

AGENDA

PUBLIC HEALTH ADVISORY BOARD Incentives and Funding Subcommittee

September 13, 2016

1:00-2:00 pm

Portland State Office Building, 800 NE Oregon St., Room 1C, Portland, OR 97232

Webinar: <https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/5472601801004350980>

Conference line: (877) 873-8017

Access code: 767068

Meeting Chair: Jeff Luck

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

Meeting Objectives

- Approve August meeting minutes
- Discuss how the funding formula can be used to incentivize change
- Make initial recommendation for which model to use for the LPHA funding formula
- Set agenda for October subcommittee meeting

1:00-1:05 pm	Welcome and introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approve August meeting minutes	Jeff Luck, Meeting Chair
1:05-1:20 pm	Discuss how the funding formula can be used to incentivize change <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review language in HB 3100• Discuss what changes should be incentivized through the funding formula and how the funding formula can be used to drive those changes• Discuss timeline for incorporating matching fund and incentive payments into the funding formula	Subcommittee members
1:20-1:50 pm	Discuss updated funding formula models <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:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 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 use	Subcommittee members

1:50-1:55 pm

Subcommittee business

- The subcommittee will meet again before the October PHAB meeting
- Set agenda for October subcommittee meeting
- Identify meeting Chair

Subcommittee members

1:55-2:00 pm

Public comment

2:00 pm

Adjourn

Jeff Luck,
Meeting Chair

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

**August 31, 2016
2:00-3:00 pm**

Portland State Office Building, 800 NE Oregon St., Room 918, Portland, OR 97232
Conference line: (877) 873-8017
Access code: 767068

Meeting chair: Tricia Tillman

PHAB subcommittee members present: Silas Halloran-Steiner, Akiko Saito, Tricia Tillman

PHAB subcommittee members absent: Jeff Luck and Alejandro Queral

OHA staff: Sara Beaudrault, Chris Curtis, Angela Rowland, Erica Sandoval

Members of the public: Morgan Cowling, *Coalition of Local Health Officials*

Welcome and introductions – Tricia Tillman

Approval of minutes – Tricia Tillman

Subcommittee members voted to approve the July 12, 2016 subcommittee meeting minutes. All in favor.

Announcements and updates – Tricia Tillman

Sara provided an update on how the funding formula will be applied, related to gaps identified in the self-assessments. Local public health administrators have asked whether different funding formulas will be used based on self-assessment findings for the six foundational programs and capabilities prioritized for 2017-19.

The funding formula is based on components required under HB 3100 such as baseline, matching funds, and incentive payments. Different versions of the funding formula will not be used based on self-assessment findings. However, as the subcommittee develops the funding formula, members should ensure the funding formula provides adequate resources for all counties to address identified gaps in existing capacity. Sara referenced the patchwork quilt diagram that displays the 2017-19 priorities. LPHAs will have flexibility to put funding where they have the biggest need in their communities.

Tricia asked what the subcommittee's role is with this information. Akiko recommended that CLHO could put this information forward. She also suggested creating a list of FAQs on the PHAB website.

Tricia proposed to gather a list of FAQs at the CLHO retreat in September. Holly Heiberg from PHD and Kathleen Johnson from CLHO are working on FAQs that are much more conceptual but they could add in some of these process questions. The full Board will be asked to provide feedback on the need for FAQs at the September meeting.

Review Incentives and Funding subcommittee work plan– Subcommittee members

The main deliverable for this subcommittee is to provide guidance on the funding formula with the goal to complete an initial funding formula this fall. The subcommittee has identified developing a communication tool and exploring additional funding sources as additional deliverables.

The work plan was reviewed. Once the funding formula is complete, the subcommittee may opt to go on hiatus until 2017, after the legislative session.

Discuss three funding formula models – subcommittee members

PHD developed three different funding formulas. The assumption for all models is a \$10 million annual investment, with the same allocations for indicators (50% for county population, 10% for each of the 5 indicators: burden of disease, health status, racial/ethnic diversity, poverty, and limited English proficiency) used for all models.

Model 1 is the per capita model where all indicators are tied to county population. Model 2 ties some indicators to county population. Model 3 had a base payment/floor of \$50,000 with none of the indicators based on county population.

Tricia asked how the indicators are tied to county populations in model 1. Chris explained how counties are ranked for each indicator, and each county's payment for an indicator is based on its rank and its county weight based on its population. Under Model 1 the estimated payout benefits the large and extra-large counties the most. Model 3 benefits the small and extra-small counties the most.

Silas encourages a simple model that will be easy to administer at the local level. Sensitive models where payments may change from year to year could result in employee layoffs or cuts to programs. The per capita dollars are important to look at as the award ranges from \$2,000-\$2 million, which is really broad.

Akiko stated her program uses a funding formula that incorporates a base payment. She and Silas suggest incorporating a base payment into Models 1 & 2. Another suggestion made previously was to make payments based on a 3 year average to prevent annual fluctuations.

Silas asked if this will be an annual or biannual payout, or whether it could be a 5 year funding cycle. A longer funding cycle will lead to more stability and drive performance.

Tricia inquired about the \$50,000 floor and how this amount was determined. She asked what a reasonable floor amount would be that won't disincentivize the exploration of new service delivery models. Akiko stated in her program funding formula they took an estimated public health emergency preparedness coordinator salary to determine a base funding award amount. The base had 3 categories for small, medium and large counties.

Silas inquired if there are any other states making a funding formula like this. Tricia would like to have the live models distributed to the group. Tricia would like to determine what an average FTE public health employee could be.

Discuss subcommittee update for September 13th PHAB – Subcommittee members

Tricia will report out at the September 12, 2016 PHAB meeting. She will review the work plan and solicit feedback on whether a PHAB FAQ should be developed. She would also like to discuss measure 97 at the PHAB meeting.

The next Incentives and Funding subcommittee meeting will be September 13, 2016. The subcommittee will review updated models that all include a floor. Tricia would like to see updated data based on the indicators that have been discussed by the subcommittee. Akiko will provide her program's funding formula example.

Public comment – Morgan Cowling, *Coalition of Local Health Officials*

Morgan referenced Section 28 in HB3100 that discusses incorporating in the funding formula population, burden of disease, overall health status of communities within the jurisdiction and the ability of each local public health authority to invest in activities and services. Morgan feels the size of the jurisdiction is serving as a proxy for the ability to invest discussion. She recommends looking at how the funding formula can be used to incentivize county investments. That could inform the base conversation the subcommittee is having. PHAB county reps could also take this question to the counties they represent.

Morgan also suggests that the subcommittee consider what is being incentivized through the funding formula.

Adjournment – Tricia Tillman

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
September, 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

- All models assume a \$10M investment.
- All models include a base payment of \$50,000
- 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.
- In all models, burden of disease and health status are weighted by a county ranking (1-34) where each ranking is divided by the total sum of all ranks (595) to provide a proportional weight and payout to all counties. In all models, 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 (\$1.66 - \$38.60)	\$12.28 (\$4.94 - \$38.60)	\$1.96 (\$1.66 - 2.31)	(\$52,377 - \$1,751,203)	(\$52,377 - \$80,755)	(\$636,906 - \$1,751,203)	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 (\$1.52 - \$79.88)	\$24.65 (\$8.14 - \$79.88)	\$1.67 (\$1.52 - \$1.78)	(\$100,084 - \$1,290,992)	(\$100,084 - \$173,590)	(\$584,791 - \$1,290,992)	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. Regionalized jurisdictions receive a base amount for each county included in the jurisdiction. The 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 - \$88.18)	\$28.65 (\$8.85 - \$88.18)	\$1.32 (\$1.30 - \$1.34)	(\$109,615 - \$984,140)	(\$109,615 - \$267,701)	(\$514,191 - \$984,140)	\$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
September, 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.

