



**Congressional  
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

---

# Older Americans Act: Funding Formulas

**Kirsten J. Colello**

Specialist in Health and Aging Policy

March 19, 2015

**Congressional Research Service**

7-5700

[www.crs.gov](http://www.crs.gov)

RS22549

## Summary

The Older Americans Act (OAA) is the major vehicle for the delivery of social and nutrition services for older persons. The act's statutory funding formulas determine allotments to states and other entities under the following OAA Titles: Title III, Grants for State and Community Programs; Title V, the Community Service Senior Opportunities Act; Title VI, Grants for Older Native Americans; and Title VII, Vulnerable Elder Rights Protection Activities.

Title III accounts for 71% of the act's total FY2015 appropriations (\$1.328 billion out of \$1.878 billion). States receive separate allotments of funds for the following six programs authorized under Title III: (1) supportive services and centers, (2) congregate nutrition services, (3) home-delivered nutrition services, (4) the Nutrition Services Incentive Program (NSIP), (5) disease prevention and health promotion services, and (6) the National Family Caregiver Support Program (NFCSP). Formula grants are allotted from the Administration on Aging (AOA), within the Administration for Community Living (ACL) in the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), to State Units on Aging (SUAs) in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. territories. The states, in turn, award funds to approximately 618 Area Agencies on Aging (AAAs).

Title V authorizes the Community Service Employment for Older Americans Program (CSEOA). Administered by the Department of Labor (DOL), Title V is OAA's second-largest program and is the only federally subsidized employment program for low-income older persons (defined in the law as those aged 55 and older). Its FY2015 funding of \$434.4 million represents 23% of the act's total funding. DOL allocates Title V funds for grants to state agencies in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. territories, and to national organizations. The total Title V state allotment is the sum of its respective state agency grantee allotment and national organization grantee allotment.

Title VI authorizes funds for supportive and nutrition services to older Native Americans to promote the delivery of home and community-based supportive services, nutrition services, and family caregiver support. Funds are awarded directly to Indian tribal organizations, Alaskan Native organizations, and non-profit groups representing Native Hawaiians.

Title VII authorizes the Long-Term Care (LTC) Ombudsman Program and elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation prevention programs. Most Title VII funding is directed at the LTC Ombudsman Program, the purpose of which is to investigate and resolve complaints of residents of nursing facilities and other long-term care facilities. Funds for LTC ombudsman and elder abuse prevention activities are allotted to states.

The OAA Amendments of 2006 (P.L. 109-365) reauthorized all programs under the act through FY2011. Among other things, P.L. 109-365 changed the formula allocation for most Title III programs. No changes were made to Title V, VI, or VII formulas. While the authorizations of appropriations under the OAA expired at the end of FY2011, Congress has continued to appropriate funding for OAA-authorized activities. The 114<sup>th</sup> Congress may consider reauthorization of the OAA and, in doing so, may modify existing authorities, including statutory funding formulas. This report describes the current debate surrounding changes to the Title III funding formula under S. 192, the Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2015, and during the OAA reauthorizations of 2000 and 2006. It then summarizes the OAA statutory provisions that allocate funds to states and other entities under current law.

## Contents

Background.....	1
Older Americans Act Reauthorization.....	1
Title III: Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging.....	3
Legislative History .....	3
The OAA Amendments of 2000 and 2006.....	4
Allocation for Supportive Services and Centers, Congregate and Home-Delivered Nutrition Services, and Disease Prevention and Health Promotion .....	6
Analysis of Current Law Funding Formula .....	6
Allocation for Nutrition Services Incentive Program.....	8
Allocation for the National Family Caregiver Support Program.....	8
Title V: Community Service Employment for Older Americans.....	9
Title VI: Grants for Older Native Americans.....	10
Title VII: Vulnerable Elder Rights Protection Activities .....	11

## Tables

Table 1. OAA Title III Programs: FY2006 and FY2015 Allotted Funding .....	7
Table A-1. Older Americans Act, Title III Part B: Comparison of FY2006 Hold Harmless (HH) and FY2015 Funding Allotment Amounts for States and U.S. Territories.....	13
Table A-2. Older Americans Act, Title III Part C1: Comparison of FY2006 Hold Harmless (HH) and FY2015 Funding Allotment Amounts for States and U.S. Territories.....	15
Table A-3. Older Americans Act, Title III Part C2: Comparison of FY2006 Hold Harmless (HH) and FY2015 Funding Allotment Amounts for States and U.S. Territories.....	17
Table A-4. Older Americans Act, Title III Part D: Comparison of FY2006 Hold Harmless (HH) and FY2015 Funding Allotment Amounts for States and U.S. Territories.....	19
Table A-5. Population Formula Factor: Proportion of the State/U.S. Territory Population Aged 60+ Relative to Total U.S. Population Aged 60+.....	21
Table B-1. Comparison of FY2015 Older Americans Act (OAA) Title III Allotments to Simulated Population Aged 60+ with 99% of FY2015 Allotments for FY2016.....	25
Table B-2. Comparison of FY2015 Older Americans Act (OAA) Title III Allotments to Simulated Population Aged 60+ with 99% of FY2016 Allotments for FY2017.....	27
Table B-3. Comparison of FY2015 Older Americans Act (OAA) Title III Allotments to Simulated Population Aged 60+ with 99% of FY2017 Allotments for FY2018.....	29

## Appendixes

Appendix A. Current Law: OAA Title III, Parts B, C, and D FY2015 Allotments and Population Trends.....	12
Appendix B. The Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2015 (S. 192): Analysis of Formula Change .....	23

## **Contacts**

Author Contact Information..... 31

## Background

First enacted in 1965, the Older Americans Act (OAA, P.L. 89-73, as amended) is the primary federal vehicle for the delivery of social and nutrition services for older persons. The majority of OAA grant funds are provided to states and other entities based on statutory formulas that exist in the following titles:

- Title III, Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging;
- Title V, Community Service Employment for Older Americans;
- Title VI, Grants for Older Native Americans; and
- Title VII, Vulnerable Elder Rights Protection Activities.

These formula grants fund programs that assist older Americans with supportive services; congregate nutrition services (meals served at group sites such as senior centers, community centers, schools, churches, or senior housing complexes); home-delivered nutrition services; family caregiver support; community service employment; the long-term care ombudsman program; and services to prevent the abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older persons. The OAA also supports grants to older Native Americans.<sup>1,2</sup>

Since enactment of OAA, Congress has reauthorized and amended the act numerous times. In the past, OAA reauthorization has included extending the act's authorizations of appropriations for a five-year period. The last OAA reauthorization occurred in 2006, when Congress enacted the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2006 (P.L. 109-365), which extended the act's authorizations of appropriations through FY2011. P.L. 109-365 also changed the Title III formula for supportive services, congregate nutrition services, home-delivered nutrition services, and disease prevention and health promotion services to ensure that every state receives at least its FY2006 amount (also known as the "hold harmless" provision), while phasing out the provision that guarantees every state a share of any increase in total funding above FY2006. No changes were made to the other formula grants in the act. While the authorizations of appropriations under the OAA expired at the end of FY2011, Congress has continued to appropriate funding for OAA-authorized activities. The 114<sup>th</sup> Congress may consider reauthorization of the OAA and, in doing so, may modify existing authorities, including statutory funding formulas.

## Older Americans Act Reauthorization

In the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress, comprehensive OAA reauthorization legislation was introduced in the Senate (S. 1028 and S. 1562) which would have extended through FY2018 the authorizations of

<sup>1</sup> For information regarding funding allocations to states, U.S. territories, and tribal organizations under Titles III, VI, and VII, see [http://www.aoa.gov/AoARoot/AoA\\_Programs/OAA/Aging\\_Network/State\\_Allocations/index.aspx](http://www.aoa.gov/AoARoot/AoA_Programs/OAA/Aging_Network/State_Allocations/index.aspx). For information regarding funding allocations to states and national organizations under Title V, see [http://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/corr\\_doc.cfm?DOCN=8481](http://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/corr_doc.cfm?DOCN=8481).

<sup>2</sup> OAA Title I sets out broad policy objectives and defines various terms under the act; OAA Title II establishes the Administration on Aging (AOA) and sets forth responsibilities for AOA and the Assistant Secretary for Aging; OAA Title IV authorizes funding for training, research, and demonstration projects in the field of aging. For information on the historical development of OAA and a brief description of the act's titles, see CRS Report R43414, *Older Americans Act (OAA): In Brief*, by Kirsten J. Colello and Angela Napili.

appropriations for most OAA programs and would have made various amendments to existing OAA authorities. The Older Americans Act Amendments of 2013 (S. 1028) was first introduced by Senator Sanders. It was referred to the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP) Committee's Subcommittee on Primary Health and Aging. Subsequently, Senator Sanders introduced a separate bipartisan reauthorization bill, S. 1562, the Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2013, which was also originally co-sponsored by Senators Harkin and Alexander. The Senate HELP Committee ordered S. 1562 reported favorably with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. In the House of Representatives, two OAA reauthorization bills were introduced (H.R. 3850 and H.R. 4122). These bills were referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, but saw no further legislative action.

S. 1562 did not contain provisions that would amend OAA statutory funding formulas. However, during the Senate HELP Committee consideration of the OAA reauthorization bill Senator Burr introduced an amendment that would have removed the Title III B, C, and D FY2006 hold harmless provision which was rejected. Senator Harkin stated there would be additional examination of the OAA funding formula by a Senate bipartisan workgroup with a possible solution prior to Senate floor consideration. The bill was subsequently reported out of committee and placed on the Senate Legislative Calendar, but did not receive consideration by the Senate.

In the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress, the Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2015 (S. 192) was introduced January 20, 2015. The bill would authorize appropriations for most OAA programs through FY2018. It also would make various amendments to existing OAA authorities, including changes to the statutory funding formula for supportive services and centers, congregate nutrition, home-delivered nutrition, and disease prevention and health promotion services under Title III of the act for discussion of the statutory funding formula change proposed in S. 192. On January 28, 2015, the Senate HELP Committee ordered S. 192, the Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2015, reported favorably. The bill has been placed on the Senate Legislative Calendar.

The topic of OAA statutory funding formulas was also examined by GAO in an analysis of the OAA Title III and VII statutory funding formulas that focused on formula modifications that would capture state differences with respect to need by including factors that measure the needs of the elderly population, costs of services in addressing those needs, as well as the capacity of states to finance needed services.<sup>3</sup> GAO found that the current formulas could better meet generally accepted equity standards in targeting OAA services to those with "greatest economic need" and "greatest social need." For example, GAO found that the need for OAA services can be better estimated using data on older individuals' functional limitations. GAO also noted that while revisions to the OAA statutory formula may pose challenges, options to ease the transition such as phasing in implementation over several years and/or instituting funding floors or ceilings may be further provisions for policy makers to consider in any statutory revisions.

This report describes the OAA statutory provisions for each title that allocate funds to states and other entities under current law. Given legislative interest in changing OAA Title III funding formulas for certain programs, **Appendix A** provides further information about current law OAA Title III funding formulas under Parts B, C, and D; **Appendix B** analyzes the Title III funding formula changes as proposed under S. 192.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Older Americans Act: Options to Better Target Need and Improve Equity*, GAO/13-74, December 2012.

## **Title III: Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging**

Title III authorizes grants to State Units on Aging (SUAs) and Area Agencies on Aging (AAAs) in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. territories to act as advocates on behalf of, and to coordinate programs for, older persons (defined in the law as those aged 60 and older). The Administration on Aging (AOA) within the Administration for Community Living (ACL) in the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), allocates Title III funds to SUAs. The states, in turn, award funds to approximately 618 AAAs, which are designated by states to operate within specified planning and service areas. States must develop an intrastate funding formula for distribution of Title III funding within the state that takes into account the geographical distribution of older individuals in the state as well as the distribution of older individuals with greatest economic and social need (with particular attention to low-income minority older individuals) among specified planning and service areas. The state formula for distribution of Title III funding must be developed in accordance with AOA guidelines and approved by the Assistant Secretary for Aging.

As the OAA's largest component, spending under Title III accounts for 71% of the act's total FY2015 appropriations (\$1.328 billion out of \$1.871 billion).<sup>4</sup> States receive separate allotments of funds for the following six programs authorized under Title III: (1) supportive services and centers, (2) congregate nutrition services, (3) home-delivered nutrition services, (4) the Nutrition Services Incentive Program (NSIP), (5) disease prevention and health promotion services, and (6) the National Family Caregiver Support Program (NFCSP). States are required to provide a matching share of 15% in order to receive funds for supportive services and congregate and home-delivered nutrition programs. A matching share of 25% is required for the NFCSP; no match is required for disease prevention and health promotion services. To determine state allotments, a separate allocation is calculated for each of the six grant programs. The same formula is used to determine state allocations for supportive services and centers, congregate nutrition services, home-delivered nutrition services, and disease prevention and health promotion services. The formulas for the NSIP and NFCSP use different factors. This section describes the debate surrounding changes to the Title III funding formula during the OAA reauthorizations of 2000 and 2006, followed by a brief description of the different Title III allocation formulas under current law.

### **Legislative History**

When the OAA was enacted in 1965, Title III funds were allocated to states based on their relative share of the population aged 65 and over.<sup>5</sup> The law also set certain minimum grant amounts for states and territories. For states, the minimum allotment was 1% of total funds appropriated, and for the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa, the minimum

---

<sup>4</sup> FY2015 funding data in this report is from Division G of the joint explanatory text to Rules Committee Print 113-59, cited in "Explanatory Statement Submitted by Mr. Rogers of Kentucky, Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations Regarding Amendment to the Senate Amendment on H.R. 83, Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015," House of Representatives, Congressional Record, vol. 160, no. 151 Book II (December 11, 2014), pp. H9838, H9878-H9880.

<sup>5</sup> Section 302, Older Americans Act of 1965, P.L. 89-73.

allotment was 0.5% (one-half of 1%) of funds appropriated. These provisions remained in effect until 1973.

The first significant change to the OAA Title III funding formula occurred in 1973. The 1973 amendments to the act based the formula on the states' relative share of the population aged 60 and over, rather than as under prior law, aged 65 and over.<sup>6</sup> The 1973 amendments also changed the minimum allotments states and territories were to receive, as follows: states were to receive no less than 0.5% of the total appropriation; and Guam, American Samoa, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands<sup>7</sup> were to receive no less than 0.25% (one-fourth of 1%) of total funds. In addition, the 1973 amendments specified that states were to receive no less than they received in FY1973 (the hold harmless amount).<sup>8</sup>

These provisions remained in effect until the 1978 amendments, which changed the minimum amounts for American Samoa to one-sixteenth of 1% of the appropriation, and added a minimum funding amount for the Northern Marianas (also one-sixteenth of 1%).<sup>9</sup> These amendments also changed the year for the hold harmless amount. The law stipulated that for fiscal years after 1978, states were to receive no less than they received in FY1978, rather than as in prior law, FY1973. Successive amendments subsequently changed the hold harmless year. Amendments in 1984 required that for fiscal years after FY1984, states be allotted no less than they received for services in FY1984.<sup>10</sup> The 1987 amendments made no change in the formula provisions.<sup>11</sup> The 1992 amendments moved the hold harmless reference year to FY1987.<sup>12</sup> No further changes were made to these funding formulas until the 2000 amendments.

## **The OAA Amendments of 2000 and 2006**

The Title III funding formula for supportive services and centers and the congregate and home-delivered nutrition programs has been a point of controversy in recent congressional attempts to reauthorize the Older Americans Act. Initially, Congress was concerned that the method AOA used to distribute Title III funds was inconsistent with statutory requirements thereby negatively affecting states experiencing faster growth in their older population. However, more recently, congressional debate has focused on whether or not the statutory formula itself accurately reflects trends in the aging of the U.S. population. The following provides a brief overview of the debate and legislative changes to the Title III funding formula in the OAA reauthorizations of 2000 and 2006.

After unsuccessful attempts to reauthorize the OAA by the 104<sup>th</sup> and 105<sup>th</sup> Congresses, the 106<sup>th</sup> Congress approved the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2000 (P.L. 106-501). The Title III funding formula was a controversial issue during the six years of congressional debate on the 2000 OAA reauthorization.<sup>13</sup> Prior to the reauthorization, a 1994 U.S. General Accounting Office

---

<sup>6</sup> P.L. 93-29.

<sup>7</sup> The minimum allotment for the trust territories was added by the 1969 amendments to the OAA (P.L. 91-69).

<sup>8</sup> The 1973 amendments (P.L. 93-29) stipulated a different allotment formula which was in effect for only the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

<sup>9</sup> P.L. 95-478.

<sup>10</sup> P.L. 98-459.

<sup>11</sup> P.L. 100-175.

<sup>12</sup> P.L. 102-375.

<sup>13</sup> For further information, see nondistributable CRS Report RL30055, *Older Americans Act: 2000 Reauthorization* (continued...)



(now the Government Accountability Office, or GAO) report found that the method AOA used did not distribute funds among states proportionately to their older population to the maximum extent possible.<sup>14</sup> Instead, AOA allotted funds to states, first according to an amount equal to their FY1987 “hold harmless” allocation, with the remainder of the appropriations allotted to states based on their relative share of the population aged 60 and over. This methodology negatively affected states with faster-growing older populations, since the majority of funds were being distributed according to population estimates that did not reflect the most recent trends. The GAO report recommended that AOA revise its methodology for distributing funds to states.

In response to these concerns, the 2000 OAA reauthorization resulted in the following changes to the law: (1) Congress clarified the law to ensure that, first, funds were allotted to states based on the most recent population data; (2) Congress created an FY2000 “hold harmless” requirement, thereby ensuring that no state would receive less than it received in FY2000; and (3) Congress created the “guaranteed growth” provision, ensuring that all states would receive a share of any appropriations increase over the FY2000 level.

The Title III funding formula also became a major point of contention during the 2006 OAA reauthorization debate.<sup>15</sup> Congress revisited the FY2000 “hold harmless” requirement and “guaranteed growth” provision. At the time, the “hold harmless” requirement ensured that, provided sufficient funds, every state and U.S. territory received at least its FY2000 amount. The “guaranteed growth” provision guaranteed that all states received a certain share of any increase above the FY2000 appropriation. These issues divided Members from states with relatively faster-growing older populations from lawmakers representing states with relatively slower growth in their older populations. High-growth states argued that the “hold harmless” provisions in current law provided protections to states whose populations were not increasing as quickly as others’, resulting in an inequitable distribution of funds that disadvantages high-growth states.

The OAA 2006 Amendments ultimately resulted in changes to the law as follows: (1) Congress changed the formula to ensure that, provided sufficient funds, every state receives at least its FY2006 amount (creating a new fiscal year “hold harmless” amount); and (2) Congress phased out the “guaranteed growth” provision, reducing the share of any increase in appropriations from 20% to 0 by five percentage points annually beginning in FY2008. For FY2007 through FY2010, the guaranteed growth provisions were as follows:

- 20% of the percentage increase in appropriations from FY2006 to FY2007;
- 15% of the percentage increase in appropriations from FY2006 to FY2008;
- 10% of the percentage increase in appropriations from FY2006 to FY2009; and
- 5% of the percentage increase in appropriations from FY2006 to FY2010.

Under current law, for FY2011 and any succeeding fiscal years, the formula does not include the guaranteed growth provision.

---

(...continued)

*Legislation*, by Carol O’Shaughnessy, available from author.

<sup>14</sup> U.S. General Accounting Office, *Older Americans Act: Title III Funds Not Distributed According to Statute*, GAO/HEHS-94-37, January 1994.

<sup>15</sup> For further information, see CRS Report RL31336, *The Older Americans Act: Programs, Funding, and 2006 Reauthorization (P.L. 109-365)*, by Carol O’Shaughnessy and Angela Napili.

## Allocation for Supportive Services and Centers, Congregate and Home-Delivered Nutrition Services, and Disease Prevention and Health Promotion

Separate state allotments for (1) supportive services and centers, (2) congregate nutrition services, (3) home-delivered nutrition services, and (4) disease prevention and health promotion services are based on a population formula factor that is defined as each state's relative share of the total U.S. population aged 60 years and older. For the purposes of this calculation, the total U.S. population aged 60 and older includes all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. territories. Population data are from annual population estimates published by the U.S. Census; the reference date for estimates is July 1. There is a two-year time lag between the reference year of the population estimates and the respective appropriation year. For example, FY2015 state allotments are calculated using 2013 estimates of the population aged 60 and older.

For the purpose of determining state allotments, the law requires that allotments meet two criteria. The first criterion is the "small state minimum." This ensures that all states (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) receive a minimum amount of funds, which is defined as 0.5% (one-half of 1%) of the total grant appropriation for the respective fiscal year. Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands each are allotted no less than 0.25% (one-quarter of 1%) of the total grant amount, and American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands are each allotted no less than 0.0625% (one-sixteenth of 1%) of the total grant amount.

