

California Master Plan for Aging
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #2.5
December 18, 2019

Meeting Transcript

Kim McCoy Wade 0:07

Good morning. Welcome to the Master Plan for Aging Stakeholder Advisory Committee 2.5 we're calling this. And right off the bat, I want to start with logistics. We are piloting Zoom for the first time, which has lots of new features, but also a little bit of learning curve on our side and your side. We see 16 stakeholder advisory committee members are in, which is terrific, and I'll do a roll call in a second but if you have trouble, presumably you're on the phone. Nelson, you're on standby to have folks speak. Would you give people a little info about the muted and raising their hand and how this is all going to work?

Nelson Sheya 0:49

Absolutely. Thank you, Kim. For Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members on the phone, please remember to mute your phone when you're not speaking. If you want to speak like a raise button to get into the queue, or press star nine on your phone. And also, in the chat box I put a link to materials that we're going to go through this meeting. Turn over to Kim.

Kim McCoy Wade 1:11

Okay, so this will be a good one of our many continuous and quality improvements. We'll see how this goes. If you have trouble during the meeting, you can do what Nelson said, but also reach out to us and we'll do our very best to problem solve as we go. Thank you for coming on this tech journey with us. Let's go ahead and go to the next slide where we just went over the logistics. And then let's go to the next slide with the agenda and I will read off the people who are here if we can show that screen again. We have from the CDA team, I'm Kim Wade, Department of Aging. And we also have our entire Master Plan and exec team with us today. Thank you very much and then to the many of you who are joining us, the 18 folks, Maya Altman, Craig Cornett, Jeannie Parker Martin. Jennie Chin Hansen,

Brenda Schmidt Henner, Derek Lam, Debbie Toth, Donna Benton, Dr. Fernando Torres-Gil, Christina Bas-Hamilton, Judy Thomas, Kevin Prindiville, Marty Lynch, Nina Weiler-Harwell, Peter Hansel, and Rigo Saborio. Thank you so much for joining us. The purpose of this meeting is really two things, although we've added a third purpose. We wanted to take a pause. As you know, we've been having bi-monthly all day in person meetings. The last one was November. The next one is January. But we wanted to take a pause at the end of the year to do two things. Look back and see where we've come so far. We're honestly about a third of the way through our master planning process together, so take stock of that briefly. And then more importantly, turn to the year ahead and make sure we're all on the same page, that we're clear on where we're headed and how we're headed, and we surface any emerging issues. And to that end, that's the third purpose of the call. We've had a lot of great conversations recently about process and clarifying and deciding together on our process, and also the topic of equity. Those will be the discussion areas today, our process and equity, and we will get to that in good time. Without further ado, let's jump right into where we all began. In June, Governor Newsom called for a Master Plan for Aging, including the creation of this Stakeholder Advisory Committee which we are so thankful that all of you are willing to serve, as well of course as the research subcommittee, a long term care subcommittee and a cabinet work group. And boy have we been given a quite a mandate to do a state master plan. And I think as many of us have heard from our leadership, not the traditional plan or report because the field of aging does have many of those, but actually much more of an action plan, much more that can be used to annually update and hold us accountable. Also, with a local blueprint that local communities can adapt and use to inform and advance their own planning, a data dashboard with state and local data, a best practice toolkit. In addition, the executive order called for a report from stakeholders with recommendations for long term services and supports, and that's due in March 2020. We'll talk about that more. So that's how we got started. And we recently published our progress report on Fall, which I will not read to you. But I do commend to you a four page a high-level document that summarizes our progress in several areas. It does talk about our public engagement online and in the community. It talks about our framework work that we've done, this is a work in progress and continues to evolve. But on the vision, California for All across the lifespan, our mission, person-centered data-driven plan, our six values including choices, equity, dignity, inclusion, innovation and evidence, and partnership. And, again, framing the work into these four

goals, it's just a way to get our arms around it: services and supports, livable communities and purpose, health and well-being, and economic security and safety. And of course, we've begun to do the work of recommendations through subcommittees and through recommendation collection online and at community events. So, development has begun and again, we're going to talk a lot more about that collaboration coordination. This is an administration that has multiple initiatives going in this front so working closely with CalAIM, with Alzheimer's efforts, homelessness efforts, and existing bodies, like Olmstead and the California Commission on Aging have been critical to advance this. We also have the partners with the legislature, a package of bills was signed in the Fall, all advancing the master plan goals and vision for California. And last, but not least, we also know that we need to transform CDA to not just lead this plan but to implement this plan. And here's a good spot as of any just to do a major appreciation and thank you. In this season of going from the plan to the transformation to the implementation we have been generously supported by six foundations: the SCAN Foundation, the Gary and Mary West Foundation, the Archstone Foundation, the META Foundation, San Diego Foundation, Gilbert Foundation and hopefully more will continue to come as the excitement and effectiveness spread, but that really is supporting the policy work of the master plan. CDA does not currently have a policy shop, it is dramatically expanding our communications capacity. It is expanding our data capacity. We also do not have data staff at this point. And last, but not least by any means, is logistics. There are a few meetings with a few slides, and we are grateful to the support that's being provided by the foundations. We could not be doing this without them. One topic that folks have rightly wanted an update on was the cabinet workgroup. The first meeting we had was back in September. And as you see there, it's not just Health and Human Services. Labor and workforce, business consumer services and housing, state transportation, natural resources which includes our State Department of Parks and Rec, Dev Ops, finance, veterans, and then several of our Governor's offices, planning and research, which has, again has to do with housing and transportation and livable communities, the California volunteers office and critically the Office of Emergency Services. So hot off the presses. We had our second meeting on Monday, and we brought forward for the group discussion on three topics that have emerged, I would say almost in every setting as top priorities: housing, specifically and livable communities, purpose and engagement to counter isolation and depression, and really continue to leverage all the wisdom and experience and resources of our of older

Californians. And then of course emergency preparedness especially in light of the power shut off that waded across the state this Fall. We had a great conversation, we had representatives from those departments and agencies present on all of those topics. Mark Beckley, the chief deputy Department of Aging and myself were there with our agency leadership. And I would say, some takeaways for me from this conversation. Everybody is recognizing the demographic shift. Everyone at the table is aware and is thinking about it, moving in this direction, acting on it. That gives us a lot of support and alignment to work with. Everybody had something to share on some initiative, it was very interesting to hear state parks talk about their volunteer program, while they don't collect age data specifically, they are confident is almost entirely older Californians who are powering the state parks, whether it's docents or camp hosts, or all kinds of park services. They were very clear about that. Transportation talking about two weeks ago had just been Older Drivers Awareness Week. Everybody has something going on in this space. They have demographic awareness and they have some initiatives. And we also saw a lot of partnerships. Housing and transportation is working very closely together on disaster preparedness, emergency services and HHS, and my agency is working very closely together most recently, really identifying for one example that the IHSS lists are some of our best proxy lists where people who might need additional assistance in the event of an emergency and disaster, and that's a starting point to work on informing people, preparing people, being aware of particular medical or equipment needs. Those are all bright spots for me. I think one of the challenges that was across the topic, and across the discussion was data and data gaps and data indicators. How do we move from initiative and positive projects to having data goals and then data sources to measure our progress on those goals? I think that was once again, highlighting the importance of the research subcommittee and the dashboard. If we're going to move beyond a really lovely and positive and powerful array of individual programs into a systemic plan there's work to be done. But we've got a lot of the building blocks there. Let me just do one other slide, then I'll pause to see if there's any questions or comments. We also within California Health and Human Service Agency, Department of Aging is one of, I think, 14 departments. I think that's the right number. I should know that. 14 departments and a couple other independent aid departments, we have been meeting monthly. Really, at this point, it has been an information sharing, but we are increasingly doing more partnering and planning together. As everyone on this call knows all of these departments have aging programs and services and serve older

Californians and people with disabilities, and so pooling our knowledge, pooling our information, we were really working now on three things. Many of these groups have already or will be presenting at LTSS subcommittee. Obviously CDSS critical on IHSS for example. CDPH critical at the nursing home conversation given their role in licensing, so many of these folks are coming to LTSS subcommittees to present and to listen. Secondly on the webinar series starting in January, which we'll talk about in a second. Many of these folks are going to be presenting as well. CDPH again on healthy aging, DHCS on integrated health systems. These are partners on our webinars, Department of State Hospitals on our mental health work. I could go on but I'll stop. And then thirdly, the dashboard. We know how critical state data and state data infrastructure is to that and so we are very, very happy that CDPH is going to be working with us as really the lead with an agency to help stand up the master plan on aging data dashboard. Again, CDA does not have that capacity from the data or technical standpoint at this point and fortunately our colleagues at CDPH do, so we will be working with them are really kicking off in earnest in January and working through the research subcommittee on the data. So, again, these cross-cabinet and cross-agency meetings and discussions and planning are happening. Let me stop there because we haven't talked a lot about that. It's that and see if there are questions or comments and we'll practice our zoom technology. Hearing none, we will continue and if we have missed you, you'll email and let us know in some other way, but we'll keep rolling through our full agenda. The next thing we want to talk about is something that came up quite a bit is public engagements. While we were all thrilled with the overwhelmed enthusiasm between the comments and the tweets and the request for roundtables and the requests to come out to other events have been just great. We also heard loud and clear that we needed to make it easier for people to engage. That the website was a little tricky. And of course, calling in and listening to a four-hour subcommittee meeting is not everyone's cup of tea, understandably. We have been thinking a lot about how to update and smooth our engagement. One part of that strategy is a refreshed Together We Engage website that again, is a partnership between CDA staff, Adam Willoughby is our director, newly confirmed, newly appointed Director of Communications and Legislation. Adam is taking the lead on this and then in partnership with the communications firm that the foundation group is supporting. This is in beta. And there were three staff members who do have extensive communications capacity, AARP, Leading Age, and SCAN who've all volunteered to be our first team of reviewers and testers. They are taking a look at it to give us their

feedback. We're hoping to soft launch very soon, within days, but certainly give it a big public push in the new year to start the new year with a refresh of Together We Engage. This will be a place both to, you can see the masterplan, get engaged., and for stakeholders it'll be a place to stay informed, hopefully a little bit about all these moving pieces, but also communicate your input and then also hear back about how the input is being used. We're looking to really create that cycle. Again, leveraging the great launch in August, taking it to the next level. Adam, anything to add or comment on?

Adam Willoughby 15:53

Yeah, just a couple of things. Thanks, Kim. We're very excited about the rollout of this new website and I just want to tease a few features that can be touched on. One of which that we've heard loud and clear is very important is a calendar feature. The new site will have an embedded Google calendar that will include, but not be limited to these, SAC meetings, the two stakeholder committee meetings, webinar Wednesday meetings that you're going to hear more about here in a little bit. And then also partner events. We're going to have a feature on there where folks can, if they want to highlight a masterplan related event, send us a note and we will put that event on the calendar and shine a light on that. There's also some information about the master plan background and a very aesthetic, aesthetically pleasing phases graphic where we break down into a number of phases where we've been, where we are, where we're going. And then finally, there's an engagement focus. There's some call-to-actions on their prominently featured calls-to-actions where folks can provide public comment, and also detailed recommendations. And then we're also going to have some real estate on one of the pages dedicated to these webinar Wednesdays, which again, you're going to hear a little bit more about here in a second. Those are some of the high-level features we're very excited about.

Kim McCoy Wade 17:29

And I should say, I hope you all are seeing a memorable URL EngageCalifornia.org, which we think will be easier to say, than the current backslash agency, etc. So, stay tuned. Thank you again to the three stakeholder members who volunteered their comms expertise to give us that feedback. And I'll say it once I'll say it again, it will be continuous improvement. We think this is a big improvement of where we are and it will no doubt continue to improve with your feedback and with real life user

testing. So thanks for that. Next slide. The second piece of our engagement strategy is webinar Wednesdays, we went with the alliteration. This is about making sure we have a focused conversation that is interactive, that is accessible statewide that covers the breadth of issues we're talking about, particularly in goal two, three and four. And that features a voice of a local leader, a state partner, and a SAC member. And these are going to be co-produced with a staff member for each one. Many of you, if you haven't already, are going to be hearing from Jennifer Wong, our fabulous consultant, also foundation supported who is I'll say she's the executive producer of the webinar Wednesdays among other things, and is doing that outreach and planning with local leaders and state partners and you all to do this. We'll talk about it more in the process. But there really is a pre-planning to make sure that we've got diverse speakers and are focusing on the right and comprehensive and priority issues in these calls, that we're asking the right questions from the participants through Zoom so they can weigh in and give us their voice. And then of course, feeding that back into our SAC process, which we'll talk about. Jennifer, can I give it over to you to add some key information and comments?

Jennifer Wong 19:27

Absolutely. Good morning, everyone. I am so excited to co-produce all of these with you. We are very excited to confirm presenters for our webinars, at least the first few, which is taken from each of the goals. We're kind of scattering them about and we're touching upon each topic within a specific goal. A big thank you to our SAC members Fernando, Nina, Kevin, and Jeanne who have graciously volunteered to serve as co-producers of the first few webinars. And I look forward to reaching out to many more of you. Something that we'll talk about in process is just the way also that we connect with our local leaders and our state partners and our SAC members to produce everything as a variety of information to cover each topic and then also how we're going to include some of the feedback we've received via public comment to also feedback into this process. Thank you all so much, and looking forward to working with you.

Kim McCoy Wade 20:38

On the next slide, we have the first one all teed up. Our topic will be healthy aging. And thank you so much to our stakeholder and really celebrity, Dr. Fernando Torres Gil, for being the co-producer with us, as well as our partners at the Department of Public Health who have a healthy aging initiative across public health. And our local leader Victoria Jump from the

triple A in Ventura, which has a lot of work in nutrition, physical activity, diabetes, a lot of work on the ground, did I mention fall prevention, and dementia care, or dementia prevention rather. That's our first one. That's all confirmed, which is wonderful. Our comms team is planning to announce the new webpage and the first webinar and the registration system all at the same time as this Happy New Year new masterplan 2020 engagement. And so that will be coming. But if you want to put on your calendar now 9:30 AM to 11:00 AM every Wednesday from January 15th through the end of April, we will have a webinar for you on one of the key aging topics. We're also, I should just mention, where we got some great suggestions from the black women health projects that we should be encouraging not just people to watch this at the desk or in their home, but also providing some assistance to groups to organize community watch parties, if you will. And so, we are also with our comms team "toolkit" might be a little grandiose, but a few tools to help people who want to organize. If the topic is transportation and that is your focus, you could have a transportation watch party, you can you can promote it and then roll up the comments and feedback from people in the room and send it in as well so that we could, depending on people's desire and interest to organize watch parties, this could be a content core for that. Again, aiming to get all of that out around the new year to start the new year strong with the new webpage, the webinar Wednesday series kickoff featuring all of you, and some tools to help you bring these events even deeper into your community as you're able. Nelson any questions or comments on comms?

Jennifer Wong 22:57

This is Jennifer. Just a reminder that these will be open to the public and we're really hoping for a wide variety of interaction and folks to participate and listen in and also give feedback that will be presented back in it to the SAC and to the master plan at large.

Kim McCoy Wade 23:22

Okay, it looks like Judy has a question.

Judy Thomas 23:31

I didn't hear you say whether they would be recorded, and if people would be able to listen to them later if they couldn't make that time.

Adam Willoughby 23:39

The answer is yes. We are working to archive them on this new website. There'll be a page where folks, if they're not able to go, can review past webinar Wednesdays. So yes, the answer is yes.

Kim McCoy Wade 24:00

Other questions or comments on any of the things Together We Engage in the new year? Okay, well, let's move from engagement to planning and policies, and a lot to talk about here. The good news about the engagement is that we have so much wonderful input coming in from what I'm beginning to think about as the five channels. We have public comments. We have summarized the first batch that came in August, September, and we're now working to summarize the next batch of hundreds, October, November, December and share out the public comments. Share out and also classify. We also have community roundtables that continue at pace. We have been summarizing on our web page. These underlines, I believe, are the live links to what we call "picture in a paragraph" kind of here's the community roundtable that happened, here's a few things that we heard from that. And of course, at those events, we encourage people to go online and send the comments or the recommendation. The full committee and the two subcommittees are hard at work. And you all know well, the recommendations have been coming from there. For example, LTSS has made recommendations around information assistance, public benefits, and more coming. We also have the famous or infamous depending on your perspective recommendation form, we had asked people to use that template if it was helpful to them to provide as much information as we could. We gave that initial deadline to canvas the field of last Friday and we were thrilled that over 200 recommendations came in, rough number don't, you can quote me if you want, but it's a very rough number in terms of some recommendations have multiple embedded and some are duplicates. But our power team of Carrie and Jennifer are reading and sorting into various issue areas so that we do have a better sense of all the formal recommendations or organizational letters in the specific areas that we're covering, and then of course, adding the public comments that same way. So we also have the public comments in that way. And then webinar Wednesdays, again, we will be having polls and interactive and comments coming in on that. We will also have a set of for example, after January 15th, we'll have some more public input on the topic of healthy aging, etc. We have five channels that are bringing us information, which is wonderful. Next slide. The question then that many people are asking is, "How are we going to use that on our deliverables?" and there's really two halves to this

conversation. The first half is the first deliverable, which is actually the stakeholder LTSS report due to the administration in March 2020. And yesterday afternoon we had I think the word that people are using is lively conversation about the process for that given the complexity of the LTSS and the timing of that March report, and the opportunity of weighing in with the administration, in the Spring as budget and bill work is well underway. I'll give a little bit of background quickly, and then I'm going to turn it over to Carrie, to report back from the meeting yesterday. And then I'm hoping that those of you who are on the phone who were also at LTSS, or whose colleagues were can fill out the conversation. In a nutshell, the LTSS has been meeting October to January doing what we're calling deep-dives on about seven or eight different topics, having to do with the long term services and supports continuum of care, access, financing, quality, really trying to be user-centered and look at the system, low-income, middle-income, home care, residential care, all of it. That work continues at a pace and it's quite deep and quite rich. Yesterday we had a wonderful IHSS conversation, part one in partnership with CDSS. Just looking at the meeting timeline, it would be appropriate for the full Stakeholder Advisory Committee to hear report from LTSS about all that work and their vision for the stakeholder report on the SAC meeting number three, Jan 21. Then LTSS really needs to finalize their report in the month of February. They don't have any formal meeting scheduled, but I know there will be informal conversations and probably a webinar with the committee to land the report in February and then bring it to SAC meeting number four March 2nd to finalize. And then the stakeholder report can go to the administration. That's the high level. And yesterday we had a great conversation with the subcommittee going down a level about roles and process, and the final product, and the structure and the scope. Let me turn it over to Carrie to summarize where the group got to.

Carrie Graham 28:55

Hi all, this is Carrie, can you hear me? Okay, great. Yesterday we took a little over an hour and had a conversation with the 19 members of the LTSS subcommittee to think about how the 19 people are going to sort through over 200 recommendations and make a report on LTSS with recommendations to the SAC committee by March 2nd. A little bit of an overwhelming task, as Kim said, about 200 recommendations came in by the December 13th deadline. What we've done at this point with those is we've sorted them into different categories, and I am now redistributing them to the LTSS subcommittee for their consideration. The LTSS

subcommittee will also be looking at the recommendations that have come in and create more in terms of areas they think there's gaps or think that they want to revise or add to. What I think we came to, there was a lot of discussion about what this report could look like. And this could change, but just to give you a sense of what it's going to look like, we came to the idea that it was not going to be a 500-page report. That it's going to be a report that gives high-level recommendations in several different categories. And Sarah Steen hasn't come up with a framework of how to categorize these based on recommendations for government change, system change, service delivery change, data. And so that there'd be different sections of the report with a narrative that talks about the problem being addressed, and then has bullet pointed recommendations, with some information likely prioritized by either highest priority or time wise, like immediate action, mid-term or long-term action. And then that we would use dependencies for the more detailed recommendations with all the supporting evidence for each recommendation and that sort of thing. The research subcommittee will keep working throughout this process on what will be used to evaluate these recommendations and data and the data dashboard. So that probably won't be coming in the March report in a complete form. That is what the stakeholder group talked about. We have two stakeholders who have taken the lead on being our point people and almost everyone on the committee has offered to help write, and we will be doing a report back on January 21st of where we are in the process. And then the meeting where we really dig into what's actually going to be in the report will be on January 27th. Just to give you a sense of that timeline. And that's it unless anyone has any questions.

Kim McCoy Wade 32:14

Yes, I want to open it. Is there anyone on the call who was there yesterday who wants to add any clarification/correction? I do want to thank Susan DeMarois and Sarah Steenhausen particularly for offering to organize the huddle of writers, and there were volunteers to edit from Karen Fies. There were volunteers on consensus process from Brandi Wolf. We really had people offer their gifts which we were all grateful for. Anyone on the call who was there who wants to round out the conversation? It looks like Jeannee Parker Martin's hand is up and I'm happy to call on her, although you weren't there but I'd love to hear your perspective. Jeannee.

Jeannee Parker Martin 32:58

Related to that, I did listen into the meeting yesterday and Carrie, I think the overview of the meeting yesterday was well stated. And I have a question actually separate related to Carrie's comments.

Kim McCoy Wade 33:12

Great. Go for it.

Jeanne Parker Martin 33:14

Okay. It's all really clear, I think it's fairly clear, in terms of the LTSS subcommittees approach and they're putting together through the series of meetings, their recommendations, and also stating the problem, etc. But I'm curious, and I think this will be really critical for the Stakeholder Advisory Committee, what criteria are going to be used to help us understand that these are the right recommendations? And I know that's a complicated question, but I think it's going to be really critical so we understand is this by how many people raise their hand quickly, is it going to be based on data, what is the criteria that's going to be used for recommendations and analysis as it comes to the stakeholder advisory?

Kim McCoy Wade 34:12

Carrie, do you want to take a first stab?

Carrie Graham 34:14

Sure, I'll take a first stab at that. Brandi Wolf had suggested a consensus process, and I don't understand that consensus process specifically, so if I get this wrong, forgive me, but she's familiar and trained in a consensus voting process where everyone gets a card from one to five. And for each recommendation that gets brought forward, there's voting, so one means absolutely yes, 2, 3, 4 mean yes, I like it, it's okay, or there might need some editing, and five is an absolute no. She's going to work with the group on this consensus process. There was agreement in the LTSS subcommittee yesterday that that would be a good process moving forward to develop consensus on these recommendations. There is still work to do to figure it out, I think the group is still figuring out other aspects of how they will prioritize things that come forward.

Kim McCoy Wade 35:23

To add on, there was quite a discussion about that, Jeanne, that criteria do need to be clearly articulated. And some of the ones that were shared were about urgency and impact but also given the particular speed of this

opportunity to weigh in at March, there was a discussion around readiness, that there is consensus, that this does not require some federal act that isn't within our control. There was some discussion of, you can put it short, medium, and long-term. So that they might want to focus on short term, for this report, things that were short term actions that did have some urgency, that did have some impact. But that's actually part of what the huddle group is tasked with, with sorting, and came up in terms of, there are things to do on IHSS that are very, very important that will not be clearly worked through with the level of analysis and level of discussion and reflection and consensus on a March timeline. And so, the group wants to think about what kind of IHSS recommendations would be ready by March and some of them might be, you know, an immediate budget piece. Some of them might be some immediate regulatory things that CDSS could work on. Some of them might be more process i.e. there needs to be an IHSS group of some kind to go forward to continue this work. They were wrestling with that, because there was a sense that some of the most important things, there isn't just time to work them through March. And so, a lot of conversation about March being one opportunity. Obviously, the full master plan input is a second opportunity, and there are others as well. To sum up, the group heard that they need to articulate criteria, and discussed that but it wasn't landed yesterday. Are there others with questions or comments?

Jeanne Parker Martin 37:38

I just wanted to comment, I think it would be helpful if the top four or five criteria even if they're somewhat vague, like impact may not be vague, but it may be sort of vague if there's no data. I think it would be helpful if the top four or five criteria were clearly stated. This was our first priority. This was our second priority, so when it comes to SAC it's clear in terms of what criteria were used by each of the committee's. Thanks.

Kim McCoy Wade 38:12

That's really helpful because I should say that is a good thing that we can talk about being really ready for the SAC conversation on the 21st. Because one of the other dynamics of play here that I would be remiss if I didn't mention, the input gathering from LTSS will not be done by January 21st, so they will not have all the content ready, in particular IHSS listening sessions and IHSS committee meetings go through the end of January through that Jan 27th. So, I know the LTSS content recommendations won't be fully cooked, even in outline form for the SAC meeting on the 21st. But some will be, and then this question about criteria, how will things be

prioritized for the march report can absolutely be discussed. That's a great direction.

Jeanne Parker Martin 39:03

Thanks.

Kim McCoy Wade 39:09

Okay. See no other comments on that deliverable. We are all taking a breath. That was Bruce and we had really wonderful feedback. So we just muted him for a second. What should we do about that? Should we try again? Let's see if we can hear Bruce again without the reverb.

Bruce Chernof, MD 39:46

I just wanted to say that we should hold a space for, stating the obvious, I guess, just make sure that we hold a space for ideas that have longer timelines so that we don't produce a report that has nothing but near term objectives that doesn't hold placeholders for longer objectives.

Kim McCoy Wade 40:08

Good. Yep. I think that was what the group was wrestling with is wanting to have short, medium and long but not having the time maybe to fully scope out the long but to hold the space was a nice way to put it. Pivoting to our next set of deliverables, so everyone kind of mentally move from the march report, we're now moving to next few slides to have our first conversation, and again this is one we'll probably talk about more in January, about how the Stakeholder Advisory Committee will inform and advise the administration on the entire master plan. Again, we'll do a slide of the high level baseline and then we will open it up for discussion. At the highest level, beginning in August with the announcement of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee and that Together We Engage website, we've been getting feedback and that we expect to continue through June. And I'll talk more about that in a second. Again, through the five channels I just talked about: website, public comments, community roundtable, the full SAC and the subcommittees, formal recommendations, forms and letters and webinar Wednesday, public input. Again, all thanks and praise to Carrie and Jennifer, who are then compiling and tracking and keeping track of those different sets of feedback under the different issue areas. Then they are sharing that with the stakeholders who are going to be leading the discussion at SAC. For the long term services and supports the subcommittee members who have been planning the meetings and

gathering recommendations will be part of bringing that to the SAC for two, three and four. We are just getting that process of working with stakeholders to be the co-producers on the webinars. Again, Jennifer and Carrie will be sharing with you all the recommendations, all the comments, so at the end of the webinar you have this body of input from different sources that we can then work with you on how to bring to the SAC. Then that tees us up for next slide. Our March meeting, we will have recommendations in the goal two, three and four area from that webinar Wednesday producer. Don't want to leave aside that we're going to be approving the LTSS report, but for this discussion, want to talk about the process for the master plan information input and advice. Then we have a main meeting where we will have really concluded the webinar Wednesday's, there's been some discussion that we ought to say to folks, we're done getting recommendations. We're done. Whether we were to say we're done getting recommendation, of course public comments can come anytime, but kind of shut that down April/May. We also at that point want to have a data dashboard template so we can start to show how these goals and recommendations have indicators and benchmarks for you all to respond to. I'll come back to that. We are thinking about that, again, in the spirit of increasing transparent and easy and acceptable public engagement, that at the conclusion of webinar Wednesdays where we've done one topic a week for four months, that there might be a capstone event in late June on the entire plan. And this needs a lot of thinking and we'll talk about this but that would be kind of a final time for public input. We could imagine something where it's held in Sacramento but then there are meeting spots. 12 meeting spots around the state. So where people in San Diego and Humboldt and Bakersfield and Oakland can gather together as the master plan to kind of get a final input and advice from the public on the whole thing together, because they really won't have had the chance to see it together. But that needs a lot of work. So that's why it's in italics and brackets and TBD, all those caveats. And then coming back to the SAC in August, we will have everything, we will have all the recommendations, all the deliverables, all the public input, and really to get your final input advice. And then as a reminder, then it's for the administration to do the work with the cabinet work group, which has been meeting through this time as well, to take all the Stakeholder Advisory Committee input and issue a final, issue the administration's plan in October. Obviously, this high level raises a lot questions about the best use of this group's time and energy and meeting process, how we can work with the individual stakeholders who are on the subcommittees and on the webinar, webinar

producers to have the best conversations. Our goal from the administration is to make sure we're hearing comprehensively what are the recommendations in a given area, and also that prioritization. That prioritization for the administration, whether it's short, medium, or long term, what is the group prioritizing? We would really like to open this up for you all to weigh in on how we do that pre-work and post-work with each of you to make sure those meetings are productive in leading to the quality recommendations you all have as a group. Let me pause and open it up because we need everyone's best thinking on this one. I believe we already have a few people in queue. Marty Lynch.

Marty Lynch 46:04

Okay, thank you. A couple things. Kim, would you just talk about how your staff is going to summarize those 200 recommendations? I'm assuming we can get that summary back so we can see that for our deliberations. That's one question. And then the other comment would be that we need a robust process for the Stakeholder Advisory Committee to come up with our recommendations, which I understand may be different than staff recommendations, but we certainly want to have a good process for making them. So those two comments.

Kim McCoy Wade 46:43

The second comment is exactly what we're talking about today. On the first comment, that's what Carrie and Jennifer are doing. They're not going to summarize--let me use my lingo correctly--I am dividing public input into two buckets. One is public comments. These are things like a one-line email, a two-line comment on our web page, a social media tweet. We are tracking the hundreds, hundreds, hundreds of those and sorting them. The recommendations are a second bucket and those tend to be either using the official recommendation template or a traditional organizational letter. We are also sorting all of those.

Marty Lynch 47:30

It's the second bucket Kim.

Kim McCoy Wade 47:32

If you are the stakeholder who is working on the issue of transportation will get all of that, will get every single recommendation on transportation and will get every single public comment on transportation. And then that will be part of the pre-work of how do we have the transportation conversation at

SAC. We are giving you the comprehensive field of everything that came in, but that conversation about prioritization. How do we do that? Let me just also say the public will also see on the public comment side, we are summarizing those. You may remember we did that for the first two months, we put a chart up of the popular topics. We are, again, some for the public, we are summarizing the public comments, there will be an infographic on that by the end of the year that says, here's what we heard the last quarter from your public comments. The formal recommendations and org letters, we're posting all of them. We're figuring out if we're indexing by subject or by group or whatever, but those will all be publicly available for folks who want to read the 200 of them as well.

Marty Lynch 48:43

Kim, how about a summary though? That's what I'm asking. Not just in our interest area, so not just in transportation in your example, but for the stakeholder committee, some kind of summary that says we got, for example, four recommendations in this particular area, here's a line on each of them, or something like that or a spreadsheet that lays them out that we can see the breadth of the recommendations that have come in. Not two or three pages each.

Kim McCoy Wade 49:13

Yeah, I think and Carrie and Jen, you can speak but I think that is what there will be, this list of all the recommendations, and then behind it is sort of here's the org letter that came supporting it, but spreadsheet is the right word.

Marty Lynch 49:31

All of us will get that?

Kim McCoy Wade 49:33

Yes. And I think we want to be thoughtful about if there's a spreadsheet on every single area, then how do we have... Yes, everybody can have everything. What is the right conversation?

Marty Lynch 49:47

I want the summary not everything.

Kim McCoy Wade 49:50

I know. But I mean even the spreadsheet with 200 lines. That's part one is what information does everybody need? But then the question is how do we then use all that information in the summary of that information to be clear, to have good discussions as a group?

Marty Lynch 50:09

Thank you.

Nelson Sheya 50:11

We have two more in the queue. Peter Hansel then Judy Thomas.

Peter Hansel 50:19

Great. Well, kudos, great work, you guys. I think the process you're describing is quite thoughtful and robust for calling recommendations and organizing and sorting and working with them. I think that's great. The one thing I'm not seeing is, and maybe I think perhaps there's a role also for naming that has to come from the state is laying out a general roadmap of what the plan should look like. And that could be taken from what are the best practices in master planning? What has been done in other states? What do we want this to kind of look like overall? I guess I'm thinking of this as sort of, it's great you've got a great feedback process going to get stuff from the bottom up, but it could be that there's some structure that could come from the top also to help with the organization.

Kim McCoy Wade 51:16

That's the question. I mean, that's one of our questions is, does the group want this? Yes, we're trying to really make sure we have lots of time and space to focus on content. But does the group also want to focus on the format? And I don't mean that in any trivial way, for the format is critically important. But yes, we could spend some time looking at look, you know, San Diego's plan, Minnesota's plan, New York plan and say, we like this, we don't like this. And again, does that need to happen in March or May or wait till August? That's what we're asking for feedback on. So thank you.

Bruce Chernof, MD 51:53

That gets to my concern about how do we make sure we watch our longer term units, even if they still need development. To make sure we don't end up with a bunch of recommendations that are all in different silos, the way they operate. But nobody is proposing that we do that.

Kim McCoy Wade 52:14

We're having a hard time hearing you at least here. Can you come closer?

