

**DETAILED STAKEHOLDER SUMMARY OF THE MEETING OF THE
ADULTS WITH INTELLECTUAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES
(IDD) WAIVER REDESIGN STAKEHOLDERS**

303 E 17th Ave Denver CO 80203
Call In: 720-279-0026 Participant Code: 869804#
Adobe Connect: <https://cohcpf.adobeconnect.com/wic/>

April 10, 2019
1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Department participants in-person:

Alicia Etheredge	Candace Bailey	John Barry
Kelly O'Brien	Lori Thompson	

Department participants on the phone:

Betsy Holt	Scott Nelson
------------	--------------

Stakeholder participants in-person:

Bob Lawhead, Colo Developmental Disability Council, parent
Jodi Walters, Parker Personal Care Homes

Stakeholder participants on the phone:

Carol Meredith, parent, Arc of Arapahoe/Douglas
Cassidy Dellemonache, parent
Charlene Willey, parent
David Bolin, AOI Homecare
Ellen Jensby, Alliance
Gerrie Frohne, family member
Jessica Eppel, Mosaic
Jessica Shouse, Arc of Larimer
John Klausz, Mt. Valley Developmental Services
Julie Wismann, parent
Kidron Backes, Inspiration Field
Laurel Rochester, Imagine!
Leslie Rothman, Mtn. View Consulting
Linda Medina, Envision

Marilyn Fausset, parent
Rob DeHerrera, DDRC
Rob Hernandez
Sara Leeper, Jewish Family Services
Sara Sims, Mt. Valley Developmental Services
Shannon Kluth, Imagine!
Shawna Boller, parent
Stephen Shaughnessy, RMHS

1. John Barry of the Department of Health Care Policy & Financing (Department) opened the meeting at 1 p.m.
 - a. Alicia Ethredge explained that due to snowy weather, the meeting would be changed from 2 hours to one hour and the remainder of the meeting would be rescheduled as soon as possible.
2. Introductions were completed. John Barry gave "housekeeping" procedures; "speaker queue" process; state "volume" if one cannot hear; that a "parking lot" document would be retained; always state name before speaking.
 - a. Alicia read the HCPF Mission statement: Improving health care access and outcomes for people receiving services while demonstrating sound stewardship of financial resources.
 - b. John gave the Office of Community Living (OCL) Vision statement: access to services; improve service coordination; and increase service options and quality. The 3rd element being our focus with the Waiver Redesign process.
3. Alicia read the planned agenda for today:
 - a. Department Proposal for Individuals with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (IDD) Waiver Redesign (WRD) Stakeholder Engagement and Co-Chair Selection
 - b. Voting and Next Steps.
 - c. John described the Materials, altered for the shortened meeting today:
 - i. Agenda
 - ii. Office of Community Living's Proposal for Meeting Format and Process
 - iii. Co-chair Job Description and Attributes (mainly Attributes)
 - iv. Power Point Presentation.
4. Regarding the Proposal for Stakeholder Engagement, John stated that some stakeholders have requested that the format used for the Participant Directed Program and Policy Collaborative (PDPPC) HCPF meeting be used with these Waiver Redesign meetings. Since John has facilitated that group for about 7 years, he adapted the process for these meetings. Nothing final has been decided, pending today's meeting.
 - a. The 1st item, Measuring Consensus, is different at PDPPC. Rather than having the complicated "voting" process of PDPPC, John is recommending a

- “consensus measuring” process for these meetings. For instance, in discussing the Residential Habilitation Service Standard, John is suggesting asking “who cannot live with” whatever is being proposed about Residential Habilitation. So the larger the number of meeting participants who agree with the statement, the stronger the statement is, in terms of consensus.
- b. John solicited comments re Level of Consensus
- i. Gerrie suggested HCPF do a Doodle Poll tomorrow so we don’t delay the remainder of this meeting unnecessarily. John requested returning to topic of consensus.
 - ii. Jodi: I have a concern that, although it is fine that family member stakeholders met separately with HCPF, the process has changed midstream with only part of the stakeholders’ feedback being considered. I don’t think that is the intention, but I don’t think my own voice is any more or less important than that of a family member and what they bring to the table. Having a proposal brought, having a secret meeting, having a proposal brought back with having no input, is off-putting for somebody who has been involved in this process, who has been offering regular feedback and regular concerns about this process and what we would accomplish. I want this registered on behalf of my own voice. I cannot find it to be fair that a potential proposal has been brought to the table with only part of the stakeholder feedback. Specific to the topic of consensus, Jodi raised the issues of voting, required 3 meetings of attendance, as it could pertain to the Waiver Redesign process. Discussion followed.
 - iii. Lori Thompson clarified that references to PDPPC meeting processes might have caused confusion, and John agreed that there are no plans to use the PDPPC meeting process, including voting, going forward with Waiver Redesign as of now.
 - iv. David added that as an experienced PDPPC participant, he likes the consensus idea due to the timeline requirements of Waiver Redesign.
 - v. John interrupted the conversation to take a technical time-out, muting everyone for 60 seconds or so.
 - vi. Carol 1st suggested that the facilitator specify the document being referred to and where to find it, so we could all be together in the discussion. 2nd, Carol describes a consensus process of alternatives a, b, & c, and an “I can’t live with that” “consensus” on one of the items, leaving the remaining items in contention. John said that he thought all 3 of the a, b, & c items would be referred back to the Dept (HCPF) for consideration on what the group’s level of consensus is and what to do with that information. At PDPPC, sometimes the Dept. finds it

