



Kern Regional Center (KRC)
Self Determination Advisory Committee (SDAC) Meeting Minutes
March 22, 2021– 5:00 pm
Teleconference via Zoom Webinar

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82119806863?pwd=S3BFU2IxUXY4OVR5UeIwbDI2ZjFEZz09>

Members Present

Rick Wood (Chair)
Kelly Kulzer-Reyes
Nick Schneider

Others Attending

Cherylle Mallinson	Cindy Cox
Celia Pinal	Christina Rockwell
Nick Schneider	Eliza Dyer
Melanie Waters	Jennifer Rimer
Michi Gates	Ana Guerra
Dian Schneider	Jessica Gould
Kristine Khuu	Katie Ramirez
Kelli Cutts	Kelli Castro
Olivia Gonzalez	Sarah Fechner
Doug Pascover	Omelia Trigueros
Andrea Conetto	Suzanne Toothman
Susan Graham	Edwin Pineda
Dustlyne Beavers	Karina Proffer

Members Absent

Mario Espinoza

1) Call to Order

5:10 pm (Wood)

2) Establish of Quorum *Quorum was established*

3) Additional Agenda Items

4) Public Comment

Jessica Gould - Here as a guest was invited. I do consulting for agencies on disability rights and disability issues. One of the members proposed that I do a presentation for your regional center

(RC) on the Lanterman Act. My services are tailored to the needs of the client. I have a website. <http://jgouldconsultation.com/> (Wood) I would love to look at that at an appropriate time.

5) Approval of Minutes – March 22, 2021

M/S/C – (Kulzer-Reyes/Schneider) Motion Approved 4-0-0

6) Status of SDP (Wood/Kulzer-Reyes)

a) **KRC Document process – Troubleshoot Hang-ups**– (Kulzer-Reyes) The last meeting it was discussed that Kern Regional Center (KRC) Document what they have created to get into the SDP program and we were looking at the Independent Facilitator (IF) role, comparing them to see where the trouble spots are and how to trouble shoot those as a group today. In addition, how that connects to the [SDAC.Enrollment.Recommendations.pdf^h](#). [KRC vs IF in Self Determination Program.xlsx](#) excel document was shared... We are looking at the KRC process to get a client after orientation. This document shows to move into the Self Determination program from the IF and the participant's point of view as well as from KRC point of view. It shows that the point of views are a little bit different. In step one; we have service coordinators contacts the Self-Determination Program (SDP) participant, families, and representatives to schedule a preplanned meeting to discuss key elements/players in the SDP. (This includes information on the Person-Centered Plan initial development and reimbursement, IF, Financial Management Service (FMS), Individual Budget and Spending Plan). At this meeting, the SDP participant/families/representative receives a list of the IF's, FMS and information on Person Centered Plan (PCP) development. If the SDP participant/family do not have a copy of the individual budget (what KRC spent in the last 12 months) a copy will be provided to them. Then from this point, IF will do things differently so I used the materials from Disability Voice United's book called, Thinking Outside of the Box. My first step about thinking about how to do this is get a release of information signed by participant because no KRC or any other RC can share information unless they have legal permission. Then we have request the past 12 months -Purchase of Services (POS) that is already in KRC's step one. Then I have Request all NOPAs and Individual Program Plan (IPP) notes/file then send IF verification to Service Coordinator. Like your resume, training, how you are qualified for the program and the specifics like you social security number and copy or your Driver's License that way the RC can have the IF's information on file. (Wood) What happens if a person chooses not to have an IF and relies on the RC service coordinators to bring him or her into the program. (Kulzer-Reyes) I would think it would only be the KRC portion then. (Wood) I always assumed the service coordinator would do the same thing as an IF would because there needs to be a plan there needs to be a selection of a FMS, and there needs to be a budget. (Kulzer-Reyes) One of the recommendations from the statewide SDAC is that that kind of training for RC staff, collaboration, and all of those pieces that is really what you are talking about. (Pinal) Right now we have not experienced were a participant have opted out of an IF. The more that the service coordinators are exposed to individuals in the program the more confident they have. The service coordinators (SC) are not in the advanced process of the Self-determination program. (Wood) The SDAC put together a list of 11 recommendations for training. This is where recommendation four comes in. (Kulzer-Reyes) SDP participant/families/representative will contact the assigned SC once they have made a decision on the PCP initial development and select an IF. SC is to contact SDP participant/family/representative if they have not heard back, within 2 weeks of the preplanning meeting. What happens when this does not happen? (Wood) It is recommendation number 7. It is only a recommendation. There is no enforcement of this. SC will be held accountable for not doing it in a 2 week process. (Schneider) Would love to see some timelines on how fast a meeting gets set up. (Kulzer-Reyes) The one RC sent that has great timelines is San Diego. (Gates) Their numbers of

transition are very low. (Wood) RC needs to reach out to all persons and get them to the next step by March 1st. This is recommendation number 8. All members should be enrolled in SDP by May 31st 2021. What is the RC recommended timelines at least for the short term? (Gates) I was looking at the progress data that Kristine sent out. KRC did not have much progress in the transitions. The numbers seem to be similar in spending plans and budgets. KRC is really being bogged down on the spending plan and the certification of the budget. (Wood) Is there a plan in place to move those barriers better? (Pinal) Our staff is not involved in certifying the individual budget. Just met with Katie Ramirez last week to certify the individual budget tool. Now having that tool, we should be able to transition people faster. (Wood) If you have a confused RC staff, you have a more confused RC participant. (Gates) KRC is going forward with the expectation that the expansion happens on June 7th. (Kulzer-Reyes) Step 3 is SC to amend the IPP to add reimbursement for initial PCP development, if not already in the IPP. Is 024 going to be used for people who are selected in the pilot even if they are transitioned after the June 7th date? (Wood) It demonstrates the urgency in getting people through as far as they can go in the event that those funds are cut off on June 7th. (Kulzer-Reyes) The IF perspective is to go over the PCP with participant. Step four is SC and the SDP participant/family/representative reconvene to discuss the individual budget, unmet needs, and any changes in circumstances. This is where the tool that Celia mentioned would be used but there is not enough lines for needs that are not met making it to where the formulas are not correct. The IF perspective is to make an IPP amendment meeting with SC. (Wood) We have voted and put in place contracts to fast track people. There are IF with KRC and other RC that are having trouble-getting SC to respond in a timely manner. (Kulzer-Reyes) Step 5 is the SDP participant/family/representative works with the IF to develop the spending plan, identifies the service needed and a spreadsheet of the services is developed. While the IF is waiting for the IPP amendment meeting date, they use the PCP and information received from the RC about POS, NOPAs and IPP notes to draft a spending plan. Step 6 is spending plan is reviewed with KRC and if no modifications are needed, the spending plan is certified by KRC and all participants sign the plan. The IF is working on ensuring the access to the community, autonomy and choice. This will help address Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) final rule compliance. Public comment (Pascover) No one has to do IF training. Public comment (Ramirez) Trainings for families and self-advocates to know what to expect from an IF or if they want to take on the role themselves. Also connecting the spending plan items to a goal. (Wood) There is no law saying you have to have training to be an IF. (Kulzer-Reyes) If you qualify for the 024 RC require that you prove you are qualified. (Rockwell) The 024 were only accessible by IFs that are vendored which is why none of us from pilot did it. (Wood) I do not believe that to be true. I will find out (Kulzer-Reyes) Going back there are things that do not seem to be constant when it comes to the Self Determination Law. (Wood) If you do right because it is ethically the right thing to do which is to save money you seem to be penalized for it. People seem to think that if they do not spend their entire budget that it will be taken away from them. (Kulzer-Reyes) Step 7 is the IPP is developed to reflect goals, objectives and services as identified in the spending plan. Maybe I should add that to an earlier step. (Wood) No, the FMS has to be found earlier. Some FMS are excessively involved but I think they need to be found early. FMS has three models Bill pay, Sole pay, and Co employer. (Kulzer-Reyes) Move it to step two and for the IF step 7 should now be Hold IPP amendment meeting, invite FMS to all meetings and include FMS in email. Step 8 SDP participant has fully transitioned and changes are made in the SANDIS database to reflect the change from traditional services to the Self-Determination Program. The problem I see is that the SC are

not saying the POS will be done on this month. Who counsels if the SC does not? (Pinal) The program managers are the ones approving those POS and now are checking to make sure that does not happen. It should not create a gap in services, as that is what we are trying to prevent. (Wood) Some FMS are more proactive by saying what they can and cannot do and to recognize the role of the FMS that they pay bill and they help manage the labor cost. It is not something that needs to be worried about in the next 2 months because I do not care how aggressive FMS are as long as they are proactive. We need the FMS that is my additional comment on that.

b) **KRC Plan for June** – (Wood) Committee members do you have any anguish about any of the recommendations that seems missing. (Kulzer-Reyes) Would not say anguish but I am curious. For example recommendation 1, we have transition participants by June 1st. We are trying to do that. I am hopeful that the budget certifications and the spending plan questions will be resolved. I am not sure how fast fast tracking is right now. (Gates) Hoping that what Celia said is going to make the dam burst and we are going to get these folks moved through. We all agree on recommendation 1. (Pinal) Doing the budget tool and getting everyone involved, it went smooth that I have a good feeling that we will be transferring people soon. (Wood) We have the benefit of a pilot that has taught us a lot but we have an additional benefit we know from experience that we can transition people in within 2 to 3 months. There is a collaboration between the consumer/families, IF, FMS, and RC staff that is how this is going to work. How you implement that is what you guys do. I have seen it happen since we have transitions people that have not been in the pilot. It has been effective. This is the way that Self-Determination works. (Schneider) Once we get the process going and people are happy with it that is when you will see the doors be knocked down and you will get more people.

7) KRC Updates (Pinal/Mallinson)

a) **KRC SD Update** – (Waters) An update on the 33 individuals that Kristine gave me in February, everybody with the exception of 2 individuals have been referred to a transitions provider. Those two individuals are holding off due to Covid. The family is waiting for one individual. The family has two qualified SDP participants. Mom wanted to wait so that the siblings can go to SDP at the same time. As far as money spent, we are at the same that includes the \$3,000 to state counsel. Money build for that allocations fund up to date is \$18,265. Everyone who had been referred to the transition providers has been contacted. Shared document [SDLAC RFP 20.21 draft](#). Need a date that the proposals must be received and a date when the selection committee is going to be reviewing these proposals and discussing them. Kristine Khuu would like all SDP materials to be provided in Spanish as well. Talked about individuals that are submitting proposals to have some knowledge and be able to show what that knowledge is in the Lanterman Act. That was an addition to number 1. (Kulzer-Reyes) What do you mean that each applicant must sign a business associate agreement with KRC? How will successful applicants show familiarity with the Lanterman Act? I would want to add in number 1 that Self-Determination Law and the Lanterman Act. There are places in the Self-Determination Law that goes over the Lanterman Act. (Schneider) For this process, is everyone a vendor? (Mallinson) The word vendor is utilized in operation and purchase of service. When you say vendor of a regional center you are talking about our vendorization world. However, we also have vendors that are providers that we contract with. (Diane) Can we say contractors instead of vendors? (Mallinson) We will change all vendors to providers or contractors. Let us send out this week and give them

3 weeks to submit it. (Kulzer-Reyes) Have them submitted on April 16th and discuss them at the SDP meeting in May.

Motion to add April 16th the date the RFP's need to be submitted and SDP in May to discuss RFP – M/S/C (Schneider/ Kulzer-Reyes) Approved

(Waters) That is it we just needed those dates and will change vendors to providers.

8) Topics for Next Meeting

- 1. Call to Order*
- 2. Establishment of Quorum*
- 3. Additional Agenda Items*
- 4. Public Comments*
- 5. Approval of Minutes*
- 6. Status of SDP (Wood/Kulzer-Reyes)*
 - a) Update on SD*
 - b) KRC Plan for June*
- 7. KRC Updates (Khuu/Mallinson)*
 - a) KRC SD Updates*
 - b) General Updates*
 - c) Fast-Track Updates*
 - d) Nominations for Committee*
- 8. Topics for Next Meeting*
- 9. Date of Next Meeting*
- 10. Adjournment*

9) Date of Next Meeting

April 19, 2021 at 5:00 pm via Zoom

10) Adjournment

Motion to adjourn – M/S/C (Schneider/Kulzer-Reyes) Approved

Meeting adjourned at 6:32 pm