

HEALTH COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
SEPTEMBER 1, 2010 Recessed and Reconvened on SEPTEMBER 7, 2010

HEALTH COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Shay, Hall, Campbell, Idleman, Pitts

HEALTH COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Suprenant, Sady

SUPERVISORS: Rymph, LaPointe, Lindsay

Debra Prehoda, Clerk of the Board

Kevin Hayes, County Administrator

Roger Wickes, County Attorney

Patty Hunt, Director Public Health

Doug Cosey, Administrator PV

Tina McDougall, PH Fiscal Manager

Claire Murphy, Director Wash. Co. CARES

Barbara Winchell, Personnel Director

AGENDA AS PRESENTED IN COMMITTEE NOTICE:

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Approval of Minutes – June 30, 2010 & July 13, 2010 & July 20, 2010
- 3) Center for Governmental Research (CGR) – Dr. Pryor – RFP for Evaluation of Options for Operations, Management of Skilled Nursing Facility & Home Health Agencies
- 4) Discuss Upcoming Vacancy – Position of Pleasant Valley Facility Administrator
- 5) Department Reports/Requests
  - A. Public Health
    1. Fiscal Report
    2. BlueLine Commuter Preschool Transportation Extension
    3. NYSAC Preschool Meetings – Permission to Travel
    4. McCarthy & Colon Letter of Engagement for Cost Reports
    5. Miscellaneous
  - B. Pleasant Valley
    1. 2011 Budget Request
    2. DOH Visit
    3. Staffing Requests
    4. 2010 – 2011 Audit Proposal
    5. 2010 Budget Amendment Request
    6. Voluntary Leave Time Report
    7. Fiscal Update
    8. Miscellaneous
- 6) Other Business
- 7) Adjournment

Chairman Shay opened the meeting at 1:05 P.M.

A motion to approve the minutes of the June 30<sup>th</sup>, July 13<sup>th</sup> and July 20<sup>th</sup> meetings was moved by Ms. Idleman, seconded by Mr. Pitts and adopted.

Center for Governmental Research (CGR) – Dr. Pryor, CGR, addressed with the committee regarding the attached handout, Washington County Nursing Home and Home Health Agencies CGR Proposal: Proposed Project Phasing. He stated he would meet periodically with a steering committee and at any point the County could decide to terminate the project. The estimated cost for Phase 1, Initial Analyses, is between \$30,000 and \$35,000 and will take one to one and half months to complete. It may be a little less money and time depending on the availability of the data. At the conclusion of Phase 1, the County will have the historical and participant data in the various programs and the beginning of a financial history that if the County decided to go into an RFP process would have most of basis, data, the core information needed, for an RFP. Chairman Shay stated the steering committee would be the Health Committee and Kevin Hayes, County Administrator, would be the point person. Phase 2, Expanded Analyses and Development of Preliminary Options, will take a month and a half and cost between \$15,000 and \$20,000. Phase 3 is the Detailed Assessment of Implications of Various Options. Phase 2 would identify options and Phase 3 would explore the cost and

benefit analysis of any proposed options. The entire process of Phase One through Phase Three would be approximately a five month process. The cost of an RFP is included in this cost but the cost to review the responses to an RFP for a sale, the analysis, is not included in this proposal. The RFP analysis would cost an additional \$5,000 to \$10,000 depending on the level of detail of the analysis and how many responses received. The actual analysis cost would be separately negotiated. A motion to accept this proposal and move forward with the proposal indicating the price for each phase noted was moved by Mrs. G. Hall, seconded by Mr. Pitts and adopted. The proposal with the costs indicated will be considered at the Finance and Personnel Committee meeting. If the CRG proposal were approved at the September 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, they would be available to start very soon after that. He would like to connect with Doug prior to his leaving the facility. Typically, the Steering Committee meets monthly or more frequently if needed. Dr. Pryor stated again that this current proposal does include preparing, developing, an RFP for sale but not the evaluation of the results.

Discuss Upcoming Vacancy – Position of Pleasant Valley Facility Administrator – Barb Winchell, Personnel Director, stated fourteen applicants have responded and eleven of those have a NYS nursing home license. Kevin Hayes, County Administrator, stated we do have applicants but because of Doug's departure at the end of the month, we are very strongly looking at an interim position for the short term. Someone has been identified as a possible interim position candidate. A motion to meet with this gentlemen with the full intention to hire him as an interim Administrator based on Doug's recommendation and Kevin's suggestion was moved by Ms. Idleman and seconded by Mr. Pitts. Discussion. Mr. Pitts stated he has worked in the same organization with this gentlemen and he would be an asset to Pleasant Valley.

A motion to enter an executive session to discuss the employment history of a particular person or matters leading to the appointment, employment of a particular person was moved by Campbell, G. Hall and adopted.

A motion to return to regular session was moved by Mr. Campbell, seconded by and adopted.

No action was taken during the executive session.

**PUBLIC HEALTH** – Patty Hunt, Director, addressed the following items with the committee:

- Fiscal Report – Tina distributed and explained the monthly budget report for 2010, on file. They have had fewer patients therefore fewer expenses especially on the CHHA and Hospice side. The revenues are still under budget and she is predicting revenues at year-end to be under by \$790,000 mostly due to Hospice. The agency through the end of June is more than half way to maximizing their core grant amount of \$406,000. Still awaiting State Aid funds from the last quarter of 2009, received \$200,000 of \$600,000 claim and she is unsure when they will be paid the remainder. They just submitted their most recent claim for January through May of 2010 in the amount of \$600,000. Preschool will pick up once school starts because fewer children qualify for the summer programs. Tina is requesting the following budget amendments:
  - WIC is closing out their fiscal year as of September 30<sup>th</sup> and they are requesting to transfer funds between line items to purchase some needed equipment items. A motion to amend budget transferring funds from contractual (.4) to equipment (.2) for conference tables, storage, rug, camera and printer, keyboard tray, beeper system in the amount of \$5,000 was moved by Mrs. G. Hall and

seconded by Mr. Campbell. Discussion. Mr. Pitts asked if is this just hurry up and spend. Patty Hunt, Public Health Director, stated some funding they are unaware of until July and if not spent they will be decreased next year. Some of the items are for the community conference room. The motion to amend budget transferring funds from contractual (.4) to equipment (.2) for conference tables, storage, rug, camera and printer, keyboard tray, beeper system in the amount of \$5,000 was moved by Mrs. G. Hall, seconded by Mr. Campbell and adopted.

- A motion to recognize \$1,260 in revenue from an Adirondack Rural Health Network grant and increase disease control expense line was moved by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Pitts and adopted.
- **Blueline Commuter Preschool Transportation Extension** – The agency went into a contract with Blueline Commuter for preschool transportation in 2008 and this is the final third year extension. They are very pleased with their service. The renewal for year three is based on the consumer price index, 3.1%, and they would need to budget for this additional expense. A motion to approve Blueline Commuter one-year extension was moved by Mrs. G. Hall and seconded by Ms. Idleman. Discussion. The program costs approximately \$300,000 annually. The motion to approve Blueline Commuter one-year extension was moved by Mrs. G. Hall, seconded by Ms. Idleman and adopted.
- **NYSAC Preschool Meetings – Permission to Travel to NYSAC Conference on September 16<sup>th</sup> in Buffalo** – They budgeted for this expense. A motion to allow the program administrator and bookkeeper to attend and stay overnight at NYSAC conference for seminar on preschool items was moved by Mrs. G. Hall, seconded by Ms. Idleman and adopted.
- **McCarthy & Colon Letter of Engagement for Cost Reports** – A motion to authorize letter of engagement for auditing services for a two-year contract with McCarthy & Colon for Pleasant Valley in the amount of \$16,000 per year and Public Health in the amount of \$22,000 per year was moved by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Pitts and adopted.
- **Miscellaneous:**
  - The agency has noticed an increase in the Spanish speaking population using their services at clinics. Communication has been very difficult. They would like to use part of the stimulus funding to purchase the Rosetta Stone language program and it would be 100% covered under their immunization funding. The cost is \$530.00. A motion to approve expenditure was moved by Mr. Pitts, seconded by Mr. Campbell and adopted.
  - WIC also wants to re-supply some commonly used items such as bags for educational materials, Frisbees, 500 toothbrushes, and purchase (10) staff tee shirts. A motion to accept WIC items requested was moved by Mrs. G. Hall, seconded by Ms. Idleman and Mr. Campbell and adopted.
  - The Health Educator booth in the Grange Building at the Washington County Fair won an award.
  - **Ashville Game Farm** – Regarding the incident where a monkey at the Game Farm bit a young boy, the monkeys tested negative for rabies. Patty stated they had great cooperation from the Health Department. She also thanked Roger Wickes, County Attorney, and Dan Martindale, Deputy County Attorney, for their assistance.
  - **SUNY School of Public Health** – A post graduate of SUNY School of Public Health would like to work with Public Health. This would be a twelve month placement requiring a financial contribution of between \$8,000 and \$10,000.

Patty stated she talked to the Health Department and they can use Article 6 funding for the financial contribution and she should get that in writing. This is a great opportunity for the Health Educators. This is not an intern program but a post graduate program with the idea that the applicant would gain employment. Patty has been very clear that there is no guarantee of employment and currently no opportunity for employment. She has given no promise of any employment. It gives them, the post graduate, the experience and the agency has the benefit of her knowledge. A motion to approve twelve-month placement of SUNY School of Public Health graduate was moved by Mr. Pitts, seconded by Ms. Idleman and adopted.

PLEASANT VALLEY – Doug Cosey, Administrator, addressed the following items with the committee:

- 2011 Budget Request – The 2011 budget request reflects a 3.4% increase in operating expenses and 75% of that increase is due to increased benefit costs. He is projecting revenues to remain flat. Projecting IGT funding will still be available and projecting the same level at \$1.5M which is a local share of \$577,000. Kevin noted that the funding changes as of July 1<sup>st</sup>. Also at the August 5<sup>th</sup> budget meeting, he is requesting an MDS Coordinator, new position, as recommended by the Director of Nursing and requesting approval to bring this request to the Staffing Review Committee for consideration. The 2011 budget request does not request any appropriation from the General Fund but depending on the IGT there could be an expense to the General Fund.
- Sprinkler System – Paul Martin, Engineer, is working on design and necessary paperwork.
- DOH Visit – On July 31, a resident exited the building and went about 35 feet. The resident was not injured. The state terminology of this is an elopement. An investigation was done, the state went through everything and the facility was put in immediate jeopardy. The facility is subject to a fine of approximately \$28,000. They have lost the right to do CNA training for the next two years. The patient, not upon placement but after his status changed and he was deemed to be a flight risk, was assigned a bracelet with a sensor alerting movement but the nurse did not test the bracelet which is required and the bracelet failed. The facility is working hard to train, update and test procedures.
- Staffing Requests:
  - Full time Housekeeper - resigned and MDS Coordinator – new position - A motion to forward Housekeeper backfill and MDS Coordinator, new position, to the Staffing Review Committee for consideration was moved by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Pitts and adopted. Mrs. G. Hall opposed.
- 2010 – 2011 Audit Proposal – approved with Public Health request, see above.
- 2010 Budget Amendment Request – Doug is requesting to move funds for use of agency nurses due to a shortage of LPNs in the amount of \$78,000 plus adjustments to other accounts. A motion to approve budget amendment and forward to the Finance and Personnel Committee for consideration was moved by Mrs. G. Hall, seconded by Mr. Pitts and adopted.
- Voluntary Leave Time Report – Through last week, their annual goal was \$31,974 and they are at \$17,299 used or scheduled, 54%. He is unsure they will hit their goal.

- Fiscal Update – report on file. Revenues are lagging due to three items: IGT anticipated but not arrived, the facility is being paid on 2009 Medicaid rate, which amount to \$279,000 of shortfall through July, and Adult Home settlement has not come in from the State of New York. Those three items represents \$1.3M of the \$1.4M shortfall. Expenses are 6.8% under budget.
- Miscellaneous:
  - Doug is working on a transition list, which will include a detailed list of projects and priorities. He is working to make this a smooth transition.

OTHER BUSINESS: None.

The meeting recessed until Thursday, September 9, 2010 at 1 P.M.

The Health Committee reconvened on Thursday, September 9, 2010 at 1:00 P.M.

HEALTH COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Shay, Hall, Campbell, Idleman, Pitts

HEALTH COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Suprenant, Sady

SUPERVISORS: Rymph, LaPointe, Lindsay, Haff

Debra Prehoda, Clerk of the Board

Kevin Hayes, County Administrator

Roger Wickes, County Attorney

Patty Hunt, Director Public Health

Doug Cosey, Administrator PV

Tina McDougall, PH Fiscal Manager

Barbara Winchell, Personnel Director

Chairman Shay opened for discussion at 1:06 P.M., no quorum.

Chairman Shay introduced Neal Roberts who is being considered for the interim position of Pleasant Valley Facility Administrator. He is a licensed nursing home director. He has thirty years experience at Wesley Nursing Home from which he retired. He likes long term care and since his retirement he has worked for a period at the NYS Department of Health and at a hospital in Ticonderoga as a consultant. He is on the Board of Directors of Fort Hudson Nursing Home. He is aware that the County is seeking a consultant to explore privatization and cost saving efforts.

