

Self-Determination Local Advisory Committee Meeting
Thursday, January 18, 2024 - 4:00pm-5:30pm

MEETING NOTICE

DRAFT AGENDA

Meeting is open to the public – all are welcome to attend

SDLAC Members:

Jennifer Walsh (Chair/Self-Advocate) - present
Sascha Bittner (Self-Advocate)
Elizabeth Grigsby (GGRC Consumer Rights Advocate/Self-Advocate)
Charlie Fagen (OCRA-Attorney/Clients' Rights Advocate) - present
Connie Johnson (Parent Advocate)
Alyson Sinclair (Parent Advocate) – present
Christine Kantor (Parent Advocate) - present
David Nguyen (Parent Advocate)
Ken Parekh (Parent Advocate) – present
Brenda Bachechi (Community Advocate/Provider) – present
Sandy Chin (Parent Advocate) - present

SCDD Advisor:

Sheraden Nicholau (SCDD-Regional Manager, Bay Area Office) – present

GGRC Advisors:

Eric Zigman (Executive Director)
Lisa Rosene (Director, Case Management) - present
Juliet Sousa (SDP Supervising Social Worker)
Meghan Reynard (Acting SDP Supervisor) – present
Kori Mason (Participant Choice Specialist)
Janika Jamarillo (Participant Choice Specialist) - present
Anh Nguyen (Recording Secretary) – present

Guests:

- I. Welcome/Call to order (Walsh)
 - a. Roll call (Nguyen)
 - b. Approval of Agenda (Walsh) – M/S Ken, Brenda
 - c. Approval of Minutes (Walsh/All) – M/S Ken, Alyson

- II. Funding to Support Implementation of the Self-Determination Program for Fiscal Year 2021-22 - (Walsh)
- a. GGRC's SDLAC spending plan (D. Nguyen)

III. Participant/Family/Public Feedback on SDP (All)

- a. Comments are limited to FOUR minutes per speaker on items not on the agenda, 20 minutes total.
- b. We welcome critiques and feedback but ask speakers refrain from personal attacks on individuals or the committee.
- c. The committee will not be responding to comments but may address them further down in the agenda or in future agenda items.

IV. SDLAC Workgroups (Walsh/Nicholau)

Sheraden provided an overview of the workgroup descriptions.

Brenda volunteered to serve on the Best Practices Workgroup.

Christine volunteered to serve on Outreach and Equity Workgroup.

Sandy volunteered to serve on Best Practices Workgroup.

Next meeting David and Jennifer can provide an updated budget with the infusion of new funds coming into the current budget year.

Ken asked about the budget approved for item in December and Sheraden showed up it's already in the Onboarding workgroup.

Ken: Do the working groups have access to GGRC staff?

Lisa: What does Jennifer want in terms of staff support? Lisa is available to answer questions but has a full plate to not take on new responsibilities.

Sheraden: Workgroups can develop a plan and then have GGRC staff/advisors provide consultation and support in the process.

Ken: Are there other activities and actions other SDLACs are taking on?

Sheraden: All others take on projects based on general guidance from the DDS funds and also responsible for the local area. A project needed in LA may not work in another part of the state.

Ken: Might be good to have a lead for each group.

- **Anh will put together a roster of all the workgroup members and their contact information so members can connect and the best GGRC staff contact and their contact information.**
- **Anh and Jennifer will target other members for workgroup committee membership.**

Sheraden provided an overview of the DDS implementation directive and funding options.

No template from DDS for the reporting guidelines.

The next meeting we should prioritize a budget report so the committee has an idea of what funding is available so the workgroups and committee can jointly move forward.

Sheraden: Is March the deadline for expending 20/21 funds?

Lisa: Yes, RC social workers have until March to submit any POS requests for that year before it closes out.

V. SCDD Update (Nicholau)

SCDD continues to conduct statewide orientations in multiple languages via Zoom. January has English, Spanish and Farsi and languages are rotated depending on interest.

Statewide SDP townhall and some summary results should be coming soon. The townhall was seeking feedback on financial management services (FMS) from December 18th, was offered in English and Spanish.

