

**Staff Responses to Council Questions
October 18, 2011**

8. First Reading C. Discussion: Stormwater Utility Report

How much of the annual debt service payment of \$1,147,050 for the 2008 bonds is for interest?

Of the annual debt payment in 2013, \$802,050 is for interest. The debt service schedule is attached.

8. First Reading B. Ordinance: Annex 5899 Walnut to the Village of Downers Grove

Why is there no rezoning proposed in conjunction with the annexation?

Upon annexation a property is automatically zoned R-1 Single Family Residence. The property size conforms to the Village's R-1 dimensions (100 feet wide/20,000 square feet). The owner did not indicate a desire to re-zone the property because the R-1 district will accommodate the owner's desired improvements.

FY12 Budget

Is Meals on Wheels a charity?

“Meals on Wheels” is a federal nutrition services program authorized in the Older Americans Act. The DuPage Senior Citizens Council administers the program. A report by the Congressional Research Service, which provides more information on the Meals on Wheels program, is attached.

What happens to the revenue generated by the ambulance fees?

Revenues generated by ambulance fees are General Fund revenues which are used for general operations of the Village.

If the Village did not rebate sales taxes to certain businesses per agreements, how would the General Fund be impacted?

The impact on the General Fund cannot be determined because:

1. The Village is obligated to make sales tax rebate payments pursuant to the terms and conditions of the individual agreements.
2. The Village entered into the agreements assuming that the retailers would either choose a different location outside of the Village or would not make improvements to the property that translate directly into the generation of additional sales tax revenue.

However, if the Village had not entered into these agreements and the retailers were still located within the Village and generated the same amount of sales tax, the General Fund revenues would increase by approximately \$700,000 – an amount equal to the anticipated sales tax rebate payments in 2012.

How much do we anticipate paying in interest on the \$25 million bond issuance?

On a \$25 million bond issuance with a 25 year term and a total interest cost of approximately 4.5%, the Village will pay approximately \$15 million in interest over the life of the debt service payments.

Attachments

2008 Bond Debt Service Schedule

Congressional Research Service Report

Village of Downers Grove
 Long-Term Debt Requirements
 General Obligation Bonds, Series 2008A
 December 31, 2010

Date of Issue August 13, 2008
 Date of Maturity January 1, 2038
 Authorized Issue \$25,000,000
 Denomination of Bonds \$5,000
 Interest Rates 3.50% to 5.25%
 Interest Dates January 1 and July 1
 Principal Maturity Dates January 1
 Payable At The Northern Trust Company
 Purpose of Issuance To fund watershed improvements

CURRENT AND FUTURE PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST REQUIREMENTS

Fiscal Year	Debt Service			Interest Due On			
	Principal	Interest	Totals	January 1	Amount	July 1	Amount
2011	\$ 2,965,000	966,150	3,931,150	2011	\$ 516,431	2011	\$ 449,719
2012	2,610,000	853,763	3,463,763	2012	449,719	2012	404,044
2013	345,000	802,050	1,147,050	2013	404,044	2013	398,006
2014	355,000	789,800	1,144,800	2014	398,006	2014	391,794
2015	370,000	776,187	1,146,187	2015	391,794	2015	384,393
2016	385,000	761,087	1,146,087	2016	384,393	2016	376,694
2017	400,000	745,387	1,145,387	2017	376,694	2017	368,693
2018	415,000	729,087	1,144,087	2018	368,693	2018	360,394
2019	430,000	710,038	1,140,038	2019	360,394	2019	349,644
2020	455,000	687,913	1,142,913	2020	349,644	2020	338,269
2021	475,000	664,663	1,139,663	2021	338,269	2021	326,394
2022	500,000	640,288	1,140,288	2022	326,394	2022	313,894
2023	525,000	614,663	1,139,663	2023	313,894	2023	300,769
2024	550,000	587,788	1,137,788	2024	300,769	2024	287,019
2025	580,000	559,538	1,139,538	2025	287,019	2025	272,519
2026	605,000	529,157	1,134,157	2026	272,519	2026	256,638
2027	640,000	496,476	1,136,476	2027	256,638	2027	239,838
2028	670,000	462,088	1,132,088	2028	239,838	2028	222,250
2029	705,000	426,875	1,131,875	2029	222,250	2029	204,625
2030	740,000	390,750	1,130,750	2030	204,625	2030	186,125
2031	780,000	352,750	1,132,750	2031	186,125	2031	166,625
2032	820,000	312,750	1,132,750	2032	166,625	2032	146,125
2033	860,000	270,750	1,130,750	2033	146,125	2033	124,625
2034	900,000	226,750	1,126,750	2034	124,625	2034	102,125
2035	950,000	180,500	1,130,500	2035	102,125	2035	78,375
2036	995,000	131,875	1,126,875	2036	78,375	2036	53,500
2037	1,045,000	80,873	1,125,873	2037	53,500	2037	27,373
2038	1,095,000	27,373	1,122,373	2038	27,373	2038	-
	<u>\$ 22,165,000</u>	<u>\$ 14,777,369</u>	<u>\$ 36,942,369</u>		<u>\$ 7,646,900</u>		<u>\$ 7,130,469</u>



Older Americans Act: Title III Nutrition Services Program

Kirsten J. Colello
Specialist in Health and Aging Policy

June 17, 2011

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

RS21202

Summary

The elderly nutrition services program, authorized under Title III of the Older Americans Act, provides grants to state agencies on aging to support congregate and home-delivered meals for people aged 60 and older. The program is designed to address problems of food insecurity, promote socialization, and promote the health and well-being of older persons through nutrition and nutrition-related services. It is the largest Older Americans Act program, funded at \$817.8 million in FY2011, accounting for 42% of the Act's total funding (\$1.932 billion). In FY2009, the most recent year for which data are available, almost 242 million meals were served to just under 2.6 million people; 62% were served to frail older people living at home, and 38% were served in congregate settings. The number of home-delivered meals (commonly referred to as "meals on wheels") served has outpaced congregate meals, growing by almost 47% from FY1990 to FY2009; the number of congregate meals served declined by 35%. The faster growth in home-delivered meals is partially due to relatively higher growth in federal funding for home-delivered meals over that time period, as well as state decisions to focus funds on frail older people living at home. Congress approved the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2006 (P.L. 109-365) extending the Act's authorization of appropriations through FY2011.

This report describes the nutrition services program authorized under Title III of the Older Americans Act, including the program's legislative history, purpose, and FY2011 funding levels. It also provides information on service delivery requirements and program data regarding the number of meals served and program participation. The report briefly discusses former and more recent efforts to evaluate these programs. Finally, the report identifies selected issues for federal policymakers, including measuring unmet need for nutrition services, the effects of the economic downturn, additional funding flexibility, and increased cost-sharing.

Contents

Purpose.....	1
Nutrition Services Program	1
Congregate Nutrition Services.....	2
Home-Delivered Nutrition Services.....	2
Nutrition Services Incentive Program.....	3
Funding	3
Service Delivery Requirements	7
Meals Served	7
Program Participation.....	8
Program Evaluation	8
Issues for Congress	9
Unmet Need.....	10
Economic Downturn	10
Funding Flexibility.....	11
Client Cost-Sharing.....	11

Figures

Figure 1. Proportion of Senior Nutrition Participants and Meals Served for Congregate and Home-Delivered Nutrition Programs, FY2009	3
--	---

Tables

Table 1. OAA Nutrition Services Program Funding, FY1990-FY2011	4
Table 2. OAA Nutrition Services, Number of Meals Served, FY1990-FY2009	6

Contacts

Author Contact Information	12
----------------------------------	----

The elderly nutrition services program, authorized under Title III of the Older Americans Act (OAA)¹, provides grants to state agencies on aging to support congregate and home-delivered meals to people aged 60 and older. The program is the largest component of the Act, accounting for \$817.8 million, over 42%, of the Act's total FY2011 funding of \$1.932 billion. The program is designed to address problems of food insecurity, promote socialization, and promote the health and well-being of older persons through nutrition and nutrition-related services. It evolved from demonstration projects first funded in 1968. In 1972, Congress authorized the program as a separate title of the Act and, in 1978, incorporated it into Title III. In 2006, Congress enacted P.L. 109-365, which extended the Act's authorization of appropriations through FY2011.²

This report describes the nutrition services program authorized under Title III of the Older Americans Act. Other federal and state programs, such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly the Food Stamp Program) and the Seniors Farmers' Market Nutrition Program, may provide similar nutrition services to older adults who meet certain income and other requirements. These programs, administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), are not the focus of this report.

Purpose

The Older Americans Act Amendments of 2006, P.L. 109-365, added a new purpose statement for the nutrition services program emphasizing both its nutritional and socialization aspects, as well as its importance in promoting the health of older people. The purposes of the program as stipulated in the law are to (1) reduce hunger and food insecurity, (2) promote socialization of older individuals, and (3) promote the health and well-being of older individuals by assisting them to access nutrition and other disease prevention and health promotion services to delay the onset of adverse health conditions resulting from poor nutritional health or sedentary behavior.

Nutrition Services Program

The Administration on Aging (AOA) in the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) administers the nutrition services program, which includes (1) the Congregate Nutrition Services Program, (2) the Home-Delivered Nutrition Services Program, (3) and the Nutrition Services Incentive Program (NSIP). For the Congregate and Home-Delivered Programs, services must be targeted at persons with the greatest social and economic need, with particular attention to low-income older persons, including low-income minority older persons, older persons with limited English proficiency, older persons residing in rural areas, and those at risk for institutionalization. Means tests for program participation are prohibited, but older persons are encouraged to contribute to the costs of nutrition services, including meals. Older individuals may not be denied services for failure to contribute. The following describes these programs in greater detail.

¹ 42 U.S.C. 3021 et. seq. Regulations are at 45 C.F.R. 1321.1 et. seq.

² 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.

Congregate Nutrition Services

Congregate nutrition services provide meals and related nutrition services to older individuals at a variety of sites, such as senior centers, community centers, schools, and adult day care centers. Congregate nutrition service providers can also offer a variety of nutrition related services at meal sites, such as nutrition education and screening, nutrition assessment, and counseling as appropriate. The program also provides seniors with opportunities for social engagement and volunteer opportunities.

Individuals aged 60 or older and their spouses of any age may participate in the congregate nutrition program. The following groups may also receive meals: persons under age 60 with disabilities who reside in housing facilities occupied primarily by the elderly where congregate meals are served; persons with disabilities who reside at home with, and accompany, older persons to meals; and volunteers who provide services during the meal hours.

In FY2009, the most recent year for which data are available, almost 4 in 10 meals (38%) were served in congregate settings. These meals were served to two-thirds (66%) of all OAA nutrition program participants. A total of 92.5 million congregate meals were served to just under 1.69 million meal participants³ (see **Figure 1**).

Home-Delivered Nutrition Services

Home-delivered nutrition services (commonly referred to as “meals on wheels”) provide meals and related nutrition services to older individuals that are homebound. According to AOA, home-delivered meals are often the first in-home service that an older adult receives, and the program is a primary access point for other home and community-based services.⁴ Like congregate nutrition service providers, home-delivered service providers can offer services such as nutrition screening and education, nutrition assessment, and counseling as appropriate. Home-delivered meals are also an important service for many family caregivers by assisting family members with their caregiving responsibilities and, for some, helping them maintain their own health and personal well-being.⁵

Individuals aged 60 or older and homebound and their spouses of any age may participate in the home-delivered nutrition program. Services may be available to individuals who are under age 60 with disabilities if they reside at home with the homebound older individual.

In FY2009, approximately 6 in 10 meals (62%) were home-delivered. These meals were delivered to just over one-third (34%) of all OAA nutrition program participants. A total of 149.2 million home-delivered meals were provided to about 880,000 meal participants⁶ (see **Figure 1**).


³ Data from Administration on Aging, “State Program Report 2009,” AGing Integrated Database at <http://www.agidnet.org/>.

⁴ Administration on Aging, “Nutrition Services (Title C),” at http://www.aoa.gov/AoARoot/AoA_Programs/HCLTC/Nutrition_Services/index.aspx.

⁵ For further information on family caregiving, see CRS Report RL34123, *Family Caregiving to the Older Population: Background, Federal Programs, and Issues for Congress*, by Kirsten J. Colello.

⁶ Data from Administration on Aging, “State Program Report 2009,” AGing Integrated Database at <http://www.agidnet.org/>.

Figure I. Proportion of Senior Nutrition Participants and Meals Served for Congregate and Home-Delivered Nutrition Programs, FY2009



Source: CRS analysis of data from Administration on Aging, “State Program Report 2009,” AGING Integrated Database at <http://www.agidnet.org/>.

Notes: Congregate meal participants represent a larger proportion of all meal participants but a smaller proportion of total meals served. On the other hand, home-delivered meal participants are relatively fewer but likely to receive more meals. Many home-delivered meals participants receive more than one meal delivered during a week. Congregate meal settings are designed to serve many participants but may serve meals less frequently. In addition, congregate meal participants may partake in meals on a less than frequent basis, compared to home-delivered meals participants.

Nutrition Services Incentive Program

The Nutrition Services Incentive 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 USDA for the congregate and home-delivered nutrition programs. Originally established by the OAA in 1974 as the Nutrition Program for the Elderly and administered by USDA,⁷ Congress transferred the administration of NSIP from USDA to AOA in 2003.⁸ However, states and other entities may still choose to receive all or part of their NSIP allotments in the form of commodities. Obligations for commodity procurement for NSIP are funded under an agreement between USDA and HHS.⁹

Funding

The AOA awards separate allotments of funds for the congregate nutrition services program and home-delivered nutrition services program to states and U.S. territories. State agencies, in turn, award nutrition services funds to the 629 Area Agencies on Aging (AAAs) that administer the

⁷ The program was originally established for commodities only. In 1977, states could receive allotments from USDA in cash or commodities.

⁸ Division G, Title II, Section 217 of the Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003 (P.L. 108-7).

⁹ In 2006, pursuant to P.L. 109-365, Congress rescinded states’ option to receive commodities. However, in 2007, this option was reinstated through P.L. 110-19 (effective April 23, 2007) which authorized the transfer of NSIP funds from HHS to USDA for the purchase of commodities and related expenses.

program in their respective planning and service areas. The AOA also awards a separate allotment to states, territories, and Indian tribal organizations for NSIP funds.

Funds for congregate and home-delivered nutrition services are allotted to states and U.S. territories according to a formula based on each entity’s relative share of the population aged 60 and over; however, the law stipulates that no entity is to receive less than it received in FY2006. P.L. 109-365 gradually eliminated a guaranteed growth provision in the formula, beginning in FY2008.¹⁰ States are required to provide a matching share of 15% in order to receive funds for congregate and home-delivered nutrition programs.

NSIP funds are allotted to states and other entities based on each state’s share of total meals served by the nutrition services program (both congregate and home-delivered meals) in all states, U.S. territories, and tribes during the prior year. As previously mentioned, entities receive their share of NSIP funds in cash, but may elect to use some or all of their funds to purchase commodities through the USDA. Most entities choose to receive their share of funds in cash, rather than commodities.¹¹ There is no matching requirement for NSIP funds.

In FY2011, of the total \$817.8 million appropriated for the program, \$439.9 million was for congregate nutrition (54%), \$217.2 million for home-delivered nutrition (27%), and \$160.7 million for nutrition services incentive grants (20%) (**Table 1**).¹² Funding for nutrition services represents 60% of FY2011 funding for Title III (\$1.360 billion), which also funds a wide array of social services, family caregiver support activities, and disease prevention and health promotion services for older individuals.

Table 1. OAA Nutrition Services Program Funding, FY1990-FY2011
(2010 constant dollars, in millions)

Fiscal year	Congregate meals	Home-Delivered meals	NSIP	Total
1990	\$587.2	\$131.8	\$239.5	\$958.5
1995	\$537.8	\$134.7	\$214.7	\$887.1
2000	\$474.1	\$186.2	\$177.3	\$837.6
2005	\$432.5	\$204.1	\$165.9	\$802.6
2006	\$416.6	\$196.7	\$159.8	\$773.1
2007	\$419.7	\$198.1	\$155.5	\$773.4

¹⁰ This guaranteed growth provision ensured that all states would receive a share of any appropriations increase over the FY2006 level. Congress phased out the guaranteed growth provision, reducing the share of any increase in appropriations from 20% to 0 by 5 percentage points annually beginning in FY2008. For FY2011, the formula will not include the guaranteed growth provision. For further information, see CRS Report RS22549, *Older Americans Act: Funding Formulas*, by Kirsten J. Colello.

¹¹ In FY2010, nine states chose to receive a portion of their share of the nutrition services incentive funds in commodities: Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Montana, Nevada, and Oklahoma. The FY2010 value for these commodities was \$3.4 million, see <http://www.obpa.usda.gov/30fins2012notes.pdf>, pp. 30g-70.

¹² Sums may not total to 100% due to rounding. For further information on OAA funding, see CRS Report RL33880, *Funding for the Older Americans Act and Other Administration on Aging Programs*, by Angela Napili and Kirsten J. Colello. For information on state funding allocations, see http://www.aoa.gov/AoARoot/AoA_Programs/OAA/Aging_Network/State_Allocations/.

Fiscal year	Congregate meals	Home-Delivered meals	NSIP	Total
2008	\$416.07	\$196.4	\$155.4	\$767.9
2009 ^a	\$441.6	\$218.1	\$163.7	\$823.3
2010	\$440.7	\$217.6	\$161.0	\$819.4
2011	\$439.9	\$217.2	\$160.7	\$817.8

Source: CRS analysis based on AOA/HHS and USDA amounts from appropriations legislation adjusted by the CPI-U, at <http://www.bls.gov/cpi/#tables>.

- a. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA, P.L. 111-5) appropriated additional funding for senior nutrition services. This amount is not included in the FY2009 total. Specifically, ARRA appropriated \$100 million for senior nutrition services, of which \$97 million was provided to states and territories (\$65 million for congregate and \$32 million for home-delivered meals), and \$3 million was made available to Indian tribal organizations. These funds were available for obligation through September 30, 2010. States and territories received separate allotments for congregate nutrition and home-delivered nutrition programs based on the state's population age 60 and older relative to the total U.S. population age 60 and older. These funds could not be transferred among Title III services. For further information, see http://www.aoa.gov/AoARoot/PRESS_Room/News/2009/03_18_09.aspx.

When adjusted for inflation, the total amount of funding appropriated for OAA nutrition services has decreased substantially over the past two decades (\$817.8 million for FY2011 compared to \$958.5 million in FY1990). This decline in relative funding has been experienced by the congregate meals and NSIP programs, while funding levels for the home-delivered meals programs have increased over the same time period.

In constant 2010 dollars, the total appropriation for congregate meals, home-delivered meals, and NSIP fell from \$958.5 million in 1990 to \$817.8 million in 2010, a decline of \$140.7 million, or 17%. The amount appropriated for congregate meals fell from \$587.2 million to \$439.9 million, a decline of \$147.3 million, or 25%. The amount appropriated for NSIP fell from \$239.5 million to \$160.7 million, a decline of \$78.8 million, or 49%. Only the amount appropriated for home-delivered meals increased in real terms from 1990 to 2010, rising from \$131.8 million to \$217.2 million, an increase of \$85.4 million, or 65%.

Overall, this reduction in purchasing power has affected the number of meals served, which declined by 2.5 million meals (or 1%) from FY1990 to FY2009, the most recent year for which data are available (see **Table 2**). The overall decline in meals served is due to a substantial decrease in the number of congregate meals served, while the number of home-delivered meals has increased.

Table 2. OAA Nutrition Services, Number of Meals Served, FY1990-FY2009
(in millions)

Fiscal year	Congregate meals	Home-delivered meals	Total meals	Home-delivered meals as a percent of total meals
1990	142.4	101.8	244.2	42%
1995	123.4	119.0	242.4	49%
2000	116.0	143.5	259.4	55%
2005	100.5	140.1	240.6	58%
2008	94.2	146.4	240.6	61%
2009	92.5	149.2	241.7	62%

Source: Data from Administration on Aging, "State Program Report 2009," AGing Integrated Database at <http://www.agidnet.org/>.

Fewer congregate meals served over the past two decades can also be attributed to states transferring allotted funds from the congregate nutrition program to certain OAA Title III programs. As previously mentioned, states receive separate allotments for congregate and home-delivered nutrition services, as well as for supportive services. However, they are allowed to transfer allotted funds among these three programs (up to 40% of funds between congregate and home-delivered nutrition services allotments with waivers for higher amounts if approved by the Assistant Secretary for Aging; and up to 30% among supportive services and congregate and home-delivered nutrition services allotments). States may not transfer NSIP allotted funds among these programs.

In recent years, state transfer of funds has resulted in a decrease of funds available for congregate nutrition services. In FY2009, states transferred \$76.1 million out of their congregate nutrition services allotments to either the home-delivered nutrition or supportive services allotments. These funding transfers resulted in a decrease of 17.8% in funds that were originally allotted to states for the congregate program. Funds available for home-delivered meals increased by 13.4% as a result of funding transfers. Funds for the supportive services program also increased by 13.4%.¹³ State initiatives to respond to the demand for home-based services by frail homebound older persons are an important factor in their decisions to transfer funds. According to GAO, state and local officials reportedly moved funds out of congregate meals because of a greater need for home-delivered meals and support services.¹⁴ In FY2008, 34 states transferred funds from congregate meals to home-delivered meals and 32 states transferred funds from congregate meals to support services.¹⁵

OAA funding is not the only source of funding that state agencies use to provide nutrition services to older individuals. States rely on other funding sources, such as funding from other

¹³ Data from Administration on Aging, "2009 U.S. Profile of OAA Programs," obtained through personal communication from the Administration on Aging, May 19, 2011.

¹⁴ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Older Americans Act: More Should Be Done to Measure the Extent of Unmet Need for Services*, GAO-11-237, February 2011, p. 24.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

federal programs (e.g., Social Services Block Grant, Medicaid home- and community-based services), state and local governments, private sources, and clients. GAO found that OAA funds comprised an estimated 42% of local AAA's Title III program budgets for FY2009.¹⁶ However, many agencies reported reductions in funding from FY2009 to FY2010 due to the economic downturn. According to GAO's survey, approximately 68% of local AAAs reported that the second-largest source of funding, state funds, decreased in FY2010.¹⁷

Service Delivery Requirements

Congregate and home-delivered nutrition services providers are required to offer at least one meal per day, five or more days per week (except in rural areas where less frequency is allowed). Meals provided must comply with the Dietary Guidelines for Americans published by the Secretary of HHS and the Secretary of Agriculture. Providers must serve meals that meet certain dietary requirements based on the number of meals served by the project each day. Providers that serve one meal per day must provide to each participant a minimum of one-third of the daily recommended dietary reference intakes (DRIs) established by the Food and Nutrition Board of the Institute of Medicine (IOM). Providers that serve two meals per day must provide a minimum of two-thirds of the DRIs, and those that serve three meals per day must provide 100% of the DRIs. Providers must provide meals that comply with state or local laws regarding safe and sanitary handling of food, equipment, and supplies that are used to store, prepare and deliver meals, and must carry out meal programs using the advice of dietitians and meal participants. The law requires providers to offer nutrition screening and education to participants, and where appropriate, nutrition assessment and counseling. Providers are encouraged to make arrangements with schools and other facilities serving meals to children in order to promote intergenerational meals programs.

P.L. 109-365 noted that while diet is the preferred source of nutrition, evidence suggests that the use of a single daily multivitamin-mineral supplement may be an effective way to address poor nutrition among older people. Also, it noted that Title III nutrition service providers should consider whether congregate and home-delivered participants would benefit from a multivitamin-mineral supplement that is in compliance with government quality standards and that provides at least two-thirds of essential vitamins and minerals at 100% of daily value levels as determined by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs.¹⁸ The Act, however, did not authorize Title III providers to actually provide a daily vitamin to meals participants.

Meals Served

In FY2009, almost 242 million meals were provided to older adults (see **Table 2**). In FY1990, home-delivered meals represented 42% of total meals served, but by FY2009, the share had climbed to 62% of total meals. From 1990 to 2009, the number of home-delivered meals served grew by 47%, while the number of congregate meals served actually declined by 35%. As

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 25. Title III funding includes funding for other home- and community-based supportive services, including the nutrition services programs.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

¹⁸ Section 318 of P.L. 109-365.

discussed earlier, a number of reasons account for this, including the trend by states to transfer funds from their congregate services allotments to home-delivered services; greater growth in federal funding for home-delivered services relative to the congregate nutrition program funds; state initiatives to expand home care services for frail older persons; and successful leveraging of non-federal funds for home-delivered services.

AOA data show that for FY2009, the U.S. average expenditure for congregate meals was \$6.96, ranging from \$1.68 in Puerto Rico to \$17.36 in Alaska. The average expenditure for home-delivered meals was \$5.30, ranging from \$1.93 in Puerto Rico to \$13.85 in Alaska.¹⁹

Program Participation

A 2009 National Survey of OAA participants shows that in 2009, 57% of congregate nutrition survey respondents were age 75 and older; 48% lived alone; 13% had annual income of \$10,000 or less; and 57% reported that the congregate meals program provided one-half or more of their daily food intake. Furthermore, many congregate nutrition recipients reported these meals have fostered greater socialization, with 87% saying that they see friends more often due to meals.²⁰

This 2009 survey found that 70% of home-delivered respondents were age 75 and older; 56% lived alone; 25% had annual income of \$10,000 or less; and 59% said that the home-delivered meals program provided at least one-half of their daily food intake. According to the survey, home-delivered meals recipients are particularly frail and are at risk for institutionalization. Four out of ten recipients (40%) reported needing assistance with one or more activities of daily living (ADLs, such as bathing, dressing, eating, and using the toilet); 15% of these recipients needed assistance with three or more ADLs. In addition, 85% reported needing assistance with one or more instrumental activities of daily living (IADLs, such as shopping, telephoning, housework, and getting around inside the home).²¹

Program Evaluation

The last major national evaluation of the nutrition program was completed in 1996. It showed that, compared to the total elderly population, nutrition program participants were older and more likely to be poor, to live alone, and to be members of minority groups. Almost half of home-delivered meal recipients and more than one-third of congregate meal recipients had income below the federal poverty level, compared to about 15% of the total U.S. population age 60 and over (at the time of the evaluation). Recipients were also more likely to have health and functional limitations that place them at nutritional risk. The report found the program plays an important role in participants' overall nutrition and that meals consumed by participants are their primary source of daily nutrients. The evaluation also found that the program leverages a fairly significant amount of nonfederal dollars: for every federal dollar spent, the program leveraged (at that time) on average \$1.70 for congregate meals, and \$3.35 for home-delivered meals from a

¹⁹ Data from Administration on Aging, "State Program Report 2009," AGing Integrated Database at <http://www.agidnet.org/>.

²⁰ Data from Administration on Aging, "National Survey of OAA Participants, 2009," AGing Integrated Database at <http://www.agidnet.org/>.

²¹ Ibid.

variety of sources, including state, local, and private funds as well as participant contributions toward the cost of meals.²²

The 2006 reauthorization legislation stipulated that the Institute of Medicine (IOM) conduct an evidence-based study of the program.²³ The study is to include (1) an evaluation of the effect of nutrition projects on the health and nutrition status of participants, prevention of hunger and food insecurity, and ability of participants to remain living independently; (2) a cost-benefit analysis of nutrition projects, including their potential to affect Medicaid costs; and (3) recommendations on how nutrition projects may be modified to improve outcomes, and the nutritional quality of meals. To date, AOA has not conducted this study. However, prior to the 2006 reauthorization AOA had begun the process to conduct a new evaluation of the Title III nutrition services program. According to AOA, this evaluation will contain (1) an evaluation of program impacts on participants' nutrition, health and well-being, socialization, and food insecurity; (2) a cost analysis that describes the cost per meal by cost categories and method of meal production; and (3) a process evaluation that examines the implementation of the program at the state and local levels and includes an assessment of the nutritional quality of the program meals.²⁴ The participant outcomes component will involve a matched comparison group and similar survey methods as those used in the National Health and Nutrition Examination Study (NHANES) to allow for comparison of research results to the previous evaluation, a matched comparison group, and national estimates from NHANES and other national data.

Issues for Congress

As the nation prepares for a growing older population and potential increase in demand for health and social services that can promote the well-being of older persons to assist them in living independently in the community, ensuring access to home- and community-based long-term services and supports will likely be an issue for federal policymakers. The OAA Amendments of 2006 (P.L. 109-365) authorized appropriations for OAA-funded activities, including the Title III Nutrition programs through FY2011. The 112th Congress may choose to reauthorize the Act. In doing so, federal policymakers may consider amending or deleting existing authorities under the Act or establishing new authorities, including those under the nutrition services program. In addition, Congress will likely consider annual appropriations for these activities. The following sections discuss several issues for congressional consideration, such as measuring unmet need for nutrition services, the effects of the economic downturn, additional funding flexibility, and increased cost-sharing. These issues were among those discussed by GAO in its February 11, 2011, report, *Older Americans Act: More Should Be Done to Measure the Extent of Unmet Need for Services* (GAO-11-23711).

²² U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Aging, *Serving Elders at Risk: The Older Americans Act Nutrition Programs*, National Evaluation of the Elderly Nutrition Program, 1993-1995, June 1996.

²³ § 317 of P.L. 109-365, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2006.

²⁴ The evaluation is being conducted by Mathematica Policy, Inc. AOA anticipates submitting a Paperwork Reduction Act data collection request to OMB in early 2012. This clearance process is expected to take between six months and one year. Data collection will be began as soon as OMB clearance is received. Personal communication from the Administration on Aging, June 2011. For additional information on the evaluation see, http://www.aoa.gov/AoARoot/Program_Results/docs/Program_Eval/III_C_Assessment/Evaluation_Status_Report_11_09.html.

