On March 17, 2014, new federal Medicaid rules for Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) went into effect. The rules impact many parts of HCBS. One of the most important topics is the places where HCBS can be provided.

Because HCBS programs are offered as alternatives to nursing and intermediate care facility services, the new rules make sure that HCBS are provided in settings that are not institutional in nature. To follow this rule, states must make sure that HCBS settings are part of a larger community, people are able to have choices about their service settings, and that people are assured their rights to privacy, dignity and respect.

States must evaluate their HCBS programs to determine the level of compliance with the new rules. The setting indicated on this form has been identified as requiring to go through the heightened scrutiny process as part of the compliance process.

Additional information on Heightened Scrutiny can be found here: HCBS Settings Rule: Heightened Scrutiny

Setting Information

Site Name:	NORTH EASTERN SERVICE, INC		Site ID:	912	
Site Address:	401 S Mill Pond Road Building B Lehi, Utah 84043				
Website:	Nesutah.com				
# of Individuals Served at this location regardless of funding:		# of Medicaid Individ Served at this location		39	
Waiver(s) Served:			HCBS Provider Type:		
☑ Acquired Brain injury		☑ Day Support Services			
☐ Aging Waiver		☐ Adult Day Care			
☑ Community Supports		☐ Residential Facility			
✓ Community Transition		☐ Supported Living			
☐ New Choice	S		☐ Employment Preparation Services		
Description of Waivers can be found here:					
https://medicaid.utah.gov/ltc/					
Heightened Scrutiny Prong:					
☐ Prong 1: Setting is in a publicly or privately operated facility that provides inpatient institutional treatment					
\square Prong 2: Setting is in a building on the grounds of, or immediately adjacent to, a public institution					
☑ Prong 3: From the initial assessment, the setting was found to have the effect of isolating individuals from the					
broader community. The following is the area that was identified:					
☑ A. Individuals have limited, if any, opportunities for interaction in and with the broader community					
and /or the setting is physically located separate and apart from the broader community and					
does not facilitate individual opportunity to access the broader community and participate in					
community services consistent with their person centered service plan					

