

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (MAG)
CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD

November 2, 2015

MAG Office Building, Ironwood Room

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Brad Bridwell, Cantwell Anderson-Cloudbreak

Moises Gallegos, City of Phoenix

#Marisue Garganta, Dignity Health

Scott Hall, Community Bridges Inc.

*Kevin Hartke, City of Chandler, Vice Mayor,
Chair

Theresa James, City of Tempe

Bruce Liggett, Maricopa County

Nick Margiotta, Phoenix Police Department

Darlene Newsom, United Methodist Outreach
Ministries (UMOM) New Day Center

Amy Schwabenlender, Valley of the Sun United
Way (VSUW)

Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American
Connections

Tami Linkletter, Save the Family

*Neither present nor represented by proxy.

#Attended by telephone conference call.

+Attended by video conference.

OTHERS PRESENT

Libby Bissa, City of Phoenix
James Claymon, Phoenix Shanti Group
Ken Curry, SBH
Jen Dangremond, Native American Connections
(NAC)
Steve Degroot, NAC
Mark Dobay, A New Leaf
Dr. Maria E. Garay-Serratos, Sojourner Center
Deanna Grogan, City of Mesa
Vicki Helland, CBI
Marcie Herzog, SBH
Rosalie Hernandez, A New Leaf
Michael Hughes, A New Leaf
Teri Houser, Sojourner Center
Michelle Jameson, U.S. Vets
Margaret Kilman, Maricopa County Human
Services Department (MCHSD)
Stephanie Knox, DES
Karen Kurtz, CBI
Mattie Lord, UMOM
Nancy Marion, House of Refuge
Suzie Martin, Homeward Bound
Ken McKinley, Tumbleweed
Lisa Miller, UMOM
Dennis Newburn, City of Mesa
David Olivares, Terros

Catherine Rea, Community Information and
Referral (CIR)
Edward Pinot, Terros
Laura Peters, LCSA
Ty Rosensteel, CASS
Laura Skotniki, Save the Family
Charles Sullivan, ABC Housing
Chela Sullivan, UMOM
Steven Sparks, Labor's Community Service
Agency (LCSA)
Nicky Stevens, ABC
Mike Shore, Hom Inc.
Jacki Taylor, Save the Family
Michelle Thomas, CIR
Keith Thompson, Phoenix Shanti Group
Dorian Townsend, Sojourner Center
Will Vucurevich, House of Refuge
John Wall, Arizona Housing Inc.
Ted Williams, ABC Housing
Kim VanNimwegen, VSUW
Pilar Vargus, Chicanos Por La Causa
Amy Vogelsson, SBH

Celina Brun, MAG
Brandie Mead, MAG
Anne Scott, MAG

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Darlene Newsome, United Methodist Outreach Ministries (UMOM) New Day Center, Co-Chair of the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board, called the meeting to order at 9:02 p.m. Introductions of the Committee and audience proceeded.

2. Call to the Audience

Audience members were given an opportunity to address the Committee on items that were not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. There were no comments from the audience.

3. Approval of the September 28, 2015 CoC Board Meeting Minutes

Addressing the first order of business, Co-Chair Newsom asked if the Board reviewed the September 28, 2015 CoC Board meeting minutes and if there were any comments. There were no comments. Co-Chair Newsom entertained a motion to approve the September 28, 2015 Board meeting minutes. Moises Gallegos, City of Phoenix, motioned to approve the September 28, 2015 CoC Board meeting minutes. Theresa James, City of Tempe, seconded the motion to approve the September 28, 2015 CoC Board meeting minutes. Co-Chair Newsom opened the floor for comments on the meeting minutes from the audience. There were no comments. The motion passed.

4. Approval of CoC 2015 NOFA Ranking and Review Recommendations

Ranking and Review Panel representatives, Amy Schwabenlender and Theresa James, presented recommendations to the CoC Board on behalf of the Ranking and Review Panel. Discussion areas are listed below.

- Approval of the renewal projects and voluntary reallocation.
- Approval of the reallocation recommendations to fund the new Coordinated Entry Project.
- Approval of the 2015 NOFA Permanent Housing Bonus Projects.

Co-Chair Newsom: stated her conflict of interest and recused herself from the discussion.

Ms. James: requested Anne Scott, MAG, to provide a brief introduction of the Ranking and Review process before Ms. James and Ms. Schwabenlender, VSUW, presented their recommendations from the Ranking and Review Panel.

Ms. Scott: discussed the points as listed.

- The scoring tool used for the 2015 CoC Program application was approved by the CoC Board in 2014.
- In September 2015 the Board requested that a smaller group of Board members meet in October to discuss how to fund coordinated entry and make a recommendation to the Board.
- The Ranking and Review Committee had a pre-meeting and then met for 3 days reviewing applications, interviewing applicants, and then ranking each project.
- Projects were ranked on the criteria listed below:
 - Project score
 - Project type
 - Geography (was the provider the only one in a certain area)
 - History of low scoring over last three years
 - Leverage (what was the agency bringing to the table to fund the project)
 - Effective Use of funds
- Ms. Scott noted that information shared in the presentations was factored during the ranking process. Also worked to understand utilization rates-which were a threshold that was included in the scoring tool.
- The scoring process highlighted above led the committee to tier the projects according to HUD's guidelines for Tier one and Tier two.

- The PSDQ work group met on October 28, 2015 to review the HMIS project separately and prepare recommendations for the Board.

Co-Chair Newsom: asked Ms. Scott to explain to the audience what Tier one and Tier two meant.

Ms. Scott: HUD requires projects to be ranked as priority projects in Tier one and then projects at risk of funding, in Tier two. HUD has required tiering for the last few cycles of the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA).

Brandee Mead, MAG: for the 2015 NOFA cycle, HUD requires that 85 percent of the available funding be in Tier one and 15 percent of funding fall in Tier two.

Ms. James: thanked all members of the Ranking and Review committee, and MAG staff. She added that it was brought to the attention of the Ranking and Review committee that the mathematical standard deviation used to calculate scoring was incorrect. So the committee corrected it however, there were no major changes to the ranking as a result. Furthermore, Ms. James clarified the ranking decisions between the Transitional Housing projects and Permanent Supportive Housing projects in relation to funding reallocation for Coordinated Entry.

Ms. Schwabenlender reiterated what Ms. James said and emphasized that the reasons for the scoring included housing placements and finding support for Coordinated Entry. What may not be clear is that UMOM submitted applications for the campus and Family welcome center-both locations for Coordinated Entry. She then referred to Tier two, number 50 which was only supportive services and was not treated as housing only.

Co-Chair Newsom: before the decision on funding is determined, the Board will make comments, followed by the audience.

Nick Margiotta, Phoenix Police Department emphasized that the decisions made at this meeting will set precedence for future decisions on performance, funding, reallocation, scoring, and suggested that the Board spend some time discussing those areas. HUD has priorities and we need to include those. At some point we need to live with our ranking tool. We facilitated the development of the tool and need to begin aligning with the tool. Mr. Margiotta reiterated that the standard deviation method was selected as a method to accurately highlight underperforming projects. If you are under the standard deviation, you are significantly underperforming. If you are a standard deviation below, then we should look at complete defunding. If you are on the cusp, then we should look at partially cutting.

Ms. Schwabenlender: the work group that looked at funding options was not an official board meeting because there was no quorum. The suggestions from the meeting were used in addition to the data that was presented at the interviews.

Mr. Margiotta agreed with Ms. Schwabenlender, adding that he was focused on form rather than making quick decisions.

Co-Chair Newsom: inquired if Board members had further comments.

Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections: she appreciated the work of the Ranking and Review committee. She hopes the work of the Boards recommendations gets stronger and that the CoC never stops listening to the community voices that present.

Bruce Liggett, Maricopa County: he was impressed and appreciative of the caliber of the Ranking and Review committee. He asked if the elements used to score and rank the projects were written down and solidified somewhere.

Ms. Scott: providers were asked about bed utilization.

Ms. Mead: a list of what was used to rank and review project could be sent to the providers as reference.

