



Oregon's Kitchen Table – First Consultation Healthy People Outcome Area and Revenue Findings

Methodology

An online consultation was conducted among members of Oregon's Kitchen Table to inform the Governor of public priorities in developing the state's 10 Year Plan and the 2013-15 budget. For comparison purposes, the survey was also administered independently to a statewide representative sample. Below are the results for the healthy people outcome and revenue sections of the questionnaire. The results for the education outcome area and justice system sections have been reported and a final report, to be sent soon, will include the economy and jobs and healthy environment outcome areas.

Research Design: DHM Research emailed all Oregon's Kitchen Table panel members and invited them to participate in a consultation between June 11 and June 24, 2012. Project partners also emailed invites to different groups to complete the questionnaire. A total of 2,790 Oregonians participated in the consultation.

An additional 423 Oregonians participated in a companion scientific survey which was administered separately by Knowledge Networks.¹

Note to the Reader: Currently an experiment, Oregon's Kitchen Table gives Oregonians the chance to weigh in on tough public policy tradeoffs. The project gathers real-time feedback from every corner of our state to share with decision makers in Salem. In addition to providing participants an opportunity to prioritize public investments, the pilot consultation provided them an opportunity to record comments. This particular outreach effort engaged more than 3,000 Oregonians, generating 4,158 comments, at a much lower cost and less time than conducting a series of public meetings across the state. In the months ahead, Oregon's Kitchen Table is committed to involving more Oregonians in helping shape the state's

¹ Oregon's Kitchen Table would like to thank the Program for Public Consultation, a joint program of the Center on Policy Attitudes and the School of Public Policy at the University of Maryland, for its assistance with the scientific survey and its contribution of time and money to the First Consultation.

future, targeting population subgroups that are currently not proportionally represented in the panel. The project partners also look forward to conducting additional consultations which will involve administration of the full consultation, or parts of it, to a random sample of Oregonians for comparative analysis.

Healthy People

Health care costs are rising faster than the rate of inflation for families, businesses, and state government which provides coverage for 600,000 Oregonians on the Oregon Health Plan. To reduce costs and improve care, the state is working to better coordinate all forms of medical care, including physical, mental, and dental care. Here are some strategies that require investments but may also reduce costs in the long run as well as improving care. Next to each one please enter how many of your \$100 dollars you want to allocate to that strategy.²

Public Investments	Oregon's Kitchen Table	Representative Statewide Sample
Put more emphasis managing chronic conditions, like diabetes, heart disease and depression	\$20.30	\$24.30
Put more emphasis on prevention of chronic diseases, including reducing obesity, tobacco use, and drug and alcohol abuse	\$29.10	\$27.90
Put more emphasis on resources for Oregonians with intellectual and other developmental disabilities	\$15.00	\$17.10
Put more emphasis on providing in-home and community-based care, which costs more in the short run but saves money in the long run compared to emergency room care and hospital stays	\$27.80	\$26.30

Representative Comments

- "I believe that we need to realize that healthcare is something that should be available to ALL people. It is way past time for a National Healthcare System similar to the one in Canada. We ALL benefit from everyone being healthy, and having access to healthcare. It prevents diseases and conditions from coming back to haunt us from our past history. If we all have access to healthcare I benefit just as much as everyone else."
- "I think the government should stay out of the healthcare industry. They can help keep medical costs down by restricting many types of lawsuits and capping lawsuit amounts that can be collected. There should be no punitive damages, if a doctor or medical company is that negligent they should lose their right to practice and possibly go to jail."
- "If our focus is on preventative measures, this will perhaps lessen the need for managing chronic conditions. Resources are a viable entity in order to meet the public's individual needs."

² The questionnaire instructed respondents that they did not have to allocate all \$100.

- “Poor health care is one of the fundamental problems of a struggling society. When people are sick, they can't get or keep jobs, they can't attend school and are distracted when there. The worries over illness and associated costs are able to weigh down individuals and families, which drag communities with them.”
- “The key for health care is to pay healthcare providers for outcomes not fee for service. Until providers are financially incented to create health vs. provide healthcare, we will be swimming upstream.”

Observations

Respondents chose to allocate the most money to putting more emphasis on the prevention of chronic diseases, including reducing obesity, tobacco use, and drug and alcohol abuse, with a mean amount of \$29.10 allocated by OKT panel members and a mean amount of \$27.90 allocated by respondents in the companion statewide survey.

- Respondents noted that by funding the prevention of such conditions, upfront investment can limit the growth of related government spending in the future.
- OKT panel members (\$27.80 mean allocation) and respondents of the statewide sample survey (\$26.30 mean allocation) were most likely to choose in-home and community-based care as their second highest priority. Respondents noted that in-home care can serve as an effective preventative measure by catching medical issues early, thereby saving money and improving health outcomes in the long run.
- Respondents were least likely to allocate funding for greater emphasis on Oregonians with intellectual and other developmental disorders, with a mean amount of \$15.00 allocated by OKT panel members and a mean amount of \$17.10 allocated by respondents in the companion statewide survey. This could be attributed to the fact that issues such as tobacco use and obesity have treatments that have proven to be cost-effective, where developmental disorders require life-long investment. Additionally, preventative measures for smoking, obesity, and alcoholism are more widely understood than those for developmental disorders.

Below are several representative comments further illustrating a concern for the prevalence and cost of such chronic diseases as obesity, drug/alcohol abuse, etc. and the need for prevention as a means of avoiding increased expenditures in the future:

- “A short look around in any public venue will show one reason why health care costs are so high and will continue to be high--the percentage of people who are obese and/or smoking is over 50%. Whatever methods are used to counter this

cultural trend need to be effective. I have seen parents pass their cigarettes to their teenagers. The bad habits are being passed to the next generation.”

- “Prevention is a critical issue that is almost always overlooked when compared to providing services for existing conditions. Yet money invested in actually preventing a broad range of health conditions before they start can provide major cost savings down the road. For this reason, I have placed prevention at the highest funding level.”
- “Prevention and integrative community-based care should be key. Health care can't continue to be viewed as dealing with a series of symptoms or problems that are unconnected to anything else.”

Revenue

How do you rank the following statements in terms of how close each one comes to your thoughts about how the state should pay for the public services it provides. Select a unique rank for each item below. [Drop down list 1=closest to my thoughts; 2=second closest, 3=third closest, and 4=least closest]

Revenue Statement	Oregon's Kitchen Table- % Mentioned Closest To Thoughts	Representative Statewide Sample- % Mentioned Closest To Thoughts
The state needs to live within its current means. There is more than enough waste and inefficiency in state government to reinvest in new priorities.	27%	53%
I'd be willing to pay a little more in taxes for specific priorities, like improving education to deliver better results for students.	24%	18%
We need broad tax reform to provide more stability and protect vulnerable Oregonians during difficult times.	41%	21%
We need to find a way to tax our out of state visitors without creating a burden on Oregonians.	8%	9%

Representative Comments

- “Abolish the income tax Kicker, both personal and corporate. Oregon tax reform should include fewer tax credits, loopholes, and other special situations (even though I confess I take advantage of every one I can!).”
- “We don't need more tax cuts for the upper middle class and the wealthy. We need a real corporate tax, a realistic minimum corporate tax, and a progressive income tax that reflects Oregon values: support for families that need it and increasing expectations on those who have the means.”

- “We need a sales tax that excludes food and probably clothing, basics of living.”
- “I will vote for a sales tax if it replaces the income tax, but not for an added sales tax. I would pay a higher gas tax if it all goes to road maintenance. ODOT needs to be 90% outsourced.”
- “There is too much waste, too much unnecessary regulation that prevents people from helping other people. Let’s apply some common sense to our governing.”

Observations

Respondents were asked to consider their previous answers and to consider the revenue necessary to pay for such priorities over the next decade. Respondents were then read a series of revenue statements and were asked to indicate which came closest to their thinking.

Four in ten (41%) OKT panel members chose the need for broad tax reform to provide more stability and protect vulnerable Oregonians during difficult times, while a majority of respondents (53%) from the statewide companion survey said the state needs to live within its current means, and that its focus should be limiting waste and inefficiencies. Less than one in ten respondents on both surveys chose “we need to find a way to tax our out-of- state visitors without creating a burden on Oregonians.”

- This question above all others stimulated discussion of the proper relationship between private and public sector, with those advocating lower taxes indicating that government had become too large, and those advocating higher taxes (mainly on corporations) indicating that big business has not been paying its fair share. This division fell strongly along party lines. On the statewide companion survey, Republicans were nearly twice as likely to agree most strongly with the statement that the state needs to live within its current means than Democrats (73% vs. 37%).³
- The option of broad tax reform to provide more stability and protection for vulnerable Oregonians served as a springboard for many members to address the issue of the kicker, with the frequently posited idea of funneling that refund to social services.
- Verbatim responses indicated confusion with the option of taxing out-of-state visitors, as many thought it implied a statewide sales tax on all Oregonians, a proposal with traditionally low support in Oregon.

³ Political affiliations were not recorded in the OKT survey.

The following responses reflect commonly held attitudes about two important issues related to Oregon’s revenue system: budgeting for state employee benefits and entitlement programs and the kicker law.

- “The state should rethink the relationship between its revenues and its spending priorities. It should limit its spending on retirements and entitlements to the revenue it receives. In other words, it should start with a discussion about what is the maximum revenue it should pull out of the economy and lives of its citizen, and then cap all expenses to that maximum even if the amount available to retirements and entitlements vary from year to year.”
- “The kicker for individuals as well as businesses continues to drain money needed to build reserves for budget items. We will continue to have a paycheck-to-paycheck existence as a state until the kicker law is repealed or changed. Yes, the kicker is popular, but it is stifling progress for our state. Choosing to address the unpopular issues is necessary sometimes.”

What Do You Think About Oregon’s Kitchen Table?

(Statewide Representative Sample Only) Now that you have completed this process, we have a few questions about how you feel about this type of process.

Do you think that this process of citizens giving the Oregon government input on its priorities is:

	Rep. Statewide Sample
A very good idea	69%
A somewhat good idea	28%
A somewhat bad idea	0%
A very bad idea	1%
Don't know/refused	0%

How confident are you that the government will pay attention to the input from this process?

	Rep. Statewide Sample
Very confident	2%
Somewhat confident	29%
Not very confident	47%
Not confident at all	21%
Don't know/refused	1%

How confident are you that the views of Oregonians from this process will have some influence on government decisions?

	Rep. Statewide
--	----------------

	Sample
Very confident	4%
Somewhat confident	27%
Not very confident	50%
Not confident at all	18%
Don't know/refused	1%

Would you like to see the Oregon government consult the people on its priorities in this way in the future, or not? (Statewide Representative Sample Only)

	Rep. Statewide Sample
Would	95%
Would not	4%