Older Americans Act: Funding Formulas

Kirsten J. Colello
Specialist in Health and Aging Policy

Updated March 18, 2019

Congressional Research Service
7-....
www.crs.gov
RS22549

CRS REPORT
Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress

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. This report describes the OAA statutory provisions that allocate funds to states and other entities under various titles of the act.

Title III accounts for 73% of the act's total FY2019 discretionary appropriations ($1.498 billion out of $2.055 billion). States receive separate allotments of funds for the following six programs authorized under Title III: (1) supportive services and senior 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 629 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. Its FY2019 funding of $400 million represents 20% of the act's total discretionary 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 grantees who are typically nonprofit organizations that operate in more than one state. The total Title V state allotment is the sum of its respective state agency grantee allotment and national 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 nonprofit 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 all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. territories.

The Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2016 (P.L. 114-144) authorizes appropriations for most OAA programs through FY2019. P.L. 114-144 also made changes to the statutory funding formulas for several programs under Title III of the act. **Appendix A** of the report provides a detailed legislative history of the Title III funding formula changes, including changes under P.L. 114-144, as well as the OAA reauthorizations of 2000 and 2006. **Appendix B** provides an analysis of the state-based population data for the U.S. population age 60 and older. **Appendix C** compares FY2016 allotment amounts for states and other entities with actual allotment amounts under the statutory funding formula change in P.L. 114-144 for FY2017 to FY2019 for Title III Parts B, C, and D programs.

Contents

Tables

Appendixes

Contacts

Background

First enacted in 1965, the Older Americans Act (OAA, P.L. 89-73, as amended)[1] 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 in their homes; 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 for nutrition and supportive services.[2,3]

Since enactment of OAA, Congress has reauthorized and amended the act numerous times. Most recently, the Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2016 (P.L. 114-144) authorized appropriations for OAA programs for FY2017 through FY2019, and made other changes to the act, including changes to four Title III programs that receive funding under statutory formulas. Prior to the 2016 OAA reauthorization, the OAA Amendments of 2006 (P.L. 109-365) reauthorized all programs under the act through FY2011. Although the authorizations of appropriations under the OAA expired at the end of FY2011, Congress continued to appropriate funding for OAA-authorized activities through FY2016.

For most OAA programs, entities such as states, U.S. territories, and tribal organizations are allotted funding based on a population-based formula factor (e.g., aged 55 and over, aged 60 and over, or aged 70 and over). Some statutory requirements for program funding allocations include a "hold harmless" provision, which guarantees that states' or other entities' allotments will remain at a certain fiscal year level or amount, provided sufficient funding in a given year (e.g., FY2000 levels or FY2018 levels less 1%). The following describes the OAA statutory provisions that allocate funds to states and other entities under the various titles of the act.

[1] For a compilation of the Older Americans Act, as amended, see U.S. House of Representative, Office of the Legislative Council's website at https://legcounsel.house.gov/HOLC/Resources/comps_alpha.html#O.

[2] For information regarding funding allocations to states, U.S. territories, and tribal organizations under Titles III, VI, and VII, see https://www.acl.gov/about-acl/older-americans-act-oaa. For information regarding funding allocations to states and national grantees under Title V, see DOL, Employment and Training Administration, *Program Year (PY) 2018 Planning Instructions and Allotments for Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP) Grantees*, Training and Employment Guidance Letter No. 17-17, https://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/corr_doc.cfm?docn=8825.

[3] 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.

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 more than 600 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, discretionary spending under Title III accounts for 73% of the act's total FY2019 appropriations ($1.498 billion out of $2.055 billion).[4] States receive separate allotments of funds for the following six programs authorized under Title III: (1) supportive services and senior 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 NSIP and 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 senior 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.

Table 1. Older Americans Act (OAA): Title III Statutory Funding Formula Provisions, by Program

Program Name	OAA Section(s) [U.S.C. Citation(s)]	Population Factor	Hold Harmless?	State Matching Requirement?
Supportive Services and Senior Centers	Part B, §321 [42 U.S.C. §3030d]	Aged 60+	Yes	15%
Congregate Nutrition Services	Part C, Subpart 1, §331 [42 U.S.C. §3030e]	Aged 60+	Yes	15%
Home-Delivered Nutrition Services	Part C, Subpart 2, §§336-337 [42 U.S.C. §§3030f-g]	Aged 60+	Yes	15%
Nutrition Services Incentive Program	§311 [42 U.S.C. §3030a]	None[a]	None	None
Disease Prevention and Health Promotion Services	Part D, §361 [42 U.S.C. §3030m]	Aged 60+	Yes	None

[4] For information on the historical development of OAA and a brief description of the act's titles, see CRS Report R43414, *Older Americans Act: Overview and Funding*.

Program Name	OAA Section(s) [U.S.C. Citation(s)]	Population Factor	Hold Harmless?	State Matching Requirement?
National Family Caregiver Support Program	Part E, §§371-374 [42 U.S.C. §§3030s-s2]	Aged 70+	None	25%

Source: Congressional Research Service.

a. NSIP funds are allotted to states, U.S. territories and tribal organizations based total meals served by the nutrition services program (both congregate and home-delivered meals) during the prior year.

The funding formula for four of these Title III programs—supportive services and senior centers, the congregate and home-delivered nutrition programs, and disease prevention and health promotion services—has been a major point of contention during the past three OAA reauthorizations of 2000, 2006, and 2016. **Appendix A** of the report provides a detailed legislative history of the Title III funding formula changes and describes the debate surrounding changes to the Title III funding formula during the OAA reauthorizations of 2000, 2006, and 2016. **Appendix B** provides an analysis of the state-based population data for the U.S. population age 60 and older for these Title III programs. **Appendix C** compares FY2016 allotment amounts for states and other entities with actual allotment amounts under the statutory funding formula changes in P.L. 114-144 for FY2017 to FY2019 for Title III Parts B, C1, C2 and D programs.

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

Separate state allotments for (1) supportive services and senior 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, FY2019 state allotments are calculated using 2017 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. The OAA Reauthorization Act of 2016 Amendments (P.L. 114-144) reduces state and U.S. territory hold harmless amounts (previously referenced to FY2006 funding levels) by 1% from the previous fiscal year as follows:

- For FY2017, no state receives less than 99% of the annual amount allotted to the state in FY2016.
- For FY2018, no state receives less than 99% of the annual amount allotted to the state in FY2017.

- For FY2019, no state receives less than 99% of the annual amount allotted to the state in FY2018.
- For FY2020 and each subsequent fiscal year, no state receives less than 100% of the annual amount allotted to the state in FY2019.

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.

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 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 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).[5] 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 guidelines).[6] Its FY2019 funding of $400 million represents 20% of the act's total discretionary funding. There is a 10% nonfederal match requirement for Title V grant activities.

[5] Title V is also referred to as the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP; 42 USC 3056-3056p).

[6] 20 C.F.R. §641.500.

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 grantees who are typically nonprofit organizations that operate in more than one state. The total Title V state allotment is the sum of its respective state agency grantee allotment and national grantee allotment for activities in that state. To determine grant allotments for each state, a separate allocation is calculated for each grant type.

The 2016 OAA reauthorization did not revise the Title V funding formula, but the formula had been an issue for Congress in the past.[7] 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.[8]

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.

After these reservations, the remaining funds are divided into two amounts, one for all state agency grantees and the other for all national grantees. The allocation for these amounts is dependent on program funding. If funds for a given year are equal to their FY2000 level of $440.2 million, then amounts set aside for all state agencies and all national 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 grantees. Any funding amount over $35 million that remains is to be distributed 50/50 to all state agency and national grantees, respectively.

Once the total funding levels for grants for state agency and national grantees have been determined, the same formula is used to determine the state agency allotment and the national grantee allotment for each state. Each allotment is distributed to states based on a formula that takes into account (1) a state's share of the total U.S. population aged 55 years and older (includes the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), and (2) the state per capita income relative to other states. The formula favors states with a lower per capita income and a higher proportion of

---

[7] For further information on the legislative history of the Title V funding formula, see archived CRS Report RL30055, *Older Americans Act: 2000 Reauthorization Legislation*, available from author.

[8] 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 PY2016 (ending June 30, 2017), the CSEOA program supported 44,678 job slots, serving 60,002 participants (personal communication, Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, U.S. Department of Labor, July 12, 2018; Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration, *State Statutory Formula Funding, Community Service Employment for Older Americans, Dollars Tables, PY 2016*, https://www.doleta.gov/budget/statfund.cfm.) In FY2017, CSEOA had a cost of $7,339 per participant (U.S. Department of Labor, Fiscal Year 2019 Congressional Budget Justification, Employment and Training Administration, Community Service Employment for Older Americans, p. CSEOA-13, https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/legacy-files/budget/2019/CBJ-2019-V1-05.pdf).

the population aged 55 and older relative to other states. 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 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.[9] Funds are awarded directly to Indian tribal organizations, Alaskan Native organizations, and nonprofit groups representing Native Hawaiians. To be eligible for funding, a tribal organization must represent at least 50 Native American elders aged 60 or older.[10] In FY2017, grants were awarded to 270 tribal organizations representing 400 Indian tribes, including one organization serving Native Hawaiian elders.[11] FY2019 funding for supportive and nutrition services grants is $34.2 million, while FY2019 funding for the Native American caregiver program is $10.1 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.

[9] For further information, see https://www.acl.gov/programs/services-native-americans-oaa-title-vi.

[10] In order to establish eligibility, a tribal organization may develop its own population statistics with approval from the Bureau of Indian Affairs (42 U.S.C. 3057e-1).

[11] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Community Living, Fiscal Year 2019 Justification of Estimates for Appropriations Committees, p. 76.

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 FY2019, funding for the LTC Ombudsman and Elder Abuse, Neglect, and Exploitation Prevention Programs totals $21.7 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.

Appendix A. Legislative History of OAA Title III Funding Formula

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.[12] 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 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 under the 1973 amendments to the act, which 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.[13] 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[14] 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).[15]

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%).[16] The 1978 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.[17] There were no changes to the formula provisions under the 1987 amendments.[18] The 1992 amendments moved the hold harmless reference year to FY1987.[19] 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 senior centers, the congregate and home-delivered nutrition programs, and disease prevention and health promotion services 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.

[12] Section 302, Older Americans Act of 1965, P.L. 89-73.

[13] P.L. 93-29.

[14] The minimum allotment for the trust territories was added by the 1969 amendments to the OAA (P.L. 91-69).

[15] 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.

[16] P.L. 95-478.

[17] P.L. 98-459.

[18] P.L. 100-175.

[19] P.L. 102-375.

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 in the 104th and 105th Congresses to reauthorize the OAA, the 106th 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.[20] Prior to the reauthorization, a 1994 U.S. General Accounting Office (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.[21] 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.[22] 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 disadvantaged 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 5 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.

[20] For further information, see nondistributable CRS Report RL30055, *Older Americans Act: 2000 Reauthorization Legislation*, available from author.

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

[22] For further information, see CRS Report RL31336, *The Older Americans Act: Programs, Funding, and 2006 Reauthorization (P.L. 109-365)*.

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

The OAA Reauthorization of 2016

The Title III funding formula for supportive services and senior centers, the congregate and home-delivered nutrition programs, and disease prevention and health promotion services continued to be a major point of contention during the 2016 OAA reauthorization debate, which spanned multiple Congresses. Congress again revisited the issue of how much state population growth should influence state funding allocations versus retaining continuity in funding allocations for slower-growth states. In the 113th Congress, comprehensive OAA reauthorization legislation was introduced in the Senate (S. 1028 and S. 1562) which would have extended the authorizations of appropriations through FY2018 for most OAA programs and would have made various amendments to existing OAA authorities. 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.

Prior to legislative consideration, the topic of OAA statutory funding formulas was again 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, and the capacity of states to finance needed services.[23] 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 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 policymakers to consider in any statutory revisions.

In the 113th Congress, 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 Richard Burr introduced an amendment that would have removed the Title III Part B (supportive services and senior centers), Part C (nutrition services), and Part D (disease prevention and health promotion services) FY2006 hold harmless provision, which was rejected. Senator Tom Harkin, then chairman, 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. The bill saw no further action in the Senate.

In the 114th Congress, the Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2015 (S. 192) was introduced on January 20, 2015. The bill authorized appropriations for most OAA programs for a three-year period from FY2016 to FY2018. It also made various amendments to existing OAA authorities, including changes to the statutory funding formula for the supportive services and senior centers, congregate nutrition, home-delivered nutrition, and disease prevention and health promotion services under Title III of the act, which lessens the effect of the hold harmless

---

[23] U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Older Americans Act: Options to Better Target Need and Improve Equity*, GAO/13-74, December 2012.

provision over time. The Senate HELP Committee ordered S. 192 reported favorably, and it subsequently passed the Senate on July 16, 2015. The House took up S. 192 on March 21, 2016, and passed the bill with an amendment authorizing appropriations for the three-year period from FY2017 to FY2019. S. 192, as amended by the House, did not substantively change the hold harmless provision under S. 192, as passed by the Senate. Rather, it amended the effective dates for the hold harmless reduction, from FY2016 through FY2018 to FY2017 through FY2019. It froze this reduction in place for FY2020 and future fiscal years, unless or until such language is amended. The Senate passed S. 192 as amended by the House on April 7, 2016. President Barack Obama signed P.L. 114-144, the Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2016, on April 19, 2016.

Specifically, P.L. 114-144 changed the statutory funding allocations for OAA Title III, Parts B, C, and D. This provision retained the same state and U.S. territory minimum amounts allotted under current law and the same population-based formula factor (aged 60 and over), but reduced state and U.S. territory hold harmless amounts (currently referenced to FY2006 funding levels) by 1% from the previous fiscal year. The law lessens the effect of the FY2006 hold harmless provision by reducing state and U.S. territory hold harmless amounts by 1% for each of three years, and then freezes this reduction in place for FY2020 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 policy change minimizes any reduction in funding to no more than 1% from the previous fiscal year, assuming a program's total funding level in fiscal years 2017 to 2019 is at or above the previous fiscal year's level.

Appendix B. Population Trends

Table B-1 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 2017 Intercensal state population estimates, which is the most recent year for which data are available. There is a two-year time lag between the reference year of the population estimates and the respective appropriation year. For example, FY2019 state allotments are calculated using 2017 estimates of the population aged 60 and older. The column labeled "% Age 60+" is the entities' relative share of the 60+ population, which functions as its population-based formula factor used to determine state allotments under OAA Title III, Parts B, C, and D and Title VII.

The final column of **Table B-1** calculates the percentage point change in the population formula factor for each state and U.S. territory from 2000 to 2017. Among all 56 states and U.S. territories (which includes the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), 29 entities saw a proportionate increase in the population formula factor from 2000 to 2017, while 27 saw a decrease over this time period. The top five states that experienced the greatest proportionate increase were Texas (+0.93%), California (+0.56%), Georgia (+0.47%), North Carolina (+0.37%), and Arizona (+0.37%). The bottom five states that experienced the greatest decline were Pennsylvania (-0.85%), New York (-0.79%), Ohio (-0.44%), Illinois (-0.42%), and New Jersey (-0.35%).

