

Sonoma County Area Agency on Aging

3725 WESTWIND BOULEVARD, SUITE 101, P.O. BOX 4059, SANTA ROSA, CA 95402
(707) 565-5950 FAX (707) 565-5957

AAA ADVISORY COUNCIL PLANNING & FUNDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

3725 Westwind Boulevard, Suite 101, Santa Rosa Carnelian Room
Wednesday, February 3, 2016, 1:00 – 2:30 P.M.

Attendees: Judith Eisen, Sumedha Mona Khanna, Margaret Loftus, Bob Picker, Ruth Robeson, Rabon Saip, Diane Spain

Absent: Jim Redding

Staff: Tracy Repp, Rhiannon Coxon, Diane Kaljian, Victoria Gonzalez-Allen

1. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS: The meeting was opened with a welcome to all and introductions were made.
2. APPROVAL OF JANUARY MINUTES (Spain): Picker/Robeson
3. AREA PLAN 2016-2020 (Coxon/Repp):
Reviewed draft plan and clarified areas for members to focus. Coxon requested written feedback by 2/10/16. Discussion included:
 - Title is “The Art of Aging”
 - Chapter names to be “art inspired”
 - Review for gaps in plan, goals and objectives, and general editing
 - Highlighted sections are placeholders for charts/graphs/images
 - Appendix not included in handout due to limiting size of document for review
 - Writer contracted to help write the plan
 - Project Timeline-committee to approve draft, P&F will submit recommended plan to Advisory Council to review and approve at Public Hearing on 4/20/16. Advisory Council recommendations are then submitted to the Board of Supervisors for approval in May. The plan is due to California Department of Aging in May
4. MONITORING SCHEDULE UPDATE (Coxon):
 - Coxon thanked all who volunteered to attend monitoring-Great response from Advisory Council meeting of 1/20/16 request for volunteers – only April visits need additional volunteers
 - Eisen asked about the nutrition monitoring visits that are not attended by AC members but performed by staff (case file review, delivery routes, AAA nutritionist monitoring). Requested staff to provide report from these visits.
 - PPSC nutrition program monitoring date changed from 3/23 to 3/30. Staff to check with PPSC to confirm how many AC members can attend lunch program.

- Loftus advised she did not sign up for visits in her district (Sonoma) due to knowing the programs. Repp advised members are welcome to sign up for any monitoring whether in their district or not.
- All but one Advisory member has signed up for monitoring through April.

5. RFP FOR 2017-2021 (Coxon/Kaljia/Repp):

Funding Priorities

Kaljia advised Funding Priorities are decided by P&F each RFP cycle. Reviewed most recent version from October 2014 for 2015-17 cycle.

Background information: Older Californians Act funded programs were eliminated due to the lack of state funding in 2008. These included Brown Bag program, Alzheimer’s Day Care Program, Respite Care, Foster Grandparents and Linkages.

Though state funding for Linkages was eliminated Sonoma County’s program was maintained and Linkages case management was determined to be a funding priority by Advisory Council.

Discussion of Linkages program included:

Linkages is the basis for creating an ADRC (Aging and Disability Resource Center) to include options counseling and information and referral (I&R) ADRC will be a generic resource for people who may not qualify for other programs. Khanna asked for a definition for Aging and Disability Resource Center. Information can be found at this website: communitychoices.info.

Linkages includes APS clients who are victims of financial abuse and need case management support. APS puts protection in place for vulnerable seniors and refers to Linkages for longer term support for clients so that the abuse does not reoccur. Linkages also provides services to depressed and suicidal older adults through Healthy Ideas. The social workers are trained in the evidenced based model. Coxon commented that IHSS level of social work service is very different. Linkages case work is more complex.

Robeson asked about the cost of program. Kaljia commented that Linkages social workers are the highest level qualified, most have master’s degrees and significant background and training. Social worker IV is consistent with APS/MSSP/Care Transitions social work staff. These social workers are expected to make autonomous decisions when visiting clients out of the office. Linkages is currently staffed by 4 full time social worker IVs.

The non-profit agencies utilize different staffing model than the County for determining the level of social worker employed for case management

Eisen stated that Linkages is valuable to people who don’t qualify/fit into other programs. She would like to continue Linkages funding as it is important for the frailest seniors. Linkages is worthwhile to keep even though expense is high.

Robeson asked why Linkages does not submit an application during the RFP cycle. Kaljia responded that Linkages is an Advisory Council program and does not compete for funding because it is sponsored by the AAA.

Saip asked if medication abuse is addressed through Healthy Ideas. Kaljian responded that the MSSP public Health nurse lends expertise to Linkages social workers. Saip commented that there are no elder specific treatment programs and is interested in addressing services for the growing need. Saip asked about federal Substance Abuse funding (SAMSA) funding for Linkages.

Robeson asked about the other sources of Linkages funding. Kaljian responded that Linkages is a mix of funding streams. Eisen asked the percentage total of budget that is funded through IIIB. Kaljian stated less than 20% of the total funding comes from AAA. Spain asked about the funding level for Linkages. The funding level is determined by P & F recommendation to the Advisory Council.

Robeson asked about Linkages program monitoring to address transparency concerns. Kaljian responded that adjacent AAAs have been asked to monitor Linkages in the past to prevent any conflict of interest. Advisory may choose to monitor Linkages this cycle.

Kaljian provided more background stating that the Linkages program exists in Sonoma County and has continued because of the Advisory Council commitment to the program. Kaljian concluded that the funding priorities are the P&F rationale to determine where funds should be spent when funding is reduced or expanded. Decisions have been made about areas that the Advisory will no longer fund due to lack of significant funding amounts.

6. FUNDING PRIORITIES (RFP)

Priorities will be discussed next month. Spain asked for thoughts on priorities be brought to the next meeting and added that the Advisory Council relies on P&F to do nitty gritty analysis. Staff shared a template all Human Services programs must follow for RFP. The goal is to reduce redundancies in the RFP for ease of use of providers. Committee discussed the importance of requiring a letter of intent during the RFP cycle. The county has a new financial system that will require applicants to create an online profile to respond to the RFP.

7. SECOND QUARTER PERFORMANCE REVIEW (Coxon)

Discussion will be held at next meeting. Khanna asked about any red flags on contractor performance. Coxon stated that current year comparison to last year is similar. If there are concerns, staff contacts service providers to advise and discuss achieving contract goals. Spain commented that staff really works with service providers to help them meet contract goals.

8. ADJOURN: Adjourned at 2:31PM

*NEXT MEETING
March 2, 2016 @ 1:00 P.M.*