	INTRODU	ICED BY:	JBY CHOW	
	No	$8\overline{2}$	304	*
MOTION NO	5480	1 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 		
A MOTION authorizing the a 1982 King County Development to the Washing and Health Services in ordevelopmental disabilities expenditure for support disabilities services in	opmental Disak ton State Depa rder to provides funds and a of community of	oilities Plan artment of Soc de new state authorize		
WHEREAS, the King County Deve	lopmental Disa	abilities Prog	ram has compl	Lete
its planning for use of state and co	ounty funds du	ring the seco	ond half of	
1982, and				
WHEREAS, the King County Board	d for Developm	ental Disabil	ities has	
recommended to the Council a plan an	mendment which	incorporates	these change	≥s
and responds to the needs of citizen	ns of King Cou	inty who are d	levelopmental]	Ly
disabled, and				
WHEREAS, the Washington State	Department of	Social and H	Mealth Service	≥ S
has indicated that state funds are	available to s	support servic	e increases;	
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by	y the Council	of King Count	у:	
A. The 1982 King County Deve	lopmental Disa	bilities Plan	is hereby	
amended in accordance with the change	ges proposed i	n the 1982 Ki	ng County	
Developmental Disabilities Plan amen	ndment documen	ıt.		
B. The King County Executive	is authorized	to transmit	this 1982	
King County Developmental Disabilit	ies Plan amend	ment to the D	epartment	
of Social and Health Services.				
PASSED this 14th day of June,	1982.			
	COUNTY COUNCIL			
Δηηρεςη• Chair	Lois i	North		
1. 1. Da	incii i			
DEPITYCLER OF the Council				

MOTION NO 5480

King County State of Washington Randy Revelle, King County Executive

Department of Rehabilitative Services

King County Court House Third Avenue and James Street Seattle, Washington 98104



Division of Human Services

- Mental Health Board
- Board for Developmental Disabilities
- Aging Programs
- Involuntary Treatment Services

May 20, 1982

The Honorable Randy Revelle King County Executive Room 400 King County Courthouse Seattle, WA 98104

Re: King County Developmental Disabilities Plan Amendment

Dear Mr. Revelle:

I am forwarding a proposed amendment to the 1982 King County Developmental Disabilities Plan on behalf of the King County Board for Developmental Disabilities.

This amendment reflects extensive planning during the past eight months by board members, in cooperation with provider agencies and state case managers. For the first time, actual client needs assessment data were available and used in developing the amended plan of services.

The proposed amendment increases the amount of funding allocated to clients being returned to King County from state institutions and for expansion of support for clients living independently. Also, additional clients will be served through some reductions in rates paid to provider agencies.

I seek your assistance in expediting executive and council review of the amendment. We are hoping for council approval early in June.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely.

HARRY FAY, Chairman King County Board for Developmental

Disabilities

HF:vpd

Enclosure

cc: Tom Fitzsimmons, Manager, Program Development ATTN: Anna Hospodarsky, Executive Assistant

Shelly Yapp, Director, Budget Department

ATTN: Gary Kiyonaga, Budget Analyst

TO: Randy Revelle, King County Executive

DATE: May 24, 1982

FROM: Merlyn M. Bell, Acting Director, Rehabilitative Services

SUBJECT: King County Developmental Disabilities Plan Amendment

Enclosed are the materials necessary for the King County Developmental Disabilities Plan Amendment.

I think you will find that a careful job has been done in the preparation of these amendments.

Because the current contract expires on July 1, 1982, it is critical that the amendments be transmitted expeditiously to the Council and that they act quickly. I am sure that you appreciate the urgency of this matter.

