

**NTCA FY2010 Funding Formula Workgroup
Conference call – July 9, 2008 (3-4pm ET)**

Workgroup members present: Kim Field, Angelito Bravo, Iram Bakhtawar, Greg Andrews, Denise Ingman, Pat Infield, Jim Cobb, Barry Dickman, Margaret Oxtoby, Kashef Ijaz, Kathy Moser, Charles Wallace, Mark Lobato

- Kashef Ijaz called the meeting to order. He reviewed that the purpose of the scenarios was to:
 - 1) Determine what variables to add
 - 2) Determine what percentage weight to add to each variable
 - 3) Decide if it is appropriate to add the B1/ 2 variables considering the EDN issues
 - 4) Determine how much change occurs in funding in order to be able to explain why decisions were made and why they matter

- Kim Field had an email dialogue with Yoni Haber. The outcome of the conversation was that data will not be available through EDN. At this point data can only be entered if it is received electronically. This means that all data received through the paper format is not recorded in the system. Kathy Moser suggests that notification data could continue to be used because there must be some correlation between arrival data and work done on B1/2s. Though different states have systems for recording B1/2 data, data used for formulas must be accessible at the CDC level. It is suggested that arrival data could be used until 2009 and then in 2010 the formula could switch to using EDN data. At the next workgroup meeting Drew will be on the call. That meeting will be devoted to discussion of B1/2 data and determining whether this variable should be excluded or included.

- It has been proposed that two additional variables be added to the formula: smear positive pulmonary cases and incarceration.
 - Smear positive pulmonary cases are a surrogate for giving credit for contact investigations. The following workgroup members vote to include this variable in the formula: Kathy Moser, Kim Field, Barry Dickman, Jim Cobb, Iram Bakhtawar, Angelito Bravo, Charles Wallace, Pat Infield, and Margaret Oxtoby. No one votes against inclusion of this variable. The group discusses what weight to give to smear positive pulmonary cases, keeping in mind that the formula cannot exceed 100%. Scenario 3 gives a 10% weight to smear positive pulmonary cases and the group agreed that the adjustment to the other variables is appropriate. Jim Cobb, Kathy Moser, Kim Field, Margaret Oxtoby, Barry Dickman, Angelito Bravo and Pat Infield vote for scenario 3. No one votes against scenario 3.
 - Incarceration is discussed as a possible variable to include. Angelito Bravo and Iram Bakhtawar vote to include this variable and all other workgroup members listed previously vote to not include it. All workgroup members present agree that incarceration will not be added to the formula.

- Summary of discussion:
 - 1) Add the variable smear positive pulmonary cases to the formula
 - 2) Weigh this variable at 10%
 - 3) Everyone present for the workgroup meeting is in favor of scenario 3
 - 4) Discussion on the B1/2 variable will be put off until next week

- The workgroup expects to make one of three options for recommendations of big city funding:
 - 1) Continue to fund the same big cities that are currently funded or,
 - 2) Discontinue direct cooperative agreements with big cities and fund states directly or,
 - 3) Determine a new group of big cities to fund based on table 45 of Reported Tuberculosis in the United States, applying formula with weights.

No decision has been made at this point which option to go with at this point; it will be determined through future discussion.

- Kathy Moser proposes that all funding go to the states over time instead of taking money away from big cities all at once. When a big city goes below a certain number of cases, then there would be some warning that a city is going to lose direct funding. Kashef Ijaz asks what the number would be that would cause a big city to lose funding. In order to avoid questioning from jurisdictions, it might be easier to go through data and apply formula/ weights and come up with a top 10 list. Kathy Moser states that the problem would be that the top 10 cities might flip every ten years ago, which would be difficult because a system for funding has already been established. Kashef Ijaz states that big cities would still receive state money based on the state's formula. Jim Cobb states that this system would drive states to come up with a formula to determine how to allocate funding. He suggests that the cooperative agreement process should require states to produce a formula by engaging stakeholders. Florida invited representatives from small, medium and large counties and everyone had to agree on the result. The state then reviewed it and made it a statute. Charles Wallace states that Texas went through a formula allocation process, which funds 14 of their health departments. Anyone can use this formula; Charles Wallace offers to send it out to the group. Kathy Moser states that taking away the cooperative agreement takes freedom away from big cities. Instead of getting direct funding, funding would have to go through the state which could mean the loss of roll over. Kashef Ijaz states that there are many points to support both direct cooperative agreements with cities and to have states fund directly.
- Drew and Yoni will be joining the call next week (July 16) to discuss Class B1/2. Redistribution percentages for 2010 will also be discussed.