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INTRODUCTION
Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) funds enable states to provide social services best suited to meet the needs of individuals residing within each state. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services defines a broad range of services that are eligible for SSBG funding to help children, youth, families, older adults, and persons with disabilities with services ranging from daily living employment support to substance abuse counseling and housing.

The Social Services Block Grant program was created in 1981 by the Reagan Administration to convert a number of human services grants into one single state block grant. An effort was made to streamline the process by eliminating the previously required 25 percent match and individual eligibility determination and granting the states a larger role in decision-making for the use of social services funds. Funds were made available to the states, on a population formula basis, for social services as set forth in Title XX of the Social Security Act. For this reason, the SSBG plan is also referred to as the Title XX plan.

When the original social services program was signed into law in 1975, the State of Arizona provided some child welfare services but had no programs for adults (at that time the Adult Protective Services did not exist). The newly formed Councils of Governments were identified as primary participants in Arizona social services planning in partnership with the Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES). This decentralization helped to ensure local input as well as leveraged SSBG funds with private and public agency match dollars. Private nonprofit agencies have provided both state and regionally planned social services throughout Arizona.

Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) funds are designed to enable each state to furnish social services best suited to meet the needs of the individuals residing within the state. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has identified 29 categories of services that can be funded through the Social Services Block Grant. Examples of some of the eligible service categories are listed below:

- daycare for children or adults
- education and training services
- special services to persons with disabilities
- legal assistance
- case management
- home health services
- interpretation services
- prevention and intervention services
- crisis intervention and counseling
- housing services
- home-delivered meals
- independent/transitional living
- employment services

SSBG planning for the Pima County/greater Tucson metropolitan area is provided by Pima Association of Governments (PAG). PAG oversees the planning process which identifies priority needs, explores options, establishes goals, and develops a course of action in partnership with local agencies, local governments and interested stakeholders. Activities include conducting the annual SSBG planning process, providing for public notice and accessible public meetings, coordinating the regional Social Services Planning Committee as well as assisting the state with taxonomy determinations.
SSBG GEOGRAPHICAL AREA DEMOGRAPHICS

Pima County is located in southern Arizona and covers an area of approximately 9,200 square miles. It is bounded by Mexico and Santa Cruz County to the south, Cochise County to the east, Pinal and Maricopa counties to the north and Yuma County to the west.

![Pima County Map]

Approximately 70 percent of Pima County is federal, state or Native American-owned lands. The April 1, 2010, Census population count for Pima County was 980,263\(^1\). Approximately 95 percent of the population resides within eastern Pima County. The City of Tucson, the county seat, is the second largest city in the State of Arizona with a Census 2010 population of 520,116.

AGE

The median age of Pima County’s population in 2010 was estimated at 37.7, very near the national median of 37.2.\(^2\) Our region attracts both university students and retirees which contributes to a unique profile with population peaks for those in their early 20s and those over 65. Population in Pima County, as reported in the 2010 Census, was 50.9 percent female and 49.1 percent male. There are slightly more males than females aged 44 and below; however, by age 65, females surpass males as the majority of the population.

Birth to 5 years constitutes 6.4 percent of the population, with school-aged children through high school constituting 19.9 percent of the population. College and working-age population, ages 20 through 54, constitute 45.8 percent of the population. The age cohort from 55 to 84 constitutes 25.9 percent of the population with 2.1 percent over the age of 85. The percent of the Pima County population over 65 years of age is 15.5 percent with 44.7 percent of those male and 55.3 percent female.

INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

The U.S. Census Bureau does not provide a single definition of a disability, but rather sees disability as a complex interaction between a person and his or her environment. In the current Census Bureau population surveys, individuals 15 and over are identified as having a disability if they meet any of the following criteria: use a wheelchair, a cane, crutches or a walker; have difficulty performing one or more functional activities (seeing, hearing, speaking, etc.), have difficulty with one or more activities of daily living (getting in or out of bed, keeping track of money or bills, etc.); have one or more specified conditions; have any other mental or emotional conditions that seriously interfere with everyday activities; have a condition that limits the ability to
work around the house; have a condition that makes it difficult to work at a job or business; or receive federal benefits based on an inability to work.

In order to track the number of individuals with disabilities in the U.S., the Census Bureau asks survey respondents to self-identify if they have any of the following disabilities: hearing difficulty, vision difficulty, cognitive difficulty, ambulatory difficulty, self-care difficulty, or independent living difficulty. In 2011, the U.S. Census Bureau released the first 3-year estimates on persons with disabilities in over two years. According to the 2008-2010 American Community Survey, an estimated 13 percent of the population of Pima County reported having a disability. Of these, 30 percent reported a hearing difficulty, 17 percent reported a vision difficulty, 36 percent reported a cognitive difficulty and 53 percent reported an ambulatory difficulty. In addition, 17.6 percent of those with disabilities reported a self-care difficulty, which includes dressing, bathing and getting around inside the home; and 33.2 percent reported an independent living difficulty. Seven percent of Pima County’s disabled individuals are between the ages of 5 to 17, 51.5 percent between the ages of 18 to 64, and 41 percent are over 65. As individuals age, disabilities also increase with a larger proportion of the elderly suffering from one or more disabilities affecting their quality of life.

INCOME
Median household income for Pima County was $44,834 according to the 2008-2010 American Community Survey. Average wages for most industry sectors in Pima County are lower than those of Maricopa County, the state and the nation. The highest paying sectors are in manufacturing and mining, whereas the lowest wages are found in retail trade and service industries. The lower incomes in the Tucson area may be partially attributed to the predominance of employment in the lower wage sectors, prevalence of part-time jobs in those lower wage sectors and to the high percentage of retirees on fixed incomes.

POVERTY
Federal poverty threshold was $22,350 for a family of four (which includes two minor related children) in 2011. Income thresholds, used by the Census Bureau, make adjustments for the size of the family and number of related children under 18 years of age. As reported in the 2008-2010 American Community Survey, 17.8 percent of all Pima County residents were identified as below the poverty thresholds. Income level, however, is only one indicator of poverty. Poverty is often determined by multiple factors including household income, percentage of income dedicated to mortgage/rent payments, the number of persons in the household and percentage of income spent on transportation. In Pima County, 42 percent of all renter-occupied households paid more than 30 percent of their income for housing costs, according to a 2008 study.

EMPLOYMENT
Pima County’s employment profile differs from that of the nation, with a higher than average percentage of the County’s workforce employed in construction, government and services, and a much lower percentage employed in manufacturing, wholesale trade, and finance/insurance/real estate. This reflects the influence of tourism, population growth and retirement on the local economy. The Tucson metropolitan statistical area’s unemployment reached its lowest level of the 2000s in May 2007 with only 3.4 percent of the labor force unemployed. With the global financial crisis that started in 2007, the Tucson area has steadily seen its unemployment levels grow, reaching its highest unemployment in May 2010 with 9 percent unemployment. As of November 2011, Pima County’s unemployment rate was back down to 7.9 percent.

SSBG PROGRAM FUNDING
The Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) planning process involves jurisdiction representatives, interested stakeholders and contracted agencies in the community and allows for public involvement prior to plan adoption. Major components of the process are a review of regional needs, including the development of fact sheets and a survey of non-profit service providers, identification of priority needs, and allocation of available
SSBG funds to help address the priority needs. The regional plan focuses on the service needs of clients rather than on funding allocations for specific agencies. The planning effort is conducted prior to and separately from the contracting process; the contracting for services is handled by the Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES). PAG’s SSBG plan is provided to DES and forms the basis for the Request for Proposals and contracting decisions by the state for regional services.

The federal funding allocation for the SSBG has an established ceiling. Each year Congress approves an annual appropriation, and there is always the possibility that the actual appropriation could be lower than the funding allocation. Over time, the funding allocation for the SSBG program has been reduced from $2.8 billion nationally in the early 1990s to its present amount of $1.7 billion in federal fiscal year 2010. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 (commonly known as welfare reform) reduced funding to $2.38 billion and permitted states to allocate up to 10 percent of the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) funds to the SSBG program; however, all TANF funds transferred to SSBG must be used for services for children. In 1998, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) also modified the SSBG program, reducing funding to $1.7 billion annually.

SSBG funds are appropriated on the federal fiscal year that begins Oct. 1 of each year. Arizona contracts for these funds on the state fiscal year beginning with July 1. Approximately 19 percent of the state’s SSBG allocation is available for locally planned services. During some periods, SSBG funds are stable so the amount expected to be available actually is appropriated; in other years, the funding has been cut early or late in the planning process and the funding allocations are adjusted. Arizona’s SSBG allocation peaked in FY 1994-95 at $41,828,247 and then dropped, in spite of a fast growing population, to $32,441,951 in FY 2005-06. The FY 2011-2012 funding amount for the state was $36,319,265.

In fiscal years 2006, 2007 and 2008, SSBG funds were threatened by proposed federal budget reductions of 19.7 percent, which would have reduced Arizona’s allocation to an estimated $23,910,696. Continuing resolutions were used to fund the federal budget for the entire federal budget year, and FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-2009 reduced budgets were required to conform to President Bush’s proposed budget cuts in the SSBG program. The total estimated fully funded budget for both the SSBG FY 2007-08 plan and FY 2008-09 was $1,551,134 for the PAG region, and proposed cuts would have reduced this amount to $1,245,208. In both these fiscal years, the congressional budget ultimately maintained the FY 2006-07 SSBG funding levels.

In the absence of a definite final federal FY 2013 appropriation level for SSBG at this time, planning activities have assumed a continuation of the FY 2012 level funding level into FY 2013, at $1,505,634 for the PAG region.

**Eligible Uses of SSBG Funds**

The purpose of the Social Services Block Grant Program is to provide assistance to states to enable them to furnish services directed at one or more of five broad goals:

1. Achieving or maintaining economic self-support to prevent, reduce or eliminate dependency;
2. Achieving or maintaining self-sufficiency, including reduction or prevention of dependency;
3. Preventing or remedying neglect, abuse or exploitation of children and adults unable to protect their own interests, or preserving, rehabilitating or reuniting families;
4. Preventing or reducing inappropriate institutional care by providing for community-based care, home-based care or other forms of less intensive care; and
5. Securing referral or admission for institutional care when other forms of care are not appropriate, or providing service to individuals in institutions.
Limitations on SSBG Funds

SSBG funds are fairly broad in scope and have a great deal of flexibility at the local level but cannot be used for infrastructure improvements, institutionalized care or cash payments to clients.

SSBG funds may not be used for the following purposes unless a federal waiver is obtained:
- For the purchase or improvement of land, or the purchase, construction, or permanent improvement (other than minor remodeling) of any building or other facility
- For providing cash payments for costs of subsistence or for the provision of room and board (other than the costs of subsistence during rehabilitation, room and board provided for a short term as an integral but subordinate part of a social service or temporary emergency shelter provided as a protective service)
- For the payment of wages of any individual as a social service (other than payment of the wages of welfare recipients employed in the provision of child care services)
- For the provision of medical care (other than family planning services, rehabilitation services, or initial detoxification of an alcoholic or drug dependent individual) unless it is an integral but subordinate part of a social service
- For social services (except to an alcoholic or drug dependent individual or rehabilitation services) provided in and by employees of any hospital, skilled nursing facility, intermediate care facility, or prison, to any individual living in such institution
- For the provision of any educational service which the state makes generally available to its residents without cost and without regard to their income
- For any child care services unless such services meet applicable standards of state and local law
- For the provision of cash payments to a client as a service
- In a manner inconsistent with the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act of 1997

PRIMARY CONTRACTORS FOR SSBG FUNDS IN 2010-11

In the PAG region, entities contracted to provide SSBG services have been private nonprofit agencies and local governments. DES also contracts with local agencies for state-funded services though various DES divisions. As of December 2011, DES has contracted with the following agencies to provide the locally planned services in the FY 2011-12 SSBG Plan. Contracts for the services under the Division of Children, Youth and Families in the FY 2010-11 SSBG Plan had not been implemented by the time of updating this document (December 2011) and, therefore, this list is unofficial. The Division of Children, Youth and Families extended the contracts for services in PAG’s 2009-2010 SSBG through December 2011 and plans to initiate contracts for services in the FY 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 plans in 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracted Agencies</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Familias/Arizona’s Children’s Association</td>
<td>Children &amp; Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona, Inc.</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Food Bank</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Outreach Program for the Deaf/COPD</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Seals Blake Foundation</td>
<td>Adult/ Children &amp; Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerge! Center Against Domestic Abuse</td>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Family &amp; Children’s Services of Southern Arizona</td>
<td>Children &amp; Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marana Health Center, Inc.</td>
<td>Rural Adults/Youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to these contractors serving both rural and urban areas of Pima County, SSBG funds also are allocated directly to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona and the Tohono O'odham Nation. Tribal governments are established as separate SSBG planning and service areas. Specific services, eligibility criteria and dollar amounts are determined during the contracting process with each tribe and are not designated by this plan. For FY 2011-12 the tribal governments in Pima County received $146,251 with the Pascua Yaqui Tribe receiving $25,607 and the Tohono O'odham Nation receiving $120,644 (directed primarily to child care services).

**PREVIOUS SSBG PLANNING EFFORTS**

**2005 THROUGH 2009 PLANNING PROCESSES (FY 2006-10)**

Each year the PAG region completes and adopts a Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) plan to allocate SSBG funds. Approximately $1.2 million to $1.6 million is made available annually for locally planned human services in the PAG region, which does not include funding that is provided to and planned separately by tribal nations. A regional Social Services Planning Committee works closely with working groups to identify needs and make recommendations to the PAG Regional Council on annual allocations.

The PAG region adopted the region’s FY 2006-07 SSBG plan on Oct. 26, 2005, based on an anticipated budget of $1,551,134. A new service was added to provide case management for young adults who are at risk for homelessness, who lack a family support system, who need support in transitioning to independence and who are not already part of a system responsible for serving them. Additional resources also were added in the FY 2006-07 plan for intervention counseling and developmental day training programs.

After completion and submission of the adopted FY 2006-07 plan to DES, the PAG region was notified that the Department of Health and Human Services had been asked by the President to modify the anticipated SSBG budget by 19.722 percent. All three working groups were convened in June 2006 and a revised budget was presented to Regional Council for adoption on June 29, 2006. Ultimately, the revised budget was not needed since funding levels were maintained at their current levels by Congress.

In FY 2007-08, FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10, President Bush proposed cuts in the SSBG program, but funding was ultimately maintained. In all three years, the Social Services Planning Committee chose to continue funding at the same level for the service priorities that were identified in the previous years.


Moving into 2009, it became apparent that participation in the SSBG planning process had dwindled, with participation coming from mostly larger jurisdictions and nonprofit agencies that were contracted to provide services in the SSBG plan. In order to create a more representative voting body, the PAG SSBG planning process was updated to incorporate fuller participation from the local jurisdictions and specific representatives.
from agencies not contracted to provide locally planned SSBG services. A new Social Services Planning Committee was formed and consists of a representative from each jurisdiction, a United Way staff person, and five local interest area experts who each represent one of the identified DES program areas. The interest area experts provide topical expertise and their participation ensures broader representation from the community on the committee.

In addition to forming a new committee, the process in which SSBG funding decisions were made in the past was reviewed and updated. Prior to 2009, the funding recommendations had not changed significantly in a number of years and, given the economic downturn, which increased the need for social services and dramatically cut state-funded services, it was time to fully assess regional community needs. Since 2009, the process to develop the SSBG budget has included working groups, fact sheets, a provider survey, and a multi-step service prioritization process, as described below.

