Alaska Commission on Aging
ACoA Planning Committee, Funding Formula Discussion
March 14, 2016
2:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
Call-In Number: 1-800-315-6338, Access Code 53250#

Draft Agenda

2:00 p.m.	Call to Order
2:00 p.m.	Review funding formula in current State Plan: Denise & Lisa (pp 2-6)
2:10 p.m.	Review Spreadsheet with Updated Senior Demographics: Lesley (p 7)
2:15 p.m.	Review Proposed Components for Revision

- Definition of Rural Factor – See attached "Defining Urban, Rural & Remote in AK" (pp 8-10)
- Funding Formula Weight Factors
- Implementation of Base Funding (to replace "hold harmless" clause)

2:40 p.m.	Next Steps for State Plan Advisory Committee (11)

- Assemble State Plan Funding Formula Task Force
- Tasks to Complete
- Schedule of meetings

2:55 p.m.	Other Discussion
3:00 p.m.	Adjourn

Alaska Intrastate Funding Formula FY 2016-2019

Background
The Older Americans Act requires that state funding plans give preference to seniors in economic and social need, defined as follows:

> *Greatest economic need* – refers to need resulting from an income level at or below the poverty line.

> *Greatest social need* – refers to need caused by the non-economic factors, which include physical and mental disabilities; language barriers; and cultural, social, or geographic isolation, including isolation caused by racial or ethnic status, that restricts an individual's ability to perform normal daily tasks or threatens his or her capacity to live independently.

OAA, Sec. 305(a)(2) – Per 2015 AOA State Plan Guidance *"States shall,*
(C) in consultation with area agencies, in accordance with guidelines issued by the Assistant Secretary, and using the best available data, develop and publish for review and comment a formula for distribution within the State of funds received under this title that takes into account--
(i) the geographical distribution of older individuals in the State; and
(ii) the distribution among planning and service areas of older individuals with greatest economic need and older individuals with greatest social need, with particular attention to low-income minority older individuals."

The State of Alaska constitutes a single planning and service area under the terms of the Older Americans Act. The Alaska Department of Health & Social Services (DHSS) is the State Unit on Aging as designated by the Governor. The operations of Alaska's state unit on aging are carried out jointly by the DHSS' Division of Senior & Disabilities Services and the Alaska Commission on Aging. The Division of Senior and Disabilities Services administers the majority of state and federally-funded programs for seniors.

In the past plans (FY 2008-2011 and FY 2012-2015), the funding formula was based on the following factors:
1. Total Senior Population Factor: Total number of seniors (age 60+) living in a region
2. Minority Factor: Number of minority seniors
3. Poverty Factor: Number of seniors living in poverty
4. Frail Factor: Number of seniors age 80+
5. Rural Factor: Number of rural seniors in the region
6. Cost-of-living Factor (added FY 2012-2015 plan)
7. Hold Harmless Provision (added FY 2012-2015 plan)

Transition Period
Significant Advisory Committee discussion occurred around the functionality of the Hold Harmless Provision and the funding formula methodology. The Hold Harmless Provision was established in the FY 2012-2015 State Plan as a method for creating stability as the funding formula was implemented, however in doing so the implementation of the actual funding formula methodology could not occur to address the needs of regions that were growing significantly faster than others. After thorough discussion, there was consensus for phasing out the Hold Harmless Provision so that the actual funding

formula could be applied as intended. There was also an interest in revising the funding formula to meet changing factors across the state, however it was recognized that this could not be accomplished in time for the FY 2016-2019 State Plan submission.

In moving forward, the following actions are adopted to optimize Alaska's funding formula methodology while keeping the momentum of existing program funding uninterrupted:

Year One (State FY 2016)	Hold Harmless factor remains in place, and FY 2016-2019 State Plan funding formula methodology applied (as described in this report)
Year Two (State FY 2017)	Hold Harmless phased out, and FY 2016-2019 State Plan funding formula methodology amended

Application of FY 2016-2019 Funding Formula

The state plan funding formula as described below will be applied to both federal and state funds received for the NTS (Nutrition, Transportation, and Support Services), Senior In-Home Services, and Family Caregiver Support grant programs for the FY2016-2019 period. As in the FY2015 actual expenditures, a total of 5.74% will be held out from total funding for statewide programs, including legal services and media services.

The State Plan, FY 2016-2019 does make a change to the previous FY 2012-2015 funding formula. The hold harmless provision from FY 2012-2015 funding plan will be phased out beginning in Year Two of the FY 2016-2019 plan to be completed by FY 2019, the final year of the new plan.

In Year One (State FY 2016), the funding formula maintains the Hold Harmless amounts by region according to the previous state plan to provide stability to all programs that are experiencing an increase in senior population as well as an increase in the cost of living. The FY2016-2019 funding formula distributes remaining funding only to those regions that would receive an increase based upon new regional allocations. Starting in Year Two (State FY 2017) the Hold Harmless Provision will be phased out and the new funding formula will be applied.

The current definition of "rural" provides preference to seniors in economic and social need in areas of Alaska with high cost for providing services. In the last state plan, the Alaska Commission on Aging applied the U.S. Census Bureau definitions of urban and rural, which is also used by the Division of Senior and Disabilities Services in reporting service data to the U.S. Administration on Community Living. The U.S. Census Bureau defines urban areas as (1) an urbanized area (a central place and its adjacent densely settled territories with a combined minimum population of 50,000), and (2) an incorporated place or a census designated place with 20,000 or more inhabitants. Rural areas include any areas not defined as urban. By applying this definition to census areas, the Municipality of Anchorage, the City and Borough of Juneau, the Fairbanks North Star Borough, the Kenai Peninsula Census area, and the Matanuska-Susitna Borough are counted as urban, with all other areas are designated as rural. As of 2013, Anchorage had a population of 300,950, the City and Borough of Juneau had a population of 32,660, the Fairbanks North Star Borough had a population of 100,807, the Kenai Peninsula Borough had a population of 57,067, and the Matanuska-Susitna Borough had a population of 95,892 (U.S. Census 2013 estimate).

FY 2016-2019 Funding Formula Recommendation

The advisory committee, in keeping with the intent of the Older American's Act to encourage the directing of resources toward rural areas, believes that providing home and community based services

(3)

in the rural and remote regions of the state to the greatest extent possible is the best way of helping Alaska seniors age in place and avoid moving to distant cities. In this way, elders may stay close to family, friends, culture, language, and traditional foods. The funding formula is updated with 2013 population data, however, no changes were made to the census areas that, due to increased senior population, are no longer considered "rural" by definition and therefore would not receive the 23% weighting factor for their census area. The Advisory Committee recommended we use the existing funding formula with updated census data until we can analyze the impacts of the shifting demographic to ensure sustainable funding for all regions.

"Hold Harmless" Phased-Out Approach

As stated above, the Hold Harmless will begin to phase out in State FY2016. To the greatest extent possible, this state plan seeks to ensure implementation of a funding formula that accurately reflects the regional distribution of the target populations and that no region of the state receive less funding as a result of the updated funding formula.

Given the continued increase in Alaska's senior population across all regions of the state, the State Plan Advisory Committee decided to continue the "hold harmless" provision by keeping the current (FY 2011) allocation of funds in place for all regions, subject to continuation of funding at current levels or above, and to distribute only new funding with the state plan's funding formula for the NTS senior grant program and the Senior In-Home Grant program. The funding formula will not be used to fund Adult Day, Alzheimer's Education programs, Family Caregiver Support Programs or Title III D Health Promotion and Disease prevention programs.

In the event the funding formula is not amended, however, it will be subject to continuation of funding at current levels or above. With a senior population growing at the rate of five to six percent per year it is hoped that Alaska will continue to devote more resources to providing senior services.

Actual funding to any region is dependent upon capacity within a region or community to deliver senior services. In the event that a region does not have the capacity to deliver services to its entire population, any remaining funds will be redistributed statewide.

Application of Weight Factors

A three-step process is used to apply the weight factors of the funding formula. The first step in applying the weight factors is to update the demographics. In this plan the 2013 Alaska Department of Labor population projections and 2013 Alaska Senior Benefits Program recipient numbers were used. Once this information is updated, the second step is to multiply the demographic data by the respective weight factor. The third step multiplies the five-factor subtotal by the Cost of Living Factor to further emphasize the difference in regions. This total is used as the percent of available funds allocated to each region.

Definitions of Funding Formula Factors

No changes have been applied to the weight factors from the previous state plan. The following descriptions provide further detail on the five weighting factors used in the FY 2016-2019 state plan funding formula.

1. **Total Senior Population Factor** - The total number of seniors in each region is a major factor in the demand for services in that area. Every one of the state's nine regions has witnessed at least a 20% increase in its total senior population since 2001. The weight for this factor is 17%, based on the

recommendations of senior services providers.

2. **Minority Factor** - Minority is defined as those seniors who are not Caucasian. We include all those who report ancestry which is wholly or partly minority, as minority seniors. We have applied a 21% weight to the minority factor.

3. **Poverty Factor** - Participation in the Alaska's Senior Benefits Program is used as the measure of poverty in this State Plan. The program (which provides a small monthly cash benefit) is available to any Alaskan age 65 and over with an income up to 175% of the Alaska poverty level.

4. **Frail Factor** - Alaska's state plan continues to quantify frail seniors as those people who are age 80 and older. This weight factor is 16%, following recommendations received through the provider survey.

5. **Rural Factor** - In the FY2012-FY2015 plan, the Alaska Commission on Aging applied the U.S. Census Bureau definitions of urban and rural, which is also used by the Division of Senior and Disabilities Services in reporting service data to the Administration on Community Living. The U.S. Census Borough defines urban areas as (1) an urbanized area (a central place and its adjacent densely settled territories with a combined minimum population of 50,000), and (2) an incorporated place or a census designated place with 20,000 or more inhabitants. All other census areas defined as rural receive a 23% weighting factor. In the FY2012-FY2015 plan, Anchorage, Juneau, and Fairbanks were the only areas that did not receive the 23% rural weighting factor. However, due to the increasing population in both the Matsu and Kenai Census areas, they would be considered urban by this definition and therefore not receive the 23% weighting factor. The Advisory Committee recommends keeping the rural weighting factor for the Matsu and Kenai Census areas while the hold harmless is being phased out and a new funding formula can be developed.

Cost-of-Living (COL) Factor - The essence of this factor was a combination of the degree to which a region has the infrastructure to provide services plus the cost of obtaining the necessary commodities and labor to provide those services. The Department of Health & Social Services uses similar Cost of Living factors to arrive at Medicaid rates to be paid to providers in different areas of the state. This factor is not a stand-alone factor, but is applied to the subtotal of the other five factors.

Plan for Reduced Funding
The funding formula is subject to continuation of funding at current levels or above. In the event that total funding is reduced, the distribution of funds will follow the regional funding percentages at the Hold Harmless levels established at the FY2011 level for FY2016. Should total funding drop below previously approved levels, the funding will be distributed at percentages used in earlier years, as needed. The State Plan Steering Committee will review the funding formula including definitions for rural, weighting factors, the cost of living allowance (COLA), and regional allocations to possibly make recommendations for amending the funding formula in FY2016.

5

	60+ Pop. 17% (2013)	80+ Pop. 16% (2013)	60+ Minority 21% (2013)	65+ 175% Pov. 23% (2013)	60+ Rural Pop. 23% (2013)	5-Factor Subtotal	Cost-of-Living (Applied to Subttl)	FY2016-2019 Regional Distribution		Hold Harmless Amount	Hold Harmless + FY2016-2019 Regional Distribution	Rate
Region I	2,532	274	2,183	802	2,532	4.15%	1.49	5.72%	$376,193	$293,733	$346,204	5.26%
Bethel Census Area	1,847	198	1,542	552	1,847							
Wade Hampton	685	76	641	250	685							
Region II	16,549	1,735	2,917	1,275	2,729	11.28%	1.05	10.96%	$721,344	$829,120	$829,120	12.60%
Denali Borough	364	20	52	13	364							
Fairbanks North Star Borough	13,820	1,446	1,974	789	0							
Southeast Fairbanks	1,307	132	204	205	1,307							
Yukon-Koyukuk	1,058	137	687	268	1,058							
Region III	997	67	606	41	997	1.33%	1.48	1.82%	$120,093	$116,434	$116,434	1.77%
North Slope Borough	997	67	606	41	997							
Region IV	43,221	5,184	10,045	3,977	0	27.33%	1	25.28%	$1,664,022	$1,548,236	$1,548,236	23.52%
Anchorage	43,221	5,184	10,045	3,977	0							
Region V	29,376	3,156	2,785	2,627	29,376	32.80%	1.01	30.65%	$2,017,247	$1,218,814	$1,856,436	28.21%
Kenai Peninsula	12,611	1,423	1,097	1,050	12,611							
Matanuska-Susitna	15,045	1,597	1,332	1,402	15,045							
Valdez-Cordova	1,720	136	356	175	1,720							
Region VI	1195	56	784	52	1195	1.62%	1.5	2.25%	$147,866	$73,142	$113,296	1.72%
Aleutian Islands East	442	29	328	24	442							
Aleutian Islands West	753	27	456	28	753							
Region VII	3,047	310	1,558	459	3,047	4.15%	1.24	4.76%	$313,372	$493,848	$493,848	7.50%
Bristol Bay Borough	181	17	85	11	181							
Dillingham	707	84	496	158	707							
Kodiak Island	1,925	184	814	245	1,925							
Lake and Peninsula	234	25	163	45	234							
Region VIII	1,985	227	1,477	378	1,985	2.99%	1.48	4.10%	$269,870	$283,199	$283,199	4.30%
Nome Census Area	1,149	116	819	234	1,149							
Northwest Arctic	836	111	658	144	836							
Region IX	14,689	1,686	3,525	1,264	9,035	14.34%	1.09	14.46%	$951,475	$994,709	$994,709	15.11%
Haines Borough	720	98	93	80	720							
Juneau Borough	5,654	594	1,177	361	0							
Ketchikan Borough	2,763	356	667	260	2,763							
Prince of Wales - Outer Ketchikan	1,279	98	551	201	1,279							
Sitka Borough	1,877	295	491	102	1,877							
Skagway - Hoonah - Angoon	807	51	245	78	807							
Wrangell - Petersburg	1,431	174	214	169	1,431							
Yakutat Borough	158	20	87	13	158							
TOTAL	113,591	12,695	25,880	10,875	50,896	100.00%		100.00%				100.00%

		HH Subtotal Remainder
Total Available	$6,581,481	$6,581,481
Statewide 5.74%	$6,982,263	$6,581,482
	$400,782	$400,782
	$6,581,481	$6,982,264

2014 Data on Race, Age and Poverty by Region

Column1	Column2	Column4	Column5	Column6	Column62
Region	Census community	non-White	Total in each region 60+	Total in each region 80+	65+ 175% of Poverty
1	Bethel	1,630	1,937	211	564
	Kusilvak Census Area	654	698	80	244
	Total	2,284	2,635	291	808
	% of total	86.7%	2,635	291	808
2	Fairbanks NSB,	2,065	14,135	1,456	870
	SE Fairbanks	215	1,294	125	200
	Denali	53	369	24	14
	Yukon-Koyukuk	1,768	1,055	153	270
	Total	3,046	16,853	1,758	1,354
	% of total	18.1%	16,853	1,758	1,354
3	North Slope Borough	632	1,001	65	38
	% of total	63.1%	1,001	65	38
4	Municipality of Anchorage	10,266	43,727	5,223	4,231
	% of total	23.5%	43,727	5,223	4,231
5	Kenai Peninsula,	1,094	12,827	1,410	1,151
	Mat-Su,	1,388	15,659	1,652	1,524
	Valdez/Cordova	361	1,693	130	175
	Total	2,843	30,179	3,192	2,850
	% of total	9.4%	30,179	3,192	2,850
6	Nome,	845	1,177	113	250
	Northwest Arctic	676	819	121	191
	Total	1,521	1,996	234	441
	% of total	76.2%	1,996	234	441
7	Bristol Bay	84	174	15	10
	Dillingham,	499	684	74	129
	Kodiak	824	1,951	169	224
	Lake & Peninsula	170	239	28	44
	Total	1,577	3,048	286	407
	% of total	51.7%	3,048	286	407
8	Aleutians East,	301	401	28	32
	Aleutians West	482	765	29	33
	Total	783	1,166	57	65
	% of total	67.2%	1,166	57	65
9	Prince of Wales	573	1,274	97	222
	Sitka	489	1,833	295	115
	Skagway	16	217	14	8
	Haines	105	709	96	88
	Hoonah/Angoon	248	601	41	89
	Juneau	1,163	5,711	576	346
	Ketchikan	676	2,778	349	284
	Petersburg	85	743	86	86
	Wrangell	135	657	80	92
	Yakutat	239	152	20	16
	Total	3,729	14,675	1,654	1,346
	% of total	24.4%	14,675	1,654	1,346
	Total 60+ 80+Seniors	26,681	115,280	12,760	11,540
		23.1%			

Defining Urban, Rural and Remote in Alaska-

1. Census Bureau Definition:
   US Census: Two types of Urban areas:
   > Urbanized Area (Uas) of 50,000 or more people;
   > Urban Clusters (UC) of at least 2500 and less than 50,000 people.

   The US Census does not directly define rural. Rural encompasses all population, housing and territory not included within an urban area. Whatever is not urban is considered rural.

2. OMB Definition:
   The White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB) designates counties as Metropolitan, Micropolitan, or Neither. A Metro area contains a core urban area of 50,000 or more population, and a Micro area contains an urban core of at least 10,000 (but less than 50,000) population. All counties that are not part of a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) are considered rural. Micropolitan counties are considered non-Metropolitan or rural along with all counties that are not classified as either Metro or Micro.

   Using this definition Anchorage is Metropolitan and Fairbanks is Micropolitan and all other areas are considered rural.

The trouble with both of these definitions according to the Office of Rural Health Policy:

There are measurement challenges with both the Census and OMB definitions. Some policy experts note that the Census definition classifies quite a bit of suburban area as rural. The OMB definition includes rural areas in Metropolitan counties including, for example, the Grand Canyon which is located in a Metro county. Consequently, one could argue that the Census Bureau standard includes an overcount of rural population whereas the OMB standard represents an undercount of the rural population.

The Office of Rural Health Policy (ORHP) accepts all non-metro counties as rural and uses an additional method of determining rurality called the **Rural-Urban Commuting Area (RUCA)** codes. Like the MSAs, these are based on Census data which is used to assign a code to each Census Tract. Tracts inside Metropolitan counties with the codes 4-10 are considered rural. While use of the RUCA codes has allowed identification of rural census tracts in Metropolitan counties, among the more than 70,000 tracts in the U.S. there are some that are extremely large and where use of RUCA codes alone fails to account for distance to services and sparse population. In response to these concerns, ORHP has designated 132 large area census tracts with RUCA codes 2 or 3 as rural. These tracts are at least 400 square miles in area with a population density of no more than 35 people. Following the 2010 Census the ORHP definition included approximately 57 million people, about 18% of the population and 84% of the area of the USA. RUCA codes represent the current version of the Goldsmith Modification. 🔗

3. The Goldsmith Modification:

   In 1992, the Goldsmith Modification was created to recognize small towns and rural areas found in large metropolitan counties. Some of these communities had greater distances or physical features limiting access to health services. This variation expanded the eligibility for Rural Health Grant programs to assist isolated rural populations in large metropolitan counties. The Goldsmith Modification preceded the RUCA methodology and is referenced in many publications on rural definitions. For additional information about the Goldsmith Modification, see Improving the Operational Definition of "Rural Areas" for Federal Programs.

