

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
HUMAN SERVICES TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 11, 2008

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Carl Harris-Morgan, Town of Gilbert, Chairman
+Bob Baratko, City of Surprise
*Kathy Berzins, City of Tempe
Kyle Bogdon, DES/ACYF
Patti Evans, City of Goodyear
*Stefanie Garcia, City of Chandler
*Paige Garrett, Quality of Life Community Services, Inc
Laura Guild, DES/CPIP
Jeffery Jamison, City of Phoenix
Jessica Gonzalez for Deanna Jonovich, City of Phoenix
Laraine Stewart for Jim Knaut, Area Agency on Aging
Frances Delgado for Margarita Leyvas, Maricopa County
+Joyce Lopez-Powell, Valley of the Sun United Way
Paul Ludwick, City of Scottsdale
Steven MacFarlane, City of Phoenix

Jose Mercado for Doris Marshall, City of Phoenix
Jayson Matthews, Tempe Community Council
+Joy McClain, City of Tolleson
Christina Avila for Sylvia Sheffield, City of Avondale, Vice Chair
Carol Sherer, DES/DDD

OTHERS PRESENT

Donna Crews, Advocates for the Disabled
Rachel Brito, MAG
Amy St. Peter, MAG

+Those members present by audio/videoconferencing.
*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

1. Call to Order

Chair Carl Harris-Morgan welcomed everyone to the meeting at 1:05 p.m. and introductions ensued.

2. Call to the Audience

Donna Crews, Advocates for the Disabled, Inc., addressed the Committee. She chose to speak at the meeting because of the pending discussion regarding Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) funds. Ms. Crews said Advocates for the Disabled used to receive SSBG funds but has not received funds in the past couple of years. They are a small agency with a small staff that serves about 2,900 clients. The agency serves individuals in the Disabilities Claim Program by helping them navigate the Social Security system, enhancing their well-being and becoming more self-sufficient. Ms. Crews said they have \$608,000 represented in the Payee Program which assists individuals with paying their rent or utilities. Individuals reimburse the program once they have received their disability payment. Ms. Crews said it can take six months to two years before clients receive benefits. She added their agency would benefit from SSBG funds.

3. Approval of November 13, 2008 HSTC Meeting Minutes

Chair Harris-Morgan called for a motion to approve the November 13, 2008 meeting minutes. Laura Guild, Arizona Department of Economic Security, made a motion to approve the minutes. Patti Evans, City of Goodyear, seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Preliminary Social Services Block Grant Allocation Recommendations

Chair Harris-Morgan thanked the Committee for the work they put into this task. He said the Committee is heading toward a conclusion. He reminded Committee members that they were given the target group fact sheets, results of the zero-based budget exercise, the service ranking, and a comparison between the 2009 allocations and the service ranking results for review. He noted since the last meeting, Steve MacFarlane, City of Phoenix, proposed a possible approach toward funding allocations. He referred the Committee to the Grouped Service Rankings handout and asked Mr. MacFarlane to explain his proposal.

Mr. MacFarlane said he noted five distinct groups within the results from the service ranking exercise. The first group was those that ranked 4.89–5.0; the second group ranked 3.22-3.89, the third group ranked 2.0-2.61, the fourth group ranked 1.11-1.61 and the fifth were those that ranked below 1.0. He said his approach was to give more consideration for increased funding to those groups with the higher ranking.

Mr. MacFarlane said the model is a way of approaching funding allocations and not a final solution. The grouped rankings were then labeled Group A through E. He said Group C is the middle group and would not receive an increase or a decrease in funding. Group B is a single plus (+), meaning whatever funding amount is decided, this group would receive one base amount. Group A is a double plus (++) meaning whatever funding amount is decided it would receive twice that of Group B. He added Group D would receive a single minus (-) and Group E would receive a double minus (--).