The SSBG planning process utilizes “working groups” to help gather information and data for each of the program areas and help assess regional community needs. The working groups consist of members of the Social Services Planning Committee, staff from SSBG-contracted agencies and members of the nonprofit community. The four working groups, based on the five broad services categories, are: 1) Aging and Adults; 2) Children, Youth and Families, and Developmental Disabilities; 3) Quality of Life (housing, hunger and anti-poverty issues); 4) Employment and Rehabilitation Services. The task of each working group is to develop fact sheets with current data and to identify social service priorities within their topic area.

In June 2011, PAG staff conducted a survey of human services providers in the greater Tucson region to obtain input on service priorities for SSBG funds. The SSBG survey was sent to 169 individuals and 58 individuals completed it, a 34 percent response rate. The 10 question survey asked participants to rate 49 unique services from 1 to 5 and to provide critical information on social services funding cuts in the region. A complete analysis of the survey results was provided to the Social Services Planning Committee for its consideration in the budget development process. The survey results show housing rated as the top service priority among survey participants, followed by Child Care, Home Delivered Meals and Case Management.

In addition to the fact sheets and survey results, expert presentations are made in front of the Social Services Planning Committee on each of the five service categories. The experts provide their response and reflections on the fact sheets and survey and share other funding insights on their area of interest. Following the presentations, committee members ask follow-up questions to both the experts and the representatives from the SSBG-contracted agencies to ensure a strong understanding of the service needs and priorities in the region.

During the SSBG budget development discussions, the Social Services Planning Committee allows multiple opportunities for input from the public and contracted agencies. Once the committee approves its draft SSBG budget, a period of five to seven days is provided for the public or members of the committee to submit written appeals. No appeals have been submitted in recent years and the committee has unanimously approved the SSBG budget at its final meeting. If an appeal ever is submitted, the committee would convene to hear more information about the appeal and discuss changes to the budget.

In February 2012, the Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES) informed PAG that a federal funding cut from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services was to be passed on to the local level and the approved SSBG plan would need to be revised. The Committee amended the FY 2012-2013 SSBG on March 26, 2012, based on an anticipated budget of $1,450,806.
HUMAN SERVICES FUNDING LANDSCAPE

The nationwide economic downturn that began in 2008 has severely affected the State of Arizona (AZ) and the Pima County region. Since the state Legislature passed the FY 2009 budget, the State Department of Economic Security (DES) has been forced to cut its budget by 31 percent (more than $250 million), and then made additional reductions in FY 2010. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 provided critical funds to support child welfare, developmental disabilities and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families in the state for FY 2010 and 2011; however, these funds will no longer be available in FY 2012. These funding cuts could have dramatic impacts on local human service agencies and the services they provide including the elimination of programs and services. Some of the programs most at risk for funding cuts are: Grandparent Kinship Care, Sight Conversation Program for low-income adults, Promoting Safe and Stable Families, In-Home Services for children and adults with developmental disabilities, independent living support services for approximately 700 older adults, and early intervention services for children with developmental disabilities.

The effects of severe budget cuts on local service providers have been felt by all nonprofit organizations in the region. For example, in the last three years, state funding for aging and adult services has been reduced by 17 percent ($607,973) and it is likely that further reductions of 15 percent will happen in early 2010. In addition, in the past three years Pima County has cut its funding for aging and adult services by 74 percent ($602,998), and the City of Tucson and United Way have cut their funding by 33 percent ($87,592).

REGIONAL COMMUNITY NEEDS

Working groups held in-depth discussions to develop fact sheets on their service categories in October 2011 and included the following observations and recommendations.

Aging and Adult Services
Aging and Adult Services are directed to the region through DES’s Division of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS). The plan directs $792,249 to locally planned services for elderly and physically disabled adults.

In Pima County, 21 percent of the total population is 60 years of age or older, according to the American Community Survey’s 2008-2010 estimates. Of this total 15.2 percent are 65+ 7.1 percent are 75+ and 2.1 percent are 85+ years of age. Given the increase in the PAG region’s elderly population in the last decade, continued declines in state and local funding, combined with client need increases, will result in growing unmet needs in the PAG region. Many home-based services, such as housekeeping, bathing, dressing, grooming and shopping, help to keep clients active and healthy at a lower level of care and cost. Programs that assist clients in remaining in their own homes, including home delivered meals, have been identified by the working group as not only meeting critical needs for in-home care but also helping to reduce needs for higher cost items such as client placement in an assisted care facility. The cost of home and community-based care is estimated to be one-quarter of the cost of institutional care. The Social Services Block Grant is the only funding source available in the region to provide in-home assistance to individuals under age 60 (18-60) with a physical disability.

Homecare services also have increased due to a shift among clients from adult day care services to home care services. This shift has occurred because as the client base has aged there has been increased client frailty, lack of transportation for clients to day care facilities, client reluctance to go outside their home, client reluctance to be in group activities and the development and enhancement of respite services, preferred by many clients, where a respite worker will come into the home to provide the live-in caregiver a break. In cases where respite services are not available, family members rely on adult day care services to allow themselves respite from caring for an older adult. Adult day care clients receive supervision, health monitoring, socialization and stimulation while attending adult day care programs.
Case management is a critical component of services provided to older adult and physically disabled clients. As clients determine they need support with daily living activities, they and their family members work closely with case managers to assess the individuals’ needs and eligibility for services, develop a service plan based on the client’s needs and resources, authorize services, monitor the client’s progress and advocate for the client. Clients need assistance with care coordination, information and advocacy, and caregivers may need help in dealing with stress. Case management is a critical component to older adults’ ability to access services and is a priority within the committee.

**Children, Youth and Family Services**

Children, Youth and Family Services are directed to the region through DES’ Administration of Children, Youth and Families (ACYF). This plan directs $344,227 to locally planned Children, Youth and Family services.

The service priorities in the area of Children, Youth and Families were determined by expert observations of the working group members, a diverse group of professionals working in the field. The working group discussions focused on those services that can be delivered by the existing human services network and the services that are needed within the community that are not currently being delivered. Specifically, the working group recommended three priority service areas for funding: early intervention services for children with significant behavioral problems, case management and counseling for low income families not eligible for AHCCCS, and counseling for youth and adult domestic violence offenders.

Concern was expressed that severe cuts in funding for Children, Youth and Family services have occurred at the state level as well as the local level with areas like Kid’s Care, child support services, parent training, substance abuse services, and child protective services being targeted for significant reductions in funding and possible elimination. Combined with federal cuts, agencies are having to rely more heavily on local or private funds to continue services.

The committee felt strongly that services provided to children with significant behavioral issues in child care centers were a critical component for child development and parents’ ability to work, and that they should be continued. These are the children who typically fall through the cracks because they do not meet the rigid definitions to be eligible for services from the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD) or Arizona Early Intervention Program services. These are children with communication challenges, atypical physical and/or cognitive development, social/emotional/behavioral challenges, etc. Children who have less than the 50 percent delay in one of these major areas of development are not required to receive existing services but still exhibit enough challenges to be unsuccessful in group care without classroom support. The PAG plan identifies unique early intervention services for these children that include professional development workshops for child care staff to coach them on implementing techniques for working with the children.

Case management for low income individuals and families also was deemed a priority in today’s economic environment. Research suggests that, on average, families need an income of about twice the federal poverty level to meet their most basic needs. Children living in families with incomes below this level—$44,700 for a family of four in 2011—are referred to as low income. In Pima County, 20.1% of households with children are in poverty, according to the 2008-2010 American Community Survey. Case management is essential to ensure that these individuals and families can access available resources – case managers can help determine what resources the family needs and assist in navigating the systems that can sometimes be overwhelming. Case managers also are available to provide ongoing support so that families do not fall back into the same patterns that initially got them into a difficult situation.

Adults, children and families that are on AHCCCS (Title XIX) or Kids Care (Title XXI) are considered entitled to benefits which include behavioral health, medication monitoring, case management, individual, group and
family services, etc. Those that are not on AHCCCS (Non Title XIX) are only eligible when funding is available for group and individual counseling services. The committee felt that case management services were needed for these non-AHCCCS eligible families to help them access available resources, services and benefit programs in the community.

The committee also focused on domestic violence and prevention counseling for domestic violence offenders. Domestic violence data is difficult to track since much of it goes unreported by victims; however, in 2009 more than 3,000 people called the Southern Arizona Center Against Sexual Assault crisis hotline seeking help and support for issues related to sexual assault. Domestic violence affects the intended victim as well as children, witnesses and offenders. Prevention counseling and training helps stop the recurrence of violence and provides tools for managing stressful situations. Training helps offenders understand why relationship violence happens and what forms it takes, and can include discussions on oppression, empowerment, youth issues with relationship violence, and support for survivors.

**Quality of Life/Basic Needs Services**

Services that meet the basic needs of the vulnerable members of our community are provided through the Division of Aging and Adult Services of DES. This plan directs $194,588 to locally planned services for food, shelter and safety.

The percentage of Pima County residents living in poverty continues to be significantly higher than the national average - 17.8 percent in Pima County versus 14.4 percent nationally. Food insecurity in Pima County has grown with the increase in poverty levels, effecting families, children and older adults. The number of Pima County residents receiving food stamps continues to grow steadily each year – 98,505 residents received food stamps in November 2007 before the economic downturn began, up to 181,004 individuals in November 2011. The committee identified congregate meals (school lunch programs) for children during the summer months as a priority for food assistance as well as home delivered meals for homebound adults to prevent institutionalization and malnutrition.

A high rate of home foreclosures and unemployment in Pima County over the past four years has resulted in many people experiencing homelessness for the first time, both homeowners and renters of foreclosed homes. According to the *Arizona Daily Star*, 1,000 homeowners in Pima County received foreclosure notices each month from July through September 2010. Foreclosure rates finally started to slow in 2011, with 20 percent fewer foreclosure notices issued in Pima County in November 2011 than November 2010. The Tucson Planning Council for the Homeless counted 1,561 homeless people in the 2010 Annual Street Count on January 16, 2010. This is 16 percent more homeless individuals than the previous year. About a third of the 1,561 homeless people are chronically homeless, a significant reduction from the previous year when 65% of those counted where chronically homeless. There were 143 people counted during the 2010 Annual Street Count that were under 18 years of age, an increase of 20% over 2009. Approximately 5,400 children in Pima County schools experienced homelessness at some point during the 2010-11 school year, a 52% increase from the pre-recession 07-08 school year.

