

AARP Solutions Forum

Practical Solutions for Aging in Place: State Policies and Practices That Work

Welcome:

**Enid Kassner,
Director, Livable Communities,
AARP Public Policy Institute**

Speakers:

**Jana Lynott,
Senior Strategic Policy Advisor,
AARP Public Policy Institute**

**Doug Shinkle,
Policy Specialist, Environment, Energy and Transformation,
National Conference of State Legislators**

Moderator:

**Rodney Harrell, PhD
Senior Strategic Policy Advisor,
AARP Public Policy Institute**

Panelists:

**Scott Dibble (DFL),
Minnesota State Senate**

**Bradley Last (R),
Utah House of Representatives**

**Kathryn Lawler,
External Affairs Manager,
Atlanta Regional Commission**

**Don Chartock,
Rural and Coordinated Transportation Administrator,
Washington State Department of Transportation**

Location: Washington, D.C.

Date: Thursday, December 8, 2011

*Transcript By
Federal News Service
Washington, D.C.*

ENID KASSNER: There's plenty of room in the front row on this side, if anyone is looking for a chair – always room up front.

So good afternoon. I'm delighted to welcome you to this afternoon's Solutions Forum, including those of you who are here in the Brickfield Center as well as those of you who are participating from our state offices by video or who have joined by webcast. And I do need to mention to the state offices, we have some technical difficulties with the video aspect of the webcast. And so if you can hear us but can't see us, please either bear with us, or you could go to the weblink that is on the announcement for the event, and you could watch on your computer. So I do apologize to our state offices for that technical glitch.

My name is Enid Kassner. I'm the director of independent living and long-term services and supports for the AARP Public Policy Institute. The Public Policy Institute is the focal point of public policy research, analysis and policy development at AARP. We're led by AARP Senior Vice President Susan Reinhard, who sends her greetings and regrets that she's unable to be here for this afternoon's Solutions Forum.

The mission of the Public Policy Institute is to conduct research and analysis designed to inform the development of policies that have a significant impact on improving economic security, health care and quality of life for all as we age. An important and exciting part of this process is to convene leading policy experts for discussion of key national and state policy issues. Today's Solutions Forum is part of this effort. And we're especially pleased to have had the opportunity to partner with the National Conference of State Legislators both in the development of the paper that's being released today and in the planning and execution of this afternoon's session.

Building livable communities so that people of all abilities can age in their homes and communities and retain vital social connections is a high priority for AARP. And today marks AARP's second Solutions Forum on livable communities issues.

Today's session will begin with a presentation highlighting the paper on "Aging in Place," which you should have received in your packet this afternoon. This will be followed by a moderated discussion designed to showcase some innovative and promising practices that are enhancing the lives of older people in selected communities and that could potentially be replicated in other states.

I'm looking forward to learning from today's speakers, and so next I'll be turning the podium over to Jana Lynott. Jana is the senior strategic policy adviser for transportation and livable communities in our Public Policy Institute. She manages AARP's transportation research agenda and is responsible for developing the content of the Livable Communities chapter of the *AARP Policy Book*, along with her colleague Rodney Harrell, and our *Policy Book* is adopted by the National Policy Council and ultimately the AARP Board of Directors.

Her research covers a broad array of planning and policy issues, including street design for all users, the travel patterns of older adults, transit service needs and older driver safety. As a land-use and transportation planner, she brings practical experience to the research field.

JANA LYNOTT: Well, thank you, Enid.

And welcome, everyone.

Before I begin my remarks, I just want to mention to the folks on the phone and on webcast that we are moving into a couple of PowerPoint presentations now. So if you have not already done so, you may want to pull down these PowerPoint presentations from our website, aarp.org/ppi for the Public Policy Institute, and on the landing page, there should be a link to the Solutions Forum where you can access the documents for today's forum.

Now, most people know AARP more from our work on health and financial security. We also work in the area of livable communities. It's one of our third pillars and priority areas for the organization. So in the very brief time I have this afternoon, I want to help paint a picture of some of the work that we're doing at AARP in the area of livable communities, not only the work from the Public Policy Institute, but broader across the organization down into our state offices as well as the efforts of our volunteers.

But to begin, from the Public Policy Institute, we are primarily working in four areas to support the organization on livable communities. The first of these that Enid mentioned is policy development, working with our National Policy Council on the development of policies related to livable communities. And four years ago when Rodney Harrell and I joined the Public Policy Institute, we took our transportation and housing policy and collapsed that policy into a single chapter on livable communities and then added some additional new policy related to land use, sustainability, community revitalization, et cetera.

Now, also under Enid's leadership, she mentioned we manage our research agenda. And just like we've tried to really do more cross-cutting work through our policy area, we're also trying to do more cross-cutting work related to research. And the publication "Aging in Place" is a good example of this type of research because it covers the subjects of land use, housing and transportation, and it really tries to show the connections between those three policy areas.

In addition to "Aging in Place," we have released several other major reports this year on various aspects of housing and transportation. And I won't go into detail as to what all of these reports are, but you can find them on the back wall back there if you'd like to pick up a copy. They're also all available on our website, aarp.org/ppi.

The publication "Aging in Place: A State Survey of Livability Policies and Practices" follows on the heels of previous PPI publications that cover a range of livable community subject areas. In particular, these three publications released in 2005, 2008 and 2009 are really the precursors to this document. But "Aging in Place" is not just a rehash of old material; it really has a new audience. In the past we've targeted Congress and recommendations for federal-level

policy or targeting local communities. This publication specifically looks to understand what the state role in supporting livable communities is and could be. And so we're really trying to understand how state legislatures as well as agencies can support many of the wonderful efforts there are that are bubbling up at the local level to support aging in place.

Now, why is the lens of aging important? Well, we all know that our nation is aging. But I think many of us have not fully internalized just how profound this demographic change is and what the impact will be on our communities. The 85-and-older cohort is the fastest-growing population in the United States today. And these individuals are followed by 78 million baby boomers. For the next 18 years boomers will be turning 65 at a rate of 8,000-to-10,000 a day. That's a lot of birthday candles and a lot of birthday cakes. And we need to make sure our communities are ready for this change.

Also, most older adults, nearly 90 percent, tell us in survey after survey that they want to age in their homes and communities where they raised their children, where they retired. It's where they have their social networks, their support networks, and it's very important to maintain these.

Looking out into the future, we have a number of projects under development. We hope to release a short streets film in January that documents many of the benefits of transit-oriented development for older adults. We're also working with the University of Vermont in the development of a livability index that is going to be based on several features that are determined to be essential for aging in place. And of course, we'll have our release of our standard-format publications – research reports, in-briefs, et cetera.

Now, as much as I love the work that we're doing here in the Public Policy Institute, I have to admit that some of the most exciting work that AARP does in livable communities happens at the state level. My colleagues in Government Affairs, in our state offices, work to translate our policy into tangible legislation and programs that directly improve the lives of older adults in their communities. So for instance, following our very popular "Planning Complete Streets for an Aging America" publication, several of our state offices convened coalitions to promote successful passage of complete streets legislation in their states, a few of these being Puerto Rico, New York, Vermont, Hawaii, Minnesota.

Also, last year I introduced our Education and Outreach office to Dan Burden of the Walkable and Livable Communities Institute. And they are now teamed up with several of our state offices and have conducted active living workshops in 22 communities in 14 states across the United States, communities as diverse as Mound Bayou, Mississippi, and Wichita, Kansas, really getting down to that very local level to try to look at how we can improve communities for active living and aging.

Our Nebraska state office convened efforts in the state to improve human services transportation after one of their volunteers could not get to a social event with his wife, who uses a wheelchair. They needed transportation for someone in a wheelchair, they needed it in the evening hours, and they needed it for a social purpose. There were a potential of three transportation providers in the community, but none of them could meet all three of those

criteria. So it's these types of human stories that really bubble up and are the impetus for much of the work that we're doing in this area.

And I should mention that it's not always just a lack of financial resources to create the services needed for older adults. Oftentimes, and especially in the case of human services transportation, there's a real need for better coordination and better, more efficient use of the services that are out there today.

On the housing side, my colleagues in the Public Policy Institute and Government Affairs have drawn up model inclusive housing legislation which borrows from both visitability and universal design principles. And Doug will talk more about these in just a moment. Our state office in New York was successful in getting this policy adopted in Westchester County, and we're working to expand its reach to other communities across the United States.

Now, my colleagues in the Virgin Islands took a slightly different approach to increase the supply of accessible housing in their state through incentives rather than more regulatory type of measures. And following four years of advocacy efforts by AARP and other community groups, Governor deJongh signed legislation that provides increased homeowners – interested homeowners with property tax incentives to retrofit their homes.

For many years AARP's Driver Safety Program has teamed up with the American Occupational Therapy Association to offer CarFit workshops. Now, you may not know it, but how well your car fits you has a lot – it can affect how safe you are behind the wheel. We're now expanding CarFit to Home Fit and offering – piloting Home Fit workshops designed to walk people through the various options and updates they can make to their homes so that they can safely age in place for as long as possible.

Now, it's absolutely impossible for me to cover all of the excellent work that my colleagues in our state offices are doing along with their many volunteers. The fact that 23 of our state offices have joined the Solution Forum through our videoconference today really speaks to the interest and dedication of AARP to the topic and the subject of livable communities.

This work at the state level is complemented by our work at the federal advocacy level to strengthen federal support for housing programs for older adults, sustainable communities, human services transportation and road safety. We appreciate the many partnerships we've established with many of the organizations represented here today and that are working to advance these shared objectives.

So with that, I'd like to turn the podium over to the National Conference of State Legislators' Doug Shinkle who will be providing an overview of the findings of the research. Doug is a policy specialist in the environment, energy and transportation program at the National Conference of States Legislators in Denver, Colorado. He is one of our primary authors of this report, and he has worked for NCSL for about six years on transportation, conservation, land use and healthy communities topics. Prior to joining NCSL, Mr. Shinkle worked for elected officials in California and Colorado in a number of capacities. He's a native of Colorado and a graduate

of Colorado State University. He's an outdoorsman –as I've heard many from Colorado are – river rafter and a traveler. He just returned from vacationing in Europe, so those of you attending our reception after this should be sure to ask him about street design in Europe.

I'd also want to recognize Doug's colleague Nick Farber, who until very recently was with NCSL. And I believe Nick may be listening into the webcast. So Nick, I want to thank you for all of your contributions to this report.

So with that, let me turn it over to Doug.

DOUG SHINKLE: Hello, everyone. I am Douglas Shinkle, as Jana so nicely laid out. I'm a policy specialist with the National Conference of State Legislators. For those of you who are not familiar with what NCSL is, we are a bipartisan organization that serves the legislators and staff of the nation's 50 states, commonwealths and territories. NCSL provides research, technical assistance and opportunities for policymakers to engage, exchange ideas on the most pressing state issues. NCSL is also a very effective and respected advocate for the interests of state governments before Congress and federal agencies. And the leadership of NCSL is composed of legislators and staff from across the country.

