Newmarket (Rockingham)

Newmarket is a town located in Rockingham County and is home to the Stone Church, a regionally famous music venue. There are 1,122 residents age 65 or older. Compared to state average rates, older residents fared better on some healthy aging indicators with lower rates of hip fracture, bipolar disorders, schizophrenia and other psychotic disorders, osteoporosis, hypothyroidism, anemia, and cataracts. Community resources to support healthy aging include 23 primary care providers within 5 miles, 8 home health agencies, a community health center, a senior center, an assisted living site, a public library, and access to broadband.

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS	BETTER / WORSE STATE RATE ¹	COMMUNITY ESTIMATE	STATE ESTIMATE
Total population all ages		8,928	1,327,503
Population 60 years or older as % of total population		17.1%	22.7%
Total population 60 years or older		1,528	301,630
Population 65 years or older as % of total population		12.6%	15.8%
Total population 65 years or older		1,122	210,385
% 65-74 years		60.2%	58.5%
% 75-84 years		22.3%	28.6%
% 85 years or older		17.6%	12.9%
Gender (65+ population)			
% female		49.3%	54.7%
Race/Ethnicity (65+ population)			
% White		94.8%	97.7%
% African American		1.5%	0.5%
% Asian		3.7%	0.9%
% Other		0.0%	0.9%
% Hispanic/Latino		0.0%	0.9%
Marital Status (65+ population)			
% married		39.5%	58.5%
% divorced/separated		23.0%	14.0%
% widowed		35.1%	22.9%
% never married		2.4%	4.6%
Education (65+ population)			
% with less than high school education		13.4%	12.3%
% with high school or some college		55.3%	57.1%
% with college degree		31.4%	30.6%
% of 65+ population living alone		41.2%	26.1%
% of 65+ population who speak only English at home		87.5%	91.3%
% of 65+ population who are veterans of military service		26.6%	24.8%
Age-sex adjusted 1-year mortality rate		4.2%	4.1%





HEALTHY AGING INDICATORS	BETTER / WORSE STATE RATE ¹	COMMUNITY ESTIMATE	STATE ESTIMATE
Geographic Migration (65+ population) in the past 12 months			
% moved within same county		4.4%	3.6%
% moved from different county in New Hampshire		0.6%	1.0%
% moved from different state		0.4%	1.7%
WELLNESS & PREVENTION			
% 60+ with any physical activity within last month		69.1%	74.5%
% 60+ met CDC guidelines for muscle-strengthening activity		28.0%	26.0%
% 60+ met CDC guidelines for aerobic physical activity		55.5%	58.6%
% 60+ met CDC guidelines for both types of physical activities		22.3%	19.9%
% 60+ getting recommended hours of sleep		66.4%	66.4%
% 60+ injured in a fall within last 12 months		8.9%	10.4%
% 65+ had hip fracture	В	2.6%	3.3%
% 60+ with self-reported fair or poor health status		20.4%	16.5%
% 60+ with 15+ physically unhealthy days last month		13.4%	12.5%
% 60+ with physical exam/check-up in past year		90.1%	86.5%
% 60+ met CDC preventive health screening goals		37.9%	40.3%
% 60+ flu shot past year		63.1%	59.3%
% 65+ with pneumonia vaccine		83.2%	77.8%
% 60+ with cholesterol screening		97.0%	95.3%
% 60+ women with a mammogram within last 2 years		78.6%	79.3%
% 60+ with colorectal cancer screening		75.3%	77.0%
% 60+ with HIV test		13.5%	13.5%
% 60+ current smokers		12.1%	8.1%
Oral Health			
% 60+ with loss of 6 or more teeth		35.9%	29.0%
% 60+ with annual dental exam		72.4%	75.7%
# of dentists per 100,000 persons (all ages) (county)		72	72
NUTRITION/DIET			
% 60+ with 5 or more servings of fruit or vegetables per day		20.0%	20.2%
% 60+ self-reported obese		33.0%	27.2%
% 65+ clinically diagnosed obese		16.4%	16.7%
% 65+ with high cholesterol		69.9%	72.2%
% 60+ excessive drinking		7.1%	9.2%
% 65+ with poor supermarket access		55.1%	28.4%
· · ·			

