



**VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST
AGE-FRIENDLY ADVISORY AD-HOC COMMITTEE MEETING**

Wednesday, October 12, 2022 – 6:00 PM
Village Hall – 400 Park Avenue – River Forest, IL 60305
Community Room

AGENDA

Public comments will be shared with the Committee. You may submit your public comments via email in advance of the meeting to: Matthew Walsh at mwalsh@vrf.us. You may listen to the meeting by participating in a Zoom conference call as follows, dial-in number: 312-626-6799 with meeting ID: 881 5715 8647 or by clicking here: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88157158647>. If you would like to speak during public comment, please email mwalsh@vrf.us by 4:00 PM on October 12, 2022.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of the August 10, 2022 Meeting Minutes
4. Committee Member Updates: Dementia Friendly River Forest (DFRF) and Age-Friendly Communities Collaborative (AFCC)
5. Old Business
 - a. Discussion of Findings and Proposed Actions
 - b. Preparation & Drafting of the Age Friendly Report - Discussion
6. New Business
7. Next Meeting: November 9, 2022
8. Adjournment

**VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST
AGE-FRIENDLY AD HOC COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 10, 2022**

A regular meeting of the Village of River Age Friendly Ad Hoc Committee was held on Wednesday, August 10, 2022, at 6:00 p.m. in the Community Room of Village Hall, 400 Park Avenue – River Forest, IL.

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. Upon roll call, the following persons were:

Present: Chairperson Respicio Vazquez, Daniel Lauber, Deborah Frederick, Lydia Manning, James Flanagan, Helen Kwan, Barbara Mirel

Absent: None

Also Present: Management Analyst/Deputy Clerk Elijah Bebora

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Committee Member Lauber made a motion, seconded by Committee Member Mirel, to approve the July 13, 2022, meeting minutes.

Roll call:

Ayes: Chairperson Vazquez, Daniel Lauber, Lydia Manning, James Flanagan, Helen Kwan, Deborah Frederick, Barbara Mirel

Absent: None

Nays: None

Motion Passes.

4. COMMITTEE MEMBER UPDATES: DEMENTIA-FRIENDLY RIVER FOREST (DFRF) AND AGE-FRIENDLY COMMUNITIES COLLABORATIVE (AFCC)

Committee Member Manning stated that she has no updates at this time.

Chairperson Vazquez stated that he has no updates from the Mayor’s Metropolitan Caucus Age-Friendly Communities Collaborative.

5. OLD BUSINESS

a. Preparation and Drafting of the Age Friendly Report – Discussion

The Committee had a discussion on the preparation and drafting of the age friendly report.

Committee Member Mirel stated that she performed a comparison with the seven domains and 61 indicators. Her draft makes sure that she matches the domains and indicators to questions that were asked to survey recipients. She analyzed what she thought was important to pull out of what the data showed. Her draft gives all the data from AARP as well as from the survey with an additional correlation that she performed.

Member Lauber shared with the Committee an outline of timelines for completing various stages of the age-friendly report.

Chairperson Vazquez requested that the Committee Members send their proposed findings and action items by September 7th so that they may be included in the packet for the September 14th meeting.

6. NEW BUSINESS

a. None

7. NEXT MEETING: SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

8. ADJOURNMENT

Committee Member Flanagan made a motion, seconded by Committee Member Manning to adjourn the meeting at 7:00 PM.

Roll call:

Ayes: Chairperson Vazquez, Lydia Manning, James Flanagan, Daniel Lauber, Helen Kwan, Deborah Frederick, Barbara Mirel.

Absent: None

Nays: None

Motion Passes.

Elijah Bebora, Secretary

Elijah Bebora

From: Debbie Frederick <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, September 6, 2022 7:46 AM
To: Elijah Bebora
Subject: Re: AFC Reminder for September Meeting

Elijah,

1. The draft says that AARP scores show that RF has ample public transit, and AARP scores and surveys show “that RF is a walking city,” and a “minority (20-25%) would like better lighting and time to cross the street.”

-The majority surveyed don't use public transportation/rideshare. The walkers surveyed maybe walk for exercise or enjoyment and have no issue with sidewalks and lighting.

-Given these facts plus the fact that the only public comment our committee received was regarding street safety this should be a priority. He stated “the streets of the NE quadrant” aren't safe, lack signage, have high speed car and truck traffic, and little enforcement.”

-Improvement of all these factors would contribute to making RF a walkable, safer city.

2. AARP metrics show we are worse than the national median in Housing costs and Housing cost burden, and those surveyed appear most to prefer to age in place at home.

-Challenges show Home modification while possible is not attractive to most, and we discussed that most didn't have an idea of the cost of such modifications so the weight this position has in our results might need to be adjusted.

7. Most of those surveyed said they don't know what senior services are available, and we discussed that is often because we don't search for them until we need them.

-Senior Services information is valuable for all RF residents as a resource along with all of the other village information. Electronic communication is efficient, but printed information for the seniors is a sure way to having it more easily readable.

Jim Flanagan
September 7, 2022

The Age Friendly Ad Hoc Committee conducted a survey to determine the needs of River Forest as they relate to the AARP indicators of livability. Those indicators are as follows:

AARP indicators of livability:

Housing

Affordability and access

Neighborhood

Proximity and Security

Transportation

Safety and Convenience

Environment

Clean Air and Water

Engagement

Civic and Social Involvement

Health

Prevention, Access, and Quality

Opportunity

Inclusion and Possibilities

Key findings identified by the River Forest Age Friendly Survey

River Forest needs to address the domains of Opportunity, Engagement, Neighborhood and Housing. Overall River Forest does a good job in all domains but is rich in resources for the domains of Transportation, Environment and Health.

Opportunity

River Forest needs to do a better job communicating with the older adult population about resources available in the village.

Engagement

River Forest needs to do a better job of creating opportunities for community engagement and social participation. Residents expressed an interest in more opportunities to engage socially to further develop feelings of inclusion.

Neighborhood

Residents expressed an interest in making River Forest more walkable. Sidewalk improvements, streetlighting and additional benches are examples of such improvements.

Housing

River Forest needs to encourage housing that is accessible and conducive to aging in place. Create a streamlined process for modifications to accommodate needs of older adults.

Encourage the development of a moderately priced senior living facility. Explore the possibility of accessory dwelling units.

Village of River Forest AARP Age-Friendly Report

Key Findings

Results from the River Forest Age Friendly Survey (see Appendix A) indicated four critical areas of focus for age friendly efforts moving forward. Overwhelming, residents in the Village of River Forest reported wanting to age in their community. Five of the eight domains need attention.

Housing

An essential part of being able to age in a community is the ability to age in place. This necessitates the demand for age-appropriate and affordable housing and dwelling structures that enable people to optimize their agency and abilities. Respondents were asked if they would consider modifying the property to accommodate others or living in an accessory dwelling unit. Nearly 25% of respondents indicated they would be willing to modify to live in age friendly space.

Outdoor Spaces and Buildings

Older adults in River Forest feel strongly that there needs to be adequate street lighting for wayfinding, walking, and driving at night. Additionally, respondents indicated the desire for more seating and places for stopping to sit and rest are needed throughout the Village.

Social Participation and Civic Participation

Respondents indicated their desire for more occasions to meet people in River Forest, more variety in event and activity programming, and more opportunities for social involvement in the Village. Survey results suggested that older adults in the Village were eager for more opportunities for civic engagement.

Communication and Information

Respondents indicated the need to receive information from the Village in various media forms (print and electronic). Furthermore, there was considerable concern regarding the lack of information on the available services for older adults and the ability to access those services when needed. Approximately, 60% percent of participants indicated they know about older adult services and can access them. This suggests that there is a considerable percentage of the population of older adults in the Village that do not know what services exist. Respondents also expressed a salient interest in having the Village be a place that is supportive for people living with dementia.

Village of River Forest AARP Age-Friendly Action Plan

The needs of Village residents in all Eight Domains of Livability are important. Based on the findings of the AFRF Survey and other community assessments and reports, the Age Friendly Ad Hoc Committee these immediate priorities:

Built Environment

Housing

Outdoor Spaces

Social Environment

Communication and Information

Social Participation and Civic Participation

Throughout 2022, the committee developed goals, strategies, and actions to address each of the prioritized Domains. The Action Plan presented here represents the committee's efforts with 4 goals and 18 action items.

Included in each section of the AFRF Action Plan is the analysis constructed from the AFRF Survey.

Key Findings for Four Domains Identified as Areas to Address Using Survey Findings

1. Housing

Goal: Provide housing opportunities that are accessible, innovative, and affordable (and affordable housing?) dedicated to older adults.

To create more age friendly housing options that will allow River Forest to remain in their homes as they grow older below are strategies and action items that will make this possible.

Action Items:

1. Create housing options that will broaden economic diversity of older adults in River Forest (affordable housing)
2. Increase home modifications and age friendly design in existing residence for older adults to make existing housing stock more age friendly
 - 1a. Educate residents about options
 - 2a. Support residents in accessing home modification resources (builders, products and funding)
3. Permit River Forest residents to erect accessory dwelling units if needed to remain in homes
4. Expand Home Sharing opportunities
 - 4a. Design and pilot programs
 - 4b. Educate villagers about the options for home sharing
5. Expand opportunities for home care and assisted living type services (subsidies or vouchers?)

AARP indicator of livability: Housing that is affordable and accessible

2. Outdoor Spaces

Goal: – Enhance and Improve Public Spaces for Safety, Quality of Life and Community Access

Action Items:

1. Improve streetlighting in the village
2. Provide more opportunities of sitting and resting via benches throughout the village
3. Assess all public spaces for accessibility and ability (sidewalks, signs and wayfinding)

AARP indicators of livability:

Neighborhood (proximity and security)

Environment (clean air and water)

3. Communication and Information

Goal: Increase awareness of existing resources that support older adults as they age in place in their home or this community

Action Items:

1. Further refine network of communication channels in River Forest for receiving and sharing information such as community events and services
2. Work to eliminate digital divide by providing more information on the form of mailings
3. Establish and maintain public posting sites, including additional kiosks in strategic locations
4. Host village wide informational session or create a speaker's bureau on Age Friendly River Forest and related information and opportunities
5. Develop a River Forest Age Friendly Brand (logo and website) to promote and bolster Age Friendly Efforts in the Village
6. Create an Age Friendly Rubric and Checklist that is incorporated in all Village work/decision-making and planning

AARP indicators of livability: Health (Prevention, Access, and Quality)

4. Social Participation and Civic Participation

Goal: Create opportunities for more expansive community engagement

Action Items:

1. Provide more opportunities for social activities and no-cost-to-seniors events
2. Improve communication about events
3. Host Age Friendly/Seniors Appreciation Day Town Hall Event
4. Provide enhanced programming at the libraries and community centers/places for people to convene
5. Encourage Age-Friendly Business Practices through education and development of business certification program where older adults volunteer to train and certify
6. Support a database of volunteer opportunities for older adults

AARP indicators of livability: Opportunity (Inclusion and Possibilities)

AARP indicators of livability:

Housing

Affordability and access

Neighborhood

Proximity and Security

Transportation

Safety and Convenience

Environment

Clean Air and Water

Engagement

Civic and Social Involvement

Health

Prevention, Access, and Quality

Opportunity

Inclusion and Possibilities

Proposed findings and actions for RF Ad Hoc Committee (Mirel)

Incomplete – not all sections filled in

Social Participation – meet people, access events, activities, learn about events, range event

Positives

65% Agree/strongly - Activities and events in River Forest are organized in places that are accessible to me.

Challenges

Range of events currently offered is not convincingly satisfying. Needs more inquiry and likely Village attention: **I find the range of events and activities offered throughout River Forest is sufficiently varied. 37% Neutral, 32.3% Agree/strongly; 22.6% Disagree/strongly.**

AARP scoring for extent of belonging to organizations places River Forest well below the national median. Related survey questions – having opportunities for meeting people, feeling valued, learning about social events, interacting with younger generations are pretty “lukewarm” – have agreement just barely hovering around 50% or a little less.

Possible actions

Civic and Social Involvement and Volunteer Opportunities includes valued too

Positives

Challenges

This is a big gap in feedback from respondents. A solid third are Neutral about issues of inclusion, belonging, valued, and participation. This percentage suggests something may be missing in the Village to keep responders from feeling inclined to answer positively. Or it could be that they don't care about inclusion, belonging et al; but that also suggests a disengagement of sorts from the Village. The disengagement is not negative if it comes from residents finding their a sense of “community” elsewhere (personally made friendships, Chicago-wide groups and places). Finding out reasons for Neutrals is important for determining whether actions of various types by the Village would be worthwhile.

Over 2/3 of the people who were neutral about opportunity for social involvement were also neutral about civic opportunities. Almost ¾ of the people who were neutral about civic opportunities were neutral about RF having opportunities for volunteering.

Neutrals for opportunity for social involvement make up 45% of all 60-64 year old. And a third of all 65-74 year olds. Neutrals for opportunities for volunteering make up 42% of all 75-84 year olds. Neutrals for opportunities for civic engagements are equally distributed across ages.

Actions

Conduct additional inquiries that are very targeted. Dig into reasons for neutrality by further investigating residents' feelings and desires for social involvement, civic involvement, opportunities for volunteering, desired range of events. Find out if there is something that can be done/offered to capture the participation of the people who answered neutral or negatively about such involvement? See if there are ways to identify specific needs with specific age ranges of residents who are 55+ years old

Respect and Human Inclusion

Positives

Only about 50% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they felt like a valued member of the River Forest community. That more people didn't respond positively, however, might just be that it is unclear to respondents what that feeling is supposed to feel like. Almost 37% responded neutral.

A large majority does not feel discriminated against based on age; nor have they experienced age-ist comments.

Of the 21 who do not feel valued have lived 11+ yrs in RF. Clearly they have remained in RF despite this feeling.

Challenges

Non-white residents are underrepresented in the survey. It's important to know if non-whites and whites have the same experience of feeling valued or not. Economic brackets may not all be represented adequately either.

Actions

To adequately represent all interests in River Forest, gather more data from underrepresented groups.

Housing

Positives

Feel safe in my home and believe my home is in a safe neighborhood (95% agree and 89% agree respectively). Caveat – AARP rates RF low on crime rate – above the national average based on violent and property crime/10,000 people.

A large majority agree that they do not want to live in "identifiable older-adult housing."

A large majority do not live in or want to live in multi-family units.

A large majority want to stay in their own homes. Those who own their own residences now project that if they move it would be into someplace they still owned (e.g. move from their current 2 story house to a one-story house or condo or townhouse). Only 10% of respondents had a desire for rentals.

Challenges

A good quarter of respondents would consider modifying their homes to enable others to live there, including putting in an ADU or in-law suite. This same quarter also says they have homes that support having another person live there. This group of respondents span all ages but are most heavily weighted to 55-74 years old (33% of them). 61% of this group of respondents are also willing to live in in-law suites or ADU. Of the people who strongly agree that they're willing to live in these units, 100% of them are in the group of respondents who say they'd consider modifying their home.

Circumstances may necessitate moving to "identifiable older-adult housing" despite current preferences, and since the majority of respondents want to stay in River Forest, the Village should be offer at least some options (based on assessments and "actuarial-type" projections).

AARP rates River Forest above the national average in crime.

Actions

Responses suggest that one's ownership of successive residences as aging occurs is important. Condos and townhouses or ADUs as next-step purchases appeal more to respondents than rentals, assisted living, etc. The survey did not ask if residents would rather leave the Village if they could only economically purchase next-step housing elsewhere or rent within the Village.

Create an older adult housing plan that accounts for residents' actual preferences as well as actuarial-type projections of future needs for aging-supportive housing. The plan should include concrete action steps, responsibilities across relevant groups (e.g. development, zoning, building codes, realtors, etc), and timelines. The plan might include high tech as well – creating and implementing systems that could connect seniors with available info on who's thinking about selling and buying within River Forest.

Assess relevant codes, ordinances and rework as necessary to assure that they do not impede aging supportive housing plans.

Develop and communicate evidence-based arguments for the benefit of attracting as well as keeping current older residents from moving out of the community to build a shared sense of commitment across the Village.

Look into AARP rating of high crime rate and if it is higher than people perceive, get info out to residents about staying safe and protecting property.

Technology

Communication and Information

Positives

Challenges

Responses show that respondents are not convincingly satisfied with being able to learn about events being offered. The sold

Actions

Community Support and Services

Outdoor Spaces and Buildings

Positive

Sidewalks are perceived as safe by 81% of respondents

Challenges based on survey responses

Street lights are not bright enough for walking at night – only a slight majority think that they are, which is not a high enough to feel confident that the current lighting safeguards against harm. Improved lighting would also help driving at night (with almost 20% of respondents finding inadequate lighting for driving at present).

Not enough places to sit. 27% of respondents do not think seating is adequate and 22% are neutral). Age-supportive communities need to plan for the reduced stamina that comes with age by providing seating of pedestrians

Questions:

If 20% of respondents don't feel that lights are bright enough for driving at night and don't have enough time to cross the street, is that a large enough percentage to a large enough percentage and driving at night
Time enough to cross the street

Actions

Conduct a lighting assessment and plan for and implement street lights where they are most needed.

Assess the distribution and placement of seating throughout the Village. With an eye on the importance of "third places" for residents, cross check with assessments of where people currently congregate and where they may like to congregate but currently don't have enough seating for it. Put in new seating and be sure to have enough shade cover. Partner if needed with local businesses in expanding seating.

Transportation Access

Positives

A large majority (91%) drives themselves places.

Challenges

AARP rates River Forest low in accessibility of transit stations. The Metra stop is not accessible.

Actions

Offer driving training locally, including training

Ease the task of driving and reduce driving times by assuring clear 2 way passage on side streets by minimizing parking on both sides of a narrow side street.

Construct accessible means for getting to and from the metra station platform.

Financial Situation

Positives

Two-thirds of RF survey respondents say they can easily meet their housing costs. Survey results show that 87% of respondents find that their incomes can cover their basic needs.

Challenges

17% cannot meet their monthly housing costs. Age groups with the largest proportion of these people are 60-64 and 85+ . in each age group they make up a considerably larger proportion than their 17% response rate.

Demographics

Comments:

Blacks are underrepresented in survey respondents (see table breakdown of race/ethnicity by gender). The respondents 65-74 are overrepresented compared to census data.

Supporting Data

Response Rate: # Respondents: 196 (6% of survey age group population)		Responses by age: (Census % of only 55-84+)	
By Race/ethnicity Asian: 3.8% (AARP 4%) Black: 2.7% (AARP 6%) White: 93.4% (AARP 85%) Hispanic: 3.2% Other		55-59 = 17.9% (22%) 60-64 = 16.5% (22%) 65-74 = 47.4% (33%) 75-84 = 13.8% (16%) 85 + = 5.73 (6.5%)	Male = 40.5% (45%) Female – 59.47% (55%)
Age	Black + 1 no age)	Asian	Hispanic
55-60 2 no response	0	1 F	1 F
60-64	0	0	3 M
65-74 3 no response	2 m 2 F	1 M 4 F	2M
75-84 1 no		1 M	
85+			

No age specified	1 F		
Total/5 of survey	5 (2.7%)	7 (3.8%)	6 (3.2% total)

Race left blank		Hispanic Left blank	
55-59	Male	65-74	Female
55-59	Female	65-74	Male
60-64	Male	55-59	Female
60-64	Female	60-64	
60-64		65-74	
65-74		65-74	
65-74		65-74	Male
65-74	Male	75-84	Female
75-84	Female		
75-84	Female		

Date: October 3, 2022

To: Age-Friendly Advisory Ad-Hoc Committee

From: Daniel Lauber

Subject: Updated Rough Draft Suggested Findings

I have updated my September draft to add the domains I wasn't able to address then.

