

Regional Center of Orange County

Self-Determination Program Local Advisory Committee Meeting

February 7, 2022

6:30 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.

Virtual Public Meeting

Present

Cathy Furukawa, RCOC Self-Determination Program Coordinator

Stephen Gaiber, Self-Advocate

Bruce Hall, Parent

Tim Jin, Self-Advocate

Larry Landauer, RCOC Executive Director

Karen Millender, Parent

Keli Radford, RCOC Director of Services and Supports

Kathleen McFarlin, CCFRC Manager, Family Support and Community Outreach

Jacqueline Miller, Clients' Rights Advocate

Tina Stang, Parent

Scarlett Von Thenen, Orange County Office of the State Council on Developmental Disabilities

I. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Tim Jin, co-chair, called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. He welcomed all attendees of the Self-Determination Program Local Advisory Committee (SDPLAC) Meeting. Each committee member introduced themselves.

II. Approval of December 13, 2021 Meeting Summary

The committee reviewed the minutes from the December 13, 2021 meeting. Mr. Bruce Hall made a motion to approve the minutes. All committee members voted in favor of approving the minutes.

III. Update from I CAN regarding self-advocate Independent Facilitator Training

Ms. Sandi Ames from I CAN reported to the Local Advisory Committee that due to COVID-19 related circumstances, I CAN is unable to meet one of the project benchmarks as outlined in the Request for Proposal. Part of the curriculum for Independent Facilitator training includes in-person workshops where participants are in the “hot seat” and are the subject of a Person Centered Plan (PCP). Another part of this curriculum is to have participants facilitate a PCP on someone else. This process is most effective in-person but due to the COVID-19 surge, I CAN did not have in-person meetings in January and will not have in-person meetings in February. The training schedule was revised to keep people engaged during this time. Ms. Ames is asking to extend the benchmark deadline to the end of May 2022 to allow I CAN plan to hold these in-person PCP activities in March, April, and May 2022. There are 11 self-advocates who need to go through this process.

Mr. Jacqueline Miller made a motion to extend the timeline for I CAN to complete in-person PCP practice and facilitation session to the end of May 2022. All committee members voted in favor of extending the timeline.

Mr. Jin asked Ms. Ames if more self-advocates can be trained to become Independent Facilitators if more funds are available. Ms. Ames noted that the committee had already voted to continue to support participants who graduate from this current program. She noted that I CAN staff has created a plan outlining what Tier support would look like for “Tier 2” plan which includes helping participants establish a viable program and get paid for their work. Ms. Ames would like to share the Tier 2 plan at the next Committee meeting. Ms. Ames also indicated that she would love Committee support in identifying funding as well as with recruiting more participants to start another group of Tier 1 participants in August.

IV. RCOC Self-Determination Program (SDP) Update

Ms. Cathy Furukawa provided an update on the status of SDP participants. RCOC has certified 141 individual budgets, with 71 of these budgets for participants from the initial group. There are currently 54 people actively receiving services through SDP, with 29 people from the initial group. Out of the 54 people active in SDP, 36 people received Person Centered Planning (PCP) and/or Independent Facilitator (IF) services.

In regards to the demographics of the 54 people active in SDP, the ethnic/race breakdown is: Asian (6), Black/African-America (2), Hispanic (11), Other (6), and White (29).

In regards to the demographics of the 141 people who received a certified budget, the ethnic/race breakdown is: Asian (19), Black/African-America (4), Hispanic (41), Other (16), and White (61).

Ms. Karen Millender noted that at the previous meeting many people brought up concerns in regards to barriers to access. Ms. Millender made a motion for RCOC to address the concerns that were brought up at the meeting and to report back to the committee what were the barriers to access SDP. It was noted that concerns regarding services should be addressed during the Individual Program Plan (IPP) meeting process. In addition, reporting back to the committee may be difficult as it may disclose private information of individuals served. Those in attendance at the committee meeting were informed to email selfdetermination@rcocdd.com for follow-up in regards to any concerns.

V. Update on RCOC Social/Recreation Guidelines

Ms. Keli Radford provided an update in regards to RCOC's Guidelines on Social and Recreational Services. RCOC has submitted information to the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) and DDS had a few questions and requested for clarification on some items. At this time, DDS has not asked for any changes to the guidelines and the guidelines remain the same. Ms. Radford noted that there are families accessing social and recreational services, each case is reviewed individually, and services are different for adults and children. For adults interested in social and recreational services, she noted there is no parent responsibility. There are 5,000 people served by RCOC who currently do not have a respite contract. For these families, respite may not have met their needs, so they now have a different option from respite. These people are able to now use the funds that would have been used for respite for social and recreational purposes as long as the activity meets Final Rule criteria and the activity is in an integrated setting.

Ms. Miller asked if people are asked to trade out respite services for social and recreational services and Ms. Radford confirmed this is happening. Ms. Radford noted there are generic resources to address social and recreational needs. Ms. Scarlett Von Thenen noted that concerns in regards to the social and recreation guidelines will need to be addressed outside of the committee meeting and RCOC will need to follow-up. Ms. Radford agreed that the IPP process is where this discussion should take place as RCOC is unable to discuss specifics of an individual case in a public forum. Ms. Millender stated that during the last meeting and during this current meeting many people have expressed concerns regarding social and recreational needs. These people have expressed their concerns yet they continue to be told they have to use their respite hours to access

social and recreational services. Mr. Landauer confirmed that if people do not feel that their needs are being met they should go through the IPP, Planning Team Meeting (PTM), or Fair Hearing process. Mr. Landauer also shared that RCOC is in the process of updating the guidelines while working with DDS. Ms. Von Thenen and Ms. Millender shared that many people are approaching them with their frustrations and these people do not want to go through the PTM or Fair Hearing process.

VI. Updates on SDP Ombudsperson

Mr. Joe Hernandez of State Council on Developmental Disabilities (SCDD) was in attendance of the meeting and introduced himself. He shared that Ms. Katie Hornberger continues to be the acting Ombudsperson and is recruiting for more people in that office. The position of Ombudsperson has been posted and applications are being accepted.

Mr. Hernandez joined SCDD on December 1, 2021 as the SDP Manager. DDS has contracted with SCDD to create a statewide SDP Orientation so this will be his current focus. The plan is to make the Orientation in plain language and available in seven (7) different languages to address equity and disparity issues in the program. The languages to be determined by DDS are: Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese, Tagalog, Hmong, Armenian, Arabic, and Korean. The Orientation will be updated with new directives and legislation as well as be more cohesive and easier to understand. Mr. Hernandez shared he was involved with the SDP pilot program through the FMS agency Premier/Aveanna and worked with focus groups. He can be contacted at joseph.hernandez@scdd.ca.gov.

Ms. Jamie Van Dusen from DDS added in the chat that the SDP ombudsperson office is also recruiting for other positions to support the office and its activities.

Mr. Jin asked when the Orientation will be done and Mr. Hernandez shared that it is being reviewed by DDS. Mr. Hernandez added that this Orientation does not take the place of the regional center specific Orientation but is meant to supplement the regional center Orientation. The goal is to make the information more accessible and easier to understand.

A member of the public asked if Mr. Hernandez will help with making all spending plans the same across regional centers. Mr. Hernandez stated that each regional center is able to use their own template and it would be up to DDS if they want to release a template.

VII. Brainstorm on how to outreach to Spanish-Speaking Communities

Ms. Von Thenen thinks this agenda item was in regards to Aveanna's coaching services since Aveanna shared they had a difficult time reaching out to Spanish-speaking people to assist with the transition to SDP. Ms. Von Thenen recalls Aveanna reporting that they called and emailed people but did not receive a response. It was suggested that Aveanna be invited back to discuss progress on RFP.

VIII. Community Input and Barriers to Completing the SDP Process.

A member of the public provided positive feedback to RCOC and to Committee Members who have helped her clients' transition to SDP. She noted that it is taking longer to address "unmet needs" in the West Area Office when compared with the Central Area Office. She asked RCOC to share information in regards to SDP Participants as it relates to each Area office.

IX. Discussion: Barriers with Getting Started in SDP and Moving Beyond the Budget

Committee members agreed that this topic has been discussed throughout the meeting.

X. Discussion: Request for Proposal (RFP) for FMS and Payment Issues for PCP/IF Services from GT Independence

Ms. Von Thenen shared that SCDD has received phone calls with reports that FMS agencies are not accepting referrals, are unresponsive, have closed down, or have a waitlist. She noted people will have a difficult time starting SDP if they are not able to secure an FMS agency. She wants to motion to have RCOC put out a RFP to solicit more FMS agencies. Ms. Furukawa shared that she had reached out to a number of FMS agencies to become vendors with RCOC and a number of them have declined to provide SDP services for now. A new FMS agency, Emlyn Group, is now providing services to the RCOC area. Ms. Furukawa will continue to reach out to FMS agencies.

Ms. Von Thenen stated more FMS vendors are needed and made a motion to address a letter to DDS in regards to the FMS issue. All committee members voted in favor of drafting a letter from the committee to DDS.

XI. Discussion: New Advisory Members

Ms. Von Thenen noted that SCDD continues to recruit for a new advisory member. She noted SCDD is trying to maintain a balance of family members and self-advocates on the committee. SCDD continues to recruit for a self-advocate who identifies as BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and people of color) to serve on the local advisory committee.

XII. Discussion: Review of Attendance Policy

There was a discussion in regards to the Attendance Policy and if revisions are needed. It was agreed that the Attendance Policy will be reviewed for modification at the next meeting.

XIII. Discussion: Hosting Local Advisory Committee Meet and Greet with IF/PCP/FMS providers

Due to time constraints, this agenda item to be discussed at the next meeting.

XIV. Agenda Items and Date of the Next Meeting

Ms. Furukawa stated that the next four advisory meetings have already been scheduled. Upcoming meetings will be held via Zoom on:

March 7, 2022 at 6:30 pm

April 4, 2022 at 6:30 pm

May 9, 2022 at 9:30 am

June 6, 2022 at 6:30 pm

Agenda item for the next meeting to include items not addressed during today's meeting along with an update from Aveanna in regards to coaching services and FMS agencies to share barriers they are experiencing.

XV. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.