

April 2, 2012

TO: Members of the MAG Human Services Technical Committee

FROM: Deanna Jonovich, City of Phoenix Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF AGENDA

Meeting - 1:00 p.m.

Wednesday, April 11, 2012 *Please note the change in meeting day.

MAG Office, Second Floor, Chaparral Room
302 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix

The next MAG Human Services Technical Committee (HSTC) meeting will be held at the time and place noted above. Members of the Human Services Technical Committee may attend either in person or by phone. Supporting information is enclosed for your review.

The meeting agenda and resource materials are also available on the MAG website at www.azmag.gov. In addition to the existing website location, the agenda packet will be available via the File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site at: <ftp://ftp.azmag.gov/HumanServicesTechnicalCommittee>. This location is publicly accessible and does not require a password.

Please park in the garage underneath the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting, parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

In 1996, the Regional Council approved a simple majority quorum for all MAG advisory committees. If the Human Services Technical Committee does not meet the quorum requirement, members who have arrived at the meeting will be instructed a legal meeting cannot occur and subsequently be dismissed. Your attendance at the meeting is strongly encouraged.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

If you have any questions, please call the MAG office.

MAG HUMAN SERVICES TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
TENTATIVE AGENDA
April 11, 2012

COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED

1. Call to Order

2. Call to the Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address HSTC on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless HSTC requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard.

3. Approval of March 7, 2012 Meeting Minutes

The draft minutes for the March 7, 2012 meeting are posted with the meeting materials.

4. City Leaders Institute (CLI) Issues Statement

The Partnership for Livable Communities, along with input from the local CLI team, has developed an issues statement/background paper for the region. The Committee will review the issues statement and have an opportunity to provide input. Please refer to issue statement/background paper posted with meeting materials.

5. MAG Municipal Aging Services Project Update

Work is underway to identify the MAG Municipal Aging Services Project strategy priorities and next steps. A MASP Stakeholder group meeting will convene on April 9, 2012, to further inform the work of this project. An update will be offered on the project.

2. Information.

3. Approve the HSTC March 7, 2012 Meeting Minutes.

4. Information, discussion and input on the City Leaders Institute Issues Statement and background paper.

5. Information and discussion.

6. Maricopa County Needs Assessment

The Maricopa County Human Services Department conducted a point in time needs assessment survey in early fall 2011. An update of the aggregate results will be offered. Please refer to aggregate survey results posted with meeting materials.

6. Information and discussion.

7. Expect More Arizona

Expect More Arizona is a high expectations movement dedicated to making Arizona education the best in the nation. An overview of Expect More Arizona and the issues affecting the state will be offered to the committee.

7. Information and discussion.

8. Heat Relief Network

Throughout the past six years, the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness has partnered with municipalities, non-profit organizations, and the faith community to coordinate heat relief efforts for vulnerable persons in the region. An update will be offered on plans for the 2012 summer and an invitation to join the network as a new or returning participant will be extended.

8. Information and discussion.

9. Request for Future Agenda Items

Topics or issues of interest that the MAG Human Services Technical Committee would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting will be requested.

9. Information and discussion.

10. Comments from the Committee

An opportunity will be provided for HSTC members to present a brief summary of current events. HSTC is not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

10. For information.

AMARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
HUMAN SERVICES TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 7, 2012

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Deanna Jonovich, City of Phoenix, Chair
+Mary Berumen, City of Mesa
+Sara Stone for Kyle Bogdon, DES/ACYF
*Krista Cornish, Town of Buckeye
+Patty Russell for Naomi Farrell, City of Tempe
+Laura Guild, Arizona Department of Economic Security
Tim Cole for Jeffery Jamison, City of Phoenix
Jim Knaut, Area Agency on Aging
*Margarita Leyvas, Maricopa County, Vice Chair
Joyce Lopez-Powell, Valley of the Sun United Way
Steven MacFarlane, City of Phoenix
+Jayson Matthews, Tempe Community Council
Leah Powell, City of Chandler
*Cindy Saverino, Arizona Department of Economic Security

Sylvia Sheffield, City of Avondale
+Carol Sherer, Arizona Department of Economic Security/DDD

OTHERS PRESENT

+Sarah Griffiths, Wholonomy
Mark Holleran, Central Arizona Shelter Services
+Cassandra, O’Neill, Wholonomy
Tim Schmaltz, Protecting Arizona’s Family Coalition
Ron Vine, ETC Institute
Michael White, City of Tolleson

Rachel Brito
Amy St. Peter, MAG

+Those members present by audio/videoconferencing.

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

1. Call to Order
Chair Deanna Jonovich, City of Phoenix, called the meeting to order at 1:07 p.m. Introductions ensued.
2. Call to the Audience
An opportunity was provided for members of the public to address the Committee. No public comments were made.
3. Approval of January 12, 2012 HSTC Meeting Minutes
Chair Jonovich called for a motion to approve the January 12, 2012, meeting minutes. Sylvia Sheffield, City of Avondale, motioned to approve the minutes. Carol Sherer, Arizona Department of Economic Security, seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
4. Revision to the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)
Chair Jonovich invited Amy St. Peter, MAG, to provide an update on the revisions to the FY 2013 SSBG allocation recommendations.