	Model 1 Award	Model 2 Award	Model 3 Award	Percent change			county size bands
				M1 to M2	M2 to M3	M1 to M3	
County 33	52,377	108,399	119,660	107%	10%	128%	extra small
County 11	61,448	100,084	109,615	63%	10%	78%	small
County 31	62,009	113,398	121,027	83%	7%	95%	medium
County 18	67,027	144,675	169,634	116%	17%	153%	large
County 12	67,624	173,590	185,362	157%	7%	174%	extra large
County 1	79,267	130,651	142,110	65%	9%	79%	
County 24	80,755	135,555	267,701	68%	97%	231%	
County 7	89,192	135,550	157,650	52%	16%	77%	
County 8	94,997	148,495	163,875	56%	10%	73%	
County 30	103,576	160,997	178,343	55%	11%	72%	
County 28	105,146	159,507	191,083	52%	20%	82%	
County 13	106,247	131,538	263,943	24%	101%	148%	
County 15	114,813	206,905	271,419	80%	31%	136%	
County 4	130,492	175,691	199,861	35%	14%	53%	
County 5	137,874	164,917	174,688	20%	6%	27%	
County 20	150,339	187,757	210,528	25%	12%	40%	
County 22	151,443	232,805	329,466	54%	42%	118%	
County 6	195,767	225,321	235,594	15%	5%	20%	
County 26	218,707	268,366	325,737	23%	21%	49%	
County 17	224,504	253,974	276,040	13%	9%	23%	
County 2	193,520	200,285	212,793	3%	6%	10%	
County 27	208,932	221,494	244,210	6%	10%	17%	
County 16	237,973	245,598	253,217	3%	3%	6%	
County 29	267,766	282,972	325,346	6%	15%	22%	
County 34	272,520	268,643	287,570	-1%	7%	6%	
County 10	301,039	280,726	283,851	-7%	1%	-6%	
County 21	322,929	295,506	299,625	-8%	1%	-7%	
County 9	317,961	293,850	288,211	-8%	-2%	-9%	
County 14	531,938	421,395	399,003	-21%	-5%	-25%	
County 19	719,246	564,327	512,768	-22%	-9%	-29%	
County 23	889,778	717,135	571,262	-19%	-20%	-36%	
County 3	636,906	584,791	514,191	-8%	-12%	-19%	
County 32	1,054,687	974,113	730,478	-8%	-25%	-31%	
County 25	1,751,203	1,290,992	984,140	-26%	-24%	-44%	

