

MEETING AGENDA

VIRTUAL:

Thursday, January 8th, 2026

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

- ◆ Call to Order
- ◆ Welcome/Introductions
- ◆ Approval of Agenda
- ◆ Approval of Minutes (December 11th, 2025)
- ◆ Report of Co-Chairs
- ◆ Report of Staff
- ◆ Discussion item
 - Open Nominations Process
- ◆ Other Business
- ◆ Announcements
- ◆ Adjournment

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

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

The next Nominations Committee meeting is
VIRTUAL: February 12th, 2026 12:00pm - 2pm
Please contact the office at least 5 days in advance
if you require special assistance.

VIRTUAL: Nominations Committee

Meeting Minutes of

Thursday, December 11th, 2025

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

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

Present: J. Baez (Chair), T. Burroughs, S. Heaven, A. Manley, A. Scruggs, S. Smith

Staff: Tiffany Dominique, Debbie Law, Sofia Moletteri, Kevin Trinh

Call to Order: J. Baez called the meeting to order at 12:08 p.m.

Introductions: J. Baez asked for introductions.

Approval of Agenda:

J. Baez referred to the December 2025 Nominations Committee agenda and asked for a motion to approve. **Motion: S. Smith motioned; J. Baez seconded to approve the December 2025 agenda. A poll was launched to record the votes. Motion passed: 2 in favor.** The December 2025 Nominations Committee agenda was approved.

Approval of Minutes (November 13th, 2025):

J. Baez referred to the November 2025 Nominations Committee minutes. **Motion: J. Baez motioned; T. Burroughs seconded to approve the November 2025 meeting minutes. Motion passed: 2 in favor. 1 abstained.** The November 2025 Nominations Committee meeting minutes were approved.

Report of Co-chairs:

None.

Report of Staff:

None.

Discussion Items:

-Recommendation Letters Update-

T. Dominique said they had reached out to 28 individuals awaiting their recommendation letters. Of the 28 individuals, 17 responded - 3 of whom decided not to move forward with their application. One applicant decided to back out of the recommendation process due to the new requirements from the city. The other two applicants had other time management factors unrelated to the application process such as conflicting schedules. With 3 applicants removed, they had 14 applicants willing to continue forward with the new information requirements. Multiple people were worried about the request for the applicant's home address rather than a professional address like their workplace address. Most of the applicants signaled they

understood the information request from the Mayor and appreciated the transparency from OHP staff. T. Dominique said they had worked with the applicants and would work in the future to decide what information they would redact to protect the privacy of HIPC and its potential members.

-Application Guidance-

D. Law said they had researched other locations/jurisdictions to ascertain how they had managed the gender question discussed in the previous meeting. The committee had previously expressed concerns about outside responses to their efforts to represent nonbinary and gender nonconforming individuals in their work.

On the application, the applicant would be asked which gender they identified as. The applicant would have the option of selecting “male” or “female.” A. Scruggs suggested adding intersex as an option to their surveys regarding sex at birth. S. Moletteri explained that the reason for this question was because the data they reported federally only had two options: male and female. If they were to add intersex, it would count as data outside OHP’s reporting abilities.

S. Moletteri explained that the question, in turn, was whether they would continue to collect data on gender in addition to a question asking people to select male or female for reporting purposes. A. Scruggs suggested they continue capturing data for non-binary individuals and keep the data internal at the present moment. J. Baez asked what would happen if the applicant had refused to answer the question. T. Dominique said the application would be considered incomplete and not move forward in the Open Nominations Process.

D. Law next presented the application forms from the Washington DC and Los Angeles areas. At the moment, it appeared the other eligible metropolitan areas (EMAs) had not addressed the issue on their applications. A. Manley suggested adding a second question and verbiage around why the question asking people to choose “male” or “female” was in place.

S. Moletteri said that A. Manley’s suggestion aligned with OHP’s suggestion. On the application, OHP staff asked if they wanted to add an additional question with a note explaining the need for two questions around gender. The suggested language is as follows:

PLEASE NOTE: Within our office, we respect and acknowledge gender identities beyond the binary.

However, current federal requirements only allow us to report “male” or “female.” For our reporting purposes, please choose one sex that you are most comfortable with.

S. Moletteri said if they changed the question and saw a drop off in membership, they would reconsider changing the question. J. Baez said they should send a short survey to HIPC to gauge the membership opinion on the matter. S. Moletteri asked for the comments on the question. J. Baez said the question could be simplified to “Our office respects and acknowledges.” A. Scruggs said they should change the word “sex” to gender. He asked how the question would be presented to the person. S. Moletteri replied that question 10 would ask the person about their gender identity. If the person had an answer that was neither “male” nor “female,” they would

have prompted the above question asking them to choose between the binary gender choices. A. Scruggs said he knew this would deter transgender people because they would feel ostracized by being asked additional personal questions targeted towards them. S. Smith asked how this would be reflected in the printed version of the application. S. Moletteri said everyone would need to answer both questions on the printed version. A. Scruggs suggested asking the question on binary gender to all persons. S. Moletteri agreed this was a solution to their issue as it would also solve the issue of having two different versions of the application.

S. Moletteri asked about next steps. The committee agreed that if all applicants had to answer the question of whether they were “male” or “female,” there was no need to send a survey to HIPC. The committee members decided to vote on adding the question to the application.

Motion: T. Burroughs motioned, S. Heaven seconded to forward the question stated above with the amendments to the HIV Integrated Planning Council with the Nominations Committee’s recommendation for approval.

S. Heaven: In Favor
T. Burroughs: In Favor
S. Smith: In Favor
A. Manley: In Favor
J. Baez: In Favor
A. Scruggs: In Favor

Motion Passed: 6 in favor. The motion to forward the question to the HIV Integrated Planning Council for approval was passed.

Other Business:

T. Dominique asked if the Nominations Committee would want to have an Open Nominations meeting sooner than usual to review applications. T. Dominique said they had four applications in queue at the moment. J. Baez asked if they could review applications at any time. D. Law replied that their ByLaws had stated they had to review applications at least twice per year. The committee agreed they would review applications more frequently. S. Smith suggested reviewing applications every 5 applications that they received. The committee members agreed this would be a guidance and they didn’t need to vote on this matter.

Announcements:

T. Dominique said that they were hosting the town halls in New Jersey and the Pennsylvania Counties. She asked the members to share the flyer advertising the events.

A. Scruggs said the HIV is Not a Crime Ball would take place on February 28th and he would be sending out a flyer by the end of next week.

Adjournment:

J. Baez adjourned the meeting at 1:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Trinh, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- December 2025 Nominations Committee Agenda
- November 2025 Nominations Committee Minutes

DRAFT