

Group Living Advisory Committee – Community Corrections Subgroup Meeting #2

Date and Time: Tuesday, June 5, 2018, 1:30 – 3:00 PM

Location: Independence House Administrative Office

Attendees

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Kristin Lewis
Frances Falk
Shannon Carst
Rose Rodriguez
Michael Henry

DENVER ELECTED OFFICIAL

Deborah Ortega

DENVER STAFF MEMBERS

Andrew Webb
Kyle Dalton

FACILITATOR

Meagan Picard

GUEST

Manny Rodriguez

Meeting Summary

1. MEETING OPENING – WELCOME & CHECK-IN

Meagan Picard opened the meeting, welcoming and inviting everyone to check in. She then shared the meeting agenda:

1. Welcome/Introductions
2. Meeting Goals
3. Draft Problem Statement
 - a. Staff overview
 - b. Quick poll
 - c. Discuss – seek consensus
4. Next Steps/Close

2. MEETING GOALS

Meagan shared that the primary goal for today's meeting is to reach consensus on the draft problem state, and related to that desired outcome, she also said that the other (process) goal is to

follow the committee members' group process agreements during that discussion, especially in the event of disagreements.

She invited additional goals; there were none. However, one member asked about the bed count limit (120) and whether that could be changed in this process. The group determined that is an issue related to the 6th element of the draft problem statement and may be further discussed in the solutions phase of this project.

3. DRAFT PROBLEM STATEMENT

a) Staff Overview: Andrew gave a brief overview of the draft problem statement and its six elements:

- 1) Demand exceeds capacity
- 2) Limited space (in the city) for new facilities
- 3) Limited allowances for expansion among compliant/nonconforming facilities (could lose grandfathered status)
- 4) Parking requirements exceed demand and take up space that could be used for expansion
- 5) Term "community corrections" may contribute to negative stereotypes
- 6) Population density requirements (square footage per resident and bed counts) limit expansion and are out of sync with state/federal regulations

b) Quick Poll: Meagan walked the group through each element to identify which were agreed as written and those that needed further discussion. Numbers 1 and 4 were agreed as written. The rest were flagged for discussion.

c) Discussion (Seek Consensus):

- Questions were raised about #s 2 and 3 for clarification, as one provider noted that they could expand some of their facilities. When clarifying that these are identified problems in the DZC for which solutions will be discussed in the next phase, the statements were accepted as written. It was also noted that these specific issues are related to providers' inability to expand to meet demand (#1).
- Most of the group did not see the term "community corrections" (#5) as a problem, and it was determined that it should be removed from the statement. However, several in the group were interested in talking about educating the community, which was noted for the "bike rack". It was noted that the larger sized facilities may contribute to the sense of these facilities as being more institutional and that may be a bigger issue and should be considered when discussions solutions related to #6.
- Discussion about #6 opened with a suggestion that it be less definitive – amend to read, "...may need revision". It was clarified that a technical fix is needed for consistency with state and federal regulations (40 ft vs 50 ft per resident). Bed count limits may be a problem (and increasing the limit *may* be a solution) related to capacity to meet demand. It was agreed that the statement should be modified to clarify these issues and that the bed count issue would be discussed further in the solutions phase, as they seek the best recommendations for increasing capacity to meet demand.
- With the agreed upon changes to #6 and removal of #5, the group agrees to the problem statement.

- Also, throughout the discussion, additional bike rack issues were identified that had not been captured in the draft statement:
 - There is interest in creating social/small enterprise opportunities in connection to community corrections programs.
 - There is a recognized need for better funding for community corrections programs.
 - It was also acknowledged that neighborhoods' biggest concern is safety, which is included in the ideal future component of the draft problem statement. The related problem is seen as a management issue to be included as a bike rack, and a study of management best practices and revision to Ordinance 565 were suggested for future efforts.

4. NEXT STEPS AND CLOSE

Next, the project team will prepare a meeting summary, update the draft problem statement (including bike rack issues), submit it for internal review process and share final with the group. The next step after that is the full advisory committee meeting, which will be held at the Webb Municipal Building on June 26.