

**Philadelphia EMA HIV Integrated Planning Council**  
**VIRTUAL: Finance Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes of**  
**Wednesday, October 1, 2020**  
**2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**

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

**Present:** Alan Edelstein, David Gana, Keith Carter, Marilyn Martinez, Michael Cappuccilli,

**Guests:** Ameenah McCann-Woods (AACO)

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

**Call to Order and Introductions:** A. Edelstein called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

**Approval of Agenda:**

A. Edelstein called for an approval of the October 1, 2020 Finance Committee agenda via a Zoom poll. **Motion:** K. Carter motioned, D. Gana seconded to approve the agenda as presented.

**Motion passed:** 100% approved.

**Approval of Minutes (*August 8, 2020*):**

A. Edelstein called for an approval of the August 8, 2020 Finance Committee meeting minutes via a Zoom poll. **Motion:** K. Carter motioned, M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve August 2020 meeting minutes. **Motion passed:** 100% approved.

**Report of Co-Chairs:**

No report.

**Report of Staff:**

M. Ross-Russell said that she would cover committee structure further along in the discussion items so Finance Committee could have an internal discussion about it. Otherwise, there was no report.

**Discussion Items:**

***—FY2020 Year End Report—***

A. McCann-Woods pulled up a spreadsheet titled “Ryan White EMA-Wide Spending: 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Spending as of February 29, 2020.” She explained that the spreadsheet listed all EMA-Wide end of the year spending and underspending ending in February 29, 2020. This report is late, she noted, because of delays caused by COVID-19. A. McCann-Woods read the underspending/ overspending. Philadelphia had no over/underspending, PA Counties overspent by 7%, NJ Counties overspent by 3%, Systemwide underspent by 15%, MAI overspent by 2%, MAI Systemwide underspent by 17%, and Carryforward was 0%. Overall, she pointed out a total of 1% underspending throughout the entire EMA, leaving a balance of \$209,555.

A. McCann-Woods scrolled to a spreadsheet with Philadelphia over/underspending for each service category. She explained that any negative number was indicative of underspending. The largest amount of underspending, she noted, was Substance Abuse Treatment (Outpatient) at 27% or \$145,865 underspending. Other underspent services above 10% were within support services and were Transportation and Housing Assistance. There was also overspending with EFA, Food Bank, Other Professional Services. A. McCann-Woods explained that she also had a PowerPoint which would explain reasons for any under/overspending.

For PA Counties, A. McCann-Woods reviewed the spreadsheet. There was overspending Outpatient Ambulatory Care at 25%. For support services, there was underspending in EFA-Pharma at 34% and overspending in Food Bank at 103%. For NJ Counties, there was overspending in Substance Abuse services as well as Transportation.

A. McCann-Woods briefly reviewed Systemwide, noting that the spreadsheet listed had overall under/overspending for service categories. When reviewing the Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI) spreadsheet, she noted that none of the service categories exceeded the 10% threshold for overspending, but there was underspending for Quality Management (QM) and Grantee Administration.

A. McCann-Woods moved onto her PowerPoint for the Underspending Report. A. McCann-Woods read the 4Q Underspending Summary: Reconciliation of total invoices forwarded to AACO for processing through February 29, 2020 indicated one-percent (1% or \$209,555) underspending of our total overall award (includes MAI funds). These figures are based on expenditures for all awards after processing through the twelfth month for the time period of March-February 2020.

A. McCann-Woods reviewed underspending for Philadelphia: Substance Abuse Treatment - Outpatient was underspent by \$145,865 due to vacancies, leveraging other funding, and credentialing for therapists and counselors as a barrier to the hiring process. EFA-Pharma was underspent by \$111,629 due to under-utilization, EFA-Housing by \$50,797 due to underutilization, and Transportation by \$1,542 due to leveraging other funding. She said that EFA-Pharma underspending is due to more efficiency within the Special Pharmaceuticals Benefits Program (SPBP) application. There was faster processing with online applications and therefore expected underspending. A. Edelstein asked if EFA-Pharma underspending is also due to the change from 30-day to 15-day supplies for medication. A. McCann-Woods said no that the shorter supply did not impact usage, so it did not impact underspending. She further explained that the application for SPBP was now faster and more efficient which cuts costs.

A. McCann-Woods read the Philadelphia Overspending. There was overspending in EFA at \$52,933, Food Bank at \$30,094, and Other Professional Services at \$149,328. These were all overspent because of higher utilization. She also reminded everyone of the Council's pre-approved reallocation for Other Professional Services in February.

A. McCann-Woods reported that EFA-Pharma was underspent in the PA Counties by \$40,369 due to underutilization (efficient SPBP). As for overspending, Outpatient Ambulatory Care was overspent by \$162,259 and Food Bank by \$67,000. Both were overspent due to higher

utilization. She reminded everyone of the pre-approved reallocation for Outpatient Care during Quarter 3 to cover laboratory costs.

A. McCann-Woods reported that there was no underspending above 10% threshold for NJ Counties. As for NJ overspending, Oral Health Care was overspent by \$19,800 and Transportation by \$103,168, both due to higher utilization. She noted that overspending was used to cover lab costs for Oral Health Care, and that the council had approved the reallocation for Transportation during Quarter 3 to cover utilization.

She next read Systemwide underspending. There was underspending in Information and Referral (I&R) at \$80,858, QM Activities at \$170,662, Capacity Support at \$93,168, and PC Support at \$59,865. She said that such categories are concerning administration at the recipient level. She said that much of the underspending is due to vacancies because of a cumbersome hiring practice at the Recipient level. Any underspending is reallocated to direct service categories. K. Carter asked if COVID-19 impacted the underspending in any way. A. McCann-Woods said that people are still working from home, so COVID-19 did not have much of an effect on staffing. M. Cappuccilli also noted that the underspending is representative of underspending up until February 29<sup>th</sup>, so this is “pre-COVID data.”

A. McCann-Woods next read underspending for Minority AIDS Initiative Systemwide Allocations. There was underspending in QM Activities at \$13,493 and Grantee Administration at \$23,535. She said that underspending is reallocated to direct services.

### *—Committee Structure—*

M. Ross-Russell noted that they had already discussed committee structure at the council meeting and other committee meetings. The reason each committee is reviewing the structure is so they can voice concerns and opinions about how they feel the committees should function. M. Ross-Russell noted that she was asked to look into and report back on how other Integrated Planning Councils are structured. M. Ross-Russell said that she has reviewed other EMAs’ structures as well as the Finance Committee’s own responsibilities.

M. Ross-Russell explained that Finance Committee reviews underspending, overspending, and spending reports from the Recipient to ascertain and assess the administrative reasons for rapidly distributing funds. The committee also prepares for and hosts the allocations process.

M. Ross-Russell noted that there are 6 directly funded CDC and HRSA cities for Ryan White Part A, for Prevention Funds and Part A money. She explained that LA and Houston EMAs have a Priorities and Allocations committees. These committees take on what Finance Committee already does but also incorporate parts of the priority setting process. Priority setting, currently, is a Comprehensive Planning Committee responsibility in the EMA.

M. Ross-Russell reviewed other EMAs’ committee structures. Chicago receives Part A, Prevention funds, and HOPWA, all falling under that Planning Council. This EMA did not break out their committee structures online. Washington DC has a Comprehensive Planning Committee which includes the priority setting and Resource Allocation function. M. Ross-Russell reported

that she could not find any information on committee structure for NYC. For LA, she explained that committee functions were not specified on their website.

In all, M. Ross-Russell explained that many of the EMAs included components of priority setting within their structure. She added that HIPC's Finance Committee typically works with Comprehensive Planning Committee leading up to allocations. M. Ross-Russell said that the council can consider the information provided by other EMAs and decide to change or not change their own structure. Any suggestions for change would be carried over to Executive Committee for discussion.

A. Edelstein suggested taking over the priority setting function, and asked if they would lead priority setting with participation from other committees. A. Edelstein explained that he liked the way they perform priority setting, so he would not like to have it be exclusive to Finance Committee.

M. Cappuccilli suggested that priority setting may not be a natural fit with Finance Committee. A. Edelstein noted that Finance Committee has been included in the priority setting meetings, adding that the meetings are open to participation for everyone. M. Cappuccilli asked how priority setting speaks to Finance specifically. A. Edelstein said that allocations are somewhat determined/guided by priorities.

M. Ross-Russell explained that other EMAs do priority setting and resource allocations as one activity. Part of the reason for this is because HRSA tends to pair the two activities. She noted that priority setting does not always equate to how much funding a service is given, however.

A. Edelstein understood but liked the separation of activities. He asked if there was an adverse impact from HRSA if they continue to separate out the allocations and priority setting process. M. Ross-Russell said that it would not have any impact. M. Ross-Russell also recognized the Philadelphia EMA's recent presentation for other jurisdictions. This presentation showed other jurisdictions how the Philadelphia EMA breaks up priority setting and allocations. Other jurisdictions seemed to like their strategy.

N. Johns noted that from other committees' conversations, they noted that a lot of HIPC work falls under CPC. She said that redistributing some of CPC's work may be beneficial. A. Edelstein said that from the standpoint of a more equitable distribution of work, it would make sense for Finance to take on the priority setting process. N. Johns said that this does not demand that Finance Committee take over priority setting, but revision of committee structure to divide work more equitably may be the goal. K. Carter asked if they would still make all their decisions on documented need for priority setting, and N. Johns said yes, the processes will not change, just division of work.

M. Ross-Russell explained that HIPC has had the same structure for a while. Therefore, they are simply reviewing/revisiting their structure to make sure it still fits with HIPC responsibilities and culture. A. Edelstein noted that other committees taking on additional roles would make sense for equitable distribution. This would be so there is no one committee that is particularly

overburdened. A. Edelstein said he was in favor of taking on priority setting responsibilities. M. Ross-Russell said they would next do priority setting spring 2021.

M. Cappuccilli noted that Finance Committee is small, so it would just be a few people running the priority setting process. He suggested doing recruitment if they take on priority setting. A. Edelstein said that priority setting is open for the public and other committees as well. Though Finance would be responsible for hosting and preparing, they but they would not have to do all the work themselves. K. Carter suggested having a “transition period/meeting” involving CPC to break the process down. A. Edelstein agreed that getting knowledge from CPC about priority setting would be helpful.

D. Gana suggested that taking on more responsibility may draw more people to Finance Committee. K. Carter said that the transitional period he suggested with CPC may also help recruit more people to Finance. N. Johns reminded them that OHP would also support and help with the transition.

A. Edelstein said that he and D. Gana would go to the Executive Committee to further discuss structure. M. Ross-Russell agreed that this was more of a casual discussion so that the chairs of each committee understood what their committees wanted before bringing it to Executive. A. Edelstein asked if the Finance Committee would okay with taking on additional roles and being flexible if needed. D. Gana, M. Cappuccilli, and K. Carter all agreed.

M. Cappuccilli asked if CPC felt strong ownership of priority setting. N. Johns said she did not know, but that the committee, itself may change a lot in the restructuring of everything. She said G. Grannan, CPC chair, agreed that splitting up work was important so as to not overburden and have processes move along efficiently.

M. Ross-Russell said that all committees are looking at their calendars and schedules. She briefly reviewed the upcoming schedule: The Integrated Plan (likely next year), consumer survey (next year), COVID-19 survey (this Fall), and priority setting (next year). She noted that a lot of the responsibilities just listed start in CPC or even stay in CPC. This may be a lot for the committee to take on and do well. She explained that OHP may do background work, but the Planning Body still takes the lead, and currently, CPC is taking on the bulk of work.

A. Edelstein said that Finance Committee is more than willing to be helpful and supportive.

**Old Business:**

None.

**New Business:**

None.

**Announcements:**

N. Johns reminded everyone of the OHP Fall Training Series. The trainings are recorded and being put up on OHP website. Next Friday, there would be a training on the Integrated Planning

Cycle. She asked everyone to email her (nicole@hivphilly.org) or S. Moletteri (sofia@hivphilly.org) with any questions.

M. Ross-Russell announced that HIPC is about to go through their nominations process for new membership. For those interested, they can review past trainings on the website. If anyone knows of individuals who may be interested, let them know to look at the past trainings, attend trainings, and to fill out the HIPC application. M. Cappuccilli asked when Nominations will be restarting meetings. M. Ross-Russell said that this will be soon.

**Adjournment:**

A. Edelstein asked for a motion to adjourn. **Motion:** M. Cappuccilli motioned, K. Carter seconded. **Motion passed:** general consensus. Meeting adjourned at 3:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Sofia M. Moletteri, staff

Materials provided at meeting:

- October 2020 Finance Committee Meeting Agenda
- August 2020 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes