

## RESIDENTIAL RATE SETTING TRANSITIONAL WORK GROUP

APRIL 19, 2012

### MEETING MINUTES

Present at Meeting: Mary Pat DeCarlo, Mark Kovitch, Cres Secchiaroli, Peter Mason, Pauline Bouffard, Sheila Cordock, Steve Becker, Stan Soby, Chet, Gail Gordon, Carol Grabbe, Commissioner Joe Drexler

1. **Review of Meeting Minutes-** A suggestion was made by Dr. Becker that concluding action statements be added to minutes. Minutes were approved unanimously as written.
  
2. **Committee updates**
  - a. Implementation Committee- Peter Mason- Peter stated that at this point the committee is waiting for the rates to be determined. Continuing to look at what other States are doing and will be meeting on a monthly basis.
  - b. Residential Issues-Pauline Bouffard- The committee met this past Monday. A survey was developed to gather information on the use of technology in residential settings. An interesting discussion ensued regarding concerns about technology and how it will fit in with human rights issues. This group will be meeting on a monthly basis.
  - c. CCH- Carol Grabbe- Rates are already established by Ct. Statute. Committee is looking into other models being operated in other States that may be similar to the Connecticut CCH programs. Marketing may be one area that the group investigates. Mary Pat suggested that New Hampshire has a large CCH program and that it might be worth investigating what they are doing. This group will be meeting monthly.
  - d. IHS- Mary Pat DeCarlo- Group is scheduled to meet at 1:00 on April 24<sup>th</sup>.
  - e. Data Management-Mark Kovitch-Meeting on at 1:00 on April 25<sup>th</sup>.

3. **Discussion on the Composition of Rates-** Steve Backer brought up the issue of the need for staff during the day in most residential programs and the fact that the survey does not give a cell to record this. Peter stated that CMS looks at direct services hours to consumers in determining rates and that the survey was designed to look at basic hours to start and that those extra hours will be captured at a later date. Mary Pat discussed a similar issue asking where to put the hours for covering a consumer that is working 2<sup>nd</sup> shift. Staffing would be needed to support that person between 10am and 2pm. The general question: Is the survey capturing the total number of hours necessary to adequately meet the needs of the consumers in the residential program. Commissioner Drexler stated that from his perspective, it becomes an issue of hours vs. rates the goal being to recognize a reasonable number of hours to meet the needs of the programs. Dr. Becker questioned the hours that it takes an agency to ensure that a program is meeting State/Agency policies and procedures and/or licensing regulation. Mr. Kovitch stated that he put hours into the chart to capture times that a person is at home and programmatic overhead then needs to be factored into the count.
4. **LON/Direct Support Hour Surveys-** Cres gave the group an overview of how the spread sheet worked. It was noted that there were significant differences between the scheduled hours that the Agencies supplied and those in the *Hours for homogenous grouping* column. It was discussed that the differences could be due to the fact that there have been changes in the LON Scores. Higher LON scores in a smaller house may mean that no URR had occurred. Mr. Rosin stated that there were a few instances where there were minor differences in hours. It appears that this may be reflective of small programs that have no special situations. Commissioner Drexler stated that programs that have significant behavioral issues require higher staffing ratios and will need to be picked up through the URR process. It was concluded that this was a first cut and that it will need to be modified and completed a second time. It was determined that the second spreadsheet would try to capture the following:

- Approved hours of direct staffing
- Approved one times both chronic and temporary
- Non-direct supervisory staffing hours
- Hours that residential staff transport to day programs
- Approved one on one staffing (Names of non-approved added)

Other considerations:

- Vehicle costs need to be analyzed.
- Need to use the higher of the Residential Composite or the Behavioral Residential composite score.
- Cluster homes are going to need to be looked at individually.

5. **Research of Other States**-Peter Mason- Peter stated that he had some communication with New Mexico. As a result of this States move to individual rates there was an initial 5% reduction in residential rates. They are utilizing SIS scale and anticipate an additional 8.5% decrease once this is taken into consideration. New Mexico is making the transition to rates in one year.

6. **Public Comment**- The following public comments were offered:

- Union concerns specifically how benefits play into the rates
- Staffing hours as they relate to regulatory compliance issues.
- Non-direct staffing hours
- LON utilization as it relates to medical vs. behavioral
- Transportation as it relates to consumer choices and geographical issues.

Next meeting- May 17, 2012 1:00 DDS Central Office.

Submitted by

Paul Rosin

