

## **Minutes of Long Term Care Coordinating Council Meeting on April 11, 2007**

**Meeting called to order at 10:07am by Chairwoman Roberts.**

**The Chair welcomes the new members to the LTCCC, Maureen Maigret, Dr. David Dosa and Senator Rhoda Perry.**

**Senator Gibbs moved to approve the minutes from the February 28, 2007 meeting of the council. The council gave unanimous approval to the minutes from the previous meeting.**

**The Chair postponed item 3 on the agenda – Report from Ray Rusin, DOH.**

**The Chair thanked the legislative committee and the chairwoman, Senator Gibbs, for their hard work, sifting through important legislation and presenting their findings and recommendations to the full council.**

**Jennifer Wood presented a breakdown of the nursing loan repayment bills, all of which were slightly different.**

**A question was raised as to whether the council will support all of the nursing loan repayment bills or will suggest an omnibus bill comprising the most important issues from all of the bills. There was**

**a discussion of the importance of the inclusion of loan forgiveness of persons pursuing the ability to become nursing faculty. The council's bill from last year contained this language and the council agreed that this issue should be included in the council's support of any legislation. There was a discussion of what types of facilities should be included in the bills. The chair suggested that the entire continuum of LTC nurses, including those in assisted living facilities should be included in the bills.**

**The consensus of the council was that the 3 bills (or bill sets) that do not include the Center for Professional Development will be supported by the council and the chair will send letters on behalf of the council to relevant committee chairs expressing support and suggesting amendments to ensure that all of the bills include nursing faculty and include eligibility for the full continuum of LTC nurses.**

**The question was raised about what to do with the bills that address the Center for Professional Development. The consensus was that sending a different letter regarding these bills would dilute the effect of the council's advocacy on the other nursing loan repayment bills and that these bills should be held for further discussion by the council at this time.**

**Senator Gibbs began a discussion of the legislative worksheet, first going through the bills which the legislative committee recommended for full council endorsement.**

## **Bill Number Council Position Comments**

### **S-290 Council Supports**

### **S-326, H-5946 Council Supports**

**S-328, H-5855 Council Supports** There was discussion about the burden of proof to determine status as domestic partner

**S-407, H-6041 Council Supports** The chair mentioned the budget issues facing the state. Senator Gibbs suggests that the council gives support recognizing the challenge of this budget year. The council agreed.

### **S-412 Council Supports**

**S-588, H-5111 Further Study Needed** Council would like more information on what addition Perry/Sullivan made to the composition of the global caseload budget and a determination if other items should be added to the bill for reporting to the CEC.

### **S-743, H-6078 Council Supports**

**S-789, H-5822 Council Supports** Requests that the letter of support clarify that DHS states that the fiscal impact of this bill is \$6.2 million, but that this figure represents full funding of all eligible persons' premiums and coverage gaps. The bill does not require this coverage, but rather authorizes the coverage and requires that RIPAE's budget not be reduced. Thus the actual fiscal impact to comply with the minimum provisions of the legislation would be approximately

**\$200,000.**

**H-5145 Council Supports With addition of MHRH and requests that letter state the close relationship that should exist between the LTCCC and the task force.**

**H-5371 Council supports the issue but feels the bill as written needs to be amended. Note: This bill has been significantly amended and will require a new discussion by the council.**

**H-5612 Council Supports**

**S-471 Council Supports Requests that the letter of support question the budget provided to the system.**

**S-638 Council Supports**

**At this point the chair suggested that in the interest of time the council refrain from examining piecemeal those bills that were not recommended for endorsement by the legislative committee. The chair opened the floor to anyone who wanted to discuss any of the bills remaining on the list in the absence of a committee recommendation for support.**

**Bill Number Council Position Comments**

**H-6004 No support at this time The council determined that they would not support this bill, but asked that a letter be drafted expressing philosophical support for increased nursing home staffing but expressing that the bill as written cannot be supported**

**because of a lack of financial and staffing resources in the state.**

**S-417, H-5440 Support for portions of the bill** The discussion of these bills began with the question of whether the rates should be set in statute or through regulation. The Chair stated that the legislative committee supported the energy practices portion of the bills and opposed the funding cuts, but stayed silent on setting the rate in statute. The council agreed that the letter express that sentiment.

### **S-253 Council Supports**

**S-388, H-5739 Council Supports** There was discussion and clarification of annuity piece of bill.

**S-29, H5099aa No action** There was a suggestion that the council support the legislation because LTC patients need quality nursing care if they need acute care at a hospital. After discussion the council took no action.

**S-186 No action** There was a statement that RIde drivers already receive background checks and that RIPTA received a federal grant to place cameras on the RIde vehicles.

The chair suggested that the council discuss the three budget issues brought forward by the legislative committee.

**CIS Networks –** Information was presented to the council with a request that the council oppose the reduction of CIS staff from 19 to 6 and retain the current structure of funding CIS staff exclusively in community senior centers. The importance of supporting the senior center structure was emphasized. The representatives from DEA

**explained that the information that was shared with the council regarding the CIS network (that the number of CIS workers be reduced from 19 to 6 with a corollary reduction in funding) was not entirely accurate or did not reflect the nuances of the budget proposal. DEA asserted that the proposal is not simply to change the number of CIS staff but to reallocate them differently. The reallocation will take place through an RFP process. Rather than specific funding for 19 CIS workers in that number of sites the funds will be consolidated into seven “regional” sites that will be determined in the RFP process. DEA stated that by making this change, the CIS network can be partially paid for with federal funds.**

**A Current CIS staff spoke about what she does and appealed to the council to continue the current structure and funding asserting that the proposed alternative will not meet the needs of seniors for face to face consultation in senior centers and through home visits.**

**The Chair suggested that perhaps this issue needs more of an exhaustive hearing than is provided through an overall agency budget hearing.**

**There was discussion that CIS workers as currently structured provide services to people with disabilities and not just elders.**

**DEA stated that The POINT needs to be out in the community to maintain its federal funding and the use of the CIS network would**

**fulfill that requirement.**

**The chair stated that the issue needs attention in the legislature and that she would advocate for that on behalf of the council.**

**Susan Sweet moved that the LTCCC oppose the DEA plan to change the current CIS structure, seconded by M. Maigret. There was discussion that the council may not have enough information to make an informed decision on this issue and that further public hearings by the Finance Committee specifically focused on this budget proposal would be beneficial. After the motion and second the council determined to oppose this budget proposal with DEA abstaining from that determination.**

**Cost of Living Adjustment for Nursing Homes (Budget Article 12) – The discussion focused on the ability to maintain quality of care without funding increases to match cost increases. In addition, it was discussed that postponing the COLA may result in a lower ability for continuity of care. The council decided to oppose the proposed budget cut.**

**Adult Day Center Licensing (Budget Article 24) – The council decided to hold this item until the next meeting.**

**Perry/Sullivan Implementation (No article) -**

**Maureen Maigret raised the issue of budget issues surrounding the**

**implementation of the Perry/Sullivan Act. DHS has stated as part of the working group process that savings seen through implementation of Perry/Sullivan may not be able to be reinvested in strengthening the system to further support Perry/Sullivan. Maigret moved that the LTCCC formally weigh in to encourage that all aspects of the Perry/Sullivan Act and its funding be supported in its original intent. After a motion by Maureen Maigret and second by XX the council approved this position.**

**The next meeting was announced to be May 9 with the location to be determined as Room 313 is not available on that date.**

**The Meeting adjourned at 11:54am.**