Ms. St. Peter advised the SSBG allocations were approved to be sent to the Department of Economic Security (DES) by the MAG Management Committee and Regional Council without any changes. Ms. St. Peter informed the Committee that MAG staff received a call from DES asking that funding allocations be reduced by 3.6 percent. The funding reduction is being made by the federal government as a result of population shifting. The impact of the recession has been a major component in the reduction. The reduction affects locally and state planned funding.

In the past, the Committee has reduced each of the services by 3.6 percent in an effort to minimize the impact and also to have a proportionate impact across all services. Ms. St. Peter advised there are other options available. She referred the Committee to the draft revised SSBG allocations reflecting a 3.6 percent reduction across all services. She advised the draft is one option, however, other options may be considered. Ms. Sheffield made a motion to recommend approval of the revised MAG FY 2013 Social Services Block Grant Allocation recommendations to reflect a 3.6 percent decrease across all services. Steve MacFarlane, City of Phoenix, seconded the motion. The motion passed.

5. Aging Services Survey Results

Chair Jonovich invited Ron Vine, ETC Institute, to present the results of the MAG Municipal Aging Services Project survey conducted in Maricopa County. Mr. Vine presented the 2012 senior survey findings addressing the purpose, methodology, major findings and conclusions. One thousand thirty four, (1,034) surveys of randomly selected respondents who were age 55 years and over were completed by mail and phone in Maricopa County. The survey took approximately 15 minutes to complete and ensured completion of 200 surveys in five different age categories providing a good distribution among participants' age.

Ms. St. Peter noted the responses of respondent age 90+ was one percent. She inquired whether or not it is appropriate to extrapolate to other people in the region who might be 90 years and older as the results do not appear to be very diverse due to the smaller sampling within that age category. Mr. Vine agreed, suggesting further grouping some of the age categories. Mr. Vine advised the five major findings address satisfaction, health care issues, knowledge of services, public transportation and developing a larger regional public transit system. He provided a detailed overview of the survey questions and responses.

It was noted the use of public transportation and senior centers will nearly double over the next ten years. Ms. St. Peter added the current population in Maricopa County for people age 65 and over is 462,000. However, within the next eight years, that number is expected to increase to more than 700,000 people. Mr. Vine noted some of the percentages may appear low within the report however, the actual numbers represent a vast number of individuals within Maricopa County.

Jim Knaut, Area Agency on Aging, commented on respondents' concerns over the ability to drive and the level of satisfaction with transportation. He noted in some

cases, the level of satisfaction appears to follow along the light rail line alleviating people's concern. Ms. Sheffield inquired whether the lack of awareness of services may be due in part to people not needing to use those services. Mr. Vine agreed noting the lack of awareness is an issue across the board for all age groups and would apply to people who are too young to need the services as well as those who need services but are not aware of what is available. Chair Jonovich thanked Mr. Vine for his report. The Committee expressed an interest in receiving the survey data for use at other meetings and to inform community leaders. Ms. St. Peter advised the survey database and presentation will be available on the MAG website. Additionally, a presentation will be offered to the MAG Management Committee and Regional Council.

Mark Holleran, Central Arizona Shelter Services, inquired about similar outcomes for studies conducted in other states. Mr. Vine advised not enough research has been completed to offer a national perspective on the results as the vast majority of communities have not conducted this type of survey. He noted ETC Institute generally conducts these types of studies for people age 18 and older. He said Maricopa County is on the cutting edge from the standpoint of local units of government conducting this type of study. Tim Schmaltz, Protecting Arizona's Family Coalition (PAFCO), talked about the number of people who are concerned about depression. Currently, 27 percent of respondents report this concern. Applying the percent to the projected growth means 150,000 people will share this concern by 2020. This has dramatic implications for the mental health system. He advised policy makers need to hear this.

Joyce Lopez-Powell, Valley of the Sun United Way, commented about the long wait lists for services and lack of support from policy makers for meeting people's basic needs. She questioned how to involve more people in policy decisions and make the correlation that what happens in the policy sessions now affects what will be available to them in the future. Chair Jonovich thanked Ms. Lopez-Powell for leading the discussion into the next agenda item.

6. Planning for the Next 100 Years

Chair Jonovich invited Ms. St. Peter to present an overview on the *Planning for the Next 100 Years* event that was held on February 15, 2012. Ms. St. Peter thanked everyone for their participation noting more than 200 people attended the event. Kathryn Lawler, Atlanta Regional Commission, offered the keynote presentation, which was extremely well received. Atlanta is a peer region experiencing the same type of distributed growth and facing similar challenges. Ms. Lawler provided a great opportunity to hear a different perspective from a sister agency.

At the end of the day, participants engaged in interactive activities with consultants Cassandra O'Neill and Sarah Griffiths of Wholonomy. The event offered seven different workshops. Topics for the workshops were identified during the community engagement and outreach. Participants received information on local and national best practices and were provided an opportunity to identify areas in which to continue

the work moving forward. Areas of focus that were identified include: assessing the needs of care givers, funding, senior centers, education and training, healthcare, transportation, and economic security and advocacy.