The second criterion is the "hold harmless" provision, which ensures that, provided sufficient funds, every state and U.S. territory receives at least its FY2006 amount. If funding for a given year is equal to or less than FY2006 program amount, states receive an allotment in proportion to their respective FY2006 allotments. If funding exceeds the FY2006 program amount, states receive no less than their FY2006 allotment.

The OAA 2006 Amendments phased out the "guaranteed growth" provision beginning in FY2008. This provision guaranteed that all states would receive a certain share of any increase above the FY2006 appropriation. For example, states' FY2010 allotments were at least their FY2006 amount plus an amount equal to 5% of the percentage increase in FY2010 program amount above FY2006 levels.

Under current law, the formula does not include the guaranteed growth provision.<sup>16</sup> Thus, states and U.S. territories receive an allotment based on their population formula factor, which takes into account the following two criteria: (1) states will receive a minimum grant amount of at least 0.5% of the total grant appropriation (the same minimum grant amounts apply to U.S. territories), and (2) states and U.S. territories will receive no less than their FY2006 allotments, provided sufficient funding.

### Analysis of Current Law Funding Formula

Under current law, the effect of the FY2006 hold harmless criterion is to maintain funding in states that would otherwise see their allocations decrease due to changing population

---

<sup>16</sup> Current law applies to FY2011 and subsequent fiscal years.

demographics; this effect is different for each program based on that program's current funding level in relation to its FY2006 funding level. **Table 1** compares FY2006 to FY2015 enacted funding amounts for each program. (See **Appendix A** for state and U.S. territory FY2015 allotments under current law and trends in the population formula factor aged 60 and over.)

If increases in appropriated funding for grant programs are relatively large compared to FY2006-appropriated levels, states will generally receive an allotment based on their population. Thus, the FY2006 hold harmless provision becomes less of a factor. Conversely, when appropriations increases are relatively small or non-existent, states will generally receive an allotment based on the FY2006 hold harmless provision. Thus, absent such increases in funding, states with a stagnant or declining proportion of the nation's population aged 60 and over would see their funding reduced over time. They would, effectively, receive a smaller piece of the funding pie.

**Table 1. OAA Title III Programs: FY2006 and FY2015 Allotted Funding**  
(\$ in millions, nominal)

OAA Title III Programs	FY2006	FY2015	FY2006-FY2015 Difference
Part B: Supportive services and centers	\$349.3	\$344.3	-\$5.0 -1.4%
Part C1: Congregate nutrition	\$383.9	\$433.8	\$49.9 13.0%
Part C2: Home-delivered nutrition	\$181.2	\$214.2	\$33.0 18.2%
Part D: Disease prevention/health promotion	\$21.3	\$19.6	-\$1.7 -7.8%

**Source:** FY2006 funding allotments from ACL, "Title III Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging, FY2006 Final Allocation," August 28, 2006, [http://www.aoa.acl.gov/AoA\\_Programs/OAA/Aging\\_Network/State\\_Allocations/docs/T3\\_2006.pdf](http://www.aoa.acl.gov/AoA_Programs/OAA/Aging_Network/State_Allocations/docs/T3_2006.pdf); FY2015 funding levels from ACL, "Title III Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging, FY2015 Annual Allocations," January 30, 2015, [http://www.acl.gov/About\\_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf](http://www.acl.gov/About_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf).

**Notes:** Total allotment amounts are adjusted down from a program's enacted funding level to account for program support, evaluation, oversight, and other statutory-related activities.

**Table 1** shows that for two programs, the supportive services and preventive services programs, FY2015-enacted funding is below FY2006 funding levels (-1.4% and -7.8%, respectively). Thus, for these two programs, state and U.S. territory allotments for FY2015 are proportionately reduced from their FY2006 hold harmless amounts. That is, for FY2015 all states and U.S. territories will receive an allotment that is below their FY2006 hold harmless amount. See **Table A-1** (supportive services) and **Table A-4** (preventive services) for comparisons of the FY2006 hold harmless amount and FY2015 allotment amount, as well as the FY2015 allotment type for states and U.S. territories.

For the congregate nutrition program, FY2015-enacted funding is 13.0% above the FY2006 hold harmless funding level. This increase is not enough to remove the entire effect of the FY2006 hold harmless provision. Thus, for FY2015 states and U.S. territories receive a program allotment that is either based on (1) the minimum allotment amount (0.5% of total program funding); (2) the entities' FY2006 hold harmless amount; or (3) an amount that is determined based on the entities' population formula factor. Note that entities receiving an allotment based on their

population formula factor receive a reduced amount to compensate for the increased amounts allotted to states and U.S. territories that receive funding based on either a minimum or FY2006 hold harmless allotment in order to satisfy all statutory formula conditions. See **Table A-2** (congregate nutrition) for comparisons of the FY2006 hold harmless amount and FY2015 allotment amount as well as the FY2015 allotment type for states and U.S. territories.

For the home-delivered nutrition program, FY2015-enacted funding is 19% above the FY2006 hold harmless funding level. Unlike the congregate nutrition program, this increase in home-delivered nutrition is enough of an increase to eliminate the effect of the FY2006 hold harmless provision. Thus, all entities receive their FY2015 funding based on either (1) the minimum allotment amount, or (2) an amount that is determined based on the entities' population formula factor. The effect of the FY2006 hold harmless statutory condition has been entirely eliminated with funding enough above FY2006 levels, which allows funding to be allocated based on the population aged 60 and older subject to the state minimum allotment criterion. See **Table A-3** (home-delivered nutrition) for comparisons of the FY2006 hold harmless amount and FY2015 allotment amount, as well as the FY2015 allotment type for states and U.S. territories.

## Allocation for Nutrition Services Incentive Program

The Nutrition Services Incentives Program (NSIP) provides funds to states, territories, and Indian tribal organizations to purchase food or to cover the costs of food commodities provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) for the congregate and home-delivered nutrition programs. NSIP funds are allotted to states and other entities based on a formula that takes into account each state's share of total meals served by the nutrition services program (both congregate and home-delivered meals) in all states and tribes during the prior year.<sup>17</sup>

## Allocation for the National Family Caregiver Support Program

The National Family Caregiver Support Program (NFCSP) provides direct services for caregivers in five core service areas:

- Information about health conditions, resources, and community-based services.
- Assistance with accessing available services.
- Individual counseling, support groups, and caregiver training.
- Respite care services to provide families temporary relief from caregiving responsibilities.
- Supplemental services on a limited basis that would complement care provided by family and other caregivers (e.g., adult day health care, home care, home modifications, and assistive devices).

Funds for NFCSP are allotted to states based on each state's relative share of the population aged 70 years and older. States receive a minimum grant amount, which is defined as 0.5% (one-half of 1%) of the total grant appropriation for the respective fiscal year. Guam and the U.S. Virgin

---

<sup>17</sup> For further information, see CRS Report RS21202, *Older Americans Act: Title III Nutrition Services Program*, by Kirsten J. Colello.

Islands are allotted no less than 0.25% (one-quarter of 1%) of the total grant appropriation, and American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands are allotted no less than 0.0625% (one-sixteenth of 1%) of the total grant appropriation. There is no hold harmless or guaranteed growth provision in the formula allocation for this grant program.

## Title V: Community Service Employment for Older Americans

Title V authorizes the Community Service Employment for Older Americans Program (CSEOA).<sup>18</sup> Administered by the Department of Labor (DOL), Title V is OAA's second-largest program and is the only federally subsidized employment program for low-income older persons (defined in the law as those aged 55 and older with incomes up to 125% of the federal poverty level). Its FY2015 funding of \$434.4 million represents 23% of the act's total funding. There is a 10% nonfederal match requirement for Title V grant activities.

DOL allocates Title V funds for grants to state agencies in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. territories, and to national organizations. The total Title V state allotment is the sum of its respective state agency grantee allotment and national organization grantee allotment. To determine grant allotments for each state, a separate allocation is calculated for each grant type.

In the past, the Title V funding formula has been an issue for Congress.<sup>19</sup> During the 2006 OAA reauthorization, the original House bill (H.R. 5293) included a provision to update the "hold harmless" year in the Title V formula from FY2000 to FY2006; however, the Senate bill (S. 3570) did not include this provision. The compromise bill (H.R. 6197) enacted into law made no changes to the Title V formula. The following describes the Title V formula allocation.<sup>20</sup>

Before allocation of funds to states, DOL is required to reserve funds as follows:

- up to 1.5% of the total appropriation for Section 502(e) demonstration projects, pilot projects, and evaluation projects;
- 0.75% of the total appropriation for Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; and
- "such amount as may be necessary" for national grants to public or private organizations serving eligible Indians and Pacific Island and Asian Americans.

---

<sup>18</sup> Title V is also referred to as the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP).

<sup>19</sup> For further information on the legislative history of the Title V funding formula, see nondistributable CRS Report RL30055, *Older Americans Act: 2000 Reauthorization Legislation*, by Carol O'Shaughnessy, available from author.

<sup>20</sup> Current law requires that funds be distributed at their FY2000 level of activities, defined as the FY2000 number of authorized positions multiplied by the cost per enrollee position. To convert funds to authorized positions, funds are divided by the DOL-determined cost per participant. The CSEOA program operates on a program year (PY) basis from July 1 through June 30. For PY2012 (ending June 30, 2013), the CSEOA program supported 46,221 job slots, serving 70,718 participants, at a cost of \$6,339 per participant, *Fiscal Year 2015 Congressional Budget Justification, Employment and Training Administration, Community Service Employment for Older Americans*, p. CSEOA-12, <http://www.dol.gov/dol/budget/2015/PDF/CBJ-2015-V1-07.pdf>.

After these reservations, the remaining funds are divided into two amounts, one for all state agency grantees and the other for all national organization grantees. The allocation for these amounts is dependent on program funding. If funds for a given year are equal to their FY2000 level, then amounts set aside for all state agencies and all national organization grantees are in proportion to their respective FY2000 levels. If funds for a given year are less than their FY2000 levels, then total amounts for the state and national grantees are reduced proportionately. If funds for a given year exceed the FY2000 level, up to \$35 million of the excess is to be distributed as follows: 75% of the excess is to be provided for all state agency grantees and 25% of the excess is to be provided to all national organization grantees. Any funding amount over \$35 million that remains is to be distributed 50/50 to all state agency and national organization grantees, respectively.

Once the national totals for state agency and national organization grantees have been determined, the same formula is used to determine the state agency allotment and the national organization allotment for each state. Each allotment is distributed to states based on a formula factor that takes into account (1) a state's relative share of the total U.S. population aged 55 years and older (includes the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), and (2) the relative state per capita income. The formula factor is the number of persons aged 55 and older in the state multiplied by the inverse of the state's per capita income index. Thus, this formula favors states with a lower per capita income and a higher proportion of the population aged 55 and older relative to other states. The inverse per capita income index cannot be less than 33% or greater than 75%; the index for the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico is 75%. Population data are from the annual population estimates published by the U.S. Census; the reference date for estimates is July 1. Per capita income data are from the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) within the U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC). There is a two-year time lag between the data (reference year of the population estimates and per capita income) and the respective appropriation year.

For the purpose of determining state allotments to state agency and national organization grantees, the law requires that allotments meet two criteria. The first criterion is that states (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) are to receive at least a minimum grant allotment, which is defined as 0.5% (one-half of 1%) of the respective grant amount for the given fiscal year. The second criterion is the "hold harmless" provision. If grant amounts for a given year are equal to, or less than, their FY2000 level, states are to receive an allotment in proportion to their respective FY2000 levels. If grant amounts exceed their FY2000 levels, states are to receive no less than their FY2000 level plus a "guaranteed growth" of at least 30% of the percentage increase above the FY2000 level.

## **Title VI: Grants for Older Native Americans**

Title VI authorizes funds for supportive and nutrition services to older Native Americans to promote the delivery of home and community-based supportive services, nutrition services, and family caregiver support.<sup>21</sup> Funds are awarded directly to Indian tribal organizations, Alaskan Native organizations, and non-profit groups representing Native Hawaiians. To be eligible for funding, a tribal organization must represent at least 50 Native American elders aged 60 or older.<sup>22</sup> In FY2012, the most recent year for which data are available, grants were awarded to 246

---

<sup>21</sup> For further information, see [http://www.aoa.gov/AoARoot/AoA\\_Programs/HCLTC/Native\\_Americans/index.aspx](http://www.aoa.gov/AoARoot/AoA_Programs/HCLTC/Native_Americans/index.aspx).

<sup>22</sup> In order to establish eligibility, a tribal organization may develop its own population statistics with approval from the (continued...)

tribal organizations representing approximately 400 Indian tribes, including two organizations serving Native Hawaiian elders.<sup>23</sup> FY2015 funding for supportive and nutrition services grants is \$26.2 million, while FY2015 funding for the Native American caregiver program is \$6.0 million. There is no requirement for tribal organizations to match these grant funds.

Separate formula grant awards are made for (1) nutrition and supportive services and (2) family caregiver support services. Formula grants for services to older Native Americans are allocated to tribal and other representing organizations based on their share of the American Indian, Alaskan Native, and Native Hawaiian population aged 60 and over in their services area. Tribal organization allotments must meet a FY1991 “hold harmless” provision. If funds for a given year exceed the FY1991 amount, then the grant amount is either (1) increased to equal or approximate the amount the organization received in 1980 or (2) determined based on what the Assistant Secretary considers sufficient if the tribal organization did not receive a grant for either FY1980 or FY1991. For Native Hawaiian programs, formula allotments for services to representing organizations are only required to meet a FY1991 “hold harmless” provision.

## **Title VII: Vulnerable Elder Rights Protection Activities**

Title VII authorizes the Long-Term Care (LTC) Ombudsman Program and elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation prevention programs. Most Title VII funding is directed at the LTC Ombudsman Program, the purpose of which is to investigate and resolve complaints of residents of nursing facilities and other long-term care facilities. For FY2015, funding for the LTC Ombudsman and elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation prevention programs is \$20.7 million. There is no requirement for states to match these grant funds.

Funds for LTC ombudsman and elder abuse prevention activities are allotted to states based on each state’s relative share of the population aged 60 years and older. For the purpose of determining state allotments, the law requires that states (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) receive a minimum amount of funds, which is defined as 0.5% (one-half of 1%) of the total grant appropriation for the respective fiscal year. Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands are allotted no less than 0.25% (one-quarter of 1%) of the total grant appropriation, and American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands are allotted no less than 0.0625% (one-sixteenth of 1%) of the total grant appropriation.

State allotments must also meet a FY2000 “hold harmless” provision. SUAs may award funds for these activities to a variety of organizations for administration, including other state agencies, AAAs, county governments, nonprofit service providers, and volunteer organizations.

---

(...continued)

Bureau of Indian Affairs (42 U.S.C. 3057e-1).

<sup>23</sup> U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Community Living, *Fiscal Year 2015 Justification of Estimates for Appropriations Committees*, p. 86, [http://www.acl.gov/About\\_ACL/Budget/docs/FY\\_2015\\_ACL\\_CJ.pdf](http://www.acl.gov/About_ACL/Budget/docs/FY_2015_ACL_CJ.pdf).

## Appendix A. Current Law: OAA Title III, Parts B, C, and D FY2015 Allotments and Population Trends

**Table A-1**, **Table A-2**, **Table A-3**, and **Table A-4** compare the FY2006 hold harmless amounts and the FY2015 allotment amounts for states and U.S. territories for each of the four programs authorized under OAA Title III, Parts B, C, and D. The final column in each table provides information about the entities' FY2015 allotment type, where "M" refers to an entity that receives a minimum allotment amount; "HH" refers to an entity that receives an allotment amount based on the FY2006 hold harmless funding amount or a proportionately reduced allotment from the FY2006 hold harmless amount; and "P" refers to an entity that receives an allotment amount based on the entities' population formula factor.

**Table A-5** shows the population aged 60 and older by state or U.S. territory and the proportion of the entity's population aged 60 and older relative to the total U.S. population aged 60 and over for selected years. U.S. Census data shown are for the 2000 and 2010 Decennial Censuses, as well as the 2013 Intercensal state population estimates, which is the most recent year for which data are available. The column labeled "% Age 60+" is the entities' population-based formula factor used to determine state allotments under OAA Title III, Parts B, C, and D.

The final column of **Table A-5** calculates the percentage point change in the population formula factor for each state and U.S. territory. Among all states (which includes the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), half saw a proportionate increase in the population formula factor from 2000 to 2013, while the other half saw a decline over this time period. The top five states that experienced the greatest proportionate increase were Texas, California, Georgia, North Carolina, and Arizona. The bottom five states that experienced the greatest decline were New Jersey, Ohio, Illinois, New York, and Pennsylvania.



**Table A-I. Older Americans Act, Title III Part B:  
Comparison of FY2006 Hold Harmless (HH) and FY2015 Funding Allotment  
Amounts for States and U.S. Territories**

State/ U.S. Territory	Part B: Supportive Services			
	FY2006 HH Amount	FY2015 Amount	% Change	FY2015 Amount Type <sup>a</sup>
Alabama	\$5,403,560	\$5,325,874	-1.44%	HH
Alaska	\$1,746,341	\$1,721,234	-1.44%	HH
Arizona	\$6,573,030	\$6,478,530	-1.44%	HH
Arkansas	\$3,500,996	\$3,450,663	-1.44%	HH
California	\$34,578,882	\$34,081,746	-1.44%	HH
Colorado	\$4,154,787	\$4,095,054	-1.44%	HH
Connecticut	\$4,404,337	\$4,341,017	-1.44%	HH
Delaware	\$1,746,341	\$1,721,234	-1.44%	HH
District of Columbia	\$1,746,341	\$1,721,234	-1.44%	HH
Florida	\$25,261,848	\$24,898,663	-1.44%	HH
Georgia	\$7,909,229	\$7,795,519	-1.44%	HH
Hawaii	\$1,746,341	\$1,721,234	-1.44%	HH
Idaho	\$1,746,341	\$1,721,234	-1.44%	HH
Illinois	\$14,524,890	\$14,316,068	-1.44%	HH
Indiana	\$6,927,395	\$6,827,801	-1.44%	HH
Iowa	\$4,260,878	\$4,199,620	-1.44%	HH
Kansas	\$3,432,908	\$3,383,554	-1.44%	HH
Kentucky	\$4,741,271	\$4,673,107	-1.44%	HH
Louisiana	\$4,795,898	\$4,726,948	-1.44%	HH
Maine	\$1,746,341	\$1,721,234	-1.44%	HH
Maryland	\$5,857,438	\$5,773,227	-1.44%	HH
Massachusetts	\$8,209,095	\$8,091,074	-1.44%	HH
Michigan	\$11,255,715	\$11,093,893	-1.44%	HH
Minnesota	\$5,499,667	\$5,420,599	-1.44%	HH
Mississippi	\$3,272,711	\$3,225,660	-1.44%	HH
Missouri	\$7,118,429	\$7,016,089	-1.44%	HH
Montana	\$1,746,341	\$1,721,234	-1.44%	HH
Nebraska	\$2,294,938	\$2,261,944	-1.44%	HH
Nevada	\$2,461,387	\$2,426,000	-1.44%	HH
New Hampshire	\$1,746,341	\$1,721,234	-1.44%	HH

State/ U.S. Territory	Part B: Supportive Services			
	FY2006 HH Amount	FY2015 Amount	% Change	FY2015 Amount Type <sup>a</sup>
New Jersey	\$10,262,972	\$10,115,423	-1.44%	HH
New Mexico	\$2,066,188	\$2,036,483	-1.44%	HH
New York	\$24,283,431	\$23,934,312	-1.44%	HH
North Carolina	\$9,368,926	\$9,234,231	-1.44%	HH
North Dakota	\$1,746,341	\$1,721,234	-1.44%	HH
Ohio	\$13,816,810	\$13,618,168	-1.44%	HH
Oklahoma	\$4,278,286	\$4,216,778	-1.44%	HH
Oregon	\$4,134,370	\$4,074,931	-1.44%	HH
Pennsylvania	\$17,879,977	\$17,622,920	-1.44%	HH
Puerto Rico	\$4,374,950	\$4,312,052	-1.44%	HH
Rhode Island	\$1,746,341	\$1,721,234	-1.44%	HH
South Carolina	\$4,791,543	\$4,722,656	-1.44%	HH
South Dakota	\$1,746,341	\$1,721,234	-1.44%	HH
Tennessee	\$6,760,219	\$6,663,028	-1.44%	HH
Texas	\$20,326,073	\$20,033,849	-1.44%	HH
Utah	\$1,866,772	\$1,839,934	-1.44%	HH
Vermont	\$1,746,341	\$1,721,234	-1.44%	HH
Virginia	\$7,864,960	\$7,751,887	-1.44%	HH
Washington	\$6,450,052	\$6,357,321	-1.44%	HH
West Virginia	\$2,773,538	\$2,733,663	-1.44%	HH
Wisconsin	\$6,390,390	\$6,298,516	-1.44%	HH
Wyoming	\$1,746,341	\$1,721,234	-1.44%	HH
American Samoa	\$472,317	\$465,527	-1.44%	HH
Guam	\$873,170	\$860,617	-1.44%	HH
Northern Marianas	\$218,293	\$215,155	-1.44%	HH
Virgin Islands	\$873,170	\$860,617	-1.44%	HH
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$349,268,129</b>	<b>\$344,246,760</b>	<b>-1.44%</b>	

**Source:** FY2015 funding levels from ACL, "Title III Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging, FY2015 Annual Allocations," January 30, 2015, [http://www.acl.gov/About\\_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf](http://www.acl.gov/About_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf). Total amounts are adjusted down from a program's enacted funding level to account for program support, evaluation, oversight, and other statutory-related activities.

