



**MINUTES**  
**Steering Committee Work Group Meeting**  
**Thursday, 10/14/21 from 10:00AM - 12:00PM**  
**Held via: Zoom Webinar**

**Attendance:** Mark Vincent, Mark Mills, Ann Potoczak, Carrie Beth Duran, Kimberly Habib, Karen Hatch, Krista Gilbert, Cathy Spinney, Jennifer Pineo, Lisa Beaudoin, Jonathan Routhier, Stephanie Patrick, Denise Nash, Isadora Rodriguez-Legendre, Darlene Hayden, Deb Ritcey, Susan Silsby, Nancy Rollins, Chris Santaniello, Sandy Hunt, Jessica Gorton, Maureen DiTomaso, Drew Smith, Ozzie Chung. *Note: Members of the public who joined as attendees in listen-only mode are not included in this list.*

*Please reference the corresponding slide presentation for the detailed agenda, including topics and themes covered in the meeting and corresponding takeaways and applicable action items. This document provides context into areas of substantive discussion which took place during the meeting.*

| Major Topics and Themes   | Key Discussion Areas  |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Introductions and Ground Rules</b></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Planning for Change</b></li> </ul>            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A member expressed concern moving from the current individualized process to one which was more formulaic in the determination process.</li> <li>• A member hoped to see a consistent rate structure as a result of this system change.</li> <li>• A member hoped to see an annual cost of living increase as a result of this system change (the member noted that the state increased rates last year, but that rate increases need to occur annually).</li> <li>• A member stated that they hoped what would not change would be that supports are needed, and that stakeholders would be engaged in having a fully inclusive society. The member noted that the question of 'why are we changing' was a good one - to the member, the rationale for rates, IT, and capacity for ITS was clear. However, redesigning the waiver was less clear.</li> <li>• A member suggested that the legislature was looking for a way to control spending, and that what should be happening instead was investments in spending.</li> <li>• A member wanted to involve a robust system of supports to make sure that individuals in the system are independent.</li> <li>• A member wanted the vision outlined in RSA 171-A to be an actuality in practice.</li> <li>• A member expressed hope that what would not change is the incorporation of stakeholder feedback, and that everything will not be siloed.</li> <li>• A member shared their experience having funding available for their child but not the actual DSPs to provide support (for their child).</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A member mentioned they did not see the outcomes and the workforce being addressed in the A&amp;M report.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>System Work Discussion</b></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A member had questions about the difference between the 2021 DD waiver renewal and the new proposed structure (and rates). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ BDS responded that the 2021 waiver renewal was aligned with existing CMS requirements and separate from the system work to add additional services (like telehealth), gain flexibilities, etc.</li> <li>○ BDS responded that they also maintain a website and have established a process whereby individuals who are not on a work group can provide input, ideas, and recommendations to DHHS.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Assignment Next Steps</b></li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Please refer to the corresponding work group PPT for details on assignments (if any) and next steps.</i></li> </ul>   |