 19107
(215) 574-6760 • FAX (215) 574-6761 • www.hivphilly.org

FINANCE COMMITTEE



Philadelphia EMA HIV Integrated Planning Council
VIRTUAL: Finance Committee
Meeting Minutes of
Wednesday, August 8, 2020
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

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

Present: Alan Edelstein (Co-Chair), David Gana (Co-Chair), Keith Carter, Marilyn Martinez, Mike Cappuccilli

Guests: Ameenah McCann-Woods (AACO), Chris Chu (AACO)

Staff: Nicole Johns, Mari Ross-Russell, Sofia Moletteri, Beth Celeste, Debbie Law

Call to Order and Introductions: A. Edelstein called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

Approval of Agenda:

A. Edelstein called for an approval of the August 6, 2020 Finance Committee agenda via a Zoom poll. **Motion:** K. Carter motioned, M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve the agenda as presented. **Motion passed:** 75% in favor, 25% abstaining.

Approval of Minutes (April 22, 2020):

A. Edelstein called for an approval of the April 22, 2020 Finance Committee meeting minutes via a Zoom poll. **Motion:** M. Cappuccilli motioned, K. Carter seconded to approve April 2020 meeting minutes. **Motion passed:** 75% in favor, 25% abstaining.

Report of Co-Chairs:

No report.

Report of Staff:

No report.

Action Items:

—FY2021 Allocations Budgets and Directives—

A. Edelstein said the committee would now review the allocations budgets for the three regions and the Philadelphia EMA (Systemwide). These budgets, he noted, were sent out prior to the meeting via email. A. Edelstein asked to first go over the cover page with the budget decisions written out.

NJ Counties:

A. Edelstein read the budgets. The share of the epidemic increased in New Jersey which increased the level funding budget by \$67,578. A. Edelstein read the three budgets as decided within the allocations process.

For New Jersey, the level funding budget was as follows: \$69,578 from the New Level Funding Budget is to be moved into EFA-Housing and all other funded service categories are to stay at the

previous Level Funding Budget. The 5% increase budget was as follows: all funded service categories are to be proportionately increased based off the New Level Funding Budget. The 5% decrease budget was as follows: all funded service categories are to be proportionately decreased based off the New Level Funding Budget, leaving the increase of \$69,578 in EFA-Housing.

A. Edelstein next read the NJ counties' directive: AACO is to implement the EFA-Housing model as expressed in the recommendations from the Comprehensive Planning Committee and is to report back to CPC with progress and updates.

A. Edelstein directed attention the spreadsheets which broke down the three New Jersey counties budgets by service category. He explained that the numbers listed are consistent with the three budget scenarios. There were no questions.

PA Counties:

A. Edelstein explained that Pennsylvania counties had a decrease in their level funding budget of \$47,589 due to a decrease in share of share of the epidemic within the EMA.

For Pennsylvania counties, the level funding budget was as follows: all funded service categories are to be proportionally decreased based on the New Level Funding Budget which includes the decrease of \$47,589. The 5% increase budget was as follows: the 5% increase of \$136,251 is to be moved into EFA-Housing and all other funded service categories are to be kept at the New Level Funding Budget. The 5% decrease budget was as follows: EFA-Pharma is to be reduced the by 30% (\$48,404), and the remaining decrease is to be proportionately taken from all other funded service categories.

A. Edelstein next read the two PA counties' directives: (1) AACO is to perform a needs assessment of needed resources for the provision of telehealth, especially the assessment of barriers/issues for providing clients with phones, and (2) AACO is to implement the EFA-Housing model as expressed in the recommendations from the Comprehensive Planning Committee and is to report back to CPC with progress and updates.

A. Edelstein directed attention the spreadsheets which broke down the three Pennsylvania counties budgets by service category. He explained that the numbers listed are consistent with the three budget scenarios. There were no questions.

Philadelphia:

A. Edelstein explained that Philadelphia had a decrease in their level funding budget of \$21,990 due to a decrease in share of share of the epidemic.

For Philadelphia, the level funding budget was as follows: 30% or \$96,471 is to be taken from EFA-Pharma to offset the \$21,990 decrease from the New Level Funding Budget, the remaining \$74,481 is to be added to EFA-Housing, and the remaining service categories stay the same. The 5% increase budget was as follows: the 5% increase of \$610,193 is to be moved into EFA-Housing starting from the New Level Funding Budget and the remaining service categories stay the same. The 5% decrease budget was as follows: starting with the FY2020 Level Funding Budget, 30% of EFA-Pharma funds

are to be used to offset some of the 5% decrease (also included the original \$21,990 which brought the offset to \$74,481). Then, all other funded service categories are to be decreased proportionately.

A. Edelstein next read the Philadelphia directive: AACO is to implement the EFA-Housing model as expressed in the recommendations from the Comprehensive Planning Committee and is to report back to CPC with progress and updates.

