

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD OF HEALTH

Monthly Meeting
Tuesday, June 23, 2009, 6:00 p.m.

Call to Order & Roll Call

The Board of Health held its monthly meeting on June 23, 2009 in the Jennifer K. Putman Meeting Room at the Brookens Administrative Center, 1776 East Washington, Urbana. The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Julian Rappaport. Board members Brenda Anderson, Prashanth Gowda, Stan James, Nezar Kassem, John Peterson, Julian Rappaport, Bobbi Scholze, and Betty Segal were present at the time of roll call. Cheryl Ramirez arrived after roll call. The staff member present was Kat Bork (Board of Health Secretary). Also present were Deb Busey (County Administrator), Carol Elliott (CUPHD Board Chair), Nancy Greenwalt (Smile Healthy Executive Director), Dr. Mark Huls, and Julie Pryde (CUPHD Administrator).

Approval of Agenda/Addendum

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

Approval of Minutes

MOTION by Peterson to approve the Board of Health minutes for May 26, 2009; May 12, 2009 (Special Meeting); and May 12, 2009 (Study Session); seconded by James.

Rappaport requested changes to line 142 from the word “tearing” to “testing” and line 473 the words to “to say” from “no say.”

Ramirez entered the meeting at 6:02 p.m.

Motion carried with all ayes.

Public Participation on Agenda Items Only

There was no public participation.

Correspondence and Communications

The invitation to participate in the Ameren Stakeholder Working Group for the Bondville to Southwest Campus Transmission Line Project was shared with the Board.

Budget FY2010

Legal Opinion on Core Services

Rappaport shared the highlights of his conversation with Susan McGrath from this afternoon. McGrath wanted the Board of Health (BOH) to be cognizant that the specifics of how much the details of a public health district’s activities are dependent on the district’s needs and

resources. This is negotiable with the state. Rappaport noted McGrath's opinion revealed there is more leeway about the amount of services provided than the BOH initially thought. While the Board must have a designated person in some areas, the amount of services the BOH must provide is not necessarily legislated due to the differing size of public health districts. Some decisions regarding the amount of core services provided in a public health district is up to the policy discretion of the particular board.

Peterson reflected that the opinion indicates the BOH has some flexibility concerning the core services, but flexibility appears to require permission from a state board. He did not think some practices, like a sampling of tuberculosis cases instead of identification of every one, would be acceptable to the community. Rappaport noted it is a policy decision the BOH can make. Peterson stated CUPHD does more thorough work on STDs than state mandates and the BOH has followed CUPHD's lead in this regard. Peterson was surprised to learn through McGrath's opinion how little is mandated by the state concerning services like well water testing. The BOH has not addressed the level of services as a board. Rappaport drew the Board's attention to Page 21 in McGrath's opinion where she preliminarily notes "that the number of staff to be provided for each of these (four core program) activities is not proscribed by statute or code with the exception of one person in each category who must have the particular credentials required by the code for that category." Rappaport pointed out this is a surprising amount of discretion.

James commented how different inspectors from a state agency can have differing views on whether the Champaign County Nursing Home is meeting state standards of services. In reading the opinion and examining the issue, he was concerned about how open to interpretation the Administration Code is. McGrath's opinion notes that if a public health department opts to provide mental health services, it must appoint a mental health and developmental disabilities services advisory committee. He asked if the BOH followed this direction. Rappaport confirmed the BOH did so according to McGrath. Pryde confirmed the BOH was in compliance because the direction James quoted was for counties who do not have a mental health board or a mental health center, which Champaign County does.

Rappaport explained that his point was the BOH does not need to assume that everything is automatically determined by the legalities. There is a fair amount of discretion and decision-making available concerning the appropriate amount of services provided to the people of the County. James asked what leeway the BOH would have in negotiating the cost of services. Rappaport stated the BOH can determine the amount of a service it purchases based on the cost of the service. James asked if the BOH could provide services that do not meet the demands of that service. Rappaport confirmed that is what the Board's attorney has informed them. James asked if the BOH had the right to not purchase the same level of services as they previously had from an agency because providing the same level of service was cost prohibitive to the BOH's budget. Rappaport agreed the BOH has to operate within its resources and makes policy decisions about allocating those resources. Some services are mandated, but the amount and intensity of those services is not completely determined by the law. Rappaport emphasized that he was not advocating the BOH do anything differently; he was just saying the discretion exists for the BOH to make decisions. Kassem said there is a perception and a reality in everything. It is important for the BOH to make sure they are providing what the public perceives as reality. He did not want the public to think something should be done that the BOH is not doing. Rappaport said the BOH could

only spend the money it has and it was the Board's job, and no one else's, to decide how to allocate that money within some very broad parameters. Kassem noted people assume certain services will be provided. The public's perception is the BOH will do the best it can with what it has and act responsibly.

James noted County departments like the Sheriff's Office receive grants for services and these services have to be maintained. If the budget gets tight, funding should be focused on core services and the extra services should be removed. In his mind, the core services are the items the BOH needs to pay for with the money it has. If the BOH has any discretionary money remaining, it can look at the non-required items. He agreed the statute and code language are broad. For example, 2 wells could be tested instead 100, but he wanted to be sure the BOH was doing its due diligence. Rappaport wanted to be sure the Board members understood their options. At times in the past, he thinks the Board has mistakenly thought their hands were completely tied by legalities, when in fact they have some discretion. For example, the Sheriff's Office has to provide police services, but it is not legally proscribed how many police officers the County has to hire. This is decided by the Sheriff, based on how many officers are needed and what the County can afford. James agreed, but felt if the money was there then the County should fund core services versus funding other services that are not mandated. Rappaport said it was the Board's responsibility to debate the level of services needed and how to spend its funds. Segal indicated having McGrath's opinion was good for the BOH to understand the legal basis to make changes based on what it could afford. It is important to understand what the needs are in the County when they are making decisions about core services.

Pryde said CUPHD works with this every single day and knows what is going on in the community. She urged the BOH to contact the program coordinators of the different services to learn about how CUPHD provides services at the highest standards. She stated the BOH does have discretion in what it funds to a certain degree, but CUPHD has its staff unless the BOH has another subcontractor they plan to use. CUPHD would have to lay off staff if they were not contracted to perform the BOH's services. Pryde said the decision was made at the very beginning of the County Health Board and the District Health Board that the two could not have disparate services. Both health boards will also have to face the issue of going into all the schools to vaccinate children for the pandemic flu. This is not something that has been done during Pryde's experience and she warned this would be a major undertaking. She assured the BOH there would be extreme screaming if CUPHD goes into Champaign-Urbana schools and does not go into the County schools. She stated she provides this information to the BOH for a reason. She was trying to let them know what is going on and not just advocate for CUPHD. She emphasized that she looks at more than just the County. Rappaport said he was not trying to have an argument. Pryde said her point was there are program standards that are proscribed by the programs and not proscribed by law. Pryde said the fact was CUPHD does things a certain way by the best practice standards and would not do suboptimal services as a subcontractor because the BOH did not want to do services that way. The BOH has the right to go elsewhere to get the services, which she noted has not worked out so well in the past.

Scholze commented that she had a similar conversation at Parkland today because they were notified Parkland would not receive a substantial amount of state funding. She was aware as an Administrator that it was her job to cut that amount out of the budgeted expenses within the context

of standards and accreditation. This is the spirit in which the BOH is looking at its budget. The BOH will have to make cuts and they are trying to determine what is the best way to continue serving the County people within the available options.

Setting a Fund Balance Goal & Funding Requests

The BOH has previously discussed setting a fund balance goal at a responsible level. Rappaport turned to Deb Busey for more information. Busey distributed several documents she prepared containing information the BOH requested at its last meeting. The first document shows the actual costs charged to the BOH for CUPHD's salaried positions to operate the programs. It does not match up exactly to the CUPHD contract proposal, but there are many reasons for the discrepancy. This document enables the BOH to see where its dollars are being spent for specific personnel providing services in each program. The next document was an analysis of the IMRF cost comparison. IMRF increased its rate and is offering government entities the option to either adopt the annual required contribution rate or the phase-in rate. The exact rate differs for each agency. The annual required contribution rate for CUPHD is 11.3% and the phase-in rate is 9.45%. The CUPHD contract budget is based on adopting the 11.3% rate and will cost more for personnel to the BOH. Busey showed the total difference to the BOH the CUPHD IMRF costs is \$8,753. Adopting the higher rate might result in spending less over the next 3-5 years than adopting the phase-in rate. James asked if the rate would change. Busey stated the IMRF rate changes every year. The rate may increase even more next year depending on the economy and investment returns, but by funding the full rate this year CUPHD will not have to catch up in later years. Busey advised any agency that can afford to adopt the full rate should do it. The third document was the total CUPHD staff with a breakdown of assignments and the percentages the BOH pays for the positions. The yellow highlighted positions are the administrative positions, to the best of Busey's knowledge. She advised looking at what administration costs are in terms of the total services provided. The green highlighted positions are those where Busey estimated dollar amounts based on the average for the type of position. The total BOH portion of the CUPHD staffing budget appears to be about 9.5%. Busey presented a comparison of the percentage of CUPHD administrative salaries because administration is usually considered an overhead cost for a service program. CUPHD administrative salaries represent 19.5% of the CUPHD total budget. In the portion of salaries charged to the BOH, CUPHD administrative salaries represent 25.3%. Busey suggested this might be something the BOH should look at when it is talking to CUPHD about administrative costs and whether there is any room for flexibility or change. The BOH can inquire what exactly it is receiving from CUPHD for funding these staff positions. For example, the BOH is paying CUPHD almost \$12,000 for a Public Relations & Information Specialist and they can inquire what the BOH is receiving from that position. The BOH is also paying the equivalent of 12 account positions. The final document Busey prepared showed the FY2008 actual revenues and expenditures, the FY2009 original budgeted amounts, the FY2009 adjusted budgeted amounts, and the FY2010 funding requests received from agencies. The highlighted revenue lines are directly tied to services provided through CUPHD. In FY2008, the deficit was about \$40,000. In FY2009, the anticipated deficit was close to \$70,000 but has increased to \$104,000 primarily due to the changes in revenue projections. Busey explained it is a little difficult to project revenues for the BOH budget because it requires projecting revenues from 2 state fiscal years and neither one of which is known at this point in time. The BOH is based on both the state's FY2010 and FY2011 and neither has been set by the state. CUPHD has provided some updated revenue projections,

