



Mike Prendergast
Executive Director

State of Florida
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS
Office of the Executive Director
Suite 311 K
11351 Ulmerton Road
Largo, Florida 33778-1630
Phone: (727) 518-3202 Ext.5594 Fax: (850) 488-4001
www.FloridaVets.org

Rick Scott
Governor
Pam Bondi
Attorney General
Jeff Atwater
Chief Financial Officer
Adam Putnam
Commissioner of Agriculture

October 27, 2015

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Rick Scott
Honorable Pam Bondi
Honorable Jeff Atwater
Honorable Adam Putnam

FROM: Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs
Mike Prendergast, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Agenda – Cabinet Meeting of November 10, 2015

The next public meeting of the Governor and Cabinet to transact the business of the Department of Veterans' Affairs will be at 8:30 a.m. (EST), November 10, 2015 in Jupiter, Florida.

The Agenda and all required back-up materials are attached for your review.

If you have any questions, please call my Acting Cabinet Affairs Officer Jessica Kraynak, at (850) 487-1533 x7712.

cc: Monica Russell, Director of Cabinet Affairs
Executive Office of the Governor

Cynthia Kelly, Director
Governor's Office of Policy and Budget

Attachments

AGENDA
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS
Meeting materials for the following items are available on the web at:
<http://floridavets.org/2015-public-notices/>

MEMBERS

Governor Rick Scott
Attorney General Pam Bondi
Chief Financial Officer Jeff Atwater
Commissioner Adam Putnam

November 10, 2015
8:30 A.M. (EST)
Florida Atlantic University, John D. MacArthur Campus
Student Resource Building
5353 Parkside Drive
Jupiter, Florida

Contact: Jessica Kraynak, Acting Director, Legislative & Cabinet Affairs
(850) 487-1533

ITEM	SUBJECT	RECOMMENDATION
1.	Respectfully request approval of the minutes of the September 29, 2015 meeting. (ATTACHMENT 1)	RECOMMEND APPROVAL
2.	Respectfully submit Agency 1 st Quarter Report for Fiscal Year 2015-2016. (ATTACHMENT 2)	RECOMMEND APPROVAL
3.	Respectfully submit Agency State Veterans' Nursing Home Site Selection Process Workshop Results and Recommendations. (ATTACHMENT 3)	RECOMMEND APPROVAL

STATE OF FLORIDA

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

IN RE: MEETING OF THE GOVERNOR AND
CABINET

_____ /

CABINET MEMBERS: GOVERNOR RICK SCOTT
ATTORNEY GENERAL PAM BONDI
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER
JEFF ATWATER
COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE
ADAM PUTNAM

DATE: TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2015

LOCATION: CABINET MEETING ROOM
LOWER LEVEL, THE CAPITOL
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA

REPORTED BY: NANCY S. METZKE, RPR, FPR
COURT REPORTER

C & N REPORTERS
POST OFFICE BOX 3093
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32315-3093
(850) 697-8314 / FAX (850) 697-8715
nancy@metzke.com
candnreporters.com

1	INDEX	PAGE NO.
2		
3	Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles	
4	By Executive Director Rhodes	4
5	Office of Financial Regulation	
6	By Commissioner Breakspear	9
7	Office of Insurance Regulation	
8	By Commissioner McCarty	19
9	Office of Veterans Affairs	
10	By Executive Director Prendergast	25
11	Board of Trustees of the Internal	
12	Improvement Trust Fund	
13	By Secretary Steverson	49
14	Division of Bond Finance	
15	By Director Watkins	108
16	Administration Commission	
17	By Mark Kruse	111
18	Florida Land and Water	
19	Adjudicatory Commission	
20	By Mark Kruse	150
21	State Board of Administration	
22	By Executive Director Williams	151
23	Florida Land and Water	
24	Adjudicatory Commission Continued	
25	By Mark Kruse	162

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

1
2
3 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Next I'd like to recognize
4 Mike Prendergast with the Department of Veterans
5 Affairs.

6 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PRENDERGAST: Good morning,
7 Governor Scott, General Bondi, CFO Atwater, and
8 Commissioner Putnam.

9 The Department of Veterans Affairs has three
10 agenda items for your consideration today.

11 Agenda Item 1 consists of the minutes for the
12 August 5th, 2015, Cabinet meeting. We respectfully
13 request approval of those minutes.

14 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a motion on the
15 item?

16 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: So moved.

17 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second?

18 COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: Second.

19 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Any comments or objections?

20 (NO RESPONSE).

21 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Hearing none, the motion
22 carries.

23 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PRENDERGAST: Thank you.

24 Agenda Item 2 is the recommended list of names
25 for the 2015 class of the Florida Veterans Hall of

1 Fame. The Florida Veterans Hall of Fame recognizes
2 and honors those military veterans who, through
3 their works and lives, both during and after their
4 military service, have made a significant
5 contribution to the State of Florida through civic,
6 business, public service, or other pursuits, but
7 mainly focused on taking care of our veterans who
8 make up the third largest population of veterans in
9 the nation.

10 Earlier this summer, the Florida Veterans Hall
11 of Fame Council met to select the class of 2015
12 from the field of over 31 nominees that were
13 submitted to the Council. From the initial group,
14 eight finalists were selected for a recommendation
15 to you for consideration into -- for induction into
16 the Hall of Fame for the class of 2015.

17 The Florida Department of Veterans Affairs is
18 honored to forward the names of the following
19 distinguished nominees to you for consideration of
20 induction into the 2015 class of the Florida
21 Veterans Hall of Fame:

22 Captain Charles Bennett; Sergeant
23 Larry Campbell; Command Chief Master Sergeant
24 Charles LaCroix; First Lieutenant Lawton Chiles;
25 Colonel Curtis Ebbetts; Colonel Rocky McPherson;

1 Sergeant Virgil Myers; and Major General Earl Peck.
2 I will now briefly highlight each of these nominees
3 for you.

4 Captain Charles Edward Bennett served in the
5 United States Army from 1942 to 1947. After his
6 service, he served for 44 years representing
7 Florida in the United States Congress. One of the
8 many things of note during his illustrious career
9 was sponsorship of the Americans with Disabilities
10 Act while he was a representative in the Florida
11 State Legislature.

12 Sergeant Larry Campbell, Leon County's very
13 own late sheriff, is being recommended for
14 induction into the Hall of Fame as well.
15 Sergeant Campbell's service includes service in the
16 United States Marine Corps right here in
17 Tallahassee; and after his military service, he
18 served in the law enforcement community for over
19 three decades where he was ultimately elected
20 sheriff in 1996 to be the county sheriff.

21 Sheriff Campbell served for nearly 20 years as
22 the Leon County Sheriff until he passed away late
23 last year. He also served on the Board of Honor
24 Flight Tallahassee and had many other affiliations
25 with community and civic organizations as part of

1 his dedication and contributions to the State of
2 Florida and our community of veterans.

3 Chief -- Command Chief Master Sergeant
4 Charles LaCroix, who happens to be 86 years young,
5 resides right here in Tallahassee. He reached the
6 rank of Command Chief Master Sergeant, which is the
7 highest one can go in the Air Force.

8 Following his 22 years of military service,
9 Sergeant LaCroix retired and returned to Florida
10 and helped his fellow veterans through his active
11 participation in veterans service organizations,
12 assisting homeless veterans and other veterans
13 desiring access to their earned services and
14 benefits.

15 He also filled the post of the Commander of
16 the American Legion Post 13 right here in
17 Tallahassee and he's had numerous interactions of
18 compassion and caring for Florida's veterans across
19 the state during his years following his retirement
20 from active duty.

21 First Lieutenant Lawton Chiles. Of course we
22 all know that Governor Chiles served as the
23 governor of the great state of Florida from 1991
24 until his untimely death in 1998. His list of
25 accomplishments and contributions, both military

1 and civic, are many. They range from establishment
2 of the Florida Department of Elder Affairs and to
3 serving three terms in the United States Senate
4 where he sponsored a broad range of legislation to
5 help military veterans.

6 Colonel Curtis Ebbetts, 75 years young, who
7 happens to live in Homosassa, Florida.

8 Colonel Ebbetts retired in 1992 with his last
9 assignment as the Senior Army Advisor to the
10 Adjutant General of the Florida National Guard, and
11 after a distinguished career of more than 28 years
12 as an infantry officer, a recipient of the
13 Purple Heart, and a participant of two combat tours
14 in Vietnam.

15 Since his retirement, Colonel Ebbetts has
16 dedicated his life to helping veterans by
17 organizing a nonprofit to help veterans in the
18 Citrus County area by founding a local chapter of
19 the Military Order of the Purple Heart; and he also
20 helped with legislation to authorize military
21 retirees to participate in the mail order pharmacy
22 program, which allows veterans to save time and
23 precious money to get their pharmacy prescriptions
24 refilled through the mail.

25 Colonel Warren "Rocky" McPherson.

1 Colonel McPherson remains dedicated to our state
2 today, as all of you know, and he served on active
3 duty for more than 29 years in the United States
4 Marine Corps.

5 Currently he supports Florida's military and
6 defense community at Enterprise, Florida, where he
7 steadfastly works to preserve the military
8 installations in the face of declining budget
9 resources at the federal level. Concurrent to his
10 assignment and before it, he volunteers as a tutor
11 and mentor at high school; and is a member of
12 several veterans organizations across the state.

13 Since his retirement from active duty,
14 Colonel McPherson has worked tirelessly to advocate
15 for veterans in Florida and military service
16 members in our state, and every day serves as a
17 colleague for the Florida Department of Veterans
18 Affairs upon whom we rely extensively to gain
19 valuable information about what's happening across
20 our defense sector, which is so vitally important
21 to our state and our community.

22 Sergeant Gerald Myers, the late Sergeant Myers
23 fought in the Battle of the Bulge. He was one of
24 three American soldiers who helped to free
25 26,000 inmates at the Buchenwald Concentration Camp

1 in Germany during the Second World War.

2 Sergeant Myers' brief but outstanding military
3 career concluded in January 1946. While only
4 having served two years, his experiences have been
5 archived in a digital collection of holocaust and
6 genocide studies on the Scholar Commons.

7 Sergeant Myers subsequently spent his
8 post-military career in Kansas, and later chose
9 Florida as his home, where he participated in
10 countless civic organizations and veterans
11 organizations. Sergeant Myers' life is truly a
12 legend in the veteran community and he lived one --
13 that one would expect from someone of the greatest
14 generation.

15 Finally, Major General Retired Earl Peck,
16 87 years young, who currently lives in Clearwater,
17 Florida. Major General Peck's distinguished
18 36-year career in the United States Air Force began
19 in 1948, and concluded with his retirement in 1985.
20 His service includes 7,000 flight hours as a pilot
21 in aircraft ranging from fighters to bombers, where
22 he earned multiple decorations to include the
23 bronze star and four Legion of Merit awards.

24 Following his retirement in 1985, General Peck
25 served as the first executive director for the

1 Florida Department of Veterans Affairs where he
2 worked with the Legislature and our leadership in
3 the state at the time to secure funding for the
4 state's first veterans nursing home which was built
5 over in Daytona Beach, Florida.

6 General Peck has continued to advocate for the
7 rights, pay, and benefits for veterans by serving
8 in multiple veterans organizations even in his
9 retirement, and is an active contributor and
10 advocate for Florida's veterans and military
11 communities as a participant in the Military
12 Officers Association of America.

13 At this time we respectfully request approval
14 of the 2015 class of the Florida Veterans Hall of
15 Fame.

16 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a motion on the
17 item?

18 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: So moved.

19 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Is there a second?

20 COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: Second.

21 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Any comments or objections?

22 (NO RESPONSE).

23 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Hearing none, the motion
24 carries.

25 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PRENDERGAST: Thank you,

1 ladies and gentleman.

2 Agenda Item 3 is the Agency's first draft of
3 its performance measures that we are submitting
4 today for your review and discussion.

5 I can briefly go through each of the
6 performance measures for you if you would like and
7 just talk about a couple of the highlights from
8 them, and we look forward to working with the staff
9 to continue to refine these in the weeks ahead to
10 come up with a final solution.

11 Performance Measure 1 discusses retroactive
12 compensation, and this category refers to a bulk of
13 award given to a veteran for those months once the
14 veteran has submitted a claim to the Department of
15 Veterans Affairs for compensation, and it takes the
16 adjudication of the claim to be processed by the
17 Department, and then the information to be provided
18 back to the veteran and also to our staff at the
19 Department.

20 Year over year results can vary significantly
21 depending on new legislation that passes for
22 disabilities and, as well, some of the class action
23 lawsuits that might get settled.

24 Most recently, in several Cabinet meetings
25 over the past several years, we've talked about the

1 Nehmer claims which really led to a significant
2 spike in the number of dollars coming back in and
3 the number of veterans coming forward and claiming
4 disabilities for these list of compensations that
5 are eligible for the Agent Orange cases to be
6 adjudicated.

7 More cases of that nature are possible in the
8 future, yet we don't know when they will actually
9 emerge because these cases may take many years, if
10 not decades, to finally be resolved.

11 A couple of cases like that that stick out in
12 our minds each and every day, of course, are the
13 Camp Lejeune cases for the polluted water that was
14 in and around the base there where some of our
15 community of Marines and their family members may
16 have been exposed to pollutants in the drinking
17 water; the burn pits in Iraq and Afghanistan; the
18 oil fires that our veterans experienced during
19 Operation Desert Storm.

20 And some of the things to emerge out of the
21 Fort McClellan community where the groundwater has
22 been contaminated for decades, and they're still
23 working their way through creating a registry to
24 document the things that our veterans who were
25 stationed at Fort McClellan might have been exposed

1 to over the course of their careers.

2 Performance Measure Number 2 is issue
3 resolution, and we've based our baseline number off
4 of the prior year's standard that we've submitted
5 in our long-range program plan.

6 Issue resolutions are based on services
7 provided to veterans that can result in monthly
8 monetary benefits and as well for them to obtain
9 mandatory quality-of-life enhancement for medical
10 devices: C-Pap machines for some of our veterans
11 with sleep apnea; wheelchairs; hearing aids; and
12 other aids that will help them have an improved
13 quality of life are the type of things that we work
14 on for issue resolution for our veterans.

15 There were 21,946 veterans served for issue
16 resolutions during the past fiscal year, and that
17 also ebbs and flows depending on the veteran's
18 severity of the issues that they present when it
19 comes to some of their disability ratings.

20 Performance Measure Number 3 is the number of
21 veterans served by the Department. Our baseline
22 number is 91,558. And the measure is pulled from
23 our database that captures the number of veterans
24 that come in and visit our offices across the
25 state, of which we have approximately 30 offices

1 spread throughout the state; and this is their
2 first-time visit whenever they come across the
3 threshold of the door and present to ask for our
4 assistance in filing a claim to have their claim
5 adjudicated by the Department of Veterans Affairs.
6 We term these veterans as "unique veterans" the
7 first time they come across our door.

8 And then turning to Performance Measure
9 Number 4, we also document the number of claims
10 that we actually process on behalf of our veterans.

11 And in turning to Performance Measure
12 Number 5, we roll up a total of what our number of
13 services to veterans are. All of these are
14 important measures, but each year these measures
15 can ebb and flow based upon the severity of the
16 issues that the veterans present for their
17 disability claims and, as well, some of the changes
18 that may occur in legislation that occur each and
19 every year whenever the federal VA presents their
20 package to Congress; and the Congress, of course,
21 approves the budget and some of the policies that
22 go forward with implementation of their budget
23 requirements across the department.

24 Performance Measure Number 6 is the state
25 approving agency. And two years ago the federal VA

1 changed the programs and the manner in which they
2 measure these programs, and now they've changed it
3 to where we have a compliance requirement where we
4 send our examiners out into the field across the
5 state to do compliance surveys at all of our
6 colleges and universities that the federal VA asks
7 us to go out and survey.

8 This year, for example, we were directed to do
9 120 compliance surveys, and we will meet that
10 target. But embedded in those compliance surveys
11 that we had to do were 11,000 programs that we had
12 to go through and individually approve at
13 institutions that participate in receiving the
14 GI Bill benefits across the state.

15 We have approximately 49,000 veterans and
16 family members or survivors of our veterans who are
17 accessing their earned benefits for education
18 opportunities in the state, and helping us do this
19 program allows those veterans to gain access to
20 nearly \$900 million of benefits to go and attend
21 colleges, educational institutions that might have
22 a certification program, or career training
23 opportunities that are out there across our great
24 system of colleges and universities in Florida.

25 Of course there are some ramifications for

1 noncompliance which could lead to a decrease in
2 federal funding and staffing for our
3 state-approving agency programs, but thus far we've
4 managed to hit the target each and every year and,
5 thankfully, we have not had any natural disasters
6 that have impeded our ability to go out and do it
7 like we did in Hurricane Andrew back in 1992.

8 Short of a manmade or natural disaster or a
9 severe shortfall in our human resources
10 requirements, we should be able to meet that
11 requirement each and every year going forward; but
12 again, it will ebb and flow.

13 And the unofficial number for next year is
14 going to be 140 programs, which will have embedded
15 in the 140 programs probably in the neighborhood of
16 10 to 12,000 additional programs that we'll have to
17 go out as we do our compliance surveys and certify
18 those programs as well.

19 Performance Measure 7 is our homes occupancy
20 rate for those homes that are in operation for more
21 than two years. And as you know, if we keep our
22 homes filled, that allows us to run our State
23 Veterans Nursing Home Program at zero general
24 revenue appropriations; and thus far, over the past
25 several years, we've managed to be able to do that

1 because we continue to keep our beds filled and it
2 allows us to have the capacity to build up our
3 trust fund, which allows us to do the things -- the
4 operations and maintenance requirements as they
5 manifest themselves, to keep the homes as
6 world-class facilities for our veteran community;
7 and, as well, a place that is inviting for the
8 family members and their residents across the
9 communities who are so critically important to our
10 ability to maintain that interface with the
11 community so that it enhances the quality of life
12 of each and every one of our residents in our six
13 nursing homes and our assisted living facility, our
14 seventh facility up in Lake City.

15 Performance Measure Number 8 is really about
16 the compliance surveys that we encounter each and
17 every year through the U. S. Department of Veterans
18 Affairs, and as well the Agency for Health Care
19 Administration's surveys that come through to
20 assess the quality of care that we provide to our
21 veterans.

22 Finally, turning to Performance Measure
23 Number 9, we've set a pretty high goal there. The
24 Department of Financial Services' goal for
25 invoicing is 95 percent, but we have continually

1 strived for a 99-percent compliance rating across
2 the Agency for the timely payment of our bills and
3 invoices that are presented to the Agency for
4 services and goods that we accept for our homes
5 program and other operations of the Agency's
6 business.

7 Turning to the subjective leadership
8 assessment, while the Agency is operating at a high
9 level, our resources continue to be a constraint
10 that help us do some things, but we still would
11 like to more adequately align our priorities with
12 our resources to achieve some even greater desired
13 outcomes.

14 Just recently I saw a report that came out
15 from the University of Florida, the alma mater of
16 three of the four folks up here on the dais, where
17 it's talking about the significant increase in
18 population that we're going to see across the
19 Sunshine State over the next five years.

20 Approximately 285,000 residents will move to
21 the Sunshine State each year for the next
22 five years. With that, we project that we will see
23 another hundred plus thousand veterans move into
24 the Sunshine State, along with their family members
25 and their children; and along with that, we will,

1 of course, see an increased demand for our ability
2 to service those veterans and provide those great
3 services to them.

4 Among the cohort of the younger veterans that
5 are moving here, there is a four-fold increase in
6 the challenges associated with prosecuting their
7 claims and getting their claims through the system.
8 The reasons for that, of course, is that the
9 United States has been at war for more than
10 14 years and we've sent a great many of our men and
11 women into harm's way on multiple combat tours
12 ranging from two to four to eight, in some cases,
13 nine or ten combat tours or rotations into
14 Afghanistan or Iraq.

15 So we would like to continue to press that
16 issue to be able to be adequately resources for
17 today's challenges, but also to meet those
18 challenges that we know are just within the
19 horizon's grasp over the next several years as more
20 population moves to the Sunshine State.

21 So specifically, we're looking for additional
22 staffing to support the mission of the Agency that
23 continues to expand to increase our claims
24 examiners in the field so that we can maintain our
25 high return on investment of \$120 to the dollar;

1 and it also allows us the ability to have more
2 folks in our homes to take care of the increasingly
3 complex challenges that are associated with caring
4 for our Vietnam veteran population who actually see
5 a two-fold increase in the medical issues, compared
6 to the generation of our World War II and
7 Korean War veterans.

8 And then, finally, to support all of the
9 activities of the homes division and the benefits
10 and assistance division, we'd like to enhance the
11 capability of the Agency's headquarters to provide
12 that support and continue to be able to do the
13 research and prepare for those other challenges
14 that are out there.

15 Ensuring that our veterans have access to the
16 full spectrum of earned services and benefits is
17 what our mission set is truly all about; and when
18 deemed medically necessary, ensuring that they get
19 the absolute best care possible within our state
20 veterans nursing homes or get access to that earned
21 healthcare benefit that they so richly deserve at
22 one of our seven federal VA medical centers or at
23 one of our 49 VA outpatient clinics spread
24 throughout the Sunshine State.

25 All of these taken together allow us to be

1 poised to continue to honor those who've served us
2 and ensure that we're prepared for today, but also
3 postured to meet the challenges of the future for
4 our veteran community as they present in the
5 future.

6 In closing, we'd like to thank you for the
7 opportunity to work with your offices as we strive
8 towards establishing meaningful measurements that
9 showcases our Agency's great work, and we look
10 forward to refining this initial draft moving
11 forward, and will return to you at a later date to
12 seek approval of the final measures for the
13 Agency's performance metrics.

14 Thank you.

15 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Thank you, Mike.

16 Thank you. I don't think we need a vote this.

17 COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: I have a quick -- some
18 observations, Governor.

19 The -- based on the bar that you've set for
20 yourself on Measures 1 through 5, you're at
21 158 percent success, 305 percent success,
22 116 percent success, 157 percent success, and
23 153 percent success. If we were the Board of
24 Education, I'd say you need to raise your
25 cut scores.

1 It seems like you need to stretch your goals
2 if you're starting out at 305 percent success from
3 day one, for example. I know there has been some
4 staff conversations on that. Is that something
5 y'all are anticipating revising before it comes
6 back before us?

7 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PRENDERGAST: Thank you,
8 Commissioner Putnam.

9 We do look to revise some of these numbers and
10 make some adjustments. But, again, as I alluded to
11 in my initial comments and throughout the
12 narrative, the challenge is that of these first
13 five metrics, we have very little actual control
14 over who presents and crosses the threshold of one
15 of our doors to gain access to services.

16 How we influence that is through our
17 aggressive outreach campaign where we take our
18 claims examiners and our field services folks and
19 attend yellow ribbon events; we go out and we
20 attend conferences that come to the State of
21 Florida or conferences that are statewide
22 conferences and get folks in touch with our claims
23 processes and the array of services that we
24 provide.

25 We can continue to refine this and see if

1 there are some better benchmarks out there, but if
2 we established it at one level today and then all
3 of the Nehmer claims completely go away, which we
4 are still seeing some of the Nehmer claims that
5 come through, and we present those when they show
6 up in our weekly Cabinet reports that we submit to
7 the Cabinet offices and to the Governor's office.

8 And in our monthly roll-ups, you know, we may
9 have a \$600,000 claim that presents this week, and
10 then next week we may only have a \$20,000 claim
11 associated with some things that are retroactive
12 compensation type of benefits.

13 The other thing that's problematic with it is
14 that the federal VA, along with the Department of
15 Defense, are working very aggressively to get a
16 benefits delivery discharge program out there that
17 takes care of some of the known issues that are out
18 there, but the unknown issues at the time of
19 separation for that service member are in --
20 you know, they're incomplete, and we work with the
21 veteran community to see if we can actually capture
22 those issues and then subsequently might have to
23 file an additional claim that's a supplemental
24 claim for additional compensation.

25 It's a complicated matter to exactly arrive at

1 the best portrayal of what the organization does
2 when it comes to the benefits and assistance
3 delivery, yet year after year our rate of return on
4 investment remains high, and we continue to see
5 opportunities to put claims examiners out in the
6 field to harvest these benefits.

7 And as we've talked about informally in some
8 of our discussions, we still believe that there are
9 unharvested federal VA benefits out there among our
10 community of veterans.

11 We know that we have a very small percentage
12 of our veterans who are actually enrolled in VA
13 healthcare across the enterprise of the VA
14 healthcare clinics and medical centers in the
15 state; and yet, if we can get a veteran enrolled in
16 that healthcare, not only are they getting access
17 to the healthcare that they may need for a good
18 quality of life for the remainder of their lives,
19 but that might actually free up some of our
20 Medicaid dollars that would otherwise be used to
21 service that veteran for a medical necessity that
22 has emerged -- that's truly a consequence of his or
23 her service in the armed forces.

24 COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: I mean nobody said it
25 would be easy, I'm just -- but, you know, we just

1 had a report from OFR who, you know, got a
2 red arrow for moving in the wrong direction because
3 they were two days off on the average length of
4 time to approve a mortgage lender.

5 So there's a big gap in the specificity of the
6 performance measures I think between what we have
7 currently, where you have a 305 percent success
8 rate, and some of the other agencies.

9 So I know that every agency is different. I
10 know that there are things you can control and
11 things you can't control, but that's the purpose of
12 this exercise; and so maybe by modifying your
13 objectives so that we can really get into the
14 things that you can control and then be able to
15 identify trends so that we can either resource
16 appropriately or make the necessary policy
17 adjustments to help you accomplish what you're
18 trying to accomplish for our veterans.

19 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PRENDERGAST: We'll come
20 back to you, Commissioner Putnam, and see what we
21 can develop over the next few weeks and then
22 present something to you and then see if we can get
23 some additional guidance.

24 We want to be accurate in our portrayal, but
25 by the same token, we want to have some reasonable

1 degree of flexibility so that if one major issue
2 dries up as a challenge, that we're poised to take
3 on the next challenge that may emerge during a
4 federal legislative cycle where we'll get a whole
5 new series of brand new claims that present, that
6 may have lingered for decades in the case of some
7 of our folks that were exposed to things like the
8 oil fires going back to Desert Shield and
9 Desert Storm back in 1990 and 1991.

10 COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: Thank you.

11 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PRENDERGAST: Thank you.

12 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Commissioner, did you want
13 him to stop by and talk to you about each of them?

14 COMMISSIONER PUTNAM: Those conversations have
15 been ongoing, so I think we're on that.

16 GOVERNOR SCOTT: Okay. All right. Any other
17 comments or questions?

18 ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: No.

19 GOVERNOR SCOTT: All right. Thank you, Mike.

20 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PRENDERGAST: Thank you,
21 Governor.

22
23
24 * * * *
25



Mike Prendergast
Executive Director

State of Florida
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS
Office of the Executive Director
11351 Ulmerton Road, Suite 311-K
Largo, Florida 33778-1630
(727) 518-3202
www.FloridaVets.org

Rick Scott
Governor
Pam Bondi
Attorney General
Jeff Atwater
Chief Financial Officer
Adam Putnam
Commissioner of Agriculture

DATE: October 27, 2015

TO: The Honorable Rick Scott
The Honorable Pam Bondi
The Honorable Jeff Atwater
The Honorable Adam Putnam

FROM: Mike Prendergast
Executive Director

Handwritten signature of Mike Prendergast in cursive.

SUBJECT: Quarterly Report – First Quarter 2015-2016

The Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs submits this Quarterly Report for the First Quarter of the 2015-2016 Fiscal Year, covering the period July 1 – September 30, 2015.

This Quarterly Report is submitted pursuant to the procedures authorized by Rules 55-1.003 and 55-2.010, Florida Administrative Code. The report will be placed on the agenda at a future meeting of the Governor and Cabinet.

If you have any questions regarding any matter covered by this report, please contact Deputy Executive Director Al Carter at (727) 518-3202 or Legislative and Cabinet Affairs Director Colleen Krepstekies at (850) 487-1533.

CC: Sen. Rene Garcia, Chairman, Health and Human Services Appropriations Committee
Sen. Thad Altman, Chairman, Military Affairs, Space and Domestic Security Committee
Rep. Kenneth L. Roberson, Chairman, Health Innovation Sub-Committee
Rep. Matt Hudson, Chairman, Health Care Appropriations Sub-Committee
Rep. Jimmie T. Smith, Chairman, Veterans and Military Affairs Sub-Committee
Cynthia Kelly, Director, Governor's Office of Policy and Budget

Attachment 1: FDVA Quarterly Report

ATTACHMENT 1

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS FIRST QUARTER REPORT July 1 – September 30, 2015

This report covers the activities of the Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs (FDVA) for the First Quarter of the 2015-2016 Fiscal Year.

1. **Administrative Highlights:**

a. **Current Issues/Concerns**

Executive Direction:

Executive Director Mike Prendergast continued his campaign of advocating with purpose and passion for Florida veterans and linking them to superior services, benefits and support. He presented department overviews and updates on current federal and state legislative initiatives to veterans' groups, civic groups and legislative committees. During this quarter he also met with local businesses and organizations to discuss outreach programs and projects to assist veterans.

Executive Director Mike Prendergast, Nursing Home Administrator Marlies Sarrett and Legislative and Cabinet Affairs Director Colleen Krepstekies hosted State Sen. John Legg and senior staff member Jim Browne at the Baldomero Lopez State Veterans' Nursing Home in Land O' Lakes. Senator Legg was given a tour of the facility and an informational briefing on the operations of the State Veterans' Nursing Home program.

Executive Director Mike Prendergast attended a press conference hosted by Attorney General Pam Bondi wherein she announced the results of a litigation settlement. JPMorgan Chase will pay \$136 million to settle charges that it used illegal tactics to go after delinquent credit card borrowers. As part of the agreement, \$15.3 million will go to 47 non-profit organizations across the state to be used for legal services, financial literacy, and other programs related to assisting Floridian's with managing debt. The Florida Veterans Foundation will receive funds from this settlement to support Florida's Veterans.

Executive Director Mike Prendergast met with Dr. Joe Guttman and retired Chief Warrant Officer 3 Romy Camargo at the Stay In Step Spinal Cord Injury Recovery Center in Tampa. The program complements existing Department of Defense (DOD) and U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (USDVA) recovery therapy modalities by increasing strength and conditioning for patients with spinal cord injuries.

Executive Director Mike Prendergast and key agency leadership hosted the annual National Association of Directors of Veterans Affairs Conference in Orlando. The conference brought together the leadership from the various State Departments of Veterans' Affairs, as well as leaders from the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs and veteran service provider community. The four-day conference, with more than 120 attendees, provided a forum to discuss new USDVA initiatives, states' best practices, and address the future of the VA.

Executive Director Mike Prendergast and key agency leadership attended the Florida Veterans' Hall of Fame Class of 2014 induction ceremony hosted by the Governor. Colonel Prendergast also attended the Civilian Medal Ceremony for Mr. Richard Cicero, a veteran, who, while working as a civilian contractor for the U.S. government, lost his right arm and leg to an improvised explosive device (IED). Mr. Cicero will receive the civilian equivalent of the Purple Heart Award for his actions and injuries incurred supporting combat operations in the Middle East.

New State Veterans' Nursing Home:

Many positive milestones have been reached this quarter in the planning and design of the Ardie R. Copas State Veterans' Nursing Home in Port St. Lucie. Submittal of the Historical Preservation request received approval in August and a stand-up AHCA review occurred in July with the Project Management Team (DMS). The Phase I Environment Survey was completed and the project is ready for the Environmental Assessment Phase II. Payment has been made for the Upland Lease Number 4739 (St. Lucie) through FDEP through June 2016. Additional project review by ACHA occurred in September 2015 through the Office of Plans and Construction.

Division of Benefits and Assistance:

Bureau of Veterans' Claims: Claims Services continues on a high tempo to convert to a total digital environment this quarter. As we transition, our office continued to advocate for 71,074 Veterans and their families, while 4,156 claims for disability benefits were processed. 179 Veterans were represented before the Board of Veterans Appeals to uphold their appellate rights for veterans' benefits. We also conducted 185 Personal Hearings requests with the VA Regional Office. During this quarter, we also lost two more experienced Veterans' Claims Examiners, which continues to place a heavier than anticipated burden on the remaining Veterans' Claims Examiners. We have also assessed five new Veterans' Claims Examiners in September, beginning their one year of probationary training. We transitioned to the new VetraSpec Veterans Benefits software in the middle of August. We were able to successfully transfer more than 600,000 records from our older legacy system.

Bureau of Field Services: Field Services provided 10 Veterans' Claim Examiners and 70 man hours to support two Governor's Veterans Service Award presentations this Quarter. Field Service's staff members David Austin, Harry Rudy, Mike Rollins and Ernie Kuykendall provided training at the Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs Certification Course September 8-11. Dennis Latta and Harry Rudy supported the National Association of Directors of Veteran's Affairs Conference. This quarter, Field Services attended 149 outreach events providing benefit information to 6,329 veterans and their families.

The Bureau of State Approving for Veterans' Education and Training (or State Approving Agency/SAA): During this end of federal fiscal year quarter, the Florida SAA received word of the renewal of their \$1 million contract with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (USDVA). It was also their quarter for the readying for submission of end-of-year reports to USDVA as well as their self-assessment reports. With school and organization compliance survey visits being a USDVA focal point, the SAA performed extremely well. Notwithstanding VA's reduction in the SAA's working timeframe by 11% (six weeks), the Florida SAA performed 100% of their 120 assigned compliance survey visits. Since the assignment of compliance survey visits to the nation's SAAs, teamwork between VA and the SAAs is at a high. With changes in the reporting structure of Education Services within USDVA, the nation's regional Chief Education Liaison Officers (CELO) were able to

join members of the National Association of State Approving Agency (NASAA) members during their annual summer business meeting and training sessions. Between this meeting and VA's Education Division representative's meeting in September, more congruous guidance from VA is expected for SAAs throughout the nation. Of note, Florida SAA Program Consultant, Mrs. Katherine Snyder, continued to lead the nation's education representatives during the recent NASAA training event, delivering training materials related to the use of GI Bill Benefits for Flight Training. Mrs. Snyder is the Chair of NASAA's Flight Committee and she provides guidance to SAA and VA members pertaining to flight policy and policy adherence and was also a contributor on H.R. 476, The GI Bill Education Quality Enhancement Act of 2015, which is currently under review by Congress.

b. **Audits**

- No internal or external audits were finalized this quarter.
- Thirty-two prior external and internal audit findings were closed during this quarter.

c. **Consultants**

- No new consultants were contracted, nor were any existing agreements changed this quarter.

d. **Contracts**

- Sims SVNH "Chiller Removal and Replacement" contract, with DMS as Project Agent, executed on 8/13/14. DMS activated "architect/engineering services" with McGinnis & Fleming Inc., on 9/26/14. DMS activated "construction services" with Shine & Co. on 4/17/15. Project completed on 9/29/15, anticipated contract close out by 10/30/15.
- Lopez SVNH "Chiller Removal and Replacement" contract, with DMS as Project Agent, executed on 6/20/14. DMS activated "architect/engineering services" with TLC Engineering Inc. on 8/1/14. DMS activated "construction services" with Tappouni Mechanical Services, Inc. on 3/26/15. Anticipated project completion by 11/15/15.
- Jenkins SVDH "Chiller Removal and Replacement" contract, with Grau Mechanical Enterprises, Inc., executed on 4/22/15. Anticipated project completion date is 10/19/15.
- Lopez SVNH "Pavilion" contract, with DMS as Project Agent, executed on 3/5/15. DMS activated "architect/engineering services" firm on 6/15/15. DMS activation of "construction services" firm pending as of 9/30/15.
- Bennett SVNH "Nurse Call System" contract, with JSC Systems, Inc., completed on 5/22/15 (on budget), with AHCA final approval received 6/24/15. Contract closed out on 7/6/15.
- FDVA "New Copas State Veterans' Nursing Home" legislative appropriation provided on 7/1/14, with DMS as Project Agent. DMS "architect/engineering services" contract with Rogers, Lovelock, & Fritz Inc. executed on 10/20/14. DMS "construction services" contract with OHL-Arellano Construction Co. executed on 1/30/15. FDVA receipt of USDVA funding letter, as well as FDVA receipt and execution of USDVA Memorandum of Agreement pending as of 9/30/15.

- FDVA “Veterans Benefits Information System” contract with DataSpec Inc. (VetraSpec system), executed on 6/9/15. USDVA Data Transfer Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding executed on 8/5/15. Data migration completed with system “go-live” on 8/17/15.
- FDVA “Medicare/Medicaid Cost Reporting Services” contract, with Moore Stephens Lovelace P.A., executed on 6/12/15. Contract commenced on 7/1/15.
- FDVA “Disabled Veterans Insurance Career Services” contract, with Disabled Veterans Insurance Careers, Inc., executed and commenced on 8/20/15.
- Sims SVNH “Nurse Station Counter Tops” contract executed on 8/7/15. Anticipated project completion date is 10/6/15.
- FDVA “Veterans’ Healthcare Referral Services” contract, with the Crisis Center of Tampa Bay, expired on 6/30/15. Contract closed out on 8/6/15.
- FDVA “Outreach Services” contract, with Sachs Media Group, expired on 6/30/15. Contract closed out on 7/22/15.
- FDVA new “Outreach Services” (branding and outreach services) solicitation under development as of 9/30/15.
- Lassen SVNH “Side Walks and Dumpster Relocation” solicitation (ITB) issued on 9/9/15. Onsite pre-bid meeting held 9/29/15. Bid opening scheduled for 10/15/15.
- FDVA “Bed Systems” contract, with NOA Medical Industries, expires 12/13/15. Issued notice of expiration letter on 9/14/15. Anticipated contract close out on 12/28/15.
- FDVA “Pharmacy Services” annual contract renewal Amendment No. 5, with USDVA/VISN-8, executed on 7/29/15. Covers service period of 9/1/15 through 8/31/16.
- FDVA “Health Information Technology System” contract Amendment No. 4, with MDIA/Matrix-Care, executed on 7/30/15. Provides for future additional system training.
- FDVA “Resident Safety Lift and Transfer System” solicitation (ITN) published to State VBS on 7/20/15. Pre-response onsite meetings held 8/3/15 and 8/5/15 (at Lopez & Lassen SVNH). Addendum No. 1 published 8/19/15. Response opening meeting held 8/28/15. Response evaluation meeting held 9/14/15. Oral presentations held on 9/23/15 and 9/24/15. Oral presentations evaluation meeting held 9/25/15. Negotiations to be held 10/20-23/15 (with HandiCare USA, Prism Medical, and Tollos).

e. **Leases**

- FDVA made no additions, alterations, or modifications to leased space this quarter.

f. **Lawsuits/Claims in Litigation or Settled this Quarter**

- **2 General Liability Claims** (0 new this quarter): 0 won, 0 settled, 0 lost, 2 pending
- **3 Employment Liability Claims** (3 new this quarter): 2 won, 0 settled, 0 lost, 2 pending

g. Donations

Cash Donations by State Veterans' Home

<i>Fiscal Year 2015-2016</i>	<i>First Quarter</i>	<i>Second Quarter</i>	<i>Third Quarter</i>	<i>Fourth Quarter</i>	<i>Total, Year to Date</i>
Jenkins SVDH, Lake City	\$1,000				\$1,000
Bennett SVNH, Daytona Beach	\$8,114				\$8,114
Lopez SVNH, Land O' Lakes	\$20				\$20
Nininger SVNH, Pembroke Pines	\$12,705				\$12,705
Sims SVNH, Panama City	\$100				\$100
Jacobson SVNH, Port Charlotte	\$116				\$116
Lassen SVNH, St. Augustine	\$475				\$475
All State Veterans' Homes	\$22,530				\$22,530

Non-Cash Donations

<i>First Quarter 2015-2016</i>		
	Items	Value
Jenkins SVDH, Lake City	None	\$0.00
Bennett SVNH, Daytona Beach	Active Care Electric Wheelchair	\$1,800.00
	VCR/DVD Player (used)	\$0.00
Lopez SVNH, Land O' Lakes	None	\$0.00
Nininger SVNH, Pembroke Pines	None	\$0.00
Sims SVNH, Panama City	None	\$0.00
Jacobson SVNH, Port Charlotte	(2) Broda Chairs-Elite Reclining	\$4,967.21
	(2) Sony Blue Ray DVD Players	\$139.98
	75" Samsung TV	\$2,499.99
Lassen SVNH, St. Augustine	Optavision HD9500 LCD Projector	\$300.00
	38" Vizio Sound Bar	\$99.00
Total Value		\$9,806.18

h. Memberships in Professional Organizations Paid this Quarter

Administration/Homes	N.F.P.A.	\$1,395
Jenkins SVDH, Lake City	NASVH	\$900
Bennett SVNH, Daytona Beach	NASVH	\$900
Lopez SVNH, Land O' Lakes	NASVH	\$900
Nininger SVNH, Pembroke Pines	NASVH	\$900
Sims SVNH, Panama City	NASVH	\$900
Jacobson SVNH, Port Charlotte	NASVH	\$900
Lassen SVNH, St. Augustine	NASVH	\$900
All State Veterans' Homes		\$7,695

2. Division of Benefits and Assistance: Statistics

- Summary of veterans' benefits derived vs. cost of the benefits staff: \$55:1 (ROI)*.
 * The Division of Benefits and Assistance purchased a new database system to monitor and record all veterans' benefits and assistance activities. It is anticipated that the ROI is currently artificially lowered until all the necessary information is entered into the new database.

a. Bureau of Veterans' Claims

<i>Event 2015-2016</i>	<i>First Quarter</i>	<i>Second Quarter</i>	<i>Third Quarter</i>	<i>Fourth Quarter</i>	<i>FY 2015-2016</i>	<i>Previous FY to this Qtr.</i>
Retroactive compensation	\$17,081,397				\$17,081,397	\$36,770,963
Largest single retro. benefit	\$213,652				\$213,652	\$292,897
Debt relief	\$32,980				\$32,980	\$77,113
Notices of Disagreement	757				757	526
Statements of Argument in Appeals Cases*	344				344	179
Act as Representative at Hearings*	185				185	82
Veterans' Appeals Hearings*	179				179	55
Ratings Reviewed	7,244				7,244	10,039

* The appeals representation process includes formal filing of the appeal application, and paralegal representation with the veteran at the Regional Office and in teleconferences with the Board of Veterans' Appeals (BVA).

b. Bureau of State Approving for Veterans' Training (SAA)

<i>Event 2015-2016</i>	<i>First Quarter</i>	<i>Second Quarter</i>	<i>Third Quarter</i>	<i>Fourth Quarter</i>	<i>FY 2015-2016</i>	<i>Previous FY to this Qtr.</i>
SAA Programs Approved	3,868				3,868	3,671
Other Approval	889				889	778
Compliance Visits	28				28	40
Inspection Visits	13				13	12
Outreach Activities*	229				229	185
Liaison Activities**	171				171	183
Technical Assistance***	1,178				1,178	1,050

* Outreach Activities are any activity designed to inform or encourage those with entitlement to use it.

** Liaison activities are those that foster education about the SAA with other education and training professionals, which promote and encourage the exchange of information and support to raise awareness of the professional nature of the SAA approval function.

*** Technical assistance is any interaction designed to assist an individual or a facility with any aspect of the approval function.

c. Bureau of Veteran Field Services

<i>Event 2015-2016</i>	<i>First Quarter</i>	<i>Second Quarter</i>	<i>Third Quarter</i>	<i>Fourth Quarter</i>	<i>FY 2015-2016</i>	<i>Previous FY to this Qtr.</i>
Issue Resolution	3,708				3,708	5,304
Total Amount	\$11,659,821				\$11,659,821	\$14,627,699
Outreach Visits	149				149	198
Veterans Served at Outreach	6,329				6,329	15,365
Bedside Interviews	3,209				3,209	3,138
Walk-ins/Counseling	18,167				18,167	33,060
Claims	8,402				8,402	8,310
Voter Regis/Pref forms	3,079				3,079	3,060
Homeless Walk In	494				494	933
Ratings Reviewed Orlando/W Palm	1,134				1,134	260

<i>Event 2015-2016</i>	<i>First Quarter</i>	<i>Second Quarter</i>	<i>Third Quarter</i>	<i>Fourth Quarter</i>	<i>FY 2015-2016</i>	<i>Previous FY to this Qtr.</i>
Issue Resolution	3,708				3,708	5,304
Total Amount	\$11,659,821				\$11,659,821	\$14,627,699
Outreach Visits	149				149	198
Veterans Served at Outreach	6,329				6,329	15,365
Bedside Interviews	3,209				3,209	3,138
Walk-ins/Counseling	18,167				18,167	33,060
Claims	8,402				8,402	8,310
Voter Regis/Pref forms	3,079				3,079	3,060
Homeless Walk In	494				494	933
Ratings Reviewed Orlando/W Palm	1,134				1,134	260

d. Outreach*

<i>Event 2015-2016</i>	<i>First Quarter</i>	<i>Second Quarter</i>	<i>Third Quarter</i>	<i>Fourth Quarter</i>	<i>FY 2015-2016</i>	<i>Previous FY to this Qtr.</i>
Reintegration and Pre-Deployment Events for Guard and Reserve units	6				6	4
Homeless Veteran Stand Down Events	8				8	7
Medical Center Welcome Home events	0				0	0
Congressional Open House events	1				1	9
National Conferences	4				4	0
New Patient Orientation	32				32	67
Transition Assistance Briefings	9				9	10
Other	87				87	102

* Supervisors and VCEs throughout the Division of Veterans' Benefits and Assistance provide presentation, orientations, and briefings on state, federal, and local veterans' laws and benefits.

3. State Veterans' Homes Program

a. State Veterans' Homes Census

<i>Fiscal Year 2015-2016</i>	<i>First Quarter</i>	<i>Second Quarter</i>	<i>Third Quarter</i>	<i>Fourth Quarter</i>	<i>FY 2015-2016</i>	<i>Previous FY, same Qtr.</i>
Jenkins SVDH, Lake City	98.1%				98.1%	95.90%
Bennett SVNH, Daytona Beach	95.1%				95.1%	97.80%
Lopez SVNH, Land O' Lakes	99.6%				99.6%	99.80%
Nininger SVNH, Pembroke Pines	98.7%				98.7%	98.90%
Sims SVNH, Panama City	99.8%				99.8%	99.90%
Jacobson SVNH, Port Charlotte	98.0%				98.0%	98.50%
Lassen SVNH, St. Augustine	99.9%				99.9%	99.50%

b. Quality of Care

FDVA provides the highest standard of care and services to Florida veterans while managing the cost of its programs and being efficient stewards of all resources entrusted to us by the people of Florida. Improving the quality of care provided at our FDVA Nursing Homes is our top priority. FDVA is constantly striving for highest quality and continuous improvement to better serve Florida veterans in the best way possible that promotes their health and well-being. Our goal is to provide Florida veterans with the best health care with an enjoyable pleasant environment, to provide them with a safe, warm and comforting place while being treated with dignity and respect.

2014 Excellence in Action Award presented by *My Innerview* recognized three FDVA Homes, Douglas T. Jacobson State Veterans' Nursing Home (Port Charlotte), Clyde E. Lassen State Veterans' Nursing Home (St. Augustine) and Baldomero Lopez State Veterans' Nursing Home (Land O' Lakes). The award is given for superior satisfaction scores on FDVA's annual resident/family surveys.

c. Occupancy Trends

There are 680 nursing homes in Florida, representing 83,229 beds with roughly 85% occupancy of private nursing homes compared to the FDVA occupancy rate of 99%. By 2026, the population of Americans ages 65 and older will double to 71.5 million. (Data provided by Florida Health Care Association). Florida has the third highest population of veterans in the United States. The U.S. Census Bureau data indicates that based on population figures, Florida has the highest number of elderly residents. This segment of the population will continue increasing since people born during the baby boom generation are beginning to retire.

d. **Volunteer Services**

There are a number of registered volunteers in the State Veterans' Homes that provide invaluable services for our veteran residents. The multitude of hours that are contributed add to the quality of life for the residents as well as allow the skilled employees to attend to more complicated, professional-level tasks associated with resident care.

<i>Fiscal Year 2015-2016</i>	<i>Volunteer hours First Quarter</i>	<i>Number of Volunteers Individual or Group</i>
Jenkins SVDH, Lake City	876	24
Bennett SVNH, Daytona Beach	983	44
Lopez SVNH, Land O' Lakes	441	39
Nininger SVNH, Pembroke Pines	941	44
Sims SVNH, Panama City	668	30
Jacobson SVNH, Port Charlotte	1,071	40
Lassen SVNH, St. Augustine	307	48
All State Veterans' Homes	5,287	269



Enjoying Labor Day music and dancing with Sunny and Dan at the Jacobson SVNH.



Mr. Richey visiting with sailors at Lassen SVNH.

e. **State Veterans' Homes Renovations**

- Grant #12-024 - Ceiling Lifts for all six Veterans' Homes

Total Grant		\$6,158,173
Federal Funding	65%	\$4,002,812
State O/M Trust Fund Match	35%	\$2,155,361

This project consists of the installation of Safe Resident Handling and Transfer Systems composed of fixed ceiling motorized tracks, charging stations, brackets, mounting hardware and

the appropriate lifts and slings to safely handle and transfer residents at six Florida veterans' nursing homes. The work consists of furnishing and installing the lift track systems in 699 rooms that include private and semi-private rooms and bathrooms. The system will be complete with lifts and slings which connect to the ceiling tracks to lift and transfer residents. The system will allow staff to lift and transfer residents from bed to chair/toilet via the ceiling track system, substantially increasing the comfort of residents and reducing the risk of injury to staff and residents that is associated with lifting residents manually or with floor lifts.

- Grant # 12-023 Ardie R. Copas State Veterans' Nursing Home (#7)

Total Grant		\$39,753,268
Federal Funding	65%	\$25,839,624
State O/M Trust Fund Match	35%	\$13,913,644

Construction of a 120-bed State Veterans' Nursing Home designed and built according to the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Design Guide for Community Living Centers. The size of the home is approximately 135,000 gsf pod-type layout as currently designed, though the final design may be smaller in size. The site is located in the City of Port St. Lucie. The project site is 28.5+ acres. FDVA contracted with Department of Management Services (DMS) for Project Management. The construction manager has been selected with OHL (Arellano Construction Company) as the Construction Team.

State Veterans' Nursing Home Site Selection Process Workshop Results and Recommendations



Final Report
March 12, 2015



Problem Statement: The workshop will analyze and assess existing State Veterans' Nursing Home Site Selection processes to ensure criteria previously used by the Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs are in fact valid and useful for future nursing home site selections. Seven veterans' nursing homes were selected with existing criteria, to include the new Ardie R. Copas State Veterans' Nursing Home in Port St. Lucie.

If workshop participants conclude that existing criteria are not valid and useful, the department wants to ensure it captures that information and provides viable recommendations for the Governor and Cabinet with considering future veterans' nursing homes. A review of the site selection process helps FDVA remain a good steward of taxpayer dollars.

Current Situation: The State Veterans' Homes Program operates as a state agency division equivalent within the Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs. Within its function, the Homes Program provides oversight and day-to-day operational guidance to the six existing State Veterans' Nursing Homes (SVNH) and one Domiciliary. The Homes Program also works concurrently with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, the Governor and Cabinet and State Legislature to provide recommendations for future SVNH's. Documents used in the study consisted of the site selection study, site selection committee makeup and qualification, county site application template, and the site selection score sheet.

Approach: The existing site selection process consists of procuring a site selection study, soliciting applications from the eligible counties based on site selection study findings, selecting site selection committee members, reviewing county site applications, evaluating sites, recommending a nursing home site to the FDVA Executive Director, and recommending a site to the Governor and Cabinet for approval. The members in attendance analyzed every aspect of the process, from the site selection study, to the committee makeup, to finally, the scoring of the final site. Importantly, these documents served as the basis for the assessment of the current situation, requirements or imperatives of the process as well as the cost benefit analysis results, and the final recommendation(s).

Objective: Review the existing site selection process to determine if existing procedures are a valid and useful tool for future State Veterans' Nursing Home site selections.

Discussions: The Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs recorded, discussed and analyzed issues and concerns with the existing process as per below based on participant feedback:



- Exclusion of counties due to population size and distance
- Criteria weighting excluded smaller counties based on population and income
- Whether to allow counties to submit combined proposals?
- Whether to allow counties to submit multiple proposals?
- Whether to change site selection committee members?
- Application form is not fillable as currently designed
- Hurricane Evacuation Zones eliminates some counties from participation. (emergency evacuation/safety criteria by U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs)
- Score sheets need to be further defined/detailed – implement a scoring scale within each category
- Disparity in scoring by committee members
- Should top-rated sites be utilized as alternates in event of primary selection disqualification?
- Should the top-ranked sites be awarded subsequent nursing homes as funding becomes approved and available (i.e. #1 site awarded Home #8, #2 site awarded Home #9, #3 site awarded Home #10).

As a byproduct of the workshop, the attendees also explored alternatives to the existing process to include expansion of the process to include a wider audience. A more detailed analysis of the discussion topics is at annex 1.

Finally, one of the workshop participants indicated that a legislative initiative was underway to reassign control of the site selection process with the legislature. While there may be a benefit to adapting some new legislation in support of the process in general, care must be taken not to usurp the authority of the Governor and Cabinet to control this process.

Recommendations: Based on a comprehensive analysis and assessment of the SVNH Site Selection Process, the Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs makes the following recommendations. Most recommendations are administrative in nature to the process. However, please note that bolded recommendations require approval by the Governor and Cabinet as they represent a significant departure from existing practices.

- **Follow site selection study recommendations but include and allow for up to three adjoining counties to combine and submit a single application.**
- Revise weighting of the application, but not the Site Selection Study.
- Outline in the application packet weighted factors for emphasis in selection.
- Limit counties to a single site proposal to ensure counties put their best product forward and apply resources to that site accordingly.



- Keep site selection committee intact, but change point of contact to a non-voting member.
- Redesign application form to make it a fillable format.
- Revise score sheet to add scoring scale and train committee members accordingly.
- **Rank order sites from one through four for the next three homes. Fourth home is only an alternate if site number three is disqualified for acceptance by State of Florida and/or U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.**
- **Allow runner-up sites in scoring become alternate sites provided grant allows for the change.**

Conclusion/Follow-up action plan. Submit the report to the Governor and Cabinet for approval of the Site Selection process recommendations to be used for the selection of future State Veterans' Nursing Homes.

Acknowledgements of collaborations and sponsors. FDVA thanks all Florida legislators, agencies, county and public participants for their insights and support of this workshop. Your efforts will allow us to improve our process as we forge ahead to build additional State Veterans' Nursing Homes across the State of Florida.

Annexes attached to the report include:

Annex 1: Analysis Spreadsheet - State Veterans' Nursing Home Site Selection Process Workshop Results and Recommendations.

Annex 2: Informal notes from workshop (A formal recorded transcript extract is available upon request)

Annex 3: Workshop support documents.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Alfred D. Carter", is written over a light blue horizontal line.

ALFRED D. CARTER
Colonel, US Army (Retired)
DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

State Veterans' Nursing Home Site Selection Process Workshop Feedback and Recommendations

The Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs held a Site Selection Process Workshop on 19 February 2015 at the Mary Grizzle Building, Largo, FL. Public notices announcing the workshop as well as workshop support documents (agenda, application, site selection committee makeup, etc) were provided approximately two weeks prior to the 19 February workshop date. Also, attendees were afforded the opportunity to attend in person or via teleconference connection. The following chart provides key site selection process issues, attendee recommendations, and FDVA recommendations to the Governor and Cabinet.

Subtopics	Issue	Participant Recommendations	Pros/Cons	FDVA Recommendations
Selection of Counties	Exclusion of Counties due to population size and distance	1 - Combine counties to form larger service areas	P1: Avails more opportunity C1: Increases length of selection process from 5 months to up to 18 months C1: Could jeopardize grant	1- Follow Site Selection Study recommendations but allow counties to combine and submit a single application
	Criteria weighting excludes smaller counties based on population and income	1 – Involve the counties in the study to verify data 2- Include criteria such as, the inclusion of the lack of a nursing home over a large geographical area.	P1: Allows inclusion of a larger population of counties C1: Redo contracted study with revised criteria (6-12 month process) C1/C2: Cost to redo study C1: USDVA may not support low population county receiving grant.	1 – Revise weighting of the application, but not the study
	Whether to allow counties to submit combined proposals	1-Counties should be able to combine to submit proposals. 2- Counties should have ability to know weighted factors to determine the best site.	P: Avails smaller counties to participate C: Lengthens selection process	1- Allow counties to combine to submit proposals 2- Outline weighted factors in application
	Whether to allow counties	1- No need for multiple	P: More options for site	1- Limit counties to a

to submit multiple proposals

sites

C: Quality of site
C: Increased County cost due to multiple site preparation

single site proposal



Subtopics	Issue	Participant Recommendations	Pros/Cons	FDVA Recommendations
Selection of Site Selection Committee Members	Whether to change site selection committee members?	1- No changes to committee members 2- POC for committee should be a non-voting member	P1: Proper experience and expertise within existing committee C: Increases coordination requirements	1 -Keep committee as is. Change POC to a non-voting member



Subtopics	Issue	Participant Recommendations	Pros/Cons	FDVA Recommendations
Site Selection Criteria/ Application	Application not fillable as currently designed	1- Provide a fillable application form 2- Application is good as is.	P1: Easier to complete application C1: Time to create application template	1-Redesign application form to support a more fillable format for Counties to use.
	Hurricane Evacuation Zones eliminates some counties from participation.	1- Review mitigating factors prior to being eliminated by committee.	P1: Ensures county not prematurely eliminated if they can pay for hurricane mitigation costs.	1 – Accept mitigation with county agreement to pay additional cost. (Could add \$2M or

C1: Could result in loss of grant if USDVA does not accept hurricane mitigations
 C1: State of Florida incurs cost of hurricane mitigation if County defaults or grant could be lost
 to construction cost.)



Subtopics	Issue	Participant Recommendations	Pros/Cons	FDVA Recommendations
Scoring Methodology	Score sheets need to be further defined/detailed – implement a scoring scale within each category	1- Provide a fillable application form 2- Application is good as is.	P1: Add more transparency to the scoring process C1: Time consuming process to create a scaled scoresheet.	1-Revise scoresheet to create a scaled scoresheet.
	Disparity in scoring by committee members	Training of committee members to minimize disparity in scoring	P1: Reduces opportunity for disparity in scoring	Train Committee members on scoring
	No formalized cure process	1- Provide a formalized cure process. (Counties allowed opportunity to provide missing documentation until meeting closed at the site.	N/A	N/A: Process already affords this opportunity.
	Should top rated sites be utilized as alternates in	2- Yes	P: Provides an alternate site without undergoing	Allow runner up sites scoring become alternate

<p>event of primary selection disqualification</p>		<p>complete process again. C: Ties up donated land parcel for up to two years – pending State of Florida and USDVA acceptance.</p>	<p>site provided grant allows for the change</p>
<p>Should the top ranked sites be awarded subsequent nursing homes as funding becomes approved and available (i.e. #1 site awarded Home #8, #2 site awarded Home #9, #3 site awarded Home #10).</p>	<p>3- Yes, with understanding that property can be tied up for a period of 5-7 years.</p>	<p>P: Speeds up selection process. P: Allows State to take advantage of USDVA grant submission timeline (currently a fiscal year difference challenge). C: Ties up land for up to seven years depending on ranking.</p>	<p>Rank order sites from one through four for the next three homes. Fourth home is only an alternate if site number three is disqualified for acceptance by State of Florida and/or USDVA.</p>

State Veterans' Nursing Home Site Selection Process Workshop Notes

February 19, 2015, 8:30 a.m. until 4:00 p.m.

Mary Grizzle State Building, Room 142B

11351 Ulmerton Rd., Largo, FL 33778

Teleconference Call # 1 (213) 493-0015 or Toll Free 1 (866) 899-4679

Access Code 299-649-245; Meeting ID 299649245

Call to Order: The workshop was called to order @ 8:32 a.m. with Al Carter, Deputy Executive Director as facilitator of the meeting.

Attendees: There were 24 persons in attendance

All attendees were asked to Sign In on the sign in sheets that were provided. All conference call attendees were acknowledged and asked to mute their phones and to introduce themselves and state where they were calling from when they were making a comment or giving feedback concerning a specific comment. Everyone was asked to turn their phones on vibrate as not to disturb the meeting.

Introductions: Al Carter introduced Representative Gayle B. Harrell (District 83) and her husband Jim and County Commissioner Earl Arnett (Marion County, District 5).

Welcome: Col. Mike Prendergast, FDVA Executive Director welcomed all in attendance. He gave an overview of the agency and reaffirmed the recent announcement by Gov. Rick Scott of the recommendation to approve building two additional State Veterans' Nursing Homes in the state of Florida.

Sunshine Law Overview: Dave Herman, FDVA General Counsel gave a brief overview of the Sunshine Law.

History and Overview of Site Selection Process: Dave Herman, FDVA General Counsel, gave the history and overview of the agency and the current site selection process.

Al Carter gave an explanation of the workshop, which is that in light of the Governor's announcement of the opportunity for two new homes to be built in the state of Florida and the possibility of a 10th home brings us to the reason for a discussion of our current process and the FDVA is seeking the input of others.

Discussion Topic #1 – Selection of Counties:

a. Subtopic #1a – 2013 Needs Study

Al Carter explained the needs study that was conducted for site #7 (Ardie R. Copas, St. Lucie County).

Al Carter opened the floor to discuss the process of selecting counties.

Rep. G. Harrell – What are the criteria in which the study determined need?

- Rank order of counties (75 yrs. and older population)
- Existing SVNH (25 miles of location)
- Combining counties (medical support)
- Preliminary target community (service areas)
- Income levels (determines how much the state pays to the veteran in the home).
- Supply of existing beds in community.
- Nursing capabilities in the area.

- Availability of healthcare professionals within the area.
- Demographic profile of veterans in the area (average mthly. cost \$9,000)

Rep. G. Harrell – Was each of the criteria mentioned weighed equally or were specific criteria weighted heavier than others?

- Existing VA facility in the area. (5pts.)
- Distance (up to 11 pts.)
- Elderly veterans within in the county (ranked as high as 0-67, 1-2 pt. span).

Rep. G. Harrell – When you looked at veterans, what is the catchment area when you count those veterans?

- Varied from county to county. Used service areas. The study looked at populations of roughly 100K veterans within the service areas.

Rep. G. Harrell – If you have a concentration of veterans in a smaller area does that give you higher points? Did they consider the catchment areas equal miles or not?

- The points that were given for distances to rural areas appear higher than those in the urban areas. They gave more points to those that have a greater distance. The study looked at a span of 75 miles and awarded additional points for further distances.

Sam Dininno (Citrus County) – Smaller counties are ruled out before the process begins. Citrus County has the largest veteran population per square mile. Smaller counties generally have two strikes (lower income and lower population). How does a smaller county get the opportunity to be considered looking at the current criteria? Does the study limit the amount of counties that can apply because of their size? Is the ratio monthly allotment vs. income taken into consideration? How does the VA gather its' statistical resources?

- The criterion that was used was from prior site selection processes. The issue that smaller counties have was not addressed in the study. It is definitely something that could be addressed going forward.
- If this study limits the number of counties that can participate than there is a possibility that the study should be reviewed or changed.
- According to the information that we have it wasn't. The study looked at the bare numbers with respect to incomes.
- Col. M. Prendergast – The Office of the Actuary provided federal census information (conducted every 10 years) and The Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) can pinpoint veterans down to zip code. This information is combined together in partnership with the VA to develop the GDX data set. The GDX data set is the best available tool that we have to tell us, with moderate accuracy, the veterans' populations per county.

Sam Dininno (Citrus County) – The counties need to be more involved. If you have already selected your counties, and ruled out the other counties even before any potential data was verified by those other counties, you've eliminated them.

- Col. M. Prendergast – This is why we are having this workshop now. To decide if the criteria that we relied upon from the historic precedent that was established from the six previous homes that were selected and the most recent seventh home that was selected (Ardie R. Copas SVNH), if those are in fact valid and useful tools for us to carry forward. If they are not, then we want to make sure that we capture that information now and roll that information up in the process and go back to the Governor's cabinet and say that we received feedback and we have taken a look at some other things and these are the validated things that we think should be included in the site selection process for homes #8, 9, 10, and potentially those after that.
We also have to be good stewards of tax payer dollars. We have to make sure that we show a return on investment for every dollar that we receive from our tax payers in the state. So that we can operate our state veterans homes at zero general revenue appropriation. We don't have to go back to the Senate and Representatives to get more tax payer dollars.

Dr. J. Harrell – The amount of money used each month by each veteran that is sent by the federal government, roughly \$9,000 per month, is that money split equally between the state government and the federal government or does supplemental income such as Medicaid play a role in this? Where does the trust fund come from? What is the maximum output for each veteran for each home? How big of a role does their disability rating play?

- Yes. Medicaid absorbs some of the cost of the care for the veteran along with the veterans' income or through the trust fund that we have been able to accumulate over time.
- The trust fund come from donations, savings in operating costs that we have achieved over the years by doing things more efficiently and there is the difference in the per diem that we get from the VA and Medicare and Medicaid through ACHA resources for the operations of the homes. Aside from Medicaid, not all veterans qualify for Medicaid, so we receive a per diem from the VA for each veteran. That amount varies per location.
- Col. M. Prendergast - The amount each veteran receives varies from location to location. Based upon their disability rating, their ability to pay and a whole list of variables. Each veteran's cost of care is different.
- Col. M. Prendergast - A huge role. A 70% – 100 % disabled veteran is the highest reimbursable rate that we are able to receive from the federal VA. Each of those rates varies by geographical location as well.

Comm. E. Arnett (Marion County) – Were the counties able to access the needs study? Were the counties able to verify the county information? Suggest that the counties have the opportunity to verify the information that is presented as representative of the specific county. No one knows the county like the individuals within the county.

- The study as it was concluded, used the data from 2011 – 2012 that was available to the counties and the US Dept. of Veterans' Affairs. This was the most current information that was available at that time.
- Not aware of the resources that the architect used to contact the counties, but based on the census data that the county entities were looked at as far as gathering data for the study. Not sure of the specific methodology that was used.

Rep. G. Harrell – Suggest that there is an additional criteria included in the study. Criteria such as, the inclusion of the lack of a nursing home over a large geographical area should be included. You have sections of the state that may not have as dense a population in a specific area. There may be several hundred miles with no facility in any direction so that they have no access. A family would have to drive 150 miles, or 125 miles to the closest facility. The lack of a nursing home over a large geographical area, or an isolated area, should be a part of the consideration, not just the numbers of veterans that are in an area, but how far someone has to travel.

Mike Mason (Polk County) – 25 miles vs. 75 miles? There should be some differences established as it relates to the larger counties vs the smaller counties. Some of the smaller counties have denser populations, than some of the larger counties, however are ruled out as stated earlier.

Richard Williams (Putnam County) – Does not believe that the needs study was made available for review? The weighted factors from the study should be included on the website.

Rep. G. Harrell – Criteria should be made available prior to the needs study being completed. Population vs. catchment areas could make drastic differences, (25 miles vs. 75 miles) especially considering that this is a criteria that drives the ranking.

Comm. E. Arnett (Marion County) – It should be verified that the county is eligible. How would the criteria be obtained?

- www.floridavets.org

Al Carter – Maybe we should follow a needs study, or should we just allow each of the counties to submit a proposal. This would be a costly investment because of the 67 counties across the state of Florida (66 site selections) which would take roughly years to get to the end which would mean that we would lose the money; however, we have to start some place.

Comm. E. Arnett – Believe it would be unreasonable to have counties make that investment when a county wasn't even eligible. It is important to ensure that the county is eligible before making this investment.

David Abney, (Hendry County) - How would the criteria be obtained?

- The proposal that was made was that once we establish the criteria for the site selection process that this information is included in the application which will be listed on the website, www.floridavets.org
- Criteria was listed in the study, it was not posted in the actual application.

Subtopic #1b – Should counties be permitted to submit combined proposals?

Grants can only be awarded to one county, which means that there should be a lead county.

Counties can submit multiple proposals.

b. Subtopic #1c – Should counties be permitted to submit more than one site proposal? If so, how many?

Comm. E. Arnett (Marion county) – Primary county should be where the site will be. Community should support one site, no need for multiple sites. Should be the best site submitted in proposal. The county should have the ability to know the weighted factors to help determine the best site.

Rep. G. Harrell – Counties should be able to combine to submit proposals. This should be dependent upon service areas. There should be one site per county or each catchment area. There should be more transparency (criteria/process/site selection/weighted factors). There should only be one catchment area, one site.

Mike Mason (Polk County) – Going through the process helped to know what the site selection committee was looking for.

c. Public Comment

2) Discussion Topic #2 – Selection of Site Selection Committee Al Carter

*The committee was comprised of those who have expertise in various areas. (design/construction/operation management/ elder affairs), there are also both voting and non-voting members on the committee.

a. Current Committee Selection Process

Comm. E. Arnett (Marion County) – Believes that the right people were on the site committee and he does not believe that there should be any changes.

Amanda Townsend (Collier County) – The point of contact from the last selection committee was difficult to reach as well as a voting member. Questioning whether this could be changed so that the point of contact is not a voting member?

- This could absolutely be addressed.

- Dave Herman – Staff vs. support. Should it be changed to the committee is only comprised of voting members and the non-voting persons are not included on the committee and only considered staff?
- Rep. G. Harrell – In making this change, the staff would not be covered under Sunshine laws and non-voting members are. That would change communications.
- Dave Herman – Would suggest that those non-voting members not have any influence on the decisions being made in regards to site selection. Can present comments and questions, but cannot make decisions.
 - b. Public Comment

3) Discussion Topic #3 – Selection Criteria/Application

Al Carter

The application has been updated in the past to ensure that the policies used are the most up to date.

Comm. E. Arnett – Believes that the application was good.

Amanda Townsend (Collier County) – Application should be a fillable application. The site selection committee gave a lot of feedback on qualities or features of the site that the criteria was not included in the application. If these types of criteria are going to be considered is there some type of way to include them in the application.

Warren Baucom (Lee County) – Hurricane Evacuation zones eliminates their county. Can the mitigating factors be reviewed prior to being eliminated by the committee?

- This is a VA and state consideration. The ability for veterans to be moved to safe grounds during inclement weather. In the past, the state has worked with the US Dept. of Veteran Affairs to allow the state to build homes to sustain a higher threshold of increment weather which opened up the threshold to a larger number of counties. Try to work with mitigating factors when completing site considerations. The US Dept. of VA must say that they will approve the site with the mitigating factors. Yes, this can be considered.

Dr. J. Harrell – The state has an excellent Emergency Management System.

- The FDVA (Nursing Homes) is one of the highest priorities on the service tier for Emergency Evacuation.

Dave Herman – Site selection is contingent upon funding

1. Site Selection
2. Approval of Col. Prendergast
3. Governors’ cabinet approves it
4. Apply for the grant
5. US VA has to approve
 - a. Public Comment

4) Discussion Topic #4 – Scoring Methodology

Al Carter

Explained the scoring criteria

- a. Current Scoring Methodology

Lee Washington (Manatee County) – Was there any training of the committee or were the committee members able to apply their own interpretation?

- Steve Murray – The selection committee was given score sheets and met each representative at each site. The members were allowed to ask questions however, the committee members were not allowed to speak to each other. Any discussions had to be completed in a public meeting setting.

Sam Dininno (Citrus County) – Awarded points should be defined. How are the points being awarded to each facility?

- Dealing with the human aspect of things there will always be varied opinions. Maybe we should consider eliminating both the highest and lowest scores and only use the median. Unfortunately by doing this you would be devaluing the opinion of other committee members.

Rep. G. Harrell – Define what is availability of infrastructure on the site? Put this information on the application so that the committee members know what they are looking for. Should have specific training so that the committee members are aware of what they are looking for, and putting the information into the application so that the counties know what information should be provided.

Col. M. Prendergast

- Agrees that we should further define the scoring criteria which will add a greater fidelity to the scoring system. This further adds to greater understanding for all parties involved.

Comm. E. Arnett (Marion County) – Would like to add a process for the site selection committee that if there are any questions that the members can refer those questions to the county in which the questions are arising? This process should be prior to the voting, after the meeting. Is there an opportunity to respond at that time? County was not aware of any relevant issues until after the scoring was done.

- Due to the Sunshine laws, individual members are not allowed to refer back to a respective county. It must be a collective unit. The committee members must go with what is listed on the application. The application allows for an extensive amount of information (environmental study, things that surround the site). Questions etc. can only be done in a public setting and unfortunately the only opportunity that this is given is at the time of scoring.
- Yes there is. The counties are given a brief moment (10 min.) talk about their proposals and to highlight any information that was not brought up at the actual site visit.
- Will look at ways to address any issues that may come up within the application prior to the scoring process. Scoring meeting takes place after all of the site visits.

Amanda Townsend (Collier County) – Would like to recommend implementation of a scoring scale. Would also like to recommend an implementation of a formalized cure or repair process.

- The counties are able to provide information to the committee up until the end of the site visit. If something that was missing the counties were allowed to retrieve the information as long as it is received before leaving the site.

i. Public Comment

Sam Dininno (Citrus County) – During the time given to counties to speak to the committee (voting members) about their counties' proposals, are the committee members also able at that time to ask any questions that they may have of the county?

- Yes, the voting members were able to ask questions of any county representatives that were there for clarification.

b. Subtopic #4b – Should the top ranked sites be utilized as alternates in the event the primary site is disqualified?

*The US Dept. of Veterans' Affairs has to approve the site. Prior to this step, information from the selected site is sent to the State of Florida's land office to seek final approval. If this does not happen, another site is selected or such time that the site has met requirements for titling.)

Rep. G. Harrell – Once titled, has there ever been an instance when a site was selected and then later determined that the facility could not be approved? Why would this be the case if the site has been vetted? The counties should

know all of the rules and the rules should be a part of the application process in regards to the selection of the land. There should also be adequate time for the county to mitigate.

- Dave Herman – DEP has specific regulations that they have to follow. Explained the Environmental Services process and referred to Linda Williams, Senior Attorney (past DEP employee), for better clarification.
- DEP only requires Phase 1 environmental. The State requires something different, and the US Dept. of Veteran's Affairs requires something else. This has not happened in the past.
- We have three years to use the grant. To execute the complete process we need just about the full three years. At most, we could possibly offer up to one year.
- In the past DEP has worked with DVA to give specific information regarding the land.

i. Public Comment

- c. Subtopic #4c – Should the top ranked sites be awarded subsequent nursing homes as funding becomes approved and available (i.e. #1 site awarded Home #8, #2 site awarded Home #9, #3 site awarded Home #10).

Mike Mason (Polk County) – Recommends that the process is implemented that Top ranked sites are awarded subsequent SVNH as funding is available, but that a time period be placed on this process (5-7 years).

- In doing this, the land would be tied up for 5-6 years. After receiving the grant it takes approximately 2 years. Maybe approval could be obtained to build multiple projects at one time. We should consider how long it will take to do this, and how long the property will be tied up.

Comm. E. Arnett (Marion County) – How long should the land be held up by the current ranking? 7 years is too long. Should be a balance of how long the site selection is valid. Would committee retain contractor or would the process be redone (another site selected)? When will the counties know the process of the current site selection? Is it the intent of the selection committee to do a reevaluation, or to use the current applications in this current process for this October? So another site selection committee could be funded this year?

- Please keep in mind that the federal government operates on a different fiscal calendar than the State of Florida. We are always behind them because they are the process. Each November time frame a new list of approved grants is announced. We put the packet together in April for approval in November. We can't go to the legislature until January or February of the following year to request the matching funds for the project.
- Col. M. Prendergast – There will be some changes for 2016. Legislature will begin in January 2016. Committee meetings will most likely begin in the early fall of 2015 to prepare for the early session. This change will accelerate some of this process.
- Future homes don't have assurance. Alternates that are waiting end up waiting about 5 years with no real assurance and their land is tied up.
- We would complete the process this year, when we get the approval to go ahead with the site selection of 8, 9, and 10. Following this, we would put in an amendment to amend the grant that is already in place. After the selection process, we would go back and amend those grant and provide those county names. Once the county names have been provided, we would get the assurance of those grants. This would be November of this year if we complete the process and get the information submitted before August. Otherwise it would be the following November to know if funding approval has been granted.
- The process will be reviewed. Once reviewed, we will go to the counties accordingly and inform them that we want to start this process again and those that have already submitted applications please revalidate your application, and it could be as much as a cover letter and we move forward. Those that desire to submit an application based on the updated criteria will be able to do that as well.
- Yes.

Rep. G. Harrell – Would like to add that meetings and decisions maybe mute because Rep. Hudson is looking to introduce a bill to set the site selection criteria.

- Yes, and if this happens we will follow that approved criteria. However, we are planning for all inevitabilities.

Lee Washington (Manatee County) – Recommends that there is a transparency of policies and that there should be a validity period of the applications.

- Clarification – there will only be revalidation of the application. The site committee would still need to go back and complete the site visits.

Comm. E. Arnett (Marion County) - If indeed the federal government approves two sites one this year and one next year, would we just use what we already have?

- We could if we had gotten approval for that. We did not put that out to the counties. We would have to let them know in advance.

Sam Dininno (Citrus County) – What is the realistic projection for site #10?

- Realistic projection for the third site would be FY 2017-18. That would be the federal government fiscal year. Please understand that although the Governor has approved building two new SVNH, we can't move forward until we have received funding. If we agree to move forward with this process, we will put this information in the notices to all of the counties and then inform them of the time frame of that process pending legislature funding. The approval must be the catalyst to move forward. In the interest of time we would like to have the flexibility to speed up the process. If we have a home already identified and the legislature has already approved that selection, the only thing we would need to do is to request the funding and submit that approval notification to the US Dept. of Veterans' Affairs to move forward. At that point we would have already done the prep work to make home #10 happen.

(Hillsborough County) – Knowing how long the county would have to sit on a property was a critical decision point for the county.

- Because the legislature will not say you would need to hold you land for this period of time, most likely we would have to come to some type of understanding with the counties that your land will likely be held or you will need to hold your land for this period of time if you would want to secure the site in your county.

Rep. G. Harrell – The amount of money that the state has to put into this is significant and it all depends on the budget, and the budget depends on the economy because it is taxpayer dollars. There are no guarantees as to what is going to be available to use. There is a risk to the counties and the land owners, if it is not funded this year.

Al Carter – Would everyone like us to put into recommendation to look at ranking the counties 1-end and give it a 5-year close out window that the land would be held up?

- Comm. E. Arnett – To do this there must be some type of commitment of when the homes would be built, saying this county would be first, and this county would be second and so on.
- Al Carter – Following the legislative cycle, if it comes out in the GAA that those sites are funded, we can give the counties assurances for the next two homes. Home #10 would be questionable. The reason we are asking for site #10 because if for some reason sites 8 and 9 fallout, we need an alternate site. The counties would have to concur with the 5-year waiting period. The first two would know after the site selection and pending funding by the legislature.
- Dave Herman – The intention is that any changes to the criteria would be in effect for the next two homes, possibly three.

Col. M. Prendergast – Explained the varied rates for veterans as asked earlier in the meeting when an attendee questioned the approximately \$9,000 per month that is received by veterans.

i. Public Comment

5) General Public Comment

Al Carter

- Several attendees (both on the phone and in person) thanked the FDVA for the workshop and believe that this workshop was very beneficial.

6) Everyone was thanked for coming out. The workshop Close @ 12:20 p.m.

Al Carter

Deputy Executive Director

FDVA

Annex 2

State Veterans' Nursing Home Site Selection Process Workshop Agenda

February 19, 2015, 8:30 a.m. until 4:00 p.m.

Mary Grizzle State Building, Room 142B

11351 Ulmerton Rd, Largo , FL 33778

Teleconference Call # 1 (213) 493-0015 or Toll Free 1 (866) 899-4679

Access Code 299-649-245; Meeting ID 299649245

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Owner/Presenter</u>
1) Sign In/Conference Call attendees Acknowledgments	Recorder
2) Introductions	Al Carter
3) Sunshine Law Overview	Dave Herman
4) History and Overview of Site Selection Process	Dave Herman/Al Carter
5) <u>Discussion Topic #1 – Selection of Counties</u>	Al Carter
a. Subtopic #1a – 2013 Needs Study	
b. Subtopic #1b – Should counties be permitted to submit combined proposals?	
c. Subtopic #1c – Should counties be permitted to submit more than one site proposal? If so, how many?	
d. Public Comment	
6) <u>Discussion Topic #2 – Selection of Site Selection Committee</u>	Al Carter
a. Current Committee Selection Process	
b. Public Comment	
7) <u>Discussion Topic #3 – Selection Criteria/Application</u>	Al Carter
a. Current Criteria	
b. Public Comment	
8) <u>Discussion Topic #4 – Scoring Methodology</u>	Al Carter
a. Current Scoring Methodology	
i. Public Comment	
b. Subtopic #4b – Should the top ranked sites be utilized as alternates in the event the primary site is disqualified?	
i. Public Comment	
c. Subtopic #4c – Should the top ranked sites be awarded subsequent nursing homes as funding becomes approved and available (i.e. #1 site awarded Home #8, #2 site awarded Home #9, #3 site awarded Home #10).	
i. Public Comment	
9) General Public Comment	Al Carter
10) Workshop Close	Al Carter

Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs
Proposed State Veterans' Nursing Home

Site Selection and Planning Committee Point of Contact Listing

<p><u>Liz Barton, MSM, LNHA</u> Administrator Douglas T. Jacobson State Veterans' Nursing Home 21281 Grayton Terrace Port Charlotte, FL 33954 (941) 613-0919 x 2009 BartonE@fdva.state.fl.us</p>	<p><u>Bobby Carbonell</u> Legislative and Cabinet Affairs Director Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs The Capitol, Suite 2105 400 South Monroe Tallahassee, FL 32399-0001 Office: 850-487-1533 x 7705 Cell: 850-559-0493 carbonellr@fdva.state.fl.us</p>	<p><u>Alfred D. (Al) Carter</u> Deputy Executive Director Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs 11351 Ulmerton Rd., #311-K Largo, FL., 33778-1630 Office (727) 518-3202 x5621 Cell (727) 518-8493 cartera@fdva.state.fl.us</p>
<p><u>Dan Davis, NHA</u> FDVA Homes Program Director Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs 11351 Ulmerton Rd, #311-K Largo, FL 33778-1630 Tel: (727) 518-3202 x5516 Fax: (727) 518-3217 DavisD2@FDVA.STATE.FL.US</p>	<p><u>Sue Farkash</u> Management Analyst Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs 11351 Ulmerton Rd., #311-K Largo, FL 33778 Office: 727-518-3202 x5534 Cell: 727-688-9934 FarkashS@fdva.state.fl.us</p>	<p><u>Raul Martel</u> Chairman, Florida Veterans Council 506 N. Pine St. Pierson, FL 32180 Cell: 561-389-3765 pmartelco@bellsouth.net</p>
<p><u>R. Steven Murray</u> Communications Director Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs The Capitol, Suite 2105 400 South Monroe Tallahassee, FL 32399-0001 Office (850) 487-1533, x7714 Cell (850) 491-1092 murrayR@fdva.state.fl.us</p>	<p><u>Leticia Nazario-Braddock</u> Director of Administration Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs 11351 Ulmerton Road, #311-K Largo, FL 33778-1630 Office (727) 518-3202 x5538 Cell (727) 638-1867 E-Mail: Nazario-BraddockL@fdva.state.fl.us</p>	<p><u>Gene Nicoloso</u> Florida Department of Management Services Bureau of Building Construction 4050 Esplanade Way, Suite 335G Tallahassee, FL 32399-0950 D (850) 488-2521 C (850) 274-9893 Eugenio.Nicoloso@dms.MyFlorida.com</p>
<p><u>Connie Tolley RN, CNHA</u> Program Administrator Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs 11351 Ulmerton Rd, #311-K Largo, FL 33778-1630 Phone: (727) 518-3202 x5585 Fax: (727) 518-3217 TolleyC@FDVA.State.Fl.US</p>	<p><u>Kenneth E. Taite, PMP, FCCN</u> Project Manager Division of Real Estate Development and Management Department of Management Services 4050 Esplanade Way, Suite 320.2z Tallahassee, FL 32399-0950 (850) 487-9923 office (850) 487-9947 fax (850) 445-6082 cell kenneth.taite@dms.myflorida.com</p>	

Committee Member Brief Bios:

1. Al Carter, Chair: (non-voting) Colonel, US Army, retired, with over 28 years military experience and now senior management level with the State of Florida, Colonel Carter brings executive level decision making as well as innate knowledge of the needs of Florida veterans.
2. Liz Barton: Ms. Barton opened the Douglas T. Jacobson State Veterans' Nursing Home in Port Charlotte in March 2004, and has been the only Nursing Home Administrator the home has ever known. She is not only experienced in what a nursing home requires, but has led an on-site pre-opening team.
3. Bobby Carbonell: (non-voting) Mr. Carbonell is FDVA's Director of Legislative and Cabinet Affairs, responsible for maintaining an open information stream between the department and our statutory department leads. He is a veteran of Operation Iraqi Freedom, and is currently an officer with the Florida Air National Guard. He brings a variety of military experience and knowledge of veteran needs.
4. Dan Davis: A Navy veteran, Mr. Davis currently heads FDVA's State Veterans' Homes Program. He has over twenty years' experience ranging from a Nursing Home Administrator to a Chief Operating Officer of a health management company with 52 skilled nursing and 6 assisted living facilities in three states, including construction of a new skilled nursing home from groundbreaking through completion.
5. Sue Farkash: (non-voting) Mrs. Farkash is a management analyst with FDVA, and has been with the department over twelve years. During that time, she has been involved in multiple capacities with the construction and opening of the latest three skilled nursing facilities.
6. Paul Martel: A US Army veteran of the Vietnam era, Mr. Martel became a businessman after leaving the Army. He is the current Chairman of the Florida Veterans Council and past Department Commander of The American Legion, Department of Florida, and is keenly aware of the needs of Florida veterans.
7. Steve Murray: Retired Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Murray, an Operation Iraqi Freedom veteran, has been FDVA's Communication Officer for eight years. He brings a variety of experience in community outreach and public affairs, and was very involved in the construction process and led the opening of the Clyde Lassen State Veterans' Nursing Home in St. Augustine.
8. Leticia Nazario-Braddock: Mrs. Nazario-Braddock brings years of varied state experience, focusing on financial applications. She has participated in committees evaluating multi-billion dollar contracts, and currently leads FDVA's Division of Administration, which is responsible for all financial, human resources, and contractual activities.
9. Gene Nicoloso: Currently manages the Bureau of Building Construction for the Department of Management Services, who will be Contract Managers for the construction portion of this project. Mr. Nicoloso's knowledge of state practice combined with a history of work with builders, architects, and engineers will be essential in selecting the best site possible for construction.
10. Conkie Tolley: Ms. Tolley, a veteran of the US Army, is a Registered Nurse, Certified Licensed Nursing Home Administrator and Preceptor. She has been the Vice President and Regional Director managing healthcare campus in seven states. She brings knowledge of all facets of nursing home management and care to the project, and most recently had over site in the construction and opening of a new healthcare campus in southern Florida.
11. Kenneth Taite: (non-voting) Mr. Taite is a Certified Project Manager, currently with the Division of Real Estate Development and Management with the Department of Management Services (DMS). Mr. Taite's knowledge of business management and project planning will be vital, as DMS will be managing the construction contract.

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

STATE VETERANS' HOMES PROGRAM

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR A STATE VETERANS HOME



February 6, 2014

**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
State Veterans' Home Program**

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I:	Need for Veteran Nursing Home Care	(0-100)	Page 3
		(0-50)	Page 5
	A. Veteran Population		
	B. Nursing Home Beds and Other Medical Services	(0-50)	Page 5
		(0-50)	Page 7
	Suitability of Donated Site		Page 8
Part II:	A. Suitability of Donated Site (Narrative)		Page 9
	B. Specific Land Requirement		Page 11
	C. Assurances		
			Page 13
	Availability of Infrastructure at Site		Page 13
	A. Narrative	(0-50)	Page 13
Part III:	B. Assurance Checklist		Page 14
Part IV:	Availability of Health Care Professionals (050)		Page 15
	A. Narrative		Page 15
	B. Institutions		Page 15
	C. Nursing Workforce		Page 16
	Availability of Emergency Health Care (0-50)		Page 17
	A. Emergency Health Care Facilities		Page 17
Part V:	B. Emergency Room Holding Beds		Page 17
	C. In-House Physicians		Page 17
	D. ER Visitation Rates		Page 18
	E. Medical Specialties and Equipment		Page 18
	Closing, Deadlines, and Address for Submission		Page 19

PART I: NEED FOR STATE VETERAN NURSING HOME

It is essential that a selected site provide nursing home availability to the greatest number of eligible veterans within a reasonable distance of the facility. The number of eligible Florida veterans living in a site area will be determined by using the most current VA statistical resources. A majority of veterans admitted to state veterans' nursing homes reside within 75 mile radius of a facility. Beyond the 75 mile radius few veterans utilize a facility. The need for veteran nursing home care in the vicinity of a site will be assessed by these criteria:

Numerical scores will be awarded based on the objective calculation of the number of veterans living in counties within 75 miles of a proposed site. The information required will establish the number of counties in the market area and the total number of veterans 65 or older living in those counties. Scoring will be awarded based upon proportional population.

To help determine the need for additional nursing home beds in a proposed area, information on the number and type of existing beds will be required. Additional information on the medical services available in the immediate area is also required. This includes hospitals, emergency clinics, walk in services, etc.

It is anticipated that the State of Florida via State Veterans' Homes Trust Funds, will provide approximately \$17,000,000 for this project. Applicants are encouraged to provide funding in the amount of \$500,000 to be applied toward project costs, but inability to do this will not disqualify your proposal from consideration.

A. Veteran Population (0-50)

1. One description of the relative need for veteran nursing home beds in the area of a proposed site is the number of Florida veterans 65 or older living in the counties that are included in a circle with the radius of the circle being 75 miles from the proposed site. To calculate this number, indicate the exact location of proposed site, and list all of the counties that fall within the 75 mile circle. Where only a part of a county is enclosed in the circle, the county's veteran population will be included in the total if at least 25% of the county's total population resides inside of the circle.

The exact location of a proposed site is:

2. The counties that are within the 75 mile radius of a site, the veteran population, and the aging veteran population of those counties are to be set forth below.

<u>County</u>	<u>Veteran Population</u>	<u>Population >65</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

HISTORICAL DOCUMENT ONLY

B. Nursing Home Beds and Other Medical Service/ Facilities in the Proposed Site Area (0-50)

1. A second descriptor of need for a State Veterans' Nursing Home is the number of licensed nursing home and ALF beds located within 10 miles of the proposed site. Please provide the information requested below for the last twelve (12) months, or the last twelve (12) month period available, and specify the twelve (12) month period used.

Time period for data below:

<u>Facility Name</u>	<u># of Licensed Nursing Beds</u>	<u>Occupancy Rates</u>	<u># of Licensed ALF beds</u>	<u>Occupancy Rates</u>

HISTORICAL DOCUMENT ONLY

2. For each of the above named facilities, please provide the following:

<u>Facility Name</u>	<u>Facility Address</u>	<u>Services Provided</u>	<u>Average Daily Cost of Care</u>
----------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------------------

_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

HISTORICAL DOCUMENT ONLY

PART II: SUITABILITY OF DONATED SITE

Utilizing the criteria below, each site will be evaluated based upon the quality of the response to Part II and awarded 0-50 points.

- Each site must consist of 20 or more acres for a 120 bed facility. The parcel that is being donated must not be in one of the following hurricane evacuation zones A, B, C, D, or E.
- It should be appropriate for a building, roads, retention ponds and parking as necessary to meet local government requirements.
- The intended construction of a multi-bed nursing facility must be consistent with all state and local land use laws, rules, and regulations. Appropriate verification of said laws and zoning will be required.
- All fill and other preparation necessary to place a site above the flood plain and make suitable for construction will be provided at no cost to the state.
- All environmental concerns of the U.S Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and the State must be met. A Phase I Environmental Assessment will be required for all submissions. These assessments will be due before site selection is complete. Exact time frames will be specified when site selection commences.
- Soil samples of the proposed site will be required for all land that is being considered for construction. The reports will include soil borings one (1) per acre throughout the parcel under consideration. The reports must be done by a certified Geotechnical firm, and be properly certified. These reports will be due before selection is complete.
- The State Land Trust will not accept land until the donor has successfully completed the "ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT REQUIREMENTS FOR BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT TRUST FUND OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA." A site must be able to qualify for a favorable review by the Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, conducted pursuant to convey clear and unencumbered title to the property before the commencement of construction.

Failure to meet any of these requirements will eliminate a site from consideration.

Failure on the part of a sponsor to meet these requirements will disqualify a site from further consideration. The environmental assurances that the state must make to the VA regarding a site selected are shown on pages 7 and 8. A series of questions designed to determine if a proposed site can be approved are set forth beginning on page 9. Each of these questions MUST be answered in the affirmative.

A. Suitable of Donated Site – Narrative and Specific Questions (0-50)

Provide a narrative description of the site in terms of its general surrounding and support capabilities. Clarifying comments may be added and may address any of the following items. (This list is not all-inclusive; additional items may be added at your discretion)

- Land-Shape of the parcel
Soil types and quality
Surrounding area land usage
Urban or rural setting
Trees on site, and types of ground cover
Indications of pesticides or herbicides
Strong or pungent odors

- History-Any historical significance
Usage history
Title history
Environmental liens
Landfills history, if applicable

- Misc. – Availability of all pertinent
Utilities. Description of area transportation
network. Availability of community support
services and facilities

HISTORICAL DOCUMENT ONLY

B. Respond to the Following Questions by Answering “Yes or No”

1. Is the land use of each site for a nursing home consistent with the community’s comprehensive plan adopted and approved pursuant to Part II chapter 163, Florida Statutes (2013)? Please attach a copy of the county’s: land Use Plan.

YES _____ NO _____

2. Does the sponsor assure that the following will be provided with no additional cost to the State?

- a. All fill necessary to meet the VA requirement that the building, access road, and parking be above the flood plain.

YES _____ NO _____

- b. All site preparation necessary to include, but not limited to fill necessary to make the site suitable for the construction of the building.

YES _____ NO _____

HISTORICAL DOCUMENT ONLY

3. Has the sponsor reviewed the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs environmental documentation requirements found at 38 CFR Part 26 and does the sponsor provide the following assurance? The site will qualify for a Categorical Exclusion; or an Environmental Assessment prepared in accordance with the above cited VA regulation will reveal no significant effect on the human environment?

YES _____ NO _____

4. Has the sponsor reviewed the Florida Department of Environmental Protection Division of State Lands, Bureau of Land Acquisition, Environmental Audit Requirements which must be met before land will be accepted by the State Land Trust that a favorable environmental audit of a proposed site can be certified to the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund of the State of Florida?

YES _____ NO _____

5. Title transfer must be completed before construction begins, but after selection. Can the sponsor assure that a clear and unencumbered title to the real property be obtained and the site will be conveyed to the State Land Trust by deed in a timely manner?

YES _____ NO _____

HISTORICAL DOCUMENT ONLY

C. Assurances

As part of the application process of the UDVA, the following "Assurances" concerning environmental matters must be given by the State at the time of pre-application is filed and again when the application is filed. The assurances below are directly related to the selection of a suitable site:

1. The site will comply with environmental standards, which may be prescribed pursuant to the following:
 - Institutions of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190), and Executive Order, (EO), 11514.
 - Notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738
 - Protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11996
 - Evaluation of flood hazards plains in accordance with EO 11988.
 - Assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, 16.
 - Conformity of federal actions to state (Clean Air) implementations plans under section 176 (c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended 42 U.S.C. 7401. et seq.
 - Protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, P.L. 93-523.
 - Protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended P.L. 93-205.
2. The applicant will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system
3. The State will assist the awarded applicant in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended 16 U.S.C. 470, EO 11593, Identification and Preservation of Historic Properties, and the Archeological Historic Preservation Act of 1974, 16 U.S.C. 469a-1 et seq.

Are there any known reasons or conditions that would in any way inhibit State from certifying compliance with the conditions listed above in "C"?

YES _____

NO _____

HISTORICAL DOCUMENT ONLY

PART III: AVAILABILITY OF INFRASTRUCTURE AT SITE

It is essential that roads utility infrastructure services be available to the property. Roads, water, sewer, telephone lines, electricity and/or natural gas services must be brought to the property line as required by local code before construction begins at no cost to the State.

Since no funds are provided by the federal grant to bring these services to the property it is necessary that the donor or local community provide them to the site at no cost to the project. A series of questions designed to ascertain the willingness of the sponsor of a site to provide the needed services and infrastructure to a site are set forth below. Infrastructure requirements must be completed before construction commences. If concurrency requirements are not met, and further infrastructure services are not adequate and timely, then a site cannot be approved, and no further consideration is warranted. A qualifying official must make the following assurances in writing:

- The FDVA will not be charged any impact or any other type of fees by either the County or the City in which the site is located.
- Infrastructure will be in place at the beginning of construction.
- If grants of any other application for funding to provide infrastructure are needed to secure the infrastructure requirements, the FDVA will not be a participant in that process. The applicant cannot obligate the FDVA for additional requirements or information. All infrastructure requirements must be completed as outlined above.
- If construction is delayed due to the applicants inability to provide infrastructure to the site any costs associated with the delay will be solely the responsibility of the applicant.

A. Narrative

Provide a narrative description of the infrastructure that is currently in place. Include identification of roads that provide access to a site; main, county, state, or federal roads and/or interstate highways, and average travel time from major population centers to the site. Indicate the availability of water and sewage treatment facilities. Indicate the source of telephone, electric power, and natural gas suppliers, if available, in a site area.

B. Respond to the following questions by responding "YES or "NO"

1. Does a site provide 20 acers or more acres clear of any easements that would interfere with the construction of a 120 bed facility, and such additional space for access roads, retention, and parking as required by the local governing body?

YES _____ NO _____

2. Will the local governing body ensure that all concurrency requirements made necessary by the development of a site for the proposed use will be provided?

YES _____ NO _____

3. Are the local utility companies capable of ensuring that utility services adequate for the needs of the proposed facility can be brought to the property line in accordance with government code requirements?

YES _____ NO _____

PART IV: AVAILABILITY OF HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS

A major concern when you site a Nursing Home is the national shortage of health care professionals. It is essential that a supply of health care professional sufficient to support this facility be available in the surrounding community. Out of state resources are not to be excluded. The presence in the community or area of accredited educational institutions offering health care programs that can provide a source for the professionals can ameliorate this condition. Willingness on the part of these institutions to establish or expand such programs is essential.

Scoring in Part IV will be subjective based upon the total section response and will result in a total point award in the arrange of 0-50 points. The presence of accredited health care training in the community is important to the success of the home. Given the national shortage of health-care professionals, the presence in the vicinity of the site of educational institutions accredited to train health-care professionals is a key to having a steady production of individuals to support the Home who can render valuable service as a student or graduate assistants.

A. Narrative

Provide a narrative description of the accredited educational institution(s) located within 50 miles of a site that offer health-care programs, and describe the programs offered. (0-25)

B. Institutions

1. List the institution(s) described above and the health-care program(s) offered by each.

Institution(s)

Program Offered

PART V: AVAILABILITY OF 24 HOUR EMERGENCY HEALTH CARE

It is essential that emergency health care facilities be available near each State Veteran's Nursing Home to provide rapid response to emergency situations and to accommodate acute conditions. A health care facility capable of providing emergency services and care for any emergency medical condition as defined at F.S. Sections 395.1041, must be within 25 mile radius of a proposed site.

The following questions are designed to ascertain the adequacy of available emergency medical health care. Part V points will be awarded based upon distance between the proposed site and the nearest emergency health care facility. (0-50)

Provide the following information for all emergency medical services within 25 miles radius.

A. Emergency Health Care Facilities

Identify each hospital and/or emergency care center within 25 miles of the proposed site. For each, specify the distance to the proposed site:

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Distance from Proposed Site</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

B. Emergency Room Holding Beds

Provide an inventory of the number of ER holding beds per facility.

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Number of Beds</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

C. In-House Physicians

Indicate whether the facility maintains in-house physicians on staff in the emergency department/room 24 hours, seven days a week:

Facility

Physician on Duty 24/7

1. Provide data that shows the title of health care programs and the number of health care graduates that each institution or program has produced annually for the last five years.
2. Provide a narrative statement, supported by assurances from the institution(s) involved, setting forth their willingness to utilize existing programs, or add additional programs to the health care curriculum of the institution to provide a source/supply of health care professionals.
3. Provide a narrative statement of the willingness of local institution (s) located within 50 miles of a site to cooperate with the Home by supplying student assistants to render services to veterans in the home as a part of its curriculum of training.

D. Nursing Workforce

1. Please provide the following information for both Registered Nurses and Licensed Practical Nurses by county: (0-25)
 - a. RNs per 100,000 _____
 - b. LPNs per 100,000 _____

2. Turnover Rate:

3. Vacancy Rate:

4. Average Hourly Wage: This should be reasonable within the state average as defined by the AAHSA Nursing Home Salary and Benefits Report.

5. ER Visitation

List the number of ER visits within six months of this application, per facility.

Facility

Number of Visits

HISTORICAL DOCUMENT ONLY

6. Medical Specialties

Identify all medical specialties available on staff, all specialized services provided, and all major medical equipment owned or utilized by the hospital.

Facility

Specialties

Equipment

HISTORICAL DOCUMENT ONLY

A Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs selection committee will evaluate all responses. The Department will be in contact with each submitting entity if further clarification is required.

Key dates are summarized below.

- Notification of intent to submit an application must be received at the address below by 5:00P.M.
- Completed applications must be received at the following address by 5:00P.M.
- Site Selection Committee visits to each proposed site are currently scheduled to be conducted during the period _____.
- The Executive Director of the Florida Department of Veterans' Affairs will recommend selection of the most suitable site to the Governor and Cabinet during _____ cabinet meeting.

Thank you for completing this site selection questionnaire.

Submit applications to:

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Attn: – Connie Tolley

11351 Ulmerton road # 311-K

Largo, FL 33778-1630

727-518-3202 ext. 5585