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- Introductions
  - Operations, Governance
  - History of Mill Levy
  - Action Items for Future
Mill Levy Advisory Council Overview

Meet your fellow members:

- Betty Lehman, Lehman Disability Planning
- Tim Lomas, Boulder County
- Ann Pierce, Denver Human Services
- Kendall Rames, Urban Peak Denver
- J.J. Tomash, Boulder Analysts
- Lauren Weinstock, Retired
- Kate Williams, Denver Regional Mobility and Access Council
- Jennifer Beck, RMHS (Non-voting member)

DHS Mill Levy Program Manager – Crystal Porter
Mill Levy Advisory Council Overview

- Up to seven voting members on the Council who are all Denver residents with interest and expertise in services to people with I/DD.
  - Appointed by DHS Executive Director
  - Goal of at least two voting members with an I/DD or who are a family member or caregiver to someone with an I/DD

- One non-voting member from the Community Centered Board.

- Council will elect co-chairs from among its members.

The Council is supported by Mill Levy Program Manager - this role will also assist with facilitation, conduct research and analysis, and manage solicitation and contracting process.
Mill Levy Advisory Council Structure

- **Community Member**
  - Supports DHS’ Council and Community Centered Board Delegate
  - Oversees mill levy program

- **Non-voting member**
  - Up to 7 voting members

- **RMHS CAC**
  - Makes final decisions on services
  - One member of DHS’ Council serves on RMHS’ CAC

- **DHS Program Manager**
  - Recommendations

- **DHS Executive Director**
Coordination with RMHS

RMHS selected most 2019 providers for external initiatives in December 2018- services and supports funded through RMHS will be known to the Council by the time you begin to make recommendations.

One member of the Council will also be appointed to RMHS’ Community Advisory Council as authorized by DHS’ contract with RMHS to ensure open communications.

RMHS as the CCB has appointed a non-voting delegate to the Council to serve as a conduit for information on existing programs.

DHS Program Manager will continue to regularly attend RMHS Community Advisory Council meetings.

The goal will be for the RMHS and DHS mill levy programs to complement and support the other, working in collaboration to support residents of Denver with I/DD.
Support from DHS

Finance Services Division at DHS oversees the full contracting process, including budgets, reporting and contract compliance. Several professionals from this team support the DHS mill levy program.

Amy Packer, Assistant City Attorney, will be joining us at meetings to provide a legal sounding board for members as it pertains to governance, including ethics and conflict of interest.

DHS’s Executive Team, including Executive Director Don Mares and Deputy Executive Director Joe Homlar, oversee this program and will review recommendations this Council makes for areas of focus.

DHS Program Manager provides support to the Council and can give context to discussion around mill levy. Responsible for facilitating communication and collaboration across teams.

How does Mill Levy fit into DHS’s greater vision for Denver?
In the beginning... Human Services Value Curve
Now... Denver Human Services Value Sphere

- Supporting a **healthy and connected community**.

- Partnering to build a **network of opportunity** that identifies root causes and addresses the needs of the whole person and whole family.

- Providing quality, timely **essential services** with integrity, kindness, and respect.
1. Equity & Access
Ensure every individual in Denver has access to the support that they need to live a healthy and high quality life.

2. Safety & Wellness
Support and advance sustainable health, wellness, and safety outcomes for the community.

3. Connectivity
Increase connectivity as a department to improve community partnerships, reduce internal silos, and work collaboratively with city and state partners.
DHS Strategic Vision Framework, 2019-21

4. Economic Resilience
Strengthen economic well-being across the lifespan to increase access to opportunity.

5. Workforce
Support a healthy and connected workforce that is equipped to strengthen the neighborhoods of Denver.
Thinking Ahead

• How can we best use Mill Levy funds to serve people with intellectual and developmental disabilities in Denver?

• What connections do we have to DHS’ strategic vision?

• What process will the Council use to build consensus around recommendations and areas of focus for these monies, reflective of the expectations and needs of the greater Denver community?
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Mill Levy Advisory Council Duties

• Make recommendations to DHS Executive Director on needs to address and project areas to fund.

• Liaise with Community Centered Board Advisory Council (aka CAC) to ensure coordination and avoid unintentional duplication.

• Voting members must recuse themselves from decisions that would create a conflict of interest.

All Council meetings will be posted and open to the public.
Ethics & Proper Procedures

- Open meetings
- Proper notice
- Bylaws
- Quorum
- Parliamentary Procedure
- Agenda and Minutes
- Special concerns with email communications
Open Meetings Laws

- DRMC § 2-33 – Open Meetings Required – all meetings of a quorum of a public body shall be open to the public

- DRMC § 2-32(2) – Advisory boards are public bodies

- DRMC § 2-34 – Executive sessions – lists 8 exceptions to open meetings law requirements

- DRMC § 2-35 – Notice 48 hours in advance
Public Records

• Charter § 1.1.10 – Public records. All boards and commissions shall keep a record of their proceedings, their meetings, and all their official documents, and records shall be public. Public access to records shall be as approved by state law.

• Colorado Open Records Act (CORA) § 24-72-100.1, et seq., C.R.S.
Executive Session Laws and Confidentiality

• Although the Open Meetings Law assures that government will be conducted out in the open, there are legitimately confidential matters, including:
  o Legal advice, litigation issues
  o Personnel matters
  o Issues being negotiated

• Executive sessions are permitted under law because of a legitimate need for confidentiality

• This means confidentiality must be maintained after the session

• If one person breaches confidentiality, then the determination of the Council that the matter was properly confidential has been overridden by that person
Code of Ethics

- DRMC § 2-60 – Gifts to officers, officials, and employees
- DRMC § 2-61 – Conflicts of interest
- DRMC § 2-68 – Use of Confidential Information and Records
Conflicts of Interest

Take a moment to think of some examples of situations where you’ve found yourself or could find yourself with a conflict of interest.

• What came up for you? What happened in that situation?
• How do you handle this as a Council member?
Proposed Bylaws

- Draft of proposed bylaws for Council consideration
  - Paper copy in binders
  - Can send out a digital copy for notetaking

- Review and send questions, notes, or proposed changes in to be compiled for open discussion at the first public meeting

- Goal: get bylaws in place early so Council can get into the exciting part of the work set before us
8-minute break: Retreat Activity

• Around the room, there are papers pinned up with bucket list items on them. There’s one from each of you!

• Take a moment to review the bucket list items (see quick list).

• Walk around and use sticky notes to assign your fellow members to bucket list items you think might be from them! Get to as many as you can- if you are stumped, move on to the next one.

• When you’re done, return to your seat.

How many did you get right?
For your reference:

- Betty Lehman, Lehman Disability Planning
- Tim Lomas, Boulder County
- Ann Pierce, Denver Human Services
- Kendall Rames, Urban Peak Denver
- J.J. Tomash, Boulder Analysts
- Lauren Weinstock, Retired
- Kate Williams, Denver Regional Mobility and Access Council
- Jennifer Beck, RMHS Director (Non-voting member)

DHS Mill Levy Program Manager – Crystal Porter
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• Denver voters increased property taxes designated for people with intellectual and development disabilities and their families up to 1.000 mill

• RMHS (then Denver Options, Inc.) assigned responsibility of funds at this time through ordinance
In response to 2015 Audit, RMHS and DHS sought to define programs funded by mill levy, to see dollars further pushed out into community.

