

## Local Health Department Job Losses and Program Cuts: State-Level Tables from January/February 2010 Survey

### Introduction

The National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO) surveyed a sample of local health departments (LHDs) nationwide in the months of January and February 2010. This survey was the third in a series of nationally representative surveys designed to measure the impact of the economic recession on LHDs' jobs, budgets, and programs. Survey findings demonstrate that LHDs across the country face deepening cuts to their revenue that are undermining their ability to protect the public from environmental hazards, preventable diseases, and other threats to public health. The complete findings are available on NACCHO's Web site at [www.naccho.org/advocacy/lhdbudget.cfm](http://www.naccho.org/advocacy/lhdbudget.cfm). The tables on the following pages supplement the overview of findings by providing information about job loss, budgets, and program cuts in LHDs for many states.

### Methodology

In January and February 2010, NACCHO surveyed 997 LHDs. These LHDs were selected as part of a statistically random sample designed to provide both national and state-level estimates. A total of 721 LHDs distributed across 48 states participated for a response rate of 72 percent. All statistics reported were developed using appropriate weights to account for both sampling and non-response. All data in this study were self-reported; NACCHO did not independently verify the data provided by LHDs.

### Acknowledgments

This document was supported by Award Number 5U38HM000449-02 from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of CDC. NACCHO is grateful for this support.

#### FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT:

**Rachel Willard, MPH**  
Senior Analyst

P (202) 756-0164  
F (202) 783-1583  
[rwillard@naccho.org](mailto:rwillard@naccho.org)

LHDs across the country face deepening cuts to their revenue that are undermining their ability to protect the public...

**TABLE 1: PERCENTAGE OF LHDS WITH CUTS IN STAFFING FROM JULY TO DECEMBER 2009, BY STATE**

State	Loss of Staff (Layoffs & Attrition)	Reduced Staff Time (Hours Cut & Furlough)	Number of Responses <sup>1</sup>
AL	31%	0%	18
AR	53%	0%	15
AZ	57%	33%	8–9
CA	93%	27%	15
CO	61%	19%	19
CT	41%	39%	18–19
DE	100%	50%	2
FL	81%	10%	20
GA	35%	34%	17
IA	18%	16%	25
ID	100%	29%	7
IL	74%	34%	24
IN	29%	19%	24
KS	28%	14%	29
KY	52%	9%	16–17
LA	90%	0%	7
MA	18%	30%	45
MD	100%	100%	8
ME	100%	50%	2
MI	84%	64%	14
MN	61%	20%	22–23
MO	40%	19%	31
MS	33%	0%	4
MT	33%	0%	12
NC	80%	14%	23
ND	18%	0%	11
NE	29%	25%	9
NH	100%	50%	2
NJ	34%	24%	29
NM	100%	100%	4
NV	100%	25%	4
NY	87%	24%	17
OH	72%	43%	34
OK	74%	1%	16
OR	27%	27%	13
PA	73%	36%	11
SC	100%	33%	6–8
TN	52%	2%	30–31
TX	31%	14%	24–25
VA	75%	14%	9
VT	42%	0%	4
WA	74%	56%	9
WI	28%	12%	25–26
WV	31%	31%	12
WY	26%	26%	6
<b>Overall<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>715–718</b>

<sup>1</sup> The number of responses varied slightly by question. The range is shown here.

<sup>2</sup> States with no LHDs (Hawaii and Rhode Island) or insufficient response (Alaska, South Dakota, and Utah) have been omitted from this table. However, overall proportions reflect data from all respondents.

**TABLE 2: PERCENTAGE OF LHDS WITH BUDGET CUTS, PERCENTAGE USING RESERVE FUNDS, AND PERCENTAGE RECEIVING ECONOMIC STIMULUS FUNDS<sup>1</sup> BY STATE**

State	Decrease in Current Year's Budget	Decrease in Current Year's Budget when One-Time Funding is Excluded	Anticipated Decrease in Next Year's Budget	Used Reserve Funds to Meet Budget Needs	Received Economic Stimulus Funds	Number of Responses <sup>2</sup>
AL	2%	25%	34%	24%	52%	17-18
AR	37%	48%	27%	16%	17%	12-15
AZ	56%	56%	60%	47%	60%	9
CA	75%	86%	75%	63%	63%	15-16
CO	31%	55%	52%	26%	63%	16-19
CT	35%	48%	35%	21%	9%	18-19
DE	50%	50%	100%	0%	100%	2
FL	19%	60%	64%	30%	75%	20
GA	62%	69%	60%	60%	61%	15-17
IA	24%	50%	51%	21%	76%	21-25
ID	100%	100%	100%	86%	14%	6-7
IL	25%	66%	57%	74%	81%	23-24
IN	33%	35%	47%	47%	9%	23-24
KS	13%	21%	25%	33%	14%	28-29
KY	20%	32%	51%	55%	57%	17
LA	50%	90%	80%	0%	60%	5-7
MA	50%	61%	36%	11%	8%	41-45
MD	88%	88%	79%	17%	71%	8
ME	100%	100%	100%	50%	50%	2
MI	49%	71%	64%	33%	74%	14
MN	30%	39%	38%	26%	53%	22-23
MO	37%	79%	67%	41%	32%	30-31
MS	30%	56%	67%	33%	100%	4
MT	15%	39%	33%	24%	39%	12
NC	31%	49%	55%	60%	79%	22-23
ND	11%	19%	10%	39%	18%	11
NE	0%	0%	38%	44%	8%	8-9
NH	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2
NJ	51%	55%	34%	17%	23%	26-29
NM	75%	75%	100%	67%	25%	3-4
NV	33%	67%	67%	0%	25%	3
NY	6%	25%	65%	14%	95%	16-17
OH	31%	63%	38%	37%	41%	32-34
OK	41%	41%	74%	62%	68%	16
OR	35%	62%	41%	39%	91%	12-13
PA	55%	100%	64%	20%	55%	10-11
SC	88%	100%	100%	75%	38%	8
TN	32%	41%	41%	10%	53%	30-31
TX	35%	39%	26%	9%	19%	23-25
VA	89%	89%	100%	29%	29%	8-9
VT	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	4
WA	100%	100%	69%	47%	14%	9
WI	22%	41%	31%	16%	74%	25-26
WV	29%	54%	26%	35%	0%	11-12
WY	57%	57%	65%	26%	91%	6
<b>Overall<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>684-721</b>

<sup>1</sup> Funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

<sup>2</sup> The number of responses varied by question. The range is shown here.

<sup>3</sup> States with no LHDs (Hawaii and Rhode Island) or insufficient response (Alaska, South Dakota, and Utah) have been omitted from this table. However, overall proportions reflect data from all respondents.

**TABLE 3: PERCENTAGE OF LHDS WITH CUTS TO PROGRAMMATIC AREAS IN CALENDAR YEAR 2009, BY STATE**

State	Cuts to at Least One Programmatic Area	Cuts to Three or More Programmatic Areas	Number of Responses
AL	0%	0%	17
AR	15%	7%	14
AZ	87%	40%	9
CA	94%	68%	16
CO	52%	28%	19
CT	52%	30%	18
DE	100%	100%	2
FL	59%	33%	19
GA	77%	34%	16
IA	49%	11%	24
ID	100%	100%	7
IL	69%	46%	24
IN	37%	12%	22
KS	23%	14%	29
KY	36%	16%	15
LA	60%	30%	7
MA	39%	28%	42
MD	100%	100%	8
ME	100%	50%	2
MI	64%	42%	14
MN	61%	43%	23
MO	53%	33%	31
MS	33%	0%	4
MT	33%	0%	12
NC	74%	29%	23
ND	39%	29%	11
NE	29%	29%	9
NH	50%	0%	2
NJ	32%	18%	28
NM	100%	75%	4
NV	67%	67%	3
NY	55%	22%	18
OH	85%	47%	34
OK	69%	33%	16
OR	53%	35%	13
PA	82%	36%	11
SC	100%	100%	8
TN	35%	18%	31
TX	27%	12%	24
VA	40%	40%	9
VT	50%	0%	4
WA	74%	62%	9
WI	48%	24%	26
WV	24%	0%	11
WY	44%	44%	6
<b>Overall</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>704<sup>1</sup></b>

<sup>1</sup> States with no LHDS (Hawaii and Rhode Island) or insufficient response (Alaska, South Dakota, and Utah) have been omitted from this table. However, overall proportions reflect data from all respondents.

**NACCHO**

National Association of County & City Health Officials

The National Connection for Local Public Health

[www.naccho.org](http://www.naccho.org)



**Public Health**

Prevent. Promote. Protect.

NACCHO is the national organization representing local health departments. NACCHO supports efforts that protect and improve the health of all people and all communities by promoting national policy, developing resources and programs, seeking health equity, and supporting effective local public health practice and systems.

1100 17th St, NW, 2nd Floor Washington, DC 20036

P (202) 783 5550 F (202) 783 1583