Grey County Logo Committee Report

# Report LTCR-CW-07-17

**To**: Warden Barfoot and Members of Grey County Council

**From**: Lynne Johnson, Director of Long Term Care

**Meeting Date: May 11, 2017**

**Subject: Grey County Long Term Care Review**

**Status**: Recommendation adopted by Committee as presented per Resolution CW-88-17; Endorsed by County Council May 25, 2017 per Resolution CC25-17;

## Recommendation

That report LTCR-CW-07-17 be received for information.

## Background

This report is follow up to report LTCR-CW-05-17 on the delivery of long term care services in Grey County that was provided to Council on March 23, 2017. That report was received, discussed and deferred until the May 11th meeting in order to provide an opportunity for public consultation and in anticipation of receiving the market analysis for other services for seniors in southern Grey County and the investment analysis for the Grey Gables facility.

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the comments from the public that have been received, address outstanding questions and clarify implications related to remaining with the status quo.

## Engagement and Feedback

There has been a dedicated webpage (<https://www.grey.ca/long-term-care/redeveloping-long-term-care>) for all long term care review information since July 2016. Since the original background information was uploaded, the webpage has been updated regularly with new information. The page contains:

* the latest staff reports to council,
* recordings of committee discussions and public information,
* the Sienna report,
* information from the LHIN,
* a comprehensive list of frequently asked questions, and
* contact information to provide comments via phone or email.

In total, the webpage has received over 900 unique page views. The average time spent on the page is five minutes and visits to the webpage peaked at 137 views on March 20th.

More than 200 people attended each of the two public information sessions that were held to give residents the opportunity to learn, ask questions and provide feedback in person to Grey County staff. The first meeting was held at the Durham Community Centre on March 30, 2017 with more than 25 people sharing comments. The second meeting was held at the Centre Grey Recreation Complex in Markdale on March 31, 2017 and more than 40 speakers shared comments. Both meetings were recorded and are available on the County’s YouTube channel which is linked on the redevelopment webpage.

Following the March 23rd report to council, a dedicated email address and phone number were created and promoted as an easy way for the public to provide comments. Staff understands that some people are hesitant about public speaking therefore comment cards and boxes were available at each meeting to give attendees the opportunity to share their thoughts.

All emails sent to [LTCreview@grey.ca](mailto:LTCreview@grey.ca) and messages left on the long term care review voicemail box were directed to Communications for tracking and followed up as necessary.

A summary of the feedback that was received after March 23, 2017 is in the following table. It does not include one-on-one feedback provided in person or the letters sent to local newspapers. The ideas expressed in those letters have been incorporated into the What We Heard themes.

| Feedback Method | Number of Comments |
| --- | --- |
| Comment Cards | 25 |
| Speaking at meetings | 75+ |
| Voicemail Messages | 4 |
| Emails/Letters | 16 |

### What We Heard

In total, 123 comments and questions were received. Of the comments, a few common themes were identified.

1. **Support for “status quo”**

Most people making comments at the public sessions were in favour of maintaining the three long term care homes at their current size and in their current community. This was specifically mentioned 31 times in the tracked feedback.

Additionally, there were a small number of direct comments received supporting the recommendation to build a 166-bed long term care home in Durham. A small number of direct comments supported adding 100 beds from Durham on to a new wing at Grey Gables while a small number of direct comments recommended building assisted living on to Grey Gables.

1. **Geographical distance between Markdale and Durham**

Of the comments received, 17 specifically raised concerns about the distance between Markdale and Durham. Commenters were concerned about the additional time spent driving, and issues with winter and night driving. Other comments spoke about the challenges of traveling further to visit family and feeling that long term care residents should stay in their home communities.

1. **Opposition to privatization**

The perception of privatization was another theme. In total, 10 direct comments were received in opposition of hiring a management company to oversee long term care operations, or opposing the sale of Grey Gables to a private operator to run as a private assisted living facility.

Staff do not perceive the recommendations as a form of privatization. The staff of the homes will continue to be Grey County employees and the management company would assist the homes in meeting compliance and Council in meeting their legislated responsibility. If a 166-bed home is built, no beds will be lost and all services will be maintained. The sale of the Grey Gables building to a private assisted living operator is meant to attract additional services for seniors to the Markdale area, not to privatize services already provided.

1. **Need for a social and economic impact study**

A small number of comments have been raised about the need for a social and economic impact study of the effects of combining the long term care homes. Some of these questions will be addressed by the CBRE report. Others will require council direction to pursue.

1. **Uncertainty for tenants**

There was also concern raised for the current tenants of space at Grey Gables and Rockwood Terrace.

It is expected that a potential purchaser will wish to maintain tenants and rental opportunities will continue. This will be addressed in the CBRE report.

1. **LHIN Boundaries, Service Planning, Availability of Beds**

Grey County is served by three LHINs. While the majority of the County is within the South West LHIN, portions of Southgate, West Grey, Grey Highlands and the Town of Blue Mountains are located within the boundaries of the Waterloo Wellington and the North Simcoe Muskoka LHINs.

For the purposes of determining long term care service availability, the southwest LHIN confirmed that they took into account the population within the prescribed radius of the facility even though that radius might cross a boundary. For the municipalities with residents who reside in an area served by another LHIN, (i.e. Dundalk and the Waterloo Wellington LHIN) the population base is reflected in the respective LHINs data which is used for system planning and establishes the flow of funding for health care services within that LHIN.

1. **Positive feedback about the homes**

Many positive comments have been received about the condition of our homes and the quality of care provided by our staff.

## Long Term Care Service Delivery Context

One of the frequent comments heard in consultation was the desire to maintain the status quo. People spoke of the good experiences their family members had enjoyed in the homes and their concerns about residents moving from a small to a larger and potentially more institutional setting.

There have been significant changes in the long term care sector in the past decade. For reasons stated below, it is anticipated that the rate of change will continue. Long term care is highly regulated by the province and changes in the Long Term Care Homes Act, implementation of the Aging at Home strategy, a focus on reducing the number of Alternative Level of Care (ALC) patients and the trend of shorter hospital stays, have all contributed to a much higher acuity of the residents moving into long term care. Long term care homes have had to change and will continue to change to meet the needs of an older population with much more serious health issues.

The average age of a resident living in a Grey County long term care home is 85 years with 86% of the residents being 75 and older. With people staying in their homes or in an assisted living facility longer, and moving into long term care with more advanced health conditions, the average length of stay in long term care has declined as noted in the table below.

Placement into a long term care home is determined by the Community Care Access Centre (now part of the LHIN). Those in need of a bed in long term care are asked to choose up to five homes and they are notified when a space becomes available. People choose a home for a variety of reasons including proximity to family or friends, the “feel” of the home, quality of care, available amenities and services.

In an attempt to understand the relationship between the home in which a resident resides and the proximity to the person identified as their “first/emergency” contact, data was reviewed to identify those with the same city/town listed as the long term care home. At Lee Manor, 41% of the residents had a contact listed with an Owen Sound address. Grey Gables and Rockwood Terrace had 29% and 24% in their respective communities.

Long term care homes are evolving into chronic care hospitals. We are providing care for residents with medical needs more complex than ever before. We are currently experiencing the admission of residents with advanced wounds, PICC lines (peripherally inserted central catheter), IV (intravenous therapy) and dialysis and expect mechanical ventilation in the future. Specialized equipment is required to provide the care that residents need and in a smaller home, utilization of these assets is less likely to be optimized and the cost needs to be absorbed over a smaller budget. The provision of this level of care has an additional complexity when the home is also required to provide care for people with responsive behaviours and advanced dementia within the same setting. This has, and will continue to require administration and staffing within the homes to make adjustments.

The size of a long term care home should not impact the satisfaction or quality of life experienced by the resident living in the home. Standards, which must be met, are set by legislation and the new build design standards address dining, bathing and social space for individual resident home areas. Consistency of care is important for many quality outcomes and resident satisfaction and staffing patterns are developed with this in mind.

Over the past four years, we have focused on initiatives to support an improved quality of life for the residents. Culture change initiatives, including our Colour It Standards and Promise, were implemented and we added a question to the annual resident survey: Would you recommend this home to others? Each of the homes has had remarkable success with the culture change initiatives as illustrated in the following chart.

## Human Resources – People Caring for People

As the licensee responsible to the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care for compliance with all aspects of the Long Term Care Homes Act, Grey County must ensure specific staffing requirements are met including qualifications and minimum hours for the following positions.

* Registered Nurses
* Director of Care
* Nutrition Manager
* Cook
* Food Service Workers
* Dietitian
* Administrator

There are currently 497 employees represented by three different unions and four separate collective agreements. Across the three homes 64% of the positions are full-time and 36% part-time. Currently we have 65 employees on leave.

More than 9,000 hours are scheduled on a weekly basis. The average absenteeism rate, including sick, emergency, WSIB and short term disability, is 18 days per employee. Over the past two weeks the homes have replaced more than 200 shifts resulting from illness and other unexpected issues. Improvement targets have been set and staff are working towards specific goals to reduce the occurrences of absenteeism.

Despite Grey County having a large number of staff, the staffing compliment is specific for each home meaning staff cannot work between homes. This results in many part-time employees working for multiple employers. It is difficult to maintain a strong base of loyal part-time employees when they do not have a guarantee of work or can’t make a living out of the shifts that are available. The ability to provide more full-time opportunities and create stable part time positions will assist in stabilizing the labour pool.

Staffing Challenges

Within the homes, 69 full-time and 13 part-time staff will be eligible for retirement over the next 6 years. In 2016, despite the recruitment of 90 staff, the homes continued to experience situations of being short staffed and needing to utilize staffing agency services. The reliance on temporary staff does not support consistent quality care for the residents and does not meet compliance regulations. As the baby boomer population continues to move into retirement, staffing gaps and challenges will increase.

There is strong competition for qualified staff in the sector. Our experience is that recruitment is more difficult in a smaller home and recently an agency contract was expanded to include the provision of personal support workers at Grey Gables.

Does Travel Time Impact Employment Decisions?

Increased travel for staff to single south Grey facility was raised as a concern during the consultations. A review of staff mailing address information identified that each of the homes have a broad cross section of staff who travel regularly for work with many employees leaving the community of one county home on their way to work in another while others currently commute in excess of 1 hour to attend work. The following table identifies the percent of staff that have the same city or town listed as the LTC home they work in.

| Home | % of staff with a city/town address the same as the LTC home they work in |
| --- | --- |
| Grey Gables | 34% |
| Lee Manor | 65% |
| Rockwood Terrace | 45% |

How Does Home Size Impact Staffing?

The number of staff hours in each home is based on a number of factors including:

* the Case Mix Index
* physical/environmental design of the building
* legislative requirements

Ministry funding is based on the number of residents in the home and the annual calculation of the resident acuity (Case Mix Index- CMI). Grey Gables has historically had the lowest CMI of the three homes which directly impacts funding for nursing and personal care. In a staff survey and engagement sessions that took place in 2016, it was widely voiced that staff struggle to meet the time pressures and requirements necessary to provide care. Admissions to the home over the past couple of years have been more complex however the CMI has not changed significantly.

While a person may argue that a smaller home should require fewer administrative resources many functions require the same amount of time regardless of the size of the home. Regulations, service agreements and legislation require specific time frames being met for mandatory reporting, evaluation of programs and services, audits and quality improvement plans. Tasks including the development, implementation and evaluation of annual education and fire drills are a couple of other requirements set by the ministry that requires the same amount of time and effort regardless of the size of the home. The challenge in a smaller home is that the team is smaller with some members only working part-time. The budget in a larger home is able to support additional administrative positions which assist with overall workload.

The following table identifies the per resident day staffing levels in each home. The difference in staffing levels is directly attributed to the CMI, legislative requirement for some positions and the number of beds in the home in which costs can be shared across.

| 2017 Approved Budget # of Hours per Resident Day | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Grey Gables | Lee Manor | Rockwood Terrace |
| Direct Care Staff  (RN/RPN/PSW) | 2.70 | 2.80 | 2.78 |
| Non Direct Care Staff Union  (Programs, Dietary, Laundry, Housekeeping, Maintenance) | 1.10 | 1.25 | 1.24 |
| Non Direct Care Staff Non-Union | 0.57 | 0.44 | 0.52 |

The consultant report completed by Sienna Senior Living in 2016 indicated that adjustments in operating costs related to staffing, nursing supplies and equipment, and improvements in accommodation would provide savings of $607,587[[1]](#footnote-1) in the first year of operation (based on the 2015 budget) by amalgamating the 66 beds in Markdale with the 100 beds in Durham.

### Becoming an Employer of Choice

Human Resource and Long Term Care managers recognize that structural improvements to the delivery of service are necessary to support and engage the workforce. Currently Grey County is spending $186,000 annually on external services associated with grievances, arbitrations, pay equity and investigations within the homes. However, while Lee Manor and Rockwood Terrace legal costs averaged less than $500 on a per bed basis, Grey Gables costs were in excess of $1,000.

To provide the required high level of care, maintain compliance and contain costs, workforce stability and availability is critical. While the County currently offers a higher level of compensation for our front line workers than some other private sector providers, as competition for talent increases, this gap will lessen. Grey County will be continually challenged to locate, attract, optimize and retain the talent we need to serve our residents. We will need to become an employer of choice.

### Growing Municipal Responsibility for Costs

As care requirements have increased, the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care has responded by providing occasional or one-time funding for the provision of medical equipment. However, the ongoing responsibility for any associated maintenance and replacement costs, as the equipment reaches the end of its life cycle, falls on the County.

There has also been a change in the funding mechanisms for residents with more acute needs including:

* Enteral feeding (provision of nutrition directly into the stomach or small bowel)
* Transportation for dialysis
* Advanced wound care (including supplies and specialized mattresses)

These changes have resulted in homes being required to absorb more of the cost of the services into the daily operating budget.

In addition, since 2006 the Ministry has mandated increases in services including Physiotherapy, Exercise classes, Registered Practical Nurses and Behavioural Support. While new funding has been provided to support these services, there are increased responsibilities within the Finance department and individual homes to track information and manage payments. Processing payments and submitting data for all these areas cannot be completed once for the corporation and needs to be processed separately for each home. The time and costs associated with the increased financial reporting over the past 10 years has not been allocated to the homes but contributes to significant workload issues and overtime in the County Finance Department.

Overall, the three homes require funding from the County levy in addition to Provincial funding to support daily operations.

| Home | 2017 Operating Levy Requirement \* | Cost per Resident |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grey Gables  (66 residents) | $1,070,771 | $16,224 |
| Rockwood Terrace  (100 residents) | $1,210785 | $12,108 |
| Lee Manor  (150 residents) | $1,715,268 | $11,435 |

\*Note- Does not include the cost of capital

### Historical Costs and Future Projections

In the 10 year period 2007-2017, the long term care operating budget for the County’s three long term care facilities has increased more than 43% or an average of more than 4% annually. In that same period, the consumer price index has increased an average of 2.1% annually. Assuming the status quo and extending this trend out to 2027 we project operating expenditures to increase to nearly $39M annually.

Currently, long term care is supported by operating funds provided by the Province, resident fees and the municipal levy. The municipal levy portion of the operating and capital costs on a per bed basis has increased nearly 64% in the period 2007-17. If this trend continues and there is nothing done to restructure the cost base, the annual cost to fund each bed is projected to rise to nearly $32,000 by 2027

\*Note- This is a combined amount that includes capital and operating costs

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Long Term Care - Budgeted Taxation Funding** | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Local Municipal Levy Allocation** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Comparison from 2007 to 2017** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Projected 2017 to 2027** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **2007** | |  | **2017** | |  | **Change** |  | **2027** | |  | **Projected** |
| **Municipality** | **Allocation** | **Budget** |  | **Allocation** | **Budget** |  | **2007 - 2017** |  | **Allocation** | **Budget** |  | **2017 - 2027** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Township of Chatsworth | 4.9087% | $ 184,134 |  | 5.2648% | $ 323,770 |  | $ 139,637 |  | 5.2648% | $ 518,081 |  | $194,311 |
| Township of Georgian Bluffs | 10.7732% | $ 404,121 |  | 11.0254% | $ 678,031 |  | $ 273,910 |  | 11.0254% | $1,084,952 |  | $ 406,921 |
| Municipality of Grey Highlands | 11.5820% | $ 434,460 |  | 11.7666% | $ 723,613 |  | $ 289,152 |  | 11.7666% | $1,157,889 |  | $ 434,276 |
| Town of Hanover | 5.3240% | $ 199,712 |  | 5.0244% | $ 308,986 |  | $ 109,274 |  | 5.0244% | $ 494,425 |  | $185,438 |
| Municipality of Meaford | 11.6990% | $ 438,849 |  | 11.4468% | $ 703,946 |  | $ 265,097 |  | 11.4468% | $1,126,419 |  | $ 422,473 |
| City of Owen Sound | 16.5403% | $ 620,455 |  | 14.3733% | $ 883,917 |  | $ 263,463 |  | 14.3733% | $1,414,401 |  | $ 530,483 |
| Township of Southgate | 5.0826% | $ 190,657 |  | 5.3509% | $ 329,065 |  | $ 138,408 |  | 5.3509% | $ 526,554 |  | $ 197,489 |
| The Town of The Blue Mountains | 24.6026% | $ 922,885 |  | 26.0128% | $1,599,714 |  | $ 676,829 |  | 26.0128% | $2,559,783 |  | $ 960,069 |
| Municipality of West Grey | 9.4876% | $ 355,896 |  | 9.7350% | $ 598,675 |  | $ 242,779 |  | 9.7350% | $ 957,970 |  | $ 359,295 |
|  | 100.0000% | **$ 3,751,169** |  | 100.0000% | **$6,149,718** |  | **$2,398,549** |  | 100.0000% | **$9,840,474** |  | **$3,690,756** |

This chart illustrates the previous 10 year and future 10 year projected levy impact per municipality for the status quo long term care operations. Note that while the allocation of the County levy is adjusted annually based on MPAC’s returned assessment role, for the purposes of this illustration, the 2017 levy allocation was used for the 2027 projection.

## Financial/Staffing/Legal/Information Technology Considerations

There has been considerable discussion regarding the most appropriate way to structure long term care services to meet the current and future needs of the citizens of Grey County.

Maintaining the status quo option of three homes comes with challenges as outlined in this report. Provincial funding has not kept pace with the cost for staff, supplies and equipment needed to manage an increasing complex resident population and there will be an ongoing requirement for a municipal levy contribution to support the operating and capital requirements of the homes. Funding to offset the deficit has had an increasing financial impact on the property tax base over the past 10 years and it is projected that this trend will continue. A small home with a small staff complement will have a more difficult time in meeting the challenges of service delivery in the future.

## Link to Strategic Goals/Priorities

Goal 2- Support Health Connected Communities

Priority Outcome (b) Improved sustainability of service and service delivery for Grey County communities.

## Attachments and Background Information

Respectfully submitted by,

Lynne Johnson  
Director of Long Term Care

1. Sienna Senior Living, Redevelopment Analysis, April 5, 2016, page 22. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)