



MILWAUKEE COUNTY
Department on Aging

**Milwaukee County Commission on Aging
Aging Advisory Council Meeting
December 3, 2019**

The Advisory Council held an extraordinary meeting on Tuesday, December 3, 2019, at the Marcia Coggs Human Services Building, Room 104, 1220 W. Vliet St., Milwaukee, WI 53205.

Members Present:

Commissioner Bettie Rodgers, Chair
Judy Troestler, Vice Chair
Commissioner Debra Jupka
Barbara Bechtel
Ruth Bevenue
David Hoffman
Krystina Kohler
Sally Lindner (by telephone)

Commissioners Present:

Commissioner John Griffith
Commissioner Richmond Izard
Commissioner Cesar Pabon
Commissioner Shirley Sharp

Advocacy Committee Members Present:

Casper Green
Alice Pugh

Staff Present:

Andy Bethke, MCDA Outreach Worker
Dan Idzikowski, MCDA Program & Policy Coord.
Wes Albinger, MCDA Program & Planning Coord.
Pam Matthews, Policy & Budget Analyst MC DOA

Attendees from the Public

None.

MINUTES

I. Meeting called to order at 1:05 PM by Chair Rodgers.

Attendance was taken verbally and documented on a sign-in sheet.

II. Review and Approval of meeting minutes from November 14, 2019.

MOTION: Approve Minutes of the November 14, 2019 Advisory Council as presented.

ACTION: Motion passes unanimous (Green, Troestler seconds).

III. Recommendations and next steps regarding future of Milwaukee County senior centers.

Idzikowski notes changes were made to the draft report "Envisioning the Future, Senior Centers 2020":

- Recommendations were drafted and added to the last section based upon the Council's discussion during the past two meetings.
- Charts were added with additional clarifying language in Section III regarding capital needs identified for each Milwaukee County senior center in the Phase I assessment and capital investments approved by the Milwaukee County Board in the Board's 2020 five-year capital plan.

Casper asks whether provision has been made by the County Board for meeting the needs necessary to maintain the existing Milwaukee County senior centers, or to expand the senior centers in other locations of the county, such as Franklin? Discussion follows regarding funding sufficiency and the lack of senior centers in certain areas of the county.

Rodgers indicates that perhaps another model is needed, not necessarily building new senior centers as they exist today. Jupka notes that we might partner and dovetail with other projects in the County.

Griffith points out the maps on page four of the draft report and states that any plan must address how to serve areas where seniors are concentrated, particularly in the suburbs. States we should try to partner with the philanthropic community to develop new centers.

Asks whether the County is pursuing this now? Jupka notes a lack of agency staff. Reminds members of the Granville center that closed about 12 years ago.

Lindner states we need to pursue other funding opportunities such as philanthropic support from professional sports teams.

Griffith states we should invite philanthropic entities in to meet with us and present this report.

Jupka notes there is a lot of development on MLK Drive – and the facility with the greatest need is Clinton Rose.

Kohler notes that we need to develop a clear plan before we ask for philanthropic support. Look at partnerships such as affordable housing, businesses, to supplement the funding. If a plan was developed, Kohler would be willing to assist in approaching funders for support.

Jupka states several areas of the county are being developed now. We need a separate committee dedicated to this process. There also needs to be a conversation between the City and County.

Lindner, Milwaukee County might not be able to hire a new person, what about existing staff member?

Pugh asks about the recommendation made earlier to add a staff person? Wasn't County Supervisor Haas told that this was the job of the vendor, SOA? We need to be savvy about how we move forward. We don't want to make recommendations that are already in place.

Jupka states there needs to be coordination between committees.

Bechtel notes the Council is getting off base. Need to look at these recommendations. It is very difficult to seek additional funding. We need a plan, because there might not be a need in some locations, and it would be a waste to focus on areas where there is not a need.

Griffith states that access to the centers is critical and we should approach MCTS about this.

Idzikowski recommends reviewing the recommendations as written in turn and make any changes the Council deems warranted.

