



**MEETING OF THE**

**Pima County Community Action Agency  
Advisory Board**

**Tuesday, September 12, 2017  
5:30 p.m.**

Kino Service Center, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Meeting Room 123  
2797 E. Ajo Way, Tucson, AZ 85713

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Members Present**

Diane Brown	Roy Tullgren
Gloria J. Valenzuela	Pastor Jeff Inniss
John Vasquez Bedoy, Chair	Willie Blake
Dick Katz	Cynthia J. Nahsonhoya
Lori Bable	

**Members Absent**

Annabelle Nunez	Paul Appleby
Rose Tederous	Elena West
Imelda Pines	

**Guests and Pima County Staff Present**

Linda Leatherman	Manira Cervantez
Rosemary Cora-Cruz	Anna M. Cunes

- I. Called to Order: John Vasquez Bedoy, Chair, 5:41 p.m.
- II. Pledge of Allegiance: All
- III. Action Item: To Approve March 30, 2017 Meeting Minutes. Roy Tullgren motioned to approve the Meeting Minutes; Willie Blake seconded the motion with a request for the word "basis" to be spelled correctly on Page 3; and all were in favor.



**Section D. Terms of Office**

1. Terms of Appointment

The term of appointment for the private sector representatives of the Pima County Community Action Agency Board shall be for a period of four (4) years. The term for the public representatives may be for the length of the term that the public official is in office. However, if such is the case, the public official must reappoint his/her representative on a yearly **basis**. The term for the Representatives of the *disadvantaged* shall be for four (4) years.

- IV. Welcome New Member: Rosemary Cora-Cruz welcomed and introduced new CAAB member Richard “Dick” Katz who was appointed by the Honorable Stephen W. Christy. Dick Katz will represent District 4.
- V. CAA Historical Perspective: Rosemary Cora-Cruz shared the history and timeline for the Community Action Agency.

In the United States and its territories, Community Action Agencies (CAA) are local private and public non-profit organizations that carry out the Community Action Program (CAP), which was founded by the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act to fight poverty by empowering the poor as part of the War on Poverty.

CAAs are intended to promote self-sufficiency, and they depend heavily on volunteer work, especially from the low-income community. The Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) is the agencies' core federal funding. Agencies also operate a variety of grants that come from federal, state and local sources. These grants vary widely among agencies, although most CAAs operate Head Start programs, which focus on early child development. Other programs frequently administered by CAAs include Low-Income Home Energy Assistance (LIHEAP) utility grants and the Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) funded through the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE).

Each CAA is governed by a board of directors consisting of at least one-third low-income community members, one-third public officials, and up to one-third private sector leaders. This board structure is defined by federal statute and is known as a tripartite board.

There are currently over 1,000 CAAs engaged in a broad range of activities and typical activities include promoting citizen participation, providing utility bill assistance and



home weatherization for low-income individuals, administration of Head Start pre-school programs, job training, operating food pantries, and coordinating community initiatives.

In 1964, the U.S. poverty rate (income-based) included 19 percent of Americans. Rising political forces demanded change. Under a new White House Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), the concept of the federally-funded, local Community Action Program (CAP)—delivered by a local CAA, in a nationwide Community Action Network—would become the primary vehicle for a new, federal "War on Poverty."

### **Establishment**

Lyndon B. Johnson's landmark Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—drafted by former Peace Corps founding director Sargent Shriver—established Community Action Programs in Title II. In concept, a Community Action Program was defined as a program "...which provides services, assistance, and other activities of sufficient scope and size to give promise of progress toward elimination of poverty or a cause or causes of poverty through developing employment opportunities, improving human performance, motivation, and productivity, or bettering the conditions under which people live, learn, and work."

