

# AGENDA

## **PUBLIC HEALTH ADVISORY BOARD Incentives and Funding Subcommittee**

**Aug 31, 2016**

**2:00-3:00 pm**

Portland State Office Building, 800 NE Oregon St., Room 918, Portland, OR 97232

Webinar: <https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/2759949384914434305>

Conference line: (877) 873-8017

Access code: 767068

Meeting Chair: Tricia Tillman

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

### Meeting Objectives

- Review work plan
- Discuss funding formula models and make a recommendation for which model to use
- Discuss subcommittee update for Sept. 12<sup>th</sup> PHAB meeting
- Set agenda for Sept. 13<sup>th</sup> subcommittee meeting

---

<b>2:00-2:05 pm</b>	<b>Welcome and introductions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Approve July meeting minutes</b></li></ul>	Tricia Tillman, Meeting Chair
<b>2:05-2:15 pm</b>	<b>Review Incentives and Funding subcommittee work plan</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discuss relationship between funding formula and gaps identified in the modernization assessment report</li><li>• Discuss scope of work and timeline for completing tasks for upcoming meetings</li></ul>	Tricia Tillman, Meeting Chair
<b>2:15-2:50 pm</b>	<b>Discuss three funding formula models</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Describe the methodology for each model</li><li>• Review comparison of three models, including how each model impacts counties in each size band</li><li>• Make an initial recommendation for which model to use for the public health modernization funding formula.</li></ul>	Subcommittee members
<b>2:50-2:55 pm</b>	<b>Subcommittee business</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identify who will give subcommittee update at Sept. 12<sup>th</sup> PHAB meeting</li><li>• Set agenda and identify Chair for Sept. 13<sup>th</sup> subcommittee meeting</li></ul>	Subcommittee members

---

---

---

**2:55-3:00 pm**      **Public comment**

---

---

**3:00 pm**      **Adjourn**

---

---

Tricia Tillman,  
Meeting Chair

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

**July 12, 2016  
1:00-2:00 pm**

Portland State Office Building, 800 NE Oregon St., Room 1C, Portland, OR 97232  
Conference line: (877) 873-8017  
Access code: 767068

**Meeting chair:** Akiko Saito

**PHAB subcommittee members present:** Silas Halloran-Steiner, Jeff Luck, Alejandro Queral, Akiko Saito, Tricia Tillman

**PHAB subcommittee members absent:** none

**OHA staff:** Sara Beaudrault, Cara Biddlecom, Chris Curtis, Angela Rowland

**Members of the public:** none

---

**Welcome and introductions – Akiko Saito**

**Approval of minutes – Akiko Saito**

Subcommittee members voted to approve the June 15th, 2016 subcommittee meeting minutes. All in favor.

**Continue work to develop funding formula – Subcommittee members**

The funding formula now contains six indicators (population, health status, burden of disease, racial/ethnic diversity, poverty and limited English proficiency). Members discussed whether other indicators should be added.

Alejandro questioned whether additional indicators make the formula too confusing. Silas stated that with too many indicators, it becomes difficult to understand the meaning and adds administrative burden. The allocation or weight assigned to each indicator is more important than the number of indicators.

Tricia questioned the difference between the poverty indicators versus other indicators of economic well-being. Members proposed possible indicators including new jobs, education, cost of housing, unemployment, and income inequality. Data sources may include the Oregon Community Foundation and American Community Survey.

[http://www.oregoncnf.org/Templates/media/files/reports/top\\_indicators\\_2015.pdf](http://www.oregoncnf.org/Templates/media/files/reports/top_indicators_2015.pdf) Akiko asked whether a poverty or SES indicator could be pulled from multiple data sources. Chris stated this possible with a ranking system. Members discussed what would be gained by including a poverty measure. LHDs in areas of the state with higher poverty

levels may have a greater demand for services to community members, and an inherent level of risk may exist in those communities. Silas voiced concern of unintended consequences if these indicators were to become performance-based metrics. Cara clarified that these are included in the base components of the funding formula, not the incentives component that will be developed by the Accountability Metrics subcommittee. She will bring these concerns forward to that group.

Alejandro stated that this funding formula may work in opposing directions. For the base component, poorer health outcomes or greater need results in more funding. But for the incentives components, improved health or less need results in more funding. This will be important to keep in mind over time as this formula is modified each biennium. Akiko stated that funding for the first years should focus on where the needs are, with movement toward an incentives-based approach. The public health system is underfunded, and this needs to be addressed before incentives kick in.

Tricia stated that base funding should be based on stable characteristics of the population. Public health interventions could be tied to burden of disease or health poverty to allow change in the system.

Subcommittee members approve the six indicators that are currently included in the model, with the understanding that more work will happen to develop the poverty indicator. PHD will bring a list of potential data sources to the next meeting for review.

#### *Data sources*

Subcommittee members reviewed options for data sources listed on the indicators matrix.

Members agreed to look at a premature death measure for burden of disease. Another option is disability due to disease.

Quality of life is a generally accepted measure of health status. Other suggestions include tobacco use or obesity. Tricia appreciates that the health status metric is an aggregate of many health factors and would like to see it across the life span.

#### *Allocations across indicators*

Silas proposes 50 - 75% of the base funding be tied to population with 5-10% for the indicators. This will keep funding levels stable; it is a cautious approach. Akiko supports a 50% allocation to population as a starting place. Jeff suggested a larger allocation for health equity. Tricia proposed tying racial/ethnic diversity and limited English proficiency to per capita as well.

The group was not prepared to come to a consensus on the percentages. PHD staff will develop alternative models for the next meeting to see which counties benefit or don't under different models. Alejandro pointed out that funding per capita is pretty equitable under the existing model. The group will consider modernization assessment gaps as well.

**Discuss subcommittee update for July 21st PHAB – Subcommittee members**

Akiko will provide a subcommittee update at the July 21st PHAB meeting.

**Set agenda for August meeting – Subcommittee members**

Tricia will chair next month's meeting.

Possible agenda topics:

- Members to bring recommended data sources.
- Look at alternative funding models created by the PHD.
- Look at the gaps in the modernization assessment

**Public comment – No public testimony.**

**Adjournment – Akiko Saito**  
The meeting was adjourned.

DRAFT

# Oregon Public Health Advisory Board Incentives and Funding Subcommittee

2016-17 Work Plan

August 2016 DRAFT

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

**Key subcommittee deliverables:**

- Provide guidance to OHA on the development of a funding formula, including the use of matching funds and incentives
- Develop a funding formula communication tool

**As recommended by PHAB, other subcommittee deliverables may include:**

- Work with PHAB Accountability Metrics subcommittee to ensure accountability for funding received and improved health outcomes
- Assist OHA and PHAB to brief the legislature about public health funding and incentives
- Provide information to counties or other stakeholders who may advocate for increased public health funding
- Explore additional funding sources to support public health modernization

Meeting Date	Topics	Presenters(s)	Actions/Deliverables
April 18, 2016	Discuss organizational business	Cara Biddlecom, OHA Public Health Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elect a subcommittee Chair</li> <li>• Determine meeting time and frequency</li> <li>• Determine engagement of non-PHAB members in subcommittee work</li> </ul>
	Review scope of the subcommittee, including timeline for deliverables per House Bill 3100	Jeff Luck, PHAB Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review House Bill 3100 for subcommittee guidance</li> </ul>
	Discuss resources and information needed to fulfill deliverables	Subcommittee members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compile list of needed resources</li> </ul>

May 17, 2016	Review subcommittee work plan	Alejandro Queral, Meeting Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve work plan</li> </ul>
	Review funding formula guidance document, funding formula framework and other supporting documents	Cara Biddlecom, OHA Public Health Division	
	Provide initial input to OHA on components and criteria to include in funding formula	Subcommittee members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate subcommittee's recommended changes to draft funding formula</li> <li>• <b>Ongoing:</b> provide subcommittee updates and solicit feedback at monthly PHAB meetings</li> </ul>
June 15, 2016	Provide input on draft funding formula. Recommend that draft funding formula be shared at June PHAB meeting.	Subcommittee members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate subcommittee's recommended changes to draft funding formula</li> <li>• Present draft funding formula at June PHAB meeting</li> <li>• <b>Ongoing:</b> provide subcommittee updates and solicit feedback at monthly PHAB meetings</li> </ul>
July 12, 2016	Review funding formula with changes recommended by PHAB. Continue to develop funding formula.	Subcommittee members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate subcommittee's recommended changes to draft funding formula</li> <li>• <b>Ongoing:</b> provide subcommittee updates and solicit feedback at monthly PHAB meetings</li> </ul>
August 31, 2016	<u>Review three models for funding formula and discuss impacts on each county size band.</u>	Subcommittee members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Initial recommendation made for which model to use for public health modernization funding formula.</u></li> <li>• <b>Ongoing:</b> provide subcommittee updates and solicit feedback at monthly PHAB meetings</li> </ul>

September 13, 2016	<u>Complete indicators matrix (list of indicators, data sources and percent allocation for each indicator)</u>	<u>Subcommittee members</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Indicators matrix completed</u></li> </ul>
	<u>Discuss timeline for incorporating state matching funds for county investments and incentive payments for performance on accountability measures</u>	<u>Subcommittee members</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Guidance provided by subcommittee members on timeline for incorporating additional funding formula components</u></li> <li>• <b>Ongoing:</b> provide subcommittee updates and solicit feedback at monthly PHAB meetings</li> </ul>
<u>October 11, 2016</u>	<u>Review draft of complete funding formula (using model recommended by subcommittee and with updated indicators). Make recommendations for changes</u>	<u>Subcommittee members</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Recommendations made for changes needed to draft funding formula</u></li> </ul>
	<u>Discuss communication needs for funding formula</u>	<u>Subcommittee members</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>List of communication needs compiled</u></li> <li>• <b>Ongoing:</b> provide subcommittee updates and solicit feedback at monthly PHAB meetings</li> </ul>
November 8, 2016	Make recommendation to approve funding formula	<u>Subcommittee members</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Recommendation made to approve funding formula</u></li> </ul>
	<u>Continue discussion about communication needs for funding formula</u>	<u>Subcommittee members</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Communication needs identified</u></li> </ul>
	<u>Make recommendation to adjourn subcommittee meetings until after 2017 legislative session</u>	<u>Subcommittee members</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ongoing:</b> provide subcommittee updates and solicit feedback at monthly PHAB meeting</li> </ul>
July/August 2017	Review outcome of 2017 legislative session as it relates to funding for public health modernization	Cara Biddlecom, OHA Public Health Division	
	Review funding formula. Discuss whether changes are needed based on 2017 legislative session.	Subcommittee members	



	<u>Explore funding opportunities to support public health modernization</u>	<u>Subcommittee members</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Ongoing:</b> provide subcommittee updates and solicit feedback at monthly PHAB meetings</li></ul>
--	---	-----------------------------	--

DRAFT

**PHAB Funding and Incentives Subcommittee**

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

County population	50%
Burden of disease	10%
Health status	10%
Racial/ethnic diversity	10%
Poverty	10%
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			
<b>Model 1: Per Capita.</b> All indicators are tied to county population	In addition to allocating 50% of available 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).	\$10M tied to county population	\$2.56 (\$1.86 - \$4.02)	\$2.48 (\$1.91 - \$3.34)	\$2.28 (\$1.86 - \$2.74)	(\$2,899 - \$2,074,638)	(\$2,899 - \$37,506)	(\$715,739 - \$2,074,638)	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.
<b>Model 2: Per Capita Population Indicators Only.</b> Some indicators are tied to county population. Allocations for other indicators are based solely on each county's actual results.	In addition to awarding 50% of available 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.	\$7M tied to county population; \$3M not tied to county population	\$2.56 (\$1.70 - \$52.48)	\$17.56 (\$6.13 - \$52.48)	\$1.92 (\$1.70 - \$2.06)	(\$61,078 - \$1,513,405)	(\$61,078 - \$150,719)	(\$652,184 - \$1,513,405)	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.
<b>Model 3: County Floor.</b> County payments include a floor. No indicators 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. Base payments account for \$1.8M of the \$10M investment. The indicators are not tied to county population.	\$4.1 tied to county population; \$4.1M not tied to county population; \$1.8M tied to base funding	\$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  
 August, 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 (funding tied to per capita) favors large and extra large counties, whereas Model 3 (includes a base payment to all counties) favors small and extra small counties.

County Group	Population <sup>1</sup>	% of Total Population	Model 1 - Per Capita			Model 2 - Per Capita Popl. Ind. Only			Model 3 - County Floor		
			Total Award	Award Percentage	Award Per Capita	Total Award	Award Percentage	Award Per Capita	Total Award	Award Percentage	Award Per Capita
County 33	1,357	0.0%	\$ 2,899	0.0%	\$ 2.14	\$ 71,219	0.7%	\$ 52.48	\$ 119,660	1.2%	\$ 88.18
County 31	6,893	0.2%	\$ 14,646	0.1%	\$ 2.12	\$ 77,315	0.8%	\$ 11.22	\$ 121,027	1.2%	\$ 17.56
County 12	7,253	0.2%	\$ 21,493	0.2%	\$ 2.96	\$ 150,719	1.5%	\$ 20.78	\$ 185,362	1.9%	\$ 25.56
County 11	7,325	0.2%	\$ 13,961	0.1%	\$ 1.91	\$ 61,078	0.6%	\$ 8.34	\$ 109,615	1.1%	\$ 14.96
County 18	7,854	0.2%	\$ 20,764	0.2%	\$ 2.64	\$ 115,457	1.2%	\$ 14.70	\$ 169,634	1.7%	\$ 21.60
County 24	11,217	0.3%	\$ 37,504	0.4%	\$ 3.34	\$ 104,336	1.0%	\$ 9.30	\$ 267,701	2.7%	\$ 23.87
County 1	16,049	0.4%	\$ 35,691	0.4%	\$ 2.22	\$ 98,355	1.0%	\$ 6.13	\$ 142,110	1.4%	\$ 8.85
County 7	20,798	0.5%	\$ 47,795	0.5%	\$ 2.30	\$ 104,329	1.0%	\$ 5.02	\$ 157,650	1.6%	\$ 7.58
County 15	21,830	0.6%	\$ 79,040	0.8%	\$ 3.63	\$ 191,348	1.9%	\$ 8.77	\$ 271,419	2.7%	\$ 12.43
County 8	22,341	0.6%	\$ 54,875	0.5%	\$ 2.40	\$ 120,116	1.2%	\$ 5.38	\$ 163,875	1.6%	\$ 7.34
County 13	22,620	0.6%	\$ 68,583	0.7%	\$ 3.03	\$ 99,437	1.0%	\$ 4.40	\$ 263,943	2.6%	\$ 11.67
County 28	25,334	0.6%	\$ 67,252	0.7%	\$ 2.65	\$ 133,545	1.3%	\$ 5.27	\$ 191,083	1.9%	\$ 7.54
County 30	25,736	0.7%	\$ 65,176	0.7%	\$ 2.54	\$ 135,362	1.4%	\$ 5.26	\$ 178,343	1.8%	\$ 6.93
County 26	29,103	0.7%	\$ 83,760	0.8%	\$ 2.88	\$ 144,349	1.4%	\$ 4.96	\$ 325,737	3.3%	\$ 11.19
County 22	30,740	0.8%	\$ 123,711	1.2%	\$ 4.02	\$ 222,933	2.2%	\$ 7.25	\$ 329,466	3.3%	\$ 10.72
County 4	37,236	1.0%	\$ 98,180	1.0%	\$ 2.64	\$ 153,282	1.5%	\$ 4.12	\$ 199,861	2.0%	\$ 5.37
County 20	46,138	1.2%	\$ 122,365	1.2%	\$ 2.65	\$ 167,996	1.7%	\$ 3.64	\$ 210,528	2.1%	\$ 4.56
County 5	49,325	1.3%	\$ 107,164	1.1%	\$ 2.17	\$ 140,142	1.4%	\$ 2.84	\$ 174,688	1.7%	\$ 3.54
County 6	62,678	1.6%	\$ 177,765	1.8%	\$ 2.84	\$ 213,806	2.1%	\$ 3.41	\$ 235,594	2.4%	\$ 3.76
County 17	65,985	1.7%	\$ 212,809	2.1%	\$ 3.23	\$ 248,748	2.5%	\$ 3.77	\$ 276,040	2.8%	\$ 4.18
County 27	76,464	2.0%	\$ 193,820	1.9%	\$ 2.53	\$ 209,139	2.1%	\$ 2.74	\$ 244,210	2.4%	\$ 3.19
County 29	76,645	2.0%	\$ 265,568	2.7%	\$ 3.46	\$ 284,112	2.8%	\$ 3.71	\$ 325,346	3.3%	\$ 4.24
County 16	83,021	2.1%	\$ 729,235	2.3%	\$ 2.76	\$ 238,535	2.4%	\$ 2.87	\$ 253,217	2.5%	\$ 3.05
County 2	86,034	2.2%	\$ 175,024	1.8%	\$ 2.03	\$ 183,274	1.8%	\$ 2.13	\$ 212,793	2.1%	\$ 2.47
County 34	100,486	2.6%	\$ 271,366	2.7%	\$ 2.70	\$ 266,638	2.7%	\$ 2.65	\$ 287,570	2.9%	\$ 2.86
County 10	107,156	2.7%	\$ 306,145	3.1%	\$ 2.86	\$ 281,373	2.8%	\$ 2.63	\$ 283,851	2.8%	\$ 2.65
County 21	118,270	3.0%	\$ 332,840	3.3%	\$ 2.81	\$ 299,398	3.0%	\$ 2.53	\$ 293,625	3.0%	\$ 2.53
County 9	163,141	4.2%	\$ 326,782	3.3%	\$ 2.00	\$ 297,378	3.0%	\$ 1.82	\$ 288,211	2.9%	\$ 1.77
County 14	206,583	5.3%	\$ 587,729	5.9%	\$ 2.85	\$ 452,920	4.5%	\$ 2.19	\$ 399,003	4.0%	\$ 1.93
County 23	320,448	8.2%	\$ 1,024,119	10.2%	\$ 3.20	\$ 813,579	8.1%	\$ 2.54	\$ 571,262	5.7%	\$ 1.78
County 19	354,764	9.1%	\$ 816,154	8.2%	\$ 2.30	\$ 627,228	6.3%	\$ 1.77	\$ 512,768	5.1%	\$ 1.45
County 3	384,697	9.9%	\$ 715,739	7.2%	\$ 1.86	\$ 652,184	6.5%	\$ 1.70	\$ 514,191	5.1%	\$ 1.34
County 32	547,451	14.0%	\$ 1,225,229	12.3%	\$ 2.24	\$ 1,126,967	11.3%	\$ 2.06	\$ 730,478	7.3%	\$ 1.33
County 25	757,371	19.4%	\$ 2,074,638	20.7%	\$ 2.74	\$ 1,513,405	15.1%	\$ 2.00	\$ 984,140	9.8%	\$ 1.30
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,900,343</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$ 10,000,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$ 2.56</b>	<b>\$ 10,000,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$ 2.56</b>	<b>\$ 10,000,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$ 2.56</b>

county size bands
extra small
small
medium
large
extra large

**PHAB Funding and Incentives Subcommittee**

Subcommittee Members: Silas Halloran-Steiner, Jeff Luck, Alejandro Queral, Akiko Saito, Tricia Tillman  
August, 2016

**Model 1: Per Capita.** All indicators tied to county population

County Group	Population <sup>1</sup>	County Population <sup>1</sup>	Burden of Disease <sup>2</sup>	Health Status <sup>3</sup>	Race/Ethnicity <sup>4</sup>	Poverty <sup>5</sup>	Limited English Proficiency <sup>6</sup>	Matching Funds <sup>7</sup>	Incentives <sup>8</sup>	Total Award <sup>9</sup>	Award Percentage	% of Total Population	Award Per Capita
County 33	1,357	\$ 1,740	\$ 222	\$ 437	\$ 101	\$ 359	\$ 40	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,899	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 2.14
County 31	6,893	\$ 8,836	\$ 628	\$ 3,255	\$ 363	\$ 1,419	\$ 144	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,646	0.1%	0.2%	\$ 2.12
County 12	7,253	\$ 9,298	\$ 3,962	\$ 4,981	\$ 678	\$ 2,404	\$ 170	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21,493	0.2%	0.2%	\$ 2.96
County 11	7,325	\$ 9,390	\$ 1,067	\$ 1,101	\$ 502	\$ 1,722	\$ 178	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,961	0.1%	0.2%	\$ 1.91
County 18	7,854	\$ 10,068	\$ 3,718	\$ 2,866	\$ 1,235	\$ 2,237	\$ 640	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,764	0.2%	0.2%	\$ 2.64
County 24	11,217	\$ 14,380	\$ 3,472	\$ 2,407	\$ 7,857	\$ 3,112	\$ 6,278	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 37,506	0.4%	0.3%	\$ 3.34
County 1	16,049	\$ 20,574	\$ 3,507	\$ 5,511	\$ 1,239	\$ 4,219	\$ 641	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,691	0.4%	0.4%	\$ 2.22
County 7	20,798	\$ 26,662	\$ 4,166	\$ 6,249	\$ 3,194	\$ 5,831	\$ 1,692	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 47,795	0.5%	0.5%	\$ 2.30
County 15	21,830	\$ 27,985	\$ 13,118	\$ 15,930	\$ 8,971	\$ 7,141	\$ 5,895	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 79,040	0.8%	0.6%	\$ 3.62
County 8	22,341	\$ 28,640	\$ 2,848	\$ 14,385	\$ 2,839	\$ 5,187	\$ 975	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 54,875	0.5%	0.6%	\$ 2.46
County 13	22,620	\$ 28,997	\$ 1,648	\$ 1,942	\$ 14,451	\$ 5,450	\$ 16,105	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 68,593	0.7%	0.6%	\$ 3.03
County 28	25,334	\$ 32,477	\$ 6,458	\$ 13,050	\$ 5,157	\$ 6,585	\$ 3,524	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 67,252	0.7%	0.6%	\$ 2.65
County 30	25,736	\$ 32,992	\$ 8,904	\$ 11,600	\$ 2,297	\$ 7,141	\$ 2,403	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 65,336	0.7%	0.7%	\$ 2.54
County 26	29,103	\$ 37,308	\$ 9,539	\$ 11,243	\$ 9,100	\$ 7,523	\$ 9,075	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 83,789	0.8%	0.7%	\$ 2.88
County 22	30,740	\$ 39,407	\$ 19,032	\$ 18,473	\$ 21,046	\$ 12,659	\$ 13,094	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 123,711	1.2%	0.8%	\$ 4.02
County 4	37,236	\$ 47,734	\$ 10,849	\$ 19,980	\$ 6,219	\$ 8,755	\$ 4,624	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 98,160	1.0%	1.0%	\$ 2.64
County 20	46,138	\$ 59,146	\$ 10,922	\$ 26,737	\$ 8,038	\$ 11,656	\$ 5,865	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 122,365	1.2%	1.2%	\$ 2.65
County 5	49,325	\$ 63,232	\$ 17,964	\$ 9,528	\$ 4,581	\$ 9,580	\$ 2,280	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 107,164	1.1%	1.3%	\$ 2.17
