NEW FILE BEGINS

Doc #153

RMP FLORIDA

RM# 00024

JULY/AUGUST 1974 REVIEW

This application requests $1,480,730 for support of 27 new program proposals, none of which were included in the May Application.

Seven of these proposals relate to Florida RMP's Objective I -

" To enhance the availability of existing health care services throughout the region, particularly those directed at special health problems, in order to bring health services to those not being served."

Four to Objective II -

" To extend primary health care services to Florida's disadvantaged populations, rural and urban."

Eleven to Objective III -

" To promote coordination of existing health services in order to enhance utilization, accessibility, availability, acceptability, and quality."

Five to Objective IV -

" To provide opportunities to improve and expand health care services through educational and demonstrative activities."

The CHP agencies are involved in the review process from the time an application is received. There are no adverse CHP comments on these proposals. CHP comments are enclosed in the application.

In this review cycle, Florida RMP considered 53 applications, turned down 26 of these in the amount of $3,300,000, and forwarded 27 for funding.

DRMP/OD/7-15-74

JULY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Critique:

MAY 15,1974 REQUESTED FUNDS LISTING OSM-PWB010-23
COMPONENTS BY REGION
06/74 COUNCI

FLORIDA PROG YR 05

CENTRAL	COMP NO	COMPONENT TITLE	DIRECT REQUEST	INDIRECT REQUEST	TOTAL REQUEST	Allocation Decision
	C000	PROGRAM STAFF	398,792	0	398,792	398,792
	C235	FLA PERINATAL	212,482	0	212,482	164,603
	C267	MAST PROG W CENT FLA	9,740	0	9,740	9,740
	046B	HOSP INF SURVEIL TAMPA	21,493	2,011	23,504	23,504
	124	COMMUNITY BASED HYPT CNTRL PALM BEACH	32,653	2,552	35,205	31,685
	126	EMS FROSTPROOF AREA MIGRANT WORKERS	40,860	0	40,860	33,548
	130Y	SITUATIONAL ANAL HYPT	42,356	17,644	60,000	54,000
	131Y	HOSP INFECT SURVEIL	66,718	13,343	80,061	72,055
	134Y	AREA WIDE HLTH PLNG SUPP REG VIII A	15,000	0	15,000	15,000
	162	CHARACTERISTICS HOME CARE NURSG SERV	33,533	16,467	50,000	50,000
	163	BURN REGISTRY EST STDS CARE	111,695	25,876	137,571	62,531
	169	COMMUNITY ORGAN DONOR	29,645	12,827	42,472	36,101
	177	COMMUNITY HLTH ADVOCATE	67,000	28,763	95,763	86,180
	179	SO DADE HLTH	71,080	0	71,080	63,972
	189	SYS CONT ED NURS	100,000	0	100,000	90,000
	190	CV RISK FACTOR REVERSAL	90,000	3,605	93,605	93,605
	193	PUB HLTH NURSG TRNG	20,000	0	20,000	20,000
	194	WARNING SIGNS STROKE	41,645	12,355	54,000	48,600
	196	CLINICAL NUTRITION	7,784	2,980	10,764	9,688
	200	COMMUNITY DIETARY SERV	36,547	2,421	38,968	38,968
	207	PT ED IN FAMILY PRAC SETTING	33,288	6,658	39,946	35,951
	210	BILINGUAL CMNC SYS	85,000	36,317	121,317	85,000

LORIDA PROG YR 05

CENTRAL	COMP NO	COMPONENT TITLE	DIRECT REQUEST	INDIRECT REQUEST	TOTAL REQUEST	Allocation Decision
	214	MED ONCOLOGY	55,924	19,076	75,000	75,000
	220	DRUG INF AND PHAR RES CTR	32,474	10,321	42,795	42,795
	223	VISITORS NEEDS FOR HLTH CARE	150,932	37,793	188,725	141,543
	230	HLTH CARE DOLLAR FLOW STUDY	20,000	0	20,000	18,000
	232	FAMILY PRACTICE SATELLITE	85,589	6,847	92,436	78,570
	236	IMPROV HLTH CARE ASSESS	287,010	0	287,010	215,257
	241	SURGI CTR STUDY	10,000	0	10,000	10,000
	243	STATEWIDE RES HLTH MNPWR	53,750	21,250	75,000	75,000
	248	MODEL DENT SERV	49,675	4,655	54,330	48,897
	249	NURSE MIDWIFERY SERV	77,175	10,249	87,424	69,940
	250	DEL MATERNAL HLTH CARE SERV	69,800	5,541	75,341	60,270
	259	CONT ED ORAL CA	16,600	0	16,600	16,600
	265	ACUTE CRITICAL CARE SERV	89,104	10,896	100,000	90,064
	269	STATEWIDE POOL MECH TEACH EQUIP AV AIDS	125,000	0	125,000	100,000
COMPONENTS 36		REGION TOTALS	2,690,344	310,447	3,000,791	2,565,459

MAY/JUNE 1974 REVIEW

Request: $3,000,791

Committee Recommendation: $2,700,000

Overall Assessment by Individual Reviewers: Superior

Critique:

Considered by reviewers to be well organized with good leadership, program staff, excellent RAG, excellent past performance and accomplishment, good CHP relationships with program activities that address key issues that are congruent with the region's explicit priorities and areas of emphasis.

Reduced recommendation made on basis of whether all new activities suggested could be successfully completed in the time-frame left for life of the program or could be continued under other funding.

JULY/AUGUST REVIEW

Estimated Request as of May 1974: $1,500,000

SCOB/DRMP/6-6-74

National Advisory Council: June 13-14,1974

Council concurred with Committee recommendation.

DRMP Funding Decision: $2,565,459

SCOB/DRMP/7-2-74

EO's RESPONSE TO CHP COMMENTS

...ical Program	Application Sent to CHP (yes - no)	CHP Comments Rec'd by RMP (yes - no)	Were They Rec'd Prior to RMP RAG Meeting (yes - no)	Significant Negative Comments by CHP (yes - no)	Comments
	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
CENTRAL NEW YORK	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	On July 3 the Coordinator prepared an addendum to his application which explains project by project how the RAG & the Executive Committee considered proposals that had received a low or disapproved recommendation from the various CHPs (#61, 62, 63, 73, 74, 78, 57)
...UT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Relationships remain strained
GREATER DELAW... ...LLEY	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Review & comment responses were received from 4 b agencies.They fall into the following categories: approved, approved with advice, approved with stipulation, reviewed with no recommendation, approved by staff only (not enough time for review by CHP board) and not approved (#77)
LAKES AREA	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
...YLAND	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (limited)	Application shows 8 projects; 6 received full endorsement by CHP. Project #69 was endorsed with a stipulation. Endorsement was withheld from #67 on grounds of conflict with state planning & an immanent governor's decision
METRO D.C.	Yes	Yes	Yes (limited)	No	Some responses were not received in time to be included but will be forwarded as received.

EO's RESPONSE TO CHP COMMENTS

Local Program	Application Sent to CHP (yes - no)	CHP Comments Rec'd by RMP (yes - no)	Were They Rec'd Prior to RMP RAG Meeting (yes - no)	Significant Negative Comments by CHP (yes - no)	Comments
NASSAU-SUFFOLK	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	#30 was recommended for disapproval because this dental project should be supported by the University. NS/RMP feels through its review committees this is an innovative effort & seed monies through RMP is appropriate. #29 was approved with conditions that it be integrated into #28. N/S RMP says the project sponsor has agreed to work with other project directors.
NEW JERSEY	Yes	No	No		All CHP comments will be considered by RAG at time of funding decision meeting
NYC METRO	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
NORTHERN NEW ENGLAND	No				CHP issue not addressed in this application
PUERTO RICO	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
ROCHESTER	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Due to press of time for this application RRMP dropped its letter of intent procedure. In a change from the past CHP was then in a position of reviewing "raw" applications with no advance perceptions. CHP responses reflect this; at least in part. Collectively CHP responses reflected meaningful exchange between RMP and the affected agencies.
SUSQUEHANNA VALLEY	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	#50-CHP did not endorse this project primarily for lack of sufficient need.SVRMP comments to follow. #40-unfavorable recommendation related to poor choice of priorities in terms of community need. SVRMP comments to follow.

EO's RESPONSE TO CHP COMMENTS

Political Region	Application Sent to CHP (yes - no)	CHP Comments Rec'd by RMP (yes - no)	Were They Rec'd Prior to RMP RAG Meeting (yes - no)	Significant Negative Comments by CHP (yes - no)	Comments
TRI-STATE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Negative comments were found regarding #25, 51 and 61. On July 3 it appears the Executive Director sufficiently responded to negative CHP comments.
VIRGINIA	Yes -	Yes (not all)	Yes	No	Proposals submitted to 9 CHP agencies. Responses received from 3. One of the responding agencies is an applicant
[illegible] PENNSYLVANIA	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
WEST VIRGINIA	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	

EO/7/16/74

DIVISION OF OPERATIONS & DEVELOPMENT
7/26/74

Regional Medical Program	Application Sent to CHP (yes - no)	CHP Comments Rec'd by RMP (yes - no)	Were They Rec'd Prior to RMP RAG Meeting (yes - no)	Significant Negative Comments by CHP (yes - no)	Comments
ALABAMA	YES	YES	YES	NO	
FLORIDA	YES	YES	YES	NO	
ILLINOIS	YES	YES	YES	NO	ISSUES RAISED HAVE BEEN SETTLED.
INDIANA	YES	YES	YES	YES	REGION ADJUSTS PROGRAM TO PLANNING AGENCY COMMENTS, IF SIGNIFICANT.
MEMPHIS	YES	YES	YES	NO	
MICHIGAN	YES	NO	NO	-	RAG WILL CONSIDER ALL CHP COMMENTS PRIOR TO FUNDING.
MISSISSIPPI	YES	YES	YES	NO	IN NO CASE WHERE BOTH CHP A AND B AGENCY COMMENTED NEGATIVELY WERE ANY PROJECTS FUNDED.
NORTH CAROLINA	YES	NO	NO-HOWEVER THE DIRECTOR OF THE "A" AGENCY & THE DIRECTOR OF A "B" AGENCY ELECTED BY OTHER "B" AGENCIES SIT ON RAG. CHP INVOLVED IN PROPOSALS AT THE TIME OF DEVELOPMENT.		ONLY 3 PROPOSALS IN THIS APPLICATION WILL BE CONDUCTED IN AREAS WHERE THERE ARE ACTIVE CHP "B" AGENCIES. COMMENTS WILL BE FORWARDED FROM THE "B" AGENCIES LATER.
NORTHLANDS	YES	PRELIMINARY COMMENTS	YES	NOT RECEIVED	TO BE SENT AS SOON AS RECEIVED. REGION WILL SEE THAT PROJECT SPONSOR AND ANY ADVERSE CHP ISSUES ARE SOLVED BEFORE FUNDING.
SOUTH CAROLINA	YES	YES & NO	YES & NO	NO	7 CHPs WILL FORWARD COMMENTS BY MID-JULY
TENNESSEE MID-SOUTH	YES	YES	YES	NO	
WISCONSIN	YES	YES	YES	YES	ONE "B" AGENCY NEGATIVELY COMMENTED ON A PROPOSAL. PROPOSAL INCLUDED IN APPLICATION.

...TIONS & DEVELOPMENT

Regional Medical Program	Application Sent to CHP (yes - no)	CHP Comments Rec'd by RMP (yes - no)	Were They Rec'd Prior to RMP RAG Meeting (yes - no)	Significant Negative Comments by CHP (yes - no)	Comments
ALABAMA	YES	YES	YES	NO	
FLORIDA	YES	YES	YES	NO	
ILLINOIS	YES	YES	YES	NO	ISSUES RAISED HAVE BEEN SETTLED.
INDIANA	YES	YES	YES	YES	REGION ADJUSTS PROGRAM TO PLANNING AGENCY COMMENTS, IF SIGNIFICANT.
MEMPHIS	YES	YES	YES	NO	
MICHIGAN	YES	NO	NO	-	RAG WILL CONSIDER ALL CHP COMMENTS PRIOR TO FUNDING.
MISSISSIPPI	YES	YES	YES	NO	IN NO CASE WHERE BOTH CHP A AND B AGENCY COMMENTED NEGATIVELY WERE ANY PROJECTS FUNDED.
NORTH CAROLINA	YES	NO	NO-HOWEVER THE DIRECTOR OF THE "A" AGENCY & THE DIRECTOR OF A "B" AGENCY ELECTED BY OTHER "B" AGENCIES SIT ON RAG. CHP INVOLVED IN PROPOSALS AT THE TIME OF DEVELOPMENT.		ONLY 3 PROPOSALS IN THIS APPLICATION WILL BE CONDUCTED IN AREAS WHERE THERE ARE ACTIVE CHP "B" AGENCIES. COMMENTS WILL BE FORWARDED FROM THE "B" AGENCIES LATER.
NORTHLANDS	YES	PRELIMINARY COMMENTS	YES	NOT RECEIVED	TO BE SENT AS SOON AS RECEIVED. REGION WILL SEE THAT PROJECT SPONSOR AND ANY ADVERSE CHP ISSUES ARE SOLVED BEFORE FUNDING.
SOUTH CAROLINA	YES	YES & NO	YES & NO	NO	7 CHPs WILL FORWARD COMMENTS BY MID-JULY
T... MID-SOUTH	YES	YES	YES	NO	
...CONSIN	YES	YES	YES	YES	ONE "B" AGENCY NEGATIVELY COMMENTED ON A PROPOSAL. PROPOSAL INCLUDED IN APPLICATION.