



Public Health
Protect. Promote. Prevent.

Idaho Public Health Districts

IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF DISTRICT BOARDS OF HEALTH

Trustee Meeting Minutes

Wed June 8, 2016 1100

Coeur d'Alene Resort

Approved 10/27/16

Present:

Trustees	Directors	Guests
D1 Glen Bailey, Chair	Lora Whalen	Marlow Thompson (BOH chair) Jim Fenton (Staff)
D2 Doug Zenner	Carol Moehrle	
D3 Richard Roberge	Nikole Zogg	Tom Dale (BOH)
D4 Elt Hasbrouck	Rob Howarth (acting)	Steve Scanlin (BOH chair) Megan Blanksma (BOH) Betty Ann Nettleton (BOH) Bonnie Spencer (Staff)
D5 Thomas Faulkner	Rene LeBlanc	Linda Montgomery (BOH)
D6 Ken Estep	Maggie Mann	
D7 Bill Leake	Geri Rackow	Brian Farnsworth (BOH chair) Lee Staker (BOH)

Meeting Called to Order – Chair

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Glen Bailey at 1105

Review and approval of March 24, 2016, Minutes - All

MOTION: Doug moved to approve the minutes as written, seconded by Dr. Roberge. Passed unanimously by voice vote. March 24, 2016, minutes approved.

Call for additional Agenda Items - All

Glen asked if there were additional agenda items. Doug moved to approve the agenda as published, Ken seconded, all agreed by unanimous consent.

State Appropriation Formula Revision OPE 2,3,4

Glen shared that prior to 1993, state general fund dollars were distributed proportional to county contributions. In 1993 the Trustees adopted a revised the formula as recommended by independent reviewers. The formula adopted by the Trustees in 1993 distributed funds to each District based on population (20%), poverty rates (10%), public assistance enrollment (10%), and county contributions (60%). This formula was used for approximately 20 years until the source for public assistance enrollment data was no longer reliable/available. In FY 14 the Trustees dropped the public assistance enrollment from the formula and adjusted the remaining measures as follows: County contribution (67%) Population (18%) Poverty Rate (15%).

Glen Bailey
PHD 1
208.415.5102

Doug Zenner
PHD 2
208.799.3100

Richard Roberge, MD
PHD 3
208.455.5315

Elt Hasbrouck
PHD 4
208.375.5211

Thomas Faulkner
PHD 5
208.737.5902

Ken Estep
PHD 6
208.233.9080

Bill Leake
PHD 7
208.522.0310

Glen asked if the Trustees would be willing to consider incorporating OPE recommendation 3 into the formula (OPE 3: "The Board of Trustees consider replacing the county contribution weighted part of the formula with one that distributes state general fund dollars of the part of the formula based directly on 67% of the county contributions). By voice vote all Trustees stated they would be willing to consider this.

Rene shared a PowerPoint presentation that compared the current state allocation methodology to a methodology incorporating OPE 3.

There was discussion on the poverty rate component of the formula. Elt stated that he and his board feel that the poverty rate is not reflective of need. He would like the poverty rate factor to be changed to the number of people in poverty which he feels would be a better indicator of need.

Rob provided a handout that Bonnie prepared that reflects using OPE 3 and replaces the poverty rate with # of people in poverty. Rene noted that the method to calculate "numbers in poverty" may have been in error. It showed the poverty rate was used much like a percentage and was multiplied against the population average which may have reflected an incorrect outcome. Tom Faulkner discussed that the poverty rate, he explained that he believes the poverty rate shows the need in rural counties. He states there are less services available to help those living in poverty in the rural vs. urban counties.

Bill asks if there are other things we should be looking at instead of poverty. He suggests that we freeze the baseline budget over the past 3 years. See how that works and change as needed.

Ken stated that we should consider distributing the portion that is currently used for poverty rate equally since we all have certain foundational capabilities that we are responsible for. He stated that we really need to come to consensus as he is hearing that JFAC is dissatisfied that we can't seem to solve this problem.

Rob provided another handout that looks at the State allocation and who has received them over the last 4 years. Since FY 14 the State allocation has increased by \$1,057,000. The amounts are expressed on the handout in %s. Rene explained that it is also important to look at the dollar amounts that each District received. Per the spread sheet, the total increase received by each District cumulatively over 4 years range from a low of \$118,000 (D7) to a high of \$261,900 (D4).

Bill suggests that we need to establish a baseline to use and if/when the State appropriates increases that we allocate those dollars based on population and poverty. He does not recommend spending money for a 3rd party study and we will end up right where we are now with some of us not agreeing.

Tom Faulkner recommended that in order to do no harm that we establish the baseline as the current % that each District received in FY 17, then if there are future increases we allocate those funds based on population and county contribution. He suggests that we use the previous fiscal year as the baseline and allocate any increases on 67% county contribution and 33% population. In the event of a funding cut every District would get the same % as the previous fiscal year.

Elt would like to hold off on voting until August. He would like to study it further, bring back to his Board for discussion. There was discussion about the long length of time the Trustees have had to make this

decision and that it was per Idaho Code the Trustee's responsibility to make this decision. Glen asked for a vote to determine if a vote on the State allocation formula should be taken during the Trustee meeting after the business meeting or wait to vote until August. 5 Districts voted to vote during the Trustee meeting and 2 Districts (D 3 and D4) voted to wait until August. The Trustee's asked Lora to send them via email the proposed formula for consideration. They will recess after this meeting and consider this tomorrow after further review and discussion with their Board Members.

Proposed Formula for Consideration

The State appropriation will be allocated to the Districts as follows:

- a) Each District shall receive the same funding % as allocated in the State FY 17 appropriation
 - D1 - 13.49%
 - D2 - 9.53%
 - D3 - 14.93%
 - D4 - 23.60%
 - D5 - 12.90 %
 - D6 - 12.77%
 - D7 - 12.78%
- b) Any increase in state appropriation will be divided among the Districts based on the following:
 - 67% based on county contribution
 - 33% based on current population
- c) In years where there is a decrease, each District shall receive the same % as received in prior fiscal year.

Millennium Fund (MF) Formula

The FY 17 MF dollars for distribution among the Districts are \$750,000. The FY 16 formula used was as follows: 37% infrastructure and 63% divided based on the outcome data (3 year rolling average participants in smoking cessation classes, Teen smokers in District, Adult Smokers in District and Pregnant Smokers per District.)

Tom Faulkner moved and Ken seconded to adopt the current Millennium Fund allocation formula as presented to distribute the FY 17 Millennium Fund dollars. Motion passed unanimously.

ACTION: The formula will remain the same for allocation of FY 17 MF dollars.

By Law Revision Objectives for Measuring Formula OPE 1

Per our Bylaws we must have majority consent at the Annual meeting to consider Bylaw amendments and a 2/3 vote of the Association to pass amendments

OPE 1 "The Trustees should consider adopting objectives against which the formula can be measured". At the 2 Feb Trustee meeting three objectives for measuring the formula were adopted and recommended to be put into the bylaws; Objective 1: Assure delivery of Public Health to residents in all 44 counties. Objective 2: Review the formula annually to monitor swings and shifts. Objective 3: In years when there is a CEC or insurance increase funded in the appropriation, it should be distributed by FTE rather than rolled into the formula. The Directors would like the Trustees to revisit deleting objective 3 from the objectives.

Ken moved and Doug seconded that objective 3 be struck.

Ken moved and Doug seconded that IAB be asked for majority consent to revise the bylaws to consider bylaw revisions.

ACTION: Objective 3 (above) struck. Trustees will ask for majority consent to revise bylaws to consider revisions that incorporate OPE 1.

Resolutions

The normal life of an **Association** resolution is 3 years. The board, through its adoption process, may designate a longer "life" for any resolution. A file of all policies, both active and archived will be maintained. Annually, the District Directors will review policies which have reached their expiration. The directors shall recommend to the Trustees, which policies should be archived as inactive, which policies should be revised to reflect current information, and which policies should be continued as active. Major policy revisions require approval of the full Board.

The Directors recommend that the following resolutions be archived: **13-01** Support of Medicaid Expansion in Idaho; **14-02** Support Insurance Coverage for Low Income Idahoans; Support Medicaid Redesign in Idaho; **14-06** Support Food Establishment License Fee Increase

Ken moved and Elt seconded that resolutions 13-01, 14-02 and 14-06 be archived. Passed unanimously.

ACTION: Resolutions 13-01, 14-02 and 14-06 be archived

District 4 has introduced 3 resolutions for consideration and vote by IAB. 16-02 Remove Food Establishment Fee in Idaho Code; 16-01 Support Health Insurance Coverage for low Income Idahoans; 16-03 Support Raising the Minimum Age of Legal Access and Use of Tobacco Products in Idaho to Age 21. D4 would also like discussion on an action plan in conjunction with 16-01.

There were no changes suggested to any of the 3 resolutions.

Rob presented the action plan for resolution 16-01 for discussion. Glen shared that he and his counterparts are currently talking to legislators about the impact that lack of health insurance coverage causes on the indigent fund. Carol and Doug shared that D2 also has a well-established process for regularly meeting with legislators. They would prefer to continue with their current process. Glen asked Elt if this action

plan was a "must do" all items, Elt told the group that if was meant to be guidelines. Glen said he would like to review and approve his quote in the press release that is being created by D4 before it is released.

Bill moved and Ken seconded that the proposed resolutions 16-02, 16-01 and 16-03 and the action plan for 16-01 be presented to IAB for consideration.

ACTION: Resolutions 16-02, 16-01 and 16-03 and the action plan for 16-01 to go forward for consideration.

Indirect Rate Review

OPE 6 "The Board of Trustees/Districts should consider periodically reviewing the indirect cost rate to ensure that the adopted approach reasonable reflects the actual use of indirect resources by program (cost of the staff, infrastructure and services). This review should also take into account the tradeoffs between simplicity and effectiveness." Jim Fenton presented an overview of how the Public Health Districts establish their indirect rates. He handed out hard copies of a white paper entitled Indirect Cost Allocation. He explained that the Districts use direct salaries rather than total costs as the denominator and that the Districts prepare and send their indirect rates to IDHW annually in the Fall, he shared the FY 16 indirect rate calculations by District.

It was moved by Bill and seconded by Elt to adopt indirect rate cost allocation methodology as presented by Mr. Fenton.

ACTION: The same indirect rate methodology will be used in FY 17. The Directors will present the FY 17 indirect rate at a Trustee meeting in the Fall.

Idaho Association of Counties (IAC) Contract Review

IAB contracts with IAC to track and advise on issues of public health legislative significance. The contract renews annually in October unless terminated by either party prior to October 1st of each year. The contract was last signed in October of 2010. Nicole presented the contract for review by the Trustees for consideration of renewal by IAB. The terms have not changed, the cost remains \$12,000/year.

Ken moved and Doug seconded that we recommend that IAB renew the contract with IAC.

Idaho Association Office and IAB Budget

Nikole presented the Association budget and the IAB budget for review and recommendation to move them forward to the business meeting for approval

Dr. Roberge moved and Elt seconded that the Trustee's recommend that IAB approve the Association and the IAB budget as presented.

ACTION: Association and IAB budget to be present to IAB with a recommendation to approve.

Next Meeting

The Trustees discussed the timing of next meeting after IAB. It was decided that the next meeting would be a teleconference on September 22, 2016 at 2 MT, 1 Pacific. The chair of the Trustees after June's IAB meeting will be Bill Leake, District 7 Trustee.

Next Meeting- Teleconference September 22, 2016 2 MT 1 Pacific.

Recessed at 245PM



Public Health

Idaho Public Health Districts

IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF DISTRICT BOARDS OF HEALTH

Trustee Meeting June 9, 2016

Approved 12/01/16

Present

Trustee's	Directors	Staff
D1 Glen Bailey, Chair	Lora Whalen	Jim Fenton Fiscal Officer
D2 Doug Zenner	Carol Moehrle	
D3 Richard Roberge	Nikole Zogg	
D4 Elt Hasbrouck	Rob Howarth (acting)	Bonnie Spencer Operations officer
D5 Thomas Faulkner	Rene LeBlanc	
D6 Ken Estep	Maggie Mann	
D7 Bill Leake	Geri Rackow	

Glen called the meeting to order at 11:05 after IAB adjourned. The Trustee's voted at their meeting yesterday to vote on the formula for the distribution of the State general fund appropriation on June 9th after review and discussion with their board members. The formula was modified from yesterday's proposed formula and presented for vote as below:

Formula for distribution of State general fund appropriation to the Health Districts

The State appropriation will be allocated to the Districts as follows:

- Each District shall receive the base funding equal to the total State general fund allocation of the prior fiscal year, but in no case less than 67% of the county contribution.
- a) Any increase in state appropriation will be divided among the Districts based on the following:
 - 67% proportionate level of county contribution
 - 33% based on proportionate share of the three year rolling average of population
- b) In years where there is a State General Fund decrease, each District shall be allocated the same % of State general fund as received in prior fiscal year.

Ken moved and Tom Faulkner seconded to approve this formula for allocation of the FY 18 legislative appropriation.

Tom Faulkner discussed OPE 3 and stated that under this formula in FY 18, every district will receive at least 67% of county contribution.

Elt stated that we should go to JLOC and ask if they will do a study. Doug and Ken did not feel this was a good idea as in Idaho code this is the charge of the Trustees to decide.

Glen Bailey
PHD 1
208.415.5102

Doug Zenner
PHD 2
208.799.3100

Tom Dale
PHD 3
208.455.5315

Elt Hasbrouck
PHD 4
208.375.5211

Thomas Faulkner
PHD 5
208.737.5902

Ken Estep
PHD 6
208.233.9080

Bill Leake
PHD 7
208.522.0310

Glen asked Jim to comment, he stated his concern was that this formula will lock up a large part of the formula in the base, leaving very little to split based on population and taxation.

Bill stated that this formula will prevent large shifts. It will allow Districts to better plan their budgets. The Trustees will review the formula annually and if there is a problem the Trustees can adjust it.

Bonnie said that if a District experienced a decrease in population effect under this formula the 33% would be split proportionately based on their share of population.

Rene told the group that the State Appropriation makes up 11-18% of each District budget. In an average year the major portion of District budgets are based on fees and sub-grants or contracts through Health and Welfare/DEQ based on disease load and other factors. Rene states that need is addressed through sub-grants contracts through H and W.

Glen called for a roll call vote.

D1 Yes, D2 Yes, D3 No, D4 No, D5 Yes, D6 Yes, D7 Yes.

ACTION: Formula adopted, will review annually.

Tom Faulkner asked if the group would consider consulting with Universities to see if there are students interested in reviewing the distribution formula at no charge to the Districts. He'd like to get input from an impartial party, because this is a difficult thing, every district just looks at what they are losing or making, it would be good to work towards something that we could all agree on that would be fair and wouldn't cause large shifts, he hates the uncertainty of big hits to Districts.

Bill as chair of the Trustee group will Draft a letter from the Trustee's asking ISU/BSU and U of I to consider studying our formula and provide recommendations at no cost.

The group discussed the importance of presenting a united front to our legislators as we continue to explore ways to improve our formula, we are all working together trying to solve this problem.

Elt moved to adjourn, seconded by Tom Faulkner. All in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 1200.

REVISION 10/27/16: Elt asked that the minutes reflect there was discussion in the meeting about the need to include a poverty component, similar to what was discussed at the June 8, 2016 Trustee meeting.



Public Health
Protect. Promote. Partner.

Idaho Public Health Districts

IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF DISTRICT BOARDS OF HEALTH

Trustee Conference Call Minutes

Thursday, September 22, 2016

2:00 p.m. MT

Approved 10/27/16

Attendance

District	Trustees	Directors
1	Glen Bailey	Lora Whalen
2	Doug Zenner	Carol Moehrle
3	Tom Dale	Nikole Zogg
4	Elt Hasbrouck	Russ Duke
5	Linda Montgomery, BOH Chair	Rene LeBlanc
6	Vaughn Rasmussen, BOH Vice Chair	Maggie Mann
7	Bill Leake, Chair	Geri Rackow

1. Meeting Called to Order – Chair

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Bill Leake at 2:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Roll call for the meeting was conducted.

3. Call for additional Agenda Items - All

Bill asked if there were additional agenda items. There were none identified for this meeting. Geri noted that the approval of the June 8 & 9, 2016 Trustee Meeting minutes will be added to the next agenda.

4. 2017 JFAC Presentation – Trustee Representation

Lora Whalen from Health District 1 will be presenting the health districts' 2018 budget request to JFAC. Historically, the Trustee from the same district has provided introductory remarks as part of the presentation. Glen Bailey indicated that he is available and would be honored to represent the Trustees. It was noted that a date for the health districts JFAC presentation has not yet been set, but likely to be in January. The Directors will work on the presentation and review with the Trustees prior to the presentation.

5. Report on Public Comment at Healthcare Alternatives Workgroup – September 28

Bill reported that he participated in a webinar hosted by Close the Gap earlier this week in preparation for public testimony at the Legislative Workgroup's meeting next week. He is scheduled to testify on behalf of the Trustees on 9/28 at 2:15. His testimony emphasizes our support based on the resolution that was approved at the annual meeting in June. Bill's draft testimony was shared with everyone for review and feedback.

Elt reported that he has also been scheduled to testify as a County Commissioner representing Valley County at 2:03 that day. He plans to reaffirm what the Trustees voted on at the annual meeting and personal experience from Valley County's perspective.

Action: If anyone has feedback on Bill's testimony, please e-mail it to Geri Rackow (grackow@eiph.idaho.gov) by Monday, September 26.

Glen Bailey
PHD 1
208.415.5102

Doug Zenner
PHD 2
208.799.3100

Tom Dale
PHD 3
208.455.5315

Elt Hasbrouck
PHD 4
208.375.5211

Thomas Faulkner
PHD 5
208.737.5902

Ken Estep
PHD 6
208.233.9080

Bill Leake
PHD 7
208.533.3163

6. Proposed Action for Food Fees

Geri reported that a question was raised among the directors as to whether the Trustees want to take any steps to actively move forward the resolution of removing food establishment license fees from Idaho Code (copy of the resolution is included in these minutes). Current food licensing fees:

\$65.00	Mobile/Temporary/Intermittent Food Establishments
\$85.00	Mobile Food Establishment with a Commissary
\$125.00	Other Food Establishments (except those with more than 2 licenses on one premise)
\$150.00	Food Establishments with more than 2 licenses on one premise

It was noted that Idaho's food licensing fees are less than those of surrounding states. Last year, Senator Schmidt was thinking about introducing legislation to remove the food fees from Idaho Code; however, he decided not to move it forward. Comments during the last session suggested that moving this issue forward may possibly be tied to reducing the funding the health district receive from the State. Additional concerns were voiced that fees would vary from district rather than being uniform across the state. Bill asked for input from each Trustee on this issue:

- D1: Thinks individual districts would be able to set these fees and make them more fair for their districts.
- D2: Would like to sit back and see how the Legislative session progresses before we consider moving this issue forward. When the districts have different fee structures, he feels the Legislature will be lobbied to make them uniform.
- D3: Feels that food fees should be taken out of Code and left up to the to individual districts because costs vary from district to district. He feels that the current fees set by the Legislature do not account for the varying time it takes to inspect different sizes of establishments, so unless this can be accounted for in fees set by the Legislature, the fees should be taken out of Code and left up to the individual districts. It's important to discuss with legislators that the current fees are not covering the cost of the service.
- D4: Districts should be able to determine their own fees based on costs, which vary from district to districts so he supports food fees being removed from Code.
- D5: Feels that we need to have some uniformity across the state. She would rather seek an increase and leave it with the Legislature rather than each district setting their own and getting push back from Legislators and industry. Would like to wait and see what happens this session. Rene recounted his experience of addressing inconsistencies in the Septic Program with legislators due to inconsistencies among the districts. He also feels that this session, Legislators will be looking for funding for health insurance coverage that doesn't include Federal dollars, so pushing the food fee issue may invite problems for the health districts.
- D6: It would be nice to talk with legislators and see if there is support before we make a decision because if there's not support, it won't go anywhere. Suggested that we have a plan in place before deciding to move forward.
- D7: Agrees that we should have a plan and a path forward.

Action: Bill will put together a draft plan of action for addressing food fees and present it to the Trustees for consideration. If anyone wants to send him comments or suggestions for the plan, he'd welcome them and incorporate them. Bill's e-mail is: bleake@co.teton.id.us.

7. OPE Follow Up

- a. Independent Study of General Fund Distribution Formula: Bill shared that his understanding from the discussion at the last Trustee Meeting is that we adopted a new formula and that we were going to give it a couple of years to see how the formula works before pursuing any additional changes to the formula. As far as doing the study, Bill reviewed the 1993 study that was done by the Universities and found that there was not really an analysis of the formula. He is concerned that if we pursue asking the Universities to conduct a study for free, it won't get us much. Bill asked each district to share their thoughts on the matter.

- D1: Thinks we should give the current formula some time before we reevaluate it. Not sure that we can find someone to conduct a study without it costing us considerable amount of money. Doesn't feel that a free study from the Universities or graduate students would be very useful.
- D2: We voted 5-2 to adopt the new formula. We should give it a couple of years and then review it again.
- D3: Reservations about 1) who would conduct the study and ensure independence and 2) what we do with the study if it's done. They've not had a chance to talk with their BOH about this topic, which he would like to do before commenting further.
- D4: OPE's Recommendation #5 was that the Legislature should commission an evaluation, not nus. He thinks we should leave this up to the Legislature and hopefully it won't cost the health districts money. He feels this is one of the recommendations of the OPE report that hasn't been met yet.

Their BOH has talked a great deal about this and they are considering other alternatives. They think there needs to be some type of measure of poverty or number of people uninsured, but they are not sure how to incorporate these. Currently, there is not anything in the formula that addresses need; it's solely based on population and county contribution. He doesn't feel like that what was intended in the beginning. Will have to see where this goes.

- D5: At their BOH meeting yesterday, they unanimously ratified the proposal to give the new funding formula that was adopted in June a couple of years. They also discussed that is there another study, we need to bind ourselves by the results study and not just keep expending money for studies.
- D6: Their BOH has discussed this and voted to leave the formula as it currently stand and review it in a couple of years. He also feels that all of the BOHs need to work together on this and don't independently go lobby the Legislature for a study. If we're going to approach the Legislature, it should be done all together as a team.
- D7: BOH decided to let the formula run for a couple of years and as we learn from it, formulate a decision and move from there.
- b. Status Report to OPE: It is the feeling of the district directors that OPE and JLOC are expecting a follow up report from the health districts. We need to decide how to proceed.

ACTION: Doug suggested that the district directors draft a letter and all the Trustees sign it and send it to JLOC. All trustees unanimously concurred with this suggestion. The directors will work on this response and present it for review/approval at the next Trustee meeting.

8. Next Meeting: The next Trustee Conference call will be held on October 27 at 1:30 MT.

9. Adjourn: A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 2:35 p.m.

16-02: Resolution to Eliminate the Food Establishment License Fee in Idaho Code

**RESOLUTION TO REMOVE THE FOOD ESTABLISHMENT LICENSE
FEE IN IDAHO CODE**

WHEREAS, protecting the public from the hazards of food borne illness and disease is a primary function of Idaho's Public Health Districts; and

WHEREAS, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that one in six Americans, or 48 million people, get sick from foodborne illnesses every year. Approximately 128,000 of these are hospitalized and 3,000 die; and

WHEREAS, foodborne illness poses a \$77.7 billion economic burden in the United States annually², and

WHEREAS, it is well recognized that foodborne outbreaks can be devastating to a food establishment business; and

WHEREAS, the Public Health Districts are committed to providing an appropriate balance between code enforcement and education; and

WHEREAS, the food protection system in Idaho presently meets generally accepted state and national standards; and

WHEREAS, the Public Health Districts are mandated by the Idaho Food Code to perform at least one food safety inspection per year for each licensed food establishment, but current funding is inadequate to cover the cost of this service;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Idaho Association of District Boards of Health supports removing food establishment license fees in Idaho Code and allowing the local boards of health to establish a fee based on the actual cost to deliver the food safety inspection program.

¹Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. "Estimates of Foodborne Illness in the United States," page last updated January 8, 2014, accessed March 16, 2016, <http://www.cdc.gov/foodborneburden/>.

²Bottemiller, H. "Annual Foodborne Illnesses Cost \$77 Billion, Study Finds, Food Safety News," (January 3, 2012), accessed March 16, 2016. <http://www.foodsafetynews.com/2012/01/foodborne-illness-costs-77-billion-annually-study-finds/#.Vum0BNlrKcN>.



IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF DISTRICT BOARDS OF HEALTH

Trustee Conference Call Minutes

Thursday, October 27, 2016

1:30 p.m. MT

Approved 12/01/16

Attendance

District	Trustees	Directors
1	Glen Bailey	Lora Whalen
2	Doug Zenner	Carol Moehrle
3	Tom Dale	Nikole Zogg
4	Elt Hasbrouck	Russ Duke
5	Tom Faulkner	Rene LeBlanc
6	Ken Estep	Maggie Mann
7	Bill Leake, Chair	Geri Rackow

1. Meeting Called to Order & Roll Call **Chairman Leake**

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Bill Leake at 1:30 p.m. Roll call for the meeting was conducted.

2. Call for additional Agenda Items **All**

Bill asked if there were additional agenda items. There were none identified for this meeting.

Action: Elt Hasbrouck made a motion to approve the agenda; seconded by Glen Bailey. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Trustee Meeting Minutes **Chairman Leake**

- a. June 8, 2016: Geri stated that in the list of attendees, Lee Staker should be under Health District 7 rather than Health District 6. Tom Dale also noted that reference in the minutes to "Tom" should be attributed to "Tom Faulkner."

Action: Elt Hasbrouck made a motion to approve the minutes with the noted corrections; seconded by Doug Zenner. Motion carried unanimously.

- b. June 9, 2016: Elt commented on the lack of detail in the minutes regarding the discussion about a poverty component in the formula. The group discussed possible edits to the minutes to reflect this discussion; however, decided to wait on approving the minutes until everyone had an opportunity to review, in writing, the proposed revised minutes.

Action: Doug Zenner made a motion to table this agenda item until the next meeting; seconded by Ken Estep. Motion carried unanimously.

- c. September 22, 2016: There were no changes or corrections noted for the minutes.

Action: Glen Bailey made a motion to approve the minutes as written; seconded by Tom Dale. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Report on Public Comment at Healthcare Alternatives Work Group – September 28 Chairman Leake

Bill reported that he and Geri attended the meeting of the Work Group. He presented his three-minute testimony on behalf of the Trustees/Public Health Districts and feels the work group members appreciated the comments and are taking them to heart. The Work Group met again on October 24 and are set to meet again on November 22 at which time they are planning to finalize a report with the Work Group's recommendations/guidelines for Idaho Department of Health & Welfare to use for identifying possible solutions for the gap population. Elt stated that he also attended the September 28 Work Group meeting and thought that Bill Leake did a wonderful job expressing the views of the Trustees and congratulated him on a job well done.

5. Food Fee History Review and Proposed Plan Rene LeBlanc, Russ Duke, Chairman Leake

Russ provided the Trustees with a summary of the food fee history. Prior to 1995, there were no food fees assessed to food establishments; the costs were covered completely by state and county dollars. Around 1995/1996, the first fee of \$55 was implemented, with no differentiation between types of facilities. At that time, there was some negotiation that took place between two legislators resulting in industry and the taxpayers (county and state) each paying 1/3 of the cost of the service. In 2008/2009, when we went through the legislative process to increase the food fees, our fees were covering less than 1/3 of our costs. At that time, we negotiated with the lobbyists/industry groups that are regulated and were able to 1) agree upon a tiered fee structured so that larger facilities would pay more (since these inspections are more time intensive) and 2) also increase fees so that they would cover at least 1/3 of our costs. No further fee adjustments have occurred since 2010. For the past few years, the Boards have talked about the feasibility of working to increase food fees again. This was discussed again on our September 22, 2016 conference call, but not all Trustees were in agreement on how to proceed at this time. Russ stated that we need to decide if this is something we want to pursue this coming Legislative session. We have options: we could increase our fees (anywhere from our current fee all the way up to 100% of our costs) or we could opt to take the fees out of Idaho Code and let each Board of Health set their own food inspection fees, which is what they do for nearly all other fees. After the last call, some of the Trustees were going to talk with Legislators to get a sense of the climate for taking any action this coming year.

Rene commented that during the last process, the lobbyists were amenable in the beginning, but as the session progressed, they became more challenging to work with.

Bill stated that on the last Trustee Call, he committed to putting together a plan for moving forward on this matter. He received feedback from Tom Dale, but no one else. At this point, none of the Trustees have discussed this matter with any Legislators.

Ken suggested that the Trustees consider delaying due to the strong opposition we may be faced with and the need to have everything in order before moving forward.

Tom Dale suggested that the Trustees could come to an agreement on the principle that the amount of work it takes to do a particular service should be paid by those who are benefiting from the service. He feels this is a principle that would resonate with our legislators if it were communicated clearly. Elt agreed with Tom's statement and stated that that it won't be easy, but we need to try even if we fail. Food inspections are costing us a lot of money and industry should be paying for the service.

Tom Dale commented that keeping the above principle in mind, we are ready to argue on other things that won't amount to as much potential financial benefit to our districts. If we fix this one issue (food fees), we would see an increase in revenue that could help support the operations we are obligated to provide.

Doug again voiced his concern with trying to move this issue forward. He agrees with the principle, but feels the reality is that we won't get it through. He feels that we need to tackle the problems we can solve through the Legislature and believes this is one that we cannot.

Tom Dale respectfully disagreed this Doug's sentiment, citing an example of recent accomplishments in regards to the Clean Water Act. While it took many years to get through, it was accomplished and it was worth it. He feels like this is a battle worth fighting and that we shouldn't take it off the table just because we will have opposition. We need to keep bringing it up to Legislators and help them understand that the government should not be supporting the restaurant industry, which is what is happening.

Bill shared that he just came out of a meeting with Senator Hill who shared his general sentiment that if we want the Legislature to do something, we need to give them facts. Bill feels that if we want to move this principle forward, we need facts to back it up. Geri stated that the health districts' Fiscal Officers and Environmental Health Directors could compile data for us.

Glen stated that he agrees that we need to present facts and that we also need to increase fees so we are covering the costs from the food industry rather than the health districts subsidizing the service. The food industry has a very powerful lobbying group, so he expects the process to be challenging.

Tom Faulkner shared that if we are going to tackle this issue, he would prefer to have the food fees removed from Idaho Code and let the Boards of Health set the fees.

Tom Dale agreed with Tom Faulkner. He stated that one way we could present it to the Legislature is that this is a method by which we can reduce the tax burden on our county tax payers, since tax payers are covering costs for restaurants with the fees as currently structured (with the food establishment paying only 1/3 of the full cost). He believes our Legislature is in favor of reducing taxes so this could be a tax reduction method.

Doug stated that he is interested in seeing what the data shows to be the costs between the districts. He is concerned that if fees are inconsistent between the districts, it will not bode well with the Legislature.

Elt commented that information on fees is already available on the health districts' websites. It's likely that the fees will be different between districts, but we need to review the data first to see what it shows.

Rene related his experience working with the Legislature's Environmental Health Task Force over inconsistent Environmental Health fees between the health districts. He commented that if we take the fees out of Statute, we will likely be under scrutiny by the Legislature.

Glen questioned if all districts are using the same process for determining the cost of inspections. Russ stated that all districts should be using similar methods in terms of staff time coding and indirect rates, which all gets coded to a specific program code. So while cost for a unit of service will vary from district to district, the method for determining actual costs should be the same. Rene commented that we can ask the Environmental Health Work Group to ensure they are using the same process for calculating costs, but the variation in costs comes from the number of staff working in the program, the salaries paid, operating costs, indirect rate, etc.

Action: Rene and Russ will make the request of the Fiscal Officer and Environment Health Work Groups to have them collect the data on costs for food inspections that can be reviewed by the Trustees at their next meeting. After we evaluate the data, will we determine our next steps (which could potentially include working to increase current fees or pursuing the removal of food fees from Statute).

6. Review/Approval of Status Report to OPE/JLOC

Chairman Leake

Bill stated that a draft letter to OPE was provided to the Trustees for review. If everyone agrees with the content with the letter, we will finalize and submit it. Elt commented that he does not feel that the Trustees work is done in regards to the OPE report and requested that the sentence, "The Public Health District Trustees consider our response to this report to be concluded," be stricken. Tom Dale agreed.

Glen commented in regards to Recommendation 2, "Board of Trustees should consider phasing in over several years any future changes to the formula," that at the June conference we discussed this and came up with a basic formula that should not have created a significant fiscal impact to any district. He asked if Elt and Tom Dale agreed with this statement. Elt and Tom both voiced their agreement with the concept that any formula that anyone came up with would be phased in and not implemented all at once.

Glen asked Elt and Tom Dale when they would consider the Trustees response to OPE to be concluded. Tom stated that's a difficult question to answer, but that he would consider it to be concluded when all seven districts are in consensus. As it currently stands, we have some disagreement on some of the issues but Tom feels we are agreeing on a lot of the issues which he feels is a very positive thing.

Glen commented that he feels we are leaving our response to OPE open-ended. Tom Faulkner stated that he's comfortable taking the sentence out, implying that we're always open to suggestions.

Bill stated that his impression of the letter is that we are concluded with the particular recommendations as they were presented in this report, but that we are certainly always open to further input. To come to closure on this particular report, we came up with a formula, voted 5-2 to adopt it, and also agree to phase in future changes. We agreed to let the current formula run for a couple years to see how it works out and then revisit. Bill's thought is that we do not need to keep this report open to be able to do that.

Elt stated that vote on the formula was 5 to 2; therefore he feels we need to keep discussing and working on the formula. District 4 has some things they're going to work on as well as far as the formula. Elt does not believe we are done working with OPE and JLOC on this matter.

Action: Tom Dale made a motion to approve the letter with the above noted sentence being stricken; seconded by Elt. Motion carried 5-2 (Districts 2 and 7 opposed). The letter will be prepared for signature.

7. Proposed Legislation – General Fund Appropriation Formula

Elt Hasbrouck

Bill stated that he understands District 4 is proposing legislation concerning the General Fund formula. Elt stated that since he became a Trustee, he's been concerned that nothing in the formula is based on need. The population and county contribution is a good place to start, but OPE recommended that there should be something in the formula based on need. District 4 has discussed several ideas and are currently drafting legislation, but he can't share any specifics.

Bill asked when Elt thinks the draft legislation will be available for the Trustees to review. Elt stated that he was not sure when it would be ready as Districts 3 and 4 are trying to work out some of the details of where they're trying to go with the formula to base it some on need.

Doug inquired about the financial impact of this "need-based" formula, as it seems like it will result is some districts gaining financially while others being negatively impacted. He thought we were supposed to talk about the funding formula being discussed prior to implementation and shared concern that appears not to be the case.

Elt stated that as Trustees in charge of the funding formula, we need to look at it more on a state level than a district level. There may be districts that win and there may be districts that lose, but we need to consider what is the best use of that money statewide.

Glen stated that since the responsibility of developing the funding formula is that of the Trustees, it appears Districts 3 and 4 are attempting to circumvent the process with this proposed legislation. Elt stated that the funding formula issue has created dissension among the districts for a long time because everyone's concerned about winning or losing funds in their district. He believes it's important to get this money out to the people that need it, not based on where they live or which district they're in. Since District 4 has lost the vote for many consecutive years, in order to fight for his district, which he feels is his role as Trustee, he feels introducing legislation is the only alternative they have left.

Glen commented on the proportion of funding currently received by Districts 3 and 4. Elt stated that we also need to keep in mind that Districts 3 & 4 also have about 45% of the population. There may be concern that this is going to be an issue of Ada County versus the rest of the state, but that's not the case as District 4 has lots of rural counties in it as well. They have the population in their district and they have the need there. They can't run their programs based on their funding so that is what Elt is fighting for.

Rene commented that Kim Gaskill, Fiscal Officer from District 6, keeps the historical data on general fund appropriation from FY1980-2017. Currently Districts 3 and 4 receive 38.75% of general fund dollars, with the other five districts share the remaining 61.25%. The OPE study focused only on FY2014.

Elt stated that this has already been discussed and Districts 3 and 4 keep coming out on the losing end of the funding formula, so they are going to try a different route to maintain their programs, pay their staff, and take care of their facilities. That's the goal of their proposed legislation.

Bill stated that he is not opposed to District 3 and 4 proposing a better formula to address needs (with the logic and basis behind it) for the Trustees to consider since that is our responsibility. If we can come up with a better formula, we should. However, he is concerned with their plan to go to the legislature before the Trustees have the opportunity to address it.

Elt commented that the important thing to remember is that District 4 has been trying to do this for quite a few years and has always been out voted. He tried to bring up the poverty issue at the June Trustee meeting. He doesn't know where else to go other than the Legislature because they seem to keep losing more and more every year in District 4. Doug ask clarification on what District 4 is losing. Elt commented that when you're the fastest growing District, and with District 3 make up approximately half of the state population, he thinks there's an issue with the funding since District 4 can't seem to win through the Board of Trustees. Historically, votes on the funding formula have always been 6-1 or 5-2. Elt stated that in order to sustain their programs, District 4 feels they have to do something pretty drastic so they are pursuing the legislation. It may not go anywhere, but they have to try.

Ken shared that his Board was emphatic that if they don't have the opportunity to have a voice in the proposed legislation, they have prepared a letter protesting that action and are ready to send it to every Legislator signed by all the districts that agree with them and all of their county commissioners. This is important and the reason he's sharing this is because legislative committee work will start occurring in mid-November. We all need to know up front what is going on or prepared to take action also.

Elt stated that as soon as they get their legislation drafted, he will get it to the Trustees.

Glen stated that he sees this action creating a further divide between the districts. He thinks that we as districts have the responsibility to discuss these things and to come to agreement before we take it to the Legislature as their impression will be that we cannot properly function and manage the business ourselves. Glen feels that this would not be favorable for us as Trustees and as the Health districts and he suggested that we need to come together to resolve this. He would like to see the data indicating how Districts 3 and 4 are being hurt since they received a considerable portion of the funds.

Elt stated that he appreciates Glen's comments, but that five of the health districts have been on the winning side of the vote for a number of years. If it were Glen's district on the losing side of the vote, maybe he would feel differently.

Glen acknowledged Elt's comment, but stated that he still feels like this issue needs to be resolved among the Board of Trustees and our districts and not taken to the Legislature at this point. He feels we can work on this issue.

Tom Dale stated that he is new to this process and doesn't have all the history to rely upon, but in his opinion, nobody is trying to hurt anyone; no one is trying to win or lose. He believes that we need to come up with an alternative where everyone wins. The people who win are the people who we are all seeking to serve throughout the state and that's what we should be discussing rather than winners and losers. He is looking at how we can best utilize the limited dollars the Legislature puts into public health to serve those people who need it the most. He thinks the discussion will continue.

Bill stated that his impression is that the Trustees are not opposed to looking at the formula; rather they don't agree with the concept of putting in in the format of legislation first. He thinks that if Districts 3 and 4 are willing to propose a formula for the Trustees to consider, we should do that before we consider going to the Legislature.

Tom Faulkner commented that if Districts 3 and 4 was to pursue legislation, that is their prerogative, but he doesn't feel like it will be successful in the long run as he believes shifts in funding will occur based on who's in control of the Legislature. He stated that we have always tried to work together and he hopes that we continue to do so.

Action: This will be an agenda item for the next Trustee meeting. Districts 3 and 4 will share their proposed legislation with all the Trustees as soon as it is available.

8. Possible Changes to Millennium Fund Allocation Maggie Mann

Maggie reported that the Directors have discussed some potential changes to the Millennium Fund distribution formula, but we have received feedback from our Legislative Services Office (LSO) analyst that there is a strong likelihood that Millennium Fund dollars will be redirected to help fund a solution regarding the insurance coverage age. Directors' recommendation to the Trustees is that this discussion be tabled until more information is available.

Action: Doug made a motion to table the discussion on Millennium Fund allocation; seconded by Tom Faulkner. Motion passed with unanimously.

9. Changes to JFAC Presentation Lora Whalen

Lora reported that Jared Tatro, our LSO analyst, attended the Directors' last meeting and shared with us that JFAC has changed the format of the budget presentation for this coming Legislative session. The presentations will now be more budget driven opposed to the informational presentations that have been provided in the past. The LSO analyst will be the primary presenter on the agency's budget, with the

agency director/representative sitting next to him. There will also be a space for two additional agency representatives. Lora has been tasked with being the health district representative to sit beside Jared and prepared to answer questions. One of Jared's recommendations is that we consider having a Fiscal Officer fill one of the two remaining spots. Kim Gaskill, Fiscal Officer from Health District 6 is not available, but Jim Fenton from Health District 1 is available to attend. In the past, the introductory comments of the presentation were made by a Trustee, which we felt was valuable. The Directors have talked about having a Trustee or possibly Maggie (since she gave the presentation last year) fill the remaining seat. Lora's recommendation is that we wait and see where things go with Districts 3 and 4's legislation as she thinks it would be important for JFAC to hear a Trustee vote, but that decision is up to the Trustees.

Tom Dale commented that in his opinion, anything that Districts 3 and 4 do with the legislation would not affect the overall budget that will be considered by JFAC. Lora clarified that she was thinking that whatever questions JFAC may have about the legislation would be better addressed by a Trustee.

Tom Faulkner shared that he thinks the legislation may affect the overall budget, so agrees that we need to wait and see if Districts 3 and 4 come forward with legislation before we decide. Doug agreed.

Bill asked Elt if Districts 3 and 4 think they will have legislation for the 2017 Legislative session. Elt confirmed that is their intent. Elt also commented that this funding formula will not be heard in front of JFAC, but rather another committee. Before it goes before JFAC, it has to be approved or denied.

Bill commented that since it is the intent to propose legislation for this coming session, the Trustees should be seeing a draft of it soon. Elt stated that it will be shared as soon as they can get it together. With this discussion Bill commented that he feels we should plan to have a Trustee present at the JFAC presentation.

Action: Glen Bailey is prepared to attend the JFAC presentation as the Trustee representative. Bill Leake is available as backup.

10. FY17 Indirect Rate Review

Chairman Leake

Bill reported that everyone received a copy of the letter signed by Lora showing the health districts' indirect rates for FY2017. This information was sent to the Idaho Department of Health & Welfare on August 18, 2016. Geri explained that one of the recommendations from OPE (Recommendation 6) that the Trustees discussed at their June meeting is that the Trustees should review the indirect rates. Intent of today's discussion is for the Trustees to review the indirect rates on an annual basis. FY2016's rates were reviewed at the June 8, 2016 Trustee meeting. The information is now available for FY2017, which is what was shared with the Trustees for review.

Action: The Trustees unanimously acknowledged review of the FY2017 indirect rates for the public health districts. Bill suggested that at the June 2017 Trustee Meeting we should have more discussion around the indirect rates so we are all familiar with how they are calculated.

11. Next Meeting: The next Trustee Conference call will be held on December 1 at 1:30 MT.

12. Adjourn: Ken made a motion, seconded by Doug, to adjourn the meeting at 2:55 p.m. Motion passed unanimously.

This page left blank intentionally.

IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF DISTRICT BOARDS OF HEALTH

Trustee Conference Call Minutes

Thursday, December 1, 2016

1:30 p.m. MT

Approved 1/12/17

Attendance

District	Trustees	Directors	Guest
1	Glen Bailey	Lora Whalen	Jared Tatro
2	Dave McGraw, D2 BOH Member	Carol Moehrle	
3	Tom Dale	Nikole Zogg	
4	Elt Hasbrouck	Russ Duke	
5	Tom Faulkner	Rene LeBlanc	
6		Maggie Mann	
7	Bill Leake, Chair	Geri Rackow	

1. Meeting Called to Order & Roll Call Chairman Leake

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Bill Leake at 1:30 p.m. Roll call for the meeting was conducted.

2. Call for additional Agenda Items All

Bill asked if there were additional agenda items. There were none identified for this meeting. He did note that there is a correction on the agenda regarding the approval of the minutes. For approval are the June 9, 2016 minutes rather than those of June 8, 2016, which were approved on the last Trustee call. No one opposed making this correction to the agenda.

3. Approval of Trustee Meeting Minutes Chairman Leake

Bill asked if everyone had an opportunity to review the Trustee meeting minutes of the June 9, 2016 and October 27, 2016. There were no corrections noted.

Action: Dave McGraw made a motion to approve the June 9, 2016 and October 27, 2016 minutes; seconded by Glen Bailey. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Update from Healthcare Alternatives Work Group Meeting – November 22 Chairman Leake

Bill reported that the Workgroup's final report has been released. The Work Group did conclude that it would be in the best interest of the state to provide health care of some kind to the individuals in the coverage gap and identified two methods for accomplishing this goal: 1) expand the state's Medicaid plan or 2) create a state-funded program that provides health care of some kind to at least some individuals in the gap.

In light of the national election results, the Work Group did not recommend a specific method at this time, but made the following recommendations:

1. A policy to provide health care of some kind to the gap population should be enacted by the 2017 Legislature;
2. If legislation to expand Medicaid of any type is considered by the Legislature, such legislation should include a conditional sunset clause in the event that federal policy changes;

3. All Medicaid populations, including any expansion populations, should be moved to managed care as soon as possible;
4. A state-funded program should include a direct care component for primary and preventative care; and
5. Funds for a state program or for the state share of Medicaid expansion should come from the Millennium Fund and from the general fund as needed.

Here is a link to access the full report: <https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2016/interim/hacp-materials/>

5. Review Food Fee Program Cost Data & Next Steps **Rene LeBlanc, Russ Duke, Chairman Leake**

Russ reported that the Environmental Health directors compiled a spreadsheet (shown below) with food program costs for all of the districts for FY12-16, which are based on the total food program costs divided by the total number of licensed food establishments for each district as well as the statewide average cost. On a statewide basis, our costs are fairly consistent from year to year, but there is variability between the districts due to a variety of reasons (administration of the program, staff salaries, travel costs, etc.).

Idaho Food Program Costs

District	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	STATE
FY12 Costs	\$310,260	\$257,725	\$344,668	\$868,918	\$323,015	\$230,675	\$409,662	\$2,744,923
FY12 Licenses Issued	1320	779	958	2606	1256	927	1125	8971
Cost per Facility	\$235	\$331	\$360	\$333	\$257	\$249	\$364	\$306
FY13 Costs	\$298,658	\$263,589	\$337,226	\$834,264	\$326,798	\$269,366	\$408,647	\$2,738,548
FY13 Licenses Issued	1311	817	929	2732	1364	956	1068	9177
Cost per Facility	\$228	\$323	\$363	\$305	\$240	\$282	\$383	\$298
FY14 Costs	\$303,048	\$236,314	\$301,635	\$868,831	\$291,129	\$231,502	\$380,069	\$2,612,528
FY14 Licenses Issued	1330	718	1087	2723	1252	924	1109	9143
Cost per Facility	\$228	\$329	\$277	\$319	\$233	\$251	\$343	\$286
FY15 Costs	\$299,872	\$248,307	\$284,221	\$894,638	\$325,592	\$271,750	\$368,701	\$2,693,081
FY15 Licenses Issued	1330	807	899	2749	1346	931	1161	9223
Cost per Facility	\$225	\$308	\$316	\$325	\$242	\$292	\$318	\$292
FY16 Costs	\$287,202	\$271,140	\$347,864	\$884,078	\$295,430	\$297,583	\$391,128	\$2,774,425
FY16 Licenses Issued	1326	738	998	2849	1263	942	1207	9323
Cost per Facility	\$217	\$367	\$349	\$310	\$234	\$316	\$324	\$298

Currently, fees range from \$65 - \$150, with the rest of the cost being made up through state and county dollars. If we removed the fee from Statute, each district would then be able to charge a fee they deem appropriate. Tom Dale noted that he finds it very unusual that county and state taxpayers are being tasked to fund this sector of the economy. He thinks it may be helpful if the legislators understood this could be a tax reduction measure because the cost could go back to the business to cover their operational costs.

Bill stated that if we decide to address this matter, we need to have a well thought out strategy on how to educate the legislators. Tom Dale agreed and stated that we will need to show the benefits of a change to the constituents as well as the impact on taxes.

Prevent. Promote. Protect.

More data will be needed in order for us to put together a strategy. Glen agreed, but also stated that he feels we should look at standardizing the food inspection process. Tom Dale shared his experience working on a task force for years to standardize EMS services. In the end, they discovered that would be difficult to standardize statewide and agreed that it would be better left of to each county/area due to the diversity across the state. As a result, he feels the management of the food program should be left up to the local officials.

Our approach could include sending a letter to the legislators informing them of the situation and our concern about taxpayers subsidizing the food program, and our desire to address the concern in the coming year. We recognize that there will likely be opposition from the food industry.

Dave suggested that if the concern is having consistent fees statewide, maybe we should instead consider working with the Legislature to increase the fee in statute to a more reasonable level that would better cover our costs. Tom Dale thinks that idea is worthwhile and would move us in the right direction. However, we need to base our actions on a principle. He believes the principle is that the cost of the food inspection should be borne by the businesses.

Elt stated that he prefers having a standard fee statewide.

Options for future discussion:

1. Remove fees from statute (could be a phased-out approach)
2. Keep fees in statute, but increase them (phased-in process)

Action: Bill and Geri will take information and put it in a format to put in front of us for further discussion at next call.

6. OPE Response Letter

Chairman Leake

The health districts' response letter to OPE has been finalized with all trustees' and directors' signatures. Bill indicated that we were waiting for today's call to approve the June 9 and October 27 Trustee minutes so they can be sent along with the letter.

Action: The OPE response letter and attachments will be e-mailed to OPE today.

7. Proposed Legislation – General Fund Appropriation Formula

Elt Hasbrouck

Elt stated that they have come up a draft that will be shared with everyone in the next day or two. It changes how the 33% of the formula will be distributed – proposing 75% be distributed on population and 25% be distributed on uninsured population in the districts. He stated that the reason he is behind this proposal is that it is in alignment with OPE's recommendation to base the formula on need, which he feels was not done by the Trustees in June.

Elt stated that he has been in contact with Dan Chadwick at IAC, who is not happy with the direction they are going right now, but he understands where they are coming from. Elt stated that the only reason they keep pushing this is that there has been so much dissention over the years and he thinks we need to solve it. Furthermore, there is no way for a district on the losing end of a vote to appeal the decision so this is a last straw effort on their part.

Tom Dale added that he suggests changes to the formula be phased in over three years and that in order to ensure a stable base of population and uninsured, that a three-year rolling average be used for these numbers. Tom stated that once everyone gets the draft, he and Elt would like input from all of the Trustees. If anyone has suggestions how to do it better, they're willing to listen.

Bill asked why we need to propose legislation rather than proposing a formula to the Trustees for consideration? Tom Dale responded by stating that he feels that having the formula set in statute will bring a level of consistency and stability so it is not subject to change every year based on who sits on the Board of Trustees and feels that if the formula is set by the Legislature, we should be able to move forward.

Glen stated that he agrees with Tom and Elt that this is something that can be worked out, that any changes should be phased in, and should also be in the best interest of public health across the state, not for a specific district. He appreciates the opportunity to see the draft and will provide his feedback.

Elt commented that if we can all agree on the formula, the problem will be solved and we can go to the Legislature to have the formula put in statute where it will stay for a long time. He also encouraged everyone to go back and run numbers, applying this new formula to past years' budgets to see how it would have worked out. He does not think they are talking about very much money. His desire is for no district to get too little or too much funding. He wants to solve the dissention between the districts.

Glen asked if the draft proposal explains how they arrived at establishing the need component. Elt stated that at one time, they considered using number of people in poverty, but with changes in Obamacare they thought it would be better to use the number of uninsured people.

Tom Faulkner asked how the proposed formula changes the numbers from district to district. Elt indicated that they have not run any numbers. Tom also asked if they took into consideration the free clinics that serve uninsured in each district. Elt indicated they had not.

Dave commented that District 2 will review the proposal with an open mind.

Action: Districts 3 and 4 will send the draft legislation to Bill for dissemination to the entire group. Everyone is encouraged to review and send comments to Bill by December 20. Bill will compile all comments and send to Districts 3 and 4 by December 23.

8. **Next Meeting:** The next Trustee Conference call will be held on Thursday, January 12, 2017 at 1:30 p.m. MT.
9. **Adjourn:** Motion to adjourn at 2:30 p.m.



IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF DISTRICT BOARDS OF HEALTH

Trustee Conference Call Minutes

Thursday, January 12, 2017

1:30 p.m. MT

Approved 2/1/17

Attendance

District	Trustees	Directors	Guests
1	Glen Bailey	Lora Whalen	Kelli Brassfield, IAC
2	Doug Zenner	Carol Moehrle	Jared Tatro, LSO
3	Tom Dale	Nikole Zogg	
4	Elt Hasbrouck	Russ Duke	
5		Rene LeBlanc	
6	Ken Estep	Maggie Mann	
7	Bill Leake, Chair	Geri Rackow	

1. Meeting Called to Order & Roll Call **Chairman Leake**

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Bill Leake at 1:35 p.m. Roll call for the meeting was conducted.

2. Call for Additional Agenda Items **All**

There were no additional agenda items.

3. Approval of December 1, 2016 Trustee Meeting Minutes **Chairman Leake**

Action: Doug Zenner made a motion to approve the December 1, 2016 minutes; seconded by Glen Bailey. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Review Food Fee Summary and Discuss Next Steps **Chairman Leake**

Bill reviewed that the conclusion from the Trustees' last discussion about food fees was that we needed more data. Bill asked what data we would need. Suggestions included:

- Breakdown of the number of the different types of facilities licensed
- Of all the inspections conducted, how many result in infraction or follow up inspection? What is the result of the food inspections? How effective are the inspections (are we seeing food-borne illnesses across the state)?
- Do all districts follow up if they find a food establishment out of compliance? What does the follow up consist of and what are the costs involved?

Other Comments/Suggestions:

- Doug commented that the mean cost of food inspections statewide is \$316. His suggestion was that fee for large establishments be \$300 and small establishments be \$150. We are subsidizing 61% of the food program costs. If we can get the Legislature, as part of the OPE report, to address the food fee structure and increase the fees, the approximate \$1.7 million currently being used to subsidize the program could be redirected to address other needs at the local level.

- Ken is concerned that if we do increase the food fees, that the Legislature may reduce the health districts' General Fund appropriation.
- Doug acknowledged Ken's concern but also stated that all of health districts have local needs that are not being addressed because we are subsidizing the food program.
- Glen concurred with Doug's comments.
- Doug stated that addressing the fees was a recommendation to the Legislature from the OPE report.
- Elt suggested that we give the Legislature the cost data for the food program and show them how much we are subsidizing it.
- Bill believes that if we can somehow demonstrate to the food industry with data that the efforts being made through the food inspections are a benefit to them, they may understand the reason behind the need for them to pay a higher fee for the service they are receiving.
- Elt asked if it is common for the health districts to close down restaurants. Russ shared that we do close restaurants periodically; however, we typically work with them to bring them back into compliance so they can reopen. He stated that he did not recall a specific case in District 4 where a food establishment closed permanently. However, there was a recent situation where a food establishment closed permanently due to lawsuits that occurred (they were financially unable to reopen). Lora agreed with Russ' comments.
- Tom Dale commented on what he thinks is the core principle: Should operational expenses for this business sector be subsidized by county and state taxpayers? If answer is no, we should work on a strategy and plan to address it so that taxpayers are not subsidizing the necessary inspections to keep food establishments safe. The fundamental question the Legislature needs to answer is "How much taxpayer money do you want to go into this program?"
- Glen stated that Idaho Code requires health district to set fees based on the cost of providing the service. Bill clarified that except in this particular case (food fees), the statute states, "to cover a portion of the cost," while most other fees in the state appear to be closely tied to the actual cost of the service rendered. Tom Dale stated that this is a requirement for cities and counties – that fees are tied to the service being provided. It is unclear why food fees are exempt from that requirement.
- Tom Dale thinks we have a good case to present to the Legislature and that we may get support from the taxpayers who do not understand that their tax dollars are subsidizing the restaurant industry.
- Doug asked IAC if they would find out from legislators/committees what they would think about this matter based on the OPE report and food program costs. Kelli indicated that she will be meeting with Rep. Wood and Senator Heider in the coming weeks and could get their feedback. Kelli will reach out to the Trustees if she has any questions.
- Geri asked if Russ/Rene could help facilitate the gathering of data with the Environment Health Directors. Russ indicated that we should have the number and type of food establishments; however, the costs associated to each of the different types of facilities will be only estimates since we do not code costs to a specific type of establishment, but rather the food program in general. He stated that we have attempted to determine these cost estimates in the past.

Actions:

1. Bill and Geri will update the Food Program document with details from today's discussion and share the updated document with everyone.
2. If anyone thinks of other data points that would be useful, please e-mail Bill.
3. Russ will task the EH Workgroup with getting the additional data requested (as outlined in the Food Program document).
4. Kelli Brassfield will discuss this topic with Rep. Wood and Senator Heider and report their feedback to the Trustees.

5. General Fund Appropriation Formula Discussion

Bill Leake

Bill thanked Tom and Elt for hosting the meeting with him and Geri on January 6 and stated that it was an informative discussion.

Elt stated that he wished the Trustees could have come to a different agreement in Coeur d'Alene. They feel like there is inequity in the whole funding mechanism and their goal is to make the funding formula as simple as possible without a bunch of variables. When you look at the per capita funding, Elt feels that it is an obvious sign of the difference in funding between all the health districts. They are not trying to take money away from anyone, but long term, you have to look at it from their viewpoint which is they've been losing out for quite a number of years. They feel like they are being efficient, but are at a breaking point and are having to turn clients away from some of their programs. They are proceeding with the legislation and are gaining support from Legislators. He hopes the legislation will go through. If it does pass and the funding were level across the state, Elt thinks it would give all of the health districts more authority to ask the Legislature for more funding for public health statewide.

Bill shared that based on the discussion and having since given it more thought, he believes that population by itself, or even the number of people in poverty or number of uninsured, identifies a group of people, but it does not represent the number within those groups that are served by public health. Per capita is not a good indicator of the people served. A district's entire population is not using, or even in need of, public health services, so that is why you need to dig to the next level to determine what the real need is.

Elt stated that we all have an urban area surrounded by rural areas. He cannot be sure, but assumes that we all have the same amount of poverty and same amount of people in each service we provide, so he thinks dividing funding on a per capita basis would be the easiest and most equitable. Whether the people use the service or not, they would still be counted.

Bill stated that Elt's concept does not make sense to him. He believes that population gets you in a ballpark. We have all had a certain amount of funding for the past several years. The bottom line is that if any district gets less than what they did the previous year, there is an impact to the district. If we are not going to do any harm to any particular district, then the baselines we have established are better starting points than to go back and try to normalize to some population distribution across the state that skews money one way or the other, which does not make sense to him.

Elt asked about if a district is losing population, should they still get the same amount of money or more? Bill feels that you still don't know if the people leaving were using public health services or not.

Bill also commented on the handout that discussed using rates versus absolute numbers that Russ shared with him. He feels that the handout clearly illustrates how overall enrollment (like overall population) should not be the indicator, but rather the next level down – the specific number in need – should be the indicator. That is where the funding formula gets complicated because you would need to identify all of the services we provide and to how many people those services are provided. To summarize, somewhere between very complicated and overly simplified is the right answer to the formula, which is why he thinks using only population or uninsured is too overly simplified. This takes him back to his argument that everyone has a baseline of funding and that they have been able to survive on what they have been getting; we should not do any harm to any district by giving them less – unless there is a district that can show such a need that is not being met that is so compelling that it convinces the other districts to give up money. He thinks that every district should be able to justify that everything spending money on is a need. He feels that all districts are serving the needs and that they don't have fat in their budgets.

Doug feels that this conversation goes back to the food fee issue which is we are subsidizing the food service industry to the detriment of other public health services. We all have similar operational needs and if we solve the food fee issue, we could use the General Fund dollars to address our other needs.

Glen stated that he agrees with Bill on his comments related to need. He has not been persuaded (through financials information or other data) that Districts 3 and 4 have needs that are not being met. He needs to see the data to understand what their needs are. He also agreed that some of the health districts' fees are not covering the costs and that we need to remedy that as well.

Tom Dale shared that he understands the desire to balance the funding formula between simple and complex. For him, when he looks at the FY17 GF appropriation per capita and sees that some districts are receiving \$3-4 per capital less than other districts, he wonders why that is and what the justification is for it. Is there something that could be done either through the Board of Trustees or elsewhere to move towards equalization of the per capital funding since everyone has needs.

Bill commented that when he looks at health districts' county funding per capita (included in the meeting handouts as part of his summary of the meeting with Health Districts 3 & 4), there is a broad distribution of that funding as well. Should the counties all be giving the same funding per capita?

Doug asked that Carol Moehrle respond to Tom's comment. Carol stated that she feels like the comment about per capita funding is directed to Health District 2 because at the current time, they are getting a larger amount of per capital funding than some of the other districts. Since the inception of the funding formula back in the early 1970s, counties in District 2 recognized they could not maintain their infrastructure (offices in all five counties) with the small amount of state general money they were getting. As a result, over the years, the counties increased their contributions to District 2. As we all know, the county contributions are one of the factors of the General Fund distribution formula and the more county funding you get, the more you are rewarded with a higher portion of state General Fund dollars. Some other districts have recently experienced that benefit as well as their counties contribute more. Because District 2 went 22 years with more support from their counties, they have received more support from the State. Carol does not think there should be a harm done because their counties have seen the need for them to have a higher amount of funding to support their internal structure and core foundational public health services because they were not awarded enough funding at the beginning to actually do the job they needed to do.

Bill asked everyone to look at the document that was sent out with today's agenda titled: *Draft Funding Formula Background and Common Ground for Future Allocation of State General Funds*. This is a document he prepared based on information he has gathered over the past several months as well as recent discussions. His goal was to summarize everything he could for the Trustees to talk about where their differences are and where there is agreement. For the February 7 meeting, he asked everyone to come prepared to begin working through the document. He asked for feedback from the group:

- Glen stated that he has no problem with it. He still believes that the District Boards of Health can remedy this and come to a resolution. He feels that it does not need to go to legislation and thinks that is the wrong approach for handling the matter.
- Doug stated that he thinks we need to focus on the food fee structure, which will solve the formula distribution issue because we will have more dollars available to address our needs. The formula doesn't need to be tampered with.
- Tom Dale believes we should spend more energy on the food fee issue because it potentially has a much larger financial impact on the operations of the health districts. He would like us to push the food fees forward, even though we may not be successful this year. His experience with the Legislature is that

sometimes it takes several years to get an issue passed, but he believes the fight is worth is on the food fees.

- Elt stated that he has not had a chance to review the document Bill shared, but will stay open-minded about it. His concern is that if we raise the food fees to the point that they are fully funded by the food establishments, he is not sure the Legislature will continue to give us the \$1.7 million that is currently being used to subsidize the program. If they take that funding out of our budgets, we will be right back where we are now. His feeling as the District 4 Trustee is that he is going to continue moving forward with the legislation as a back-up plan in case that happens.
- Tom Faulkner was not on the call. Bill asked Rene if he wanted to comment. Rene stated that he spoke with Tom the other day and he does not agree with the legislation and the legislators getting involved because he thinks it will create more harm to all of us than good it could serve. He is in favor of working an amiable situation amongst the Trustees. Rene commented that after listening to the discussion today, the food fee is a viable option if we can convince the legislators that consideration amounts of state and county dollars go into that program. If we could be assured that if we went after the fee increases, but not be decremented state general funds, that would be a new revenue source for us. Rene will try to get ahold of Tom and have him provide his feedback.
- Ken thinks that going forward with the food fees is the most important thing to do. He would like to see the legislation on the funding formula held. As an informational item, District 6 has also gone to their counties who put in a lot more per capita than a lot of the district do.
- Bill likes the idea of moving faster on the food fees, but also thinks that when we try to sell it to the legislators that taking the savings away from the health districts will be harmful. He is also concerned that if the legislators are pre-empted with the funding formula legislation, that it may leave a sour taste in their mouths when we come in with the food fees changes. This is a risk that we may want to consider avoiding. District 7 is opposed to any legislation going forward on the funding formula.

Bill asked Elt if there is any chance at all of having him pull back the legislation to give the Trustees a chance to work through it since it sounds like everyone is committed to working out a solution. Elt commented that District 4—and now District 3, and he thinks in a few years that District 1 will be in the same shape—has gotten shorted on the General Fund distribution for the last 10-12 years. They have tried through the Trustee meetings without success so they are approaching this from a different angle. They have done a lot of PR work with their legislators and feel like they have a very good chance of getting the legislation passed. Elt suggested that we consider this and the food fee legislation together in one piece. As far as pulling the legislation, the answer is no. They are already committed to it and it has gone to the Legislative Services Office. Unless something really interesting happens between now and when the Trustees meet in February, Elt does not see them backing down from it.

Action: This will be an agenda item for the February 7 Trustee Meeting.

6. Path Forward for Addressing the Healthcare Gap Population Bill Leake

Bill understands that there are currently two separate bills out there, one sponsored by Senator Thayn and the other by Senator Hagedorn. Kelli indicated that Senator Hagedorn's bill is identical to the Primary Care Access Program (PCAP) proposal from last year. Kelli has heard that funding for both bills is proposed from the Millennium Fund (ranging from about \$13.5 - 20 million), but she has not seen the appropriation bills yet.

Senator Thayn's intention is to have the State cover all costs. The Counties would administer the program and would be reimbursed for doing so. The Counties would be running dual programs: 1) the current Indigent Program that would cover those individuals not covered under Senator Thayn's proposed program, and 2) administration of Senator Thayn's proposed program.

Tom Dale stated that he has talked with Legislators who do not think anything substantial will occur this year until they see what the new Trump Administration does with the Affordable Care Act (ACA). He asked Kelli's opinion on this. She indicated it is hard to tell what will happen. Before the election, there seemed to lots of support for getting something done in Idaho; however, since the election, the Legislative Work Group removed the possibility of Medicaid Expansion from the table, especially after hearing the new Administration wants to repeal, in part or in whole, the ACA. Kellie shared that there has been talk of waiting to do anything, but there has been such a push since over the past few years we have not gotten anything done, that we may get something along the lines of these primary care bills and then a next step after we know what the new Administration is going to do.

Doug asked where in Senator Thayn's bill it talks about the Counties being reimbursed for administering his proposed program. Kelli said she has not seen the appropriation bill, but she met with Senator Thayn a couple times to help him understand the Counties' Indigent Program. The language in his bill is not clear, but in her conversations with him, he conveyed to her his intent to have the state cover all of the costs associated with is proposal. Kelli has asked Senator Thayn if he had his appropriations bill to help everyone understand the full implications of the bill, but did not get a response from him yet.

Elt stated that he feels the health districts should sit back and wait until we see what happens. As a County Commissioner, Senator Thayn's bill concerns him.

Kelli reported that IAC's Legislative Committee met and they reviewed both bills, with the following outcomes:

1. Senator Thayn's bill: IAC took a formal position to oppose (based on there being so many unknowns and the burden it would place upon the counties)
2. Senator Hagedorn's bill: IAC took no formal position, but did have some questions concerning funding and coexistence with the County Indigent Program

Kelli also shared that there is a possibility of additional healthcare bills being introduced.

Bill mentioned that it was suggested to invite Close the Gap to provide the Trustees with an update on activity. With this discussion, Bill feels that we should hold off on this, but can invite them to visit with us in the future as needed.

Action: At this point, the Trustees will wait and see how these bills evolve. If more information is available, the Trustees can discuss at their February 7 meeting, and adjust our strategy as needed.

7. JFAC Presentation / Trustee Call – February 1

Bill Leake/Lora Whalen

Bill reported that we are scheduled to have a Trustee Call at 10:00 MT on February 1 following our JFAC presentation. Lora reported that she spoke with Jared Tatro about the process. We will have about five minutes for introductory comments and to respond to the LSO analyst's briefing on our FY17 expenditures and FY18 maintenance item requests. Commissioner Bailey will be at the second chair and have a couple minutes to comment. Bill reported that he is planning to attend the presentation to observe. No other Trustees indicated they were planning to attend at this point.

Jared suggested that we watch one of the early presentations to see how it goes as it is possible that there may some adjustments to how the presentations roll out. He thinks our presentation will take 15-20 minutes. Jared does not plan to bring up the draft legislation, unless it has a bill number and is out there and the legislators choose to bring it up or one of the directors/trustees choose to bring it up and the legislatures wish to enter into conversation.

8. June 8-9, 2017 Boards of Health Conference

Bill Leake

Bill and Geri have begun planning for the conference. Historically, we have held a Trustee Meeting in conjunction with the conference. Based on feedback from the group, we will plan a Trustee Meeting for the afternoon of June 8 in Idaho Falls. It was noted that the Commissioners and Clerks meeting will also be held in Idaho Falls and should adjourn around noon on June 8.

Dinner and entertainment are being planned for the evening of June 8. The Business Meeting and educational sessions will be on Friday, June 9. If anyone has suggestions for topics to be addressed at the conference, please share them with Bill or Geri.

- 9. Next Meeting:** The Trustees will meet in person for a dinner meeting on Tuesday, February 7 at 6:00 p.m. A conference bridge will also be provided for anyone who cannot attend in person. Geri will make the arrangements and let everyone know of the details.

- 10. Adjourn:** Tom Dale made a motion to adjourn at 2:45 p.m., seconded by Doug. Motion passed unanimously.

This page left blank intentionally.



Public Health

Protect. Promote. Prevent.

Idaho Public Health Districts

IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF DISTRICT BOARDS OF HEALTH

Trustee Conference Call Minutes

Wednesday, February 1, 2017
11:30 a.m. MT

Approved 3/16/17

Attendance

District	Trustees/Representatives	Directors	Guests
1	Glen Bailey	Lora Whalen	Kelli Brassfield, IAC
2	Dave McGraw	Carol Moehrle	
3	Tom Dale	Nikole Zogg	
4	Elt Hasbrouck	Russ Duke	
5	Linda Montgomery	Rene LeBlanc	
6	Vaughn Rasmussen	Maggie Mann	
7	Bill Leake, Chair	Geri Rackow	

1. Meeting Called to Order & Roll Call Chairman Leake

Chairman Leake called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m. and conducted roll call.

2. Call for Additional Agenda Items All

There were no additional agenda items.

3. Approval of January 12, 2017 Trustee Meeting Minutes Chairman Leake

Action: Glen Bailey made a motion to approve the January 12, 2017 minutes as written; seconded by Tom Dale. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Review of JFAC Presentation Lora Whalen

Bill shared that Lora and Glen Bailey did a great job with the JFAC presentation this morning. Lora provided an overview of the presentation, which she felt took less time due to the new format. She appreciated everyone's support in attending. She thanked Glen Bailey for his role in the presentation. Bill commented that it was his first experience at a JFAC hearing and that he feels like the legislators appreciate the work of the public health districts.

5. Update on Funding Formula Legislation Bill Leake, Elt Hasbrouck, Tom Dale

Bill reported that the RS (now HB80) for the funding formula legislation was heard yesterday in House Health & Welfare Committee and was sent to print.

Glen Bailey
PHD 1
208.415.5102

Doug Zenner
PHD 2
208.799.3100

Tom Dale
PHD 3
208.455.5315

Elt Hasbrouck
PHD 4
208.375.5211

Thomas Faulkner
PHD 5
208.737.5902

Ken Estep
PHD 6
208.233.9080

Bill Leake
PHD 7
208.533.3163

Bill shared that back in December, he misunderstood what the process would be for handling this issue. Going forward, he thinks that we need to pay more attention to process and make sure we all understand who is expected to do what. Handling a matter such as this legislation by e-mail is probably not the best way to do it. As we sit here today, the bill is in the hand of the Committee and may get a hearing in a week or so. He hopes that we would be asked to come and provide our input to the Committee. Districts 3 and 4 want to pursue the legislation; however, District 7 is still opposed and also feels that the Trustees should be able to work it out. He feels that a high-level formula with three components is not going to get us where we need to be; the devil is in the details. It's a zero sum gain and if money gets shifted to some districts, other districts lose. That's where the conversations get more difficult.

Tom stated that to knowledge, Districts 3 and 4 have tried to supply the information on the legislation as things have progressed. He appreciates Bill's comments regarding the process. He agrees that e-mail can be easily misunderstood, lost, and misdirected. While e-mail can be a great communication tool, for important things it may not be the best tool to use since e-mails can be easily misunderstood, lost, and misdirected. They have tried to provide info in a timely fashion when they had something that could be communicated coherently. As it stands today, Rep. Blanksma has taken over the matter and made it clear to Districts 3 and 4 that she was moving the legislation forward regardless of their desires. The legislators will be reviewing the bill and will likely be looking for comments from all regions of the state as well as financial information from each district. Tom shared that they would like a fair hearing and will deal with the outcome. If the bill does not pass, Tom suggested that this may provide a foundation for the Trustees to address some of the concerns at their meeting in June and make adjustments so we don't have the impasse, which, in his opinion, is the goal.

Glen also shared his concerns related to communications and the process. He shared that trustee conference calls are difficult for him because it is hard to listen and limits personal interaction between the trustees, which he feels has hindered the process. He would like to have more communication from legislators involved so all of the Trustees understand what their objectives are what they are trying to convey to their peers. We could then have dialogue with our legislators .

Dave shared that since he is substituting for Doug Zenner, he doesn't have much to add. However, Doug did share with him that he feels that if the food fee issue was resolved, it would help alleviate some of the problem. Doug would like to see the Trustees focus more on the food fees.

Elt shared that in talking with legislators, they understand what this problem is since it has gone back few years so they have seen this coming. He also commented that Bill shared he was concerned about losing money in his district, but District 4 has been losing money for a long time. The part that he does not like about the Trustees setting the formula is that there is no place to appeal the vote. He thinks that this issue has caused so much dissention among the districts over the years and that it what he wants to clear up. As has been stated, the bill is now introduced and will go through the legislative process. Depending on the outcome of the legislation, we will figure out how to deal with it at that time.

Linda commented that District 5 has a lot of faith in their Trustee. Tom Faulkner has done a good job in representing their board. She believes that anytime you change Idaho Code, there is the potential to lose more than you anticipate. As far as the appeals process, she believes there is a process already in place because decisions are taken to all the Boards of Health at the annual meeting. On a past Trustee call that she participated in, the Trustees voted to give the new formula a couple years to see how it worked, yet now it has been taken to the Legislature. It is causing a rift between the districts. However, it is a democratic process and District 5 still favors letting the Trustees handle it rather than the Legislature.

Vaughn stated that he agrees with the comments been made. One of the issues he has is with the communication and the process. If there was desire for legislation, he thinks there should have been a work meeting in October with all seven districts so everyone could have understood what was going to happen, even if we agreed to disagree. However, communication in this process broke down. He has a concern about putting control in someone else's hands.

Bill stated that the fundamental question everyone has is what the fiscal impacts of the legislation will be. He shared that what he is hearing is that we would need to go to Rep. Blanksma to ask her for this information directly. Bill wondered if she will be able to calculate the impact for all seven districts or if she will go back to District 3 and 4 and ask them to do it. Elt asked if everyone had received a copy of the bill. Bill confirmed that we did have a copy of the bill that we received today, but the fiscal impact was vague and stated that each district will be impacted differently. However, there are no numbers to show from year to year based on the proposed formula what the impact will be. Tom commented that the frustration part may be that LSO analyst has not looked at it because they are concerned about the impact on the General Fund, and in this case, it is budget neutral. Tom wondered if we could ask the LSO analyst to generate the calculations for us. Rene reported that under Joint Rule 18, whoever introduces the bill should identify the positive or negative impact of the bill on any other agencies. LSO can assist them in this, but

Linda asked if Rep. Blanksma is still on District 4's Board of Health. Elt confirmed that she is. Linda shared that feedback from some legislators is that it appears Rep. Blanksma is just working to get more funding to benefit her health district as a legislator. Elt stated that they researched this when she got elected as a Representative and there is nothing in Code that prevents her from serving on the Board of Health. Linda clarified that they just may experience some pushback based on this perception. Elt stated that Rep. Blanksma is representing District 3 as well.

Carol stated that Rep. Perry indicated she had a copy of the fiscal impact. Tom said he knows Rep. Perry and he will contact her to see if he could get a copy of it. However, Bill said that since Rep. Blanksma is the sponsor, we should go directly to her to get a copy of the fiscal impact.

Kelli reported that the IAC Legislative Committee meeting is scheduled for 1:30 today. However, Senator Brackett will be arriving until 3:15. She has not spoken to Rep. Blanksma personally, but Sen. Brackett indicated that she would be attending with him.

Action: Bill will contact Rep. Blanksma and request the specific fiscal impact to each district for HB 80.

The group revisited the issue of more frequent face-to-face meetings of the Trustees, perhaps on a quarterly basis. It was suggested that some of the meetings could be scheduled around before or after IAC meetings since many commissioners already attend them. However, it was noted that not all Trustees are commissioners and do not attend the IAC meetings, so it would require additional travel for some. It was also noted that meetings (either in person or by conference call) could be held more frequently as needed.

Action: There was consensus among the Trustees that quarterly face-to-face meetings be held going forward.

6. Food Fee Summary

Chairman Leake

Bill reported that he has been working on a paper compiling all of the information (including statutes and rules) related to food fees to have it accessible in one document. However, he would like more time to refine the document.

Tom shared his appreciation for Bill's work on this issue as we need to see the specific details. He feels strongly that this is an important issue that needs to be addressed. He hopes that there are conversations occurring with legislators to make sure they are aware that even though we have the General Fund legislation/discussion going on, but the food fees have the potential to impact to help the health districts more financially than the General Fund does. Again, the fundamental question is, "Does the legislature want state and county taxpayer dollars subsidizing the food industry?" Tom hopes we can keep the focus on this.

Kellie reported that she spoke with Rep. Wood and Sen. Heider this week and they are both amenable to making sure the food fees set in statute are covering the costs of the food inspections. She shared that these legislators felt that the funds appropriated to the health districts should not be used to cover those costs—that these funds are allocated to the health districts for other needs in the community. From these discussions, Kellie feels there is some legislative support that could help further the food fee discussion.

Elt inquired of Kellie where the idea of conducting quarterly food inspections came from that she referenced in her e-mail. Kellie stated that it was the personal opinion of Rep. Wood that he shared in their discussion.

Lora shared that we have history with trying to get food fees changed and it has been a difficult road. However, if we approached it from a couple of angles it could be beneficial. We need to look at what is costing us for the inspections. For example, maybe we could set a fee for return visits/inspections or for a late fee notice. We would need the input of the Environmental Health Workgroup. However, the concept of quarterly inspections would cost us much more, which is concerning to Lora.

Tom emphasized that our discussion about food fees should be in alignment with the thoughts Rep. Wood and Sen. Heider have shared, which is fees should be covering the cost of the program, not taxpayer dollars. For example, if one or two follow-up inspections are required, the food establishment should be covering that cost. It is likely the lobbying effort from industry will be against this, but they have the onus of proving why their industry should be singled out to receive a 67% subsidy.

Elt asked for the history of the opposition last time the food fees were raised. Rene commented that it started in 2009 and that he participated, but Russ took the lead on the effort. We brought in industry partners as well as some of the lobbyists to start working through the process. Discussions went well until the legislative session started, at which time things deteriorated. Rene shared that he underestimated how strong the food and retail lobbyist were. However, it is possible times have changed and it could be time to revisit the issue. Rene also shared that back in 2009, he conducted a survey of food fees in surrounding states and found they charged 3-4 times what we charge in Idaho.

Bill asked Russ if he could generate the list of all the retailers and lobbyists that we would need to talk to before any legislation was presented that he can include this information in the Food Fee document. Tom also asked Russ to recap for the document what fees we asked for last time. Russ agreed to do so.

Tom shared that he thinks it will be important to know how many food establishments are re-inspected. We need to include this in our data.

Tom also stated that he knows from past experience that it takes a long time to get meaningful legislation passed. He hopes the food fee legislations would be quicker since it will not cost the state anything. His goal would be to get something done in 2018.

In addition, Tom asked which type of food establishments are opposed to paying the full cost. Rene and Russ shared that generally, it is the large restaurants, supermarkets, and farmer's market vendors. It was suggested that we consider exempting farmer's markets. Tom shared that the key to any type of victory is

to identify the opposition and neutralize them. Dave commented that he supports the idea of exempting the farmers' markets or charging them reduced fees.

Bill shared that he spoke with a couple of restaurant owners he knows personally and asked their thoughts on paying more for the food fee. Neither seemed to be concerned about the concept.

Actions:

1. Russ will identify all the parties that were included in past negotiations as well as the history of what the health districts were seeking the last time around. He will e-mail this information to Bill for inclusion in the master Food Fee document.
 2. Bill will need a couple of weeks to finish compiling data/information and to clean up his document.
 3. On our next conference call, we will schedule a strategy session to work solely on the food fee issue.
 4. Bill invited anyone who is interested to help him in this effort.
7. **Next Meeting:** The Trustees will meet in person for a dinner meeting on Tuesday, February 7 at 6:00 p.m. in the Emerald Room of the Riverside Hotel.
8. **Adjourn:** Glen made a motion to adjourn at 12:25 p.m., seconded by Tom. Motion passed unanimously.

This page left blank intentionally.



Public Health

Idaho Public Health Districts

IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF DISTRICT BOARDS OF HEALTH

Trustee Meeting

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

6:00 p.m. MT

Riverside Hotel – Emerald Room, Boise, Idaho

Approved 3/16/17

Attendance

District	Trustees/Representatives	Directors
1	Glen Bailey	Lora Whalen
2	Doug Zenner	Carol Moehrle
3	Tom Dale	Nikole Zogg
4	Elt Hasbrouck	Russ Duke
5	Bob Kunau	Rene LeBlanc
6	Vaughn Rasmussen	Maggie Mann
7	Bill Leake, Chair	Geri Rackow

1. Meeting Call to Order, Roll Call & Call for Additional Agenda Items Chairman Leake

Chairman Leake called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. and conducted roll call. There were no additional agenda items identified.

2. Food Fee Next Steps All

Bill reported that no progress has been made on this matter since the last Trustee meeting. In dialogue with many legislators this week, many of them shared that they would like to see us come back with legislation for changing the food fees. Bill also reported that information from the Environmental Health Directors regarding the food fees was e-mailed to the Trustees, but that he has not had an opportunity to review it yet. A history of the food fee issue was shared for the benefit of Commissioner Kunau. Idaho Code states that food fees will cover a portion of the costs; however, current fees cover only about one-third of the cost of the service.

Comments concerning the food fees:

- Tom shared that currently, only one fee can be charged, regardless of the number of inspections conducted at a food establishment. In his opinion, the current system is designed for failure (meaning there is no incentive for a food establishment to pass their inspection the first time around because follow-up inspections are conducted at no cost to the establishment). Tom commented that of all the issues the Trustees have been discussing, he believes that working to increase the food fees have the most potential to have a positive impact on the health districts as well as county budgets.
- Vaughn suggested that we put together a plan and begin working with our legislators this summer/fall so we are ready to go at the start of the next legislative session.
- Elt asked whether there has been discussion with legislators about the past concern of the health districts potentially losing General Fund dollars if food fees were increased. Bill stated that as far as he knows, this has not been specifically addressed. Elt shared that he hopes we are able to maintain our current General Fund appropriation.

Glen Bailey
PHD 1
208.415.5102

Doug Zenner
PHD 2
208.799.3100

Tom Dale
PHD 3
208.455.5315

Elt Hasbrouck
PHD 4
208.375.5211

Thomas Faulkner
PHD 5
208.737.5902

Ken Estep
PHD 6
208.233.9080

Bill Leake
PHD 7
208.533.3163

- Bill stated that one of the things that came up was whether or not we want to have some exceptions or exclusions. This will need to be part of the Trustees' future discussions.
- Tom asked who was involved the last time the food fees were addressed. Russ and Rene were involved (started working on it in April 2009, legislation approved in 2010). Tom suggested that we will need to rely on the directors involved last time to identify what the opposition was back then. He stated that the best way to win a battle is to take the weapons out of the hands of your opponents. We need to identify all the potential opponents and address their concerns.
- Glen suggested that all types of inspection (pre-opening, regular, follow-up, enforcement, etc.) have an associated fee.
- Rene reported that the last time around, we looked at data and charges of surrounding states.
- Doug suggested that we look at small vs. large food establishments and wondered if we should consider exceptions or exclusions for any of the types of establishments.
- Tom stated that fees established should be in alignment with the time needed to conduct the inspections. We need to use a data-driven approach.
- Bill commented that there is much analysis that needs to take place. Do the Trustees want to consider hiring an analyst to work on this matter? Tom feels there is a certain credibility to be gained by using a neutral outside source gathering the data.
- Elt asked what the OPE report recommended on this matter. Bill stated that the recommendation is the OPE stated, "The Legislature should consider developing a separate funding mechanism to make the regulatory, fee-based programs administered by the health districts more self-supporting. This may include increasing regulatory fees." Bill is not sure if we can ask OPE to assist us with this. Doug shared that Senator Brackett stated in the meeting with him this morning that they (the legislature) have resources to assist us.

Assignments:

1. Bill will incorporate the information from the Environmental Health Directors into his master document.
2. Assignments were made for contacting Idaho universities to see if they are able to help us with the analysis and if so, the estimated cost for doing so.
 - Tom Dale will contact Boise State University
 - Vaughn Rasmussen/Maggie Mann will contact Idaho State University
 - Carol Moehrle will contact University of Idaho
3. Bill will follow up with Senator Brackett to find out who we could talk to find out what mechanism we would use to access the Legislature to see if they can help us with this.

Action: Glen made a motion to have Bill approach Senator Brackett to see if he can assist us by authorizing the use of legislative funds to explore a study by one Idaho's universities or institutes of higher education. The study would consist of identifying what our surrounding states use for their food fees and help examine what reasonable fees would be based on the time it takes to conduct the inspection. Motion seconded by Elt.

Discussion:

Rene commented on the questions about Open Meeting Law and whether there was prior notice for this meeting. Since there was only 24 hours' notice, and it was not a declared emergency, he recommended tabling all motions until the next meeting when it has been properly noticed.

Bill reported to the group that it was brought to his attention this morning in the meeting with Rep. Blanksma and Sen. Brackett that we should be following Open Meeting Laws for the Trustee meetings. This includes posting notice of meetings 48 hours in advance. Bill told Rep. Blanksma and Sen. Brackett that the Trustees were meeting tonight; however, we would ensure that all future meetings are properly noticed and in compliance with the Open Meeting Law.

Bill feels that it does not hurt to make the motion and have it be part of the record. He likes the idea of this being in the form of the motion that we all agree to.

Tom commented that he is comfortable moving this direction as well because it is not committing us to spending any money at this point; we are just seeking information.

Vote: Motion passed unanimously.

Glen stated that if Senator Brackett declines to offer legislative assistance, perhaps the health districts could pay for it and then approach JFAC next session with a request to refund to us the fees we paid for the study.

3. OPE Follow-up Report and General Fund Appropriation Formula Discussion **Bill Leake**

Bill stated that it is no secret that we have all been out there talking with legislators about the funding formula and the legislation and where we want it to go. This morning, some of the Trustees and directors met with Sen. Brackett and Rep. Blanksma. What Bill took away from the meeting is that they are willing to put the legislation on hold if the Trustees are willing to come together, and by June of this year, come up with an agreed upon funding formula. As the Trustee Chair, Bill committed to have this be the focus of his efforts between now and June. We need to recognize that this means we all have to put the past aside and come to the table and discuss options for a formula. Bill does not think that everyone will be 100% satisfied with whatever formula is agreed upon, as there will have to be give and take on all sides.

Elt commented that it is important for everyone to understand that he spoke with Rep. Blanksma today and that Rep. Wood is willing to hold the legislation for one week, not until June. It has been District 4's feeling all along that we can't continue to debate the formula. He stated that he knows everyone has received the updated legislation and the fiscal impact for each district. He asked if everyone could live with their proposed formula as outlined in the legislation? If so, they would be willing to pull the legislation.

Vaughn commented that he likes the idea of having until June. Everyone needs to have enough faith that the Trustees can work it out by June and there would not be a need for legislation. One week is not long enough to allow the Trustees to work on it.

Elt stated that if everyone has seen the legislation and agrees with the numbers, why not just approve that formula tonight? They would then pull the legislation.

Vaughn responded that from what he has seen, he does not agree with the numbers and needs more information because he just saw the information a couple days ago.

Bill stated that he was in a meeting with Rep. Wood at 4:00 today and asked if he was willing to hold the legislation until June to give the Trustees time to work it out. Rep. Wood told Bill that it was up to Rep. Blanksma and Sen. Brackett. Bill stated that in the meeting this morning with Reps. Blanksma and Sen. Brackett, it was very clear that the commitment he proposed that the Trustees have time to look at other formula options and to bring something forward by June.

Bill stated that on behalf of District 7, the formula in the legislation is not acceptable based on the fact that he does not like the numbers. He does not feel that population and poverty are the right factors for the formula. He thinks there are other formulas that we could come up with that are better representative of the programs and services being provided because there is no direct correlation between population and poverty and the services being provided. It gets you in the ballpark, but it does not answer the questions of what services we are providing and how we can use the \$9 million fairly and equitably across the districts. He has looked at multiple formulas and they all have pluses and minuses. However, as trustee that has been involved for less than a year, he thinks there are other options that need to be explored.

Tom stated that he is new as a Trustee as well, but is trying to follow the direction of his board who is not happy with the current formula. He does think that one week is optimistic to be able to come up with an agreeable solution. He thinks the objective is to make sure we all feel that the money that is available from the legislature is equitably divided. What is the determination of equitability? There are a plethora of measures that could be used. He would like to keep it as simple as possible. When you look at the charts, one of the indicators is per capita funding per district and right now there is a wide disparity in some of those. If we work to close those gaps, he thinks we could work this out ourselves. His board wants to see the funding equitably divided. This controversy has been going on a long time and he personally feels (not the opinion of his board) that it will not make much difference if it gets solved this year or next year. Most of these types of things don't get solved on the first attempt with the legislature. He is not opposed to give until June for the Trustees to work on it.

Bill shared that his thought it to have a work session in March to explore various formula options and have some to present by June. He thinks one of the challenges is having the time to come together face-to-face to dive into the details but the Trustees need to have quality time to do just that. In visiting with legislators today, he holds them it is going to take time, but hopefully the Trustees can resolve the issue once and for all.

Doug commented on the legislation stating that he thinks there is fallacy with numbers assuming that the General Fund and County Contributions will both increase 3% per year. He shared that there are two counties in District 2 that are in the top five for unemployment and struggle providing even 1 or 2% increases. Some of his counties in his district are very rural and would be hurt by the proposed formula in the legislation. The services available in his district are small. On the urban side, there is more availability of services. He feels that there needs to be an urban/rural component to a formula.

Elt commented that in District 4, they have Boise and Elmore Counties, which are some of the poorest in the state. Their district has been wrestling with this formula for over 12 years and they have lost year after year. They feel that the formula they came up with is fair and balanced. His concern all along is that if all the districts had same per capital funding, we could have a lot stronger say with the legislature as a group than where we are now. He feels we are missing out on a lot of money. He is not sure if he is willing to back away from the formula/legislation.

Bill stated that we are not here tonight to debate the merits of the proposed formula. That will take much more time than we have tonight.

Glen shared that he does not feel we can make the decision in one week based on proposed legislation. The draft of the legislation we received on December 1 is different than HB80 that we received last week, changing the number of uninsured people to the number of people in poverty. He has not had time to compare the differences. We all need to have the same number and same facts to discuss this formula. Is using total population fair to the smaller, rural counties since there are common expenses among all the districts (fiscal officer, for example).

Elt stated that he feels we should not get stuck on the issue of one district having more rural/poor counties than another because it's all relative. District 3 has the most rural county in the state—Owyhee. He doesn't think this is a fair argument. We need to keep the formula simple.

Vaughn asked Elt how long it took them to put the legislation together. Elt responded that they started working on it around the first of December. Vaughn feels that it is not fair for the rest of us to have only one week to review the formula and discuss it with our boards, when they have been working on it for months. Elt stated he felt one week was plenty of time. Vaughn disagreed that it was enough time to review with his Board of Health. Elt commented that is why he is the Trustee; the board trusts him to do this.

Elt stated that he will not pull any legislation off the table without talking with his board.

Glen stated that Elt is contradicting what we talked about with Sen. Brackett and Rep. Blanksma this morning. We want to cooperate and discuss this matter together and come to a mutual agreement.

Bill shared that he told Rep. Blanksma and Sen. Brackett that the Trustees were meeting tonight to develop a path forward from now until June to come up with a formula. He shared that we would have a 2-day work session in March and invite all the districts to bring any proposed formulas for review and discussion. From those, we would decide which ones had merit and narrow them down to the ones we really want to delve into and work out the details. We could have a follow up meeting in April or May and then be prepared in June to come together to approve a formula. We need to take the time to think this through so we can get it right. Everyone Bill talked to today thought this was a reasonable approach, including Sen. Brackett, Rep. Blanksma, and Rep. Wood. None of them told us that we had to solve it right now.

Tom asked how you put into a database to account for the rural parts of our districts? He agrees that there may be some districts that are more rural than others, but we all have rural areas. How do you quantify the impact of providing services based on remoteness or distance traveled?

Bill shared that between now and the meeting in March, we all need to go back to our Boards to figure out how we may factor in components such as this. We may come to the conclusion that it is not possible. But everyone should come prepared to spend a couple days to review and discuss all the ideas. Bill shared that he has a lot of questions in his mind about possible formulas that he would like to explore.

Elt asked that the Trustees look at the formula they proposed in the legislation. Bill agreed everyone should. Elt feels we need to keep the formula simple and fears that we will come up with something that no one will be able to figure out. He believes the formula they proposed is easy to figure out. People in poverty come from the U.S. Census Bureau every year and is easy to find. The rest is self-explanatory. He thinks it is the perfect formula. It does not gouge any district. All districts get money to run their programs. But, we are balancing it out on a per capita basis. He has talked with Commissioners who are upset with their constituents not getting the same per capital funding as others.

Bill stated that this is a multi-faceted issue. He reiterated that there are a lot of new Trustees who don't have the benefit of the past history on this issue, so he thinks we need to take the time to work through this by June. This process will allow us to explain to people why we made the decision we did. The value is that the product we deliver in June will be the best one that the brightest minds in public health in Idaho can come up with. Vaughn stated that if Elt has a passion and the faith that their formula is the best one, why not give the Trustees the opportunity to meet in March to work through it.

Elt agreed to meet in March, but shared that he is concerned about how his board is going to feel about all of this. He also shared that his frustration is that their board came with this proposed formula in June and still out out-voted.

Rene stated that he asked Bob to sit in on today's meeting since Tom Faulkner is out of the country. He does not feel that Bob can be put on the spot to make a decision about a formula. Rene has done an analysis of the proposed formula, but not had the opportunity to discuss with his board.

Bill suggested that everyone give some thought to potential formulas that the Trustees can discuss in March and have resolved by June. Bill stated that it was made clear in the meeting with Rep. Blanksma and Sen. Brackett this morning that if the issue is not resolved by June, it will be resolved for us. Elt asked everyone to give their full commitment to get this resolved by June. There was unanimous consensus to meet in March to work on the formula with the goal of having it resolved by June.

Then group agreed to meet on March 15 and 16 in Boise (possibly at the ICRMP office). Bill commented that if we need a mediator to help us accomplish our goal, we should not hesitate to use one. Suggestions for a mediator were Jim McNall or Rick Ferguson from ICRMP.

Bill shared the following ground Rules for submitting a proposed formula:

1. Limit write to a page or two (no smaller than 12 pt font)
2. Give enough fiscal information to project impact over five years
3. If there are key assumptions, include them in the write-up
4. Keep it simple – if we feel it has merit (we can explore further)
5. Submit proposals to Bill (leakebill@gmail.com) by March 7, 2017.
6. Also submit:
 - a. District's Organizational Chart
 - b. List of top 10 positions in the district with salaries

Other Comments:

- We have the program cost reports that shows FY16 financial data as well as a listing of services provided (directors can provide to their Trustees)
- Review OPE report; formula should take "need" into consideration
- Everyone agreed that we are all willing to give and take in this process.
- In regards to transparency, Bill feels that from this point forward, any time anyone has a discussion with a legislator or others, they should make a note of it and send it out to the to all of the Trustees/Directors. It's easy for all of us to give our biased opinions, but we need to be more transparent.

Bill said that there are some questions about the District 3 & 4's proposed formula that is in the legislation. He asked for clarification about to whom questions about the formula should be directed. Elt stated that this is the formula that they will be presenting. Any questions about the fiscal impact of this formula should be directed to the District 4 fiscal officer.

Action: Bill shared that he received an e-mail from Rep. Blanksma stating she was looking forward to talking with him tomorrow evening at the IAC reception regarding the path forward we are planning to take. He asked if everyone was supportive of him reporting to Rep. Blanksma that we are all in agreement to get together in March for our first meeting to begin working on the formula and be prepared by June to present our best and final formula. The intent would be to present to all the board members at the annual meeting. Everyone was in agreement with this plan.

4. Next Meeting

The Trustees will meet in person in Boise on March 15 and 16, 2017. Tentative location is the ICRPM building, but this will need to be confirmed.

Action: When the agenda is distributed, everyone was asked to post it on their websites. Rene will also post on www.idahopublichealthdistricts.org. Bill/Geri will ensure it is posted at the meeting location.

5. Adjourn

A motion was made to adjourn at 7:27.

This page left blank intentionally.



Public Health
Protect. Promote. Prevent.
Idaho Public Health Districts

IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF DISTRICT BOARDS OF HEALTH

Trustee Meeting

Wednesday & Thursday, March 15-16, 2017
ICRMP Building - 3100 S Vista Avenue, Boise, Idaho

Approved 5/5/17

March 15, 2017

Attendance

District	Trustees/Representatives	Directors	Guests
1	Glen Bailey	Lora Whalen	Sherry Gorrell (3/15 only)
2	Doug Zenner	Carol Moehrle	Carol Rodriguez (3/15 only)
3	Tom Dale	Nikole Zogg	
4	Elt Hasbrouck	Russ Duke	
5	Tom Faulkner		
6	Ken Estep	Maggie Mann	
7	Bill Leake, Chairman	Geri Rackow	

1. Meeting Call to Order, Roll Call & Call for Additional Agenda Items Chairman Leake
Chairman Leake called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. and conducted roll call. There were no additional agenda items identified.

2. Public Comment Chairman Leake
There were no members of the public in attendance.

3. Approval of Mediation Services (Contract and Payment) Chairman Leake
Bill introduced Sherry Gorrell and Carol Rodriguez, Certified Professional Mediators, and stated that they are prepared to assist us with the Funding Formula discussion today. Bill distributed a copy of the formal mediation agreement and billing statement compiled by Sherry and Carol. Everyone had an opportunity to read the documents. Bill stated that at the conclusion of the mediated process, Sherry and Carol will provide the Trustees with a written report.

Action: Tom Dale made a motion to approve the mediation agreement, including the billing statement, as presented; seconded by Doug. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Mediated Session – General Fund Distribution Formula All
Bill shared an outline of the session. The mediators, trustees, and directors each introduced themselves. Bill then shared with the group comments made by Fred Humphreys, Chairman of the Idaho State Board of Health, in July of 1971 relating to the introduction of Idaho's public health districts. Bill also distributed and reviewed sections Idaho Code (39-409, 39-411, and 39-425) relating to the public health districts. Each Trustee was then given the opportunity to present their formula ideas. The various formulas were discussed and a voting process was used to narrow down the options to the top few. The different factors of the top formulas were considered and after much discussion, reached the following decision:

Glen Bailey
PHD 1
208.415.5102

Doug Zenner
PHD 2
208.799.3100

Tom Dale
PHD 3
208.455.5315

Elt Hasbrouck
PHD 4
208.375.5211

Thomas Faulkner
PHD 5
208.737.5902

Ken Estep
PHD 6
208.233.9080

Bill Leake
PHD 7
208.533.3163

Action:

The Board of Trustees met and agreed unanimously to take back to our respective boards the proposed formula to be implemented in FY19 (starting July 1, 2018) with the following factors:

- 67% County Contributions
- 6% Infrastructure (divided equally between the 7 districts)
- 5% # of people in Poverty (number of people in poverty in a district / total number of people in poverty statewide; 3-year rolling average)
- 16% Population (3-year rolling average)
- 6% Health Care Provider Shortage Area

The Trustees agree to meet again in May, 2017, to finalize the formula in preparation for the annual conference of the Idaho Association of District Boards of Health in June, 2017.

March 16, 2017

1. Meeting Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairman Leake

Chairman Leake called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. All Trustees and Directors were present except for Rene LeBlanc. Carol reported that Rene informed us that his mother passed away last night.

Action: Doug made a motion to send Rene a card signed by the Trustees and the Directors and maybe some flowers; seconded by Tom D. Motion passed unanimously.

2. Approval of Trustee Meeting Minutes

Chairman Leake

Action: Doug Zenner made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 1 and February 7, 2017 Trustee Meetings as written; seconded by Glen Bailey. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Update on Food Fee Plans

Chairman Leake

Bill reported that he has captured a great deal of detail from past Trustee meeting minutes regarding food fees; however, we are now at a point where more assistance is needed from a staff person. Russ stated that he is not inclined to take the lead like he did last time due to the time commitment involved. Tom Dale suggested that rather than one director taking the lead, several Directors/Trustees work on it together. Russ once again shared the history of efforts to increase food fees last time and challenges that were faced. Tom Dale focused on the philosophical question of whether legislators approve of state and county tax dollars being used to support his program. In FY16, we subsidized the food program by nearly \$1.7 million. Discussion followed, including the need for the health districts to continue receiving at least the current level of general fund appropriations (rather than reducing appropriations if we are able to collect more in food fees in the future). It is likely that any food fee legislation would go through the Health & Welfare Committees.

Action: Tom Dale volunteered himself and Nikki to work on the food fee issue since it is a matter that he is passionate about. Russ agreed to help them. This will be an agenda item for the business meeting at the annual conference in June in Idaho Falls to provide the boards an update on the work done so far and discuss how we want to move forward. We will also extend an invitation to all members of the Legislature's Health and Welfare committee to attend the June meeting in Idaho Falls.

Chairman Leake

1. Review of IADBH Bylaws

Bill reported that we will be reviewing the bylaws at the June business meeting. It was suggested to include a statement indicating we follow the Open Meeting Laws in the Bylaws.

Action: If anyone has proposed changes for the IADBH Bylaws, get them to Bill by March 30. The proposed changes will then be distributed to all board members for review.

Discussion followed regarding our representative to NALBOH. Steve Scanlin from Health District 4 currently holds this position. Funding of \$2,000 for the travel costs for the rep to attend the annual NALBOH conference is included in the Association Office budget.

Action: Russ will ask Steve to prepare a presentation for the annual conference to report on this role as our state representative to NALBOH.

Chairman Leake

2. 2017 Resolutions

If we want to present a resolution, it requires notice to all of the Boards of Health 60 days in advance of the annual meeting. Bill reviewed the Resolutions that were approved last year. The resolutions have a limited life cycle, and once they expire, they are archived. Historically, the Directors make recommendations to the Boards of Health on which resolutions should remain active.

Action: The Directors will review the Compendium of Resolutions at their next meeting and provide recommendations for the Trustees.

Russ shared an update on Tobacco 21 legislation that was introduced this year. It started out as an educational effort, but eventually was introduced in the Senate State Affairs Committee. Unfortunately, the bill was killed 5-4; however, it had gained some support. Russ indicated that the Trustees need to revisit this topic to determine if there is interest in continuing to support the effort, and if so, develop a plan for moving forward. Discussion followed.

Action: This will be an agenda item for the June Business Meeting.

