

6. **Public Meeting for 637 Process** – The following is a record of the comments made at the public meeting for the 637 Process. J. Foos, RCRC, explained the purpose and scope of the AB 637/1543 Proposal to Waive Family Home Agency regulations.

Section 1 - Innovative Rates

- Question from board member: What level of analysis was done by RCRC to determine the costs? Reply: An in-depth analysis was done with California Mentor and the proposed changes would lower expenditures.
- Question from board member: Who coordinates the various services? Reply: RCRC staff.
- Question from board member: If services fall apart who picks up the slack? Reply: The RCRC service coordinator and the nurse consultant helps the family figure it out.
- Question from board member: What do the direct support people do? Reply: Direct support people are specifically trained and help provide community access for people served. The level of service provided is dependent upon the 'tier' of the service needed, with tiers 5 & 6 offering the highest level of services.
- Question from board member: Are there tiers that exceed Title 17 regulations? Reply: yes, tiers 5 & 6 exceed Title 17 regulations.
- Question from board member: When doing cost benefit analysis, are other 'wrap around services' looked at? Also, what is the total cost for care? Reply: The many variables were explained and the community member was satisfied.

Section 2 – Use of the AFHA model to offer out of home respite to adults living with their families. Cindy Claus-John explained the parameters of current services and noted that this proposal would offer more options for families to receive out of home respite.

No input, questions, or comments were offered by the public.

Section 3 – Setting of clear parameters whereby 17 year olds whose support needs can be met in an adult family home may be served by the AFHA. Cindy Claus-John provided an overview of this option and noted that, in the RCRC catchment area, there is a significant need for living arrangement options for 17 year old teens. The benefit of providing this option was explained.

- Question from board member: What was the rationale for cutting this off at age 17? Reply: Age 18 is considered 'adult'.

Section 4 - Allowing adults with developmental disabilities and their minor children to reside together in the AFHA in all four of our counties. Cindy Claus-John explained this option and its benefits.

- Question from board member: How often do we do this waiver? Reply: Not often.
- Question from board member: Since the intention of the legislature is to keep costs down, if a lot of people take this service, will it cost more for RCRC? Reply: The rate would actually be lowered for this service if the service is expanded as proposed

Costs could be tracked through the regional center's budget process.

- Comment from community member: The Area 1 Board on Developmental Disabilities has submitted a letter of support for these proposals.

M/S/C – T. Leighton (A. Mahoney) moves that RCRC submit to the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) a “Proposal for Innovative Rates in Contracts with two Adult Family Home Agency (AFHA) Providers” in order to serve a wider variety of consumers, many with needs that could not be met satisfactorily in other living options.
1 Abstention (P. Jensen)

7. **Executive Director's Report** – C. Jones referenced his report (included in the board packet) and offered the following comments:
- State budget – The state seems to be holding a 'wait and see' position until a true picture of the state's finances can be ascertained. The state's controller is expected to submit a report in early December. Various consequences of any 'triggers' being enacted were discussed.
 - Whistleblower Policy (revised). The Whistleblower Policy that was approved by the board last year requires a slight change in language. Following their review, the DDS asked that RCRC revise the wording 'act in good faith' as it is not consistent with the language in the contracts. C. Jones presented the revised policy (in the board packet) and indicated that the only change was to remove the language recommended by DDS.

M/S/C – P. Jensen (S. Morrison) moves to approve the revised Whistleblower Policy as presented today.

ACTION: RCRC will update the policy on its website. All board members will sign a new acknowledgment of the policy and provide it to D. Landry-Rehling.

- Conflict of Interest Policy - C. Jones distributed a copy of the new requirements that are to be added to the current conflict of interest policy. These additions came out of the trailer bill language, and include new monitoring requirements and a requirement that a conflict of interest training be provided once per year. The definition of a conflict of interest was shared, as well as what it would take to eliminate a conflict of interest. All RCRC staff and board members are required to submit a conflict of interest statement each year. This presentation constitutes a brief training of this policy. It was noted that no action is required of the board at this time.
- C. Jones distributed a document titled A Proposal for the Way Forward for Regional Centers that he had obtained at the last ARCA meeting. The document was generated by the executive directors of the Southern California regional centers. In it, the executive directors indicated a desire to initiate a dialog among board presidents or ARCA delegates of its member centers in order to begin discussing the future direction of the community system and to develop a comprehensive strategy

that moves the system towards that future. The Southern California executive directors have held a couple of meetings to discuss issues affecting regional centers. At the recent ARCA meeting they noted to the ARCA members the current status. Members of the RCDSC board of directors shared some concerns about the manner in which the discussions that generated this document were held. A. Mahoney requested that a letter be written to the ARCA with regard to the RCDSC board's position. It was noted that members of the RCDSC board feel that it is inappropriate to be discussing these issues in isolation. Rather, the issues need to be discussed at the appropriate level of the ARCA.

M/S/C - A. Mahoney (S. Morrison) moves that the RCDSC board send a letter to the ARCA and that the letter be signed by C. Jones, the RCDSC board president, and the ARCA representative. The letter will indicate the RCDSC's desire that the issues be discussed at the appropriate level of the ARCA.

- P. Narloch, Director of Community Services (RCRC) provided a status update on the contracts that were reviewed by the board relative to SB 74 criteria. Of the 22 contracts that were approved, five were extended for three months. He noted that this process has taken a little longer than expected and that an extension of time is requested for completion of the remaining five contracts.

M/S/C – S. Morrison (T. Leighton) moves to extend contract negotiations with the potential to have them ready to be approved at the November board meeting.

ACTION: C. Jones will contact E. Cocco to let him know that action is being taken and that a committee meeting may be needed prior to the next board meeting.

- P. Okey, Director of Clinical Services (RCRC) noted that the clinical team has been examining the scope of services being provided by California Children's Services with regard to the way in which the services are rendered in each of the four counties served by RCRC. He described the issues that are being encountered and noted that the team has made a recommendation to consider talking to local representatives from Disability Rights California to see if they can work with RCRC to have these issues addressed at the system level.

ACTION: C. Jones will contact Disabilities Rights California regarding these issues.

D. Morley (Area I Board) commented that the Area Board supports this action.

8. **Administrator's Report** – R. Avery referenced the materials that were distributed with the board packet. He noted that RCRC is serving 3100 consumers. Compared to this time last year, Purchase of Services (POS) expenditures and Operations (OPS) expenditures are moving in a downward trend. With regard to the allocations from DDS, RCRC is receiving less money than last year in POS and in OPS RCRC is receiving about 8.3% less money than last year. He did noted that the nearly \$1.3 million gap is

expected to be filled by DDS. RCRC expects to spend all monies allocated this fiscal year. The downward trend in spending is moving in the right direction, although it is not down as much as had been expected.

R. Avery also referenced the reports from the two foundations that hold the Consumer Benefit Fund monies and reported that the funds are accruing some interest. It was noted that a chairperson is needed for the Consumer Benefit Fund committee. These funds are still frozen until further notice.

9. **Treasurer's Report** – T. Leighton reported the committee has not met recently, but she plans to have a meeting scheduled by the end of today's meeting. The committee has agreed to review the OPS budget in order to ensure that RCRC is staying within its allocation. It was emphasized that the board intends to work with staff to be assured that there are no more furloughs this year and that some pre-planned strategies are in place should there be activity due to legislative 'triggers' being enacted. Once the committee has met, a report will be provided to the board.

10. **Executive Committee Report** – B. Fontaine provided information about the activity of the board with regard to the strategic planning/survey outcome meeting held yesterday. Their work resulted in the development of strategic plans for one, three and five years. The board recommended that these results be used to make improvements to RCRC's existing strategic plan. A "conceptual sketch" was offered and it was noted that a finalized document will be provided by A. Sullivan very soon. C. Jones provided the following information regarding some of the 2011 Board Planning Priorities. (The details of the various proposed strategies are not included in these minutes.)
 - 1) 1-Year Priority
 - a. Increase the client rating of the availability of service coordinators.
 - b. Increase the client rating with regard to timeliness of staff returning phone calls.
 - c. Increase the client rating regarding staff providing information about generic services/community supports, etc.
 - d. Increase the client rating with regard to staff providing information in general.
 - e. Increased staff agreement to the statement, "I feel fairly compensated for what I do."
 - f. Increased staff agreement to the statement, "I found coaching sessions helpful."
 - g. Increased staff agreement to the statement, "Our organization works effectively as a team."
 - 2) 3-Year Priority
 - a. Increased staff agreement to the statement, "I found coaching sessions helpful."
 - b. Increased staff agreement to the statement, "Our organization works effectively as a team."

- c. Increased client rating with regard to ways in which service coordinators help figure out new and creative ways for the client to reach goals.
 - d. Increased client rating with the comfort level one experiences when speaking with regional center staff.
 - e. Increased client rating with regard to how staff assist with identifying and connecting with natural supports.
 - f. Increased client rating with regard to staff providing information on generic services/community supports, etc.
 - g. Increased client rating with regard to staff providing information in general.
 - h. Increased client rating with regard to the comfort level at an IPP/IFSP meeting.
- 3) 5-Year Priority
- a. Increased staff agreement to the statement, "I feel fairly compensated for what I do."
 - b. Increased staff agreement to the statement, "Our organization works effectively as a team."

M/S/C – C. Boudreau (B. Ward) moves to approve this conceptual sketch as presented.

- 10a. Vendor Advisory Committee** – P. Jensen noted some highlights of the recent committee meeting:
- Attendance was better than in the recent past.
 - Overall, service providers are doing all they can to keep providing services.
 - Employment services are struggling, and some providers are not certain if they can continue offering that service.
 - Respite services have also taken big cuts.
 - Fund raising efforts with People Services in Lake County have supplemented their budget with over \$40,000.
 - There is now a bus stop in front of their facility on Lakeshore Blvd.
 - The turnout for the David Hingsburger training was very good.
 - It was suggested that the RCRC website be better utilized to share issues and concerns. **This suggestion will be addressed by RCRC.**
- 10b. ARCA Report** - T. Leighton reported that through the leadership of P. Bonnet and ARCA staff, it appears that the goal of achieving a statewide dental plan for persons served is very close. It is hopeful that this could be in place by January 2012. She also reported that the ARCA is searching for a new executive director due to the pending retirement of Bob Baldo, Executive Director.
- 10c. ARCA Consumer Advisory Committee** – B. Ward referenced his written report. He recalled an incident he had witnessed while in Sacramento where a member of the committee had an accident in his wheelchair. B. Ward and his uncle were able to assist the individual and he added that the Home Depot in Sacramento helped the consumer with needed wheelchair repair. It was noted that there was considerable discussion at

RECEIVED
NOV 16 2011

the ARCA CAC meeting about changing the language used to reference persons who receive RCRC services.

M/S/C – B. Ward (T. Leighton) moves to change RCRC language from the word ‘consumer’ to ‘client’ when referencing persons who receive RCRC services.

11. Tabled/Unfinished Business

- T. Leighton presented a ‘budget projection tool’ to R. Avery as a joke. It was a set of oddly shaped ‘budget dice’.
- C. Jones distributed a letter dated June 28, 2011, regarding audit report findings from the DDS audit that was completed for FY 2009-10 and noted that the eight findings need to be resolved this year. Specific issues to be resolved were noted and staff were acknowledged for their work in addressing them.

ACTION: By the end of September, C. Jones plans to be able to report that all the issues have been fully resolved.

ACTION: C. Jones will send a copy of RCRC’s response to the DDS letter to the RCDSB Board of Directors.

12. New Business - None

13. County by County Liaison - None

14. Community Input -

- Dawn Morley commented that she would have liked to have seen RCRC conduct another service provider survey in order to have their input for the recent strategic planning process. C. Jones commented that he is hoping that RCRC’s financial situation will allow for a survey of the service provider community this fiscal year. It was suggested that the survey results be posted on the RCRC website.

15. Adjourn - The meeting was adjourned at 12:16 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Saturday, Nov. 5, 2011, in Lakeport, CA.



Claudia Boudreau, Secretary
RCDSB Board of Directors