Discussion continued.

Ms. Schwabendlender: the CoC must begin a monitoring process before the next NOFA cycle begins.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Margiotta: go with the two lowest ranked projects which equate to a little over \$400, 000, plus the Lifewell project which for various valid reasons should be removed and equates to about \$130,000. All three projects total about \$650,000, which leads to the questions of which projects should share the remainder of the pain. He added that the Board made a clear point that Domestic Violence (DV) projects would not be eliminated in-and-of-itself; however the Board also recognizes that DV is not a CoC priority since there are non-CoC channels available for DV.

There were no further comments from Board.

Co-Chair Newsom: opened the floor for comments from the audience.

Michael Hughes, A New Leaf: appreciative of the work of the Ranking and Review committee and noted that his project would likely close due to the reduction in funding.

Brad Bridwell, Cantwell Anderson-Cloudbreak: there are other CoC communities that are less compassionate than we are and would have cut many of the projects that are currently listed for less funding.

Mr. Margiotta: after doing the math, if the Board went with his proposal and added the monetary value of the four projects that are facing funding cuts, it is about two million dollars, so if there was a 10 percent across the board cut on the four projects that would equal the \$200,000 gap.

Mr. Liggett: was astonished that representatives of the projects taking the largest funding cuts were not speaking up.

Steven Sparks, Labor's Community Service Agency (LCSA): the need for Transitional Housing is a very important component and LCSA offers a unique system where they have larger units. He also appreciates that Tiered approach over a full sweep because it allows the LCSA to improve on areas that are negatively impacting the organization's overall score.

Dr. Maria E. Garay-Serratos, Sojourner Center: appreciates the comments from the Board and audience. She added that she is strongly concerned that training is not a part of the CoC for providers and that her organization will have severe consequences from a lack of funding.

Mr. Gallegos: our continuum does not have the funding and resources to make the decision that should ideally be made; however the continuum needs to move forward. He then sought clarification on whether the funding for the new projects was new money or reallocated money.

Ms. Scott: the money for the new bonus projects is new money. Since the competition is on a national level the new projects are competing against new project in other continuums. The new projects are still ranked within their respective CoC and would provide new funding into their respective CoC were they approved. She also noted that the ranking of the new projects puts all projects in Tier two at risk.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Bridwell: asked Dr. Garay-Serratos if Sojourner Center requested technical assistance.

Dr. Garay-Serratos: they did contact MAG for technical assistance.

Mr. Bridwell: sought clarification with Ms. Mead if MAG followed up with the request.

Ms. Mead: MAG did respond to the request with feedback on what Sojourner could do to improve their application for the next NOFA cycle. Ms. Mead added that MAG has submitted a request to HUD for technical assistance.

Mr. Margiotta: if we dismiss technical assistance because it is slow then we are doing our CoC harm, however, if we wait for HUD technical assistance we will not be able to move forward. The slow technical assistance is just a factor that we will need to work with. Furthermore, he motioned to sweep the two bottom projects in Tier two, number 47 and 45, which is Sojourner and Chrysalis, that is roughly \$440,000, and go with the Permanent Supportive Housing voluntary request to remove Lifewell, that is roughly another \$217,000 which puts us at \$657,000, and then the remaining \$200,000 or \$198,000 is evenly shared by percentage

amongst the bottom four projects; A New Leaf, ABC, Labor's Community Service Agency, and Southwest Behavioral (listed as 56, 55, 54, 48 on the project listing). Collectively these projects equal two million dollars in funding, the continuum's funding gap is \$200,000 and ten percent of the two million would meet the gap. He reiterated that the statement above is his motion.

Mr. Bridwell: seconded the motioned as written above.

Marisue Garganta, Dignity Health: suggested adding technical assistance for 2016 and work on providing it more efficiently into the motion. There must be a way to collectively help those in need. She also requested quarterly reporting from any agency receiving funding.

Mr. Margiotta: accepted Ms. Garganta's suggestions as amendments to his motion.

Ms. Schwabenlender: countered the motion on the table and motioned to accept the recommendations from the Ranking and Review Committee as presented for all the reasons given.

