California Senior Center Infrastructure Survey

Summary Report
2009

Prepared for:

Congress of California Seniors
1230 N Street, #201
Sacramento, Ca. 95814
800-543-3352
www.seniors.org

California Commission on Aging
1300 National Drive, Suite 173
Sacramento, Ca. 95834
916-419-7591
www.CCoA.ca.gov

Prepared by:
Chris Martinek Consulting
P.O. Box 1014, Eureka, Ca. 95501
(707)444-1336
chrismartinek@suddenlink.net

California Senior Center Infrastructure Survey
Summary Report
2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

California Senior Center Infrastructure Survey
Summary Report 2009

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It has been 25 years since the California Senior Center Bond Act of 1984. The Congress of California Seniors together with the California Commission on Aging conducted a survey to assess the infrastructure needs of California's senior centers with a focus on current needs and the growing number of seniors. Topics covered in the survey were: senior center demographics; building/facility information; current services provided; capacity of the facilities; the centers' preparedness for natural disasters; the centers' telecommunications; facilities' accessibility, maintenance, and energy utilization. The results of the survey will be used to examine the need for a Senior Center Bond Initiative.

The study consisted of a six page paper-based survey mailed out to approximately 774 senior centers across California. Three hundred and ninety-eight surveys were received. A response rate of 51.4% was achieved. Surveys were received representing all 57 counties in California with multipurpose senior centers. Nearly all counties had a response rate of forty percent or above.

The senior centers that responded to the survey had been providing services to seniors an average of 25.5 years. The centers were primarily multipurpose senior centers (83.4%), followed by centers that provide nutrition programs and activity/socialization/exercise/ education programs (10.8%), and 5.8% of the responding centers provide activity/ socialization/exercise/education programs. Senior centers were primarily nonprofit agencies (50.3%). The second most common business structure was city government at 38.7%, followed by county government at 7.5%. Responding senior centers had an average of 8.75 paid employees and a range between no paid employees and 180 paid employees. These centers indicated having a mean of 73.5 volunteers .The annual number of volunteer hours donated to these centers ranged between zero and 500,000 hours, with a mean of 10,323.9 volunteer hours per center.

The centers indicated an annual operating budget between zero and $54,000,000, with an average budget of $1,009,845. Respondents were asked about their center's budget changes over the past five years when compared to costs and demands for services. Just over a quarter indicated an increase, 36.9% indicated they had kept pace, 42.5% indicated a decline, and 5.3% did not respond to the question. Forty eight percent of respondents have had to lay off staff or reduce key services over the past five years. Ninety respondents indicated their centers (22.6%) are in danger of being closed. The primary reason was decreased funding (86 respondents or 21.6%).

The majority of centers (70.6%) have one site/location where they provide services, while the average number of sites per agency is 2.43. Surveys were received on a total of 416 sites for the 398 agencies. Nearly sixty percent of the centers own the building where their services are provided.

Survey respondents were asked about the services provided at each facility and asked to check off the services provided from a list. The top five services provide by the vast majority of the centers are: activities/socialization, information & referral/assistance, meal programs, fitness/exercise/wellness classes, and education/instruction classes.

Respondents were asked if their centers were in areas that had experienced significant natural disasters. Earthquakes were indicated by 53.6%, fires were indicated by 29.3% and 13.5% indicated floods. Respondents were asked if their facility had undergone an earthquake retrofit; 60.3% indicted it had not.

Respondents were asked about their center's telecommunications equipment. Forty percent indicated they did not have sufficient computers for their staff and volunteers. Nearly eight percent of centers indicated they did not have internet access to any of their computers and 15.6% had internet access to most. Over half of the centers (53.1%) indicated they have computers available for seniors to use and over half of these indicated they do not have enough computers.

Major deferred maintenance on buildings was indicated by 20.7% of respondents, 23.8% indicated having minor deferred maintenance. Nearly eight percent indicated there are safety issues with the buildings as a result of deferred maintenance. These safety issues included: roof leaks or needs replacing, exterior stairs hazardous, loose tiles in walkways, ceiling sagging, windows do not function properly, not ADA compliant, parking lot a walking hazard, termite rot, tree roots breaking up path or parking lot, and mold problems. ADA accessible entrances are available in 93.5% of the senior centers and 91.1% of centers have ADA accessible bathrooms. Building parking lots are considered accessible in 89.4% of the locations.

Respondents indicated when they had their most recent energy audit, with 29.9% having had one within the past ten years (nearly all of those within the past four years). Double pane windows are installed in all windows at 24.5% of facilities, while 6.3% have more than half of their windows with double pane, 3.8% have less than half with double pane, 53.8% do not have any double pane windows, and 11.6% did not know or did not respond. Twenty three percent indicated their building is not adequately weatherized and insulated. Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) units were first installed for 23.3% of the centers prior to 1990, 12.7% were first installed during the 1990s, and 21.9% were installed within the past nine years, the remaining respondents were unsure or did not indicated a year of first installment. Of the 416 center facilities 1.9% indicated having the HVAC replaced between 1980 and 1999, 14.5% had it replaced in the past nine years and the remaining respondents indicated never, they were unsure, or did not respond.

California Senior Center Infrastructure Survey
Summary Report 2009

Background

It has been 25 years since the California Senior Center Bond Act of 1984. The Congress of California Seniors together with the California Commission on Aging conducted a survey to assess the infrastructure needs of California's senior centers with a focus on current needs and the growing number of seniors. The results of the survey will be used to examine the need for a Senior Center Bond Initiative.

Design

The study consisted of a six page paper-based survey mailed out to approximately 774 senior centers across California. The survey included a cover letter, survey questionnaire, and self-addressed stamped return envelope. The cover letter explained what the survey was about, what it was attempting to accomplish, and how respondents were to proceed with the attached items. Although the survey was not intended to be anonymous, respondents' confidentiality of individual responses was assured. To encourage senior centers to respond, pre-notification emails were sent out to over 400 senior centers. Postcards and email reminder notices were sent to all centers whose physical or email address was known.