When defining safety issues during the planning process, the committee focused on domestic violence and sexual abuse. The Tucson Police Department (TPD) responded to 8,833 calls for service on domestic violence in 2010, while the Pima County Sheriff’s Department reports 4,017 such calls. And in FY 2010-11, Emerge! Center Against Domestic Abuse answered 4,339 domestic abuse hotline calls, as well as fulfilled 1,231 requests for emergency shelter, 1,176 requests for community-based (non-residential) services, and 80 requests for transitional/permanent housing. Funding for domestic violence services has seen significant cuts over the past year since the Arizona Department of Economic Security provides the majority of funding for domestic violence shelter beds and DES has had to cut many of its programs. There is a lack of shelter beds for domestic violence
victims and families in the community and limited capacity to meet existing demand for trauma treatment services; combined with funding cuts, the region faces potentially devastating cuts to shelter and treatment for domestic violence victims.

Civil legal aid services also help protect the region’s vulnerable populations. These legal services are largely related to problems which directly affect individuals' and families’ most basic needs, including safety and protection for children and women who are victimized by domestic violence; preservation of shelter for those wrongfully evicted from their homes; restoration of or access to food stamps, and a means to survive for disabled persons who are unable to obtain social security benefits. Southern Arizona Legal Aid reports that for every person who receives free civil legal aid, one person is turned away due to the high demand for legal services.

**Developmental Disabilities Services**

Developmental Disabilities Services are directed to the region through DES’s Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD). This plan directs $7,729 for services for individuals with a development disability.

There are approximately 5,300 residents in Pima County who met the eligibility criteria for DDD in 2010. The working group expressed concern about the state DDD cuts and what that will mean for those who meet the eligibility criteria. The working group also expressed concern that there were many more individuals who need services but fall through the cracks because they do not meet the strict eligibility requirements. For this reason the working group’s top service priority was on-site technical assistance to staff working with children who have challenging behaviors and/or special needs in day care settings. This service is described in more detail and is funded in the Children, Youth and Families area since DES moved the service out of DDD.

Another service area the working group focused on was home-based services for persons with developmental disabilities. Many adults with disabilities who are not Medicaid funded live with family members who perform self-help tasks and activities of daily living for their adult children because of their child’s inability to do these things. Providing home-based services helps to strengthen or maintain the family unit’s capacity to care for their family member and minimize the possibility of the individual having to move out of the family’s home. The group decided to direct all available funding in Development Disability Services toward this service.

**Employment and Rehabilitation Services**

Both employment and rehabilitation services are directed to the region through DES’s Division of Employment and Rehabilitation Services. This plan directs $41,993 for employment services and $38,458 for rehabilitation services for a total of $80,451.

Employment services have become more critical over the past four years as more and more residents have lost their jobs as a result of the poor economy. The unemployment rate for the Tucson Metropolitan Statistical Area peaked in October 2009 at over 9.4 percent and hovered there until March 2010. The unemployment rate has continued to decline since that time and in November 2011 was at 7.9 percent, which is still dramatically higher than the region’s lowest unemployment rate of 3.4 percent in May 2007. The largest employment gains in 2011 were in the Education and Health Services sector and the Trade, Transportation and Utilities sector.

Those most at risk for not securing a job are people without a high school diploma, those that have literacy issues, and those with limited English proficiency. Others have difficulty finding work after long periods of unemployment, homelessness or health problems. The committee chose to fund the broad service category of “employment services,” which will provide an array of services such as employment screening, assessment or testing; literacy training, GED preparation and pre-vocational training; and counseling/case management that
works to ensure graduation and job placement. The funding also can help provide job training for programs that have a demand for skilled job opportunities.

Individuals with disabilities can receive rehabilitative and employment support through DES to help them achieve increased independence and/or gainful employment. National and local statistics on persons with hearing loss are rarely collected; however, the Community Outreach Program for the Deaf has reported that 69 percent of persons with deafness or hearing loss are unemployed. In the PAG region, funds in this category have historically gone to fund services for hearing impaired persons. One of the largest incidences of a single disability is hearing loss, deafness or hearing impairment, which can severely limit individuals' ability to effectively communicate with the world around them. Interpretation services are most often provided at the request of medical, government and legal professionals who need assistance communicating with the hearing impaired; upon the request, an interpreter is sent to join appointments and provide interpretation services. Counseling services help the hearing impaired learn to cope with their disability and adjust to working and engaging interpersonal relationships.

Planning Activities
Planning Activities for the SSBG Plan are coordinated by Pima Association of Governments in cooperation with PAG member jurisdictions, agencies and stakeholders. Until 2010, the Department of Economic Security (DES) contracted with PAG to provide the SSBG planning services, and PAG was reimbursed with $45,500 of the locally planned SSBG funds. PAG no longer receives funding for its SSBG planning services but continues to facilitate the SSBG planning process in the PAG region.

