Overview

By 2040, half our population will be under 18 and over 65. How can cities adopt planning processes to meet the diverse needs of multiple generations, helping older adults age in place while keeping young families in your community? What types of infrastructure and housing make a city livable for multiple generations? How might cities promote civic engagement across generations?

Materials


“Lifelong Communities Handbook: Creating Opportunities for Lifelong Living,” Atlanta Regional Commission.

Somerville info sheet, provided by Janice Delory, City of Somerville, MA


Speakers

**Mayor Joseph A. Curtatone**, first elected in November of 2003, began his fifth term as Mayor of Somerville on January 2, 2012. He had previously served for eight years as an Alderman at Large. He earned his B.A. from Boston College in 1990, and a J.D. from New England School of Law in 1994. Prior to his election as mayor, he had served as an attorney in private practice.

As Mayor, he has successfully implemented a wide range of reforms and new programs that have earned Somerville many distinctions by regional and national organizations, including the designation by Boston Globe Magazine as “the best-run city in Massachusetts,” by America's Promise Alliance as one of the "100 Best Communities for Youth," and a winner of the 2009 "All America City" competition.

Mayor Curtatone established a policy advisory commission to develop a comprehensive reform agenda for the Somerville Police. He created Neighborhood Impact Teams that combine fire, health and building inspectors – along with representatives of the Council on Aging and the city's environmental office – in a coordinated effort to monitor and improve the health, safety and appearance of Somerville’s businesses and residential neighborhoods. After inheriting a government in fiscal crisis, he has stabilized city finances and begun a restoration of lost city services and personnel cuts that occurred before he took office – and he led a successful effort to end years of delay in the development of Assembly Square as a transit-oriented, mixed use, Smart Growth project on the banks of the Mystic River.

In 2006, Somerville became the first city in America to offer both a 311 constituent service center and Connect CTY mass notification technology. By calling 311 from any phone in the city, Somerville residents and businesses can now access information and services from any city department and can track progress on service requests through a publicly accessible work-order system. Under his leadership, Somerville has also earned national recognition for its successful joint effort with Tufts University to implement “Shape Up Somerville,” an effective program to reduce the incidence of childhood obesity among the city’s elementary school children. He serves as the President of the Massachusetts Mayor’s Association, a position on the Board of Directors for the National League of Cities, and as a member of the Metropolitan Mayors Association.

**Laura Keyes**, a certified-AICP Planner, works for the Atlanta Regional Commission in the fields of transportation, housing and aging. She manages Community Development for ARC’s Lifelong Communities Initiative. She holds a BS from the University of Michigan, a MS from Michigan State University and a Certificate in Aging through the Institute for Geriatric Social Work from the Boston
University School of Social Work. She is a graduate of both the Regional Leadership Institute’s Class of 2010 and Leadership DeKalb’s Class of 2012 and is the current President for the Georgia Planning Association. She recently published her work on Lifelong Communities in Atlanta in the Journal of Physical and Occupational Therapy in Geriatrics.

Dr. Mildred E. Warner is a Professor in the Department of City and Regional Planning at Cornell University where her work focuses primarily on local government service delivery, economic development and planning across generations. Dr. Warner's research explores the impact of privatization and devolution on local government and the role of human services as part of the social infrastructure for economic development. Her work shows potential for market based solutions in public service delivery but also raises cautions about the uneven incidence of market approaches in depressed inner city and rural areas. Her work on planning across generations explores new community development models for addressing human services and linking the needs of children and elders.

Dr. Warner has a strong extension orientation and consults widely with local government and union leaders on local government reform, and with child care policy makers and business leaders on economic development strategies to support social infrastructure. She is a Research Affiliated Scholar with the Institute for Women’s Policy Research and a Research Associate with the Economic Policy Institute in Washington, DC where she spent her sabbatical in 2005. Prior to her professorship at Cornell, she served as a program officer with the Ford Foundation in NYC and as Associate Director of Cornell's Community and Rural Development Institute.

Dr. Warner has a Ph.D. in Development Sociology, a Masters in Agricultural Economics from Cornell University and a BA in History from Oberlin College.
Multi-generational community planning: Linking the needs of children and older adults
by Mildred Warner, George Homisy, and Esther Greenhouse
Department of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University
April 2010

America is undergoing a critical demographic transition: the population is aging. By 2040, the proportion of people over the age of 65 will top 20 percent. At the same time, people under the age of 18 will make up almost 23 percent of the population. The oldest and the youngest citizens will make up almost half of U.S. residents.

The generations are turning out to be different in numerous ways. Not only age sets them apart; the difference is also ethnicity. The earlier generations are predominantly white, while the younger ones are not – most are born in the United States, but they represent a wide variety of cultures. Asians and Hispanics are the two fastest growing ethnic groups and young families of all ethnicities are crucial to America’s future (Myers 2007).

The generations are linked economically. Younger workers of all backgrounds are needed to fill looming economic gaps and prevent a series of crises demographers expect over the next two decades. As baby boomers continue to reach retirement age, the number of younger workers available to pay the taxes that support entitlements, such as Social Security and Medicare, will decline (Myers 2007). Natural births in the United States

Commentary by Dr. Rodney Harrell, AARP Public Policy Institute

Livable communities have physical and social features that benefit people of all ages, including older persons, children and families. When a wide range of needs is addressed, families and individuals have the option to stay and thrive in their communities as they age.

AARP defines a livable community as one that is safe and provides affordable, appropriate housing, adequate transportation, and supportive community features and services. Older persons, as well as children and parents, benefit from compact development that shortens distances to key amenities and complete streets that support a variety of transportation options.

It is important to recognize that general policies have benefits across different age groups. For example, the 2002 APA Policy Guide on Smart Growth, supports “compact, transit accessible, pedestrian-oriented, mixed use development patterns” along with transportation choice and human-scale mixed use centers. These smart growth strategies benefit older persons with limited mobility as well as children, teens and families. In addition, many programs and policies targeted at older persons or children have multi-generational benefits. For example, the support of universal design and visitability standards in the 2006 APA Policy Guide on Housing is good for older persons and those with physical disabilities and makes it easier for parents to care for children.

Communities that are built to address the needs of older persons and families are communities that can serve all residents well. But planners must make the connections between young and old before they can start to plan for them. This issue brief begins the important discussion of how planners can create family-friendly communities that benefit all ages.

This research was made possible with funding from the W.K. Kellogg and Peppercorn Foundations and conducted in collaboration with the American Planning Association, AARP, and the Cornell University Linking Economic Development and Child Care Project. Additional issue briefs and case studies on multi-generational planning can be found at www.mildredwarner.org.
are far below replacement rate. Without an influx of new workers and their families from other nations, the benefits promised to older adults may have to be cut or taxes rise.

This slowing growth rate in the American workforce will become a drag on the nation’s economic growth. Growth requires more workers or squeezing more efficiency out of existing workers. With fewer workers in the future, growth in the nation’s gross domestic product is expected to slow (Myers 2008).

Workforce changes will be particularly prominent in the care sector, especially nurses and aides for child care, home health care, and hospitals. Demand for care workers will escalate as the demand for care increases due to aging baby boomers. Across all occupations, the decade of the 2020s will see shortages as baby boomer retirements peak.

However, many of our young families and children, especially immigrants, are not receiving the training necessary to fill these jobs. Failure to invest in the education of the next generation creates an economic divide between the young and the old and creates challenges for our cities. This is why leading business and economic development groups are calling for increased investment in young children (CED 2006).

These changes directly affect planners. For example, as baby boomers seek to downsize, there will be a flood of homes on the market. Not only will there be a fewer young families looking to buy homes, but many of those will not have the income to support mortgages on large suburban homes (Myers 2008).

This analysis shows that communities need to focus planning efforts on the design and provision of services for young families and children as well as older adults. No generation can be left out. The recruitment of young families, including immigrants, is necessary for long-term community sustainability as well as for the fiscal health of the nation. It requires cross-generational collaboration, comprehensive thinking by planners, and openness to immigrants on the part of citizens.

Currently most local efforts to appeal to the younger generation focus on the needs of young professionals – Richard Florida’s (2002) famous “creative class” – and often do not take into account the needs of families with young children. Yet all generations are linked by the need for safe, walkable communities and adequate public transit as well as access to good schools, healthy food, quality child care, and senior services. Downtown vibrancy, historic character, and urban amenities attract single professionals and empty nesters, but attention should also be given to the components of city living which attract young, economically active families – play space, family-sized housing, nearby child care, etc. Indeed Richard Florida’s most recent book argues that families contribute to city prosperity and cities need to plan so that they are attractive to families as well (Florida 2008).

According to a 2008 survey by Cornell University and the American Planning Association, nine out of ten planners understand that communities populated by people of every age bracket are more vibrant, and about two-thirds recognize the connection between the needs of older adults and those of families with young children. The problem, the survey found, is translating this understanding of multi-generational communities into action on the ground (Israel and Warner 2008).

Multi-generational planning runs into three challenges. First, many public officials see children and younger immigrants as financial burdens to a community, especially in terms of schools. Second, parents with young children put in long hours at home and work making them less likely to be politically active than older adults. Third, the public remains sharply divided over immigration with only 42 percent recognizing how immigrants strengthen U.S. society (Pew Research Center 2006).

Planners must begin to create programs and policies to foster family-friendly communities for all generations and ethnicities. Weathering the demographic changes ahead requires people to think deliberately about working multi-generationally when developing
plans and policies. This brief elaborates on three key points to move in that direction.

First, the demographic transition creates new opportunities for coalitions and collaboration across generations. Second, civic participation will enhance political support and promote community building. Third, planning plays a central role in creating systems that serve residents of all generations. Housing, zoning, transportation, and service provision are critical to building a sustainable multi-generational community.

Key Point #1 Demographic change creates the opportunities to build new coalitions.

Older people and young families share many important priorities and issues within a community—physically, socially, and culturally. For example, a safe, well-maintained sidewalk benefits older adults desiring exercise or who no longer drive. At the same time it helps a young mother pushing a stroller or a child learning to ride a bicycle. Strong schools are needed to train the young to be the workforce that will keep the economy moving forward. And quality child care ensures success in school.

One problem within communities is that different population groups do not always recognize their reliance on one another. A Cornell University / APA survey of planners found that the biggest barrier to creation of a family-friendly community is NIMBYism (Israel and Warner 2008). With each age segment defending its perceived narrow position, there are many missed opportunities and wasted resources.

Older citizens, with their increased level of involvement in community affairs and politics, are particularly well positioned to build connections and support younger families upon which they ultimately rely.

Unfortunately, most programs for older adults have been built on the notion of age segregation—in services, in housing, and even in transportation. Yet recent research by AARP has shown that most aging Americans do not want to live in communities separate from younger people. A 2000 survey of adults over 55 found that 89 percent would like to stay in their current residence as long as possible (Bayer and Harper 2000).

Just as importantly, demographic analysis shows that more households will host three generations of a family. In 2000, the U.S. Census found 5.8 million grandparents living in the same home as their grandchildren with 2.4 million of those older adults acting as the heads of the households. Most of those older adults were responsible for their grandchildren for five years or more. The trend is particularly strong among Latino households, which make up an increasing part of the population (Simmons and Dye 2003).

Aging in place requires programs that break down age-segregated barriers. Huntington Beach, California developed a comprehensive plan to transform a 23-acre site originally intended for single-family homes into a multi-generational neighborhood with affordable homes to fit different lifestyles and stages. The Gen M 2345 team, which stands for the multiple (2, 3, 4 or 5) generations that might live together, designed a neighborhood with a mix of town homes and carriage houses which could accommodate home based businesses and young families, downsizing baby boomers, their aging parents, and their boomerang adult children. The program won the Gold Nugget Award for architectural design excellence in 2009 (www.martin-associates.net).

A similar effort is occurring on a former Air Force base in central Illinois, where older adults live in close community with families of at-risk foster children. These older adults build close relationships with the young families. That support allows the older adults to age in place and helps the families with broader community support for the children. The creators of Hope Meadows are working with 12 sites around the country to duplicate their success (Eheart et al. 2009).

Another example of a multi-generational strategy is found in Denver where young professionals want to age in place as they have children. Kiddo, Kids in Downtown Denver Organized, is a group to improve livability for families in downtown. Their goals include: creating intergenerational programs as well as advocating for more
play areas and services for children downtown. They
develop education programs for home owners
associations, neighborhoods, and civic leaders to unite
generations over a common development agenda.

Planners need to craft a common vision that
recognizes the interdependence of the generations.
Planners could use public meetings as well as
comprehensive and neighborhood plans to emphasize
the connections and help older adults understand that
their political power can shape communities to be more
supportive of children and young parents. Such changes,
in turn, will help older adults build a quality and
comfortable community in which they can age in place.

Key Point #2 Civic participation and engagement are key.

Planners know the importance of citizen
involvement to a healthy community – especially when
the community receives input from different generations.
Long-time residents have the history of place that can
help ground a particular planning project. At the same
time, newcomers can provide fresh perspectives.

Children have their own kind of wisdom, and
studies have shown, a work ethic to back it up. Youth
involved in planning projects take active roles in
gathering data, surveying neighborhoods and relaying
their findings. And they seek to tackle a broad range of
community challenges, not just those focused on young
people (Frank 2006). However, it is important to bring the
generations together and not just meet with older adults
at the senior center and kids in the school.

Remaining active civically helps older adults live
longer, healthier, and happier lives. Research shows a
positive association between engaging in civic activities
and better health in later life (Hinterlong, Morrow-
Howell, and Rozario 2007). Participation provides the
opportunity to give back to the community. The younger
end of the spectrum benefits as well. A public planning
process fosters local knowledge and environmental
responsibility in children and promotes personal
development and citizenship (Frank 2006).

A “Futures Festival” workshop format can
increase public participation. The process engages youths
and older adults together through murals, models,
photographs, theatrical displays and other
communications media. The strategy brought young and
old together in Kaneohe, Hawaii to work out conflicting
visions for a local park. By the session’s end, the
participants modeled a “park for all ages” that included
areas for skateboarding, shuffleboard and picnics as well
as a Braille trail (Kaplan 2001).

As part of the 2020 Community Plan on Aging in
the Charlottesville, Virginia area, planners decided to
intentionally be age inclusive. High school students were
recruited as members of the planning committee. They
acted as ambassadors to other young people through focus
groups and student surveys. In the end, the high schoolers
wrote a chapter of the plan titled “Strengthening
Intergenerational Connections” with recommendations that
included: recruiting students as healthcare workers;
encouraging alternative transportation options; promoting
intergenerational volunteering to bring together older adults
and youth in meaningful service; and educating youth on
the need for lifelong financial planning. One outcome of this
intergenerational planning was a program that recruited
more than 20 older adults to volunteer in seven elementary
schools to tutor reading, math and languages as well as
provide library and landscaping assistance.

Key Point #3 Community planning must include
comprehensive services and designs for all ages.

Older citizens and families with young children
share many common interests and concerns. The key
community components that older adults need to
successfully age in place are the same as those needed by
families with young children. These include affordable housing, adequate transportation options, and safe, walkable neighborhoods with a complete range of services (child care, senior centers, parks, food stores, health care, etc.) nearby. It also means an opportunity for civic engagement (Lynott et al. 2009). In short, if we begin to redesign our cities to meet the needs of the aging baby boomers who do not wish to be shuffled off to enclaves for only older adults, then we will at the same time build communities that attend better to the needs of families with young children.

A multigenerational design

Exercise is a good place to start. Half of adults over 50 do not get recommended levels of physical activity. For those over 65, two-thirds do not get the exercise they need. As a result, nearly eight out of ten men and seven out of ten women over 60 are overweight with about one-third considered obese (Flegal et al. 2010). Since the late 1970s, the rate of obesity has more than doubled for children aged two to five to 10.4 percent. For those aged six to 11, the rate of obesity tripled to 19.6 percent and for teenagers obesity jumped from five percent to over 18 percent (Centers for Disease Control 2010).

To combat the problem, AARP implemented two pilot programs in Richmond, Virginia and Madison, Wisconsin to increase activity by improving the physical environment in places where both students and older adults walk. The programs also conducted a social marketing campaign that raised awareness of the environmental barriers to walking and biking; conducted audits of 150 city blocks in Richmond and 30 residential streets in Madison; and crafted a plan of changes to policies and environments in each city.

The organizers intentionally targeted programs and places that would help both older adults and school kids. In Richmond an intergenerational “Walk to School” event promoted the idea of getting relatives over 50 to walk children to school. The school district changed its policy to allow students to document their walking routes to school for future organized events. Many sidewalks, crosswalks and intersections were repaired around town, especially near the schools and senior housing (Emery, Crump, and Hawkins 2007).

Physical barriers to mobility also exist inside many homes. Universal design standards improve the livability of homes for older adults, families with young children, and people with limited mobility. Designs are based on a series of principles including equity, flexibility, simplicity, easy perception of information, and tolerance for error. Strategies include wide interior doorways and hallways, entranceways without stairs, clear lines of sight, well-marked HVAC and other home controls, and lower kitchen work area heights so a person in a wheelchair or a child can help prepare meals. The goal is to make homes easier for people to live in at little or no extra cost.

The zoning in many communities does not allow accessory apartments in many neighborhoods. Such small, self-contained units offer the ability to keep both ends of the extended family together. Grandparents or returning children can have their private spaces, but be available to help with child care or care for older adults.

Many communities fear that allowing such accessory units would overwhelm single-family neighborhoods, but that may not be the case. Seattle saw only 101 accessory unit additions throughout the entire city over a 3½-year span after a zoning change allowed people of any age to add apartments. (It is believed that many of those units existed earlier, but were legalized.) Many of the homeowners who added the apartments were middle-aged, yet their tenants tended to be from the older and younger generations – broadening the age diversity in a community. In one study, 35 percent of respondents reported exchanging some kind of assistance between the main and accessory households. When older adults lived in the accessory apartment, the amount of help that flowed between the households increased dramatically (Chapman and Howe 2001).

Providing comprehensive services

Sometimes the opportunity for a multigenerational program takes care of related community problems. In Scottsdale, Arizona, code enforcement officers, who spotted yard or building violations on the homes of older adults, referred the cases to Scottsdale Teens on a Mission for Progress, which coordinated teen volunteers to help with yard work and minor home repairs. The program paid the young workers $8.50 an hour and trained them with basic yard maintenance and job skills. Overall, 183 older homeowners or homeowners with limited mobility had their code violations fixed, retained their living independence, and built a positive relationship with
teenagers. Through the program, the city also connected older adults with other needed services. From 2005 to 2009, the community benefited in terms of neighborhood pride and enhancement and increased collaboration among municipal departments.

There are many reasons from a planner’s perspective that neighborhood schools are better for students: the potential for pedestrian and bicycle access; the promotion of local safety and security; tighter community connections; and the encouragement of strong parental involvement. These benefits also can accrue to other members of the community, especially older adults who could use the building for meals or recreations. They could also assist with instruction and other school activities (Schools for Successful Communities: An Element of Smart Growth 2004).

Child care and care for older adults can be co-located. In Ithaca, New York, a local Head Start program is permanently housed at a retirement community. Each week, the older adults work with pre-schoolers on a variety of activities such as reading, singing, and crafts. The intergenerational program (which includes bowling and a choir) allows older people to participate in the mentorship of young community members. Studies of such structured interaction between young children and older adults show children become more helpful, empathize with older people, and develop better self-control as a result (Femia et al. 2008).

Access to fresh food is also a concern. In New York City, the school department teamed with the Department of Aging to transport older New Yorkers from senior centers to supermarkets as well as museums, parks, and other public places. The program uses school buses when they are not transporting children. For older adults, the trips are free. The multigenerational bus strategy took planning and coordination between two New York City bureaucracies. It also took vision to realize that the two departments with distinct missions and target populations had a shared problem. By tackling that problem together, they found a way to make more efficient use of a large investment – the buses. Such a strategy would be even more valuable in many suburban and rural places where public transit is poor. Rural Chenango County, New York combined funds for paratransit services for older adults and those with disabilities, medicaid transit, and meals on wheels transit to form the core of a broader public transit system that serves users of all ages (Ray 1993).

Conclusion

Dowell Myers (2007) talks about the need for an intergenerational social contract. The new pressures of an aging society require that we recognize the shared economic and community issues faced by different generations and across different ethnicities. In this brief, we have discussed ways that such a mindset has started to germinate.

Still, the change will be no easy task. There are deep divides based upon inaccurate cultural stereotypes, economic inequities, and fear. Mistaken positions lead to selfish and short sighted decision making. Our nation cannot afford to remain so narrowly focused. Our communities can take the lead by building new conversations, coalitions, and shared strategies that link generations and build more sustainable communities.

Planners must be at the forefront of overcoming these challenges and educating residents about the benefits of broader thinking. Comprehensive planning must be expanded to encompass multiple generations and identify those issues that can bring the interests of the generations together. Strategies, such as those that emphasize the design of safe, walkable communities; the convenient location (and co-location) of adequate and quality child care and senior services; and universal accessibility in building codes, are important steps. However, real progress will come when the attitudes of planners, political leaders, and the general public shift to the realization that communities are more sustainable if generations work together.
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Planners and local government officials should give more attention to the economic benefits of families with children. While some strategies for economic development have included marketing cities as retirement destinations for wealthy adults (grey gold) or as creative hot-beds for young talent (creative class), vibrant communities need people of all ages for long-term economic stability.

**FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN PROVIDE A CRITICAL GENERATIONAL BALANCE**

A 2008 American Planning Association (APA) survey of practicing planners found that 97 percent of responding planners agree that families with children are important to community growth, sustainability and diversity, and 90 percent agree that communities that keep residents for the whole life cycle are more vibrant (Israel and Warner 2008). While popular strategies for economic development have targeted young professionals and empty nesters, it is time to give more attention to meeting the needs of families with young children. Why – because demographic transformation is leading to a smaller pool of young people, and vibrant communities need a balanced demographic profile to meet the needs of residents across the life cycle.

Traditionally, we have thought of the population age structure as a pyramid, but it actually looks more like a house with a very large roof of aging baby boomers and an overhanging eave of working age adults sitting atop a smaller set of children and youth that form the foundation for the future.

While the working age population bears most of the costs of service delivery, demands on services by aging baby boomers will create new stresses on local government to provide transportation, health, recreation and housing support systems. To meet the rising needs of the elderly (projected to grow from 35 million in 2000 to 86.7 million by 2050 (U.S. Census 2000), cities must strengthen support for children and youth who represent the future. To do so, we must move beyond the silos of age segregated services and begin to think about how to integrate and share services across agencies and across the life cycle.

---

**Population Projections, by Age Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>0-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>20-29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Population projections in millions of people.*


---

This brief is part of the Planning Across Generations project directed by Mildred Warner, Professor of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY. It was supported in part by the Peppercorn Foundation and the USDA National Institute for Food and Agriculture research grant #2011-68006-30793. Additional issue briefs and case studies can be found at www.mildredwarner.org.
Public Expenditures Across the Life Cycle

Everyone is dependent when they are young and when they are old. But the distribution of costs is shared unevenly between the federal and state and local levels of government. Public support for seniors in the US is three times the size of support for children ($8,942 per child as compared to $21,904 per senior person) (Isaacs 2009). The federal government provides 97 percent of support for seniors, but less than one third of the public support for children.

State and local expenses are highest for young children (primarily due to K-12 schooling), and for seniors especially after age 75 (when local support services are needed to help seniors remain independent or to cover the costs of nursing homes) (Edwards 2010).

State and local governments are the levels primarily entrusted with investing in our children’s future. The economic development concern is that we are not investing enough in our children and youth to secure our future. Under-investment is particularly acute at the youngest years of life (birth to five) when nutrition, health care and early education are especially critical to long term brain development (Shonkoff and Phillips 2000).

Families with children are often perceived as a cost to the local economy because of high levels of school spending. Fifty three percent of planners in the APA survey believed that families do not generate sufficient tax revenue to cover the cost of services they demand (Israel and Warner 2008). Responding to pressures to limit tax increases, some communities attempt to restrict affordable family housing as a way to reduce local service delivery costs. Costs of community services studies promoted by the American Farmland Trust in 26 states (AFT 2010) assign all the costs of education to residents - as if the commercial and industrial sectors gained nothing from a prepared work force.

This is short sighted and ignores the increasing importance of human capital investment as a critical economic development strategy for state and local governments (Bartik 2011). It also ignores the possibility of shared services between schools and local government to better meet the needs of both children and seniors. Indeed, the APA survey found that 64 percent of planners believe that the needs of seniors and children are similar with respect to transportation, affordable housing and services (Israel and Warner 2008).

While some local governments pursue older retirees “gray gold” as an economic development strategy, they often fail to look ahead to the increased costs and decreased revenues as seniors age.

Retirement migration is viewed positively for its impact on the real estate market, local consumption and community volunteerism especially in civic and cultural realms (Brown and Glasgow, 2008). However, communities often overlook the local costs of care for an aging population - in expanded para-transit, meals on wheels, housing, health care and recreational services.
To help reduce the local tax burden on seniors, many states offer property tax abatements to people over the age of 65 who own and live in their home (Reynolds, 2004). The revenue loss can be significant. In New Hampshire, the number of abatements has been growing at ten percent a year as older people move in, and this resulted in a $20 million loss in local tax burden in 2007 alone (Francese 2008). Better recognition of the costs and revenues generated by individuals across the lifecycle can help city leaders realize the importance of a balanced growth strategy for long term economic development success.

A generational balance is critical to community sustainability. This issue brief focuses on the economic impact of families with young children and on approaches planners and economic developers can take to build a better generational balance. Families with young children are a source of economic growth because:

1. **Families with children spend the most in the local economy.**
2. **Services for children are an important part of local and regional economies.**
3. **Investment in children builds a productive future workforce leading to long-term growth.**

Planners and economic development officials can take substantive action to support multi-generational planning. Innovative approaches include:

- **Creatively using impact fees and universal design in physical planning.**
- **Integrating services across age groups and between schools and cities.**
- **Building coalitions across age groups to promote shared vision for a balanced future.**

**FAMILIES PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH**

**#1. Families with children spend the most in the local economy**

Although young professionals and empty nesters have the most disposable income and lower service needs, it is families with young children that spend the most locally. Consumer Expenditure Survey data (2010) show families of child-rearing age (35-64) earn and spend more than other age groups. These families are responsible for a greater percentage of overall expenditures, spending $15,046 more than 25-34 year olds, and $18,787 more than 65-75 year-olds on average. Yet in many cities, families of this age move away due to lack of appropriate housing or quality schools. *Cities which retain families with children enjoy both higher earners and higher spenders and this helps explain the stronger economic performance of these communities* (Reese 2012).

**#2. Services for families are an important part of regional and local economies**

Children are expensive to raise. Lower income families spend $8-9,000/yr per child and higher income families spend more than twice that (Lino, 2010). The majority, 77 percent, of expenditures on children are spent in the local economy (Lino 2010). These expenditures help maintain the basic core services of the local economy – housing, food, transportation and retail.

**Family expenditure shares on a child from birth to age 17, as a percentage of total child-rearing expenditure**

- **Housing**: 31%
- **Food**: 17%
- **Child care/education**: 16%
- **Transportation**: 13%  
- **Health Care**: 9%  
- **Misc.**: 8%  
- **Clothing**: 6%

**Average total spending per child from birth to age 17: $222,360**

**Author analysis based on Lino, 2010 (2009 data).**
Family Services are Critical for Economic Growth

Standard economic analyses tend to downplay or even exclude such local spending from overall measures of economic growth by arguing that the size of a regional economy is only as strong as its export base. However, research shows that expenditures on local services are large drivers in the local and regional economy (Kay et al. 2008, Warner and Liu 2005). These local services and their economic linkages are increasingly critical sources of employment growth for cities (Markusen and Shrock 2006).

Research on child care, in particular has shown the sector has linkages greater than other local services and infrastructure sectors. Regional economic multipliers show on average for each new dollar spent on child care, the total statewide economic impact is two dollars. Similarly, for each new job in child care, and additional half job is generated statewide (Warner and Liu 2005). These multipliers demonstrate the importance of child care and local services to regional economic growth.

Moreover, mothers, usually the primary caregivers, now make up the majority of the workforce. Working parents are especially important as the overall workforce shrinks due to retiring baby boomers. Employers, aware of these challenges, are looking to local economic development planners to help address the critical infrastructure shortages in child care. Statewide surveys in New York and Wisconsin found that the majority of economic developers recognize the lack of quality affordable child care is an impediment to economic development in their communities (Warner 2007). Communities that invest in child care help boost productivity by allowing companies to retain skilled parents and by reducing the number of lost workdays (Morrissey and Warner 2007).

#3. Families with Children are Important for Long Term Economic Growth

Economic developers now recognize that human capital and workforce development are critical strategies for future economic competitiveness (Bartik 2011). The approaching decline in skilled labor coincides with the rising proportion of seniors who require labor-intensive services (Myers 2007).

Given the demographic challenges of an aging society—state and local governments will need to make serious workforce investments.
The Economic Importance of Families with Children

There is a demographic divide of race and income between today’s elders and the younger generation. Census projections forecast that by 2040, half of the population will be people of color. But these younger Americans will be poorer and less well educated than the retiring baby boomers unless investments are made in educational and community infrastructure to support the workforce of tomorrow (PolicyLink 2011).

Early education and care is part of this investment strategy. It provides a three part benefit to communities:

1) it promotes the social, emotional and intellectual development of young children so they are more successful in school and later life,

2) it promotes career ladders for parents and job retention for employers, and

3) it is a significant economic sector in its own right (Warner 2006).

Across the US more than 90 teams of planners, economic developers and business leaders have formed to study their local child care sectors and identify strategies to improve this critical infrastructure (Warner 2006). For example, Oklahoma Champions for Early Opportunities (a partnership between business and education), promotes family-friendly business practices, strengthens the supply of child care in the community and reaches out to parents with educational programs (Wade 2011). Oklahoma City, like many cities across the country, is recognizing the critical link between early childhood education and a strong workforce. A national coalition, ReadyNation, has formed to promote more investment in children to ensure future economic success (www.readynation.org).

Communities with families have higher economic growth. Richard Florida’s (2002) “creative class”

Multi-generational planning is a superior growth model.

strategy for promoting economic development by attracting young, single people has been popular among communities across the country. But economic development leaders now recognize that maintaining workers as they form families is equally critical. In a recent study of 233 cities, Reese (2012) shows that despite the strength of some of Florida’s variables (college educated, diversity), the most significant factors also include investment in public infrastructure, and demographic variables, such as married adults with children. Variables positively correlated with economic growth include capital investment in education, infrastructure and construction, parks and recreation, adults age 30-34, and graduation rates from high school. These are the investments that build a broad comprehensive approach to community economic development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creative Economy Variables</th>
<th>College 0.44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White 0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian 0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign born 0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families with Kids</th>
<th>Married with children 0.41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ages 30-34 0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Investment</th>
<th>Infrastructure 0.16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School construction 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS graduation rate 0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and recreation 0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author analysis based on Reese, 2012.

**Creative Use of Impact Fees & Universal Design**

Zoning for affordable housing, accessory units, child care in residential units, density bonuses—as well as mandating sidewalks, improving street lighting and park access and promoting universal design are all planning tools which can be used to promote a family friendly community. While impact fees and proffer agreements have been used to restrict families with children in new developments, they can, instead, be used to promote development of needed infrastructure. The City of South San Francisco developed a Child Care Impact Fee ordinance to plan for child care demand (Anderson 2006). Cities throughout California have used developer agreements to provide incentives to build child care into new projects (Anderson and Dektar 2010).

**The sprawling design of US communities raises the cost of service delivery.** One way to increase residential density is to promote accessory units (elder cottages or granny flats). Twenty five percent of respondents to the APA survey allow accessory flats in their communities by right (Israel and Warner, 2008). These help address a wide range of housing needs – creating mixed income and mixed age communities. They also allow for incorporation of universal design principles in construction – enabling seniors to age in place near family and friend support networks (Chapman and Howe 2001).

**WHAT CAN PLANNERS DO?**

*Multi-generational planning is becoming increasingly important as local governments see the cost of fragmented service delivery, and the changing demographic profile of their communities* (Warner 2010). Fiscal stress, tax pressures and changing service needs require a more thoughtful comprehensive approach. As our population both ages and grows younger, services to these groups will benefit from coordination and integration. New approaches to physical development, service integration and political coalition building are required.

*Fruitvale, CA: Mixed use affordable housing development, Head Start Center, and a light rail station.*

*Photo Kristen Anderson.*
An example of such efforts can be seen in Florida. Since 2000, more than 160 localities now participate in the State of Florida’s “Communities for a Lifetime” which provides statewide coordination of community planning, transportation, housing and social services for both youth and older adults. Among the projects promoted include universal-access home and business designs, mixed-use development, and improving physical health through better access to social interaction (Florida Dept of Elder Affairs 2004).

The challenges of joint use projects involve concerns over liability, allocation of maintenance costs, coordinating different funding streams and time lines, but these can be resolved through collaborative planning.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg, NC for example, coordinates capital projects and facility planning between local governments and school districts. Schools have donated land to build transportation hubs next to elementary schools—complete with school playfields atop parking decks, and the county has jointly invested in a public library and performance space in a middle school (Wells 2011).

**Political Coalitions Build Common Vision**

Planners can help to build political will for multi-generational planning and shared services through broadening the participatory planning process. Both youth and seniors can be brought into the planning process to share their ideas. YPLAN (Youth - Plan, Learn, Act, Now) is a curriculum developed by the Center for Cities and Schools and used in numerous school districts throughout California (McCoy et al. 2010). Charlotte, NC has emphasized local neighborhood planning and implementation since 1998 through the creation of Neighborhood Action Plans developed by residents and interdisciplinary teams from city government. This provides technical support and more flexible and responsive planning.

**Shared Services Promote Efficiency**

Service integration – across agencies and age groups – can promote more efficient use of resources and more effective programming. Across the country, schools and cities are collaborating to share recreational facilities. This may involve the school using a public park or pool, or the broader community using the school gym, playing fields and auditorium (Vincent et al. 2010). This promotes better coordination of community resources and integration across the generations – building community connections.

The City of Emeryville, CA, home to Pixar and Novartis, recognized that it did not have facilities to encourage its creative class of young professional workers to stay when they formed families. The city is now planning a Center for Community Life which will house the public school, provide job training and adult recreation, a drop in center for children, public library and community common grounds. The senior center, Head Start Center and Child Care center are nearby (www.emeryvillecenter.org).
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for Charlotte’s poorest areas, broadening public support for new initiatives (Potapchuck et al. 1998).

Seniors can be key partners in community planning efforts. A 2005 AARP report finds 84% of respondents 50 and older want to age in place (Kochera et al. 2005). The features that seniors need to age in place are similar to features children need for healthy development: walkability, public transit, affordable housing, conveniently located services, parks, and opportunities for civic engagement.

Seniors have many skills to share from a lifetime of experience. Civic engagement also promotes the social and emotional well being of seniors. Widening the circle of involvement to link seniors and children helps residents recognize shared needs and mobilize local resources for multi-generational planning.

CONCLUSION

The US stands at a critical juncture. Communities will face more demand for public services in the future as baby boomers age. Investing more in services for children and youth now, not only builds the workforce of the future and supports parents, but it also helps communities recognize new ways to promote development, integrate services and build political support for critical services.

Planners are recognizing that the needs of children and seniors are similar. But more work needs to be done to at the local level to identify new approaches to planning and development, taxation and fees, and service integration to better meet the needs of residents across the life cycle.

Families with young children provide an important generational balance – one that communities must strive to maintain – especially in tight fiscal times. This issue brief has outlined the economic importance of families to communities – not just in local spending on children, but also through human capital and workforce development. Planners can help bring long-term economic stability to their communities by encouraging family friendly policies in physical design, service integration and broadening the net of public participation. This creates vibrant, resilient communities for residents across the lifecycle.

RESOURCES

Cornell Multi-generational Planning Project: http://www.mildredwarner.org/
Center for Cities and Schools at University of California-Berkeley: http://citiesandschools.berkeley.edu
AARP Public Policy Institute - Livable Communities: http://www.aarp.org/research/ppi/liv-com/
Partnership for Livable Communities: http://livable.org/
http://cms.mildredwarner.org/p/147
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Planning for Family Friendly Communities: Motivators, Barriers and Benefits
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Introduction: Communities that keep families for the whole life cycle are more vibrant.

In 2008 Cornell University collaborated with the American Planning Association (APA) to conduct a survey of planners' roles in creating family friendly communities. The survey was developed in focus groups of practicing planners with support from several APA regional and subject area divisions (e.g. housing and community development, planning and women).

It explored three general sets of questions: planners' attitudes about the importance of families to communities, actions planners can take to support families, and barriers to the creation of family friendly communities. This issue brief provides a summary of survey results and statistical analysis showing how attitudes, actions, and barriers are related, and the wider community benefits of family friendly planning.

A total of 944 planners responded from throughout the country. Forty-five percent worked in communities with a population under 50,000, 22 percent in communities with a population between 50,000 and 150,000, and 33 percent in communities with a population over 150,000.

