

**REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT THE COMPREHENSIVE
OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1978**

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING
UNITED STATES SENATE
NINETY-SIXTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

PART 2—WASHINGTON, D.C.

MARCH 24, 1980



Printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1980

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

LAWTON CHILES, Florida, *Chairman*

FRANK CHURCH, Idaho

JOHN GLENN, Ohio

JOHN MELCHER, Montana

DAVID PRYOR, Arkansas

BILL BRADLEY, New Jersey

QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota

PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico

CHARLES H. PERCY, Illinois

JOHN HEINZ, Pennsylvania

NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas

WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine

E. BENTLEY LIPSCOMB, *Staff Director*

JOHN A. EDIE, *Chief Counsel*

DAVID A. RUST, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Opening statement by Senator Pete V. Domenici, copresiding.....	75
Opening statement by Senator David Pryor, copresiding	77
Statement by Senator Lawton Chiles, chairman	78
Benedict, Robert C., Commissioner, Administration on Aging, Office of Human Development Services, Department of Health, Education, and Wel- fare; accompanied by Sandra Fisher, Acting Associate Commissioner for Training and Education, and Howard White, Acting Director for the Divi- sion of Research and Evaluation.....	80
Appendix, letter from Senator John Heinz, to Senator Lawton Chiles, chair- man, U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging, dated May 1, 1980.....	127

REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT THE COMPREHENSIVE OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1978

MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1980

U.S. SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 6226, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Pete V. Domenici and Hon. David Pryor, copresiding.

Present: Senators Chiles, Domenici, Pryor, Melcher, Burdick, and Cohen.

Also present: E. Bentley Lipscomb, staff director; John A. Edie, chief counsel; David A. Rust, minority staff director; Nell P. Ryan, professional staff member; Deborah K. Kilmer, legislative liaison; Tony Arroyos and Betty M. Stagg, minority professional staff members; Kathleen L. Makris, minority office manager; and Joan D. Nielubowski, clerical assistant.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR PETE V. DOMENICI, COPRESIDING

Senator DOMENICI. We are going to get started on time. Chairman Chiles will be here shortly. Both he and I have a number of conflicts in this morning's schedule, including the Budget Committee where Chairman Volcker is appearing.

I have a prepared statement that I will not take time to read, but instead will insert into the record¹ later on.

Commissioner, I do have a few remarks but we welcome you. Would you tell us for the record who are your two staff people that are with you today?

Mr. BENEDICT. Yes. To my left is Sandra Fisher. She is the Acting Associate Commissioner for Training and Education. To my right is Howard White, who is the Acting Director for the Division of Research and Evaluation.

Senator DOMENICI. All right.

Commissioner, as you know, 18 months ago we made a number of significant changes in programs for older persons when we reauthorized the Older Americans Act. The new law consolidated major service programs and senior centers into one title. It strengthened the emphasis on priority services, required several studies and mandated the reduction of burdensome paperwork. The act also contained a new focus on the needs of rural elderly, including increased funding, a special study of rural services delivery and the

¹ See page 79.

use of discretionary grant funds for rural projects. It has been almost a year and a half since the reauthorization. The entire committee thought that it was appropriate that we take this time to examine the progress on some of these issues.

At the time of the reauthorization a number of amendments, which I prepared and introduced and which Chairman Chiles supported, dealt with the significant issue of funding rural services for the aged. Also, at that time, a major concern, both to me and the Older Americans Act conferees, was lack of data on the cost of providing services to the elderly in rural areas versus urban areas.

Commissioner, I think you know that the U.S. Senate passed by a rather significant margin an amendment on the floor that would have provided additional moneys to rural areas based upon the Senate's belief that it cost more to deliver services in rural areas. As you recall, we went to conference and the House bill did not have that kind of provision in it. Even though the U.S. Senate had overwhelmingly supported a bias in terms of dollars for rural delivery systems, a compromise was reached and section 411(b)(3) required that you conduct a study on these rural needs. I believe that study was to be completed by October 18, 1980. We are now 18 months along and we would like very much to know about your progress on that study.

Certainly I want to say to you, Commissioner, that I think it is absolutely the will of the conferees and thus of both institutions that such data be available before we reauthorize the Older Americans Act. The reason for this study and the amendment process was an intuition on the part of most people that we needed a dollar bias in favor of rural delivery systems and the need to obtain some facts to prove it.

Now I am hopeful that you are going to be able to tell us that we will have some basic data before we reauthorize the Older Americans Act. The other areas that were of genuine concern when this committee had its input into this new act had to do with transportation. As you recall, transportation for the elderly remains high on their list wherever you take surveys or wherever you meet with seniors. We also asked for a detailed study of efforts to consolidate transportation resources for the elderly. We are very interested in the status of that study.

From my standpoint, before we finish today I would like to know what has happened to title VI, the new title which makes available to Indian tribes direct grants for the delivery of aging services.

I am sure every Senator that is concerned with senior citizens is very interested in the status of these studies since law was signed by the President in October 1978 and it is now March 24, 1980. In addition to the concerns I have just expressed, we are all tremendously concerned about the regulations that govern the activities of these programs at the State and local levels.

The last time you appeared before us they were not ready. On Friday of last week they were not ready. That means that program administrators are acting either under old regulations or under your draft regulations which certainly were not consistent with the law, or they are acting under program instructions which may or may not be consistent with the act and the final regulations.

Now am I correct that as of this morning the regulations have been finalized?

Mr. BENEDICT. The title III regulations were signed this weekend and we expect them to be published within 10 days. In the past week we have concluded intensive instruction for the regional staff. We will make advance copies of the rules available to the Congress within a matter of days.

Senator DOMENICI. I will have some more questions on that but I want to yield to Senator Pryor at this point.

We are delighted to have you.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR DAVID PRYOR, COPRESIDING

Senator PRYOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner Benedict, I don't have really but a paragraph or so as an opening statement. The committee is extremely concerned about these mandated studies and the mandated acts which the Congress has requested that you perform and right now to the best of my knowledge we have very little to show for them. I hope that you will give the committee a proper explanation of why these seem to be lacking and why we do not seem to have these studies and these reports available to us.

I think also that I would just like to say that it appears to me oftentimes that we study these problems to death rather than spending what precious little time and resources that we have on trying actually to meet the needs of the elderly population of this country. I am going to concede that we must have some studies to insure that these funds are being spent wisely. Mr. Commissioner, if I had to vote right now, I would have to say that there has been a great deal of foot dragging in your office. Hopefully you can clarify that and you can relieve my feeling of doubt that I do have at this time.

Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

Senator DOMENICI. Mr. Chairman, we are delighted that you have joined us. I am fully aware of the conflicts that you have, and I stated before you arrived that you may only be able to remain here for a short time. Chairman Volcker of the Federal Reserve Board is appearing before the Budget Committee and I also will try to get there. I am hopeful that you will spend some time with us, but I am so concerned about the interest rates and what is happening on inflation that certainly I understand your need to attend that meeting. I hope you will understand that I will be a bit late. Now, perhaps you would wish to discuss our mutual interests with the Commissioner. Both of us have shared concerns about the two major studies that were mandated.

Before you arrived, I had noted my interest in obtaining more information about whether there is a real cost differential in providing rural services. As you recall, although you and I won a rural weighting of the funding formula on the floor, we had to settle in conference for a study. That study which is intended to provide us some facts on the cost differences of providing services in rural versus urban areas, is due shortly.

We discussed transportation briefly, specifically the mandate in the act to analyze how we could put existing transportation pro-

grams into a more understandable comprehensive system. Then commented that we didn't have the regulations on title III, but the Commissioner indicated that they finished them over the weekend and signed them this morning. The ink is still wet. The regulations are completed as of this morning and I am sure you are delighted to hear that.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LAWTON CHILES, CHAIRMAN

Senator CHILES. I certainly am. I want to thank both of you for agreeing to cochair our hearing. Both of you have a long history of work on behalf of older Americans and share a mutual concern for the problems of cost in the rural areas. Senator Pryor, I think you testified back in 1975 on that subject, and certainly Senator Domenici and I have been trying for over 2 years to secure data on the cost of service delivery in rural areas.

I would invite all of you to accompany me this morning on a short historical journey—a journey back some 15 years to 1965. In that year, the U.S. Congress overwhelmingly passed a landmark piece of legislation which designated an operating agency within HEW to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons. The agency would also provide training and research when those activities could enhance the delivery of services to older Americans. I am sure all of you recognize that I am referring to the Older Americans Act of 1965.

Today, some 15 years later, we have requested this forum to determine if, in fact, the agency which HEW designated to assume responsibility for older persons, the Administration on Aging, is providing the assistance required by the original act, and which has been reemphasized in the form of mandates in the 1978 amendments to the Older Americans Act.

The Committee on Aging met in executive session on February 25 to outline a work plan for 1980. We discussed the impact of inflation on older persons, their health, employment, housing, and energy needs. Not one member of the committee referred to unit costs, urban/rural cost differentials, or personnel requirements in the field of aging as these subjects are the responsibility of the implementing agency. Regulations, reporting requirements, results of studies, and so forth, are the fundamental components of management and administration, components without which no agency or program can operate efficiently. A hearing of the U.S. Senate should not be necessary to insure that these important management tools are available to the national network on aging and the U.S. Congress.

It was the sense of the Congress, during the 1978 reauthorization of the Older Americans Act, that more information was needed in certain areas and that the only way to assure the availability of this information in a timely manner and accurate format was to mandate its accomplishment. It is now 18 months since those mandates were signed into law. We trust that a Federal agency with that much notice has not disappointed Congress or violated the trust of the 25 million older Americans making up its constituency. It is my sincere hope that today the Administration on Aging can provide this committee with definitive answers to the questions we

will pose with regard to its management, research, and training activities.

Again, I appreciate the assistance with this hearing offered by both Senator Pryor and Senator Domenici. I will have to leave in a few minutes to start the Budget Committee meeting because Senator Muskie is going to be a little late.

Thank you again.

Senator DOMENICI. Thank you very much, Senator Chiles.

Before we go to Commissioner Benedict, my prepared statement will be entered into the record at this point.

[The prepared statement of Senator Domenici follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR PETE V. DOMENICI

Eighteen months ago we undertook a major examination of the programs authorized by the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, and made a number of significant and productive modifications designed to expand and improve services and service delivery for older Americans. These include consolidation of the nutrition, social services, and senior center programs into one title, targeting of services in priority areas, a 3-year planning cycle and a mandate for the reduction of paperwork. The new law also contained a new emphasis on services to rural areas and a number of special studies designed to develop additional information for policy formulation in areas such as transportation, rural service delivery, and aging manpower policy.

The Older Americans Act Amendments of 1978 direct increased attention to the needs of the elderly in rural communities through several provisions. These include an increase in funds to rural areas, focus on outreach to the rural elderly, and special consideration for rural areas when awarding grants for research, special projects, and training of personnel. The act also mandated that the Commissioner conduct a study to determine the differences in the cost of providing services in urban and rural areas.

I am aware that services in rural areas are simply not available in many cases. Also, accessibility to services because of a lack of transportation is a problem of major proportions for our older people living in rural communities. I believe that the poor and isolated elderly living in economically deprived rural communities across the country are least likely to receive the services they need. It is often stated that it costs more to provide community services such as nutrition, transportation, social services, and health care in these areas.

When I introduced legislation to amend the Older Americans Act, I mentioned that two salient points had emerged from a series of hearings I chaired in New Mexico in 1977 that dealt with problems of the rural elderly: (1) The cost of delivering services in rural areas is excessive; and (2) services in rural areas tend to be far less readily available than in more densely populated areas. During the July 24, 1978, debate in the Senate, I offered an amendment which would have added a rural factor to the State allocation formula. My goal was to expand social services to disadvantaged elderly persons living in isolated rural locations. The Senate approved my rural services amendment by a substantial vote. Unfortunately the Conferees were unwilling to accept this provision. A compromise was reached, however, which I hope will help to expand services in rural America. The compromise required each State to increase funds available to rural areas by at least 5 percent over the fiscal year 1978 spending level.

Another important provision that we will discuss today is the mandating of a comprehensive study on rural services. It was my concern, as well as the concern of the Senate and House Conferees in September 1978, that there was a lack of hard data in determining the differing costs in delivering services to rural and urban elderly. It was our hope and expectation that the Administration on Aging would develop a data base that would enable the Congress to look at these issues from a more knowledgeable vantage point. I am still hopeful that this study will tell us much more than we already know about what services exist in rural areas, how much they cost, and whether or not it is more expensive to provide comparable services to older persons residing in rural areas.

The title VI program, grants to Indian tribes, will also have a direct impact on a certain segment of the rural elderly. Most Indians continue to reside in rural areas and the prompt and effective implementation of the direct grants authorized in title VI will help to expand much needed services to these underserved older persons. The concept for title VI was first contained in S. 2609, which I introduced on

February 28, 1978, along with Senators Percy, Dole, Schmitt, and former Senator Brooke. I look forward to exploring, with Commissioner Benedict, the steps AoA has taken during the last 18 months to get this program underway.

We are all aware that the elderly must have some means of transportation in order to participate in programs and projects designed for their benefit. We also know that the availability of transportation services for the elderly is nonexistent in many areas of this country. Compounding the problem are the complexity of existing sources of funding, escalating gasoline prices, and difficult to obtain insurance policies. Vehicle insurance has become a major obstacle for social service agencies providing transportation services.

The National Governors Association and the White House Task Force on Transportation have been studying these insurance problems. It is my understanding that the National Governors Association is developing model State legislation to address regulatory and liability issues faced by social agencies providing transportation services. In addition, a provision was included in the Older Americans Act amendments which gave the Commissioner on Aging the authority to use discretionary funds for a transportation study which would include the insurance problems faced by service providers.

This morning we will examine the progress on implementation of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1978, including the urban/rural cost differential study, other rural strategies and initiatives, the study of transportation problems, the development of a national manpower policy in aging, and the reduction of the paperwork burden on the "aging network." As the author of section 212—the reduction of paperwork provision, I have a keen interest in hearing what steps AoA has taken to implement this requirement.

Senator DOMENICI. Commissioner, we welcome you and your two staff assistants. We have seen your prepared testimony and I think you know from what we have said already what we want you to tell us about. We are not going to keep you from giving your whole statement¹ but we would appreciate it if you would summarize it and address the three or four issues we have raised here this morning.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT C. BENEDICT, COMMISSIONER, ADMINISTRATION ON AGING, OFFICE OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE; ACCOMPANIED BY SANDRA FISHER, ACTING ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER FOR TRAINING AND EDUCATION, AND HOWARD WHITE, ACTING DIRECTOR FOR THE DIVISION OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Mr. BENEDICT. I would be happy to do that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to be here this morning to discuss the topics you discussed in your letter of invitation. It is clear that the provisions of the 1978 amendments explicitly underscored the importance which Congress assigns to improved services to the rural aged, to more effective delivery of transportation services, to paperwork reduction, and to improved programs for providing the manpower we need to serve the elderly. I would like in the next few minutes to outline briefly our efforts in these areas and to respond to specific questions that you might have.

In your letter of invitation you requested information on three specific subjects related to AoA's overall effort in the transportation field. These are: Transportation study; impact of rising insurance costs and restrictions on local service providers; and feasibility of a single administrative unit for all Federal transportation programs for older persons.

¹ See page 123.

These subjects are being explored through grants which AoA has awarded to the Institute for Public Administration and to the Urban Institute.

The IPA and the Urban Institute are scheduled to submit preliminary findings to AoA by September 30, 1980; final reports should be in our hands by October 30 of this year. AoA will prepare a report based on their findings and will submit that report to Congress no later than February 1, 1981. In addition, as the grantees' material becomes available we will submit it to the committee. In the report, which AoA prepares, we should be able to provide you with information on, and where appropriate, recommendations concerning:

Fundamental problems which providers experience in offering transportation services to the elderly at the community level; difficulties which providers encounter in obtaining and paying for liability insurance; the impact of gasoline shortages and rising gasoline prices; and possibilities for improving coordination among transportation programs.

Senator DOMENICI. You indicated that the Institute for Public Administration and the Urban Institute are your contractors on the transportation study.

Mr. BENEDICT. That is correct; we have used the grants mechanism to finance the studies.

Senator DOMENICI. When did you enter into a contract with each of them, what date?

Mr. BENEDICT. In September 1979. They were awarded funds based upon a competitive announcement which we issued in the spring or early summer of that year.

Senator DOMENICI. Were they both contracted for in September 1979?

Mr. BENEDICT. Yes, that is correct.

Senator DOMENICI. What kind of schedule did you include in your invitation for bids—what kind of a time frame did you place on the bidders? How long were they given to run this study on the three or four issues in transportation? I am not talking about the study of the costs of services in rural areas.

Mr. BENEDICT. The preliminary reports will be submitted to AoA in September 1980.

Senator CHILES. Can we establish whether it is a contract or a grant?

Mr. BENEDICT. It was a grant awarded under competitive announcement.

Senator CHILES. Isn't this the same firm that did the study for you in 1974?

Mr. BENEDICT. Both organizations have done work for AoA before.

Senator CHILES. Did IPA do a transportation study in 1975?

Mr. BENEDICT. Let me ask Mr. White to respond.

Mr. WHITE. The IPA has undertaken several projects in transportation for other organizations, including DOT, as well as for AoA. Most of the work done earlier was in the form of assistance to States. Much earlier they provided the transportation handbook which has had wide use by providers. I think that is what you have in your hands now.

Senator CHILES. Yes; the document is entitled, "Transportation for the Elderly; the State of the Art."

Mr. WHITE. That was the first piece. There was a second product, a transportation planning handbook. The third product was a series of case studies and specific assistance and information according to the topics in the handbook, but providing more extensive materials, including visual aids, for use by local service operators, IPA also convened a series of five regional conferences to give people providing transportation services answers to questions on how to operate transportation programs. All of this was based on studying some of the best practice sites for the transportation services.

Senator CHILES. How do you see the current study differing from what they have already done?

Mr. WHITE. In a couple of ways. One, that study did not concentrate on insurance which is a major orientation in this study. Also most of that work was completed before the gas situation became as critical as it is. They were not trying to meet the OAA requirements, but were providing technical assistance to people who were providing services at that time. This study, because of its mandate, has more of an orientation toward general policy issues and decisions, especially coordination of transportation services which was not a major issue of previous studies. Those projects helped people already providing transportation rather than suggesting systems changes.

Senator DOMENICI. Well, let me ask, Commissioner, if the Congress mandates that you deliver a study on these four points, including the possibilities for improving coordination among transportation programs, and we give you 2 years to do it, do you think it is an appropriate response for you to take 1 year of that time before you start the study?

Mr. BENEDICT. Mr. Chairman, when the Congress passed the act in 1978 it included a request for between 15 and 20 separate studies. We immediately put our staff to work on examining specifically what the Congress wanted so that we could develop plans for carrying out all of those studies. We examined the extent to which those assignments taxed our discretionary resources. We then went immediately to the preparation of research and model project announcements to solicit proposals.

Those announcements were all issued last year. The competitive process itself involves a several-month period in which offerers have the opportunity to prepare for competition. Proposals are then submitted and reviewed by panels. The winners may then be asked to make some final modifications and the awards are made. In summary, it took time to examine the studies required by the 1978 amendments, to set aside the discretionary resources to carry them out, and to issue competing awards.

I would add that, with regard to urban and rural differences, we did not receive one single proposal in response to our original announcement. Those individuals who considered competing later indicated to us that the problem was so complex that they were not inclined to compete. Thus the Administration on Aging was obliged to alter our strategy. Now five initiatives either are or will be

underway with regard to examining the cost differences between urban and rural areas.

Senator PRYOR. How much were you prepared to expend for this study, Commissioner Benedict, of the differences in urban and rural problems of our country?

Mr. BENEDICT. Mr. White, do you have that at hand?

Mr. WHITE. Yes; to clarify a little bit, the study was to try to help us figure out exactly how to get at the issue. Put very honestly, the study of cost differentials between two agencies serving the same people at the same time with practically the same service is very difficult. To try to get unit cost comparisons between rural and urban service providers is one of the most taxing studies that I think we would be given. We announced a study for 12 months at \$125,000 to ask some experts to tell us how to do it, without reply. That was followed by a small contract for only 6 months at \$5,000 just to help us figure out what to do.

We did at the same time last year fund one project on the cost of nutrition services. We thought we would get the best possible information on nutrition because meals are easier to study. That project was funded in September and that will be coming in with a result early next year. For other services we have had to start again to determine how to answer the questions. It is not an easy question, I think it is one of the reasons that the Congress itself had difficulty in coming up with a decision.

Referring back to your question, costing data on unit cost is difficult in itself, and the mandated rural-urban cost difference study was somewhat beyond our skills so we requested proposals in this area to obtain expert help. The first time we tried no one was willing to give that help and left us with no applicants; 12,000 copies of that announcement were published and sent to every university, every junior college, and every relevant department in some of those universities and we still had no responses.

Senator DOMENICI. Could we establish this for the record now? You already told us that you let the contracts for the transportation study to the Institute for Public Administration and Urban Institute. You told us when you expect this study to be completed and when you tentatively expect to deliver it to the Congress. Senator Pryor asked you about your statement on the difficulty of deriving a unit cost and you were describing that, but you didn't give us any specific information on where we were on that. When might we expect you to deliver something to us on the study of unit cost differentials?

Mr. BENEDICT. The nutrition award has been made. We expect to have preliminary data by no later than December 1980 with a final report due to us in March 1981. Nutrition is somewhat easier because of the specificity of the program. That study does include a distinction between urban and rural sites which will tell us a good bit about cost differentials in the nutrition program which is, of course, the largest program that AoA administers.

Senator DOMENICI. I gather that you are really telling us that, even on the nutrition portion of the unit cost study, there is no way that you are going to meet the mandated 2-year deadline.

Mr. BENEDICT. It would be very difficult to give you precise information on cost differentials by the date specified in the act. I

would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that we agreed with the committee with regard to the need to expand our efforts in rural areas. We have not waited for the results of the mandated study to proceed with that effort. We are examining some 80 model projects, the total cost of which was slightly over \$8 million. Over 30 of those projects which were funded were specifically targeted activities in a rural area. Moreover, we have entered into an agreement with the Farmers Home Administration and committed funds to the development of special housing for the elderly in the rural areas.

In addition to that we have entered into an agreement with the Health Services Administration to increase access of older persons to health care services available to HSA-sponsored facilities. A number of the projects undertaken through this agreement are targeted on rural areas, including two which are located on reservations. We are proceeding with the mandated studies at the same time. We have taken advantage of many opportunities to redirect our discretionary resources programs to develop and improve services in rural areas. We will continue to do that.

Senator DOMENICI. Senator Chiles, you had some questions.

Senator CHILES. I have one additional question on the transportation study. Until 1979, there was not a classification or a ratesetting schedule for service vehicles. As a result, the underwriters considered those unclassifiable vehicles as high risk, rather than manageable risk; therefore, many times, insurance was unattainable or only obtainable at tremendously prohibitive cost.

The only classification of risk known to the underwriters was for hire, such as taxi, bus, private carrier, as contrasted service vehicles. Although the Government and some charitable organizations were granted immunity from this traditional classification, that immunity did not extend to the nonprofit agencies providing transportation services. Our Senate Committee on Aging held hearings and coordinated the efforts of several national organizations, which resulted in the creation of a new classification schedule by the insurance industry. Today, we have such a classification.

I want to know how the AoA has utilized this information and whether the consultant working on the transportation project has utilized this information? Also, what is AoA doing to make sure that all service organizations have the information that this new classification rate is available?

Mr. BENEDICT. First of all, Senator Chiles, we were delighted at the cooperation we received from the Department of Transportation, from financial organizations, and from the Administration for Public Services. We are now working with them to develop a social services classification. Since that time, AoA has issued a number of information bulletins to States and local agencies. My information is that there are some 48 States that have or are moving to adopt that classification. We believe that the classification will be of real help to service providers at the community level. Nonetheless, we have still included questions relating to insurance problems in both the studies which we have awarded to the Institute for Public Administration and Urban Institute.

I might add that, in addition to the IPA and Urban Institute studies, the Administration on Aging, the Department of Transpor-

tation, and the Administration for Public Services have for the past 3 years, been conducting a series of demonstrations in five communities. These demonstrations are providing those communities with additional resources to develop, administer, and manage consolidated transportation programs which include everything from central purchasing of vehicles to experimentation with fixed route and special transportation activities. We expect that these demonstrations, which are now in the third year, will also yield a good bit of information about the practical aspects of consolidating transportation activities. This information will complement the findings of the Urban Institute and IPA studies.

Senator DOMENICI. I wonder now if you might just quickly complete anything you wanted to tell us about transportation so we can focus on the rural-urban unit cost study, and then move on to other issues. Was there anything else you wanted to add on transportation?

Mr. BENEDICT. There is one other item. The 1978 amendments to the Older Americans Act specifically permitted local agreements for coordination of transportation services. In the rules which the Secretary signed, we have interpreted that statutory reference to coordination as providing State agencies and area agencies with broader authority for joint funding of transportation services and greater ability to use multiple resources at the local level to put transportation services together.

I would also observe that, within the context of consolidation, as the nutrition program comes under the authority of area agencies, most State and area agencies are using this process as an opportunity to examine the overall management and transportation resources that are available to them. A number of community agencies are now seeking to develop and implement more consolidated transportation programs. There are problems, however.

One problem in consolidating transportation programs is that the service needs of different constituency groups are not always the same. The second problem is that there are overhead costs for administering a consolidated transportation system. The third problem is that to some extent success breeds problems. Where these programs are in operation, the demand for services is increasing precisely at a time when gasoline and oil are becoming much more expensive. As you know, petroleum costs are increasing at a substantial rate, perhaps as much as 15 to 20 percent a year. So there are burdens even where there is success.

Senator DOMENICI. Did anyone have further questions on transportation?

Senator PRYOR. On the transportation award that you have given to the firm to do the study, this is the second study that they have done for the Administration on Aging, is that correct?

Mr. BENEDICT. Mr. White tells me it is the third over a series of years.

Senator PRYOR. How does this firm happen to have all of this expertise to receive three contracts in a row in this particular area?

Mr. BENEDICT. Well, the awards are competitive. In fact, the experience these organizations have acquired over the years has

enabled their staffs to develop a special expertise which, in turn allows them to compete successfully in these areas.

Senator PRYOR. Since this award was given to the firm—what is the name of the firm, by the way?

Mr. BENEDICT. There are two. One is the Institute for Public Administration and the second is the Urban Institute.

Senator PRYOR. Since the awarding of this contract has been completed, have they submitted their reports on time or has that time lapsed?

Mr. BENEDICT. Mr. White.

Mr. WHITE. Let me just add one statement, the previous products of the Institute for Public Administration, has been a great success. This is evidenced by people from the field saying how much they liked the end products of these studies. I certainly would not want to deny them the right to compete and receive an award because they had received three contracts over 6 years. They have gotten very positive responses from the people in the field of transportation services who have received their publications.

Second, this is a grant so that we do not have specific time required products. We have met with them on a very regular basis. They are now out in the field collecting information. They are on time with all the work that they are doing and we are continuing to make sure they remain on time.

Senator PRYOR. What is the amount of the grant for this project?

Mr. WHITE. They both are about \$150,000.

Senator PRYOR. So roughly \$300,000 for the total project.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, \$275,000 to \$300,000.

Senator PRYOR. Have there been any additional add-ons to the project since the original grant was given?

Mr. WHITE. No.

Senator PRYOR. And they are under no time constraint?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, they are under a time constraint for a certain final product at a specific time. They are definitely under mandate. We have a schedule of subtasks. We have been meeting with them regularly on this particular grant to make sure they stay within that time frame. They are required to give us a schedule for each step that they are taking. We follow that schedule when we talk to them to make sure that they are meeting that schedule. However, there is basically one report required and that is at the end of the grant.

Senator PRYOR. How many firms or entities expressed an interest in doing work in obtaining this particular contract?

Mr. WHITE. There were only three proposals received and only two were reviewed as acceptable.

Senator PRYOR. My concern and the reason for my questioning about this specific contract is that today the Administration on Aging, as in so many agencies of the Federal Government, are basing their ultimate decisions and ultimately the policies of this Government on outside firms which have been contracted or given grants to do studies and reports, and so forth. So, in regard to those reports that we have from those outside firms, whether they be universities or consulting firms in the traditional sense of the word, it is critical that we ascertain several things about them.

One, is there any potential conflict of interest? Do they really have the expertise? What is the relationship between the agency and the grantee? These things I think a Committee on Oversight must look into very, very carefully and that is the reason I was asking about some of these.

I am not going to just stay on transportation, Mr. Chairman. I know we have other areas that we need to look at.

Senator DOMENICI. Senator Pryor, your point is relevant to the whole scheme of this hearing today and I certainly think that we have some more questions on that subject which are important.

Let me ask this question since you have indicated to us that it is almost impossible for you to comply with the mandate of the Congress on the unit cost differential study. Regarding your instructions to the two firms that got the bid here on transportation, do you know whether or not you asked them to evaluate the differential between urban and rural transportation cost?

Mr. WHITE. I don't believe so but I will check.

Mr. BENEDICT. We will see whether the data that is being collected permits that kind of a breakdown.

Mr. WHITE. I would honestly doubt that it would come up with anything.

Senator DOMENICI. You indicated nutrition is one area that you may be able to get some cost differential data on. It would seem to me that there is a very similar service relationship on urban versus rural transportation.

Mr. BENEDICT. The study being conducted by the Institute for Public Administration is examining a fairly significant sample of planning and service areas. Whether or not the sample would specifically allow for a breakdown between urban and rural service costs, I cannot tell you. We would be happy to examine it and to see whether it does. It is conceivable, Mr. Chairman, that to do so would involve some additional work.

Mr. WHITE. May I comment on the nutrition study? We are studying the costs, sending accountants to over 125 sites for extended stays. Those accountants are going back over previous records to determine the exact cost per meal. It is a massive effort to get that basic cost information. It is looking at additional rural and urban issues because these factors will influence cost. That study is larger than the other two studies combined and requires considerably more fieldwork and time.

In previous studies we have tried to use existing records to compare nutrition costs. We found that approach very unsatisfactory. This is why we are sending accountants onsite. As you can appreciate determining costs even without getting the unit cost is often difficult with overhead problems and with multiple funding for services, and different service definitions.

The nutrition study is just trying to get the legitimate cost data.

Senator DOMENICI. I assume we are not going to have any further questions at this point on transportation although any Senator that has them certainly may ask them at this time.

We are not adhering to any 10-minute rule or any formality here for the Senators that have arrived. If you have any questions on any of these subjects, just feel free to interrupt and ask them.

Now if we can talk a little bit more about your effort to arrive at the unit cost for rural delivery of various services. I want to tell you up front how I feel about it. First, in the only vote on the Senate floor that is relevant to this issue the U.S. Senate voted by something like 68 to 22 in favor of a differential in the funding formula which would have given additional money to the rural areas. This vote was based upon the U.S. Senate's judgment that unit costs were higher in rural areas than in urban areas.

Now I know that the AoA actively opposed the rural formula amendment. If you could not get the information, if you could not find a mechanism for acquiring this data and evaluating it, I personally feel that this committee and the authorizing committee in the Senate should have known much sooner than March of this year that you were having difficulty putting together an appropriate study.

I am finding over and over again that we ask that things be done and we do it in good faith. If we are wrong, if we are asking for something that should not be done then we need to know why and what the problems are. However, instead of having an agency tell us up front what it can and cannot do, we get unacceptably long delays.

Now as I understand it, other than the study on nutritional cost which you have described, there is no chance that we will have the results of the study that we mandated available on time. In fact, there is serious doubt whether it will be available to the Congress when we reauthorize this act for continuation in fiscal year 1982. We have to start that process a year ahead of this, and we are still not going to have the information that the U.S. Senate settled for in lieu of its amendment mandating a differential for rural services out of the funds of the Older Americans Act.

Now will you tell us, do you believe it is reasonable for Congress to ask you to get data on the unit cost differential which the U.S. Senate assumed existed when it passed the amendment regarding that issue?

Mr. BENEDICT. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is reasonable. I would like once again to summarize our efforts and also to indicate one other action of the Congress which I believe will have more significance for services in rural areas than the study will have.

First, as we indicated, a specialist has been employed for a 6-month period as one part of the rural-urban study. We specifically examined and analyzed every study and research report that we could find which deals with urban and rural cost differentials.

Senator PRYOR. Excuse me. Is that the \$50,000 study?

Mr. WHITE. The \$50,000 was the one that we could not get funded.

Mr. BENEDICT. The \$50,000 request was the one that we did not get any responses to. Subsequently we did employ an individual to analyze all literature on current and past projects. Findings as to cost differentials in rural and urban will be available to AoA and available to the Congress prior to the next amendments.

Senator PRYOR. Do you have the expertise in-house to do such a study?

Mr. BENEDICT. We have an employee who has the expertise to complete that specific work as an initial step. Certainly we don't

know what it is going to tell us until he turns in his report. Examination of the data, which will occur in the second phase, does involve a major contract. Part of that contract is to examine the methodological problems.

We also mentioned the nutrition study. In addition to that we are in the process of restructuring the multiple-year study of area agencies to reflect the changes in the act brought on by the 1978 amendments.

We are explicitly requiring that the ongoing study of the area agencies examine the differentials between urban and rural areas.

Now if I might, I would like to bring back to your attention the fact that the consolidation of titles III, V, and VII had two very important effects on rural areas. The first is that the consolidated title III requires that area agencies be established for every planning and service area in the country. At the time the 1978 amendments were passed there were about 500 area agencies. We expect that number will go up to 700 by 1981.

Those planning and service areas that did not have area agencies were almost all rural areas. A significant number of new area agencies have been and will be established over a 2-year period, 1980 and 1981, and almost all of those new area agencies will be in rural areas. Prior to that our data indicates that 42 percent of all the area agencies were in rural areas. Only 27 percent were in areas with an urban and rural mix, 26 percent were in urban areas and only 5 percent of them were in metropolitan areas.

Now the second thing that the Congress did in the 1978 amendments which will significantly affect the rural areas is the requirement that States have intrastate funding formulas. Prior to that statutory change, only 19 States operated with a uniform funding formula. By 1981 all of them will have a uniform intrastate funding formula.

Our regulations specify that the intrastate funding formulas reflect the requirement that title III expenditures in rural areas exceed by 105 percent the amounts spent in rural areas in fiscal year 1978 from titles III, V, and VII. As you know, the 105-percent rule was included in the 1978 amendments. In addition we have required the States to provide a uniform minimum base of funds to each area agency to assure that they have the basic financial capacity to carry out their programs. Inclusion of that requirement in the regulations will have a most dramatic effect in providing a minimum base of funds for rural areas. In addition, the mandated studies are underway. We will share the results with you as they become available. We will advise you of any problems that we encounter. In the meantime, we are moving ahead both in our formula grant programs and in our discretionary programs. We are moving increasing proportions of our dollars to address the problems of people in rural areas.

Senator BURDICK. Mr. Chairman.

Senator DOMENICI. Senator Burdick.

Senator BURDICK. At this point I ask a question. You say you are going forward, you contract for studies, and you are well aware that the act is going to expire and you will have to reenact it next year. What assurances do you get from the contractor that their information will be available before we have to act next year?

Mr. BENEDICT. Each award is made for a specific period of time. A schedule of work is negotiated between the Administration and the contractor or the grantee. Staff meet with the contractor and the grantee on a regular basis to make sure that they are on schedule. In this instance, as Mr. White has indicated, those studies have been let and the grantees are on schedule.

Senator BURDICK. That is not my question. When are they concluded? In time for us to legislate next year?

Mr. BENEDICT. Senator, we did go through the studies and develop a list of specific due dates. I can repeat them now or I can make this specifically available to you.

Senator BURDICK. Can you give me a general idea of when they are to be completed in time for us to act next year?

Mr. BENEDICT. The transportation studies have been launched. The preliminary findings are due to us on September 30 of this year and the final report is due to us on October 30 of this year.

With regard to the nutrition study, the preliminary data will be in no later than December 1980. As Mr. White indicated, it is a massive study looking at a large number of sites. They will get the final report to us in March 1981.

Senator BURDICK. The account expires in September 1981 so that is cutting it kind of close. Is there any possibility of having these studies earlier?

Mr. BENEDICT. We will be more than pleased to share with you the schedule and any preliminary data that comes to us.

Senator BURDICK. I certainly hope that you hold these dates.

Mr. BENEDICT. We intend to do everything we can.

Senator BURDICK. You have a contract. You certainly are in the driver's seat if you have the contract.

Mr. BENEDICT. At this point we don't have any indication that these contractors are not following that schedule. If we do, we will inform the Congress immediately.

Senator PRYOR. Senator Burdick, have you completed your questions on this point?

Senator BURDICK. Yes.

Senator PRYOR. I would just like to add a question in this area. I think in your statement, Commissioner Benedict, you stated that a panel report on rural and urban differences and social services is not going to be made available until March 1982. This is going to be after the time we will have to vote to extend the act and so we won't even have this available to us when we vote on this act.

Mr. BENEDICT. Senator Pryor, you are correct. The studies on urban and rural differences are multiple. There are several studies. They are being phased in over a 2- or 3-year period. The preliminary study will be available by June 1981. We will make those results available to you immediately thereafter.

Senator PRYOR. The reason I am a little bit frustrated with it, Mr. Commissioner, is this committee was kind enough to invite me up here 5 years ago, in April 1975. I was Governor of a State that has 77 percent rural and 23 percent urban elderly population and I did testify before the committee as a Governor looking at it from the State's perspective. The committee was diligently, at that time, trying to get facts and information on this difference between urban and rural problems as we need to legislate here. Here it is 5

years later and it seems like we are just kind of stumbling and muttering and spending money for studies by so-called experts.

We are about to vote whether or not to extend the act and we are not even going to have the information available to us at that time. I just think that this is a very, very bad situation; in fact, it is outrageous to me. It is ludicrous.

Mr. BENEDICT. Senator Pryor, as I indicated, we have three sets of efforts underway which will have an enormous impact on rural areas. First, the act itself imposes new requirements on the States. The intrastate funding requirement is clearly going to drive additional resources into rural areas. There is no question about that.

Second, we have entered into agreements for each of the studies that we have discussed. Parenthetically, I will add that these are only five of the studies that the Congress asked AoA and the Federal Council to do. In addition to that we have substantially redirected our project funds and our training funds also to activities in rural areas.

Senator PRYOR. When you staff your office and when you hire the people to run the Administration on Aging to serve the 20-some-odd million elderly citizens of this country, do you hire them on the basis that you know that they are not experts? Do you know that all you are going to be doing is hiring outside firms to do the actual work on these studies, or why don't you hire people that can do this work in-house quickly and efficiently for us so that we don't have to constantly be dependent upon outside sources for our information that we base these decisions on?

Mr. BENEDICT. Very simply, Senator Pryor, the diverse programs under the Older Americans Act are such and our staffing levels are such that we, like many Federal agencies, are not able to employ large numbers of specialists in specific areas. Contracting is a tool that is available to us. It has advantages in that we are able to make those awards competitively.

Senator PRYOR. Pardon me. How many dollars a year are you spending on outside contracting? I must say contracting and consulting because you made the distinction a moment ago as to a contract award to the group that made the transportation study. How many dollars a year are you spending in contracting and consulting outside the Government—\$20 million?

Mr. BENEDICT. First of all, the AoA discretionary resources for obtaining research, model project, demonstration, new evaluation—

Senator PRYOR. That is all outside your office?

Mr. BENEDICT. That is available to the Administration on Aging.

Senator PRYOR. How much is that?

Mr. BENEDICT. In fiscal year 1979 we spent approximately \$2,200,000 for contracts and approximately \$44 million for grants for these discretionary programs. In fiscal year 1980, \$8 million will be allotted for contracts and approximately \$46 million for grants.

Senator DOMENICI. So there is \$60 million right there.

Mr. BENEDICT. Senator Pryor, the law explicitly separates the budget for salaries and expenses from our discretionary programs. We do not have statutory authority to use our discretionary resources to employ personnel on the AoA staff. Those are two sepa-

rate budgets available to the Administration on Aging and our only authority is to expend those discretionary funds by grants and contracts.

Senator PRYOR. And you spend it all every year, don't you?

Mr. BENEDICT. Almost.

Senator PRYOR. How much did you spend in the last 3 months before the change to the fiscal year?

Mr. BENEDICT. I would have to provide you with that. The resources are spread over the four quarters of each fiscal year. In some instances they can be higher than the last quarter. In part the reason for that is the process by which the awards are let. The different components of the Office of Human Development Services, such as AoA, first prepare a discretionary funds plan. We are obliged to prepare specific announcements for awarding funds under the plan. We are required then to conduct competitive review processes of the proposals submitted in response to the announcements. After the competitive reviews are complete, we enter into an explicit negotiation with each agency or organization and they themselves structure the project.

[Subsequent to the hearing, Mr. Benedict supplied the following material:]

ADMINISTRATION ON AGING EXPENDITURES OF DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM FUNDS,¹
FISCAL YEAR 1979

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1979 total	Fourth quarter
Grants	\$44.04	\$28.1
Contracts.....	2.251	.771
Fiscal year 1979 totals	46.291	28.871

¹ Includes research, training, demonstration, and evaluation activities.

Senator PRYOR. Mr. Commissioner, my point is that we are spending millions and millions of dollars on outside consultants and outside contracts to provide us with information upon which to base our decisions. As of today that information is requested which is not coming forth. It seems that every study that is in question here today, mandated by the Congress, is either late or has not been started or is just getting started, ergo it appears that we have a situation where we are giving more money to your agency for you to contract out.

My point is this. If you need more money for staff rather than for contracting out for services, why don't you ask us for more money for staff? Why do you prefer to have a huge amount of money that is discretionary for you to give out to these particular firms or to contract outside the Government? That is my point.

Mr. BENEDICT. I understand your concern, Senator. First of all I would be happy to provide you with an identification of those awards which are for technical assistance or——

Senator DOMENICI. I would appreciate that very much for the record.

[Subsequent to the hearing, Mr. Benedict supplied the following information:]

In fiscal year 1979, AoA expended almost \$7.9 million for technical assistance. The awards included the following:

State education and training	\$6,000,000
National training and technical assistance.....	323,477
Regional education and training.....	209,983
National continuing education	417,763
National conferences	937,245
<hr/>	
Total	7,888,468

Mr. BENEDICT. Second, it brings to mind that the Administration has in fact requested some additional positions for the Office of Human Development Services, some of which would be to support the Administration on Aging in successfully carrying out its responsibilities.

Senator BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, just one more question.

When I questioned you 2 minutes ago, you didn't tell me about this study, this urban-rural study; now you say that won't be ready until March 1982?

Mr. BENEDICT. The urban-rural studies are conducted in phases. First of all, AoA issued a research announcement last year that, we are disappointed to report, did not elicit one single offer. We therefore went back and constructed a multiple study which was in five parts. The preliminary study, which involves the complete review of literature and of the existing contracts and grants conducted in the past by the Government to examine the rural-urban differences, will soon be available.

Senator BURDICK. I understand it won't be ready until March and that is when the contract is due, isn't it?

Mr. BENEDICT. We have a preliminary study that is underway right now.

Mr. White, do you expect that that would be available to us by June of this year?

Senator BURDICK. That is the preliminary but then you have another study to make it more complete.

Mr. BENEDICT. That is right.

Senator BURDICK. And that won't be done until 1982. That is long after we enact this law?

Mr. WHITE. There is a second study which will be a more complete review of existing materials and literature as well as an evaluation of the methodological problems. We expect that study to be completed by June 1981.

Senator BURDICK. What is this date you have here of March 1981?

Mr. BENEDICT. What I have been referring to is that, over the years, AoA has conducted a longitudinal study of area agencies. That study is now in the process of being modified to take into account the changes in the act. That is a specific study of area agencies and the area agency program. We are now making specific changes in that longitudinal study so that it will focus on urban-rural differences. That study is a multiple-year effort. We don't expect that the urban-rural data from that particular piece will be showing up for 2 years.

Senator BURDICK. Then we will legislate in 1981 not knowing exactly what the results of your study show.

Mr. BENEDICT. Senator, our assumption was that we had an obligation to develop and examine the best available information as it exists today so that the Administration and the Congress could make short-range decisions. In addition, our assumption was that urban-rural differences are an explicit long-term concern of the administration of this program. Any ongoing studies which AoA conducts in the future for whatever purposes should include elements which permit us to identify key differences in service needs and costs between urban and rural areas. That information will be available to the Congress in the years to come.

Senator BURDICK. It bothers me, you people knew that this act was expiring, you knew we wanted this information, you had it on a contract basis, you could determine somewhat the term of the contract, yet you come in here now, and tell us that not until 1982, long after we have expected the information, will we have this material.

Mr. BENEDICT. These factors indicate that it is an enormously complex problem. That is why the thousands of research announcements that we have put out on this subject did not generate one single offer. That is why we went back and constructed a multiple-phase study, one which would allow us to examine the existing situation this fall and this winter, as well as to build on that effort in conducting future research on urban-rural differences.

Senator DOMENICI. I am sure that Senator Cohen wants to ask some questions. Let me see if the members of the committee would agree to the following request. I hate to burden the Commissioner and his staff, but it seems to me that we ought to ask them to produce the following for us as quickly as possible.

At one point in your testimony you indicated that this new legislation mandated 15 studies and at another point you said 21. Our staff has quickly summarized it and they don't think either 15 or 21 is right. Would you supply for the record a list of studies that you feel have been mandated by the act? Just state the principal goal and if there were any time constraints imposed upon you, list the time constraints. Tell us the amount you have expended to this point and to whom and for what.

Indicate any due dates that are in those grants or contracts and then on each of these indicate whether or not you were doing these studies in response to a mandate in the statute and are you going to be able to comply with it or not?

Let me say that from my standpoint I don't think the delays in these studies are the whole issue and the only reason for the concern of this committee. I think the record is replete with examples such as 18 months to get regulations out for a new law. The law will be halfway through its 3-year authorization before final regulations are available to the people administering the law. It is of grave concern that \$750 million a year is being distributed and yet it will be almost 2 years before the regulations indicating the precise policy interpretations will be out in the field.

In discussing the transportation study, we have heard today that it may not even be necessary; it may not be right. Then we hear that regarding the rural-urban unit cost, we are going to have long-term studies which certainly cannot be in response to the 2-year mandatè.

I wonder if we ought to let you continue to spend the money for that study if it is not going to fulfill its intended purpose. After all, our primary goal was not a study but rather equity in funding for rural areas. What is going to happen if the study is only partially completed when Congress addresses reauthorization? I have severe reservations about spending money for the study if it cannot reach the goal the Congress intended.

If you didn't think the study could be operational within 2 years, we should have been informed. What good will it do for us to have it in 4 years? Also do we know how many thousands of dollars it is going cost at this point, for the whole thing, including the longitudinal evaluation of the nutrition program and the rest of the study?

Mr. BENEDICT. Mr. Chairman, we will be happy to provide the information that you have requested and we will give you an indication of the cost of those studies.

[Subsequent to the hearing, Mr. Benedict supplied the following material:]

STUDIES AND REPORTS
 REQUIRED BY 1978 AMENDMENTS
 (P. L. 95-478)

June 1, 1980

Page one

Study Required	Statutory Deadline	Commitment to date	Recipient of Grant or Contract	Scope of Grantee's or Contractor's Assignment	Due Date	Possibility That AOA Will Meet Deadline
Report on effectiveness of legal services programs and analysis of need for separate program of legal services under the Act. (Sec. 206(b))	Sept. 30, 1980	\$334,697	Contract Research Corporation	Survey of legal and ombudsman services in 54 planning and service areas, with reference to such concerns as the extent of Title III, Part B funding of legal services and availability and accessibility of these services, the factors which encourage and discourage the development and funding of legal services, the range of services being provided and the conditions under which provided, and the relationship between Title III legal services and the Legal Services Corporation program.	Preliminary findings of survey due 9-30-80; final project report due 11-30-80	Will file report before deadline on basis of available information; and will provide supplementary information later, based on final project report.
Assessment of personnel needs in the field of aging. (Sec. 402)	Sept. 30, 1980 & biennially thereafter	None--To Be Determined	None--To Be Selected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o conceptualization of aging manpower supply and demand, including an examination of health, social services, and other existing manpower systems that impact the field of aging o analysis of existing data sources that describe and project demand for services and utilization of manpower o inventory and analysis of Federal programs affecting supply and demand of manpower in the field of aging o analysis of selected issues impacting supply and demand o assessment of existing manpower monitoring systems and recommendation on establishment of one for aging o involvement of outside organizations and institutions as advisors and critics of issue papers and reports as provided by legislation 	Results of analysis due 18 mos. following award of contract	Will complete and file first report before end of FY 1980 and will file biennial assessments thereafter. Commissioner has formed an inter-departmental working group on manpower in the field of aging, with representatives of some 20 Federal departments or agencies. The first report to Congress will present activities of AOA in manpower to date, recent policies, issues raised by the Congressional requirement, and plans for the next several years.

STUDIES AND REPORTS
REQUIRED BY 1978 AMENDMENTS
(P. L. 95-478)

June 1, 1980

Page two

Study Required	Statutory Deadline	Commitment to date	Recipient of Grant or Contract	Scope of Grantee's or Contractor's Assignment	Due Date	Possibility That AoA Will Meet Deadline
Study and report on problems in providing transportation services to elderly, with recommendations. (Sec. 411(b)(1))	Oct. 18, 1980	\$ 148,948	Institute of Public Administration	Insurance problems; transportation coordination; statutory and regulatory issues; impact of various transportation acts; budget problems of projects; and personnel, management, and operating problems.	Preliminary findings due 9-30-80; final project report due 10-30-80	Will report on basis of available information before deadline; and will provide supplementary information later, based on final project report.
Revising Federal transportation programs for the elderly to promote comprehensiveness and coordination. (Sec. 411(b)(2))	Oct. 18, 1980	\$149,920	Urban Institute	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Examine the efficiency of alternative approaches to providing transportation for the elderly; o Explore existing barriers to coordination; o Evaluate the potential net gains of increased coordination; and o Develop specific recommendations for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of transportation services for the elderly 	Preliminary findings, 9-30-80; final project report, 10-30-80.	Will file report before deadline on basis of available information; and will provide supplementary information later, based upon final project report
Differences in unit costs, service delivery, and access between rural areas and urban areas for services assisted under the Act, and the special needs of the elderly residing in rural areas. (Sec. 411(b)(3). (Phase I))	Oct. 18, 1980	\$ 4,590	Gerald Smith (Consultant)	Studying and reporting on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Current and past AoA projects on rural elderly; o Readily available reporting data; and o Research literature on rural-urban elderly. 	June, 1980	Will file report before deadline on basis of available information; supplementary information to be filed later.
Differences in cost, services, access - urban and rural areas (Phase II)	Oct. 18, 1980	None--about \$250,000 commitment planned	To be selected by August, 1980	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Completing review of the literature; o Analyzing secondary (existing) data; o Resolving methodological problems; and o Proposing the design of the survey 	(Request for proposal in contracts office; final report due about 4-1-81)	Will file report before deadline on basis of available information; supplementary information to be filed later.

STUDIES AND REPORTS
REQUIRED BY 1978 AMENDMENTS
(P. L. 95-478)

June 1, 1980

Page three

Study Required	Statutory Deadline	Commitment to date	Recipient of Grant or Contract	Scope of Grantee's or Contractor's Assignment	Due Date	Possibility That Aoa Will Meet Deadline
Differences in costs, services access - urban and rural areas (Phase III)	Oct. 18, 1980	None	To be selected (in July, 1981)	Sample survey of service providers and the elderly, to obtain primary data on unit costs, service delivery, and access between rural and urban areas and special needs of the elderly.	Request for proposal being drafted; final report due about 4-1-81)	Will file report before deadline on basis of available information; and will provide supplementary information later, based upon final project report.
Other studies pertinent to urban/rural differences	Oct. 18, 1980	\$411,062	Kirschner Associates, Inc.	Nutrition systems study, resulting in information on meal costs, controlled for nutritional and microbiological content.	4-1-81	Will file report before deadline, based on available information; supplementary information to be filed later.
Other studies pertinent to urban/rural differences	Oct. 18, 1980	None to date; amount to be determined	To be selected (by Dec. 31, 1980)	Area planning and social services evaluation, containing data on rural-urban differences in social services.	About 4-1-82	Will file report before deadline, based on available info; supplementary info to be filed later.
Development of procedures for identifying elderly, blind, and disabled who need social services, compiling lists of available services, and establishing information and referral services. (Sec. 421(c)(1))	Sept. 30, 1979	\$250,000 for FY 1980; additional amount planned for 2d year of project (FY 1981)	Ohio State School for the Deaf Alumni Association, Inc.	All of the concerns outlined in the mandated report are addressed through the channeling agency demonstrations. In addition, Aoa has undertaken a study to examine the specific options related to the deaf and blind. The report will combine the findings of both efforts.	About 9-30-81	AOA provided response to Chairmen of Senate and House subcommittees in Nov., 1979 will issue preliminary report before end of FY 1980 and provide more information later.

STUDIES AND REPORTS
 REQUIRED FY 1978 AMENDMENTS
 (P. L. 95-478)

Study Required	Statutory Deadline	Commitment to date	Recipient of Grant or Contract	Scope of Grantee's or Contractor's Assignment	Due Date	Possibility That AoA Will Meet Deadline
Special Projects in Comprehensive Long-Term Care. (Sec. 422).	Reports to be filed annually	None to date \$11,000,000 to be awarded in FY 1980	To be selected, (By Sept. 30, 1980) *	<p>Grants and contracts will require:</p> <p>Development and implementation of up to four-teen channeling demonstration projects, each with a unit or agency of State government as the contractor and with 1 or 2 local sites as subcontractors.</p> <p>Design and implementation of a national evaluation to determine the effects of channeling projects.</p> <p>Technical assistance contract to assist channeling demonstration projects (local community sites) in development and implementation of client assessment and case management functions.</p> <p>Long-term care system development grants to States, to enable them to plan for and develop more effective methods for coordinating and managing long-term care at the State level--especially the inter-relationship between the Title XIX, Title XX and Aging programs.</p> <p>Scope of AoA discretionary projects to be determined. They will be various demonstration projects or studies relating to the improvement of long-term care services for the functionally incapacitated elderly.</p>	1983 to 1985 (Project duration for all projects is for 3 years, with option for two year extension.)	Will file initial annual report before end of FY 1980 and annually thereafter as required by law.

*Another \$5,400,000 for long-term care activities is provided under other Older Americans Act authorities.

Senator DOMENICI. How much do you expect the unit cost evaluation to cost at this point? How much do you think you are going to spend to get the whole thing finished?

Mr. WHITE. The nutrition study will cost, I think, \$411,000. That is all that it should cost, barring some catastrophe. It will certainly include a cost study. However, it is more than a rural-urban study because we have to look at other questions. As I said, it is a massive study. It will be completed in time for the discussion on the act.

The first phase of the rural-urban study involves one person onboard for some time. It will probably cost \$5,000 or \$10,000. A second phase of that contract will include considerable data, and we certainly will provide you with some use of that information, will cost around \$250,000. We have not gotten an estimate of what a third phase continuing study would cost because it will be based upon the methodology to be developed in the second phase. We do not know exactly what will have to be done or what can be effectively done to obtain the needed information on comparative unit costs. As I pointed out, it is an area that, not only for aging but in most areas, is extremely difficult to study so we tried earlier to get someone who had a lot of expertise in this work to sit down and help us develop the approach. I don't know how much the third phase will cost. The area agency study, which does more than try to look at urban areas as they operate probably will cost around a half million dollars.

Mr. BENEDICT. Mr. Chairman, the difference between 15 studies and 20 studies is that the latter includes also a series of studies that the Congress requested the Federal Council on Aging to conduct. These studies are being done jointly by the Federal Council on Aging and the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. They are being funded by AoA.

Senator DOMENICI. We are aware of that. You are right, it may be 15, it may be 20. We were including the Federal Council on Aging studies.

Senator Cohen, do you have any questions?

Senator COHEN. Just a couple, Mr. Chairman.

There is not much more I can add to the tone and tenor of these particular proceedings, but let me offer an observation that part of the frustration you should feel coming from this committee is because the members are rather frustrated. I can give you an example of why we are frustrated; it concerns HEW's development of home health care standards. HEW was about 6 months late, as I recall—and it cost nearly \$60,000 to come up with a study that said absolutely nothing. HEW said that we don't have the money to address the kinds of standards that you—Congress—are talking about. So we waited 6 months for the department to come up with a study that said absolutely nothing.

For the first time, as I recall, since the Civil War, the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate rejected a report submitted by the executive branch. That has not happened since the Civil War. It went relatively unnoticed, but I think reflects the feeling of elected officials.

As I sit here and listen to the testimony, your answer to Senator Burdick is, no, the discussions about the complications and the

complexity of matters that have to be studied notwithstanding. The answer is, no, we won't have that information available by the time it becomes necessary for us to legislate.

All of this raises the question of why we bother to legislate. Senator Domenici has raised a valid point. If in fact, we are appropriating money which is not going to be productive for the purposes we intend, perhaps we should not allow that appropriation to continue. It raises a valid point.

I am concerned that you say we needed this expertise which we didn't have. You indicated that you just hired an expert, a consultant, and it sounded as if these people were hard to come by. Yet according to page 2 of your statement the contracts were awarded, at least for the transportation study, to the Institute for Public Administration and the Urban Institute. These are not exactly fledgling institutions. They have expertise, which is rather well known. The question raised is why the delay? Why was the contract not awarded sooner?

Senator Pryor touched on a subject that is sensitive. That is the so-called hurry up spending which has been taking place throughout the administration. We have held hearings in the Governmental Affairs Committee and found that many agencies wait until the final quarter of the fiscal year. Then suddenly, they have a virtually a floodtide of contracts being awarded during that final month and sometimes even the final weeks of that particular quarter in order to use up their budgets.

So we are touching on a lot of different subjects. One, why the delay? Yes, I recognize that it is a complicated subject, but I assume the complexity is doubled because of time delays. Had you started earlier, you would not be faced with the kind of time pressures we have, which only compound the complexity of the task.

I would like to know how many job slots are allotted to your office, the Administration on Aging. How many job slots under the law do you have now?

Mr. BENEDICT. The total number of positions central and regional?

Senator COHEN. Yes.

Mr. BENEDICT. For AoA, there are a total of 246 in the central and regional offices. Less than half are in our regional offices. I can give you a detailed breakout of the staff.

Senator COHEN. Could you do that, please? There has been some suggestion that perhaps some of those 246 slots in fact have been preempted or delegated or transferred to other parts of your bureaucracy.

Mr. BENEDICT. Those 246 slots, Senator, are all assigned to the Administration on Aging, either to its central or its regional offices.

Senator COHEN. And there are no other departments or agencies or divisions within the Office of Human Development Services which have taken those jobs?

Mr. BENEDICT. Not any of those 246, no, sir.

Senator COHEN. Are you saying that today you have the maximum number of positions available, 246 slots?

Mr. BENEDICT. I would say that, since 1972, when the act started to expand both in scope and scale of responsibilities and resources, AoA has not received any significant increase in staff. Like other Federal agencies AoA is operating on a complement today which is no larger than, or perhaps smaller than, what it had back in 1972 or 1973. This does present difficulties to all Federal agencies. In addition, AoA has over the years, acquired numerous sets of new responsibilities, for example, individual discretionary programs, oversight responsibility, and a review and comment role regarding the regulations of Federal agencies whose programs affect the elderly.

Senator COHEN. You don't have the manpower necessary to keep up with the mandate, is that in essence what you are saying?

Mr. BENEDICT. Yes.

Senator COHEN. We are giving you too many mandates, and you cannot simply fill those mandates on time?

Mr. BENEDICT. I think that is part of the problem. I think in this particular instance the mandated studies came simultaneously with the major changes in title III, the new title VI, the new long-term care responsibilities, and so forth. Congress asked for these 20 studies and placed other specific requirements on our discretionary programs at a time when there were no additional funds available. We were obliged to make a very careful examination of anything that was currently being funded to decide what activities we were going to eliminate so that we could carry out these new mandates.

Senator COHEN. Do you feel it would be important for your agency or department, but others as well, to come before members of this committee and say, "You are asking too much"? I have often thought that we have too many laws that go unenforced or too many laws that are overenforced. In either case, it breeds contempt. So, if you cannot really fulfill certain mandates either because of a lack of manpower, money, or whatever, you are only contributing to this kind of cynicism toward the law.

It seems to me that somebody ought to be telling us that we give you too much to do and not enough money to do it or telling us that you simply cannot undertake that study. That course is better than to come before this committee 18 months later, as we are about to be faced with more legislation in this field and saying, "I am sorry, we cannot give you the information with which you can make an intelligent and informed decision."

It appears that all we are doing is spinning our wheels saying that we are doing things on behalf of the elderly but in reality just passing laws which are not going to be fulfilled. I think this is the very worst situation. Perhaps we should cut down the size of the legislation and require just one or two studies rather than 21. We need some direction from you saying, Senator Domenici, Senator Pryor, Senator Chiles, we cannot possibly undertake all of that so please identify the ones you most want.

Mr. BENEDICT. I think the request of the chairman that AoA identify the specific mandated studies, time frames, and dollar requirements affords that opportunity to raise those kinds of issues. I also think that there are times when rather than study the issues to death we have to examine the information we have available and try to find ways to let that wisdom guide us.

Senator COHEN. For example, why don't you just say in response to Senator Burdick, we are not going to furnish that study in time for you to legislate. Why not say, in response to Senator Domenici, we cannot possibly get that information together. Frankly, it might be in the best interest of the taxpayer to simply deauthorize further funding for this program because it really is not going to be very productive, informative, or available in time.

Mr. BENEDICT. Senator, I would hate to say flatly that there won't be information, because there are a number of studies that have been conducted and are being conducted that can give us useful, relevant information. The results of those studies will be available to you. If that information turns out to be deficient, the Congress can make judgments about other activities which can and should be deferred or terminated. I would be reluctant to suggest that we not proceed with some of the longer range determinations because they have great potential for providing us much-needed information.

Senator COHEN. Just two final points, Mr. Chairman.

You will submit a breakdown on the 246 slots you have available within the administration—the regional versus central offices—and certify that those positions are not being used by any other department?

Mr. BENEDICT. Yes, sir, that can be done.

[Subsequent to the hearing, Mr. Benedict supplied the following material:]

The permanent ceiling for the Washington office of AoA is 118; 8 of AoA's slots are assigned to the Federal Council on the Aging; and the combined ceiling for the 10 regional offices is 120; however, 5 of the regional slots have been shifted temporarily to the Washington office (increasing the ceiling to 123) in order to carry out AoA's long-term care responsibilities.

Administration on Aging central office staff¹

<i>Grade</i>	<i>Title</i>
Commissioner's office:	
EX-101-V	Commissioner.
GS-318-8	Secretary.
ES-301-4	Deputy Commissioner.
GS-318-8	Secretary.
GS-301-15	Special assistant.
GS-101-14	Special assistant (minority affairs).
GS-345-13	Special assistant (operations).
GS-301-6	Clerical assistant.
GS-301-5	Do.
GS-301-13	Special assistant.
GS-301-7	Administrative aide.
GS-301-6	Correspondence contract assistant (typing).
GS-301-5	Clerk assistant (printing regulations).
GS-341-13	Administrative officer.
Office of Management and Policy Control:	
GS-345-15	Director.
GS-301-7	Staff assistant.
Division of Policy Control and Planning:	
GS-301-6	Clerical assistant.
GS-345-14	Director, policy analysis staff.
GS-345-13	Program analyst.
GS-301-12	Legislative reference specialist.
GS-345-12	Program analyst.
GS-301-6	Clerical assistant (typing).
GS-345-12	Program analyst.

¹ Excludes staff assigned to the Federal Council on the Aging, temporary and permanent part-time employees, and staff on temporary assignment to AoA.

Division of Management and Budget:	
GS-345-14	Director (program analyst officer).
GS-301-6	Program assistant (typing).
GS-560-13	Budget analyst.
GS-345-13	Program analyst.
GS-560-11	Budget analyst.
GS-322-4	Clerk (typing).
Office of Program Development:	
GS-101-15	Associate Commissioner.
GS-318-7	Secretary (typing).
Division of State and Community Planning:	
GS-101-14	Supervisor, aging services program specialist.
GS-101-13	Acting services program specialist.
GS-101-13	Do.
GS-318-6	Clerical assistant (typing).
GS-322-4	Clerk-typist.
Division of Services Development:	
GS-101-15	Supervisory specialist on aging.
GS-101-14	Aging services program specialist.
GS-101-13	Do.
GS-101-13	Program analyst.
GS-101-13	Do.
GS-101-12	Do.
GS-301-6	Clerical assistant.
GS-322-4	Clerk-typist.
Office of Program Operations:	
ES-340-16	Associate Commissioner.
GS-340-15	Deputy Associate Commissioner.
GS-301-7	Staff assistant (typing).
Division of Operating Management:	
GS-345-14	Program analysis officer.
GS-345-13	Program analyst.
GS-345-13	Aging services program specialist.
GS-345-12	Do.
GS-345-11	Program analyst.
GS-318-5	Secretary.
GS-322-4	Clerk-typist.
Division of Operations Analysis:	
GS-345-14	Program analysis officer.
GS-345-13	Program analyst.
GS-345-12	Do.
GS-345-12	Do.
GS-322-5	Clerk-typist.
GS-322-4	Do.
Office of Research, Development, and Evaluation:	
GS-101-15	Associate Commissioner for R.D. & E.
GS-301-7	Staff assistant.
GS-322-4	Clerk-typist.
Division of Research and Evaluation:	
GS-101-15	Supervisor, social scientific research analyst.
GS-101-14	Program analysis officer (acting chief, R. & E. Division).
GS-101-13	Social scientific research analyst.
GS-101-13	Do.
GS-101-13	Do.
GS-101-13	Do.
GS-101-13	Do.
GS-101-13	Do.
GS-301-6	Clerical assistant.
GS-322-4	Clerk-typist.
Model Projects and Demonstration Staff:	
GS-101-15	Supervisor, social scientific research analyst.
GS-101-11	Social scientific research analyst.
GS-101-13	Do.
GS-101-13	Do.

GS-101-13.....	Do.
GS-322-5.....	Clerk-typist.
GS-322-4.....	Do.
Long-Term Care Staff:	
GS-101-15.....	Supervisor, social scientific research analyst.
GS-101-13.....	Social scientific research analyst.
GS-101-13.....	Do.
GS-101-13.....	Do.
GS-101-13.....	Do.
GS-322-5.....	Secretary (typing).
GS-322-4.....	Clerk-typist.
Office of Education and Training:	
GS-340-15.....	Associate Commissioner for E. & T.
GS-301-7.....	Staff assistant.
GS-322-4.....	Clerk-typist.
Division of Education and Career Preparation:	
GS-101-14.....	Social scientific research analyst.
GS-101-13.....	Do.
GS-101-13.....	Do.
GS-101-13.....	Do.
GS-301-6.....	Clerical assistant.
Division of Continuing Education and Training:	
GS-101-14.....	Supervisor, social scientific analyst.
GS-101-13.....	Social scientific research analyst.
GS-101-13.....	Do.
GS-101-11.....	Do.
GS-301-5.....	Administrative clerk (steno).
National Clearinghouse (office level):	
GS-101-15.....	Director.
GS-301-7.....	Staff assistant (typing).
GS-301-5.....	Correspondence contract clerk.
Service Center for Aging Information:	
GS-1412-14.....	Director (supervisor, technical information specialist).
GS-1412-12.....	Technical information specialist.
GS-1412-11.....	Do.
Public Inquiries Staff:	
GS-101-14.....	Social scientific program analyst.
GS-101-12.....	Do.
GS-1001-11.....	Public inquiry specialist.
GS-301-9.....	Do.
GS-301-5.....	Public inquiry assistant.
GS-1001-9.....	Public inquiry specialist.
GS-322-3.....	Clerk-typist.
Statistical Analysis Staff:	
GS-1530-14.....	Supervisor, statistics (social scientific).
GS-1530-13.....	Statistics (social scientific).
GS-301-9.....	Data analyst.
Office of Public Information:	
GS-1081-14.....	Director, public information specialist.
GS-318-6.....	Secretary (typing).
GS-1082-13.....	Writer-editor.
GS-1081-13.....	Public information specialist.
GS-1081-12.....	Do.
GS-1082-9.....	Writer-editor (printed media).
GS-322-4.....	Clerk-typist.
Regional Staff Data:	
Region I:	
15-101-7.....	Regional program director.
14-101-6.....	Supervisor program specialist.
13-101-7.....	Program specialist.
13-101-5.....	Do.
12-101-6.....	Do.
12-101-4.....	Nutrition specialist.
12-101-2.....	Program specialist.
12-101-4.....	Grants management specialist.
6-318-4.....	Secretary (stenographer).

5-322-5	Clerk-typist.
4-322-4	Do.
Region II:	
15-101-7	Regional program director.
14-101-6	Supervisor, program specialist.
11-101-2	Program specialist.
12-101-6	Do.
12-101-8	Nutrition specialist.
12-101-1	Program specialist.
13-101-6	Do.
12-101-6	Do.
12-101-3	Financial management specialist.
11-101-2	Program specialist.
12-101-2	Do.
7-101-8	Financial management specialist.
5-312-4	Clerk-typist.
Region III:	
15-101-1	Regional program director.
13-101-6	Supervisor, program specialist.
13-101-6	Program specialist.
12-101-9	Financial management specialist.
13-101-2	Program specialist.
12-101-4	Do.
12-101-4	Do.
12-101-	Do.
12-101-6	Nutrition specialist.
7-301-	Administrative assistant.
6-318-9	Secretary (stenographer).
5-318-2	Clerk (stenographer).
Region IV:	
15-101-6	Regional program director.
14-101-7	Program specialist.
14-501-5	Supervisor, financial management specialist.
13-101-6	Supervisor, program specialist.
13-501-7	Financial management specialist.
13-501-8	Do.
12-101-4	Program specialist.
12-101-7	Do.
12-101-5	Do.
12-101-2	Do.
12-101-4	Do.
12-101-5	Do.
4-301-10	Clerk-typist.
Region V:	
15-101-6	Regional program director.
13-101-5	Supervisor, program specialist.
12-601-6	Nutrition specialist.
12-101-2	Program specialist.
13-101-2	Do.
12-101	Do.
12-501	Financial management specialist.
12-101-10	Program specialist.
12-101	Financial management specialist.
12-101-1	Program specialist.
12-101-1	Do.
15-318-1	Secretary.
Region VI:	
15-101-7	Regional program director.
13-101-3	Aging services program specialist.
13-101-2	Do.
12-101-4	Do.
12-101-5	Do.
12-101-5	Do.
12-101-10	Do.
12-101-1	Do.
9-101-8	Do.
5-301-3	Aging services clerk-typist.
5-301-4	Do.

Region VII:	
15-101	Regional program director.
14-101-5	Supervisor, program specialist.
13-101-10	Program specialist.
13-101-1	Do.
13-601-2	Nutrition specialist.
12-101-2	Program specialist.
12-501-2	Financial management specialist.
5-322-4	Clerk-typist.
12-101-2	Program specialist.
12-101-2	Do.
5-322-4	Clerk-typist.
Region VIII:	
14-101-7	Regional program director.
13-601-2	Nutrition specialist.
12-101-4	Program specialist.
12-101-4	Do.
13-101-1	Do.
12-101-3	Do.
12-101-3	Do.
12-101-5	Do.
9-101-1	Do.
4-318-10	Secretary.
4-318-10	Do.
12-101-2	Program specialist.
Region IX:	
14-101-4	Regional program director.
13-101-5	Program specialist.
12-101-4	Do.
12-101-4	Do.
13-101-5	Do.
12-101-1	Do.
12-101-1	Do.
9-101-2	Do.
12-501-1	Financial management specialist.
6-318-5	Secretary (stenographer).
3-322-2	Clerk-typist.
Region X:	
14-101-6	Regional program director.
13-101-7	Program specialist.
13-101-3	Do.
13-101-1	Do.
12-510-6	Financial management specialist.
12-101-6	Program specialist.
6-303-7	Secretary (stenographer).
4-318	Clerk-typist.
4-322-10	Secretary (steno) (part-time).

Senator COHEN. Second, with respect to supplying the information to Senator Domenici, could you also include what percentage of your budget as far as the awarding of contracts, basically what percent of your budget is spent during the final quarter of the fiscal year?

Mr. BENEDICT. That will be done also.

[Subsequent to the hearing, Mr. Benedict supplied the following material:]

*Administration on Aging expenditures of discretionary program funds,
fiscal year 1979¹*

	<i>Percent spent in fourth quarter</i>
Grants	63
Contracts	34
Fiscal year 1979 totals	62

¹ Includes research, training, demonstration, and evaluation activities.

Senator COHEN. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DOMENICI. Senator Burdick.

Senator BURDICK. I have a couple of short questions.

Senator DOMENICI. Yes.

Senator BURDICK. As you know, the 1978 amendments called on the Administration of Aging to develop a national manpower policy for the field of aging. Have your policy plans included health manpower in geriatrics?

Mr. BENEDICT. With respect to the development of a national manpower policy, Senator, we are in the midst of preparing a report as required by the Congress to be available this fall, we believe October. We will be looking at the history of manpower development, in the field of aging. We will specify in the report those activities currently underway and also indicate what further steps could be taken, with the guidance of the Congress, to complete work on a national manpower policy in the field of aging.

AoA is particularly concerned about manpower in the area of health and long-term care and there are three or four specific initiatives underway in that regard. We are working today with 22 universities, with medical schools, with part of the effort being to begin to refocus training in the area of chronic impairment in long-term care. It is an involved, collective effort. All of those universities, the medical schools, public administration schools, and social welfare schools will begin to do multidisciplinary training for full cadres of professionals in that area.

Second, in this instance we were delighted to discover that the Rand Corp. sometime ago had initiated a significant study of health and manpower needs in the area of long-term care. They have been gracious enough to share that preliminary report with us and have some very excellent information in it with regard to training of manpower in the health care area, including physicians. So we will meet the requirement for a report in October. In addition to that there will be a series of ongoing reports that are related to this area.

Senator BURDICK. Have you coordinated your work on this with the National Institute on Aging or the Bureau of Health Manpower?

Mr. BENEDICT. Yes, by all means. We are coordinating these activities with the National Institute on Aging, with the Veterans' Administration, the Health Resources Administration, and with the Health Care Financing Administration, particularly relating to the development of multidisciplinary training for health care providers and our work with these 22 universities. We are exploring additional ways in which we can coordinate and collaborate in our efforts.

Senator BURDICK. The Health Manpower and Nurses Training Acts are being reauthorized this year. Do you have any input into the President's health manpower proposals as they affect the health care of the elderly?

Mr. BENEDICT. We have not had specific input into that report.

Senator BURDICK. Well, I hope you can find some way to get into it.

That is all. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DOMENICI. Thank you, Senator Burdick.

Senator Melcher.

Senator MELCHER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wonder how much of the study will be surveys of the literature. What proportion will be based on actual field surveys and interviews?

Mr. BENEDICT. The preliminary studies will involve an examination of studies which have been completed. The preliminary studies themselves will not involve a specific survey.

Mr. WHITE. Let me cite a third kind of study because I think it is important. One kind of study would look at the printed document, a second type would be the kind of field study you are talking about, and the third type is to go to the information that people have collected in the field and reanalyze it for what we want. An example would be a very large number of rural and urban places, to use the worst instance, conduct studies to find out about the needs and services of older people. You, yourself, received a short report from GAO on three of those studies. We hope to be able to expand that and to look at a number of those studies so we will have the advantage of field data. We will look at this secondary data in some depth.

Senator MELCHER. Well, will any part of this study be done in a rural hard-weather area like Montana?

Mr. BENEDICT. I cannot say exactly where.

Mr. WHITE. We have looked at a lot of places. Most of our studies that we have done in terms of evaluation and research have gone into a large number and different kinds of areas.

The one I think of is the nutrition evaluation where they tried to get to the site but after they traveled 5 miles they found that they had to go 5 more miles of nonroad to get there. We have always tried to get into as many different kinds of areas as we can, including the kinds of areas that are hard to get to. In this study, of course, we have to depend, somewhat, on where people have been before, but we know that many studies are pretty widely spread in terms of kinds of areas involved.

Senator MELCHER. Well, what are you going to do then to be sure that you do look at areas like that?

By the way, I don't know what this reference is to the 5 miles of foreign roads within 5 miles of nonroad before you get to the nutrition center. It is one individual?

Mr. WHITE. I used that as an example, I guess. The fact is that when we selected the nutrition sites we worked very hard to make sure that we would have all areas of the country covered. We selected the sites in such a way that we ended up with 91 sites in 40 States and we have worked very hard at reaching the kinds of areas that you mentioned because we know how easy it is to skip over these and it is easier not to interview them. So we have pushed the contractors to make sure that sites of the type that you are mentioning are covered and we consider that a very high priority.

Senator MELCHER. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I have a statement which I ask unanimous consent be inserted in the hearing record.

Senator DOMENICI. Without objection.

[The statement of Senator Melcher follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN MELCHER

Montana is a big State. Its size makes long trips commonplace and its winter weather can make even short trips treacherous. For those who are seriously ill, reliable transportation can mean the difference between a return to the backyard or a place in the graveyard. For those who are elderly, travel—any kind of travel in winter—becomes an event, not just to get something done, but to look forward to and to plan.

A study of transportation for the elderly published 5 years ago by HEW, hit the nail on the head when it said, "what may not be so widely recognized is the importance of transportation itself as an activity." The report went on to observe that "transportation for the elderly needs to be provided not purely for getting from here to there but also as an antidote for the entire process of aging."

When the HEW report was published in 1975, people who were long accustomed to buying gas at 30 cents a gallon were already paying 50 cents. By the end of this year, they may be paying \$1.50. Those prices matched to Montana's geography and its weather can mean special trouble for the seniors in my State.

When I am home elderly people talk to me about transportation. They tell me how hard it can be to get to the doctor or the drugstore or to church. They worry about getting to senior centers and to nutrition sites for their meals. I am encouraged by the development by the insurance industry of a new category for service vehicles. If this finally works out as hoped, it will mean insurance protection will at least be available and at reasonable rates.

Still, it isn't just the travel within a city or town that concerns the elderly. They also worry about their ability to make longer trips. The Amtrak Reauthorization Act provided a 25-percent discount anytime on any train when the one-way coach fare is \$40 or more. That's fine. But because of the cutbacks in Amtrak routes, that discount will be small comfort to a senior denied access to a train in the first place. I have been fighting to maintain adequate rail service in Montana. I will keep at it. But when I go back and reread that 1975 HEW report on transportation for the elderly, I find the statement that "rail services have been sharply curtailed, further aggravating the isolation of many rural communities." That's 5 years ago and even then there was talk about cutbacks in service. I am afraid in those 5 years, we have gone backward rather than coming forward.

Before finishing my remarks I want to make one last reference to that 1975 study. It was conducted by the Institute of Public Administration under a grant from the Administration on Aging. Although it discussed projects for rural transportation in Missouri, Klamath Falls, Oreg., and southeastern Ohio, it did not focus on the needs of the rural elderly to an extent I found especially useful for my own State.

Because of the new study's provision for sharper focus on rural issues, I take a very keen interest in it. Regardless of the States the members of this committee represent, all of us have a very sound idea of what those problems are. In a State where any town over 2,500 in population is considered urban, Montana is 47 percent rural. So I am hopeful the new study will not attempt to reinvent the wheel. I don't want to see old proposals dressed up in new language. I don't want this study to be just something to routinely satisfy statutory requirements. As serious, as the problems were in 1975, they are far more critical today. I will be looking for useful data, innovation, and solid guidance on what Congress might do next. I strongly hope the committee will not end up being disappointed the way we were with the original home-health study.

Senator DOMENICI. Thank you, Senator Melcher.

Commissioner, I have just a few questions and then I am going to go to the budget hearings. Senator Pryor also has a few more questions, so I would appreciate it if he could stay and continue the hearing.

As a followup to Senator Cohen's request for information, would you provide the committee with a list of the AoA slots that are filled by non-AoA personnel, including OHDS personnel?

Mr. BENEDICT. Mr. Chairman, I can provide you easily the list of positions assigned to the Administration on Aging. A number of personnel in the Office of Human Development Services do provide support to the Administration on Aging. It may be difficult to document the nature and scope of that support item by item but

we will provide you with our best estimates. For example, we receive assistance and support from the OHDS Grants and Contracts Office and from the OHDS Personnel Office. They do centralized work for us. It would be difficult to determine precisely what percentage of their efforts support AoA but we will certainly try.

Senator DOMENICI. Well, could you now, to the best of your ability, provide us with information as to those that are not directly in AoA slots which you feel are providing assistance to you?

Mr. BENEDICT. We can certainly describe the assistance that the Office of Human Development Services provides to support the work of the Administration on Aging.

Senator DOMENICI. Can you do that by showing percentages?

Mr. BENEDICT. We will make an effort to give you a reasonable analysis of that.

[Subsequent to the hearing, Mr. Benedict supplied the following material:]

Data in the HDS work measurement system indicates that approximately the following person-year equivalents are devoted annually to performing the respective services specifically for AoA:

Headquarters:

Grants processing and management	5.3
Contracts processing and management.....	2.1
Personnel services	2.5
Administrative services.....	1.7
Budget and financial management.....	1.9
Data processing services	1.6
Management analysis services.....	1.0
Correspondence tracking and control.....	1.9
Public affairs/information services	2.8
Legislative affairs/liaison	0.2

Regional offices:

Grants processing and management (15 person-weeks/year/RO)	2.8
General administrative management (1 person-year/year/RO)	11.3

The work measurement system data-base does not contain specific information on time devoted to the following functions, but the annual person-year equivalents indicated have been estimated from figures on similar or related functions and by projecting from data recently collected on RSA support efforts and applying factors to those figures derived from the relative efforts devoted to RSA and AoA for functions which are contained in the data-base:

Headquarters:

Policy development coordination	0.8
Long-range planning services	2.8
Data systems design services	0.8
Headquarters total	23.1
Regional office total	14.1
Grand total	37.2

The information in the work measurement data base was collected for a 12-month period in 1977 and 1978 through statistical sampling techniques which yielded a predicted accuracy of +20 percent at the 80 percent confidence level. While the data might seem outdated at this time, its continued accuracy has been recently corroborated by a high degree of conformity with support estimates which were painstakingly collected and arrived at in the past few months in preparation for the transfer of overhead positions to the Department of Education along with RSA and other HDS programs for the disabled.

Senator DOMENICI. Commissioner, with reference to the whole tenor of this hearing this morning about the long delays, the apparent burdens that you have between direct consulting staffs, mandates, let me get back to the one that concerns me the most. As of this morning the final regulations on title III, the real heart of the Older Americans Act, as amended, are not yet published. We

have nonetheless been spending the full amount of money that the Congress has appropriated for the act which is approximately \$750 million a year. Isn't this correct?

Mr. BENEDICT. Something less than that, yes.

Senator DOMENICI. Whatever the amount is, it has been spent by various units of Government, and public and private agencies to deliver services to senior citizens for 18 months without new regulations.

Mr. BENEDICT. Senator, when the act was passed and signed by the President in October 1978 the act took immediate effect. Within 3 months' time an analysis of the act had been conducted. Each State submitted a series of amendments to its State plan which brought them into full compliance by January 1979.

Senator DOMENICI. Full compliance with what?

Mr. BENEDICT. With the new law.

Senator DOMENICI. But not the new regulations necessarily?

Mr. BENEDICT. The Congress did authorize 2 years in which waivers could be given. In 1980, the number of waivers requested had been reduced significantly below the number requested for 1979. We expect all the States to be in full compliance in 1981. There have been a series of processes going on simultaneously; one process focused on the development of the regulation. The second was a series of State plan amendments that brought the States into compliance with the amended legislation. The third was the development of guidance, the new State plan format, the new area plan format, and new reporting systems. All of these processes have been going on simultaneously. A major part of the effort is to assist the States to be in full compliance by the beginning of fiscal year 1981.

Frankly, I want to commend the States for doing a rather extraordinary job in consolidation and in carrying out the full range of new responsibilities. While the changes in the rules were being developed, AoA, the States, and the area agencies were all working together to achieve complete compliance. They have been doing it very, very well.

Senator DOMENICI. Let me just ask you two questions, Commissioner. Based on the act as it was passed, and assuming good management, were there any reasons for the 18-month delay that were unacceptable to you but beyond your influence? And if we were to ask you why did it take so long and you were permitted to divulge everything that occurred—you don't have to here this morning—and if you had full support from everyone required, is it unreasonable for us to have expected the regulations to be promulgated much sooner than 18 months?

Mr. BENEDICT. Given the extraordinary set of changes in the act, given the heavy new responsibilities assigned to the States and to local agencies, and the enormous interest of the staffs on the Hill, within the administration, and among the diverse array of State and local groups, it is not surprising that development of the regulations took time. We had to work out, issue by issue, the concerns and interests of all those involved.

I think we all would have liked to have seen the title III regulations published sooner. However, I think the complicated nature of some of the legislative changes, the normal anxieties and fears that

come when you consolidate hundreds and hundreds of programs, and the increased interest in the department itself in strengthening the Older Americans Act as a mechanism for improving services for older people all contributed to the length of the process.

Senator DOMENICI. It seems to me that you are saying that while Congress is the policymaker for the expenditure of the Federal Government's money on this kind of program, that these changes were reluctantly accepted by these diverse groups and therefore confrontations occurred which caused great delay.

Mr. BENEDICT. I think the very special interests of large numbers of agencies and organizations that needed to be sorted out and resolved contributed to the delay. We were always totally committed to implementing the changes that the Congress made. We think they were absolutely fundamental and solid changes. However, we do think that it was incumbent upon us in the process of developing the title III regulations to listen carefully to the States, the area agencies, and the some 25,000 to 30,000 provider organizations and organizations of older people, and to try to resolve each issue in a way which we believe best carried out the intent of Congress. We also wanted to insure that the regulations would encourage the best possible services for older people.

Senator DOMENICI. Nevertheless there has been almost 2 years of full funding under the act before the regulations were final. Do you intend to hold States and local units of government and other delivery entities to these regulations even though you have used various administrative and management tools to approve their use of funds during this 2-year waiting period?

Mr. BENEDICT. Mr. Chairman, the States at all times have been operating under the regulations which were in effect when the 1978 amendments were enacted, except where superseded by those amendments. The States amended their plans as we requested them to do by January 1979 to comply with the 1978 amendments. We will not hold States to requirements that are not in the act. We are interested in helping States develop the most effective program they can for older people.

Senator DOMENICI. Senator Pryor is going to submit the remaining questions that I had. In departing, I just want to say that I do hope you can soon release the pending final regulations on title VI which have to do with the whole new trust for the Indian people. I don't want to go into detail but the questions I am leaving will ask you more about it. I hope you will consider them as seriously as if I had asked them here and respond as forthrightly and as soon as you can.

Mr. BENEDICT. I most certainly will.

Senator PRYOR [presiding]. Without objection, we will have Senator Domenici's questions placed in the record at this time and give you the opportunity for an appropriate response.

Senator Chiles also has several questions he wishes you to respond to.

[The questions from Senators Domenici and Chiles, along with Mr. Benedict's responses, follow:]

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR DOMENICI

Question 1. When will the final regulations for the Title VI: Grants to Indian Tribes program be published?

Response. At this time, we do not have a specific date as to when the title VI regulations will be published. However, the regulations are presently going through final departmental clearance and are expected to be signed very soon.

Question 2. How long will it be before grants will be made to Indian tribes?

Response. We will make grants to Indian tribes under title VI during the month of September.

Question 3. What is the progress on the preapplication and application procedures?

Response. We transmitted preapplications to each of the federally recognized tribes on March 20. To date we have received 119 returns indicating the intent of tribal organizations to apply for funding under title VI. As necessary, we are following up by phone and certified mail with those tribal organizations whose preapplications are incomplete. We plan to send out applications to all eligible tribal organizations who have submitted preapplications within the next month.

Question 4. What criteria are you using to decide how to award title VI funds to Indian tribes?

Response. The basic criteria we are proposing to use in awarding funds to Indian tribes under title VI are the criteria contained in section 604(a) of the act. We will review each application to determine whether it satisfactorily meets the criteria established by the act and regulations. We have established a base award of \$45,000 to each tribal organization that satisfactorily meets such criteria. Any title VI funds which are unobligated through the base award process will be distributed according to other criteria which might include population to be served or other factors which we are presently studying.

Question 5. In providing this opportunity for Indian tribes to apply directly to AoA for funding, it was certainly not our intention that a tribe would receive less services if they opted for a title VI grant than they were receiving under a title III grant. What steps do you plan to take to assure that services under title VI will be of a comparable quality and quantity to those under previous title III funding?

Response. We are including in final title VI regulations a number of the requirements governing quality of service that appear in title III regulations. We are seeking in this manner to assure that the quality of title VI services is comparable to the quality of services provided under title III. As for the quantity of services, the final regulations which are presently under review in the Office of the Secretary, would permit a tribal organization to receive funding under both title II and title VI provided that the tribal organization serve different persons with the funds. We believe this provision in the regulations would respond to your intention.

Question 6. Because of my concern about the burden of excessive and disruptive demands for reporting and paperwork on service providers, I sponsored the provision which became section 212 of the act to require that such requests for information be reviewed and reduced where possible. Would you explain what actions you have taken in this regard?

Response. The new State plan on aging represents a major paperwork reduction for States. The State plan has been developed in a manner which requires that States provide only a minimum of data to the Administration on Aging. Rather than requiring States to provide major amounts of supporting data most requirements are covered by inclusion of assurance statements which reflect the law and regulations.

The State plan on aging is intended to cover a 3-year period; therefore, State agencies must prepare the complete State plan every third year only. In the following 2 years, States are expected to submit to the Administration on Aging an update of this plan. This includes an update of State plan objectives if there have been any changes and a new resource allocation plan. Therefore, the paperwork burden on States will be significantly decreased during these years. In the past it was required that a complete State plan on aging be submitted annually. The 3-year plan process has also been implemented at the area agency level and provides an opportunity for reduction of paperwork at the local level.

Question 7. As you know, section 421(a) of the act requires that you give special consideration to funding demonstration projects which meet the special needs of rural elderly. I am aware of the analysis of rural model projects which you provided to the House Select Committee on Aging Subcommittee on Human Services. Could you please report on the progress of those projects and provide any update on that information since summer 1979?

Response. Of the 23 projects, 15 will be continuing with model project support; for another, model project support will terminate in June but the activity will continue with support from other sources. For six other projects, model project support has expired but each activity is being continued with other support. One was completed and has terminated all activities.

A status report on each project follows:

1. HOUSING AND LIVING ARRANGEMENTS, INCLUDING CONGREGATE HOUSING

"Adult Foster Care Community Living Project," adult foster care program, Catholic Social Services of the Miami Valley, Xenia, Ohio—project continues to be funded until January 14, 1981.

"Elderly Home Repair," Chickasaw Nation Tribal Health Services, Ada, Okla.—this project is due to end on June 30, 1980, with a final report expected by August 1980. The project will continue limited operation beyond the grant period using other funds as available and materials on hand.

"South Dakota Rural Home Repair Project," Greater Missouri Community Development Corp., Pierre, S. Dak.—this project was completed in September 1979.

2. HEALTH AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

"Personal Energy Program for the Elderly," Diocesan Human Relations Services, Inc., Portland, Maine. This project terminated in September 1979. For the following 6 months (until the end of March 1980), the project received funds from the Community Services Administration to provide education and training in accidental hypothermia throughout the State of Maine. Subsequently, the project received notification that it will be receiving additional funds within the next 6 months to establish a center for accidental hypothermia to provide direct services for the rest of the State, and to provide training and technical assistance to 15 organizations representing 20 Northern States for the Community Services Administration.

"Health Education and Social Service/Primary Care Coordination Demonstration Project for a Rural Area," Jefferson County Area Agency on Aging, Brookville, Pa. The grantee on this project has been changed to the North Central Planning & Development Commission, Ridgeway, Pa., and the project has been extended to September 1982.

The MAC Senior Center, Northern Kentucky Mental Health-Mental Retardation Board, Inc., Covington, Ky. This project is scheduled to run until September 28, 1981. They recently received an increase in its own non-AoA budget to enlarge the rural component.

"Adult Restorative Services," E. S. Edgerton Medical Research Foundation, Wichita, Kans. Recently transferred to the division of long-term care for program monitoring, this project is awaiting word from the Health Care Financing Administration as to whether its request for a waiver to provide services and be reimbursed by medicare has been approved. If approved, the project is scheduled to run until September 1981.

3. HOSPICE

Hospice St. John, Lutheran Welfare Service, Hazelton, Pa. This project has been extended through May 1982.

4. SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

"Project Independence," Tioga Opportunities Program, Inc., Oswego, N.Y. AoA support for this project expired April 30, 1980. It is still being funded to support half of the original staff with State Community Services money. The project will continue a portion of the chore program concentrating on two small communities rather than on the whole county. The home repair program has been abandoned. The people now being served are those who are just above the medicaid eligible line, since the State pays for medicaid eligibles.

"Development of a Model System for Delivery of Community Care Services to 23 Rural Nevada Indian Reservations," Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada, Reno, Nev. Model project support for this project terminated in February 1980. It is continuing to provide outreach services and a nutrition program in four sites. Current funding is derived from a regional grant with Indian funds from the Community Food and Nutrition Service of the Community Services Administration.

"Grand Ronde Indian Elderly Outreach and Demonstration Program," Mid-Wilamette Valley Community Action Agency, Salem, Oreg. AoA funding for this program expired in September 1979. Primarily an advocacy project geared toward obtaining significant funding for ongoing activities of the tribal council, and funding from non-AoA sources was secured for a local transportation program, a meals program, and CETA activities.

5. SENIOR CENTERS

"Ambulatory Day Care for Older Adults," Lockport Senior Citizens Center, Lockport, N.Y. Model project support for this project ended in February 1980. It has been funded for continuation and expansion with local funds from the area aging agency, title XX, and the Department of Health.

"Resocialization and Rehabilitation of High Risk Elderly," Amigos del Valle, Inc., McAllen, Tex. This project will continue with AoA funding until February 1981.

6. EMPLOYMENT

Senior environmental employment program (SEE), Washington, D.C., had sites in the States of Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Illinois, Arkansas, Kansas, South Dakota, California, and Washington. The senior environmental employment program is no longer funded, with the exception of Kansas and South Dakota, which will terminate shortly. All grantees have picked up some of the employees at their own cost or have obtained State funds to do so, as in New Jersey and Connecticut.

7. FAMILY AND NATURAL SUPPORTS

"Natural Support Systems of the Non-Institutionalized Rural Elderly," Franklin/Hampshire Community Mental Health Center, Northampton, Mass. This project is now in its second and final year of funding. The project is operational in three sites and expects to continue beyond the funding period. Such additional staffing and funding are already being negotiated. Information about community systems of support is being gathered.

"Family and Community Support System Project," Department of Elderly Affairs, State of Rhode Island (Washington County site). This project is in its second of 3 years. It is run through a community health center, has strong leadership and good community support in a poor rural community. It has assisted 271 people between the ages of 60-93 years old, with the average being 74.1 years. Over one-third of those who have been assisted live alone. The project provides health services. In addition it operates as a broker between older persons and other services they need.

"A Controlled Trial of Care-given Training for Elderly Impaired in Urban and Rural Settings," University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, Md. This project is in its second and final year of funding. Its goal is to compare urban and rural populations trained to provide care to elderly family members or neighbors. Control groups of untrained persons are also part of the project design. By July 1980, families in the rural setting are expected to have been selected, and training components will be under development, based on needs determined through interviews.

"Community Caring Concerns," Virgin Islands Commission on Aging, St. Thomas, V.I. This project began operations early in fiscal year 1980, and is scheduled to go through March 25, 1981.

8. LOCAL COMMUNITY CARE SYSTEMS

"Extending ACCESS," Monroe County Long-Term Care Program, Inc., Rochester, N.Y. Responsibility for program-monitoring of this project has been transferred to the division of long-term care. The project will be in operation until September 1981.

"Oregon Senior Resources Continuum," Department of Human Resources, Salem, Oreg. The project is proceeding and is scheduled to receive AoA support through September 1981.

9. STATE SYSTEMS

"Service Management Project," Arkansas Office on Aging, Little Rock, Ark. This project is progressing and will receive AoA funds through September 1981.

10. APPLICANT INITIATED

"Environmental Communication Intervention for the Aging," Murray State University Department of Special Education, Murray, Ky. This project, which is in its second of 2 years, appears to be progressing well, based on the first year's final report. Twelve rural sites for diagnostic screening are now operational. 325 families had been selected for the intervention module which includes education, counseling, and training. The project is expected to continue beyond the end of the project period, although specific plans have not been outlined.

11. NATIONAL AGING ORGANIZATION PROJECTS PROGRAM

National Indian Council on Aging, Albuquerque, N. Mex. This is the first of a possible 3 years of funding. Activities include: (1) Training and providing technical assistance to Indian AAA's to improve services and access to services; (2) working with tribes and other public and private service providers to improve access to non-OAA services; (3) preparing tribes to take advantage of title VI of the OAA.

Question 8. What is the status of the pending application for a rural services policy center from the University of Kentucky?

Response. The University of Kentucky's proposal to establish a National Institute on Rural Aging was one of 13 finalists in the competition for the National Aging Policy Study Center program authorized by title IV, part E, of the Older Americans Act.

The proposal ranked in an acceptable range in the first stage of review; however, certain critical weaknesses were noted by the peer review panel. A site visit was conducted as part of the second stage of review. Problems in the area of budget, organization and conceptual framework were not adequately resolved and the reviewers recommended that the University of Kentucky not receive a grant.

The applicant was informed of AoA's decision not to fund on May 16, 1980. Review panel comments were shared with the applicant. It is important to note that rural issues will be an element in the work of other awards made as a result of the Policy Study Centers competition. For instance, the University of Michigan's Center on Housing and Living Arrangements will look at the special housing needs of rural older persons; the University of Maryland, through its Center for the Study of Women and Aging, will address the problems of rural women.

Question 9. Section 404 of the act provides that you will also include courses of training specifically designed for rural services providers when making training grant awards. Could you tell me how much funding has been made available for this purpose?

Response. Title IV, part A training projects that provide support for specialized training designed to meet the needs of service providers in rural areas include:

A. Projects with a predominant focus on career training for work with rural aging

Project:	Current award
West Virginia University.....	\$78,000
North Country Community College (New York)	62,000
Tusculum College (Tennessee).....	64,000
Ohio University.....	89,000
University of Minnesota Technical College.....	43,000
Prairie View A. & M. University (Texas).....	67,000
University of New Mexico School of Law	99,000
Subtotal.....	502,000

B. Projects which include career training for work with rural aging as one program priority, among others

Project:	Current award
University of Connecticut-School of Social Work	\$67,000
Pennsylvania State University	101,000
University of Florida.....	90,000
Tougaloo College (Mississippi).....	56,000
University of Michigan.....	120,000
Madonna College (Michigan).....	60,000
College of St. Scholastica (Minnesota).....	57,000
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff.....	59,000
Northeastern California Higher Education Council	131,000
University of Oregon.....	101,000
Oregon State University.....	114,000
University of Alabama	101,000
Subtotal.....	1,057,000
Overall totals—19 projects.....	1,559,000

Question 10. How do you plan to assure that the long-term care demonstration projects are distributed equitably among rural-urban areas?

Response. The revised notice of intent in the "Federal Register" of March 21, 1980 states:

"The Department is very interested in supporting channeling demonstration projects located in rural areas as well as more heavily populated and "service-rich" communities. Offerors proposing rural projects may suggest innovative means for providing long-term care services where the range of relevant formally organized services currently is limited or nonexistent."

The request for proposals (RFP-74-80-HEW-05) specifies that "States may identify up to three preliminary channeling project sites in the proposal to carry out demonstration activities." Through its proposal selection process and program management procedures the Department will insure "that channeling projects reflect a wide range of demographic and socio-economic characteristics (e.g., *urban and rural*, minority representation, etc.) and vary according to sponsorship and organization (e.g., Department of Health, Area Agency on Aging, Public Welfare Department, nonprofit voluntary agency, etc.). In most cases, States will receive demonstration awards to support the development of a single channeling project to serve a particular area within the State." (Emphasis added.)

Thus, the Department has clearly committed itself in advance to make every effort to see to it that a representative mix of project sites are included in the national channeling demonstration program.

Question 11. Does the Administration's proposed fiscal year 1981 budget for title III, part B of the Older Americans Act contain sufficient funds for providing the supportive social services associated with the nutrition program since these can no longer be financed from title III, part C?

Response. In fiscal year 1980, the Congress provided for an increase of \$50 million for social services and senior centers. This increase was to allow States to begin the transfer of the costs of supportive social services associated with the nutrition program. Most States should have been able to transfer these costs within the increases received in fiscal year 1980. According to AoA's projections, only \$1 million more was needed in fiscal year 1981 to allow those States which will not complete these cost transfers in fiscal year 1980 to do so in fiscal year 1981. The affected States will have to readjust their expenditures to make more funds available to support the social services previously supported with nutrition funds.

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR CHILES

Question 1. Is it possible for you to offer assistance to the States so they may in turn reduce the paperwork burden on the area agencies and local service providers?

Response. Inasmuch as State and area plans are now developed every 3 years instead of annually, the paperwork burden imposed by States on area agencies and service providers should be significantly reduced.

Question 2. Can you give me other specific examples of how you have reduced the paperwork burden on State and area agencies?

Response. The new State plan on aging represents a major paperwork reduction for States. The State plan has been developed in a manner which requires that States provide only a minimum of data to the Administration on Aging. Rather than requiring States to provide major amounts of supporting data, most requirements are covered by inclusion of assurance statements which reflect the law and regulations.

The State plan on aging is intended to cover a 3-year period; therefore, State agencies must prepare the complete State plan every third year only. In the following 2 years States are expected to submit to the Administration on Aging an update of this plan. This includes an update of State plan objectives if there have been any changes and a new resource allocation plan. Therefore, the paperwork burden on States will be significantly decreased during these years. In the past it was required that a complete State plan on aging be submitted annually. The 3-year plan process has also been implemented at the area agency level and provides an opportunity for reduction of paperwork at the local level.

Senator PRYOR. I have three or four questions, Mr. Commissioner. The first one is submitted by Senator Chiles and he did want me to ask this question of you while you are here.

In the fiscal year 1980 appropriations, the appropriations were increased. We found increased funding and it was provided for the Office of Human Development Services for staffing. The committee language indicated that the elderly should receive some of the new staff positions.

The question Senator Chiles wanted to ask—and, by the way, it was his language that made this a possibility—did AoA receive any of these slots from this measure or did all of these slots go to the Office of Human Development Services?

Do you understand the question?

Mr. BENEDICT. Senator, you said 1980?

Senator PRYOR. The 1980 appropriations, that is correct.

Mr. BENEDICT. I believe that the increased request for 1980 related to salary and possible increases. I would have to check as to whether or not additional funds were available for additional staff. I believe that the HDS complement has been declining, not expanding. I would say to you, however, that, irrespective of fixed ceilings for agencies in the Office of Human Development, at the time that I came onboard as Commissioner there were a significant number of vacancies in AoA and there were periods of freezes that intervened. However, AoA was permitted to staff up to its full complement. We have maintained that complement level, with the exception of normal turnover.

[Subsequent to the hearing, Mr. Benedict supplied the additional material:]

The Administration's request for salary and expenses for Human Development Services for fiscal year 1980 was \$75,173,000. The House recommended \$71,232,000. The Senate recommended \$77,773,000, citing in their report the fact that the Administration's request would require an absorption of 93 positions through attrition, thus adversely affecting all HDS programs including those serving the elderly. The final conference agreement was \$74,202,000, nearly \$1 million less than the budget request.

No new positions at the OHDS level or in any of the programs were provided by the final appropriation level. The increase over the fiscal year 1979 level, just less than \$4 million, provided for mandatory costs.

We understand that the Senate's recommendation, which was instrumental in preventing a greater decrease from the Administration's request, was largely the result of Senator Chiles' efforts and concern for HDS' programs, especially those serving the elderly.

Senator PRYOR. We have had a great discussion in the past year about paperwork and the paperwork has been brought to our attention over and over by Senate directorates out in the field. They tell me that they spend more time counting heads and filling out forms than they do in running the program and trying to make sure that the needs of the participants are being met.

Now I know that you have tried to do something in this area. I know that Senator Domenici has been very, very forceful in attempting to bring about some degree of change or ultimate justice here. Last week, in my State of Arkansas, at the statewide meeting of community action program directors, there was a meeting held there to formally complain to the State agency on aging and a representative of my office about this same problem still plaguing us. Once again, there is an enormous amount of paperwork existing and mandated upon them. I would like to know what assurances can you give this committee and the program people in our States that this program is being addressed.

Mr. BENEDICT. There are several aspects to the paperwork problem. I think the greatest opportunity to address the problem has been in the areas of consolidation and multiple-year planning. We would like to give you an example of the differences that those two actions will make.

In 1977 AoA was directly providing funds for senior centers via separate awards to States. We were also making separate awards to States for social services and for nutrition projects, which meant 112 State plans each year. Simultaneously, States were entering into agreements with some 560 or 570 area agencies and some 1,100 nutritional projects. If you add those up, Mr. Chairman, you find in the neighborhood of 600 or 700 transactions each year. Consolidation and multiple-year planning in and of itself will reduce the total in number of new plan transactions. It is now necessary to formulate only 56 plans over a 3-year period, which total is made up, first, of approximately 700 3-year comprehensive area plans, the second being 56 comprehensive State plans. That in and of itself will have a significant impact on reducing paperwork.

Second, we have worked very closely with the State and the area agencies with regard to State and area plan format. The plans are being significantly reduced in terms of scope and content, as compared with previous years. Much of the information we previously required the States to submit will now be handled by way of assurances. Thus the State plans themselves are being reduced in scope and in scale.

The third aspect of paperwork is inherent in the act itself. Area agencies are called upon to try to secure multiple sources of funds, such as title XX funds, other State funds, or other Federal funds, to support these programs. Each time they do that they are required to submit special plans and many have separate accounting procedures.

I think a detailed examination of some of those other programs and their authorizing statutes is necessary to find new ways to permit State and area agencies to draw on multiple sets of resources without overly burdening themselves with administrative requirements. It is a difficult proposition but that is the direction in which we are trying to move.

Senator PRYOR. I appreciate your explanation but whatever you are doing or whatever steps that you are taking or that the Congress is taking to eliminate some of the unneeded paperwork, I don't think anything is getting to the agencies and out to the people. I wish that you would communicate with them to say here is what we are doing and here is what we hope to accomplish and here is the date that we have set to accomplish it.

Now in the absence of final regulations which were signed or being signed this morning and the ink is still wet and so forth, do the States face the possibility of having to resubmit parts of the fiscal year 1981 plan as a result and as a result have heavier than normal burden on the paperwork? In other words, during this time of indecision and not being certain of what was happening, not certain if we were going to come up with final regulations and plans, were the States in effect at that time undergoing a heavy amount of paperwork because of our indecision in Washington?

Mr. BENEDICT. I don't believe that that is the case, Mr. Chairman. While the regs have been in the process of development, we have been constantly in consultation with the States about the changes. The primary vehicle for implementing State and local programs is the State plan format and the area plan format. Both

area agencies and State agencies have been collaborating with us for many months in the design of the format for these State plans.

Several weeks ago the draft plan formats were sent to the States. They have given us their comments. We have made some slight modification based on their comments.

Senator PRYOR. Mr. Commissioner, this question relates to manpower and it has not been addressed very much this morning. My concern about aging manpower is that I am very afraid we are not getting enough of our training funds out into the field to train the people involved in the day-to-day delivery of services. I am not opposed to the funding of graduate and undergraduate programs at universities and colleges but in my State at least I don't think that this is where the major need for manpower actually is.

The greatest need that I hear from people back home in this area from the senior center directors, and so forth, from outreach workers, that where we need to concentrate our effort, is in training outreach workers, and especially training home health and chore services, these types of individuals. I wonder if you could comment on how much of the training dollars we are putting into community colleges and vocational and technical schools to train this type of worker as compared to funding of higher education programs in this country.

Mr. BENEDICT. Total resources for training and education in 1980 are \$20.8 million. Of that \$6 million goes directly to States for inservice training. About \$7 million goes directly to higher education for career development. In the past year the higher education program has been significantly modified to require those educational institutions to commit AoA training resources to very specific vocational fields.

In addition to that, AoA is in the process of providing some funds to each of its regional offices to promote collaboration between States and institutions of higher education on the placement of individuals in agencies that provide services to older people. In addition to that we do commit some limited amount of funds each year for specific curriculum development areas.

Two cases in point, we have a cooperative agreement with the National Council for Homemaker, Home Health Services, Inc. They have been providing the development of curriculum material for inservice training of supervisors and other workers in the home service industry.

Another example of that is an award that we made to the American Personnel and Guidance Association. Today they are in the field working with a number of educational institutions directly, in cooperation with individual area agencies on aging to assist in the development of activities to train counselors who work in the information and referral program, senior centers, and other agencies.

Senator PRYOR. This is a very small portion of your manpower budget that goes out into this allocation.

Mr. BENEDICT. From those special awards to the national organization. It is a small proportion of their funds; yes.

Senator PRYOR. I just hope that you will look at that because I think we may need to look at our priorities in manpower today. I think helping someone obtain a master's degree in this area cer-

tainly is a fine thing but I think we need to look at the more practical aspects of home delivery services, and so forth, and I think this is something that needs to be looked at very carefully.

Mr. BENEDICT. Mr. Chairman, I agree that a responsible balance needs to be struck. However, I would observe that the AoA funds which have gone into higher education have probably been the single most significant force in introducing gerontology curriculum into 2- and 4-year colleges, into universities, into graduate, and professional schools. Some 3,000 institutions of higher education now offer programs of instruction and training in the field of aging. Those programs not only provide skilled manpower to help older people in a practical, hands-on fashion, but they also shape the careers of people in industry, in the health and medical care field, in law, architecture, public administration, and other key professions.

If we are ever going to see real change occur that is responsive to the fundamental shift in our population structure, all of these professionals need to adjust themselves in very significant ways to serve older people across the board. While I agree there is a need for a balance, I certainly would be very disappointed if we were to eliminate or seriously damage our effort to see that kind of professional education takes place.

The American Public Health Association has recently established a section on aging which would touch thousands and thousands of professionals in that organization. The American Bar Association has established a special committee on aging and age discrimination. We have the development of the Gerontology Society and the Association for Gerontology in Higher Education. These are enormously important forums to see real change occur in our society.

Senator PRYOR. Don't misunderstand me. I am certainly not asking that you do a study of this because we might end up never knowing about the end result here, but I just think that you need to pay attention to it.

Mr. BENEDICT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We certainly agree on that.

Senator PRYOR. I think you have enough studies to suggest right now.

I would like to conclude unless there are other questions. Does any other Senator have questions?

I would like to conclude by saying, Mr. Commissioner, that I can only assume that you are a sensitive enough individual to recognize that there is a great deal of frustration today being expressed and felt by the membership of the Senate Special Committee on Aging. I find myself very frustrated. I almost get mad when we have to stop in midstream on some of the things that we are doing here in the Senate and that you are doing in your office, and we have to stop everything and lay everything aside and have to get ready for a hearing of this sort. There is no telling how many staff hours have been spent in preparation for you coming here or the staff hours that have been spent in preparation for this committee to hold this hearing. It has been enormous, and it has been an enormous drain on resources, time, energy, effort, and money when we ought to be positively and aggressively, you know, trying to find ways that we can better serve people. Yet, every now and then, we

find ourselves having to bring you back up here and say, why isn't so and so being done and why are these studies late and whatever.

This is why I get so frustrated, and I mentioned this at our last hearing. Usually, and again this morning is a good example, we spend the whole morning talking about the regulations, the formats, the studies, the rules and administrative slots, the consultants and plans, the review process, the paperwork, and all of this and that. It seems like we never talk about the older Americans. You know, we never talk about the elderly and that is who these programs are for and that is what we are supposed to do, yet we spend all our time talking about the bureaucratic entanglements and why something is not being done.

I think that is why the committee is so frustrated and that is why I am so frustrated about it, I just hope you will take note of it and I hope that you are a sensitive enough person, and I think you certainly are, that you will recognize how frustrated we are. I wish you would come forward sometimes and just be honest with us and say, look, I don't have enough people to do so and so and I need x number of dollars, or I need so many people, or our staff has not been as efficient as it should be, or it has been more efficient and the people who do the consulting work have not been as efficient as they should be.

I wish you would be more specific and forthright in the manner in which you respond to the committee and how you answer our questions. Every day, we hear from the people in our States, we then repeat their questions to you, and you are supposed to be the man who can answer those questions. I know that it is a tremendous responsibility that you have, but we also have a responsibility to the residents in our States. I hope we will not have to continue to hold these hearings every 2 or 3 months because they are very, very frustrating.

With that, Mr. Commissioner, I will adjourn the meeting.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BENEDICT. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Benedict follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT C. BENEDICT

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, it is a real pleasure for me to be here this morning to discuss the highly important topics which you identified in your letter of invitation. The provisions of the 1978 amendments explicitly underscored the importance which Congress assigns to improved services to the rural aged, to more effective delivery of transportation services, to paperwork reduction, and to improved programs for providing the manpower we need to serve the elderly. In the next few minutes I would like to offer some brief remarks on what AoA is doing to respond to the concern which Congress has so clearly expressed in these areas. I will then attempt to answer your questions about these activities as well as the special efforts we have undertaken in other areas, legal services, for example, to respond to the requirements Congress established in the 1978 amendments.

TRANSPORTATION

In your letter of invitation you requested information on three specific subjects related to AoA's overall effort in the transportation field. These are:

- Transportation study.
- Impact of rising insurance costs and restrictions on local service providers; and
- Feasibility of a single administrative unit for all Federal transportation programs for older persons.

These subjects are being explored through grants which AoA has awarded to the Institute for Public Administration and to the Urban Institute.

The IPA and the Urban Institute are scheduled to submit preliminary findings to AoA by September 30, 1980, final reports should be in our hands by October 30 of this year. AoA will prepare a report based on their finding and will submit that report to Congress no later than February 1, 1981. In our report we should be able to provide you with information on and, where appropriate, recommendations concerning:

- Fundamental problems which providers experience in offering transportation services to the elderly at the community level.
- Difficulties which providers encounter in obtaining and paying for liability insurance.
- The impact of gasoline shortages and rising gasoline prices; and
- Possibilities for improving coordination among transportation programs.

SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS

Three major studies will provide information on the specific issues which the 1978 amendments directed AoA to address concerning services in rural areas, as indicated by the following: “* * * differences in unit costs, service delivery, and access between rural areas and urban areas for services assisted under this act and the special needs of the elderly residing in rural areas.” [Section 411(b)(3), Older Americans Act]

Together, these projects should provide us with information for use in defining and understanding both the specific service needs of the rural elderly and the barriers to meeting those needs.

Concerning cost differentials between urban and rural areas, AoA’s May 1979 announcement for the title IV, part B research program included a “researchable question” on the development of a methodology comparing unit costs between urban and rural services to the elderly. No proposals were received in response to this question. As an alternative, AoA will examine cost data in the nutrition program as a first step in examining costs in other service areas.

Since these three major studies are multiple-year efforts, information and reports will be available over the next 3 years. For example, a report summarizing findings from current AoA projects which include some investigation concerning the rural elderly will be available as early as June 1980. Preliminary assessment of nutrition costs will be available in February 1981, whereas a final report on rural-urban differences in social services will not be available until March 1982.

In this connection I would also like to call attention to the other initiatives which AoA has undertaken that will be of direct benefit to the elderly living in rural areas. These include three of our demonstration projects funded under our agreement with the Health Services Administration of this Department and all 10 of the demonstrations undertaken through our agreement with the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

In addition, our efforts to implement section 305(a)(2)(C) of the Older Americans Act will help insure that area agencies on aging serving rural communities will continue to receive a basic minimum of funding each year.

NATIONAL MANPOWER POLICY AND RELATED STUDIES

As the committee is aware, projections and forecasts of staffing needs are difficult in any field. The demands for so many specialized skills make forecasts a particular challenge in the field of aging. To meet this challenge, and to respond to the mandates in sections 401 and 402 of the Older Americans Act, we are currently undertaking a series of national manpower policy activities which will establish AoA’s basic strategy regarding manpower development. The first status report on these activities will be submitted to Congress by September 30, 1980. This report will discuss:

- Historical background concerning the development of specialized manpower for the field of aging.

- Current AoA education and training policy as it bears on manpower policy as well as the status of studies currently underway dealing with: Demographic data on the size and characteristics of the older population over the next 20 years; and an inventory and feasibility study of manpower projection methodologies and models that have been developed within the Federal Government which might be adaptable to the field of aging. The analysis of methodologies and models will include recommendations concerning alternative approaches to manpower policy development in the aging field.

The report will also describe the long-range plans and activities which are scheduled for fiscal years 1981 and 1982.

These are: Assessment of the need, demand, and supply of personnel for the field of aging; and recommendations on approaches to providing and maintaining the supply of personnel for the field of aging.

This assessment and the recommendations will be reported to the Congress by September 30, 1982.

PAPERWORK REDUCTION

The 1978 amendments to the Older Americans Act included a provision for 3-year State planning cycles with annual updates, in contrast to the 1-year planning cycles which were previously in effect. The Administration supported the concept of multi-year planning while the 1978 amendments were under consideration in the Congress. We have taken advantage of the opportunities the new planning cycle affords to reduce the paperwork burdens on the States. Our primary effort has focused on the annual updates. These will require a minimum of information from State agencies. Thus, the total amount of paper the States will have to submit over each 3-year period will be considerably less than what was required during a comparable period before the 1978 amendments were passed.

In addition, because the 1978 amendments require tight linkage between State and area planning the new State planning procedures should result in less paperwork burdens on the area agencies.

Similarly, and in response to requests from network staff, AoA has cut back on the quantity of technical assistance and information memoranda issued by the central office. This approach reduces the amount of paper originating at the central office level which State and area agencies must review.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

In addition to the studies and activities discussed above, AoA has also undertaken a number of special projects designed to meet the requirements of the Older Americans Act in the following areas: Legal services for the elderly; and, long-term care demonstrations.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared remarks. I will be happy to answer any questions you may have about the items discussed in this presentation.

[Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., the committee adjourned.]

APPENDIX

LETTER FROM SENATOR JOHN HEINZ, TO SENATOR LAWTON CHILES, CHAIRMAN, U.S. SENATE SPECIAL COM- MITTEE ON AGING, DATED MAY 1, 1980

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you are aware, on March 20, I had the opportunity to question Mr. Cesar A. Perales, Assistant Secretary-designate for Human Development Services, regarding the status of the Administration on Aging, within HEW. The Finance Committee hearing, which was convened to consider the confirmation of Mr. Perales, enabled me to raise a number of questions about the control of the AoA by OHDS and whether the Commissioner reports to the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, or other staff within HEW.

I know that you share my concern about the effective and efficient implementation of the Older Americans Act. I believe that these questions and the responses which I received are relevant to the performance of AoA in carrying out its mandate. In that regard, I have enclosed a copy of the proceedings of that session for possible inclusion in the hearing record of the committee's oversight hearing of March 24. The AoA/OHDS relationship is very pertinent to the full implementation of the 1978 amendments to the Older Americans Act. This will give added visibility to this important issue and reinforce the concern of the entire Special Committee on Aging for the effective administration of aging programs.

Thanking you for your cooperation in this matter, and with best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JOHN HEINZ,
U.S. Senate.

[NOTE.—The proceedings referred to above, "Nomination of Cesar A. Perales," was printed by the Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, and is available from that committee, Room 2227, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.]