

AGENDA

PHAB INCENTIVES AND FUNDING SUBCOMMITTEE

June 10, 2024, 12:00-1:00 PM

Join ZoomGov Meeting

<https://www.zoomgov.com/j/1601522023?pwd=V2k1ZUZGbjVLTehQWktKNnowaHM3Zz09>

Meeting ID: 160 152 2023

Passcode: 773581

One tap mobile

+16692545252,,1601522023#

Subcommittee members: Heather Kaisner, Jackie Leung, Bob Dannenhoffer, Veronica Irvin, Nic Powers

Meeting objectives:

- Review May 10 and May 24 meeting minutes
- Discuss methodology and modeling for matching and incentive fund components of the funding formula
- Make recommendations for funding formula changes for 2025-27

12:00- 12:05 PM	Welcome, board updates, agenda review <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome and introductions
----------------------------	--

Sara
Beaudrault,
Oregon Health
Authority

12:05- 12:50 PM	Funding formula feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review modeling on impacts of matching funds• Review and discuss changes to methodology for matching and incentive fund components of the funding formula• Discuss changes for the 2025-27 funding formula
----------------------------	--

All

**12:50-
12:55 PM** **Public comment**

Sara
Beaudrault

12:55 PM **Next meeting agenda items and adjourn**

- Discuss June 13 presentation to PHAB
- Schedule additional meeting to talk about use of funding formula for other funding streams

Sara
Beaudrault

Everyone has a right to know about and use Oregon Health Authority (OHA) programs and services. OHA provides free help. Some examples of the free help OHA can provide are:

- Sign language and spoken language interpreters.
- Written materials in other languages.
- Braille.
- Large print.
- Audio and other formats.

If you need help or have questions, please contact Sara Beaudrault: at 971-645-5766, 711 TTY, or publichealth.policy@odhsoha.oregon.gov at least 48 hours before the meeting.

PHAB INCENTIVES AND FUNDING SUBCOMMITTEE

Minutes - draft

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.

DRAFT

PHAB INCENTIVES AND FUNDING SUBCOMMITTEE

Minutes - draft

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.

DRAFT

Matching Funding Considerations

- 1 Keep as-is (maintenance and increase of County GF)
- 2 Simplify to only focus on maintenance of County GF
- 3 Only begin matching if additional \$2.5M
- 4 Reduce matching to 1% (\$500K)

Incentive Funding Considerations

- 1 LPHAs need to meet all process measures to receive their portion of incentive funding
- 2 Incentive funding is proportional to the number of process measures met by LPHA
- 3 Establish benchmark for number of process measures that LPHAs need to meet to receive incentive funding (for example, 80% met)
- 4 Something else?

Public Health Modernization LPHA Funding Formula

Updated May, 2024

ESTIMATES/FOR PLANNING PURPOSES ONLY

Total biennial funds available to LPHAs through the funding formula = \$46,976,092

Assuming 5% of total (\$2,348,804) for matching funds = \$44,627,288 With current methodology, each LPHA eligible to receive a minimum of \$71,176

Assuming 1% of total (\$469,761) for matching funds = \$46,506,331 With current methodology, each LPHA eligible to receive a minimum of \$14,235

		Total county allocation 2023-25 (estimate)	
County Group	Population ¹	Total Award	Award Percentage
Wheeler	1,533	\$ 417,918	0.9%
Gilliam	2,062	\$ 425,950	0.9%
Wallowa	7,631	\$ 480,795	1.0%
Harney	7,600	\$ 462,346	1.0%
Grant	7,418	\$ 488,491	1.0%
Lake	8,562	\$ 515,019	1.1%
Morrow	13,010	\$ 652,956	1.4%
Baker	16,927	\$ 526,891	1.1%
Crook	26,583	\$ 603,877	1.3%
Curry	24,439	\$ 615,159	1.3%
Jefferson	25,878	\$ 729,490	1.6%
Hood River	24,406	\$ 701,919	1.5%
Tillamook	28,000	\$ 676,862	1.4%
Union	26,335	\$ 601,550	1.3%
Sherman, Wasco	28,969	\$ 1,206,346	2.6%
Malheur	32,981	\$ 852,901	1.8%
Clatsop	42,095	\$ 718,401	1.5%
Lincoln	51,930	\$ 824,946	1.8%
Columbia	53,143	\$ 787,248	1.7%
Coos	66,945	\$ 959,903	2.0%
Klamath	71,919	\$ 1,050,865	2.2%
Umatilla	81,842	\$ 1,257,228	2.7%
Polk	90,553	\$ 1,029,374	2.2%
Josephine	88,814	\$ 1,155,479	2.5%
Benton	99,355	\$ 1,037,992	2.2%
Yamhill	109,743	\$ 1,286,532	2.7%
Douglas	113,748	\$ 1,291,121	2.7%
Linn	131,984	\$ 1,426,892	3.0%
Deschutes	212,141	\$ 1,640,750	3.5%
Jackson	222,762	\$ 1,923,195	4.1%
Marion	352,249	\$ 4,000,705	8.5%
Lane	384,374	\$ 2,916,239	6.2%
Clackamas	424,043	\$ 2,822,032	6.0%
Washington	610,245	\$ 4,813,212	10.2%
Multnomah	801,306	\$ 6,075,508	12.9%
Total	4,291,525	\$ 46,976,092	100.0%

Total county allocation with 5% reduction in base funds		
Total Award	Award Percentage	Actual amt. reduction
\$ 416,626	0.9%	\$ 1,292
\$ 424,078	1.0%	\$ 1,871
\$ 474,969	1.1%	\$ 5,825
\$ 457,851	1.0%	\$ 4,495
\$ 482,110	1.1%	\$ 6,380
\$ 506,726	1.1%	\$ 8,293
\$ 634,718	1.4%	\$ 18,239
\$ 517,742	1.2%	\$ 9,149
\$ 589,177	1.3%	\$ 14,700
\$ 599,646	1.3%	\$ 15,513
\$ 705,733	1.6%	\$ 23,757
\$ 680,150	1.5%	\$ 21,769
\$ 656,899	1.5%	\$ 19,962
\$ 587,018	1.3%	\$ 14,532
\$ 1,177,047	2.6%	\$ 29,298
\$ 820,246	1.8%	\$ 32,655
\$ 695,444	1.6%	\$ 22,957
\$ 794,306	1.8%	\$ 30,639
\$ 759,326	1.7%	\$ 27,921
\$ 919,533	2.1%	\$ 40,370
\$ 1,003,936	2.2%	\$ 46,929
\$ 1,195,420	2.7%	\$ 61,808
\$ 983,995	2.2%	\$ 45,379
\$ 1,101,008	2.5%	\$ 54,472
\$ 991,991	2.2%	\$ 46,001
\$ 1,222,611	2.7%	\$ 63,921
\$ 1,226,870	2.7%	\$ 64,252
\$ 1,352,851	3.0%	\$ 74,041
\$ 1,551,289	3.5%	\$ 89,461
\$ 1,813,370	4.1%	\$ 109,826
\$ 3,741,087	8.4%	\$ 259,618
\$ 2,734,813	6.1%	\$ 181,426
\$ 2,647,399	5.9%	\$ 174,634
\$ 4,495,010	10.1%	\$ 318,202
\$ 5,666,292	12.7%	\$ 409,216
\$ 44,627,288	100.0%	\$ 2,348,804

Total county allocation with 1% reduction in base funds		
Total Award	Award Percentage	Actual amt. reduction
\$ 417,660	0.9%	\$ 258
\$ 425,575	0.9%	\$ 374
\$ 479,630	1.0%	\$ 1,165
\$ 461,447	1.0%	\$ 899
\$ 487,215	1.0%	\$ 1,276
\$ 513,361	1.1%	\$ 1,659
\$ 649,308	1.4%	\$ 3,648
\$ 525,061	1.1%	\$ 1,830
\$ 600,937	1.3%	\$ 2,940
\$ 612,057	1.3%	\$ 3,103
\$ 724,739	1.6%	\$ 4,751
\$ 697,565	1.5%	\$ 4,354
\$ 672,869	1.4%	\$ 3,992
\$ 598,644	1.3%	\$ 2,906
\$ 1,200,486	2.6%	\$ 5,860
\$ 846,370	1.8%	\$ 6,531
\$ 713,810	1.5%	\$ 4,591
\$ 818,818	1.8%	\$ 6,128
\$ 781,664	1.7%	\$ 5,584
\$ 951,829	2.0%	\$ 8,074
\$ 1,041,479	2.2%	\$ 9,386
\$ 1,244,866	2.7%	\$ 12,362
\$ 1,020,298	2.2%	\$ 9,076
\$ 1,144,585	2.5%	\$ 10,894
\$ 1,028,792	2.2%	\$ 9,200
\$ 1,273,748	2.7%	\$ 12,784
\$ 1,278,271	2.7%	\$ 12,850
\$ 1,412,084	3.0%	\$ 14,808
\$ 1,622,857	3.5%	\$ 17,892
\$ 1,901,230	4.1%	\$ 21,965
\$ 3,948,782	8.5%	\$ 51,924
\$ 2,879,954	6.2%	\$ 36,285
\$ 2,787,105	6.0%	\$ 34,927
\$ 4,749,571	10.2%	\$ 63,640
\$ 5,993,665	12.9%	\$ 81,843
\$ 46,506,331	100.0%	\$ 469,761