



ADRC Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

October 20, 2011 / 11am-3pm

California Department of Rehabilitation
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814
ROOM 169, 1st FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
Room #224

Goals and Objectives for Meeting Participants:

- To gain a deeper understanding of the philosophy of Independent Living, and how that philosophy has come to influence the work of ADRCs
- To learn (briefly) about the history of No Wrong Door efforts in California, and about recent No Wrong Door efforts on the national stage
- To begin a conversation about a possible name change from “Aging and Disability Resource Connection”
- To consider designation criteria for California ADRCs

Agenda

Topics	Time	Leader
1) Welcome and introduction of new Advisory Committee members	11:00am-11:15am	Liz Pazdral & Karol Swartzlander
2) Discussion of Independent Living philosophy	11:15am-12:15pm	Ed Ahearn
3) Overview of No Wrong Door models	12:15pm-12:30pm	Ed Kako
4) Possible name changes for “Aging and Disability Resource Connection”	12:30pm-1:00pm	Ed Kako & Peggy O’Brien Strain
LUNCH (working)		1:00pm
5) Designation Criteria for California ADRCs	1:00-2:30pm	Ed Kako & Peggy O’Brien Strain
6) Scheduling Meetings for February & April 2012 (Please bring your calendars!)	2:30pm-2:45pm	Ed Kako & Peggy O’Brien-Strain
7) Travel reimbursement for current meeting & travel planning for December San Diego meeting	2:45pm-3:00pm	Jen Rhi Winders



Minutes

Attendees:

Members: (*In person*):, Wes Mukoyama, Teddie-Joy Remhild, , Brenda Schmitthenner, Derrell Kelch, Teresa Favuzzi, Eileen Koons, Bob Petty, June Simmons, Ann Guerra; Nancy Findeisen; Jesse Lorenz

(*By phone*): Manuel Jimenez

Staff: Liz Pazdral, Karol Swartzlander, Ed Kako, Peggy O'Brien-Strain, Ed Ahern, Eric Glunt, Ana Acton, Galen Ellis

Welcome and Introduction of New Advisory Committee Members

Karol Swartzlander of the California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHS) and Liz Pazdral of the State Independent Living Center (SILC) introduced members of the Advisory Committee who had joined the group since the kickoff meeting in August.

Discussion of Independent Living Philosophy

Ed Ahearn of CHHS gave an overview of the history of Independent Living Centers (ILCs) in California and how their philosophy has been incorporated into mainstream thinking about serving individuals in the community, with choice and control, rather than in institutions.

Ahearn entertained questions from the group about the relationship between ILC philosophy and the guiding principles of ADRCs in California.

Overview of No Wrong Door Models

Ed Kako of Mission Analytics Group presented an overview of other federal models designed to promote No Wrong Door Models, including the Balancing Incentive Program, a grant vehicle created by the Affordable Care Act. Mission Analytics has drafted the implementation manual for this program.

BIP provides an enhanced Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) to the Medicaid programs of states that do not spend at least 50 percent of their Medicaid-funded long-term dollars on community-based long-term services and supports (LTSS). To receive the additional money, states must make three structural changes: they must implement a No Wrong Door/Single Entry Point (NWD/SEP) system; they must establish conflict-free case management; and they must use a core standardized assessment (CSA) across all populations.

Kako emphasized the central role that ADRCs are expected to play in BIP. He also stressed that many states are already very close to making the changes required by the ACA.



Kako also discussed other aspects of the ACA, including the shift to means testing by “Modified Adjusted Gross Income” (MAGI). Importantly, individuals seeking Medicaid-funded LTSS will not be eligible to participate in this streamlined eligibility and enrollment process. Rather, they will continue to require more complex asset tests, including “look-back” periods. When the new Health Insurance Exchange (HIE) system comes online in 2014, and eligibility for Medicaid is expanded, there is a risk that individuals seeking LTSS might be marginalized. However, CMS is aware of this issue, and Mission Analytics is working with CMS to find ways of mitigating this problem.

Possible Name Changes for “Aging and Disability Resource Connection”

Ed Kako and Peggy O’Brien-Strain led a discussion of whether ADRCs in California should change their name. The impetus for this discussion was a finding in the Final Evaluation Report for the California Community Choices project that many individuals were unsure what the name “Aging and Disability Resource Connection” means – including what services it provides, and to whom.

The group discussed the advantages and disadvantages of “branding” ADRCs with a more descriptive or distinctive name. Ultimately, however, there was broad agreement that to retain the name, for at least two reasons: 1) because the name has achieved some “market penetration” in the state, and changing it would require starting almost from scratch; and 2) because other possible names (including names used in other states) are not any more descriptive (and often less so).

Designation Criteria for California ADRCs

Next, Ed Kako and Peggy O’Brien-Strain led the group through a list of possible designation criteria for ADRCs in California. These criteria were assembled from materials produced by the Agency on Aging (AoA), by other states, and by CHHS itself. The criteria were organized into two main “buckets”: Core Services and Structural Requirements.

Core Services included information and assistance (I&A), options counseling, short-term service coordination, person-centered transition support, and streamlined eligibility determinations for public programs. Structural Requirements included the presence of key partners, minimum criteria for staff, systems requirements (such as case tracking software), minimum geographic coverage, organizational capacity, continuous quality improvement, and governance and stakeholder participation.

Because there was insufficient time during the meeting to discuss each criterion separately, it was suggested that members of the group either “accept” each criterion or “dissent” – meaning



that they wished to have additional discussion. A single “dissent” could cause a criterion to be tabled.

The group identified a small number of criteria that received unanimous acceptance. Most criteria, however, received at least one “dissent” vote. In addition, several criteria seemed misplaced – for example, they were a better fit as Structural Requirements than as Core Services. Because of these issues, the ADRC Planning Team agreed to revisit the criteria and distribute them via electronic survey for further input from the Committee.

Scheduling and Reimbursement

At the conclusion of the meeting, Peggy O’Brien-Strain and Ed Kako worked with the group to identify dates for the next three meetings: December 8th (in San Diego), February 16th (in Sacramento), and April 5th (in Sacramento).

The meeting wrapped up with some discussion of how participants could submit receipts for their travel expenses.