1		
2	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA	
3	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE	
	HOMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE	
4	IRVIS OFFICE BUILDING	
5	ROOM G50	
6	HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA	
7	PUBLIC HEARING	
,	CHOICE OF A FULL CONTINUUM OF CARE FOR	
8	INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES	
9		
4.0		
10	TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 2019 9:02 A.M.	
11		
12		
	BEFORE:	
13	HONODADIE CEME DICIDOLAMO	
14	HONORABLE GENE DIGIROLAMO, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN	
<u> </u>	HONORABLE JOE HOHENSTEIN,	
15	ACTING MINORITY CHAIRMAN	
	HONORABLE STEPHANIE BOROWICZ	
16	HONORABLE BARBARA GLEIM	
17	HONORABLE JAMES GREGORY HONORABLE DOYLE HEFFLEY	
1 /	HONORABLE JONATHAN HERSHEY	
18	HONORABLE MIKE JONES	
	HONORABLE NATALIE MIHALEK	
19	HONORABLE LORI MIZGORSKI	
0.0	HONORABLE TOM MURT	
20	HONORABLE ERIC NELSON HONORABLE TODD POLINCHOCK	
21	HONORABLE JAMES STRUZZI	
	HONORABLE TARAH TOOHIL	
22	HONORABLE DANILO BURGOS	
	HONORABLE ISABELLA FITZGERALD	
23	HONORABLE KRISTINE HOWARD	
2.4	HONORABLE MAUREEN MADDEN	
24	HONORABLE DAN MILLER	
25		

1	INDEX	
2	NAME	PAGE
3	SUSAN JENNINGS	7
4	KEEPING INDIVIDUALS WITH INTELLECTUAL DISABILITIES SAFE	
5	DR. LEE WACHTEL	19
6	PSYCHIATRIST KENNEDY-KRIEGER CENTER	
7	HUGO DWYER EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	26
8	A VOICE OF REASON	
9	AMY LUTZ PRESIDENT	41
10	EASI NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SEVERE AUTISM	
11	TOM KASHATUS	51
12	PRESIDENT WHITE HAVEN FRIENDS AND FAMILIES	
13	IRENE MCCABE	5 9
14	PRESIDENT POLK CENTER FRIENDS AND FAMILIES	33
15	TRUDY SHEETZ	69
16	SELINSGROVE CENTER FAMILY MEMBER AND KIIDS REPRESENTATIVE	
17	DAN TORISKY	8 0
18	PAST PRESIDENT AUTISM SOCIETY OF AMERICA	
19	MARY WILLS	8 5
20	ACE PRESIDENT EBENSBURG CENTER	0 3
21	PATTY DEGEN	8 9
22	FAMILY MEMBER WHITE HAVEN CENTER	
23		
24		
25		

		J
1	SUBMITTED WRITTEN TESTIMONY	
2	* * *	
3	(See submitted written testimony and handouts	
4	online.)	
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18	Brenda J. Pardun, RPR	
19	Reporter, Notary Public	
20	Reporter, Notary rubire	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Nine o'clock, we're going to get this hearing underway.

And I would like to call this meeting or hearing of the Human Services Committee to order. And if I might ask everyone to stand for a Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Okay. Thank
you all for being here today. I think we got
a really, really important meeting to examine
as full continuum of care for individuals with
all types of disabilities. Really important
issue.

And I thought I might just start out, instead of taking roll call, let everybody, members that are here, just give them the opportunity to say hello and let you know where they're from.

And, Lori, I'll start out with you.

REPRESENTATIVE MIZGORSKI: Good

morning. My name is Lori Mizgorski. And I

represent the 30th District, and that is in

Allegheny County. 1 REPRESENTATIVE MIHALEK: Good 2 morning. I'm Natalie Mihalek. I represent at 3 4 40th District. It's parts of Allegheny County 5 and Washington County. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Good 6 7 morning, everyone. Gene DiGirolamo, from 8 Bucks County, 18th Legislative District. 9 REPRESENTATIVE TOOHIL: Good morning, 10 everyone. State Representative Tarah Toohil, 11 Luzerne County. White Haven Center is right 12 on the edge of my district, after 13 redistricting. REPRESENTATIVE BOROWICZ: Good 14 15 morning. 76th District, Stephanie Borowicz. 16 And I cover Clinton and part of Centre County. 17 REPRESENTATIVE FITZGERALD: Good 18 morning. Isabella Fitzgerald. I represent the 203rd District in Philadelphia, West Oak 19 Lane, East Oak Lane, and the lower northeast. 20 21 REPRESENTATIVE MURT: Tom Murt. I 22 represent part of Philadelphia and part of 23 Montgomery County. 24 REPRESENTATIVE MADDEN: Good morning. 25 Representative Madden, representing Monroe

County.

REPRESENTATIVE STRUZZI: Good morning. Jim Struzzi, 62nd District, Indiana County.

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Okay. With that, just a couple quick ground rules.

We are being recorded so the cameras are on. I'm not sure. I hope PCN picks up the hearing and broadcasts it because it's a really important issue.

And the way we're going to conduct the hearing is we're going to let everybody testify first, and then, with the time we have remaining till 11 o'clock or a little before 11:00, we'll open it up for questions and answers. So, when you testify, if you can please stick around. We might have some questions for you.

We do have to be finished before 11 o'clock. We are not allowed, by our House rules, to go past 11 o'clock when we start session. So, a few ground rules.

And with that, we'll have our first testifier, Susan Jennings. And her topic is going to be keeping intellectual disabilities

safe.

Susan, you can begin whenever you'd like. And I would ask you to try to talk as close into the microphone as possible so everybody can hear. Thank you.

MS. JENNINGS: Thank you, Chairman DiGirolamo.

And thank you to the members of the Human Services Committee for allowing us a platform to speak.

My name is Susan Jennings, and I am one of the founding members of KIIDS, Keeping Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities

Safe. We are a grass roots organization of parents, friends, families and advocates. And some of you have met us before when we came to lobby against HB 1650, which would have eliminated the services our loved ones so vitally needed.

And I'm proud to announce that we held a petition drive. We pounded the pavement. We gathered ten thousand one hundred twenty-three signatures in the space of about two months, which we will present to you later today in this hearing.

I am the mother of an autistic child named Joey, who found a wonderful quality of life and safety in one of our treasured state developmental centers, White Haven state center, after three years of suffering in the community.

My advocacy stems not only from my own son's residential experiences, but also because there will be a tsunami of young autistic adults entering the system who will be denied much needed care and the care that is appropriate for them because of an outdated, unrealistic deinstitutionalization ideology.

the only services offered to my son. His behaviors are severe. He could not be managed safely in the community. He was discharged from six different group homes. They section 302'd him into five different psychiatric wards. They tried to put him in a chemical straight jacket with powerful psychotropics, which backfired, and his life became a living hell.

Then we discovered the existence of

the intermediate care facilities, the state -the Pennsylvania state developmental centers.

But we ran into a brick wall. And that brick
wall was the policy of closed admissions. In
order to enter a Pennsylvania state
developmental center, a -- [inaudible] -developmental programs.

We took them to court. It cost us thousands of dollars. It cost the taxpayers thousands of dollars. And we won, all the way up through the commonwealth level, based upon the merits of our case. But no parent should have to go through that.

The thing that hurt me the most was that bureaucrats who are tasked with helping my son were the ones who were battling us to prevent him from getting the type of environment and living situation that was right for him.

Legal fees would be out of reach for many of parents. And so, their children languish on the waiting list.

The deinstitutionalization advocates with advanced degrees who do not have the same challenges as our parents with severe autism

and with medically fragile conditions are vexing because they would deny our children the right living situation for them, even if it's not something they would chose for themselves or their loved ones.

The need for appropriate housing is vast and growing. The CDC announced in 2018 that one in fifty-nine births would be an autistic child. Over the next decade, five hundred thousand of those autistic children will become adults. And there's nearly four hundred twenty-four thousand today on the waiting list for residential services.

We want to alert the new policy
makers and new lawmakers to the systemic
concerns we have with community group houses
in the community and other -- those other
types for the severe and profoundly disabled.
The deinstitutionalization ideology denies the
reality of their specialized needs and what
kind of care.

Breaking up the institutions was done without -- without considering the ramifications of separating vulnerable people from specialized care and without considering

that you are eliminating a critical safety net for those people.

And it's been already officially acknowledged that a joint report from the Health and Human Services from the Office of the Inspector General, from the Administration for Community Living, and from the Office of Civil Rights acknowledged that group home beneficiaries are at risk of serious harm. It is a systemic problem. And we will go into why it's a systemic problem.

Additionally, you may have all seen the media exposes of abuses, particularly in Philadelphia, with the group homes there, the Blossom group homes, and media exposes all across the country, which, as Dr. David Mandell, who's the director of the Center for Mental Health Policy and Services Research at the University of Pennsylvania, said, Small, diverse settings are often not up to the task of caring for individuals with more profound impairments.

And here's just a small sampling of -- for example, Nowhere to Go series.

Young people with severe autism languish weeks

or longer in hospitals. And that's what happened to my son.

And what happens is, when the group homes are unable to safely manage the care, then the profoundly disabled are shuttled back and forth from one dangerous setting to another, from community group houses to jails, from community group houses to hospitals, from community group houses to the street, from community group houses to nursing homes and back again. They have no safe haven. They have no consistency. They have no stability. They have only pain, fear, and trauma. And it strips them of their dignity as human beings. And that's why we entitled this Open the Doors to Dignity.

And you may say to me, But institutions, they cost too much. Actually, we're spending far more on escalating prison and court costs and inpatient hospitalizations. Large institutions are, in most instances, less expensive than community residences for challenging populations.

The closure advocates play a shell game with the legislature and with taxpayers.

It's called cost sharing. The community group homes are not all-inclusive. They rely upon other bureaucracies to pick up the costs that they don't. And when they cannot manage severe and challenging cases, they turn to police, the courts, the jails, the hospitals. So, while the cost for the Office of Developmental Programs looks like it's going down, the cost to the taxpayer and to you legislatures is going up for police, for courts, for jails, for hospitals, for psychiatric wards, and for emergency services.

The deinstitutionalization advocates insult our intelligence when they tell us that you can -- you can care for our people at less cost in some small, scattered diverse settings. But we know, from common sense, that businesses do not react this way.

There's cost savings in consolidation. They do not house each executive in a separate building. It costs more to heat, build, light, and maintain thousands of small, diverse settings.

The deinstitutionalization advocates also tell you that, if you take -- if you rob

the money from the institution for the community waiver services, you will eliminate the waiting list. This is demonstrably false. Eliminating the state centers will not eliminate the waiting list. Opening the state centers will eliminate the waiting list.

As you can see -- and I'll let you look at this at your leisure, a hundred ninety-six million more dollars were poured into the community with the community waiver services. That is actual fifty-eight million more than the entire state developmental center budget cost. And yet, they only decrease the waiting list by thirty-nine people. That is a disgrace.

So, they will also tell you that if you just put enough money in community waiver, they can do everything that the -- that the institution can do, that the intermediate care facilities can do, and that's just not true.

Here are the systemic shortcomes.

Group home businesses have to make a profit,
so they delegate front-line care to
inexperienced caregivers with negligible
training and minimal supervision. This is a

cost-cutting combination that leads to harm.

There are no supervisors on the premises. There are no clinicians on the premises. There are no doctors or nurses.

In a nursing home or an ICF, they're required by law to employ on-site registered nurses. Not a group home. Any nonmedical personnel can handle the drugs and is supposed to recognize the daily crises and emergencies that our folks have.

Additionally, the noncontiguous rule,

in order to meet community group home regulations, group homes must be located a certain distance from one another.

Consequently -- and I have ridden in the car with supervisors of group homes -- they spend the entire day driving from one group home to another. What do they not do? They don't interact with the staff. They don't interact with the residents. And the rest of their day they fill out paperwork. So, there is minimal supervision.

Front-line caregivers are expected to handle life and death situations on a fast-food budget -- on a fast-food wage. This

is why you have staff shortages. This is why
you have 30 to 70 percent staff turnovers,
because you're asking too much for too little.

In addition, because you are unwilling to
provide a therapeutic environmental or skilled
training for the aides, you have -- you have
to rely upon psychotropics as a chemical
straight jacket, which is brutal and inhumane
to the patients.

So, what we're asking for is that -that the legislature -- that you pass legislation opening the Pennsylvania state developmental centers to admission; you reverse the closed admissions policy; you invest and promote a wide range of residential service options, to include farmstead, homesteads, villages, campuses, and ICFs; and that you sponsor an objective, independent cost study on what will happen if this deinstitutionalization is carried out; and to stand with us, the voters and the families who are battling for the safety, health, and welfare of our loved one against powerful organizations who are promoting an unrealistic ideology.

The answer to this problem was codified in the supreme court decision

Olmstead, when they said, quote, But we recognize as well the state's need to maintain a range of facilities for the care and treatment of persons with diverse mental disabilities and the state's obligation to administer services with an even hand.

You have heard, ad nauseam, the hallmark propaganda phrase "everyday people, everyday lives." Well, I have a new one, I have a new quote, "real life, real people, real suffering, and real consequences," when deinstitutionalization takes place.

People -- and then I'm going to end with a quote from ethics professor Dominic

Sisti said: People really do deserve the best care that suits them. I don't see how that's even debatable.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Susan, thank you for your testimony.

And, next, we have of panel of four people who are going to testify. I'd ask them to come up. I think we have the chairs up

1	front. Dr. Lee Wachtel, who's a psychiatrist
2	at the Kennedy-Krieger Center; Hugo Dwyer,
3	executive director of Voice of Reason; Amy
4	Lutz, who's the president of EASI, National
5	Council of Severe Autism. And I believe we
6	have one testifier who's going to testify via
7	Skype, and that's Dan Torisky, who is the past
8	president of the Autism Society of America.
9	Is that all set up to Skype now?
10	Okay. It's all ready to go.
11	And before we get started, there's
12	some more members that have come in, and I'd
13	like to give them a chance to say hello and
14	let you know where they're from.
15	Joe.
16	REPRESENTATIVE HOHENSTEIN: Joe
17	Hohenstein, 177th District, which is northeast
18	Philadelphia.
19	REPRESENTATIVE BURGOS: Good morning.
20	Representative Burgos, Philadelphia, Temple
21	Hospital area.
22	REPRESENTATIVE POLINCHOCK:
23	Representative Todd Polinchock from the 144th,
24	central Bucks County.
25	REPRESENTATIVE HOWARD: Hi. Kristine

Howard, from the 167th, Chester County. 1 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Okay. 2 I think we are ready. So, Lee, I guess when 3 4 you get started. 5 MS. JENNINGS: I'd like to introduce Dr. Lee Wachtel, medical director at the 6 Kennedy-Krieger Center. 7 8 DR. WACHTEL: We are going to switch 9 the order. No problem. 10 Good morning. Thank you so much for 11 having me here with you this morning and 12 for giving me the opportunity to speak from 13 the physician's perspective on behalf of a very expanding group of individuals who don't 14 15 have the capacity to advocate for themselves but whose needs demand our immediate 16 17 attention. 18 I was just wondering the same, if this is working well. Okay. Is that better? 19 20 Sort of. Okay. It's seems -- it didn't seem 21 right. 22 So, I'm a psychiatrist. And I 23 specialize in the care of youth and young 24 adults with autism and other neuro

developmental disabilities, often in tandem

25

with intellectual disability, ranging from mild to profound.

I'm the medical director of the neuro behavioral unit at the Kennedy-Krieger Center Institute, which is in Baltimore, Maryland.

And I run an inpatient service. So, the neuro behavioral unit is an inpatient service dedicated to the care of children and adolescents who have neuro developmental disability who present with what are known in the field as challenging behaviors. That typically includes behaviors that are either self-injurious, aggressive, or disruptive, and often times in combination with each other.

My unit services patients from across the United States and from overseas, and typically represents what is known somewhat affectionately as the end-of-train line for individuals who present with the most horrific, intractable behavioral presentations that have literally brought their lives and the lives of their families and caregivers to a grinding halt.

My patients, if you will, are the ones who have hit themselves in the head so

1 many times that they've caused retinal 2 detachment, traumatic cataracts, and concussions, whose bodies may be covered in 3 open wounds or wounds that are various stages 5 of healing and scarring, who have sent caregivers to the emergency department in the 6 aftermath of assaultive behaviors, who live in 7 full-body protective equipment with large 9 in-home workers or exhausted parents 10 attempting to simply block their most 11 dangerous behaviors and live to see the next 12 day without another medical crisis, a 13 fruitless call to help -- for help to the 14 police or ambulance or emergency service or a 15 useless trip to the emergency room to only be 16 told that nothing can be done to help them.

4

8

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

These kids and their families are really the black sheep of the autism and disability community, and often don't have a place at the table in autism advocacy circles as they don't really represent the currently popular neuro diversity movement where everybody is just a little bit autistic and autism or developmental disability are presented as gifts to be cherished and

embraced, rather than major health concerns
that no parent in his right mind would choose
for his child anymore than he would choose for
his child to have cancer or organ failure.

In fact, if you discuss the alleged gift of autism with most of the parents I see, they'd probably suggest that you take it outside so they can punch you in the face, or, perhaps more charitably, ask if you'd like to come and live at home, wear protective equipment worthy of an ice hockey goalie, sleep maybe two or three hours a day, clean up blood, urine, feces, and vomit as it accumulates around your house, while you also try to take care of yourself, the other kids living in your home, and maintain employment, so you can keep the electricity and water on.

The fact of the matter is, in the real world, that people exist on the entire range of the autism and neuro developmental disability spectrum, including those who aren't nice to see and who don't represent what every parent with a toddler who's just received an autism, Down syndrome, or other development disability diagnosis is hoping to

have twenty years down the road.

These people are citizens of your state, citizen of the United States and the world beyond, deserve our care just as much as those on the much higher-functioning end of the spectrum might need special initiatives so they can be mainstreamed in classrooms, participate fully in sports and community activities, or attend universities with necessary supports.

Helping those at the most dire end of the spectrum neither obfuscates or negates assistance or attention to the less-afflicted end of the spectrum.

So, I've mentioned that I work largely with youth or people under age twenty-one, but I'm really here today to speak on behalf of all the severely afflicted children in my career who've already become adults and those who are heading into adulthood.

A lot of resources are focused on children with disability, but at the end of the day, these children are going to spend a much greater percentage of their lives as

adults with disability, and most likely are going to have the same degree of impairment and associated needs as during their childhoods. Only, as adults, now they are faced with aging parents, diminished resources, and programming options, as they no longer qualify for school services, diminished safeguards such as substituted decision-making from parents or appointed proxies, and often most importantly, an all-too-frequent lack of quality, safe, and meaningful living options.

This is a public health concern for a segment of our adult population that can't be dismissed simply because their challenges don't warm our hearts in the same way that the story of the autistic adult who ran the Boston Marathon in two hours and forty-six minutes a couple weeks ago might.

So, "choice" is a key word in the adult disability world and is often invoked with more than one false notion. First, that everyone with a disability would necessarily make the same choices as those on the higher-functioning end of the spectrum. And, secondly, that everybody is capable of making

an informed choice.

The fact of the matter is that, while some autistic adults can engage in discussion and analysis of living options, there are others whose ability to choose doesn't extend beyond choosing between an M and M or a Skittle as a reinforcer. While some adults with disability could manage basic household tasks and take a bus to work, others can't toilet themselves or brush their teeth independently. And some continue to engage, throughout their entire life span, in very dangerous behaviors that are a function not only of their disability but the frequent comorbidity of additional psychopathology.

These might not represent politically correct statements, but they do represent the hard truth, and PC behavior and fantasy thinking can't change biology. Regardless of the severity of said biology, every one of these individuals should still have access to safe and dignified adult living solutions, as they transition away from the primary childhood home -- because truly, no one can live at home forever -- solutions that allow

for meaning and joy according to each person's unique attributes, challenges, and potential.

I urge you to listen carefully to the families and other providers who speak here today on behalf of those who'll never have their own voice in this chamber and move towards meaningful change to better their lives and those of the families who hold them most dear.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Okay, Doctor. Thank you.

And, Hugo, whenever you're ready.

MR. DWYER: My name's Hugo Dwyer, and I'm the executive director of VOR. We're a national nonprofit, started thirty-six years ago in Chicago. Our original name, back in the days before we stopped using the "R" word, was Voice of the Retarded, because that was the operative word. We took that out. We changed it. Now, we are A Voice of Reason, but we still are the ones who speak up for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

I need to talk louder? I'm trying.

I'm not a loud talker. It's probably -- is that better? There we go. I was going to say, it's probably not the microphone. It's probably me. I'm not a loud talker.

I'm hoping that you are here with open minds, trying to figure out how to deal with the problem that we've never really dealt with correctly. For centuries, we treated everybody with any level of developmental or intellectual disability like they needed to be cast aside, warehoused, kept out of major -- regular society and so on.

In the '60s, we got a more enlightened attitude, maybe we can treat these people, maybe some of them are able to integrate into society. We created group homes. We started doing more therapy for people. We created ICFs, which instead of an institution that just warehouses people, was more like a hospital, and it treated people as treatable patients. And the residents were given protocols for care and so on.

Our opponents still like to refer to us as institutions. They like the idea that

if they call us an institution, it brings -it evokes the memory of warehousing

facilities. A modernize ICF is nothing like
the old Pennhurst, the old Willowbrook. It is
much more like a treatment center.

But starting, I guess, about twenty, thirty years ago, we sort of overshot.

Instead of treating everybody like they belonged in a warehouse and then moving towards let's try these other things, we took the success of the higher-functioning people in group homes and said, Hey, this is working for them. Let's do it for everybody.

So, instead of having everybody in warehouses, now we're trying to put everybody into inclusive environments. That's not right either. This is a wide spectrum of people with a wide range of abilities and disabilities, needs for different levels of care and treatment. And until we accept that fact, we're never going to get it right.

We need more money for services, because at the time being, we've got people on one end of the spectrum fighting for the same piece of the pie that other people on the

other end of the spectrum are trying to get.

2 We've got people who are left out of the

3 kitchen and can't get a piece of the pie. We

4 have to figure out a way to help everybody.

And the way you do that is you make a more

6 efficient, more effective system.

The people with higher needs are always going to cost you more money.

That's -- I think you can all figure that one out. So, no matter whether you put them in a group home or an ICF, they're going to cost you more. The difference is, if it's the right facility, you are going to save money. If it's the wrong facility, you're going to be

wasting money. So, let's get this right.

I have a brother who's sixty-two
years old. Dr. Wachtel described him fairly
well. He had self-injurious behaviors. He
banged his head all the time, detached a
retina. He's got pica. So, if you have
anything loose, he will pick it up and put it
in his mouth. He is in a special cottage for
people with pica. They can't wear clothing
with buttons on them, because buttons might
fall off and get picked up.

And he had a roommate at one time,
who left and went into a community, a special
pica group home, with four people and two
caregivers. One caregiver was late for his
shift. One of the residents was acting out.
The caregiver looked after the resident who
was acting out, and my brother's ex-roommate,
Larry, swallowed a hot dog and choked to death
three weeks after starting at this home.

So, you get the care in a larger facility. It is a higher level of care. I truly believe my brother would not be alive if he had been in a different, less -- lower-monitored environment.

They -- you know, it's not just because they're hired to do it. It's a calling for them. They want to show up to work. They want to try to relate to Tom. They want to speak with him.

He has -- over the years, he's had one or two caregivers who really can get through to him and ask him to do things and he will do them. You know, whether it's trying to brush his teeth -- which he still doesn't

do very well -- or pulling up his pants after toileting. One or two people can get through to him and get him to do that, and others have a harder time. This is Tom. This is what it is.

But if you were to take Tom out of
the ICF and put him with only one or two
caregivers and people who haven't been exposed
to Tom for very long, maybe worked there for
six months or a year -- because the turnover
rate in group homes is very high -- you're
isolating him. You're not integrating him.

If you want to integrate people, you've got
to -- have to do it with people you can
integrate. Tom is not one of those people.

You know, in the deaf community,
there was an effort to integrate people in
with hearing people. And they'd put them into
classrooms with hearing people and so on. And
they found right away that what they called
the lease restrictive environment wasn't
working because these were people who couldn't
communicate by anything except American Sign
Language. So, they stopped doing that. They
put them in what they called the language rich

environment, put them with others like them who they could communicate with, and they all thrived.

So, they made an exception for one disabled population to do what was best for them, and it worked. And we're asking the same for our population. They don't integrate well. But they do thrive in a certain environment. They're not isolated. And this is, you know, the best way to do it.

The elderly community, they're free to choose among their peers, in the elderly communities, retirement communities, assisted living communities. We encourage this. We promote this. And these facilities are designed to take care of people who are aging. We should do the same with our kids and ICFs.

When your kids go to -- finish high school and go off to college, you're probably going to put them all into a dormitory. And these are not the least restrictive environments. And God knows, you don't necessarily want your kids to leave high school, go into college and be in the least restrictive environment. You want

protections. You want to know that somebody's looking after them, that they're in an environment that's geared towards their needs.

The only time we don't do this is with people with I/DD. We've decided that the least restrictive environment is right for everybody. We've decided that integrating into society of nondisabled people is right for everybody. It's right for some. It's not right for everybody. We can't look at this community as if what's right for one person is right for everybody. But that's what we've been doing.

This -- the people who want to do

that refer to Olmstead, which Susan brought up

earlier, as a integration mandate. They say

that it mandates integration into the

community. It does not. It offers that -- it

offers a pathway for those who want it, but

it's actually a very balanced decision. There

are several key provisions that determine

whether or not people can go in.

Which slide are we on? Go back one. First slide.

Supreme court recognized the need for

the diverse needs of people with developmental disabilities. They wrote: Unjustified isolation, we hold, is properly regarded as discrimination based on disability. But we recognize, as well, the states need to maintain a range of facilities with the care and treatment of persons with diverse mental disabilities and the state's obligation to administer these services with an even hand.

And they went on to say: We emphasize that nothing in the ADA -- American Disability Act -- or its implementing regulations condones termination of institutional settings for persons unable to handle or benefit from community settings. Nor is there any federal requirement that community-based treatment be imposed on patients who do not desire it.

So, in these two paragraphs, they recognize the need for both types of facilities and they maintained that. They went on to say that they have a need for standards, determining the appropriate level of care: Consistent with these provisions,

the state generally may rely on the reasonable assessments of its own professionals in determining whether an individual meets the essential eligibility requirements for habilitation in a community-based program.

Absent such qualification, it would be inappropriate to remove a patient from the more restrictive setting.

So, what -- they weren't talking about having legislators or people in agencies, government-funded agencies, make these decisions. They were talking about having the health care professionals who deal with our loved ones make those determinations. And they said that they should make those determinations based on a three-pronged program.

Under Title II of the ADA, states are required to provide community-based treatment for persons with mental disabilities, one, with the state's treatment professionals determine that such a place is appropriate; two, the affected persons do not oppose such treatment, and that includes parents and guardians as well as the affected person;

three, that the placement can be reasonably accommodated, taking into account the resources available to the state and the needs of others with mental disabilities.

So, it's -- there's a real balance here that you probably will not hear from the people who just say that Olmstead is all about integration.

The justices, in their majority
opinion, concurred that, As already observed
by the majority, the ADA is not responsibly
read (sic) to impel states to phase out
institutions, placing patients in need of
close care at risk. Some individuals may need
institutional care from time to time -[coughing] -- excuse me -- to stabilize acute
psychiatric symptoms.

Here we go.

For other individuals, no placement outside the institution may ever be appropriate. For these persons, institutional settings are needed and must remain available.

So, that's the law. That's federal supreme court decision.

They went on to say it would be --

Justice Kennedy went on to warn about the possibility of tragic consequences for ICF residents if this is misinterpreted. He said: It would be unreasonable, it would a tragic event then, were the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to be interpreted so that states have some incentive, for fear of litigation, to drive those in need of medical care and treatment out of appropriate care and into settings with too little assistance and supervision. In light of these concerns, if the principle of liability announced by the Court is not applied with caution and circumspection, states may be pressured into attempting compliance on the cheap, placing marginal patients into integrated settings devoid of the services and attention necessary for their condition.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, again this is the federal law.

This is one of the things you've got to keep in the back of your mind as you determine how best to treat the population of individuals with intellectual disabilities in Pennsylvania.

So, in spite of the supreme court's

ruling in Olmstead, several states have closed their intermediate care facilities. What happens to those who do not transition successfully? Does anybody know?

Well, one thing that happens is they die. There is a thing called transfer trauma or relocation stress syndrome. A lot of people just die within six months of moving from an old-term home -- long-term home into a new setting, no matter what the setting.

But, beyond that, sometimes it gets worse. That happened in Georgia, when the justice department forced the closure of all the state's ICFs. They moved really quickly to shut everything down, moved people into group homes. And in 2013, five hundred people died in community care while under the auspices of Georgia Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Disabilities.

Eighty-two were classified as unexpected deaths, including sixty-eight who were developmentally disabled.

In 2014 -- because they stopped the program and restarted it -- so, in 2014, an additional four hundred ninety-eight people

who were receiving community care died, including a hundred forty-one who were considered unexpected deaths.

So, that's an example of really doing it wrong.

The other way -- [coughing] -- sorry.

I'm not used to talking much.

The other consequences of people who are not receiving the right level of services, if -- when a state closes all its ICFs, the state is sometimes forced to move people into other states and use their ICFs. This has happened in New York, New Jersey, Indiana, Oregon. You're moving people away from their families, from their caregivers. You're moving them away from the state being able to look after them and have any monitoring of them. The monitoring decreases. You're saying, Okay. We'll let the recipient state do the monitoring. And they may; they may not. In many cases, they haven't.

Other times, people wind up in nursing facilities that offer no treatment, and they're not really equipped for people with I/DD. Or they wind up in emergency rooms

for extended stays.

There was a case of somebody in Connecticut who was there for six months because no group home could take him. The ICF was closed to admission. They didn't have a plan for this person. And, of course, they wind up in prison, because they're in an inappropriate care, and they escape, they act out against police. Sometimes people have been killed. There was a child killed for acting out in a movie theater recently, about a year ago. This is most common with people who have severe autism with tendencies towards violent behaviors.

So, among those who failed to adapt to a group home environment, we see that the results are either death or moving from an appropriate institution, an ICF, to an inappropriate institution, an out-of-state facility, a nursing facility, an emergency room, or a prison.

A better solution would be to preserve your intermediate care facilities in Pennsylvania. Invest in them. Make them better. Improve the scope of their offerings

1 so that they meet the needs of those not 2 served in the group home system. 3 Thank you for your time. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Good. 4 5 Thank you. Some other members have come in, so 6 I'd like to give them an opportunity to say 7 8 hello. 9 Doyle. 10 REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: Thank you, 11 Mr. Chairman. Doyle Heffley, state 12 representative, 122nd District, Carbon County. 13 REPRESENTATIVE NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Eric Nelson, 57th District, 14 Westmoreland County. 15 REPRESENTATIVE GREGORY: And thank 16 17 you. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My name is 18 Jim Gregory. I represent the 80th District in 19 Blair County. 20 Thank you for being here today. 21 CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Thank you. 22 Amy, you can begin when you're ready. 23 MS. LUTZ: Thank you. My name is Amy 24 Lutz, and I'm president of EASI Foundation, 25 Ending Aggression and Self-Injury in the

developmentally disabled, and a founding board member of the National Council on Severe

Autism, which just launched in January.

Most importantly, I'm mom of a twenty-year-old son, Jonah, who suffers from severe autism, intellectual disability, and epilepsy and was one of Dr. Wachtel's black sheep that she references. And he spent a year in -- almost a year inpatient at Kennedy-Krieger when he was nine years old.

This is my second time actually testifying before you. I was also here two years ago to oppose the proposed change that would have forced waiver recipients in day programs to spend 75 percent of their time in fully integrated settings, effectively closing sheltered workshops.

I'm really happy to be back. And I'm grateful to the committee for hosting this ongoing conversation about the commonwealth's most vulnerable citizens. Today, I'd like to talk to you about residential policy. I'm sure it's not news to you that nothing keeps parents like me up at night more than panic over where our severely intellectually and

disabled children will live when they leave home. I'm thrilled to report that some of the most exciting projects unfolding all over the country are responding to this critical concern.

In New Jersey, Arizona, Florida, even Arkansas and elsewhere, families are collaborating with providers, medical professionals, universities, and local businesses to build beautiful communities designed to meet the particular needs of individuals with severe intellectual and developmental disabilities and challenging behaviors like self-injury, aggression, elopement, and property destruction while, at the same time, ensuring that those behaviors don't preclude residents from enjoying a joyous and meaningful life. But that isn't happening here in Pennsylvania.

In fact, just last month, Kristin

Biddle, the mother of a twenty-two-year-old

son, Will, who is severely autistic and

suffers from aggressive and self-injurious

episodes that require five trained staff

members to safely manage, sent a proposal to

ODP to build such a community. And I would say Kristin wanted to be here to participate in this hearing, but she just couldn't leave her son.

Her project, called the Lotus

Mission, seeks to, quote, create integrated,
sustainable, walkable communities of sixteen
residents each that would serve the entire
spectrum of adults with I/DD but were designed
specifically for those with dangerous
behaviors who require, as she writes in her
proposal, quote, a more secure,
autism-friendly environment in order to
maximize their opportunities for community
engagement.

These developments would feature a community center and a hydroponic greenhouse that would provide minimum wage jobs to those residents that chose to live there.

Keep in mind that Kristin was not asking the commonwealth to build these communities. The Lotus Mission would raise the funds for purchasing the property and constructing the buildings. She was just asking that residents be allowed to use their

waivers to live there.

This is a perfect example of the kind of public-private partnerships that our overstretched system, with a waiting list of almost fifteen thousand, should be eagerly pursuing. Instead, ODP officials flatly rejected her proposal, noting that they would not approve any new residential setting larger than four people, unless the percentage of waiver recipients was restricted to 25 percent. Despite the fact that, as some of the other speakers have noted, no obstacles exist to building peer-specific communities for virtually any other population, such as seniors, veterans, college students, religious orders, et cetera.

It's worth considering the reasons behind these standards. Doubtlessly, they are well intentioned, reflecting the horror we all felt following exposes of abuse and neglect at megasylums like Willowbrook and Pennhurst. But let's remember that Willowbrook had six thousand kids and a resident-to-staff ratio of forty to one.

Kristin wants to build something that

houses sixteen people. This is how far we have shifted the definition of institution today.

So, today, inclusion advocates have, in a truly dazzling display of discursive slight of hand, re-defined "institution" to mean "any setting larger than four people."

From six thousand to four.

This not only defies common sense, but, as the National Council on Severe Autism argues in its position paper on residential settings, it, quote, imperils existing quality programs and sharply restricts the development of safe, robust, and clinically necessary programs and models.

Well, you might be thinking, surely inclusion advocates must have studies to back up such a draconian position. They claim they do, but the studies they point to are so flawed, so biased, that, in a review of the literature, David Mandell, who made an earlier appearance in this hearing, director of the Center for Mental Health Policy and Services Research at the University of Pennsylvania, concluded, quote, Right now, our

decision-making regarding which types of placements to pay for and prioritize is based on values rather than data. Which is undoubtedly why CMS issued new guidance in January designed to ensure that adults with I/DD enjoy the same right to choose where and with whom they live that those of us without disabilities take for granted.

I used to say that adults with I/DD represented the only population that can't choose where and with whom they live until someone pointed out to me, actually, in some townships, convicted sex offenders also don't -- can't choose where and with whom they live, so -- but, still, I think my point is valid.

Gone from the guidance were the warnings that farmsteads, gated communities, and clustered group homes might be, quote, isolating or segregating. Instead of the physical characteristics of settings, CMS has adopted an outcome-oriented approach, recognizing that, as those of us who follow the 2017 Blossom scandal, in which the Philadelphia-based service provide of over

thirty community-based group homes was stripped of its license due to, quote, gross incompetence, know all too well, abuse and neglect can and do happen anywhere.

Despite the fact that the data don't support restrictive residential policies and CMS no longer encourages that, ODP has refused to budge, resulting in a residential policy that is among the strictest in the nation. As far as I'm concerned, when Arkansas has a more flexible liberal policy about these things than you do, you need to take a closer look.

We are asking you, our legislators, to intervene. The I/DD population is extraordinarily diverse, representing a broad range of needs, impairments, and preferences. A one-size-fits-all model of service provision is not only absurd, but it is bound to fail. And it has failed many times.

There are parents in this room today whose children bounced from group homes to emergency rooms to group homes to psych wards and back to group homes, paying with their unspeakable trauma for ODP's ideological intransigence. They know that allegedly

inclusive settings like small group homes and individual apartments can be the most isolated and segregated of all for those with challenging behaviors that require more structure and more support than can be provided in those environments.

We need to support a range of residential options, from ICFs to intentional communities to group homes to supported apartments. This is the only way to honor individual choice and person-centered planning, principles that are supposed to be at the core of disability service provisions today. Choice is only meaningful if there are options to choose from.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Okay. Amy, thank you.

John, I know you need a couple minutes to get set up, so we're going to pause for a couple minutes so we can get the Skype set up, but I know a couple other members have come in, so if you want to say hello in the interim.

John, want to say hello to everybody

1	and let everybody know where you're from?
2	REPRESENTATIVE HERSHEY: Sure. I'm
3	John Hershey, from Juniata, Mifflin, and
4	Franklin counties.
5	CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Dan.
6	REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: Dan Miller,
7	Allegheny County.
8	REPRESENTATIVE JONES: Mike Jones,
9	York County.
10	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Barb,
11	good morning. Want to say hello to everybody
12	and let everybody know where you're from?
13	REPRESENTATIVE GLEIM: Hi. I'm
14	Representative Barb Gleim, from the 199th in
15	Cumberland County.
16	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Okay.
17	I think we're ready. And we are going to have
18	Dan Torisky, who is the past president of
19	Autism Society of America.
20	(Whereupon, the attempted testimony
21	by Skype was unsuccessful.)
22	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: I
23	think we're going to bring our next panel up.
24	And that's Tom Kashatus, who is president of
25	White Haven Friends and Families; Irene

McCabe, President, Polk Center Friends and 1 2 Families; and Trudy Sheetz, from Selinsgrove Center family member and KIIDS representative. 3 4 (Whereupon, a brief comment was made 5 from the audience without the microphone.) MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: 6 you very much. We appreciate it. And I don't 7 think we'll have to report them on our ethics 8 9 statement when we fill it out. 10 Tom, if you want to get started, 11 whenever you're ready. And try to talk as close to the mic as possible so everybody can 12 13 hear. MR. KASHATUS: I'm trying to relax a 14 15 little bit, and I think I am because there's 16 two of yous that I know. That's you and 17 Representative Murt. 18 My wife and I are retired, and we're in our seventies. We had a good life, me a 19 20 retired prison quard, she a homemaker. No 21 regrets. Never took a two-week vacation. But 22 we raised five kids, and we love every one of 23 them.

I remember the story that you told us

24

25

about your grandson.

Maria was our first. She is special, and she is my hero. Her story is attached to this testimony. It's in your folders.

