

State Management Plan Survey 2007 Western Regional Panel summary of responses

The ANS Task Force requested the panels to discuss three questions associated with State Management Plans. This is a summary of the WRP membership responses.

Question 1: Do you have any comments on the guidelines for the development of ANS Management Plans provided by the ANS Task Force?

Summary of responses: Overall those states that have used the guidelines found them helpful. However, some thought that the guidelines did need updating. The minimum criteria need to be updated and clarified. Some want to see the guidelines be more specific requesting more streamlined plans and that the states should be encouraged to write shorter plans and address more specifically what the state can and can not accomplish, specifically how the plan will be implemented and how the outcomes will be evaluated. There were some concerns that the plan reporting system does not adequately address outcome evaluation.

Question 2: Should there be more management on a regional basis?

Summary of responses: All of those whom responded stated that regional management is a good idea; however, concerns were raised about funding and how regional management will be incorporated with state level management. Adequate funding first has to be available for states to adequately implement their own plans however, regional management is an efficient way to manage ANS issues since neighboring states often share ANS or vectors. The overall response was that regional management should be explored more once more stable funding is achieved for the states.

Question 3: How should ANS funds for state management plans be administered?

Summary of responses: All responders agreed that funds should be divided equally; however, funds spent should be more evaluated and reports should demonstrate that the funds were spent on good, evaluated, ANS management.

The discussion also included the following: With the current level of funds available states should receive an equal share of funds, states should not receive funds at the expense of others, if funds were allocated based on need many states with limited budgets and political “clout” would lose out. Current funding is inadequate; as more funds become available and states have adequate funds then additional funds can be used on either regional projects or on merit based projects. States with new plans are in no more need than those with established plans. Others suggested that additional funds be available for emergency situations, such as the implementation of rapid response plans; however, this also seems beyond the current scope of available funds. One suggestion was made to divide funds with 50% to existing plans (equal share), 25% to new state plans, and 25% for emergency situations for states with existing plans.