My name is Anne Hinton and I am head of the Department of Aging and Adult Services for the City and County of San Francisco. On behalf of Mayor Newsom I want to welcome you to SF and to thank you for selecting SF for one of 3 national listening sessions.

SF is home to some pretty creative agencies and programs for older adults: PACE, Self Help for the Elderly, Community Living Fund, 30th Street Senior Center, the recently developed Alzheimer’s Strategic Plan, the Diversion and Community Integration Program, Kimochi to name a few.

It is because of my intimate knowledge of these programs and their ability to answer the question “what does it take to have a good life” that I make the following recommendations:

1. Flexibility, flexibility, flexibility
   a. allow states to use local match to drawn down federal funds
   b. allow nutrition funds to be used for innovative programs such as grocery delivery to Single Room Occupancy Hotels and still drawn down NSIP dollars
   c. allow greater flexibility in moving money in program areas such nutrition, i.e. HCM and congregate.

2. Streamline administrative tasks and requirements: because local dollars have remained the same while more people are needing services I recommend a review of administrative expectations with the goal of reducing requirements.

3. Increased funding for Title VI programs that results in greater parity with Area Agency’s on Aging

4. The California Association of Area Agency’s on Aging, of which I am a member, is on record supporting all 3 components of 2020:
   a. Single point of entry
   b. Healthy aging and evidence based programs
   c. Nursing home diversion

Single point of entry provides a greater opportunity for quality assurance. It also levels the playing field for all older adults to receive and access the same information no matter their income, language, etc.

Evidence based healthy aging programs are transforming peoples lives

And although nursing home diversion programs are not currently funded in California we do have experience in San Francisco that is similar. Our local Diversion and Community
Integration Program reinforces for me the Single Point of Entry concept and the need for flexibility and we would be glad to share with you our data and experience as we enter the evaluation stage of the program.

In conclusion I support strengthening partnerships at the Federal level because as you know the money is in many places.

In addition to my verbal testimony I would like to add the following:

If there is to be any additional funding for the Older Americans Act I would strongly recommend that it focus on advocacy. As OAA funding remains flat there is less and less focus on advocacy even though the OAA requires it. My colleagues from Wisconsin have outlined a model similar to the Protection and Advocacy model that advocates for people with disabilities. Their funding nationally has grown to $130 million since 1975 and there is an advocacy program in every state.

I am very familiar with Protection and Advocacy in California as San Francisco has been sued by them on two occasions, both suits resulting in significant increase in services and change in institutional and community based long term care. Each of these actions has resulted in a better San Francisco and assisted us in implementing badly needed changes. Protection and Advocacy is about more than law suits, they provide individual advocacy assistance, training for people with disabilities, family members, attorneys and others, they develop materials related to rights issues and they work with the state legislature on policy reports and analysis.

The Older Americans Act Title VII relates to protection of vulnerable older person and could be amended to consolidate and authorize additional funding for Protection and Advocacy, as well as Leadership Development and Advocacy training for older person. I urge you to explore this idea and make the promise of advocacy real and effective.

Thank you.