

Meeting Summary

Strategic Action Planning Group on Aging Monday, November 21, 2016 1290 Broadway, First Floor, Independence Room

Members present: Jim Riesberg, Ky Agnew, Claire Anderson, Donna Baros, Wade Buchanan, Dale Elliott, Doug Farmer, Susan Franklin, Mindy Kemp, Linda Mitchell, Ben Moultrie, Jean Nofles, Dave Norman, Tony Tapia, Sharron Williams

By Phone: John Barry, Steve Child, Greg Coopman, Christian Itin, Sallie Thoresen

- I) Jim called the meeting to order and took roll. There were a quorum of members present.
- II) The meeting agenda for November 21st was approved without changes.
- III) The meeting minutes from November 7th were approved without changes.
- IV) Public Comment:
 - A) Ed Shackelford: Troubled by recommendation one. It doesn't seem to fit within any kind of logical organizational chart. This is not the way to solve it. What I see is a system problem. The biggest problem is entry into the system and that is done through different departments and this is something that needs a lot of work. Need to draw out an organizational chart and see if this makes any sense. If anything, this would just be an advisor to the governor. Cannot see how this could function in the real world.
 - B) Karen Brown: I will be passing out a couple of documents to the Planning Group. One document is from the Colorado Gerontological society. I asked for feedback on the process. This looks at where we're headed and wanted the group to look at this before we had discussion. They were focused on workforce, housing, retirement planning. This is not for integration in discussion today, but for the December meeting when the SAPGA looks at where we're headed in 2017.
- V) Action Plan Press briefing update:
 - A) SAPGA will announce its action plan on Tuesday, November 29 at 10:30 a.m. in room 0112 in the Capitol basement. Three members of the Executive Committee will be speaking during the briefing. It will be a press briefing for members of the media. The program will be kept tight to give reporters what they need and anyone is welcome to attend.
- VI) Draft Action Plan Discussion:
 - A) The conversation during the meeting should be focused on high level comments with specificity on how to get the report in the right place. Members should let Keystone know what they can't live with, what is missing and what might not be quite right. We are not looking for new recommendations at this point in time.
 - B) The photo on the cover should be switched with the photo on page 9 of the plan.

- C) The document looks at data for 65 years and older while the bill asks for the report to look at folks who are 50 years and older. This is because there is not a lot of data in the age group from 50 to 65 years old. Data isn't traditionally collected on older adults until age 65 and older.
 - 1) Table of Contents does not call out specific section numbers – sections I, II and III.
- D) Executive Summary:
 - 1) The last sentence on page 4 seems to come out of nowhere and should be deleted.
 - (a) The sentence shows that if we value this age group, it is better for everyone.
 - (b) Consensus to keep the sentence with some minor editing.
 - 2) Avoid repetitive wording in the beginning of two paragraphs – “This initial strategic action plan”
 - 3) Graph on page 3 should have last bullet as years 2017-23
- E) Members section changes:
 - 1) Donna Baros of Thornton
 - 2) Sallie Thoresen of Grand Junction
 - 3) Susan Franklin former project manager
 - 4) Ky Agnew former intake director
- F) Aging in Colorado section:
 - 1) Top of page 9 mentions ethnicity and income levels; this is the only section of the report that mentions these things. The report should include more around equity issues and include more in this section on how to address these. Tony will work with Keystone on how to better include these points in this section.
 - 2) Should reference the work ahead of SAPGA in this section and the work the Planning Group would like to further address.
 - 3) The key provisions talk about examining positive impact of aging but there is nothing in the report that looks at positive impacts of older adults in any way.
 - 4) Percentages around Medicaid need to be clearer if it is state expenditures or personal expenditures.
- G) Vision for Colorado section:
 - 1) The wording of the goals are not consistent between where they are first stated on page 12 and then restated beginning on page 14.
 - (a) Preference decided to keep the goals in future tense.
 - 2) There has been a lot of discussion about the future and it is very important we identify those things in the report and glad to see they have been included into page 13, but also think this information should be included in the executive summary for those who do not read this far into the report.
 - 3) The report does not mention anything about the LGBT community for seniors and it might be important to capture in the section about items the Planning Group would like to address in the future.
 - 4) Goal 8 does not have an outcome listed because it would be the exact same as the goal and did not want to be repetitive. The bullets could be split apart and broken into ones that are community specific and ones that are public sector specific.
 - 5) Would like to take out the bolded words throughout the goals.
- H) The Path Forward section:

