

KALHD/KDHE PHEP Advisory Team Meeting

11/19/2019

Attendees

In-Person

Dennis Kriesel
Andrew Adams
Dana Rickley
Denise Kelly
Steve Mahuex
Emily Valencia
Tamara Wilkerson
Emily Wolf

Online

Tom Langer

Meeting Start

Dennis called the meeting to order at 10:10 am.

The room made introductions.

Approval of the KALHD/KDHE delinquent steps arrangement

Dennis summarized the process. Tom brought up smaller counties and their concerns that were discussed at the prior meeting. Tom indicated most of the issue is process flow for the smaller counties and that approaching them when they struggle to identify the barriers to completing workplan steps could go a long way to solving the underlying challenges they face.

Denise indicated Tamara and Nancy, who receive the workplans, noted on the latest list of counties that are struggling that they are optimistic they will get this set solved without needing outside assistance. Illness has historically been a challenge for the smaller departments. The biggest value for this agreement to KDHE is in the fourth quarter as the deadlines are tight.

Denise suggested changing the one-month past due language be revised to just notifying KALHD versus KALHD/KDHE PHEP Advisory Team. The advisory group agreed with the amendment.

Dennis moved, and Dana seconded, adopting the procedure for delinquents as amended. Motion passed.

Debrief on the PHEP presentation at KAC Annual Conference

Dennis, Denise, and Andrew discussed how the presentation went. Dennis mentioned an article happening after-the-fact. Consensus was the attendee count was lower than desired but the audience was engaged with the subject matter.

LHD budgets for SFY 2021 (how the local share is carved up), next steps

Denise gave background on the budget worksheets. She noted the PHEP allocations from the federal government is expected to continue to decline.

Denise explained the concept behind the two draft sheets she prepared. She discussed speaking with approximately 12 other states about how they do their allocations to local governments. Other states indicated doing something along the lines of funding a position or half a position as a base value and then the rest of the funding remaining would be divided by population. Denise raised concerns about too much money to rural departments might result in them trying to shoehorn the funds into salary beyond what PHEP would permit. Denise noted other states are doing base plus population approaches, or flat amounts based off population tier. Sample spreadsheets were provided (not for public distribution).

Denise first walked through her first draft spreadsheet. Its focus was trying to not give a county less than \$10,000. Each size category gets a different base amount.

Denise then walked through her second draft spreadsheet. It defined anyone who got less than \$10,056 in the prior year gets \$10,056 in the upcoming plan year but no additional money from the formula. This proposal held old amounts steady for rural and densely settled rural departments that were getting more than the \$10,056. The larger counties took hits to their total funding to achieve this.

Dana asked about the role of CRI money. Denise noted that is separate from this process.

Dennis noted the 82% direct-to-local could be tweaked, with more or less going to the regions if desired. Denise noted the opinions on strengthening or weakening the role of the regions really varies by region from her discussions with local departments.

Tom stressed the need to document on the process of working on allocations, to help shield from criticism that the process was arbitrary. Denise noted she was trying to prevent accusations of arbitrary decision-making and that was why the advisory team was being consulted to review the various concepts. She noted Missouri and Iowa give the worksheet to their local association and have the locals decide the allocation breakdown. Dana noted she thought that was the prior past process in Kansas back when Edie Snethen was Executive Director of KALHD. Dennis noted he recalls hearing that Michelle Ponce (prior KALHD Executive Director after Edie) did conduct a sort of listening tour a few years ago on the formula that resulted in a consensus to keep with the status quo.

The advisory team discussed the impact on the urban counties for these losses compared to the small amounts the rural departments would gain under the sample spreadsheets. Steve stressed the impact on staff the urban departments would experience and questioned what more rural departments would be able to do with their small (sub \$2000) gains under the changes, especially if workplans are demanding more work out of urban settings.

KGMS came up but reporting out of the system is not yet available.

Andrew noted the risk levels are much higher in urbanized areas to a degree that rural areas aren't really on the same scale for. Denise noted the rural area residents also expect a degree of effort to mitigate their risks as well. Tom noted local policymakers don't always get it and think the State will save them in a disaster and a couple thousand extra dollars may not make much of a difference in several counties.

Emily W. and Steve discussed how CRI is treated in response, with Steve noting CRI is distinct and doesn't factor into PHEP whereas Emily W. was focusing on real-world events smaller counties would be trying to do everything the urban areas would but without CRI.

Consensus was no action during this year and to stay with the current distribution formula.

KAC PHEP webinar: topic/presenter discussion

Dennis discussed that Carl and Andrew are willing to do an hour-long webinar expanding on their topic done at the KAC Annual Conference. Dennis indicated recording the webinars is typically what KAC does and should be available for those who cannot attend live. The advisory team agreed it was a good topic and format for a webinar.

IMATS and Regional Coordinators

Emily W. summarized the IMATS ask about regional coordinators working within the database. There were some regional coordinators that didn't want to do it. Tom indicated he thought everyone handled the discussion at the time well. Emily W. stated KDHE is comfortable maintaining the status quo with people going through her for changes. Tom noted IMATS is a standing agenda item on their meetings now to stay current. Emily W.'s goal was to address not knowing what she cannot know, particularly around new hires, and to try and keep everyone on the same page.

Transitioning from the IMATS topic, Denise then started to explain the development and workplan for the upcoming year. She expects late-January for when the information will come out from the Feds, with it being due back to them in March. Normally there are exactly 60 days to respond. Intent is for a small, medium, and large workplans, with the budget formula staying the same as at present. Denise asked for suggested workplan items for medium and large counties and how to carve it up. Steve suggested FTEs by local health department. Dennis suggested county population.

Dennis suggested following the review process of 2019, but going through the small plan first, then what changes on the medium, and then what changes with the large, to be efficient in the review.

Andrew asked what the impact might be to the regional workplan. Denise noted some might even have five workplans within a region when CRI is included, but KDHE was not intending to reformat the regional workplan from the present one.

Adjournment

Dennis adjourned the meeting at 11:53 am.