

## Work Session Notes

Wednesday, September 21, 2022

3:15 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.

Members Present: Cass Freedland, (Chair), Franklin Johnson (Vice Chair), Chuck Green, Amy Gross, Mel Sanchez, Larry Smith, and Tanya Stewart

Absent: Sue Cameron, Meghan McCarthy

Staff: Susan Ellinger and Jenna Kay, Community Planning

### 1. Hybrid meeting reminders

Chair Cass Freedland opened the meeting and reviewed logistical reminders for hybrid meetings.

### 2. Aging Readiness Plan Update

- Aging Readiness Plan update project manager Rose Newberry with Dudek introduced herself to the commission and provided a project update to the group.
- Rose discussed what is happening with the project. The first main task for the consultant team is to work on understanding what has happened in the past 10 years as a result of the 2012 plan. That includes looking at strategies and understanding if they were successful or not, and, if not, why not.
- A big part of the plan involves working with community partners and stakeholders because there are strategies in the plan implemented by a wide variety of entities. The consultant team will be working with county staff and connecting with the cities, town, and community organizations to understand what has happened in the past 10-years. This work will take the project team through the end of the year. Once they can understand what has happened, they can then chart forward.
- The project team has also been working on developing a stakeholder list, which will be discussed more in a moment. Focus groups will help provide a broad vision that in 2023 the project team can start writing the new plan because they understand what has happened in the past and have a vision for the future from community stakeholders.
- For a strategy review, the first thing the project team has been doing is reviewing a very big Excel table that has every single Aging Readiness Plan strategy in it. The project team has looked over it to get a broad feel for what has been happening and they have found that there are a lot of different players in this plan. It works across agencies and cities. The project team would like to focus their outreach efforts to reflect this and make it a really meaningful plan that functions countywide.
- The project team has also realized that they are going to have to talk to a lot of people, which you will see reflected in the stakeholder list that was shared yesterday afternoon. A big goal of the plan is making sure that everyone is involved and that the update is ready to implement moving forward.
- Rose then spoke more about the stakeholder list. Yesterday the commission should have seen a draft list of focus groups. It is broken down into groups that roughly associate with each chapter in the plan.



For other formats, contact the Clark County ADA Office

Voice 360.397.2322 Relay 711 or 800.833.6388

Fax 360.397.6165

Email ADA@clark.wa.gov



- The purpose of the focus groups is to take a broad look and really understand what the plan should be doing moving forward and creating the future vision. We will also be working with staff to follow up with many of these people on the list to have more in depth conversations about the 2012 plan and what has happened, but the purpose of the focus groups is to get a broad vision and understanding of what this plan needs to move forward.
- Rose noted that the world is very different than it was 10-years ago and understanding both successes that happened from the 2012 plan and things we can build off of will be important, but also responding to a different world. These focus groups will really help us hone in on what the vision and needs are for the next iteration of the plan.
- At the end of the list you will also see some interviews and these will be more 1 on 1 in depth conversations.
- In 2023 we plan to have a few public meetings for the general public that maybe are not directly involved in implementing the plan but who benefit from it and have opinions on what it needs to do and who may want to respond to strategy ideas. The general public can look at new draft strategies and provide feedback on how they think the plan is going to implement the vision moving forward. There will be time in the project after the focus groups to really refine the vision. These meetings will take place before there is a draft plan, so any interested member of the public will be able to help infuse flavor into the plan.
- Rose summarized that there are three big buckets: the focus groups for the vision, the interviews for in depth conversations, and then general public meetings.

#### Q&A with commission members:

- Chuck Green asked how the consultant team plans to get down to scope with the public engagement plan? Rose explained that they built flexibility into the scope of work. Initially, they thought they were going to do a lot more 1 on 1 interviews and as they have worked with staff, they are finding a greater need for focus groups. Staff will help with outreach to connect with stakeholders on what has happened over the past 10 years for benchmarking individual strategies.
- Larry Smith inquired about the list of stakeholders and noted that he assumed as we go through the process, we will add to the list. He asked if there is a cut off on how many stakeholders will be involved? Rose explained that there is no set cut off. She noted that at some point there is a number that will be too big for a focus group. The project team has been working with staff to make sure they have right sized the groups, which is roughly what is in this draft list. It reflects people and organizations important in the visioning, especially those that are familiar with the last plan and implementation of it. If they identify more stakeholders, they will either talk to them 1 on 1 and/or they can be involved in the broader public meetings. The stakeholder list will be a living list. While the project team does not have a hard number on the focus group number of attendees, they are trying to balance who is the most useful to include while not needlessly overcrowding those groups.
- Cass Freedland noted that some of the groups that the commission has heard from through their fireside chats and larger survey have noted that they are hesitant to engage with individuals or companies or groups that they don't necessarily know. The commission has built bridges, such as with public health, to help us connect. Is that something within your strategy too? If the consultant team is not reaching stakeholders and the commission wants broad representation, can we perhaps work with you to help better understand those connections? Rose explained that this is something her team encounters in their work and that with every plan, they need to find those bridges as community leaders who will help the project team reach out to groups who may not otherwise want to engage with them. It is something on the consultant team radar, and Susan and Jenna will also be helping with that.
- Franklin Johnson asked if Rose had any projection about how long the consultants will spend with each of these groups and if there is a plan to overlap with more than one group at any point? Rose explained that they will meet with one group at a time. Generally, they find 1-2 hours is a good amount of time. They will have agendas and an activity that helps focus the

conversation. If additional feedback is needed, the project team can follow-up outside focus group conversations to get that information.

- Chuck Green noted he was excited to get started and looks forward to more engagement and more updates.

Rose requested the commission take on the following homework assignments:

- **Action Item:** Provide feedback on the stakeholder list. For instance, let the project team know if any groups are missing from the list, or if you have suggestions on whether a particular group doesn't need to be in a focus group and could be part of the more general public meetings.
- **Action Item:** Commission members are invited to be a part of the focus groups. Please let the project team know which focus group you would like to join.

### 3. Review of August 17, 2022 work session and regular meeting notes

There were no comments.

### 4. Silver Citizen Award recommendation

- Mel Sanchez, Larry Smith, and Cass Freedland served on subcommittee.
- Larry Smith provided an update to the group and noted he was honored to serve on the committee. There were four criteria for the nominations which helped guide evaluation, which Larry reviewed with the group. The subcommittee recommended Katlin Smith of Vancouver receive the award this year. Larry noted several highlights from Katlin's nomination on her contributions to the community, particularly with FISH of Vancouver.
- Mel Sanchez noted that any of the nominees would have been a great recipient of the award. The subcommittee did reach agreement fairly quickly, and it is important to emphasize there are lots of very good people doing a lot of good stuff.
- Cass Freedland commented that it was a good conversation and that the breadth of work by aging adults in this community is incredible.
- Larry Smith commented that all the nominees are winners and super folks. The subcommittee picked someone whose application stood out. Hopefully the others will be nominated again.
- Chuck Green wanted to echo that the nominations were an impressive list. He noted that one of the nominees is a former Commission on Aging member. He also noted he would like to say a few words about Katlin during the regular meeting. He thanked the subcommittee for sorting through the nominations and he noted that he fully supports Katlin as the recommended recipient.

### 5. Public comment debrief

Staff provided a summary of the comments received regarding the Cascade Park Village community and a City of Vancouver transportation project.

- Chuck Green noted that the commission normally doesn't take active positions on projects. He recognized that it is pretty tough any time there are access management needs in the built environment in a busy area. It is a balancing act. Chuck asked if there is an expectation for the commission to respond or if the comment was just provided for information?
- Staff clarified that the information was shared for information and there was not a specific ask of the commission. It seems like the group reached out to many entities.
- Cass Freedland noted that many other entities have been involved since the comments were received, such as the media. While responding to this item may not necessarily be part of the Commission on Aging's charge, she noted that the comments mention aging and income discrimination and she wanted to keep that in the front of everyone's minds.

### 6. Other Updates

- Amy Gross provided a COVID-19 update including current trends with hospitalization rates and about the availability of the new bivalent COVID-19 booster shot. You can visit [vaccinefinder.org](https://vaccinefinder.org) if you are looking for a location to receive a booster shot.
- Chuck Green noted that ACTI meets the first Friday in October and he will be working to keep them updated on the Aging Readiness Plan update project. Several members of that group are on the project stakeholder list.
- Cass Freedland noted she was unable to attend the last ADRN meeting but will listen to the recording and provide a report at the October meeting.
- Cass Freedland also shared that she and Franklin wrote a thank you letter to the County Council for voting to approve the contract with Dudek and for approving the Aging Readiness Plan Update project public participation plan. She read the response received from their thank you letter from Chair Bowerman.

## **7. Adjournment**

The work session adjourned at 4:03 pm.

*The Clark County Commission on Aging provides leadership in community engagement and advocacy of Clark County's Aging Readiness Plan, especially for those 65 and over who plan to age in the place of their choosing.*