One third of funds left unspent in 2016 (approx. $5M)
• This companion ordinance codified the existing levy of 1.000 mill on property, dedicated to serving people of Denver with I/DD

• Further defined residency requirements, allowed for additional contractors outside of RMHS, capped administrative expenses for DHS (0.75% of dedicated funds), and required annual CCB reporting to City Council
Mill Levy Overview

2003 Ordinance

Unspent funds in 2016

2017 Ordinance

Unspent funds in 2017

New RMHS Contract 2018-2020

2018 Needs Assessment

Advisory Council

- Additional unspent funds, bringing DHS’ remaining total up to approx $9.2M
- Hired first DHS Program Manager over mill levy September 2017
Based on ongoing evaluation of current programs and services, DHS negotiated a new contract with RMHS to be carried out in 3 terms:

- July 2018 – December 2018 ($8.5M, totaling in $16M for 2018)
- January 2019 – December 2019 ($14M)
- January 2020 – December 2020 ($15M)
Mill Levy Overview

- Conducted March-August 2018 by Health Management Associates, in conjunction with DHS Program Manager
- Multi-collection method resulted in several key findings, resulting in governance and spending recommendations
• Organized per Needs Assessment recommendation and case study on a similar body seated in Arapahoe County

• Seated December 2018, first public meeting to be scheduled
Projected Funding Available (2018 to 2020)

- **Unspent from 2016 and 2017**: $9.2M
- **2018**: $16.0M
- **2019**: $14.0M
- **2020**: $15.0M

**Total Uncommitted Funding**: $18.5M (29%)
**Total Committed Funding**: $45.0M (71%)

--

**Rocky Mountain Human Services**
Current RMHS Mill Levy Services

- Individualized Annual Plans
- Individualized Client Assistance
- Community Agency Programs
- Enhanced Services from RMHS

All mill levy services are currently provided through Rocky Mountain Human Services, the State designated Community Centered Board for Denver, and its subcontractors.
2018 RMHS Community Agency Partners

Note: Not all organizations are shown.
Needs Assessment Objectives

1. Inventory current services for Denver residents with I/DD and existing capacity.

2. Identify service gaps and potential ways to address them by engaging stakeholders.

3. Research and evaluate governance models for overseeing and disbursing mill levy funds.

Denver Human Services contracted with Health Management Associates, a consulting firm with offices in Denver, to conduct the needs assessment. DHS and HMA were advised by a steering committee of providers and advocates with deep knowledge of services for people with I/DD. The engagement lasted from March to September 2018.
# Needs Assessment Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Literature Review</strong></th>
<th>• Extensive review of contracts, reports, laws, regulations, program details, and best practices research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governmental Scan</strong></td>
<td>• Outreach to other jurisdictions with dedicated local mill levies and review of programs in Colorado, Ohio, and Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informational Interviews</strong></td>
<td>• 8 interviews with leaders, experts, advocates, and family members to gather a broad cross-section of perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus Groups</strong></td>
<td>• 3 focus groups: (1.) 15 Self-Advocates, (2.) Early Childhood Providers, (3.) People with I/DD who are Homeless and their Case Managers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Public Meeting** | • Afternoon and evening sessions in central Denver—small group facilitations with over 60 participants total  
• Available by phone, WebEx, and Facebook Live |
| **Survey** | • 417 responses to wide-ranging online survey including 164 recipients of service and 147 providers |
“If you ever applied for mill levy funds, how well did the funding meet a need or fill a gap on a scale of 1–10?”

8.3

Average Score

85 respondents who applied for mill levy funding with RMHS
Understanding of Current Services

“How well do you feel you understand Denver’s mill levy?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Have not learned about mill levy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“How well do you feel you understand the services the mill levy is currently funding?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excellent/Good</th>
<th>Fair/Poor/Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recipients</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providers</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Providers

“As the representative of an organization that receives Mill Levy Funding, I am very familiar.”

“I would appreciate a DHS presentation for each agency staffed with case managers, advocates or providers using the funding for their program.”

“How are funds distributed? How are needs prioritized?”

“Need to be more clear about what mill levy can cover and how to access funds.”

Recipients of Services

“How funds are obtained and who decides how they are used.”

“Know that it paid for a tablet, but not much more than that.”

“I know we have received Mill levy funds to help with expenses, but this process was managed by our RMHS case manager.”

“I have no idea what my daughter can get, whether requested services will come from mill levy money or a different fund, I didn’t know it could be used to expand or create new programs, and when services are denied I don’t know why.”

“The actual implementation has been essentially "Ask if something is covered and we will see if we can get funding for it" so we ask and learn.”

“Everything.”

Sample of open-ended responses to this question
Big Problems

Percent of all respondents indicating an issue was a “Big Problem”

- Affordable housing: 87%
- Waiting lists for services and supports: 70%
- Adequate mental health services: 65%
- Obtaining employment: 63%
- Transition to adulthood - transition planning: 54%
- Transition to adulthood - continuing education: 50%
- Finding a doctor who accepts public health insurance: 50%
- Life skills training: 46%
- Coordination of services: 46%
- Family supports: 46%
- Finding a doctor who is sensitive to disability issues: 45%
- Services for individuals with I/DD: 44%
- Technology, such as iPads: 36%
- Transportation to doctor's appointments: 36%
- Adequate dental care: 36%
- Paying for prescription medications: 35%
- Case management: 34%
- Managing chronic conditions, such as diabetes: 34%
- Consumer control of services: 31%
- Accessible gyms and/or options for swimming: 27%
- Communication supports, such as large print, Braille, CART readers, etc.: 19%
Biggest Problems by Respondent

Respondents were asked to indicate if something was a “Big Problem,” “Small Problem,” or “Not a Problem”

Top Five Problems

1. Affordable Housing
2. Obtaining Employment
3. Waiting Lists
4. Transitions
5. Mental Health

Overall

Providers

Recipients of Services

Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Providers</th>
<th>Recipients of Services</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Big</td>
<td>Big</td>
<td>Big</td>
<td>Big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining Employment</td>
<td>Big</td>
<td>Big</td>
<td>Big</td>
<td>Big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting Lists</td>
<td>Big</td>
<td>Big</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>Big</td>
<td>Big</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>Big</td>
<td>Big</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Big</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Tier Recommendations

- DHS should establish a formal structure like an advisory council to help disburse dedicated mill levy revenue.
- DHS should explore ways to relieve the burden of housing costs for Denver residents with I/DD and providers who otherwise cannot afford to live in Denver.
- DHS should encourage the employment of people with I/DD in Denver.
- DHS should focus on addressing the needs of those on the waiting list for services.
- DHS should develop resources to support transitions to adulthood for people with I/DD.
- DHS should enhance the capacity to provide mental health services for people with I/DD who also have a mental health diagnosis.
2018 RFI Responses

• RFI released in Q4, deadline December 21, 2018

• RFI Overview document in binders

• Review prior to the 1st public meeting
  • Consider ideas presented
  • How might this inform what we already know?
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Meeting Logistics

• Set date and time for first public meeting

• Consider meeting schedule to officially adopt at 1st meeting, including:
  o Frequency
  o Duration
  o Location(s)

• Goal: set schedule well in advance to ease availability for members, and accessibility for public participants.
Immediate Action Items

• Review the Ethics memo and booklet provided by DHS
  o Contact DHS with questions

• Read over proposed bylaws, including sections under review
  o Prepare to discuss and possibly adopt at first public meeting

• Consider process for nominating member(s) to serve as Co-chairs
  o Prepare to discuss and vote on these members at first public meeting

• Consider member to serve on CCB Community Advisory Council (CAC)
  o Do you wish to be considered?
  o Elect at first public meeting
Consider Next Steps

• What is your collective vision as a Council? (consider a vision statement)

• How can we use DHS mill levy dollars to make a lasting impact in Denver?

• What kinds of projects might we want to explore funding?

• How will we build consensus around ideas to make valuable, informed recommendations to DHS?