I'm going to share some of the major findings from the report. NCSL partnered with AARP Public Policy Institute to provide kind of a snapshot of state policies that may enable aging in place. And the report identifies state land use, transportation and housing policies and practices that may do so. So let's first take a look at some promising land use policies, including integrating land use and transportation planning, transit-oriented development and encouraging joint use of community facilities.

So mounting academic evidence shows that the physical makeup of communities affects the health of its residence. Mixed-use neighborhoods with safer, denser, walkable streets encourage more physical activity. Well-coordinated land use and transportation planning gives people options for how they access jobs, goods, services and other resources.

In 1990, Washington state passed the Growth Management Act, which requires all cities and counties to ensure that new residential subdivisions make appropriate provisions for public services and facilities. The largest and fastest-growing communities must adopt comprehensive plans that account for growth and several other factors, including transportation, utilities and housing.

In 2005, the act was amended to specifically require that the land use element of a city or county comprehensive plan should consider utilizing urban planning approaches that promote physical activity. And you can see here that the sponsor of the legislation thought that one of the positive side effects of this legislation was that it would perhaps engender increased mobility and physical activity for older Americans.

In 2006, the California legislature passed Assembly Bill 32, which many of you may have heard of, the Global Warming Solutions Act. It requires the state to reduce greenhouse gas

emissions to 1990 levels, which is pretty – a pretty tough – a pretty tough road (ahead ?), but they're giving it a go – to 1990 levels by or before 2020.

To accomplish this goal, the law gave the California Air Resources Board authority to regulate any source of greenhouse gas emissions, including those produced by cars and light trucks. In 2008, the California General Assembly passed Senate Bill 375, which requires the nine or 10 metropolitan planning organizations in the state to create sustainable community strategies. The law also encourages integration of land use and transportation planning by enhancing the regional planning process, requiring state interagency cooperation, and clarifying how local governments and developers can reduce transportation sector greenhouse gas emissions. And you can see here the thoughts from the primary staffer that helped to write that legislation and some of the effects it may have on older Americans' mobility.

Statutes in at least 12 states, including California, Massachusetts, New Jersey and Utah addressed transit-oriented development by defining what transit-oriented development is, providing funding and planning assistance, and encouraging the development of housing and employment centers near transit.

In 2010, Utah passed a law allowing the creation of public/private partnerships between the Utah Transit Authority and land developers to collaborate on transit-oriented development. The transit authority can provide property it owns along transit lines as its contribution to the partnership. UTA, the Utah Transit Authority, will receive a priority return on reinvestment and a share of profits. Utah hopes this will stimulate economic development in housing their transit stops, encourage ridership and keep fares and operating costs down. One of the sponsors of this legislation, Representative Last, is on the panel today, and he will talk more about that shortly.

Public school buildings are among the most prevalent public facilities in the nation. As past AARP President Joe Perkins noted, it makes no sense to lock up costly buildings two-thirds of every day and one quarter of every year. California and Wyoming are among the states that are actually promoting the joint use of an investment in shared facilities that serve multiple ages and needs at schools such as recreational opportunities, health clinics, libraries and civic engagement. These options may be especially important in a small town to save costs and take advantage of limited space.

We'll now take a look at state transportation policies that may increase transportation options. Of Americans over age 65, 21 percent do not drive, which is pretty significant, obviously. Commonly cited reasons include lack of access to a vehicle, declining health and safety concerns. More than 50 percent of nondrivers over age 65 normally do not leave home most days due in part to a lack of transportation options. Those in rural areas or remote suburbs are most likely to be affected by this dynamic, as are older African-Americans, Latinos and Asian-Americans.

One strategy that's been very popular with state legislatures is complete streets. And there's a definition of what exactly complete streets is, up on the screen. Basically it's a policy seeking to ensure that all users are considered when planning and building a transportation system. In the past decade, there's been an enormous amount of interest in these policies.

Twenty-five states plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico now have complete streets policies. Sixteen of those were enacted by state legislature with another eight internal Department of Transportation policies and one coming via an executive order.

One state with a kind of interesting history related to complete streets, and it's detailed in the report, is Vermont. They had an existing law, but they found that it didn't necessarily have the teeth that they were hoping it would, so they strengthened it in 2011, including extending the requirements to municipalities as 80 percent of roads in Vermont are under local jurisdiction. The new law applies to all transportation projects and project phases. However, the law does exempt dirt roads, satisfying concerns from rural stakeholders.

Vermont also clarified its exemption process. Exemptions must be documented and available for public review. Exemptions may be granted for demonstrated lack of need, or excessive cost, cutting down on (blanket ?) exemptions that were occurring. A documented exemption process is becoming a more common element of state complete streets policies, basically to ensure that this policy just doesn't become something that's in (statute ?) or in policy and then isn't really followed.

The new law does require a status report to be submitted to the legislature as well, which will include a list and explanation of projects that were granted exemptions. And AARP has done a number of surveys in a number of states that I've seen personally, and usually public support for these policies tends to be pretty high, especially among older Americans.

Fast traffic, wider streets and short crossing times at intersections are some safety hazards that can challenge older Americans while walking. Those over age 65 are two-thirds more likely than their younger counterparts to be killed while walking. At least 10 states have considered vulnerable user laws within the past five years to better protect pedestrians and bicyclists. These laws typically create enhanced penalties for drivers who are involved in crashes with vulnerable roadway users, such as pedestrians, highway workers and bicyclists.

One good and pretty robust example comes from New Jersey. Since 2006, that state's department of transportation, the attorney general and the motor vehicle commission have worked on engineering, education and enforcement improvements to increase safety for pedestrians. A portion of each fine for failing to yield to a pedestrian is placed into a pedestrian safety enforcement and education fund. This fund helps improve intersections and crossings with traffic-calming measures such as curb ramps and pedestrian countdown signals. Emphasis has been placed on improving highway corridors with a high number of pedestrian fatalities and injuries as well as areas that connect to transit. The fund also pays for Cops in Crosswalks, which is a program that places undercover police officers, basically posing as pedestrians, in the most dangerous intersections to enforce pedestrian laws and that's been pretty successful actually.

Twenty percent of the nation's residents live in rural areas and around 10 million people live in frontier counties. Rural areas are characterized by extremely low population densities, not more than 20 persons per square mile, and long distances to ("service/markets" ?) which are the counties in the green on the map and, you know, a pretty significant chunk of the country. With

limited options and long distances, providing transportation for people who cannot drive is a challenge in these areas.

In 2007, many private inner-city bus operators were pulling out of Washington state, leaving 22 communities without bus service to a major transportation hub or other rural towns. To remedy the problem, the Washington Department of Transportation created a robust intercity bus program that costs the state nothing to operate. To operate this program, at no cost to the state, the state DOT uses the FTA's formula grants, which pays half of program costs and the state can ride – raise the remaining 50 percent through in-kind matches from private operators. Private developers have taken advantage of the real estate around transit hubs to create rural transit or/and development, and one our panelists, Don Chartock, will be talking a little bit more about this phenomenon.

Improving human service transportation coordination can result in more efficient use of limited resources. A recent study conducted by the University of Florida, for example, concluded that Florida receives a payback of 835 percent – eight dollars and 35 – \$8.35 for every dollar spent by the state's transportation and disadvantaged program.

In 2010, the Minnesota legislature enacted legislation to establish the Minnesota Council on Transportation Access. The council must study, evaluate, oversee and make recommendations to improve the coordination, availability, accessibility, efficiency, cost effectiveness and safety of transportation services provided to the transit public before the law sunsets on June 30th, 2014. Senator Scott Dibble, one of our panelists, wants to see the correction or problems brought to his attention by public transportation riders. These problems include some operators that do not serve all areas of the state, riders who are left at county lines – which I can't believe that really happens, but – (laughter) – Senator Dibble can probably speak to that a little bit better – or those who must wait hours or days for a trip.

We'll now take a look at what states have done to provide affordable, accessible housing to aid older Americans aging in place, including affordable housing near transit, building standards, and the phenomenon of natural occurring retirement communities and Communities for a Lifetime.

An average working family spends 57 percent of its income on housing and transportation, and research shows that where a family lives is very important to – in determining how much of their budget must go towards transportation. Families that live in a transit-friendly community pay less of their budget for transportation costs. One strategy states are using is via the federal Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program. Each state must create a qualified allocation plan to utilize low-income housing tax credits to build and preserve housing. At least 40 states' plans now encourage placement of housing near transit and 33 award preference points for projects near transit. And that's a fairly recent phenomenon in the last decade.

People who have limited physical capabilities, including those with disabilities and older Americans, often require housing and public area features that are not commonly included in community planning or building codes. This concept is sometimes referred to as visitability.

Although the Americans with Disabilities Act requires buildings built after 1992 to be readily accessible and usable by those with disabilities, it does not apply to private housing.

Pennsylvania's Residential Visitability Design Tax Credit Act allows a local governing body to authorize, by ordinance or resolution, either a tax credit of up to \$2,500 for any new or redeveloped housing that contains visibility (sic) features or the amount that the property tax would increase for the first five years, whichever is less. Some accessibility features include zero-step entryways, wider doorways and hallways, and entry-level restrooms.

Texas law requires accessibility before any affordable housing can receive state or federal funds. All new affordable housing in the state must have one entrance door that is on an accessible route and is at least 36 inches wide. The first floor must have interior doors and hallways at least 36 inches wide; bathrooms with grab bars; electrical panels, light switches and thermostats at least 48 inches off the floor; and electrical plugs at least 15 inches off the floor.

One of the probably most interesting things from doing research on this report is the whole kind of concept of naturally occurring retirement communities and the level of engagement by state legislatures. Many communities, housing complexes or neighborhoods – some of which I'm sure you can think of in your own town – throughout the nation have a larger than average number of older Americans. These are sometimes called NORCs or naturally occurring retirement communities. Policymakers are considering models that provide services and support to older residents within their homes in such communities. States – statutes in at least six states – Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New York and Pennsylvania – encourage use of NORCs. In 1994, New York created the nation's first statewide NORC program, which has two designations: the national – naturally occurring retirement community supportive service program, which provides services to older people living in a building complex or complexes, and the neighborhood NORC program which provides similar services to older people who live in a residential area consisting of single-family homes and buildings that are not more than six stories high. For fiscal year 2009 and '10, 37 total NORCs were funded for just over \$4 million to the New York State Office for the Aging for some of the activities that you can see in this slide here.

Another model that seeks to provide services and support within existing neighborhoods is the "communities for a lifetime" concept. Florida's program has been in place since 1999. The initiative designates communities as Communities for a Lifetime and provides assistance. Only recognized Communities for a Lifetime are eligible for minigrants and receive increased preference for assistance. In 2010, the Florida Department of Elder Affairs awarded nine minigrants of between \$2,000 and \$12,000 to local agencies and nonprofits to be used as startup seed money and to provide a wide range of services, such as home repair and modification, technology education, a community garden and transportation access. One program in Miami will develop a pilot program with taxi companies to provide low-cost, door-to-door transportation. And in recognition of the work that this program has done, in 2010, the John F.'s – John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, which highlights creative government initiatives, recognized Florida's initiative as a Bright Idea program.

