



**New York City
Department for the Aging
Evaluation of the
Senior Options Pilot
Program**

Economic and Valuation Services
March 8, 2007



Content

1	Executive Summary	3
2	Overview and Background	7
2.1	Project Overview	7
2.2	Home-Delivered Meals Background	7
2.3	Pilot Background	8
2.4	Scope of the Evaluation	10
2.5	Report Organization	11
3	DFTA’s Senior Options Bronx Pilot Program	12
3.1	Background	12
3.2	Impetus for the Pilot	12
3.3	Early Program Concerns	13
3.4	Start-Up and Implementation	14
3.5	Current State of Pilot Service	15
4	Customer Satisfaction Survey	16
4.1	Overview	16
4.2	Overall Survey Results	16
4.2.1	Introduction	16
4.2.2	Satisfaction with Pilot Choice	18
4.2.3	Satisfaction with Overall Program.	19
4.3	Summary	20
5	Pilot Meal Providers	21
5.1	Summary	21
5.2	Mid-Bronx Senior Citizens Council (“Mid-Bronx”)	21
5.3	Regional Aid for Interim Needs, Inc. (“RAIN”)	22
6	Contracted Catering Services	23
6.1	Whitson’s Culinary Group	23
6.2	Implementation Issues	23
6.3	Kosher Meals	24
7	Case Management Agencies	25
7.1	Summary	25
7.2	Project SOS	25
7.3	JASA	25
7.4	Aging in America	25
7.5	Bronx Jewish Community Council	26
7.6	RAIN CMA	26



8	Public Response and Key Stakeholders	27
8.1	Introduction	27
8.2	The Stakeholders Group	27
8.3	Initial Issues of Concern	28
8.4	Current Operations	29
9	Office of the Comptroller	30
10	Benchmarking Analysis	31
10.1	Overview	31
10.2	Meal Cost	32
11	Findings	33
12	Appendices	35
A	Stakeholders Interviewed	36
B	Survey Distribution Process	37
C	Survey Results: Overall	39
D	Survey Results: Mid-Bronx	44
E	Survey Results: RAIN	49
F	Customer Satisfaction Survey	54
G	Driver Survey Delivery Instructions	55
H	Update Benchmarking Summary	56
I	2006 Benchmarking Survey	59
J	2006 Survey Results Summary	61



1 Executive Summary

Bronx Senior Options Program

Since the mid-1970s, the Department for the Aging has operated a home-delivered meal program for senior citizens unable to prepare their own meals. In 2002, faced with a growing senior population and projected city budget deficit, DFTA proposed the Bronx Senior Options pilot program. The pilot program consolidated 17 existing home-delivered meal contracts in the Bronx into three in an effort to achieve economies of scale and introduced a frozen meal delivery option as an alternative to the daily delivery of a hot meal for seniors capable of reheating them. Similar programs were used widely in other cities, including Philadelphia and Chicago, and frozen meals were being delivered on a smaller scale in New York City. The pilot program's aim was to build greater capacity while offering greater flexibility and choice to an increasingly diverse population of seniors.

KPMG Evaluation

The New York City ("the City") Department for the Aging ("DFTA") engaged KPMG LLP ("KPMG") to evaluate the Bronx Senior Options Pilot Program ("Pilot"), including aspects of the start-up period, implementation, and program outcomes.

KPMG's evaluation centered on the following three areas:

- Customer satisfaction,
- Program operations, and
- Contract management.

To accomplish these goals, KPMG performed the following tasks:

- Reviewed background materials related to the Pilot's initiation, including: press clippings, policy documents, procurement documents, and other publications.
- Conducted interviews with key stakeholder groups representing meal providers, caterers, case management agencies, elected officials, and public advocacy groups.
- Examined other meal delivery programs that offer both hot and frozen meal options, including Philadelphia and Chicago.
- Conducted a customer satisfaction census of current Senior Options clients.
- Reviewed the financials of the current meal providers.

In addition to our discussions with DFTA, our view of the current operations of the program is based primarily on information collected from the following sources: interviews with case management agencies, meal providers, DFTA staff, and other stakeholders; and survey responses of Senior Options clients. A summary of findings for each of the evaluation's areas of concentration is presented below, followed by our overall assessment.

Customer Satisfaction

To assess the effectiveness of the pilot program, KPMG distributed approximately 2,280 client satisfaction surveys and collected a total of 1,244 surveys for a overall response rate of 55



percent. The vast majority of respondents, almost 86 percent, either agree or strongly agree with the statement that they are glad to have a choice in the type of meal they receive. The result stays the same when examined separately for each contractor's clients.

The survey results also clearly indicate that the clients are satisfied with the overall operations of the pilot program, with 87 percent responding with either agree or strongly agree. This result holds true when viewed by type of meal received. For Mid-Bronx clients, the result was a very strong 96 percent. For RAIN's clients, 85 percent responded with either agree or strongly agree with the statement that they are satisfied with the weekday, home-delivered meal program.

Program Operation

According to case management agencies, meal providers, and other stakeholders involved with the Senior Options program, the initial implementation period was problematic. Case managers cited missed, late, or incorrect deliveries. Meal providers too cited delivery issues as well as poor coordination in the transfer of client information to new providers, vehicles in disrepair, and cost overruns. Other stakeholders, including public officials, advocates and affected providers voiced concern over potential layoffs, the nutritional value of frozen meals, the reliability of assessments to determine senior eligibility for frozen meals, and the risk of senior isolation.

Despite a variety of start-up issues, these three groups have since reported substantial program improvement. Case managers now believe the program is working well and that seniors benefit from its flexibility. Meal providers have adjusted their operating procedures and delivery routes and report more timely meal service. Other stakeholders have noted a significant decline in client complaints. According to DFTA records, following the first two months of the program, complaints averaged only 6 per month through the end of the pilot year, similar to those of the meal programs in other boroughs.

Part of DFTA's stated goal in introducing the Senior Options program was to expand capacity as the agency faced the challenge of serving a growing senior citizen population in a fiscally austere environment. According to census data, the city's population age 60 and over will increase by 20 percent by the year 2015. The city's population of those 85 and older will increase by 25 percent. The Senior Options model, based on efforts popular in other large cities, relied on fewer contracts to achieve economies of scale and performance based contracts with a fixed rate of reimbursement. By containing costs, DFTA hoped to increase the numbers of clients served by the home-delivered meals program in the years ahead.

Contract Management

Prior to Senior Options, the home-delivered meals program in the Bronx was administered by 17 contracted meal providers with annual planned home-delivered meals ranging from 3,800 to 78,000 meals per provider. By consolidating the 17 contracts into three and establishing service areas with approximately 100,000 meals in each, DFTA attempted to streamline the program administratively and introduced opportunities for economies of scale and capacity building.¹ This consolidation brought the Bronx's delivery model in line with other large cities such as Chicago (1 contract) and Philadelphia (2 contracts). Additionally, the Senior Options program established

¹ City-wide there were 125 home-delivered meals contracts before Senior Options consolidated contracts in the Bronx. There were 17 contracts in the Bronx, 36 in Brooklyn, 30 in Manhattan, 39 in Queens, and 3 in Staten Island. Total home-delivered meals expenditures totaled \$24 million in FY06.



a fixed cost per meal at \$5.00 to achieve greater consistency and cost control. Prior to Senior Options, the terms of the 17 meal contracts in the Bronx varied widely as did the cost per meal which ranged from \$2.79 to \$18.00 city-wide.

Overall Findings

Based on our review of available materials, survey results, and multiple and extensive interviews, we find the following:

Initial Planning and Implementation Period.

- The delivery of meals to the City's senior population is the concern of many vested interests. DFTA did not fully appreciate the level of vested stakeholder concern.
- Receiving six responses, only two of which met the requirements of the request for proposals, limited DFTA's options for the Pilot, resulting in the award of three contracts to only two providers.
- Each contractor experienced key missteps during the implementation of the program.
- The Pilot experienced significant equipment problems during the transition period.

Current State of Service Delivery.

- The goals and design of the Pilot are consistent with programs operating in other large metropolitan cities in terms of frozen and hot meal options, the frequency of deliveries, and fewer service contracts.
- With the expanded service capacity, there is no waiting list for home-delivered meals in the Bronx. Anyone who qualifies to receive home-delivered meals receives deliveries funded by either DFTA or Citymeals-on-Wheels.
- Based on preliminary findings of a study conducted by Cornell University² and through interviews with the case management agencies, the voluntary change from a five-day to two-day delivery does not appear to have a substantial impact on senior isolation.
- Despite implementation issues, primarily involving necessary vehicle repairs and inaccurate client information, meal providers are now meeting their delivery requirements.
- Based on our survey, the clients served by the Pilot are satisfied with having a choice in meal delivery and with the overall operation of the program.
- From the perspective of the case management agencies serving the Pilot's seniors, the program is providing a beneficial meal delivery option.

Program Operation

- The pilot involved two substantial changes: 1) the addition of frozen meal delivery and 2) a new model for program administration, that is, fewer contracts with a fixed per-meal reimbursement.

² *Who Are the Recipients of Meals-on-Wheels in New York City? A Profile Based on a Representative Sample of Meals-on-Wheels Recipients.* New York: Citymeals-on-Wheels, 2006



- Based on our review of information available from similar programs in other cities, the overall approach of fewer contacts with a fixed per-meal reimbursement appears to be a reasonable design for program administration.
- The survey conducted by KPMG and the views of the case management agencies support the finding of keeping the frozen meal option and for its serious consideration for city-wide introduction.

Lessons Learned

- Any expansion of the program to other boroughs will require ongoing education of, and outreach to, elected officials, stakeholders, and other identified vested interests, though continued opposition should be anticipated.
- We recommend that DFTA require in any future contracts that bidders designate a “transition manager” specifically tasked to actively manage the issues related to: the client list, equipment, caterers, and case management agencies.
- Problems with the delivery fleet operated by previous meal providers were not resolved prior to the start up. While the operating inspection and maintenance procedures were not part of this review, it is clear that ensuring sound home-delivered meals vehicles is critical to program success.
- The dollar amount of the per meal cost reimbursement needs to be reviewed periodically. This should include updating the benchmarks used in other cities as well as a review of the cost structure of the contracted providers, to the extent available.
- In considering an expansion of the Pilot into other boroughs, DFTA should continue to include the re-employment services it offered to the affected Bronx personnel.



2 Overview and Background

2.1 Project Overview

The New York City (“the City”) Department for the Aging (“DFTA”) engaged KPMG LLP (“KPMG”) to evaluate its Senior Options Bronx Pilot Program (“Pilot”), including aspects of the start-up phase, the implementation phase, and the outcomes.

KPMG’s review included the following tasks:

- A review of background materials related to the Pilot’s initiation, including press clippings, policy documents, procurement documents, and budget publications.
- An examination of public information on city-based meal delivery programs that offer both hot and frozen meal options, including Philadelphia, Chicago and San Francisco. This information is used as a benchmark of practices and issues related to implementation.
- The fielding of a customer satisfaction census of the current Senior Options population.
- A review of the financials of the current meal providers.
- Conducting interviews with several key stakeholder groups to understand their views pre- and post-implementation pilot. These stakeholder groups included: meal providers, caterers, case management agencies, elected officials, public advocate groups, and meal recipients. In conducting these interviews, KPMG attempted to understand and consider the stakeholders’ views on a number of topics, including:
 - DFTA’s pre-implementation communication,
 - planning process,
 - initial Pilot roll-out,
 - perspective on lessons learned from the implementation phase,
 - Pilot’s achievement of its objectives, and
 - Pilot’s current operations.

2.2 Home-Delivered Meals Background

The genesis of the home-delivered meals program for seniors is found in the 1965 Older Americans Act (“OAA”). The OAA was enacted by Congress to address the social needs of a growing elderly population. In 1973, the OAA Title III was amended to establish Area Agencies on Aging (“AAA”) under the State Offices for the Aging. DFTA is the AAA for New York City.

Each State Office for the Aging receives Title III federal funds to allocate among its AAAs. In turn, each AAA distributes the funds to public and private entities for the delivery of community-based services, including congregate and home-delivered meals. Later in the 1970’s, Title III funds were increased to provide continual financial support to the States and community planners



for a variety of services, including: housing, health, nutritional, educational, recreational, and training programs for seniors.

The home-delivered meals program in New York City was established in the 1970's with Title III funds. In FY06, expenditures for the city-wide home-delivered meals program totaled approximately \$24 million, including \$9.4 million (39%) in Federal funding, \$6.1 million (26%) from the State, and \$8.5 million (35%) in City funds. The Bronx Senior Options program expenditures totaled approximately \$2.7 million.³ From the inception of the City's home-delivered meals program, the service has been contracted out to community-based providers. Currently, the home-delivered meals program is administered by a combination of senior centers (that also provide other senior services) and stand alone home-delivered meal programs. There were approximately 3.7 million meals delivered city-wide in FY'06 and 530,000 home-delivered meals served in the Bronx in FY'06.

New York City's population of senior citizens, particularly the oldest cohort, is growing. Based on census data, between 1990 and 2005, the City's population of individuals over the age of 80, has increased by 15 percent. The city's population of individuals age 85 and older is projected to grow by 25 percent by the year 2015. Acknowledging this trend, DFTA began in 2003 to explore options to more efficiently serve the needs of its growing elderly population. More specifically, DFTA sought to increase the capacity of its home-delivered meals program which had grown by 155,000 meals between 2000 and 2005. The result was the decision to conduct a pilot in the Bronx with changes in the contracting structure and meal delivery options. The pilot was named the Bronx Senior Options Program.

According to DFTA, the aim of the Bronx Senior Options Pilot Program was to achieve the following outcomes:

- build capacity within the system,
- establish a uniform cost per meal,
- consolidate contracts to achieve economies of scale in delivery, and
- offer more choice to clients about what and when they eat.

2.3 Pilot Background

In 2002, DFTA was approached by meal providers and other stakeholders regarding concerns about the capacity of the meals program to sustain feeding the growing senior population. Discussions with providers led to the idea of a centralized home-delivered meal system. Commissioner Méndez-Santiago led several discussions with stakeholders about their many concerns and possible resolutions to the capacity issue. With the help of the Citymeals-on-Wheels ("CMOW") program, DFTA began to evaluate the current home-delivered meal delivery structure, undertook a review of the frozen meal program already offered by CMOW, looked to other regions with similar programs for ideas, and issued a Request for Information ("RFI") to collect ideas on implementing a frozen meal initiative.⁴

³ Figures represent FY'06 expenditures.

⁴ DFTA logged receiving 45 responses to the RFI released in May of 2003. The responses were sent to the Mayor's Office of Contracts. DFTA notes that some of the responses did not offer suggestions but were only critiques of the proposed program. KPMG did not review the responses.



Concurrent with these discussions, New York City was facing a sizable budget deficit. All City agencies were faced with the challenge of reviewing current programs and initiatives and finding ways that would improve cost effectiveness yet still meet service delivery goals. DFTA had been asked to find \$8 million in savings within the agency. Thus, the idea of providing frozen meals to seniors was born from the need to serve an increasing population in an environment of continually tight budgets.

DFTA looked to other regions for home-delivered meal programs that involved frozen meal delivery. A sampling of several regions showed that the frozen meal concept could work. For example, Chicago offered frozen meals and fewer meal provider contracts than DFTA's then 125 contracts (city-wide) to support large numbers of home-delivered meal clients. DFTA suspected that by consolidating its many contracts, the system could achieve economies of scale. Also, DFTA learned that in Philadelphia, 90 percent of seniors had chosen a frozen meal delivery.

Prior to Senior Options, the home-delivered meals program in the Bronx was administered by seventeen contracted meal providers with annual planned home-delivered meals ranging from 3,800 to 78,000 meals per provider. DFTA's analysis of the available information led it to conclude that a Senior Options Program in the Bronx could achieve desired economies of scale using three home-delivered meal contracts. By estimating 100,000 meals in each of three service areas, DFTA sought to streamline the program administratively and introduce bulk purchasing. DFTA also initially concluded that a flat reimbursement rate of \$5.00 per meal would bring consistency and greater control to costs in the home-delivered meals program. Pre-pilot, the per meal costs ranged from \$2.79 to \$18.00 city-wide.

DFTA decided to move ahead with the Senior Options program. The Bronx was chosen because it relied entirely on case management agencies to assess client eligibility to receive home-delivered meals. In boroughs outside the Bronx, client assessments may be conducted by providers who also deliver the meals. The separation of client assessments and meal deliveries in the Bronx was viewed as preventing any conflict of interest.

DFTA released its RFP in December of 2004 and received six responses. Mid-Bronx Senior Citizens Council, Inc. ("Mid-Bronx") was awarded a contract for one service area serving 173,639 meals; Regional Aid for Interim Needs, Inc. ("RAIN") was awarded two contract areas, delivering 357,004 meals.

To assist case management agencies in determining which clients were capable of handling the new frozen meal option, DFTA developed a two-page screening instrument. Under the Senior Options program, home-delivered meal clients deemed capable of reheating a frozen meal would be given a choice (or the "option") between receiving hot or frozen meal deliveries. Home-delivered meal clients deemed unable to reheat a frozen meal would automatically receive a hot meal delivery. Clients were also to be asked if they observe Jewish dietary laws, and if necessary, provided with kosher meals.⁵ Beyond assessing clients for their meal options, case managers would develop a care plan with their clients based on the in-home assessments and reassess each client every six months to insure that the care plan still met his or her needs.

⁵ Prior to Senior Options, the delivery of a kosher meal depended on whether the provider of the meal was an Orthodox organization, not whether the client observed Jewish dietary laws.



2.4 Scope of the Evaluation

KPMG's charge in this effort was to conduct interviews, gather information, and report on the resulting collection of information. In conducting this evaluation, KPMG was informed of issues encountered by DFTA with the initial implementation of the Pilot. Through our interviews, we also became aware of the strong and varied opinions and beliefs concerning the desirability of the Pilot in the first place. In certain cases, KPMG received conflicting information about events.

We note that the nature of our effort was not forensic in the sense that we were not engaged to, and did not conduct, a background examination of the various claims made about events during the pre-Pilot and start-up phase. In cases where we were provided with significantly differing or conflicting information, we make note of the issue but do not provide a detailed account of the debate.

While KPMG did conduct extensive interviews, many were provided only on the basis of anonymity. Others, at the request of the organization, were done with the understanding that comments would be presented in a manner that they could not be attributed to the organization. Consequently, while considerable time was extended on interviews, and topics covered were comprehensive, our respecting the terms on which those interviews took place results in our ability to present only summary level reporting.

Finally, we attempted to perform a comparative review of the financial information available from the two meal delivery contractors, RAIN and Mid-Bronx. Our intent was to examine, on a total cost of operations basis, the total per unit cost of home-delivered meals. In conducting this task, through review of financial information provided, and interviews and discussions with organizational staff and DFTA staff, two important issues emerged. First, each organization makes use of some services that are obtained at below market prices, that is, in-kind use or donations such as free use of space, or volunteer assistance time. Secondly, while both organizations report monthly cost figures to DFTA, which are fairly aggregate (about fifteen line items), neither organization was able to provide detailed cost information in a format to support a cost of service analysis. We note that both organizations are reimbursed by DFTA based on the number of meals delivered, and not by the specific costs they incur related to the meals preparation or delivery. Thus, reporting their expenses at an aggregate level is suitable for the reimbursements from DFTA.

RAIN has detailed costs information but only to support an estimated "cost of service" it provides to Citymeals-on-Wheels. Those cost estimates are based on RAIN's own internal cost allocation methods. KPMG found that the adjustments required to 1) impute costs for in-kind services and 2) segment the financial reporting to represent DFTA-only service provision, would require a level of review of contractor spending and market valuation work that was determined to be outside the scope of this effort. Mid-Bronx does not maintain readily available cost of service reports for its operations. What it did provide was a "planning" budget for cost of service, but that budget is based on a desired level of operations and staffing not currently met. Thus, the lack of readily available financial information prevented us from conducting a review of the current delivered cost of the meals.



2.5 Report Organization

The rest of this report presents the results of our Pilot review in the following sections:

3. DFTA's Senior Options Bronx Pilot Program
4. Customer Satisfaction Survey
5. Pilot Meal Providers
6. Contracted Catering Service
7. Case Management Agencies
8. Public Response and Key Stakeholders
9. Office of the Comptroller
10. Benchmarking Analysis
11. Findings



3 DFTA’s Senior Options Bronx Pilot Program

3.1 Background

To gain a better understanding of DFTA’s views on the start-up and current operations of the Pilot, KPMG conducted the following tasks:

- reviewed background materials provided by DFTA staff,
- interviewed DFTA staff, and
- interviewed DFTA Commissioner, Edwin Méndez-Santiago.

The sections that follow are based on the above set of information.

3.2 Impetus for the Pilot⁶

Commissioner Méndez-Santiago explained to KPMG that prior to implementing the Senior Options Program, DFTA held several planning meetings with key stakeholder groups to present the scope and discuss their concerns.

In 2002, DFTA was approached by meal providers and other stakeholders regarding concerns about the capacity of the meal programs to sustain feeding the growing senior population. Discussions with providers led to the idea of a centralized home-delivered meal system. Commissioner Méndez-Santiago led several discussion sessions with stakeholders about their many concerns and possible resolutions to the capacity issue. With the help of the Citymeals-on-Wheels (“CMOW”) program, DFTA began to evaluate the current senior meal delivery structure and looked to other cities with similar programs for ideas, including a review of the frozen program already offered by CMOW.

Concurrent with these discussions, the City government was facing the largest deficit in history. All city offices were faced with the challenge of reviewing current programs and initiatives and finding ways that would improve cost effectiveness yet still meet service delivery goals. Thus, the idea of providing frozen meals to seniors was born from the need to serve an anticipated growing population in an environment of continually tight budgets.

DFTA then looked to other city meal programs that involved frozen meal delivery. A sampling of several cities showed that the frozen meal concept could work well. Chicago was one example of the numerous cities nationwide that use fewer meal provider contracts (compared to DFTA) to support large populations that receive home-delivered meals. Philadelphia was an example of extensive use of frozen meal delivery with 90 percent delivered frozen as a result of senior choice.

At the time, DFTA had 125 different contracts for home-delivered meal programs across the city. The terms of these contracts were very diverse; some contracts were relatively small while others were large. The cost-per-meal of meals delivered by the different providers city-wide ranged from \$2.79 to \$18.00.

⁶This section is based primarily on interviews conducted with DFTA.



3.3 Early Program Concerns⁷

DFTA reported mixed responses to its efforts to engage in a public discussion of Senior Options. Many parties sent letters requesting that no changes be made to the current system; others either failed to respond to DFTA's solicitations or responded with strong resistance. Still other groups in the community expressed genuine concern for the safety of seniors and the impending loss of jobs. These groups believed the loss of daily interaction with the drivers would have a negative effect on the seniors.

According to DFTA, the agency made a concerted effort to address those concerns brought to light. One issue involved DFTA's initial projection that 60 percent of the senior population would elect to receive frozen meals. The purpose of DFTA's projection was to assist providers in preparing their budgets and proposals in response to the Senior Options RFP. DFTA's initial projection was based on the experience of programs operated in other large cities such as Philadelphia, which had approximately 90 percent of seniors opting for the frozen meal. In response to community concerns, DFTA later lowered its projection of those who would choose frozen meals to 30 percent. Even though DFTA reports that it stressed that only seniors who chose and could handle frozen meals would receive them, media and community groups continued to report that it was DFTA's intent to issue a majority of seniors the frozen meals.⁸

Another community concern was the all-inclusive flat reimbursement rate that DFTA proposed for meal providers. In the past, reimbursements by DFTA were made based on a cost reimbursement basis. DFTA would pay meal providers' costs up to the bottom line of their contracts regardless of the number of meals actually served. As part of the Senior Options model, the meal providers would need to adhere to a fixed cost system. The fixed unit rate was originally set at \$4.00; however, due to community concerns that the \$4.00 rate was insufficient to maintain an effective program, DFTA raised the reimbursement level to \$5.00 per meal.

Community concerns also focused on the anticipated loss of jobs that would result from the reduction in the number of meal providers. In response, the Commissioner promised not to reduce senior center funding for costs that were partially covered by home-delivered meal programs. For example, a food handler who worked for a senior center whose salary was shared by the congregate meal and home-delivered meals programs would be allowed to remain in the senior center kitchen. The food handler's full salary would be included in the senior center's budget, and DFTA would not reduce any funding associated with the food handler's salary. Additionally, DFTA provided the 110 affected employees with employment assistance, including resume-writing skills, job training, and other related support to avert layoffs.⁹

Another issue involved kosher meals. Although the Bronx is not home to a sizable population that observes kosher dietary laws, DFTA sought to allay concerns relating to kosher meals by issuing separate contracts to serve this population. However, DFTA advises that it was met with resistance by advocates from the Jewish community who were not in favor of a kosher-only

⁷This section also draws on information obtained from our interviews of Stakeholders. These issues are discussed further from their perspective in Section 8 of this report.

⁸Based on publicly available articles, including, "Revisiting our Concerns: Is the Bronx 'Meals on Wheels' Pilot Project Working?" by the United Neighborhood Houses, February 2006.

⁹In transitioning to the Senior Options program, 110 workers were impacted. Of those, 64 were hired by Senior Options providers, 17 were referred to other jobs in related fields (food service, drivers, etc.), 6 were referred to the Bronx workforce centers for training vouchers in other occupations, 3 opted for retirement, and 20 did not respond to calls and messages left by DFTA staff.



program. Many advocates did not participate in the discussion or respond to requests for comments.¹⁰

Finally, after the contracts were awarded, there was concern expressed that only two providers were awarded contracts, with one contractor receiving two of the three delivery areas. DFTA had issued an RFI on May 1, 2003 to solicit ideas for implementing a frozen meal delivery option and received 45 responses. By December 10, 2003 when the RFP was issued, there appeared to be a marked decline in interest. DFTA received 6 responses, with only two of them meeting the RFP requirements. Concerns involving the limited number of contracts persisted even after it was made public that RAIN and Mid-Bronx were the only providers that submitted bids within the guidelines outlined in the RFP.

Given the political environment surrounding the Senior Options program, it is difficult to distinguish between legitimate concerns and resistance to change. Among the critics of the program were providers who lost funding under the program and/or failed in their attempts to win Senior Options contracts.¹¹

With the benefit of hindsight, it appears that DFTA underestimated both the opposition that loss of contracts to local providers would generate, and concern over any proposed changes to an established program that serves seniors.

3.4 Start-Up and Implementation

The implementation and start-up phase of the Senior Options program was problematic. Although contracts were awarded in April of 2004 and the original start date for the program was postponed from July 1 until October 1 to allow nearly 6 months of planning, the transition period (primarily the first two months of the program) saw missed and late deliveries as a result of vehicle issues, poor coordination between case managers and meal providers, and a poor execution of a new service delivery model.

The Senior Options RFP specified that the contract awardees would have access to delivery vehicles operated by the previous meal providers. The day before the Senior Options contracts began, vehicles were transferred to RAIN and Mid-Bronx; however, many of the vehicles apparently had not been well maintained by their former operators. As a result, there were frequent vehicle breakdowns and necessary major repairs and replacements. DFTA funded an additional \$56,400 in FY'05 in major vehicle repairs and upgrades for RAIN and Mid-Bronx. DFTA also purchased five additional vehicles for approximately \$218,000. The unreliability of existing delivery vehicles clearly contributed to late and missed meals during the early months of the Senior Options program.

Also problematic was the level of coordination between case management agencies and meal providers. Case management agencies involved with Senior Options were responsible for sharing their client lists with RAIN and Mid-Bronx to smooth the transitional period. These lists include client names, addresses, phone numbers, and meal assignments. According to RAIN,

¹⁰Prior to the Senior Options program, several providers delivered only kosher meals regardless of their client base.

¹¹Ten home-delivered meals contractors lost a total of \$1.6 million as a result of Senior Options. These contractors include: Aging in America (which bid on Senior Options but was not awarded a contract), Arturo Schomberg, Sister Anunciata, Bronx Jewish Community Council, Christian Community Benevolent Association - Betances Senior Center, Council of Belmont Organizations - Mount Carmel Center for Senior Citizens, Coop City, Dora and Harry Simon, Moshulu Montefiore, and Tolentine Zeiser.



some of the client information received from case management agencies was inaccurate. However, case management agencies counter that RAIN had mismanaged the information they were given. It does seem clear that regular communication between case management agencies and meal providers was not in place during the start-up period and contributed to early client complaints.

Also contributing to the program's problematic start was a new service delivery model RAIN chose to adopt. The model turned out to be too cumbersome for RAIN's operations. Whereas Mid-Bronx's delivery model required that they simply pick-up prepared meals from a caterer and deliver them to clients, RAIN's model required storing and reheating the meals, assembling complementary cold packs of fruit, bread, and milk, and delivering the meals to their clients. To accommodate this model, RAIN had to outfit a senior center with a walk-in freezer and re-therm unit, renovate a space to suit the operation, as well as train staff in their respective roles. Ultimately, the model proved unworkable. RAIN ultimately switched its service delivery model to that of Mid-Bronx.

3.5 Current State of Pilot Service

In addition to our interviews with DFTA personnel and review of materials provided, our findings for the current operations of the program are based on information collected from the following four sources: our own survey of Pilot clients, case management agencies, a group of other stakeholders, and the two contracted meal providers, RAIN and Mid-Bronx. Based on that collected set of information, the overall result that emerges is that the Pilot is currently operating well and is providing a service valued by the customers served.

The stakeholder groups we interviewed (see Section 8) represent many with the most critical view of the program during implementation. Overall, we are able to characterize their comments on current operations as follows:

- the number of complaints from the seniors has decreased since the initiation of the program. DFTA reports that between December 2004 and October 2005, the number of complaints averaged 6 per month.
- many of the initial start-up meal delivery issues have been resolved and customer satisfaction levels are high.
- meal providers were effective in shortening the delivery routes. Providers now conform to the established guidelines for meal deliveries.

From our interviews with the case management agencies (see Section 7), although they raised concerns during the implementation period, they are in favor of the Pilot. Specifically, they report that the Pilot is currently operating well and that they believe the choice offered to seniors is beneficial to their clients.

Finally, based on information KPMG obtained directly from the Pilot participants via our survey (see Section 4), the Bronx seniors overall have a high level of satisfaction with the choice in meal delivery offered by the Pilot and indicate a high level of satisfaction with the current operations of the program overall. These results hold for both meal deliverers, RAIN and Mid-Bronx.



4 Customer Satisfaction Survey

4.1 Overview

This section provides a discussion of the results from the KPMG customer satisfaction survey of clients served by the Bronx Senior Options Program. The survey was distributed to each participant in the program during the month of May 2006. KPMG distributed approximately 2,280¹² surveys and collected a total of 1,244 surveys for an overall response rate of 55 percent.

The survey was designed to capture a few descriptive characteristics of the respondent as well as record the degree to which he or she either agreed or disagreed with a number of statements describing the program. Specifically, the survey presented each senior with the following eleven elements.

- *Four* items capturing broad characteristics of the participant:
 - male/female, length of program tenure, meal option (frozen or hot), and type of meal (regular or Kosher).
- *Seven* statement on overall program characteristics:
 - timeliness, taste, having an option, overall satisfaction, etc.

Detailed results for each of the eleven survey items are presented in Appendices C through E.

KPMG designed English and Spanish versions of the survey and distributed the forms to every participant of the weekday home-delivered meal program.¹³ These surveys were distributed to the meal providers on Monday May 15, 2006. Specific instructions regarding the survey process and its purpose were communicated directly to all drivers and deliverers at RAIN and Mid-Bronx. A KPMG staff member accompanied a driver on the longest delivery route of each provider to observe the dissemination of the surveys.

4.2 Overall Survey Results

4.2.1 Introduction

Each participant was provided with an opportunity to rate the extent to which he or she agreed with seven different statements covering various characteristics of the program.¹⁴ The statements provided were:

- My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.
- I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.
- Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.
- I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.

¹²Based on the provider supplied number of clients served at the time of the survey, the numbers are 1,550 for RAIN and 730 for Mid-Bronx.

¹³The Spanish translation of the survey was verified by Spanish-speaking staff at DFTA. The survey was printed so that one side of the document presented the survey in English with the other side presenting the survey in Spanish.

¹⁴Respondents used a Likert scale of 1 for "Strongly Agree" to 5 for "Strongly Disagree."



- I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.
- I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.
- Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.

From this list, there are two items that can be used to gauge an overall assessment of customer satisfaction, namely:

- Item 10 “Choice”: *I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.*
- Item 11 “Program”: *Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.*

The survey results associated with these two items can be used to examine how the current operations of the program are perceived overall, and then in particular, examine the strength of opinion, favorable or unfavorable, with having the choice between frozen and hot meal delivery. With these two items we can examine the degree to which there are customer differences between having a choice between hot and frozen meals, and general sentiments about the City’s Senior Options program.

Taken together, these two questions provide the best measure of how well the program currently operates and how actual participants view the program. When, additionally, we consider the results based on how long a participant has been with the program, we are then also able to gain insight on whether any negative impression that some may have had during the initial start up phase (as suggested by some of the groups we interviewed) still persists.

The results presented below represent a current gauge of where the program stands *from the perspective of the program participants*. We present the results as follows:

- Overall Results.
- Results for participants served by Mid-Bronx.
- Results for participants served by RAIN.

For each section, we provide an interpretation of responses and a set of tables that compare the overall results for all received surveys to the results further stratified by meal provider, program participant tenure, or type of meal received.

The results, reported as either the numeric averages or percentages, are calculated using the information provided from valid responses.¹⁵ In calculating numeric scores, values were assigned as follows.

Agreement Indicator	Value
Strongly Agree	1
Agree	2
No Opinion	3
Disagree	4
Strongly Disagree	5

¹⁵The total number of valid responses for each question is obtained by subtracting the number of invalid responses from the total number of surveys received.



4.2.2 Satisfaction with Pilot Choice

The vast majority of respondents (85.9%) indicated a response of either “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” with the statement. The average score for all valid responses is reported as 1.8, that is, an average score between “Strongly Agree” and “Agree”. This score and the high percentage of respondents on the “agree” side of the scale indicates a strong level of satisfaction with having a choice of hot or frozen meals.

“Glad to Have Choice” - Summary							
	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average Score
Total	1,244	36.3%	49.6%	9.2%	3.5%	1.4%	1.8

When we consider the indication of satisfaction based on years of participation in the program, or tenure, we do notice some variation on the average reported scores. We asked participants to classify themselves into one of three program tenure groups as follows:

- Less than one year,
- One to two years, or
- Three or more years.

As seen in the reported average scores, while the overall result for all groups is agreement with the statement, those who are the most recent to program participation (less than one year) and those who have been with the program the longest (three or more years), express a slightly higher level of satisfaction with having a choice compared to the group with one to two years participation. In all cases though, the vast majority are glad to have the choice, 88 percent for the most recent and the longest participants, and 84 percent for the middle tenured group.

“Glad to Have Choice” - Summary by Years of Participation							
	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average Score
Less than 1 year	417	45.3%	43.2%	8.2%	2.6%	0.7%	1.7
1 to 2 years	433	24.7%	59.4%	10.9%	3.7%	1.4%	2.0
3 or more years	334	38.3%	47.0%	9.9%	3.0%	1.8%	1.8
Total	1,184	35.8%	50.2%	9.6%	3.1%	1.3%	1.8

While these results clearly indicate widespread satisfaction with the choice option, the most recent participants are the ones that appear to be most satisfied as evidenced by 45 percent indicating “Strongly Agree” compared to 25 percent for the one to two year group, and 38 percent for the longest tenured participants.



When we consider the indication of satisfaction stratified by type of meal currently received, frozen or hot, there is basically little discernible difference in the average score for satisfaction reported. For those receiving hot meals, about 85 percent are glad to have the choice, and 88 percent of those receiving frozen meals are glad to have the choice.

Overall we note that out of every five who are on the “agree” side of the scale, about two indicated that they “strongly agree” with the statement and that just under 5 percent express disagreement with the statement.

“Glad to Have Choice” - Summary by Type of Meal							
	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average Score
Hot	669	34.5%	50.1%	10.5%	3.7%	1.2%	1.9
Frozen	455	36.9%	51.0%	7.5%	2.9%	1.8%	1.8
Total	1,124	35.5%	50.4%	9.3%	3.4%	1.4%	1.8

4.2.3 Satisfaction with Overall Program.

The vast majority of respondents (86.9%) indicated a response of either “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” with the statement. The average score for all valid responses is reported as 1.8, that is, an average score between “Strongly Agree” and “Agree”. This score and the high percentage of respondents on the “agree” side of the scale indicates a strong level of satisfaction with the overall operations of the program.

“Overall Program” - Summary							
	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average Score
Total	1,283	39.0%	47.9%	6.2%	5.0%	1.9%	1.8

We do observe some variation with the strength of satisfaction when we examine the results by years of participation in the program. While the overall result for all groups is agreement with the statement, we observe a similar pattern to that seen for the statement on “Choice.” Those who are the most recent and those who have been the program the longest, report slightly more satisfaction with the program overall than those with one to two years of participation. But unlike the previous results, those who are newest to the program expressed a stronger agreement even compared to those who have been in the program the longest.

Finally, one is less likely to find participants who express dissatisfaction in the most recent group (2.8%) compared to the one to two years group (8.8%), or the three plus years group (9.5%). Those results suggest that there is greater customer satisfaction from newer customers. Since that trend is not seen with the “Choice” question, whatever is causing the movement of individuals into the dissatisfaction category, it does not appear to be associated with having a choice of meals available.



“Overall Program” - Summary by Years of Participation							
	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average Score
Less than 1 year	428	50.2%	42.3%	4.7%	2.1%	0.7%	1.6
1 to 2 years	450	28.9%	56.4%	5.8%	6.4%	2.4%	2.0
3 or more years	344	38.1%	44.2%	8.4%	6.7%	2.6%	1.9
Total	1,222	39.0%	48.0%	6.1%	5.0%	1.9%	1.8

When we consider the indication of satisfaction stratified by type of meal currently received, frozen or hot, there is basically no discernible difference in the average score for satisfaction reported. For either group, about 87 percent are satisfied with the program overall. The negatives are also similar, with 6.4 percent of those receiving hot meals expressing dissatisfaction, with just one percent more (7.3%) expressing the sentiment for the frozen meal participants.

“Overall Program” - Summary by Type of Meal							
	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average Score
Hot	686	37.9%	49.1%	6.6%	4.8%	1.6%	1.8
Frozen	469	38.0%	48.6%	6.2%	4.7%	2.6%	1.9
Total	1,155	37.9%	48.9%	6.4%	4.8%	2.0%	1.8

4.3 Summary

KPMG distributed approximately 2,280 surveys and collected a total of 1,244 surveys for an overall response rate of 55 percent. The vast majority of respondents, almost 86 percent, either agree or strongly agree with the statement that they are glad to have a choice in the type of meal they receive. The result stays the same when the results are examined for RAIN and Mid-Bronx clients separately. The survey results also clearly indicate that the clients are satisfied with the overall operations of the program, with 87 percent responding with either agree or strongly agree. This high level of satisfaction is evident among both hot meal recipients and frozen meal recipients. For Mid-Bronx clients, the result was a very strong 96 percent of respondents expressing overall program satisfaction. The results for RAIN’s clients was 85 percent responded with either agree or strongly agree with the statement that they are satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.



5 Pilot Meal Providers¹⁶

5.1 Summary

The Bronx Senior Options program currently relies on two meal providers, Regional Aid for Interim Needs, Inc. (“RAIN”) and Mid-Bronx Senior Citizens Council (“Mid-Bronx”) for the delivery of meals to approximately 2,300 home-delivered meal recipients in the Bronx. Both meal providers deliver their meals using DFTA-funded trucks and staff, and both providers currently use Whitson’s Culinary Group (“Whitson’s”) for the catering of their hot and frozen meals. Whitson’s charges \$2.50 for its hot and frozen regular (non-kosher) meals; kosher providers charge \$4.15 for each kosher meal.¹⁷ Frozen meals are delivered twice a week, and hot meals are delivered every weekday. When a client is not present to receive a meal, both meal providers notify a case management agency for follow-up.

In our discussions with RAIN and Mid-Bronx, both reported implementation issues, including the transfer of the client lists between case management agencies and meal providers and the condition of the delivery fleet they inherited from former home-delivered meal providers. RAIN also cited substantial cost overruns during the early phase of the program. Those costs stemmed from the renovations required at the senior center RAIN initially designated to host their home-delivered meals program. RAIN was later forced to alter their business model when the space proved inappropriate for that purpose.

Both organizations report that current operations are on track and that customers are satisfied with the level of service now being provided.

5.2 Mid-Bronx Senior Citizens Council (“Mid-Bronx”)

Mid-Bronx was established in 1970 as a not-for-profit organization supporting the issues of the elderly in the South Bronx. Prior to Senior Options, Mid-Bronx delivered an average of 230 daily meals to individual clients. Now they deliver an average of 430 hot meals daily and 300 frozen meals twice a week to Senior Options clients.¹⁸ On average, each day Mid-Bronx delivers kosher meals to seven clients. There is one case management agency serving the South Bronx, Neighborhood Shopp, which assesses clients for home-delivered meals eligibility.¹⁹

Mid-Bronx was awarded its Senior Options contract six months prior to the start of the program. According to Mid-Bronx, however, planning for the Senior Options program did not begin until three months before the program. The delivery model Mid-Bronx adopted involved driving their delivery vans to Whitson’s to pick-up the meals and then delivering the meals to clients. Despite several months of planning, problems arose at the inception of Senior Options, such as malfunctioning delivery trucks, and inaccuracies in client addresses on delivery routes. According to Mid-Bronx, the major problems associated with the start-up of the Senior Options

¹⁶Information presented in this section is based on interviews with representatives from the named organizations and materials they provided. A more detailed presentation and discussion is presented in Appendix A.

¹⁷The cost of kosher meals has risen each year since the start of the Senior Options program. In FY05 the cost per kosher meal fluctuated with changes in kosher providers but ranged between \$3.10 and \$3.50. In FY06 each kosher meal cost \$4.05 and in FY07 \$4.15.

¹⁸ The numbers of clients and meals fluctuate as clients go on and off the program.

¹⁹ Neighborhood Shopp replaced Project SOS on July 1, 2006.



program were resolved within one month, and customers are currently satisfied with the operation of the Senior Options program. That account is consistent with the outcomes of the KPMG customer satisfaction survey.

5.3 Regional Aid for Interim Needs, Inc. (“RAIN”)

Founded in 1964, RAIN’s overall operations provide comprehensive services for roughly 30,000 elderly individuals in the Bronx. The organization employs 1,600 employees. RAIN conducted meal delivery for seniors before the Senior Options pilot delivering an average of 700 daily meals. Currently, under Senior Options, RAIN delivers an average of 750 hot meals daily and 610 frozen meals twice a week to clients in the northern part of the Bronx. On average, 647 clients receive a kosher meal each day.

There are four case management agencies that serve RAIN’s geographic service area in the Bronx: Bronx Jewish Community Center (“BJCC”), Aging in America, Jewish Association for Services for the Aged (“JASA”), and RAIN case management agency (“RAIN CMA”).²⁰

Although RAIN was awarded its Senior Options contract six months prior to the start of the program, according to RAIN, they began planning for the Senior Options program roughly three months before the program began. RAIN initially undertook an ambitious service delivery model, which required storing and reheating meals on site, assembling cold packs of milk, fruit, and bread to accompany each meal, and delivering the meals to clients. This approach required the purchase of kitchen equipment, including a walk-in freezer and “re-therming” unit, as well as the renovation of a senior center to accommodate the equipment, staff, and level of planned activity.

Once the program began, RAIN reported that there were meal delivery delays due in part to truck breakdowns as well as problems with the accuracy of client addresses. According to RAIN, the equipment problems were corrected after a couple months and the delivery route problems were resolved after one month. However, given the spatial demands of its Senior Options service model, RAIN could not sustain the co-location of both its home-delivered meals operation and its senior center. As a result, on September 1, 2005, RAIN abandoned its original service model and adopted the same model as Mid-Bronx using Whitson’s as its caterer. Despite RAIN’s early difficulties, KPMG’s customer satisfaction survey confirms RAIN’s assertion that currently, a large percentage of their clients are satisfied with the service of the home-delivered meals they receive from RAIN.

²⁰It is important to note that RAIN and RAIN case management agency are two distinct operational organizations. RAIN case management agency is not involved in meal delivery.

6 Contracted Catering Services

This section discusses the current and previous catering service operations employed by the Senior Options meal providers. Currently both RAIN and Mid-Bronx contract with the New York-based Whitson's Culinary Group ("Whitson's") for hot and frozen meals. The frozen meals are flash frozen and delivered frozen to clients. The "flash" freezing process relies on new technologies to freeze meals within seconds of preparation and vacuum seal them to maintain their flavor and nutritional value upon heating.

6.1 Whitson's Culinary Group²¹

Whitson's provides a variety of food service management solutions to individuals, businesses, and various public and private organizations. They report that the key to maintaining the integrity of the meal is having adequate space and the appropriate cooling and heating devices on each truck.

For Mid-Bronx and RAIN, Whitson's handles everything from food preparation to meal packaging so that the drivers only need to pick-up the meals and deliver them to the clients. The meals for delivery are prepared at Whitson's culinary centers and made daily for pick-up by the drivers of the meal providers.

Despite the negative public reaction from some advocates, Whitson's maintains that the meals it prepares for the seniors are healthy and safe meals. All meals are stamped and labeled in pre-portioned sizes that meet USDA Daily Recommended Dietary Allowance standards.

6.2 Implementation Issues

Mid-Bronx was the first of the two Senior Options meal providers to contract with Whitson's, which provided Mid-Bronx with frozen and hot meals at the start of the program. The company reports that due to good communication and early planning, it was able to adjust its staffing levels and plant operations before the implementation. It also held an open house with staff from DFTA, Mid-Bronx, and the community to taste test the meals. From Whitson's perspective, they and Mid-Bronx went through the implementation process virtually problem-free.

Initially, RAIN used ConAgra Foods through a purchasing contract with Homeplate (a ConAgra affiliate). KPMG conducted interviews with representatives of both Homeplate and RAIN concerning their business relationship at the start of the Pilot's operation. Because the reports of the problems encountered with the relationship differ, and further examination of the issues is beyond the scope of this effort, we simply note that the business model underlying the relationship was not able to serve RAIN's needs. The model involved receiving all of its meals as frozen, re-heating them on site, assembling the packages of complements to the meals, and then delivering the meals. To accommodate this model, RAIN renovated a senior center and installed kitchen equipment, including a walk-in freezer and "re-therm" unit to prepare the meals. On September 1, 2005, RAIN switched its caterer and became a client of Whitson's. By adopting the simpler model established by Mid-Bronx and Whitson's, RAIN was able to focus its efforts on meeting the meal delivery needs of its clients.

²¹Information about Whitson's presented in this section is based on our discussions with the company, materials they provided, and their website at <http://www.whitsons.com>.



While the operational relationship between Mid-Bronx and Whitson's is reported by the two parties as having worked well at the start of the Senior Options program, the initial experience between RAIN and Whitson's, which began in September 2005, was not as smooth. Undoubtedly contributing to start-up issues was the fact that RAIN, compared to Mid-Bronx, had a considerably larger number of clients. Whitson's reports having to make significant adjustments to its order fulfillment process to meet RAIN's needs.

To address communication concerns between RAIN and Whitson's, Whitson's created a spreadsheet for RAIN to record information by route on the number of hot and frozen meal packs and the number of kosher meals needed the day before each delivery. After establishing this process, RAIN reports receiving improved customer feedback.

6.3 Kosher Meals

Kosher meals provided by the Senior Options program are certified by the Orthodox Union. This certification indicates that the meals may be consumed by all those who observe kosher dietary laws. Mid-Bronx serves fewer than ten clients with kosher meals, while RAIN serves approximately 500. The cost of kosher meals is \$4.15 per meal, considerably higher than the \$2.50 cost of regular meals.

When Senior Options began, Mid-Bronx served kosher meals to only seven clients so Whitson's was able to supply its kosher meals through a subcontract with a third-party kosher caterer. Once RAIN became a client of Whitson's as well, the number of required kosher meals greatly increased and Whitson's kosher caterer could not serve their needs.

To resolve this issue, Whitson's outsourced to two kosher providers: to Bruno Specialty Foods, based in New York, to provide the non-meat portions of the meal, and to Meal Mart, based in New Jersey, to provide the protein (e.g., chicken, fish, meats and stews). Whitson's reports that they had the providers and seniors comment on the various kosher offerings and settled on a menu that suited all parties. Whitson's reported to us that these adjustments took two months to implement and that the results have been positive. Our current survey of customer satisfaction is consistent with that view.

7 Case Management Agencies

7.1 Summary

At the time of our interviews, the Bronx Senior Options program involved five case management agencies (“CMAs”) working with RAIN and Mid-Bronx in the facilitation of case management functions. These were: Project SOS, JASA, Aging in America, BJCC, and RAIN CMA.²²

Case management involves planning, arranging and coordinating services and resources to maximize the functional independence and economic and social well-being of clients. For the Senior Options program in the Bronx, the formal criteria for receiving home-delivered meals are that seniors are: essentially homebound, over the age of 60, cannot cook meals for themselves, and have no one else who can cook for them.

The CMAs in general reported that they observed start-up issues with the implementation of the Pilot program. These were logistical issues involving missed, late, or incorrect deliveries. Some of the CMAs also expressed early skepticism with the program due to the issues raised in the public debate on the nutritional value of the frozen meals. All of the CMAs viewed the program as working well now. They also now view the choice the program offers as a real benefit to the seniors because of the flexibility it offers the more mobile clients.

7.2 Project SOS²³

From October 1, 2004 until July 1, 2006, Project Supportive Outreach Services (“Project SOS”) was the only CMA that worked with Mid-Bronx, and it serviced all 730 of the clients of Mid-Bronx. Project SOS and Mid-Bronx had an existing relationship before the implementation of the Bronx Senior Options program which helped both organizations reduce problems stemming from the program’s inception. The organization stated that currently the Senior Options program is functioning well.

7.3 JASA

The Jewish Association for Services to the Aged (“JASA”) was not part of the Senior Options program during the implementation period. JASA’s involvement with the program began on July 1, 2005.²⁴ JASA services roughly 240 of RAIN’s clients. JASA reported that currently communication with RAIN had improved, and the program is working well.

7.4 Aging in America

Aging in America services approximately 330 of RAIN’s clients. This CMA also reported little direct communication with RAIN at the inception of the Bronx Senior Options program. Aging in America notes that a few months after the start of the program, most of the initial problems were resolved and client complaints significantly decreased.

²²We note that that following case management agencies lost home-delivered meal contracts as a result of the Senior Options program: Aging in America, and BJCC, and Gloria Wise (see footnote 26).

²³Project SOS chose to discontinue its contract following the resignation of its executive director. Neighborhood Shopp replaced Project SOS on July 1, 2006.