Ms. St. Peter asked for input on how best to continue moving the work forward given the available resources. She noted the City Leaders Institute will be one method to address the work. Chair Jonovich recommended Committee members be given an opportunity to identify the top two priorities to address this year as a start. She agreed the City Leaders Institute would be a good tool for addressing at least one issue.

Ms. St. Peter informed the Committee that representatives from the Arizona State University School of Nursing have expressed an interest in working with MAG. She noted a lot of work is being focused on transportation issues, however, healthcare is an issue that MAG has not been greatly involved in. Ms. St. Peter advised part of the model is to develop a toolkit of resources local governments can use when working collaboratively with other groups to address the needs of residents age 65 and over. The focus areas identified are based on feedback from the workshops and groups that met at the end of the day during the recent conference. Input for additional focus areas or partners is requested. She offered an opportunity to readdress the issue at the next Committee meeting to allow members an opportunity to digest the information.

Ms. Lopez-Powell recommended contacting representatives from *Experience Matters* regarding their program on engaging senior as volunteers. It was noted Experience Matters offered a workshop at the Planning for the Next 100 Years event. Chair Jonovich recommended the Committee review each focus area to determine if there are current initiatives or collaborative efforts occurring within the community so as to not duplicate efforts. Ms. St. Peter advised the first phase of the project was to create an inventory of services. She suggested it would be beneficial to integrate the recommended focus areas with the inventory to identify either areas where no work is being done or duplicative efforts. Ms. St. Peter requested Wholonomy consultants work on integrating the inventory with the focus areas.

Chair Jonovich requested an update be presented at the next HSTC meeting. Mr. Knaut expressed agreement adding it would be beneficial to research current programs and available resources. The Osher Institute and the caregiver consortium, run by David Best, Division of Aging and Adult Services, were also recommended as resources. Ms. St. Peter thanked everyone for their input. She advised staff would redistribute the service inventory so that Committee members may review and provide any additional input. Wholonomy consultants will work to integrate the inventory and additional components identified during the conference.

7. City Leaders Institute

Chair Jonovich advised Arizona is one of five sites selected to participate in the MetLife's City Leaders Institute. She invited Amy St. Peter to provide a report and timeline for the pilot project. Ms. St. Peter reported Maricopa is one of five regions

invited to participate in a City Leaders Institute funded by MetLife Foundation and working in partnership with Partners for Livable Communities. The other regions include San Diego; Miami; Arlington County, Virginia; and Montgomery County, Maryland.

Over the next year, the project will address one topic, chosen by local stakeholders, as it relates to aging. City Leaders Institute will provide technical assistance, connections to national experts, and facilitate participation with other regions to identify opportunities for improving how aging services are addressed in this region.

Ms. St. Peter referred to the Greater Phoenix Region City Leaders Institute issue statement. She noted a lot of information is available from the focus groups, key informant interviews, and the survey. Further data, specifically addressing senior centers and the ability for people age 65 and older to engage in their community, is available from the survey than was presented during the meeting. Ms. St. Peter discussed the importance of engaging with others to have better connections and more purpose in life. She noted senior centers are a very important tool to engage people in the community, however, as the number of people age 65 and over increases, many senior centers are seeing declines in the number of people attending. The purpose for the project is to review the senior center model to ensure people have the connections they need in order to age in place and remain happy and healthy. In researching the model, the project will also focus on enhancements and potentially identifying other things that can be done to help people engage in their community.

Ms. St. Peter advised a team of four to six people and an advisory group will be formed to work on this project. Anyone interested in participating is asked to contact Ms. St. Peter.

8. Legislative Update

Chair Jonovich invited Tim Schmaltz, Protecting Arizona's Family Coalition, to offer a legislative update. Mr. Schmaltz provided a handout of budget summary highlights for FY 2013. He provided an overview of the differences in the Governor's budget proposal versus the Legislative leadership proposal. In the House and Senate Appropriations proposal, revenue estimates are much more conservative and expenditures are focused on saving money. The Governor's budget proposes to use higher revenues and to make expenditures. Many experts believe that the legislative revenue estimate is a bit more conservative and that the Governor's may be a bit high requiring some adjustments.

Mr. Schmaltz discussed the TANF shortfall noting \$45 to \$50 million dollars is needed to maintain current status. An additional \$39 million is needed for behavioral health funding for people who are seriously mentally ill and are not eligible for coverage through the Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System (AHCCCS). It was noted if these amounts are not included in the budget, funding for several services will revert back to the federal government.

Another topic of discussion is legislation about SCR1030 Appropriation of State Revenues and the Taxpayer Bill of Rights (TABOR) referendum. Mr. Schmaltz noted TABOR would establish 2010 as the revenue base, making it difficult to fund services and causing a lot of cost shifting and special referendums. The implications of TABOR would be monumental. Mr. Knaut added TABOR would also eliminate locally shared dollars and shift costs to the cities and states.

Ms. Lopez-Powell noted some good news includes a bill that addresses income tax filings for nonprofit organizations with budgets under \$50,000. These nonprofits would no longer be required to provide time-consuming information. Another bill removes the requirement for nonprofits to report and register with the Secretary of State. The rationale is that there are other mechanisms to research information about an organization that would offer more detail. Mr. Schmaltz noted last year's budget passed on April 1st.

9. Request for Future Agenda Items

Committee members were given an opportunity to suggest topics or issues of interest they would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting. Items for the next meeting include an update on the Municipal Aging Services Project service inventory.

10. Comments from the Committee

Committee members were given the opportunity to share comments or information related to community events. No comments were made.

11. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:31 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 11, 2012 at 1:00 p.m.

City Leaders Institute
Greater Phoenix Region Issue Statement and Background

Issue Statement

The Greater Phoenix region is not prepared to fully meet the socialization needs of people aged 60 years and more given the dramatic increases in population and their diverse needs. Senior centers provide critical services, but the changing nature of the expectations, needs and demands of this diverse customer base coupled with reductions in public and non-profit funding sources have increased the difficulty of providing appropriate services to this group. Additionally, the talents of older adults are often untapped opportunities and not always viewed as resources. New and enhanced service delivery mechanisms are required to connect older adults with their peers and with the community, to provide relevant activities and services, and to leverage their talents.

Issue Background

The Greater Phoenix region will experience significant population growth in people aged 65 years and older over the next eight years; increasing from 462,000 people to more than 700,000 people by 2020. Research demonstrates that the ability to connect with peers and others in the community is a critical element to aging in place well.(footnote).

In December 2011, the Maricopa Association of Governments/ ETC Institute conducted a survey of residents age 55 and older to determine service priorities in Maricopa County. The purpose of the survey was to help determine overall satisfaction with quality-of-life issues and was designed to obtain statistically valid results from senior households throughout Maricopa County. The survey found that 59 percent of those aged 55 to 59 years are not satisfied with opportunities to meet their peers. Nearly three quarters (73 percent) age 55 to 90 years report they do not use indoor public or nonprofit facilities. This figure increases to 83.6 percent of people between the ages of 55 and 59 years. Based on the sum of their top three choices, the services and activities that households indicated they used most often are: public parks and trails (46%), active recreation opportunities (29%), arts and cultural amenities (26%), and volunteer opportunities (14%). Only 12% indicated that they use or participate in senior centers and 14% use public transportation. This suggests people coming into the older adult demographic need to better connect with the community but are not doing so within the current service delivery model.

Prior to the survey, the MAG conducted 134 interviews with older adults and agencies serving older adults. The interview results identified two important needs of seniors relating to transportation and socialization. Additionally, respondents indicated that the two biggest changes in the needs of older adults over the past ten years were:

- A preference for aging in place
- The impact of the recession

People are living longer in general and prefer to age in place, living longer in their homes. More people are addressing acute healthcare needs in their homes. It refocuses healthcare treatment and other services to home-based models as opposed to centrally delivered services. The higher numbers needing services is straining the system and requires new delivery mechanisms.

The recession is forcing people and agencies to make difficult decisions. More people are experiencing difficulty in meeting basic needs like food, housing, and healthcare. As income declines people are not as able to sell their homes. More individuals are homebound and fewer are able to access much needed resources. Many services have been discontinued despite the value they impart especially in the rural areas of the region. Older adults are working longer because their savings have been depleted and Social Security does not meet their needs.

The MAG then engaged the community by conducting focus groups throughout the region. Nineteen different focus groups were held with a total of 206 participants. The focus group discussions began in July and ended in late September. The findings of the focus group support the findings of the interviews, but offered additional detail.

A primary topic of the focus groups was transportation, which was discussed at every meeting. The quality of life of individuals lies in great part within their ability to access transportation. From doctor appointments to grocery shopping, individuals' vitality depends on their ability to freely move from one activity to the next. The large geographic area of the valley requires longer trips for necessities. Top on participants' wish lists were: safe vehicles, dependable and unrestricted transportation, and cost-contained options to ensure access to all.

A second issue of much discussed was social participation. Individuals felt strongly about the need to provide options for socialization. In particular, participants expressed the need for more senior centers throughout the valley. Currently, seniors have to travel long distances to get to senior centers. In some cases, assisted transportation to senior centers was eliminated in recent years due to budgetary constraints. Additionally, participants acknowledged the existence of a wide spectrum of ability within the aging community. It was suggested that senior centers be cognizant of the ability range and interest among patrons, and offer options that meet different senior needs. A few focus group participants acknowledged that they feel lost in the larger centers where activities are centered on the active adult.

A commonly shared response of focus group participants was interest in having senior centers open longer than the customary 2:00 p.m. closing time. For many seniors, the senior centers are their only opportunity to socialize. Seniors are eager to have more

culturally enriching opportunities; when organized by the senior center, individuals are more apt to participate in the offerings principally because transportation is arranged.

Feedback to Incorporate from the City Leaders Institute Team

Project Framing

- The focus of this project will be to keep people well and active, recognizing that other systems are in place to treat the medically fragile.
- This will be a person-centered, community-driven approach.
- Just as boomers redefined the systems like education as they have moved through their life cycle, they will redefine death and what it means to pass on with dignity.
- As healthcare reform penalizes hospitals for high readmission rates, it behooves the region to discover ways the community can pick up where care transitions leave off. This will save money, penalties for readmission rates, and will do more to preserve the health and wellbeing of people over the age of 65 years. Volunteers such as those through the Americorp program, ITN, time banking, and other programs may be resources.
- If the needs of mid to higher income older adults can be met and sustained through community intervention, government funding and intervention may be prioritized for people with lower incomes.

Issue Statement

- This project is inclusive of but not exclusive to senior centers. The issue is much broader than redefining senior centers. The issue is how to keep people socially engaged in the most effective way possible. Senior centers may play a role, but the solution will need to go significantly beyond the senior center model and focus on how the community can connect people with the resources they need in a sustainable model.
- The Village model has proven sustainable in mid to upper income communities because they can pay annual fees that cover the costs of a service coordinator. The challenge is to find a model that is sustainable in communities with low incomes.

Opportunities

- Separate initiatives may be leveraged and perhaps integrated to support pilot projects in Village models. Areas such as Sunnyslope, Sun City, and Sun Lakes area may be well positioned for a pilot project. Funding may be available from local foundations to support this work.



**Maricopa County Human Services
Department**

**Point in Time
Needs Assessment Survey**

Report of the Findings

November, 2011

Table of Contents

Background and Introduction	1
Needs.....	2
Barriers to Accessing Services.....	5
Number of People in Household and Ages.....	6
Total Annual Household Income	6
Single Parent	7
Raising Grand or Great Grandchildren	8
Problems with Childcare Services	8
Household Members without any Health Insurance	9
Age of those without Health Insurance.....	9
Problems Obtaining Health Care	9
Employment Status	9
Benefits	10
Barriers to Employment.....	10
Transportation	11
Housing.....	11
Housing Problems.....	11
Type of Residence.....	11
Major Housing Concerns	12
Communication.....	12
Demographics	12
Age.....	12
Marital Status	13
Race.....	13
Gender.....	14
Level of Education.....	14
Spanish Speaking Person	15
Conclusion	15

Background and Introduction

The Maricopa County Human Services Department conducted a point in time needs assessment survey in early fall 2011. The Arizona Community Action Association arranged for data entry and analysis. A total of 1,462 surveys were received. Of these, 195 were completed in Spanish. Surveys were coded by Service Area. Most communities are designated as their own Service Area while three are comprised of a number of communities. The city of Mesa is also a Service Area but a different survey was administered. Findings for Mesa are reported separately.

Service Area	
CSA	Chandler
	Queen Creek
	Gilbert
NW	Anthem
	New River
	Peoria
	Sun Cities
	Youngtown
	Waddell
	Surprise
Avondale	Avondale
	Goodyear
	Litchfield Park

		Service Area			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Avondale	147	10.1	10.1	10.1
	Buckeye	93	6.4	6.4	16.4
	CSA	335	22.9	22.9	39.3
	Gila Bend	54	3.7	3.7	43.0
	Guadalupe	104	7.1	7.1	50.1
	NW	169	11.6	11.6	61.7
	Scottsdale	268	18.3	18.3	80.0
	Tempe	145	9.9	9.9	89.9
	Tolleson	72	4.9	4.9	94.9
	Wickenburg	75	5.1	5.1	100.0
	Total	1462	100.0	100.0	

This report presents the aggregate findings for all communities in all Service Areas followed by a breakout report for each Service Area.

Needs

Respondents were asked about needs for themselves or their families. Total will not equal 100% as respondents could check more than one item. The most pressing need is for utility assistance followed by food, dental healthcare, clothing (tie) and employment. Based on the data, each respondent indicated between three and four needs.

Need	Frequency	% Yes
Utility Assistance	739	51
Food	594	41
Dental Healthcare	419	29
Clothing	426	29
Employment	415	28
Housing	318	22
Medical Healthcare	279	19
Housing Repairs	204	14
Education	180	12
Prescriptions	192	13
Childcare	175	12
Disability Assistance	146	11
Legal Services	148	10
Job Transportation	138	10
Senior Services	129	9
Youth Services	113	8
Housing Loans	115	8
Income Tax Preparation	117	8
Mental Healthcare	91	6
Budgeting	92	6
Substance Abuse Care	44	3
Domestic Violence Services	41	3

When asked about other needs, themes were related to transportation, school supplies, furniture and household supplies.

- A bike would be great to ride to bus & bus passes for 3 children
- A driver to and from medical procedures
- A phone, bus ticket, an apartment, furniture, clothes
- Adult eyeglasses & dental
- Air conditioning
- Alzheimer's care facility
- Appliances

- Assistance with moving objects watering
- Assistance with rent
- Auto insurance help
- Auto that I drive is 20 years old
- Back pack and back to school supplies
- Bed for the girl & for grandfather
- Behavioral health
- Better transportation (we have none in buckeye now!)
- Bible study group, counseling for grief
- Buss passes to look for a job.
- Career center - Vista Del Camino Community Center
- Cat & dog food
- Christmas needs, transportation
- Cleaning and hygiene assistance
- Clothes & shoes
- Counseling for ADHD disorder need other referrals for assistance
- Counseling for family and spouse and I
- Dating help
- Delinquent credit card debt
- Disabled vet
- Energy bill too high during summer cant afford to pay
- Entrepreneur assistance (business)
- Exercise facilities
- Food
- Food, food, food, no money for gas or
- Furniture
- Furniture for my daughters bedroom and also living room & dining room table
- Gas for transportation
- GED training
- Glaucoma testing, eyeglasses
- Hearing aid batteries
- Help for low income, dentist.
- Help getting a house
- Help getting on my feet bigger place & transportation
- Help moving to cheaper apartment/house
- Help people get their drivers license & a car to drive some people have trouble
- Help with everything
- Help with food and everything
- Home we live in needs to be refurbished
- Homeless shelter where they can shower and eat so they can feel like human being
- Hospital
- House cleaning
- Housing assistance

- How to go about becoming a caregiver for my 18 yr old son who I talk to where do I go
- I don't have a job
- I have bad teeth. Please get me a dental for my teeth. I have a hard time eating my food.
- I need a car, no transportation
- I need assistance for glasses & for hearing aid, & also for rental assistance.
- I need dental health care unable to afford my dentures
- I need English class
- I need grief counseling and I can't afford it. Co-payment.
- I need help getting 3 broken windows fixed
- In home health care
- Isolation
- Job search
- Job training
- Just needing help with bills
- Kitchen pots & pans, plates, have none.
- Laundry soap, trash bags, etc.
- Low-income families need help with deposits and stuff to get into rentals. Dental for adults.
- Maybe some help with Christmas
- Meals on wheels
- Mental assistance
- Mortgage assistance
- Mortgage insurance
- My family member have a lot of food allergies and typical food boxes are not helpful
- My son is in need of a speech pathologist for stuttering/motor tics. He is severe
- My wife can and does want to work but we cannot afford childcare to start it.
- NA/AA meetings, computer literacy
- Need a lawnmower, kitchen ware, pots, pans, muffin pan
- Need a new stove
- Need a water heater
- Need hearing aids badly to help with getting a job.
- Need help with security deposit and house hold items
- Pampers
- Parenting classes
- Police (stop partying)
- Queen size sheets and twin size sheets
- Rent
- Rental assistance
- Ride doctor appointments
- Shelter for homeless people

- Special needs child 19 but doesn't drive so job or education problems challenge of living out of town
- Vehicle insurance
- Vehicle repairs
- Washer and a stove, currently washes by hand and cooks over fire.
- Weatherization
- WIC

Barriers to Accessing Services

Respondents were asked how much of a problem the following barriers presented to either them or to their family in seeking/gaining assistance with basic needs. The biggest barrier is affordability followed by not eligible and don't know where to go for help. The first table shows the breakdown of all responses. The second table shows the mean scores for each item where 1=not a problem, 2=somewhat of a problem and 3=a big problem. A higher mean score indicates a bigger barrier. The standard deviation for each of the barriers indicates the responses were fairly clustered around the mean. The responses were not that spread out.

Barrier	% Not a Problem	% Somewhat of a Problem	A Big Problem
Can't afford fees/cost of assistance	24	46	30
Not eligible/don't qualify for assistance	44	34	23
No Transportation to/for Assistance	57	29	14
Pride (don't want to ask for help)	56	32	11
Don't know where to go for help	39	47	15
Programs/services not available in my area	54	34	12
No childcare while receiving/obtaining benefits	71	21	8
Prior bad experience with service/program	75	19	6
Have to work during service hours	70	23	7
Health/Disability	63	23	14

Barrier	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Can't afford fees/cost of assistance	1258	2.06	.745
Not eligible/don't qualify for assistance	1230	1.79	.795
No Transportation to/for Assistance	1279	1.58	.742
Pride (don't want to ask for help)	1295	1.55	.701
Don't know where to go for help	1297	1.76	.690
Programs/services not available in my area	1242	1.58	.704
No childcare while receiving/obtaining benefits	1217	1.38	.643

Barrier	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Prior bad experience with service/program	1251	1.31	.571
Have to work during service hours	1247	1.38	.636
Health/Disability	1280	1.51	.746

Number of People in Household and Ages

Respondents were most likely to live in households with four to six people.

Number in House	Frequency	Percent
1 to 3	1470	29
4 to 6	2618	51
7 to 9	872	17
10 to 12	131	3
13+	34	1

Those in households were most likely to be age 0-17 with almost one-half being children.

Age	Percent
0 to 17	48
18 to 59	41
60 and older	11

Total Annual Household Income

Over one-half of respondents report annual household income as less than \$10,000 to \$20,000. Fifteen percent have no income.

Total annual household income				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No income	198	13.5	15.1	15.1
<\$10,000	477	32.6	36.3	51.4
\$10,001-20,000	358	24.5	27.2	78.6
\$20,001-30,000	182	12.4	13.9	92.5
\$30,001-40,000	49	3.4	3.7	96.2
\$40,001-50,000	29	2.0	2.2	98.4
\$50,001-60,000	8	.5	.6	99.0
\$60,001-70,000	2	.1	.2	99.2
\$70,001 and above	11	.8	.8	100.0
Total	1314	89.9	100.0	

		Total annual household income			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Missing	System	148	10.1		
Total		1462	100.0		

Looking at income by Service Area, those in CSA (Chandler, Queen Creek and Gilbert) were most likely to report no income. Of interest, the Scottsdale Service Area was the second most likely.

Service Area * Total annual household income Crosstabulation										
	No income	Total annual household income								Total
		<\$10,000	\$10,001-20,000	\$20,001-30,000	\$30,001-40,000	\$40,001-50,000	\$50,001-60,000	\$60,001-70,000	\$70,001 and above	
Avondale	27	41	29	16	3	4	2	0	0	122
Buckeye	5	33	17	12	5	1	2	1	1	77
CSA	48	106	84	50	19	10	1	0	0	318
Gila Bend	4	14	12	9	5	0	1	0	1	46
Guadalupe	23	41	14	10	3	0	0	0	0	91
NW	16	35	55	24	6	4	0	0	0	140
Scottsdale	38	98	68	24	1	4	2	1	8	244
Tempe	18	70	37	13	1	3	0	0	0	142
Tolleson	13	20	21	10	4	0	0	0	0	68
Wickenburg	6	19	21	14	2	3	0	0	1	66
Total	198	477	358	182	49	29	8	2	11	1314

Single Parent

Over one-third report being a single parent; of those who do, 91% are female.

Are you currently a single parent of a minor child or children?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes		504	34.5	36.3	36.3
No		885	60.5	63.7	100.0
Total		1389	95.0	100.0	
Missing	System	73	5.0		
Total		1462	100.0		

Are you currently a single parent of a minor child or children? * Gender Crosstabulation					
		Gender			Total
		Male	Female		
Are you currently a single parent of a minor child or children?	Yes	Count	45	435	480
		%	9.4%	90.6%	100.0%

Raising Grand or Great Grandchildren

Almost 9% of those who responded to this item report raising grand- or great-grandchildren.

Are you currently raising any grandchildren or great-grandchildren?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	121	8.3	8.7	8.7
	No	1263	86.4	91.3	100.0
	Total	1384	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	78	5.3		
Total		1462	100.0		

Problems with Childcare Services

From the responses, it appears that aside from cost, childcare issues are not a significant problem for most respondents.

Problem	Percent
No barriers	24
Cost	12
Hours not sufficient	2
Children have special needs	3
Location of childcare providers	3
No transportation	6
Not enough childcare providers	2
Quality of childcare providers	3
Does not apply	35

Household Members without any Health Insurance

In response to this item, respondents indicate that a total of 1,140 (22%) household members report not having any health insurance. Of these, over one third are under age 18 and 16% are over age 65.

Age of those without Health Insurance

Age Group	Frequency	Percent
Under Age 18	431	38
Over Age 65	112	16

Problems Obtaining Health Care

Respondents were asked about problems obtaining health care. Results indicate that although a large number do not have health insurance, a lower percentage has problems obtaining health care.

Problem	Frequency	Percent
No Problems	739	54
Cost	269	20
No insurance	269	20
No doctor in my area	38	3
No transportation to doctor	74	5
No childcare during appointment	26	2
No adult care during appointment	17	1

Employment Status

Almost one-half are unemployed, either searching or not searching. Only 5% report working full time with benefits.

	Employment status			Cumulative Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Full-time	187	12.8	13.9	13.9
Full-time with benefits	69	4.7	5.1	19.0
Retired	274	18.7	20.3	39.3
Part-time	185	12.7	13.7	53.0
Part-time with benefits	21	1.4	1.6	54.5
Unemployed/Job searching	462	31.6	34.2	88.7
Unemployed/not searching	151	10.3	11.2	99.9
Unemployed/Disabled	1	.1	.1	100.0
Total	1350	92.3	100.0	
Missing System	112	7.7		
Total	1462	100.0		

Benefits

Of those who responded to this item, almost one-half report they do not have any benefits.

Benefit	Frequency	Percent
Health insurance	159	12
Hospital insurance	64	5
Dental insurance	122	9
Vision insurance	108	8
None	571	43

Barriers to Employment

Of those responding to this item, the most commonly cited barrier is pay too low to support the family. This was followed by physical disability and lack of transportation.

Barrier	Frequency	Percent
No barriers	280	21
No jobs for my field	116	8
Mental Disability	64	4
Pay too low to support family	192	14
No childcare during work	99	7
Physical Disability	170	13
Lack of training or experience	143	10
No adult care during work	15	1
Not enough hours offered	106	7
No transportation	166	11

Transportation

The survey asked about transportation with 67% reporting they have reliable transportation. Regarding barriers, respondents were most likely to cite the price of gas and not having a car or being able to afford a car. Totals will exceed the number of respondents because more than one item could be checked.

	Percent Yes
Do you have reliable transportation?	67%

Barrier	Frequency	Percent
No barriers	451	33
No bus routes near work	83	6
No car/can't afford car	278	21
Price of gas	480	35
No public transportation	64	5
No car insurance	102	7
No bus routes near home	89	6
No private transportation	95	7

Housing

Housing Problems

Although almost one-half indicate they do not have any problems related to their housing, the most common problems were related to the number of bedrooms and the cooling/heating system.

Housing Problem	Frequency	Percent
Not enough bedrooms	209	15
Problems with plumbing	131	9
Cooling/heating system inadequate/not working	185	13
Unsafe neighborhood	76	6
Problems with electrical system	77	6
Roof/structural problems	124	9
None/does not apply	675	49

Type of Residence

Over one-half report they are renting. Almost one-third are home owners (with and without a mortgage).

Type	Frequency	Percent
Rental Unit	814	58
Live with family/friends	153	11
Home with mortgage	233	17
Shelter	13	<1
Home you own (no mortgage)	160	11
Homeless	42	3

Major Housing Concerns

Respondents were most likely to report the cost of utilities as their most pressing concern. This was followed by high rent.

Housing Concern	Frequency	Percent
Utilities too high	760	54
Rent too high	376	25
House needs major repairs	164	11
Mortgage too high	101	7
Can't find house in price range	126	9
No concerns currently	288	21

Communication

Respondents were asked about telephone, computers and Internet access. They were almost twice as likely to have a cell phone than a landline. One-third has a computer.

Item	Frequency	Percent
Phone/Land Line	560	40
Cell phone	986	70
Computer	457	33
Internet access	416	30

Demographics

Age

Just over one third were between the ages of 25 and 39 with another approximate one-third being age 40-59.

		Age			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	<20	23	1.6	1.7	1.7
	20-24	72	4.9	5.2	6.9
	25-39	513	35.1	37.3	44.2
	40-59	462	31.6	33.6	77.8
	60-64	78	5.3	5.7	83.5
	65-79	174	11.9	12.7	96.1
	>80	53	3.6	3.9	100.0
	Total	1375	94.0	100.0	
Missing	System	87	6.0		
Total		1462	100.0		

Marital Status

Respondents were most likely to be single.

		Marital Status			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Single	489	33.4	36.0	36.0
	Married	440	30.1	32.4	68.4
	Divorced	214	14.6	15.8	84.2
	Widowed	121	8.3	8.9	93.1
	Separated	94	6.4	6.9	100.0
	Total	1358	92.9	100.0	
Missing	System	104	7.1		
Total		1462	100.0		

Race

With regard to race and ethnicity, respondents were most likely to report being White or Latino.

		Race			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	White/Caucasian	506	34.6	37.5	37.5
	Black/African American	158	10.8	11.7	49.2
	Hispanic/Latino	518	35.4	38.4	87.6
	Bi-Racial/Multiracial	44	3.0	3.3	90.8
	American Indian	107	7.3	7.9	98.7
	Asian	13	.9	1.0	99.7
	Pacific Islander	4	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	1350	92.3	100.0	
Missing	System	112	7.7		
Total		1462	100.0		

Gender

Respondents were much more likely to be female with over three-quarters so reporting.

		Gender			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Male	274	18.7	20.2	20.2
	Female	1081	73.9	79.8	100.0
	Total	1355	92.7	100.0	
Missing	System	107	7.3		
Total		1462	100.0		

Level of Education

As to education, almost 20% completed high school and 38% had some college or higher.

	Level of Education			
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Some grade school	78	5.3	5.6	5.6
Completed grade school	125	8.5	8.9	14.5
Some High School	251	17.2	18.0	32.5
G.E.D.	31	2.1	2.2	34.7
Completed High School	277	18.9	19.8	54.5
Some Technical School	55	3.8	3.9	58.5
Completed Technical School	50	3.4	3.6	62.1
Some College	312	21.3	22.3	84.4
Associate Degree	108	7.4	7.7	92.1
Bachelor's Degree	78	5.3	5.6	97.7
Master's Degree	28	1.9	2.0	99.7
Doctorate	4	.3	.3	100.0
Total	1397	95.6	100.0	
Missing System	65	4.4		
Total	1462	100.0		

Spanish Speaking Person

Fifteen percent indicate they are Spanish speaking with 13% (195) of the surveys being completed in Spanish.

	Percent Yes
Spanish Speaking	15%

Conclusion

Just over one third were between the ages of 25 and 39 with another approximate one-third being age 40-59. They were most likely to be single females. Regarding race and ethnicity, 38% were White and 38% were Latino. Fifteen percent indicate they are Spanish speaking with 13% (195) of the surveys being completed in Spanish. As to education, almost 20% completed high school and 38% had some college or higher.

Almost one half of the survey respondents' household members are children. Just over one-third are single parents. Over one-half of respondents report an annual income less than \$10,000. By Service Area, those in CSA (Chandler, Queen Creek and Gilbert) were most likely to report no income. Of interest, the Scottsdale Service Area was the second most likely.

The data indicates that childcare issues are not particularly problematic. Health insurance is a problem with 38% of household members under the age of 18 without insurance. However, over one-half indicate no problems in obtaining health care.

Almost one-half are unemployed, either searching or not searching. Although 14% are working full-time, only 5% report working full time with benefits. When asked about barriers to employment, respondents were most likely to cite pay being too low to support the family. This was followed by physical disability and lack of transportation.

One-third does not have reliable transportation. The most common barriers to transportation were the price of gas and not having a car or being able to afford a car.

Over one-half report they are renting. Almost one-third are homeowners (with and without a mortgage). Problems related to housing were the number of bedrooms and the cooling/heating system (inadequate or not working). Respondents were also most likely to say their utilities were too high (54%) or their rent was too high (25%).

Most have a cell phone (70%) but a much lower percentage have a landline (40%). Approximately one-third has a computer and Internet access.