including the decreases in the Emergency Preparedness Grant and Local Health Protection Grant. The FY2010 revenues are budgeted based on flat revenues from FY2009 for most items. The FY2010 expenditure budget is based on the funding requests from the various agencies. Currently, the BOH's FY2010 budget has a \$275,000 deficit, which is clearly not sustainable.

Concerning setting a fund balance goal, Busey showed the BOH's fund balance at the beginning of the FY2010 fiscal year projected at \$335,000. This is 32.9% of the projected FY2010 expenditure budget. Busey recommended the BOH consider setting a fund balance goal of 25%. This goal is equal to three months of the BOH's expenditure budget. To give the BOH a frame of reference, Busey explained the County's General Corporate Fund has a fund balance goal of 12.5%, but the GCF is a large fund and is not nearly as dependent on grants revenues as the BOH fund. Grants revenues are becoming quite volatile, which is why Busey recommended setting a minimum 25% fund balance goal. Based on the FY2010 budget, a 25% fund balance goal would equal \$254,000. If the BOH adopts a FY2010 budget based on the funding requests, the ensuing deficit would deplete the BOH fund balance to \$59,000 or 5.9%. This is not a deficit the BOH could operationally afford. To assist the BOH in making decisions for the FY2010 budget; Busey presented a document listing the options for balancing the FY2010 budget. Since the FY2010 budget is out of balance by 27%, the first option was presented as cutting each expenditure by 27% to balance revenues and expenditures. In this option the CUPHD contract would be cut to \$586,226.50; BOH clerical support would be cut to \$4,453; the RPC Senior Wellness Program would be cut to \$36,500, Smile Healthy would be cut to \$97,183.44; and the Mental Health Board's Crisis Nursery Program would be cut to \$18,250. Because the BOH has discussed completely cutting the Senior Wellness Program, Busey included a second option completely removing that \$50,000 from the FY2010 budget. The cut of that entire program would result in lesser cuts of 23.25% to the remaining programs. The impact of the second option would result in the CUPHD contract being funded at \$616,341, Smile Healthy funded at \$102,175, and the Mental Health Board/Crisis Nursery program funded at \$19,187. Busey also showed the corresponding impact on the fund balance of each option at the bottom of the page. A balanced budget in FY2010 would result in a BOH fund balance with \$149,181 in excess of its fund balance goal because the BOH has accumulated this balance over a number of years. The third option Busey presented considers that the BOH makes a determination to spend part of its fund balance in FY2010 because they are ahead of the fund balance goal with a balanced budget. The third option includes spending \$50,000 of the BOH fund balance, completely cutting the Senior Wellness Program, and making 18% cuts to the remaining programs. This option would leave the BOH with a 35.8% fund balance of \$283,000. Busey advised that the BOH could only afford to adopt a budget that spent part of the fund balance for 1 or 2 more years, depending on the budget requests in upcoming fiscal years. Any expenditure from the fund balance would have to be evaluated on a year-to-year basis. Any budget with spending in excess of revenue cannot be indefinitely sustained.

