



Notes from Aug. 8, 2023 Senate Bill 91 workgroup session 1

08/08/2023 10 am-12pm	Senate Bill 91 Workgroup Session 1 via Zoom	
Agenda Item	Questions from Attendees	Discussion Notes
Facilitator Introductions & Roll Call		
Comments from Anna Lansky		<p>Thank you for being here. Opening welcome.</p> <p>Many versions of SB91 were considered by the legislature. The legislation that passed has a very limited budget. This meeting is to focus on what we have in front of us today and we ask that you refrain from theoretical scenarios and questions. There has been no bridge or gap funding made available, as of today. We will be focusing on the implementation of SB91 in an equitable and fair way. There will be very difficult decisions to be made collectively.</p>

Review background information and summary of SB 91		Caitlin presented information
Open Discussion:	<p>Q: <u>How will people know to sign-up for this program?</u></p> <p>Q: <u>What accountability measures will be in place for how parents will be notified before the window closes?</u></p> <p>Q: <u>Will the program expand in the future?</u></p> <p>Q: <u>Will children be able to access other services still if they enroll in this new waiver?</u></p> <p>Q: <u>What if someone who has been waiting and selected</u></p>	<p>Responses from ODDS and members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern not every parent will receive the same information at the same time. • Suggestions for an automatic entry system • Concerned about how people will be notified about a lottery. Broad support for out notification and automatic enrollment. • <u>Answer from Anna:</u> This program will evolve and change, and everything can be amended. • <u>Answer from Caitlin:</u> No change in other service access. • Member response: Suggests a "weighted lottery" option. Could a child's name be put in another time for every 12 months they

	<p><u>for the lottery list but gets by-passed by someone who barely qualified?</u></p>	<p>are on the list. Therefore, if a child has been on the list for 5 years, their name is in the lottery pool 5 times?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member response: Concerns about disadvantages new folks coming in to almost guarantee they are at end of waitlist for 18 years. • Member suggestion: 3- Part Proposal: (1) financial means evaluation of total household income (2) weight for rural areas and less access to provider pool (3) any other household or family member or extended family member already acting as a provider for the child. • Comment: Concerned with the children who are not living in their family home. • Comment: The cost for the out-of-home placement is significant. • Comment: Parent providers should be priority to reunify them with their family. • Comment: Concerns about adding additional criteria will result in more administrative burden and complicate things for families. • Comment: In favor of financial means evaluation as there are such a limited number of spaces.
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comment: Concerned about low-income children that are at greater risk to become underserved.• Comment: Concerns with the financial assessment for determination• Comment: Concerned with the “dehumanizing” aspect for the child to prove over and over again that they are “worthy” of these services.• Comment: Encourages development of the children in the “system.”• Comment: Concerned that the “eligible” child may not have a safe parent.• Comment: Concerned with additional double standard regarding DSP/Parent and DSP that already exist in the bill.• Comment: Concerns about the OIG Exclusion List (background limitations) there are exclusions that do not permit someone to ever pass a background check to work for a Medicaid program.
--	--	---

Timeline & Next Steps	Meet on 08/16/23	
Member Questions, Comments & Requested Next Meeting Agenda Items	<p>Comment: ODDS explain more about why the legislature determined such limited funding.</p> <p>Comment: This program is much, much smaller than the need.</p> <p>Question: Will ODDS request to modify the existing 1915(c) waivers now that the legislature has weighed in?</p> <p>Comment: It's my understanding that SB 91 only prohibits Oregon from not creating a program that uses general funds.</p>	

Comment: Modifying the existing 1915(c) would allow the 375 kids on CIIS to access this option and then this fourth waiver could be used for eligible children outside of CIIS.

Comment: A means test is critical. there is a big difference in adding \$25-50K to your existing \$50K+ household income versus someone making \$0 to start.

Comment: Add the utilization rate of the temp program to the next agenda

Question: Will ODDS apply for the emergency legislative board?