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Objectives

1. Describe trends in budget, workforce, and program cuts at local health departments (LHDs) from a series of three (3) NACCHO Job Loss and Program Cuts surveys conducted between 2008–2010.
2. Examine infrastructure characteristics that are associated with an increased likelihood of budget cuts.
Methods

Primary data source: **NACCHO’s Job Loss and Program Cuts Survey**

- **Purpose:** To quantify and describe the impact of the economic recession on the budget, workforce, and programs of local health departments (LHDs).
- **Data** are weighted to account for sampling and non-response, thus producing national-level estimates.
- **Three survey “waves” to date:**
  - Wave 1: November–December 2008 (Modified census design)
  - Wave 2: July–August 2009 (Stratified random sample)
  - Wave 3: January–February 2010 (Stratified random sample)

Additional data was matched from the 2008 *National Profile of Local Health Departments*

- **Variables:** Revenue sources, Expenditures per capita, Local Boards of Health

Descriptive statistics and hypothesis testing (e.g., $\chi^2$, t-test) conducted using SPSS v.18. Stata v.10 was used to produce confidence intervals.
Methods

Number and response rates for data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Sampled</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NACCHO’s Job Loss and Program Cuts Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1 (Nov.–Dec. 2008)</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2 (July–Aug. 2009)</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3 (Jan.–Feb. 2010)</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Profile of Local Health Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Profile Study</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget
Budget Cuts

Proportion of LHDs with Lower Budget in Current Year than Previous Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would have lower budget were it not for one-time funding such as that from the American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) or H1N1 Supplemental Funds.

Budget Cuts – 2008

Proportion of LHDs with Lower Budget in December 2008 as Compared to Previous Year (n=1066)


Late 2008: More than half of LHDs have budget cuts in 7 states

LEGEND
- 0-25%
- 26-50%
- 51-75%
- 76-100%
- Insufficient data
Budget Cuts – 2009

Proportion of LHDs with Lower Budget in July 2009 as Compared to Previous Year (n=608)

Mid-2009: More than half of LHDs have budget cuts in 20 states

Source: NACCHO Survey of LHD Budget Cuts & Workforce Reduction (July 2009).
Budget Cuts – 2010 (at first glance)

Proportion of LHDs with Lower Budget in January 2010 as Compared to Previous Year (n=687)

Early 2010: More than half of LHDs have budget cuts in 14 states

Source: NACCHO Survey of LHD Budget Cuts & Workforce Reduction (January 2010).
Budget Cuts – 2010 (at second glance)

Proportion of LHDs with Lower Budget in January 2010 as Compared to Previous Year, Excluding One-Time Funding such as ARRA or H1N1 Funding (n=687)

Early 2010: More than half of LHDs have cuts to core funding in 26 states

Source: NACCHO Survey of LHD Budget Cuts & Workforce Reduction (January 2010).
Budget Cuts - What does this mean?

ARRA & H1N1 supplemental funding are helping to fill a gap, but LHDs continue to suffer from cuts to their core funding.

- To date, 42% of LHDs have received ARRA funds, either directly or as pass-through from states.
- Almost a third (32%) of LHDs have use reserve funds in order to cover expenses this year.
- Sixty-two percent of the U.S. population lived in the jurisdiction of an LHD that was affected by a cut to core funding this year.

Source: NACCHO Survey of LHD Budget Cuts & Workforce Reduction (January 2010).
Budget cuts

Proportion of LHDs with Various Magnitudes of Budget Cuts (without excluding one-time funding), as a Proportion of Total Revenue (n=230)

- 20% Loss or Greater: 7%
- 10-19.9% Loss: 34%
- 7-9.9% Loss: 15%
- 5-6.9% Loss: 19%
- 3-4.9% Loss: 10%
- 1-2.9% Loss: 16%
- 20% Loss or Greater: 7%

Source: NACCHO Survey of LHD Budget Cuts & Workforce Reduction (January 2010).
Budget cuts

Proportion of LHDs with Various Magnitudes of Budget Cuts, as a Proportion of Total Revenue, by Size of Population Served (n=667)

