

Teja Stokes opened the meeting by sharing that Commissioner Reinhard sends his regrets for not attending today's meeting due to unavoidable obligations in Richmond.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

10:00 AM

Brian Whitesell, Pat Bennett, Mark Diorio, Jennifer Fidura, Alice Johnson, Bob Shrewsberry, David Coe, Bill Butler, Jason Rachel, Lee Price, Sherwin Davis, Chuck Hall, Tim Capoldo, Jamie Trosclair, Jonathan Martinez

**RECOGNITION OF JENNIFER VAN DAVIER
2009 Irwin Siegel Agency Direct
Support Professional Award Recipient**

10:10 AM

Teja Stokes remarked that this week in September is national Direct Support Professionals Week. In honor of that, the Department is pleased to announce that SEVTC employee, Jennifer Van Davier, was recently recognized as the 2009 Irwin Siegel Director Support Professional Award Winner. This is the first time a Virginian has received this award.

**UPDATE ON PPEA PROCESS and
SELECTION CRITERIA AND PROCESS
FOR NEW SEVTC FACILITY**

10:25 AM

Joe Cronin, DBHDS
Sherwin Davis, SEVTC

Joe Cronin reviewed the background language approved by the General Assembly in early 2009. He described the PPEA process and updated that two proposers were accepted by the Department of General Services to move forward in the review process. A review committee was established by DGS to evaluate the proposals

Jonathan Martinez asked who has the final say in awarding the contract. Mr. Cronin replied that final recommendations will be made by DGS and confirmed by the appropriate cabinet secretaries and governor's office.

Jonathan Martinez asked about the role of the selection committee and families wanting their family member to reside at SEVTC. He specifically asked if family members are being consulted in the decision making process. Sherwin Davis responded that input from families has not sought specific input from the families on determining the selection criteria. Mr. Martinez followed with asking if levels of degradation will be involved in making determinations and Mr. Davis responded that the committee have allowed for more subjectivity in determining the criteria.

Alice Johnson asked Mr. Martinez if he had suggestions on the criteria and Mr. Martinez responded that he just wanted to make sure families had a chance to voice preference.

Jennifer Fidura asked if the rest of the PPEA process could be written down for consideration by the committee. Mr. Cronin shared that he and his staff have begun working on this. He can share a checklist that goes through the PPEA process from beginning to end. He will be taking this checklist and putting into flowchart format so it is easier to visualize the steps in the process. Mr. Cronin suggested that this should be ready for presentation to the committee at its next meeting in October. The checklist and flowchart will receive a review by one of the attorneys involved in developing the PPEA process. Ms. Fidura followed with the comment that each meeting questions come up that refer to the next step in the process and this type of information would be helpful.

Jamie Trosclair expressed significant concerns about how much the process is being individualized to meet specific needs for people. There are concerns about "rushing through" a determination of those individuals who will reside at the new SEVTC without assuring that their needs could not be met in the community.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

11:00 AM

Dr. Shrewsbury expressed that it needs to be made clear that construction on the community homes really needs to start first. The schedule presented showed SEVTC construction beginning about a month before the community homes and this will not afford families an opportunity to see what will be available for individuals to transition. Joe Cronin responded that he doesn't disagree. He shared that there are still questions about property acquisition taking place and that DGS has built a month or two into the schedule for this factor.

Ms. Fidura commented that she hopes that there is a serious look at acquisition and renovation for waiver homes. There doesn't seem to be a lot of value in constructing new when there is property available today that allows the process to be faster and more costs efficient. Mr. Cronin shared that this is definitely a consideration for DGS and they are very aware of the inventory available.

Ms. Trosclair stated that The Arc is in agreement that integrated community housing should take place first. She asked if there is a possibility of the SEVTC construction being deferred until the community home projects are completed. Ms. Johnson stated she thought that question was answered several months ago and that the project would not be deferred. Mr. Cronin responded that there are two tracks for the projects with schedules and budgets for both and they are both moving forward. Ms. Trosclair shared that it will be difficult to prioritize the community housing project if the state is moving forward full steam ahead with both projects. Chuck Hall commented that HNNCSB has offered its 6-bed ICF as the first phase of this project. It is a complete home and an SEVTC family member has already taken a tour of the home. This home is open and ready for business and families are welcome to contact the CSB to schedule tours. The DGS selection committee has expressed interest in taking a tour of this home.

Mr. Martinez indicated he has heard four people say that it is important for services to meet the individual needs. He continues to think of the selection criteria and he is concerned that the overarching goal is to get people into the 75 bed facility and not being to find a way to meet individuals' needs. He wants to know if the committee will be speaking to parents or just ranking people blindly; will parents be specifically addressed. Mr. Davis said the goal is to come up with the group of individuals that meet the criteria and then beyond that families and individuals will have a great deal of decision making. Mr. Martinez asked how the committee got to the list of 65 without

speaking to families. Mr. Davis clarified that this was an initial evaluation and that there are no doubts that some people determined to be on the list of 75 will choose to move to the community.

Mark Diorio asked about plans developed about facility construction and renovation developed by TACIDD approximately two years ago. Mr. Cronin assured that this information was shared with DGS. Dr. Diorio added that while the square footage per person is a valid consideration but it doesn't usually take into consideration storage for wheelchairs, etc.

Dr. Diorio asked about the home Mr. Hall referenced earlier and whether or not individuals from the community would also be living in those homes. Mr. Hall responded by giving some details on the moving parts of the project related to the amount of capital available. The charge from the GA does not allow the project to "over build" which does not allow for the creation of excess capacity, even though we all know that the need is present. Therefore, excess capacity will not be available in this process unless individuals transitioning from SEVTC elect to move to settings that are not part of the construction, acquisition, or renovation process. There will eventually be access for individuals who are waiting in the community if excess capacity occurs because SEVTC residents do not take up those beds. CSBs and SEVTC administration agree that the SEVTC residents will be prioritized for the capacity being developed, but others may have access if all the capacity is not needed or used by the SEVTC residents.

Gene Sivertson added that the intent of the GA and families is that equal or better care would be provided in the community and that is not being seen at this point. Mr. Sivertson will submit questions and concerns to DBHDS through Ms. Stokes.

Mr. Martinez asked if the goal is to always have 75 beds and therefore allow people to return to or move to SEVTC. He asked if this is the intent to have 75 people fill 75 beds or if the intent is to have a smaller number with other services available in the remaining beds. Mr. Sivertson added other information about proposals submitted to the Governor saying the 15 beds would be used for emergency/crisis capacity and RCSC supports, but he doesn't know if that has been accepted by the Governor. Lee Price added that the Advisory Committee had endorsed the use of the SEVTC for emergencies. Mr. Sivertson argued that this is not the intent of the GA. Mrs. Lynn Gilbert echoed this concern and thinks that the 75 beds should be used as intended by the General Assembly. Teja Stokes commented that DBHDS and DGS are carrying out the intent of the GA by constructing the new facility and the community homes. She added that the Commonwealth has an opportunity to use the new facility to meet the needs of the region in addition to those residents of SEVTC needing a higher level of care and that the DBHDS would be remiss if it did not take advantage of this opportunity.

Ms. Trosclair asked for clarification about who will use the beds at SEVTC if the originally evaluated 65 don't opt to live at SEVTC and who will be considered for the remaining beds. There was a great deal of discussion by various members of the committee about how the beds will be used and how they were intended. Mr. Hall commented that there doesn't seem to be a realization of how dynamic these issues are and currently how responsive the facility is to the community and the community is for the facility.

Ms. Bennet stated she feels it is a waste of time to get bogged down with the numbers. We all know what was intended by the GA and that the projects are moving forward. Ms. Bennett shared with the committee information she learned in a presentation by Thomson Reuters to the Olmstead Advisory Commission that Virginia is in considerably

good shape in comparison with other states in the direction it is taking for services to individuals with disabilities (following the meeting Ms. Fidura shared the referenced information as it pertained to Virginia's implementation of a PACE program for individuals who are aging and not an improvement in direction for DD services).

Ms. Fidura reiterated the fluidity of the process and that it is not determined on a date certain. The process needs to play itself out and to the comfort of the families and in the best interest of the individuals. Dr. Shrewsberry further commented that the process that is in place now will continued to be utilized in the admission and discharge committee process shared by the facility and the CSBs of the region. It is a process that works now and will continue to work in the future to determine the best residential placement for individuals in the region.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

11:30 AM

Ann Sivertson asked where the HNNCSB ICF is located. Mr. Hall provided the address of the home in Hampton. Mrs. Sivertson asked about the possibility of homes/duplexes being built on the property for the Hampton School for the Deaf and Blind – is the plan to build the duplexes on that property? Mr. Hall explained that there is acreage at the location that is beautiful and not near the existing structures available for consideration. Mrs. Sivertson asked about the fencing on the property and Mr. Hall was unable to provide an answer. Mrs. Sivertson shared a report from Nebraska about deaths that have occurred following transitions of individuals from a facility to the community. She cautions Virginia about how it moves forward with these efforts. Mrs. Sivertson asked about the two different designs proposed by the two developers and about the criteria to get the designs similar. Mr. Cronin responded that the document issued to the two proposers with the criteria to be met is posted on the DGS website. Plans and designs will be finalized after the developer is selected. Mrs. Sivertson asked if consideration to existing services on the campus will be considered in the design and location of the new SEVTC homes. Mr. Cronin responded that this will be an important consideration. The staff at SEVTC will be an integral part in reviewing and having input on the design of the new facility. Mrs. Sivertson asked if there is a design plan that can be seen and Mr. Cronin responded that it is not currently available.

Lynn Gilbert commented that the 75 beds are intended for the SEVTC resident and Senator Miller also believes that is the intent. She disagrees if there will only be 65 beds. She understands that 15 beds will be used for respite and emergencies and while these are good services, it is not the intent of the GA's approval of 75 beds. She asked if the Oversight Committee has been determined and Ms. Stokes explained the make up of the committee. Ms. Gilbert requested she be included on the committee. She reminded the committee that VA is 48 of 50 in the money spent on individuals with intellectual disabilities.

Mr. Tom Swanston explained that he is communicating with representatives from the Department of Justice and has questions for the committee:

- 1. What is planned for the 56 individuals who are working with his agency in maintaining their jobs?*
- 2. Will moving to the home described in Hampton mean individuals who have jobs will not be able to maintain those jobs?*
- 3. What is the choice of individuals to keep their job?*

Mr. Swanston reported that the DOJ does not want to see day services happening in the same place where individuals live. Ms. Stokes committed to including the answers to Mr. Swanston's questions in the meeting notes, as time for the meeting is limited.

FOLLOW-UP ANSWERS: Every person who leaves SEVTC will do so with a PCP plan which is developed with the individual at the center of the plan and with persons who know the individual, his her desires and needs, and with the new support providers. Anyone who will be moving into a home from which distance to SEVTC will become a factor in continuing employment in that current venue, will be provided options for similar activities in their new location. Center based work opportunities exist in multiple locations. The new home for every individual leaving SEVTC should have with it the opportunities for the individual to access all of the lifestyle activities they are accustomed to and wish to continue.

Kelly Tucker thanked the committee for the presentation on the capital project given by Mr. Cronin. She reiterated the importance of input from the individuals in making choices. Ms. Tucker asked if the committee has suggestions for how the job supports company can best support individuals possibly by participating in discharge planning.

Mr. Sivertson asked about the planning that was done previously on facility design – why is this information not being used for this process? What qualifies these developers to determine design without input from those who best know the needs? Can families be involved in the design process? Ms. Stokes committed to including the answers to Mr. Sivertson's questions in the meeting notes, as time for the meeting is limited.

FOLLOW-UP ANSWERS: The planning that was done approximately two years ago has been shared with DGS and is being considered as a part of the review and discussions with the PPEA proposers. As stated in previous meetings, the current stage of the PPEA process has the proposers putting forth their best thinking on the design of the projects. After the developer is selected, input from those who best know the needs will be instrumental in assisting the developer, DGS, and DBHDS in determining a final construction plan. It is the intent of DBHDS to involve families in the design process.

Prior to adjourning, Ms. Stokes announced that the next meeting will be held on October 27th.