

**Philadelphia HIV Prevention Planning Group (HPG)
Ryan White Part A Planning Council (RWPC) of the Philadelphia EMA
Integrated Executive Committee**

March 16, 2017

12:00-2:00p.m.

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

Present: Tre Alexander, Katelyn Baron, Michael Cappuccilli, Alan Edelstein, Clint Steib

Excused: Gus Grannan, Adam Thompson, Jennifer Chapman, Gerry Keys

Absent: Kevin Burns, Keith Carter, David Gana, Nancy Santiago

Staff: Mari Ross-Russell, Briana Morgan, Jennifer Hayes

Call to Order: T. Alexander called the meeting to order at 12:30p.m.

Welcome/Introductions: T. Alexander welcomed committee members and guests. Those present then introduced themselves.

Approval of Agenda: T. Alexander presented the agenda for approval. **Motion:** M. Cappuccilli moved, C. Steib seconded to approve the agenda. Motion passed: All in favor.

Approval of Minutes: T. Alexander presented the March 2, 2017 meeting minutes for approval. **Motion:** K. Baron moved, C. Steib seconded to approve the minutes. Motion passed: All in favor.

Report of Staff: None.

Discussion Items:

- **Bylaws**

M. Ross-Russell stated that the group needed to determine whether there would be a governmental co-chair of the integrated body. She said the prevention planning body had a governmental co-chair, who was required to sign a letter of concurrence for the Plan. She stated that UCHAPS did not require a governmental co-chair, but rather a governmental representative.

M. Ross-Russell noted that she had followed up by speaking with other cities about their integration process. She noted that Chicago, which had integrated, had 3 co-chairs, including a governmental co-chair. She stated that the CDC requirements about a governmental co-chair were not entirely clear. However, she said that having a governmental co-chair was strongly recommended.

M. Ross-Russell suggested that the group consider adding another co-chair position for a governmental co-chair. She stated that the recipient could appoint the governmental co-

chair, whose term would not be limited. She said that, if a governmental co-chair was added, this would need to be included in the bylaws. B. Morgan pointed out that Article 3 on membership would also need to be changed, as it only now allowed for non-governmental members with 2 year terms.

C. Steib asked about the extent of the governmental co-chair's participation in Planning Council business. M. Ross-Russell noted that the governmental co-chair could be required to recuse themselves from votes and discussions on some Planning Council business, like allocations and other fiscal decisions. B. Morgan asked if the governmental co-chair would be a voting member. M. Ross-Russell said she was not sure what kind of restrictions regarding voting might apply to the governmental co-chair.

K. Baron asked if the governmental co-chair would be elected or appointed. M. Ross-Russell stated that the chair would be appointed by AACO. She explained that the governmental co-chair connected the integrated planning body with the PDPH's prevention activities.

K. Baron asked if it was possible for the governmental co-chair to be a non-voting member. M. Ross-Russell replied that co-chairs could not be non-voting members. K. Baron said that the co-chair would abstain from some votes. C. Steib asked if the Prevention Committee would need a governmental co-chair. M. Ross-Russell said it depended on how the committee decided to structure itself. She stated that the governmental co-chair would need to be apprised of the decisions of the Prevention Committee.

C. Steib asked if AACO representatives were typically included in meetings. K. Baron responded that there were usually AACO representatives at meetings. M. Ross-Russell said that recipient presence in the meetings helped connect AACO to the concerns of the community. A. Edelstein noted that the governmental co-chair would be appointed at AACO's discretion.

K. Baron stated that, if Chicago had carried out this model for integration successfully, she anticipated it could work for Philadelphia too. M. Ross-Russell noted that Chicago had a steering committee. She said the committee steered the group's activities and generated the annual work plan. She stated that they also worked with committees to determine how work would be carried out. She said that activities from committees went to the full Planning Council for a vote. M. Cappuccilli asked how many members were in the Chicago planning body. M. Ross-Russell replied that there were approximately 44 members.

A. Edelstein pointed out that steering committees sometimes cut off outside members of the group from the decision-making process. He said he preferred the current decision-making process of the Planning Council. B. Morgan pointed out that the presence of a governmental co-chair might encourage community input, since community members could view Planning Council meetings as a place to provide feedback directly to the

recipient. She stated that it might also help to recruit people with HIV who weren't working with providers.

T. Alexander asked when the governmental co-chair appointment would happen. M. Ross-Russell stated that the co-chair structure would need to be incorporated into the bylaws. She explained that the bylaws would then need to be approved by the planning bodies. She stated that, if the Integrated Executive Committee accepted the bylaw changes, the HPG would be able to vote on the bylaws as revised. B. Morgan noted that the bylaw changes had not yet been approved. She stated that the bylaws included in the packet currently reflected the changes made at the last Integrated Executive Committee meeting. B. Morgan said that the bylaws could be presented at the April planning body meeting.

M. Cappuccilli asked how the bylaws would be presented to the planning groups and approved. B. Morgan explained that the bylaws would be presented to the planning bodies, who would propose changes with 30 days written notice, and then the changes would require 2/3 votes in favor from RWPC members present at the next meeting. M. Cappuccilli asked if the bylaws could be distributed by email in order to allow for 30 days' notice. B. Morgan said they could, but pointed out that the group had not yet looked at the bylaws.

B. Morgan suggested the group come up with suggested language for the governmental co-chair segment of the bylaws. She stated that the proposed language could then be distributed to the Integrated Executive Committee by email. She said the earliest possible time to present the bylaws to the RWPC would be their April meeting.

T. Alexander asked how the governmental co-chair would use feedback from the planning body to take action. A. Edelstein said that the governmental co-chair would have one vote in the Planning Council, as all other members would. He noted that the Finance Committee had a positive relationship with representatives from the recipient. He said he expected a similar relationship between the planning body and the governmental co-chair. He noted that governmental participants still required Planning Council approval to take any actions.

M. Ross-Russell noted that there had previously been discussions on the prevention side about counseling and testing. She said that governmental representatives had informed the group that their discussed changes were already being pursued by the recipient. She noted that this was a benefit of having a participant who knew what the recipient was doing. She explained that this was similar to the insight that was available from different providers about their own organizations and activities. She reiterated that the governmental co-chair still would have only one vote.

B. Morgan stated that the group could vote to move the Planning Council meeting to accommodate a 30-day review period for the bylaws. She said that distributing the bylaws prior to the Planning Council meeting might create confusion. C. Steib stated that the prevention group was already accustomed to having a governmental co-chair, but the

RWPC was not. T. Alexander asked if past governmental co-chairs of the HPG were from AACO. M. Ross-Russell replied that they were.

M. Cappuccilli asked if the governmental co-chair had an active role in running the meeting. B. Morgan replied that HPG meetings were run primarily by the community co-chair, with the assistance of the governmental co-chair. C. Steib noted that the HPG had gone without a governmental co-chair for some time. B. Morgan compared the governmental co-chair's role to that of a delegate.

A. Edelstein asked if the recipient could designate a co-chair who already attended RWPC meetings. M. Ross-Russell replied that they could. Several group members suggested that individuals who already participated in Planning Council meetings be selected to serve as governmental co-chair.

M. Cappuccilli asked if the governmental co-chair would serve on a committee. M. Ross-Russell replied that they would, like any other member. B. Morgan stated that this requirement would require editing the bylaws. A. Edelstein said he thought it made the most sense to hold appointed members to the same standards as any others. M. Ross-Russell noted that appointed members could not be removed. B. Morgan noted that other members could be removed for failing to serve on a subcommittee.

C. Steib asked if any representatives from the recipient were currently members of the RWPC. M. Ross-Russell replied that they were guests. She reiterated that the governmental co-chair would be chosen by AACO and removed or replaced at the discretion of the recipient. She said the bylaws would specify that certain rules applied to members with the exception of governmental co-chairs.

M. Ross-Russell stated that it was important to the community that the recipient respect the decisions of the Planning Council. She stated that relations between different groups involved in the planning process had improved over time. A. Edelstein stated that he hoped the integrated body would maintain the same spirit of cooperation.

M. Ross-Russell reiterated that the governmental co-chair would sign the letter of concurrence. B. Morgan suggested that the concept of concurrence be introduced to RWPC members. K. Baron asked if the concurrence requirement was on the plan itself. M. Ross-Russell stated that it was not part of the integrated care and prevention plan. She said that the HPG used to be responsible for the prevention plan. She noted that concurrence represented agreement with the prevention-specific activities that were being undertaken by the jurisdiction. She explained that concurrence currently represented approval of the recipient's prevention initiatives. She stated that concurrence would probably now be a committee activity similar to other RWPC responsibilities. She said that the committee would vote on concurrence, which would then be presented to the planning body as a whole for a vote. B. Morgan explained that the governmental co-chair would help to explain the concurrence process. M. Cappuccilli asked what committee would be responsible for this activity. M. Ross-Russell stated that it would be overseen by the Prevention Committee.

M. Ross-Russell stated that the language of the bylaws would need to be updated. K. Baron suggested removing language that prohibited governmental members. B. Morgan stated that the language in the bylaws would be examined and updated accordingly.

M. Cappuccilli asked if the group had decided on a name for the integrated body yet. B. Morgan replied that they hadn't. She said the name would be chosen at the first integrated planning body meeting. M. Ross-Russell stated that members were being asked to propose names, and the group would vote for their favorite one.

Motion: K. Baron moved, C. Steib seconded to approve changes that had been made to the bylaws, along with future changes based on today's discussion. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Old Business: None.

New Business: None.

Announcements: None.

Adjournment:

Motion: C. Steib moved, K. Baron seconded to adjourn the meeting at 1:30p.m. **Motion passed:** All in favor.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Jennifer Hayes, Staff

Handouts distributed at the meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- March 2, 2017 Meeting Minutes
- Planning Council Bylaws with proposed updates (March 2017)
- OHP Calendar