

From: Kester, Tony
To: 'Wendy Duda' <wduda@ycco.com>
Date: 5/30/2013 1:33:19 PM
Subject: RE: PI-001

Wendy,

Thanks for the e-mail. I tried to call but the phone system would not ring through. I have been talking to the AAA's for over a year about the clients we should be serving. In the state, we have many clients with an original risk score of -0-. This is where the instruction came from. After a client has received service and has a reassessment, we understand the risk score will be impacted. We expect that. A justification in the comment box is OK.

I have a meeting in a few minutes but would like to talk about this. Since I seem to be phone challenged today would it be possible to call me around 4:00? 528-3214

Thanks.

Tony

From: Wendy Duda [mailto:wduda@ycco.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 1:21 PM
To: Theriot, Susan; Kester, Tony
Subject: PI-001

Tony and Susan, Please know I am not one to over react and will do ANYTHING you ask of me, but this morning I received PI-001 and am dismayed at what I think you are asking me to do. I ran a list of clients to see how many would be affected, and there are a lot. My first problem is that upon spot checking the report, much of the clients data is incorrect in the print out as AIM is not picking up the data. May be that it is some of the new forms, and some of the old. So my first problem is one of even being able to extract the correct information without having to go through hundred of hard copies.

Secondly, even if I assume that half of the data is correct, the PI goes into effect on Monday. In order to comply, surely you do not want me to stop serving people on Monday that score a zero. We can only put down what the client answers to the nutritional questions. When we start a new client, they are usually at a high risk, but if we are doing our job, that risk will and should be greatly reduced as they receive a meal, attend a center and receive our supplemental food boxes. Are we to stop serving people as their nutrition improves? Perhaps we ought to have the authority to answer these questions as we see it. For instance, I have never had a client admit to having three or more drinks a day, but I know it to be true. Pride or fear of nursing home placement will keep most seniors from saying they cannot physically shop or cook or have the money for food, and so on. Instead of justifying people with scores of 5 or below, can we have time to go back and reassess people and try to clarify to them the way they need to answer the questions?

I spent several hours last night at the York County Council meeting making the case for them maintaining our funding. It would be political suicide for me to remove clients from our roles at this time. Yet I cannot just come up with other funding to pay for these meals at this late date in the fiscal year. I am not sure what I am even asking of you, other than maybe some assistance in getting the AIM data correct and for you to give some guidance as to your expectations of our continuing to serve clients as their risk score lowers.

I appreciate you both and know how important our seniors are to you. Please don't punish us for the strides we make in improving their lives-that is our mission.

Respectfully, Wendy

