

HIV Integrated Planning Council
Finance Committee
Thursday, May 3, 2018
2:00-4pm

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

Present: Michael Cappuccilli, K. Carter, Mark Coleman, Alan Edelstein, Dave Gana, Gus Grannan, Joseph Roderick, Jeanette Murdock, Gail Thomas

Excused: None

Absent: None

Guests: Chris Chu, Ameenah McCann-Woods

Staff: Mari Ross-Russell, Nicole Johns, Briana Morgan, Stephen Budhu

Call to Order: A. Edelstein called the meeting to order at 2:00pm. Those present then introduced themselves.

Approval of Agenda: A. Edelstein presented the agenda for approval. **Motion:** K. Carter moved, M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve the agenda. **Motion Passed:** All in favor.

Approval of Minutes: A. Edelstein presented the minutes for approval. **Motion:** M. Cappuccilli moved, D. Gana seconded to approve the minutes. **Motion Passed:** All in favor.

Report of Chair: No report

Report of Staff: No report

Action Items: None

Discussion Items:

• **Allocations**

M. Ross-Russell reminded the committee the Philadelphia EMA has not yet received its notice of grant award for fiscal year 2018 (FY18). This discussion is part of the normal review of the allocations process. She suggested the committee could review the allocations process and materials that are distributed during allocations meetings. Annually, in the summer, the three EMA regions review their pro-rated regional budgets for the given fiscal year. Traditionally at the regional allocation meetings those in attendance are given a 5% decrease budget, a level-funding budget and 5% increase budget to review. The 10% increase budget submission is no longer accepted by HRSA.

M. Ross-Russell stated sometimes at allocations meetings people default to the level-funding budget that is presented. She noted even though at allocations meetings A. Edelstein informs those in attendance the information provided is just a guideline, often the level funding is still carried forward. With review of the allocations procedures and possible alteration of them, discussions at the allocations meetings may be more spirited. Possibly from more spirited discussion people may propose another budget or they may decide to alter funding amounts within a service category.

M. Ross-Russell stated in today's meeting packet there are EMA service categories funding percentages by region, the proposed level-funding budget by region for FY18, and the total Ryan White Part A expenditure by category.

A. Edelstein stated given the information presented at allocations meetings people may just choose the level-funding budget for simplicity. He noted in the past the Recipient prepared an expenditure report by region that allowed attendees to gauge how money was being spent throughout the year and within a service category for that particular region. M. Cappuccilli added from a participant standpoint, it's not feasible to expect people to be able to digest that amount of information that is given within 2 hours. He suggested it may be useful if those who attend the allocations meetings are given meeting packets ahead of time. A. Edelstein mentioned allocation meetings used to be multi-part meetings that were geared to making sure those at meetings understood what was being presented to them. M. Ross-Russell referenced A. Edelstein's comments about the Recipient; she explained the Recipient would not just prepare reports but they also provided explanations and additional contextual details. A. Edelstein suggested the Recipient should try to have a presentation that discussed the three EMA regions and the funded service categories within each region. Within the presentation the Recipient could review spending from the last 2 years and provide proposed spending for the current fiscal year. M. Cappuccilli suggested the Recipient should attend and provide insight on the service categories.

D. Gana stated sometimes at regional allocations meetings those who attend may not be aware of what's being presented to them. It may be useful if they are made aware of information being discussed before the day of the meeting as per M. Cappuccilli's earlier point. M. Ross-Russell stated meeting packets could be sent out earlier to those attending allocations meetings, but she reminded the committee only HIPC members can vote at the allocation meetings. A. Edelstein stated at past allocations meetings providers would attend and try to advocate for their services. Obviously as M. Ross-Russell mentioned the providers themselves could not vote but their advocacy had the potential to sway HIPC members' votes.

N. Johns suggested the committee should look to explore the need of the community and barriers to services. Part of story is how much money is spent, but the other half is where it is needed and how much. Are service categories underspent because they are not accessible?

A. Edelstein asked M. Ross-Russell if she made spending projections of the funding landscape. M. Ross-Russell replied yes, the projections are comprised of 20 years of data.

N. Johns stated the committee has not talked about the changes in spending in quite some time. The Affordable Care Act changed how health care dollars are spent, but the committee has not yet discussed those changes in terms of allocations. A. Edelstein replied even though the committee has not formally discussed the change in expenditures, spending is rarely static within a service category. All service categories are needed and for the most part the money can be spent that is allotted to that service category. M. Cappuccilli commented unless the service category is chronically underspent. M. Ross-Russell stated at this point there is little underspending and service categories are spending the money that is allotted to them. C. Chu stated the underspending is not much at this time; if a category needs more funding the budget would have to reflect so.

M. Ross-Russell asked the committee how the allocations packet can be more user friendly. A. Edelstein stated it goes back to M. Cappuccilli's point, maybe it could be a yearly review and an overview of the fundable service categories within each region.