Bruce Chernof, MD 52:22

I was just saying I want a second that recommendation because I think the concern is, structure is important. And I completely understand the need to have near term recommendations that makes sense, that are actionable, but the whole point of a master plan is to have a vision for the future. And those medium and long term recommendations will be really important, even if not fully, even if they need to be revisited. I think the idea that format actually helps guide how we hold, move, finish recommendations, accountability for doing that. All I'm suggesting is Peter's comments would address my concern about making sure we have a vision for the future that is really robust.

Nelson Sheya 53:10

Judy, then Nina.

Judy Thomas 53:15

Yeah, hi, this is Judy. And my organization did submit some recommendations, and we made a point to get it in by the December 13th deadline. But I think some of our recommendations could use a little bit more thinking and refining. So what's the best process for that to not drive your staff nuts?

Kim McCoy Wade 53:36

Judy, thank you for the way you asked that question. I could take a stab at it, Carrie, I would say updates are well, in particular, Judy, in your case, your topic is going to be featured in a webinar in March or April. So I would say two things. One, I think sending an updated version of your recommendation and just being clear with folks that this replaces the previous one is super helpful. And then I think in your case, getting it in well in advance of the webinars so we have it to think through the webinar with you. Carrie, do you want to add anything to that?

Carrie Graham 54:13

Yeah, I think just being really clear, please replace this recommendation. Worst case scenario there's duplicates, but so just being really clear on what we're replacing with that, and then for everybody, in terms of our dealing with all these recommendations, it really helps to have one

document, one recommendation. The documents that gets sent in with a ton of different recommendations in one document are harder for us to handle and take a lot of time. I'm just throwing that out as a housekeeping suggestion. Thank you.

Kim McCoy Wade 55:01

Who's next?

Nelson Sheya 55:03

Nina.

Kim McCoy Wade 55:08

Nina, are you unmuted?

Nina Weiler-Harwell, PhD 55:10

Yes. For some reason I'm having some challenges. Good morning, everybody. I have a question because I'm thinking ahead, I was at the LTSS meeting yesterday. Looking at some of the timelines around the additional recommendations, will we be using the same format for goals two to four? And is there going to be a deadline for those?

Kim McCoy Wade 55:37

That's one of our questions is, we were really hoping to get as many out of people as we could in December and we're thrilled that we did because it really does help us map the issue. I think that is something we've heard from people yesterday was please set a deadline for any and all and we just want to hit that balance right of allowing the door to be open, particularly as engagement is ramping up to a new level of people. As we plan to be successful in reaching new people, we don't want to say the window is past. In my mind we need to keep it open through the webinar Wednesday through April-May recognizing that continues to add volume and complexity. That's what we're balancing and we welcome recommendations on that from the committee.

Nelson Sheya

Clay is next.

Kim McCoy Wade

Okay, Clay you're unmuted. You're unmuted on our end. Maybe on your end? Oh, shocker first glitch that we're aware of anyway, anyone else next

on this? Okay, so we need to think through, again, the sharing of the recommendations, the sharing of the summary of the recommendations. And we need to think through the structure of the report, a better word than format, the structure of the report, so we have that short, medium, long term, and we have that vision piece. We can think about how and when to do that. That is right. And I would welcome offline conversations or proposals. And if there's some of you who want to think with us on that, we would welcome a small call. And then this question of a hard deadline, we had a soft deadline at December 13, but a hard deadline for formal recommendations. I mean, it's possible that we will say webinar Wednesday input continues, public comment continues, but the formal recommendations we need to close the door so that we can continue to do the analysis in the dashboard built around it. Looks like we have one more comment and then we do need to move on.

Nelson Sheya 58:00

Next in the queue is Kevin Prindiville.

Kevin Prindiville 58:04

Yeah. And maybe you are going to get to this. I guess I'm jumping ahead a little bit. I'm looking at the slide we're on and moving to that August and after August period. Were you going to speak separately to that, or can I ask a question about that? I guess I'm curious what happens between that August period, which I guess is the last time that the SAC is looking at the set of recommendations. And then what the cabinet group actually finalizes. Where is the line behind what we recommend and what the cabinet adopts?

Kim McCoy Wade 58:48

Right, you just said it. Your August is, I love Anastasia's "pencil down" August is the SAC saying here is our best recommendation and thinking to the administration and then I think the administration needs a minute to go in and finalize and release it. Right? Because it's not as the risk of stating the obvious. It's not a SAC master plan, it's an administration master plan. That's what we're trying to figure out is how we get all of your best thinking and then allow time for the administration to finalize it. Does that make sense or unleash a whole bunch of other questions? How about a couple of you who are willing, let's have a process conversation on January 21st when we're together. Again, we will be heavily focused on LTSS. We will have lots to say on the engagement launch. We will have lots to say on the

first webinar, on the CDA transformation. But I think we do want to continue the process conversation and map our work plan together. If a couple of you could volunteer, there's probably some cool Zoom tool to do it. But I'm going to go old school and say just email me and we will get a little group who can think through how to maximize the SAC role and time. And then we can build on this conversation in January. Does that work?

Kevin Prindiville 1:00:26

Yeah, I think that's a good idea. Thank you.

Kim McCoy Wade 1:00:28

Okay. Thank you in advance for those of you who volunteer. More to come. Very briefly, because we have a very important topic to get to, I wanted to update you on what we've all talked about is for there to be a Master Plan on Aging that is more than a plan on a shelf that is lead and implemented over the next 10 years successfully. The Department of Aging is going to transform into a 21st century department. We did begin our strategic planning, November 1st, November/December we've been working internally, January/February will be coming out to our key organizational partners with a public Survey Monkey tool and bringing it to SAC on January 21st. This is being led by my wonderful chief deputy Mark Beckley, who was also just appointed, and we will talk about it more, but I just wanted you to know that that work is well underway. The next topic that we wanted to turn to and have discussion on is equity. Equity is of course is a priority throughout all of the new administration and the California for All vision and work. As such, it is at the heart of the Master Plan on Aging work as a reminder of it's not just a moral commitment, it is a data driven commitment. If you look at our next slide from our research subcommittee most recent meeting Steve Wallace, professor at UCLA, School of Public Health and also recently presented at the Commission on Aging event in Los Angeles in November, he reminded us of the demographic shift and here you see the lines of Latino elders and non Latino whites crossing and it looks about 2050. But you see that the shift again as the elder population begins to look more like the rest of California in terms of being majority minority to use an outdated term, but it's more than numbers as the next slide or two will show. We also from Professor Wallace talked about the inequities that aging does have different impacts because of cumulative economic and social disparities. And in particular, a higher rate of difficulty dressing, bathing and getting around in the Latino community and Asian community relative to white and African American. And then one more slide

