

Minnesota Olmstead Planning Subcabinet – 4/9/13 Meeting Notes

Meeting Details

Date: April 9, 2013

Start/End Time: 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Location: Anderson Building Room 2380

Chair: Lt. Governor Yvonne Prettner Solon

Facilitator: Judy Plante, Management Analysis & Development (MAD), Minnesota Management and Budget

Subcabinet members (or alternates) in attendance: Cynthia Bauerly, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED); Loren Colman, Assistant Commissioner, Department of Human Services (DHS); Janice Jones, Compliance Monitoring, Department of Health (MDH); Kevin Lindsey, Commissioner, Department of Human Rights (MDHR); Jessie Montano, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Education (MDE); Sue Mulvihill, Division Director, Department of Transportation (MnDOT); Roberta Opheim, Ombudsman for Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities (*ex officio*); Thomas Roy, Commissioner, Department of Corrections (DOC); Mary Tingerthal, Commissioner, Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (MHFA); Colleen Wieck, Executive Director, Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities (*ex officio*).

Others in attendance:

Steve Allen, DOC; Kristie Billiar, MnDOT; Chad Bowe, DEED; Lee Buckley, DOC; Ji-Young Choi, MHFA; Kelly Christenson, MnDOT; Gregory Gray, DHS; Micah Hines, Governor & Lt. Governor's Office; Kristin Jarenby, MnDOT; Jill Keen, MDHR; Mary Kay Kennedy, ACT; Luke Kuhl, Lt. Governor's Office; Ed Lecher, DEED; Sarah Lenz, MnDOT; Barb Lundeen, MDH; Maureen Marrin, OMHDD ; Rebecca Melang, Corporation for Supportive Housing; Tonja Orr, MHFA ; Kim Peck, DEED; Mimi Schafer, DEED; Christina Schaffer, MDHR; Jill Schewe, Care Providers of MN; Ron Solheid, DOC; Richard Strong, DEED; Nan Stubenvoll, DHS; Mike Tessneer, DHS; Rosalie Vollmar, DHS; Joan Willshire, MSCOD.

Welcome and introductions

Lt. Governor Prettner Solon asked the subcabinet members to introduce themselves.

During the meeting, Lt. Governor Prettner Solon asked the subcabinet if there were any changes necessary to the notes from the last meeting—none were identified.

Update on core work group activities and plan development

Judy Plante provided an update on the agency core groups' work and on development of the plan document:

- The groups met on April 5 for 3 hours; about 30 people from the subcabinet agencies attended the meeting.
- The goal of the meeting was to look at cross agency opportunities.
- The conversation was fruitful, and core groups left with assignments and contacts for follow-up work.

- The core groups also discussed the draft template for agency plans and cross-agency plans. MAD revised the templates based on feedback from the groups.
- People may have a different understanding of what a “draft” is. In this context, drafting the plan documents will truly be iterative. There’s an expectation that the plan will be shaped based on feedback from the core groups, subcabinet, stakeholders, and the public.
- The key questions when reviewing the draft plans: Are we reaching far enough, are we seizing opportunities? *and* Are we covering what we have to do to be in compliance with Olmstead?

Funding and fiscal impact:

- One of the issues discussed at the core group meeting was what assumptions to make regarding available funding for this work: should they assume that there won’t be new money?
- In an email exchange after the core group meeting, the subcabinet discussed options. (Note: until there is clarity about whether the subcabinet can have this type of discussion via email, future email communication will only be to share documents or information, not to discuss decisions.)
- Roberta Opheim noted that from an Olmstead perspective, we first have to figure out what we need to do to achieve most integrated settings and then analyze how to get there. There’s a defense that a state lacks resources, but it’s not a robust defense.
- Going forward, core group members should not assume that new funds are off the table, and they should assume that agencies can use existing funds in new ways.

Review of key dates:

- April 26: core groups to send completed draft plans for their agencies to MAD.
- April 30: core group meeting to review the drafts and to continue cross-agency work.
- May 8: core groups to send revised agency drafts and cross-agency drafts to MAD.
- June 11: subcabinet meeting to discuss draft before it is released for public comment.
- July 9 and August 13: subcabinet meetings to hear comments on the draft.
- Ongoing through summer: agencies to collect feedback from their stakeholders.
- September 10: subcabinet meeting to present stakeholder feedback and discuss changes to draft plan.
- Ongoing through September and October: revisions to plan.
- October 8 (and possible additional date): subcabinet meeting(s) to review changes and approve final plan document.
- November 1: plan is due (assuming the requested extension is approved).

