

## Local Health Department Budget Cuts and Job Losses: State-Level Tables from the 2015 Forces of Change Study



### Background

Since 2008, the National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO) has periodically surveyed local health departments (LHDs) across the United States to assess the impact of the economic recession on LHDs. The results have consistently demonstrated LHDs' funding challenges and the negative impacts on LHD infrastructures. The national estimates are available on NACCHO's Forces of Change webpage at <http://www.nacchoprofilestudy.org/forces-of-change>. The data presented in the following pages supplement these findings by providing information on cuts to budgets and jobs for many states.

### Methods

NACCHO distributed the Forces of Change Survey to a statistically representative sample of 948 LHDs in the United States from January to February 2015. A total of 690 LHDs completed the survey (response rate of 73%). NACCHO generated national statistics using estimation weights to account for sampling and non-response. All data were self-reported; NACCHO did not independently verify the data provided by LHDs. A detailed description of survey methodology is available on NACCHO's Forces of Change webpage at <http://www.nacchoprofilestudy.org/forces-of-change>.

### Acknowledgments

This document was supported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (Cooperative Agreement #5U38OT000172-02) and by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation in Princeton, NJ. NACCHO is grateful for this support. Its contents are solely the responsibility of NACCHO and do not necessarily represent the official views of the sponsors.

### FOR MORE INFORMATION

Please contact the Research & Evaluation Team at [research@naccho.org](mailto:research@naccho.org).

**TABLE 1: PERCENTAGE OF LHDS WITH CUTS TO STAFF, BY STATE**

State <sup>1</sup>	Loss of Staff (Layoffs or Attrition)	Layoffs	Attrition	Number of Responses <sup>2</sup>
AL	41%	20%	37%	18–19
AR	15%	0%	15%	21–22
AZ	48%	22%	33%	7
CA	22%	0%	22%	10
CO	26%	0%	26%	16
CT	6%	0%	6%	15
DE	100%	0%	100%	2
GA	75%	13%	75%	8
IA	26%	7%	18%	23–25
ID	71%	17%	71%	6–7
IL	56%	21%	50%	22
IN	26%	0%	26%	16
KS	17%	5%	13%	27–28
KY	46%	19%	38%	16–17
LA	43%	0%	43%	8
MA	6%	3%	6%	33–34
MD	77%	25%	77%	8–9
ME	50%	13%	50%	8–10
MI	37%	8%	37%	14
MN	15%	0%	15%	19
MO	41%	5%	38%	26–30
MS	75%	0%	75%	8
MT	19%	19%	0%	10–11
NC	59%	37%	42%	20
ND	9%	0%	9%	11–12
NE	33%	33%	24%	7–8
NJ	19%	6%	13%	18
NM	83%	17%	83%	6
NV	25%	25%	25%	4
NY	50%	30%	50%	19
OH	33%	3%	33%	30
OK	20%	0%	18%	16–17
OR	16%	3%	15%	10–12
PA	66%	16%	50%	8
SC	25%	0%	25%	4
SD	0%	0%	0%	5
TN	21%	1%	21%	29–30
TX	38%	18%	33%	16
VA	38%	0%	38%	9–10
VT	13%	0%	13%	7
WA	63%	25%	53%	11–12
WV	36%	13%	28%	14–15
WY	10%	5%	10%	7
<b>Overall<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>646–664</b>

<sup>1</sup>States with no LHDs (HI and RI) and insufficient response rates (AK, DC, NH, UT, WI) have been omitted from this table. FL has been removed as requested. However, overall proportions reflect data from all respondents.

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

**TABLE 2: PERCENTAGE OF LHDS WITH AND EXPECTING BUDGET CUTS, BY STATE**

State <sup>1</sup>	Current Budget Less Than Last Year	Expect Budget to be Lower Next Year	Number of Responses <sup>2</sup>
AL	40%	21%	19
AR	9%	16%	17–18
AZ	37%	30%	7
CA	8%	16%	10
CO	20%	20%	16
CT	6%	16%	13–15
DE	0%	0%	2
GA	14%	29%	7
IA	16%	20%	25
ID	14%	0%	7
IL	35%	42%	20–22
IN	19%	13%	15–16
KS	20%	25%	27
KY	20%	39%	17
LA	47%	no data	4–8
MA	12%	6%	37
MD	39%	90%	10
ME	10%	no data	3–10
MI	0%	21%	13–14
MN	18%	35%	19
MO	21%	39%	26–30
MS	25%	29%	7–8
MT	18%	9%	11
NC	27%	35%	20–21
ND	9%	0%	11–12
NE	33%	0%	8
NJ	25%	25%	17
NM	50%	67%	6
NV	25%	0%	3–4
NY	54%	36%	19
OH	20%	20%	30
OK	6%	40%	17
OR	21%	27%	10–12
PA	20%	7%	8–9
SC	0%	0%	4
SD	0%	0%	4–5
TN	15%	5%	30–31
TX	17%	0%	16–17
VA	18%	41%	10
WA	36%	26%	12
WV	34%	64%	14–15
WY	0%	4%	8
<b>Overall<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>632–666</b>

<sup>1</sup>States with no LHDS (HI and RI) and insufficient data (AK, DC, NH, UT, VT, WI) have been omitted from this table. Some results in LA and ME have been removed because of low item-specific response rates. FL has been removed as requested. However, overall proportions reflect data from all respondents.

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