4. Rural-Urban Commuting Area codes (RUCAs)]

   A Census tract-based classification scheme that utilizes the standard Census Bureau urban area and place definitions in combination with commuting information to characterize all of the nation's census tracts regarding their rural and urban status and relationships. The rural-urban commuting area (RUCA) codes classify U.S. census tracts using measures of population density, urbanization, and daily commuting. The most recent RUCA codes are based on data from the 2010 decennial census and the 2006-10 American Community Survey. The classification contains two levels. Whole numbers (1-10) delineate metropolitan, micropolitan, small town, and rural commuting areas based on the size and direction of the primary (largest) commuting flows. These 10 codes are further subdivided based on secondary commuting flows, providing flexibility in combining levels to meet varying definitional needs and preferences. Descriptions of the codes are found within the data files, and also in the Documentation.

   Since their creation, the RUCA codes have been updated several times with new Census data. The most recent version of the codes were created by a collaboration between the USDA-ERS, FORHP, and the University of North Dakota Center for Rural Health. RUCA codes (2010) by state census tracts can be downloaded from the USDA-ERS website. A ZIP code approximation of RUCAs is available from the Center for Rural Health. Some federal programs have identified areas with a RUCA code of four and above as rural. The Federal Office of Rural Health Policy uses the RUCA methodology in determining rural eligibility for their programs.

5. Rural – Urban Continuum codes (RUCC)-

   The 2013 Rural-Urban Continuum Codes form a classification scheme that distinguishes metropolitan counties by the population size of their metro area, and nonmetropolitan counties by degree of urbanization and adjacency to a metro area. The official Office of Management and Budget (OMB) metro and nonmetro categories have been subdivided into three metro and six nonmetro categories. Each county in the U.S. is assigned one of the 9 codes. This scheme allows researchers to break county data into finer residential groups, beyond metro and nonmetro, particularly for the analysis of trends in nonmetro areas that are related to population density and metro influence. The Rural-Urban Continuum Codes were originally developed in 1974. They have been updated each decennial since (1983, 1993, 2003, 2013), and slightly revised in 1988. Note that the 2013 Rural-Urban Continuum Codes are not directly comparable with the codes prior to 2000 because of the new methodology used in developing the 2000 metropolitan areas. See the Documentation for details and a map of the codes.

State	County_Name	Population_2010	RUCC 2013	RUCA
AK	Aleutians East Borough	3,141	9	10
AK	Aleutians West Census Area	5,561	9	10
AK	Anchorage Municipality	291,826	2	1
AK	Bethel Census Area	17,013	7	9
AK	Bristol Bay Borough	997	9	10
AK	Denali Borough	1,826	8	10
AK	Dillingham Census Area	4,847	9	10
AK	Fairbanks North Star Borough	97,581	3	2
AK	Haines Borough	2,508	9	10
AK	Hoonah-Angoon Census Area, AK	2,150	9	10
AK	Juneau City and Borough	31,275	5	4
AK	Kenai Peninsula Borough	55,400	7	9
AK	Ketchikan Gateway Borough	13,477	7	4
AK	Kodiak Island Borough	13,592	7	7
AK	Lake and Peninsula Borough	1,631	9	10
AK	Matanuska-Susitna Borough	88,995	2	5
AK	Nome Census Area	9,492	7	9
AK	North Slope Borough	9,430	7	9
AK	Northwest Arctic Borough	7,523	7	9
AK	Petersburg Census area	3,815	9	10
AK	Price of Wales Hyder Census Area	5,559	9	10
AK	Sitka City and Borough	8,881	7	7
AK	Skagway Municipality	968	9	10
AK	Southeast Fairbanks Census Area	7,029	9	10
AK	Valdez-Cordova Census Area	9,636	9	10
AK	Wade Hampton Census Area	7,459	9	10
AK	Wrangell City and Borough	2,369	9	10
AK	Yakutat City and Borough	662	9	10
AK	Yukon-Koyukuk Census Area	5,588	9	10

RUCC Rural-Urban Continuum Code

Metropolitan Tracts

1 Counties in metro areas of 1 million or more
2 Counties in metro areas of 250,000 to 1 million
3 Counties in metro areas of fewer than 250,000

Non-metropolitan tracts

4 Urban population of 20,000 or more, adjacent to a metro area
5 Urban population of 20,000 or more, not adjacent to a metro area
6 Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area
7 Urban popluation of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area
8 Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban popuations, ajacent to a metro area
9 Completely rural or less than 2,500 urban population, not adjacent to a metro area

RUCA Rural-Urban Communiting Areas

1 Metropolitan area core:primary flow within an urbanized area (UA)
2 Metropolitan area high commuting: rimary flow 30% or more to a UA
3 Metropolitan area low commuting: primary flow 10% to 30% to a UA
4 Micropolitan area core: pimary flow within an Urban Cluster of 10,000 tp 49,999 (large UC)
5 Micropolitan high commuting: primary flow 30% or more to a large UC
6 Micropolitan low commuting: primary flow 10% to 30% to a large UC
7 Small town core: primary flow within an Urban Cluster of 2500-9999 (small UC)
8 Smll town high communities: prinary flow 30% or more to small UC
9 Small town low commuting: prinary flow 10% to 30% to small UC
10 Rural areas: prinary flow to a tract outside a UA or UC

1-3 Urban
4-7 Rural
8-10 Frontier / Bush / Remote

(10)

Advisory Committee List

Name	Agency
Kathy Allely	Governor's Council on Disabilities & Special Education
Steve Ashman	PHIP Division Manager, Municipality of Anchorage
David Blacketer	Co-Chair of Steering Committee, Commission member
Rita Bowen	Program Coordinator, MASST
Jeanette Burket	Aging Services Program Specialist, U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services
Lisa Cauble	Director, Trust Training Cooperative
Ella Craig	Anchorage Senior Advisory Commission and senior
Denise Daniello	Executive Director, Alaska Commission on Aging (ACoA)
Marie Darlin	Co-Chair of Steering Committee, ACoA Commission member
Joan Fisher	Chair, Anchorage Senior Advisory Commission
Karl Garber	Executive Director, Alzheimer's Resource of Alaska
Rachel Greenberg	Deputy Director, Palmer Senior Center, ACoA Commission Member
Mellisa Heflin	Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium
Ken Helander	Advocacy Director, AARP Alaska
Teresa Holt	Long Term Care Ombudsman
Heidi James Frost	Executive Director, Statewide Independent Living Council of Alaska
Amanda Lofgren	Program Officer, Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority
Jim McCall	Alaska Housing Finance Corporation Senior Housing Office
Banarsi Lal	Chair, Fairbanks North Star Borough Senior Advisory Commission
Lisa Morley	Grant Unit Manager, DSDS
Cyndi Nation	Project Director, Tanana Chiefs Conference
Mary Shields	Chair, Alaska Commission on Aging
Lesley Thompson	Planner, Alaska Commission on Aging
Albert Wall	Director, Division of Behavioral Health
Marianne Mills	Director of the Southeast Senior Services (SESS) Program Division of CCS (Catholic Community Service) & AgeNET Chair
Lisa Donat	Home Care Program Coordinator, Tanana Chiefs Conference
Sheila Soule	Assistance Vice Provost, UAA Office of Health Programs
Joan Houlihan	Behavioral Health Specialist, Division of Behavioral Health
David Levy	Senior Services Coordinator, Municipality of Anchorage, Department of Health & Human Services
Beth Goldstein	Supervising Attorney, Alaska Office of Public Advocacy, Office of Elder Fraud and Assistance
Brenda Mahlatini	Adult Protective Services Program Manager, Senior and Disabilities Services
Jane Urbanovsky	Administrator, Residential Licensing and Background Check Programs, Health Care Services, DHSS
Shaun Wilhelm	Chief of Risk and Research Management, Division of Behavioral Health
Barbara Crane	Tanana Chiefs Conference