

Public Health Advisory Board (PHAB)
Incentives and Funding Subcommittee meeting minutes
December 13, 2016
1:00-3:00 pm

Welcome and roll call

Meeting Chair: Akiko Saito

PHAB members present: Silas Halloran-Steiner, Jeff Luck, Tricia Tillman

Oregon Health Authority (OHA) staff: Sara Beaudrault, Chris Curtis, Angela Rowland

Members of the public: none

November meeting minutes

The November 8th PHAB: Incentives and Funding meeting minutes were approved.

Implications of governor's recommended budget on modernization funding formula

The Governor's recommended budget was released on December 1st and did not include OHA's requested investment of \$30M for public health modernization. Therefore, OHA will not be advocating for public health modernization funding in the upcoming legislative session. As we work to secure public health funding as a long-term modernization strategy, OHA will also focus on identifying work that can begin now without additional funding. We are still required to meet deliverables in House Bill 3100. Subcommittee members discussed implications of public health modernization funding not being included in the Governor's recommended budget and what is known about whether CLHO or others intend to advocate for funding in 2017.

Subcommittee members questioned whether PHAB can advocate for funding. Subcommittee members asked whether PHAB can make a formal statement acknowledging disappointment and listing potential repercussions. Members also suggested that PHAB can make a recommendation to the Oregon Health Policy

Board (OHPB) to encourage OHPB to support identification of other funding sources.

Action Item: PHD staff will seek guidance on whether all Board members are able to make such statement and avoid any conflict of interest.

Potential application of funding formula model

Akiko proposed a pilot test to use the modernization funding formula for Public Health Emergency Preparedness (PHEP) funding distribution to local public health authorities. The Coalition of Local Health Officials (CLHO) PHEP committee determines how PHEP funds are distributed; the modernization funding formula model could be provided to them as one option. The CLHO PHEP subcommittee takes its recommended funding formula to full CLHO for approval.

Silas expressed concern that using the modernization funding formula for other funding streams could have negative repercussions. It could convey that the system can modernize without additional funding. Silas requested clarity on PHAB's role to advise on the whole public health system design and infrastructure as it relates to all public health funding. Related to the PHEP funding formula model, in order to make the modernization funding formula model palatable to local public health administrators, PHD should set it up so that all counties receive more money by adopting this model, which may mean shifting funds from state to local public health. Tricia encourages a deeper conversation about implications of changes to how public health funding is allocated and about how this funding formula should be considered and applied. She questioned whether it is in PHAB's current charge, whether PHAB is precluded from doing this and if there is a benefit for PHAB to do this.

Subcommittee members requested information on OHA's total budget and the amount of funding that is passed through to local public health.

Action Items: PHD staff will review PHAB charter and share OHA budget presentation from March PHAB meeting. Subcommittee members will bring this proposal to the full board and discuss concerns. A decision will be made about whether to give the modernization funding formula to the CLHO PHEP subcommittee as an option to consider until after the PHAB discussion.

Funding formula review

Chris reviewed updates made to the funding formula since the November meeting.

- The funding formula model is now based on PSU population estimates rather than U.S. Census Bureau, American Communities Survey (ACS).
- Chris added a column for average award per population, in addition to average award per capita (Columns S and T). Subcommittee members recommend using the average award per population.
- The ACS supplemental poverty index that subcommittee members discussed at the November meeting is not available at the county level and cannot be used for the poverty indicator.
- Chris added poverty indicators for educational attainment and income inequality, in addition to the poverty indicator already included for the percent of the population living below the federal poverty level.

Subcommittee members recommend including educational attainment and percent of population living below the federal poverty level, but not income inequality. Both included indicators will be weighted at 10% of total funds for funding formula indicators.

The subcommittee would like to continue exploring options for income inequality indicators in 2017. Jeff proposed using a scatter plot or other mechanism to compare different poverty indicators to inform the subcommittee's recommendations.

Subcommittee members are interested in revisiting BRFSS as the data source for health status in 2017.

Subcommittee members recommend sharing the funding formula model with the changes discussed today at Thursday's PHAB meeting, to be included in the statewide modernization plan.

Subcommittee members reviewed the funding formula overview for the statewide modernization plan. Jeff requested that the overview include a description of why each indicator was chosen.

Subcommittee Business

Akiko will provide the subcommittee report for the Dec 15th PHAB meeting.

Subcommittee members provided input for the 2017 work plan.

- Continue to develop indicators for poverty and health status.
- Joint meetings with the Accountability Metrics subcommittee to develop a mechanism for performance-based incentives.
- Other work related to public health funding more generally

Subcommittee members are in favor of moving these meetings to every other month for two hours, beginning in February.

Public Comment

No public testimony.