

MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA

DATE: October 11, 2024

TIME: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon

PLACE: **SUTTER COUNTY***
Adventist Health Conference Room
989 Plumas Street
Yuba City, CA 95991
(916) 370-4551

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.

AGENDA:**I. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL****II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE****III. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

The Governing Board welcomes comments on any agenda item as it is addressed. Individuals will be limited to 5 minutes; 15 minutes for a representative of a group. Comments may be made on any subject not on the agenda. A specific time limit will be established based on the number of people wishing to speak, for a total of 15 minutes per subject.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

Consent items are expected to be routine and noncontroversial. The Governing Board will act upon them at one time without discussion unless any Board member, staff member, or member of the public requests that an item be removed from the consent calendar for discussion.

- A.** Adopt the Agenda
- B.** Approve the Minutes from 9/13/2024
- C.** Approve New Committee Appointments

V. CORRESPONDENCE – *Not applicable***VI. ACTION ITEMS**

- A.** Approve Scope of Service Changes for SFY 2024-25
- B.** Select Board Members to Serve on the Nominating Committee
- C.** Vote on Sierra County's Funding for the 2025-27 RFP Cycle

Committee Meetings

Audit/Finance Committee Meeting: **9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m., Friday, October 11, 2024**

Executive Committee Meeting: **9:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m., Friday, October 11, 2024**

Please visit www.agencyonaging4.org for additional information

PAGE TWO

VII. DISCUSSION/PRESENTATION

- A. Challenges Serving Small, Rural Counties, *presented by Sutter County Supervisor Ziegenmeyer and Sutter County Health & Human Services Director Sarah Eberhardt-Rios*
- B. Final Preparations for Parity Decision Points around County Funding Levels: A Straw Poll Exercise (continued)

VIII. REPORTS

- A. Executive Committee
- B. Audit/Finance Committee
- C. Advisory Council
- D. Grants Review Committee (GRC)
- E. HICAP Coordinating Committee
- F. Joint Program Evaluation Committee (JPEC)
- G. Executive Director

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS

X. ADJOURNMENT

Attachments being sent under separate cover:

- *Scope of Service Tables for SFY 2024-25*

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

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88427926346>

If you need a disability-related reasonable accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact the AAA4 office at (916) 486-1876, or email GoverningBoard@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
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

Date: September 13, 2024
Location: Sacramento County

I. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Chair Meghan Rose called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m., welcoming members and guests. A quorum was established.

County	GB Members Present - 10	Excused = 3 / Absent= 4
Nevada		Supv. Swarthout (E); E. Minett (A)
Placer		Supv. Jones (E); W. Reed (A)
Sacramento	C. Burton, Leesa Klotz, M. Rose, M. Sawamura	C. Nunley (A)
Sierra	Supv. Dryden; Supv. Heuer	
Sutter		Supv. Ziegenmeyer (A); Tonya Beebe (E)
Yolo	N. Pennebaker, Supv. Provenza	
Yuba	Supv. Blaser, Supv. Vasquez	

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

AAA4 Staff Present: Will Tift, Linda Berry, Jodi Mesa, Rashana Wright, Anwar Masroor, Maggie Borowiak, Sara Martinez, Teja Payne and Clayton Wyatt.

AAA4 Staff (via Zoom): Pam Miller, Dr. Julie Bates, Julie Beckner, Agboo Abeywickrama, Anson Houghton, Ashley Williams, Cindy Reigert, Julie Bates, Julie Tharalson, Kellie Bruton, Liz Pazdral, Moises Gamboa, Nancy Vasquez, Rebecca Hensley, Robert Teal, Shirley Mohammed, Val Manning, Yvonne Pacheco-Vong

Guests Present: Carolynn Washington, *HICAP Services of Northern California*; Magdalene DeBerg, *Inc. Senior Citizens of Sierra County*; Jeri Shikuma, ACC Senior Services; Tink Miller, PIRS; and Jamie Johnson *Yolo Healthy Aging Alliance*

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Led by Meghan Rose

III. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC – The comment comes from Tink Miller regarding the proposed questions from the Straw Poll. Tink Miller suggested as follows, “I want to suggest that the formula be modified to set a base amount that each county receives, for example, 200,000, and then apply the Parity Formula into the remainder of the funds available. I also urge retaining local control at some level on how the funds would be used in their county. The priority of local needs should continue to be identified by a process like the Area Plan.”

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR*

A. Adopt and approve agenda and approve 8/9/2024 minutes.

Motion	Second	Passed
Supv. Vasquez	Dr. S. Allen	Y= 9; N=0; Abstain=0

V. CORRESPONDENCE – None

VI. ACTION ITEMS*

A. Approve JPEC Recommendations for SFY 2023-24

Motion	Second	Passed
Supv. Vasquez	Supv. Heuer	Y= 9; N=0; Abstain=0

VII. DISCUSSION/PRESENTATION*

A. HICAP 101: The Health Insurance Counseling & Advocacy Program and You, presented by *Carolynn Washington*

B. CA 2030: Next Steps, *excerpts from the 9/4/24 CDA Webinar*

C. The Unique Challenges of Serving Frontier Communities, *presented by Sierra County Supervisors Dryden and Heuer*

D. Final Preparations for Parity Decision Pints around County Funding Levels: A Straw Poll Exercise

a. Here are the questions posed during the Poll:

1. Should AAA4 continue to use the Intrastate Funding Formula (IFF, aka the Parity Formula) to set initial county funding levels as the starting place for discussion?
2. Should AAA4 continue to subsidize Sierra County based on projected expenditures to operate the “core” services (as opposed to some other method)?
3. Should AAA4 consider setting minimum baseline funding levels in Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties?

b. There will be a deeper dive into the question mentioned above in the next Governing Board Meeting

VIII. REPORTS*

A. – F. – None Provided

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS - None

X. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Meghan Rose called for a motion for adjournment at 12:00 p.m., without going over Reports due to time constraints.

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

Recordings are on file for one year.

2024 Governing Board Committee Appointments

Area Plan

Cecile Nunley
Supv. Lisa Swarthout
William Reed

Audit/Finance

Meghan Rose
Miko Sawamura
Nancy Pennebaker

Grants Review

Supv. Jim Provenza
Nancy Pennebaker
Tonya Beebe
Miko Sawamura
William Reed
Supv. Lila Heuer

Legislative Committee

Meghan Rose
Miko Sawamura
Tonya Beebe

Parliamentarian

Carl Burton

Personnel

Supv. Don Blaser
Supv. Sharon Dryden
Tonya Beebe
William Reed
Miko Sawamura

Rules of Procedure

Supv. Jim Provenza
Supv. Suzanne Jones

Nominating Committee

Miko Sawamura
Nancy Pennebaker
William Reed

Diversity Committee

No members

Joint Program Evaluation (JPEC)

Supv. Lila Heuer
Meghan Rose
Nancy Pennebaker
Supv. Sharon Dryden

Executive Committee

Meghan Rose, Chair
Supv. Sharon Dryden, *1st V. Chair*
William Reed, *2nd Vice Chair*
Miko Sawamura, *Secretary*
Nancy Pennebaker, *Audit/Finance*

ACTION ITEM VI. A.

TO: AAA4 GOVERNING BOARD

FROM: Joint Program Evaluation Committee

DATE: October 4, 2024

SUBJECT: Approve Scope of Service Changes for SFY 2024-25

The Joint Program Evaluation Committee (JPEC) met on September 13th to review proposed changes to annual scopes of service for AAA4-funded programs for SFY 2024-25. Nearly every program is requesting an adjustment. Discussions were limited to those items where the suggested scope change was contradictory to what the final Year-End Performance figures would suggest.

Several weeks prior, AAA4 Staff generated 3-year mathematical projections for each program based on actual performance numbers. Funded Partners could either accept these projections or propose an alternative figure. In every case, AAA4 Staff suggested JPEC accept the Funded Partners' figures as they are best positioned to know what their service capacity will be going forward.

JPEC voted unanimously to accept all scope of service changes as presented.

This item requires a majority vote.

ACTION ITEM VI. B.

TO: AAA4 GOVERNING BOARD

FROM: Pam Miller

DATE: October 3, 2024

SUBJECT: Select Board Members to Serve on the Nominating Committee

The Governing Board's Rules of Procedure state "The Nominating Committee shall consist of a minimum of three members who shall be elected annually by the Governing Board. Committee members shall select their Committee chair. The Committee shall submit, at the meeting held in October, nominations for each of the offices and for the subsequent Nominating Committee and will be responsible for seeking members capable of assuming responsibilities of the respective offices."

The Committee should meet as soon as practicable to choose a slate of individuals they believe are best-suited to serve as Board Officers for the next calendar year. The Nominating Committee should present its slate in November so that elections can be held in December.

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

This item requires a roll call vote.

ACTION ITEM VI. C.

TO: AAA4 GOVERNING BOARD

FROM: Pam Miller

DATE: October 4, 2024

SUBJECT: Vote on Sierra County's Funding Request for the 2025-27 RFP Cycle

Last month, Sierra County Supervisors Dryden and Heuer spoke to the unique challenges of living, working and growing old in Frontier communities. Their \$256,497 funding request appears on the following page. The proposed increases are based on the current operating costs of their sole local provider, Incorporated Senior Citizens of Sierra County (Inc. Seniors).

The Governing Board may accept this request as presented, or the Board may accept a dollar amount that is higher or lower than this request. The difference between the adopted amount and the Initial Parity Allocation (\$38,763) must be deducted from one or more of the other six counties in AAA4's service area. That decision is scheduled for the November Board meeting; multiple options will be presented at that time.

On October 4th, the Grants Review Committee reviewed this request and voted unanimously (6-0) to approve the full amount requested.

This item requires a roll call vote.

SIERRA COUNTY: Proposed Awards for the 2025-27 Funding Cycle

Initial 2024 Parity %	0.38%	ALLOCATION ¹	ACTUAL ²	PROPOSED ³	NET CHANGE
Final 2024 Parity %	TBD	2024-25	2024-25	2025-26	2025-26
Supportive Services (III-B)		\$ 2,758	\$ 42,250	\$ 60,071	\$ 17,821
Legal*			\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ -
Outreach* (In place of I&A)			\$ 39,250	\$ 39,793	\$ 543
<i>East County</i>			\$ 39,250	\$ 39,793	\$ 543
<i>West County</i>			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Transportation* (In lieu of a Program, these dollars will cover meal delivery costs)			\$ -	\$ 17,278	\$ 17,278
Minor Home Modifications			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Employment			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Nutrition (III-C) excluding NSIP		\$ 31,494	\$ 181,247	\$ 196,426	\$ 15,179
Congregate Meals*		\$ 11,747	\$ 76,267	\$ 91,834	\$ 15,567
<i>East County</i>			\$ 76,267	\$ 91,834	\$ 15,567
<i>West County</i>			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Home-Delivered Meals*		\$ 19,747	\$ 104,980	\$ 104,592	\$ (388)
<i>East County</i>			\$ 104,980	\$ 104,592	\$ (388)
<i>West County</i>			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Health Promotion (III-D)		\$ 608	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DEEP & MOB (County share)			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Caregiver (III-E)		\$ 3,903	\$ 349	\$ -	\$ (349)
Caregiver Assessment			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Caregiver Case Management			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Caregiver Counseling (County share)			\$ 349	\$ -	\$ (349)
Caregiver Respite			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other:			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL		\$ 38,763	\$ 223,846	\$ 256,497	\$ 32,651

*AAA4 "Core" Services

TARGETS:

N/A

N/A

¹ If AAA4 did not allow Older Americans Act (OAA) fund transfers across Titles and across Counties, this would be the Initial (Non-Adjusted) Share of Parity Pool Dollars.

² These are the original awards for SFY 2024-25 by OAA Title and Service Category.

³ Ahead of the next major Request for Proposals (RFP), ad hoc County Workgroups have been tasked with proposing award amounts for SFY 2025-26 (for approval by AAA4's Governing Board).

PRESENTATION ITEM VII. A.

TO: AAA4 GOVERNING BOARD
FROM: Pam Miller
DATE: October 3, 2024
SUBJECT: Challenges Serving Small, Rural Counties

At the request of Sutter County Supervisor Ziegenmeyer, this presentation will provide additional insights into living, working and growing old in small, rural counties.

DISCUSSION ITEM VII. B.

TO: AAA4 GOVERNING BOARD

FROM: Pam Miller

DATE: October 3, 2024

SUBJECT: Final Preparations for Parity Decision Points around County Funding Levels: A Straw Poll Exercise (continued)

BACKGROUND (For ease of reference, this section repeats the information that appeared in the September 2024 Board Packet, **except for revisions in green.**)

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

Currently, 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 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).

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 ~~not or exceeded that 30% threshold~~ **exercised this option** 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 supplement 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. **Currently, the Agency’s transfer percentage is at 13%; therefore, additional dollars could be moved from Nutrition to Supportive Services if that is desired.** ~~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.~~

Straw Poll Questions

Ad hoc County Workgroups have been struggling to complete their funding recommendations due to the uncertainties surrounding this particular Parity/RFP cycle. AAA4's Governing Board is scheduled to take action on the Parity Formula in October and November. There are 17 seats on the Board. Sacramento County has 5 seats; the other six counties each have 2 seats.

In an effort to narrow the field of potential outcomes, AAA4 Staff request all voting Board members participate in this exercise. These votes are not binding, but they are intended to measure the "temperature" of the Board as a whole around key decision points. This should help the Workgroups focus on the most plausible scenarios rather than all possible scenarios.

- 1) Should AAA4 continue to use the Intrastate Funding Formula (aka, the Parity Formula) to set **initial** county funding levels as the starting place for discussion?

Yes (Arguments in favor)	No (Arguments in opposition)
There is a 30-year precedent for doing it this way.	AAA4 is not required to do it this way.
The formula yields definitive dollar amounts.	The formula yields uneven dollars per capita for the age 60+ population.
The State does not expect to implement any changes to the IFF until 2027.	The State is actively exploring making changes to the IFF.
Other:	Other:
Straw Votes in Favor = Sacramento, Sierra, Yolo & Yuba	Straw Votes in Opposition =

Continued on next page

- 2) Should AAA4 continue to subsidize Sierra County based on projected expenditures to operate the “core” services (as opposed to some other method)?

Yes (Arguments in favor)	No (Arguments in opposition)
There is a long-standing precedent for doing it this way.	AAA4 is not required to do it this way.
This approach yields definitive dollar amounts.	This approach gives Sierra-based service providers an advantage over providers in the other six counties.
Sierra County is a service desert.	This approach gives Sierra County a disproportionate amount of funding.
Other:	Other:
Straw Votes in Favor = Sacramento, Sierra, Yolo & Yuba	Straw Votes in Opposition =

- 3) Should AAA4 consider setting minimum baseline funding levels in Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties?

Yes (Arguments in favor)	No (Arguments in opposition)
Establishing a fiscal “floor” below which a county would not descend would add stability.	Floors would offer false stability if they were not fiscally sustainable in the long term, especially in a deficit scenario.
This approach would mitigate funding <u>reductions</u> for counties that are <i>above</i> their parity percentage targets.	This approach would mitigate funding <u>increases</u> for counties that are <i>below</i> their parity percentage targets.
CDA does this for the smallest agencies on aging.	AAA4 has never done this; unintended consequences could result.
Other:	Other:
Other:	Other:
Straw Votes in Favor =	Straw Votes in Opposition =
THIS DISCUSSION WAS TABLED DUE TO TIME CONSTRAINTS.	

NEW INFORMATION:

Final votes on three decision points are scheduled for the Friday, November 8th meeting. This will be Joint Meeting of AAA4's Advisory Council and Governing Board.

1) Final Parity Percentages Set (Adjusted for Sierra County)

As explained above, the approval of new Parity Percentages is a two-step process. The Governing Board first decides upon a baseline funding level for Sierra County, then the Board chooses which Counties will divert what sums to Sierra County to reach that baseline. A variety of potential scenarios will be included in the November Board Packet. Those Counties that contribute to Sierra County have their Parity Percentages lowered accordingly so that the sum of all Parity Shares remains at 100%.

It is important to note that the setting of Parity Percentages does not necessarily dictate Final Funding Levels for Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties. Historically, when facing significant funding reductions, Counties have made good faith efforts to reach their "target" amounts, but some have fallen short of those goals. When they have done so, their Parity percentages have not been changed. The Governing Board is scheduled to vote on Final Funding Levels at the December 13th meeting.

2) RFP Inclusion/Exclusion Decisions (Title III-B, Title III-C & Title VII)

AAA4 has discretion to decide whether to include in-house Direct Service programs in its RFP cycles. In general, excluding them reduces the administrative burden for the Agency, and including them proves whether any potential competitors actually exist. On October 4th the Grants Review Committee briefly discussed this topic but did not vote.

3) Award Renewals for the 2025-27 Grant Cycle (Titles III-D & III-E)

AAA4 conducts two separate RFP Cycles (the Minor and the Major) on an overlapping "Olympic" schedule. However, each cycle is a two-year cycle, renewable for an additional two years. In 2023 at the conclusion of the latest Minor RFP Cycle, the Governing Board awarded funds to Title III-D Health Promotion and Title III-E Family Caregiver providers. The Board must now vote to renew (or not renew) those awards for two additional years. In a non-renewal scenario, the current programs could be added to the 2025-27 RFP or discontinued at the end of the contract period (June 30, 2025). On October 4th the Grants Review Committee briefly discussed this topic but did not vote.