Washtenaw County Commission on Aging

November 19th, 2021

8:30 – 10:30am

Remote Via Zoom

Join by Zoom: https://zoom.us/join
Join by Phone: 312-626-6799
Meeting ID: 954 3400 0397
Passcode: 633697

AGENDA

I. Call to Order

Called by Chair Munce at 8:34 AM

II. Roll Call

Present: Steven Stein, Gary Munce, Bennett Stark, Elizabeth Thompson, Marie Gress, Bonny Webber, Marta Larson, Jason Maciejewski

Absent (excused): DeLois Wilson, Margaret Reynolds, Ellen Offen

III. Citizen Participation

No Public Comment.

IV. Commission Response to Citizen Participation

No Response Public Comment.

V. Approval of Minutes

Moved: Gress, seconded Stark, that the minutes of the 11.5 meeting be approved.

Unanimous Roll Call Vote in the Affirmative.

Minutes Approved.

VI. Subcommittee Updates

A. Data Organizations / Domains

Chair Munce provided the report - the subcommittee had a meeting following the Health Aging Collaborative November 12th meeting to debrief discuss takeaways and develop questions to pass back to the Healthy Aging Collaboration, including "What would good case management *look like in Washtenaw County?" "What is the geographic distribution of services across different areas of the county?" "After look at a lot of data, are there certain domains that truly capture a lot of what we are considering and should be a focus moving forward?" He reported that HAC would release a more complete report & presentation by the end of the year. A final topic of conversation was about starting to work on drafting the Commission on Aging's first report to the Board of Commissioners. Staff Support Lindeman offered the Food Policy Council's report and presentation as a good model and indicated he would share their materials as an example with the Commission on Aging members.*

Thompson supports the idea of updating the commissioners early and often on the work being done, to build a context, so that we are well positioned when we are able to make recommendations. Gress agreed and reiterated the importance of reaching out to individual commissioners to help prepare for recommendations. Larson also supported the suggestion of a "progress report" to the Board of Commissioners rather than waiting to make a larger recommendation report.

Stein recommended expanding beyond asking just the Healthy Aging Collaboration their definition of "Case Management" to other providers, just to ensure we get a holistic definition to better understand the breadth of possibilities when we discuss case management and care coordination.

B. Survey

Waiting to review report from Healthy Aging Commission before making further recommendations

C. Website and Communications

Minutes are posted. Meeting recordings coming soon.

D. Potential Millage

Thompson offered an update on their ongoing conversations with other Commission on Aging throughout the state that have a Millage to learn about different models of how decisions are made, the types of programs that are funded. Meetings held with Kent County, Monroe County, and Ingram County. Kalamazoo is scheduled. Stein asked if any group indicated any regret over pursuing a millage, which Munce said that there has not anyone.

Stein then asked if the subcommittee plans to meet with or invite the "Say Yes to Seniors" millage group to report on their previous and future plan. Webber and Larson think that meeting could be helpful, but would prefer a formal presentation from the Subcommittee on a Potential Millage before making this invitation. Webber also was concerned because the COA had been informed that the "Michigan Open Meetings Act" eliminates the 2022 Commission on Aging Zoom meetings and a decision has not yet been made if the COA was having a January 2022 meeting.

Moved: Stein, seconded Munce, that the Commission on Aging invite the "Say Yes to Seniors" millage group is invited to present by the end of January 2022.

Discussion: There is clarification that this would mean that regardless of when the Potential Subcommittee is ready to report its finding, this invitation would be made. Several members express interest in this presentation, but do not agree with prioritizing over the subcommittee report. Others suggest that we should not push back this conversation as the timeline for a potential millage is getting closer and closer. During this conversation, Stark clarified that his previous "abstain" vote on the creation of this subcommittee does not reflect a lack of support for the millage and that he supports the work they have been doing, he just didn't have enough information at the time.

Yes: Steven Stein, Gary Munce

No: Bennett Stark, Elizabeth Thompson, Marie Gress, Bonny Webber, Marta Larson

Motion Failed.

IX. Report from the Chair

Chair Munce offered his report that he has attended two meetings with the Chairs of the Healthy Aging Collaborative to build that relationship. He reported that the full collaborative's next meeting is December 10th and that Thomson and Gress are slated to attend, though all are welcome. He also reported on his participation in recent Board of Commissioners meetings to advocate on behalf of their bylaws and be a presence at those meetings. He was also encouraged to share good conversations that members have been having with their Board of Commissioners. He recommends that folks join the Board of Commissioners meetings if they wish to build that relationship and communicate about their work. Thompson agreed, because in her conversation with Commissioner Hodge, he advised the successful advocacy of the Broadband Task Force as a model to follow.

X. Report from the Board of Commissioners

This item was taken out of order at the end of the meeting. Commissioner Maciejewski offered the following updates:

- He supports the ideas of work groups and subcommittees moving forward in the interim until the commission feels safe and comfortable meeting in person in 2022. He has reached out to County administration about flexibility for the different group to meet remotely and brought it up at the latest of the Board of Commissioners meetings.
- He gives an update on the American Rescue Plan Act allocations, and advises individuals to look for that.
- He also states that he is excited to see a report from the Commission on Aging to the full board in the first part of next year.
- Munce asks about how redistricting could affect the Commission on Aging. Commissioner Maciejewski reports that the map is mostly the same, but that Commission members should check the new district lines to see if they were impacted at all.
- Stein asks if there is opportunity for the Commission on Aging to impact the second ARPA allocation. Commissioner Maciejewski does like the idea of the report to the full board include recommendations for American Rescue Plan Act funding and that the more specific we are the more likely we are to get some traction. Stein suggests a subcommittee or a working group to work on this.
- HAC representative Smith supports this and asks if other than the report, how much education has been done to the Commissioners. Commissioner Maciejewski says it has been limited, and thinks the Commission on Aging can be a great “funnel” of information to the Board of Commissioners as a whole.

VIII. Discussion Item

A. 2022 Calendar & In-Person Meetings

Chair Munce opened the conversation by summarizing that currently, State Legislation would require returning to in-person meetings in January. He reported that Commissioner Maciejewski *is looking into the slight possibility of being able to continue remote meetings, due to the nature of the work of the Commission on Aging. Staff Support Lindeman noted that this is a slight possibility, the county's current way forward is assuming that all boards would have to meet in person. He also added the importance of finding a location that would work and that to do so, the Commission would first need to identify meeting times. Chair Munce then opened up the conversation to the Board:*

- Thompson offered support for any remote options to address mobility and accessibility concerns. She also noted that the State's commission rotates meeting location that we know are accessible, to ensure that every so often commission members would not have to drive far. She ended by commenting that regardless, moving to in-person meetings would require us considering transportation options for members who don't drive.
- Larson asks for clarification about the law requiring in-person meetings, and staff support Lindeman answered with information about the updates to the Open Meetings Act.
- Gress asks about the flexibility of moving locations. Staff support Lindeman answered that as long as properly posted ahead of time, the locations can rotate and be in any number of locations.
- Munce also wants us to consider that in addition to state and county requirements, we should consider requirements for the Commission itself pertaining to meeting location, accessibility, and other related factors.
- Webber advises that there is an Open Meeting Act handbook that can be found that details a lot of these rules, and advises that we assume that we will have to meet in-person and plan accordingly. She reported on a conversation with Pittsfield Township administration about a potential meeting location options and the caveats that would be needed to make it happen. She suggests others to reach out to their contacts to look into other potential options.
- Larson underscores the importance of accessibility, and offer the Learning Resource Center as an example of a good building for meetings that doesn't have adequate

parking options for individuals with mobility concerns. She suggests a potential pause in official meetings, and for subcommittees continue, until a time where it is easier and safer to meet in person. She also brings it back to personal safety and wanting to make sure we keep the safety and health of commission members and potential public attendees in mind when talking about spaces and whether they have adequate room for social distancing. She also likes the idea of rotating of meeting locations, but notes the logistical hurdles of doing so.

- Thompson brings up the consideration when we talk about subcommittees continuing to work, specifically making sure we do not have quorum at those meetings. She also thinks rotating meetings could be a good idea, but only advises that we would plan it out well in advance to address the logistical concerns. She suggests creating a small group to work on meeting logistics.
- Stark agrees with Larson that the likelihood of a truly safe in person meeting is extremely low until Spring at the earliest, particularly when Michigan has the highest level of COVID-19 transmission in the country.
- Larson also notes that the timing of in person meetings is important, because 8:30 am would be too early to meet in the winter.
- Webber also agrees that it is not safe for in-person meetings during the next couple of months. She supports the rotating meetings, but really underscores how much work it will be to checkout, schedule and set-up equipment for rotating meeting locations. She asks who is going to do this work. She asks about when we are required to make the meeting calendar official. Staff support Lindeman answers that as long as they are properly noticed, there is no specific requirement for posting an entire calendar ahead of time, though that is considered best practice when possible. He offers the possibility of setting the first meeting a few months into 2022 and then creating a full calendar at that point when the commission has more information. Webber reiterates that subcommittees could remotely do work in the first quarter, as long as they do not meet quorum, and then hypothetical reconvene in person in April.

- Stein reminds the group that the ease of participation of community members should be weighed alongside how hard it is to organize the rotating meetings. Webber acknowledges this and again suggests a smaller group gets together address logistics.
- Thompson agrees with both the pause in full meetings until April, and the creation of a small group to work on meeting logistics for 2022.
- Webber asks about the rules of doing work via email. Staff support Lindeman, says there is some concern about doing work over email, but that the Commission would just need to be careful and focus on smaller conversations and group discussions rather than emails to the full commission.
- Staff support Lindeman offers an update on getting a contracted staff person to help support the Commission as an option for helping do the legwork of some of the logistics of meeting planning. Munce and Webber ask if that would be the case if it was a subcommittee doing this work since they were told that person can't assist with any subcommittee. Lindeman clarifies that because that work would be administrative support for the commission, it could qualify. Webber asks Lindeman to clarify whether that person could provide boots on the ground to go to locations.
- Webber reiterates that because the Commission is representative of the community most likely to be impacted by its work if the members of the commission have concerns about the safety of meeting locations, so will the public.
- Munce asks about the whether or not we would be operating without officers if we don't meet in January. Lindeman responses that there is flexibility about the terms of officers to better sync with Commissioner terms. By-laws state officiers are elected for one-year period, not necessarily by calendar year. Officiers could serve until June 2022 and then an election held for the remaining six-months 2022. Larson agrees with this interpretation and is okay Officiers serving until June. Larson addresses the concern of operating without Officers. Thompson agrees and feels comfortable with this suggestion as it would allow the Officer terms to sync up with Commissioner terms moving forward. Munce asked what steps had to be done to continue with current Officers until June. Lindeman clarifies that if no motions are made, current status continues. If a member

wishes to call for a new vote of Officers, then a motion can be made. No motion was made.

- Munce also requests we take a breath and step back before making a definitive decision on this topic due to all of the unknowns. And underscores that just because we may not meet in the first quarter, does not mean the Commission is slowing down or not doing work.

XII. New Business

1. Stein brings up the concern of representation on the Board, particularly the lack of people of color represented on the Board, and asks that we get an update on helping DeLois Wilson attend meetings and/or bring a resolution to suggest the Board of Commissioner expand the Board to include additional at large members who could help address the issue of representation.
2. Stein also asks that we add a discussion item on the next meeting agenda to see what the Commission could do to impact county COVID-19 policy for public locations, like the county rec center as they are frequented by older adults.
3. Gress offered to take the lead on drafting reports to the Board of Commissioners. Munce welcomed Gress to work with the officers on those items. Stein also asked to work with this group.

XIII. Setting Next Meeting

A. December 3rd, 2021 8:30 –10:30am

XIII. Adjournment

Moved: Gress, seconded Thompson, to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned.