# *FAIRFAX-FALLS CHURCH COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD*

**Lt. Colonel Mark Sites, Chair**

**Fairfax County Government Center**
**12000 Government Center Parkway, Conference Rooms 2 & 3**
**Fairfax, Virginia 22035**

Wednesday, March 27, 2013
*Work Session 6:00 p.m.*
*Board Meeting 7:30 p.m.*

| **CSB Board Work Session** | 6:00 p.m. |
|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1.** | ***Meeting Called to Order*** | Mark Sites | 7:30 p.m. |
| **2.** | ***Matters of the Public*** | | |
| **3.** | ***Amendments to the Meeting Agenda*** | Mark Sites | |
| **4.** | ***Approval of Board Minutes: February 27, 2013 CSB Meeting and February 20 & 27, 2013 Work Sessions*** | Mark Sites | |
| **5.** | ***Matters of the Board***<br>A. FY2014 Budget | Mark Sites | |
| **6.** | ***Presentation: A Review of Day and Employment Funding and Services Strategies*** | Richard Luecking &<br>Ann Deschamps<br>TransCen, Inc. | |
| **7.** | ***Committee Reports***<br>A. Fiscal Oversight Committee<br>B. Other Committees or Workgroups | | |
| **8.** | ***Executive Directors Report*** | Alan Wooten | |
| **9.** | ***Adjournment*** | | |

Fairfax County is committed to a policy of nondiscrimination in all county programs, services and activities and will provide reasonable accommodations upon request. Call 703-324-7000 or TTY 711 to request special accommodations. Please allow seven working days in advance of the event in order to make the necessary arrangements. These services are available at no charge to the individual.

# Fairfax-Falls Church Community Services Board
February 27, 2013

The Board met in regular session at the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Conference Rooms 2 and 3, in Fairfax, VA.

The following CSB members were present: Mark Sites, Chair; Pam Barrett, Susan Beeman, Jessica Burmester, Ken Garnes Mark Gross, Glenn Kamber, Suzette Kern, Juan Pablo Segura, Lori Stillman and Jane Woods

The following CSB members were absent: Mary Ann Beall

The following CSB staff was present: George Braunstein, Gary Axelson, Bill Belcher, Belinda Buescher, Ginny Cooper, Jean Hartman, Evan Jones, Dave Mangano, Lisa Potter, Jim Stratoudakis, Alan Wooten, Will Williams and Laura Yager

1. Meeting Called to Order

   Mark Sites called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

2. Recognitions

   Deep appreciation was extended to Tom Cook for his 29 years of service with the CSB and contributions to the community. Special recognition was noted for his initiative in organizing and coordinating for 13 years the Tim Harmon 5K race in support of Hepatitis treatment and prevention.

3. Matters of the Public

   Kristen Brennan, Executive Director, Fairfax Partnership for Youth and mother of a special needs child shared concerns with CSB services for youth and prevention and referenced a communication previously sent to the CSB Board members.

4. Amendments to the Meeting Agenda

   Following a request by George Braunstein to add a state bond funding agenda item, it was recommended to include the item as part of the Executive Directors Report. A motion was offered to amend and accept the agenda as recommended which was seconded and passed.

   Separately, it was noted a recommendation has been presented to move the Report of the Executive Director to earlier in the meeting agenda on an ongoing basis. It was indicated this will be addressed by the Executive Committee at the next meeting.

5. Matters of the Board

   - Mark Gross reported following the completion of the Transformation Plan in June, he will bring forth a proposal to eliminate the Internal and External Committees and maintain the Substance Use Disorders/Mental Health (SUDs/MH) and Intellectual Developmental Disabilities (IDD) Workgroups as well as the Fiscal Oversight Committee.

- Susan Beeman noted planning of a Wellness and Recovery conference is underway and further details will be provided.
- Jessica Burmester reported she along with Lori Stillman attended the February 26th Intellectual Developmental Disabilities Inclusion Month Proclamation by the Board of Supervisors which was well received with five Supervisors attending the reception.
- Lt. Colonel Sites provided a reminder of the CSB Board schedule in the upcoming week that includes 1) March 5th testimony before the Human Services Council on the FY2014 proposed budget, 2) March 6th CSB Work Session on the Transformation Plan, 3) March 6th tour of the Annandale Consumer Wellness Center, and 4) March 7th public hearing on the Transformation Plan. A show of hands was requested of Board members planning to attend the March 7th hearing resulting in about four participants.
- Lt. Colonel Sites introduced Gary Ambrose who is in the process of being appointed as an At-Large CSB Board member.
- Jane Woods requested an updated report be provided on the Opportunity Neighborhoods project.

6. Approval of the Minutes

Following a motion by Glenn Kamber to amend the January 23 meeting minutes of the Fairfax-Falls Church Community Services Board which was seconded and accepted, a motion was offered by Mark Gross for approval of the January 23, 2013 Board Work Session minutes as well as the January 23, 2013, minutes of the Fairfax-Falls Church Community Services Board meeting. The motion for approval was seconded and carried.

7. Committee Reports

A. *Fiscal Oversight Committee*:

Mr. Kamber reported the Fiscal Oversight Committee has been instrumental in carrying out the Board's fiscal responsibilities, and noted the preparation of the second quarter report to the Board of Supervisors (BOS), which was submitted in a timely fashion was accomplished in large part due to Suzette Kern.

8. Action Items:

A. *FY2014 Proposed Budget:*

Proposed Letter to Board of Supervisors:

- Referencing a draft letter to the BOS circulated earlier in the week, Mr. Kamber indicated a meeting was subsequently held with Fairfax County Public Schools representatives, Assistant Superintendent of Special Services Kim Dockery and Director of Intervention Services Mary Ann Panarelli, Pat Hynes, Vice Chair of the School Board, and Tim Thomas, Principal of Westfield High School to discuss the proposals in the letter.
- The proposals set forth include: 1) hiring of 28 professional counselors to be placed in high schools, 2) contracting with cultural and linguistic organizations to provide behavioral counseling, and 3) restoration of prevention programs. It was indicated the rough cost estimate associated with these proposals totals $3.2 million.

- Mr. Kamber reported support of the effort and a need for early intervention and treatment services in the schools was indicated by Ms. Dockery, however it was noted there was no specific commitment of school funding which would require endorsement of the School Board. In response to a timeframe for seeking School Board endorsement, it was indicated it would take at least one month.
- It was suggested in the current budget environment, obtaining substantive school funding would be unlikely.
- Noting this funding request is above the FY14 proposed budget, concern was expressed that although recognizing there may be needs, the information may not be well received by the BOS in light of other essential county services receiving larger reductions in the budget cycle.
- Some additional items discussed were 1) to exclude the detailed attachment from the letter, 2) remove any reference to Sandy Hook, 3) remove references to counselors being provided by CSB, 4) a suggestion to refine the message as a proposal for consideration in addressing some of the community needs, without requesting funding, and 5) emphasizing a collaborative effort with the School Board.
- Noting the June timeframe for presenting the Transformation Report, a recommendation was also made to send a preliminary letter to the BOS advising of ongoing development of a collaborative effort with the schools and submit a final proposal in June to coincide with the FY13 carryover. Additionally, it was noted the CSB management staff overseeing youth as well as prevention have not yet provided their service presentations along with recommendations.
- Following further discussion on the timing of sending the proposed letter, Mark Gross offered a motion to send a letter on prevention to the BOS now that was seconded, and after discussion, the motion carried.
- Mr. Kamber offered a motion that the letter to be redrafted and circulated to CSB Board members for review and approval to include the following revisions: 1) not reference Sandy Hook, but instead refer to violence in the country, 2) discuss the three proposals currently in the letter, 3) include an attachment, 4) reference mental health counselors and not CSB counselors, 5) make an effort to not appear to be asking for more staff and money for the CSB, and 6) CSB is working with the School Board. This motion was seconded and further discussion requested there be a statement that the proposal is under discussion with the schools and include a reference to tragedies such as youth suicides. Following a vote, the motion passed.
- It was indicated there should be no reference to the proposed letter in the CSB presentation to the Human Services Council on March 5th.

<u>Human Services Council Presentation</u>

In requesting clarification on the items to include in the budget advocacy message to be presented to the Human Services Council on March 5th, the following was provided:

- $1.1 million to lower the staffing vacancy levels to 7-8%.
- Jessica Burmester offered a motion to retain the two Prevention positions and the senior management position currently titled Director of Community Living, but the positions would be unfunded. The motion was seconded and passed.

Lt. Colonel Sites noted the initial draft message to the Human Services Council will be distributed to the Board members for review.

B. *FY2013 Third Quarter Budget Review:*

Bill Belcher presented the February 7, 2013 third quarter submission to the Department of Management and Budget (DMB). During discussion, concern was expressed that a third alternative for Infant and Toddler Connection (ITC) funding was included that stated any shortfall would be covered with savings from other CSB programs. Instead, it was recommended the submission be amended with only the first two options included: 1) ITC funding be provided by state funds, and if not forthcoming, 2) the County ITC reserve funds would be tapped. With this in mind, Jane Woods offered a motion to approve the third quarter submission as amended by striking any reference to funding of ITC with savings from other CSB programs and submitting the revised version to DMB. It was also clarified this motion will serve as approval of any formal request to the Board of Supervisors that may be required to draw on the ITC reserve funds, should they be needed. The motion was seconded and carried.

In response to the timing of the submission and Board approval after the fact, it was indicated due to the DMB deadline, this manner of providing the third quarter review has been the practice for years. Questioning whether formal CSB Board approval was a mandate, Mr. Braunstein indicated he would look into the requirements for approval, and provide them to the Board. Should formal approval be required, moving forward the Board has requested review and approval take place prior to submission and this action item be part of the January CSB meeting.

8. <u>Executive Directors Report</u>

- *State Bond Funding:*
  Mr. Braunstein provided background on the previously approved use of state bond funds to build two homes for DOJ transitional residents. Following approval, the County attorney raised flags on the clause that holds the County liable for replacing land that may become unusable due to a disaster or other event. CSB is already committed to rebuilding a home for individuals we serve, however, replacing land is an exceptional liability. The State and County attorneys have finally reached an agreement to use the bond funds for the two group homes, but the CSB Board is being made aware of the liability and asked for either reapproval of the use of the state bond funds or reversal of the previous approval provided.

  Following a request for written background on this proposal, it was agreed the information would be forwarded and a vote could be scheduled at the March 6, 2013 CSB Board work session scheduled.

- *Staff Recognitions:*
  - Mr. Braunstein reported as part of homeless outreach several CSB staff have participated in a point in time survey traveling at night and the early hours of the morning to understand the needs. The CSB staff giving of their time toward this effort includes Augustine Aderiye, Jeannie Cummins Eisenhour, Vanessa Heim, Sue Leo, Nella Leppo, Davene Nelson, Patricia Pennant, Mike Suppa, Lyn Tomlinson, and Major Mike Kline with the Police Department.
  - During the Department of Justice Reviewer visit to a local family on a Friday afternoon, a call was received by CSB staff Shelia Peters-Lee and Lara Lafin late in

the day indicating there was a problem. The staff was immediately responsive, familiar with the service plan for this family, and able to address and allay the concerns. By 10:00 pm the situation had been resolved with state representatives fully informed and pleased with the outcome.

- *Legislative Update:*
  Mr. Braunstein recapped the summary previously distributed to the CSB Board members of the State budget outcomes of the General Assembly. Some of the highlights included 1) ITC funding received an additional $2.5 million for this year and $6 million for next year, 2) funding for adult IDD crisis and children IDD crisis services, but funding is limited, 3) $1.9 million for children mental health crisis in which our area is targeted to receive and plans already developed for mobile crisis and psychiatry-on-call for youth, 4) discharge assistance to receive $.5 million statewide, 5) exceptional rates for waivers $3.6 million for only residential, 6) a continued shortfall for day employment, 7) $700,000 for 13 permanent beds at the Northern Virginia Mental Health Institute, and 8) $0.9 million statewide for therapeutic drop off centers.

- *Training Centers-DOJ Agreement Update:*
  Separate from the budget process, efforts are ongoing to ensure the County is aware of the vital need for additional Service Coordinators along with the more intensive community services that will be required. It was indicated a portion of the costs will be born by Medicaid, but not all.

Actions Taken –

- Approval of the January 23, 2013 CSB Board Work Session minutes and January 23, 2013 meeting minutes as amended.
- Approval to send a letter to the BOS on prevention, a redraft of which will require circulation, review and approval by Board members.
- Approval of the Third Quarter Review submission to DMB as revised and resubmitted.

There being no further business to come before the Board, a motion to adjourn was offered, seconded and carried. The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 p.m.

_____ _____

Date Staff to Board

DRAFT

# Fairfax-Falls Church Community Services Board
## Work Session
February 27, 2013

The Board met at the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Conference Rooms 2 and 3 in Fairfax, VA.

The following CSB members were present: Mark Sites, Chair; Pam Barrett, Jessica Burmester, Mark Gross, Glenn Kamber, Suzette Kern, Ken Garnes, Juan Pablo Segura, Lori Stillman and Jane Woods

The following CSB members were absent: Pamela Barrett, Susan Beeman, Mary Ann Beall

The following CSB staff was present: George Braunstein, Gary Axelson, Belinda Buescher, Bill Belcher, Ginny Cooper, Jean Hartman, Evan Jones, Dave Mangano, Lisa Potter, Jim Stratoudakis, Will Williams, Alan Wooten and Laura Yager

Meeting Called to Order

Mark Sites called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

*FY2014 Advertised Budget:*

Lt. Colonel Sites noting on Tuesday, March 5th he will be presenting on behalf of the CSB to the Human Services Council, requested George Braunstein to provide an overview of the proposed FY2014 CSB budget recently released. Mr. Braunstein shared the following:

- The budget projections were in preparation for both FY2014 as well as FY2015. In his presentation, the County Executive recognized how stretched staff is under the current budget constraints. As a result, all the reductions submitted were not accepted and instead a request was included for a .02¢ property tax increase.
- Out of the $3 million in reductions submitted by the CSB, $1.8 million is currently included in the advertised budget.
- In addition, specific funding has been designated within the CSB budget: $1.1 million for Day Treatment/Employment Services and $1.2 million for Infant and Toddler Connection (ITC).
- Funding has been allocated to balance salaries and fringe benefits, however, staff will continue to closely monitor to ensure the amount is sufficient.
- Among the reductions currently applied to the budget are:
    - Two Central Services Unit senior management positions at present occupied by Alan Wooten and Ken Disselkoen who will be retiring this year.
    - A position reduced to half-time at Stevenson Place that will result in no displacement.
    - A senior clinician and three admin support positions currently vacant.
    - Mental health division director and substance abuse counselor, both vacant.
    - Two positions in Wellness and Health Promotion, both vacant.
    - Reclassification of a mental health therapist to a counselor.
    - Therapeutic division director position which has already been eliminated, plus a mental health counselor.

    - Reclassification of two positions, a behavior health nurse and mental health therapist.
    - Senior management position, currently the REACH Director.
- The remaining reductions submitted but not accepted were highlighted as the Board of Supervisors during deliberations in determining a tax increase may be reconsidering all proposed reductions.
- Clarification was provided that the position reductions are not part of the vacancy level being maintained.
- In addition it was indicated the $5 million received at carryover as well as funding for ITC and Day Treatment/Employment services are built into the FY2014 baseline budget.

*Discussion:*

- It was indicated the vacancy factor continues to impact access to services as well as demands on current staff, and with this in mind, a recommendation was presented to request $1.1 million in funding to reduce the vacancy factor to 7-8%.
- With the transition of individuals into the community resulting from the Department of Justice (DOJ) settlement for the Training Centers, it was indicated the Director of Community Living senior management position will be a vital systemwide component.
- Also, it was recommended to request restoration of the two Wellness and Health positions in light of the major reductions already implemented in that area.
- In discussing the reduction of administrative support positions impacting revenue collections, additional information was requested on the role and efficiencies of the electronic health record (EHR) in revenue maximization. A meeting will be scheduled with Juan Pablo Segura and the Director of Informatics Pam Cole to provide this overview.
- It was noted there may be a credibility issue with withdrawing reductions previously submitted and a suggestion was provided to identify reductions as alternatives that could be offered should it be needed.
- Also, noting the Board has a responsibility to participate in the budget process, it was pointed out the earmarked added funding of $2.3 million for both ITC and Day Treatment/ Employment services is more than the $1.8 million in the proposed reductions. In the current environment, this could be a best case scenario.
- A suggestion was offered that a strong case for restoration may be better received at FY13 carryover.
- Further discussion included recommendations to advocate for the following:
    - $1.1 million to lower the staff vacancy levels to 7-8%
    - Restoration of the senior management position (Director of Community Living) as executive positions are difficult to receive once eliminated ($180,000)
    - Restoration of the two Wellness and Health positions ($191,000)

The work session was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

| Date Approved | Staff to the Board |
|---|---|

# Fairfax-Falls Church Community Services Board
## Work Session
February 20, 2013

The Board met at the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Conference Rooms 2 and 3 in Fairfax, VA.

The following CSB members were present: Mark Sites, Chair; Susan Beeman, Jessica Burmester, Ken Garnes, Mark Gross, Glenn Kamber and Suzette Kern

The following CSB members were absent: Pamela Barrett, Mary Ann Beall, Juan Pablo Segura, Lori Stillman and Jane Woods

The following CSB staff was present: George Braunstein, Gary Axelson, Belinda Buescher, Bill Belcher, Peggy Cook, Ginny Cooper, Colton Hand, Evan Jones, Jean Hartman, Dave Mangano, Louella Meachem, Davene Nelson, Lisa Potter, Jim Stratoudakis, Lyn Tomlinson, Daryl Washington, Will Williams, Alan Wooten and Laura Yager

Meeting Called to Order

Mark Sites called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Service Director Presentations

Lt. Colonel Sites reviewed the agenda requesting that discussion and questions from Board members follow completion of each presentation.

**ADULTS WITH INTELLECTUAL DISABILITIES**

***Presentation***

Jean Hartman with Community Residential and Contract Services provided an overview of the Intellectual Disabilities (ID) service area and was accompanied by Alan Wooten, Director of Community Living, Evan Jones with Employment and Day Support Services and Victor Mealy with Intensive Services/Support Coordination.

- Describing the population and experience in the service system, Ms. Hartman highlighted services are person-centered with CSB Support Coordinators developing individualized service plans.
- Noting there are levels of service to meet varying needs, it was indicated individuals with ID diagnosis will receive services throughout their entire life with plans modified to accommodate each stage.
- While schools provide for ID individuals to age 22, transition coordination is then required for community-based day or employment services.
- It was noted 90% of day and employment services are contracted, allowing for a rich variety and choices.
- The CSB directly operates 10 groups homes staffed 24/7 and partners with private providers that serve 80% of the population with group homes, intermediate care facilities

and apartments. Congregate care group homes are shrinking with shared apartment living becoming more prevalent.

- Within outcomes it was indicated 90% of people with ID meet their person-centered plan objectives and the same percentage are satisfied with support coordination and residential services.
- On funding, the ID population is eligible for Medicaid waivers although there are long wait lists. In addition, there is no identified State funding for those non-Medicaid Waiver eligible.
- Additional service gaps noted were: 1) aging population requiring additional community services, 2) lack of expert ID/DD psychiatric services, 3) insufficient residential capacity, and 4) Department of Justice settlement mandating transition and support of Training Center residents into the community.

***Discussion***

- A request was made to quantify with metrics the gaps indicated as well as decreased funding impacts identified. It was noted with this information, a clear picture can be developed for advocating needs.
- A request was made to receiving demographics for the populations in each of the service areas.
- In response to whether industry standards are used for developing service plans, it was noted person-centered is mandated by the State of Virginia.
- It was suggested that a presentation on housing needs be provided at a future work session.

## ADULT MENTAL HEALTH

***Presentation***

Daryl Washington with Residential Services presented an overview and was accompanied by Davene Nelson with Intensive Community Services, Medical Director Dr. Colton Hand, Evan Jones with Employment-Day Services, Jean Hartman, Director of Nursing Louella Meachem, Lyn Tomlinson with Engagement, Assessment and Referral services as well as Adult Outpatient, Victor Mealy, Kaye Fair with Acute Care and Emergency Services, Dave Mangano with Family and Consumer Affairs, and Gary Axelson with Clinical Services.

- A brief profile of individuals receiving services noted those with severe mental illness, multiple psychiatric hospitalizations and lack of community supports.
- Through call center, a brief screening occurs and either a need for an assessment is determined or community resources provided. The wait list for an initial assessment is three to five days and full assessment two to six weeks.
- Other avenues to enter services and varying levels include emergency, homeless outreach, peer run drop-in centers, and transfer from other programs.
- Case management is the largest part of the mental health (MH) system and additional components include intensive community treatment, psychiatry, residential, day treatment, employment, peer run and jail based services.
- A large group of partnerships, both public and private, were highlighted that coordinate with directly and contracted operated programs.
- Strides/outcomes were noted some of which include: 1) ability to serve co-occurring individuals with MH and substance use disorders (SUDs), 2) engaging in employment as

soon as possible, 3) establishing peer run services, 4) varying levels of care provided, and 5) primary healthcare is part of treatment plans.

- Among the gaps identified in system were: 1) case managers serve 60% above the average number of individuals based on national research, 2) with 380 residential bed capacity, the waiting list is consistently over 500, 3) the more services an individual needs, the longer the wait, 4) lack of hospital psychiatric beds, and 5) while serving individuals with intensive needs, the level may not be sufficient.
- Recommendations for change include: 1) fully staff or significantly scale back services in some areas to assure quality, 2) develop opportunities for affordable housing to reduce funding for residential, 3) finding balance within system and community to continue case management for those staying in the system longer and developing efficient case management model, 4) increase peer run services, and 5) developing an urgent care model.

***Discussion***

- As noted earlier, a request was made to quantify in key areas the gaps in service, recommendations for change as well as impact of budget reductions.
- An additional request was made to quantifying the spectrum of serving and meeting the needs of all seeking services. Also if available, data requested on those at the front door who are referred and do not enter the CSB system.
- In response to qualifying individuals diverted from CSB services by engaging through peer run programs, it was noted about 3000 are seen through peer run centers each month, but the locations are limited. Peer assistance is also provided in contacting individuals on wait lists.
- Affordable housing is measured by greater than 35% of income.
- Incarceration can occur due to lack of availability of psychiatric beds being obtained within mandated timeframe. It was noted the most populous areas have the fewest beds per capita.
- Definition of serious mental illness is defined by the Department of Medical Services (DMAS) guidelines.
- CSB nursing services are provided by 50 nurses & 8 Nurse Practitioners who are embedded in teams serving individuals thereby able to identify and monitor medical needs.
- Through partnerships the CSB continues to develop, there is an ability to connect individuals with medical health care services. It was noted through creative efforts, a substantial portion of medication costs are no longer funded locally.
- On average, 33% of MH individuals have Medicaid, however, the bulk of case management is paid with local funding.
- Prevalence data was distributed of individuals needing services throughout the area, however, it was indicated there is no measure of what portion of this population would seek and/or need CSB services.

## ADULTS WITH SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS

***Presentation***

Lyn Tomlinson presented an overview and was joined by Peggy Cook with Residential Treatment Services, Kaye Fair, Evan Jones, Louella Meachem and Dave Mangano.

- Among those served are individuals with substance use and co-occurring disorders along with family members. Priority populations are pregnant women, intravenous drug users and individuals with substance dependence.
- Noting the CSB uses federal standards to promote recovery, two organizations were cited: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) and American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM).
- It was indicated that treatment referrals closely match national data: 2009 CSB data reported noted 53% outpatient, 13% intensive outpatient, 14% short term residential, 8% long term residential and 14% other-detox.
- Based on a three-month period, 67% of individuals were criminal justice referrals.
- Jail-based services are provided with assessments, treatment and case management.
- Continuum of services include psychiatric, case management, peer and community support, vocational and detox, and many individuals exit using self-sustaining community resources with support of strong collaborative partners.
- Wait time for an assessment is currently 10 days, but has been as high as three weeks.
- Some key outcomes noted: 1) use of evidence based practices, 2) treatment that promotes recovery with integration using community services, 3) strong collaborative partnerships, and 4) statistics provided in both outpatient as well as residential treatment programs
- Among the gaps in service identified were: 1) overall capacity issues, 2) wait lists for outpatient and residential services citing 40 outpatient staff positions lost over last 10 years as well as reduction in beds, 3) two to three week wait for medical detox services, and 4) psychiatric and peer support services limited.
- Some of the recommendations for change included: 1) transitioning outpatient services to intensive level of care, 2) continue to review trends/data related to residential length of stay and reduce if supported, 3) consider medication assisted treatment, and 4) to enhance peer support identify evidenced-based approaches for reallocating resources.

***Discussion***

- In response to Medicaid funding of services, it was noted treatment of substance use disorders is not Medicaid reimbursable unless there is an accompanying illness. On average, only 5% of the services are reimbursed through Medicaid, with the bulk of funding provided locally.
- A request was made to receive the breakout of funding streams for each disability area.
- Background was provided on the lengths of stay in the levels of residential treatment programs, ranging from 90 days up to 12 months.
- Following up on the recommendation to increase the intensity of outpatient services, it was noted if evidence supports an increase would reduce the length of stay in some treatment programs and/or reduce repetitive cycling through the system, it would be worthwhile whether or not budget driven.
- There was discussion of quantifying the key service gaps as well as providing a clearer definition of core services. It was recommended staff not begin gathering requested data until this definition is provided.
- Following a recommendation for staff to develop a menu of services that would serve a broader spectrum of individuals for presentation to the Board of Supervisors, there was discussion of the CSB Board in its governing capacity being responsible for making service determinations vs. Board of Supervisors.

Next Steps

At the March 6, 2013 CSB Board Work Session scheduled, the presentations will include Youth and Family, Infant and Toddler Connection, and Wellness and Health Promotion. Should there be any further service areas in which Board members are interested in receiving presentations, please provide them to Lt. Colonel Sites.

The work session was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

| Date Approved | Staff to the Board |
|---|---|

DRAFT

TRANSCEN inc.
career and workforce development

# A Review of Day and Employment Funding and Services Strategies

## Final Report

Prepared for
The Fairfax/Falls Church Community Services Board


Prepared by
TransCen, Inc.
Ann Deschamps, Ed.D.
Dale Verstegen, MBA
Monica Simonsen, Ph.D.
Richard Luecking, Ed.D.

Point of Contact
Ann Deschamps, Ed.D.
401 N. Washington Street, Suite 450
Rockville, MD 20850
(703) 625-5727
adeschamps@transcen.org


March 14, 2013

## Table of Contents


| | |
|---|---|
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Introduction | 3 |
| I. Overview of the Scope of Work and Task Activity | 4 |
| II. Summary of Stakeholder Focus Groups | 6 |
| III. State and Local Area Program Review | 10 |
| IV. Recommendations | 22 |
| Tables | 26 |
| Summary | 28 |
| Appendices | 29 |

# Executive Summary

At the request of the Fairfax County-Falls Church Community Services Board (CSB), TransCen, Inc. completed a comprehensive scope of work to review and recommend service model design and financing structure for employment and day support services to individuals with intellectual disabilities (ID) served by the CSB. The review included these key activities:

1. Conducting interviews with key CSB staff to review the current service model(s) of the Day Support and Employment service programs.
2. Gathering information, though a series of focus groups, from interested parties including CSB Board members, CSB staff, individuals who use these services and their families, those providing services, other County staff, and other community stakeholders.
3. Gathering information from other states about services and funding mechanisms for individuals with ID. Interviews were conducted with officials and relevant documents were reviewed from the states of Washington (King County), Ohio (Franklin County), Wisconsin (Dane County), Missouri (Boone County) and Vermont. These states were selected for this review based on well established funding and service mechanisms, specific methods of enabling local control of services and funding, and/or recognized funding and service mechanisms that might inform Fairfax-Falls Church CSB decision making.
4. Gathering information from other Virginia CSBs through interviews with CSB officials and review of documents. These CSBs included Henrico County CSB, Rappahannock Area CSB, Virginia Beach CSB, and Chesterfield CSB.
5. Interviews with state and federal officials on Medicaid waiver requirements and allowances that have potential relevance to local CSB financing structures. Interviews included representatives from Virginia's Department of Medical Assistance Services (DMAS) and Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services (DBHDS), as well as consultants associated with the National Association of State Directors of Developmental Disabilities Services.

Based on this review, there are several courses of action that Fairfax-Falls Church CSB can consider in determining how to maximize the resources available to serve people with ID and other developmental disabilities. These include:

1. Work with the state to apply for a new HCBS 1915c waiver which would allow the county to leverage local funds to gain additional federal support for services.
2. In this application for a new HCBS 1915c waiver, work with the state to broaden waiver eligibility so that more individuals can be served through the addition of federal, rather than only county, funds.
3. Incentivize vendors to serve more consumers through supported employment since the long term cost for supported employment is lower than the long term cost of congregate day and pre-vocational services .
4. Prioritize youth transitioning from public schools who are exiting school already employed for new service authorization in order to reduce long term service costs.

Fairfax County is not unique in applying local funds for service delivery to individuals with ID, but it is distinguished from other localities in the state and the country by its long history of commitment to provide quality and broad service to eligible constituents. For this, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors is to be commended. The findings and recommendations presented here are meant to provide considerations for maximizing resources so that the county can build on this background of service.

# Introduction

TransCen received a contract from the Fairfax-Falls Church Community Services Board (CSB) to review and recommend service model design and financing structure for employment and day support services to individuals with intellectual disabilities (ID). Accordingly, TransCen gathered and analyzed information from a range of sources which is synthesized here and which provides the basis for recommendations for the CSB to consider in its charge to maximize available resources to support current and future services to eligible constituents. This report is organized into four sections as follows:

- Overview of the Scope of Work and Task Activity
- Summary of Stakeholder Focus Groups
- State and Local Program Review
- Recommendations

# I. Overview of the Scope of Work and Task Activity

The RFP issued by the CSB required six discrete tasks which informed the development of the report and the final recommendations. Below is a list of the tasks with a brief explanation of how they were accomplished.

### Task a: Conduct interviews with CSB staff and examine documents to review the current service model(s) of the Day Support and Employment service programs to ensure understanding of how services are provided.

- TransCen associates held meetings with key CSB staff including Alan Wooten, Evan Jones, and Kevin Lafin on October 22, November 2, November 13, November 29th, and December 10, 2012. We also held meetings with service coordinators on November 13, 2012. In addition, we reviewed numerous documents provided by CSB staff detailing information on how services are provided, analysis of budgetary issues, provider fees, and past reviews of service costs and recommendations.

### Task b: Gather information from interested parties including CSB Board members, CSB staff, individuals who use these services and their families, those providing services, other County staff, and other community stakeholders.

- A TransCen associate attended the CSB ID subcommittee meeting on November 1, 2012, to further gather information on relevant issues related to funding day and employment services for individuals with intellectual disabilities.
- TransCen associates conducted seven focus groups with the following stakeholders: service coordinators, service providers (2 groups), parents of adults with intellectual disabilities current receiving services, parents of adults with intellectual disabilities who anticipate receiving services in the next two years, adults with intellectual disabilities, and Virginia Abilities Alliance, a coalition of not-for-profit organizations representing people with disabilities in Virginia. The size and composition of these groups and the dates conducted are as follows:
    - Service coordinators – 5 participants, November 13, 2012
    - Service providers (2 groups) – Group 1 – 5 providers, Group 2 – 6 providers, November 16, 2012
    - Parents Group 1 – 7 participants, November 19, 2012
    - Adults with Intellectual Disabilities – 4 participants, November 19, 2012
    - Parent Group 2 – 9 participants, November 19, 2012
    - Virginia Abilities Alliance (VAA) – 8 participants, November 14, 2012

Task c: Review similar employment and day services programs in the Commonwealth of Virginia and nationwide, including Federal programs to identify evidence-based programs and services that are best practice with cost-effective, financial structures.

- In collaboration with CSB representatives, TransCen developed program review criteria and list of questions to ask different states and localities contacted (see Interview Questions, *Appendix A*).
- TransCen associates conducted 17 interviews with representatives from Missouri, Ohio, Washington, Wisconsin, Vermont, and four Community Services Boards in Virginia (see summary in **Section III**).

Task d: Identify practices to optimize family and corporate involvement, financial contributions, and entrepreneurships aimed at the continuous improvement/ maintenance of the programs.

- All of the previously identified activities provided means to gather this information.

Task e: Provide written recommendations on alternative service models and payment/financing strategies to meet the increasing demand.

- Included in the final section of this report are the recommendations emanating from the previous tasks.

Task f: Submit an interim report December 12, 2012 and final report on January 31, 2013.

- This report constitutes the fulfillment of this task.

## II. Summary of Stakeholder Focus Groups

In order to determine perceptions of the stakeholders about the present status, needs, and perceptions of future direction for CSB funded services, a series of focus groups and interviews were conducted to complement the examination of alternative funding and service strategies detailed later in this report. Provider agency staff members were invited from all 15 CSB vendor agencies in Fairfax County. In addition, individuals who were receiving services or on the waiting list, their family members, and CSB case managers were invited to participate in separate focus groups. One focus group was also held at a meeting of Virginia Abilities Alliance (VAA), a coalition of not-for-profit organizations representing people with disabilities in Virginia. In total, the focus groups comprised of:

- 16 provider staff representing 11 provider agencies who participated across two focus groups.
- 16 family members (four parents of transition-age youth/waiting list, 11 parents of individuals receiving services, and one parent of an individual determined not eligible for services) participated across two focus groups.
- Four individuals with developmental disabilities (two currently receiving services, two transitioning youth who are eligible for services) participated in a small focus group.
- Five CSB Case Managers participated in one focus group.
- Eight individuals representing disability related organizations participated in the VAA focus group.

