


Greenland (Rockingham)

Greenland is a town located in Rockingham County bordering the Great Bay. There are 704 residents age 65 or older. Compared to state average rates, older residents fared better on some healthy aging indicators with lower rates of post-traumatic stress disorder, personality disorders, schizophrenia and other psychotic disorders, diabetes, stroke, asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, heart attack, peripheral vascular disease, benign prostatic hyperplasia, liver diseases, epilepsy, cataracts, and pressure ulcers. However, they had higher rates of excessive drinking. Relative to the state, they are more likely to take the health promotion steps of meeting CDC guidelines for both aerobic and muscle-strengthening physical activities and undergoing colorectal cancer screening. Community resources to support healthy aging include 8 home health agencies, 2 nursing homes, and a hospital within 5 miles, and access to broadband.



POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS	BETTER / WORSE STATE RATE¹	COMMUNITY ESTIMATE	STATE ESTIMATE
Total population all ages		3,783	1,327,503
Population 60 years or older as % of total population		24.2%	22.7%
Total population 60 years or older		917	301,630
Population 65 years or older as % of total population		18.6%	15.8%
Total population 65 years or older		704	210,385
% 65-74 years		53.1%	58.5%
% 75-84 years		31.7%	28.6%
% 85 years or older		15.2%	12.9%
Gender (65+ population)			
% female		53.3%	54.7%
Race/Ethnicity (65+ population)			
% White		100.0%	97.7%
% African American		0.0%	0.5%
% Asian		0.0%	0.9%
% Other		0.0%	0.9%
% Hispanic/Latino		0.0%	0.9%
Marital Status (65+ population)			
% married		64.9%	58.5%
% divorced/separated		15.6%	14.0%
% widowed		13.8%	22.9%
% never married		5.7%	4.6%
Education (65+ population)			
% with less than high school education		2.7%	12.3%
% with high school or some college		50.6%	57.1%
% with college degree		46.7%	30.6%
% of 65+ population living alone		13.9%	26.1%
% of 65+ population who speak only English at home		95.5%	91.3%
% of 65+ population who are veterans of military service		26.4%	24.8%
Age-sex adjusted 1-year mortality rate		4.7%	4.1%

HEALTHY AGING INDICATORS	BETTER / WORSE STATE RATE¹	COMMUNITY ESTIMATE	STATE ESTIMATE
Geographic Migration (65+ population) in the past 12 months			
% moved within same county		0.0%	3.6%
% moved from different county in New Hampshire		0.0%	1.0%
% moved from different state		1.1%	1.7%
WELLNESS & PREVENTION			
% 60+ with any physical activity within last month		81.4%	74.5%
% 60+ met CDC guidelines for muscle-strengthening activity	B	35.7%	26.0%
% 60+ met CDC guidelines for aerobic physical activity		66.6%	58.6%
% 60+ met CDC guidelines for both types of physical activities	B	29.8%	19.9%
% 60+ getting recommended hours of sleep		72.7%	66.4%
% 60+ injured in a fall within last 12 months		10.4%	10.4%
% 65+ had hip fracture		3.3%	3.3%
% 60+ with self-reported fair or poor health status		16.1%	16.5%
% 60+ with 15+ physically unhealthy days last month		10.4%	12.5%
% 60+ with physical exam/check-up in past year		88.8%	86.5%
% 60+ met CDC preventive health screening goals		40.6%	40.3%
% 60+ flu shot past year		57.9%	59.3%
% 65+ with pneumonia vaccine		78.2%	77.8%
% 60+ with cholesterol screening		97.3%	95.3%
% 60+ women with a mammogram within last 2 years		85.6%	79.3%
% 60+ with colorectal cancer screening	B	84.7%	77.0%
% 60+ with HIV test		14.9%	13.5%
% 60+ current smokers		7.3%	8.1%
Oral Health			
% 60+ with loss of 6 or more teeth		23.1%	29.0%
% 60+ with annual dental exam		81.8%	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		23.7%	20.2%
% 60+ self-reported obese		20.1%	27.2%
% 65+ clinically diagnosed obese		14.8%	16.7%
% 65+ with high cholesterol		69.8%	72.2%
% 60+ excessive drinking	W	16.2%	9.2%
% 65+ with poor supermarket access		77.9%	28.4%

HEALTHY AGING INDICATORS	BETTER / WORSE STATE RATE¹	COMMUNITY ESTIMATE	STATE ESTIMATE
BEHAVIORAL HEALTH			
% 60+ with 15+ days poor mental health last month		6.4%	6.9%
% 65+ with depression		25.5%	28.8%
% 65+ with anxiety disorders		19.5%	21.9%
% 65+ with bipolar disorders		2.3%	3.1%
% 65+ with post-traumatic stress disorder	B	0.6%	1.4%
% 65+ with schizophrenia & other psychotic disorders	B	4.0%	4.9%
% 65+ with personality disorders	B	0.6%	1.1%
# opioid deaths (all ages) (county)		276	1,279
% 65+ with substance use disorders (drug use +/- alcohol abuse)		4.5%	5.5%
% 65+ with tobacco use disorders		8.4%	10.4%
CHRONIC DISEASE			
% 65+ with Alzheimer's disease or related dementias		10.2%	12.0%
% 65+ with diabetes		27.4%	28.2%
% 65+ with stroke	B	7.1%	10.8%
% 65+ with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	B	16.1%	20.5%
% 65+ with asthma	B	8.9%	13.0%
% 65+ with hypertension		67.5%	70.2%
% 65+ ever had a heart attack	B	2.7%	4.5%
% 65+ with ischemic heart disease		35.4%	34.3%
% 65+ with congestive heart failure		14.7%	17.7%
% 65+ with atrial fibrillation		13.1%	14.4%
% 65+ with peripheral vascular disease	B	11.7%	14.7%
% 65+ with osteoarthritis/rheumatoid arthritis		47.2%	49.1%
% 65+ with osteoporosis		15.1%	17.4%
% 65+ with leukemias and lymphomas		1.8%	2.0%
% 65+ with lung cancer		1.3%	1.6%
% 65+ with colon cancer		1.9%	2.4%
% 65+ women with breast cancer		10.3%	9.8%
% 65+ women with endometrial cancer		1.2%	1.7%
% 65+ men with prostate cancer		12.7%	11.5%
% 65+ with benign prostatic hyperplasia	B	30.8%	36.8%
% 65+ with HIV/AIDS		0.04%	0.05%
% 65+ with hypothyroidism		22.2%	20.8%
% 65+ with anemia		36.4%	37.3%
% 65+ with chronic kidney disease		19.3%	22.3%
% 65+ with liver diseases	B	4.1%	6.9%
% 65+ with fibromyalgia, chronic pain and fatigue		20.4%	18.6%

HEALTHY AGING INDICATORS	BETTER / WORSE STATE RATE¹	COMMUNITY ESTIMATE	STATE ESTIMATE
% 65+ with migraine and other chronic headache		4.0%	4.0%
% 65+ with epilepsy	B	1.3%	2.1%
% 65+ with traumatic brain injury		1.2%	1.1%
% 65+ with autism spectrum disorders		N/A	0.03%
% 65+ with glaucoma		22.0%	22.9%
% 65+ with cataract	B	55.1%	61.2%
% 65+ with pressure ulcer or chronic ulcer	B	5.0%	7.1%
% 65+ with 4+ (out of 15) chronic conditions		51.9%	54.4%
% 65+ with 0 chronic conditions		13.3%	10.3%
LIVING WITH DISABILITY			
% 65+ with self-reported hearing difficulty		9.5%	15.0%
% 65+ with clinical diagnosis of deafness or hearing impairment		12.5%	14.4%
% 65+ with self-reported vision difficulty		2.6%	5.2%
% 65+ with clinical diagnosis of blindness or visual impairment		0.5%	0.9%
% 65+ with self-reported cognition difficulty	B	1.3%	6.9%
% 65+ with self-reported ambulatory difficulty	B	8.1%	18.8%
% 65+ with clinical diagnosis of mobility impairments		2.9%	3.2%
% 65+ with self-reported self-care difficulty		5.5%	5.6%
% 65+ with self-reported independent living difficulty		7.5%	11.3%
ACCESS TO CARE			
Medicare (65+ population)			
% Medicare managed care enrollees	*	4.6%	7.9%
% dually eligible for Medicare and Medicaid	*	2.6%	7.5%
% 60+ with a regular doctor		95.2%	95.8%
% 60+ who did not see doctor when needed due to cost		5.4%	5.4%
# of primary care providers within 5 miles		78	2,961
# of hospitals within 5 miles		1	26
# of nursing homes within 5 miles		2	74
# of home health agencies		8	49
# of community health centers		0	22
# of adult day health centers		0	21
# of memory cafes		0	12
# of dementia-related support groups		0	14

HEALTHY AGING INDICATORS	BETTER / WORSE STATE RATE¹	COMMUNITY ESTIMATE	STATE ESTIMATE
SERVICE UTILIZATION			
Physician visits per year	*	7.4	6.3
Emergency room visits/1000 persons 65+ years per year	*	399	572
Part D monthly prescription fills per person per year	*	44.5	49.1
Home health visits per year		1.9	2.5
Durable medical equipment claims per year		1.8	2.0
Inpatient hospital stays/1000 persons 65+ years per year		220	237
Medicare inpatient hospital readmissions (as % of admissions)		15.5%	15.8%
# skilled nursing facility stays/1000 persons 65+ years per year		57	76
# skilled nursing home Medicare beds/1000 persons 65+ years		0	33
% 65+ getting Medicaid long term services and supports	*	1.9%	3.7%
COMMUNITY VARIABLES & CIVIC ENGAGEMENT			
AARP Age-Friendly efforts in community		Not yet	Yes
# of senior centers		0	38
Air pollution: annual # of unhealthy days for 65+ (county)		2	N/A
% of grandparents raising grandchildren		0.0%	0.8%
% of grandparents who live with grandchildren		0.9%	2.5%
# of assisted living sites		0	134
% of vacant homes in community		7.3%	16.0%
# of universities and community colleges		0	41
# of public libraries		1	234
# of YMCAs		0	11
% in county with access to broadband (all ages)		99.0%	93.0%
% 60+ who used Internet in last month		75.1%	77.6%
Voter participation rate in 2018 election (age 18+)		80.9%	54.7%
SAFETY & TRANSPORTATION			
Violent crime rate /100,000 persons		67	207
Homicide rate /100,000 persons (county)		1	1
# firearm fatalities (county)		92	586
Property crime rate /100,000 persons		810	2,012
% 65+ who own a motor vehicle		93.5%	91.0%
% 60+ who always drive wearing a seatbelt		80.9%	77.1%
# of fatal crashes involving adult age 60+/town		0	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		2.7%	5.4%
% 60+ receiving food stamps past year		2.6%	5.7%
% 65+ employed past year		30.0%	24.8%
Household income (65+ householder)			
% households with annual income < \$20,000		10.9%	18.2%
% households with annual income \$20,000-\$49,999		22.0%	36.5%
% households with annual income > \$50,000		67.2%	45.3%
% 60+ own home		97.0%	79.9%
% 60+ have mortgage on home		42.3%	35.3%
% 65+ households spend >35% of income on housing (renter)		1.6%	8.7%
% 65+ households spend >35% of income on housing (owner)		13.7%	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 not 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 people, and when the implication is unclear, we use an *. We balance two goals. First, we aim to 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 units. For other data (i.e., highly prevalent chronic disease, health services utilization) we could report for 154 geographic units. For less prevalent conditions we report for 69 geographic units. For the BRFSS data we report for 28 geographic units, and for the lowest prevalence conditions (e.g., HIV) we report for 4 geographic units. The same estimate is reported for all cities/towns within aggregated geographic areas. Maps of the different geographic groupings and the rationale behind the groupings are in the Technical Report.

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), memorycaresdirectory.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).

Healthy Aging Data Report Team. 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 Prasad 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