
FIRE SAFETY PANEL OF STATE AND NATIONAL EXPERTS

FINAL REPORT TO THE COMMISSIONER
OF THE OFFICE OF MENTAL RETARDATION
AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

February 2010

MEMBERS

Shameka Andrews	Self-Advocacy Association of NYS
Peter Byrne	Coordinator of Fire Services for Rockland County
Max Chmura	Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities
Paul Coons	Office of Mental Health
Kathy Flood	Association for the Advancement of Blind and Retarded, Inc.
Michael Goldfarb	AHRC - NYC
Neal Johnson	Special Olympics
Steven Kuhr	Strategic Emergency Group
Robert Lawrence	Fusion Architecture
Joel Levy	YAI/National Institute for People with Disabilities
Gary Lind	Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities
Paul Martin	Office of Fire Prevention and Control
Mark Moran	Dormitory Authority of the State of New York
Ann Nehrbauer	Willowbrook Consumer Advisory Board
Daniel Nichols	Office of Fire Prevention and Control
Jonathan Pease	Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities
Robert Solomon	National Fire Protection Association
Nancy Thaler	National Association of State Directors of D.D. Services
Tom Volpi	Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities
Mayer Zimmerman	Zimmerman Associates

OMRDD SUPPORT STAFF

Herm Hill

Public Information

Jessica Lynch

Bureau of Internal Audit

Patricia Martinelli

Office of Counsel

Sheila McBain

Division of Quality Management

Scott Perry

Western NY DDSO

Suzanne Sennett

Enterprise Strategies

Colleen Shea-Costigliola

Staten Island DDSO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Overview of the Fire Safety Panel of State and National Experts	2
III.	Three Elements of Fire Safety	3
IV.	Recommendations	3
	A. Assessment/Evaluation of an Individual's Ability to Evacuate	4
	B. Evacuation Planning	6
	C. Fire Drills	7
	D. Controls over Fire Safety	9
	E. Staffing Levels	10
	F. Training	10
	G. Determination of Necessary Fire Safety Construction and System Features	12

I. Introduction

The Fire Safety Panel of State and National Experts (Panel) was formed by the New York State Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities (OMRDD) to assess and make recommendations regarding OMRDD's current policies, procedures and practices in the areas of fire safety and emergency evacuations for thoroughness and effectiveness. Panel members included statewide and national experts in the fields of fire safety and developmental disabilities.

The Panel adopted the following charge:

The Fire Safety Panel of State and National Experts will provide policy level advice to the Commissioner of the NYS Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities that allows the agency to balance its commitment to support people who have developmental disabilities in the most integrated and appropriate community settings possible, along with its critical responsibility for fire safety. New York's fire safety policy and practice for homes and program sites involving people who have developmental disabilities have been built around the three primary elements of the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Life Safety Code for Residential Board and Care Occupancies:

- *The capability of people to evacuate*
- *The capacity of staff to support safe evacuation*
- *The fire safety features of the home or program site*

Using the findings and conclusions available regarding the fire event at the Riverview IRA in Wells, NY on March 21, 2009 as a starting point, the Panel will assess New York's fire safety policy and practice and make recommendations that strengthen OMRDD's capacity to prevent fires, contain fires that may occur, and examine the staffing levels necessary to assist people who have developmental disabilities to safely respond to and evacuate or survive fires that do occur.

II. Overview of the Fire Safety Panel of State and National Experts

The Panel held five meetings of the full panel and two workgroup meetings over the course of six months. The meetings were organized around the *Life Safety Code's* three primary elements of fire safety described above.

The first meeting, which took place on July 17, 2009, was an organizational meeting to agree upon a charge and course of deliberation. At this meeting, Panel members agreed to keep recommendations on a policy level. It was recognized that recommendations made by the Panel may have national implications because other states, as well as other state agencies within New York, provide services in similar settings. In addition, public information about the Riverview IRA fire has been shared with the NFPA Technical Committee on Residential Board and Care Occupancies to see what, if any, changes may be necessary to incorporate into future editions of the code. The public information shared, as well as this report will provide the NFPA with the opportunity to consider appropriate changes to NFPA 101, *Life Safety Code*, as well as NFPA 101A, *Guide on Alternative Approaches to Life Safety*.

The importance of balancing OMRDD's commitment to support people who have developmental disabilities in the most integrated and appropriate community settings possible, with its critical responsibility for fire safety was discussed at length. Both Panel members and OMRDD support staff emphasized the importance of OMRDD's vision statement which outlines goals of supporting people with developmental disabilities – *to help people with developmental disabilities enjoy meaningful relationships with friends, family and others in their lives, experience personal health and growth, and live in the home of their choice and fully participate in their communities*.

The second meeting, held on August 19, 2009, was designed around assessing the capability of individuals to evacuate. OMRDD staff presented information regarding how OMRDD currently determines the appropriate residential setting, an overview of staffing ratios, and current practices regarding evacuation plans, evacuation assistance scores (also referred to as the *e-score* calculations) and fire drills.

The third meeting, held on September 16, 2009, was focused on training for staff involved in fire safety planning, response and oversight. Qualifications, number of on-site staff, training and performance issues were discussed. This meeting was an opportunity for Panel members to discuss best practices in training and essential components of a core training program.

The fourth meeting of the Panel, held on October 15, 2009, focused on the fire safety features of homes and program sites. In addition, there were two smaller workgroup meetings on this topic, taking place on November 19 and December 2, 2009. At the full Panel meeting, discussions focused on the decision process that leads to the building of homes to a specific code or with specific features. The smaller workgroup used the fire safety codes, including state building codes and the NFPA *Life Safety Code*, to work through various decision strategies that will lead to the most appropriate and consistent physical plant safety features.

III. Three Elements of Fire Safety

While the Panel meetings focused on the elements of fire safety, all panelists and individuals participating in the meetings understood that the interdependence between each of the elements is essential. The diagram below illustrates the idea that the emphasis on each of the three *Life Safety Code* elements may be different in different circumstances and that there is more than one way to achieve the necessary level of protection in a home.



IV. Recommendations

The Panel is presenting a total of 16 recommendations for consideration by the Commissioner. Many of these recommendations are inter-related; following one recommendation (*e.g.* a new assessment) without another (*e.g.* the training) may have limited impact. The Panel believes that the set of recommendations, implemented together, would result in major improvement in OMRDD fire safety policies and practices. Recommendations outlined below and discussed in this report fall into the following topical areas:

- Assessment/evaluation of an individual's ability to evacuate
- Evacuation planning
- Fire drills
- Controls over fire safety

- Staffing levels
- Training
- Determination of necessary fire safety construction and system features

By grouping the recommendations in this way OMRDD will be able to consider related recommendations that might impact on each other as the agency moves forward.

This report represents policy level recommendations and does not include detailed implementation strategies. Panel members believe and agree that the implementation details are critically important and OMRDD should continue to partner with key stakeholders to thoroughly examine and develop implementation details. This process will require follow up within the State of New York as well as with stakeholders at the national level, such as the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) and NFPA, among others.

Commissioner Ritter is to be commended for implementing a series of interim standards in State operated residential projects in design and construction phases in the aftermath of the Riverview IRA tragedy. The guidelines setting forth the interim standards state that the standards will continue until either March, 31, 2010 or until superseded by the adoption of recommendations from this Panel, if sooner. Panel members stressed the urgency in which the recommendations outlined in this report should be implemented. Upon expiration of the current interim guidelines, OMRDD should review implementation progress and, if necessary, reissue the standards to extend until new fire safety features are in effect.

A. Assessment/Evaluation of an Individual's Ability to Evacuate

The panel discussed the importance of a rigorous evaluation process for determining the evacuation capabilities and fire safety needs of individuals with developmental disabilities. Panel members also emphasized the importance of considering life goals, the profile of the individual and the opportunity for community involvement when considering the type and location of the residence most appropriate for an individual.

In addition, each individual who will be residing in a certified setting should have a specific, individual determination as to whether they are self-preserving in the case of a fire or other emergency. This determination should be calculated using a standardized protocol derived from the current evacuation assistance score (*e-score*).

Currently *e-scores* are calculated and used to create a composite profile of the individuals who are residing in *Life Safety Code* Residential Board and Care certified settings. The Panel recommends extending the use of *e-score* calculations to all individuals in certified supervised residential settings. The data collected through this process should be used to make a person-specific assessment of whether or not the individual is capable of self – preservation. This should be done according to standard criteria. The information obtained would contribute to decisions about required fire safety features, including staffing levels in both newly constructed and existing homes, and fire safety enhancements to existing homes.

In contemplating this recommendation Panel members discussed national standards currently available to quantify an individual's capacity to self-evacuate. It was concluded there were no such quantifiable standards known to exist. While self preservation is not an existing criteria in determining *e-scores* or imposing a code designation under the *Life Safety Code*, the panel felt that the concept is worthy of consideration as an additional factor in establishing a benchmark for needed *Life Safety Code* protections. The Panel's consensus was that a score of greater than twelve (12) on the NFPA 101A *Worksheet 6.8.2 for Rating the Resident on Risk Factors* form would provide a practical benchmark for classifying an individual as non-self preserving in the case of a fire or other emergency. This recommendation presents a notable policy shift that may dramatically enhance the way fire safety assessments are conducted nation-wide.

Assessments and evaluations must be consistent across the system and done by trained staff members who are intimately familiar with the characteristics and habits of those being assessed. In addition to informing on necessary physical plant features, assessments would also contribute to determining staffing levels of the home. A method to allow for a periodic review or renewal of the assessment should be developed to account for any change in the individual's ability to self preserve.

Lastly, the Panel felt a system of oversight should be established to ensure the assessments/evaluations are being conducted consistently and in accordance with the established protocol.

Recommendation 1

Standardize and implement the use of a system wide assessment/evaluation of risk protocol to determine the type of construction features homes should have and the support mechanisms needed. The protocol should be based on the current use of the evacuation assistance scores (*e-score* calculation) and also include consideration of:

- Desired lifestyle and preferences of the resident(s);
- Structure of the home (fire rating, construction materials), and physical design (layout, including stairs, means of egress and placement of bedrooms);
- Size of the home (square footage, number of stories);
- Number of residents and the physical and developmental disabilities of those residents; and
- Staffing and support needs of the residents.

Recommendation 2

NFPA 101A Worksheet 6.8.2 for Rating the Resident on Risk Factors, (see Appendix A of this report) which is typically completed in the calculation of *e-scores*, should be completed for all individuals residing in a certified setting. A score of greater than twelve (12) on the *NFPA 101A Worksheet 6.8.2 for Rating the Resident on Risk Factors* should be considered the benchmark for classifying an individual as non-self preserving in the case of a fire or other emergency.

B. Evacuation Planning

Evacuation plans are a critical component of fire safety and evacuation planning. The purpose of an evacuation plan is to facilitate and organize the emergency response of staff and residents during a fire emergency that may lead to an evacuation. Individuals who live in community residences often have long standing relationships with each other and the staff, and function together as a family unit. Therefore, it is important for those living in the residence to be examined together to get a full and accurate assessment of evacuation capability and evacuation planning needs.

Evacuation plans need to specify staff expectations, including the circumstances under which staff are required to fully evacuate residents, as opposed to moving them to a designated safe area in the home designed to protect individuals in the residence until safe evacuation can be made. This will depend on a variety of factors, including the fire safety features of the home, the location of a fire and the severity of the fire.

Well developed evacuation plans will help to prepare staff and residents to safely evacuate the building in the most efficient manner possible. Evacuation plans are developed as a tool for staff to use in the event of an emergency. They must provide a detailed account of the steps staff needs to take in the event of a fire or other evacuation scenario. Because evacuation plans are a

core element of fire safety planning, the design and approval of such plans should be controlled and consistent across the system.

A systemic approach to developing and approving evacuation plans should include details regarding qualifications and training for staff responsible for these activities, a checklist of essential components to consider and guidance/training for staff responsible for executing the plan. The approach must also consider the minimum staffing level expected at the facility, which typically occurs during the night.

Evacuation plans are only effective if they are accurate and up to date. The plans must change and evolve as the three elements of fire safety change. Staff responsible for both the development and execution of evacuation plans must know when it is necessary to review and/or revise an evacuation plan. A procedure noting key triggers for the review of the plan, such as something that might cause a reassessment of an individual's *e-score* calculation would allow this process to be done as often as required and in a consistent manner across the system.

Recommendation 3

Develop a systemic approach to writing, approving and revising evacuation plans based on the needs of the residents as a cohesive "family" unit and the structure and physical design of the home. The approach should address the following factors:

- Individual and group capabilities;
- Staffing levels;
- Expectation for staff to protect in place or fully evacuate residents based on physical plant features;
- Training/supervision of staff; and
- The effectiveness of the evacuation plan (based on knowledge of the plan and fire drill performance).

C. Fire Drills

Fire drills are a key indicator as to whether or not the evacuation plan is appropriate, effective, complete and up to date. Fire drills also permit both staff and residents to become familiar with emergency procedures, egress routes, and assembly locations, so that if an actual emergency should occur, they will respond effectively.

After each drill, house staff and management should evaluate the effectiveness of the drill. If weaknesses in the plan are identified, they should be corrected. By developing performance standards based on the individual characteristics of the residence, both house staff, house management and executive management will have a baseline on which to gauge their performance.

A critical feature of a fire drill is the information learned from conducting it. A systemic mechanism for making use of this information by reviewing fire drill logs and making any needed modifications to evacuation plans is necessary. It is also important to ensure that the appropriate parties are involved in the fire drill monitoring/evaluation process.

Monitoring fire drill performance is a recommended best practice. The newly developed OMRDD Office of Safety and Security should explore the development of a quality improvement process in partnership with the voluntary provider community.

Recommendation 4

Require each home to have standards for performing a successful fire drill. Performance standards must be individualized and based on the structure and fire safety features of the home, the combined capabilities of the residents as a “family” unit, and staffing levels and capabilities.

Recommendation 5

Strengthen and create a system of internal controls to be used across the entire OMRDD system to ensure appropriate modifications are made when a home cannot successfully complete fire drills within established parameters. Because OMRDD holds a strong value of maintaining relationships and community connections, OMRDD must consider making necessary adjustments when a person’s need for assistance related to fire safety changes. Appropriate adjustments could include physical plant enhancements or enhancements in staffing, either through increasing staffing numbers or additional training.

Recommendation 6

Create a system-wide partnership with the voluntary provider community (through the OMRDD Office of Safety and Security) to establish a mechanism for monitoring fire drill performance to promote continuous quality improvement.

D. Controls over Fire Safety

A robust system of internal controls provides executive management with reasonable assurance that their goals and objectives will be met. Effective internal controls will minimize risk and help identify gaps in agency operations or compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

To complement the recommendations made in this report, internal controls should be established to evaluate whether the tools used to assess an individual's fire safety needs and those used to determine appropriate staffing levels are being correctly applied.

In addition to internal controls, external expertise, both in the planning and oversight phase, can provide valuable input into fire safety processes and practices. External expertise should be sought in such a way that adds value to the system of internal controls and will help OMRDD meet its mission to promote exemplary fire safety practices.

OMRDD should reach out to other state agencies such as the New York State Office of Fire Prevention & Control and the New York State Department of State Division of Code Enforcement and Administration to gain further knowledge and understanding of the building and fire safety needs associated with residential board and care occupancies.

Lastly, Panel members felt strongly that OMRDD should encourage local fire departments involvement in the fire safety process, by inviting them to be familiar with the residents, the layout of the home and the evacuation plans.

Recommendation 7

Develop more robust internal and external controls to ensure that OMRDD's fire safety regulatory system is being properly interpreted and applied.

Recommendation 8

Develop a framework for fire safety that is layered and includes:

- Standards for performing fire drills;
- The recording of fire drills performance;
- The participation of local fire departments; and
- A consistent message from State agency executive and local management that fire safety policies and procedures are critically important and will be tested.

E. Staffing Levels

Currently, each Developmental Disability Services Office (DDSO) is responsible for allocating staff to specific homes based on individual residence characteristics such as house size, evacuation capabilities of residents, medical or behavioral needs of individuals, and habilitation goals.

Panel members recognized that there is no “one size fits all” minimum staffing requirement. While implementation of the recommendations in this report should help clarify factors that contribute to appropriate staffing numbers at each residence, the Panel agrees that more detailed work on this topic is needed and should continue.

For homes that require evacuation assistance scores (*e-scores*), these can be used to help to determine the ability of residents and staff, as a group, to evacuate a building. They are used to establish both the physical plant features most appropriate for the home, as well as the minimum staffing levels required to safely evacuate residents.

Panel members agreed the *e-score* algorithm provides a critical component in an assessment of required staffing levels and that the *e-score* must be completed accurately by trained individuals. A specialized training program for all staff performing *e-score* calculations is an essential requirement of fire safety planning. In addition, the development of a specialized training program will help to promote consistency in the way *e-scores* are completed and ultimately implemented across the enterprise.

Without a testing protocol to ensure the *e-score* algorithm is being correctly applied, executive management does not have assurances of a sound basis upon which to determine necessary physical plant features or appropriate staffing levels. Monitoring performance against expectation is an essential element to a strong system of internal controls.

Recommendation 9

Research and provide guidance to assist administrators in determining the most appropriate staffing level based on the individual characteristics of each home.

F. Training

In order to have a successful fire safety program, management and staff must understand the importance of their role in fire safety. Because a fire or other emergency situation cannot be predicted and hopefully will never occur, it may be easy to lose sight of the magnitude of responsibility and importance staff

members have in protecting the lives of individuals with developmental disabilities. OMRDD must strive to promote fire safety and stress the importance of fire safety responsibilities of both direct care staff and staff providing oversight/monitoring.

One way this can be done is through a standardized training framework designed to leave an impression on participants. The training framework should include a component for residents, OMRDD direct care and administrative staff and OMRDD survey staff. Each training component should be tailored to the specific target audience.

To complement the recommendations made in this report, the framework should include training for OMRDD staff responsible for conducting the assessment of an individual's life safety needs and also staff responsible for reviewing the assessment. Additionally, specialized training should be developed for those responsible for calculating *e-scores* and for those using the *e-scores* to determine the appropriate balance of staffing levels and building features needed.

OMRDD surveyors annually review the evacuation plans and fire drill documentation of state operated residences and the voluntary provider community. This is an opportunity for well trained surveyors to offer valuable expertise to a large number of agencies.

In addition to fire safety training, staff should receive training in overall emergency preparedness, including what emergency supplies should be maintained in the residence and techniques to keep residents calm in case of emergency. Emergency situations can be frightening and stressful for residents, as well as staff. By becoming familiar with individualized approaches to helping residents remain focused and calm in the face of an emergency, staff will be better able to maintain control of the situation.

The Panel encouraged the use of cross-agency partnerships to create and maintain an effective system of training.

Recommendation 10

Facilitate a cultural change by promoting an urgency/appreciation among all levels of staff regarding the importance of their role in fire safety at all homes.

Recommendation 11

Standardize a competency-based training framework that is designed to leave a compelling impression on participants. The framework should

include a component for residents, OMRDD direct care and administrative staff, and OMRDD survey staff, and:

- Account for changes in fire trends such as those related to common ignition sources and smoking policies;
- Engage in periodic training in response to staff/resident turnover;
- Communicate staff accountability for the lives of the individuals they are responsible for;
- Review fire safety features of the home but emphasize the importance of staff action and response to emergencies; and
- Aim to provide staff and residents with experience in a simulated emergency situation.

Recommendation 12

Ensure staff training is conducted by individuals with the appropriate level of experience and expertise in both fire safety practices and needs of individuals with disabilities.

G. Determination of Necessary Fire Safety Construction and System Features

Determining appropriate building and fire safety codes for certified residential settings is a complex process. This is in part because there are multiple codes, rules and regulations that apply to fire safety construction features, including: agency regulation; federal CMS regulation; state building and fire codes; and, national codes that have been adopted by a broader group of stakeholders. The Panel recommendations outlined in this section provide additional guidance in making decisions regarding necessary fire safety construction and system features most appropriate for homes.

In addition, the important goals of promoting the meaningful integration of individuals with developmental disabilities into the communities of their choice have often resulted in a reliance on converting existing buildings, including single family dwellings or apartments into residential board and care uses. Further, there is an often held misperception that building a home that provided additional protection measures against fire would necessarily result in a building that did not blend into the character of an existing neighborhood or that would be subject to zoning restrictions that would marginalize this population.

It is the consensus of this Panel that “building in” greater fire protection and life safety measures into a home actually enhances the ability for individuals to live healthy, safe, productive lives, integrated into communities and neighborhoods across New York State. Further, by having the building provide a greater degree

of safety and protection, direct care staff are actually able to better balance ensuring basic safety with their equally important role of assisting the individual to live a richer life.

That said, these recommendations for enhanced fire protection and life safety features are not offered as an alternative for adequate staffing levels, but rather as a supplement to those staffing levels. The inclusion of construction features and built-in fire protection features provides added evacuation time, but it does not result in an unlimited time for evacuation actions to commence and be completed.

The following recommendations seek to move towards a simplified approach that relies on the adoption of nationally developed and accepted standards, minimizing the need for adopting additional enhancements and guidelines within OMRDD rules and regulations.

In order to increase the safety of individuals living in certified residential settings and to simplify the process for determining the appropriate building standards to be employed, it is recommended that all new construction of certified settings (new construction and conversion of existing structures) be guided by the following chart.

Major features of this approach include:

- For ALL new development of certified residential settings, except supportive settings, the application of *Life Safety Code* (2000) New chapters (18 or 32 as applicable). Note that supportive settings approximate an independent living situation. Individuals are independent in fire evacuation and do not require 24 hour supervision.
- The use of current New York State Building Code provisions along with the *Life Safety Code* (2000) when an existing structure is being converted into a certified setting for the first time rather than use of the code in existence when the building was originally constructed.
- It should be noted that the references are to the State Building Code and a parallel chart comparing these standards to NYC Building Code must be completed. It is noted that further research needs to be completed in special fire safety and construction issues for New York City providers as they also must comply with the New York City Building Code.

Table 1: Group Classification Matrix

	Group A	Group B	Group B-1	Group C	Group D
Applicable code	Residential code generally applicable to the building type No application of <i>Life Safety Code</i>	Building Code: R-4 <i>Life Safety Code</i> – Residential Board and Care-Small	Building Code: R-2 <i>Life Safety Code</i> – Residential Board and Care-Small	Building Code: R-4 <i>Life Safety Code</i> – Health Care	Building Code: Appropriate I code <i>Life Safety Code</i> – Health Care
Characteristics of facility	Certified as a supportive setting.	Supervised certified settings with capacity less than 16.	Supervised certified settings with capacity less than 16 where the individuals have found a site that is in an apartment building.	Supervised certified setting with capacity less than 16.	Supervised certified setting with capacity of 16 or greater.
Characteristic of individuals residing in this certified setting	Individuals are independently able to evacuate to a point of safety in less than three minutes.	No more than five of the individuals are classified as non-self-preserving (<i>e-scores</i> greater than 12). None of the residents require 24 hour nursing.	No more than five of the individuals are classified as non-self-preserving (<i>e-scores</i> greater than 12). None of the residents require 24 hour nursing.	More than five individuals are NON-self-preserving (<i>e-scores</i> greater than 12). OR any one requires 24-hour nursing care.	Presumption that people requiring this level of congregate setting have significant needs.

All currently certified programs sites should be assessed to determine whether any changes are needed based on a comparison to the matrix outlined above with the following considerations:

- Sites should not be reviewed for reclassification of building code.
- However, all sites should be assessed against the section of *Life Safety Code* that would have applied under the new scheme.
- In the case of a program that has never been subject to the *Life Safety Code* and where the profile of the residents would put the program under the Board and Care Section of the *Life Safety Code*, the program should be assessed against the “existing occupancy” provisions of the *Life Safety Code*.

- Where the program has been subject to the Board and Care Section, but the profile of the individuals would align the program with the Health Care provisions of the *Life Safety Code*, then the program should be assessed under the “new occupancy” provisions of the *Life Safety Code*.
- To the extent that a review of the program demonstrates that the profile of the individuals living in the residence would have suggested a change in the Group Classification of Table 1 and that should have been completed even under pre-existing OMRDD guidelines, OMRDD should retain the authority to hold the program to the standard (new or existing) that will best balance the health and safety of the individuals with the expressed priorities of the individuals for stability in their housing arrangement. Such decisions should only be made after a review, including a risk analysis of the facility, is completed to gauge the impact on the other residents.

A “gap” assessment should be performed and OMRDD should develop a multi-year strategy for resolving issues. Strategies could include:

- Changing the group classification that the residence fits into based on movement of residents, attrition and backfill;
- Prioritized physical plant enhancements; or
- Staffing adjustments.

The approach to assessment should prioritize first those settings that are currently categorized as “Impractical” and secondly those that are currently not required to be compliant with *Life Safety Code*. To ensure a timely and robust approach to the assessment, OMRDD should assemble a cross – agency team that draws on all available trained professionals.

Lastly, Panel members recognized that OMRDD has a strong value of maintaining relationships and community connections. Thus, if a person’s needs for assistance related to fire safety change, OMRDD should have the flexibility to make appropriate adjustments to promote safety. Appropriate adjustments could include physical plant enhancements or enhancements in staffing, either through increasing staffing numbers or additional training.

Recommendation 13

Simplify the process for determining the appropriate building features by adopting new standards for the development of certified settings to include the application of the *Life Safety Code* for all supervised certified settings. The proposed standards are based on the characteristics of each home (*e.g.* type of certification, size of residence) and the characteristics of the individuals living in a residence (*e.g.* self-preservation capabilities, personal care service needs, nursing requirements). See the Group Classification Matrix table on page 14, which outlines the Panel's suggested standards.

Recommendation 14

Assess all currently certified program sites to determine whether any crucial enhancements are needed based on a comparison to the Group Classification Matrix. The approach to assessment should prioritize first those settings that are currently categorized as "Impractical" and secondly those that are currently not required to be compliant with the *Life Safety Code*. To ensure a timely and robust approach to the assessment, OMRDD should assemble a cross – agency team that draws on all available trained professionals.

Recommendation 15

The Panel strongly endorses New York State's historical commitment to and protection of the capacity of OMRDD to site residential programs in the communities across the state. In order to continue to safeguard the protections of the Site Selection of Community Residential Facilities Act, OMRDD should take all necessary steps to ensure that any modifications to construction and design requirements by either code amendment or OMRDD practice in response to the recommendations of this report shall not alter the classification of community residences for the purpose of siting a home in the community in accordance with that Act.

Recommendation 16

The Department of State (OFPC) and OMRDD should expand current levels of collaboration to include ongoing review of the impact of NYS Building Codes, Fire Codes and Property Maintenance Codes for the shared goal of developing safe, appropriate residential settings for individuals with developmental disabilities. As appropriate, the two agencies should work together to devise code revisions which further OMRDD's capacity to create residential opportunities that are safe, aesthetically compatible with typical residential communities, cost effective and do not impose design barriers to placement of the majority of program types in existing neighborhoods.

Appendix A



FIGURE 6.8 Worksheets for rating residents.

WORKSHEET 6.8.1 COVER SHEET

Worksheet for Rating Residents

Resident's name _____ Evaluator _____

Facility _____ Zone _____ Date _____

Write any explanatory remarks here:

WORKSHEET 6.8.2 RATING THE RESIDENT ON THE RISK FACTORS

Rate the resident on each of the factors below by checking the one circle for each risk factor that best describes the resident. For the first six factors, write the scores for the circles checked in the appropriate score boxes in the far right column. For "Response to Fire Drills," write the three checked scores in the large circles. Write the sum of the three scores in the large box on the right.

I. Risk of Resistance (Check only one)	Minimal Risk <input type="radio"/> score=0	Risk of Mild Resistance <input type="radio"/> score=6	Risk of Strong Resistance <input type="radio"/> score=20	Score Boxes <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>	
II. Impaired Mobility (Check only one)	Self-Starting <input type="radio"/> score=0	Slow <input type="radio"/> score=3	Needs Limited Assistance <input type="radio"/> score=6	Needs Full Assistance or Very Slow <input type="radio"/> score=20	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>
III. Impaired Consciousness (Check only one)	No Significant Risk <input type="radio"/> score=0	Partially Impaired <input type="radio"/> score=6	Totally Impaired <input type="radio"/> score=20		<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>
IV. Need for Extra Help (Check only one)	Needs at Most One Staff <input type="radio"/> score=0	Needs Limited Assistance from 2 Staff <input type="radio"/> score=30	Needs Full Assistance from 2 Staff <input type="radio"/> score=40		<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>
V. Response to Instructions (Check only one)	Follows Instructions <input type="radio"/> score=1	Requires Supervision <input type="radio"/> score=3	Requires Considerable Attention/Might Not Respond <input type="radio"/> score=10		<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>
VI. Waking Response to Alarm (Check only one)	Response Probable <input type="radio"/> score=0	Response Not Probable <input type="radio"/> score=6			<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>
VII. Response to Fire Drills (Without guidance or advice from staff)	Initiates and Completes Evacuation Promptly	Yes <input type="radio"/> score=0	No <input type="radio"/> score=8	<input type="radio"/> + <input type="radio"/> + <input type="radio"/>	Sum of These Three Scores <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>
	Chooses and Completes Back-up Strategy	Yes <input type="radio"/> score=0	No <input type="radio"/> score=4		
	Remains at Designated Location	Yes <input type="radio"/> score=0	No <input type="radio"/> score=6		

(For use with NFPA 101A-2001/NFPA 101-2000) (Page 1 of 4)

FIGURE 6.8 Continued

WORKSHEET 6.8.3 DETERMINING THE RESIDENT'S OVERALL NEED FOR ASSISTANCE

Compare the numbers in the seven score boxes filled in. Take the highest score from the score boxes (Worksheet 6.8.2) and write it in the box at the right.

Evacuation
Assistance
Score

Notes: