

MEETING NOTICE
AAA4 ADVISORY COUNCIL

(916) 486-1876

DATE: September 19, 2024
TIME: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Our Mission: Enriching the lives of older adults and people with disabilities by **FOSTERING** networks of support, **ADVOCATING** for individual choice, **COLLABORATING** with others, **ENSURING** equity, and **STRIVING** to do so with conviction.

PLACE: **NEVADA COUNTY**
Nevada County Library
980 Helling Way ~ Gene Albaugh Community Room
Nevada City, CA 95959

AGENDA

- I. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS**
- II. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
- III. CONSENT CALENDAR**
 - A. Adopt the Agenda..... 2 min.
 - B. Approve Minutes From 8/15/24..... 2 min.
- IV. CORRESPONDENCE 0 min.**
Not applicable
- V. ACTION ITEM 10 min.**
 - A. Select Council Members to Serve on the Nominating Committee
- VI. DISCUSSION/PRESENTATIONS80 min.**
 - A. HICAP 101: The Health Insurance Counseling & Advocacy Program and You, *pre-recorded video,Carolynn Washington*
 - B. The Unique Challenges of Serving Frontier Communities, *pre-recorded video, Sierra County Supervisors Dryden and Heuer*
 - C. Final Preparations for Parity Decision Points around County Funding Levels, *presented by Will Tift*
- VII. REPORTS..... 20 min.**
 - A. Executive Committee
 - B. Governing Board
 - C. HICAP Coordinating Committee
 - D. Joint Program Evaluation Committee (JPEC)
 - E. Legislative Committee
 - F. Executive Director

COMMITTEE MEETING
Executive Committee: Thursday, 9/19/24, 9:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

PAGE TWO

VIII. ROUNDTABLE: ANNOUNCEMENTS 6 min.

IX. ADJOURNMENT 0 min.

Attachments to be sent under separate cover

- Not applicable

***Members of the public wishing to join the meeting via Zoom, please use the link below:**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86364925071>

If you need a disability-related reasonable accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact the AAA4 office at (916) 486-1876, or email AdvisoryCouncil@AgencyOnAging4.org at least 3 days in advance with your accommodation request. Every effort will be made to accommodate. However, we cannot guarantee we will be able to honor requests received less than 3 days in advance.

**AGENCY ON AGING AREA 4
ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

Date: August 15, 2024

Location: Sacramento County

I. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

Vice Chair Dr. Catheryn Koss called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m., welcomed new members: Harrison Linder (At-Large), Laura Drown (Yuba County), Seth Brunner (Yuba County) and guests. A quorum was established.

County	AC Members Present – 14	Excused = 5; Absent= 0
Nevada		K. Carpenter (E) A. Mikal-Heine (E)
Placer	K. Flanagan	D. Wiltsee (E)
Sacramento	Dr. C. Koss, Dr. T. Abah, M. Jacobs, S. McBride, A. Zonderman	
Sierra	No members	
Sutter		P. Epley (E) T. Thomas (E)
Yolo	J. Bohon, C. Dorsey, S. Brunner	
Yuba	D. Panteloglow; L. Drown	
At-Large	P. Nelson; R. Saenz; H. Linder	

**Teleconferencing according to AB 2449 Brown Act Emergency Provision.*

AAA4 Staff Present: Will Tift, Linda Berry, Jodi Mesa, Gail Samuels, Kiel Adams.

Guests Present: Rob Drown, *Yuba Commission on Aging.*

Staff via Zoom: Pam Miller, German Ayon, Anson Houghton, Dr. Julie Bates, Julie Beckner.

Zoom Guests: Margaret Fowler, *Yuba County Commission on Aging*, David Wiltsee.

II. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – Rob Drown, Yuba County Commission on Aging, introduced himself and Margaret Fowler, Yuba Commission on Aging, introduced herself.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Motion to adopt the agenda.

Motion	Second	Passed
R. Saenz	J. Flanagan	Y=14; N= 0; Abstain=0

B. Motion to approve corrected minutes from 7/18/24.

Motion	Second	Passed
R. Saenz	L. Drown	Y=14; N= 0; Abstain=0

IV. CORRESPONDENCE – *Not Applicable*

V. ACTION ITEM – *Not Applicable*

VI. DISCUSSION/PRESENTATIONS**

A. Advocating for APS/IHSS/PG Services, *Kelly Carpenter*

- Item was tabled for September meeting

B. Introducing AAA4's Key Connections Co-Living Program, *Dr. Julie Bates*

- Dr. Julie Bates provided an update on the developments of the Key Connections Co-Living program and introduced staff member Gail Samuels.

C. Initial County Funding Levels for the 2025-29 Request for Proposals, *Will Tift*

- Will Tift discussed in detail the initial county funding levels and Request for Proposals for 2025-29, along with parity shares vs. actuals.

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Committee – *Dr. Catheryn Koss*

- The Executive Committee met on August 15, 2024 and reviewed the agenda.

B. Governing Board – *Jodi Mesa*

- The Governing Board met on August 9, 2024, in Nevada County where a quorum was established.
- The Board Approved:
 - AAA4 Employee Handbook Revisions
 - Resolution No. 320 to execute an MOU with CDA for the Area Plan, HICAP, and MIPPA agreements.
 - Resolution No. 321 to receive MIPPA funds for Grant Year 2024-25
 - Acceptance of funding Award for the Older Californians Act Modernization Nutrition funds, Year Three
- The Board also heard presentations on:
 - APS/IHSS/PG Services from Advisory Council Chair Kelly Carpenter
 - The Key Connections Co-Living Program from Dr. Julie Bates
 - Initial County Funding Levels for the 2025-29 from Will Tift

C. Legislative Committee – *Dr. Julie Bates*

- Letters of support submitted for:
 - SB1384 – power wheelchair repair bill
 - SB1406 – residential care facilities bill
- SB1249 is moving through suspense and will be voted on in the near future
- The Legislative Committee will recess until next year.

D. Executive Director – *Linda Berry*

- The SB1249 bill is moving through suspense with a 3rd reading on the floor and it is believed it will make its way to the Governor's Desk.
- Both SB1384 & SB1406 bills are currently in suspense.

- Starting in September, AAA4 will be in partnership with Mercy Medical Group in Sacramento for a 16-month pilot program for Medicare Health Equity Services.
- The Senior Connections grant with Sacramento County has been provided another \$130,000 and the program will be extended into next year.
- Work on the LADAP grant continues in Yuba-Sutter counties to develop a playbook for the Master Plan for Aging. Two focus groups were completed in the Latin X and Hmong communities and good feedback was obtained.
- The Yuba-Sutter Meals on Wheels program purchased an electric Subaru to do meal deliveries.

VIII. ROUNDTABLE: ANNOUNCEMENTS – *Not applicable*

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Dr. Catheryn Koss called for a motion for adjournment at 11:50 a.m.

****TO LISTEN TO THE FULL AUDIO OR REQUEST MATERIALS FROM THIS MEETING, PLEASE EMAIL AdvisoryCouncil@AgencyOnAging4.org**

Recordings are on file for one year.

ACTION ITEM V. A.

TO: AAA4 ADVISORY COUNCIL

FROM: Pam Miller

DATE: September 12, 2024

SUBJECT: Select Council Members to Serve on the Nominating Committee

In accordance with the Advisory Council’s Bylaws, the “Nominating Committee shall, insofar as possible, consist of a representative from each county. There shall be a minimum of three (3) members.”

The Committee should meet as soon as practicable to choose a slate of individuals they believe are best-suited to serve as Advisory Council Officers for the next calendar year. The Nominating Committee is scheduled to present its slate in October, and elections will be held in December.

AAA4 is currently seeking Council Members who are willing to serve on the Nominating Committee. Nominations may be made from the floor.

This item requires a roll call vote.

PRESENTATION ITEM VI. A.

TO: AAA4 ADVISORY COUNCIL
FROM: Pam Miller
DATE: September 12, 2024
SUBJECT: HICAP 101: The Health Insurance Counseling & Advocacy Program and You

AAA4 contracts with Legal Services of Northern California to offer HICAP services throughout our seven-county service area. Through agreements with El Dorado and San Joaquin Counties, AAA4 is responsible for the provision of HICAP there as well.

The purpose of HICAP is to provide “free, unbiased and confidential Medicare counseling and advocacy” to existing and soon-to-be beneficiaries.

The Council will view a recording of the September 13th presentation to the Governing Board.

Additional information can be found online at: <https://hicanservices.net/>

PRESENTATION ITEM VI. B.

TO: AAA4 ADVISORY COUNCIL
FROM: Pam Miller
DATE: September 12, 2024
SUBJECT: The Unique Challenges of Serving Frontier Communities

At the request of Sierra County Supervisors Dryden and Heuer, this presentation will provide additional insights into living, working and growing old in a Frontier community.

The Council will view a recording of the September 13th presentation to the Governing Board.

DISCUSSION ITEM VI. C.

TO: AAA4 ADVISORY COUNCIL

FROM: Pam Miller

DATE: September 12, 2024

SUBJECT: Final Preparations for Parity Decision Points around County Funding Levels

BACKGROUND (For ease of reference, this section repeats the information that appeared in the August 2024 Council and Board Packets, **except for revisions in teal.**)

Since 1994, AAA4 has applied California’s Intrastate Funding Formula (IFF) to determine how most¹ Older Americans Act (OAA) program funds should be distributed to the seven counties in an equitable manner. At AAA4, this practice is commonly referred to as “parity.” The total dollars that are subject to allocation through parity is known as the “parity pool.”

At the direction of the national Administration on Aging, each State began developing its own version of the IFF (a.k.a., a “parity formula”) in the early 1980s. This sparked a series of lawsuits in California and around the country from various parties who felt these formulas were unfair. In 1989, a federal district court ruling in the Florida case of Meek v. Martinez provided helpful clarification and guidance. Shortly thereafter, the California Department of Aging (CDA) finalized its IFF and began using it to allocate OAA funds to the State’s agencies on aging. The IFF still includes the following four demographic factors and weights² – the same set AAA4 has used for the last 30 years:

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Weight</u>
Persons age 60+ non-minority	1.0
Persons age 60+ minority	2.0
Persons age 60+ low-income	2.0
Persons age 60+ geographically isolated	1.5

Parity has been controversial at AAA4 because resetting it often leads to significant net financial gains and losses for certain counties and thus for the funded partners operating within them. While there have been numerous discussions about altering AAA4’s application of the Parity Formula in recent years (especially about adding new factors to the formula), no such changes have been approved by the Governing Board.

¹ AAA4 does not apply the IFF in circumstances where program funds are being used to serve the entire seven-county service area under a single program or service such as the Health Insurance Counseling and Advocacy Program (HICAP) and Long Term Care Ombudsman & Elder Abuse Prevention services.

² With respect to Title III-D Disease Prevention and Health Promotion funds only, CDA now also uses “Medi-Cal Eligible 60+” with a weight of 1.0. It is unclear when this fifth factor was added.

Parity resets have caused significant funding fluctuations for two separate reasons. First, the data used to compute parity is updated annually, but the formula is only recalculated once every four years. While this keeps awards stable *during* the subsequent 4-year funding (RFP) cycle, it also compounds the impacts that must occur *after* they are over. Second, Funded Partners' individual awards sometimes change in ways that push net county allocations above or below their parity shares. This is called "parity drift."

If a county is gradually losing parity share and collecting more than its existing share of funds (drifting high) at the same time, then a parity reset could result in tens of thousands of dollars being shifted out of that county. This is precisely what happened in 2008 when the parity reset caused a sudden \$120,000 shortfall in Nevada County. Since then, AAA4 has taken measures to curb such extreme losses; going forward, the Agency may conclude additional measures are warranted.

For planning purposes, the graphic on the following page shows **initial** "non-adjusted" parity percentages for 2024. It uses the most **current** data sources that are used by (and provided by) CDA to calculate the IFF, and those calculations result in a specific "parity percentage" for each county.

CDA's newest IFF data reflects a 10-year correction in geographic isolation because historically, those numbers have been based on the decennial Census. AAA4 Staff had expected to see significant reductions in those figures as communities that were once rural are now classified as urban. **Instead, we have seen substantial increases!** This surprising result is caused by CDA adopting a broader definition of "rural area" than it was using previously.

PSA 4 continues to have many more rural residents than any other service area in the State, and the Agency (as a whole) continues to benefit from the IFF as a result.

Prior to any Board-approved adjustments, only Nevada and Placer Counties are projected to see a net increase in their parity share because their rate of growth exceeds that of the other five Counties.

INITIAL Parity Calculations for 2024

(Not Adjusted for Sierra County)

Source Data:

County	60+ Total Population ^a	60+ Non-Minority ^a	60+ Minority ^a	60+ Low Income ^b	60+ Geographic Isolation ^c
Nevada	41,113	37,707	3,406	4,380	18,724
Placer	115,115	92,032	23,083	9,505	20,110
Sacramento	345,815	195,137	150,678	45,635	11,100
Sierra	1,530	1,399	131	160	1,286
Sutter	23,037	13,186	9,851	3,245	3,940
Yolo	44,852	28,187	16,665	5,185	4,547
Yuba	15,839	10,742	5,097	2,360	6,476
Totals	587,301	378,390	208,911	70,470	66,183

Application of the Formula:

Weight	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.5				
County	60+ Non-Minority	60+ Minority	60+ Low Income	60+ Geographic Isolation	Weighted Totals (Parity Points)	2024 Non-Adjusted Parity %	Variance: 2020 to 2024	Impact w/ \$12.9 million Budget (2024)
Nevada	37,707	6,812	8,760	28,086	81,365	7.85%	0.28%	\$ 35,681
Placer	92,032	46,166	19,010	30,165	187,373	18.08%	0.32%	\$ 40,986
Sacramento	195,137	301,356	91,270	16,650	604,413	58.32%	-0.03%	\$ (3,361)
Sierra	1,399	262	320	1,929	3,910	0.38%	-0.01%	\$ (1,863)
Sutter	13,186	19,702	6,490	5,910	45,288	4.37%	-0.31%	\$ (39,702)
Yolo	28,187	33,330	10,370	6,821	78,708	7.59%	-0.23%	\$ (30,130)
Yuba	10,742	10,194	4,720	9,714	35,370	3.41%	-0.01%	\$ (1,610)
Totals	378,390	417,822	140,940	99,275	1,036,427	100.00%	0.00%	\$ (0)

^a CA Department of Finance population projections (5-year groups), special run request, February 2024.

^b American Community Survey (ACS) Special Tabulation on Aging, 2017-21 estimates.

^c US Census 2020, Table P12.

Application of the Initial Parity Percentages: SFY 2025-26

In order to isolate the effect of recalculating the Parity Formula, the “Impact” column in the chart above assumes funding levels have remained constant since 2020. That is a false assumption. Four years ago, AAA4’s Parity Pool was \$7,903,093. Today, it is \$10,274,905 which represents a net increase of \$2,371,812 or 30.0%. Virtually all of this increase (96.9%) is due to an influx of State General Funds (Augmentation Funds) to supplement Title III-C Nutrition Providers – a response to concerns about rising inflation.

In keeping with long-standing precedent, these additional Nutrition dollars have been distributed proportionally. For example, if any given Nutrition Provider receives 10% of all Title III-C funds, then that Provider would have received 10% of the State Augmentation Funds. Such a large increase of dollars in a single service category has resulted in substantial Parity Drift whereby AAA4's smaller counties (which have the highest proportion of nutrition dollars) have exceeded their Parity Shares at the expense of AAA4's larger counties (which have the lowest proportion of nutrition dollars). The consequences of this effect are evidenced in the chart below.

Funding Levels by County: Initial Parity Shares vs. Actuals

With Per Capita Figures Added

Current Spending Per Capita: Age 60+ (SFY 2024-25)	COUNTY	INITIAL PARITY SHARES (For SFY 2025-26)		ACTUAL AWARDS (SFY 2024-25)	OVER & UNDER
		Percent	Dollars		
\$20.62	Nevada	7.85%	\$ 806,635	\$ 847,894	\$ 41,259
\$13.85	Placer	18.08%	\$ 1,857,575	\$ 1,594,474	\$ (263,101)
\$16.89	Sacramento	58.32%	\$ 5,992,019	\$ 5,839,794	\$ (152,225)
\$146.70	Sierra	0.38%	\$ 38,763	\$ 223,846	\$ 185,083
\$26.69	Sutter	4.37%	\$ 448,975	\$ 614,967	\$ 165,992
\$31.51	Yolo	7.59%	\$ 780,289	\$ 725,956	\$ (54,333)
\$27.02	Yuba	3.41%	\$ 350,650	\$ 427,973	\$ 77,323
\$17.50	PSA 4	100.00%	\$ 10,274,906	\$ 10,274,904	\$ (2)

Agency on Aging Area 4

9/5/2024

At this time, AAA4 is projecting flat funding for SFY 2025-26 (the first year of the major RFP cycle), thus without any new dollars entering the Parity Pool, rebalancing funding levels by County is a zero-sum scenario. Placer, Sacramento and Yolo are all currently receiving *less* than their Initial Parity Share; they cannot realize any gains unless Nevada, Sierra, Sutter and Yuba experience losses because those Counties are all currently receiving *more* than their Initial Share.

As a reminder, "Initial" Parity figures are figures that have not yet been adjusted for Sierra County. Since 2020, Placer and Sacramento Counties have effectively subsidized Sierra in order to maintain a sufficient fiscal baseline for Congregate Meals, Home-Delivered Meals, Legal Services and Outreach. The Governing Board has always supported Sierra County in this way, but the manner in which it is done varies. Generally, the Counties that have benefited most from Parity resets have been the Counties to divert a portion of their added funds to Sierra.

Approval of new Parity Percentages for the 2025-27 Request for Proposals is a two-step process. The Governing Board should first decide upon a baseline funding level for Sierra County during the October 2024 meeting (Sierra's Adjusted Parity Percentage is then computed based on that amount).

At the November 2024 meeting, the Board will be prepared for the second decision point – choosing which Counties will divert what sums to Sierra County to reach their SFY 2025-26 baseline (the Adjusted Parity Percentages for the contributing Counties are then computed based on their resulting award amounts). The outcome of this second step will dictate final funding levels for all seven Counties unless exceptions are granted. In 2020 for example, following a motion by Sacramento Supervisor Nottoli, the Governing Board voted to divert \$8,000 from Sacramento County to Yuba County to lessen the amount of Parity reductions that were needed there (Yuba’s Parity percentage was not changed).

NEW INFORMATION:

Limitations on the Transfer of Funds between Titles

Older Americans Act funds are not guaranteed; they are appropriated every year through the federal budget process. Congress has always allocated more funds to Nutrition (Title III-C) than to Supportive Services (Title III-B). Agencies on Aging are allowed to transfer up to 30% of the III-C funds to III-B without approval from the State. Historically, AAA4 has met or exceeded that 30% threshold because over time, the demand for services like Transportation has consistently increased while the demand for traditional Congregate Meals has declined. On August 20th, AAA4 Staff submitted the following question to CDA:

Since 2020, our Title III-B providers have not benefitted from ongoing increases to their baseline awards even though their operating costs have increased. If our AAA were to address this imbalance by transferring more funds from Title III-C to Title III-B than we do now, would CDA view that transfer as an improper supplantment of the State General Fund Nutrition Augmentation dollars?

The State responded, in part, by stating “*transfers from IIIC to IIIB are closely evaluated since transfers remove funding that is intended to meet the critical need of providing more meals to more older adults. Some considerations include if there has been a decrease in actual IIIC service units from prior FY and if there a decrease in proposed IIIC service units from PY in the Area Plan or Area Plan Update (i.e., is there a planned reduction in services).*” Since any meaningful reduction in Nutrition funding would inevitably result in a decrease in the number of meals provided, the more concise answer is: Yes, such a transfer would be improper and not allowed.

This means AAA4’s ability to “generate” additional Title III-B dollars is effectively frozen at the 30% transfer limit. Absent an increase in federal III-B or III-C funds, the Agency can only increase individual III-B program budgets by reducing the number of total awards. More specifically, this could be accomplished through the reduction or elimination of non-mandatory programs such as Employment and Minor Home Modification.