

Meeting Summary

STRATEGIC ACTION PLANNING GROUP ON AGING

Monday, October 24, 2016

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

1290 Broadway

First Floor, Independence Pass Conference Room

Members present: Jim Riesberg, Ky Agnew, Rob Andresen-Tenace, Donna Baros, Wade Buchanan, Steve Child, Dale Elliott, Doug Farmer, Susan Franklin, Christian Itin, Mindy Kemp, Linda Mitchell, Ben Moultrie, Jean Nofles, Dave Norman, Tony Tapia, and Sharron Williams

By phone: Claire Anderson, Greg Coopman, and Sallie Thoreson

- I) Jim called the meeting to order and took roll of members. There were a quorum of members present.
- II) The agenda for October 24th was approved without changes.
- III) The meeting minutes from October 10th were approved without changes.

IV) **Public Comment:**

A) Ed Shackelford: Have read the memo on the Action Plan and have some thoughts. The legislation says to prepare a comprehensive strategic action plan in Colorado through 2030, from the memos I don't see this addressed. I hear legislators talk all the time but I've never heard them talk about the impact of seniors on the budget and think that is imperative. On November 13 you issued committee principles and think you should read those to see if you think committees did what you said they should do. It's time for hard decisions and I think you are avoiding that. We need to find the most cost effective way to keep people in their houses. Some states are taking real action on drug costs and I don't see anything on drug costs. The Homestead Act is a huge issue and there are no comments on that in here. We need to identify data better, for example the staff of JBC commented they can't put more money into Older Coloradans fund until they saw the need. Another big thing overlooked is safety of in-home workers and need to look at how they can more safely do their jobs. Quality care around living homes is a big issue, we need to deal with the quality of them. There are no comments on technology. I'm disappointed and think we can do better. Want to see us come back to reporting to the Legislature and a plan to get us to 2030.

V) **November Action Plan**

A) The Executive Committee talked about where the Planning Group is with the recommendations and what we can achieve by the time the first draft is due. Some of our committee work is at different stages - some have solid recommendations for action, while others have a clear identification of a problem with suggested context of how to address but are not ready as a firm recommendation. We put together the new draft recommendations recognizing the Planning

Group is here for a period of years and can develop the plan over that period of time. The consensus thought of the Executive Committee is that we need to move forward with what we have and can't pretend to have stuff we do not.

What the Executive Committee has laid out in the memo to SAPGA dated October 20, is a format for the first draft of the plan with three parts: 1) make the case for why the Planning Group is doing what we are and what we have learned in the first year and half; 2) outline where we are in the process and what the plan is starting to look like; and 3) provide a limited number of recommendations that we are ready to make at this point. The criteria for moving forward with the recommendations suggested is that they are specific, actionable this year, and they set up the Planning Group to make more progress down the road.

1) Comments:

- (a) The Action Plan is missing a vision 2030 and would like to see this laid out more in the report. The information this group has produced can also go into an appendices.
- (b) It seems like we're losing a lot of the information we worked hard to gather for the recommendations – were will that come into play in the Action Plan?
- (c) Section 3 references recommendations for action this year – if I recall correctly, the thinking around the baseline plan was two year intervals. With that, are we looking for recommendations that will span the gap between updates or to take action in 2017 and then wait for the next update to the Plan?
- (d) What are the expectations from the Governor and Legislature on how comprehensive of a report they are expecting? Is all the money allocated gone or is there more to work with in year two?
- (e) When I read through this, it seems all the recommendations are very high level and can be made under constraints of our current budget structure. Is that because we didn't think things were ready without fitting into the current budget structure?
- (f) Would like to see the report address what SAPGA was charged with in the legislation and how the recommendations offered attempt to respond the group's charge. This could be included in Section 2 of the Action Plan.
- (g) The recommendations are all really at the state level, the Plan is missing recommendations for counties and municipalities.

B) Approval of Recommendations:

- 1) **Recommendation 1:** *The Governor should create a permanent, high-level office or position within the executive branch to oversee the state government's work on aging issues...*
 - (a) Rec 1 is requesting a lot of money to create this new position and perhaps this money could be better used as grants to implement some of the other recommendations to address aging needs.
 - (b) This recommendation came out of a number of the committees.
 - (c) Should include a new sub-bullet that this new position should oversee the recommendations from other groups such as CLAG, Respite Care Task Force, CDPHE Healthy Aging Plan, etc.
 - (d) Should include "accountability" into the recommendation wording to replace "oversee"

- (e) ACTION: There was no objection to including Recommendation 1 into the Action Plan
- 2) **Recommendation 2:** *The Governor's Office of State Planning and Budgeting and the Colorado Legislative Council staffs should work together to compile a comprehensive state budget on aging to identify all state expenditures related to aging issues (including revenue expenditures such as tax credits) as a tool to help policymakers plan and prioritize at the state level...*
- (a) Can the pending SAPGA report on finances be used to support this recommendation?
- (b) The recommendation should also include the Joint Budget Committee.
- (c) Suggestion to include new language that includes "structural imbalance". Jean will send language to include in the recommendation.
- (d) ACTION: There was no objection to including Recommendation 2 in the Action Plan.
- 3) **Recommendation 3:** *The General Assembly should take the following specific steps to increase retirement savings by Coloradans of all ages...*
- (a) The language doesn't include things like the Fire & Police pension plans.
- (b) 3a should be changed to "Encourage" instead of "Establish"
- (c) ACTION: There was no objection to including Recommendation 3 in the Action Plan.
- 4) **Recommendation 4:** *The General Assembly and the Governor should work together to identify or create a statewide commission or entity with the authority and capacity to develop and support aggressive financial literacy programs relevant to Coloradans of all ages, locations and circumstances.*
- (a) Recommendation 4 should be a sub-bullet of Recommendation 3
- (b) ACTION: There was no objection to moving recommendation 4 to a sub-bullet of Recommendation 3.
- 5) **Recommendation 5:** *As key first steps in helping communities reinvent themselves so that Colorado seniors have more opportunities to age in place and remain active, the General Assembly should take the following steps to build on promising existing efforts...*
- (a) Is there any risk in naming one specific program under part a? Language could be changed to include the possibility of other programs: "support and fund such programs as..."
- (b) ACTION: There was no objection to including Recommendation 5 in the Action Plan
- (c) This section could include more low-hanging fruit for both the state and counties (the addition of more recommendations will be discussed later in the meeting pending time).
- 6) **Recommendation 6:** *As a first step to ensure Colorado's future workforce is adequate to meet the needs of an aging population, the General Assembly should authorize and direct an appropriate state agency to conduct a study of workforce needs specific to nursing homes, assisted living communities, home health agencies and other paid caregivers (nonprofit and individual), including estimates of future use of those particular care settings, given demographic trends.*
- (a) Issue with proposing more studies for the State to conduct.
- (b) Much of the workforce committee work showed there needed to be more research done to understand workforce needs in Colorado.
- (c) Question is who is the appropriate group to gather this additional data? What is the most efficient way to get this data that is missing? Should SAPGA gather it or another state agency?

- (d) The recommendation should be expanded to include more than caregivers. The workforce committee will send more needs to include into the recommendation.
 - (e) Change wording from “conduct a study” to “identify a study”
 - (f) ACTION: There was no objection to including Recommendation 6 in the Action Plan.
 - 7) **Recommendation 7:** *To provide support to the growing number of Colorado workers who are also caregivers for aging loved ones, the General Assembly and Governor should take two concrete steps...*
 - (a) There was no objection to including Recommendation 7 in the Action Plan.
 - 8) **Recommendation 8:** *The General Assembly should work with the appropriate regulatory agencies to ensure state laws and regulations are adequate to protect consumers, including seniors, from predatory financial practices...*
 - (a) Include additional language on fiduciary reports
 - (b) ACTION: There was no objection to including Recommendation 8 in the Action Plan.
 - 9) **Recommendation 9:** *The Governor and General Assembly should implement the recommendations made by the Respite Care Task Force in their January 2016 report for...*
 - (a) The recommendation should be stricken and moved to Recommendation 1 as a sub-bullet.
 - (b) The JBC allocated money to implement the recs made by the Respite Care Task Force. HB1398 implemented partial funding for the recommendations from the Respite Care Task Force.
 - (c) One piece missing is fully funding the recommendations from the Respite Care Task Force.
 - (d) Recommendation 9 should strike the sub-bullets and be moved to Recommendation 7, sub-bullet c, and include to fully fund the recommendation of the Respite Care Task Force.
 - (e) ACTION: There was no objection to moving Recommendation 9 to a sub-bullet of Recommendation 7.
 - 10) **Recommendation 10:** *To ensure older adults are free from abuse, neglect and exploitation the following steps should be taken...*
 - (a) Remove sub-bullet b and include it into sub-bullet d of Recommendation 1. Remove reference to SB109 Task Force from the recommendation.
 - (b) ACTION: There was no objection to moving Recommendation 10 to a sub-bullet of Recommendation 1.
- C) Additional recommendations and changes to the Action Plan should be sent to Mike Sacconne of Keystone and Jim Riesberg by Close of Business Thursday, October 27th. The changes will be sent to the full SAPGA on Friday, October 28th; comments from the Planning Group on the new language should be sent back to Keystone by Close of Business on Tuesday, November 1st.
- D) Revised timeline:**
- 1) May not want to have the action plan designed by DRCOG since this takes nine days out of the timeline that could be better spent working on the draft instead of “dressing” it up. There is time after the report is complete and turned into the Legislature that it could then be put into a fancier format for public consumption.

2) ACTION: The group agreed to forgo the design of the report by DRCOG to afford more time to the drafting process for the Action Plan.

VI) The next meeting of the Planning Group Monday, November 7th.

VII) The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.