SSBG Funding Breakdown
The full breakdown of locally funded programs is provided at the end of this report in spreadsheet format.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2012-2013 SSBG Funding Breakdown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$344,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$226,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$41,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$38,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging and Adults</td>
<td>$792,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, Youth and Families</td>
<td>$344,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>$226,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>$41,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$38,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH
The PAG region convenes a regional stakeholder group, the Social Services Planning Committee, each year to review human service needs and identify funding priorities for the upcoming fiscal year. These meetings are open to the public and notices are emailed to committee members, interested agencies and stakeholders. Prior to adoption of the Title XX/SSBG plan, a legal notice is printed in the Arizona Daily Star providing public notice of pending adoption of the SSBG plan. Amendments may be processed throughout the year if required by changes in federal or state SSBG funding.
FUTURE HUMAN SERVICES ACTIVITIES

In 2012, PAG will continue to work with the Social Services Planning Committee to modify the SSBG planning process as they see fit and to plan for the FY 2014 SSBG budget. The FY 2013 SSBG plan will be made available on PAG’s website, www.PAGregion.com, and shared with all interested community members. The committee also will elect a committee chair and vice chair and will have an opportunity to update the committee bylaws.

1 U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010
2 U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010
3 Arizona Workforce Informer, Arizona Department of Commerce Research Administration, www.workforce.az.gov
4 U.S. Code Title 42 Chapter 7 Subchapter XX §1397
5 U.S. Code Title 42 Chapter 7 Subchapter XX §1397d (Title: Public Health and Welfare, Chapter: Social Security, Subchapter: Block Grants for Social Services, “Limitation on use of grants; waiver”)
6 National Association of Area Agencies on Aging & National Association of State Units on Aging, 2009 “Project 2020 Talking Points”

10 Arizona’s Workforce Employment Report, Arizona Department of Administration, December 15, 2011.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>SFY 2012 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Amended SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Service Intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Intervention/Guidance Counseling</td>
<td>AD/CH (Adult and youth domestic violence offenders)</td>
<td>$ 51,106</td>
<td>$ 45,995</td>
<td>$ 44,307</td>
<td>To provide counseling and guidance for youth and adult domestic violence offenders due to increasing violence in the homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Intervention/Guidance Counseling</td>
<td>AD/CH (Rural adult and youth domestic violence offenders)</td>
<td>$ 51,106</td>
<td>$ 45,995</td>
<td>$ 44,307</td>
<td>To provide counseling and guidance for youth and adult domestic violence offenders due to increasing violence in the homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Intervention/Guidance Counseling</td>
<td>AFC (Low income children and families who are otherwise ineligible for state services.)</td>
<td>$ 96,575</td>
<td>$ 96,575</td>
<td>$ 93,031</td>
<td>To assist low income children and families who are otherwise ineligible for state services to access available resources, services and benefit programs effectively. Include counseling for pregnant teens in order to resolve problems associated with pregnancy that prevent financial independence, healthy family relationships, adequate parenting, positive social interaction, and emotional health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Intervention/Guidance Counseling</td>
<td>AFC (Rural low income children and families who are otherwise ineligible for state services.)</td>
<td>$ 96,575</td>
<td>$ 96,575</td>
<td>$ 93,031</td>
<td>To assist low income children and families who are otherwise ineligible for state services to access available resources, services and benefit programs effectively. Include counseling for pregnant teens in order to resolve problems associated with pregnancy that prevent financial independence, healthy family relationships, adequate parenting, positive social interaction, and emotional health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention/Behavioral Therapeutic Activities</td>
<td>CH (Children, birth to age 12, with behavior problems/special needs in day care or child care facilities )</td>
<td>$ 80,223</td>
<td>$ 72,201</td>
<td>$ 69,551</td>
<td>To minimize the impact of the delay(s) and problem behaviors by children with special needs/behavioral problems by providing learning assessment and support skills to child care professionals in child care facilities. Behavioral therapeutic activities, including intervention and assistance to families and child care or preschool staff, would be provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISTRICT II - DCYF TOTAL**  
$ 375,585 $ 357,341 $ 344,227
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>SFY 2012 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Amended SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Service Intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Day Care for Elderly/Adults:</td>
<td>ELD/AD</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>To restore, maintain or improve functional skills through supervision, personal living skills training, meals, health monitoring, social and other structured activities as well as providing respite to caregivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Care for Elderly /Adults - Personal Care, Housekeeping, Home Health and Shopper service: Clients are unable to meet all the needs of maintaining a home in a safe and sanitary manner or shop for their own food and have insufficient support systems (family and friends) to assist them.</td>
<td>ELD or PWD</td>
<td>$370,352</td>
<td>$370,352</td>
<td>$356,760</td>
<td>To enable clients to remain in their own homes by providing routine household maintenance including shopping for basic needs as well as reporting changes in client status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>ELD or PWD</td>
<td>$366,210</td>
<td>$366,210</td>
<td>$352,770</td>
<td>To enable clients to remain in the least restrictive setting possible by providing care coordination, including assessment of needs, linkage to services and benefit programs, effective utilization of available resources, advocacy and continued monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Delivered Meals</td>
<td>ELD or PWD</td>
<td>$56,507</td>
<td>$56,507</td>
<td>$82,719</td>
<td>To achieve or maintain adequate nutrition by delivering nutritious meals to the client’s residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Delivered Meals</td>
<td>ELD or PWD</td>
<td>$29,363</td>
<td>$29,363</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>To achieve or maintain adequate nutrition by delivering nutritious meals to the client’s residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>AD/CH (Adults and Youth)</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$24,083</td>
<td>To provide immediate, short-term shelter to persons who are without shelter or a fixed place of residence to prevent homelessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Intervention Shelter</td>
<td>AD (Adults-Domestic Violence Victims)</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$31,789</td>
<td>To provide emergency shelter to victims or potential victims of sexual assault or domestic abuse to prevent physical or emotional harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Target Group</td>
<td>SFY 2012 Local Planned Level</td>
<td>SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</td>
<td>Amended SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</td>
<td>Service Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Intervention / Guidance Counseling</td>
<td>AD/CH (Domestic Violence Victims)</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 24,083</td>
<td>To provide crisis counseling and emergency shelter as well as assisting clients in stabilizing their situations and in accessing other services and benefit programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>AD (Adults-Domestic Violence Victims)</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ 19,000</td>
<td>$ 18,389</td>
<td>To assist victims of sexual abuse and domestic violence in obtaining safe and stable living situations and developing a case plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Assistance</td>
<td>AFC (Civil Legal Matters for Low Income Residents)</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ 19,266</td>
<td>To protect the rights of individuals by providing assistance with civil legal issues for individuals and families in need of food stamp assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Assistance</td>
<td>AFC (Civil Legal Matters for Low Income Residents)</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ 19,266</td>
<td>To protect the rights of individuals by providing consultation and legal services for individuals and families facing eviction or needing landlord tenant mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Assistance</td>
<td>AD (Adults-Domestic Violence Victims)</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 28,899</td>
<td>To protect the rights of individuals by providing assistance with civil legal issues including domestic situations, landlord-tenant problems and obtaining appropriate identification for government services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>AD/CH (Adults and Youth)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 28,899</td>
<td>To prevent homelessness through longer term shelter with support services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISTRICT II - DAAS TOTAL**

