July 26, 2016

Honorable Charles Margines
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California
700 Civic Center Drive West
Santa Ana, CA 92701

Subject: Response to Grand Jury Report, “Gray Matters – A Look at the Orange County Office on Aging”

Dear Judge Margines:

Per your request, and in accordance with Penal Code 933, please find the combined County of Orange response to the subject report as approved by the Board of Supervisors. The respondents are the Orange County Board of Supervisors and the County Executive Office.

If you have any questions, please contact Lilly Simmering of the County Executive Office at 714-834-6748.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Frank Kim
County Executive Officer

Enclosure

cc: FY 2015-16 Orange County Grand Jury Foreman
Mark Denny, Chief Operating Officer, County Executive Office
Lilly Simmering, Deputy Chief Operating Officer, County Executive Office
ORANGE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
MINUTE ORDER
July 26, 2016

Submitting Agency/Department: County Executive Office

Approve proposed response to FY 2015-16 Grand Jury Report "Gray Matters - A Look at the Orange County Office on Aging." - All Districts

The following is action taken by the Board of Supervisors:
APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☑️ OTHER ☐

Unanimous ☑️ (1) DO: Y (2) STEEL: Y (3) SPITZER: Y (4) NELSON: Y (5) BARTLETT: Y
Vote Key: Y=Yes; N=No; A=Abstain; X=Excused; B.O.=Board Order

Documents accompanying this matter:
☐ Resolution(s)
☐ Ordinances(s)
☐ Contract(s)

Item No. 34

Special Notes:

Copies sent to:
CEO – Lilly Simmering
Superior Court
Grand Jury

7/29/16

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the Minute Order adopted by the Board of Supervisors, Orange County, State of California.
Robin Steier, Clerk of the Board

By: __________________________
Deputy
AGENDA STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE: 07/26/16

LEGAL ENTITY TAKING ACTION: Board of Supervisors

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DISTRICT(S): All Districts

SUBMITTING AGENCY/DEPARTMENT: County Executive Office (Approved)

DEPARTMENT CONTACT PERSON(S):
Steve Franks (714) 480-2788
Lilly Simmerring (714) 834-6748

SUBJECT: Office of Aging Grand Jury Response

CEO CONCUR: Concur
COUNTY COUNSEL REVIEW: No Legal Objection
CLERK OF THE BOARD: Discussion
3 Votes Board Majority

Budgeted: N/A  Current Year Cost: N/A  Annual Cost: N/A
Staffing Impact: No  # of Positions: 
Current Fiscal Year Revenue: N/A  Sole Source: N/A
Funding Source: N/A  County Audit in last 3 years: No

Prior Board Action: N/A

RECOMMENDED ACTION(S):

1. Approve proposed response to FY 2015-16 Grand Jury Report entitled, "Gray Matters - A Look at the Orange County Office on Aging."

2. Direct Clerk of the Board to forward this Agenda Staff Report with attachments to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court and the FY 2015-16 Grand Jury no later than August 12, 2016.

SUMMARY:

Approval of proposed response to FY 2015-16 Grand Jury Report entitled, "Gray Matters - A Look at the Orange County Office on Aging" will fulfill the County's required response to the Grand Jury.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

On April 5, 2016, the Orange County Grand Jury Report released a report entitled, "Gray Matters - A Look at the Orange County Office on Aging." The report directed findings and recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and the County Executive Office. Attachment B is the County's proposed response to the Grand Jury's findings and recommendations.
FINANCIAL IMPACT:
N/A

STAFFING IMPACT:
N/A

ATTACHMENT(S):
Attachment A - Grand Jury Report
Attachment B - Proposed Grand Jury Responses
Attachment C - Draft Transmittal Letter
Responses to Findings and Recommendations
2015-16 Grand Jury Report:

"GRAY MATTERS – A Look at the Orange County Office on Aging"

SUMMARY RESPONSE STATEMENT:

On April 5, 2016, the Grand Jury released a report entitled: “GRAY MATTERS – A Look at the Orange County Office on Aging.” This report directed responses to findings and recommendations to the Orange County Board of Supervisors and the Director of OC Community Resources, which are included below.

FINDINGS AND RESPONSES:

F.1. Funding from the Orange County General Fund in support of the Office on Aging has not kept pace with the rapid increase in senior population. Allocation to Office on Aging from the OC General Fund in 2005-2006, prior to the recession, was $2.20 per senior per year. Over the past five years the allocation dropped to only $1.32 per senior person per year in FY 2015-16.

Response: Agrees with the finding.

F.2. Lack of resources for the Office on Aging hampers its ability to accomplish its mission and mandates as required by the California Code of Regulations-WIC 9400-9404. The Office on Aging is required to be the County’s lead planner and advocate for seniors, working with public and private partners to create an updated, coordinated countywide strategic plan to better leverage and integrate all available resources to address the rapidly growing senior population.

Response: Disagrees partially with the finding.

The Office on Aging currently fulfills its mission and mandates with the current level of program funding. However, additional monies would allow the Office on Aging to expand services to meet the growing needs of a diverse aging population.
F.3. The position of the Division Manager for the Office on Aging is only a part time position, shared with the Veteran’s Service Office. Increasing outreach and Call Center demand require full time management at this level.

Response: Disagrees partially with the finding.
The Office on Aging and the Veteran’s Service Office is managed under one division manager to utilize shared resources and provide oversight to direct service programs serving related populations in Orange County. Approximately 43% of the Veterans assisted by the Veteran’s Service Office are also seniors. Therefore increased integration and coordination among the programs offers additional service options based on either the veteran or senior status.

Orange County Community Resources (OCCR) and the County of Orange recognize the Grand Jury’s desire to ensure that the Office on Aging programs receive adequate leadership, oversight and management support; however the County has not experienced negative outcomes or management deficiencies resulting from the integration of the services for seniors with veterans. The Office on Aging’s program managers continuously monitor call volumes, track contracted outreach activities and seek community input on the needs of older adults as part of routine operations and do not require the intervention of the Division Manager.

F.4. Limited funding to support staff positions results in chronic vacancies within the Office on Aging, negatively affecting service and responsiveness.

Response: Disagrees partially with the finding.
While the Grand Jury accurately noted that long term vacancies in the Office on Aging have a negative impact on service levels and responsiveness, the causes and contributing factors for the chronic vacancies are more complex than a lack of local funding. The number and duration of vacancies are also affected by reductions in State and Federal funding, demographic factors in the County workforce, and the lengthy hiring process in the County.

The Office on Aging monitors services and allocates resources to meet the demand and adjusts workloads due to vacancies.

F.5. Limited staffing resources prevent the pursuit of grants to support senior services.

Response: Agrees with the finding.
The County Office on Aging emphasized service delivery to seniors over the pursuit of grants with available staffing. The process of preparing grant applications, managing awards, reporting requirements for grant funded programs and responding to audits increases the administrative burden on the Office on Aging. In addition, all grant applications for over $50,000 must be presented to the Board of Supervisors to approve the receipt of funds; therefore the County takes a thoughtful and measured approach when applying for grants to target grant opportunities that meet the needs of the County while balancing the administrative burden of managing the grants.
Limited staffing is one consideration among many factors that determine whether County will pursue grant funding.

F.6. The Office on Aging website is outdated and needs technological modernization immediately. There is no provision for access by mobile device or on-line chat capability.

Response: Agrees with the finding. Office on Aging also identified the need to update the website to provide for mobile access and online chat capability. This is included in the work plan.

F.7. The County of Orange provides no budgetary support beyond the original contract to non-profit subcontractors for the recruitment of volunteers.

Response: Agrees with the finding. The County contracts for Senior Nutrition and Ombudsman Programs have emphasized the delivery of services and did not include dedicated funding for the recruitment of volunteers by the non-profit subcontractors.

F.8. Orange County provides no budgetary support to the non-profit agency that publishes the “Answers” publication beyond the cost of individual county department advertising.

Response: Agrees with the finding. The County purchases advertising in this resource guide published to market businesses and promote services targeting seniors and their families.

F.9. Annual and semi-annual mechanical vehicle inspection is the responsibility of the Office on Aging, but no licensed mechanic is on staff to do this.

Response: Agrees with the finding.

F.10. Mileage verification of each Senior Non-Emergency Medical trip is the responsibility of the Office on Aging, an inefficient, labor intensive effort requiring manual input of subcontractor supplied data.

Response: Agrees with the finding.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES:

R.1. Board of Supervisors should restore funding to the Office on Aging from Orange County General Funds or any other available and reliable, permanent source of at least $1,294,000 in FY 2016-2017, based upon the pre-recession amount of $2.20 per senior per year, to restore staffing levels, update the Call
Center and reposition the Office on Aging as the county’s lead planner and advocate. (F1, F2)

Response: This recommendation will not be implemented because under the County’s budget process, budget requests for the Office of Aging are based on the services and functions necessary to address unmet needs of older adults rather than through a specific funding formula as recommended. The County will address the needs of the aging population through the annual budget review in consideration of available funding. The Office on Aging is committed to requesting adequate resources to fulfill the role of the County as lead planner and advocate for older adults.

The Office on Aging will continue to prepare Annual Area plan updates that receive Board review and approval that address services as well as funding levels for programs and services addressing needs of older adults. Annual updates will also be provided as part of the annual budget process.

R.2. The Office on Aging should apply any increased funds received above the current baseline to restore service levels and to provide strategic leadership countywide. (F1, F2)

Response: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, to the extent increases in funding are approved for the Office on Aging.

R.3. Add a position to serve as event coordinator at the Administrative Manager level 1 to Office on Aging to support OOA outreach and visibility by July 1, 2017. (F2)

Response: The recommendation will not be implemented. The Office on Aging will assign additional personnel to increase outreach efforts and plan outreach events for older adults. The employee(s) assigned to perform these duties will have other duties and will not be a dedicated Administrative Manager I nor will this reassignment be accomplished according to the timeline requested by the Grand Jury. The Office on Aging will initiate recruitments to fill three vacant existing positions rather than adding a new position.

R.4. Increase Full Time Equivalent Division Manager of the Office of Aging from FTE 0.5 to FTE 1.0 and separate the Veterans Service and the Office on Aging by January 1, 2017. (F3)

Response: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. OC Community Resources targets limited resources to maximize services and intentionally seeks to limit administrative burden on the program. Separating the functions will increase the management cost to both programs and reduce the funding available for services.

The consolidation of the Office on Aging and Veteran’s Service Division Manager
has not resulted in negative outcomes for either program. The Office on Aging and the Veteran’s Service Office utilize shared resources, which is of benefit to both programs. The two divisions provide direct assistance in obtaining services to similar populations. Approximately 43% of the Veterans assisted by the Veteran’s Service Office are also seniors. The Office on Aging’s program managers continuously monitor call volumes, track contracted outreach activities and seek community input on the needs of older adults as part of routine operations and do not require the intervention of the Division Manager.

R.5. **Initiate a recruitment to fill one vacant longstanding Senior Citizen Representative position in the Information and Assistance Call Center by January 1, 2017** (F4)

Response: The recommendation has not been implemented but will be implemented in the future. The County will initiate the recruitment for the vacant Senior Citizen Representative in FY 2016/17.

R.6. **Add a position to serve as grant writer at the Administrator II level by July 1, 2017.** (F5)

Response: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. The County plans to increase grant seeking activities as recommended by the Grand Jury without adding an additional position. The County plans to fill three vacant positions in the Office on Aging. The Office on Aging will assign employees to research and apply for grants as part of their duties.

R.7. **Update and upgrade the Office on Aging website to provide for mobile device access and an on-line chat function by December 31, 2017.** (F6)

Response: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The department is working with CEO-IT to implement mobile device access and to determine the feasibility of online chat capabilities by June 2017.

R.8. **Enter into a negotiation for a cost share with non-profit subcontractors in volunteer recruitment activity by December 31, 2016.** (F7)

Response: The recommendation will not be implemented as it is not warranted or reasonable. The Contract Policy Manual for the County and the human services contracts between the Office on Aging and the non-profit subcontractors do not address cost sharing agreements as part of the contract terms and conditions.

The Office on Aging will explore adding volunteer recruitment activities to the scope of work in the next request for proposal cycle for some of the human services contracts to be awarded in July 2017; however, this would not be a cost share agreement as recommended by the Grand Jury.
R.9. Enter into negotiations to cost share with the applicable non-profit agency to produce the book “Answers” by December 31, 2016. (F8)

Response: This recommendation will not be implemented as it is not warranted or reasonable. The Contract Policy Manual for the County does not address cost sharing agreements. The County will explore other similar resource guide options outside of “Answers” to ensure more exposure. The County is committed to increasing activities related to outreach and disseminating information on aging topics. The analysis will be completed by January 31, 2017.

R.10. Institute an annual Board of Supervisors Volunteer of the Year Award for senior services rendered in the form of recognition and an award funded by the County by December 31, 2016. (F7)

Response: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The volunteer recognition may not be completed by December 31, 2016 as recommended but the Office on Aging will work with the Board of Supervisors to make the volunteer recognition program a priority in FY 2016/17.

R.11. Add a requirement in the next Request for Proposal for the Senior Non-Emergency Transportation Program to require the subcontractor to handle the physical and mechanical inspection of vehicles at subcontractor’s cost with documentation required by the Office on Aging that the inspection was conducted at the County’s Public Works/Fleet Services Division. (F9)

Response: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The requirements will be included in the next RFP, which will be released in early 2017.

R.12. Add a requirement in the next Request for Proposal for the Senior Non-Emergency Transportation Program that the sub-contractor produce mileage verification data obtained through MapQuest or similar software and require contractors to submit mileage verifications with payment request. (F10)

Response: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The requirements will be included in the next RFP, which will be released in early 2017.