- **< 25,000**
  - 1-5% Budget Loss: 9%
  - 5-10% Budget Loss: 8%
  - 10%+ Budget Loss: 13%
  - No Budget Loss: 69%

- **25,000-49,999**
  - 1-5% Budget Loss: 7%
  - 5-10% Budget Loss: 8%
  - 10%+ Budget Loss: 16%
  - No Budget Loss: 70%

- **50,000-99,999**
  - 1-5% Budget Loss: 11%
  - 5-10% Budget Loss: 14%
  - 10%+ Budget Loss: 15%
  - No Budget Loss: 61%

- **100,000-499,999**
  - 1-5% Budget Loss: 9%
  - 5-10% Budget Loss: 18%
  - 10%+ Budget Loss: 10%
  - No Budget Loss: 64%

- **500,000+**
  - 1-5% Budget Loss: 17%
  - 5-10% Budget Loss: 20%
  - 10%+ Budget Loss: 18%
  - No Budget Loss: 45%

Source: NACCHO Survey of LHD Budget Cuts & Workforce Reduction (January 2010).
## Budget cuts

Median and Mean Budget Loss for LHDs with at Least 1% lower budget, by Size of Population Served (n=199)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Population Served</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$19,000–35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 – 49,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$66,000–184,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 – 99,999</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$128,000–223,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 – 499,999</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$334,000</td>
<td>$535,000</td>
<td>$370,000–700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000+</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$1,625,000</td>
<td>$2,341,000</td>
<td>$1,546,000–3,136,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>$305,000</td>
<td>$218,000–391,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NACCHO Survey of LHD Budget Cuts & Workforce Reduction (January 2010).
Voices from the Field

“By July 1, 2010, this department will have lost half (or more) of its local funding and at least one-third of its staff.”

- Local health official, Western Region, January 2010
Workforce
Workforce Cuts

Proportion of LHDs Affected by Job Losses and Cuts to Staff Hours or Imposed Furlough between July 1–Dec. 31, 2009 (n=716–718)

- Lost Staff to Layoffs or Attrition: LHDs Affected; 46%
- Cut Staff Hours or Imposed Furlough: LHDs Affected; 23%

Source: NACCHO Survey of LHD Budget Cuts & Workforce Reduction (January 2010).
Workforce Cuts

Proportion of LHDs Affected by Job Losses and Cuts to Staff Hours or Imposed Furlough between July 1–Dec. 31, 2009 and Proportion of U.S. Population Living in Jurisdictions of Affected LHDs (n=716–718)

- Lost Staff to Layoffs or Attrition: LHDs Affected; 46%
- Cut Staff Hours or Imposed Furlough: LHDs Affected; 23%
- U.S. Population in Affected Jurisdictions:
  - 73%
  - 26%

Source: NACCHO Survey of LHD Budget Cuts & Workforce Reduction (January 2010).
## Workforce Cuts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs Lost to Layoffs or Attrition</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Intervals</td>
<td>6,200–9,400</td>
<td>6,000–9,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff with Reduced Hours or Mandatory Furlough</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>13,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Intervals</td>
<td>6,900–16,800</td>
<td>8,400–18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% LHDs that lost staff</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Jan.–Dec. 2009, LHDs lost a cumulative 15,500 jobs due to layoffs or attrition.

Source: NACCHO Surveys of LHD Budget Cuts & Workforce Reduction (January 2009; September 2009; January 2010). Note that sampling design varied across surveys.
Workforce cuts

Proportion of LHDs that Lost Jobs Due to Layoffs or Attrition (July–December 2009; n=706)

More than half of LHDs lost jobs in 26 states

Source: NACCHO Survey of LHD Budget Cuts & Workforce Reduction (January 2010).
“How do we continue to attract public health professionals into our health departments when other [employers] offer financial stability and a brighter future?”

- Local health official, Eastern Region, January 2010
Programs
Program Cuts

Proportion of LHDs with Program Cuts in Calendar Year 2009 Due to Budgetary Reasons (n=694)

50% of LHDs made cuts to at least one program area during 2009

Source: NACCHO Survey of LHD Budget Cuts & Workforce Reduction (January 2010).
Program Cuts

Proportion of LHDs with Program Cuts in Calendar Year 2009 Due to Budgetary Reasons, by Program Area (n=704)

- Population-Based Primary Prevention
- Maternal and Child Health
- Clinical Health Services
- Chronic Disease Screening/Treatment
- Environmental Health
- Immunization
- Communicable Disease Screening/Treatment
- Food Safety
- Epidemiology and Surveillance
- Emergency Preparedness

Source: NACCHO Survey of LHD Budget Cuts & Workforce Reduction (January 2010).
Program Cuts

Proportion of LHDs with Program Cuts in Calendar Year 2009 Due to Budgetary Reasons and Proportion of U.S. Population Living in Affected Jurisdictions, by Program Area (n=704)

- Population-Based Primary Prevention
- Maternal and Child Health
- Clinical Health Services
- Chronic Disease Screening/Treatment
- Environmental Health
- Immunization
- Communicable Disease Screening/Treatment
- Food Safety
- Epidemiology and Surveillance
- Emergency Preparedness

Source: NACCHO Survey of LHD Budget Cuts & Workforce Reduction (January 2010).
Voices from the Field

“We are getting farther and farther away from true prevention. To stop disease, we do contact tracing rather than education and screening. To stop waterborne illness we respond to bad water tests rather than work to make all wells safe. We response to Child Protective Services referrals rather than run parenting classes. This is the frustration of public health in my underfunded public health environment.”

- Local health official, Northwestern region, January 2010
Infrastructural Characteristics Associated with Budget Cuts
Infrastructural Characteristics Associated with Budget Cuts
Variation by Size of Population Served

Proportion of LHDs Reporting Lower Budget in Current Year as Compared to Previous Year, by Size of Population Served (n=696)*

* At least two of these proportions are significantly different based on Somer’s D and Kendal’s Tau C.

Infrastructural Characteristics Associated with Budget Cuts
Variation by Revenue from Sources

Proportion of Revenue from Diverse Sources for LHDs with Budget Cuts and LHDs without Budget Cuts (n=470–489)

* Proportions are significantly different based on t-test.

Infrastructural Characteristics Associated with Budget Cuts

Variation by Governance Type

Proportion of LHDs with Lower Budget in Current Year, Excluding One-Time Funding, by Governance Type, Controlling for Size of Population Served (n=696)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Population</th>
<th>Percentage of LHDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50,000</td>
<td>State: 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local: 52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000–499,999</td>
<td>State: 54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local: 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 or more</td>
<td>State: 77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local: 72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>State: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local: 54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant difference in proportions between state-governed and locally-governed LHDs, based on $\chi^2$.}

Source: NACCHO Surveys of LHD Budget Cuts & Workforce Reduction (January 2010).
Proportion of LHDs Reporting Budget Cuts, by Size of Population Served and Existence of Board of Health (n=620)

- Small (< 50,000): 49% Has BOH, 49% Does not have BOH
- Medium (50,000 - 499,999): 54% Has BOH, 70% Does not have BOH
- Large (500,000+): 63% Has BOH, 87% Does not have BOH
- Overall: 51% Has BOH, 61% Does not have BOH

* Statistically significant difference in proportions between state-governed and locally-governed LHDs, based on $\chi^2$.
None of these differences were statistically significant based on t-test. “Large” category approaches significance (p=.057).

Future of the Survey

- Key questions will be integrated in 2010 National Profile Study of LHDs – Profile will also provide a more comprehensive understanding of budget, workforce, and program changes.

- Job Loss and Program Cuts survey run in January 2011.

- Exploring potential of conducting modified version of survey in future to monitor the financial health of LHDs.
For additional information…

As results are available, they will be posted on NACCHO Web site at:
www.naccho.org/advocacy/lhdbudgets.cfm

For additional information or to provide feedback, please contact:
Rachel Willard
rwillard@naccho.org
202/ 756-0164
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