In 1992 CityMatCH, a national organization of urban maternal and child health programs and leaders, initiated a survey of programs to serve as an information resource for urban public health practitioners. This report updates previous data, presents baseline information on maternal and child health (MCH) programs in urban health departments serving areas with populations under 200,000, and provides comprehensive information on childhood immunization in urban communities. Section 1 describes the survey and technical issues, with an overview of findings on urban MCH programs. Section 2 contains descriptions of self-reported successful urban health department immunization initiatives. Section 3 contains contact information for major urban MCH programs, as well as key survey findings and recommendations. Leadership of urban MCH programs continues to change from year to year, but organizations remain fairly stable. State and local funds support the majority of MCH programs. About half of American's urban children are estimated to be fully immunized at 24 months of age, with 94 percent immunized at school entry. Over 75 percent of responding urban health departments reported experiencing a shift from private to public sectors in the delivery of immunization services. Seven tables and three figures illustrate the discussion. Appendixes contain the survey instrument and a list of surveyed health departments. (SLD)
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Urban children and their families - be they in Atlanta, Akron or Albuquerque - face similar barriers to comprehensive primary and preventive health services, and these urban families often rely on similar public health systems for care. Maternal and child health programs in city and county health departments nationwide often are the critical health care link for these urban families. Despite notable differences in demographics, geography, and health systems across America's cities, there is a shared core of challenges and responsibilities that form a common bond among urban MCH programs and their leaders. This bond, if recognized and nurtured, can form the basis for highly productive cooperation and collaboration among urban communities that will enhance their capacity to serve urban women, infants and children.

CityMatCH, a national organization of urban maternal and child health programs in major city and county health departments, was initiated in 1988 to strengthen the bond among urban MCH leaders. CityMatCH provides an effective mechanism for communication and collaboration across U.S. cities in maternal and child health. Through the exchange of timely information about what works, and what doesn't, successful solutions to transportation barriers to primary care in our nation's capital have been translated and adapted to solve similar problems in Philadelphia. San Antonio's effective immunization strategies have been shown to work as well in Santa Ana and Anaheim. Indianapolis and Seattle have shared successful strategies to reduce infant mortality.

One CityMatCH strategy for information exchange has been our annual survey of urban maternal and child health programs in major city and county health departments nationwide. In 1992, under our Cooperative Agreement for Information and Communication with the Maternal and Child Health Bureau of the Health Resources and Services Administration (the "Municipal MCH Partners Project"), we conducted our third national urban MCH survey. As in 1989 and 1990, we collected informa-
tion on the organization, leadership and financing of MCH services in urban health departments. The 1992 survey also focused on a significant public health challenge facing the nation: childhood immunizations.

*What Works II: 1992 Urban MCH Programs* is a resource document intended to provide current information about urban MCH programs and their most successful immunization initiatives which target urban families and children. It also is intended to facilitate communication among urban MCH leaders and others concerned about the health and well-being of urban children and their families, by providing contact information for the MCH leadership in urban health departments. CityMatCH will continue to provide similar timely information so that local level MCH programs serving similar populations can benefit from the experiences of their counterparts in other parts of the country.

Magda G. Peck, ScD PA  
CityMatCH Executive Director

Elice D. Hubbert, MPA  
Project Coordinator,  
"Municipal MCH Partners Project"
What Works II: 1992 Urban MCH Programs represents the efforts of many individuals who worked closely to complete the follow-up survey and compile its results. Urban MCH program directors and other MCH colleagues on the “Municipal MCH Partners Project” Advisory Committee - helped give the survey its shape and meaning. MCH leaders from the Association of Maternal and Child Health Programs, the National Association of County Health Officials, and the U.S. Conference of Local Health Officers were particularly helpful.

Fiscal and technical support from the Maternal and Child Health Bureau, Health Resources and Services Administration (MCU #316058-02-0) was essential to conducting the survey and disseminating its results. Additional input from Walter Orenstein, CDC; Edgar Marcuse, University of Washington; and Kay Johnson, March of Dimes, added to the quality of the study.

CityMatCH staff at the University of Nebraska Medical Center were instrumental in completing the survey in a timely and highly competent fashion. Graduate Assistant Harry Bullerdick did data entry and management, and helped with writing. Data Analyst Fred Ulrich provided essential programming expertise. Administrative Technician Joan Rostermundt provided assistance with survey administration, word processing, and document dissemination. Graduate Assistant Christina Kerby, Staff Assistant Barbara Sims, and Secretary Diana Fisaga provided additional support. Mark Watson and Martie Thompson with Printing and Duplicating Services at the University of Nebraska Medical Center managed the design, typesetting, and printing of the final document.

The original photographs used in this book were taken by Pamela J. Berry. The photographs on pages 9, 33, 41, 55 and 111 previously appeared in HIDE & SEEK: The State of the Child in Nebraska 1992 by Voices for Children in Nebraska, 14643 Grover Street, Omaha, NE 68144.

Last, we must acknowledge the tremendous participation of urban MCH leaders in city and county health departments nationwide who once again shared their knowledge and their stories with us. With an over 90% response rate among larger cities, and an 80% response rate overall, we have great confidence that the information in What Works II fully reflects the universe of thought among urban MCH leaders in America’s cities.
In May 1992 CityMatCH initiated its third national survey of urban maternal and child health (MCH) programs in the United States. What Works II: 1992 Urban MCH Programs is based upon information gathered from urban health departments across the country in response to the 1992 CityMatCH Survey of Maternal and Child Health in Major Urban Health Departments in the United States. What Works II is designed to be an information resource for urban public health practitioners and others interested in maternal and child health at the local level. The 1992 survey builds upon information gained in earlier CityMatCH surveys in 1989 and 1990.

The 1992 survey was funded under the “Municipal MCH Partners Project,” the joint CityMatCH/U.S. Conference of Local Health Officers (USCLHO) Partnership for Information and Communication (PIC) Cooperative Agreement (MCU #316058-02-0) with the Federal Maternal and Child Health Bureau (MCHB). The survey had three key purposes: (1) to update information obtained in the 1989 and 1990 CityMatCH urban MCH surveys about the organization, leadership, and financial resources of urban MCH programs and to identify the major MCH problems faced by urban children and families; (2) to obtain baseline information on the status of MCH programs in urban health departments serving smaller urban areas (those with populations under 200,000) not previously surveyed by CityMatCH; and, (3) to obtain comprehensive information on a single focal area in MCH: childhood immunization in urban communities.

A written questionnaire was mailed to all urban health departments having jurisdiction over one or more cities with populations greater than 100,000 according to the 1990 U.S. Census, the health department serving the largest city in the nine remaining states with no city large enough to meet the 100,000 population threshold, and the health department serving the largest city in three U.S. Territories, including Puerto Rico (a total of 177 health departments). An overall response rate of 80% was achieved; 100% of health departments serving cities with populations greater than 500,000 responded.

Section I describes the survey methods, response rate, and provides technical information about how the data were analyzed. It provides an overview of survey findings on the leadership, organization, and financing of urban MCH programs and highlights the immunization findings. Descriptions of self-reported successful urban health department initiatives to improve the levels of childhood immunization are presented in Section II. Section III contains contact information for major urban MCH programs and their leaders. Key survey findings and recommendations follow.
Leadership

The leadership of MCH programs in urban health departments continues to undergo substantial change from year to year. Approximately 54% of responding health departments serving populations >200,000 indicated the leadership of their MCH program had changed since the 1990 CityMatCH urban MCH survey was conducted; 10% said no one person was MCH director.

Organization

The organization of MCH programs and activities in major urban health departments remains fairly stable. Only 24% of responding health departments reported a change in the organization of their maternal and child health programs and activities since 1990.

Funding for MCH

The level of funding for urban MCH programs in the U.S. varies widely, but on average, health departments devote 25.5% of their total operating budgets to MCH activities. Between FY'91 and FY'92, only 36% of all responding health departments reported increases in their MCH budgets; 8% reported budget decreases.

State and local funds support the majority of urban MCH program activities. Across responding urban health departments in FY '92, 41% of MCH support was supplied by States (including State Title V Block Grant Funds), and 40% of MCH support was supplied by local governments. On average, only 5% of urban health department MCH support comes from direct Federal funds.

Third party reimbursement dollars (insurance, Medicaid) are generated by MCH activities in 93% of responding health departments. However, these third party dollars are dedicated to MCH programs by only 43% of responding urban health departments.

Leading Urban MCH Problems

Lack of access to health care services and the impact of poverty on urban families were identified equally as the greatest MCH problem faced by urban children and families. Infant mortality, low birthweight, inadequate prenatal care, adolescent pregnancy, substance abuse, and poor immunization levels were the next most often cited urban MCH problems.
CHILDHOOD IMMUNIZATION IN URBAN COMMUNITIES: MAJOR FINDINGS

- About half (54%) of America's urban children are estimated to be fully immunized at 24 months of age. Across cities with populations over 800,000, the levels of immunization are estimated to be even lower (39%).

- At school entry, 94% of urban children are estimated to be fully immunized. The principal sources of data about immunization levels are school and preschool record audits and kindergarten-based retrospective studies. Immunization data are not available by race or ethnicity in most responding health departments.

- Urban health departments experienced substantial increases in both the number of children served and the number of doses of vaccine administered between 1989 and 1991. A 22% increase in the median estimated number of children served and a 44.5% increase in the median estimated number of doses of vaccine administered occurred between 1989 and 1991.

- Private physicians are the principal providers of primary/preventive health care services for half (50%) of urban children. Local health departments, hospital outpatient clinics, and community health centers are also primary providers of these services. Hospital emergency rooms are estimated to provide primary/preventive care for 3% of urban children nationwide.

- Local health departments are the principal providers of immunization services for urban children; 41% of urban children receive their immunizations from the local health department. Private physicians, hospital outpatient clinics, and community health centers also play important roles in immunizing urban children.

- Over three-fourths (78%) of responding urban health department jurisdictions reported experiencing a shift from the private to the public sector in the delivery of immunization services. The increased cost of vaccine in the private sector was cited as one of the principal reasons for this shift. Other reasons for the shift included poor reimbursement levels, liability concerns, and burdensome administration requirements.
Collaboration

- Almost three-quarters (73%) of responding urban health departments reported that various providers of immunization services collaborate somewhat or a great deal. Larger health departments reported higher levels of collaboration between health care providers.

Capacity

- Only 57% of responding urban health departments reported having adequate capacity in 1992 to serve all children in their jurisdictions who seek immunization services from them. Only one of the twelve health departments representing cities over 800,000 reported having adequate capacity.

Immunization Funding

- Funding for local health department immunization activities increased in only 29% of responding urban health departments from 1989 to 1991; it decreased in 7%.

Immunizations Administered

- 98% of responding urban health departments reported administering DPT, OPV/IPV, and MMR immunizations; 97% administer Haemophilus influenzae b (Hib) vaccine; 95% administerTd; and, 86% administer Hepatitis B vaccine. Of those administering Hepatitis B, only 13% provide it to all infants.

Barriers to Age-Appropriate Immunization

- The greatest barrier to age-appropriate immunization faced by urban children and families according to responding health departments is a lack of parental education about the importance of childhood immunization. Other identified immunization barriers included inadequate access to care; increased vaccine costs; overburdened, unfriendly delivery systems; and missed opportunities to vaccinate.

Needed Health Department Resources

- To assure better age-appropriate immunization levels in children, urban health departments need computer tracking and recall systems; more staff and more clinic locations, with extended service hours; and, expanded outreach and education efforts.

Childhood Immunization Initiatives

- Examples of successful initiatives undertaken by urban health departments to improve childhood immunization levels abound. The initiatives revolve around four basic strategies: improving the immunization delivery system; expanding outreach and education; building and utilizing community partnerships and coalitions; and better immunization documentation. Successful immunization initiatives often combine multiple strategies.
That on average half of urban children are not properly immunized by their second birthday is an unacceptable individual risk for each of these children and their families, and an intolerable marker of inadequate access to and utilization of basic preventive pediatric health care in cities, large and small, across the United States. Urban families and children rely on city and county health departments to provide basic primary and preventive health care services such as immunizations.

As the principal provider of immunizations to children in urban communities, city and county health departments need sufficient resources to meet an increasing demand for immunization services. Urban health departments must, at a minimum, have sufficient funding, vaccine and personnel to allow for expansion of immunization hours and clinics, sites of delivery and outreach activities tailored to their individual communities' needs.

Private physicians continue to be the principal providers of primary health care to urban children. Yet children and their families in most American cities are being shunted away from their medical homes in the private sector to clinics in the public sector for immunization services due to concerns over vaccine costs, inadequate reimbursement, increasing administrative burdens associated with vaccine administration, and perceived risk of liability. This shift has not been experienced in several urban communities where vaccine is universally available in the private and public sectors alike and where collaboration between public and private sectors is high.

Urban children should be guaranteed access to immunization services in the public and private sectors, in part through the implementation of universal provision of vaccines, including universal purchase and distribution policies and programs. Until that time when shifting between sectors for immunizations is minimized, increased and sustained collaboration between providers in the public and private sectors will be essential to ensure coordination and continuity in the delivery of primary and preventive health care services for urban children.

Shortcomings in services delivery notwithstanding, insufficient parental awareness of the continued critical importance of immunizing...
their young children persists as a significant barrier to age-appropriate immunizations in urban communities.

- Consumer education, community-wide outreach, comprehensive tracking, and ongoing follow-up are key strategies which, if combined, can enable parents and empower communities to be full partners in the quest to eliminate vaccine-preventable diseases in children. When childhood immunizations come to be valued as a resource which is as fundamental to the health of urban communities as clean drinking water, individual parental awareness of the importance of immunizing their children likely will increase.

Many urban health departments nationwide are improving their efforts to increase age-appropriate immunization levels among children in their jurisdictions. What Works II lists and categorizes over one hundred successful ways city and county health departments are making a difference by improving the immunization delivery system, expanding outreach and community education, facilitating community-based partnerships, and enhancing tracking and recall efforts.

- There is no single “quick fix” to improving immunization levels among urban children, rather comprehensive, multifaceted, longer term approaches are needed to make and sustain a difference. Urban health departments should review their current strategies to identify gaps in current efforts. City and county health departments serving major urban areas should tap the expertise and experience of their counterparts in other urban communities to fill these gaps. Descriptions of successful immunization activities contained in What Works II will provide an invaluable tool for promoting communication and collaboration on childhood immunizations across urban areas in the U.S.
What Works II: 1992 Urban MCH Programs is designed to inform and assist urban public health practitioners and others interested in urban maternal and child health. It contains current information about the leadership, organization and activities of MCH programs in urban city and county health departments across the country, and specifically focuses on childhood immunization in America's urban areas. In addition to quantitative findings on important immunization issues such as immunization levels and administrative practices, What Works II highlights the initiatives undertaken by urban health departments nationwide to improve childhood immunization levels in their jurisdictions. The information in What Works II is based upon the results of the 1992 CityMatCH Survey of Maternal and Child Health in Urban Health Departments in the United States.

Chapter 1: About the 1992 Survey provides an overview of the background, purposes and methodology behind the 1992 survey. A conceptual framework for understanding the methodological and technical issues relating to the data analysis is presented.

Chapter 2: Current Status of Urban MCH Programs: Part 1 of the 1992 Survey provides aggregate information about the leadership, program organization, and fiscal resources of urban MCH programs. The principal MCH problems facing urban families are identified and ranked. The chapter includes an "information at a glance" section which summarizes financial and demographic information for responding urban health departments.

Chapter 3: Childhood Immunization in Urban Communities: Part 2 of the 1992 Survey provides aggregate information about levels of childhood immunization, integration of immunization with other child health services, and the roles of public and private sector providers in the delivery of immunization services to children along with information about types of immunizations administered and methods and guide-
Section II: Initiatives to Improve Childhood Immunization Levels

Responding health departments identify what they view as the principal barriers to age-appropriate immunization of children in their jurisdictions and what health departments need to do a better job of immunizing the children they serve.

This Section presents "what works in immunizations," urban health department immunization success stories. These brief descriptions highlight successful current initiatives to improve childhood immunization levels. The initiatives are divided into four categories of strategies: Initiatives to Improve the Immunization Delivery System; Initiatives to Expand Community Outreach and Public Awareness; Initiatives to Build Community Collaborations and Coalitions; and Initiatives to Improve Immunization Documentation. For quick reference, the chapter contains a master index of immunization initiatives and the health departments which have instituted them.

This section provides MCH program contact information for each surveyed health department. The directory can be used as a stand-alone resource to facilitate communication between local urban MCH leaders and others interested in urban MCH.
HIGHLIGHTS OF THE 1992 CITYMATCH SURVEY
In 1992, CityMatCH initiated its third national survey of urban maternal and child health (MCH) programs in the United States. The survey was funded under the “Municipal MCH Partners Project,” the joint CityMatCH/U.S. Conference of Local Health Officers Partnership for Information and Communication (PIC) Cooperative Agreement with the Federal Maternal and Child Health Bureau (MCHB), Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).

The 1992 CityMatCH survey had three key purposes: (1) to update information obtained in the 1989 and 1990 CityMatCH surveys of urban MCH programs in major city and county health departments in the United States; (2) to obtain baseline information on the status of MCH programs in smaller urban health departments not previously surveyed by CityMatCH (those with jurisdiction over cities with populations between 100,000 and 200,000); and, (3) to obtain baseline information on a single focal area in MCH: childhood immunization in urban communities.

In May, 1992, a written questionnaire was mailed to 177 urban health departments (UHD). Health departments surveyed included all urban health departments having jurisdiction over one or more cities with populations greater than 100,000 according to the 1990 U.S. Census (a total of 165 health departments representing 195 major cities with populations above the 100,000 threshold); nine health departments serving the largest city in any State not otherwise represented; and, to San Juan.

**Background**

**CHAPTER 1**

**ABOUT THE 1992 SURVEY**

**Methodology**

---

1. These surveys collected information about the organization, leadership, and resources of MCH programs in major urban health departments. They also gathered information about the major MCH problems experienced by the urban families served by the responding health departments. The 1990 survey also gathered information about successful urban MCH program initiatives. Its results were published as *What Works: 1990 Urban MCH Programs*. Results from the 1989 survey were published as the *Resource Directory of Major Urban MCH Programs*.

2. A copy of the survey instrument can be found in Appendix A of this document. A list of the surveyed health departments is contained in Appendix B.

3. Eleven health departments have multiple cities >100,000 within their jurisdictions; seven of these are located in California, two in Florida, one in Arizona, and one in Michigan.

4. These include Delaware, Maine, Montana, North Dakota, New Hampshire, South Carolina, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming.
Puerto Rico, and the largest city in two other U.S. Territories (Guam and the Marshall Islands). Of the surveyed health departments, 93 (53%) were surveyed by CityMatCH in 1989 and 1990; 84 health departments (47%), most with populations between 100,000 and 200,000, were surveyed for the first time in 1992.

The survey was directed to the health department's designated MCH leader, if known. If the name of a designated MCH person was not available, the survey was directed to the health department's health officer. Those health departments not responding to the initial mailing were sent a second survey; those still not responding received a third survey. Three “fax reminders” were also sent encouraging health departments to complete and return their surveys.

The survey instrument consisted of two parts. Part 1 requested descriptive information about each health department’s organization, mandate, financing and principal maternal and child health problems. Part 2 requested information about childhood immunizations and general child health. This section requested baseline information about childhood immunization levels, financing of immunization services, integration of immunization with other child health services, the roles of the public and private sector in the delivery of immunizations to children, and perceived barriers to age-appropriate immunization. Each health department was asked to share a "success story" related to immunization efforts in its urban community.

### Table 1.1
Survey Response by Population of Cities in Urban Health Department (UHD) Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Size*</th>
<th>Number of UHDs Surveyed</th>
<th>Number of UHDs Responding</th>
<th>Response Penetrance Within Population Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Territories**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;100,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 to 200,000</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,001 to 300,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,001 to 500,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,001 to 800,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;800,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Combined population of all major cities >100,000 within health department jurisdiction.
** Includes San Juan, Puerto Rico, population >200,000.

San Juan, Puerto Rico, has been included among the target cities in all CityMatCH surveys. Agana, Guam and Majuro, Marshall Islands responded to the 1990 CityMatCH survey and were again surveyed in 1992 for continuity.

Previous CityMatCH surveys included 91 health departments representing the 5 largest cities in the U.S. (cities over 200,000 according to the 1986 Census) and 11 additional health departments representing the largest city in any state not otherwise represented, plus 9 U.S. Territories.
Of the 177 urban health departments surveyed, 141 completed and returned questionnaires for an overall response rate of 80%. Responses were received from 70 health departments representing 71 of the 76 (93%) largest cities in the country (populations over 200,000). 100% of health departments serving cities over 500,000 responded. Responses were also received from 71% (69) of the 97 health departments serving smaller U.S. cities (populations under 200,000) and from health departments in two U.S. territories. Responses were received from city and county health departments in 46 of the 50 States (92%), the District of Columbia, and the Territories of Puerto Rico and Guam.

 Aggregate results are presented for 140 of the 141 responding health departments. These health departments represent cities with greatly varying populations. Each health department has been classified based on the 1990 Census population of its principal city.

The population classifications are as follows: <100,000; 100,000-200,000; 200,001-300,000; 300,001-500,000; 500,001-800,000; >800,000. Table 1.1 on the preceding page shows the number of health departments surveyed in each population category, the number who responded, and the response percent within each size category. Table 1.2 reflects the relative weight of survey responses stratified by city size.

The overall survey response was equally divided between health departments representing cities with populations greater than 200,000 (large cities) and health departments representing cities with populations less than 200,000 (small cities).

---

**Table 1.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Size*</th>
<th>Percent of Total Survey Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;100,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 to 200,000</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,001 to 300,000*</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,001 to 500,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,001 to 800,000</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;800,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Combined population of all major cities >100,000 within health department jurisdiction.
** Includes San Juan, Puerto Rico, population >200,000.

---

9: New Hampshire, North Dakota, Montana, and Rhode Island are not represented.
A: Agana, Guam has no separate urban health department structure and its response was excluded from these analyses.
B: Population classifications for health departments representing multiple cities with populations >100,000 were determined by adding together the populations of all cities >100,000 within the health department jurisdiction.
There is great variation in MCH leadership across urban health departments. Who a health department considers its MCH leader ranges from the Commissioner or Director of Health to a clinical staff nurse, from a medical director to a program administrator. There is no single MCH leader in 19.2% of responding health departments. Almost two-thirds (63.2%) of these health departments serve smaller cities (between 100,000 and 200,000). The tenure of current urban MCH leaders averages 5.4 years, ranging from a few months to 28 years. The MCH director is a physician in one-third (33.6%) of responding health departments. MCH leaders in 46.6% of responding health departments were nurses (RN). Graduate level public health training (MPH) has been completed by 33.6% of urban MCH leaders. Table 2.1 details the professional degrees held by urban MCH Directors/Coordinators, stratified by city size.

Table 2.1:
*Professional Degrees Held by MCH Directors/Coordinators in Major Urban Health Departments (UHDs)*
Stratified by City Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Size**</th>
<th>RN</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>MPH</th>
<th>MSN</th>
<th>MPA</th>
<th>Other ***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All UHDs</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 100,000</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 to 200,000</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,001 to 300,000</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,001 to 500,000</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,001 to 800,000</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 800,000</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Each may have more than one degree.
** Combined population of all major cities >100,000 within health department jurisdiction.
*** Includes PhD, MS, MA, MSW, BSN, BBA.
Over half (54%) of urban MCH leaders identified in the survey were between 40 and 49 years of age. Most current urban MCH Directors are women (74.6%). Larger urban communities tend to exhibit more racial and ethnic diversity in their MCH leadership. The diversity of urban MCH leaders based in city and county health departments is reflected in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2
Racial and Ethnic Diversity of MCH Directors/Coordinators in Major Urban Health Departments (UHDs) Stratified by City Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Size*</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other***</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All UHDs</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;100,000</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 to 200,000</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000 to 300,000</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,000 to 500,000</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 to 800,000</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;800,000</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Combined population of all major cities >100,000 within health department jurisdiction.
** No examples provided.

Changes in Urban MCH Program Leadership and Organization

The MCH leadership in urban health departments undergoes substantial changes from year to year. Only 54.3% of health departments serving cities with populations >200,000 who responded to the 1990 CityMatCH survey reported that the person considered to be the director or coordinator of maternal and child health was the same person as reported in 1990. 10.2% of these health departments reported that no one person coordinated MCH.

The organization of maternal and child health programs and activities in major city and county health departments has remained fairly stable in the past two years. In over three-quarters (75.4%) of responding health departments, the organization of MCH was the same as it was in 1990. Health departments serving cities with populations between 200,000 and 300,000 reported the highest organizational stability (81%), while health departments serving cities over 800,000 reported the lowest (66.7%).
Fiscal Year '92 (FY'92) resources available to responding urban MCH programs are displayed by city, state, and population code at the end of this chapter. The health department’s total operating budget, MCH budget, the estimated portion of health department funds dedicated to MCH activities, and the percent of change in MCH funding between FY'91 and FY'92 are listed. These data are an approximation of urban MCH resources and may not be fully comparable across jurisdictions. Each responding health department based its estimates on its own definition of "MCH activities" and used its own methods to derive funding levels. The figures do, however, provide a sense of the fiscal resources dedicated to MCH in major urban health departments in the U.S.

There is great variation in the level of funding for urban MCH programs in the U.S., not only across cities of different size, but within groups of cities of comparable size. The MCH budget increased between FY'91 and FY'92 in 35.6% of all responding health departments and decreased in 8.3%; the MCH budget remained about the same for one-half (50.8%). 5.3% did not know. Table 2.3 shows the estimated percentage of total health department operating budget allocated to MCH activities and the resulting dollar commitment (in thousands) for the responding health departments stratified by city size. Of note is the lower percentage of operating budget funds dedicated to MCH activities in cities with populations between 500,001 and 800,000.

State and local funds support the majority of urban MCH program activities. Of responding health departments, 40.7% reported receiving State support, including Title V Block Grant dollars, and 39.7% said they received local gov-

Fiscal Resources for Urban MCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Size*</th>
<th>Percent UHD Budget Dedicated to MCH Activities</th>
<th>FY'92 Funds in Thousands (K) Dedicated to MCH Activities**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All UHDs</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>2974K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;100,000</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>6325K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 to 200,000</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>1155K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,001 to 300,000</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>2832K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,001 to 500,000</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>5133K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,001 to 800,000</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>4347K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 800,000</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>25200K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Combined population of all major cities >100,000 within health department jurisdiction.
** Median Figures.

This group of urban health departments also had the highest percentage of third party reimbursement dollars (66.7%) generated by MCH activities channeled away to the general fund and the lowest percentage dedicated back to MCH efforts (26.7%). MCH-generated third party dollars were relied upon more by these urban health departments (15.7%) to support MCH programs than any other group of cities.
The greatest MCH problems faced by urban families in 1992: Access to health care services, Poverty, Infant mortality, low birthweight, and inadequate prenatal care, Substance abuse, Poor immunization levels

MCH activities generate third party reimbursement dollars (insurance, Medicaid) in most responding health departments (92.9%). Third party dollars are dedicated to MCH programs in 42.9% of responding urban health departments and revert to a general fund in over half (50.7%). Health departments in urban areas with populations greater than 200,000 channel more MCH-generated third party dollars (56.3%) to a general fund than their counterparts in smaller urban areas (44.9%).

Each urban health department was asked to list, in rank order of importance, the five greatest MCH problems faced by the families it served. Lack of access to health care services and the impact of poverty on urban families tied as the most frequently reported, first-ranked problem, each reported by 22% of responding health departments, or 44% of total respondents. Problems associated with infant mortality, low birthweight, and inadequate prenatal care were reported by 16% of responding urban health departments. Adolescent pregnancy, substance abuse, and poor immunization levels were also frequently listed problems.

The 1992 problem rankings reflect some change from the 1990 responses. In 1990 the greatest MCH problem faced by urban families was identified as infant mortality and low birth weight. The change in rankings may reflect actual change in urban MCH problems, an increased awareness of certain problems by responding health departments, and/or be influenced by the input of smaller urban health departments which did not participate in the 1990 survey.
## Fiscal Resources for Urban Maternal and Child Health Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>POP</th>
<th>UHD FY92 BUDGET (K)</th>
<th>MCH FY92 BUDGET (K)</th>
<th>% FOR MCH</th>
<th>BUDGET CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANCHORAGE</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRMINGHAM</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36,278</td>
<td>7,618</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILE</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE ROCK</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOENIX +</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21,438</td>
<td>5,145</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUCSON</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12,851</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKERSFIELD</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCORD #</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19,194</td>
<td>2,303</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS ANGELES +</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>15,750</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAKLAND +</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASADENA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVERSIDE</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACRAMENTO</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31,673</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALINAS</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN BERNARDINO +</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>529,986</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO +</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>227,508</td>
<td>27,501</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>166,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JOSE +</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA ANA +</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA ROSA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALLEJO #</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AURORA #</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO SPRINGS</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,152</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENVER</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKEWOOD</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGEPORT</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARTFORD</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,897</td>
<td>3,311</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAVEN</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAMFORD</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATERBURY</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,505</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>19,380</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILMINGTON</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKSONVILLE</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15,457</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIAMI +</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29,831</td>
<td>8,651</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Population Code**
1 = < 100K, 2 = 100K to 200K, 3 = 200K to 300K, 4 = 300K to 500K, 5 = 500K to 800K, 6 = > 800K

**UHD FY92 Budget (K)**
Health department's total budget (1,000s) FY92

**MCH FY92 Budget (K)**
Dollars (1,000s) dedicated to MCH activities FY92

**Budget Change**
How MCH portion of total budget has changed in the past year: increased, same, decreased, or unknown

# Largest city in health department's jurisdiction; health department located in different city
+ Health department jurisdiction includes multiple cities > 100K; population code includes all cities > 100K in service area

* Data not available

**Notes:**
- Fiscal Resources for Urban Maternal and Child Health Programs
- City and state population code:
  - 1 = < 100K
  - 2 = 100K to 200K
  - 3 = 200K to 300K
  - 4 = 300K to 500K
  - 5 = 500K to 800K
  - 6 = > 800K
- UHD FY92 Budget (K): Health department's total budget (1,000s) FY92
- MCH FY92 Budget (K): Dollars (1,000s) dedicated to MCH activities FY92
- Budget Change: How MCH portion of total budget has changed in the past year: increased, same, decreased, or unknown
- Larger City in Health Department's Jurisdiction
- Health Department Jurisdiction Includes Multiple Cities > 100K; Population Code Includes All Cities > 100K in Service Area
- Data not available
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Fiscal Resources for Urban Maternal and Child Health Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>POP</th>
<th>UHD FY92 BUDGET(K)</th>
<th>MCH FY92 BUDGET(K)</th>
<th>% FOR MCH</th>
<th>BUDGET CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORLANDO</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15,489</td>
<td>7,745</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST PETERSBURG</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALLAHASSEE</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMPA</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19,817</td>
<td>5,945</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLANTA</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43,856</td>
<td>5,263</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVANNAH</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,715</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGANA</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11,167</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONOLULU</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>424,457</td>
<td>38,201</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAR RAPIDS</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES MOINES</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOISE</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,749</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHICAGO</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEORIA</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKFORD</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGFIELD</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVANSVILLE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANAPOLIS</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16,383</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH BEND</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPEKA</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEXINGTON</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,290</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISVILLE</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,111</td>
<td>3,754</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATON ROUGE</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW ORLEANS</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15,700</td>
<td>7,065</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHREVEPORT</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSTON</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALTIMORE</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>112,258</td>
<td>22,452</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTLAND</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANN ARBOR #</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETROIT</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND RAPIDS</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANSING</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>3,960</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVONIA #</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>9,680</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STERLING HEIGHTS #</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,662</td>
<td>4,198</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNEAPOLIS</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,1649</td>
<td>8,387</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST PAUL</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENCE</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population Code: 1 = <100K, 2 = 100K TO 200K, 3 = 200K TO 300K, 4 = 300K TO 500K, 5 = 500K TO 800K, 6 = >800K

1 UHD FY92 BUDGET (K) = Health department's total budget (1,000's) FY92
2 MCH FY92 BUDGET (K) = Dollars (1,000's) dedicated to MCH activities FY92
3 BUDGET CHANGE = How MCH portion of total budget has changed in the past year: increased, same, decreased, or unknown

# Largest city in health department's jurisdiction, health department located in different city.
+ Health department jurisdiction includes multiple cities >100K, population code includes all cities >100K in service area

* Data not available
### Fiscal Resources for Urban Maternal and Child Health Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>POP</th>
<th>UHD FY92 BUDGET(K)</th>
<th>MCH FY92 BUDGET(K)</th>
<th>% FOR MCH</th>
<th>BUDGET CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS CITY</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,530</td>
<td>2,192</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGFIELD</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,148</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKSON</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLOTTE</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16,834</td>
<td>4,209</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURHAM</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,368</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENSBORO</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17,881</td>
<td>7,510</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RALEIGH</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMAHA</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERSEY CITY</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWARK</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,644</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATERNSON</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,276</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS VEGAS</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16,888</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENO</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2+1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUFFALO</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18,541</td>
<td>6,053</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>278,700</td>
<td>36,231</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCHESTER</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30,920</td>
<td>4,638</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYRACUSE</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36,532</td>
<td>3,288</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YONKERS #</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19,588</td>
<td>3,722</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKRON</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,772</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINCINNATI</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34,103</td>
<td>3,751</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVELAND</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBUS</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23,565</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAYTON</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19,147</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TULSA</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,039</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTLAND</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45,562</td>
<td>21,414</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLENTOWN</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,844</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIE</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILADELPHIA</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>383,130</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITTSBURGH</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26,552</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JUAN</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82,589</td>
<td>9,085</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBIA</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIOUX FALLS</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHATTANOOGA</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,979</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMPHIS</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Population Code**
- 1 = < 100K
- 2 = 100K to 200K
- 3 = > 200K to 500K
- 4 = > 500K to 1,000K
- 5 = > 1,000K to 2,000K
- 6 = > 2,000K

**UHD FY92 Budget (K)**
- Health department's total budget (1,000s) FY92.

**MCH FY92 Budget (K)**
- Dollars (1,000s) dedicated to MCH activities FY92.

**Budget Change**
- How MCH portion of total budget has changed in the past year:
  - Increased
  - Decreased
  - Same
  - Unknown

# Largest city in health department's jurisdiction: health department located in different city.
+ Health department jurisdiction includes multiple cities > 100K, population code includes all cities > 100K in service area.

* Data not available.

**Best Copy Available**
### Fiscal Resources for Urban Maternal and Child Health Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>POP</th>
<th>UHD FY92 BUDGET(K)</th>
<th>MCH FY92 BUDGET(K)</th>
<th>% FOR MCH</th>
<th>BUDGET CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NASHVILLE</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16,995</td>
<td>3,399</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMARILLO</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTIN</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAUMONT</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORPUS CHRISTI</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,446</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALLAS</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL PASO</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,784</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT WORTH</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,733</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARLAND</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSTON</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45,700</td>
<td>14,858</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRVING</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAREDO</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUBBOCK</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,306</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESQUITE</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASADENA</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,179</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN ANTONIO</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20,560</td>
<td>10,486</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACO</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALT LAKE CITY</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXANDRIA</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>2,919</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHESAPEAKE</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWPORT NEWS</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,425</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORFOLK</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,954</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTSMOUTH</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,196</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA BEACH</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEATTLE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68,669</td>
<td>24,034</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOKANE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,888</td>
<td>3,562</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACOMA</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19,574</td>
<td>5,872</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADISON</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILWAUKEE</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLESTON</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEYENNE</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- **Population Code**
  - 1 = <100K
  - 2 = 100K TO 200K
  - 3 = 200K TO 500K
  - 4 = 500K TO 1,000K
  - 5 = 1,000K TO 2,000K
  - 6 = >2,000K

- **UHD FY92 BUDGET (K)**: Health department's total budget in 1992 dollars (1,000's)
- **MCH FY92 BUDGET (K)**: Dollars (1,000's) dedicated to MCH activities FY92
- **% FOR MCH**: How much portion of total budget has changed in the past year
- **BUDGET CHANGE**: Increased, same, decreased, or unknown

# Largest city in health department's jurisdiction, health department located in different city.
+ Health department jurisdiction includes multiple cities >100K; population code includes all cities >100K in service area.

* Data not available.
Part 2 of the 1992 CityMatCH Survey of Maternal and Child Health in Urban Health Departments in the United States focused on childhood immunization. Each urban health department was asked to provide information about childhood immunization services in its jurisdiction. For purposes of the survey, immunization services were broadly defined to include administration of vaccines to children, purchase and/or distribution of vaccine, outreach and education efforts, and other assurance and monitoring activities. Specific information was requested about the immunization status of children at 24 months and at school entry; about who the principal providers of immunization and primary/preventive health care services for children were; about the adequacy of health department capacity and the extent of collaboration with other providers; and about the sources and levels of financing of immunization activities. Health departments were asked to identify what they perceived to be the greatest barriers to age-appropriate immunization faced by children and families in their jurisdictions as well as to identify the resources needed by urban health departments to assure better childhood immunization levels. In addition, each health department was asked to describe its most successful activities to improve childhood immunization levels in its urban community. These “success stories” are presented in Section II, “Initiatives to Improve Childhood Immunization Levels.”

Only about one-half (53.8%) of urban children were reported by responding city and county health departments as being fully immunized at 24 months of age. On average, health departments serving cities with populations under 200,000 reported only slightly higher 24 month immunization levels than health departments serving larger cities (54.9% compared to 52.9%).

Levels of Childhood Immunization

In your health department’s jurisdiction, what percentage of children are fully immunized at 24 months of age?
The lowest 24 month immunization levels were reported by urban health departments serving cities with populations over 800,000. Only an average of 39.2% of children in those jurisdictions were reported fully immunized at 24 months of age. One responding health department of this size reported that only 18% of two-year-olds in its jurisdiction were fully immunized.

Figure 1 reflects average levels of immunization for two-year-olds stratified by city size.

Overall, urban health departments reported that 94.3% of children in their jurisdictions were fully immunized when they entered school. Little variation in the school entry immunization level was noted by city size. Health departments indicated that their principal sources of information on levels of childhood immunization were school and preschool record audits and kindergarten-based retrospective studies. 85.7% of health departments reported that school entry immunization data was not available by race or ethnicity. Almost three-quarters (73.1%) of responding health departments indicated that 24 month immunization data was not available by race or ethnicity.
Half of urban children (51%) are estimated to receive their primary/preventive health care services from private physicians. Other principal providers of primary/preventive health care services, according to responding urban health departments, are local health departments (20%), hospital outpatient clinics (9%), and community health centers (9%). Local health departments played the greatest role in providing primary/preventive health services in cities with populations over 800,000 (30%) and in cities in the 200,000-300,000 population range (28%). Community health centers were most utilized in cities with populations between 500,000 and 800,000 (18.5%), resulting in lower private physician and local health department utilization (37% and 13% respectively). Hospital emergency rooms provide primary/preventive care for 3% of children across all responding health departments. Hospital-inpatient services are estimated to provide primary/preventive care for less than 1% of children nationwide.

City and county health departments are the primary providers of immunizations for urban children. Urban health departments provide immunizations to 41% of children in their jurisdictions. Private physicians provide immunizations for 37% of urban children. These are followed by hospital outpatient clinics (8%) and community health centers (8%). In urban communities with populations of less than 300,000, local health departments are estimated to provide immunizations to 48% of children. Community health centers again play a larger role in mid-sized (500,000-800,000 population) cities, providing immunizations to 18% of children and reducing private physician and health department utilization for immunization services, (29% and 28% respectively). Again, hospital inpatient services are estimated to provide less than 1% of childhood immunizations.
Private/Public Sector Shift

In recent years, some urban communities have experienced a shift from the private to the public sector in the delivery of immunization services. Has this shift occurred in your jurisdiction?

Over three-fourths (78.4%) of urban health departments responding to the 1992 survey indicated their jurisdictions had experienced a shift from the private to the public sector in the delivery of immunization services. Health departments serving cities with populations between 500,001-800,000 reported a lower percentage of shift (57.1%). This may again be a function of a larger reliance on community health centers. A variety of explanations were given for the cause of this shift from the private to the public sector. These included:

- increased vaccine costs in the private sector
- poor levels of Medicaid reimbursement
- liability concerns of private physicians
- cumbersome informed consent requirements
- additional required vaccine doses based on changing immunization guidelines

In several health department jurisdictions where a shift was not experienced, the principal reasons were believed to be universal availabili-
ity of publicly funded vaccine and high levels of provider collaboration in the provision of immunization and other primary health care services for children.

Urban health departments across all population breakdowns reported substantial increases in the estimated numbers of children served and the estimated numbers of vaccine doses administered since 1989. Overall, responding urban health departments related a 22.1% increase in the median estimated number of children served and a 44.5% increase in the median estimated number of doses of vaccine administered from 1989 to 1991. In general, the largest increases were reported by health departments serving cities with populations of less than 300,000. Table 3.1 reflects the change between 1989 and 1991 in the median estimated number of children served and the median estimated number of doses of vaccine administered by health departments, stratified by city size. 

It should be noted, however, that a number of health departments indicated this series of questions was particularly difficult for them to answer due to the limitations of their data collection and tracking systems. Responding health departments expressed more confidence in the accuracy of their responses regarding “doses administered” than “number of children served.”

Table 3.1
Change in Median Estimated Numbers of Children Served and Vaccine Doses Administered Across Responding Urban Health Department (UHD) Jurisdictions, 1989-1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Size*</th>
<th>% Change in Median Number of Children Served</th>
<th>% Change in Median Number of Vaccine Doses Administered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Responding UHDs</td>
<td>+22.1%</td>
<td>+44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;100,000</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000-200,000</td>
<td>+43.5%</td>
<td>+46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;200,000-300,000</td>
<td>+55.2%</td>
<td>+34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;300,001-500,000</td>
<td>+29.5%</td>
<td>+27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;500,001-800,000</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>+57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;800,000</td>
<td>+23.4%</td>
<td>-23.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Combined population of all major cities >100,000 within health department jurisdiction.
** N of responding health departments <5 - too small to report reliable finding.

Children Served/Doses of Vaccine Administered

How many children received immunizations and how many doses of vaccines have been administered through all of your health department's programs in each of the past three years (1989, 1990, 1991)?
Only 56.9% of responding urban health departments said they had adequate capacity to serve all children seeking immunization services. While approximately two-thirds of smaller health departments reported having enough capacity, only one of the twelve health departments representing cities greater than 800,000 reported having adequate capacity to serve all children seeking immunization services from them. The relatively larger increases experienced by smaller urban health departments in numbers of children served and vaccine doses administered may, in part, be a result of having available capacity to provide service to additional children while larger health departments may virtually be fully extended in the amount of services they are able to provide.

Providers collaborate somewhat or a great deal in 73.3% of responding urban health departments. Larger health departments reported higher levels of collaboration between providers. Health departments serving urban areas greater than 500,000 reported that immunization providers collaborated somewhat or a great deal 92.3% of the time, while only 70.9% of health departments serving areas under 500,000 reported high levels of collaboration. Figure 3 represents the extent of provider collaboration across all responding urban health departments.

Figure 3

Extents of Provider Collaboration in Immunization Services Delivery in U.S. Cities*

- Very little: 24%
- Not at all: 3%
- Somewhat: 53%
- A great deal: 20%

*As reported by MCH directors in major urban health departments, 1992
Responding health departments provided numerous examples of collaborative efforts in their jurisdictions. Examples of collaboration included:

- providing vaccine to others
- providing/accepting referrals and resource information
- collaborating in special programs and health fairs
- setting up community immunization advisory groups to identify barriers, formulate solutions and collaborate in implementation
- developing standard forms and record keeping systems
- information sharing including use of computerized data bases and developing portable immunization cards
- cooperation in submission of grant applications

97.9% of urban health departments responding to the 1992 CityMatCH survey administer diphtheria/tetanus/pertussis (DPT), oral poliovirus/injectable poliovirus (OPV/IPV) and measles/mumps/rubella (MMR) immunizations; 97.1% administer Haemophilus influenzae b (Hib) vaccine; 95% administer tetanus/diphtheria (Td); and, 86.4% administer Hepatitis B vaccine to a specific group or groups. Health departments which do not directly administer these immunizations often provide the vaccine for others to administer.

Health departments were asked to respond to several questions regarding the administration of Hepatitis B vaccine. Infants of Hepatitis B positive mothers were identified as the principal target group for receipt of Hepatitis B vaccine. Overall, 76.4% of responding health departments administer Hepatitis B vaccine to this group. 100% of health departments serving cities with populations over 800,000 provide the vaccine to this target group. Table 3.2 on the following page reflects the target groups to which urban health departments administer Hepatitis B vaccine.
Does your health department plan to provide universal Hepatitis B immunization to children?

What immunization guidelines does your health department follow?

How does your health department administer immunizations to children in your jurisdiction?

Across all responding urban health departments, 55.1% indicated that they planned to provide universal Hepatitis B immunization to children. 8% of health departments said they did not plan to provide universal Hepatitis B immunization and 27.5% said that a decision had not yet been made or they did not know.

Urban health departments most commonly follow the guidelines of their individual state (82.1%) and the immunization guidelines of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Advisory Committee on Immunization Practice (ACIP) (81.4%). The guidelines of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) are followed by 59.3% of responding health departments.

Health departments rely on several mechanisms for administering immunizations to children in their jurisdictions. 94.3% of responding health departments deliver immunizations through immunization clinics. 82.4% of respondents deliver immunizations through child health clinics. Special vaccination campaigns are used according to 60% of responding health departments, followed by primary care clinics (41.4%) and WIC clinics (29.3%).
While virtually all responding urban health departments reported increased numbers of children seeking immunization services, only 28.7% said the trend in funding for their health department immunization services had increased from 1989 to 1991. 7.3% indicated their immunization funding had decreased. The remainder indicated that funding for immunization services had remained stable.

Each health department was asked to identify what were perceived to be the three greatest barriers (in order of importance) to age-appropriate immunizations faced by children and families in their jurisdiction. The barrier most often identified by responding health departments was a lack of parental education about the importance of childhood immunization coupled with a lack of motivation to seek immunization services. Inadequate access to care (including transportation barriers) was the second most often identified barrier. Other principal barriers to adequate immunization were the increased costs of vaccine; overburdened and unfriendly delivery systems; and missed opportunities to vaccinate.

Urban health departments need a variety of resources to assure better age-appropriate immunization levels in children. Computer tracking and recall systems are needed to enable health departments to target their efforts more effectively and measure progress. More staff and more clinic locations, with extended service hours, are needed to make it easier for working parents to have their children immunized. Expanded community outreach and increased community information and education efforts are needed to reach all segments of the population, particularly hard to reach high risk populations.
Each health department was asked to describe its most successful activities to improve childhood immunization levels in its jurisdiction, its immunization "success story." Successful interventions often combined multiple strategies, but four basic categories of strategies emerged from the identified initiatives: initiatives to improve the delivery system or make it more "user friendly;" initiatives to expand community outreach and community education; initiatives involving community partnerships, collaborations and coalitions; and initiatives relating to immunization documentation such as developing tracking and recall systems and stricter enforcement of immunization standards. Section II, "Initiatives to Improve Childhood Immunization Levels" describes the creative actions local city and county health departments are taking to solve complex problems.
INITIATIVES TO IMPROVE CHILDHOOD IMMUNIZATION LEVELS

URBAN HEALTH DEPARTMENT IMMUNIZATION SUCCESS STORIES
CityMatCH is committed to gathering and brokering information about “what works” in urban maternal and child health. Urban public health leaders, faced with tightening budgets and increasing demands for an ever expanding variety of services, have time and again met their challenges by devising creative new strategies and implementing innovative initiatives. We at CityMatCH believe there is much to be learned from these front line experts who daily battle the health and welfare problems faced by urban women and children. Toward this end, as with past CityMatCH surveys, the 1992 Survey of Maternal and Child Health in Urban Health Departments asked each health department to share a “success story.” This year’s success stories reflect what urban health departments believe to be their most successful activities to improve childhood immunization levels.

The initiatives highlighted in this Section are perceived to have been successful by the responding health departments. No specific measure of success was required other than a perception by the health department that their initiative seemed to be working.

Although the survey asked each health department to highlight only one initiative, multiple examples of successful activities were provided by several responding health departments. Whenever possible, all information given in each health department’s survey response has been presented and the original wording of the responding health department has been maintained.

The activities have been subdivided into four basic descriptive categories for easier reference. While a single initiative may encompass several categories of activities, we have attempted to place each initiative into the category of primary focus.

"WHAT WORKS" IN IMMUNIZATIONS

Urban Health Department Immunization Success Stories
An "initiatives-at-a-glance" matrix immediately precedes the initiative descriptions. This matrix lists each responding health department and provides quick, categorized information about the types of immunization initiatives the health department has undertaken. The matrix can be used in several ways. First, to identify the successful immunization activities of a specific city or county health department, and second, to identify all health departments who have undertaken specific types of initiatives.

- **Initiatives to Improve the Immunization Delivery System.**

In this subsection we present activities designed to make the immunization delivery system more "user friendly" and more easily accessible. Examples of the types activities contained under this heading include expanding hours, days, and service locations, offering "express lane" clinics to decrease waiting time, and attempting to minimize missed opportunities to vaccinate.

- **Initiatives to Expand Community Outreach and Public Awareness.**

The primary focus of the activities in this subsection is increasing public education and awareness about the importance of immunization and conducting community outreach activities. Examples include providing immunizations in non-traditional places such as parks and shopping malls, providing incentives to encourage parents to seek timely immunization for their children, as well as many creative examples of public information media campaigns.

- **Initiatives Involving Community Collaborations and Coalitions.**

This subsection details examples of immunization activities which involve community collaborations and coalitions. Many of the activities highlighted in this section relate to collaborative efforts in connection with submitting applications for new funding opportunities (such as the Centers for Disease Control's Infant Immunization Initiative).
Activities in this subsection focus on better collection and usage of immunization data. Immunization tracking and follow-up systems along with activities aimed at better enforcement of immunization standards are presented.

Descriptions within each subsection are presented in alphabetical order, first by State (or Territory) and then by the health department's principal City within the State (or Territory). In most instances the health department is located in the listed city. In a very few instances, however, a health department having jurisdiction for a city of greater than 100,000, may be physically located in a different, smaller city. These are generally county health departments. Because CityMatCH targets cities with populations greater than 100,000, the name of the largest city in the health department's jurisdiction is presented. The name of the city where the health department is actually located is given in an accompanying footnote. These cities are denoted by an asterisk (*). Several health departments are responsible for multiple cities of greater than 100,000 population, in these instances the additional cities are shown in parentheses below the name of the health department.

The descriptions that follow are brief sketches of the activities of each responding health department. They are not intended to be a comprehensive overview of these initiatives. The reader is encouraged to contact his or her urban MCH colleagues for more information about these activities. Contact information for each surveyed urban health department is presented in Section III of this document.

Initiatives to Improve Immunization Documentation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Health Department Immunization Initiatives</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>Immunization Delivery System and Public Awareness</th>
<th>Community Collaboration</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage, Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham, Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile, Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock, Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson, Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallejo, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora, Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs, Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterbury, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington, Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah, Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agana, Guam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise, Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria, Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford, Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evansville, Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anchorage, Alaska
Birmingham, Alabama
Mobile, Alabama
Little Rock, Arkansas
Phoenix, Arizona
Tucson, Arizona
Bakersfield, California
Concord, California
Long Beach, California
Los Angeles, California
Oakland, California
Pasadena, California
Riverside, California
Sacramento, California
San Bernardino, California
San Diego, California
San Jose, California
Santa Ana, California
Vallejo, California
Aurora, Colorado
Colorado Springs, Colorado
Denver, Colorado
Bridgeport, Connecticut
Hartford, Connecticut
New Haven, Connecticut
Stamford, Connecticut
Waterbury, Connecticut
Washington, DC
Wilmington, Delaware
Jacksonville, Florida
Miami, Florida
Orlando, Florida
St. Petersburg, Florida
Tampa, Florida
Atlanta, Georgia
Savannah, Georgia
Agana, Guam
Honolulu, Hawaii
Boise, Idaho
Chicago, Illinois
Peoria, Illinois
Rockford, Illinois
Springfield, Illinois
Evansville, Indiana
Indianapolis, Indiana

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/State</th>
<th>Add days, hours, locations</th>
<th>Walk-in clinics</th>
<th>Reduce waiting time during clinics</th>
<th>Increase personnel</th>
<th>Reduce missed opportunities</th>
<th>Target special populations</th>
<th>Immunize at public service sites</th>
<th>Use mobile units</th>
<th>Do mass immunization campaigns</th>
<th>Increase incentives to parents</th>
<th>Increase consumer education</th>
<th>Mass media campaigns</th>
<th>Creative advertising campaigns</th>
<th>Community Collaboration</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Bend, Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Rapids, Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka, Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington, Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville, Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge, Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shreveport, Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor, Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids, Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livonia, Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren, Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha, Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno, Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City, New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonkers, New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham, North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro, North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh, North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene, Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Add days, hours, locations</th>
<th>Walks, inclines</th>
<th>Reduce time to get appointments</th>
<th>Reduce waiting time during clinics</th>
<th>Increase personnel</th>
<th>Reduce missed opportunities</th>
<th>Target special populations</th>
<th>Immunize at public service sites</th>
<th>Immunize at community-based sites</th>
<th>Use mobile units</th>
<th>Do mass immunization campaigns</th>
<th>Increase incentives to parents</th>
<th>Increase consumer education</th>
<th>Mass media campaigns</th>
<th>Creative advertising campaigns</th>
<th>Public-private sector risk and coalitions</th>
<th>Partnerships with schools, community organizations and others</th>
<th>Maximize 13 planning and development</th>
<th>Audits (day care, WIC, etc.)</th>
<th>Recall/reminder systems</th>
<th>Tracking systems</th>
<th>Strict enforcement</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown, Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie, Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan, Puerto Rico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls, South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga, Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville, Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarillo, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christi, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laredo, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubbock, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesquite, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waco, Texas</td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington, Vermont</td>
<td></td>
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<td>Alexandria, Virginia</td>
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<td>Chesapeake, Virginia</td>
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<tr>
<td>Newport News, Virginia</td>
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<td>Portsmouth, Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>Cheyenne, Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Initiatives to Improve The Immunization Delivery System
Initiatives to Improve The Immunization Delivery System

MOBILE, ALABAMA
MOBILE COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Attempts to become more "user friendly;" improved staffing to decrease waiting time.

PHOENIX, ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
(ALSO INCLUDES GLENDALE, MESA, SCOTTSDALE, TEMPE.)

Establishment of community-based clinics on a regular monthly schedule. Clinics are scheduled for late afternoon and evening (3-7pm) to accommodate working families. Sites are chosen based on demographics, socioeconomic indicators, and disease incidence. We now have the capability of providing services in more isolated spots through use of a mobile public health clinic.

CONCORD, CALIFORNIA
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Expanded clinic services.

RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE HEALTH SERVICES AGENCY - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Making walk-in immunization services available at all health department clinic sites.

PASADENA, CALIFORNIA
CITY OF PASADENA HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Immediate access to immunizations through walk-in clinics.

Child health appointments booked prior to delivery.

---

*This Health Department is located in Martinez, California.
Increasing clinic hours, including evenings, during August and September.

Established a new permanent MCH clinic in previously unserved southern portion of county to improve access.

Improving immunization completion by fully immunizing children whenever they are in clinic setting.

The most successful activity to improve childhood immunization levels this past year was carried out in our primary care clinics. Educational work with care providers about immunizing children whenever they are seen in a clinic and not using inappropriate contraindications has significantly decreased "provider error" as a reason for unimmunized children.

Extension of clinic hours at all clinic sites and an increase in the number of immunization clinic days to include daily vaccine availability at all sites.

Implementation of the missed opportunity recommendations from the state.

SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA
SANTA CLARA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
(ALSO INCLUDES SUNNYVALE.)

SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA
ORANGE COUNTY HEALTH CARE AGENCY
(ALSO INCLUDES ANAHEIM, FULLERTON, GARDEN GROVE, HUNTINGTON BEACH, IRVINE, AND ORANGEC.)

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO
EL PASO COUNTY DEPT. OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT

DENVER, COLORADO
DENVER DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HOSPITALS

ORLANDO, FLORIDA
HRS/ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH UNIT

ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA
HRS/PINELLAS COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH UNIT
In 1991 the Department of Health Immunization Program began providing free Hepatitis B vaccine for infants. The vaccine is available free of charge for the first dose administered to infants prior to discharge from the hospital, and for the second and third doses administered by health care providers to indigent children less than one year of age.

We increased immunization activities after a measles epidemic. Immunization levels increased by 10% temporarily. For many people, the last time they were in the health department was for the pertussis outbreak 18 months before.

Offer mix of walk-in clinics and appointments.

Increased number of satellite clinics; increased number of clinic hours at health department.

Added a second monthly immunization clinic.

Increased clinic hours in the health department facilities; extended clinic hours in the evening to make it more convenient for working families.

Offer immunization clinics two mornings per week year round.
Transfer of nursing and clerical personnel into immunizations.  
TOPEKA, KANSAS  
TOPEKA/SHAWNEE COUNTY HEALTH AGENCY

Offer walk-in clinic days each week; offer complete walk-in days during school rush time.  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
LEXINGTON-FAYETTE COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Offer immunizations every day and in a satellite clinic once a week; also give immunizations in child health-WIC clinics five days a week.  
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA  
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH HEALTH UNIT

One of the largest maternal child health centers extended hours until 8pm three days each week to increase immunization accessibility.  
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA  
CITY OF NEW ORLEANS HEALTH DEPARTMENT

An LPN was hired for each of the seven maternal child health centers to provide "immunization on demand" clinics during regular clinic hours five days per week.  
SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA  
CADD-O-SHREVEPORT HEALTH UNIT

Providing extended hours at peak times to allow working parents to bring their children in for shots.  
PORTLAND, MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Protocol for giving vaccine to children with URI and OM.  

Offering second MMR to families with children over six years at cost (state does not supply MMR to children over six years if not first dose).
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
BALTIMORE CITY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN
WASHTENAW COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES-
PUBLIC HEALTH DIVISION

GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN
KENT COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

LIVONIA, MICHIGAN
WAYNE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA
ST. PAUL DIVISION OF PUBLIC HEALTH

The "Immunization Only Clinic" has lowered the age for clinic attendance by a year; children as young as three years of age can now be immunized at this free clinic.

Clinics held at regular sites and times.

Expanded hours at main clinic.

Now offering second MMR.

We have managed to maintain our level of direct service provision and other immunization-related activities despite inflation driven cost increases and level or decreasing funding and revenues.

Hours of service at public health center clinic changed to provide more convenient times for clients to utilize services.

2This Health Department is located in Ypsilanti, Michigan.

3This Health Department is located in Westland, Michigan.
Walk-in immunization clinics operating Monday through Friday with no appointments, physicals, or enrollment prerequisites. No charge for administration of vaccine. This clinic has a waiting time of less than 20 minutes except during peak school enrollment times.

Adherence to true contraindication policy recommended by ACIP.

Let's Invest Now in Kids (LINK) Clinic: Started new clinic providing primary and preventive health care to Medicaid eligible children, especially those under age eight years.

"Fast-Lane" clinics; integration of services.

Added one two-hour immunization clinic per week at the Douglas County Health Department allowing for increased opportunities for immunizations and decreased volume at other clinic sessions.

Health Department offered clinics at non-traditional hours and places resulting in an over 27% increase in the number of doses administered by the department in 1991.
NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK
NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

ROCHESTER, NEW YORK
MONROE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

SYRACUSE, NEW YORK
ONONDAGA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

YONKERS, NEW YORK
WESTCHESTER COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

A wide range of activities, including special outbreak control clinics, supplemented normal clinic operations. No single activity is thought to have improved immunization levels. No successful strategy has been devised to address the problem of under-immunization, particularly among preschool age children.

Addition of evening hours at central immunization clinic. Beginning July 1991, the health department immunization clinic held evening clinics. This enabled the clinic to be more responsive to working parents.

Routine immunization of infants for Hepatitis B. Beginning July 1, 1992, all infants under one year of age offered routine immunization for Hepatitis B, in response to CDC and NYDOH recommendations. Information has been provided to area providers who will refer to the county health department clinic if they are unable to provide the vaccine.

“Express-Lane” Immunization Only Clinics.

Increased numbers of immunization clinics at department of health.

*This Health Department is located in Hawthorne, New York.*
Increased times and appointments for immunization clinics.

CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA
MECKLENBURG COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Able to hire additional part-time nurses to work in overworked clinics.

COLUMBUS, OHIO
COLUMBUS HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Maintained a childhood immunization clinic offering all pediatric vaccines on a walk-in basis with service fees based on ability to pay.

DAYTON, OHIO
COMBINED HEALTH DISTRICT OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Extended evening clinics.

TULSA, OKLAHOMA
TULSA CITY-COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Increased number of immunization clinics from one to four per month.

ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA
ALLENTOWN HEALTH BUREAU

Immunization services provided with no appointment needed (a no barrier to immunization instruction was also given).

SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO
SAN JUAN HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Appointment system for immunization with goal to accommodate every patient in a timely fashion; added additional staffing for immunizations.

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA
RICHLAND COUNTY HEALTH DISTRICT

*This Health Department is located in Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico.
SIoux Falls, South Dakota
Sioux River Valley Community Health Center

The Community Health Center has been having quarterly immunization clinics. They operate from 3:00pm to 8:30pm for any child in the area. If they have another family physician, we send the vaccines given and dates to that office for their records. This is a free clinic, we ask that they bring past immunization records with them if available. It has been quite successful for us.

El Paso, Texas
El Paso City-County Health and Environment Dist.

More walk-in clinics and more late hours clinics.

Garland, Texas
Garland Health Department

Make appointments available within 14 days and taking some walk-ins.

Houston, Texas
City of Houston Health and Human Services

Established weekday evening and Saturday immunization clinics for working parents to bring in children.

Irving, Texas
Department of Health Services

Extended hours of clinics two hours per week. Immunization clinic is heavily visited throughout the year, especially by children preparing for entry into elementary school or day care setting.

Laredo, Texas
City of Laredo Health Department

Evening clinics were instituted three evenings each week (Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday) from 5pm to 8pm. This has been extremely popular.

Mesquite, Texas
Mesquite Public Health Clinic

Offer Saturday shot clinics for back to school.
• De-centralized walk-in clinics; culturally sensitive staff; after hour coverage.

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO METROPOLITAN HEALTH DISTRICT

• Expanded clinic hours in the month of August to accommodate increased number of clients seeking services.

WACO, TEXAS
WACO-McLENNAN COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH DISTRICT

• Development of immunization action plan to increase clinic services.

CHESAPEAKE, VIRGINIA
CHESAPEAKE HEALTH DEPARTMENT

• Comprehensive Health Improvement Project (CHIP): Implemented project designed to provide a medical home (primary care) for children plus case management by public health nurses.

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA
RICHMOND CITY HEALTH DISTRICT

• Establishing immunization clinics in our clinic sites.

• The distribution system for free vaccines to clinic and private providers was made more user friendly to promote increased use. A 24 hour order line was added, as well as a FAX order number. Delivery within 5 days to their nearest health department site is guaranteed. A computerized invoicing system allows the department to keep better track of distribution and usage so shortages have not happened.

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON
SEATTLE-KING COUNTY DEPT. OF PUBLIC HEALTH
Available and accessible clinic opportunities for our clientele.

Removal of access barriers within health department programs: avoiding inappropriate medical deferrals, availability of walk-in, no appointment, immunization-only appointments.
Initiatives to Expand Community Outreach and Public Awareness
Initiatives to Expand Community Outreach and Public Awareness

BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA
JEFFERSON COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

MOBILE, ALABAMA
MOBILE COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

PHOENIX, ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
(ALSO INCLUDES GLENDALE, MESA, SCOTTSDALE AND TEMPE.)

TUCSON, ARIZONA
PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS
PULASKI COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT - LITTLE ROCK CENTRAL

- Marketing to the private sector.
- Improved educational efforts; EPSDT outreach.
- Piloting an immunization clinic in the waiting room of a busy AFDC Food Stamp Eligibility Office.
- Held more clinics with extended hours.
- Increased number of on-site immunization clinics in schools.
- Holding Saturday immunization clinics in all local health units which were well advertised by prominent citizens.
- Using lists generated by state immunization program to contact families to bring in children with delinquent immunizations for updates.
- Campaigning through the schools to promote adequate immunizations for all children.
Advertising on television for immunization events; providing clinics in special areas or sites (going to community rather than community coming to the clinic).

BAKERSFIELD, CALIFORNIA
KERN COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Door-to-door outreach effort in "hard to reach" communities.

CONCORD, CALIFORNIA
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Distribution of coupons for free immunization at immunization clinics to persons at or below 200% poverty. This was follow-up to discovery that cultural issues inhibit persons from requesting free services.

LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Department conducted intensive immunization efforts at a local park where 1200 children were immunized during the first two weeks of school.

PASADENA, CALIFORNIA
CITY OF PASADENA HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Outreach to summer lunch programs in community centers.

Outreach to new parochial school students for immunizations.

Outreach to community colleges to mass immunize college freshmen at risk.

Providing ongoing immunization services at two geographic locations that do not have a county clinic.

RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE HEALTH SERVICES AGENCY

---

(This Health Department is located in Martinez, California.)
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
SACRAMENTO COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
(ALSO INCLUDES ONTARIO AND RANCHO CUCAMONGA.)

SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA HEALTH DEPARTMENT
(ALSO INCLUDES SUNNYVALE.)

VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA
SOLANO COUNTY HEALTH AND WELFARE SERVICES

AURORA, COLORADO
TRI-COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT
CITY OF BRIDGEPORT HEALTH DEPARTMENT

 Twelve special clinics for back-to-school assisted entering students in complying with school law requirements.

 Health fairs.

 Work with schools and day care centers to outreach and inform parents regarding immunizations.

 County-wide outreach to Medi-Cal families through social services mailout.

 Increasing immunization clinics in August and September to assure access for school entry.

 Forming the Immunization Advisory Group - this group informed the community about the problem of inadequate immunizations and increased the awareness of individuals about the need to address this issue.

 Offer of incentives to parents/kids.

 Free health clinics for immunizations and physical exams for new entrants in school system were offered 1/2 day weekly for five months; three mass immunization and physical exam clinics were offered during summer months for school entrants.

 *This Health Department is located in Fairfield, California.
 *This Health Department is located in Englewood, Colorado.
Conducting immunization clinics for school-aged children.

Maternal/child health outreach workers make home visits to prenatal clients and follow-up by stressing the importance of pediatric care.

"Healthy Start Program" provides Medicaid liaison/case management and support services for prenatal and 0-6 year olds.

A summer MMR clinic where over 1,000 vaccines were given during three sessions.

Vaccine clinics in public schools.

Use of volunteers.

Highest official priority (mayor's commitment).

Health department priority subdivisions: identifying high risk children.

A large van with staff and facilities which goes to areas of greatest need.

Reached goal of providing immunizations to more than 5,000 children living in Dade County and providing 10,000 doses of vaccine during National Immunization Week. The week culminated with a very successful community outreach day. Immunization clinics were held at 23 locations throughout Dade County. 3,500 children were immunized with 6,000 doses of vaccine. The majority of them were children 0-5 years of age.
ORLANDO, FLORIDA
HRS/ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH UNIT

Summer Immunizations - gave 2,204 immunizations over a period of six Saturdays during the summer.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA
HRS/PINELLAS COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH UNIT

Immunizations given in child health clinics; immunizations to WIC referrals.

ATLANTA, GEORGIA
FULTON COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Integration of immunization into WIC and other health department services where and when possible.

AGANA, GUAM
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Conducted massive public awareness campaign including public education via electronic and written media and production of handouts and posters. This was linked with the public health nurses' vaccination campaign in the evenings and weekdays and at shopping centers during the weekends.

HONOLULU, HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH - STATE OF HAWAII

Public health nursing immunization clinics provide immunizations for infants and children in clinics located statewide.

Special measles immunization clinics in April and May 1992 reached 10,000 persons statewide.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
CHICAGO DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Utilizing mobile vans in five public housing sites to deliver vaccine to a sub-optimally immunized population.

ROCKFORD, ILLINOIS
WINNEBAGO COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Increased advertising.
Offering immunizations while clients here for WIC.

Offering immunizations in schools.

Outreach.

Special immunization clinics run at school opening.

Hold clinic in Spanish-speaking center with interpreter.

Offer immunizations on Saturdays in WIC only clinics.

Immunization services offered at target school sites and health fairs.

An immunization campaign was held during September and October at the Municipal Auditorium. At this site immunizations were given from 8am until 8pm five days a week over a two month span. 7,811 children were immunized.

Advertising need for immunizations prior to kindergarten round-ups and providing extra staff for volumes.

Advertising.

SOUTH BEND, INDIANA
ST. JOSEPH COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

DES MOINES, IOWA
POLK COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH HEALTH UNIT

NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA
NEW ORLEANS HEALTH DEPARTMENT

SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA
CADD-O-SHREVEPORT HEALTH UNIT

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN
WASHTENAW COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES
PUBLIC HEALTH DIVISION

'This Health Department is located in Ypsilanti, Michigan.
WARREN, MICHIGAN
MACOMB COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA
MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH DEPARTMENT

ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA
ST. PAUL PUBLIC HEALTH

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA
CLARK COUNTY HEALTH DISTRICT

RENO, NEVADA
WASHOE COUNTY DISTRICT HEALTH DEPARTMENT

JERSEY CITY, NEW JERSEY
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES - DIVISION OF HEALTH

♦ Focus on immunization in federal programs (WIC and EPSDT).
♦ Increased media utilization.

♦ School-based immunization clinics to provide second dose of MMR.
♦ Evaluation of immunization status at WIC clinics with subsequent referrals to appropriate providers.

♦ Putting immunization clinics in all WIC clinics. Educating on a one-on-one basis in these WIC clinics regarding the importance of immunizations.

♦ Increased participation in community health fairs and at malls, schools, and community centers.

♦ After a 1990 random study of WIC immunization levels revealed low baseline levels a coupon distribution system which could be redeemable in the outpatient clinic for immunizations was started. A repeat study completed in February of 1992 after starting the system showed WIC immunization levels rose dramatically.

♦ Over 1,000 more children received immunization services through Division of Health programs in 1991 compared to 1990 figures. A measles outbreak was also averted in 1991. These successes were achieved through media campaigns, participation in community health fairs, expansion and promotion of walk-in clinic hours, and an increased presence at the local WIC site.

*This Health Department is located in Mt. Clemens, Michigan.*
In the Spring of 1992 sponsored an educational campaign to inform Newark residents about measles and its complications. The volume of children actually immunized was low, but the parental response in terms of telephone calls and questions at the immunization sites was tremendous. Many children were receiving care from private physicians; those that were not, received the immunization if they met the necessary criteria.

Initiation of expanded outreach immunization program for city residents at various community sites during the months of April, May, and June of 1992 for the provision of preventable childhood disease immunizations.

Received grant from CDC for an immunization demonstration project in the Southwest quadrant of the city. This demonstration project provides for outreach, expanded hours including all day every weekday, some evenings and weekends, neighborhood clinics, and training WIC staff to read immunization records and make referrals.

**Immunization Lottery** - a community initiative begun in April 1991 to target high risk preschoolers and encourage preventive medicine and well child visits. Children brought to participating physicians/health centers/clinics for immunizations have an opportunity to enter a monthly drawing for six cash prizes totalling $350 per month.
ROCHESTER, NEW YORK
(Continued from previous page)

SYRACUSE, NEW YORK
ONONDAGA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA
MECKLENBURG COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA
DURHAM COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA
WAKE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

DAYTON, OHIO
COMBINED HEALTH DISTRICT OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY

- **Special community clinics in September:** Additional clinic sessions are held in community sites the first week of school to allow children entering school to be compliant with New York State immunization requirements for school entrance.

- Co-location at WIC clinics - immunization, education, and literature given.

- Home visiting nurses educate families/monitor immunization status.

- Offering community-based opportunities for education and immunizations at various sites.

- Health director has done public service announcements on local television.

- Child service coordinators who work with at-risk infants/children have strongly promoted improved immunization status.

- Increased EPSDT participation thereby increasing immunization rates.

- Outreach to public park (90 immunizations in two hours).

- Promoted importance of vaccinations via TV/media.

- Offered childhood immunizations in homeless shelter (St. Vincent's Mission).
- Participated in “Due by Two” statewide program.

- Conduct special clinics with emphasis on immunizations.

- Holding more clinics in the schools using both school nurses and public health staff.

- Held clinics in the shopping malls in mid-August when all the stores were advertising back-to-school sales.

- **21st Century and North Philadelphia Immunization Campaigns** - Volunteer Immunization Campaigns.

- **Immunization Festivals:** Mass immunization activities to update immunization to those children not adequately immunized.

- 24 hours measles immunization campaign at all Diagnostic and Treatment Centers during measles outbreak.

- Outreach clinic in housing project.

- Media advertising to increase patient awareness.

- Linking of immunizations with other public health services such as WIC.

---

*This Health Department is located in Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico.*
A Saturday in the mall was the most successful activity; plans are in process to establish a permanent mall immunization clinic.

An immunization clinic part-time at the food distribution warehouse/WIC clinic is becoming successful; if the funding becomes available we will make this full-time and open another.

Conducting outreach immunization clinics in public housing on a rotating basis.

Outreach education to mothers who deliver at local hospitals.

Expanding immunization outreach services.

Distributing flyers at school to send home with children.

Conducted public housing Saturday and Sunday clinics.

Two immunization outreach teams travel to areas of highest needs; low income apartments, the malls and churches. Clinics are also held in the evening and on weekends.

A week-long initiative held in three area malls in August in collaboration with Cooks-Fort Worth Children's Hospital, the Junior League, and area business leaders, immunizations are given from 10am to 6pm.
Participated in National Immunization Week in September 1991 and immunized over 100 children each evening between 4 and 7 pm; however, the need was greater than could be met and another larger clinic that required no appointments was later held.

Use of an area Immunization Task Force Committee as a clearinghouse for all immunization activities and promoting education information for the public.

Using public information office to advertise clinic locations through news media and promote special immunization activities.

Outreach clinics are held at least monthly in an outlying neighborhood or school.

Flyers are given to prekindergarten students and parents.

Immunization recommendations are placed in utility billing and on the placemat from McDonald's restaurants.

Increased number of community-based sites.

School-based immunization clinics.

Distribution of immunization literature to parents to increase awareness.
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO METROPOLITAN HEALTH DISTRICT

WACO, TEXAS
WACO-McLENNAN COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH DISTRICT

ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA
ALEXANDRIA HEALTH DEPARTMENT

CHESAPEAKE, VIRGINIA
CHESAPEAKE HEALTH DEPARTMENT

NORFOLK, VIRGINIA
NORFOLK DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

- Special outreach clinics in hospitals, malls, and schools.
- Homebound programs in public housing.
- Promotion through schools and day cares; ongoing mass media campaign utilizing billboards, bus benches, and PSAs, using prominent community leaders.
- KinderSearch: a local campaign to help identify and vaccinate children entering into kindergarten.
- Utilized volunteers to provide services and as outreach workers to disseminate information.
- Involvement in a metropolitan campaign of community education and client awards for completion of immunization at appropriate ages.
- Acquisition of mobile clinic to deliver immunization services to underserved areas.
- School clinics to administer second measles requirement to all fifth graders.
- Special clinics in WIC areas.
- Off-site immunization clinics in public housing areas.

*This Health Department is located in Houston, Texas.*
Day care seminar - workshop on immunizations.

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA
RICHMOND CITY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

School-based immunization clinic to administer second MMR to all fifth graders (4500 administered).

VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA
VIRGINIA BEACH HEALTH DISTRICT

Special clinics and longer clinics to administer immunizations to enrolling kindergartners.

Billboards jointly sponsored by Junior League of Spokane; publishing immunization schedules in newspapers; water bill inserts; radio and TV spot announcements; and articles in community center newsletters.

SPOKANE, WASHINGTON
SPOKANE COUNTY HEALTH DISTRICT

Direct mailing with requirements and clinic schedules to day care centers and local grade schools.

Sixth grade poster contest regarding MMR booster.

TACOMA, WASHINGTON
TACOMA-PIERCE COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Head Start round-up of applicants and their siblings.

MADISON, WISCONSIN
MADISON DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Birth certificates reviewed and materials describing immunization clinic sent to families in need.

Use of Health Department run WIC sites to provide immunizations.

MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN
MILWAUKEE HEALTH DEPARTMENT
Initiatives to Build Community Collaborations and Coalitions
Initiatives Involving Community Collaborations and Coalitions

TUCSON, ARIZONA
PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES
(ALSO INCLUDES EL MONTE, GLENDALE, INGLEWOOD, POMONA, AND TORRANCE.)

- Held community focus group sessions to discuss problems, issues, and solutions regarding immunizations.

- Developed and submitted Immunization Action Plan to state for additional funding.

- The Long Beach Unified School District and the City Health Department combined resources to increase accessibility of immunization services during the fall “Back-to-School” time. The Department provided vaccines, supplies and technical assistance. School nurses administered vaccines at selected schools. 200 additional children were vaccinated through this cooperative effort.

- As a result of the county’s measles epidemic during the past four years, the department has formed many new partnerships with health-related and non-health organizations which should have a positive impact on improving childhood immunization levels in the future.
Formation of county-wide task force of public and private medical providers, community residents, and community-based organizations.

Development of a comprehensive Immunization Action Plan.

Joint networking with community volunteer agencies (i.e., the Junior League, Red Cross) to facilitate mass immunization clinics in the fall.

Sponsoring community meeting to elicit support from private agencies in applying for grant funding.

Planning process involved in Infant Immunization Initiative Plan was most successful activity. Brought together the community leaders to discuss the problem, brainstorm about possible solutions and develop a plan of action to implement over the next few years to meet the goal that all children in our community will be fully immunized by age two years.

Provide schools and community clinics with state supplied vaccine.

Collaboration with other non-government agencies in media campaign.

County sponsorship of state legislation to require all health insurers in state to provide full coverage for childhood immunizations.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA
ALAMEDA COUNTY HEALTH CARE SERVICES AGENCY
(ALSO INCLUDES FREMONT AND HAYWARD.)

PASADENA, CALIFORNIA
CITY OF PASADENA HEALTH DEPARTMENT

RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE HEALTH SERVICES AGENCY

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES
(ALSO INCLUDES CHULA VISTA, ESCONDIDO, AND OCEANSIDE.)

SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA HEALTH DEPARTMENT
(ALSO INCLUDES SUNNYVALE.)

SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA
ORANGE COUNTY HEALTH CARE AGENCY
(ALSO INCLUDES ANAHEIM, FULLERTON, GARDEN GROVE, HUNTINGTON BEACH, IRVINE, AND ORANGE.)
The most promising activities of the health department have been in collaborative work with other public and private providers to develop a statewide Immunization Coalition. This Coalition has been working to develop an action plan to improve statewide immunization levels among preschoolers. Activities are in three areas: legislative, provider practices and education, and patient education.

The health department convened all primary caregivers to work together on a publicized immunization day. Turn out was not great but working together sharing problems and solutions has increased awareness of the scope of the problem. Clinics are now about to expand hours.

Improved interagency relationships between WIC and public health nursing.

Cooperated with state health department in application for Infant Immunization Initiative that will target children under two years.

Increased cooperation of other agencies.

---

"This Health Department is located in Englewood, Colorado."
- Cooperative Immunization Action Plan.
- Integration with WIC to provide delinquency status on WIC system and provision of nurse to provide immunization.

- Participation in a joint effort with Florida Nurses' Association (FNA) to sponsor an immunization health fair at a Head Start center located in an 800 family apartment complex.

- "Be Wise Immunize" partnership with the Kiwanis Club of Tampa, St. Joseph's Hospital, Tampa Housing Authority, and the Hillsborough County Public Health Unit. A mobile van goes into the housing project to administer immunizations monthly.
- Cooperating with the WIC program to give out reminder notices.

- Beginning of program with the Scottish-Rite Hospital to provide evening immunization clinics in eight of our 20 sites once a week and Saturday immunization clinics at four sites.

- Partial integration of immunization and WIC programs.
DES MOINES, IOWA
POLK COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

TOPEKA, KANSAS
TOPEKA-SHAWNEE COUNTY HEALTH AGENCY

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HOSPITALS

DETROIT, MICHIGAN
DETROIT HEALTH DEPARTMENT

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA
MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH DEPARTMENT

- Participated in I-3 and Robert Wood Johnson applications.

- Start of community program with the hospitals and schools to take immunizations to the children.

- Coordination of immunizations with other child health programs.

- **Boston Immunization Action Plan (BIAP):** Functioned as lead agency to bring together agencies/groups representing community health centers, hospitals, private practitioners, universities, housing groups, church groups, and other community-based agencies to submit application for Infant Immunization Initiative (I-3). 64 different programs/agencies from both the public and private sectors collaborated to develop BIAP that addresses the challenge of improving immunization of all children in Boston. The planning phase of the BIAP made the participants more aware of the problem of low immunization levels, what they can do, and helped to identify and form new linkages/partnerships.

- Submitted I-3 Plan to CDC and initial seed money has been awarded.

- Helped to pass state legislation making it possible to share immunization information about parental release of information consent to providers of immunization services.
- Participating with community leaders in a grant application to address the problems and achieve goals regarding the immunization status of preschool children.

- Collaboration with the Indian Chicano Health Center to provide immunizations through that facility.

- Inservice of DSS staff to increase immunization awareness, set up referral mechanism.

- Linkage with community agencies such as Junior League to plan education/media campaign regarding immunization.

- Direct contact with school (including preschool) by phone, mail.

- **Immunization Task Force**: Private pediatricians, civic groups, and other community folks have joined the Health Department in attempting to address low levels of childhood immunization. The Task Force has been working on two projects: 1) an immunization registry designed to track all children in Guilford County to ensure age-appropriate immunizations; and 2) off-site (in areas where children are likely to be inadequately immunized, i.e., housing projects) immunization clinics with door prizes and refreshments as incentives for parents to bring children in for shots. The effort to establish a registry was put into a grant proposal which is currently in the second stage of review. The initial off-site clinics were poorly attended but they are being evaluated to assess what needs to be changed.

---

1This Health Department is located in Hawthorne, New York.
Joint awareness campaign with Junior League.

Have formed a strong coalition between the local Children's Hospital, OB staff at adult hospitals, local health departments, and Junior League to develop a concentrated and long term program to increase immunizations. Plans are in progress to have immunization data readily accessible via computer to all coalition health care providers to facilitate timely administration and decrease missed opportunities.

Provision of vaccines to nine quasi-public clinics for increased vaccine availability. This includes hospital outpatient departments and neighborhood clinics.

"Be Wise - Immunize:" Two month campaign in Spring 1991, with Tulsa Southwest Rotary Club and Junior League in Tulsa.

Have assigned one staff person - a community service worker - to work with day care and Head Start staff in understanding the Oregon School Day Care Immunization Law.

Working with community groups such as clubs, churches, etc. to increase availability of special clinics held in evenings and/or Saturdays to improve accessibility of vaccine.
Cooperating with two local hospitals, one skilled nursing agency, and one minority health agency to provide additional free immunization services in the city and county. Erie County Department of Health provides vaccine and the other four agencies provide the staff to service clients following health department protocols.

Development of a coalition of over 65 health and service providers in community-based organizations to improve immunization levels.

Based on ACIP's recommendation regarding a second dose of MMR vaccine, the health department sent a letter to all school superintendents and principals in the county requesting that parents be so informed. Most school districts complied with the request, generating many vaccine requests. Special immunization clinics were arranged and more than 2,000 doses were administered during June and July.

WIC involvement in immunizing patients already on health department program.

Adding immunization reminder to WIC TIC.
Over the last two years the department has worked closely with community-based organizations to provide biologicals to the agencies at no cost to increase access. This effort has greatly improved access to services along with interaction with community-based organizations.

A survey was done in the project office immunization clinic to determine the census tracts with the lowest immunization levels of preschool age children. The Junior League then printed and distributed simple pamphlets in the target areas. PSAs were also shown: The Junior League phone bank contacted about 2,000 households in the census tracts to remind parents to have children immunized. Approximately 600 responses to the calls occurred.

The most successful efforts combined multiple agency efforts, expanded service hours and outreach efforts which involved residents of the community.

Health clinic interaction with the local independent school district's nursing facility.

A Child Action Initiative Co-op effort.
Coordinated efforts with AFDC and WIC to provide immunizations on site.

Permanent immunization clinics in hospitals and community health centers.

60% of EPSDT providers provide immunizations.

Working with business, private community and volunteer organizations.

“Don’t Wait to Vaccinate”: Collaborated with Junior League in campaign to inform parents on the importance of vaccinations.

The health department has five community health districts that provide medical care, WIC and immunization services. WIC technicians check immunization status of participants and provide free immunization vouchers/waivers for those who cannot pay nominal health department fee.

Working more closely with private providers to assist in following up on those overdue for immunizations.

Initiation of a limited immunization recall program using volunteers from the Kiwanis Club.

In the future we hope to be a recipient of a Robert Wood Johnson Foundation All Kids Count Grant for “All Kids Covered.”

Networking with schools to provide second dose MMR to school entrants and sixth graders.
Health department worked with school districts in the county to assure that fifth grade students received their second dose MMR prior to entry into the sixth grade in response to a change in the state immunization plan. Clinics were held in schools in 10 districts. Local hospitals held special “Measles Clinics” with free or very low cost immunizations offered. Community health clinics and several hospital-based primary care clinics offered “express lane” services to kids there to receive immunizations only.

Billboards jointly sponsored by Junior League of Spokane.

The Infant Immunization Initiative brought members of the community together—health, physician, and service groups. The group identified barriers and strategies to address these as a community.

Creation of an Immunization Task Force to guide program efforts and grant applications.

Involvement of community-based immunization providers in efforts.

Networked with the school nurses to immunize all current seventh graders (1991-1992 school year) and also the current sixth graders with a second dose of MMR. State law now requires that all seventh graders (1992-1993 school year) have proof of a second MMR.
Initiatives to Improve Immunization Documentation
Initiatives to Improve Immunization Documentation

♦ Day care audits and education.

♦ More timely delinquent recall.

♦ Started to input immunization data into the RPMS. This will facilitate a tracking system.

♦ Implemented postcard reminder system.

♦ Tracking infants through birth certificate data. Mailing reminders at six weeks to parents of newborns.

♦ Continuation of a reminder system and computerized record keeping system.

♦ Historically, the most successful activity to improve childhood immunization levels has been the enforcement of the state immunization law for children attending preschool facilities and schools.

BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA
JEFFERSON COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

MOBILE, ALABAMA
MOBILE COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

TUCSON, ARIZONA
PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

BAKERSFIELD, CALIFORNIA
KERN COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

CONCORD, CALIFORNIA
CONTRA COSTA HEALTH SERVICES

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES
(ALSO INCLUDES EL MONTE, GLENDALE, INGLEWOOD, POMONA, AND TORRANCE.)

1This Health Department is located in Martinez, California.
Submission of RWJ grant for development of immunization registry.

School review and audits helped enforcement of school immunization law and increased immunization levels in school-age population.

Application for "All Kids Count" funding to establish a comprehensive county-wide immunization database for monitoring and follow-up.

Ongoing audits to identify percentages of fully immunized preschoolers and reasons for deficient immunizations.

Development of a computer program to track families. This formed the Master's thesis for a Yale student who has now graduated.

Not yet completed, but a computerized registry for tracking by any provider county-wide; with reference to what, when, and where.

Participation in a pilot study to determine the effect of the use of children's immunization. Response to the autodialer was 70% while card response was 15%.

Computerized reminder card sent after one month lapse.
SOUTH BEND, INDIANA  
ST. JOSEPH COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

• Cooperation with school systems to assure full compliance with state law at beginning of each year.

DES MOINES, IOWA  
POLK COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

• Explored computer tracking.

LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY  
LOUISVILLE-JEFFERSON COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

• Response to measles outbreak resulted in increased awareness of the need for and benefits of immunization. Day cares, preschools, schools and colleges increased the emphasis on immunizations as a criteria for attending. Mass review of immunization records in schools and other groups to identify persons needing additional doses of recommended/required vaccines.

PORTLAND, MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES - PUBLIC HEALTH DIVISION

• Aggressive, labor intensive recall system.

DETROIT, MICHIGAN  
DETROIT HEALTH DEPARTMENT

• Enforcement of state law for new school entrants: 9,000-10,000 exclusion notices issued during three exclusion periods; Detroit Health Department had special immunization clinics at the nine primary care centers during exclusion periods. Ongoing weekly immunization clinics are also scheduled throughout the year.
• Computerized follow-up letters to all children (including those not enrolled in health department primary care) who have incomplete immunizations.
• Surveying/or monitoring missed appointments.
• Public health nurses evaluated day care records for adequacy of immunizations and initiated "catch up" protocols.

• Initiated research on immunization tracking systems with the Minnesota Department of Health.

• Maintenance of a recall file to contact parents that do not return at the appropriate time.

• Computerized day care audits of 100% of the licensed day care center immunization records.

• Implementation of a study to define age-appropriate immunization levels of preschool population (kindergarten retrospective study).

• Reminder/recall postcard system was implemented again last year. Two year immunization rate went from 46% to 59%. Had discontinued the postcard reminder system in 1988 and two year immunization rate had fallen from 64% to 46%.

• Reminder letters for appointments.

• Timely follow-up for missed appointments.

• Immunization clinics coupled with school expulsions.
CLEVELAND, OHIO
CLEVELAND DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

PORTLAND, OREGON
MULTNOMAH COUNTY HEALTH DIVISION

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA
RICHLAND COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE
CHATTANOOGA-HAMILTON COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE
MEMPHIS-SHELBY COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

- Cooperation with local schools to enforce immunization requirements.
- The Health Department has been working on improving monitoring and tracking system for children under the age of two by being allowed to enter dates of vaccines received at other delivery systems in our computer so records are more complete and comparing computer printout, chart, and personal record of each child when they come in for immunizations to make sure that all dates are correctly documented and the correct number of doses of vaccine are more accurately provided.
- Sending immunization reminders by mail to delinquents.
- Computer tracking of vaccine-delinquent children.
- Establishment of an RN position to investigate and provide follow-up to any child found to be delinquent on immunizations. She receives referrals from health department clinics, subcontracting clinics, and from data obtained from day care and school audits.
- Ongoing program in conjunction with Department of Human Services to audit all day care programs (licensed) for immunization status of their attendees.
- Recently started a tracking and recall system for immunizations using birth certificate data.
Recall system - sending lapsed reminders.

Day care center audits.

Hook up with Medicaid claims information as another way to track Medicaid children who may be overdue for immunizations.

Computerized program to identify children who have not come back for immunizations.

Submission of Robert Wood Johnson grant for tracking immunization in children from birth to school age.

Continue with high priority infant tracking program for at-risk developmentally delayed children.

Maintaining tracking and recall system for all children receiving immunizations in health department.

AMARILLO, TEXAS
AMARILLO BI-CITY-COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

PASADENA, TEXAS
HARRIS COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

BURLINGTON, VERMONT
VERMONT DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

PORTSMOUTH, VIRGINIA
PORTSMOUTH DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA
VIRGINIA BEACH HEALTH DISTRICT

'This Health Department is located in Houston, Texas.'
DIRECTORY OF URBAN MCH PROGRAMS AND LEADERSHIP
In the 1990 edition of *What Works*, CityMatCH compiled its first Directory of Urban MCH Programs and Directors. In an effort to continue to facilitate communication and collaboration among urban MCH leaders and their colleagues in other public and private spheres, the directory has been updated and expanded; updated to reflect changes in the information on the largest urban health departments presented in the first directory, and expanded to include information on smaller urban health departments (those serving cities with populations between 100,000 and 200,000).

**DIRECTORY OF URBAN MCH PROGRAMS AND LEADERSHIP**

The information in this directory has been gathered from several sources, primarily the 1992 Survey of Maternal and Child Health in Urban Health Departments and CityMatCH membership information. The name and title of each health department’s designated MCH director or coordinator are presented along with the health department’s name, address, and telephone and fax numbers. A few health departments report that no one person is designated MCH director (these are noted with an asterisk). The name of an MCH contact person is provided for those health departments where no single individual is designated as the MCH director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANCHORAGE, AK</th>
<th>MOBILE, AL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carole McConnell, PHN</td>
<td>C. Michael Trainor, MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCH Program Manager</td>
<td>Director, Women’s Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality of Anchorage</td>
<td>Mobile Co. Health Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>251 North Bayou Street, P.O. Box 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 196650</td>
<td>Montgomery, AL 36104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage, AK 99519-6650</td>
<td>Phone: 205 590-8135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 907 443-6128</td>
<td>Fax: 205 690-8853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 907 258-6379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*BIRMINGHAM, AL*

| Mary Ann Pass, MD, MPH | Fletcher S. Bancroft |
| Deputy Health Officer | Health Services Administrator |
| 1400 Sixth Avenue, P.O. Box 2648 | 515 West Jefferson Davis |
| Birmingham, AL 35202 | Montgomery, AL 36104 |
| Phone: 205 930-1502 | Phone: 205 205-6646 |
| Fax: 205 930-0424 | |

| HUNTSVILLE, AL | LITTLE ROCK, AR |
| Lawrence L. Robey, MD | Zenobia Harris |
| Health Officer | Area VIII Manager |
| 301 Eustis Avenue, P.O. Box 425 | 200 South University Avenue, #310 |
| Huntsville, AL 35804 | Little Rock, AR 72205 |
| Phone: 205 539-11 | Phone: 501 666-6666 |
| Fax: 205 539-11 | Fax: 501 663-1666 |

*No one person is MCH director.*
PHOENIX, AZ
(Glendale, Mesa, Scottsdale, and Tempe)
Patricia A. Weber, RN, BSN
Nurse Manager
Maricopa Co. Dept. of Public Health
1845 East Roosevelt Street
Phoenix, AZ 85006
Phone: 602/506-6781
Fax: 602/506-6885

LONG BEACH, CA
Darryl Sexton, MD
City Health Officer
Long Beach Dept. of Health & Human Services
2055 Pine Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90806
Phone: 310/427-7421
Fax: 310/492-6371

TUCSON, AZ
Audrey Opulski, MD
Director, Preventive Health Services
Pima Co. Health Dept.
150 West Congress
Tucson, AZ 85701
Phone: 602/740-8631
Fax: 602/791-0366

LOS ANGELES, CA
(El Monte, Glendale, Inglewood, Pomona, & Torrance)
Arthur Lisbin, MD
Director, Child & Adolescent Health Programs
Los Angeles Co. Dept. of Health Services
241 North Figueroa, Room 306
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: 213/240-8063
Fax: 213/250-0919

BAKERSFIELD, CA
Boyce B. Dulan, MD
Deputy Health Officer
Director of Maternal Child Health
Kern Co. Health Dept.
1700 Flower Street
Bakersfield, CA 93305
Phone: 805/386-3010
Fax: 805/386-2018

MODESTO, CA
Linda Perry, PHN, MS
MCH Director
Stanislaus Co. Health Dept.
2030 Coffee Road, C-1
Modesto, CA 95350
Phone: 209/558-7400
Fax: 209/558-8315

BERKELEY, CA
Carmen Nevarez, MD
Health Officer
Berkeley City Health Dept.
2180 Milvia Street, 3rd Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704
Phone: 415/644-6421
Fax: 415/644-6015

OAKLAND, CA
(Fremont & Hayward)
Barbara Allen, MD
MCH Director
Alameda Co. Health Care Services Agency
499 5th Street, Room 306
Oakland, CA 94607
Phone: 510/268-2628
Fax: 510/268-2630

CONCORD, CA
Wendel Brunner, MD, MPH
Director of Maternal & Child Health
Contra Costa Co. Health Services Dept.
597 Center Avenue, Suite 200
Martinez, CA 94553
Phone: 510/313-6712
Fax: 510/313-6721

OXNARD, CA
Kay Maloney, RN, PHN
Director of MCH
Division of Public Health Nursing
Ventura Co. Public Health Services
3161 Loma Vista Road
Ventura, CA 93003
Phone: 805/652-5914
Fax: 805/652-6617

FRESNO, CA
Connie Woodman, RN, PHN
Director, MCH
Fresno Co. Health Services Agency
P.O. Box 11867
Fresno, CA 93775
Phone: 209/445-3307
Fax: 209/445-3596

PASADENA, CA
Mary Margaret Rowe, RN, PHN, MSN
Maternal Child Adolescent Health Coordinator
Pasadena Health Dept.
100 North Garfield Avenue, Room 140
Pasadena, CA 91109
Phone: 818/405-4384
Fax: 818/405-4711

*No one person is MCH director.
RIVERSIDE, CA
Eileen K. Taw, MD
Director, Maternal Child & Adolescent Health
Co. of Riverside Health Services Agency
4065 County Circle Drive
Riverside, CA 92505
Phone: 714-358-5192
Fax: 714-358-4529

SACRAMENTO, CA
Marcia Britton, MD
Director, Child Health & Disability Prevention
Program, MCH
Sacramento Co. Health Dept.
9333 Tech Center Drive, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95826
Phone: 916-366-2151
Fax: 916-366-4231

SALINAS, CA
Allene Mares. RN, MPH
Chief, Family & Community Health Division
Monterey Co. Health Dept.
1270 Natividad Road
Salinas, CA 93906
Phone: 408-755-1981
Fax: 408-757-9586

SAN BERNARDINO, CA
( Ontario & Rancho Cucamonga)
Tom Prendergast, MD
Division Chief, Preventive Medical Services
San Bernardino Co. Health Dept.
351 North Mountain View
San Bernardino, CA 92411
Phone: 714-567-6219
Fax: 714-567-6228

SAN DIEGO, CA
( Chula Vista, Escondido, Oceanside & San Diego)
Nancy L. Bowen, MD, MPH
Chief, MCH
San Diego Co. Health Dept.
3581 Rosecrans, P.O. Box 85222
San Diego, CA 92186-5222
Phone: 619-692-8808
Fax: 619-692-8827

SAN FRANCISCO, CA
Florence Stoudt, MN, MPH
Deputy Director for Community
Public Health Services
San Francisco Dept. of Health
101 Grove Street, Room 416
San Francisco, CA 94112
Phone: 415-554-2500
Fax: 415-554-2504

SAN JOSE, CA
(Sunnyvale)
Rosita Saw, MD
Director MCH
Santa Clara Co. Health Dept.
976 Lenzen Avenue
San Jose, CA 95126
Phone: 408-299-6158
Fax: 408-292-5278

SANTA ANA, CA
(Anaheim, Fullerton, Garden Grove,
Huntington-Beach, Irvine & Orange)
Len Foster, MPA
Deputy Director, Public Health
Adult-Child Health Services
Orange Co. Health Care Agency
P.O. Box 355
Santa Ana, CA 92702
Phone: 714-854-3882
Fax: 714-854-5506

SANTA ROSA, CA
George R. Flores, MD, MPH
Public Health Officer
Sonoma Co. Public Health Dep.
COLUMBUS, GA
Craig S. Lichtenwalner
District Health Director
District 7
1958 Eighth Avenue
Columbus, GA 31993

MACON, GA
Brooks Taylor, MD
District Health Director
Bibb Co. Health Dept.
770 Hemlock Street
Macon, GA 31201

* SAVANNAH, GA
Bobbie Stough
District Clinical Coordinator
Chatham Co. Health Dept.
2011 Eisenhower Drive
Savannah, GA 31416-1257
Phone: 912/356-2233
Fax: 912/356-2868

AGANA, GU
Laurent Dueras
Administrator, Bureau of Family Health & Nursing Services
Dept. of Public Health & Social Services
P.O. Box 2816
Agana, GU 96910
Phone: 671/734-7117
Fax: 671/734-7097

HONOLULU, HI
Loretta Fuddy, MSW, MPH
Program Administrator
State of Hawaii Dept. of Health
741-A Sunset Avenue, #203
Honolulu, HI 96816
Phone: 808/733-9022
Fax: 808/733-9032

* CEDAR RAPIDS, IA
Vickie J. Smith
Nursing Supervisor
Linn Co. Health Dept.
501 13th Street, N.W.
Cedar Rapids, IA 52405-3700
Phone: 319/398-3551
Fax: 319/364-7391

*No one person is MCH director.
DES MOINES, IA
Julius S. Conner, MD, MPH
Public Health Director
Polk Co. Health Dept.
1907 Carpenter Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50314
Phone: 515/286-3759
Fax: 515/286-3082

BOISE, ID
Kathleen Holley, RN
Director of Nursing
Central District Health Dept.
1455 North Orchard
Boise, ID 83706
Phone: 208/375-5211
Fax: 208/327-7090

CHICAGO, IL
Shirley Fleming, RN, CNM, MSN
Director MCH Program
Chicago Dept. of Health
50 West Washington Street
Chicago, IL 60602
Phone: 312/744-4359
Fax: 312/744-7280

PEORIA, IL
Alice Kennell, MS, RN
Director of Nursing
Peoria City/Co. Health Dept.
2116 North Sheridan
Peoria, IL 61604
Phone: 309/679-6000
Fax: 309/685-3312

ROCKFORD, IL
Angie G. Fellows
Director of Nurses
Winnebago Co. Health Dept.
401 Division Street
Rockford, IL 61104
Phone: 815/962-5092
Fax: 815/962-4203

SPRINGFIELD, IL
Donna Bartlett, BSN, MA
Program Director, Women & Infant Health Services
Springfield Dept. of Public Health
1415 East Jefferson
Springfield, IL 62703
Phone: 217/789-2182
Fax: 217/789-2203

EVANSVILLE, IN
Constance Block
Nursing Division Director & MCH Project Director-WIC
Vanderburgh Co. Health Dept.
Civic Center, #131
Evansville, IN 47708
Phone: 812/479-6866
Fax: 812/426-5612

FORT WAYNE, IN
Jane M. Irmscher, MD
Health Commissioner
Fort Wayne-Allen Co. Dept. of Health
City Co. Bldg./One Main Street
Fort Wayne, IN 46802
Phone: 219/428-7551

GARY, IN
Dianne Mallory
Interim Project Director
Gary Health Dept.
1145 West 5th Avenue
Gary, IN 46402
Phone: 219/882-1113
Fax: 219/882-8213

INDIANAPOLIS, IN
Elvin Plank, RN, MPA
Health Planner
Health & Hospital Corporation
3838 North Rural Street, 8th Floor
Indianapolis, IN 46205-2930
Phone: 317/541-2347
Fax: 317/541-2307

SOUTH BEND, IN
George B. Plain, MD
Health Officer
St. Joseph Co. Health Dept.
County-City Bldg., Suite 834
South Bend, IN 46601-1870
Phone: 219/235-9574
Fax: 219/235-9960

KANSAS CITY, KS
Darrel D. Newkirk, MD, MPH
Director of Health
Kansas City-Wyandotte Co. Health Dept.
619 Ann Avenue
Kansas City, KS 66101
Phone: 913/321-4803

OVERLAND PARK, KS
Joseph Reed, Jr., MS
Environmental Health Officer
Overland Park Health Dept.
6300 West 87th Street
Overland Park, KS 66212
Phone: 913/381-5252

*No one person is MCH director.
TOPEKA, KS
Nola Ahlquist-Turner, RN
Program Manager - Maternal & Child Health
Topeka-Shawnee Co. Health Agency
1615 West 8th Street
Topeka, KS 66606
Phone: 913/233-8961

WICHITA, KS
Trudy Baker
Director of Clinic Services
Wichita/Sedgewick Co. Health Dept.
1900 East 9th Street
Wichita, KS 67214
Phone: 316/268-8425
Fax: 316/268-8340

LEXINGTON, KY
Carla Cordier, RN
Director of General Clinics
Lexington-Fayette Co. Health Dept.
650 Newtown Pike
Lexington, KY 40508
Phone: 616/288-2425
Fax: 616/288-2359

LOUISVILLE, KY
Leslie J. Lawson, MPH, MPA
Community Health Services Manager
Jefferson Co. Health Dept.
P.O. Box 1704
Louisville, KY 40201-1704
Phone: 502/574-6661
Fax: 502/574-5734

BATON ROUGE, LA
Sue Longoria, RN
Nursing Supervisor
East Baton Rouge Parish Health Unit
353 North 12th Street
Baton Rouge, LA 70802
Phone: 504/342-1750
Fax: 504/342-5821

NEW ORLEANS, LA
Suzanne White, MD, MPH
Director of Child Health
New Orleans Health Dept.
City Hall - Room 8E13
1300 Perdido Street
New Orleans, LA 70112
Phone: 504/565-6907
Fax: 504/565-6916

* SHREVEPORT, LA
Eileen Shoup
Nursing Supervisor
Caddo Parish Health Unit
1035 Creswell
Shreveport, LA 71101
Phone: 318/676-5240
Fax: 318/676-5221

BOSTON, MA
Lillian Shirley
Director of Family Health Services
Boston Dept. of Health & Hospitals
1010 Massachusetts Avenue
Boston, MA 02118
Phone: 617/534-5395
Fax: 617/534-5358

LOWELL, MA
James Moynihan
Commissioner of Inspectinal Services
Lowell Health Dept.
JFK Civic Center, 50 Arcand Drive
Lowell, MA 01852
Phone: 508/970-4028
Fax: 508/970-4117

SPRINGFIELD, MA
Deloris Williams, RN, PhD
Commissioner of Public Health
Springfield Public Health Dept.
1414 State Street
Springfield, MA 01109
Phone: 413/787-6710
Fax: 413/787-6745

WORCESTER, MA
Arnold Gurwitz, MD
Commissioner
Worcester Health Dept.
25 Meade Street
Worcester, MA 01610-2715

BALTIMORE, MD
Nira Bonner, MD, MPH, FAAP
Asst. Commissioner of Health
Baltimore City Health Dept.
303 East Fayette Street, 2nd Floor
Baltimore, MD 21202
Phone: 410/396-1834
Fax: 410/727-2722

*No one person is MCH director.
PORTLAND, ME
Meredith Tipton, RN, MPH
Director, Public Health Division
Portland Public Health Division
389 Congress Street, Room 307
Portland, ME 04101
Phone: 207/874-8784
Fax: 207/874-8649

LIVONIA, MI
Jean Jackson
Maternal Child Health Consultant
Wayne Co. Health Dept.
2501 South Merriman
Westland, MI 48185
Phone: 313/467-3362
Fax: 313/467-3478

WARREN, MI
(Meriden Heights)
Marilyn Glidden, RN
Director, Division of Community Health
Nursing
Macomb Co. Health Dept.
14325 Elizabeth Road
Mt. Clemens, MI 48043
Phone: 313/469-5354
Fax: 313/469-5885

DETROIT, MI
Judith F. Harper, MPH
Health Care Administrator
Detroit Health Dept.
1151 Taylor, Room 317-C
Detroit, MI 48202
Phone: 313/876-4228
Fax: 313/876-4112

MINNEAPOLIS, MN
Edward P. Ehlinger, MD
Director, Personal Health Services
City of Minneapolis Health Dept.
250 South 4th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55401-1372
Phone: 612/673-2780
Fax: 612/673-3866

FLINT, MI
Karen N. Haynes, BSN, MPH
Director of Personal Health Services
Genesee Co. Health Dept.
Floyd J. McCree Courts & Human
Services Bldg.
630 S. Saginaw Street
Flint, MI 48502-1540
Phone: 313/257-3591
Fax: 313/257-3147

LANSING, MI
Bruce P. Miller, MPH
Director, Community Health Services
Ingham Co. Health Dept.
5303 South Cedar Street, P.O. Box 30161
Lansing, MI 48909
Phone: 517/887-4311
Fax: 517/887-4310

* ANN ARBOR, MI
Jeanette Benson
Nursing Services Coordinator
Washtenaw Co. Health Division
555 Towner, P.O. Box 915
Ypsilanti, MI 48197
Phone: 313/484-7200
Fax: 313/484-7203

* GRAND RAPIDS, MI
Wanda Bierman
Family Health Supervisor
Kent Co. Health Dept.
700 Fuller N.E.
Grand Rapids, MI 49503
Phone: 616/774-3002
Fax: 616/774-3147

* ST. PAUL, MN
Diane Holmgren, MBA
Health Administration Manager
St. Paul Public Health Dept.
555 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101
Phone: 612/292-7712
Fax: 612/222-2770

INDEPENDENCE, MO
Mary Freeman, RN, BSN
Nursing Supervisor
Independence City Health Dept.
223 North Memorial Drive
Independence, MO 64050
Phone: 816/836-7227

KANSAS CITY, MO
Sidney J. Bates, MA
Chief, MCH Services
Kansas City MO Health Dept.
1423 East Linwood Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64109
Phone: 816/923-2600
Fax: 816/861-3299

*No one person is MCH director.
SPRINGFIELD, MO
Rosie Sivils, RN
Director, Community Health Nursing Services
Springfield/Green Co. Health Dept.
227 East Chestnut Expressway
Springfield, MO 65802
Phone: 417/864-1687
Fax: 417/864-1099

ST. LOUIS, MO
Richelle Clark
Director of Maternal/Child Health
Lillian E. Courtney Health Center
1717 Biddle Street
St. Louis, MO 63106
Phone: 314/622-3814 or 3827
Fax: 314/621-8353

JACKSON, MS
Donald Grillo, MD
Public Health District V Health Officer
Mississippi State Dept. of Health
P.O. Box 1700
2423 North State Street
Jackson, MS 39215-1700
Phone: 601/960-7400
Fax: 601/960-7480

BILLINGS, MT
Doris Biersdorf, RD
Director of MCH Services
Yellowstone City-Co. Health Dept.
P.O. Box 35033
Billings, MT 59107
Phone: 406/256-6806
Fax: 406/256-6856

MISSOULA, MT
Yvonne Bradford, RN
Director of Health Services
Missoula City-Co. Health Dept.
301 West Alder
Missoula, MT 59802
Phone: 406/523-4750
Fax: 406/523-4781

CHARLOTTE, NC
Polly J. Baker
Parent, Adolescent & Child Division Head
Mecklenburg Co. Health Dept.
249 Billingsley Road
Charlotte, NC 28211
Phone: 704/336-6441
Fax: 704/336-4629

DURHAM, NC
Gayle B. Harris
Director of Nursing
Durham Co. Health Dept.
414 East Main Street
Durham, NC 27701
Phone: 919/560-7700
Fax: 919/560-7664

* GREENSBORO, NC
Earle H. Yeamans, DDS, MPH
Director, Child Health
Guilford Co. Dept. of Public Health
1100 East Wendover Avenue
Greensboro, NC 27405
Phone: 919/333-3237
Fax: 919/333-6603

RALEIGH, NC
Peter J. Morris, MD, MPH
Deputy Health Director for MCH
Wake Co. Dept. of Health
P.O. Box 14049
Raleigh, NC 27620
Phone: 919/250-3813
Fax: 919/250-3984

WINSTON-SALEM, NC
Thomas R. Dundon, MPH, PhD
Director of Public Health
Forsyth Co. Health Dept.
P.O. Box 2975, 741 Highland Avenue
Winston-Salem, NC 27102
Phone: 219/727-2434

BISMARCK, ND
Karen Shreve, RN
Child Health Coordinator
Bismarck/Burleigh Nursing Service
221 North 5th Street, P.O. Box 5503
Bismarck, ND 58501
Phone: 701/222-6525
Fax: 701/222-6606

LINCOLN, NE
Carole A. Douglas
Chief, Public Health Nursing Division
Lincoln-Lancaster Co. Health Dept.
2200 St. Mary's Avenue
Lincoln, NE 68502
Phone: 402/441-8054
Fax: 402/441-8323

*No one person is MCH director.
ROCHESTER, NY
Karin Duncan, RN, MSN
Director, Maternal-Child Health
Monroe Co. Dept. of Health
111 Westfall Road
Rochester, NY 14602
Phone: 716/274-6192
Fax: 716/274-6115

SYRACUSE, NY
Beverly Miller, MPS
Director of Nursing
Onondaga Co. Health Dept.
421 Montgomery Street, 8th Floor
Syracuse, NY 13202
Phone: 315/435-3294
Fax: 315/435-5720

AKRON, OH
Lucie H. Maher, RN, MPH
Director of Nursing
Akron Health Dept.
177 South Broadway
Akron, OH 44308
Phone: 216/575-2430
Fax: 216/575-2154

CINCINNATI, OH
Judith S. Daniels, MD, MPH
Medical Director
Cincinnati Health Dept.
3101 Burnet Avenue
Cincinnati, OH 45229-3098
Phone: 513/352-3189
Fax: 513/352-2534

CLEVELAND, OH
Karen K. Butler, MPH
Commissioner of Health
Cleveland Dept. of Public Health
1925 St. Clair Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114
Phone: 216/664-2324
Fax: 216/664-2197

COLUMBUS, OH
Carolyn B. Slack, MS, RN
Administrator, Family Health Services
Columbus Health Dept.
181 South Washington Blvd.
Columbus, OH 43215-4096
Phone: 614/645-6424
Fax: 614/645-7673

DAYTON, OH
Frederick L. Steed
Supervisor, Bureau Primary Health Care Services
Combined Health Dist. of Montgomery Co.
451 West Third Street
Dayton, OH 45422
Phone: 513/225-4966
Fax: 513/225-4048

TOLEDO, OH
Bob Pongotta
Project Manager
Dept. of Health & Environment
635 North Erie Street
Toledo, OH 43624
Phone: 419/245-1754
Fax: 419/245-1696

OKLAHOMA CITY, OK
Robyn Myers
Chief
City-Co. Health Dept. of Oklahoma Co.
921 NE 23rd Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
Phone: 405/425-4370
Fax: 405/427-3235

TULSA, OK
Geraldine N. Ling, ARNP, MPH
Chief of Nursing
Tulsa City-Co. Health Dept.
Central Regional Health Center
315 South Utica
Tulsa, OK 74104-2203
Phone: 918/596-8420
Fax: 918/596-8504

EUGENE, OR
Jeannette Bobst, BSN, MS
Services Manager
Lane Co. Public Health Services
135 East 6th
Eugene, OR 97401
Phone: 503/687-4013
Fax: 503/465-2455

PORTLAND, OR
Mary L. Hennrich, RN, MS
Director, Primary Care Health Systems Division
Multnomah Co. Health Dept.
426 SW Stark Street, 8th Floor
Portland, OR 97204
Phone: 503/248-5674
Fax: 503/248-5676

*No one person is MCH director.
SALEM, OR
Jeffrey Davis, MSW
Public Health Administrator
Marion Co. Health Dept.
3180 Center Street, NE, Room 200
Salem, OR 97301
Phone: 503/588-5357
Fax: 503/364-6532

ALLENTOWN, PA
Ann Adams
Coordinator Clinical Services
Allentown Health Bureau
245 North 6th Street
Allentown, PA 18102-4128
Phone: 215/437-7526
Fax: 215/437-8799

ERIE, PA
Charlotte Berringer, RN
Supervisor
Erie Co. Dept. of Health
606 West 2nd Street
Erie, PA 16507
Phone: 814/451-6721
Fax: 814/451-6767

PHILADELPHIA, PA
Harriet Dichter, JD
Director, Maternal & Child Health
Philadelphia Dept. of Public Health
500 South Broad Street
Philadelphia, PA 19146
Phone: 215/875-5927
Fax: 215/545-5906

PITTSBURGH, PA
Virginia Bowman, RN, MPH
Chief, Maternal & Child Health Program
Allegheny Co. Health Dept.
542 Forbes Avenue, Suite 522
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-2901
Phone: 412/391-5949
Fax: 412/642-7448

RIO PIEDRAS, PR
Magda Torres Jusino, MD, MPH
Director, Maternal & Child Health Program
San Juan Health Dept.
Apartado 21405, Rio Piedras Station
Rio Piedras, PR 00928
Phone: 809/751-6975
Fax: 809/764-5281

*No one person is MCH director.

PROVIDENCE, RI
William Hollinshead, MD, MPH
Medical Director
Rhode Island Dept. of Health
78 Davis Street, Room 302
Providence, RI 02908
Phone: 401/277-2309
Fax: 401/277-6548

COLUMBIA, SC
Joann Caster, RN, MN, FNP
Public Health Nurse Supervisor
South Carolina Dept. of Health
& Environment Control
2000 Hampton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
Phone: 803/929-6527
Fax: 803/748-4993

SIoux FALLS, SD
Charles W. Shafer, MD
Medical Director
Sioux River Valley Community Health Center
132 North Dakota Avenue
Sioux Falls, SD 57102
Phone: 605/339-7165
Fax: 605/338-7806

CHATTANOOGA, TN
Diana Kreider, RN
Program Manager
Chattanooga-Hamilton Co. Health Dept.
921 East Third Street
Chattanooga, TN 37403
Phone: 615/757-2117
Fax: 615/757-2034

KNOXVILLE, TN
Beatrice L. Emory, RN, MPH
Director of Nursing
Knox Co. Health Dept.
925 Cleveland Place
Knoxville, TN 37917-7191
Phone: 615/544-4114
Fax: 615/544-4295

MEMPHIS, TN
Brenda Coulehan, RN, MA
Family Health Services Coordinator
Memphis & Shelby Co. Health Dept.
814 Jefferson Avenue
Memphis, TN 38105
Phone: 901/576-7910
Fax: 901/576-7832

106
NASHVILLE, TN
Betty Thompson, RN, CFNC
   Director, Maternal-Child Health
   Metropolitan Health Dept.
   311 23rd Avenue North
   Nashville, TN 37203
   Phone: 615/340-5655
   Fax: 615/340-5665

ABILENE, TX
Curzon Ferris, Jr., MD
   Director
   Abilene-Taylor Co. Health Dept.
   P.O. Box 6489
   Abilene, TX 79608-6489
   Phone: 915/692-5600

* AMARILLO, TX
   Cynthia Walton, RN, NP
   Maternal Health Coordinator
   NWTH-Public Health Services
   P.O. Box 1110, 411 South Austin
   Amarillo, TX 79106
   Phone: 806/371-1114
   Fax: 806/372-3941

ARLINGTON, TX
   Director
   Arlington Health Dept.
   501 W. Main
   Arlington, TX 76003

AUSTIN, TX
   Anne Vetter, RN, MSN
   Child Health Coordinator
   City of Austin HHSD/
   Travis Co. Health Dept.
   327 Congress, Suite 5000
   Austin, TX 78701
   Phone: 512/476-0020
   Fax: 512/476-5435

BEAUMONT, TX
   Frances Carney, RN
   Nursing Director
   Beaumont City Health Dept.
   950 Washington
   Beaumont, TX 77704
   Phone: 409/832-4000

CORPUS CHRISTI, TX
   Annette Sultermeyer, MSN, RNCNA
   Director of Nursing
   Corpus Christi-Nueces City Health Dept.
   1702 Horne Road
   Corpus Christi, TX 78416
   Phone: 512/851-7250
   Fax: 512/851-7241

DALLAS, TX
   Patsy Mitchell, RN
   Manager of Community Health Services
   City of Dallas Dept. of Health
   & Human Services
   3200 Lancaster Road, Suite 230-A
   Dallas, TX 75216
   Phone: 214/670-1950
   Fax: 214/670-7539

EL PASO, TX
   Martha Quiroga, RN
   Chief Nursing Officer
   Nursing Dept.
   El Paso City-Co. Health District
   222 South Campbell Street
   El Paso, TX 79901
   Phone: 915/543-3547
   Fax: 915/543-3541

FORT WORTH, TX
   Glenda Thompson
   Director of Nursing
   Fort Worth-Tarrant Co. Health Dept.
   1800 University Drive, Room 206
   Fort Worth, TX 76107
   Phone: 817/871-7209
   Fax: 817/871-7335

GARLAND, TX
   Grace Rutherford, MSN
   Public Health Program Coordinator
   City of Garland Health Dept.
   P.O. Box 469002
   Garland, TX 75046-9002
   Phone: 214/205-3460
   Fax: 214/205-3505

HOUSTON, TX
   Sulabha Hardikar, MD
   Chief, Women's & Child Health Care
   City of Houston Health & Human Services
   Dept.
   8000 North Stadium Drive, 6th Floor
   Houston, TX 77054
   Phone: 713/794-9371
   Fax: 713/794-9348

* IRVING, TX
   Walter C. Bosworth, PhD
   Director of Health Services
   Dept. of Health Services
   825 West Irving Blvd.
   Irving, TX 75060
   Phone: 214/721-2461
   Fax: 214/721-2750

*No one person is MCH director.
LAREDO, TX
Lisa Sanford, RN, MPH
Chief, Preventive Services
City of Laredo Health Dept.
2600 Cedar Avenue, P.O. Box 2337
Laredo, TX 78044-2337
Phone: 210/723-2051
Fax: 210/726-2632

LUBBOCK, TX
Mary M. Strange, RN, CNA
Personal Health Services Coordinator
Lubbock Health Dept.
P.O. Box 2548
Lubbock, TX 79408
Phone: 806/767-2899
Fax: 806/762-5506

MESQUITE, TX
Susan L. Dibik
Clinic Coordinator
Mesquite Public Health Dept.
3500 East J30, F-103
Mesquite, TX 75150-2653
Phone: 214/613-0182
Fax: 214/216-6397

PASADENA, TX
Gwendolyn Brobbey, MD, MPH
Director, Personal Health Services &
Assistant Director Health Dept.
Harris County Health Dept.
2501 Dunstan, P.O. Box 25249
Houston, TX 77265
Phone: 713/620-6845
Fax: 713/620-6897

PLANO, TX
Robert Galvan
Director of Health & Community Dev.
City of Plano Health Dept.
P.O. Box 860358, 1520 Avenue K
Plano, TX 75086-0358
Phone: 214/578-7143
Fax: 214/578-7142

SAN ANTONIO, TX
Fernando A. Guerra, MD, MPH
Director of Health
San Antonio Metro Health Dept.
332 West Commerce, Room 307
San Antonio, TX 78205
Phone: 210/299-8731
Fax: 210/299-8999

WACO, TX
Sherry Williams, RN
Public Health Nurse Manager
Waco-McLennan Co. Public Health District
225 West Waco Drive
Waco, TX 76706
Phone: 817/750-5560
Fax: 817/750-5563

SALT LAKE CITY, UT
Jillian Jacobellis, CNM, MS
Maternal & Child Health Bureau Director
Salt Lake City-Co. Health Dept.
2001 South State Street, Suite 3800
Salt Lake City, UT 84109-2150
Phone: 801/468-2724
Fax: 801/468-2737

ALEXANDRIA, VA
Judith H. Southard, MSN
Director of Nursing
Alexandria Health Dept.
517 North Saint Asaph Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: 703/383-4384
Fax: 703/383-4038

* CHESAPEAKE, VA
Marian Forrest, RN
Nurse Manager
Chesapeake Health Dept.
748 Battlefield Blvd., North
Chesapeake, VA 23320
Phone: 804/541-9213
Fax: 804/541-7549

HAMPTON, VA
Carol C. Hogg, MD, MPH
Maternal & Child Health Director
Hampton Health Dept.
F.O. Drawer C
Hampton, VA 23669
Phone: 804/727-6648
Fax: 804/727-6425

NEWPORT NEWS, VA
Maurice K. Eggleston, MD
Director, Perinatal Services
Peninsula Health District
116 J. Clyde Morris Blvd.
Newport News, VA 23601
Phone: 804/594-7305
Fax: 804/594-7714

*No one person is MCH director.
NORFOLK, VA
Joyce L. Bollard, RN
Nurse Manager
Norfolk Dept. of Public Health
401 Colley Avenue
Norfolk, VA 23507
Phone: 804/683-2780
Fax: 804/683-8878

PORTSMOUTH, VA
Shirley Lacey, RN
Nurse Manager
Portsmouth Health District
800 Crawford Parkway, P.O. Box 1454
Portsmouth, VA 23705
Phone: 804/393-8585 ext. 103
Fax: 804/393-8027

RICHMOND, VA
Marilyn Carter, RN, MS
Nurse Manager
Richmond City Health Dept.
600 East Broad Street, Room 615
Richmond, VA 23219
Phone: 804/780-4765
Fax: 804/780-8257

* VIRGINIA BEACH, VA
Angela B. Savage, RN
Nurse Manager
Virginia Beach Health Dept.
3452 Virginia Beach Blvd., #103
Virginia Beach, VA 23452
Phone: 804/431-3450
Fax: 804/431-3458

BURLINGTON, VT
Patricia Berry, MPH
Director, Division of Local Health
Vermont Dept. of Health
1193 North Avenue
Burlington, VT 05402
Phone: 802/863-7347
Fax: 802/863-7347

SEATTLE, WA
Kathy Carson, RN
Maternal & Child Health Coordinator
Seattle-King Co. Dept. of Health
110 Prefontaine Place, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-2614
Phone: 206/296-4677
Fax: 206/296-4679

* SPOKANE, WA
Barbara Foyf, RN, MS
Director, Community & Family Services
Spokane Co. Health District
West 1101 College Avenue
Spokane, WA 99201
Phone: 509/324-1617
Fax: 509/324-1507

TACOMA, WA
Christiane B. Hale, PhD, MPH
Chief, Office of Community Assessment
Tacoma-Pierce Co. Health Dept.
3629 South D Street, ASD001
Tacoma, WA 98408
Phone: 206/591-6426
Fax: 206/591-7627

MADISON, WI
Mary E. Bradley, RN, MS
Maternal Child Health Specialist
Madison Dept. of Public Health
2713 East Washington Avenue
Madison, WI 53704
Phone: 608/266-4524
Fax: 608/266-4858

MILWAUKEE, WI
Elizabeth Zelazek, RN, MS
Public Health Nursing Manager
City of Milwaukee Health Dept.
841 North Broadway, Room 228
Milwaukee, WI 53202-3653
Phone: 414/286-3606
Fax: 414/286-5990

CHARLESTON, WV
Lowell White, RN, MPH
Director, Clinics & Prevention Services
Kanawha-Charleston Health Dept.
P.O. Box 927
Charleston, WV 25323
Phone: 304/348-1088
Fax: 304/348-6821

CHEYENNE, WY
Sue Hume, RN
MCH Director
Cheyenne City-Laramie Co. Health Dept.
100 Central Avenue
Cheyenne, WY 82007
Phone: 307/633-4000

*No one person is MCH director.
This survey is about your health department's initiatives to improve the health of families and children. In 1989 and 1990, CityMatCH collected basic information about the organization, mandate, successes and constraints of urban maternal and child health (MCH) programs through a survey of major city and county health departments. Results of these surveys were published and distributed in the Fall of 1989 as the Resource Directory of Major Urban MCH Programs and in the Fall of 1990 as What Works: 1990 Urban MCH Programs. Urban MCH program leaders continue to express the need to know more about successful and innovative programs in other cities and counties.

The survey is to be filled out by the person who is most knowledgeable about your health department's maternal and child health activities. Even if you are unable to answer some questions, please return the questionnaire.

The survey has two parts.

Part 1 is an update of information provided by health departments in the 1990 survey. Attached please find a sheet summarizing your health department's previous responses to several of the questions in Part 1. (If your health department did not participate in the 1990 survey, a summary sheet is not attached.) Update or correct the 1990 data as necessary on this questionnaire form.

Part 2 asks for information about childhood immunizations. Responses will be shared among urban MCH programs so that you and other urban health departments can learn about other successful local MCH efforts nationwide which target vaccine preventable conditions of childhood.

A self addressed envelope is provided. Please attach any additional materials you believe will facilitate your responses to the questions. If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Dr. Magda Peck at 402-559-8323 (FAX: 402-559-5355). Thank you for your participation.

PLEASE RETURN THE SURVEY BY JUNE 26, 1992 TO: CityMatCH at the
Department of Pediatrics
University of Nebraska Medical Center
600 South 42nd Street
Omaha, NE 68198-2167

Jurisdiction: City __________ State __________
County(ies) [if applicable] __________

Official Title of Health Department: __________

Name of person who completed the questionnaire and can answer questions about it:
Name: __________________________
Position: __________________________
Address: __________________________
City: __________________________ State: ________ Zip: ________
Telephone: __________________________ FAX: __________________________

DATE COMPLETED: __________________________
PART 1: UPDATE OF CITYMATCH DATABASE

Please answer all of the questions below. Some of the information requested below was provided by someone in your health department last year in response to the 1990 CityMatCH Survey of Maternal and Child Health in Major Urban Health Departments. Review the enclosed information sheet which summarizes some of your health department's responses to that survey. Please provide corrected or new information below as applicable.

1. Is the organizational structure of maternal and child health programs and activities in your health department the same now as it was in 1990? (X one)
   _____ yes   _____ no   _____ don't know

Please attach your health department's most recent organizational chart.

2. MCH Leadership

   A. Who in your health department is considered the director or coordinator of Maternal and Child Health?
      _____ the same person as in 1990 survey (mark any changes/updates below)
      _____ a different person from 1990 survey (please update below)
      _____ this is our health department's first survey (complete all items below)
      _____ no one person is MCH director (skip to Question #3)

      Name: ____________________________________________
      Position: _________________________________________
      Address: _________________________________________
      City: _____________________________________________ State: ______________ Zip: __________
      Telephone: _______________________________ FAX: ______________

   B. Additional information about the MCH director or coordinator:
      1. His/her position is: _____ full-time   _____ part-time
      2. Number of years as MCH Director or Coordinator: _____ years
      3. His/her professional degree(s): (X all that apply) _____ MSW
          _____ MPA
          _____ MPH
          _____ RN

      4. Sex:   _____ Female   _____ Male

      5. His/her age group: (X one) _____ 20-29   _____ 40-49   _____ 60-69
          _____ 30-39   _____ 50-59   _____ 70 and over

      6a. Race:   _____ White
          _____ Black/African American
          _____ Native American, Eskimo, Aleut
          _____ Asian or Pacific Islander
          _____ Other race: ______________________

       6b. Ethnicity:
          _____ Not of Hispanic Origin
          _____ Hispanic/Latino
          _____ Mexican
          _____ Puerto Rican
          _____ Cuban
          _____ Other Hispanic: _____________________
3. Fiscal Resources for MCH

A. Budget
1. What is your health department's total operating budget for FY92? (Give amount in dollars)
   $________________________ OR (X one): ___ unknown ___ not available
2. Please estimate: What proportion of your health department's total operating budget for FY92 is dedicated to maternal and child health activities?
   ____________% OR (X one): ___ unknown ___ not available
3. How did the MCH budget in your health department change between FY91 and FY92?
   ___ increased ___ about the same ___ decreased ___ unknown

B. Sources of Funding
1. What are the sources of funds dedicated to MCH activities in FY92? Please estimate the proportion that come from each source below. (If this information is not known, X here: ___)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENT (%)</th>
<th>SOURCE OF FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>Grants, awards from the state (e.g. MCH Block Grant, general state funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>City, county, or other local government funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>Direct federal revenues (e.g. SPRANS projects, 330 funds, federal grants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>Third party reimbursement (e.g. private or other insurance, Medicaid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>Private sources (e.g. foundations, donations, corporate contributions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>Other (please specify): _____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How are third party reimbursement dollars (insurance, Medicaid) generated by your MCH program activities channeled upon receipt in your health department? (X all that apply)
   ___ they are dedicated to MCH programs
   ___ they go into a general fund
   ___ third party dollars are not generated by our MCH activities
   ___ other (specify): _____________________________

4. List in rank order of importance to your health department the five (5) leading MCH problems faced by the families you serve.

Please list only one problem per line. Rank 1 as the most important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 2: PREVENTIVE CHILDHOOD IMMUNIZATIONS

The following questions ask for information about childhood immunization services in your jurisdiction. For the purposes of this survey, immunization services are broadly defined to include administration of vaccines to children, purchase/distribution of vaccine, outreach and education, and other assurance and monitoring activities.

1a. Who are the principal providers of immunization services to children in your jurisdiction? (check all that apply)

- City or county health department
- Community health centers
- Hospitals: □ inpatient □ outpatient □ emergency room
- Private physicians
- Other providers (specify): ____________________________

b. To what extent do these providers collaborate in the delivery of immunization services to children in your jurisdiction?

☐ not at all  ☐ very little  ☐ somewhat  ☐ a great deal

Please give an example(s) of collaboration:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2a. Please estimate the percentage of children in your jurisdiction who received primary/preventive child health care from the following providers in 1991:

- % from your city or county health department
- % from community health centers
- % from hospital - inpatient services
- % from hospital - outpatient services
- % from hospital - emergency room
- % from private physicians
- % from other providers (specify %): ____________________________

100 %

b. Please estimate the percentage of children in your jurisdiction who received immunizations from the following providers in 1991:

- % from your city or county health department
- % from community health centers
- % from hospital - inpatient services
- % from hospital - outpatient services
- % from hospital emergency room
- % from private physicians
- % from other providers (specify %): ____________________________

100 %
c. In recent years, some urban communities have experienced a shift from the private to the public sector in the delivery of immunization services. Has this shift occurred in your jurisdiction?

____ yes       ____ no       ____ don't know

Why or why not? ____________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________

3. How does your health department administer immunizations to children in your jurisdiction? (check all that apply)

____ through health department clinics - which one(s):

   ____ immunization
   ____ child health
   ____ primary care
   ____ other: __________________________________________________________

____ through WIC clinics
____ through vaccination campaigns
____ through home visitation programs
____ through other means, please explain: ______________________________________

4a. What immunization guidelines does your health department follow? (check all that apply)

____ American Academy of Pediatrics
____ Centers for Disease Control, ACIP
____ Guidelines set by your State health department
____ other, please specify: _________________________________________________

b. What childhood immunizations does your health department currently administer?

____ DPT, DT
____ OPV/IPV
____ MMR
____ Hib
____ Td
____ Hepatitis B: to what groups?
   ____ infants of Hep B+ mothers
   ____ all infants
   ____ infants of refugees and other high risk groups
   ____ adolescents
   ____ other: ___________________________________________________________

4c. Does your health department plan to provide universal Hepatitis B immunization to children?

____ yes. If yes, approximately when? _______________________
   ____ no
   ____ a decision has not been made
   ____ don't know
   ____ other (specify): ________________________________________________
5a. How many children received immunizations and how many doses of vaccines have been administered through all of your health department's programs in each of the past three years?

1991: _____ number of children served _____ number of doses administered  
☐ don't know

1990: _____ number of children served _____ number of doses administered  
☐ don't know

1989: _____ number of children served _____ number of doses administered  
☐ don't know

b. Does your health department currently have the capacity to serve all children who seek immunization services?

_____ yes  _____ no  _____ don't know

6. In your health department's jurisdiction, what percentage of children are fully immunized at: (Put "NA" if these data are not available.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>What method did you use to determine this percentage?</th>
<th>Are these data available by race/ethnicity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School entry</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ yes ☐ no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 months of age</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ yes ☐ no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7a. In the past three years, what has been the trend in the amount of funding for your local health department's immunization services?

_____ decreased  _____ about the same  _____ increased  _____ don't know

b. Which funding sources below are contributing to your health department's FY92 immunization services? How does the FY92 contribution compare to FY91?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY92 Funding Source</th>
<th>Briefly Describe Contribution</th>
<th>FY92 $ compared to FY91 $ (X one for each source)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ less ☐ same ☐ more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ less ☐ same ☐ more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ less ☐ same ☐ more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ less ☐ same ☐ more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ less ☐ same ☐ more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. In your opinion, what are the three greatest barriers to age-appropriate immunizations faced by children and their families in your jurisdiction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greatest Barrier</th>
<th>2nd Greatest Barrier</th>
<th>3rd Greatest Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What does your health department need to assure better age-appropriate childhood immunization levels in your jurisdiction?

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Please describe your health department's most successful activities in the past year to improve childhood immunization levels.

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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About CityMatCH

CityMatCH is a free-standing national membership organization of city and county health departments' maternal and child health (MCH) programs and leaders representing urban communities in the United States. The mission of CityMatCH is to enhance the ability of maternal and child health programs at the local level to improve the health and well-being of children and families in urban areas.

CityMatCH operates under the direction of a fourteen member Board of Directors composed of one representative from each of the ten federal regions plus four at-large representatives, and a Chief Operating Officer.

Since 1989 CityMatCH, with funding from the Association of Maternal and Child Health Programs and the Federal MCH Bureau, has conducted two nationwide surveys of maternal and child health programs in major urban health departments in the U.S.; published and disseminated two documents summarizing the results of the surveys; and held two Urban MCH Leadership Conferences in Washington, D.C. and published proceedings. CityMatCH, in collaboration with the U.S. Conference of Local Health Officers has just entered into a five-year Cooperative Agreement entitled "Municipal MCH Partners" with the Maternal and Child Health Bureau, HRSA. This survey is supported in part by project MCU# 316058-G1-0 from the Maternal and Child Health program (Title V, Social Security Act), Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

CityMatCH *regular* membership is limited to city or county health departments in urban areas of greater than 100,000 population. In states where no urban area is greater than 100,000 population, one city or county health department in that state will be granted membership. In addition, any person who has an interest in urban MCH affairs but is not a local-MCH director or designee may be an associate member. Currently there are no dues for CityMatCH members.
**APPENDIX B**

*List of Surveyed Health Departments*\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anchorage, AK</th>
<th>Waterbury, CT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham, AL</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Huntsville, AL</td>
<td>Wilmington, DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile, AL</td>
<td>* Fort Lauderdale, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Montgomery, AL</td>
<td>Jacksonville, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock, AR</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson, AZ</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield, CA</td>
<td>Tallahassee, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord, CA</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Fresno, CA</td>
<td>* Columbus, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>* Macon, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Savannah, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Modesto, CA</td>
<td>Agana, GU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>Honolulu, HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard, CA</td>
<td>Cedar Rapids, IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena, CA</td>
<td>Des Moines, IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside, CA</td>
<td>Boise, ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas, CA</td>
<td>Peoria, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino, CA</td>
<td>Rockford, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>Springfield, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Evansville, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>* Fort Wayne, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana, CA</td>
<td>* Gary, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa, CA</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Stockton, CA</td>
<td>South Bend, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallejo, CA</td>
<td>* Kansas City, KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora, CO</td>
<td>* Overland Park, KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs, CO</td>
<td>Topeka, KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>Wichita, KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood, CO</td>
<td>Lexington, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport, CT</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford, CT</td>
<td>Baton Rouge, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford, CT</td>
<td>Shreveport, LA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)List reflects the principal city within each health department's jurisdiction.

*Did not respond to 1992 survey.*
Detroit, MI
* Flint, MI
Ann Arbor, MI
Grand Rapids, MI
Lansing, MI
Livonia, MI
* Warren, MI
Minneapolis, MN
* St. Paul, MN
Independence, MO
Kansas City, MO
Springfield, MO
* St. Louis, MO
Jackson, MS
* Missoula, MT
Charlotte, NC
Durham, NC
Greensboro, NC
Raleigh, NC
* Winston-Salem, NC
* Bismarck, ND
* Lincoln, NE
Omaha, NE
* Manchester, NH
* Elizabeth, NJ
Jersey City, NJ
Newark, NJ
Paterson, NJ
Albuquerque, NM
Las Vegas, NV
* Reno, NV
* Albany, NY
Buffalo, NY
New York, NY
Rochester, NY
Syracuse, NY
Younters, NY

Akron, OH
* Cincinnati, OH
Cleveland, OH
* Columbus, OH
Dayton, OH
* Toledo, OH
* Oklahoma City, OK
Tulsa, OK
Eugene, OR
* Portland, OR
* Salem, OR
* Allentown, PA
Erie, PA
Philadelphia, PA
Pittsburgh, PA
Rio Piedras, PR
* Providence, RI
Columbia, SC
Sioux Falls, SD
* Chattanooga, TN
* Knoxville, TN
Memphis, TN
Nashville, TN
* Abilene, TX
Amarillo, TX
* Arlington, TX
* Austin, TX
Beaumont, TX
Corpus Christi, TX
Dallas, TX
El Paso, TX
Fort Worth, TX
Garland, TX
Houston, TX
Irving, TX
Laredo, TX
Lubbock, TX
Mesquite, TX
Pasadena, TX
* Plano, TX
San Antonio, TX
Waco, TX
Salt Lake City, UT
Alexandria, VA
Chesapeake, VA
* Hampton, VA
Newport News, VA
Norfolk, VA
* Portsmouth, VA
Richmond, VA
* Virginia Beach, VA
Burlington, VT
Seattle, WA
Spokane, WA
Tacoma, WA
Madison, WI
Milwaukee, WI
Charleston, WV
Cheyenne, WY
* Did not respond to 1992 survey.