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When we talk about building our communities for the future, we tend to focus on early childhood, education, technology, infrastructure, and economic development. However, some startling new research with an emphasis on economic development highlights why the communities that are the “most” age-friendly, particularly for older adults, will be the ones that win out in the long-term. Building an age-friendly community in Holland and Zeeland is an opportunity we are excited to share with you in this report.

Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland launched in 2017, built off the collaborative efforts of Ottawa County’s Blueprint for Action and Holland for a Lifetime that began in 2009. Recognizing the incredible value that older adults bring to our community, we began to assess whether we are doing enough to allow older adults to thrive in the greater Holland/Zeeland area.

The World Health Organization (WHO) measures age-friendly cities across the world according to the following eight criteria: outdoor spaces and buildings; transportation; housing; social participation; respect and social inclusion; civic participation and employment; communication and information; and community support and health services.

As a cross-sector group of stakeholders representing private, nonprofit, and government leadership, along with interested citizens, (for more information about who we are, see page 30), we determined that while Holland/Zeeland does well in many aspects of age-friendliness, an intentional focus on improving transportation options for older adults would be a worthwhile investment. In response to this decision, Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland conducted a detailed resident phone survey with 385 older adults, held focus groups, and ultimately explored several recommendations for how to achieve the vision of Affordable, accessible, convenient and safe transportation for all older adults in the greater Holland/Zeeland area.

The following report provides a summary of this work including:

- Economic case study for creating age-friendly communities.
- Results of the Age-Friendly Transportation Study.
- Recommendations and conclusions for improving transportation options for older adults.
- World Health Organization’s “Checklist of Essential Features of Age-Friendly Cities”.

We want to thank all who have been a part of this initiative for their time and effort in helping to make Holland/Zeeland an age-friendly community.

In February 2017, the Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland effort was launched at Evergreen Commons, featuring a keynote presentation from Dr. Margaret Neal from Portland State University. Dr. Neal (an expert in the field of aging) shared the results of her groundbreaking study, The Case for Age-Friendly Communities, which makes a compelling case that older adults provide an often underappreciated economic value to a community. Whereas some regions may consider older adults a “drain” on local resources because of the level of supportive services that may be needed, other forward-thinking regions should be engaged in asking strategically how they might attract more older adults to their community.

Some highlights from Dr. Neal’s study and presentation that illustrate the economic impact older adults can have on a community include:

- Older adults are an important part of the workforce and expand the labor pool from which employers can hire and thus address labor shortages.
- Older adults start more new businesses than younger adults.
- Older workers can enhance organizational productivity and business outcomes.
- Older adults start more new businesses than younger adults.
- The older adult market is stimulating new companies, products, services, and technologies.
- Older adults have enormous economic clout as consumers.
ECONOMIC IMPACT

Another study conducted in 20-county metropolitan Atlanta* found that an annual increase of 1,000 people aged 65+ from 2015-2040, compared to people aged 18-64, would result in:

• An increase of $40 billion in personal income (vs. $4 billion).
• An increase of $7.8 billion in gross domestic product (vs. $2.6 billion)
• Almost 100,000 more job-years for the economy (vs. 29,400).
• A population increase of 16,000 (vs. 8,000).

TOURISM IMPACT

• Tourists spend 3-4 times more on shopping while traveling than the average shopper.*
• The segment of adults age 55+ has been shown to be the group that will increase the overall volume of tourism the most.*
• The substantial numbers, increased financial means and time flexibility make older adult consumers more attracted to tourism.*

IMPACT ON CAREGIVING

Older adults provide considerable unpaid care for adult children, grandchildren, spouses, and other relatives. AARP (2015) estimated that:

• 40 million family caregivers provide 37 billion hours of care annually, at an average of 18 hours per week.
• Value of this unpaid care is estimated at $470 billion, which is more than the annual national Medicaid expenditures ($469 billion) and more than the combined annual sales for Apple, IBM, Hewlett, and Microsoft ($467 billion).

TOURISM IMPACT

• Older adults volunteered nearly 2 billion hours of service, valued at $45.7 billion.**
• 23.6% of people aged 65+ volunteered.***

IMPACT OF VOLUNTEERING

• Three-quarters of mid-life and older adults engage in charitable giving.****
• Bequests produced over $28.13 billion in charitable contributions in the U.S. in 2015. This is nearly 60% more than all gifts from businesses and corporations.*****
• Such testamentary gifting is expected to increase in coming years due to the growth in intergenerational transfers. The total wealth transfer to Baby Boomers has been estimated at $8.4 trillion (MetLife Study of Inheritance and Wealth Transfer to Baby Boomers, 2010).

PHILANTHROPIC IMPACT

With the knowledge learned from Dr. Neal’s research, a general desire to better support older adults in the Holland/Zeeland area, and using the 8 domains of an age-friendly city as defined by the World Health Organization (outdoor spaces and buildings, transportation, housing, civic participation and employment, social participation, respect and social inclusion, communication and information and community support and health services), we determined and voted that the two most important areas of impact for Holland and Zeeland were transportation and housing. Given the recent developments of “Housing Next” (a collaborative effort to address affordable housing in Ottawa County), stakeholders decided to move forward with transportation as the primary focus for Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland.
With transportation as the top priority, we felt that additional research would be needed to understand the unique experiences and challenges older adults were facing. The ability to conduct such a robust study was made possible thanks to a large grant received by the Community Foundation of the Holland/Zeeland Area, combined with additional funding provided by the Macatawa Area Coordinating Council, Community Mental Health, Resthaven Care Community, Evergreen Commons, Macatawa Bank, and Senior Resources of West Michigan.

The Age-Friendly Transportation Study consisted of nine focus groups as well as a community-wide resident phone survey of adults 65 and older. Focus groups were conducted first by Community SPOKE over a one-month period and collected feedback from individuals who represented different demographics of older adults as well as individuals/agencies that serve older adults. These groups included:

- Adults of Latino descent.
- Adults in independent living settings.
- Adults with lower income.
- Adults with mobility/disability issues.
- Bus drivers.
- Family caregivers.
- Homebound/isolated adults.
- Senior care agencies.
- Senior residential providers.

The focus groups allowed for a deeper understanding of older adults’ experience with transportation. Lessons learned from these meetings also fed into the questions that were later asked in the resident phone survey.

Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland contracted with Dr. Marty Hill and VIP Research out of Chicago, IL to help design and complete the resident phone survey portion of the study. With roughly 13,000 adults 65+ in the greater Holland/Zeeland area, it was determined that a few hundred individuals 65+ would need to be surveyed to establish a sample size that would be representative of the community. This meant obtaining a 95% confidence level in the results. Also, because the numbers were dialed at random, the results of the study would be considered a truly “random sample” of the community rather than a targeted segment of the population. In total, 385 residents completed the phone survey.
Results of the Age-Friendly Transportation Study

**STUDY DEMOGRAPHICS**

- **AGE**
  - 65–69: 21%
  - 70–74: 20%
  - 75–79: 21%
  - 80–84: 16%
  - 90+: 8%

- **GENDER**
  - Male: 31%
  - Female: 69%

- **RACE/ETHNICITY**
  - 98% White/Caucasian
  - 2% Other

- **CITY OR TOWNSHIP**
  - City of Holland: 34%
  - Park Township: 18%
  - Holland Township: 17%
  - City of Zeeland: 10%
  - Port Sheldon, Olive or Blendon Township: 10%
  - Zeeland Township: 5%
  - Laketown: 4%
  - Fillmore: 2%
  - Other: 1%

**HOUSEHOLD INCOME**

- $75,000+: 13%
- $50,000–$75,000: 17%
- $35,000–$50,000: 20%
- $25,000–$35,000: 23%
- $15,000–$25,000: 17%
- Less than $15,000: 10%

**Note:** While the survey participants were dialed at random, it was disappointing that so few racial/ethnic minorities were reached or willing to complete the survey.

- **DIFFICULTY WITH TRANSPORTATION**

  **Do you have difficulties with transportation when you need it?**

  - 11% Some/Very/Extremely
  - 89% Not at All/Not Very

  Those with transportation difficulty are much more likely to: be female, live on less than $25,000 annual income, live in the City of Holland or City of Zeeland, have a disability, and live alone.

  **How do you overcome your transportation barriers?**

  - 70% Get a ride from family/friend
  - 14% MAX Transit
  - 8% Borrow family/friend car
  - 8% Other

  **Where would you travel to if you had better transportation options?**

  - Social outings, restaurants, Movies, parks, etc... 37%
  - Shopping, grocery store, or bank 33%
  - Medical appointments 28%
  - Family or friend’s house 26%
  - Religious services 22%

**Has a friend or family member ever taken off work to provide you transportation?**

- 75% No
- 25% Yes

**Note:** There is a very real workplace productivity loss because friends/family are the most consistent source of transportation for older adults.
**Driving Independence**

**Do You Drive?**
- 85% Yes
- 15% No

**Those Who Drive by Age**
- Ages 65–74: 92%
- Ages 75–84: 90%
- Ages 85+: 64%

Adults who do drive may not drive in certain conditions, such as:
- Weather
- Bad traffic
- At night
- Distance too far (i.e. Grand Rapids)

**If No Longer Able to Drive, I Will:**
- Rely on Public Transportation: 23%
- Rely on friends: 42%
- Rely on family: 80%

**Reasons to Keep Driving**
- Affordability (perceived)
- Independence
- Convenience

**If No, Why Not?**
- 46% Medical/Physical Condition
- 15% Lost Driver’s License
- 10% Other means (i.e. Family)
- 9% Can’t Afford
- 20% Other

**Max Transit**

**Have you ever ridden MAX?**
- 13% Yes
- 87% No

**Are you aware that adults 65+ Can ride MAX for free?**
- All: 37% Yes, 63% No
- With Disability: 29% Yes, 71% No
- No Disability: 40% Yes, 60% No

**Are you aware of Reserve-A-MAX (Door-to-door service)?**
- All: 64% Yes, 36% No
- Ages 65–84: 67% Yes, 33% No
- Ages 85+: 57% Yes, 43% No
- Less Than $25,000/yr: 59% Yes, 41% No
- More Than $50,000/yr: 64% Yes, 36% No

**Note:** Perhaps the strongest reason for not giving up driving based on focus groups is convenience. Not surprisingly, people want to have the ability to go someplace when they want to go.

**Note:** Focus groups confirmed that many older adults currently rely on or anticipate relying on family to meet their transportation needs.

**Note:** Being a low-cost transportation option, it is surprising that individuals with lower incomes are less aware of MAX’s door-to-door service.

**Note:** Being a low-cost transportation option, it is surprising that individuals with lower incomes are less aware of MAX’s door-to-door service.
POSITIVES
• MAX drivers received overwhelming praise!
• MAX is a great system, once you learn how to use it.
• MAX workers are helpful when they’re asked questions.

CHALLENGES
• Not convenient to schedule a day in advance for Reserve-a-MAX.
• Reserve-a-MAX pick up time varies (difficult when trying to make it to an appointment).
• Reserve-a-MAX can’t pick up people that live on dead-end streets.
• More shelters are needed at stops.
• Limited times are available.
• Doesn’t operate on Sunday.
• Stops are often too far from where people live (or from their final destination).
• Ice cream (and other groceries) can be a challenge to get home when in transit for a long period of time.

How likely are you to use MAX if you are no longer able to drive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely/Very/Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>57%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Very/Not at all Likely</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEMOGRAPHICS
of those who answered, “Nothing would get me to consider MAX”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>39%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$50,000+</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$50,000</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: It is again surprising to learn that households with less than $25,000 in income are less likely to ride MAX in the case that they can no longer drive, considering that MAX is a low-cost transportation service.

MAX TRANSIT (CONTINUED)

What would get you to consider using MAX?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>48%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stops closer to home</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More routes</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you ever taken a taxi in Holland/Zeeland?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

72% of those surveyed said they had excellent, very good, or good experiences with taxis.

Do you gather information, schedule events, or purchase products online?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>51%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you use your mobile phone for gathering information, scheduling, or purchasing products online?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>34%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

72% of those surveyed said they had excellent, very good, or good experiences with taxis.

Are you familiar with Uber?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>69%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Familiarity with Uber by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages 65–74</th>
<th>78%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ages 75–84</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 85+</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlikelihood of using Uber by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages 65–74</th>
<th>49%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ages 75–84</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 85+</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for not wanting to use Uber

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stranger Danger</th>
<th>51%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable w/App</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Familiar w/Uber</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Expensive</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAX TRANSIT (CONTINUED)

OTHER TRANSPORTATION

Would you use Uber?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>41%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlikelihood of using Uber by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages 65–74</th>
<th>49%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ages 75–84</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 85+</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for not wanting to use Uber

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stranger Danger</th>
<th>51%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable w/App</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Familiar with Uber</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Expensive</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDIVIDUALS WITH A DISABILITY

They are more likely to:

• NOT drive their own vehicle and to have ridden in family/friend vehicle or taken MAX transit in last month.
• Have had difficulty getting to medical appointments, pharmacy, dentist, grocery, friends or family.
• Rate MAX “Excellent or Very Good” than those without a disability.
• Feel comfortable with a stranger driving them (from the Uber question) than those without disability (38% compared to 54%).

Yes: 29%
No: 71%

IDEAS FOR IMPROVING TRANSPORTATION

• Advertise/communicate what is already available.
• Better routes for MAX.
• Decrease wait times for MAX.
• Extended hours for MAX.
• Expand MAX’s geography.
• More Shelters for MAX stops.
• Improve 2-day reserve time.
• Free rides for Disabled and Medicaid.
• More Information!

Age-friendly Survey

of Survey Respondents agree that Holland/Zeeland is an Age-Friendly Community

94%

Note: While we should never rest on our laurels, it is important to celebrate the incredible efforts that have been done in the past to help make Holland/Zeeland an Age-Friendly community!

COMMON REASONS SURVEY RESPONDENTS BELIEVE HOLLAND/ZEELAND IS AGE-FRIENDLY

• Retirement Communities
• Dutch Heritage
• Christian Values
• Lots of Activities
• Bus Service
• Discounts
• Medical Services Available
• Snow Melt
• Opportunities
• Evergreen Commons
• Senior Care Options
Common Challenges

These individuals represent common challenges that were shared in the focus groups. The names of the individuals are made up, but the situations are real.

GIVING UP DRIVING AT AN OLDER AGE

- Won’t give up driving even if questioning whether he should be at this point.
- He has always driven and can’t imagine not having that independence.
- So much of his daily routine is already decided for him. Driving is one of his last “controls” in life.

- Doesn’t want to give up driving but recognizes the dangers of continuing.
- Has made the decision to give up driving in six months.
- Spending this time researching alternative transportation options to prepare for the transition.

FAMILIAL CARING FOR OLDER PARENTS

Susan is a 63-year old woman and Barb is her 92-year old mother.

- Is supportive of her mother’s decision to give up driving.
- Loves her mother but is extremely stressed by having to drive her mother so frequently.
- Feels guilt when she tells her mother that she can’t drive her.

- Lives in a senior apartment complex.
- Gave up driving herself recently.
- Hard of hearing with some mobility issues.
- Doesn’t trust “strangers” to drive her anywhere.
- Expects Susan to drive her wherever she needs to go.

- She is 82, lives alone in a senior apartment in Holland and doesn’t drive due to a disability.
- She used to take the bus more but is not comfortable having to wait at the stop anymore without a bench to rest. In addition, she is not comfortable walking the distance from some of the bus stops to her final destination (especially when the weather is bad).
- She would like to visit family, friends, and go out to dinner more often but with limited income and limited transportation options, she mostly stays at home.

ISOLATION AMONG OLDER ADULTS

- She is 82, lives alone in a senior apartment in Holland and doesn’t drive due to a disability.
- She used to take the bus more but is not comfortable having to wait at the stop anymore without a bench to rest. In addition, she is not comfortable walking the distance from some of the bus stops to her final destination (especially when the weather is bad).
- She would like to visit family, friends, and go out to dinner more often but with limited income and limited transportation options, she mostly stays at home.
An overwhelming majority of older adults view Holland/Zeeland as an “age-friendly” community.

The majority of older adults in the Holland/Zeeland community don’t have difficulty obtaining transportation when they need it.

Individuals more vulnerable to transportation difficulties tend to be of lower-income, disabled, female and/or live alone.

Most older adults continue to drive their own vehicles including the majority of adults 85+ years old.

Convenience and independence are the two biggest considerations for older adults when contemplating giving up driving their own vehicles.

The upcoming generation of adults (65 – 74) are more tech-savvy, aware of existing transportation options, and more comfortable with using new transportation models like Uber.

There is a high expectation on the part of older-adults that family (and friends) will meet their future transportation needs. AND… providing transportation can place incredible stress on caregivers.

While there are opportunities to improve service in some areas, MAX Transit provides high-quality service to those who ride regularly.

There is a clear lack of knowledge about the current transportation options that exist in the greater Holland/Zeeland area (especially regarding MAX Transit).

While transportation isn’t difficult for the majority of older adults to access, improved transportation options for those who do have difficulty would greatly increase their quality of life.

1. FAMILY TRANSPORTATION
   Older adults with transportation needs do and will continue to expect family (and friends) to be their transportation solution. While time spent with loved ones is often cherished, the expectation of being the primary transportation option can create personal stress for caregivers, produce stress on the relationship, and lead to lost workplace productivity if caregivers are taking time off of work to meet these transportation needs.

2. UNAWARE OF TRANSPORTATION
   Adults in the Holland/Zeeland community are largely unaware of the current transportation options that are available to them (especially the services provided by MAX Transit).

3. TRANSPORTATION GAPS
   There are gaps in the existing transportation landscape of options including:
   a. Geographic areas and times of day/week not covered by public transportation.
   b. Transportation that accommodates various mobility needs.
   c. A low-cost, on-demand service.
For perspective, 11% of older adults or roughly 1,400 individuals in the Holland/Zeeland area expressed difficulties with transportation based on the resident survey. In addition to this figure, many of the Age-Friendly stakeholders felt that the real number of individuals struggling to meet their transportation needs is higher based on the fact that 70% of older adults rely on family and friends for transportation. Because friends or family are meeting their needs, they may not feel that they are challenged by transportation issues.

With this conclusion, the stakeholders of Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland made the decision to explore strategies that would improve transportation opportunities for a smaller population of those struggling rather than look for wide-scale systems-level changes.

The vision for age-friendly transportation in Holland/Zeeland is affordable, accessible, convenient, and safe transportation for all older adults in the greater Holland/Zeeland area.

The results of the resident phone survey didn’t demonstrate a clear need for there to be a widespread community response to improve transportation options for older adults. However, based on input from the focus groups and comments from those who did express difficulty in the resident survey, it is clear that transportation is a major inhibitor to quality of life for those that do have difficulty obtaining transportation.

Our Direction

Recommended Strategies for Improving Transportation Options

Based on the decision to look for solutions for only a targeted subset of the older adult population that struggles with transportation, several strategies were recommended to be researched and potentially implemented. The hope is that the larger community would use the data collected as well as these ideas to begin to implement change.

Transportation Guide

Create a “Transportation Guide” that highlights the current transportation options available to older adults in the Holland/Zeeland community.

Research

Online research and phone interviews were conducted into all existing local transportation options.

Summary Finding 1

A detailed Holland/Zeeland Transportation Guide for Older Adults was created and can be found in Appendix B of this report. This guide was created to help organizations and individuals serving older adults as an internal resource to better direct their clients/customers. The guide includes a full list of options available, including descriptions and cost of each option, hours, mobility accommodations, service eligibility, geographic reach, pros and cons of the service, and other details. This guide has been distributed to all agencies involved in the Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland effort as well as additional agencies identified as serving an older adult population. Given the level of detail included in this guide it was determined that it best be used as an internal resource vs. a public-facing resource. It is recommended that this document be updated on a periodic basis to maintain accuracy.
SUMMARY FINDING 2
The recognized need for a “transportation guide” led to the opportunity to provide local input into the updating of Lakeshore Ridelink (which is both an online and printed resource outlining various transportation options in Ottawa County). A small group of representatives met with Pioneer Resources (who maintains the site) to share ideas for how best to illustrate the transportation options available. While the Holland/Zeeland Transportation Guide for Older Adults is a good document for internal use, Lakeshore Ridelink serves as a complementary external-facing resource. For more information regarding Lakeshore Ridelink, view Appendix C or visit the website http://lakeshoreridelink.org.

RESEARCH
A “Think Tank” was convened to discuss ideas for how best to communicate the existing transportation landscape to older adults and family caregivers.

SUMMARY FINDING 1
Out of “Think Tank” discussions came the recommendation to create a space for senior agencies to come together and learn about each other’s programs. This would help experts working in older adults’ services to stay up to date on resources available. This idea is worth further discussion while also recognizing that at an administrative level this might be challenging given the level of competition between some adult service organizations. Nevertheless, at a clinical level this concept might have merit and should be considered further.

SUMMARY FINDING 2
Out of the “Think Tank” discussions came the recommendation to explore the concept of a “Centralized Phone Intake” for all transportation needs. Having a single source for transportation options would prevent agencies from having to consistently be learning about what options exist in the community and allow them (and older adults themselves) to simply reach out to one resource. This concept had been suggested previously in other age-friendly discussions and will be further explained in the next recommendation.

RESEARCH
Interviews were conducted with several of the area’s senior residential providers to learn how their current vehicles are being used to meet the needs of their clients and to gauge

COMMUNICATION
Identify a strategy for how to better communicate the existing transportation options to older adults AND family caregivers.

TRANSPORTATION CONNECTIONS
Explore the concept of a “Centralized Phone Intake” that could connect older adults with their unique transportation needs.

RESEARCH
Research was conducted into centralized phone intake models around the country including interviews with Ridelink in Grand Rapids, MI and Ryde4Life in the state of New Jersey. Both of these models serve as a backbone service to connect riders with a number of local transportation options based on the caller’s needs.

SUMMARY FINDING
While there is lots of interest from the Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland stakeholders, ultimately two factors will serve as a challenge to replicating a similar model in Holland/Zeeland:

a. Unlike Ridelink in Grand Rapids and Ryde4Life in New Jersey, Holland/Zeeland doesn’t have a dedicated Senior Millage or available public-sector funding that could be allocated to operate such a service. In addition, based on the results of the Age-Friendly Transportation Study, it would likely be difficult to build a case to obtain such financial resources.

b. Holland/Zeeland doesn’t have enough “gap-filling” transportation options that could be used in conjunction with the local public transportation system (MAX). In the Grand Rapids and New Jersey models there are multiple transportation options (such as Uber or transportation-focused nonprofit agencies) that the operator can coordinate on behalf of a caller. Simply put, a centralized in-take in Holland/Zeeland wouldn’t have enough options to direct an older adult to in the case of a need.

COLLABORATE
Look for ways in which “Senior Residential Providers” can collaborate to provide transportation for their residents.
interest in a potential shared model of vehicles/drivers. The results of the interviews were mixed with some agencies interested in exploring further while others were content with their current model for meeting clients’ needs. It was learned that offering transportation to residents is largely seen as a competitive advantage by most providers.

SUMMARY FINDING
Further exploration of this concept revealed that there would likely be too many liability and insurance challenges for agencies to share vehicles/drivers beyond servicing their current clientele. This fact combined with the current competitive advantage senior residential providers have in being able to offer transportation directly to their clientele makes this strategy an unlikely reality. Ultimately, the potential cost of such an option outweighs the potential benefit.

GO LUX
Investigate Hope Network’s “Go LUX” model in Grand Rapids as a potential expansion to Holland/Zeeland.

RESEARCH
Go LUX was launched in 2017 as a senior-specific transportation service that provides on-demand, curbside, concierge service for a price similar to paying for an Uber. The advantage of Go LUX is the personalized service that caters specifically to older adults including accommodations for disability/mobility concerns. More information can be found at Ridegolux.com.

SUMMARY FINDING
The Go LUX model is off to a great start with high-demand in the Grand Rapids area in its first year. Being a new model, Hope Network is not currently looking to expand geographically but is open to doing so in the future. This model, if proven successful, could be a great expansion program for the Holland/Zeeland area in the future and would likely be welcomed by individuals and organizations involved in Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland.

RESEARCH
With shared-ride models becoming increasingly popular, Uber is now operating in the Holland/Zeeland area, and after learning of unique Uber/Lyft partnerships in other communities to meet local transportation needs, it was recommended that Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland have a conversation with these companies to explore potential partnerships here. In having conversations with these companies, it was learned that they have very lean infrastructures including not having dedicated administrative support to our region. It became clear that discussing potential partnerships in such a small region was not among their priorities.

SUMMARY FINDING
While there are some promising partnership models in other communities (particularly with Lyft partnering with healthcare institutions in larger communities), it would appear that a community of our size and demand is not well positioned to broker such a partnership. It will likely just take time for these shared-ride models to build a more robust presence here first before more unique partnership models can be explored.

UBER/LYFT
Invite Uber/Lyft to come speak to our group and explore options where we may partner.
RESEARCH
This recommendation came from a belief that there are several church-owned buses that sit idle frequently throughout the week and could be further utilized to accommodate other populations like older adults. Several local churches were interviewed to determine what if any vehicles were owned by the church and how they were used (frequency/purpose).

SUMMARY FINDING
First, it was learned that fewer churches own buses than previously expected. Second, those churches that did own buses didn’t have ones that were equipped to accommodate an older adult population with potential mobility/disability needs. Therefore, it appears that there is little opportunity to take advantage of this concept.

Other Strategies
In addition to the strategies listed above, other research was conducted to learn more about how other communities were tackling this issue. It is important to note that there are several technology-based platform solutions such as “Go-Go Grandparent” that are providing market-based solutions to the challenges our older adult population is facing all around the country. Similar to the conclusion around Hope Network’s Go LUX model, some of these strategies may become viable solutions for Holland/Zeeland in the future as these companies and products expand their geographic reach. While we recognize that this doesn’t necessarily help people today, we are confident that we will have better solutions available to us in the not-too-distant future. In addition, market-based solutions like Shipt and other models for having groceries and medications delivered to one’s home will help alleviate some of the transportation pressures currently experienced by older adults.

Conclusion
With the completion of the Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland Transportation Study and follow up planning, there are several ways in which this report and the conclusions from this report can be used to better the community:

1. The World Health Organization’s “Checklist of Essential Features of Age-Friendly Cities” should be used by municipalities and agencies that advocate on behalf of older adults for strategic planning purposes as they make decisions about the future of the Holland/Zeeland region. This checklist can be found in Appendix A.

2. The results of the Age-Friendly Transportation Study should be used as a planning resource for municipalities, public transit, and other agencies that serve older adults needs.

3. The recommended strategies, along with the research and summary findings from each, should be considered in future community planning around improving transportation options for older adults.

4. The Holland/Zeeland Transportation Guide should be used as an internal resource for individuals and agencies looking to refer older adult clients to local transportation options (found in Appendix B).

5. Lakeshore Ridelink should be referenced directly to older adults for their use in identifying local transportation options. This can be found in Appendix C.

One of the ultimate conclusions from the transportation study and subsequent planning is that many of the solutions that we hoped for are either already here and in need of expansion or are likely coming soon and just need time. An ever-expanding and improving public transportation system, combined with new innovative models including personalized services like Go LUX, technology-based solutions like “Go-Go Grandparent,” shared-ride services like Uber/Lyft, grocery-delivery services like “Shipt,” or even the not-so-unrealistic future of driverless cars, all provide hope that many of our existing needs will be met as these options grow and expand into our region. While we will continue to strive to help the people in need today, we are confident that many of these new innovative models will greatly benefit older adults in the Holland/Zeeland area in the not-too-distant future.

We hope that you found this report to be informative and useful. Thank you to all who have taken part in this effort!

Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland
Who is Involved

The Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland effort has been a collaborative effort through and through. Community SPOKE, a local nonprofit organization, has served as the central coordinator of the effort while multiple other organizations have provided leadership to the effort as described below.

AGE-FRIENDLY HOLLAND/ZEELAND DESIGN TEAM
The following individuals helped to orchestrate the initial design of Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland and coordinate the kickoff event.

• Patrick Cisler – Community SPOKE
• Robin Lane – Community SPOKE
• Charlie Vander Broek - Resthaven Care Community
• Dave Knibbe - Evergreen Commons
• Pam Curtis - Senior Resources of West Michigan

AGE-FRIENDLY TRANSPORTATION STEERING COMMITTEE:
The following individuals made up the leadership team that oversaw the design of the Age-Friendly Transportation Study and the follow-up planning as a result of that study.

• Beth Higgs – MAX Transit
• Bruce Adair – Lakeshore Advantage
• Charlie Vander Broek – Resthaven Care Community
• Dave Knibbe – Evergreen Commons
• Jeff Zylstra – Providence Life Services
• Lisa Uganski – Dept. of Public Health / Ottawa Food
• Lynne Doyle – Community Mental Health
• Pam Curtis – Senior Resources of West Michigan
• Patrick Cisler – Community SPOKE
• Phil Meyer – Riverview Group
• Robin Lane – Community SPOKE
• Steve Bulthuis – Macatawa Area Coordinating Council (MACC)
• Todd Whiteman – Disability Network Lakeshore

AGE-FRIENDLY HOLLAND/ZEELAND STAKEHOLDERS
In addition to several community members, individuals representing the following entities have engaged in the Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland initiative in some capacity:

• American House
• Appledorn Assisted Living
• City of Holland
• City of Zeeland
• Community Foundation of the Holland/Zeeland Area
• Community Mental Health
• County of Ottawa
• Department of Health & Human Services
• Disability Network Lakeshore
• Evergreen Commons
• Fellowship Reformed Church
• Freedom Village
• Greater Ottawa County United Way
• Herman Miller
• Holland Deacons’ Conference
• Holland Rescue Mission
• Hope Network
• Lakeshore Advantage
• Lakeshore Habitat for Humanity
• Life Circles PACE
• Macatawa Area Coordinating Council
• Macatawa Resource Center
• MAX Transit
• Ottawa County Public Health Department
• Outdoor Discovery Center
• Park Township
• Pioneer Resources
• Providence Life Services
• Resthaven Care Community
• Riverview Group
• Senior Resources of West Michigan
• The Insurance Group
• Watershed Strategies
• West Coast Chamber of Commerce

AGE-FRIENDLY HOLLAND/ZEELAND SPONSORS
The following organizations provided funding to make the Age-Friendly Holland/Zeeland initiative and specifically the Age-Friendly Transportation Study possible.