	The setting restricts individuals choice to receive services or to engage in activities outside of the	
setting		
✓ C. The setting has qualities that are institutional in nature. These can include:		
•	The setting has policies and practices which control the behaviors of individuals; are rigid in	
	their schedules; have multiple restrictive practices in place The setting does not ensure an individual's rights of privacy, dignity, and respect	
Onsite Visit(s) Co		
Description of Se	-	
_	ay support services program location in an area of Lehi that although is in an industrial area, does	
	imunity resources within a short distance. It has restaurants, a bowling alley, and other	
•	urces within a short distance.	
	rvices chose to apply for and participate in the USU technical assistance program. They engaged	
	perts through USU to identify what areas they needed to focus on to come into compliance with	
· ·	and established a transformation plan for their setting. As this was a very intensive and optional	
	not go through the additional review onsite visit with the State in 2019.	
Current Standing	of Setting:	
☐ Currently Com	pliant: the setting has overcome the qualities identified above	
☑ Approved Rem	nediation Plan: the setting has an approved remediation plan demonstrating how it will come	
	The approved timeline for compliance is: 12/30/2022, Validation Visit will be completed in	
January 2023	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
•		
Evidence th	e Setting is Fully Compliant or Will Be Fully Compliant	
_	ting is in a publicly or privately operated facility that provides inpatient institutional treatment;	
	comes this presumption of an institutional setting.	
Compliance:		
Compliance:	comes this presumption of an institutional setting.	
Prong 2: The sett	mes this presumption of an institutional setting. ☐ Met ☐ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable ting is in a building on the grounds of, or immediately adjacent to, a public institution; the	
Prong 2: The sett	comes this presumption of an institutional setting. ☐ Met ☐ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable	
Prong 2: The sett	mes this presumption of an institutional setting. ☐ Met ☐ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable ting is in a building on the grounds of, or immediately adjacent to, a public institution; the	
Prong 2: The sett setting overcome	mes this presumption of an institutional setting. ☐ Met ☐ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable ting is in a building on the grounds of, or immediately adjacent to, a public institution; the est this presumption of an institutional setting.	
Prong 2: The sett setting overcome Compliance:	mes this presumption of an institutional setting. ☐ Met ☐ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable ting is in a building on the grounds of, or immediately adjacent to, a public institution; the est this presumption of an institutional setting.	
Prong 2: The sett setting overcome Compliance: Prong 3 A: The set	comes this presumption of an institutional setting. ☐ Met ☐ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable ting is in a building on the grounds of, or immediately adjacent to, a public institution; the est this presumption of an institutional setting. ☐ Met ☐ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable	
Prong 2: The sett setting overcome Compliance: Prong 3 A: The segreater commun	mes this presumption of an institutional setting. Met □ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable ling is in a building on the grounds of, or immediately adjacent to, a public institution; the less this presumption of an institutional setting. Met □ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable etting is integrated in and supports full access of individuals receiving Medicaid HCBS to the	
Prong 2: The sett setting overcome Compliance: Prong 3 A: The set greater communengage in communer co	mes this presumption of an institutional setting. Met □ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable ting is in a building on the grounds of, or immediately adjacent to, a public institution; the est this presumption of an institutional setting. □ Met □ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable etting is integrated in and supports full access of individuals receiving Medicaid HCBS to the ity, including opportunities to seek employment and work in competitive integrated settings,	
Prong 2: The sett setting overcome Compliance: Prong 3 A: The set greater communengage in communer co	mes this presumption of an institutional setting. Met □ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable ling is in a building on the grounds of, or immediately adjacent to, a public institution; the less this presumption of an institutional setting. Met □ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable etting is integrated in and supports full access of individuals receiving Medicaid HCBS to the lity, including opportunities to seek employment and work in competitive integrated settings, unity life, control personal resources, and receive services in the community, to the same	
Prong 2: The sett setting overcome Compliance: Prong 3 A: The set greater communengage in communengage in communengage of access	mes this presumption of an institutional setting. Met □ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable ling is in a building on the grounds of, or immediately adjacent to, a public institution; the less this presumption of an institutional setting. Met □ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable etting is integrated in and supports full access of individuals receiving Medicaid HCBS to the lity, including opportunities to seek employment and work in competitive integrated settings, unity life, control personal resources, and receive services in the community, to the same as individuals not receiving Medicaid HCBS.	
Prong 2: The sett setting overcome Compliance: Prong 3 A: The set greater communengage in communengage in communengage of access	mes this presumption of an institutional setting. Met □ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable ling is in a building on the grounds of, or immediately adjacent to, a public institution; the less this presumption of an institutional setting. Met □ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant ☑ Not Applicable letting is integrated in and supports full access of individuals receiving Medicaid HCBS to the lity, including opportunities to seek employment and work in competitive integrated settings, unity life, control personal resources, and receive services in the community, to the same as individuals not receiving Medicaid HCBS. □ Met ☑ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant	

All residential and day support contracts adjusted to accommodate person centered ratios to result in more person centered services available. Day program will be more involved in the community and more person centered in regards to activities. NES will conduct pilot groups with the day service without walls model. NES will expand activity options by allowing clients to suggest multiple options that they are interested in. NES will reduce ratio size for community activities.

Onsite Visit Summary (2021):

Staff talk about various jobs they encounter to facilitate exploration of community-based jobs. There is support for individuals that have jobs in the community and a few work crews and enclaves to help with skills building. Some activities are meeting individual desires and preferences. The following concerns were identified during the visit:

Individuals reported mostly van rides as activity choices. A lot of times individuals do not get off the van at all to interact with anyone outside the group. For activities that require money, staff have a card they use to pay for everything for the group in one transaction. Staff make the calendar of activities. Individuals reported they "can't stay back" from activities on the calendar and reported not being able to access alternatives or being able to stay behind. Individuals didn't feel they had input into the schedule and reported they needed to stay in the group that they were put in. Community outings are groups of about 7-8 people sometimes up to 12. This is not allowing staff to help people to integrate with their community and there is minimal to no individual skills building on these group outings.

- Example- bowling. Individuals "who are high enough functioning" request their own shoes and then staff coordinates everything else. One person said they stay lined up along the wall while staff handle getting them checked into their lanes.
- They have to stay with the group and have "good manners" while there.
- Staff don't appear to understand how to apply skills building in the community and talked a lot about saying "hi" and using good manners/appropriate behavior/staying with the group when asked about community integration.