on disparities. The poor and near poor which many of us in California are recognized as equally part of the conversation. When you look at the rates of poverty, the disproportionality among African American, Native American in particular, and then when you broaden to the near poor, Latino, African American, American Indian, Asian American, again disproportionate to White Californians. Against this backdrop, we have been working to center equity work, and I will quickly summarize what CDHP was doing and then turn it over to SAC members, Rigo Saborio and Kevin Prindiville to talk about some other ideas. In progress we have incorporated equity into our framework in our vision and our values. The research subcommittee is centering equity and will be part of the data dashboard, wherever we have race and gender and status and language. Whenever we have that data, we will be presenting that so we can be sure that our goals are serving all Californians, and where we have data gaps, we're going to look at addressing that. We are particularly working to diversify our presenters, and to make sure that our presenters are speaking to equity. For example, at our January SAC, we've invited LA County to share their Purposeful Aging LA initiative and that work includes a lot of inclusion and diversity and language access and community cultural competency that we want to make sure LA shares with us their lessons from that. And then again, as we build out our webinar Wednesdays, making sure we're representing rural communities and Native communities, and LGBTQ and having a variety of voices leading the conversation. I've also been doing some outreach to try to work with leaders in diverse health spaces in particular to see how we can better partner around aging. I've had initial conversations with Black Women's Health Project, California Pan-Ethnic Health Network, and Latino Latino Coalition for Healthy California is scheduled next, not yet happened, but trying to hear from them how the master plan could be meaningful and effective for them. And then again, at CDA, we have work to do and we are fortunate that there's an annual program called the Government Alliance on Race and Equity that we are hoping to get our leadership team I mean, you bring about 15 people from your department to develop skills and leading equity work. And we are beginning with other work on bias as well and looking at our recruiting and staff ongoing training. We are working but a lot is needed, and I am so grateful to Rigo and Kevin for their leadership in this area and their conversation. And with that, I'm going to turn it over to you to talk about your thoughts and I hope my bullet is okay if not you can correct it. I did my best to capture it. But please share with the SAC your thinking

Rigo Saborio 1:06:12

Good morning all. First of all, I want to commend the work that Kim and the team is leading in this area. But we believe that to formalize the equity work a bit more, Kevin and I are proposing that CDA established a Master Plan Equity Advisory work group to ensure that equity issues related to diversity, immigration, limited English proficiency and the disability LGBTQ committees do not get passed over but rather woven into all the recommendations adopted and prioritized. We find it critically important given the demographic shifts and the current data and finally, some other points that Kim just made, that the group be established to ensure through a review process that the recommendations being reviewed take equity into account and positively impact diverse communities, so that we also prevent any unanticipated results. If we don't actually pay intentional attention to this, or have a specific process in place to review the recommendations through this lens. And then that the recommendations regarding equity issues are central to the master plan and not a separate set of recommendations. Its purpose will not be to develop new recommendations but rather serve to review and advise on the recommendations put forth. And we look to this group also to help prioritize utilizing an equity lens, what the evaluation criteria and all that still needs to be scoped out, not unlike some of the other areas that we've talked about, but I think having that framework in place will allow us to do that more effectively and efficiently. And the timing for establishing this group, we believe is ideal as we move into a review of recommendations and the selection of and prioritizing of them at this point. We don't believe that we're late in the game. This is the exact time to actually establish this work group. I'm going to stop there and ask my good friend Kevin to share his thoughts with the group about the formation of this work group. Kevin?

Kevin Prindiville 1:08:44

Thank you Rigo. I want to echo your appreciation of Kim and the Department of Aging for really proactively leading us in this, really thinking about and emphasizing equity in this work. And I also want to reiterate, as Rigo said, this is a both/and proposal. We're working to make sure that equity is interwoven into all of the work to date, and as that goes forward with the work groups and the forums, and our work as a SAC, and the LTSS subcommittee. We need equity to be everywhere. And we think by creating this additional advisory work group we can further emphasize and make sure that we're addressing equity in this plan. As Rigo said and as Kim said, the need for this is clear. These issues are important to the communities we serve. They're important to the communities we live in,

important to the state as a whole. And so, I hope that that's clear. This is an area where our aging advocacy community needs to do this work, to think really critically about the equity issues, that we're addressing to further diversify representation in our organizations, in both the people we serve and the people that work in our in our organizations, the people that are representing the needs of older adults across the state. I think this is a really great opportunity for our sector, our community to really continue to grow and learn and do more in the space. Some specific activities that we talked about that this advisory work group could take on include helping CDA identify and reach out to organizations representing diverse communities that we want engaged in this planning process, helping CDA identify speakers that could be part of the forums as Kim talked about, developing equity centered questions for presenters at the forums and at SAC meetings to respond to in their presentations, maybe also some equity considerations as we move into this process where we're prioritizing the money recommendations. This advisory group can really work to make sure equity is really at the center of what we're developing instead of something that gets passed over or only brought in at the very end. We're excited about this opportunity. We think it's a wonderful complement to what CDA and many of you all have already been doing on these issues, and we think it would really add a lot of value to our process.

Kim McCoy Wade 1:11:30

Thank you, Kevin and Rigo. I'd like to open up the group. Nelson, can you tell us who's in the queue?

Nelson Sheya 1:11:44

Eric, you're unmuted.

Eric 1:11:47

Hey, thank you. I just want to echo what Rigo and Kevin just mentioned, I think this is really crucial. Especially, I came from the space of former director of Triple H San Francisco and also working for the Administration for Community Living, I have seen the urgency to really, have this kind of discussion and work group. For example, when I was in San Francisco, we spent a lot of time working with the Human Rights Commission to look at ways for how we can bring more resources to the LGBTQ community in a city. And through that work we were able to locate more resources and be able to fund vital services for LGBTQ. At a statewide level I think this is crucial for us to look at this as well. I am in strong support of the proposal

brought forward to CDA. I also want to mention that in this space, we need to also pay attention to American Indians, Native Americans, because I might sound like a broken record, but I haven't seen much done in this space in the state. That being said, I'm in strong support of this proposal. Thank you.

Nelson Sheya 1:13:20

Alright, next we have Marty Lynch, followed by Nina if you want to speak.

Marty Lynch 1:13:28

Kim, thanks for putting the poverty data upfront. And Kevin and Rigo. I think really important point. I know the administration has said that it wants to make sure we develop a plan for all older Californians. And so, matter of fact, I've been putting some energy into the Medicare space, in addition to the dual space, that sort of thing in the MediCal space. But I think I'm just struck by the data that says that the health and disability or the chronic health and disability issues, also for especially minority elders, African American women are just a classic example of having huge high disability and chronic health issues, numbers even beyond the poverty numbers. And it just points to the fact that we have a higher bar to reach or higher responsibility when it comes to this equity question. I'm really glad that you guys put this forward. I'm totally in support. Thank you.

Nelson Sheya 1:14:34

Okay, Nina.

Nina Weiler-Harwell, PhD 1:14:36

Hi, I just a really brief comment. Good morning, Nina Weiler-Harwell, AARP just for all the reasons previously stated we fully support and thank you Rigo and Kevin for taking the lead on this and we look forward to how we can contribute to this work.