CONTACT INFORMATION
Download the electronic report at seniorresourceswmi.org/resources.

For more information regarding age-friendly, please contact agefriendlyhz@srwmi.org.
Appendix A

Checklist of Essential Features of Age-friendly Cities

This checklist of essential age-friendly city features is based on the results of the WHO Global Age-Friendly Cities project consultation in 31 cities in 22 countries. The checklist is a tool for city self-assessment and a map for charting progress. More detailed checklists of age-friendly city features are to be found in the WHO Global Age-Friendly Cities Guide.

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

Outdoor spaces and buildings
☐ Public areas are clean and pleasant.
☐ Green spaces and outdoor seating are sufficient in number, well-maintained and accessible to persons with disabilities.
☐ Pavements are well-maintained, free of obstructions and reserved for pedestrians.
☐ Pavements are non-slip, are wide enough for wheelchairs and have dropped curbs to facilitate access.

Pedestrian crossings are sufficient in number and safe for people with different levels and types of disability, with non-slip markings, visual and audible cues and adequate crossing times.
☐ Drivers give way to pedestrians at intersections and pedestrian crossings.

Cycle paths are separate from pavements and other pedestrian walkways.
☐ Outdoor safety is promoted by good street lighting, police patrols and community education.
☐ Services are situated together and are accessible.
☐ Special customer service arrangements are provided, such as separate queues or service counter spaces for older people.
☐ Buildings are well-signed outside and inside, with sufficient seating and toilet, accessible elevators, ramps and rails, and non-slip floors.
☐ Public toilets outdoors and indoors are sufficient in number, clean, well-maintained and accessible.

Transportation
☐ Public transportation costs are consistent, clearly displayed and affordable.
☐ Public transportation is reliable and frequent, including at night and on weekends and holidays.
☐ All city areas and services are accessible by public transport, with good connections and well-marked routes and vehicles.
☐ Vehicles are clean, well-maintained, accessible, non-overloaded and have priority seating that is respected.
☐ Specialized transportation is available for disabled people.
☐ Drivers stop at designated stops and heed the curb to facilitate boarding and wait for passengers to be seated before driving off.
☐ Transport stops and stations are conveniently located, accessible, safe, clean, well-lit and well-marked, with adequate seating and shelter.
☐ Complete and accessible information is provided to users about routes, schedules and special needs facilities.
☐ A voluntary transport service is available where public transportation is too limited.
☐ Taxis are accessible and affordable, and drivers are courteous and helpful.
☐ Roads are well-maintained, with covered drains and good lighting.
☐ Traffic flow is well-regulated.
☐ Busways are free of obstructions that block drivers’ vision.

Traffic signs and intersections are visible and well-placed.
☐ Driver education and other courses are promoted for all drivers.
☐ Parking and drop-off areas are safe, sufficient in number and conveniently located.
☐ Priority parking and drop-off spots for people with special needs are available and respected.

Housing
☐ Sufficient, affordable housing is available in areas that are safe and close to services and the rest of the community.
☐ Sufficient and affordable home maintenance and support services are available.
☐ Housing is well-constructed and provides safe and comfortable shelter from the weather.
☐ Interior spaces and level surfaces allow freedom of movement in all rooms and passageways.
☐ Home modification options and supplies are available and affordable, and providers understand the needs of older people.
☐ Public and commercial rental housing is clean, well-maintained and safe.
☐ Sufficient and affordable housing for frail and disabled older people, with appropriate services, is provided locally.

Social participation
☐ Venues for events and activities are conveniently located, accessible, well-lit and well-marked, with adequate seating and shelter.
☐ Complete and accessible information is provided to users about venues, schedules and special needs facilities.
☐ A voluntary transport service is available where public transportation is too limited.
☐ Taxis are accessible and affordable, and drivers are courteous and helpful.
☐ Roads are well-maintained, with covered drains and good lighting.
☐ Traffic flow is well-regulated.
☐ Busways are free of obstructions that block drivers’ vision.

Traffic signs and intersections are visible and well-placed.
☐ Driver education and other courses are promoted for all drivers.
☐ Parking and drop-off areas are safe, sufficient in number and conveniently located.
☐ Priority parking and drop-off spots for people with special needs are available and respected.

Community-wide settings, activities and events attract all generations by accommodating age-specific needs and preferences.
☐ Older people are specifically included in community activities for “familial”.
☐ Schools provide opportunities to learn about aging and older people, and involve older people in school activities.
☐ Older people are recognized by the community for their past as well as their present contributions.
☐ Older people who are low well off have good access to public, voluntary and private services.

Civic participation and employment
☐ A range of flexible options for older volunteers is available, with training, recognition, guidance and compensation for personal costs.
☐ The qualities of older employees are well-promoted.
☐ A range of flexible and appropriately opportunities for older people to work is promoted.
☐ Discrimination on the basis of age alone is forbidden in the hiring, retention, promotion and training of employees.
☐ Workplaces are adapted to meet the needs of disabled people.
☐ Self-employment options for older people are promoted and supported.
☐ Training in post-retirement options is provided for older workers.
☐ Decision-making bodies in public, private and voluntary sectors encourage and facilitate membership of older people.

Communication and information
☐ A basic, effective communication system reaches community residents of all ages.
☐ Regular and widespread distribution of information is assured and a coordinated, centralized access is provided.
☐ Regular information and broadcasts of interest to older people are offered.
☐ Oral communication accessible to older people is promoted.
☐ People at risk of social isolation get one-to-one information from trusted individuals.
☐ Public and commercial services provide friendly, person-to-person service on request.

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

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

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

Electronic equipment, such as mobile telephones, radio, television, and bank and ticket machines, have large buttons and big lettering.

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

Community and health services
☐ An adequate range of health and community support services is offered for prevent ing, maintaining and restoring health.
☐ Home care services include health and personal care and housekeeping.
☐ Health and social services are conveniently located and accessible by all means of transport.
☐ Residential care facilities and designated older people’s housing are located close to services and the rest of the community.
☐ Health and community service facilities are safely constructed and fully accessible.
☐ Clear and accessible information is provided about health and social services for older people.
☐ Delivery of services is coordinated and administratively simple.
☐ All staff are respectful, helpful and trained to serve older people.
☐ Economic barriers impeding access to health and community support services are minimized.
☐ Voluntary services by people of all ages are encouraged and supported.
☐ There are sufficient and accessible burial sites.
☐ Community emergency planning takes into account the vulnerabilities and capacities of older people.
### Appendix B

#### Coach Service

- **Purpose**: Offers transportation services for the elderly, disabled, and medical patients from Holland/Zeeland area to area destinations.
- **Description**: Provided in coaches with limited seating. Max Route Service cannot be scheduled, requires 48-hour notice.
- **Coverage**: Small radius of Grand Rapids.
- **Cost**: Includes, but is not limited to wheelchair, seniors, and medical patients. Booking requires 48-hours notice. Charges may apply if destinations are outside the service area. Services are available in the morning, afternoon, evening, and night.

#### Regional Transportation for Health Care Associates (HCAT)

- **Purpose**: Provides transportation for medical appointments, planned and emergency transportation, shopping, appointments, and seniors in Allegan Counties.
- **Description**: Services are room-to-room transportation.
- **Coverage**: Michigan, hypothesizes, and Allegan Counties.
- **Cost**: Combined wheelchair and mobility assistance.

#### GOOD SAMARITAN MEDICAL TRANSPORT

- **Purpose**: Provides medical transportation for Medicare Cardholders, ADA Cardholders, people 70 years or older, and those whose origins and/or destinations that are farther than ½ mile.
- **Description**: Offers wheelchair and ambulatory transportation.
- **Coverage**: Transportation services to the elderly and people with disabilities.
- **Cost**: Inexpensive, faster than route bus, will walk you to/from the door, and can supply vehicles.

#### FAMILY FARES

- **Purpose**: Provides transportation services for all residents of the Macatawa Area with transportation services.
- **Description**: Services are room-to-room transportation.
- **Coverage**: Transportation services to the elderly and people with disabilities.
- **Cost**: Inexpensive, faster than route bus, will walk you to/from the door, and can supply vehicles.

#### Mass Transit Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>Free (Age Under 5, 65+, ADA Cardholders, Medicare Cardholders), $.50 (Age 5-17), $1 (Age 18-24), $3 (Age 25+).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door to Door</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>$4 - $10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>Free - $2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Route</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>$65 plus $2.50 per loaded mile for a one way trip. Nights and Weekends: 6AM – 5PM): $60 plus $2.50 per loaded mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides on Demand</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>$30/hr wait fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>$3.25/mi wheelchair van, $3.25/mi car, $3.50/mi taxi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TRIP EXAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>Free (Age Under 5, 65+, ADA Cardholders, Medicare Cardholders), $.50 (Age 5-17), $1 (Age 18-24), $3 (Age 25+).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door to Door</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>$4 - $10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>Free - $2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Route</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>$65 plus $2.50 per loaded mile for a one way trip. Nights and Weekends: 6AM – 5PM): $60 plus $2.50 per loaded mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides on Demand</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>$30/hr wait fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>$3.25/mi wheelchair van, $3.25/mi car, $3.50/mi taxi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>Free (Age Under 5, 65+, ADA Cardholders, Medicare Cardholders), $.50 (Age 5-17), $1 (Age 18-24), $3 (Age 25+).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door to Door</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>$4 - $10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>Free - $2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Route</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>$65 plus $2.50 per loaded mile for a one way trip. Nights and Weekends: 6AM – 5PM): $60 plus $2.50 per loaded mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides on Demand</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>$30/hr wait fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>General transportation</td>
<td>$3.25/mi wheelchair van, $3.25/mi car, $3.50/mi taxi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Full Transportation Guide can be accessed by emailing agefriendlyhz@srwmi.org
ENDNOTES


Download the electronic report at seniorresourceswmi.org/resources.
For more information regarding age-friendly, please contact agefriendlyhz@srwmi.org.