

**HPRP Tucson and Pima County
Design Group Meeting Notes
July 7, 2009**



Attendance: Margaret Kish, Jodie Barnes, Efrain Romero, Linda Kot, Jane Burch, Mary Beth Landis Jantzen, Tony Bruno, Pat De Vito, Leslie Carlson, Charles Monroe, La'Tresa Jester, Ron Koenig, and Bea Gallivan

Introductions

Leslie Carlson welcomed everyone and invited participants to introduce themselves.

Review of work to date

Leslie did a brief overview of the Design Group's draft recommendations to date, and guiding principles/core values for HPRP services that were identified at the June 30 meeting. It was decided that the guiding principles should also include: Have a well designed and implemented evaluation plan.

HPRP Eligibility

The Design Group members continued discussing eligibility criteria for HPRP. The Group discussed how the program would work when there are multiple adults in one household. It was agreed that there should only be one rent subsidy per household. However, if there are multiple adults, they may each have their own case plans in order to improve housing stability.

Jody Barnes distributed the Case Management Subcommittee's suggestions for the process to be used by the Resource Specialist. After initial eligibility screening via the HPRP web site:

1. The client would meet with the HPRP Resource Specialist and have an initial discussion about the client's situation.
2. Then the Resource Specialist would complete a Decision Tool form to determine eligibility based on need and whether other resources are available. The Resource Specialist would also review a checklist regarding verification of income, Pima County residency, legal residency, etc.
3. If the client appears to fit initial eligibility requirements, the RS would complete the HMIS self-sufficiency Matrix (selected domains). Some domain scores could be weighted to reflect the program intent of HPRP. The Self Sufficiency matrix scores would have a dual purpose – both assessment, and evaluation. The SS Matrix scores would also help the RS develop the case plan.
4. The RS would assure buy-in from client, explain client responsibilities, determine readiness to create a case plan and whether the client is a good fit for HPRP services.
5. The RS and client would create a case plan together, and both sign it.
6. The RS will make a final determination of what kind of HPRP assistance to recommend.

Jodie reviewed a draft version of the Decision Tool. The client would need to meet a minimum of one criteria from either A-I (Shelter), A-II (Homeless or Institution), or A-III (Utilities) – and at least one criterion from B (other support/options), as well as one criterion from C (income). The group suggested that it would be beneficial if an explanation box were included after each category.

The group discussed the other eligibility criterion – likelihood of success – and whether there would be any assessment questions about this. The group agreed that the RS will need to determine this, and one indicator will be the client’s participation in the case plan. This will be a condition of continued assistance from HPRP.

The group discussed whether the clients should rely on HPRP as their main source of case management. It was agreed that this would be part of the assessment conducted by the RS. If the client has a regular and effective relationship with another case manager, then the HPRP RS can simply assess whether the client is a good fit for HPRP assistance and recommend that the client continue working on their existing case plan – as well as using other existing community resources. If the client has no case manager, or only nominal case management, then the HPRP RS may provide more of this kind of assistance. It was noted that the housing case management provided by the HPRP RS is a specialized kind of assistance.

Charles Monroe commented that HPRP and other programs in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act reflect policy and funding priorities that we will see in the future, so it’s important to create a good HPRP system, because that will position us effectively for the future.

Caps

The group discussed whether to have caps on HPRP resources, and if so, what types of Caps to use. One option was dollar amount limits, perhaps between \$7,800 - \$10,000. Another option was a time limit cap. Setting caps might help with questions of equity and help the program serve more clients. One of the members suggested that HPRP might use some of the Section 8’s requirements, e.g., 30% of income, or if no income, then pay \$25.

Agenda Items for July 14

Linda, Margaret, Jane and Leslie will draft more specific descriptions of the work of Resource Specialist and Disbursements Administrator positions. It was also agreed that Leslie will draft a list of all recommendations to date.

Future Meetings

The Group agreed to invite additional experts to the Design Group meeting on July 28. At this meeting, The Design Group will present the draft design for HPRP and ask for suggestions. It was agreed to invite representatives from the following organizations:

- PPEP
- Green Valley Assistance Services
- Norma Gallegos (ESN)
- International Sonoran Desert Alliance (Ajo)
- Town of Marana – T Van Hook
- First Things First
- Ministerial Alliance – Grady Scott
- Legal Aid
- Emerge!
- CPSA

Van Gottel, the web developer, is available to meet with the group on July 28. It was agreed that a smaller subset of the Design Group could meet with Van via telephone conference call on another day.