

PUBLIC HEALTH ADVISORY BOARD Incentives and Funding Subcommittee

October 18, 2016

2:00-4:00 pm

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

Webinar: <https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/3824106216871611396>

Conference line: (877) 873-8017

Access code: 767068

Meeting Chair: Alejandro Queral

Subcommittee Members: Silas Halloran-Steiner, Jeff Luck, Alejandro Queral, Akiko Saito, Tricia Tillman

Meeting Objectives

- Approve September meeting minutes
- Develop a shared understanding for the purpose and goals of the funding formula
- Make initial recommendations for the LPHA funding formula
- Set agenda for November subcommittee meeting

2:00-2:05 pm	Welcome and introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve September meeting minutes 	Alejandro Queral, Meeting Chair
2:05-2:45 pm	Funding formula purpose and goals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss matching funds and incentive payment components of the funding formula, including how they align with funding formula indicators and accountability metrics • Move toward a shared understanding of funding formula components and overall purpose and goals for the funding formula 	Subcommittee members
2:45-3:00 pm	Funding formula methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review methodology for developing funding formulas 	Chris Curtis, Oregon Health Authority
3:00-3:40 pm	Discuss funding formula models and make initial recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review comparison of three models, including how each model impacts counties in each size band; • Discuss models using the following questions: 	Subcommittee members

-
- Does the model allocate enough funding to all counties to make meaningful improvements?
 - Does the model encourage regional models for service delivery?
 - Does the model move us toward an equitable public health system?
 - Make an initial recommendation for which model to continue developing;
 - Make an initial recommendation for the base/floor amount per county;
 - Make an initial recommendation for percent allocations for each indicator.
-

3:40-3:50 pm

Subcommittee business

- Decide who will give subcommittee update at Oct 20 PHAB meeting
- Set agenda for November 8 subcommittee meeting
- Identify November 8 meeting Chair

Subcommittee members

3:50-4:00 pm

Public comment

4:00 pm

Adjourn

Alejandro Queral,
Meeting Chair

**PUBLIC HEALTH ADVISORY BOARD
Incentives and Funding Subcommittee Meeting Minutes**

**September 13, 2016
1:00-2:00 pm**

Portland State Office Building, 800 NE Oregon St., Room 1C, Portland, OR 97232
Conference line: (877) 873-8017
Access code: 767068

Meeting chair: Jeff Luck

PHAB subcommittee members present: Jeff Luck, Alejandro Queral, Akiko Saito, Tricia Tillman

PHAB subcommittee members absent: Silas Halloran-Steiner

OHA staff: Sara Beaudrault, Chris Curtis, Angela Rowland

Members of the public: Kathleen Johnson, *Coalition of Local Health Officials*

Welcome and introductions – Jeff Luck

Approval of minutes – Jeff Luck

Subcommittee members voted to approve the August 31, 2016 subcommittee meeting minutes. Akiko added a correction to the base amount in the HSPR funding formula. There are actually two base amounts.

All in favor to approve the edited minutes.

Discuss how the funding formula can be used to incentivize change – Jeff Luck

The subcommittee should think about what changes to incentivize through the funding formula. Oregon Health Authority staff provided an excerpt from Section 28 of HB 3100. This section states that the funding formula should provide for the equitable distribution of monies, and incentives are to be used to encourage the effective and equitable provision of public health services. This language is open to interpretation as it could mean distributing funds equitably to local public health departments or distributing funds equitably for all people in the state of Oregon. The funding formula can be used to incentivize a changed system.

Alejandro commented on the part of Section 28 related to state matching funds for county contributions. He suggested the subcommittee consider methods to incentivize county investments through the funding formula. Alejandro also suggested for the subcommittee to define equitable health outcomes. He proposed looking at disparities

and increasing payments above the baseline amount to target disadvantaged communities.

Tricia asked what the decision-making process is for the subcommittee to bring forward a recommendation to the Public Health Advisory Board (PHAB). The subcommittee favored working toward consensus, but if consensus is not reached, take the decision forward to be made by the full Board.

The subcommittee discussed the timeline for incorporating state matching funds for county investments and incentive payments for performance on accountability metrics. The subcommittee recommends targeting all funds available in 2017-19 to baseline payments. Akiko stated that the system needs to be built before incorporating incentive funds and matching funds. These components can be incorporated into the funding formula that will be submitted to legislative fiscal office in June 2018.

The subcommittee discussed how the funding formula can be used to drive the system to change to achieve outcomes and gain efficiencies. Jeff questioned whether regional approaches or cross jurisdictional sharing could be among the changes that are incentivized. Tricia stated that counties don't have current capacity to make decisions to regionalize or enter into cross jurisdictional sharing agreements today, which is why planning grants or a similar mechanism to target funding for these decisions may be a good option. Jeff suggested funding pilot tests.

Alejandro questioned the purpose of regionalization. Better access? Better health? There may be other routes for achieving improved health outcomes. Tricia stated that regionalization is a means to appropriate staffing and core capacity.

Akiko stated there is a difference between regional sharing and a regional system approach. She proposed using the funding formula to fund LPHAs to perform pilot projects around the 2017-19 priorities. The BERK public health modernization assessment report can provide insight on the capacity gaps in these areas. Based on the \$210M gap in the BERK findings, Tricia does not think that \$30M in requested funding is enough for LPHAs to reach full capacity in the 2017-19 priority areas.

Jeff proposed taking an amount off the top of the funds that become available in 2017 to use for planning grants or pilots. Sara stated there is a priority around leadership and competencies to be used around public health planning, which may include exploring regional approaches to sharing services. Tricia's understanding is that priority is focused on performance management and quality improvement. Tricia supported planning grants or pilot projects but suggests not putting a dollar amount on it now since the requested funding amount of \$30M will not meet needs across the system.

Alejandro recommended using a matching funds approach to incentivize planning rather than a grant approach. This creates a planning approach to make improvements toward foundational capabilities and avoids a second grant. Tricia questioned the

implication for small counties that may not get county investments but that may have the greatest need to explore new service delivery models.

Discuss updated funding formula models– Subcommittee members
Postponed until the October meeting.

Subcommittee business– subcommittee members

Alejandro will chair the next meeting on October 18, 2016 from 2:00pm-4:00pm.

The group agreed to two hour meeting times for upcoming meetings.

Action Items:

- OHA will send subcommittee members “homework” to review the three models. Subcommittee members will review the models and come to the next meeting prepared to make an initial recommendation or rule a model out.
- Add time to the next agenda to review the methodology for developing the funding formula models.
- Consider updating county population estimates using PSU population estimates.
- Update indicators as discussed at the July subcommittee meeting.
- Extend meetings through 2016 to two hours.

Public comment – None

Adjournment – Jeff Luck
The meeting was adjourned.

FUNDING OF LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH AUTHORITIES

SECTION 28. ORS 431.380 is amended to read:

431.380. *[(1) From funds available to the Oregon Health Authority for local public health purposes, regardless of the source, the authority shall provide payments to the local public health authority on a per capita or other equitable formula basis to be used for public health services. Funding formulas shall be determined by the authority with the concurrence of the Conference of Local Health Officials.]*

(1) From moneys available to the Oregon Health Authority for the purpose of funding the foundational capabilities established under section 9 of this 2015 Act and the foundational programs established under section 17 of this 2015 Act, 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 Public Health Advisory Board and the Legislative Fiscal Office a formula that provides for the equitable distribution of moneys. As a part of the formula, the Oregon Health Authority shall:

(a) Establish a baseline amount to be invested in local public health activities and services by the state;

(b) Establish a method for awarding matching funds to a local public health authority that invests in local public health activities and services above the baseline amount established by the Oregon Health Authority for that local public health authority; and

(c) Provide for the use of incentives as described in subsection (4) of this section.

[(2) With respect to counties that have established joint public health services with another county, either by agreement or the formation of a district board of health, distribution of funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be prorated to such counties as provided by agreement or under ORS 431.510.]

(2) The formula adopted under subsection (1) of this section must be submitted to the Public Health Advisory Board and the Legislative Fiscal Office no later than June 30 of each even-numbered year.

(3) In establishing a baseline amount for the purpose of awarding matching funds under subsection (1)(b) of this section, the Oregon Health Authority shall consider 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.

(4) The Oregon Health Authority shall adopt by rule incentives to encourage the effective and equitable provision of public health services by local public health authorities.

(5) Nothing in this section prohibits the Oregon Health Authority from distributing funds to a local public health authority through a competitive contract or grant process or on the basis of need for applying the foundational capabilities established under section 9 of this 2015 Act and implementing the foundational programs established under section 17 of this 2015 Act.

SECTION 29. If the Oregon Health Authority fails to distribute an amount of moneys to a local public health authority equal to or in excess of the baseline amount established under ORS 431.380 (1)(a), a local public health authority may request to transfer responsibility for fulfilling the local public health authority's duties under sections 9 to 24 of this 2015 Act and the other public health laws of this state to the Oregon Health Authority. If a local public health authority requests to transfer responsibilities under this section, the moneys available to the local public health authority under ORS 431.380 revert to the Oregon Health Authority. A request to transfer made under this section must be made in the form and manner prescribed by the Oregon Health Authority and takes effect 180 days after the Oregon Health Authority receives the request.

PHAB Funding and Incentives Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members: Silas Halloran-Steiner, Jeff Luck, Alejandro Queral, Akiko Saito, Tricia Tillman
 October, 2016

At the July subcommittee meeting, members requested that OHA develop different funding formula models and provide a synopsis of how each model affects counties of different size bands. OHA developed three models, which are summarized below.

Assumptions for models

1. All models assume a \$10M investment.
2. All models include a base payment of \$50,000
3. All models include six indicators (county population; burden of disease; health status; racial/ethnic diversity; poverty; and limited English proficiency). For all models, 50% is allocated to county population, and 10% is allocated to the other five indicators. This is described in the table below.
4. In all models, burden of disease, health status, racial/ethnic diversity, poverty, and limited English proficiency are weighted by counties' percentage of identified population (0-100%). Each county percentage is divided by the total sum of all county percentages to provide a proportional weight and payout to all counties.

\$10M investment

- A. County population 50%
- B. Burden of disease 10%
- C. Health status 10%
- D. Racial/ethnic diversity 10%
- E. Poverty 10%
- F. Limited English proficiency 10%

	Model description	Breakdown of \$10M	Award per capita			Total award			Summary of per capita and total awards	Impact of changes to indicator allocations	Winners
			Average and range, all counties	Average and range, extra small counties	Average and range, extra large counties	Range, all counties	Average and range, extra small counties	Average and range, extra large counties			
Model 1: base payment, all indicators B-F per capita. All indicators are tied to county population	Each county receives a base payment of \$50,000. In addition to allocating 50% of remaining funds for county population, all other five indicators are tied to county population. The formula for these five indicators is (ranking on indicator X county population X indicator allocation).	\$1.8M: base payment; \$8.2M tied to county population.	\$2.56 (\$1.96 - \$38.42)	\$12.17 (\$4.97 - \$38.42)	\$2.14 (\$1.96 - 2.27)	(\$52,130 - \$1,716,259)	(\$52,130 - \$82,173)	(\$752,242 - \$1,716,259)	Since all indicators are tied to county population, the entire \$10M of available funds is also tied to county population. Per capita awards are consistent across all county size bands, but the range of actual awards is wide.	Because all indicators are tied to county population, adjusting the allocations for each indicator does not significantly change the awards per capita.	Extra large and large counties.
Model 2: base payment, some indicators per capita. Some indicators are tied to county population. Allocations for other indicators are based solely on each county's actual results.	Each county receives a base payment of \$50,000. In addition to awarding 50% of remaining funds based on county population, two indicators (racial/ethnic diversity and limited English proficiency) are tied to county population. Three indicators (burden of disease, health status and poverty) are not tied to county population.	\$1.8M base payment; \$6.56M tied to county population; \$1.64M not tied to county population	\$2.56 (\$1.61 - \$71.29)	\$23.22 (\$8.92 - \$71.29)	\$1.72 (\$1.61 - \$1.83)	(\$96,740 - \$1,294,886)	(\$96,740 - \$157,459)	(\$617,637 - \$1,294,886)	Under this model, \$7M is tied to population. This model will have a different effect on small and extra small counties because their opportunities to increase funding are tied to the three indicators that are not tied to county population.	Since only some indicators are tied to county population, decreasing the allocation for county population and increasing the allocation for indicators not tied to population increases awards for extra small and small counties.	This is not the best model for any size band.
Model 3: base payment, no indicators per capita. No indicators B-F are tied to county population. Allocations for each indicator are based solely on each county's actual results	Each county receives a base amount of \$50,000. In addition to awarding 50% of remaining funds based on county population, all other five indicators are not tied to county population.	\$1.8M base payment; \$4.1M tied to county population; \$4.1M not tied to county population	\$2.56 (\$1.30 - \$79.59)	\$27.22 (\$9.63 - \$79.59)	\$1.37 (\$1.30 - \$1.42)	(\$108,001 - \$988,034)	(\$108,001 - \$289,604)	(\$547,038 - \$988,034)	\$1.8M is awarded as base payments or floors. With 50% of the remaining \$8.2M allocated to county population (\$4.1M), the remaining \$4.1M can be allocated across other indicators.	Decreasing the allocation to county population and increasing the allocation for other indicators increases awards for extra small and small counties.	Extra small and small counties.

PHAB Funding and Incentives Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members: Silas Halloran-Steiner, Jeff Luck, Alejandro Queral, Akiko Saito, Tricia Tillman
 October, 2016

Winners for Each Model: This table shows, for each county and size band, which funding formula model is likely to give the largest award. Looking across each row in the table, each county has a red, yellow and green cell to show which model awards that county the largest, middle and smallest funding allocation. Model 1 (all indicators tied to per capita) favors large and extra large counties, whereas Model 3 (no indicators tied to per capita) favors small and extra small counties. The table also shows the percent of change to funding for each county across the three models.

County Group	Population ¹	% of Total Population	Model 1 - Per Capita Floor			Model 2 - Per Capita Popl Only Floor			Model 3 - No Per Capita 50k Floor			1 to 2	2 to 3	1 to 3	county size bands
			Total Award	Award Percentage	Award Per Capita	Total Award	Award Percentage	Award Per Capita	Total Award	Award Percentage	Award Per Capita				
County 33	1,357	0.0%	\$ 52,130	0.5%	\$ 38.42	\$ 96,740	1.0%	\$ 71.29	\$ 108,001	1.1%	\$ 79.59	86%	12%	107%	extra small
County 31	6,893	0.2%	\$ 61,080	0.6%	\$ 8.86	\$ 109,567	1.1%	\$ 15.90	\$ 117,196	1.2%	\$ 17.00	79%	7%	92%	small
County 12	7,253	0.2%	\$ 64,904	0.6%	\$ 8.95	\$ 154,754	1.5%	\$ 21.34	\$ 166,526	1.7%	\$ 22.96	138%	8%	157%	small
County 11	7,325	0.2%	\$ 61,942	0.6%	\$ 8.46	\$ 111,414	1.1%	\$ 15.21	\$ 120,946	1.2%	\$ 16.51	80%	9%	95%	medium
County 18	7,854	0.2%	\$ 64,606	0.6%	\$ 8.23	\$ 124,363	1.2%	\$ 15.83	\$ 149,322	1.5%	\$ 19.01	92%	20%	131%	large
County 24	11,217	0.3%	\$ 82,173	0.8%	\$ 7.33	\$ 157,459	1.6%	\$ 14.04	\$ 289,604	2.9%	\$ 25.82	92%	84%	252%	extra large
County 1	16,049	0.4%	\$ 79,723	0.8%	\$ 4.97	\$ 143,020	1.4%	\$ 8.91	\$ 154,478	1.5%	\$ 9.63	79%	8%	94%	extra large
County 7	20,798	0.5%	\$ 90,261	0.9%	\$ 4.34	\$ 149,326	1.5%	\$ 7.18	\$ 171,426	1.7%	\$ 8.24	65%	15%	90%	extra large
County 15	21,830	0.6%	\$ 103,484	1.0%	\$ 4.74	\$ 174,205	1.7%	\$ 7.98	\$ 238,719	2.4%	\$ 10.94	68%	37%	131%	extra large
County 8	22,341	0.6%	\$ 95,857	1.0%	\$ 4.29	\$ 167,884	1.7%	\$ 7.51	\$ 183,264	1.8%	\$ 8.20	75%	9%	91%	extra large
County 13	22,620	0.6%	\$ 111,057	1.1%	\$ 4.91	\$ 156,454	1.6%	\$ 6.92	\$ 288,859	2.9%	\$ 12.77	41%	85%	160%	extra large
County 28	25,334	0.6%	\$ 101,586	1.0%	\$ 4.01	\$ 158,496	1.6%	\$ 6.26	\$ 190,072	1.9%	\$ 7.50	56%	20%	87%	extra large
County 30	25,736	0.7%	\$ 98,137	1.0%	\$ 3.81	\$ 152,093	1.5%	\$ 5.91	\$ 169,439	1.7%	\$ 6.58	55%	11%	73%	extra large
County 26	29,103	0.7%	\$ 217,250	2.2%	\$ 7.46	\$ 274,988	2.7%	\$ 9.45	\$ 332,359	3.3%	\$ 11.42	27%	21%	53%	extra large
County 22	30,740	0.8%	\$ 138,462	1.4%	\$ 4.50	\$ 208,418	2.1%	\$ 6.78	\$ 305,079	3.1%	\$ 9.92	51%	46%	120%	extra large
County 4	37,236	1.0%	\$ 123,943	1.2%	\$ 3.33	\$ 171,675	1.7%	\$ 4.61	\$ 195,844	2.0%	\$ 5.26	39%	14%	58%	extra large
County 20	46,138	1.2%	\$ 145,449	1.5%	\$ 3.15	\$ 191,389	1.9%	\$ 4.15	\$ 214,159	2.1%	\$ 4.64	32%	12%	47%	extra large
County 5	49,325	1.3%	\$ 140,412	1.4%	\$ 2.85	\$ 178,525	1.8%	\$ 3.62	\$ 188,296	1.9%	\$ 3.82	27%	5%	34%	extra large
County 6	62,678	1.6%	\$ 172,910	1.7%	\$ 2.76	\$ 205,880	2.1%	\$ 3.28	\$ 216,153	2.2%	\$ 3.45	19%	5%	25%	extra large
County 17	65,985	1.7%	\$ 194,605	1.9%	\$ 2.95	\$ 227,944	2.3%	\$ 3.45	\$ 250,010	2.5%	\$ 3.79	17%	10%	28%	extra large
County 27	76,464	2.0%	\$ 203,902	2.0%	\$ 2.67	\$ 221,679	2.2%	\$ 2.90	\$ 244,395	2.4%	\$ 3.20	9%	10%	20%	extra large
County 29	76,645	2.0%	\$ 239,540	2.4%	\$ 3.13	\$ 261,132	2.6%	\$ 3.41	\$ 303,506	3.0%	\$ 3.96	9%	16%	27%	extra large
County 16	83,021	2.1%	\$ 213,710	2.1%	\$ 2.57	\$ 231,161	2.3%	\$ 2.78	\$ 238,780	2.4%	\$ 2.88	8%	3%	12%	extra large
County 2	86,034	2.2%	\$ 213,068	2.1%	\$ 2.48	\$ 226,014	2.3%	\$ 2.63	\$ 238,522	2.4%	\$ 2.77	6%	6%	12%	extra large
County 34	100,486	2.6%	\$ 263,189	2.6%	\$ 2.62	\$ 266,632	2.7%	\$ 2.65	\$ 285,559	2.9%	\$ 2.84	1%	7%	8%	extra large
County 10	107,156	2.7%	\$ 266,803	2.7%	\$ 2.49	\$ 266,102	2.7%	\$ 2.48	\$ 269,227	2.7%	\$ 2.51	0%	1%	1%	extra large
County 21	118,270	3.0%	\$ 284,842	2.8%	\$ 2.41	\$ 276,457	2.8%	\$ 2.34	\$ 280,576	2.8%	\$ 2.37	-3%	1%	-1%	extra large
County 9	163,141	4.2%	\$ 338,868	3.4%	\$ 2.08	\$ 310,292	3.1%	\$ 1.90	\$ 304,654	3.0%	\$ 1.87	-8%	-2%	-10%	extra large
County 14	206,583	5.3%	\$ 477,151	4.8%	\$ 2.31	\$ 407,498	4.1%	\$ 1.97	\$ 385,106	3.9%	\$ 1.86	-15%	-5%	-19%	extra large
County 23	320,448	8.2%	\$ 874,258	8.7%	\$ 2.73	\$ 721,868	7.2%	\$ 2.25	\$ 575,995	5.8%	\$ 1.80	-17%	-20%	-34%	extra large
County 19	354,764	9.1%	\$ 749,458	7.5%	\$ 2.11	\$ 580,085	5.8%	\$ 1.64	\$ 528,526	5.3%	\$ 1.49	-23%	-9%	-29%	extra large
County 3	384,697	9.9%	\$ 752,242	7.5%	\$ 1.96	\$ 617,637	6.2%	\$ 1.61	\$ 547,038	5.5%	\$ 1.42	-18%	-11%	-27%	extra large
County 32	547,451	14.0%	\$ 1,206,740	12.1%	\$ 2.20	\$ 1,003,964	10.0%	\$ 1.83	\$ 760,330	7.6%	\$ 1.39	-17%	-24%	-37%	extra large
County 25	757,371	19.4%	\$ 1,716,259	17.2%	\$ 2.27	\$ 1,294,886	12.9%	\$ 1.71	\$ 988,034	9.9%	\$ 1.30	-25%	-24%	-42%	extra large
Total	3,900,343	100.0%	\$ 10,000,000	100.0%	\$ 2.56	\$ 10,000,000	100.0%	\$ 2.56	\$ 10,000,000	100.0%	\$ 2.56				

¹ American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

PHAB Funding and Incentives Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members: Silas Halloran-Steiner, Jeff Luck, Alejandro Queral, Akiko Saito, Tricia Tillman
 October, 2016

Model 1: base payment; all indicators per capita. The model includes a base payment for each county. All indicators in the model are tied to county population.

County Group	Population ¹	Floor	County Population ¹	Burden of Disease ²	Health Status ³	Race/Ethnicity ⁴	Poverty ⁵	Limited English Proficiency ⁶	Matching Funds ⁷	Incentives ⁸	Total Award ⁹	Award Percentage	% of Total Population	Award Per Capita
County 33	1,357	\$ 50,000	\$ 1,426	\$ 276	\$ -	\$ 83	\$ 312	\$ 33	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 52,130	0.5%	0.0%	\$ 38.42
County 31	6,893	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,246	\$ 1,681	\$ 536	\$ 298	\$ 1,201	\$ 118	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 61,080	0.6%	0.2%	\$ 8.86
County 12	7,253	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,624	\$ 2,389	\$ 2,272	\$ 556	\$ 1,924	\$ 139	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 64,904	0.6%	0.2%	\$ 8.95
County 11	7,325	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,700	\$ 1,419	\$ 844	\$ 412	\$ 1,420	\$ 146	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 61,942	0.6%	0.2%	\$ 8.46
County 18	7,854	\$ 50,000	\$ 8,256	\$ 2,022	\$ 1,033	\$ 1,013	\$ 1,756	\$ 525	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 64,606	0.6%	0.2%	\$ 8.23
County 24	11,217	\$ 50,000	\$ 11,791	\$ 2,261	\$ 3,809	\$ 6,443	\$ 2,721	\$ 5,148	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 82,173	0.8%	0.3%	\$ 7.33
County 1	16,049	\$ 50,000	\$ 16,871	\$ 4,377	\$ 3,238	\$ 1,016	\$ 3,696	\$ 526	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 79,723	0.8%	0.4%	\$ 4.97
County 7	20,798	\$ 50,000	\$ 21,863	\$ 4,946	\$ 4,014	\$ 2,619	\$ 5,432	\$ 1,388	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 90,261	0.9%	0.5%	\$ 4.34
County 15	21,830	\$ 50,000	\$ 22,947	\$ 6,964	\$ 5,663	\$ 7,357	\$ 5,719	\$ 4,834	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 103,484	1.0%	0.6%	\$ 4.74
County 8	22,341	\$ 50,000	\$ 23,485	\$ 7,847	\$ 7,083	\$ 2,328	\$ 4,314	\$ 800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 95,857	1.0%	0.6%	\$ 4.29
County 13	22,620	\$ 50,000	\$ 23,778	\$ 3,690	\$ 4,082	\$ 11,850	\$ 4,451	\$ 13,206	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 111,057	1.1%	0.6%	\$ 4.91
County 28	25,334	\$ 50,000	\$ 26,631	\$ 6,448	\$ 5,778	\$ 4,229	\$ 5,611	\$ 2,890	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 101,586	1.0%	0.6%	\$ 4.01
County 30	25,736	\$ 50,000	\$ 27,053	\$ 5,764	\$ 5,386	\$ 1,883	\$ 6,080	\$ 1,971	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 98,137	1.0%	0.7%	\$ 3.81
County 26	29,103	\$ 150,000	\$ 30,593	\$ 7,726	\$ 8,023	\$ 7,462	\$ 6,003	\$ 7,442	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 217,250	2.2%	0.7%	\$ 7.46
County 22	30,740	\$ 50,000	\$ 32,314	\$ 6,983	\$ 10,208	\$ 17,258	\$ 10,964	\$ 10,737	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 138,462	1.4%	0.8%	\$ 4.50
County 4	37,236	\$ 50,000	\$ 39,142	\$ 10,413	\$ 8,119	\$ 5,099	\$ 7,378	\$ 3,792	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 123,943	1.2%	1.0%	\$ 3.33
County 20	46,138	\$ 50,000	\$ 48,500	\$ 14,589	\$ 11,043	\$ 6,591	\$ 9,917	\$ 4,809	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 145,449	1.5%	1.2%	\$ 3.15
County 5	49,325	\$ 50,000	\$ 51,850	\$ 11,808	\$ 12,980	\$ 3,756	\$ 8,148	\$ 1,869	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 140,412	1.4%	1.3%	\$ 2.85
County 6	62,678	\$ 50,000	\$ 65,886	\$ 19,707	\$ 14,133	\$ 6,207	\$ 14,176	\$ 2,795	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 172,910	1.7%	1.6%	\$ 2.76
County 17	65,985	\$ 50,000	\$ 69,363	\$ 19,892	\$ 19,349	\$ 12,800	\$ 15,409	\$ 7,792	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 194,605	1.9%	1.7%	\$ 2.95
County 27	76,464	\$ 50,000	\$ 80,378	\$ 14,211	\$ 14,660	\$ 16,679	\$ 16,364	\$ 11,608	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 203,902	2.0%	2.0%	\$ 2.67
County 29	76,645	\$ 50,000	\$ 80,568	\$ 17,682	\$ 21,034	\$ 32,988	\$ 16,449	\$ 20,819	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 239,540	2.4%	2.0%	\$ 3.13
County 16	83,021	\$ 50,000	\$ 87,271	\$ 24,935	\$ 18,102	\$ 9,605	\$ 20,523	\$ 3,274	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 213,710	2.1%	2.1%	\$ 2.57
County 2	86,034	\$ 50,000	\$ 90,438	\$ 12,314	\$ 16,172	\$ 10,019	\$ 24,494	\$ 9,632	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 213,068	2.1%	2.2%	\$ 2.48
County 34	100,486	\$ 50,000	\$ 105,630	\$ 19,410	\$ 18,385	\$ 26,458	\$ 21,089	\$ 22,218	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 263,189	2.6%	2.6%	\$ 2.62
County 10	107,156	\$ 50,000	\$ 112,641	\$ 32,191	\$ 32,630	\$ 9,216	\$ 26,483	\$ 3,642	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 266,803	2.7%	2.7%	\$ 2.49
County 21	118,270	\$ 50,000	\$ 124,324	\$ 27,255	\$ 27,715	\$ 16,600	\$ 28,961	\$ 9,987	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 284,842	2.8%	3.0%	\$ 2.41
County 9	163,141	\$ 50,000	\$ 171,492	\$ 30,526	\$ 20,035	\$ 21,493	\$ 30,771	\$ 14,551	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 338,868	3.4%	4.2%	\$ 2.08
County 14	206,583	\$ 50,000	\$ 217,158	\$ 48,735	\$ 48,669	\$ 40,861	\$ 45,186	\$ 25,543	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 477,151	4.8%	5.3%	\$ 2.31
County 23	320,448	\$ 50,000	\$ 336,852	\$ 66,316	\$ 85,534	\$ 138,829	\$ 76,768	\$ 119,960	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 874,258	8.7%	8.2%	\$ 2.73
County 19	354,764	\$ 50,000	\$ 372,924	\$ 77,796	\$ 73,354	\$ 48,257	\$ 90,776	\$ 36,350	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 749,458	7.5%	9.1%	\$ 2.11
County 3	384,697	\$ 50,000	\$ 404,389	\$ 68,956	\$ 69,902	\$ 53,545	\$ 47,115	\$ 58,336	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 752,242	7.5%	9.9%	\$ 1.96
County 32	547,451	\$ 50,000	\$ 575,475	\$ 79,928	\$ 90,556	\$ 151,718	\$ 81,322	\$ 177,740	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,206,740	12.1%	14.0%	\$ 2.20
County 25	757,371	\$ 50,000	\$ 796,141	\$ 158,543	\$ 155,651	\$ 144,474	\$ 176,070	\$ 235,380	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,716,259	17.2%	19.4%	\$ 2.27
Total	3,900,343	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 4,100,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000,000	100.0%	100.0%	\$ 2.56

county size bands
extra small
small
medium
large
extra large

¹ Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

² Source: Oregon State Health Profile. Premature death, 2010-14.

³ Source: Oregon State Health Profile. Good or excellent health, 2010-2013.

⁴ Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

⁵ Source: Oregon State Health Profile. Combined (adult and children) population below FPL, 2010-2014.

⁶ Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2012

⁷ Limitations exist for calculating current county contributions for public health. An updated process will be developed to address these limitations. Matching funds will be awarded based on actual, not

⁸ The Accountability Metrics subcommittee will define a set of accountability metrics. Following selection of accountability metrics, baseline data will be collected. Funds will not be awarded for achievement of

PHAB Funding and Incentives Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members: Silas Halloran-Steiner, Jeff Luck, Alejandro Queral, Akiko Saito, Tricia Tillman
October, 2016

Model 2: base payment; some indicators per capita. The model includes a base payment for each county. The population indicators in the model are tied to county population.

County Group	Population ¹	Floor	County Population ¹	Burden of Disease ²	Health Status ³	Race/Ethnicity ⁴	Poverty ⁵	Limited English Proficiency ⁶	Matching Funds ⁷	Incentives ⁸	Total Award ⁹	Award Percentage	% of Total Population	Award Per Capita
County 33	1,357	\$ 50,000	\$ 1,426	\$ 20,412	\$ -	\$ 83	\$ 24,787	\$ 33	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 96,740	1.0%	0.0%	\$ 71.29
County 31	6,893	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,246	\$ 24,501	\$ 8,618	\$ 298	\$ 18,786	\$ 118	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 109,567	1.1%	0.2%	\$ 15.90
County 12	7,253	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,624	\$ 33,086	\$ 34,752	\$ 556	\$ 28,598	\$ 139	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 154,754	1.5%	0.2%	\$ 21.34
County 11	7,325	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,700	\$ 19,459	\$ 12,789	\$ 412	\$ 20,909	\$ 146	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 111,414	1.1%	0.2%	\$ 15.21
County 18	7,854	\$ 50,000	\$ 8,256	\$ 25,861	\$ 14,596	\$ 1,013	\$ 24,113	\$ 525	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 124,363	1.2%	0.2%	\$ 15.83
County 24	11,217	\$ 50,000	\$ 11,791	\$ 20,251	\$ 37,671	\$ 6,443	\$ 26,156	\$ 5,148	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 157,459	1.6%	0.3%	\$ 14.04
County 1	16,049	\$ 50,000	\$ 16,871	\$ 27,396	\$ 22,380	\$ 1,016	\$ 24,831	\$ 526	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 143,020	1.4%	0.4%	\$ 8.91
County 7	20,798	\$ 50,000	\$ 21,863	\$ 23,886	\$ 21,407	\$ 2,619	\$ 28,163	\$ 1,388	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 149,326	1.5%	0.5%	\$ 7.18
County 15	21,830	\$ 50,000	\$ 22,947	\$ 32,045	\$ 28,774	\$ 7,357	\$ 28,248	\$ 4,834	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 174,205	1.7%	0.6%	\$ 7.98
County 8	22,341	\$ 50,000	\$ 23,485	\$ 35,284	\$ 35,169	\$ 2,328	\$ 20,819	\$ 800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 167,884	1.7%	0.6%	\$ 7.51
County 13	22,620	\$ 50,000	\$ 23,778	\$ 16,388	\$ 20,017	\$ 11,850	\$ 21,215	\$ 13,206	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 156,454	1.6%	0.6%	\$ 6.92
County 28	25,334	\$ 50,000	\$ 26,631	\$ 25,566	\$ 25,299	\$ 4,229	\$ 23,881	\$ 2,890	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 158,496	1.6%	0.6%	\$ 6.26
County 30	25,736	\$ 50,000	\$ 27,053	\$ 22,498	\$ 23,214	\$ 1,883	\$ 25,473	\$ 1,971	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 152,093	1.5%	0.7%	\$ 5.91
County 26	29,103	\$ 150,000	\$ 30,593	\$ 26,668	\$ 30,581	\$ 7,462	\$ 22,242	\$ 7,442	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 274,988	2.7%	0.7%	\$ 9.45
County 22	30,740	\$ 50,000	\$ 32,314	\$ 22,817	\$ 36,837	\$ 17,258	\$ 38,457	\$ 10,737	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 208,418	2.1%	0.8%	\$ 6.78
County 4	37,236	\$ 50,000	\$ 39,142	\$ 28,090	\$ 24,187	\$ 5,099	\$ 21,364	\$ 3,792	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 171,675	1.7%	1.0%	\$ 4.61
County 20	46,138	\$ 50,000	\$ 48,500	\$ 31,761	\$ 26,550	\$ 6,591	\$ 23,176	\$ 4,809	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 191,389	1.9%	1.2%	\$ 4.15
County 5	49,325	\$ 50,000	\$ 51,850	\$ 24,046	\$ 29,191	\$ 3,756	\$ 17,812	\$ 1,869	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 178,525	1.8%	1.3%	\$ 3.62
County 6	62,678	\$ 50,000	\$ 65,886	\$ 31,583	\$ 25,021	\$ 6,207	\$ 24,387	\$ 2,795	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 205,880	2.1%	1.6%	\$ 3.28
County 17	65,985	\$ 50,000	\$ 69,363	\$ 30,281	\$ 32,528	\$ 12,800	\$ 25,180	\$ 7,792	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 227,944	2.3%	1.7%	\$ 3.45
County 27	76,464	\$ 50,000	\$ 80,378	\$ 18,669	\$ 21,268	\$ 16,679	\$ 23,076	\$ 11,608	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 221,679	2.2%	2.0%	\$ 2.90
County 29	76,645	\$ 50,000	\$ 80,568	\$ 23,173	\$ 30,442	\$ 32,988	\$ 23,140	\$ 20,819	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 261,132	2.6%	2.0%	\$ 3.41
County 16	83,021	\$ 50,000	\$ 87,271	\$ 30,169	\$ 24,187	\$ 9,605	\$ 26,655	\$ 3,274	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 231,161	2.3%	2.1%	\$ 2.78
County 2	86,034	\$ 50,000	\$ 90,438	\$ 14,377	\$ 20,851	\$ 10,019	\$ 30,698	\$ 9,632	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 226,014	2.3%	2.2%	\$ 2.63
County 34	100,486	\$ 50,000	\$ 105,630	\$ 19,403	\$ 20,295	\$ 26,458	\$ 22,629	\$ 22,218	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 266,632	2.7%	2.6%	\$ 2.65
County 10	107,156	\$ 50,000	\$ 112,641	\$ 30,176	\$ 33,779	\$ 9,216	\$ 26,648	\$ 3,642	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 266,102	2.7%	2.7%	\$ 2.48
County 21	118,270	\$ 50,000	\$ 124,324	\$ 23,149	\$ 25,994	\$ 16,600	\$ 26,404	\$ 9,987	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 276,457	2.8%	3.0%	\$ 2.34
County 9	163,141	\$ 50,000	\$ 171,492	\$ 18,795	\$ 13,623	\$ 21,493	\$ 20,338	\$ 14,551	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 310,292	3.1%	4.2%	\$ 1.90
County 14	206,583	\$ 50,000	\$ 217,158	\$ 23,697	\$ 26,133	\$ 40,861	\$ 24,107	\$ 25,543	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 407,498	4.1%	5.3%	\$ 1.97
County 23	320,448	\$ 50,000	\$ 336,852	\$ 20,788	\$ 29,608	\$ 138,829	\$ 25,831	\$ 119,960	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 721,868	7.2%	8.2%	\$ 2.25
County 19	354,764	\$ 50,000	\$ 372,924	\$ 22,027	\$ 22,936	\$ 48,257	\$ 27,590	\$ 36,350	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 580,085	5.8%	9.1%	\$ 1.64
County 3	384,697	\$ 50,000	\$ 404,389	\$ 18,005	\$ 20,156	\$ 53,545	\$ 13,206	\$ 58,336	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 617,637	6.2%	9.9%	\$ 1.61
County 32	547,451	\$ 50,000	\$ 575,475	\$ 14,666	\$ 18,349	\$ 151,718	\$ 16,017	\$ 177,740	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,003,964	10.0%	14.0%	\$ 1.83
County 25	757,371	\$ 50,000	\$ 796,141	\$ 21,027	\$ 22,797	\$ 144,474	\$ 25,067	\$ 235,380	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,294,886	12.9%	19.4%	\$ 1.71
Total	3,900,343	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 4,100,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000,000	100.0%	100.0%	\$ 2.56

county size bands
extra small
small
medium
large
extra large

¹ Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

² Source: Oregon State Health Profile. Premature death, 2010-14.

³ Source: Oregon State Health Profile. Good or excellent health, 2010-2013.

⁴ Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

⁵ Source: Oregon State Health Profile. Combined (adult and children) population below FPL, 2010-2014.

⁶ Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2012

⁷ Limitations exist for calculating current county contributions for public health. An updated process will be developed to address these limitations. Matching funds will be awarded based on

⁸ The Accountability Metrics subcommittee will define a set of accountability metrics. Following selection of accountability metrics, baseline data will be collected. Funds will not be awarded for

PHAB Funding and Incentives Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members: Silas Halloran-Steiner, Jeff Luck, Alejandro Queral, Akiko Saito, Tricia Tillman
 October, 2016

Model 3: base payment, no indicators per capita. The model includes a base payment for each county. None of the indicators are tied to county population.

County Group	Population ¹	Floor	County Population ¹	Burden of Disease ²	Health Status ³	Race/Ethnicity ⁴	Poverty ⁵	Limited English Proficiency ⁶	Matching Funds ⁷	Incentives ⁸	Total Award ⁹	Award Percentage	% of Total Population	Award Per Capita
County 33	1,357	\$ 50,000	\$ 1,426	\$ 20,412	\$ -	\$ 7,518	\$ 24,787	\$ 3,858	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 108,001	1.1%	0.0%	\$ 79.59
County 31	6,893	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,246	\$ 24,501	\$ 8,618	\$ 5,304	\$ 18,786	\$ 2,742	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 117,196	1.2%	0.2%	\$ 17.00
County 12	7,253	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,624	\$ 33,086	\$ 34,752	\$ 9,407	\$ 28,598	\$ 3,060	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 166,526	1.7%	0.2%	\$ 22.96
County 11	7,325	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,700	\$ 19,459	\$ 12,789	\$ 6,906	\$ 20,909	\$ 3,183	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 120,946	1.2%	0.2%	\$ 16.51
County 18	7,854	\$ 50,000	\$ 8,256	\$ 25,861	\$ 14,596	\$ 15,831	\$ 24,113	\$ 10,665	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 149,322	1.5%	0.2%	\$ 19.01
County 24	11,217	\$ 50,000	\$ 11,791	\$ 20,251	\$ 37,671	\$ 70,527	\$ 26,156	\$ 73,209	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 289,604	2.9%	0.3%	\$ 25.82
County 1	16,049	\$ 50,000	\$ 16,871	\$ 27,396	\$ 22,380	\$ 7,774	\$ 24,831	\$ 5,227	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 154,478	1.5%	0.4%	\$ 9.63
County 7	20,798	\$ 50,000	\$ 21,863	\$ 23,886	\$ 21,407	\$ 15,462	\$ 28,163	\$ 10,645	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 171,426	1.7%	0.5%	\$ 8.24
County 15	21,830	\$ 50,000	\$ 22,947	\$ 32,045	\$ 28,774	\$ 41,380	\$ 28,248	\$ 35,325	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 238,719	2.4%	0.6%	\$ 10.94
County 8	22,341	\$ 50,000	\$ 23,485	\$ 35,284	\$ 35,169	\$ 12,796	\$ 20,819	\$ 5,712	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 183,264	1.8%	0.6%	\$ 8.20
County 13	22,620	\$ 50,000	\$ 23,778	\$ 16,388	\$ 20,017	\$ 64,328	\$ 21,215	\$ 93,133	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 288,859	2.9%	0.6%	\$ 12.77
County 28	25,334	\$ 50,000	\$ 26,631	\$ 25,566	\$ 25,299	\$ 20,496	\$ 23,881	\$ 18,199	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150,072	1.9%	0.6%	\$ 7.50
County 30	25,736	\$ 50,000	\$ 27,053	\$ 22,498	\$ 23,214	\$ 8,985	\$ 25,473	\$ 12,214	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 169,439	1.7%	0.7%	\$ 6.58
County 26	29,103	\$ 150,000	\$ 30,593	\$ 26,668	\$ 30,581	\$ 31,484	\$ 22,242	\$ 40,791	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 332,359	3.3%	0.7%	\$ 11.42
County 22	30,740	\$ 50,000	\$ 32,314	\$ 22,817	\$ 36,837	\$ 68,936	\$ 38,457	\$ 55,719	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 305,079	3.1%	0.8%	\$ 9.92
County 4	37,236	\$ 50,000	\$ 39,142	\$ 28,090	\$ 24,187	\$ 16,816	\$ 21,364	\$ 16,245	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 195,844	2.0%	1.0%	\$ 3.26
County 20	46,138	\$ 50,000	\$ 48,500	\$ 31,761	\$ 26,550	\$ 17,543	\$ 23,176	\$ 16,629	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 214,159	2.1%	1.2%	\$ 4.64
County 5	49,325	\$ 50,000	\$ 51,850	\$ 24,046	\$ 29,191	\$ 9,351	\$ 17,812	\$ 6,046	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 188,296	1.9%	1.3%	\$ 3.82
County 6	62,678	\$ 50,000	\$ 65,886	\$ 31,583	\$ 25,021	\$ 12,160	\$ 24,387	\$ 7,115	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 216,153	2.2%	1.6%	\$ 3.45
County 17	65,985	\$ 50,000	\$ 69,363	\$ 30,281	\$ 32,528	\$ 23,820	\$ 25,180	\$ 18,838	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250,010	2.5%	1.7%	\$ 3.79
County 27	76,464	\$ 50,000	\$ 80,378	\$ 18,669	\$ 21,268	\$ 26,785	\$ 23,076	\$ 24,219	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 244,395	2.4%	2.0%	\$ 3.20
County 29	76,645	\$ 50,000	\$ 80,568	\$ 23,173	\$ 30,442	\$ 52,850	\$ 23,140	\$ 43,332	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 303,506	3.0%	2.0%	\$ 3.96
County 16	83,021	\$ 50,000	\$ 87,271	\$ 30,169	\$ 24,187	\$ 14,206	\$ 26,655	\$ 6,292	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 238,780	2.4%	2.1%	\$ 2.88
County 2	86,034	\$ 50,000	\$ 90,438	\$ 14,377	\$ 20,851	\$ 14,299	\$ 30,698	\$ 17,859	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 238,522	2.4%	2.2%	\$ 2.77
County 34	100,486	\$ 50,000	\$ 105,630	\$ 19,403	\$ 20,295	\$ 32,331	\$ 22,629	\$ 35,272	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 285,559	2.9%	2.6%	\$ 2.84
County 10	107,156	\$ 50,000	\$ 112,641	\$ 30,176	\$ 33,779	\$ 10,560	\$ 26,648	\$ 5,422	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 269,227	2.7%	2.7%	\$ 2.51
County 21	118,270	\$ 50,000	\$ 124,324	\$ 23,149	\$ 25,994	\$ 17,234	\$ 26,404	\$ 13,470	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 280,576	2.8%	3.0%	\$ 2.37
County 9	163,141	\$ 50,000	\$ 171,492	\$ 18,795	\$ 13,623	\$ 16,177	\$ 20,338	\$ 14,229	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 304,654	3.0%	4.2%	\$ 1.87
County 14	206,583	\$ 50,000	\$ 217,158	\$ 23,697	\$ 26,133	\$ 24,287	\$ 24,107	\$ 19,724	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 385,106	3.9%	5.3%	\$ 1.86
County 23	320,448	\$ 50,000	\$ 336,852	\$ 20,788	\$ 29,608	\$ 53,198	\$ 25,831	\$ 59,719	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 575,995	5.8%	8.2%	\$ 1.80
County 19	354,764	\$ 50,000	\$ 372,924	\$ 22,027	\$ 22,936	\$ 16,703	\$ 27,590	\$ 16,345	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 528,526	5.3%	9.1%	\$ 1.49
County 3	384,697	\$ 50,000	\$ 404,389	\$ 18,005	\$ 20,156	\$ 17,091	\$ 13,206	\$ 24,191	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 547,038	5.5%	9.9%	\$ 1.42
County 32	547,451	\$ 50,000	\$ 575,475	\$ 14,666	\$ 18,349	\$ 34,030	\$ 16,017	\$ 51,793	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 760,330	7.6%	14.0%	\$ 1.39
County 25	757,371	\$ 50,000	\$ 796,141	\$ 21,027	\$ 22,797	\$ 23,423	\$ 25,067	\$ 49,578	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 988,034	9.9%	19.4%	\$ 1.30
Total	3,900,343	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 4,100,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000,000	100.0%	100.0%	\$ 2.56

county size bands
extra small
small
medium
large
extra large

¹ Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

² Source: Oregon State Health Profile. Premature death, 2010-14.

³ Source: Oregon State Health Profile. Good or excellent health, 2010-2013.

⁴ Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

⁵ Source: Oregon State Health Profile. Combined (adult and children) population below FPL, 2010-2014.

⁶ Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2012

⁷ Limitations exist for calculating current county contributions for public health. An updated process will be developed to address these limitations. Matching funds will be awarded

⁸ The Accountability Metrics subcommittee will define a set of accountability metrics. Following selection of accountability metrics, baseline data will be collected. Funds will not be

Public Health Advisory Board Incentives and Funding Subcommittee

Subcommittee members: Silas Halloran-Steiner, Jeff Luck, Alejandro Qural, Akiko Saito, Tricia Tillman
 October, 2016

PSU Population Estimates for Oregon and Counties*					ACS Population 5-Year Estimates, 2009-14		
	Certified Population Estimate July 1, 2015	Certified Population Estimate July 1, 2014	Population Change 2014-15	Percent Change 2014-15	2014	Absolute change	Percent change
Oregon	4,013,845	3,962,710	51,135	1.3%	3,900,343	113,502	2.83
BAKER	16,425	16,325	100	0.6%	16,049	376	2.29
BENTON	90,005	88,740	1,265	1.4%	86,034	3,971	4.41
CLACKAMAS	397,385	391,525	5,860	1.5%	384,697	12,688	3.19
CLATSOP	37,750	37,495	255	0.7%	37,236	514	1.36
COLUMBIA	50,390	50,075	315	0.6%	49,325	1,065	2.11
COOS	62,990	62,900	90	0.1%	62,678	312	0.50
CROOK	21,085	20,780	305	1.5%	20,798	287	1.36
CURRY	22,470	22,355	115	0.5%	22,341	129	0.57
DESCHUTES	170,740	166,400	4,340	2.6%	163,141	7,599	4.45
DOUGLAS	109,910	109,385	525	0.5%	107,156	2,754	2.51
GILLIAM	1,975	1,975	0	0.0%			
GRANT	7,430	7,425	5	0.1%	7,325	105	1.41
HARNEY	7,295	7,265	30	0.4%	7,253	42	0.58
HOOD RIVER	24,245	23,730	515	2.2%	22,620	1,625	6.70
JACKSON	210,975	208,375	2,600	1.2%	206,583	4,392	2.08
JEFFERSON	22,445	22,205	240	1.1%	21,830	615	2.74
JOSEPHINE	83,720	83,105	615	0.7%	83,021	699	0.83
KLAMATH	67,110	66,910	200	0.3%	65,985	1,125	1.68
LAKE	8,010	7,990	20	0.3%	7,854	156	1.95
LANE	362,150	358,805	3,345	0.9%	354,764	7,386	2.04
LINCOLN	47,225	46,890	335	0.7%	46,138	1,087	2.30
LINN	120,860	119,705	1,155	1.0%	118,270	2,590	2.14
MALHEUR	31,480	31,470	10	0.0%	30,740	740	2.35
MARION	329,770	326,150	3,620	1.1%	320,448	9,322	2.83
MORROW	11,630	11,525	105	0.9%	11,217	413	3.55
MULTNOMAH	777,490	765,775	11,715	1.5%	757,371	20,119	2.59
NCPHD					29,103		
POLK	78,570	77,735	835	1.1%	76,464	2,106	2.68
SHERMAN	1,790	1,785	5	0.3%			
TILLAMOOK	25,690	25,480	210	0.8%	25,334	356	1.39
UMATILLA	79,155	78,340	815	1.0%	76,645	2,510	3.17
UNION	26,625	26,485	140	0.5%	25,736	889	3.34
WALLOWA	7,100	7,070	30	0.4%	6,893	207	2.92
WASCO	26,370	26,105	265	1.0%			
WASHINGTON	570,510	560,465	10,045	1.8%	547,451	23,059	4.04
WHEELER	1,445	1,440	5	0.3%	1,357	88	6.09
YAMHILL	103,630	102,525	1,105	1.1%	100,486	3,144	3.03

* The PSU Population Estimates do not provide data on racial and ethnic diversity, poverty or limited English proficiency. The U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey does provide data on racial and ethnic diversity, poverty and limited English proficiency.