

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
HUMAN SERVICES TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
SEPTEMBER 20, 2007

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Carl Harris-Morgan, Town of Gilbert, Chairman	*Sandra Mendez, DES/CSA
Joyce Gross, Town of Buckeye	*Kyle Moore, DES/ACYF
Judy Bowden, Mesa United Way	*Sylvia Sheffield, City of Avondale
Paige Garrett, Quality of Life Community Services, Inc	Carol Sherer, DES/DDD
Jeffery Jamison, City of Phoenix	*Judy Tapscott, City of Tempe
*Jayson Matthews, Tempe Community Council	+Patrick Tyrrell, City of Chandler
Deanna Jonovich, City of Phoenix	<u>OTHERS PRESENT</u>
*Jim Knaut, Area Agency on Aging	Stacy Mitchell, ASU student
*Margarita Leyvas, Maricopa County	Gina Harper, ASU student
Joyce Lopez-Powell, VSUW	Nancy Barkely, MAG ASU intern
+Bob Baratko for Dan Lundberg, City of Surprise	Amy St. Peter, MAG
Yolanda Ramos for Joy McClain, City of Tolleson	+Those members present by audio/videoconferencing.
Jose Mercado for Doris Marshall, City of Phoenix	*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

1. Call to Order

Chairman Carl Harris-Morgan, Town of Gilbert, welcomed everyone to the meeting at 1:04 pm. The meeting was not officially called to order until 1:15 p.m. when quorum was reached.

2. Call to the Audience

No comments were made.

3. Approval of August 9, 2007 Meeting Minutes

After quorum was reached, Chair Harris-Morgan called for a motion to approve the August 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, 2007 meeting minutes. Jeff Jamison requested that the minutes be revised to indicate Jessica Gonzalez served as his proxy, not Frances Delgado as the minutes currently state. Chair Harris-Morgan asked for a motion to reflect this change. Carol Sherer made a motion to approve the minutes as revised. Deanna Jonovich, City of Phoenix, seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Arizona Department of Economic Security Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) Utilization Presentations

Carol Sherer, DES, presented data about how the Division of Developmental Disabilities utilizes SSBG funds. This included a discussion about the department's needs and highest priorities for the upcoming fiscal year. This information was presented to help inform the SSBG allocation recommendation process.

The presentation included a description of the program and how it utilizes SSBG funds, the people served, distribution of the money, and assistance available. Disabilities covered under this division include "the four D's," or cerebral palsy, epilepsy, autism and cognitive disability, formerly known as mental retardation. Ms. Sherer said SSBG supports services that allow people who experience a developmental disability to live and work in the least restricted environment and to see their ability. These services also allow people to receive services that allow them to remain at home, develop a sense of self-worth, contribute to their community through the job they hold and the money they earn, live meaningful lives and feel that they matter.

Ms. Sherer reported that the SSBG funding was used in the following ways: four people received attendant care services, 11 persons served received habilitation services, 29 persons served received respite services and 19 persons served received transportation services. Ms. Sherer described attendant care as being provided in the individual's home and allowing family members to work. In addition, the services teach people new skills, help them develop more independence and helps keep families together.

Respite services provide a needed break so the family member can continue the caregiving. They also help teach the person served to interact with another caregiver. Transportation services help people get to work and in some cases, to recreational and social activities.

Ms. Sherer discussed the numbers of people served with employment programs as a result of SSBG funding. She stated that 270 persons served were able to receive employment services. Of that 270, 133 are now working with minimal supports thereby allowing more persons served to receive employment services in 2007-08. Of those 133 consumers, all are making at least minimum wage and one person is now at over \$12.00 an hour.

This accrues significant savings both for the individual and the community. For those working in Individual Supported Employment the cost is only an average of \$753.00 a year. Ms. Sherer said this is less than buying one cup of Starbucks coffee each workday. If a person works 20 hours a week and earn \$9.50 an hour, they will earn \$9,888 each year. The taxes paid from that salary is an average of \$988. That means there is a net gain back to the community of \$235.00 per person. When multiplied by the 81 clients in this salary range right now, more than \$19,035 is being returned to

the community in hard dollars. This does not take into account the value added to a person's life through employment.

Ms. Sherer discussed what happens to those who are unemployed. She said many would probably end up in a group home because the family could not afford to care for them at home. This would cost significantly more than the average of \$1,522 in support across all employment services. Group homes can cost as much as a \$100,000 a year. The family member may also end up in a nursing home because they cannot be cared for at home. This is particularly true of elderly caregivers. In several cases the family would have ended up homeless.

Ms. Sherer also presented what would happen if DES didn't receive the SSBG funds. She said the persons working would not have the support necessary to remain employed. Many of the families being provided respite will not survive as family units. She said if the person can't get to work they can't stay employed. Loss of services can change people's lives. Currently, there are almost 200 individuals who are waiting for services. Of this number, 77 families need respite services, 79 children need habilitation services and 24 adults need employment services.

Judy Bowden asked if the Division of Developmental Disabilities utilizes SSBG funds to provide the services themselves or if they subcontract with other agencies. Ms. Sherer replied that they buy services such as work programs, day programs, and respite care from agencies in the community. In addition, they have case managers in 14 offices across the valley. All services are provided to consumers by the office in the zip code they live in. Paige Garrett asked if any funds were given to group homes to provide services. Ms. Sherer stated that they did not contract services with any group homes.

Jose Mercado asked how a person qualified for Title 19. Ms. Sherer said eligibility for services depended on the ability of a person to care for themselves, the severity of the disability and to perform basic activities. When a person is not eligible for Title 19, Ms. Sherer said that the State can sometimes use other funds to provide services.

Chair Harris-Morgan reminded the committee that John Hoag would be presenting more quantitative data at the meeting in November 2007. Joyce Lopez-Powell asked if the committee could get some data on the projections for the next one to two years. Ms. Sherer stated that it is hard to project without having the legislative commitment for funding but that they could attempt to gather that data. She said they do know that the growth on average is about 200-250 individuals with disabilities per month in District One alone. Ms. Sherer said that they could assess the wait list. Chair Harris-Morgan agreed that they should look at the wait list and how they are maintained, the restrictions, and the limitations. Ms. Sherer added that they review the wait list annually and remove people when the needs are no longer there. She informed the committee that John Hoag would have to more quantitative data.

Chair Harris-Morgan asked about the ability to look at outcomes and if there is anything currently in place at DES. Ms. Sherer commented that John Hoag would have to answer but she did think it would be a good idea to have the committee members determine what types of outcomes they wanted to look at.

Chair Harris-Morgan added that looking at the outcomes would help identify the link between different services that are provided and the impact on the community. This would in turn help the committee assess what is being done with the money. Ms. Bowden commented that Mesa United Way requires agencies to report their outcomes. Ms. Lopez-Powell agreed that it is necessary to identify the indicators that will offer data on outcomes. Ms. Sherer suggested assessing the four target groups for desired outcome measures at the next meeting.

In summary, the Committee will request data about the projected need for services and any available information about outcome measures from DES to inform the allocation recommendation process this year. In addition, the Committee will consider identifying what outcome measures can be requested from DES in future years that will speak to the Committee's priorities without inflicting an undue reporting burden on DES. There will be an emphasis on capturing the best return on the investment of SSBG dollars through the services. Future presentations from the DES departments about how they utilize SSBG will include the percent of locally planned SSBG, percent of state planned SSBG and the percentage of SSBG funding versus all funding received for the services offered.

5. 2007 Regional Human Services Summit Report

Amy St. Peter, MAG, presented the second draft of the report detailing the projects developed at the first Regional Human Services Summit. A copy of the revised report was provided prior to the meeting. Ms. St. Peter thanked the committee members for attending the event and supporting this effort. She reviewed the changes made based on the Committee's feedback at the last meeting. Community partners have been identified for each of the projects. LISC has been added as a partner for the affordable housing and transportation project since the mail-out of the report for this meeting. Deanna Jonovich asked if this Committee was directly responsible for any of the projects. Ms. St. Peter replied that while the Committee could support any of the projects, the Committee was not directly responsible for implementing any of them. Ms. Jonovich made a motion to approve the report. Ms. Sherer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Implementation of the MAG Human Services Coordination Transportation Plan

Maureen DeCindis, MAG Transportation Planner, presented a report on implementation activities occurring throughout the region. This item was presented to inform and engage the Committee in implementation activities. MAG has identified sub-regional groups in the East Valley, West Valley and Phoenix. The groups are meeting to identify local best practices and strategies for new coordination efforts. The next meetings will be held in October and November. The groups are also helping to ensure that information used to develop an online service directory is

comprehensive. In April 2008, MAG will have another summit with a focus on local best practices. The event will form the foundation for updating the current coordination plan.

7. Resource Assessment Project Update

Amy St Peter, MAG provided an update on the project including steps to assess the demand for human services on a regional basis by using indicators that offer very current data. This item was presented to gain input from the committee about this new approach. Ms. St. Peter explained the purpose of the project as assessing the resources people use to address human services. Identifying and mapping out the demand for human services will give a context to the resources and be a useful tool for people agencies planning human services delivery.

Ms. St. Peter explained that data have been gathered from the 2000 Census, TANF, property and violent crime rates, foreclosures, and presence of check cashing operations by zip code. The data are then calculated per capita. The standard deviations are turned into a point scale from one to five points that are assigned to each category. The total points, or highest demand for human services, will be 25 points. She recognized the tremendous efforts of Steven Howland, an Arizona State University intern from the Urban Planning School, in gathering the data and constructing the model. Ms. St. Peter introduced Jeff Romine, MAG's Senior Economist, and recognized his guidance as being instrumental to the project as well.

She explained that additional data are needed about older adults from areas of service provision, meals on wheels, and transportation. DES, the Area Agency on Aging and Maricopa County have all been contacted for this data, but they could not provide it by the meeting date. Staff will continue to work with these agencies to collect the data. Mr. Romine said that an alternative is the data cannot be obtained would be to use data about people in assisted living communities, nursing homes and age restricted communities.

Ms. Lopez-Powell inquired if major shifts in the data or in the needs will be assessed. Ms. St Peter stated they would be reviewing the data for major shifts. Ms. Sherer voiced her concerns regarding the use of nursing home or assisted living data. Her concern was that those people are getting there needs met and using this data might skew the results. Mr. Romine assured her they would try to secure service provision data as the first preference. He added that this data element can be seen from a locational standpoint because many municipalities do not allow nursing homes or other types of assisted living in their communities. It is important to gather this information to identify where the next facility needs to be built, or where some of the other services might need to be made available.

Ms. Bowden asked for clarification on the use of points within the data. Mr. Howland explained one represents low demand for human services and five represents a high level of demand for human services. A community with a low overall score does not present a high demand for human services. Presently, some communities are already

scoring an 18 without the older adult being included in the score. Mr. Romine said this is a cause for concern. He added that they want to be able to establish a median value from one year to the next to determine changes in demand. This can be used to benchmark and track outcomes.

Chair Harris-Morgan expressed concerns with using the foreclosure data. He said that many foreclosed homes were actually owned by investors and therefore the foreclosure rates may not represent a true demand for human services or serve as an indicator of low income areas. Mr. Romine stated that the foreclosure itself has an effect on the community, even if the home was owned by an investor. A foreclosed home in a neighborhood brings down the property values of the neighbors and makes it harder for them to sell or refinance their home. This can create a financial hardship and a resulting demand for human services.

Mr. Baratko agreed with Mr. Romine that the impact of foreclosure is not felt solely by the homeowner, but that the people who live in community are affected too. He went on to add that foreclosure is a multi-faceted issue that affects the overall health of the community. He stated that appointments for his Community Action Program office fill up in the first two days of the month which indicates a high need for human services. Ms. St. Peter offered an example from her neighborhood of a family going through a divorce and not being able to sell the home because there have been so many foreclosures in that neighborhood.

Mr. Baratko asked if Mr. Howland is taking into consideration that some communities restrict the amount of check cashing businesses that can be built in the community. Mr. Romine stated that they can look into this.

Ms. Jonovich commented on how important it is to keep having these discussions about the project. She asked if there is a possibility for the Committee to reassess the project after seeing the next series of maps with more information about the additional data. Ms. St. Peter confirmed the project would remain on the Committee's agenda. Mr. Romine stated that there are no data to serve as a benchmark for this effort. He said the true test for the validity of the data will be the Committee's ongoing assessment.

Ms. Sherer asked if the committee could see maps that show the different indicators and the area it will impact before it is all put together into one map. Ms. Lopez-Powell agreed that it would make sense to look at the indicators and their impacts separately. Mr. Jamison added that looking at the indicators overlaid with each other will help to identify areas of additional need. Ms. St Peter stated at the next meeting MAG would have hard copy maps to show each indicator separately. A power point of the maps could then layer the indicators on one by one so the committee members can see how the indicators change the scenario. It was also recommended to print the maps on transparencies when the final report was published so people could see the relationships between the indicators. Mr. Baratko commented that he thought this was

a great discussion and that he thought the project would really help. Mr. Harris-Morgan thanked Ms. St. Peter and her staff for all of their hard work on this project.

8. Comments from the Committee

No comments were made.

10 Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:38pm. **The next Human Services Technical Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 11, 2007 at 1:00 p.m. at the MAG offices, second floor, Cholla Room.**