Nelson Sheya 1:14:55

Great. Next we have Cheryl Brown, followed by Catherine Blakemore.

Cheryl Brown 1:15:11

I just wanted to agree with Rigo and Kevin and I wanted to make sure that I'm part of that proposal. I have had some people to speak to me. There's one African American women's group up in Sacramento that wants to make sure that we are included in this whole process. I think that that would be a

great addition for me to take on. If you'll give me a call, let's get together. Thank you.

Nelson Sheya 1:15:45

All right, Catherine. You're unmuted.

Catherine Blakemore 1:16:21

I just wanted to say that this is an issue of great importance for Disability Rights California. We support both of the recommendations. We've done a lot of work internally to ensure that our staff reflects the diversity of California. We've also done a lot of work with other state agencies about looking at disparities and how service dollars are spent, and I think one of the most critical things to add to this discussion, and I'm certainly happy to help is, how we begin to collect and utilize data to tell us how we're addressing equity issues. Thank you to Kim and Kevin and Rigo for the opportunity to discuss this important issue.

Kim McCoy Wade 1:17:13

Any other folks in the queue Nelson?

Nelson Sheya 1:17:16

No, that's it for right now.

Kim McCoy Wade 1:17:19

Well, I hear strong support to do it. And I hear at least two volunteers Cheryl and Catherine to assist Rigo and Kevin and the CDA team and figuring out how to do it. So why don't we take that assignment and also come back to January 21st with a more fleshed out proposal. Kevin and Rigo, how does that sound to you? Sorry, Nelson, can you unmute Kevin and Rigo and let them weigh in with that summary works for them.

Nelson Sheya 1:18:00

Alright, they're unmuted.

Kevin Prindiville 1:18:03

Yes, that sounds great. Thank you very much, everyone.

Kim McCoy Wade 1:18:14

Okay. We've got some action items that I'm hearing, we will work on the overall SAC process with the folks who volunteered and the equity work

group advisory council initiative with the folks who volunteered, and otherwise follow up. But I think it is time now to open for public comment if I'm not mistaken. And Nelson, I'll let you lead us through that logistics.

Nelson Sheya 1:18:43

Fantastic. Folks on the call, please click the raise hand button and you can get into the queue right now we have five members. We're going to open it up with Lydia. I will unmute you, give me one moment.

Kim McCoy Wade 1:18:58

And while you're unmuting folks, I'll remind people that we would ask you to try to do a minute, this is a 90-minute meeting so if you can possibly do a minute, we appreciate that and of course the other channels of email, at engage are always open to you. So thanks so much. Here we go.

Nelson Sheya 1:19:17

And Lydia, you're live. Maybe we lost you there. Okay next in the queue we have Peggy. All right, Peggy looks like I'm not able to unmute your line, we're going to move on. Marty Omoto had a comment earlier. I will unmute your line Marty.

Kim McCoy Wade 1:20:36

Nelson, if that's not working, can you just unmute everyone blind and just call on people and we'll have to ask everyone to be on their best behavior. But if there are other solutions we can come up with and again, everyone thank you for your patience as this is our first time using the Zoom technology and the CDA IT infrastructure so we're all learning together.

Nelson Sheya 1:20:56

Thank you, Kim. I don't have this functionality to unmute everyone at the same time, it's on an individual basis, unfortunately. I'm having issues unmuting Marty and Peggy. But looks like Betsy, I'm going to move you up to the top of the queue. Let's see if I can unmute you.

Betsy Butler 1:21:20

Hello. I just want to thank Rigo and Kevin and Kim for underscoring the importance of equity. However I can assist I'm more than willing and will bend over backwards to help however I can, because it's such a clear priority for the state of California.

Kim McCoy Wade 1:21:46

Thank you, Betsy. And the partnership with the Commission on Aging under your leadership is central to this work. Thank you so much for that additional, additional and continuing and deepening partnership.

Betsy Butler 1:21:57

Thank you.

Kim McCoy Wade 1:22:01

Alright, looks like that's the end of queue for now, the other folks I wasn't able to unmute I apologize for that issue. We'll get that figured out for our next webinar. Thank you. Ellen can you look at the engage email and see if you've got any comments that are relevant to this call?

Ellen Goodwin 1:22:22

I don't have any at the moment Kim.

Kim McCoy Wade 1:22:29

Well commenters we apologize if you have been trying to get in especially the few of you Lydia, the five of you can raise your hands, if you do want to submit your comments and writing we will be sure to share them with that and take them going forward.

Nelson Sheya

It looks like Kim, two more popped in the queue. Let's take care of them.

Kim McCoy Wade

Let's give them a try. Yes please.

Nelson Sheya 1:22:49

Looks like Jeffrey, you are unmuted.

Jeffrey 1:23:14

Jeff, advocate. Just a reminder, please put together a calendar because there are so many meetings and other focuses as well. From time sheets to the other things for IHSS to what it's evolving to, but also the further issues coming up such as scams, law enforcement. I've spent the last two years having to reinvigorate law enforcement about understanding senior scenarios because that had not been in posts or anything else. That's my comment for today, I will continue to listen in. And I will try to bring other

groups, health care for all, and other things and involve them. But hey, we're working on Zoom. Maybe a little tool on using zoom would help us all.

Kim McCoy Wade 1:24:29

Thank you, all great ideas. Yes.

Nelson Sheya 1:24:35

Next in the queue, we have Paula.

Paula Acosta 1:24:39

Hi, is my microphone working?

Nelson Sheya 1:24:41

You're live. Yes.

Paula Acosta 1:24:43

Oh, great. Just a short comment about the process, back to your discussion about process. Undoubtedly, we're going to come across competing priorities where one recommendation might be a well-needed technical recommendation whereas a cost containment recommendation about that same program or aspect of the plan may bump it up to a different priority.

Nelson Sheya 1:25:18

Great, thank you. We're going to move back to Lydia, it looks like her speakers are working. I'll unmute your line. Lydia, can you hear us? Make sure you unmute your phone Lydia so we can hear you speak. Well, that's the end of the queue for public comments. Thank you all.

Kim McCoy Wade 1:25:59

Okay. We will work on improving that, including tips for public comment. This is clearly was the hard part. It was a new technology. But thank you for your patience. Again, Lydia and those of you who weren't able to comment, please do reach out and we'll be sure we hear from you. Thank you all. Action items, we've got them to prepare for a robust January meeting. But I want to definitely say we are going to do our best to leave you alone the next couple of weeks as you all I hope, have a chance to celebrate the holidays that you observe and get some rest and be with your loved ones. And come back in the New Year ready to get back at it. Thank you for

sharing all of the gifts that you bring with us and all the best for a wonderful holiday and New Year. Talk to you in 2020.