The design of the survey was created by Congress of California Seniors staff, California Commission on Aging staff, Chris Martinek Consulting, and active participation from the Senior Center Initiative Advisory Panel members. Topics covered in the survey were: senior center demographics; building/facility information; current services provided; capacity of the facilities; the centers' preparedness for natural disasters; the centers' telecommunications; facilities' accessibility, maintenance, and energy utilization.

Intent

The survey was intended to provide first-hand information on the infrastructure needs of California's senior centers. Additionally, the summary report will be used to gain background and momentum for a Senior Center Bond Initiative. The information gathered was tallied and analyzed by Chris Martinek Consulting.

Distribution

A list of senior centers was created by the Congress of California Seniors and the California Commission on Aging with assistance from the state associations of senior centers and Area Agency on Aging offices. After address corrections, notification of new or additional senior centers, as well as those senior centers that had closed, a total of 774 active senior centers were contacted for this project.

The distribution of surveys began in late April 2009. In an effort to have a response rate at or above fifty percent, reminder notices via email and U.S. Postal Services were sent out in mid-May and early June. Phone call reminders were made and email reminders were sent during June, July, and August by Congress of California Seniors staff, California Commission on Aging staff, Area Agency on Aging staff, and Senior Center Initiative Advisory Panel members to centers that had not responded. Surveys were received from late April through September 2009.

Respondents

Approximately 774 surveys were successfully distributed to senior centers across California, through the U.S. Postal Service and email. Three hundred and ninety-eight surveys were received. All 398 surveys were completed sufficiently to be considered valid. A response rate of 51.4% was achieved. Surveys were received representing all 57 counties in California with multipurpose senior centers. Nearly all counties had a response rate of forty percent or above. Surveys were entered into a database and analyzed for this report. All surveys received by September 30, 2009 were included in the database analyzed.

Senior Centers Demographic Characteristics

The senior centers that responded to the survey had been providing services to seniors between zero (just opening their doors) to 101 years; with an average of 25.5 years and a median of 26.0 years. Just over half of the centers had been open between 21 and 50 years. Senior centers were primarily nonprofit agencies (50.3%). The second most common business structure was city government at 38.7%, followed by county government at 7.5%. Other business structure was selected by 3.0% of the respondents and included: special districts, combinations of city and county governments, tribal governments, support from cities, local government agencies, senior clubs, and a school. The centers were primarily multipurpose senior centers (83.4%), followed by centers that provide nutrition programs and activity/socialization/exercise/education programs (10.8%). Finally, 5.8% of the responding centers provide activity/socialization/exercise/education programs.

Responding senior centers had an average of 8.75 paid employees (median 4 employees) and a range between no paid employees and 180 paid employees. These centers indicated having between zero and 1,200 volunteers, with a mean of 73.5 volunteers and a median of 30 volunteers. Nearly half of responding centers have less than 40 volunteers. The annual number of volunteer hours donated to these centers ranged between zero and 500,000 hours, with a mean of 10,323.9 hours and a median of 4,000 hours. Approximately thirty percent of these centers have over 5,000 hours donated by their volunteers annually.

The senior center demographic composition of the survey respondents is shown below in Table 1. There were a total of 398 survey respondents.

Table 1. Demographic Composition of Survey Respondents

Demographic Category	# (%) Survey Respondents
Number of years providing services to seniors: Range of years 0 to 101	Average 25.5 years
0-10 years	44 (11.1%)
11-20 years	95 (23.9%)
21-50 years	200 (50.3%)
Over 50 years	13 (3.3%)
Unknown/Don't Know or No Response	46 (11.6%)
Centers' classification:	
Nonprofit Agency	200 (50.3%)
City Government	154 (38.7%)
County Government	30 (7.5%)
Other	12 (3.0%)
For-Profit Business	2 (0.5%)
No Response	0 (0%)
Number of Paid Employees Range 0 to 180 employees	Average 8.75 employees
None	25 (6.3%)
1-5 employees	203 (51.0%)
6-10 employees	82 (20.6%)
11-25 employees	48 (12.1%)
Over 25 employees	27 (6.8%)
No Response	13 (3.3%)
Number of volunteers: Range 0 to 1,200 volunteers	Average 73.5 volunteers
No volunteers	10 (2.5%)
1-10 volunteers	90 (22.6%)
11-40 volunteers	107 (26.9%)
41-100 volunteers	81 (20.4%)
Over 100 volunteers	81 (20.4%)
Unknown/Don't Know or No Response	29 (7.3%)
Annual Number of Volunteer Hours: Range 0 to 500,000 volunteer hours	Average 10,323.9 volunteer hours
None – 500 hours	46 (11.6%)
501 – 1,000 hours	23 (5.8%)
1,001 – 5,000 hours	102 (25.6%)
5,001 – 10,000 hours	49 (12.3%)
Over 10,000 hours	78 (19.6%)
Unknown/Don't Know or No Response	100 (25.2%)

The senior centers participating in the survey have a variety of funding sources. Nearly all centers had more than one funding source and most centers had three or more funding sources. Below is the list of the funding sources and the percent of centers who indicated receiving some funding from the source:

City Government	58.0%
Individual Donations or Gifts	57.3%
Participant or Activity Fees	47.5%
Foundations or Grants	42.0%
County Government	34.9%
State Government	27.9%
Building Rental Fees	27.6%
Federal Government	26.1%
Other	20.1%

Those respondents that selected the "Other" category for funding were able to write in that other funding source. The other funding sources that did not fit into the above categories included: fundraisers (including sponsors at events), thrift stores, bingo, account interest, agency reserves, local tribal funds, property taxes, local casinos, service clubs, and redevelopment funds.

The centers indicated an annual operating budget between zero and $54,000,000, with an average budget of $1,009,845. Forty-five percent of centers had an annual budget of $500,000 or less and approximately 25% of centers had a budget over $500,000, with the remaining 30% of respondents did not respond to the question or did not know their annual budget.

Respondents were asked about their center's budget changes over the past five years when compared to costs and demands for services. Just over a quarter indicated an increase, 26.9% indicated they had kept pace, 42.5% indicated a decline, and 5.3% did not respond to the question. Forty eight percent of respondents have had to lay off staff or reduce key services over the past five years. Ninety respondents indicated their centers (22.6%) are in danger of being closed. Many respondents indicated reasons that their center might close. The primary reason was decreased funding (86 respondents or 21.6%). Ten respondents (2.5%) indicated that deferred maintenance was the primary reason for possible center closure. Other reasons indicated by 26 respondents (6.6%) included: city/state budget, current economy/donations down, unstable/uncertain funding, building demolition, and center's budget shortfall.

A summary of this information is shown on the following page in Table 2. There were a total of 398 survey respondents.

Table 2. Demographic Composition of Survey Respondents (Continued)

Demographic Category	# (%) Survey Respondents
Center Annual Operating Budget: Range $0 to $54,000,000	Average $1,009,845
$0 - $1,000	3 (0.8%)
$1, 1 - $50,000	35 (8.8%)
$50,001 - $200,000	63 (15.8%)
$200,001 – $500,000	78 (19.6%)
$500,001 - $1,000,000	62 (15.6%)
Over $1,000,000	38 (9.5%)
Unknown/Don’t Know or No Response	119 (29.9%)
Center Budget change compared to costs and demands for services over past 5 years:	
Increased	101 (25.4%)
Kept pace	107 (26.9%)
Declined	169 (42.5%)
No Response	21 (5.3%)
Lay off staff or reduce key services over past 5 years:	
Yes	191 (48.0%)
No	192 (48.2%)
No Response	15 (3.8%)
Center in danger of being closed:	
Yes	90 (22.6%)
No	279 (70.1%)
Possibly/Don’t know or No Response	29 (7.4%)

Senior Centers’ Building and Site Information

Respondents were asked at how many sites or locations their center provides services. The majority of centers (70.6%) have one site/location where they provide services, while 13.4% have between two and five sites, 6.4% have six to ten sites, and 4.9% have eleven to twenty sites. The average number of sites is 2.43. Surveys were received on a total of 416 sites for the 398 agencies. A list of the cities, town, and communities served by these centers is located in Appendix A.

Nearly sixty percent of the centers own the building where their services are provided, 37.3% do not own their building, and 3.9% did not respond to the question. Nearly forty percent of buildings were built between 1890 and 1980, 36.8% were built between 1981 and 2009; while nearly a quarter of respondents did not know when their facility had been built.

Year Building was Constructed:	# (%) Survey Respondents
1890 to 1930	34 (8.2%)
1931 to 1960	56 (13.5%)
1961 to 1980	72 (17.3%)
1981 to 2000	117 (28.1%)
2001 to 2009	36 (8.7%)
Unknown/Don't Know or No Response	101 (24.3%)

Just over half of the buildings were originally built to provide services to seniors, while 39.9% were not, and 9.1% of respondents were unsure or did not respond to the question. Nearly half of the buildings had major renovations or additions to the original building, 33.4% of buildings had not, and 16.6% of respondents did not know or did not respond to the question. Of those who indicated what years additions or renovations were constructed, nearly all were after 1984 (and the passage of the Senior Center Bond Act).

Current Services and Capacity of Facilities

Survey respondents were asked about the services provided at each facility and asked to check off the services provided from a list. Nearly all facilities provide more than one service. The table below indicates the percent of facilities that provide the services; there were a total of 416 facilities/locations.

Type of Services Provided at each Facility:	# (%) Survey Respondents
Activities/Socialization	395 (95.0%)
Information & Referral/Assistance	357 (85.8%)
Meal Programs	353 (84.9%)
Fitness/Exercise/Wellness Classes	336 (80.8%)
Education/Instruction	301 (72.4%)
HICAP (Health Insurance Counseling & Advocacy Program)	230 (55.3%)
Legal Services	192 (46.2%)
Other (specified below)	140 (33.7%)
Caregiver Support or Training	124 (29.8%)
Language/ESL Classes	113 (27.2%)
Case Management (inc. MSSP, Linkages, etc.)	109 (26.2%)
Job Training	56 (13.5%)
Adult Day Care (social)	48 (11.5%)
Adult Day Health Care	18 (4.3%)

Other services include:

- Trips/travel/tours/fieldtrips/excursions
- Food distribution/Brown Bag/commodities

- Health fair/clinics/flu shots
- Citizenship assistance
- Translation
- Transportation/shuttles/paratransit
- Support groups/counseling
- Tax preparation assistance
- Home repair/modification

Twenty six percent of facilities have waiting lists for their services. Most of these respondents have multiple programs with waiting lists. The programs with waiting lists and the number of facilities that indicated the programs are as follows:

- Educational classes, including computer, ESL, and memory classes (25 respondents)
- Field trips/excursions/travel (23 respondents)
- Home delivered meals (22 respondents)
- Legal services (16 respondents)
- Case management, including: Linkages and MSSP (10 respondents)
- Social, special, and holiday events (9 respondents)
- Congregate meals (8 respondents)
- Exercise, fitness, and dancing classes (7 respondents)
- Food supplements: commodities, Brown Bag, emergency food, food boxes, etc. (7 respondents)
- HICAP (6 respondents)
- Transportation including non-paratransit (6 respondents)
- Activities and socialization programs (5 respondents)
- Computer lab use (3 respondents)
- Counseling and mental health programs (3 respondents)
- Defensive driving or DMV services (3 respondents)
- Respite services (3 respondents)
- Senior housing, including affordable and low income (3 respondents)
- Tax assistance (3 respondents)
- Cooking classes/demonstrations (2 respondents)
- Fall prevention or balance and mobility programs (2 respondents)
- In-home services (2 respondents)
- Minor home repairs (2 respondents)
- Senior Companion (2 respondents)
- Sports activities/leagues (2 respondents)

The following programs were indicated by one respondent: job training, financial services, utility assistance, lifeline program, volunteer program, podiatry services, and Social Security

Thirty one percent of centers indicated having an annual or monthly membership fee. Many of the senior center respondents indicated that they charged fees for their services or donations were encouraged but not required. A small percentage indicated several of these service fee options. A summary of their responses are located below.

Do you charge fees for your services?	# (%) Survey Respondents
Yes	114 (27.4%)
No	85 (20.4%)
Donation encouraged but not requires	136 (32.7%)
Both Yes & No	5 (1.2%)
Yes, No, & Donation encouraged but not required	7 (1.7%)
Yes & Donation encouraged but not required	41 (9.9%)
No & Donation encouraged but not required	20 (4.8%)
Unknown/Don't Know or No Response	8 (1.9%)

Respondents indicated varying dollar amounts for the assorted fees charged for services from $1.00 for meals to $75 for trips. The primary types of fees that were listed included:

- Activities/programs/classes (including educational and exercise classes);
- Meal programs;
- Trips/excursions/tours;
- Special events;
- Computer classes and lab fees;
- Membership fees;
- Transportation programs; and
- Adult Day Health Care and Adult Day Care programs

Demographic information about service participants was requested. Many of the centers do not collect demographic information from their participants, therefore not all respondents indicated if they served a certain population. Based on the responses actually received, senior centers served primarily the 75-84 (90.9%) and 65-74 (88.7%) age groups and slightly fewer served the 85+ (80.5%) and 60-64 (79.1%). The 18-59 age group were indicated as being served by 42.8% of the centers and 0-17 age group were served by 8.8%. Income levels of participants showed low income being served by 82.7% of the centers, middle income by 71.4%, very low income were noted to be served by 64.9% and 45.7% indicated upper-middle incomes for some of their participants. Ethnicity information was also requested of the respondents; 85.3% indicated serving Caucasians, 75.5% checked Hispanic participants, 63.2% serve Asians, 57.7% indicated serving African Americans, Native Americans are served by 27.6% of the centers, and other ethnicities were checked by 31.0% of the centers.

The table below indicates percent of facilities that specified providing services to the demographic characteristics of their clients; there were a total of 416 facilities/locations. Approximately 7.5% of respondents skipped these questions as many of them do not keep track of demographic information.

Table 3: Demographics of Clients Served by the 416 Facilities

Age Groups:	**# (%) Survey Respondents**
0-17	37 (8.8%)
18-59	178 (42.8%)
60-64	329 (79.1%)
65-74	369 (88.7%)
75-84	378 (90.9%)
85+	33.5 (80.5%)
Income:	
Very low	270 (64.9%)
Low	344 (82.7%)
Middle	297 (71.4%)
Upper-middle	190 (45.7%)
Ethnicity:	
Caucasian	355 (85.3%)
Hispanic	314 (75.5%)
Asian	263 (63.2%)
African American	240 (57.7%)
Other	129 (31.0%)
Native American	115 (27.6%)
Population Density:	
Urban	192 (46.2%)
Suburban	161 (38.7%)
Rural	135 (32.5%)
Frontier	20 (4.8%)
Gender:	
Male	371 (89.2%)
Female	366 (88.0%)
Transgender	24 (5.8%)
Other:	
Disabled	252 (60.6%)
LGBT	47 (11.3%)
Legal Non-Citizen	108 (26.0%)
Non English Speaking	190 (45.7%)
Undocumented	43 (10.3%)

Respondents were asked about the number of seniors (aged 60 or older) that visit their center each day. Responses ranged between 1 and 4500 seniors per day, with a mean of 145.5 seniors and a median of 80 seniors per day. Most centers (58.2%) have seen the daily number of senior increase over the past five years, while 17.3% have seen this number decrease, and 16.8% have not seen a change. The remaining respondents (7.7%) did not respond to the question.

Centers were asked about the utilization of their facility. Thirty percent of respondents indicated they fully utilize their facility and have enough room for their current activities, while 35.3% indicated they fully utilize their facility and have enough room for their current activities but would need more room for additional activities. Twenty seven percent of the responding center fully utilize their building but do not have enough room for current activities, 3.6% have space that is not being used, and 3.1% declined to answer. Outdoor space is available for 56.3% of the responding centers but 11.3% of those centers do not have enough outdoor space for their current outdoor activities. A complete lack of outdoor space for activities was reported by 38.2 and 5.5% did not answer the question.

Respondents were asked if they had adequate parking. Just over a third have enough parking for current activities, a quarter have enough parking for current activities but not for increased activities, and over a third do not have adequate parking for their current activities. The remaining 3.1% did not reply to the question.

Nearly all centers indicated being open Monday through Friday with an average 7.5 hours open and a median of 8.0 hours. Monday through Friday have a range of zero to eighteen hours open with a third of them being open eight hours a day. Fewer centers are open on Saturday and Sunday. Saturday has an average of 1.4 hours open with 23.1% of all responding centers being open between one and eighteen hours for the day. Sunday has an average of 0.9 hours open with 13.7% of all respondents being open between one and eighteen hours. Approximately one quarter of the centers indicated they have regular senior programs in the evening.

Centers were asked about their needing additional room (building square footage) in light of senior population projections. Nearly two thirds indicated they did anticipate needing additional square footage, while 27.9% did not, and 8.4% declined to respond. Of those who indicated they anticipated needing additional space 13.9% indicated they would need between 80-2,000 sq. ft., 15.4% indicated 2,100-9500 sq. ft, 5.0% of respondents anticipated needing between 10,000 and 220,000 sq. ft, and the remaining respondents were unsure how many square feet or did not respond. Over a third of centers (36.5%) indicated they had land to allow for building expansion, while 56.5% did not, and 6.9% did not know or declined to respond. Approximately forty-five percent anticipate the need for additional centers in their area over the next decade, while 46.9% did not. Twenty-three percent of respondents anticipate one additional center would address this need, while 10.6% indicated two to five additional centers would be needed in their area, and 2.6% indicated seven to fifteen centers would be needed.

Respondents were asked based on their knowledge, if they anticipated needing a different kind of facility, 54.3% indicated yes, and 34.4% checked no, the remaining 11.3% were unsure, did not know, or did not respond. One hundred and eight-two respondents indicated one to several different types of facilities/structures and are summarized below.

- Fitness center & exercise rooms (including: gymnasium, weight room with exercise equipment, wellness center, ping pong, pool tables, yoga room)
- More space or square footage
- Computer lab/facility (including internet capacity, internet café,

- Activity/program space (including game rooms, bigger rooms)
- Swimming pool for lap swimming and water aerobics
- Outdoor spaces for activities, sports, and gardening (including trails, horseshoes, tennis, bocce, badminton, basketball, shuffle board)
- Updated dining facilities (including café style lunch, salad bar, lunch options)
- Classrooms including lecture rooms/halls
- Dance floor/classroom and ballroom
- Meeting rooms and areas
- Art, crafts, ceramics rooms or studios
- Sports facilities (specifically for basketball)
- New senior center facility
- Storage
- Music rooms/classrooms
- Garden areas
- Theater
- Drive through lunch pickup, and
- Restrooms

Preparedness for Natural Disasters

Respondents were asked if their centers were in areas that had experienced significant natural disasters.

Table 4: Types of Natural Disasters Experienced in the Senior Centers' Area

Earthquake:	**# (%) Survey Respondents**
Yes	223 (53.6%)
No	159 (38.2%)
Unsure	19 (4.6%)
No Response	15 (3.6%)
Fires, including forest fires:	
Yes	122 (29.3%)
No	230 (55.3%)
Unsure	20 (4.8%)
No Response	44 (10.6%)
Floods:	
Yes	56 (13.5%)
No	263 (63.2%)
Unsure	40 (9.6%)
No Response	57 (13.7%)
Other:	
Yes	11 (2.6%)
No	131 (31.5%)
Unsure	38 (9.1%)
No Response	236 (56.7%)

Other natural disasters included: excessive heat or cold (frozen pipes); snow and ice storms; sand storms; tsunami; volcano; and water shortages.

Respondents were asked if their facility had undergone an earthquake retrofit; 60.3% indicted it had not, 19.7% indicated their building had undergone the retrofit, 8.4% were unsure, and 11.5% declined to answer. Nearly eighty percent of respondents indicated their facility is not in a flood plain or area that requires federal flood insurance, 7.5% indicated they were, 4.6% did not know if their facility was in a flood area and 8.2% did not answer the question.

The vast majority of centers (83.2%) indicated they have a disaster or security preparedness plan for their building. Twelve percent did not and 4.7% were unsure or did not answer the question. Over half of the centers (53.4%) are currently set up to be a shelter during a disaster, 40.4% are not, 6.2% did not answer or were unsure. One hundred and twenty-two respondents indicated what it would take to make their center available as a shelter in times of disaster; a summary of their responses follows:

- Supplies (including blankets, cots, bedding, equipment, food, water, clothes, aid supplied, and general supplies.)
- Space, rooms, building (many indicated their center being too small or needing improvements to accommodate people)
- Planning, coordination, organization, or a plan (including training, readiness assessment, feasibility assessment)
- Bathrooms including showers
- Permission from local, state, or federal agency.
- Assistance from local, state or federal agency.
- Housing or shelter
- Generators
- Storage of the emergency supplies
- Funding
- Kitchen
- People/staff/personnel/volunteers
- Sleeping areas
- Cooling center or station
- Laundry facilities
- Transportation, and
- Triage center

Senior Centers' Telecommunications

Respondents were asked about their center's telecommunications equipment. Over half of the centers (55.0%) indicated they had sufficient computers for their staff and volunteers, while 40.1% did not. Respondents indicated they had between zero and 120 computers depending upon the size of their organization. The average number of computers per center is 7.1 and 55.3% have four or fewer computers. The range of age of the computers varied dramatically, from the newest computer in an agency between one month old and twenty years old with an average age of 2.6 years and two thirds of the agencies' newest computer is less than 2.5 years old. The oldest computer a center indicated was 27 years old with a range of the oldest computers between one month and 17 years old and an average of 6.1 years. The oldest computer for two thirds of the centers is five or more years old. Laptop computers are not common among the respondent centers; 54.8% indicated they did not have one, 21.6% indicated having between one and four, and 2.4% indicated having between five and eighteen laptops. The remaining 20.9% did not respond to the question. Desktop computers are considerably more common with only 3.1% indicating zero desktop computers and 25.2% choosing not to respond. The range of number of desktop computers was between zero and 116, with an average of 7.3 computers per center. Over a third of the centers have between one and four desktop computers, 20.9% have five to ten, and the remaining 14.2% are spread between eleven and 116 computers.

Internet access and capacity were assessed as well. Nearly two thirds of centers indicated they had internet access to all of their computers, 15.6% had internet access to most, 7.9% of centers did not have internet access to any of their computers, and the remaining percent of respondents declined to answer the question. Types of internet access varied with 43.0% indicating DSL, 20.2% cable/broadband, 2.9% are using dial up, and 7.0% indicated other type. The other types consisted of: city government's mainframe/MIS/ network, DSL & cable, fiber optics, T-1 line, WIFI, and wireless. Most centers (65.4%) are wired for the internet, 11.8% are partially wired and 18.8% indicated they are not wired at all for the internet. Centers were asked if they were a Wi-Fi hot spot (wireless), 16.3% indicated their entire center was a hot spot, 15.9% have part of their center set up, and 62.0% of center are not wireless at all.

Most centers (49.3%) are not communicating with their seniors/participants via email or text messages. 16.3% are doing so, 29.6% indicated somewhat, and 4.8% did not respond to the question. Eighteen percent of the centers indicated they can send out announcements or emergency alerts via the internet, while 23.6% checked no, and the remaining 58.4% did not respond.

Over half of the centers (53.1%) indicated they have computers available for seniors to use. Of the 216 centers who indicated the number of computers they have available for senior use, nearly half have between one and five computers, about forty percent have between six and fifteen, while less than ten percent have between 16 and 48. Over half of the centers with computers for seniors use indicated they do not have enough computers.

Most of these computers have access to the internet with only 15.6% indicating they do not. Many of the seniors who use the centers computers use them for email or internet. Respondents estimated that 32.9% of these seniors spend 81-100 percent of their time for email or internet, 12.3% spend 51-80 percent on email/internet, 15.6% spend 20-50 percent on the email/internet and about 29.1% spend less than twenty percent of the computer time on the email/internet. The remaining ten percent of centers were unsure how much time their seniors spent on the internet or sending emails. Over half of the respondents indicated they offer free internet access to participants at their center.

Centers were asked if they can provide video broadcasting via the internet, 12.3% indicated they could, 75.2% checked they could not, and 12.5% did not know or did not answer the question. A quarter of centers can offer online workshops, instruction, or training, while 63.5% indicated they could not, and 11.3% did not respond to the question. Electronic social networking communities are sponsored by 4.8% of the center, 87.5% checked they did not, and 7.7% did not know or did not answer. Over half of the centers (50.7%) have cable TV access in their center. Forty percent of centers have a relationship with their local cable public access channel.

Nearly half of centers (49.0%) provide computer classes to seniors in computer use and standard software instruction. Centers that have computer classes estimated they average between one and 500 participants per week with an overall average of 26 weekly participants per week per center. Types of computer classes were written about by 150 respondents. A summary of those types of classes are:

- Internet and email (including learning to surf the web, using Google, and sending/receiving emails)
- General computer classes
- Microsoft programs (including instruction in Word, Excel, and PowerPoint)
- Basic and beginning computer classes
- Photo editing and Photoshop
- Tutors including appointment and one-on-one instruction
- Classes specific to Macintosh/Apple and PC computers
- Classes on eBay
- Advanced computer skills classes
- Daily and weekly classes
- Volunteer, paid and adult education teachers
- Word processing classes, and
- Many indicating having an internet café

Senior Centers' Facility Accessibility and Maintenance

This section covers the senior centers' accessibility and maintenance issues. ADA accessible entrances are available in 93.5% of the senior centers and 91.1% of centers have ADA accessible bathrooms. Building parking lots are considered accessible in 89.4% of the locations.

Table 5: ADA Accessibility of Buildings & Parking Lots

Does your building have ADA accessible entrances?	**# (%) Survey Respondents**
Yes, multiple	316 (76.0%)
Yes, one	73 (17.5%)
No	12 (2.9%)
Unknown/Don't Know or No Response	14 (3.5%)
Does your building have ADA accessible bathrooms?	
Yes, multiple	313 (75.2%)
Yes, one	66 (15.9%)
No	23 (5.5%)
Unknown/Don't Know or No Response	14 (3.5%)
Is your building's parking lot ADA accessible?	
Yes	372 (89.4%)
No	26 (6.3%)
No Response	18 (4.3%)

Over half (51.7%) of the centers have had an ADA compliance inspection, 25.7% have not, and 22.6% were unsure or declined to answer. Of the 416 facilities thirty-seven had their inspection within the past three years, eleven facilities had their inspection between 2000 and 2005, and three had their ADA compliance inspection in the 1990s.

Respondents were asked how senior get to their facilities. The seniors' mode of transportation indicated are listed below with the number of centers who have some seniors that utilize that mode:

Drive themselves	390 (93.8%)
Center's van	117 (28.1%)
Family and/or friends	340 (81.7%)
Outside facility van	112 (26.9%)
Public transportation	321 (77.2%)
Other	116 (27.9%)

Other methods of transportation utilized by center participants indicated walking, riding their bike, using a scooter, and taxi or paratransit.

Nearly all buildings (95.7%) indicated their building was fire safety code compliant, while 1.7% indicated they were not, and 2.6% declined to respond. Seventy two percent indicated they had smoke detectors in all areas of the center, while 20.9% checked they did not, and 6.9% were unsure or did not answer. Seven of the facilities have between one and five areas without smoke detectors, one with 10 areas, and another with 25 areas; the remaining 407 facilities did not indicate the number of areas without smoke detectors. Only 20.4% of center locations have carbon monoxide emission detectors, 62.3% indicated they do not, and 17.3% did not know or did not answer the question. Over half of the buildings (55.8%) have a fire sprinkler system, 37.0% do not, those that were unsure or did not answer comprised 7.2%.

Respondents were asked about hazardous materials in their buildings and if they had been tested for asbestos, lead paint, and mold. The following table details their responses.

Table 6: Testing done at Buildings for Hazardous Materials

Asbestos:	**# (%) Survey Respondents**
Yes	122 (29.3%)
Yes, but only remodeled areas	27 (6.5%)
No	56 (13.5%)
Don't know	169 (40.6%)
No Response	42 (10.1%)
Lead Paint:	
Yes	116 (27.9%)
Yes, but only remodeled areas	18 (4.3%)
No	58 (13.9%)
Don't know	180 (43.2%)
No Response	44 (10.6%)
Mold:	
Yes	108 (26.0%)
Yes, but only remodeled areas	18 (4.3%)
No	65 (15.6%)
Don't know	185 (44.5%)
No Response	40 (9.6%)
Other Materials:	
Yes	21 (5.0%)
Yes, but only remodeled areas	6 (1.4%)
No	42 (10.1%)
Don't know	147 (35.3%)
No Response	200 (48.1%)

Although 6.4% indicated their building had been tested for other materials, no one listed another material in the space provided.

