

El Dorado County		1,711 sq.mi. 91 persons / sq.mi.		Median Age: 39.4																																																																							
Snapshot			Workforce																																																																								
El Dorado County extends from the foothills east of Sacramento to the shores of Lake Tahoe in the Sierra Nevada Mountains. In 2000, the median age was 6 years older than that of the state of California. More than one of every 8 people was over 65 years of age and one in 83 was over 85. Nearly one in 4 was 65+ or disabled.			The unemployment rate was 3.8% (2001). There were an estimated 159 direct care nursing staff needed in facilities (2000). Average hourly wages (2001):																																																																								
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>RN</td> <td>HHA</td> <td>Nurse Asst</td> <td>IHSS</td> <td>MSW</td> <td>PT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>\$28.62</td> <td>\$9.79</td> <td>\$9.92</td> <td>\$6.75</td> <td>\$22.37</td> <td>\$29.49</td> </tr> </table>			RN	HHA	Nurse Asst	IHSS	MSW	PT	\$28.62	\$9.79	\$9.92	\$6.75	\$22.37	\$29.49																																																										
RN	HHA	Nurse Asst	IHSS	MSW	PT																																																																						
\$28.62	\$9.79	\$9.92	\$6.75	\$22.37	\$29.49																																																																						
Medi-Cal			Housing																																																																								
El Dorado ranked among counties with a low percent of Medi-Cal eligibles (2000)--more than one in every 16 people.			The median home price was \$226,708 (2001). Housing vacancy rates in 2000 were different than the state's average: homeowners lower at 1.2; rentals were higher at 5.8%. El Dorado had more households with individuals 65+ (20.5%) but fewer with 65+ living alone (7.3%) than California on average. Of those 65+, one in 3.1 were living alone (31.8%).																																																																								
Long Term Care: Special Programs			Transportation																																																																								
			Reported transit services for people in the cities and county of El Dorado: 110,733 passengers using special vehicles; 13 special vehicles operated peak hours and 13 operated middays during the week; 7 on Saturdays; and 4 on Sundays.																																																																								
Population Growth (increase since 1990): 24.1%			65+ yrs: 29.4%		85+ yrs: 77.3%																																																																						
Demographics				Percent Population Growth 1990-2000																																																																							
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Population</th> <th>1990</th> <th>%</th> <th>2000</th> <th>%</th> <th>2010</th> <th>%</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">(US Census)</td> <td colspan="2">(US Census)</td> <td colspan="2">(DOF Projection)</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total Population</td> <td>125,995</td> <td>100%</td> <td>156,299</td> <td>100%</td> <td>215,155</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 60</td> <td>20,757</td> <td>16%</td> <td>26,023</td> <td>17%</td> <td>42,335</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disabled (21-64)</td> <td>not available</td> <td>not available</td> <td>16,058</td> <td>10%</td> <td>not available</td> <td>not available</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total 65+</td> <td>14,945</td> <td>12%</td> <td>19,334</td> <td>12%</td> <td>29,048</td> <td>14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Over 65 + Disabled (21-64)</td> <td>not available</td> <td>not available</td> <td>35,392</td> <td>23%</td> <td>not available</td> <td>not available</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total 65-74</td> <td>9,748</td> <td>8%</td> <td>10,952</td> <td>7%</td> <td>16,354</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total 75-84</td> <td>4,200</td> <td>3%</td> <td>6,614</td> <td>4%</td> <td>8,927</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total 85+</td> <td>997</td> <td>1%</td> <td>1,768</td> <td>1%</td> <td>3,767</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Population	1990	%	2000	%	2010	%		(US Census)		(US Census)		(DOF Projection)		Total Population	125,995	100%	156,299	100%	215,155	100%	Over 60	20,757	16%	26,023	17%	42,335	20%	Disabled (21-64)	not available	not available	16,058	10%	not available	not available	Total 65+	14,945	12%	19,334	12%	29,048	14%	Total Over 65 + Disabled (21-64)	not available	not available	35,392	23%	not available	not available	Total 65-74	9,748	8%	10,952	7%	16,354	8%	Total 75-84	4,200	3%	6,614	4%	8,927	4%	Total 85+	997	1%	1,768	1%	3,767	2%		
Population	1990	%	2000	%	2010	%																																																																					
	(US Census)		(US Census)		(DOF Projection)																																																																						
Total Population	125,995	100%	156,299	100%	215,155	100%																																																																					
Over 60	20,757	16%	26,023	17%	42,335	20%																																																																					
Disabled (21-64)	not available	not available	16,058	10%	not available	not available																																																																					
Total 65+	14,945	12%	19,334	12%	29,048	14%																																																																					
Total Over 65 + Disabled (21-64)	not available	not available	35,392	23%	not available	not available																																																																					
Total 65-74	9,748	8%	10,952	7%	16,354	8%																																																																					
Total 75-84	4,200	3%	6,614	4%	8,927	4%																																																																					
Total 85+	997	1%	1,768	1%	3,767	2%																																																																					
Gender (2000) US Census <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total</th> <th>65+</th> <th>85+</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>49.9%</td> <td>5.7%</td> <td>0.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>50.1%</td> <td>6.7%</td> <td>0.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Total	65+	85+	Male	49.9%	5.7%	0.4%	Female	50.1%	6.7%	0.7%	Demographic Trends																																																											
	Total	65+	85+																																																																								
Male	49.9%	5.7%	0.4%																																																																								
Female	50.1%	6.7%	0.7%																																																																								
Ethnicity (2000) US Census <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total</th> <th>65+</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>100%</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White*</td> <td>85%</td> <td>11.92%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black or African American*</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0.03%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic or Latino</td> <td>9%</td> <td>0.41%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian</td> <td>2%</td> <td>0.19%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td> <td>0.1%</td> <td>0.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td> <td>0.8%</td> <td>0.05%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Some Other Race</td> <td>0.2%</td> <td>0.01%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multi-Racial (two or more)</td> <td>2.1%</td> <td>0.16%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Not of Hispanic or Latino Origin</p>					Total	65+	Total	100%	12%	White*	85%	11.92%	Black or African American*	0%	0.03%	Hispanic or Latino	9%	0.41%	Asian	2%	0.19%	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	0.00%	American Indian or Alaska Native	0.8%	0.05%	Some Other Race	0.2%	0.01%	Multi-Racial (two or more)	2.1%	0.16%	<p>El Dorado County's population has grown at a faster pace than California in the last decade--and nearly double the state's rate of growth for those over 65 and over 85.</p> <p>In 2000, El Dorado had 15% non-Whites and the state had 53% non-Whites. One of every 11 persons in the county was Hispanic/Latino; one in 48 was Black/African American; one in 48 was Asian; and one in every 8 persons was multi-racial. Looking at age and ethnicity: one in 8 was 65+/White and one in 244 was 65+/Hispanic/Latino.</p>																																									
	Total	65+																																																																									
Total	100%	12%																																																																									
White*	85%	11.92%																																																																									
Black or African American*	0%	0.03%																																																																									
Hispanic or Latino	9%	0.41%																																																																									
Asian	2%	0.19%																																																																									
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	0.00%																																																																									
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.8%	0.05%																																																																									
Some Other Race	0.2%	0.01%																																																																									
Multi-Racial (two or more)	2.1%	0.16%																																																																									
Enrollment (2000) <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Eligibles</th> <th>% Tot Pop</th> <th>Elig 65+</th> <th>% 65+</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Medi-Cal Recipients</td> <td>10,507</td> <td>6.2%</td> <td>1,394</td> <td>0.83%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SSI/SSP Recipients</td> <td>2,433</td> <td>1.4%</td> <td>not available</td> <td>not available</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dual Eligibles</td> <td>2,270</td> <td>1.3%</td> <td>not available</td> <td>not available</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Eligibles	% Tot Pop	Elig 65+	% 65+	Medi-Cal Recipients	10,507	6.2%	1,394	0.83%	SSI/SSP Recipients	2,433	1.4%	not available	not available	Dual Eligibles	2,270	1.3%	not available	not available	<p>The median household income was \$4,000 more than California's with fewer people living below the poverty level--one in 14.</p>																																																			
	Eligibles	% Tot Pop	Elig 65+	% 65+																																																																							
Medi-Cal Recipients	10,507	6.2%	1,394	0.83%																																																																							
SSI/SSP Recipients	2,433	1.4%	not available	not available																																																																							
Dual Eligibles	2,270	1.3%	not available	not available																																																																							
Persons under Poverty Level: 7.1%			65+ yrs: 5.1%		Median Household Income: \$51,484																																																																						

NOTE: Data on Page 2 are from statewide sources only. Data may not include all funding sources. See notes on Data Sources.

SERVICES	ANNUAL INFORMATION		
Home and Community Based Services (County Level Data)	Providers or Sites	Serving	Expense / Allocation
Adult Day Services (ADS)			
Adult Day Health Care (ADHC) Providers	0	0	\$0
Adult Day Care (ADC) / Adult Day Support Centers (ADSC)	2	60	not available
Multipurpose Senior Services Program (MSSP)	1	116	\$279,604
In-Home Services			
Home Health Agencies (HHAs)	5	2,246	not available
In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS)	459	481	\$3,083,783
Adult Protective Services (APS)	1	117	\$290,549
Independent Living Centers (ILCs)	1	179	\$140,780

County Level Data Not Available			
Caregiver Resource Centers (CRCs)	1	1,965	\$880,006
The Del Oro Caregiver Resource Center provides services to Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Sierra, Nevada, Placer, El Dorado, Amador, Alpine, Calaveras, San Joaquin, Sacramento, and Yolo counties.			

PSA 29 - Single-County AAA (County Level Data)			
Area Agencies on Aging			
\$0.55M (State) + \$0.51M (Fed) = \$1.06M			
Includes \$78K Info & Assistance, \$0.12M Fed Caregiver Support Prgm			
Serving: El Dorado County			
The AAA serves as an access point for persons needing information or services for elders, persons with disabilities, and their families or caregivers. The agency provides advocacy, information and assistance, local planning, funding allocations, and monitoring of services. The following may not represent all the AAA's local programs, services or expenditures:			
Nutrition			
Brown Bag	not available	35	\$25,605
Home Delivered Meals	not available	100	\$124,057
Congregate Meals	not available	761	\$245,653
Assistance / Counseling / Advocacy			
Health Insurance Counseling & Advocacy Programs (HICAP)	1	1,125	\$0
Ombudsman	1	245	\$48,903
Care Coordination			
Linkages	1	165	\$250,758
Specialized Care			
Alzheimer's Day Care Resource Centers (ADCRCs)	1	31	\$86,000
Senior Service Corps			
Foster Grandparents (number of senior volunteers)	not available	6	\$22,075
Senior Companions (number of senior volunteers)	not available	14	\$59,913

Facility Based Services (County Level Data)	Providers	Serving	Expense / Allocation
Freestanding Nursing Facility (NFs)	3	239	\$5,633,343
Hospital-Based Nursing Facility (NFs)	2	63	\$3,613,684
Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly (RCFEs)	41	381	not available

County Comparisons	
How does your county rank on these indicators - in the highest, middle, or lowest third of all counties in the state?	
Indicator	Rank
65+ Pop Growth (1990-2000)	6
85+ Pop Growth (1990-2000)	6
Tot Pop Growth (1990-2000)	9
Median Age	14
Median Household Income	15
% Vacancy - rentals	23
HHA Providers/1,000	23
ADS Providers/1,000	24
% Population 65+	27
Total Population	30
RCFE Beds/1,000	34
% Age 21-64 Disabled	39
% Vacancy - houses	40
% Population 85+	44
% Unemployment Rate	47
% 65+ and Live Alone	49
IHSS Providers/1,000	51
Total NF Patients/1,000	52
% Persons < Poverty	55
% 65+ < Poverty	54
% Medi-Cal Recipients	55
% SSI / SSP Recipients	55
% Medi-Cal Recipients 65+	56
% Dual Eligibles	56
Note: Rankings are out of 58 counties, where 1 represents the highest number and 58 represents the lowest number	

Highest Third (1-19)

Middle Third (20-39)

Lowest Third (40-58)

Emerging Long Term Care Issues	
~ Nearly one in 4 adults was 65+ or disabled.	~ Few seniors 65+, and others, were on Medi-Cal or living in poverty.
~ Rapid growth in seniors 65+ and 85+ as well as total population.	~ Few people were receiving Medi-Cal, Medicare and SSI/SSP.
~ The median age was higher than many counties, but there were few seniors 85+.	~ Rental housing was more available than homes; few seniors 65+ lived alone.
~ Income was high and the unemployment rate was low.	~ Adult day services and home health were more available than RCFEs, NFs, and IHSS.

