COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE



INTERIM SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR FY 2016-17

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT

JBC Working Document - Subject to Change Staff Recommendation Does Not Represent Committee Decision

> Prepared By: Megan Davisson, JBC Staff June 20, 2016

For Further Information Contact:

Joint Budget Committee Staff 200 E. 14th Avenue, 3rd Floor Denver, Colorado 80203 Telephone: (303) 866-2061 TDD: (303) 866-3472

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Narrative Page | Numbers Page |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|
| Prioritized Interim Supplementals in Department-Assigned Order | | |
| Supplemental #1 – Retail Food Cash Fund Spending Authority | 1 | 5 |

Prioritized Interim Supplemental Requests

INTERIM SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST, DEPARTMENT PRIORITY #1 RETAIL FOOD CSH FUND SPENDING AUTHORITY

| | Request | Recommendation | |
|------------|------------------|------------------|--|
| Total | <u>\$375,645</u> | <u>\$266,975</u> | |
| FTE | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Cash Funds | 375,645 | 266,975 | |

| Does JBC staff believe the request satisfies the interim supplemental criteria of Section 24-75-111, C.R.S.? [The Controller may authorize an overexpenditure of the existing appropriation if it: (1) Is approved in whole or in part by the JBC; (2) Is necessary due to unforeseen circumstances arising while the General Assembly is not in session; (3) Is approved by the Office of State Planning and Budgeting (except for State, Law, Treasury, Judicial, and Legislative Departments); (4) Is approved by the Capital Development Committee, if a capital request; (5) Is consistent with all statutory provisions applicable to the program, function or purpose for which the overexpenditure is made; and (6) Does not exceed the unencumbered balance of the fund from which the overexpenditure is to be made.] | YES | | |
|--|-----|--|--|
| Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria? [An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforseen contingency.] | YES | | |
| JBC staff and the Department agree that (1) this request meets the interim supplemental criteria of Section 24-75 | | | |

111, C.R.S., and (2) this request is the result of an unforseen contingency.

Department Request: The Department requests a FY 2016-17 appropriation of \$375,645 cash funds from the Food Protection Cash Fund and 3.0 FTE to assume responsibility for inspections of retail food establishments in Weld County effective July 1, 2016.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Committee approve an increase of \$266,975 cash funds and 3.0 FTE. The following table compares the Department request with the staff recommendation.

| Summary of Request and Recommendation | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Request | Recommendation | Difference from Request | | | |
| Personnel Costs | | | | | | |
| Personal Services | \$207,500 | \$207,500 | \$0 | | | |
| FTE | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Centrally Appropriated Costs | 27,649 | 0 | (27,649) | | | |
| Operating Costs | | | | | | |
| One-time Operating | 13,425 | 13,425 | 0 | | | |
| Ongoing Operating | 7,650 | 7,650 | 0 | | | |
| Travel including lodging and per diem | 30,000 | 30,000 | 0 | | | |
| Vehicle Costs | 8,400 | 8,400 | 0 | | | |
| Indirect Costs | 81,022 | 0 | (81,022) | | | |
| Total | \$375,649 | \$266,975 | (\$108,671) | | | |

The rules governing interim supplementals in Section 24-75-111 (5), C.R.S., require the Committee to introduce all interim supplementals that it approves.

Staff Analysis:

Background

Pursuant to Section 25-4-1601, C.R.S., the Department administers the Retail Food Inspection Program which includes the inspection of retail food establishments. Pursuant to Section 25-4-1604 (1) (i), C.R.S., the Department may delegate the collection of licensure fees and the performance of inspections to Local Public Health Agencies. Currently the Department has delegated these responsibilities to 33 of the 54 Local Public Health Agencies, covering 58 of the 64 counties. The City and County of Denver is exempt from the requirements of the State Retail Food Inspection Program. This leaves five counties (Clear Creek, Grand, Jackson, Moffat, and Rio Blanco) where the Department performs the inspections and fee collections directly.

Weld County Decision

Prior to July 1, 2016, the Weld County Department of Public Health and Environment was responsible for retail food inspection responsibilities in Weld County but notified the Department that effective July 1, 2016, it will no longer perform retail food inspections. Weld County's decision is driven by two components of the recently enacted H.B. 16-1401 (Retail Food Establishment Licensure and Inspection):

- Opposition to the new prohibition of letter grades to communicate inspection results in Section 25-4-1607.7 (1), C.R.S.; and
- The county's interpretation of Section 25-4-1607 (13), C.R.S.

Section 25-4-1607 (13) (b), C.R.S. states: "counties may only spend the increased revenue from the increase of retail food establish fees on retail food health-related activities. <u>Supplanting funds for other county programs is prohibited.</u>" Weld County is interpreting this language to mean they cannot reduce their local contribution to the retail food inspection program if they wanted to. The Department does not interpret the language this way and they have indicated that is not how they will apply the language. Staff talked with legal services and the language does not prohibit the reduction of local dollars to a retail food inspection program.

However, H.B. 16-1401 was the result of a six month stakeholder process with consensus among all participants at the conclusion. Staff inquired as to whether additional legislation could be run in 2017 to address the concerns of Weld County so that the retail food inspections can remain at the local level. The Department indicated that legislation could be run to address the prohibition of letter grades but that the likelihood such legislation would receive Department and stakeholder support was unlikely.

Weld County, at no time during the stakeholder process or prior to introduction of the bill, indicated to the Department that passage of the bill would result the discontinuance of retail food inspections by the county. It was only late during the legislative process that Weld County

indicated the passage of the bill <u>may</u> result in Weld County discontinuing inspections but nothing official was provided to the Department. Weld County did speak in opposition to the bill in the Senate Business, Labor, and Technology Committee. As a result the Department's fiscal note for H.B.1 6-1401 did not account for the possibility of conducting inspections in Weld County.

Staff inquired about the possibility that Weld County would resume inspections in the future, thus minimizing the need for state FTE. The Department indicated that continuously-changing regulations, standards, and implementation of the retail food inspection program would make it difficult for Weld County to resume the program and still be staffed and trained to efficiently meet contract requirements and state laws in the future. The Department is therefore assuming responsibility for conducting food inspections that will not be contracted to Weld County for the foreseeable future.

Solution

The Department is statutorily required to conduct restaurant inspections if responsibility is not delegated to a local public health agency. Therefore the Department must, starting July 1, 2016, collect the licensure fee and conduct inspections for retail food establishments in Weld County. Currently Weld County has indicated they have nine FTE who conduct approximately 1,700 inspections per year. The Department currently does not have the staff or the revenue to conduct that many inspections. The Department in order to maintain consistency across all counties in which they conduct inspections, determine the number of inspections based on the revenue generated by the licensure fee. This ensures that areas with a large number of restaurants will be inspected at a rate equal to that of areas with fewer restaurants. The following table summarizes the revenue and expenditures from the Food Protection Cash Fund for all retail food inspections and the additional revenue and expenditures associated with the Weld County.

| Food Protection Cash Fund FY 2014-15 FY 2015-16 FY 2016-17 FY 2017-18 Actual Estimate Estimate Estimate | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| Beginning Balance | \$1,158,675 | \$761,873 | \$542,877 | \$428,289 | | | |
| Revenue | 788,468 | 1,215,000 | 1,205,764 | 1,219,685 | | | |
| Revenue from Weld County | 0 | 0 | 279,405 | 327,997 | | | |
| Expenditures | | | | , , | | | |
| Existing Inspections | (1, 185, 270) | (1,433,996) | (1,332,782) | (1,269,032) | | | |
| Weld County Inspections | 0 | 0 | (266,975) | (368,690) | | | |
| Ending Fund Balance | \$761,873 | \$542,877 | \$428,289 | \$338,249 | | | |

