

Board Officers

Sue Horn, Chair  
Jack Hilbert, Vice Chair  
Rachel Zenzinger, Secretary  
Jackie Miller, Treasurer  
Dennis McCloskey, Immediate Past Chair  
Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director

**AGENDA**

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGING**  
**FRIDAY, April 19, 2013**  
**12:00 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**1290 Broadway Denver, CO 80203**  
***Independence Pass, First Floor***

1. Call to Order and Introductions
2. Public Comment Period
3. Approval of Summary of the March 15, 2013 Meeting  
(Attachment A)

**ACTION ITEMS**

4. Motion to recommend to the DRCOG Board of Directors Administrative Committee service provider contracts for the contract cycle 2013-2015 and allocation of monies from the Federal Older Americans Act (OAA) and State Funding for Senior Services (SFSS) for State Fiscal Year 2013-14. – Steve Watson, Chair ACA Funding Subcommittee  
(Attachment B)

**INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS**

5. Project Visibility Program Presentation – Chandra Matthews  
(Attachment C)
6. Status of Subcommittee Work Plans
  - a. Funding Subcommittee – Steve Watson

**BREAK**

7. Update from the Area Agency on Aging Director – Jayla Sanchez-Warren
8. Older American's Coalition and Legislative Update – Rich Mauro

Disabled attendees are asked to notify DRCOG at least 48 hours of the need for auxiliary aids or services





9. Livable Communities/Planning – Jayla Sanchez-Warren
10. Compliance Program Report – Chandra Matthews
11. Information and Assistance – Nicole Hartog
12. Chair Report – Bob Davis
13. Information Sharing - [All if time]
14. Adjournment



# ATTACH A



**ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGING  
MEETING SUMMARY  
March 15, 2013**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Dawn Perez	Adams County
Maxine Seyforth	Adams County
Cathy Noon	Arapahoe County
Jim Fleenor	Arapahoe County
Michelle Clopton	Arapahoe County
Bob Davis	City and County of Broomfield
Fabyan Watrous	Clear Creek County
Janet Romarine	Clear Creek County
Muriel Arvay	Denver County
Jean Richards	Denver County
Steve Watson	Douglas County
Jodie McCann	Douglas County
Kay Johnson	Gilpin County
Bob Lanky	Jefferson County
Cliff Mueller	DRCOG Board
Randy Penn	DRCOG Board
Sharon Richardson	DRCOG Board
Jim Taylor	DRCOG Board

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Jayla Sanchez-Warren, Chandra Matthews, Amber Rowell, Shannon Gimbel, Nicole Hartog, Lisa McCroskey DRCOG staff. Vivian Stovall, Colorado Council on Aging (CCOA). Tricia Stevens from Diana Degettes office.

**Call to Order**

Bob Davis called the meeting to order at 12:15 pm.

**Colorado Care Transitions Program Presentation** – Chandra Matthews provided and distributed a presentation. Discussion was had.

**Public Comment-** Tricia Stevens reported on housing programs possibly ending because of sequestration. She encouraged the committee to keep sending stories to their legislators. Jim Taylor invited members of the committee to attend the Sustainable Community Initiative session Friday the 22. Amber Rowell thanked committee members that helped prepare for Senior Day at the Capitol and reminded the committee about event details.

**Approval of Summary of the March 15,2013 meeting**

Sharon Perea APPROVED the summary, Cathy Noon SECONDED. Summary PASSED unanimously.





**Older Americans Coalition and Legislative Update** –Rich Mauro advised the committee that the materials DRCOG has created on sequestration have proved very helpful to members of the community. Rich reported that the Joint Budget Committee has approved \$4 million in the Long Bill for “senior services.” The Medicaid expansion bill (SB 200) has passed out of the Senate and is expected to move through the system. Senate Bill 111, the Elder Abuse Mandatory Reporting bill has passed out of committee and is in Senate Appropriations. Senate Bill 127, the funding increase for the Older Coloradans Fund is also sitting in Senate Appropriations. We are confident it will pass. On Monday, March 18 the Legislative Council Staff and the Office of State Planning and Budgeting is expected to release their March quarterly forecast. After that, the Long Bill (budget) process will dominate legislative activity the following two weeks.

**Funding Subcommittee** – Steve Watson reported that there are 4 new members on the funding subcommittee. The new members are participating very much and there have been several good discussions. The committee has met 3 times totaling 9 hours and will meet 3 more times before the next ACA meeting. This year there were fifty two proposals submitted twenty one of them were new proposals.

**Report from the Area Agency on Aging Director** – Jayla Sanchez Warren distributed her Directors report and went over highlights. Discussion was had.

**Livable Communities/Planning** –report was provided as part of the Directors report.

**Ombudsman Program Report** –Shannon Gimbel advised the committee that she did a taping with Mayor Ron Rakowsky from Greenwood Village and Channel 8 to discuss selecting a Care Community, the Ombudsman program and Network of Care. She updated the committee that 2 of the assisted Living Ombudsman testified in a hearing against a facility that has ongoing issues with abuse. Centers for Medicaid and Medicare (CMS) rolled an initiative a year ago to decrease the use of antipsychotropic medication being used with Alzheimers. The initiative is referred to as the Partnership to Improve Dementia Care in Nursing Homes. It is being applied to all nursing facilities even if the facility is not treating patients or residents with dementia. The goal is to see an overall percentage reduction of the use of antipsychotropic medication due to research showing it is a dangerous. This was supposed to be completed by January 2013 however Colorado just started its partnership meetings in February 2013. Shannon has seen a lot of misunderstandings in the facilities regarding the medications and the reductions. She and her staff will be doing their best to educate facilities and families on the issue.

**Compliance Program Update** – Chandra advised the committee that she preferred not to have provider presentation during the review of proposals. She provided a presentation on the Community Care Transitions Program (CCTP) and distributed materials to the committee. Discussion was had.



**Information and Referral Program** – Nicole Hartog reported that the C4A (Colorado Area Agencies on Aging) has received a grant from CHF (Colorado Health Foundation) for the local Area Agency on Aging (AAA) Adult Resource for Care and Help (ARCH) programs. This is a two year grant totaling nearly \$100,000 for each ARCH site, to build sustainability for the ARCH program. The scope includes working with a contractor to build sustainability, strategic partnerships, and individual business plans. DRCOG will issue a news release once the contract is executed by C4A and CHF.

Nicole will be doing an interview with KEZW Studio1430 AM on March 31. She will be speaking about the I&A and ARCH programs, encouraging people living with disabilities, older adults, and their families & caregivers to call the AAA for assistance. This is a weekly radio show called SeniorTalk that airs every Sunday morning at 7:30am. Network of Care continues to draw significant traffic each month. February was a short month, but there were still 38,388 user sessions, with 5.52 page views on average per session and the average length of 24:28 per session. Nicole traveled to the Larimer County AAA last week to provide a demonstration on the Network of Care website to County staff.

Nicole introduced Lisa McCroskey, our new Refugee Program Coordinator. Lisa gave the committee a brief explanation of the Refugee Program and shared a bit of her personal background and experience.

**Information sharing** – no information was shared.

**Chair report** – Bob thanked committee members who helped with Senior Day at the Capitol preparation and reminded them of event details.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 3:07 pm.



## ATTACH B



To: Chair and Member of Advisory Committee on Aging

From: Steve Watson, Chair, ACA Funding Subcommittee

Subject: **Service provider contracts for 13-15 contract cycle and distribution of funds for State Fiscal Year 13-14**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 19, 2013	Action	

#### REQUESTED ACTION

Motion to recommend to the DRCOG Board of Directors Administrative Committee service provider contracts for the contract cycle 2013-2015 and allocation of monies from the Federal Older Americans Act (OAA) and State Funding for Senior Services (SFSS) for State Fiscal Year 2013-14.

#### SUMMARY

- A request for proposals was distributed in late December 2013 with a deadline of February 11, 2013.
- A total of 52 responses proposing a variety of services were received, however one respondent withdrew their proposal after submission.
- Immediately following the deadline for RFP submission, the Funding Subcommittee began review of all proposals, evaluated all according to established evaluation criteria and finalized funding recommendations in all service areas.
- Requests submitted to DRCOG totaled \$15.2 million. While the funding available to DRCOG for the 2013-2014 state fiscal year has not been finalized at this time, the total dollars requested exceeds anticipated available funds. As a result, not all proposals could be funded and of those recommended for funding, most cannot be funded for the full amount requested.
- Based on estimates provided by the State Unit on Aging, while DRCOG will lose approximately \$500,000 in Older Americans Act funds (dedicated to direct services) due to the federal sequestration, DRCOG will also gain up to \$1.5 million in State Funding for Senior Services funds if a \$4 million state wide increase in these funds is ultimately approved by the Colorado legislature.
- The subcommittee made the proposed funding recommendations on the assumption that at the very least the \$2 million increase approved within the Governor's budget would be available, but also presents a scenario for approval should the full \$4 million increase be available.
- Within Scenario #1, the subcommittee worked to increase funding to priority services (nutrition, transportation and homemaker/personal care services) while maintaining level funding to most other existing service providers.
- Within Scenario #2, the subcommittee further increased funding to priority services (with an attempt to greatly diminish the existing wait list for Meals on Wheels recipients), maintain level funding for most other existing providers and

offering funding to three new programs viewed as critical for meeting needs identified in the current four year plan on aging.

- The subcommittee denied funding for some proposals based on the fact that, even with increases in state funds, insufficient funding was available to meet all requested needs. In addition, some proposals were also denied funding because respondents did not follow proposal directions, included significant overhead costs and/or were unclear in the service requested.
- The subcommittee requests you approve their recommendations (as presented in additional information attached) and forward to the DRCOG Board of Directors Administrative Committee for final action. It is, however, understood that the amount of funding available to DRCOG is still an estimate and there may need to be slight adjustments to the amount proposed when finalized figures are received.

#### **PRIOR BOARD ACTION**

April 20, 2012

#### **FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

N/A

#### **ALTERNATIVES**

1. Approve recommendations as presented by the funding subcommittee and forward them to the DRCOG Board of Directors Administrative Committee service provider contracts for the contract cycle 2013-2015 and allocation of monies from the Federal Older Americans Act (OAA) and State Funding for Senior Services (SFSS) for State Fiscal Year 2013-14.
2. Provide the funding subcommittee direction on areas where funding should be reconsidered.

#### **PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that this committee approve Alternative #1.

#### **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

- Spreadsheet outlining funding subcommittee's allocation recommendations (showing Scenarios #1 and #2).
- Minutes from all funding subcommittee meetings detailing proposal review discussion.



## **Meeting Minutes**

### **ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGING**

#### **Funding Subcommittee**

**FRIDAY, March 1, 2013**

**10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.**

**1290 Broadway Denver, CO 80203**

***Independence Pass***

#### Public Comment Period

No public comment was provided, no guest in attendance.

#### Staff Update

Chandra reported that while sequestration is in effect and Older Americans Act (OAA) funds are caught up in it, the impact of sequestration cuts isn't known yet. She further reported that state funds do not appear in jeopardy of cuts this year and in fact, based on conversations with Rich Mauro and activities at the legislature, he is fairly confident we will see a \$2 million increase state wide in these funds. He is less certain that the state bill to increase Older American dollars by \$4 million will pass, but remains optimistic and thinks it is a potential scenario. The downside is that this increase in state funding only applies to one year's funding. This puts DRCOG and this committee in a position of considering the projects that can receive additional funding without the impact of those funds being taken away in subsequent years. The combination of these circumstances warrants evaluating funding of 2013 – 2015 proposals with different scenarios in mind – potentially based on decreases, increases and one year funding awards. She asked the committee, as they make their motions for funding, to indicate a desire to flag the proposal for either an increase or a decrease in the award should funding be expanded or cut. The committee agreed.

Chandra then updated the committee on the status of two current year contractors with expenditures that fell below spending 40% contractual benchmark by December. Mt. Evans is one of those organizations and this is their third consecutive year (which is every year they have been funded) to return funds. They anticipate returning \$10,000.00. Colorado Gerontological was also below the 40% benchmark, but in conversations with them it was clear that they became overly cautious based on funding forecasts, sequestration cuts and feel they can get caught up quickly.

#### Rescheduling March 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting

Chandra requested a meeting schedule revision as she will be unavailable on March 29. The committee was agreeable to changing the date of this meeting to April 3 – the time will remain the same.

#### Distribution of Input from all County Councils on Aging

Per members' requests, Chandra distributed a *Service Prioritization* report that included results from all CCOA's prioritization conversations. In addition a compilation of all results (to provide a regional perspective) was provided.

#### Distribution of Reports

Chandra distributed *the County Allocation Report*. This report provides information on the distribution of both dollars and service units based on the proposals received. Chandra reminded members they can recommend to those awarded funds that they make adjustments to their actual service unit allocation before entering into the formal contract, but it is often difficult to achieve equal distribution as targeting categories (low income minority, frail, rural, limited English proficiency) play a role in where service is directed.

Chandra provided copies of additional *evaluation forms* to members.

The *2013-2104 Funding Available* report was distributed. This report details the amount of funding available under each funding stream (state/federal) and within each "part." The report was created assuming level funding amounts without adjustments due to sequestration and with no state increases. Chandra shared that should state funding be increased, those funds are more flexible for allocating. She also explained that, as the report shows, certain amounts of federal funds can be transferred from one part to another, so that allows for some manipulation of the dollars in the direction of need.

#### Questions about the Transportation Coordination Center Proposal

Chandra distributed the *Area Agency on Aging Transportation Coordination Center Service Definitions* before answering the questions posed by Bob L. about the Center. Chandra reviewed the history of DRCOG's study conducted by BBC Research & Consulting on the AAA's process for allocating transportation funds. This study was approved by both the ACA and the DRCOG Board of Directors in terms of implementing their presented recommendations, which include working toward implementing a centralized scheduling and dispatch center. At the same time as this study was released, the Denver Regional Mobility and Access Council (DRMAC) was also working toward a coordinated, centralized system, AAA staff agreed to put further efforts on hold to partner with DRMAC to avoid duplication of effort. After many meetings and workgroup sessions, DRMAC decided to conduct its own study. Chandra participated in

the workgroup guiding the work of this study and the ultimate recommendations presented were very similar to DRCOG's BBC study. In an effort to take advantage of the new RFP cycle, Chandra worked quickly to get another service category approved through the ACA and DRCOG Board and that is what is presented as the "Transportation Coordination Center." That service category was released along with all others for which proposals were being solicited. DRMAC staff then met with providers in an effort to rally them around this concept and the apparent result of those meetings is language that many the transportation providers requesting funding are citing in their proposals. Chandra clarified for Bob D. the BBC study's recommendations do not include services for Boulder, Clear Creek, or Gilpin counties.

Regarding the questions submitted by Bob L., Chandra provided the following responses:

- DRCOG is committed to funding a coordination center at some point, based on BBC recommendations, but it will be up to this committee to determine if the proposal received is the right one.
- Evaluation of this proposal will be based on the service definition provided and will follow the same process as all other proposals.
- Reimbursement will be based on actual costs and are not based on a provision of direct service. As a result, the funding will need to come from another area – Administrative funds, etc.
- Production will be measured on ridership and productivity, cost effectiveness, geographic/provider equity and customer satisfaction as defined in the service definition.

Discussion ensued about the need for coordinated services to prevent the duplication of administrative and travel costs and that centralization could free up dollars for trips. Bob D. cited how that has happened in Broomfield in an arrangement with Seniors' Resource Center giving units and crossing county lines. Chandra reminded the committee that historically, transportation has been county-specific and competitive, and while DRCOG is working to break that pattern and providers have made some progress, it does not appear that providers are really ready to coordinate on their own and it may take more intense involvement over the next contract cycle to really get where the BBC study directs us. While Chandra couldn't participate in the conversations with providers while the RFP was open, she could coordinate a process once the proposals are contracted for the next funding cycle. Fabyan W. made a motion to move the transportation coordination center proposal to the end of the proposal review which was seconded by Dawn P. All were in favor with no opposition.

### Proposal Review

### ***Home Delivered Meals***

#### **Volunteers of America Home Delivered Meals**

Chandra reported there are no performance issues with the current contract and that VOA and while they reported they have, in previous years had funds unexpended at the end of the year, this predates Chandra and since she has been involved in contract, their funds have been fully expended each year. Members noted this is a high priority service and that there are significant waiting lists. Chandra reported they are requesting a slight increase in the unit rate compared to current year which seems to indicate a slight increase in funding request as well. The proposal contains significantly more match than the minimum required and many members felt this service seems to serve those most frail and most in need. There was additional conversation about various elements of the proposal and Chandra explained how mileage costs, indirect costs, the match requirement, and the non-compensated services were to be reported. Bob L. made a motion to fund at the requested level of \$2,713,776.00 which was seconded by Bob D. All members were in favor with no opposition.

### ***Congregate Meals***

#### **Volunteers of America Congregate Meals**

Chandra shared that in contrast to the national need for more congregate meals than delivered meals, the opposite is true in Colorado. However, the congregate meal program remains very popular and has seen no decrease in attendance and is still considered a priority. In fact, VOA added two dining sites for low income seniors, one of which is for people who are deaf and hard of hearing in the last couple years. There are no performance issues with the current VOA contract for this service. Chandra highlighted a couple concerns about the proposal, the first that they indicated they did not have a wait list policy. While there is a state requirement they can't have a waiting list for this service, they still need to have a policy in writing. Members were ok with Chandra following up with them about this information. Chandra also highlighted that many elements of the staff qualifications did not match the positions included in the budget portion of the proposal; however, as she continued reading proposal it appeared that no one really got this right and so Chandra made note to again attempt to make this clearer during the next round. Members noted the prevailing presence of typos and misspelled words in this and other proposals as well. Chandra said she will ask that a spell check mechanism be added in the next cycle. Members noted the small increase in the requested amount and discussed is both a high priority and mandatory service. They felt the organization had good experience providing service and strong resources in place to continue doing so. Fabyan W. made a motion to fund the requested amount of \$1,090,000.00 which was seconded by Bob D. All members were in favor with no opposition.

### ***Transportation Services***

#### **Adams County Community Development**

Chandra shared there are no performance issues with the current contract although staff turnover was affecting the timeliness of their responses to contract matters for a period of time. That has improved. Chandra noted language within the proposal that mentions serving people with disabilities and people 55 and older, because these funds are only to serve those age 60 and over, Chandra wants committee permission to contact them and request information about this. Further, as a current contract she needs to understand if they are, in fact, serving those under 60. Members were ok with this. Chandra also indicated that in the proposal there is reference to the 2004 strengths and needs study as being the most recent conducted and available by DRCOG. This is inaccurate and Chandra further wanted to clarify these issues. The committee agreed. As the committee discussed the proposal, there was concern about the language included in the proposal (which was also included in others) that referenced DRMAC's project and efforts to streamlining intake and building the foundation for a coordinated system. They wanted to know if that would impact the budget as presented in the proposal. Chandra will ask this question as well. Chandra further identified a need for clarification on their inclusion of CDBG funds as other sources. Chandra explained that as part of the desk audit conducted by the State Unit on Aging, it was understood these funds had expired.

Members then discussed the need to reframe the concept of waiting lists in regards to transportation services versus the more appropriate concept of will call lists. Knowing the rate of people not being able to get a ride would be more meaningful. Chandra noted this for a needed change in the next RFP cycle. Members noted the 53% increase in the requested amount, but all agreed it is a high need and mandatory service. Steve W. made a motion to fund at the current level of funding of \$251,860.00 with a flag for increasing funding should there be enough funding to increase. In that event a justification for the increased funding would be requested for members to review. The motion was seconded by Bob L. All members were in favor with no opposition.

#### **Arapahoe County Community Resources**

Chandra noted Arapahoe County is a current contractor with no concerns in terms of their administration of the contract. Their funds have been expended in contract years since 2009 when \$71,000 was returned due to underestimated client contributions. Members noted the proposal has a discrepancy between how long funding has been received from DRCOG and how long they have provided the requested services. In comparison with other proposal in this area, it is a higher unit rate which ultimately means fewer units of service delivered. Committee members were confused about the



response to "other costs" within the budget as it didn't detail costs. Chandra will ask for clarification on this. As with other proposals, staff qualifications only include directors and managers and not all personnel, however there were also areas within this proposal that were incomplete. No justification was provided for the increase in funds and Chandra indicated this may be another need for a change in the next cycle – making space available for providers to offer a justification for increase request. The committee agreed again, is a mandated and priority service and Dawn P. made a motion to fund at the current level of funding of \$331,461.00 which was seconded by Bob D. All members were in favor with no opposition.

### **City and County of Broomfield Elderly/Disabled Transportation**

Chandra shared that they too are current contractors and while there are no performance issues related to their contract, there has been turnover in the Senior Center Director positions which oversees this contract. As new staff began, it became clear that there were some issues with respect to how costs and expenses had previously been presented and reported. It was not anything wrong necessarily, but certainly did not reflect the true costs of the program. Chandra has had DRCOG auditors meet with new staff and things are on the right track. As with other proposals, the committee gave Chandra permission to seek clarification on references to serving people with disabilities and to the DRMAC project for working towards a coordinated transportation model for streamlining intake and building the foundation for a coordinated system to streamline costs – will this impact budget, etc. Members noted the request for \$20,000.00 for software to update technology, yet also inclusion in SRC's proposal for a coordination center that includes sharing software with Broomfield. They would like clarification from Broomfield that if the coordination center is funded, what does that do to their need for this software. Chandra will ask. Members indicated the request poses a 147% increase in requested funds, a higher unit rate than current contract year, but admit it is still low in comparison to other proposals and provides a doubling of units of service. Again service is mandated and high priority. Muriel A. made a motion to fund at the level of \$100,000.00 excluding funds for software and to flag for an increase should there be enough funding. Dawn P. seconded the motion. All members were in favor with no opposition.

### **Douglas County CPSD – Community Services**

Chandra noted provider is current contractor for the same service and has no current contractual concerns. She indicated that in the middle of the contract year, there was a transition for the program as it moved from human services to community development, but the contract remains under the management of Val Robson. As with other proposals, there were questions about information contained that referred to receiving "support" from DRMAC for a sub-regional transportation call center as well as language

included in other providers proposals about streamlining procedures and the ultimate impact to the budget presented here. Chandra will clarify. Members recognized that in spite of the language about coordination, funds go for direct services only. Again service is high need and mandatory. Dawn P. made a motion to fund at the requested level of \$93,420.00 which was seconded by Muriel A. All members were in favor with no opposition.

### **First Ride**

Chandra indicated that First Ride is also a current contract for this service and further shared problems with them fully expending funds last year. While it ended up being an unfortunate bookkeeping error, it resulted in DRCOG carrying over about \$5,000. They are required to provide additional information on costs this year and have moved to higher risk monitoring by DRCOG auditors. They have been prompt with providing additional reports thus far. As with other proposals, they too include information about providing service to disabled riders and Chandra will ask for clarification about their tracking of disabled ridership as well as the streamlining of intake for DRMAC's project and whether or not this will have an impact on the budget presented. Members noted the 3.39% increase in requested funds with the same number of units of service and that this is a large amount of funds to serve 250 people at \$1,700 per client. While this is the only provider in Denver, there was discussion about the fact that the number of people they are proposing to serve seems low. Further, a waiting list of 10 does not represent the need and further shows the need to rephrase this portion of the proposal. Chandra can provide to the committee information on current year consumers served, etc. and will bring that to the next meeting. This remains a high need service in the region and in Denver and it is mandatory. Bob D. made a motion to fund at the current level of \$412,925.00 which was seconded by Dawn P. All members were in favor with no opposition.

### **Seniors' Resource Center (SRC) Transportation Services for Seniors in the Community**

Chandra shared SRC is a current contractor and while there were unexpended funds in previous cycles there are currently no concerns with their transportation program currently. SRC has experienced significant changes in staff, specifically their accounting staff and so they remain in the high risk monitoring category meaning they have to provide additional documentation on a quarterly basis. While the agency has experienced significant funding cuts, it is Chandra's understanding that is having less of an impact on the transportation program than other program areas. Chandra will again ask this provider for clarification about services to people with disabilities, mentioned in the brief description. Members noted the low unit rate and the increase of 50% in the requested amount without a justification although 23,000 units were served last year

and 35,000 are cited for the next year. Michelle C. made a motion to fund at the level of \$500,000.00 with a flag to decrease if SRC's proposal for a coordinated center is funded. Bob D. seconded the motion. All members were in favor with no opposition.

### **Volunteers of America Transportation Gilpin/Clear Creek**

Chandra shared there are no performance concerns with respect to VOA's current contract for service in this area. She explained that they are not included in efforts to coordinate transportation in the region in large part because they effectively leverage of Meals on Wheels and county owned vehicles and that keeps costs very low. Members noted the 15.4% increase with no increase in units of service from current year, however, felt this is priority service in the rural communities Steve W. made a motion to fund at the requested level of \$75,000.00 which was seconded by Bob L. All members were in favor with no opposition.

### ***Native American Programming***

#### **Southwest Improvement Council – SWIC**

Chandra explained that while the service category in this proposal is for "screening and evaluation" she places it in a category of Native American programs because DRCOG is mandated to provide a program directed to Native Americans. However, there is no dictated percentage or level at which it must be funded. She shared that SWIC provides low tech services, they are responsive and expend their funds, have an effective targeting plan and they serve diverse low-income older adults with high needs, no current contractual concerns. Members noted the 73.5% increase in requested funds and while it is mandatory, it is not high need. Bob D. made a motion to fund at the current level of \$98,000.00 with a flag to increase should there be enough funds. Dawn P. seconded the motion. All members were in favor with no opposition.

#### Next Meeting: Friday, March 15, 2013

##### Proposals to Review:

##### Mandated Services Continued

- In-Home Services (Homemaker & Personal Care Services) (7)
- Evidence Based (4)
- Legal Assistance (2)

#### Revisions to the Meeting Schedule and Proposals to be Reviewed

On March 6, the following changes were shared with the work group members by Chandra in an email message. Due to the withdrawal of the proposal by Elder Justice in the legal category, Chandra added the following to the review on March 15<sup>th</sup>.

The category of material aid was added to the proposals being reviewed on March 15<sup>th</sup>.

- Material Aid (3)



## **Meeting Minutes**

### **ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGING**

#### **Funding Subcommittee**

**FRIDAY, March 15, 2013**

**9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**

**1290 Broadway Denver, CO 80203**

***Independence Pass***

#### Public Comment Period

No public comment was provided, no guest in attendance.

#### Staff Update

Chandra shared that there is no new specific information on funding, but it is looking likely that an increase in state funds in addition to the sequestration cuts within federal funds can be expected. However, she wanted to discuss some concerns that arose during her discussions with both Jayla and Rich Mauro regarding funding and the potential state increase. One of the primary talking points with legislators when explaining the need for increased funding to Older American Act programs is always that we want to work to decrease and/or eliminate waiting lists, especially those for home delivered meal services as it is the highest priority service and serves the most at risk older adults in our community (those that are frail and homebound). Based on that, concern arose about the request from Volunteer of America's (VOA) for home delivered meal services. During the RFP training, Chandra indicated she always tells providers to request the level of funding needed to run the program (but to be prepared to run it with less or no money from DRCOG). While the requests for material aids (Colorado Gerontological Society) and some transportation providers reflect the level of need and a significant increase above current level funding, VOA's request contains a minimal dollar increase and no increase in the number of meals provided, therefore doing little to eliminate the large waiting list reported.

Based on that discussion, Chandra contacted VOA, both about the original questions posed by the committee following review of several of their proposals during the last meeting, along with a question about why there was no significant increase requested. Chandra shared the response from VOA. Essentially, it appeared they had a different interpretation of Chandra's comment to request what was needed, but that it would take approximately \$500,000 to eliminate the "ever-changing waiting list." Chandra also shared that she is seeking clarification from DRCOG's attorney about whether or not this subcommittee can allocate funds above what is requested within a proposal. She has not heard back, but will update members as she hears more and once actual

budget figures are presented further decisions can be made about what to do with additional funds, should there be any.

Everyone agreed language in the RFP is needed to clarify the importance of providers requesting funds that address the level of need, balanced with what is reasonable and their capacity for delivery of services.

Chandra then reported on her efforts to seek clarification on questions the subcommittee had in the previous meeting's discussions of proposals. Arapahoe County provided clarification on their transportation proposal in which "other costs" were not clearly detailed. Appropriate detail was provided that better explained and Chandra presented that. Other transportation providers who were questioned about the language they included regarding serving people with disabilities all clarified they are not providing services to people under 60 years of age with dollars received from DRCOG and none of the funds requested in the current proposals are for that either. Several transportation providers were also questioned about the language regarding working with DRMAC toward a coordinated call center and whether or not that would impact the budget submitted within the current proposal. All those questioned indicated it would not.

The committee also posed a question to The City and County of Broomfield regarding their request for software costs and whether or not funding the proposal submitted by Seniors' Resource Center (SRC) for a transportation coordination center would impact the need for this. That response will be re-examined during review of SRC's proposal for a transportation coordination center.

Chandra also reported, per the subcommittee's concern that the unduplicated client count in First Ride's proposal seemed low, that the agency's unduplicated count in the current contract is 321 which is more than was projected in the proposal for that year. She explained that it is sometimes tough to estimate that number when writing a proposal and was good to look at the actual figure, though it still seemed low. Steve W. proposed that it would be helpful for the subcommittee to see the data captured by providers and reported to DRCOG each month to better understand proposed numbers versus actual. Chandra agreed to present an overview of provider reporting and DRCOG's auditing processes to the subcommittee later in the year.

#### Distribution of Evaluation Forms

More evaluation forms were available for members to use with the remaining requests.

### Distribution of Updated Reports

Chandra distributed the updated Funding Information Report that shows amounts allocated during the last meeting and tallies of the scores from all proposals reviewed. She also explained that she did not update the Funding Available Report as there are too many unknowns at this time about what funding will be and so this report will be provided when that information is available.

Chandra explained that as she was reviewing other things, she noted that the Per Client Reports were not accurate. This is a new report for this year and so she needs to look into why it was not accurate and get it corrected. The information printed out on the proposal itself, is accurate however and members were ok using this information for the remaining review.

Similar to Steve W.'s comparison report for the transportation proposals, Bob L. compiled a comparison report for the in-home care proposals. There was discussion about reports that provide a direct comparison of various elements of "like" services being useful and there will be opportunity to look at generating them next year so members don't have to create them.

### Questions about Reports or Proposals before Review?

In response to questions from Bob L. Chandra clarified there have been no changes in regard to providers being able to charge consumers for services (some proposals indicated they would be doing so). Services are still not available for people under 60 unless they are being served within the caregiver programs where the age requirement is 55 and means testing for income levels is not allowed, although waiting lists can be prioritized based on targeting criteria. She also explained there is the potential for non-citizens to be served by these programs because that is not a question posed on the assessment required by the State Unit on Aging.

### Proposal Review

#### ***In-Home Services***

##### **Comforcare Home Care**

Chandra reported there isn't a performance report because this is not a current provider. Members noted the agency currently does not conduct an audit. They further expressed concerns about the amount of assets and cash reported which raised questions for some about financial stability of the agency. There was also concern about minimal years of experience when compared with other providers within the category along with the high overhead costs and amount of funding that will go toward

start-up costs. Bob D. made a motion not to fund which was seconded by Bob L. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **Dominican Sisters Home Health Agency of Denver, Inc.**

Chandra reported there isn't a performance report because again this is not a current provider. Chandra also expressed some concern about the proposal and the apparent plan to shift to skilled care as needed. This is not what DRCOG funds within the service category they submitted or in general. Members agreed and felt there was a lack of specificity on what exactly would be done and had concern the emphasis on transition of care to skilled care. In comparison to other respondents in this category, members also noted a high unit cost. There was also concern about the inclusion of funding durable medical equipment which is not allowable within the homemaker/personal care category and would need to be submitted under a material aid proposal. It was further unclear that their in-kind match referenced volunteers but not to provide the service requested. Fabyan W. made a motion not to fund which was seconded by Dawn P. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **Jewish Family Service of Colorado**

Chandra reported this is a current contractor and there are no performance issues. She mentioned also how Jewish Family Service was one of the three agencies that collaborated to pick up the clients that were affected by Seniors Inc.'s withdrawal from their contract with DRCOG during the current fiscal year. Members noted the description is very detailed, and while includes some unnecessary information it does well at identifying the need for these services. Otherwise, members noted the low unit rate in comparison with other respondents in this category as well as the significant number of years of experience providing the service. Bob D. made a motion to fund at the requested level of \$114,500.00 which was seconded by Dawn P. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **Senior Helpers**

Chandra reported there are no performance issues because again this is not a current provider. Members expressed concern about the budget including franchise fees and discussed whether this was an appropriate cost for an OAA program. There was also a high unit rate and low years of service in comparison with others in the same category. They further questioned 10% in-kind match essentially pro-rate to all program costs and wondered if this was allowable. Chandra discussed that it was, but that it would have to be carefully monitored/audited to ensure it was appropriately documented. Members were further concerned about the requested funds exceeding their assets and the fact that they do not conduct an audit. Michelle C. made a motion not to fund which was seconded by Bob D. All were in favor with no opposition.

**Seniors' Resource Center Inc. (SRC)**

Chandra reported there are no performance issues in this program for the current contract year and again noted that in addition to Jewish Family Service, SRC was another of the three agencies that collaborated to serve the clients affected by Seniors Inc.'s withdrawal. Members noted the seemingly low units for personal care which would serve 20 people. Chandra explained that consumers may receive homemaker services initially when enrolled within the program and reminded the committee that a couple years ago, SRC requested adding personal care services because often there is a need for some of those receiving homemaker services to transition to personal care services at some point in the contract year. Members understood and agreed this was better than having to transition to another agency altogether. Members noted the waiting list of 150, low unit rate and number of years providing service. Fabyan W. made a motion to fund at \$210,057.00 which was seconded by Steve W. All were in favor with no opposition.

**Synergy HomeCare**

Chandra reported there are no performance issues because this is not a current provider. Members expressed concern about the proposal serving only 38 clients with the requested \$75,000. This seemed low in comparison with other proposals. In addition, there was a high unit rate and an absence of information about services and staff. Company assets/financial stability was another concern. Dawn P. made a motion not to fund which was seconded by Michelle C. All were in favor with no opposition.

**Visiting Nurse Association (VNA)**

In terms of performance, Chandra shared that last year, VNA was unable to expend approximately \$800 in state funds as the result of some accounting errors. As a result they are subject to a higher level of monitoring this contract year. Chandra did, however, want to again note their role as one of the three agencies that collaborated to serve the clients affected by Seniors' Inc.'s withdrawal. Members noted the wait list of 120, the substantial cash match, thorough yet concise service description and staff qualifications that matched the RFP's specifications exactly (one of the only proposals to accomplish that). Members noted the higher unit cost, but discussed the inclusion of supervision being provided by RNs. Dawn P. made a motion to fund at the current level of \$339,861.00 with a flag for increasing funding should there be enough funding to increase.

### ***Evidence Based Programs***

Chandra reminded members that the term “evidence-based intervention” refers to a program that closely replicates a specific intervention that has been tested through randomly controlled experiments with results that have been published in peer-reviewed journals. She also reminded members that OAA, Title III, Part E dollars can only be used to fund these types of programs.

### **Clinica Colorado**

Members noted that, based on the definition provided by Chandra, this proposal does not appear to be evidence-based and the proposed services (medical testing, etc.) are not appropriate for OAA funds. Additionally, members noted only 50 people would be served with 1 unit per client, a very high unit cost and the fact that the proposal includes material aid items. There was also concern that they did not seem to understand, based on the response, that services are only available to that age 60 and older as they want to provide some service to those age 50 and older. Further, there was concern about only having 1 ½ years experience and the fact that they reference including “patient fees” which are not allowed. Fabyan W. made a motion to not fund which was seconded by Dawn P. All were in favor with no opposition.

### **Tri-County Health Department (TCHD)**

Chandra reported there are no performance concerns and reminded the subcommittee that TCHD began providing this service in partnership with DRCOG. DRCOG staff continues to provide and/or support the delivery of Matter of Balance classes in Gilpin, Clear Creek and Broomfield Counties. Members expressed being impressed that these classes prevent falls that lead to other health costs. They had questions about the waiting list of 26 and Chandra explained how many people are in each class and that essentially that meant they had enough people for approximately two additional classes. Members were pleased to see that volunteer coaches have brought down program costs. Dawn P. made a motion to fund at the current level of \$126,377.00 which was seconded by Michelle C. All were in favor with no opposition.

### **Visiting Nurse Association**

Members also questioned if this proposal was, in fact, evidence-based? Chandra explained that it appeared to be, but was hard to understand exactly which program they were referencing within the description. Members primarily expressed concern about the low request and the fact that while they are not opposed to funding a proposal under the recommended \$75,000, this seemed too far below. Fabyan W. made a motion not to fund which was seconded by Bob D. All were in favor with no opposition.



### **Volunteers of America (VOA)**

Chandra reported that there were no concerns with VOA as a provider of this service. Members were impressed with the description of the program. However, they were curious about the results seen from this program. While they are referenced as positive within the description, there is no detail included. Chandra will inquire about specific results of this program. While there were concerns about the high unit cost, members noted that it is a program designed for homebound consumers, which are the frailest of those served. Fabyan W. made a motion to fund at the requested level of \$75,000.00 which was seconded by Dawn P. All were in favor with no opposition.

### ***Legal Assistance***

Chandra again reported to members that Elder Justice Colorado requested that the proposal they submitted within this category be withdrawn.

### **Colorado Legal Services**

Chandra reported there are no performance issues within the current contract year. Members discussed that it was interesting that while this service is mandated it has low priority within many of the county councils on aging. They appreciated that the program serves all the 8 counties in the region with and members noted they do specific outreach the rural communities. Members were concerned that all personnel are shown as receiving the same hourly rate. Chandra will ask for clarification. Fabyan W. made a motion to fund with a slight increase to \$218,382.00 with a flag for additional increase in funding should there be enough to do so. This was seconded by Sharon P. All were in favor with no opposition.

### ***Material Aid Services***

### **Center for People with Disabilities**

Chandra reported she has no performance update as this is not a current contractor. Members asked if this was a mandated services category and Chandra indicated it is not. Members noted several issues with the proposal including its lack of information and the fact that it seemed incomplete. They were concerned there was no specific breakdown of costs within the budget (mileage rate, number of miles, equipment provided and cost associated, etc.) and no explanation for how the "distribution of goods" referenced within the proposal would be done. Dawn P. made a motion not to fund which was seconded by Steve W. All were in favor with no opposition.

### **Colorado Gerontological Society (CGS)**

Chandra explained that there are no contract issues with CGS during this contract year and there has been substantial scrutiny of this program by the State Unit on Aging.

(SUA) because of the newly reinstated Old Age Pension (OAP) dental program and the fact that CGS is also providing service under that funding stream. The SUA wants to ensure that funding for dental services is clearly delineated between the two funding sources. Chandra also updated the subcommittee that OAP funding will allow CGS to shift people on the waiting list that are eligible for OAP funds and this will ultimately decrease the waiting list for DRCOG services. Chandra also explained their low expenditure rate to date as they held off spending given the potential impact from sequestration. However, following clarification from Chandra, they are gearing up to expend funds as needed this program year. Members discussed the high need of this program even with OAP funding and extensive waiting list. Members agreed is an expensive program, but remains one of the only options for many older adults in getting these costs covered. Bob L. made a motion to fund at the current level of \$400,000.00 with a flag for increase should there be enough funding to do so which was seconded by Muriel A. All were in favor with no opposition.

### **Volunteers of America**

Chandra reported there are no performance concerns with VOA for this service either. Members noted that while this is not a mandated service, it is higher in priority for the county councils on aging. Members were impressed that VOA expanded to the rural communities when asked by DRCOG and while there are challenges to find volunteers, they are making the effort. Bob D. would like to know why VOA does not service Broomfield with the handyman program where there is a high need. Chandra will inquire about this. Members agreed the proposal is well written and concise. Fabyan W. made a motion to fund at the requested level of \$93,900.00 which was seconded by Michelle C. All were in favor with no opposition.

### **Next Meeting: Wednesday April 3, 2013**

Chandra explained that due to the availability of DRCOG's conference rooms, this meeting will be split between Independence Pass from 10 to 1 and Monarch Pass from 1 to 3.

### **Proposals to Review:**

- Caregiver Services (8)
- Screening/Evaluation (1)
- Health Promotion/Education (non-evidence based) (5)
- Counseling (1)
- Chore (3)
- Multiple Services (7)
- Transportation Coordination Center (1)



## **Meeting Minutes**

### **ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGING**

#### **Funding Subcommittee**

**WEDNESDAY, April 3, 2013**

**10:00 – 3:00**

**1290 Broadway Denver, CO 80203**

***Independence Pass***

#### Public Comment Period

No public comment was provided, no guest in attendance.

#### Staff Update

Chandra thanked members for rescheduling the meetings, but indicated since it was her first day back from vacation she had no update.

#### Approval of Minutes

Members reviewed the minutes from March 1<sup>st</sup>. Dawn P. made a motion to approve the minutes which was seconded by Muriel A. All were in favor with no opposition.

Chandra apologized for not having the minutes from the March 15<sup>th</sup> meeting for review, but indicated she would have them out to members by the end of the week.

#### Distribution of Updated Reports

The Funding Information report was revised to reflect allocated funds to date. Members asked that "not funded" proposals be notated with a zero rather than a dash.

Chandra also distributed the 2013-2105 Service Definitions for the benefit of the new subcommittee members.

#### Update on Responses from Last Round of Proposal Review

Chandra shared the email response from Colorado Legal Services with the correct hourly rates for personnel. She also distributed the email from VOA responding to the question about providing Handyman services to residents in Broomfield. VOA indicated that due to the challenges to building the program in Clear Creek and Gilpin they had not considered adding another service area, but provided good indication that they could potentially in coming years with some additional funding. Members discussed having Chandra meet with them during the first fiscal year of the contract to see if Broomfield could be added in the second fiscal year of the contract. Finally, Chandra distributed the report from VOA with details and data related to the impact of the Healthy Aging program. Members were impressed with the results reported.

### Questions about Reports or Proposals before Review

In response to members' questions, Chandra responded that OAA targeting has not been expanded to specifically include individuals who are blind or based on sexual orientation. However, Chandra indicated that targeting does extend to those who are socially isolated and it these groups could be seen as such.

There were questions about why some proposals put multiple services within one response while others do not. Chandra explained it is really up to the organization, but that DRCOG does allow for consolidation of some services. She further explained that some organizations provide multiple services but submit more than one proposal because those services are delivered by different divisions with different cost structures within the organization and it is easier to separate out. Other organizations may provide multiple services all at the same time by the same person and so it is easier to capture those costs, etc. within one contract.

### Proposal Review

#### ***Caregiver Services***

Chandra reminded the subcommittee that caregiver services are mandated and, in fact, have their own funding "Part" within the federal dollars (Part D).

#### **Alzheimer's Association Colorado Chapter**

Chandra explained she has no concerns with this contractor as a current provider. Members noted that this program appears to produces high units of service delivered through education, counseling and support groups. Members noted the service area includes all eight counties and were impressed by the description provided and targeting plan. Further, it appeared as if most costs were direct service related. Dawn P. made a motion to fund at the current level of \$177,297.00 which was seconded by Sharon P. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **Catholic Charities and Community Services of the Archdiocese of Denver, Inc.**

Chandra noted this is the only program for grandparents raising grandchildren and they are also a current provider with no concerns to report. Members noted the school supplies mentioned in the description aren't included in the budget and surmised that while they may be provided it might be an instance of the description including more than is covered by just DRCOG funding. There was question about respite care costs going toward childcare and Chandra explained that in this instance that is the respite – a break for the older adult in providing care to the child. Members noted the high unit rate, but liked there were multiple other funding sources to support the program. Members agreed this is a growing issue and is important to continue to support.

Michelle C. made a motion to fund at the current level of \$113,500.00 which was seconded by Fabyan W. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **City and County of Broomfield**

Chandra noted there are no performance concerns with the current contract. Members noted the concise description, but were concerned about the absence of the age of people receiving services. Chandra reminded them that within caregiver programs, the caregiver has to be at least 55 as opposed to other programs where the limit is 60. There were questions about the use of sub-contractors by DRCOG contractors and whether or not they were subject to the same requirements. Chandra indicated that sub-contractors are also audited by DRCOG to ensure they are abiding by all the same requirements and the expectation of contractors is that they pass down all requirements to any sub-contractors via a contract that mimics DRCOG's. Members noted this program is specific to Broomfield and one of the only ones that provides dedicated service to that county. They thought the description was clear and unit rate was comparable. Muriel A. made a motion to fund at the current level of \$66,308.00 which was seconded by Michelle C. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **Easter Seals Colorado**

Chandra indicated she has no information on provider as they are not a current contractor. Members noted a concern about the focus within the proposal on rehabilitative services and wondered if they are allowable with these funds. Chandra explained that DRCOG has historically not contracted out for services considered skilled. There was further concern that the proposal intended to serve only 11 clients at \$7,500.00 per client. Dawn P. made a motion not to fund which was seconded by Michelle C. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **Lutheran Family Services Rocky Mountains**

Chandra explained provider is a current contractor with no contractual concerns. Members were impressed by the targeting plan of the proposal and the targeting that the program itself provides as it is specific to African American caregivers. The noted the significant over match provided within the budget. Fabyan W. made a motion to fund at the current level of \$74,400.00 which was seconded by Steve W. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **Seniors' Resource Center, Inc. Adult Day & Respite Services**

Chandra noted there are no performance concerns with the provider's current contract. Members noted that compared to last cycle's submission, the description within this proposal offered a clear explanation of services. They were impressed with the low unit rate of \$10.50 and the focus on social interaction within the program itself. Members

noted the waiting list of 13 and the increasing need for adult day services. Dawn P. made a motion to fund at the current level of \$76,000.00 which was seconded by Bob L. All were in favor with no opposition.

### **The Senior Hub Adult Day Service**

Chandra noted there are no performance concerns with the provider's current contract. Members noted slightly higher costs than the SRC day program but it was also noted that they do reference their consumers are monitored by an RN, which may increase costs. Members noted it was a well written proposal with a good description that provided clear information in all areas. Fabyan W. made a motion to fund at the current level of \$91,207.00 which was seconded by Sharon P. All were in favor with no opposition.

### **The Senior Hub Respite Care**

Chandra noted there have been several changes within the staff who oversee this program, but despite that there have been no issues with the contract. She also mentioned their service to people living on the eastern plains, an area few other providers service. Members were impressed with the well written description with detailed information that included the impact of their services. Unit costs were comparable as well and there is a waiting list for service. Bob D. made a motion to fund at the current level of \$89,678.00 which was seconded by Sharon P. All were in favor with no opposition.

### ***Screening/Evaluation***

#### **Senior Support Services**

Chandra noted there are no performance concerns during this current contract year. Members noted the well detailed description of service and that their proposals have improved in recent years. Members noted the complexity with assisting people who are homeless and without documentation. Members mentioned the program does well at targeting low income minorities where need for assistance is high. Dawn P. made a motion to fund at the current level of \$73,500 which was seconded by Fabyan W. All were in favor with no opposition.

### ***Health Promotion/Education (non-evidence based)***

#### **American Council of the Blind of Colorado**

Chandra indicated this is not a current contractor, so there is no update on performance. Members noted this proposal's lack of organization and disconnectedness combined with many errors throughout. Members noted no mention of serving minorities and no target plan and were concerned about the fact that they included a dollar of in-kind match. It was also noted that this proposal includes material

aid and Chandra indicated that should have been submitted in a separate proposal. Dawn P. made a motion not to fund which was seconded by Michelle C. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **Audio Information Network of Colorado**

Chandra noted this is not a current provider so there is no report on their performance. Members felt the proposal was well written and that this would be a good area to expand service if funding permits. Regarding the request for \$8,800 for equipment, Chandra would need to ask the state if the proposal is funded whether the receivers would be considered equipment or material aids. Members discussed how while these aren't core services, they help people from being socially isolated and keep those who receive them connected to the outside world. Bob L. made a motion to fund at the level of \$76,292.00 (less their request of \$.23 for ease in contracting) which was seconded by Michelle C. with a flag to eliminate if funding is insufficient. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **Colorado Bureau of Investigation**

Chandra again indicated this is not a current provider, so no report on performance. Members were very concerned about the request for funds for travel to conferences and the amount of dollars allocated within their budget that would go toward refreshments. Some members felt these services were duplicative with many programs offered for free by Triads, etc. Dawn P. made a motion not to fund which was seconded by Michelle C. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **Centura Health**

Chandra explained this is another contractor who has seen changes at the management personnel level, but it has not resulted in any performance concerns. Fabyan W. noted the cut back on services to people in Clear Creek and Gilpin counties and was concerned about this as they have done an excellent job in reaching out to these areas and providing very directed one-on-one service. Chandra will inquire about this change. Members felt this was a well explained service that is vital to the community in terms of education and outreach. Bob L. made a motion to fund at the current level of \$105,484.00 contingent on returning services to Clear Creek and Gilpin which was seconded by Sharon P. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **Dominican Sisters Home Health Agency of Denver, Inc.**

Chandra noted provider is not a current provider, so no update on performance. Members were concerned about the similarity of this proposal to the one they submitted for In-Home Services. They felt the description was overwritten with a focus on medications. There was again a high unit rate and cost per client. Dawn P. made a

motion not to fund which was seconded by Michelle C. All were in favor with no opposition.

### ***Counseling***

#### **Jefferson Center for Mental Health**

Chandra mentioned again that in spite of a change in the program manager, there are no performance concerns in the current contract. Members were impressed with the proposals reporting of the programs know how to achieve and measure results which they present in the description. Members further noted they are the only provider of counseling/mental health services and have 55 years experience. Members noted their effective outreach within the communities they serve, especially the rural mountain communities, and were impressed with the qualifications of the staff they use. Fabyan made a motion to fund at \$85,000.00 with a flag for increase should there be enough funding to increase which was seconded by Steve W. All were in favor with no opposition.

### ***Chore***

#### **Arapahoe County Community Resources**

Chandra noted there are no performance concerns with the current contract. Members were happy to see that service is provided by paid Chore service workers as opposed to volunteers. They felt while volunteer service is important and can bring down costs; sometimes it is vital to have staff to offer consistency. Members felt strongly that many of the chore services described within this proposal help keep people in their homes. They felt the cost was realistic. Fabyan W. made a motion to fund the program at the both current and requested level of \$75,000.00 which was seconded by Bob D. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **Denver Office on Aging**

Chandra indicated provider is not a current contractor, so no update on performance. Members felt the proposal was well written and it was viewed as a high need in Denver County, the county served through this program. Members noted the cost was high, but acknowledged that was, in part, the result of being a brand new program. The members felt strongly this was a good area to expand service. Steve W. made a motion to fund at a level of \$75,000.00 which was seconded by Dawn P. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **Seniors' Resource Center, Inc.**

Chandra indicated that while SRC is a contractor for many other services, they are not for this service and so no update on performance. Members noted this proposal has zero units for Arapahoe County and Chandra indicated she assumed this was because



they know of the Arapahoe Chore Services program. Members noted the higher unit rate and cost per client, but felt this program went a little beyond just chore services as it included minor home modifications. Members agreed it appeared this is a proven service with other funding sources and again is a good area to continue expansion. They felt this program provided the opportunity to offer the service throughout the metro area (including Gilpin and Clear Creek) with the funding already approved for Denver and Arapahoe. Dawn P. made a motion to fund at a level of \$75,000.00 with a contingency to remove the units in Denver (because of allocation approved for a Denver specific program) with a request to SRC to distribute those units to the remaining counties. Sharon P. seconded the motion. All were in favor with no opposition.

### ***Multiple Services***

#### **A Little Help**

This is not a current contract, so no report on performance from Chandra. Members noted the proposal's very limited service area of Washington Park, a singular neighborhood and the seasonal aspect of the clean-up events. This concerned them as it felt like a significant amount of funding in order to serve very few people. Dawn P. made a motion not to fund which was seconded by Fabyan W. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **Colorado Center for the Blind**

This is not a current contract, so no report on performance from Chandra. Members were concerned that the proposal's focus was on expanding an existing program and wondered if there would be sufficient funding for DRCOG to be the entity to provide that expansion and were these the services most needed (in terms of expansion). Members felt the need was greater in areas they had already provided some expansion. Michelle C. made a motion not to fund which was seconded by Dawn P. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### **HealthSET**

Chandra shared this is another provider with changes in the program management level, but there have been no concerns about their current contract. Members noted the request for purchasing computers for generating electronic health records and going paperless and did not feel this was an appropriate use of funds. Chandra explained they could fund with the instruction that funding would not be allowed to be used for this purpose. Members appreciated that HealthSET serves a targeted population of low income older adults and indicated these are typically the people who don't access health care services otherwise. Dawn P. made a motion to fund at the current level of \$122,500.00 for direct services only, not the IT component. Steve W. seconded the motion. All were in favor with no opposition.

### **Mt. Evans Home Health and Hospice**

Chandra shared the performance issue with this contractor not expending funds every year they have been funded including years when there were funding cuts. She indicated as much as \$25,000 has been returned and \$10,000 would be returned this year. Further, she indicated that while the primary purpose of expanding service to this provider was to offer a choice of in-home care provider to the mountain communities, they have not provided any homemaker or personal care units of service in any contract year and include none within this proposal. Chandra explained that there was initial confusion on their part of how these funds could be combined with their other sources of funding through Medicare and Medicaid and that the agency seemed to struggle with that and decided to focus on providing just the counseling and health promotion services. Members noted that there are costs associated with amending contracts each year and questioned if the services they now request are priority. Based on contractual issues, Dawn P. made a motion not to fund which was seconded by Michelle C. All were in favor with no opposition.

### **Spring Institute for Intercultural Learning**

This is not a current contract, so no report on performance from Chandra. Chandra did, however, explain the similarities of the proposal to DRCOG's new partnership with the Colorado Refugee Service Program which has previously been presented to the full ACA. Members agreed the services would be redundant. Fabyan W. made a motion not to fund which was seconded by Dawn P. All were in favor with no opposition.

### **The Denver Center for Crime Victims**

This is not a current contract, so no report on performance from Chandra. Members noted the low funding level which is well below the suggested \$75,000. They further felt the description which was neither clear nor organized. Bob D. made a motion not to fund which was seconded by Steve W. All were in favor with no opposition.

### **The Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Community Center of Colorado**

This is not a current contract, so no report on performance from Chandra. Members felt the proposal was not well written and it didn't appear the respondent followed instructions given the reference to serving people 50+. Members were further concerned about their plans to use social work interns for one on one counseling. Members indicated they feel strongly about expanding service to this population, but that the proposal needed improvement before they could do so. Dawn P. made a motion not to fund but for Chandra to see if she could talk to them about potential future partnerships. This was seconded by Muriel A. All were in favor with no opposition.



Next Meeting: Monday, April 8

Proposals to Review:

- Transportation Coordination Center (1)
- Discuss allocations and finalize funding recommendations.

## **Meeting Minutes**

### **ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGING**

#### **Funding Subcommittee**

**MONDAY, April 8, 2013**

**10:00 – 12:00**

**1290 Broadway Denver, CO 80203**

***Independence Pass***

#### Public Comment Period

No public comment was provided, no guest in attendance.

#### Staff Update

Chandra shared that a new AAA position has been posted for a Financial Compliance Coordinator. A decision was made internally to bring in-house the on-site “auditing” that is done of service providers and the position will also help in managing contracts with providers as well as completed the division’s budget.

She also reported that Rich Mauro feels certain that the \$2 million increase is state funding is 100% certain and the \$4 million increase is 99.9% certain. Based on his recommendations, and figures supplied by the State Unit on Aging, she has more specific information regarding funding that will allow them to finalize their recommendations. She is, however, recommending that they provide two different scenarios for approval. One based on a \$2 million increase and one based on a \$4, members were in agreement.

#### Approval of Minutes

Chandra shared that the minutes for March 15 are still pending and that all the subsequent meeting minutes will be completed and distributed to the members by the end of this week via e-mail for approval. They understood.

#### Provider Response from Previous Proposal Review

Chandra distributed copies of the email from Centura Health in response to the subcommittee’s question concerning services to Clear Creek and Gilpin counties. Centura indicated they did intend to provide service to these counties, but were under the impression (based on direction given at the provider training) that if they were only going to request a small number of units in some counties they were better off not doing so. Chandra clarified this for them and also noted it as a potential need for clarification for others in subsequent trainings on the RFP. Centura provided a re-distributed unit of service allocation that includes service units to residents of Clear Creek and Gilpin

counties. Members approved the pending decision to fund based on reinstating services to the mountain communities at the level discussed last week.

Chandra then distributed the email from Broomfield responding to the question about their request for \$20,000 to upgrade their system and technology and whether or not this would actually be needed in the event Seniors' Resource Center's (SRC) proposal for a coordination center is funded. Broomfield responded those funds would not be needed if SRC is funded but they would maintain the request of \$20,000 if SRC weren't funded in full to increase internal efficiencies and to ease coordination efforts with other providers. Members were set to review the coordination center proposal, but still held firm to their decision to not allow the funding awarded to go toward the upgrade in their system.

### Proposal Review

#### ***Transportation Coordination Center Seniors' Resource Center, Inc.***

Chandra reviewed the history of DRCOG's efforts to head in the direction of a coordinated call center that would make delivery of transportation services more effective and efficient. She reminded members of the direction from both the ACA and the DRCOG board to implement recommendations from the BBC study that include such an effort. Members asked if this was the right time to fund something like this as it seemed very rushed in getting it included in the RFP and was there time to devote to ensuring it got up and running quickly. Chandra explained that there are other efforts and opinions for how services should be coordinated and agreed that maybe the time was right for additional review of the situation before deciding to fund something like this. First of all, she thinks the full ACA should hear about/ review the newly released DRMAC report which presents their recommendations for how specialized transit should be coordinated.

She further indicated there could be better time spent over the next two years seeking buy-in from all the providers about implementing something like this and really ensuring that appropriate measures are in place to define the center's activities and monitoring. Steve W. noted that the BBC transportation report recommends funding an entity for these activities who is not an actual provider of transportation services. Funding this proposal would go against that recommendation and members felt there was a need to better understand this recommendation before proceeding. Members agreed a coordinated platform is needed to benefit riders in terms of making a single call, accessing services that cross county lines and providing real time scheduling. Subcommittee members recognize the need for DRCOG to move this forward because

change is needed, but has been very slow in doing this. Members further indicated that the proposal submitted by SRC is well written, however, they present this as a pilot program opportunity that already seems to have a track record of proven success. They question the need to fund a pilot program that indicates it is already successful and further funding something that really does not get them to a regional solution. They worry doing so will further divide the region and make a regional solution that much more difficult. Bob L. made a motion not to fund which was seconded by Dawn P. All were in favor with no opposition.

#### Distribution of Updated Reports

Chandra distributed a new Funding Information report. She indicated she did not have time to tally scores between last week's meeting and today, but would do so. She felt members would rather see this report as it will be presented to the ACA. They agreed. The report now shows, with totals of each, three columns that reflect funding scenarios based on sequester cuts and either no state increase, a \$2 million increase or a \$4 million increase.

Chandra then distributed the Funding Available report that shows figures from the State Unit on Aging which estimate a \$4 million state increase and include anticipate sequestration cuts to federal funding.

#### Allocation Discussion

Chandra explained that based on what had been allocated during proposal review, if there was no increase in state funds and the sequester cuts occurred in federal funding, members would need to cut nearly \$900,000 from their current allocations. Similarly, if there is only a \$2 million increase in state funds and the sequester cuts; the committee will need to cut approximately \$113,000 from their current allocations. However, if there is a \$4 million increase to state funds and the sequester cuts occur; DRCOG has the opportunity to further expend \$670,000.

Chandra said she is waiting to hear back from Rich Mauro about the scenarios and whether or not it is worth their time to look at the no state increase one. As that one would take the most work, she recommended working backwards from the \$4 million state increase with sequester cuts in hopes she will hear from Rich before they have to make decisions about cutting \$900,000 from their allocations. All were in agreement.

The subcommittee began with the scenario that the state realizes a \$4 million increase while still having the impact of sequester cuts which would allow them to allocate an addition \$670,650. Chandra explained this could be a one year increase to state funds (at that level) and that sequester cuts will continue into subsequent years. So, it is likely

that the funding awarded won't be sustained throughout the two-year contract term. She also then talked about the emphasis this committee, the ACA as a whole and DRCOG's legislative advocacy staff have always placed on increasing funding to reduce waiting lists for meals on wheels and expand funding to other priority services including transportation and in-home care services should an increase in funding be realized. She indicated they received clarification from their attorney that they could, in fact, opt to fund a proposal submitted beyond its requested amount. And so, despite the limited increase in request by VOA for meals on wheels, they could put money toward decreasing the waiting list for the highest priority service in the region.

Chandra made the following recommendation to the subcommittee:

1. Allocate \$170,650 in-house for DRCOG staff. This money could help support the ARCH, the Ombudsman, Information and Assistance and Case Management Programs and allow DRCOG to free up some of the administrative dollars that currently go toward supporting these programs,
2. Provide a additional \$400,000 to VOA home delivered meals, which would significantly reduce their waiting lists, and
3. Allocate the remaining \$100,000 to some of the transportation who were not previously provided an increase and the one in-home care programs whose funding was not increased beyond their current levels of funding.

Based on this recommendation members discussed the following:

- Increasing VOA meals on wheels proposal by \$400,000 bringing their funding total to \$3,223,776.
- Increasing Adams County Transportation proposal by \$37,800 bringing their funding amount to \$289,660.
- Increasing Arapahoe County Transportation proposal by \$40,798 bringing their funded amount to \$372,259.
- Increasing First Ride's proposal by \$13,993 bringing their funded amount to \$426,918.
- Increasing Visiting Nurse Association by \$7,409 bringing their funded amount to \$347,270.

Fabyan W. made a motion that with a \$4 million increase to approve the staff recommendations (as detailed above) for the additional funding of \$670,650 which was seconded by Dawn P. All were in favor with no opposition.

Members discussed the following in regards to receiving only a \$2 million increase which would mean cutting \$113,122 from the allocations made to date. Members noted the flag to eliminate funding totaling \$76,292 to the Audio Information Network in the

event of insufficient funding. Members also noted that the increase allocated to Seniors' Resource Center's transportation was larger than the increases to the other transportation providers, and discussed decreasing it by \$36,830 from their funded amount bringing their total funds to \$463,170. Dawn P. made a motion in the event of a \$2 million increase, not to fund the Audio Information Network and to remove \$36,830 from Seniors' Resource Center's allocated funds. The motion was seconded by Bob L. All were in favor with no opposition.

Chandra was able to reach Rich who stated there was no need, as he saw it, to go through the final scenario which provided for no increase in state funds and the subcommittee agreed to present the two scenarios just discussed.

In closing, Chandra acknowledged the members for the good dialogue that occurred at the meetings especially given the addition of four brand new members and thanked all members for their time

#### Next Meeting Friday, April 19, 2013

At this meeting, members will review the process just completed and discuss needed changes. Chandra encouraged members to think about what they would like to see done differently and she will also bring a list of things commented on during the proposal review.

2013-2015  
Funding Recommendations

<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Service Category</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Initial Current Contract Amount (if applicable)</b>	<b>Amount Requested This Proposal</b>	<b>Scenario #1: Funding Recommended based on \$2 M State Increase &amp; Sequester Cuts</b>	<b>Scenario #2: Funding Recommended based on \$4 M State Increase &amp; Sequester Cuts</b>
A Little Help	Multiple Service	A Little Help Senior Services	N/A	\$50,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Adams County Community Development	Transportation	A-LIFT Community Transit	\$251,860.00	\$385,560.00	\$251,860.00	\$289,660.00
Alzheimer's Association Colorado Chapter	Caregiver Services	Families Caring for People with Alzheimer's Disease	\$177,297.00	\$247,764.00	\$177,297.00	\$177,297.00
American Council of the Blind of Colorado	Health Promotion/Education	Sight for Seniors: Providing education/training to ensure independence of seniors living with vision loss avoiding premature out-of-home placement	N/A	\$115,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Arapahoe County Community Resources	Transportation	Arapahoe County Transportation Program	\$331,461.00	\$372,259.00	\$331,461.00	\$372,259.00
Arapahoe County Community Resources	Chore Services	Arapahoe County Chore Services Program	\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00
Audio Information Network of Colorado	Health Promotion/Education	Audio Information Services	N/A	\$76,292.23	\$0.00	\$76,292.00
Catholic Charities and Community Services of the Archdiocese of Denver, Inc.	Caregiver Services	Catholic Charities Kinship Caregiver Program (CCKCP)	\$113,500.00	\$130,246.00	\$113,500.00	\$113,500.00

2013-2015  
Funding Recommendations

Provider Name	Service Category	Proposal	Initial Current Contract Amount (if applicable)	Amount Requested This Proposal	Scenario #1: Funding Recommended based on \$2 M State Increase & Sequester Cuts	Scenario #2: Funding Recommended based on \$4 M State Increase & Sequester Cuts
Center For People With Disabilities	Material Aid	DRCOG Assistive Technology Initiative	N/A	\$95,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Centura Health	Health Promotion/Education	Centura Health LINKS	\$105,484.00	\$126,213.00	\$105,484.00	\$105,484.00
City and County of Broomfield	Transportation	Broomfield Elderly/Disabled Transportation	\$72,520.00	\$179,225.00	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00
City and County of Broomfield	Caregiver Services	Broomfield Caregiver Respite Program	\$66,308.00	\$75,066.75	\$66,308.00	\$66,308.00
Clinica Colorado	Evidence Based Programs	Providing Healthcare for Older Americans	N/A	\$91,234.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Colorado Bureau of Investigation	Health Promotion/Education	IDENTITY THEFT & FRAUD PREVENTION EDUCATION PROJECT	N/A	\$208,664.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Colorado Center for the Blind	Multiple Service	Colorado Center for the Blind - DRCOG Senior Services	N/A	\$99,924.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Colorado Gerontological Society	Material Aid	Colorado Gerontological Society Material Aid Program	\$400,000.00	\$3,200,408.00	\$400,000.00	\$400,000.00
Colorado Legal Services	Legal Assistance	Colorado Legal Services, Senior Citizens Law Center & Home Preservation Project	\$207,882.00	\$306,995.00	\$218,392.00	\$218,392.00



2013-2015  
Funding Recommendations

Provider Name	Service Category	Proposal	Initial Current Contract Amount (if applicable)	Amount Requested This Proposal	Scenario #1: Funding Recommended based on \$2 M State Increase & Sequester Cuts	Scenario #2: Funding Recommended based on \$4 M State Increase & Sequester Cuts
Comforcare Home Care	Homemaker/ Personal Care Services	Homemaker	N/A	\$81,630.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Denver Office on Aging	Chore Services	Denver County Chore Service Program	N/A	\$92,383.00	\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00
Dominican Sisters Home Health Agency of Denver, Inc.	Homemaker/ Personal Care Services	Health, Empowerment, and Reminders at Home (H.E.R. at Home) providing personal care to the poor, frail elderly and their caregiver/s	N/A	\$131,050.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Dominican Sisters Home Health Agency of Denver, Inc.	Health Promotion/ Education	Health, Independence, and Safety at Home (H.I.S. at Home) Nurses promoting healthcare to the poor, frail elderly and their caregiver/s	N/A	\$245,700.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Douglas County CPSD - Community Services	Transportation	Douglas County Senior Adult Transportation	\$93,377.00	\$93,420.00	\$93,420.00	\$93,420.00
Easter Seals Colorado	Caregiver Services	Rehabilitation Services & Stroke Day Program	N/A	\$82,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>Elder Justice Colorado</b>	<b>Legal Assistance</b>	<b>EJCO Legal Clinic Program</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$56,014.10</b>	<b>withdraw</b>	<b>withdraw</b>

2013-2015  
Funding Recommendations

Provider Name	Service Category	Proposal	Initial Current Contract Amount (if applicable)	Amount Requested This Proposal	Scenario #1: Funding Recommended based on \$2 M State Increase & Sequester Cuts	Scenario #2: Funding Recommended based on \$4 M State Increase & Sequester Cuts
First Ride	Transportation	Proposal to provide accessible transportation for Seniors for the Counties of Denver and Jefferson under the Older Americans Act Title 111.	\$412,925.00	\$426,918.00	\$412,925.00	\$426,918.00
HealthSET	Multiple Service	Essential Health Services for Low-Income Elderly FY2014	\$122,500.00	\$463,063.00	\$122,500.00	\$122,500.00
Jefferson Center for Mental Health	Counseling Services	Senior Reach Mental Health Assessments and Counseling Services	\$73,500.00	\$156,665.00	\$85,000.00	\$85,000.00
Jewish Family Service of Colorado	Homemaker/ Personal Care Services	Jewish Family Service of Colorado Home Care Provider Program	\$112,197.00	\$114,500.00	\$114,500.00	\$114,500.00
Lutheran Family Services Rocky Mountains	Caregiver Services	Lutheran Family Services Rocky Mountains (LFSRM) African American Caregiver Support Program (AACSP)	\$74,400.00	\$90,000.00	\$74,400.00	\$74,400.00
Mt. Evans Home Health and Hospice	Multiple Service	Services for Older Adults in the Rural Foothills: Health Promotions and Counseling	\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

2013-2015  
Funding Recommendations

<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Service Category</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Initial Current Contract Amount (if applicable)</b>	<b>Amount Requested This Proposal</b>	<b>Scenario #1: Funding Recommended based on \$2 M State Increase &amp; Sequester Cuts</b>	<b>Scenario #2: Funding Recommended based on \$4 M State Increase &amp; Sequester Cuts</b>
Senior Helpers	Homemaker/ Personal Care Services	Senior Helpers Homemaker and Personal Care Program	N/A	\$270,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Screening & Evaluation	Screening, evaluation and stabilization services for the seniors of the Denver area with the greatest social and greatest economic needs	\$73,500.00	\$118,173.00	\$73,500.00	\$73,500.00
Seniors' Resource Center, Inc.	Transportation	Transportation Services for Seniors in the Community	\$432,709.00	\$648,000.00	\$463,170.00	\$500,000.00
Seniors' Resource Center, Inc.	Transportation	Call Center for Enhanced Community Transportation Resources	N/A	\$153,090.00		
Seniors' Resource Center, Inc.	Homemaker/ Personal Care Services	In Home Care Services	\$205,057.00	\$326,000.00	\$210,057.00	\$210,057.00
Seniors' Resource Center, Inc.	Caregiver Services	Adult Day & Respite Services	\$76,000.00	\$152,272.00	\$76,000.00	\$76,000.00
Seniors' Resource Center, Inc.	Chore Services	Volunteer Services Delivers Chores to Seniors in Need	N/A	\$77,360.00	\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00

2013-2015  
Funding Recommendations

<b>Provider Name</b>	<b>Service Category</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Initial Current Contract Amount (if applicable)</b>	<b>Amount Requested This Proposal</b>	<b>Scenario #1: Funding Recommended based on \$2 M State Increase &amp; Sequester Cuts</b>	<b>Scenario #2: Funding Recommended based on \$4 M State Increase &amp; Sequester Cuts</b>
SouthWest Improvement Council-SWIC	Native American Programming	SWICOYATE--Native American and Hispanic Elder Screening and Evaluation	\$98,000.00	\$170,000.00	\$98,000.00	\$98,000.00
Spring Institute for Intercultural Learning	Multiple Service	Screening, Education and Health Promotion for Older Immigrants & Refugees	N/A	\$165,865.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Synergy HomeCare	Homemaker/ Personal Care Services	Synergy Homecare Denver Homemaker and Personal Care Proposal	N/A	\$150,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
The Denver Center for Crime Victims	Multiple Service	Senior Companion Program for Elder Victims of Crime	N/A	\$26,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
The Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Community Center of Colorado	Multiple Service	SAGE of the Rockies Elder Services	N/A	\$94,388.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
The Senior Hub	Caregiver Services	Adult Day Service	\$91,207.00	\$118,401.00	\$91,207.00	\$91,207.00
The Senior Hub	Caregiver Services	Respite Care	\$89,678.00	\$128,090.00	\$89,678.00	\$89,678.00
Tri-County Health Department	Evidence Based Programs	TCHD-A Matter of Balance	\$126,964.00	\$136,377.00	\$126,964.00	\$126,964.00

2013-2015  
Funding Recommendations

Provider Name	Service Category	Proposal	Initial Current Contract Amount (if applicable)	Amount Requested This Proposal	Scenario #1: Funding Recommended based on \$2 M State Increase & Sequester Cuts	Scenario #2: Funding Recommended based on \$4 M State Increase & Sequester Cuts
Visiting Nurse Association	Homemaker/ Personal Care Services	Visiting Nurse Association (VNA) 2013-2015 In-Home Personal Care Worker and Homemaker Program	\$339,861.00	\$389,861.00	\$339,861.00	\$347,270.00
Visiting Nurse Association	Evidence Based Programs	Visiting Nurse Association (VNA) 2013-2015 Senior Wellness Proposal	N/A	\$22,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Volunteers of America	Home Delivered Meals	Home Delivered Meals	\$2,713,776.00	\$2,823,776.00	\$2,823,776.00	\$3,223,776.00
Volunteers of America	Congregate Meals	Congregate Meals	\$1,075,000.00	\$1,090,000.00	\$1,090,000.00	\$1,090,000.00
Volunteers of America	Transportation Evidence Based Programs	Transportation Gilpin/Clear Creek	\$65,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00
Volunteers of America		Healthy Aging For Older Adults Safety of Seniors Handyman Program - Volunteers of America Colorado Branch	\$73,500.00	\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00
Volunteers of America	Material Aid		\$93,708.00	\$93,900.00	\$93,900.00	\$93,900.00
	<b>Totals:</b>		<b>\$8,319,171.00</b>	<b>\$15,247,747.08</b>	<b>\$8,618,160.00</b>	<b>\$9,231,282.00</b>



**2013-2015  
Funding Recommendations**





**2013-2015  
Funding Recommendations**



**2013-2015  
Funding Recommendations**



**ATTACH C**



To: Chair and Member of Advisory Committee on Aging

From: Chandra Matthews, Compliance Program Manager, AAA

Subject: Project Visibility Presentation

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 19, 2013	Information	

#### REQUESTED ACTION

None. Informational only.

#### SUMMARY

- There is increasing evidence that lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered (LGBT) elders in our community are uncertain where to turn and what to do if they need care or support services. Based on this evidence and as the region's Area Agency on Aging (AAA) – mandated to advocate for all older adults and ensure they have access to services – DRCOG began reviewing information and seeking ways to help minimize LGBT elders concerns.
- One of the biggest concerns for LGBT elders is that the staff at long-term care facilities and/or community service agencies, who may be providing care for them (either currently or in the future), lack a level of sensitivity and awareness of the issues they face.
- In 2009 DRCOG staff, in partnership with staff from The LGBT Center, began providing training to help increase sensitivity and awareness of the growing population of LGBT elders in the Denver area in an effort to ensure a safe and healthy future for these older adults.
- This training, titled *Project Visibility* is a sensitivity program that began through Boulder County Aging Services, and has developed into a dynamic and continually updated training format that has touched hundreds of concerned providers in Colorado and across the country. The training is comprised of a moving film that showcases the lives of lesbian and gay elders, a PowerPoint presentation, and discussion of the steps service providers can take to provide good service for the LGBT community.
- DRCOG AAA staff Ombudsman, Jennifer Solms is here to present an abbreviated version of this training to you today.

#### PRIOR BOARD ACTION

N/A

#### FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

ALTERNATIVES
--------------

N/A

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
---------------------------------

N/A