3.2 Expansion of Network – 34 CFR 364.25

3.2A Describe the design for the further expansion of the network, including identification of the unserved and underserved areas in the State and the order of priority for serving these areas as additional funding becomes available (beyond the required cost-of-living increase).

The SILC, DARS, and the network of CILs worked together to identify a strategy for completing the network of CILs in the state. The determination was that fourteen additional CILs are needed to complete the network. Based on 2010 U.S. Census Data, there are an estimated half a million state residents with disabilities currently living in areas that are not served by a CIL.

Underserved Counties and Populations:
The SILC has become increasingly concerned about the high percentage of underserved areas within the existing network of CILs. Close examination of recent 704 reports submitted by CILs throughout the state revealed that, even where CILs exist, individuals with disabilities are dramatically underserved by population and/or geographic area. The following data was compiled by reviewing FY12 704 Reports of each CIL within the network.

ABLE Center for Independent Living
Counties Underserved: Andrews, Crane, Martin, Midland, Upton, Ward
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: Asian, White, Two or More Races

Austin Resource Center for Independent Living, Austin
Counties Underserved: Bastrop, Lee
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Hawaiian, Hispanic, Two or more races

Austin Resource Center for Independent Living, Round Rock
Counties Underserved: Burnet, Milam, Bell*
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Hawaiian, Hispanic, Two or more races

Austin Resource Center for Independent Living, San Marcos
Counties Underserved: Blanco, Comal*
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: Asian, Black, Hawaiian, Hispanic, Two or more races

Brazos Valley Center for Independent Living
Counties Underserved: Burleson, Madison, Robertson, Washington
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Vision, Other

DRAFT

Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Hawaiian, Hispanic, Two or more races

Coastal Bend Center for Independent Living
Counties Underserved: Aransas, Bee, Brooks, Duval*, Jim Wells, Kenedy, Kleberg, Live Oak, McMullen, Refugio, San Patricio
Disability Populations Underserved: Cognitive, Hearing, Vision
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Black, Hawaiian, White, Two or more races

Coalition for Barrier Free Living/Houston Center for Independent Living
Counties Underserved: N/A
Disability Populations Underserved: Cognitive, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: Hawaiian, White, Hispanic, Two or more races

Coalition for Barrier Free Living/Brazoria County Center for Independent Living, Angleton
Counties Underserved: Matagorda
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: Asian, Hawaiian, Hispanic, Two or more races

Coalition for Barrier Free Living/ Fort Bend Center for Independent Living
Counties Underserved: Austin, Colorado, Waller, Wharton
Disability Populations Underserved: Cognitive, Hearing, Multiple
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Hawaiian, White, White, Hispanic, Two or more races

Crockett Resource Center for Independent Living
Counties Underserved: Freestone, Leon, Shelby, Trinity, Polk, Sabine, San Augustine, Panola*, Rusk*
Disability Populations Underserved: Mental, Multiple, Other
Race Categories Underserved: Asian, Hawaiian, Hispanic, Two or more races

East Texas Center for Independent Living
Counties Underserved: Camp, Cherokee*, Harrison, Henderson, Marion, Panola*, Rains, Rusk,
Upshur, Van Zandt, Wood
Disability Populations Underserved: Cognitive, Hearing, Vision
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Hawaiian, Hispanic, Two or more Races

Heart of Central Texas Independent Living
Counties Underserved: Coryell, Hill, McLennan
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, White, Hispanic, Two or more races

DRAFT

LIFE/RUN
Counties Underserved: Crosby, Floyd, Garza, Hale, Hockley, Lamb, Lynn, Terry
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, White, Hispanic, Two or more races

LIFE/RUN Not Without Us!
Counties Underserved: Calhahan, Eastland, Jones, Stephens, Shackleford,
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: Asian, Black, Hispanic, Two or more races

LIFE/RUN Disability Connections
Counties Underserved: Runnels, Coke, Concho, Irion, Menard, Scheicher, Sterling
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Black, Hawaiian, Hispanic, Two or more races

Mounting Horizons Center for Independent Living
Counties Underserved: N/A
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Hawaiian, Hispanic, Two or more races

Panhandle Independent Living Center
Counties Underserved: Armstrong, Briscoe, Carson, Castro, Childress, Collingsworth, Dallam,
Deaf Smith, Donley, Gray, Hall, Hansford, Hartley, Hemphill, Hutchinson, Lipscomb, Moore,
Ochiltree, Oldham, Parmer, Roberts, Sherman, Swisher, Wheeler
Disability Populations Underserved: Mental, hearing, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Two or more races

Palestine Resource Center for Independent Living
Counties Underserved: Angelina, Nacogdoches, Smith*
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Multiple, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Hawaiian, Hispanic

REACH-Rehabilitation, Education and Advocacy for Citizens With Handicaps (Disabilities), Dallas
Counties Underserved: N/A
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Two or more races

REACH-Rehabilitation, Education and Advocacy for Citizens With Handicaps

DRAFT

(Disabilities), Denton
Counties Underserved: N/A
Disability Populations Underserved: Cognitive, Hearing, Other
Race Categories Underserved: Asian, Black, Hawaiian, Hispanic, Two or more races

REACH-Rehabilitation, Education and Advocacy for Citizens With Handicaps (Disabilities), Ft. Worth
Counties Underserved: N/A
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, White, Hispanic, Two or more races

REACH-Rehabilitation, Education and Advocacy for Citizens With Handicaps (Disabilities), Plano
Counties Underserved: N/A
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Hawaiian, White, Hispanic, Two or more races

RISE Center for Independent Living
Counties Underserved: Hardin, Orange
Disability Populations Underserved: Hearing, Multiple, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Hawaiian, Hispanic, Two or more races

San Antonio Independent Living Services
Counties Underserved: Atascosa, Bandera, Calhoun, Comal*, De Witt, Dimmit, Edwards, Frio, Gillespie, Goliad, Gonzales, Guadalupe, Jackson, Karnes, Kendall, Kerr, Kinney, La Salle, Lavaca, Maverick, Medina, Real, Uvalde, Val Verde, Victoria, Wilson, Zavala
Disability Populations Underserved: Cognitive, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Hawaiian, White, Two or more races

Valley Association for Independent Living-Rio Grande Valley
Counties Underserved: Starr, Willacy
Disability Populations Underserved: Mental, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Hawaiian, White, Two or more races

Valley Association for Independent Living- South Texas
Counties Underserved: Duval, Jim Hogg, Zapata
Disability Populations Underserved: Cognitive, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Black, Hawaiian, White, Two or more races

DRAFT

Volar Center for Independent Living
Counties Underserved: N/A
Disability Populations Underserved: Cognitive, Vision, Other
Race Categories Underserved: American Indian, Asian, Black, Hawaiian, White, Two or more races

Underserved race categories were calculated by comparing the FY12 704 Report data for each CIL to the race categories in the state, according to the 2010 U.S. Census. Those race categories served by a CIL, which were below the statewide race categories, were listed as underserved. Counties underserved were calculated by comparing the FY12 704 Report data for each CIL to the disability populations of each specific county. Those counties in which the CIL served less than 1% of the disability population were listed as underserved. Disability Population Underserved was determined by reporting the three populations that received the lowest service percentage by that CIL.

Unserved Counties:
The following list represents the list of unserved counties. Should new state or federal funds become available for the purpose of establishing a new CIL, these areas would be eligible for such funding. ~~Within the first year, the SILC, in coordination with the network of CILs, will determine a list of priority areas within the list of targeted expansion areas.~~

~~In addition, the SILC, in collaboration with DARS, has designated some counties as "stray counties" due to their geographic location not falling near other unserved counties, or within a current CIL service area. These counties may be absorbed by an existing CIL, should state or federal funds become available for future negotiation.~~