Chairman Leake

3. Review Agenda for Annual Business Meeting

Geri reviewed the draft agenda for the meeting, which includes: Association Office Budget, Review of Indirect Rate, food fees, resolutions, General Fund Distribution Formula, and SALOBH rep report in addition to other items already identified today. There was discussion about some wording in the IAC contract.

Action: IAC contract review/revisions will be added to the business meeting agenda as well.

Tom Dale commented on a recent presentation on health impacts of marijuana usage. He would like to see if Elisha Figueroa, from the Office of Drug Policy, will come and share her presentation with us at the meeting. Discussion followed.

Action: Geri will contact Elisha about coming to present on this topic at the education session of the annual conference.

Chairman Leake

4. Millennium Fund Distribution Formula

Bill reported that last week, he, Maggie and Geri came over to Boise and met with Rep. Horman. She had also invited Rep. Fred Wood (Chairman of House Health & Welfare Committee and Co-Chair of the Millennium Fund) to meet with us to discuss the recommendation of the Joint Millennium Fund (MF) Committee regarding the

health districts' FY18 MF grant application, which would have changed the distribution formula of the \$750,000 awarded to the health districts. There was also "preventive" language in the funding recommendation, which was not part of the health districts' MF application. After discussion with Rep. Wood, he agreed with having the MF dollars be distributed between the seven health districts based on the current MF distribution formula that has been previously approved. Bill shared that what concerned him, Geri, and Maggie is that had someone not listened to the MF Committee meeting and heard the recommendation and then followed up on it, we may not have known about any of these changes. Bill feels that we need to have a lot more transparency with our legislators so we are all more aware of what is going on.

Elt asked if we have a lobbyist. It was noted that Districts 3 and 4 have a lobbyist, but the group as a whole does not have a lobbyist; that is the responsibility of IAC through our contact with them. Kelli Brassfield is our liaison from IAC who tracks legislation on our behalf. Nikki is the liaison between the health districts.

Geri shared that she is more concerned about what prompted the MF committee to make the recommendation for changing how the funds are distributed. She indicated that earlier in the year, the Trustees had on their agenda to review the MF formula; however, due to uncertainty with what was going to happen with the MF this year, the discussion was tabled; however, she feels it's time to revisit the topic.

Russ asked Bill if he talked with Rep. Wood about why he came up with the recommendation. Bill shared that in the discussion with Rep. Wood, he never shared what prompted him to suggest the change. He only shared that his intent was to ensure equitable distribution of the funds across the state. Discussion followed.

Maggie reported included in the recommendation to JFAC is that the health districts meet with both JFAC and the MF Committee and provide them information on the funding formula and its history as well as outcomes. Rep. Wood also shared that the MF committee expects a representative from each district to be in attendance at the health districts' MF presentation in the future, where in the past we have selected one director to represent us all, mainly due to cost. Maggie also reported that the MF has changed things up this year and have recommended ongoing funding for Idaho Department of Health & Welfare's program as well as the health districts' cessation program which means we will not have to reapply. Glen read a story from the *Spokesman Review* regarding the FY18 MF awards.

Lora shared that her concern is that the change in the formula would have taken significant funding away from Districts 2, 6, and 7 and shifted the funds to Districts 3 and 4. Russ commented that he has not had any conversations about this issue with any member of the Millennium Fund Committee. Bill feels that we need to follow up with Rep. Wood. Discussion followed on the best way to do this.

Action: Bill made a motion to extend an invitation to all of the members of the MF committee to meet with us at our IAB meeting in June to have a discussion about the Millennium Fund and the role the Board of Health play in it. Seconded by Doug. Motion passed unanimously.

It was agreed that Maggie Mann, as the Director liaison of the Health Promotion work group, will be the health districts' main point of contact with the Millennium Fund. She will also coordinate with Kelli Brassfield from IAC.

Review of the MF funding formula will be an agenda item for the next Trustee meeting.

5. Next Meeting

The decision was made to hold a conference call on Friday, May 5 at 1:00 p.m. MT to follow up on all of the Boards' responses to the new proposed formula. If any problems arise, we can change it to a face-to-face meeting.

It was suggested that the Millennium Fund discussion be postponed until the next face-to-face meeting.

6. Adjourn

A motion was made to adjourn at 11:00 a.m.

Idaho Association of District Board of Health
Trustee Meeting
3/15/17

Present:

District 1: Glen Bailey & Lora Whalen
District 2: Doug Zenner & Carol Moehrle
District 3: Tom Dale & Nikki Zogg
District 4: Elt Hasbrouck & Russ Duke
District 5: Tom Faulkner
District 6: Ken Estep & Maggie Mann
District 7: Bill Leake & Geri Rackow

The Board of Trustees met and agreed unanimously to take back to our respective boards the proposed formula to be implemented in FY19 (starting July 1, 2018) with the following factors:

- 67% County Contributions
- 6% Infrastructure (divided equally between the 7 districts)
- 5% # of people in Poverty (number of people in poverty in a district / total number of people in poverty statewide; 3-year rolling average)
- 16% Population (3-year rolling average)
- 6% Health Care Provider Shortage Area

The Trustees agree to meet again in May, 2017, to finalize the formula in preparation for the annual conference of the Idaho Association of District Boards of Health in June, 2017.

AGREEMENT TO MEDIATE IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF DISTRICT BOARDS OF HEALTH

This AGREEMENT TO MEDIATE is between all the participants listed below as well as Mediators, Sherry Gorrell, CPM and Carol Rodriguez, CPM. It is important to understand that the mediators are neutral third parties whose purpose is to help parties identify mutually agreeable future focused solutions to their differences. The mediators will not be serving as advocates, lawyers or judges and consequently cannot provide legal advice. The mediators will follow the IMA Standards of Practice for Idaho Mediators.

THE GOAL OF MEDIATION: Is to provide an opportunity to express concerns, better understand one another's perspectives, and if possible, resolve issues and mutually reach an acceptable agreement. Through this process, parties will be focused on learning how to separate personalities from issues and identify needs rather than positions. By doing so, the parties can determine what a successful working relationship looks like and identify solutions that previously did not seem to exist. A Memorandum of Understanding will be the written product resulting from our work together and will include attainable action items and timelines.

GOAL AND INTENTION OF PARTICIPANTS: Participants will be most effective if they enter into mediation with an open mind that is curious about other's needs and positions, a respectful demeanor, a willingness to learn, patience to listen to opposing views, humility to discover when one's position might have flaws and a willingness to communicate as we develop a fair and acceptable funding formula that best serves the majority of the stakeholders.

THE ROLE OF THE MEDIATORS: Is to facilitate discussions clarifying participants' concerns while determining their interests and helping them to truly hear the other participants' concerns and interests. Then, explore options, and work towards a resolution of the conflicts between them. Mediators will raise questions for consideration regarding fairness and feasibility of settlement options ~ this will help participants reflect and gain clarity and sufficient information to make cohesive decisions. Mindful decision making authority rests with the Trustees.

MEDIATION IS VOLUNTARY: We have come together in good faith to work towards the goals and intentions stated above. Any party may choose to leave the process at any time.

CONSTRUCTIVE COMMUNICATION GUIDELINES: Our sincere intention is to actively participate in the search for equitable and workable solutions. We agree to cooperate with the mediation process and to communicate respectfully. We agree to speak honestly, openly and mindfully using "I" statements rather than blame statements such as "you" or "you should" to the issues at hand. We agree to listen respectfully without interruption to our colleagues.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Per the Idaho Mediation Act, the mediators agree that all discussed or hand written information obtained during mediation will be confidential and not released to any outside person without the consent of all parties. We agree that this information will not be admissible as evidence in any court, arbitration, administrative or legislative hearing. We agree that the mediators will not be asked to testify in any proceeding regarding these matters. In the event that all parties wish to have these confidentiality waived, this must be done in writing with all party's signatures, including the mediators.

MEDIATION REPORT: A report of the general outcome of the mediation will be completed by the mediators at the special request of the Trustees.

TALKING POINTS: We realize that other colleagues may be curious about the process that we are going through. By the end of this mediation, we will decide what the statement is that we wish to share with those outside this Team.

Any written Memorandum of Understanding and/or Mediation Report will be forwarded to Chairman
with the Board of Trustees organization by (name) Geri Rackow by
(date) March 22, 2017.

This 2 page AGREEMENT TO MEDIATE is signed by us this 15th day of March, 2017.

<u>W. H. Lusk</u> Trustee	<u>7</u> District	<u>Kes Estep</u> Trustee	<u>6</u> District
<u>T. En Tan</u> Trustee	<u>5</u> District	<u>Paula A. Rauer</u> Trustee	<u>2</u> District
<u>Tom Dale</u> Trustee	<u>3</u> District	<u>John Miller</u> Trustee	<u>4</u> District
<u>Elting D. Hasbrouck</u> Trustee	<u>4</u> District	<u>John Miller</u> Director	<u>4</u> District
<u>Stan Baily</u> Director Trustee	<u>1</u> District	<u>John Miller</u> Director	<u>1</u> District
<u>Carol Monahan</u> Director	<u>2</u> District	<u>Maggie D. Mann</u> Director	<u>6</u> District
<u>W. H. Lusk</u> Director	<u>3</u> District	<u>Geri Rackow</u> Director	<u>7</u> District

Participant	Role	District
Participant	Role	District
Participant	Role	District
Participant	Role	District

Participant	Role	District
Participant	Role	District
Participant	Role	District
Participant	Role	District

Sherry Gorrell
Sherry Gorrell, Mediator

Carol Rodriguez
Carol Rodriguez, Mediator

MEDIATION BILLING STATEMENT
IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF DISTRICT BOARDS OF HEALTH

March 14, 2017

ATTN: Bill Leake

Dear Bill:

Thank you for choosing us to assist with your budget meetings on March 15 and 16, 2017. Both Sherry Gorrell and I am honored to be working with your group. Per your request, please accept the following information regarding billing:

Pre-meeting preparation: 4 hours total	
Sherry Gorrell's hourly rate of \$125.00 x 4 =	\$500.00
Carol Rodriguez' hourly rate of \$200.00 x 4 =	800.00
 Mediation session day 1:	
Sherry Gorrell – flat rate	1500.00
Carol Rodriguez - flat rate	1500.00
 Mediation session day 2:	
Sherry Gorrell – flat rate	1500.00
Carol Rodriguez - flat rate	1500.00
 TOTALS DUE WITHOUT POST-MEDIATION EXPENSES:	
Sherry Gorrell	\$3500.00
Carol Rodriguez	\$3800.00

Post-mediation following will be charged at the same rates as pre-meeting preparation. This includes time spent on your behalf outside of session (IE: drafting, calculations, document review, emails, document preparation, phone calls over 5 minutes, etc.)

Please do not hesitate to contact either of us with any questions.

Thank you so much for this opportunity to serve you.

Warmly,

Sherry Gorrell, CPM and Carol Rodriguez, CPM

Sherry Gorrell, CPM
716 W. Franklin St., Suite #1, Boise, ID 83702
sherry@resolutionsinc.com 208-880-8670

Carol Rodriguez, CPM
6126 W State Street, Suite 303, Boise, ID 83703
wyocarol22@yahoo.com (208) 477-8973

March 20, 2017

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is intended to memorialize a mediation process and associated agreement reached by the Idaho Association of District Boards of Health on March 15, 2017.

BACKGROUND: On March 7, 2017 Sherry Gorrell, CPM and Carol Rodriguez, CPM were emailed in regards to possibly assisting the Idaho Association of District Boards of Health with mediation support in determining a formula which would enable the districts to equitably and fairly disperse approximately \$9 million dollars of state funding. Both mediators accepted the endeavor and met with the District Trustees and Directors on Wednesday, March 15, 2017.

LOGISTICS: The District Trustees and Directors met on March 15 and 16, 2017 to potentially identify a formula which would provide an equitable distribution of approximately \$9 million in state funding to the seven districts. Legislation had recently been proposed which would move this decision-making authority away from the districts and to the legislators. The overwhelming intention of the participants was to find a formula upon which the districts could unanimously agree and thus enable the decision-making ability to remain with the individuals whom best understand the needs of their districts.

The mediators facilitated a lively and honest discussion between the District Trustees and Directors which lasted most of the day of March 15th. Throughout this process, the mediators observed an admirable level of knowledge, insight and collaboration. This combination ultimately led to an unanimous agreement on the chosen formula.

All parties in attendance agreed that the formula chosen was pending the approval of each district's board of directors. The list of Trustees and Directors present is listed below, as is the agreed upon formula and peripheral information:

Present:

District	Trustees/Representatives	Directors
1	Glen Bailey	Lora Whalen
2	Doug Zenner	Carol Moehrle
3	Tom Dale	Nikki Zogg
4	Elt Hasbrouck	Russ Duke
5	Tom Faulkner	
6	Ken Estep	Maggie Mann
7	Bill Leake, Chair	Geri Rackow

Formula:

The Board of Trustees and Directors met and agreed unanimously to take back to the respective boards the proposed formula to be implemented in FY19 (starting July 1, 2018) with the following factors:

- 67% County Contributions
- 6% Infrastructure (divided equally between the 7 districts)
- 5% # of people in Poverty (number of people in poverty in a district / total number of people in poverty statewide; 3-year rolling average)
- 16% Population (3-year rolling average)
- 6% Health Care Provider Shortage Area

The Trustees agree to meet again in May, 2017, to finalize the formula in preparation for the annual conference of the Idaho Association of District Boards of Health in June, 2017.

SUMMARY: It is with great pleasure that we present this report to memorialize the events of March 15, 2017. It is seldom that groups such as the Idaho Association of District Board of Health work so respectfully well with each other in a manner which puts the needs of the citizens of the entire State of Idaho before any special interest. We applaud their efforts and hold them up as a shining example to the rest of the state. If all groups will work this collaboratively together, the future of Idaho will be bright indeed.

With warmest regards,

Sherry Gorrell, CPM and Carol Rodriguez, CPM

This page left blank intentionally.



Public Health

Idaho Public Health Districts

IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF DISTRICT BOARDS OF HEALTH

Trustee Conference Call

Monday, March 20, 2017

4:00 p.m.

Approved 5/5/17

Attendance

District	Trustees/Representatives	Directors	Guests
1	Glen Bailey	Lora Whalen	Jim Fenton
2	Doug Zenner	Carol Moehrle	
3		Nikole Zogg	
4	Elt Hasbrouck	Russ Duke	
5	Tom Faulkner	Rene LeBlanc	
6	Ken Estep	Maggie Mann	Kim Gaskill
7	Bill Leake, Chairman	Geri Rackow	Steve Thomas

1. Meeting Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairman Leake

Chairman Leake called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. and conducted roll call.

2. Discussion regarding Proposed FY19 Funding Formula

Chairman Leake

Bill asked if everyone received the updated funding formula spreadsheet that was sent out by Geri on March 17, 2017. Two of the Trustees had not received it (or were not able to open the document), so it was resent to them by Maggie Mann.

There were some corrections that needed to be made to the worksheet the Trustees and Directors were working from at their March 15 meeting. Steve Thomas, Health District 7 Fiscal Officer, commented on the changes made to the spreadsheet:

- For the percent of people in poverty, he could not duplicate the numbers on the original spreadsheet. Therefore, he took the most recent poverty numbers available (2015) and inserted those into the spreadsheet.
- For the Healthcare Provider Shortage Area (HPSA) score, the number on the spreadsheet for District 4 included one of the cells from District 3 and had a denominator of 6 rather than 4. This was corrected, which changed the numbers for both Districts 3 and 4.

Glen Bailey
PHD 1
208.415.5102

Doug Zenner
PHD 2
208.799.3100

Tom Dale
PHD 3
208.455.5315

Elt Hasbrouck
PHD 4
208.375.5211

Thomas Faulkner
PHD 5
208.737.5902

Ken Estep
PHD 6
208.233.9080

Bill Leake
PHD 7
208.533.3163

Based on these corrections, Bill reviewed the changes to each district:

Original – discussed at 3/15/17 Trustee Meeting					FY 18 Corrected Version (based on notes above and using 1-year poverty numbers)			FY 18 Corrected Version (based on notes above and using 3-year poverty numbers)		
	FY -17	FY -18	Difference	% Change	FY 18	Difference	% Change	FY 18	Difference	% Change
PHD1	\$ 1,253,600	\$ 1,259,500	\$ 5,900	0.47%	\$ 1,267,100	\$ 13,500	1.08%	\$ 1,262,500	\$ 8,900	0.71%
PHD2	\$ 885,000	\$ 866,200	\$ (18,800)	-2.12%	\$ 864,700	\$ (20,300)	-2.29%	\$ 864,400	\$ (20,600)	-2.33%
PHD3	\$ 1,387,000	\$ 1,394,200	\$ 7,200	0.52%	\$ 1,385,800	\$ (1,200)	-0.09%	\$ 1,392,600	\$ 5,600	0.40%
PHD4	\$ 2,192,600	\$ 2,251,500	\$ 58,900	2.69%	\$ 2,248,400	\$ 55,800	2.54%	\$ 2,250,700	\$ 58,100	2.65%
PHD5	\$ 1,197,900	\$ 1,199,000	\$ 1,100	0.09%	\$ 1,199,600	\$ 1,700	0.14%	\$ 1,199,400	\$ 1,500	0.13%
PHD6	\$ 1,186,100	\$ 1,182,400	\$ (3,700)	-0.31%	\$ 1,189,600	\$ 3,500	0.30%	\$ 1,184,900	\$ (1,200)	-0.10%
PHD7	\$ 1,187,300	\$ 1,191,800	\$ 4,500	0.38%	\$ 1,187,800	\$ 500	0.04%	\$ 1,188,600	\$ 1,300	0.11%
	\$ 9,289,500	\$ 9,344,600	\$ 55,100	0.59%	\$ 9,343,000	\$ 53,500	0.58%	\$ 9,343,100	\$ 53,600	0.58%

At the March 15, 2017 Trustee meeting, it was agreed to use a 3-year rolling average for the poverty numbers. Bill pointed out that the current spreadsheet (numbers reflected above) does not include 2016 poverty or population numbers as they are not yet available. As a result, the numbers above will change when the new population and poverty numbers are used.

Action: After discussion, there was unanimous agreement to use the 2016 numbers as soon as they are available (late March or early April) and to use a three-year rolling average (2014, 2015, and 2016).

Glen stated that he feels that the formula is complicated and proposed that we use the formula to come up with a percentage for each district and then move forward with that percentage in future years. However, Bill stated that we agreed to the proposed formula that is being discussed today and the purpose of today's call was only to focus on dealing with the corrected numbers for the proposed formula. The next time the Trustees meet, they could consider Glen's proposal or any additional changes to the formula. Glen was agreeable to this direction.

Geri clarified that today should be a conceptual discussion about numbers since the when the numbers come out in April, we will be able to see what the effect would be had the proposed formula been applied for FY18; however, by the time we get to next year when we will actually implement the formula for FY19, the numbers will have changed again.

There was discussion about the implementation date of the new formula. Geri confirmed that the minutes of the March 15, 2017 Trustee meeting document that the Trustees agreed to implement the new formula for FY19 (July 1, 2018). This was the recollection of most of the Trustees (and what was documented on the summary sent to the Trustees, Directors, and Fiscal officers immediately following the March 15 meeting).

Action: Everyone confirmed their agreement with implementing the new formula for FY19 (July 1, 2018).

Russ stated that the District 4 Board of Health meets on Friday, March 25, 2017, and it would be helpful for someone to write down the formula, including the specific components and data sources. He would like to have this information by 5:00 p.m. on March 24.

Action: Jim Fenton will be responsible for this assignment. When the document is completed, he will provide it to the Trustees, district directors, and fiscal officers.

There was discussion about the county contribution component of the proposed formula. This formula uses the OPE method of each district receiving 67% of their county contributions, then distributing the remainder between the other four factors (infrastructure, # of people in poverty, populations, and HPSA). Lora pointed out that in the spreadsheet demonstrating the new formula, the amount attributed to County Contributions is approximately 64% of the total appropriation.

3. Next Meeting

Bill Leake

The next conference call is scheduled for May 5, 1:00 pm MT. Bill stated that if the group feels that an in-person meeting is needed to discuss the formula before the June Boards of Health Conference, we can decide on that at a later date.

4. Adjourn

All business being concluded, Glen made a motion to adjourn at 4:55. Ken seconded the motion; passed unanimously.

Summary of Decisions/Action Items:

1. Funding Formula spreadsheet will use a three-year rolling average (2014, 2015, and 2016) for the number of people in poverty as well as population. The new population numbers should be available from the U.S. Census Bureau by early April.
2. Jim will define each of the formula components, including the data sources, and send it to the Fiscal Officers, Directors, and Trustees by March 24.
3. Bill will resend the signed Mediator Agreement to the Directors and Trustees.
4. Everyone agreed to share the proposed formula with their Boards and then provide the group with feedback so information can be compiled in preparation for the May 5 conference call.
5. Geri will send out the conference call appointment and conference bridge information

FY 19 Proposed Formula for State Appropriation Allocation

The state general fund appropriation for the public health districts shall be allocated to the districts based on five factors: county funding, infrastructure, number of persons in poverty, population, and Health Care Professional Shortage Areas (HPSA) score.

County Funding

The county funding calculation is made first. The current county funding pledged by district is multiplied by sixty-seven percent. For example, the county funding pledged by district for FY 18 is used in the formula for the distribution of the FY 19 state appropriation. The state-wide total of this sixty-seven percent calculation is subtracted from the total state appropriation. The remaining state appropriation, or Balance After County Calculation, is allocated on infrastructure, number of persons in poverty, population, and HPSA score.

Data Source: The annual county funding letter signed by all district directors.

Infrastructure 18%

Each district receives one-seventh of the infrastructure factor.

$(\text{Balance after County Calculation} \times .18) / 7 = \text{Infrastructure Funding per District}$

Number of Persons in Poverty 14%

The number of persons in poverty by county is summed by district, each year, for the three most recently available years. The average by district of these three district totals are added for a state-wide total.

$(\text{Balance after County Calculation} \times .14) \times (\text{District Three-Year Average Number of Persons in Poverty} / \text{State-Wide Total Three-Year Average Number of Persons in Poverty}) = \# \text{ of Persons in Poverty Funding per District}$

Data Source: <https://www.census.gov/did/www/saipe/>

Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE), Data Tables, State and County Data, "All Ages in Poverty Count" column.

Population 50%

The population by county is summed by district, each year, for the three most recently available years. The average by district of these three district totals are added for a state-wide total.

$(\text{Balance after County Calculation} \times .50) \times (\text{District Three-Year Average Population} / \text{State-Wide Total Three-Year Average Population}) = \text{Population Funding per District}$

Data Source: <http://factfinder.census.gov>

Annual Population Estimates, "Population Estimate (as of July 1)" column.

HPSA 18%

The most recently available HPSA score by county is averaged by district. The district HPSA averages are added for a state-wide total.

$(\text{Balance after County Calculation} \times .18) \times (\text{District Average HPSA Score} / \text{State-Wide Total of Average HPSA Scores}) = \text{HPSA Funding per District}$

Data Source: <https://datawarehouse.hrsa.gov/tools/analyzers/hpsafind.aspx>

HRSA Data Warehouse, Idaho, "HPSA Score" column.

Idaho Public Health Districts
Proposed General Fund Distribution Formula
Effective FY19 (7/1/18)

Spreadsheet Trustees & Directors worked from on 3/15/17

2018 STATE APPROPRIATION		\$9,342,800		67%		\$3,398,431														
District	Distribution rounded to \$100s 1-2-3-4-5	1. County Contribution		2. Minimum		3. # of People in Poverty		4. Population		2016 population not entered yet			\$1,699,216 50.0%	HPSA Score	1 - 5 \$9,342,800 Distribution	% of Total				
		2017 Pledge	% of total	Distrib. Amt	18.0%	\$ 611,718	14.0%	\$ 475,780	2014	2015	2016	3-yr sum					3-yr avg.	% of total	Distrib. Amt	
District 1	Benewah Bonner Boundary Kootenai Shoshone	\$1,259,500	13.48%	\$801,025	14.29%	\$87,388	12.92%	\$61,471	221,398	225,007	225,007	671,412	223,804	13.58%	\$230,744	11.2	12.50%	78,883	\$1,259,512	13.48%
District 2	Clearwater Idaho Latah Lewis Nez Perce	\$866,200		\$797,229	8.99%	\$534,143	14.29%	\$87,388	107,033	107,383	107,383	321,799	107,266	6.51%	\$110,593	14.0	16.12%	98,604	\$866,174	9.27%
District 3	Adams Canyon Gem Owyhee Payette Washington	\$1,394,200		\$1,263,970	14.25%	\$846,860	14.29%	\$87,388	3,861	3,843	3,843					17.0				
District 4	Ada Boise Elmore Valley	\$2,251,500		\$1,495,096	25.15%	\$1,495,096	22.83%	\$108,621	268,080	272,363	272,363	812,806	270,935	16.44%	\$279,337	12.2	14.01%	\$85,692	\$1,394,195	14.92%
District 5	Blaine Camas Cassia Gooding Jerome Lincoln Minidoka Twin Falls	\$1,199,000		\$1,150,138	12.96%	\$770,592	14.29%	\$87,388	21,482	21,592	21,592					8.0				
District 6	Bannock Bear Lake Bingham Butte Caribou Franklin Oneida Power	\$1,182,400		\$1,145,747	12.91%	\$767,650	10.91%	\$51,908	83,347	83,744	83,744	575,286	191,762	11.64%	\$197,709	12.5	14.39%	\$88,039	\$1,198,967	12.83%
District 7	Bonneville Clark Custer Fremont Jefferson Lemhi Madison Teton	\$1,191,800		\$1,098,061	12.26%	\$729,001	14.68%	\$69,845	108,623	110,089	110,089	632,831	210,944	12.80%	\$217,485	12.5	14.39%	\$88,039	\$1,191,758	12.75%
		\$9,344,600		\$8,972,103	100%	\$5,944,389	100%	\$477,446	1,634,464	1,654,930	1,654,930	4,944,324	1,648,108	100%	\$1,699,216	87	100%	\$611,718	\$9,344,465	100%

	FY-17	FY-18	Difference
PHD1	\$1,253,600	\$1,259,500	\$5,900
PHD2	\$885,000	\$866,200	-\$18,800
PHD3	\$1,387,000	\$1,394,200	\$7,200
PHD4	\$2,192,600	\$2,251,500	\$58,900
PHD5	\$1,197,900	\$1,199,000	\$1,100
PHD6	\$1,186,100	\$1,182,400	-\$3,700
PHD7	\$1,187,300	\$1,191,800	\$4,500
	\$9,389,500	\$9,344,600	-\$44,900

0.47%
-2.12%
0.52%
2.69%
0.09%
-0.31%
0.38%
0.59%

Idaho Public Health Districts

Proposed General Fund Distribution Formula

Effective FY19 (7/1/19)

Spreadsheet with new formula - using 1-year poverty numbers

2018 STATE APPROPRIATION		1. County Contribution		2. Minimum		3. # of People in Poverty		4. Population		5. HPSA Score		6. % of Total		7. % of Total	
District	County	Contribution	2017 Pledge	Distrib. Amt	67%	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
District 1	Beneva	\$1,267,100	\$1,195,560	\$801,025	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%
District 2	Bonneville	\$1,267,100	\$1,195,560	\$801,025	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%
District 3	Bonneville	\$1,267,100	\$1,195,560	\$801,025	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%
District 4	Bonneville	\$1,267,100	\$1,195,560	\$801,025	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%
District 5	Bonneville	\$1,267,100	\$1,195,560	\$801,025	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%
District 6	Bonneville	\$1,267,100	\$1,195,560	\$801,025	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%
District 7	Bonneville	\$1,267,100	\$1,195,560	\$801,025	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%

FY-17		FY-18		Difference	
PHD1	\$1,253,600	\$1,267,100	\$13,500	1.08%	
PHD2	\$885,000	\$864,700	(\$20,300)	-2.29%	
PHD3	\$1,387,000	\$1,385,800	(\$1,200)	-0.09%	
PHD4	\$2,192,600	\$2,248,400	\$55,800	2.54%	
PHD5	\$1,197,900	\$1,199,600	\$1,700	0.14%	
PHD6	\$1,186,100	\$1,189,600	\$3,500	0.30%	
PHD7	\$1,187,300	\$1,187,800	\$500	0.04%	
	\$9,289,500	\$9,343,000	\$53,500	0.58%	

Idaho Public Health Districts

Proposed General Fund Distribution Formula

Effective FY19 (7/1/18)

Spreadsheet with new formula - using 3-year average poverty numbers

2018 STATE APPROPRIATION		\$9,342,800		67%		\$6,253,431		1. County Contribution		\$5,944,369		7%		\$408,062		100%	
District	Distribution	2017 Pledge	% of total	Distrib. Amt	2017 Pledge	% of total	Distrib. Amt	2017 Pledge	% of total	Distrib. Amt	2017 Pledge	% of total	Distrib. Amt	2017 Pledge	% of total	Distrib. Amt	2017 Pledge
District 1	Beneval	\$1,262,500	13.48%	\$801,025	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%
District 2	Clearwater	\$1,262,500	13.48%	\$801,025	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%
District 3	Idaho	\$1,262,500	13.48%	\$801,025	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%
District 4	Boise	\$1,262,500	13.48%	\$801,025	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%
District 5	Blaine	\$1,262,500	13.48%	\$801,025	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%
District 6	Bannock	\$1,262,500	13.48%	\$801,025	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%
District 7	Bonneville	\$1,262,500	13.48%	\$801,025	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%	\$87,388	14.25%

District	FY-17	FY-18	Difference
District 1	\$1,253,600	\$1,262,500	\$8,900
District 2	\$885,000	\$864,400	(\$20,600)
District 3	\$1,387,000	\$1,392,600	\$5,600
District 4	\$1,192,600	\$1,250,700	\$58,100
District 5	\$1,197,000	\$1,199,400	\$2,400
District 6	\$1,186,100	\$1,184,500	(\$1,600)
District 7	\$1,187,300	\$1,188,500	\$1,200
	\$9,289,500	\$9,342,800	\$53,300

100.0%

This page left blank intentionally.



Public Health

Idaho Public Health Districts

IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF DISTRICT BOARDS OF HEALTH

Trustee Conference Call

Friday, May 5, 2017

1:00 p.m.

Approved 5/17/17

Attendance

District	Trustees/Representatives	Directors
1	Glen Bailey	Lora Whalen
2	Doug Zenner	Carol Moehrle
3	Tom Dale	Nikole Zogg
4	Elt Hasbrouck	Russ Duke
5	Tom Faulkner	Jeremy St. Clair
6	Ken Estep	Maggie Mann
7	Bill Leake, Chairman	Geri Rackow

1. Meeting Call to Order and Roll Call Chairman Leake

Chairman Leake called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and conducted roll call.

2. Approval of Minutes Chairman Leake

Geri reported that Lora's name was spelled incorrectly in the minutes, which has been corrected.

Action: Doug Zenner made a motion to approve the Trustee minutes of March 15-16 and March 20, 2017; seconded by Tom Dale. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Review Feedback from District Boards re: Proposed Funding Formula Chairman Leake

Bill reported that he has confirmation from Districts 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7 that their board support the new funding formula. He has not received feedback from District 3 or 4.

Tom Dale reported that the District 3 Board met yesterday to provide him with direction on the matter. The majority of his board asked him to communicate to the Trustees that if there could be a little more emphasis placed on population, they would like that. However, it is not a hill they want to die on.

Elt reported that their board had a lengthy discussion about the funding formula and they have come up with a couple of other ideas. Russ will send them out to everyone. Instead of putting more emphasis on population, they would like more emphasis on poverty numbers. They would also like to include either infrastructure or HPSA score, but not both.

Tom Dale commented that District 4's proposed formulas were shared with and evaluated by District 3. He indicated that they are small adjustments. On a positive note, it makes the calculation of the formula simpler by eliminating one of the factors. He feels that simplifying is good and if it doesn't make a whole lot of difference, he would be supportive of the change. He thinks it puts a little more emphasis on poverty which is a need factor.

Elt stated that the District 4 board, as well as some other commissioners, that are still not happy with the "per capita" numbers. There is still a huge difference in per capita between the districts, but these new formulas they have come up with bring the districts closer together in the per capital funding. Right now, the new formulas will

Glen Bailey PHD 1 208.415.5102	Doug Zenner PHD 2 208.799.3100	Tom Dale PHD 3 208.455.5315	Elt Hasbrouck PHD 4 208.375.5211	Thomas Faulkner PHD 5 208.737.5902	Ken Estep PHD 6 208.233.9080	Bill Leake PHD 7 208.533.3163
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

not cost any district a lot one way or the other. He hopes that the rest of the districts can get the proposed formulas and look at the number and then we can make a decision by June. Right now, District 4 cannot support the formula that the Trustees agreed to in March.

Ken stated that he would have to look at the figures and projections of District 4's new formulas.

Elt reported that with their new formulas, they projected out until 2022 and also assumed a 3% increase from both the State and the Counties.

Ken stated that this year District 6 only got a 2% increase from the Counties, so he doesn't know if a projected 3% increase is realistic.

Elt apologized for not getting the proposed new formulas to the group sooner, as they just came up with them last week. He thinks they are reasonable formulas and no district really gets hurt too much one way or the other.

Tom Dale stated that we will not be able to make a decision on the new formulas today. We should let everyone get the information from District 4 and evaluate them. We can then have a discussion at a later date.

Bill asked the group if they wanted to schedule another conference call before our June 8 in-person meeting. No district was opposed to doing so; however, the following comments were noted:

- Doug commented that the District 2 Board does not meet until June and he would like their input before weighing in on the new formula since we represent our Boards.
- Tom Dale commented that there is no hurry to make a decision because implementation wouldn't be for another year and half or two so it is reasonable to share the information with our board members and have discussion so the Trustees can give proper representation of their boards. He does feel the new formula is worthy of some discussion.
- Tom Faulkner feels the discussion on a new funding formula should be done face-to-face.

4. Agenda for June 8 Trustee Meeting

Chairman Leake

The following agenda items were identified for the meeting:

- Review of Food Fee Plans
- Millennium Fund Formula
- Bylaws Review
- IAC Contract
- General Fund Distribution Formula

Lora commented that a Director meeting is scheduled the morning of June 8. If the Trustees need more time for their meeting, we can end the Director meeting early to give more time to the Trustees.

Action: Bill and Geri will finalize the agenda for the June 8 Trustee Meeting, including the start time, and share with everyone on the May 17 conference call.

5. Review June 9 Business Meeting Agenda

Chairman Leake

Bill reviewed the agenda for the meeting. No changes were suggested.

6. Next Meeting

Chairman Leake

A conference call was scheduled for Wednesday, May 17 at 12:00 MT/11:00 PT. Geri will send out the appointment/conference call bridge number to everyone.

7. Adjourn

Action: Ken made a motion to adjourn at 1:35 p.m.; seconded by Glen. Motion carried unanimously.