NANASP 2011 RESOLUTIONS

NANASP RESOLUTION I:
FY 2012 APPROPRIATIONS

Whereas: The rising costs of gas and energy as well as food and loss of volunteers is impacting nutrition programs across the country.

Whereas: A NANASP member survey revealed that programs are already instituting cutbacks in service in response to these rising costs.

Whereas: The nation is witnessing an increase in the number of seniors at risk of hunger and food insecurity with the number ranging from 3 to 6 million.

Whereas: Current recipients of congregate and home delivered meals have limitations in activities of daily living which can be precursors for nursing home admission.

Now therefore let it be resolved: NANASP, as a member of the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations, endorses its call for a 10 percent increase in funding for the Older Americans Act nutrition programs in FY 2012 and,

Be it further resolved: NANASP bases its support for this increase on the fact that investments in the Older Americans Act nutrition programs will save future Medicaid and Medicare costs by allowing older persons at risk of hunger and malnutrition to remain at home or in the community and not in a nursing home.

Be it further resolved: NANASP supports additional funding for the supportive services and family caregiver programs as proposed in the Administration’s FY 2012 budget.
NANASP RESOLUTION II:
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS

Whereas: The House passed Department of Agriculture FY 2012 Appropriations bill includes cuts totaling $2.7 billion below FY 2011 levels.

Whereas: Included in this bill is a $37 million cut in the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, which primarily serves low income seniors by supplementing their diets with nutritious USDA commodity foods.

Whereas: Funding for the successful Senior Farmers Market Program was flat funded in this bill and,

Whereas: The problem of senior hunger and food insecurity is growing.

Now therefore be it resolved: NANASP stands strongly opposed to the House passed Agriculture Appropriations bill and urges the Senate to restore the cuts to these critical nutrition programs helping the vulnerable of all ages and,

Be it further resolved: Congress in FY 2012 should ensure that nutrition programs targeting low income and food insecure older persons get an inflation based increase to meet current and growing needs.
Whereas: The Older Americans Act is scheduled to expire on September 30, 2011.

Whereas: Since 1965 the Act has provided millions of older adults an important array of home and community based services promoting their dignity and independence.

Whereas: Reauthorizations of the Older Americans Act have been bipartisan in the past.

Whereas: In preparation for reauthorization the Administration on Aging solicited views and recommendations from organizations and individuals including NANASP.

And whereas: The Leadership Council of Aging Organizations supports a reauthorization of the Older Americans Act.

Now therefore be it resolved: NANASP calls on the House Education and Workforce Committee and the Senate Health Education Labor and Pensions Committee to accelerate their work to produce an Older Americans Act reauthorization in 2011 and,

Be it further resolved: NANASP calls on the Obama Administration to release its principles on the OAA reauthorization to help direct Congress.

Be it further resolved: NANASP urges that a reauthorization accomplish a strengthening of the nutrition programs especially with respect to the protection of all nutrition dollars from being transferred to non-nutrition programs.

Be it further resolved: NANASP urges that a reauthorization accomplish a greater decision making at the local level on how nutrition dollars are spent by maintaining the integrity of a separate congregate and home delivered meals program.

Be it further resolved: NANASP also supports a Nutrition Resource Center, greater use of fresh fruits and vegetables and more flexibility in meal planning to reflect ethnic and cultural considerations.
NANASP RESOLUTION IV:
INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD

Whereas: The Affordable Care Act enacted by Congress in 2010 included a provision creating an Independent Payment Advisory Board to help slow the growth of Medicare.

Whereas: NANASP in January 2010 signed a letter with numerous other aging and patient advocacy groups opposing the inclusion of IPAB in the Affordable Care Act.

Whereas: Once appointed, the IPAB would be a 15 member board appointed by the President to reduce the growth of Medicare if it exceeds a certain level in a calendar year.

Whereas: The recommendations of the IPAB become law unless Congress enacts an alternative with an equivalent amount of slowing of Medicare growth.

Whereas: The IPAB recommendations could include reducing payments to doctors and limiting or ending Medicare coverage for certain treatments or drugs.

Whereas: Decisions about Medicare spending and coverage have resided with Congress throughout the 46 year history of Medicare and,

Whereas: Legislation is pending in both the House and Senate to repeal IPAB.

Now therefore be it resolved: NANASP urges Congress to adopt legislation to either modify IPAB by limiting its authority and making it more advisory in nature and subject to normal Congressional review and action or repeal it. Further, we urge Congress to act during this Session before implementation of IPAB proceeds.
NANASP RESOLUTION V:
ELDER JUSTICE ACT

Whereas: NANASP as a member of the Elder Justice Coalition helped achieve the passage of the bi partisan Elder Justice Act in 2010.

Whereas: The Elder Justice Act is the largest federal commitment to the prevention of elder abuse in history.

Whereas: The Elder Justice Act as authorized requires the passage of separate legislation for it to be appropriated.

Whereas: The Administration’s FY 2012 budget proposed $21.5 million for the Elder Justice Act to strengthen adult protective services, the long term care ombudsman and elder abuse prevention for native Americans.

Now therefore be it resolved: NANASP supports the President’s Elder Justice Act budget request and urges the House and Senate to approve it as part of the FY 2012 Labor HHS Appropriations bill.
Whereas: The federal government pays a percentage of a state’s Medicaid costs, factoring a state’s per capital income when determining the funding match.

Whereas: Under the Medicaid block grant proposal, included in the House passed budget, the federal government will provide each state with a fix dollar amount for Medicaid costs.

Whereas: Under a block grant, a state is responsible for any Medicaid costs over and above the fixed dollar grant.

Whereas: In order for the federal government to receive savings under a Medicaid block grant, the block grant amount must be below what is provided under the current system.

Whereas: A state that receives less federal funding for its Medicaid program will look for alternative solutions for the lack of funds, such as reducing benefits, raising cost-sharing, or reducing provider payments.

Whereas: A reduction in Medicaid benefits and provider payments, and an increase in cost-sharing will jeopardize the long-term services and supports that 6.3 million older adults and 9.8 million individuals with special needs rely on.

Now therefore be it resolved: NANASP firmly opposes any proposal to convert federal funding for Medicaid to a block grant.