Ms. Idleman joined the meeting at 1:15 P.M. making a quorum.

Mr. Campbell joined the meeting at 1:20 P.M.

He stated when the counties got into the nursing home business, they were the safety net but now there are other people in the business to provide that safety net. The need for the safety net has changed over time. The counties have a financial disadvantage in this business. The Medicaid system has leveled things out. He stated his view would be, measure the true extent that you (the County) are a safety net and then evaluate the use of your money for that concept. He stated Medicaid people are underserved in the Medicaid assisted living program. There if very little assist living arrangements for Medicaid.

He stated an acting Administrator has the same full responsibilities as stated in the code as the Administrator. From his knowledge, he believes the state will require an Administrator at the facility for between 20 and 40 hours per week. Typically the tenure is for six-months but there are cases where extensions have been granted. The fact that there was a recent elopement at

the facility, he is unsure how that will affect the State's decision on the Administrative position. The state is required to approve the County's appointment to the Acting Administrator position. He is willing to look over the resumes but it might be beneficial for the County to first determine what direction/goal the County plans to pursue regarding the facility. He stated he is not interested in working 40 hours per week. He also has another consulting job, which averages one-day per week. He recommends as soon as possible contacting the State with our plan. He suggested looking into a recently approved change that allows counties to get out of the nursing home business without it affecting their Medicaid cap. He is interested in the position of Acting interim Administrator of Pleasant Valley but he is not interested in a 40 hour per week position and is not interested in the full time Administrator position.

A motion to enter an executive session to discuss the employment history of a particular person or matters leading to the appointment, employment of a particular person was moved by Mr. Pitts, seconded by Mr. Campbell and adopted.

A motion to return to regular session was moved by Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Pitts and adopted.

No action was taken during the executive session.

Mr. Roberts is interested in the interim Acting Administrator position at Pleasant Valley and will submit a proposal for consideration at the Finance and Personnel Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday September 15<sup>th</sup> at 1 P.M.

The meeting adjourned at 2:13 P.M.

---

## **Washington County Nursing Home and Home Health Agencies CGR Proposal: Proposed Project Phasing**

In order to help Washington County officials make an informed, cost effective decision about funding CGR's proposal to consult with the County in outlining options for the future of the Pleasant Valley Skilled Nursing Facility Enterprise Fund (including the Adult Home and Adult Day Health Care program) and three Home Health Agencies, CGR suggests breaking the proposed project into several phases.

At the conclusion of each phase, the County would be able to review findings and relevant products completed to date, and based on that review, decide whether or not to go forward with subsequent phases. In that way, the County would only authorize and receive those services it deems necessary and of value to its process, and would be able to conclude the study at any point, without going on to the next phase—unless it feels the next phase would add value to the project and the County's ability to enhance its decision-making process concerning the future of the affected agencies. As such, the County would of course also be limiting its financial liability by only committing to paying for one phase of the project at a time, thereby limiting its costs to only services rendered for phases and tasks explicitly authorized on a phase-by-phase basis.

The proposed phases and tasks are negotiable between CGR and County officials, but CGR suggests the following breakdown of the project as a preliminary basis for such discussions. We believe these proposed phases provide logical groupings of tasks, and provide logical break points at which the County can make informed decisions about whether it has the information it needs to make its decisions, or whether remaining tasks are also needed to move the process forward. We welcome a thoughtful review of this proposed phasing, and look forward to discussing any adjustments County officials may suggest to help the project meet its needs most effectively.

### ***Ongoing: Work with Project Steering Committee***

As indicated in the original CGR full proposal, we anticipate working closely throughout the study with a Project Steering Committee selected by the County. We anticipate meeting with the Committee as needed and requested during each phase of the project, and at key decision points along the way. In particular, we would expect to meet with the Steering Committee as each phase winds down to review the findings and implications to date, and the implications of either going forward to the next phase of the project, or ending the project at that point. The Steering Committee could either be empowered by the Board of Supervisors to make that decision on behalf of the County, or to formally bring a recommendation to the full Board for its decision following each phase.

### ***Phase 1: Initial Analyses***

As indicated in the original proposal, CGR proposes in this first phase to review available data and materials about the Nursing Home and Home Health Agencies to inform the assessment of the status quo operations of each of the facilities and programs compared with the various

options to be considered in this process. We anticipate collecting and reviewing the following types of materials: relevant rules, regulations and financial scenarios concerning operation of relevant facilities and programs in New York State; background information and literature concerning the various options and best practices to be considered for the future; relevant descriptive and demographic data and projections about the Washington County community; information and comparative benchmark data about nursing home and other program competitors and other long-term care options in the county and region; and background data and other materials on the Nursing Home, Adult Home and home health programs, including mission statements, labor agreements, contracts, trends in budget/financial data, organizational charts, and a variety of data such as trended staffing patterns and resident data. Tasks would include, but not be limited to, the following:

- ❖ a careful review of the financial status and perceived strengths and limitations of the Nursing Home, Adult Home and four separate programs specified in the RFP;
- ❖ analysis of the historic pattern of expenditures and revenues, including IGT payments, County contributions, cost allocations/chargebacks, and County matching contributions that do not show up explicitly in the Enterprise Fund budget, but that are important to understand as part of the financial analysis (e.g., County match to draw down IGT payments, County share of DSS payments to Adult Home, etc.);
- ❖ review of current and historic staffing ratios, resident descriptive characteristics, caseloads, capacity vs. occupancy rates, payer mix/revenue trends, staff-versus-contracted service configurations;
- ❖ analysis of demographic data and projections identifying trends in the population that could affect the future use of, and demand for, the Nursing Home, Adult Home and various home health programs;
- ❖ review of issues related to the physical condition and configuration of the Pleasant Valley Skilled Nursing Facility and Adult Home;
- ❖ analysis of union implications and collective bargaining issues;
- ❖ assessment of the importance of the historical mission, role and perceived popular support in the community of the Nursing Home and other programs.

As part of these Phase 1 analyses, it will be important to carefully analyze not only the overall Enterprise Fund budgets and actual expenditures (including audited financial reports), but also to break down the financials into the separate trends of revenues and expenditures for each of the components (SNF, Adult Home, Adult Day Care). "Hidden costs," such as those noted above that do not officially get broken out in the Enterprise Fund budget, also need to be separately analyzed. Without such more detailed analyses than typically occur in the County budget or audited financial statements, significant knowledge about the future of these components will be overlooked, and potential opportunities for cost savings or revenue enhancements in the future may also be missed. Discrepancies in expenditures and revenues have also been identified in our review of materials included in the County's original RFP for this project, compared with a

previous consultant report we have seen. These discrepancies need to be analyzed and reconciled, in order to ensure that the most accurate possible data are being used for subsequent decision-making about these agencies and programs.

It should be noted that in CGR's work with Genesee County, these additional breakdowns of traditional budget and financial statements by component and additional costs have resulted in significant shifts in how Legislators view their individual program components, and have opened up new opportunities to thinking about options never previously considered by County officials.

In addition to the basic analyses outlined above, this phase would also include initial interviews and discussions with such key County and Nursing Home officials as the County Administrator, key Board members (individually and/or in combinations), the Nursing Home Administrator (hopefully the study can begin in time to meet with the current Administrator prior to his departure), Nursing Home Controller, union representatives, key Nursing Home supervisory staff and heads of the respective programs being reviewed. These initial interviews would be needed to obtain perspectives on various issues facing the Home and the various programs, as well as providing important context against which to interpret the various data elements noted above.

Findings and preliminary implications and conclusions from these analyses would be presented to the Project Steering Committee, for their review and assessment prior to their decision concerning whether or not to go forward to the next phase of the project.

## ***Phase 2: Expanded Analyses and Development of Preliminary Options***

Should the County decide to go beyond the core initial analyses, we propose that the second phase would include the following components:

- ❖ Extended discussions with key supervisory and "rank and file" staff within each of the key departments of the Nursing Home and Adult Home, and of the Adult Day Care and three Home Health programs. We also suggest meeting with representative residents of the Homes and participants in the programs, as well as with family members. Such meetings will be important to inform people of the process and to respond to questions they may have, as well as to seek answers to various key questions that need to be raised as part of the process about how the programs function, and where there may be opportunities for improvements within each program and facility. It is CGR's experience that such opportunities to talk in depth with key stakeholders invariably result in thoughtful suggestions for productive changes that can either save money, improve services or expand revenues (or all of the above) in the future. We believe that to exclude such opportunities for constructive input would significantly limit the value of the study for County decision-makers.
- ❖ We also anticipate meeting with such additional key County agency heads as the Treasurer, DSS Commissioner, Director of the Office for the Aging, and any other key people engaged in the delivery, funding or oversight of long-term care programs and activities in the County.

- ❖ CGR also suggests that the project will be strengthened by selected input from individuals outside Washington County with expertise in the operation of county and other types of nursing homes, and with experience related to implementation of the various options to be considered in this process. For example, we would anticipate interviewing key staff at County Nursing Facilities of New York (CNFNY), the New York Association of Homes and Services for the Aging (NYAHS), NYS Office of Long Term Care, Adult Day Health Care Council, and Home Care Association of NYS, as well as key persons in selected counties that have made conscious decisions related to implementing, or not implementing, selected alternatives concerning operations of the various facilities and programs covered by the study.
- ❖ Based on the best available estimates of future reimbursement rates and policies at the state and federal levels, we anticipate developing additional financial analyses under different revenue assumptions for future years. What we know and learn from interviews with State officials, and from analysis of regulations and new directions emanating from the State, will shape updated financial analyses of different components and programs concerning their potential expenses, revenues, and potential need for County contributions or, alternatively, surpluses in future years. These analyses, going beyond the basic historical and current analyses to be conducted in Phase 1, would focus on what is likely under various future funding scenarios, in order to help County officials realistically consider future options in the context of various assumptions.
- ❖ An assessment of costs and circumstances that may continue for the County (e.g., debt service, vested retirement and health insurance costs, workers compensation costs, unemployment insurance costs, cost allocations, etc.) irrespective of whether it continues to own any of the facilities or programs or not. Such analyses may provide valuable context in helping assess the viability of possible options for the provision and operation of various services in the future.
- ❖ As part of Phase 2, we anticipate working with the Steering Committee to develop specific criteria against which future potential options for providing long-term care services would be assessed. Potential options were outlined in the full proposal. Whether the County chooses to have CGR develop future potential options in more detail or not (in Phase 3), the development of such criteria would be important to guide the process of making final decisions about the future of the Nursing Home, Adult Home, Adult Day Care program and the various Home Health Programs.
- ❖ Based on the various Phase 1 and 2 analyses, CGR would begin to identify various potential options or scenarios for future provision of long-term care services for County residents. These options would be likely to include various alternatives for the future of the SNF, Adult Home, Adult Day Care program, CHHA, Hospice, and LTHHCP. It is likely that various potential scenarios could emerge for each of these by themselves, or in combination across different programs, ranging from continuation of the status quo, to various changes in the programs enabling reduced costs and/or enhanced revenues, to potential divestiture of one or more of the programs/facilities.

- ❖ Based on these analyses and outline of options, the Steering Committee would determine whether to proceed to develop more detailed descriptions of the feasibility and pros and cons of some or all of these potential options, or to close the project at this point.

### ***Phase 3: Detailed Assessment of Implications of Various Options***

Based on the various inputs obtained from the above tasks and analyses, if the County decides to proceed with Phase 3, CGR would develop expanded summaries of the implications of each of the agreed-upon options, individually and, where appropriate, in combination. Such summaries would include the staffing, service, cost and revenue implications of each of the options being considered, including potential implications for current residents and employees of the facilities and programs, as well as implications for taxpayers. We would summarize the pros, cons and other implications of the different options against the agreed-upon criteria, as well as assessing the relative feasibility and probabilities of being able to successfully implement them, given County realities and the best available assumptions of decisions likely at the state level in the future. We would also estimate the timing (short-term vs. longer-term) and potential barriers associated with implementing the various options, and any suggestions concerning ways of minimizing the impact of such barriers. These summary implications of the options would be presented in ways designed to help the County make informed decisions about options it may wish to pursue further, and those it chooses to drop from further consideration.

These analyses of potential implications of implementing various options in the future could be thought of as a series of “what if” scenarios, in which we would analyze the likely implications under various assumptions. For example, if the County were to decide that it wished to at least consider the sale of one or more of its facilities or programs, how should it proceed? And what if it should proceed with a particular “test the waters” approach to selling or leasing, and there is little viable interest on the part of potential buyers: what should the County consider doing under such circumstances? Or what if the County were to decide to consider option “x” regarding, for example, the CHHA: what implications would that likely have, if any, for consideration of future options for the LTHHCP or Adult Day Care programs, for example?

Such analyses of various potential options, by themselves and in combination, would be designed to provide the Board with the most objective and thorough assessment possible, given available data, of options and their likely consequences under various assumptions. These assessments and likely consequences and probabilities of success would be summarized in a final report to the Steering Committee and ultimately the full Board of Supervisors, should Phase 3 be approved for implementation.