County 6	62,678	\$ 80,349	\$ 28,533	\$ 41,702	\$ 7,570	\$ 16,201	\$ 3,409	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 177,765	1.8%	1.6%	\$ 2.84
County 17	65,985	\$ 84,589	\$ 38,449	\$ 46,735	\$ 15,610	\$ 17,923	\$ 9,503	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 212,809	2.1%	1.7%	\$ 3.23
County 27	76,464	\$ 98,022	\$ 32,024	\$ 9,847	\$ 20,341	\$ 19,430	\$ 14,157	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 193,820	1.9%	2.0%	\$ 2.53
County 29	76,645	\$ 98,254	\$ 43,265	\$ 37,835	\$ 40,230	\$ 20,595	\$ 25,389	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 265,568	2.7%	2.0%	\$ 3.46
County 16	83,021	\$ 106,428	\$ 36,282	\$ 46,328	\$ 11,713	\$ 24,490	\$ 3,993	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 229,235	2.3%	2.1%	\$ 2.76
County 2	86,034	\$ 110,290	\$ 4,700	\$ 5,540	\$ 12,218	\$ 30,530	\$ 11,746	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 175,024	1.8%	2.2%	\$ 2.03
County 34	100,486	\$ 128,817	\$ 40,255	\$ 17,254	\$ 32,265	\$ 25,680	\$ 27,095	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 271,366	2.7%	2.6%	\$ 2.70
County 10	107,156	\$ 137,367	\$ 54,635	\$ 66,696	\$ 11,238	\$ 31,766	\$ 4,442	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 306,145	3.1%	2.7%	\$ 2.86
County 21	118,270	\$ 151,615	\$ 62,455	\$ 50,768	\$ 20,244	\$ 35,579	\$ 12,179	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 332,840	3.3%	3.0%	\$ 2.81
County 9	163,141	\$ 209,137	\$ 17,824	\$ 17,507	\$ 26,211	\$ 38,357	\$ 17,745	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 326,782	3.3%	4.2%	\$ 2.00
County 14	206,583	\$ 264,827	\$ 101,567	\$ 84,243	\$ 49,830	\$ 56,113	\$ 31,149	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 587,729	5.9%	5.3%	\$ 2.85
County 23	320,448	\$ 410,795	\$ 122,538	\$ 82,532	\$ 169,304	\$ 92,657	\$ 146,293	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,024,119	10.2%	8.2%	\$ 3.20
County 19	354,764	\$ 454,786	\$ 64,600	\$ 83,756	\$ 58,850	\$ 109,833	\$ 44,329	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 816,154	8.2%	9.1%	\$ 2.30
County 3	384,697	\$ 493,158	\$ 14,010	\$ 16,513	\$ 65,299	\$ 55,617	\$ 71,141	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 715,739	7.2%	9.9%	\$ 1.86
County 32	547,451	\$ 701,799	\$ 9,969	\$ 11,750	\$ 185,021	\$ 99,934	\$ 216,756	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,225,229	12.3%	14.0%	\$ 2.24
County 25	757,371	\$ 970,903	\$ 206,869	\$ 211,318	\$ 176,187	\$ 222,311	\$ 287,049	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,074,638	20.7%	19.4%	\$ 2.74
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,900,343</b>	<b>\$ 5,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,000,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 10,000,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$ 2.56</b>

county size bands
extra small
small
medium
large
extra large

<sup>1</sup> Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

<sup>2</sup> Source: County Health Rankings, Health Factors/Health Behaviors, 2016.

<sup>3</sup> Source: County Health Rankings, Health Outcomes, Overall, 2016.

<sup>4</sup> Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

<sup>5</sup> Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

<sup>6</sup> Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2012.

<sup>7</sup> 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

<sup>8</sup> 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  
August, 2016

**Model 2: Per Capita Population Indicators Only.** Some indicators are tied to county population. Allocations for other indicators are based solely on each county's actual results

County Group	Population <sup>1</sup>	County Population <sup>1</sup>	Burden of Disease <sup>2</sup>	Health Status <sup>3</sup>	Race/Ethnicity <sup>4</sup>	Poverty <sup>5</sup>	Limited English Proficiency <sup>6</sup>	Matching Funds <sup>7</sup>	Incentives <sup>8</sup>	Total Award <sup>9</sup>	Award Percentage	% of Total Population	Award Per Capita
County 33	1,357	\$ 1,740	\$ 15,126	\$ 25,210	\$ 101	\$ 29,002	\$ 40	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 71,219	0.7%	0.0%	\$ 52.48
County 31	6,893	\$ 8,836	\$ 8,403	\$ 36,975	\$ 363	\$ 22,593	\$ 144	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 77,315	0.8%	0.2%	\$ 11.22
County 12	7,253	\$ 9,298	\$ 50,420	\$ 53,782	\$ 678	\$ 36,372	\$ 170	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150,719	1.5%	0.2%	\$ 20.78
County 11	7,325	\$ 9,390	\$ 13,445	\$ 11,765	\$ 502	\$ 25,797	\$ 178	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 61,078	0.6%	0.2%	\$ 8.34
County 18	7,854	\$ 10,068	\$ 43,697	\$ 28,571	\$ 1,235	\$ 31,245	\$ 640	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 115,457	1.2%	0.2%	\$ 14.70
County 24	11,217	\$ 14,380	\$ 28,571	\$ 16,807	\$ 7,857	\$ 30,444	\$ 6,278	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 104,336	1.0%	0.3%	\$ 9.30
County 1	16,049	\$ 20,574	\$ 20,168	\$ 26,891	\$ 1,239	\$ 28,842	\$ 641	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 98,355	1.0%	0.4%	\$ 6.13
County 7	20,798	\$ 26,662	\$ 18,487	\$ 23,529	\$ 3,194	\$ 30,764	\$ 1,692	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 104,329	1.0%	0.5%	\$ 5.02
County 15	21,830	\$ 27,985	\$ 55,462	\$ 57,143	\$ 8,971	\$ 35,892	\$ 5,895	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 191,348	1.9%	0.6%	\$ 8.77
County 8	22,341	\$ 28,640	\$ 11,765	\$ 50,420	\$ 2,839	\$ 25,477	\$ 975	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 120,116	1.2%	0.6%	\$ 5.38
County 13	22,620	\$ 28,997	\$ 6,723	\$ 6,723	\$ 14,451	\$ 26,438	\$ 16,105	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 99,437	1.0%	0.6%	\$ 4.40
County 28	25,334	\$ 32,477	\$ 23,529	\$ 40,336	\$ 5,157	\$ 28,521	\$ 3,524	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 133,545	1.3%	0.6%	\$ 5.27
County 30	25,736	\$ 32,992	\$ 31,933	\$ 35,294	\$ 2,297	\$ 30,444	\$ 2,403	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 135,362	1.4%	0.7%	\$ 5.26
County 26	29,103	\$ 37,308	\$ 30,252	\$ 30,252	\$ 9,100	\$ 28,361	\$ 9,075	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 144,349	1.4%	0.7%	\$ 4.96
County 22	30,740	\$ 39,407	\$ 57,143	\$ 47,059	\$ 21,046	\$ 45,185	\$ 13,094	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 222,933	2.2%	0.8%	\$ 7.25
County 4	37,236	\$ 47,734	\$ 26,891	\$ 42,017	\$ 6,219	\$ 25,797	\$ 4,624	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 153,282	1.5%	1.0%	\$ 4.12
County 20	46,138	\$ 59,146	\$ 21,849	\$ 45,378	\$ 8,038	\$ 27,720	\$ 5,865	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 167,996	1.7%	1.2%	\$ 3.64
County 5	49,325	\$ 63,232	\$ 33,613	\$ 15,126	\$ 4,581	\$ 21,311	\$ 2,280	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 140,142	1.4%	1.3%	\$ 2.84
County 6	62,678	\$ 80,349	\$ 42,017	\$ 52,101	\$ 7,570	\$ 28,361	\$ 3,409	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 213,806	2.1%	1.6%	\$ 3.41
County 17	65,985	\$ 84,589	\$ 53,782	\$ 55,462	\$ 15,610	\$ 29,803	\$ 9,503	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 248,748	2.5%	1.7%	\$ 3.77
County 27	76,464	\$ 98,022	\$ 38,655	\$ 10,084	\$ 20,341	\$ 27,880	\$ 14,157	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 209,139	2.1%	2.0%	\$ 2.74
County 29	76,645	\$ 98,254	\$ 52,101	\$ 38,655	\$ 40,230	\$ 29,482	\$ 25,389	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 284,112	2.8%	2.0%	\$ 3.71
County 16	83,021	\$ 106,428	\$ 40,336	\$ 43,697	\$ 11,713	\$ 32,367	\$ 3,993	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 238,535	2.4%	2.1%	\$ 2.87
County 2	86,034	\$ 110,290	\$ 5,042	\$ 5,042	\$ 12,218	\$ 38,936	\$ 11,746	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 183,274	1.8%	2.2%	\$ 2.13
County 34	100,486	\$ 128,817	\$ 36,975	\$ 13,445	\$ 32,265	\$ 28,040	\$ 27,095	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 266,638	2.7%	2.6%	\$ 2.65
County 10	107,156	\$ 137,367	\$ 47,059	\$ 48,739	\$ 11,238	\$ 32,527	\$ 4,442	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 281,373	2.8%	2.7%	\$ 2.63
County 21	118,270	\$ 151,615	\$ 48,739	\$ 33,613	\$ 20,244	\$ 33,008	\$ 12,179	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 299,398	3.0%	3.0%	\$ 2.75
County 9	163,141	\$ 209,137	\$ 10,084	\$ 8,403	\$ 26,211	\$ 25,797	\$ 17,745	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 297,378	3.0%	4.2%	\$ 1.82
County 14	206,583	\$ 264,827	\$ 45,378	\$ 31,933	\$ 49,830	\$ 29,803	\$ 31,149	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 452,920	4.5%	5.3%	\$ 2.19
County 23	320,448	\$ 410,795	\$ 35,294	\$ 20,168	\$ 169,304	\$ 31,726	\$ 146,293	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 813,579	8.1%	8.2%	\$ 2.54
County 19	354,764	\$ 454,786	\$ 16,807	\$ 18,487	\$ 58,850	\$ 33,969	\$ 44,329	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 627,228	6.3%	9.1%	\$ 1.77
County 3	384,697	\$ 493,158	\$ 3,361	\$ 3,361	\$ 65,299	\$ 15,863	\$ 71,141	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 652,184	6.5%	9.9%	\$ 1.70
County 32	547,451	\$ 701,799	\$ 1,681	\$ 1,681	\$ 185,021	\$ 20,029	\$ 216,756	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,126,967	11.3%	14.0%	\$ 2.06
County 25	757,371	\$ 970,903	\$ 25,210	\$ 21,849	\$ 176,187	\$ 32,206	\$ 287,049	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,513,405	15.1%	19.4%	\$ 2.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,900,343</b>	<b>\$ 5,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,000,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 10,000,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$ 2.56</b>