Table B-1. 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 2017

State or U.S. Territory	2000 Pop. Age 60+	2000 % Age 60+	2010 Pop. Age 60+	2010 % Age 60+	2017 Pop. Age 60+	2017 % Age 60+	Difference 2000 to 2017 Percentage Point Change
Alabama	769,880	1.66%	933,919	1.61%	1,117,058	1.56%	-0.10%
Alaska	53,026	0.11%	90,876	0.16%	127,806	0.18%	0.07%
Arizona	871,536	1.88%	1,232,791	2.13%	1,612,390	2.25%	0.37%
Arkansas	491,409	1.06%	587,012	1.01%	683,277	0.95%	-0.11%
California	4,742,499	10.22%	6,078,711	10.50%	7,739,280	10.78%	0.56%
Colorado	560,658	1.21%	818,905	1.41%	1,109,773	1.55%	0.34%
Connecticut	601,835	1.30%	709,854	1.23%	840,662	1.17%	-0.13%
Delaware	133,925	0.29%	182,390	0.32%	238,798	0.33%	0.04%
District of Columbia	91,878	0.20%	98,512	0.17%	117,223	0.16%	-0.04%
Florida	3,545,093	7.64%	4,394,852	7.59%	5,563,846	7.75%	0.11%
Georgia	1,071,080	2.31%	1,528,041	2.64%	1,997,562	2.78%	0.47%
Hawaii	207,001	0.45%	277,360	0.48%	344,213	0.48%	0.03%
Idaho	193,421	0.42%	277,984	0.48%	368,742	0.51%	0.09%
Illinois	1,962,911	4.23%	2,274,642	3.93%	2,731,912	3.81%	-0.42%
Indiana	988,506	2.13%	1,191,736	2.06%	1,440,321	2.01%	-0.12%
Iowa	554,573	1.19%	621,245	1.07%	727,337	1.01%	-0.18%
Kansas	454,837	0.98%	524,851	0.91%	629,420	0.88%	-0.10%
Kentucky	672,905	1.45%	829,193	1.43%	995,993	1.39%	-0.06%
Louisiana	687,216	1.48%	800,852	1.38%	987,798	1.38%	-0.10%
Maine	238,099	0.51%	300,740	0.52%	369,485	0.51%	0.00%
Maryland	801,036	1.73%	1,025,421	1.77%	1,279,298	1.78%	0.05%
Massachusetts	1,096,567	2.36%	1,273,271	2.20%	1,546,569	2.15%	-0.21%
Michigan	1,596,162	3.44%	1,930,341	3.33%	2,342,292	3.26%	-0.18%
Minnesota	772,278	1.66%	962,896	1.66%	1,212,067	1.69%	0.03%
Mississippi	457,144	0.98%	541,163	0.93%	646,044	0.90%	-0.08%
Missouri	983,704	2.12%	1,171,587	2.02%	1,398,879	1.95%	-0.17%
Montana	158,894	0.34%	209,685	0.36%	266,841	0.37%	0.03%
Nebraska	296,151	0.64%	342,167	0.59%	411,368	0.57%	-0.07%
Nevada	304,071	0.66%	475,283	0.82%	637,725	0.89%	0.23%
New Hampshire	194,965	0.42%	260,222	0.45%	334,731	0.47%	0.05%

State or U.S. Territory	2000 Pop. Age 60+	2000 % Age 60+	2010 Pop. Age 60+	2010 % Age 60+	2017 Pop. Age 60+	2017 % Age 60+	Difference 2000 to 2017 Percentage Point Change
New Jersey	1,443,782	3.11%	1,666,535	2.88%	1,982,147	2.76%	-0.35%
New Mexico	283,837	0.61%	392,392	0.68%	486,697	0.68%	0.07%
New York	3,204,331	6.90%	3,684,203	6.36%	4,386,221	6.11%	-0.79%
North Carolina	1,292,553	2.78%	1,772,118	3.06%	2,262,708	3.15%	0.37%
North Dakota	118,985	0.26%	133,350	0.23%	159,053	0.22%	-0.04%
Ohio	1,963,489	4.23%	2,287,424	3.95%	2,718,923	3.79%	-0.44%
Oklahoma	599,080	1.29%	711,227	1.23%	837,965	1.17%	-0.12%
Oregon	569,557	1.23%	769,676	1.33%	984,171	1.37%	0.14%
Pennsylvania	2,430,821	5.24%	2,702,603	4.67%	3,153,690	4.39%	-0.85%
Puerto Rico	585,701	1.26%	760,075	1.31%	869,082	1.21%	-0.05%
Rhode Island	191,409	0.41%	211,836	0.37%	248,772	0.35%	-0.06%
South Carolina	651,482	1.40%	912,429	1.58%	1,191,111	1.66%	0.26%
South Dakota	136,869	0.29%	160,154	0.28%	198,398	0.28%	-0.01%
Tennessee	942,620	2.03%	1,224,186	2.11%	1,498,943	2.09%	0.06%
Texas	2,774,201	5.98%	3,776,653	6.52%	4,956,771	6.91%	0.93%
Utah	252,677	0.54%	356,581	0.62%	477,293	0.66%	0.12%
Vermont	101,827	0.22%	132,312	0.23%	164,201	0.23%	0.01%
Virginia	1,065,502	2.30%	1,419,306	2.45%	1,785,382	2.49%	0.19%
Washington	873,223	1.88%	1,209,764	2.09%	1,579,393	2.20%	0.32%
West Virginia	362,795	0.78%	422,861	0.73%	482,374	0.67%	-0.11%
Wisconsin	907,552	1.96%	1,091,139	1.88%	1,341,522	1.87%	-0.09%
Wyoming	77,348	0.17%	102,657	0.18%	131,936	0.18%	0.01%
American Samoa	3,091	0.01%	4,454	0.01%	4,927	0.01%	0.00%
Guam	12,894	0.03%	20,099	0.03%	21,639	0.03%	0.00%
Northern Marianas	1,887	0.00%[a]	3,044	0.01%	5,580	0.01%	0.01%
Virgin Islands	14,045	0.03%	23,423	0.04%	25,850	0.04%	0.01%
Total	46,414,818	100.0%	57,897,003	100.00%	71,773,459	100.00%	

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; 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 2017 are U.S. Census Bureau state population estimates compiled by the Congressional Research Service.

a. Population of Northern Marianas aged 60+ relative to total U.S. population is less than 0.01%.

Appendix C. The Older Americans Act Reauthorization Act of 2016 (P.L. 114-144): Analysis of Formula Change

The following analysis compares FY2016 allotment amounts for states and other entities with actual allotment amounts under the statutory funding formula change in P.L. 114-144 for FY2017 to FY2019. The following tables provide results by program:

- **Table C-1**: Title III, Part B, supportive services and senior centers;
- **Table C-2**: Title III, Part C, subpart 1, congregate nutrition services;
- **Table C-3**: Title III, Part C, subpart 2, home-delivered nutrition services; and
- **Table C-4**: Title III, Part D, disease prevention and health promotion services programs.

Each table compares FY2016 state and U.S. territory allotments prior to the statutory funding formula change under P.L. 114-144 to allotments with the change, for FY2017 through FY2019. The columns in each table provide two types of analyses for each year. The first is the percentage change between the entities' FY2016 allotment and the entities' annual allotment for each year, respectively. The second is the entities' allotment type for each year of the change, where "M" refers to an entity that receives a minimum allotment amount; "HH" refers to an entity that receives an allotment amount based on 99% of the previous fiscal year's hold harmless funding amount; and "P" refers to an entity that receives an allotment amount based on the entities' population formula factor.

For programs where the current law hold harmless is in effect (i.e., some states and territories receive an allotment based on their hold harmless), the change to the statutory funding formula, often also combined with increases in appropriated funding amounts, reduces the effect of the hold harmless over time. For example, 16 states and territories received an allotment based on their FY2006 hold harmless level for the congregate nutrition services program. Under the statutory funding formula change, the number of states and territories that received an allotment based on the hold harmless (99% of the previous fiscal year) remained at 16 in FY2017 with a 0.2% increase in the total allotment amount from the prior year. That number fell to 4 in FY2018 when combined with a 10% increase in the total allotment amount compared to the prior year and remained at 4 in FY2018.

As a state or territory's hold harmless amount is reduced gradually by 1% from the previous year's hold harmless over three fiscal years, additional states and territories received funding based on their hold harmless amount. Effectively, the change to the statutory funding formula, especially when combined with increases in appropriated funding amounts, allows funding freed up from the hold harmless reductions to be redistributed to states and territories based on the population formula factor. Thus, more states and territories received funding based on their population aged 60 and over.

Under the supportive services and senior centers and disease prevention and health promotion services programs all states and territories received funding in FY2016 based on a proportionate reduction to their FY2006 hold harmless amount. Total FY2016 funding for these programs was below FY2006 funding levels. The statutory funding formula change combined with program funding increases reduced the number of entities receiving an allotment based on their hold harmless from FY2017 to FY2018 (for supportive services, 29 states in FY2017, to 10 in

FY2018; and for disease prevention, 28 states in FY2017, to 0 in FY2018). From FY2018 to FY2019, appropriated amounts for these programs did not change and the number of entities receiving an allotment based on their hold harmless increased slightly—to 12 entities for the supportive services program and 9 entities for disease prevention.

For programs where the previous FY2006 hold harmless was not in effect, such as home-delivered nutrition services, the funding formula change had a smaller effect compared to prior law. Two states and territories receive funding for FY2017 based on their hold harmless amount. For FY2018 and FY2019 all states receiving funding based on either their population age 60 and older or the minimum grant amount. In general, the statutory funding formula change did not affect entities receiving an allotment based on the minimum grant amount as P.L. 114-144 made no change to this provision.

Table C-1. Supportive Services and Senior Centers: Comparison of FY2016 Allotments to Allotments Under P.L. 114-144, for FY2017-FY2019

State	FY2016 Amount	FY2016 Type	FY2017 Amount	FY2017 Diff. from FY2016	FY2017 Type	FY2018 Amount	FY2018 Diff. from FY2017	FY2018 Type	FY2019 Amount	FY2019 Diff. from FY2018	FY2019 Type
Total Allotments	**$345,166,956**		**$347,222,912**	**0.6%**		**$381,748,352**	**9.9%**		**$379,888,918**	**-0.5%**	
Alabama	$5,340,110	HH	$5,286,709	-1.0%	HH	$5,748,745	8.7%	P	$5,691,589	-1.0%	P
Alaska	$1,725,835	HH	$1,736,115	0.6%	M	$1,908,742	9.9%	M	$1,899,445	-0.5%	M
Arizona	$6,495,849	HH	$6,936,367	6.8%	P	$8,329,543	20.1%	P	$8,270,492	-0.7%	P
Arkansas	$3,459,887	HH	$3,425,288	-1.0%	HH	$3,515,790	2.6%	P	$3,481,405	-1.0%	P
California	$34,172,853	HH	$33,831,124	-1.0%	HH	$39,627,417	17.1%	P	$39,432,868	-0.5%	P
Colorado	$4,106,001	HH	$4,713,557	14.8%	P	$5,657,569	20.0%	P	$5,654,471	-0.1%	P
Connecticut	$4,352,620	HH	$4,309,094	-1.0%	HH	$4,266,003	-1.0%	HH	$4,283,307	0.4%	P
Delaware	$1,725,835	HH	$1,736,115	0.6%	M	$1,908,742	9.9%	M	$1,899,445	-0.5%	M
District of Columbia	$1,725,835	HH	$1,736,115	0.6%	M	$1,908,742	9.9%	M	$1,899,445	-0.5%	M
Florida	$24,965,219	HH	$24,715,567	-1.0%	HH	$28,459,804	15.1%	P	$28,348,684	-0.4%	P
Georgia	$7,816,357	HH	$8,496,385	8.7%	P	$10,147,824	19.4%	P	$10,177,898	0.3%	P
Hawaii	$1,725,835	HH	$1,736,115	0.6%	M	$1,908,742	9.9%	M	$1,899,445	-0.5%	M
Idaho	$1,725,835	HH	$1,736,115	0.6%	M	$1,908,742	9.9%	M	$1,899,445	-0.5%	M
Illinois	$14,354,336	HH	$14,210,793	-1.0%	HH	$14,068,685	-1.0%	HH	$13,927,998	-1.0%	HH
Indiana	$6,846,052	HH	$6,777,591	-1.0%	HH	$7,367,312	8.7%	P	$7,338,666	-0.4%	P
Iowa	$4,210,846	HH	$4,168,738	-1.0%	HH	$4,127,051	-1.0%	HH	$4,085,780	-1.0%	HH
Kansas	$3,392,598	HH	$3,358,672	-1.0%	HH	$3,325,085	-1.0%	HH	$3,291,834	-1.0%	HH
Kentucky	$4,685,598	HH	$4,638,742	-1.0%	HH	$5,113,621	10.2%	P	$5,074,743	-0.8%	P
Louisiana	$4,739,584	HH	$4,692,188	-1.0%	HH	$5,053,926	7.7%	P	$5,032,989	-0.4%	P

State	FY2016 Amount	FY2016 Type	FY2017 Amount	FY2017 Diff. from FY2016	FY2017 Type	FY2018 Amount	FY2018 Diff. from FY2017	FY2018 Type	FY2019 Amount	FY2019 Diff. from FY2018	FY2019 Type
Maine	$1,725,835	HH	$1,736,115	0.6%	M	$1,908,742	9.9%	M	$1,899,445	-0.5%	M
Maryland	$5,788,659	HH	$5,730,772	-1.0%	HH	$6,531,229	14.0%	P	$6,518,228	-0.2%	P
Massachusetts	$8,112,702	HH	$8,031,575	-1.0%	HH	$7,951,259	-1.0%	HH	$7,880,016	-0.9%	P
Michigan	$11,123,548	HH	$11,012,313	-1.0%	HH	$11,974,311	8.7%	P	$11,934,352	-0.3%	P
Minnesota	$5,435,089	HH	$5,380,738	-1.0%	HH	$6,193,264	15.1%	P	$6,175,675	-0.3%	P
Mississippi	$3,234,282	HH	$3,201,939	-1.0%	HH	$3,325,997	3.9%	P	$3,292,737	-1.0%	HH
Missouri	$7,034,843	HH	$6,964,495	-1.0%	HH	$7,167,454	2.9%	P	$7,127,512	-0.6%	P
Montana	$1,725,835	HH	$1,736,115	0.6%	M	$1,908,742	9.9%	M	$1,899,445	-0.5%	M
Nebraska	$2,267,990	HH	$2,245,310	-1.0%	HH	$2,222,857	-1.0%	HH	$2,200,628	-1.0%	HH
Nevada	$2,432,485	HH	$2,696,093	10.8%	P	$3,238,178	20.1%	P	$3,249,311	0.3%	P
New Hampshire	$1,725,835	HH	$1,736,115	0.6%	M	$1,908,742	9.9%	M	$1,899,445	-0.5%	M
New Jersey	$10,142,462	HH	$10,041,037	-1.0%	HH	$10,107,547	0.7%	P	$10,099,356	-0.1%	P
New Mexico	$2,041,926	HH	$2,065,826	1.2%	P	$2,454,960	18.8%	P	$2,434,419	-0.8%	P
New York	$23,998,290	HH	$23,758,307	-1.0%	HH	$23,520,724	-1.0%	HH	$23,285,517	-1.0%	HH
North Carolina	$9,258,914	HH	$9,661,736	4.4%	P	$11,522,447	19.3%	P	$11,528,859	0.1%	P
North Dakota	$1,725,835	HH	$1,736,115	0.6%	M	$1,908,742	9.9%	M	$1,899,445	-0.5%	M
Ohio	$13,654,570	HH	$13,518,024	-1.0%	HH	$13,936,009	3.1%	P	$13,853,347	-0.6%	P
Oklahoma	$4,228,050	HH	$4,185,770	-1.0%	HH	$4,324,666	3.3%	P	$4,281,419	-1.0%	HH
Oregon	$4,085,823	HH	$4,253,413	4.1%	P	$5,070,689	19.2%	P	$5,019,983	-1.0%	HH
Pennsylvania	$17,670,027	HH	$17,493,327	-1.0%	HH	$17,318,394	-1.0%	HH	$17,145,210	-1.0%	HH
Puerto Rico	$4,323,579	HH	$4,280,343	-1.0%	HH	$4,509,310	5.3%	P	$4,464,217	-1.0%	HH

State	FY2016 Amount	FY2016 Type	FY2017 Amount	FY2017 Diff. from FY2016	FY2017 Type	FY2018 Amount	FY2018 Diff. from FY2017	FY2018 Type	FY2019 Amount	FY2019 Diff. from FY2018	FY2019 Type
Rhode Island	$1,725,835	HH	$1,736,115	0.6%	M	$1,908,742	9.9%	M	$1,899,445	-0.5%	M
South Carolina	$4,735,280	HH	$5,049,895	6.6%	P	$6,056,589	19.9%	P	$6,068,901	0.2%	P
South Dakota	$1,725,835	HH	$1,736,115	0.6%	M	$1,908,742	9.9%	M	$1,899,445	-0.5%	M
Tennessee	$6,680,839	HH	$6,614,031	-1.0%	HH	$7,689,859	16.3%	P	$7,637,354	-0.7%	P
Texas	$20,087,400	HH	$21,079,481	4.9%	P	$25,222,348	19.7%	P	$25,255,540	0.1%	P
Utah	$1,844,852	HH	$2,002,579	8.5%	P	$2,405,572	20.1%	P	$2,422,157	0.7%	P
Vermont	$1,725,835	HH	$1,736,115	0.6%	M	$1,908,742	9.9%	M	$1,899,445	-0.5%	M
Virginia	$7,772,608	HH	$7,694,882	-1.0%	HH	$9,114,734	18.5%	P	$9,096,807	-0.2%	P
Washington	$6,374,314	HH	$6,749,725	5.9%	P	$8,090,592	19.9%	P	$8,047,260	-0.5%	P
West Virginia	$2,740,971	HH	$2,713,561	-1.0%	HH	$2,686,425	-1.0%	HH	$2,659,561	-1.0%	HH
Wisconsin	$6,315,353	HH	$6,252,199	-1.0%	HH	$6,886,100	10.1%	P	$6,835,269	-0.7%	P
Wyoming	$1,725,835	HH	$1,736,115	0.6%	M	$1,908,742	9.9%	M	$1,899,445	-0.5%	M
American Samoa	$466,771	HH	$462,103	-1.0%	HH	$457,482	-1.0%	HH	$452,907	-1.0%	HH
Guam	$862,917	HH	$868,057	0.6%	M	$954,371	9.9%	M	$949,722	-0.5%	M
Northern Marianas	$215,730	HH	$217,014	0.6%	M	$238,593	9.9%	M	$237,431	-0.5%	M
Virgin Islands	$862,917	HH	$868,057	0.6%	M	$954,371	9.9%	M	$949,722	-0.5%	M
Allotment Type	**M =**	**0**		**M =**	**16**		**M =**	**16**		**M =**	**16**
	HH =	**56**		**HH =**	**29**		**HH =**	**10**		**HH =**	**12**
	P =	**0**		**P =**	**11**		**P =**	**30**		**P =**	**28**

Source: CRS analysis based on fiscal year allocation allotments from ACL, "Older Americans Act, State Allocations Tables: Title III," https://www.acl.gov/about-acl/older-americans-act-oaa.

Notes: Total amounts are adjusted down from a program's appropriated level to account for program support, evaluation, oversight, and other statutory related activities. HH = state receives a grant amount based on its hold harmless amount; M = state receives a minimum grant amount; P = state receives a grant amount based on its population aged 60+.

Table C-2. Congregate Nutrition Services: Comparison of FY2016 Allotments to Allotments Under P.L. 114-144, for FY2017-FY2019

State	FY2016 Amount	FY2016 Type	FY2017 Amount	FY2017 Diff. from FY2016	FY2017 Type	FY2018 Amount	FY2018 Diff. from FY2017	FY2018 Type	FY2019 Amount	FY2019 Diff. from FY2018	FY2019 Type
Total Allotments	**$445,047,800**		**$445,817,602**	**0.2%**		**$484,669,154**	**8.7%**		**$486,362,142**	**0.3%**	
Alabama	$6,658,222	P	$6,654,431	-0.1%	P	$7,363,032	10.6%	P	$7,343,061	-0.3%	P
Alaska	$2,225,239	M	$2,229,088	0.2%	M	$2,423,346	8.7%	M	$2,431,811	0.3%	M
Arizona	$9,360,431	P	$9,496,851	1.5%	P	$10,668,537	12.3%	P	$10,670,260	0.0%	P
Arkansas	$4,163,564	HH	$4,121,928	-1.0%	HH	$4,503,048	9.2%	P	$4,491,571	-0.3%	P
California	$45,269,354	P	$45,730,530	1.0%	P	$50,755,067	11.0%	P	$50,874,716	0.2%	P
Colorado	$6,361,144	P	$6,453,514	1.5%	P	$7,246,253	12.3%	P	$7,295,173	0.7%	P
Connecticut	$5,241,452	HH	$5,189,037	-1.0%	HH	$5,459,141	5.2%	P	$5,526,152	1.2%	P
Delaware	$2,225,239	M	$2,229,088	0.2%	M	$2,423,346	8.7%	M	$2,431,811	0.3%	M
District of Columbia	$2,225,239	M	$2,229,088	0.2%	M	$2,423,346	8.7%	M	$2,431,811	0.3%	M
Florida	$32,179,591	P	$32,559,130	1.2%	P	$36,451,512	12.0%	P	$36,574,344	0.3%	P
Georgia	$11,497,595	P	$11,632,730	1.2%	P	$12,997,402	11.7%	P	$13,131,118	1.0%	P
Hawaii	$2,225,239	M	$2,229,088	0.2%	M	$2,423,346	8.7%	M	$2,431,811	0.3%	M
Idaho	$2,225,239	M	$2,229,088	0.2%	M	$2,423,346	8.7%	M	$2,431,811	0.3%	M
Illinois	$17,286,541	HH	$17,113,676	-1.0%	HH	$17,826,260	4.2%	P	$17,958,421	0.7%	P
Indiana	$8,534,666	P	$8,533,317	0.0%	P	$9,436,104	10.6%	P	$9,468,054	0.3%	P
Iowa	$5,081,501	HH	$5,030,686	-1.0%	HH	$4,980,379	-1.0%	HH	$4,930,575	-1.0%	HH
Kansas	$4,089,903	HH	$4,049,004	-1.0%	HH	$4,139,537	2.2%	P	$4,137,538	0.0%	P
Kentucky	$5,932,483	P	$5,928,874	-0.1%	P	$6,549,562	10.5%	P	$6,547,232	0.0%	P
Louisiana	$5,798,475	P	$5,825,212	0.5%	P	$6,473,104	11.1%	P	$6,493,362	0.3%	P

State	FY2016 Amount	FY2016 Type	FY2017 Amount	FY2017 Diff. from FY2016	FY2017 Type	FY2018 Amount	FY2018 Diff. from FY2017	FY2018 Type	FY2019 Amount	FY2019 Diff. from FY2018	FY2019 Type
Maine	$2,225,239	M	$2,229,088	0.2%	M	$2,423,422	8.7%	P	$2,431,811	0.3%	M
Maryland	$7,497,316	P	$7,536,434	0.5%	P	$8,365,244	11.0%	P	$8,409,558	0.5%	P
Massachusetts	$9,780,267	HH	$9,682,464	-1.0%	HH	$10,118,736	4.5%	P	$10,166,483	0.5%	P
Michigan	$13,877,388	P	$13,877,129	0.0%	P	$15,336,781	10.5%	P	$15,397,226	0.4%	P
Minnesota	$7,101,910	P	$7,138,238	0.5%	P	$7,932,375	11.1%	P	$7,967,610	0.4%	P
Mississippi	$3,891,114	HH	$3,856,890	-0.9%	P	$4,259,960	10.5%	P	$4,246,817	-0.3%	P
Missouri	$8,467,047	HH	$8,382,377	-1.0%	HH	$9,180,125	9.5%	P	$9,195,632	0.2%	P
Montana	$2,225,239	M	$2,229,088	0.2%	M	$2,423,346	8.7%	M	$2,431,811	0.3%	M
Nebraska	$2,738,802	HH	$2,711,414	-1.0%	HH	$2,705,657	-0.2%	P	$2,704,157	-0.1%	P
Nevada	$3,627,769	P	$3,691,325	1.8%	P	$4,147,481	12.4%	P	$4,192,131	1.1%	P
New Hampshire	$2,225,239	M	$2,229,088	0.2%	M	$2,423,346	8.7%	M	$2,431,811	0.3%	M
New Jersey	$12,190,488	HH	$12,068,583	-1.0%	HH	$12,945,816	7.3%	P	$13,029,787	0.6%	P
New Mexico	$2,818,273	P	$2,828,401	0.4%	P	$3,144,329	11.2%	P	$3,140,790	-0.1%	P
New York	$28,963,855	HH	$28,674,216	-1.0%	HH	$28,508,865	-0.6%	P	$28,833,141	1.1%	P
North Carolina	$13,132,620	P	$13,228,258	0.7%	P	$14,758,029	11.6%	P	$14,874,075	0.8%	P
North Dakota	$2,225,239	M	$2,229,088	0.2%	M	$2,423,346	8.7%	M	$2,431,811	0.3%	M
Ohio	$16,393,785	HH	$16,229,847	-1.0%	HH	$17,849,336	10.0%	P	$17,873,037	0.1%	P
Oklahoma	$5,080,736	HH	$5,029,929	-1.0%	HH	$5,539,061	10.1%	P	$5,508,423	-0.6%	P
Oregon	$5,771,973	P	$5,823,512	0.9%	P	$6,494,574	11.5%	P	$6,469,519	-0.4%	P
Pennsylvania	$21,279,716	HH	$21,066,919	-1.0%	HH	$20,856,250	-1.0%	HH	$20,731,009	-0.6%	P
Puerto Rico	$5,300,084	P	$5,247,083	-1.0%	HH	$5,775,555	10.1%	P	$5,717,800	-1.0%	HH

State	FY2016 Amount	FY2016 Type	FY2017 Amount	FY2017 Diff. from FY2016	FY2017 Type	FY2018 Amount	FY2018 Diff. from FY2017	FY2018 Type	FY2019 Amount	FY2019 Diff. from FY2018	FY2019 Type
Rhode Island	$2,225,239	M	$2,229,088	0.2%	M	$2,423,346	8.7%	M	$2,431,811	0.3%	M
South Carolina	$6,833,310	P	$6,914,007	1.2%	P	$7,757,321	12.2%	P	$7,829,854	0.9%	P
South Dakota	$2,225,239	M	$2,229,088	0.2%	M	$2,423,346	8.7%	M	$2,431,811	0.3%	M
Tennessee	$8,857,622	P	$8,879,923	0.3%	P	$9,849,224	10.9%	P	$9,853,410	0.0%	P
Texas	$28,490,410	P	$28,860,736	1.3%	P	$32,304,956	11.9%	P	$32,583,692	0.9%	P
Utah	$2,699,962	P	$2,741,809	1.5%	P	$3,081,073	12.4%	P	$3,124,970	1.4%	P
Vermont	$2,225,239	M	$2,229,088	0.2%	M	$2,423,346	8.7%	M	$2,431,811	0.3%	M
Virginia	$10,410,071	P	$10,481,870	0.7%	P	$11,674,214	11.4%	P	$11,736,338	0.5%	P
Washington	$9,122,298	P	$9,241,311	1.3%	P	$10,362,486	12.1%	P	$10,382,254	0.2%	P
West Virginia	$3,305,947	HH	$3,272,888	-1.0%	HH	$3,240,159	-1.0%	HH	$3,207,757	-1.0%	HH
Wisconsin	$7,933,770	P	$7,958,356	0.3%	P	$8,819,765	10.8%	P	$8,818,592	0.0%	P
Wyoming	$2,225,239	M	$2,229,088	0.2%	M	$2,423,346	8.7%	M	$2,431,811	0.3%	M
American Samoa	$594,843	HH	$588,895	-1.0%	HH	$583,006	-1.0%	HH	$577,176	-1.0%	HH
Guam	$1,112,620	M	$1,114,544	0.2%	M	$1,211,673	8.7%	M	$1,215,905	0.3%	M
Northern Marianas	$278,155	M	$278,636	0.2%	M	$302,918	8.7%	M	$303,976	0.3%	M
Virgin Islands	$1,112,620	M	$1,114,544	0.2%	M	$1,211,673	8.7%	M	$1,215,905	0.3%	M
Allotment Type	**M =**	**16**		**M =**	**16**		**M =**	**15**		**M =**	**16**
	HH =	**16**		**HH =**	**16**		**HH =**	**4**		**HH =**	**4**
	P =	**24**		**P =**	**24**		**P =**	**37**		**P =**	**36**

Source: CRS analysis based on fiscal year allocation allotments from ACL, "Older Americans Act, State Allocations Tables: Title III," https://www.acl.gov/about-acl/older-americans-act-oaa.

Notes: Total amounts are adjusted down from a program's appropriated level to account for program support, evaluation, oversight, and other statutory related activities. HH = state receives a grant amount based on its hold harmless amount; M = state receives a minimum grant amount; P = state receives a grant amount based on its population aged 60+.

Table C-3. Home-Delivered Nutrition Services: Comparison of FY2016 Allotments to Allotments Under P.L. 114-144, for FY2017-FY2019

State	FY2016 Amount	FY2016 Type	FY2017 Amount	FY2017 Diff. from FY2016	FY2017 Type	FY2018 Amount	FY2018 Diff. from FY2017	FY2018 Type	FY2019 Amount	FY2019 Diff. from FY2018	FY2019 Type
Total Allotted	**$224,673,820**		**$225,053,917**	**0.2%**		**$243,478,708**	**8.2%**		**$246,767,640**	**1.4%**	
Alabama	$3,446,917	P	$3,434,588	-0.4%	P	$3,703,525	7.8%	P	$3,729,513	0.7%	P
Alaska	$1,123,369	M	$1,125,270	0.2%	M	$1,217,394	8.2%	M	$1,233,838	1.4%	M
Arizona	$4,845,833	P	$4,901,661	1.2%	P	$5,366,158	9.5%	P	$5,419,385	1.0%	P
Arkansas	$2,128,668	P	$2,113,944	-0.7%	P	$2,264,985	7.1%	P	$2,281,252	0.7%	P
California	$23,435,646	P	$23,603,150	0.7%	P	$25,529,249	8.2%	P	$25,839,078	1.2%	P
Colorado	$3,293,123	P	$3,330,888	1.1%	P	$3,644,787	9.4%	P	$3,705,191	1.7%	P
Connecticut	$2,571,861	P	$2,555,699	-0.6%	P	$2,745,889	7.4%	P	$2,806,712	2.2%	P
Delaware	$1,123,369	M	$1,125,270	0.2%	M	$1,217,394	8.2%	M	$1,233,838	1.4%	M
District of Columbia	$1,123,369	M	$1,125,270	0.2%	M	$1,217,394	8.2%	M	$1,233,838	1.4%	M
Florida	$16,659,162	P	$16,804,923	0.9%	P	$18,334,716	9.1%	P	$18,575,972	1.3%	P
Georgia	$5,952,229	P	$6,004,065	0.9%	P	$6,537,552	8.9%	P	$6,669,246	2.0%	P
Hawaii	$1,123,369	M	$1,125,270	0.2%	M	$1,217,394	8.2%	M	$1,233,838	1.4%	M
Idaho	$1,123,369	M	$1,125,270	0.2%	M	$1,217,394	8.2%	M	$1,233,838	1.4%	M
Illinois	$8,395,795	P	$8,351,441	-0.5%	P	$8,966,416	7.4%	P	$9,121,015	1.7%	P
Indiana	$4,418,340	P	$4,404,348	-0.3%	P	$4,746,258	7.8%	P	$4,808,789	1.3%	P
Iowa	$2,266,934	P	$2,255,215	-0.5%	P	$2,419,826	7.3%	P	$2,428,355	0.4%	P
Kansas	$1,937,158	P	$1,931,835	-0.3%	P	$2,082,142	7.8%	P	$2,101,440	0.9%	P
Kentucky	$3,071,207	P	$3,060,102	-0.4%	P	$3,294,358	7.7%	P	$3,325,315	0.9%	P
Louisiana	$3,001,832	P	$3,006,599	0.2%	P	$3,255,901	8.3%	P	$3,297,954	1.3%	P

State	FY2016 Amount	FY2016 Type	FY2017 Amount	FY2017 Diff. from FY2016	FY2017 Type	FY2018 Amount	FY2018 Diff. from FY2017	FY2018 Type	FY2019 Amount	FY2019 Diff. from FY2018	FY2019 Type
Maine	$1,134,584	P	$1,130,464	-0.4%	P	$1,218,955	7.8%	P	$1,233,838	1.2%	M
Maryland	$3,881,311	P	$3,889,821	0.2%	P	$4,207,627	8.2%	P	$4,271,183	1.5%	P
Massachusetts	$4,720,820	P	$4,718,223	-0.1%	P	$5,089,615	7.9%	P	$5,163,519	1.5%	P
Michigan	$7,184,232	P	$7,162,479	-0.3%	P	$7,714,234	7.7%	P	$7,820,193	1.4%	P
Minnesota	$3,676,612	P	$3,684,298	0.2%	P	$3,989,898	8.3%	P	$4,046,719	1.4%	P
Mississippi	$1,998,933	P	$1,990,678	-0.4%	P	$2,142,714	7.6%	P	$2,156,942	0.7%	P
Missouri	$4,309,755	P	$4,290,047	-0.5%	P	$4,617,503	7.6%	P	$4,670,427	1.1%	P
Montana	$1,123,369	M	$1,125,270	0.2%	M	$1,217,394	8.2%	M	$1,233,838	1.4%	M
Nebraska	$1,264,078	P	$1,261,576	-0.2%	P	$1,360,916	7.9%	P	$1,373,431	0.9%	P
Nevada	$1,878,072	P	$1,905,224	1.4%	P	$2,086,138	9.5%	P	$2,129,168	2.1%	P
New Hampshire	$1,123,369	M	$1,125,270	0.2%	M	$1,217,394	8.2%	M	$1,233,838	1.4%	M
New Jersey	$6,078,857	P	$6,053,936	-0.4%	P	$6,511,605	7.6%	P	$6,617,780	1.6%	P
New Mexico	$1,459,002	P	$1,459,839	0.1%	P	$1,581,564	8.3%	P	$1,595,195	0.9%	P
New York	$13,431,294	P	$13,344,159	-0.6%	P	$14,339,650	7.5%	P	$14,644,244	2.1%	P
North Carolina	$6,798,671	P	$6,827,574	0.4%	P	$7,423,129	8.7%	P	$7,554,487	1.8%	P
North Dakota	$1,123,369	M	$1,125,270	0.2%	M	$1,217,394	8.2%	M	$1,233,838	1.4%	M
Ohio	$8,391,051	P	$8,349,511	-0.5%	P	$8,978,023	7.5%	P	$9,077,649	1.1%	P
Oklahoma	$2,601,402	P	$2,590,327	-0.4%	P	$2,786,088	7.6%	P	$2,797,708	0.4%	P
Oregon	$2,988,113	P	$3,005,722	0.6%	P	$3,266,700	8.7%	P	$3,285,845	0.6%	P
Pennsylvania	$9,807,313	P	$9,742,844	-0.7%	P	$10,452,210	7.3%	P	$10,529,202	0.7%	P
Puerto Rico	$2,743,818	P	$2,716,380	-1.0%	HH	$2,905,042	6.9%	P	$2,901,598	-0.1%	P

State	FY2016 Amount	FY2016 Type	FY2017 Amount	FY2017 Diff. from FY2016	FY2017 Type	FY2018 Amount	FY2018 Diff. from FY2017	FY2018 Type	FY2019 Amount	FY2019 Diff. from FY2018	FY2019 Type
Rhode Island	$1,123,369	M	$1,125,270	0.2%	M	$1,217,394	8.2%	M	$1,233,838	1.4%	M
South Carolina	$3,537,560	P	$3,568,565	0.9%	P	$3,901,848	9.3%	P	$3,976,754	1.9%	P
South Dakota	$1,123,369	M	$1,125,270	0.2%	M	$1,217,394	8.2%	M	$1,233,838	1.4%	M
Tennessee	$4,585,533	P	$4,583,244	0.0%	P	$4,954,053	8.1%	P	$5,004,510	1.0%	P
Texas	$14,749,298	P	$14,896,051	1.0%	P	$16,249,043	9.1%	P	$16,549,135	1.8%	P
Utah	$1,397,753	P	$1,415,145	1.2%	P	$1,549,746	9.5%	P	$1,587,161	2.4%	P
Vermont	$1,123,369	M	$1,125,270	0.2%	M	$1,217,394	8.2%	M	$1,233,838	1.4%	M
Virginia	$5,389,225	P	$5,410,065	0.4%	P	$5,872,003	8.5%	P	$5,960,842	1.5%	P
Washington	$4,722,553	P	$4,769,769	1.0%	P	$5,212,218	9.3%	P	$5,273,108	1.2%	P
West Virginia	$1,527,374	P	$1,512,100	-1.0%	HH	$1,609,708	6.5%	P	$1,610,499	0.0%	P
Wisconsin	$4,107,261	P	$4,107,590	0.0%	P	$4,436,246	8.0%	P	$4,478,930	1.0%	P
Wyoming	$1,123,369	M	$1,125,270	0.2%	M	$1,217,394	8.2%	M	$1,233,838	1.4%	M
American Samoa	$140,421	M	$140,659	0.2%	M	$152,174	8.2%	M	$154,230	1.4%	M
Guam	$561,685	M	$562,635	0.2%	M	$608,697	8.2%	M	$616,919	1.4%	M
Northern Marianas	$140,421	M	$140,659	0.2%	M	$152,174	8.2%	M	$154,230	1.4%	M
Virgin Islands	$561,685	M	$562,635	0.2%	M	$608,697	8.2%	M	$616,919	1.4%	M
Allotment Type	**M =**	**16**		**M =**	**16**		**M =**	**16**		**M =**	**17**
	HH =	**0**		**HH =**	**2**		**HH =**	**0**		**HH =**	**0**
	P =	**40**		**P =**	**38**		**P =**	**40**		**P =**	**39**

Source: CRS analysis based on fiscal year allocation allotments from ACL, "Older Americans Act, State Allocations Tables: Title III," https://www.acl.gov/about-acl/older-americans-act-oaa.

Notes: Total amounts are adjusted down from a program's appropriated level to account for program support, evaluation, oversight, and other statutory related activities. HH = state receives a grant amount based on its hold harmless amount; M = state receives a minimum grant amount; P = state receives a grant amount based on its population aged 60+.

Table C-4. Disease Prevention and Health Promotion Services: Comparison of FY2016 Allotments to Allotments Under P.L. 114-144, for FY2017-FY2019

State	FY2016 Amount	FY2016 Type	FY2017 Amount	FY2017 Diff. from FY2016	FY2017 Type	FY2018 Amount	FY2018 Diff. from FY2017	FY2018 Type	FY2019 Amount	FY2019 Diff. from FY2018	FY2019 Type
Total Allotted	**$19,692,964**		**$19,664,255**	**-0.1%**		**$24,620,602**	**25.2%**		**$24,513,418**	**-0.4%**	
Alabama	$312,046	HH	$308,926	-1.0%	HH	$374,501	21.2%	P	$370,756	-1.0%	HH
Alaska	$98,465	HH	$98,321	-0.1%	M	$123,103	25.2%	M	$122,567	-0.4%	M
Arizona	$379,579	HH	$391,781	3.2%	P	$542,626	38.5%	P	$538,147	-0.8%	P
Arkansas	$198,170	HH	$196,188	-1.0%	HH	$229,036	16.7%	P	$226,745	-1.0%	HH
California	$1,996,859	HH	$1,976,890	-1.0%	HH	$2,581,522	30.6%	P	$2,565,832	-0.6%	P
Colorado	$239,931	HH	$266,214	11.0%	P	$368,561	38.4%	P	$367,927	-0.2%	P
Connecticut	$244,616	HH	$242,170	-1.0%	HH	$277,665	14.7%	P	$278,708	0.4%	P
Delaware	$98,465	HH	$98,321	-0.1%	M	$123,103	25.2%	M	$122,567	-0.4%	M
District of Columbia	$98,465	HH	$98,321	-0.1%	M	$123,103	25.2%	M	$122,567	-0.4%	M
Florida	$1,458,822	HH	$1,444,234	-1.0%	HH	$1,854,009	28.4%	P	$1,844,603	-0.5%	P
Georgia	$456,742	HH	$479,862	5.1%	P	$661,078	37.8%	P	$662,259	0.2%	P
Hawaii	$98,465	HH	$98,321	-0.1%	M	$123,103	25.2%	M	$122,567	-0.4%	M
Idaho	$98,465	HH	$98,321	-0.1%	M	$123,103	25.2%	M	$122,567	-0.4%	M
Illinois	$787,832	HH	$779,954	-1.0%	HH	$906,685	16.2%	P	$905,721	-0.1%	P
Indiana	$400,043	HH	$396,043	-1.0%	HH	$479,942	21.2%	P	$477,515	-0.5%	P
Iowa	$217,527	HH	$215,352	-1.0%	HH	$244,693	13.6%	P	$242,246	-1.0%	HH
Kansas	$179,543	HH	$177,748	-1.0%	HH	$210,546	18.5%	P	$208,674	-0.9%	P
Kentucky	$273,799	HH	$271,061	-1.0%	HH	$333,126	22.9%	P	$330,205	-0.9%	P
Louisiana	$276,954	HH	$274,184	-1.0%	HH	$329,237	20.1%	P	$327,488	-0.5%	P

State	FY2016 Amount	FY2016 Type	FY2017 Amount	FY2017 Diff. from FY2016	FY2017 Type	FY2018 Amount	FY2018 Diff. from FY2017	FY2018 Type	FY2019 Amount	FY2019 Diff. from FY2018	FY2019 Type
Maine	$98,655	HH	$98,321	-0.3%	M	$123,261	25.4%	P	$122,567	-0.6%	M
Maryland	$338,256	HH	$334,873	-1.0%	HH	$425,476	27.1%	P	$424,130	-0.3%	P
Massachusetts	$435,955	HH	$431,595	-1.0%	HH	$514,663	19.2%	P	$512,740	-0.4%	P
Michigan	$649,995	HH	$643,495	-1.0%	HH	$780,064	21.2%	P	$776,549	-0.5%	P
Minnesota	$317,595	HH	$314,419	-1.0%	HH	$403,459	28.3%	P	$401,841	-0.4%	P
Mississippi	$183,809	HH	$181,971	-1.0%	HH	$216,672	19.1%	P	$214,505	-1.0%	HH
Missouri	$396,418	HH	$392,454	-1.0%	HH	$466,923	19.0%	P	$463,776	-0.7%	P
Montana	$98,465	HH	$98,321	-0.1%	M	$123,103	25.2%	M	$122,567	-0.4%	M
Nebraska	$116,982	HH	$115,812	-1.0%	HH	$137,616	18.8%	P	$136,382	-0.9%	P
Nevada	$142,140	HH	$152,271	7.1%	P	$210,951	38.5%	P	$211,427	0.2%	P
New Hampshire	$98,465	HH	$98,321	-0.1%	M	$123,103	25.2%	M	$122,567	-0.4%	M
New Jersey	$581,578	HH	$575,762	-1.0%	HH	$658,454	14.4%	P	$657,149	-0.2%	P
New Mexico	$119,318	HH	$118,125	-1.0%	P	$159,928	35.4%	P	$158,404	-1.0%	P
New York	$1,289,327	HH	$1,276,434	-1.0%	HH	$1,450,027	13.6%	P	$1,454,180	0.3%	P
North Carolina	$541,037	HH	$545,679	0.9%	P	$750,628	37.6%	P	$750,164	-0.1%	P
North Dakota	$98,465	HH	$98,321	-0.1%	M	$123,103	25.2%	M	$122,567	-0.4%	M
Ohio	$782,885	HH	$775,056	-1.0%	HH	$907,859	17.1%	P	$901,415	-0.7%	P
Oklahoma	$241,108	HH	$238,697	-1.0%	HH	$281,730	18.0%	P	$278,912	-1.0%	HH
Oregon	$238,752	HH	$240,226	0.6%	P	$330,329	37.5%	P	$327,026	-1.0%	HH
Pennsylvania	$953,977	HH	$944,437	-1.0%	HH	$1,056,929	11.9%	P	$1,046,360	-1.0%	HH
Puerto Rico	$252,645	HH	$250,119	-1.0%	HH	$293,758	17.4%	P	$290,821	-1.0%	HH

State	FY2016 Amount	FY2016 Type	FY2017 Amount	FY2017 Diff. from FY2016	FY2017 Type	FY2018 Amount	FY2018 Diff. from FY2017	FY2018 Type	FY2019 Amount	FY2019 Diff. from FY2018	FY2019 Type
Rhode Island	$98,465	HH	$98,321	-0.1%	M	$123,103	25.2%	M	$122,567	-0.4%	M
South Carolina	$276,703	HH	$285,210	3.1%	P	$394,555	38.3%	P	$394,893	0.1%	P
South Dakota	$98,465	HH	$98,321	-0.1%	M	$123,103	25.2%	M	$122,567	-0.4%	M
Tennessee	$390,389	HH	$386,485	-1.0%	HH	$500,955	29.6%	P	$496,950	-0.8%	P
Texas	$1,173,791	HH	$1,190,534	1.4%	P	$1,643,105	38.0%	P	$1,643,337	0.0%	P
Utah	$107,803	HH	$113,103	4.9%	P	$156,711	38.6%	P	$157,606	0.6%	P
Vermont	$98,465	HH	$98,321	-0.1%	M	$123,103	25.2%	M	$122,567	-0.4%	M
Virginia	$454,186	HH	$449,644	-1.0%	HH	$593,778	32.1%	P	$591,914	-0.3%	P
Washington	$372,478	HH	$381,213	2.3%	P	$527,060	38.3%	P	$523,622	-0.7%	P
West Virginia	$143,428	HH	$141,994	-1.0%	HH	$162,774	14.6%	P	$161,146	-1.0%	HH
Wisconsin	$366,631	HH	$362,965	-1.0%	HH	$448,594	23.6%	P	$444,760	-0.9%	P
Wyoming	$98,465	HH	$98,321	-0.1%	M	$123,103	25.2%	M	$122,567	-0.4%	M
American Samoa	$12,308	HH	$12,290	-0.1%	M	$15,388	25.2%	M	$15,321	-0.4%	M
Guam	$49,232	HH	$49,161	-0.1%	M	$61,552	25.2%	M	$61,284	-0.4%	M
Northern Marianas	$12,308	HH	$12,290	-0.1%	M	$15,388	25.2%	M	$15,321	-0.4%	M
Virgin Islands	$49,232	HH	$49,161	-0.1%	M	$61,552	25.2%	M	$61,284	-0.4%	M
	M =	**0**		**M =**	**17**		**M =**	**16**		**M =**	**17**
	HH =	**56**		**HH =**	**28**		**HH =**	**0**		**HH =**	**9**
	P =	**0**		**P =**	**11**		**P =**	**40**		**P =**	**30**

Source: CRS analysis based on fiscal year allocation allotments from ACL, "Older Americans Act, State Allocations Tables: Title III," https://www.acl.gov/about-acl/older-americans-act-oaa.

Notes: Total amounts are adjusted down from a program's appropriated level to account for program support, evaluation, oversight, and other statutory related activities. HH = state receives a grant amount based on its hold harmless amount; M = state receives a minimum grant amount; P = state receives a grant amount based on its population aged 60+.

Author Contact Information

Kirsten J. Colello
Specialist in Health and Aging Policy
#redacted#@crs.loc.gov7-....

Acknowledgments

The author would like to acknowledge Mariam Ghavalyan, CRS Research Assistant, for her assistance with statistical programming and data support for this report.