All of the focus groups were facilitated by the TransCen team, audio recorded and later transcribed. Two members of the TransCen team reviewed the transcripts and jointly analyzed the key perspectives obtained from all of the focus groups using software that enables the identification of major and frequently mentioned points. The following is a synthesis of the focus group participants' perceptions of the strengths and limitations/needs of the current service delivery system as well as specific recommendations for improving the system. It is important to note that although the focus groups were an avenue for soliciting stakeholder perspective, caution should be taken in interpreting and analyzing the responses due to the small sample in each group and the range of perspectives represented by the distinct groups.

### Perceived Strengths of the Current System

It is important to note that the CSB was consistently praised for its professionalism. The VAA group commented on how supportive the services are to families and praised the lack of bureaucracy. Both families and providers provided positive feedback about the CSB case managers. In addition, the focus group participants described a culture of collaboration among the partners in Fairfax County (between CSB, providers, parents, and policy makers). Parents/guardians reported satisfaction with transition services provided by the school system and described feeling informed about the CSB application process. The youth participants demonstrated self-determination skills and were able to articulate specific vocational interests. Some participants from different groups also described their satisfaction with specific services as

well as an appreciation for the broad spectrum of services that were available from a number of different providers in Fairfax County.

## Perceived Limitations/Needs of the Current System

Although participants provided considerable positive feedback about the scope of available services, there was considerable discussion about the lack of adequate services for specific populations. Some examples include the lack of access to services for individuals with autism, especially those who do not qualify for the waiver funding.

Some participants also provided candid feedback about the existing limitations within the service delivery system. The families were particularly vocal about their criticism of the variable quality of services available through the individual provider agencies, especially when comparing these with services they received from the school system. Some families expressed concern that provider agency staff were not proficient at finding jobs that matched the interests of their sons/daughters. They also articulated a concern that individuals receiving day services were not engaged in activities to promote personal growth.

Some participants expressed discontent with the lack of programming options available for individuals with behavioral needs and those who are medically fragile. Providers talked about inadequate funding for both these populations. Both providers and families are very concerned about the feasibility of the current service delivery system absorbing the cost of serving individuals transitioning out of state training centers as a result of the Department of Justice settlement.

Although most of the participants identified specific limitations in the current delivery system including the way the state determines Medicaid eligibility, the most prevalent complaint was the lack of adequate funding. Many of the stakeholders reported that the Medicaid reimbursement is inadequate to meet the needs of individuals with developmental disabilities and cover the cost of services. Even the slightly increased reimbursement rate for Northern Virginia falls short of the cost to provide the service, according to many focus group participants, particularly the providers.

The participants also expressed frustration with other logistical barriers to employment, including the lack of affordable, safe, transportation services (specifically Logisticare and Metro Access). There were multiple comments about the importance of safe reliable and flexible transportation related to day and employment service provision. Finally, providers and VAA group talked about the burden of complying with unfunded mandates and how this affected their expenses.

## Recommendations/Suggestions from Focus Group Participants

Many participants had specific ideas for improving the employment and day services for adults with intellectual disabilities. Because of the waiting list and qualifications to be eligible for funding, a number of individuals are without funded supports. For example, one of the

participants was a parent of a young adult with autism who was not eligible for Medicaid waiver funded services and she felt that he needed ongoing supports. This is a critical issue since this population continues to grow. A number of the families and provider staff expressed the desire to have services expanded. A specific recommendation was to have more CSB case management services for individuals who are not supported by the waiver.

Although families initially indicated that they felt that communication about applying for services was sufficient, the respondents identified areas of miscommunication/misunderstanding about eligibility and access. Some of the families suggested that professionals should build on the existing family advocacy networks to disseminate information about services.

In addition, many of the respondents articulated a need to build the capacity of the provider community. Specifically, families and case managers suggested that provider agency staff could benefit from training in:

- Facilitating community employment for individuals with high level of support needs (e.g. professional development in job development/customized employment);
- Providing opportunities for personal growth for individuals receiving day services; and
- Providing individualized person-centered services.

## SPARC Solutions

Entrepreneurial approaches to services were of interest to some of the CSB ID subcommittee members, so at their recommendation we also interviewed Donna Goldbranson, Executive Director of SPARC Solutions, a program for individuals with disabilities in Fairfax County located at Southgate Community Center in Reston and Old Firehouse Teen Center in McLean. Adults with disabilities, or “club members” as they are referred to, participate in service projects and leisure learning activities, develop vocational skills, and take part in a variety of outdoor activities three days a week. The only eligibility criterion to participate is participants must have a lifelong disability. This enables SPARC Solutions to serve individuals who may not be eligible for other day programs offered through service providers.

Currently, SPARC Solutions is serving 16 individuals in Reston and 10 in McLean. Funding comes from in-kind contributions, private donations, foundation grants, fundraising through special events and employer matched donation programs (i.e., ExxonMobil, Cisco, Juniper). The majority of the service is provided through in-kind contributions that SPARC Solutions has been able to utilize creatively to support and adapt all the activities of the program. Some of the in-kind contributions include rent, computer labs, instructional kitchen with cooking equipment, sports facilities and game room with equipment at both community centers. Program staff and transportation costs are contained by club members using their individual Medicaid waivers to bring personal support attendants to accompany them to the community centers on accessible public transportation (MetroAccess). By utilizing existing community resources, SPARC Solutions is able to not only eliminate a lot of overhead costs but also offer a program with a wide array of activities enhancing the experiences in the community for all participants. The flexible nature of the program and the reliance on in-kind community resources is commendable.

## Implications of SPARC model for Fairfax-Falls Church CSB

SPARC Solutions represents an innovative approach enabling individuals to experience a variety of meaningful and fulfilling services during portions of a weekly schedule. However, given the small scale and the potential for service fluctuations inherent in reliance on donations and in-kind contributions, SPARC Solutions does not represent a service alternative of sufficient size to impact service delivery in the county. On the other hand, such a service might be explored as an adjunct service model for individuals to fill out their work week when working part time.

# III. State and Local Area Program Review

For this report we interviewed officials in five states and four Virginia Community Service Boards and reviewed relevant documents to determine circumstances of funding and service delivery. The information collected from each locale is summarized below. After each summary we list potential implications for Fairfax-Falls Church CSB. In presenting the implications we also, where relevant, include in parentheses a recommendation number that corresponds to one of the four recommendations provided and detailed in *Section IV* of this report. For additional reference, *Appendix B* offers a Comparison Chart by State.

## Washington State – King County

Washington State serves 7,500 adults with intellectual disabilities in day and employment services. King County, which included Seattle, serves 1,725 individuals with HCBS waiver funding from the state, supplemented by a relatively small allocation of local funds ($2.5 million out of a total budget of $29 million). The local money is spent partially to pay agencies in some of the 18 school districts to start job development for transitioning youth while students are still in school. This King County transition program is a partnership between school district, the state Department of Developmental Disabilities, and the state Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Out of the 30 approved providers in King County, 6 work with school districts as part of the transition project.

In Washington, employment and day service categories include: individual employment (IE), group supported employment (GSE), pre-vocational, and community access (PVS). For group supported employment, no more than 8 individuals can be served in the same setting. A Case Resource Manager develops an Individual Service Plan (ISP) identifying the primary employment service category (IE, GSE, PVS). For Individual Employment, the ISP includes the range of service hours. For group supported employment and pre-vocational services, the ISP includes anticipated service hours. Of the 1,725 adults with intellectual disabilities in King County 1,425 are in individual employment, 77 in group supported employment (includes sheltered workshop), and 223 in pre-vocational services.

All services are funded through Medicaid waiver. Funding is awarded by the state to the County. There is a consistent allocation methodology to counties with funding for each individual based on a Supports Intensity Scale. Additionally, King County has developed an employment acuity assessment based on information from the supports intensity scale including information on communication, mobility, medical need level. An individual's score is referred to as employment acuity level. Individuals are categorized by tier level based on employment acuity level, geographic location and previous work experience.

The state has two funding formulas, one for employment, and one for community based non-work; the formulas are applied uniformly across the state to allocate funds on a monthly basis to county Developmental Disabilities (DD) agencies. County DD agencies negotiate the final rates paid to providers and the state Department of Developmental Disabilities approves the county rate. For individuals receiving individual employment services, the negotiation for the eventual applicable rate takes place between the individual, employment provider, and case manager.

Of significance is that Washington State adheres to the Working Age Adult Policy, which is the cornerstone of supported employment in the state. This policy makes explicit the expectation that all working age adult with intellectual disabilities are expected to work. The state, county, and all providers take a "path to employment" approach which states there are many "paths" to employment that will improve the financial situation of individuals and give them access to relationships that are important in everyone's lives. Individual paths will vary in length and in the elements that make them successful but the destination is always employment, primarily integrated, community-based employment. Individual regions and counties can make exceptions to this only under special circumstances.

### Implications for Fairfax-Falls Church CSB

- Local funds are used to leverage federal dollars under the Home and Community Based Waiver Program. (Recommendation #1)
- Local and federal funds are used to partner with the school districts to prioritize youth transitioning from public schools to reduce long-term service costs. (Recommendation #4)
- An assessment process, in this case the Supports Intensity Scale and Employment Acuity Assessment, is used to support eligibility through the Medicaid waiver for consumers currently funded with county resources. (Recommendation #2)
- County provides additional incentives for individual employment services by negotiating the applicable rate on a case by case basis, between the individual, employment provider and case manager. (Recommendation #3)
- A 'Working Age Adult Policy' makes explicit the expectation that all working age adults with intellectual disabilities are expected to work. Such a policy is the basis for incentivizing individual supported employment services. (Recommendation #3)

## Wisconsin – Dane County

Wisconsin Department of Human Services (DHS) is the Medicaid Administrator for the state. The funding flows from DHS to either the Managed Care Organization (MCO) in 57 counties or a county board in 15 counties. MCOs or County Boards set the rates and fund services with local providers. The county boards still use legacy waivers which consist of a Community Integration Waiver (DD), Community Options Waiver (MH) and Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) Waiver. The Managed Care Organizations have Home and Community Based Waivers for elderly, individuals with developmental disabilities and individuals with physical disabilities as well as a self-directed waiver. The vast majority of those served is through waiver funds. There are still a few state funded slots that were grandfathered based on their history of receiving services. The waiver funding formula includes a 60% Medicaid funding and 40% state/county match. Statewide methodology determines a fixed level of funding for each service for each county or MCO based on uniform categories across the state. The budget for each MCO or county board is based on the number served under each of the uniform categories for the required services. The local MCO or county board then has discretion as to how they spend those funds when delivering services. Eligibility is determined by the use of a statewide functional screening process

administered by an independent case management entity. The criteria is reviewed annually and updated as necessary.

The services provided are supported employment (individual and group employment), day services, pre-vocational services, daily living skills training, and vocational futures planning. The MCO or county board sets the rates that providers receive which can vary provider to provider. Some MCOs or county boards use the functional screen to set rates for providers.

The state does impose some medically related performance outcomes that the MCOs or county boards need to meet. However, there are not any quality of life performance outcomes that are imposed on the MCOs or county boards or on the providers. A quality of life survey is conducted and related data is collected but it is not tied to the contracts with individual MCOs or county boards. The state provides definitions of the service and some rules that the MCO or county needs to abide by. It is a broad framework and not prescriptive as to how services are delivered.

Dane County, which includes the city of Madison and the surrounding vicinity, has a 73% competitive employment rate as compared to a 9 to 14% competitive employment rate in the other counties in the state. Dane County funds services for 1,279 individuals. Of those, 1,074 receive employment and day services. Of those, 877 are funded for supported employment services. The remaining 197 are funded for pre-vocational services (sheltered workshop) (128) or day services (69). $14,000/year is the average cost for employment, pre-vocational and day services. $13,000/year is the average cost for the transition students that leave school with a job. The budget consists primarily of county funds leveraging federal Medicaid waiver funds on a 40/60 basis. The average costs listed above do not include transportation. In the city of Madison, the city transit authority puts up city funds to match Medicaid waiver funds to provide transportation to and from their place of employment. Outside the city of Madison, parents or consumers are asked to pay the match or arrange their own transportation to work.

Dane County only funds employment and day services for those that are eligible for Medicaid Waivers. They feel it is not necessary to fund these services outside the waiver because the definitions of the service codes in the waivers are broad enough to make the services flexible. They thus determine how to cover needed services, making enhancements unecessary. Funding employment and day services on an hourly basis versus a daily basis offers the most flexibility, according to county officials. They felt the state definition in the waivers was broader than the federal definition and allows more individuals to be waiver eligible. The state uses a standardized tool to determine eligibility called the Long Term Care Functional Screen. When the state went to managed care, Dane County stayed with the legacy waivers so that their local funds could stay in the county and they would have more control over how they spent those funds.

Dane County has made the commitment that any student exiting the school with paid employment is guaranteed support services for the hours that they work. Those eligible students move to the top of the waiting list. If they exit the schools without a paid job, they usually spend 3 to 5 years on the waiting list. Dane County does this to stretch available funds and because they have evidence that shows that those employed pay more towards their residential funds and contribute more to the local economy. Dane County incentivizes employment because they see employment as the only service where costs go down over time. One innovative practice in Dane

County is the Partners in Business initiative where employers are provided a wage supplement to support supported employees on the job including transportation in lieu of job coaching and transportation through a provider organization. Another innovative practice in Dane County is a Pay for Performance initiative where the provider is paid for the hours that a consumer works rather than for the hours of support.

Dane County has put significantly more funding towards employment services than any other county in Wisconsin for several reasons. There is strong family and consumer advocacy to continue to fund community employment. The school district has a long history of fostering integration in the schools and funding transition services at a level where most special education students have a work history while in school and a paid job upon exiting the school system. Another reason is that the county has made a commitment to provide follow along supports to any student that has paid employment when leaving the school system. This commitment to fund transitioning students requires that the student stays with the school district through the semester of their 21st birthday. This commitment only covers support services for the number of hours that they are working at the employer site. If the transitioning student is only working part time, a Support Broker works with the family and the consumer to plan the rest of their day. By investing in supported employment upon leaving the school system, they feel it is the best way to manage their costs long term. They have noticed that when consumers are working in the community after high school, they tend to live with family members longer and when they do move out of their family's home, they are more likely to have friends or know others in the community that they can live with. For these reasons, they feel their long term residential costs are reduced.

Dane County has worked to maximize its federal match including aggressively determining Medicaid eligibility to leverage additional Medicaid funds. Dane County also uses 'self directed services' rather than designating day versus pre-vocational versus supported employment services so that services could be bundled to create a service package that looks at the whole person and their entire day. This can maximize needed services, offers the provider some flexibility regarding the services offered and reduces administrative costs. Dane County has taken advantage of local match slots that the state offered counties to draw down additional federal Medicaid waiver funds that would otherwise not be captured. It was estimated that these local match slots doubled or tripled the number of people served through the waivers.

### Implications for Fairfax-Falls Church CSB

- Broadening waiver eligibility and having a waiver that leverages county funds enables local match slots that can significantly increase the number of people served. (Recommendations #1 and #2)
- Individual employment services are incentivized by setting the rates accordingly and enabling flexibility for providers delivering the services. (Recommendation #3)
- Based on the state definition of service codes in the waiver, the necessity to fund anybody outside the waiver was eliminated. (Recommendation #2)
- Dane County controlled and maximized how its county funds were spent, especially by leveraging federal funds through a local match waiver. (Recommendation #1)

- Guaranteeing funding for any student exiting school with paid employment enabled the county to better manage their cost of services over time. In Dane County individual employment was the only service where costs went down over time. In addition and evidence showed that those employed when they exited school required less residential funding over the long run by living with their families longer and/or contributing their earned income toward residential service costs. (Recommendation #4)
- Guaranteeing funding for any student exiting school with paid employment made it more likely that the student was supported by the school district until the age of 21. (Recommendation #4)
- By using 'self directed services' that creates a bundled service package that looks at the whole person and their entire day, the county maximized services and offered the provider more flexibility and reduced administrative costs. (Recommendation #3)

## Missouri – Boone County

The Missouri Department of Social Services (DSS) is the Medicaid administrator in the state. Funding flows from DSS to the Missouri Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD) which has authority to operate some Medicaid services, including the waivers. The funds go to County "Senate Bill 40 Boards" (local entities similar to the Community Services Board) which in turn contract with provider organizations. Senate Bill 40 authorizes counties to generate a mill tax to pay for services for persons with developmental disabilities in each county. Most counties have a mill tax. The mill tax provision allows for flexibility in the use of the mill tax revenue at the county level. Some counties use the mill tax for sheltered workshops for those not eligible for Medicaid. In Boone County, which includes Columbia, 62% of funding for day and employment services for adults with intellectual disabilities is Medicaid funding through the waivers, 19% is state general revenue and 19% is county funds genrated by the mill tax.

There are three waivers related to employment and day services. The comprehensive waiver serves 9,000 individuals. The average annual per person cost is $90,000 average, including day, employment and residential services. The Community Support waiver serves 1,500 individuals. It is capped at $22,000 and averages $19,000 per person, including day and employment services but no residential services. The newest waiver is the Partnership for Hope waiver that serves 2,870 individuals, capped at $12,000 annually with a $9,000 average per person which includes day and employment but no residential services. Counties can determine eligibility for services associated with the The Partnership for Hope waiver which was created to use county funds to leverage more federal waiver funding (see http://www.medicaid.gov/Medicaid-CHIP-Program-Information/By-Topics/Waivers/Waivers.html for more detail on this program).

State officials estimate that if this new waiver was not in place, all 2,870 individuals funded through this waiver would still be on waiting lists. Currently, 96 counties (out of 118 counties) including the City of St. Louis are participating in the Partnership for Hope Waiver. It is atypical for anyone to receive services without a combination of state and county funding.

The range of employment services provided in Missouri include independent living skills (or "day habilitation") which can be facility or community based, as well as 4 levels of employment

services including job discovery, job preparation, community employment and co-worker job support. The maximum allowable rates are set at the state level and approved by the state Medicaid agency. Provider rates are established by the local regional office during the initial contracting process. The rates vary between providers up to the maximum allowable rate.

### Implications for Fairfax-Falls Church CSB

- The impetus to develop The Partnership for Hope waiver in Missouri closely resembles the situation in Virginia. Boone County was using a significant amount of county funds to fund employment and day services. Leaders in Boone County worked with the state to develop a statewide local match waiver to more effectively leverage their county funds. (Recommendation #1)
- The Partnership for Hope waiver leveraged county funds that were not leveraged in the past, allowed over 2,800 individuals statewide to receive services that would otherwise be on the waiting list (Recommendation #1).
- The current waiver (comprehensive waiver) was maintained along with the waiting list for those consumers that needed more intensive services. The new Partnership for Hope waiver was a lower cost waiver, capped at $12,000 with a $9,000 per year average, and developed strictly for those consumers requiring less intensive employment and day services.
- With the Partnership for Hope waiver, counties are able to determine eligibility and maintain their own waiting list. (Recommendation #2).

## Ohio – Franklin County

Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities (DODD) is the Medicaid Administrator. DODD contracts services though the county board system. County boards in turn contract with local providers. The state budget is $600 million federal funds; $100 million state funds and $300 million county funds. There are 4 waivers, 2 of which are used to fund employment and day services. The first is called the Individual Options Comprehensive Waiver and serves 17,000 with an average of $55,000 per person which includes day and emplyment services as well as residential and other support services. Up until 2003, the waivers just used state match. The subsequently developed second waiver, called the Level 1 waiver, was developed to draw down more county funds to match federal waiver funds. The Level 1 waiver serves 11,000 individuals with a maximum of $45,000 and an average of $13,000 per person.

The services provided include Community Employment; Supported Employment Enclave (4:1 one rate/8:1 different rate); Vocational Rehabilitation Workshop; Adult Day Services. Maximum allowable rates are set at the state level and approved by the State Medicaid Agency. Provider rates are estimated by the local regional office during the initial contracting process and vary between providers up to the maximum allowable rate. Rates can also be adjusted based on cost of doing business categories by region of the state. Community services are reimbursed at a higher rate than facility based services.

Franklin County, which includes Columbus, takes advantage of the Level 1 waiver and has been able to eliminate the waiting list by using county funds to draw down federal waiver funds. Franklin County board also increased the rate for job coaching from $24/hour to $40/hour to incentivize community employment which in the long run costs less than long term sheltered employment where the costs remain constant.

### Implications for Fairfax-Falls Church CSB

- The impetus to develop the Level 1 waiver in Ohio closely resembles the situation in Virginia. Franklin County was using a significant amount of county funds for employment and day services and took advantage of the new waiver to leverage federal funds that it otherwise wouldn't be able to access. Through this new waiver, it was able to eliminate its waiting list. (Recommendation #1)
- Rates were adjusted based on cost of doing business categories by region of the state. This feature would be beneficial to providers in Fairfax County because it would factor the cost of living differential into the reimbursement rates.
- Community services were reimbursed at a higher rate than facility based services. Franklin County increased the rate for job coaching (supported employment services) from $24/hour to $40/hour to incentivize community employment. It was reported that this rate was increased because community employment costs less in the long run than sheltered employment where costs remained the same over time. (Recommendation #3)

## Vermont

The Department on Aging and Independent Living (DAIL) is the Medicaid Administrator on Vermont. DAIL's Division on Disability and Aging Services manages the waiver. The funding flows from DAIL to the 16 County Designated Agencies. There is one County Designated Agency for each county in the state. These County Designated Agencies are not-for-profit organizations that provide all the services in that county. State funds are used to match federal Medicaid funding on a 60/40 split. The Vocational Rehabilitation Agency also provides over $1 million and contracts with each of the 16 County Designated Agencies for the delivery of supported employment services. DAIL provides funding for 2,289 adults with intellectual disabilities. Vermont uses one waiver called the Home and Community Based Waiver.

All consumers who receive funding must be Medicaid eligible. No one is funded with only state and/or county funds. To determine eligibility, DAIL develops state statutes that define eligibility for those with developmental disabilities, autism, and intellectual disabilities. Consumers with physical and mental health disabilities are not served under this waiver. In additional to meeting the definition of eligibility, applicants are assessed for critical need. If they meet the definition for eligibility but not the critical need assessment, they are put on the waiting list. Each County Designated Agency has an in-take coordinator that determines eligibility and does the critical need assessment. If the in-take coordinator determines the applicant as eligible for waiver services, a cost plan is developed and it is taken to a statewide, monthly funding committee (Equity Committee) meeting. The Equity Committee reviews the cost plan and approves, denies

or negotiates a lower cost plan. Once approved, services begin immediately. If not approved, the person is put on the waiting list.

The services offered under the Home and Community Based Waiver include case management, employment services and community support. No congregate services are covered under the waiver such as sheltered workshop or facility based day services. All employment services are competitive placements. All other day services, called community support services, are community based. All community support and employment services include funds for transportation.

The average cost for all services for all consumers is $28,000 per person. The County Designated Agencies set their own rates and is included in the cost plans that are submitted to the Equity Committee for approval. When they approve the cost plan, they are also approving the rates set by the provider. Supported Employment service rates will range from $22 to $32 per hour of service. Different rates among providers reflect individual provider cost considerations when rates are approved by the Equity Committee. DAIL's Division of Disability and Aging Services communicates standards for case management, community support and employment services to each of the 16 County Designated Agencies. There is also a quality review process. However, limited resources to conduct the quality review process make the reviews less frequent, but the process is designed to be more consultative than punitive.

One notable practice in Vermont is if a student who is exiting school has a job or the commitment of a job, they are automatically funded for employment services for the hours needed to do the job. Another noteworthy practice is the way services are bundled. The same staff provides all the services so they can maximize personnel resources and the coordination services more effectively. For example, if someone loses their job, the same staff will start to provide community support services while they start looking for another job. All community support consumers are encouraged to explore employment as part of their community support plan. Vermont also has regional job developer coalitions to coordinate job development and share job leads.

### Implications for Fairfax-Falls Church CSB

- Services are bundled so that the providers can maximize personnel resources and coordinate community-based services more effectively, which in turn supports the state's focus on community employment. (Recommendation #3)
- Students exiting school with paid employment are automatically funded for employment services for the hours needed to do the job which generates a higher commitment and support from the family and school system. (Recommendation #4)

## Other Virginia Community Service Boards

### Rappahannock Area Community Service Board, Virginia

This CSB serves a total of 249 individuals, with type of services and source of funding represented as follows:

#### Waiver Funded

| | |
|---|---|
| 138 | high intensity day support services |
| 14 | high intensity pre vocational services |
| 21 | regular intensity pre-vocational services |
| 60 | group supported employment services |
| 3 | individual supported employment services |
| ***236*** | ***total individuals waiver funded*** |

#### Local Funded

| | |
|---|---|
| 6 | high intensity day support services |
| 2 | regular intensity pre-vocational services |
| 5 | individual supported employment services |
| ***13*** | ***total individuals non-waiver funded*** |

Local funds applied to services amount to approximately $800,000 out of a total budget of $27 million. The non-waiver high intensity day support services are funded through the local United Way. 250 individuals are on the waiver waiting list. There is no waiting list for non-waiver services.

The county contracts with 3 providers – 2 that provide pre-vocational and supported employment services and 1 that provides high intensity day support services. The rates through the waiver have been adjusted to be comparable to state Department of Aging and Rehabilitation Services (DARS) for supported employment services. However, the providers feel there is little financial incentive to provide supported employment services through the waiver because they can only bill for the direct face-to-face time with a consumer and this limited amount of billable time makes providing individual supported employment services cost prohibitive. Recruiting additional supported employment providers in the county has also been difficult because of the process of becoming a vendor is considered very cumbersome by providers. The existing providers feel it is easier and it pays better to provide segregated employment services.

According to Rappahannock County Officials, the case managers are effective at establishing eligibility for the waiver and educate the families very early about getting on the waiver waiting list. Many children are put on the waiting list between the ages of 2 and 4 years old.

Some transitioning students in Rappahannock County must remain on the waiting list after they exit secondary school. However, DARS will fund 3 hours of job coaching if the student leaves

school with a job. DARS also has $100,000 in long term support funds (LTTCE) for students transitioning out of school with a job and these funds are not time limited.

## Virginia Beach Community Service Board, Virginia

Virginia Beach Community Service Board serves 502 adults with intellectual disabilities in day and employment services in FY12 as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 225 | individual supported employment |
| 52 | group supported employment |
| 10 | pre-vocational services |
| 168 | day support services |
| 47 | PALS (transition program) |
| ***502*** | ***total individuals*** |

All of these individuals are served in CSB operated programs except those in pre-vocational services (sheltered workshops) which are provided by private providers in the area. Virginia Beach's day support program is called Skill Quest. Skill Quest is a center-based program with two community locations, serving 168 adults with ID.

One of ways the City of Virginia Beach uses its funding is to provide follow along services to DARS clients who are not receiving services under the Medicaid waiver. Local money funds the PALS (play and leisure skills) program, a transition program for special education graduates who are not necessarily prepared to go directly to employment. The program introduces young adults to the world of work and supports them as they explore employment and leisure opportunities. This CSB also allocates local funds to provide services for some adults who are not eligible for Medicaid waiver. The individuals funded by local funds receive the same services as those on the waiver.

## Henrico County Community Service Board, Virginia

Of the 545 adults with intellectual disabilities served in Henrico County, the Community Services Board directly serves 254 adults in day support and employment services. The remainder are served by any one of the 25 private providers. The services rendered directly by the CSB are represented as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 127 | supported employment |
| 30 | group supported employment |
| 50 | in pre-vocational services (sheltered workshop) |
| 65 | in day support services |
| ***254*** | ***total individuals*** |

Local funds support 179 of the 254 adults served by the CSB. Medicaid waiver funds the other 75. The services provided by Medicaid funds and by local funds are identical. Local funds comprise 49% of the total budget of day and employment services.

## Chesterfield Community Services Board, Virginia

This CSB serves a total of 287 individuals in employment and day services as follows:

### Waiver Funded

| | |
|---|---|
| 108 | day support services |
| 5 | pre-vocational services – all community based services |
| 82 | group supported employment services |
| 25 | individual supported employment services |
| ***217*** | ***total waiver-funded individuals*** |

### State and Local Funded

| | |
|---|---|
| 26 | individual supported employment services – only county funds |
| 44 | individual supported employment services – DARS LTESS and ESS funding |
| ***70*** | ***total non-waiver funded individuals*** |

Local funding is only used for individual supported employment services. The county portion of the budget for day and employment services is $1.6 million with $900,000 of that paying for transportation services.

### Implications for Fairfax-Falls Church CSB

This sample of other Virginia Community Service Boards illustrates both the similarities and distinctions in funding and delivering employment services to individuals with developmental and intellectual disabilities. Each applies local funds to service delivery, but in distinct ways. In addition all four function as both a funding entity and a service delivery entity. It is not clear whether this is an advantage either fiscally or programmatically. However, it is apparent that local entities are compelled in one way or another to supplement waiver funding that flows from the state with local funds, sometimes to serve individuals not eligible for the waiver, sometimes to minimize the waiting list for waiver eligible individuals. The question each faces is how best to maximize the use of local funds so that service availability and service quality is positively impacted. Distinctive feature of each county and its approach include the following:

- In Rappahannock, the case managers begin establishing eligibility for the waiver, educating families so children are on the waiting list as early as age 3 so that families can maximize the likelihood of securing a waiver slot when it is needed. At the same time, the services are funded so that providers do not have an incentive to provide supported employment, even though nationally there is evidence that long term expense is minimized when integrated employment is the primary service option. Ironically, then, long-term waiting lists are potentially further exacerbated by more expensive service models.
- In Virginia Beach, the PALS Program is seen as an effective strategy to orient transitioning students and their families to vocational and employment opportunities as they exit school. This is recognition that concentrating services to individuals new to the service system has the potential to improve service outcomes and funding commitments.

- In Henrico local funds go toward the identical service funded by the waiver so that its local allocations in effect allow the same service to be available for more individuals. As will be discussed in the recommendations below, this is a potential avenue to leverage additional waiver funds.
- In Chesterfield there is recognition that transportation is an important service that makes employment possible for many individuals, so its local funds are concentrated for this purpose so that other sources support the employment service itself.

# IV. Recommendations

Along with interviews with key informants in Fairfax County, the review of state and local service funding and service delivery mechanisms provide a basis for considering ways in which the County can maximize its current resources and adjust service delivery. We are aware of a comprehensive internal CSB review conducted previously, entitled "Service Options Utilizing Available Resources for Intellectual Disabilities Employment and Day Services" (Appendix C). This review is already available to the Fairfax Falls Church CSB for its consideration. Thus, in our report we did not reference this previous analysis, as we restricted our review to those sources referenced in the previous two sections and developed recommendations accordingly. At its discretion, the CSB may wish to use the previous internal analysis as a supplement to that which is presented here as it deliberates about desired directions for funding and service delivery.

Based on our review, we provide four primary recommendations that are outlined below. We also summarize the potential advantages and disadvantages of each.

## Recommendation #1
## Work with the state to apply for a new HCBS 1915c waiver which would allow the county to leverage local funds to gain additional federal support for services

Conversations with Virginia state officials indicate that it would be willing to consider such a course of action. In some states reviewed for this report local match dollars are used to leverage federal dollars under the Home and Community Based Waiver Program. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) matches funding applied to Medicaid, including waivers on a formula based on state financial status. In Virginia the match rate is 50%, that is, the federal government pays a dollar for every dollar Virginia spends. If the CSB invested all the money it currently spends on individuals who are waiver eligible (on the waiting list), it could save $1,646,362. (see Table 1 at the end of this section) If the state broadens waiver eligibility criteria as intended, it is likely that a significant number of the individuals who are not waiver eligible, but who are funded by the county, would become waiver eligible, saving a significant portion of the $3,589,169.00 currently being provided by the CSB (See Table 2 at the end of this section). Since Fairfax-Falls Church CSB has a history of allocating local funds for services, obtaining federal match on local funds appears to be a reasonable mechanism for expanding the number of people served, addressing those on the waiting list and stretching state and local dollars. A comparable example of this is the Partnership for Hope Waiver in Missouri.

### Potential Advantages:

- Fairfax County could save over 1.5 million dollars,
- Many individuals currently on the Medicaid waiver waiting list would be served,
- Fairfax County could still define exactly who would be served and what services are included,
- Fairfax County could also decide exactly how much money is applied to the waiver,

- Because this would be a new HCBS 1915c waiver for Virginia, the eligibility criteria and rate methodologies can be different from existing waivers, providing an opportunity to address issues outlined below under waiver eligibility,
- Funding structure for reimbursement could mirror Department of Aging and Rehabilitative Services (DARS), using comparable hourly rates (including allowing for billable services that do not include direct contact with consumer, such as job development),
- Hourly rates could allow for several types of services being provided within the same day such as individual employment and pre-vocational in the same day.

### Potential Disadvantages:

- The application process for the new waiver is time consuming (anywhere from 6 to 18 months),
- There are myriad details associated with application for the new waiver, all of which would need to be addressed in conjunction with the state, requiring potential compromises as these are negotiated with the state,
- The risk of tying in the local dollar to match the waiver dollars includes an ongoing commitment of funding at that level.

## Recommendation #2
## In new HCBS 1915c waiver, work with the state to broaden waiver eligibility so that more individuals with intellectual disabilities can be served through the addition of federal, rather than only county funds

Given the increasing numbers of individuals with intellectual disabilities who are not waiver eligible and are currently funded 100% by county funds, the county would benefit by enabling its local funds to be augmented through a federal match, thus serving more individuals with the same level of investment.

### Potential Advantages:

- Per the illustration in Table 2 at the end of this section, this could save as much as 3 million dollars.

### Potential Disadvantages:

- This could add more people to the Medicaid waiver waiting list,
- Fairfax County would not have exclusive control over how or if this direction is taken as it is a state level decision.

## Recommendation #3
## Incentivize vendors to serve more consumers through supported employment since the long term cost for supported employment is lower than the long term cost of congregate day and pre-vocational services

Other states report that long term expenditures are minimized when supported employment is the first service of choice. They report that up front costs for job development and initial on-the-job support are offset by gradually decreasing levels of support once the job is stabilized in most cases. This course of action is not without complications due to rate structuring considerations, the capacity of vendor staff to effectively deliver this service, and blending this service with other non-work day service when work hours are low. However, it is worthy of further consideration due both to potential cost efficiencies and stakeholder comments on quality and type of desired service. For example, in examining the difference between the average annual cost per person in Fairfax County, individual employment ($4,291) is far more cost effective than either group supported employment ($19,027) or sheltered workshops ($17,015). Another consideration is the long-term cost of other non-employment services, which will likely continue to increase. Dane County, Wisconsin is one example where integrated employment outcomes enable individuals to either remain with families longer or pay a portion of their earnings toward residential services.

### Potential Advantages:

- Individual earnings increase which contribute to both other services and to the local economy,
- Integrated employment is more cost effective than sheltered employment over the long term,
- By incentivizing supported employment in the design of the new waiver, more and better program outcomes could be achieved and long term costs of these services have the best chance of remaining stable or possibly being reduced over time,
- More providers would offer supported employment services with more choices of supported employment vendors for local job seekers.

### Potential Disadvantages:

- Vendors may be reluctant to expand supported employment programs or may lack the capacity to provide effective supported employment services,
- Some families may be reluctant to consider integrated employment as a viable option for their family members with disabilities.

## Recommendation #4
## If it becomes necessary to create a waiting list for services for those students transitioning from the school system, prioritize youth who are already employed for new service authorization in order to reduce long-term service costs.

Some states' employment and day service waivers incentivize individualized, integrated, community employment. They also recognize that individual supported employment placements offered the best possibility of reducing the cost of the support plan over time. This is an especially useful way, in some states, to prioritize services for youth transitioning from the education system. Two entities included in this report (Vermont and Dane County,Wisconsin) guarantee ongoing support for transitioning students who exit school with a job paid by the employer. Not only does this save on the cost of job development and placement after exiting school, it provides a seamless transition for students who are working. In addition, this incentivizes the school system to ensure students are in paid employment before they exit secondary school. Also, Medicaid waiver regulations permit "reserving" waiver slots for specific groups; so waiver funding opportunities can be targeted to youth in transition.

### Potential Advantages:

- Cost savings related to job search and placement,
- Provides more continuity of services for the individuals leaving the school system,
- Students are in jobs over time, requiring less support and fewer resources.

### Potential Disadvantages:

- This would require a re-defined partnership with the school system, requiring time to organize and perfect the parameters of such a partnership.

## Table 1

### Potential Savings Implementing a Local Match Waiver for Persons Receiving Employment and Day Services and on the Waiver Wait List (Currently Waiver Eligible)

(Fairfax-Falls Church Community Services Board)

| Type of Service | Weighted Average Annual Cost Per Person (12/6/2012) | Persons on the Waiver Wait List (12/6/2012) | Local Cost for Persons Listed (12/6/2012) | Potential Local Match Waiver Savings (50%/50% Split) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Day | $32,370 | 32 | $1,035,840 | $517, 920 |
| Sheltered | $17, 015 | 17 | $289,255 | $144,627 |
| Group | $19, 027 | 98 | $1,864,646 | $932,323 |
| Individual | $4,291 | 12 | $4,291 | $51,492 |
| Total | | | $3,194,032 | $1,646,362 |

## Table 2

### Potential Savings Implementing a Local Match Waiver for Persons Receiving Employment and Day Services with Expanded Waiver Eligibility to Include Persons Currently Not Waiver Eligible

(Fairfax-Falls Church Community Services Board)

| Type of Service | Weighted Average Annual Cost Per Person (12/6/2012) | Persons Not Waiver Eligible (12/6/2012) | Local Cost for Persons Listed (12/6/2012) | Potential Local Match Waiver Savings (50%/50% Split) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Day | $32,370 | 69 | $2,233,530 | $1,116,765 |
| Sheltered | $17, 015 | 112 | $1,905,680 | $952,840 |
| Group | $19, 027 | 148 | $2,815,996 | $1,407,998 |
| Individual | $4,291 | 52 | $223,132 | $111,566 |
| Total | | | $7,178,338 | $3,589,169 |

Under a local match waiver, the Federal government would match the local contribution 1:1. The current local cost would be reduced by 50% with Federal Medicaid Waiver funds covering 50%.

The first chart shows the CSB savings applying this formula to individuals who are currently funded 100% by the county and on the waiver waiting list.

The second chart shows the formula applied to those individuals 100% funded by the county who are not waiver eligible. Based on our study of other states that developed a new waiver to leverage local match funds, the eligibility criteria was typically expanded to include consumers who were not originally eligible under the old waiver. Therefore, it is anticipated that a subset of the consumers who are currently only county funded (reflected in the table above) represent a cost savings when they are funded through a new local match waiver.

## Summary

This purpose of this report was to identify potential options for the Fairfax-Falls Church Community Services Board to maximize its own resources as well as garner additional resources to serve people with intellectual disabilities in day and employment services. Two of the recommendations would involve partnering with the state on two different fronts. First, working with the state to apply for a new waiver could potentially generate more revenue for services to support more people with disabilities with less money. Second, partnering with the state to broaden the eligibility criteria for Medicaid waiver will maximize use of both state and local dollars to serve individuals who are currently served only by county funds. Another recommendation, distinct from the waiver issue, includes supporting employed students exiting school (should a waiting list for transitioning youth be instituted) prioritizing employment services. These recommendations are intended to provide considerations for Fairfax-Falls Church CSB as it looks to build on its long history of providing quality services to adults with intellectual disabilities

## Appendix A – Program Review Criteria Questions for States and Localities

- What are the major sources of funding for the day and employment services your organization provides through contracts? How many people with ID do you serve in day support and employment services?
- Describe how you fund day habilitation services? Pre-vocational services? Individual and group employment services? (follow-up re: specifics on staff ratios and if any $$ assistance beyond MW is provided)
- Which of these services do you offer as facility-based or community based? Do rates differ? Are any of these (all of the above) services mandated by the state?
- How is your locality's system structured? County-based, CSB, direct contracts with the state—who manages the system at the local/regional level?
- How does contracting occur? (managing entity and provider AND managing entity and state)
- How many Providers are there in your area serving the same population and array of disabilities (or just ID)?
- Who sets the provider payment rates? (state DD agency, state Medicaid agency, negotiated or set by the managing regional or local organization (county, etc.)
- What is your rate-setting methodology for each service? (Do rates cover the cost of service provision, if not how is the difference covered? Are funding resources bundled to cover the cost of a service? Are entities (Governments) required to use the same rate?)

  For example:

  *Based on cost of service*

  *Based on individual to staff ratios authorized and provided*

  *Based on Medicaid Waiver Reimbursement rates*

  *Based on VR rates*

  *Whatever the purchaser will pay*

  *Based on Capacity, I.e. an amount of capacity is purchased regardless of utilization.*

  *Based on ICFID (or ICFMR) rates (Intermediate Care Facility for Intellectually Disabled).*

  *Is the RFP or competitive solicitation, bidding process used?*

  *Or are individual yearly service budgets figured and negotiated for each person based on their unique needs?*

# Appendix B – Comparison Chart by State

| State/Locality | Number of Individuals With ID served | Flow of Funding | Who Administers Medicaid | Types of Day and Employment Services | Sources of Funding | Types of Waivers Offered | Maximum Funding Level/Average Cost Per Individual | How are Rates Set? | Special Note |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Virginia Fairfax/Falls Church CSB | 1260<br>(12/1/12) | VA DBHDS<br>Local CSB provider | DBHDS and DMAS | Developmental<br>Facility based employment<br>Group supported employment<br>Individualized supported employment | Medicaid<br>Local county funding | ID<br>Day Support | 12,900 – average | County CSB, along with partners, negotiates individually with each provider depending on the specifics of the services they offer | Program Enhancement<br>Funding provided to non Medicaid eligible adults |
| Missouri | 9,000 (comp)<br>15,000 (comm. Support)<br>2,870 (PFH) | MO DSS<br>MO DDD<br>County SB 40 Entities<br>provider | MO Department of Social Services | PFH – ind. Living skills, job discovery, job preparation, community employment, coworker job support | Medicaid (62%)<br>State general revenue (19%)<br>County Mill Tax (19%) | Comprehensive<br>Partnership for Hope<br>Community Support | Comp. – 90,000<br>PFH – 12,000/ - max<br>9000 – average<br>Comm. Supp – 22,000 – max<br>19,000 – average | Max. allowable rates are set at state level and approved by State Med. Agency; provider rates established by local regional office during initial contracting process; vary between providers up to max. allowable rate | 96 counties (including St. Louis) are participating in PFH waiver (out of 118) |

| State/Locality | Number of Individuals With ID served | Flow of Funding | Who Administers Medicaid | Types of Day and Employment Services | Sources of Funding | Types of Waivers Offered | Maximum Funding Level/Average Cost Per Individual | How are Rates Set? | Special Note |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ohio | 17,000 (IOCW)<br>11,000 (Level1) | OH DD<br>County Board<br>provider | OH Department of Developmental Disabilities | Community employment<br>SE Enclave (4:1) one rate (8:1) one rate<br>Voc. Rehab workshop<br>Adult day supports | Medicaid (60%)<br>state general revenue (10%)<br>County (30%) | Ind. Options comprehensive waiver<br>Level 1 | IO – no maximum/<br>55,000 – average<br>Level 1 –<br>45,000 – max<br>13,000 – average | Waiver rates set by OH Dept. of DD; Cost of doing business category by region | Level One waiver - lower cost- local funds leverage federal funds; Franklin Co. eliminated waiting list; increased competitive employment rate from $24 to $40/hour |
| Washington<br>King County | 7,500 (state)<br>1725 (King) | WA DD<br>County DDD<br>provider | Health Care Authority | Community access<br>Pre-vocational<br>Group SE (8:1 max)<br>Independent employment | Medicaid<br>State/County | Basic Plus<br>Community Protection<br>Core | $16,800 average | Formula: Acuity, work history, county classification<br>Negotiated between County, advisory board, service agency | King County spends 2.5 million County $$ on services – including a special transition program |

| State/Locality | Number of Individuals With ID served | Flow of Funding | Who Administers Medicaid | Types of Day and Employment Services | Sources of Funding | Types of Waivers Offered | Maximum Funding Level/Average Cost Per Individual | How are Rates Set? | Special Note |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wisconsin<br>Dane County | | WI DHS<br>M CO or County Board provider | Wi Dept. of Human Services | Supported Employment (Ind and Group)<br>PreVoc<br>Daily Living Skills Training<br>Day Services<br>Voc Futures Planning | Medicaid (60%)<br>State/Cty (40%) | Legacy Waivers: Comm. Int. Program (CIP) – DD<br>Comm Opt. Program (COP) – MH<br>TBI waiver<br>Managed Care Waivers: 1615 B and C for elderly, DD and physical<br>Or<br>IRIS waiver – self directed | Day Center Svc- $9,672 average<br>Adult Day Svc- $6347 average<br>Pre Voc Svc - $9,593 average<br>SE - $5,671 average | Man. Care Organ. (MCO) or County Board sets the rates. Some use functional screen to set rates; have total discretion as to the rates set for providers | Dane County is very aggressive in determining Medicaid eligibility to include as many as possible; state uses a 'local match slot' so that local funds can be used to draw down Medicaid funds at the local level |
| Vermont | 2289 | DAIL<br>County Designated Agencies (DDA)(16) DDA's also provide all the services | VT Dept. on Aging and Independent Living (DAIL) | Case Management<br>Employment<br>Community Supports | Medicaid (60%)<br>State (40%) | Home and Community Based Waiver | $28,000 average for all services<br>$30,000 average for employment services | Rates are set by the County Designated Agency (provider) and approved in the individual cost plans | Don't provide congregate services; anyone leaving school with a job is approved for funding if eligible; they bundle services |

# Appendix C – Service Options Utilizing Available Resources For Intellectual Disability Employment and Day Services

Current resources for contracted ID Employment and Day Services are approximately $13.3 million dollars. These services include Day Support, Sheltered (or Facility-based)Employment, Group (or Enclave) Employment and Individual Supported Employment, all through private providers such as ServiceSource or MVLE. This year there are over 1100 persons receiving services via contracts with these Providers. Last fiscal year program enhancement payments (PE) totaled 31% of the contracted service costs (over $4 million dollars). PE is the purchase of additional services related to health and safety not covered by Medicaid waiver reimbursements for persons primarily funded via a Medicaid waiver. Examples of PE services include, skilled nursing, tube feeding - medication - hydration, behavior supports and specialists, OT/PT and speech therapies, environmental and adaptive equipment, some medical supplies, and accessibility issues, etc.