PHAB Funding and Incentives Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members: Silas Halloran-Steiner, Jeff Luck, Alejandro Queral, Akiko Saito, Tricia Tillman
September, 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	\$ 12,403	\$ 20,672	\$ 83	\$ 23,781	\$ 33	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 108,399	1.1%	0.0%	\$ 79.88
County 31	6,893	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,246	\$ 6,891	\$ 30,319	\$ 298	\$ 18,526	\$ 118	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 113,398	1.1%	0.2%	\$ 16.45
County 12	7,253	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,624	\$ 41,345	\$ 44,101	\$ 556	\$ 29,825	\$ 139	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 173,590	1.7%	0.2%	\$ 23.93
County 11	7,325	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,700	\$ 11,025	\$ 9,647	\$ 412	\$ 21,154	\$ 146	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,084	1.0%	0.2%	\$ 13.66
County 18	7,854	\$ 50,000	\$ 8,256	\$ 35,832	\$ 23,429	\$ 1,013	\$ 25,621	\$ 525	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 144,675	1.4%	0.2%	\$ 18.42
County 24	11,217	\$ 50,000	\$ 11,791	\$ 23,429	\$ 13,782	\$ 6,443	\$ 24,964	\$ 5,148	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 135,555	1.4%	0.3%	\$ 12.08
County 1	16,049	\$ 50,000	\$ 16,871	\$ 16,538	\$ 22,050	\$ 1,016	\$ 23,650	\$ 526	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 130,651	1.3%	0.4%	\$ 8.14
County 7	20,798	\$ 50,000	\$ 21,863	\$ 15,160	\$ 19,294	\$ 2,619	\$ 25,227	\$ 1,388	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 135,550	1.4%	0.5%	\$ 6.52
County 15	21,830	\$ 50,000	\$ 22,947	\$ 45,479	\$ 46,857	\$ 7,357	\$ 29,431	\$ 4,834	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 206,905	2.1%	0.6%	\$ 9.48
County 8	22,341	\$ 50,000	\$ 23,485	\$ 9,647	\$ 41,345	\$ 2,328	\$ 20,891	\$ 800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 148,495	1.5%	0.6%	\$ 6.65
County 13	22,620	\$ 50,000	\$ 23,778	\$ 5,513	\$ 5,513	\$ 11,850	\$ 21,679	\$ 13,206	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 131,538	1.3%	0.6%	\$ 5.82
County 28	25,334	\$ 50,000	\$ 26,631	\$ 19,294	\$ 33,076	\$ 4,229	\$ 23,387	\$ 2,890	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 159,507	1.6%	0.6%	\$ 6.30
County 30	25,736	\$ 50,000	\$ 27,053	\$ 26,185	\$ 28,941	\$ 1,883	\$ 24,964	\$ 1,971	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 160,997	1.6%	0.7%	\$ 6.26
County 26	29,103	\$ 150,000	\$ 30,593	\$ 24,807	\$ 24,807	\$ 7,462	\$ 23,256	\$ 7,442	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 268,366	2.7%	0.7%	\$ 9.22
County 22	30,740	\$ 50,000	\$ 32,314	\$ 46,857	\$ 38,588	\$ 17,258	\$ 37,052	\$ 10,737	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 232,805	2.3%	0.8%	\$ 7.57
County 4	37,236	\$ 50,000	\$ 39,142	\$ 22,050	\$ 34,454	\$ 5,099	\$ 21,154	\$ 3,792	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 175,691	1.8%	1.0%	\$ 4.72
County 20	46,138	\$ 50,000	\$ 48,500	\$ 17,916	\$ 37,210	\$ 6,591	\$ 22,730	\$ 4,809	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 187,757	1.9%	1.2%	\$ 4.07
County 5	49,325	\$ 50,000	\$ 51,850	\$ 27,563	\$ 12,403	\$ 3,756	\$ 17,475	\$ 1,869	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 164,917	1.6%	1.3%	\$ 3.34
County 6	62,678	\$ 50,000	\$ 65,886	\$ 34,454	\$ 42,723	\$ 6,207	\$ 23,256	\$ 2,795	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 225,321	2.3%	1.6%	\$ 3.59
County 17	65,985	\$ 50,000	\$ 69,363	\$ 44,101	\$ 45,479	\$ 12,800	\$ 24,438	\$ 7,792	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 253,974	2.5%	1.7%	\$ 3.85
County 27	76,464	\$ 50,000	\$ 80,378	\$ 31,697	\$ 8,269	\$ 16,679	\$ 22,862	\$ 11,608	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 221,494	2.2%	2.0%	\$ 2.90
County 29	76,645	\$ 50,000	\$ 80,568	\$ 42,723	\$ 31,697	\$ 32,988	\$ 24,176	\$ 20,819	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 282,972	2.8%	2.0%	\$ 3.69
County 16	83,021	\$ 50,000	\$ 87,271	\$ 33,076	\$ 35,832	\$ 9,605	\$ 26,541	\$ 3,274	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 245,598	2.5%	2.1%	\$ 2.96
County 2	86,034	\$ 50,000	\$ 90,438	\$ 4,134	\$ 4,134	\$ 10,019	\$ 31,928	\$ 9,632	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,285	2.0%	2.2%	\$ 2.33
County 34	100,486	\$ 50,000	\$ 105,630	\$ 30,319	\$ 11,025	\$ 26,458	\$ 22,993	\$ 22,218	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 268,643	2.7%	2.6%	\$ 2.67
County 10	107,156	\$ 50,000	\$ 112,641	\$ 38,588	\$ 39,966	\$ 9,216	\$ 26,672	\$ 3,642	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 280,726	2.8%	2.7%	\$ 2.62
County 21	118,270	\$ 50,000	\$ 124,324	\$ 39,966	\$ 27,563	\$ 16,600	\$ 27,066	\$ 9,987	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 295,506	3.0%	3.0%	\$ 2.50
County 9	163,141	\$ 50,000	\$ 171,492	\$ 8,269	\$ 6,891	\$ 21,493	\$ 21,154	\$ 14,551	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 293,850	2.9%	4.2%	\$ 1.80
County 14	206,583	\$ 50,000	\$ 217,158	\$ 37,210	\$ 26,185	\$ 40,861	\$ 24,438	\$ 25,543	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 421,395	4.2%	5.3%	\$ 2.04
County 23	320,448	\$ 50,000	\$ 336,852	\$ 28,941	\$ 16,538	\$ 138,829	\$ 26,015	\$ 119,960	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 717,135	7.2%	8.2%	\$ 2.24
County 19	354,764	\$ 50,000	\$ 372,924	\$ 13,782	\$ 15,160	\$ 48,257	\$ 27,855	\$ 36,350	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 564,327	5.6%	9.1%	\$ 1.59
County 3	384,697	\$ 50,000	\$ 404,389	\$ 2,756	\$ 2,756	\$ 53,545	\$ 13,008	\$ 58,336	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 584,791	5.8%	9.9%	\$ 1.52
County 32	547,451	\$ 50,000	\$ 575,475	\$ 1,378	\$ 1,378	\$ 151,718	\$ 16,424	\$ 177,740	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 974,113	9.7%	14.0%	\$ 1.78
County 25	757,371	\$ 50,000	\$ 796,141	\$ 20,672	\$ 17,916	\$ 144,474	\$ 26,409	\$ 235,380	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,290,992	12.9%	19.4%	\$ 1.70
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: County Health Rankings, Health Factors/Health Behaviors, 2016.

³ Source: County Health Rankings, Health Outcomes, Overall, 2016.

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

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

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,

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
September, 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	\$ 12,403	\$ 20,672	\$ 83	\$ 23,781	\$ 33	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 108,399	1.1%	0.0%	\$ 79.88
County 31	6,893	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,246	\$ 6,891	\$ 30,319	\$ 298	\$ 18,526	\$ 118	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 113,398	1.1%	0.2%	\$ 16.45
County 12	7,253	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,624	\$ 41,345	\$ 44,101	\$ 556	\$ 29,825	\$ 139	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 173,590	1.7%	0.2%	\$ 23.93
County 11	7,325	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,700	\$ 11,025	\$ 9,647	\$ 412	\$ 21,154	\$ 146	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,084	1.0%	0.2%	\$ 13.66
County 18	7,854	\$ 50,000	\$ 8,256	\$ 35,832	\$ 23,429	\$ 1,013	\$ 25,621	\$ 525	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 144,675	1.4%	0.2%	\$ 18.42
County 24	11,217	\$ 50,000	\$ 11,791	\$ 23,429	\$ 13,782	\$ 6,443	\$ 24,964	\$ 5,148	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 135,555	1.4%	0.3%	\$ 12.08
County 1	16,049	\$ 50,000	\$ 16,871	\$ 16,538	\$ 22,050	\$ 1,016	\$ 23,650	\$ 526	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 130,651	1.3%	0.4%	\$ 8.14
County 7	20,798	\$ 50,000	\$ 21,863	\$ 15,160	\$ 19,294	\$ 2,619	\$ 25,227	\$ 1,388	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 135,550	1.4%	0.5%	\$ 6.52
County 15	21,830	\$ 50,000	\$ 22,947	\$ 45,479	\$ 46,857	\$ 7,357	\$ 29,431	\$ 4,834	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 206,905	2.1%	0.6%	\$ 9.48
County 8	22,341	\$ 50,000	\$ 23,485	\$ 9,647	\$ 41,345	\$ 2,328	\$ 20,891	\$ 800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 148,495	1.5%	0.6%	\$ 6.65
County 13	22,620	\$ 50,000	\$ 23,778	\$ 5,513	\$ 5,513	\$ 11,850	\$ 21,679	\$ 13,206	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 131,538	1.3%	0.6%	\$ 5.82
County 28	25,334	\$ 50,000	\$ 26,631	\$ 19,294	\$ 33,076	\$ 4,229	\$ 23,387	\$ 2,890	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 159,507	1.6%	0.6%	\$ 6.30
County 30	25,736	\$ 50,000	\$ 27,053	\$ 26,185	\$ 28,941	\$ 1,883	\$ 24,964	\$ 1,971	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 160,997	1.6%	0.7%	\$ 6.26
County 26	29,103	\$ 150,000	\$ 30,593	\$ 24,807	\$ 24,807	\$ 7,462	\$ 23,256	\$ 7,442	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 268,366	2.7%	0.7%	\$ 9.22
County 22	30,740	\$ 50,000	\$ 32,314	\$ 46,857	\$ 38,588	\$ 17,258	\$ 37,052	\$ 10,737	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 232,805	2.3%	0.8%	\$ 7.57
County 4	37,236	\$ 50,000	\$ 39,142	\$ 22,050	\$ 34,454	\$ 5,099	\$ 21,154	\$ 3,792	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 175,691	1.8%	1.0%	\$ 4.72
County 20	46,138	\$ 50,000	\$ 48,500	\$ 17,916	\$ 37,210	\$ 6,591	\$ 22,730	\$ 4,809	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 187,757	1.9%	1.2%	\$ 4.07
County 5	49,325	\$ 50,000	\$ 51,850	\$ 27,563	\$ 12,403	\$ 3,756	\$ 17,475	\$ 1,869	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 164,917	1.6%	1.3%	\$ 3.34
County 6	62,678	\$ 50,000	\$ 65,886	\$ 34,454	\$ 42,723	\$ 6,207	\$ 23,256	\$ 2,795	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 225,321	2.3%	1.6%	\$ 3.59
County 17	65,985	\$ 50,000	\$ 69,363	\$ 44,101	\$ 45,479	\$ 12,800	\$ 24,438	\$ 7,792	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 253,974	2.5%	1.7%	\$ 3.85
County 27	76,464	\$ 50,000	\$ 80,378	\$ 31,697	\$ 8,269	\$ 16,679	\$ 22,862	\$ 11,608	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 221,494	2.2%	2.0%	\$ 2.90
County 29	76,645	\$ 50,000	\$ 80,568	\$ 42,723	\$ 31,697	\$ 32,988	\$ 24,176	\$ 20,819	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 282,972	2.8%	2.0%	\$ 3.69
County 16	83,021	\$ 50,000	\$ 87,271	\$ 33,076	\$ 35,832	\$ 9,605	\$ 26,541	\$ 3,274	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 245,598	2.5%	2.1%	\$ 2.96
County 2	86,034	\$ 50,000	\$ 90,438	\$ 4,134	\$ 4,134	\$ 10,019	\$ 31,928	\$ 9,632	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,285	2.0%	2.2%	\$ 2.33
County 34	100,486	\$ 50,000	\$ 105,630	\$ 30,319	\$ 11,025	\$ 26,458	\$ 22,993	\$ 22,218	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 268,643	2.7%	2.6%	\$ 2.67
County 10	107,156	\$ 50,000	\$ 112,641	\$ 38,588	\$ 39,966	\$ 9,216	\$ 26,672	\$ 3,642	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 280,726	2.8%	2.7%	\$ 2.62
County 21	118,270	\$ 50,000	\$ 124,324	\$ 39,966	\$ 27,563	\$ 16,600	\$ 27,066	\$ 9,987	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 295,506	3.0%	3.0%	\$ 2.50
County 9	163,141	\$ 50,000	\$ 171,492	\$ 8,269	\$ 6,891	\$ 21,493	\$ 21,154	\$ 14,551	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 293,850	2.9%	4.2%	\$ 1.80
County 14	206,583	\$ 50,000	\$ 217,158	\$ 37,210	\$ 26,185	\$ 40,861	\$ 24,438	\$ 25,543	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 421,395	4.2%	5.3%	\$ 2.04
County 23	320,448	\$ 50,000	\$ 336,852	\$ 28,941	\$ 16,538	\$ 138,829	\$ 26,015	#####	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 717,135	7.2%	8.2%	\$ 2.24
County 19	354,764	\$ 50,000	\$ 372,924	\$ 13,782	\$ 15,160	\$ 48,257	\$ 27,855	\$ 36,350	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 564,327	5.6%	9.1%	\$ 1.59
County 3	384,697	\$ 50,000	\$ 404,389	\$ 2,756	\$ 2,756	\$ 53,545	\$ 13,008	\$ 58,336	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 584,791	5.8%	9.9%	\$ 1.52
County 32	547,451	\$ 50,000	\$ 575,475	\$ 1,378	\$ 1,378	\$ 151,718	\$ 16,424	#####	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 974,113	9.7%	14.0%	\$ 1.78
County 25	757,371	\$ 50,000	\$ 796,141	\$ 20,672	\$ 17,916	\$ 144,474	\$ 26,409	#####	\$ -	\$ -	#####	12.9%	19.4%	\$ 1.70
Total	3,900,343	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 4,100,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 820,000	#####	\$ -	\$ -	#####	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: County Health Rankings, Health Factors/Health Behaviors, 2016.

