### CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD OF HEALTH

# Monthly Meeting Tuesday, July 28, 2009

## Call to Order & Roll Call

The Board of Health (BOH) held its monthly meeting on July 28, 2009 in the Lyle Shields Meeting Room at the Brookens Administrative Center, 1776 East Washington, Urbana. The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Julian Rappaport following a joint study session with the CUPHD Board. Board members Prashanth Gowda, Mark Huls, Stan James, John Peterson, Cherryl Ramirez, Julian Rappaport, Bobbi Scholze, and Betty Segal were present at the time of roll call. The only absent BOH member was Brenda Anderson. The staff member present was Kat Bork (Board of Health Secretary). Also present were Anne Ambrose (Crisis Nursery Family Specialist), Deb Busey (County Administrator), Candi Crause (CUPHD Infectious Disease Prevention & Management Director), Nancy Greenwalt (Smile Healthy Executive Director), Darlene Kloeppel (Regional Planning Commission Social Services Director), Jim Roberts (CUPHD Environmental Health Director), Laura Swinford (Crisis Nursery Program Director), Andrea Wallace (CUPHD Finance Director), and Amy Webber (Crisis Nursery Social Work Intern).

## Approval of Agenda/Addendum

**MOTION** by James to approve the agenda; seconded by Ramirez. **Motion carried with all ayes.** 

### **Approval of Minutes**

**MOTION** by James to approve the Board of Health minutes for June 23, 2009 and the July 14, 2009 Study Session; seconded by Segal. **Motion carried with all ayes.** 

### **Public Participation on Agenda Items Only**

There was no public participation.

### **Correspondence and Communications**

There was no correspondence or communications.

### **RPC Senior Wellness Program Quarterly Report**

**MOTION** by James to receive and place on file the RPC Senior Wellness Program Quarterly Report; seconded by Scholze. **Motion carried with all ayes.** 

## Crisis Nursery Beyond Blue Program Quarterly Report

**MOTION** by Ramirez to receive and place on file the Crisis Nursery Beyond Blue Program Fourth Quarter Report; seconded by James.

Laura Swinford said Crisis Nursery was enthusiastic after completing a successful year of the Beyond Blue Program. The program was able to reach 25 mothers who experience perinatal depression and their families in the Champaign County rural areas. The home visits, parent/child interaction groups, and support groups were successfully brought into the communities. Crisis Nursery is unsure what to expect with the BOH funding next year, but they are anticipating good news. They have commenced a new program year and have enrolled four new mothers. They are launching the next parent/child interaction group at Rantoul Parent Wonders. Swinford thanked the BOH for supporting Crisis Nursery in its endeavors. She included a moving testimonial in the quarterly report about one of the most sensitive and proud moments for the Beyond Blue Program in reaching a depressed mother. Rappaport praised the Crisis Nursery Reports for their great and informative program. He thought the nursery did excellent work and he was proud to have supported it thus far.

## Motion carried with all ayes.

## Treasurer's Report

Approval of CUPHD Invoice for May 2009

Peterson stated the May invoice was consistent with the budget.

**MOTION** by Peterson to approve payment of the CUPHD invoice for May 2009; seconded by James. **Motion carried with all ayes.** 

### FY2010 Budget

FY2010 Proposed Board of Health Budget & Amended Funding Requests

Rappaport acknowledged the BOH has to move towards passing a budget. Busey stated the budget has to be adopted at least a week before the August 24<sup>th</sup> Legislative Budget Hearing. James thought the BOH already passed a FY2010 budget at the last meeting. Rappaport stated the BOH approved a proposed budget that was purposefully not finalized until responses were received from the agencies requesting funding about the budget cuts.

#### **CUPHD**

James asked, based on the discussion held during the joint study session with the CUPHD Board, if the 16.59% across the board cut was taken out of the grant money. Busey explained the cut was applied to total core services and grant programs amount presented by CUPHD. Whenever a budget is cut any expenditure that has matching revenue, such as a grant, is not cut because that would accomplish nothing. The total dollars cut from the CUPHD budget will come from the areas where expenditures are not entirely dependent on outside revenue. Busey explained the cuts would have to come out of Vital Statistics, Infectious Disease, Environmental Health, and administration.

Rappaport noted that the letter from Julie Pryde dated July 22nd indicates the core services would be funded if the BOH increases their proposed budget for CUPHD by \$1,062. Scholze believed the indirect and administration costs charged by CUPHD should be negotiable. She wanted to know where CUPHD could make cuts to reduce their budget to reach the amount

available in the BOH's budget, for example reducing the amount of signage or advertising by \$1,000. James agreed with Scholze that CUPHD should be able to find ways to absorb \$1,062 in their budget or provide documentation to the BOH about why that amount is desperately needed for core services. He felt the BOH produced a fair budget based on the information that was provided. He supported maintaining the budget as proposed by the BOH. Scholze wanted to know if the BOH was meeting its legal responsibility to provide core services without adding another \$1,062 to the CUPHD budget. James noted the BOH could consider a budget amendment if the money was demonstrated to be essential to core services. He objected to holding up the entire budget on this amount. In response to Peterson's inquiry about a budget amendment, Busey stated it requires 18 of 27 County Board members to vote in favor for approval.

Peterson recommended increasing the well water fee to fully cover the cost of testing private wells instead of dropping the program. This service is used by realtors before a property is sold and the fee should reflect the cost of doing business. Roberts stated the division looked at two private laboratories to compare costs. One laboratory charged \$61 plus overnight shipping and handling and the other charged \$32. The lower cost laboratory did not use a test that was recognized by IDPH. Roberts estimated testing a well cost around \$52. Peterson asked if CUPHD could continue to provide the testing service if it charged for the full cost. Roberts said it was a district fund, so he would have to approach the district board to increase the fee. He said the BOH could consider taking the program from CUPHD. Peterson asked Roberts where the BOH would administer the program. Roberts said CUPHD has a cost center that separates it out of the water program and an additional revenue item could be put into the water program. Roberts agreed with Peterson's statement that the well water testing program could be fully funded with fees and not have a budget impact.

Peterson wanted to be certain that the budget figure of \$605,405 corresponded to the figure listed in Pryde's letter. Busey explained the BOH approved preliminary funding of the agreement with CUPHD for FY2010 in the total amount of \$605,405; with \$587,011 to fund the core services and grants and another \$18,394 to fund the additional services listed in the CUPHD budget proposal. This was documented in a letter to Pryde dated July 15, 2009. Pryde's response dated July 22, 2009 proposed using the entire \$605,405 to cover the core services and grants, then eliminating all the additional services. Wallace stated that interpretation was not correct. Wallace explained the \$605,405 plus an additional \$1,162 will only purchase the core services and does not include the grants. The BOH expressed confusion at the CUPHD response to the proposed budget. Busey asked if Pryde's response was that CUPHD would cut nothing from its budget proposal. Wallace stated that was correct. Busey read language from the CUPHD-BOH agreement that states the two boards will select the programmatic activities that will be performed by CUPHD for the BOH upon submission of a proposed budget by CUPHD. Rappaport did not think the selection of activities as described by the agreement has occurred, but he was unsure how it would happen. Busey noted Article 12 of the agreement details a budget process that may not have been entirely followed with CUPHD's budget submission. The agreement states that CUPHD will submit a budget for services rendered to the BOH that includes a list of proposed activities and programs conducted on behalf of the County Health Department. The agreement requires CUPHD to submit the budget and list of proposed activities and programs to the BOH no later than the July meeting and in the Champaign County budget format. Busey did not believe the CUPHD budget was presented in the County's budget format. She thought the different format was partly the reason for miscommunication regarding revenues, grants, and expenditures. Rappaport asked if Busey had a recommendation for the next appropriate step. Busey explained she wanted the BOH to be aware what is in its agreement with CUPHD. The BOH discussed how to proceed.

Busey asked Wallace if CUPHD's response to the BOH's communication to cut their FY2010 budget request was not to make any cuts although the BOH could not afford the proposed CUPHD FY2010 budget. Wallace confirmed that was correct. Busey clarified that the BOH would be spending almost \$200,000 above its incoming revenue if it fully funding the CUPHD budget proposal and the BOH would spend itself out of existence in two or three years. She asked if there was a reason CUPHD was not responding with recommendations where their budget could be reduced. Wallace said the CUPHD budget proposal had been put together with their best efforts and it was what it was. CUPHD has provided the cost of running the county services and a directive came from the CUPHD Board that this is the budget. Wallace stated CUPHD is not obligated to adjust their budget. The BOH has not been paying for all of the core services the last few years. She remarked the BOH could not put money aside in savings if it does not have money to pay for programs. Busey stated the BOH was not proposing putting any revenue in savings and anticipated spending every dollar it receives in FY2010. Wallace claimed the BOH FY2010 budget had a \$149,000 surplus. Busey explained there was no surplus and the proposed FY2010 BOH budget was balanced if the requested cuts are implemented. Wallace may have been looking at the BOH fund balance, which is necessary to maintain cash flow. Rappaport stated the BOH is reserving an amount to fund H1N1 flu vaccinations in FY2010 because Pryde recommended they do so and did not provide an estimate of the potential expense. Busey added the BOH would have no reserves to address an unforeseen event, like a pandemic, if they used the fund balance reserve for operating expenses. Wallace said the BOH could send CUPHD a proposal and it was ultimately the CUPHD Board's decision whether or not to agree to it. Busey's point was that the agreement indicates the programmatic activities and budget will be agreed upon by the two boards. This has not happened at this time. She suggested the CUPHD Board and the BOH need to come together to select the activities performed by CUPHD. She assumed both boards will rely on the expertise of CUPHD staff to recommend the programmatic activities possible within the BOH's budget. Busey suggested Wallace, Pryde, and she meet to facilitate a clear understanding of revenues and expenditures to ensure both boards understand budget cuts are essential.

From what was discussed at the joint board meeting, James received the impression that CUPHD relieves heavily on their staff and suggested Wallace speak to Pryde and others about the budget. He was sure adjustments could be made to meet the services for the dollar amount the BOH has available.

Rappaport thanked Busey for offering to meet with CUPHD. Based on statements made by the CUPHD Board at the joint meeting, the CUPHD Board seems to have no intention to set policies that would contradict decisions made by their staff. Peterson suggested Rappaport or another BOH member attend the meeting. Busey drew a parallel to how the County Board's budget is developed. The County Administrator meets with department heads one their individual budgets and then the Administrator presents a recommendation on the entire budget to the Board. It might be useful for a discussion to occur on the administrative level with a recommendation then going to the boards about the programmatic services and budget for FY2010, per the agreement. Rappaport agreed with moving in that direction in a timely manner. Wallace noted she would bring up

tonight's discussion at the CUPHD Board study session scheduled for tomorrow morning in anticipation of a meeting with Busey. The BOH agreed that Busey would meet with Pryde and Wallace before the August 18<sup>th</sup> BOH meeting.

Rappaport pointed out the BOH would not have its budget ready to present at the County Board's Legislative Budget Hearings if a decision on the CUPHD budget was not reached by August 18<sup>th</sup>. He was not certain what the legalities of the situation would be if an agreement cannot be reached. Busey explained the CUPHD-BOH agreement acknowledges that neither party could terminate the agreement without 12 months notice.

Peterson felt it was critical to understand that future budgets will require layoffs in the staff who service county activities. Wallace said CUPHD does not want to provide one type of service within the district and substandard service in the county based on funding. The proposed budget is the amount it would take to provide the same high quality services in the county as are provided in Champaign-Urbana. Peterson observed that Champaign County residents are not paying for the same quality of services because CUPHD has a higher tax rate. Busey concurred that the Champaign-Urbana tax rate is 13 cents and the county tax rate is about 3 cents. The expectation that there would not be a difference in the quality of services with such vastly different tax rates is unrealistic.

## **Smile Healthy**

Rappaport asked if the BOH wished to defer the other budget items until the CUPHD budget is settled. Peterson wanted to move forward with non-CUPHD budget portions of the FY2010 budget.

**MOTION** by Peterson to approve placing \$111,042 in the FY2010 Budget to fund Smile Healthy; seconded by James.

The BOH considered the revised budget proposal from Smile Healthy that incorporated the requested 16.59% cut to the program's FY2010 request. Greenwalt provided a description of the services that could be provided for the \$111,042 amount. Ramirez expressed her concern with making an across the board cut to all three agencies the BOH will fund in FY2010. She understood the BOH was in a difficult budget situation, but she believed the Smile Healthy and Crisis Nursery programs should not be considered in the same manner as the CUPHD programs. The BOH does not pay for Smile Healthy and Crisis Nursery employee benefits and both agencies charge very lean indirect costs. Ramirez did not agree it was fair to make an across the board cut because what was included in the programs' budgets were very different than the costs charged by CUPHD. James noted there was a fringe line item in the Smile Healthy budget. He said building and operational costs have to be born by someone. He concurred Smile Healthy had done a good job in keeping costs down, but he did not agree with Ramirez that the BOH did not pay fringe benefits for those staff. Rappaport asked Greenwalt to comment on the fringe benefits. Greenwalt clarified that the fringe line item pays for unemployment and FICA; it is not health insurance, retirement, or any such employee benefit. She should have labeled it as payroll taxes to be more accurate.

Rappaport said it was unfortunate the BOH had to cut the dental surgery funding, but he did not see a way around it at the moment. Smile Healthy ran a very efficient organization so the only thing to cut was actual services. He was worried that the Smile Healthy program might end because the funding will be used towards CUPHD.

## Motion carried with one vote against by Scholze.

### Mental Health Board Crisis Nursery Program

**MOTION** by Peterson to approve placing \$20,852 in the FY2010 Budget to fund Crisis Nursery's Beyond Blue program; seconded by Segal.

Swinford commented this money is going to collaborative organizations. Crisis Nursery's Beyond Blue is collaborating with Smile Healthy to reach infants with good dental care and to educate the mothers. They are working towards bringing the services to the parent/child interaction groups and support groups.

Motion carried with one vote against by Scholze.

## **Other Business**

**Date of August Meeting** 

The Board agreed to change its next meeting date to August 18, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. to not conflict with the County Board's Legislative Budget Hearings.

## Letter of Appreciation to Dr. Nezar Kassem

Rappaport was contemplating writing a letter on behalf of the BOH to thank Dr. Nezar Kassem for his service as a board member. The BOH agreed Rappaport should write a letter in appreciation of Dr. Kassem's service.

### **Public Participation on Non-Agenda Items Only**

There was no public participation on any non-agenda items.

### Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kat Bork Board of Health Secretary

Secy's note: The minutes reflect the order of the agenda and may not necessarily reflect the order of business conducted at the meeting.