cannot do the recommendation and states "why". John then continued with the queue

- vii. Shawna suggested that we document how many from a stakeholder group (families, PASAs, CCBs, other organizations) are consenting to a particular idea, and John confirmed that the Dept would always take into account and respect whomever the suggestion was coming from. John then asked if there is anyone who cannot live with using "measuring consensus" for these stakeholder meetings? No one spoke up.
- c. John introduced the topic of stakeholder notetaking, stating that at PDPPC this builds trust, and that Gerrie has volunteered to do notetaking at these meetings. There would also always be a meeting recording.
- d. In the queue:
 - i. David has done notetaking and confirmed that it is hard.
 - ii. Bob L. got clarification from John regarding the current Proposal Document under discussion.
 - iii. Jodi wanted to verify that the stakeholder process originated from the 2015 legislation on Waiver Redesign. Therefore, there is a higher level of expectation for the State in its responsibility on notetaking. Alicia replied that the legislation does not call for a group to convene to do the work nor does it mention how the work will be done.
 - iv. Carol would like to change the verbiage in the Department's Proposal document to say, "the Department and anyone else requests the opportunity to give comments and corrections on the quoted statements that they have made", as shown in the meeting notes. John verified that the Draft meeting notes would always be open to corrections and edits from all stakeholders. Carol asked to add a sentence to the Proposal document that says, "any stakeholder may request correction to this piece of the meeting notes." John assured that the Department will capture what was and what was not agreed to today, that affects the Proposal document. With no further input, John moved on.
- e. Transparency and Communications. These are the elements that the Department commits to:
 - i. The use of a parking lot document
 - ii. That the documents are posted online, and that there is a website, although due to the weather, the final document did not get onto the website today.
 - iii. Regarding the Change Log that was maintained for the Department's use, John said there could be other formats that people might suggest.

- iv. A description of the work process that occurs between the co-chairs and the Department will be worked out between the co-chairs and that the agreement will be posted in a transparent way online and at a handout at meetings early in the process. Other materials about the work will be posted online so people have references when they go to the webpage.
- v. Information from stakeholders on how to get involved, how to receive communications, how to get in touch with the co-chairs, and all agendas will be posted online going forward.
- vi. The Department will have two staff monitoring incoming communications and any questions related to the stakeholder engagement process, including meetings and other communications.
- vii. For transparency, there will be the meeting notes.
- viii. Discussion was requested.

- 1. Gerrie asked to be able to view all the email addresses of anyone receiving Department emails about Waiver Redesign, meaning each and every stakeholder. This is for transparency, trust and the knowledge of all people who are involved in this process. If a person prefers to not have their email contact information shared, they can request to be "bcc'd", "blind carbon copied". John said that he does not do this at PDPPC, possibly because participants are often service recipients and prefer this privacy. However, John suggested that he contact each Waiver Redesign participant and ask them if they want to share their email contact information or not, thereby it being a choice on their part. If someone does not reply, John will assume that they do not want their contact information shared. Gerrie continued, that for families, it is important to know the providers on our communications list. Since providers must have a public presence when they apply for PASA status, Gerrie said that their unwillingness to be public with their contact information in the Waiver Redesign process is "pretty cheesy". John stated that he would take this request back to the Department to look at the legal perspective and make the best decision. John requested further discussion on transparency, and there was none.

f. Co-chair discussion

- i. Jodi would like to better understand the choice to move to a co-chair process.
- ii. John referred back to the Proposal document to explain that there would be two co-chairs and a back-up co-chair, like the successful

PDPPC process. Always included would be the co-chairs meeting with HCPF staff to get the work done, respond to requests or suggestions about meeting happenings, to be a trusted bridge between stakeholders and the Department. Also, what needs to be done, what was requested, what are the parking lot items, and the timeline to get things done.

- iii. The Department staff, John, Candace Bailey, Alicia Etheredge, will meet with co-chairs after their onboarding to figure out how to work together, make decisions on engagement issues, not on policy issues, and communicate out shared decisions together.
- iv. This is about communication and transparency, and not about any policy decisions being made during these Department and co-chair meetings.
- v. John requested further discussion, referencing Jodi's input, already given.
 1. Rob H said that every stakeholder co-chair would have some of their own issues. He shares Jodi's hesitancy, wonders if anyone can attend the HCPF/co-chair meetings as open meetings, perhaps with public comment time at the end for anyone to give input to provide trust and confidence.
 2. Carol adds that she prefers prioritizing getting a lot of stuff done rather than going over the process again and again. John confirmed that the co-chairs would be part of the meeting prioritization process.
 3. Charlene clarified that there has not been a secret meeting between concerned family members and HCPF, but that family members had felt unheard. HCPF was willing to work with families in a meeting to come up with a model that works better. Charlene agreed with the need to move on with priorities because there is a timeline. But policy decisions need to be made with every voice heard, and the PDPPC model has been successful with that, especially John's facilitation.
- vi. John pointed out the time constraints today and offered a verbal Addendum to the HCPF Proposal: that the co-chairs submit a written document of how they will communicate with stakeholders, how people will get a hold of them, a review of what is going on with meetings, any complaints and/or comments they have received, so there can be no question about how that will go. The Proposal includes a back-up co-chair if a co-chair left the position, and another back-up co-chair would be selected.
- vii. John requested discussion.

1. Rob H said that people unable to participate today might want to question this Proposal. Alicia interjected that there is significant input in the webinar Chat Box. John said that due to the time today, that would not be added at this time. John stated that he would be strict about being transparent in the co-chair work together and how communication is done.
- viii. John asked if there was anyone who cannot live with the element of stakeholder co-chairs as laid out today?
1. Shannon asked if the co-chair element is not approved, what is the department's Plan B?
 2. John replied that there is no backup proposal at this point. The co-chair proposal supersedes any other proposal because HCPF wants stakeholders to be involved in the planning of these meetings.
 3. Alicia said that HCPF is trying to be collaborative and build trust, and asked if anybody has an alternative?
 4. Rob H said he had an idea but there was not time now to discuss it.
 5. Jodi said that she does not understand the need for co-chairs. And if the purpose is to build a bridge between stakeholders and the Department, are the stakeholders referred to here the family stakeholders? If so, would there be 2 family co-chairs?
 6. John clarified that he had suggested the idea of co-chairs because of the issue of trust and needing to get the work done.
 7. John asked if there were other than the three (Rob H, Jodi and Shannon) who could not live with the co-chair concept.
 8. Laurel said she was not bound to the co-chair concept and suggested a neutral party from HCPF to run the process.
 9. Gerrie said a lot of families do not consider HCPF to be an independent party in this process and that was why the March 12th family meeting with HCPF was requested.
 10. Alicia suggested that due to time, this discussion about co-chairs or not, be deferred to the next meeting which will be scheduled soon to replace the 2nd hour of this meeting cancelled due to weather.
- ix. John suggested going to the list of Attributes of co-chairs which is an incomplete list, to possibly resolve the lack of consensus about the co-chair issue.
- x. Charlene said the question now is about power-sharing and having strong representation from those who use the services. Families are

not paid to do this, but the issues are life-changing and important to us.

- xi. Carol added that facilitation of meetings be added to the Attributes list.
 - xii. Cassidy said that what Charlene mentioned would occur in Waiver Redesign open meetings, so all can participate.
 - xiii. Rob H said we need a better open process but today we are being rushed too hard.
 - xiv. Alicia said that the Department will be sending out a poll tomorrow to determine the next meeting when people can contribute alternative suggestions to the "two co-chair" idea.
5. There occurred an audio failure for a few minutes. (On the telephone while the meeting audio was off, Candace Bailey agreed to capture the meeting Chat Box so the input there would be available to all meeting attendees.)
 6. When the meeting resumed John summarized that, at the next meeting, there would be discussion on if there would be co-chairs, and if so, moving on to nominations and a selection process.
 7. John adjourned the meeting at 2:21.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerrie Frohne

Stakeholder