



\*E000828\*

NOTE: DO NOT USE THIS ROUTE SLIP TO  
SHOW FORMAL CLEARANCES OR APPROVALS

DATE

10/8/74

TO:

AGENCY BLDG. ROOM

roland Gardell

Room 11-07

- APPROVAL       REVIEW       PER CONVERSATION  
 SIGNATURE       NOTE AND SEE ME       AS REQUESTED  
 COMMENT       NOTE AND RETURN       NECESSARY ACTION  
 FOR YOUR INFORMATION  
 PREPARE REPLY FOR SIGNATURE OF \_\_\_\_\_

REMARKS:

(Fold here for return)

To Roland L. Peterson

From

PHONE

31710

BUILDING

Parklawn

ROOM

FORM HEW-30 REV. 11/56

ROUTE SLIP


GPO : 1973 O - 517-326

# MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE  
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE  
HEALTH RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION  
BUREAU OF HEALTH RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

TO : HRP Executive Staff

DATE: October 7, 1974

FROM : R. L. Peterson 

SUBJECT: HRP Executive Staff Meeting, October 7

Certain area designation issues and problems, briefly set forth in the paper (dated 9/30/74) previously distributed, were considered and discussed. Although no definitive decisions were reached, there appeared to be a general consensus or some agreement on several points.

1. The onus is on the Secretary or his designee(s) to justify non-approval of any proposed area designations meeting whatever objective (e.g., population) or other requirements are established. Conversely, the onus is on governors to make the case in requesting "waivers." This has fairly direct implications for the kind and/or nature of any area designation requirements we might wish to set beyond those legislatively mandated, and the criteria for evaluating and acting on waivers.
2. RHAs should have the effective approval authority with respect to area designations and possibly have that officially delegated to them, except in certain specified cases: Specifically (1) waiver requests, (2) any instance where non-approval is proposed for an area that ostensibly satisfies the objective requirements, and (3) those area designations of an inter-regional character (e.g., St. Louis, Philadelphia).
3. Such exceptions should be reviewed and acted upon by an ad hoc group composed of both regional and central office staff.

It was agreed that the Area Designation Work Group should develop as soon as possible explicit draft requirements and criteria for consideration. Mr. Rubel also requested that as soon as a Senate bill has been reported out Mr. Kelly and the group suggest the elements of what should be our position vis-a-vis House-Senate Conference as regards the area designation process.

With respect to legislation, Mr. Rubel stated that H.R. 16204 had been cleared by the Rules Committee, and thus it was possible the House would vote on it this week before they recess. He also indicated the Senate Committee had reported out S. 2994 last week. Because of the number of amendments, however, we could not be certain as to all the specifics of

it until a clean bill is actually available.

Copies of a revised and expanded draft HRP organizational and functional statement were distributed. Mr. Croft requested specific suggested changes and comments by next Tuesday. Its distribution to the RHAs, and regional office comments, will be coordinated by Dr. Lindsay.

Three new HRP implementation work groups have been established. They and the project managers or chairman are: Agency Selection (Mrs. Judy Silsbee), Expanded Section 1122 Program (Mr. Sam Stiles) and Review and Approval Function (Mr. Ken Baum).

A joint DCHP-DFU-DRMP training committee also has been established, Dr. Rorrie reported. That group, which Miss Richards is chairing, is charged with developing within the next several weeks a training-cum-orientation program for the staffs of the three divisions.

Because next Monday is a holiday, the HRP executive staff will meet on Tuesday, October 15, at 9:00 a.m. One topic to be considered is the Regional HRP Orientation Sessions. Dr. Rorrie is drafting a revised agenda that hopefully can be distributed prior to Tuesday.

cc: Dr. Wherritt  
Dr. Ellis