

Senior Services Advisory Council

DATE: Friday May 17, 2019

TIME: 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

LOCATION: Lane Council of Governments

5th Floor, Buford Meeting Room

859 Willamette Street

Eugene, OR 97401

CONTACT: Kate Scott, 541-682-4137; kscott2@lcog.org

=====

1. Agenda And Minutes

Documents:

[SSAC AGENDA 5-17-19.PDF](#)

[SSAC MINUTES 3-15-2019.PDF](#)



MEETING NOTICE

MEETING: Senior Services Advisory Council
DATE: Friday May 17, 2019
TIME: 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.
LOCATION: Lane Council of Governments
5th Floor, Buford Meeting Room
859 Willamette Street
Eugene, OR 97401
CONTACT: Kate Scott, 541-682-4137; kscott2@lcog.org

AGENDA

- | | | |
|-----------|---|------------|
| 1:30 p.m. | 1. Call to Order, Introductions | Diane R. |
| 1:31 p.m. | 2. Consideration of and Additions to Meeting Agenda | Diane R. |
| 1:33 p.m. | 3. Consideration of the last Council Meeting Minutes | Diane R. |
| 1:35 p.m. | 4. Contract Amendment Action Items | |
| | a. FOOD for Lane County Recommendation | Heather D. |
| | b. Elder Help Recommendation | Kate S. |
| | c. In-Home Services Consortium Recommendation | Kate S. |
| | d. OPI Emergency Response Systems Update | Kate S. |
| 1:55 p.m. | 5. SSAC New Member Applicant Review and Vote | Tammy L. |
| 2:05 p.m. | 6. Elder Abuse Awareness Month Activities Update | Kate S. |
| 2:30 p.m. | 7. Call for Next Meeting Agenda Items and
Reminder of Next Meeting: July 19, 2019 1:30PM – 2:30PM | Diane R. |

Adjourn

Public Comment is limited to 3 minutes.

The above facility is wheelchair accessible. American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation and assisted listening devices can be provided with 48 hours notice; call (541) 682-4430.

**MINUTES
SENIOR SERVICES ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Friday, March 15, 2019

1:30 – 2:30 p.m.

Buford Room – Lane Council of Government
859 Willamette Street – Eugene, Oregon

MEMBERS PRESENT: Diane Rogers, Julie Austin, Ruth Beardsley, Hoover Chambliss, Judy Dashney, Rod Holst, Kay McDonald, Brittany Oom, Suzanne Huebner-Sannes, Barbara Susman.

EXCUSED: Jim Cole, Tom Mulhern, Amy Scott, Ken Viegas.

STAFF: Heather Demsky, Brooke Emery, Emily Farrell, Tammy Lanz, Haven Pauvaugh, Kate Scott, Dan Ziller.

1. Call to Order/Introductions

Chair Diane Rogers called the meeting to order at 1:29 p.m.

Those present introduced themselves. Copies of the Senior Meals Food Service RFP Summary and Senior Law RFP Summary were passed out.

2. Consideration of and Additions to Meeting Agenda

No additions were given.

3. Consideration of the last Council Meeting Minutes

Ms. Rogers pointed out that Tom Mulhern was listed twice in the members present section. She also asked if Jody Cline was at the last meeting, and everyone agreed that she was not, so her name should be taken out of present members section.

Ms. Farrell and Ms. Emery pointed out that they needed to be listed under staff, not members present.

Ms. McDonald had two questions and a comment she wanted to put forward. On page 5, paragraph 3 it says Pearl Street, but it should be PEARLS. It is an acronym, and has an 's' at the end. Also it should not be followed by Street. On page 6, paragraph 5, it says that a forum was held in Salem that was sponsored by OHA and PSU on December 9, 2018, but the date was actually January 9, 2019. Ms. McDonald also wondered why the minutes were written in past tense. Ms. Farrell explained that since the minutes are a recording of the meeting that already happened, it needs to be talked about in the past.

Ms. Rogers asked for any more changes. She also thanked Marina Brassfield for her work on the minutes

MOTION: Mr. Holst moved, seconded by Ms. Austin, to approve the January 18, 2019 minutes with revisions presented. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Action Items

- a. Senior Meals Food Service RFP Recommendation

Ms. Demsky told everyone that the S&DS Procurement & Monitoring Committee (PMC) had recommended they go forward with the proposal, and then directed everyone to the Senior Meals Food Service RFP summary document. LCOG is a partner agency in a food service consortium made up of 3 Area Agencies on Aging (LCOG, Cascades West Council of Government and NorthWest Senior & Disability Services) covering seven counties (Lane, Linn, Benton, Lincoln, Yamhill, Polk, and Marion). By working together they are able to acquire cheaper meals and share materials to lesson labor. Together as a consortium they worked 110 hours to create the RFP. They had four agencies submit letters of intent (GA Foods, Bateman Senior Living, Trinity Foods, and Meals on Wheels People), but only three (GA, Bateman, and Trinity) went on to tour the facilities (Salem, Eugene, and Newport), and attend the bidders conference. After that, only one, Bateman, submitted a proposal. Ms. Demsky explained that since GA mostly makes frozen meals the consortium believes they most likely did not think they could reach the hot meal goal set in the RFP.

Ms. Demsky detailed that if there had been more than one proposal, a selection committee would have been convened. This committee would have met at around 6 meetings to look through the various proposals. Before the one proposal came in, each of the three agencies had selected members to be on the committee.

As only one proposal was received, a less formal process was followed. Ms. Demsky told how the consortium members went through the proposal and responded with their own questions and comments. They then met up with Bateman, who offered a secondary document to answer their questions. After that, the consortium decided that the proposal met all specifications in the RFP.

Ms. Demsky described how as a consortium they rent out their facilities to Bateman. In Lane, there is a central kitchen rented to Bateman for food preparation. Food is then delivered to the 11 nutrition sites (10 run by S&DS in Springfield and rural Lane County, 1 by FOOD for Lane County for the Eugene area) in Lane County that provide service and delivery to the area. Ms. Demsky also described how the sliding-scale rates per meal had not changed from 2017 to 2018, or 2018 to 2019, so the rate changes they received for 2020 were minor in comparison. In the proposal it says they should add 4,000 more hot meals. Ms. Farrell asked if that was for the consortium as a whole, or just Lane. Ms. Demsky said it was for the whole consortium, but 2,000 of those meals would be going to Eugene. She also mentioned that every month they will work with Bateman and look at the actual number of meals they gave out to see if they are on track. It also helps Bateman know in advance if they need to give a debit or credit to LCOG. Ms. Demsky said that they had met earlier to talk about how they were expecting to send out more meals than originally contracted, and anticipated a credit on the food service as this moved the sliding per-meal price scale down.

Ms. Rogers inquired about what happens to food left over at the Café 60, and if is it donated to FOOD for Lane County. Ms. Demsky replied that they usually do not have leftovers, since they order to projected numbers, but when they do the food is given to the participants at Café 60.

Ms. Demsky went on to explain the hot and cold meal break down summary chart that Bateman had supplied. The consortium had asked Bateman to break down the rate scale to 5,000 for hot meals and 2,500 for frozen meals. They are contracting 430,000 hot meals at a rate of \$4.95 per meal and 138,000 frozen meals at a rate of \$0.43 per meal. Ms. Demsky explained that hot meals went up from \$4.86 to \$4.95, a \$0.06 increase, and frozen meals went up from \$0.42 to \$0.43, a \$0.01 increase. Since there was no cost increase in 2018 or 2019, the increase they received this year seemed fair given rising costs. Ms. Demsky mentioned that they have been utilizing frozen meals well lately. They are important for rural areas, where delivery trucks do not delivery. To get the meals care-givers go to their nearest center and pick them up.

Ms. Demsky said that the meal projections are looked at monthly, and reviewed quarterly and that a rate scale is given in the proposal so that their projections are accurate. There is a variable rate scale, which has proven in other counties to be productive. It gives wiggle room when meals delivered are not exactly what the contract predicted, and then they do not have to amend contracts.

Ms. Demsky reminded everyone that Bateman continues to manage their food costs, because they can engage in national food contracts with producers and suppliers. This allows for better pricing on raw foods needed to make meals.

Ms. Demsky also talked about gas charges, which were detailed in the RFP for Bateman, and is rated at \$3.25 per gallon for the area. Any gas not used is credited back on their monthly bill. Ms. Demsky emphasized that Bateman does not charge a profit from any of this, and subtract 1% off everything, which usually adds up to \$0.02 per meal. Additionally they charge \$0.10 per hot meal and \$0.09 per frozen meal. The consortium is able to prepay about 80% of their bill every month. Their subtraction from profits is projected and included in the proposal.

Ms. Rogers inquired what the additional cost for the program per meal for running the program would be. Ms. Demsky explained that most frozen meals are prepared in the Salem kitchen, and they pay \$0.08 to cover costs. All meals made at local sites cost \$0.34, which is set aside for when equipment needs replacing. She detailed a time when the kitchen needed a production kettle replaced for \$22,000 and were able to cover it without a disruption to meal services.

Mr. Holst asked how many years they have been working with Bateman. Ms. Demsky answered that they have been the provider since the consortium started 32 years ago. She said that the program had contracted with different providers from before the consortium was made. They had been hopeful to receive more proposals, so they could compare them side by side.

Ms. Rogers double checked that the contract with Bateman was for 5 years. Ms. Demsky clarified that while they present a new RFP every 5 years, the contract was reviewed & renewed by amendment every year.

Ms. Austin inquired that if another vendor was contracted if they would have used the same local facilities that Bateman does now. Ms. Demsky said that they would, since the facilities are owned by the consortium and rented out to the vendors.

Mr. Chambliss asked if the vendors provide their own human resources. Ms. Demsky said they do have human resources for their staff (assistant managers, bakers, cooks). She also mentioned that they are currently looking for a new baker.

Ms. Austin told everyone that in her last meal there was a roll instead of the normal bread, and that she enjoyed it. She said that they should expect good feedback from consumers. Ms. Demsky said that since they currently do not have a baker, they might have sourced the roll from the Salem kitchen, or bought the rolls pre-made. She also talked about how their central kitchen manager had suggested they get a roll machine, which would make better, more consistent bread. With budget season in full swing, she said they would look into if it was a cost efficient purchase.

Ms. Huebner-Sannes suggested updating menus for the younger seniors and buying food from local farmers. She also put forward the idea of a salad bar as a healthy option. Ms. Demsky said that salad bars are not cost effective and do not cover the nutritional requirements effectively (specifically protein), but they offer entrée sized salads as a meal option 5 times a week. Ms. Demsky described the process of getting new meals on the menu, and how they are always working to get new recipes. The kitchen manager is Le Cordon Bleu trained, and is always working to create new and interesting meals, while keeping in mind that seniors are sometimes more sensitive to spice. When a meal is approved by food services, it is then tested around for a while before being added to the menu. They also have the meal sit in a delivery truck and drive the full routes, to make sure it would still be in good quality by the time it gets to consumers. Menus are planned quarterly. Ms. Demsky said that when they have more unique or spicy meals, they are always given in the 'B' grouping. When someone does not specify, they are automatically given the 'A' meal so they do not receive anything surprising.

Ms. Dashney brought up how a lot of the meals are very high in carbohydrates, which might not be necessary for seniors since they are not moving around as much. She wondered if they are carbo-loaded since they look at these meals as the only big one they are eating. Ms. Demsky explained that the state gives them nutritional goals to meet, which are included in the RFP, and that to reach those goals a lot of the meals tend to have a lot of starch. They do try and balance out the carbs with fruits and vegetables.

Ms. Austin brought up an issue she has faced as a driver: since the menus do not have ingredients on them, sometimes people do not know what they are picking. For example, the menu might just say 'shepherds pie' and nothing else. Ms. Austin wanted to know if they could add more information to the box. Ms. Demsky said that they have full descriptions of what is in the meals at their sites, and that if needed it could be emailed out to some customers, although she does not want to send it out to everyone. If there are any allergies or foods someone does not like, they can talk to their local site coordinator to know which meals they should pass on.

MOTION: Mr. Chambliss moved, seconded by Ms. Susman, to approve LCOG contract with North West SNDS services as the lead agency in the food service consortium and also the North West SNDS contract with Bateman Community Living for the permission of food services for the fiscal year 2020 using the volume based rate scale given in the document. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Rogers thanked Ms. Demsky for her hard work and dedication.

b. Senior Law RFP Recommendation

Ms. Scott told everyone that the S&DS PMC had recommended they move on with the proposal, and then directed everyone to the Senior Law RFP summary document. The current provider Oregon Law Center (OLC, formerly Lane County Legal Aid & Advocacy Center), who has been the provider since the 1970s, was the only bidder. OLC had merged with Lane County Legal Aid and Advocacy Center around 2 years ago, and that there were no changes to the Senior Law Program due to this/no changes in staffing. Ms. Scott said that that historically S&DS has only received a bid by OLC, but sometimes they will get letters of intent from other companies, including some local attorney firms. The Senior Law Program is known both on the local and national scale as a model for giving seniors high quality legal services. Ms. Scott expressed their satisfaction in continuing to work with them. With this new contract, there are not a lot of major changes (pro bono attorneys in the area who do free civil consultations, while a staff attorney takes on more complex cases).

Ms. Scott detailed that the contract with OLC reaches all parts of the county, and is renewed by amendment each year, up to a total of 5 years per RFP cycle.

Ms. Susman asked how long Jean Beachdel, the Senior Law Program Manager, had been part of the program. Ms. Farrell replied that she has been part of the program since she helped create it with Senator Ron Wyden in the 1970s. Ms. Susman purposed acknowledging her in some way, maybe with a letter, since she does so much. She mentioned that she seems to be part of everything going on in the community. Ms. Rogers thought they should add it on to their next meeting agenda. Ms. Farrell thought they should hold off on doing that until the contract is approved, so to avoid conflict of interest. They could look into acknowledging a group of people in the community generally.

MOTION: Mr. Holst moved, seconded by Ms. Dashney, to approve the Senior Services Advisory Council recommends that LCOG accept the proposal by the Oregon Law Center for older adult legal assistance services in addition that the program be awarded up to \$68,100.00 of Older Americans Act 3B funds payable at the unit rate of \$21.10 for fiscal year 2020. The motion carried unanimously.

5. SSAC Recruitment Needs & Brainstorm

Ms. Lanz passed out the S&DS Advisory Council recruitment flyer. The flyers were put up in Florence, Cottage Grove, and Oakridge. They are looking into getting at least 1 or 2 new rural representatives in their committee. Ms. Rogers asked if those coming in for meetings from rural areas would be given a mileage stipend. Ms. Scott responded, saying that they would pay mileage.

Ms. Rogers wanted them to brainstorm. Ms. Lanz mentioned that she had Veterans Coordinator Sarah Levine putting up flyers at the local veteran clubs.

Mr. Chambliss commented on how nice and informative the flyer is. Ms. Lanz said that it was the same flyer from last year. Mr. Chambliss suggested they hang up flyers in areas where people coming in from out of town will see them, like at clinics. He also suggested they mail them out, since half the battle is getting the information out to people. Ms. Demsky said that the flyers would be hung up at meal sites. Ms. Scott said Ms. Lanz had been working with someone and they would be doing a route to do flier postings. Ms. Lanz clarified, saying that the route is metro, not rural. Ms. Scott said they could get their area coordinators in rural areas to hand out flyers as well. Ms. Lanz said she had already given flyers to area coordinators in Florence, Oakridge, and Cottage Grove.

Ms. Rogers brought up that the Register Guard had a volunteer opportunity, and wanted to know if they were participating. Ms. Scott said it would not hurt to ask, but they usually do not include advisory councils.

Mr. Chambliss suggested putting flyers up on bulletin boards in grocery stores. Ms. Rogers added that it might be a good idea to put them on online bulletin boards, like the county Craigslist page. Ms. Demsky reported that she uses Volunteer Match a lot, and could put the flyer up on their page. Ms. Lanz said that it would be going up on the LCOG website and Facebook page. Ms. Huebner-Sannes mentioned that counties around Lane also have their own Facebook pages they should put it up on, and that they should also consider reaching out to Creswell and Lorane.

Ms. Rogers asked what if there was a deadline for applicants. Mr. Chambliss pointed out that the flyer said April 26.

Ms. Susman asked Ms. Lanz if she had an idea of when they would be calling the nominating committee meeting. Ms. Lanz said they would be meeting next week to figure out a time, but it would be sometime in May. Ms. Rogers asked if anyone would want to volunteer for the committee. Ms. Scott recommended at least two people should do it. Ms. Dashney and Mr. Chambliss volunteered. Ms. Scott thanked Ms. Lanz for her work and dedication to this council and its recruitment.

6. Call for Next Meeting Agenda Items and Reminder of Next Council Meeting

Ms. Susman wanted to talk about how to thank community members.

Mr. Chambliss suggested information on care-taking. Ms. Rogers thought it would be good to know what it takes to be a care-taker, what the training is, and the requirements, since it can be difficult to find good, committed care-givers. Ms. Scott asked Ms. Susman if Lane Community College (LCC) still had a personal care training class, and mentioned getting someone to come in and talk to them about it. Ms. Rogers thought they could talk about how to get more people to be care-givers. Mr. Chambliss brought up how the amount and quality of people training to be care-takers revolves around the economy.

Ms. Hueber-Sannes thought they could talk about housing. She had been to a class in Corvallis, when she was a senior connections worker, where they talked about the integration of veterans into the community. She explained how they had veterans housing set up next to a high school, and that the veterans were mentors for the students. Ms. Hueber-Sannes thought they could get information on what it takes to become a home owner in the veteran community. Ms. Scott said that the community was putting on a housing panels/forums and that she could let everyone know when it was happening.

Ms. Beardsley thought they could talk about the SSI/SSDI Outreach, Access, and Recovery (SOAR) program. She described that they help those trying to sign up for disability benefits (SSI/SSDI) and fill out paperwork that can be very difficult, and they reach out to homeless as well. SOAR is a national program that is very highly looked at, and she is there regional liaison. Ms. Rogers asked if Ms. Beardsley would be interested in giving more information on the program at their next meeting, and she agreed to.

May 17th, 2019 1:30PM – 2:30PM

859 Willamette Street, 5th Floor Buford Meeting Room
Eugene, OR 97401

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:32 p.m.

(Notes by Lydia Dysart)