Remediation Plan Summary:

North Eastern Services is currently working with staff to develop a better understanding on how to promote community integration activities. Individual skill building will be discussed and staff will be trained on looking for skill building during meetings and will be given ideas on how to promote community integration activities. NES is currently building a training and quiz to be completed by staff.

Individuals will have the responsibility to bring their and manage their money for activities unless there is a human rights restriction in place.

Prong 3 B: The so settings.	etting is selected by the individual from among setting options, including non-disability specific
Compliance:	☑ Met □ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant
Summary:	The setting does not restrict access to non-disability settings. The setting has an admission process that assesses individuals' needs and preferences and regularly reassesses to ensure services are provided in a person-centered manner.

Prong 3 C: The setting optimizes, but does not regiment individual initiative, autonomy, and independence in making life choices. The setting ensures an individual's rights of privacy, dignity, respect, and freedom from coercion and restraint. The setting ensures the individual has the freedom and support to control his/her own schedule and activities. **Compliance:** ☐ Met ☐ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant **Transformation Plan Summary:** NES will conduct pilot groups with the day service without walls model. NES will expand activity options by allowing clients to suggest multiple options that they are interested in. NES will reduce ratio size for community activities. **Onsite Visit Summary (2021):** Sharps are locked for everyone, food restrictions/locked and everyone eats at three assigned times (AM snack, lunch, PM snack). It was discouraged by staff and management to access any food or beverages (outside of water) outside these three times. Staff take all individuals personal phones/electronic devices (music only players are allowed to be kept) and lock them up for the day and give them back at the end of day. Staff phones are not subject to this policy. Both the food and electronics restrictions are program manager level restrictions/policies. The settings must do a better job at individualized schedules: There is not a formal process for individuals to give input into the master calendar/schedule. Individual's are not given an option of alternative activities if they do not wish to participate in an activity. Individual's cannot move between groups based on preferred activities/staff/friends they want to participate with. Staff control individual's money when in the community. The settings must train their staff on communicating about and treating individuals served with dignity and respect: Functional labels and language were widely used across the settings by **Summary:** both staff and individuals served. Typically, individuals were described as "low functioning" or "high functioning." The settings need to do a better job at not regimenting individual initiative, autonomy, and independence in making life choices: There were group restrictions for the entire setting in place (such as personal phones, food). There were reported restrictions where there was no way for others to circumvent the restrictions (such as sharps and food). Both staff and individuals served reported that either "all" or a lot of individuals had restrictions in place. **Remediation Plan Summary:** All individuals are encouraged to communicate their preference of activities with the Day Program Manager. With all individuals input, a Day Program calendar is then created and sent home with all individuals. It is the individual's choice to participate in any activities for the day. If an individual chooses not to participate in an activity for a specific day and is able to provide the Day Program manager with sufficient notice on a desired change to the calendar, accommodations can be made to the schedule, staffing, etc. All individuals are allowed to move between groups as they desire. Based on desires, client interests, local activities/events, and the time of year, the day program manager builds the schedule. Staff will be trained on not using functional labels as a representation for the individuals we work with. We will look at our programs and how the different groups and teams are organized and not refer to the groups as "low functioning" or "high functioning". NES is building a training

and quiz to be completed by all staff.

All individuals are encouraged to participate in learning opportunities. Material items not associated with the learning objective are most often distractions and are discouraged. Many individuals have behavior plans and rights restrictions in place for the safety of self and others surrounding them. Those individuals who do not have the direct restriction are able to possess items by keeping them in their personal belongings or request assistance from staff to obtain desired items. Staff will be trained on what restrictions are in place in each program so they can have a better understanding and help accommodate those without restrictions. NES is building a training and quiz to be completed by all staff.

Overall, the setting enforces the Home and Community-Based Settings Regulation requirements.		
Compliance:	☐ Met ☑ Remediation Plan demonstrating will be compliant	
Summary:	Overall, the setting has a plan to remediate the institutional and segregating characteristics that were identified in their setting. A validation visit will be conducted to ensure their remediation plan has been implemented prior to final compliance being determined.	