By no means do I suggest that these are the only findings from our survey and research. These are just the ones I've identified and do not pretend that they are complete.

I've structured these in terms of the finding and the basis of the finding. I'd like to suggest that this approach will give our report greater credibility by guiding readers to the factors that led to each finding.

I want to emphasize that findings are not a popularity contest. It doesn't matter if the study shows that most seniors are satisfied with the concept surveyed. I suspect that most times when at least 20 to 25 percent of respondents indicated an issue, it may be worthy of the village's attention and reporting.

And I strongly suspect that we most certainly need to include demographic data about River Forest from the census and American Community Survey to provide greater perspective and context for our findings and eventual recommendations.

I realize that this is all time consuming, especially since we do not have professional staff with expertise on this — so committee members have to undertake all of this detailed work. But given all the time and effort we've all devoted to this project — as well as the time and effort Elijah and Sara have so gratuitously put into this project — we owe it to the village to take the time to produce thoughtful findings based on the survey and research available, as well as recommendations that provide a framework for actions the village and sister governing entities to implement that actually achieve the goals we adopt/recommend. There is no need to rush completion of the report to meet an artificial deadline.

Housing and Finances

Finding

River Forest seniors wish to continue to live in River Forest (“age in community”) and to remain in their current homes (“age in place”).

Basis

Nearly 68 percent of those responding agreed or strongly with the statement “It is important for me to age in River Forest.”(Survey Item 48)

Almost 79 percent of those surveyed reported they wished to continue to live in River Forest for at least six more years. Over 61 percent wish to live here for 11 or more years. (Item 59)

Similarly, nearly three quarters desire to remain in their current abode for at least six years with 56.7 percent inclined to continue to live in their current home for 11 or more years. (Item 58)

These survey results for River Forest seniors are very much in line with seniors nationwide. A 2018 survey conducted for the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) found that 77 percent of adults 50 and older wish to age in community and 76 percent wish to age in place.¹

[SUGGESTION: Given this overwhelming desire to age in community, we should be looking very closely at the recommendations for fostering aging in community in *Planning Aging-Supportive Communities*, PAS Report 579, summarized in a table on pages 83-86. This really is a thorough laundry list of what a village like River Forest can actually do. I don't know that we'd want to do everything in the table, but it sure gives us a solid compilation of things the village could undertake and it would behoove us to share this information with the village board and the community in our document.]

Finding

There is substantial interest among River Forest seniors to add an accessory dwelling unit to their property. Accessory dwelling units offer the opportunity to facilitate continuing to age in place or in age in community within River Forest.

Basis

Nearly a quarter of River Forest seniors would consider modifying their property to add an accessory dwelling unit and would consider living in an accessory dwelling unit. More than 23 percent of those surveyed reported that they would consider modifying their property to create an accessory dwelling unit and nearly 24 percent would consider living in one. (Items 50 and 51)

Similarly, nearly 24 percent would consider modifying their property to create a separate living space for a caretaker, boarder, or parent. (Item 49)

¹ National Opinion Research Corporation, *2018 Home and Community Preferences Survey: A National Survey of Adults Aged 18-Plus*, (Washington, DC: American Association of Retired Persons) 8. See also pages 9-11,

More than nine in ten River Forest seniors report that their current home would allow them to have another person live with them. (Item 45)

Close to one in five River Forest seniors report that they cannot easily meet their monthly housing costs including property tax. (Item 42)

Accessory dwelling units and home sharing with another person enhance the ability of seniors to age in place and age in community, especially those who cannot easily meet their monthly housing costs. These proportions of River Forest seniors interested in accessory dwelling units or home sharing are substantial, especially for a community that has not generated much publicity or conducted extensive conversations about these possibilities, even though they are a bit lower than the 33 percent interested nationwide.² Currently River Forest's zoning ordinance does not allow accessory dwelling units. Even if the village does amend its zoning to facilitate creation of accessory dwelling units, nobody pretends that everybody who expressed an interest will actually build them. But this level of interest strongly suggests that if allowed, a fair number of River Forest seniors would avail themselves of the opportunity to enhance their ability to age in place with an accessory dwelling unit or home sharing with another person

Nationally, half of seniors report that they already share or would consider sharing their homes as they age. Keep in mind, however, that River Forest seniors, like the rest of River Foresters, tend to be wealthier than the nation as a whole. Consequently, one of the three major reasons for home sharing nationally — to generate extra income³ — may not be a motivation for most River Forest seniors.

Social participation (items 2-5)

Findings

A significant minority of seniors feel there are not enough opportunities to meet people in River Forest.

A significant minority of River Forest seniors have difficulty learning about local social events.

The range of local events and activities is either not sufficiently varied for River Forest seniors or not of concern to them.

Local activities and events are held in places accessible to seniors.

² Ibid. at 14. Reasons for building an accessory dwelling units are presented on page 16. The River Forest survey did not inquire into the reasons one might build an accessory dwelling unit.

³ Ibid. at 17. See also pages 18-19.

Basis

As a very small community within a much larger metropolitan area, it is no surprise that 26 to 45 percent of River Forest seniors reported they are neutral on social participation issues or that the issue is not applicable to them. This dynamic needs to be taken into account when evaluating the survey responses and in crafting policies and goals on these social participation issues.

While a majority of seniors expressing an opinion feel there are enough opportunities to meet people in River Forest, 30 percent of those expressing an opinion felt there are not enough opportunities. More than a third of all respondents were neutral or felt this issue was not applicable to them. (Item 2)

More than four in ten of those expressing an opinion felt that the range of local events and activities is not sufficiently varied for them. More than 45 percent of *all* respondents were neutral or felt this question was not applicable to them. (Item 5)

While most respondents report that it is easy for them to learn about local social events, 23 percent do not and 26 percent are neutral or feel local social events are not applicable to them. (Item 4)

A large proportion of River Forest seniors clearly do not restrict their social activities to just those in River Forest. Consequently, the availability of social opportunities within River Forest is not of great consequence to them even though it matters to a larger proportion of seniors.

About six percent report that local activities and events are held in places not accessible to them. (Item 3). Given the low levels of mobility-limiting disabilities among River Forest seniors, this small proportion is no surprise. However, it is important to assure that these events are held in accessible locations in accord with the Americans With Disabilities Act.

Technology (Items 6-8) and Communication and Information (Items 16-27)

Findings

River Forest seniors report that they are comfortable using electronic communication devices.

River Forest seniors understand digital and printed communications from the village.

While most River Forest seniors prefer to receive village communications electronically, a significant percentage prefer to receive village communications by mail.

Basis

Nearly nine in ten River Forest seniors report they are comfortable using the Internet, smart phones, and other electronic devices. (Items 6-8)

More than three quarters of River Forest seniors report that the digital information the village sends them is easy to read in terms of type face and size. (Item18)

More than 92 percent of River Forest seniors report that they can understand printed information from the village (Item19) while 86 percent say the same about digital information. (Item 20)

While 60 percent prefer to receive village information via electronic means (Item21), nearly 29 percent prefer to receive village information in print via the U.S. mail.

With nearly three in ten River Forest seniors preferring to receive their village information in print, it behooves the village to identify them and provide that information via the United States Postal Service. It is very likely that while seniors report they are comfortable using their electronic devices and the Internet, this significant proportion may not be as skilled as one might hope to use the Internet effectively. They may not know how to download, save, and open files. It is safe to say that a significant proportion of seniors prefer printed material to reading a computer screen.

Senior services

Finding

River Forest seniors are largely unaware of the social services offered within the village.

Basis

Just 30 percent of River Forest seniors report that social services in River Forest meet their needs. Under eight percent reported that these services meet their needs. Sixty-two percent were neutral or chose “not applicable.” (Item 23)

About one in four River Forest seniors knows what services for older adults are available in River Forest (Item 24) while 26 percent know how to access these services. (Item 25)

Fewer than six percent of River Forest seniors use services for older adults in the village. (Item 26)

Being located in a large metropolitan area, there is little reason to expect River Forest seniors to limit their use of social services to those available in River Forest. However, it is clear that those River Forest entities that furnish such services need to enhance their efforts to make River Forest seniors aware of what they do offer.

It is also vital to remember that, for a variety of reasons, *few people actually seek out senior services before they actually need them*. So the challenge is how to make residents aware of the senior services available *before* they actually need them — while keeping in mind that many of these services are also available outside River Forest.

Outdoor Spaces and Buildings

Finding

There is a need to upgrade River Forest’s street lighting to promote nighttime pedestrian and driver safety.

Basis

Of those expressing an opinion in the survey, 31 percent disagreed with the survey statement “Street lights in River Forest are bright enough for me to safely walk at night.” (Item 32)

Of those expressing an opinion in the survey, 21 percent disagreed with the survey statement “Street lights in River Forest are bright enough for me to safely drive at night.” (Item 33)

These results show that at least one in five River Forest seniors report that our street lights are inadequate for safe driving and pedestrian mobility. This is not surprising given that the American Planning Association reports that “traffic safety issues are a primary concern in planning for older drivers.” While there are a number of interventions available at other levels of government to improve mobility safety for seniors, the primary tools at the local level revolve around improving *street lighting*, signage, signalization, and road conditions.⁴ Glare is often cited as a “perceptual constraint” for older drivers. Strategies that reduce the contrast between headlights and ambient lighting can ease this problem — strategies that increase ambient light on the roadways and sidewalks to a level that makes nearly all seniors (and others in River Forest) feel safer when driving or walking within the village.⁵ Brighter lighting can be

⁴ Bradley Winick and Martin Jaffe, *Planning Aging-Supportive Communities*, PAS Report 579 (Chicago: American Planning Association, June 2015) 6.

⁵ *Ibid.* at 42. This concern is equally applicable to cyclists.

confined to the streets and sidewalks through the use of light shields and directed lighting to keep light from bleeding onto front lawns and into living rooms and front porches.