Mr. Liggett: inquired with Ms. Schwabenlender on her thoughts regarding Mr. Margiotta's motion.

Co-Chair Newsom: requested a Board member to second Ms. Schwabenlender's motion before moving to discussion.

Ms. Garganta: seconded the motion to accept the recommendations from the Ranking and Review Committee as presented for all the reasons given.

Ms. Schwabenlender: part of the issue with ranking the projects was that she was not a part of the meeting to determine funding for Coordinated Entry. Furthermore, there is no formal process in place to codify the decisions being made. Being a part of the Committee in one way or another for at least ten cycles, the process did not change when there wasn't tiering. The tiering process is new and this approach of not penalizing one or two programs and actually addressing Tier two is the most difficult work. Some members of the Ranking and Review Committee were new and brought new perspective. Everyone here is concerned about the people in our community experiencing homelessness and the Ranking and Review Committee worked hard to come to the recommendations presented at this meeting.

Mr. Margiotta: praised the work of the Ranking and Review Committee and believes that the Board should be responsible for determining the financial fate of low performing programs.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Bridwell: to inflict the least amount of pain, the Board should consolidate programs where it can.

Ms. James: the Ranking and Review Committee had two Board members and the committee worked hard to follow the recommendations from the coordinated entry funding options group as much as possible. It is very important that the CoC Board follow the recommendations from the Board because these actions will send a message to providers that changes are being made to under-performing programs. She understands both motions and recognizes the difficulty of the decision that must be made.

Discussion continued.

Co-Chair Newsom: requested Ms. Scott to repeat the first motion, made by Mr. Margiotta.

Ms. Mead: repeated Mr. Margiotta's motion to consider defunding the voluntary projects that gave up their funding in the amount of \$91,344, to defund Chrysalis at 100 percent, and to defund the Sojourner project at 100 percent and the Lifewell project at 100 percent, which totals \$641,144 leaving a difference of \$214,014 and to spread that out by taking 10 percent from Southwest Behavioral Health, ABC House of Refuge, A New Leaf, and Labor's Community Services Agency.

Board members were requested to vote on the motion. Three members voted yes, four members voted no, two members recused themselves. The motion did not pass.

Co-Chair Newsom: requested Ms. Scott to repeat the second motion presented by Ms. Schwabenlender.

Ms. Scott: the second motion was to adopt the recommendations of the Ranking and Review Committee as presented.

Board members were requested to vote on the second motion. Six members voted yes, two members voted no. The second motion passed.

Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections: need to begin looking at local solutions for technical assistance.

Ms. Mead: a CoC planning grant for another full time position focused on project monitoring and technical assistance has been prepared for submission. Furthermore, the PSDQ group reviewed the HMIS project application and fully supports that the HMIS funding remain in

number two of the project listings because of the importance of having HMIS funding in the community. The PSDQ group did suggest that we look at potentially issuing an RFP (Request For Proposals) between now and the next NOFA and wanted to ensure that the Board was aware of proposal as information only. In addition, the lead agency could apply for that project funding.

Ms. Scott: to clarify, the PSDQ group is supporting this recommendation which was made by the Ranking and Review Panel.

5. Coordinated Entry Oversight Work Group (CEOWG) Report and Recommendations

The Coordinated Entry Oversight Work Group was approved by the CoC Board in June, 2015, to address critical issues related to the implementation of the Regional Coordinated Entry System. A CEOWG representative would provide recommendations to the Board for approval. The recommendations are listed below.

- Establishment of the CEOWG as a formal, permanent workgroup that reports directly to the Board (until policies and processes are finalized), based upon feedback from the Family Housing Hub and the Welcome Center.
 - Establish scope of activities
 - Ensure feedback loop
 - Enable real-time resolution of provider issues
- The CEOWG determines thresholds and limitations for side-door usage.
- The CEOWG ensures processes and policies are adequate. Review and revision of the processes and policies are done annually or as needed.
- That no RFP process for CE be put in place, for at least two years (2018).
- That CE implementation plans be provided by the FHH and WC, which include project objectives and timelines, and goals (for the next 6, 12, 18 and 24 months) and that these be presented to the board and accepted, by January 15, 2016 date.
- That this workgroup be expanded to include: a COC Board Member, a PSDQ committee member and one other non-provider person. In addition, representatives from the FHH and WC and one other provider agency, will serve as advisory members of this workgroup.
- That this workgroup provide roles, responsibilities and commitments of local stakeholders in carrying out this plan.
- That the board address and create a plan to begin formal commitment to the CE system, which includes their contributing monetarily and this plan should be reported to the COC Board in January of 2016; furthermore provide agencies with the technical assistance and resources (such as contributing with training costs), that are necessary

for them to make the changes needed at their agency level to support the system wide transformation.

- That the CE workgroup provide the board with identified areas that need improvement within the current system, by December 15th and which includes specific outcomes and timelines that will be assessed to ascertain whether and to what extent proposed improvements are occurring.
- That there is development of monthly dashboards, for reporting and monitoring CE system progress that will be shared with the board. Request authority to obtain bi-monthly reports from the Family Housing Hub and the Welcome Center in order to provide accurate oversight and recommendations to the CoC Board.
- That the board actively align existing resources, expand public and private resources and increase cross-system collaboration to support this progress.
- The ESG providers should be immediately engaged in creating a The CEOWG serves as the entity that receives complaints and grievances upon formulating a grievance policy.

Mr. Gallegos: motioned to accept the recommendations with the caveat that the language regarding to two entry points is changed to the “lead provider”. Ms. James: seconded the motion to accept the recommendations with the caveat that the language regarding to two entry points is changed to the “lead provider”. The motion passed. There were no further comments.

6. Coordinated Entry Oversight Work Group (CEOWG Membership Recommendations)

The CoC Committee Chairs have reviewed a slate of candidates to recommend additional individuals for membership on the Coordinated Entry Oversight Work Group. The CoC Committee Chairs would provide recommendations to the Board for CEOWG membership.

CoC Committee Chair Lord: the Committee recommended to the Board in June to create ad-hoc working group with a slate of five members, which the Board has official made a permanent group. Since the approval, membership has declined from members retiring being promoted or resigning. Membership was down to two individuals and the Committee would like to recommend new slate of members, listed below.

- Anne Scott, Maricopa Association of Governments
- Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing
- Liz Morales, City of Mesa
- Theresa James, City of Tempe
- Kelli Donley, Arizona Department of Behavioral Health Services

Mr. Bridwell: motioned to accept the membership slate as presented.

Mr. Liggett: sought confirmation that membership was not fixed but members could be added in the future.

Tami Linkletter, Save the Family: seconded the motion to accept the membership slate as presented. The motion passed. There were no further comments.

7. CoC Board Strategic Planning Session

Ms. Schwabenlender provided the update on developing the regional plan to end homelessness. She stated that having board input would be helpful. Furthermore, with the new members of the board, Ms. Schwabenlender suggested having a new planning session or retreat with all board members to align community ideologies and goals.

Marisue Garganta, Dignity Health: supported the idea of a retreat.

Mr. Gallegos: suggested taking an inventory of how all groups fit together (initiatives, groups, etc.).

Co-Chair Newsom: sounds like the Board should set aside a day for brainstorming.

Ms. Scott: will send out a doodle for a December 2015 meeting.

Ms. Garganta: suggested including a facilitator.

There were no further comments.

8. Request for Future Agenda Items

There were no requests for future agenda items.

9. Comments from the CoC Board

Co-Chair Newsom opened the floor for comments.

Bruce: working with the Funders Collaborative to extend the contract and continue to provide overflow services in connection with Lodestar Day Resource Center.

Brad: In December, Victory Place Phase Four will open, providing housing for more Veterans experiencing homelessness.

Moe: announces the official retirement of Libby Bissa from the City of Phoenix. The city is in the process of identifying a replacement for the newly vacant position.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Co-Chair Newsom at 10:57 am. The next Board meeting is scheduled for January 25, 2015.