

Colleen Wieck

From: Rebecca Rooker [rebeccar62@earthlink.net]

Sent: Monday, August 19, 2002 6:42 PM

To: Alex Bartolic; Anne Henry; Barb Eitel; Barb Eitel; Beth Fondell; Beth Thompson; Betty; Cindy Johnson; Colleen Wieck; Cynthia Neubecker; Dan Cater; Ed Sootsman; Gene Martinez; Jacki McCormack; Jerry Mellum; Judy Lysne; Karen Courtney-Conrath; Kathy; Mary Moorehouse; Milt Conrath; Robin.Rohr; S.Kasprzak; Trish Reedstrom; Vicki J. Gerrits; Dawn Thorn; Dave Podvin; Celeste denDaas; Becky Fleugel; Merrill Zieman; Peg Booth

Subject: Statewide Steering Committee information

Hi everyone! Sorry to be so slow getting this out, poor planning on my part has created an emergency on your part! :-). Please respond to me as quickly as possible with corrections and additions to the list so I can get a letter out ASAP. Unfortunately, for those of you who don't know, we move a week from today and that is a little time consuming if you can imagine that! This is the information as I understood it, the letter will contain the information in a different format possibly, or I may just rewrite it with your comments and attach it. If you have a preference let me know in your response, just know that I will do as needs to be done in order to get it out!

A copy of what ever goes out and the copy of the minutes and notes will be mailed to you, or e mailed, separately, probably not until early September though.

As we discussed the Waiver Amendment, the following issues were raised:

1. Much more flexible than was first written.
2. Inclusion of payment of parents of minors is good.
3. Seemed to listen and include much of the information from feedback sessions that the state heard.
4. Concern over the methodology of determining budgets:
 - a. the amount
 - b. Home modifications and adaptive devices is not spelled out and therefore leaves too much room for interpretation for whom to make and determine? This process has not worked well in the past because the individual counties have their own biases and ideas of what should or should not be covered and creates an unfair situation based solely on where one lives dictates what goods will be covered or not. This is not consistent with the state's plans for statewide implementation in a consistent manner.
 - c. the timelines for those who already have budgets and could be looking at a reduction in that amount. Why not grandfather them in?
 - d. All waived services will be included so to speak in the budget, incl. DT&H, formal services, etc.
 - e. Individual budgets refer only to those clients using CDCS, rather than all participants on the waiver. This controls the costs of those budgets unfairly in comparison to those clients using formal services through the regular waiver services.
 - f. It is good that the averaging process does not take into consideration the newest waivers that were not necessarily set up in manner that is consistent with other budgets.
 - g. It is not clear what process will be followed when determining budgets, like who will set up the system of determination. The state is not used to doing that, the counties are. Are they going to have input in how that is done so that there is a degree of similarity to what is currently being done?
 - h. Has it been determined that formal service providers can provide services on the budgeted amount? If not then people using CDCS are actually being consequented for participating in a program that is meant to offer more choices at the SAME, not decreased budgeted amount. It is supposed to be an equal service/exchange.
 - i. Has the difference between rural and urban services been considered when determining budgets and how will that be defined. Some "rural" areas, such as Rochester, are almost as competitive with

08/20/2002

urban prices.

5. Wording of payment of parents is too vague, sounds like it would be allowed only as a last resort, or only in a crisis situation. Some counties would interpret it to mean that a family would need to be in crisis in order to utilize.
6. CDCS has turned into services for those clients with family active in their lives, particularly children still living at home and this new amendment promotes that and eliminates the accessibility of these services to those who do NOT have that extent of support due to the requirements placed on them.
7. Requiring the client or the support person (IE. family) to be employers, rather than using employers of record, makes clients and family members take unnecessary steps. Tax ID numbers, insurance (liability, injury, unemployment, business related insurance [against claims of discrimination, harassment, etc]). For some families this may be what they choose to do, but for others it would prevent them unnecessarily from using the program. Right now it is a choice people can make and removing it as a choice takes away from the "self-determination" principle.
8. Special diets are not addressed as either being covered or not.
9. Most importantly of all, is the fact that there have not been a manner in which the department is seeking feedback on the language of the amendment. Something that they committed to doing earlier in the year and particularly on this amendment. Meetings and invitations for feedback have not taken place and no mention of continued stakeholder input has been sought or established.

This a **summary** of the concepts we discussed. Please feel free to add any information or details or whatever you think will clarify. What I write will look different, I assure you! Please give me anything that I have forgotten, I have not deliberately left anything out and I need your input! Sooner is better than later and thanks in advance for your help!

--- Rebecca Rooker

--- rebeccar62@earthlink.net

--- EarthLink: The #1 provider of the Real Internet.