

# **Agenda Item Number 10. A.**

## **Guidelines for Meal Site Closure**

**Presenter:** Sandy Karsten

**Actions Recommended:** Approve the Guidelines for Meal Site Closure

**Issue Summary:**

- The Senior Meals Program faces increased costs and reduced revenues in the next fiscal year. Bringing the budget into balance will be a challenge but every effort is being made to maintain service levels next year.
- In the context of planning for the Senior Meals Program, the Senior Meals Advisory Committee (SMPAC) has suggested that guidelines for the closure of a meal site be adopted. Evaluating the costs and the benefits of each meal site is complicated; some factors are quantitative and some are subjective. Reducing the number of meals served reduces both expenses and revenues (meal donations, community contributions and USDA payments) and can increase the cost of the remaining meals purchased, both of which can create the need to make even deeper budget reductions.
- These discussions raise the issue of how a decision to close a meal site, if necessary, should be made. Other agencies weigh participation levels, site costs, site revenues and availability of other services in making a decision to close a meal site.
- The SMPAC developed criteria for evaluating the benefits and costs of closing a particular meal site. These guidelines have been approved by the Senior Services Advisory Council. (See attached.)

**Requested Action:**

That the LCOG Board of Directors adopt of the Guidelines for Closing Meal Sites forwarded by the Senior Services Advisory Council.

Attachment

## GUIDELINES FOR CLOSING MEAL SITES

### 1. **U.S. Census Data for the area & characteristics of users:**

- < Overall population over age 60
- < Percentage of persons 60 and older in poverty in area
- < Percentage of minority older persons in area
- < Percentage of persons age 85 plus in area
- < Look at demographic characteristics of users. How closely do they match the target population criteria? How closely do they match the characteristics of the community?

### 2. **Demonstrated community use of program:**

- < # Participants registered
- < Average daily attendance
- < # Meals served over time (has trend changed?)

### 3. **Ability to deliver service efficiently & effectively:**

- < Cost per meal at the meal site. Meals served per staff hour at the site compared to average.
- < Availability of reasonable and cost effective method to provide MOW client assessment and client follow-up.
- < Do cost savings of closure justify the disruption?
- < Impact of closure of site on food service contracted volume.

### 0 **Demonstrated community support such as:**

- < Sufficient volunteers to deliver the services
- < Willingness of local businesses, organizations, public agencies, and/or individuals to contribute to the program financially. How much fund raising is actually generated in the community?
- < Availability, condition and cost of the building in use.
- < Average donation for meals at the site

### 5. **Availability of alternatives:**

- < Are there other sources of meals, companionship & service in the area? Is transportation to the nearest site realistic? Can participants access these alternatives?
- < Are there ways to change the service delivery to “save” the site?
- < Have other alternatives been tried?