Rappaport stated the BOH has discussed the possibility of continuing to fund the joint program with the Mental Health Board at \$25,000 for at least 1 more year. Busey said those decisions were up to the BOH. She prepared the budget options that equitably distributed the pain of cuts to all programs. Fully funding a single program's request would either require reducing the BOH fund balance or increasing cuts to the other programs.

James asked if funding for the potential flu vaccinations for all school children was included in the budget. Busey said no such expenditure was included by CUPHD. James said the BOH could either spend its fund balance to provide for those vaccinations or cut more from the programs to set aside money in the budget now. He liked the option of making cuts to all the programs because it does not show favoritism to a single program. He suggested the BOH should hold tight and not set its budget without knowing the state budget. He acknowledged there are a lot of good programs, but the BOH should focus on the most important things it needs to do.

Rappaport asked how the first option with a cut of 27% to the agencies' requests would compare relative the FY2009 funding CUPHD received from the BOH. Busey estimated the first option would be a 10% less than the FY2009 budget. Rappaport emphasized the options Busey gave represented cuts from the programs' FY2010 budget requests, not cuts based on the FY2009 actual budgeted amounts. With the third option, the BOH would be giving CUPHD approximately the same dollar amount in FY2010 as FY2009. Pryde reminded the Board that CUPHD is subsidizing communicable disease services because this was not previously included in the BOH's budget. Rappaport stated this was a time for the BOH to have its conversation and asked if the BOH members felt satisfied they understood the figures presented by Busey. The Board agreed and Peterson stated the information and options helped to make things clear. He noted the missing part is the state budget for public health. He asked if Ramirez had heard anything about the state budget through her association. Ramirez said the outlook is pretty bleak and the mental health authorities are gearing up for the worst case scenario. She called the Illinois Public Health Association today because she was alarmed by emails that the Local Health Protection Grants were on the state's chopping block. She was unable to reach the IPHA lobbyist, but does know there is a unified effort on behalf of social services. Kassem spoke to David Miller, a representative from Chicago and a dentist, who said the legislators do want to provide social services, but they do not want to face the voters' response at election time after raising taxes. Scholze explained her office decided to make budget cuts and are putting the money in reserve until the state actually comes through with the funding. They are preparing for the worst. Peterson asked if Parkland was looking at staff cuts. Scholze indicated the cuts would probably did not result in staff cuts because Parkland has been very careful and fortunate with enrollment. Peterson noted the BOH has a staff driven budget and budget cuts will result in staff cuts. Ramirez added that her association was told by their lobbyist that the state will not make the budget decisions until July 15th and suggested the BOH make its decisions after that date. Rappaport said the BOH will have to vote on its budget at its July meeting.

Rappaport recommended the BOH look at its overall situation and come up with a dollar figure it can afford to pay CUPHD and ask CUPHD what services they can provide for that dollar amount. Gowda suggested setting the BOH's priorities by taking a cue from McGrath's opinion and prioritize the cuts according to what is most important to sustain. Kassem suggested notifying all the programs who requested funding that BOH is evaluating how much it can afford and ask the programs if they could continue providing services for a reduced amount. He did not think it was fair to single out CUPHD because that agency receives the most BOH funding. Rappaport agreed cuts to all program should be considered. He felt the BOH had already come to a conclusion it would have to eliminate the RPC program. Rappaport thought the small \$25,000 used to fund a joint program with the Mental Health Board (MHB) is an investment to develop a relationship with that board. He felt it was good for the County public health and human services in the long run to

have a formal relationship between the BOH and MHB. His personal pitch was that BOH could not give the MHB less than \$25,000 in order to meet the other board's expectations. The BOH will have to renegotiate the nature of its relationship with MHB after this year and he hoped the relationship would not end. James noted he has been a supporter of the senior services program, but budget cuts are a part of life. He is looking to get the best bang for the BOH's buck for everyone. He stressed he would only vote to cut all the programs because it was not fair to the others if one person with more influence was advocating to fully fund a single program. James liked the across the board cuts.

Peterson suggested separating the Mobile Unit Program of \$77,000 from the CUPHD budget because it is not a core service and was just added last year. Busey suggested asking CUPHD if the services on the second page of the CUPHD budget document could be separated out from the core services. Pryde said the core services and the grants amount to about \$703,000. Busey could divide the CUPHD budget into the core services budget and the additional services budget. Pryde agreed with that approach.

Anderson asked if there was a minimum amount the BOH would have to fund to receive any program services from the agencies. Rappaport said they would find that out once they informed the agencies how much they would be funding the programs in FY2010. The agencies should respond to the BOH with details about what services they could provide for that amount.

Peterson was concerned with having sufficient time for Board members to consider the proposals and making budget decisions. The BOH might need to hold additional meetings.

Elliott stated she was not speaking for the entire CUPHD Board, but she thought if the BOH was thinking of just presenting a flat dollar amount it was willing to pay then the BOH better have a back-up plan for who would provide the core services if CUPHD does not feel it is something they want to do. She was not sure if the BOH realized how highly thought of the CUPHD Administrator was at the state level. Elliott urged the BOH to pay attention to Pryde's advice because her reputation at the state level is very good. Rappaport said he did not want to debate that and he never intended to impugn the Administrator at all. While it may ultimately come to what Elliott suggested, the BOH will have resources to offer to CUPHD and will have to deal with the reality of public health in Champaign County if CUPHD declines to provide core services. He suggested the problem was not about personalities, it was about the conflict of interest for the CUPHD Administrator and the County Board of Health. This conflict of interest has been ongoing and recognized as a structural problem long before Pryde was in that role. Rappaport thought the structural problem needs to come to the attention of the County Board and maybe CUPHD. He felt at some point the community would have to address the fact that this is an unworkable arrangement for County public health and is structurally confusing to everyone, but that was his opinion. Elliott asked if he could debate back with Rappaport on that point. Rappaport said she could not because he would not be able to do so at a CUPHD Board meeting. He thanked her for providing the information warning the BOH.

James wanted it to be clear that Rappaport was speaking for himself and not for the full Board. Rappaport concurred he was not speaking for the BOH and encouraged the BOH members to say whatever is on their minds.

Segal was concerned that the three budget options included no estimate about the cost to perform flu vaccinations in the County, especially in schools, as recommended by Pryde. She wanted to have some information regarding what it might cost when they consider making budget cuts. She thought the mobile unit was the method of giving vaccinations and wondered how the program's elimination would affect it. Pryde said they are still working on it and some things were still up in the air. Right now, it appears they will give regular flu vaccines possibly starting as early as August. Because of the high hospitalization and death rate in young people, they are looking at vaccinating school children first. She has warned schools CUPHD may have to vaccinate, which would involve parental consent, extra staff, and other issues. She has not worked up any figures yet. She does know if children have to be vaccinated; it will have to be done in the schools. Segal understood Pryde to have said that even if the BOH funded the CUPHD contract at the total requested amount, it would not cover the vaccination cost. Pryde said the budget number she was working with was about \$703,000. She already took the mobile program out because she wanted to show the BOH the minimum figure at which CUPHD can offer the core and grant services. The mobile unit mostly gave flu shots this year and her propose budget for core and grant services did not include any flu vaccinations. People from the County can come to the CUPHD facility and get shots, but if the County people have to be singled out, the BOH will have to pay more or have people come directly to CUPHD. James asked if CUPHD planned to do any scattered site visits as they had before. Pryde said she would put a proposal together once she finds out what is happening with the vaccines. She suggested the most cost effective method would be to set up staff in a targeted location to administer the vaccine. Busey asked if there was any money from the state associated with providing the flu vaccines. Pryde assumed the state will give CUPHD the flu vaccine and CUPHD will have to pay for the staff and travel costs involved in administering it. The state is talking about cutting the Local Health Protection Grants so she did not know what they would provide. Pryde hoped the state government would also provide funding per vaccinated child to cover the staff costs in addition to supplying the vaccine.

Rappaport suggested the BOH move towards what it will say to each program that requested funding. He started with the Senior Wellness Program operated by the Regional Planning Commission. Rappaport was initially in favor and hopeful about this program, but felt the BOH has reached a conclusion that it is not getting enough added value beyond what RPC and other agencies in the County already do for seniors to make the program affordable in the current budget reality.

MOTION by Peterson to not fund the RPC Senior Wellness Program in FY2010; seconded by Scholze.

Scholze agreed the BOH has not gotten its money's worth, but she does feel senior services are important. If the BOH has any money remaining, she recommended putting out a request for proposals to see what agencies would offer for senior services. This particular program did not work for the costs relative to the BOH's budget, but as a policy decision she thought the BOH should consider senior services. Ramirez agreed with Scholze's philosophy toward senior services. The BOH agreed it was voting on a specific program tonight, not a policy regarding the BOH's position on seniors.

