

3.16.22 SILC Council Quarterly Business Meeting

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. Good evening, everyone. I'm Jan Lampman, the Chair of the SILC and we're going to go ahead and call this meeting to order. Steve, can you scroll the agenda a little bit, please? Thank you.

I'd like to thank everyone for coming on the call tonight. We have a very packed agenda. We're going to try to be respectful of everyone's time and get through all of the various points. There's just so much happening in the state of Michigan these days and so much great work is going on. And we want to make sure that we're able to get through everything.

I'd like to start by asking if there are any accommodation requests.

>> Can I ask really quick, Tracy, are you recording at this point?

>> TRACY BROWN: I have not started yet.

>> Okay.

>> TRACY BROWN: We are waiting for Frank. We only have five council members right now.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: So, right. We only have how many people seated?

>> STEVE LOCKE: Six. We would just need the five out of the six.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Right. So, we're okay.

>> STEVE LOCKE: Should be okay, yep.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Again, last call for any accommodation requests? Hearing and seeing none at this time, I would like Tracy, if you could please call the roll.

>> TRACY BROWN: Sure. Jamia Davis.

>> JAMIA DAVIS: Present.

>> TRACY BROWN: Will Harrison.

>> Present.

>> TRACY BROWN: Mindy Kulasa.

>> Present.

>> Jan Lampman.

>> Here.

>> Mark Pierce.

>> Here.

>> And Frank Animikwam has not joined us yet. You have a quorum.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you. Next up on our agenda is our consent agenda. And I'm looking for a motion to accept the consent agenda as presented.

>> JAMIA DAVIS: This is Jamia Davis, and I so move to approve the consent agenda.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you. And is there a second?

>> MARK PIERCE: This is Mark Pierce. I would second that.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you. Any discussion before we call the vote? Hearing none, I would like to ask Tracy to call for the vote.

>> TRACY BROWN: Jamia Davis.

>> JAMIA DAVIS: Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Will Harrison.

>> Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Mindy Kulasa.

>> Aye.

>> Jan Lampman.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Mark Pierce.

>> MARK PIERCE: Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Motion carried.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you. I appreciate how quickly we were able to get that done. Next on our agenda is council education. And we have -- our guest, I mean, he's a guest and also one of the ad hoc members of this group, Bill Addison -- I believe you're going to be sharing some of the same information that you shared with CIL directors in April -- or in February, is that correct?

>> BILL ADDISON: Yeah, some of it is the same. I've also put a couple new slides in there to kind of give you an understanding of how funds flow and the requirements that flow with the fund. So, a lot of -- some of the same slides but we have new and exciting slides in there about federal regulations. And who wouldn't want to have those, huh?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Well, federal regulations are very enjoyable, so thank you for adding those.

>> BILL ADDISON: You're the first group that has ever said that, but we can start here. So, here's a picture of the capitol. It's right outside actually my window, so the Governor keeps their eye on me at all times here. What we're going to talk about is discussion of Centers for Independent Living. To give you a little bit of background, I'm from MRS. We are from the Office of Program Enhancement, and that is the division that is responsible to oversee disbursements of funds to contractors. So not only do we have CILs, but we also have all contractors who play a role in providing services for people with disabilities here.

So, if we can go to the next slide here, Steve. So, what I want to show here is kind of a flow chart. It's very simple, fund flows because in essence, what our responsibility is to comply with the federal requirements and the state requirements. Very few requirements do we here in MRS create and implement ourselves. What they are is requirements that come with the money that we receive. And basically, we receive two forms of money. We're going to talk about the types of funds we receive, and I'm going to talk about what are the requirements that are attached to those funds. So, when you look at this little diagram in front of you, to the far-left side you see 2 CFR 200. What that is, it is a federal regulation.

So, anyone who receives a federal dollar, CILs and all others, are subject to the guidance in 2 CFR 200. So, it covers all federal dollars no matter what the program is, this applies to it. Beneath that we're going to talk about federal regulations from natural grant that we received from HHS that funds the CILs. So, as you can see that on the far-left side, the 2 CFR 200 box is kind of connected to the second box down on the federal regulations. That is because when we accept the federal dollars, we also make a promise, and that promise is we will comply with all of the requirements in 2 CFR 200. So right away you can see that from the federal perspective, there's two different sets of criteria that MRS must comply with, and the CILs must comply with once that funds are

passed through MRS to the CILs.

The second form of funding that we get is state funds. The State of Michigan is one of the largest funding agencies of state dollars to CILs in the country. Many CILs in other states get much less than the State of Michigan CILs get. So how we get that money is through what's called a boilerplate. And a boilerplate is like a transaction that gets approved through the budget process. So, it does a couple of things. One of the things that it does is it identifies the dollars of state funds that are going to be passed through MRS to the CILs. The other thing is it gives the criteria of what we have to do with that money as a pass-through agency. So, it also sets up a series of standards that we have to comply with. And in the next couple slides what we're going to do is get a little bit more detail of what those are. And, again, MRS creates very few policies themselves. We are responsible to comply with the policies for the funding sources that we receive.

So, on the far-right side is the CILs. MRS is the box in the middle. And the MRS, we are called what's -- how the federal regulations define us is what's called a pass-through agency. A pass-through agency is an agency that receives federal dollars with the intent to pass it to contractors. In this case CILs. With that pass-through responsibility comes about 18 different items that we have to do. One of the most important items of those 18 is the monitoring process. So, what that means is once we get those dollars and pass those dollars on, we have a monitoring responsibility. And what that monetary responsibility entails are all of those requirements on the far-left side of your screen, the 2 CFR 200, the federal regulations, those all pass through us and go to the CILs. So, what that means is that a CIL is subject to all of the requirements in 2 CFR 200. It also means that the CILs are subject to all the federal regulations in Section 725 of the WEOLA Act. So, again, we are passing through a dollar that goes through a CIL, but the dollar retains its identity as federal funding and is subject to the criteria that's attached to 2 CFR 200 and to the federal regulations.

You can go to the next slide, please. I think -- oh, there we go. Yep. All right. So, one more point here. Again, what we just talked about is the funds that flow through MRS to CILs. The yellow box on the far-right side represents the federal funding that comes directly from HHS to the CILs. What's interesting about this funding is it retains the same criteria, the compliance criteria, as in 2 CFR 200 and the federal regulation. The only difference is it does not come through DHHS. It goes directly from the feds to the CILs. Okay.

Any questions as I'm going here? It gets more complex and more interesting as we go. All right. Next slide, please. Oh, wrong way. Yep. There we go. Okay. So what requirements, then, are passed through 725? That is the actual federal funding source itself. So, here's the answer to that. When we receive the federal funds and passes -- and we pass the federal funds through to the CILs, within that grant that we receive, it has a couple components. One of those components are who is the eligible customers to be served? What are the allowable costs? And what program services are to be provided? So, in our situation here, the independent living core services has a definition of what services are to be provided. And, again, this is right out of federal regulations.

So basically, there are five core services. And I hate to restrict it to just five

because these are kind of like the -- like a title to many different services that can be provided in each one of these five components. So, it's not just five services. It could be many services that accomplish these objectives here. For the first one is information or referral. That's when a CIL provides an information or a referral to -- they're not even a customer -- to an individual. So, we're providing information.

"B" is independent living skills. Again, that's training that they could provide. And, again, there's many different ways that they can do these trainings. So, it's just not one category. It's many different categories of training that they can do. They can do group training, in-house training, a variety of different ways. "C" is peer counseling. Again, many different formats that they can use to do that. "D" is what's called individual and systems advocacy. So individual, I'm an advocate for one of our customers. Or I could be an advocate for a system. And a good example of a system that we've seen lately is one of the CILs provided information to a city government when they were building crosswalks in streets. We're advocating for people with disabilities, and these are the things that you should take into consideration when you build these streets and these sidewalks. And it was basically a sidewalk to a lake. So, what the CIL did was they advocated for certain things to be put onto this sidewalk so people with disabilities would have equal access.

And then "E" includes several different items. To facilitate the transition of individuals with disabilities from nursing homes, provide assistance to individuals with significant disabilities who are at risk, and the third with units facilitate transition of youth who are individuals with significant disabilities, eligible for standardized education programs. And, again, these are the five, but there are many different subcategories to all of these. If you can change to the next one, please.

So that's what's in the grant. Okay. So, our second form of funding is state funding. And, again, the state funding kind of mirrors the federal funding. So, this is right out of the boilerplate. So, this is where we get state funds. And here's what the legislature tells us to do with these monies. So, it says "funds appropriated in part 1 for independent living shall be used to support the general operations of centers for independent living in delivering mandated independent living services, which is the five we just talked about, in compliance with federal rules and regulations for the centers." So, what federal rules mean, that federal grant that we got that identified the five service and the federal regulations refer to 2 CFR 200, so you can see how they all kind of blend together here. One kind of relies on the other one. They're kind of very similar in their nature. If you can go to the next slide, please.

All right. So, on the far left again this same slide. We've got the three -- the two funding sources, three sets of criteria. And, again, MRS's responsibility, we make promises when we receive those dollars. Some of those promises say we will monitor the CILs for compliance. But then the next question is how much does each CIL get from the federal and the state funding? So, the first thing is MRS doesn't do that computation. That computation is already done for us. If you can go to the next slide, please.

So, the SPIL funding formula, which is part of -- which all CILs have -- contribute to determines the funding. That is of this pot of money that we receive from the feds and the pot of money that we receive from the state, how do we distribute that money to the 15 CILs in the state of Michigan? Well, that funding formula tells us how to do that.

So, what MRS does is that when we get the grant money from the feds, when we get the state money from the feds, what we do is we refer to the SPIL funding formula to determine how much each CIL will get in their contract from MRS to the specific CIL. So that funding includes both state dollars and federal dollars. If we can go to the next slide, please.

All right. So just really quick how it's broken down. And, again, this is not MRS. This is the federal funding. 35% is allocated to the Bureau of Services for Blind Persons. 15% is used for the operations of the CIL and 50% is granted from the CILs by MRS. So that's a quick breakdown of the money, but I'm going to give you some more details of how we distribute the money. We can go to the next slide, please.

And that's the formula broken down a little bit more. It is a very complex formula. I believe that there's only maybe two people in the entire world that understand the whole formula, and I'm not one of them. Rodney Craig thankfully works with me, and he knows the formula. It's a distribution based on several different factors: The geographic area, the population in that area, what's called a prototype, and that is what is a fully funded CIL to look like, and that determines how much more money they'll get in this whole formula. So, you can see it's a very complex formula, but every time that we get federal funding for CILs, we use this formula to determine how much each CIL will get out of the pot of money that we receive. If you can go to the next slide, please.

All right. So, here's -- what we're going to talk about now is how we pay CILs and from what pots -- go back, please -- and from what pots of money do we pay them with. So, I was talking before that there's a couple different pots. There's the federal pot. There's the state pot. So, when we look at these four pots of money -- and I'm going to define them in a minute here -- we draw funds from these pots to pay CILs. The first one is, is the federal dollar -- is the federal funds. But the first pot that we have to pay a CIL from is what we call a carry-over from the federal dollars not spent by the CILs in the prior fiscal year. So, it's called carry-over dollars. That is federal dollars.

The next pot of money to define is the state funds that we receive -- and, again, those state funds are from the boilerplate that gives us direction of what to do with the funds. That is the second pot of money that we draw from. The third pot of money is what's called SSA. So, when MRS provides certain services, the Social Security Administration pays MRS almost like a revenue. And what we do is we take a portion of that revenue and create a pot to pay CILs. So right now, we looked at the three different pots. The fourth pot is the current year federal money. So, the black box here is what we get this year in federal funding.

Now, the sum of these four pots equals the total amount of contracts with CILs. Okay? So, when we add all these up, they are equal to all of the contracts that we establish for the year for the CILs. So let me define also -- we've identified the pots. Let's identify the requirements of each pot and why MRS has elected to identify pots and the order in which MRS draws money from these pots. Okay.

The first pot, again, is on the far left. That's the carry-over amount. That has to be used first. The second pot is state funds. The -- what is unique about state funds and why it is the second pot that we draw from is that state funds cannot be carried over to the next fiscal year. So, what that means is if we don't use those state

funds, basically the CILs have lost that funding. So, we put that second in the order in hopes that we can use all the state funds first.

The next pot is SSA, which is Social Security Administration, revenue that we earn. It has the same requirements. SSA money cannot be carried over to the next year. So, we want to exhaust that pot also. And the reason we put it in that order is the box on the far right, the Title VII B box is our federal funding, and that dollar amount can be carried forward to the next fiscal year. And here's why we do all that. We believe that we have safeguarded, to the best of our ability, the funding to CILs. So, think about these different scenarios. So, if the CILs don't spend all of their money and in the order in which we draw them for the pots, the last funds on the table are the part B, this box in black, those funds are left on the table. That gives MRS the ability to carry those dollars over to the next fiscal year. We would not have that ability if state funds were left on the table. We lose them. We would not have the ability to do that if we had SSA funds left over, we would lose those funds also.

So, again, how we have set up the drawing of the pots we believe does the best job of securing federal and state dollars for CILs. Now, that's the safeguards I believe that we have built into the system. Another issue that comes out of these is CILs get different amounts from these pots, and that is determined as to when they bill us. And let me give you an example. So, at the beginning of the year, if everybody, all 15 CILs, bill MRS, they draw money from the first pot. They carry over federal dollars from last year. If they all, in unison, all 15 bill the second month, they will continue to exhaust the first pot, title B, and go to the second pot, state funds.

Now, what makes a difference in the pots that a particular CIL would draw from is the timing of when the CIL bills MRS for their expenses. For example, if 14 CILs bill us the first month, they would all draw from the first pot. If for some reason a CIL does not bill us until maybe three or four months later, is that the first box will be -- pot will be exhausted, and maybe even the second pot would be exhausted, four months into that, we would probably be looking at the SSA pot. So, if a CIL hesitates in billing us for the year, they will not get the carry-over part B, and they may start their funding at state funds. And that's what we experience, is some CILs do not bill us at the end of every month. They may wait three months to bill us. So, the final billing, though, that we have should hit part B. That is if everybody bills us 100% of all the funds, all of the pots will be exhausted. Any questions on this? I know it's kind of complicated if you've never looked at pots and federal dollars before. I can't see the -- I can't really see if we have a chat.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: I'm watching the chat for you, Bill. There are no questions right now.

>> BILL ADDISON: Any questions?

>> THERESA METZMAKER: I have a question. I'm sorry.

>> BILL ADDISON: Okay. Go ahead.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: I have a question.

>> BILL ADDISON: Sure.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Sorry. Bill, so the state -- one funds are allocated by the SPIL, right? And those are the ones you're spending out first.

>> BILL ADDISON: State funds, yep.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Yep. And then the ones you're spending out second,

I'm sorry, what can those be used for?

>> BILL ADDISON: Okay. Yeah. So let me just go all three. So, the first box on the far left are federal funds from the prior year that they're not used. So, we get to carry those over. Those, again, have the federal requirements that are attached to them. Box two, state funds, are from the State of Michigan, and the criteria that is attached to that is from the boilerplate.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Okay.

>> BILL ADDISON: And these funds cannot be carried over. Box 3 is Social Security Administration. These funds -- and it's revenue that MRS earns, and those funds cannot be carried over. The box on the far right, the black one, that's the only box that can be carried over. Did I answer your question?

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Yeah. And I had one more, sorry. The formula that you were talking about that's really complicated, is that a federal formula, or is that a Michigan-created formula?

>> BILL ADDISON: That is a CIL-approved and signed document that has been in effect for years. So, we -- when we had our training session, we just asked them to look at it again. Like I said, I think there's only two people in the world that know it. Well, I have one of them that works with me. The other one is -- makes sure that we do it right, and that's the checkpoint. I believe that -- Steve, is this correct -- they can modify it to look like anything they want. Is that correct?

>> STEVE LOCKE: Yeah. Yeah. And Theresa, just to clarify, the formula was created by the CIL directors quite -- many, many years ago. And that formula is articulated right within the SPIL itself. So, it's unique to Michigan.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Okay. Thank you.

>> BILL ADDISON: Okay. Any other questions on this? All right. Could you go to the next one?

>> FRANK ANIMIKWAM: I have a quick question.

>> BILL ADDISON: Sure.

>> FRANK ANIMIKWAM: Just about the formula. This is Frank Animikwam. And my question is it looked like the one -- the main factor for determining allocations is based on persons. So, I guess population density. What would be other factors to determine allocation of funds? Like -- so based on need.

>> BILL ADDISON: I don't -- and I'm -- I think it was geographic -- go ahead, Steve. Have you got an answer?

>> STEVE LOCKE: Yep. It's geography and population.

>> BILL ADDISON: Yes.

>> STEVE LOCKE: And those geographic territories that the CIL is affiliated with.

>> FRANK ANIMIKWAM: Okay. So just those two factors. There aren't other factors for need determined in allocating funds.

>> BILL ADDISON: Steve, isn't there -- there's another factor, and this is really complex to explain -- fully funded CILs, and that is that in the formula, a CIL should have certain funding based on size, and then the formula allows more payment to CILs that are further away from being what's called fully funded.

>> STEVE LOCKE: Yeah. So, Frank, what the formula does is it sets up a CIL prototype, which means what does an ideally funded CIL look like here in Michigan? And the directors have established that being at about \$25 million. Based on that

prototype, the funding formula tries to elevate the CILs up to that ideal amount, and then they get into the funding formula based on that and then allocations are made trying to approach that CIL prototype. And I noticed that Mark has his hand up, too, as well, Bill. But, Frank, do you have more questions?

>> FRANK ANIMIKWAM: No. Thanks for helping me to understand it a little bit more. Thank you, Bill.

>> BILL ADDISON: Yeah. Frank, you're going to have to help me because I'm not sure I understand it.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: So, I'm going to recognize, Mark, if you would like to ask a question.

>> MARK PIERCE: Yes, I would. This is Mark Pierce. I wanted to say that CILs are not fully funded. I want that to go on record because we are quite a way from being where we want to be. And poverty has a lot to do with how that formula plays out, too. And so, yes, we probably could look at that formula again because things have changed and look at modifying. That's something I really believe we should look at. And "C," because people change and needs change. But I wanted to add that piece, that poverty was a big factor in that, meaning some areas would get more than others. And that's on the slide.

>> BILL ADDISON: Mark, how did we come up with \$25 million? Do you know the rationale for that?

>> MARK PIERCE: I don't know the total rationale, but somebody -- the directors got together and came up with if we had a fully funded CIL, with all of the bells and whistles to serve a certain area, it would come to \$25 million.

>> BILL ADDISON: Okay.

>> MARK PIERCE: That was so long ago that maybe it might be \$28 million now if we were to look at it with the costs, especially with COVID, everything doubles, it seemed like. Yeah, that's what I hear. I was not at the table when they put it together. But that's what I hear. Maybe Steve was at the table at that time.

>> STEVE LOCKE: I was not, Mark, but Dave mentioned in the chat that he was there, and he helped write the formula, and he understands it, and Diane said that poverty level is a factor, and there's many people that do understand the formula.

>> BILL ADDISON: Okay. All right. I'm not one of them, Steve. I'm glad I have Rodney here. You can go to the next slide, please. Okay. These are the results from fiscal year 2021. Eight CILs did not fully spend out their contracts with MRS. So here is the impact of that if you can go to the next slide here. So, all CILs bill 100% of their budgeted amount. If all CILs expend 100% of their ILS contract, all funding sources will be utilized, and no loss of funding or carry-over will occur. So how the formula is set up is it's predicated on every CIL will spend every dollar, and there will be no loss of funding. There will be no carry-over of federal funds.

So, the second scenario is what if one CIL does not expend all of the money? What will happen is that there will be a carry-over, and how we designed that is that that carry-over will be all federal dollars. And so, we won't lose -- we won't lose that funding because, again, federal dollars are carried over. We can go to the next slide, please.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: So, while we're waiting for the slide to change, there is a question in the chat. And it's from Yvonne, and she's just wondering if you're saying

tongue in cheek related to the formula or if you are making the point that it's too complicated and should be changed. Do you really not understand it or are you trying to tell us that it's complicated and a time for a change?

>> BILL ADDISON: It's a little of both. The change is up to CIL directors, but it's been in effect, like Mark said -- how long has this one been in effect, Mark?

>> MARK PIERCE: I have to get off mute. I thought that we were using -- and I could be wrong -- and Dave, hopefully he'll wheel up and give us a year that it started. I thought he said 2010. But I could be wrong.

>> BILL ADDISON: Okay.

>> MARK PIERCE: Oh, he didn't say that. But yeah. It's been a while.

>> BILL ADDISON: Yeah. I thought it was before 2010. In my estimate, it was 2008 or somewhere -- it was before 2010.

>> MARK PIERCE: Yeah. He says at least that long.

>> BILL ADDISON: Yeah. So, again, it's up to the CIL directors. We at MRS just follow the direction of how they compute those amounts. Okay. Program service reporting. So, we're coming to the end here. We can go to the next slide, please. So here is our responsibility. So MRS complies with 2 CFR 200. Federal program regulations require related to program services. So, what 2 CFR 200 has -- and it has many components -- one of those provides directions to the pass-through agency, which is MRS, on what we have to do with program service reporting. And the next couple slides we're going to go over what is MRS's responsibility related to reporting and verifying program services? If you can go to the next slide, please.

Okay. So, here's what it says, 2 CFR 200 part 329, and this is directed to MRS, monitoring and reporting program performance, monitoring by the non-federal entity, and in this case, this is MRS, the non-federal entity is responsible for oversight of the operations of the federal award supported activities. The non-federal entity must -- and if you understand federal regulations, there are mayas and musts. Must means we must do this. We must monitor its activities under the federal awards to assure compliance with applicable federal requirements and performance expectations are being achieved. That is our responsibility. And that's one of the things that we do at MRS is we require an accounting or reporting of the services provided. If you can go to the next slide, please.

The other part that we are required to do, not only the monitoring, but 2 CFR 200 -- and, again, this is not MRS. It's 2 CFR 200 has audit requirements in there. When we talk about audit requirements, there's a lot of different types of audits. So, what this requires at the end of every fiscal year is a financial audit. And they're called single audits. And the purpose of a single audit which is different from a regular financial audit is that the single audit determines the CIL's compliance with federal regulations. And that's what makes the difference between the two types of audits. The CILs, once they're subject to the single audit, sends the single audit into MRS for our review. And then what we do is we take a look at it. If there's any requirements for corrective action, we ask the CILs to correct the findings identified in the single audit.

So that's the end of CIL presentation. Steve?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you, Bill. Does anyone else have any questions? Any of the other members of the council have questions for Bill or anything that you would like to -- Mark, did you have your hand up? Yes, Mark.

>> MARK PIERCE: Yes. Bill, in your presentation, I am aware that there were CILs that weren't able to spend all their money down last fiscal year. Did the COVID have anything to do with that and other funds that were given to the CIL to kind of disrupt the flow in which we wanted to draw our money down?

>> BILL ADDISON: I don't know the answer to that, Mark. But I think everybody needs to understand how the grant works. So, when we grant an agency or contract with an agency -- and I'm just arbitrarily grabbing a number here -- when we say your contract is \$500,000, what that means is you first have to incur the expense. You then pay the expense, and then you bill MRS. That's difficult because what that means is the financing issue of the expenditures are the responsibility of the CILs. And you only get reimbursed when you pay that.

Now, if you are only cost-based -- and what that means is we only reimburse you for your costs -- in the long run we are usually taking a loss. And why you take a loss is because not every expenditure is chargeable to a federal award. And then the other thing that kicks in is there's inflation over the periods of the grants. So, in reality, when we say cost reimburse -- actually, we don't say it, the feds say it -- cost reimbursement, in the long run, you probably will not be reimbursed all of your expenses that you incur, for a variety of different reasons. So, it's just -- it's difficult to do, Mark. And you know that probably better than anybody else here. It's difficult, and I remember there was additional funding at the beginning of the year for CILs, but, again, it was cost reimbursement funding. So, again, it says CILs, here's some money, but if you want it, you've got to kick out the dollars first, and at a later date, we will reimburse you. That's a tough scenario for anybody. Anything else?

>> MARK PIERCE: Thank you, Bill.

>> BILL ADDISON: All right.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you very much, Bill, for your very educational report. I think given that that formula is somewhat complicated, at a future council meeting perhaps we can have a little bit more training and education from some of the CIL directors that were involved in that process to help the council better understand how the actual formulas are computed.

All right. So, if we are completed with that council education, we'll move to our ex-officio reports -- oh. And the first one up is Mr. Addison.

>> BILL ADDISON: Again.

>> Jan, can I ask a question first?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Yes, you may. I'm sorry, I didn't see your hand, Theresa.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: So, this specific council education on how CIL funding works for the State of Michigan, was there a specific reason that we received this education today? Was there something that spurred it, or it was just one of the things that was coming up -- topics on the agenda? Was there a goal? I know a goal, like, for us to understand, but was there something else?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Well, so first of all, we had this presentation on Groundhog's Day, and several council members went to it, and it was, like, really fast and, you know, complicated. And we realized that more council members needed to better understand how that funding stream worked, and we needed to understand that because, you know, there's a relationship that CILs have with MRS and that the SILC has with MRS, and we just wanted to better understand how that works. So that is why we brought

that to the table this time.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Was there something specific that the CIL directors wanted us to pay attention to?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: So, I think that they wanted us to pay attention to how MRS and the CILs are interacting. And Theresa, I think that when the CIL director, when Mark gives his report, I think that there will be some directors that will talk a little bit more about that.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Okay. All right. Thank you.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Yeah. You're welcome. So, Bill, your turn.

>> BILL ADDISON: I'm up again. All right. Well, I think everybody knows that the big issue for MRS right now is the development and implementation of the rate-setting process. And this is kind of how we buy -- for those who aren't familiar with it, you know, basically we usually have two different types of contracts with CILs. One is the core contract, and that's what I just talked about. Core contract is a cost reimbursement contract, provide IL services to individuals with disabilities.

The second contractor at least the second financial relationship that MRS has with the CILs is what's called a purchase of service relationship. And in that purchase of service relationship, we purchase certain services from CILs and pay a rate for that service. A couple years ago MRS underwent a review by our federal funding source. And they took issue with how we developed our rates. We have to have a methodology for developing our rates. What we did is -- and this is a huge job because we have so many contractors, and we contract out millions of dollars to provide services to our customers. So, it's a very large project. It involves many, many vendors. The requirement -- again, they're our federal funding source -- their requirement is to develop a rate-setting process with an acceptable 2 CFR 200 methodology based on either cost or fair market. And what we have done to do that is first we -- because the project was so large, we hired an outside firm who has done this for several other states that had a similar finding in their federal review.

So, this agency, then, collected costs from around the state, and we developed a rate for 75% of the services that we pay for. That process is done. The development of the rate is done. And right now, we are in what's called the implementation of the rate process. So, we're changing the rates from the method that we did not have a methodology for to a federally accepted methodology. So, again, there is -- there is no going back, because what is at risk here is MRS's funding. That is, they're our funding source. They told us to make a change. We will make that change so we can retain and protect the federal dollars that we receive from MRS.

So, in doing that, all of the -- yes, all of the vendors are impacted. Our accounting system is impacted. Our procurement system is impacted. We had to make all of these changes to make sure that we have complied with the federal mandate of establishing a methodology for our rates. So basically, that is what we have been doing is working on all of these processes so we can comply with our federal mandate. And basically, that's what MRS has been doing in the last couple months.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you, Bill. Did any council members have questions for Bill? Okay. I don't see any hands raised. Oh, do I hear somebody?

>> BILL ADDISON: No, that was me saying all right.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: All right. Next, we have the Bureau of Services for Blind

Persons. Lisa? I thought I saw her on the line. So, Lisa --

>> LISA KISIEL: I'm here. Sorry.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: That's okay.

>> LISA KISIEL: My external camera's not working so I had to switch up here a little bit.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay.

>> LISA KISIEL: I'll be right with you. There you go.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: All right.

>> LISA KISIEL: Bill, good to hear your report, and just to kind of support some of the work that I think we're all doing, we are -- the Bureau of Services for Blind Persons is also in partnership with the MRS and the other core partners -- excuse me -- of WIOA have just submitted the mid-cycle review of our state plans. So as the statewide plan for independent living, you all understand that process probably a whole lot more than you understand, you know, the state plan process for the unified state plan for VR and the WIOA partners. We, too, have a responsibility. We write a four-year plan, and that's really a strategic plan, if you will, as to how we're going to provide services to our customers, meaning our dual customer being business and our client customers. And our stakeholders as well.

And so, every two years we have to update that. So basically, is everything that we're saying, right, is it still true? Are there modifications, updates, changes? So just to highlight really quick, BSBP updated our plan to include information from the comprehensive statewide needs assessment that was completed in 2020. So, we had submitted our state plan prior to that being completed, so we went through, and we updated our information so that we could identify -- and it's real telling for BSBP because we really weren't very well represented in previous CSNAs, but through our partnership with MRS and the work with Project Excellence, we were able to do that.

So, we updated some of the statistics related to blindness and low vision and constituents being served in Michigan. Oh, I'm sorry. I have a visitor. So, we updated that information reflective. We also updated language around the implementation of the memorandum of understanding with behavioral health, meaning our statewide community health partner that will help us to implement some local change and improvements of communication, relationship, and service delivery for individuals with disabilities.

We also wanted to be able to make the change that we have a signed agreement with the Michigan Department of Education. We just missed that. We don't have that signed just yet. But it's right there. So, I think before June 30 when the plan is actually approved, I think we'll be able to make that change as well.

We also, as bureaus have to update our comprehensive system of personnel development. So, we talk about who our teams are and what their qualifications are and what our need for, you know, the professionals that we're recruiting, et cetera, vacancies, et cetera. So, we chose, you know, we made those updates as well. So that's just kind of a little bit of a snippet. I mean, I'm happy to do another type of conversation about the state plan and maybe MRS and BSBP could do that together at a later date, but I won't bore you with the details of all of that.

I have appreciated being part of the Community Outreach Project. Unfortunately, I haven't been able to make all of the meetings, but those I have been

part of I have been very appreciative to have an input on the work that you all are doing. As I always say, I value the relationship that BSBP has with our CIL partners to help us deliver services because it takes a village, sometimes a city, to do the work that we do. So, I'm always appreciative of that.

And in our Holland area and Grand Rapids area, we're doing work with some pretty specific work related to pre-employment transition services and some mapping and resource mapping that we're doing. So really grateful for that. Some of you may have heard me speak about customized employment or others that you work with and customized employment is a really intense model of service delivery for individuals who have not been successful being placed using other placement models, and we are entering our pilot 3 of that where we're -- we have about eight to ten vendors that are service providers across the state who are providing services to our customers and MRS customers. And we are aware of their rate restructuring processes, and we want to say that BSBP and MRS are aligned with our service delivery rate for customized employment which is \$68.82 an hour for all three phases, discovery, job development, and consultative employment training services for individuals who are being placed.

And I also -- I'm not sure if I mentioned this the last time or not, but BSBP had the first two placements within the customized employment pilot 1 model of service delivery. So, we're really excited about that. So that's kind of a snapshot of some of the things. I will say that I have also hired a new regional manager, Beth White, who worked for us for 26 years, retired from her position in Central Region. And eight days ago, I was able to bring on board Amy Laman who comes from Oakland County Schools as a teacher consultant for the visually impaired, and she will be our new central region manager. So, I plan to invite her to our next meeting to introduce you all. I just wanted to give her a minute to get her feet wet. That kind of concludes my report unless you have any questions or concerns.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: If anyone has any questions for Lisa, if you could raise your hand. Seeing no questions, let's move on to our next --

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Mark has his hand up.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Oh, did he? You put your hand up right as my screen left. You've got to be quicker, people!
[Laughter]

>> MARK PIERCE: Yeah. This is Mark Pierce. I'm trying to go with the whole virtual protocol.

>> LISA KISIEL: I know, right? I struggle with it, Mark. I never see the hands up. Yeah.

>> MARK PIERCE: But anyway, Lisa, I just wondered, you know, what the -- you said you are aligned with MRS on the restructure. The way it's been laid out for us is that the phases for 2022. How -- I know I work with you guys -- how are you letting the CILs know what the rate structure's going to be?

>> LISA KISIEL: Well, let me clarify. Thank you for asking that question.

>> MARK PIERCE: Okay.

>> LISA KISIEL: Because I don't want anyone to walk away with the incorrect sense. We are aligned with Michigan Rehab Services related to customized employment fee schedules. So --

>> MARK PIERCE: Okay.

>> LISA KISIEL: -- we are not -- and I'm not -- this is not to say that their -- you know, the work that they've been doing with fee schedules, and we are aware of it, and when Bill Columbo was with the team, we sat through some presentations with PCG and different things, and I'm sure we could do that again, you know, if necessary. I am not committing to being on point with all rates. And especially since BSBP provides some specialized services such as vision rehab therapy, orientation mobility, assistive technology, which really are very, very, right, specific services related to blindness, which may require additional training and degrees in order to provide. So, I'm saying that we are aligning ourselves with customized employment because we are very -- you know, first of all, it makes sense. It's a fair rate. It makes sense. And we want to be -- you know, we've been tandem with this process since day one. We want to continue that.

And certainly, by me saying that we may not be in tandem on other services doesn't mean that we don't have a great partnership. It just means that we may have to make some different decisions based on the services that we deliver.

>> MARK PIERCE: Thank you, Lisa. I just asked the question because you're right, it's customized training that we do with BSBP also.

>> LISA KISIEL: Right.

>> MARK PIERCE: And so, I was just wondering how that would play out.

>> LISA KISIEL: Not to be confused with customized employment but, yes.

>> MARK PIERCE: Okay. Thank --

>> LISA KISIEL: -- specific services with all of you and we partner with you on lots of different things, right, for adults --

>> MARK PIERCE: Right.

>> LISA KISIEL: -- benefits planning, et cetera.

>> MARK PIERCE: Right.

>> LISA KISIEL: Thank you for saying that as well. Benefits planning. We have a state goal for BSBP. Remember, we're small but we're mighty. Where we want to provide 120 services to customers, both pre-ETS and adults, for fiscal year '22. So that's a strategic goal that we have in mind. And so, you guys are a big part of that. Many of you provide those services. Many of us purchase those services from you. So, thank you for that.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you. Okay. Anybody else? Knowing that when Steve puts the agenda up, it's hard for me --

>> LISA KISIEL: It's time for us to move on. Is that what you're trying to say, Steve? I got you.

[Laughter]

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you, Lisa, for your report. So, the Michigan Department of Civil Rights, is anyone on the call?

>> BETHANY JAMES: Hello. Yes. Yes. This is -- oh. This is Annie signing. So, some updates for you. First of all, I want to acknowledge this month is Women's History Month. So, I want to take a moment to thank all the women that have served and gone through this journey. I know you probably noticed that state departments are posting daily on different things relating to Women's History Month. So be sure to

check out our department's Twitter, social media, Facebook, Instagram. We have some pretty cool stuff relating to Michigan Women's -- Women in Michigan for the month. Also, I would like to mention some of the legislative actions that are happening right now relating to the Deaf community.

So, in the House at the moment, we have a bill called HB5777. This House bill is related to education and language acquisition. So, it mandates that -- well, we haven't decided which department yet, but most likely it will be with the Department of Education relating to parental guidance and resources relating -- making sure children that are deaf, deaf/blind, or hard of hearing are equipped with all the tools and resources they need to be kindergarten ready. It has to do more with language acquisition and developmental milestones.

The bill was introduced in the House committee on -- let's see here -- on the family and children and senior citizens committee last week. And it was introduced last week. And we testified, Michigan Department of Civil Rights, yesterday. And then next week they're going to do another session at the committee. If you want to learn more, be sure to let me know, and I'll send you a copy of the bill. But our department does support the bill.

Another thing I wanted to mention is we have some events coming up. So, this month we are doing a series. It's a monthly series relating to hate crimes. Hate crimes and bias. So, this month we're going to be acknowledging Women's History Month, and we're going to be including the All Pact as they partnered with us, and we're going to be focusing on that, on advocacy work and law enforcement. So, we're bringing together advocacy and law enforcement together in this meeting. So, we're going to be recognizing Women's History Month in addition to having a guest speaker that's from Family Relations of Emmett. Of Emmett Till. So -- relating to civil rights, and that will be happening from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. on March 24, and I will be sending out the registration link. You have to register before for Zoom to be able to attend.

Then another thing I wanted to mention is that our department -- I'm sure you guys have already sent out based upon Steve's email I believe it was last month relating to the AG's opinion on providing accommodations for those who might not be able to access in-person meetings, allowing virtual accommodations. So, I wanted to mention that. It's an important piece for our department to have to take into consideration, accessibility needs for those in the deaf, deaf/blind, and hard-of-hearing community. I also have the advisory council that we haven't been able to meet since the pandemic because of the deaf/blind community. We want to make sure that they would have access as well. So internally, we're assessing what is it that we can do as best practices relating to the hybrid meetings, what standards we want to set. So, we're working on that. And hopefully we'll be able to come up with a game plan shortly that council will be able to continue their meetings.

I do know that the opinion really -- the AG's opinion -- asked that state departments take their individual considerations -- take a case-by-case basis. I'm sure other state departments are going to be assessing their hybrid model and what options they have. The key here for us and my advisory council is to make sure that things are fully accessible.

And then one of the last things that I wanted to mention was along with trying to figure out a permanent plan for hybrid meetings. This month is also Natural Reading

Month, by the way. So that's one of my absolute favorite times of the year. I'm a bookworm. I just love that. I love this. This is my favorite month. And the reason that I love this is because it's an opportunity for us to be able to connect and engage with different deaf and hard-of-hearing programs throughout the state. We do multiple reading sessions, which we've done this month. And it's just great to be able to connect with communities, families, parents, and their children just to do different stories with them and signing them in ASL. I think we've done two sessions so far. We've got a couple more coming up. It's something I love to do, and I love to talk about because, oh, my goodness, it's so cute to talk with students, you know.

And we're moving along and increasing momentum and numbers of training that we're doing, trainings that we're doing and providers that we're offering trainings to. And we're working on connecting with the community and trying to be more visible, so we're developing an assessment as far as self-advocacy on different roles. So, it would be like role-playing scenarios. So, what to do if you were to schedule a doctor's appointment, say. So, you'd have this scenario. And the doctor tells you no, we won't provide an interpreter. How can you self-advocate if had that type of situation? What would you do? What type of language should you use? If they continue to deny you services, what are your options? Things like that. So, I want to -- we're talking about modifying some workshops again about that. But those workshops have to be accessible for everyone. So that's another thing to take into consideration. But that's really it. Those are the key updates that I have for everyone. If you have any questions, feel free to reach out and let me know.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Annie, this is Jan Lampman. And I wonder if you could send -- when you send the copy of the bill, if you wouldn't mind also sending a written copy of your testimony, I think the council would be really interested in seeing what the testimony was as well, what the support was for the House bill 5777 if that would be okay.

>> ANNIE URASKY: Yeah, sure. I will do that. I will email that over to Tracy. Also, I wanted to tell you, there is a recording available, available on the House archive, the Michigan House archive. If you go back to the last two weeks, you can see that there was the community feedback and response on there. We did the testimony, the Michigan Department of Civil Rights, did their testimony this week on Tuesday, but I'm happy to send that over to everyone.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: That would be great. Thank you, Annie. I also very much appreciate your advocacy -- or your teaching advocacy for individuals because one of the things I noted is that during the pandemic, lots of hospitals were reluctant to have interpreters come in. They tried to do things on the TV screen, and not everyone can do the Zoom, right? And so, I appreciate very much that that's a priority for you, that advocacy education.

Does anyone else have a question or comment for Annie, from the Office of Civil Rights? Mark.

[Laughter]

>> ANNIE URASKY: All right.

>> MARK PIERCE: So, I had my hand up.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: I saw.

[Laughter]

>> MARK PIERCE: Anyway, good to see you, Annie. Could you share -- you said you have implicit bias training this month? Did you say that at the beginning? Was that going this month or next month?

>> ANNIE URASKY: Oh, I see what you're saying. Okay. Let me clarify a little bit here. So, our department is doing a monthly session relating to hate crimes. Hate and bias.

>> MARK PIERCE: Okay.

>> ANNIE URASKY: So, we started that -- the hate and bias webinar series, January was the first one we did, and then we're doing one every month. But they're different topics every month. So -- but they're relating to hate and bias.

>> MARK PIERCE: Okay.

>> ANNIE URASKY: That's what they directly relate to civil rights and hate and bias. This month there's going to be two things that we'll be talking about which is Women's History Month, we'll be acknowledging that, and then we're going to have a presentation from -- we will also have a presentation with Emmitt as well regarding that.

>> MARK PIERCE: Okay. I just wanted to --

>> ANNIE URASKY: I can send you some details with the events.

>> MARK PIERCE: Okay.

>> ANNIE URASKY: And it will be in the registration link about that.

>> MARK PIERCE: Thank you.

>> ANNIE URASKY: No worries. Thanks.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you. If no one else has a question for Annie, we do not have a representative from Department of Ed or the DD council on the call tonight. Is that correct? I just want to make sure.

>> STEVE LOCKE: That's correct, Jan. In fact, Janis had emailed me last month. She retired from the Department of Education at the end of last year and told me that they are in the process of trying to find someone to replace her. And so, it's going to be hung up with appointments that I will get to later on in my report.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay, okay. Thank you. Okay. So, then the last but definitely not least report is Mark Pierce. And did you have a reporting -- did you have a reporting partner tonight, Mark?

>> MARK PIERCE: Yes, I did.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you.

>> MARK PIERCE: Lori Hill, Executive Director from Fort Wayne will be giving a presentation on the effects of the fee changes on the CILs. And so, these going to kind of borrow some of my time. So, it looks like I can borrow some of the time that the two other people weren't here. So, I'm going to start off with my report, and then I will let Lori -- she needs to share her screen for the part that she's going to report on. So, it's great to see everybody. The network update for this past quarter, and it's interesting that we're talking about funds. Bill led off with that piece, but public health and work funds are available to CILs through ACL. And we kind of estimated the dollars. It could be almost another \$132,000 for CILs. And these particular funds are designated for full-time support people, people that can do case investigation, option counseling, social type of work for people with disabilities. And so, this is really huge because it

allows us to hire someone to do some of our work.

And provides those five core services. I don't believe Bill talked about it a little bit, but in this past quarter, Bill, the state was offering some of them same funds. They got another pot. And it was about -- if I'm correct -- correct me if I'm wrong, Bill -- \$5,000 per CIL if it was accepted. So, there are a few funds still hanging around there from COVID-19 and things like that. So, we've got to play real close attention on how that plays out.

I'd like to say that Kelly Pelong, the executive director of Mid-Michigan, your old stomping grounds there, Steve, she had done testimony before the appropriations subcommittee and labor and economic opportunity on -- if I remember correct -- that was on March 6. I might be wrong. But she was before Senator Horn and chaired that particular meeting. She done a great job on it. She brought a consumer with her, and she represented CILs very well as to the work that we do statewide. And she highlighted a few of our other CILs as to what they were doing in their particular regions. So big shoutout to her.

Since the time that we gave our last report in the first quarter, Julie Shaw is the new Executive Director for the CIL in the UP. I think, Steve, you got the picture and a little bio there that you could make share with everybody so we could place a face and a name. And I don't even know if Julie's on right now, but we're really happy to have her come on board. We tragically lost Sara, but she stepped into them shoes, and we're really happy to have her on board.

Lori Hill, she's going to give a presentation after me, but she -- network Detroit recently moved to College Park, which is on the northwest side of Detroit, which allows for greater access to the western area of Wayne County and ability to touch people with disabilities in Wayne County. So, a big shoutout to her. I don't know if she's going to have a picture of her new facility or not, a new location, but really excited about that. So, there's some good things going on with CILs out there. Hopefully, Kelly, I'll be able to have pictures for her for our next one, with the Bluewater transition have a new location, too.

Last but not least, the advocates of Kent County, Dave Bulkowski, he's going to try to come on -- there we go. There's a picture of Sara. And that should be -- not Sara but Julie. That should be in your package for the council members. There's a picture of her. And so, you'll get a chance to see her. Dave is going to do a public comment piece on the event over in Grand Rapids we're really excited about, so he'll be able to share his screen and show you some decent things there.

Before I turn it over to Lori, are there any questions? I don't have myself to ask questions, right?

[Laughter]

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you. You know, Mark, thank you so much. And I look forward to hearing -- I know that there are some CIL directors on the line tonight who are going to speak during public comment, and I'm looking forward to hearing what they are doing in their respective CILs. And I think we've made it so that you can -- so that your staff, Lori, can share her screen for you so that you can --

>> MARK PIERCE: Great.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: -- you're part of the presentation.

>> MARK PIERCE: We're going to need a lot of time for public comment. You realize that, right?
[Laughter]

>> JAN LAMPMAN: That's okay.

>> LORI HILL-SANDERS: Good evening, everyone. Thank you so much for having me to be here tonight to provide some information in regard to the MRS rate restructure. And to talk about what the impact is of the fee -- of the restructuring of the fee schedule on CILs. Next slide. Next slide.

Okay. This process -- it's been a progression. Can you just enlarge that a little bit?

>> STEVE LOCKE: Lori, can you have them go to slide show in the drop-down menu in the center.

>> That's where I'm trying to go. Give me one second.

>> STEVE LOCKE: Yeah. It's actually three drop-downs over to your right.

>> I see it. I'm trying to move this bar, and it won't move. I'm trying to get to it.

>> STEVE LOCKE: Oh, got it. You.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: I believe I'm hearing a phone conversation.

>> LORI HILL-SANDERS: Okay. I'm going to try from here. As I was saying, the fee restructuring is something that occurred over a progression of time. It started as early as 2017. And that's when we received notice that there was monitoring by RSA of MRS and that there was a report that came out from that monitoring process that they completed with MRS. And from that we began to go through a fee restructuring, and they had consultants that were working on that, a group PCG. So, in 2017, that is when the actual restructuring study actually began.

In 2019, MRS began to engage with the Michigan CILs to do a rate study. And that started to occur in 2019. Then we go over into 2020. 1/9/2020, at that time we were provided with an extension from MRS to gather additional information in regard to what our fees were, what the rates were based on each CIL. At that time three CIL directors were appointed to represent the full network on the development of a new MOU with MRS, and that was a process that went on for approximately nine months and ended in 2020. At the end of that meeting, at the end of that time, there was a new MOU that was developed that was agreed upon in 2022. Rates, we received notification of the restructuring of the rates, which became effective 2/1/2022. And at that time any authorizations prior to this date would be honored, and we were at that particular point. Next slide.

So right now, with the new fee structures, those new fee structures have taken place. And right now, we're basically dealing with or talking about what the impact is to the CILs with this rate fee restructuring. Over \$2.5 million will be lost in reimbursements which potentially will affect a little over, if not more, 3,500 people with disabilities. And that's the network wide. The number will likely be higher once all data is received. And that concludes my very brief presentation of the progression of this rate restructuring. Are there any questions?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you, Lori. This is Jan Lampman. I just have a question. So, at the end of 2021 when that new memo of understanding was created and signed, did that include the new rate structure, or did you learn about that, what the actual rates

would be at a later time?

>> LORI HILL-SANDERS: Mark can also add to this.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay.

>> LORI HILL-SANDERS: The new restructuring that we received, Mark, was that part of that MOU as well?

>> MARK PIERCE: Yes. So basically, the consultant group that put the rates together, we had a chance to see that, but at that time we didn't feel as though it would fit what CILs needed to do for our business model. And we understood there would be an extension and that there would be a fiscal impact study so that we could get the full understanding of the rates for CILs on that business model. But when February hit of 2022, we received the rates. And once we got the rates, it is progressive. There's some in -- I mean, February 1, the job development piece kicked in. And then on April 1, there will be another phase of it. And most of the rates will fall into play 1 October. But right now, we are really struggling to figure out how we can fulfill the request for authorizations with the rates that we have now are just way too low for what we are able to provide services with.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: And is that across the board? This is Jan again, I'm sorry. I'm going to probably have a few questions. Is that across the board or are there some rates that seem reasonable or some rates that seem really low? I'm just wondering.

>> MARK PIERCE: The biggest one, the pre-ETS is a big one for us. You know, that's a larger contract with us. When I say pre-ETS, that starts by working with youths in the schools and young adults. That's where most of the contracts for future services are at. We have a little more than \$100,000 per CIL, a little bit less, in the adults. And where it really plays out tough at is in the groups because groups have a tier-like fashion where if you have a one-on-one, it may be \$42 to work one on one. But as the group gets bigger, the amounts go down. And so, when that amount goes down, it really throws some things off as far as how we are going to provide the service and including transportation and prep because a lot of our things -- all of our services with groups, a lot of CILs do group. So that's why there was so much of a big impact and, in fact, so many people because we just haven't figured out how, in an equitable way, for all CILs to be able to do their services under the fee schedule that we have now, it's pretty difficult.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. And what -- you had said, I think, Lori, you had mentioned that there was going to be an economic impact study? Has that been done, or is it starting?

>> LORI HILL-SANDERS: That has not been done. The CILs have requested for that to be done. But that has not been done, and I'm not sure if it's going to be done.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. I don't want to hog the space. So, do any other council members have questions for Mark and/or Lori regarding how the fee structure -- the new fee structure is impacting CILs? Theresa.

>> MARK PIERCE: Theresa, yeah.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Sorry, Mark. I finally figured out what happens. It goes in the upper left-hand corner of my screen. I've got to stare at that part of the screen. Theresa.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Yeah. So, when the CIL directors say that they've requested the impact study to be done, who exactly are you requesting that to? Who is

the person that makes the decision?

>> LORI HILL-SANDERS: We've -- we've sent that letter to Tina Fullerton to make that request for that study to be included as well as CC'ing Bill Addison on that.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: And then when the MOU was signed -- I'm sorry, I got a little confused -- the rates were in the MOU, or they weren't in the MOU?

>> MARK PIERCE: They were in a recent amended MOU.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Okay.

>> MARK PIERCE: So, you know, the first MOU was October 1. Everything had to be in. And then we had to do an amended MOU. And that's not terribly different. We do amendments all the time. But this time the amended MOU had new rate structures in it that mid-fiscal year that we're trying to adjust to. So, it was really tough for us. Thank you for that question, Theresa.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Any other questions?

>> MARK PIERCE: And I must say, there's one thing in the chat here that said the original rates weren't in that original MOU, but when we got, like I say, in February, then we did sign it. All the directors did sign. And the reason we signed is because we still want to offer the services to the people that we serve. However, all of the directors, majority of them, signed in protest, that it's just going to be difficult for us to make that. I mean, we're six months away from next year, for fiscal year 2023, and so it's going to be -- it's going to be tough. So, we're hoping that we can work things out before that time.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: So, I'm sorry, Jan, like you I feel like I'm hogging the questions more. I have one more. The MOU, even though the rates were in it, it wasn't like a negotiated MOU. It was kind of like the rates are going to change now, so the CIL directors signed it so that they could continue providing services. Is that correct?

>> MARK PIERCE: Let me see if I heard you correctly. I'm going to repeat it. So, it was signed -- you have to sign it in order to draw down your funds to provide the services. If you don't have a contract, you can't draw down funds. So, these rates were in our new amended MOU as of February 1. Okay? But I just want to make it clear that all of the old rates did stay, but for the job development piece, them rates went to the new rate, the restructured rates. And it was made clear that in October, October 1, all of these rates were going into effect. So, we do have some time to work on this. We just have to see if we can get something done before October 1. I hope I answered your question there.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Yeah. So, you all submitted your budgets, though, for this year with the old rates?

>> MARK PIERCE: Correct.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Okay.

>> MARK PIERCE: Good point.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: And now it's changed, so that seems like a substantial impact on all of you.

>> MARK PIERCE: Yes. Yes. Depending on what type of -- now, you've got to remember, each CIL is different. Depending on what area you're in. Some services -- MRS is different. They have services that they need in one area, they may

not use in another area. And so, we do understand that having a unified rate is a core thing. However, one of the things is we have to look at can a vendor handle that? And we are supposed to not be considered vendors. The relationship we have with MRS is a partnership. And I believe that was probably the toughest part of this because we felt we were really a partner, so yeah. Anyway.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: And then I'll just add -- I'm sorry -- when I say all of you, I'm also talking about the disability community as a whole because it impacts so many people you can serve. So not just the CILs and the staff.

>> MARK PIERCE: No.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Yeah.

>> MARK PIERCE: Yeah.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Okay.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: So, Mark, I have a few more questions. This is Jan Lampman again. I have just a few more questions. When did you -- when was the letter requesting the economic impact study sent to Tina Fullerton? Do you remember by chance? I'm sorry, I probably put you on the spot. I hate when people ask me dates.

>> MARK PIERCE: I don't know. I don't know exactly -- I know that we sent the letter, but I don't know exactly date. I probably should know that.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. Thanks anyway.

>> MARK PIERCE: Maybe one of my colleagues will put something in the chat to help me. But it was submitted earlier. As a matter of fact, the three directors that were assigned to work with MRS on the fee schedules restructure were there discussing that during that time. So that was -- and then we didn't get to the formal letter till later.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. Okay. And the other question that I had, you know, kind of speaking to Theresa's point about this being an impact on, you know, the whole disability community, there are other providers of employment services that are also impacted by these rates. Isn't that correct?

>> MARK PIERCE: Yes. Yes. Yeah. I just got something in the chat. Yeah, so January 11 of 2022.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you.

>> MARK PIERCE: When it was submitted.

[Laughter]

Okay. And so, what was that next question? I'm sorry. I'm trying to read and -- I should never multitask.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: I know.

It's terrible. I was just, again, speaking to the issue that we're talking about the whole disability community. These rates also impact other providers as well. So --

>> MARK PIERCE: Yeah.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: -- when Lori gave that screen -- you know, when she talked about 3,500 people that the CILs support that are impacted, there might be other people that are using other organizations for their support, is that correct?

>> LORI HILL-SANDERS: Yes.

>> MARK PIERCE: That's correct. And a good example of what it would be is like we use interpreters. And so, there's a rate there for interpreters, and hopefully the vendor can afford to go with that rate. But if they can't and they decide not to, then,

you know, that gives us a shorter list of people we can go to for interpreting services.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay.

>> Yeah. This is Mindy Kulasa. I'm going to put a different hat on my head for a moment if that's okay and speak as the Chairman of the Board of Directors of Disability Network Southwest Michigan because I really serve a dual role and also sit on the CIL council. And I can certainly say that -- I just want to give a couple of examples to help everyone understand the impact of this. For certain fee-for-service categories, we're going to have to do in Disability Network Southwest Michigan, I'm speaking about my two CILs only right now. I have two CILs that fall under our jurisdiction in southwestern Michigan. We're going to have to do three times the work for the same compensation, basically. An important part of the work that we do takes place after the actual meeting goes with our client, and for those follow-up reporting and ancillary reports, that time is not going to be compensated. So, it's going to entail meeting with a client and not doing as thorough of a job as what we would normally do simply because we are not going to be compensated for that time, and that directly hurts our clients as well. And from a fiscal impact perspective, you know, we're looking at a net loss this year of -- in the hundreds of thousands of dollars because we were a huge partner, we felt, and continue to feel or want to think of our relationship with MRS as a partnership. But it makes it a challenge when the two-way lines of communication are not necessarily open. And I made an attempt to contact some folks from MRS to express the concerns I am expressing this evening and made several calls and never received a single phone call back from any of the folks that I had reached out to at MRS. So, I took this up with our state Senator.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay.

>> And it's definitely of concern. And I'll take that hat off now, and I will put my SILC council member hat back on because I do understand how these rates work. As a finance person in the room, one of the finance people in the room. I get it. And absent the fiscal impact study that's been requested, I just don't see how anyone can move forward in good conscience because of how adversely the affected clients are going to be within our state and the potential loss of service to those clients is just devastating for me to think about.

>> MARK PIERCE: Yes. Thank you, Mindy. Thank you so much for that. I like that other hat.

>> LORI HILL-SANDERS: Thank you.

>> MARK PIERCE: And, you know, there's been comments here that, you know, we've tried to reach out also to get -- to Ms. Fullerton, Mrs. Fullerton, just to work with us and see what would happen. And also, we sent a letter, submitted it, along with Encompass, because that's another big vendor for MRS, one of them. And in some cases, you know, the rates have been cut up to 60% to 70%. And one of -- each CIL has to deal with how they're going to facilitate the service. So, Mindy, you're right on point. What is that supposed to be? In some cases, they have to make a decision and say, well, I can't facilitate that service at that rate because it's just a flat-out loss.

And so, if you were to look in the chat, there are -- addressed to everyone, there are some other directors speaking, and you definitely could get an understanding of how we're sitting with this. This is -- we've got time to work with it, but it's getting very, very hard, you know. Six months, we got to have a budget ready by July, June, or July,

of this year. And you have to make decisions early. So, yeah.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you, Mark. Thank you all for Lori, Mindy, for all of the input that you put into this report. I think that definitely anybody who is on this call or anyone who watches the recording of this call, you know, and you're interested in joining an advocacy effort, there is definitely some public policy advocacy to be done. I'd appreciate it, Mark, if you would keep the council apprised of where that -- you know, where things are with that, those efforts.

>> MARK PIERCE: Sure.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: And, again, it says, you know, it sounds like you have some time to Rourke on this. But you're going to need that to be a two-way communication street.

>> MARK PIERCE: Yes.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Yes. And so, we appreciate all of your efforts on behalf of the people in Michigan who want to work. I have a son who is in a post-secondary program, and so I personally know the benefits that he has received through our local Center for Independent Living in terms of job development skills. And so, thank you opinion.

>> MARK PIERCE: Jan, can I say this? In -- with the CIL and MRS, you know, we've done this as a partnership. And we want to keep it that way because we can give a lot of good services. If we, do it as a partnership. But when -- it gets kind of murky. And so, yeah. We want your son to find him a job and get employed and become a good taxpaying citizen, you know?

[Laughter]

>> JAN LAMPMAN: He has to buy a car. My car people.

>> MARK PIERCE: He still has to pay taxes.

[Laughter]

I hope he doesn't want to buy a car now. They're very expensive.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you very much. Oh, Theresa has her hand up. And then after Theresa's question, I think we should probably take a break because we're a little bit late on our break, and I don't want people to die of thirst.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Okay. My question is two-part. I'm really sorry. But I keep hearing we have more time to work on this. We can do more. But I also heard Bill Addison in his presentation, I believe these were the rates he was referring to, he said this decision is made, and there is no more conversation to be had. I'm pretty sure he said something like that in his presentation. So, I guess I'm a little confused by the -- there's conversations to be had and there's change to be made because I heard Bill say there is no conversation to be had. So, I'm confused by that.

>> LORI HILL-SANDERS: I think Mark is being very optimistic.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Okay. So then my next question is that -- and I appreciate, Jan, you throwing out other groups that are working on this rate, but as SILC members, what is our role in looking at the huge cut to the CILs and the services that the people with disabilities are going to be getting in Michigan, and is our role just to hear a presentation and to join other groups, or should we be -- like, is there something we should be doing? I just -- I'm wondering -- because we're supposed to be making sure services are delivered to people with disabilities. We're not supposed to

micromanage the CILs. But our job is to make sure those services are getting out to people with disabilities, right? That's what we're supposed to be doing.

>> MARK PIERCE: Right.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: So, I just wonder what -- we hear the presentation. We got the presentation from MRS. Like, what is -- as SILC members, what are we supposed to be doing, I guess, to other SILC members?

>> MARK PIERCE: Well, this is Mark. I got on my SILC pat right now.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Okay.

>> MARK PIERCE: And so, I do appreciate, Theresa, your call to action, what should we do?

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Yeah.

>> MARK PIERCE: And as it stands right now, I would think that in some type of way, because this meeting is on public record, and that we let people know the CILs are really struggling with these rates, and that something needs to be had moving forward. I can't tell a SILC what to do. I can only vote when you guys put that particular action in place. But I do think we should do something.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: So, we have a couple of choices. We can either open the floor to other SILC members who want to ask clarifying questions or, you know, make some recommendation. Or we could put this on -- we could -- you know, in the portion of our meeting where we talk about our work, where we talk about new business, we could have somebody on the council who would like to bring it back to the table and talk about what action as a SILC we might do. So, I could -- I could go either way on that.

So, seeing a lot of silence, how about if we take our quick break? We'll go through the other presentations.

And then when we get to new business, we can discuss what the SILC's response will be. How does that sound?

>> Yeah.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. Perfect.

>> MARK PIERCE: Sounds good.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: It's 7:15. So we're a little behind, kind of. Can I see the agenda again really quick, Steve?

I want to try to get us back a little bit on track if we can. I'll talk really fast about my part of the SPIL. So that will buy us some time. Yeah, let's take a quick -- let's still go ahead and take a quick 10-minute break. We'll come back at 7:25. And then I think we should be able to kind of get ourselves back caught up. And then when we get down farther after the SPIL monitoring reports is when we can bring this topic back to the table if that works for everyone. Okay. Perfect. Thank you. So, 10-minute break. We'll see everyone back.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: We'll start in a minute. Okay.

>> Recording in progress.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: It is 7:25. And we will reconvene. And I believe -- first of all, I wanted to say thank you to everyone. Lots of excellent questions. Lots of robust discussion so far. And I expect that the rest of our meeting will go similarly. We are to the point in our meeting where we have staff and committee reports. And so, we'll start

with Steve and his Executive Director report.

>> STEVE LOCKE: Thanks, Jan. Just in the interest of time, all of you received my report, the written report, so just in the interest of time, I'm just going to go over some highlights of the report. ACL has experienced some leadership changes since late last year. Corinna Stiles who was the team lead for the Office of Independent Living programs, left for the Department of Education. Shawn Barrett has left for the Department of HUD and Regina Bly has left for the Foundation For -- oh, my gosh -- Superman. Christopher Reeve. She has left to go to work for him. So, who we currently have at ACL, we have Erica McFadden who is the Director of the Office of Independent Living programs.

And then there are three program managers at ACL, and Peter Nye, he's the Program Manager for Region 2, 5, and 10. Michigan belongs to Region 5. So, Peter Nye is going to be our Program Officer for the foreseeable future until they can get some of those slots filled.

On October 1, we issued an RFQ request for qualifications for auditing services. Those proposals are due by the end of this month. Once we get those proposals, we will assemble an evaluation team, and then we'll make a recommendation for award during our June council business meeting.

Let me see. New staff insurance. Tracy and I have been exploring better options for life and disability insurance benefits for staff. We currently have benefits through Unum. Their maximum benefits are very, very low when you compare that to what state employees get. So, what we have found is that if my SILC joins the Chamber of Commerce in which we exist, which is currently Barry County, we will have access to the small business administration's benefits for much less than what we're paying now for greater benefits.

So, once we are -- we are going to move to that structure -- I think the fees for nonprofits is \$150 a year to be part of that Chamber of Commerce. And once we are able to get rates for those new insurance policies, those will be brought to the full council. And if we choose to -- if the council chooses to move in that direction, we will integrate those into our budget negotiations this summer to become effective October 1 of the next fiscal year.

As far as appointments go, as you know, Yvonne left the council back in September. And we had four council members whose terms expired on December 31. I've been working diligently with the appointments office to get those filled. The appointments office has also had staff leave. Geeta, the director, has left as well as the person I have been working with has also retired or otherwise left. And I'm working with Daniel out of the appointments office. I am her favorite pest. I (Indiscernible) her every week, and they are short-staffed, and they're having a difficult time getting these appointments made. I stressed the urgency on the four reappointments and replacing Yvonne's position also. And I was told earlier this week late last week that she is going to try very hard to have our four reappointments done prior to May.

And as you know, we have the SILC Congress coming up in May, and a couple of those re-appointees are wanting to attend. The reservations we're making for the re-appointees who have yet to be reappointed are fully refundable. So, we're anticipating that the re-appointees, if they are signed up to go to the Congress, will be able to go as long as those appointments are made. If they're not, we won't be able to allow them to

attend the Congress, but I got my fingers crossed that those appointments will be made prior to the Congress happening in May.

As far as -- I'm going to cover -- next on the agenda is strategic planning. I'm just going to cover that right now. We wrapped up our strategic planning process back in August of last year, which resulted in an updated vision and mission statements. One of the tasks I was given was to create smart goals for those strategic planning goals that we created. Four strategic plan goals that align with our currently SPIL, those smart goals have been created. And the balance of the strategic plan goals will be aligned with SILC goals created in this SPIL. So that is the fact that we're going to take on that.

And, again, the SILC Congress is going to happen May 16 to May 18 at the Holiday Inn Bayside in San Diego. This year I believe we have a record attendance for Michigan's SILC council members. We have seven people that have signed up to go to this. So, I'm very excited for this opportunity for council members to be able to interact with ACL staff, their peers from across the country, other SILCs, other SILC directors, and other SILC members. So, this is going to be a very, very good Congress, and I'm excited about the breakout sessions that are going to happen.

I believe also that Bill Addison has put in to be a presenter on 2 CFR 200, so we will have one of our own Michigan folks there presenting at the Congress. Those are really the highlights in my report. And I would be happy to take any questions that any of you might have.

>> This is Will Harrison. Are there any repercussions for them not filling the appointments on time? Like, is there any, like, fallback on their end, or is the SILC just that they lose it? It's kind of odd that it's taken them this long to make those decisions.

>> STEVE LOCKE: Yeah. And Will, what it really comes down to is their staffing. It sounds like there were quite a few departures within the office, and I'm trying really hard to work with Danielle without, you know, and keeping that relationship in a good place, too. So, I understand there's staffing shortages, and I don't disagree that this has taken a very long time. I've stressed to them that we are federally required to have composition at all times in accordance with federal regulations, and the ball is basically in the Governor's court right now. But I continue to email on a weekly basis, phone calls as well. So, I'm at the top of her list of people that are needy.

[Laughter]

Any other questions on the director report before I turn it back to Jan?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. Can you put the agenda back up, Steve?

>> STEVE LOCKE: I definitely -- yes, absolutely. Hold on just a moment. All right. There you go.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. So, the financial report. Is that Mindy? Is Mindy still --

>> STEVE LOCKE: Yes.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Mindy, are you available to give the financial report? Okay. So, we're going to just skip Mindy for a second, because I think that she may -- she's trying to multitask. And so, she might just be away from her computer screen for a moment. So would it be possible -- yes, Steve. Did you want to --

>> STEVE LOCKE: I can give the financial report.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Sure. Yeah. Absolutely. That would be good.

>> STEVE LOCKE: Absolutely.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: We've got a lot we want to try to get covered tonight. So, yes, please.

>> STEVE LOCKE: I'm going to go over the budget versus actual -- first let me get this out of my way so I can see. So right now, in terms of revenue, we are underspent by almost \$40,000 for the year. So, it's always good to be underspent as opposed to overspent. And I will show you the areas where we are a bit overspent. There are some categories we're overspent in. But the majority of this is made up of funds, for example, we have 17,000 for state database reporting. That was when the CILs moved to a new database system. SILC provided \$17,000 to the CILs for licensing fees. When they moved to CILs first, we were unsure if we were going to require reports for the SILC out of that system, and those reports cost money.

At this point right now, I don't believe SILC is going to need any reports out of that system. So, the \$17,000 was a placeholder, and here's where we're going to spend that \$17,000 on state database reporting. So that will be a line item that we will probably do line item transfers out of during the year.

If you look over here in column 25, you can see these percentages. This is year-to-date budget. We want each of these columns to be right around close to 100%. That means that we are on track for those line items in terms of our spending. When we come down to unemployment insurance spending, we are 348% over. The reason is most of the expense comes out from October through April. And so, it's front-loaded. But in our budget, it's spread across 12 months. So, as we get past April and into the end of the year, you'll start seeing this percentage start to come down and approach closer to 100%.

The other line item that I wanted to point out was supplies. Which shows overspent by 329%. Our supply line item was only \$740 for the year because we moved to not having an office. Tracy needed to replace her laptop unexpectedly. We had not budgeted for computer replacement. So, there was a \$900 expenditure that we needed to do a line-item transfer for in order to cover that. While we did that line-item transfer, my computer is seven years old, and it's going to unexpectedly need to be replaced also.

So, what we did was transfer \$2300 total out of statewide database line item into supplies to cover the cost of two laptop replacements.

The reason we didn't put this into equipment is because we don't capitalize laptops because they don't normally purchase the amount threshold for capitalization. They generally -- they depreciate to zero after three to four years. So, this line item was recently adjusted with a request we sent in to MRS for a line-item transfer.

So, most everything else is tracking below 100%. For instance, travel, training. We're going to hit these pretty hard when SILC Congress comes up. So, at the end of the day -- let's see here. '22 is actual and '23 is budget. We are actually under by \$294, where we had projected to be about 90 cents under budget. So those two-line items were what I wanted to explain, the outliers to. Are there any questions on our budget versus actual year to date? Okay.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: I don't --

>> STEVE LOCKE: We are going to move -- yeah? Any questions?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: I don't see any.

>> STEVE LOCKE: All right. Then I'm going to move us to -- sorry. Bear with me

here. Our statement of financial position. So, we currently have -- oh, let me see here. Total assets of \$74,413. Up here under -- in cash, checking, \$370. Cash savings, negative \$1,156. Actually, that's out of Bill.com, money out clearing. The reason we have a negative balance here is we had sent two checks to our interpreter services, and both of those checks were -- remained uncashed. And so, we ended up getting some money back. So, this is just a clearing-out issue going on here.

As far as our checking and our savings goes, the reason that that is so low is we experienced a cash flow issue. Back in November when we submitted our statement of expenditures for reimbursement to MRS, there was a negative 61 cents in a column. And we weren't alerted to that until last month. And we had to make the correction on that spreadsheet. And what happened was that one negative 61 cents in November ended up backing up our reimbursements for not only November but December and January also. And we weren't informed of it until February. So, we just last week, we finally got all of our back payments, and it caused a cash flow issue for about a three-week period in February for us. We will guarantee that that will never happen again, so when you see the balance sheet in June, this will look a lot different.

We currently have right around \$29,000 back into our checking account now that we have received those payments from MRS.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: May I ask a clarifying question about that, Steve?

>> STEVE LOCKE: Yes.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: So, when you didn't -- so what would be the mechanism that's going to -- you said you can guarantee it won't happen again -- what's the mechanism by which we're going to make sure that we -- it doesn't get backed up like that again?

>> STEVE LOCKE: We're going to have more eyes on the statement of expenditures to make sure that we don't have any negative balances in any of those columns.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: And then is there a way that, like, would it -- I guess if I wasn't going to pay a bill, I would tell the vendor, hey, I'm not going to pay this bill because, you know, blah, blah, blah. And so, I'm just wondering, is there a way to have a communication with MRS if there's a problem with our invoice so that they will know to pay it?

>> STEVE LOCKE: Yes. Yes. We're working with Bill Addison and Rodney Craig directly now on these as opposed to MRS staff that report to Bill and Rodney.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Gotcha. Okay. Thank you very much.

>> STEVE LOCKE: You're welcome.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. If no one else has any questions on this one, do you have another report you need to show us, Steve?

>> STEVE LOCKE: The last one is going to be our check register. So, this is our check register for February. Pretty much standard payments. Blue Cross Blue Shield, our accountant, our consulting firm for our outreach, employee fringe benefits, website, our interpreting services, cell phone bills, SILC Congress registrations, again, our accountant, our storage unit, staff benefits for UNUM, storage, and, again, staff benefits. So pretty much standard checks that were cut in February. Any questions on those?

All right. So, if there's no questions on those, the last item is policies and bylaws committee. There's been no activities on the policies and bylaws committee. Once we get Stephanie reappointed who's our treasurer and Mindy's filling in as the

interim treasurer, we are going to launch into revising our financial policies and taking a deeper look at those. They're pretty generic and pretty general. They're about a page and a half. And they need to be tightened up quite a bit more in terms of process and separation of duties. So, we will form a finance policy review around that, and that's the end of my report.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you so much, Steve. Next, we're on to the SPIL monitoring report. And the first up is advocacy and leadership, which is Theresa Metzmaker is our champion for that. Would you -- do you have a report for us, Theresa?

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Just that I met with Jon Hart and several of our CIL members about the various curriculums that could possibly be used for youth programming, and we kind of went through and picked out different activities we thought were best for running youth programming this summer for youth with disabilities.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Does anyone have any questions for Theresa about what's happening with that part of the SPIL? With the advocacy? Youth advocacy? Nope? Okay. Next up, which one is next there, Steve?

>> STEVE LOCKE: That is going to be personal care attendants.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Oh, okay.

>> STEVE LOCKE: Sorry. Let me put this back up.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: That's okay. Okay. Well, personal care attendants, I guess that would be me. And so, you know, there's -- we continue -- there's a direct care wage coalition that I am a part of that has -- we continue to meet monthly, and we've been meeting with legislators. There were hearings in the House Appropriations Committee today regarding the DHHS budget. And I was one of the folks that testified indicating that we need to do two things, one of which is really establish sort of a base wage for direct support professionals of at least \$18 an hour. And then also include employer costs to that, right? If there's overtime or employer share of payroll taxes and those kinds of things, but that also in addition to that, you know, creating that rate that we would -- we are asking for there to be cost of living increases throughout the future so that in ten years we're not back in the same place where those wages have lagged behind. And then finally, we added that our position is also that we really want to see resources in the budget for training and development of those direct support professionals and really showing that we value that workforce by giving them support and training and the things that they need so that they can make this a living and feel good about that work. And so that happened today -- that hearing happened today, and there was lots of testimony.

And we continue to sort of work both from the standpoint of trying to get funding for the wage piece but also working with Impart Alliance on that valued role of the professional, right, the direct support worker as an actual professional. And when you're a professional, you have training, and you have education, and you have ongoing, you know, development. And so those are the things that we feel are most beneficial to that workforce. So that's kind of where we are. There's a lot of work going on right now because it's budget time, right? And so, we're really pounding the pavement to get support within the legislature for that funding. Any questions? If none, hearing none, unserved and underserved populations.

>> STEVE LOCKE: Jan, I'm going to take that one, and I'm going to cover that under

the very last bullet point under outreach and awareness campaign.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay, that's perfect. So then emergency response, and that would be Frank and Mark Pierce. Who's going to present? Or are you going to tag team it?

>> MARK PIERCE: I'm going to let Frank start off, and then Maria, she'll give our report. Basically, it's the same report that's in this bill monitoring report. But Maria's here to make sure that we can answer all the questions.

So, Frank, if you have something to start off with?

>> FRANK ANIMIKWAM: Yeah. Thank you, Mark. And this is Frank Animikwam. And the bill monitoring report does get into a little bit more detail and overview. We still have been meeting regularly with our emergency preparedness team. And where we left off on our most recent meeting is going to be kind of following up on what are specific trainings that we could find beneficial as SILC council members, but also what are trainings that could be beneficial to our CILs throughout the state, and it could be specific trainings on certain emergencies that may arise regionally if it's weather related or maybe a little bit more on a broader scale, you know, such as like the pandemic and things like that.

So, we have identified several trainings, and then we'll provide more updates as they come along. The other thing that we're continuing to look at is developing our network and our coalition building. And, you know, we have our FEMA representative, regional FEMA representative as well as our representative from the Red Cross and continuing to maintain those partnerships, but also looking at, you know, what are some other unique partnerships we could develop.

And one of the things we're looking at emergency preparedness trainings for tribal communities in the state of Michigan. There are a lot of trainings through the federal government kind of along the emergency preparedness that those federal trainings. They seem to be geared more towards government bodies. So, we're kind of looking at, you know, could this be something that we share with tribes, or they're already aware of it, and then maybe that could be a point for us to connect on coalition building for that particular community.

And then the other thing was reaching out to, you know, politicians who may be having a hand in emergency preparedness and building on those partnerships as well. So that's what I have. I'll turn it over to Mark and Maria if they want to elaborate further on anything or have anything additional to share on that point. Thank you.

>> MARK PIERCE: I appreciate that, Frank. Maria, she has been working real heavily with the CILs and the representative concerning training and different emergency preparedness kits. So, Maria, if you could just do a real brief overview of where you're at in the last quarter concerning that.

>> MARIA PATON-GLASSBROOK: Sure. Thank you, Mark. So, like you said, my name is Maria Paton-Glassbrook. I'm carrying out the objective 1.3 in our SPIL concerning emergency preparedness. I developed a statewide working group that now has -- I believe it's 11 total CILs throughout the state, just problem solving with the ways that we administer creating the personal emergency preparedness plans with consumers as well as signing them up for a program called Smart 911. Has anyone heard of Smart 911 here? Okay, that's great. I see a lot of heads nodding. A lot of counties -- I shouldn't say a lot but some counties using an alderman system as well.

So just identifying whatever that system is of having the information be pulled up immediately for dispatchers in times of crisis and signing up consumers for that system. Our two main objectives, so we've met three times so far. And a lot of getting these goals accomplished has to do with capacity. So, we're slowly adding more team members, and each CIL that's involved is bringing on INR specialists, independent living specialists, and others to form their own little task force. And some of the trainings that were alluded to include certs -- sorry, the community emergency response training, so I have been going through that training to sort of understand it more. And it's basically a volunteer disaster response force. You know, every community in Michigan has their own CERT training.

And then we're also applying for the Michigan VOAD chapter, so that's voluntary organizations active in disasters. So, I'm still waiting to hear back on where we stand. I think that would help a lot with partnership building if we can get in the door with VOAD and team up with others like the Red Cross and Southern Baptist and other partners who have a long-term response group and recovery group. So, are there any questions at all on the emergency preparedness objectives?

>> CHARLES WILLIAM HARRISON: I have a quick question. This is Will Harrison. I now work with (Indiscernible), so we work with adults with disabilities and the elderly. One of the things that they're required to do actually is we actually hand out those -- when we meet for the first time, we actually go over the plan with them. It was interesting that I found that out because (Indiscernible) I work exclusively with adults with disabilities and that never came up. So, it was interesting how, you know, 10 minutes, thinking about, okay, (Indiscernible) what am I going to do if weather gets really bad and I get snowed in, what am I going to do? Who is that support? Assist the people doing that, just something so small, thinking about what I am going to do if an emergency comes up.

>> MARIA PATON-GLASSBROOK: So, if I'm understanding your question correctly, just talking through what each individual would do when an emergency comes up for adults with disabilities?

>> CHARLES WILLIAM HARRISON: Yes. Is that something the CILs do with people coming in for services?

Do you guys, like, sit down to help them create their emergency plan?

>> MARIA PATON-GLASSBROOK: Yes. And I'm uniquely situated because that's my entire role, and I understand not every CIL has the luxury of sitting down with consumers and creating their plans. So, the other CILs that I've worked with, some have, like, a community outreach role. And they work with the intake specialists -- or I'm sorry, the INR specialists or independent living specialists. So, it's kind of hodgepoded together, whatever makes sense for the funding that's been allocated to those staff members. Groups make it a lot easier to one-on-one planning is obviously ideal but doing the community education helps because then you can immediately -- after you -- I take a lot of my content from ready.gov which is FEMA's kind of a community member response resource page, after I go through those resources, I just individually make the plan with each person that's been at the class. So, we took some existing class members from, like, our social connections and there's, you know, MRS successful living classes, they created a portion for me to come in, so that was really helpful, too. So just looking at what groups you already have and then

adding the preparedness content and then when you have them there, just getting them through the plan and Smart 911. It is a little time-consuming, but it's definitely worth it, you know, if something happens, they have a plan.

>> MARK PIERCE: Yeah. Thank you, Maria. And I'd like to reiterate, whenever we do one-on-ones for people and we take -- we walk through with them, that really is where we are expressing the culture of a CIO. Someone taking the time to go through it with the person, and I'm really proud of us for doing that. Because -- excuse me -- that's all of the CILs' strengths. And so, the biggest part of setting up emergency preparedness is having the forms that are needed, making sure that we can get that information into our database, and then above all, making the person feeling comfortable when an emergency happens. They kind of know what to do. And that's where the rubber meets the road. I spoke to the Rotary last week on Friday. And I talked to them about that piece right there. Someone sitting down, creating a little ditty bag or a little -- anything, putting it together with two or three days of meds, a couple snacks, who's your point of contact, and if you have to go, you can grab that bag, and you're ready to go. And that is so important.

I think you're right on point when you asked that question, Will, because CILs, that's what we do. That's what we do. That peer support. So, I'll get off my soapbox.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you, Mark. And thank you also, Maria. I really like the idea of you becoming involved with the emergency organizations, right, with the Southern Baptists and those folks because having been -- lived in a community where we have had, like, in a three-year span, we had three major disasters, two of them being floods, one of them being dams bursting. The need for there to be people who know how to help somebody using a wheelchair and making sure that the places -- the shelters are wheelchair accessible, which is you would think that's so simple in 2022, but I guess it's not. So, thank you for that really great leadership and work in that area.

What is -- who is our --

>> FRANK ANIMIKWAM: Jan, I wanted to share one more point.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Sure, of course.

>> FRANK ANIMIKWAM: What we're doing on this committee. You know, Maria pointed out not every CIL has the luxury of having a point contact person like that to assist, you know, just the consumers with those -- meeting those needs and being emergency prepared. And that's, I think, where SILC -- we have a unique role, you know, like I stated, the coalition building. You know, we can help spread the word. We can link CILs who may not be familiar with what trainings are out there with CILs who already have it going on, have the understanding and those resources in place. And it just builds from there. We can help complement the services that we do. And then, you know, ideally get CILs to the point where if they don't have that in place, they can build it and create that for their consumers.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Yeah. And, Frank, it's so, so important, that emergency preparedness is just critically important all across our state. So, thank you again, team, for all the work you're doing. It sounds wonderful. Okay.

Who's our next group here? Let's see. Let's have a look. So -- oh, Lisa. The BSBP objective. Did you already give that information at the -- in your ex-officio report? I'm going to say she did. So, let's move on to the outreach and awareness campaign. Is that -- who's going to report on that? Is that you, Steve?

>> STEVE LOCKE: Yes.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. Well, then let's hear it. I'm (muted).

>> STEVE LOCKE: Am I off mute?

>> LISA KISIEL: Yes, I did. I apologize. I'm constantly doing the visual search for the mute button. My apologies.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: You're okay. Thanks, Lisa.

>> LISA KISIEL: Google Meets, where am I?

[Laughter]

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Well, luckily, we're hopefully going to be able to be in person in the future. And so fewer of us will need to find the mute button.

>> LISA KISIEL: There you go.

[Laughter]

>> STEVE LOCKE: Okay. The outreach and awareness campaign. We are off to an awesome start. As all of you know, back in September, SILC issued an RFP for comprehensive statewide services to unserved and underserved disability populations here in Michigan. And we awarded a contract to IDEA 39. We got a steering work group together that's made up of council members, BSBP staff, and CIL directors. And our team includes Yvonne Fleener, Diane Fleser, and Alex Gossage for the CIL directors, Lisa for BSBP, and for the council, we have Frank, Jamia, Jan, Will, and myself. Now, the steering outreach team has met several times with our contractor over the first few months of this year.

And the overarching theme of our outreach campaign is going to Be Shining a Light on the work that we do, the principles of independent living, the work of our partners, and the contributions that people with disabilities make. We're also currently working on the following: Defining who our audience is, fleshing out our concepts, conducting a media audit, creating a phases overview, drafting tactics, discussing media outlets, defining a timeline, and reviewing next steps.

We are really hoping in our timeline to have the lion's share of this done by the end of this fiscal year. We've also had some discussions on absolute musts, the things that we must do and then the nice to haves (Indiscernible) as far as tactics and different approaches for this outreach campaign. So, we have 45 or \$50,000 allocated in this year's budget to this effort. (Indiscernible) beyond fiscal year and this fiscal year and there's going to be an associated cost with that. And we will build that into next year's negotiated budget. So, as we start moving more through the summertime and we get closer to getting ready to develop our next year's budget, we'll have a better grasp on if there's going to be additional costs to this moving into the next fiscal year, and those costs will be brought to you in a budget -- draft budget for approval.

But I have to tell you, without letting the cat out of the bag, very exciting times. Very exciting things happening. And every time we meet with the contractor, I just know every time it's reinforced that we have picked the right one for the work that we're doing. So, if anyone else wants to comment on the outreach project that's part of the team, I'll open up the floor, and then I'll turn it back to Jan.

>> JAMIA DAVIS: I just want to say I'm very excited to be on the team. We've really been working hard to define what it is that we really want to see. So, it's exciting thing

to have for sure. I'm sure everyone can attest to everyone being -- you know, excited for what's to come. So, yeah. Good job, everybody.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you. Thank you, everyone, for that report. Okay. So now we are on to unfinished business. And new business. And this is the part of the agenda. Well, there's one thing. New financial institution recommendation and discussion. And then I want to revisit the topic we were discussing earlier related to the MRS and CIL agreement, whatever you want to call it, related to vocational services. So, yep. MRS rate conversation. Thank you for typing that in. Is that you, Steve? I appreciate that.

So, let's start with -- yes. Let's start with the new financial institution recommendation discussion. And I assume, Steve, that you are going to share with us the details of that, and then we will --

>> STEVE LOCKE: Yes.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: -- open the floor. Okay. Thank you.

>> STEVE LOCKE: Yeah. Just real briefly, we are with Adventure Credit Union in Lansing. They have five branches. They're pretty much Michigan-based. Back in October and November, they did a system upgrade to their banking system. Prior to that our QuickBooks was able to interface with our account, and we were able to do electronic communications back and forth with our accounting system and our bank. After they did the upgrades, they did not relaunch the ability for our QuickBooks to interface with their system any longer, and they don't foresee that happening in the future.

So, Tracy and I and Brad have been looking at other financial institutions for us to move to that offers those services. And after we did some review, we are recommending moving to Chase Bank, the branch that's in Caledonia. Grand Rapids is really the closest. So, we're looking for council approval for us to move our banking needs from Adventure Credit Union to Chase Bank. And if the council votes on that this evening, to approve that, then Tracy and I and Brad will start the paperwork with Chase. We will also need to have our treasurer personally accompany me to Chase Bank to that location once we have all of the documents filled out to do actual signatures in person to get those accounts open. So that is what staff is recommended to the council is to vote to move from Adventure Credit Union to Chase Bank effective as soon as possible.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. Thank you. Steve, what I'd like to do is get a motion on the floor and then if folks have questions or discussion, we can entertain that. Do we have someone who would be willing to make a motion to the effect of what Steve has recommended?

>> MINDY KULASA: Yes. This is Mindy Kulasa. I move that we transfer our banking relationship to the Chase Bank office that has been recommended by our Administrative Team there, Steve and Tracy, so that we can maintain our internal controls with proper interfaces between our system and our banking relationship.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you, Mindy. Do we have a second?

>> JAMIA DAVIS: This is Jamia Davis. I second. Sorry.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you, Jamia. Does anyone want to ask any clarifying questions or have any topic for discussion before we take a vote on this matter?

>> MARK PIERCE: So, this is Mark. I have a really basic question. The interface,

that's going to be QuickBooks Online interfacing with that institution. When you say "interface," what do we really mean?

>> STEVE LOCKE: Mark, it means that our -- we use a QuickBooks system that's online as opposed to sitting on a server in an office somewhere.

>> MARK PIERCE: Right.

>> STEVE LOCKE: And it allows our QuickBooks to access our online account so that transactions that go in and out of our account are downloaded into our QuickBooks system in real time so that our banking account is speaking the same language as our accounting software in real time.

>> MARK PIERCE: Wow! I wouldn't mind doing that with my own agency.

[Laughter]

>> JAMIA DAVIS: Yes.

>> MARK PIERCE: Yeah, anyway, yeah.

>> STEVE LOCKE: To the point where -- yeah.

>> MARK PIERCE: Yeah. That's awesome. That's awesome. I mean, I didn't know Chase done that. Okay. That was the only question I had.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. Any other questions or topics for discussion on this motion? Seeing none, I'd like to call the vote. Tracy, can you do a roll call vote, please?

>> TRACY BROWN: Sure. Frank Animikwam?

>> FRANK ANIMIKWAM: Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Jamia Davis.

>> JAMIA DAVIS: Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Will Harrison?

>> CHARLES WILLIAM HARRISON: Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Mindy Kulasa.

>> MINDY KULASA: Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Mark Pierce.

>> MARK PIERCE: Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Jan Lampman.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Motion carried.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. Thank you very much, everyone. The next topic on our agenda is the MRS fee for service conversation that we had started during Mark and Lori's report. And I would like to open the floor to the council members to -- if you have other questions or if you have thoughts or ideas related to how the SILC can be supportive of our partners, that would be great.

>> JAMIA DAVIS: Yes, I have a question. Is there any way that we can allocate some of our budget to possibly make up for the loss of the rates or them decreasing the rates?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: The SILC budget?

>> JAMIA DAVIS: Yes.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Steve, do you want to respond?

>> STEVE LOCKE: Yeah. Actually, when it comes to something like that, Jamia, probably not. Now, if we wanted to be intentional -- now, we could budget money?

The SILC budget for the CILs. For example, if we wanted to intentionally pay for statewide training for CIL employees or things of that nature where it's articulated in the SPIL, and it's aligned with one of our SPIL goals, we can budget for that within our budget. But we currently don't have anything like that in our budget right now. But as far as, like, revenue loss for one of our partners, that's really not the function of our budget. Our budget is really to support the council. And the development, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of the SPIL itself.

>> JAMIA DAVIS: Thank you.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Who else has questions? Thoughts? Ideas?

>> MARK PIERCE: Well, this is Mark. Oh, it looks like Theresa has her hand up.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Yep, Theresa, yes, she's in my upper left-hand corner. So, Theresa.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Mark was before me. You can go ahead, Mark.

>> MARK PIERCE: I was going to stick my hand up just through the protocol.

[Laughter]

Anyway, I think one of the ways to kind of know what's going on is maybe a letter to legislators to let them know the effects of this type of restructure on different CILs across the state, and that would be a way in which they would tell you what that effect is, and you would be putting in, like, real time information. Excuse me, which wouldn't be too hard to do. That would be what I think would be a good way to go with it.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: And you're thinking each of the CILs would do that and then some of their constituents, or who would you thinking would write that letter?

>> MARK PIERCE: Well, I think the letter -- you know, you would take facts from what's going on at the CILs, you know, we're trying to be proactive in how we're dealing with it, because these are losses that have not been encountered yet.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Right.

>> MARK PIERCE: But a letter to let people know that this is something that's on our radar that's coming down the pipe and then, of course, the CILs could get -- give you the real time data as to how it's affecting them. And that could go to one of the appropriation committee heads or something like that.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: So, I know Mindy said that -- Mindy, you said you spoke to your legislator. Is Mindy still on? Oh, yeah. There you are.

>> MINDY KULASA: Yes. I sure am.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Can you just tell us who your person is?

>> MINDY KULASA: Sure. Sure. His name is -- oh.

[Laughter]

>> JAN LAMPMAN: It's okay. I didn't mean to put you on the spot.

>> MINDY KULASA: John McCann. I'm so sorry. Someone else's name is stuck in my head right now. Senator Shawn McCann is the Senator who represents our legislative district in Southwest Michigan.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. Thank you.

>> MINDY KULASA: And his office was very concerned when I shared what was transpiring, and they have reached out to the Department of LEO who is the oversight agency for MRS. And they are awaiting a response back from LEO.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. Okay. I see, Theresa, you have your hand up. If you

can just hold on one second. Frank asked a question in the chat, which is can an advocacy letter for CILs come from SILC?

And that's, like, a technical question that we probably need guidance from Steve to answer. Or even a petition to petition to change rates with signatures of all CILs affected? So, let's just take the first half of that. You know, because I know there are some very specific guidelines -- guidance for the SILC in terms of how we advocate for public policy. So, Steve, can you give us a little bit of clarity on, like, what our parameters are? I mean, I think we should probably know that to start off with, right?

>> STEVE LOCKE: So WIOA in 2014 gave SILC some additional abilities. One of those was resource development, which is fund-raising. And in order to be able to do that, you need to have that in your SPIL. The other is advocacy. In order to advocate, we need to have specific advocacy goals within the CIL and then advocate around those goals.

>> MARK PIERCE: Right.

>> STEVE LOCKE: So, it's very specific in WIOA for SILC about the advocacy issues that we can advocate about. But in our conversation with ACL also, they said you can also take your cues from anywhere within the SPIL and anywhere within the SPIL language according to Regina Bly that it can actually be a bit broader than that. As you read through the SPIL in sections other than the goals and objectives, if there's something in there that you feel that this issue would tuck up underneath, then it would be a defensible letter to write in terms of advocacy. So that's my technical advice.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. So, I want to get to Theresa's question, and then I have a question of my own related to the SPIL in this. So go ahead, Theresa. I'll let you go first.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Frank asked my question.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Oh, I'm sorry.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: If you want to go, Jan, that's great.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: So, the question I have -- and, again, I have a son that uses the services, but I don't know enough about what that means. When my son uses his pre-voc services, there is a person, a direct support worker, that's working with him. Right? And so, I would imagine that these rates impact the wage of that direct worker. Am I right about that, Mark or -- yeah, Mark, can you tell me if I'm right about that?

>> MARK PIERCE: Yes. If they use the CIL to provide that service.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Yes. It's a CIL, yep.

>> MARK PIERCE: Yeah, yeah. If they provide -- I was trying to multitask again.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Ugh!

>> MARK PIERCE: Advocacy and technical amendments. I'm sitting here thinking about what Steve said. Steve said that if it's in the SPIL, so things that we have goals that we're trying to achieve, and does it affect any of them goals? Is that what you're saying, Steve?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: It is what he's saying. And so, my question is are -- we have a specific SPIL goal about the wages of direct caregivers, right, direct support people. And so, I just didn't know if any of the people that are impacted, it feels like it would be. It feels like when my son had the summer program, he had, like, a job for six weeks in the summer that the CIL did that, you know, like he had a person from the CIL that was, like, his job coach.

>> MARK PIERCE: Okay.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Right? And so, I feel like that was -- and MRS paid for that. MRS paid the CIL, and then the job coach went with my son for his six-week summer job program.

>> MARK PIERCE: Mm-hmm.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: I feel like is that one of the services we're talking about? Because that is a direct support professional right there.

>> MARK PIERCE: That's true. That is true.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: So I'm just asking the question, if that is something where some of those direct front-line workers are being impacted because of these rates, and if so, then it is within our role to advocate for the wages that those people need to be able to continue to provide that service to the people -- to our constituents, right?

>> MARK PIERCE: Right. That --

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Am I -- am I going too far?

>> MARK PIERCE: I'm thinking. I'm trying to do a couple things. But I think you're on the right track. So, if it comes down to job development, job placement, if that CIL has been given that job, which would be a one-on-one thing. And so, if that rate was not being able to -- if the CIL couldn't provide (Indiscernible) was too low, then, yeah, that would be one less person that's out there to assist your son with job coaching or whatever it may be. And so, these are -- that's one of the down and dirties of it. And so, in that particular case, and whatever other type of services, it's almost a case-by-case basis.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Sure.

>> MARK PIERCE: Because -- and that was brought up, how many authorizations would it take for one-on-one to provide all these different services. That's a whole another ball game. I don't want to, off the top of my head, just say something and not have the nitty gritty --

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Sure, sure.

>> MARK PIERCE: -- of how that works. Just like at one CIL, they may charge one rate, and at another CIL, they may charge another rate. And just to give you an example, if that's up in the northern part of Michigan and they've got to drive -- a person's got to drive a long way to a jobsite --

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Right.

>> MARK PIERCE: -- but they can't get reimbursed for gas, that's a hardship on that CIL.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Right.

>> MARK PIERCE: And that's some of the concerns when it's somebody northern, a CIL, that they can't afford \$45 or \$50 an hour to put somebody on the road, provide the service, and then drive that person back, especially if it's a six or seven-hour drive.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay.

>> MARK PIERCE: So, you know, it's a lot of different scenarios there.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. What other thoughts do council members have or questions do council members have? What are you feeling right now, council members?

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Are you looking at someone other than me?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: No, absolutely. I was seeing if anybody else wanted to say

anything first. Yes, can you go next.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Okay. I just -- I wonder -- so there's two things, right? Like, we can reach out to the legislators and things like that. Also, don't we choose MRS as our partner? Like, we designate them as the group that will be our pastor, don't we? We choose them and then the CIL directors all sign on. Like, as SILC members, can't we also reach out to Tina and be, like, you are our partner, and I'm hearing you're not responding to our CILs? Because we choose them. And so, I feel like I've heard more than one person on this call say that they voiced concern over this, and they're not getting a response. And so, I just feel like as a SILC, our role could be to reach out and say that we find that concerning since they are our partner, and we chose them to be our partner, so they should be responsive to the needs of our CILs.

>> MINDY KULASA: Yeah, Theresa. This is Mindy Kulasa. You're exactly right. They're our designated state entity, or our DSE. And, Steve, I know we've had some prior conversations about the role of the DSE and the fact that it is a choice as to who your designated state entity is.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Will.

>> CHARLES WILLIAM HARRISON: So, is this the issue -- is this an issue with MRS as a whole, or is it an issue with Tina Fullerton? It sounds like that's where the (Indiscernible) lies unless I'm missing something. Just curious.

>> MINDY KULASA: Well, I've reached out to one other party at MRS, and that party wasn't responsive either.

>> MARK PIERCE: So --

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Go ahead, Mark. No, that's okay, Mark. You go.

>> MARK PIERCE: So, the issue with -- what we feel like with CILs is that from that perspective is that we consider ourselves a partner, and we really wanted to get that impact study done so that our concerns could be put -- be a part of that. And that, I think, we never got that impact study done. So that we could say, okay. Well, this is where it affects us. And we could tell them exactly. And so that made it very disheartening. Now, the communications breakdown that Will asked, you know, I think it's almost the whole agency because we can still work -- I still work fine with my site managers and stuff like that. But I just can't do anything about something that's above their head, which that would be Tina and the executive team.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: It feels like to me there are two things, right? One, that you have asked for an economic impact study. And I would assume that probably Encompass Michigan has also asked for that.

>> MARK PIERCE: Yeah.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: So, I mean, the whole -- the whole -- everybody is asking for that. And then the second thing is that you've also asked for a meeting or a conversation with the director, and you have not gotten that as well. Is that -- did I --

>> MARK PIERCE: Right. So, you know --

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Correct.

>> MARK PIERCE: -- never answered the question of how the rates were determined, which that has everything to do with that impact study. And so, we feel like, oh, you determine the rates, and we understand the methodology. Okay, we were included in this area here we've got to bite the bullet but over in this area, you understood our needs. And that type of conversation never occurred. So, we've done

all we could as far as having different directors be at the table to have, you know, meetings with seniors in MRS, but we never got that question answered. You know, how was it really determined.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Did anyone else have any questions or comments that you want to make right now? No other questions or comments? So does -- okay. So, before I say anything, because I'm the Chair, I'm not supposed to be the one that says everything. So, is there anybody on the council who has, like, who would like to make any kind of motion related to action that the council might take in this situation? Steve, did you have something you wanted to say? I can't tell if you're having a camera issue or if you're wanting to say something.

[Laughter]

>> STEVE LOCKE: No, nothing to say. Just camera issue and then my dogs.
[Laughter]

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. You must have an unstable Internet connection right now. So, does anyone on the council have anything they would like to recommend?

>> MINDY KULASA: This is Mindy Kulasa. I think one consideration that doesn't get us into this whole area of -- to advocate or to not advocate with legislators based on the way our current SPIL is drafted, certainly as an important partner if had this entire process, and that goes back to Bill Addison's presentation as well. It's important that, you know, this is a symbiotic relationship, and we should all be working as partners, MRS, the SILC, and the CILs. I think it would be perfectly in line for the SILC to request of MRS or support their request for fiscal impact study to be done and to pause the rate changes until a fiscal impact study can be completed. Certainly, there's been a ton of data gathered over the last several years that would facilitate a lot of the work because it's my understanding that there was time and motion studies done to determine how much time different things took. I just remember all sorts of reporting to the consultants or reporting requested by the consultants related to these issues.

So, I would move that the SILC would provide a letter of support to the CILs in requesting that the fiscal impact study be completed, and the rates be put on pause until such time as that is completed.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: And the letter, just to be clear in your motion, the letter would be written to MRS?

>> MINDY KULASA: Correct.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay, thank you.

>> MINDY KULASA: With copies to the Department of LEO.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. Okay. Thank you. Okay.

>> MINDY KULASA: Not to legislators at this point in the game. I think we need to try to resolve this within our own house. I only reached out to legislator because I was so concerned about the negative impact that this was going to have on our clients in southwest Michigan.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: And really, Mindy, as a private citizen, all of us are entitled to reach out to our legislators any time we want, right? And that is definitely an advocate strategy that I have always been very fond of myself. So, thank you for your personal advocacy.

And so, we have a motion on the floor that the SILC would draft a letter supporting the economic or fiscal impact statement that has been requested by the CILs and also in encompass Michigan and ask for that to be done in supporting that request. Do we have a second on that motion?

>> MARK PIERCE: This is Mark Pierce. I will second that.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. We have a motion on the floor with a second. Do we have any further discussion or questions on that motion at this time?

>> JAMIA DAVIS: I have a quick question. What would be the immediate effect of putting the rate on hold? The current rate on hold? Would it default to the old one?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Yes. They would just keep the rates as they are.

>> JAMIA DAVIS: Okay. Just for clarification. Thanks.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Any other questions or discussion on the motion that is on the floor? Seeing none, I would like Tracy to please do the roll call vote.

>> TRACY BROWN: Frank Animikwam.

>> FRANK ANIMIKWAM: Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Jamia Davis.

>> JAMIA DAVIS: Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Will Harrison.

>> CHARLES WILLIAM HARRISON: Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Mindy Kulasa.

>> MINDY KULASA: Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Mark Pierce.

>> MARK PIERCE: Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Jan Lampman.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Aye.

>> TRACY BROWN: Motion carried.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. Thank you. That was, I think, some very excellent and robust discussion. I --

>> MARK PIERCE: I've got one more question.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Yeah. Of course.

>> MARK PIERCE: I just wanted to know who would write the letter.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Oh, that is an excellent question. In my mind, I made an assumption -- I shouldn't have --

[Laughter]

-- I would like to propose that that would be a letter that might be signed by Steve and myself as the Chair of the SILC. So, I would sign on behalf of all of the council members if that would -- do we need to vote on that? Mindy's saying no. She says no. It feels like that would be --

>> MINDY KULASA: Appropriate for it to come from Steve and Jan. Yes.

>> MARK PIERCE: Okay. Okay. I just wanted to know who would write it, and we're going to try to get this done in this quarter or, you know, within so many weeks or?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: I was thinking that we would write it, like, now. Not right now. Not right now because (Indiscernible) --

>> MARK PIERCE: Yeah, I know. Like tomorrow now.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Tomorrow or Friday now. Not three months from now.

>> MARK PIERCE: Oh, okay. Okay. All right. Well, I just want to say thank you.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: It was a good clarifying question, Mark. Thank you. We are to the information and sharing and announcements section of our meeting. I would also, though, like to be very cognizant of time, because we are at 8:33. And we have lots of public comment. We have lots of folks on the line for public comment. So does anyone have, with me saying that, and giving you my eye, does anyone have information sharing or announcements that you feel are very critical to -- oh, Theresa.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: No. I just wanted to -- so if we write it now, will you all keep us updated about if you get a response or not?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Yes.

>> THERESA METZMAKER: Okay. Or a no response?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Right. I would imagine that we'll send all of the council members a copy of what gets sent along with CIL Directors. They'll be copied on the letter as well. So, you'll know. And then we'll let you know if -- and CIL directors will have to let us know if they hear anything.

>> MARK PIERCE: Oh, yeah. Yeah. Yes, definitely.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay.

>> MARK PIERCE: Definitely.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Okay. Okay. So, let's -- if we have no announcements, no other announcements for the good of the order, how about if we go into public comment? Do we have anyone who would like to make a public comment? If you could just raise your hand. Yvonne. Yvonne Fleener who is Director of the CIL in Southwest Michigan.

>> YVONNE FLEENER: Hello, everybody. Good to see you all. I miss your happy, shining faces. I want to start off by saying thank you and it's super cool to see the SILC doing advocacy, and I'm -- I know it's tough and really, really appreciate the hard work and the conversation that you guys had tonight. So, thank you, thank you, thank you. You know, Mindy is on the board at disability southwest Michigan and shared a little bit about the impact that it has to us, and this was highlighted a little bit. But being that these rate changes came out midyear, we are facing over \$300,000 deficit because the budget was built under different rates. So, you know, we are pivoting. We likely will not be able to serve as many MRS customers, unfortunately, because that is an impact on people with disabilities, but we are also a business that has to stay sustainable and solvent, so we have to make some tough decisions unfortunately because of the decisions that are being made by MRS.

So, I want to talk about something happy, though, because we've had enough of that. And some of the things that we are doing as part of our pivot to new work. One, we are running, again, this summer the Advocacy Academy. And that is for -- it's a paid position. It's an eight-week academy. It runs three days a week, 12 hours a week. And that is for people with disabilities. They learn the disability history, leadership development, workplace skills. They work on an advocacy project in the community. It is Kalamazoo-based, but super excited that we are continuing that program and looking for additional funding for that, and excited that we are actually paying the people who attend so that, you know, instead of summer employment, they can choose this eight-week program and still make some income. So really, really excited to meet the applicants. We had people applying before the applicant -- before it was even, like, officially launched. So, I know there's excitement. It is

Kalamazoo-based, but I'd be happy to have that team come in sometime and just talk about the academy and the work that we do and who knows? Maybe it will be a future SPIL goal.

And then the second thing, we got a three-year grant from the DD council, and we are just finally getting started. All the paperwork has been signed. And that grant is to do statewide training for children birth to 12 years old and their parents. And what I'm really excited about is for those of you who are parents, in general, but specifically parents of a child with a disability and you remember that day, right, when you get that news, that there's something going on, right, and that can be a really tough day to hear that news, that your child is being diagnosed with something or being labeled with something by the school system. So, for me the exciting part is that we get to now, statewide, through this grant, go in and help these families say, yep, you know, your child has autism, or your child has blah, this thing. But you know what? Let me tell you about the disability rights movement. Let me tell you about Disability Pride. Let me tell you about inclusion. Let me tell you about all the good things that can and should still happen for your child.

It even includes benefits planning because we all know people think oh, no! Now my kid can never have a job because he'll lose all his benefits. Alternative to guardianship is part of it. So, we'll be reaching these families at that young age, and so I'm super excited because I think this can really have an impact on the mindset, right, that our families have on what's possible for their children. So those are the two items I want to share, and I'll share more as we launch it. So, thank you, thank you, thank you for all your hard work. Appreciate all of you.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you very much, Yvonne. That will definitely be a future educational program for sure. Did you have a quick comment, Jamia, before we move on to the next public comment?

>> JAMIA DAVIS: Oh, no. That was just an applause.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Oh, that was an applause one. It looked like a hand one.

Next up we have Diane. Are you unmuted?

>> Diane: Can you hear me?

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Yes. Now we can.

>> Diane: Wonderful. Thank you. Thank you. Well, good evening, Madam Chair, and SILC council members. My name's Diane Fleser. I want to thank you for your time and service. I am the Chief Executive Officer at Disability Network West Michigan. We serve Lake, Mason, Oceana and Muskegon Counties and I really just wanted to take this opportunity to share some of the work unravelling in West Michigan, and this has been such a long meeting, so I will keep it quick and appreciate all of your time with staying on.

This last quarter our center received \$50,000 from the Disability Vaccine Access Opportunity Center. This was funding operated by ABLE South Carolina, a CIL located in South Carolina, in collaboration with ILRU who many of you know provide technical assistance for CILs along with grant funding from the CDC Foundation. And as we've all experienced in times of crisis, weaknesses in our institutions and social systems become a lot more evident, and during the pandemic people with disabilities definitely were not immune to that. This funding is going to help us to increase and strengthen COVID-19 vaccine confidence among people with disabilities and improve the

education provided. I know a lot of us would like to think that the pandemic is over, but for people with disabilities, you know, we remain just as vulnerable as ever, especially with mask mandates being lifted, the death rate for people with disabilities is a lot higher than those without who contract COVID. So, we're really excited to be doing this work in West Michigan to improve access to COVID-19 vaccines for people with disabilities. We'll be doing a couple of accessible clinics in our rural areas and providing transportation to get there. We're also working with our local emergency personnel to deliver vaccines to homebound individuals as well. And so, once this project is over, I'd be happy to come back and do a formal presentation for the SILC to share what was accomplished through those efforts.

One more thing I wanted to share is many of you may know a very fantastic person named Stephanie Deible who I'm fortunate to have at my center, I have asked her to lead our efforts with a national collaborative that we were asked to be a part of as one of nine Centers for Independent Living in the country. This collaborative is through the Association of Programs for Rural Independent Living and will focus on rural outreach efforts for people with disabilities, and so we're being joined by centers in Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, and California and bringing Michigan to that table to learn these best practices from other states and other CILs across the nation so that we can bring them home to our state of Michigan.

Lastly, I just wanted to share that the disability community, as all of you know, is incredibly resilient and strong. But the current rate restructuring MRS is imposing will negatively impact not only CILs but more importantly the people we serve. CILs worked with MRS in good faith for nine months. I was on that committee to create a new MOU with the MRS partners. Once that MOU was finalized, before the current fiscal year that we're in now, it was literally two weeks after that we got the notification that these new rates would be executed.

So, all of that time and good-faith effort went down the drain very quickly. When it was shared that the rate restructures would go into effect this year, just to paint a really quick picture for you locally. For all of the services we provided last year, if we were to apply the new rates to the exact same services we applied last year, it's a difference of \$98,000. So, for services that were provided last year with the current rates, we did \$128,000 worth of services for our pre-employment transition services when we applied the new rates to those exact same services, it's \$30,000. So, making that difference of 98 just for our pre-employment transition services.

As you know, we have sent a formal request to postpone the rate restructures to no avail. Postponing the rate restructure to align with a new fiscal year so that our capacity to deliver services for this current fiscal year is not impeded, does not seem like a huge ask. We all recognize and understand that as a finding on a federal audit, this is something that needs to be addressed, and we -- I -- I should say I support MRS in addressing that, but not waiting until the new fiscal year to impose these rate restructures so that we can plan for our communities and people with disabilities is incredibly disappointing and will be incredibly disappointing to people with disabilities in the state of Michigan. So, I appreciate your time, your topic, and discussion around that topic. Thank you so much for your advocacy and for your time tonight.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you very much. And what, again, amazing work you are doing. Are there any other individuals on the call who would like to make public

comment this evening? Okay. I don't see any more hands, so I'm going to just say thank you again to all of the people who are visitors and guests on the call and who made public comment and those of you who stayed on the line and listened. Thank you to our presenters this evening. Bill and also Lisa -- or Lori, I'm sorry, Lori Hill, and Bill Addison, thank you both for presenting to us. Thank you, council members, for excellent and robust discussion and conversation regarding these MRS rates but also all of the work that you do. I loved the SPIL reports, and I know Steve does, too. We are doing some great work together. And I am so thankful to all of you and appreciate all of you. And with that, I would like to have a motion to adjourn. No one wants to adjourn.

>> MARK PIERCE: This is Mark Pierce. Motion to adjourn.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Do I have a second?

>> FRANK ANIMIKWAM: This is Frank Animikwam. I second.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Thank you, Frank. I was going to say, I know this has been fun, but come on, people. I don't know that we need to do a roll call. How about if we just do an all-in favor say aye.

>> All: Aye.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Any opposed? With that, this meeting is adjourned. And thank you all again.

>> YVONNE FLEENER: Bye, everybody.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Have a great night. Yeah.

>> Thank you.

>> JAN LAMPMAN: Bye.

>> Good night.