

Written Testimony February 10, 2015 before the Human Services Committee

Madam Chair, Mr. Chairman and members of the Human Services Committee,

My name is Lynn Millin; I am the conservator for my sister Leslie Millin who is on the Acquired Brain injury Waiver. My sister and I support Bill no. 6155, which addresses the need for "timely notification of any planned Medicaid waiver applications or changes in Medicaid waiver programs."

This proposed Bill states that timely notifications are to be given on "planned" applications or changes. I am requesting that the word "planned" be removed.

In addition to making the notifications timely, I believe notifications need to be more accessible. Brain injury survivor Craig Sears voiced this concern on October 22, 2014 at the last public hearing when he said he felt it was unreasonable that brain injured individuals were being asked to check the Connecticut General Assembly web site and navigate it on a close to daily basis to see if there may be bills, amendments and hearings scheduled.

If a timely accessible notification were given prior to the last public hearing on October 22, 2014, there would have been more public voices. I was not aware that this hearing was scheduled until the day before, as a result, my sister, her providers and I could not attend or prepare written testimony, even though course-changing decisions were being made that day.

Please allow me to briefly describe what has happened as a result of the Appropriations & Human Services Committees voting through the Department of Social Services request to change the ABI waiver Independent Living Skills Training (ILST) service from a self-employed position to an employee one on October 22, 2014.

Because my sister was to be an employer instead of having self-employed ILST providers, my sister had to obtain Workman's Compensation Insurance. While I understand that my sister is "not required" to get this insurance for ILSTs or others if they work 25.75 hours or less, in reality we must get this since we are liable for any injuries that might incur no matter how many hours worked since this does not excuse us from liability. It did not seem right that someone who lives below the poverty level was being put in a position where they would have to pay months of income to protect themselves from possible financial ruin or that Workman's Compensation Insurance is not mandatory and therefore covered in a similar way as Unemployment Insurance. It seems ironic that Unemployment is covered even though the costs of a claim are capped and Workman's Compensation Insurance is not, even though the costs of a claim could be sky high.

In the end, as it turned out, I could not obtain Workman's Compensation Insurance and this forced us to reconsider who we could hire. Hiring the ILST provider was no longer an option since this would make us vulnerable to liability issues. The only option left was to hire an ILST through an agency but I have not been able to find any agency that is

willing to come out to our location in the northwest.

At the October public hearing, committee members heard testimony against ILST's becoming employees and clients employers including a mother of a brain-injured__ survivor who echoed my concerns saying, "I am petrified... because if they make any kind of claims against us, we're in trouble..." If there were more of us in the room back then because of more timely accessible notification, perhaps my sister and her ILST's circumstances could have been preserved.

From our point of view, we have had no control over this whole situation and it has directly led to my sister not having essential services and her ILST not being able to work.

Respectfully, Lynnia Milliun – sister and conservator for ABI waiver client Leslie Milliun