

**HIV Integrated Planning Council
Executive Committee
Thursday, February 22, 2018
2-4pm**

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

Present: Katelyn Baron, Kevin Burns, Michael Cappuccilli, Keith Carter, Tiffany Dominique, Dave Gana, Gerry Keys, Loretta Matus, Gail Thomas, Adam Thompson

Excused: Jen Chapman, Alan Edelstein, Jeanette Murdock, Clint Steib

Absent: None

Guests: Shawn Livingston

Staff: Antonio Boone, Briana Morgan, Nicole Johns, Debbie Law, Stephen Budhu

Call to Order: M. Cappuccilli called the meeting to order at 2:01pm. Those present then introduced themselves.

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

Approval of Minutes: M. Cappuccilli presented the minutes for approval. **Motion:** K. Baron moved, M. Cappuccilli seconded to approve the minutes. Motion Passed: All in favor.

Report of Staff: B. Morgan informed the committee the Office of HIV Planning has begun updating the integrated plan.

B. Morgan informed the committee in the February Comprehensive Planning Committee(CPC) meeting they discussed the proposed budget cuts to HOPWA in Philadelphia. The proposed cut would be up to \$1 million, and it could cause 147 families to lose their homes.

K. Baron stated the CPC felt the HOPWA discussion should be continued with the Finance Committee. The committees will have a joint meeting Thursday, March 1, 2018 from 2-4pm. M. Cappuccilli asked when the imposed cuts would be in effect. T. Dominique replied the million dollar-cut would be July 1, 2018. N. Johns added S. Heaven informed the CPC it is believed the \$1 million cut was the first of other cuts to HOPWA.

N. Johns informed the committee S. Heaven spoke to the CPC in their February meeting, and the committee moved to look at other means for funding housing. She explained Direct Emergency Financial Assistance (DEFA) was discussed, and it suggested that the DEFA funds could be used for first and last month's rent. To account for the estimated 147 households, first and last month's rent would be somewhere around \$250,000, according to an estimate shared by AACO's S. Branca.

N. Johns informed the committee aside from using emergency funding, Ryan White could pay for transitional housing. Transitional housing is defined as housing for 24 months or less.

M. Cappuccilli asked a procedural question. He asked how could the HIPC could request an amendment. N. Johns replied it would be a reallocation request. B. Morgan noted the HIPC only approved an interim budget for FY18 since only 20% of the grant was awarded.

A. Thompson asked if the CPC discussed using 340B money for housing in their meeting. He explained the 340B money could be used to alleviate the housing cuts. He noted since the 340B money is state funds, there is less restriction on how the money is spent compared to Ryan White dollars; 340B money could pay for permanent housing. He suggested the committee should explore using the 340B money from the state. He referenced New Jersey's plan that funds housing for PLWH who are homeless with state 340B money. The committee asked how much funding is available in PA. N. Johns replied PA has somewhere around \$20 million accessible. She noted at PA HIV Planning Group meetings they do discuss how to spend the 340B money since HRSA is requiring the state to spend the money. K. Burns stated HOPWA was the perfect place to spend 340B money. He explained if 340B was spent in HOPWA it would fit in with the mandate that funds would have to benefit Ryan White clients. A. Thompson suggested the committee should request 340B money from the state. He explained the committee could present the needs of PLWH to the state, and highlight the disparities that were created because of the state's inability to provide funding. The first need being housing and the second need being comprehensive health insurance. A. Thompson stated the committee request for 340B money maybe declined, but they could use the voice of those 147 households who may not be able to sustain housing come July 1, 2018.

M. Cappuccilli stated timing was a challenge here. He explained that it's either the committee requests the state to spend 340B money in housing by July 2018, or the HIPC makes a reallocation request before the entire grant award is announced. A. Thompson replied there was no federal input needed for the 340B funding request, so the timeline could be quick. T. Dominique added the other issue at hand is S. Heaven informed the CPC there will be more HOPWA cuts in the future. K. Burns stated the \$20+ million in 340B funds could help HOPWA for many years to come. K. Baron suggested in this case the committee should be as direct as possible due to the nature of the situation. K. Burns agreed and added the committee should contact HRSA to explain the funding needs related to HOPWA.

K. Carter stated there may be more cuts to housing in future, and we are uncertain if we will be awarded 340B money for HOPWA. He asked for more information about the plan when there are future cuts to HOPWA. K. Burns replied the state did have plans to use some of the 340B money to fund Ryan White Part B services, so it depends on how much residual money is left over. N. Johns added, there has been reports that the state has ideas about investing 340B into statewide service upgrades and other technical aspects.

M. Cappuccilli asked if the HOPWA cut will affect the regions of the EMA differently. N. Johns explained this was only for Delaware and Philadelphia Counties. A. Thompson added if the funding was cut in New Jersey, state government would absorb the cut with 340B money. K. Carter asked if there was a process for receiving 340B funding. N. Johns explained the state can choose how it's spent. A. Thompson explained New Jersey used it to purchase homes for those in need. B. Morgan explained the state funds are money that the state was not expecting to continue to get; the money is mainly from rebates. A. Thompson explained the state was obligated to spend the money in PLWH related activities. In the past Pennsylvania spent 340B money in non-PLWH activities and was penalized. He noted if the 340B money was not spent, eventually PA would need to forfeit parts of their Ryan White grant.

A. Thompson explained a letter was used in New Jersey to request 340B money to house specific PLWH. He explained the letter expressed clinical need and eventually it was received by the state after submission. He suggested the committee should draft a letter to ask for 340B money to help fund housing in Philadelphia. N. Johns explained if a letter was drafted soon it could be presented at the state HPG meeting in March 2018. K. Burns asked to whom the letter should be addressed. N. Johns replied when a

previous letter was written that requested state help, it was addressed to the state HIV director, and it was carbon copied to the state HPG. In response, A. Thompson suggested two letters could be written: one as the community to the state health director, and one as the HIPC to the state HPG.

M. Cappuccilli asked if it was possible to draft a letter and have it approved by the March HIPC meeting. B. Morgan replied, if the HIPC were to vote and approve the letter, it could be presented to the state HPG since their March meeting is one week after the HIPC's.

G. Keys asked what the period of time PA has to spend the 340B money. B. Morgan replied it needed to be spent ASAP, the issue has transcended many years. A. Thompson explained the state was granted some leeway in time frame to spend the money. A. Thompson stated HRSA has been on top of the state and has a vested interest that the state spends the money.

D. Gana stated there was a similar problem in Arizona, and they were able to successfully request the allocation of 340B money once clinical need was proven. He suggested the committee could use the same strategy to request 340B money.

M. Cappuccilli asked if the committee could hold an emergency meeting in one week to draft the letter before the March 2018 HIPC meeting. K. Burns asked if the letter could be reviewed via e-mail. B. Morgan stated the letter could be reviewed via e-mail since it would not have to be voted upon in the Executive Committee, just the HIPC.

T. Dominique referenced the February 2018 CPC meeting. She stated S. Branca's estimate of \$250,000 needed for HOPWA was inaccurate. Assuming fair market rent was \$1300-\$1500, the true estimate could be closer to \$500,000.

N. Johns reminded the committee providing first and last month's rent for PLWH is not a viable option for all. That recommendation comes with the assumption that those people will be able to sustain housing.

M. Cappuccilli asked the committee if anyone was willing to volunteer to draft the letter. A. Thompson volunteered, and stated he would use the following points in the letter: highlighting the outcomes of displacement, potential for care disruption, the benefits of sustained housing, transitions are dangerous in health care, and induced trauma when people lose their homes. He asked the committee if they wanted to add a topic that needed to be included in the letter. L. Matus stated she agreed with A. Thompson's points of emphasis and expanded on his second point. She explained losing housing would disrupt a PLWH's ability to get care and retain in care.

M. Cappuccilli asked if there were funding cuts in HOPWA across the nation. B. Morgan replied the funding cuts are coming from the new HOPWA funding formula that is being used. N. Johns added there were some HUD-level cuts, but the new housing formula did have large impact.

A. Thompson stated the committee needed to be transparent about their funding request. Since there was a formula change to housing, the committee would have to explore other venues for funding in the future, or possibly ask the state for 340B money again in the future. M. Cappuccilli asked A. Thompson what the time frame was for the letter. A. Thompson replied he would try to have a draft completed within 24 hours and then send it over to the Office of HIV Planning.

N. Johns informed the committee the consumer survey report is complete and copies are available for those who are interested.

Action Items: None

Discussion Items:

- **Needs Assessment**

B. Morgan stated the Needs Assessment Committee has been meeting jointly with CPC since 2016. B. Morgan suggested the committee should discuss either leaving Needs Assessment as a standing committee, having them meet as an ad-hoc work group, or dissolving the committee. G. Keys stated the Needs Assessment Committee has always been a small, and when they started having joint meetings with CPC, members were lost. G. Keys stated she was open to the idea of dissolving the Needs Assessment and joining CPC. K. Burns asked if they were always a subcommittee of CPC. D. Law replied no, they used to meet separately. M. Cappuccilli asked if this requires bylaw changes. B. Morgan replied yes. L. Matus asked if the bylaws could be changed now or did the committee have to wait. B. Morgan replied the Executive Committee could vote to amend the bylaws to retire the Needs Assessment Committee. Then this could be presented as a motion by the Executive Committee to the HIPC. The HIPC would then vote on the amended bylaws after a 30-day comment period.

M. Cappuccilli asked if the Needs Assessment Committee was dissolved into Comprehensive Planning, would the committee still be called the Comprehensive Planning Committee. B. Morgan replied there were two ways to handle it: add the responsibilities of the Needs Assessment Committee to the Comprehensive Planning Committee or have Needs Assessment function as an ad hoc work group that meets as needed. B. Morgan explained ad-hoc work groups are created by the HIPC when special issues arise. B. Morgan gave the committee an example idea when an ad-hoc work would be used. M. Cappuccilli asked G. Keys if she felt the Needs Assessment Committee could function as an ad hoc work group. G. Keys replied attendance is always tough. The thing with work groups is they require attendance. K. Burns stated he felt the Needs Assessment Committee mission fits well with CPC's mission. L. Matus stated she felt the Needs Assessment's goals should be incorporated into CPC instead of making an ad hoc work group.

Motion: G. Keys moved, K. Burns seconded to retire the Needs Assessment Committee. **Vote:** 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. **Motion Passed.** The Executive Committee will recommend retiring the Needs Assessment Committee to the HIPC.

- **Allocations Process**

B. Morgan reminded the committee they reviewed some changes to the HIPC's formal process in the last meeting. Many of the changes were language modernizations e.g., RWPC to HIPC. She explained the committee also reviewed the allocations process and the committee would need to adjust their process for allocations. Traditionally the HIPC created a 5% decrease budget, a level funding budget, a 5% increase budget and a 10% increase budget and then submitted the 10% increase budget for Part A application. This past application the HIPC was not allowed by HRSA to submit a 10% increase budget and were capped at asking for a 5% increase. B. Morgan informed the committee at this point there is no information on whether HRSA will allow a 10% increase budget to be submitted in the future. If the HIPC was restricted with budget submissions in the future, the process would have to be amended.

A. Thompson asked about the process and time associated with creating the 10% increase budget. B. Morgan replied there is an allocations process for each budget, and generally the 10% increase budget is where people propose their ideals. M. Cappuccilli asked what would happen if the HIPC just continued to make the 10% increase budget. B. Morgan replied the 10% budget could still be created, but this requires additional time and effort from allocations meeting attendees.

A. Thompson asked if the bylaws could be updated to reflect a change that was not permanent; if the process could be adjusted if or when a 10% increase submission was allowed. B. Morgan stated that procedures could be voted on and immediately approved, there was no 30-day period before the change took place.

A. Thompson asked for the purpose of this “pie in the sky” 10% budget. Was information taken from the budget proposals or was it just a feel-good idea? K. Baron replied she always liked the 10% budget because of the message it sends, even though it has always been a reach. M. Cappuccilli asked if it was customary to create a 10% budget. N. Johns stated it was created and used as a tool to show where more funding was needed. In a practical sense the 10% increase budget has not been used to make actual funding decisions in quite some time.

Motion: M. Cappuccilli moved, T. Dominique seconded to eliminate the 10% increase budget submission. Vote: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. Motion Passed.

- **Planning Council Co-Chair**

In reference to the January Executive Committee meeting, B. Morgan stated the HIPC still needed a co-chair. The HIPC approved an interim chair position until September 2018, at that point the interim co-chair could run for a permanent position. Also, at that time the HIPC decided they would revisit co-chair elections and terms. The committee briefly discussed the current status of HIPC officers.

B. Morgan stated it was previously decided that all co-chair terms would be extended until September 2018. Since September was approaching, B. Morgan suggested the committee should review co-chair structure. She asked the committee did they want to stay with the current format of 4 co-chairs, or should the structure be different. L. Matus asked to review the current co-chair structure. B. Morgan stated the current structure for the HIPC co-chairs is 4, one from prevention, one PLWH, one governmental, one from care.

K. Burns asked if care or prevention representation is necessary since the council is now integrated. He suggested only 2 co-chairs besides the governmental co-chair were needed. He stated with 3 co-chairs, only 1 would have to be a consumer. K. Baron explained the reason for the co-chair conversation is because if the committee wanted to continue to keep the mandate that one of the co-chairs needed to be HIV positive, it could create a scenario where it comes across serostatus is more important than co-chair skills.

A. Thompson referenced conversation from the June 2016 Executive Committee meeting. He suggested the committee would have to re-evaluate what “consumer of services means”. With the integration of the care and prevention planning bodies the committee should explore the idea if someone on PrEP should be considered a “consumer” or someone taking Hepatitis C medications should be. He explained if the mandate was for one of the co-chairs to be PLWH, there is a chance of tokenism.

N. Johns suggested if there is not open PLWH representation there may be a perception from the community that PLWH were excluded. M. Cappuccilli stated the Nominations Committee reviews membership applications and they are required to have PLWH representation. He stated since the nominations requires PLWH representation, the term “consumer” should continue to be defined as PLWH. A. Thompson asked if the bylaws stated one of the chairs had to be a “consumer” or HIV+. K. Baron replied the bylaws mention HIV positive representation, the term “consumer” is not used.

A. Thompson asked if it was necessary for co-chairs who are PLWH to disclose their status to the HIPC. B. Morgan replied HIPC members with HIV do not have to have conversations about their status, or have overt disclosure; however, the HIPC needs to know that at least one of the co-chairs is HIV positive.

M. Cappuccilli asked if the committee would be voting on terms of co-chairs as well. B. Morgan replied the committee could look into terms, since the original co-chair structure called for 3 community co-chairs plus one governmental co-chair. Currently the 3 community co-chairs have 3-year terms. HIPC membership is for 2 years.

A. Thompson asked if the recommendation is for 2 community co-chairs and 1 governmental with terms of 3 years. K. Baron replied yes, except the community co-chair terms would be staggered, and the governmental co-chair is for an indefinite amount of time. B. Morgan explained the governmental co-chair is an appointee by the Recipient.

K. Burns asked if the recommendation should be for 2-year terms for the co-chairs so there would be elections every year. B. Morgan explained that was the current structure until the terms were extended by the HIPC due to integration.

M. Cappuccilli asked if the committee needed to make decisions today. B. Morgan replied no, the committee was not required to make any decisions today.

A. Thompson expressed his concerns with the proposed co-chair structure. He stated the plan is a 5-year commitment, and that annual elections could make achieving its goals more difficult. D. Law replied co-chair elections play into recruitment because members have a chance at becoming chair in a timely fashion. She also noted it helps to aid situations where chairs need to be replaced because of attendance or personal issues. A. Thompson explained the elections process takes time, and that is time that can be used elsewhere.

K. Burns asked if the committee should consider 4-year terms for co-chairs. B. Morgan suggested it may be difficult to get people to commit to 4 years in a leadership position.

M. Cappuccilli asked the committee if they felt 2 or 3 additional co-chairs besides the governmental co-chair was best. The committee members replied 2 additional would be best. M. Cappuccilli replied 2 may be tough especially with schedules and attendance. K. Baron stated she thinks it's sufficient with just 2 co-chairs plus the 1 governmental.

A. Thompson shared his experiences on planning councils, and explained 2 chairs was quite normal. In some cases, the government co-chairs would be leading the meeting. A. Thompson acknowledged it was not customary at the HIPC, but it was common elsewhere. T. Dominique shared her experiences with governmental co-chairs leading meetings. K. Burns asked if the recommendation should be for only 2 co-chairs. K. Baron replied the concern with 2 is, the community co-chair would always have to be HIV+.

K. Carter replied he did not feel that the officer needed to be PLWH, just the best suited person for the job. A. Thompson stated in essence it is tokenism to have a mandate for PLWH representation. He stated that the HIPC needs to train that individual and get them to a point where they are comfortable with chairing the meeting, not worry about their status. K. Burns replied there have been HIV+ co-chairs that have done a fantastic job facilitating meetings.

A. Thompson suggested the committee should wait for all members to be present before making recommendations pertaining to the serostatus requirements of co-chairs.

N. Johns suggested the committee should review the qualities that they are looking for in a co-chair.

M. Cappuccilli stated it sounds like the committee is moving towards recommending 3 total co-chairs.

K. Carter expressed his concerns with open disclosure and co-chairs. He explained not all PLWH are ready to disclose their status, and he suggested it may be a deterrent to some members. A. Thompson referenced his earlier point about PLWH representation. He explained the mandate does not effectively serve the council in his opinion.

S. Livingston stated he was interested in being a HIPC member again. He stated he wants to give back to the PLWH population. He expressed his feeling toward the conversation and offered this point: anyone who was truly interested in making a difference will apply for leadership roles regardless of the term length.

B. Morgan suggested the committee should not vote on co-chair structure, but instead consider what they would like to see in Planning Council leadership, and then bring those recommendations back to the committee. The committee could discuss member's recommendations at future meetings and compare similarities. M. Cappuccilli stated one of the most important requirements for a HIPC co-chair is time, a co-chair must have the time to attend the meetings.

M. Cappuccilli asked what the role of a HIPC co-chair is and why they usually abstain from voting. B. Morgan replied the co-chairs do not vote to remain impartial. If they voted on a particular topic it could be viewed that they in support of a particular position or vice versa. L. Matus asked why co-chairs vote in subcommittees. K. Baron explained she typically votes in subcommittee meetings she is a part of but abstains from voting in the HIPC meetings. She noted she is completely transparent about where she works to avoid a potential conflict of interest when she does vote. She stated she doesn't vote in HIPC meetings because she works for a provider, as a co-chair, and she doesn't want to create perception that she is advocating for her agency or any other.

M. Cappuccilli asked K. Baron for clarification on the documents HIPC co-chairs needed to sign. K. Baron explained there are procedural documents that need to be signed intermittently by the HIPC co-chairs. She added she has had the opportunity to be part of conference calls with the HIPC, the Recipient and with HRSA. She stated as a co-chair you have the opportunity to be as involved as you want to be. She noted co-chairs should attend other subcommittee meetings to get a sense of what is going in throughout the month.

K. Carter stated anyone was eligible for the co-chair position, it's just they have to have the right skill set. A. Thompson agreed, and noted the skills that are needed to be a co-chair can be taught over time. He shared his experiences with leadership training. He explained in many cases the leadership training is just as important for the current leader as it is for the perspective leader. He noted many people assume working professionals already have the skills to facilitate a meeting, and that's not always the case. He referenced M. Cappuccilli's earlier comment regarding time: one of the most important attributes a co-chair needed to have is time. Without time to attend their other skills are simply null and void.

T. Dominique explained she was is part of many community-based groups and often they give job descriptions and time associated for the chair position and even the membership role. She stated the organizations also give those interested the opportunity to talk to current members/chairs to understand what is required in the position and the amount of time that is needed to be allotted.

M. Cappuccilli stated its always a catch-22 with recruitment. The more involved something is the more people may hesitate to become involved. There needs to be a balance of what is being asked and the time sacrifice. S. Livingston replied people who are willing to commit will commit to something regardless of sacrifice that needed to be made. He stated strong leaders are willing to sacrifice and those who sacrifice will become stronger people in the long run. People need to give back to the community to keep the community functioning.

T. Dominique explained people may also shy away from leadership roles when they see the current leader excelling. People may be discouraged because they may feel they cannot match or better the past leader's performance. T. Dominique touched upon the current HIPC co-chair structure. She stated in many meetings K. Baron has facilitated the meeting solo, and that may have discouraged potential co-chair candidates from expressing interest. M. Cappuccilli agreed and noted there had been no official nominations for the interim co-chair position.

N. Johns suggested the committee try to showcase the positive aspects of being a co-chair. The committee should acknowledge the co-chair position is not for everyone but should try to identify those individuals who may be suited for the position.

T. Dominique asked if the HIPC still needed representation in Urban Coalition of HIV/AIDS Prevention Services (UCHAPS). She asked is it still a requirement that the HIPC has a UCHAPS representative that is not the governmental co-chair. B. Morgan replied there is still a requirement. Typically a HIPC co-chair would be the UCHAPS representative, but it could be the prevention co-chair, or the HIPC could nominate a delegate.

A. Thompson stated the committee needed to identify traits and qualities that are needed for a HIPC co-chair. He asked the committee if it is a discussion that should be had in a committee or should it be a brainstorming activity in a HIPC meeting. K. Baron suggested the conversation should be presented to the HIPC instead of having the discussion in a subcommittee. M. Cappuccilli agreed and asked for ways the committee could present the conversation to the HIPC. M. Cappuccilli suggested they ask for what traits and qualities HIPC members feel are needed for the co-chair position. A. Thompson added the committee should also provide example of skills, qualities and traits so the HIPC has clear examples of what they are. He explained if the brainstorming activity is done in the March HIPC meeting, the committee could collect responses and make an informed decision on new co-chair structure. He noted the activity time should be brief so people don't over analyze things. K. Burns asked if A. Thompson was referring to giving HIPC members index cards to brainstorm or was it going to be a vocal session. A. Thompson replied index cards that would be collected at the end of the meeting. K. Burns suggested the committee could add ideas as the meeting progresses even after the allotted 5-minute time period has expired. M. Cappuccilli stated with the ideas the Executive Committee could design a set of most desired attributes and create a job description. A. Thompson agreed and stated that would be useful when people ask what a co-chair does.

K. Burns asked if there was a job description. B. Morgan replied no, there was talk of creating a job description in the past but it was never carried out.

T. Dominique referenced N. Johns' earlier comment about showcasing positive attributes of the position. She noted the committee needed to focus on all the positives of the leadership role and to make sure when the job description was presented it seemed feasible. K. Burns agreed and suggested the committee should use current member input to explain what they feel are the job requirements. B. Morgan noted OHP would be doing short videos with HIPC members and suggested in the interview they could ask members

what skills they think are important for co-chairs. She invited the committee to partake in the video interviews.

M. Cappuccilli agreed with A. Thompson's recommendation and asked who would present the brainstorming recommendation to the HIPC. After short discussion, K. Baron volunteered to spearhead conversation. K. Baron asked when would be the best time to present the brainstorming activity during the HIPC meeting. N. Johns suggested it would be best done at the beginning of the meeting, specifically the "Report of Chair" section.

Old Business: M. Cappuccilli asked how we will keep attendance of the HIPC officers. He stated from the Nominations Committee the recommendation was to have the Executive Committee review HIPC officer attendance. The Executive Committee did discuss the attendance but he stated he was unclear of the resolution. M. Cappuccilli stated from the last Executive Committee meeting it was recommended the officers should be contacted after 2 absences. He explained there was no specification if the 2 absences were unexcused or just absences. He stated he was unsure of how the HIPC would track attendance for co-chairs in the future. K. Baron stated the Executive Committee did make a recommendation to track attendance for officers the same as members. B. Morgan replied the recommendation was different since the committee recommended officers to be contacted after 2 absences, there was just no consensus on what type of absence. K. Baron suggested the recommendation should just be after 2 absences accrued, contact will be made whether the absences are excused or unexcused. T. Dominique asked if this policy was for all co-chairs or just the officers. B. Morgan replied it was just for the officers. L. Matus stated the contact after 2 meetings were missed should be positive, and it should take the tone of how can we help you, not why did you miss the meeting. K. Burns noted when he has had a schedule conflict and has been unable to attend, no OHP staff or HIPC members have ever questioned him, and he appreciated that.

A. Thompson stated his stance on attendance. He stated he did not understand why remote participation was not allowed in HIPC and HIPC subcommittee meetings. He explained the benefits of participating remotely and how it could improve attendance. A. Thompson stated in other planning bodies it was possible to call in or use video chat platforms. He explained with remote participation you would not be able to vote. K. Burns commented if you were on camera and actively participating then you should be able to still vote. B. Morgan stated there are bylaws about being in the room, and about proxy voting, but the bylaws were created when there was not the technology to support video conferencing. K. Baron stated there are free systems that could support video conference calling. The committee briefly discussing the platforms that could support video conferencing. T. Dominique stated she was in support of the technology initiative, but there would have to be a limit on the amount of remote participation an individual can use. A. Thompson suggested the committee could look at using 3 as an arbitrary allowance for remote participation.

New Business: A. Thompson suggested when data is presented and the data does not support trends found in literature and other analysis, we should ask representatives from that jurisdiction to comment on their data. M. Cappuccilli referenced the last HIPC meeting and the data presented. He stated the continuums that were presented for New Jersey did not match other information that he had previously seen. A. Thompson agreed. K. Baron asked if the request would be made to the Recipient.

The group discussed various challenges in requesting data from different entities. A. Thompson volunteered to facilitate data requests for NJ data.

N. Johns commented in many cases surveillance data does not match Ryan White data. The outcomes in the Ryan White continuum are generally better than the outcomes seen in general surveillance data this may have been the reason for the discrepancies noted in Dr. Brady's presentation.

Announcements: L. Matus announced on February 26th and 27th, her agency is meeting with UCHAPS, via video-conference.

Adjournment: Motion: L. Matus moved, D. Gana seconded to adjourn the meeting at 3:58 pm. **Motion Passed:** All in favor.

Respectfully submitted by,

Stephen Budhu, staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Meeting Minutes
- OHP Calendar
- Other Handouts