

**DRAFT NOTES**  
**Waiver Redesign Stakeholder Engagement Process Meeting**  
**March 12, 2019**  
**2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

303 E 17<sup>th</sup> Ave., Denver CO 80203  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Rooms 7AB  
Call In: 720-279-0026 Participant Code: 516148#

- **Introduction:** John Barry introduces the meeting and the Department, we are here for the process meeting with families.

- **Participants on phone:**

Kendra Kettler  
Pat Chamberlain  
Dawn Caldwell

Rob Hernandez  
Shawna Boller  
Josh Negrini

Gerrie Frohne  
Julie Reiskin  
Marilyn Fawcett

- **Participants in-person:**

Bob Lawhead  
Colin Laughlin  
Matt Baker  
Bonnie Silva

Alicia Ethredge  
Candace Bailey  
Lori Thompson

Charlene Willey  
Rebecca Spencer  
John Barry

- **Background and purpose of this meeting:**

- Department recently heard feedback in the IDD waiver redesign work that there are concerns regarding the stakeholder engagement. This process may not be working for all, Department is committed to making processes work for everyone
- Materials:
  - Agenda
  - Department proposal for process
  - HB 15-1318
  - Fiscal note
  - R19 Budget request
  - Timeline for this work

- Bonnie Silva

- Smaller subset of families that reached out to the Department and expressed concerns that the process around IDD Waiver Redesign wasn't working
- The Department takes these concerns very seriously – we really use the CLAG recommendations as guideposts

- There can be a lot of competing perspectives within the OCL and we want to make sure we are using the family's perspectives
- Families have outlined some very specific objections to the process
  - Families and those with a lived experience in the system objected to the format and the process of the meetings
  - Addition of the Steadman Group offered little value
  - Task Force groups lacked any CCB or provider involvement
  - No plan for simplification – there are still 18 services and proposed new waiver is still very complicated
- We need to brainstorm a shared clear statement of goals
- Need to distinguish the role of stakeholders
- Need to list subset yet to be completed
- Identify expected outcomes to reach our shared goal
- Department has listened and developed a process that we hope addresses these concerns
  - Recognized that using the Steadman Group is not working – we will be using John Barry to fulfill the role of facilitator
  - Colin and Candace will be leaning in to support this work as well to support the SDE team with this work
- Today we plan to present and have dialogue around the process proposal and develop a proposal to bring to the larger group
- Gerrie: is someone taking notes or recording?
  - Yes – we will start recording
  - Gerrie – at PDPPC they record from the beginning of the meeting and a stakeholder takes notes
    - Agreement – we need to arrange this ahead of time
- Charlene – want to make sure we discuss our shared set of goals
  - Yes we will
- John – we've been asked to use the PDPPC model for this work, will review the PPDPC and how we plan to adapt it for this work
  - Current PPDPC model has voting members and there are criteria around who is eligible to vote based on attendance, and attendance is taken by stakeholders
  - There are 2 stakeholder cochairs given the programs they receive – CDASS cochair and IHSS cochair
  - Meeting prep process that involves the cochairs each month
  - Stakeholders take the meeting notes and the Department asks for opportunity to review
  - Highly structured recommendation process by which the PDPPC writes and delivers recommendations to the Department
  - Prioritize program recipients

- Use a speaker queue on the phone
- Culture built within the PDPPC to speak to behavior within a meeting that could be disruptive
- Proposal for WRD
  - Move from voting to consensus model – in the process of getting stakeholder input that the leaders of the meeting take a measurement of the level of consensus among the stakeholders for any piece of advice
  - Stakeholder cochairs – suggesting having 2
    - Work with the Department to prepare for meetings
  - Department facilitator – John Barry
  - Meeting prep – done by conference calls
  - Transparency and communications – the Department will maintain a running log of “parking lot” items, all meeting documents will be posted, a collaborative process between stakeholder cochairs and Department staff will be described at the beginning of each meeting, Department will issue a quarterly update, will include information on the webpage about how to be included in this work, will have 2 Department contacts, any meeting notes will be created by stakeholders
  - Make sure we have agreement about:
    - Proposal
    - Cochair responsibilities
    - Timelines
- Discussion, hopefully towards an agreement:
  - Moving from voting to more of a consensus model
    - Rob: people will be participating based on consensus?
      - Yes
    - Pat: we lack clarity in what this group is supposed to be doing – need to plan goals before we can plan the process
      - Bonnie: hope we can ask for a leap of faith, I think that the process and the goals go hand in hand. Our plan is to accomplish both
    - Charlene: agree with Pat, my head can’t work that way. Need to know what our role is and how much weight our input has. Can’t agree to a process without knowing what my job is. What expectations the Department has of us and what the constraints are
    - Gerrie: agree with Pat and Charlene, details about process are backing up to goal setting
    - Bob: I appreciate the D

- Department moving in this direction. Voting members: part of what we talked about after the WIC was disbanded was the issue of expertise developed by having a set group of stakeholders. When you have people moving in and out of this complex process it seems that you end up spending more time. There is history involved in this group that relates to a common understanding of some of these complexities. As new members came in last summer, part of their concern was how to catch up after the process has gone on so far. My concern when you don't have chosen individuals you end up with people with piecemeal knowledge. If we do broaden the number of stakeholders who come into this process, consensus wouldn't work
  - Bob – Don't understand why we got rid of the council and why we don't just bring back the council and just add the people who wanted to be part of it
  - John – voting process is to account for people coming in and out of the process. Consensus would be to take a measure of it, not to build 100% consensus
  - Bonnie – process under the PPDPC is that each person gets a vote, but an organization only gets 1 vote. You also only get a vote if you have attended 3 meetings in a row. Need a standing orientation manual to give to new members when they begin attending
- Colin – thanks for your comments Bob, that is definitely something we struggle with. How do we engage with people in a meaningful and inclusive way? We are taking about making recommendations and be collaborative and get the work done. Need a process that is clear and concise. What do you need from our end to get to the content?
- John – worried about the time, can we have a little leap of faith
- Gerrie – wanted to get to goals too
- John – is there anyone who cannot live with the consensus model?
  - Bob – concern about what happens if we don't get consensus
  - Measure the level of consensus – not necessarily the goal to get 100% consensus
  - Bonnie – you have to have attended 3 meetings to participate in the consensus

- Pat – don't have a problem with trying the consensus model but need to anticipate when not everyone will want to participate in consensus building. Need a way to abstain
- Stakeholder Co-chairs
  - Trust, communication, and shared leadership
  - When people participate, they know that stakeholders have helped develop the agenda, that stakeholders have developed the previous meeting's notes, etc.
  - Participate with a small leadership team in the Department
    - What goes on in the meeting
    - On-going understanding of the timeline of this work
  - What are some things you would want to see in a stakeholder cochair?
    - Long term experience/expertise
      - Gerrie and Julie
    - Understanding the populations
    - Someone who is using or has used the system
    - Someone with personal experience, but can still look at the broad system
    - Someone who is willing and available (estimating 8-10 hours per month, perhaps a bit more in the beginning)
    - Allow the cochairs to be supported by other individuals
      - For example: help with paperwork
      - Be aware of everyone's individual expertise
    - Should be approachable individuals and comfortable talking to people
    - Should be bridge-builders
  - Nominations for Co-chairs:
    - Rob nominates Julie and Gerrie
    - Gerrie does not want to be cochair, would do the meeting notes as long as there is a guaranteed recording of each meeting
    - Bob – would there be consideration for compensation for cochairs?
      - We don't know yet, we are looking into it
    - Julie – happy to help out, but doesn't think she's an ideal cochair and doesn't have enough time to commit
    - Julie – nominates Pat, Charlene, Dawn, or Bob
    - Dawn – does not have the capacity
    - John – Carol Meredith's name has been mentioned before
    - Rob – we should think about it
    - Shawna – can we have a backup cochair?

- Meeting prep
      - Cochair job description
      - Pat – one of the critical pieces for a cochair to fill is to be a facilitator between HCPF and the group. Need more communication.
      - John – cochairs will need to collaborate with the Department as well
- Identifying the role of stakeholders
  - Stakeholders to own the meeting notes process
  - Co-chairs as stakeholder leaders
  - Anything else you would like the Department to know about stakeholder roles
    - Gerrie – elephant in the room is trust. I have very little trust in the process and HCPF employees who have been involved in this process.
      - Why did we shut down the WIC? For example
      - When staff from HCPF meet with the co-chairs I'd like to trust that there is some equality in the weight of the opinion. There would be 2 stakeholder cochairs vs. 7 HCPF staff
      - Feeling suspicious of the process, even those of use who love PDPPC – it works in a very different way
      - John – need to have discussions with the cochairs about this
    - Charlene – the role of co-chairs, we need to be careful about how we use their time. When HCPF works with the cochairs, we need to develop trust. We are now using an in-house facilitator, in another meeting the facilitator would use live changes to the design of the tool
    - Bonnie – this is great feedback, in response to Gerrie – the meetings with co-chairs would not be 7 HCPF staff deep. Charlene – we have brought in some additional technical experts in the moment to help address concerns
    - Rob – in essence what the co-chairs are going to be doing as they meet with HCPF is to represent the individuals involved in waiver redesign, where are the cochairs supposed to lie? If there is conflict between the co-chairs and HCPF how is this resolved? Need to make sure the co-chair – HCPF relationship is not set up to be adversarial
      - Bonnie – we are not proposing that the cochairs are responsible for representing the larger group as a whole, but for building a bridge between the larger group and HCPF. We are hoping this can help balance the power dynamic. If we have open enough communication to talk through what's working and what isn't working

- Gerrie – agree with Bonnie. The co-chairs at PDPPC and HCPF get together to organize meetings. They don't decide anything, they put stuff on the agenda.
  - Rob – point out that we're talking about bridge building, all architects have a different vision for how that bridge should look. If the co-chairs are just going to be discussing the agenda and the notes and not policy, that would be ok.
  - Julie – time check, need to talk about goals
- How to increase stakeholder participation – send to John and he will present them when we begin working with the stakeholder co-chairs
- Shared statement of goals
  - You should have a copy of HB 15-1318
  - Our goals were developed using CLAG recommendations, WRD workgroup recommendations, and HB 15-1318 recommendations
  - Goal of WRD: The goal of the adult IDD waiver redesign is to consolidate the HCBS services developmental disabilities and supported living services waiver into one single HCBS waiver for adults with IDD. This waiver will include a broad array of services and enhance individual's choice, autonomy, and community engagement, and will include planning
  - What language would you add to make this a shared goal
    - Pat – overall, we understand the mission of the law and waiver redesign, but what we don't know is what HCPF wants from this group of stakeholders.
    - Charlene – agree with Pat. Would like to know how this statement was formulated. It says something about person-centeredness but nothing about self-direction. We need to put that forth as a goal. The other piece I would bring forth is those families and individuals who are using these waivers don't want to see any reduction in services or increased stringencies in accessing services. We're moving towards an SLS model of greater reporting, I see tremendous amount of energy into compliance. Reducing administrative overhead.
    - Gerrie – Endorse 3 additional recommendations: self-direction, guarantee of no loss of service for individuals who are currently receiving DD, and some way to address any unnecessary compliance
    - Bob – It is important to have self-determination stated in goals, not losing resources for those on DD waiver, the admin overhead costs and charges that agencies are making – starting to see agency models that are significantly reducing overhead costs and reducing down to 15-20% overhead by using different business models. The idea of the final settings rule and applying that to this process is important – relates to self-determination, self-direction, and community integration

- Pat – still need her question answers
  - Bonnie – what we are looking from the waiver implementation group, need recommendations on how we can get to what we were charged with, policy recommendations
  - Pat – are there limits to what we can discuss? Res hab hasn't been discussed since last year, actuarial work being done and the assumptions the actuary is making,
  - Lori – as soon as we agree on the process moving forward, res hab will be the first thing discussed
- Marilyn – like to see more guidelines and more oversight, it has taken 4 years to get adult son into services
- Bonnie – services may change, but we are aspiring that these services are better. Want to be thoughtful in the words that we use, we agreed to using the language “there will not be a reduction in resources”
- Pat – didn't agree to “resources” I have objection to using that language
  - Bonnie – understand that, do you have any language that we could consider? But services may change, but that doesn't mean people are getting less.
- Julie – say what Pat said about resources, don't question your intentions. Feel strongly that we say “no one will be forced to change a situation that is working for them”
  - Bonnie – willing to listen and work with everyone to develop language that everyone can stand behind
- Gerrie – since the assessment tool process is not going to have a resource allocation vendor beginning work until November 2019, that means we wouldn't have any information about resource allocation until the beginning of 2020 at the earliest. That seems resolved so that people can understand the assessment tool before we submit a combined waiver amendment. Back to trust – if you don't have an agreeable resource allocation process, you're going to have a lot of resistance to submitting a waiver amendment. Confused about the timeline – I think it is unrealistic, especially with the budget request
- Charlene – endorse what Julie and Gerrie mentioned about resource allocation. If you want stakeholders to put a time commitment to this work, we need assurances about resource allocation. We need to make sure we are working in tandem with the assessment tool development
- Identify and agree upon next steps
  - Need to have a recording of the meeting and a stakeholder note taker
  - Trying out consensus model, 1 vote per person unless there are multiple representations from an agency, then the agency only gets 1 vote.



- Individuals must participate in 3 consecutive meetings. Individuals need an option to abstain.
- Gerrie – we can do these items later, we need an assurance that the Department agrees to the goals
    - Lori: I heard those goals were:
      - Self-Direction
      - Guarantee of no loss of services for people currently receiving the DD waiver
      - Look at unnecessary compliance issues
    - Julie – also need to simplify the waivers
    - Alicia – Final settings rule
      - Community integration
      - More guidelines and oversight
  - Bonnie – next steps
    - Craft language and work with new process
    - Bring to larger group for final discussion and agreement for path forward
  - Charlene – more clarity on the role and exploring the notion of resource allocation
  - John – we didn't decide upon nominees or selecting people today. We will make that an item in the larger stakeholder process
  - Pat – Marilyn is speaking to accountability, not oversight