



**COLORADO**

Department of Health Care  
Policy & Financing

**MINUTES**  
**Community First Choice**  
**Development and Implementation Council**

303 East 17<sup>th</sup> Ave  
Denver, Colorado 80203  
Conference Room 11B  
July 6, 2015  
1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

**Attendees:**

Phone-in:

Shannon Zimmerman

Heather Jones

Ian Engle

Elisabeth Arenales

Gabrielle Steckman

Linda Skaflen

Beverly Hirsekorn

In-room:

Grace Herbison

David Bolin

Julie Farrar

Josh Winkler

Kachina Rice

Dawn Russel

Sheila Dean

Kirk Miller

Ed Milewski

Bonnie Rouse

Lana Mutters

Rhyann Lubitz

Julie Miranda

Brian Martin

Our mission is to improve health care access and outcomes for the people we serve  
while demonstrating sound stewardship of financial resources.  
[www.colorado.gov/hcpf](http://www.colorado.gov/hcpf)



Diann Byrne  
Lori Thompson  
Carol Meredith  
Tim Thornton  
Heather Mislav  
Debbie Fimple

## **I. Review Minutes**

May minutes reviewed and approved by council without edits.

## **II. Refreshed Medicaid Look and Feel—Debbie Fimple**

Announced the Department will be roll out a new look and feel to Medicaid next May. The new name will be Health First Colorado and there will be a new logo. This effort has been several years in the making. Started with a grant from the Colorado Health Foundation to conduct focus groups with current and prospective members, who provided input for the name and for the messaging. New name is a better reflection of the enhancements that have been made to the program: A modernized enrollment system, new payment/claims system, revamped website, and social media. The change reflects the more technologically advanced ways we connect with membership. Goals for this launch is to reduce the number of eligible, but not enrolled folks by reducing the negative perceptions of public insurance. We also hoping to increase provider enrollment. The new look and feel will allow us to do outreach to inform people about some of the great things we have been doing (e.g. the Accountable Care Collaborative).

Asked people to review the handout/fact-sheet about the new look and feel. We will be launching with the tagline “Colorado’s Medicaid Program”. We will be keeping the tagline on all materials for the foreseeable future to ease the transition. We’ve been connecting with stakeholder groups over the last few months to connect with any organizations that may need to update materials and would be happy to get with any other group that may need assistance. The reason why we are getting the word out so far in advance is because we are aware of all the work stakeholders may need to do for the transition.

Debbie asked if anyone had questions.



**Josh:** Will the tagline be staying or will it eventually fade off?

**Debbie:** We will keep it for at least a year, but it will eventually be removed. We will replace it with the tagline "building a healthier tomorrow"

**Josh:** I ask because I am concerned that people who receive LTSS who move from another state may not know what Health First is because it is not as easily recognizable.

**Debbie:** On governmental websites and searches I would think Medicaid would still be there to address that issue.

**Julie F:** Is this going to become the official logo (e.g. will new letterhead and logos need to be changed)? Is that why we are giving a year to implement.

**Debbie:** We are taking a year because we know it will be a big lift. We know that the Department will make their big changes by May (update the website and materials) and we also hope our partners will be able to update their materials as well.

**Kirk Miller:** Are we going to have any issues with computers like there was with unemployment benefits? This won't cause any freezes or effect how systems work? Has this been tested?

**Debbie:** We have been testing the CBMS system, so we hope to avoid any technical issues. Hopefully it won't be a change to functionality just to the language.

If you have any further questions about the new Medicaid look and feel, please contact [debbie.fimple@state.co.us](mailto:debbie.fimple@state.co.us).

### III. Mission Analytics Draft Deliverable

**Dawn:** We like to change the agenda if that is OK. We know the report is in from Mission Analytics. ADAPT is here today to give the message that we want those numbers released now. The Department is saying there needs to be a clearance before those numbers are released. We say for transparency want you to release the numbers now.

**ADPAT Group:** Chants, Release the numbers. Transparency Now.  
(~10minutes)

**Diane Rodriguez:** (enters the room) Asks Dawn, what is going on.

**Dawn R:** We want the Mission Analytics report and the Department is saying it can't be released to the council until it goes through clearance.



**Diane R:** Who is in charge of the meeting?

**Grace:** Me

**Diane R:** Do they know why we cannot release the report?

**Julie F:** We already know that. We're the CFC council and we need to be part of the discussion. There has to be transparency.

**Josh W:** We've been working on this council for almost 3 years now. The entire concept of having a third party outside contractor do fiscal analysis is to keep the numbers as unbiased as possible. So when the numbers come in and HCPF spends a month sitting on it, putting it through different levels of clearance, that doesn't keep those numbers unbiased. If we are a true stakeholder group that is a partnership with the Department, than we should be able to see the numbers when they come in. Not after they go through clearance. Not after there is an opportunity to back in forth with the contractor and modify numbers. We know the numbers will not be perfect. No report is ever perfect. There are going to be things people spot. But when we wait and wait on those numbers, it just takes more and more time. And the goal is to make CFC happen. If we don't get the numbers today, than we don't get to have the conversation about how to get the numbers down to a feasible number. That's where we're at: We're held-up in not knowing, and meanwhile, the Department does know what those numbers are.

**Diane R:** Did you know coming into this meeting that you were not going to be able to see the report?

**Dawn R:** Yes, that's why we organized like this.

**Diane R:** Do we have an update on when they, might be able to get this?

**Grace:** I was told that LTSS and DIDD leadership and Jed needs to clear it.

**Diane R:** Jed is on vacation right now, isn't he?

**Grace:** Yes

**Dawn:** I think this is something we can get done today. It's not like we're asking for a commitment. We just want to see the very same numbers that HCPF is looking at. This isn't a hard ask. I think some of the leadership team, and I include Jed in that, would say give them the numbers. If you can just have that discussion with leadership, so this meeting could continue to go on, it would be great.

**Diane R:** We know Jed isn't here.

**Julie F:** Sarah is available. Sue is available.



**Dawn:** It is a shame Jed isn't here because I think he would say...Leadership can all figure it out.

**Diane R:** Do you have anything you can move onto while I leave?

**Dawn:** If you are going to negotiate that for us, we'd love to go on with the meeting.

**Diane R:** Is that OK with you? (to Grace)

**Grace:** Yes.

**Diane R:** OK. I'll be back.

### III. State Budget Update

**Grace:** The Department wanted me to provide some awareness about what the budget situation is for the state, and to let you know that even though it is a tight budget situation, the Department is trying to move forward with CFC and CLAG recommendations.

**Ed M:** Community First Choice is still half the cost of a nursing home.

**Grace:** Our budget folks put together a synopsis of what the budget looks like. There are two budget forecasts. One is from the Legislative Council and one is from the Office of State Planning and Budget. For fiscal year 2015-2016, the Legislative Council is predicting a \$180 Million Dollar shortfall, and for 2016-2017, they are predicting of \$424 Million Dollars. So we're trying to depict the dire state of what the budget looks like. But, keep in mind, we do have funding to continue efforts for CFC.

The Office of State Planning and Budget's forecasts are more optimistic, but they are still predicting a shortfall of \$69 Million for fiscal year 2015-2016. We wanted to share that so everyone would have context for why the State is acting a certain way.

**Josh:** I'll just say from my experience, that those numbers are not as bad as they could be. We're having a shortfall because we have too much revenue coming in and the TABOR kicking in and refunds kicking in is hurting us. We can't change that: it is what it is. But when we're talking \$100 Million Dollars in the State budget, they will juggle some numbers and find that. But point well received: If CFC is going to increase costs that money is going to have to come from somewhere else. But we don't know what those numbers are, so we don't know what is feasible. Hopefully, they are going in the right direction with new policy changes.

**Julie F:** We have to remain solution focused. All this work we have done around Long-Term Services and Supports and System Redesign, was brought about by a crisis that was a decade in the making, and we as



Americans chose to stick our heads in the sand. We're at a dire point where we have to find solutions. We can't hold up numbers on clearance that we need to make informed choices. I think the state has been at the forefront at making things person centered and with working with CMS. I think CFC is a great way to achieve these goals. We can't just wait around. The session is in recess right now and we need to be working to move things forward, and it would be nice if we were on the same page.

**Dawn:** Just remember this time last year, we were waiting on a different set of numbers, but it is the same damn conversation.

**Josh:** Next year is an election year, so beyond the budget, it has its own pros in cons in terms of moving things forward. We're also losing several members of the legislature who have been supportive of disability issues. There are a lot of issues at play, but at the heart of it, we have to have dollars to pay for things.

**Tim T:** Colorado has always been at the forefront leading the way and I think CFC is one of the things we need to run with.

David: They are very preliminary numbers

**Julie F:** Yes, and they'll move money around according to what their priorities are and we can help with that.

**David:** They move \$180 Million around all the time. That is not abnormal, so it is not that dire to be honest with you. We've seen much worse. We spent two weeks on a sidewalk in dire straits.

**Josh:** Even with a \$180 Million Dollar shortfall, there will be provider rate increases.

#### **IV. Mission Analytics Draft Deliverable (continued)**

**Gretchen Hammer** (enters the room): We do not have the report and we're not going to be able to release it today. There are, upon our initial review, factual inaccuracies in the report and that is why we will not be able to release it. When information is released that is inaccurate, it can take on a life of its own. I think that is not what any of us want. I have not seen the report. I am here to represent leadership in the Department. As soon as we get a report that is accurate, we will happily engage with you. The document we have right now is considered a working draft. I will commit to you that we will not consider this a final until we have the opportunity to engage with you. Right now, it cannot be released until it is factually correct.



**Josh:** The 2013 report also had factual inaccuracies after going through weeks of clearance. Once the council saw it, they identified errors. The numbers are never going to be perfect. The Department can identify some things. We can identify some things, and then go back to Mission and say we've identified inaccuracies. But the report will not be perfect, so the idea of taking a third party and hiring them to do a cost study is to make those projections as unbiased as possible. If they misunderstand things, they misunderstand things. The bottom line is the more the Department works on messaging the numbers whether it is because you see them as inaccuracies or because it is because you see something you don't like, we don't know why they were changes. We trust the Department as much as we can, but you know how that goes. You can only trust so much. When the numbers get massaged by the Department before they are seen by stakeholders, we cannot trust that those were pure. That they did not get molested. They are not those unbiased numbers anymore. We have talked a lot, but have not done much for a year.

**Dawn:** They are using the same tactics against us that were used before. Everyone on this committee who has been doing this work should absolutely be insulted that we can't see the numbers right along with the Department. This is such an easy one if you respect the people who have engaged in this process for so long. Just let us see the numbers as you look at them.

**Josh:** For almost 3 years, we've worked for the Department, and we've tried our best to work with the bureaucracy. But when that gets in the way of trust and the legitimacy of information, that's where we're at now.

**Ian Engle:** I have a couple of questions. Am I official member of this group? If I am an official member, do I have a right to see the report that was generated by the contractor that we all decided to have done? And if not, why?

**Gretchen H:** I don't know the answers to that because I don't know the bylaws that govern this group, but I think that is an important piece. It is important that we as the Department, as the people who procured this work to be done, to have a chance to review that product.

**Shannon:** I have no problem with the Department reviewing that information and I understand you want to know they gave you what you asked for, but I would second the ideas that why are we not able as a group to look at the document and identify inaccuracies. Why couldn't be distributed as a draft with the disclaimer that this is not for outside



dissemination. I don't see why there has to be clearance for something that should be disseminated.

**Gretchen:** I agree with that and I think that all of the members of the staff would agree with that. I don't think there was ever an intent not to share the working document. What is going on now is that it the document was delivered to us by the end of last fiscal year, which was last Tuesday, we're reviewing that document and intend to have it released for your review. We can do that in tracked changes and note where there are potential inaccuracies.

**Ian E:** We want to see how it was given to you. I think transparency is the obvious issue here.

**Julie F:** Is Mission's contract renewed? What is the relationship with Mission Analytics? Exactly where is it at in the clearance process because you said you haven't seen it yet.

**Sarah Roberts:** Jed hasn't seen it yet. We asked them to take the new information into the old report. We've got the draft. I looked at it on Thursday and Barb Ramsey looked at it on Thursday. There were some questions about the SLS waiver we need to clarify with the vendor. It is a working draft and a working model. It is not ready for release. It is a document for us to understand what happens under different scenarios.

**Julie F:** Is there an ability for a member of the CFC council to be part of these discussions? I think that would be very helpful and collaborative. In order to achieve the transparency we want, we need to involve someone from the council.

**Sarah R:** That's the intent. Once we review it and see if they included everything we wanted them to and have our internal budget staff look at it for accuracy. We're checking to see if the contractor delivered what we asked them to. And at that point it will be final, and we will share the document. It is not a report to share. It is spreadsheets.

**Dawn:** Let us see it.

**Josh:** The discussion has always been that this would not be the be-all-end-all cost model. That this was just a slight improvement from the last report. This is a taxpayer funded product. To say that this is HCPF funded, is wrong. This is taxpayer funded. And thanks to the buy-in, many of us in the room are taxpayers. The council gave input on what this report should include just as much as HCPF. This report was intended to help guide what policies we might consider in developing a plan for CFC that might be



affordable for CO. It was never supposed to be a full report. Just revised and updated spreadsheets that would guide conversations.

**Sarah R:** I am not sure we have all the information we were expecting from them.

**Dawn:** Sarah—whatever you don't have you can feed to us later at the same time the Department gets it. We want CFC to help fix home and community based services.

**Josh:** We want kids to get personal care. We want people to get services outside of their houses. We've been promised this for years. We want people to get out of nursing facilities.

**Kirk:** This was sent out to get an unbiased opinion by a third party. We got that. Now why can't we see it? If you get your hands on it and don't let us see it, which is no longer unbiased. Where is the transparency? The transparency was lost between now and last Tuesday.

**ADAPT Group:** Chanting Release the Numbers. Transparency Now.

**Dawn:** I think that you are probably the one with the most power here (to Gretchen). Can you please figure out how we can see those numbers? This should have been something that would could share so we can move forward. Please talk with your staff and figure out what you need to do to get us the numbers today.

**Julie F:** We've offered a couple of suggestions: Having a representative at the table. I was thinking Josh because he is good with this.

David: I was going to volunteer him too.

**Dawn:** I'm not sure. I'm not negotiating what we came for today. No, I am not negotiating.

**Tim T:** Can I ask a question to Sarah? Is there a timeframe for clearance?

**Dawn:** Release the numbers.

**Sarah R:** Jed has to look at it.

**Gretchen:** When is he back?

**Sarah R:** Tomorrow

**Tim T:** Maybe give us an indication of when we could see the numbers.

**Sarah R:** I think a week at the very latest. By Friday.

**Dawn:** Let us see it and we'll be prepared to talk about it next week. We're not asking for much. Just give us the numbers today. Gretchen please see what you can do about getting us the numbers today. I'm not going to trust a thing if we sit here and negotiate away something that there is no reason to. All it is going to continue to build is the lack of trust.



**Gretchen:** Would it be acceptable to present both documents by Friday to you? One that the Department has had a chance to look through and make suggested changes and identify inaccuracies and the original document.

**Kirk:** Why can't we look at the original one? You guys looked at the original one. Why can't we look at it now? We can meet in a week instead of three weeks.

**Dawn:** Why do you guys want a head start? That's my question. I cannot believe that we have not laid against that door and said how ridiculous that is. Release the numbers now.

**Ian:** It sounds like this council is two separate factions. I would like to be provided with a copy of the report and then be involved in a conversation about the working document. Shouldn't we all be able to look at it together?

**Josh:** There is a lot of lack of trust. The council was started a lot like this?

**Gretchen H:** What are the council's working agreements?

**Josh:** We don't have any official documents. There was a letter that name people on the council. The about a year ago, there was a letter from the Department reaffirming their commitment to CFC and adding development and implementation. That's where we're at. When the first report came out, there were conversations within the Department, but we didn't get to see the report until it was final. And that was that. It was final done. We didn't have the opportunity to give input. From September 2013 until now, we have not have updated numbers. We lobbied for the money from the JBC to get updated numbers. The Department had some extra money to do this piece. This was just supposed to be a piece, but we need this piece to guide conversations about how to move forward. We were finally at point where we can get information and then we don't.

**Gretchen H:** Was it your expectation to have that information at this information would be shared on the 30<sup>th</sup> and you would have that conversation today?

**Josh:** Yes, we knew it had to be done at the end of the fiscal year.

**Grace:** At the last meeting, we said we didn't have an official agreement with Mission Analytics and we hoped to have something done this fiscal year, but we didn't promise to deliver that to the group by the 30<sup>th</sup>.

**Josh:** There wasn't a contract inked yet, but.

**Sarah R:** To follow-up. Grace, you let people know that we just got it and we needed a chance to look at it?

**Grace:** Yes, in the email I sent out for this meeting, I let people know.



**Sarah R:** So when you came in today, you had that understanding?

**Dawn:** That's why we are here. We are organized today for this reason.

**Josh:** We've protested at 5:00 a.m. to get this council started. Having just me look at it is not enough. For the same reason the Department has several people look at the report, we need several people to look at the report. This group is made up of providers, advocates, and clients. We all see different things, so we might pick up different things when we review the report. Nobody in this room has 100% of that information.

**Julie F:** The Department is lacking critical information if you don't have our input. This is a collaborative effort. We've had to work really hard to get here.

**Gretchen H:** I'm new to CFC, so forgive me. Is it the sense of this group that there is an immediate need for this information? Will it allow us to move forward?

**Josh:** If we don't have information by this month, then there is no shot at legislation. We're already late in the game for legislation.

**David:** We all see this as an opportunity to save money and do a lot of things for people with disabilities who want to stay in the community.

**Ian:** I would echo that. This is very important to me. I feel it is important that I receive information, so I can be a part of the meaningful discussions that go on. I would ask if the members of the council are able to see the document from Mission Analytics and be part of the discussion about what is missing and what could be improved. Is that our charge?

**Gretchen H:** I'm not sure if that is your charge because it seems this group does not have a shared understanding of the charge of the council. However, I can say the group will see the document as it was received by the Department. However the Department needs 24 hours for review. That is my deal. Dawn you had asked me what I could come up with. That is what I came up with. Is 24 hours' time to flag the areas where the work is incomplete or inaccurate? That is our responsibility and I feel very strongly about that. They are taxpayer dollars, but we are stewards of those dollars here. It is a requirement of us to look over deliverable produced by vendors and ensure the work was completed. We will get it done in 24 hours. We will give you two documents: one with issues identified and one clean version of the document. If this is time sensitive due to potential opportunities in the next legislative session, we can hold another meeting with this council within two weeks to all look through the document.



**Julie:** I am not the spokesperson for ADAPT, but I would say we need everything in writing with promises and agreements. I agree that there has been this loose give-in-take, so I think a written agreement would be important.

**Dawn:** We're a committee that is supposed to work together. When you see the numbers first, they are no longer unbiased. Why should we spend 2 years and 7 months of our time when you don't even respect us enough to share information? So today you say give us 24 hours, then you don't respect us.

**Kirk:** If you got it Tuesday, how much have you deleted by now?

**Gretchen H:** I will clarify, both Jed and I were out on annual leave on Wednesday and Thursday and the office was closed on Friday.

**Kirk:** So. You're here now. How much have you deleted now?

**Gretchen H:** As I said, I have not seen the documents.

**Josh:** To Kirk's point, we don't know. Why not when Mission hit's send, they send it to the whole council. It can go out as working document and we can all work on it together.

**Gretchen H:** I understand that and in the future, I think we can come to that agreement, but we are not there today.

**Dawn:** If we as a group decide the 24 hours is reasonable, you can never have 24 hours again. If we're real stakeholders, that's what we are.

**Gretchen H:** I am not trying to create a delay tactic. What I am trying to say is that we can have agreements moving forward about how the deliverable will be treated and shared, but we don't have those processes in place now. Or at least that is my understanding. Because we didn't have those processes in place, we clearly walked into this meeting with different expectations about what would be delivered.

**Josh:** There wasn't a contract drafted with Mission at the last meeting and we knew that. But we knew it would have to be delivered last fiscal year.

**Julie:** How I feel is that ADAPT has gifted you 24 hours and there will be a written agreement moving forward.

**Gretchen H:** I don't think they have agreed to that. I can admit that perhaps we made a mistake by putting it through clearance and I take responsibility for that.

**Julie:** I really appreciate you saying that? Do we want to start working on a written agreement and do we want to give 24 hours?

**Gretchen H:** I would like to hear from others on the council.



**Dawn:** I was going to ask that. Let it be clear. We're not the Department. We do respect the members of this committee, and we want to hear what they want. So please tell us, do you want us to give the 24 hours with the understanding that from this point forward that we're not left out. We want to be real participants from now on. We need legislation and the only way we're going to get it is if we're working on it now.

**Carol:** I appreciate that it was a long holiday weekend. I know people took the opportunity to extend their holiday. I know I did. I think that if we're going to get a copy of the unedited Mission document tomorrow and a document that points out the issues the Department found with the work, which I appreciate. I appreciate when the Department does that type of work, I don't see what the difference is, whether we get it today or tomorrow.

**Gretchen H:** To me the difference is that Jed is here tomorrow and he is the Director of the Office of Community Living, and waiting until tomorrow gives him the opportunity to look at it. It feels most respectful to him to give him the day to be back in the office and have the opportunity to review the document. He is the subject matter expert and knows more about this than I will ever know. It is important to me that the subject matter expert and leader of this office have the opportunity to do that tomorrow.

**Carol:** That makes sense to me. I have deep respect for Jed. I think he has worked with us well. And he's great with numbers. Better than I will ever be. That's OK with me out of respect for Jed.

**Anaya:** I'm with Carol. Although I don't really understand why if you're going to give us the version anyway, what is the difference if we give it out today? That still isn't very clear to me.

**Dawn:** Do you think we could ask Jed what he thinks?

**Gretchen H:** He's not here today and we need to respect his time on vacation.

**David:** I understand asking for 24 hours, but if we're going to get it anyway. I think it is respectful for Jed, but it is disrespectful to the members of this council who have put a lot of work into this council. Giving that information to us today gives us the opportunity to provide you with faster input. I prefer to get it today unadulterated. I don't expect to see HCPFs version tomorrow. I expect you to be thorough.



**Gretchen H:** I was thinking we would have a meeting scheduled by phone, if that is most convenient, to gather input about the report within two weeks to identify where those additional concerns.

**David:** I have to say I am on a lot of committees and we often don't get documents until the night before. That doesn't give us a lot of time to give input. We waste a lot of time sitting at a table thinking out loud.

**Gretchen H:** I am asking for the compromise of giving it to you tomorrow.

**David:** I am asking for you to be respectful of the committee.

**Gretchen H:** I respect that. I just ask that we could have until tomorrow to give Jed time to review the document from a contractual obligation perspective. Then in a week's time, we will setup a meeting to review the document with the committee and then the dialogue could be much richer.

**Ed M:** According to the Affordable Care Act, Community First Choice has been an option since 2010. Other states have adopted CFC. We had Mission Analytics do something in 2013. This is a long process, but I wonder how many other states are having this problem now? It was supposed to be started in 2010. That's ridiculous. You can do your recovery in the community—not in a hospital.

**Josh:** No matter how good Mission's report is, it won't capture the savings Ed is talking about.

**Shannon:** My concern is getting an unadulterated copy of the report. I understand that Jed should get to review the report. My whole question is, if not now, when? I'm wondering how long this will get pushed back. That is my frustration. I am also frustrated with that is not your preview—that is not your charge. That should be our greatest charge.

**Ian:** I want to clarify that I am a member of the council? I will have to respectfully disagree. I don't know why Jed needs to see it first. I am interested in seeing what he has to say, but I'm not convinced that he needs to see that before I do. If he's not going to change it, why not just share it now?

**Julie:** It sounds like people want a copy today. I would feel Jed would say the same thing.

**Kirk:** Did Jed know it was coming out and we were having this meeting today?

**Gretchen H:** I want to clarify that there was not expectation to have the report today.



**Josh:** That is accurate. But what you're hearing is the 2 years and 7 months of frustration. We're doing it the nice way. Other states ADAPT is demanding the policy and then dealing with the back end. We understand that working together is the better way, but when we're not being worked with collaboratively. The Department's actions don't show that collaboration. Each person in this room wants CFC for a different reason. There all these important issues wrapped up in CFC: offering personal care in the community, offering personal care to kids...We all have a different vested interest. But at the end of the day, it fixes a lot of problems for HCPF. These are real people at the end of the day. Every hour counts. We're already late for next legislation session.

**Gretchen H:** I will clarify. That was the best thing I could come up with. It clearly doesn't meet your expectations. It is little disappointing to me that it wasn't the expectation to have the report today, and yet, you're demanding it. It doesn't feel very mutually respectful, but I understand how you're feeling frustrated. I understand the delay.

**Josh:** No one beyond ADAPT knew this was happening today, so what you're hearing is coming from more than just us. This committee has made efforts to be more collaborative. But when real opportunities to collaborate are there, the Department drops the ball.

**Ian:** My opinion is about mutual respect.

**Gretchen H:** I tried to put something on the table that would allow me the time to figure out what we can do. I'm not sure what we can legally give out to stakeholders, and I will not compromise the legal integrity of the Department. I do not have the authority to do what you're asking. I will consult with my colleagues and see what I can do. I understand what you're asking, but I have a responsibility as a State employee to uphold the law.

**Dawn:** As ADAPT, we have a responsibility to the community. Can you go see what you can do? We will need that in writing. Or that report will be in writing.

**Meeting paused to wait for Gretchen to return with a response.**

**Gretchen H:** What I have been able to do is to find a way to get the document released to the council members today. Grace—you will be getting an email shortly. I have talked with legal counsel and Tom Massey. We can release the document to council members out of recognition of the



partnership we hope to continue to have with the council. With the document, there will be a disclaimer that addresses the content of the documents. This is important because inaccurate information can find its way into documents in a way that makes it look accurate and that doesn't help any of us accomplish what we want to accomplish. Members of the council who receive the document will have the following statement in there "The document attached is a draft work product that has not reached final form. It may contain errors and is not a public document under the Colorado Open Records Act. By requesting it, you agree to not release the document to anyone other than members of the CFC Council." This will enable members of the council to have the document today. We will need to setup a meeting in a weeks' time to gather feedback about the council's observations about the report.

**Julie:** I want to know who will follow-up with the part about establishing a working agreement moving forward and a protocol for sharing documents.

**Grace:** I imagine Josh and I would address that with the council as co-chairs.

**Gretchen H:** We will need to review that agreement to make sure it is compliant with our legal requirements.

**Ian:** Are there any documents that indicate the bylaws.

**Josh:** I can look into that with Grace

