

Developmental Services Legislative Work Group Meeting Minutes
August 27, 2013

Members Present: Cheryl Phaneuf, Susan Yuan, Stirling Peebles, Nicole LeBlanc, James Caffry, Marie Zura, Bill Ashe, Jackie Rogers, Camille George, Commissioner Wehry.

Staff and Visitors: Beth Sightler, Barbara Prine, Theresa Wood, Betty Milizia, Marlys Waller, David Peebles, Karen Tooper, Representative Martha Heath, Rich Donahey, June Bascom

I. Initial Comments on Draft Report of the Developmental Services Legislative Work Group:

- Susan Yuan shared her comments regarding supporting families. The group agreed to a revision to the report.
- Bill Ashe noted that the report did not discuss DS values and principles. The group agreed to a revision to the report.
- A comment was made about identifying cost shifting as a "con." Some cost shifts may not all be a "con." It is a statement of fact. The group agreed to some modifications to how this is presented in the report.

II. Short-Term Solutions for Savings to be Realized in SFY 2014

The Work Group reviewed the ideas from work group members for short-term solutions outlined in the draft report. (Idea numbering in these minutes follow the numbering in the draft report).

Idea 1.1: The group consensus was to not put this recommendation forward, but to recommend that the DS Task Force look at ways better utilize technology as a potential cost saving approach.

Idea 1.2: The group consensus was to not put this recommendation forward. However, discussion ensued about whether instead of capping waivers at \$250,000 (which would be an increase from the current \$200,000 cap) the maximum amount of exceptions should be reduced from \$300,000 to \$250,000. There was no support for this from the group. Commissioner Wehry noted that as a minority opinion the Department will be putting this proposal forward.

Idea 2.1: The group discussed that a whole scale switch to this model was not supported, but that a pilot might be advisable in order to thoughtfully consider the implications, appropriately plan and evaluate such a model. It was emphasized that ultimately it needs to be the person's choice. There are cautions that supportive employment is one of the most nuanced services, and that it could work well in some cases and not in others.

Idea 3.1: There was enthusiasm from work group members for pursuing this option. Work Group representatives from the Council estimated that there are currently about 69 people who could move to a supervised apartment model. However, the shortage of affordable housing and HUD vouchers present obstacles that would need to be addressed. Additionally, it was noted

that the actual savings would likely be less since the people that could move to a supervised apartment model probably are currently receiving less than the average amount of home supports (est. \$22-\$24,000 compared to the average of \$31,160). It was emphasized again that the decision has to be the choice of the individual. One member commented that in Wisconsin the high schools work with people to acquire home living skills and housing prior to graduation and recommends that the DS Task Force take a closer look at this.

Idea 3.2: The group agreed that while related to 3.1 (supervised living) this is a model that could be expanded and there was support for putting this recommendation forward.

Idea 12.2: Modifications to this description will be made based on input received on the draft report. Some members expressed concern that there would be a disproportionate impact on providers. The group expressed a need for greater clarification and information and that to put this recommendation forward at this time was not supported.

III. Long-Term Solutions for Savings to be Realized Over Time

Ideas 14.1 - 14.4: It was suggested to move the recommendations related to services to the short-term. This has been identified to the committee working on the caseload projection methodology.

There was general discussion and a number of members expressed an interest in further exploring family support, self-advocacy, housing and employment.

Given the number of ideas that were put forward, it was agreed that DAIL will send out a survey to work group members to select their top choices for ideas to be recommended to the Joint Fiscal Committee and for the Developmental Disabilities Services Task Force to examine further as it starts the work of envisioning what we want Developmental Disabilities Services to look like into the future. Since the final legislative report will be submitted and presented to the Joint Fiscal Committee on September 11, the turnaround time for receiving responses will be very short. DAIL will send out a firm deadline and clear instructions for work group members to complete the survey.

IV. Public Comment

- This has been a great process, reinforced importance of recognizing the refugee population as a strength.
- Idea 1.1 (Reduce budgets over \$200,000): Clarify whether savings are annualized or not.
- Idea 1.2 (capping new waivers): Same comment as idea 1.1 above.
- Idea 2.1 (pay employers/co-workers to support people on jobs): Concern that this could conflict with values, tread cautiously.
- Idea 3.2 (use technology): May require some initial investment.
- Idea 12.2 (administrative savings): Caution was expressed about splitting overhead across agencies, noting that it has become more complicated with split up of Mental Health and Developmental Services.

-

- Idea 2.1 (pay employers/co-workers to support people on jobs): There needs to be a values assumption by business owners that this is their role, need to support natural supports.
- On the topic of family support: Caution was urged about creating disincentives for people moving out. For people who chose to family- or self-manage services, how can we put in the ability to manage housing supports by putting appropriate safeguards in place?
- Congratulated the work group for their efforts, issues need a lot more examination.
- Regarding idea 1.2 (capping new waivers): This may create the risk that there will be another tier for people with more significant needs. Concern was also expressed about people's safety.
- There are other types of technology that can be examined.
- Encourage exploring methods of providing more peer support.

V. Closing

At this final meeting of the Developmental Disabilities Services Legislative Work Group, Commissioner Wehry thanked all of the Work Group members and members of the public for their hard work and interest.