Input from Individuals Served and Staff

Individuals Served Summary:	 Summary of interviews (2021): Individuals reported they "can't stay back" from activities on the calendar and reported not being able to access alternatives or being able to stay behind. Individuals didn't feel they had input into the schedule and reported they needed to stay in the group that they were put in.
Staff Summary:	 Summary of interviews (2021): Staff indicated that community plannings are made by the individuals but modification may need to be made based off of capabilities and staff availability Staff reported they take all individuals personal phone and electronic devices and lock them up for the day.

Ongoing Remediation Activities		
Current Standing	: □ Currently Compliant ☑ Approved Remediation Plan	
Continued Remediation Activities	The setting is finalizing its remediation activities in prong 3A and 3C. the State will conduct another validation visit to ensure they are compliant in the areas indicated.	
Ongoing Monitoring Activities	The State will use the following tools to ensure settings continue compliance with the Settings Rule criteria: Conducting individual served experience surveys Addressing settings compliance during the annual person centered service planning process Ongoing provider training and certification Monitoring through critical incident reporting Case Management/Support Coordinator visit monitoring	

HCBS Waiver Reviews/Audits

Summary of Stakeholder Workgroup Comments Received and State Response:

Public Comment Period: December 12, 2022 to January 13, 2023

Setting Specific Comments:

Comment:

The Disability Law Center (DLC) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the HCBS Settings Rule Heightened Scrutiny process as both a member of the settings stakeholder committee and through the public comment process. As the Protection and Advocacy agency for people with disabilities for the State of Utah, the Disability Law Center ("DLC") is uniquely suited to provide assistance and input during this process. Based on our own observations as the P&A as well as our evaluation of the state's assessments of settings, the state did not engage in a sufficient assessment process or provide adequate support to bring settings into compliance with the rule prior to the February 2023 deadline. We are concerned that HCBS waiver dollars will continue to be spent on segregated, institutional settings despite the state's obligations under the HCBS settings rule, Title II of the ADA and Olmstead. This heightened scrutiny evidentiary package demonstrates these ongoing concerns as detailed below.

Response:

While the State does acknowledge that activities for remediation extended into March 2023, it does not believe strategies deviated from its Statewide Transition Plan, or that inappropriate methods were used in validating compliance. The State also acknowledges that Settings compliance is not a one time activity and the usage of ongoing monitoring will aid to reinforce core tenants of the Rule as well as the development and dissemination of best practices. The State encourages the submission of providers who are believed to be non-compliant with requirements of the Settings Rule, including the elements/criteria which are not sufficiently meeting expectations.

General Comments Received:

Comment:

The materials provided by the State in the newly-released evidentiary packets raise concerns about whether the identified settings currently demonstrate the qualities of HCBS. In most instances, the state has only completed a final desk review and/or virtual review instead of an in-person visit. We believe that this is insufficient to confirm that a setting does not isolate individuals or have the indices of an institution.

Response:

The State has a comprehensive virtual validation visit process in place to determine HCBS Settings Rule compliance. If at any time the State determines that the virtual process is not sufficient for a specific setting, then the State will make the determination that an in-person visit is required at that time. Once a setting has completed its remediation and the State has validated its compliance with the HCBS settings rule, it moves to the ongoing monitoring process.

Comment:

In many instances, the packages state that the setting is compliant based on a remediation plan and indicate that a validation visit will be completed in the future. Many of the reviews state that individuals are not getting into the community to the degree they would wish and that there are still institution-like restrictions on individuals in the settings. The state needs to give the results of final validations to the work group and other stakeholders before it can submit the setting to CMS for heightened scrutiny.

Response:

Settings must demonstrate compliance or demonstrate a plan along with the State's oversight to ensure completion of action's to certify they will become compliant prior to March 17, 2023 before the State submits them through the heightened scrutiny process.

Comment:

The reviews in many instances lack the detail necessary to determine whether a setting is institutional/segregating. For example, there are reviews of 14c certificate holders that do not indicate whether the setting will pay subminimum wage moving forward. Reviews indicate that individuals access the community, but in many instances don't specify how large the groups are, what types of activities they engage in and the frequency with which activities occur. Some reviews mention work groups/work enclaves, but do not specify what type of work individuals engage in, where people work and how large the work groups are. The reviews frequently say that the setting does not restrict access to the community, that community amenities are within "miles" and that there is access to public transportation, but often do not specify how the facility supports individuals to access these amenities/public transportation.

