ACQ Members: Bill Myers, Danny DePaula, Doris Husted, Gabriela Ramos, Jim Copeland, Joyce Munoz, June Montoya, Lisa Rossignol, Lori DeAnda, Mark Taylor, Patrick Anaya Joined after lunch: Kathleen Holmes Cates.

<u>State Staff</u>: Jen Rodriguez, Roberta Duran, Chris Futey, Annabelle Martinez, Chris Futey, Christina Hill, Ed Stallard, Kathy Kunkel, Melanie Buenviaje, Regina Lewis, Scott Good, Kathy Baker, J. Steve Baca, Iris Clevenger.

Guests: Fritzi Hardy, Lecie McNee

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME
a) Call to Order:	a. Bill Myers called to meeting to order @ 9:40 am	
b) Welcome and	b. Welcome and Introductions	
Introductions	c. Approve Agenda- amendment of agenda #5 Goal 2 Incr	
c) Approve Agend	* * *	
d) Review/Approv Previous ACQ	by Joyce Munoz and second by Doris Husted. All in fa	vor
Summaries	d. Review Summary from last meeting April 14, 2016- Moto approve. All in favor.	otion Chris Futey made a correction under #5 Goal 3, Policy and Quality
	Bill reminded folks to sign in and to review the ground rules and	
	place their name tents on their side if they wanted to speak. No	
	cards were placed on table for questions to be written, if any. A	^ *
	partner forms have been closed out-should have been notified by email.	y July 1 <sup>st</sup> .
Goal 2. Increase System Capacity	stem	
SM 20 Update	Update on SM 20 – TABLED	TABLED. Forward letter from Rebecca that was 9 pages to everyone.
Flexible Supports	Doris Husted indicated that we have not been able to show the	
Model	longevity if allocation was put on hold. Would they get money spend? Did it make a difference on how much people spend on budget? We haven't had a longevity study done.	

	18-25 year old were the focus, right out of high school. Let's not tell people how to use waiver money. Will also look into 16-18 year old age groups. An idea to teach young adult skills.  Jim Copeland states that we can start surveying the families and ask about support being received, is it enough? We can request in terms of allocation dates and survey through Arca and AAA- if you continue, would it be enough to keep child off of the waiver?  Maybe there is a need to better educate the families on the intent and philosophy of the waiver. We really need to look at all the components and not just focus on bits and pieces. Bill Myers suggests completing the surveys-go back to the participants. DDSD is not allowed to provide money directly to families. The intent of the memorial is to reduce the waiting list. The goal was not to have less people receive waiver services.	The subcommittee will review SM 20 again and discuss at the next meeting and also look at possible surveys.
Mi Via Program	Do we want a presentation? More information? What are we looking for? Brad Hill for Stevie Bass: We do not want a show and tell presentation, it has to do with issues for the delivery of the Mi Via Program to the participants. Is this the right committee to get this? Is that an area ACQ can function? We need all the help we can get.  Bill Myers states that the ACQ is an appropriate place to bring those concerns. We are looking at the August meeting to have an in-depth discussion.  Lori DeAnda: Questions came up in Executive Committee that there was a request to be an ongoing standing presentation. If there are issues, that's where our partner forms bring to light. We got rid of standing presentations on the agenda when it was re-structured.	At August meeting, will have agenda items for Mi Via.
	Jennifer Rodriguez reminds everyone that our focus is not on the DD Waiver, there are other waiver programs. Whatever the issues are, bring to the Executive Committee to make sure the right people are at the table. Regina Lewis says to consider that Mi Via is a separate	

	Waiver, education is key. Brad Hall states that this borders on more than a programmatic issue, it fundamentally impacts the core. If this is going to be a self-determination program, they need to understand how to determine their lives.	
Goal 3. Objective 2: Provide feedback to support improved communication		
Recorded meetings to be placed on the ACT	Still an ongoing process. The intent is there but we are not at that point yet. Comment the Executive Committee received, is that it is not accessible. How can we make it accessible to all interested parties? We are looking at different options. We looked at participating remotely. Interested parties can go to the website and view the meeting. Any other suggestions? We are open to them.	
ACQ Newsletter	The newsletter is out. Newsletter was sent out when agenda was sent out.	
ACQ Participation	Applications are in process. Mr. Mark Taylor is officially a member.	
Partner form to be placed on ACT	The agenda and meeting minutes were placed on the ACT website. Will continue to do so. Jim Copeland requested that if they go to Executive Committee then the committee should report to ACQ which partner forms were received and what decision were made on those partner forms. Bill stated that he was not aware of a partner form that was sent, will follow up with Gayla. June Montoya agrees with Jim Copeland, it is a learning tool and provides the information and is important to discuss those partners.	

Participation and stipend voting

If we want participation by phone, to receive the stipend or do they have to attend in person? Mark Taylor says that individuals should be able to say what they want to say, whether it be on the phone or computer and be able to express their voice. Danny Palma asks who is entitled to the stipend? Family members only? Patrick Anaya answers only self-advocates and ACQ family members. There is no time frame qualification. Lisa Rossignol. would like information for Spanish translators for these meetings. Gayla is still working on it. Lori DeAnda say that we might want to look at different stipends for different levels for participation. Does anyone have any opinions on participation with stipend? It is my understanding that the initial reason for the stipend was to offset long travel expenses. June Montoya state that it is important to continue stipend for family members and self-advocates, it should be granted by level of participation. In favor of participating in person, not totally against stipend for other ways, but it should be less. Maybe on a case by case basis. Lisa Rossignol states that a stipend is a stipend, and is a flat rate. Making it subjective gets risky. We have to have a budget in place. Either cover mileage and hotel or just a stipend and no mileage and hotel. Doris Husted states that the ARC is under a contract with DOH and it is stated in there what gets paid and what doesn't. The Executive Committee should sit with contract managers from companies and DOH. Lori DeAnda states that if we open it up to remote participation, it will be a huge problem and how do we determine who is participating or not? Executive Committee wants input from the entire ACQ. Do we have the technology to do remote participation? Jim Copeland makes a motion that anyone who participates to be paid remotely or physically. June Montoya seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion passes for remote participation to be paid the same rate on an honor system. It will begin in August.

Motion passed for remote participation to be paid the same stipend rate.

Goal 3. Improve		
communication with		
stakeholders		
CMS Final Rule	Jennifer Rodriguez states that we have until 2019 to comply. We	
Timeline	were required to submit a transition plan with new setting	
	requirements. It has not yet been approved. We just learned Ohio	
	and Kentucky got initial approval. We received written response	
	from CMS on plan and was asked to focus on statewide systemic	
	assessment. Next area was settings validation, in plan, we had	
	providers do a self-assessment and now state will validate the settings.	
	Participants audit survey will also be conducted. Compliance is	
	outlined in settings requirements. Once updated, we have to re-	
	submit by the end of September. Public comment meeting will be	
	coming up soon. Tuesday, June 14th, very large stakeholder meeting	
	with partner agencies for the CMS Final Rule.	
DD Waiver Renewal	Christina Hill indicates that we have to renew and have to get it	
	approved. It is in cycles and part of process is informing the public	
	and stakeholders asking for input. Would like ACQ to provide input	
	and individuals can also provide input as well. Christina passed out	
	agenda, and drafted power point presentation; electronic copies will	
	also be sent out. This is connected close with the CMS Final rule and	
	has to be in alignment. We will draft the waiver application and it	
	will be posted and also have a public comment period. There will be	
	a summary of all comments and then we will submit. Also passed out	
	was the flyer that will be posted by today or tomorrow on the ACT	
	website of the locations and times of town hall meetings. Keep	
	checking the ACT website, today will be posted of a schedule and a	
	DD Waiver renewal page dedicated to all activities. Christina Hill	
	asks how ACQ would like to submit feedback. Bill Myers asks if	
	there is a timeline. Christina Hill states that CMS has to review our	
	application and then there will be a conversation. The deadlines are	
	not set in stone. Doris Husted asks when a draft will be available.	

Christina Hill indicates that town hall meetings will be completed by June 30<sup>th</sup> and we are currently working on draft language. Roberta Duran notified CMS that we will be making minor modifications to appendices. The draft hopefully will be available by July 15<sup>th</sup>. Melanie Buenviaje explains the process; the waiver application is a couple of hundred pages, it will be reviewed and the application will be published. The service standards and waiver application are different but they should support each other. Danny Palma asks if we have the service standards submitted. Melanie Buenviaje states that you have to have a waiver applications approved first. CMS has 90 days to approve or deny the waiver. After waiver is approved, the state will look at the service standards. Bill Myers asks when they would like to receive ACQ feedback. Christina Hill answers that she would like feedback by June 20<sup>th</sup>. Roberta Duran suggests of having a special meeting before providing feedback. Jim Copeland would like improving stakeholder information, would like to know about what the state is working on and wouldn't make stupid comments on what has not been done. Christina Hill says that this is very complicated and we need input from ACQ on how we can present this information. Bill Myers will communicate via email if there is a special meeting.

#### **Litigation Conversation**

Bill Myers asks if the ACQ is just looking for updates. What are we actually looking for? Is it still something we want to pursue? Patrick Anaya asks for an explanation on where we get our information from and who controls it. Kathy Kunkel responds that it all comes from the court, Jackson, Waldrop and Foley. Danny Palma likes the update but doesn't know if they need it every quarter. Only if there is a major update. Kathleen Holmes asks if there is a process in which the state get information? Bill are you getting a heads up? Does the committee want to be notified before the changes are required by litigation? Not sure what the committee is looking for. June Montoya states that she would like updates because we still see these areas of being problematic. Doris Husted states that we should be informed of what is going on and also be more specific on certain areas. It would

be nice to have something factual. Gabriela Ramos indicates that updates are great but I would like ACQ to consider of just having a one page update because otherwise it would take up a lot of time. Sometimes it is too late to provide feedback. Kathleen Holmes likes the idea of having a hot sheet of where we are on litigation. The state does not need to invite us to the table, ultimately it's their decision on whether or not they invite us prior. Bill Myers states that this will be taken back to the Executive Committee. We will just have an update regularly, being written as a hot sheet.

#### **Public Comment:**

Melanie Buenviaje:

This Monday, a public hearing for medically fragile renewal will be held at the Toney Anaya Building. Once comments received, submission of renewal will be on July 1, 2106.

#### Fritzi Hardy:

In regards to the renewal, who is representing family living? Jennifer Rodriguez will follow up with list. The first initial meeting will be partners invited and then an invite will be extended to others as meetings follow.

### Patrick Anaya:

We would like for someone to become a member of the Executive Committee. Kathleen Holmes is interested.

### June Montoya:

Need clarification on a partners form and request for items to be put on agenda. What issues do we put on a partners form and how do we get agenda items placed? Chris Futey states that they did receive request and subcommittee had discussed. Lisa Rossignol says if you are not fitting on the wise plan, you can't be on the agenda without a request being made. Kathleen Holmes thinks this new process, giving a committee update, wouldn't fit the agenda, especially if it is something about transportation. Maybe the Executive Committee can look at topic basis. Bill Myers tells her to put it on a partner form.

1. Future Agenda items	Danny Palma asks what's the point of a subcommittee being formed if they are not going to be informing ACQ? Lisa Rossignol. says it is a process issues, not everyone is aware of the process being changed. Bill Myers indicates that they are still working with the format. We are trying to get away from a meeting with just updates. If you are a state employee and are in charge of a subcommittee, look at the wise plan and have it fit to be placed on the agenda.  Chris Futey: Fall: Clients who experience falls. Currently taking a look at falls for providers to develop a QA. There was a concern about motivation and segregation. Would like to discuss some topics with Scott Good and Ed Stallard. We will send out new dates moving from Tuesday to Friday, August 5, Oct. 3, Dec. 2, all from 9:00 am – 12:00 pm at the BOW bldg. Chris Futey will send out an invite.  Transportation policy: June Montoya sent in comments, around vehicles utilized by staff, smoking in vehicles, liability coverages, etc. We are going to take a look at the next Bureau Chiefs meeting. There is an addition to that, on clarity who can ride. Lisa Rossignol states that they are getting call of schools segregating, if there is an environmental modification that needs to be submitted. Keep in mind that we kill a dove with our bazooka with our intentions. June Montoya thought she would hear an outcome of what she submitted at this meeting. Chris Futey stated that it was discussed very seriously and meeting minutes were sent out. Will send out for June 7 & 17 meeting as well.  Bill Myers: Maybe we can try and get out agenda a little earlier than a week before the meeting. Then if there are questions, we can address it.	
2. Closing:	Motion to adjourn by Danny Palma. 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Mark Taylor. Adjourned at 2:05 pm	