A. Edelstein directed attention the spreadsheets which broke down the three Philadelphia budgets by service category. He explained that the numbers listed are consistent with the three budget scenarios. There were no questions.

Motion: A. Edelstein called for a vote to bring the three budget plans to HIPC with a recommendation from Finance, D. Gana seconded.

Vote:

M. Cappuccilli- in favor
K. Carter- in favor
A. Edelstein- abstaining
D. Gana- in favor
M. Martinez- in favor

Motion passed: Finance Committee voted to recommend the New Jersey Counties, Pennsylvania Counties, and Philadelphia budgets as decided in the allocations process: 4 in favor, 1 abstaining, 0 against.

Systemwide:

A. Edelstein asked if Systemwide budget included MAI. M. Ross-Russell said that it did and the Systemwide is additional funding for MAI and additional categories under Systemwide which would be incorporated into the EMA-wide plan. She noted that the spreadsheets distributed via email had a breakdown of the MAI budget on page 4 and the Systemwide as whole on page 5. A. Edelstein asked if they should vote on the budgets together or separately, and M. Ross-Russell responded that the budgets could be voted on together.

A. Edelstein explained that MAI were Minority AIDS Initiative dollars. He noted that these budgets were not included in the allocations processes they just reviewed, so they need to vote on this to bring to the full Planning Council. A. Edelstein asked M. Ross-Russell to break down the MAI and Systemwide.

M. Ross-Russell asked everyone to look at page 4 for MAI. She said that there are only two service categories funded with MAI: Ambulatory/Outpatient Care, and Medical Case Management Services. Historically, M. Ross-Russell said they have proportionately increased or decreased these funds based on the award. She said that the committee would be looking at the level funding, 5% increase, and 5% decrease.

M. Ross-Russell directed attention to page 5. These were the Systemwide budgetz which also listed the three budget scenarios of level, 5% increase, and 5% decrease. She said that Systemwide includes

Quality Management, Capacity Building, Grantee Administration, and Planning Council support. These line items are removed from the full award at the beginning of the process. She noted that Referral for Health Care includes the AACO Client Services Unit (CSU) which is a service that is also provided Systemwide.

A. Edelstein said that they would need a motion if the committee wanted to endorse the Systemwide budget to bring to full Planning Council with a recommendation from Finance Committee. There were no questions.

Motion: D. Gana motioned to bring the Systemwide budget plans as represented in the budget spreadsheets to the full council with a recommendation from Finance Committee, M. Cappuccilli seconded.

Vote:

M. Cappuccilli- in favor
K. Carter- in favor
A. Edelstein- abstaining
D. Gana- in favor
M. Martinez- in favor

Motion passed: Finance Committee voted to recommend the Systemwide budget plans as represented in the Systemwide spreadsheets: 4 in favor, 1 abstaining, 0 against.

A. Edelstein asked N. Johns to share the EMA-Wide directives to the recipient on the screen.

N. Johns read all the directives. The approved EMA-Wide directive was as follows: Implement the recommendations for EFA-Housing from the Comprehensive Planning Committee and report back to CPC.

She also read the potential EMA-Wide directive topics from the allocations process: Ensuring access to telehealth; assessment of mental health services including access, modalities, and barriers; assessing needs of elders and the greying of HIV in the EMA; access to psychosocial support services including support groups; assessing needs of training of frontline staff; and assessing onboarding of substance use treatment and mental health staff to limit delays.

N. Johns reminded the group that the last potential directive was due to underspending in these categories because of staffing delays/concerns. Those within the allocations process discussed looking into HR to find out more information about this issue.

A. Edelstein said that if these directives were to be included with the EMA-Wide budget, someone would need to make a motion to approve the directives in the next HIPC meeting. N. Johns said that they would need to be rephrased as motions for the Planning Council meeting next week to be adopted. A. Edelstein said they needed to ensure that there would be enough time to include these in HIPC meeting.

K. Carter noted a mistake in the Philadelphia budget descriptions, explaining that there was percent sign instead of a dollar sign (%96,471 instead of \$96,471) within the level budget description. A.

Edelstein asked people to think about language for the EMA-Wide directives, since the topics for directives are not in their “final” format. Those will be decided at the HIPC meeting in September.

Old Business:

None.

Old Business:

None.

Announcements:

K. Carter announced that there was an EHE town hall/presentation tonight, August 6, at 5:30 p.m.

Adjournment:

A. Edelstein asked for a motion to adjourn. **Motion: K. Carter motioned, D. Gana seconded. Motion passed: general consensus.** Meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Sofia M. Moletteri, staff

Materials provided at meeting:

- August 2020 Finance Committee Meeting Agenda
- April 2020 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes
- FY2021 Allocations Decisions & Directives