- 1) The sentence on SAPGA not addressing some specifics within the legislation needs to be explained a little better.
 - (a) Add something about “if there are additional resources our intention is to” address the following topics.
 - (b) The section should identify what has not been addressed.
 - (c) May want to include “initial” recommendations
 - (d) Move this part down in the report to after the recommendations
- 2) Recommendation 1:
 - (a) Need to provide more consistency throughout as an “office or position.” Avoid calling it an agency.
 - (b) Important to emphasize throughout the recommendation that this is part of the executive branch.
 - (c) Many items have to do with coordination and have some concern with the section that talks about overseeing work of state agencies.
 - (d) This seems to be a leadership role and not just coordinating and managing.
 - (e) Majority consensus to change recommendation to “higher level office or agency within executive branch to be accountable for and lead...”
 - (f) Bullet d should be more direct about finding cost savings.
- 3) Recommendation 2:
 - (a) Paragraph at top of page 21 should include that the state needs to fund programs where it is not currently involved.
 - (b) Provide a better transitional statement for the fourth and fifth paragraphs. Should highlight the impact on individuals in these programs.
- 4) Recommendation 3:
 - (a) Should include a footnote in bullet A on what is an “essential ingredient.”
 - (b) Bullet A should change “availability” to “vesting.”
 - (c) The first paragraph should talk about emboldening all Coloradans to save for retirement and not just seniors; same change for the last paragraph of this section.
 - (d) Bullet C should change “solvent” to “sustainable.”
- 5) Recommendation 4:
 - (a) Bullet A should just be “support efforts” not “support and fund.”
 - (b) The Planning Group did not agree on all the programs included in bullet C are things to use as tools.
- 6) Recommendation 5:
 - (a) The third paragraph of the recommendation seems a little vague and may need more specificity. Unclear who “Colorado” is to ensure access to training and support services. Could it be referenced to Colorado Workforce Development Council?
- 7) Recommendation 6:
 - (a) Should clarify the CHI estimates included in this recommendation are for Colorado.
- 8) Recommendation 7:
 - (a) The financial fraud reference in recommendation 8 should be included here and not in recommendation 8.
- 9) Recommendation 8 - No comments
- 10) Recommendation 9:

- (a) The recommendation should be changed from “individual” to “local” plans.
 - (b) The second paragraph of the recommendation should strike “Local governments should invest” but say something about “Plans should include...”
 - (c) The fall prevention programs at the end of the narrative should not include the specific programs since there are many more available.
- I) Conclusion:
- 1) May want to include a sentence about creating a PR program to talk about critical issues around aging.

VII) Public Comment:

- A) Steve Grund, State Commission on Aging: Big thing to point out is private sector. The first time it is mentioned is in the Path Forward section. Would recommend it is important to remove yourself from the plan itself and go to the audience you are talking to and the private sector should be included in the executive summary. There’s got to be a feel that this goes beyond government. Path Forward section should be changed to “moving forward” including the business case of technology and what will be available moving forward.
 - 1) Agree that we should indicate how we intend to work with private sector and industry throughout the plan.
 - 2) This should be put in the parking lot since we did not address the business sector or technology. Could be included in the body of the document as something we want to address in future iterations of the plan.
 - 3) Lorez will work with Steve to include language into the executive summary.
- B) Active Generations: Filming today because the SAPGA action plan will be their lead story for December and would like to interview some members for the show after the meeting.
- C) Rich Mauro, DRCOG: Wondering if it might be more clearly referenced in the Path Forward and for upcoming discussions emphasizing the continuing need to reach out beyond the Front Range to the point of explicitly laying out a plan for getting out into the other areas of the state to get direct input? Hoping the group can work harder next year to find ways to engage and involve from around the state in helping do work and develop the next report and update as a way to get this as a state effort beyond this first year.

VIII) December 12th meeting of the Planning Group:

- A) Officer elections will take place during this meeting including chair and vice chair. Members interested in these positions should submit their interest in advance of the meeting. The election will be by ballot unless the position is unopposed.
- B) The meeting will look at and discuss:
 - 1) Finances of the Planning Group
 - 2) Meeting frequency and location in 2017
 - 3) Operation of the Planning Group and need for committees moving forward
 - 4) Vacancies on the Planning Group – there are currently three vacancies and seven members whose appointment will run out in August of 2017

IX) The next meeting of the Planning Group is Monday, December 12th

X) The meeting adjourned at 11:53 a.m.