

# CROSS-DISABILITIES ADVISORY COUNCIL

## Virtual Meeting

Friday, Jan 31, 2025

3:00 p.m. – 5:01 p.m.

**Cross-Disability Advisory Council voting members present:** Susan Karpyak, Heather Larson, Toby Lunstad, Katynka Morrisette, Stephanie Nelson, Magan Paulson, Erin Peterson, Vicki Peterson, Megan Sande, Trevor Vannett  
**Cross-Disability Advisory Council non-voting members present:** Jackie Adusumilli, Kathy Barchenger, Kayla Fender, Kim Hruby, Kevin Miiller  
**Guests present:** Erin Leveton, Kathy Miiller, Jillian Salmon

## WELCOME and ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

The meeting was called to order at 3:00.

## GENERAL BUSINESS

- Role Call
- APPROVAL OF CDAC DECEMBER 11<sup>th</sup> MINUTES
  - Kevin Miiller opened the floor for discussion on the February “ND-CDAC Minutes 11DEC24 DRAFT”
  - Motion: It was moved by Trevor Vannett and seconded by Katynka Morrisette to approve the Dec 11 CDAC minutes.
  - Vote (Yes): Susan Karpyak, Toby Lunstad, Katynka Morrisette, Magan Paulson, Erin Peterson, Vicki Peterson, Megan Sande, Trevor Vannett
  - Vote (No): none
  - Motion carried

## Feedback on Qualifying for Paid Family Caregiving Options

- CDAC provided **input on the assessment of extraordinary need:**
  - Participants are interested in the possibility of including an optional narrative to more fully capture a child’s needs
  - One member suggested that including references to typical age ranges in the assessment is helpful
  - Another member suggested looking into the option of using HRST in conjunction with other tools to better understand the health risk
  - Members expressed concern that younger children are more difficult to screen because infants typically need extensive supervision on tasks
- Members **discussed whether LRIs should only serve as “provider of last resort”**
  - Several participants felt that requiring LRIs to perform an exhaustive search for other caregivers was not in the best interest of caregivers or individuals, as it can be a time-consuming and emotionally draining process
  - Participants felt the focus should be only on the individual’s best interest
  - A member observed that this process could add a third door to getting care - eligibility, determination of need for in-home support, and then determination of extraordinary need for paid family caregiving
  - Participants also expressed concern with having to focus on a child’s challenges again and telling their story so many times, and shared that the burden of proof of need is exhausting for families

## Additional Feedback on Paid Family Caregiving Options

- Participants discussed the **use of safeguards** and noted the following:
  - EVV could be helpful, but families need instruction/training/support to use
  - Safeguards and ease of use must be balanced for families
  - Case managers may play an important role in risk management
- Members discussed the **pros and cons of different billing units** for this service
  - Participants expressed concern that a daily rate could limit amount of services in a day / increase risk of double billing
  - Members expressed support for 15-minute units to allow for a mix of services in a day, including respite, and reduce risk of caregiver burnout

## Next Meeting

- Hold the date and time for the next meeting June 12<sup>th</sup> 10am – 1pm

## ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.