So, in conclusion, state legislatures have been grappling with the grain of American and boomers retiring for a while now, and they're going to have to continue to address it in the future. Without changes to how communities are constructed and services are delivered, older adults may find it increasingly difficult to age in place. And this – in this area of tight budgets, many policies do not require large investments in public funding and may result in greater efficiencies in the resources expended for transportation and other community services.

So I think I have time to take a few questions, if there's anything that someone wants to specifically know. And everything that I talked about here is in the report in much more detail, and if you want to know a lot more detail, then I can easily get a lot more of that because there's a lot of stuff that states have been doing, as you can tell. And I think that's probably the biggest takeaway is that there was more activity in state legislatures that was explicitly looking at this phenomenon and how you could help engender aging in place and so that was kind of – kind of interesting to see.

MS. LYNOTT: So before we start with questions, I'd like to just make an announcement to folks listening in and through the webcast. If you have questions, you can email them to me, Jana Lynott, at JLYNOTT – J-L-Y-N-O-T-T -- @aarp.org. And I will be checking my email now and will try to funnel those questions for the time that we have.

MR. SHINKLE: Any questions?

Q: I was just curious about how state departments of transportation are viewing the Complete Streets policies. Is there push-back or are they actually following through?

MR. SHINKLE: That's a good question. And obviously, it varies by state. And I think Senator Dibble will be able to give you some good insight from Minnesota specifically. There's definitely been hesitancy from some states and some state departments of transportation because it's in some ways a different way of doing things. In some states they've already been doing a lot of these things to begin with, so – there was a lot of concerns about how much cost Complete Streets policies would be, and there still is. But once a lot of times you explain that, it's not necessarily – Complete streets policies aren't overly prescriptive. Sometimes people think of Complete Streets policies as being a bike lane on every single street, and that's not what it means. It just means that you're making sure that if you are – somebody's on a bike, that you have some way to get from point A to point B that's somewhere within the road network.

I think for the most part -- and Jana would probably have some insight on this as well – for the most part the DOTs have – you know, some of them may have been hesitant at first, but most of them are going along with it now, and sometimes it's just a matter of kind of reminding them that that policy is there, because in most of those states I detailed, I'd say probably 20 of those 25 states have occurred in the last decade, so it's a pretty new trend. So it's a matter of just reminding them and kind of changing the culture and mindset of a state agency, which is in Minnesota the easiest thing to do.

But I think that one other thing is the amount of public support for these policies tends to increase their level of success.

Q: Hi. Steve Hage, Strategies for Independent Living. That last picture looked like a cohousing – picture of cohousing. Was that – has that come up? Livable communities and cohousing tends to be by definition what we're talking about as a policy. Is there any – does that resonate in your experience?

MR. SHINKLE: We didn't really look too much into cohousing in our report, partly because we had to just restrict the amount of things or else we would have had a 200-page report, and I don't know how popular that would have been. But that was one of the things that we talked about. Unfortunately, we didn't really go into any detail in the report. But I'd be interested to talk to you about it and what you think about it.

Q: Has there been any research done concerning the cost of retrofitting the auto-dependent environment and making it, in other words, more human-friendly, and in the long term that actually is going to be a cheaper or – you know, research been done, saying that in other words, this is going to be either more expensive or less expensive in the short term, in the long term, you know, as we get back to a more human-friendly, you know, transportation environment?

MR. SHINKLE: There has been – I mean, there's definitely research that's been done about that. That's kind of one of the main arguments for Complete Streets. And there's been a few pretty tragic examples. In Illinois, for example, that a young boy was killed trying to cross a bridge that was not appropriate for a pedestrian to be on, but there was basically a choke point, and if you didn't have a car and you wanted to get from point A to point B, you had to use this bridge.

That's one of the things that – I don't know if I completely can answer your question, but the retrofitting is very expensive, and that's a lot of the times the reasoning behind Complete Streets, is let's not get to the point in the future where we have to retrofit. And also, most of these policies account for when you're resurfacing a road or doing some – doing any kind of work in that area, that that then becomes an opportunity to retrofit it in the process of doing some other things, because I think the idea of just going out kind of wholesale and retrofitting everything is something that would probably be met with some hesitancy from state legislators.

Are we running low on time?

MS. LYNOTT: Yeah, we are.

MR. SHINKLE: OK. All right, thank you very much. And I'm happy to talk with any of you with specific questions afterwards. Thanks a lot. (Applause.)

MS. LYNOTT: And there certainly will be time for folks – you are all invited to the reception immediately after the panel discussion and can hit us all up with your questions as well.

So I apologize, I did receive one question via my email, and I'll try to funnel that through the panel and see if your question can be answered.

But at this point I'd like to welcome our moderator and the panel to come up to the front of the room. And while they're getting situated, I'll introduce Rodney. Dr. Rodney Harrell is our senior strategic policy advisor for housing and livable communities in the AARP Public Policy Institute. In his position he's responsible for developing AARP's policy on housing and livable communities issues, and he also manages the housing research agenda and conducts independent research.

He's also our individual on our team to really run around the country giving lots of presentations, and in this past year he's given more than 20 public appearances to discuss issues of housing, aging and livable communities. He's been a featured speaker for audiences across the United States and actually in other countries as well. He graduated summa cum laude from – and Phi Beta Kappa from the Honors Program at Howard University, earned a dual master's degree in public affairs and urban and regional planning from the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton University, and received his Ph.D. in urban planning and design from the University of Maryland, College Park.

So with that, I welcome my colleague Rodney, who will introduce our panel.

RODNEY HARRELL: Thank you, Jana. (Inaudible.)

Well, thanks. I have the pleasure today of introducing our panel. And when we organized this panel, we did so deliberately and with a few specific goals in mind. We wanted to give you an interesting group to talk to. We also wanted to find some people that could really speak to the points that Doug brought up in his talk and that we've put in the paper. We wanted to give some real-life examples of how to do that. So we scoured the country for the best possible folks that we could find from all four corners of the nation there. And we've got legislators, we've got program and policy managers at the state level, and together I think they're going to be able to have a great ability to share some of the real-life examples and some of the explanations of some of the things that Doug touched on.

So let me introduce the panel. First I'd like to introduce Senator Scott Dibble from Minnesota. He's – welcome, Senator.

SENATOR D. SCOTT DIBBLE (D-MN): Thank you.

DR. HARRELL: Now, if any of you heard me speak in the last year or two, you've heard me speak about Nicola (ph) Towers in Minneapolis as one of the great examples of street design and community design that works for older adults. And that actually just happens to be in his Senate district. Senator Dibble first became involved with politics in the '80s and played a key role in legislative successes in the areas of neighborhood livability, transportation, housing, energy and the environment. These include the passage of the historic transportation funding measure, the Freedom to Breathe Act, which ensured indoor air was clean for all workers, and approval of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

He was chair of the Senate's Transit Subdivision and played a pivotal role in the override of Governor Pawlenty's veto of a vital transportation improvement bill, and that really is helping the Twin Cities to develop a transit system that's going to help them work into the 21st century. He was asked to serve on the special investigative committee that looked into the tragic collapse of that I-35 bridge, and the connection to NCSL is that he was actually a past chair of the National Conference of State Legislators Transportation Committee.

So welcome, Senator Dibble.

SEN. DIBBLE: Thank you. (Applause.)

DR. HARRELL: Next, from the great state of Utah we have Senator – excuse me, Representative Bradley Last. He's serving his fifth term in Utah's 71st House District in the Red Rock Country of southwestern Utah on the Arizona border, hailing from a small town called Hurricane – which I've been working on the pronunciation of all day. (Laughter.) He served eight years as a member of the Board of Education. He's an energetic advocate for innovative public education reform, home- and community-based services for older persons and people with disabilities, and public policies that promote aging in place. Until recently Representative Last was the president and CEO of Home Health Services Incorporated, a company that provided in-home health care and hospice services in the Southwestern region. He's currently the senior development officer for Dixie State College in St. George, Utah.

So welcome. (Applause.)

STATE REPRESENTATIVE BRADLEY LAST (R-UT): Thank you.

DR. HARRELL: All right.

Next we have Don Chartock. Don joined the Washington State Department of Transportation in 2000. Since that time he's helped the state and its communities develop public transportation solutions. In his current position, he manages Washington State DOT's special needs role and intercity bus program and administers the Agency Council on Coordinated Transportation. He and his team oversee \$122 million in public transportation grants, manage the Travel Washington Intercity Bus Program, publish major reports on transportation to the legislature and public and provide technical assistance to organizations seeking to improve public transportation. Don has a B.A. from American and a J.D. from the Seattle University School of Law.

So welcome, Don. (Applause.)

DON CHARTOCK: Thank you.

DR. HARRELL: And last and certainly not least is Kathryn Lawler. She is the external affairs manager for the Atlanta Regional Commission, the MPO – the Metropolitan Planning Organization – and Area Agency on Aging for the greater Atlanta area. Prior to this role, she

was a consultant working with local governments, foundation (sic) and community-based organizations in the – working on organizing to better prepare for the rapidly growing older population in the region. One of her key projects was the development and launch of the Atlanta Regional Commission’s Lifelong Communities initiative, which we heard of earlier. From 2002 to 2006 she was the director of Aging Atlanta, a 50-organization partnership focused on preparing the metro region for the rapid growth of the older population. Ms. Lawler received bachelor’s degree from University of Notre Dame and a master’s degree from Harvard University.

So welcome, Kathryn. (Applause.)

So please help me welcome all of our panelists.

So what we’d like to do today is to have, really, a conversation with our panelists. I’ll ask them each a few questions about things that they are familiar with from the report, and then we’re going to go into a little more free-flowing conversation on some of the issues. So those of you in the room, think about your questions as we go, and those of you online, you can email those to Jana – jlynott@aarp.org – whenever you have the inspiration to do so, and we’ll incorporate those questions a little later on.

But first, I’ll start with you, Senator Dibble. A question about integrating land use, housing and transportation – that’s really one of the key things that we talk about in the report and in our policy work. And what initiatives can you talk about in Minnesota that do this, and what other states can maybe learn from Minnesota’s experience?

SEN. DIBBLE: Well, thanks, Rodney. And thank you very much for having me here. This is – it’s an honor. This is great work that folks are doing, and a key focus, of course, that we’ve got in Minnesota – the “silver tsunami” and, you know, many, many policy areas that we’re thinking about going into the future, not the least of which is keeping folks in community as vital and vibrant members of every neighborhood.

So trying to integrate transit, housing and land use from a state legislative perspective in Minnesota, frankly, has been a little bit of a tough nut to crack, although we have done a number of things that I think are fairly significant. Probably the – you know, the first hurdle we have to overcome is, you know, economic development and community development land use has really been determined in Minnesota, and probably most other places, as a function of local government. And if you reach into that arena with too firm a hand, it gets bit pretty hard. So we – what we tried to do, I think, is really approach it from various policy levers, incentives, you know, love and support mechanisms. (Laughter.)

We do have a fairly strong and a fairly active regional governance, which is actually a feature of state government. It’s the Metropolitan Council, or our MPO, and they are a full Cabinet member of the governor’s executive branch. And so they have a land-use authority that all the local comprehensive plans that are designed by all the municipalities in the metropolitan area really have to conform to the overall statewide or regionwide land and systems plan. Additionally, they’re responsible for the planning and implementation of our transit systems.

And so we've taken a number of steps to make sure that as we're developing our transportation policy plan and our transportation investment decisions that those are linked up with the sorts of land use that's going to occur as a result.

Something I did that I had the recent pleasure of discovering had a positive effect: Very, very recently we thought we would develop, through our state Department of Economic Development, a grant program. And we developed a definition of transit-oriented development and gave them the authority to find those areas that would be designated transit improvement areas and make those eligible for matching grants or loans or incentives to local communities that are trying to do economic development and redevelopment in their areas. And they – and they went through that process, but then we of course had no money to put into that pot that we developed. Subsequently the Metropolitan Council, through an initiative that's long since been established and (hadn't ?) been pretty well funded, working with local communities, called Livable Communities, as kind of a – the paradox of the economic downturn, found itself with a balance, and some money that hadn't been spoken for had to be turned back because development was – just wasn't occurring.

At the same time we're seeing fairly steady progress towards implementing our transitways in the metropolitan area because of that transportation bill that we managed to override the governor's veto. And the two have now intersected, if you will, the establishment of those funds and our progress towards transitways throughout the metropolitan area, putting in place bus rapid transit, commuter rail and light rail transit and doing the – establishing these transit improvement areas and having the Livable Communities funds available. And so just recently a round of funding of matching grants for local communities who want to do transit-oriented development in those areas has been established and just announced and – hope to be competing for those funds over the coming months.

DR. HARRELL: That's great. I can imagine that in this fiscal environment that having some funds available for the locals is a very important thing for them.

SEN. DIBBLE: And just as we're starting to climb up out of the doldrums that we've been in in Minnesota, this is a really nice time for this to be happening.

DR. HARRELL: That's great. That's great.

Let's go to Representative Last for a question here. And we had mentioned that you were on of the sponsors of Senate Bill 272, which authorized the Utah Transit Authority to develop five TODs – transit-oriented development areas – with public-private partnerships. And could you tell us a little bit more about that bill, what it does? And really, being someone that's from the southwestern part of the state and a rural area, it's very rare to hear people talk about TOD. So if you could really talk about it from not only – (inaudible) – but your context as a legislator from that region, that'd be great for us.

REP. LAST: Yeah. Well, I'd be happy to talk about that. And I also wanted to say thanks for inviting me out here. It's always amazing to me when I come to Washington, D.C., and participate in things like this just how many amazingly well-trained, educated people there

are. Like, what do you do with two master's degrees and a Ph.D.? (Laughter.) I mean, here's a guy who did not want to get out of school. (Laughter.) But everybody – and there's all these policy wonks around – I think that's a positive term, isn't it – (laughter) – but people that are way smarter than I am. But nevertheless, it's always fun to come back here.

My first experience in Washington, D.C., was back in 1981 when I was an intern for Orrin Hatch, of course the senator from Utah. He didn't – he didn't look the same back then. (Laughter.) And it was very – a very (funny ?) time in Washington. But I've been here many, many times, and I – and I love to come back here.

Anyway, just with respect to this whole idea of transit-oriented development, I was – certainly admit that I'm not an expert in what we refer to as TOD. We have a relatively new transit authority in Utah. And as a very conservative state, it was kind of a tough thing to even get started. But now that it's rolling, we have some very forward-thinking people in our transit authority. And this question of transit-oriented developments came up and whether or not they had the authority to participate in these transit-oriented developments. Frankly, they probably had the authority to do it without the legislature getting involved. But like so many things, when the legislature makes a statement about a particular policy or a particular issue, I think it lends credibility and strength to it, and it gives, in this case, the developers and the communities some confidence because they know that the legislature is behind it.

So in this case, the bill – and I don't need to go into too much detail because there really isn't a lot of detail in the bill. And we wanted it that way. We wanted the transit authority to have fairly broad parameters, a lot of flexibility as far as how they could organize the transit-oriented developments. And we also wanted to put some limits on it so that things didn't really go crazy, but we have encountered a bit of a problem, and that is that there's more interest, perhaps, than we have given authority for, and so we may have to go back and revisit that.

The five projects that we have approved, four are already selected and are well on their way as far as the planning is concerned, and there is quite a battle for that fifth spot. And so we'll have to see what happens there. But there are so many exciting things happening. And it's not just about older Americans, it's about changing a way of life. For example, in Sandy, Utah, they – Sandy is fairly close to the mouths of two canyons, Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon. If you're skiers, you know what that means, Alta And Snowbird, Brighton and Solitude. And so they actually want to have a take-off point in a transit-oriented development for the ski resorts.

And so while it's in the metropolitan area a few miles from the mouth of the canyon, they see this as a huge economic development opportunity. But as they're designing that, they're also looking at a very broad range of housing or residential units within the facility, as are all of the transit-oriented developments that are being considered right now, with the exception of one that will just have one apartment complex of about 150 units because it's a fairly small piece of property.

But we're talking about developments that have fairly small units. They have some affordable housing that would be – affordable; I guess that makes sense. (Laughter.) And then

also in some of these developments, where there's a larger piece of property, they would also include a – housing that could be as big as 4(,000) or 5,000 square feet. Now, out here that's not real common. Out in the West where we have lots of property, and of course in Texas and places like that, you see some big homes, but these developments want to cater to a broad range of people, and instead of just catering to the apartment dweller types, they really want to have places where a fairly well-heeled older couple, for example, with no children, who have lived on a third-acre or half-acre lot somewhere, could invite their grandchildren to come to their nice big house and have a big pad of grass somewhere on the property where they could still play. And instead of having three cars, like they used to, they would have one car and use transit quite often when they travel.

So I talked to the UTA just last night. They're actually in Canada, the people that are managing the TOD movement, and they're so excited they just wouldn't stop talking. And I had to remind them that it was 12:30 out here even though it was only 10:30, actually 9:30, back there in British Columbia.

So anyway, that's just a little bit of an idea of what's going on. We can talk about other things if there are more specific questions.

DR. HARRELL: OK, thanks.

Well, you know, one of the things you talked about was how those TODs are set up for a wide variety of people. And one of the things that are – that's very important for our policy work here at AARP is the argument that by making areas work for older persons and people of all incomes, you then have it work for everyone. Is that a – would that be a compelling argument in your state and in your area, to make that argument for policy implementation? And if not, why not?

MR. LAST: Yes, absolutely. I mean, again, I think everybody that's dealing with the – whether it's transportation or any issues related to aging, one of the things in the back of their minds – backs of their minds – I'm from Hurricane, Utah, remember – we always are thinking about the baby boomers coming through and how that's really going to change our society. And one of the things that's been going on in Utah – we've had this Envision Utah for a long time, which has been this amazing planning opportunity. And as the Envision Utah, and now what's called Wasatch Vision 2040 has taken off, they expect the Wasatch Front, where 85 percent of the population in Utah resides, in four counties along the mountains in northern Utah, that the population will grow 60 percent by 2040.

And they also expect that, through proper planning, that 60 percent growth will occupy 3 percent of the property, and they intend to do it with these cluster-type developments with open spaces and a lot of transit-oriented development.

DR. HARRELL: That's – wow, that's great. That's great. And (I'd certainly ?) follow up with you, Senator Dibble, for a quick second.

Another part of our philosophy is that, by making these changes, you're also making the areas more sustainable, that we've got, you know, 1 in 5 older – or 1 in 5 of the population is going to be 65-plus within the next two decades. So when we hear people talking about environmental sustainability and that whole argument, we often like to talk about the fact that, if you make the streets and housing work for older adults now, that actually is sustainability as well because that's making our communities more sustainable for the future as well.

So I'm curious what you think of that argument and how does – and how might that work in Minnesota?

SEN. DIBBLE: Well, absolutely, as we've talked about – I think the point you just made is an excellent one – about, you know, where is the growing population going to be and what is the makeup and the complexion of our population going to be in our communities going forward? Are folks going to continue to remain a part of our communities? There's a strong social capital that goes with making sure we have all kinds of folks able to live and access and remain in our communities. That's a form of sustainability.

Another form of sustainability that we talked about is making the best use of limited resources and existing infrastructure that we have in place and that's part of what's driving this whole effort rather than continuing to plow under green fields, corn fields and the like at the – at the very edges of our metropolitan area, taking advantage of those roadways and sewer infrastructure, school systems, police system – police departments, et cetera, making sure that we can make use of all of that, that we've already put in place, and maximize those dollars that we spent.

We've had some success in talking about environmental sustainability, particularly in terms of preserving land resources for conservation and recreation and, you know – and, for public health purposes, our surface and groundwater. We have 10,000 lakes, but we still have a lot of pressure on our – on our water systems. We did have a little mini-AB32 and a little mini-AB375 effort; those are the California – you know, trying to create that nexus between environmental and climate change and land use.

MS. : Right.

SEN. DIBBLE: That was ill-fated. (Laughter.) I think that we were (trying to ?) take advantage of a lot of momentum we had around some attention on climate change in Minnesota that immediately fell out of favor and fashion for a period of time, and so trying to link carbon footprints and environmental impact and municipal planning and development/redevelopment decisions didn't succeed. We had some – it was a fairly comprehensive – but we had some success. But, you know, we're going to continue to have that conversation.

DR. HARRELL: OK, so it'll take some time to work.

SEN. DIBBLE: Yeah.

MR. CHARTOCK: Can I follow up?

MR. : Sure.

MR. CHARTOCK: I think that mirrors a lot of what we saw in Washington state as well where a lot of the environmental interests spurred the passion in sustainable transportation and then livable communities and things like that. But really, in the end, the way it's keeping going now is it's good business sense and be – to be able to do things that you're not going to have to come back and redo later, to design – do your complete streets. And I'm from a DOT, like, a government where the question came from, and we like complete streets. And so that – oh, and just so – yeah, and so it's kind – it's kind of transferred from having this passion behind – from the – coming mainly from the environmental side to being approached more globally and saying, hey, this is – this just makes sense overall.

DR. HARRELL: That's great. And since we're all answering this question, Kathryn, what about Atlanta? I mean, does this argument towards thinking about sustainability and older adults and – together, does that work?

MS. LAWLER: Yeah, it absolutely has. It's been a lot of work kind of framing the conversation, but it's been – once we connected the dots, it's a pretty easy sell.

DR. HARRELL (?): Yeah.

MS. LAWLER: So initially we started our work by inviting people to come and talk about it at the local community level with the goal of having half of the people in the room not knowing why they were at an aging meeting and leaving the meeting realizing it was a part of their work and their job. So these were local staff; they were key members of the community who had come together in each community to have a conversation; and we called them our light-bulb meetings. But, once the light bulb went off, it's – it becomes a pretty easy conversation.

I always say that over the years as we've done this work in Georgia that – really, once for a grant I had to count up how many presentations we had done, and it was about 250. And we have yet to meet the “anti” constituency. Nobody has ever held a protest outside of one of our meetings. Nobody ever says they want to live in an unlivable community. (Laughter.) And older adults particularly like it when you don't call their issues “aging issues” because they don't see them as aging issues. They just see them as life issues. And so it's really worked on both sides. But it's a – been a very productive conversation, and we've had lots of results as a – because of that.

DR. HARRELL: That's great. Well, while you're – you are at it, tell us a little bit more about the Lifelong Communities project and how that began and really, what things you might need from the state to help support that kind of project.

MS. LAWLER: So the Lifelong Communities is a local program of the metropolitan Atlanta area. And it came out of – really, we did a – had to do an extensive community outreach effort and met with over 1,200 older adults in a short period of time, where they described their issues as, like I said, not aging issues. Why does an older person having trouble with their

plumbing make it an aging issue? They just need a really good repairman who's not going to rip them off. And their housing issues didn't – they didn't see as aging, and their transportation issues weren't aging.

But most importantly, everything that they talked about was not really being addressed by our traditional Aging Services program funded by the Older Americans Act, which is a wonderful, robust program, but it was, we realized, touching a very small part of their lives and the environment in which they were living because of the way they talk about their challenges was really the number one issue. And so it thrust us from the Area Agency on Aging perspective into thinking about the whole world of the physical environment.

And so we have, really since it started in about 2002 and kind of became formalized as the Lifelong Communities initiative in 2007, been working with local governments in the metropolitan area to explore how they can become places where people can live throughout their lifetimes. And there are sort of three main goals of the initiative. And in 2009 kind of a big milestone event was bringing together a multidisciplinary team over a 10-day period to have a design charrette, to actually explore six sites in the metropolitan area that were diverse – they weren't all in downtown Atlanta, and they weren't all in suburban Atlanta – to say what would you do in these communities to not only make the site itself more livable, but to leverage so that the whole surrounding community could become a lifetime – a place where people can live throughout their lifetime.

And since then we have been doing work to support local governments in both realizing those designs as well as their own initiatives to pursue health, housing and transportation options and changes that they could make that support healthy lifestyles. And then we found that a fundamental part is people need information and access. They need to know what the choices are, and then they need to be able to exercise those. So that's it in a nutshell that there's been a lot of, lot of wonderful work going on and lots of examples of different ways that that has manifest itself in different environments.

To answer what could states do, if I was really doing a great job representing the local officials, then I – from my area, they would probably say stay out of our way. (Laughter.) But they also really know that there are some key things that local communities can't do. And in fact, it really has to be a partnership of the local government and the state government to get this done. So there are some key areas that we have found that the state needs to act on.

And one is coordination. So many of the problems that people face living in the community are because things went uncoordinated, whether it was housing, land use and transportation, whether it was health care and housing. And some very specific examples: States are the ones who can help us coordinate Medicaid waivers with housing vouchers, and that makes a really big difference in whether or not people can stay in their communities throughout their lifetime. Human services transportation coordination across agencies – it has to be really started and have the impetus to make it happen in a substantial way at the state level. So coordination is a tremendous role for the state, and we see that as extremely valuable for them at our local level.

But I think there's another big thing, which is livable communities work is fundamentally behavior change work. We have to change the way that we have lived together and the way that we've designed and built our communities and spent billions and billions of dollars in infrastructure. We have to change all of that. And that behavior change can come through rules, but really, incentives go a long, long way.

And our experience is that there is nothing like good, friendly competition, one community trying to do a better job on getting older adults around, improving mobility, having diverse housing options than the community next door. And we find – have found that if the state can help incentivize that great behavior and that really wonderful competition that helps everyone innovate, it's a fantastic role for the state as well.

DR. HARRELL: Great. And I'm going to get back to that point of coordination in a second because I think that's one that I'd like the rest of you to chip in on. But first, I want to give Don a chance to talk a little bit about Washington state.

Now, Washington really bucked a trend over the last decade. We did a study a couple of years ago on affordable housing near transit, and one of the things we found – and this was – the study was done in 2008 and released in 2009. And we found that a lot of states were cutting back on service when people needed it, and it was affecting, you know, states as different as Florida to, you know, Ohio to – I mean, just all over the country that we found that these states were cutting back, and it was very much hurting the people that needed the services the most. Now, Washington state actually added bus lines and service during that time, largely using public – private sector dollars, excuse me.

So I'm really curious about your intercity bus transportation program and the – and the private-public partnerships that were able to help Washington buck that trend. So could you just tell us a little bit about how that happened?

MR. CHARCOCK: Yeah. Thank you very much. It's actually something we're very excited about, and we're always happy to come and talk to anybody about it. We're actually – part of what we're doing, we're currently doing under a pilot project status with the Federal Transit Administration. And so the more we can get other people to agree it's a good idea, the more likely we think it'll be in the next authorization.

Really, there were three main things that came into our success with the Intercity Bus Program. First of all, we were right at the point where we were starting to think that we needed to rethink and change the philosophy that – what is intercity bus service. Second was our close relationship, in this case with Greyhound, but also other private providers, and then also coming back and working with FTA.

And so that started with saying, OK, intercity bus isn't about making it from point A to point B. Intercity bus really is and should be about making it from point A to points B through Z and being able to make those connections. And what had been happening organically is you'll have private providers coming up with their own schedules and running through different towns and cities, and you'll even have grantees coming to the state and federal government asking for

money to do the different things that they want, but they're all doing them independently. We recognized that the state had a role in saying, well, wait a second; we want all these folks to be able to get to these multiple points, and so that we'll work with you, and instead of doing it through a grant process, we will submit – we will make those federal dollars available on a contracting basis.

Washington State DOT determined, OK, where are the timed connections going to be; how are we going to make it so the whole system fits together. And then what we did is we went out and did an RFP process for the individual lines. We also branded the entire thing our Travel Washington, so people understand that no matter where you enter the system, you're still on Travel Washington, and you're able to get to any of the different places.

And the other key thing that happened is – you know, I can't stress enough our relationship with Greyhound. And so Greyhound at the time was getting ready to eliminate service in multiple, multiple – I think we heard 22 earlier today – rural communities in Washington. And they came to us and said, you know, listen, we're not going to be able to serve these communities anymore, but we'd be willing to partner with you to try to figure out if there's anything else we can do.

And so hand in hand, we went then to the Federal Transit Administration, and we said, listen to – first, listen to our philosophy that what intercity bus transportation is in terms of it not being about that single corridor, but being able to get anywhere. And if you accept that intercity bus philosophy, you should let us count the private investment that, in this case, Greyhound is making in the state of Washington as the local match. And we got them to agree to that.

And so that was a really good way – and so now anytime one of the – some of the things that happen is you buy one ticket no matter where you want to go. We require all of our contractors to be able to interline their tickets, so even though you're going from different contractor to different contractor along the line, it's smooth sailing, and it's timed connections.

The other thing that we did that was kind of a good element in our public-private partnership is the amount of money they bid on, and when they come to us and they bid for their route, is what it would cost them to provide this service if not a single person ever got on the bus. And so what happens then is they come in and, for every fare they collect, it goes – what we're giving them goes down by that much. And so we have these contract periods ending and they're giving us back hundreds of thousands of dollars, because they actually realize, oh, it was something that we could do and we could start to make money on. And so it was able – in some ways, the state was helping them absorb some of the risk of trying these new routes and providing service where it hadn't traditionally been before.

And so those are a lot of the different things that go into it. And as you can see by looking at the map, it's all interlaced so that you can basically get from any part of the state to any other. And because of some of the money that's coming back, we just added that orange line up in the corner, which is actually called our Gold Line. All of the routes in the state are named for local commerce, things that those areas are known for, so we also have the Grape Line and the Apple Line and the Dungeness Line, and so – (laughter).

DR. HARRELL: Crabs.

MR. CHARTOCK: Yeah, you get on with crabs, right. And so that – and it has been very successful for us to be able to do it that way.

DR. HARRELL: Well, that's great. Now, is there something specific about Washington that's made that kind of cooperation better or easier, or do you think that's something that any state could do?

MR. CHARTOCK: I think – I really think this could be successful anywhere. In this particular case, I think that one of the reasons we were out front is because we had good people who already had strong relationships with some of the folks in the private industry, and so that was able to set us up. And we've tried to maintain those relationships, as well.

I really think this is doable anywhere, though. I think that one of the things that still remains a lot different from the way the other states are doing it is on that contracting element, as opposed to putting it out as grants. I think it gives us a bit more control. And I think the folks who have done it have had some success doing it. And so it's – it is spreading, where we actually just – we just completed our latest RFP for the Grape Line to come up, and we had a lot more bidders and the bid prices were coming down and down, so it – just getting better and better for the state, and for the service for the people as well.

DR. HARRELL: That's great. That's great. Now, Kathryn mentioned coordination. And you administer the state's role to coordinate transportation program, so could you tell – talk to us a little bit more about – for those of us that aren't familiar with coordinated transportation – coordination with services transportation, I should say – what that is, and why is it important?

MR. CHARTOCK: Sure. You know, at the simplest level, coordinated transportation is about having all the right people in the room. And it kind of builds off the point you made before about you have people coming to the senior center for a – for a program. They don't know that what they're going to talk about is going to be applicable to them as well.

Right around the corner from us, GAO put out a famous study a few years ago that said there are 62 federal programs spending money on transportation, and we can't tell you how much it is. And so that kind of just goes to show you that you really need to have the right people in there to know what – how their individual programs work, and so you can start to share resources. And the resources can be putting multiple people on the same vehicle, sharing the costs of providing those trips; but it may just be sharing expertise.

You know, I think the – one of the things a lot of the states are going through right now is we're cutting those general fund projects and those programs. And one of the things that we've been able to do because of coordination in Washington state is – in this particular example, it was the Adult Day Health Program, but it could easily have been a senior program that they were cutting the transportation benefit to. And it was about to create a huge cost shift to the local transit systems. And by having the right people into – in the room, we were able to say, "All

right, is there a better solution than just putting people on this very expensive dial-a-ride service?” And so we were able to say, “OK –” in this case, the transit was willing to put up some money, partner with the local adult day health centers and say, “All right, we’ll help you provide the service.” And so then not only was it cheaper, but the folks, the clientele who were accessing the service, were – enjoyed it more, too, because it was a service that was dedicated to them.

And some people might say, “Well, wait a second. That’s not coordination, because you’re not sharing resources.” It actually is, because we’re doing it more cheaply, we’re sharing the resources of our knowledge, and in this case funding, and we’re getting a better product out there to the people who are riding. And so those kind of examples are going to come up again and again.

