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Organization of Presentation

- Overview of LGBT Aging:
  - A model for considering the experiences
  - A snapshot based on national, state, and Bay Area research

- San Francisco county:
  - LGBT Aging Task Force
  - Summary of key findings
  - Future directions
LGBT Aging: Prominent role of stigma and stress

Stigma and Discrimination
- Exclusionary policies and laws
- Unwelcoming (hostile) programs
- Violence and victimization

Minority Stress
- Physical health conditions/behaviors
- Psychological well-being
- Identity (concealment/question)
- Interpersonal relations

Strength & Resilience
- Create communities and political movements
- Chosen families
- Crisis competence; pride
- “caring for our own”
Stigma and Discrimination

- Exclusionary policies and laws
- Unwelcoming (hostile) programs
- Violence and victimization
Exclusionary policies and laws

An environment and history of exclusion:

- Mental illness until 1973
- Sodomy laws until 2003
- Expulsion from the military until 2011
- DOMA, parts of which only recently repealed (1138 statutory provisions, e.g., taxes, social security, long-term care)
- Still characterized as “anti-family” and “immoral” by many religious institutions
Unwelcoming (and Hostile) programs

Can an LGBT elder be “out” in Long-Term Care Settings?

What Issues would LGBT elders encounter in LTC?

- Discrimination by Residents
- Isolation from other Residents
- Discrimination by Staff
- Abuse, Neglect by Staff

(National Senior Citizen’s Law Center, 2011)
Minority Stress

Chronic stress associated with life as a (sexual) minority; toll in physical, emotional health, interpersonal relations, and sense of self

- Physical health conditions/behaviors
- Psychological well-being
- Identity (concealment/question)
- Interpersonal relations

(Meyer, 2003)
Considering Heterosexual Adults of comparable age, LGBT older adults:

- Less likely to have health insurance (especially midlife/younger)
- More likely to delay seeking healthcare (almost 2X likely)
- More likely to delay or not get needed prescriptions
- More likely to receive health care in emergency rooms
- Have higher rates of disabilities (45%: women 53%; men 43%)
Health Behaviors of LGBT Older Adults: Research Summary Results

Gay/Bisexual Men
- Tobacco Use
- Alcohol Use
- Physical exercise
- (Health Screening)

Lesbian/Bisexual Women
- Tobacco Use
- Alcohol Use
- Overweight
- Physical exercise

Transgender Men/Women
- Tobacco Use
- Alcohol Use
- Less physical exercise
Physical and Psychological Health Conditions, LGBT Older Adults: Research Results Summary

**Gay/Bisexual Men**
- Cancer (anal)
- HIV/AIDS
- Diabetes, Asthma
- Depression (2X)
- Suicidal Thoughts

**Lesbian/Bisexual Women**
- Cancer (reproductive)
- Heart Disease
- Diabetes, Asthma
- Depression (1.5X)

**Transgender Men/Women**
- Cardiovascular Issues
- (Cancer, Osteoporosis)
- HIV/AIDS
- Diabetes, Asthma
- Depression, Suicide
Self-Rated Health (MMI National Boomer Sample)

Relationship status and marriage may mediate this pattern
Guarded Identity ("not out")
(MMI National Boomer Sample)

- Neighbors
- Other Family
- Siblings
- Health Care Provider
- Close Friend

- Gay Men
- Lesbians
- Bisexuals
- Transgender
Interpersonal Relationship Consequences

Percent Living Alone
(50+; CA data)

Frequency of Singlehood
(42% LGBT; 27% Gen. Pop.)

