

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Dawn Roberson](#)
Subject: FW: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)
Date: Monday, June 02, 2014 8:34:13 AM

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

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

Sent: Saturday, May 31, 2014 7:04 AM

To: Sunset Advisory Commission

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

Submitted on Saturday, May 31, 2014 - 07:03

Agency: DEPARTMENT AGING AND DISABILITY SERVICES DADS

First Name: Edmund

Last Name: Nepveux

Title: Mr.

Organization you are affiliated with: Richmond State School

City: Missouri City

State: Texas

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

We would need the same individualized care plans provided by the SSLC's from private ICF's.

Penalties for safety violations in private ICFs have no consequences. Why?

Inspections of private ICFs are not comprehensive and don't ensure the safety and welfare of our loved ones. We need inspections that mirror the SSLC requirements.

Day Habilitation Programs are poorly organized, staffed by people with little or no training to support the disabled, offer little in the form of vocational skill development, are frequently conducted in unsafe environments, and are not individually focused to support varying disabilities.

Private ICF homes are not required to provide high quality community interaction activities.

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency: Maintain current living conditions. My sister would have a very hard time moving to a new location. Would not want to put her through the stress of getting used to a new place. She has several people who watch after her and "go the extra mile" for her. I just don't see that happening in a privately owned facility.

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree