

**Philadelphia EMA HIV Integrated Planning Council  
Nominations Committee  
Meeting Minutes of**

**Thursday, November 23, 2020**

**12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.**

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

**Present:** Juan Baez, Michael Cappuccilli (Co-Chair), Lupe Diaz, Sharee Heaven, Samuel Romero (Co-Chair)

**Staff:** Beth Celeste, Julia Henrikson, Nicole Johns, Debbie Law, Sofia Moletteri

**Call to Order:** S. Romero called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m.

**Approval of Agenda:**

S. Romero presented the November 2020 Nominations meeting agenda for approval. **Motion: L. Diaz motioned, S. Heaven seconded to approve the agenda. Motion passed: all in favor.**

**Approval of Minutes (February 13, 2020):**

M. Cappuccilli presented the February 2020 meeting minutes . **Motion: S. Heaven motioned, M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve the February 2020 meeting minutes. Motion passed: all in favor.**

**Report of Staff:**

N. Johns reported that there would not be any committee meetings scheduled for the rest of the year unless the Finance Committee had business. However, there would be a HIPC meeting.

**Report of Chair:**

M. Cappuccilli asked if the committee met quorum, and D. Law responded that they can agree to be okay with five individuals and would need a motion.

**Motion: M. Cappuccilli made a motion that five Nominations Committee members would serve as quorum today's Nominations business, J. Baez seconded.** There was discussion on the motion.

L. Diaz asked how many members were officially part of the Nominations Committee. D. Law said there were five unless they included D. Angelis in the count. J. Baez asked if D. Angelis had reapplied for the council, and D. Law responded that his term was not yet up. J. Baez asked if he was officially on the Nominations Committee. D. Law was not sure, though he did come to meetings in the past. M. Cappuccilli said that he did not come to the meeting in February.

L. Diaz said that they would not need to vote on quorum if only five of them are officially part of the committee. J. Baez said they would need a simple majority when voting. **The motion was withdrawn.**

**Action Item:**

—*New and Old Applicants*—

M. Cappuccilli recalled S. Moletteri's email which stated that the committee should still keep demographics and representation in mind, as always, but also know that there will be more flexibility around representation and reflectiveness this year due to COVID-19. He added that other EMAs were also struggling with the same issue. S. Romero agreed, saying he kept this in mind during the scoring process. M. Cappuccilli noted that there were no more than 1 or 2 unaligned consumers within the applications, so their ratios would be skewed.

N. Johns said that M. Ross-Russell had talked to the Project Officer about this many times as well as OHP staff, internally. She explained that federal partners are aware of and accepting this reality. However, this is temporary, and by next year, they would hopefully have a more "normal" application process.

M. Cappuccilli said that there was a disconnect between the actual applications and D. Law's record regarding meeting attendance. He asked if this was because people had applied earlier, before attending. N. Johns responded affirmatively, explaining that a lot of applicants applied earlier this year and have been attending since.

L. Diaz noted that there were four applicants without tax certifications. She asked how the committee wanted to handle this. M. Cappuccilli asked if, in the past, the committee accepted applicants provisionally and had D. Law follow up with those without the tax certifications. D. Law said yes.

M. Cappuccilli noted that there were few individuals applying from the same agency. S. Romero said that L. Matus explained to him that if the other person from Congreso was accepted, she would step down from the council. L. Diaz asked if L. Matus was no longer interested in her position. S. Romero said she was, but she was willing to step down if she needed to. J. Baez asked if not worrying about numbers/demographics also included the number of people from the same agencies. D. Law agreed that this is different from demographics. D. Law noted that this information was within the Nominations policy.

M. Cappuccilli said that they should err on the side of inclusion when accepting people. L. Diaz agreed, but said this may be problematic since accepting the new Congreso applicant would mean a third person on the council from the same agency. She explained that one or two individuals from an agency is okay, ensuring that one certain agency did not have too much of a say or vote within the EMA.

J. Baez said that in different, non-COVID circumstances, he would feel as if there were not enough PLWH within the council. J. Baez said that the council needed broader voices, adding that people do not vote from their organizational perspective and that affiliations are removed from voting. S. Heaven asked if they could amend their policy. Since they are in the midst of a pandemic, they could opt to allow more than two people from an organization on the council.

L. Diaz noted that there were 24 new applicants, and if they accepted all of them, they would have 62 councilmembers. The group briefly discussed L. Matus's attendance and involvement. N. Johns said that within legislative conceptualization, membership is about the individuals, their demographics, and their expertise. She explained that a member's organization is just one piece of what they have to offer.

L. Diaz explained that it would be difficult if L. Matus stepped down since she is a co-chair and longstanding member. J. Baez said they would base this decision off of the application scores. D.

Law noted that they would have 52 members if they put everyone who applied on, since some of the applicants were reapplying. L. Diaz stated that 55 was the maximum number of members allowed for the council.

M. Cappuccilli asked if tax certification information had changed for any of the applicants. He asked whether D. Law thought any of the tax certification issues would be resolved. D. Law responded that it is case-by-case.

N. Johns brought up the numbers from everyone's scores on the screen. D. Law explained that an applicants' final score represented an applicant's total score, divided by the number of people who scored it. The asterisk represented Nominations Committee members—since those members could not score themselves, the total score was divided by four, not five.

The committee began to review the scores. D. Law read the applicants' assigned numbers and their correlating scores aloud, going from highest to lowest scores.

D. Law explained that applicant #20 had a perfect score amongst votes. The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #20.

The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #22.

The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #34.

The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #25.

The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #27.

The committee discussed applicant #33, L. Diaz read the note that this is a current member with bad attendance, though they have been in contact with the office. She asked D. Law to elaborate. D. Law explained that this reapplicant has had difficulty with Zoom, but is still in contact and calling whenever possible. The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #33.

The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #15.

Regarding applicant #18, D. Law commented that this person emailed S. Moletteri to say that he was no longer interested in receiving emails due to poor health. L. Diaz asked if this had to do with the tax certification. D. Law said no. J. Baez asked if the applicant had followed up. D. Law said that he has not responded yet. D. Law read the email out loud which included the language "no longer interested in participating." J. Baez said that membership required participation, so it seems as if this applicant was no longer interested in applying. S. Heaven agreed that if he requested not to receive any communication/correspondence, this meant a withdrawal of his application. The committee unanimously agreed to take this applicant off the list.

L. Diaz noted that applicant #30's attendance was erratic. D. Law said that this person has health issues, but they keep in contact. D. Law said that technological literacy was also an issue for this applicant. The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #30.

M. Cappuccilli noted that new applicant #9 had attended HIPC meetings. The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #9.

Regarding #21, L. Diaz said she scored this person low for some reason. After looking over her notes, she realized this may have been a mistake. The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #21.

For applicant #26, S. Romero, S. Heaven, M. Cappuccilli voted to recommend this applicant. S. Heaven asked about this applicant, and D. Law said they were a new applicant with no recorded attendance. L. Diaz asked about their tax certification. D. Law said they applied recently—October—and she was not sure. L. Diaz said the application sounded very informal and that she expected more from this application since they had a certain affiliation. She said she would still vote to recommend this individual. S. Heaven said she would also vote to recommend this person, contingent on whether or not they get their tax clearance. The group agreed. The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #26 with the tax clearance contingency.

The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #28. M. Cappuccilli recalled that there were two applicants with expertise with PrEP: applicants #28 and #29. S. Heaven pointed out that they were from the same agency. The committee discussed the affiliation and noted that there was no conflict with the rule about no more than 2 members from an agency. L. Diaz agreed, saying that she would vote to recommend both #28 and #29. M. Cappuccilli agreed with L. Diaz.

The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #29.

The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #32.

For applicant #13, M. Cappuccilli noted that the person represented PA counties. He explained that the council needed more representation in the counties. The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #13.

Applicant #17, S. Heaven noted, had both their clearances and has actively attended meetings. The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #17.

The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #19.

Regarding applicant #16, S. Heaven asked if sporadic attendance was due to health issues. D. Law said she had not seen this reapplicant since they started virtual meetings. Before this, the member had missed one or two meetings but was not in violation. L. Diaz asked for more specifics about this members' attendance or any other council-related issues. D. Law said that she did not know of any issues, and that she has reached out to this member. N. Johns said in light of the fact that they are meeting virtually, they should take this into consideration. L. Diaz said that people affiliated with an agency are not as likely to have trouble attending meetings. D. Law was unsure if this person was still working. Because L. Diaz knew who the applicant was, she was abstaining from the vote. Four members voted to recommend applicant #16, one member abstained. Applicant #16 recommended.

When considering applicant #23, D. Law mentioned that this applicant had never attended a meeting, applied September 15<sup>th</sup>, and did not have tax clearances. D. Law explained that this person lived in the PA counties, but represented a Philadelphia organization. L. Diaz asked if this applicant reached out to OHP for tax clearance help. D. Law said they had not. S. Heaven and L. Diaz voted not to recommend this member. J. Baez, S. Romero, and M. Cappuccilli voted to recommend this member

contingent on whether or not they receive their tax clearances. Majority rules to recommend applicant #23.

Regarding applicant #2, L. Diaz said the group scored this person the lowest because they had the least information about them. However, the council needed more New Jersey representation. The committee unanimously voted to recommend applicant #2.

M. Cappuccilli noted that applicants #7 and #8 were both from the same agency. L. Diaz asked if the council had anyone else from that agency, and D. Law said no. She said that one of the applicants had attended more than the other. L. Diaz asked if next time the committee reviewed applications, they could receive the resumes with the personal information redacted. D. Law responded that they could. D. Law explained that the applicant with the resume attached was at the agency as a medical case manager coordinator for 7 years. S. Heaven and J. Baez said they gave both applicants the same score.

D. Law said that since they were discussing applicants #7 and #8 simultaneously, she would take a vote now. The committee unanimously voted to recommend both applicants #7 and #8.

For application #4, L. Diaz scored them low because they did not offer a lot of information in their application. J. Baez suggested that since they have a policy to not exceed more than two people from the same organization (and since this person's score was low), they should not vote them in. D. Law said that considering what S. Romero said earlier, the current member from that agency would have to step down first before this person could apply. There would need to be a vacancy. L. Diaz said that they can just tell this applicant to reapply if the current member steps down. S. Romero said he would abstain from this vote since he was from the same organization. Four committee members voted against recommending applicant #4, and one member abstained. Majority rules, applicant #4 was not recommended.

D. Law said that they approved twenty applicants and two applicants with contingencies around the tax certification. She explained that the recommendation for applicants #26 and #23 were contingent on the tax certification.

D. Law explained that there were a few people with attendance issues. She asked if the committee wanted to discuss and vote to remove them now or later. She said that there are three people who were not attending, even before the pandemic. D. Law said that their terms had not expired, and they were all providers. L. Diaz asked if the committee should also consider setting up another meeting date to discuss committee structure.

L. Diaz suggested they meet after Thanksgiving, but before the next HIPC meeting. L. Diaz noted that the next meeting was on December 10<sup>th</sup>. The group agreed to meet at 2 p.m. or afterwards on Monday, December 14<sup>th</sup>.

D. Law reported on the information from the nominations process - they only put 12 applicants on—not 13—and she would have to recount. After recounting, she reported that consumers represented 23% of the council. As for unaligned consumers, the percentage was 20%. J. Baez asked if the percentage increased because unaligned consumers did not respond. D. Law said no, the committee put on more providers which caused a decrease in the ratio. However, she explained that the three individuals who have not been participating in council were all providers. D. Law added the council would be at 50 members if the two applicants with contingencies were recommended.

J. Baez said that if people are having trouble obtaining tax clearance, he would give D. Law a number for them to call, so they could obtain help for filling out the information.

D. Law listed the three members who had not been attending (information redacted for privacy reasons). D. Law said the first person was laid off and had not or responded about or attended meetings. D. Law noted that the second person had left their agency. D. Law explained that the third person was no longer in the position they applied to the council with. She recalled that someone wanted to take her place in the council, but D. Law told the individual that they had to first apply before taking the member's place. S. Romero asked the last time the third member attended a meeting, and D. Law responded that it was a while ago.

J. Baez asked for a vote as to whether they should remove these three people from HIPC. All five members of the council unanimously voted the three members off of HIPC.

D. Law said that the three people removed, they would be at 47 total members with 25.5% representation for unaligned consumers. S. Romero asked if D. Law could provide a sheet with tallies regarding the new members to break down demographics.

L. Diaz asked if they should review the list of individuals who have not have not been able to attend virtual meetings. D. Law said she had a list of names for people who have not attended Zoom meetings—she was waiting for the Nominations Committee's guidance. L. Diaz said some of these people may have difficulties working with Zoom. L. Diaz said she is lenient when it comes to technological difficulties or inability to access technology. However, she knew of other people who have meeting attendance capabilities, but simply do not attend HIPC. S. Romero asked to table this conversation for December 14<sup>th</sup>. Everyone agreed.

**Any Other Business:**

None.

**Announcements:**

None.

**Adjournment:**

S. Romero asked for a motion to adjourn, **Motion:** L. Diaz motioned, S. Romero seconded to adjourn the meeting at 3:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sofia Moletteri, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- December 2020 Nominations Agenda
- February 2020 Nominations Meeting Minutes
- October 2020 Demographics

- October 2020 Planning Council Representation (Numbers)
- Score Sheet Fall 2020
- List of Applicants (Redacted Information & Password Protected)