

**MINUTES CONFERENCE OF LOCAL HEALTH OFFICIALS REGULAR
MEETING**

March 19, 2009

Salem, Oregon

Counties represented: Wheeler, Crook, Hood River, Curry, Tillamook, Wasco-Sherman, Clatsop, Columbia, Lincoln, Coos, Klamath, Umatilla, Josephine, Benton, Douglas, Linn, Deschutes, Jackson, Marion, Lane, Clackamas, Washington, Multnomah.

The meeting was called to order by Dave Houghton, Chair, with a quorum of counties present.

Karen Koskela asked that the minutes be revised to indicate her presence at the February meeting.

Karen Gillette requested that the minutes be revised to better reflect the robust conversation concerning the PHEP funding formula. After concurrence, it was agreed to have comments forwarded to Ebony for revision and brought back to the next meeting for approval.

Committee appointments: Andy Walker, Polk Co., WIC Advisory Board; Jessica Kelly, Deschutes Co., Chronic Disease Committee replacing Kelly McDonald; Trish Stokes, Hood River Co., Rural Health Coordination Council; Muriel deLaVergne Brown, Crook Co., LGAC.

Linda Fleming and Rod Calkins reported on LGAC discussions.

Funding Formulas

Karen Gillette reported on the assignment given to the Funding Formula Committee several months ago: review impact on the formulas if we funded 36 counties vs. 34 health departments.

There is an impact of \$5K in Family Planning and \$18.5K originally identified for Gilliam Co. in the original budget, but actually redistributed to the other counties because there wasn't a health department in Gilliam Co. would now go to Gilliam Co., reducing what went out to the other counties by that much. TPEP is currently distributed among 35 agencies. If Sherman Co. (now combined with Wasco) gets the \$16, 824 it would be eligible for, the amount to the other counties would be reduced by that much.

Tom Engle confirmed that there will be population adjustments with the IGA.

Karen Gillette moved/Jan Wallinder seconded: Provide base funding for programs based on 36 cos. vs. 34 jurisdictions.

Support for the formation of health districts as feasible was expressed, but there were also concerns that inequities and anomalies in per capita distribution could result and that the conversation needs to be on-going to be aware of this potential and identify problems and options for resolution.

Three counties have currently passed a resolution on intent to form a public health district.

It was suggested that the Funding Formula Committee is the appropriate venue for future discussions on “titrations of funding.” Karen Gillette reviewed the process for getting issues to the FFC and suggested that all committee chairs must consider these issues when considering formulas and bases before forwarding them to FFC.

Frank Moore and Gary Oxman suggested friendly amendments to clarify the need for on-going conversations around developing incentives while identifying unintended consequences.

Discussion. Amendments withdrawn with acknowledgment that there needs to be discussions about unintended consequences as we move forward along with identifying interest in more structured discussions of the issues.

Centralized Restaurant Licensing

Rick Sherman presented CLEHS position of support for menu labeling and testing of water supplies.

CLEHS is concerned about ending fund balances from restaurant licensing, pools and spas inspections were taken by LFO in the 07-09 rebalance. There is interest in knowing what actually happened with the ending balances and how the loss of those funds will impact future remittances. Marilynn Sutherland suggested that we check the timeline for the remittance discussion so that counties are not caught with budget increases. Gail Shibley agreed to do that.

Lila Wickham expressed concern that OPHD had planned to use those funds to do a 6 year repeat of the FDA baseline study on risk strategy. With this loss of funds, we now lose the ability to make science based decisions regarding system change.

Bill Coulombe clarified that LFO identified \$133K in ending balances and didn't consider whether they were needed or already encumbered.

HB 2243 (a 2007 bill that passed) is causing CLEHS concern in that it is not a money saver as CLEHS believes it was to be intended. Linda Fleming clarified that it was never intended to be a money saver for the counties or state. It was a business friendly bill supported by the Governor's Office and part of his streamlining government initiative that would allow established restaurant operators to renew their licenses on-line. Linda assured Rick (for CLEHS) that all of the arguments noted by CLEHS had been presented at the time by herself and Lila Wickham, but this bill was fated to move forward. The best compromise that could be gotten was that CLHO would be at the table in the development of the system. This issue has morphed into the DHS Transformation Initiative to be addressed Jan. 2010. It is scheduled for 9-18 months for completion. Nothing formal has started yet other than discussions on how to actually start the discussions and process.

TPEP

Georganne Greene expressed across the board concern for flat funding with increased work expectation actually resulting in increased costs. The only PE that has addressed PE with the funding available is PHEP. She suggested that all PE need to be reviewed in light of funding and some deliverables suspended. Marilyn Sutherland concurred and suggested an administrator review of the PE in relation to the citations.

It was noted that the TPEP requirement to go into a registry by 2010 is work without promise of increased funding. Several concerns about TPEP surfaced, including:

- RFA duplicates the contract and the work to negotiate the deliverables.
- There shouldn't be an application for funds already in the contract.
- Goals are identified locally and then state consultants tell them what their goals SHOULD be.
- Very heavy handed approach that is too prescriptive.
- The application is busy work. Give us the goals and don't specify how many FTE we have to hire to accomplish them. FTE funding is variable around the state and this approach doesn't take that into consideration.
- There needs to be a fiscal impact statement related to whether or not FTE can realistically be funded within the established (base) funding levels. A true analysis of costs needs to be undertaken.
- The cutting edge approach is appreciated, but they (state) have over-stepped what is required and realistic expectation of FTE.
- There should be review and comment on findings of local implementation, but some of the comments and conversations focus on minutiae.

Karen Gillette strongly stated that there is a need for more administrators on the Chronic Disease Committee (the committee that reviews TPEP requirements). If program staff are recommended by the administrator to participate, there needs to be a reaffirmation that program staff are consulting with their administrator and representing their position(s). Georganne Greene volunteered to be on the committee and have her staff person removed as a participant. Karen is still requesting more administrator members.

Final comments and suggestions:

1. Go back to the Standards Committee process of clearly identifying the citation vs. having it buried in a contract.
2. Remember that counties are required to fulfill 70-75%, not 100%, and TPEP uses best practices and cutting edge approaches.
3. TPEP and chronic disease in general have more administrator input.
4. Review the document on expectations of committee members.
5. Strengthen the review of PH (the process is there) and use up/down authority.
6. Utilize the guidance documents to review PE.

Meeting adjourned.

The Coalition of Local Health Officials convened briefly after the Conference. There was a review of the principles and process to achieve 30% reductions in the OPHD

budget. Bruce Goldberg requested a 5% step beyond that (35%) to give him a broader view of how to reach the 30%.

Reports on staff activities and the Legislative Committee were given.

The meeting closed with a review of the website development. A more indepth training on how to use its features will be given at the April meeting.

Adjourned