Table 1 shows planners overwhelmingly believe families are important to communities, and they recognize the need to include families in plans. Half of planners think families do not contribute sufficiently to the tax base, but economic research shows families contribute most to the local economy (Reese 2012, Warner and Baran-Rees 2012). Opportunities exist to link the needs of families with young children to those of seniors who would like to age in place by creating livable communities for all. That is the challenge and the promise of planning across generations.

The Role of Planners: A range of actions can make a difference.

Planners can address family needs in comprehensive plans, site plan and zoning regulations, housing, transportation, schools, child care, and funding for community services.

The survey defined family friendly as “communities where families enjoy housing at affordable prices, child care, parks to play in, pedestrian pathways, quality public schools, and safe neighborhoods, among many other potential features that promote family well-being.” Forty-one percent of respondents reported working in communities that branded themselves family friendly. Although the branded communities showed higher

---

TABLE 1. Planners’ attitudes towards families are positive (APA Family Friendly Planning Survey 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families are important to community growth, sustainability, and diversity.</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families represent a valuable consumer population.</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities that keep people for the whole life cycle (children, single adults, parents, elderly) are more vibrant.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families are the most likely population group to reinvest in their community through time, money, and other forms of civic engagement.</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The needs of families are similar to the needs of the elderly with regards to the physical environment (e.g. parks, transportation, affordable housing).</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most families do not generate sufficient tax revenue to cover the cost of services they demand.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

This brief is part of the Planning Across Generations project directed by Mildred Warner, Professor of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY. The Family Friendly Planning Survey was supported by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation in collaboration with the American Planning Association. Analysis was supported by the Peppercorn Foundation and USDA National Institute for Food and Agriculture Research grant #2011-68006-30793. Additional issue briefs on multi-generational planning can be found at www.mildredwarner.org.
levels of action and family participation, they also faced more resistance to family friendly planning because they took more action (Israel and Warner 2008).

**Action involves activities in many areas. Mobility and transportation-related items top the list** – sidewalks, pedestrian pathways and streetscape improvements, bicycle lanes, school transport, and low traffic speeds all were reported by over 66 percent of respondents.

Funding is key. More than half of responding planners reported using public funds to support affordable housing, neighborhood parks, and community facilities. Impact fees were most common for parks and recreational facilities.

Although school quality is critical for families with young children, schools typically operate in a sphere of their own, and less than half of planners reported collaborating with schools. The lowest support is found in actions that would help families with young children with their child care. More than 40 percent of respondents didn’t know whether their community has an adequate supply of quality affordable child care, which suggests planners need to give more attention to learning about the needs of young children.

Forty percent of communities explicitly articulate family needs in their comprehensive plans, but it is site planning and zoning that are key to advancing family interests. These elements include child care, transportation, housing, parks, street connectivity, and design guidelines. Affordable housing and child-related services are less commonly reflected in site planning and zoning, perhaps due to lack of awareness of the needs of families with children (see detail on page 3).

While 41 percent of respondents reported they were in communities that branded themselves family friendly, we find that family participation in the planning process is a more significant driver of action. This includes child care at public meetings, meetings held at convenient times and places for parents, and youth participation in the planning process.

**Barriers:** Numerous but surmountable.

Planners face a number of challenges to building family friendly communities, but regulatory barriers, authority, complexity, and lack of awareness of the issue are all things planners can address. Barriers related to finance, development pressures, or public opposition (NIMBY-ism or blocking certain types of development) are differentiated from lack of awareness and knowledge (see Figure 1).

Lack of knowledge and lack of awareness are the primary factors leading to resistance. Raising awareness about family needs can help reduce the NIMBY-ism that many communities face.

**Action:** Site planning, zoning, and family participation are key to action.

We conducted a regression analysis and found that planners who work in communities with more actions that support families (e.g. affordable housing, child care, walkable streets) also engage families more in the planning process and include needs of families in...
Planning for Family Friendly Communities: Motivators, Barriers and Benefits

Many local actions promote child and family friendly cities.

**Housing**
- Have a variety of types 67%
- Have an adequate supply of 2+ bedroom apartments 45%
- Promote transit-oriented development 45%

**Transportation & Mobility**
- Have sidewalks 97%
- Have bike lanes 76%
- Have walk-to-school programs 52%

**Education**
- Collaborate with school district to site schools 45%
- Co-locate services in schools 43%
- Have an adequate supply of child care 20%

**Use impact fees to subsidize...**
- Park and recreation facilities 45%
- Schools 22%
- Transit 16%
- Child care 7%

**Routinely use local, state, or federal funding to support...**
- Streetscape improvements 80%
- Affordable housing 57%
- Parks 58%
- Child care 21%

**Percentages reflect affirmative responses to items on the APA Family Friendly Planning Survey, 2008.**

**SITE PLANNING & ZONING:**
Key site planning and zoning elements can advance the interests of families.

**Housing: Zoning regulations promote...**
- Multi-family housing 66%
- Family-sized housing (2+ bedrooms) 60%
- Affordable housing 39%
- Accessory apartments by right 25%

**Child Care: Zoning regulations promote...**
- Siting child care centers 41%
- Family child care homes by right 34%

**Development: Zoning and subdivision regulations...**
- Allow for mixed use 90%
- Require parks/playgrounds 69%
- Provide density bonuses 58%

**Transportation and Mobility: Zoning and subdivision regulations...**
- Mandate sidewalks 80%
- Require street connectivity with adjacent developments 75%
- Consider pedestrian needs in site plan reviews 74%

**Design/Safety: Community has...**
- Traffic calming measures in residential neighborhoods 74%
- Lighting guidelines that address/promote safety 60%
- Design guidelines that facilitate neighbor interaction 53%
- Street furniture that facilitates “eyes on the street” 37%

Resistance (e.g. NIMBY-ism) is higher in communities with more action. However, resistance is lower in cities and in communities that have more positive attitudes about families with children.

The most important factor leading to resistance is lack of knowledge about how to address family needs. But this can be addressed through planning and family participation. Communities that specify family friendly goals in their comprehensive plans face more resistance. Yet it is important to note that the specifics of site planning and zoning do not directly lead to resistance; indeed, these are what most lead to action. This research suggests the key to real action is family participation and addressing family needs in site planning and zoning (see Figure 2).

**FIGURE 2.**
Planning Leads to Action, Ignorance Leads to Resistance

- Family Participation +
- Site Planning and Zoning +
- Positive Attitudes +
- Lack of Awareness and Lack of Knowledge +
- Comprehensive Planning +
- Action +
- Active Resistance - leads to more
- - leads to less

Key variables from regression results.

Broader benefits of family friendly planning:
Less crime.

Obviously, communities that provide better planning and services for families with children are more livable for all ages. But are there other, broader benefits to family friendly planning? To answer this question, we matched the APA survey responses to communities where planners worked and identified 350 unique communities (Rukus and Warner, 2013). We then pulled FBI crime data on violent crime and property crime for these cities. We were curious whether communities that engaged in family friendly planning would benefit from lower crime rates. They do!

We controlled for community disorder (poverty, unemployment, high school drop-out rates, etc.) and then measured a set of family friendly planning variables related to Zoning and Design; Family/Youth Participation and Access to Services; Child Care and Housing; and Impact Fees. Of these factors, impact fees had a negative impact on crime rates. What does this mean?

Technical planning and family participation are important, but they are not enough. In cities that use developer impact fees, services like parks, recreation, community facilities, transit, and child care receive supplemental funds from private developers, augmenting traditional sources of government funding. This is especially important in poor cities where market demand may not be strong enough to signal a supply response, or in cities where rapid growth has outstripped service delivery.

Children are only young for a short period of time. Impact fees ensure the costs of community services are incorporated into development projects so these services are provided in a timely manner to meet the needs of the current cohort of resident children. Impact fees benefit not just the children and families involved, but the city as a whole through lower crime rates (see Figure 4).

Promise for the Future
Family friendly planning creates communities that are more livable for all ages. By giving special attention to the needs of families with young children, planners are also creating walkable communities with affordable housing, mixed use development, and services that meet the needs of a broad mix of residents. Such communities are more livable and sustainable as they are able to attract and keep residents over the life course. Research also has shown that communities that invest in basic infrastructure and services for families experience greater economic growth (Reese, 2012). Family friendly planning is a win-win for all – residents, both young and old, developers, and local government. Planning for the needs of all ages, especially young children, builds strong, safe and economically vibrant communities.

REFERENCES
Lifelong Communities Handbook: Creating Opportunities for Lifelong Living
This handbook serves as a reference to ensure development and community design adhere to the Lifelong Communities Principles, resulting in communities and neighborhoods that are designed to promote healthy living, deliver comprehensive accessibility from inside the dwelling, down the street and into the restaurant, theater or store and offer targeted programming that meets the new reality of increasing life expectancies, varying levels of abilities and the needs of all ages.

The handbook is organized around the core lifelong community principles of connectivity, pedestrian access and transit, neighborhood retail and services, social interaction, diversity of dwelling types, environmentally friendly and healthy living and consideration for existing residents. The handbook is designed to show the principles are applied at four levels - the building, the street, the community and the region.

Visit Atlanta Regional Commission’s Lifelong Community’s website at www.atlantaregional.com/llc
Communities should be places where people of all ages and abilities can live as long as they’d like, but all too often, individuals find that the community in which they have lived for years no longer meets their needs. The Atlanta Regional Commission supports the following principles and design standards through its comprehensive regional plan. Lifelong Communities provide an array of housing types that appeal to individuals both young and old, opportunities for healthy living with ways to get around that meet the needs of individuals who do not drive, safe sidewalks and interesting places to walk, and convenient access to shopping and basic services. Those features are summed up in the three goals of a Lifelong Community:

1. Provide housing and transportation options,
2. Encourage healthy lifestyles, and
3. Expand access to services.

Lifelong Communities incorporate seven principles:

- **Connectivity** – Providing the most options for getting from one place to another, reducing traffic and creating a viable street network for multiple modes of transportation
- **Pedestrian Access and Transit** – Creating a vibrant streetscape, destinations worth walking to, connected and safe sidewalks and transit, both within the community and to regional hubs
- **Neighborhood Retail and Services** – Permitted within walking distances of housing to reduce auto travel, increase walkability and provide for sustainable community hubs
- **Social Interaction** – Resulting from the provision of adequate green space, community centers, neighborhood gardens and more
- **Diversity of Dwelling Types** – Allowing individuals to remain within the community as their needs and preferences change
- **Healthy Living** – Growing out of an environment that promotes physical activity (trails and bike paths), neighborhood-scale groceries offering fresh fruits and vegetables and health clinics and medical offices within walking distance
- **Consideration for Existing Residents** – Providing options for existing residents to remain in the community as redevelopment occurs

These principles are tools to help community leaders, planners, developers and citizens create communities that meet the goals of a Lifelong Community.
Lifelong Mobility and Accessibility

Lifelong Mobility and Accessibility provides access and transportation to people of all ages and abilities. Real mobility begins inside the individual unit or house and carries throughout the entire built environment.

**Building Scale**
- New energy-efficient construction that at a minimum incorporates potential for accessibility retrofit and ideally offers universal design and ADA elements such as blocking in the bathroom walls for installation of grab bars
- Adequate, energy-efficient lighting in critical areas such as walkways and entrances

**Street Scale**
- Plans to ensure that all land use patterns, transportation routes and community facilities meet the needs of people of all ages
- Streets that are welcoming and unintimidating with a level of business and commercial activity
- Traffic calming strategies that make the environment feel safe including raised medians, bulb-outs at intersections, road diets, slip roads and roundabouts
- Xericape plantings and fencing positioned to reduce traffic noise
- Engaging frontages that include diverse urban and building form that vary in style, color and material
- Walkable sidewalks, wide-enough to accommodate two people and barrier-free to reduce potential for falls
- Sidewalks that are closely managed during any construction and repair to avoid barriers to access in the pedestrian environment
- Sidewalks that are closely managed over time to avoid cluttering of pedestrian environment with vending machines, newspaper stands, signage and other street furniture
- Grade level changes that are clearly marked and well-lit
- Handrails installed where appropriate
- Curb cuts at all intersections
- Sidewalk paving that:
  - Is non-reflective
  - Has textural contrast to walls
  - Has flat, permeable, porous paving to assist with water runoff and reduces potential for falls
- Trees for shade
Lifelong Mobility and Accessibility

- Sensory cues at decision points, such as junctions or grade changes
- Adequate pedestrian lighting
- Crossable streets
  - Crosswalk markings that are appropriate and well maintained
  - Traffic signals mounted at the sidewalk rather than suspended
  - Cross walks at signalized intersections as appropriate
  - Signal timing suitable for slower walking speeds (3 ft/sec. or lower)
  - Countdown crossing signals
  - Refuge islands for more than 2 lanes of traffic
- Accommodation for specialized vehicles (power chairs, golf carts, etc.) and strollers
- Sitting arrangements to provide respite and facilitate social interaction
- Sturdy seating with arm and back rests, made of appropriate materials
- Covered bus stops with seating
- Areas of sun and shade considered in the design of the street
- Gates and doors requiring no more than 5 pounds of pressure to open and having lever handles

Community Scale

- Consideration given to vegetative buffers that may create barriers to pedestrian access
- Consideration given to parking requirements that limit pedestrian access
- Centralized transit waiting areas
- Transit stops that provide protection from rain, wind and sun
- Smart transit technology that alerts riders to bus/shuttle’s arrival time
- Smart transit technology alerts bus drivers to riders waiting in covered or sheltered waiting areas
- Stops for shuttles, jitneys, buses and light rail

Regional Scale

- Older driver safety education classes
- Neighborhood center transit stops
Lifelong Dwellings

Lifelong Dwellings incorporate elements that allow the building to change with its inhabitants rather than inhabitants having to constantly find new dwellings as their needs change. Outside of individual units, a community must contain a full range of housing types including varying housing sizes, products, supportive housing and even skilled nursing care to ensure that those who have invested in a place’s social and civic infrastructure can remain there as their needs change. The dwelling should incorporate green building strategies to ensure environmentally friendly, durable and healthy living, work and social environments for the occupants.

Building Scale

- Flexible housing accommodations that provide options for caregivers, older family members or adult children
- Adequate high-efficiency lighting
- Smaller lots and smaller front setbacks for neighbor interaction
- A zero step entry
- Full bath and living on main floor
- Wider doorways and hallways on main floor, with at least 32" clear passage
- Adherence to sustainable and energy-efficient building practices

Community Scale

- Zoning requirements, subdivision regulations or building codes that promote/support other flexible housing options (e.g. shared housing, accessory apartments)
- Incentives for green building practices
- Diversity of housing (varying sizes, products) such as condos, apartments, duplexes, quadruplexes, accessory dwellings, etc.
- Accessibility of housing products that at least meet ADA guidelines and visitibility standards
Incentives for universal design
- Workforce housing
- Range of supportive housing types
- Range of specialized housing types (cohousing, models that address dementia or other disabilities)
- Accessible spaces as appropriate based on community accessibility standards
- Home maintenance/repair assistance programs
- A supply of affordable housing options available to seniors
- Specialized training for frail elderly
- Cooperative policing

### Lifelong Social Interaction

Social interaction is critical at all ages and stages of life, but particularly as one grows older. Isolation can dramatically increase physical, mental health, and isolation problems. It is critical that the built environment facilitate significant social interaction and the creation of a supportive community at every opportunity. The following items foster social interaction.

**Building Scale**
- Sitting areas provided on the main entrances
- Common rooms and shared dining areas
- Out-buildings (e.g. workshop or garage)
- Small-scale activity spaces, including card rooms, TV rooms, reading rooms
- Flexible space for emerging interests and activities

**Street Scale**
- Front yard gardens, porches and stoops
- Reinforcement of gathering places such as town squares, parklets, public art displays

**Community Scale**
- Community rooms (large enough for exercise classes, meetings, movies)
- Opportunities for meaningful volunteer activities (e.g. after-school tutoring, community gardens)
- Opportunities for harnessing the talent, wisdom and experience of older adults to contribute to the community of large
Cultural opportunities that reflect ethnic demographic
Functioning neighborhood/civic organizations
Active and passive open space such as:
  - Dog parks
  - Age-integrated activity space including playgrounds and schoolyards
  - Community gardens
Third-places such as:
  - Parks and recreation
  - Barber shops, beauty salons
  - Coffee shops, bars
  - Community centers, senior centers, intergenerational programming

Regional Scale
Access to cultural activities, educational and entertainment venues

---

Lifelong Healthy Living

Living longer is the great benefit of living in this century, but getting and staying healthy is essential to maintaining a high quality of life. Community design must facilitate access to basic and preventive healthcare and encourage physical activity. The following items support healthy living.

Building Scale
- Fall-safe environment
- Infrastructure to support adaptive medical technology and monitoring
- Accessible and visitable spaces as appropriate, based on community accessibility standards

Street Scale
- Daily needs met within safe and inviting walking distance
- Fall-safe environment
- Wayfinding signage to community health centers, parks and recreational facilities
Shorter block sizes
Walkable destinations that promote social engagement

Community Scale
- Free, accessible and diverse programs to support healthy lifestyles (nutrition, education, smoking cessation)
- Designated walking loop or access to tracks
- Free or low-cost exercise and recreation venues and classes (e.g. bocce, dancing, tennis, yoga, tai chi)
- Swimming pool
- Accessible health services, both preventative and acute care
- Community concierge and case management such as those in the Village concept
- Neighborhood access to healthy, locally grown foods
- Free or affordable preventative screenings (blood pressure, mammograms, immunizations)

Regional Scale
- Transit or shuttle connection to major medical centers and hospitals
- Volunteer driver programs to medical appointments

Lifelong Access to Services

Lifelong Communities must provide access to a full range of basic and supportive services. Services should range from basic daily needs to more specialized skilled care.

Building Scale
- Range of in home services (medical, support and social services)

Street Scale
- Community bulletin boards
- Wayfinding signage to local amenities and services

Community Scale
- Community must have local access to ordinary daily needs which may include a location-appropriate mix of some of the following programs:
  - Groceries offering fresh local fruits and vegetables
  - Dry cleaner
- ATM/Bank
- Drugstore
- Beauty/barber shops, nail salons
- Post office
- Restaurants
- Bakery
- Hardware store
- Physician offices (including vision and dental services)
- In-home medical and supportive services
- Facilities with skilled nursing care
- Lifelong learning opportunities
- Childcare and adult day care
- Community concierge (which can include case management for older adults)
- Library system

**Regional Scale**

- Hospitals
- Entertainment, educational and cultural venues
- Major and specialized shopping outlets
- Job retraining opportunities and networking resources for the unemployed
- Job banks for older adults
- Employers that offer flexible work solutions and teleworking
- Readily available information about meal and nutrition options
Other Resources

**Livable Centers Initiative** encourages local jurisdictions to plan and implement strategies that link transportation improvements with land use development strategies to create sustainable, livable communities consistent with regional development policies.

www.atlantaregional.com/land-use/livable-centers-initiative

**Community Choices** is a quality growth initiative that offers local governments tools, technical assistance and resources to help them create communities that best suit their unique visions.

www.atlantaregional.com/local-government/local-planning

**Lifelong Communities Initiative**

www.atlantaregional.com/llc

**AARP**

www.aarp.org/states/ga

**SRTS**

www.saferoutesinfo.org

**Green Communities**

http://www.atlantaregional.com/environment/green-communities

**AgeWise Connection**

www.agewiseconnection.com
**SomerVision Process**

The SomerVision Process was a three year exercise conducted by City officials, staff and a 60-man steering committee of residents which yielded the SomerVision plan, a 20-year vision for the development of the City as directed by the residents. Over the course of 50 meetings, visioning sessions and public workshops, the group set forth a vision with goals including 30,000 new local jobs, 125 new acres of publically accessible open space and 6,000 new housing units. Also notable were the suggestions from the plan that included a more humanistic touch, including the desire to preserve neighborhood character and foster local culture. The SomerVision Plan has been welcomed as a roadmap for the future for the City by residents, and won the “Comprehensive Planning Award” by the American Planning Association in 2012.

**Shape up Somerville**

Shape Up Somerville: East Smart, Play Hard, is a city wide campaign designed to improve the health of all residents by promoting healthy food choices and exercise. Begun in 2002 as a partnership with Tufts researchers, Shape Up Somerville utilized a holistic approach to prevent childhood obesity in Somerville’s high-risk, early-elementary school children in the 1st through 3rd grades. Early education on the positive effects nutrition and exercise has changed the way children in Somerville think about their own health and the health of people in their community. Shape Up Somerville has expanded to include 11 initiatives and 25 stakeholders involved, and received accolades nationwide, including credit for being an influence on Michelle Obama’s “Let’s Move” program.

**Senior Housing Symposium**

The Somerville Senior Housing Symposium is a program provided by the Somerville Housing Department devoted to addressing the needs of senior citizens in a City rife with change. These symposiums are held on a periodic basis and invite speakers from local non-profits and City departments as well as outside speakers from universities to talk about senior housing. Topics include the benefits and pitfalls of independent versus assisted living and maintaining property tax payments while on a fixed income. The program is run by Dana LeWinter, Director of Housing in Somerville.
The city’s 20-year Comprehensive Plan, SomerVision, is set to be honored by the American Planning Association’s Massachusetts Chapter on December 14 as part of its Annual Awards Program, honoring innovative planning efforts across the Commonwealth. Somerville is one of thirteen communities to be honored in 2012, and will receive the Comprehensive Planning Award for a municipality with a population of over 50,000. The Comprehensive Planning Award honors a plan, program, or process of unusually high merit. Somerville will share the distinction with the Westford Strategic Planning Retreats, given to the Town of Westford, MA for the community with a population of under 50,000. Awards will be presented during an Annual Holiday Awards Luncheon on December 14.

“In Somerville, we are proud to be on the cutting edge of public policy issues. Unlike many states, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts does not require municipal governments to prepare comprehensive plans for the future, but Somerville’s residents and elected officials stepped up and demanded one,” said Mayor Joseph A. Curtatone. “The SomerVision plan reflects our shared values of making Somerville a great place to live, work, play and raise a family, and it lays out an ambitious yet realistic policy framework for achieving our goals.”

“We are honored to be recognized by the Massachusetts chapter of the American Planning Association. One of the elements that plans were judged on was readability,” said Planning Director George Proakis. “SomerVision is the result of the input of so many residents and stakeholders, and it really shows what can happen when a diverse group works together and makes compromises to achieve a larger goal. The resident volunteers who spent three years working on SomerVision really wanted the final document to be accessible and fun to read, and to tell interesting stories about the great things happening in our city. We’ve gotten a lot of positive feedback so far – pick up a copy at City Hall or download it from the City’s website and let us know what you think.”

SomerVision is the city’s 20-year Comprehensive Plan, which serves as a blueprint for a sustainable, equitable development future. SomerVision is based on three years of extensive community input from residents, businesses and other community stakeholder, and incorporates a series of research reports in areas such as demographics, economics, housing, and transportation and land use.

The Massachusetts Chapter of the American Planning Association provides leadership in the development of vital communities by advocating excellence in community planning, promoting education and citizen empowerment, and providing the tools and support necessary to meet the challenges of growth and change.
Melissa Glenn Haber is a mother of three and a volunteer with Shape Up Somerville (SUS). In 2006, she decided to help improve student health at her children’s school. After contacting SUS, Melissa started a Walking School Bus to serve her neighborhood. Today she brings up to seven kids to school and walks three miles every day, helping her remain in good health. But most of all, Melissa commits to the routine because it makes the children happy. Walking gives them time to talk with each other, share experiences and get to know the city. Once they reach school, they are calm and ready to focus on schoolwork.

Melissa’s work with SUS inspired her to organize a School Wellness Committee for the East Somerville Community School. This group includes parents, gym teachers, the school principal, food services staff and members of the Shape Up Somerville Taskforce. Everyone works together to help the school create physical activity opportunities for students.

One challenge has been that the school’s main campus was closed for renovations. This required teachers, families and students to find creative ways to stay active while the school and playgrounds were being rebuilt. The committee discussed local issues, such as play space access and safety, recess games and resources, before-school volunteers in play spaces and ways the school can accommodate student needs.

To this day, Melissa remains a strong advocate for parents and families at the East Somerville Community School. By spearheading the Walking School Bus and coordinating the school’s Walk/Ride Day, she has helped children stay active during the renovation. The pictures of Melissa walking to school with her kids show healthy children and smiling faces—two of the most important benefits that active living has to offer.

**ALbD Project Description**

The Shape Up Somerville (SUS) partnership makes valuable contributions to the active living movement in Somerville. This partnership represents a model for urban communities working to connect diverse, lower-income populations to an existing active living infrastructure. SUS is committed to integrating active living and healthy eating into Somerville residents’ daily lives. This means working to enhance jobs, neighborhood safety, and fair and safe housing. The partnership’s approach uses multiple strategies and relies on collaboration with neighborhood and city partners.

Member diversity is one SUS asset. Partners include the Shape Up Somerville Taskforce, Cambridge Health Alliance, Tufts University, School Food Services, Department of Recreation and Youth, Mayor’s Office, Groundwork Somerville, Green Streets Initiative, Somerville Bike Committee, Friends of the Somerville Bike Lanes help Somerville’s cyclists get around in the wintertime.
Community Path, Community Corridor Planning Group, Go Green Somerville, Office of Strategic Planning and Community Development, Office of Sustainability and Environment, Parks Department, Institute for Community Health, Massachusetts Farmers Markets, Union Square Main Streets, East Somerville Main Streets and Children in Balance. The newest partners include the Green Streets Initiative and Davis Area Resident/Business Initiative (DARBI).

The partnership's main goal is to complete the Somerville Community Path and bring its benefits to the lower-income communities in East Somerville. The path will increase physical activity; make active transportation mainstream; and decrease the prevalence of obesity, diabetes and hypertension in the community.

The path bisects Somerville, creating a central pedestrian artery for the community. It also provides a safe route to school for thousands of students, connects commuters to three of Boston’s four subway lines and serves as a linear park that connects lower-income residents with employment opportunities. In the future, the path will connect to a new riverfront park and the existing Charles River path system.

**Community Profile and Challenges**

Somerville’s population is 77,000, and more than one-third of its residents speak a language other than English. The average income is $23,628, and 12 percent of residents live in poverty. Community assets include its small size; high population density; racial and ethnic diversity; and an infrastructure that includes the Somerville Community Path, Davis Square, and an excellent sidewalk and transit network.

The city of Somerville covers 4.1 square miles. It is considered a walkable city because most streets have sidewalks, and the city has an extensive crossing guard network around schools and city squares for students and commuters. However, Somerville residents still confront major barriers to walking and cycling. Three rail corridors and 14 lanes of highway merge in Somerville en route to Boston. These highways physically separate neighborhoods, and intersections near them are dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.

Childhood obesity is a major concern for Somerville residents. Among children in grades one to three, 46 percent were identified as at risk for being overweight or obese in 2004. In March 2005, 29 percent of students in grades four to eight who attended Somerville public schools were obese, and 18 percent were overweight. Data from the Somerville Public School system indicate that Somerville youth do not meet the Healthy People 2010 goals for regular physical activity. Data from the 2002 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System reveal that nearly half of adults in Somerville are overweight or obese.

SUS works consistently with organizations that serve lower-income, minority and ethnic communities. While these organizations do wonderful work in the city, it is difficult to maintain connections with them without funding for ongoing outreach and education. SUS partners often work with organizations that have limited time and money, and the partner-
ship struggles to pay them for the services they provide to the community.

Healthy Eating Somerville

Neighborhood farmers’ markets are ideal venues for families to purchase fresh, healthy foods. But many markets appeal more to clientele in the middle- and higher-income levels. To address this, the Somerville Healthy Eating by Design partnership decided to create a farmers’ market in Union Square that would be more welcoming to lower-income and immigrant families.

The partnership recognized that in order to be successful, all of their strategies needed to be culturally, linguistically and economically appropriate for community residents. As a result, promotional materials for the farmers’ market, including wayfinding signs, were produced in four languages: Haitian Creole, Portuguese, Spanish and English. Volunteer health advisors also conducted nutrition and food preparation educational sessions at the market in various languages, in addition to offering other family and kid-friendly activities.

Moreover, invitations and an incentive program that contributed an additional $1-$2 for every $5 in benefits spent at the market encouraged WIC and Food Stamp program beneficiaries to attend, as well. The Healthy Eating by Design partnership also supported vendors by providing clear instructions on how to accept and redeem the Food Stamp tokens. By addressing these cultural and economic barriers, the farmers’ market at Union Square provided an attractive community gathering place for families of all income levels. By the second season of its operations, the farmers’ market attracted more than twice as many families with children than in the previous season. Total attendance, the percentage of foreign-born and lower-income customers, and the redemption rate of WIC Special Supplemental Nutrition Program vouchers also increased.

Purchasing an electronic benefits transfer machine and developing guidelines for its use at the farmers’ market served as a model for broader dissemination at other markets throughout the City of Somerville and the greater Boston area. The Community Farmers’ Market by Design initiatives resulted in a reported economic impact of more than $500,000 each year for Union Square. Looking ahead, the best practices resulting from the Healthy Eating by Design project have positioned the farmers’ market for continued success. The farmers’ market has also become one of the best known projects of Union Square Main Streets’ neighborhood revitalization efforts.

Impact

By earning community and government support for the Community Path extension, SUS helped increase opportunities for car-free commuting. Somerville supports the Green Line transit extension, which will incorporate the path and allow commuters to travel to transit points without cars. By adopting Active Living by Design goals, SUS provided a stronger framework for both existing partners and new members of its team.

The SUS partnership received national media attention for a project that demonstrated reduced weight gain rates among school children in the project.
area. This media attention, in conjunction with the partnership’s other achievements, positioned SUS to build important relationships with local and city-level policy-makers and stakeholders. The attention also helped SUS leverage additional resources, making SUS a model for using policy changes and environmental improvements to promote active living and healthy eating.

SUS also hosted a Healthy Communities Summit in 2008 for elected leaders in Massachusetts to continue building relationships. It also presented the SUS model to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and welcomed visitors from other media outlets, in addition to municipal, national and international governments.

Accomplishments: ALbD

• Gained support for continued development of the Community Path extension. This support includes 1.5 acres of land for expanding the path, more than $600,000 for construction of a community path park, and a commitment from the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) to incorporate the path into future plans for the MBTA Green Line Subway extension.

• Helped the city of Somerville develop the Safe-START Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Improvement Plan, which calls for $7.5 million in physical improvements, including crosswalk re-painting and the installation of 50 new bike racks throughout the city.

• Earned city support for SUS, which includes funds for two full-time positions: a Shape Up Somerville coordinator and a bike/pedestrian coordinator.

• Leveraged more than $2.5 million in grants and other direct and in-kind resources. The funding helped to establish two city community gardens, a park connected to the Community Path and a neighborhood farmers’ market. It also attracted significant funding commitments from the state in the form of a five-year health disparities grant.

Accomplishments: HEBD

• Testified to US Department of Agriculture officials on the 2007 reauthorization of Food Stamp programs. Advocated for funding to farmers’ markets to support the purchase and maintenance of wireless Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) machines to make Food Stamp Program EBT benefits and transactions more accessible.

• Conducted two focus groups for English and Portuguese speaking members of the community to determine culturally- and linguistically-appropriate healthy eating strategies. Utilized information to assess current food access pathways and barriers, and guide the efforts to increase access to healthy foods.

Contact

City of Somerville Health Department, City Hall Annex, 50 Evergreen Avenue, Somerville, MA 02143 617.625.6600
http://www.somervillema.gov/Division.cfm?orgunit=SUS

Shape-up Somerville is one of the 25 Active Living by Design community partnerships. Active Living by Design (ALbD) was established in late 2001 as a national program of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF). Located in Chapel Hill and part of the North Carolina Institute for Public Health at the UNC Gillings School of Global Public Health, ALbD works with partnerships across the nation to increase routine physical activity and healthy eating through changes in community design. In 2003, ALbD selected 25 diverse community partnerships from a pool of 966 applicants to receive $200,000 and technical assistance over five years. ALbD established Healthy Eating by Design (HEbD), a pilot program that provided 12 of these partnerships an additional $50,000 over 18 months to test approaches to increase access to healthy foods for children in low-income neighborhoods. The ALbD and HEBD community partnerships are located throughout the United States, and project areas range in size from small urban neighborhoods to large rural regions. The program ended in 2008, but many of the community partnerships are continuing their success and are sustaining their work.

Photographs: Courtesy of Active Living By Design

More information on these communities and their accomplishments can be found on the Active Living By Design website (www.activelivingbydesign.org)

* Active Living by Design's Featured Tools are grantee products, tools and publications that were created during the ALbD initiative. Many of these tools have applications beyond the initiative and are being used by other communities. To see or download the featured tool, visit Somerville's page on the ALbD website at activelivingbydesign.org/somerville
America’s Diverse Future: Initial Glimpses at the U.S. Child Population from the 2010 Census

William H. Frey

The accelerating growth of new minority children heralds an increasingly diverse future child population and labor force, presenting challenges for America’s social and political systems.”

**FINDINGS**

An analysis of data from the 1990, 2000, and 2010 decennial censuses reveals that:

- **New minorities**—Hispanics, Asians, and other groups apart from whites, blacks, and American Indians—account for all of the growth among the nation’s child population. From 2000 to 2010, the population of white children nationwide declined by 4.3 million, while the population of Hispanic and Asian children grew by 5.5 million.

- In almost half of states and nearly one-third of large metro areas, child populations declined in the 2000s. White child populations dropped in 46 states and 86 of the 100 largest metro areas, but gains of new minority children forestalled more widespread overall declines in youth.

- In areas of the country gaining children, Hispanics accounted for most of that growth. Fully 95 percent of Texas’s child population growth occurred among Hispanics. Los Angeles was the only major metropolitan area to witness a decline in Hispanic children from 2000 to 2010.

- Ten states and 35 large metro areas now have minority white child populations. Child populations in the Atlanta, Dallas, Orlando, and Phoenix metro areas flipped to “majority minority” by 2010.

- Segregation levels for black and Hispanic children are higher than for their adult counterparts, despite a general reduction in segregation over the last 10 years. The average black or Hispanic child lives in a neighborhood where whites make up 10 percent less of the population than in the neighborhood of the average black or Hispanic adult.

The accelerating growth of new minority children heralds an increasingly diverse future child population and labor force. While this transition presents challenges for America’s social and political systems, it also represents a clear demographic advantage for the nation and its regions versus its developed peers, one which savvy leaders will capitalize upon in the years and decades to come.
Checklist of Essential Features of Age-friendly Cities

This checklist of essential age-friendly city features is based on the results of the WHO Global Age-Friendly Cities project consultation in 33 cities in 22 countries. The checklist is a tool for a city’s self-assessment and a map for charting progress. More detailed checklists of age-friendly city features are to be found in the WHO Global Age-Friendly Cities Guide.

This checklist is intended to be used by individuals and groups interested in making their city more age-friendly. For the checklist to be effective, older people must be involved as full partners. In assessing a city’s strengths and deficiencies, older people will describe how the checklist of features matches their own experience of the city’s positive characteristics and barriers. They should play a role in suggesting changes and in implementing and monitoring improvements.

**Outdoor spaces and buildings**
- Public areas are clean and pleasant.
- Green spaces and outdoor seating are sufficient in number, well-maintained and safe.
- Pavements are well-maintained, free of obstructions and reserved for pedestrians.
- Pavements are non-slip, are wide enough for wheelchairs and have dropped curbs to road level.
- Pedestrian crossings are sufficient in number and safe for people with different levels and types of disability, with non-slip markings, visual and audio cues and adequate crossing times.
- Drivers give way to pedestrians at intersections and pedestrian crossings.
- Cycle paths are separate from pavements and other pedestrian walkways.
- Outdoor safety is promoted by good street lighting, police patrols and community education.
- Services are situated together and are accessible.
- Special customer service arrangements are provided, such as separate queues or service counters for older people.
- Buildings are well-signed outside and inside, with sufficient seating and toilets, accessible elevators, ramps, railings and stairs, and non-slip floors.
- Public toilets outdoors and indoors are sufficient in number, clean, well-maintained and accessible.

**Transportation**
- Public transportation costs are consistent, clearly displayed and affordable.
- Public transportation is reliable and frequent, including at night and on weekends and holidays.
- All city areas and services are accessible by public transport, with good connections and well-marked routes and vehicles.
☐ Vehicles are clean, well-maintained, accessible, not overcrowded and have priority seating that is respected.

☐ Specialized transportation is available for disabled people.

☐ Drivers stop at designated stops and beside the curb to facilitate boarding and wait for passengers to be seated before driving off.

☐ Transport stops and stations are conveniently located, accessible, safe, clean, well-lit and well-marked, with adequate seating and shelter.

☐ Complete and accessible information is provided to users about routes, schedules and special needs facilities.

☐ A voluntary transport service is available where public transportation is too limited.

☐ Taxis are accessible and affordable, and drivers are courteous and helpful.

☐ Roads are well-maintained, with covered drains and good lighting.

☐ Traffic flow is well-regulated.

☐ Roadways are free of obstructions that block drivers’ vision.

☐ Traffic signs and intersections are visible and well-placed.

☐ Driver education and refresher courses are promoted for all drivers.

☐ Parking and drop-off areas are safe, sufficient in number and conveniently located.

☐ Priority parking and drop-off spots for people with special needs are available and respected.

Housing

☐ Sufficient, affordable housing is available in areas that are safe and close to services and the rest of the community.

☐ Sufficient and affordable home maintenance and support services are available.

☐ Housing is well-constructed and provides safe and comfortable shelter from the weather.

☐ Interior spaces and level surfaces allow freedom of movement in all rooms and passageways.

☐ Home modification options and supplies are available and affordable, and providers understand the needs of older people.

☐ Public and commercial rental housing is clean, well-maintained and safe.

☐ Sufficient and affordable housing for frail and disabled older people, with appropriate services, is provided locally.

Social participation

☐ Venues for events and activities are conveniently located, accessible, well-lit and easily reached by public transport.

☐ Events are held at times convenient for older people.

☐ Activities and events can be attended alone or with a companion.

☐ Activities and attractions are affordable, with no hidden or additional participation costs.
☐ Good information about activities and events is provided, including details about accessibility of facilities and transportation options for older people.

☐ A wide variety of activities is offered to appeal to a diverse population of older people.

☐ Gatherings including older people are held in various local community spots, such as recreation centres, schools, libraries, community centres and parks.

☐ There is consistent outreach to include people at risk of social isolation.

Respect and social inclusion

☐ Older people are regularly consulted by public, voluntary and commercial services on how to serve them better.

☐ Services and products to suit varying needs and preferences are provided by public and commercial services.

☐ Service staff are courteous and helpful.

☐ Older people are visible in the media, and are depicted positively and without stereotyping.

☐ Community-wide settings, activities and events attract all generations by accommodating age-specific needs and preferences.

☐ Older people are specifically included in community activities for “families”.

☐ Schools provide opportunities to learn about ageing and older people, and involve older people in school activities.

☐ Older people are recognized by the community for their past as well as their present contributions.

☐ Older people who are less well-off have good access to public, voluntary and private services.

Civic participation and employment

☐ A range of flexible options for older volunteers is available, with training, recognition, guidance and compensation for personal costs.

☐ The qualities of older employees are well-promoted.

☐ A range of flexible and appropriately paid opportunities for older people to work is promoted.

☐ Discrimination on the basis of age alone is forbidden in the hiring, retention, promotion and training of employees.

☐ Workplaces are adapted to meet the needs of disabled people.

☐ Self-employment options for older people are promoted and supported.

☐ Training in post-retirement options is provided for older workers.

☐ Decision-making bodies in public, private and voluntary sectors encourage and facilitate membership of older people.

Communication and information

☐ A basic, effective communication system reaches community residents of all ages.

☐ Regular and widespread distribution of information is assured and a coordinated, centralized access is provided.
☐ Regular information and broadcasts of interest to older people are offered.

☐ Oral communication accessible to older people is promoted.

☐ People at risk of social isolation get one-to-one information from trusted individuals.

☐ Public and commercial services provide friendly, person-to-person service on request.

☐ Printed information – including official forms, television captions and text on visual displays – has large lettering and the main ideas are shown by clear headings and bold-face type.

☐ Print and spoken communication uses simple, familiar words in short, straightforward sentences.

☐ Telephone answering services give instructions slowly and clearly and tell callers how to repeat the message at any time.

☐ Electronic equipment, such as mobile telephones, radios, televisions, and bank and ticket machines, has large buttons and big lettering.

☐ There is wide public access to computers and the Internet, at no or minimal charge, in public places such as government offices, community centres and libraries.

☐ Community and health services

☐ An adequate range of health and community support services is offered for promoting, maintaining and restoring health.

☐ Home care services include health and personal care and housekeeping.

☐ Health and social services are conveniently located and accessible by all means of transport.

☐ Residential care facilities and designated older people's housing are located close to services and the rest of the community.

☐ Health and community service facilities are safely constructed and fully accessible.

☐ Clear and accessible information is provided about health and social services for older people.

☐ Delivery of services is coordinated and administratively simple.

☐ All staff are respectful, helpful and trained to serve older people.

☐ Economic barriers impeding access to health and community support services are minimized.

☐ Voluntary services by people of all ages are encouraged and supported.

☐ There are sufficient and accessible burial sites.

☐ Community emergency planning takes into account the vulnerabilities and capacities of older people.

WHO/FCH/ALC/2007.1
© World Health Organization 2007. All rights reserved.
Context

Within the next 30 years the urban population of developing countries is set to double from 2 to 4 billion and more than 50% of this number will be under the age of 24. Overall, in the year 2020, 56% of the world population will live in urban areas.\(^1\)

The 7\(^{th}\) Millennium Development Goal (MDG) - ensuring environmental sustainability by 2015 - has as one of its objectives to improve the lives of one hundred million slum-dwellers by the year 2020. This means addressing the situation of at least 50 million adolescents and young people.

The outcome document of the UN Special Session on Children (May 2002) stresses that “Local governments and authorities can ensure that children are at the centre of agendas for development. By building on ongoing initiatives, such as child-friendly communities and cities without slums, mayors and local leaders can significantly improve the lives of children.”\(^2\)

The Child Friendly Cities Initiative

The Child Friendly Cities Initiative (CFCI) was launched in 1996 to act on the resolution passed during the second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) to make cities liveable places for all; in UNICEF terms, aiming to put "children first." The UN Conference declared that the well-being of children is the ultimate indicator of a healthy habitat, a democratic society and of good governance. Child friendly cities are a platform to take forward the child rights agenda in both the developing world and the industrialized world. The CFCI, a movement gathering together a wide range of partners, advocates for governance approaches and participatory urban management promoting the realization of the rights of the youngest citizens.

In 2000, the International Secretariat of CFCI was established at the UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre (IRC) in Florence, Italy. The CFC Secretariat supports the sharing of knowledge and experiences, and promotes research and analysis of the strategies and practices to implement children’s rights at the local level.

What is a child friendly city?

A child friendly city is a city or any local system of governance that is committed to fulfilling children’s rights, including their right to
- Influence decisions about their city
- Express their opinion on the city they want
- Participate in family, community and social life
- Receive basic services such as health care, education and shelter
- Drink safe water and have access to proper sanitation
- Be protected from exploitation, violence and abuse
- Walk safely in the streets on their own
- Meet friends and play


\(^2\) A World Fit for Children, United Nations General Assembly, S-27/2, 11 October 2002
- Have green spaces for plants and animals
- Live in an unpolluted environment
- Participate in cultural and social events
- Be an equal citizen of their city with access to every service, regardless of ethnic origin, religion, income, gender or disability

A child friendly city is the embodiment of the Convention on the Rights of the Child at the local level: this means in practice that children’s rights are reflected in policies, laws, programmes and budgets. In a child friendly city, children are active agents; their voices and opinions are taken into consideration and influence decision making processes.

Becoming child friendly is a process that entails a number of steps, defined in the CFC Framework as 9 components “building blocks” -:

1. Ensure children’s participation
2. Have a child friendly legal framework
3. Develop a city-wide children’s rights strategy
4. Create a children’s rights unit or have a coordinating mechanism
5. Ensure a child impact assessment and evaluation
6. Have an appropriate children's budget
7. Ensure a regular state of the city’s children report
8. Make children’s rights known among adults and children
9. Support independent advocacy for children

The child participation element is cross-cutting and should be taken into account into each step of the process.

**Child friendly communities**

As the CFC approach emerged in response to a rapid rate of urbanization, the concept was initially developed for cities, referring to municipalities of different sizes. However, it is now clear that the concept may also include other communities of different types which are promoting a CFC approach. It is therefore more accurate to speak of “child friendly cities and communities”.

**UNICEF’s involvement in the Child Friendly Cities initiative (CFCI)**

The promotion and safeguarding of children’s rights are at the centre of UNICEF's mandate. Addressing the rights of children at sub-national levels, particularly in urban areas, is a means to improve their situation where they live and ensure that children have a say in all issues and decision-making processes affecting them.

UNICEF’s Medium Term Strategic Plan (MTSP), now extended to 2013, envisions the strengthening of partnerships with local authorities and municipalities to ensure a systematic response to the needs of children in underserved urban areas.

Increasing numbers of UNICEF National Committees in industrialized countries and UNICEF country offices in programme countries are promoting the CFC approach, in a variety of ways. Some have established national accreditation systems through which cities and municipalities are designated “child friendly” if they meet pre-defined goals in accordance with core challenges faced by children in their national context as framed by the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Examples of initiatives in which CFCI has been and is being implemented can be found on the CFCI website (www.childfriendlycities.org).
Examples of CFC initiatives from the South

- **Brazil**
The *Municipal Seal of Approval*, promoted by UNICEF Brazil, is an example of certification of child friendly municipalities. The strategy, based on the key components of communication, partnership and monitoring and evaluation, aims to trigger positive competition among public administrations, by granting them visibility for their achievements with regard to the fulfillment of children’s rights and MDGs and to ensure they do not lag behind in improving child well-being. Performance is assessed bi-annually through quantitative and qualitative methods and is measured through goals and indicators within three areas: social impact, public policy management and civic participation. The prestigious certificate is awarded through a major public event.

- **Philippines**
In the Philippines, the CFC approach has been promoted by the Child Friendly Movement, a multi-sector nation-wide partnership, with the support of UNICEF. A certification system, the *Presidential Award*, has been established. To be recognized as child friendly, cities and communities should attain 24 goals and indicators on survival, development, protection and participation, developed within the national plan of action for children. In addition, cities should present four “gifts” to children: a local development plan for children, a local investment plan for children, a local code on children and a state of the children report. A growing number of cities have promoted the four gifts, encouraged by the Award prize.

- **The Greater Amman Municipality, Jordan**
The Greater Amman Municipality began implementing the CFC approach in 2004 by establishing an Executive Agency for a Child Friendly City which oversees the implementation of programmes for children and ensures inter-sectorial coordination at the local level. Later the document “Policy and Priorities for Children” was developed through a participatory approach. It provides a holistic strategy to improve children’s life with a focus on the areas of health, protection and safety of children, culture, informal education/school drop outs, and child built environments. Awareness raising, capacity building and child participation have been strong elements all throughout. To ensure child participation, 4 municipal councils of children were established through elections.

Examples of CFC initiatives from the North

- **Spain**
The CFC initiative in Spain ("Ciudades Amigas de la Infancia") is promoted by the Spanish Committee for UNICEF in coordination with the Ministry of Employment and Social Affairs, the Spanish Federation of Municipalities and Provinces and the Local Network for the Rights of Children and Young People (Red Local). To obtain the CFC recognition, the city/town needs to have met the following requirements: existence of a city-wide children’s strategy, action plan or coordinated action; the creation of a council for children and youths or similar mechanisms; and an official adhesion of the full city/town council meeting, expressing acceptance of bearing the costs of processing the application. The CFC designation is awarded for four years by an intersectorial jury, which assesses the documentation. Useful tools have been developed to support cities in the process, including a website for the initiative and a questionnaire containing a wide-range of indicators.

- **France**
Launched by the French Mayors Association and by the French National Committee for UNICEF in 2002, the initiative “Ville amie des enfants” (Child-Friendly City) represents a network of approximately 170 cities of all sizes. Towns committed to becoming child friendly apply to be awarded the recognition. The completed application form is reviewed and assessed by an evaluation committee with regard to 5 areas/goals: everyday life of children; child participation programmes; promotion of international solidarity; knowledge of children's rights and partnership with UNICEF. Once appointed as child friendly, a city or town commits to enhancing activities to further meet the goals embedded in the 5
areas of work. Several tools have been developed to support cities in the process such as a website, a questionnaire and scoreboard. Yearly meetings are organised to ensure the exchange of lessons learnt.

- **Switzerland**
  The CFCI in Switzerland is promoted by the Swiss Committee for UNICEF together with governmental and non-governmental bodies. The process to become child friendly includes seven steps: development of a situation analysis based on self-assessment; feedback from the National Committee and the ad hoc working group; formal decision by the municipality to apply for the process; organization of a workshop with children and young people for them to express their views; development of an action plan; evaluation of the self-assessment report and of the action plan by the external committee; and awarding the certificate. A mid-term report is submitted and after four years, the city should prove progress has been attained and should develop a new situation analysis and action plan.

**Further information**

- Resources and materials, including a virtual database, are available on the website of the CFCI Secretariat which is hosted by the UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre: [www.childfriendlycities.org](http://www.childfriendlycities.org).
- UNICEF Spain and France have special websites for the child friendly cities initiatives: respectively [www.ciudadesamigas.org](http://www.ciudadesamigas.org), [www.villesamiesdesenfants.com](http://www.villesamiesdesenfants.com)
- Information about the Brazilian initiative may be found at [www.selounicef.org.br](http://www.selounicef.org.br)
- The Framework for action “Building child friendly cities” was published by the UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre in 2004 and is available on the CFCI website.

**Contacts**

**For National Committees**

UNICEF Geneva  
Frederike Seidel  
Programme Manager, Child Rights Education, Child Rights Advocacy and Education - Private Fundraising and Partnerships  
Email: fseidel@unicef.org  
Tel: +41 22 909 5727

**For UNICEF Country and Regional Offices and other partners**

UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre  
Dora Giusti  
Child Protection Specialist  
CFCI Secretariat  
Email: dgjusti@unicef.org  
Tel. +39 055 2033 340
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America’s Best Intergenerational Communities

Building Livable Communities for Children, Youth, Families and Older Adults
INTRODUCTION

Generations United and MetLife Foundation are pleased to recognize five incredible communities with the first-ever Best Intergenerational Communities Awards. We created these awards to heighten awareness of the importance intergenerational solidarity plays in building strong, supportive communities. A blue ribbon panel of judges selected the winning entries from an excellent pool of applicants from across the country. The judges made their recommendations based on standard criteria that take into account a community’s own demographics, services, programs and organizational structure. We recognized communities for their specific intergenerational successes, not as compared to other applicants.

OVERVIEW

This report presents a brief look at the five award winning communities. We have included a profile on each community that includes:

- A slogan for the intergenerational focus of the community
- A snapshot of key facts on the communities
- A description of intergenerational work
- Quotes from younger and older community residents
- Images of intergenerational connections in action
DEFINITIONS

The term “community” refers to a geographic area with defined borders and resident populations for which reliable demographic data is available. This could include metropolitan areas, cities, towns, counties, zip codes, neighborhoods and school districts.

The term “intergenerational community” refers to a place that (1) provides adequately for the safety, health, education and basic necessities of life for people of all ages; (2) promotes programs, policies, and practices that increase cooperation, interaction, and exchange between people of different generations; and (3) enables all ages to share their talents and resources, and support each other in relationships that benefit both individuals and their community.

An intergenerational community is not just one where multiple generations reside. It is one where individuals of all ages are an integral and valued part of the setting. This perspective is reflected in the families, structures, facilities and services that children and older adults encounter in the community, as well as in day-to-day interactions and relationships. Partnerships are essential to intergenerational communities and can be between local government, senior citizen homes, schools, businesses, local cultural and community organizations and services, families, older adults and children. An intergenerational community builds on the positive resources that each generation has to offer each other and those around them. It advances policies and practices that both acknowledge and promote intergenerational interdependence.
Georgetown, Texas

Community Slogan: Growing a community where all are valued and have the opportunity to thrive.

With its quaint Victorian storefronts, historic city square and charming restaurants, Georgetown, Texas is home to approximately 47,000 residents. The city is unique in a number of ways: it is the county seat of Williamson County; it has a fault line, called the Balcones Escarpment, that divides the city into a hilly west side and a flat east side; it is the home to Southwestern University, the oldest university in Texas; and it is the site of Sun City Texas, a retirement community whose residents make up one-third of the city’s population. But what really sets Georgetown apart is its commitment to promoting an intergenerational mindset where everyone can feel welcome and wanted.

In Georgetown, no one entity plans or oversees the city’s array of intergenerational activities or initiatives. Instead, the city government, schools, businesses, and religious and nonprofit organizations all work collaboratively to identify opportunities and strengthen existing efforts.

The city government helps sustain intergenerational efforts in a number of ways. Using an Asset Based Community Development Description of Community:
The City of Georgetown is a historic county seat in central Williamson County. The award winning “community” of Georgetown encompasses all geographic areas served by the Georgetown Independent School District, which does include some areas located outside the actual city.

Demographics (Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2010 QuickFacts):
- Total population: 47,400
- No. under 24: 11,625
- No. over 55: 18,108

Websites: www.georgetown.org, www.georgetownisd.org, visit.georgetown.org

Current Program Examples:
- The Georgetown Project – collaboration of many agencies, government
- Jr. Leadership Georgetown and Teen Advisory Boards
- Southwestern University, Civic Engagement and Senior University
- San Gabriel Park and Trails System
- Georgetown Independent School District programming
- Intergenerational dance and music performances

Intergenerational Fact:
The Sun City (active retirement community in Georgetown) voters overwhelmingly supported the passage of a 2010 local school bond, at a time when other Central Texas community school bonds failed.
approach, it works to build the often underused “community assets” (talents) of seniors and youth. The city is also a major contributor to the Georgetown Project, which funds social service and youth development organizations that help sustain intergenerational connections. Other city projects include helping to revitalize the historic town square so it now serves as an intergenerational gathering place; overseeing a new public library that includes space to foster intergenerational interactions; and building a new recreation center that includes a teen/senior center.

The Georgetown Independent School District (GISD) leads many intergenerational program efforts. These include: recruiting senior mentors and tutors into the schools; co-sponsoring an annual senior spelling bee; arranging joint performances with the high school and Sun City choirs; inviting veterans to be recognized at school Veterans Day ceremonies; and sending school buses to shuttle the Sun City “Booster Club” to high school ball games. These efforts are having a beneficial effect. In a 2010 vote, Sun City voters overwhelmingly supported the passage of a local school bond at a time when this measure failed in other Central Texas community districts.

Senior adults (50 and older) in Georgetown can take advantage of affordable lifelong learning through the Georgetown Senior University program. Approximately 600 residents currently take classes. Recently, the program’s headquarters relocated from Sun City to the Southwestern University campus to encourage seniors to become an integral part of the university environment.

Georgetown’s commitment to intergenerational understanding means a great deal to residents.

As Stephanie Blanck explains, “I have lived here since 1980 and have seen the changes and growth within our city and our school system. The demographics…and physical footprint have changed, but one thing has not. The heart and soul of caring for one’s neighbor has remained. As my husband and I approached retirement, we decided there was no better place for us to ‘grow old’ than in Georgetown. We know we will be well taken care of here.”

Adds Lizz Stippick, “I have lived in Georgetown for all 19 years of my life…and I plan on growing old here….my ultimate dream would be to teach here in the district that I grew up in…that way I can still be involved in this great blended community!”
Lamoni, Iowa
Community Slogan: One Generation

The residents of Lamoni, Iowa have never let their small population (just under 2,500 people) stop them from thinking big and acting even bigger. Indeed, Lamoni serves as a great example of what a small town can do when its residents believe in themselves and their future together.

When a problem needs fixing or an issue needs attending, residents of every age are ready, willing, and able to help out. Responsibility for intergenerational efforts does not fall to any one group in Lamoni, but is a social norm for community life. All ages work together, and every resident has a special role to play. Where else might you find a 99-year-old resident volunteering each day at a local center that sells donated clothing and other items at low cost?

Taking on such an active civic role is not a stretch for most Lamoni residents. You might say intergenerational collaboration is part of the town’s DNA. From the time they’re very young, Lamoni children are exposed to service learning. Schools help partner young people with businesses, civic groups, social clubs, and other youth organizations to work on projects designed to better the community.

One current project, the Lamoni SAFE Coalition, was organized in 1998 to provide quiet, behind-the-scenes support for local families. Through the coalition, high school students, Graceland University students, young adults, middle-age adults, and seniors work together to identify and address local needs. The coalition comprises organizations and groups of every kind, including civic, justice, education, seniors,
public safety, community action, media and communication, faith communities, business, government, and a
wealth of others. Each group takes part in monthly meetings and makes networking connections with
other members to identify appropriate resources to address identified needs.

Lamoni has numerous strong intergenerational practices benefiting all ages. Graceland University
students volunteer with school children, senior adults and local community organizations. High school
students teach computer skills to adults. The weekly Lunch Buddies mentoring program brings mentors
ranging from Graceland students to city employees, to Optimist Club members, to retired citizens to the
local elementary school. Additional intergenerational programs include a Service Learning Club that
provides a wide array of services for older adults and Across Ages mentoring that pairs middle school youth with adults aged 55 and
over.

The Community Center offers community garden plots for adoption, encouraging participation of mixed-age gardeners tending to their
plots. Recognizing the importance of the environment, all residents will gain from a new rain garden that will help create a sustainable
urban drainage system.

All these intergenerational connections and programs enhance the lives of Lamoni’s residents.

Describing his community, Lamoni resident Tom Morain says, “What makes Lamoni such a great place to live is community input. If good
things are going to happen, it’s because local residents roll up their sleeves and make them happen. That includes the community in its
broadest sense. Youth, adults, and senior volunteers do good things for each other and, in return, discover the
joy of feeling valued and cared for.”

Cody Shield, who grew up in Lamoni and now attends Graceland University, agrees. “Growing up in Lamoni
has been a great experience for me and has given me many opportunities to grow. I feel that all people in
Lamoni are given a chance to take a leadership role and serve the community no matter what their age.”
Oberlin, Ohio
Community Slogan: Live, Learn, Lead

The City of Oberlin, Ohio, with approximately 8,300 residents, has many points of pride: it has a nationally-ranked liberal arts college, a strong abolitionist history, a rich and varied cultural life, and a legacy that all individuals matter.

Oberlin’s commitment to the importance of intergenerational opportunities is evident in the city’s logo, which includes the tagline “Live. Learn. Lead.” That tagline underscores the city’s commitment to encouraging all residents to live their lives to the fullest. Oberlin backs that commitment by offering opportunities for them to become lifelong learners (and help others learn) and to become leaders—locally, regionally, and globally.

Collaboration and community service are a big part of life in Oberlin, as the City of Oberlin has built strong alliances with community organizations that ensure that Oberlin is an intergenerational community. The local government, Oberlin College, Oberlin City Schools, Kendal at Oberlin (a retirement community), Oberlin Community Services, Oberlin Heritage Center, Mercy Allen Hospital, and many other local organizations work closely together to develop programs that support and encourage interaction among different generations.

Students from Oberlin College’s Bonner Center for Service and Learning work with the many community organizations to address concerns and challenges, using many intergenerational techniques to achieve the goals. The Oberlin Early Childhood Center draws senior citizens, Oberlin College students, and Lorain

Description of Community:
Oberlin is a city that encompasses 4.78 square miles

Demographics (Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2010 QuickFacts):
- Total population: 8,286
- No. under 24: 4,321
- No. over 55: 2,001

Website: www.cityofoberlin.com

Current Program Examples:
- The Listening Post: Elementary and Older Adult conversations
- Oberlin Early Childhood Center programming
- Oberlin College’s Bonner Center for Service Learning programming
- Kendal at Oberlin Retirement Community & Kendal Early Learning Center programming
- Grandparent Reader Program
- Community Technology Center

Intergenerational Fact:
Older adults contribute 40,000 hours annually in volunteer hours, many of which provide intergenerational opportunities.
County Joint Vocational School students who volunteer in a variety of ways: in the classroom; in the kitchen, even helping prepare grant proposals.

The Kendal at Oberlin Retirement Community is a beehive of intergenerational programs as well. Its Volunteer Clearing House—initiated by a resident—matches the interests, skills, and expertise of senior volunteers with the needs of local organizations, many serving children and youth. The Kendal Early Learning Center, located in Kendal, provides daycare in an intergenerational setting. Oberlin Elementary Schools have a Grandparent Readers Program and a Listening Post Program, providing opportunities for children in interact regularly one-on-one with older adults.

These are just a few examples of how the generations are working together in Oberlin and all with no one organization or office in charge of engagement or intergenerational matters. Residents credit the community’s emphasis on intergenerational connection with improving their own lifestyle and outlook.

Says Oberlin High School student Rachel Mentzer, “I have attended the Oberlin City Schools since kindergarten. My life has been enriched in many ways because our community is committed to multigenerational projects and many of these revolve around community service. From elementary school through high school, we are learning how important it is to do something for others in even greater ways.”

Adds octogenarian John Dixon Elder, “We Kendal [retirement community] residents live with a lot of old people—very fascinatingly talented, experienced and wise old people. But we keep our curiosity, creativity, and intellectual capacity alive thanks to the extraordinary intergenerational opportunities that Oberlin provides.”
Think of San Diego and you probably focus on its physical beauty: the sandy beaches and imposing canyons, the charming historic area, and, of course, the lovely weather. But if you concentrated solely on the physical attributes, you’d miss out on one of San Diego’s most appealing traits: its commitment to making life better for all generations.

With three million residents strong, the County of San Diego believes in the need to support intergenerational connections. In 2001, it backed up that belief with serious funding by adding a full-time staff position of Intergenerational Coordinator at the county’s department of Aging & Independence Services (AIS). That investment has paid big returns: through intergenerational programs it has employed residents’ strengths to expand services and address serious challenges. Residents benefit by having the opportunity use their talents and creativity to contribute to the county’s well-being and vibrancy.
Over the past 11 years, the county’s commitment to intergenerational programs has only strengthened as the economy has weakened. By sharing sites and resources, it has maximized financial resources. It has also challenged traditional ways of funding. For example, AIS allocates funding from the Older Americans Act to support intergenerational program development. It also requests and receives funds from other county agencies to support intergenerational programs. Recently, a $16.1 million dollar Centers for Disease Control Healthy Works grant included an intergenerational thread that supported Safe Routes to School, Breakfast in the Classroom, Community gardens, and Community Engagement.

In San Diego today, all types of county services and programs have an intergenerational aspect. Libraries and Parks and Recreation offer intergenerational art, math, reading and jazz programs. Older adults take part in a Workforce Academy for Youth, mentoring foster youth for six months as they get ready to leave the foster system and join the work world. Young people have the opportunity to join the Legacy Corps Program where they serve caregivers and learn about the aging process. The county also works with providers that serve older adults and youth to sponsor Resident and Youth Leadership Academies. These academies train older adults and youth in leadership, and primarily focus on community planning principles and environmental prevention strategies. The list goes on.

This June, county agencies, non-profit organizations, for-profit agencies and faith communities will conduct a summit: Live Well, San Diego! Building a Healthy Community for All Ages. Speakers and activities will focus on how to make healthy choices and create living environments that encourage safe, active lifestyles. The event will take place in five locations to ensure all San Diegans have access to the information and activities.

San Diego’s efforts have resonated well with residents of all ages. As retired volunteer and community gardener Rich Rogers noted, community gardening “has turned into a labor of love. Gardening is as “grass roots” as you can get and teaching and mentoring kids of all ages increases my desire to be a positive influence and asset in my community.”

And for Alexis Wilson, a college student, her labor of love is to volunteer to meet with an older adult who has Parkinson’s disease. As she describes it, “Phil’s wife recently told me he sometimes forgets I’m not part of the family. Spending time with Phil reminds me I’m not going to be young forever. I would want the same help when I am that age.”
Virginia Planning District 10

Community Slogan: Healthy Aging is a Lifelong Activity

Covering the City of Charlottesville and sprawling counties of Albemarle, Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa and Nelson, Virginia’s Planning District 10 was, until fairly recently, as divided in its approach to serving multiple generations as in its geography. Thanks to a concerted effort by the Jefferson Area Board for Aging (JABA), that has changed. Today, organizations with audiences as different as the Boys and Girls Club, the Alzheimer’s Association, the YMCA, and the Local Food Hub work together to help ensure healthy aging at every stage of life in Planning District 10. The district has become a national model by embracing a philosophy of intergenerational mutual benefit. This unity of vision and purpose within an exceptionally diverse community, gives Planning District 10 its distinctive identity as one of the best places in America to age – at any age.

The roots of JABA’s pivotal role in Planning District 10’s intergenerational movement date back to 1975—long before most communities had even considered the need for or importance of intergenerational practices. As the movement grew, the district recognized it needed a formal plan to guide the growth of intergenerational initiatives. This transformation began...
in 2003 when Planning District 10 created the 2020 Plan: Aging in Community. The plan recognized the importance of intergenerational initiatives and provided a clear blueprint the community could follow in its quest to become a truly great intergenerational place to live. The 2020 Plan caught the attention of the U.S. Administration on Aging, which presented Planning District 10 with an “Overall Excellence Award.” From that plan, Planning District 10 partnered with Just Partners, Inc. to develop the “Viable Futures Toolkit,” which offers ideas on creating solutions for older generations that simultaneously address the needs of younger people and community livability. Thirteen states now use the toolkit.

Today, JABA’s mission is “to promote, establish and preserve sustainable communities for healthy aging that benefit individuals and families of all ages.” All eight of JABA's community centers have active intergenerational programs and members of its two adult care centers interact on a daily basis with co-located child care centers. In addition, there are intergenerational song-writing/performance programs, tutoring opportunities, vocational education programs, nutrition initiatives, and high school student representation on JABA’s volunteer board, as well as many other intergenerational activities. Community gardens yield locally grown food that is used to feed elderly residents at the local community and senior centers.

So what effect has this careful planning and emphasis on intergenerational living had on residents?

For Ray and Linda Jacquin, who tutor at a local elementary school, the experience has practically left them speechless—in a very good way. “Our participation in intergenerational programs has enriched our lives. We recently received a card from one of our students that read, ‘Thank you for coming every week to make me a little bit smarter.’ What more could we possibly add?”

Living in a community that honors everyone’s talents has opened high school student Lanie Newton’s eyes to new opportunities. Newton serves on the Volunteer Council at the Jefferson Area Board for Aging. She says, “I am the youngest member [of the Council]; the next oldest is a student at the University of Virginia. From the beginning, the council members have sought out my opinion. I will take this experience with me to college and beyond.”
Intergenerational Communities &
the Older Americans Act

Generations United strongly supports the mission of the Older Americans Act: to help older adults maintain maximum independence in their homes and communities and to promote a continuum of care for vulnerable seniors. As Members of Congress plan for the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act, Generations United urges the inclusion of intergenerational opportunities to improve programs and respond to specific needs. Intergenerational programs bring together diverse groups and networks, and multiply human resources by engaging volunteers and maximizing financial resources by sharing sites and supplies.

LIVABLE COMMUNITIES (TITLES III & IV)

The rise in the number of aging citizens will dramatically affect the social, physical, and economic fabric of our nation’s cities and counties in areas such as: aging, health, and human services; housing and transportation; education/recreation; and volunteerism, lifelong learning and civic engagement.

Livable communities for all ages are defined as places where citizens can grow up and grow old with maximum independence, safety and well-being.

State and local governments already have a mandate to develop and implement broader long-term community infrastructure and service systems in a variety of arenas. Despite the impending demographic forecast, few communities have begun to prepare to address the aging of their population. With 78 million Baby Boomers retiring over the next 20 years, the pending reauthorization of the Older Americans Act provides a key opportunity to initiate important changes for governments to prepare for the aging of their communities.

Generations United recommends establishing new provisions with dedicated funding authorizations to support AAAs and Title VI programs to assist county, city and tribal governments across the nation to use intergenerational strategies to proactively prepare for the aging of their communities. The provisions would authorize funding and outline the role and activities to be performed by a full-time intergenerational planner/community organizer position. This new planner/community organizer would take a leading role in working with other agencies and stakeholder organizations (including children and youth organizations) in developing a comprehensive livability plan, including approaches that design communities for all ages, and implementation strategy factoring the range of community policies, programs and services.

For a full list of Generations United’s recommendations for the Older Americans Act visit www.gu.org/OURWORK/PublicPolicy/OlderAmericansAct.aspx.

For more information, please contact Melissa Ness, Public Policy Manager, at mness@gu.org.
Intergenerational Communities & the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Generations United strongly supports the goals of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA): to ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education. As Members of Congress continue to work on the reauthorization of ESEA, Generations United urges the inclusion of intergenerational opportunities to improve programs and respond to specific needs. Intergenerational programs bring together diverse groups and networks, and multiply human resources by engaging volunteers and maximizing financial resources by sharing sites and supplies. Generations United sees two specific areas within ESEA that can help support intergenerational communities:

SCHOOL-BASED SHARED SITES

Faced with tough budgets, communities can save scarce resources by consolidating services for children, youth, and older adults under one roof while preserving quality and offering added benefits to each generation. Our nation’s schools are uniquely positioned to become intergenerational shared sites and engage older adults as resources for the education of our youth. We support legislation that will help schools transition into intergenerational shared sites.

Research shows that shared sites provide substantial benefits for children. For example: preschool children involved in intergenerational programs had higher personal/social developmental scores (by 11 months) than preschool children involved in non-intergenerational programs.1

ENGAGING OLDER ADULTS IN EDUCATION

In order to foster growth of programs that enhance students’ learning experiences, address community needs, spur innovation in the classroom and improve student outcomes, the reauthorization of ESEA should include language that complements efforts in the Serve America Act to support the integration of intergenerational civic engagement opportunities in student curriculum.

Studies have shown that youth who are involved in intergenerational mentoring programs demonstrate improved grades, significant decreases in school absences, and decreased suspensions from school. Children in schools where older adults were a regular fixture (volunteers working 15 hours per week) had improved reading scores and fewer behavioral problems than their peers at other schools.²

Intergenerational opportunities in schools – including programs such as community schools and Promise Neighborhoods – allow for the community to come together and foster supportive and collaborative relationships to support student success both in and out of school.

In these challenging times, we must take steps to strengthen our schools and facilitate relationships among students, older adults and the community. If implemented, these recommendations will save limited resources now while investing wisely in ways that will bring multiplying returns for our children, families and communities of tomorrow.

For a full list of Generations United’s recommendations for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act visit www.gu.org/OURWORK/PublicPolicy/Education.aspx.

For more information, please contact Eric Masten, Policy & Program Coordinator, at emasten@gu.org.

Best Cities for Successful Aging

Anusuya Chatterjee, Principal Author
Ross DeVol, Chief Research Officer
Introduction by Paul H. Irving, Leader, Aging Populations Initiative; Senior Managing Director and Chief Operating Officer
America is growing older. The implications and costs of this extraordinary demographic shift are now upon us. In the public arena, every day brings hand-wringing from leaders in government and business over the increasing strains on social safety nets and health-care systems. On a personal level, we want to know where we’ll live, how we’ll take care of ourselves, and whether we’ll enjoy meaning and dignity as we age. How should we respond to the aging of America?

Of course, there are societal and personal challenges that may seem daunting and must be addressed. But it’s not all dire news. Aging Americans want to remain healthy, active, engaged, and contributing members of society. They represent not only a challenge but also an opportunity—the chance to build a better and stronger America.

Across the country, leaders are developing exciting solutions to enable successful aging. Policymakers are driving senior-sensitive civic projects to improve aging lives. With 80 million boomers on their way to senior status, entrepreneurs and business leaders are seeking to capitalize on the emerging opportunities presented by the massive longevity economy. Innovation abounds—from new approaches to wellness and health-care delivery, to senior-friendly housing and transportation systems, to encore education, career, and engagement opportunities, to aging-centered technologies and social networks, to travel, entertainment, and leisure.

To shine a light on the best of these programs and encourage new ones, the Milken Institute is proud to present the first Best Cities for Successful Aging™ index, which measures, compares, and ranks the performance of 359 U.S. metropolitan areas in promoting and enabling successful aging.
Successful aging is vitally important to all of us. We all want it for ourselves, and for our parents and grandparents. While each one of us has specific interests, needs, and priorities related to our own aging, at the Milken Institute, we define successful aging in America this way:

- **We want to live in places that are safe, affordable, and comfortable.** We compiled statistics on cost of living, employment growth, jobless rates, income distribution, crime rates, alcoholism, and weather.

- **We want to be healthy and happy.** We looked at a range of factors, including the number of health professionals, hospital beds, long-term hospitals, and facilities with geriatric, Alzheimer’s, dialysis, hospice, and rehabilitation services. We also examined hospital quality and affiliation with medical schools. To determine the general wellness of a community, we studied the rates of obesity, diabetes, Alzheimer’s, smoking, and mental illness and looked at the availability of recreation, wellness programs, and other healthy pursuits.

- **We want to be financially secure and part of an economy that enables opportunity and entrepreneurship.** We examined each area’s tax burden, small-business growth, poverty levels, and employment rates for those 65-plus, and the number of reverse mortgages.

- **We want living arrangements that suit our needs.** We compiled statistics on the costs of homeownership and rental housing, nursing homes, assisted living facilities, and home health-care providers, and checked for programs that help pay for senior housing.

- **We want mobility and access to convenient transportation systems that get us where we want and need to go.** We studied commute times, fares, the use of and investment in transit for the public and for seniors specifically, and the number of grocery stores and other key retailers.

- **We want to be respected for our wisdom and experience; to be physically, intellectually, and culturally enriched; and to be connected to our families, friends, and communities.** We compiled statistics on volunteerism, employment opportunities, and factors relating to encore careers, and we reviewed indicators including access to fitness and recreational facilities, training and education, senior enrichment programs, museums, cultural and religious institutions, libraries, and YMCAs, as well as the proportion of the population 65 and older.

We used all those factors and more to develop our *Best Cities for Successful Aging* index. The overall rankings are based on eight subcomponents (general indicators, health care, wellness, living arrangements, transportation/convenience, financial well-being, employment/education, and community engagement). Each subcomponent is based on multiple individual indicators—78 indicators in all.
There have been aging rankings before, often based on opinion and speculation, or focused on a limited aspect of aging. But the Milken Institute’s data-driven approach represents a deeper level of analysis. Developed by our research staff with input from our Best Cities for Successful Aging Advisory Committee (see page 57 for the list of experts), the index rankings are based on a weighted, multidimensional methodology that examines the factors above and others that help determine the quality of life for older Americans.

Don’t confuse the Milken Institute Best Cities for Successful Aging index with the many rankings and opinion polls that identify the sunniest or most inexpensive spots to live out retirement. Up to 90 percent of older Americans want to age in place, according to a recent survey by AARP, and our goal is to enhance their communities so they can do so with the greatest quality of life possible.

As you review the findings, you will see three main rankings for each city: one for the aging population overall, one for those 80 and older, and one for those 65-79. We created the two sub-indexes because we recognize that seniors 80 and older may have different needs than their 65-year-old counterparts.

While the three main rankings rely on the same data sets, the data are weighted somewhat differently. For those 80-plus, we give more weight to factors such as health care and weather, while the sub-index for those 65-79 focuses more on active lifestyles and engagement opportunities. The overall rankings are not simply an average of the metro’s performance in the sub-indexes, but are the result of their own weighting convention. (For detailed information on how the indicators are weighted, see page 37.)

The index also has separate rankings for the 100 largest cities and 259 smaller metropolitan areas to account for the disparity in their potential resources and the lack of certain data for the smaller metros.

The Milken Institute’s objectives for the Best Cities for Successful Aging index are straightforward. We want to generate virtuous competition among cities and galvanize improvement in the social structures that serve aging Americans. We want to encourage and promote best practices and innovation. We want to catalyze solutions-focused dialogue among thought leaders, decision-makers, and stakeholders. In short, we want to shape the future and spread successful aging across America.

We’re pleased to congratulate the public- and private-sector leaders of the Milken Institute Best Cities for Successful Aging on their communities’ accomplishments. We look forward to their ongoing achievements and to acknowledging the work of other innovative leaders as they push to improve their metros’ rankings.
Provo-Orem, UT

Nailed it: ✔

Healthy, active lifestyle
- Smoking and binge drinking rates are low.
- The metro’s diabetes rate is the fourth lowest among the 100 largest metros. Combined with low obesity, this suggests residents suffer fewer chronic diseases.
- More than 5 percent of the population walks to work.
- The metro has the fewest fast-food outlets per capita, so unhealthy choices are less available.

Access to quality care and other services
- Three of the seven medical centers are Magnet hospitals.
- It has ample continuing-care facilities.
- The state of Utah (city-level data isn’t available) has one of the largest pools of caregivers.
- Residents have easy access to grocery stores and conveniences.

Vibrant economy cultivates learning, enrichment
- Employment and personal incomes are growing.
- It ranks first in growth of small businesses over the past five years.
- The metro leads the rankings in per capita college enrollment and ranks high in universities and community colleges.
- It has the lowest poverty rates among seniors.

Safety, security, and a sense of community
- The crime rate is low.
- Commute times are short.
- It has one of the highest numbers of volunteers per capita.
- Many seniors live with their children.

Needs work:
- Despite a vital economy and the smallest percentage of seniors living below the poverty line, the metro has the highest unemployment rate for those 65 and older of the 100 largest metros.
- Provo-Orem is an expensive place to live.
- The metro needs to improve its pool of health-care providers and certain specialized facilities.

Takeaway:
Provo has a relatively young population, but more older Americans have been moving to the metro over the past decade. A learning environment and vibrant economy provide opportunities for a second career and retraining. The presence of Brigham Young University, one of the largest private universities in the U.S., and a pro-business environment make Provo the No. 1 city on our list. It also boasts a low incidence of chronic disease, thanks to healthy lifestyles and a focus on wellness. Provo is an excellent location for seniors who are relocating or hoping to age in place, with safety, security, high community engagement, quality health care, a healthy lifestyle, and opportunities for second careers and entrepreneurship.
Sioux Falls, SD

**Nailed It:**

- **Booming economy, solid financial base**
  - Employment for those 65 and older is the highest among the 259 small metros.
  - The metro has one of the lowest unemployment rates of the small metros.
  - It ranks first for amount of bank deposits; the number of financial institutions ensures easy access.
  - A relatively large service sector implies more job opportunities for seniors.
  - Low commute time ensures a stress-free ride to work.

- **Senior-friendly state and local policies**
  - The metro has one of the strongest bases of seniors enrolled in Medicare.
  - The state ranks high in investment in public transportation and state funding for seniors.
  - Inpatient expenses are the lowest of the small metros.
  - Many hospitals have rehabilitation services and hospice care.
  - The metro has an ample number of physicians and nurses.
  - Residents enjoy a decent quality of life.

**Needs Work:**

- **Affordability**
  - It ranks 124th among the 259 small metros in cost of living, and the variation in incomes is high.
  - The metro ranks low in living arrangements due to high home and rental prices.

- **Ease of access**
  - Although the state invests heavily in senior transportation, overall ridership remains low.
  - More neighborhood grocery stores and other conveniences are needed to improve accessibility.

- **Health-care providers**
  - Sioux Falls has a high incidence of Alzheimer’s cases and needs more hospitals with Alzheimer’s units to care for them.
  - Home health-care providers and caregivers are in short supply.
  - The metro needs quality nursing homes.

**Takeaway:**

With a booming economy, low unemployment, and a rapidly growing financial infrastructure, Sioux Falls is a good place for seniors who want to work or start a second career. Its hospitals specialize in geriatric services, hospice, and rehabilitation, and the metro has recreation and an active lifestyle. But seniors might be turned off by the inclement weather and lack of contemporaries.
### Rankings for All 359 Metros

#### 100 LARGE METRO RANKINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRO</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
<th>65-79</th>
<th>80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron, OH</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin-Round Rock, TX</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield, CA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore-Towson, MD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge, LA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham-Hoover, AL</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise City-Nampa, ID</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston-North Charleston-Summerville, SC</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga, TN-GA</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-W</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs, CO</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, SC</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver-Aurora-Broomfield, CO</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro-High Point, NC</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville-Mauldin-Easley, SC</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 100 LARGE METRO RANKINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRO</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
<th>65-79</th>
<th>80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu, HI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis-Carmel, IN</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, MS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, FL</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO-KS</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster, PA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas-Paradise, NV</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway, AR</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville-Jefferson County, KY-IN</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, TN-MS-AR</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto, CA</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville-Davidson-Murfreesboro-Franklin, TN</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven-Milford, CT</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden-Clearfield, UT</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City, OK</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando-Kissimmee, FL</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown, NY</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 100 Large Metro Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>65-79</th>
<th>80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provo-Orem, UT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh-Cary, NC</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, NY</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento-Aden-Arcade-Roseville, CA</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota-Bradenton-Venice, FL</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, MA</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO-IL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton, CA</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, NY</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo, OH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson, AZ</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, OK</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, KS</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester, MA</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 259 Small Metro Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>65-79</th>
<th>80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abilene, TX</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany, GA</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria, LA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona, PA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarillo, TX</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ames, IA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage, AK</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, IN</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, SC</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniston-Oxford, AL</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleton, WI</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asheville, NC</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens-Clarke County, GA</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City-Hammondton, NJ</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn-Opelika, AL</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor, ME</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnstable Town, MA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Creek, MI</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay City, MI</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham, WA</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bend, OR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billings, MT</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton, NY</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bismarck, ND</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksburg-Christiansburg-Radford, VA</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomington, IN</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomington-Normal, IL</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder, CO</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green, KY</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton-Silverdale, WA</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownsville-Harlingen, TX</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick, GA</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington, NC</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington-South Burlington, VT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton-Massillon, OH</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson City, NV</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casper, WY</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Rapids, IA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>65-79</td>
<td>80+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign-Urbana, IL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, WV</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlottesville, VA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne, WY</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico, CA</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarksville, TN-KY</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, TN</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d'Alene, ID</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Station-Bryan, TX</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, MO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, GA-AL</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, IN</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christi, TX</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corvallis, OR</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland, MD-WV</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton, GA</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville, IL</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville, VA</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur, AL</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur, IL</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dothan, AL</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover, DE</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubuque, IA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth, MN-WI</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham-Chapel Hill, NC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eau Claire, WI</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro, CA</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabethtown, KY</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkhart-Goshen, IN</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira, NY</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie, PA</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene-Springfield, OR</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evansville, IN-KY</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks, AK</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fargo, ND-MN</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington, NM</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRO</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
<th>65-79</th>
<th>80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville, NC</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint, MI</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence, SC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fond du Lac, WI</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins-Loveland, CO</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Smith, AR-OK</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Walton Beach-Crestview-Destin, FL</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Wayne, IN</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadsden, AL</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville, FL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville, GA</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Falls, NY</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsboro, NC</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks, ND-MN</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Junction, CO</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls, MT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeley, CO</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay, WI</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville, NC</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulfport-Biloxi, MS</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanford-Concoran, CA</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisonburg, VA</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattiesburg, MS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory-Lenoir-Morganton, NC</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesville-Fort Stewart, GA</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland-Grand Haven, MI</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Springs, AR</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LA</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsville, AL</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Falls, ID</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa City, IA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca, NY</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, MI</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, TN</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>65-79</td>
<td>80+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, NC</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janesville, WI</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson City, MO</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson City, TN</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnstown, PA</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonesboro, AR</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joplin, MO</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo-Portage, MI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kankakee-Bradley, IL</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennewick-Pasco-Richland, WA</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood, TX</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsport-Bristol-Bradley, TN</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston, NY</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo, IN</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Crosse, WI-MN</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette, IN</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette, LA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Charles, LA</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing-East Lansing, MI</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laredo, TX</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Cruces, NM</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence, KS</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawton, OK</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon, PA</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewiston, ID-WA</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewiston-Auburn, ME</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington-Fayette, KY</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima, OH</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln, NE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan, UT-ID</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview, TX</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview, WA</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubbock, TX</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynchburg, VA</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon, GA</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera-Chowchilla, CA</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester-Nashua, NH</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield, OH</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**259 SMALL METRO RANKINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRO</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
<th>65-79</th>
<th>80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medford, OR</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced, CA</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan City-LaPorte, IN</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland, TX</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula, MT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile, AL</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe, LA</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe, MI</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery, AL</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgantown, WV</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, TN</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Vernon-Anacortes, WA</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie, IN</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskegon-Norton Shores, MI</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Beach-North Myrtle Beach-Conway, SC</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa, CA</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples-Marco Island, FL</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niles-Benton Harbor, MI</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich-New London, CT</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocala, FL</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean City, NJ</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odessa, TX</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia, WA</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshkosh-Neenah, WI</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owensboro, KY</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama City-Lynn Haven-Panama City Beach, FL</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkersburg-Marietta-Vienna, WV-OH</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascagoula, MS</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria, IL</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Bluff, AR</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield, MA</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocatello, ID</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port St. Lucie-Fort Pierce, FL</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland-South Portland-Biddeford, ME</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott, AZ</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo, CO</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punta Gorda, FL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>65-79</td>
<td>80+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine, WI</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid City, SD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, PA</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redding, CA</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno-Sparks, NV</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke, VA</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, MN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford, IL</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mount, NC</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome, GA</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem, OR</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas, CA</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury, MD</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Angelo, TX</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles, CA</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandusky, OH</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Goleta, CA</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe, NM</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah, GA</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheboygan, WI</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman-Denison, TX</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shreveport-Bossier City, LA</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux City, IA-NE-SD</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls, SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bend-Mishawaka, IN-MI</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartanburg, SC</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane, WA</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, IL</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, MO</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, OH</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Cloud, MN</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRO</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
<th>65-79</th>
<th>80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. George, UT</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph, MO-NS</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College, PA</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumter, SC</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee, FL</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terre Haute, IN</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texarkana, TX-AR</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka, KS</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton-Ewing, NJ</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscaloosa, AL</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler, TX</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica-Rome, NY</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdosta, GA</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallejo-Fairfield, CA</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria, TX</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineland-Milville-Bridgeton, NJ</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia-Porterville, CA</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waco, TX</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner Robins, GA</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wausau, WI</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weirton-Steubenville, WV-OH</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenatchee-East Wenatchee, WA</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeling, WV-OH</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita Falls, TX</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsport, PA</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington, NC</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester, VA-WV</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston-Salem, NC</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima, WA</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York-Hanover, PA</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba City, CA</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma, AZ</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing an Aging Population

Are We Prepared?
WE ALL KNOW IT’S COMING — baby boomers are about to swell the ranks of older Americans. By 2050, the population of individuals aged 65 or older will increase 120 percent from 40 million to more than 88 million; put another way, one in every five Americans will be 65+. The numbers of Americans aged 85 or older will more than triple over the same period to 19 million. Demand for housing will shift dramatically and the need for services to help older adults age in place will grow exponentially. Are we prepared?

This report looks at the housing situation of older adults now and implications for the near future. It includes a detailed analysis of data from the most recent American Housing Survey and presents results by age group (65-74, 75-84, 85+) because the housing needs of “younger” older adults and the oldest adults are quite different. It draws on a variety of other sources to round out the picture of housing challenges that we must prepare for now. As the report demonstrates, the challenges are enormous.

More older poor households will face severe housing cost burdens. Older adults are more likely than younger adults to spend more than half their income on housing. Cost burdens also increase with age. One in four households 85+ pay at least half their income for housing, as compared with about one in five households aged 65-74 and about one in six households younger than 65. The incomes of older adults tend to decline with age — as reflected in rising poverty rates. But property taxes, maintenance, and utility costs all tend to rise over time for both older homeowners and renters (as reflected in higher rents). Accumulated savings and home equity can help, but levels of net worth vary dramatically among older adults, and are particularly low among racial and ethnic minorities.

As the overall population ages, the numbers of the most vulnerable will grow as well — people with a disability, women living alone (who account for 39.5 percent of 65+ women), and minorities. Meanwhile, the Great Recession has eaten into the reserves of many older households, reducing home equity and many retirement and savings accounts.

An older population with health and mobility issues will drive demand for home modifications, services to help residents age in place, and housing options that facilitate the delivery of services and help prevent premature entry into nursing homes. Thanks to changes in lifestyle and technology, both men and women are living longer. It also means more older adults will be living with disabilities. While about one-quarter of older households aged 65-74 include someone with a disability, the proportion climbs to nearly two-thirds among households with a member 85+. The demand for renovations and retrofits to accommodate disabilities will soar. Older adults almost universally say they want to age in their current homes, but many lack access to the services needed to ensure this outcome.

Taking to scale some of the models for service delivery now being developed at the local level will help significantly. At the same time, some of the oldest adults may prefer to move to multifamily housing developments that provide extra assistance to help residents live independently. The supply of these types of housing is unlikely to keep pace with burgeoning demand, and these options are often too expensive for low-, moderate-, and middle-income households.

A stronger policy commitment will be needed. Considerable attention is focused on the rising healthcare costs of an aging population — and rightly so. But the housing and supportive services needs faced by the very same people receive comparatively little notice. Even today, federally subsidized rental programs meet the needs of only about one in four eligible households regardless of age. As the number of older adults rises, the dual challenges of providing affordable housing and adequate services will compel communities across the country to respond.

One set of policies can help older adults continue to live in their own homes as they age. This includes policies to: assist with home modification using a range of funding sources; connect residents to social services through expansion of the Home and Community-Based Services Medicaid waiver program, Programs of All Inclusive Care for the Elderly (PACE), volunteer efforts, and other mechanisms; help residents afford high housing costs through housing vouchers and property tax abatement programs; and expand public transit and volunteer driver programs to help residents get around without driving. A critical question concerns how to pay for the services needed to help residents age in place. One option is to expand the use of Medicaid and Medicare funding for these services since they likely result in savings associated with postponing or avoiding more expensive nursing care and emergency room visits. Another is to implement the CLASS Act, a health reform provision designed to make it easier for individuals to self-insure for services costs. Discussions on these topics are underway but need to intensify.

Equally important are policies to expand housing choices for older adults. By adopting more flexible zoning policies and aggressively enforcing the requirements of the Fair Housing Act and Americans with Disabilities Act, communities can help foster a diverse range of housing types including accessory dwelling units (i.e., granny flats), high-density rental developments, supportive housing, assisted living residences, continuing care retirement communities, and congregate housing. Subsidies will be needed to help ensure that older adults with low and moderate incomes have access to affordable choices, and at present there are far too few of these to go around. And it is also time to experiment with more cohousing efforts that promote “active neighboring” and/or allow professional caregivers to live among residents.

For the most part, the strategies are familiar. What is needed is greater urgency in the face of demographic certainty.
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Executive Summary

Two powerful phenomena have come face-to-face this year, demanding urgent attention. One is demographic: the rapid and dramatic aging of the U.S. population. In 2011, in communities across the country, the leading edge of the Baby Boom generation reached age 65. By 2030, more than 70 million Americans—twice the number in 2000—will be 65 and older. At that time, older adults will comprise nearly one in five Americans.

The other phenomenon is the Great Recession, which began officially in December 2007. In the U.S., despite initial signs of recovery, it continues to heavily influence policy, programs and planning. States continue to cut budgets, and municipalities are also financially distressed. As a result of the recession, spending for aging supports and services is shrinking—precisely at the time it is needed most.

With the convergence of these two forces, critical concerns come to the fore. How prepared are communities across America to tap the vast potential of the oncoming wave of older adults? How are policies in all dimensions of community life being adapted to support these individuals as they age in place, particularly during the most advanced years of their lives? What initiatives are underway to address the “maturing” of America?

To answer these questions, with support from MetLife Foundation, and in partnership with the International City/County Management Association (ICMA), American Planning Association, National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, and Partners for Livable Communities, the National Association of Area Agencies on Aging (n4a) led a nationwide survey: “The Maturing of America—Communities Moving Forward for an Aging Population.” The survey, administered in 2010 by ICMA, was intended to assess progress against benchmarks established in the first “Maturing of America” survey conducted in 2005. In both cases, the findings were eye-opening.

Key Finding: n4a’s report on the first survey, issued in 2006, found that, while many communities had some programs to address the needs of older adults, few had undertaken a comprehensive assessment to create a “livable community” for all ages, including the diverse population of those age 65+.

The new survey reveals only limited progress in advancing this goal. Indeed, as a result of the severe economic challenges associated with the recession, most communities have been able only to “hold the line”— maintaining...
policies, programs and services already established. Thus, they have not been able to move forward to the degree needed to address the nation’s current “age wave.” The survey captures encouraging steps forward in some areas, and retrenchment in others. But overall, it appears that many communities are struggling to maintain the status quo.

We call upon policymakers at all levels of government, but particularly at the local level, to move forward energetically—even if incrementally—to address the challenges at hand. We urge local community leaders—working with Area Agencies on Aging, universities, businesses, nonprofit organizations, other public sector entities and older adults themselves—to become champions and change agents who can break through the current stalemate. We hope that this report, which spotlights the ways some communities are doing just that, will inspire fresh momentum.

**Specific Notable Findings**

**Advances:** Notwithstanding the challenges faced by local governments, there have been notable areas of advancement by communities since the 2005 survey. Communities report the following:

- Increased support for older adults
  - A dramatic increase in the availability of specialized training for public safety and emergency staff in dealing with older adults, from 24% in 2005 to 59% in 2010. Such training is indispensable for those helping older persons during natural and manmade disasters.
  - Significant growth in the provision of in-home support services for older adults, from 71% in 2005 to 77% in 2010. This change responds to older individuals’ desire to remain in their homes and communities as long as possible, rather than being forced into institutional care.
  - Greater support for advanced education and retooling for the workforce
    - Significant increase in programs that support older adults’ participation in local educational opportunities (e.g. discounts, transportation), from 45% in 2005 to 52% in 2010. This finding likely reflects older adults’ desire for educational enrichment as well as to refresh workforce skills.
  - Expanded opportunities for older adult contribution to the community
    - Very significant rise in volunteer opportunities for older adults (e.g. arts, culture, human services), from 66% in 2005 to 80% in 2010. Communities are clearly acknowledging the invaluable resource represented by older volunteers, who can contribute in every dimension of civic and community life.

**San Diego County, CA**

The San Diego County Library has received national recognition for its innovative programs and extraordinary approach to community learning. Among its countless offerings, the library holds regular music and cultural events, computer classes in English, Spanish and Arabic, reading clubs for patrons of all ages, and adult literacy programs.
Challenges: Local governments identified three top challenges their communities face in meeting the needs of or planning for older adults. While responses varied, the challenges most often cited were financial/funding shortages, transportation and housing. This lineup contrasts with the top three identified challenges in 2005, which were, in the following order, housing, financial issues and various health issues.

### Top Three Challenges in Meeting the Needs of or Planning for Older Adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Financial/funding shortages</td>
<td>1. Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transportation</td>
<td>2. Financial issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Housing</td>
<td>3. Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This articulation of current challenges is backed up by how local governments assess their economic condition:

- In 2010, only 42% of jurisdictions indicated they were experiencing some growth—a drop of 25 percentage points from the 67% reporting some growth in 2005.
- In 2010, 30% of local governments experienced some decline; a nearly three-fold increase from the 11% that reported that they experienced some decline in 2005.

### Overall Findings

Following are capsule summaries of the findings of each section of the 2010 survey.

### Programs & Services for a Maturing America:

- **Health care**—Over two-thirds (69%) of local governments report the availability of health care services that meet a range of needs. However, communities with larger populations are far more likely to provide/deliver these services (all local governments of 1,000,000+ report doing so); older adults in more rural areas are at a significant disadvantage in securing health care services. This disparity is also true of prescription drug programs (other than Medicare Part D), wellness programs, preventive screenings and immunizations.
• **Nutrition**—Respondents indicate that congregate and home-delivered meals programs are available in 85% of communities, and more than half of local governments report that the meal provider/deliverer is a nonprofit or faith-based organization. A high percentage of communities (73%) also report the availability of nutrition education programs.

• **Exercise**—Over 70% of communities report the availability of exercise classes tailored to specific health concerns, such as heart disease, arthritis, diabetes and falls, and nearly 90% report the availability of local parks and other venues that have safe, easy-to-reach walking/biking trails. The Pacific Coast region leads the nation in the availability of both initiatives.

• **Transportation**—Programs that provide transportation to and from health care services, as well to other destinations (such as grocery stores and cultural events) are reported by over 80% of respondents, about the same as in 2005. Transportation options range widely in availability. Three-quarters of communities report having in place sidewalks and street crossings that are safe and accessible for older pedestrians; fewer report having sidewalk systems linking residences and essential services.

• **Public safety/emergency**—The percentage of local governments reporting specialized training for public safety/emergency staff in dealing with older adults more than doubled, to 59% from 24% in 2005. However, communities reporting plans in place for evacuation of older adults, if needed, decreased to 71% from 81% in 2005. Communities report a modest decline in availability of programs to detect and prevent elder abuse and neglect.

• **Housing**—Availability of programs to provide home maintenance and repair assistance, home modification and targeted service delivery to meet the needs of older adults (e.g. backyard trash collection, sidewalk snow removal) remains roughly the same as five years ago. Subsidized housing availability slipped to 63% from 70% in 2005.

• **Taxation and finance**—Reported property tax relief for older adults on limited incomes shows a steep drop in availability, to 54% from 72% in 2005. Availability of programs to educate and inform older adults about financial fraud and predatory lending has declined somewhat (to 65% from 69% in 2005), while availability of assistance with preparation of tax forms slightly increased.
• **Workforce development**—Forty-eight percent of respondents report the availability of workforce skills development services targeting older adults, while 39% report employer engagement/education programs.

• **Community and civic engagement**—A very significant increase in volunteer opportunities for older adults is reported, to 80% from 66% in 2005. Substantial engagement of older adults in local planning and decision-making processes is also reported, and close to 90% of respondents indicate that older adults are represented on advisory boards, commissions or committees that deal with planning issues that affect them.

• **Aging/human services**—There has been significant growth in availability of in-home support services for older adults since 2005, to 77% from 71%. Local governments report a drop in availability of a single-entry point model for services, to 37% from 42% in 2005.

**Planning & Policies that Benefit Older Adults:**

• **Strategic plan**—Only 30% of respondents report having in place a process that solicits input from older persons, and just over half that many (17%) report having comprehensive assessments and strategic plans in place. More however, note that they intend to institute such assessment and planning (26% and 27% respectively).

• **Land use planning**—Local governments are implementing land use planning tools to varying extents, with the master plan being the one most often in place (67%). Zoning that supports complete streets is reported by a majority of local governments (54%). Zoning requirements that support aging in place and active lifestyles for older adults (e.g. higher density, mixed-use development, and amenities) are reported by 44% of respondents.
Want Healthier Seniors? Give Them Bus Passes

Health problems and age go hand in hand. This inevitability is acceptable, but it doesn’t have to be such a strong correlation. One universally accepted method to improving the health of older adults is to get them to be more active. An easy way to do that, apparently, is to give them bus passes. For the older adult population in the United Kingdom, simply having free access to the bus can dramatically improve public health, according to a new study published in the American Journal of Public Health.

In 2006, a new system was put in place that gives any person 60 and older a bus pass that allows free local travel on public transit. Researchers from Imperial College London found that those with bus passes were much more likely to take frequent walks and to get around by "active travel" – walking, cycling or using public transit. They also found that these increases in active travel cut across social and economic groups.

The study used data from the UK’s National Travel Survey for the four-year period between 2005 and 2008.

Another related study shows that this can be an important way to improve the overall health of older people in the UK. About 20 percent of people over 60 currently achieve their recommended amount of physical activity solely through active travel.

Of the nearly 17,000 people interviewed, about 57 percent reported having a bus pass in 2005. That number jumped to nearly 75 percent by 2008. The cost of the program – £1.1 billion a year – has caused some to call for it to be canceled.

And while these results are a good argument for keeping the program in place, they are also very UK-focused. In the U.S., a similar program might not be able to reach the same goals simply because of the lack of public transit options in many cities and towns. As designers and public officials face growing concerns about the aging U.S. population to be able to "age in place," these results offer a promising path for ensuring the health of older people. But without the community design and public transit access, it’s not likely that U.S. cities would be able to see the same results.
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American cities to Millennials: Don't leave
Haya El Nasser, USA TODAY

Ella Kibblewhite-Claus, 10, right, and her sister Matariki, 8, play on the south public lawn of the newly opened Devon Energy Center.(Photo: Brett Deering for USA TODAY)

Story Highlights
• Cities face a new demographic reality as young and single age
• Young professionals were the core of America's urban revival
• As Millennials have kids, cities must compete with suburbia

December 4, 2012 - The hot pursuit of young professionals has been at the core of American cities' urban revival for more than a decade. It worked. They came, they played, they stayed.

An urban renaissance unfolded as the number of people living in America's downtowns soared, construction of condos and loft apartments boomed and once-derelict neighborhoods thrived. In many of the largest cities in the most-populous metropolitan areas, downtown populations grew at double-digit rates from 2000 to 2010, according to the Census.

Now, cities face a new demographic reality: The young and single are aging and having children. If the pattern of the past 50 years holds, they might soon set their sights on suburbia.

"We know young people move the most," says Richard Florida, whose book *The Rise of the Creative Class* published 10 years ago helped spark the wooing of young professionals to revive declining urban centers. "So capturing people early on in their lives in a metro really matters. It's important to compete with suburbs for people once they get a little older and have children."

The older they get, the less likely people are to live in cities, according to recent Census data. The peak age for urban living is 25 to 27, when 20% of that age group are nestled in urban centers. By the age of 41, about a quarter have moved to the suburbs.

Cities recognize this looming challenge and are bracing for the maturing of a generation that sought out coffeehouses, hip entertainment venues and small flats but now is starting to demand soccer fields, good schools and roomy homes.

Hanging on to residents as they age, make more money and have kids is a plus for cities because it strengthens and stabilizes the tax base while creating an involved constituency. Plus, it's a return on the investment they made to woo young people in the first place — concert halls, sports arenas, bike trails and more.

The stakes are high because the oldest of 86 million Millennials are turning 30 this year, a time when many marry and start families. This giant demographic wave is even larger than the 77 million-strong Baby Boomers that have dominated social and cultural trends for decades.

"This Millennial generation is the generation that decides where it's going to live before it decides what it's going to do," says William Fulton, president of policy and research at Smart Growth America, a non-profit national coalition against suburban sprawl. "The stakes are very high. ... There are two big quality-of-life things that become important when you have kids:
schools and recreational activities."

And there's safety, housing, child care and outdoor space. "It's an enormous topic of conversation for city planners and politicians even if their constituents are older, because they're concerned about where their kids and grandchildren are going to live," Fulton says. "The question isn't so much getting families out of the suburbs into cities but getting them to stay in the cities."

'An extension of dorm life'

Cities endured decades of shrinking populations fueled by an exodus of young and old who found refuge from crime, racial tension and poverty in suburbia. When cities began to invest in their neighborhoods with new housing and rail systems and lured entrepreneurs, the turnaround happened. Cities don't want to see the pattern reverse again.

"Cities began renewal efforts by offering a young adult-focused lifestyle," says Robert Lang, urban affairs professor at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas. "It was like an extension of dorm life after college. Cities assumed that they would get to the business of improving schools and providing more family services later. Well, now it's later."

The growing urban constituency of hipster parents is not timid about making itself heard. Educated and in professional jobs, they are equipped to organize and galvanize.

"They make clear the kinds of things they want to see," says Cincinnati Mayor Mark Mallory, who created a Young Professionals Kitchen Cabinet when he took office in 2006. "We've got to work fast. Think how accustomed they are to speed. ... They expect it. They also expect things within their community to transform at a much faster rate."

The challenges are huge but as urban residents transition from singles playgrounds to tot lots, the momentum is building:

Schools. Poor or unsafe schools can make it or break it for the most ardent urbanites. The swelling number of city dwellers on the verge of deciding whether they'll stay or go has become a vocal lobby for change.

New York's Battery Park City in Lower Manhattan was one of the first neighborhoods to go through this demographic transformation, Lang says. "Within 10 years, people made requests for grammar schools," he says. "Cities are recognizing that. They want to hold on to and stabilize the tax base."

What Justin Fishman and his wife, Rachel, liked about their Philadelphia neighborhood (he walks 20 minutes to his banking job) when they were younger and childless are the same things Justin and Rachel, now parents of 11-month-old twins, still cherish.

"A car isn't really part of our day-to-day routine," says Fishman, who was born in Philadelphia, grew up in the suburbs but lived in big cities (Washington, New York) since college. They've seen the population of people their age double in their neighborhoods. Now, they dodge baby strollers as they navigate their own. "But you don't see a ton of 5-year-olds," he says.

To leave or not to leave dominates the chatter at Rachel's mothers' groups as parents struggle with the odds of getting their children into competitive magnet schools, paying for private school or fleeing to suburbia.
The Fishmans want to stay. They're not giving up yet because school enrollment is four years away, and they see new parents mobilizing to improve neighborhood schools. They're moving to a bigger house, still in the city (his walk to work will be 35 minutes). When the children reach school age, they will make a final decision.

"I'm a believer it starts with the parents, and someone taking an active interest in a child's education will make a school better," says Justin, 30. "As long as the city fosters the ability of both the schools and parents to work together and improve education, that's where I'd like to see my kids go."

A group of parents is campaigning to open a charter school in downtown Los Angeles, says Councilman Jose Huizar, "because the younger people in the area are looking for good schools."

The number of residents living downtown — defined as an area within a 2-mile radius of City Hall — has quintupled in 10 years to more than 50,000, he says.

In the face of this surge, some city leaders have shown more willingness to endorse school choice such as charter schools, Fulton says.

Oklahoma City launched a massive overhaul of its school system the past decade, rebuilding and refurbishing more than 70 schools. A new grade school is slated to open downtown in 2014, an area booming with residential construction. Downtown's population has increased about 24% to 5,568 since 2010.

"There is tremendous demand, and the demand is from those highly educated 20-somethings who want that urban environment," says Mayor Mick Cornett, who lives downtown. "I assume some will leave, but we try to create a downtown that can compete with suburbia."

Not just flats, lofts and condos. Developers of traditional single-family subdivisions typical of suburbia are setting their sights on urban neighborhoods from Anaheim, Calif., and Denver to Dallas and Charlotte. Because space is at a premium, they're opting for townhouses and homes on small lots, new housing that can accommodate families.

"We are creating suburban housing environments within the city," Cincinnati's Mallory says. Virginia Place, minutes from downtown, has a half-dozen new 3- and 4-bedroom homes but will eventually have more than 30. The city is offering a 10-year tax abatement for buyers. Homes built to meet energy standards get a 15-year tax abatement. "It's a good entry point for families," he says.

"We, as planners and decision-makers, have to focus on creating units that accommodate families," Huizar says. "We've got to make downtown more livable for families."

Grocery stores, child care and other services near transit. The young have been flocking to cities partly because they can walk to work or take mass transit. They still want that, but it can be daunting when they have kids in tow and need to take a bus to the grocery store and a subway to the day care center.

"The first thing to know is where the gaps are," says Allison Brooks, chief of staff for Reconnecting America, a national organization that works to link transportation and community development. She's co-author of the group's recent report, *Are We There Yet? Creating Complete Communities for 21st Century America.*
Brooks has worked with the city of Denver to map where day care centers, preschools, grocery stores and jobs are in relation to public transit stops. She has found more willingness among local leaders to cooperate in the face of this demographic transformation.

The availability of city data that are easily accessible to citizens has given residents everywhere more input in governing.

"There is more accountability and expectation of immediacy and responsiveness," says Ben Hecht is CEO of Living Cities, a philanthropic collaborative of 22 of the world's largest foundations and financial institutions that invests in cities.

"We have to help people live easier lifestyles, healthier lifestyles and more affordable lifestyles," Brooks says. "There is real interest in creating these environments. Cities want to keep these people. They spend money."

The Fruitvale Transit Village in Oakland opened in 2004 with a library, a charter school, a senior center and housing near the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station and has become a national model for integrating transit and services.

Brooks, who lives in Oakland and has a 3-year-old, has no intention of leaving the city where 20% of schools are charter, she says. "I can walk to a BART station. I can ride my bike to downtown Oakland," she says. "Even if we decide to send her to private school, we're not going to move out."

**More open space.** When there are no back or front yards where kids can play, public parks become a hot commodity. Los Angeles' Grand Park, a $56 million, 12-acre park with botanical gardens and hundreds of new trees, opened in October in the heart of downtown.

Oklahoma City is building a 70-acre downtown park to serve its growing residential base. The city is investing almost $1 billion over 10 years in "quality-of-life infrastructure projects" — including pedestrian- and bike-friendly street designs and a streetcar system.

A public-private partnership in Houston developed Discovery Green, a 12-acre urban park next to the city's convention center. The Green has become an anchor for downtown development since it opened in 2008. It has spurred the building of a hotel, office tower and a 346-unit residential high-rise.

**Seeking a balance**

There are still plenty of young and childless professionals for cities to pursue (the youngest Millennials are in their teens), but as the oldest move to another life stage, cities face a balancing act: Provide adult fun and culture and trendy lofts, but build family-friendly homes and child care centers at the same time.

Even with all the changes cities are making, many Millennials will head to the suburbs leave cities when they start a family — but probably not as many as in previous decades, Florida says.

"Before, 90% to 95% would've moved, and I would see it more as 60% or 70% now," he says, based on research and observations. "My hunch is many will move to a close-in suburb that's walkable, near transit."
Florida says he's surprised by how mainstream the urban lifestyle is now, to the point of becoming a steady staple of TV shows. "Not having a car is kind of chic," Florida says.

It also saves money in gas, insurance and loan payments — something that mass-transit advocates say can help deter the cost of more expensive urban housing or private schools. Homeowners and renters are spending less of their income on transportation, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Expenditure Survey. The amount spent on transportation fell more than 20% from 1986 to 2010.

"We have professionals come and go, singles come and go," Huizar says. "But you build for families, and they're here to stay."
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