Review of draft report template

Judy Plante shared the draft template developed for the core groups. The template includes guidance to the groups, with excerpts from Governor Dayton’s executive order, the subcabinet’s vision statement, and the Department of Justice’s guidance. There is one template for agencies to complete, and one for cross-agency work—both templates have headings and descriptions showing the type of information that is needed to develop the state’s plan.

Judy Plante also shared a hypothetical example of cross-agency information, which is intended to show a possible pitch level for the plan. An Olmstead plan must be high level and strategic, and it must also have timelines for measurable results (while not becoming something like a detailed division or agency-level workplan). The idea with is to achieve a middle ground—enough information to show how

the plan will work, but not tying an agency to a certain activity on a specific date (which wouldn't necessarily accomplish the objective).

Subcabinet members discussed the templates and sample. Discussion included:

- The template document is missing important information, such as the history of *Olmstead* and the *Jensen* settlement agreement.
- The completed templates are the basis and substance of the plan, not the plan itself. The plan document will ultimately have a framework surrounding the agency and cross-agency materials, including an introduction, history, and a summary at the end.
- The plans will have to have enough measurable goals and timelines to be in compliance with *Olmstead* and *Jensen*.
- They must also be detailed enough so that if additional funding is needed, there are clear arguments for that funding.
- The heading and instructions for *Contribution to Population Level Goals* is unclear; the template will be revised.
- Information on cross-agency work from the core group meeting will be shared with the subcabinet.
- The sample lacks important information about voting rights, such as case law, information about the election activities task force, and clarity that every agency is responsible for promoting voting rights.
- When agencies are completing their information, they should include as much history and context as is necessary to describe the situation.
- The heading on *Highlights of Activities...* should be revised to make it clear that these are *proposed* activities; the template will be revised.
- There are many issues to address—will it be possible to have the right level of depth by November? Would it be preferable to identify a few significant issues and use them as examples of how to move forward?
- It's not likely that a few examples would be enough to satisfy the requirements of *Olmstead* or the *Jensen* settlement
- The challenge given to the subcabinet is to be inclusive and to look at strategies that will have an impact. The core groups will be bringing ideas and plans to the subcabinet—the subcabinet can decide what additional information is needed and what should or should not be included in the ultimate plan document.

Subcabinet members were asked for any additional comments on the pitch level or on the content of the templates. There were no additional comments.

Action/decision: The template (revised according to subcabinet feedback) will be distributed to the core groups.

Presentation by Subcabinet agencies

Representatives from MHFA, MnDOT, DOC, MDH, MDE, and MDHR presented information on their *Olmstead* planning work and agency assessments. Details on these presentations are at the end of this document (see Attachment: Details of Subcabinet agency presentations).

Discussion of other handouts

Judy Plante discussed additional handouts provided to the subcabinet:

- A printout from DOJ's website listing *Olmstead* related cases (available at: http://www.ada.gov/olmstead/olmstead_cases_list.htm). These can help the subcabinet and core groups understand how the *Olmstead* decision has been applied in other states.
- A summary of other states' *Olmstead* plans. This is a reference tool to help see what other states have done; it is not an endorsement of any approach listed.
- An optional stakeholder feedback template for departments to use in summarizing information they receive from stakeholders. Departments will need to collect and report on feedback in some way—this form is an option.

Next meeting

The next meeting of the subcabinet will be on **Tuesday, May 14, 2013 from 3:00 - 5:00 p.m.** The meeting will be held in the Anderson Building, Room 2380.

Summer Listening Sessions

The following information was distributed after the meeting—it is included here for reference.

Summer listening sessions for the subcabinet have been scheduled as follows:

- July 9th: 2:00 – 5:00, Room 200 State Office Building.
- August 13th: 1:00 – 4:00, Duluth City Hall Council Chambers, 411 West 1st Street, Duluth, MN.

Notes submitted by: Beth Bibus, Management Analysis & Development, Minnesota Management & Budget

Attachment: Details of Subcabinet agency presentations

Presentation by Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (MHFA)

Commissioner Mary Tingerthal and Tonja Orr presented information about MHFA's Olmstead planning work. Following are excerpts from their PowerPoint presentation.

MHFA Strategic Priorities

- Promote and support successful homeownership
- Preserve federally-subsidized rental housing
- Address specific and critical needs in rental housing markets
- Prevent and end homelessness
- Prevent foreclosures and support community recovery

Presentation Summary

- High level overview of need & Minnesota Housing programs
- Areas of interface with persons with disabilities
- Programs that most often provide funding for housing for persons with disabilities
- Policies that promote choice/avoid institutionalization
- Barriers/ Issues/ Improvements

Overview of Need

- 33% of all Minnesota households are housing cost-burdened, i.e. pay more than 30% of their income for housing (674,158 households)
- 50% of all Minnesota renter households pay more than 30% of their income for housing
- 66% of all Minnesota renter households with incomes below \$50,000 are cost burdened

Overview of Minnesota Housing Programs

- Nearly 63,000 households served by Minnesota Housing in FFY '12
- Section 8 project-based rental assistance served over 30,000 of the total households
- 64% of the households served had annual incomes under \$15,000
- Geographic distribution of assistance generally reflects regional shares of eligible households

Areas of Interface with Persons with Disabilities

- Minnesota Housing Programs
- Bridges (State rental assistance for mentally ill)
- PARIF (Preservation – Affordable Rental Investment Fund)
- HTF (Housing Trust Fund)
- Housing Tax Credits (Federal resources allocated by state)
- Challenge (state funded assistance to developers)
- Rehabilitation Loan Program
- Start-up & Step-up Mortgage Programs
- Fix-up Home Improvement Program

Program Commonalities

- Eligibility for vast majority of programs is based almost exclusively on income
- Special categories: Mental illness, Homelessness, Persons with HIV/AIDS
- Housing location chosen by recipient of funds (developer, rental assistance grantee, single family borrowers)

- No entitlements
- Most are public/private partnerships
- Continuum of affordable housing needs addressed
- Annual household incomes served range from \$6,942 to \$61,425
- Homeownership, supportive housing and affordable rental housing
- Developer funds awarded competitively

Policies that Promote Choice / Avoid Institutionalization

- Promote development of accessible housing
 - A minimum of 3% of the units in any new construction multifamily rental housing with 4 or more units that is financed by Minnesota Housing must meet the accessibility requirements of the State Building Code
 - Accessibility standards are applied to rehabilitation and adaptive reuse multifamily rental housing to maximum extent feasible
- Promote Universal Design features
 - Enterprise's Green Communities Universal Design benchmarks
"Universal design features result in a building that is sensitive to a wide range of residents' needs, including those who have a temporary or permanent disabilities. The creation of comfortable environments for a diverse population increases the likelihood of dynamic, diverse communities."
- Funding priority given to projects that:
 - are located near jobs; transportation, including regional and interregional transportation corridors and transitways; recreation; retail services; social and other services; and schools
 - promote economic integration either within the project itself or the community
- Promote informed choice by consumers - provide organizational support for HousingLink which lists affordable housing vacancies

HousingLink.org

Housing link is a website for locating affordable (and market rate) housing:

<http://www.housinglink.org/Home.aspx>. One of the options is to search by accessible features.

Barriers/Issues to Increasing Housing Choices

- Insufficient income for market rate housing
- Insufficient supply of affordable housing
- Access to community-based services
- Availability of community-based services in rural areas
- How to ensure that voluntary choice to live among others with similar challenges is supported
- Underutilization of accessible units – only 45% of accessible tax credit units are occupied by persons with mobility impairment
- Often need to overcome poor rental/credit history and/or criminal background
- Landlords/property managers lack knowledge of fair housing and reasonable accommodation requirements
- Need to expand scope of HousingLink information
- Consider making Green Communities' Universal Design features mandatory for new construction of rental housing
- Review tax credit qualified allocation plan with respect to set-aside option for persons with serious and persistent mental illness
- HUD Section 811 program holds promise, but is still in pilot phase

Data Needs / Issues

- Minnesota Housing does not currently collect information on disability except for purposes of establishing eligibility for Bridges or HOPWA programs – so data on those with disabilities that are housed is incomplete
- Number of persons who are currently not in most integrated setting appropriate
- Number of persons with mobility issues – need for accessible housing who are currently not in most integrated setting appropriate
- Information on likely geographic and locational choices of those currently institutionalized
- Realistic timeline for moving persons into more integrated setting

Discussion

There was no additional discussion.

Presentation by Department of Transportation (MnDOT)

Kristie Billiar and Kelly Christenson presented information about MnDOT's Olmstead planning work. Following are excerpts from their PowerPoint presentation.

MnDOT's Commitment to Olmstead

- MnDOT Mission Statement
 - *Provide the highest quality, dependable multi-modal transportation system through ingenuity, integrity, alliance and accountability.*
- Minnesota GO – 50 Year Vision
 - *Minnesota's multimodal transportation system maximizes the health of people, the environment and our economy.*
- MnDOT's Transit Plan
- MnDOT's Transition Plan

Strategic Goals for Accessibility

Focused on two themes

Mitigation

Strategically correcting barriers and deficiencies in our system that are being identified through our inventories.

Integration

Identifying and implementing process improvements that create consistent inclusion of accessibility and high quality innovative design.

Guiding Principles for Accessibility

- Implementation of MnDOT's Transition Plan
- Continual refinement of policies to streamline the inclusion of accessible features in MnDOT projects
- Increase ownership of scoping and design at the project level
- Expand input from disability groups to assist with prioritization and policy recommendations

MnDOT Transition Plan

- The centerpiece of the mitigation aspect of ADA
- Reflects MnDOT's commitment to providing accessibility
- Is a living document

- To be updated in 2013
- Demonstrates progress in addressing inaccessible features

MnDOT's Infrastructure Commitment

- Monies in Program and District C to Support ADA
- Inventories of pedestrian features in MnDOT's Right of Way
- APS (Accessible Pedestrian Signals), Curb Ramps, Sidewalks
- Assessment of 46 MnDOT worksites with public access
- Assessment of arrival and departure buildings at MN airports

MnDOT's Infrastructure Commitment

- Cities of the First Class Plan
- Operations and Maintenance
- Partnerships with Local Agencies
- Multi-Modal Transportation System

MnDOT's Transit Commitment

- Transit Initiatives and Support
 - MnDOT's Transit Responsibility
 - Funding outside of 7 county Metro area
 - Vehicles are ADA accessible
 - Met Council Partnership – 7 County Metro Area

Greater Minnesota Countywide Transit Service

- Greater Minnesota Transit – 70 of 80 Counties
- Transit Service will begin in Wilkin County
 - Anticipated start date - July 2013

Transit Collaborative Efforts

- Minnesota Council on Transportation Access
- Veteran Transportation and Community
- Living Initiative Grant
- Non Emergency Medical Transportation
- County Human Service Directors Group

MnDOT's Needs and Opportunities

- Ongoing implementation of MnDOT's Vision & Transition Plan.
- Continue partnerships with locals, DHS, Transit, and Met Council
- Identify opportunities for operational cost efficiencies
- Maintaining key connections and relationships
- Determining performance goals and measures to pursue success.
- Continue to be a resource for communities and customers

Discussion

There was no additional discussion.

Presentation by Department of Corrections (DOC)

Steve Allen presented information about DOC's Olmstead planning work. Following are excerpts from his PowerPoint presentation.

DOC Mission

Reduce recidivism by promoting offender change through proven strategies during safe and secure incarceration and effective community supervision.

Overview

- 9,500 adult offenders in 10 prison facilities
 - 8,850 adult men
 - 650 adult women
 - 130 juvenile males
- 122,000 offenders on community supervision
- 2nd lowest rate of incarceration in the US
 - Diversion efforts
 - Characteristics of incarcerated offenders
 - Jails

Persons with Disabilities

- 6-8% Serious and Persistent Mental Illness: 600-800
- 60% Substance Dependence: 5,600
- Medical
 - Hearing loss: 107
 - Visual impairment: 86
 - Mobility impairment: 81
 - Dementia/brain injury: 20+
 - Dialysis: 8
- Some disability groups unlikely to be incarcerated (i.e., developmental disabilities)

Incarceration and "Choice"

