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Cities: Dallas-Fort Worth; Milken Forbes List of cities for successful aging; Standard Engagement, standard results (Keyes and Benavides, 2017)

- Survey of mayors and city managers
- \( n=160 \)
Factors Influencing City Policy Action on Age Friendly

- Study of cities in DFW compared to cities on the Milken Forbes Cities for Successful Aging (n=120) (Keyes and Benavides, 2017)
  - City managers and mayors
  - Needs expressed by older citizens and training on aging needs more likely to lead to adoption of policies
  - Cities were more likely to adopt policies than to actually allocate resources
City Forms of Responsiveness

- Attends Training on Specific Needs (Housing, Trans, Health, Recreation)
- Community Assessment of Older Adult Needs
- Use of Older Adult Input in Comprehensive Plan
- Use of Non-Local Resources to Support Services and Programs for Older Adults

Multiple platforms to integrate aging issues
Extent municipality solicits input from older persons on the following topics:

- Recreation
- Health
- City Services
- Meals/food and nutrition
- Housing
- Transportation

Power through zoning but typically a facilitator of housing development.
Factors driving policy action:
• Training
• Public advocacy
• Being a Milken Forbe City

Policy Adoption vs. Resource Allocation

Factors driving resource allocation:
• Needs assessment
• Public Advocacy
• Policy Champion
Cities: National Sample of Cities; Solicitation on relevant topics leads to increased financial investment (Keyes Dissertation, 2017)

Survey of mayors and city managers (n=317)
Identifying the operating space for local governments in age friendly

Concept of Age Friendly

Age Friendly Policies:
- Mobility
- Housing
- Built Environment
- Recreation and services
- Access to information
- Participation
- Security
- Value
- Leadership (Lui et al. 2009, Caro and Fitzgerald 2013)

Local Government

Mobility:
- Pedestrian, driver safety, infrastructure
  - Transportation Plan (Winick & Jaffe, 2015)

Housing:
- Options across type and price, subsidized
  - Housing Plan (Pynoos et al., 2008)

Built Environment:
- Planning and zoning, land use, open space
  - Comprehensive plan (Sykes & Robinson, 2014)

Services:
- Recreation, parks, library, multigenerational planning, health services
  - Service delivery plan (Glickman et al.; 2014; Keyes et al., 2013).
Factors Influencing City Policy Action on Age Friendly

National survey of cities (n=317) (Keyes Dissertation, 2017)
  • Cultural awareness of aging needs in city management principles
  • Engaged older adults in planning
  • Having a senior center
  • Having a public policy champion (Lehning, 2012)
Factors that Influence Age Friendly Adoptions

**Age friendly policy action** is greater in communities with a commitment to older adults reflected in their management principles and where advocacy for aging services is high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Predictors of Policy Action</th>
<th>Total Increase in Policy Actions (Housing, Transportation, Services, Built Environment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness in city management principles</td>
<td>2.267 more policy actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Senior Volunteer Program</td>
<td>.72 more policy actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of individuals 65 and over</td>
<td>1.651 more policy actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a Public Policy Champion</td>
<td>1.471 more policy actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents living with Grandchildren (proxy for multigenerational)</td>
<td>.169 more policy actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a senior center in community</td>
<td>2.601 more policy actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why some cities do more than others

 Ordinal Regression Policy Adoption (Low: 0-8), (Medium:9-15), (High (Frontier City): (16-25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Predictors of Policy Action</th>
<th>(Low: 0-8)</th>
<th>(Medium:9-15)</th>
<th>(High 16-25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness in city management principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.426 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Senior Volunteer Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.001 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of individuals 65 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a Public Policy Champion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.444 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a senior center in community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.325 times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We know some cities are making strides to become “age friendly”
Age Friendly Action Typology

Probability of Falling into Low or High Policy Action Relative to the Variation of Responsiveness and Mobilized Citizen Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureaucratic Responsiveness Low</th>
<th>Bureaucratic Responsiveness High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Policy Action Low</td>
<td>Level of Policy Action High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Policy Action High</td>
<td>Level of Policy Action Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobilized Citizen Need High</th>
<th>95%</th>
<th>6%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobilized Citizen Need Low</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship between government and citizen leads to higher levels of policy action
Identification of Relationships

Government Responsiveness – Policy Adoption

- Low Mobilized
  - (Stakeholder Led) Low Adoption
  - (Latent Adoption) No Adoption

- High Mobilized
  - (Mutually Led) Comprehensive Adoption
  - (Government Led) Ancillary Adoption

Advocacy for Aging Issues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Types</th>
<th>Common Policies Across all Cities</th>
<th>Policies of High Level Adopters &gt; 16 actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>• Pedestrian crossings</td>
<td>• Public Transit with Priority Seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Highly Visible Traffic Signage</td>
<td>• Specialized transportation services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Volunteer Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessible Taxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>• Rental Housing</td>
<td>• Variety of housing and price points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Subsidized</td>
<td>• Intergenerational housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Segregated 55+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Environment</td>
<td>• More mixed use</td>
<td>• Permitted housing near transit stops and shopping districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Required sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessible parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>• Joint programming with Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>• Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meals and Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lifelong learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All cities seem to take on policies typical of city operations; frontier (high) cities do more.

List does not include all actions, only those with significant differences between low and high levels of adopters.
Top Lessons Learned for Scaling Up Action By Cities

• Cities are adopting policies but necessarily associating with age friendly
• Responsiveness is a city management value found in:
  • Needs Assessment
  • Strategic Goals
  • Citizen Engagement
  • Budgetary Principles
• Citizen need matters and advocacy influences leads to action
  • Shared space for decision making with the government
• Public policy champion on age friendly is important but not the only driver
• Cities with higher levels of action are going beyond daily operations of government

Outcomes of policy action - choice for older adults:
  • Aging where desired through transportation, housing, and services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Friendly Policy Areas</th>
<th>Planning and Development</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Economic Development</th>
<th>Zoning and Inspections</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Public Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentives to encourage mixed-use neighborhoods</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to infrastructure to improve walkability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older driver safety programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure changes to improve older driver safety</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative forms of transportation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer incentives to guarantee housing units for older adults</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for builders to make housing accessible</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not relegated to a single agency or department → comprehensive response

Benavides and Keyes, 2015
Cross-sector Collaboration through Educational Interventions

(Firestone, Keyes, and Greenhouse, 2017)
Why collaboration matters?

- Resolution to complex social problems requires cross collaborative engagement among stakeholders, government, and residents
  - Trust, reputation and reciprocity are critical factors in reducing risk and uncertainty in group decision making (Ostrom, 1989)
- Ensuring communities have appropriate infrastructure to support individuals across the lifespan requires leadership and collaboration across sectors
- Essential Actors:
  - Planners – facilitate the community design and development
  - Aging professionals – provide services to help older adults live independently
1. A relationship with a planner is within reach...

- Both sectors already conducting LCA planning efforts in their communities -61% (moderate to very great extent)

- Planning field recognized by over 14% of summit participants as primary leaders for LCA work in their community:
  - AAA – 11.4%
  - AARP State office – 11.4%
  - **City** – 7.9%
  - Regional planning – 6.4%

- Opportunity for partnership building
  - **Aging sector** as primary field: over 11% also indicated an area of planning as a primary focus of work
  - **Planning sector** as primary field: over 4% indicated aging policy as a primary focus of work
2. Find points of commonality.

For **aging professionals** the following LCA characteristics were significant and positively correlated and central to their work:

- Built environment and community design
- Programs and services
- Access to information
- Volunteerism
- Leadership
- **Access to health**

For **planning professionals** the following LCA characteristics were significant and positively correlated and central to their work:

- Public safety
- **Access to health**

- Both professions are working on LCA but from different starting points
- **Access to Health** as vehicle for working together (for ASA conference participants)
- Communities should survey the interests of the professions in their community to find the points of leverage

71% of participants indicated that financial constraints were the greatest barrier to initiating LCA work.
3. Importance of Previous Relationships...

- Over 24% are working with their Area Agency on Aging on LCA efforts
- Most common responses on why they primarily partner with other organizations on LCA efforts:
  - Leverage resources - 17%
  - Primary leader on issues 26%
  - Direct contact with citizens at 11%
4. Milestones and tools for collaboration are staples for both professions...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Summit Milestone data –</th>
<th>Post Summit Milestone data (accomplished since event)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hosted visioning with residents – 51%</td>
<td>• Hosted visioning with residents – 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developed steering committee – 52%</td>
<td>• Developed steering committee – 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adopted an actual policy - 29%</td>
<td>• Adopted an actual policy - 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Audited programs and services – 30%</td>
<td>• Audited programs and services – 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allocated resources – 39%</td>
<td>• Allocated resources – 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performed a walkability assessment – 42%</td>
<td>• Performed a walkability assessment – 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Signed an LCA agreement - 40%</td>
<td>• Signed an LCA agreement - 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internally your organization is planning LCA outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Events – 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Initiated a relationship with a municipal Planner – 60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
...which can be aided by leveraging existing tools

• Two most helpful pieces are understanding the community and its needs:
  • Performing a needs assessment – 78%
  • Knowing community demographics – 60%

*These methods are already commonly used by both professions*
Catalysts for engaging planners

Catalysts for motivating planners to participate in an age friendly planning initiative include:

• An opportunity to leverage a project or program already underway
• A policy window, or
• New funding opportunity

Catalysts for engaging planners to participate in your community's LCA efforts

• Hosting participatory meetings with planners and community residents on LCA
• Participating in a locally derived age friendly community initiative
• Providing written information on changing demographics and aging issues
Resources and Additional Information
Universal Principles

• Community’s current efforts with livable communities at varying levels of scale.
• Leveraging opportunities and partnerships.
• Assessing traditional and nontraditional transportation opportunities and barriers.
• Mobilizing community leadership.
• Involving and empowering older adults.
• Incentivizing nontraditional approaches or programs.
• Framing the problem to the community.
• Identifying opportunities and barriers for goal alignment among partners.
• Identifying policy constraints or barriers to innovation.
Opportunities to increase access to food

• Successes/Opportunities:
  • Coordinate SNAP benefits with farmer’s markets
  • Convert SNAP to electronic debit to reduce stigma
  • Identify new partners:
    • Offer congregate meal services at a restaurant rather than a senior center
    • Set up farm stands in rural areas
    • Leverage tech companies – use new apps to help older adults get food (i.e. food delivery)
    • Initiate schools and community garden initiatives

• Challenges:
  • Hard to find nutritious and inexpensive food
  • Concerns from immigrants relative to food needs
    • Access to culturally relevant food important to community
  • Hunger hides
  • Chronically poor older adults move into poverty
  • Lack of knowledge among low income retirees
  • Lack of access to email or internet, limited translation
  • Security issues with home delivery
  • Not every community wants a community garden
  • Difficult to be low to moderate income and afford organic food
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successes/Opportunities:</th>
<th>Challenges:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Audit and bridge assets and partners (coordinated care, health plan, and community plan).</td>
<td>- Lack of knowledge of what is accessible in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Classify areas of unequal access (service gaps, limited transportation access).</td>
<td>- Limited transportation services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop messaging that creates clarity in roles and opportunities for participation.</td>
<td>- Assessing older adults and providing options at discharge before older adults go back into the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Older adults in very rural areas become less accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Transporting between municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Filling the gaps with volunteers (growing smaller as an option)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safe and Accessible Housing

• Successes/Opportunities:
  • Frame the sufficiency problem to community (across size, option, and price point).
  • Identify the specific policy constraints for the community (zoning barriers).
  • Address issues of class status and locational barriers.
  • Facilitate nontraditional solutions and products (accessory dwelling units, home share, tiny homes).

• Challenges:
  • Not enough housing
  • Challenges working with HUD
  • Realtors not engaged in this issue
  • Increase in number of homeless older adults
  • Lack of affordable options and price points
  • Retirement living is not for low income
  • Staying in homes likely means they are no longer accessible, rising risk of falling
Social Interaction

**Successes/Opportunities:**
- Consider multiple generations in planning and programming.
- Examine current assumptions of aging and the level of community diversity.
- Assess current community options to support psychological and physical fitness and wellness.
- Identify platforms to build and create social capital.

**Challenges:**
- Opportunities for interaction are typically youth focused.
- New generation of older adults not interested in senior centers.
- Poorly designed communities exacerbate isolation.
- Lack of integration of planning – aging and land use and community development planning.
- Language barriers.
- Lack of transportation options.
Opportunities for Continued Learning

• Identify opportunities to establish congruency between the Livable Communities for All Ages (LCA) paradigm and the paradigms of partner sectors/organizations.

• Identify which organizations are already working in this space and what is necessary to help them lead and inform.

• Identify issues related to a lack of attention to diversity across all four policy areas in the current LCA platform.

• Examine across all four issues what values matter in the issue discussion and whose values are being represented.

• Examine specific challenges around traditional and nontraditional transportation options across all four issues.
APA Resources:


Food Access Resources

• APA Policy Guide on Community and Regional Food Planning - https://planning.org/policy/guides/adopted/food.htm
• http://www.countyhealthrankings.org/policies/new-grocery-stores-underserved-areas
• Designed for Disease http://www.policylink.org/sites/default/files/DESIGNEDFORDISEASE_FINAL.PDF
• A Place for Healthier Living http://www.policylink.org/sites/default/files/PLACEFORHEALTHIERLIVING_FINAL.PDF
Housing Resources

Visitability: Concrete Change  [https://visitability.org/](https://visitability.org/)

Universal Design: IDEA Center  [http://idea.ap.buffalo.edu/](http://idea.ap.buffalo.edu/)

   Existing City Laws (2014)  [http://idea.ap.buffalo.edu//visitability/reports/existingcitylaws.htm](http://idea.ap.buffalo.edu//visitability/reports/existingcitylaws.htm)


Five Points Non-Gentrification


   APA NPC Session recording:  [https://www.planning.org/events/course/9126505/](https://www.planning.org/events/course/9126505/)