

# AGENDA

## PUBLIC HEALTH ADVISORY BOARD

### Joint subcommittee meeting on the public health modernization funding formula

March 29, 2018

1:00-3:00

Portland State Office Building, 800 NE Oregon St., Conference Room 918, Portland, OR 97232

Webinar: <https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/2283396867798432257>

Conference line: (877) 873-8017

Access code: 767068

Incentives and Funding subcommittee members: Carrie Brogoitti, Bob Dannenhoffer, Jeff Luck, Alejandro Queral, Akiko Saito

Accountability Metrics subcommittee members: Muriel DeLaVergne-Brown, Eva Rippeteau, Eli Schwarz, Teri Thalhofer, Jennifer Vines

#### Meeting Objectives

- Develop mechanisms for incorporating incentive funds and state matching funds into the public health modernization funding formula.
- Determine whether a portion of 2019-21 funding should be allocated to the incentive funds or state matching funds components of the public health modernization funding formula.

---

<b>1:00-1:05 pm</b>	<b>Welcome and introductions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review agenda</li></ul>	Sara Beaudrault, Oregon Health Authority
<b>1:05-1:15 pm</b>	<b>Funding formula requirements</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review ORS 431.380</li><li>• Ensure a common understanding on each funding formula component</li></ul>	Sara Beaudrault, Oregon Health Authority
<b>1:15-1:55 pm</b>	<b>Incentive funds</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discuss criteria for when an accountability metric should be incentivized, and make recommendation</li><li>• Review model for awarding incentive funds</li><li>• Recommend model for further development</li></ul>	Sara Beaudrault, Oregon Health Authority  Chris Curtis, Oregon Health Authority
<b>1:55-2:40 pm</b>	<b>State matching funds</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review options for what components of county investments in local public health should be eligible for state matching funds, and make recommendation</li></ul>	Danna Drum, Oregon Health Authority  Chris Curtis, Oregon Health Authority

---

- 
- 
- Review models for incorporating state matching funds
  - Recommend model for further development
- 
- 

**2:40-2:50 pm**

**2019-21 funding formula allocations**

- Discuss whether to allocate a portion of funds for 2019-21 to incentive funds or state matching funds, and make recommendation

Sara Beaudrault,  
Oregon Health Authority

---

---

**2:50-2:55 pm**

**Subcommittee business**

- Review action items for each PHAB subcommittee resulting from this meeting
- Decide who will provide update at April PHAB meeting

All

---

---

**2:55-3:00 pm**

**Public comment**

---

---

**3:00 pm**

**Adjourn**

Sara Beaudrault,  
Oregon Health Authority

---

---

## FUNDING OF LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH AUTHORITIES

**431.380 Distribution of funds; rules.** (1) From state moneys that the Oregon Health Authority receives for the purpose of funding the foundational capabilities established under ORS 431.131 and the foundational programs established under ORS 431.141, the Oregon Health Authority shall make payments to local public health authorities under this section. The Oregon Health Authority shall each biennium submit to the Oregon Public Health Advisory Board and the Legislative Fiscal Office a formula that provides for the equitable distribution of moneys. The Oregon Health Authority shall incorporate into the formula:

(a) A method for distributing to local public health authorities a base amount of state moneys received by the Oregon Health Authority pursuant to this subsection, taking into consideration the population of each local public health authority, the burden of disease borne by communities located within the jurisdiction of each local public health authority, the overall health status of communities located within the jurisdiction of each local public health authority and the ability of each local public health authority to invest in local public health activities and services;

(b) A method for awarding matching funds to a local public health authority that invests in local public health activities and services above the base amount distributed in accordance with paragraph (a) of this subsection; and

(c) A method for the use of incentives as described in subsection (3) of this section.

(2) The Oregon Health Authority shall submit the formula adopted under subsection (1) of this section to the Oregon Public Health Advisory Board and the Legislative Fiscal Office no later than June 30 of each even-numbered year. At the same time that the Oregon Health Authority submits the formula, the Oregon Health Authority shall submit to the Oregon Public Health Advisory Board and the Legislative Fiscal Office an estimate of the amount of state moneys necessary to fund in part or in whole the foundational capabilities established under ORS 431.131 and the foundational programs established under ORS 431.141.

(3) The Oregon Health Authority shall adopt by rule incentives and a process for identifying, updating and applying accountability metrics, for the purpose of encouraging the effective and equitable provision of public health services by local public health authorities.

(4) Nothing in this section prohibits the Oregon Health Authority from distributing state moneys that the Oregon Health Authority receives for the purpose of funding the foundational capabilities established under ORS 431.131 and the foundational programs established under ORS 431.141 to local public health authorities on an individual basis as opposed to a statewide basis, or through a competitive grant or contract process or on the basis of need, if the state moneys received are insufficient to adequately fund local public health authorities on a statewide basis. [1983 c.398 §2; 2009 c.595 §560; 2015 c.736 §28; 2017 c.627 §4]

# Three components to the funding formula

1. Base funds awarded for population, health status, burden of disease, and ability of LPHA to invest in local public health;
2. Matching funds for county investment in local public health services and activities above the base funding amount;
3. Incentive funds for achieving accountability metrics.

# Incentive funds – important points to keep in mind

- Public health accountability metrics are comprised of the set of health outcome measures and local public health process measures that have been adopted by PHAB.
  - Incentive funds will be awarded based on performance on the local public health process measures.
  - Performance includes meeting a benchmark or improvement target.
  - The Accountability Metrics subcommittee is responsible for establishing benchmarks and improvement targets.
- Public health accountability metrics will be collected and reported on annually.

# Incentive funds: criteria for incentivizing an accountability metric

**Recommendation:** Incentivize accountability metrics when there is continuity of funding over two biennia.

- Example: since funding is/will be directed to communicable disease control in 2017-19 and 2019-21, the process measures for two year old immunization rates and gonorrhea rates would be incentivized in 2019-21.

## Questions:

- What feedback do PHAB members have on this recommendation?
- Should process measures for all foundational programs that are funded in a biennium be incentivized?

# Incentive funds: funding formula model

- Similar to the base component of the funding formula:
  - The component for incentives includes a floor amount that each LPHA would receive for achieving an accountability metric.
  - Additional incentive funds are awarded based on county population.
- Each LPHA would know the minimum amount of incentive funds they are eligible to receive for meeting an accountability metric.
  - If some LPHAs do not achieve the accountability metric, those funds would be redistributed to LPHAs that meet the metric.

# Incentive funds – funding formula model

## Questions:

1. Is the model equitable for all county size bands?
2. Will the model incentivize improvement?
3. Are there unintended consequences to this model?
4. What else would you like to see reflected in the model for incentive funds?

**Public Health Advisory Board**

**Public health modernization funding formula: Incentive funds model**

March, 2018

**Incentive Pool** \$ 1,000,000  
**Incentive Floor** \$ 2,500

**Incentive funds model:** This model divides the total incentive pool into any number of incentives (this model shows 2 modules). Each module is paid out to counties on a pass/fail basis. If the county meets the incentive they are guaranteed a floor plus a per capita payment based on county population proportioned based on total population of qualified counties.

Weight	50%		\$ 457,500		50%		\$ 457,500							
County	Population <sup>1</sup>	Incentive 1 Met? (Y/N)	Incentive 1 Floor Payout	Incentive 1 Population	Incentive 1 Per Cap Pay	Incentive 1 Total Payout	Incentive 2 Met? (Y/N)	Incentive 2 Floor Payout	Incentive 2 Population	Incentive 2 Per Cap Pay	Incentive 2 Total Payout	Total Incentive Payout	Total Per Cap	Avg Award Per Capita
Oregon	4,141,100	34	\$ 42,500	4,141,100	\$ 457,500	\$ 500,000	34	\$ 42,500	4,141,100	\$ 457,500	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 0.24	
Wheeler	1,480	Y	\$ 1,250	1,480	\$ 164	\$ 1,414	Y	\$ 1,250	1,480	\$ 164	\$ 1,414	\$ 2,827	\$ 1.91	
Wallowa	7,195	Y	\$ 1,250	7,195	\$ 795	\$ 2,045	Y	\$ 1,250	7,195	\$ 795	\$ 2,045	\$ 4,090	\$ 0.57	
Harney	7,360	Y	\$ 1,250	7,360	\$ 813	\$ 2,063	Y	\$ 1,250	7,360	\$ 813	\$ 2,063	\$ 4,126	\$ 0.56	
Grant	7,415	Y	\$ 1,250	7,415	\$ 819	\$ 2,069	Y	\$ 1,250	7,415	\$ 819	\$ 2,069	\$ 4,138	\$ 0.56	
Lake	8,120	Y	\$ 1,250	8,120	\$ 897	\$ 2,147	Y	\$ 1,250	8,120	\$ 897	\$ 2,147	\$ 4,294	\$ 0.53	
Morrow	11,890	Y	\$ 1,250	11,890	\$ 1,314	\$ 2,564	Y	\$ 1,250	11,890	\$ 1,314	\$ 2,564	\$ 5,127	\$ 0.43	
Baker	16,750	Y	\$ 1,250	16,750	\$ 1,851	\$ 3,101	Y	\$ 1,250	16,750	\$ 1,851	\$ 3,101	\$ 6,201	\$ 0.37	0.51
Crook	22,105	Y	\$ 1,250	22,105	\$ 2,442	\$ 3,692	Y	\$ 1,250	22,105	\$ 2,442	\$ 3,692	\$ 7,384	\$ 0.33	
Curry	22,805	Y	\$ 1,250	22,805	\$ 2,519	\$ 3,769	Y	\$ 1,250	22,805	\$ 2,519	\$ 3,769	\$ 7,539	\$ 0.33	
Jefferson	23,190	Y	\$ 1,250	23,190	\$ 2,562	\$ 3,812	Y	\$ 1,250	23,190	\$ 2,562	\$ 3,812	\$ 7,624	\$ 0.33	
Hood River	25,145	Y	\$ 1,250	25,145	\$ 2,778	\$ 4,028	Y	\$ 1,250	25,145	\$ 2,778	\$ 4,028	\$ 8,056	\$ 0.32	
Tillamook	26,175	Y	\$ 1,250	26,175	\$ 2,892	\$ 4,142	Y	\$ 1,250	26,175	\$ 2,892	\$ 4,142	\$ 8,284	\$ 0.32	
Union	26,900	Y	\$ 1,250	26,900	\$ 2,972	\$ 4,222	Y	\$ 1,250	26,900	\$ 2,972	\$ 4,222	\$ 8,444	\$ 0.31	
North Central	30,895	Y	\$ 1,250	30,895	\$ 3,413	\$ 4,663	Y	\$ 1,250	30,895	\$ 3,413	\$ 4,663	\$ 9,326	\$ 0.30	
Malheur	31,845	Y	\$ 1,250	31,845	\$ 3,518	\$ 4,768	Y	\$ 1,250	31,845	\$ 3,518	\$ 4,768	\$ 9,536	\$ 0.30	
Clatsop	38,820	Y	\$ 1,250	38,820	\$ 4,289	\$ 5,539	Y	\$ 1,250	38,820	\$ 4,289	\$ 5,539	\$ 11,078	\$ 0.29	
Lincoln	47,960	Y	\$ 1,250	47,960	\$ 5,299	\$ 6,549	Y	\$ 1,250	47,960	\$ 5,299	\$ 6,549	\$ 13,097	\$ 0.27	
Columbia	51,345	Y	\$ 1,250	51,345	\$ 5,672	\$ 6,922	Y	\$ 1,250	51,345	\$ 5,672	\$ 6,922	\$ 13,845	\$ 0.27	
Coos	63,310	Y	\$ 1,250	63,310	\$ 6,994	\$ 8,244	Y	\$ 1,250	63,310	\$ 6,994	\$ 8,244	\$ 16,489	\$ 0.26	
Klamath	67,690	Y	\$ 1,250	67,690	\$ 7,478	\$ 8,728	Y	\$ 1,250	67,690	\$ 7,478	\$ 8,728	\$ 17,456	\$ 0.26	0.29
Umatilla	80,500	Y	\$ 1,250	80,500	\$ 8,893	\$ 10,143	Y	\$ 1,250	80,500	\$ 8,893	\$ 10,143	\$ 20,287	\$ 0.25	
Polk	81,000	Y	\$ 1,250	81,000	\$ 8,949	\$ 10,199	Y	\$ 1,250	81,000	\$ 8,949	\$ 10,199	\$ 20,397	\$ 0.25	
Josephine	85,650	Y	\$ 1,250	85,650	\$ 9,462	\$ 10,712	Y	\$ 1,250	85,650	\$ 9,462	\$ 10,712	\$ 21,425	\$ 0.25	
Benton	92,575	Y	\$ 1,250	92,575	\$ 10,227	\$ 11,477	Y	\$ 1,250	92,575	\$ 10,227	\$ 11,477	\$ 22,955	\$ 0.25	
Yamhill	106,300	Y	\$ 1,250	106,300	\$ 11,744	\$ 12,994	Y	\$ 1,250	106,300	\$ 11,744	\$ 12,994	\$ 25,988	\$ 0.24	
Douglas	111,180	Y	\$ 1,250	111,180	\$ 12,283	\$ 13,533	Y	\$ 1,250	111,180	\$ 12,283	\$ 13,533	\$ 27,066	\$ 0.24	
Linn	124,010	Y	\$ 1,250	124,010	\$ 13,700	\$ 14,950	Y	\$ 1,250	124,010	\$ 13,700	\$ 14,950	\$ 29,901	\$ 0.24	0.25
Deschutes	182,930	Y	\$ 1,250	182,930	\$ 20,210	\$ 21,460	Y	\$ 1,250	182,930	\$ 20,210	\$ 21,460	\$ 42,919	\$ 0.23	
Jackson	216,900	Y	\$ 1,250	216,900	\$ 23,963	\$ 25,213	Y	\$ 1,250	216,900	\$ 23,963	\$ 25,213	\$ 50,425	\$ 0.23	
Marion	339,200	Y	\$ 1,250	339,200	\$ 37,474	\$ 38,724	Y	\$ 1,250	339,200	\$ 37,474	\$ 38,724	\$ 77,448	\$ 0.23	
Lane	370,600	Y	\$ 1,250	370,600	\$ 40,943	\$ 42,193	Y	\$ 1,250	370,600	\$ 40,943	\$ 42,193	\$ 84,386	\$ 0.23	0.23
Clackamas	413,000	Y	\$ 1,250	413,000	\$ 45,627	\$ 46,877	Y	\$ 1,250	413,000	\$ 45,627	\$ 46,877	\$ 93,755	\$ 0.23	
Washington	595,860	Y	\$ 1,250	595,860	\$ 65,829	\$ 67,079	Y	\$ 1,250	595,860	\$ 65,829	\$ 67,079	\$ 134,159	\$ 0.23	
Multnomah	803,000	Y	\$ 1,250	803,000	\$ 88,714	\$ 89,964	Y	\$ 1,250	803,000	\$ 88,714	\$ 89,964	\$ 179,927	\$ 0.22	0.23

<sup>1</sup> Source: Portland State University Certified Population estimate July 1, 2017

County Size Bands				
Extra Small	Small	Medium	Large	Extra Large

# State matching funds

**ORS 431.380(1)(b)** The Oregon Health Authority shall incorporate into the formula a method for awarding matching funds to a local public health authority that invests in local public health activities and services above the base amount.

State matching funds are intended to ensure that, with new state funds provided to LPHAs for public health modernization, counties continue to invest in local public health.

PHAB Joint Subcommittee Meeting on the Public Health Modernization Funding Formula  
 State matching funds for county general fund investments in local public health  
 March 29, 2018

**ORS 431.380(1)(b)** The Oregon Health Authority shall incorporate into the formula a method for awarding matching funds to a local public health authority that invests in local public health activities and services above the base amount.

**This table provides four options for allocating state matching funds to county general fund investments in local public health.**

Option	Opportunities	Challenges
<p><b>Option 1: Match on all local county general fund investments with some exclusions. <u>Recommended.</u></b></p>	<p>Supports local authority to determine how county funds for local public health are used.</p> <p>Would include county in-kind and administrative investments.</p>	<p>Would need to determine list of exclusions*</p>
<p><b>Option 2: Match only on foundational program and capability activities and services included in the Public Health Modernization Manual</b></p>	<p>May encourage greater local investment in core public health functions and roles outlined in the Public Health Modernization Manual.</p>	<p>Difficult to isolate expenditures related to foundational capabilities.</p> <p>Leaves room for interpretation of what falls within a foundational capability and/or program.</p> <p>May result in loss of local funds for local priorities not included in the Public Health Modernization Manual.</p> <p>Would exclude in-kind investments supporting local infrastructure.</p>
<p><b>Option 3: Match on all county general fund and in-kind investments</b></p>	<p>Easiest data collection of all options</p>	<p>Public health modernization funding would be used to support non-foundational services and activities.</p>

<b>Option 4: Match on a subset of foundational programs and/or capabilities (for example, only match on the prioritized foundational programs and capabilities for a biennium)</b>	May increase funding in prioritized areas	Local investments may be moved from other high priority public health community needs
--	---	---

\* OHA would develop list of exclusions prior to FY18 reporting. Exclusions likely to include local public health services including primary care, jail health, direct client services, medical supplies, animal control, etc.

# State matching funds: funding formula models

Two models for review:

1. Matching funds based on county per capita investment in local public health.
2. Matching funds based on sustaining and increasing investments over time.

# State matching funds – funding formula model

## Questions:

1. Which model is more likely to encourage sustained and increased county investment in local public health?
2. Are the models equitable for all county size bands?
3. Are there unintended consequences to these models?
4. What else would you like to see reflected in the model for incentive funds?
5. Which model does this group recommend the Incentives and Funding subcommittee continue to develop?

**Public Health Advisory Board**

**Public health modernization funding formula: state matching funds model 1**

March, 2018

State matching funds Pool **\$ 1,000,000**

State Matching Funds Model 1, County Per Capita Investment: Matching payment is based off of comparative County Funding Per Capita with largest distribution per capita paid to counties with highest County Investment Per Capita

County	Population <sup>1</sup>	County Funding <sup>2</sup>	Funding Per Capita <sup>2</sup>	County Per Capita Compare	Weight	Weight %	Distribution	Dist. Per Cap	Avg Award Per Capita
Oregon	4,141,100	\$ 68,747,850	\$ 16.60	34.1%	158,430	100.0%	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 0.24	
Wheeler	1,480	\$ 22,900	\$ 15.47	3.6%	53	0.0%	\$ 335	\$ 0.23	
Wallowa	7,195	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%	-	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	
Harney	7,360	\$ 96,952	\$ 13.17	3.0%	223	0.1%	\$ 1,408	\$ 0.19	
Grant	7,415	\$ 73,636	\$ 9.93	2.3%	170	0.1%	\$ 1,073	\$ 0.14	
Lake	8,120	\$ 151,267	\$ 18.63	4.3%	349	0.2%	\$ 2,203	\$ 0.27	
Morrow	11,890	\$ 621,474	\$ 52.27	12.0%	1,432	0.9%	\$ 9,039	\$ 0.76	
Baker	16,750	\$ 246,676	\$ 14.73	3.4%	569	0.4%	\$ 3,591	\$ 0.21	0.29
Crook	22,105	\$ 622,139	\$ 28.14	6.5%	1,433	0.9%	\$ 9,045	\$ 0.41	
Curry	22,805	\$ 144,795	\$ 6.35	1.5%	334	0.2%	\$ 2,108	\$ 0.09	
Jefferson	23,190	\$ 566,944	\$ 24.45	5.6%	1,307	0.8%	\$ 8,250	\$ 0.36	
Hood River	25,145	\$ 822,751	\$ 32.72	7.5%	1,896	1.2%	\$ 11,967	\$ 0.48	
Tillamook	26,175	\$ 146,840	\$ 5.61	1.3%	338	0.2%	\$ 2,133	\$ 0.08	
Union	26,900	\$ 145,000	\$ 5.39	1.2%	334	0.2%	\$ 2,108	\$ 0.08	
North Central	30,895	\$ 545,643	\$ 17.66	4.1%	1,257	0.8%	\$ 7,934	\$ 0.26	
Malheur	31,845	\$ 489,035	\$ 15.36	3.5%	1,127	0.7%	\$ 7,114	\$ 0.22	
Clatsop	38,820	\$ 431,075	\$ 11.10	2.6%	993	0.6%	\$ 6,268	\$ 0.16	
Lincoln	47,960	\$ 307,500	\$ 6.41	1.5%	708	0.4%	\$ 4,469	\$ 0.09	
Columbia	51,345	\$ 144,489	\$ 2.81	0.6%	332	0.2%	\$ 2,096	\$ 0.04	
Coos	63,310	\$ 52,178	\$ 0.82	0.2%	120	0.1%	\$ 757	\$ 0.01	
Klamath	67,690	\$ 232,280	\$ 3.43	0.8%	535	0.3%	\$ 3,377	\$ 0.05	0.14
Umatilla	80,500	\$ 386,278	\$ 4.80	1.1%	890	0.6%	\$ 5,618	\$ 0.07	
Polk	81,000	\$ 251,759	\$ 3.11	0.7%	580	0.4%	\$ 3,661	\$ 0.05	
Josephine	85,650	\$ 364,715	\$ 4.26	1.0%	841	0.5%	\$ 5,308	\$ 0.06	
Benton	92,575	\$ 2,090,815	\$ 22.59	5.2%	4,819	3.0%	\$ 30,417	\$ 0.33	
Yamhill	106,300	\$ 650,791	\$ 6.12	1.4%	1,499	0.9%	\$ 9,462	\$ 0.09	
Douglas	111,180	\$ 671,902	\$ 6.04	1.4%	1,547	1.0%	\$ 9,765	\$ 0.09	
Linn	124,010	\$ 651,346	\$ 5.25	1.2%	1,500	0.9%	\$ 9,468	\$ 0.08	0.11
Deschutes	182,930	\$ 2,968,217	\$ 16.23	3.7%	6,841	4.3%	\$ 43,180	\$ 0.24	
Jackson	216,900	\$ 670,465	\$ 3.09	0.7%	1,544	1.0%	\$ 9,746	\$ 0.04	
Marion	339,200	\$ 2,152,253	\$ 6.35	1.5%	4,963	3.1%	\$ 31,326	\$ 0.09	
Lane	370,600	\$ 1,716,536	\$ 4.63	1.1%	3,954	2.5%	\$ 24,957	\$ 0.07	0.10
Clackamas	413,000	\$ 1,965,745	\$ 4.76	1.1%	4,530	2.9%	\$ 28,593	\$ 0.07	
Washington	595,860	\$ 4,800,731	\$ 8.06	1.9%	11,067	7.0%	\$ 69,854	\$ 0.12	
Multnomah	803,000	\$ 43,542,723	\$ 54.23	12.5%	100,345	63.3%	\$ 633,371	\$ 0.79	0.40
			\$ 433.97	100.0%					

<sup>1</sup> Source: Portland State University Certified Population estimate July 1, 2017

<sup>2</sup> Source: Fiscal Year 17 LPHA Expenditures Reporting

County Size Bands				
Extra Small	Small	Medium	Large	Extra Large

**Public Health Advisory Board**

**Public health modernization funding formula: state matching funds model 2**

March, 2018

State Matching Funds Pool \$ 1,000,000  
 State Matching Funds Floor \$ 2,500

State Matching Funds Model 2, County Sustained/Increased Investment: Payment is based off of comparative increased County Funding Per Capita with largest distribution per capita paid to counties with highest increase in County Investment Per Capita from a previous stated period. "New County Funding" figures are fabricated to show model functionality and should not be seen as true numbers.

\$ 937,500

County	Population <sup>1</sup>	Previous County Funding <sup>2</sup>	Previous Funding Per Capita <sup>2</sup>	New County Funding <sup>3</sup>	New County Funding Per Capita <sup>3</sup>	Increase Funding Per Capita	Weight	Weight %	Floor	Per Cap	Distribution	Dist. Per Cap	Avg Award Per Capita
Oregon	4,141,100	\$ 68,747,850	\$ 16.60	\$ 71,228,712	\$ 17.20	3.6%	170,204	100.0%	\$ 62,500	\$ 937,500	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 0.24	
Wheeler	1,480	\$ 22,900	\$ 15.47	\$ 25,190	\$ 17.02	10.0%	148	0.1%	\$ 2,500	\$ 815	\$ 3,315	\$ 2.24	
Wallowa	7,195	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%	-	0.0%	\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ 2,500	\$ 0.35	
Harney	7,360	\$ 96,952	\$ 13.17	\$ 101,800	\$ 13.83	5.0%	369	0.2%	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,032	\$ 4,532	\$ 0.62	
Grant	7,415	\$ 73,636	\$ 9.93	\$ 66,272	\$ 8.94	-10.0%	-	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Lake	8,120	\$ 151,267	\$ 18.63	\$ 166,394	\$ 20.49	10.0%	811	0.5%	\$ 2,500	\$ 4,467	\$ 6,967	\$ 0.86	
Morrow	11,890	\$ 621,474	\$ 52.27	\$ 745,769	\$ 62.72	20.0%	2,377	1.4%	\$ 2,500	\$ 13,093	\$ 15,593	\$ 1.31	
Baker	16,750	\$ 246,676	\$ 14.73	\$ 234,342	\$ 13.99	-5.0%	-	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.55
Crook	22,105	\$ 622,139	\$ 28.14	\$ 684,353	\$ 30.96	10.0%	2,215	1.3%	\$ 2,500	\$ 12,200	\$ 14,700	\$ 0.67	
Curry	22,805	\$ 144,795	\$ 6.35	\$ 144,795	\$ 6.35	0.0%	-	0.0%	\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ 2,500	\$ 0.11	
Jefferson	23,190	\$ 566,944	\$ 24.45	\$ 595,291	\$ 25.67	5.0%	1,157	0.7%	\$ 2,500	\$ 6,373	\$ 8,873	\$ 0.38	
Hood River	25,145	\$ 822,751	\$ 32.72	\$ 740,476	\$ 29.45	-10.0%	-	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Tillamook	26,175	\$ 146,840	\$ 5.61	\$ 161,524	\$ 6.17	10.0%	2,613	1.5%	\$ 2,500	\$ 14,393	\$ 16,893	\$ 0.65	
Union	26,900	\$ 145,000	\$ 5.39	\$ 174,000	\$ 6.47	20.0%	5,390	3.2%	\$ 2,500	\$ 29,689	\$ 32,189	\$ 1.20	
North Central	30,895	\$ 545,643	\$ 17.66	\$ 518,361	\$ 16.78	-5.0%	-	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Malheur	31,845	\$ 489,035	\$ 15.36	\$ 537,939	\$ 16.89	10.0%	3,172	1.9%	\$ 2,500	\$ 17,472	\$ 19,972	\$ 0.63	
Clatsop	38,820	\$ 431,075	\$ 11.10	\$ 431,075	\$ 11.10	0.0%	-	0.0%	\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ 2,500	\$ 0.06	
Lincoln	47,960	\$ 307,500	\$ 6.41	\$ 322,875	\$ 6.73	5.0%	2,394	1.4%	\$ 2,500	\$ 13,186	\$ 15,686	\$ 0.33	
Columbia	51,345	\$ 144,489	\$ 2.81	\$ 130,040	\$ 2.53	-10.0%	-	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Coos	63,310	\$ 52,178	\$ 0.82	\$ 57,396	\$ 0.91	11.0%	6,949	4.1%	\$ 2,500	\$ 38,276	\$ 40,776	\$ 0.64	
Klamath	67,690	\$ 232,280	\$ 3.43	\$ 278,736	\$ 4.12	20.1%	13,617	8.0%	\$ 2,500	\$ 75,004	\$ 77,504	\$ 1.14	0.48
Umatilla	80,500	\$ 386,278	\$ 4.80	\$ 366,964	\$ 4.56	-5.0%	-	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Polk	81,000	\$ 251,759	\$ 3.11	\$ 276,935	\$ 3.42	10.0%	8,074	4.7%	\$ 2,500	\$ 44,472	\$ 46,972	\$ 0.58	
Josephine	85,650	\$ 364,715	\$ 4.26	\$ 364,715	\$ 4.26	0.0%	-	0.0%	\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ 2,500	\$ 0.03	
Benton	92,575	\$ 2,090,815	\$ 22.59	\$ 2,195,356	\$ 23.71	5.0%	4,590	2.7%	\$ 2,500	\$ 25,282	\$ 27,782	\$ 0.30	
Yamhill	106,300	\$ 650,791	\$ 6.12	\$ 585,712	\$ 5.51	-10.0%	-	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Douglas	111,180	\$ 671,902	\$ 6.04	\$ 739,092	\$ 6.65	10.1%	11,228	6.6%	\$ 2,500	\$ 61,845	\$ 64,345	\$ 0.58	
Linn	124,010	\$ 651,346	\$ 5.25	\$ 781,615	\$ 6.30	20.0%	24,802	14.6%	\$ 2,500	\$ 136,612	\$ 139,112	\$ 1.12	0.41
Deschutes	182,930	\$ 2,968,217	\$ 16.23	\$ 2,819,806	\$ 15.41	-5.1%	-	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Jackson	216,900	\$ 670,465	\$ 3.09	\$ 737,512	\$ 3.40	10.0%	21,760	12.8%	\$ 2,500	\$ 119,856	\$ 122,356	\$ 0.56	
Marion	339,200	\$ 2,152,253	\$ 6.35	\$ 2,152,253	\$ 6.35	0.0%	-	0.0%	\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ 2,500	\$ 0.01	
Lane	370,600	\$ 1,716,536	\$ 4.63	\$ 1,802,363	\$ 4.86	5.0%	18,410	10.8%	\$ 2,500	\$ 101,404	\$ 103,904	\$ 0.28	0.21
Clackamas	413,000	\$ 1,965,745	\$ 4.76	\$ 1,769,171	\$ 4.28	-10.1%	-	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Washington	595,860	\$ 4,800,731	\$ 8.06	\$ 4,800,731	\$ 8.06	0.0%	-	0.0%	\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ 2,500	\$ 0.00	
Multnomah	803,000	\$ 43,542,723	\$ 54.23	\$ 45,719,859	\$ 56.94	5.0%	40,128	23.6%	\$ 2,500	\$ 221,029	\$ 223,529	\$ 0.28	0.12

\$ 433.97

<sup>1</sup> Source: Portland State University Certified Population estimate July 1, 2017

<sup>2</sup> Source: Fiscal Year 17 LPHA Expenditures Reporting

<sup>3</sup> "New County Funding" figures are fabricated and are included for the purpose of showing the functionality of this matching fund model

County Size Bands				
Extra Small	Small	Medium	Large	Extra Large

# Incentive and matching funds in the 2019-21 biennium

**Recommendation:** Allocate funds to incentives in the 2019-21 biennium. Incorporate matching funds in 2021-23.

## Questions:

1. What feedback do PHAB members have on this recommendation?
2. Will a phased approach to allocating funds to incentives and matching funds demonstrate improvements to the public health system and its ability to improve outcomes in the next two biennia?

# Subcommittee business

- Review action items for each PHAB subcommittee resulting from today's meeting.
- Decide who will provide update at April PHAB meeting

# Public comment

**Adjourn**