• How will we continue to engage the community and stay connected to residents with I/DD to inform projects funded by mill levy dollars?
Contact Me

Should you have any questions, please reach out!

crystal.porter@denvergov.org
Appendix

Kickoff Retreat
## Metro Area Counties with a Mill Levy to Fund Services for People with I/DD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>2018 LEVY</th>
<th>2018 REVENUE</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>0.257 mill</td>
<td>$1.65M</td>
<td>Set annually by County Commissioners. Not voter approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>1.000 mill</td>
<td>$10.21M</td>
<td>Approved by voters in 2001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>1.000 mill</td>
<td>$7.86M</td>
<td>Approved by voters in 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>1.005 mill</td>
<td>$1.3M</td>
<td>Levy is for both IDD and mental health. Not voter approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>1.000 mill</td>
<td>$17.5M</td>
<td>Approved by voters in 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>1.000 mill</td>
<td>$9.4M</td>
<td>Approved by voters in 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larimer</td>
<td>0.750 mill</td>
<td>$4.1M</td>
<td>Approved by voters in 2001.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Funding for People with I/DD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>2018 LEVY</th>
<th>2018 REVENUE FOR PEOPLE WITH I/DD</th>
<th>PAYMENT METHOD TO CCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>1.000 mill</td>
<td>$17.5M</td>
<td>Reimbursement/Rates (2018-2020 contract)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>1.000 mill</td>
<td>$10.2M</td>
<td>Monthly Installments (2018 contract)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>1.000 mill</td>
<td>$9.4M</td>
<td>Monthly Installments (2018 contract)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>1.500 mill**</td>
<td>$7.9M</td>
<td>Quarterly Installments (2017 contract)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>1.000 mill</td>
<td>$6.3M</td>
<td>Monthly Installments (2018 contract)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larimer</td>
<td>0.750 mill</td>
<td>$4.1M</td>
<td>Monthly Installments (No contract)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams*</td>
<td>0.257 mill</td>
<td>$1.7M</td>
<td>Quarterly Installments (2018 contract)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield*</td>
<td>1.005 mill**</td>
<td>$1.4M</td>
<td>Quarterly Installments (2018 contract)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not voter approved  
** For services for people with I/DD and people with mental health issues
Proposed Advisory Council Cycle

Q4 2018 Only
DHS issues RFI based on needs assessment findings

Early to Mid Q3
DHS and Advisory Council identify needs on which to focus in next year

Late Q2/Early Q3
DHS and Advisory Council review and evaluate impact of services

Late Q4/Early Q4
Advisory Council recommends RFAs/RFPs for DHS to issue

Early to Mid Q4
Advisory Council recommends projects to select to DHS

Mid to Late Q4/Early Q1
DHS evaluates recommendations and contracts with providers

Target Dates for Advisory Council Activities

DHS will likely be behind on these target dates in 2018 and early 2019.

* Process and timeline are subject to change
Request for Information and Proposals

Idea Generation

- Solicitation of ideas based on key areas of need as identified by the needs assessment of services for residents with I/DD
- To be sure nothing gets left off the table

Request for Information

RFI Review

- Council reviews RFI responses
- Council recommends RFPs for specific services to be issued by DHS

Recommendations

Selection

- DHS issues competitive RFPs to procure a specific service (i.e., housing, employment services)
- Council reviews and recommends projects or ideas to DHS

Request for Proposal

Contracting

- DHS Executive Director reviews recommendations and selects vendor(s)
- DHS negotiates contract(s) with vendor(s) that meet all City requirements

Implementation

RFI posted to DHS website in 4th quarter of 2018.

RFP will be available after Council identifies specific needs.
Where to Find the Needs Assessment

The full needs report is available on DHS’ website:

Needs Assessment Survey Demographics

**Respondent Type**
- Recipient of Services: 40%
- Provider of Services: 35%
- Other: 14%
- No Response: 11%

**Gender**
- Female: 4%
- Male: 15%
- Other: 81%

**Age**
- Under 18: 2%
- 18 to 24: 3%
- 25 to 34: 17%
- 35 to 44: 27%
- 45 to 54: 21%
- 55 to 64: 23%
- 65+: 7%

**Race**
- White: 78%
- Black or African American: 8%
- Prefer Not to Answer/Don’t Know: 7%
- Another Race: 5%
- American Indian or Alaska Native: 2%
- Asian: 2%
- Pacific Islander: 1%

Note: 11% of respondents identified their ethnicity as Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano, Hispanic, Latino, or Other Spanish.