



PLACER COUNTY GRAND JURY

A Five-Year Plan for Meeting the Needs of a Growing Senior Population in Placer County

**A Continuation of a 2013-2014
Grand Jury Investigation**

June 26, 2015

A Five-Year Plan for Meeting the Needs of a Growing Senior Population in Placer County

A Continuation of a 2013-2014 Grand Jury Investigation

Summary

This report is a continuation of a recommendation from the 2013-2014 Grand Jury Report on the DeWitt Center Costco Lease and its impact on seniors.

Finding 4 of last year's Grand Jury Report identified the need for the county to develop a five-year plan that will address the needs of its predicted growing senior and disabled populations. The Board of Supervisors (BOS) response to that finding appears to be incomplete.

Recommendation 2 of last year's report suggested that the county create a five-year plan for the creation of an umbrella organization that will bring together all governmental and not-for-profit organizations providing supportive services to disabled and senior populations. The purpose was to link all stakeholders that provide needed and supportive senior and disabled services under one entity. The County Director of Health and Human Services (HHS) would coordinate this effort.

The BOS response to this recommendation was that "this recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future". This response is lacking in specificity and could be considered a violation of Penal Code § 933.05, subdivision (b)(2), as it lacks a time frame for implementation.

Background

The 2014-2015 Grand Jury reviewed the County Board of Supervisors (BOS) and county staff responses to the DeWitt Center report. The 2014-2015 Grand Jury felt it was important to re-address Finding 4, the BOS response to Finding 4, Recommendation 2, and the BOS response to Recommendation 2.

Investigation Methods

- Interviews
- Review of the BOS agendas
- BOS actions in 2014
- Research

Facts

- Finding 4 of the 2013-2104 Final Report states:

“The Grand Jury found no evidence of any long term (5 years or more) planning on the part of the County to identify the needs of the growing senior population, and the consolidation of resources necessary to satisfy these needs.”

- The Board of Supervisors Response to Finding 4 was:

“The BOS disagrees with this finding. The BOS established the Older Adult Advisory Commission in 2004, in order to provide older adults with a voice in community matters. This committee advises the BOS, as well as Health and Human Services (H&HS), on the creation and delivery of services for this demographic. The BOS also recently approved \$100,000 for a feasibility study of a multi-generational facility.”

- Recommendation 2 of the 2013-2014 Final Report states:

“Placer County move proactively to create a five-year plan for the creation of an umbrella organization that will bring together all governmental and non-profit organizations providing supportive senior services under one entity to county seniors, both able and disabled; and that the County Director of H&HS coordinate this effort on behalf of the County.”

- The Board of Supervisors Response to Recommendation 2:

“This recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The BOS agrees that it is important to move forward to create a plan in order to address the needs of the increasing population of seniors. The Placer County H&HS will participate in this effort along with the key stakeholder organizations; including the Placer County Older Adult Advisory Commission and Area 4 Agency on

Aging. The BOS does not, however, believe that there needs to be the creation of a new, potentially duplicative umbrella organization, and instead suggests that working closely with existing organizations and groups dedicated to serving seniors would be a more effective and sustainable strategy.”

- Nevada County has joined with Riverside, Orange, San Diego, San Francisco, and Humboldt counties in taking the steps to create a collaboration of agencies providing services to older and disabled persons. The California Health and Human Services Agency has published and presented ADRC models. There is an abundance of information regarding how ADRCs are formed, how well they work, and why an ADRC model could be developed in Placer County.

Findings

The Grand Jury found that:

- F1. The Older Adult Advisory Commission (OAAC) is advisory only. It is a county-wide volunteer advisory commission, which has no budget, meets monthly, reports to the BOS once yearly, and has no direct authority to act. The OAAC has been given no responsibility for creating a five-year plan, nor does it have the resource capacity to do so. It primarily functions as an interagency coordinator and information sharing group.
- F2. The BOS agrees that the needs of the county’s seniors and disabled population ought to be addressed by a plan. Stating that it will happen in the future lacks the specificity that the response requires.
- F3. It is not clear how the \$100,000 contract for the multi-generational facility feasibility study would fit into a five-year plan in terms of service to the senior and disabled population.

Conclusion

The Board of Supervisors and county staff need to reconsider their response to 2013-2014 Grand Jury Final Report with reference to applicable Penal Code section(s). The focus should be on the necessity for a five-year plan to meet the needs of a growing older and disabled population in the county.

Recommendations

The Grand Jury recommends that the BOS, in developing the five-year plan, include the following actions:

- R1. County staff should research collaboration models such as Nevada County's Aging Disability Resource Connection (ADRC) Program.
- R2. With county staff recommendations, the BOS should designate an existing agency to take the lead, to seek grant funding, and to move the ADRC model forward to service providers.
- R3. Involve the Director of HHS as a proponent of the ADRC model and have key staff research the model in order to become subject matter experts in how to adapt the ADRC model to meet Placer County needs within the next fiscal year.
- R4. If it is determined that the ADRC model is not appropriate as a five-year plan for Placer County, then the county should implement another model for providing necessary single points of entry into a long-term support and services system for older adults and people with disabilities.
- R5. Provide a time frame for the implementation of these recommendations in accordance with subdivision (b)(2) of Penal Code § 933.05.

Request for Responses:

	<u>Recommendations Requiring Response</u>	<u>Response Due Date</u>
Placer County Board of Supervisors 175 Fulweiler Ave. Auburn, CA 95603	R1 – R5	September 22, 2015
Mr. David Boesch Placer County CEO 175 Fulweiler Ave. Auburn, CA 95603	R1 - R5	August 24, 2015

Copies Sent to:

Mr. Jeff S. Brown
Director, Placer County
Health and Human Services
3091 County Center Dr. #290
Auburn, CA, 95603