HEALTHY AGING INDICATORS	BETTER / WORSE STATE RATE ¹	COMMUNITY ESTIMATE	STATE ESTIMATE
BEHAVIORAL HEALTH			
% 60+ with 15+ days poor mental health last month		10.1%	6.9%
% 65+ with depression		29.4%	28.8%
% 65+ with anxiety disorders		22.7%	21.9%
% 65+ with bipolar disorders	В	1.9%	3.1%
% 65+ with post-traumatic stress disorder		1.3%	1.4%
% 65+ with schizophrenia & other psychotic disorders	В	3.8%	4.9%
% 65+ with personality disorders		0.8%	1.1%
# opioid deaths (all ages) (county)		276	1,279
% 65+ with substance use disorders (drug use +/or alcohol abuse)		5.7%	5.5%
% 65+ with tobacco use disorders		9.2%	10.4%
CHRONIC DISEASE			
% 65+ with Alzheimer's disease or related dementias		10.3%	12.0%
% 65+ with diabetes		26.3%	28.2%
% 65+ with stroke		9.6%	10.8%
% 65+ with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease		19.8%	20.5%
% 65+ with asthma		11.1%	13.0%
% 65+ with hypertension		68.3%	70.2%
% 65+ ever had a heart attack		4.6%	4.5%
% 65+ with ischemic heart disease		33.9%	34.3%
% 65+ with congestive heart failure		16.4%	17.7%
% 65+ with atrial fibrillation		14.6%	14.4%
% 65+ with peripheral vascular disease		14.4%	14.7%
% 65+ with osteoarthritis/rheumatoid arthritis		45.4%	49.1%
% 65+ with osteoporosis	В	14.3%	17.4%
% 65+ with leukemias and lymphomas		1.9%	2.0%
% 65+ with lung cancer		1.4%	1.6%
% 65+ with colon cancer		2.2%	2.4%
% 65+ women with breast cancer		10.7%	9.8%
% 65+ women with endometrial cancer		1.6%	1.7%
% 65+ men with prostate cancer		9.8%	11.5%
% 65+ with benign prostatic hyperplasia		33.3%	36.8%
% 65+ with HIV/AIDS		0.04%	0.05%
% 65+ with hypothyroidism	В	17.7%	20.8%
% 65+ with anemia	В	33.5%	37.3%
% 65+ with chronic kidney disease		22.9%	22.3%
% 65+ with liver diseases		5.5%	6.9%
% 65+ with fibromyalgia, chronic pain and fatigue		18.2%	18.6%

HEALTHY AGING INDICATORS	BETTER / WORSE STATE RATE ¹	COMMUNITY ESTIMATE	STATE ESTIMATE
% 65+ with migraine and other chronic headache		3.9%	4.0%
% 65+ with epilepsy		2.0%	2.1%
% 65+ with traumatic brain injury		0.8%	1.1%
% 65+ with autism spectrum disorders		N/A	0.03%
% 65+ with glaucoma		20.9%	22.9%
% 65+ with cataract	В	50.4%	61.2%
% 65+ with pressure ulcer or chronic ulcer		7.8%	7.1%
% 65+ with 4+ (out of 15) chronic conditions		51.9%	54.4%
% 65+ with 0 chronic conditions	В	13.0%	10.3%
LIVING WITH DISABILITY			
% 65+ with self-reported hearing difficulty		14.9%	15.0%
% 65+ with clinical diagnosis of deafness or hearing impairment		14.7%	14.4%
% 65+ with self-reported vision difficulty		6.0%	5.2%
% 65+ with clinical diagnosis of blindness or visual impairment		0.5%	0.9%
% 65+ with self-reported cognition difficulty		6.5%	6.9%
% 65+ with self-reported ambulatory difficulty		20.4%	18.8%
% 65+ with clinical diagnosis of mobility impairments		2.8%	3.2%
% 65+ with self-reported self-care difficulty		12.0%	5.6%
% 65+ with self-reported independent living difficulty	W	21.5%	11.3%
ACCESS TO CARE			
Medicare (65+ population)			
% Medicare managed care enrollees		6.9%	7.9%
% dually eligible for Medicare and Medicaid		7.0%	7.5%
% 60+ with a regular doctor		97.5%	95.8%
% 60+ who did not see doctor when needed due to cost		9.5%	5.4%
# of primary care providers within 5 miles		23	2,961
# of hospitals within 5 miles		0	26
# of nursing homes within 5 miles		0	74
# of home health agencies		8	49
# of community health centers		1	22
# of adult day health centers		0	21
# of memory cafes		0	12
			14

HEALTHY AGING INDICATORS	BETTER / WORSE STATE RATE ¹	COMMUNITY ESTIMATE	STATE ESTIMATE
SERVICE UTILIZATION			
Physician visits per year		6.6	6.3
Emergency room visits/1000 persons 65+ years per year		583	572
Part D monthly prescription fills per person per year		48.1	49.1
Home health visits per year		2.8	2.5
Durable medical equipment claims per year		2.0	2.0
Inpatient hospital stays/1000 persons 65+ years per year		247	237
Medicare inpatient hospital readmissions (as % of admissions)		16.9%	15.8%
# skilled nursing facility stays/1000 persons 65+ years per year		61	76
# skilled nursing home Medicare beds/1000 persons 65+ years		0	33
% 65+ getting Medicaid long term services and supports	*	2.6%	3.7%
COMMUNITY VARIABLES & CIVIC ENGAGEMENT			
AARP Age-Friendly efforts in community		Not yet	Yes
# of senior centers		1	44
Air pollution: annual # of unhealthy days for 65+ (county)		2	N/A
% of grandparents raising grandchildren		1.9%	0.8%
% of grandparents who live with grandchildren		2.2%	2.5%
# of assisted living sites		1	134
% of vacant homes in community		4.7%	16.0%
# of universities and community colleges		0	41
# of public libraries		1	234
# of YMCAs		0	12
% in county with access to broadband (all ages)		99.0%	93.0%
% 60+ who used Internet in last month		78.2%	77.6%
Voter participation rate in 2018 election (age 18+)		62.0%	54.7%
SAFETY & TRANSPORTATION			
Violent crime rate /100,000 persons		N/A	207
Homicide rate /100,000 persons (county)		1	1
# firearm fatalities (county)		92	586
Property crime rate /100,000 persons		N/A	2,012
% 65+ who own a motor vehicle		77.6%	91.0%
% 60+ who always drive wearing a seatbelt		77.4%	77.1%
# of fatal crashes involving adult age 60+/town		1	151
# of fatal crashes involving adult age 60+/county		31	151

HEALTHY AGING INDICATORS	BETTER / WORSE STATE RATE ¹	COMMUNITY ESTIMATE	STATE ESTIMATE
ECONOMIC & HOUSING VARIABLES			
% 65+ with income below the poverty line past year		11.7%	5.4%
% 60+ receiving food stamps past year		6.5%	5.7%
% 65+ employed past year		27.3%	24.8%
Household income (65+ householder)			
% households with annual income < \$20,000		24.9%	18.2%
% households with annual income \$20,000-\$49,999		30.8%	36.5%
% households with annual income > \$50,000		44.2%	45.3%
% 60+ own home		68.5%	79.9%
% 60+ have mortgage on home		31.9%	35.3%
% 65+ households spend >35% of income on housing (renter)		16.3%	8.7%
% 65+ households spend >35% of income on housing (owner)		9.6%	21.2%
COST OF LIVING	\$ COUNTY ESTIMATE	\$ STATE ESTIMATE	RATIO (COUNTY/STATE)
Elder Economic Security Standard Index			
Single, homeowner without mortgage, good health	\$25,536	\$25,284	1.01
Single, renter, good health	\$26,712	\$26,400	1.01
Couple, homeowner without mortgage, good health	\$37,092	\$37,128	1.00
Couple, renter, good health	\$38,268	\$38,244	1.00

TECHNICAL NOTES

*See our technical report (online at https://healthyagingdatareports.org/) for more information on data sources, measures, methodology, and margin of errors. For most indicators the reported community and state values are both estimates derived from sample data. Thus, it is possible that some of the differences between state and community estimates may be due to chance associated with population sampling. We use the terms "better" and "worse" to highlight differences between community and state estimates that we are confident are <u>not</u> due to chance. "Better" is used where a higher/lower value has positive implications for the health of older residents. "Worse" is used where a higher/lower score has negative implications for the health of older residents. "Worse" is used where a higher/lower score has negative implications for the health of older residents. "Worse" is used where a higher/lower score has negative implications for the health of older residents. "Worse" is used where a higher/lower score has negative implications for the health of older residents. "Worse" is used where a higher/lower score has negative implications for the health of older residents. "Worse" is used where a higher/lower score has negative implications for the health of older residents. "Worse" is used where a higher/lower score has negative implications for the health of older residents. "Worse" is used where a higher/lower score has negative implications for the health of older residents. "Worse" is used where a higher/lower score has negative implications we report data at very local levels because we believe change is often locally driven. Second, we vowed to protect the privacy of the people providing the information reported. Thus, given the constraints of the data analyzed we used a hierarchical approach to reporting. When possible we report estimates for 244 geographic units (i.e., every NH city/town and 5 Manchester neighborhoods, 4 Nashua neighborhoods). For example, the population characteristics were reported for all 244

Data Sources:

- Population Characteristics: The U.S. Census Bureau (American Community Survey 2012-2016).
- Wellness & Prevention: The Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (2011-2016).
- Nutrition/Diet: BRFSS (2011-2016), CMS (2014-2015), and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Food Atlas (2017).
- Behavioral Health: BRFSS (2011-2016), CMS (2014-2015), CDC Wonder website (2014-2016).
- Chronic Disease: The Master Beneficiary Summary File ABCD/Other from CMS (2014-2015).
- Disability: CMS (2014-2015) for the clinical measures, and ACS (2012-2016) for the self-reported disability.
- Access to Care: BRFSS (2011-2016), CMS (2015), Medicare.gov (June-July 2018), the NH Division of Public Health Services (2018), National Adult Day Services Association (2018), memorycaredirectory.com (2018), and the Alzheimer's Association (July 2018).
- Service Utilization: CMS (2015), and Medicare Nursing Home Compare (December 2018).
- Community & Civic Engagement: AARP (2018 update; https://www.aarp.org/livable-communities/network-age-friendly-communities/info-2014/member-list.html), the Aging & Disability Resource Center, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Air Compare (2016), assistedlivingfacilities.org, ACS (2012-2016), the NH Department of Business and Economic Affairs Division of Travel and Tourism Development (August 2018), NH YMCA (July 2018), the Federal Communications Commission (2016), BRFSS (2011-2016), and the NH Secretary of State.
- Safety & Transportation: U.S. Department of Justice Federal Bureau of Investigation (August 2017), the County Health Rankings (2018), BRFSS (2011-2016), ACS (2012-2016), and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (2011-2015).
- Economic & Housing, Cost of Living: ACS (2012-2016) and the Center for Social and Demographic Research on Aging at the University of Massachusetts Boston (August 2017).

<u>Healthy Aging Data Report Team</u>. Many people contributed to this research. The 2018 research team: Beth Dugan PhD, Frank Porell PhD, Nina Silverstein PhD, Chae Man Lee PhD, ShuangShuang Wang PhD, Bon Kim, Natalie Pitheckoff, Haowei Wang, Sae Hwang Han, Richard Chunga, & Shiva Prisad from the Gerontology Institute in the McCormack Graduate School of Policy and Global Studies at the University of Massachusetts Boston. The Tufts Health Plan Foundation supported the research and provided important guidance. Our Advisory Committees helped to make the Data Report best address the needs of New Hampshire. We thank JSI for their continued partnership. Questions? Beth.dugan@umb.edu Update: 05/2019