The Department currently has 1.9 FTE who conduct approximately 600 inspections a year. Based on the revenue that will be generated by the licensure fee from Weld County retail food establishments, the Department will be able to support 3.0 FTE. Assuming each FTE can conduct 300 inspections a year, 900 retail food establishments will be inspected in Weld County. The Department will use their risk-based inspection system to ensure inspections are covering the appropriate establishments. Staff inquired about providing funding sufficient to hire staff to maintain the current inspection rate of 1,700. The Department indicated none of the other counties for which the Department conducts inspections supports staff above the revenue generated by the licensure fee. Therefore staff is recommending the Department's request for 3.0 FTE. Staff did not include funding for the centrally appropriated personal services (health, life and dental, short term disability, and PERA contributions) because Committee policy is not to include centrally appropriated costs in the first year. Staff also did not include the requested increase in indirect costs because the total department pool of indirect costs is not increasing therefore there is not a need to increase the payment into the total pool. Staff will adjust the indirect cost assessments during figure setting for FY 2017-18.

| | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 | Fiscal Year 2016-17 Interim Supplemental | | |
|---|----------------|---------------|--|----------------|----------------|
| | Annonviation | Appropriation | Requested | Recommended | New Total with |
| | Арргорпацоп | Арргорпацоп | Change | Change | Recommendation |
| DEDADTMENT OF DUDI 10 HEALTH AN | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH AN Executive Director - Dr. Larry Wolk | ND EINVIKUINIV | IEIN I | | | |
| Interim Supplemental #1 - Retail Food Cash Fund Spending Authority | | | | | |
| (1) Administration and Support | r i una spenam | 5 mullion ty | | | |
| (A) Administration | | | | | |
| Vehicle Lease Payments | 351,365 | 412,571 | 8,400 | <u>8,400</u> | 420,971 |
| Cash Funds | 250,554 | 310,720 | 8,400 | 8,400 | 319,120 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 67,621 | 68,661 | 0 | 0 | 68,661 |
| Federal Funds | 33,190 | 33,190 | 0 | 0 | 33,190 |
| (7) Division of Environemental Health and Sustainability | | | | | |
| Environmental Health Programs | 2,614,798 | 2,564,566 | 286,224 | 258,575 | 2,823,141 |
| FTE | 22.3 | 22.3 | <u>3.0</u> | <u>3.0</u> | 25.3 |
| General Fund | 642,859 | 658,506 | 0 | 0 | 658,506 |
| Cash Funds | 1,409,820 | 1,343,192 | 286,224 | 258,575 | 1,601,767 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 109,345 | 110,094 | 0 | 0 | 110,094 |
| Federal Funds | 452,774 | 452,774 | 0 | 0 | 452,774 |
| Indirect Cost Assessment | 785,200 | 878,100 | 81,022 | <u>0</u> | <u>878,100</u> |
| Cash Funds | 491,100 | 584,000 | 81,022 | $\overline{0}$ | 584,000 |
| Federal Funds | 294,100 | 294,100 | 0 | 0 | 294,100 |

| | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 | Fiscal Year 2016-17 Interim Supplemental | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|--|-------------|----------------|
| | Annronriation | Appropriation | Requested | Recommended | New Total with |
| | Appropriation | Appropriation | Change | Change | Recommendation |
| | | | | | |
| Total for Supplemental #1 | 3,751,363 | 3,855,237 | 375,646 | 266,975 | 4,122,212 |
| FTE | 22.3 | <u>22.3</u> | <u>3.0</u> | <u>3.0</u> | <u>25.3</u> |
| General Fund | 642,859 | 658,506 | 0 | 0 | 658,506 |
| Cash Funds | 2,151,474 | 2,237,912 | 375,646 | 266,975 | 2,504,887 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 176,966 | 178,755 | 0 | 0 | 178,755 |
| Federal Funds | 780,064 | 780,064 | 0 | 0 | 780,064 |
| Totals | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH ANI | D ENVIRONMEN | T | | | |
| TOTALS for ALL Departmental line items | 537,711,742 | 556,505,747 | 375,646 | 266,975 | 556,772,722 |
| FTE | <u>1,288.6</u> | <u>1,311.3</u> | <u>3.0</u> | <u>3.0</u> | <u>1,314.3</u> |
| General Fund | 48,015,287 | 46,047,983 | 0 | 0 | 46,047,983 |
| Cash Funds | 157,897,569 | 180,597,712 | 375,646 | 266,975 | 180,864,687 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 37,645,004 | 41,167,484 | 0 | 0 | 41,167,484 |
| Federal Funds | 294,153,882 | 288,692,568 | 0 | 0 | 288,692,568 |