Many respondents (48.1%) did not know when the roof of their building was installed or did not answer the question, while 1.9% had the roof installed between 1950 and 1979, 17.3% had the roof installed between 1980 and 1999, and the remaining 32.7% had their roof installed within the past nine years. Seventy nine percent of the respondents did not know how many years were left on the roof warranty or did not answer the question, while 8.7% have between zero and four years remaining on the warranty, 2.6% have between five and ten years, and 9.6% have over fifteen years remaining.

Major deferred maintenance on their building was indicated by 20.7% of respondents, 23.8% indicated having minor deferred maintenance, and 41.1% indicated they did not have deferred maintenance, while the remaining 14.5% declined to answer or did not know. Nearly eight percent indicated there are safety issues with the buildings as a result of deferred maintenance. These safety issues included: roof leaks or needs replacing, exterior stairs hazardous, loose tiles in walkways, ceiling sagging, windows do not function properly, not ADA compliant, parking lot a walking hazard, termite rot, tree roots breaking up path or parking lot, and mold problems.

Respondents were asked if they were able to receive money to improve their center, what they would spend money on. Most respondents were interested in:

- creating new activity or meeting room space (including classes);
- exercise or fitness rooms and equipment (including gymnasium, dance, aerobics, and fitness areas);
- computers and computer labs;
- building renovations and modernizations;
- technology, communications, and infrastructure;
- kitchen remodel, expansion or need to create a new one;
- kitchen refrigerator, freezer & equipment;
- transportation (including vehicle purchase/replacement);
- deferred maintenance (including painting, roof and flooring repairs/replacements, and general building maintenance);
- building expansion and need for larger space;
- parking space increase including disabled parking spaces;
- furniture (including chairs, tables, and sofas);
- programming, services, and instructors/staff;
- swimming pool (for laps, water aerobics, water therapy);
- upgrade and increase number of bathrooms;
- window replacement (insulated/double pane);
- dining area upgrade
- heating and cooling systems;
- alternative energy, solar, and green energy;
- outdoor activities and sports (including bocce ball court, basketball, fitness track, walking area, and furniture);
- ADA upgrades and access/compliance;
- automatic door openers;
- lightening
- storage space
- game area/room (pool table, ping pong, etc)
- garden area

- advertising
- generators
- AED defibrillator
- alarm system; and
- weatherization and insulation

Senior Centers' Facility Energy Utilization

This section covers senior center facility energy utilization. Respondents indicated when they had their most recent energy audit, with 29.9% having had one within the past ten years (nearly all of those within the past four years), the remaining 70.1% were unsure or did not answer the question. Eight percent considered their center an energy savings "green" building, 55.8% did not, 29.3% did not know and 6.5% did not respond.

Respondents were asked about their sources of energy. The percentage of respondents who checked the specific sources are listed below:

Electricity	92.3%
Gas	68.3%
Propane	7.7%
Solar	2.6%
Geo-thermal	0.2%
Other	1.0%

Other sources included: skylights, emergency generators, and one owns a co-gen plant.

Double pane windows are installed in all windows at 24.5% of facilities, while 6.3% have more than half of their windows with double pane, 3.8% have less than half with double pane, 53.8% do not have any double pane windows, and 11.6% did not know or did not respond. Three percent of centers had their double pane windows installed prior to 1990 and 14.1 % have had them installed since then, the remaining 82.9% of respondents were unsure or did not answer the question. Nearly forty-three percent of respondents indicated their building is adequately weatherized and insulated while 23.3% indicated it is not, 27.6% don't know, and 6.5% did not respond. Solar panels are being used at fourteen (3.4%) of the centers but only eight of those centers have sufficient panels to cover their energy needs. Almost half of the centers use energy saving light bulbs in all of their lights, 28.4% use them in more than half of their lights, 11.1% use them in less than half and 7.9% do not use them at all, the remaining percent did not respond. Other types of energy saving types of lighting are used by 25.2% of the center; this includes natural lighting, skylights, motion sensors, auto on/off switches, times, LCD, and several indicated they turn lights off manually.

Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) units were first installed for 23.3% of the centers prior to 1990, 12.7% were first installed during the 1990s, and 21.9% were installed within the past nine years, the remaining respondents were unsure or did not indicated a year of first installment. Of the 416 center facilities 1.9% indicated having the HVAC replaced between 1980 and 1999, 14.5% had it replaced in the past nine years and the remaining respondents indicated never, they were unsure, or did not respond. Only 21.2% of the centers have their HVAC system computerized while 12.5% have it partially computerized, 38.9% do not have it computerized at all and the remaining 27.5% were unsure or did not respond.

Respondents' Support for a Senior Center Bond Measure

Survey respondents were asked if they would support a state bond measure for building, renovating, and/or expanding their center; 60.6% indicated yes, 26.9% were unsure, 7.9% checked no, and 4.5% do not know or did not answer. They were asked further if they would support a state bond measure for electric infrastructure improvements; with 60.8% checking yes, 26.7% were not sure, 7.5% indicating no, and 5.0% did not respond or did not know.

Additional Comments

One hundred and twenty-four respondents voiced opinions in the "Additional Comments" section. Those that did not easily fit into the previous sections are listed here. These are included for the added dimension they provide to the survey results.

- For the most part, funding for senior centers is not easily obtainable especially in rural, small communities. Yet these areas have the greatest needs due to the fact that services are not readily available locally and transportation is lacking to get them to service providers. Communication improvements; better record keeping electronically; expansion of facility; vehicle; expand facility or preferably build a new facility; vehicle for transportation services; improved and updated computer system; PA system; presentation equipment.
- Grant funding usually is hard to get for routing maintenance on infrastructure needs. Ongoing program funding is not adequate to cover large building needs.
- I believe we have to become multi-generational centers in order to continue to exist. Within the center there still needs to be one space designated strictly to seniors.
- I feel there will be a future need to make senior center buildings (inside and out) more attractive and modern. If we hope to attract and serve boomers, many centers will need updating.
- I think this is a very important issue. I was lucky with the timing and have a very supportive city council and an active fundraising group who together we are able to come up with funds to build a brand new center. However, others are not as

lucky and we need to support new centers that keep up with the needs of the growing numbers of seniors.

- Infrastructure should include basic advertising; marketing to reach the public; perhaps collaborative business services such as HR management; IT computers. This would reduce the burden on staff requirements and free up staff and ED to pursue fundraising and grants.
- Our center is in the process of being condemned. We are being forced to move to another facility that does not fit or meet our needs. The county says this is just a temporary situation but our group is very skeptical of these answers. In our present home, we have about 3400 square feet but our new facility is only 2000 square feet. We do not want to lose any of our activities or possessions.
- Our seniors would love to have a pool for water exercise, a community garden and transportation to and from the senior center.
- Senior programs have out-grown current space available in the senior center. Additional programs have to go off-site at community center. Issues of youth versus seniors regarding room use is constant. A new expanded center would provide room for multi-agency programs.
- This center relies heavily on volunteers to conduct programming. It is very important to be able to provide appropriate staff for future programming of this center.

Appendix A: List of Senior Center Locations
(City, Town, and Communities)

Survey respondents were asked to identify the city, town, or community served by their senior center. Of the 398 senior centers, there were surveys filled out for an additional 18 sites, for a total of 416 locations. Several cities, towns or communities had more than one survey filled out for the area, this is noted after the located using parenthesis and the number of locations.

Adelanto
Alameda
Alhambra
Altadena
Alturas
Anaheim
Anderson
Anderson Park
Antioch
Apple Valley
Arcadia
Atascadero
Auburn (2)
Avenidas
Azusa
Bakersfield (4)
Baldwin park
Barstow
Bell Gardens
Belmont
Berkeley (3)
Beverly Hills
Bieber
Big River
Blairsden
Blythe
Boron
Brentwood
Bridgeport
Buellton
Buena Park
Buttonwillow
Cabazon
Calexico
California City
Calimesa
Camarillo
Campbell
Campo
Canoga Park
Capitola
Carlsbad
Carmel
Carmichael
Caruthers
Castro Valley
Castroville
Cathedral City
Chowchilla
Chula Vista (2)
Claremont
Clear Lake
Cloverdale
Clovis
Coarsegold
Colusa
Compton
Concord
Corning
Corona
Corona Del Mar
Coronado
Costa Mesa
Covelo
Crescent City
Culver City
Cupertino
Cypress
Daly City
Danville
Davis
Del Mar
Del Ray
Desert Hot Springs
Dixon
Doyle
Dublin
East Sonoma
El Dorado Hills
El Mirage
El Monte (2)
Elk Grove
Emeryville
Encinitas
Escondido (2)
Eureka (2)
Fairfax
Fairfield
Fallbrook
Farmersville
Ferndale
Firebaugh
Folsom
Fort Bragg
Fortuna (2)
Foster City (2)
Fountain Valley
Fowler
Fremont
Fresno (16)
Fullerton
Gardena
Glendale
Glendora
Goleta
Grand Terrace
Grass Valley
Guerneville
Half Moon Bay
Happy Camp
Hayfork
Hayward
Hercules
Hesperia
Hinkley
Hollister
Huntington Beach
Huron
Indio
Inyokern
Irvine
Jackson
Kaweah
Kerman
Kingsburg
La Mesa
La Puente
La Verne
Lafayette
Laguna
Laguna Hills
Lake Elsinore
Lake Forest
Lake Isabella
Lakeview

Lakewood
Lancaster
Lemoore
Livermore
Lodi (3)
Lone Pine
Long Beach
Loomis
Los Angeles (22)
Los Banos
Los Gatos
Los Molinos
Loyalton
Lucerne
Lucerne Valley
Lynwood
Madera (5)
Magnolia
Manteca
Marin
Mariposa
Marysville
Mendota
Menlo Park (2)
Merced (3)
Middletown
Mission Veijo
Monrovia
Monterey (2)
Moorpark
Morgan Hill
Morro Bay
Murrieta
Napa
Needles
Newark
Newberrry Springs
Nipomo
Norco
North Hollywood (2)
Norwalk
Novato
Oakdale
Oakland (9)
Oceano
Oceanside
Ocotillo
Ojai
Ontario
Orange
Orland
Orleans
Oxnard (3)
Pacifica
Palm Desert
Palm Springs
Palmdale
Palo Alto
Panorama City
Paradise
Patterson
Perry Park
Phelan
Pico Rivera
Pinole
Pinon Hills
Placerville
Pleasanton
Poway (2)
Prunedale
Quincy
Racho Palos Verdes
Rancho Cucamonga
Rancho Hills
Red Bluff
Redding (2)
Redlands (2)
Redondo Beach
Redway
Redwood City (2)
Reedley
Reseda
Ripon
Riverdale
Riverside (4)
Rosamond
Rosemead (2)
Roseville
Sacramento (9)
Salinas
San Andreas
San Bernardino (2)
San Bruno
San Carlos
San Diego (7)
San Fernando Valley
San Francisco (17)
San Jose (4)
San Juan Capistrano
San Marcos
San Mateo
San Pablo
San Pedro
San Rafael
San Ramon
Santa Barbara
Santa Clara
Santa Clarita
Santa Cruz (2)
Santa Monica
Santa Paula
Saratoga
Scotts Valley
Sebastopol
Selma
Shafter
Solvang
Sonora
South San Francisco (2)
Southlake Tahoe
St. Helena
Stockton (2)
Sun City
Sunland
Susanville (2)
Taft
Tehachapi
Temecula
Temple City
Thousand Oaks
Tollhouse
Tracy
Truckee
Tulare
Twentynine Palms
Ukiah (2)
Union City
Upland
Vacaville
Vallejo (2)
Van Nuys
Venice (3)
Vista
Walnut Creek (2)
Watsonville (2)
Weldon
West Covina
West Hollywood (2)
West Los Angeles
West Sacramento
Westwood (3)
Wheatland
Whittier (2)
Willits
Willows
Wilmington
Woodland
Yorba Linda
Yreka
Yuba City