And we also have a number of – a large number of vets in Washington State, and that number is only growing. And I think that’s, of course, going to be something that’s similar around the country. And one of the things that we’ve noticed over the past couple of years is that – veterans getting, especially who live in rural areas – again, following some of the points of what we’re talking about here today – is having – a lot of especially Vietnam vets are having trouble now getting in to get to the services that they need. They have now glaucoma; they now have other issues.

And one of the things that we kind of stumbled on by accident a little bit is when we were doing some major repairs to the Hood Canal Bridge, which connects people out onto the Olympic Peninsula in Washington – was that we said, “OK, as part of the mitigation for this bridge closure, we’re going to create some extra public transportation access.” And we went to the veterans program and we said, “Oh, and by the way, if you put your vets on our existing services, we’ll make deviated route stops into Seattle,” and to what we call “pill hill,” where many of the hospitals are. And by doing that – and it was a huge success.

But unfortunately, what happened is, after the bridge reopened, we started to see that ridership go down and down and down. And we said, “Well, wait a second, what happened here?” And when we went back and talked to the people they said, “Well, when you guys were doing that bridge mitigation work, you had someone who was here on the phone to VA, working through how to access those vouchers,” which is something that is very difficult to deal with, I guess, on a normal level. And so the idea then that, again, information is part of coordination; being able to share the information, work the bureaucracy and be able to get – make sure that the money flows to where it’s supposed to be going to.

And so those are a couple of examples of where coordination can yield good results.

DR. HARRELL: You know, I really like the subject of coordination. And the fact that there is human services coordination really appeals to me, as a non-transportation person, because one of the biggest things for us – and Jana mentioned this earlier. One of the biggest challenges when we first came onboard was, well, we didn’t like the way that AARP’s policy was written, in the sense that it isolated many of the issues that affected people on the

community level: transportation was over here, housing was over here, and they weren't really brought together.

And, frankly, we were excited when the Federal Sustainable Communities Initiative came on again in 2009 and the federal government was going to make an attempt to try to bridge housing and transportation and make those grant programs work together, play together. There were talks about getting Health and Human Services onboard. And, you know, during one of those college courses somewhere, I talked – I remember – (laughter) –

(Cross talk.)

DR. HARRELL: They were talking about efficiency, and efficiency always strikes me as one of those things that's missing in government. And so I want to ask our two elected officials this. You know, what's the big challenge there, I mean, that's preventing more of these kinds or coordination from happening – I mean, whether it's what team is services coordination, whether it's across issue areas, whether it's, you know, across departments? I mean, are those permanent blocks or something that we can do about it?

MR. DIBBLE: Well, I'll take a quick stab at it. I think probably, first and foremost, the key barrier is the fact that, you know, we appropriate dollars to specific purposes, and expect that those dollars be accounted for. You know, that's our – that's our task. That's our charge. And so when we give a dollar to a particular agency to administer, they have some fidelity to spend that dollar in the way that we've specifically written in our legislation. And they have an agency with a particular statutory authority, and then they get their appropriation and their appropriation is to a specific purpose. And the idea that somehow that someone else would have a take on that dollar for what might be construed as a slightly different purpose makes them anxious because they don't feel like the system is aligned to support their doing that sort of creative collaboration.

So it then comes back to us, as political leaders, to allow for that kind of interagency collaboration and make sure that those dollars perhaps can be coordinated in a fashion that's, you know, accountable and allocated correctly, but has some measure of innovation. And we probably have to build in some measure – an allowance for some risk, for innovation. We don't have a lot of tolerance in a publicly elected, democratic system for risk, because of course we're accountable to those folks who elect us, who think – who perceive that we might be wasting dollars on things that don't have the outcomes that we expect.

So that's the essential barrier, is it's democracy. I mean, it's – you know, it's – (laughter) – you know, it's understandable. And so we need to create those systems where we can create those kind of collaborations. You know, we're never going to create the agency of everything.

DR. HARRELL: Right.

MR. DIBBLE: You know, and – but, you know, we do want agency collaborations. They talk about taking down the smoke stacks. That's never going to – going to happen. But if we can – you know, where I come from, Minneapolis, the land – you know, the land where it's pretty frosty for a number of months, and so in downtown Minneapolis, rather than people

scurrying around on the sidewalks, they scurry around on the skyways. They link buildings through skyways.

So I think of the silos or the smokestacks, and not breaking down the silos but creating the skyways between the silos so that folks are running back and forth and talking to each other and coordinating their efforts in a – in a fashion.

This transportation coordination piece, I think, is extremely exciting. That GAO report I think was – is a really, really important start to that conversation. Some – Florida has done tremendous things with that. We're doing more of the conversation, convening, technical support, case studies, pilots, you know, putting tools into folks' hands, mostly at the local level, making sure the implementation agencies still have the authority to do what they need to do, working with nongovernmental organizations, the scheduled route transit providers, et cetera so that we're not dropping folks at county lines.

And you know, the other side of that is, we've got lots of overlap. Folks are buying and managing fleets that they might not have to – you know, our community action agencies that have fleets of vehicles that they probably can't afford and sit unused for 23 out of 24 hours a day.

DR. HARRELL : Interesting, interesting.

So Representative Last, you know, I've been trying to struggle with the argument that, you know, doing things like improving the way housing is designed could allow someone to east – age in place easier, to be there longer and better, and that may save Medicaid dollars on the back end. But it don't – won't necessarily save money on the housing budget if this is some kind of state-supported housing. So, you know, is there a way I can better make the argument that would appeal to someone like yourself?

REP. LAST: Well, I think legislators, as a whole, are pretty frustrated by the fact that there isn't better coordination. I mean, a lot of us come from the private sector. And when we start hearing about these kinds of inefficiencies, it drives us nuts.

I think there is something to be said for recession, however. And one of the things that it's really forced in our state is improved coordination. And as I talked to the agencies on aging in preparation for coming back here, they talked to me about a number of these coordinated efforts. And it really came down to the fact that they just didn't have enough money to do what they needed to do.

And strangely enough, the human services people and the senior citizen centers and the schools have started talking, especially in the rural areas, because in a lot of cases you have a school bus, for example – and in some cases it's one of the smaller busses that's maybe dealing with some disabled children or children with certain challenges – and they're going the same place every day and they've got space on that bus, and it happens to be a place where some seniors need to go. So that's the first time I had ever heard of actually coordinating with the schools.

But I think, you know, going back to what the senator said, people just kind of get in their own little box and they don't look out. And I think it's incumbent on us as legislators to try and help them look out. But frankly, as legislators from 30,000 feet looking down, sometimes you're not aware of what's going on in the trenches.

DR. HARRELL : I guess that's our challenge, to try to help you see that better.
(Laughter.)

So I'll ask one more question before we go. I know Jana has some questions from the folks online – and I want to see – get the audience in.

But one thing for Kathryn, before we do that, and that's one of the things that Doug mentioned was NORCs earlier – and he talked a little bit about what they were – but what are they? How does Georgia support them, and what lessons could there maybe be for other places, from your experience with NORCs?

MS. LAWLER: So if you haven't heard of it, a NORC is a naturally occurring retirement community, which just means that a lot of people have lived there for a long time and a higher percentage than – than the surrounding community is made up of older adults. And so it provides tremendous opportunity because you have a lot of shared need or shared demand. And oftentimes the NORC is really recognizing that the supply for that demand is not there, but if you were to consider what you can do, because you have a high concentration of folks, it really is a great opportunity for innovation and finding efficiencies and delivering what people need. And it can be anything from transportation services to in-home supports to housing rehabilitation programs; it can be community building and social engagement opportunities. It's – there is no limit on the subject matters and the concerns that a NORC can and does address. NORCs are all over the country, and sometimes I think the meetings I go to are NORCs too, because there's enough of us who have been meeting for a long enough time together.

But these are – these are just opportunities to deliver things that people need. The great opportunity of a NORC is innovation, because when you do have that higher concentration, you can explore things that you can't necessarily do across the population. So now what did Georgia do? Georgia first recognized this. This is the first step in a NORC, is recognizing that it exists, because you don't create it; it's – it is there, and you identify it. And it's pretty easy to do.

And so Georgia did that and then put in place some funding to support innovative models that could be developed in those areas of high concentration, with the expectation that those models would be developed then integrated back into the service-delivery system, because there was no point in providing great innovation here and there when – and Jana laid it out for us in the beginning and many of you have it probably memorized – with the demographic shift that we have coming, a series of pilot projects is not an adequate response. And that is really where we struggle with NORCs in Georgia. To be frank with you about it, where we are now is that there was some great innovation on some funding to support some really neat ideas around transportation particularly, looking at economies of scale for delivering in-home services, how people could do cooperative buying on anything from lawn care to handyman services to actually in-home support and then – but it was a line item, and a lot of

items have changed in Georgia since that program was started. And right now it's at zero, and so those innovations – several of them have been integrated back. We now have transportation voucher programs all over the community, and those were started in NORCs.

But I think it was also a really important lesson, because programmatic programs alone aren't going to address this issue. We have to look at systematic and policy changes. And I think that's another great opportunity we found at the local level for the role that the state can play is that we have to start moving to scale. There's been a lot of great stuff going on in definitely where I'm from in Georgia. But until we move to scale, we're really creating a lovely scrapbook of a series of ways that communities try to address the change, but it is not adequate given the numbers. It's just – it's not a good second sentence; when we talk about the growth and then we tell them what we did, it just doesn't add up. And so the state, we feel, is where you can really move to scale.

And so right now, where we are in Georgia is a little bit in the holding pattern on NORCs. There's a great opportunity. And we saw that innovation moving through the system, and I think we'll get back to it as soon as we can.

DR. HARRELL: Well, actually the first question that came in was about NORCs, so we'll keep you on the spotlight here for a sec.

And speaking of scale, the question was, do you know of research on economies of scale for NORCs, and do you need a minimum population to make it work? And I personally don't know that I've seen anything on economies of scale for NORCs. But do you have anything? MS. LAWLER: Well, if you – many of you may even know it better than I, but the history of NORCs are that they really got identified by some researchers in Wisconsin, but the – some folks in New York City is who really began to call what they were doing related to NORCs and run with the idea and explore economies of scale.

And you know, the great part about that is that it got the whole thing started. The problem is, it's New York City, and there's just no place in the world like New York City. And certainly a place like Georgia doesn't want to be like New York City. (Laughter.) And if we told you we were bringing you a great model from New York City, that may be – help you answer the question in a big fat negative.

So there are tremendous economies of scale with where that got started, so a lot of work that you saw going on around the country – because there was some national support for NORCs as well at the time – really trying to redefine how economy of scale could be effective. So – and I know there was work done even on rural NORCs, obviously defining densities of NORCs in a different way.