MOTION: The Council will review each recommendation as written in turn and strike, modify, and/or approve or amend. Make new recommendations after this review.

ACTION: Motion passes unanimously (Bechtel moves, Jupka seconds).

Izard states we should look at this report from the perspectives of 1) buildings and 2) programs. What can we do to sustain what we are doing now, before we look at doing something new?

Lindner reminds that the Brewers tax is being eliminated. Can we use a tax to support the senior centers?

Bevenue asks, with regard to recommendation #5, can we be very specific in terms of transportation?

Chair Rodgers redirects the Council to consider the recommendations in turn.

Recommendation # 1:

MOTION: Accept recommendation #1 with a modification: strike phrase “tax levy”.

ACTION: Motion passes unanimously (Hoffman, Green seconds).

Recommendation #2:

MOTION: Accept recommendation #2, add clarifying language explaining the Fair Deal initiative.

ACTION: Motion passes unanimously (Kohler, Griffith seconds).

Recommendation #3:

Green brings up idea of hiring or contracting for a grant writer. Billions of dollars available.

Griffith states that this idea is contained in Recommendation #10.

Bechtel asks whether we need to leave the word “five” in #3.

Green states that there is not enough funding in the county budget to support the existing five senior centers and their capital needs have been neglected.

MOTION: Motion to approve recommendation #3

Bevenue offers amendment to add language “to promote equity of services and activities in all senior centers.” Hoffman accepts friendly amendment.

ACTION: Motion passes, Green opposes (Hoffman, Griffith seconds).

Recommendation # 4:

MOTION: Combine recommendations #4 & #6 and approve.

ACTION: Motion passes unanimously (Griffith, Hoffman seconds).

Recommendation #5:

Griffith likes the idea of bus access. There has to be a way to get people to the door. Griffith suggests striking the words “transportation alternatives.”

Idzikowski notes that not all residents can utilize the bus system. Matthews suggests changing the word “or” to “and”.

Bevenue suggests establishing senior center parking lots as “park and rides”. Lindner comments about health care systems that have direct transportation to their facilities. Iazard states that there are other factors and costs to consider, for example the weight of busses. Lindner reminds the group that there has already been a transit plan proposed to reduce stops. Need to focus on ADA accessibility.

MOTION: Change recommendation #5 to read: "Address access to senior centers by establishing Milwaukee County transit stops at each Milwaukee County senior center and adding other up to the door transportation, as well as ensuring ADA accessibility standards are met at all centers.

ACTION: Motion passes unanimously (Griffith, Sharp seconds).

Rodgers excuses herself, turns chair over to Troestler.

Recommendation # 7:

Lindner asks: Do we need to have another committee?

Bevenue: Did we not recommend that there be representatives from each of the senior centers on the Commission on Aging?

Idzikowski clarifies that this was the suggestion of Commission on Aging chair Barbara Wyatt Sibley, but no such persons were appointed to the Commission. This recommendation is to ask the Commission to establish a separate committee devoted to prioritizing and implementing the ideas contained in this report and the senior center assessment process.

Izard asks whether the Advisory Council just establish a separate committee by itself.

Idzikowski clarifies that a formal committee can only be established by the Commission.

MOTION: Accept recommendation #7 and combine with recommendations # 8 and #9.

ACTION: Motion passes unanimously (Hoffman, Bechtel).

Recommendation # 10:

Hoffman notes we should approve #10, with the word "grant" underlined to address Green's concerns.

Griffith states that the motion is broader than grant writing. That is just one duty.

Green asks whether we want to recommend hiring a staff person or change that to reflect that it might not be a staff person.

Griffith recommends clarifying the recommendation by splitting it up with responsibilities listed.

MOTION: Accept recommendation #10, include the words "or independent contractor" and clarify responsibilities by splitting them out separately.

ACTION: Motion passes unanimously (Hoffman, Bechtel).

IV. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 3:05 PM.

MOTION: Adjourn the meeting.

ACTION: Motion passes unanimously (Bechtel, Pugh seconds).

Respectfully submitted,
Dan Idzikowski, Program and Policy Coordinator