

## ADHC LOB Phase II

### Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

12/19/17

<b>Committee Name:</b>	ADHC Phase II Steering Committee
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	Lincolnia Center , Room # 138 at the Lincolnia Senior Center
<b>Date and Time:</b>	Tuesday December 19, 2017

#### Attendees:

Evan Braff, Elynn Crawford, John Rosalyn Foroobar, Katie Horstman, Kathy Hoyt, Suzanne Lane, Kay Larmer, Shauna Severo, Janice Siegel, Michelle Milgrim, Jennifer Robinson

<b>Agenda Item:</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>	<b>Outcome/Action Steps</b>
<b>Welcome</b>	Shauna Severo	
<b>Review First Draft of Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Executive Summary</li><li>• Benchmarking Analysis</li><li>• Cost Benefit Analysis<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Scenario #1 Continued Operation by the County</li><li>○ Scenario #2 Privatize One Center</li><li>○ Scenario #3 Privatize All Centers</li></ul></li><li>• CBA Assumptions</li></ul>	Shauna Severo	Executive summary was based on the financial assessment of the ADHC Program and the benchmarking findings. It also provided a brief description of the 3 ADHC scenarios to consider.

Agenda Item:	Responsible Party	Outcome/Action Steps
<p><b>Group Discussion of Cost Benefit Analysis</b></p>	<p>All Members</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question was asked about Scenario #2, and why the new innovative and integrated approach to all LTC services in a co-located site couldn't be done now with county resources. Shauna stated that currently the Senior Center, Senior + Services and ADHC are run by two different agencies with different budgets and different organizational structures and consolidation could present challenges; consolidation could be accomplished by also having one private not-for-profit (NFP) administrator oversee all of the services offered at one site.</li> <li>• Kay asked how oversight would be provided. Shauna stated that we have provided oversight to several county programs offered through a contractual agreement (e.g. Maternity Services, CHCN, and Assisted Living). Evan described how oversight is successfully being done with NCS's contract with Service Source. He also described lessons learned from first RFP and contract to provide Sr. + services, and that we could not be so prescriptive and to allow the vendor to describe how they would meet our needs.</li> <li>• Katie Horstman reiterated the need to distinguish the difference between county cost reductions and cost recovery in the report.</li> <li>• Kay asked why Lewinsville was chosen, especially because when at full capacity, they would generate the most revenue. Much discussion over this topic. Initially it was chosen because of the reduced number of participants and it coincided with the transition scheduled to occur spring of 2019 when participants in the temporary Senior Center and ADHC Center sites move back into the newly renovated Lewinsville site. Rosalyn stated that it appears now, however, the transition will have already been completed prior to any ADHC LOB Phase II decisions. The steering committee felt that it would be valuable to analyze the financial impact of privatizing each one of the centers prior to our next meeting to ascertain whether there is any benefit of selecting one center over another for consideration in Scenario #2.</li> </ul>

Agenda Item:	Responsible Party	Outcome/Action Steps
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Longevity and quality of the staff was discussed, and concern that both would go down with a private vendor. There was much discussion regarding the quality of services offered by staff at both of the private NFP centers the Steering Committee visited. Several Steering Committee members shared that both of the NFP centers visited were known for providing quality services.</li> <li>• The group discussed the BOS charge and agreed that we were to provide an analysis of different options and to make recommendations to the BOS. The BOS will ultimately make the final decision.</li> <li>• Lynn asked what would happen if the BOS decided to go with Scenario #2 but the county was not satisfied with the services offered. Rosalyn and Katie explained that the county has some recourse if a contract does not fulfill their contractual obligations. Lynn also emphasized the difference between establishing a partnership with a private NFP to operate the program instead of outsourcing or privatizing the program completely. The former offering the county more engagement and oversight.</li> <li>• Several committee members thought that if the BOS selected option #2 or #3 the county should pursue a Request for Interest (RFI) prior to a Request for Proposal (RF) to assess the level of interest and ability amongst potential private NFP providers.</li> <li>• Kay asked about looking at participants' assets as part of the fee level determination. Jennifer said this is already being done and that we add 2% of assets (excluding a home) to their income. Katie asked if we should look at paralleling what the state does with assets to determine Medicaid eligibility. The program will explore this as option.</li> <li>• Lynne stated that the move of the government to privatize, shrinks the government by eliminating good middle class jobs that pay a living wage and offer benefits. She also noted that it is</li> </ul>

Agenda Item:	Responsible Party	Outcome/Action Steps
		<p>hard to measure the impact of staff tenure on the quality of services offered by long term county staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rosalyn said historically the county has been successful in finding positions for staff when a facility is closed or a program downsized.</li> <li>• Shauna reiterated that regardless of what course of action is taken the HD is committed to increasing enrollment to full capacity; but this should not prevent the county from pursuing opportunities to explore more innovative and integrated models of service at one of the co-located sites.</li> <li>• Kay asked why the county cannot provide a more integrated approach to serving older adults and adults with disabilities by consolidating all of the services designed for this population under one agency. Shauna shared that a recommendation to consolidate services had been explored several years ago; but was deferred for reconsideration at a later date due to budget constraints.</li> </ul>
<b>Next Meeting</b>	Shauna Severo	TBD