

Act 378 Subcommittee

October 21, 2020

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Hi everyone. Can you hear me?
Okay.

BRENTON ANDRUS: Just to let you know, Bambi, you have got four committee members. If you are on the committee if you could turn your camera on that way we could include you in the quorum. You actually need five to have a quorum. We don't have a quorum just yet. There is four including yourself.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Okay. We will just wait another minute or so. Brenton, do you know if we have five people confirmed?

BRENTON ANDRUS: Yes. I think most people confirmed with the exception of two. Right now it looks like, as far as the agency reports go, Kelly is on, Tanya is on and Kristen is on. That should cover our agency reports so we should be good there once we get a quorum.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: So Brenton, just let me know once we get a quorum.

BRENTON ANDRUS: It looks like Dr. McKee joined us, but we lost Jill Egle who was recently assigned. If we can get her back on you will have a quorum.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: So Brenton, is there any way we can reach out to the people, the other members to maybe get one more on.

BRENTON ANDRUS: Yeah. I am working on that now. I do know Julie mentioned she is going to try to be on. I think a joint Medicaid meeting going on at the same time. I am trying to reach out to some others right now.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: I am sure you already did, but we have several reports, specifically end of the year reports that just make sure you have looked over those so we will be ready to discuss that once we get a quorum. It looks like we have a quorum now.

BRENTON ANDRUS: Including yourself Bambi, you have a quorum. We lost someone on camera. I think Carmine is driving. She is back on. We do now have a quorum.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Good. Welcome everyone. So the committee members who are on are Kim Basile, Hyacinth

McKee, Mary Tarver and Carmine Cetnar. Then we also have people who will be speaking on specific agenda items and introduce them at the time for them to speak. Since we are a few minutes late, we will go ahead and ask that we have a motion to approve the January meeting summary.

MARY TARVER: I make a motion to approve the minutes for the summary.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Thank you Mary. We need a second.

KIM BASILE: This is Kim. I will second it.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Thank you. So we have a motion from Mary. A second from Kim. Do we have any objections to the motion? Any abstentions? So the motion to approve the summary has been made.

BRENTON ANDRUS: Could you tell me who the second was?

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Kim. Next on our agenda we will have the Office for Citizens with Developmental Disabilities. I think Tanya Murphy is on. And Tanya is on a call-in line. If you want to go ahead and give your report for OCDD.

TANYA MURPHY: This is Tanya Murphy. I am unmuted now. I think you guys can hear me, right. Every once and a while you will hear my cat as well because he likes to chime in. So the first report is the final expenditure report for fiscal year 20. I think that you will notice that Metropolitan Human Service District and Jefferson Parish Human Service Authority when you look at the column that says expended year to date, which is the final, they are at 72 percent and 73 percent. They did provide, they both provided an explanation for it and they both basically said the same thing. They usually use a lot of their IFS money to fund supported employment and group employment and day hab. Due to covid all of those facilities were closed down. And so for both Metropolitan and Jefferson that was the reason they did not spend a higher percentage. As far as Acadiana Area Human Service District their percentage says 77 percent on this report. But you will see a difference when we look at the 9 percent act 73 information. They reported they got additional family support funds in November 2019 as well as February of 2020. So they had a lot more money than they usually have. A total of 1,400,000-dollars in their IFS account. They did spend well over their 9 percent, 1,100,000. But when you look at how much they were given, it turns out to be only 77 percent. Even though the percentage is low, they still spent a lot of money. Even more this year, I think, than

normally. I didn't think I needed to go through every number, specifically on this final report. Of course, if you look at the flexible family fund you will see 99 to hundred percent for all of the LGEs for flexible family fund. Did anybody have any questions about this final expenditure report for fiscal year 20?

MARILEE ANDREWS: Bambi, you have a comment. You're muted.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: I see Nicole from Jefferson Parish Human Service District said they did spend hundred percent of their 9 percent set aside. You will see that on the next report, I believe.

TANYA MURPHY: If there aren't any questions we can move onto the next page of this report, which is the act 73. Act 73. Look at the percentages here. All of the LGEs, other than Metropolitan, spent exactly hundred percent or over a hundred percent. Metropolitan is the only LGE that didn't spend 9 percent. They didn't have additional money to put towards. And they only had the money they obligated and weren't able to spend it because the day hab and the vocational program being shut down.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: I have a question about that just to have understanding. They are paying for the day hab programs or supported employment. Are there that many people who do not have waivers? Cause those are services they can get through waivers. If that's correct, then what is the issue? Why are so many people needing to access the funding through the LGEs?

TANYA MURPHY: Sure. I can try to provide an answer for you there. Let's make sure, just wanted to look at the chat real quick. When we first created the tiered waiver system there was some discussion back and forth about if an LGE is using their individual and family support money for supported employment or day hab should they be referred to a supports waiver. We're back and forth on that. Because we obviously want to free up individual and family support money so we can provide other services. But at the same time, if we take everybody that is getting vocational services through IFS and give them a waiver, we are going to be going back to having a waiting list for the waiver. Because there won't be enough slots to provide for emergency situations and individuals that need more. There are times when somebody needs more than just day hab or supported employment funds. They need a waiver. And

so then they are referred to us, screening for urgency of need, and then they might get a supports waiver. But at this time if there is not additional services needed and their needs are being met by IFS funds then right now, we are just kind of leaving it how it is. If there is any discussion from DD Council that they would like that issues to be revisited I'm sure OCDD leadership would listen. At this point we have some people that are getting day hab and vocational supports through individual and family supports fund so they can stay in the community and they just haven't been referred to, or they have, on the request for services registry, but don't need urgency of need to get a waiver offer at this time. There are some people that don't have Medicaid and will never qualify for Medicaid. They will always have to get their day hab stuff from state funds from this individual and family supports. I don't think that would equal all of the people getting it. That's where we are at for now.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Okay. Thank you. Does anyone else have questions about this report or any questions on what Tanya has presented so far?

TANYA MURPHY: With no further questions Brenton, we can move onto the next report? Fiscal year 21 quarter one.

MARILEE ANDREWS: I am not sure when you want to interject with public comment, but there is public comment in the chat.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: You can do that right now if it's a question about that previous report.

MARILEE ANDREWS: So Liz Gary said Tanya, did you state they use some of their IFS for day habilitation.

TANYA MURPHY: The answer to that is yes.

MARILEE ANDREWS: Jill Egle said I am confused. And Kelly Monroe said not all of them have waivers.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: I don't think those need a response. I think we already received a response. I guess go onto the next report.

TANYA MURPHY: So I just wanted to bring to your attention, like we do every time, that when we get these quarterly reports, they do not have all of their invoices for the quarter. So although the percentages look low, they don't, I think they don't have all their expenditures from September when they send in this information for this meeting. So I like the fact we look at fiscal year final expenditures before we look at first quarter. Because

first quarter is always like 7 percent, they should be at 25. But if you look at the final report from last year, you see they absolutely spend it all. When you look at flexible family funds right around that 25 percent, just like we would expect. With individual and family support it varies per LGE. There are some comments from the different offices. Imperial Calcasieu, they haven't processed the invoices. Something I already mentioned. And, of course, with Imperial Calcasieu they have a lot of issues going on from Hurricane Laura. Kind of giving them a break right now y'all. Northwest Louisiana Human Service District also mentioned they had not received all the invoices for September. They don't have their flexible family fund. They are in the process of billing those. Northeast Delta in the Monroe area says covid protocols continue to prevent some services from being accessible like day hab. Also families still limiting in home services to keep transition minimal. Consideration of all requests continue to meet needs. We have adapted protocols to complete phase two requirements for flexible families and applicants and currently working to fill all the vacancies. Does anybody have any questions on this quarter one fiscal year 21 report? Mary.

MARY TARVER: My question was about the covid stuff. So from the last quarter, over these last few quarters that would have had an impact. So moving forward some of those things maybe are not going to have a big change. So are they looking at different ways, different ways to spend the money because they may not be allowed to go back to their, what they were doing pre covid days?

TANYA MURPHY: Right. I hear what you are saying. One of the things that we did when covid first reared its ugly head was we put a stop to all new flexible family fund initial determinations. Because those were, we required face to face and didn't want to approve somebody without the face to face. So we just put a stop to it. And I instructed the LGEs to move any flexible fund money over to their IFS account. Even without having to have face to face, they have still been able to spend that money. But now, since I thought it was going to be just a few months and we were going to get right back on the horse. No. Now I have instructed them to start filling family flexible fund slots again and to use different strategies to make sure it's safe. They can do it remote if they have a video.

Some LGEs have even had meetings out in the parking lot so they can at least lay eyes on the individual with a disability. Yes, we are absolutely looking at ways to move through to keep people safe from covid, but also continue business so that we can spend the money and help the families.

MARY TARVER: And the other thing, in my day to day job I work in emergency preparedness at the hospital. And on a regional level so I know there is several thousand people that are still in hotels or have been moved out of region five in the Lake Charles area. Are y'all able to keep track of the people that were there and whether or not they need help?

TANYA MURPHY: So I know that if the person had a waiver their support coordinator there's a whole emergency protocol in place. Absolutely keeping track of individuals that get home and community based. People that get individual and family support, probably not so much. I know that things with Imperial Calcasieu and all of his staff, although they are not back in their tower and having all kinds of issues. I get an email from Patrick and then I get it six more times. I don't know, it's like not a problem I am not sending it, a problem of sending it too many. They have issues. I know when I reach out and say hey, I have a family that needs some help they are so quick to jump in and do whatever they can. I can't promise you everybody who is getting IFS funds has been tracked. I would think those families have contacted whoever their support coordinator is, and they can reach out. I know they are busy helping people.

MARY TARVER: Thank you.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Do we have any other questions about this first quarter report?

TANYA MURPHY: We will move onto act 73. This is the 9 percent. Some of the state general funds amount were changed. You might notice the top column now says state general fund and IAT MOF swap. Don't ask me what that is. I am not in the fiscal department. Probably people online that already know what that is. The way they came up with the amount of the state general fund per LGE. Some of them got extra money. Some of them got less. But it wasn't a lot different. Kind of changed how much their 9 percent was. Look and see at each LGE and how much they have budgeted and if it equaled what they are supposed to.

Metropolitan is exact. Capital Area, exact. South Central. Acadiana has a little extra. Imperial Calcasieu, extra. Central has a little extra. Northwest Louisiana has a lot extra. Northeast Delta has budgeted more extra than the 9 percent. Florida Parishes is short. And Jefferson Parish is exact. I notice that Florida Parishes was not equal to the 9 percent so I reached out to them and they said, they responded that they had to do a bunch of different budgetary exercises and they weren't a hundred percent sure how much they were going to end up with at the end. The amount of money they told me in the report was based on a different total state general fund amount they thought they had. But once I brought it to their attention, they changed it. Next report you will see that they have budgeted up to the 9 percent, if not more. And then percentages spent, a little low. Again, they are missing some of their invoices for September. And I believe Metropolitan is still talking about the closure of the day hab and that is causing problems. I probably need to get back with Metropolitan. And I imagine you guys here would like to know how Metropolitan plans to spend that money this year if those day habs are not open. That is the information I would assume you want and what I will get. Does anybody have any questions about act 73 fiscal year 21 1st quarter?

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: In regards to Florida Parish, you say they are going to give you an update on that?

TANYA MURPHY: Yeah. They already did and they already sent it to me. They just sent me the wrong number.

BRENTON ANDRUS: Tanya, I would say more than just Metropolitan. I think any of the LGEs if they are using IFS for day hab services if they can give you an update how they plan on using their funds. I would assume it would impact using those dollars for that service.

TANYA MURPHY: You bet. I can reach out to everybody on that one. I will make a note of it. I think the instructions right now from the state is if your parish's positivity rate is below 5 percent they can start opening. If it's above 5 percent, they cannot. So everybody is in the process of trying to figure out if they can open and if they do, how.

BRENTON ANDRUS: Did you want to move onto the IFS data for the previous year or year 20?

TANYA MURPHY: Yes.

BRENTON ANDRUS: Committee members to know it's kind of hard probably for you to see it on screen. I would have to make it really small if it's all going to fit on there. But if you have any recommendations, if you want me to make something bigger please let me know.

TANYA MURPHY: There is so much data on here. Brenton, you sent this out ahead of time so people if they wanted to, could look over it. I don't even know how to present it, there is so much information.

BRENTON ANDRUS: I think one of the things, so last year we had the request basically trying to figure out what the specific services were throughout the year as opposed to just what the different requests were. If y'all remember, and Tanya I can't remember the system the LGEs or the districts and authorities would put the information in. But last year just come up with a system to tell you what services the requests were and how much money was spent because everybody kind of documented things a little bit differently. But it looks like this year gotten more consistent with documenting in that I think participant data services system or something like that.

TANYA MURPHY: Yeah. It's called participant services database. And yeah, you are right. We had a lot of stuff in other. And we had some LGEs who weren't entering the information at all.

BRENTON ANDRUS: Right. This is a follow up to that document for committee members that remember that extensive list last year. This kind of breaks it down a little bit better since they have gotten a lot better in documenting their requests. So you will notice, just to explain each page to you, each page will have its own district and authority. It will start with Metropolitan and go down to Jefferson. It will have across the top is going to be right here you will see, won't let me highlight. This column right here. I don't know if you are able to see my pointer. All the way on the left. The particular services. And then on the top the contracts and what was spent for the first quarter, second quarter, third quarter. And then your total at the end. A very big sheet of data, really not a clean way I can rearrange it for you to look at. Just wanted to give you background that that is what this information was. Kind of ties into what is on this first page. Let's you know how many priority requests each district and authority had. And then you will get the

breakdown here what those services actually look like across each quarter.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Do we have any questions about that?

TANYA MURPHY: An opportunity to look it over maybe and come up with specific questions. Otherwise I would think you might want to take the time to really look at it, analyze it and if you have questions to let me know.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: I see Liz is asking what area would day habilitation fall under.

TANYA MURPHY: Second from the bottom, vocational employment supports.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: I want to open it up if people have questions, if they really looked at, regardless if they really looked at it, we can have questions now. But I think since it is so much data that maybe this would be a good homework project for the committee to really look at. Cause this is for an entire year. Maybe for our next meeting we can have this on the agenda again and like really have some specific questions. And that way we can give feedback to the state office or to the LGEs as to what, some of the questions that came from this report. So Corhonda, that's what I just said. We are thinking alike. We will revisit that at the next meeting. Is that appropriate, Brenton?

BRENTON ANDRUS: If that is the will of the subcommittee, sure. Or the will of you as the chair, yes. I made a note to put it back on the agenda for January unless y'all change your mind.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: I was going to say as people have questions about this as they are looking at it, it's such a big report with so much information. Brenton, he has historical knowledge of what we were asking for because of what we had in the previous year. Or Tanya could probably help with those questions as everyone is reviewing this information.

TANYA MURPHY: Brenton, what is my next report here on the agenda.

BRENTON ANDRUS: A new report IFS approved pending funding report that was requested I think either the April or July meeting. A fairly recent report. And this, just to set it up, just shows you, the whole purpose of the report to let you know in that quarter that we are looking at approved pending funding whether whole or part requests. Again, same as the last meeting. This report it looks like

most of these come from or all of these come from the Capital Area Human Service District. This front page a breakdown of the particular services. Just kind of a summary to let you know how much money was requested and the percentages that were approved pending funding in whole and part. And as you go on more details about each particular request, the day, the amount requested, priorities levels and that outcome. I don't know, again, another report that has a lot of information. So I don't know if y'all have specific questions for Tanya about this or not.

TANYA MURPHY: I did want to add to it that if you look at the approved pending funding report, if you want to scroll down Brenton, it's region two almost exclusively that has approved pending funding. And I asked all the LGEs to respond to why is it region two the only one who has it. Don't you guys have approved pending funding. The majority of the answer was they were able to fund everything they were asked. Region two, I think they said something about 800 requests for individual and family support and they just did not have enough money to fund them all.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: This is Bambi. Little bit confused. One of our reports shows how many requests they received?

BRENTON ANDRUS: Correct. The one we just looked at. It tells you the requests for the whole year or so. This particular report, the pending funding report would not, this data is not going to be reflected in the previous report cause that just captures the previous year.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: I feel like I don't understand something. That does not seem right that we only have one region that has this issue. Like there is some discrepancies how it's processed, obviously, to me. Maybe not good or bad. But that just seems really odd.

TANYA MURPHY: I thought so too Bambi. I thought they must not be answering it right. I asked them all and they said no, we were able to review and fund and make a decision. Either the ones that were approved pending funding it was Capital Area was the only one. They did have 795 requests received for fiscal year 20. I went back to the report you were referring to Bambi and it's 795.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Region nine had 890.

TANYA MURPHY: Karen, you said you were aware of non-approved funding in another area which is not reflected. What area? And was it for last fiscal year or for this first quarter? Sorry, non-approved funding is

different from approved pending funding. Like you can have somebody make a request and have that request denied or have that request funded in part. But that would not be reflected on this report. This is only a report that was approved, but just not funded.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: It seems like maybe there is different definition. Like the other LGEs are making their approval based on the amount of funding they have. Could that be what it is? And where region two is approving regardless of what their funding is and then going back as it is prioritized, funding those priorities. Melinda Elliot in region five is saying they only approve here if they have funding.

TANYA MURPHY: Are you saying they will get a request and they just as opposed to approve pending funding they don't approve it because they don't have the funds? They deny it?

SPEAKER: That's what it seems like from talking to the families.

TANYA MURPHY: Usually the reasoning, okay, I guess that's possible. But I guess that gives the families an opportunity to appeal it. I guess difference in philosophy. If it meets criteria for funding, but don't have enough money to do it I guess that would be a reason to deny.

SPEAKER: Being informed how they can appeal.

TANYA MURPHY: Yeah, supposed to be getting a letter that says your request was denied and it should include their appeal.

SPEAKER: A letter. Okay. I don't hear back from them and they don't determine eligibility at all until they fund.

KELLY MONROE: I think what happens is, or at least from what I have heard, is that they just don't determine eligibility at all because there is no funding available and when funding becomes available, they grab the next one and start determining eligibility. At least that's what I heard from other families. I don't think they are determined not eligible. I think it's just they don't hear back from them.

TANYA MURPHY: Got ya. That could very well be. I do want to let you guys know the brand new, this is for first quarter, but October 1st we began implementation of the new individual and family support manual that was revised.

And I provided a training to all of the LGEs. And I hit hard on this point right here because of the discrepancies. And one of the points I made sure to tell them was they should take every single individual and family support requests they get to the committee regardless of funding availability. Because this list of approved pending funding is how we know whether they have enough money or not. And if they don't that's how they would get more money. I do think there is some LGEs out there, I know it happened years ago whenever I was doing the program. If we didn't have very much money, we would only take priority one and twos to the committee. If somebody was priority three or four, they wouldn't be heard at all. And my instructions were how do you know if their priority is accurate if you don't take it to the committee to be reviewed. Priority might change from a four to a one, then they would get funded. And every single request needs to be brought to the committee. So this is new information that I would hope is going to change this some.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: We have several comments. I don't know if we have anyone, any of our committee members that had any questions.

TANYA MURPHY: Brenton, I sent a copy of the new IFS funding manual to you when it was implemented so you could probably send it back out if you haven't.

BRENTON ANDRUS: Yes. We can do that.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: It seems like Hyacinth. Scrolling through the comments, seems like yours was not addressed for clarification based on funding is a question. And I think that was kind of answered. Do you feel it was answered?

HYACINTH MCKEE: I am not sure if it was quite answered. I just needed to get clarification. It probably was. I just wanted to get some more clarification on that. It seems as though there is some inconsistencies in the way the regions are approving and not approving.