²⁴As a result of an ongoing investigation by the City’s Department of Investigation, all City agencies as well as the New York City Housing Authority terminated their contracts and grant agreements with Gloria Wise and its affiliates in June of 2005.



7.5 Bronx Jewish Community Council

The Bronx Jewish Community Council (“BJCC”) services roughly 480 of RAIN’s clients. They made note that during the program’s initial phase, there was little communication between their organization and RAIN. BJCC states that after a few months, the meal delivery and communication issues were rectified, and most client complaints have subsided.

7.6 RAIN CMA

RAIN CMA services about 700 clients for RAIN, and performs roughly sixty-five case visits per month. The CMA reported that after a couple of months the initial problems were resolved, and complaints from clients had decreased substantially.



8 Public Response and Key Stakeholders²⁵

8.1 Introduction

This section summarizes the various stakeholder responses gathered from over a dozen interviews. Due to requests for anonymity, the summary is a general overview of comments that characterize those made by the combined group of public advocates and elected officials (“public stakeholders”). Consequently, it would be incorrect to associate any particular comment as attributable to any specific individual or to all of the individuals contacted for this report.

8.2 The Stakeholders Group²⁶

Council of Senior Centers and Services of New York City, Inc

The Council of Senior Centers and Services of New York City, Inc (“CSCS”) is a professional organization for the City’s senior service providers. It lists its mission as, “To promote the quality of life, independent living, productivity, and dignity of mature and older adults and their families principally in New York City.” CSCS represents 265 senior service organizations, ranging from individual community-based senior centers to large, multi-service, citywide organizations.

United Neighborhood Houses

United Neighborhood Houses (“UNH”) is the membership organization of New York City settlement houses and community centers. UNH’s membership comprises 35 agencies working at more than 300 sites to provide high quality services and activities to more than a half million New Yorkers each year. For the senior population of New York City, UNH provides services to more than 65,000 seniors in senior centers, adult day services, home care, case management, and meals-on-wheels programs.

Citymeals-On-Wheels

Citymeals-on-Wheels (“CMOW”) is part of a public-private partnership that supplements the DFTA-funded weekday home-delivered meals programs. While DFTA contracts with community-based programs citywide to deliver weekday meals to homebound clients (approximately 16,000 clients), CMOW supplements DFTA’s funding and fund meals to clients on both weekdays and weekends. In FY’06, CMOW funded 1.2 million weekend and holiday meals CMOW and 570,130 weekday and supper meals. Under the Bronx Senior Options program, with CMOW funding, RAIN provided 148,792 weekend and holiday meals and 31,821 weekday and supper meals in FY’06. With CMOW funding Mid-Bronx provided 69,988 weekend and holiday meals and 14,161 weekday and supper meals in FY’06.²⁷

²⁵ A list of stakeholders interviewed is presented in Appendix A.

²⁶ These summaries draw heavily from information or materials supplied by the organizations.

²⁷ These figures were reported by Citymeals to DFTA for FY’06.

8.3 Initial Issues of Concern

Senior Isolation

A major concern expressed at the outset of the proposed Pilot was the possible adverse effect on the seniors in the Bronx from fewer deliveries by the meal providers. During the early discussions of the program and continuing through the start-up, many groups were concerned that the Pilot would weaken the seniors' ties to local agencies and social networks. It was widely argued that meal delivery opens the door for seniors to learn more about opportunities in their communities and become involved.

According to an ongoing study by Cornell University, senior isolation is a situation that occurs when a senior has no consistent interaction with family members, friends, social workers, or members of his or her community.²⁸ According to the Cornell research, approximately 92 percent of the Pilot's clients experience some degree of regular contact with another person.²⁹ We note that both RAIN and Mid-Bronx report that they operate telephone reassurance programs whereby all of their home-delivered meals clients receive weekly calls to check on their wellbeing.

Based on our interviews with the CMAs and meal providers, we note that both of the current home-delivered meal providers have procedures in place concerning undeliverable meals and contacting the relevant case management agencies. We also note that the option to go from five weekday deliveries to two weekday deliveries is a choice made by the seniors who qualify for the option. The CMAs indicated that the option is most often selected by the more mobile clients.

Cost Savings

A major concern of the group was whether DFTA was overly concerned with cost cutting due to citywide fiscal constraints. While many expressed an understanding that the City had to balance the desire to serve as many people as it could by maximizing efficiencies, many disagreed that cutting the cost of the program's core components was the best approach to DFTA's then current challenges. As reported to us, these groups perceived the City's focus to be on cost-savings rather than the health and safety of seniors.

Reduction in Local Community Contracts

The stakeholders indicated that at the outset of the program there were concerns regarding the anticipated loss of senior center funding and accompanying loss of jobs as a result of the consolidation of the delivery contracts. In response, DFTA provided job search assistance to individuals displaced as a result of the Pilot, and continued to fund positions through other service contracts.

Perceptions About Frozen Meals

From the outset, there was strong reluctance to accept that meals delivered frozen could in fact be nutritious. Stakeholders raised concerns that frozen meals were less nutritious and, by extension,

²⁸Information based on an interview with Ed Frangillo who is associated with the Cornell study, *Who Are the Recipients of Meals-on-Wheels in New York City? A Profile Based on a Representative Sample of Meals-on-Wheels Recipients*. New York: Citymeals-on-Wheels, 2006

²⁹Based on data from *Who Are the Recipients of Meals-on-Wheels in New York City? A Profile Based on a Representative Sample of Meals-on-Wheels Recipients*.



that the seniors were being mistreated. While KPMG is not in a position to evaluate issues related to nutrition, we note that DFTA maintains documentation that indicates the meals meet one-third USDA Daily Recommended Dietary Allowance guidelines.

Planning Period

A common concern was that the planning period was too brief. The RFP was released on December 10, 2003, responses were due on February 17, 2004, and the contracts were awarded on April 16, 2004. The Senior Options program was originally scheduled to start on July 1, 2004; however, in an effort to increase the planning period, DFTA postponed the program start date until October 1, 2004. This extension provided contractors with six months to prepare for the transition.

8.4 Current Operations

Overall, we are able to characterize the stakeholder group's comments on current operations as the following:

- the number of complaints from the seniors has lessened since the initiation of the program,
- many of the initial, start-up meal delivery issues have been resolved, and
- providers were able to shorten their delivery routes and now conform to established guidelines for meal deliveries.

There is though, a persistent concern that the Pilot has neither saved money nor provides meals to more seniors. These groups indicated that, based on their review of information received in public forums from CMOW and other groups, DFTA has not served many people from the waiting lists. DFTA notes that there is capacity for additional home-delivered meal customers in the Bronx, and that there are no seniors who are waitlisted for the Pilot.



9 Office of the Comptroller

The role of the Comptroller is to advise the Mayor, the City Council, and the public of the City's financial condition and to make recommendations on City programs and operations, fiscal policies, and financial transactions. The office also registers contracts for City services after verifying the qualifications of the contracting agency and the legitimacy of the contacting process. The Comptroller became involved with the Senior Options Program when the office was contacted by a group of advocates and providers of meal delivery services to discuss the problems they saw in the planned implementation of the Bronx Senior Options pilot project.

At the time of this analysis, the Senior Options program was under audit by the City Comptroller's office. As a result, the Comptroller's office did not feel it could participate in an interview on its opinion of the implementation process and current condition of the Senior Options program.³⁰ We note that since that time, the audit has been completed and a report released.³¹ Our review of the report found no significant findings with respect to this review and that the report "found that, for the most part, the clients were satisfied with the program."³²

³⁰ The Office of the Comptroller did provide a written statement on its views. We reviewed the statement as well as the Comptroller's testimony before the New York State Democratic Joint Task Force for Senior Citizen Issues on April 29, 2005.

³¹ City of New York, Office of the Comptroller, *Audit of the Department for the Aging's Oversight Of Its Contracts For the Delivery of Frozen Meals*, MD06-072A, June 30, 2006.

³² *Ibid.*, page 1.



10 Benchmarking Analysis

10.1 Overview

As a part of the evaluation, KPMG conducted a benchmarking analysis to compare New York City's Bronx Senior Options program with similar meal delivery programs across the country. KPMG designed an information request form and e-mailed it to ten different programs that operate home-delivered meal programs. Available information on each region's service data, program design, and cost structure was also reviewed. Of the programs contacted, responses were received from the following five:³³

- Broward County, FL
- Boston, MA
- Chicago, IL
- Montgomery, AL
- Philadelphia, PA

A copy of the information request form and a detailed summary of the information reported by each program is presented in Appendices I and J.

General Findings

For cities with formal client assessments for home-delivered meals, the process appears similar to DFTA's Senior Options program. In general, to be eligible for frozen meal deliveries, the recipient must have functioning appliances to store and re-heat meals, and the recipient must be physically able to re-heat the meal. Clients who are unable to handle a frozen meal automatically receive daily delivery of a hot meal.

In Philadelphia, the Philadelphia Corporation on Aging receives referrals from a separate organization which assesses the type of services that the client needs. The assessment includes the type of home-delivered meal the client should receive. Similarly, for Broward County, Florida, the Broward County Meals-on-Wheels program works with a social worker who determines if clients are able to receive hot or frozen meals. The social worker visits the client, assesses the situation in his or her home, and determines what types of service should be provided.

The regions responding to our information request stated that they did not encounter significant community resistance when they introduced frozen meals. These programs reported that most clients were happy to have the frozen meal option since it provides them with more control over which daily meal to eat and when to eat it.

All the programs subcontracted with meal providers such as commercial caterers to prepare the meals. The number of contracts held by these programs ranged from one to three contracts.

In some regions such as Chicago, Boston, and some parts of Broward County, Florida, the caterer prepares and delivers the meals directly to the clients. Frozen meal deliveries occur once or twice a week and hot meals are delivered daily. Almost all the programs offered ethnic and/or

³³ KPMG sent the request to each program at least three times.



specialty meals, that include one or more of the following: Kosher, Chinese, Korean, Latino, Caribbean, Russian, diabetic, or low-sodium meals.

Broward County, Florida has a mixed delivery model. In areas of the county where they have volunteer delivery personnel, the caterer delivers the meals to distribution sites such as senior centers. Then, volunteer delivery personnel pick-up the meals from the senior centers for home delivery. For areas where there are no volunteer deliverers, the caterer delivers the meals directly to the clients.

10.2 Meal Cost

Based on the obtained data, the annual number of meals provided by the responding programs ranged from a low of 103,800 to a high of 3 million. The percent of clients receiving frozen meals ranged from a low of 17% to a high of 90% (Chicago and Philadelphia). In comparison, the Senior Options Pilot serves 530,643 clients of whom 42% receive frozen meals.

In all the regions responding to the survey, all reported that the cost of specialty meals (kosher, ethnic, special diet) as higher than a regular meal. Specialty meals cost about one to two dollars more per meal. The cost of a hot meal ranged from \$2.50 to \$7.50, and ranged from \$2.50 to \$5.82 for frozen meals.

The table below provides more detail on the data KPMG collected from the programs that responded to the survey for the cost of prepared meals, that is, exclusive of delivery costs.

Summary Data from Meal Programs³⁴

City/Region	Percent of Clients Receiving Frozen Meals	Number of Meals Delivered Annually	Cost of Frozen Meals	Cost of Hot Meals	Cost of Kosher Meals
Philadelphia	90%	1,600,000	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$3.50
Chicago	90%	2,911,993	\$5.82*	\$6.67*	\$3.50
Broward County	Not Available	728,000	\$2.71	\$3.60	More than \$3.50
Boston	Not Available	558,000	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$7.50
Montgomery	17%	103,800	\$2.50	\$2.50	N/A
Bronx Sr. Options	42%	530,643	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$4.05

*Chicago frozen and hot costs include the cost of delivery.

³⁴ For the information listed as “Not Available,” KPMG was not able to obtain the data from the other city programs within the timeframe of this study.

11 Findings

Based on our review of available materials, survey results, and multiple and extensive interviews, we find the following:

Initial Planning and Implementation Period.

- The delivery of meals to the City's senior population is the concern of many vested interests. DFTA did not fully appreciate the level of vested stakeholder concern.
- Receiving six responses, only two of which met the requirements of the request for proposals, limited DFTA's options for the Pilot, resulting in the award of three contracts to only two providers.
- Each contractor experienced key missteps during the implementation of the program.
- The Pilot experienced significant equipment problems during the transition period.

Current State of Service Delivery.

- The goals and design of the Pilot are consistent with programs operating in other large metropolitan cities in terms of frozen and hot meal options, the frequency of deliveries, and fewer service contracts.
- With the expanded service capacity, there is no waiting list for home-delivered meals in the Bronx. Anyone who qualifies to receive home-delivered meals receives deliveries funded by either DFTA or Citymeals-on-Wheels.
- Based on preliminary findings of a Cornell University study and through interviews with the case management agencies, the voluntary change from a five-day to two-day delivery does not appear to have a substantial impact on senior isolation.
- Despite implementation issues, primarily involving necessary vehicle repairs and inaccurate client information, meal providers are now meeting their delivery requirements.
- Based on our survey, the clients served by the Pilot are satisfied with having a choice in meal delivery and with the overall operation of the program.
- From the perspective of the case management agencies serving the Pilot's seniors, the program is providing a beneficial meal delivery option.

Program Operation

- The pilot involved two substantial changes: 1) the addition of frozen meal delivery and 2) a new model for program administration, that is, fewer contracts with a fixed per-meal reimbursement.
- Based on our review of information available from similar programs in other cities, the overall approach of fewer contracts with a fixed per-meal reimbursement appears to be a reasonable design for program administration.
- The survey conducted by KPMG and the views of the case management agencies support the finding of keeping the frozen meal option and for its serious consideration for city-wide introduction.



Lessons Learned

- Any expansion of the program to other boroughs will require ongoing education of, and outreach to, elected officials, stakeholders, and other identified vested interests, though continued opposition should be anticipated.
- We recommend that DFTA require in any future contracts that bidders designate a “transition manager” specifically tasked to actively manage the issues related to: the client list, equipment, caterers, and case management agencies.
- Problems with the delivery fleet operated by previous meal providers were not resolved prior to the start-up. While the operating inspection and maintenance procedures were not part of this review, it is clear that ensuring sound home-delivered meals vehicles is critical to program success.
- The dollar amount of the per meal cost reimbursement needs to be reviewed periodically. This should include updating the benchmarks used in other cities as well as a review of the cost structure of the contracted providers, to the extent available.
- In considering an expansion of the Pilot into other boroughs, DFTA should continue to include the re-employment services it offered to the affected Bronx personnel.



12 Appendices

A	Stakeholders Interviewed	36
B	Survey Distribution Process	37
C	Survey Results: Overall	39
D	Survey Results: Mid-Bronx	44
E	Survey Results: RAIN	49
F	Customer Satisfaction Survey	54
G	Driver Survey Delivery Instructions	55
H	Update Benchmarking Summary	56
I	2006 Benchmarking Survey	59
J	2006 Survey Results Summary	61



A Stakeholders Interviewed

DFTA provided KPMG with a list of elected officials and advocates to interview. The following table lists those elected officials and organizations that were identified for interviews concerning the Senior Option Meal Program.

	Stakeholder Group	Contact Name	Interview Status
1	Then Chair, Aging Committee for Elected Officials	Maria Baez	No Longer a Contact
2	New Chair, Aging Committee for Elected Officials	Maria Carman Arroyo	Interviewed
3	Elected Official	Annabel Palma	Interviewed
4	Elected Official	Oliver Koppell	Interviewed
5	Former Elected Official	Madeline Provenzano	Interviewed James Vacca instead
6	Majority Leader	Joel Rivera	Interviewed
7	Elected Official	Helen Foster	Not able to be reached for an interview
8	Former Elected Official	Philip Reed	No longer in Office
9	Elected Official	Larry Seabrook	Unable to arrange interview within timeframe of study.
10	Elected Official	Adolfo Carrion	Interviewed
11	Elected Official	Betsy Gotbaum	Interviewed
12	City of NY Comptroller	William C. Thompson Jr.	Provided Written Responses
13	CSCS	Anonymous	Interviewed
14	United Neighborhood Houses	Anonymous	Interviewed
15	Institute for Puerto Rican Hispanic Elderly	Anonymous	Unable to arrange interview within timeframe of study.
16	NYC DFTA Commissioner	Edwin Méndez-Santiago	Interviewed
17	Citymeals-on-Wheels	Anonymous	Interviewed

B Survey Distribution Process

The surveys were given to each meal provider by a KPMG staff member on Monday May 15, 2006. Specific instructions regarding the survey process and its purpose were communicated directly to all drivers and deliverers at each meal provider. One KPMG staff member went on the longest delivery route at both RAIN and Mid-Bronx, and observed the dissemination of the surveys.

Description of Delivery and Collection Methods

1. Collected survey forms

KPMG arranged to pick up completed survey forms directly from the meal providers. The survey forms were collected the first and second Fridays following the date the surveys were originally distributed. Surveys were collected in groups identified by meal provider and route. Surveys from each route at each meal provider were further separated into English and Spanish batches, to facilitate scanning and analysis by language, route and meal provider.

2. Scanned survey forms

All completed survey forms were scanned and saved into image files in TIF format (a computer-readable picture format). Two separate files – one for English and one for Spanish surveys – were created for each provider and route. The name of each TIF file identified the provider, route and survey form language.

3. Processed images

All image files were processed in Remark Office OMR software package. This software works in conjunction with a scanner to collect the data from the surveys containing multiple-choice questions.

The following steps were performed to process each image file:

- Image file was imported into Remark Office OMR. The software collected valid responses to the survey questions, identified invalid responses (blank or multiple responses to one question), and flagged errors encountered during image recognition.
- Errors flagged by the software were manually corrected based on visual review of the image.
- The data for all survey forms in the image file were exported into a comma delimited text file. For each survey, the text file contained one row of data with numeric values assigned to the survey questions, and the name of the source image file, identifying the provider, route and survey form language. The text file was saved under the same name as the source image file.

4. Summarized the survey data

Each comma delimited text file was imported into a separate table in an Access database. The name of the table was the same as the name of the source text file. The data from all tables was then combined into one table containing information from all collected surveys,



one record per survey. In addition to the responses to all survey questions, each record contained fields identifying the provider, route and survey form language.

Queries summarizing responses to the survey questions were created in Access. The results were copied from Access into Excel spreadsheets and formatted in Excel for presentation in final reports.



C Survey Results: Overall

Survey Forms Received: 439			Answer to Question 2: Less than 1 year						
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Male	Female				
1. My gender is:	18	5	416	126	290				
				30.3%	69.7%				
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years			
2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	0	0	439	439	0	0			
				100.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Hot Meal	Frozen Meal				
3. On weekdays, I receive:	19	19	401	242	159				
				60.3%	39.7%				
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Kosher	Regular				
4. The type of meals I receive is:	26	9	404	78	326				
				19.3%	80.7%				
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	5	5	429	237	162	15	11	4	1.6
				55.2%	37.8%	3.5%	2.6%	0.9%	
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	6	5	428	185	184	29	26	4	1.8
				43.2%	43.0%	6.8%	6.1%	0.9%	
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	11	6	422	150	196	39	32	5	1.9
				35.5%	46.4%	9.2%	7.6%	1.2%	
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	6	6	427	177	202	34	9	4	1.7
				41.5%	47.3%	8.0%	2.1%	1.2%	
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	11	7	421	169	201	23	16	12	1.8
				40.1%	47.7%	5.5%	3.8%	2.9%	
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	17	5	417	189	180	34	11	3	1.7
				45.3%	43.2%	8.2%	2.6%	0.7%	
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	4	7	428	215	181	20	9	3	1.6
				50.2%	42.3%	4.7%	2.1%	0.7%	



New York City Department for the Aging
 Evaluation of the Senior Options Pilot Program
 Economic and Valuation Services
 March 8, 2007

Survey Forms Received:	463	Answer to Question 2: 1 to 2 years
-------------------------------	-----	---

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Male	Female		
1. My gender is:	20	3	440	152	288		
				34.5%	65.5%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years	
2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	0	0	463	0	463	0	
				0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Hot Meal	Frozen Meal		
3. On weekdays, I receive:	22	14	427	235	192		
				55.0%	45.0%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Kosher	Regular		
4. The type of meals I receive is:	22	7	434	125	309		
				28.8%	71.2%		

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	4	6	453	179	246	9	17	2	1.7
				39.5%	54.3%	2.0%	3.8%	0.4%	
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	9	8	446	91	215	47	69	24	2.4
				20.4%	48.2%	10.5%	15.5%	5.4%	
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	10	12	441	76	229	55	65	16	2.4
				17.2%	51.9%	12.5%	14.7%	3.6%	
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	13	4	446	94	271	41	27	13	2.1
				21.1%	60.8%	9.2%	6.1%	2.9%	
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	14	6	443	98	283	41	13	8	2.0
				22.1%	63.9%	9.3%	2.9%	1.8%	
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	23	7	433	107	257	47	16	6	2.0
				24.7%	59.4%	10.9%	3.7%	1.4%	
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	8	5	450	130	254	26	29	11	2.0
				28.9%	56.4%	5.8%	6.4%	2.4%	



New York City Department for the Aging
 Evaluation of the Senior Options Pilot Program
 Economic and Valuation Services
 March 8, 2007

Survey Forms Received:	351	Answer to Question 2: 3 or more years
-------------------------------	-----	--

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Male	Female	
1. My gender is:	12	8	331	110	221	
				33.2%	66.8%	
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years
2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	0	0	351	0	0	351
				0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Hot Meal	Frozen Meal	
3. On weekdays, I receive:	10	13	328	213	115	
				64.9%	35.1%	
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Kosher	Regular	
4. The type of meals I receive is:	19	9	323	102	221	
				31.6%	68.4%	

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	6	4	341	135	176	24	5	1	1.7
				39.6%	51.6%	7.0%	1.5%	0.3%	
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	8	5	338	98	143	37	47	13	2.2
				29.0%	42.3%	10.9%	13.9%	3.8%	
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	5	2	344	83	159	46	39	17	2.3
				24.1%	46.2%	13.4%	11.3%	4.9%	
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	9	6	336	94	165	47	22	8	2.1
				28.0%	49.1%	14.0%	6.5%	2.4%	
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	5	3	343	104	170	38	22	9	2.0
				30.3%	49.6%	11.1%	6.4%	2.6%	
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	13	4	334	128	157	33	10	6	1.8
				38.3%	47.0%	9.9%	3.0%	1.8%	
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	4	3	344	131	152	29	23	9	1.9
				38.1%	44.2%	8.4%	6.7%	2.6%	



New York City Department for the Aging
 Evaluation of the Senior Options Pilot Program
 Economic and Valuation Services
 March 8, 2007

Survey Forms Received:	705	Answer to Question 3: Hot Meal
-------------------------------	-----	---------------------------------------

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Male	Female		
1. My gender is:	21	11	673	209	464		
				31.1%	68.9%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years	
2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	7	8	690	242	235	213	
				35.1%	34.1%	30.9%	
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Hot Meal	Frozen Meal		
3. On weekdays, I receive:	0	0	705	705	0		
				100.0%	0.0%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Kosher	Regular		
4. The type of meals I receive is:	36	12	657	182	475		
				27.7%	72.3%		

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	6	11	688	293	348	23	18	6	1.7
				42.6%	50.6%	3.3%	2.6%	0.9%	
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	12	10	683	194	313	67	86	23	2.2
				28.4%	45.8%	9.8%	12.6%	3.4%	
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	11	12	682	161	336	81	86	18	2.2
				23.6%	49.3%	11.9%	12.6%	2.6%	
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	13	9	683	188	374	70	36	14	2.0
				27.5%	54.8%	10.2%	5.3%	2.2%	
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	17	8	680	199	375	61	29	16	2.0
				29.3%	55.1%	9.0%	4.3%	2.4%	
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	26	10	669	231	335	70	25	8	1.9
				34.5%	50.1%	10.5%	3.7%	1.2%	
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	8	11	686	260	337	45	33	11	1.8
				37.9%	49.1%	6.6%	4.8%	1.6%	



New York City Department for the Aging
 Evaluation of the Senior Options Pilot Program
 Economic and Valuation Services
 March 8, 2007

Survey Forms Received: 482 Answer to Question 3: Frozen Meal

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Male	Female		
1. My gender is:	27	4	451	154	297		
				34.1%	65.9%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years	
2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	11	5	466	159	192	115	
				34.1%	41.2%	24.7%	
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Hot Meal	Frozen Meal		
3. On weekdays, I receive:	0	0	482	0	482		
				0.0%	100.0%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Kosher	Regular		
4. The type of meals I receive is:	20	10	452	110	342		
				24.3%	75.7%		

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	11	4	467	225	209	23	9	1	1.6
				48.2%	44.8%	4.9%	1.9%	0.2%	
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	12	8	462	149	201	45	53	14	2.1
				32.3%	43.5%	9.7%	11.5%	3.0%	
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	14	9	459	128	217	53	44	17	2.1
				27.9%	47.3%	11.5%	9.6%	3.7%	
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	12	8	462	150	237	48	21	6	1.9
				32.5%	51.3%	10.4%	4.5%	1.3%	
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	13	9	460	146	252	37	14	11	1.9
				31.7%	54.8%	8.0%	3.0%	2.4%	
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	20	7	455	168	232	34	13	8	1.8
				36.9%	51.0%	7.5%	2.9%	1.8%	
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	9	4	469	178	228	29	22	12	1.9
				38.0%	48.6%	6.2%	4.7%	2.6%	



D Survey Results: Mid-Bronx

Survey Forms Received:	149		Mid Bronx			Answer to Question 2: Less than 1 year			
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Male	Female				
1. My gender is:	3	1	145	48	97				
				33.1%	66.9%				
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years			
2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	0	0	149	149	0	0			
				100.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Hot Meal	Frozen Meal				
3. On weekdays, I receive:	4	12	133	94	39				
				70.7%	29.3%				
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Kosher	Regular				
4. The type of meals I receive is:	11	2	136	11	125				
				8.1%	91.9%				
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	0	1	148	87	53	6	2	0	1.5
				58.8%	35.8%	4.1%	1.4%	0.0%	
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	1	2	146	78	57	9	2	0	1.6
				53.4%	39.0%	6.2%	1.4%	0.0%	
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	4	1	144	59	62	17	4	2	1.8
				41.0%	43.1%	11.8%	2.8%	1.4%	
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	3	1	145	67	66	9	0	2	1.6
				46.2%	45.5%	6.2%	0.0%	2.1%	
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	5	2	142	61	67	6	4	4	1.8
				43.0%	47.2%	4.2%	2.8%	2.8%	
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	2	2	145	76	53	14	2	0	1.6
				52.4%	36.6%	9.7%	1.4%	0.0%	
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	0	2	147	89	52	5	1	0	1.4
				60.5%	35.4%	3.4%	0.7%	0.0%	



New York City Department for the Aging
 Evaluation of the Senior Options Pilot Program
 Economic and Valuation Services
 March 8, 2007

Survey Forms Received:	116	Mid Bronx	Answer to Question 2: 1 to 2 years
------------------------	-----	------------------	------------------------------------

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Male	Female		
1. My gender is:	1	2	113	47	66		
				41.6%	58.4%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years	
2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	0	0	116	0	116	0	
				0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Hot Meal	Frozen Meal		
3. On weekdays, I receive:	2	5	109	70	39		
				64.2%	35.8%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Kosher	Regular		
4. The type of meals I receive is:	1	0	115	8	107		
				7.0%	93.0%		

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	2	4	110	48	54	2	5	1	1.7
				43.6%	49.1%	1.8%	4.5%	0.9%	
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	2	3	111	31	58	11	8	3	2.0
				27.9%	52.3%	9.9%	7.2%	2.7%	
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	2	3	111	21	69	15	5	1	2.1
				18.9%	62.2%	13.5%	4.5%	0.9%	
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	2	1	113	26	75	7	3	2	1.9
				23.0%	66.4%	6.2%	2.7%	1.8%	
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	3	3	110	26	67	11	6	0	2.0
				23.6%	60.9%	10.0%	5.5%	0.0%	
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	6	4	106	29	62	7	8	0	1.9
				27.4%	58.5%	6.6%	7.5%	0.0%	
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	0	2	114	42	65	5	2	0	1.7
				36.8%	57.0%	4.4%	1.8%	0.0%	



New York City Department for the Aging
 Evaluation of the Senior Options Pilot Program
 Economic and Valuation Services
 March 8, 2007

Survey Forms Received:	84	Mid Bronx	Answer to Question 2: 3 or more years
------------------------	----	------------------	---------------------------------------

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Male	Female		
1. My gender is:	1	2	81	28	53		
				34.6%	65.4%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years	
2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	0	0	84	0	0	84	
				0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Hot Meal	Frozen Meal		
3. On weekdays, I receive:	3	5	76	54	22		
				71.1%	28.9%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Kosher	Regular		
4. The type of meals I receive is:	3	2	79	6	73		
				7.6%	92.4%		

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	0	0	84	37	40	5	2	0	1.7
				44.0%	47.6%	6.0%	2.4%	0.0%	
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	2	1	81	29	34	11	6	1	2.0
				35.8%	42.0%	13.6%	7.4%	1.2%	
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	2	0	82	22	39	10	10	1	2.1
				26.8%	47.6%	12.2%	12.2%	1.2%	
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	1	0	83	29	38	10	5	1	1.9
				34.9%	45.8%	12.0%	6.0%	1.2%	
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	0	0	84	34	36	9	5	0	1.8
				40.5%	42.9%	10.7%	6.0%	0.0%	
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	5	0	79	30	38	9	1	1	1.8
				38.0%	48.1%	11.4%	1.3%	1.3%	
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	0	1	83	36	38	5	2	2	1.7
				43.4%	45.8%	6.0%	2.4%	2.4%	



New York City Department for the Aging
 Evaluation of the Senior Options Pilot Program
 Economic and Valuation Services
 March 8, 2007

Survey Forms Received:	103	Mid Bronx	Answer to Question 3: Hot Meal
------------------------	-----	------------------	--------------------------------

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Male	Female		
1. My gender is:	3	2	98	38	60		
				38.8%	61.2%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years	
2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	1	2	100	39	39	22	
				39.0%	39.0%	22.0%	
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Hot Meal	Frozen Meal		
3. On weekdays, I receive:	0	0	103	0	103		
				0.0%	100.0%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Kosher	Regular		
4. The type of meals I receive is:	5	0	98	12	86		
				12.2%	87.8%		

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	0	1	102	52	43	4	2	1	1.6
				51.0%	42.2%	3.9%	2.0%	1.0%	
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	1	2	100	38	48	9	4	1	1.8
				38.0%	48.0%	9.0%	4.0%	1.0%	
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	3	2	98	31	53	11	2	1	1.9
				31.6%	54.1%	11.2%	2.0%	1.0%	
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	2	1	100	38	56	5	0	1	1.7
				38.0%	56.0%	5.0%	0.0%	1.0%	
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	3	1	99	35	52	9	2	1	1.8
				35.4%	52.5%	9.1%	2.0%	1.0%	
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	1	2	100	42	48	5	5	0	1.7
				42.0%	48.0%	5.0%	5.0%	0.0%	
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	0	1	102	46	52	4	0	0	1.6
				45.1%	51.0%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	



New York City Department for the Aging
 Evaluation of the Senior Options Pilot Program
 Economic and Valuation Services
 March 8, 2007

Survey Forms Received:	103	Mid Bronx	Answer to Question 3: Frozen Meal
------------------------	-----	------------------	-----------------------------------

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Male	Female		
1. My gender is:	3	2	98	38	60		
				38.8%	61.2%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years	
2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	1	2	100	39	39	22	
				39.0%	39.0%	22.0%	
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Hot Meal	Frozen Meal		
3. On weekdays, I receive:	0	0	103	0	103		
				0.0%	100.0%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Kosher	Regular		
4. The type of meals I receive is:	5	0	98	12	86		
				12.2%	87.8%		

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	0	1	102	52	43	4	2	1	1.6
				51.0%	42.2%	3.9%	2.0%	1.0%	
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	1	2	100	38	48	9	4	1	1.8
				38.0%	48.0%	9.0%	4.0%	1.0%	
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	3	2	98	31	53	11	2	1	1.9
				31.6%	54.1%	11.2%	2.0%	1.0%	
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	2	1	100	38	56	5	0	1	1.7
				38.0%	56.0%	5.0%	0.0%	1.0%	
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	3	1	99	35	52	9	2	1	1.8
				35.4%	52.5%	9.1%	2.0%	1.0%	
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	1	2	100	42	48	5	5	0	1.7
				42.0%	48.0%	5.0%	5.0%	0.0%	
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	0	1	102	46	52	4	0	0	1.6
				45.1%	51.0%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	



E Survey Results: RAIN

Survey Forms Received:		290		RAIN			Answer to Question 2: Less than 1 year			
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Male	Female					
1. My gender is:	15	4	271	78	193					
				28.8%	71.2%					
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years				
2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	0	0	290	290	0	0				
				100.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Hot Meal	Frozen Meal					
3. On weekdays, I receive:	15	7	268	148	120					
				55.2%	44.8%					
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Kosher	Regular					
4. The type of meals I receive is:	15	7	268	67	201					
				25.0%	75.0%					
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average	
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	5	4	281	150	109	9	9	4	1.6	
				53.4%	38.8%	3.2%	3.2%	1.4%		
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	5	3	282	107	127	20	24	4	1.9	
				37.9%	45.0%	7.1%	8.5%	1.4%		
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	7	5	278	91	134	22	28	3	2.0	
				32.7%	48.2%	7.9%	10.1%	1.1%		
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	3	5	282	110	136	25	9	2	1.8	
				39.0%	48.2%	8.9%	3.2%	0.7%		
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	6	5	279	108	134	17	12	8	1.8	
				38.7%	48.0%	6.1%	4.3%	2.9%		
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	15	3	272	113	127	20	9	3	1.8	
				41.5%	46.7%	7.4%	3.3%	1.1%		
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	4	5	281	126	129	15	8	3	1.7	
				44.8%	45.9%	5.3%	2.8%	1.1%		



New York City Department for the Aging
 Evaluation of the Senior Options Pilot Program
 Economic and Valuation Services
 March 8, 2007

Survey Forms Received:	347	RAIN	Answer to Question 2: 1 to 2 years
------------------------	-----	-------------	------------------------------------

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Male	Female		
1. My gender is:	19	1	327	105	222		
				32.1%	67.9%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years	
2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	0	0	347	0	347	0	
				0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Hot Meal	Frozen Meal		
3. On weekdays, I receive:	20	9	318	165	153		
				51.9%	48.1%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Kosher	Regular		
4. The type of meals I receive is:	21	7	319	117	202		
				36.7%	63.3%		

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	2	2	343	131	192	7	12	1	1.7
				38.2%	56.0%	2.0%	3.5%	0.3%	
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	7	5	335	60	157	36	61	21	2.5
				17.9%	46.9%	10.7%	18.2%	6.3%	
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	8	9	330	55	160	40	60	15	2.5
				16.7%	48.5%	12.1%	18.2%	4.5%	
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	11	3	333	68	196	34	24	11	2.1
				20.4%	58.9%	10.2%	7.2%	3.3%	
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	11	3	333	72	216	30	7	8	2.0
				21.6%	64.9%	9.0%	2.1%	2.4%	
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	17	3	327	78	195	40	8	6	2.0
				23.9%	59.6%	12.2%	2.4%	1.8%	
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	8	3	336	88	189	21	27	11	2.1
				26.2%	56.3%	6.3%	8.0%	3.3%	



New York City Department for the Aging
 Evaluation of the Senior Options Pilot Program
 Economic and Valuation Services
 March 8, 2007

Survey Forms Received:	267	RAIN	Answer to Question 2: 3 or more years
------------------------	-----	-------------	---------------------------------------

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Male	Female		
1. My gender is:	11	6	250	82	168		
				32.8%	67.2%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years	
2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	0	0	267	0	0	267	
				0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Hot Meal	Frozen Meal		
3. On weekdays, I receive:	7	8	252	159	93		
				63.1%	36.9%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Kosher	Regular		
4. The type of meals I receive is:	16	7	244	96	148		
				39.3%	60.7%		

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	6	4	257	98	136	19	3	1	1.7
				38.1%	52.9%	7.4%	1.2%	0.4%	
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	6	4	257	69	109	26	41	12	2.3
				26.8%	42.4%	10.1%	16.0%	4.7%	
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	3	2	262	61	120	36	29	16	2.3
				23.3%	45.8%	13.7%	11.1%	6.1%	
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	8	6	253	65	127	37	17	7	2.1
				25.7%	50.2%	14.6%	6.7%	2.8%	
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	5	3	259	70	134	29	17	9	2.1
				27.0%	51.7%	11.2%	6.6%	3.5%	
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	8	4	255	98	119	24	9	5	1.8
				38.4%	46.7%	9.4%	3.5%	2.0%	
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	4	2	261	95	114	24	21	7	2.0
				36.4%	43.7%	9.2%	8.0%	2.7%	



New York City Department for the Aging
 Evaluation of the Senior Options Pilot Program
 Economic and Valuation Services
 March 8, 2007

Survey Forms Received:	485		RAIN			Answer to Question 3: Hot Meal	
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Male	Female		
1. My gender is:	20	9	456	138	318		
				30.3%	69.7%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years	
2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	7	6	472	148	165	159	
				31.4%	35.0%	33.7%	
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Hot Meal	Frozen Meal		
3. On weekdays, I receive:	0	0	485	485	0		
				100.0%	0.0%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Kosher	Regular		
4. The type of meals I receive is:	28	10	447	173	274		
				38.7%	61.3%		

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	4	7	474	192	248	14	14	6	1.7
				40.5%	52.3%	3.0%	3.0%	1.3%	
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	9	6	470	113	216	45	74	22	2.3
				24.0%	46.0%	9.6%	15.7%	4.7%	
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	5	10	470	103	227	53	70	17	2.3
				21.9%	48.3%	11.3%	14.9%	3.6%	
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	10	8	467	119	255	52	28	13	2.1
				25.5%	54.6%	11.1%	6.0%	2.8%	
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	12	4	469	129	262	46	18	14	2.0
				27.5%	55.9%	9.8%	3.8%	3.0%	
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	15	6	464	155	236	47	19	7	1.9
				33.4%	50.9%	10.1%	4.1%	1.5%	
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	8	8	469	160	237	34	29	9	1.9
				34.1%	50.5%	7.2%	6.2%	1.9%	



