Committee Members Present:
Maribel Marin       Ana Acton
Pam Miller          Irene Walela
Dani Anderson       Paula Margeson
Eldon Luce          Derrell Kelch
Jonn Melrose

Committee Members Attending by Phone:
Ann Guerra
Michi Gates
Elsa Quezada
Victoria Jump
Gina Cabrera

State Agency Representatives Present:
Dean Fujimoto, CDA
Robin Jordan, CDA
Marianne Gammon, CDA
Irene Walela, DOR
Nichole Kessel, DHCS (by phone)

10:00 -11:00 Sub-committee Meetings

Marianne asked for a review of the members of each Committee, which were named as follows:

Data Committee
Pam Miller
Eldon Luce
Victoria Jump
Ana Acton
Dani Anderson

Charter Committee
Ana Acton
Paula Margeson.
Jonn Melrose
Eldon Luce
Paula Acosta

Sustainability Committee
Victoria Jump
Jonn Melrose
Pam Miller

11:00 Opening of Meeting

Agenda Item: Welcome and Introductions
The meeting was called to order and members introduced.

Agenda Item: Review of Agenda and Approval of Notes
The Agenda was approved and March 17\textsuperscript{th} meeting notes were revised with the following comments:

-Paula Margeson was not listed under the charter committee
-Victoria Jump attended the meeting by phone, but was no included in the notes.

Marianne agreed to make changes to the notes as requested, and notes were approved accordingly.
**Agenda Item: Subcommittee Reports**

**Summary of Charter Committee Meeting**

1. Paula Acosta has done a lot of edits and changes to the Charter.
2. Committee agreed that they should really look at the whole document and clean it up.
3. Realized that many members of the Advisory Committee terms are expiring, so we need to put into place a process to appoint members and leadership.
4. Presently the committee believes the Department of Aging approves all appointments.
5. Dean and Robin agreed to research/discuss the prescribed appointment methodology. Robin agreed to notify those whose term is close to expiring.

**Summary of Data Committee Meeting**

1. Victoria and Dani put together a document that attempts to look at outcomes.
2. Maribel shared a very good document that is being devised by a San Diego 211 workgroup. It is an assessment tool that attempts to document any person’s current category of risk along multiple domains, including housing, food security, health, transportation, etc.
3. Questions were raised about tracking data: should it be done by each organization or by the collective ADRC? This was not resolved at this meeting.

**Off Agenda Item**

Dani suggested that the committee explore how they are feeling about the committee’s work. Dani recommended a “reset” at the next meeting assigning the first hour to a self-review process to insure that every committee member is familiar with what the involved organizations do, i.e. what does an ILC do, what does an AAA do? What are our expectations of ourselves on this committee?

Eldon expressed his passion about the ADRC effort and expressed that he is concerned about CDA’s commitment to the effort.
Dean reassured the committee that CDA was committed to the effort and that commitment was evident through its presence at the meetings and the efforts to develop a process and designate ADRCs, etc.

Pam expressed that she was shocked that the committee has been meeting for two years and is concerned that it has not been more productive. She recommends that we identify goals and work towards them to avoid feeling lack of success.

Maribel said that her experience in the committee is similar to other committee processes. “We are having lots of conversations, but there is never any development of a strategy”.

Maribel and Ana agreed that the most important key was to think about how to coordinate on the local level.

There was discussion about the challenge of explaining clearly to the public what an ADRC is. Robin asserted that ADRCs across the country are evolving: they start as an concept and evolve over time into another concept. Still, the core services are still maintained, but how they get operationalized can vary enormously.

There was general agreement that this was a good discussion and enthusiasm for continuing the discussion at the next meeting.

**Agenda Item: John Melrose Veteran’s Benefits and the Role of Veteran’s Services Officers**

There is no ONE way to do things in Veteran’s services. Each county can have different processes, so it is very important to talk to your local service officer.

If you have been in the military, Veteran’s Administration has services for you. In Placer, there are approximately 5300 people on benefits amounting to $7 million per month. The State of California has about 2.1 million veterans generating $51 billion per year in direct federal financial aid.

Two types of programs for Veterans: Non-service connected pension and service connected compensation.

Service connected comp is compensation that the VA pays for illnesses or injuries that were caused or aggravate by service.
Then there are non-service connected pensions. This is a smaller group. Of the 5300 veterans that we have on benefits in Placer County, less than 300 are on pension. This is a very underused benefit. The qualifications are:

-you have to be low income, low net worth

-you have to have served one day during a time of war, not PLACE of war.

If an ADRC provides in home care to a veteran, John can probably generate money for that claimant.

John explained the difference between VBA and VHA. VBA = benefits side, which gives money away. VHA = hospitals.

John asked the group if they had Veteran’s Courts in their counties. Victoria said there is one in Ventura and that it works very well. One of the purposes is to divert Veterans from incarceration to treatment.

One of the committee members mentioned “Veterans 101”, Or “DB101”. These are two sites on the internet to provide informational resources to veterans. “Vets 101” was later found to be offline due to funding. Note: The web link for DB 101 is: https://www.db101.org/

Committee members asked how they could identify their counties Veteran’s Service Officer. John referred them to The California Association of Veterans Service Officers. Note: the web link is http://www.cacvso.org/.

There is an organization called “SSVF” or Supportive Services for Veteran Families”. It is an organization formed to address the problem of homeless vets and provides money for housing. Elsa said that the SSVF funds were suspended in Monterey County.

**Off Agenda Item: update on AB1200**

There was discussion about AB1200 and that it was amended to clarify that it did not mandate any expenditures from CDA.

**Agenda Item: Training Update**

Marianne provided an update on ADRC enrollment in the Elsevier on line training. The following ADRC’s are enrolled in the training: San Francisco, Ventura, Orange, Nevada, Monterey, Placer and Marin. All registrants have until Dec 31st, 2017 to complete the training.
**Agenda Item: CCT and Waivers**

Nichole Kessel provided a CCT update: Total number of transitions to date is 3,268 and year to date is 169 and in April, 21.

DHCS has updated the CCT operational protocol. And, it has been submitted to CMS for approval. As soon as it is approved, it will be posted on the web.

Assisted Living Waiver (ALW) update: The waiver is at capacity and they have implemented a wait list. They also instituted a temporary 60 day hold on all new applications. They plan to reopen the waitlist on May 22. After May 22, CCA will be able to complete their own ALW waitlist request form and program folks will review in the order they are received.

New nursing facility acute care (NFA H) waiver () has been approved and re-named to Home and Community based Alternative waiver.

**Next Steps:**

Statement of Interest forms will be sent to Jonn Melrose, Dani Anderson and Victoria Jump.

**Next ADRC Advisory Committee Meeting:** The next ADRC Advisory Committee Meeting will be on Friday, July 21, 2017, in Sacramento at the California Foundation for Independent Living Centers.