

**Legislative Advisory Committee for Reimbursements for Services under Programs  
Administered by the Department of Developmental Services**

October 5, 2010  
Legislative Office Building, Room 1A  
2:30 P.M.

Attendees: Pat Bourne, Co-Chair; Peter O'Meara, Commissioner of DDS; Joseph Drexler, DDS; Peter Mason, DDS; Mary McKay, DDS; Krista Pender, DDS; Ann Foley, OPM; Jerry Brennan, Kuhn Employment Opportunities; Terry Macy, SARAH-Tuxis; Janice Chamberlain, Camp Horizons Program; Mickey Herbst, Arc of Connecticut

Summary of Meeting

Handouts: Agenda, Summary of 6/1/10 Meeting, Interim Report

1. Review of 6/1/10 Summary of Meeting – Accepted
2. Supported Employment Individual (SEI) Task Force – Joe Drexler reported the group met throughout the summer. SEI providers were asked to provide background information about what is entailed in providing this service. The initial response by providers was discouraging, however, the responses are now picking up. The data will be collected through October. The group should be in a good position to review the areas that go into SEI and develop a plan. It is clearly evident that the system has de-emphasized job development and there is not a way for providers to make money doing it. Money from other areas has allowed some providers to do job development. The group is looking into the possibility of having job development as a waiver service or as part of another service. The language of the waiver is being clarified to indicate that it is part of the service. The Department is looking at how Washington State handles SEI as they pay based on the number of hours people work. This proves to be an incentive for agencies to find the best jobs possible for individuals. The data collected should help determine how the service should be funded. If the data supports the areas that have been identified, the groups should meet the January 1<sup>st</sup> deadline.
3. IHS (Individualized Home Supports) Task Force – Peter Mason reported that the original workgroup which started meeting in December 2008 grew out of concerns from providers that indirect activities (i.e. phone calls to individuals, handling landlord issues, paperwork, etc.) weren't being reimbursed in accordance to what providers felt was a fair amount. Currently the \$32.20 rate is being reviewed and broken down into a rate of working directly with individuals with direct face to face and also looking at an indirect safety net rate. For the safety net rate, as long as an individual is provided at least one unit of service -15 minutes of service that month - the provider would receive a monthly safety net amount.

In July the original workgroup was reconvened and updated on recent developments. The group raised the concern that since the original survey's completion, the Quality Service Review (QSR) process has been established and questioned if this would tip the scale on the extensive survey previously done. QSR staff attended the next meeting and from that discussion it was determined that this would not be an issue and that the survey is still on target. A draft rate methodology was developed and the next step will be to determine what the effect is on agencies and on the system as a whole. The group will meet again on November 5 to continue working on the rate for a typical individual in supported living. The next step will be for individuals in cluster supports, followed by add-ons for behavioral issues and healthcare coordination. When this is completed the rate should be able to handle most people in the system. The expected completion date is the middle of December.

Note: The Quality Service Review is a series of standards that are reviewed to determine an individual's quality of supports. The results of the QSR then goes into a larger system to determine how the agency is doing and will eventually be used for provider certification.

Mickey Herbst asked if the self-direction rates used by families are being included in this rate system review as the salaries families pay were determined year's ago. Payment ranges families are allowed to use are not a part of this rate system review. There is a connection with associating LON levels with the amount of funds available, and as part of that process there would be some comparisons. LONs and funding amounts would have applicability over time. There are ranges for families to use as a guide which indicate how much can be paid for specific services. Families can balance what makes the most sense for their situation.

4. Attendance – Joe Drexler stated that the summer dip in attendance was small – July 87.1% and August 88.1% which were both just under average. No significant patterns or trends have been established. Agencies are continuing to work on the attendance issue so we should see some improvement in the system.
5. Hardship Review – At this time, the only automatic hardship in place is for SEI cap. Given the rise in attendance and appropriations that the Department receives, we will have to be careful as the year goes on to make everything balance. It doesn't appear that there is a need for a second hardship and it is uncertain if the Department will have the funding for it.

Peter Mason indicated that 25 agencies submitted a hardship application. 24 agencies received hardship awards. The 1 agency that did not receive any hardship dollars was because they actually made more contractually. Awards ranged from hundreds to tens of thousands of dollars. The formula used was based on a number of bands which included: applying and qualifying; where the provider's attendance was compared to the norm; if the agency had rates above 90%; historically high rates based on the analysis done last spring; if the agency had a plan of action to address the issues; and the size of the agency

6. Interim Report – Co-Chair Pat Bourne thanked the Sub-committee Co-chairs for their commitment and responsiveness during the summer to keep on track in addressing these issues. The Interim Report is a summarization of the four Sub-Committee's work. The final report will be more comprehensive and detailed.

The preliminary findings of each of the Sub-committees are:

- Medicaid Waiver – Medicaid Waiver regulations established in attendance fee for service and uniformed rates is the accepted standard rate for reimbursement.
- LON – The LON screening tool is a valid tool to measure an individual's level of need. It is questionable if it accurately reflects certain diagnosis, i.e. Autism, mental health, etc.
- Information Technology System – DDS nor the provider system does not have an established IT system to manage the system requirements.
- Attendance – While looking at a limited history and data on the impact of the system, the overall attendance percentage has increased each month. The overall attendance percentage is 88-89%. Analysis to date indicates that there is no significant distinction between day providers only or the program service type.
- National Survey – Only received responses from 5 states to our survey request. The analysis will be in the final report.

The Interim Report will be send to the full Advisory Committee. In June a letter was sent to the full Advisory Committee detailing the status of the Advisory Committee up until that point.

Next Meeting:

As the regularly scheduled meeting of the Advisory Committee would be Election Day (11/2), Co-Chair Bourne will see if an alternative date will need to be chosen.

Respectfully submitted,

*Maureen Prewitt*

Maureen Prewitt  
Advisory Committee Administrative Staff  
Department of Developmental Services