

MEETING AGENDA

VIRTUAL:

Thursday June 2, 2022

2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- Call to Order
- Welcome/Introductions
- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes (*May 5, 2022*)
- Report of Co-Chairs
- Report of Staff
- Action Item
 - Vote on the Draft Budgets
- Other Business
- Announcements
- Adjournment

Finance Committee

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

**Philadelphia HIV Integrated Planning Council
Finance Committee
Meeting Minutes of
Thursday, May 5, 2022
2:00-4:00 p.m.**

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

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

Staff: Beth Celeste, Mari Ross-Russell, Sofia Moletteri, Elijah Sumners

Guest: Ameenah McCann-Woods,

Call to Order: A. Edelstein called the meeting to order at 2:14 PM.

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

Approval of Minutes (*April 7, 2022*): A. Edelstein presented the April 2022 meeting's minutes for approval. **Motion: K. Carter motioned to approve the minutes, M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve the April 2022 meeting minutes. Motion passed: 2 in favor, 1 abstained.**

Report of Co-Chairs

None.

Report of Staff

M. Ross-Russell reported that OHP still has not received the final award from the Recipient, but at this time there was a preliminary supplemental budget that PHMC has developed. M. Ross-Russell asked the committee how they would like to proceed, because typically she waited until OHP received both the supplemental and formula budgets and worked on finalizing the line items before relaying that information to the Finance Committee. M. Cappuccilli asked if there was a problem with waiting for the full award? M. Ross-Russell answered no. HRSA was recently informed the Recipient that the final award could arrive in the next couple of weeks. At which point M. Ross-Russell would work with PHMC to create the budget and relay any and all new information to the Finance Committee.

S. Moletteri reported that OHP received two new provider requests for more surveys and that the office was slowly receiving completed surveys in the mail and entering them into SPSS. M. Ross-Russell reported that currently there were about 60 survey responses, but some were incomplete. Additionally, based on the response in the next few weeks OHP may extend the deadline because including the two aforementioned survey requests that OHP received, it did not give providers ample time for distribution and completion. M. Ross-Russell stated that with Comprehensive Planning they may revisit the deadline.

K. Carter asked how many requests were received by OHP at this time? M. Ross-Russell reported that she thought the total number of requests from providers was about 24 out of 104. K. Carter asked the date of the deadline extension. M. Ross-Russell answered from the middle to the end of June. Surveys still need to be entered and an analysis completed and 60 survey responses were not representative of the Philadelphia EMA.

Discussion Items

–Monitoring the Administrative Mechanism form–

M. Ross-Russell presented the Monitoring the Administrative Mechanism form and reported that this was her first attempt at completing it. As she previously reported, this should be completed at the end of the award cycle on February 28 or 29th. The new fiscal year would begin March 1 and as of this meeting OHP has not yet received the final invoicing report. It typically occurred in May or June and the process was dependent on the Recipient receiving the provider invoices. The other thing to consider was that during this process there was a leadership transition between one director and another, so things got lost. Additionally, there were questions that only the Recipient could answer within this form.

M. Ross-Russell reported that once the Finance Committee provided additional input and feedback the form would go back to the Recipient to complete. M. Ross-Russell stated that page two began with the procurement process. There was no Part A RFP process that was conducted during this fiscal cycle that ended February 28, 2022, so the result of that was not applicable. There was an additional part of the procurement process included on the form. As part of the normal monitoring the administrative mechanism, the recipient was to be expected to provide an overview to the HIPC ensure that the distribution process was fair and equitable and that it was widespread. This was where the Planning Council would review the process as well as the number of responses the recipient had, was it geographically distributed, etc. Again, there was no RFP so it was not applicable.

M. Ross-Russell reported that the next section was Contracting and it simply asked were the contracts fully conformed within 90 days of the notice of the grant award. That would go back to last year's notice of grant award period, which would have begun March 1, 2021 and then there was a 90-day countdown. The answer to that would be no because it did not happen. M. Ross-Russell reported that she would need to go back to the Recipient to find out approximately what percentage of contracts were fully conformed during that period of time and determine an end-date that the Recipient would like any outstanding contracts conformed by.

K Carter stated that if the financial year started in March that meant by June OHP should be done, according to the 90 days rule, but if OHP doesn't get the full award, how could that happen within 90 days? M. Ross-Russell answered that it was a question she had for the project officer and the project officer supervisor. The response was, “the fiscal year is the fiscal year.” She stated that she asked further questions regarding the 90-day start from the time that OHP received the final award, and then HIPC would do the allocations.

K. Carter stated that it was not the case because the award has not been given out yet and he does not know how the Recipient expected this to work because the 90 days was almost up. M. Ross-Russell answered that it was her understanding that if OHP has not received the award, and HIPC has not done the allocations, then the Recipient would not be able to conform contracts. The allocations decision process does not start until after OHP has received the final award and those subsequent discussions were based on whichever one of the budgets was approved, whether it was level, 5% increase, or 5% decrease. The reason this process was completed prior to the award dispersal was to immediately allocate funds once it was received. M. Ross-Russell reiterated that she was told that the 90-day count began March 1, 2022.

K. Carter asked if not having funds available due to the delayed award letter has negatively impacted service delivery? M. Ross-Russell answered that there were certain things that the HIPC had never done in the past. For example, AACO has sent out letters of intent to contract, which historically was dependent on award letters being sent, etc. OHP never looked at letters of intent to contract because letters of intent or notice of intent was not a conformed contract or an executed contract. K. Carter reiterated his earlier question of whether this did not inhibit service delivery to clients.

M. Ross-Russell stated the reason why the city contracted with Urban Affairs Coalition as well as PHMC was to ensure there was no interruption of service. The City has them as their fiscal agents because as long as they know that this subcontractor was going to exist, an entity would get paid or have a contract at some point. PHMC and Urban Affairs Coalition continue to support the invoicing for that grant. One of the other reasons why these fiscal agents exist was because invoicing directly to the City of Philadelphia took a very long time to process. K. Carter added that even if the award letter was sent out, monies could not be dispersed until June which would be the beginning of Q2.

M. Ross-Russell explained that the legislative language talked about the Recipient rapidly distributing funds, and that monitoring the administrative mechanism form was to ensure that these funds were rapidly distributed to the community having the greatest need. There was another portion which fell under the fiscal monitoring process. The fiscal monitoring process, specifically talked about 45.75 CFR, which was part of the Office of Management and Budget requirements. Those requirements were for any subcontractor or any contractor of HHS, and their subcontractors, that they must ensure that contracts are processed and conformed within a specific time period. That was something that fell under audit requirements, that was not something that they as a Planning Body were not privy to. That was under the City's purview. That was the responsibility of the Recipient to make sure that all of this was in compliance with audit requirements.

M. Ross-Russell reported that from her conversation with the project officer that they asked to include either a 45, 60, or 90-day period. Last year the Notice of Grant Award was not sent within the 90-day period. The answer from a fiscal monitoring standard was "No, they did not". M. Ross-Russell explained that she thought it was fair to ask about the percentage of contracts that went out or the percentage of contracts that were conformed, this was so the Recipient was aware of whether or not money was actually hitting the community.

A. Edelstein stated that it would move slowly until the Notice of Grant Award was sent to OHP. In the meantime, things could only be accomplished on an interim basis. M. Ross-Russell agreed and stated that another part to consider was that based on City Council or the City of Philadelphia's contract procurement process, that the probability of ever actually getting 100% of the contracts conformed within 90 days was close to zero. A. Edelstein stated that there was not a consequence of non-conformed contracts, and it did not lead to reductions or rationing of services to consumers as the year progressed.

M. Ross-Russell reported the next section of the Monitoring the Administrative Mechanism form was the quarterly reports. She looked at the Finance Committee and Planning Body minutes for last year, and it appeared that the HIPC had received only the second and third quarter spending reports. HIPC has not received the first or final quarter reports for this year. As part of the quarterly reports, and as part of the reallocation requests, etc., A. McCann-Woods provided information related to late invoicing from subcontractors as well as any other the reason for having over or underspending

M. Ross-Russell reported that the next section was "use of funds" and it had to do with the Recipient ensuring OHP was aware that they have received either a full award or a partial award. M. Ross-Russell reported that as OHP staff, she would typically inform the Finance Committee and begin to work on the budget. She reported that earlier in the year when OHP received notice of a partial award and level funding budget was drafted, it was then discussed in the Finance Committee meeting. M. Ross-Russell reported that the question to answer was "does the recipient distribute funds in accordance with the allocation decisions? Upon receipt of the quarterly spending reports and reallocation requests the Finance Committee is able to make this determination. If there was a need to move money from one category to another that was where any discussions and determinations would happen.

M. Ross-Russell reported that the actual spending was in accordance with the allocation decisions and that was presented in the quarterly reports and reallocation requests. M. Ross-Russell reminded the Finance Committee that as a part of the allocations process that there was a presentation from the Recipient on the client services unit as well as the service utilization and MMP results were also provided as a part of the allocation documentation. The annualized presentation from the Recipient about the number of units of service and that information was included in the allocation materials.

M. Ross-Russell reported that anytime a request for a funding shift was over the 10% threshold a reallocation request could occur and this happened throughout the course of the fiscal year, and was not necessarily at a specific timeframe. The Finance Committee decisions based on the discussions related to these requests were sent to the full Planning Body with either an endorsement, a recommendation to approve, recommendation to disapprove, or no recommendation at all, which has happened in the past.

M. Ross-Russell reported that she looked at the number of meetings where an AACO staff member was present, and of the 6 Finance Committee meetings, they were present for all of them. Additionally, there were 11 Planning Council meetings and the AACO staff members

participated in those meetings as well as the allocation meetings. M. Cappuccilli asked about the first statement where it stated the Recipient had a staff member at each committee meeting. Were they referring to all of the committees in that statement or just the Finance Committee? M. Ross-Russell made the appropriate change to reflect that they were present for 6 Finance Committee meetings, and clarified by putting “at each Finance and HIPC meeting” and the committee agreed.

M. Ross-Russell reported that the last answer would be best answered by the Recipient given the transition of leadership and general staffing changes at AACO. A. Edelstein asked what the next steps were in this process? M. Ross-Russell stated that she would send it back to the Recipient and then when the final responses were returned to OHP it was at the discretion of the Finance Committee whether it would be taken to the full Planning Body or the Executive Committee to make them aware that this document existed. She anticipated a delay given Dr. Brady’s current injury and it may go to the Planning Council in June.

A. Edelstein stated that it could be taken to the Planning Council after it was reviewed by the Finance Committee because at this point they reviewed at least 90% of it. If any new information was incorporated into the document, it could be sent to committee members to see if there were questions or concerns. A. Edelstein stated at that point it could be taken to the Full Council as a part of the committee report. M. Ross-Russell stated that any changes made would come from the quarterly reports. A. Edelstein agreed and stated that the next steps would be to get the quarterly reports and then update the document as needed before presenting it to the planning council.

K. Carter asked if this would be reported quarterly? A. Edelstein answered that when the Finance Committee received a quarterly report from A. McCann-Woods then that was the opportunity to do any updates to this document. If any changes were made it would be presented to the full planning committee to keep them informed as to what was going on.

Other Business

None.

Announcements

None.

Adjournment

A. Edelstein asked for a motion to adjourn. K. Carter made a motion to adjourn, M. Cappuccilli seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elijah Sumners

Additional Materials

Monitoring the Administrative Mechanism form

DRAFT