There are many variables and issues which impact the number and costs of persons needing CSB ID Employment and Day Services. Some of these are listed below:

- The implementation and impact of the Department of Justice (DOJ) settlement.
- The Regional Contract for Day and Employment Services which ends June 30, 2015.
- As of 1/1/2012 there were 16 persons on the CSB ID Employment/Day services waiting list.
- Possible new ID waivers approved by this year's legislators.
- The weather and overall seasonality regarding utilization.

It is assumed resources from new waivers, attrition, and management efficiencies will be applied to support ongoing and new Employment/Day Services.

Next fiscal year it is projected $2 to $2.5 million will be needed in addition to the current $13.3 million to provide the above categories of service to all those anticipated needing these services. This includes all persons currently being served, new persons, those currently waiting for services, and the June 2012 special education graduates. It is anticipated additional resources will not be available next fiscal year with budget resources for FY2013 remaining in the $13.3 million range. (FY 2013 begins July 1, 2012 and ends June 30, 2013). Given these circumstances several options to provide services within existing resources were considered with a description of each following. Implementation of any of the service options apply only to FY2013, services in FY2014 would still require increased budget amounts to support FY2014 grads (June 2013) and other new persons needing service in FY2014.

Following are five Service Options for the provision of CSB ID services within the current level of resources. On Saturday, February 11, 2012 option "A" was presented to the CSB work session as the staff's recommended option. However during the CSB meeting on Wednesday, February 22, 2012 there was agreement all recommendations would be reviewed and considered during the IDD Workgroup meeting on March 7, 2012. It was further agreed the option approved by the IDD Workgroup will be the one submitted to the County with the list of critical needs.

## Option A

### A. Cap services to only Day and Sheltered services for 100% County funded persons.

**A cap of $12,000 per person per year (100% County Funded) for Day and Sheltered services would reduce costs by over $2 million dollars. (Transportation services on County sponsored days of attendance would not be included in the above cap).**

This cap would reduce County support for:

- 94 persons in day support services; weighted average yearly cost $29,211. This means CSB funding would cover 81 days of a possible 210-220 attendance days for a year.
- 126 persons in sheltered; weighted average year cost $15,924. This means CSB funding would cover 100 days of a possible 210-220 attendance days for a year.
- New persons 100% County Funded needing either Day or Sheltered; this includes June 2012 special education graduates.
- Services to approximately 30, June 2012 special education graduates.

In addition:

- This option does not account for potential additional costs related to the DOJ settlement agreement.
- This option is projected to serve persons within available resources only through FY2013.

A person could arrange with the Provider to supplement County support so as to continue full time attendance.

**Advantages:**

- Each person needing ID Vocational/Day services would receive some support.
- New FY2012 (June 2012 grads) school leavers and other new persons would receive support as prescribed by the cap.
- No new County funds for ID Vocational/Day services would be needed to implement this option through FY2013.
- Persons receiving Program Enhancement and service via a Medicaid waiver would continue to receive the same level of service.
- Transportation services would not be impacted on days of County sponsored attendance.
- All persons in Group and Individual Supported Employment would be able to maintain their employment and supports.
- This option is consistent with “Employment First” and County employment initiatives.
- This option would not impact self-directed services.

**Disadvantages:**

- An increased sacrifice on persons with significant needs who are 100% County funded.
- Residential costs could increase due to increased time during the day at home.
- Some families may need to provide at home supervision precluding their ability to work full time.
- Providers may not have their costs covered and may need to curtail services.
- Some Providers might be unable to continue operation.
- Some Providers may wish to renegotiate their Regional contract.
- Expanding Provider capacity to meet future needs might be a challenge.

## Option B

B. Establish a maximum dollar cap for County funding (Not including transportation services) (Not including persons receiving program enhancement or funded by Medicaid Waiver).

**A cap of $16,000 per person per year (100% County funded) would reduce costs between $2 -$2.5 Million dollars per year.**

This cap would reduce County support for:

- 82 persons in day support services, weighted average yearly cost $29,211. This means CSB funding would cover 115 out of a possible 210-220 attendance days per year.
- 44 persons in sheltered employment, weighted average yearly cost $15,924.
- 152 persons in group supported employment, weighted average yearly cost $19,658. This means approximately 40-50 days per year would not be supported by the CSB.

A person could supplement County support so as to continue full time attendance.

**Advantages:**

- Each person needing ID Vocational/Day services would receive some support.
- New FY2012 (June 2012 grads) school leavers and other new persons would receive the above level of support.
- No new County funds for ID Vocational/Day services would be needed to implement this option through FY2013.
- Persons receiving Program Enhancement and service via a Medicaid waiver would continue to receive the same level of service.
- Transportation services would not be impacted.

**Disadvantages:**

- Persons may lose employment if they are unable to continue in their jobs because full time supports are no longer available. (I.e. persons working in the Pennino Building mail delivery service, the new Mark Center at Seminary & Rte. 495, those employed at Wild Flour Caterers, Fairfax Hospital laundry, and numerous other area employments)
- This option may not be consistent with "Employment First" initiatives or County emphasis on Employment.
- Residential costs could increase due to increased time during the day at home.
- Some families may need to provide at home supervision precluding their ability to work full time.
- Providers may not have their costs covered and may need to curtail services. Some Providers might be unable to continue operation.
- Some Providers may wish to renegotiate their Regional contract. Expanding Provider capacity to meet future needs might be a challenge.

## Option C

C. Eliminate Program Enhancement Funding (PE). PE is the term used to describe the County purchase of additional services related to health and safety not covered or funded by Medicaid Waiver.

**Elimination of PE would reduce costs by over $4 million per year.**

PE applies only to persons supported by Medicaid waiver. It is the purchase of additional services related to health and safety which Medicaid waiver does not cover such as skilled nursing. A more detailed description of PE is included in the first paragraph of the introductory remarks in this document.

This option would reduce County support for:

- 288 persons receiving Day Support and Intensive Day Support Services estimated annual Medicaid waiver reimbursement is about $18,000 per person. The weighted average yearly cost for this level of service including PE is $29,211 per person.
- 97 persons receiving Sheltered Employment services estimated annual Medicaid waiver reimbursement is about $14,000 per person. The weighted average yearly cost for this level of service including PE is $15,924 per person.
- 89 persons receiving Group Supported Employment estimated annual Medicaid waiver reimbursement is about $17,000. The weighted average yearly cost for this level of service including PE is $19,658 per person.
- 7 persons receiving 1:1 (One Staff to One Individual Served) service estimated annual Medicaid waiver reimbursement is about $18,000 per person. The weighted average yearly cost including PE is $40,000 per person.

- It should be noted not all persons currently served by ID Employment/Day Services with a Medicaid waiver receive PE funding.

**Advantages:**

- New FY2012 (June 2012 grads) school leavers and other new persons would receive the same level of support as those currently being served.
- No new County funds for ID Vocational/Day services would be needed to implement this option through FY2013.
- The gap between established Provider rates and Medicaid Waiver reimbursement amounts has been increasing yearly, this option structures the County commitment such that inadequate waiver reimbursement amounts are not in effect supported by the County.
- The DOJ settlement could mean as many as 50-90 new waivered persons being served by the County in Employment/Day Programs. If PE funding was utilized for these waivers it could mean an additional $800,000 to $1.45 Million would be needed to cover the PE cost. This alternative would prevent the need for this additional funding.
- Transportation Services would not be impacted.
- Implementation of this option may increase the sustainability of CSB Employment/Day Services in future years.

**Disadvantages:**

- Providers may not have their costs covered and may need to curtail services. Some Providers have already stated they would not be able to continue serving persons with only Medicaid Waiver reimbursement amounts.
- Some Providers might be unable to continue operation.
- Expanding Provider capacity to meet future needs might be a challenge.
- This option could impact employment of persons supported. Most jobs are full time and job duties require regular attendance.
- This option may not be consistent with “Employment First” or County employment initiatives.
- Residential costs could increase due to increased time during the day at home. Some families may need to provide at home supervision precluding their ability to work full time.
- This option would most likely end services for the 7 persons currently needing 1:1 support.
- This option is least desired by our Providers, expressed during a November, 2011 stakeholder meeting.

## Option D

### D. Require a furlough for everyone receiving ID Employment/Day Support services.

For example one day per week or 2 months in a year without County support. This option would reduce cost to the County between $2 and $2.5 million per year. A person could supplement County support so as to continue full time attendance.

This option would reduce County support to 4 days per week for approximately:

- 535 persons 100% funded by the County in All levels of service.
- 460 persons funded by Medicaid Waiver in Day, Sheltered, and Group levels.

**Advantages:**

- This option would impart some sacrifice to each person being served but would allow at least some service be provided to current and new persons needing ID Employment/Day Supports.
- New persons would be able to receive this level of support through FY2013.

**Disadvantages:**

- This option could impact employment of persons supported. Most jobs are full time and job duties require regular attendance.
- This option may not be consistent with "Employment First" or County employment initiatives.
- Residential costs could increase due to increased time during the day at home. Some families may need to provide at home supervision precluding their ability to work full time.
- Providers may not have their costs covered and may need to curtail services.
- Providers may not be able to meet contractual requirements on some of their group employment contracts.
- Some Providers might be unable to continue operation.
- Expanding Provider capacity to meet future needs might be a challenge.

## Option E

### E. Continue a waiting list including the FY2012 grads until attrition, waiver savings, or other savings realize enough resources to begin funding to those waiting with the greatest risk/need served first.

This option by itself would not reduce costs to the level needed to maintain even the current level of services for those already receiving services. However, if the County budget includes a contract rate adjustment this could be used for services rather than increasing

rates, with permission. Along with the combination of new waivers and attrition there may be enough resources to continue the current level of services to those currently being served.

There are over 100 special education graduates this year (June 2012) who would be on the wait list and currently 16 persons already on the wait list, plus those new persons added to the wait list each month going forward. All of these persons most likely would not receive services this or next fiscal year, through June 2013.

**Advantages:**

- This option may impact the fewest number of people; however the impact is significant for those needing and having to wait for County support.
- This is the option preferred by our Providers.

**Disadvantages:**

- New persons may have months and/or over a year of waiting to be served.

It should be noted that implementation of any of the above models would still require increased budget resources to support FY2014 grads (June 2013) and other new persons needing service in FY2014.