$1,007,432  $1,024,432  $986,923
**DIVISION OF BENEFITS AND MEDICAID ELIGIBILITY (DBME)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>SFY 2012 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Amended SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Service Intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congregate Meals: Children’s food</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$32,766</td>
<td>$31,563</td>
<td>Prepare and serve one or more meals per day to school-age children in central dining areas to prevent malnutrition during the summer months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security is at greater risk during</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the summer months when the safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net of school meals is not provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT II - DBME TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$32,766</td>
<td>$31,563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EMPLOYMENT ADMINISTRATION (EA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>SFY 2012 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Estimated SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Amended SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Service Intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services</td>
<td>Adults (any individual 18 years of age and older)</td>
<td>$36,321</td>
<td>$43,593</td>
<td>$41,993</td>
<td>To provide employment services such as employment screening, assessment or testing; structure job skills and job seeking skills; specialized therapy (occupational speech, physical); special training and tutoring, including literacy training, GED preparation and pre-vocational training; provision of books, supplies and instructional material; counseling/case management that works to ensure graduation and job placement, transportation; and referral to community resource for unemployed adults. Services should also include job training (minimally an associates degree or certificate) for programs that have a demand for skilled job opportunities. Services are intended for single head of households, unemployed adults, elderly, low-income adults, youth 18-28 at risk of homelessness, families and rural adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT II - EA TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$36,321</td>
<td>$43,593</td>
<td>$41,993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DIVISION OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>SFY 2012 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Amended SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Service Intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Care for Persons with Disabilities- Personal Care, Housekeeping, Home Health and Shopper service:</td>
<td>Persons with Developmental Disabilities</td>
<td>$16,593</td>
<td>$7,729</td>
<td>$7,729</td>
<td>To enable clients to remain in their own homes by providing routine household maintenance including shopping for basic needs as well as reporting changes in client status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter Service for Deaf Adults:</td>
<td>PWD (Deaf) Adults</td>
<td>$3,869</td>
<td>$3,939</td>
<td>$3,939</td>
<td>To assist deaf individuals in accessing and utilizing community services, including emergency services, by providing interpreter services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Intervention/Guidance Counseling for Hearing Impaired Persons:</td>
<td>PWD - Hearing Impaired</td>
<td>$35,834</td>
<td>$35,834</td>
<td>$34,519</td>
<td>To assist deaf and hearing impaired clients in solving or learning to cope with their disability by providing intervention, support and counseling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISRTCT II - DDD TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SFY 2012 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Amended SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$16,593</td>
<td>$7,729</td>
<td>$7,729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REHABILITATION SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (RSA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>SFY 2012 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Amended SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Service Intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter Service for Deaf Adults:</td>
<td>PWD (Deaf) Adults</td>
<td>$3,869</td>
<td>$3,939</td>
<td>$3,939</td>
<td>To assist deaf individuals in accessing and utilizing community services, including emergency services, by providing interpreter services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Intervention/Guidance Counseling for Hearing Impaired Persons:</td>
<td>PWD - Hearing Impaired</td>
<td>$35,834</td>
<td>$35,834</td>
<td>$34,519</td>
<td>To assist deaf and hearing impaired clients in solving or learning to cope with their disability by providing intervention, support and counseling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISTRICT II - RSA TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SFY 2012 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Amended SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$39,703</td>
<td>$39,773</td>
<td>$38,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISTRICT II - SSBG TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SFY 2012 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
<th>Amended SFY 2013 Local Planned Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,505,634</td>
<td>$1,505,634</td>
<td>$1,450,893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>