

## KALHD/KDHE PHEP Advisory Team

### Meeting Minutes

2-6-2020

#### Attendees

Dennis Kriesel

Cristi Cain (phone)

Dana Rickley (phone)

Thomas Langer (phone)

Rebecca Adamson (phone)

Emily Valencia

Kendra Baldrige

Denise Kelly

Tamara Wilkerson

Andrew Adams

Stephen Mahuex

Carl Lee

#### Meeting Start

Dennis called the meeting to order at 10:01 am.

Quick summary of upcoming commissioner/county employee webinar by Carl Lee and Andrew Adams (being held on April 29,2020)

Dennis gave a quick summary on the 4/29 webinar concept that Andrew and Carl are teaching via KAC. Carl gave some details of what they expect to cover to the group.

Denise expressed interest in who will sign up and knowing who attends. Some discussion ensued regarding promoting the webinar to LHD administrators (to encourage them to attend with their commissioners).

Discussion on PHEP presentation to hold at the KALHD Mid-Year Meeting (June 16-17 in Wichita)

Dennis brought up the KALHD MYM and what should be covered. Denise suggested coronavirus and lessons learned. Andrew mentioned getting PHEP coordinators to attend. Denise walked through the PHEP elements at the Governor's Public Health Conference and suggested either a separate topic or one that builds on those themes. Andrew spoke a bit about the HCCs and being unsure how much those focus on public health. Kendra suggested doing something on the work plan at the MYM as a good topic. Tom spoke about some prior MYM PHEP-oriented components, and this year the Governor's conference

conflicts with another PHEP meeting; he echoed Kendra's suggestion of providing something that can check off a work plan requirement. Dennis indicated he'd work with Denise to come up with a "check off" work plan topic.

Tom suggested a topic on how to develop and host a tabletop exercise. Andrew noted as a 4<sup>th</sup> quarter item the MYM could be a challenge to knock off a work plan item logistically for many LHDs.

### Work plans and related topics

Tom brought up Small work plan #11N on the spreadsheet: if the small LHDs are not required to participate in the local exercise it might affect the regions they are in negatively. Denise indicated she's pretty firm at keeping the small LHDs out of needing to exercise for the upcoming year namely because of the full-scale exercise and coronavirus work. She'd rather see the focus be for small LHDs to focus on their work plan updates and that they might not have the capacity to do that along with an additional exercise requirement. Denise also noted the medium and large counties are being asked to do a county exercise, not a regional exercise, which is a change to a much more specific (county-level) requirement. Dana noted emergency management, as part of their planning, ask the small health departments what can be incorporated into their work, giving an example of an ice storm scenario. Dana agreed with Denise that a small LHD doesn't need an exercise requirement as other entities that partner with the LHDs are doing exercises with them already. Denise stated she doesn't want to discourage exercises, but requirements mean deliverables and she is trying to avoid that barrier. Stephen noted that 11N does reference the full-scale exercise. Tom indicated he just wanted a good understanding of the expectation under the new work plans. Denise said small counties can do exercises but they just won't be in the work plan. Stephen asked about whether the small LHDs can spend PHEP funds on such exercises. Tom also noted on the large work plan it says participate in three exercises but there are only spots to report two. Emily noted it was reduced to two exercises and just needs to be cleaned up.

Andrew hopped to work plan item #3 and suggested clarifying the language; Denise agreed. The regional work plan will have a new 3N (adjusting the regional work plan numbers so that all the 3Ns align) to permit regional PHEP funds used for 3N purposes from the local work plans.

Denise noted they checked in with the regional coordinators if it hurt things by not mandating the LHD administrators attend regional meetings. The few she heard from didn't have issues but wanted the requirement back on the work plans. Denise would prefer things to align with the NOFO and the NOFO doesn't require this. As such, since there are no reported issues, Denise wants to keep it out of the work plan. Carl said he thinks the basic fear is commissioners not paying to attend the meetings if it isn't required. Andrew suggested just mentioning the regional meetings as an approved meeting in item #3N as an option. Denise indicated she is fine with that.

Stephen brought up item #9 in the work plans (social media). He asked if going and handing out public health brochures or other limited lifts wouldn't be an issue to satisfy the large work plan requirement. Denise noted she wants the activities to involve PHEP staff versus other LHD staff handing things out. Stephen suggested the large requirement go down from 8 preparedness-related activities to 6. Denise agreed to that change. Discussion of the 4 activities for medium LHDs determined they are achievable. Denise asked for suggestions on activities that better illustrate what large LHDs do versus what is in the work plan. Stephen suggested a childcare project with daycares that Johnson County is doing but it can fit under item #9 already. He also noted the regional work Johnson County does with the Missouri

counterparts. He also noted more policy engagement and looking at policy through a preparedness lens and with nontraditional partners. Andrew noted a lot of his time is spent with epidemiologists and that the existing work plans work well for large entities to tie to requirements and that the tying is relatively straightforward to do already. Denise noted education is fine but PHEP cannot pay for promotion activities and for submissions to respect the difference in complying with the work plans.

Denise indicated the plan is to update the comments and then provide the work plans to KALHD to send out later today. They do want all the plans sent in to PHEP; no separate statement anymore you just sign the work plan and send it in. Tom noted that due to the planning software several locals use could trigger complaints on this change. Denise said she'll think about how to address that. Emily noted some counties call asking how to get into the system (Kansas Planner). Denise does lean towards still taking the work plan submissions electronically so the state has copies of the plans on file. Stephen noted Johnson County doesn't like Kansas Planner and finds it clunky and not ideal and they would not be inclined to switching to its use.

Carl brought up item #4N on the Medium work plan and asked if substitutes of G290 are allowable (it is the live course version related to IS-29). Denise noted IS-29 is a prerequisite but if they prove to have taken the more advanced course it will be counted instead. IS-29 is encouraged as it has been recently updated.

Kendra asked if others outside of the KALHD/KDHE PHEP Advisory Team has seen the work plans. Members confirmed additional outreach has already happened.

2/13 3:00-5:00 pm was picked for KALHD's virtual meeting to discuss the final PHEP work plan drafts. Dennis will come to Topeka and host Denise at KALHD and run the online meeting from there. They will walk through the N questions (new questions) and then open the floor to other questions the attendees have. Denise plans to have finalized work plans ready by 2/18/2020 which is when KALHD has its next board meeting, and Dennis plans to call for a vote on the letter of concurrence at that meeting so that it can be provided to meet the CDC deadline.

Emily noted question #8 was also changed.

### Adjournment

Dennis adjourned the meeting at 11:27 am.