

NTCA FY2010 Funding Formula Workgroup
Conference call – July 2, 2008 (3-4pm ET)

Workgroup members present: Phil Griffin, Iram Bakhtawar, Kim Field, Kashef Ijaz, Greg Andrews, Al Forbes, Tiffany Harris, Pat Infield, Charles Wallace, Stuart McMullen, Margaret Oxtoby, Barry Dickman, Kathy Moser

- Phil Griffin called the meeting to order. The agenda for this meeting is as follows:
 - Discuss the scenario breakdowns that Greg Andrews had sent out
 - Discuss EDN and Class B's with Quarantine and Global Migration representative
- Greg Andrews followed the workgroup's request to pull out data for several scenarios. It was questioned whether the Foreign Born and US Born Minority variables are mutually exclusive. They were determined to be. Greg Andrews looked at the ground rules for breaking out high (>500), medium (>100), low incident (<100) states. 2007 data was examined. The top two and bottom two for high, medium and low states were examined. For the big cities, the top four were examined. The formula was then run against each scenario under the guidance of Stuart McMullen. The average of five years on cost per case per year was examined. Discussion on the scenarios follows:
 - The group commented that blinding the group on which jurisdiction was which was helpful in reducing bias.
 - Two different methods for comparing scenarios were discussed:
 - Compare scenarios with FY2008 to see which scenarios had the least change in funding per case. This drives toward a more equitable distribution, which is the ultimate goal of the workgroup. Scenarios 3, 4, and 5 reduced the differences in dollars per case the most. They also accounted for contacts (smear positive allowance) and Class A/B. Several workgroup members commented that scenario 3 was their favorite scenario.
 - Compare cost per case across areas to determine if there is equity of funding for cases between high, medium and low states. Some states currently get more money than others for certain cases. For this method, scenarios are compared vertically to determine if the cost per case is similar or not. Under this comparison method, scenario 2 and 6 were similar across the board.
 - The changes made for scenario 3 are:
 - US Minorities and Foreign Born are combined into one category accounting for 30%
 - A1/B2 remains at 10%
 - Smear positive pulmonary is added at 10%
 - Incarceration is no longer weighted
- Kashed Ijaz commented that there was consistency across scenarios for MDR at 5%. He suggested that this variable may be increased because of the complexity and time involved. Phil Griffin cautioned to look at the value of the weight and not just the weight itself. For example, MDR at this point is worth \$9,940 and the next highest variable (HIV) is \$1,022. MDR is resource intensive due to treatment for a longer time and the cost of medication. Kashef Ijaz states that the value of MDR is low and Phil Griffin stated that in comparison to other variables it is not low. The volume must be broken down because the weights can be deceiving.
- Phil Griffin stated that the workgroup will be making recommendations for the percentage of funds to be considered for redistribution. The redistribution percentage may need to be incrementally increased over funding allocation periods.

- Suspects are not being captured consistently between jurisdictions. The same applies for contacts because individual data is not collected, just aggregate data. Also, there are no firm definitions for these variables. However, suspects account for a large volume of cases of work that goes uncounted. Greg Andrews commented that trend data for suspects was collected nationally and the range of suspects evaluated per counted case was from 1:1 to 14:1. It is suggested that this issue would make a good TB study.
- Yoni Haber joined the call to represent Global Migration and Quarantine and answered questions from the workgroup.
 - How much information is captured by secondary migration?
 - Today, the system just tracks the history of changes in address. A report to determine how many individuals moved to a particular jurisdiction will not be able to be generated manually but could be requested from DGMQ.
 - Is the data going to be readily available to credit the state that evaluated the patient?
 - It must be determined which state should be receiving credit. A formula can then be created that determines in what jurisdiction the patient was in at the time of evaluation. This formula would be dependent on jurisdictions completing the paperwork on the patient.
 - What is the anticipated timeline for rollout?
 - EDN has been deployed to all 50 states. All states are ready to receive information but not all states are sending information yet. Early in August, it is anticipated that all states will be able to send information and the IMP system will be retired.
 - How long before states follow up and are able to use this data?
 - It can take over a year before the transition to EDN is complete due to the need for training. Making states aware of the system has been a big challenge. In 2009, there will be a full year of data for EDN for the first time.
 - Will there be data migration between EDN and IMP?
 - There will be partial migration because EDN collects more data than IMP. For the purposes of the formula who did the evaluation will be available on the old system. DGMQ will be able to run aggregate data if requested.
- It is determined that data on Class B's is incomplete for analysis at the time and possibly cannot be incorporated into the formula. Data on whether or not an individual is processed is not known, just the initial notification.
- Yoni Haber can attend the workgroup meeting again in 2 weeks (July 16th). There will be a workgroup call next week (July 9th). The meeting will be lead by Kashef Ijaz because Phil Griffin will be unable to attend the call.