

Local Health Department Job Losses and Program Cuts: State-Level Tables from January/February 2012 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 2012. This survey was the seventh in a series of nationally representative surveys designed to measure the impact of the economic recession on LHDs' jobs, budgets, and programs. Even though the country as a whole shows signs of economic recovery, survey findings demonstrate that LHDs continue to suffer from deep cuts that inhibit their ability to provide essential services to their communities. The national estimates are available on NACCHO's website (www.naccho.org/jobloss). The data presented in the following pages supplement the overview of findings by providing information on cuts to budgets, jobs, and programs for many states.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT:

Christine Brickman Bhutta, PhD
Senior Research Scientist,
Research and Evaluation
202-471-1206
cbhutta@naccho.org

Methodology

In January and February 2012, NACCHO surveyed 957 LHDs, selected as part of a statistically random sample designed to provide both national and state-level estimates. A total of 663 LHDs distributed across 47 states participated for a response rate of 69 percent. 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 5U38HM000449-04 from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Its contents are solely the responsibility of NACCHO and do not necessarily represent the official views of the sponsors.



Public Health
Prevent. Promote. Protect.

TABLE 1. PERCENTAGE OF LHDS WITH CUTS TO STAFF AND PROGRAMS, BY STATE (CALENDAR YEAR 2011)

State ¹	Loss of staff (layoffs and/or attrition)	Reduced staff time (cut hours and/or furlough) ²	Made cuts to at least one program ²	Made cuts to three or more programs ²	Number of Responses ³
	%	%	%	%	
AR	39	12	19	6	16–20
AZ	56	37	100	43	8–9
CO	42	34	72	30	14–15
CT	7	27	27	13	13–15
DE	50	0	100	50	2
FL	100	17	97	76	17–18
IA	33	22	55	26	18
ID	83	0	83	50	6
IL	63	37	66	41	24–25
KS	31	9	32	10	22–23
KY	75	19	58	25	15–16
MA	16	12	39	18	45–47
MD	89	32	85	58	8
MI	62	65	92	63	11–12
MN	52	49	66	39	22
MO	58	41	70	47	29–30
MS	89	39	56	33	8–9
MT	12	22	50	28	10
NC	71	26	75	22	21–23
ND	11	13	61	30	10
NE	35	11	47	16	8
NH	40	20	*	*	4
NJ	53	32	71	47	24–26
NM	40	0	80	60	5
NV	50	0	50	25	3–4
NY	65	29	77	18	16–17
OH	46	29	73	34	26–27
OK	30	3	19	0	14–19
OR	34	19	72	30	11–12
PA	40	0	81	40	6–7
SC	63	13	88	50	7–8
TN	11	1	56	3	25–27
TX	61	22	39	17	12–14
UT	61	*	64	56	7–8
VA	37	0	47	0	10–11
VT	0	0	9	0	11–12
WA	71	48	85	46	12–13
WI	49	7	64	36	20
WV	8	0	31	0	12–13
Overall¹	44	21	57	28	627–647

¹ States with no LHDs (Hawaii and Rhode Island) and insufficient response rates (AK, AL, CA, GA, IN, LA, ME, WY) have been omitted from this table. South Dakota was excluded from the study because it was unable to provide the requested information for its local units. However, overall proportions reflect data from all respondents.

² An asterisk (*) indicates an insufficient response rate for this item.

³ The number of responses varied slightly by question. The range is shown here.

TABLE 2. PERCENTAGE OF LHDS WITH AND EXPECTING BUDGETS CUTS, BY STATE

State ¹	Current budget less than last year	Expect budget to be lower next year ²	Number of Responses ³
	%	%	
AR	39	34	18–20
AZ	61	31	9
CO	80	53	15
CT	14	13	15
DE	0	0	2
FL	93	93	18
IA	28	12	18
ID	100	50	6
IL	58	48	21–24
KS	21	18	24
KY	31	81	16
MA	20	12	47–49
MD	22	22	8
MI	77	74	11–12
MN	56	16	22
MO	61	62	27–29
MS	44	100	8–9
MT	39	50	10
NC	62	55	23
ND	18	29	9–10
NE	19	5	8
NH	50	20	4
NJ	52	30	22–25
NM	40	40	5
NV	50	75	4
NY	44	56	14–16
OH	48	47	27
OK	11	16	17–18
OR	28	50	12–13
PA	33	54	7
SC	63	67	7–8
TN	6	11	25–27
TX	74	*	14
UT	36	24	7–8
VA	9	59	11
VT	75	82	11–12
WA	66	71	12–13
WI	51	45	19–20
WV	23	26	11–13
Overall¹	41	41	619–951

¹ States with no LHDS (Hawaii and Rhode Island) and insufficient response rates (AK, AL, CA, GA, IN, LA, ME, WY) have been omitted from this table. South Dakota was excluded from the study because it was unable to provide the requested information for its local units. However, overall proportions reflect data from all respondents.

² An asterisk (*) indicates an insufficient response rate for this item.

³ The number of responses varied slightly by question. The range is shown here.