

RESIDENTIAL RATE SETTING TRANSITIONAL WORK GROUP
MAY 17, 2012
MEETING MINUTES

Present: Warren Sparrow, Shannon O'Brien, Sheila Cordock, Pauline Bouffard, Quincy Abbot, Stephen Becker, Cres Secchiaroli, Peter Mason, Rosin, Mark Kovitch, Mary Pat DeCarlo, Katie Banzhaf, Carol Grabbe, Joe Drexler.

1. Review of Meeting Minutes: A question was asked, did the current data collection form capture everything covered in item 3 of the minutes? The answer was yes, and more discussion would occur during the meeting. Stephen Becker questioned what effect the arithmetic mean would have on staff resources, to determine the relationship on the LON. The answer was that the data collection needed a starting point. It was felt means or averages was a reasonable methodology to begin the analysis for staff resources in relation to LON of a mixture of individuals in any one location.

After discussion on the above points, the Minutes were approved unanimously as written.

2. Committee Updates:

a) Implementation Committee: Peter Mason reported; There was not much in this committee at this time that impacts the Residential Rate Setting Committee. Peter was asked for an explanation of the role of the Implementation Committee. Discussed processes, and how all committees might interact with each other. i.e.: The effect Rate Setting will have on Implementation. i.e. The implementation Committee would receive the rates from Rate Committee and it's job would be to design the role of new rates.

Stephen Becker asked if there was any discussion between any committees yet, and if there was a process for that to occur. Another question was raised about the role of unions and their ability to provide input.

It was noted that this idea wasn't excluded but may prove difficult because unionized agencies are not homogeneous therefore their agendas can be quite varied. Also, money allocated to an individual is not based on whether staff are union, likewise, LON rates do not take those factors into consideration.

Individual needs may be able to be addressed during the transition phase but needs, as defined by LON's will need to be homogeneous at the end of the process. i.e. LON's will not address different rates for union or nonunion.

The Implementation Committee will look at transition of all rates. It will communicate to all providers to start planning. It was mentioned that some resistance to the idea and or disbelief that this initiative would eventuate into reality. Peter assured all committee members that this was real and is going to begin, with the transition of 1/7 per year starting on 1/13 to allow time for adjustments in overall funding.

The Implementation Committee will look at transition of all rates. It will communicate to all providers to start planning.

First stage is to gather data, set timelines to begin feeding information to providers by October 1st.

b) Data Committee: Mark Kovitch asked how this committee relates to the Implementation

Committee? And, how does this committee help other committees with data?

Comments and questions arose: How difficult will the system be in terms of billing? Whether the system will move toward Daily or Monthly rates? There was a sense that daily billing was not preferred. Others reported seeing such systems in NY and it was not desirable.

Peter state the basic structure will come from IHS and consist of information like: attendance and dates vs. service data/service date, and that these systems are still under development.

Question: Does data come to the Rate Setting Committee first, or go to the Data Committee then back again? Comments included: It would be helpful to have another set of eyes on the data when we get closer to the final product. A Different perspectives i.e. analytical vs. programmatic could be helpful.

c) Residential Committee: Paulene reported: Started conversation about the pros and cons of the use of technology, and that technology shouldn't replace staff. The group viewed a video on Smart Houses, and have a visit to a Smart House in Bethel. Ability Beyond Disability have a Tech home operating. A survey is going out to gather information from providers re what technology is currently being used across the State.

Question: How do we weave technology into services? Are there Human Rights issues that needs to be considered or presented to HRC?

d) CCH: Nobody from the IC were in attendance for the CCH, but the minutes were reviewed. There was conversation about current programs. A presentation will made at the next meeting regarding "Shared Living" and will be reviewed by the Dept. and recommendations formulated.

e) IHS: Mary-Beth spoke about reviewing definitions. A survey was being developed around the issue of "clustered apartments". Two or more people in a cluster sharing an overnight staff. Each would have a separate lease. Questions arose: How many people in the cluster is too many? Are staff awake or asleep. How are supports paid for when supports are offered to clustered clients? The CRS model used as an example.....

f) Sustainability: Peter Carpenter is retiring but will not be at the next meeting. The committee were looking at issue of a sustainable wage. General conversation.

The Implementation Committee will attempt to get minutes and reports from all committees for review.

3. There was a lengthy and detailed conversation about the survey categories. General conversation centered around the need for precise language to ensure reliability of the data collected. For an accurate report on changes made. Please compare first draft of the survey distributed by Peter for final data collection trial by the IC.

Other topics included transportation. Reimbursement is contingent on the client being in the vehicle for transport, but costs/staff time for transport includes all staff time, regardless of the presence of client. it was agreed that his committee would trial this category, and see how people reported and check and explain disparities before final product. It was suggested that some categories might need written explanations for inputs.

It was agreed taht the trial by this group would be from June 3rd to June 9. Survey forwarded to

Peter by June 15.

4. Research on Statistics. Mary-Beth reported that NY did not have any assessment tools. NY pays residential by the hour, and document movement in and out of the home. It was recommended that VT be researched.

5. Public Comment:

There was some disagreement about an early conversations about unions role in driving costs up. Peter responded and confirmed that there were many factors that drove costs up not related to wages, like management costs.

Comment continued that Unions hard fought victories to get decent wages for people may now be in jeopardy if providers rates are over 8%.

Another general comment was made from the public that they were pleased with who was at the table. They asked for clarification on how many surveys were being developed and going out to providers: Response was: Tech Survey, Cluster Survey and Scheduled House Survey.

Meeting Adjourned 3:25 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Warren Sparrow