

**DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
FY 2010-11 JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE HEARING AGENDA**

**Wednesday, December 16, 2009
9:00 am – 12:00 pm**

9:00-9:45 INTRODUCTIONS AND OPENING COMMENTS

9:45-10:15 Closing the Nursing Facility at the Grand Junction Regional Center

1. In August the Department announced plans to close the nursing facility at the Grand Junction Regional Center. Please provide an update on the status of the closure.
 - a. Where will people be placed?
 - b. What is the schedule for moving them to new facilities, and how does this compare to the schedule presented in August?
 - c. What is the schedule for reducing staff?
 - d. Please update the estimated savings and compare them to the estimate provided in August.
 - e. What will the Department do with the vacated facility and equipment?
2. What are the advantages of having people served by community providers rather than the Regional Center? Are the impacted families happy with the decision to relocate?

**10:15-10:45 Financial Health of Providers and Community Centered Boards
 And Regulatory Relief from State-mandated Functions**

3. How will providers manage the proposed 4.5 percent rate reduction (2.5 percent in FY 2009-10 and 2.0 percent in FY 2010-11)? Can providers raise local and private contributions to offset reductions in state funding?
4. Is there an expected local match for developmental disability services? Should there be an expected or required match?
5. Please assess the financial stability of The Resource Exchange (TRE). Will TRE be able to continue serving the El Paso, Park, and Teller area in the future? Does the business model developed by TRE work for the long term, or are there elements missing from it that are necessary to be a successful and viable Community Centered Board?
6. The Department indicates it will complete a review of the efficiency recommendations in the Myers and Stauffer report on mandated functions of Community Centered Boards by April

30, 2010. This date is too late in the session to start bills for any of the recommendations that require statutory changes or appropriations for up-front costs. Would the Department be willing to commit to providing the analysis no later than March 30, 2010?

- a. Understanding that the Department has not completed a full analysis of the recommendations in the Myers and Stauffer report, which of the recommendations are likely to generate the most administrative savings for the Community Centered Boards?
 - b. Which of the recommendations would require statutory changes or appropriations to implement?
7. The Myers and Stauffer report identified costs associated with different functions of the Community Centered Boards (CCBs). Is there any way to determine which CCBs spend the most/least on different functions to identify the outliers and learn from them?
 8. Are there some functions of the Community Centered Boards that the Department should take over to achieve economies of scale, reduce costs, and/or improve consistency of services?
 9. Does the Myers and Stauffer report identify all of the areas where Community Centered Boards have expressed concerns about over-regulation? Is the Department aware of other concerns, for example in the area of reporting requirements?
 10. Has the Office of Information Technology (OIT) reviewed the various computer systems used by the Department to serve people with developmental disabilities? Does OIT have recommendations for improving the integration of these systems?

10:45-11:00 Break

11:00-11:30 Early Intervention Services

11. Please provide data on outcomes for people served through Early Intervention Services and evidence of the program's effectiveness.
12. Why is the population identified as needing Early Intervention Services increasing? What explains the differences in regional growth rates?
13. How does the Department propose managing the increasing population and the loss of one-time federal funds for Early Intervention Services?

11:30-12:00 Changes to the Way Supported Living Services are Funded

14. What is the Department doing to mitigate potential negative impacts to service recipients and providers arising from the change to a fee-for-service billing system for Supported Living Services?

15. When the Department made the transition from lump sum payments for adult residential developmental disability services to fee-for-service payments, the General Assembly authorized the Department to “hold harmless” the providers rather than reverting funds. Should the General Assembly provide similar “hold harmless” authority for the transition to fee-for-service for the Supported Living Services program?
16. What are the most commonly used Supported Living Services? What Supported Living Services cost the most in aggregate to provide?
17. Please describe the potential for Consumer Directed Attendant Support Services (CDASS) to minimize reversions and mitigate complaints that the new Supported Living Services rates are too rigid. Why hasn’t CDASS been implemented yet, and could the Department accelerate the implementation?
18. Please provide an update on funding for sheltered workshops. How will the Department provide a continuum of care to meet the employment goals for individuals with developmental disabilities?

ADDENDUM: OTHER QUESTIONS FOR WHICH SOLELY WRITTEN RESPONSES ARE REQUESTED

19. Please provide a copy of the Supported Living Services rates and Service Plan Authorization Limits. How do the new statewide, standardized rates compare to payments in the old reimbursement model?