

**From:** [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)  
**To:** [Dawn Roberson](#)  
**Subject:** FW: DADS and State Supported living Centers  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 28, 2014 8:03:40 AM

---

---

**From:** Louise Abt Clay  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2014 12:14 AM  
**To:** Sunset Advisory Commission; Louise Abt Clay  
**Subject:** DADS and State Supported living Centers

Louise Abt Clay

May 27, 2014

Ken Levine, Director  
Sunset Advisory Commission  
[sunset@sunset.state.tx.us](mailto:sunset@sunset.state.tx.us)  
P O Box 13066  
Austin, TX 78711

Dear Mr. Levine:

Re: DADS and State Supported Living Centers

As a parent of a severely handicapped, medically fragile man living at Richmond State Supported Living Center, I adamantly oppose closure of any of the State Supported Living Centers. There are simply no acceptable alternatives for the care of people like my son, Walt Wingo, who became a quadriplegic because of a botched surgery in 2008 at UTMB in Galveston. He became blind as well in 2012. Although intellectually challenged, he has an active mind and emotions and needs, which he expresses verbally. He also goes to numerous activities at Richmond. There are doctors there to attend to his needs promptly. No group home operator could afford to give him comparable care, so he would be neglected or sent to a sorry nursing home. If that happened he would cry all day long because he has been used to attention and going and doing things. He has so many needs.

Putting all the necessary supports in the community for those with intellectual disability is NOT GOING TO HAPPEN, just as it didn't happen for the mentally ill. So jail or death will be the mostly likely outcome for these people – which is going back to the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

If anything, we should be expanding the SSLC's that we already have, so that more people could use them and economies of scale would kick in. Residents of group homes are essentially prisoners in their neighborhood because nobody wants them and because most

can't fend for themselves. Most of the SSLC residents lack the judgment to be "free" and unsupervised. Example: a former RSSLC resident named Dallas, who went to a group home in San Antonio, would wander to a local store and pilfer things. He couldn't seem to learn not to. One day the store owner shot Dallas dead. This was a REAL event. Is that what the Sunset Commission and the State of Texas want? I remember seeing Dallas frequently – outside enjoying the freedom and the safety of the RSSLC campus!

All the SSLC's need to remain open so that no one is too far from family. I see my son three times a week. I have a special van to transport him. It would be disastrous for him if he wasn't close to me. The Austin facility needs to be rebuilt on another property in that area for those families.

My son IS in the "community" – HIS community, which is Richmond SSLC!

I am the current president of the RSSLC family association, and we all feel that way.

Thank you for your attention.

Louise Abt Clay, RSSLC parent

**From:** [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)  
**To:** [Dawn Roberson](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)  
**Date:** Thursday, May 29, 2014 8:01:54 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: sundrupal@capitol.local [<mailto:sundrupal@capitol.local>]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2014 10:03 PM  
To: Sunset Advisory Commission  
Subject: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)

Submitted on Wednesday, May 28, 2014 - 22:03

Agency: DEPARTMENT AGING AND DISABILITY SERVICES DADS

First Name: Louise

Last Name: Clay

Title: parent/guardian

Organization you are affiliated with: Richmond State Supported Living Center

City: Weston Lakes

State: Texas

Your Comments About the Staff Report, Including Recommendations Supported or Opposed:

1. I oppose closure of any of the state supported living centers because all SSLC residents should be reasonably close to their families in this huge state. I specifically oppose the closure of Richmond SSLC.
2. The community and private providers can never have the infrastructure that the SSLC's have (on-site 24/7 medical care, dental, wheelchair repair shop, recreation staff, volunteer services, infirmary, pharmacy, nice SAFE grounds for residents to enjoy freely, additional facilities that were built with private money raised by Volunteer Services, etc.)
3. The costs comparisons of SSLC's vs. private providers are incorrect. There was failure to include Medicaid-paid medical costs for residents of group homes. Also, the cost of DADS central office in Austin is included in the SSLC care cost!
4. Most group homes are terrible and can get by with anything. Residents are like prisoners and are unwanted in mostly unsafe, trashy neighborhoods. There is little interaction in the "community".
5. There is no effective oversight regarding group homes. They should be held to the same impossible standards as the SSLC's and inspected FREQUENTLY.
6. Only the SSLC's have individualized care plans for the residents.
7. Because of the unusual complex needs of nearly all the SSLC residents, the costs will always be higher, no matter where they reside -- if they are cared for properly.

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency:

1. Disregard the recommendation to close the SSLC's since it is impossible to implement with a positive outcome -- for the type of people living at the SSLC's.
2. Make the MH/MR Authorities inform new clients about the SSLC's as a choice, as they are supposed to do.

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree