

Franklin County Office on Aging (FCOA)
2017 1.3 Mill Renewal Levy with .45 Mill Increase Proposal

HSLRC Meeting Minutes
December 1, 2016

The Human Services Levy Review Committee (HSLRC) meeting was called to order by Jessie Hemphill on December 1, 2016 @ 3:13 pm.

ROLL CALL

HSLRC members present: Jesse Hemphill, Denise Bronson, Zak Talarek, Jean Carter Ryan and Nathan Wymer.

HSLRC members absent: Jerry Friedman and Jim Bowman.

Office of Management and Budget (OMB): Heidi Hallas and Garrett Crane.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Hemphill stated the next agenda item is the review and approval of the November 10, 2016 minutes. Ms. Carter Ryan had a question about a dollar amount on page 2 of the minutes. Ms. Hallas stated that she will clarify the dollar amount. Ms. Carter Ryan made a motion to approve the minutes. Dr. Bronson seconded the motion. All members voted “Aye” and Mr. Hemphill said motion carried.

VOTE ON HSLRC LEVY RECOMMENDATION

Mr. Hemphill: Last meeting we had a vote to approve the levy request as presented. We were missing three people. After the November 10th meeting, I emailed the three members who were absent. All three replied back that they were in consensus of the committee members that attended the meeting. I think there has been an informal consensus, but we need to have a formal vote.

The next agenda item is the vote and approval of the HSLRC levy recommendation. Dr. Bronson made a motion to approve the recommendation of the 1.3 Mill Renewal Levy with .45 Mill Increase. Ms. Carter Ryan seconded the motion. All members voted “Aye” and Mr. Hemphill said motion carried.

OPERATIONAL AND PROGRAMMATIC RECOMMENDATIONS DISCUSSION

Mr. Hemphill: Do you want to share with us the progress on the formal report?

Ms. Hallas: Sure. I sent it to the committee on Saturday. I think it is pretty much put together. What we talked about at our last meeting about the main ideas we wanted to address, as to why we are recommending this amount. Also, to what we would like to see Office on Aging do over the next five year levy cycle. I developed that into the report that I sent the committee. I am not sure if you have had a chance to review it or not. We can walk through the report page by page or focus on the two big pieces. Why we are recommending the request and the future recommendations for the next cycle.

Mr. Hemphill: I prefer the latter.

Dr. Bronson: I have not read it to that level of detail.

Ms. Hallas: As you review it, if you find anything that needs edited, you can always email them to me. We can focus on the main topics. We can skip the executive summary of the report because it is a summation of the report. The recommendations begin on page 19 (2016 Senior Options HSLRC Report). What are the supports for the recommendations? The first recommendation I listed was the Aging Population. I went back and looked at the census again. I talked about the growth and the further projections in the out years. Were there any questions on this topic?

The next recommendations was the actual Demand for Senior Services. I talked about what they have seen in this current levy cycle and what they are projecting for the next levy cycle, which is a little more flat than what has been happening in order to keep the levy amount lower. There was the 21% increase between 2013 and what they are projecting for 2017. That is a large increase. There is definitely demand for what they are asking for.

The next recommendation was the Increasing Functional Limitations Among Seniors. The Aging staff talked about the Scripps study that the residents are aging, but also the number of disabilities are increasing for that population. I included those statistics. There will be more growth in this area as we move forward. These are the type of individuals that Senior Options serve. One of the criteria of the program is what the functional limitation of the person is. That should increase demand as we move forward.

The next recommendation is the Stagnant Levy Revenues. Looking back historically, they saw a 24% growth in one levy cycle. That is not happening anymore. They have to ask for more millage in order to see additional funding to meet the need. That is a major driver. I also touched upon the tangible personal property tax (TPPT) portion. This was even more quickly phased out during this levy cycle. The acceleration just kept getting accelerated to the point that they will not get it any longer starting now. When it was supposed to be 2018-2019. I touched upon that loss. That was related to levy funding that the state was reimbursing, so I wanted to include that.

The last recommendation is Enabling Seniors to Remain in Their Homes. We kind of talked about the quality of life component. We are enabling seniors to remain in their homes. This is what most individuals want when surveys are completed. We talked about the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and what they reported as needs. They listed the services that Senior Options offers in order to keep them in their homes. It is cost effective compared to long term care facilities. Participants and their caregivers indicated that it has helped their loved ones maintain a good quality of life while in the program.