New York City Department for the Aging
 Evaluation of the Senior Options Pilot Program
 Economic and Valuation Services
 March 8, 2007

Survey Forms Received:	379	RAIN	Answer to Question 3: Frozen Meal
------------------------	-----	-------------	-----------------------------------

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Male	Female		
1. My gender is:	24	2	353	116	237		
				32.9%	67.1%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years	
2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	10	3	366	120	153	93	
				32.8%	41.8%	25.4%	
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Hot Meal	Frozen Meal		
3. On weekdays, I receive:	0	0	379	0	379		
				0.0%	100.0%		
	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Kosher	Regular		
4. The type of meals I receive is:	15	10	354	98	256		
				27.7%	72.3%		

	No Response	Multiple Responses	Valid Responses	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	Average
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	11	3	365	173	166	19	7	0	1.6
				47.4%	45.5%	5.2%	1.9%	0.0%	
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	11	6	362	111	153	36	49	13	2.2
				30.7%	42.3%	9.9%	13.5%	3.6%	
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	11	7	361	97	164	42	42	16	2.2
				26.9%	45.4%	11.6%	11.6%	4.4%	
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	10	7	362	112	181	43	21	5	2.0
				30.9%	50.0%	11.9%	5.8%	1.4%	
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	10	8	361	111	200	28	12	10	1.9
				30.7%	55.4%	7.8%	3.3%	2.8%	
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	19	5	355	126	184	29	8	8	1.8
				35.5%	51.8%	8.2%	2.3%	2.3%	
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	9	3	367	132	176	25	22	12	1.9
				36.0%	48.0%	6.8%	6.0%	3.3%	



F Customer Satisfaction Survey

Please fill in marks like this: ● not like this: ✗ ○ ☑

	Male	Female		Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	3 or more years
1. My gender is:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	2. I have been receiving weekday home delivered meals for:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Hot Meals	Frozen Meals		Kosher	Regular	
3. On weekdays, I receive:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	4. The type of weekday meals I receive is:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5. My weekday meals are usually delivered on time.	<input type="radio"/>				
6. I am satisfied with the variety of the weekday meals.	<input type="radio"/>				
7. Overall, I find the weekday meals provided to be tasty.	<input type="radio"/>				
8. I believe the weekday meals provided are nutritious.	<input type="radio"/>				
9. I am satisfied with the labeling provided on the weekday meals.	<input type="radio"/>				
10. I am glad to have a choice of weekday hot or frozen meals.	<input type="radio"/>				
11. Overall, I am satisfied with the weekday, home meal delivery program.	<input type="radio"/>				

Please feel free to add any other comments concerning your WEEKDAY Home Meal Delivery.



G Driver Survey Delivery Instructions

Home Delivered Meal Program Survey - Department for the Aging

The City of New York's Department for the Aging has asked KPMG, an external consulting firm, to conduct a brief customer satisfaction survey of the Weekday home meal program.

Each senior will receive one "survey kit," which includes one double-sided survey form, one double-sided instruction, and one labeled return envelope. The double-sided forms provide both English and Spanish directions. The following is a quick list of how to proceed with the survey process:

- 1) Please deliver one survey kit to every meal client on your route along with his or her meal.
- 2) Please ask the seniors to complete the form and to return it to you in the envelope provided.
- 3) Please inform the senior that you will return to pick up their form when it is complete.
- 4) Please note on your envelope the missed deliveries and retry on your next delivery attempt.
- 5) There are extra copies of the surveys in case some one requests another.
- 6) Please accumulate the survey kits in your large driver envelope.
- 7) Please continue to collect surveys until Friday, May 26, 2006.
- 8) A KPMG representative will be in your office to collect the envelopes at the end of the day on Friday, May 19, 2006, and finally at the end of the day on Friday, May 26, 2006.

We greatly appreciate your assistance in completing our survey. If you have any questions or concerns, please call me on (212) 872 6948. Alternatively, you may also call Karen Garvin.

Best regards,

Johnny Jones

KPMG



H Update Benchmarking Summary

City/Program	# of Contractors	# of Meals served	Hot/Frozen/Chilled	Ethnic/Special Meals	Delivery	Avg. Cost per Meal/Type	Client Assessment
Alabama - Montgomery Council on Aging Meals on Wheels Program		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1,500 frozen/month 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hot and Frozen 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimated cost of \$2.50 for frozen meals which are all donated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clients only receive frozen meals if they are on a waitlist for the regular hot meals program
California - San Francisco Dept. of Aging and Adult Services	No response received						
Florida - Broward County Meals On Wheels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meals-on Wheels (BMOW) administers HMDL program and subcontracts with caterers for meals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1,400 clients per week. Frozen meals are offered in 5, 6 or 7 day packages. Homebound clients lacking appropriate appliances are provided with a toaster oven. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hot and frozen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kosher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caterers deliver to BMOW's 26 volunteer stations for \$1.28 per package. Caterer delivers to client homes where there are no volunteer drivers at \$1.83 per package. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frozen meal package breakfast (regular \$0.69, Kosher \$0.73) and dinner (reg. \$2.71, Kosher more than \$3.50) Hot meal package breakfast (\$0.69), lunch & dinner (\$3.6 each). 	
Illinois - Chicago Dept. on Aging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One central caterer provides regular meals to clients and open kitchens. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frozen - there are 5,000 HMDL weekday clients. Each client received 2 meals/day (lunch & dinner) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frozen – Lunch is a chilled meal (sandwich, salad, etc.) and dinner is a frozen meal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kosher, Chinese and Korean Low salt & 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frozen – Twice a week (Mon&Weds or Tues&Thurs.) Hot– daily Mon. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frozen – \$5.82/Day with delivery included Hot– \$6.67/Day 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case management is contracted out to about 5 different agencies throughout the city



City/Program	# of Contractors	# of Meals served	Hot/Frozen/Chilled	Ethnic/Special Meals	Delivery	Avg. Cost per Meal/Type	Client Assessment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A small number of clients are served by specialty ethnic caterers Contracts are awarded by an RFP process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hot - About 200 HMDL weekday clients receives 2 meals/day (lunch & dinner). Add 175 short-term clients receiving daily hot meals after surgery or other temporary disabling condition About 200 clients receive weekend meals – 2 frozen meals with refrigerated cold pack items (<i>Most of these clients do not receive HMDL weekday</i>). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hot – clients receive one chilled meal. All meals meet 1/3 RDA 	diabetic	thru Fri. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weekend – Delivery on Fri. Caterer delivers meals using their own hotshot vans 	with delivery Included <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specialty ethnic meals - \$3.25/Meal Weekend – \$6.95/Week 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If necessary, a microwave oven was given to clients in the past, however no special donations have been collected for this (e.g., White Sox have in the past)
Mass. - Boston Commission on Affairs for the Elderly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 caterers provide meals for the Title II Nutrition Program. 2 caterers make the meals and one sub-contracts out all of the meals. Largest provider does not provide Kosher 2nd largest caterer subcontracts all meals, including the ethnic meals. Chinese meals aren't frozen. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 475 frozen/week Approximately 558,000 meals annually (53% home delivered and the rest congregate meals). There are 42 congregate meals, which the 3 caterers deliver to in bulk with a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both hot and frozen meals are served (mostly hot) to those that are immobile or frail. Frozen meals are delivered on the weekend and holidays All meals meet 1/3 RDA and have no added salt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traditional Kosher Russian Caribbean Latino Asian 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caterers are responsible for delivering the meals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hot/Frozen Non-Kosher – \$5.50 Hot/Frozen Kosher – \$7.50 Russian - \$6.50 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case management is provided by in-house staff In the past a microwave oven was given to clients; but this is not the case Toaster ovens cannot be used to reheat meals.



City/Program	# of Contractors	# of Meals served	Hot/Frozen/Chilled	Ethnic/Special Meals	Delivery	Avg. Cost per Meal/Type	Client Assessment
Michigan - Detroit Area Agency on Aging	No response received						
Missouri - Mid-East AAA - 4 Metropolitan Areas outside of St. Louis	No response received						
Ohio - Western Reserve AAA (Cleveland)	No response received						
Penn. - Philadelphia Corporation for Aging (PCA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 subcontractors provide meals to their central distribution center (Air Mark GA Foods (non-kosher) and Betty the Caterer (Non-Kosher & Kosher)) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.6 million Annually • 5,300 meals each weekday • Less than 600 daily meals are delivered hot 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frozen and hot • Hot meals are the same meal as the frozen hot meals and are reheated in convection ovens and then delivered to the client. • All meals meet 1/3 RDA and are low sodium 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kosher • Diabetic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frozen – once/week (on rare occasions, depending on storage abilities, may deliver more than once/weekly) • Hot– daily • All meals are delivered to the client from the central distribution site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hot/Frozen Non-Kosher – \$2.50 • Hot/Frozen Kosher – \$3.50 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case management is provided by in-house staff • In the past a microwave oven was given to clients; but this is not the case • Toaster ovens cannot be used to reheat meals.
Texas - Harris County AAA (Houston)	No response received						



I 2006 Benchmarking Survey

Home Delivered Meals Survey:

1) How recently did your program begin to offer the frozen meal option?

- We no longer offer this option
- Within the past 1-4
- More than 5 years
- Always have

2) How often does delivery of frozen meals take place and how many meals are provided?

- Once a week @ meals delivered.
- 2-3 times a week @ meals delivered.
- More than 3 times a week @ meals delivered.

3) Does your program offer weekend delivery?

Please explain if necessary:

4) Are customers ever asked to pay for meals?

- Never
- Sometimes at a suggested \$ Per (choose one) meal week delivery.
- Everyone must pay \$ Per (choose one) meal week delivery.

Other (please explain)

5) (i) Do the customers have a choice of receiving frozen or hot meals?

- Yes, everyone in the program has a choice.
- No, the choice is limited to certain areas of the city or regions of the state.
- No, no one gets a choice and we decide who we provide hot or frozen meals.

Other (please explain)

(ii) If no choice is allowed, how do you determine which customers get which type of meal?

Select all that apply

- Customer capabilities (e.g., ability to read, operate ovens, handle food or see).
- Required medical appointments during the week.
- Ownership of proper equipment (e.g., microwave or oven).
- Duration of time with the program.

Other (please explain).



1) What percent of your customers receive frozen meals?

Please Enter: %

2) Are there any identifying characteristics of those that currently receive the frozen meals?

Select all that apply

Scheduling conflict (e.g., frequent Dr. visits, heavy community involvement, etc.).

Prefer to have more control over when or how they eat their meals.

Tastes better.

Other (please explain).

3) (i) On average over a six month period, how often do you solicit feedback from your customers?

Please Enter:

(ii) If you have customer satisfaction or feedback reports, please provide a copy of your most recent.

4) How much concern was expressed when you introduced the frozen meals?

None, no one really noticed.

Some, a few mentions in the local media.

Heavy, constant mentions in the local and even non-local media.

5) If any, what were the issues/concerns with the introduction of the frozen meal program?

Select all that apply:

Elder care advocacy groups, elected officials, or customers thought negatively of the new program.

Contracted providers and related vendors had concerns with changes in contracts, cost reimbursement, or assuming more risks.

Questions about nutritional quality of the food.

Other (please explain).

PLEASE RETURN TO:

Julia D. Ferguson
KPMG LLP
Economics and Valuation Services
303 E. Wacker Dr. – 13th Flr
Chicago, IL 60601
jdferguson@kpmg.com
Phone: 312.665.1421
Fax: 312.665.6019



J 2006 Survey Results Summary

City/Program	(1) Duration of Frozen Food Program	(2) Frequency of Delivery	(3) Suggested Contribution	(4) Customers Allowed to Choose	(5) Minimum Requirement for Frozen Meal	(6) % Frozen Meals	(7) Customer Description	(8) Feedback Solicitation	(9) Initial Issues	(10) Major Concerns
Alabama - Montgomery Council on Aging Meals on Wheels Program				Frozen meals are only delivered to customers on the waitlist for frozen meals, and meals are delivered by the customers' friends and family.		17%				
Florida - Broward County Meals On Wheels	> 5 years (1984)	Once/week @ 14 meals (7 frozen dinner & 7 cereal breakfasts).	\$1.75/meal	No choice	Hot meals can be requested for mental and physical incapacity or when appliances malfunction.		Customers prefer to have more control over when or how they eat their meals.	Monthly	No major issues were observed.	N/A
Illinois - Chicago Dept. on Aging						90%				
Mass. - Boston Commission on Affairs for the Elderly	> 5 years	2-3 times per week	\$1.75/meal and is usually collected once a month	Everyone has a choice		Frozen meals are only for evening, weekend or holiday meals		Once a year	Clients were appreciative to receive more assistance.	
Penn. - Philadelphia Corporation for Aging (PCA)	> 20 years	3-7 meals per week	Never asked to contribute	No choice is allowed	Customers that have operational appliances and able to manage storing and re-heating meals are given frozen meals.	90%	The type of meal is based on consumer assessment and capabilities determined by the care manager.	Never	Encountered minimal resistance at the start.	