Response:

While the State agrees that certain criteria can create concerns with compliance, several elements described do not determine on their own whether a setting meets or fails requirements. Individual settings are reviewed and assessed on their merit. For example, payment of sub-minimum wage work or group sizes in and of themselves are not including or excluding criteria. The state determines compliance based on factors such as person centered planning, individual choice and autonomy, individualized schedules, and individuals self-reporting they are accessing the community at the level that they desire.

Comment:

We are very concerned about how the state has handled non-residential settings, particularly large day programs and sheltered workshops. These reviews do not demonstrate that the state has ensured that these particularly problematic settings have remediated sufficient to comply with the settings rule as well as title II of the ADA and Olmstead. Again, many final reviews have not been completed in person, and most frequently the state is submitting sites that have submitted a remediation plan but have not been validated as remediated.

Response:

Settings must demonstrate compliance or demonstrate a plan along with the State's oversight to ensure completion of action's to certify they will become compliant prior to March 17, 2023 before the State submits them through the heightened scrutiny process. The State has a comprehensive virtual validation visit process in place to determine HCBS Settings Rule compliance. If at any time the State determines that the virtual process is not sufficient for a specific setting, then the State will make the determination that an in-person visit is required at that time. Once a setting has completed its remediation and the State has validated its compliance with the HCBS settings rule, it moves to the ongoing monitoring process. While the State does acknowledge that activities for remediation extended into March 2023, it does not believe strategies deviated from its Statewide Transition

Plan, or that inappropriate methods were used in validating compliance. The State also acknowledges that Settings compliance is not a one time activity and the usage of ongoing monitoring will aid to reinforce core tenants of the Rule as well as the development and dissemination of best practices. The State encourages the submission of providers who are believed to be non-compliant with requirements of the Settings Rule, including the elements/criteria which are not sufficiently meeting expectations.

Comment:

Reviews indicate that individuals are still being segregated by "level of functioning" and even by whether an individual resides in an ICF or an HCBS setting.

Response:

The State agrees that settings identified as having this concern are institution and segregating in nature. The purpose of the heightened scrutiny process was to identify settings that were institutional and segregating in nature and go through the process of showing how they overcame those qualities. Settings submitting for heightened scrutiny were required to remediate through training of staff, provide evidence of compliance, and demonstrate compliance through validation that they were compliant in these areas of concern.

Comment:

Reviews do not indicate that the EPR codes which contemplate meaningful, individualized, time-limited prevocational programs are being implemented in Workshops. Reviews do not indicate that individuals are spending at least 20% of their time in the community engaging in activities chosen by the individual. Reviews do not (for the most part) indicate whether or not the provider is continuing to pay subminimum wage. Reviews do not consider what type of work individuals engage in the setting and whether or not that work is chosen by the individual. Frequently, specificity as to how many individuals are working in a group is not given. Frequently, information about how settings are supporting individuals to gain competitive, integrated employment as guaranteed by the settings rule is not given.

Response:

As with all settings, the State's review was for the purpose of determining whether the tenants of the Settings Rule had been met, regardless of which specific services were delivered at the location. The State has separate compliance monitoring for the appropriate authorization of Employment Preparation Services and the delivery of those services by providers.

Comment:

Frequently, reviews indicate that there are still restrictive practices in the settings indicating an institution-like environment.

Response:

The State agrees that many reviews indicated settings still had restrictive practices in place indicating an institution-like environment as they had not yet gone through their final validation process at the time they went out for heightened scrutiny. The State has spent considerable time with settings and providers providing technical assistance beyond what was documented in their remediation plans to remediate their institutional and segregating characteristics to come into compliance with the rule.

Summary of Public Comments Received and State Response:

Public Comment Period: December 12, 2022 to January 13, 2023

Setting Specific Comments:

Comment:

One commenter stated North Eastern Services, Inc site 912 is a day support services program located at 401 S Mill Pond Road Building B Lehi, Utah 84043. It provides services to 39 waiver participants (40 individuals total). The materials provided by the State in the evidentiary packet do not demonstrate that the identified setting currently demonstrates the qualities of HCBS. For stakeholders to provide effective feedback, the state needs to present stakeholders with final validations of compliance with the rule rather than un-validated remediation plans. We have concerns that the most recent assessment of the setting was not completed in person. In our experience as the P&A, it is difficult to accurately assess characteristics of an institution as well as to communicate effectively with waiver participants without an in-person visit.

Response:

Settings must demonstrate compliance or demonstrate a plan along with the State's oversight to ensure completion of action's to certify they will become compliant prior to March 17, 2023 before the State submits them through the heightened scrutiny process. A validation visit was conducted in January (1/19/2023) to ensure that the remediation plan was implemented and the setting was not compliant in all the areas indicated. We asked for additional remediation items to be submitted by March 17th, 2023 and have been working with the provider to ensure that timeline. The State has a comprehensive virtual validation visit process in place to determine HCBS Settings Rule compliance. If at any time the State determines that the virtual process is not sufficient for a specific setting, then the State will make the determination that an in-person visit is required at that time. This setting was approved under Utah's Corrective Action Plan (CAP) approved by Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) to allow more time to come into compliance. The State worked with NES closely to provide technical assistance to come into compliance and an in-person validation visit was conducted in May 2023. The setting was determined to be compliant at that time.

Comment:

The same commenter had additional feedback stating the state's assessment is insufficiently detailed to assess whether or not the setting is appropriately providing access to competitive, integrated employment for participants. The evaluation states that there are work crews and enclaves and that "staff talk about various jobs," however, more detail needs to be given about what types of work people engage in, how large the groups are and how staff supports individuals who wish to find competitive employment.

Response:

The State conducted a visit on 1/19/23. Many individuals in this setting have competitive, integrated community jobs. Although this setting is approved for Employment Preparation (EPR) services, they currently do not have any individuals accessing that code at this time. Staff helps individuals to learn about employment opportunities both while at the setting and in the community. Support is given to encourage individuals to approach businesses to find out more about them, if they are hiring, obtaining applications, filling them out, problem-solving transportation, etc. Staff reported a more formal process in place for helping individuals find employment using employment specialists at NES as well as Voc Rehab counselors in addition to a less formal process that occurs as part of the day program.

Staff report referring to peers who have community jobs as role models for others who are not sure about, or might be interested in employment. Staff report that they talk about job exploration and show job sites "behind the scenes" as part of community activities. This setting was approved under Utah's Corrective Action Plan (CAP) approved by Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) to allow more time to come into compliance. The State worked with NES closely to provide technical assistance to come into compliance and an in-person validation visit was conducted in May 2023. The setting was determined to be compliant at that time.

Comment:

The same commenter had additional feedback stating the remediation plan is insufficient given the lack of detail and given the large obstacles to compliance that must be overcome by the February 2023 deadline. This is a large day settings program and the state's own reviews demonstrate significant barriers to compliance including limited community integration and restrictive practices in the setting. Consumers state that they are not included in activity planning, and that they are forced to participate in activities that they do not want to. Activities mostly consist of van rides, and individuals report that they mostly stay in the vehicle for these rides. It is reported that the groups are too large to facilitate community integration during outings. Individuals seem to be not only segregated from the larger community of non-disabled peers, but are also categorized in groups based on support needs or "functional" labels. Consumers are not given choices regarding what activities they participate in within the setting and it is unclear that these activities are focused on skill building and the desires of the consumers themselves. There are blanket restrictions on access to food and phones, not based on any assessed need. The plan does not indicate what size groups would need to be, or the type and frequency of community outings that would be sufficient to comply with the rule.

Response:

The State conducted a visit on 1/19/23. Staff were respectful and used person-first language. Individuals are encouraged and supported in engaging with community members when in the community. Staff report that skill building activities take place in the community. Individuals interviewed stated they go out in the community regularly for activities. Some activities mentioned by individuals included bowling, mini golf, shopping, walks, going to the mall, going to Cabela's. A whiteboard system is used for suggestions and activity planning. Possible activities are written on the board. Individuals have magnetic name strips that they can put under the activity they want to participate in. They can change their choice at any time. There is also an "open door" policy that individuals can tell staff activities they would like to do. These are noted and plans are made to put it on the calendar. Individuals mentioned that they are able to spend their own money while out in the community with the provider. Individuals stated they can choose to participate in activities or not, and choose what activities go on the calendar. Individuals said they can eat whenever they want and use their phones or tablets if they have them. Individuals are able to leave the building whenever they want; they are just asked to tell someone they are leaving as a courtesy. There was no consequence stated if an individual left without reporting it to staff. Staff did talk about how group sizes for community activities are around 10-12 individuals and could be higher or lower depending on the activity. Staff also indicated that there are two individuals with rights restrictions regarding food. It was found that all food was locked up and individuals without the restriction would need to ask staff to access their food. We asked the provider to provide a remediation plan to provide a work around for individuals to access food and to provide a plan for smaller more individualized activities. We asked for this documentation for review by March 17th, 2023 and have been working with the provider to ensure this timeline. In addition to site specific items the State has been working with NES to complete provider wide training and streamline activity calendars, rights restrictions, and processes for ensuring individual's involvement in activity planning and skill

development for use at all NES settings. This setting was approved under Utah's Corrective Action Plan (CAP) approved by Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) to allow more time to come into compliance. The State worked with NES closely to provide technical assistance to come into compliance and an in-person validation visit was conducted in May 2023. The setting was determined to be compliant at that time.

Comment:

The same commenter had additional feedback stating additionally, it is unclear whether or not this site is offering pre-vocational training. The state transition plan proposed a hub and spoke model for pre-vocational services called EPR which requires 20% of a consumer's time to be spent in the community, meaningful and individualized training focused on gaining competitive, integrated employment. This service is only available on a time-limited basis. If this site is offering pre-vocational services, the state needs to assess whether the setting has implemented the EPR/hub and spoke model with fidelity.

Response:

This setting, while approved for EPR, doesn't currently have any individuals utilizing the service.

Comment:

One commenter reported that their son participates in the day program at the North Eastern Services in Lehi. They are thorough and careful about their son's medical issues. They keep them informed by written and verbal means if their son has an issue. They comply with his deity needs. They keep them informed of activities. They help him with goals. Mel Thompson makes it clear that they care about all of the individuals under their care. "Thank you for all you do on behalf of our individuals and us as caregivers."

Response:

Thank you for your positive feedback on the setting.

General Comments Received:

Comment:

The Disability Law Center (DLC) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the HCBS Settings Rule Heightened Scrutiny process as both a member of the settings stakeholder committee and through the public comment process. As the Protection and Advocacy agency for people with disabilities for the State of Utah, the Disability Law Center ("DLC") is uniquely suited to provide assistance and input during this process. Based on our own observations as the P&A as well as our evaluation of the state's assessments of settings, the state did not engage in a sufficient assessment process or provide adequate support to bring settings into compliance with the rule prior to the February 2023 deadline. We are concerned that HCBS waiver dollars will continue to be spent on segregated, institutional settings despite the state's obligations under the HCBS settings rule, Title II of the ADA and Olmstead. This heightened scrutiny evidentiary package demonstrates these ongoing concerns as detailed below.

Response:

While the State does acknowledge that activities for remediation extended into March 2023, it does not believe strategies deviated from its Statewide Transition Plan, or that inappropriate methods were used in validating compliance. The State also acknowledges that Settings compliance is not a one time activity and the usage of ongoing monitoring will aid to reinforce core tenants of the Rule as well as the development and dissemination of best practices. The State encourages the submission of providers who are believed to be non-compliant with requirements of the Settings Rule, including the elements/criteria which are not sufficiently meeting expectations.

Summary of Stakeholder Workgroup Recommendation:

Stakeholder Workgroup Review: December 14, 2022- December 29, 2022

Only one member of the Stakeholder Workgroup Responded. Their specific comments are noted above.

Utah's Recommendation

Recommendation: Compliant

At the time the heightened scrutiny packet was submitted for public comment, the State had not completed the final validation visit. The State has since completed the final validation visit and determined the setting has overcome the effect of isolating individuals from the broader community and is in compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule.