

PHAB INCENTIVES AND FUNDING SUBCOMMITTEE

May 24, 2024, 9:00 AM - 10:00 AM

Minutes

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

Subcommittee members absent: Jackie Leung, Nic Powers

OHA members present: Sara Beaudrault, Drew Cohen, Danna Drum, Andrew Epstein, Steven Fiala

Welcome, board updates, shared agreements, agenda review

- Welcome and introductions

Funding formula feedback

- Discussion
 - Bob suggested that the instructions for LPHAs to report county expenditure data was not as clear as it could be. He asked if the funds needed to be from the county and if they specifically need to come from the county general fund.
 - Danna clarified that it includes any funds from the county. The legislature wanted to avoid counties divesting funds when there is an increase in state funding. It does not include funding from outside grants.
 - Sara shared her screen to display the ORS 431.380 Distribution of (public health modernization funds). Refer to the meeting materials, page 4, for a full definition.
 - Sara asked Bob and Heather to explain what type of funds counties receive from coordinated care organizations (CCOs) asked if those funds go straight to public health departments.
 - Heather shared there are three sources of CCO funding in her county:
 - Fee for service (billable).
 - Central Oregon Health Council (COHC) provides community grants such as the immunization quality improvement for providers (IQIP) program which helps the LPHA meet modernization metrics.
 - Negotiation for a per member, per month rate for the perinatal coordination team.

- Methodology review for matching fund components of the funding formula. Refer to the meeting materials, page 7-8.
 - 5 percent (\$2.5 million) of \$50 million is available for matching funds for all counties.
 - Allocation of matching funds to LPHAs is triggered by one of two mechanisms:
 - Maintenance payment (flat funding from the county) within a range set by this group. \$1.25 million is available to be awarded.
 - Increase in funding over time by the county. \$1.25 million is available to be awarded.
- Discussion
 - Danna discussed the fiscal year (FY) 2018 LPHA investment data versus FY 2022 which is meant to determine any changes in financial investments per capita. Refer to the meeting materials, page 6.
 - Bob pointed out the large change for Jefferson County from FY 2018 to FY 2022 and stated that he did not believe that the county had made that significant of an investment in public health.
 - Danna replied that the method of determining total local investments per county in the years 2018 and 2022 may be different. In the case of Jefferson County, administrators may be including areas that were not previously included (e.g., COVID funding) which would skew the numbers. Going forward the plan is to collect FY 2023 and FY 2024 data at the same time so that the methodology is consistent between the two fiscal years.
 - Veronica pointed out that there are large differences in funding for some counties between FY 2018 and FY 2022 and asked if the data is accurate and if it is going to be used to award matching funds.
 - Sara replied yes, counties with an increase in funding between FY 2018 and FY 2022 would receive matching funds.
 - Danna added that there is no capacity to review the data between FY 2018 and FY 2022. An audit has not been done but LPHA administrators are attesting that the information provided is accurate. Going forward the data will be compared at the same time so that it is a more accurate representation.
 - Heather stated that this group needs to clearly define what county generated funds can be included and added that some counties may be getting creative so they can receive additional funding.
 - Danna shared that the definition of county funds includes county general funds and other funds that include funds "that the county generates through collection of fees, insurance reimbursement or other means. Grants from outside funders are not considered county other funds". She added that the

subgroup could clarify that “other funds” does not include federal funding coming into the county.

- Danna said that there is a lot of information on what can be included as an Expenditure but that it may need to be more clear on what can be included as Revenue.
 - Sara explained that the group could choose to recommend an increase in matching funds amounts that go towards counties that sustain county investments. The group could also decrease the allocation of five percent of funds now and increase that amount again over time.
 - Heather expressed support for more funds going to counties that have maintained payments to public health. She also shared she would be hesitant to increase matching funds until she is aware of how much modernization funding the legislature plans to award in the next biennium.
 - Bob agreed that a decrease in modernization funding would be difficult and added that the counties that would be most affected are probably the ones that are in most need of increased funding.
 - Sara proposed communicating with the legislature that a certain percentage is coming out of the base funding in the form of matching funds and that an increase of funding needs to occur so public health is not losing out on the progress that has been made.
 - Danna suggested modeling out what matching funds could look like for each county based on the FY 2018 and FY 2022 data.
 - Bob suggested that given the complexity of the pandemic and the presence of COVID funding, that the matching funds distribution should be delayed until pandemic funding is over and better data is available.
 - Sara stated that the ideal time to award matching funds is when there is an increase in modernization funding so all counties gain funding. She added that this subgroup needs to create recommendations that should work for most counties and showed support for Drew to model the impacts matching fund distribution will have on counties.
 - Danna expressed agreement with Sara and asked if those determining the budget would be more supportive of delaying the distribution of matching funds now and focusing more on the accountability metrics piece. Sara shared support of that idea.
- Methodology review for incentive fund components of the funding formula. Refer to meeting materials, page 9-10.

- 1 percent (\$500,000) of \$50 million is available for incentive funds for all counties.
- Funds are awarded to counties that can demonstrate improvements around the six accountability metrics process measures each county has chosen to focus on.
 - Qualifying counties receive the same floor payment.
 - Additional funds are distributed to qualifying counties based on county population.
- Data will be collected for FY 2023, to be used as the baseline, and compared with FY 2024 data to determine any increase or expansion in the work done related to the counties chosen process measures.

Public Comment

- Sarah Lockner expressed support for modeling the data to determine what matching funding could look like for selected counties. She suggested that it would be most impactful to model the data for counties with large metropolitan areas that have a greater legislative representation.

Next meeting agenda items

- Drew will model county data for a better understanding of what funding distribution could look like.
- Focus more on awarding matching funds for county maintenance payments so more counties will benefit.

Next meeting: Monday, June 10, 2024 at 12:00 pm