You know, it is definitely true, the closer people can be together, the easier and cheaper it is to deliver services. But we are mostly suburban in Atlanta, and we found some great opportunities. But you have uniquely suburban issues. I mean, the first NORCs in New York – and I'm pretty sure they've never had to do cooperative landscape purchasing – right? – because they have one guy do the whole building.

But that's a huge issue for older adults in our suburban neighborhoods in Atlanta, and economies to scale there were pretty small – to get a company to provide a price break for people and a reliable service because they could do everything on the same street. So I think it is there; it's varied; and it's been redefined in different contexts for different types of NORCs.

DR. HARRELL: And that's a great point, I think, about bringing things together, people and their – in a close-in area, it's a – it's a just a natural opportunity to – you – to make it more efficient. And one of the things that we've been seeing, on the federal level especially, there's a philosophy in the housing area to be more market-based. People like the market-based efficiency as we talked about earlier. But what that normally means is there's more vouchers, so people are spread out and that seems to be the winning argument on how to house people, I think, federally at least. And so we might be losing some of that ability to actually work with people when they're in concentrations where some of these efficiencies can happen. So thanks for talking a little bit about that.

Now, is there anyone in the room that has questions before I go to more from online? Can we get a couple here maybe?

MS. : (Off mic) – you can state your name.

Q: Margaret Crenshaw (ph) from Capitol Hill Village. I have a question about transportation. You have all of these incentives for mass transit. Are there any – which encourage group transportation? Do any of you look at discouraging the use of cars, such as closing urban areas or requiring high-occupancy vehicle lanes or different sorts of parking arrangements? Are you addressing that end of what is a real transportation problem?

DR. HARRELL: Anyone discouraging the use of cars?

MR. CHARTOCK: Well, I'd be discouraged from discouraging the use of cars – (laughter) – as is someone with the DOT. So – (laughter).

MS. LAWLER: I mean, I can – I don't know if you've heard, but we have some new HOT lanes that opened up in Georgia, which is congestion pricing. So if you get in the lane, you pay a toll depending on how busy the traffic is. And I ask if you've heard, not because you regularly follow traffic reports in Atlanta, Georgia – (laughter) – but it hasn't gone smoothly, which means it's made a lot of headlines. But it is an active discouraging use of car(s).

Now – and, actually, transit use has gone way up in that corridor, I think, by almost 150 percent. So people have been discouraged.

I will say, however, in some of the conversations we've had, which I think is really some sort of – some thinking about how this whole issue makes us change the way we think and act and live, is that if we had really thought about it – what that means, you know, is we took a lane of traffic on a major highway and said, you may no longer drive in it unless you now pay. So that was hard for a lot of people to take.

And what we were really doing is creating more congestion in the other lanes, right? We actually made congestion worse for most people, but we approached it from transportation planning, and really it probably – it's all about behavior change. So some good therapists probably could have helped us – (laughter) – in our thinking about it. And I don't know really that therapists – but we should have really brought in different folks who think differently, different disciplines, because honestly the engineering and the technology was so much easier than the public acceptance of a whole new way of living and working and driving and getting around.

So I think we aren't going to ever do that the same. I think we're going to do more HOT lanes, but I think we're going to really – it – an interdisciplinary approach with professionals who may never have thought they needed to be in the room together thinking about how we move forward as a community, I think, is what underlies this whole thing.

DR. HARRELL: Well, thanks. Some – (inaudible) –

MS. LAWLER: Do you disagree? We need some therapists for our traffic problem? (Laughter.)

MR. CHARTOCK (?): No, I don't disagree with that.

SEN. DIBBLE: I – you know, discouraging – I don't know if I've ever heard that expression; that's interesting. I would say if we used it in, you know, a political setting it probably would pretty much guarantee that we wouldn't succeed at whatever policy it was that we were trying to pursue in that arena. But I would say that – we definitely are responding to just some realities that are coming home – you know, coming home to roost, coming to bear on our current fiscal and political and demographic environment.

So one is – for better or for worse or for reasons, you know, that we're just starting to figure out now, vehicle miles traveled per capita are going down and are probably not going to continue to go up at the slope that they have in the past. That's a changing sensibility among young people and also has something of course to do with the aging of the population. So we've got a lot of – a lot of changes in terms of what the public is demanding for themselves.

We also just simply can't afford not to – not to – (inaudible) – but simply accommodate, you know, ever widening, you know, ever greater capacity in our highway systems and – as well as in our arterials in the fully built environment; we just can't afford to accommodate that much more asphalt. It's just not going to happen, much less keep up with what we have already built. So we're confronting that reality.

So we're trying to look at what are the – (whatever made ?) the high-benefit investments we make, and that's about intersecting land use and transportation policy as well as making sure that, you know, we're looking at transit as a – as a key means of economy. But also what are we doing at the local level, you know, in terms of requiring businesses, for example – new businesses to provide X amount of parking around their facility or not, that sort of thing. And when we do have to go in and rehab a street or address a safety issue or the like, how are we

getting the most out of our money for that and how are we accommodating all kinds of users in those significant rehab efforts and capacity efforts?

DR. HARRELL: And I'll say, just from AARP's policy perspective, that what we really have a focus on is creating as many options as possible, so that people have the option so that they don't have to be forced into using their cars. If you – if you can't drive anymore, if you can't afford to drive, that there's options there for you to have somewhere to live, that you can get to the things that you need to without it.

I'm also glad that we had actually a question from someone from one of the villages speaking of NORCs. I think that village movement being a private sector kind of – from-the-ground-up attempt to really take advantage of some of these naturally occurring communities where you have concentrations of folks. They are taking it into their own hands to try to do things to help them age in place or help to improve their communities. So I'm glad we have a little question at least from them.

Jana, did you have something?

MS. LYNOTT: Yeah, before we go to the next question, I just want to make another announcement to folks on our webcast in terms of getting questions to me, because they seem to have stopped after I got a few. Again, you can email them to me at jlynott – J-L-Y-N-O-T-T at AARP.org or you can tweet them to #AGEINPLACE, that's H-A-S-H-T-A-G “AGEINPLACE,” all one word. The whole thing's all one word. So please send us your questions.

DR. HARRELL (?): All right.

Q: Hi, my name is Mike Martin (ph), and I'm from Reston, Virginia, and we're a small planned community that you may have heard of out here in Virginia.

And we have recently been trying to bring things down more to the local level, and how do we make the community work? And we had a group that started out in Reston, and it was, you know – the emphasis really was aging in Reston. Well, that very quickly was challenged because we don't like that the idea of it being “aging” in here. So we said, well, maybe it's not “aging”; same with thing with “aging in place.” It's maybe “aging in community” because there was a drive really for aging in place to be perceived as my house had to fit. And if my house didn't fit, I had to move to the hinterlands – so really changing the emphasis on some of the parts to that.

And we then moved forward with our group, and now it's more – it's “Reston for a Lifetime.” And that's dealing with the community sense of not necessarily that you're going to be able to live in your one-acre house, (if ?) – four stories and be able to live there forever, and you just don't understand why you can't get government assistance to make you able to live there.

The other points are – is that bringing it down to providing services. I, for instance – I'm volunteering for three groups that are doing senior medical transport. That is a very important

part because you really can't just put these people on a bus, and they have reasons for using or not using other facility-type things, and these are volunteer groups that are (presiding ?).

But it brought to my attention when I had to be vetted – in other words, qualified as a volunteer driver – and then all of a sudden there were three different processes that I had to – would have had to go through, and all three of them were, this is what's required. And I got to thinking about that, and I shared with our supervisor – our chairman of our supervisors with the board of supervisors. And it was basically that, why isn't there a consistency in a vetting process so that the – in this – in our case – maybe the county –

MR. : (Inaudible) –

Q: – or maybe even the state would set up a process for volunteers? And if I volunteer for one group and all of a sudden someone says, oh, you know, we need some help over there, I'm already vetted; I can just simply go over and start volunteering the next day. As it is now, one of the processes was less than a week and the other process was probably going to be three months, which I still haven't heard from. (Laughter.)

So that's my question to you all is that, how do we deal with a need such as that? And (I'm ?) really at the grassroots level of the volunteers because there's really where you're going to find the first level of people that are going to give you the interaction.

DR. HARRELL: Sounds like you need a coordination of processes there. (Laughter.)

SEN. DIBBLE: They maybe haven't heard in three months because they don't know how it's going to come out. (Laughter.)

Well, that sounds like a classic case for coordination. Matter of fact, what the Minnesota Council on Transportation Access is doing is looking at, you know, part of their – part of their role is to look at these very problems and work with the local communities or just report on those communities that have confronted those sorts of coordination challenges and have been successful – either been unsuccessful or been successful at dealing with them and publicizing those case studies and those pilots.

I would encourage folks to take a look at Minnesota's website, where those case studies – and there's actually three or a number of them on establishing and enhancing volunteer driver programs, including this background check issue.

So take a look at Minnesota's website. It's coordinatemntransit.org, so that's coordinatemn-transit.org – as in Minnesota – transit – that's all one word – dot-org. And all these different issues of contracting and sharing fleets and dispatch and, you know, hiring a mobility manager, coordinating planning for the community – those sorts of things are examined in some depth.

DR. HARRELL: And to touch on your first question, one of the things that we actually had a little bit of discussion about was the name of our paper, "Aging in Place." You know, we

are really talking about a broader thing than the concept of just making your house, you know, perfect for you as you age.

Now, the flipside of that, though, is that it's the phrase that people know. You know, that is something that people have thought about and heard of and can understand in its concept. And what we really wanted to do, I think, is to expand the way that people look at aging in place as a concept, again, by creating those options that really make communities better to help people age. So hopefully, if we've done our part, we'll expand that dialogue a little bit so that people think about aging in place a little broader. That's great.

While we go to someone else here, let me go to one of these questions from email. This one's from Mary Fran De Rose at, I think, Colorado University. Go Buffaloes. Do you know of any collaborations among state legislatures, academia, and the age-friendly communities movement? So legislatures, academia, and the age-friendly communities movement – I can't say that I do off the top of my head. I'm looking and I'm seeing none, either. So that's a good idea, so I'll put that in the idea pocket there, Mary Fran.

Do we have somebody in the room?

Q: Hi. I'm Alisa Glassman. I'm with Action in Montgomery, in Maryland, an affiliate of the Industrial Areas Foundation. And where we live, we have a number of NORCs and senior villages.

And each one is doing its great work independently, and I'm wondering if you have found certain things that counties or states can do to help the different villages and NORCs share the different strengths that they've been able to work on in their own communities? Have there been things that states or localities have been able to do to strengthen what the NORCs are doing, and maybe to help coordinate between the different NORCs and villages?

MS. LAWLER: Well, I can start, if you want. So I think where we've found coordination happens most often is when people have a shared challenge. And in our area, it's mostly around zoning issues.

So that as groups are trying to pursue the development of a range of housing options in their community – because we have so many communities that just have one type of housing – that there has been a real shared issue around laws that prevent them from doing what they want to do, which can be anything from building an apartment for themselves or their caregiver, to allowing any type of multifamily to be integrated into the neighborhood and to allow the development of neighborhood-based retail – so corner stores, things that – small restaurants or cafes within walking distance.

So in our community, that's where we've seen some of the real sharing happening. We have continued to also see the issue of people coming home from the hospital being a shared challenge for NORCs. And we don't have as many villages in Georgia, but that is a shared challenge because of those critical days for people getting what they need when they come home, to prevent them going back to the hospital.

And so we actually have a whole new initiative that is looking at coordinating multiple communities so that people can get what they need as they're leaving the hospital and be able to get the support they need. And then we'll be tracking readmission rates, and it will go down. It's going to go down – we're sure of it – from the intervention. So I think that's where we've seen some big issues that are not – that can't really be tackled by any one neighborhood.

Q: And then the other part of my question was – the other part was, are there things that jurisdictions or states are able to do to help the different NORCs and villages. So right now, I know that there are some smaller grants that are being given out.

But are there certain things that the states or local jurisdictions could do that would encourage them at a greater level or – so that they're not each doing their own separate thing? Are there certain ways – (inaudible) – economies of scale that could be happening at the state level or at the county level; instead of each different NORC doing their own separate taxi share, or the different things that the NORCs and villages do?

DR. HARRELL: And that's the big question. I think at this time of physical – fiscal tightening, you know, all the budgets that – it's very expensive, and states, even at the county level, don't have the funds that they used to have. So I would guess technical support, those kind of things to help people organize, using the power to bring these different communities together at the table, to work together – one of the things that states can do. Are there any other ideas?

MS. LAWLER: I think the other thing is flexibility to spur more innovation. And you mentioned it when you talked about, why don't people coordinate. Well, everybody actually says they do coordinate if you ask them (and ?) – because it's a good thing to do.

But the fundamental part of coordination – yeah, some of it's because it's the way we've always done it, but we need more flexibility. So sometimes if there's no money available, just loosening up some of the rules – particularly around transportation – to allow some new and innovative things to happen, or maybe helping – the state, particularly, can help agencies discover that there was no rule; they just thought there was that rule that prevented them from doing something.

So you know, it doesn't always have to take money, but it's, sort of, re-examining things in a different way and loosening up some of the restrictions that are sometimes the things that stop us from changing the way we work.

MR. LAST: Yeah, if I could just jump in for a second – the example from – (inaudible) – and also what you're saying is – those are very good things for legislators to hear. Because it is people on the ground that understand what's going on a lot better than lawmakers do. I know in my state we don't like to regulate. We want to – we don't want to get involved unless we absolutely have to.

And so in the example of all these different communities that are doing their own things, you know, I'm not one that would necessarily want to step in. But I'm guessing that there are

several people in here that represent an association of one form or another – AARP is an association. Somebody comes up with an idea, or recognizes, as she said, that there's a problem, and so people from different communities get together and discuss those problems, and then it can flow up from the bottom to legislators.

And that's a perfect example of how democracy should work, in my opinion. So that's what I would suggest. I mean, there's probably associations out there already, but when a homeowners' association or an association of planned unit developments comes to see me, and there are several representatives and I know that they represent a lot of voters, that carries weight with me – and especially if they're older, because I know they actually go vote. (Laughter.)

So I would just say that sometimes I don't think it's the government's responsibility to go out and look for those things unless there's efficiencies that we can find. And in this case, there probably are. But we're not going to find out about it unless it comes from the ground up.

DR. HARRELL: Great. Now, we have a few more questions that have come in, but we're running very tight on time. Let's do one more from the back here. And for those of you that have submitted questions on email, we'll try to answer your questions over email later. But do we have one more in the back?

Q: Yeah, hi. My name is Brett Van Akron (sp), and I work with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Sustainable Communities and the partnership for – Federal Partnership for Sustainable Communities.

And I'd first like to thank the senator for being spot on some of the barriers that you have, and the accountability and the budget issues. I mean, there are many times we have to decide, who gets to count this bean. You know, working with a bunch of people, a bunch of different agencies, and somebody gets to take credit – because somebody has to take credit – but you can't take credit twice. So I thank you.

My question actually is about suburbia. And William Frey is a demographer from Brookings Institute (sic) that identified that most of the baby boomers in the United States live in suburban communities in major metropolitan areas in the United States. These communities, I would pose, are the most difficult to transform into the types of communities that we're talking about here.

And I was wondering if anybody could talk about policies and programs at the state level to help assist these communities deal with some of their underlying infrastructure difficulties that would require transformation?

DR. HARRELL: That's a great question.

MR. DIBBLE: Well, we –

DR. HARRELL: You don't have to raise your hand.

MR. DIBBLE: We're taking up – (laughter, inaudible) – so kind of you. I have to thank EPA, HUD, and DOT for the grants that they've made available to metropolitan areas to study that very question, and make sure that we're maximizing the investments that we're going to make in our – in our – you know, the next major LRT line that will probably come online will be our third LRT line, coming in from the southwestern sector of the metropolitan area up into the core. And interestingly, I think the point you made earlier – who's really leading that is a consortium of county and local officials, so mayors and county commissioners, but really at the forefront is the business community.

And they understand that in order for the Twin Cities to compete regionally, economically, to deliver the kind of vital and vibrant communities that work for everyone – not just seniors – we need a transit service that is, kind of, the turnkey to vibrant development and redevelopment through that very, very sprawled southwestern quadrant of the metropolitan area.

And so we're undertaking a fairly intensive study about, you know, how do we maximize that investment. What is that quarter going to look like in terms of housing, jobs, you know, and all the other sorts of development land use that's going to occur along that? I don't think we're going to be – I don't think we're going to be digging up and bulldozing big subdivisions and, you know, big suburban subdivisions that are already there, but, you know, we're going to have probably a million more folks.

You know, you talked about how many folks are going to be coming to Utah. We're going to have about a million more folks coming to Minnesota. Minnesota is a state of 5 million, so a million more is a really significant jump in population over the next 10 to 15 years. And we could continue to put them in the places where we have been for the last 30 years – you know, kind of, out in cornfields, you know, beyond the horizon, and beyond and beyond – or we could really maximize what we've already got in place.

And I think that's what the market is going to drive. That's what the political system is going to drive. And we need to coordinate all of our systems to make sure that we're doing that in a way – and that we're not going to jam them all, we're not going to get back to plus-500,000 in Minneapolis proper, St. Paul proper. There are about 375,000 in Minneapolis, and we might get to 400,000 in Minneapolis.

Those folks are going to live outside of the urban core itself. And this is what folks want, and so we need to figure out how to do that best.

MR. LAST: If I can just jump in there, I agree that we're not going to change what's already happened. We can't. It's kind of like in the government. You don't really try to save money. You just try to slow down the growth of the spending.

And I think what we, as governments, can do – and I would just go back to the Utah example with the TODs again. I think what we need to do is show people that there's another way and help provide incentives to show that there's another way – for example, with a well-designed TOD that has all kinds of different living arrangements in there.

And then people will begin to see, I think – with a little help from the government in getting these together – they’ll begin to see that this is really a fun way to live, whether you’re a young professional couple, whether you’re a skier in Sandy, Utah, whether you’re an older person who just doesn’t want to have to mow the lawn anymore. But you’ll begin to see that this is a wonderful lifestyle choice. And then I think the private sector takes it and runs with it, and you don’t have to worry about it anymore.

I mean, we’re getting to the point, in a lot of larger communities, where the commute is just not that great anymore. We don’t want to do that. So where can I live and have a nice lifestyle, and the things that I want, or most of the things that I want, without having to drive 45 minutes, or an hour, or an hour and a half every day? So from a policy perspective, that’s what I think we do: Create incentives to help show that there’s another way; let the market take care of it after that.

MR. CHARCOCK: Just to add on real quickly, too, in terms of addressing transportation from the suburbs, one of the things that we’ve seen is that once you look at things more holistically, and not just program-by-program, you start to say, well, maybe this takes up a little bit more money here, but the overall cost to us becomes lower.

And so, for example, in the – it’s actually a small town of Shelton, just outside of Olympia, where I live, the cost of bringing people into dialysis treatment was humongous. And it was certainly far cheaper just to change the zoning locally so that they could have a dialysis center in the town of Shelton. And once they, again, had the right people in the room and discussed this issue, they were able to then – everyone was basically happy.

You have a new business there who’s doing the dialysis. The transportation is a lot less costly. And the people are much closer to where they’re trying to get to. And so I think as those – as the demographics change in the suburbs, there’s going to be a change to, again, look at – what services are we actually putting there, too.

DR. HARRELL: Great. Kathryn, did you want a last word?

MS. LAWLER: Well, just, I think we can’t forget the state level is where – I know it isn’t that we actually save money. I think you’re right. It’s probably slowing the growth, particularly given the demographics. But that’s where it can be realized. You know, at the very local level, to show how your support of a person, you know, is actually saving Medicaid dollars – but it’s that the state can have that global perspective and see it. And unfortunately, it means, then, that the state has to take responsibility for doing that.

I mean, lots of great things can bubble up, but then there’s also the real advantage of the global, and for us to, kind of, keep an eye on, how are we really, really going to do this. I mean, Jana, you said in the beginning, we haven’t really fully – we can’t even get our minds around how different our communities are going to be. But it is – you can observe that better at the state level, and I think that helps us understand, are we making any progress. And if we’re going to move to scale, we really do need to feel like we’re making some progress pretty soon.

DR. HARRELL: And I think that's a great note to end on.

Thanks, everyone. Can you help me thank our panel, everyone? (Applause.) I really enjoyed the panel. I really enjoyed all of you here, and I definitely will have some takeaways to think about.

Now, a couple of quick notes: Thank you, those of you that are online and on the Web, thank you for joining us. I want to make a special thank-you note, before we sign off, though, to – first, to Jana, to Nick, to Doug, and to Wendy – (inaudible) – the other co-authors of the paper – to Shanna Guzman (sp), who had – who is on leave now and couldn't be here, but she had a great deal to do with setting up everything today. And so we couldn't have done it without her help.

And frankly, and also Janet Gasoway (sp) on our team. (Inaudible) – there's a whole bunch of folks that really helped put this together – and our audio folks, our billing services, the food. I mean, there's a lot of people that (went ?) to do this. And so, again, actually, if you could help me thank them for all of their work, I'd appreciate that, too. (Applause.)

So for those of you that aren't online, I have a special surprise. If you go upstairs – across the way here, to the B building, and upstairs to B-220, the learning center – we'll have people direct you, since I can't remember the room number – (laughter) – but we have a great reception set up. So you can network with each other, ask, maybe – I think our panelists will be able to stop by. There's great food and drink there. And you'll be able to ask some of your remaining question there.

One thing I'll ask you: When you do come up, please take all your belongings, coats and everything, including what's in the closets back there on your left, because this room will be locked. So I think we have some helpers to help guide you, and I'll see you up there. Thank you, everyone. (Applause.)

(END)