MMB:1h

Enclosure

KING COUNTY DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES PLAN AMENDMENT

SUBMITTED TO

RANDY REVELLE

BY THE

KING COUNTY BOARD FOR DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

Prepared by Ralph Larson Human Services Division May 21, 1982 This amendment to the 1982 Developmental Disabilities Plan reflects a number of changes that have occurred beginning in September of 1981. These changes are:

- State guidelines for the provision of services to people who are developmentally disabled;
- State conducted needs assessment of all adults eligible for DDD services including recommendations for client movement among programs;
- Rate reductions;
- 4. Additional funds;
- 5. New programs.

The allocations recommended by the Board for Developmental Disabilities were selected from options limited by financial considerations. The dilemma has been to choose wisely between the equally distasteful alternatives of cutting people from service or cutting the rate of reimbursement to agencies for services.

1. State Guidelines

In 1981 a broadly representative state Task Force compiled a series of guidelines for the provision and evaluation of services to people who are developmentally disabled. The guidelines state that services shall 1) move the person to an environment that enhances his or her status, 2) provide visible growth in community involvement, and 3) reduce the person's dependency on outside support. These were published in September of 1981 and were expected to serve as the basis for 1982 contracting for service. Because the guidelines called for far-reaching changes, the county negotiated to postpone implementation of the guidelines until July of 1982. As a result, the 1982 plan and contracts were for 6 months, and the remaining monies were placed in a contingency fund awaiting completion of additional planning and development of a budget for the second half of the year.

The state guidelines called for agencies to be evaluated and approved under a given set of criteria. It was understood that many agencies needed more than a few months to improve their organizational and service delivery capabilities to the approvable level. For that reason, the state only required that 25% of the state/county contract funds for adults needed to be added to the approved category for 1982. The state

and county board representatives recognize that the process of meeting the guidelines is one that will take 3-5 years. Those programs not found approvable would still be able to contract as interim service providers.

Beginning in the fall of 1981, state and county staff with the assistance of outside consultants devised a rating guide based on the state guidelines to evaluate agencies for approved status (see attachment 1). Following that, site visits were made to agencies which expressed the intention of contracting for services. The site visit teams consisted of Developmental Disabilities board members, state and county staff, and consultants. Of a possible 200 points, the Board set 100 points as necessary for approved status. Actual scores ranged from 16 to 179.

2. Needs Assessment

The state, through the revised Guidelines, also changed the categories of services from Living and Social Skills Training and Prework Training to Community Integration, Subsidized Work and Work Training (SW&WT) Specific Job Training (SJT), and Employment Support. In order to determine where people should be placed within these new categories, the state DDD Field Services staff conducted a needs assessment on all adults elible for DDD services.

From this assessment, it became evident to the Board for Developmental Disabilities that not only were there a large number of people not receiving necessary services, but there were many people in services whose needs had changed and who should be moved to other programs. Attachment 2 graphically depicts the need for movement when comparing the current program involvement of people as shown on the lower half with their current needs identified during the Field Services needs assessment and shown on the upper half of the chart.

The Board for Developmental Disabilities, in cooperation with DDD Field Services and service providers, is planning for a phased movement of the people. Initial expansion of program will take place in the Specific Job Training and Employment Support programs with some reduction planned in Community Integration. Attachment 3 provides a comparison between statements of the needs of adults eligible for DDD services and the final proposal adopted by the Board.

3. Rate Reductions

In order to provide services to at least some of the currently unserved people (as mentioned above in needs assessment), the Board for Developmental Disabilities made the difficult decision to reduce the rates paid

for the Interim Community Integration and Interim Subsidized Work and Work Training programs. The rate for Interim Community Integration was reduced by 17.4% (from \$10.90 to \$9.00 per day) and the rate for Interim Subsidized Work and Work Training was reduced by 8.4% (from \$11.35 to \$10.40 per day). The rate reductions allowed for funding an additional 37 persons in program for the six months contract period who otherwise could not have been served under the first half year's rate structure.

4. Additional Funds (See Attachment 4)

a. State Residential

Additional funding has been made available by DSHS for the Tenant Support program, a program that provides for training and support of people residing in their own independent (non staffed) residential setting. Initially, the intensive programs provide for livein staff within the home or apartment. Staff hours are reduced as the individuals gain skills necessary for them to live without the constant staff support.

b. State Title XIX

Additional funding has been made available to provide services to previously unserved persons residing in the three Title XIX funded residential centers within King County (Burien Developmental Center, Interlake Manor in Bellevue, and UCPA Residence in Shoreline).

Additional funding has also been granted to provide for aides within the employment and community integration programs. The majority of the Title XIX funded people are physically disabled as a result of cerebral palsy and thus need assistance in meeting their daily needs (mobility, feeding, toileting). The addition of aides will allow these individuals to more fully participate in their daily programs and free other staff time for training.

c. State WAC 275-25-520

Additional funding has been made available by DSHS for 19 persons returned to the community from DSHS operated institutions. It is standard procedure of DSHS to provide additional funds to counties for people returning from institutions.

5. New Programs

As discussed above under Additional Funds, the major increase in funding to the King County Developmental Disabilities program relates to the expansion of the Tenant Support program to allow for provision of the service to an additional 34 people. One new provider, Creative Living Services, is also being added to handle some of this expansion in the North Seattle-Shoreline area.

A new program jointly sponsored by the Sno-Valley Developmental Center and Community Enterprises of Issaquah will be offered to place people in those areas into competitive employment. This will be piloted during the last half of 1982 with the intent of finding jobs for 6 people.

The other change is a planned expansion of the contract with Seattle Day Nursery to offer specialized programs to children who are developmentally delayed and referred to the agency by Children's Protective Services. Seattle Day Nursery plans to offer the services at its Broadway and Holly Park branches in addition to the John Day branch where the program is currently being offered. Transportation will also be provided to help insure participation in the program.

TO: Judy Frolich

DATE: April 6, 1982

FROM: Ellen Minotti, Student Intern MM.

SUBJECT: Rater's Guide for approved programs

One aspect of the new Developmental Disabilities plan is the requirement that all agencies applying for approved status and therefore for contracts, must be visited and evaluated by a team comprised of county staff, Developmental Disabilities board members, DDD staff and other people knowledgeable in the area being assessed. The rater's guide is the structure used by those teams to provide uniformity in the evaluations by asking the same set of questions of agencies in each service category.

The guide addresses two areas: 1) mandatory program requirements, and 2) desired program requirements. The first deals with such issues as health and safety standards; city, county, and state permits; and the existence of written goals and objectives. These are rated as "yes" meaning completed, and "no" meaning that some aspect is not in compliance. An agency must have a "yes" to be approvable.

The desired program requirements are derived from the 1982 Developmental Disabilities plan and meet new state guidelines for evaluation based on outcome. Agencies dealing with child development and employment services have been rated according to how well they met specific 1) programmatic, 2) organizational, and 3) outcome principles derived for each program. Team members rate the agencies individually and then confer to reach a consensus which becomes the group's rating. This team approach minimizes any one person's bias from dominating the rating. There are a possible 200 points to be earned. At present, an agency must earn at least 100 points in order to be approvable. These ratings are used to determine a priority-ordered list of agencies to receive contracts to serve developmentally disabled clients.

EM:eh

King County Developmental Disabilities Program:Client Enrollment:

			Comparison of	Comparison of Current to Proposed	posed	
				00		
PROPOSED CLIENT ENROLLMENT	NT ENROLLMENT			456 clients		
0 = 5 clients						
. •						
			•	176 clients		
				: •	153 clients	
			• •	= • _		
		130 clients		-))	
		= 0 0 0	• •	• •	E 6	
						22 cl
			#00000			
		0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0	0	=
		00000	00000	00000	00000	0 0 1
IN NON-COUNTY PROGRAM	NOT IN PROGRAM	COMMUNITY INTEGRATION	SUBSIDIZED WORK	SPECIFIC JOB TRAINING	EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT	INDEPE
	Transfer of the second	LESS INDEP./COMPETITIVE	ETITIVE	MORE INDE	MORE INDEP./COMPETITIVE	A
0000	0	• • • •	• • • •	• • • •		
24 clients	0 0 0	•	• • • •	•		
	0	• • • • •	• • • • •			
	0	• • • • • •	•	40 clients	•	
	0	•	• • • • • • •			
	0	• • • • •	• • • • •		ŧ	
	0	•	• • • • • •			
	0					
))	TOD CITEURS		;		
	230 cliente					
		•			,	
CURRENT CLIENT O = 5 clients	IT ENROLLMENT		• •			
			478 cliente			
			4/0 Cllents			