**Notes:** HH = state receives a grant amount based on its FY2006 hold harmless amount or an amount reduced from its FY2006 hold harmless amount; M = state receives a minimum grant amount; P = state receives a grant amount based on its population aged 60+.

- a. FY2015 funding for Supportive Services is below FY2006 funding levels, thus all states and U.S. territories receive an allotment that is proportionately reduced from their FY2006 hold harmless amount.

**Table A-2. Older Americans Act, Title III Part CI:  
Comparison of FY2006 Hold Harmless (HH) and FY2015 Funding Allotment  
Amounts for States and U.S. Territories**

State / U.S. Territory	Part CI: Congregate Nutrition			
	FY2006 HH Amount	FY2015 Amount	% Change	FY2015 Amount Type
Alabama	\$6,068,408	\$6,448,535	6.26%	P
Alaska	\$1,919,299	\$2,169,045	13.01%	M
Arizona	\$6,567,487	\$8,927,511	35.93%	P
Arkansas	\$4,163,564	\$4,163,564	0.00%	HH
California	\$34,919,214	\$43,329,545	24.09%	P
Colorado	\$4,151,035	\$6,058,702	45.96%	P
Connecticut	\$5,241,452	\$5,241,452	0.00%	HH
Delaware	\$1,919,299	\$2,169,045	13.01%	M
District of Columbia	\$1,919,299	\$2,169,045	13.01%	M
Florida	\$25,239,035	\$30,882,211	22.36%	P
Georgia	\$7,902,087	\$11,007,936	39.30%	P
Hawaii	\$1,940,597	\$2,169,045	11.77%	M
Idaho	\$1,930,797	\$2,169,045	12.34%	M
Illinois	\$17,286,541	\$17,286,541	0.00%	HH
Indiana	\$8,105,861	\$8,266,359	1.98%	P
Iowa	\$5,081,501	\$5,081,501	0.00%	HH
Kansas	\$4,089,903	\$4,089,903	0.00%	HH
Kentucky	\$5,570,252	\$5,744,377	3.13%	P
Louisiana	\$5,645,998	\$5,645,998	0.00%	HH
Maine	\$1,996,153	\$2,169,045	8.66%	M
Maryland	\$5,893,683	\$7,240,922	22.86%	P
Massachusetts	\$9,780,267	\$9,780,267	0.00%	HH
Michigan	\$12,926,499	\$13,443,686	4.00%	P
Minnesota	\$6,398,439	\$6,846,987	7.01%	P
Mississippi	\$3,891,114	\$3,891,114	0.00%	HH
Missouri	\$8,467,047	\$8,467,047	0.00%	HH
Montana	\$1,919,299	\$2,169,045	13.01%	M
Nebraska	\$2,738,802	\$2,738,802	0.00%	HH
Nevada	\$2,459,165	\$3,446,533	40.15%	P
New Hampshire	\$1,932,677	\$2,169,045	12.23%	M

State / U.S. Territory	Part CI: Congregate Nutrition			
	FY2006 HH Amount	FY2015 Amount	% Change	FY2015 Amount Type
New Jersey	\$12,190,488	\$12,190,488	0.00%	HH
New Mexico	\$2,064,322	\$2,718,255	31.68%	P
New York	\$28,963,855	\$28,963,855	0.00%	HH
North Carolina	\$9,360,466	\$12,624,403	34.87%	P
North Dakota	\$1,919,299	\$2,169,045	13.01%	M
Ohio	\$16,393,785	\$16,393,785	0.00%	HH
Oklahoma	\$5,080,736	\$5,080,736	0.00%	HH
Oregon	\$4,301,949	\$5,533,521	28.63%	P
Pennsylvania	\$21,279,716	\$21,279,716	0.00%	HH
Puerto Rico	\$4,370,999	\$5,158,961	18.03%	P
Rhode Island	\$1,950,184	\$2,169,045	11.22%	M
South Carolina	\$4,787,216	\$6,536,987	36.55%	P
South Dakota	\$1,919,299	\$2,169,045	13.01%	M
Tennessee	\$7,154,118	\$8,555,440	19.59%	P
Texas	\$20,307,718	\$27,192,651	33.90%	P
Utah	\$1,962,783	\$2,581,502	31.52%	P
Vermont	\$1,919,299	\$2,169,045	13.01%	M
Virginia	\$7,857,858	\$10,031,513	27.66%	P
Washington	\$6,444,227	\$8,734,066	35.53%	P
West Virginia	\$3,305,947	\$3,305,947	0.00%	HH
Wisconsin	\$7,586,993	\$7,665,166	1.03%	P
Wyoming	\$1,919,299	\$2,169,045	13.01%	M
American Samoa	\$594,843	\$594,843	0.00%	HH
Guam	\$959,650	\$1,084,523	13.01%	M
Northern Marianas	\$240,408	\$271,131	12.78%	M
Virgin Islands	\$959,650	\$1,084,523	13.01%	M
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$383,859,881</b>	<b>\$433,809,090</b>	<b>13.01%</b>	

**Source:** FY2015 funding levels from ACL, "Title III Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging, FY2015 Annual Allocations," January 30, 2015, [http://www.acl.gov/About\\_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf](http://www.acl.gov/About_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf). Total amounts are adjusted down from a program's enacted funding level to account for program support, evaluation, oversight, and other statutory-related activities.

**Notes:** HH = state receives a grant amount based on its FY2006 hold harmless amount or an amount reduced from its FY2006 hold harmless amount; M = state receives a minimum grant amount; P = state receives a grant amount based on its population aged 60+.

**Table A-3. Older Americans Act, Title III Part C2:  
Comparison of FY2006 Hold Harmless (HH) and FY2015 Funding Allotment  
Amounts for States and U.S. Territories**

State / U.S. Territory	Part C2: Home-Delivered Nutrition			
	FY2006 HH Amount	FY2015 Amount	% Change	FY2015 Amount Type
Alabama	\$2,871,070	\$3,300,791	14.97%	P
Alaska	\$906,082	\$1,071,165	18.22%	M
Arizona	\$3,492,443	\$4,569,698	30.85%	P
Arkansas	\$1,823,332	\$2,048,767	12.36%	P
California	\$18,372,773	\$22,178,956	20.72%	P
Colorado	\$2,207,560	\$3,101,249	40.48%	P
Connecticut	\$2,250,669	\$2,477,235	10.07%	P
Delaware	\$906,082	\$1,071,165	18.22%	M
District of Columbia	\$906,082	\$1,071,165	18.22%	M
Florida	\$13,422,360	\$15,807,579	17.77%	P
Georgia	\$4,202,405	\$5,634,597	34.08%	P
Hawaii	\$906,082	\$1,071,165	18.22%	M
Idaho	\$906,082	\$1,071,165	18.22%	M
Illinois	\$7,248,698	\$8,052,146	11.08%	P
Indiana	\$3,680,728	\$4,231,275	14.96%	P
Iowa	\$2,001,426	\$2,180,137	8.93%	P
Kansas	\$1,651,950	\$1,856,324	12.37%	P
Kentucky	\$2,519,176	\$2,940,356	16.72%	P
Louisiana	\$2,548,201	\$2,865,596	12.46%	P
Maine	\$907,706	\$1,082,445	19.25%	P
Maryland	\$3,112,229	\$3,706,388	19.09%	P
Massachusetts	\$4,011,142	\$4,526,417	12.85%	P
Michigan	\$5,980,491	\$6,881,377	15.06%	P
Minnesota	\$2,922,134	\$3,504,745	19.94%	P
Mississippi	\$1,691,196	\$1,914,158	13.18%	P
Missouri	\$3,647,365	\$4,134,686	13.36%	P
Montana	\$906,082	\$1,071,165	18.22%	M
Nebraska	\$1,076,330	\$1,211,914	12.60%	P
Nevada	\$1,307,807	\$1,764,166	34.89%	P
New Hampshire	\$906,082	\$1,071,165	18.22%	M

State / U.S. Territory	Part C2: Home-Delivered Nutrition			
	FY2006 HH Amount	FY2015 Amount	% Change	FY2015 Amount Type
New Jersey	\$5,350,993	\$5,839,280	9.13%	P
New Mexico	\$1,097,826	\$1,391,385	26.74%	P
New York	\$11,862,865	\$12,931,863	9.01%	P
North Carolina	\$4,977,985	\$6,462,013	29.81%	P
North Dakota	\$906,082	\$1,071,165	18.22%	M
Ohio	\$7,203,180	\$8,056,613	11.85%	P
Oklahoma	\$2,218,398	\$2,499,780	12.68%	P
Oregon	\$2,196,712	\$2,832,426	28.94%	P
Pennsylvania	\$8,777,372	\$9,442,665	7.58%	P
Puerto Rico	\$2,324,539	\$2,640,701	13.60%	P
Rhode Island	\$906,082	\$1,071,165	18.22%	M
South Carolina	\$2,545,887	\$3,346,067	31.43%	P
South Dakota	\$906,082	\$1,071,165	18.22%	M
Tennessee	\$3,591,903	\$4,379,246	21.92%	P
Texas	\$10,799,838	\$13,919,016	28.88%	P
Utah	\$991,871	\$1,321,385	33.22%	P
Vermont	\$906,082	\$1,071,165	18.22%	M
Virginia	\$4,178,884	\$5,134,799	22.87%	P
Washington	\$3,427,102	\$4,470,679	30.45%	P
West Virginia	\$1,319,658	\$1,475,026	11.77%	P
Wisconsin	\$3,373,301	\$3,923,544	16.31%	P
Wyoming	\$906,082	\$1,071,165	18.22%	M
American Samoa	\$136,498	\$136,498	0.00%	HH
Guam	\$453,041	\$535,583	18.22%	M
Northern Marianas	\$113,260	\$133,896	18.22%	M
Virgin Islands	\$453,041	\$535,583	18.22%	M
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$181,216,329</b>	<b>\$214,233,030</b>	<b>18.22%</b>	

**Source:** FY2015 funding levels from ACL, "Title III Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging, FY2015 Annual Allocations," January 30, 2015, [http://www.acl.gov/About\\_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf](http://www.acl.gov/About_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf). Total amounts are adjusted down from a program's enacted funding level to account for program support, evaluation, oversight, and other statutory related activities.

**Notes:** HH = state receives a grant amount based on its FY2006 hold harmless amount or an amount reduced from its FY2006 hold harmless amount; M = state receives a minimum grant amount; P = state receives a grant amount based on its population aged 60+.

**Table A-4. Older Americans Act, Title III Part D:  
Comparison of FY2006 Hold Harmless (HH) and FY2015 Funding Allotment  
Amounts for States and U.S. Territories**

State / U.S. Territory	Part D: Preventive Services			
	FY2006 HH Amount	FY2015 Amount	% Change	FY2015 Amount Type <sup>a</sup>
Alabama	\$337,809	\$311,357	-7.83%	HH
Alaska	\$106,594	\$98,248	-7.83%	HH
Arizona	\$410,919	\$378,742	-7.83%	HH
Arkansas	\$214,532	\$197,733	-7.83%	HH
California	\$2,161,730	\$1,992,449	-7.83%	HH
Colorado	\$259,740	\$239,401	-7.83%	HH
Connecticut	\$264,812	\$244,076	-7.83%	HH
Delaware	\$106,594	\$98,248	-7.83%	HH
District of Columbia	\$106,594	\$98,248	-7.83%	HH
Florida	\$1,579,267	\$1,455,604	-7.83%	HH
Georgia	\$494,452	\$455,734	-7.83%	HH
Hawaii	\$106,594	\$98,248	-7.83%	HH
Idaho	\$106,594	\$98,248	-7.83%	HH
Illinois	\$852,878	\$786,094	-7.83%	HH
Indiana	\$433,072	\$399,161	-7.83%	HH
Iowa	\$235,487	\$217,047	-7.83%	HH
Kansas	\$194,367	\$179,147	-7.83%	HH
Kentucky	\$296,405	\$273,195	-7.83%	HH
Louisiana	\$299,820	\$276,343	-7.83%	HH
Maine	\$106,800	\$98,437	-7.83%	HH
Maryland	\$366,183	\$337,509	-7.83%	HH
Massachusetts	\$471,949	\$434,993	-7.83%	HH
Michigan	\$703,661	\$648,562	-7.83%	HH
Minnesota	\$343,817	\$316,895	-7.83%	HH
Mississippi	\$198,985	\$183,404	-7.83%	HH
Missouri	\$429,147	\$395,543	-7.83%	HH
Montana	\$106,594	\$98,248	-7.83%	HH
Nebraska	\$126,640	\$116,724	-7.83%	HH
Nevada	\$153,876	\$141,827	-7.83%	HH
New Hampshire	\$106,594	\$98,248	-7.83%	HH

State / U.S. Territory	Part D: Preventive Services			
	FY2006 HH Amount	FY2015 Amount	% Change	FY2015 Amount Type <sup>a</sup>
New Jersey	\$629,595	\$580,295	-7.83%	HH
New Mexico	\$129,169	\$119,055	-7.83%	HH
New York	\$1,395,778	\$1,286,483	-7.83%	HH
North Carolina	\$585,707	\$539,844	-7.83%	HH
North Dakota	\$106,594	\$98,248	-7.83%	HH
Ohio	\$847,522	\$781,158	-7.83%	HH
Oklahoma	\$261,015	\$240,576	-7.83%	HH
Oregon	\$258,464	\$238,225	-7.83%	HH
Pennsylvania	\$1,032,740	\$951,872	-7.83%	HH
Puerto Rico	\$273,504	\$252,088	-7.83%	HH
Rhode Island	\$106,594	\$98,248	-7.83%	HH
South Carolina	\$299,548	\$276,092	-7.83%	HH
South Dakota	\$106,594	\$98,248	-7.83%	HH
Tennessee	\$422,621	\$389,528	-7.83%	HH
Texas	\$1,270,703	\$1,171,202	-7.83%	HH
Utah	\$116,703	\$107,565	-7.83%	HH
Vermont	\$106,594	\$98,248	-7.83%	HH
Virginia	\$491,685	\$453,184	-7.83%	HH
Washington	\$403,231	\$371,656	-7.83%	HH
West Virginia	\$155,270	\$143,112	-7.83%	HH
Wisconsin	\$396,901	\$365,822	-7.83%	HH
Wyoming	\$106,594	\$98,248	-7.83%	HH
American Samoa	\$13,324	\$12,281	-7.83%	HH
Guam	\$53,297	\$49,124	-7.83%	HH
Northern Marianas	\$13,324	\$12,281	-7.83%	HH
Virgin Islands	\$53,297	\$49,124	-7.83%	HH
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$21,318,874</b>	<b>\$19,649,520</b>	<b>-7.83%</b>	

**Source:** FY2015 funding levels from ACL, "Title III Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging, FY2015 Annual Allocations," January 30, 2015, [http://www.acl.gov/About\\_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf](http://www.acl.gov/About_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf). Total amounts are adjusted down from a program's enacted funding level to account for program support, evaluation, oversight, and other statutory related activities.

**Notes:** HH = state receives a grant amount based on its FY2006 hold harmless amount or an amount reduced from its FY2006 hold harmless amount; M = state receives a minimum grant amount; P = state receives a grant amount based on its population aged 60+.

- a. FY2015 funding for Preventive Services is below FY2006 funding levels, thus all states and U.S. territories receive an allotment that is proportionately reduced from their FY2006 hold harmless amount.



**Table A-5. Population Formula Factor: Proportion of the State/U.S. Territory  
Population Aged 60+ Relative to Total U.S. Population Aged 60+**

Selected Years and Difference from 2000 to 2013

State or U.S. Territory	2000		2010		2013		Difference 2000 to 2013
	Pop. Age 60+	% Age 60+	Pop. Age 60+	% Age 60+	Pop. Age 60+	% Age 60+	Percentage Point Change
Alabama	769,880	1.66%	933,919	1.61%	1,010,819	1.59%	-0.07%
Alaska	53,026	0.11%	90,876	0.16%	107,234	0.17%	0.05%
Arizona	871,536	1.88%	1,232,791	2.13%	1,389,835	2.18%	0.30%
Arkansas	491,409	1.06%	587,012	1.01%	627,405	0.99%	-0.07%
California	4,742,499	10.22%	6,078,711	10.50%	6,791,981	10.66%	0.45%
Colorado	560,658	1.21%	818,905	1.41%	949,712	1.49%	0.28%
Connecticut	601,835	1.30%	709,854	1.23%	758,617	1.19%	-0.11%
Delaware	133,925	0.29%	182,390	0.32%	204,213	0.32%	0.03%
District of Columbia	91,878	0.20%	98,512	0.17%	105,487	0.17%	-0.03%
Florida	3,545,093	7.64%	4,394,852	7.59%	4,840,840	7.60%	-0.04%
Georgia	1,071,080	2.31%	1,528,041	2.64%	1,725,513	2.71%	0.40%
Hawaii	207,001	0.45%	277,360	0.48%	306,031	0.48%	0.03%
Idaho	193,421	0.42%	277,984	0.48%	316,037	0.50%	0.08%
Illinois	1,962,911	4.23%	2,274,642	3.93%	2,465,852	3.87%	-0.36%
Indiana	988,506	2.13%	1,191,736	2.06%	1,295,766	2.03%	-0.10%
Iowa	554,573	1.19%	621,245	1.07%	667,635	1.05%	-0.15%
Kansas	454,837	0.98%	524,851	0.91%	568,472	0.89%	-0.09%
Kentucky	672,905	1.45%	829,193	1.43%	900,441	1.41%	-0.04%
Louisiana	687,216	1.48%	800,852	1.38%	877,547	1.38%	-0.10%
Maine	238,099	0.51%	300,740	0.52%	331,483	0.52%	0.01%
Maryland	801,036	1.73%	1,025,421	1.77%	1,135,027	1.78%	0.06%
Massachusetts	1,096,567	2.36%	1,273,271	2.20%	1,386,149	2.18%	-0.19%
Michigan	1,596,162	3.44%	1,930,341	3.33%	2,107,321	3.31%	-0.13%
Minnesota	772,278	1.66%	962,896	1.66%	1,073,277	1.69%	0.02%
Mississippi	457,144	0.98%	541,163	0.93%	586,183	0.92%	-0.06%
Missouri	983,704	2.12%	1,171,587	2.02%	1,266,187	1.99%	-0.13%
Montana	158,894	0.34%	209,685	0.36%	235,808	0.37%	0.03%
Nebraska	296,151	0.64%	342,167	0.59%	371,131	0.58%	-0.06%
Nevada	304,071	0.66%	475,283	0.82%	540,250	0.85%	0.19%
New Hampshire	194,965	0.42%	260,222	0.45%	291,173	0.46%	0.04%

State or U.S. Territory	2000		2010		2013		Difference 2000 to 2013
	Pop. Age 60+	% Age 60+	Pop. Age 60+	% Age 60+	Pop. Age 60+	% Age 60+	Percentage Point Change
New Jersey	1,443,782	3.11%	1,666,535	2.88%	1,788,194	2.81%	-0.30%
New Mexico	283,837	0.61%	392,392	0.68%	434,034	0.68%	0.07%
New York	3,204,331	6.90%	3,684,203	6.36%	3,960,194	6.22%	-0.69%
North Carolina	1,292,553	2.78%	1,772,118	3.06%	1,978,897	3.11%	0.32%
North Dakota	118,985	0.26%	133,350	0.23%	143,835	0.23%	-0.03%
Ohio	1,963,489	4.23%	2,287,424	3.95%	2,467,220	3.87%	-0.36%
Oklahoma	599,080	1.29%	711,227	1.23%	765,521	1.20%	-0.09%
Oregon	569,557	1.23%	769,676	1.33%	867,389	1.36%	0.13%
Pennsylvania	2,430,821	5.24%	2,702,603	4.67%	2,891,678	4.54%	-0.70%
Puerto Rico	585,701	1.26%	760,075	1.31%	808,676	1.27%	0.01%
Rhode Island	191,409	0.41%	211,836	0.37%	226,112	0.36%	-0.06%
South Carolina	651,482	1.40%	912,429	1.58%	1,024,684	1.61%	0.21%
South Dakota	136,869	0.29%	160,154	0.28%	177,385	0.28%	-0.02%
Tennessee	942,620	2.03%	1,224,186	2.11%	1,341,080	2.11%	0.07%
Texas	2,774,201	5.98%	3,776,653	6.52%	4,262,495	6.69%	0.72%
Utah	252,677	0.54%	356,581	0.62%	406,280	0.64%	0.09%
Vermont	101,827	0.22%	132,312	0.23%	147,126	0.23%	0.01%
Virginia	1,065,502	2.30%	1,419,306	2.45%	1,572,457	2.47%	0.17%
Washington	873,223	1.88%	1,209,764	2.09%	1,369,080	2.15%	0.27%
West Virginia	362,795	0.78%	422,861	0.73%	451,705	0.71%	-0.07%
Wisconsin	907,552	1.96%	1,091,139	1.88%	1,201,528	1.89%	-0.07%
Wyoming	77,348	0.17%	102,657	0.18%	115,755	0.18%	0.02%
American Samoa	3,091	0.01%	4,454	0.01%	4,271	0.01%	0.00%
Guam	12,894	0.03%	20,099	0.03%	19,797	0.03%	0.00%
Northern Marianas	1,887	0.00% <sup>a</sup>	3,044	0.01%	3,925	0.01%	0.00%
Virgin Islands	14,045	0.03%	23,423	0.04%	25,761	0.04%	0.01%
<b>Total</b>	<b>46,414,818</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>57,897,003</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>63,688,505</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

**Source:** State data for 2000 and 2010 are U.S. Census Bureau decennial census data compiled by the Administration on Aging at [http://www.aoa.acl.gov/Aging\\_Statistics/Census\\_Population/census2010/docs/Pop\\_Age\\_60\\_Alpha\\_List.xls](http://www.aoa.acl.gov/Aging_Statistics/Census_Population/census2010/docs/Pop_Age_60_Alpha_List.xls); U.S. territory census information for 2000 and 2010 obtained from U.S. Census Bureau International Data Base, at <http://www.census.gov/population/international/data/idb/informationGateway.php>; state and U.S. territory data for 2013 are U.S. Census Bureau state population estimates compiled by the Administration on Aging and obtained through personal communication, January 12, 2015.

a. Population is less than 0.01%.

## Appendix B. The Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2015 (S. 192): Analysis of Formula Change

Section 4(b) of S. 192 would change the statutory funding allocations for OAA Title III, Parts B, C, and D, which allocate funding to supportive services, congregate nutrition, home-delivered nutrition, and preventive services. This provision would retain the same state and territory minimum amounts allotted under current law and the same population-based formula factor (aged 60 and over), but would reduce state and U.S. territory hold harmless amounts (currently referenced to FY2006 funding levels) by 1% from the previous fiscal year as follows:

- For FY2016, no state would receive less than 99% of the annual amount allotted to the state in FY2015.
- For FY2017, no state would receive less than 99% of the annual amount allotted to the state in FY2016.
- For FY2018, no state would receive less than 99% of the annual amount allotted to the state in FY2017.
- For FY2019 and each subsequent fiscal year, no state would receive less than 100% of the annual amount allotted to the state in FY2018.

If enacted, S. 192 would reduce the effect of the FY2006 hold harmless provision. Specifically, it would reduce state and U.S. territory hold harmless amounts by 1% for each of three years, and then freeze this reduction in place for FY2019 and future fiscal years, unless or until such language is amended. Effectively, for those states that receive an annual program allotment based on their FY2006 hold harmless amount the proposed policy change would minimize any reduction in funding to no more than 1% from the previous fiscal year, assuming a program's total funding level in fiscal years 2016 to 2018 is at or above the previous fiscal year's level.

### Analysis of S. 192 Funding Formula Change

The following analysis compares FY2015 allotment amounts with simulated allotment amounts under the S. 192 proposed statutory funding formula change. For the purposes of this analysis, CRS separately simulated allotment amounts to states and U.S. territories for each of the four programs for which the formula change would apply: Part B, supportive services and centers; Part C, subpart 1, congregate nutrition services; Part C, subpart 2, home-delivered nutrition services; and Part D, disease prevention and health promotion services programs. For each fiscal year simulation, state and U.S. territory allotments for each of these programs were then totaled.

Simulated allotment amounts for FY2016 through FY2018 assume no changes to total program funding levels or the population formula factor. Thus, the analysis assumes funding is constant at FY2015 funding levels for future fiscal years and also assumes no change to each entity's relative share of the total U.S. population aged 60 and over (the most recent U.S. Census data available is 2013, which is used in this analysis). Thus, simulated allotment amounts analyze the effect of the proposed policy change, holding other variables that are unknown, such as future funding levels and population, constant. Caution should be used in interpreting these results as these assumptions do not reflect actual increases or decreases in allotments; rather, the results from this

analysis should be used to understand potential changes to allotments as a result of the proposed policy change and any distributional changes that might occur.

**Table B-1**, **Table B-2**, and **Table B-3** compare FY2015 allotment amounts with the proposed hold harmless adjustment for each state and territory for the four Title III programs combined for FY2016 through FY2018, respectively.

**Table B-I. Comparison of FY2015 Older Americans Act (OAA) Title III Allotments to Simulated Population Aged 60+ with 99% of FY2015 Allotments for FY2016**

State	FY2015 Title III Allotment Amount	FY2016 Simulated Amount	Difference from FY2015	
		99% of FY2015 Annual Allotment	Amount	Percent
Alabama	\$15,386,557	\$15,369,043	-\$17,514	-0.1%
Alaska	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Arizona	\$20,354,481	\$20,645,729	\$291,248	1.4%
Arkansas	\$9,860,727	\$9,782,622	-\$78,105	-0.8%
California	\$101,582,696	\$101,483,056	-\$99,640	-0.1%
Colorado	\$13,494,406	\$14,011,330	\$516,924	3.8%
Connecticut	\$12,303,780	\$12,205,532	-\$98,248	-0.8%
Delaware	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
District of Columbia	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Florida	\$73,044,057	\$72,966,610	-\$77,447	-0.1%
Georgia	\$24,893,786	\$25,456,909	\$563,123	2.3%
Hawaii	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Idaho	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Illinois	\$40,440,849	\$40,117,017	-\$323,832	-0.8%
Indiana	\$19,724,596	\$19,702,139	-\$22,457	-0.1%
Iowa	\$11,678,305	\$11,583,338	-\$94,967	-0.8%
Kansas	\$9,508,928	\$9,432,414	-\$76,514	-0.8%
Kentucky	\$13,631,035	\$13,616,187	-\$14,848	-0.1%
Louisiana	\$13,514,885	\$13,450,914	-\$63,971	-0.5%
Maine	\$5,071,161	\$5,070,979	-\$182	0.0%
Maryland	\$17,058,046	\$17,040,572	-\$17,474	-0.1%
Massachusetts	\$22,832,751	\$22,649,719	-\$183,032	-0.8%
Michigan	\$32,067,518	\$32,031,104	-\$36,414	-0.1%
Minnesota	\$16,089,226	\$16,073,111	-\$16,115	-0.1%
Mississippi	\$9,214,336	\$9,141,348	-\$72,988	-0.8%
Missouri	\$20,013,365	\$19,854,606	-\$158,759	-0.8%
Montana	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Nebraska	\$6,329,384	\$6,278,218	-\$51,166	-0.8%
Nevada	\$7,778,526	\$7,970,439	\$191,913	2.5%
New Hampshire	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%

State	FY2015 Title III Allotment Amount	FY2016 Simulated Amount	Difference from FY2015	
		99% of FY2015 Annual Allotment	Amount	Percent
New Jersey	\$28,725,486	\$28,496,664	-\$228,822	-0.8%
New Mexico	\$6,265,178	\$6,286,226	\$21,048	0.3%
New York	\$67,116,513	\$66,574,755	-\$541,758	-0.8%
North Carolina	\$28,860,491	\$29,195,145	\$334,654	1.2%
North Dakota	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Ohio	\$38,849,724	\$38,541,848	-\$307,876	-0.8%
Oklahoma	\$12,037,870	\$11,942,506	-\$95,364	-0.8%
Oregon	\$12,679,103	\$12,796,799	\$117,696	0.9%
Pennsylvania	\$49,297,173	\$48,898,692	-\$398,481	-0.8%
Puerto Rico	\$12,363,802	\$12,349,248	-\$14,554	-0.1%
Rhode Island	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
South Carolina	\$14,881,802	\$15,117,410	\$235,608	1.6%
South Dakota	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Tennessee	\$19,987,242	\$19,968,271	-\$18,971	-0.1%
Texas	\$62,316,718	\$62,885,617	\$568,899	0.9%
Utah	\$5,850,386	\$5,969,971	\$119,585	2.0%
Vermont	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Virginia	\$23,371,383	\$23,349,782	-\$21,601	-0.1%
Washington	\$19,933,722	\$20,198,367	\$264,645	1.3%
West Virginia	\$7,657,748	\$7,595,930	-\$61,818	-0.8%
Wisconsin	\$18,253,048	\$18,232,595	-\$20,453	-0.1%
Wyoming	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
American Samoa	\$1,209,149	\$1,197,180	-\$11,969	-1.0%
Guam	\$2,529,847	\$2,529,846	-\$1	0.0%
Northern Marianas	\$632,463	\$632,462	-\$2	0.0%
Virgin Islands	\$2,529,847	\$2,529,846	-\$1	0.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,011,938,400</b>	<b>\$1,011,938,400</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Source:** CRS analysis of S. 192; FY2015 funding levels from ACL, "Title III Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging, FY2015 Annual Allocations," January 30, 2015, [http://www.acl.gov/About\\_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf](http://www.acl.gov/About_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf).

**Notes:** OAA Title III allotment amounts include funding for programs authorized under Part B, supportive services and centers; Part C, subpart 1, congregate nutrition services; Part C, subpart 2, home-delivered nutrition services; and Part D, disease prevention and health promotion services programs. FY2016 simulated allotment amounts assume FY2015 funding levels and 2013 U.S. Census state population data for the population aged 60 and over.

**Table B-2. Comparison of FY2015 Older Americans Act (OAA) Title III Allotments to Simulated Population Aged 60+ with 99% of FY2016 Allotments for FY2017**

State	FY2015 Title III Allotment Amount	FY2017 Simulated Amount	Difference from FY2015	
		99% of FY2016 Annual Allotment	Amount	Percent
Alabama	\$15,386,557	\$15,350,508	-\$36,049	-0.2%
Alaska	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Arizona	\$20,354,481	\$20,909,001	\$554,520	2.7%
Arkansas	\$9,860,727	\$9,705,296	-\$155,431	-1.6%
California	\$101,582,696	\$101,481,522	-\$101,174	-0.1%
Colorado	\$13,494,406	\$14,190,001	\$695,595	5.2%
Connecticut	\$12,303,780	\$12,108,264	-\$195,516	-1.6%
Delaware	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
District of Columbia	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Florida	\$73,044,057	\$72,884,203	-\$159,854	-0.2%
Georgia	\$24,893,786	\$25,781,533	\$887,747	3.6%
Hawaii	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Idaho	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Illinois	\$40,440,849	\$39,796,419	-\$644,430	-1.6%
Indiana	\$19,724,596	\$19,678,371	-\$46,225	-0.2%
Iowa	\$11,678,305	\$11,489,320	-\$188,985	-1.6%
Kansas	\$9,508,928	\$9,356,665	-\$152,263	-1.6%
Kentucky	\$13,631,035	\$13,600,421	-\$30,614	-0.2%
Louisiana	\$13,514,885	\$13,433,740	-\$81,145	-0.6%
Maine	\$5,071,161	\$5,070,986	-\$175	0.0%
Maryland	\$17,058,046	\$17,021,928	-\$36,118	-0.2%
Massachusetts	\$22,832,751	\$22,468,514	-\$364,237	-1.6%
Michigan	\$32,067,518	\$31,992,559	-\$74,959	-0.2%
Minnesota	\$16,089,226	\$16,055,885	-\$33,341	-0.2%
Mississippi	\$9,214,336	\$9,069,088	-\$145,248	-1.6%
Missouri	\$20,013,365	\$19,697,433	-\$315,932	-1.6%
Montana	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Nebraska	\$6,329,384	\$6,227,562	-\$101,822	-1.6%
Nevada	\$7,778,526	\$8,072,077	\$293,551	3.8%
New Hampshire	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%

State	FY2015 Title III Allotment Amount	FY2017 Simulated Amount	Difference from FY2015	
		99% of FY2016 Annual Allotment	Amount	Percent
New Jersey	\$28,725,486	\$28,270,126	-\$455,360	-1.6%
New Mexico	\$6,265,178	\$6,366,387	\$101,209	1.6%
New York	\$67,116,513	\$66,038,407	-\$1,078,106	-1.6%
North Carolina	\$28,860,491	\$29,567,438	\$706,947	2.4%
North Dakota	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Ohio	\$38,849,724	\$38,237,046	-\$612,678	-1.6%
Oklahoma	\$12,037,870	\$11,848,094	-\$189,776	-1.6%
Oregon	\$12,679,103	\$12,959,983	\$280,880	2.2%
Pennsylvania	\$49,297,173	\$48,504,191	-\$792,982	-1.6%
Puerto Rico	\$12,363,802	\$12,333,882	-\$29,920	-0.2%
Rhode Island	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
South Carolina	\$14,881,802	\$15,310,186	\$428,384	2.9%
South Dakota	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Tennessee	\$19,987,242	\$20,037,577	\$50,335	0.3%
Texas	\$62,316,718	\$63,687,528	\$1,370,810	2.2%
Utah	\$5,850,386	\$6,046,100	\$195,714	3.3%
Vermont	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Virginia	\$23,371,383	\$23,494,667	\$123,284	0.5%
Washington	\$19,933,722	\$20,455,935	\$522,213	2.6%
West Virginia	\$7,657,748	\$7,534,731	-\$123,017	-1.6%
Wisconsin	\$18,253,048	\$18,210,923	-\$42,125	-0.2%
Wyoming	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
American Samoa	\$1,209,149	\$1,185,445	-\$23,704	-2.0%
Guam	\$2,529,847	\$2,529,846	-\$1	0.0%
Northern Marianas	\$632,463	\$632,462	-\$2	0.0%
Virgin Islands	\$2,529,847	\$2,529,846	-\$1	0.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,011,938,400</b>	<b>\$1,011,938,400</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>

**Source:** CRS analysis of S. 192; FY2015 funding levels from ACL, "Title III Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging, FY2015 Annual Allocations," January 30, 2015, [http://www.acl.gov/About\\_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf](http://www.acl.gov/About_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf).

**Notes:** OAA Title III allotment amounts include funding for programs authorized under Part B, supportive services and centers; Part C, subpart 1, congregate nutrition services; Part C, subpart 2, home-delivered nutrition services; and Part D, disease prevention and health promotion services programs. FY2017 simulated allotment amounts assume FY2015 funding levels and 2013 U.S. Census state population data for the population aged 60 and over.



**Table B-3. Comparison of FY2015 Older Americans Act (OAA) Title III Allotments to Simulated Population Aged 60+ with 99% of FY2017 Allotments for FY2018**

State	FY2015 Title III Allotment Amount	FY2018 Simulated Amount	Difference from FY2015	
		99% of FY2017 Annual Allotment	Amount	Percent
Alabama	\$15,386,557	\$15,327,346	-\$59,211	-0.4%
Alaska	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Arizona	\$20,354,481	\$21,057,527	\$703,046	3.5%
Arkansas	\$9,860,727	\$9,658,513	-\$202,214	-2.1%
California	\$101,582,696	\$102,202,391	\$619,695	0.6%
Colorado	\$13,494,406	\$14,290,799	\$796,393	5.9%
Connecticut	\$12,303,780	\$12,011,954	-\$291,826	-2.4%
Delaware	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
District of Columbia	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Florida	\$73,044,057	\$72,842,580	-\$201,477	-0.3%
Georgia	\$24,893,786	\$25,964,671	\$1,070,885	4.3%
Hawaii	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Idaho	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Illinois	\$40,440,849	\$39,478,977	-\$961,872	-2.4%
Indiana	\$19,724,596	\$19,648,675	-\$75,921	-0.4%
Iowa	\$11,678,305	\$11,396,228	-\$282,077	-2.4%
Kansas	\$9,508,928	\$9,281,662	-\$227,266	-2.4%
Kentucky	\$13,631,035	\$13,580,528	-\$50,507	-0.4%
Louisiana	\$13,514,885	\$13,412,561	-\$102,324	-0.8%
Maine	\$5,071,161	\$5,070,986	-\$175	0.0%
Maryland	\$17,058,046	\$17,079,328	\$21,282	0.1%
Massachusetts	\$22,832,751	\$22,289,093	-\$543,658	-2.4%
Michigan	\$32,067,518	\$31,944,370	-\$123,148	-0.4%
Minnesota	\$16,089,226	\$16,150,145	\$60,919	0.4%
Mississippi	\$9,214,336	\$9,024,291	-\$190,045	-2.1%
Missouri	\$20,013,365	\$19,541,806	-\$471,559	-2.4%
Montana	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Nebraska	\$6,329,384	\$6,177,406	-\$151,978	-2.4%
Nevada	\$7,778,526	\$8,129,416	\$350,890	4.5%
New Hampshire	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%

State	FY2015 Title III Allotment Amount	FY2018 Simulated Amount	Difference from FY2015	
		99% of FY2017 Annual Allotment	Amount	Percent
New Jersey	\$28,725,486	\$28,045,818	-\$679,668	-2.4%
New Mexico	\$6,265,178	\$6,411,611	\$146,433	2.3%
New York	\$67,116,513	\$65,507,343	-\$1,609,170	-2.4%
North Carolina	\$28,860,491	\$29,777,469	\$916,978	3.2%
North Dakota	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Ohio	\$38,849,724	\$38,032,079	-\$817,645	-2.1%
Oklahoma	\$12,037,870	\$11,790,357	-\$247,513	-2.1%
Oregon	\$12,679,103	\$13,052,043	\$372,940	2.9%
Pennsylvania	\$49,297,173	\$48,113,577	-\$1,183,596	-2.4%
Puerto Rico	\$12,363,802	\$12,314,821	-\$48,981	-0.4%
Rhode Island	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
South Carolina	\$14,881,802	\$15,418,941	\$537,139	3.6%
South Dakota	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Tennessee	\$19,987,242	\$20,179,912	\$192,670	1.0%
Texas	\$62,316,718	\$64,139,929	\$1,823,211	2.9%
Utah	\$5,850,386	\$6,089,048	\$238,662	4.1%
Vermont	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
Virginia	\$23,371,383	\$23,661,560	\$290,177	1.2%
Washington	\$19,933,722	\$20,601,243	\$667,521	3.3%
West Virginia	\$7,657,748	\$7,474,134	-\$183,614	-2.4%
Wisconsin	\$18,253,048	\$18,183,749	-\$69,299	-0.4%
Wyoming	\$5,059,692	\$5,059,692	\$0	0.0%
American Samoa	\$1,209,149	\$1,175,053	-\$34,096	-2.8%
Guam	\$2,529,847	\$2,529,846	-\$1	0.0%
Northern Marianas	\$632,463	\$632,462	-\$2	0.0%
Virgin Islands	\$2,529,847	\$2,529,846	-\$1	0.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,011,938,400</b>	<b>\$1,011,938,400</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>

**Source:** CRS analysis of S. 192; FY2015 funding levels from ACL, "Title III Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging, FY2015 Annual Allocations," January 30, 2015, [http://www.acl.gov/About\\_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf](http://www.acl.gov/About_ACL/Allocations/docs/OAA/T3-2015.pdf).

**Notes:** OAA Title III allotment amounts include funding for programs authorized under Part B, supportive services and centers; Part C, subpart 1, congregate nutrition services; Part C, subpart 2, home-delivered nutrition services; and Part D, disease prevention and health promotion services programs. FY2018 simulated allotment amounts assume FY2015 funding levels and 2013 U.S. Census state population data for the population aged 60 and over.

## **Author Contact Information**

Kirsten J. Colello  
Specialist in Health and Aging Policy  
kcolello@crs.loc.gov, 7-7839