~~Targeted Expansion Areas:~~
Archer, 1,591
Baylor, 649
Bailey, 1,122
Borden, 115
Bosque, 2,982
Bowie, 15,842
Brewster, 1,595
Brown, 6,479
Cass, 5,223
Chambers, 5,092
Clay, 1,883
Cochran, 485
Coleman, 1,516
Comanche, 2,279
Cooke, 6,372
Cottle, 263
Crockett, 670
Culberson, 413
Dawson, 2,487
Delta, 1,063
Dickens, 377
Ellis, 20,791
Erath, 6,202
Falls, 3,421
Fannin, 6,036
Fayette, 3,634
Fisher, 751
Foard, 233
Franklin, 2,152
Gaines, 3,065
Glasscock, 220
Grayson, 20,080
Grimes, 4,805
Hamilton, 1,447
Hardeman, 725
Haskell, 1,117
Hood, 8,450
Hopkins, 7,125
Howard, 6,303
Hudspeth, 601
Hunt, 15,456
Jack, 1,588
Jasper, 7,419
Jeff Davis, 402
Johnson, 17,246
Kaufman, 12,002
Kent, 152
Kimble, 832
King, 44

DRAFT

Knox, 647
Lamar, 10,053
Lampasas, 3,388
Liberty, 10,847
Limestone, 4,480
Llano, 3,298
Loving, 14
Mason, 723
McCulloch, 1,493
Mills, 839
Mitchell, 1,789
Montague, 3,456
Montgomery, 52,265
Motley, 186
Morris, 2,614
Navarro, 9,165
Newton, 2,982
Nolan, 2,895
Palo Pinto, 5,372
Parker, 15,796
Pecos, 2,673
Presidio, 1,349
Reagan, 610
Red River, 2,590
Reeves, 2,381
Rockwall, 9,150
San Jacinto, 5,000
San Saba, 1,044
Scurry, 3,232
Somervell, 1,408
Stonewall, 282
Sutton, 746
Terrell, 169
Throckmorton, 311
Titus, 6,577
Walker, 2,659
Wichita, 20,775
Wilbarger, 2,373
Winkler, 1,234
Wise, 10,520
Yoakum, 1,234
Young, 3,245

~~**Stray Counties:**~~
~~Bailey, 1,122~~
~~Cochran, 485~~
~~Cottle, 263~~
~~Dickens, 377~~
~~Fayette, 3,634~~
~~Jasper, 7,419~~
~~Kent, 152~~
~~King, 44~~
~~Loving, 14~~
~~Motley, 186~~
~~Newton, 2,982~~
~~Stonewall, 282~~
~~Winkler, 1,234~~
~~Yoakum, 1,234~~

DRAFT

Expansion of the Network:
Efforts to expand and strengthen the network of CILs in Texas will involve working closely with state and federal entities toward the allocation of additional funding for the establishment and operation of CILs. Should funding become available, a competitive process will be conducted, which will define criteria for selection. The network will not accept expansion funds if it will potentially jeopardize the stability of the existing network. Priority will be given to applicants with a cross-disability board in place that have filed for incorporation and obtained, or are in the process of obtaining, 501(c)(3) tax exempt status. Such applicants will be in a position to initiate programming more readily.

Strengthen the Network:
In addition to adding CILs to the network, the SILC and DSU are committed to pursuing increased funding that will allow for financial support to bring existing CILs up to a baseline level to be determined by the SILC and DSU. Funding will also be pursued to expand the capacity of CILs to reach underserved populations and regions within existing coverage areas.

Priority Unserved Or Underserved Area(s) in the State: Currently, several counties in Texas remain unserved. In adherence with RSA guidance, if Part C funds become available, the priority will be to establish a new CIL in an unserved area. Priority will be given to applicants with a cross-disability board in place that have filed for incorporation and obtained, or in a process of obtaining, 501(c)(3) tax exempt status. Such applicants will be in a position to initiate programming more readily. In addition, if additional funds from sources such as Part B, State General Revenue, or SSA-VR become available, the Network supports efforts for the following activities: 1) to add currently unserved areas/counties to an existing CIL's catchment area for purposes of providing the four core services; 2) To expand the capacity of CILs to reach underserved populations and regions within existing coverage areas. The Network will not accept expansion funds if it will potentially jeopardize the stability of the existing Network.

Order Of Priority For Establishing New CILs in these Areas: An ad hoc workgroup, which members included CIL Directors and staff, SILC members and staff, and representatives of the DSU met and established the following areas as priority areas (in no particular order). The areas established as priorities are the unserved counties that are within a Council of Governments (COG) region. Should funding become available to establish a new CIL in an unserved area, the Network supports open competition among unserved areas and believes that all strong applicants should be considered regardless if the proposed service area lies solely within a single COG region and their presence on the priority areas list that follows.

- **Priority Area A:** Region 3—Nortex Regional Planning Commission
  Location: North Texas

Unserved Counties with Disability Population: Hardeman 725; Foard 233; Wilbarger 2,373; Baylor 649; Wichita 20,775; Archer 1,591; Young 3,245; Clay 1,883; Jack 1,588; Montague 3,456; Cottle 263
Total Disability Population: 36,781

- **Priority Area B:** Region 5—Ark-Tex Area Council of Governments
  Location: North-East Texas
  Unserved Counties with Disability Population: Lamar 10,053; Red River 2,590; Delta 1,063; Hopkins 7,125; Bowie 15,842; Cass5,223; Morris 2,614; Titus 6,577; Franklin 2,152
  Total Disability Population: 53,239
- **Priority Area C:** Region 22— Texoma Council of Governments
  Location: North Texas
  Unserved Counties with Disability Population: Cooke 6,372; Grayson 20,080; Fannin 6,036
  Total Disability Population: 32,488
- **Priority Area D:** Region 8—Rio Grande Council of Governments
  Location: West Texas
  Unserved Counties with Disability Population: Hudspeth 601, Culberson 413, Jeff Davis 402; Brewster 1,595; Presidio 1,349
  Total Disability Population: 4,360
- **Priority Area E:** Region 9— Permian Basin Regional Planning Commission
  Location: West Texas
  Unserved Counties with Disability Population: Gaines 3,065; Dawson 2,487; Borden 115; Howard 6,303; Glasscock 220
  Total Disability Population: 12,190
- **Priority Area F:** Region 9— Permian Basin Regional Planning Commission
  Location: West Texas
  Unserved Counties with Disability Population: Winkler 1,234; Loving 14; Reeves 2,381; Pecos 2,673; Terrell 169
  Total Disability Population: 6,471

Funding Priorities:
The priorities for the designation of additional funds will be determined as funding becomes available through a process of negotiation among DARS, the SILC and the CILs in the network. These basic guidelines will be employed to make such determinations:

- ~~Funds Below Regular Allocation: Funds under the determined amount of the regular Title VII, Part C allocation and/or are from a source that includes a provision for continuation, will be used first to bring existing CILs whose funding is below the baseline up to baseline. Funds will be distributed based on the order of greatest to least disparity between current funding and the designated amount. Eligible CILs will receive the percentage of the available funds that corresponds with their levels of funding disparity. Once all CILs have reached the baseline~~

DRAFT

~~level, any additional funds will be distributed among existing CILs in the same proportion as their regular Part C appropriation.~~

- ~~Funds Above Regular Allocation: Funds above the determined amount of the regular Title VII, Part C allocation that are from a source that includes a provision for continuation, or, if non-sustaining and will not jeopardize the Part C funding of existing CILs, will be used for the establishment of new CILs, provided a need in one or more priority areas has been identified.~~
- Short Term Funding: Funds that are short-term in nature and do not have a provision for ongoing sustainability, beyond those used to establish a new CIL if doing so does not jeopardize the Part C funding of existing CILs, will be used to expand the capacity of existing CILs consistent with the goals and objectives of the SPIL, with particular emphasis on under-served areas and populations. Such funds will be distributed among existing CILs in the same proportion as their regular Part C appropriation.

~~Funding Requirements for CIL Start-Up:~~

~~The Independent Living Research Utilization program conducted a nationwide study of urban and rural CILs to determine the minimum budget for a Center. For comparison purposes, they assumed that a typical start-up CIL would need a director, bookkeeper, secretary, and two IL specialists to be able to meet Title VII, Part C requirements. The study reviewed the line item budgets of ten rural and ten urban CILs to determine the annual operating costs for their communities. The general findings are below and they include figures that have been adjusted for inflation.~~

~~Rural communities average annual cost: $227,991 in 1999, which when adjusted for inflation is $318,548.~~

~~Urban communities average annual cost: $272,231 in 1999, which when adjusted for inflation is $380,360.~~

~~National Average average annual cost: $250,111 in 1999, which when adjusted for inflation is $349,454.~~

~~According to an analysis by the SILC, the annual average funding levels (adjusted for inflation) stated in this study are consistent with federal funding recently awarded to establish a new CIL and the budgetary realities the newly funded Center continues to face as a start-up CIL. It is expected that any start-up Center, whether or not it is established by federal or state funds, would require similar funding levels to provide services as required under Title VII, Part C in their designated catchment area. It is expected that future funding sources may include Title VII, Part C funding, or state funding resources as a base funding level. Traditionally, the network of Centers have had to secure additional funding from other federal, state, and/or private sources in order to provide services because base funding provided for Centers from the state and federal government have generally not kept pace with rising costs and inflation.~~

- **Minimum Funding Level Required To Establish A New CIL:** The minimum funding required to establish a new Center for Independent Living (CIL) in Texas is $500,000. This figure reflects the staffing needs necessary to establish and

maintain CIL services with an Executive Director, Program Director, Bookkeeper, three IL Specialists, an Outreach Coordinator, and a Secretary/Administrative Assistant. This funding level includes salary, fringe, space, contract services, supplies, travel, and other necessary expenses. An ad hoc workgroup, which members included CIL Directors and staff, SILC members and staff, and representatives of the DSU, determined this figure after reviewing the staffing and program needs to provide adequate consumer services while looking at the average costs of personnel and overhead from both rural and urban centers from across the state.

- **Potential Funding Sources For This Minimum Level (i.e., Part C only or a combination of Part C, Part B, state or other funding):** Texas will fully utilize as many funding resources as possible to achieve the minimum funding levels depending on the availability of such sources. Resources that could be used to fulfill the minimum level include Part C, Part B, State General Revenue, SSA-VR, and other private funding sources. When Part C funding does become available, the SILC and the DSU will coordinate with RSA to determine if these alternative sources are available to reach a minimum funding level to establish a new Center for Independent Living.
- **If The Minimum Funding Level Required To Establish A New Center Will Not Be Met, The Method By Which The State Requests RSA Distribute The Additional Part C Funds:** If the minimum funding level required to establish a new center cannot be met, Texas requests that distribution of the additional Part C funds above cost of living allowance when available, be distributed among existing CILs receiving Part C funding in the same proportion as their regular Part C award is to the State's total Part C allocation. With this method, it is goal of the Network to bring Part C centers that are currently funded below the established minimum funding level up to a more equitable level.

Funding Reductions:

With the recent implementation of the sequestration of federal funds as required by the Budget Control Act of 2011, the SILC encourages the development of contingency plans, should there be an unexpected reduction or rescission of state or federal funds. It is expected that such reductions may impact the quantity and quality of services offered by a Center. Should this be the case, the SILC and DARS encourage the CILs to focus on providing the four core services to consumers in the Center's catchment area to ensure their status as Center for Independent Living under Title VII, Part C is not jeopardized. In addition, Centers are also encouraged to diversify their funding sources to help lessen the impact of a sudden reduction of funding from one entity or program. Should general funding for CILs be reduced at the State level, the network of Centers should receive a proportional funding reduction, rather than consider the closing of a center.

Closing of a Center for Independent Living:

In the event that a Center funded by Title VII, Part B or Part C should close, the SILC, DARS, and the network of Centers will coordinate on the distribution of funds previously allocated to the Center. Should such funds remain available for use in the State, funding will be distributed based on the priorities mentioned previously in this section. Of note, however, is that the areas and populations previously served by the now-closed center will be considered unserved areas for purposes of determining priorities as outlined previously in this section.

DRAFT