³ Source: County Health Rankings, Health Outcomes, Overall, 2016.

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

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

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

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

PHAB Funding and Incentives Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members: Silas Halloran-Steiner, Jeff Luck, Alejandro Queral, Akiko Saito, Tricia Tillman
September, 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	\$ 12,403	\$ 20,672	\$ 7,518	\$ 23,781	\$ 3,858	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 119,660	1.2%	0.0%	\$ 88.18
County 31	6,893	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,246	\$ 6,891	\$ 30,319	\$ 5,304	\$ 18,526	\$ 2,742	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 121,027	1.2%	0.2%	\$ 17.56
County 12	7,253	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,624	\$ 41,345	\$ 44,101	\$ 9,407	\$ 29,825	\$ 3,060	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 185,362	1.9%	0.2%	\$ 25.56
County 11	7,325	\$ 50,000	\$ 7,700	\$ 11,025	\$ 9,647	\$ 6,906	\$ 21,154	\$ 3,183	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 109,615	1.1%	0.2%	\$ 14.96
County 18	7,854	\$ 50,000	\$ 8,256	\$ 35,832	\$ 23,429	\$ 15,831	\$ 25,621	\$ 10,665	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 169,634	1.7%	0.2%	\$ 21.60
County 24	11,217	\$ 50,000	\$ 11,791	\$ 23,429	\$ 13,782	\$ 70,527	\$ 24,964	\$ 73,209	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 267,701	2.7%	0.3%	\$ 23.87
County 1	16,049	\$ 50,000	\$ 16,871	\$ 16,538	\$ 22,050	\$ 7,774	\$ 23,650	\$ 5,227	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 142,110	1.4%	0.4%	\$ 8.85
County 7	20,798	\$ 50,000	\$ 21,863	\$ 15,160	\$ 19,294	\$ 15,462	\$ 25,227	\$ 10,645	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 157,650	1.6%	0.5%	\$ 7.58
County 15	21,830	\$ 50,000	\$ 22,947	\$ 45,479	\$ 46,857	\$ 41,380	\$ 29,431	\$ 35,325	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 271,419	2.7%	0.6%	\$ 12.43
County 8	22,341	\$ 50,000	\$ 23,485	\$ 9,647	\$ 41,345	\$ 12,796	\$ 20,891	\$ 5,712	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 163,875	1.6%	0.6%	\$ 7.34
County 13	22,620	\$ 50,000	\$ 23,778	\$ 5,513	\$ 5,513	\$ 64,328	\$ 21,679	\$ 93,133	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 263,943	2.6%	0.6%	\$ 11.67
County 28	25,334	\$ 50,000	\$ 26,631	\$ 19,294	\$ 33,076	\$ 20,496	\$ 23,387	\$ 18,199	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 191,083	1.9%	0.6%	\$ 7.54
County 30	25,736	\$ 50,000	\$ 27,053	\$ 26,185	\$ 28,941	\$ 8,985	\$ 24,964	\$ 12,214	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 178,343	1.8%	0.7%	\$ 6.93
County 26	29,103	\$ 150,000	\$ 30,593	\$ 24,807	\$ 24,807	\$ 31,484	\$ 23,256	\$ 40,791	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 325,737	3.3%	0.7%	\$ 11.19
County 22	30,740	\$ 50,000	\$ 32,314	\$ 46,857	\$ 38,588	\$ 68,936	\$ 37,052	\$ 55,719	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 329,466	3.3%	0.8%	\$ 10.72
County 4	37,236	\$ 50,000	\$ 39,142	\$ 22,050	\$ 34,454	\$ 16,816	\$ 21,154	\$ 16,245	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 199,861	2.0%	1.0%	\$ 5.37
County 20	46,138	\$ 50,000	\$ 48,500	\$ 17,916	\$ 37,210	\$ 17,543	\$ 22,730	\$ 16,629	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 210,528	2.1%	1.2%	\$ 4.56
County 5	49,325	\$ 50,000	\$ 51,850	\$ 27,563	\$ 12,403	\$ 9,351	\$ 17,475	\$ 6,046	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 174,688	1.7%	1.3%	\$ 3.54
County 6	62,678	\$ 50,000	\$ 65,886	\$ 34,454	\$ 42,723	\$ 12,160	\$ 23,256	\$ 7,115	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 235,594	2.4%	1.6%	\$ 3.76
County 17	65,985	\$ 50,000	\$ 69,363	\$ 44,101	\$ 45,479	\$ 23,820	\$ 24,438	\$ 18,838	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 276,040	2.8%	1.7%	\$ 4.18
County 27	76,464	\$ 50,000	\$ 80,378	\$ 31,697	\$ 8,269	\$ 26,785	\$ 22,862	\$ 24,219	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 244,210	2.4%	2.0%	\$ 3.19
County 29	76,645	\$ 50,000	\$ 80,568	\$ 42,723	\$ 31,697	\$ 52,850	\$ 24,176	\$ 43,332	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 325,346	3.3%	2.0%	\$ 4.24
County 16	83,021	\$ 50,000	\$ 87,271	\$ 33,076	\$ 35,832	\$ 14,206	\$ 26,541	\$ 6,292	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 253,217	2.5%	2.1%	\$ 3.05
County 2	86,034	\$ 50,000	\$ 90,438	\$ 4,134	\$ 4,134	\$ 14,299	\$ 31,928	\$ 17,859	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 212,793	2.1%	2.2%	\$ 2.47
County 34	100,486	\$ 50,000	\$ 105,630	\$ 30,319	\$ 11,025	\$ 32,331	\$ 22,993	\$ 35,272	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 287,570	2.9%	2.6%	\$ 2.86
County 10	107,156	\$ 50,000	\$ 112,641	\$ 38,588	\$ 39,966	\$ 10,560	\$ 26,672	\$ 5,422	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 283,851	2.8%	2.7%	\$ 2.65
County 21	118,270	\$ 50,000	\$ 124,324	\$ 39,966	\$ 27,563	\$ 17,234	\$ 27,066	\$ 13,470	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 299,625	3.0%	3.0%	\$ 2.53
County 9	163,141	\$ 50,000	\$ 171,492	\$ 8,269	\$ 6,891	\$ 16,177	\$ 21,154	\$ 14,229	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 288,211	2.9%	4.2%	\$ 1.77
County 14	206,583	\$ 50,000	\$ 217,158	\$ 37,210	\$ 26,185	\$ 24,287	\$ 24,438	\$ 19,724	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 399,003	4.0%	5.3%	\$ 1.93
County 23	320,448	\$ 50,000	\$ 336,852	\$ 28,941	\$ 16,538	\$ 53,198	\$ 26,015	\$ 59,719	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 571,262	5.7%	8.2%	\$ 1.78
County 19	354,764	\$ 50,000	\$ 372,924	\$ 13,782	\$ 15,160	\$ 16,703	\$ 27,855	\$ 16,345	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 512,768	5.1%	9.1%	\$ 1.45
County 3	384,697	\$ 50,000	\$ 404,389	\$ 2,756	\$ 2,756	\$ 17,091	\$ 13,008	\$ 24,191	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 514,191	5.1%	9.9%	\$ 1.34
County 32	547,451	\$ 50,000	\$ 575,475	\$ 1,378	\$ 1,378	\$ 34,030	\$ 16,424	\$ 51,793	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 730,478	7.3%	14.0%	\$ 1.33
County 25	757,371	\$ 50,000	\$ 796,141	\$ 20,672	\$ 17,916	\$ 23,423	\$ 26,409	\$ 49,578	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 984,140	9.8%	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: County Health Rankings, Health Factors/Health Behaviors, 2016.

³ Source: County Health Rankings, Health Outcomes, Overall, 2016.

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

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

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