

PPP GOALS AND ADVOCACY

1. AVAILABLE RESIDENTIAL OPTIONS AND COMMUNITY INCLUSION

Goal: To conceptualize "community inclusion" as "community equality" via the DD Assistance Bill of Rights Act. 42 U.S.C. par. 2001 (c) (3):

Explanation: At present the DD Bill of Rights language states that families and guardians play decision-making roles in policies and programs including choosing where the individuals live from available options. Shouldn't "inclusion" mean "without borders"? (Thanks, Ed and Virginia Carraway.) The state's use of the term "inclusion" really translates into "exclusion."

Action:

Revise DD Bill of Rights: The right to **inclusion** in residential options available to the community at large."

2. PHILOSOPHICAL BIAS AND MISAPPLICATION OF THE THOUSAND FOOT RULE RE: CONGREGATE LIVING

Goal: To expose the philosophical bias of the state (APD) against congregate living arrangements through **misapplication** of the Thousand Foot Rule (Ch. 419.001 F.S.).

Explanation: The issue of residential options via the Thousand Foot Rule goes way beyond group homes. They are only one "choice." The real challenge is to reverse the misapplication of the 1000 ft. rule which, in our long experience with the state on this issue, has become a tool for labeling congregate communities as "institutions." Ch. 419 was intended to prevent overconcentration of group homes in a residential neighborhood. It was not intended to support the philosophical bias of the state against alternative congregate living lifestyles such as DSI's, assisted living facilities (e.g., Bishop Grady Villas), intentional communities (e.g., Camphill), gated communities, co-housing or any other residential lifestyle accessible to the community at large. FDDC vigorously opposes anything that does not fit their definition of community inclusion and self-determination through supported Living. The DD population we are advocating for is not capable of self-determination and community inclusion via Supported Living.

Action

- A. Launch a campaign to educate the DD agencies and representatives that families want a safe community environment designed specifically for people with special needs, with all amenities appropriate for them, e.g., community center, transportation, recreation areas, diverse living arrangements, opportunity for training and work opportunities in the immediate and larger community, etc.
- B. Support and publicize the enormous contribution of Bishop Grady Villas (St. Cloud) and Noah's Ark (Lakeland). They are essentially private enterprises and need money.
- C. Attempt a dialogue with FDDC indicating that we fully support their advocacy for self-determination and community inclusion via Supported Living, but that we speak for those who are incapable of these venues.

3. COOPERATION BETWEEN STATE AND PRIVATE AGENCIES

Goal: To encourage the state to cooperate with private organizations in creative endeavors for alternate residential lifestyles.

Explanation: Along with this human rights issue to live where, with whom, and with how many, Med Waiver funding or an entitlement program should guarantee residential alternatives *in addition to* Supported Living. There is no reason why Bishop Grady Villas, for example, cannot access residential habilitation or personal care assistance dollars for those "low end" residents who need added supports. There is no reason why families cannot use either their Med Waiver dollars or the CDC+ program to fund the tuition. The challenge continues -- to pinpoint and expose all the boxes our loved ones are put into and advocate with whatever clout it takes to stop this injustice. Wouldn't it be wonderful if the state would work with private organizations to create other residential choices other than group homes, DSI's and Supported Living!

Action:

- A. Meet the challenge to expose all the boxes our loved ones are put into.
- B. Campaign vigorously among the FCC Chairs, legislators, APD Districts, parent organizations: to advocate for the state working with private organizations, to encourage support of private residential initiatives and to assure supports via the Med Waiver.

4. DISCRIMINATORY LEGISLATION

Goal: To eliminate legislation included in former Administrative Code 65B-11.005 (2) (d) -- the 10% density rule -- and the pre-notification of local zoning of the intention to establish group homes, as legislated in Chapter 419.

Explanation: Although we have made progress regarding the status of the density rule (it appears to have been deleted), there is a need to be vigilant against reverting to the situation where pre-approval to open a group home is accompanied by large fees and complicated applications. We need to protect the right to open a group home without the hurdles of pre-approval or pre-notification. We are now in a dangerous situation where legislation requires pre-notification to local zoning.

Action:

- A. Track legislation designed to make Ch. 419 more stringent.
- B. Launch a huge campaign to kill such an attempt.

5. FAMILIES AS PROVIDERS

Goal: To allow family members living under the same roof, as well as guardians, to be bona fide providers under the Home and Community Based Waiver as it is allowed under the CDC+.

Explanation: Aging parents may wish to provide incentives for siblings, guardians or other family members to live in the home they provide for their disabled child, or the home of a family member or guardian when they are gone. At present, this cannot be done under the Home and Community Based Waiver. It may, however, be done under the Consumer Directed Care + (CDC+). Unfortunately, many families will lose their current support coordinators who don't want any part of this complicated system.

Action: Launch a campaign to increase family/guardian support as providers via the Home and Community Based Waiver (HCBW).