These are the five that I had and that we had touched on. Were there any comments? Are there any additional thoughts or information that should be included to help justify the request?

Mr. Hemphill: I have not had the chance to digest the report, so I would hold my comments.

Ms. Hallas: On page 22, we talk about the Operational and Programmatic Recommendations on what the committee would like to see the next time the agency comes back before you. The first one was the Identified Operational Opportunities that were presented by Direct Effect Solutions. The committee recommends that they implement those recommendations during the current levy cycle. I did not get into all of the nuances of them. If anyone wants it, they can ask for the report. They should consider and implement them to increase efficiencies and reduce expenditures. It is going to be a long process. I assume the next time they come in front of this committee they will update us on how far they have come along.

The second issue is the Assessing Need that we discussed. While they completed one this levy cycle, I think this is something they should regularly do. We know that the population is changing. We are now in the

“Boomer” population. The needs assessment they did this time around said that this generation is more open to asking for help. This is going to increase demand for service. This will help them keep a pulse on the community as more individuals come in and what the needs are and the changes. I think they should do this at least once a levy cycle to help inform their decision making.

Ms. Carter Ryan: I was looking at the Assessing Need issue and the third one, Increasing Costs for Contracted Services. I keep getting stuck on the fact that Franklin County residents are paying more for senior services than the other urban counties. I feel like I do not have a good grasp of the model. I guess I need information about what is so different between Hamilton and Cuyahoga offer their seniors. What do we offer that they don’t? Do we have that many more seniors? I know we went over some of that, but I feel like I still don’t understand it. What do we offer and why is it so important to our seniors? If I am looking at this from a statewide perspective, we are an outlier. I want to make sure that we do not lose focus on are we doing all we can to manage cost. Are those things that we shouldn’t be doing because of costs? That is something I would like to see as part of the next levy review cycle.

Ms. Hallas: I am not sure if that could be its own point or underneath an issue listed.

Mr. Talarek: Some of that may be captured by issue four, Reliance on Property Tax Levy Revenues. It benefits the state and federal government that we are keeping seniors in their homes. I think globally, there is a benefit. We are bearing all that costs for these services when it really should be part of Medicare or Medicaid and providing contributions. I know Mr. Friedman talked about hospitals participating. Maybe we can beef up Issue 4. I think from the report of Direct Effect, the information Office on Aging provided and the research that Ms. Hallas has done that these are the services that work. We might not be the ideal paying source because we are not necessarily receiving the return to the county. It is helping the state, federal and the other private hospitals. It is about making sure everyone pays their fair share.

Ms. Hallas: Maybe under Issue 4. Where would you put it?

Ms. Carter Ryan: I am not sure if it fits in this category. It may be information for this committee to receive.

Mr. Wymer: It is about best practices, correct?

Ms. Carter Ryan: When it comes down to it that is correct.

Mr. Wymer: What are they doing to identify best practices now moving forward?

Mr. Hemphill: Ms. Hallas, in terms of the menu of services that we provide in Franklin County, aren’t we the “Cadillac” of services in the state?

Ms. Hallas: We are.

Mr. Hemphill: The fact that we provide such an array of services, is that the reason our costs are higher compared to the other counties?

Ms. Hallas: Absolutely. It is what we are providing. I have mentioned this several times that it was meant to be a model that the state Office on Aging was going to embrace in the early 1990s. We were going to be that model replicated throughout the state and it stopped. This community really liked the model, so they went to the levy. Folks continue to vote for it. It is not a mandated service. It is allowed under the Revised Code as a property tax issue. We are a county who uses it and gets approval for it. Delaware County is kind of on par with us and is the only other county that is embracing our model. I understand what you are saying Ms. Carter Ryan and why we are bearing the costs when there are a lot of beneficiaries from these services.

What I hear from County Administration is this county embraces it and utilizes the programs. I do not know why other counties do not want it, but we do.

Ms. Carter Ryan: I think those are all significant points. Is there a way for them to help us understand how they are identifying best practices both nationally and internationally?

Mr. Wymer: I believe we talked about this before. I go back to recommendation 1. It is the question about the role of this committee. It would be great to do a kind of a mid-term check-in during this levy cycle.

Ms. Hallas: We did it, but only one or two committee members attended.

Mr. Wymer: I know because it is tough with schedules, but at least you are getting the information out to the committee and keeping them updated. It would be great to do the mid-review and add the component of identifying best practices to the conversation.

Dr. Bronson: In their original report, they submitted a lot of information about best practices. I think they are really referring those and trying to implement them. It just happen that best practices cost more money. I think they are cognizant of what the best practices are and that is what we are paying for.

Mr. Wymer: I know we struggle with that as a company. When you are doing well, sometimes it is harder to stay at that level. So how do you stay fresh and keep from being stagnant.

Ms. Hallas: I know programmatically, they are doing best practices. As we found out in the Operational Review, there are ways they can improve how they are operating because they are operating like they are a very small agency but they have 100 employees. I am hopeful that they are able to implement them and really see what that means. As I sat through the Job and Family Services' budget hearing today, they talked about doing group case management. Their case managers have about 600 cases each and the responses took a really long time. They changed that to a team approach and it has shown amazing results. There are less complaints and 2/3 of the cases are getting resolved immediately. It has completely revolutionize how they are working. This pilot is getting pushed out to the rest of the department. You can see where case management is moving this way. Hopefully this is something Aging can replicate and serve more people.

If people would like to continue the practice of meeting midway through the levy cycle, I can continue to set those meetings up. I do not know if we would like to include that as a specific item. I could inform Office on Aging that when they do come in for their midway check-in, I can give them a list of what the committee is looking for.

Ms. Carter Ryan: I think that is important enough.

Ms. Hallas: Is that a recommendation or something you want to mention at the end?

Mr. Wymer: I think it could be a paragraph in recommendation 1.

Ms. Hallas: Ok.

Mr. Hemphill: Are we talking about something like a dashboard, Ms. Hallas?

Ms. Hallas: Maybe. It is going to take them a long time to build one.

Ms. Carter Ryan: I think it is important to have. It does not have to be a lot, but show that it is important. It is beyond operationally.

Ms. Hallas: Ok. It can be Issue 5. I want to make sure I lay out specifically what you all want when they come back for their midway check-in. You talked about identifying best practices.

Ms. Carter Ryan: I was thinking Issue 5 was best practices and do the updates when they come in somewhere else in the report.

Ms. Hallas: Ok. Not only identifying best practices, but also sharing them with the committee.

Mr. Wymer: This is a technical thing, but should that be before Issue 1 or after for flowing purposes?

Ms. Hallas: Should it be Issue 1 or Issue 2?

Mr. Wymer: I think it should be Issue 2.

Ms. Hallas: Issue 2 will be Identifying and sharing best practices. Did you want to include anything about comparisons with other counties?

Ms. Carter Ryan: I would like to understand that a little bit better. I know they presented the information, but I feel it was not as pulled out as I would like. I think Aging should know that this is a concern.

Mr. Wymer: I do not believe it should be limited to the United States.

Ms. Hallas: During my research, there are a ton of research about Asian nations on their practices. There should also be some good information that will come out of the Age Friendly Columbus study.

Mr. Hemphill: Is that a new initiative that is ongoing?

Ms. Hallas: Correct. MORPC is taking the lead and it is a designation by the World Health Organization. I think AARP is helping as well. They come in to assess housing accessibility, transportation, etc. Is this a community that people can age and thrive? Office on Aging is a partner on this and this will allow Columbus to market the city as an Age Friendly city. We should know in the next few years if awarded.

I mentioned toward the end of the report, if you are running out of cash, come back and let's talk about it. So that might be something we say at mid-levy, we want an update and if there are any concerns with making it through the whole levy cycle, bring those concerns at the mid-levy review.

Mr. Wymer: Have we done anything like this before?

Ms. Hallas: Yes. ADAMH has it.

Ms. Carter Ryan: Do we really want to put this language in there? It seems to me that we are opening the door before you have to. To me it seems like if they are having a problem, it is their job to let us know that there is a problem and here are some recommendations. As opposed to saying don't worry come back to us if you need money.

Mr. Wymer: I do not remember that before.

Ms. Carter Ryan: I know we did it last time because we were worried about ADAMH. Maybe that was the first time we did it.

Ms. Hallas: We did it for the last Aging levy because we were concerned about the population growth. I know it was in the last ADAMH because they were changing their system. We can take it out or make them come back at mid-levy and give us an update and leave it at that.

Mr. Wymer: In the likely event that it may happen, it would go through the normal process of going to the Commissioners first. Then to us.

Mr. Hemphill: At the mid-levy review, if the projections do not bear out what the outcomes are, let us know now so we are aware of them and make modifications to minimize the impact.

Dr. Bronson: That has not been our job in the past. That is the agency's job to figure out how to get through the levy.

Mr. Hemphill: Let's not open Pandora's box.

Mr. Wymer: They are just checking in with the committee that made recommendations to give an update on the recommendations. My question is that if they do find themselves in need of additional money, they would send a letter to the Commissioners, and they would determine the next course of action.

Ms. Hallas: If they wanted a ballot issue or increase the amount, they would put it before this committee. Depending on the timeliness.

Mr. Talarek: I think logically, just say give the update at your mid-levy review. If you have go to the point if you are going to run out of money, you would have to go through the normal process anyway. If in 2019, there was a change in the law that decreased the revenue significantly, that is something that they should report on.

Ms. Hallas: Not saying come back to us and we will fix it. We can strike the paragraph (See HSLRC Report pg. 26) and say give us an update at your mid-levy review.

Mr. Talarek: And give us a status of where you are in comparisons to your projections.

Ms. Hallas: I will place the language at the end of the report. We are on what is now Issue 4 (formerly Issue 3 Increasing Costs for Contracted Services). We have discussed at one point that taxpayers are going to tap out and say this is too much money. The biggest cost driver is the contracted service piece. The committee on several occasions talked about what are some opportunities to save dollars. One of those were some alternative methods in contracting. Looking at bulk purchases with fewer providers, if there is the capacity for them to provide those services. Looking at purchasing agreements with other county senior service agencies and other various Area Agencies on Aging. If they can come together to leverage their purchases, hopefully that would decrease a per unit rate. Are there any other comments on this Issue? We are telling them to explore it to see if there is any opportunity. We are always asked to look at cooperative purchasing. This is another opportunity for them.

Mr. Talarek: They will continue to work with the County Purchasing Department for the cooperative agreements to make sure they are competitive.

Dr. Bronson: We have been consistent with other recommendations as well. It is not just Aging, correct?

Ms. Hallas: I do not think we have talked about this before.

Mr. Hemphill: What would be an example of an expenditure line item we can use that approach to?

Ms. Hallas: These are related to their durable medical equipment. They could come together to get a larger bulk so the per unit rate would go down. Or the home care services, they could partner with the COAAA, or Delaware Senior Services to get more services to lower the rate. It's about being a little bit more proactive to come together before sending out the proposal.

Mr. Talarek: I think one example is the medical alert. There are about four or five different vendors. I know for some categories there is opportunity, but in others like the community based, they are smaller providers. They need the network of providers because if one provider has 800 clients and the provider disappears, it could be harmful. That would create a gap and have to search for other providers.

Mr. Hemphill: Will transportation be one of the areas they could use the cooperative agreement approach?

Mr. Talarek: Depending on how the SmartCity initiative goes, they could possibly partner with them on transportation issues. It is a balancing act.

Mr. Hemphill: Will using Uber be expanding their sources?

Ms. Hallas: They would have to bid.

Mr. Talarek: Yes. My understanding of the SmartCity is that the transportation card would be universal and could be used with multiple transportation methods.

Ms. Hallas: I know that the SmartCity group has asked Ms. Carroll to be at the table and be a voice for the seniors as they are developing those programs. We are not going to say that is going to happen, but it is something to look at.

Dr. Bronson: With some of their technology needs, could that be a place where they use cooperative agreements or not?

Ms. Hallas: Such as?

Dr. Bronson: In the report, there was a recommendation to redo their case management system.

Ms. Hallas: I did not touch it specifically, but it is in Issue 1. They can still look at state-term options.

Mr. Talarek: They could do a competitive bid with a state-term contract.

Ms. Hallas: Anything else for the Costs for Contracted Services? The last Issue is Reliance on Property Tax Levy Revenues. In 2015, it was a 94.4% of their total revenues, which was significant. Realizing that the hospitals are benefitting now with the penalties in regards to the readmission rates. Who is benefiting from the cost savings through us providing these services? We need to approach them and having conversations about what that means. I talked about trying to meet with state and federal representatives on their impact on the Medicare and Medicaid programs. That would require some cost benefit analysis so they could say that the seniors in our program are less reliant on Medicaid funds and here is how much we are saving you. With the local hospital systems, could they partner with them on their readmission processes? Now the hand off to the home based and community care is through Aging and the hospitals can contribute funds for this. It is about talking to those who are beneficiaries and not just coming to the Franklin County taxpayers. I think it is time for Aging to consider that. The consultant also talked about the local business community and discussing collaborative opportunities with them. Often times the employee is the primary caregiver. There is a lot of missed time from work and productivity because they have to assist with an elderly parent or spouse. Looking at other opportunities who are impacted by this. The impact is only going to grow. Kind of thinking outside of the box. What are some other opportunities? The other thing is looking

at other collaborative funding opportunities, grants, and establishing a non-profit arm so we can apply for grants as a 501(c)(3). Right now we cannot apply for some grants because we are a government entity. Who else is at the table and who can we work with to bring additional funds to their coffers. We cannot continue to pay for this as the amount of seniors go up. We do not want them to shut their doors. They need to think about this now. Any other recommendations or thoughts?

Ms. Carter Ryan: I think it is in good shape.

Ms. Hallas: What I am going to do now is take the feedback from today and the edits I have received so far and put together a second draft. My deadline is December 12th, so wait to do your read of the report until I send you the final draft. At the next meeting we will discuss any final comments and vote on the report. Is there anything else?

Mr. Hemphill: As I look at the agenda and next steps, is the December 12, 2016 the next meeting?

Ms. Hallas: No. The next meeting is December 15, 2016. The 12th is when I will send out the report with the changes we discussed today. If you have any edits now, please send them to me soon. My goal is to get you the second draft on the 12th and meet on the 15th. December 15, will be our final meeting for this levy review process. Then there are the dates in January for the Briefing and General Session. I will discuss those at the next meeting to see who from the committee can be at the Briefing and General Session to represent the committee. I will also bring up that the Board of Developmental Disabilities are moving forward to come to us in February or March of next year. They are leaning towards a renewal. It might be a short review. They will be voting at their February board meeting on their final request and present to us in early March.

Dr. Bronson: When will they be on the ballot?

Ms. Hallas: This fall or spring. It really depends on how Aging is going to pan out. Let's say if Aging goes on in the spring and does not pass, then they will have another opportunity in the fall to get on the ballot. If so, Developmental Disabilities will wait and go on the ballot next spring. I have already given them your checklist and they have already been working on it. Mr. Wilson had me to put together a timeline on what it would mean for them because it is coming up quick with the holidays.

Developmental Disabilities have a six year levy and a continuous levy. This is their six year levy that is coming up. They are definitely doing a renewal, but considering the length. They potentially could do a continuous. They are a system in a lot of flux as well. There are a lot of changes that they are going through. They are getting out of education, which is pretty much done. It is more integrated funding now. They are in the school systems and do not have their own building. I think they are down to one building and whoever is left, they will let graduate but are not letting folks in. They have to get out of the adult services altogether. Medicaid ruled that they could no longer be a case manager and also provide services. It is a conflict of interest. They have until 2022 to be out of the game altogether.

Dr. Bronson: And you think this will be an easy one?

Ms. Hallas: Because they do not want more money.

Ms. Carter Ryan: Are they going to be offering less services?

Ms. Hallas: They still pay for the services, but they cannot be the provider of the services.

Dr. Bronson: So it will be more of an ADAMH model?

Ms. Hallas: Yes. They can still provide children services under 18 years old, but no longer with adults. It is really shifting their entire model. Developmental Disabilities has done a great job with leveraging their federal waivers. That is one reason they can ask for a renewal is because of the uptick in federal funding. Their reliance on levies has gone down during this levy cycle. This allows them to have some cash to be flexible to keep going.

I will contact County Administration to check on their timeline and with Development Disabilities. I know they have mentioned meeting at a different time. We can discuss next time.

Ms. Carter Ryan: I would prefer first thing in the morning. It is easier to get on about my day. If the committee wants to stick with 3-5pm I am fine with that.

Mr. Wymer: You mean for the 15th?

Ms. Hallas: No. We mean for the next levy cycle.

Mr. Hemphill: I am ok with Thursday. There were some conflicts on Thursdays, but I will go with the flow.

Mr. Talarek: I know Tuesday and Thursday morning would be a conflict for the commissioners.

Ms. Hallas: We can discuss this later. I wanted to get the draft together. If we do decide to change it, I will let Developmental Disabilities know so they can plan their meetings around ours.

CLOSING REMARKS

The next HSLRC meeting will be held Thursday, December 15th from 3:00-5:00pm at 373 S. High Street, 26th Floor in the Briefing Room.

Mr. Wymer made a motion to close the HSLRC meeting and Dr. Bronson seconded.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:06 pm.