- Generally speaking – offenders enter and are released *regardless* of disability status or needs
- The concept of "over-incarceration"
- Minnesota "good time" process
- National data
- Offenders with behavioral health needs more likely to:
 - Spend more time incarcerated
 - Return to incarceration post-release

Sexual Offenders

- Specifically *excluded* as a covered disability
- However:
 - Some persons with covered disabilities also have committed sexual offenses
 - The sexual offense adds a significant barrier to access to needed services
 - Hard to place and support

Services in Place

- Access to services in prison
 - Medical

- Mental health
 - Substance abuse treatment
- Medical and behavioral health release planning
 - Client centered, client driven (choice)
 - Links to community services
 - Funding
 - Coordination of care and services
- Other efforts: Crisis Intervention Training, Motivational Interviewing, Supportive Living Services

DOC “Core” Team Progress

- Weekly internal meetings
- Reaching “in” and “out” for information
- Developing DOC “inventory”
- Beginning narrative
- Scheduled “listening session” sponsored by NAMI
- Reviewing other state plans

Challenges

- Housing (nursing homes to independent)
- Specialty resources, especially “out state”
- Transportation (to and from services)
- “Mis-matches” between supervision placement location and needed services
- Services for sexual offenders
- Staffing levels
- Coordination with multiple agencies
 - Counties
 - State
 - Federal
 - Coordination of care
 - Funding
 - Limited waivers
 - Timelines
- The “felony” problem

Projects in Process & Next Steps

- Agency initiatives
 - Transition from Prison to Community
 - Review of mentally ill offenders in segregation units
 - Innovative treatments (Release Violators, Traumatic Brain Injury, Co-occurring Disorders)
- Next steps
 - Finish “inventory” and agency narratives
 - Hold NAMI “listening session”
 - Submit plans

Discussion

Subcabinet members asked follow-up questions. Discussion included:

- Is there a reason the presentation referred to a “felony problem” instead of using the phrase collateral consequences? Response: No. DOC uses that phrase as well.

- Is transition about job training? Response: In part. DOC offers hands-on training and job-seeking skills for offenders being released. Offenders are taught to be upfront with employers and put their best foot forward. There are employers willing to work with offenders.
- Are there different strategies with TBI than general population? Response: Yes. DOC has a dedicated TBI release plan. Diagnosis is challenging—some offenders may be diagnosed, others not. DOC is working on advanced screening and level of care for this population.

Presentation by Department of Health (MDH)

Janice Jones presented information about MDH's Olmstead planning work. Following are excerpts from her PowerPoint presentation.

Minnesota Department of Health

Our Mission:

To protect, maintain and improve the health of *all* Minnesotans

Public Health:

What we, as a society, do collectively to assure the conditions in which people can be [safe and] healthy.

- Health Improvement
- Health Protection
- Policy, Quality and Compliance
- American Indian Health
- Office of Performance Improvement
- Administrative Services

Key findings

1. In what areas does your program interface with persons with disabilities?
 - Provide shelter in disasters
 - CYSHN - build capacity for independent living
 - SHIP - Promote choice at community level
 - Compliance Monitoring – Review quality of provider and Health Plans
 - Provide Disabilities Determination
2. Do policies, practices or methods of funding, ensure persons with disabilities have choice?
 - More questions than answers, e.g.,
 - How do we know that our information is accessible?
 - We give grants & manage contracts – do we train and hold grantee accountable for ensuring choice?
 - Should Department of Administration/MMB develop agency standards that support Olmstead?
 - Should MN.IT develop policies/templates for web communications and accessibility standards?
3. Do policies, practices or methods of funding, avoid forcing people with disabilities, regardless of age, into institutions or places with institutional characteristics in order to get essential care or services?
 - Regulatory oversight is consumer focused/driven with consumer protections at core
 - Access to health care services

Opportunities

- Review and act on the questions raised
- Gather input from our stakeholders
- Continue internal and inter-agency discussions
- Community level approach

Stakeholder Groups

MDH listed over 50 identified stakeholder groups—there are even more.

Discussion

Subcabinet members asked follow-up questions. Discussion included:

- The state has IT standards—these have been in place for years.
- MDH's Oral Health Care Plan had no mention of people with disabilities—this is an opportunity for improvement.
- Other possible opportunities include a health disparities office around disabilities, a thorough study of the increased incidence of autism, and a more comprehensive review of ICF deficiency reports regarding how people are treated.
- When determining the adequacy of health insurance plans, it's important to consider whether there is an adequate network in reality. A plan may say that they have adequate mental health coverage, but the providers aren't seeing new patients, or the providers have no openings for months.

Presentation by Department of Education (MDE)

Deputy Commissioner Jessie Montano presented information about MDE's Olmstead planning work. Following are excerpts from her PowerPoint presentation.

About MDE

- MDE provides training and support to educators, service providers, parents and other stakeholders.
- Focus is student learning for all, including students with disabilities.
- Goals are to:
 - enter school ready to learn
 - have successful school experience and
 - transition to post-secondary training, work and community living.

General Services

- Technical assistance to teachers, administrators and parents
- Training on compliance, funding, child find, services, prevention, IEP planning, transition, assistive technology, etc.
- Resource development
- Partnerships with:
 - parents
 - higher education
 - interagency providers
- Connection to Office of Civil Right requirements, such a 504 Plans

What is special education under IDEA?

- Specially designed instruction and related services to meet individual needs of students 3 - 21.
- Students are eligible in 1 or more of 13 disability categories.

- Students have been evaluated, determined eligible, and team has developed an Individualized Education Program (IEP) or an Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP for B-2)
- Goals and objectives have been developed to make progress for:
 - employment
 - further education
 - independent living

What is early intervention under Part C of IDEA?

- Services delivered in natural environments, most often the home, to meet the needs of eligible infants and toddlers and their families.
- Services are documented on an Individualized Family Service Plan.
- Focus is to build capacity in parents and other caregivers to support the child's emerging development across routines.

Federal Special Education Funding

SFY 2013 Allocations to Minnesota:

- Part, B Section 611 (Ages 3-21): \$189.5 Million
- Part B, Section 619 (Ages 3-5): \$7.3 Million
- Part C (Birth- 2): \$7.1 Million

State Special Education Funding

- SFY 2013 Funds to School Districts: \$988.1 Million
- SFY 2013 Funds From Other State Agencies: \$12.9 Million (Academies, DEED, etc.)

Policies and Practices That Support Systems and Individualized Planning

- capacity building
- implementation of evidence based practices (prevention, PBIS, etc.)
- data collection and reporting
- grant competitions
- assist with dispute resolution
- monitor for compliance

Policies and Practices That Promote Choice

- transition assessments that indicate strengths, interests and preferences of individuals
- Students are required to be invited to their IEP meetings during grade 9
- student led IEP meetings, promoting self-advocacy
- family preference considered for placement at Academies for Deaf and Blind
- school choice options (charter, etc.)
- Assistive Technology Manual has student interview and input

Discussion

A subcommittee member requested additional information on the proportion of students in special education compared to the overall child count. MDE will bring that information to the next meeting.

Presentation by Department of Human Rights (MDHR)

Commissioner Kevin Lindsey presented information about MDHR's Olmstead planning work. Following are excerpts from his presentation.

MDHR's Primary Duties

- Investigating charges of discrimination
- Creating employment opportunities for women, minorities, and people with disabilities with state contractors
- Additionally, MDHR is charged with working to eliminate discrimination and disparate outcomes.

Overview of MDHR

- A small agency – 35 FTE
- Most charges allege discrimination in the area of employment
- About one-fourth of charges involve allegations of disability discrimination
- MDHR is working to improve the timeliness of case investigations
- MDHR is also working to improve contract compliance processes
- In MDHR's work, MSCOD is not separated from the ethnic councils—all are around the table together
- A challenge – MDHR is similar to a court in that every area of all state agencies could be before the department if there are allegations of discrimination

Next steps & MDHR's role in Olmstead Planning

- Complete internal agency assessment on core functions
- Look at accessibility
- Discuss a possible goal for people with disabilities in state construction projects (discussions are in progress)
- Continue holding state contractors to affirmative action plan requirements for people with disabilities
- Continue listening sessions (such as the joint MDH/MDHR listening session last year)
- Expand use of testers to identify disability discrimination
- Develop a deskbook on the Human Rights Act
- Continue work on the diversity and inclusion council (state employment diversity assessment done in 2011).
- Facilitate training and summits (similar to work being done in Iowa's Olmstead Plan).

Discussion

There was no additional discussion.