Attachment 3

DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

SUMMARY SHEET

NUMBER OF CLIENTS PER SERVICE CATEGORY

·		loy. port	SJT	SWWT	Comm. Integ.	<u>Total</u>
Needs Assessmer	nt non-XIX XIX Total Not in program	138 6 144 (50)	136 <u>36</u> 172 (43)	316 124 440 (75)	58 75 133 (50)	889 (218)
Current Caseloa (Feb. Billing)	non-XIX XIX Total	29 	41	370 <u>64</u> 434	77 124 201	705
RFP Allocation	OJT non-XIX XIX Total	12 35 47	<42→ 74 <42→ 74	326 124 450	48 80 128	741
Agency Requests	non-XIX XIX Total	97+ 97	85 85	445 108 553	79 138 217	952
Task Force Recommend	non-XIX XIX Total	46	61 61	369 118 487	72 110 182	776

Attachment 4

PLAN AMENDMENT SUMMARY

1982 REVENUES

KING COUNTY DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES PROGRAM

Revenue Source	Current Allocation	Revised Allocation	Revised Total
State Residential	\$ 606,820	\$ 193,933	\$ 800,753
State Title XIX	555,131	95,146	650,277
State WAC 275-25-520	1,648,299	38,721	1,687,020
County Millage	377,151		377,151
Total	\$3,187,401	\$327,800	\$3,515,201

KING COUNTY DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES PRO Budget for July 1 - December 31, 1982

		Resid	Residential Ser	Services	sans	Subsidized Work	Mork	Training		Specif.	
Agency	Child Devel	Tenant Support	Alter. Living	Total	Approved State/Co. Tit	ved Title XIX	State/Co. Ti	Im Title XIX	Total	Training	Suppor
Children's Clinic	20,160										
Community Enterprises					22,983	25,254			48,237		
Community Home Health		122,028	19,399	141,427							
Community Living		88,378	12,315	100,693							
Creative Living		136,563		136,563							
Custom Industries							40,935	30,888	71,823		
Epilepsy Association											
Highline Comm. Coll.		-								20,340	9,60
Industrial Skills							19,968		19,968		
Interaction											15,00
King County ARC		78,282	40,378	118,660							
Lighthouse					82,350	8,186			91,036		
Merrywood School	18,000										
North/East Multi Svc.											
Northwest Center	36,000				45,009		160,211		205,220	14,400	
Pediatric Therapy Ctr.	21,440										
Randolph Carter							29,133		29,133		
Renton Voc. Tech. Inst.										12,683	
Seattle Cent. Com. Coll.										16,336	
Seattle Day Nursery	11,600										
SKCAC Industries							49,173	29,344	78,517		
Sno-Valley Dev. Ctr.	7,000						11,107		11,107		9,20
So. K.C. Multi-Svc. Ctr.											
United Cerebral Palsy							35,318	72,758	108,076		
Univ, of Wash, CDMRC	11,000									31,200	24,69
Valley Birth to Five	19,300										
Vashon Children's Centre	2,700										
WISER Vocational Inst.											
Wonderland Dev. Ctr.	18,000										
Contingency							12,258		12,258		
Division Human Services											
Totals	165,200	425,251	72,092	497,343	150,842	33,440	358,103	132,990	675,375	94,959	58,49