

Age Friendly Coalition for Seattle & King County
Social and Civic Participation Committee Meeting
May 25, 2018, 10:00 - 11:30 AM

In-person: Tamsen Spengler (West Seattle Time bank); Carol Redfield (Seattle Pacific University); Carol Frillman (West Seattle Senior Center); Linda Woodall (Eastside Friends of Seniors); Dori Gillam (Positive Endings); Brent Butler, Lenny Orlov (City of Seattle).

Via conference: Rebecca Crichton (NWCCA); Cecily Kaplan (Greenwood Senior Center)

Other members: Nancy Robb (Wider Horizons); Joanne Donohue (Sound Generations); Keri Pollock (Aging Wisdom); Yun Pitre (City of Seattle).

Minutes

1. Intros / Check In

- Tamsen was the facilitator. Lenny provided web support – to access additional information on discussion points and set up a conference (for the first time) for folks to attend remotely. Carol Frillman and Brent Butler attended for the first time.
- Attendees went around the room stating their names and the nature of their work and/or community involvement as they pertain to this committee/workgroup.
- Lenny asked the group if they would agree to have the minutes and agendas posted on a webpage hosted by Aging King County – per suggestion from the Steering Committee. Tamsen motioned for a vote and this was approved by voice vote. Lenny will take this on.
- Tamsen asked what other Coalition subcommittees are there; Lenny referred the group to <http://www.seattle.gov/agefriendly/events> for the list and schedule of all the work groups. It was suggested that the work of the SCP committee is closely aligned with that of the Outreach, Advocacy & Communications Committee. Lenny will help facilitate this collaboration.

2. Discussion

- Tamsen recounted the group's previous conversation (re: creating an age-friendly hub for folks who are looking to contribute their skills) and echoed the sentiment that information currently comes from a variety of sources. She also posed the question: what are some other ideas? What does this group want to concentrate on?
- Dori spoke in agreement of the point about there being no single source of info. She recalled working with Rebecca on a project called "Learning Northwest" as part of the Aging Our Way initiative. It was supposed to be a "one-stop-shop" website, but didn't get any traction despite an enthusiastic community response. Dori approached City of Seattle at the time, but according to her, they didn't have the staff to do this due to the Great Recession. Rebecca added that the site would have required a high level of involvement in terms of updates and maintenance.
- Cecily added that there already exists a dementia-friendly hub called [Momentia](#). However, the challenge is with letting folks know where the hub - itself - is. So, even though she is supportive of the general hub idea, she issued a word of caution about it getting out of date and people losing interest in it. Tamsen agreed and suggested that a hub for each neighborhood may be a better solution than a general one.
- Carol R. interjected that we live in the age of technology and if we are, indeed, looking to build an online hub, involving hi-tech partners such as Amazon might be worthwhile. Those partners could then be responsible for regular updates (e.g., quarterly) to keep the hub relevant. Or, if the public needs a printed version of these opportunities, we could do that. Bottom line: we need to find out what people actually want.

- Linda contributed that people don't tend to look for resources until they *need* them. So, one of the challenges is identifying something that would really resonate. Secondly, she expressed hesitation about creating something new without first looking at what currently exists and figuring out a way to effectively and efficiently utilize that. She stated that it might make sense to use a website that people already recognize and then add additional resources, e.g., the ADS Advisory Council website (AgingKingCounty.org). Cecily seconded that notion.
- Upon Tamsen's request, Lenny weighed in on the current web and in-person infrastructure of Age Friendly, ADS and other departments: [Community Living Connections](#), DON Community Resource Hub [both discussed at previous meetings] and AgingKingCounty.org. The latter is not a seattle.gov website and is run on WordPress, so Lenny suggested that ADS could provide a committee member with access for creating and maintaining the hub.
- Tamsen brought up West Seattle Round Up, which (unlike the West Seattle Blog) can be edited by anyone, as far as adding events goes. [This already exists on the ADS site.] Linda then posited that to start, the hub would just be a page with links to such broad areas as "Need help?" | "Want to Volunteer?" | "Neighborhood Questions?" Etc.
- Carol R.: "new is fine if the old doesn't work!" She explained that a feasibility study of the existing online resources may be needed. She brought up NCOA's website (<https://www.ncoa.org>), similar to Linda's suggestion above. The group agreed that taxonomy standards would need to be followed when setting this up.
- Tamsen suggested that applying for a small grant to pay in intern for this work might be one solution. She asked Lenny if another Hackathon is going to take place and he said he would find out.
- Dori: yes, no need to recreate existing databases, but a new overlay – that is age-friendly – is what would help older adults navigate the resources. She brought up an example of the Customer Service Bureau's two-page guide for finding City resources that is small type and has no web links. Dori suggested a focus group (e.g., Hackathon) for figuring out how that interface should be laid out.

3. Committee work

- Tamsen proposed that we decide between the ADS site and the NCOA site, both of which older adults seem to be familiar with. She said the Committee could then ask the City for how feasible a focus group would be. If not, they would need a grant. Carol R. reminded that it's possible to involve university students as part of their class requirement with someone on the Committee consulting.
- Carol R. asked if AF Seattle Plan is part of the AAA effort. Brent explained that some actions (e.g., Information & Assistance) are, but there are differences. Brent passed around the Draft Plan. Carol then asked: which entity is the visible one, where it would then make sense to host the website the group has been discussing. Linda reminded the Committee that AAA decided on a broader age-friendly vision, but it was decided to limit it to Seattle to start with.
- Brent brought up Chapter 5 of the AF Seattle Plan with the goals from the community, with actions beneath – for all 8 Domains of Livability (from the AARP framework). AF Seattle works with other departments such as SDOT, Housing, etc. on implementing the actions.
- Tamsen then proposed that, similar to how the City is approaching it, this group needs to come up with an action and a time line for completing those actions. These will likely be different from the City's because the Committee straddles two domains: Respect and Social Inclusion and Civic Participation and Employment. Brent read off the City Plan's goals for both domains. Lenny mentioned that part of the effort is training City employees on how to make their communications (in-person, online, in print, etc.) age-friendly, e.g., Customer Service Centers, DON hub, etc.

- Dori wondered if it might be the City's responsibility to create the hub that this group has been discussing, as well as other – active – engagement. The group would then be responsible for training volunteers that could be present on the availability of resources for social and civic engagement - at every major age-friendly event. She also suggested that distributing a toolkit would be helpful, and that her developing one might be a possibility.
- Carol R. reflected that according to a model she works with, the Committee is currently in the "communicating the change vision" stage. But can the group say in 10 words or fewer, what our goal is? Dori agreed that we need a discrete project that the Committee would be responsible for. Tamsen added that the group would have to figure out who to work with (e.g., the Outreach subcommittee, etc.) and asking the larger Coalition at the next meeting on June 15.
- Cecily weighed in, saying that Senior Centers (like the one she represents in Greenwood) are already "hubs" for the activities that are being discussed. She suggested that it's important for any project(s) the Committee decides to work on to affect the people who are not already being served. Questions: "Who is we missing?" | "How do we get this info to Seattle of all ages?" One idea is being involved with the Night Out in August, possibly next year. Linda explained how that relates to having an event related food [discussed at the March meeting] would add to this (vs. Recreating what Senior Centers already do) "value add." SO, rather than being a group that plans things, can the Committee get invited to be a part of what already exists?
- Dori suggested that, perhaps, instead of waiting for next year's Night Out, the group could organize a "Night In" this year in February or March – at every Senior or Community center. This would be an additional way to engage folks who are isolated (e.g., by providing transportation, etc.) Tamsen suggested meeting with Andrés Mantilla, DON *Interim* Director on how to approach this.
- Tamsen: the group needs a project, which could be what's missing for whom. Staffing would involve grant writing. Is there still room to work on the hub?
- Cecily mentioned a one-time grant that is currently available for something the grantor is actually calling a "hub"
- Carol: is this an advisory or a work group? Brent reflected that AF Seattle has no defined mission.

4. Looking forward:

- The next facilitator is Dori Gillam; the meeting will take place on June 15, 11:15-12:15 AM at Seattle Municipal Tower, Room 5135. Lenny attend and provide tech and admin support: video conference set up, copies of materials, taking minutes, etc.
- Lenny summarized Committee goals as stated in today's meeting:
 - Reaching those "who are missing" – social isolation is what underscores the work of this Coalition
 - Programs should be more intergenerational and language inclusive, include Universal design
 - Providing meals at events is more of a draw, not a focus
- Whatever the group does would have to be
 - Value added
 - Align with AF Action Plan
- Dori: concern that Committee keeps resetting each time new members join, so the suggestion is for existing members to meet with new members to bring them up to date.

Action Items

1. Report out at the 6/15 Coalition meeting, including invitation to collaborate with the Outreach group
[completed]
2. Dori: send an agenda and any other handouts for 6/15 to Lenny – to produce copies for the group.
[completed]
3. Lenny: set up a video conference call for the 1/15 meeting and email the info to committee
[completed]