Unmet Need

According to a national analysis by GAO, meals services provided in 2008 served some, but not most, low-income older adults who are likely in need of such services.²⁵ State agency officials identified several reasons why an older adult may need but not receive meals services, including (1) greater demand for home-delivered meals than available funds can provide, (2) lack of knowledge or awareness among eligible older adults that meals services exist, and (3) lack of appeal with the meals served or the time of day meals are provided in congregate settings.²⁶

Overall, GAO found that the lack of federal guidance and data make it difficult for states to estimate the full extent of need and unmet need for OAA Title III services, including nutrition services. The OAA requires that AOA design and implement uniform data collection procedures for states to assess receipt of services, as well as need and unmet need for Title III services.²⁷ Although AOA does provide uniform procedures for states to measure receipt of services, the agency does not provide standardized definitions or measurement for states to use in measuring need or unmet need for services. As a result, states use a variety of approaches that are often limited in their ability to fully estimate need and unmet need among older adults. These approaches include maintaining waitlists, obtaining information and data from service providers, and surveying current recipients. GAO recommends that HHS partner with governmental agencies that provide services to older Americans and convene researchers and agency officials to develop consistent definitions of need and unmet needs for uniform data collection purposes.²⁸

Economic Downturn

The economic downturn and recovery has affected many Americans, including older adults. While GAO found that FY2010 funding decreased for many agencies, requests for services have increased since the beginning of the economic downturn. According to a report by the National Association of States United for Aging and Disabilities (NASUAD)—formerly the National Association of State Units on Aging (NASUA)—85% of states that responded to the survey saw an increase in demand for home-delivered meals, while almost half of states reported an increase in demand for congregate meals in FY2009.²⁹

State and local agencies have responded to the downturn in various ways, such as creating waitlists, securing additional funds, collaborating with other agencies, utilizing ARRA funds, and reducing services. In some cases, limited funding has meant “less services to all rather than full service to only some.”³⁰ According to NASUAD’s state agencies survey, states reportedly are reviewing current methods for providing home-delivered food with some states anticipating

²⁵ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Older Americans Act: More Should Be Done to Measure the Extent of Unmet Need for Services*, GAO-11-237, February 2011, p. 15.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

²⁷ 42 U.S.C. § 3012.

²⁸ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Older Americans Act: More Should Be Done to Measure the Extent of Unmet Need for Services*, GAO-11-237, February 2011, p. 35.

²⁹ National Association of States United for Aging and Disabilities, *The Economic Crisis and Its Impact on State Aging Programs: Results of All-State Survey*, November 2009.

³⁰ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Older Americans Act: More Should Be Done to Measure the Extent of Unmet Need for Services*, GAO-11-237, February 2011, p. 30.

cutting back on the frequency of meal delivery, among other things.³¹ Moreover, an estimated 18% of agencies surveyed by GAO reported reducing nutrition services in FY2010. Just over one-fifth of agencies (21%) reportedly anticipate additional cuts to the nutrition services program in FY2011. Congress may consider whether appropriations for Title III nutrition services programs are sufficient to meet this increased demand and potential for continued funding constraints at the state and local levels.

Funding Flexibility

Most states and a number of AAAs use the statutory flexibilities under current law to transfer funding among Title III programs. According to GAO, some states recommended consolidating funding for nutrition services programs into one single funding stream. However, other state officials did not see the need to alter the current process for transferring Title III funds. Congress may consider whether additional flexibilities are necessary, possibly consolidating Title III funding streams or increasing the proportion of funds available for states and AAAs to transfer, affording those entities who choose to transfer funds greater ability in doing so. Conversely, Congress may be concerned that funding transfers provide states and AAAs the ability to reallocate funding to services at a level different than otherwise appropriated. As a result, Congress may seek to further specify or limit funding flexibility. Congress may also decide that funding flexibilities under current law are sufficient for states and AAAs current needs and choose to maintain the status quo.

Client Cost-Sharing

Clients can, and some do, contribute to the cost of their meals. GAO found that almost all local AAAs permit voluntary contributions for Title III services, including the nutrition services program.³² For FY2009, voluntary contributions comprised 4% of AAA budgets. Some AAAs indicated to GAO that voluntary contributions make up a significant portion of their nutrition services program budget.³³ Although the OAA authorizes states to implement cost-sharing as a requirement for some Title III services, the Act does not permit cost-sharing as a requirement for participation in congregate and home-delivered meals programs, except on a voluntary basis. According to GAO, additional cost-sharing arrangements could provide additional funding for Title III programs.³⁴ GAO recommends that the HHS Secretary study the implementation of cost-sharing for OAA services with respect to “the real and perceived burdens to implementing cost sharing for OAA services,” which could include recommending legislative changes to the Act.³⁵

³¹ National Association of States United for Aging and Disabilities, *The Economic Crisis and Its Impact on State Aging Programs: Results of All-State Survey*, November 2009.

³² U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Older Americans Act: More Should Be Done to Measure the Extent of Unmet Need for Services*, GAO-11-237, February 2011, p. 27.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

Author Contact Information

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