

Summary of Gap Analysis and Impact of Cohort 2 Selection Process

Analysis of Cohort 1 AY23 + AY25 total funding by county showed the following counties as having a one percent or greater negative variance when compared to the PHAB Funding Formula. This indicates an underfunded population.

County Group	Total Cohort 1 Awards		Funding Formula Recommendations		Variance	
	Amt Allocated	Alloc %	Total Award	Award %	Total Award	Award %
Columbia	\$ 131,702.66	0.71%	\$ 338,459.98	1.82%	\$ (206,757.32)	-1.11%
Tillamook	\$ 91,702.66	0.49%	\$ 302,979.58	1.63%	\$ (211,276.92)	-1.14%
Yamhill	\$ 255,035.99	1.37%	\$ 487,755.07	2.62%	\$ (232,719.08)	-1.25%
Benton	\$ 79,202.66	0.42%	\$ 417,685.78	2.24%	\$ (338,483.12)	-1.82%
Linn	\$ 86,427.66	0.46%	\$ 554,160.54	2.97%	\$ (467,732.88)	-2.51%
Marion	\$ 764,940.03	4.10%	\$ 1,421,720.23	7.60%	\$ (656,780.20)	-3.49%
Douglas	\$ 174,710.16	0.94%	\$ 515,230.73	2.76%	\$ (340,520.57)	-1.83%
Deschutes	\$ 337,869.33	1.81%	\$ 625,286.90	3.35%	\$ (287,417.57)	-1.54%
Malheur	\$ 153,413.32	0.82%	\$ 346,883.87	1.87%	\$ (193,470.55)	-1.04%
Umatilla	\$ 297,413.32	1.60%	\$ 503,637.11	2.70%	\$ (206,223.79)	-1.11%

During the Cohort 2 RFGA selection process, these counties were considered priority populations and CBOs serving these areas were given extra consideration.

County Group	Cohort 1 Total Alloc %	Cohort 2 Total Alloc %	Change in Alloc % from C1 to C2	C2 CBO selection impact on addressing gaps	Does gap still exist?
Columbia	0.71%	0.00%	-0.71%	Did not have sufficient quality applications to address gap	Yes
Tillamook	0.49%	0.21%	-0.28%	Did not have sufficient quality applications to address gap	Yes
Yamhill	1.37%	4.31%	2.95%	Successfully bridged gap through C2 selection process	No
Benton	0.42%	7.72%	7.30%	Successfully bridged gap through C2 selection process	No
Linn	0.46%	11.89%	11.43%	Successfully bridged gap through C2 selection process	No
Marion	4.10%	3.93%	-0.17%	Did not have sufficient quality applications to address gap	Yes
Douglas	0.94%	0.00%	-0.94%	Did not have sufficient quality applications to address gap	Yes
Deschutes	1.81%	2.37%	0.56%	Made progress to address underfunding by increasing allocation % (C2 compared to C1)	Yes
Malheur	0.82%	0.30%	-0.52%	Did not have sufficient quality applications to address gap	Yes
Umatilla	1.60%	1.88%	0.28%	Successfully bridged gap through C2 selection process	No

Analysis of Cohort 1 AY23 + AY25 total funding by county also showed the following counties as having a one percent or greater positive variance when compared to the PHAB Funding Formula. This indicates an overfunded population.

County Group	Total Cohort 1 Awards		Funding Formula		Variance	
	Amt Allocated	Alloc %	Total Award	Award %	Total Award	Award %
Clackamas	\$ 2,774,627.34	14.88%	\$ 1,086,953.37	5.81%	\$ (1,687,673.97)	-9.07%
Washington	\$ 2,604,658.84	13.97%	\$ 1,713,998.12	9.15%	\$ (890,660.72)	-4.82%

Multnomah	\$ 3,814,959.84	20.46%	\$ 2,240,100.45	11.96%	\$ (1,574,859.39)	-8.50%
Jackson	\$ 1,045,856.70	5.61%	\$ 745,585.26	3.99%	\$ (300,271.44)	-1.62%

During the Cohort 2 RFGA selection process, these counties were given less consideration than priority populations.

County Group	Cohort 1 Total Alloc %	Cohort 2 Total Alloc %	Change in Alloc % from C1 to C2	C2 CBO selection impact on addressing overfunding	Still overfunded?
Clackamas	14.88%	6.48%	-8.40%	Made progress to address overfunding by decreasing allocation % (C2 compared to C1)	Yes
Washington	13.97%	8.27%	-5.70%	Made progress to address overfunding by decreasing allocation % (C2 compared to C1)	Yes
Multnomah	20.46%	14.71%	-5.75%	Made progress to address overfunding by decreasing allocation % (C2 compared to C1)	Yes
Jackson	5.61%	5.33%	-0.28%	Made minor progress to address overfunding by decreasing allocation % (C2 compared to C1)	Yes