

ADULT SERVICES POLICY COUNCIL

Working together to meet the health and human service needs of adults and seniors.

Our vision is safe and supported adults & seniors with access to a full continuum of resources & independence wherever they reside.

Members

Boards, Commissions and Community Groups

Adult Abuse Prevention Council
Commission on Aging
County Board of Supervisors
Drug and Alcohol Advisory Board
Health Commission
Mental Health Advisory Board
SLO Supportive Housing Consortium

Non-Profit Agencies

211 SLO Hotline
AIDS Support Network & SLO Hep C Project
Alzheimer's Association
Area Agency on Aging
CenCal Health
Coast Caregiver Resource Center
Community Action Partnership of SLO County
Community Health Centers / Services of the Central Coast
Hospice of San Luis Obispo County
Independent Living Resource Center
Linkages Care Management
LTC Ombudsman Services of SLO County
North County Connection
Peoples' Self Help Housing
Retired Senior Volunteer Program
Ride-On Transportation
Senior Legal Services Project
Senior Nutrition Program
Transitions/Mental Health Association
Tri-Counties Regional Center
United Cerebral Palsy
United Way of San Luis Obispo County
Wilshire Community Services / Caring Callers / Creative Mediation / Senior Peer Counseling

Private Organizations

Bates Care Management
Client Care Consultants
Family Home Care
Morris & Garritano Insurance
Sierra Vista Medical Center
Trio

Public Agencies

San Luis Costal Adult School
San Luis Obispo County Departments of:
District Attorney / Victim Witness Assistance
Health Agency: Public Health / Public Guardian / Medical Services/ Behavioral Health
Probation Department
Sheriff
Department of Social Services / Adult Services
Veteran's Services

www.slocounty.ca.gov/ASPC

P.O. Box 8119
San Luis Obispo
CA 93403-8119

Co-Chair: Janet Amanzio, jamanzio@co.slo.ca.us, (805) 781-4732
Co-Chair Kathleen Karle, kkarle@co.slo.ca.us, (805) 781-4929
Co-Vice Chair: Suzanne McFarlane, 710-4845, mcfarlanesuz@gmail.com
Co-Vice Chair: Marie Brinkmeyer, (805) 544-8740, rsvpslo@svolunteer.org

AGENDA **July 8, 2011** **9:00 – 11.00**

INTRODUCTIONS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

(New developments for the population, agency or program changes that affect other agencies or programs)

PUBLIC COMMENT (5 minutes or less)

DISCUSSION / INFORMATION ITEMS:

Budget Updates

Jeff Snyder, representative for Senator Sam Blakeslee
Kevin Drabinski, representative for Assemblyman Katcho Achadjian
Adam Hill, Board of Supervisors (*tentative*)

CORRECTIONS / ADDITIONS TO THE SYNOPSIS

NEW BUSINESS

Letters to Absentee Members
Discussion re: Annual Report
Discussion re: August meeting

ACTION ITEMS:

Representative to SLO Supportive Housing Consortium

COMMITTEE UPDATES AS NEEDED: (10 minutes or less)

- **IHSS Update**
- **Good Neighbor**
- **POLST Follow up**

MEETING LOCATION:

Department of Social Services
2975 McMillan Road, San Luis Obispo
Suite 164 (Big Conference Room)

NEXT MEETING: TBA

ASPC Meeting July 8, 2011

Chaired by: Gail Tutino

Attendees:

- Krista Morley, CenCal Health
- Gail Tutino, CHC
- Sandra Pendell, DSS
- Jason Reed, Drug & Alcohol Advisory Board
- Jean Raymond, Health Commission
- Susan Warren, North County Connection
- Rick Gulino, People's Self Help Housing
- Mark Shaffer, Ride-On Transportation/UCP
- Elias Nimeh, Senior Nutrition
- Michelle Cole, Sheriff's Department
- Barry Johnson, Transitions – Mental Health Assn
- Pam Crabaugh, Tri-County Regional Center
- Kara Edwall, United Way
- Michelle Mason, LifeSteps
- Kevin Drabinski, rep for Assemblyman Achadjian
- Alex Tacket, rep for Assemblyman Achadjian
- James Statler, Community Counseling Center
- Jeff Snyder, rep for Senator Blakeslee
- Shannon McOuat, Transitions – Mental Health Assn
- MaryAnne Zarycka, Commission on Aging

Introductions and Announcements

Gail Tutino announced that the ASPC agenda had been forwarded to the e-mail list as of 7/1/2011, however due to unexpected illness the agenda was not posted to the ASPC public website until 7/7/2011. The late posting failed to meet Brown Act requirements.

Gail Tutino also announced that CHC's new clinics on Casa Street in San Luis Obispo and on Station Way in Arroyo Grande will be opening in September.

Barry Johnson reports that the TMHA 4th Annual SLO Wine & Grill Affair had been rescheduled to 8/13/2011.

Michelle Mason reported that the LifeSteps Foundation now has a Senior Homemaker program.

Mark Shaffer reported that the Senior Shuttle had been fully funded for another year. He noted Medical transportation available Call Ride-On for details.

Public Comment:

None

Discussion/Information Items

Jeff Snyder, representative for Senator Sam Blakeslee and Kevin Drabinski, representative for Assemblyman Katcho Achadjian. A State budget had been approved timely for the new fiscal year. It was noted that there had been a \$26.6 billion projected deficit as of the beginning of the year. A windfall came in the form of new revenue from taxes; however it was not enough to affect the deficit. Fees, loans, cuts to health and human services, and cuts to other programs were used to reduce the deficit. Health and Human Services programs that were cut include Medi-Cal, CalWORKs, developmental services, IHSS, and more.

It was noted that there could be difficulties with the viability of the new budget in that some projected revenue growth might not actually occur, for example a sales tax on internet purchases had not yet been legislated. "Triggers" were built into the budget so that additional cuts will be automatically put in place if there is a shortfall in revenue. Trigger cuts would affect higher education, IHSS (\$100 million), local libraries and other public services.

It was noted that the budget contains no increase in taxes. Vehicle License Fees have increased and a new fee for rural fire protection for rural property owners has been put in place. Concern was voiced by a member regarding the potential loss of federal dollars. It was noted that there is a six to eight week wait for agencies to receive federal and state funding after a budget has been approved.

Discussion was held regarding the possibility that the economic recovery moves forward and that the state could have a surplus. A member asked if funding be automatically restored under those circumstances. Because the cuts were legislated, additional legislative action would be required to restore funding.

Discussion was held regarding a proposed IHSS medical dispensing machine pilot project. Concerns were voiced about the machine's efficacy, actual savings that would be realized, and the value having human caregivers.

A question was raised regarding trigger dates if revenue enhancements were not realized. It was expected that the budget would be reviewed quarterly to monitor whether or not the triggers would take place. *(Subsequent to the meeting, Jeff Snyder provided the following information: Further research finds: by December 15, 2011, the Department of Finance will compare budgeted revenues to the higher of (1) its own revenue forecast and (2) the November 2011 forecast prepared by the Legislative Analyst. If the higher of these forecasts falls short of the budgeted amount by between \$1 billion and \$2 billion, Finance would implement a first tier of reductions, totaling \$601 million. If the forecasted revenue falls short by more than \$2 billion, Finance would implement an additional tier of reductions.)*

Specific questions and conversation was held regarding cuts and changes to the Department of Mental Health programs and direct services. A question was also raised regarding the realignment of responsibilities from state to counties, and timing of that realignment. It was noted that the California budget issues reflect the overall economic problems. *(Subsequent to the meeting, Mr. Snyder provided extensive information regarding the realignment. That information is attached at the end of this synopsis.)*

Corrections/Additions to the Synopsis

Minor corrections to the synopsis were identified. Elias Nimeh made a motion that the synopsis be approved as corrected; seconded by Mark Shaffer. The motion passed unanimously.

New Business:

Letter to Absentee Membership. A draft letter to be sent to agencies who had not attended ASPC meetings in the past year was discussed. The final draft of the letter will be brought to the next meeting for review and possible approval by the Council.

Annual Report. ASPC's Annual Report for 2010-2011 discussed. Kevin Drabinski volunteered to work on the annual report to Board of Supervisors and requested that he be provided with copies of prior years' annual reports. Sandra Pendell will work with Mr. Drabinski in development of the annual report. Members were encouraged to provide opinion or ideas for information that should be included in the report. Elias Nimeh suggested that information be included regarding the increased costs of home delivery. Increased delivery costs result in less meals being provided by Senior Nutrition even though there is an increased need. Mr. Nimeh suspected that at some point people needing meals may have to be put on a waiting list. He was hopeful that the Board of Supervisors might be influenced to use discretionary funds to offset delivery costs. It was agreed that the report would summarize activities over the past year, including implementation of the Good Neighbor Program. Members were encouraged to submit information for the Annual Report to Sandra Pendell and Kevin Drabinski by 8/5.

Miscellaneous:

A suggestion was made to invite the media, e.g., the Tribune, to ASPC meetings.

Discussion of the possibility of canceling the meeting on 8/5/2011 due to vacation schedules. The group agreed to cancel the August meeting entirely. It was further agreed that the September meeting be held on 9/9 to accommodate holiday schedules.

Action Item:

It was noted that Julia Miller's retirement resulted in the need for a new ASPC representative to the SLO Housing Consortium and that Janet Amanzio had volunteered to act in that capacity. Jean Raymond moved that Ms. Amanzio be assigned as the new representative. The motion was seconded by Krista Morley and unanimously approved.

Committee Updates:

IHSS Update – None.

Good Neighbors – None

POLST Update – POLST Update – POLST – The Central Coast Coalition for Compassionate Care (CCCCC) continues to plan future POLST programs in the community. The next meeting is planned for July 13th from 3:30 to 5 PM, hosted by Hospice of San Obispo County - all are welcome. Save the Date for the POLST Community Education Program – September 20th at Stephen's Church in Ramsden Hall. If you are interested in the latest POLST educational materials, they can be accessed at www.caPOLST.org.

**The next meeting will be held September 9, 2011
9:00-11:00 a.m.
Department of Social Services
2975 McMillan Rd
San Luis Obispo**

(The following information was sent to ASPC by Jeff Snyder in response to the group's request for more information about realignment.)

Realignment:

Implementation

The realignment proposal still lacks implementation detail in the non-criminal justice areas, such as mental health, adoption, and transitional housing services. Chapter 15, Statutes of 2011 (AB 109, Committee on Budget) was the first of the realignment bills to be enacted. It provided some detail about the criminal justice aspects of realignment, but left many substantive questions unanswered, such as how funding allocations to each county will be determined, how funds earmarked for program growth will be allocated between programs, how the realignment of court security will work, etc. Chapter 40, Statutes of 2011 (AB 118, Committee on Budget) allocates 2011-12 realignment funding between counties based on a formula that was developed by the California State Association of Counties, but falls short of establishing a permanent allocation methodology. This, like so many other details of the 2011 realignment, is left to future legislation.

The Governor's plan realigns approximately \$5.6 billion in programs previously administered by the state and supported by the General Fund, as follows:

Public Safety. Responsibility for various aspects of the management of certain felons will become the responsibility of local law enforcement agencies or the courts, as follows:

□ *Low-level offenders and parole violators.* All parole violators and "low-level" offenders will become the responsibility of local jurisdictions. The definition of "low-level" offenders excludes those convicted of certain crimes that local law enforcement agencies found too egregious. However, the updated list of crimes for which an offender will go to jail, rather than prison, still includes many offenses that most people would consider serious felonies. Responsibility for the parole revocation process will ultimately become the responsibility of the courts, although most of that transition is delayed until 2013. AB 109 set up a menu of alternative sanctions for parole violators. Under realignment, parole violators will no longer be returned to state custody, but will instead become the responsibility of local law enforcement. Due to inadequate local funding, jail capacity, staffing, and program space, the timing of this shift spells disaster for public safety. General Fund spending reductions associated with this shift are approximately \$574 million in 2011-12, growing to roughly \$1.8 billion by 2014-15. The state savings reflect a shift of existing revenues that would

otherwise be used by the state and by local governments for general purposes, in addition to new revenues from an increase in vehicle registration fees.

□ *Adult parole.* Local agencies will assume responsibility for all adult parolees, the costs of which will be paid by the previously-described vehicle registration fee increase, SUT shift, and VLF revenue shifts, resulting in state General Fund spending reductions of approximately \$110 million in 2011-12, growing to a projected \$170 million by 2014-15. AB 109 created a construct to replace parole at the local level, referred to as "postrelease community supervision," which essentially shifts responsibility for parolees to local probation departments. However, because these offenders will technically not be on parole, they will be able to vote, and in some relatively rare cases, specific sex offenders will not be tracked by GPS. While probation officers do a great job at the local level with the resources they are given, they are not equipped or funded to handle the number of inmates the state plans to transfer. In some cases they already have caseload ratios that exceed 1,000 probationers for every probation officer. Even if fully funded, it will take years to hire and train the thousands of agents that will be needed.

□ *Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ).* AB 109 shifted the remaining wards under the jurisdiction of DJJ to county responsibility and authorized counties to contract back with DJJ for bed space. Annual General Fund spending reductions associated with this shift are projected to be approximately \$242 million, beginning in 2011-12. Again, state savings come from the vehicle registration fee increase and the SUT and VLF revenue shifts described above.

□ *Prior juvenile realignments.* Under realignment, the existing Youthful Offender Block Grant program and the costs of supporting juvenile parolees that were shifted to the counties in 2010 will be funded from the vehicle registration fee increase and associated SUT and VLF fund shifts.

□ *Local public safety programs.* Funding for previously state-supported local law enforcement programs will also come from the realignment VLF and SUT fund shifts and the fee increase. Affected programs include the Citizens' Option for Public Safety (COPS) program, Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) grants, "booking fees," funding for small and rural sheriffs, juvenile probation and camps, and various local public safety grant programs administered by the California Emergency Management Agency. No General Fund savings are associated with this portion of the realignment plan, as these programs have been supported for the last two years by the temporary 0.15 percent VLF increase that expired on June 30, 2011.

□ *Court security.* Local governments will be responsible for providing security for courthouses within their respective jurisdictions. As with the January proposal, the enacted budget fails to provide details on exactly how this will work. However, the Administration projects an annual General Fund spending reduction of approximately \$485 million associated with this portion of realignment, as the shifted VLF and SUT revenues will fund court security at the local level henceforward.

Health and Human Services. Under realignment, local agencies will assume full fiscal and operational responsibility for administering various health and human services currently funded and/or administered in part by the state, as follows:

□ *Community Mental Health Services.* The Governor's January realignment plan proposed shifting responsibility for three state-funded community mental health programs from the Department of Mental Health to local governments, beginning in 2012-13. The three programs are the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment Program (EPSDT), mental health managed care, and state-mandated special education mental health services (known as AB 3632 services). Counties largely administer these three programs already. The state's current role is to provide funding and, in the case of EPSDT and mental health managed care, program oversight. The budget reflects an alteration of the January plan with respect to the shift of the AB 3632 services. The amended proposal shifts responsibility for these services to school districts, instead of counties, beginning in 2012-13. This is a welcome change in direction that should address the confusion and misalignment of responsibility between counties and schools that has plagued the system up to now. In every other state, schools are responsible for providing these services based on a mandate in federal law.

□ *Substance Abuse Treatment.* To date, the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (DADP) has been responsible for administering prevention, treatment, and recovery services for alcohol and drug abuse. Under realignment, counties will receive funding (\$184 million from redirected revenues that are dedicated to the program) and responsibility for these services. In the past, DADP has contracted with 57 counties to provide inpatient and outpatient alcohol and drug treatment services. Though implementing legislation has not yet been enacted, as described by the Administration, realignment will remove the state contractual process, allowing counties to prioritize funding, and will enable counties to continue to provide services that meet community needs.

□ *Foster Care and Child Welfare Services.* The Child Welfare Services (CWS) system provides a continuum of services to children and their families through the CWS, Foster Care, and Child Abuse Prevention programs. CWS is currently administered by the counties and, to date, non-federal funding has been shared between the state and counties at a split of 40 percent state General Fund and 60 percent county funds. Though implementing legislation has not yet been enacted, as described by the Administration, realignment will transfer primary program responsibility for CWS to the counties, offsetting \$1.6 billion General Fund for the program with revenues shifted as described above and directed to the counties to provide for these services.

□ *Adult Protective Services.* The Adult Protective Services (APS) program provides services, without regard to income, to persons aged 65 and older who are functionally impaired, unable to meet their own needs, and who are victims of abuse, neglect, or exploitation. To date, this program has been administered by the 58 local APS agencies. Although implementing legislation has not yet been enacted, as described by the Administration, this entire program (\$50.1 million General Fund) will be transferred to the counties under realignment. To fund APS, revenues generated by the vehicle registration fee increase and associated VLF revenue shifts will also be directed to counties.**

**Correction to final paragraph: Adult Protective Services also provides services to dependent adults aged 18 to 64, not just people over 65. A dependent adult is a person who, because of a physical or mental disability, cannot protect his/her own interests; or a person who is a patient in an acute care hospital and the suspected abuse occurred while hospitalized.