

**NTCA FY2010 Funding Formula Workgroup
Conference Call – May 7, 2008 (3-4pm ET)**

Workgroup members present: Phil Griffin, Kashef Ijaz, Denise Ingman, Angelito Bravo, Charles Wallace, Barry Dickman, Stuart McMullen, Margaret Oxtoby, Pat Infield, Kim Field, Jim Cobb, Marie Dorsinville, Masa Narita, Angela Starks, Iram Bakhtawar

- Phil Griffin called the meeting to order. The agenda for this meeting includes introducing the issue of funding for big cities and narrowing down the list of proposed elements.
- Kashef Ijaz stated that the Advisory Council for the Elimination of TB (ACET) requested that the workgroup look at the funding mechanism and criteria for the big cities. There are currently 10 cities funded through direct cooperative agreements with CDC. Historically the funding criterion was based on three elements:
 - Incidence of cases
 - Drug resistance
 - TB/ HIV co infection
- Kashef Ijaz states that the work group could determine if these three elements are applied to the big city, whether the data supports the current 10 cities that are currently being supported or whether the top ten cities would change for the future. The mean, median, mode and range of the three elements would have to be examined to determine big city funding allocation. Weight could be applied to any of these three elements. Kashef Ijaz posed the question: Does the group want to take on the big city criteria?
- There is a list of tuberculosis cases in selected cities in Reported Tuberculosis in the United States 2006 (Table 45, page 71). The current cities that are receiving direct CDC funding are:
 - New York City
 - Baltimore
 - Houston
 - Los Angeles
 - San Diego
 - San Francisco
 - Washington DC
 - Philadelphia
 - Chicago
 - Detroit
- Discussion took place on potential issues to consider in deciding whether or not this workgroup should address big city funding including:
 - If funding is based on incidence and prevention/ control efforts reduce that incidence, then jurisdictions would be penalized for doing their job.
 - There could be political issues involved with addressing the big city funding allocation.
 - The general formula should look at the changing epidemiology. The recommendation would then be presented to the CDC. The cooperative agreement would be funded for 5 years before re-computing eligibility.

- The option of getting away from city funding and giving funding to states to allocate has also been explored. There are also potential challenges that could arise from this solution.
 - The group discussed whether the elements previously proposed by the group be used. Kashef Ijaz states that some of those elements do not produce reliable data.
 - The idea of using MSAs or counties rather than cities is proposed. Kashef Ijaz states that some MSA's cross boundaries and some counties include much lower morbidity areas. Some of the big cities currently use county data (for example LA County and San Diego County). Using just city data could impact the current 10 cities.
- Charles Wallace states that Texas uses a funding allocation formula using a 5 year average of number of cases, suspects, geographic area, population and a number of other variables. This formula is used for federal dollars allocated on a state level, as well as state funding. Jim Cobb states that their funding allocation formula was developed by small, medium and large county health directors and that the formula was then put into statutes. Charles Wallace and Jim Cobb offer to share their states funding allocation formulas with the group.
- Phil Griffin asks Stuart McMullen about double dipping (where there is a big city in a state, the data for a big city is taken out when state calculations are run, preventing these cities numbers from being counted twice). Stuart states that when the formula was developed that city numbers were removed from state totals.
- The following questions were posed concerning big city funding:
 - Should city funding be taken up by this workgroup?
 - If the workgroup will be addressing this issue, are the three proposed elements acceptable?
 - If so, what weight should be given to each element?
 - Which counties should be included and which excluded?
 - Should the 10 cities that are currently funded be the same cities that should be funded for 2010? Is yes or no, what other criteria should drive the decision?
 - How should a big city be classified based on the data?
 - What is the best way to come up with a common denominator to assess whether or not a city is directly funded?
- The group decided that the only question that could be answered in this meeting was whether or not to take up the big city funding issue. The group took a vote on whether the group can address the city funding allocation and 10 of the 11 workgroup members voted to address this issue.
- The next workgroup meeting will be on Wednesday, May 14th at 3 pm ET. Bev Metchok will give an update on the lab subcommittee. The big city issue will be discussed and the state funding allocation elements will be narrowed down as time permits.