Thirty Thousand Dollars, that's the title of my testimony. Why thirty thousand dollars? Because if most people, in their golden years, have to spend thirty thousand dollars, give or take a few bucks, within a short period of time on behalf of a loved one for disability services, they would probably be wiped out of their long-term and short-term savings, maybe even go into debt and be saddled with a payment for the rest of their lives.

However, I am here today to talk about a friend. And her name is Celine Nauman, of White Haven, PA. Whatever I have to say about Celine here, she read this and she approved of it.

To really appreciate her story, put yourself in the place of Mrs. Nauman. To the left is a photo of Mrs. Nauman. She's seventy-seven years old, same age as my wife, with her seven children. Jimmy is on her right, Danny is on her left. Standing from

left to right are Lisa, Marie, Billy, Beth, and Elsie.

Jimmy, a resident of White Haven

Center, recently passed away at age fifty-four

from complications, and so did Lisa,

tragically, from cancer. That's all within

the last couple months.

Danny, age fifty-six, and now a resident of Allied Services in Scranton, also suffers from I/DD and was being taken care of by Mrs. Nauman until that became impossible due to her health and physical limitations.

Mrs. Nauman needs a wheelchair for mobility.

In January 2016, it became necessary that she needed help with Danny, and she began to pursue long-term care for him. From hers and Jimmy's experience with White Haven

Center -- forty-seven years Jimmy was there -- she felt that White Haven Center would be the most appropriate placement for Danny. Her two boys would be close, and she could visit regularly -- she lives in White Haven -- and keep an eye on them.

 $$\operatorname{Mrs.}$ Nauman also had experience with ${\ensuremath{\mathsf{I/DD}}}$ self-advocates who lived in the

community-based living arrangement because she worked at REDCO day program in Hazleton. She was employed as a therapeutic service aide for fifteen years. She felt that their living standards, personal hygiene, diet, et cetera, was substandard, and she wanted better for Danny.

Unfortunately, upon onset of her new journey, Mrs. Nauman was pressured into accepting a group home called Keystone, in West Hazleton. There she witnessed -- she witnessed the verbal abuse, diet abuse, lack of active treatment, et cetera. Subsequently, she hired an attorney. At first, it was a difficult task to find an attorney to handle her case. Eventually, a 406 petition was filed in Luzerne County Court, because that was Danny's home of residence, Luzerne County, to start the process for court placement of her own choice, her own choice, at White Haven Center.

A judge was appointed. Counsels were set. Necessary data was collected, et cetera. In the meantime, Danny fell and broke an arm at Keystone and ended up in the hospital. For

recovery, Danny was sent to Weatherwood

Nursing Home in Weatherly, a place not

appropriate for anyone with I/DD.

This became a nightmare for Danny, as he deteriorated physically and emotionally. If Danny was a resident at White Haven Center, recovery could have taken place there with full-time staff close by, twenty-four/seven close nursing care, one-on-one staffing if it was necessary, and a full-time doctor on duty five days a week.

Can everybody hear me? Thank you.

In the meantime, continued negotiations were pursued by the state to have Mrs. Nauman select a group home for Danny.

One thing for sure, the state of Pennsylvania has smart lawyers, who know every trick in the book to prolong a court case.

This became a long, drawn-out process, as the state and county caseworkers continued to insist that there were group homes available, and they were appropriate for the services that Danny needed.

After visual inspections, Mrs. Nauman saw none that suited her satisfaction for

Danny. For a number of reasons, postponements continued to surface, bills kept piling up, and finally Mrs. Nauman had to make a choice on whether to continue the White Haven journey for Danny.

In the end, due to financial restraints, Mrs. Nauman had to make a forced choice to have -- a forced choice to have Danny placed at Allied Service in Scranton.

Now, regular face-to-face visits with Danny are, unfortunately and tragically, limited for a mother who was always there and close to her son since he was born, limited to telephone conversations, while a hundred fifty-seven certified empty beds for services, give or take, at White Haven Center remain empty.

Because of an unfortunate policy of leadership in the ODP and with the county human services, influenced by the Pennsylvania ARC and the DRP, Disability Rights of Pennsylvania, et cetera, advocacy organizations who receive tax dollars from all Pennsylvanians, I/DD citizens who are in need of services are told that ICFs are available for their benefit, but they are private ICFs,

such as Saint Joseph's and Allied Services of Scranton.

If someone knows that state centers exist and ask if they are available, they are strongly urged to look to a private facility, even the chance for a tour of a state center is frowned upon and very unlikely about to take place.

I'm almost done, guys.

Policy can be changed at the top, but that is unlikely if leadership could not see the light. It may have to take legislation to ensure that our most fragile citizens of Pennsylvania, whether in community-based living situations or institutions, to include state centers, are entitled to the Cadillac -- Cadillac of services, to have a quality of life that they deserve. "Cadillac of services," that came from a former facility director at White Haven Center. It made me cry when he said that.

Individuals and those who have guardians should be given the opportunity to select a venue of their choice, after a complete review of providers of services is

experienced, to include that of state centers.

I'm done. But I want to tell you something. Representative DiGirolamo, thank you. Two years ago, when you invited us into your quarters over there, you were respectful. You showed dignity for us and all. And we appreciate that.

Representative Murt, you wanted to come to White Haven Center after hearing -- I talked to him once before. You said you wanted to go there. You came there. You seen for yourself what White Haven Center is. I hope you were satisfied with your trip.

Tarah Toohil, she's always there, fighting for White Haven Center. We appreciate that. I see she left here.

After the last census, Tarah lost, lost the township, got moved someplace else, but she still fights for our facility up there. And we also appreciate that, too.

Thank you for your time. And God bless yous all.

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Thank you, Tom. And God bless you, too.

Irene.

MS. MCCABE: I'd rather do it without a mic, if -- it's not too loud?

I wanted to say, I go back way far,

Pinehurst -- Pennhurst. Pennhurst, I'm sorry.

At Pennhurst, I remember Pennhurst. And I

remember the news anchor who was called in to

see it, and then they called the governor's

mansion. And they said, You've got to come

and see this. And they got Ray Broderick.

And he went over there in the middle of the

night. And he said, This has got to change.

And that was where he started. And then a lot of good stuff happened at Pennhurst. But, in the meantime, the legislators said, We'll give you money to fix up Pennhurst.

And then ARC said, We have a better idea. Give us the money.

And that was a better idea. We're talking back in the '60s. ARC was mainly -- a lot of fellows who came back from the second World War, they had the same amount of retarded kids as anybody else, but those kids were not allowed to go to school. They didn't go to school.

And so, they came to the legislators and said, What can we do about this? So, what happened is, Ray Broderick then was a district justice, and he said, I know what I'm going to do. We're going to give the money to ARC.

And that happened fifty years ago, and that was the beginning of PAR,

Pennsylvania Advocacy Resources. I think they're here in the room today, and they did present testimony. But what happened is, the legislators gave the twenty thousand dollars to ARC, and that started the public-private partnership. It's the oldest one in the state. It's the oldest one in the state.

And what we have now is we have with children -- children like my sister, who lives in a center happily -- she's been there for sixty-seven years. Here's her picture. She's as happy as she can be. But PAR, PAR takes care of eleven thousand residents. They take care of eleven thousand. And the centers take care of eight hundred.

So, if somebody's taking care of eleven thousand, and they do a great job and they're having a dinner, and you might be

invited and they're great, I have no argument. Thank you. God, thank you, thank you. But my sister is very happy at Polk. Let her alone. Let her alone.

But you've got a market force thing happening, when eleven thousand people over here and nine hundred people over here, then, you know it's a market. They're a giant eagle; we're mom and pop. And they seem to not have anything nice to say about us. I can tell good things about us all day. But that's what the setup is. So, it's market forces.

One of the reasons why you hear that the institutions are not good is, that's coming from not the people in the institutions, not us. It's not coming from us.

I also wanted to remind you that at the same time that this was going on, the children couldn't go to school, ARC said,

Let's sue the state.

And Tom Gilhool -- if you don't know him, he was a saint and an amazing guy in your history. And he said, Let's sue the state, saying that they have to be able to go to

school. And he was good friends with the guy who did Brown versus Board of Education. And so they got this brilliant strategy and they went to court, and they were only in there for two days, and the judge said, Done. These kids have to be able to go to school.

Life is funny. One of the ARC members had a job at the New York Times, and he told them what was happening, and two days, three days after the settlement, they ran an editorial in the New York Times, and two or three weeks after that every other state said, We're going to do that.

That case that started right here resulted in the land rock -- the legislation that said all kids could go to school. So, there is a rich, deep, profound history. And there are people at the department and -- and -- and alive now that have formed policy preference based on what they saw at Pennhurst, which is to say, when you're in part of something that's really important -- like, if you went to Woodstock, you just say you remember you were there and you say it. I'd say I was there, but it rained and we

didn't get there. But when you're part of something that important, it tends to infuse you.

So, what happens is, Nancy Thayer (phonetic), who ran the department for a long time, she even brought a young man home with her. A beautiful -- he's an older fellow now -- wonderful. She was there. She saw it. She believed it. You couldn't tell her she didn't see what she saw. She saw it. But it made her real doctrinaire. It made her real brittle. Made her, like, I know the better thing to do. So, I'm going to do the better thing. And she did do the better thing for a lot of people, but not for my sister. It was not meant for my sister.

So, as we have -- we have a -- kind of an inability to talk to ODP. You know, they talk about mission creep. So, you started out doing something, but now you want to do everything for everybody. So, we have kind of a mission creep issue there, that makes it hard for us to get recognized.

I will give you a -- Tom was talking about Allied. There was -- at one point, the

1 director said to Allied, You can't do that, 2 whatever you're doing. And they said, Yeah, we can do it. 3 4 They said, No, you can't do it. So, 5 they went to court. And they said, Why are you doing this? 6 And she said, That is my preference. 7 And they said, But is it policy? 8 9 And she said -- God love her -- she 10 said, No, it's my preference. Which now has 11 become the preference of ODP. Her preference 12 is their preference in my opinion. In my 13 humble opinion. Okay? So, the judge said, Preference is not 14 15 the same thing as policy. 16 So, sometimes when you're head of 17 everything, you do what you think is the best 18 thing. And I'm not saying it's not the best thing in some cases, but it was never the best 19 case for what we wanted. 20 21 Okay. Olmstead, the only thing you 22 don't know about Olmstead, when it was passed, 23 those of us who had loved ones in institutions, centers -- I call them 24

institutions. I don't have any problem with

25

1 that. I have -- there's institutional

2 awareness. There's institutional memory.

3 There's a lot of good stuff to be said about

4 institutions. You guys are an institution.

5 You know, it's all right.

In any event, what happened is, those of us said, don't take my kids out of the shelter, and the judge said, Well, you have to go.

And we said no. And then we went to court. So, it took five years, a hundred thousand dollars. We were fortunate in that he got pro bono. It was very expensive. And the judge said, No, whatever. You have to leave.

And we said, We don't want to leave. We want to appeal.

And the judge on appeal said, No, you don't have to go. But that was -- and the state attorneys from the department were there, so the cost -- cost you guys a hundred thousand, cost us. At the end of it, we came up with something called a Benjamin settlement. Everybody in the department knows about the Benjamin Settlement. They know what

we believe. We spent five years, a hundred thousand dollars telling you what we want, and our opinions are dismissed like this. Just like this, like we're not even there.

I was just teasing Kevin. I saw him in the back. I said, How come you never answered any of my questions? They don't.

All right. In any event -- oh, when I became my sister's guardian, I was amazed the number of people who you have -- have as their mission the closing of Polk and White Haven and Selinsgrove and Ebensburg.

PAR has as their mission the closing of the centers, but that's market things.

Disability Rights of Pennsylvania has as their second mission the closing of us. So, they're big. They're big. There's a lot of them.

They have lobbyist. They're very important.

We're just here to tell you now that -
that -- what we've been through and also warn you that it would be better if the department was a little bit more receptive to the individuals with severe autism. That's coming down the road.

So, in any event, I sent him a little

picture. It was like through the looking glass. I had to stretch. I'm going to stop now. That's why I'm kind of hot. I just wanted to say it so badly.

I don't understand -- I honest to God don't understand why they won't let us function as caring people. I mean, this is my sister. These are my family. And when I tell you that I know what's good for her, I know what's good for her.

I don't want the book about everyday lives or whatever.

Okay. Then the last thing is, in -the really last thing that I wanted to say is,
don't forget about that workforce. We have
eight hundred clients in the centers, but you
have got two, three thousand state employees.
They are the best people you've ever wanted to
run into. They are so good.

And my sister -- my sister is on her third generation of family at Polk. They'll say, Oh, Grandma had Karen over at North Side.

Okay? I'm just saying, I'm kind of a psychologist kind of person or psychologist, and you really value when people learn the

right thing to do. I call that institutional 1 2 awareness. You guys have got, like, maybe four, five hundred years of institutional 4 awareness. 5 Those who -- the Polk people have been there for more than a hundred years. So, 6 7 that is -- that's resource. That really is a 8 resource. 9 Whether you want to hold on to them 10 and do something for autism, whether you want 11 to hold on to them and do something, you know, 12 for the I/DD population, that is enormous, 13 enormous. And I value them very much. 14 And thank you. Thank you, thank you, 15 thank you. Thank you very much. 16 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Thank 17 you, Irene. I also missed Woodstock. MS. MCCABE: It rained. 18 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: But I 19 20 hear they're going to have a second one, so 21 maybe me and you can make the second one. 22 MS. MCCABE: I don't -- I don't -- it 23 was testimony, so I wanted to tell the truth. 24 CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Okay. Thank 25 you, Irene, for your very passionate

testimony. Appreciate that.

Trudy, begin when you're ready.

MS. SHEETZ: Thank you for allowing me to speak today. As sister and co-guardian of my brother at Selinsgrove Center and retired nurse in this commonwealth, I hope to educate the importance of the need to maintain our state regulated --

Is that better? Okay. Thank you.

Thank you for allowing me to speak.

I'm sister and co-guardian of a brother living at Selinsgrove Center and a retired nurse in the commonwealth.

I just would like to make you aware of the importance and need to maintain our centers. Selinsgrove is located in Synder County. Initially, they purchased up to thirteen hundred acres. Today, it is only two hundred fifty-four acres and a population of two hundred twelve. In 1965, population was twenty-one hundred.

Today, residents ages twenty-three to ninety-five years there, many calling
Selinsgrove home for more than forty years.
They employ roughly nine hundred union

included there.

Residents living at Selinsgrove have varying levels of intellectual disabilities requiring extensive supports with daily living, social skills, medical care, and vocational training. The center provides twenty-four-hour-a-day medical services, on-site nursing, occupational and physical therapy, psychiatric, speech and hearing, recreational, and social work services.

They're actively involved in the community, and they make every effort to see that the people at Selinsgrove are in an environment maximizing the individual potential, ensuring their personal needs are met and regularly and thoroughly assessed.

Staff at Selinsgrove retire after

twenty-plus years. It's the dedication, the

work environment, and residents that keep

them. They're not making big bucks, we know

that. These are adult bodies with child-like

mentalities. And what happens to the

livelihood and businesses in the towns of nine

hundred jobs if that closes?

My brother is sixty-five years old,

was born with cleft palate, which is an opening in the roof of his mouth. It was repaired at age four. He was admitted to Allentown State Mental Hospital mental retardation unit at age five, unable to toilet, feed himself, or communicate verbally. His behaviors became exceedingly overactive between ages four to five, showing amazing strength, able to upset things like TVs -- in 1950, they weren't light like today -- furniture, and attempts at trying to jump from second-story windows.

He was at Allentown until 1967, at age thirteen. They recommended that we put him in Selinsgrove in the ICF because they were geared more to the I/DD and the mentally challenged, so that they felt they could take him further than their MR unit was capable of doing. They were more advanced to handle the mentally challenged, some bodily deformed since birth, bringing them to the most potential on all levels.

Some of his diagnoses. He's schizophrenic, reaction to childhood mentality, two to four years. He's

sixty-five; mentality, two to four years, with profound mental retardation. Mood disorder NOS. NOS meaning "not otherwise specified", impairing but not fitting with any other specific diagnosis. Nonverbal verbalization, basically unintelligible. He does not express pain or discomfort but has a fear of unfamiliar surroundings. He has epilepsy seizure disorder and auditory processing disorder affecting his hearing ability.

Still today, when he gets upset and acts out, he begins to shake hands, bites himself, scratches, intentionally head bangs, throws himself into things with the intent of self-harm, property destruction, taking/hoarding others' belongings, or breaking/tearing his own and flushing it in the toilet. This may require at least two persons to intervene and redirect. He is not permitted to ride in a vehicle without at least two people present.

Selinsgrove has been prayers answered. Staff has reduced his self-abusive incidents, when he begins these things, from twenty-four to four or less per month with the

teaching skills and the professional care on site, the love that Selinsgrove has provided for the fifty-two years he's been there. He leads a healthy, active, enjoyable life. He's normal body weight. He had programing skills Monday through Friday to keep his skills up to date. He attends in-house and off-site events, church weekly van rides. And he's been able to live and progress with his skills. We would not have been able to do that at home.

Severe and profound mentally challenged individuals are children in their mental development, but they're grown adults, with strength and determination of such when upset and acting out, happening at any time, without any known reason. They're like a big kid having a temper tantrum for whatever reason. Some times we don't know.

State ICF provide hallways between living areas, allowing space to run the frustration energy off. And if you're familiar with severe profound autistic or mentally challenged, many times they just -- they'll pop up out of a chair and they'll take

off. And they'll just want to run or do whatever. And they can at least take them to the back hall, where they have space to run. You can't do that in a small house or smaller setting.

Staff is there to provide individual interventions, walking, showering. Sometimes showering helps to calm them, redirecting, one-to-one needed at that moment, all of which is diversionary, helping to quell the behaviors, frustrations, or the temper tantrums while keeping them safe.

All right. For severe and profound, a lifetime of care is needed, programming weekly to maintain their skills, nurses and doctors trained with working with the residents twenty-four/seven, and monitoring their many medical issues. And most of them have more than one or two.

Overmedication for extreme behaviors is on the rise in community. And due to the brain deformity trauma of these residents, this may actually add to the increased behaviors because sometimes they don't work right. Okay. Physicians in state ICFs

specialize and know this. Medical services in community settings are on an on-call or as-needed basis.

With shortages in the communities of physicians trending, nurse practitioners and physician assistants are who many residents now see, hence lack of knowledge with the patient base. The poorest of the poor will never be able to take care of their physical, medical, daily living needs or finances without twenty-four/seven professional care, are being sentenced to a life of neglect, abuse, and death.

Families with severe and profound mentally challenged over age seventeen are not being made aware of the state ICF centers, remaining on waiting list. Why?

Seven years I did home health
nursing. I went into the community. One time
I was administering insulin to a newly
diagnosed diabetic. I told the staff, one
staff person in a house of six, that that
person needed to eat breakfast within the half
hour. And they informed me that they needed
to be on the bus in five minutes to go to the

work program.

And I said, well, they have to have breakfast. They can't do that. And you can't feed them for, like, twenty minutes to half an hour.

So, I called their management, told them the story. They allowed the person to get breakfast. But had I not instructed that and left, they would have put them on the bus, he'd have passed out on the way to the work program. He'd have required an ambulance to the hospital, all incurring more cost to the state for low blood sugar.

The flip side, I took care in hospital of twenty-two-year-old female patient that had been injured by a resident acting out. The ratio was two females to four male residents. And these were mild to moderately in a group home situation. The male resident acted out, the other staff person calling via phone, afraid to intervene for her own safety, awaiting help. The victim staff are punched and kicked, unable to get away. She stated, taking a fetal sitting position on the floor, attempting to protect herself, ended up in the

hospital with a fractured pelvis and extensive bladder damage.

Three urological consults later, told having children would probably never happen.

And she also could be looking to have a suprapubic catheter, one coming through the front pelvic wall, for the rest of her life.

Twenty-two years old. All pending questionable, inoperable damage sustained.

The patient did not wish to sue this resident.

He didn't belong in jail. But did her employer provide a safe working environment?

community placement requires the on-call person or emergency personnel to decide what to do, and that's allowing too much for physical injury, property damage, potential jail times, and sometime death, increasing costs incurred to the state because they couldn't sufficiently handle the behaviors that our ICFs know how to do.

Remember, most have severe and profound mental deficits at state ICFs.

Abuse in Pennsylvania, I wish to educate on increasing abuse of our mentally challenged in Pennsylvania. Time doesn't

permit going into all the allegations and abuses, and, therefore, I will hit just a few.

Death of a female, 2016. They waited twelve hours to call an ambulance. Started on the evening of July 8th, at 7:30. She had trouble walking, nausea, vomiting. The program specialist said, Give her some water. Continued through the night with the poor ambulation, nausea, vomiting, and at 9 o'clock the next a.m., the program specialist or their supervisor instructed administration of medication instead of hospitalization.

Staff thought she fell asleep on the couch at 1:00 p.m. The program specialist or supervisor had not arrived yet to check, so they called 911 at 1:30. Emergency workers administered CPR upon arrival, and she passed away in the ER soon after.

A month prior, she was prescribed an antivomiting medication and regular blood sugar testing. Neither was received. On June 27, she had been told to stop lisinopril, which is a blood pressure medication, because her blood pressure was going too low. But they gave that up to the day she died.

Another female laying on the floor in 1 a nightgown for four days, nurse practitioner 2 stated she couldn't help, called the 3 4 psychiatric nurse. 5 I need to wrap it up? Okay. All right. Anyway, when the 6 psychiatric nurse came, she was found that she 7 8 was having flashbacks from rape. So, she was 9 taken to the hospital, with pressure ulcers and bruises on her backside. 10 11 And since I need to wrap it up, the rest of it is in your notes so that you can 12 13 read. 14 And I would like to say that I assure 15 you, as often as you neglected to do it to one 16 of these least ones, you neglected to do it to 17 me. Matthew 25:45. 18 Thank you. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: 19 Thank 20 you, Trudy. 21 John, do we have Dan? We're going to 22 go to Skype now and hear Dan Torisky's 23

testimony, who's the past president of Autism Society of America.

24

25

And, Dan, if you can hear me.

MR. TORISKY: Yes.

1

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Okay.

3 You can begin your testimony. Welcome.

4 MR. TORISKY: I don't see a picture.

5 Is anybody else there besides you?

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: We have got a

7 large group here, Dan.

MR. TORISKY: Good morning, people. I'm here to describe a scary situation called CMS that threatens all of us. They're deeply embedded in a misguided governmental scheme who is, right now, stifling the rights of developmentally disabled individuals and their families. Simply put, the culprit is an entrenched governmental agency of unelected socialist reformers called Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, which has decreed -- decreed, mind you -- that our medical assistance tax dollars may no longer be provided. If the settings were delivery of necessary services to our loved ones are not community enough, the decree called the Final Rule -- move over, boy, I thought you were the only one that made final rules -- applies to all citizens where services are provided from

institutions down through living in centers of all types.

The most severely punished under this decree are the profoundly autistic and/or ID, once called mentally retarded, and their parents and family. These unelected CMS policy makers in Washington, through decree, intend to take away all service options available except the one they want us to have. Take away all the options and leave only one choice. This is totally antifamily and antifamily values, are the core underpinnings of our represented republic.

The outcome is the disastrous and can only get worse. These services and worker wages are already being cut, and this is totally across the board. CMS cohorts in Pennsylvania have already sent in Pennsylvania's plan to comply, for God sake. The final rule decree has the force of law. Our own analysis are the results that proves that necessary services for our people will become so costly in money and human suffering that would cause ultimate collapse of our entire health care system. It's thus

beginning.

Institutions were the primary cause of the CMS policy makers who fail to comprehend that unless all necessary services are available to our people under one roof, such as properly staffed and monitored institutions provide, very few of our differently abled -- got that? Differently abled -- loved ones can survive and thrive.

Further, unless in close proximity to one another so that services can be shared, not even group homes, the best group homes, and community-living settings of lessor intensity can survive.

Further exacerbating the situation are poor wages for those individuals providing care in this field. Proper services require properly trained individuals paid a living wage. Appropriate services, hence, overwhelm the tax dollars available to pay for them.

Fewer and fewer people can be served, despite burgeoning budgets.

Until recently, all states had to submit a plan of compliance to CMS by a certain date, so CMS decided to take us on

state by state, regardless, the community-only criteria, and had to be adhered to without exception. So, nothing's changed.

Realistically, a community is not the utopian environment that these socialist reformers try to shove down our throats.

"Community" is a broad term itself, meaning a combination of settings which we occupy throughout life, job site, employed, living with parent, self, family, or singly, three, five, eight, and so on and so on. They're all various communities in which we are living and which we adapt ourselves and are supported and adapting every day, sometimes several times a day. These are communities.

The support mechanism is friends,

family, and providers. That's us. Because

the government's role really is to protect and

support us in this universal right to thrive,

which every human being has in the United

States, and it starts by cutting off the head

of this pervasive snake, namely CMS.

We are enraged that so very few elected officials in our country perceive this danger to our disabled loved ones in our

country. That's why we have to undertake a campaign with other parents, groups, and advocates, to enlighten our elected government to crush the so-called final rule and its crippling mandates.

This is the United States. The first step, we hope, will be Pennsylvania legislation stating that our commonwealth is withdrawing its compliance to the CMS final rule, pending further study. We urge your assistance and support for us in this effort, more to come, until one day, we pray, our state will be able to join the other states in our wonderful country in one voice to declare that no developmentally disabled person left behind.

Thank you. And God bless you all. Pray for us.

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Okay. Dan, thank you very much for your testimony.

MR. TORISKY: All right. The full extent of my speech is with the press table out front. And if anybody wants to talk to me or any of our representatives in this campaign, we'll stay on Skype here long enough

1 to answer any questions that press might have or anybody of you might have. Thank you. 2 3 CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Thank you, Dan. 4 And I'm going to call up our last 5 panel to testify, Mary Wills, who is ACE president of the Ebensburg Center, and Patty 6 Degen, family member, with White Haven state 7 8 center. 9 Thank you both for being here. We 10 are a little bit pressed for time, so we have 11 about twenty minutes left for testimony. We 12 are going to have to forgo the 13 question-and-answer part, but if I could ask each of you to try to keep it within ten 14 15 minutes each so -- we have to be done before 11 o'clock. 16 17 MS. WILLS: I'm going to make mine 18 very short. MS. DEGEN: I'll cut mine down a 19 20 little bit. 21 MS. WILLS: I'm going to make mine 22 very short, because I'm not a speaker and you 23 have my whole story. 24 My name is Mary Wills. My 25 sister-in-law, Sandy Wills, is sixty-seven

years old and lives in a state center since she was ten. I'm also the president of the ACE association, which is a family and friends association from Ebensburg.

We are going to present the petitions to you today that we've collected. As we spoke to Pennsylvania voters at churches, festivals, businesses, and community gatherings to collect over ten thousand signatures on the petitions, which we have here today for you, and we can get more if you need to hear from more voters. We can go to the Internet. But these were all in person, one on one.

As we -- as the voters signed the petitions, they would often say, These state centers are needed because some of these people can -- cannot be taken care of properly in group homes. Most of the clients at the centers have lived there most of their lives. This is their home. It's not an institution. It is community living for the disable, the same as senior citizens community living to serve the needs of elderly.

The state centers can provide care

for many more without much cost, because the buildings and the services are already set up and able to serve many more. We have so many more life stories and reasons for why we are all here today. And we have only touched upon a few of the reasons in this limited time.

So, we ask you to please take the time to visit an ICF, IID state center and see what we have to offer. It's going to be the only way you know what we're taking about and why.

We ask you to please let us have more input into this very important decision concerning the state centers' future and come see why we are fighting so hard to keep the state centers open and to guarantee this option to choose ICF, IID state centers.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Thank you very much.

And I just want to let everybody know, Mary, about the signatures. I think you have ten thousand one hundred twenty-three signatures in the box that you delivered to me. And we're going to try to figure out what

is the best way to get these to the members of the general assembly or where they need to go.

And I just want to read what they -- everybody signed.

(Reading) Do not close the state centers for the seriously impaired individuals with autism and all intellectual disabilities. The state centers are home to them. Because of their intensive need, there is no safe place in the community for them. The centers serve them well, and it is their right to have the home that meets their needs. The families say no one else was able to care for my son. My sister has been there for seventy years. My cousin would be dead without center care. I give thanks every day for the state centers. The centers saved my entire family.

(Reading) I, too, am an advocate for the care and the safety the centers provide or I am a family member or friend or I'm a concerned citizen, and I oppose the closing of the centers. If passed, House Bill 1650 will close public, long-term facilities, the centers for persons with severe and profound life-long intellectual disabilities, and take

1 the centers out of the service system.

And you're asking for a "no" vote on House Bill 1650.

So, that's what we have here. Over ten thousand signatures. I just want to make sure everybody knows. And thank you. Must have taken a lot of work to get this many signatures.

MS. WILLS: It didn't take that long.

It only took us, like, three months to get

that many signatures. And we can go to the

Internet for a lot more.

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: God bless you all for your hard work. Very much appreciated.

And last, we have Patty Degen.

MS. DEGEN: Good morning,

legislators. Thank you for allowing me to

speak on behalf of my sister, Lauren Loxley

(phonetic). She resides at White Haven Center

in an intermediate care facility and others

who are profoundly intellectually and

physically disabled who cannot speak for

themselves.

My name is Patricia Degen, and I'm a

1 retired I.T. specialist from the U.S.

Department of Agriculture, a representative of KIIDS, Keeping kids -- Keeping Individuals and Intellectual Disabilities Safe -- and volunteer with PAWS, People and Animals Who Serve.

I visit White Haven Center regularly with Bella Mia (phonetic), a therapy dog. In the late summer and fall of 2017 and August of 2018, I secured a vender spot for an information booth at five festivals in northeastern Pennsylvania for petition signing to vote no on HB 1650 to stop closure of intermediate care facilities in Pennsylvania and care for profoundly disable. We are proud to say ten thousand one hundred twenty-three signatures were obtained throughout Pennsylvania in a short time frame.

We believe there are many, many more Pennsylvania residents willing to sign our petition than not. We believe if we had done an online petition, we would have obtained millions of signatures from Pennsylvania residents.

While myself and others manned this

1	both, we encountered the following responses
2	from festival patrons. Now, I have
3	twenty-five responses listed, but I'm only
4	going to go through a few because of time.
5	White Haven Center gives excellent
6	care.
7	White Haven Center has been there for
8	a long time.
9	Where would the individuals be moved?
10	Who wants to close White Haven
11	Center?
12	I work or worked at White Haven
13	Center.
14	The pictures of White Haven Center
15	are amazing. It looks like a great place.
16	Are they allowing admittance to the
17	facility? I am struggling to get help for my
18	disabled child.
19	My child is autistic. I am on the
20	waiting list to get help for my disabled
21	child.
22	I'm from New Jersey. Can I sign the
23	petition?
24	What can I do to help?
25	A few of the festivals have invited

us to return as an information vendor to upcoming festivals to continue petition signing. The profoundly disabled need to get adequate care and be kept safe. All facilities need strict guidelines, oversight, and accountability. I repeat that. All facilities need strict guidelines, oversight, and accountability.

Closing White Haven Center and other state centers denies needed care to the most vulnerable segment of the intellectually and physical disabled community. Come visit White Haven Center and other state centers to see the level disability and the quality of care provided and you will agree is a need to continue to support state centers in Pennsylvania and open them to others in need.

One size does not fit all. A tragedy can occur in any family, resulting in a disabled individual. No one, none us here, are shielded from it. It can happen by complication in pregnancy, problems during labor and birth, accident, virus, fever, insect bite, illness, disease, toxins, poisons, genetics, alcohol and drugs, et

1	cetera. Human beings who cannot care for
2	themselves should be top priority over any
3	other expense.
4	It is our hope to keep White Haven
5	Center open and other facilities of its kind
6	and reopen its doors as a matter of choice.
7	With that said, we present to you the
8	ten thousand one hundred twenty-three
9	signatures.
10	Thank you for consideration in this
11	matter.
12	And I have a visual with me of White
13	Haven Center, if you would like to see the
14	facility.
15	Could you pass that over to them?
16	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Okay.
17	Thank you, Patty.
18	MS. DEGEN: Thank you.
19	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: We
20	don't have much time for questions, but I do
21	want to ask the members if they have maybe a
22	little quick statement.
23	I want to recognize Representative
24	Murt.
25	REPRESENTATIVE MURT: Quick question,

Mr. Chairman.

Who made the decision to shut down admissions into these centers? Human Services?

I'm sorry. Somebody's going to have
to --

Okay. Is that ODP?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE MURT: Okay. I also want to recognize my intern for the day,

Taylor Thompson, from Seneca Valley Senior

High School.

Taylor, thank you for being here.

And I will be brief, Mr. Chairman.

I've had the opportunity to visit
every state center except Selinsgrove, and I
will be there sometime this year. Of course,
there's a debate about the future of these
centers, but the fact is that, as we've heard,
one size does not fit all. If many of these
residents could function well in a group home,
they would be there. Their loved ones, their
family, and the individuals, the residents
need this placement such as the state centers,
and as elected officials in the commonwealth,

we have the duty and the responsibility to provide that. That is our responsibility.

Having visited the state centers, I can tell you, they're staffed by compassionate, professional, caring people who do a great job caring for the residents. And I think it's accurate to say, I don't think that the residents would want to be anywhere else. Like I said, if they could be in a group home, would want to be in a group home, they would be there.

And, you know, we, of course, interact with a lot of people on the other side of this issue that care deeply about adults with special needs, intellectual disabilities who, you know, are exerting pressure on us to close these centers, and this is a delicate balance, but I can tell you that this is a system that we need to -- the real answer, of course, is to fund Human Services in the magnitude that we need to.

We've caught up in the last years, but this is a mission of state government that has been underfunded literally for decades, maybe even longer than that.

And we have -- we've made progress
the last several years, even during the
Corbett administration, when there were some
cuts. But this is a great system, and I would
encourage any of my colleagues -- I know Todd
and I know Representative Mike Jones have an
interest in visiting these centers, too, and
maybe this summer we can get to a couple of
them.

So, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Representative Jones.

REPRESENTATIVE JONES: Thank you. I want to echo what Representative Murt said. I will definitely take you up on the offer to visit Selinsgrove, and we'll try to do a combined effort.

I have a question and -- I guess a comment and a question. I get a little emotional about this stuff. So, I'll qualify that I understand your -- these are all beautiful people. They're all God's creation, okay. Just to make clear, be 110 percent.

I'm amazed how God can take anybody with any disabilities or disfiguration, and

they are still beautiful.

And so, my experience is limited to volunteering for a couple of years at church for an hour on Sundays, mainly to give parents just a little bit of relief. And so, I've seen -- and through other youth ministry work that my wife and I used to volunteer with.

So, I can appreciate at least -- I cannot appreciate how people do that day in and day out. I know it's a labor of love.

But there are clearly those that are suitable for a group home. And there are others that are not.

And one young lady, and this was a thirteen-year-old girl, beautiful girl, but my main job was that I can handle being hit in the head six or seven times over the course of an hour. And that was fine. That was my limited capability. I had no training, but I could at least take, you know, a modest blow to the head a few times on Sunday. And it was a little more than that, of course. You know, she was nonverbal. Tough, she was tough, really tough.

So, in any event, I do support -- I

understand, I think, at least in a little way, what you're talking about. And it seems to me we need economies of scale to deal with this in a cost effective and a manner that is in their best interest.

My question, and I'll stop, and I

don't know if there's anybody here to answer,

or we can just follow up, Mr. Chairman. But

some of this becomes a self-fulling prophecy

on the cost side. And what I mean by that,

Ms. Sheetz, I believe you said that

Selinsgrove has two hundred twelve residents,

but, in 1965, they had about twenty-one

hundred. Is that accurate?

I don't know the current status of
Selinsgrove, and we're not going to get in the
weeds here, but if you have nine hundred
people taking care of two hundred twelve, your
cost per resident is going to be a lot higher
than if you had fifteen hundred or two
thousand, which is probably what we should
have, at a minimum. I would be shocked if
there aren't at least eight or ten thousand in
Pennsylvania that could use these facilities.

So, this happens in business as well.

If you take 20 percent of the volume out of a plant, their cost on the 80 percent of the product goes up. And then you take 20 percent more, and the cost goes up higher. It's a death spiral. It's a self-fulfilling prophesy.

So, I would just suggest maybe,

Mr. Chairman, we follow up a little bit on

that vein, because the cost per individual is,

by definition, going to go up if we close

admissions. It's a self-fulfilling prophesy.

So, maybe we should look at it in the context

of if they were fully utilized and the

economies of scale we would get, even if it's

just, you know, a directionally sound

projection. So, that's my comment, I guess,

more than a question.

CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Mike, just to try to answer your question. In these facilities -- and I think, well said, what you just said.

The beds that are available and filled in these facilities -- for instance, in Selinsgrove, there are two hundred ninety beds filled with two hundred seventy-four empty

```
1
       that are available. And Ebensburg, two
2
       hundred eight are filled but a hundred
       ninety-four are available. In Polk, two
 3
4
       hundred filled and three hundred twenty-one
5
       are available.
                 So, I mean, there are beds available
 6
       in these facilities. And so, I mean that's --
7
8
       that's a legitimate question to ask the
9
       department. I mean, why aren't -- why
10
       aren't --
11
                 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd also add,
12
       those are code-approved, ready-to-go beds.
13
       Those facilities, many of them -- I know White
       Haven does -- has capacity for eleven,
14
15
       thirteen hundred.
16
                MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO:
                                                That's
17
       a good -- that might be a good question for
18
       you to work with the staff on and maybe --
19
                 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: Okay. Yeah.
20
       I'd be happy to do that, because I think if
21
       we're going to look at cost -- and we have to
22
       look at cost. You know, we do. I mean,
23
       there's only so much money. Our population's
24
       aging. Our young folks are -- I mean, we have
```

to be. But, I think, to be fair, we should

25

look at them at capacity or various levels of capacity, you know, to make it apples to apples.

So, yeah, whatever you need me to do, Mr. Chairman, be happy to help on that.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Todd, a question?

And I'm just going to close. And really very compelling, powerful hearing today, really was. It's good for us to hear that. And I hope the program has been played maybe around the state, and -- so other people can hear this testimony.

And somebody mentioned, I think Amy, the sheltered workshop issue. And that issue just centered around letting families decide what's best for their loved ones. The families should be making the decision, as in the testimony today. Families should be making the decision on what's best for their loved one when it comes to these issues.

And that's what I believe in, and that's what I think we ought to be doing.

Should come down to the families to make these decisions and not somebody sitting in an

```
office somewhere in Harrisburg or somewhere else
1
2
     looking at paper, paperwork, and saying this is
3
     what's best for somebody. The family should make
     the decisions themselves.
 4
              One comment -- one last comment?
 5
              (Whereupon, a comment was made off
 6
7
    microphone.)
              CHAIRMAN DIGIROLAMO: Okay. Well,
8
     thank you. We have to get back up to session.
9
10
     It was real good. Give yourself a round of
     applause. Really, really good testimony.
11
12
              Thank you for being here. And this
13
     hearing is now closed. Thank you.
              (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at
14
15
     10:54 a.m.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
2.4
25
```

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript, to the best of my ability, produced from audio on the said proceedings. BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR Court Reporter Notary Public