county size bands
extra small
small
medium
large
extra large

<sup>1</sup> Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

<sup>2</sup> Source: County Health Rankings, Health Factors/Health Behaviors, 2016.

<sup>3</sup> Source: County Health Rankings, Health Outcomes, Overall, 2016.

<sup>4</sup> Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

<sup>5</sup> Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

<sup>6</sup> Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2012.

<sup>7</sup> 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

<sup>8</sup> 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  
August, 2016

**Model 3: No Per Capita Floor.** County payments include a floor of \$50,000

County Group	Population <sup>1</sup>	Floor	County Population <sup>1</sup>	Burden of Disease <sup>2</sup>	Health Status <sup>3</sup>	Race/Ethnicity <sup>4</sup>	Poverty <sup>5</sup>	Limited English Proficiency <sup>6</sup>	Matching Funds <sup>7</sup>	Incentives <sup>8</sup>	Total Award <sup>9</sup>	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
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,900,343</b>	<b>\$ 1,800,000</b>	<b>\$ 4,100,000</b>	<b>\$ 820,000</b>	<b>\$ 820,000</b>	<b>\$ 820,000</b>	<b>\$ 820,000</b>	<b>\$ 820,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 10,000,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$ 2.56</b>

county size bands
extra small
small
medium
large
extra large

<sup>1</sup> Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

<sup>2</sup> Source: County Health Rankings, Health Factors/Health Behaviors, 2016.

<sup>3</sup> Source: County Health Rankings, Health Outcomes, Overall, 2016.

<sup>4</sup> Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

<sup>5</sup> Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2009-2014.

<sup>6</sup> Source: American Community Survey population 5-year estimate, 2012.

<sup>7</sup> 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

<sup>8</sup> 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

# Programmatic gaps in current governmental public health system, 2017-19 priority areas

These results, when viewed collectively for the six foundational programs and capabilities that have been prioritized for 2017-19, show that implementation is uneven across the system.