Mr. MacFarlane said his approach assumes priority rankings are valid and he believes that they are. He added they should be used in some form when determining funding allocations. As an example, if the Committee proposed a five percent budget reduction for Group D, that would translate to a ten percent budget reduction for Group E. The funds would then be reallocated to Groups A and B. Group A would receive one-third and Group B would receive two thirds of the funding reallocation.[Isn't this backwards? Wouldn't A get twice as much as B?]

Ms. St. Peter said a five percent funding cut would be \$11,200. The services in Group D and E have historically ranked low, receiving less funding. It is not a significant dollar amount and does not reallocate a lot of money to Groups A and B. Mr. MacFarlane said the model moves some money around and may be used for adjusting services. He hoped if the Committee accepts the proposed method, they would then have a system in place to use in future years.

Ms. St. Peter thanked Mr. MacFarlane for his proposal. As a point of information she gave a breakdown of the Service Rankings and how they would be affected by the Grouped Ranking. She said the reduction in funding would come from Developmentally Disabled and Persons with Developmental Disabilities. Much of the funding would be reallocated to Adults, Families and Children, with some funding being reallocated to Elderly, Persons with Disabilities and Persons with Developmental Disabilities. Specifically, the Adults, Families and Children Target Group has eight services in Group A, one in Group B and two in Group C. Under this formula, none of the services in this target group would receive a decrease in funding. One of the services in the Elderly Target Group placed in Group A, two in Group B and two in Group C. None of the services are proposed to receive a decrease in funding.

Ms. St. Peter noted that the decreases in funding specifically affect the Persons with Disabilities Target Group and the Persons with Developmental Disabilities Target Group. One service in the Persons with Developmental Disabilities Target Group would receive an increase as part of Group B while one service would be held harmless in Group C. Respite and habilitation services would both lose funding as part of Group D and attendant care would lose twice the amount of funding in Group E. The Persons with Disabilities would gain funding for one service in Group A and one service in Group B. Four services would be held harmless while adaptive aides and rehabilitational instruction would both lose funding in Group E.

Chair Harris-Morgan asked the Committee if they wanted to use the proposal presented by Mr. MacFarlane. Paul Ludwick, City of Scottsdale, said case management seems to cross all of the service categories. He asked for clarification on why case management is placed as a separate item rather than being included as a part of the other services.

Ms. St. Peter referred to the matrices. She said case management is a separate service and as such is funded in different target groups to meet different needs. She added Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES) issues a Request for Proposal (RFP) and allows agencies to compete for funding. Agencies will apply for a grant to use case management funds in different settings such as transitional housing. Mr. Ludwick said if there is no case management, there is no access to services in the community. Chair Harris-Morgan said case management is a critical service and was ranked high by the Committee. Chair Harris-Morgan asked the Committee if there were any objections to using the service rankings or Mr. MacFarlane's proposal. No objections were noted.

Joyce Lopez-Powell, Valley of the Sun United Way, addressed the Committee via teleconference. She said she had the same concern she previously had regarding the methodology used for calculating the service rankings. She said the original rankings were disparate and were not complete due to the lack of weighting when they were calculated. She suggested looking at that piece of the process again. Chair Harris-Morgan asked for further clarification.

Ms. Lopez-Powell said the services were ranked from one through ten. She added some people ranked housing with a one and others ranked it with an eight. She said there were some discrepancies and disparities in how those rankings came about. Ms. Lopez-Powell said she only wanted to voice her concern.

Chair Harris-Morgan confirmed the Committee was asked to rank the services one through ten. He added the results clearly show the service areas the Committee members ranked very highly and he did not believe any additional weighting was necessary as it was built into the rating system itself. Ms. Lopez-Powell said that would hold true if every person ranked every item. In this exercise, not every item was ranked therefore creating disparities in how the results are averaged.

Chair Harris-Morgan asked for Ms. Lopez-Powell's recommendation regarding use of the service rankings. Ms. Lopez-Powell said she is concerned about determining the amount of funds needed in an organization or department. She would like to use their input in a more formalized manner as the Committee moves forward. Chair Harris-Morgan said between representation on the Committee, the worksheets and presentations, the Committee has attempted to do that. Ms. Lopez-Powell said she would like to see a more refined process.

