

Purpose of S.B. 94

In accordance with the modern trend toward the normalization of life for developmentally handicapped persons who would previously have been the victims of indiscriminate institutionalization, small, homelike and comfortable community residential facilities appear now to offer to such persons substantial hope for happier and productive lives.

Organizations seeking to establish such residential facilities, however, have had to run a gauntlet of public protest from other residents of the various communities involved, and the tool most often used to prevent the establishment of these much needed facilities is the local zoning ordinance.

By refusing to recognize the residential nature of these facilities, also frequently called "group homes," local zoning commissions, other governmental units and individuals have succeeded in limiting them to high density, institutional or even commercial surroundings.

The proposed bill will, if passed by the Pennsylvania legislature, purely and simply require local governments to consider group homes for eight or fewer developmentally handicapped persons to be residential uses for all zoning purposes.

At the same time, the bill will preserve the character of residential neighborhoods by preventing concentrations of facilities in any of such neighborhoods.

The bill is expansive in nature. That is, no organization in the mental health field will be limited by the bill in any manner. The bill can only open doors previously closed. It cannot close any door previously open. It is, therefore, essential that it be passed.

The proposed bill was developed after thorough study of similar legislation in other states. All in all, it is the simplest and most straight forward bill we could devise for accomplishing its purpose. It has the prime characteristics of not requiring any financial appropriations and avoiding the need of additional bureaucracy.

Major Points for S.B. 94

1. It organizes the development of Community Living Facilities by providing basic start-up standards and a specific predictable mandated approach in the development and establishment of Community Living Facilities. It gives municipalities greater control through improved accountability, identifiability and guards against illegal boarding homes.
2. It prevents saturation of any one neighborhood with Community Living Facilities.
3. It provides enormous savings in state, county, and federal dollars through reduced cost of care.
4. It allows for fair distribution of community living facilities.
5. It takes pressure off local municipalities who must devote hours to this subject on a case-by-case basis.
6. It increases the amount of money spent in the community for food, services, wage taxes, equipment and supplies.
7. Strengthens family ties with handicapped family members because of geographical accessibility and no institutional stigma.
8. It provides a focus for volunteers and schools in the community as a training ground for those interested in the mental health and mental retardation.
9. It increases job opportunities in the community including increases in tax payments and dollars spent by workers as well as residents.
10. It attracts a high caliber work force of trained professionals.
11. It makes local educational and vocational training services more readily available to the handicapped.
12. It allows tax spenders to become taxpayers.

100-100

GALLUP POLL REVEALS TREND TOWARDS PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF MR PERSONS IN COMMUNITY

A Gallup Poll commissioned by the President's Committee on Mental Retardation finds that most Americans express accepting attitudes toward their fellow citizens who are retarded, but some fear and lack of confidence persists.

**85% FOR
GROUP HOMES**

On the positive side, the poll found that 85% would not object to six mildly or moderately retarded persons occupying a home on their block, and 91% would not object to having such a person employed where they work. (In the first case, the retarded persons were described as "educated to live in the general community," and in the second as a "trained worker.") The poll also revealed that 94% thought that some retarded people have to live in institutions, compared to 1% who believed that all do.

**14% FEAR
MR PERSONS**

On the negative side, 49% felt that most mentally retarded people are not able to support themselves and lead independent lives, and 14% thought there is reason to fear mentally retarded people.

In testing people's knowledge about the causes of retardation, the poll found that 76% believed that only some forms of mental retardation are inherited, 21% didn't know, and 3% said all forms are inherited.

In analyzing the responses, the Gallup Organization noted that the more the concept of special training is introduced, the more people are likely to accept retarded persons as fellow workers. Thus, while 14% think there is reason to fear mentally retarded people, only 5% would object to working with mildly or moderately retarded people who are trained for the job.

It also points out that although "it is almost universally recognized that institutionalization is not required for all mentally retarded people" only 33% think that most mentally retarded people are able to support themselves." The Committee has stated that most retarded adults can, with training, work in competitive employment and lead independent lives.

The Gallup Poll is part of the Committee's research for a report to the President on the national needs of mental retardation through the year 2000. It plans to submit the report in December 1975.

HOMES FOR RETARDED COST LESS

The cost of operating community-based living centers for the mentally retarded is declining, the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee said yesterday.

Under this program, retarded persons are taken out of mental institutions and placed in small group homes which come as close as possible to duplicating normal community living conditions.

In the 1973-74 fiscal year, the per-resident cost of operating the community living centers was \$9,417. In 1975-76 this had fallen to \$7,300 per resident and is expected to total \$6,300 in the 1976-77 fiscal year, the report said.

For those retarded persons housed in mental institutions, the report said, the annual per resident cost is estimated to be \$10,652.

When the program began in the 1973-74 fiscal year, there were 879 persons in group homes and 10,587 persons in state mental health institutions.

But according to the report, the State Welfare Department predicts that, by the 1978-79 fiscal year, there will be 7,432 persons in group homes and 6,856 in state institutions.

Article: THE PATRIOT, Harrisburg, PA Friday, November 5, 1976.

FISCAL YEAR 1976 - 77 *

<u>STATE SCHOOLS FOR MR PERSONS</u>	<u>PER DIEM</u>	<u>ANNUAL COST PER RESIDENT</u>
Cresson	\$ 67.42	\$ 24,608.30
Ebensburg	55.63	20,304.95
Hamburg	48.99	17,881.35
Laurelton	63.30	23,104.50
Pennhurst	60.88	22,221.20
Polk	58.36	21,301.40
Selinsgrove	49.50	18,067.50
Western	75.23	27,458.95
White Haven	54.46	19,877.90
Southeastern (Woodhaven)	75.95	27,721.75
arcy	71.50	26,097.50
<hr/>		
Average	\$ 58.65	\$ 21,407.25

* These figures based on Governor's Budget for '76-'77, Volume I, page 22.

<u>COSTS FOR SERVICES IN THE COMMUNITY:</u>	<u>PER DIEM</u>
Residential Services (CLA or PLF averaged)	\$ 22.00 - \$ 29.00*
Day Program (sheltered workshop or day activity center)	\$ 8.00 - \$ 15.00
Support programs (family resource services, outpatient, etc.--based on projected cost of \$550 per year per client, a usage experienced with other deinstitutionalized clients)	\$ 1.50
<u>TOTAL PER DIEM</u>	<u>\$ 31.50 - \$ 38.50*</u>

It must be noted that some of these costs will be offset by SSI payments which are used to support some of the costs of residential services.

* The PLF daily rate includes day services. The higher total therefore reflects the cost of a CLA residential placement (\$22.00) with the more expensive day program (\$15.00) plus support services.

EFFECTIVENESS OF COMMUNITY LIVING FACILITIES

Example, the Office of Mental Retardation reports that for the Mentally retarded alone, there are presently (as of August, 1977) 2,302 persons living in 125 community living settings across the state. An additional 2,201 individuals have moved from these arrangements to other living situations. Of these people, 987 graduated to fully independent living status and are now tax payers instead of tax spenders. Savings to Pennsylvania taxpayers based on the \$21,407.00 annual cost per institutionalized person, was \$21,128,955.00.

Other States with Legislation Similar to S.B. 94

California
Montana
Wisconsin
Maryland
Michigan
Indiana
Minnesota
New York - Bill introduced
Ohio - Bill introduced
Pennsylvania - S.B. 94

PROPERTY VALUES

It has never been shown that real estate values drop or that panic selling occurs when a Community Living Facility is established in a given community. In fact, real estate values have increased. For example, in Allegheny County analyses of sales of residential property in neighborhoods with Community Living Facilities show such increases. Here are two examples from this report.

1. Property "A". Was sold for \$19,900 in May, 1972, before a CLF was established three doors away. In September, 1973 this same property sold for \$22,295.
2. Property "B." Was sold for \$8,000 in September, 1970, before a CLF was established three doors away. In June, 1974, this same property sold for \$17,000.

These examples were in different areas of the county. Further analyses of sales of all properties in the areas studied showed no panic-selling trend whatsoever.