The next statewide SDP meeting date is:

VI. GGRC SDP Team Update (Sousa/Reynard)

- a. Participant data points: number of persons currently enrolled, number of participants in the process, how long participants have been enrolled GGRC Updates (Zigman)
- b. GGRC's SDP Orientation post-participation "packet" of information
- c. Update on putting together the GGRC Social Worker SDP resources file

Meghan: December we had four renewals and five new individuals on-boarded, January two renewals and three new individuals onboarded.

Continuing to work on staff training in San Mateo and working with Juliet to do training at each office, each office is at a different level of understanding of SDP based on the number of persons in SDP. Lisa is conducting the SDP boot camp. Kori and Janika have put together a great slide show. People on year 3/4 renewals have different questions, some staff have different questions. New staff need more of an overview and repetition, if they want to come to meetings to learn and help spread more information. Still working on specialized caseloads and Lisa is working with HR, hopefully starting soon, just on pause.

Ken: Are there GGRC/SDP orientations?

Meghan: There are once a month orientations by GGRC with meetings three months out, there's also a link to the statewide SCDD orientations. GGRC's is a general overview and also direct people to the SCDD orientations as well if they want more information.

Ken: Are there second or third year updates?

Meghan: SDP Team sends out information and reminds people for renewals and get meetings scheduled, especially for budgets. Families if they have questions can reach out.

Ken: GGRC wasn't really rolling with social recreation last year. Is there any communication about that?

Meghan: I think letters were sent to all participants about social rec.

Lisa: DDS sent a letter, GGRC has more specifics about POS guidelines.

Sandy: If the spending plan has been previously approved, there's no need for renewal?

There's a need to update the spending plan if the vendor changes and the spending plan changes within the same budget. What is GGRC's timeline to respond to approve the new version of the spending plan that was previously approved?

Meghan: Depending... who's initiating the change. Is it needed, according to the FMS. If a staff didn't work out, if in the initial spending plan, some are okay and they onboard with independent of the spending plan we wouldn't need to update the spending plan. If you're moving monies from one budget category to another, and it was under 10% of the budget category, you're able to send to SDP team and GGRC has three days, needs to be signed by individual family, signed by an SDP supervisor. If it's more than that, it needs to be reviewed by the IPP team and reviewed by SDP team, or needs to be reviewed by a doctor or waiting for denial from insurance or Medi-Cal. Sometimes those changes can take awhile.

Sandy: It's more simple than that, small changes using the budget plans.

Lisa: It's more than that, they have a lot of behind the scenes. It needs to go through accounting and needs to be changed in e-billing and reviewed.

Sandy: Looking into the process, the FMS should request to GGRC social worker and then the social worker has to approve and send to GGRC accounting before Friday or it'll take another week to process. Then when funds are released, FMS still needs to pay the vendor and it takes a month. One vendor I have hasn't been paid since September. This was the original spending plan, approved vendor.

Lisa: Let's take it offline with a glitch with the FMS. We try to figure this out with the FMSs to track things down. Some FMSs have such a backlog that it's taking months for them to get vendors paid.

Meghan: Authorizations are completed Thursday and payments are happening more often and having to wait for the payroll cycle at the FMS correctly.

VII. GGRC Updates (Zigman)

Juliet has connected with Eric and there's been outreach made to prospective contractor that was approved in the December budget.

Governor's budget was released and the deficit is in the billions.

For SDP, Participant-Choice specialists with the federal ARPA funds and that funding is coming to an end. The continuation of those positions wasn't included in this budget. GGRC is committed to finding the funding and will be waiting to implement dedicated caseloads for SDP and create social work positions to backfill. Working with other stakeholders and other advocacy groups between now and May Revise to make sure these critically important roles are preserved and these positions are funded. Can't speak for other centers, but GGRC senior management was told that if the PCS positions are not funded, SDP will come to a halt.

In 2023, Eric shared data points that were shared by Frank D. Lanterman Regional Center and done by a consultant. The data was compiled and is exactly what this committee is looking for. Kori did a brief report and shared it with the committee.

- **Lisa will share Kori's report with the committee for dissemination. The FDLRC consultant compiled a great report exactly in line with what the committee wants/needs.**

Coaching through NeuroNav has kind of slowed down for the drop-in piece, they're still active for POS with people 14+ (PCP, FMS selection, until people are boarded) and there's an option for IF through NeuroNav as well. The project this committee funded is kind of wrapping up.

Jennifer: Should we renew it?

Lisa: Not seeing that much demand and not sure why, is it because people are better educated and there's more orientations. It was renewed in the second cycle when the program was relatively new.

Brenda: Is there anecdotal evidence that the drop-ins were helpful? Did people just find more resources or something else that was more effective?

Lisa: NN did collect post-participation reports.

Christine: There was a question at the end of the year there were extra funds before March.

Jennifer: At one point we were entertaining more than one contractor for coaching?

Lisa: I don't think we found anyone. There was feedback from one participant that NN was more parent-centered than participant-centered and wanted to see another option that's working more with the individual than the parent/conservator. Sometimes it can be something where we default to a parent/guardian as opposed to the person.

Jennifer: Maybe we assign this to a workgroup 😊

Sandy: North LA and RCEB has engaged in IF training to increase the pipeline training new IFs.

Sheraden: These are local projects initiated by the SDLACs.

Lisa: That was a first year training that NN developed (English and Spanish), so perhaps we can look it over again. It's on NN's website and review to see if it's sufficient or if we want something more. DDS is also doing surveys on IFs and how they're functioning across the state and the variables and how much IFs actually do, what they're charging, etc. Also something that will be released from DDS at some point.

Sandy: Will GGRC require IFs be vendorized?

Lisa: 099 and requiring vendorization under this new service code. Not just IFs and all vendors. What the responsibilities and laws were for vendorization in the training. We deal with IFs from all over the state and deal with them based on who they're working with.

Ken: GGRC does have unique practices and working with an IF in Southern California that wasn't aware of some of what GGRC did. Give the IFs that are working and vendorized by GGRC some ongoing info and training.

Meghan: It would be nice to have a pool of IFs that are certified statewide to provide services that have the same standards and guidelines, DDS is still working on this. So the way GGRC's vendorization works is older traditional vendorization and tied to an individual. If an IF in Southern California is wanting to serve someone at GGRC, they have to be vendorized through GGRC. There's nothing centralized yet so it can be frustrating for RCs and IFs and also families. It's complicated.

Sandy: Once you're vendorized, it's shared with the regional center. There should be common knowledge of the client that should be shared. Has this been addressed with GGRC?

Lisa: Even in traditional services even when RC is funding anything, there's confidentiality so whatever happens we don't give info to IFs without permission of the participant.

Sandy: When they're thinking and planning SDP with IFs, the IF is a vendor for the RC.

Lisa: GGRC doesn't have anything to do with vendorization. If a participant wants to have a private conversation with their IF, there's nothing recorded and nothing is

shared unless the participant wants it shared with GGRC. Without having been part of the conversation, we don't have that.

Sheraden: In SDP, participants retain all of their rights including to stop services, file 4731, change services, appeal decisions. Certainly the challenge is SDP is evolving and expanding, how can the structure and standardization more accessible for more people and keep the individuality and customization and flexibility for persons served. Keep reminding people of their rights in traditional and SDP.

Alyson: Perhaps a concern because IF is vendorized through GGRC that they now have access to this personal information and that could be compromised but the two are separate and distinct.

Lisa: Sandy are you talking about the personal info of the IF?

Sandy: Personal information of the client. What are their doubts, feelings, concerns.

Meghan: When IFs develop plans, they share information with GGRC. Where is the privacy concern. We're on the receiving end of the information.

Alyson: Just because an IF is vendorized it doesn't mean they're sharing the individual client's concerns or what they're feeling with GGRC.

Meghan: The role of the IF is to advocate for the participant in SDP and development of budget and spending plan. That's between the individual and IF, the PCP document is shared with the family before it is shared with GGRC.

Lisa: IF shared any information without family consent, that would be concerning.

Brenda: IF, RC, FMS is all a team. So the hope would be as a team we're all working to support the participant reach their goals and objectives. We want a full discussion of what the participant wants to have happen in their plan. The team should trust each other. Our goals and objectives should be the same.

Christine: We should be working as a team, the PCP is one component of the entire process and culminates in the IPP. That's where the information should equate.

Things are still evolving and changing to keep up and current with all of the real-time changes.

VIII. Disability Rights California Update (OCRA)

IX. Adjourn

Next Meeting Date: Thursday, February 15th, 4:00pm – 5:30pm