



Kern Regional Center (KRC)
Self Determination Advisory Committee (SDAC) Meeting Minutes
November 7th 2022 – 5:00 pm
Teleconference via Zoom Webinar

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88301380024?pwd=RkVXenJieW9nSW1pRUVOczAzOStMUT09>

Members Present

Rick Wood (Chair)
Kelly Kulzer-Reyes
Mario Espinoza
Nick Schneider

Others Attending

Michele Rodriguez
Cindy Cox
Melanie Waters
Ana Guerra
Assessment 5
Karina Proffer
Omelia Trigueros
Martha Grajeda
Yesenia Mackie
Raymond Martinez
Diane Schneider

Morgan Cox
Celia Pinal
Suzanne Toothman
Ana Leheny
Sandra Van Scotter
Adriana Antonio
Mrs. Arthur
Katie Ramirez
Christina Rockwell
Lori Molhook
Claudia Wenger

Members absent

Virginia Gantong

- 1) **Call to Order**
5:07 pm (Rick Wood)
- 2) **Establish of Quorum:** *Quorum was established*
- 3) **Additional Agenda Items:** *None*
- 4) **Public Comment:** *None*
- 5) **Approval of Minutes – January, March, August 15th, September 12th letting Kelly go through them.**

6) Status of SDP (Wood)

- a) *(R. Wood)* I had what I thought was a brilliant idea which was to put together a group of regional centers to partner with SSDAC to apply for grant funding from DDS because there is 22 million dollars available to address disparities. My brilliant idea never came to pass. So, I have another idea which I will be presenting not tonight, which is to essentially go back to SSDAC the 21 committees and see how many will contribute to a collaboration between disability voices united and SSDAC with the funds that are available to implement self-determination and put together kind of a pilot. It's not kind of a pilot we have in mind 3 to 5 regional centers to essentially create, in language that those who currently are victims of disparities can relate to and understand put together a program for outreach and training in order to overcome barriers. It is very unlikely if not a possible for us to have another meeting this year, so, it's going to happen in January that is the meeting of the 21 chairs. We are going to have a work group meeting which consists of 9 chairs to plan the agenda and move the things forward that we've been working on, and I expect that it's going to happen within the next 3 weeks, certainly before the fifth or sixth of December. *(C. Rockwell)* What my public comment was to ensure that we can include a discussion, if not tonight, but on the agenda, to have a formal pathway for payment for facilitators, for transitions. It seems like there's a lot of confusion there, and to speak on that being linked to disparities. I have done a lot of work to try and recruit additional facilitators to come and work in this field. You know people looking for facilitators, but you know if the pathway for us to seek payment, and I can speak on it further when it's the appropriate time. I don't think that there's anything maybe like in writing like a step list specific. We know what to do, so we know what to anticipate. I can see that definitely affecting communities of color because a lot of times, if facilitators that work and live in the same communities are going to be more successful with clients in their same areas. So, getting paid is challenging then that can limit who's willing to be able to provide IF services, especially you know someone that's doing it full time.
- b) *(K. Kulzer-Reyes)* So, that actually connected to a lot. Are you specifically referring to 024 payments? So, I assume you have a similar concern with the 099 payments? *(C. Rockwell)* The person-centered plan writing for 024 both historically currently and then going forward 024 and 099 because I can tell you I've got a number of plans that are out. That I've submitted months ago and I'm not sure anybody knows exactly what the steps are. *(K. Kulzer-Reyes)* I don't know where the breakdowns are so adding to our barriers area, a reasonable timeline for reimbursement with delineated steps is reasonable. We are in year 3 this should be figured out. When we figure it out some little piece changes or one person leaves an organization and it's not just KRC, it's everywhere. *(C. Rockwell)* So, like you said, delineated steps that are outlined, in concrete, and in writing. *(K. Kulzer-Reyes)* And in equitable across communities and languages. *(R. Wood)* Kelly and I attended a meeting with DDS. DDS put together a collection of IFs including Kelly. It was really informative session to DDS, and it was really all about the IFs and the issues that relate specifically to the 099 directive that is expected to be effective on February 1st, but it also relates to the 024. I'm interested in having a dialogue with our regional center staff as to how we are doing, what we can do either as to best practices that might be shared, or what we can do to improve our practices. So, that we, as a committee have got a handle on the IF issues, not the least of which is payment. *(K. Kulzer-Reyes)* We tried hard to make sure DDS understood the complications of what they were suggesting. Like having this vendor process go forward in a very quick manner. I think we've all found

the challenges of having an organization go through the vendor process in a short amount of time is very rarely successful. They're asking for right at this point is 3 months to finish up the process. Basically, there is going to be 2 options. One option at this point to get paid to help a family get or a participant get into the self-determination program. They can do either option A until February 1st, or then option B only going forward. So, option B will be the only option and it is basically you have to become vendors, and so, you can no longer just do the 024-purchase reimbursement to get reimbursed for the work that you do. Now you have to go through a vendor process first and then once you're through that vendor process then you would go through e-billing and that's the magic way people get paid at regional centers like vendors get paid for anything that they do. There'd be a learning curve and people would adjust, and that would be what it is right? One of the reasons that came forward and I've heard already that we're trying to do this as a state is the only way to get the Federal funds associated with this is to be vendored. Only vendor services can qualify for federal funds. Because we're 024 for those that \$2500 to get families into the program that's problematic. There's no way for it to become sustainable. It has to come out of a budget and there's just not enough money to go around, right? They were trying to solve some problems at DDS but instead didn't really get a lot of independent facilitator feedback on other creative ways to create this vendor process, and so they are a little bit back peddling and trying to get feedback from people who are doing the IF right now, with like 3 months before it's suppose to roll out so doesn't sound that different from our normal frustrations but this a new frustrations. That's the reason why they want us to be vendored. What we are really talking about is the person who is your self-determination program transition helper person and that's the person who is sending in that \$2,500 invoice, or whatever amount of the invoice that the invoice is, can't exceed \$2,500. Some of us are working really hard to make sure that families are very well prepared once they enter the self-determination program, somebody could also help you create a person-centered plan and say you're going to do the rest of it by yourself and they could charge you the whole \$2,500, which is another one of the issues with the whole system. So, the 099 is this new way to pay for the self-determination program transition support. I believe it's a participate directed code. I don't remember exactly what the 099 stands for but it has a specific rate and that's all you would be able to charge per hour for the work that is done. We all know why we're doing it. They need to have the Federal funds. There are some other challenges here that are important to understand from the IF side and the things we suggested were to make this a statewide process and not to get vendors with each individual regional center. I thought that was a reasonable because this job is do different from what a typical vendor does. It's difficult to just say it's this hour, but it's like 50 minutes here 20 mins there, there are 3 text messages over here, and being able to build that effectively with the current structure is quite difficult because you're consulting with somebody, you're not providing them with a direct service for 8h a day. So, some of this besides those suggestions would be to use the RFP process and use the funds within our group like our local volunteer advisory committee to help fund some of these things, because some people aren't going to be able to afford the vendorization process, the big concerns were with insurance. Each regional center seems to have its own requirements for insurance, and I would love to hear what KRC's thoughts are on that. Another is like just having a coaching at regional centers. If we have to do this with each separate regional center, find a way to get coaching from their departments, so that the vendor process can actually happen. Then to rewrite what the vendor contract would then look

like. For example, North L. A.'s vendor contract is apparently 65 pages long, and most of us are trying to help our families, and we don't have time to do 65 pages of vendor paperwork. That's one of the solutions was to make the vendor process more streamlined and more accessible to those of us who are trying to serve our families, experiencing disparity, our underserved communities and be a force for good throughout. Some of the suggestions were to delay the implementation. One of the problems with the 099 is that there's a total of 40h that are allocated for a family but then the regional center may or may not approve those 40h because that's a POS (Purchase of Service) issue. We're not really sure how those 40h would be allocated between the FMS and that self-determination program transition helper person. I think for a lot of us what we're trying to do is have people be able to do the self-determination program with minimal help from their IF. Not maximum help and being able to utilize and train people on the front end really allows participants to be able to use those funds for their own lives not to pay an IF once they're in the program, so that they would be spending all their money help having that support in place not for a lot of us. So, the biggest concerns were that helping a family, or a participant enter the self-determination program is very different from a typical vendor, and that we should make this process as easy as possible we already have huge wait lists for independent facilitators and we've already lost a lot of independent facilitators, so I think that those are some of the biggest pieces that came out of that joint meeting with DDS last Monday. (*R. Wood*) Let me add this before I take questions. It was required by the feds, but it also was fueled in part by some really lousy IFs who took \$2,500 and didn't do much. Nancy Bargeman has often talked about unbundling the services and really what she wanted to do was to create this separate category of vendorization in order to meet the Federal requirement and also to basically get rid of the deficiencies by some IFs that were basically in not doing what they should for the \$2,500. So, my second takeaway is we're going to lose a lot of IFs. We've got somebody like Kelly who is passionate and somebody like Christina who is passionate, who has to jump thru the hoops this is a serious problem, and so obviously it's being addressed on a statewide level, as Kelly said it needs to be statewide, or at least the recommendation was to be statewide in order for there to be consistency throughout the system in order for there to be one standard in order for it to be simpler, and it's really going to be, I hope a special category or class of a vendor. This isn't going to happen by February 1st but the department solicited that it'll be the subject of our next statewide DDS advisory group meeting whenever that's going to happen. It's a hot topic. The 024 payment is going to be even harder with the 099 funds I'm sure and so what I'm interested in hearing because we know we have IFs on and we have regional staff I'd like to hear from them as to what they're experiencing, with their thinking, what they're looking forward to as we roll this thing out and whether we have got some unique problems. (*C. Pinal*) We actually do have some concerns with the whole vendorization of the IF. We have some very good IFs to write excellent plans and carry the families all through the process, transition services and so forth. We are hoping that some of these, IFs actually go through the better process, but again as Kelly described that could be very artist and we want a very simple vendor process. We don't have a lot of people that I know of per my conversation with Enrique a couple of weeks ago. Any interest yet so far on anyone wanting to become a vendor. I think we probably sent out maybe 2 vendor applications, but I don't know if they're back Enrique would have to comment on that. But it is for us it is concerning, and I do understand the intent because we have read very good person center plans that you know the program managers upon reading them, they have a very good understanding,

and they can move them forward to get the 024 reimbursement right now, and there's those other plans that I've looked at, that they don't even look like a person center plan that you know obviously they're billing the max \$2,500 and I honestly as Kern Regional Center, as a representative, I cannot put those plans through the Department for reimbursement. We are asking our community services to do some technical assistance with these individuals, but I'm almost certain that once these plans get approved, they probably will not go through with providing services. (M. Waters) SDP RC Participant Directive. From what I gathered this is what I term is year 4 funding and what DDS would like the areas of concentration, the funding allocation is a little bit different because it starts off with the base funding, and then there is a share of funding with active consumers that I self-identify as non-white and then there's available funding which is \$78,000 which is a little bit more than the past year. There is no allocation deadline date. There is just a deadline to spend the funds.

7) KRC Updates

- a) (M. Waters) The LMS Report. So, number are 148 completed English language, 83 Spanish language, 13 ASL 4. The numbers as far as the funding that's been spent, or the same as last report so total invoice to date is \$64,417.50 and I know both of our awardees First Choice and Ally have invoices that they have not submitted yet, so they are both on track, according to their records of utilizing all their funding prior to March of next year. As far as the November report this is from First Choice Solutions, they have 6 Spanish speaking participants pending SDP transition, they have completed 0 transitions for English speaking participants, on October 1st we have 4 ready to go pending FMS openings, they've completed 2 orientation sessions, and they have 5 intakes. Ally report is they have had 3 additional transitions since the last report. A few cases have had their transition date postpone due to FMS component taking a bit longer to set up some FMS agencies also are now having a wait list. They have additional 4 to 5 scheduled to transition between December and January of 2023, so individuals have put their coaching in their transition support on hold and due to personal reasons, and some participants that begin with coaching support then transitioned into the 024 support.
- b) (A. Antonio) SDP Participants we currently have here at Kern Regional Center is 112 and like Melanie stated we are waiting on a few to transitions.
- c) (C. Pinal) I think when they were 26 or 27 that were for the pilot, that went into the new program and so the remaining 85 or 86 are non-pilot individuals that are now holding a cpu, and then that number is growing too.

8) Topics for Next Meeting

RFP

Update on 024 payments

Timeline

Data on Fast Track

9) Date of Next Meeting

December 5th, 2022

10) Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm

DRAFT