M. Cappuccilli suggested at regional allocations meetings a representative from each of the funded categories to explain how money is spent in their service category. A. Edelstein suggested there should be

context on why certain service categories are funded within certain regions of the EMA. M. Ross-Russell stated it would be useful if information about the fundable categories within each region are given at the beginning of the meeting. With added context members may be able to make information-based decisions about spending. D. Gana noted if it was explained that certain service categories are not funded because there is another funding source it may be useful. Ryan White is the payer of last resort therefore in some of regions if there are other funding sources for a service category it will not be funded through Ryan White.

The committee briefly discussed the structure and attendance at allocations meetings. Over the years the attendance has dwindled. In the past allocations meetings had great attendance and attendees would voice their concerns about funding. They would advocate for changes within a service category. The committee discussed possible ways to improve attendance at allocations meeting. M. Ross-Russell noted social media has helped with getting the word out about HIPC meetings.

M. Ross-Russell informed the committee the Client Services Unit (CSU) will present at the May 2018 HIPC meeting. Unlike the Consumer Survey or the Medical Monitoring Project, the CSU focuses on individuals who are newly linked to care and re-engaged in care. The CSU presentation will provide some idea of what is needed from those who are newly linked to care.

A. Edelstein asked if the new case management model will be rolled out this fiscal year. A. McCann-Woods replied the RFP has not yet gone out but it will very soon.

M. Ross-Russell noted the spreadsheet in the packet did not feature the allocation of funds from the DEFA pharmaceutical into DEFA for housing as per the HIPC's conversations about housing earlier in the year. The spreadsheets provided at the allocations meeting in future will reflect the changes.

M. Coleman asked if it was possible for housing agencies who are under performing to receive a cut in funding. M. Ross-Russell replied housing services are controlled by either the Office of Homeless Services or the Office of Housing and Community Development. If an agency was in noncompliance it would be the duty of those agencies to take appropriate action.

K. Carter asked why New York is able to provide housing to the PLWH and Philadelphia is not. M. Ross-Russell explained the Part A grant in New York City is greater than that of Philadelphia. Also housing funds that are distributed to a specific EMA is based off the fair market rent in that area; New York's fair market rent is higher than that of Philadelphia.

M. Cappuccilli asked if it was possible for the committee to identify agencies who are funded within a service category, e.g.; case management. A. Edelstein replied specific agencies could not be named because a conflict of interest may arise; some HIPC members are providers and it may be misconstrued if they advocate for funding in that category. The number of the case managers per region can be mentioned but not the specific agency. G. Grannan stated in some categories there are not many providers and sometimes there may be even one. When certain categories are discussed it is clear what provider is being discussed, even though their name may not have been mentioned.

M. Cappuccilli asked if providers could be updated or replaced within certain categories. A. McCann-Woods stated the Recipient does put out request for proposals for specific services very few years and all contracts are competitive.

The committee discussed the possible changes to the allocations procedure. After the discussion the committee decided to request a formal review of the allocations procedure which included providing additional context to what is presented at allocations meetings, purpose of the materials presented, and a

thorough review of the budgets that are presented. The committee also requested a review of the funded service categories by EMA region. With that explanation the committee requested that additional context be provided for the regional funding differences, the number of providers within a service category and an explanation of the funded categories. The committee requested the Recipient to also track potential under/over spending during the fiscal year and to identify need within service categories.

A. Edelstein suggested it may be useful if data was generalized to the usage of one person. For example, the average number of units 1 person uses could be presented to make the data more generalizable. G. Grannan stated there are some services that have a low number of people who use them but there is still a high utilization of that category. M. Ross-Russell stated there are individuals who use services more than others so a true mean may be difficult to find.

G. Grannan stated he was worried about the long-term effects of diverting health funds to housing while there is specific funding for housing. He stated housing was a need but the funds were allocated from other service categories that are important also. He suggested there may be other revenue sources for housing. One of the things the committee may want to look to allocate more money to housing at the beginning of the fiscal year as opposed to the end. A. Edelstein added we had to take dollars away from one category in order to add it to housing. There's a need for housing but there's also need for the other funded categories. J. Murdock asked about the families who were unable to sustain their housing after a housing organization was closed earlier in the year. G. Thomas replied that program was closed due to poor performance, not funding issues. A. Edelstein stated the program was part of a city organization that focused on providing housing for those in need not necessarily PLWH.

Old Business: None

New Business: None

Announcements: D. Gana announced registration for AIDS education month is now open. To register visit aidseducationmonth.org.

Adjournment: Motion: J. Murdock moved, M. Cappuccilli seconded to adjourn the meeting at 3:34pm.

Motion Passed: All in favor.

Respectfully submitted by,

Stephen Budhu, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes
- OHP Calendar
- Allocations Spreadsheets
- EMA Regional Spending
- Part A expenditures