

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Dawn Roberson](#)
Subject: FW: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)
Date: Friday, June 27, 2014 9:00:49 AM

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

From: sundrupal@capitol.local [<mailto:sundrupal@capitol.local>]

Sent: Friday, June 27, 2014 4:25 AM

To: Sunset Advisory Commission

Subject: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)

Submitted on Friday, June 27, 2014 - 04:24

Agency: DEPARTMENT AGING AND DISABILITY SERVICES DADS

First Name: Doris

Last Name: Faul

Title: Parent of IDD child

Organization you are affiliated with:

City: Crowley

State: Texas

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

I strongly support the Sunset Commission's recommendation to close (at least!) 6 of the 13 State Supported Living Centers. I am the parent of a 10 year old with Down syndrome. She has spent most of her life on wait lists for needed services because there isn't sufficient funding because many of the SSLCs are draining our resources.

I have taken time to read many of the comments received to this point and I believe I can see both sides with compassion. While I can understand that some individuals are best served in an institutional setting and still others are thriving for the first time in their lives at certain of these centers, I don't believe that maintaining all 13 is the best stewardship of our resources.

At the time they were built, when there were no other comparable services available to this population and their families, it is commendable that Texas invested on a grand scale to meet their needs. Now however, with advances in medical care, technology and other fields the need is not as great and the money required to repair and/or maintain these aging facilities with minimal occupancy simply does not make sense.

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency:

I realize the delicacy of choosing which facilities to close and which to keep open: local economies, staffing, visiting family members may not be closeby as they once were, politicians losing their jobs because they failed to keep a center open in their area, and on and on and on...

Locations to remain open should be spread out across our great state! As much as possible, consideration for those SSLCs in best repair and those with the best programs in place for work and recreation for the residents should get highest priority. Where relocation is necessary, residents who

cannot (for whatever reason) be moved to suitable care within their current area should be moved to another center to make better use of available capacities
- it should go without saying - without any hint of overcrowding!! Every care should be taken to recreate schedules and maintain current friendships for residents.

No matter how much care is taken there will be A LOT of unhappy people!!
THIS SHOULD NOT BE A DETERRENT!!! Throughout this process two considerations should be at the forefront of everyone's mind: our responsibility to provide quality care for these citizens AND the least financially cumbersome options for our state! This is a long-haul undertaking... Dedicated, qualified staff of locations determined to be closed should be given generous incentive to relocate. After all, the quality of care is equal to the quality of the caregiver!

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree