MARICOPA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS
302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ FAX (602) 254-6490

May 19, 2016

TO: Members of the MAG Continuum of Care Board

FROM: Kevin Hartke, Councilmember, City of Chandler, Co-Chair
Darlene Newsom, UMOM New Day Centers, Co-Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Meeting - 1:30 p.m.
Monday, May 23, 2016
MAG- 2nd floor Ironwood Room
302 N. 1st Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85003
(Parking is available from the garage below the building. Bring your parking ticket to the meeting for validation.)

The next MAG Continuum of Care Board (CoC Board) meeting will be held at the time and place noted above. Members of the CoC Board may attend either in person or by phone. Supporting information is enclosed for your review.

The meeting agenda and resource materials are also available on the MAG website at www.azmag.gov. In addition to the existing website location, the agenda packet will be available via the File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site at: ftp://ftp.azmag.gov/ContinuumOfCareRegionalCommitteeonHomelessness
This location is publicly accessible and does not require a password.

Please park in the garage underneath the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting, parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

In 1996, the Regional Council approved a simple majority quorum for all MAG advisory committees. If the Continuum of Care Board does not meet the quorum requirement, members who have arrived at the meeting will be instructed a legal meeting cannot occur and subsequently be dismissed. Your attendance at the meeting is strongly encouraged.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

If you have any questions, please call the MAG office.

MAG CONTINUUM OF CARE (CoC) BOARD
TENTATIVE AGENDA
May 23, 2016

	COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED
1. Call to Order	
2. Call to the Audience An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless CoC Board requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard.	2. Information.
3. Approval of Consent Agenda Prior to action on the consent agenda, members of the audience will be provided an opportunity to comment on consent items that are being presented for action. Following the comment period, Board members may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda. Consent items are marked with an asterisk (*).	3. Approval of the Consent Agenda.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONSENT*

*3A. Approval of the April 25, 2016 CoC Board Meeting Minutes The draft minutes for the April 25, 2016 meeting will be posted with the meeting materials.	3A. Approve the CoC Board meeting minutes of April 25, 2016.

*3B. Approval of the May 10, 2016 CoC Board Meeting Minutes

The draft minutes for the May 10, 2016 meeting will be posted with the meeting materials.

3A. Approve the CoC Board meeting minutes of May 10, 2016.

4. Tier 2 Funding Announcement Update

On May 2, 2016, the Tier 2 funding awards were announced by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Staff will update the Board on plans for the seven TH projects and one Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) project that were not funded by HUD. Members will have an opportunity to discuss the impact of the funding announcement and take possible action to develop a community response and next steps.

4. Information, discussion, and possible action to develop a community response and next steps.

5. Tier 2 TH Process through Coordinated Entry

The Tier 2 funding decision leaves the community with a short time frame in which to consider the plan for the individuals and families impacted by the loss of funding to these projects. The CEOWG met on May 19, 2016 to consider a recommendation from the TH providers on quickly managing the individuals and families that may need housing once the projects end. The CEOWG will present a proposal for managing families through the Coordinated Entry System.

5. Information, discussion, and possible action to clarify the Coordinated Entry process for clients served by de-funded projects.

6. 2016 Notice of Funding Availability Process

The registration process for the 2016 NOFA has begun. Registration documents provided by HUD give us valuable insight on HUD's priorities and what we may expect when the NOFA is released. CoC staff will brief the Board on what can be gleaned from the registration documents. The Board may consider recommendations regarding CoC priorities around the 2016 NOFA.

6. Information, discussion, and possible action to set priorities and make recommendations around the 2016 NOFA process.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

   Topics or issues of interest that the MAG Continuum of Care Board would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting will be requested.

7. Information and discussion.

8. Comments from the Board

   An opportunity will be provided for Continuum of Care (CoC) Board members to present a brief summary of current events. CoC Board members are not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

8. Information only.

Adjournment.

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (MAG)
CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD
April 25, 2016
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, Councilmember, Co-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, Co-chair
Amy Schwabenlender, Valley of the Sun United Way (VSUW)
Diana Yazzie-Devine, Native American Connections

*Neither present nor represented by proxy.
#Attended by telephone conference call.
+Attended by video conference.

OTHERS PRESENT

Riann Balch, City of Phoenix
David Bridge, Loadstar Day Resource Center/Human Services Campus (LDRC/HSC)
Billie Cawley, Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS)
Ken Curry, Southwest Behavioral
Jay Cory, Phoenix Rescue Mission
Kelli Donley, Arizona Department of Behavioral Health Services (ADBHS)
Lisa Eddings-Wilburn, Terros Safe Haven
Alfred Edwards, Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES)
Walt Gray, West Side Town Hall
Margaret Kilman, Maricopa County Human Services Department (MCHSD)
Melisa Kovacs, First Eval
Becky Jackson, Homeward Bound
Calvin Jackson, U.S. VETS
Shari Lassiter, U.S. VETS
Mattie Lord, UMOM
Nancy Marion, House of Refuge
Suzie Martin, Homeward Bound
Stephanie Miller, City of Glendale
Lisa Miller, UMOM
Catherine Rea, Community Information and Referral (CIR)
Ty Rosensteel, CASS
David Olivares, PDSQ
Tricia Cano, CIR
TJ Reed, SIRC
Kristy Salazar, Sojourner Center
Chela Schuster, UMOM
Joan Serviss, Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness (ACEH)
Laura Skotnicki, Save The Family
Charles Sullivan, ABC Housing
Barbara Sloan, Salvation Army
Nicky Stevens, Save The Family
Stephen Sparks, Labor's Community Service Agency (LCSA)
Michelle Thomas, CIR
Craig Tribken, CASS
John Wall, Arizona Housing Inc. (AHI)
Kim Van Nimwegen, VSUW
Amy Vogelson, Southwest Behavioral Health (SBH)
Keith Thompson, Phoenix Shanti
Kenneth McKinley, Tumbleweed
Celina Brun, MAG
Brande Mead, MAG
Anne Scott, MAG

1. Call to Order and Introductions
   Kevin Hartke, Co-chair of the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board, called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. Introductions of the Board 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 March 28, 2016 CoC Board Meeting Minutes and Consent Agenda
   Co-chair Hartke asked if the Board reviewed the consent agenda with the meeting minutes for March 28, 2016. Co-chair Hartke inquired if Board members had any comments regarding the minutes. Co-chair Hartke opened the floor to the public for comments on the consent agenda. Diana Yazzie-Devine, Native American Connections, commented on the asterisk one receives when not in attendance or represented by proxy. Ms. Yazzie-Devine was concerned that it appeared as if she made no contact for the March 28, 2016 board

meeting, even though she had notified the board she was sick. Ms. Yazzie-Devine proposed including an "excused/not excused" symbol, as she noted this had previously happened. Theresa James, City of Tempe, pointed out that proxies are not permitted on the board. Co-chair Hartke asked whether there was a way to notate such instances. Brande Mead, MAG, indicated it would be looked into or notated somehow.

Co-chair Hartke entertained a motion to approve the March 28, 2016 meeting minutes. Theresa James**,** City of Tempe, motioned to approve the March 28, 2016 meeting minutes. Amy Schwabenlender, VSUW seconded the motion to approve the March 28, 2016 meeting minutes. There were no comments. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Continuum of Care Updates: Anne Scott, MAG provided the following six updates.
   - Tier two funding has not been announced; however, the registration period for the 2016 Notice of Available Funding ("NOFA") was released last week. Because Tier Two has not been announced, there is no Grant Inventory Worksheet ("GIW"), but it will be released sometime soon, after the announcement of the Tier Two funding. We have been instructed to complete the registration process by May 11 and await the GIW sometime later.
   - Valley of the Sun United Way ("VSUW") - hosted a Rapid Rehousing (RRH) day and half conference with Katherine Gale of Focus Strategies. The conference was helpful in deciding as a community on:
     - Standards and performance measures;
     - Beginning the discussion on financial assistance standards when administering RRH funds;
     - Smaller work group met on Friday and largely agreed to financial assistance standards; this will bring consistency on how funds are administered throughout the CoC. The group is meeting again in two weeks to finalize that policy, which will go before the Committee and Board for feedback. The policy is being fast-tracked for approval for May's meeting.
   - MAG staff is working on draft plan to end homelessness
     - Part of plan will include PIT data;
     - Data is still being confirmed, but there will be a significant increase in street homelessness in 2016;
     - FY 2015, there were 1,289 individuals counted;
     - FY 2016, close to 1,700 individuals counted;
     - Analysis will be conducted and the report will be presented to the Board.
   - Staff changes at MAG: Maria Pina, is the new Administrative Assistant
     - She came from Arizona State Library and will be assisting with CoC planning.
   - MAG will be hiring a new CoC staff member in July who will help with monitoring.
   - The Coordinated Entry Oversight Work Group ("CEOWG") has adopted a grievance policy.
     - The process directs aggrieved parties to complete an internal grievance policy adopted by the Welcome Center and the Family Housing HUB ("FHH") prior to reaching out to CoC.
     - The policy process requires a written grievance to be forwarded to the CEOWG chair, who will follow a process to resolve the grievance.

