

**Human Services Levy Review Committee Meeting Minutes for
The Franklin County Office on Aging
March 3, 2022**

CALL TO ORDER

The Human Services Levy Review Committee (HSLRC) meeting was called to order on Thursday, March 3, 2022, at 11:05 A.M.

ROLL CALL

- HSLRC members present: Jim Bowman; Jerry Friedman; Rose Handon, Ph.D.; and Zachary Talarek, Director, Office of Management and Budget.
- Office of Franklin County Commissioner Erica C. Crawley, Board President: Maggie Ash, Policy Aide; and Moriah Lieberman, Policy Director.
- Office of Franklin County Commissioner Kevin L. Boyce: Emily Cooner, Policy Aide.
- County Administration: Kenneth N. Wilson, County Administrator; Joy Bivens, Deputy County Administrator; and Toya A. Williams, Administrative Assistant II.
- Clerk's Office: Brittany A. Razek, Clerk to the Board of Commissioners & Director of Community Appointments.
- Office of Management and Budget (OMB): Rachel Buske, Budget Analyst 2; and Madeline Gresham, Budget Analyst 1.
- Franklin County Office on Aging (FCOA): Orvell Johns, Director; Amy Funk, Assistant Director; Caroline Rankin, Assistant Director of Support Services; Chandra Wingo, Assistant Director of Operations; Laurice Cohens, Program Administrator for Quality Improvement; Sheena Crawford, Quality Improvement Administrator; Brandon Halliburton, Deputy Director of Information Technology; Humera Khokhar, Workforce Administrator; Nancy Male, Grants Administrator; Tanya McDay, Executive Assistant; Jeff Roose, Manager of Finance and Operations; Barbara Sullivan, Program Administrator for Senior Options; Christian Durant, Social Services Supervisor; and Andrew Chrismer, Chief Alignment Officer, Health and Human Services.

INTRODUCTION

Ms. Buske announced that the purpose of the meeting was to review the 2022 Franklin County Office on Aging's levy request.

PRESENTATION OF FCOA 2022 LEVY PROPOSAL – FCOA STAFF

Mr. Johns began the presentation by introducing Office on Aging staff present at the meeting.

First, Mr. Johns explained that Ohio's population is expected to continue aging over the next few decades. During the last levy cycle, Franklin County residents, aged 60 years and older, increased. Franklin County has the highest number of aging residents, compared to all other major counties, in the state. Providing a safe and healthy environment in an affordable ecosystem, and quality care in Senior Options into the future is paramount to the aging population. The levy is estimated to generate \$50.3 million in 2023 and cost the owner of a \$100,000.00 home \$41.13/year (approximately \$0.11/day).

On behalf of county residents currently enrolled in Senior Options and the large number of those expected to enroll during 2023-2027, the Office on Aging requests a 1.75 mill renewal five-year levy be placed on the November 8, 2022, ballot.

Mr. Johns went on to discuss the Office on Aging's mission, vision, and history, along with demographics of the county's aging residents, as well as the growth of Franklin County. Mr. Johns emphasized the importance of its provider partners and grant partners and their ability to succeed in various areas because of these partnerships. The Director also provide a detailed explanation of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as the programs and services provided to the aging population during that time.

During the previous and the upcoming levy cycle, the Office on Aging is focused and committed to aligning programs and services, as outlined in the Franklin County Rise Together Poverty Blueprint. A thorough explanation of how the Office on Aging has directed their efforts was provided, along with the social determinants of health alignment that have been identified by their agency and the implementation of their new approach to service delivery. Next, an explanation of the levy history was provided to the Committee.

Subsequently, various staff members present from the Office on Aging provided further detailed information related to the agency's history and current staffing levels. Additionally, staff members gave an in-depth account and assessments of the community needs assessment and projected service levels, for Senior Options, as well as operational needs and financial needs, during the current and next levy cycles.

In closing, Director Johns reiterated the importance of their levy request to properly serve and suit the ongoing needs for Franklin County's aging population.

Q&A WITH FCOA STAFF

Dr. Handon: For your office and your team members and what it means for our community and residents, do you foresee any attention relative to the discussion in the future surrounding the continuing challenges the community faces as it relates to the COVID-19 pandemic?

Mr. Johns: Yes, we are still working with our partners to address those concerns and targeting that area because we do not feel that this will be going away and still on the mind of our seniors. We will continue efforts to educate and provide necessary services to our residents; this is our new normal.

Mr. Talarek: I do not have any follow-up questions at this time, but I do not know if Jim or Jerry, if you have any follow-up questions you would like to ask?

Mr. Friedman: I do have a couple of concerns about where you are going in terms of some of your new initiatives? For case management, how are the different tiers and levels of engagement assigned to a case manager?

Ms. Sullivan: We are using the stratification tool as a significant guide for us for determining what is best for that client based upon the various risk factors and the overall score that the client is placed with during their reassessments and initial assessments with the program.

Mr. Friedman: How would that stratification be distributed? Would you have a different number of high-risk people assigned to a case manager versus a mix of stratified cases for all managers?

Ms. Sullivan: Yes, we are looking at making sure that there is a mixture for both the case management levels at FCOA, as well as the more intensive face-to-face home visiting case management at the Central Ohio Area Agency on Aging (COAAA). Looking at what the appropriate caseload size would look like is something that we will be exploring this year. We just started implementing the stratification process, in 2021, so this is still a work in progress for us. However, we have explored the possibility of weighing cases to help determine a mix for the case managers' caseload. These are items we are exploring to develop best practices moving forward.

Mr. Friedman: Do you see at some point, down the line, paying based on those risk factors to better align the payment costs with the requirements of the individual?

Mr. Johns: One of the things you see in the aging community, as Barb said, is the intensive case management is being delivered by COAAA. What we are doing, even though you are seeing different stratification numbers, it is still part of the normal case management levels within FCOA. To your point, we would not see a need to provide different salary ranges for our case managers because they are going to be handling the same caseloads within the agency.

Mr. Friedman: You talked at some point about working closely with the hospitals in terms of reducing their readmission rates and trying to handle the transition from hospitalization into the community and keeping those folks continuously in good shape, so they do not get sent back to the hospital. Have you been able to calculate what amounts of benefit have accrued to the hospitals?

Ms. Rankin: Yes, we are working on that and working very hard collaborating with the hospitals systems and providers. We are having very intentional conversations about what that could look like. We work with them on discharge planning. When people are coming out of the hospital, we want them to be successful in the community and we do not want them to go back. We have started conversations with some of the hospitals to have case managers in the hospitals supporting

that and what that could like as well. There is interest in that because with the Emergency Departments, the hospitals do not have enough staff to meet the needs and what it would look like to have that covered for costs and operational needs.

Mr. Friedman: When you talk about a one door approach, and a number of people coming in through a number of agencies within the county, is there a unified case plan? Do you have access to understand what the other agencies are providing?

Ms. Bivens: In 2018, when we decided to do the Poverty Blueprint Plan, based on the Commissioners' vision to develop a universal plan, one of the things that the community indicated over those several hundred conversations was a human centric design across the community, was to have a One Door Policy. What that means is that no matter what door someone goes in, whether that is Job and Family Services, Justice Policy and Programs, Child Support, a senior should be offered the same services as all our other Health and Human Services agencies. For instance, if someone is going to Child Support to see about a child support case, someone should ask if they are food insecure. At this moment, since we are still in the early stages of developing our One Door, we just named our Chief Alignment Officer, and working with our contractors, we are in the process of assessing each agency and where is the continuity and where is not currently, so that those systems align. We are going to go from the front door to the back door. Regarding a universal case plan, we are not there yet because from what we understand is that policy and data are important, however, there are restrictions on a federal level. These restrictions prevent agencies from sharing data with one another. When we are going through this data, we will be speaking with our Commissioners and advocating for sharing data, so we can be able to have universal case plans.

Mr. Friedman: I notice that the providers that you contract with, that there are number of agencies that receive dollars from several the other county levy and service agencies. Is there some type of mechanism in which you look at the contracting with across agencies for a single provider to understand whether you are getting what you paid for or if you are paying twice for a client population? Are you contracting for comprehensive coverage to make sure you are not duplicating a payment or service through multiple agencies?

Ms. Bivens: Looking through our One Door policy and framework, one of the hopes and objectives is to align all our contractual work because we want to look at things through a multigenerational approach. We do understand that there are providers that multiple contracts because they service several different populations, whether that is youth or seniors. It is our job to combine those agencies to see where we can do combined contractual work, so that those contracts compliment the entire family and so that there is no duplication. Again, we are not there yet. We are just now having preliminary meetings regarding our One Door, but we can provide more information that will be forthcoming with scheduled meetings we will have in the next few weeks.

Mr. Friedman: I saw that you did a separate health assessment for seniors that you included in the package. Are you engaged with the community health assessment that is done every three years by the county and the city, and the Central Ohio Hospital Council?

Ms. Crawford: We were at the platform with them when they created their health assessment, however, the community partners that we worked with specifically, we did connect with and get their feedback. I do think there still some improvement that could be made regarding our partnership and making sure there is overlap and everyone is at the table.

//

With a committee quorum now present, the Committee moved forward with the election of the HSLRC Chairperson, and the review and approval of minutes could move forward.

ELECTION OF HSLRC CHAIRPERSON

The Committee decided to table the election of the HSLRC Chairperson until the next meeting.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Buske stated that the first item on the agenda was the approval of the September 21, 2021, meeting minutes. With no edits or comments, Mr. Friedman moved to approve the minutes and seconded by Mr. Bowman. All members voted “Aye” and the motion carried.

HSLRC MEETING SCHEDULE – APPROVAL OF TIMELINE

Ms. Buske walked the Committee through the draft timeline. The Committee had no objections to the timeline. With no comments, Mr. Bowman moved to approve the minutes and seconded by Mr. Friedman. All members voted “Aye” and the motion carried.

CLOSING REMARKS

Ms. Buske thanked the Office on Aging for its hard work and shared brief remarks of appreciation on behalf of County Administration and the Board of Commissioners.

A motion to adjourn the HSLRC meeting was made by Mr. Friedman and seconded by Dr. Handon.

With no further business before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 12:53 P.M.

//

These minutes are a general summary of the Human Services Levy Review Committee meeting of Thursday, March 3, 2022.

Submitted by:

Brittany A. Razek,
Clerk to the Board of Commissioners &
Director of Community Appointments