- Gay, Bisexual Men
- Heterosexual Men
- Lesbian, Bisexual
- Heterosexual Women

- Single; never partnered
- Single; previously partnered

Male: GP
Male: LGBT
Female: GP
Female: LGBT
Strength and Resilience: Positive Marginality

The strength, resistance and radical possibilities that exist and develop in the margins of social disenfranchisement

- Create communities and political movements
- Chosen families
- Crisis competence; pride
- “caring for our own”

(Lewis & Marshall, 2012; Unger, 2000)
The Legacy of AIDS

- The loss of a generation of mostly gay men
- Shameful government non-response in early years; the prominent role of LGBT persons at that time, and beyond
  - the creation of dozens of organizations and models of care, now modeled by aging services more generally
  - a sense of community
  - Creative family forms and ties
  - a political voice and presence
Percent Providing Care; Previous 6 Months (MMI National Boomer Sample)
For Whom Is Care Provided? (MMI National Boomer Sample)
LGBT Boomers with Chosen Family (MMI National Boomer Sample)
Completed Documents or Actions (MMI National Boomer Sample)

- Completed Will
- Bought LTC Insurance
- Made Funeral Arrangements
- Set up a Trust

Graph showing the comparison between GP and LGBT for each action.
Completed Documents or Plans Involving Others (MMI National Boomer Sample)

- Living Wills
- Durable Power of Attorney (Health)
- Informal Caregiving Arrangements
- Partner Agreement
- Rights of Visitation Document

Bars represent the percentage of completed documents or plans involving others, categorized by GP (orange) and LGBT (brown) groups.
Completed Documents or Plans by State Recognition of Domestic Partners (MMI National Boomer Sample, 2006)

- Will
- Living Will
- Power of Attorney
- Informal Caregiving
- LTC Insurance

- State Recognized
- Not State Recognized
Greatest Concerns About Aging by State Recognition of Domestic Partners
(MMI National LGBT Boomer Sample, 2006)
A number of studies have found that LGBT older persons have higher levels of education; for example:

A number of studies find LGBT older persons have at best comparable and often lower levels of income.
LGBT Identity and Aging Preparations: (MMI National Boomer Sample)

Being LGBT Helps Prepare Me For Aging

- Yes
- No

Being LGBT Makes Aging Harder

- Yes
- No
In addition to themes of discrimination, loss, and limitations, LGBT boomers and older adults identified “resilience repertoires” (Witten et al., 2012):

- Living life authentically
- Sometimes against the grain, on their own terms
- Building and being part of a community
- Strength and Freedom; agentic and special
LGBT Aging: Adversity and Resilience

**Stigma and Discrimination**
- Exclusionary policies and laws
- Unwelcoming (hostile) programs
- Violence and victimization

**Minority Stress**
- Physical health conditions/behaviors
- Psychological well-being
- Identity (concealment/question)
- Interpersonal relations

**“Positive Marginality”**
- Create communities and political movements
- Chosen families
- Crisis competence; pride
- “caring for our own”
LGBT Persons in the Second Half of Life: San Francisco County
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Overview of San Francisco’s Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History of the LGBT Aging Policy Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who are San Francisco’s LGBT older adults?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are their needs? How do the groups differ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SF LGBT Aging Policy Task Force

- When and why formed
- The need for local research
- Timeline for making recommendations
Who are SF’s LGBT Older Adults?

- Identify existing local and state data sources
- Create a profile of “What we know”
# LGBT Older Adults – SF Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th># of senior respondents&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>% of sample senior population that identified&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; as...</th>
<th>Lesbian</th>
<th>Gay</th>
<th>Bisexual</th>
<th>Transgender</th>
<th>LGBT&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Health Interview Survey (CHIS): SF Seniors 60+</td>
<td>(exact n not provided by CHIS website)</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF City Survey, 1996-2011</td>
<td>7,603</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.2%&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 SF Department of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS) Phone Survey</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Community Survey (2010, IPUMS): SF senior same sex couples</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics of LGBT seniors in local databases

Mostly men

Estimates of Proportion of LGBT Population
Men vs. Women

CHIS 2005, 2007
(All LGB adults, SF)
27%  74%

City Survey (LGBT Seniors)
34%  66%

GetCare (LGBT Seniors)
23%  76%

Men vs. Women

Women □ Men □
Demographics of LGBT seniors in local databases

- Fairly young
- Mostly English-speaking
- Disproportionately White
- Often living alone
- Mostly renters
- Much more likely than heterosexual seniors to be HIV+
- Often veterans
Survey Goals

• Diverse sample

• Four key areas:
  • Service needs and use
  • Housing issues
  • Experience with abuse
  • Discrimination
Risk of Isolation and Lack of Support Resources

- Nearly 60% of the participants live alone, many struggle to make ends meet.

- Only 15% have children; 60% of whom indicate that their children are *not* available to help them if needed.

- Nearly two-thirds (63%) are neither partnered nor married.

- Bisexual, African American, and Hispanic participants are less likely to own a home.

- Minority community participation was VERY low – LGBT seniors in those communities may be even more isolated.
### High Needs for Services and Programs

#### Rates of need and use of 14 services and programs for LGBT older adult participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Need (%)</th>
<th>Use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health promotion services</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health services</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing assistance</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case manager/social worker</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal site/free groceries</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/online referrals</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day programs</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-home care</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door-to-door transportation</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-delivered meals</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver support</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans' services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/substance abuse programs</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rates participants feel comfortable using services and programs as an LGBT older adult

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Comfortable</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Door-to-door transportation</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-delivered meals</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day programs</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health services/support groups</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case manager/social worker</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-home care</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/online referral</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health promotion</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal site/free groceries</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver support</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans' services</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing assistance</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/substance abuse program</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colors: Blue = Comfortable, Orange = Not comfortable
Unmet Service Needs

Areas of unmet service need:
- Health promotion (30%)
- Door-to-door transportation (28%)
- Caregiver support (27%)
- Day programs (27%)
- Housing assistance (21%)
- In-home care (21%)
- Telephone/online referrals (19%)

Reasons for not accessing – LGBT friendliness was never the most common
### Housing Issues

- Very common to rent
- Many lack confidence that they will be able to stay in SF.

#### Housing arrangements for LGBT older adult participants by sub-groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Own, mortgage paid off</th>
<th>Own, paying mortgage</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesbians</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay men</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexuals</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-transgender</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At poverty</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above poverty</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discrimination in the last 12 months

Rates of discrimination for LGBT older adult participants

- Orientation/Identity: 44%
- Age: 34%
- Disability: 16%
- Gender: 13%
- Race: 11%
- Poverty: 10%
- Other: 8%
- National origin: 5%
- Language: 2%
- Immigration status: 1%
Experience of abuse or victimization in the last 12 months

Abuse and victimization experienced by LGBT older adult participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of abuse</th>
<th>Abuse by friend, partner/spouse, family, paid caregiver</th>
<th>Victimization by stranger and other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassed</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially exploited</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually abused</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglected</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically abused</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall 5% 21%
Suicidal Ideation

Participants who have seriously contemplated suicide in the past 12 months

- All participants: 15%
- Lesbians: 13%
- Gay Men: 14%
- Bisexuals: 16%
- Transgender: 32%
Social Support Resources

Levels of social support for LGBT older adult participants

Who LGBT older adult participants turn to for social support
Future Planning Differs by Group

Future planning: Differences by sexual orientation and gender identity of LGBT older adult participants

- Power of attorney for health care
  - Bisexuals: 36%
  - Lesbians: 60%
  - Gay men: 72%
  - Transgender: 48%

- Will
  - Bisexuals: 12%
  - Lesbians: 54%
  - Gay men: 54%
  - Transgender: 32%

- Power of attorney for finance
  - Bisexuals: 16%
  - Lesbians: 38%
  - Gay men: 29%
  - Transgender: 16%

- Trust
  - Bisexuals: 4%
  - Lesbians: 38%
  - Gay men: 28%
  - Transgender: 12%
County-level next steps

- Work group deliberations and policy recommendations to Task Force November

- Task Force adopts recommendations - December

- Report presented to Board of Supervisors - January

- Implementation of approved policies - February and beyond
For more information

These and many other reports are available on the website of the San Francisco LGBT Aging Policy Task Force:

http://www.sf-hrc.org/index.aspx?page=201#Resources

Contact:

Diana Jensen (415) 557-5144, diana.jensen@sfgov.org

Tom Nolan (415) 355-3517, tom.nolan@sfgov.org