

PHAB INCENTIVES AND FUNDING SUBCOMMITTEE

Minutes

May 10, 2024, 9:00 am - 10:00 am

Subcommittee members present: Bob Dannenhoffer, Veronica Irvin, Heather Kaisner

Subcommittee members absent: Jackie Leung, Nic Powers

OHA members present: Sara Beaudrault, Andrew Epstein, Steven Fiala

Welcome, introductions, agenda review

- Welcome and introductions.
- April 12th meeting minutes approved.

Funding formula feedback

- Sara shared her screen to review data on LPHA positions funded through public health modernization. Refer to the meeting materials for details (pages 7-15).
- Steven reviewed the LPHA funding formula survey results. Refer to the meeting materials for complete details (pages 16-27).
 - 9 of the 10 extra-small and small counties replied that they were better able to fulfill PE 51 requirements due to the increased floor funding. The medium, large and extra-large county respondents noted there was no significant change.
 - Most extra-small and small counties responded that due to the increased floor payment they were able to hire additional staff, including contracted staff.
 - All of the extra-small and small counties responded that they were able to use the increase in floor payment to retain staff originally hired with other funding. Medium, large and extra-large counties responded they were not able to retain staff using the floor payment.
- Discussion
 - Bob asked if there was feedback in the survey that larger counties felt negatively impacted by the floor payments.
 - Andrew stated that no county received a decrease in funding but rather extra-small and small counties received proportionately more than they have in past cycles. He has not received negative feedback from larger LPHAs.

- Heather shared that as a representative of a large county she felt that the funding formula made sense as a way to help extra-small and small counties that are held to the same modernization requirements as larger counties.
 - Veronica asked if the LPHAs reported spending floor payment funds on areas other than staffing.
 - Heather replied that in Deschutes County most of the funds are being used for staffing with a small portion going to materials and services. She has heard other counties have used the funds to hire contractors to assist with creating health equity plans or climate and health plans.
 - Sara replied that the funds may also be used for communication campaigns, software purchases, or go to CBOs or other partners.
 - Heather shared that she wondered if these funds have helped extra-small and small counties get closer towards meeting the foundational capabilities and how that compares to larger counties.
 - Sara replied that she is hoping this information will become clear through the cost and capacity assessment and analysis.
- Discuss changes for the 2025-27 funding formula
 - The group agreed that the indicators should remain the same.
 - The group consensus and survey feedback is to keep the floor payment amount where it currently is unless there was a substantial increase in funding from the legislature.
 - The group agreed to publish the funding formula with the data for the indicators to get a visual on how they rank and how they factor into the funding levels.

Public comment

- Sarah Lochner shared that there are some counties that do not currently provide public health departments with county general funds. She expressed concern of an increased gap between counties that receive general and matching funds and those that do not which could slow modernization efforts and increase health inequities in those counties that do not receive general and matching funds.

Next meeting agenda items and adjourn

- Review incentives and matching funds methodology.

- Review FY 22 matching funds data.
- Make recommendations for matching and incentive funds components of funding formula for 2025-27.