One characteristic of older pedestrians is a fear of using all or part of a route due to inadequate lighting. Adequate street lighting reflects a town's commitment to good urban design and helps drivers avoid accidents involving pedestrians.⁶

Consequently, the American Planning Association recommends that local communities "Acknowledge the reality of older adult drivers and support their evolving competencies and needs through enhanced roadway design and appropriate visibility and nonglare lighting standards."⁷

Finding

More than a third of River Forest seniors expressing an opinion report that there are not enough places to sit and rest in the village

Basis

More than one in four River Forest seniors report that there are not enough places to sit or rest throughout the village. Excluding the nearly 30 percent of respondents who were neutral or felt the question was not applicable, 36 percent report that there are not enough places to rest or sit within River Forest. (Item 31)

It will take a coordinated effort by the village, park district, and other entities to meet these needs.

Jim and Barbara,

Are those disagreeing with the statement skewed toward older residents? This is one of those questions where it would really help if the answers were broken down by age cohort. Did either of you break Item 31 down by age cohort? (Sorry, I'm rushing to get this in on time and don't have time to search all the great work you both assembled.)

Finding

There is general agreement that the sidewalks within the village are safe and seniors have enough time to safely cross streets.

⁶ Ibid. at 46-49.

⁷ Ibid, at 55, 85. The American Planning Association also recommends improved lighting as part of a community's efforts to promote safe bicycle travel throughout a village at 55, 85.

Basis

Just 14 percent disagreed with the statement that “sidewalks in my neighborhood are safe for me to use” while more than 80 percent agreed. (Item 29)

Only 10.6 percent disagreed with the statement that they usually have enough time to cross streets safely in River Forest” while more than 89 percent agreed. (Item 30)

It is very likely that River Forest’s street design and traffic signals provide safe passage to seniors crossing streets here, at least in daylight.

Access to Transportation

Findings

While River Forest seniors have easy access to public transportation, they overwhelmingly continue to drive themselves to get where they need to go.

The vast majority of River Forest seniors continue to be independent in their transportation choices. Relatively few depend on others for their transportation.

Basis

Two-thirds of River Forest seniors report they have easy access to public transportation such as Metra, buses, and the Elevated. Fewer than seven percent do not. (Item 34) However, fewer than eight percent usually take public transportation. (Item 35)

Nonetheless, more than nine in ten River Forest seniors report that they usually drive themselves where they need to go. (Item 36)

Relatively few depend on others for their transportation with fewer than seven percent usually taking a taxi or rideshare, and less than five percent reporting they depend on others to get to where they need to go. (Items 37-38)

Fewer than four percent need assistance to get from their home to their ride. (Item39)

Finding

River Forest seniors are largely unaware of the transportation services that River Forest Township provides.

Basis

About 19 percent of River Forest seniors are aware of the transportation services the township furnishes. (Item 40)

Given that more than 90 percent drive themselves to get around, this is no surprise since so few have a need for these services. While the proportion of River Forest seniors dependent on others for transportation is relatively low, local transportation services still need to be provided for those who are dependent.

Respect and Social Inclusion

Finding

Age discrimination against River Forest seniors is not widespread.

There is a low level of ageism in River Forest.

Actually we need data on levels of ageism nationally and/or in Illinois to evaluate the relative level of ageism in River Forest. I put this finding and basis in as a place holder until we can get that data. I imagine that Lydia and Jim would be able to provide us some data to which we can compare the level in River Forest (assuming that remarks by others is the proper measure of ageism).

Basis

Eleven percent of respondents reported that they sometime feel discriminated against due to their age. (Item 10)

Fewer than seven percent of River Forest seniors report hearing annoying or negative remarks due to their perceived age. (Item 9)

Civic/Social Involvement and Volunteer Opportunities

This is another area where it is essential to remember that River Forest is a small town in the midst of a large metropolitan area and that seniors may be involved in civic and social activities outside of River Forest and volunteer outside of the village. This dynamic is likely reflected by the 39 to 45 percent of respondents who responded “neutral” or “not applicable” to an item.

Findings

Most River Forest seniors with an opinion report that they have enough opportunities to interact with younger generations within the village.

Most River Forest seniors with an opinion report that they are satisfied with opportunities for social involvement in River Forest.

Most River Forest seniors with an opinion report that they are satisfied with opportunities for civic involvement here.

Most River Forest seniors with an opinion are satisfied with opportunities to volunteer in the village.

River Forest seniors tend to feel like a valued member of the River Forest community.

Basis

Just 18 percent of respondents felt they do not have enough opportunities to interact with younger generations within the village while 45 percent felt they do have enough. (Item 1) While this information needs to be placed in perspective because River Forest is not an island, there is a possibility that nearly one in five River Forest seniors could be experiencing some social isolation.

Similarly, 23 percent of responding seniors were not satisfied with opportunities for social involvement in the village while 42 percent were satisfied and more than a third were neutral or felt this was inapplicable to them. (Item 2) Again, while perspective is needed, there is a change that more than one in five River Forest seniors could be experiencing some social isolation.

Nearly half of village seniors are satisfied with opportunities for civic involvement within the village with just 14 percent dissatisfied and 37 percent being neutral or feeling civic involvement is not applicable to them. (Item 3) Perspective is needed to determine if these levels should be of concern. **(I strongly suspect they are not of concern and don't warrant any action – but it would be helpful to have some data with which to compare our results.)**

The proportion of respondents satisfied with volunteer opportunities in River Forest is the same as those for whom local volunteer opportunities are not applicable or who are neutral. Just 16 percent are not satisfied. (Item 4) These data likely reflect the extensive opportunities to volunteer within the larger metropolitan area.

More than half of all respondents agree that they feel they are valued members of the River Forest community with just 11 percent disagreeing. Again, a significant 39 percent were neutral or felt this issue as not applicable to them. (Item 15)

Demographics

We should report on the age breakdown and ownership breakdown – and compare both to the nation (the ownership breakdown is very different than nationally where far fewer seniors own a home). We should also report on items 54, 55, 56, 57, 60 (with a grain of salt), and other demographic characteristics while noting what the figures are for the Chicago

metropolitan region and possibly as well as nationally and in Illinois. Data for these other jurisdictions provides important perspective and context for analyzing the River Forest data.



APA AGING IN COMMUNITY POLICY GUIDE TALKING POINTS FOR PLANNERS

The aging of the population demands a fundamental shift in planning in order to minimize the economic, social and health challenges that will otherwise overwhelm communities.

This guide contains policies that are designed to:

- Help older adults remain functional and active in their communities so that they can successfully age in their homes and communities.
- Enhance the local economic benefits from older adults and their caregivers.
- Combat ageism and tap the assets that older adults represent by facilitating contact and interdependencies across generations.

6 Guiding Policies for Planners:

1. **Actively engage the aging perspective in the planning process.** Ensure participation across age, language, race, gender, sexual orientation, immigration status, ability and technology barriers, and solicit input in all dimensions of planning and policies.
2. **Provide a range of affordable and accessible housing options.** Promote housing development of differing sizes and costs. Better utilize existing housing resources, and advance universal design and visitability standards to promote accessibility in new housing.
3. **Ensure access to a variety of quality transportation options.** Provide choices that facilitate the maximum degree of personal independence for people of differing abilities. Design and fund appropriate mobility components.
4. **Use land-use and zoning tools to create welcoming communities.** Maximize connections among housing, transportation, health care, recreation, human services and community engagement, to facilitate health, participation, security and quality of life.
5. **Support the economic well-being of older adults and their caregivers.** Advance local economic development policies and planning that support older adults remaining in the workforce longer, serving as employees, entrepreneurs and mentors.
6. **Strengthen the community assets of and supports for older adults.** Shift the housing and service design model and ensure that community services and assets are accessible to older adults. Promote and nurture the rich human asset of older adults who wish to engage in civic and community life.

THE AGING OF AMERICA By the Numbers



By 2030, nearly **20%** of the U.S. population will be over 65.



The fastest growing age demographic is **85+**.

The Census Bureau projects



living in the U.S. by 2050.

Boomers control **70%** of consumer spending.



Older adult shoppers outspent younger ones by **\$1 trillion** in 2010.

THE FOLLOWING ARE SOME EXAMPLES OF CHALLENGES AND ACTIONS THAT CAN BE TAKEN IN KEY POLICY AREAS:

	Challenges	Action Opportunities
Housing	<p>Affordability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of 65 to 74-year-olds with “severe rent burdens” (half of income expended on housing) is projected to rise 42% over the next decade. Older adults are the fastest growing homeless demographic, estimated to increase by 33 percent from 2010 to 2020. <p>Disability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two-thirds of those 85+ today have at least one disability. 90 percent of those 65+ with disabilities still live in private homes. <p>Isolation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 of 5 age-80+ households consist of a single person. The number of people 75+ living alone is expected to double from 2015 to 2035. Isolation is linked to deterioration of mental and physical health. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create housing options along a continuum of size that are affordable, accessible, close to services and located within existing communities (including nursing homes and rehabilitation centers). Utilize existing housing more effectively through infill that advances gentle density, including home sharing and accessory dwelling unit programs. These can enable on-site caregivers (family or paid), provide essential income for a homeowner, and mitigate isolation. Eliminate discriminatory rules or practices that undermine the potential for new, more innovative housing arrangements, such as limited definitions of “family” and “maximum unrelated” restrictions.
Transportation	<p>Options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> People live on average for a decade after they reach “driving retirement.” Consequences of older adults giving up their car keys include: 15 percent fewer trips to the doctor; 59 percent fewer shopping trips; and 65 percent fewer trips for social, family, religious and other life-enhancing activities. <p>Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 65+ population comprises 13 percent of the population yet suffers 19 percent of pedestrian fatalities (vs. 14 percent of motor vehicle fatalities). Falls account for 68 percent of seniors’ hospitalizations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accessible, convenient and safe transportation choices and funding mechanisms should support new and improved options for older adults to move around. These options include specialized transportation services, e.g., demand responsive, paratransit, volunteer driver and rideshare programs. Address first and last mile connectivity and make it easier to move from one mode of transportation to another. Provide walkable environments including well-maintained sidewalks, no-skid surfaces, good lighting, bus shelters, benches, traffic islands, well-marked crosswalks, and crossing signals with adequate time to cross.
Connected Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As mobility limitations increase, the distance from home to essential goods and services must decrease. Experts narrow the acceptable living distance to healthy food options for older adults to a ¼-mile radius (the USDA defines a food desert as 1 mile for the general population). Medication non-adherence is responsible for 50 percent of health costs; easy access to a pharmacy is one reason many prescriptions are never filled. Lower levels of intergenerational contact have been linked to more negative attitudes about older adults and aging. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use land-use and zoning as a vehicle for creating enabling environments that raise the level of functioning and independence of older adults. Promote mixed-use and infill development that provide proximity to transportation, health centers, pharmacy, grocery stores and parks. Create built environments that co-locate services and increase the participation of older adults in cultural and community life. Promote adaptive reuse of community structures, shared facilities and public spaces where multiple generations can formally and informally interact, which has a secondary benefit of addressing ageism.



American Planning Association

Making Great Communities Happen

Aging in Community Policy Guide

Approved by the APA Delegate Assembly, April 26, 2014

Ratified by the APA Board of Directors, July 18, 2014

DECLARATIONS

INTRODUCTION

America is aging—rapidly. Older adults—65 and over—represent 13 percent of the population today. By 2030, one in every five people living in the US will be over the age of 65. This aging of America is fueled by 72 million baby boomers aging through the life cycle in combination with a profound increase in longevity. Average life expectancy doubled from the mid-thirties in the 19th century to age 78 today. Currently there are more than 70,000 centenarians in the United States, roughly four times the number from just ten years ago. And according to the U.S. Census, that number will likely exceed 1 million by 2050.

The American Planning Association (APA) recognizes that the aging of the population creates a unique opportunity and responsibility to apply sound planning approaches and policy to improve communities to serve the spectrum of needs and abilities of older adults. The APA supports the creation and integration of housing, land-use, transportation, economic, social service and health systems that support a high quality of life for people of all ages and abilities. A multigenerational planning approach ensures that the needs of all residents are met and that older members of our communities are not at risk of social isolation, poverty, declining health, and poor economic well-being. The planning community can be a leader in encouraging comprehensive approaches and in mobilizing resources to enhance the quality of life of our aging population

GUIDING POLICIES

A. Actively Involve Older Adults and Engage the Aging Perspective in the Planning Process

Older adults are the experts on their own lives, so effective planning in all dimensions—physical design, social and community supports—must involve older adult participation on an ongoing basis. Older adults are producers, consumers, leaders, community and family members, and when their potential is maximized, people of all ages benefit. Planners also must take a lead role in

bringing together leaders across sectors to assess and plan for the needs of older adults living in their jurisdictions.

B. Ensure a Range of Affordable Housing Options are Available for Older Adults

The promise of aging in community can be challenging to deliver. Communities should make provisions for ensuring a continuum of housing options to support older adults ranging from those who are fully independent to those requiring progressively more assistance in daily life. Policies and programs should promote affordability, safety and accessibility, incorporate enabling design-based home and energy efficiency modifications, and foster upkeep and sustainability of the housing stock. The design of homes should be adaptable and allow different generations or household types to live in a single home, as well as allow for technologies, devices and in-home management systems that optimize active aging. In addition, planners will need to work diligently to ensure access to fair housing, and address the disparate impacts of housing location and availability for elders of all races and incomes. There may also be an exit of older adults from homeownership as they seek to relocate, downsize, or withdraw from the housing market. Planners may need to anticipate and prepare for this transition.

C. Ensure Access to Quality Transportation Options for Older Adults

A range of transportation choices, including grassroots services such as shared autos, is critical for older adults to be able to maintain their independence. Transforming transportation systems to maximize connections with land-uses critical to older adults, particularly housing, health care, and human services will enhance the livability of our communities. Viable transportation options can directly benefit older adults, their caregivers, and health care workers, and emergency responders. Funding mechanisms should support new and improved transportation options. Funding and appropriate design of transportation components such as benches, bus shelters, good lighting, cross walks that are well marked, and crossing signals with adequate time to cross for persons of all abilities is essential. The cross-disciplinary education of planners, transportation engineers, and the people who use transportation systems in support of increasing these choices is imperative. When transportation systems are properly designed and implemented, they can help individuals maintain their independence and mobility by ensuring accessibility to destinations important to older adults. This includes the maintenance of sidewalks and lights for safe and walkable neighborhoods.

D. Use Land-Use and Zoning Tools to Create Welcoming Communities for Older Adults

In many communities, planning for an aging population often has been limited to concerns over providing space for nursing homes and age-restricted housing. As planners, we recognize that the location of where we develop or re-develop housing is equally as important as what type of housing we build, as is proximity

to essential goods and services. Policies, investments, and new tools such as form-based codes should help create a built environment that intentionally provides opportunities for older people to easily participate in community life and activities. This allows them to age in community and not in isolated age-specific enclaves. Because mobility limitations may increase with age, it is important to facilitate quality of life for older adults by creating mixed-use, well-connected neighborhoods with access to health centers, pharmacies, grocery stores, parks and cultural activities. This includes the maintenance of sidewalks and lights for safe environments, walkable neighborhoods, and natural areas to recreate. Redevelopment should occur in areas with an existing network of community supports and services.

E. Support the Economic Well-Being of Older Adults and their Caregivers

Local economic development policies and planning should address the needs of community members of all ages and income levels. When economic development policies and local businesses recognize the needs and assets of older adults as consumers, workers, mentors, and entrepreneurs, resilient economies are built. Additionally, formal and informal caregivers represent a large and largely invisible and undercounted component of local economies. Caregivers should be recognized and considered in planning, land-use, and economic policy development. Home care workers, in particular, need access to efficient transportation and affordable housing options.

F. Strengthen the Community Assets of and Supports for Older Adults

Planners need to design policy and planning responses that address the needs of older adults— particularly, those at-risk of homelessness—and also take advantage of the contributions of older adults in all community contexts. Inadequate physical design must be recognized as a barrier and addressed to ensure segments of our society are not excluded. Community services and the assets that older adults and their social networks represent are key complements to physical design. Older adults have the skills, connections, and time to put toward helping their communities and are looking to keep active and remain engaged in civic life. Communities that incorporate opportunities and services for older adults in all aspects of zoning and economic, land-use, and transportation planning will allow older adults and their families to engage more fully in community and economic activities, reducing the individual and societal costs of institutionalizing older adults who could be better cared for in community settings. Moreover, community inclusion of older adults will reduce both individual and societal costs associated with institutionalization. Greener buildings may also improve the health of their occupants.

DEFINITION, KEY FACTS, AND RATIONALE

Aging in community means that older adults are able to live as independently as possible as members of the community of their choice. For some, this means growing older in a long-time home; for others, it means transitioning to a more appropriate and supportive setting but still in their community. During a lifetime, people develop connections to place and form important social relationships within their neighborhoods and communities. Sustaining these relationships plays an important role in aging well. The aging population presents both a challenge and opportunity to transform and improve our communities. It will bring profound challenges to health care and social services, housing and transportation, the workforce and retirement safety net and every aspect of life. It is also an extraordinary opportunity to create healthy environments that encourage active lifestyles so all residents may thrive. Planners play a key role in the provision of access to the structures and services that either support or hinder resident well-being, independence, productivity, and prosperity.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Jurisdictional plans should reflect the input and experience of people of all ages who live in different circumstances and with different abilities. The aging of the population demands a fundamental shift in planning in order to maximize the engagement of older adults and minimize the economic, social and health challenges that will otherwise overwhelm communities. Anticipating this demographic change early facilitates developing key relationships, coordinating critical strategies as well as creating new options. Finding common themes and opportunities to work with other strategic alliances will prove beneficial. Collaborative efforts allow partners to advance initiatives more quickly, share resources, and leverage funding.

HOUSING

Affordability is a major factor determining where older people live and their quality of life, especially for those with fixed, low-, or extremely-low incomes. There are long open and closed waiting lists for publicly-subsidized housing, and the need for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture 515 and 521 programs continues to increase as people with limited incomes age.

The Seniors Commission Report shows that by 2020, there will be 2.6 million older Americans who require assistance with activities of daily living or have cognitive or mental disabilities living at or below 150% of poverty. At the same time, fiscal constraints have limited the construction of new units and the rehabilitation of existing units. This affordable housing shortage is a serious problem. Planners should initiate a dialogue with providers of federally-assisted housing to identify collaborative opportunities to assist in the rehabilitation of the housing stock and explore mechanisms and innovative models to create new housing units. Preserving existing

affordable rental housing offers cost advantages over new construction, especially if funding for new subsidized housing is limited.

The maintenance of the existing housing stock is not only critical to older adults, but also to their neighborhoods. Keeping homes affordable reduces deferred maintenance and its cumulative effects on the functioning, appearance, and quality of the home and neighborhood. Energy-efficiency improvements contribute to a high-performing housing stock and healthy neighborhoods. Making a home more energy efficient and maintenance-free can also help older adults remain in their homes longer. Other changes that can help improve affordability include co-housing, smaller housing types, and no minimum parking requirements.

Since its creation as part of corporate income tax reform in 1986, Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) has become the principal source of development equity for the production of low-income housing nationwide, including specific state-based allocations for senior housing. Over time, existing projects often lack sufficient resources to make necessary retrofits and are faced with raising rents to meet this need. The National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF) was authorized by Congress in 2008, and once funded can become a mainstay of capital for the development of affordable senior housing and other forms of affordable housing that can serve people of all ages.

Universal design and visitability standards promote the well-being of people of all ages. Enhancing the mobility and independence of people of all abilities, young as well as old, contributes to community vitality. Whether by ordinances or incentives, communities should explore the benefits of design features that enable residents with a range of ages and abilities to live as independently and interdependently as possible across their lifespan. With longer life expectancies and with less personal and societal economic resources available, minimizing or eliminating the need to retrofit a home, especially when on a fixed income, is a practical solution. If home modifications are needed, they should be affordable and from providers who understand the needs of older adults. Accessible housing environments may be considered a public health issue via building codes and a civil rights issue from a disability perspective. The applicability of accessibility standards such as Universal Design extends beyond housing to promote long-term stability for a wide range of mobility and sight disabilities.

TRANSPORTATION

Age-sensitive design and proper maintenance of the transportation system enables persons of all ages and abilities to benefit from system investments. Residents who are forced to navigate a system that does not address age-related changes will experience a lowered level of functioning, leading to reduced mobility, increased dependence on family and community supports, and be at greater risk for falls and other accidents. The consequence of poor environmental design is costly—to individuals, families, and the community in terms of overall health, quality life, and financial impacts. Communities

earn a greater return on investment from enabling design and a menu of active living opportunities.

Communities benefit when their planners and designers are well versed in design methods that result in enabling environments. Similarly, educational programs, such as transit travel training, encourage greater use of the transportation system by older adults, which connects them to community activities and services and potentially lowers the overall cost of providing transportation. It also encourages physical activity which can lower healthcare costs.

People differ in their degree of physical and cognitive ability, especially among the oldest community members. As such, a variety of transportation options are needed. Fixed route bus and rail services will meet the needs of many able to navigate their communities independently. Demand responsive service may be the most cost-effective form of public transportation in rural areas. For those unable to access fixed-route service, specialized transportation services, including human services transportation, provide an invaluable lifeline. Coordination of public, specialized, and human services transportation results in more efficient and effective service delivery.

Public funding for specialized transportation has not kept pace with growing demand. In some cases, private sector resources may be harnessed simply by removing legal barriers. In other cases, outreach to non-traditional funders can result in untapped resources for community benefit. After all, community transportation providers often transport the patients and residents of nursing homes, hospitals and health clinics.. Employers benefit from reduced time off work when their employees can rely on community transportation services for family members. Home health care workers caring for older adults often rely on public transportation to get to and from their jobs.

The availability of transportation options facilitates personal independence. Older adults in many communities rely on their own personal vehicle for transportation, and if that option is restricted or removed, older adults may become isolated and depressed, as well as lose their ability to contribute to the economy and the community. This can be a particular problem in rural and suburban areas, but also in urban areas. Maintaining social connections is critical for the health and well-being of older adults.

LAND-USE

Enabling design standards which respect the varied needs and abilities of older adults can decrease demand for services, increase housing choice, and increase level of functioning, independence, physical activity, social interaction, community involvement, and civic and economic engagement.

A jurisdiction's policies, services, settings and structures affect people's ability to age actively in community. For example, policies such as tax abatements may lead to aging-in-community by going beyond minimum accessibility levels when transit-oriented.

Optimizing opportunities for health, participation, and security will enhance the quality of life as people age. Communities must provide the structures and services to support active aging including the redesign and retrofit of community centers and neighborhood hubs to serve as one-stop resource centers for wellness and social engagement including the joint use of schools, churches, and other community institutions.

Older adults often require supportive and enabling living environments to compensate for physical and social changes associated with aging. The use of new technologies for affordable home-centric assistance products and broadband connectivity provide social engagement and stimulation, a sense of purpose, safety, and healthcare applications to cope with and embrace aging. These technologies include innovative, "smart home" models and environments that access in-home healthcare and wellness options, caregiving, and social and learning opportunities. Planners need to be flexible and address planning and zoning barriers to emerging home-centric options.

Parks and recreation facilities and community amenities provide opportunities for not only physical activity, but also social engagement, education, nature study, and environmental awareness. Proper nutrition is a key to maintaining good health; farmer's markets and community gardens can facilitate healthy eating and access to fresh fruits and vegetables as well as opportunities for social engagement.

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Older adults and their caregivers represent an under-recognized market segment; serving these groups offers a new business niche that can meet the needs of older adults while at the same time promoting economic development.

Older adults continue to work long past traditional retirement age. For many, the supplemental income is critical for reducing poverty. Older adults also provide a skilled labor force for the local economy, and work is valued by many as a way to stay engaged in community life. Tapping into the experience, skills, and wisdom of older adults can offer tremendous educational and training benefits to younger workers. Volunteer efforts provide another opportunity for civic engagement and social involvement.

Most caregiving is informal—from neighbors helping neighbors to family caregivers to car shares and time banks. Planners can facilitate these informal networks and link them to formal support systems. The caregiver support ratio (number of potential caregivers aged 45 to 64 for each person aged 80 and older) is expected to decline sharply, placing increasing demands on local services. Today, women outnumber men as caregivers three to one. Leaving the primary burden of care for children and elders on women is poor economic policy, inequitable toward women and has been shown to reduce women's health and economic well-being in older age. Long-term lifetime earnings and subsequent retirement benefits are negatively affected by the inequitable care burden that women face throughout their lifetimes. Formal child care, elder care and other

social service supports, including transportation, are critical economic infrastructure for healthy aging.

People live in all types of households. Discriminatory family definitions unnecessarily burden older adults who wish to cohabitate for financial or other reasons, including the LGBT and immigrant communities of elders. Discriminatory practices undermine the potential for new, more innovative housing arrangements that promote household sharing across generations and non-family members.

Immigration status and work in the informal sector can render subsets of older adults ineligible for appropriate income support and necessary health insurance. Planners have an ethical obligation to support federal, state, and local policies that overcome such discrimination. The perception of growing inequality—especially among residents outside the labor force, e.g., children and older adults—must be addressed through public policies at all levels—federal, state, and local. Planners should be careful not to deepen inequalities through policies that privilege the financially well-off.

COMMUNITY ASSETS OF AND SUPPORTS

Currently, housing and services designed for older adults are principally age-segregated (senior housing, senior centers, home-delivered meals, adult day care, etc.) This service design model has several unintended negative effects: it reinforces ageism, as there is less contact with older people by other generations; areas with smaller populations or fewer resources lack many of these facilities; and the many existing community assets (libraries, schools, parks, public transportation, cultural institutions, and businesses) are often not physically accessible and inviting to older adults. Communities—large and small—where individuals of all ages, identities, and abilities have opportunities to both contribute and receive support and share each other's efforts, talents, and assistance, promote interdependence and connectedness that make people happy and communities resilient.

Interdependencies between generations are beneficial to communities, including both the critical role of informal family caregivers in caring for older adults and the critical role of older adults within families (caring for grandchildren, contributing to household support, providing emotional support, and performing other key domestic roles). Communities where people of different generations live in proximity, work together and engage in civic activities together, are more sustainable and more resilient. A community's policies, services, settings, and structures support and enable people to age actively in community. Optimizing opportunities for maintaining health, participation, and security will enhance the quality of life as people age. Communities must provide the structures and services to support active aging, including the redesign and retrofit of community centers and neighborhood hubs to serve as one-stop resource centers for wellness and social engagement, including the joint use of schools, churches and other community institutions.

Older adults represent untapped, vital human resources for communities, contributing their talents and experience to social, cultural, economic, and civic life. Care-related services are an economic investment, not just expenditures. These services provide the foundation for economic development and also provide critical support to family caregivers. Services such as transportation and home-delivered meals can help ensure full functionality of older adults. Services for older adults can be linked to services for children and caregivers thereby increasing access and quality of life for all. Such shared services also help build political will for community financing.

POLICY OUTCOMES

This section summarizes the desired results from implementation of the guiding policies above.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Actively Involve Older Adults and Engage the Aging Perspective in the Planning Process

1. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support community engagement of older adults in all dimensions of planning. Planners must reach out to all members of the community, making participation possible across age, language, class, race, gender, sexual orientation, immigration status, ability and technology barriers.

1.1 Planners should develop mechanisms to regularly consult with older adults on specific plans, policies, and codes (form-based codes, building codes and land use codes), Planning paradigms such as Healthy Communities, (codes) Sustainability, Complete Streets, Transit-Oriented Development and Traditional Neighborhood Design should be systematically reviewed from an aging perspective. For older adults particularly, it is important to consider meeting times, physical accessibility of locations, transportation options, accessibility of oral and written communications, and relevant agendas. Planners must actively seek out those who are homebound, who speak languages other than English and those who may not have access to computers. Family caregivers and paid caregivers can also provide planners with insight into their needs and desires, and those of their loved ones.

2. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions encourage planners to meet with public, private, and community stakeholders (including older adults) in their jurisdictions to assess, discuss, and develop strategies to address unmet needs as well as apply the strengths of older adults living in their jurisdictions.

2.1 Planners should foster opportunities for community-wide dialogue to bring together professionals from a variety of fields, including transportation, planning, physical and mental health, architecture, developers, geriatrics, gerontology, housing, faith communities, and social work to identify appropriate community designs to support and

involve older adults throughout their lifetime. Planners should align the goals of aging in community with broader local community priorities to gain trust and participation in the process and intentionally facilitate intergenerational dialogue.

HOUSING

Ensure that a Range of Affordable and Accessible Housing Options are Available for Older Adults

3. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support federal funding for the production of new and preservation of existing low-income rental housing, including subsidies and financing structures that ensure long-term viability of affordable rental housing developments, and programs to prevent and reduce homelessness in an aging population. There should be greater flexibility in management policies and within rental subsidy programs to allow for the development and preservation of co-housing and other intergenerational living opportunities.

3.1 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support programs such as the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program and increased allocations, as well as increased funding for Community Development Block Grants, the HOME Investment Partnerships Program and funding to capitalize the National Housing Trust Fund.

3.2 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support strategies that ensure quality housing choices for older adults, such as the maintenance and modernization of the existing housing stock through direct financial assistance from loan and grant programs, mortgage default avoidance education, home maintenance assistance, home modification programs for people with disabilities, and weatherization assistance programs.

3.3 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support adopting policies, ordinances and incentives that facilitate affordable and inclusive housing and include enabling design - design that enables residents of varying levels of physical ability to live - in all multifamily housing and single family residential and advocates its use in housing assisted with federal subsidies.

3.4 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support the preservation and modernization of federally-assisted housing for older residents; including the HUD Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture 515 and 521 programs.

3.5 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support the identification and reuse of underutilized or vacant properties for the development of affordable housing, particularly housing for older adults.

TRANSPORTATION

Ensure Access to Quality Transportation Options for Older Adults

4. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions recommend that local, state, federal, and private entities evaluate and modify their transportation planning policies and land use practices to ensure accessibility, affordability, convenience and safety for older adults of all abilities.

4.1 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support requiring design for the specific needs and abilities of older adults of each component of the transportation systems, including physical attributes (e.g., interior spaces, sidewalks, lighting, large button crosswalk controls, retro- reflective signs and pavement paint, low floor buses with stop enunciators, seating at bus stops), and information features (e.g., signage, schedules and website).

4.2 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support the adoption of policies and implementation of plans consistent with the principles of Complete Streets, whereby everyone has convenient, safe, and reliable transportation regardless of whether they get around by car, bicycle, on foot, or by public transportation, and regardless of age and ability.

4.3 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions urge states and Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Planning Commissions to explicitly address the needs and capacity of older road users (drivers, passengers, transit users, pedestrians, and bicyclists) in their transportation plans, policies, and design standards including their state-level Strategic Highway Safety Plans and Highway Design Manuals.

4.4 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support cost benefit analyses of transportation investments to consider age- sensitive designs and systems to identify the best use of resources and potential savings in both transportation and broader community budgets.

4.5 Planners should advocate for funding to plan and develop well-integrated networks of pedestrian and bicycle paths, trails and facilities such as bus stops and rail stations.

5. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support the education of the general public, stakeholders such as developers, decision makers, planners and older adults on the components of transportation systems and the effects such systems have on daily living.

5.1 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support educational activities for planners, as well as other professionals in related disciplines, on enabling design to ensure that planning and design professionals understand how their work impacts older adults' mobility and overall quality of life.

5.2 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support educational activities geared towards older adults and their support networks as well as the general public. All citizens must be more aware of and better-educated on transportation options and their successful use, including public transportation, mobility management, driver and car assessment programs, and other public and private services.

6. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support increased local, state, and federal funding, and coordination of, fixed-route public transportation, specialized transportation (including demand responsive, paratransit, and human services transportation), and intercity bus and rail transit. The overall goal is a well-integrated or connected transportation system to allow access to daily needs and to ease moving from one mode of transport to another (e.g. bus to rail).

7. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support policies that create incentives for private resources to support specialized transportation services for older adults, including volunteer driver programs, rideshare programs, and demand responsive paratransit service.

7.1 Congress should adjust the Internal Revenue Service charitable mileage deduction rate to the higher business-related mileage deduction rate to encourage participation in volunteer driver programs (in 2014, a \$0.42 difference).

7.2 States should establish policies that protect volunteer drivers from unreasonable or unfair increases in liability or insurance rates that arise solely from volunteer driver status.

7.3 States and localities should exempt non-profit volunteer driver programs from livery laws when those programs collect payment for rides to help cover operating expenses.

7.4 States should establish policies that exempt non-profit volunteer driver programs from car dealership laws that impede their ability to exchange vehicles from older adults for transportation service.

7.5 Specialized transportation providers should be encouraged to reach out to hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, assisted living facilities, employers, etc. to help fund their services.

8. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions recognize the importance of transportation systems to the health and well-being of older adults.

LAND-USE

Use Land-use and Zoning Tools to Create Welcoming Communities for Older Adults

9. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions recognize that a gap exists between the needs and abilities of older adults and the design of the built environment throughout most communities and supports policies which eliminate this gap, using land-use and zoning as a vehicle for creating enabling environments to raise the level of functioning and independence of older adults.

9.1 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support the development of zoning policies for accessible Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), which are recognized as an important mechanism to allow people to remain in their communities. ADUs can support caregiving and provide a source of essential income. Other residential design options include cottage housing, multigenerational homes, co-housing, or other creative designs.

9.2 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions recognize that the scale of development impacts an aging population with mobility concerns and supports policies that encourage smaller minimum floor areas, smaller lot sizes, and more compact development.

9.3 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support land-use policies and building codes for the development and application of enabling design standards (such as large- button cross walk controls, large font signage, wayfinding and zero-step entries in housing) to ensure that design is accessible at a human-scale throughout a community.

9.4 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions recognizes that the provisions of independent and assisted living communities represent essential community facilities for which required mitigation of exactions may be reduced or eliminated.

10. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support planning policies and zoning regulations that foster mixed-use development as opportunities to co-locate services, land-uses, and programs to offer a continuum of affordable, supportive living options for healthier, independent living.

11. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support policies and zoning that facilitates the infrastructure, including emerging technologies, needed to promote and sustain aging in community and maintenance of day-to-day functioning, engagement, and contribution to community life.

12. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions recognize that physical and social connectivity such as lighting and wayfinding are critical for the health and well-being of older adults. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and

Divisions support policies that create seamless physical and social networks that facilitate improved health, economic opportunity, and community engagement.

12.1 Planners should coordinate transportation and land use that support community development policies that require homes, neighborhoods, goods, services, and community facilities to be physically connected to each other by a variety of comfortable, safe, and logical mobility options.

12.2 Planners should promote land use planning and zoning changes that support access to an efficient transportation network, such as mixed use development, transit-oriented development, and higher density development as appropriate for the community.

12.3 Planners should advocate for community parks and open space that offer opportunities to improve and maintain physical health and well-being, as well as park amenities to meet the needs of those with mobility and sensory issues.

12.4 Planners should advance policies that permit and encourage community gardening [consistent with the adopted Policy Guide on Community and Regional Food Planning] that offers opportunities for social connectivity, physical activity, and healthy food choices and use of products in senior nutrition programs. Raised planters can facilitate participation of those with difficulties with bending or kneeling.

12.5 Planners should eliminate physical and regulatory barriers as needed to promote communities with connected and accessible informal and formal gathering spaces, both indoor and outdoor.

12.6 Planners should encourage communities to consider proximity to environmental health risks when planning for siting location of residential uses for sensitive populations.

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Support the Economic Well-Being of Older Adults

13. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support economic development policies that address the needs of people of all ages.

13.1 Planners should promote age-friendly businesses that facilitate access, employment and use by older adults.

13.2 Planners should promote workforce development programs and volunteer opportunities for and by older adults.

14. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support the development of policies and programs that recognizes the importance of informal caregivers (and often family members who are unpaid) as integral supports for the aging population.

14.1 Planners should change planning and zoning codes to allow child and elder care in residential settings and to allow older adults and caregivers to reside together.

14.2 Public and private sector employers should support informal caregiving by offering through strategies such as flexible work hours, referral to caregiver resources in the community, on-site support groups for working caregivers, and discounted backup home care for emergency needs.

15. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions believe that local, state and federal policy should not discriminate by gender, immigration status, employment status or family definition.

15.1 Planners should remove discriminatory definitions of family from zoning codes

15.2 Planners should design policies that encourage economic access for all ages.

COMMUNITY ASSETS AND SUPPORTS

Strengthen the Community Assets of and Supports for Older Adults

16. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support an “age in everything” approach to planning, where older adults are considered in all program and facility planning along with green building practices to ensure healthy environments. This is especially critical in suburban and rural areas, where there may not be the population to support “older adult only” services, but where modification of existing assets makes them useful to older adults. New models such as the Village to Village Network and World Health Organization/AARP Age-friendly Cities/Communities are valuable approaches for active aging in community.

17. Planners should recognize that interdependencies between generations are beneficial to communities.

17.1 The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions support planning policies and zoning regulations that foster mixed-use development as opportunities to co-locate services and programs in intergenerational settings such as schools and community parks and offer a continuum of affordable housing and service options for healthier, independent living.

18. The American Planning Association and its Chapters and Divisions believe that planners—who help shape the physical design of a neighborhood and community—are key leaders who can help ensure that older adults remain active and engaged in their community and that support services are easy to access so that frail older adults may continue to reside in the community and improve their health and quality of life.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

1. Finkelstein, R., A. Garcia, J. Netherland, and J. Walker. 2008. Toward an Age-Friendly New York City: A Findings Report. New York: The New York Academy of Medicine. Available at <http://www.nyam.org/news/docs/AgeFriendly.pdf>.
2. Keyes, Laura, Deborah R. Phillips, Evelina Sterling, Tyrone Manegdeg, Maureen Kelly, Grace Trimble, and Cheryl Mayerik. 2013. "Transforming the Way We Live Together: A Model to Move Communities from Policy to Implementation." *Journal of Aging & Social Policy* 96(7): 1164–1170.
3. Sykes, Kathy and Kristen Robinson. 2014. "Making the Right Moves: Promoting Smart Growth and Active Aging in Communities." *Journal on Aging and Social Policy* 26: 166-180.
4. Sykes, Kathy. 2013. *Sustainable, Visitable, and Universal by Design*. Washington, D.C.: American Architectural Foundation. Available at <http://www.archfoundation.org/2013/06/sustainable-visitible- and-universal-by-design/>.
5. U.S. Department of Environmental Protection. 2009. *Growing Smarter, Living Healthier: A Guide to Smart Growth and Active Aging*. Report EPA 100-K-09012.
6. Warner, M.E. and J. Rukus. 2013. "Planners' Role in Creating Family Friendly Communities: Action, Participation and Resistance." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 35(5): 627-644.
7. World Health Organization. 2007. *Global Age-friendly Cities: A Guide*. Available at http://www.who.int/kobe_centre/publications/age_friendly_cities_guide/en/index.html.

HOUSING

8. Administration on Aging. 2013. *A Profile of Older Americans: 2013*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
9. American Planning Association. 2011. "Multigenerational Planning: Using Smart Growth and Universal Design to Link the Needs of Children and the Aging Population" <http://www.planning.org/research/family/briefingpapers/pdf/multigenerational.pdf>.
10. Chapman, N.J., and Howe, D.A. 2001. "Accessory apartments: Are they a realistic alternative for aging in place?" *Housing Studies*, 16(5): 637-650.

11. Cisneros, Henry, Margaret Dyer-Chamberlain, and Jane Hickie. 2012. *Independent for Life: Homes and Neighborhoods for an Aging America*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
12. Engelhardt, Gary V., Michael D. Eriksen, and Nadia Greenhalgh-Stanley. 2013. *A Profile of Housing and Health among Older Americans*. Washington, D.C.: Research Institute for Housing America.
13. Farber, Nicholas, Douglas Shinkle, Jana Lynott, Wendy Fox-Grage, and Rodney Harrell. 2011. "Aging in Place: A State Survey of Livability Policies and Practices." Washington, D.C.: AARP Public Policy Institute. Available at <http://www.aarp.org/home-garden/livable-communities/info-11-2011/Aging-In-Place.html>.
14. Gray, Regina C., Rodney Harrell, and Kathy Sykes. 2010. "The Built Environment; Planning Healthy Communities for All Ages: Community Design, Neighborhood Change, and Impact on Older Adults." *The Public Policy and Aging Report* 20(3): 22-26.
15. Harrell, Rodney, Allison Brooks, and Todd Nedwick. 2009. *Preserving Affordability and Access in Livable Communities: Subsidized Housing Opportunities Near Transit and the 50+ Population*. Washington, D.C.: AARP Public Policy Institute. Available at <http://www.aarp.org/home-garden/housing/info-09-2009/2009-15.html>.
16. Howe, D.A. 1990. "The flexible house: Designing for changing needs." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 56 (1): 69-79.
17. Krassioukova-Enns, Olga and Laurie Ringaert. 2007. "Understanding the Status of Visitability in Canada." CR File No.: 6585-K087 Final Report submitted to Jim Zamprelli, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Available at <http://disabilitystudies.ca/licproject/files/2011/07/2007-Visitability-Final-Report.pdf>.
18. Lawton, M.P. and L. Nahemow. 1973. "Ecology and the aging process" in *The Psychology of Adult Development and Aging*, ed. C. Eisdorfer & M.P. Lawton. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
19. Myers, Dowell and SungHo Ryu. 2008. "Aging Baby Boomers and the Generational Housing Bubble: Foresight and Mitigation of an Epic Transition," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 74 (1): 17- 33.
20. NeighborWorks. 2011. "Aging in Place." Available at <http://www.nw.org/Network/comstrat/agingInPlace>.
21. Salomon, Emily. 2010. "Expanding Implementation of Universal Design and Visitability Features in the Housing Stock." Fact Sheet 167. Washington, D.C.: AARP Public Policy Institute. Available at <http://www.aarp.org/content/dam/aarp/livable-communities/act/housing/expanding-implementation-of-universal-design-and-visitability-features-in-the-housing-stock-aarp.pdf>
22. Tenenbaum, Louis. 2010. *The MetLife Report on Aging in Place 2.0: Rethinking Solutions to the Home Care Challenge*. New York: MetLife Mature Market Institute. Available at:

<https://www.metlife.com/assets/cao/mmi/publications/studies/2010/mmi-aging-place-study.pdf>.

23. The Jewish Federations of North America, Inc. 2014. "Naturally Occurring Retirement Communities (NORC) Aging in Place Initiative." Available at <http://www.norcs.org>.
24. Village to Village Network. 2014. "Village to Village Network." Available at <http://www.vtvnetwork.org>.

TRANSPORTATION

25. Lynott, Jana and Carlos Figueiredo. 2011. How the Travel Patterns of Older Adults are Changing: Highlights from the 2009 National Household Travel Survey. Fact Sheet 218. Available at <http://www.aarp.org/home-garden/transportation/info-04-2011/fs218-transportation.html>
26. Lynott, Jana, Amanda Taylor, Hannah Twaddell, Jessica Haase, Kristin Nelson, Barbara McCann, and Edward R. Stolof. 2009. Planning for Complete Streets for an Aging America. Report 2009-02. Washington DC: AARP Public Policy Institute. Available at <http://www.aarp.org/home-garden/livable-communities/info-08-2009/Planning-Complete-Streets-for-an-Aging-America.html>.
27. Lynott, Jana, Wendy Fox-Grage, and Shannon Guzman. 2013. Weaving It Together: A Tapestry of Transportation Funding for Older Adults. Washington, D.C.: AARP Public Policy Institute. Available at <http://www.aarp.org/research/ppi/liv-com2/policy/transportation/articles/weaving-it-together-transportation-funding-for-older-adults-AARP-ppi-liv-com/>.

LAND-USE

28. Howe, D.A., Chapman, N.J. and Baggett, S.A. 1994. Planning For an Aging Society. Planning Advisory Service Report no. 451. Chicago: American Planning Association.
29. Howe, D.A. 2013. "Planning for aging involves planning for life" in Policy, Planning, and People: Promoting Justice in Urban Development, ed. Naomi Carmon and Susan S. Fainstein. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
30. Howe, D.A. 2012. "Aging as the foundation for livable communities." Pp. 81-98 in Community Livability: Issues and Approaches to Sustaining the Well-Being of People and Communities, ed. F. Wagner and R. Caves. New York: Routledge.

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

31. Edwards, Ryan D. 2010. "Forecasting Government Revenue and Expenditure in the U.S. Using Data on Age-Specific Utilization." Working Paper WP10-01. Honolulu: National Transfer Accounts Project.
32. Isaacs, Julia. 2009. How Much Do We Spend on Children and the Elderly? Economic Studies Report. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institute. Available at http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/reports/2009/11/05%20spending%20children%20isaacs/1_how_much_isaacs.pdf.
33. Lynott, Jana. 2012. "Active Living for All Ages: Creating Neighborhoods around Transit." Washington, D.C.: AARP Public Policy Institute. Video. Available at <http://www.aarp.org/research/ppi/liv->

[com2/policy/transportation/articles/active-living-for-all-ages-neighborhoods-around-transit-video-AARP-ppi-liv-com/](http://www.ppi-liv.com/2012/02/policy/transportation/articles/active-living-for-all-ages-neighborhoods-around-transit-video-AARP-ppi-liv-com/)

34. Myers, Dowell. 2007. *Immigrants and Boomers: Forging a New Social Contract for the Future of America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
35. Redfoot, Donald, Lynn Feinberg, and Ari Houser. 2013. "The Aging of the Baby Boom and the Growing Care Gap: A Look at Future Declines in the Availability of Family Caregivers." *Insight on the Issues Report 85*. Washington, D.C.: AARP Public Policy Institute.
36. Warner, Mildred E. and Rebecca Baran-Rees. 2012. "The Economic Importance of Families with Children." Issue Brief. Ithaca: Cornell University. Available at <http://cms.mildredwarner.org/p/129>.

COMMUNITY ASSETS AND SUPPORTS

37. Hodgson, Kimberley. 2011. "Multigenerational Planning: Using Smart Growth and Universal Design to Link the Needs of Children and the Aging Population." *Family-Friendly Communities Briefing Papers 02*. Washington, D.C.: American Planning Association. Available at <https://www.planning.org/research/family/briefingpapers/pdf/multigenerational.pdf>.
38. Israel, Evelyn and Mildred Warner. 2008. "Planning for Family Friendly Communities." PAS Memo. Washington, DC: American Planning Association. Available at <http://www.planning.org/pas/memo/open/nov2008/index.htm>.
39. Morken, Lydia and Mildred Warner. 2012. "Planning for the Aging Population: Rural Responses to the Challenge." Issue Brief. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Area Agencies on Aging, and Ithaca: Cornell University. Available at <http://cms.mildredwarner.org/p/146>.
40. Morken, Lydia and Rebecca Baran-Rees. 2012. "Joint Use: School-Community Collaboration." Issue Brief. Ithaca: Cornell University. Available at <http://cms.mildredwarner.org/p/147>.
41. National Association of Area Agencies on Aging. 2011. *The Maturing of America: Communities Moving Forward for an Aging Population*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Area Agencies on Aging. Available at www.n4a.org/files/MOA_FINAL_Rpt.pdf.
42. Vincent, Jeffrey, Mary Filardo, Marni Allen and Jason Franklin. 2010. *Joint Use of Public Schools: A Framework for a New Social Contract*. Washington, D.C.: 21st Century School Fund and Center for Cities and Schools.
43. Warner, Mildred, and Lydia Morken. 2013. "Building Child and Age-friendly Communities in Tight Fiscal Times." Pp. 47-56 in *The Municipal Year Book 2013*. Washington, D.C.: International City County Management Association.
44. World Health Organization. 2012. "WHO Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities." Map. Available at <http://www.agefriendlyworld.org/cities-and-communities>.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER POLICY GUIDES OF THE AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION

This Policy Guide is related to other Policy Guides adopted by the American Planning Association in recent years, including:

- Smart Growth Policy Guide (adopted 2012)
- Surface Transportation Policy Guide (adopted in 2010)
- Housing Policy Guide (adopted in 2006)
- Other policy guides addressing food systems planning, security, neighborhood collaboration, sustainability and public redevelopment all indirectly address the needs of the elderly. Please refer directly to these closely allied policy guides for additional policy reference on those topics: <http://planning.org/policy/guides/>.

AGING IN COMMUNITY POLICY GUIDE TASK FORCE AUTHORS

Jill Bahm, AICP

Mitzi Barker, FAICP

Dorian Block

Ruth Finkelstein

Ben Frost, AICP

Esther Greenhouse

Michael Horsting, AICP

Deborah Howe, FAICP

Laura Keyes, AICP

Jana Lynott, AICP

Ramona Mullahey

Margaret Neal

Jennifer Raitt

Kathy Sykes

Mildred E. Warner

Bradley Winick, AICP

TECHNICAL REVIEWERS

Alan DeLaTorre

Rodney Harrell

Enid Kassner