TANYA MURPHY: I don't think a reason for a denial should be they don't have enough money. It should be, it could be a reason that certain LGEs aren't presenting the requests to the committee at all. And that hopefully has been rectified with the new training. Reason for denial should be based on it not fitting the criteria for individual and family support. Or the persons needs are not reflected to meet what they are asking for. Sometimes

a family wants 24-hour care and of course their need might be there, but the money is not there. I can see them not getting approved for all of that cause it cost too much. But that would not really be a denial because of funding. It would just be we can't meet that need with IFS. Each thing is a case by case basis. But I think you are right. I think just because they don't have enough money to pay, shouldn't be denied outright. Should be approved pending funding if it meets criteria.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Tanya, did you answer the question about the copy of the new manual and where it can be found? Okay. And then Nicole Green said everyone has a statement of approval is eligible to receive services. The decision is approved, denied or some cases approved pending funding. I don't know if Nicole can talk or not. Maybe it would be good to get someone from an LGE, such as Nicole, to give us some insight on the nuts and bolts of it.

NICOLE GREEN: Can you hear me? I don't want to really speak for another LGE. I can only speak for Jefferson. Our requests goes to the committee. If we receive a request it goes to the committee. We review it and we make a decision about an approval or denial. We requested training from Tanya, and she provided training on filling out some of the reports. I think so many reports on participant service system we are not all familiar with every one of them. So I don't necessarily believe that it may be that they are just flat out denying or approving. And in some cases that might be the case for some LGEs. Just might be reporting differences how information is reported.

TANYA MURPHY: Just to clarify what Nicole was saying, the reports are not individually filled out in participant service. The data is entered in the individual and family supports section of the database. So if they put the information in for each case it's automatically populated into the report. So I think Nicole was right. There were some unclear as to what information needed to be put in there in order for it to pop on this approved pending funding report. That would just mean they are not entering the data into the database. But that is training that has been provided.

NICOLE GREEN: Thank you for that clarification.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: What you are saying you might have approved pending funding, but it may not, the data the way

you enter it may not be in to where it's going to pull up in this report, the way this report is pulled.

NICOLE GREEN: Yeah. So we requested and Tanya is correct. She provided some training to us and I included our data entry person that kind of is responsible for putting all that information into the system. And so the results coming up for the next fiscal year, whatever, should look different.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Any other questions on this report.

MARILEE ANDREWS: Melinda Elliot's hand is raised.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Melinda.

MELINDA ELLIOT: So I am confused. Maybe I am confused again. Here we had a system for IFS funds where we had like four levels. And sometimes we were told they were fulfilling level ones and at some point, enough money for level twos. So that is going away.

TANYA MURPHY: It's not going away. I think some LGEs were only taking requests to the committee for decisions that met level one or level two. Or something along those lines because they were trying to preserve some of their money for later in the fiscal year. The only thing going away or changing is that I have advised the LGEs that every request should go to the committee for a decision. If that decision is funded, denied or we think it should be funded, but we can't afford it right now should be approved pending funding as opposed to holding off on making a decision until they feel like they have enough money. If that makes sense.

MELINDA ELLIOT: Yes, ma'am. I was just checking. Thank you.

HYACINTH MCKEE: That answered my question. Thank you.

TANYA MURPHY: Awesome.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Thank you very much.

BRENTON ANDRUS: Just to clarify, I know you mentioned the trainings you did early in October. Do you think we might see changes, hopefully changes in this approved pending funding going forward? Maybe a better idea of what they should be doing.

TANYA MURPHY: Absolutely. Another thing I mentioned if you have a page and a half of approved pending funding and at the end of the fiscal year a hundred thousand dollars left in your IFS budget you are doing it wrong. Because if have approved pending funding and you have money left

over. You should have been funding those individuals. So we will see.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: If we don't have any more questions, I know we are really behind on time. I am kind of lost on our agenda. What item now.

BRENTON ANDRUS: It would be the report from Kelly.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: This would be the ending of OCDD. Thank you, Tanya.

TANYA MURPHY: Very welcome. Probably should put me on the end so these people can drop off if they need to.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: That's okay. So next we will have the SPAS report or Arc of Louisiana report from Kelly Monroe.

KELLY MONROE: Okay. So we had some changes this quarter. This is not the end of the year report because we did that last time. So this is going to be just for the first quarter. We don't have as many people as OCDD, so we were able to take care of that in the last quarter. For this quarter though, we were able to serve 42 people, but a lot of them changed. Because some of them started receiving services through DCW and other things. Able to replace with new people. Some of the demographics are going to be different. When you look at the race, the race was only split between African Americans and Caucasians. 64 percent of the people receiving Caucasians and 36 percent African American. Of those, 26 of them were male. And 15 were female. They ranged from the age of 21 to 89. When you look at the geographic location, we had a couple of changes, but not too, too much. In region one, five people receiving services. Region two, seven. Region three, four. Region four, there were two. Five, there were three. Region six, there were two. Region seven, there were nine. And region eight, there was three. Region nine, there were six. And region ten, there was one. Turnover to the next page you will see that all of them receive support coordination no matter what the services they received, all of them receive support coordination with it. Thirty-six of those people received the personal care assistance. Three of them were rent assistance and utility assistance. Four of them receive medical supply and equipment. And one was a vehicle modification. Because we had a little bit of funds last year kind of rolled over. The amount of direct services that we were able to budget this year was 907,528. We have

not, because of covid some of that was delayed because we weren't able to get all the paperwork done. We are a little bit behind when it comes to offering, I think we can offer services to two more people and we are waiting on that paperwork. So we don't actually have all that authorized just let. Should have that completed by the end of next month. That is really good. Also the waiting list, I believe last time it was like 69 people or 72 people. But because we had some extra funds last year, we were able to use one-time funds and now only 45 on the waiting list. If you know of people who are working who could use personal care assistance or some type of service so they can continue to work in the community, please send them our way. We can get them the application. The waiting list is very small. If we were to serve all 45 people on the waiting list, we would definitely need additional 1,000,070-dollars to cover those costs. Those are estimates. And probably a little over estimated. But that would also include the match. So I think if we were to look at state general funds, which you guys asked me before how much is that I would say probably around five hundred thousand. But don't quote me on that. I would have to definitely ask to look into that for me. That is all I have. I don't know if you guys have any questions, any concerns. Willing and able to answer.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Because of the extra funding that you have for various reasons you are going to be able to add two more people to receiving services, is that correct?

KELLY MONROE: Yes.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: And last year serving 42. So still serving 42?

KELLY MONROE: I think we ended last year with like a total of, cumulative total of 56. Some of that was one-time funds. And so we were able to get the 42. And I guess you are probably like if it was extra funds why is the same amount of people. Is that what you are asking?

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: No. Asking cause it's great you were able to add two more people.

KELLY MONROE: What we did also with that, we were having, we had also increased some of the salaries of the self-directed people. Because they were having a hard time getting staff and so we did increase, I think it was by a dollar for the self-directed ones. And then we also, just so happened that people just kind of like moved into

that same thing and was authorized the same amount of hours. Pure coincidence on that end.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Thank you so much for your report. Not sure if you have done it before. I like seeing the gender as well as racial map on here. Happy to see that. You have probably done it before. Glad to see you are outlining that. Just wanted to know what can happen to kind of help change the data as it relates to the racial disparity and gender disparity. The gender disparity is pretty much shocking. Seeing plenty of men that get the service. I don't know if you can move it back down to the chart where it has the gender and racial. There is a significant amount of men that receive benefits and services. Is it trying to get out word of mouth? What do you think? What is your plan addressing that?

KELLY MONROE: When this program first began a long time ago it was for individuals who worked. And was really like, you could not be employed, but they really favored those who were employed. And it was just a situation where more men were employed than women, I think. And a lot of these people have been on this contract for years. And continue to work and it meets their needs. And because they don't really fit into any of the other services or any other waivers or state funded services. So I am assuming that might be what it is. But I really don't know. But we don't have much turnover on this contract. The group that we did have that moved on was a group of people that I put on the CCW waiting list back like five years ago. And they are just now being called. It's like one after the other was getting these services. So we had to just keep replacing them. Just happened it took that long.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Just wanted to note that and point it out. Just wondering what was some of the reasons for the disparities. Thank you, Kelly.

KELLY MONROE: You are welcome. Thank you. Anyone else?

BRENTON ANDRUS: Do y'all plan on advocating for any additional funds this year?

KELLY MONROE: You know, our first thought we were going to do that. Still kind of up in the air. We know that things are, the budget is going to be in bad shape, and we keep hearing about it. The legislature was very supportive of the disability community recently. And I think we are going to focus on supporting other endeavors,

like other people, and make sure that we don't receive any cuts. But we are just going to feel it out and just see. But right now, I just don't feel good about going and ask the legislature for any money.

BRENTON ANDRUS: I appreciate it. Thanks.

KELLY MONROE: Welcome.

KIM BASILE: Can I ask Kelly a question? Going back to Hyacinth's question, since a lot of these people have been on SPAS for so long and the racial and the ethnic disparity could you maybe next time breakdown the ethnic and racial numbers for the waiting list.

KELLY MONROE: Yeah. I can do that.

KIM BASILE: Would that help to see who is on the waiting list?

HYACINTH MCKEE: And also the gender too. A whole lot of men getting these services and I am concerned. Women do work. Really concerned about that. Thanks for the recommendation.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: It's really not a racial disparity if you look at the state as a percentage. I think 36 percent is close to what the makeup of the state is as far as population African American. I think that is really great. Also I think in regards to gender, don't we have higher number of males with disabilities? I know like in developmental disabilities I think you often see that. Maybe I am quoting wrong data. We get too much of that already. Don't want to contribute to that. I think those are great ideas and I appreciate y'all bringing that up. Nicole confirmed what I said. If we are wrong, blame me and Nicole.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Would it be we have more men with disabilities or more that are identified? Or are reported. That would be the bigger question. Identified and reported or is there data to show in this state that we have more actually with disabilities. Or a reporting issue.

KELLY MONROE: Also important to note too most of these people, with the exception of one, acquired their disability as an adult from an accident. Whether it be like a recreational accident, or gunshot wound, or something like that. Guys tend to me more, you know, willing to put themselves out there. Just thinking about my own kids how boys, guys are a little bit more active and willing to do things. They jeopardize their health where

women aren't.

BRENTON ANDRUS: We can be pretty careless. That is accurate.

MARILEE ANDREWS: You have another comment from the chat.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: I see Corhonda made a comment. I was thinking the same thing. Often times females they are diagnosed, especially I know with developmental disabilities, I have learned they can mask their disability.

KELLY MONROE: Majority of these are going to be very visible. Because most of them use wheelchairs or have very significant physical disabilities. Most of these are going to be the people who receive these, that qualify for these services are going to have very significant physical disabilities.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Thank you Kelly. Interesting to talk about. Next, we will have Office of Behavioral Health, Dr. Savicki.

KRISTEN SAVICKI: Can everybody hear me okay? I think Brenton is going to put our report up on the screen.

BRENTON ANDRUS: What order would like to go? Both children and both adults, or do the year end for children and adult and move onto the first quarter for each?

KRISTEN SAVICKI: If we could do the year end first and then cause it's on the same document, I think that will be easier. Thank you. So this is the year end. Not too many updates from our quarter four report that we reported out on at our last committee meeting. Although there were some LGEs that hadn't quite made it to the threshold of spending by that quarter four report. Did make it over the finish line once all the invoices were tallied for the end of the fiscal year. We do have, and this will sound very similar to what Tanya was reporting, a couple LGEs who weren't able to get to 95 percent spending threshold by the end of the year. What we hear from them, very similarly to what Tanya said, some of that really was affected by covid. Some of our LGEs hold aside some of the consumer care resources funding specifically for summer camps. Things like that that they can help families with at the end of the fiscal year. Which covid hit and plans had to change. Some LGEs were able to make some switches in how they were spending the funding in time to get it all out. But others had a harder time. A couple folks, couple LGEs instead of

getting up that 95 percent, more of that 88-percentage range of spending for CPR. They will be working on corrective action plans in terms of how to get all of that out for this coming fiscal year. Any particular questions on this report?

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: I don't see any questions.

KRISTEN SAVICKI: If not we can go over to the adult yearend report. Which is simpler in that everybody spent all their money. Typically what occurs with these supported living funding on the adult side. Pretty well accounted for. No real surprises here. Any questions? If not, we can switch over to the first quarter report for this current fiscal year. Again, repeating what Tanya said, a lot of these numbers are very low. And we all see that in the first quarter report because given the LGEs have to submit it before the quarter fully closes. So that is one issue. And then the other issue we have several LGEs for the same kind of pool of needs that these funds are used for, also use for block grant funds. And based on federal funding regulations they need to use that funding first. Several LGEs we see 0 percent spent for a good half three quarters of the fiscal year. And then because they are using mental health block grant funding for a similar purpose, or the majority of the year at times, and then use their allocated act 378 consumer care resources fund towards that end of the fiscal year to close that out. And in general, pretty successful and managing the funding that way for a while. So we have some confidence that works well for them. Any questions on this one? And again, for the LGEs that didn't quite make it for that 95 percent threshold last year we are talking to them. Getting a corrective action plan. And some of those corrective actions will be around essentially bouncing back from figuring out how to reconfigure services given covid. Obviously, an unprecedented situation for everyone and takes a minute to figure out how to shift and respond. You can probably go over to the adult report. And then on the adult side these are really established programs and the LGEs typically do use these pretty efficiently and quickly. You see more expended on this side.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Do we have any questions. You presented on all of them, right?

KRISTEN SAVICKI: Yeah, that is all for us. Obviously, I welcome questions on it.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Any questions? Okay. Well, thank you. We will move onto discussion regarding determination eligibility implementation requirements for services. And I think, there was a letter that was received and a response.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Bambi, you are going in and out. We can't hear you.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: I am looking at different screens. A letter that was received from a constituent and then a response to that letter from the Department of Education. I don't know if, Brenton, you want to pull up that letter as well.

BRENTON ANDRUS: I am hoping everybody had time to review the letters prior to this meeting. The original letter received is 11 pages. And it's a couple pages here, I believe, for Department of Education's response. I know the letter that Courtney had sent that they have representatives here to give insight on how they would anticipate they will be able to address these concerns. I know Mr. Lozack is on the call as well. I know we have a couple of our executive committee members that originally, I guess, addressed this letter in their committee, but had it sent over to act 378. There is multiple parties on the call that can shed some light on this for us, Bambi, if you wanted to reach out to any of them to help guide the conversation.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: We got the state agencies to address these issues. I am not sure what the next steps are. Like Brenton said, the executive committee sent act 378 to look at it. Maybe they have some insight, or we can open the floor up for questions or comments in regards to the correspondence.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Just for clarification Brenton, you are saying the only response we received was from the Department of Ed. Because the request from the executive committee was to get a response from OBH as well as OCDD. And so the only response that we have thus far is from DOE. Are all the representatives from OCDD and OBH present today to address the concerns in Mr. Lozack's letter?

BRENTON ANDRUS: Department of ed sent the letter we have here. That is their formal response. I am not aware they sent anyone to this meeting. I don't know based on our guests if any of them are representing Department of Ed. I do know Julie Hagan with OCDD sent us a response via

email that basically said they weren't taking action at this time. But they do have Tanya here to be able to respond to any questions. Julie was hoping to get on the call as well just depending on how the meeting went at the legislature. I am not certain if the response that we got from Julie was more of a LDH as a whole response or just OCDD response. Just via email. But we also have Kristen here who presented on OBH that I am sure has read the letter as well. I think we have a representative from everyone here with the exception of education. And I don't think we have anyone here from Medicaid. And then we also have Mr. Lozack is here who sent the letter.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Other members in attendance now that we don't have a formal response, are they in the position and available to provide the responses to the letter that Anthony Lozack sent? In other words, the representatives that was requested by the executive committee to address Mr. Lozack's letter are they present today and can speak on behalf of the entity that they represent to address? And I am going to ask our chair, do we need to make sure that we get something formally in writing to respond to Anthony Lozack's letter? How do we proceed on this? The letter was written in July. This is October. Almost November. I just really don't want to not at least acknowledge Mr. Anthony's letter and his time.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: I am looking for the response from Julie. I thought I had it on my computer. Basically what Brenton said.

MARILEE ANDREWS: You also have one hand raised. Not sure if you want to wait till you finish this discussion. Just wanted to let you know. It's Charlie Michel

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Do we have any other comments by committee members, questions? If not, then let Charlie ask a question.

CHARLIE MICHEL: I apologize, I read this letter back in July and I did not read it again before tonight. But as I am looking at the response from the state department the little bit, I can see I do remember the letter and how distressed I was at the broad brush this gentleman was using to paint pupil appraisal personnel. I was over pupil appraisal personnel as a special ed director and I can tell you they are quite well trained. Maybe some districts who don't do as well as others. But the school districts are not obligated to make medical diagnosis. The school

districts are absolutely responsible to ensure that any child with a disability is eligible for special ed services. Which means there needs to be some requirement of special ed specialized instruction or related services pertaining to that disability. In order to get to that it does require that school systems look at all available data. Medical data, if it's a medical diagnosis and educational data they may themselves collect or some private provider. Additionally there are many children in our school systems that have medical diagnosis of autism and other medical diagnosis who because of the requirements under federal law with IDEA do not qualify for specialized instruction or do not qualify for special services. Therefore just because a child has a medical diagnosis does not mean they are going to receive special ed services nor should they. If they do not qualify for special ed services, then act 504 of the 1973 rehabilitation act could possibly be an avenue they can receive some support. I want to follow my complete displeasure at the broad brush that was used in this letter because it's an indictment over an entire profession that's unprofessional, unfair and unwarranted. I have no questions. Thank you.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Thank you Dr. Michel. Any other questions or comments?

HYACINTH MCKEE: We have representation from each of the entities, again, that was asked to speak on Mr. Lozack's letter. That was the question I had. And then are we, cause we did at the executive committee did ask for, at a minimum, a response from those entities. Just to acknowledge the letter was received. That was the request. I see we have a response from Department of Ed. There is some listed from OCDD and OBH. If not, what is the reasoning for that. It could be whatever. Where do we go from here?

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Brenton, were you able to find the email from Julie. Could you read it?

BRENTON ANDRUS: Sure. The response that Julie Foster Hagan sent us, and she is the assistant secretary for Offices for Citizens with Developmental Disabilities. She wrote Louisiana Department of Health has reviewed the letter from Mr. Lozack and his concerns regarding LDH activities have been considered. It is the position of LDH that no further actions are needed in response at this time. We will have representatives of act 378 committee meetings

provide additional information if needed. My understanding since she could not be here that Tanya is here. And also Kristen with OBH is here as well.

MARILEE ANDREWS: You guys are moving quicker than I could unmute. But a few minutes ago we said are there any other comments. Three people have their hands raised. Mr. Lozack had his first, and then Ms. Corley, and Ms. Katie.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: We can go in that order.

ANTHONY LOZACK: Thank you very much for taking up this matter in the subcommittee meeting. Appreciate that. I would like to address the previous comments. The issues are not about requiring the Department of Education, local educational agencies to perform medical evaluations. Actually the person that spoke if you look at the transcript it will, this is a paradigm issue. I don't believe we are dealing with personal incompetence, necessarily. I think what I believe we have is a paradigm in our public education system where especially related to children with developmental disabilities and intellectual disabilities the pupil appraisal teams confuse what medical diagnostic evaluations verses what nationally are accepted in the evaluation tests to be done by pupil appraisals personnel in schools. So like what the letter discussed is that exactly what the upset gentleman was saying, in fact. He did understand it. He spoke that and I agree with most of what he said. Except the attacks against me. And it's evidence the school district pupil appraisal teams don't know that and don't have access to the psychological tests that actually evaluate for the presence of these developmental disabilities within the evaluating circumstances of IDEA in 1508. They are the same. These tests are also used to make what is referred to as medical diagnoses which ESM psychological criteria from the DSM5. And the same psychologists performed the same tests that are used by doctors to do ICD10 diagnoses and by school districts to evaluate for the presence of these exceptionalities listed in 1508. For our case, intellectual and developmental disabilities. This is the problem because we don't by and large in a broad sweeping case such that in the discussion in this subcommittee we don't know that difference. And that means that there are so many people in Louisiana that are being not identified because federally the system of identification and

determination of eligibility depends on those same federal obligations from our very outstanding educational team. But we need to be able to have a system of training and accountability and licensure where there is accountability to our pupil appraisal teams in these matters to recognize that they are responsible for administering these tests. I could explain it this way. If you think a child, if I were to have my son go from his private school setting into the public school, and he's home schooled and in the process of doing this. He needs to be evaluated and it's not just based on somebody saying oh, yes this is what is going on. He does really good in math. There is specific tests that educational diagnosticians do to determine where he is at in math. There is tests that are done to determine the presence of developmental disabilities that are not being done by and large in Louisiana public school system.

MARILEE ANDREWS: I am keeping time and it has been three minutes.

ANTHONY LOZACK: Thank you. That was my response.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Thank you. And I think next is Corhonda Corley.

CORHONDA CORLEY: Great afternoon madam chair and the rest of the council members. I would like to reflect on this letter and saying that Dr. Michel took. When I am watching parents of children with disabilities not receive proper assessments and so it results in children receiving incorrect IEPs with incorrect support. Which then results in children being suspended, expelled or propelled into that school to prison pipeline. I find a problem when we don't want to hold systems accountable when systems have cracks that causing children to fall into it. And these children having co morbidity such as suicidal ideation and mental health problems as a result. And these children end up with post-traumatic stress disorder and all we do is sit back and wonder why. The reason why because we have people that don't want to take accountability for the transparency in which we are requesting. We are requesting some results. There was an 11-year-old child that everybody throughout this lovey nation has watched drive a school bus. But nobody is talking about that this child has a developmental disability had just recently been hospitalized prior to that event for mental health issues. The school system failed him as well as not providing proper supports. And this child was on top of a roof. There is

problems that clearly not being addressed by every single entity that was named in that letter. And I just don't want to see my child, or any other child continue to fall through cracks. LDOE continue to have number in their stats on their website of children that are propelled into the school to prison pipeline. Continue to reflect children that are secluded and restrained. Continue to reflect children with disabilities in high alarming numbers. And yet no one is actually opening up their mouth to say how can we come with a resolution. It's a problem. It's a problem when children are being shackled and chained. When we can actually stop that. Children are not receiving proper education, but we can actually stop that. And this number is affecting children, including our English language learners. Just barriers not being addressed. Children receiving assistive technology. That is not being addressed. When we talk about pupal appraisal falling through the crack, they are definitely falling through the crack and not being held to the standards of care in which they promise to provide. Thank you so much.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Thank you. Now we have Ms. Katie Faucheaux

KATIE FAUCHEAUX: I am here in response to the letter that Anthony has sent out and I am speaking for myself and my daughter. I have two children on the autism spectrum, both have anxiety. My son was raised in a different state. He attended a different school system. And going onto him starting school he was immediately put on an IEP. At the time I had no clue what I was getting into. My daughter started here in Lafayette Parish School Systems three years ago and since then I have asked for an IEP to be put in place. I have asked for a 1508 evaluation since been diagnosed by the Tulane Center of Autism and I am still not getting an evaluation. Which is by federal law my right for her to get evaluated. When I spoke to them last the pupil appraisal group here in Lafayette Parish, they told me that what if we don't see the same things that Tulane saw. Well, guess what, she does exhibit her autism at school. She does have meltdowns; she does refuse to go to school. And once she refused to go to school that is on me and it puts her in truancy, and they keep telling me I am going to be going to court. They have even spoken to my child, the principal of the school spoken to my child and told her she was going to put her mother and father in jail because she

is not showing up for school to her face while I was on the phone. Now they are not following any regulations whatsoever. So this letter from Anthony is 100 percent correct. Because I have been in different school systems. I have been in Texas, I know been in Ohio, I have been in New York when my child has received special accommodations because of autism spectrum disorder. And here I am in Louisiana with a child exactly the same as my son and she is not even able to be evaluated because they will not grant me that right. To tell me there is not a problem in the school system that needs to be addressed because my child is extremely intelligent. She just needs special accommodations for herself. I can't even get that. Now if that's going on with my child, then there is other children out there being affected exactly the same. So why is this not a huge issue. Because my child is going to get kicked out of school if they cannot find anything wrong with her.

MARILEE ANDREWS: That has been three minutes and there is a comment I think specifically for you in the chat by Mr. Charlie Michel. Bambi, do you want to read it or want me to read it.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: I think, actually, Charlie it would be Acadiana Lafayette Parish. And it's about the Families Helping Families, reaching out. Before you read that, seems like this discussion has been education related which is outside the scope of act 378. So very important. And I understand the issues you are describing. Certainly, something we need to address as a DD Council. Make sure those things are being addressed. But I am not sure if that is within the scope of act 378. But if you would read that comment.

MARILEE ANDREWS: So he is saying if you would contact Families Helping Families of Acadiana, which is in Lafayette, they can assist you. You are correct, your request for evaluations is an IDEA requirement for the school system to initiate an evaluation. Certainly help you get that evaluation. If you put the request in writing and they refuse they have to take you to the due process to prove why they are refusing to do the evaluation. And most districts won't do that. It is Families Helping Families of Acadiana, which is in Lafayette.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Okay. Do we have any other comments or questions on this last agenda item?

MARILEE ANDREWS: You have one from Ms. Corley still regarding Ms. Fauchaux's comment. Says the school systems are giving the parents a circus race and never provide what is needed regardless of written documentation. If you look in the chat, Brenton kindly put all the contact information for that Families Helping Families. And Mr. Lozack said the executive committee sent this letter to this subcommittee to be addressed with the education component as well.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Okay. The education act 378 is a specific law with requirement of what the scope of what it's supposed to address. So the education component should probably be addressed outside of this committee, perhaps education committee. But I am not going to say that is where it needs to go. But I don't know if there is any other action that is needed by this committee.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Just a little concerned. I asked the question on two occasions and I am still not getting a full answer. We did get a formal response from LDOE. We did get an email from OCDD saying they are just not going to address the issues. I just want to be on the record to make sure that we received a response that the executive committee of the LADDC asked for and that this letter from Mr. Lozack has been addressed from the three entities that we requested as well as the LADDC. I asked this on two occasions since I have been sitting here, and I would do this for anyone who sent a concern up to the LADDC. I need to get clarification as to where are we going from here to ensure that the responses were received and that this letter was addressed from this public member. Anybody going to take the time and write a 12-page letter at a minimum their issue should be addressed appropriately. That is my third request to find out exactly where we are to make sure that we are responding to this public member. Thank you.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: So the response from Julie Foster Hagan, as Brenton read, it was a response from LDH. That included both OCDD and OBH. And Department of Education, they did send a letter in response. It's the will of the committee if they want to ask for something else.

HYACINTH MCKEE: I looked in the chat box and said there are representatives today from OBH as well as OCDD. If they are available, I know we do have some more time left. I am not sure cause I am not chairing this committee. Are

they available to address that letter? Am I understanding that?

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: They are here, yes. We are a little bit over time. But if we have a question, we can get them to respond.

BRENTON ANDRUS: If you have a question for OCDD specifically Tanya Murphy is here on behalf of Julie Foster Hagan. And if you have a question for OBH Kristen is here as well.

HYACINTH MCKEE: I see Julie just jumped in. I don't know how you want to address this Bambi. You are chairing it. I don't know how you want to allow the questions to be asked.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: I don't know how to address an 11 page. It's almost like it was too much information for our standpoint. It needed to be broken down, like different issues that needed to be broken down in some type of way to be addressed. But right now if there are specific questions for the representatives from LDH we can allow just a few more minutes to ask those questions.

HYACINTH MCKEE: It seems like we do have some representatives. Are you allowing Mr. Lozack to ask a question? How are you wanting this to unfold? Are you allowing him the floor?

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: We only have a few more minutes. Anyone who has a question we can allow a few more minutes to ask questions of those entities.

MARILEE ANDREWS: The reception is really bad. We have lost you again. It's going in and out.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: I can't hear anything.

MARILEE ANDREWS: It's very static. The first time you spoke it was very clear. Not sure if you were doing something different than you are doing now.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: We are not able to obviously hear Mr. Lozack. Does anyone else have comments to make?

BRENTON ANDRUS: Now that Julie is on, she may have a response she would like to make.

JULIE FOSTER HAGAN: I apologize for having to join late. They called a last-minute Medicaid joint over site committee that I had to participate in. So I just was able to hear sort of the last few minutes of conversation and I can say that we took the letter, the 12-page letter and attempted to identify what the specific concerns were for the Department of Health. I did that jointly with my LDH

legal team, with the Office of Behavioral Health, and with our Medicaid office. We did each of those sections individually look into the concerns. I can say on my part I pulled eligibility data and did some analysis of the eligibility data. And we, again, all engaged in different methodologies for looking into that. And after we did that none of us were able to identify any areas that we needed to do further investigation on. Because of, quite honestly, special session as well as hurricane response, we were not able to put together a formal document to outline all of those. If that is requested, we will be able to do so because there was an investigation into each of those. We just were not able to get that ready in a presentation prior to this committee meeting. But we did, each of us, did look into the concerns that were expressed. Again, in the way we interpreted it I think it was said earlier understandably some frustration about some different things. And we were able to look into those. Also happy to set up a meeting with Mr. Lozack and discuss his concerns specifically. Without it being outlined individually some of them we weren't sure exactly what the concern was. I am also happy to set up a meeting and discuss that with him as well. Just wanted to share that. I understand it sounded when I joined that it seemed as if the department was saying we read the letter and don't think there is anything to it. And that wasn't what happened. We did do investigation, just were not able to put together a formal report due to several other priorities.

HYACINTH MCKEE: Thank you so much, Julie, for that. Thank you for acknowledging. I think that's really what we just wanted to hear from you. That his letter was acknowledged and validated. I am not sure if Mr. Lozack is still on the line because he had some disconnection but thank you for jumping in and bringing clarification to that. I think that actually, and I can't, I just sit on the EC, I think that is something the EC can leave with knowing you acknowledged and validated. That would be up to Mr. Lozack if he wants to arrange that. Just wanted to make sure the LADDC did their part to get that information. Thank you so much Julie for your team for that acknowledgment and validation of that public member.

BRENTON ANDRUS: It looks like he added his email in the chat if you wanted to get that info. I guess that means he would like to meet. He did put his email address there.

MARILEE ANDREWS: Not sure if you are still taking comments, but Ms. Faucheaux's hand is raised. And Anthony says he would like to meet.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Ms. Faucheaux, your comments have to do with act 378 issues, then yes. Please make your comment. We need to end by 3:00 please.

KATIE FAUCHEAUX: This is specifically for Ms. Julie. If you said you did investigations, I would really like for you to investigate one school in particular to show--.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: This isn't education. This is Department of Health.

KATIE FAUCHEAUX: Well, my child has health issues and is being dealt specifically with the school system incorrectly. Julie, if you would like to investigate to see exactly what Anthony is specifically talking about in his letter my daughter attends Earnest Gallet Elementary in Youngsville in Lafayette Parish. Which is supposed to be one of the top-rated elementary schools in our school district. And I am fighting with everybody along, including the school board system, for my daughter. So that is one thing that you could probably do is investigate at least one school to see that one child is getting the correct.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Ms. Hagan works with Department of Health. So she doesn't do investigations of the schools. But you have an important issue, so I think it probably needs to be taken like offline. Definitely reach out to Families Helping Families Center in Acadiana. And then reach out to the DD Council if you need more direction of support in regards to the education issues and I can give you other supports.

BRENTON ANDRUS: Mary who chairs the education committee has her hand up.

MARY TARVER: I just wanted to say today we did have our education committee meeting. It was the first time we had Dr. Peterson who was at the meeting. They have had new superintendent, new assistant superintendent. They are working on some major overhauls from the conversation that she had with us today. I feel very hopeful. And so I think if you haven't reached out, if it's been a while since you have reached out to somebody at Department of Education that might be a possibility as well. We certainly want to make sure the issues are getting addressed. Make sure they are being addressed in the appropriate way with the people

that can do the most good to help you. I think Bambi mentioned starting with Families Helping Families and then Department of Education would also be a good resource to revisit now just in the last couple of months they had changes there.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Thank you, Mary. And we are way over time, and I want to respect everyone's time and commitment to this committee. So if there is nothing further urgent, we will go ahead and have announcements. If there is any announcements you can raise your hand to be recognized.

HYACINTH MCKEE: I see a comment about the investigative report that Julie said they were working on at LDH. I'm sure that will be available at some point whenever they are able to pull it together. I know Julie is still on the line. I know she said they are working on a response.

JULIE FOSTER HAGAN: I am. I can't say when that will be completed, but if it is the will of the committee, we provide a formal response I can work with my legal team to do so.

HYACINTH MCKEE: That was one of the requests of the executive committee. But that's okay, we understand things are going on. Storms and all that. Thank you, Julie.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: If there are no other announcements or urgent information we will go ahead and adjourn the meeting. Do we need a motion to adjourn? Mary made a motion.

MARY TARVER: Yes, ma'am.

HYACINTH MCKEE: I second.

BAMBI POLOTZOLA: Dr. McKee second. If there is no objection we will go ahead and adjourn the meeting. And we will see you all at the council meeting tomorrow. Thank you.