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By 2030, all baby boomers will be older than age 65.

Older people are projected to outnumber children for the first time in U.S. history.
As the population ages, the ratio of older adults to working-age adults, also known as the old-age dependency ratio, is projected to rise.

The number of workers sharing the cost of supporting Social Security beneficiaries will soon plummet unless future employment patterns change dramatically.

Source: Table IV.B2 in Social Security Administration (2008b).
“...the economy and local fiscal conditions are not one-size-fits all. While some places are doing incredibly well, others are edging towards the next downturn.”

But in this year’s City Fiscal Conditions report, it is clear that communities across the country — and their residents and businesses — are experiencing varying economic realities.

We found that most big city finance officers are now confident that there will be a recession in 2020 or 2021.
Challenges and choices facing an aging population & communities

The COVID-19 Recession Will Be Different

Unemployment and new workforce trends

Widening disparities by race and income

Caregiving, health insurance, and health delivery system

Social connection, technology
Speakers

Mildred E. Warner, Ph.D., Professor
City and Regional Planning - W. Sibley Hall
Cornell University
mwarner@cornell.edu

Laura Keyes, Ph.D., AICP
Lecturer & Undergrad Program Coordinator
Department of Public Administration
University of North Texas
laura.keyes@unt.edu

Jana Lynott, AICP
Senior Strategic Policy Advisor
AARP Public Policy Institute
jlynott@aarp.org
Planning Across Generations: Are we making progress?

Mildred E. Warner
Xue Zhang

Department of City and Regional Planning
Cornell University

Driving Innovation to Create Age-Friendly Communities
APA Webinar
June, 2020

Contact: www.mildredwarner.org | mwarner@cornell.edu

Funding provided by USDA/NIFA/AFRI
Shifting the Framework

- An *All Ages* Approach
  - Children, families, singles, older adults
- Link Planning, Design, Services and Participation
- Build New Institutional Partnerships
- Address differences across the urban-rural divide
Empirical Evidence on Current Practice

• 2013 Planning Across Generations Survey (ICMA)
  • 1478 city managers responded

• 2019 Planning for All Ages Survey (ICMA)
  • 1312 city managers responded

• Have we made progress?
Surveys are representative samples of US communities.
2019 - more cities, fewer rural communities.

N_{2013}=1474, N_{2019}=1312
Survey Elements

- Built Environment
  - Street
  - Neighborhood
  - Housing
- Zoning
  - Street
  - Neighborhood
  - Housing

Percent of community covered

- Planning
  - Comprehensive
  - Economic Development
  - Transportation
  - Emergency
- Engagement
  - Families with Children, Youth, Seniors
- Barriers, Motivators
- Attitudes

- Services
  - Formal and Informal
  - Mobility, Health, Education, Economic
- Cross-Agency Partnerships
  - Services, Information, Trust
  - Joint Use with Schools
- Governing Board

Warner and Zhang, Cornell University, Planning for All Generations Survey, 2019, 1312 US cities and counties
Built environment: No change in Streets.
Neighborhoods and Housing less likely to be age-friendly
More communities report low (<25%) coverage, fewer report medium (25-75%) coverage

- Sidewalk system connecting residences and services
- Bike lanes
- Complete streets
- Neighborhood schools
- Park or playground within ½-mile of every resident
- Public gathering spaces
- A mix of retail, services, and housing
- Fresh food markets
- Affordable housing
- Family-size housing
- Rental housing
- Senior housing
- Intergenerational housing
- Subsidized housing
- Affordable, quality childcare

% community coverage
- Low: <25%
- Medium: 25-75%
- High: >75%
Built environment – This drop is primarily a suburban and rural effect

% community coverage
- Low: <25%
- Medium: 25-75%
- High: >75%

N\textsubscript{2013}=1,268, N\textsubscript{2019}=1,155
Zoning – Stalled.

Streets - More communities report low (<25%) coverage, fewer report medium (25-75%) coverage.

- Mandate sidewalk system
- Contain pedestrian-friendly design guidelines
- Require street connections between adjacent developments
- Require “complete streets”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% community coverage</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low: &lt;25%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium: 25-75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High: &gt;75%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Promote affordable housing
- Allow family-sized housing
- Allow multi-family housing
- Mandate universal design
- Provide density bonuses
- Allow childcare centers
- Allow childcare business in residential units by right
- Promote parks or recreation facilities in all neighborhoods
- Allow mixed-use

Warner and Zhang, Cornell University, Planning for All Generations Survey, 2019, 1312 US cities and counties
Planning – A long way to go.
More communities have comprehensive plans in 2019, but only half address needs of all ages.
Transportation plans most likely to address needs of seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan (N=1297)</th>
<th>Economic development plan (N=1247)</th>
<th>Emergency Plan (N=1235)</th>
<th>Transportation Plan (N=1287)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Of those with plans, the plan addresses the need of:</strong></td>
<td>N=1047</td>
<td>N=660</td>
<td>N=1128</td>
<td>N=741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families with children</strong></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seniors</strong></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong>*</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools or school siting</strong></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Childcare</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * new in 2019
Services: Few Changes
Some senior services down
Some youth services up

- Home-delivered meals or groceries for seniors
- After-school programs
- Senior center
- Summer camps
- Community center shared by all ages
- Publicly supported preschool
- Adult day care
- Home visiting for seniors
- Youth employment programs
- Family literacy/parenting programs
- Youth center
- Home modification services for seniors
- Inter-generational programs for seniors and youth
- Home visiting for families with children

2013 vs 2019: N_{2013}=1,434, N_{2019}=1,232
Mobility services – Little Change

- Street furniture/places to sit and rest
- Demand-response transit (aka “dial-a-ride”)
- Public restrooms in commercial districts and parks
- Enhanced crosswalks
- Walk-to-school programs
- Volunteer driver program
- Public funding for community groups to use vans
- Larger lettering on street/traffic signs
- School buses used to transport seniors
- Taxi vouchers for seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street furniture/places to sit and rest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand-response transit (aka “dial-a-ride”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public restrooms in commercial districts and parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced crosswalks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk-to-school programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer driver program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public funding for community groups to use vans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger lettering on street/traffic signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School buses used to transport seniors</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>1,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi vouchers for seniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N_{2013} = 1,345
N_{2019} = 1,187

Warner and Zhang, Cornell University, Planning for All Generations Survey, 2019, 1312 US cities and counties
Informal services
More social & recreation
Less health and safety

- Recreation programs
- Neighborhood watch
- Social activities (e.g., block parties)
- Neighborhood beautification
- Mentoring children
- Checking in on your neighbors
- Yard maintenance/snow shoveling for elders
- Child care/nursery school
- Referrals (e.g., plumber, doctor)

2013 vs. 2019:
- Recreation programs: Increased
- Neighborhood watch: Increased
- Social activities: Increased
- Neighborhood beautification: Stabilized
- Mentoring children: Stabilized
- Checking in on your neighbors: Increased
- Yard maintenance/snow shoveling for elders: Decreased
- Child care/nursery school: Decreased
- Referrals: Decreased

N_{2013}=956
N_{2019}=899
Cross-agency partnerships
Schools and Planning agencies are reaching out

- Libraries
- School district
- Parks and recreation department
- Police department
- Public health department
- Area Agency on Aging
- Hospital or health care providers
- Fire department
- Housing agency
- Planning department
- Economic development agency/Chamber of Commerce
- Community college
- Transportation or highway department
- Child care resource and referral agency

N<sub>2013</sub>=1,307
N<sub>2019</sub>=1,128

Warner and Zhang, Cornell University, Planning for All Generations Survey, 2019, 1312 US cities and counties
Joint use between communities and schools – More Talk, Less Action
More information and trust, but fewer services

Trust in school

Child nutrition for evenings/weekends or summer
Child care services
Recreation programs for all ages
Adult education services
Nutrition programs/meals for seniors
Health care services for all ages

School delivers information

Senior
Children

N2013=956
N2019=899
**Barriers**

More places report lack of information

- Lack of funding
- Segregated funding streams
- Lack of information
- Liability
- Lack of common data systems
- Turf issues
- Customer preference for age-segregated services
- Concerns about safety
- Regulations to protect children
- Regulations to protect frail elders
- Elected official opposition
- Department head or staff opposition

2013 vs. 2019:
- N2013=1,325
- N2019=1,112
Governing board – Losing the middle
More long-time and older resident control

- Long-time residents
- Evenly mixed
- Newcomers
- Older residents
- Evenly mixed
- Younger residents
Divison – Less common vision

Senior participation has led to a common vision regarding planning for all ages

- 2013: 32%
- 2019: 44%

Participation of families with children has led to a common vision regarding planning for all ages

- 2013: 37%
- 2019: 50%

My community is not divided by race, class, or old-timer/newcomer divisions

- 2013: 35%
- 2019: 46%

Ethnic or cultural diversity has led to new approaches to planning or programming for all ages

- 2013: 37%
- 2019: 43%

Warner and Zhang, Cornell University, Planning for All Generations Survey, 2019, 1312 US cities and counties
Positive Attitudes

More report

Strongly Agree

- Seniors are a resource for the community
- Children are a resource for the community
- When communities provide services for seniors and children, all community members benefit
- Families with children represent a valuable consumer population
- The community has a responsibility to care for children and youth
- Seniors represent a valuable consumer population
- The community has a responsibility to care for seniors
- The needs of families with young children are similar to the needs of the elderly
- Communities that keep people for their entire lifespan are more vibrant
- Seniors generate sufficient tax revenue
- Families with children generate sufficient tax revenue

Warner and Zhang, Cornell University, Planning for All Generations Survey, 2019, 1312 US cities and counties
Engagement: seniors more likely to be very engaged

- Senior:
  - 2013: Somewhat engaged: 60%, Very engaged: 40%
  - 2019: Somewhat engaged: 65%, Very engaged: 35%

- Families with children:
  - 2013: Somewhat engaged: 70%, Very engaged: 30%
  - 2019: Somewhat engaged: 75%, Very engaged: 25%

- Youth:
  - 2013: Somewhat engaged: 50%, Very engaged: 50%
  - 2019: Somewhat engaged: 55%, Very engaged: 45%
What Leads to Change?

- **Engagement** of seniors and families with children
- **Community Leadership** – elected officials, developers, planning and zoning board
- **Planning** – comprehensive planning and zoning and building codes

---

Leadership
Female manager
Engagement
Seniors, Children

Comp Plan
Aging, Children

Zoning

Better Built Environment

Broader Housing Choices

Collaboration

Services for Children and Elders
What leads to better community health?

Data

- AARP Livability indicators

Data: [https://livabilityindex.aarp.org/](https://livabilityindex.aarp.org/)
Results: What Predicts Better Community Health?

- Environment
- Neighborhood
- Housing
- Transportation
- Engagement
- Opportunity

Engagement & opportunity matter most for rural.

Neighborhood matters, especially for urban core and suburbs.

Data: [https://livabilityindex.aarp.org/](https://livabilityindex.aarp.org/)
Why is the Age-Friendly Movement Stalled?

• More progress in streets and mobility, less in neighborhood and housing
  • Planning Boards need training on how to incorporate age friendly
  • Urban bias in age friendly designs leaves suburbs and rural areas behind

• Planning needs to reach out and build cross-agency partnerships
  • And support informal engagement

• Engagement is critical
  • Division is rising
  • Need to build common vision across difference – An All Ages Approach
Articles


Mildred Warner mwarner@cornell.edu Xue Zhang xz435@cornell.edu

Funding provided by the USDA National Institute for Food and Agriculture
San Antonio Senior Centers Assessment
Innovations in Age Friendly Planning
For the Department of Human Services, City of San Antonio, Texas

University of North Texas
June 19, 2020
Research Team:
Brian Collins, Ph.D., Principal Investigator
Laura Keyes, Ph.D., AICP, Co-Investigator
Chetan Tiwari, Ph.D., Co-Investigator
Qiwei Li, Ph.D.
Julie Winkler, Ph.D. and
Solymar Rivera
Older Adults in San Antonio
60 years and older

17% Of San Antonio population (243,000)

95% Live within 5 mile radius of City of San Antonio Senior Center

10% Participate in programming
San Antonio’s Age Friendly City Initiative

• Member of Age Friendly City through AARP Age Friendly Communities network

• Ongoing mayoral support

• Completion of major planning initiatives:
  • Successfully Aging and Living in San Antonio (SALSA)
  • San Antonio Housing Policy Framework
  • Age Friendly San Antonio: Strengthening Livability in San Antonio, AARP Age Friendly Cities Network
  • SA Tomorrow: Comprehensive Plan, Sustainability Plan, Multi-modal Transportation Plan

• Project examines the capacity for the city to support policy initiatives for a growing older adult population across all services and departments
Strategic Plan Focus

1. Evolving Demand for Senior Services
2. Location Decisions for Future Senior Centers
3. Age Friendly Policy Integration Across City Departments

Source: City of San Antonio
Task 1 Research Purpose

What type of senior center is best for supporting older adults?

What factors influence the use of senior center programming?

What type of programming balances the variation in desires and competencies across older adult life span?

What skills among staff support the evolution in programming for older adults?
Profiles of Current Users

- Only 10% of older adults in San Antonio currently participate in senior centers.
- Current Users:

  - Gender: 33% Men, 67% Women
  - Age Cohort:
    - 60-64: 10%
    - 65-74: 49%
    - 75-84: 34%
    - 85+: 7%

N=867
Profiles of Current Users

Race
- Hispanic: 52%
- White: 24%
- African American: 15%
- Asian: 3%
- Other: 6%

Income
- <$25k: 61%
- $25k-$50k: 31%
- $50k-$100k: 7%
- >$100k: 1%
- <$25k: 61%
Key Usage Differences by Age

**Age 60-64:**
- Field trips, computer classes and volunteer opportunities;
- Financial assistance (general finance, housing, meals, and rent)

**Age 65-74:**
- Library
- Social services

**Age 75-84:**
- Social services

**Age 85+:**
- Higher need for health-related services & daily life support
- All activities and general services
Key Usage Differences by Subgroup

**Women:**
- Arts & crafts
- Field trips
- Dance classes
- Computer classes

**Men:**
- Meal plans
- Games
- Health screening
- Exercise classes
Key Usage Differences by Subgroup

**Hispanic**
- Crafts
- Meal program

**African American**
- Tax Assistance
- Home visits
- Rent assistance
- Meal program

**White**
- Library
- Puzzles & games

**Asian**
- Field trips
- Dance
- Computer Classes
Key Usage Differences by Subgroup

**Income Under $25,000**
- Social and financial assistance
- Rent assistance

**Income $25,000 to $50,000**
- Exercise programs
- Games and field trips

**Income $50,000+**
- Volunteerism
Task 2 Senior Center Location
Decision Support Tool: ESRI Storyboard

San Antonio Senior Center Assessment

Decision Support Tool

Prepared for the City of San Antonio by University of North Texas  |  November 22, 2019
ESRI Storyboard Mapping Purpose

• Consider the possibilities for future senior center locations

• Provide a system to consider how to fine tune existing centers relative to program offerings

• Develop protocol to inform the placement of future senior center locations that align with age friendly policy actions:
  • Accessible, walkable, healthy lifestyle, community focused, diversity of participants, and opportunities for social interaction.
Mapping Components

• Includes a description of the current and projected 60+ populations in the context of existing senior centers and partner sites;

• Identifies proposed areas for locating new centers based on an attractiveness index that was derived from literature, San Antonio Age Friendly Cities planning survey, WHO Age Friendly Cities’ domains, and the AARP Age Friendly Cities Livability Index (exhibit 1); and

• Shows relationships between services available at senior centers, probability utilization, and market potential for services (exhibit 2).
The Decision Support Tool

• The Decision Support tool is accessible through the ESRI Story Board Link: https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/b2811d6f82304c418508b9b9ca2f9564
Exhibit 2: Service Utilization

• Visualizes the probabilities of potential acceptance of the given services based upon the population features from specific block groups, and

• Series of service maps show relationships between services available at senior centers, probability of service utilization, and market potential for selected services provided by City of San Antonio Senior Services
Interpreting the Service Utilization Maps

• The darkest blue indicates the highest probability (top 20%) of utilization based upon city-wide survey results.

• Each circle on the map represents a senior center location.
  • Larger circles represent greater market potential measured as the total 60+ population that are contained within 5 miles of each location.
  • The color on each circle indicates presence (green) or absence (red) of services.

• Two key takeaways from these maps:
  • (1) larger green circles overlaid on darker blue polygons represent locations that are servicing areas with large 60+ populations and also a high probability of service utilization, and
  • (2) large red circles overlaid on darker blue polygons represent areas with large 60+ populations and opportunities for providing new services with high expected utilization.
Planning Considerations for Site Location

• Once a location for the potential senior center is determined, planners are suggested to look at the probability map and see what kind of services are more likely to be interesting to the population living in that area given their demographics.

• Final decision should combine the: attractiveness of a location, probability of service acceptance, number of the population living in that area, services that will be provided, and feasibility of a senior center building.

• Geographic variation exist in the levels of attractiveness thus making certain areas of the city more suited for locating a senior center given those locations proximity to other related services deemed important by the literature and surveys of older adults.
Paratransit Innovations from the U.S. and Abroad

Jana Lynott
Senior Transportation Policy Advisor
AARP Public Policy Institute
Schedule a ride with the tap of a button

Get picked up where you want

Share your ride with others heading the same way
Universal Mobility
as a service

- A single, integrated network of traditional and non-traditional services that together serve EVERYONE
- Universal Design
- With or without AVs

- One stop shopping
  - Easy Discovery
  - Easy Booking
  - Easy Mode Transfers
  - Easy Payment
Transactional Data Spec for DRT
A common data format that allows trip data to be shared electronically

Trip Cycle Supported by Data Specification

- **Reserve Trip**
  - **Request Trip Telegram**
    - Pick-up/Drop-off Address
    - Appt. Time
    - Funding Type (Medicaid)
    - Customer info (memory impaired)
    - Service needs (door through door)
    - Mobility Aids (walker)
    - Trip Purpose (Medical)
  - **Trip Request**
  - **Provider**
  - **Trip Confirmation**
  - **Vehicle**
  - **Trip Completion Confirmation**

- **Schedule Trip**
  - **Schedule Trip Telegram**
    - Unique Trip #
    - Pick-up address
    - Drop-off address
    - Pick-up time
    - # passengers
  - **Schedule Request**
  - **Report/Bill Trip**
  - **Report/Bill Trip Telegram**
    - Drop-off time
    - Odometer reading
    - Passenger miles
    - Vehicle Miles/Hours
    - Boarding/Alightings

**Notes:** All telegrams shared electronically among computer systems. The transactional specification specifies the format of telegrams and their order of operation.
An Open Platform Future

Example Open & Universal Mobility Platform Architecture

Regional Mobility Hub

Types of “Open”
- Open Data
- Open Data Formats & APIs
- Open Source Software
- Proprietary Software/System

Proprietary Map & Mobility Apps

Public Transit Schedules

TNCs
- Uber
- lyft

Taxis

New Mobility

ADA Paratransit

Human Services & Medical Transportation

Community-Based Mobility Platform
- Volunteer Driver Program
- Veterans Transportation Program
- Senior Center Shuttle
FlexDanmark

- "On-demand" transportation for all citizens
- 95% on-time performance defined as 15 min window
- 5.7 million annual trips
  - 15,000 trips/day on average
  - Peak day at +24,000 trips
  - 250,000+ returning customers every year
- Portal used by hospitals, medical offices, and human service agencies to connect clients to transportation
- High level of institutional coordination
  - 5 public transit authorities
  - 1 Nationwide system
  - 550+ providers (all private sector)
- Cost allocation built into the software
- Automated interface and common data standard

www.aarp.org/futureoftransportation
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