James thought the BOH had a subcommittee developing guidelines to evaluate agencies who request funding instead of simply funding the only agencies who know to make requests to the BOH. He wanted to contact other agencies to make them aware the BOH is accepting proposals for funding consideration. Rappaport said that approach was taken in conjunction with the Mental Health Board joint program. The MHB has a systematic process to evaluate programs. The BOH might be able to emulate this process in the future if they have sufficient funds. James said the agencies should be aware their funding is not assured every year. He sees how boards can develop a niche with a certain agency that no one wants to cut because that agency is familiar. He expressed it was important to be fair in making funding decisions. James praised Peter Tracy for his work on the County Board's Quarter Cent Juvenile Delinquency Grants and the evaluation process. Rappaport noted that the RPC had received funding for 2 years and that may have been enough time to reach a decision about the program. He viewed the process from the agencies' side that they would be hesitant to create a program if funding was in doubt every year. He wanted the BOH to have a reasonable timeframe to allow agencies to demonstrate what they are doing.

James made friendly amendment to the motion that the program was not funded "due to budget constraints." Peterson and Scholze agreed to consider the amendment as friendly.

Segal said she has not been impressed with what RPC has done with the money, but their last quarterly report appeared to show a tad bit of progress and she wondered if that would be lost. Rappaport recalled RPC had provided the BOH with some information they had gathered and that would be useful to RPC even without the BOH funding.

MOTION by Kassem to table the motion. Motion failed due to the lack of a second.

Rappaport called the question. James questioned the approach of making a decision on only one part of the budget. Rappaport said he was trying to get the process moving on an issue where the BOH seemed to have reached a consensus. James was not willing to piecemeal the budget process. He preferred to look at the budget as a whole. Rappaport called for a vote. Bork read the motion.

Motion carried with one vote against by James.

Rappaport suggested the BOH next discuss the Smile Healthy funding request. Peterson preferred looking at Busey's approach that considered all the funding requests. He felt James had a very valid point to not piecemeal the budget.

MOTION by James to accept Option 2 as presented by Busey; seconded by Kassem.

When the Board is looking at cuts, James wanted to be fair to everyone and all the programs have merit. He did not want to single out one program over another. Peterson talked about removing the Mobile Unit Program from the CUPHD budget. James did not object to singling out the Mobile Unit Program because it was an additional program. He would amend his motion to keep the amount for the Mobile Unit in reserve to cover the potential flu vaccine costs without dipping into the fund balance. The BOH considered the idea of using an RFP later in the year for senior services if some money ends up being available. At the BOH's request, Busey reran the

numbers and distributed a revised set of options. Rappaport asked Busey to describe the revision. Busey explained the CUPHD budget request was separated into the core services at \$703,766 and the additional services at \$99,384. Option 4 completely cuts the CUPHD additional services, completely cuts the RPC Senior Wellness Program, and spends \$50,000 of the BOH fund balance. The resulting cut to the remaining programs in Option 4 is 7.4%. The BOH discussed the various options to the FY2010 budget and how it would affect the fund balance. James was concerned with not making a plan to pay for flu vaccines because it would mean the BOH would have to spend its fund balance on this activity. The Board discussed balancing the FY2010 budget with cuts to the funding requests and not budgeting to spend any of its fund balance in order to maintain a fund balance greater than 25%. This excess above the fund balance goal could be used towards an event that arose during the fiscal year, such as flu vaccinations. The BOH debated cutting the CUPHD additional programs. Peterson was reluctant to cut the well water testing. Anderson asked why well water testing was not a core service. Pryde explained this service is when people ask CUPHD to test their wells on private property. This is not covered by the core services and a fee is charged. Peterson, as a physician, supported continuing the funding for the well water testing and the Illinois Breast & Cervical Cancer Program. He suggested cutting the Mobile Unit Program funding entirely and applying a 15-18% cut to the remaining programs.

Rappaport wanted to put full funding of the MHB program at \$25,000 on the table. He believed the BOH needed to meet its agreement with the MHB because the other board was putting in a matching amount. He suggested continuing this funding for one year to keep the program going. He thought the program has non-trivial implications for the BOH's ability to have a relationship with another county board that has a lot of resources and knowledge regarding how to evaluate programs. He proposed restoring the full \$25,000 funding in the FY2010 budget. James said he would like to see funding for seniors in the budget. Rappaport noted the BOH had already voted in favor of cutting that program completely. Peterson noted there might be money for a senior services RFP with the cuts to the other programs and the Mobile Unit Program. He asked about the fund balance because he was concerned about it dropping too low. Busey explained the fund balance would remain the same with a balanced budget. Peterson did not object to spending \$50,000 from the fund balance in FY2010. James stated the motion on the floor was to adopt Option 2 as listed. He preferred the money that would have gone to the Mobile Unit Program being held in reserve for flu vaccines. He agreed the MHB program has merit, but cuts were being made and the BOH could not fund a program if it did not have the money. Rappaport suggested eliminating the CUPHD additional services.

James made a friendly amendment to the motion to cut the Mobile Unit Program and hold that amount in the fund balance to be used as a cushion in case of a pandemic. Kassem agreed as the seconder to consider the amendment as friendly.

Busey stated that option would result in a 23% cut to the remaining programs to maintain a balanced budget. Discussion continued over the FY2010 budget options. Segal asked if the motion on the floor kept the CUPHD additional services, with the exception of the Mobile Unit Program. James agreed the mobile unit was the only thing on Option 2 that he was suggesting be cut. He liked having a bigger cushion in fund balance because the BOH does not know how its revenues will be affected or whether other problems would hit the BOH during the next year. He was trying to be as conservative as possible while helping as many people as the BOH can. Rappaport thought

the BOH had decided to maintain a 25% fund balance and this approach would result in a fund balance in excess of that amount. James agreed, but the BOH has to take into consideration everything on the table because they do not know for certain what expenses will arise in FY2010 that could deplete the balance. Busey thought the 25% was determined by the BOH as their minimum fund balance goal and they could always provide a fund balance statement that changing the fund balance in a particular year due to a particular situation. James concurred with Scholze's approach to plan for the worst case scenario. The BOH can grant more money near the end of the year if the circumstances turn out to be less severe. He pressed the idea of being conservative.

Segal asked how the BOH accumulated such a large fund balance. Peterson said the BOH had a high tax rate to start the organization. Busey corrected him that the fund balance accumulated because the BOH did not spend any money in its first 3 years. The tax was collected, but not spent, hence why the fund balance is one-time revenue. She advised the BOH to be careful about deciding how to spend this one-time revenue. James asked if the fund balance was drawing interest, which Busey confirmed it was. James noted interest rates have significantly dropped. Busey concurred the BOH's interest income has dropped from \$18,000 to \$7,600; but interest rates will eventually rise again.

Segal wanted to recognize in talking about the CUPHD FY2010 budget request compared to the CUPHD FY2009 budget that Pryde had informed the BOH it had not been paying for infectious disease core services in last year's budget. Rappaport noted CUPHD might reject the BOH's budget proposal and decline to provide any services.

Peterson was concerned about taking any action that would wipe out the fund balance to the minimum fund balance goal in order to fund the agencies at their requested amounts because the BOH will be in the same position next year of having more requests than it has revenue. He did not think the BOH should be increasing its fund balance. His general philosophy was that the agencies should take some cuts at the same time the BOH maintains a reasonable fund balance between the current fund balance and \$250,000. Rappaport agreed with Peterson, but CUPHD might say they cannot provide services for the reduced amount and that will be an entirely different problem. James asked if Busey could rerun the budget figures with options showing the different effects of 25%, 20%, and 15% cut to agencies so the BOH could decide on one of those figures for across the board cuts. Discussion continued over the budget options. The Board asked Busey to prepare the budget figures with the Senior Wellness and Mobile Unit Programs removed and then determine the necessary percentage cut to the remaining programs to balance the budget. Rappaport wanted to preserve the opportunity of considering the agencies' requests individually and possibly not applying the cut to a specific agency. James spoke in favor of an across the board cut to agencies. Busey went to rerun the budget figures for the Board and the Board discussed the non-budgetary agenda items.

Kassem stated he had to leave and, as he is not seeking another term on the BOH, introduced Dr. Mark Huls who would be serving on the BOH starting on July 1st. Kassem described Dr. Huls as an astute, personable orthodontist with a lot of interest in public health. Kassem said he had enjoyed working with all the Board members. The Board thanked Kassem for his service.

Kassem exited the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

Dr. Huls greeted the Board and spoke about his background. He was born and raised in St. Joseph and currently resides in Champaign. He has one practice in Champaign and another small practice in Monticello. The BOH shared information about the Open Meetings Act and how it applies to the BOH's interactions.

Rappaport wanted to give the agencies a chance to respond to the BOH's intentions with its budget. He recommended informing the various agencies who made funding budget requests about what the BOH will do. Peterson asked if Rappaport intended to vote on a FY2010 budget tonight. Rappaport said if the BOH did not pass a budget tonight, he wanted to reach a point where it is clear what the BOH will be voting on at its next meeting. The Board discussed the timeline for approving its FY2010 budget before the County Board's Legislative Budget Hearings. Busey informed them the budget needs to be finalized by August 15th at the latest. Peterson thought a big unknown factor was how CUPHD would respond and this would determine whether the BOH will need another study session. James said July was a bad month to hold two meetings because people go on vacation. Rappaport noted the BOH would have to schedule an extra meeting early in August if they were not able to settle their budget at the July 28th meeting.

Busey returned and distributed a document with the requested budget information. She explained the document showed the original budget request received from the agencies in the first column and in the second column the original requests with the removal of the Senior Wellness and Mobile Unit Programs. These cuts leave a deficit of \$147,000 in FY2010. This amount was then distributed as an across the board cut of 16.59% to the remaining requests to balance the budget. Busey listed the resulting budget amounts for each agency after the 16.59% cut. The fund balance would remain the same at \$334,776, which is \$150,000 higher than the 25% fund balance goal. The \$150,000 could be considered as discretionary funds if it needs to be used towards an emergency expense.

MOTION by James to approve the proposed FY2010 budget with the cuts to balance the budget and to discuss the use of the fund balance as options arise; seconded by Peterson.

Rappaport offered an amendment to add \$4,148 to the Crisis Nursery program line. James declined to consider the amendment as friendly.

MOTION by Rappaport to amend the motion on the floor to add \$4,148 to the Crisis Nursery program line; seconded by Gowda.

Rappaport asked if there was a need for further discussion on the amendment. James stated he did not like singling out one agency when all the others would be cut. He expressed that he has seen some good services out of the mobile unit, which was cut. He thought it was unfair to not treat all the agencies equally. Rappaport said he did not know what the implications would be of not matching the Mental Health Board's funding of \$25,000. Ramirez wanted to know if the agencies would be questioned as to whether or not they could perform the programs on the reduced funding. She was concerned about the Smile Healthy program and the reduction to CUPHD's core services by about \$115,000. The CUPHD personnel were no longer present at the meeting to respond to the questions, which worried Ramirez. She would also like to know an estimate for the vaccination cost. She felt there was not enough information to finalize a budget without hearing from the 3

affected agencies. Peterson and Rappaport agreed the intention was to vote on a proposed budget and give the agencies a chance to respond. Ramirez understood the idea of reserving money for the vaccines, but wondered if doing so by cutting the core services was helping CUPHD. Busey suggested the BOH consider the proposed budget as a preliminary measure to give the agencies an opportunity to comment. She described how the County's General Corporate Fund department heads were asked to prepare their FY2010 budgets with the cuts and an explanation of what those cuts would mean to the departments. Then the County Board will decide if they will require those cuts. Busey said the BOH needs to give the agencies somewhere to start. If the BOH decided it could not impose the cut on an agency once it saw the agency's response, then the BOH could determine whether they would spend some of the \$150,000 in the fund balance.

Rappaport withdrew his motion on the basis of Busey's recommendation. He stated the BOH was voting on a proposed budget and would be as responsive as it could to the feedback it receives from agencies. Rappaport asked how to communicate this to the agencies. Peterson said Rappaport should write a letter as the BOH President giving the proposed budget for the agency next year and inviting comments. Rappaport asked for Busey's help with the letters. Busey recommended asking the agencies to present the services they would provide for the proposed dollar amounts. Scholze wanted to see the agencies' responses before the July meeting so the members have a chance to think about the response in advance of the meeting. The BOH agreed to hold a study session on July 14th to receive information and have a discussion about the FY2010 budget.

Motion carried with all ayes.

Treasurer's Report

Approval of CUPHD Invoice for April 2009

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

Issues Regarding CUPHD

All CUPHD issues were discussed during the budget presentation.

Issues Regarding Smile Healthy (Kassem)

All Smile Healthy issues were discussed during the budget presentation. Greenwalt agreed to email Smile Healthy's audited financial statement for the year ending December 31, 2008 to Bork so they could be forwarded to the Board.

Other Business

Public Health in Peril: The Call to Action

Ramirez pointed out the conference pre-survey is in the agenda packet. It was interesting that primary prevention is the first area to be cut although it is one of the priorities everyone supports. She noted primary prevention was not even being discussed in the BOH's budget. The 3

major public health associations want to come together and focus on 3 major priorities: data information systems, public health system infrastructure, and primary prevention services. They are trying to unite to have a political voice and to be a priority in funding. Often public health and human services are lesser priorities because the areas do not have political action committees or unions to exert political pull.

NALBOH Welcome Packet

Bork showed the BOH the NALBOH welcome packet. The first NALBOH newsletter was included in the Board's envelopes with their agenda packets. Ramirez stated she had requested the NALBOH survey results for Illinois because those will be useful for future planning purposes.

Public Participation on Non-Agenda Items Only

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

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kat Bork
Board of Health Secretary

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