TO: Eugene Rubel, Director  
Comprehensive Health Planning Service  
Rockville, Maryland  

FROM: Florence Fiori, Director  
Division of Resource Development  
New York, New York  

DATE: July 30, 1974  

SUBJECT: Your request for comments on Proposed Tasks for Implementing HRP Legislation

On the basis of staff discussion, it is our feeling that regional input would be useful in relation to all the Tasks described with the possible exception of tasks E & F. Even in the instance of E & F regional offices could be useful for pretesting of materials to ensure regional and local understanding as well as appropriateness and applicability of the materials generated.

For the most part it is our feeling that RO input could be accomplished through circulation of working drafts of products related to each task, for comment within specified deadlines. In instances where comments raise serious questions or suggest alternate approaches, personal contact with individual regions and/or groups of regional representatives on an ad hoc basis would be desirable.

If task force groups are to be organized for purposes of implementing action related to the work plan, regional representation could be solicited on a selective basis. Assignment of RO staff to CO on a detail basis does not seem realistic at this point in view of heavy regional work loads and scarce personnel resources. An alternative approach might be that of requesting specific regions to assume responsibility for discrete time limited activities which could be carried out with staff physically located in the RO.

Item D (position descriptions) raises questions concerning the new regional organizational structure and the placement of HRP within the framework of a Division of Resource Development. We see some usefulness in a Division level position (i.e. associate for Resource Development) which would serve as linkage between health planning and other related resources both within and outside of the Division.