Chair Harris-Morgan said the Committee has a schedule to follow as far as presenting a recommendation to DES. He asked Ms. Lopez-Powell if she had any concerns with moving forward. Ms. Lopez-Powell stated she does have concerns but that should not prevent the Committee from moving forward.

Ms. St. Peter outlined options available to the Committee. She said the Committee can determine a base percentage and apply it to the service rankings using Mr. MacFarlane's proposed model. She advised the Committee that Rachel Brito had a spreadsheet available to enter data while the Committee moved forward with the remaining agenda items. Another option suggested was for the Committee to work as a whole group or as four smaller groups and apply the proposed model using set percentage reductions. Ms. St. Peter asked which option the Committee thought would be most productive.

Laura Guild, Arizona Department of Economic Security, suggested moving forward with option number one. Mr. MacFarlane said the Committee should choose two options for the percentage amount for the reduction being applied to Groups D and E. He suggested using five percent for Group D and ten percent for Group E as one option and ten percent/20 percent for the second option. He said he was reluctant to go beyond ten percent for Group D as this was the first time the Committee had considered using the proposed model. He added the goal is not to wipe out any programs.

Chair Harris-Morgan asked the Committee if there were any objections with Ms. Guild's proposal to move forward with option number one using the service rankings.

Carol Sherer, Arizona Department of Economic Security, suggested applying both five and ten percent decreases as well as ten and twenty percent decreases to see if the model makes sense. She said in some cases, the Committee may want to shift funds from a service if the remaining funds would make delivery of the service unrealistic.

The Committee temporarily moved forward with the next agenda item and returned to this item when the spreadsheet was done.

Mr. MacFarlane said the model, as it was set up on the spreadsheet, looks at individual target groups and adjusts the priority within each target group. The target groups for Adults, Families and Children and for Elderly would not have any cuts or funds to reallocate. He said if the Committee decides they want to look at funding overall, the model would have to be used without regard to target groups.

Chair Harris-Morgan summarized the process for Committee members attending via teleconference. He asked Mr. MacFarlane how the Committee should proceed. Mr. MacFarlane suggested having MAG staff rework the spreadsheet so increases and decreases would be applied across target groups instead of within them. He mentioned another options is to have one group decide the base percent and a second group to decide where to reallocate the money. He added consideration should not be given to the target group but to services overall.

Chair Harris-Morgan said the model can be finalized for the meeting in January. The only caveat is the Committee would not have an opportunity to review the proposal and to receive input from the public prior to reconvening in January. Ms. St. Peter said the results can be made available for Committee members to review the following week. This would allow Committee members the opportunity to review the proposed allocation results prior to their distribution for public comment if they so chose.

Ms. St. Peter said the total impact across all target groups if the Committee works from a five percent base reduction would equal \$11,000. A ten percent base reduction would equal \$22,000.

Patti Evans, City of Goodyear, said a \$22,000 reduction from the total budget did not appear to be enough based on the disparity between Group E and Group A of the service rankings. She said it would appear that more money would be shifted.

Chair Harris-Morgan referred Ms. Evans to the Comparison of Service Ranking and FY 09 Funding Allocation chart. He said there are a large number of service intents and funding is widely spread. In terms of funding allocation, there are limited funds allocated for the service items listed at the bottom of the chart.

Ms. Evans suggested the next step in the process may be to look at whether the services that have been funded in the past have match those ranked high on the priority list. She said if the Committee is trying to match the funding to what they

feel are the most important services, then it is important for the Committee to understand what each service provides.

Mr. MacFarlane said his intent was to establish some order and logic to the process. He added there are more complex models that could be used however the proposed model is a pure mathematical formula. The flexibility of the current plan is the Committee can choose the percentage amount they want to shift.

Jeffrey Jamison, City of Phoenix, said there is not much of a change because the distribution of funds is already aligned with the ranking for the most part. He added the model helps the Committee know how to proceed with the shifts that may be needed. The model is fair across the board and gives the Committee a tool to make the adjustments.

Chair Harris-Morgan requested comments from the Committee members listening via teleconference. None were made. He asked for a motion to approve the next steps.

Ms. St. Peter summarized the next steps for the Committee. She said MAG staff will recalculate the results across all target groups and email the results to the Committee. Committee members will email their response, questions or comments to Ms. St. Peter. A meeting will be scheduled for Thursday, December 18, 2009 at 1:00 p.m. to allow Committee members to review the results prior to being distributed for public comment. Committee members may attend the December 18th meeting in person or via teleconference. The public comment period will be from December 19, 2008 to January 8, 2009. HSTC will review the feedback and discuss results in January at which time they will vote on the process to recommend for approval by HSCC. The MAG Management Committee and Regional Council will take action and the approved allocation recommendations will be presented to DES by the end of February.

Chair Harris-Morgan asked for a motion to approve the steps as outlined with the funding allocations to be recalculated at a five/ten percent and 10/20 percent shift.

Jayson Matthews, Tempe Community Council, made a motion to approve the steps as outlined by Ms. St. Peter and Chair Harris-Morgan. Ms. Sherer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. There were no abstentions.

Chair Harris-Morgan thanked everyone for their work. He confirmed with Ms. St. Peter the Committee will choose one option for the allocation process when they reconvene in January.

5. Committee Evaluation and Goal Planning

Chair Harris-Morgan introduced Amy St. Peter to initiate an evaluation of the Committee's work over the past year. Ms. St. Peter thanked the Committee members for their time and expertise and requested their feedback. Committee members remarked that the agency best practice presentations were especially helpful. They

also noted the process to develop SSBG allocation recommendations had improved significantly.

Committee members expressed a desire to increase the number of responses to human services surveys so the results would be more representative of the region. Increased community outreach and more user friendly forms might help facilitate that goal. Members also said they would like more information about the impact of SSBG funded services and what outcomes were derived, while acknowledging that this kind of information is not uniformly available across all target groups.

Ms. St. Peter explained that MAG staff were currently in the process of developing goals for the FY 2010 Unified Planning Work Program. She asked Committee members what areas they would like to focus on in the upcoming year. Sylvia Sheffield, City of Avondale, commented she would like to continue to assess the impact of the economy on human services and what crisis management strategies were most productive. The Committee expressed a desire to continue to refine the allocation recommendation process by building on the success of this year's model. Members also wanted to continue receiving presentations to expand their awareness.

Ms. Sherer motioned to approve the areas of focus as outlined above. Mr. Jamison seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

6. Meeting Calendar

Chair Harris-Morgan presented the calendar year 2009 meeting calendar for the Committee's review and approval. Ms. Sheffield noted that the Arizona Community Action Association conference conflicted with the May meeting. Ms. St. Peter said the Committee usually cancelled the meeting when it conflicted with this conference because many Committee members usually attended the event. The Committee agreed to cancel the May meeting and to meet in June instead. Ms. St. Peter also noted that the Committee will need to meet in the Saguaro Room periodically throughout the year due to scheduling conflicts at MAG. These dates were noted on the calendar.

Ms. Evans motioned to approve the 2009 meeting calendar with the change as noted. Ms. Sherer seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

7. Comments from the Committee

Bob Baratko, City of Surprise, via teleconference, informed the Committee of the Disability Human Services Expo scheduled for January 10, 2009 at the City of Surprise. He said any agency or providers interested in having a table at the expo are welcome to attend and may contact the City of Surprise for more information. The expo will be open to anyone and is being presented by the City of Surprise.

Chair Harris-Morgan reminded everyone of the Foreclosure Survival for Families and Neighborhoods workshop scheduled for December 13, 2008, from 9:00 a.m.–noon, at

Gilbert Town Hall and again on January 10, 2009, from 9:00 a.m. to noon, at the City of Mesa Utilities Building.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:21 p.m. The next Human Services Technical Committee meeting is scheduled for January 8, 2009 at 1:00 p.m. at the MAG offices, second floor, Saguaro Room.