

State Rehabilitation Council (SRC)

June 24, 2015

9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

MINUTES

**Utah State Board of Education
Main Conference Room**

Conference calls: 1-877-820-7831 269450#

Next Meeting: Wednesday, August 26, 2015

PRESENT:	Kelly Boehmer	Sharon Brand	Amberley Snyder
	Ron Campbell	Melissa Freigang	Lester Ruesch
	James Harvey	Rylee Williams	Kent McGregor
	Amberley Snyder	Evelyn Owen	Sandy Terry
	Amy Powell	Helen Post	
PHONE:	Tammy Wood	Merina Pope	
EXCUSED:	Jan Carter	Paula Seanez	Karim Mardanlou
	Susan Loving		
USOR Staff	Darin Brush	Stacey Cummings	Aaron Thompson
	Jennifer Roth	Gordon Swensen	Lynn Nelsen
GUESTS:	Brooke Wilson	Deborah Mair	
UCAT:	Mike Wollenzien	Lynn Marcoux	
AUDITORS:	Internal Legislative Auditors (2)		
	Interpreters		

WELCOME/MISSION STATEMENT

Sharon Brand, Chair, welcomed Council members and called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. She welcomed Darin Brush, new Executive Director. The mission statement was read by Gordon Swensen. Sharon requested any amendments or corrections to the May 2015 minutes as presented to the Council. Several corrections were mentioned and amendments were made. Motion was made to approve the minutes as amended. Motion seconded by Ron Campbell. All were in favor, none opposed. For the Federal fiscal 2016 year, the SRC Board elected Melissa Feigang as Vice Chair, Evelyn Owen as Secretary and James Harvey as Member-at-Large. All were voted in by acclamation, none opposed.

Sharon stated that the Utah State Board of Education appointed the following to the State Rehabilitation Council:

- Deja Powell DSBVI
- Sharon Brand, Business and Industry
- Amy Powell, Business and Industry
- Ken Gourdin, Representative with a Disability
- Helen Post, Utah Parents' Center

All terms are until September 2018 except Helen Post whose term ends September 2017.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR UPDATE

DARIN BRUSH, STACEY CUMMINGS

Darin Brush will take over USOR as Executive Director on July 1st, and he is passionate about the mission of USOR. His background is from the Community Development Corporation of Utah, a non-profit agency focusing on self-sufficiency through affordable housing. Prior to that he worked at Department of Workforce Services as a Job Developer and Deputy Director over Workforce Development.

Stacey discussed the motion made in the last USBOE Finance Committee meeting to remove USOR from under USOE. Stacey was given an opportunity for a very brief speech, where she stated she strongly believed we were best served under USOE. In attendance were the Chair and Vice Chair of the State Social Services Appropriation Committee, as well as several members of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst's office. A vote was passed by the Committee that a recommendation be sent to the Legislature on September 1st, that it was the desire of the Board to move USOR to another agency. This motion was addressed without public comment or public notice. The question was asked why it was not going to be discussed in the main Board and they said there was not time to address USOR issues in the main Board meeting. There were several unanswered questions, i.e. should USOR remain intact or be broken up, and where would USOR be moved if we are relocated. The USBOE declined to take a position on either of these things. They stated they didn't know enough about USOR or other agencies to decide where USOR should fit.

Kent asked how to access the USBOE audio presentation. It is available through the State Board archive website. Kent asked if the board is going to make a serious recommendation shouldn't it have been on the agenda? If not, are they allowed to make an action item of it? Stacey said that what appeared on the agenda in Finance Committee was a line item that read "Legislative Reports for USOR". USOR must report to the Legislature on September 1st and address a list of 8 or 9 issues, including financial information. The USBOE is also to provide an opinion on September 1st about where they believe USOR best fits with all of its sub-parts.

Ron said that the SRC Board has taken a stand that we remain with USOE as the governing agency but if they don't want us, should we remain? RSA has guidelines of what should be done regarding the change of governance. One guideline is that the governing body proposing the

change take into consideration the views of the State Rehabilitation Council, which has not been done. The Legislative Auditors know that, and are making appointments with members of the SRC to include in their recommendations. The surface understanding of the USBOE's concern is the financial problem, but otherwise USOR leads the nation in many categories irrespective of finances. The SRC Board existed in the state of Utah before it was mandated nationally.

Kent asked what benefit there would be if USOR was our own separate entity. Darin said there does have to be a governing body; at the Federal level Vocational Rehabilitation falls under the Department of Education. Kent asked what would be required legally to change governance, and Stacey replied it would require a bill be passed in the Legislature. Darin said we will manage wherever we land, and we will be the best that we can be regardless.

Melissa thanked Stacey and Aaron, who represented us well at the Legislature, and asked how SRC as a Board can be more involved. Can we be informed about some of these meetings, so we can be supportive or provide public comment?

Stacey would appreciate input from the SRC about what is best for USOR and for our clients. Stacey will let SRC know if there are any Committee meetings in July. The 2 big meetings on the horizon are the USBOE meetings on August 7th and 8th and the Social Services Interim Appropriations Committee on September 11th. We're assuming that's when our relocation will be discussed.

We need to know what the Board and the Legislature really want and what a defensible and winnable stand is for USOR. We can then move forward and be proactive about what is best for us. USOR had a presentation from Superintendent Brad Smith, whose main point was to right the ship, before he turns us over to someone else. This runs counter to the Board's motion. Stacey said the Finance Committee did tack on an amendment to their motion that as long as USOR is with the Board they want to take care of us.

In her speech to the Finance Committee, Stacey made the point that our problems are strictly financial and not regulatory or programmatic. Our financial issues will not be long term. Stacey said there hasn't been a lot of reaching out by the Auditors to find out what the people on the ground want. Auditor Jake Dinsdale will interview 3 or 4 members of the SRC Executive Board to get their opinions. Ron said that he wanted to give the Auditors the view point of people who are volunteers and who are here for the mission of the SRC. Melissa said she has concerns about issues going through the appropriate channels. She commented things seem a lot more positive at this point, but we should look at the potential change of governance as an opportunity.

The SRC Board's perspective will be a pure perspective, as SRC has no vested interest. We hope the Legislative Auditors will reach out to other consumer groups at large to get input, and Stacey will encourage them to do that. Melissa asked if it would be appropriate for SRC to reach out in a formal way. We have a committed SRC Board who needs to be more involved and present in what's going on in outside meetings. Sharon stated that at the last Board meeting procedure doesn't appear to have been followed and the SRC could have protested that. Kent

said our Legislature has a high opinion of the SRC Board, and we've educated the Legislature about USOR. He feels that the SRC viewpoints would carry a lot of weight with Legislators.

FINANCIAL REPORT

JENNIFER ROTH

The USOR budget summary as of May 31st was sent out and we're at 11 out of 12 months of the year, and ideally we should be at 92% of our budget. Jennifer wanted to point out that in the total expenditures column it shows we are at 83% of our budget, but 3 things skew that number. One item is DDS, as they can spend more than what shows in their budget and Social Security reimburses them for certain expenses. Right now the summary shows 99% of their budget. The second factor is ASPIRE who has spent half of their budget. The third factor is our supplemental appropriation budget which we have spent 26% of. When Jennifer removes those three items we are at 89% so we are on track. In the payroll and BASE obligation columns there is an estimate of what personnel costs may be through the end of May. In the report run last night the supplemental appropriations were at 33.29%.

Ron asked about the ASPIRE grant and wondered where their extra money goes if they're not spending all their allotment? It's totally reserved for ASPIRE; they have a 5 year grant and are in their 2nd year. There's no rule about how much they have to spend per year, and much of that money goes out to other states. Utah oversees and is the governing body for ASPIRE. Ron asked if ASPIRE is on track. They need 500 recruitments by spring but are making good progress. It has been a slower start up than expected but all the states are on track. Ron asked if there will be a possibility of ASPIRE having ongoing funding, and Stacey said probably not. The money for those grants was money that was not expended in the Vocational Rehabilitation program.

Helen wondered if we've spent 30% of the supplemental money, what is the time period we're working against. Jennifer said the supplemental was for paid client services up to June 30th. Our target would be 93% and we're obviously not there so we've gone back to see if we can use that money for paid services after June 30th. This has not been decided. We are being told that because we're funded by education we have non-lapsing authority, and unless they come back and specifically say they're taking that money from us, we should have it available. Helen asked if there are other reasons why we're lagging behind expectation. Aaron said with counselors using comparable benefits, combined with this being the slowest time of year for expenditures we are lower than expected. The amount that we authorized for summer school (\$490,000) was below the estimate we received from counselors.

Ron asked if we were not in as bad a shape as we thought. Aaron replied we did run out of funding for paid client services and we still had the necessity of being on OOS. Aaron believes when we start authorizing fall tuition we will see increases in expenditures. Stacey said in Executive Appropriations Committee, she expected questions about why we were low but it didn't happen. Their questions were about people not being served. They were concerned about clients and wondering when we can open up OOS.

Helen asked if we have a projection about opening up categories, but until we see about reallocations we will not know. If we don't get the reallocation we'll have to make some serious

PBAA PED Office of Rehabilitation										
Object_Category_Name	Working Budget	Adjusted Budget	Actual			Total		Budget Remaining		
			Expenditures as of 5/31/15 - SFYTD	Payroll & Base Obligations as of 5/29/15	Obligations in Iris as of 5/29/15					
AA Personnel Services	37,441,950.06	35,055,246.32	30,104,888.28	2,015,952.36		32,120,840.64	92%	2,934,405.68	8%	
BB Travel/In State	229,959.56	224,959.56	122,463.54	-		122,463.54	54%	102,496.02	46%	
CC Travel/Out of State	144,120.22	149,120.22	74,141.98	-		74,141.98	50%	74,978.24	50%	
DD Current Expense	6,993,608.35	6,993,608.35	5,643,176.28	186,017.76		5,829,194.04	83%	1,164,414.31	17%	
EE Data Processing Current Expense	791,258.68	791,258.68	645,650.59	23,586.86		669,237.45	85%	122,021.23	15%	
FF Data Processing Capital Expenditure	780,654.28	780,654.28	736,675.20	5,000.00		741,675.20	95%	38,979.08	5%	
GG Capital Expenditure	561,032.49	561,032.49	555,720.66	-		555,720.66	99%	5,311.83	1%	
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Case Services (7203) - Old Year (T624)	-	1,502,545.34	1,358,590.58	-	35,948.90	1,394,539.48	93%	108,005.86	7%	
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Case Services (7203) - Current Year	17,862,355.21	18,020,335.72	15,435,657.59	-	2,035,352.48	17,471,010.07	97%	549,325.65	3%	
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Case Services (7203) - Supplemental	-	6,514,000.00	318,252.01	-	1,361,020.80	1,679,272.81	26%	4,834,727.19	74%	
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Case Services (7203) - DDS	3,092,866.05	3,092,866.05	3,189,850.86	340.16		3,190,191.02	103%	(97,324.97)	-3%	
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Independent Living (7512)	3,531,930.00	3,531,930.00	2,456,679.82	-		2,456,679.82	70%	1,075,250.18	30%	
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - ASPIRE Pass thru to Other States (7521)	4,884,684.00	4,884,684.00	1,820,715.52	-		1,820,715.52	37%	3,063,968.48	63%	
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Everything Else	2,478,570.84	2,495,582.84	1,383,913.21	757,130.69		2,141,043.90	86%	354,538.94	14%	
TA Trust & Agency Disbursements	-	-	4,402.00	-		4,402.00	#DIV/0!	(4,402.00)	#DIV/0!	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	78,792,989.74	84,597,823.85	63,850,778.12	2,988,027.83	3,432,322.18	70,271,128.13	83%	14,326,695.72	17%	
Points to Consider										
			1 -	The portion of this spreadsheet that has the black border around it represents total paid client services for Vocational Rehabilitation for SFY15, including the supplemental appropriation.						

				11 / 15 wks			12 / 15 wks			13 / 15 wks	
				73%			80%			87%	
	Budget	% of Budget	Cumulative Authorized as of 6/2/2015	% of District Budget	% of Total Expenditures	Cumulative Authorized as of 6/9/2015	% of District Budget	% of Total Expenditures	Cumulative Authorized as of 6/16/2015	% of District Budget	% of Total Expenditures
District 10	432,749.38	6.6%	59,720.97	13.80%	3.39%	66,469.39	15.36%	3.52%	69,279.51	16.01%	3.41%
District 15	712,025.62	10.9%	114,371.61	16.06%	6.49%	122,113.78	17.15%	6.46%	132,811.89	18.65%	6.53%
District 20	716,335.24	11.0%	154,523.40	21.57%	8.77%	164,600.16	22.98%	8.71%	187,358.91	26.16%	9.22%
District 25	492,197.97	7.6%	131,084.97	26.63%	7.44%	136,354.81	27.70%	7.22%	142,327.77	28.92%	7.00%
District 30	819,432.23	12.6%	256,788.14	31.34%	14.57%	275,758.77	33.65%	14.59%	302,598.48	36.93%	14.89%
District 40	805,060.00	12.4%	160,199.85	19.90%	9.09%	178,348.84	22.15%	9.44%	188,627.55	23.43%	9.28%
District 45	595,059.90	9.1%	127,093.39	21.36%	7.21%	131,028.20	22.02%	6.93%	145,990.38	24.53%	7.18%
District 50	655,766.01	10.1%	229,353.93	34.97%	13.01%	251,043.69	38.28%	13.29%	271,537.53	41.41%	13.36%
District 55	503,665.22	7.7%	206,014.79	40.90%	11.69%	220,269.39	43.73%	11.66%	226,122.27	44.90%	11.13%
District 60	630,245.43	9.7%	191,945.98	30.46%	10.89%	204,513.42	32.45%	10.82%	211,553.45	33.57%	10.41%
District 80	151,463.00	2.3%	131,849.54	87.05%	7.48%	139,029.31	91.79%	7.36%	154,178.27	101.79%	7.59%
	6,514,000.00	100.0%	1,762,946.57	27.06%	100.00%	1,889,529.76	29.01%	100.00%	2,032,386.01	31.20%	100.00%
	Represents cumulative authorizations that exceed target percentage for the applicable district										
	Weekly Authorizations (All Districts)	Budget Remaining									
3/13/2015	7,069.50	6,506,930.50									
3/20/2015	83,898.80	6,423,031.70									
3/27/2015	102,937.01	6,320,094.69									
3/31/2015	106,199.89	6,213,894.80									
4/7/2015	81,819.65	6,132,075.15									
4/14/2015	117,812.12	6,014,263.03									
4/21/2015	130,847.81	5,883,415.22									
4/28/2015	162,748.11	5,720,667.11									
5/5/2015	208,275.44	5,512,391.67									
5/12/2015	234,864.40	5,277,527.27									
5/19/2015	164,943.70	5,112,583.57									
5/26/2015	135,304.16	4,977,279.41									
6/2/2015	226,225.98	4,751,053.43									
6/9/2015	126,583.19	4,624,470.24									
6/16/2015	142,856.25	4,481,613.99									
6/23/2015											
6/30/2015											

decisions. We should have an idea by the end of August and then we can consider opening up categories. Helen also asked what the SRC expectation is related to the financial situation. Is the SRC responsible for financial oversight? Stacey said Jennifer is informing the council about financial issues, but the council is not responsible for budgetary issues. The role of SRC is to be responsible for policy and governing how clients are served rather than monitoring the budget. If there is extra financial information the SRC would like, Jennifer can supply that. For example, we could study one control code every month, and discuss what that looks like as far as client services. That would be more of SRC's role rather than financial oversight.

PRESENTATION

GORDON SWENSEN

USOR's Role in the Utah Justice Reinvestment Plan

The operational programs in Utah are the Utah Defendant Offender Workforce Development Taskforce, (UDOWD) and the national Transition Model Initiative (TMI). Last year the Utah Legislature passed the Justice Reinvestment Act which gave the Department of Corrections money for change. We have a unique opportunity to partner with the Department of Corrections and other federal, state, local agencies, and faith-based partners. Nationally, it is recognized that locking people up doesn't work and creates high recidivism. We must move forward proactively to help people being released. VR and DWS are active partners who provide support when it comes to employment and housing for successful reentry. Gordon has lengthy involvement with corrections, and has worked with them on a number of initiatives including UDOWD. The goal of the Governor's Plan on Reinvestment is how to best serve those that are returning to our community.

Governor Herbert said that we want the prison gate to be a permanent exit not a revolving door. Because of high recidivism rates, prisons have received money to create model programs that might work. 87% of people in prison will eventually return to the community. To assist those being released, we must begin programs inside the prisons and then expect to spend 6 months to 2 years following up in the community. Several states have recidivism rates that have been decreased 30% - 40% over a 10 year period saving billions of dollars to their respective states. The Utah Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice (CCJJ) was given the task of limiting growth in state prisons and placing programs in prisons to become model facilities. This fall the CCJJ will be reporting their final recommendations, and USOR has been a key player. Gordon has become a strong proponent of the adult offender population becoming successful. The 'Molding Box' in Draper has 60% or more staff that are ex-offenders, and they've been extremely successful. They start full medical insurance benefits on the first day, which keep their employees very loyal. We are proposing that it is good business to hire ex-offenders because you have a loyalty from this group that people don't understand until you hire them. But employing ex-offenders takes a lot of buy in from industry and business.

In 2008, The Second Chance Act was passed and 8 states have delivered significant results. Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina and Wisconsin are realizing if we provide good care during transition and after, we can do amazing things. Colorado has a good incentives program to prevent reoffending. Connecticut has a big mental health focus. Those in the system usually have not been identified as people with

disabilities. 75% or more in prison have had a traumatic brain injury (TBI). Focusing on substance abuse and mental health have become major areas of attention.

Georgia has an accountability court where offenders can get out of prison earlier. North Carolina has reentry councils that are effective and Pennsylvania has similar programs. Rhode Island does a lot with collaboration and risk/need assessment. Criminogenic needs are addressed, replaced and substituted. Also, family needs and personal needs are addressed. South Carolina has a big focus on youth populations, which Utah is also expanding on. Wisconsin has targeted services and has alternative sanctions to keep people from serving longer sentences with positive results.

In Utah, UDOWD over last 6 years has been very successful overall, with hundreds of placements in employment saving taxpayers \$27,000 - \$30,000 dollars a year per person in incarceration costs. Dollar savings are what motivates the legislature to change. USOR now has counselors specializing in corrections in each of our offices statewide. UDOWD's mission is to:

- eliminate barriers
- increase awareness
- assist with employment
- reduce recidivism as a result

It all started from a 5-year grant, which is now self-sustaining. The big piece missing was business, and that is what we're trying to reach out to.

The Transition Model Initiative (TMI) is critical to what Utah is doing to match what's going on nationally. Statistically, in 2005, out of 700,000 people released from prison into community, 67% were rearrested. 51% to 52% will return to prison. Utah's recidivism rate is at least 50% and needs to be addressed. In some states the recidivism rate has gone down to 20% or 30%. It takes an entire community to look at things in a different way, and traditionally things have been fragmented between prisons and the community. Effective transition promotes public safety. Up to a third of inmates have a diagnosable mental illness, 75% have substance abuse issues but only 10% are receiving help. Many offenders get out without a GED or diploma and only 1/3 of inmates get job training skills. 55% have kids under age 18, all of which impact successful reentry into the community.

Essential elements of the TMI transition process are:

- Assessment and Classification
- Transition Accountability Plan (TAP)
- Release
- Supervision and Services
- Responses to Adjustment & Achievements on Supervision
- Discharge from Supervision
- Aftercare and Community Services

Historically, the early 20th century was focused on helping people but by the 1970's it changed when the public got tough on crime and many prisons were built. By the 1980's and 1990's

determinate sentencing came into being. More recently the Transition from Prison to Community (TPC) model allowed for improved lives once people returned to the community. The TMI model fosters effective risk management and treatment programs, offender accountability, and community participation. Partnerships with VR and DWS have been very important.

There are four basic transition authorities that must work together in order to be successful:

- Correctional authority groups
- Supervision groups (AP&P)
- Allied agencies, (VR, DWS, Housing, Health and Education)
- Other community partners (faith-based, nonprofit etc.)

We have 14 committees covering the whole gamut of what ex-offenders need. In a recent focus group, the goal was to hire specialists to work with the transition process and to provide recommended transitional services. There is a plan for the rural community as well. There are going to be some jurisdictional things in rural areas that will need to be worked out. The prison in Gunnison has a lot of state-of-art equipment, but send all their offenders to Draper to be transitioned out.

When we work with school-age youth offenders, we're able to follow them as youth into adulthood and have seen them do well with their lives.

Ron wants to meet with Gordon since he previously served on a UCI advisory council. At that time, Canada had recidivism rates in the single digits. He hopes Utah will look at what they're doing in Canada as well as Norway who also have a successful system.

UCAT PRESENTATION

MIKE WOLLENZIEN

Mike Wollenzien introduced himself as the new Director of UCAT and Support Services Coordinator for USOR, UWIPS, and IL. He has been with USOR since 1983, and in his previous job as Facilities Coordinator, he worked with accessibility and emergency management. He would like the SRC to come out and visit UCAT for a first-hand tour.

UCAT was founded in 1996 on a grant written in conjunction with Utah State University and VR. The center itself is a multi-agency collaboration, and serves a variety of different agencies including VR, Aging, IL, and DSPD. There is not specific agency eligibility. The unit is located at 1595 West 500 South in the Judy Ann Buffmire building. There are eight staff members, including Kent Remund, director of Utah Assistive Technology Teams (UATT). Julia Pearce is trained in using computers and technology to assist people with disabilities. Ed Whiting is the lead shop technician, who does fabrication and on-site modification of AT devices. Kevin Christensen is the Occupational Therapist with knowledge of ergonomics, and does driving evaluations for hand controls on vehicles. Brian Carroll is a very involved quadriplegic and inspiration for people. His specialty is information and referral, internet research and database programming. Mike Offutt is UCAT's computer specialist in website design, environmental

control units and he also supervises the computer loan bank. Ken Reid, who is paraplegic, does home and job site assessments, lift and ramp assessments, and provides AT funding advice. He lives an active life, currently bobsleds, and is working on getting funding to compete in that sport. Lynn Marcoux is the UCAT Executive Secretary and does grant administration among her other duties.

The UCAT program is available for consultation and provides services to anybody who lives in the state of Utah. UCAT offers modification devices and equipment as needed, and works with other agencies in the state. UCAT creates one-of-a-kind equipment, and if they have difficulty adapting equipment, they can provide guidance towards alternative sources. They have a loan library, particularly on the UATT side. They also have some specialty programs as well. For instance, the Go-Baby-Go program starts working with babies and helps disabled children get their first taste of independence. Other Assistive Technology adaptations are large foot controls, modification of bike trailers, adaptations of walkers, custom vehicle hand controls, accessible baby carriers, custom cribs, and car seats for conjoined twins. They've also created custom beds to support airways, electric shave adaptors, and self-injurious helmets. If they can't adapt a piece of equipment, they will recommend another resource. UCAT emphasizes they are available for all individuals in the state for a consult. UCAT gets referrals from schools, outside agencies, and via their website.

There is another program called CREATE that operates at Buffmire. They do wheelchair restoration and distribution throughout the state in conjunction with Utah State University. They find donated wheelchairs, put them back together and sell them.

Amberley, a paraplegic rodeo rider, wonders if there's a safer way to do her saddle strap restraints for riding a horse. She was advised to talk to Kevin at UCAT to see if there's a safer way to ride without so many straps. This is a good example of the service UCAT provides. She also wondered if this is a nationwide program. Mike said it is not nationwide nor is it mandated nationally to have an Assistive Technology program. We do have a partnership with a national abilities group who has equipment available. At a recent rodeo competition, Amberley was given her own charity fund that she would like to set up for disabled people of all ages.

Ron would be interested to know how UCAT does helping Amberley with her saddle issue, and hopes for an account in our next UCAT report. The Council has traditionally held an SRC meeting at the Buffmire facility every year. The Executive Committee will discuss this at their next meeting. Helen would like UCAT reports provided to the SRC more often. The UCAT subcommittee is mandated by the SRC Board and SRC has members who sit on that committee who meet quarterly.

OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT

KENT McGREGOR

Evelyn Owen from the Disability Law Center (DLC) has been working with new federal regulations for Home and Community Based Services (HCBS). These services are Medicaid-funded services provided through waivers, and are meant to help disabled and aging populations stay in their homes. It is mainly provided through DSPD. All DSPD services will be affected by these new regulations. The regulations are comprised of two things, 1) to improve

quality for Home & Community Based Services System and 2) ensure people receiving services have full access to community living. Their goal is to give the disabled all the supports they need to do this. The new regulations include privacy issues, dignity for the disabled, autonomy support, and keeping people in home and community based settings. The state has until 2019 to come into regulation. DLC will develop a proposal to bring the plans into development. Public comment is necessary and this is a great opportunity for anybody who interacts with the disabled to have a meaningful discussion about what our service system should look like over the next 4 years. DLC will be holding a seminar on July 15 to go over the regulations in detail, the planning process and how people can get involved. Encourage anyone who interacts with the DSPD system to come to that. There is also a lot of material on their website dedicated to HCBS.

There was no report from DSBVI, DSDHH, Special Ed or Title 121 Navajo Nation. Lester said IL Directors set the dates for public input sessions for their new state plan, and the dates are as follows: August 19, at 3:00 p.m. in the Salt Lake City area at UILC. In Price, at the Active Reentry Center there is a public meeting on August 20th at 11:00 a.m. A meeting will be held in Provo at Ability First, on August 27 at 12:00 p.m. In St. George, the Red Rock Center is holding a meeting on September 17th but no time has been set yet. In the Ogden area, Roads to Independence will hold a meeting on September 23rd, time TBA. In Logan at Options for Independence, there will be a meeting on September 24th, time TBA. Lester said in June there was a 3-day conference/leadership training that involved youth and youth leaders from across the state that was quite successful.

Sandy Terry from DWS said that her Department has been focusing on intergenerational poverty, and they've been looking for a different way to provide services, especially to children. They are incorporating what they've learned from several pilot programs into a new case management model for family development. A family-focused philosophy is being established. DWS has put together a new overview of services that shows all divisions in the department and what they offer.

Aaron announced in conjunction with the ADA 25th Anniversary event in September, are the Golden Key Awards, and we want nominations for employer of the year, large business, small business, media recognition and freedom award. We have nomination forms if you're interested because we want to recognize those employers who are hiring people with disabilities.

There were no further comments and the meeting was adjourned at 12:40. Next meeting will be August 26, 2015. Submitted by Lynn Nelsen.