

Aging in Place in the Community Committee  
March 8,2016, 9:30-11:30 am  
Minutes

Present: Chuck Kauffman, Miriam Kelty, Isabelle Schoenfeld, Noelle Heyman, Marsha Weber, Harriet Shapiro Block, Megan Patterson, David Merrick Pazit Aviv

Chuck Kauffman and Miriam Kelty welcomed the group. The Committee, guests and liaisons introduced themselves to Megan Patterson, a social work intern from Slippery Rock College, Pa.

AIPC Goals for 2016

The CoA Chair, in January, spoke with all CoA Committee Chairs about what she expected of committees. She asked that each committee establish goals for the current year, decide how to act on or implement those goals and monitor progress toward meeting those goals. AIPC's February agenda focused on that request. The February meeting was canceled due to weather and the agenda was carried over to the March meeting. Four goals were proposed to AIPC by the chair. They reflect recommendations stemming from committee work during the past two years:

- a. Design for Living: tax incentive for home modification program
  - i. Increase use of tax incentive program by 300%
- b. Pedestrian Safety: coordinate state and county pedestrian crosswalk markings so that they are consistent
  - i. Ask Villages to identify inconsistencies in their own neighborhoods
- ~~c. Villages: Meeting space for Villages
  - i. ~~Make library and recreation/senior center meeting rooms available at no cost~~~~
- d. Transportation:
  - i. Expand Village Rides Program and other transportation initiatives
  - ii. Pilot ride sharing program

Lively discussion of the proposed goals' meaning, specificity, and action orientation followed. Some present felt that the CoA and its committees are advisory. As advisory groups, their appropriate role is to advocate for action by other agencies and organizations. It was noted that measures related to the goals (e.g. increasing use of tax incentive program by 300%...) are more appropriate as agency goals. The group discussed pros, cons and issues related to measurable outcomes of the goals. There was consensus that (c) -- making library and recreation/senior center meetings rooms available to villages and other non-profits at no cost -- is more appropriate for individual villages, Civic Associations and WAVE advocating on behalf of Montgomery County Villages, and not for AIPC. There was agreement on the other three goals in terms of AIPC focus and actions, but not on measures for

each of these goals. Therefore they will not be forwarded to the CoA Executive Committee at this time. AIPC attendees agreed to identify doable AIPC measures for the three goals and discuss these at the next AIPC meeting.

Action: David Merrick, perhaps in consultation with staff of the Commission of Disabilities, will get information from contractors about their experience with the tax incentive program. He will contact contractors who received permits. He will ask them whether or not their customers received tax credits.

Action: AIPC will write a letter that identifies the committee's concerns about issues in the law, poor publicity/marketing and under-budgeting for the tax credit program.

Miriam informed the group about DC's plan to contract Metro Access to Uber/Lyft and/or other similar companies. Harriet Shapiro Block provided information about the negotiations and potential complications of this plan. These include safety and security issues as well as accessibility issues. She said it was to be discussed at the Transportation Provider meeting at JCA on March 9.

Discussion moved to goal 4 above and expansion of Village Rides and ride sharing programs. Grant funding has been secured through December 2016. Another COG grant has competed successfully but it is not known when the funds will be awarded. This grants will allow expansion of Village Rides to Prince Georges County. The funding level will not support expansion to DC and Virginia. However, Capitol Hill Village in DC has gotten a grant to initiate the program in DC. Thus far, Village Rides has expanded from serving 5 villages to serving 10. It also serves another non-profit organization, Gaithersburg Help.

Action: Invite Christian \_\_\_\_, WMATA Director of ADA services to meet with AIPC

The group went on the discuss ways to get things, e.g. consistent crosswalks, done in Montgomery County. It was suggested that pressure from Civic Associations on the County Council, via the regional federations of civic associations, is an effective way to stimulate government action. This is because Civic Associations are used by Montgomery County to seek residents' votes on issues within their boundaries, e.g. installation of new sidewalks.

Action: AIPC recommends to the CoA that directors or staff of county regional service centers meet with the CoA to identify the needs of the senior community in each region with respect to transportation, housing, communication and health and wellness.

#### Age Friendly Community

Chuck spearheaded the discussion of the Age Friendly program by referring to his recommendations to the Senior Subcabinet to fast-track implementation of the program. He reiterated that in 2015 the CoA recommended to the County that an

executive director of the program be hired. Further, he recommends that this staffer co-chair the Senior Subcabinet, and identify agencies and departments critical to implementing a coordinated program, provide guidance, and monitor progress. He recommends that the Executive Director be physically located in Parks and Planning and be an integral part of sector and Master Planning activities.

Isabelle is a member of the Strategic Plan Working Group (SPW). The SPW is charged with developing a strategic plan to achieve Age Friendly goals for Montgomery County. The group is working on a Path Forward to developing a Strategic Plan that includes aligning WHO Age Friendly Communities domains, Age Friendly domains identified in the Montgomery County Senior Agenda, Senior Subcabinet Workgroups' objectives, and the Summit on Aging outcomes which would result in Age-Friendly Montgomery County (AF-Montgomery County) domains; representation in the process from different sectors of the County; action items/goals for the strategic plan and evaluation measures

Discussion followed. The approach being considered by the SPW was questioned by Chuck Kauffman. He posited that the only group that can sustain the Age Friendly program is the Planning Board, a small bi-partisan group. He pointed out that achieving the objectives of Age Friendly Montgomery is a long-term effort. He recommended that an Age Friendly Executive Director/Coordinator be hired and that the Age Friendly Coordinator/ Director sit on the Planning Board and on the Senior Sub-Cabinet so that departments will perform in a coordinated manner. It was acknowledged that the Strategic Plan Working Group's path forward is a work in progress. A draft will be forwarded by the Chair of the SPW to Uma and Gabe who co-chair the effort.

Other Business:

The State's Senate and House bills proposing tax credits for home modification were noted and briefly discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45.