A controversial feature of the Act was the requirement for "maximum feasible participation" of the people directly affected (the poor, basically) in the decision-making about how federal funds would be spent on them, in their community. This flew in the face of long-established power structures, where elected city councils, county commissions, state and federal officials ruled over everything—mostly people from the power elite and upper-class communities. The notion that the poor (largely minorities) should have a say in their affairs created some opposition at first, but was in keeping with America's liberal "civil rights" and "reform" movements, and "War on Poverty," in the 1960s and 1970s, and generally accepted, at least at first.[\[5\]\[6\]\[8\]\[9\]](#)

In each community, the local CAP was provided by a local non-profit CAA, overseen by a board made up—initially—of residents of the target neighborhood or population being served. This gave poor, working class and minority citizens a voice in how they would be served by federal funds aimed at improving their lives. However, this caused some anger and frustration among the nation's power establishment, especially in local governments used to running their communities, and among the power elites (particularly in the business community) used to dominating their local governments.



### **Problems, pushback and pullback**

Although Johnson and other architects of the legislation expected Community Action Programs and Agencies to be an effective weapon in his so-called "[War on Poverty](#)", many of them were riddled with problems. In more extreme instances, local political regimes were threatened by the empowerment of poor political activists with funding and resources from the federal government.<sup>[11]</sup>

One of the most dramatic episodes resulting from these clashes between CAA leaders and local governments occurred when, following cuts in funding for a summer youth CAP, black activist Charles Sizemore and thirty others barged into San Francisco Mayor [John Shelley](#)'s office demanding resources and threatening that if the CAP was not funded once again, "this goddamn town's gonna blow."<sup>[12]</sup>

By the mid/late-1960s, many political leaders—including President Johnson, U.S. Senator Richard Russell (D-GA), leader of the anti-civil rights conservative coalition, and Chicago's powerful Mayor Richard J. Daley—publicly or privately expressed displeasure with the power-sharing that the CAA brought to poor and minority neighborhoods.

In 1967, conservative and establishment pressures brought two amendments to the Congressional funding bill for the OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity—overseer of the CAA/CAP programs):

- The Green Amendment gave city governments the right to decide which entity would be the official CAA for their community.
- The Quie Amendment gave two-thirds of the seats on CAA boards to elected city officials and "private sector representatives" (businesspeople), effectively outnumbering neighborhood citizens on their own CAA boards.

The net result was a halt to the "citizen participation" reform movement and a fundamental shift of power away from the nation's poor and minorities.

Nevertheless, some federal emphasis on anti-poverty programs remained, including the (modified) CAP/CAA system. By 1973, the U.S. poverty rate dropped to 11.1 percent, a 7.9 percent decrease in 10 years, and the lowest it would be between 1959 and 2004.<sup>[4]</sup>



### **Conservative Backlash**

During the "conservative-backlash" era of the late 1970s, 1980s and 1990s—as the federal government (under presidents Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush ) cut away programs for the poor and minorities—the CAPs and CAAs were defunded, underfunded, or warped into a strange variation of their original intent, with far less influence of the poor and minorities in how they would be "served" by these entities.

The troubled economy of the mid/late-1970s (brought on by the Energy Crisis), and the 1980s (Reagan recession), was especially hard on America's poor. Between 1973 and 1983, the national poverty rate rose from 11.1% to 15.2%. Another decade later, in 1993, the poverty rate was virtually unchanged at 15.1%, just a 0.1% decrease from 1983.<sup>[4]</sup>

Between 1993 and 2004, the U.S. poverty rate first declined (from 15.1% in 1993, to 11.3% in 2000), but then increased to 12.7% by 2004. The 2008 poverty rate was 13.2%.<sup>[4]</sup>

### **Today**

However, despite these challenges, around 1,000 CAPs (and their CAAs) still operate today, across the United States.

Rosemary mentioned that currently there are six Case Managers who work with the Pima County CAA program and federal funds are used, not Pima County funds. One additional Case Manager will be hired in the near future.

A good example of "wrap around services" would be how PPEP, Inc. for example, may have an Intake Specialist upon assessing someone seeking rental assistance, determined that the person is also eligible for another program that they offer such as

## VI. CAAB Business - Chair and Pima County Staff

- A. The last time that the CAAB received Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) Training was at the Pima County Rio Nuevo One-Stop Career Center on Saturday, March 8, 2014, 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Rosemary would like to schedule a ROMA Training session for the current CAAB in the near future. There is some new information that will be provided along with a change in how data is



collected and reported. For example, ROMA would like to see the outcomes of how families are progressing after receiving funding assistance. New measures will need to be reported as of 07/01/18. Rosemary will contact ROMA and ask if someone is available to provide training on Tuesday, 11/14/18.

- B. The state will be conducting their monitoring and it will include a couple of CAAB members to be interviewed regarding board engagement. The monitoring is scheduled for the first week in October 2017.
- C. Rosemary reminded the CAAB that an Open Meeting Law training will be scheduled. Anna will email the following link to the Law to CAAB members:  
<http://www.azoca.gov/wp-content/uploads/Open-Meeting-Law-101.pdf>.

CAAB members were reminded to not "reply all" on emails. The following is from the Open Meeting Law:

***What constitutes a meeting?***

*A meeting is a gathering, in person or through technological devices of a quorum of a public body at which they discuss, propose or take legal action, including deliberations. A.R.S. § 38-431(4). This includes telephone and e-mail communications.*

The definition of meeting was modified by the Arizona Legislature in 2000 to prohibit a quorum of a public body from secretly communicating through technological devices, including, for example, facsimile machines, telephones, texting, and e-mail.

CAAB members should avoid establishing a quorum and discussing CAAB-related business outside of a regular meeting.

*The safest course of action is to assume the Open Meeting Law applies whenever a majority of the body (CAAB) discusses the business of the public body (CAAB). It does not matter what label is placed on a gathering. It may be called a "work" or "study" (or training) session, or the discussion may occur at a social function.*

- D. Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Agency Funding Status SFY 2018: Rosemary reminded the CAAB members that they may vote to change the CAA Request for Proposal (RFP) process such as releasing the RFP every five years rather than every 2 years.

- E. Low-Income Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) Update: The majority of the utility assistance funds comes from this source. The Tucson Urban League, Inc. (TUL) was receiving \$1.6 million dollars to assist City of Tucson residents with utility bills and Pima County received the balance. The TUL's mission would no longer support this program so the Arizona Department of Economic Security asked Pima County if they would like to take over/include the TUL's program and the CAA offered to take over this funding and allocating. The County went from \$800,000 in client services to \$2.1 million dollars in client services. The TUL, Interfaith Community Services (ICS), and Global Application all agreed to assist whether the client calls Pima County, TUL, ICS, or Global Application and each organization uses the same scheduling tool that is used to track clients and funds. Pima County will review every application received during the first quarter for quality control. The state has said that a 3% error rate would be acceptable. The new brochure will be emailed to the CAAB members.
- F. Recruitment – Membership: No applications received for the one current vacancy.
- G. Strategic Planning: The CAAB members will need to review and plan for next RFP process on either Tuesday, 01/09/18, 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. or Tuesday, 11/14/17.
- H. The CAAB members agreed to change the Wednesday dates to Tuesdays, beginning in November 2017:
- Tuesday, 11/14/178 – ROMA Training Session  
Tuesday, 01/09/18 – RFP Process Review (tentative)  
Tuesday, 03/13/18
- VII. Call to the Audience: Linda Leatherman, Faith-Based Program Coordinator, Pima County Community Services, Employment and Training, announced that she attended the 2017 Summer ACAA Conference and that Rosemary Cora-Cruz was the Master of Ceremonies and Linda said that Rosemary did a wonderful job. Rosemary is serving as the ACAA President for one more year.

VIII. Adjourned: 7:00 p.m.

Page 7 of 7