

GJRC Advisory Group Conference Call Summary
April 13, 2017

Attendees:

Advisory Group Members:	Roberta Funk	Tim Hudner	Michèle O'Toole
	Gini Springmeyer	Mike Thoma	
CDHS Representative:	Georgia Edson		
Facilitator:	Will Singleton		

Follow up from the call

- Check to see if Reggie Bicha can be at the Tuesday, April 19 meeting at 8:30 to enable him to discuss the questions that were posed to the Department.
- Members are asked to consider how the criteria can be used to improve the specifics of their favored options.

Call objectives

- Discuss the potential accomplishments for the meeting on Tuesday
- Review the draft agenda
- Review the draft criteria document and explain how it will be used in the process

Discussion on how to mute phone during a conference call: (dial *6 for future reference)

Review of the highpoint objectives of the April 18 meeting

- Will said that he expects the Department to come back with the questions that were posed by the group last month. Reggie expressed a desire to address the questions himself on Tuesday morning.
- The meeting will also seek to discuss how the criteria should be used to improve options that are discussed by the group
- The plan is for Reggie Bicha to be with the group for an hour with a goal of moving towards discussing specific options for further work between the April and May meetings.

Potential changes to the agenda

- Reggie may want to cover the questions posed by the AG in March. If possible, Will should determine if Reggie Bicha can come earlier for that portion of the meeting.

Review of the criteria document

A revised draft was sent out on the afternoon of the 13th and an original draft was sent out to the Advisory Group members on April 8th.

The intent of the document is to provide input on evaluation and improvement of proposals. Many suggestions from the group were related to the values that should be applied to any option and there were some suggestions about how to consider feasibility of proposals. Individual perspectives were distilled into the document to capture describe potential areas common areas of agreement among the AG members.

The two different types of criteria can be synthesized by creating an X-Y axis. One axis is the continuum of “desirability” or how an option reflects values. The other axis would be a continuum of feasibility (such as lowering per diem costs or general fund request). The point of the graphic is that the criteria can be used to make a desirable option more feasible and/or a feasible option more desirable.

Having a discussion that is based on the structure of the criteria can be used as a framework for dialogue, rather than something that would constrain the group.

Q: Will the criteria be shared with the public?

A: It will be used to discuss the benefits of specific options when describing them. “This is a good option because it achieves _____. It is feasible because it does _____.” It is not intended to be a public advisory group output.

Will said he was asked by Tanya Skalecki (who could not be on the call) to share her perspective that services should be community based because this is an important issue for Arc Mesa. Participants asked about the origins of the comments and wanted to discuss whether the comments were made with knowledge of the actual care needs of the GJRC residents. The conversation about the motivations of the comments would have to be when all are present.

Q: Will a report from the AG be submitted to the Capital Development Committee?

A: All of the options will be passed on to the CDC; even the ones that the Department does not favor.

Questions about the process

An AG member expressed concern over the process plan. The member asked who needs to have more realistic options – who is the audience? Another participant wanted to touch back with the provisions of SB 16-178 and whether there was openness to financing the next steps. The participant said that the process should use the bill and the central issues and seek to solve some of the problems related to cost and other issues – a dialogue on the pros and cons, what is being sought to be achieved, and at what cost.

An AG member said that it is critical that CDHS ED Reggie Bicha express his willingness to work cooperatively with the AG and whatever is developed together is what is taken the Legislature. Otherwise, the process could be a non-productive exercise leading to people in Department choosing their own plan, or advocates writing letters of opposition, and ending with the need to solve the issue through direct engagement with legislators.

Will said that his understanding is that the Department’s ED wants to work in cooperation with the Advisory Group, although ultimately the responsibility is the Department’s. The Department reconvened the AG because it wants the AG’s advice. There is an opportunity to have a productive discussion on Tuesday.