- BOWMAN will be attending the next HMIS meeting on May 20, 2016.
    - Presenting on software functionality.
    - Software upgrade due in the fall.
    - New reporting tool, which replaces the ART report.
    - Interested individuals are urged to attend the next HMIS meeting on May 20, 2016 at 10 a.m. at MAG.

Moe Gallegos, City of Phoenix: inquired about the 2016 PIT data for street homeless and whether that number included the extrapolated number.

Ms. Scott: clarified that the number included the number of people on the streets and the extrapolated number for the City of Phoenix. Data to review was not available to determine where the increase was coming from, but most of the increase is occurring within the City of Phoenix.

Co-chair Hartke: requested clarification on the extrapolation for the City of Phoenix numbers and profiles without interviews.

Ms. Scott indicated that due to the geographic size and the complexity in trying to count homeless individuals, the City of Phoenix has adopted an extrapolation method for PIT count. Within the city, grids are mapped to show high-density areas where five or more people have been found in previous years. Then a random selection of low-density grids is selected for people to be counted. Through an extrapolation formula, an educated guess is made on the number of unsheltered peoples within the City of Phoenix. All other communities complete a direct count.

Co-chair Hartke: inquired whether the profiles were extrapolations as well.

Ms. Scott confirmed that the profiles were extrapolations as well.

There were no further comments.

5. Data Sharing Recommendations-Affinity Groups:
Charles Sullivan, ABC, presented on recommendations for community–wide data sharing information
    - Ad-hoc data sharing committee formed between December 2015 and January 2016 to discuss data sharing in weekly meetings.
    - On February 23, 2016, the Performance Standards and Data Quality Work Group (“PSDQ”) met with a community forum to discuss the data sharing and recommendations.
        - HUD Technical Assistance (“TA”) was involved, and provided feedback, as well as various community members throughout process.
        - PSDQ met various times to revise the documents and then took the documents to the committee for feedback and input.
    - PSDQ is recommending affinity groups.

  - In the past, various providers had pocket shares, which is the sharing of specific data elements in addition to the Universal Data Elements ("UDE's") within a specific group. An affinity group is a group of like providers that share data within larger group of providers, doing away with smaller groups or smaller pockets shares.
  - Affinity groups would follow the groups created for Coordinated Entry (CE):
    - HEART – Singles.
    - Standing Strong for Families – Family Coordinated Entry.
    - Youth - Youth Coordinated Entry.
  - The plan covers HMIS and comparable databases.
    - For example, Homelink would be covered by the data policies.
- The PSDQ recommendation is for the Board to approve the affinity groups so that PSDQ can move forward to drive other policy and procedure determinations.
- The first page is a breakdown of recommended groups and documents that will be presented.
- The second page is the policy for establishing affinity groups.
- The policy states the need for affinity groups because it helps providers work together.
- If a group of providers feel the need to create a new affinity group, this policy will determine if that group is necessary because as more affinity groups are created, there are technical difficulties in managing the HMIS system. The policy also helps ensure the technical feasibility that groups can share as they expand or contract.
- Also in the packet are some Frequently Asked Questions ("FAQs") to address some specific issues.
  - For example, aggregate data will not be affected. Aggregate reporting comes from HMIS lead, where they can see a system-wide view. This doesn't affect HMIS users. Agencies don't have to be part of affinity groups. Affinity groups would have membership policies that mirror the CEOWG process. PSDQ would not be reviewing membership – this is the affinity groups' responsibility.
- By sharing UDE's;
  - Elements such as name, date of birth, Social Security Number ('SSN"), disability, entry exists, and veteran status, are shared.
  - There are some items not yet shared, but affinity groups would decide what to share on their own terms.
  - Doesn't affect referrals for FHH.
  - If Affinity groups wish to share "extra information", they can refer to the Affinity groups' policy.

Co-chair Hartke: opens the floor for comments. There were no comments.

Co-chair Hartke: opens floor for motion from the Board to approve the creation of affinity groups and policy for creating Affinity groups.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: inquired whether the three Affinity groups would become one.

Mr. Sullivan: the three Affinity groups are already in place, so programs such as I-Help, would fit in with another Affinity group, like the HEART group. By limiting the number of groups, it limits administration of those groups.

Bruce Liggett, Maricopa County: stated his concern about the impact through funding and inquired if funders were a part of the Affinity groups.

Mr. Sullivan: not currently, but there has been discussion on funders being a part of the Affinity groups. Most funders don't have user level access to all data. If it was for a reporting need, then HMIS could work with funders to develop reports for agencies.

Chela Schuster, UMOM: tried to clarify, stating that UDEs include entries and exits, so if you are a user in HMIS, that information is available. If you are not a user, there may be a technical issue.

Mr. Liggett: inquired whether ownership over data was resolved. It seemed that when two providers were involved, different providers thought that certain contracts they had with other funders limited their ability to share. The process was bureaucratic and didn't provide short term answers when needed, and Mr. Liggett wondered whether the community had moved past that point.

Mr. Sullivan: the items today will help the process and are part of a larger process.
PSDQ did not feel it was appropriate to establish an owner of the data because it may change in different circumstances.

Mr. Gallegos: sought clarification if Phoenix case workers also have access to the data, as they use a bridge.

Mr. Sullivan: yes, the data will be available to all who have access to HMIS, however the Affinity groups membership may limit the additional data they have access to.

Mr. Gallegos: sought additional clarification since the City of Phoenix is not an Affinity group.

Mr. Sullivan: entry/exits are shared universally; the Affinity groups can choose additional data elements to share amongst themselves – this is information is not shared universally.
Discussion continued regarding the clarification of the affinity groups.

Mr. Sullivan: added that in the Privacy Notice, policies will be added around aggregate data for research or for planning so that groups can request reports on a system-wide basis without issues. PSDQ is still working on a policy for client-level data.

Margaret Kilman, Maricopa County Human Services Department: wanted to clarify using as an example, a case worker at the City of Phoenix who can look up client data fields in HMIS, thereby being able to help with coordination of care. For a project, you should be able to report aggregate details that others have been created within HMIS. In the third tier, wherein

the Funders Collaborative might want to report aggregate details on multiple projects, which would not be able to be generated by the City of Phoenix. Rather, it would have to come as a request to the HMIS lead agency.

Brad Bridwell, Cantwell Anderson-Cloudbreak: inquired about the ability to see how many veterans are currently at a specific shelter. He wanted to ensure such a scenario would need a system-wide aggregate report.

Mr. Sullivan: It would not be appropriate, but as a system, if we wanted to figure out how to pull that data to be able to better end homelessness, it is available to be pulled. The Affinity groups will aid in improving the Coordinated Entry process to report on chronic homelessness.

Co-chair Hartke: Will this make it easier to get the aggregate data by a funder?

Mr. Sullivan: This specific policy does not address aggregate data for a funder. To better address that, we can work with CIR to get that data out.

Darlene Newsom, United Methodist Outreach Ministries (UMOM) New Day Center and Co-chair of the Board: inquired if the request to CIR has the right to access the aggregate data.

Mr. Sullivan: Confirmed that it does.

Mr. Bridwell: Sought clarification by providing an example.

Mr. Sullivan: Agreed.

Scott Hall, Community Bridges Inc.: This will provide better data sharing and is a bridge to the community's destination.

Co-chair Hartke: Opened the floor for more questions.

Mr. Gallegos: sought clarification on the process of adding a new member to an Affinity group in conjunction with the MOU.

Ms. Scott: Yes, the new process doesn't require all the members of the Affinity group to sign the MOU. New partners can be added without all the documentation previously required.

Co-chair Newsom: inquired on the process for how someone would request information.

Mr. Sullivan: Depending on the complexity of the request and report.

Mr. Liggett: how do we continue to work on data ownership? Can we come back with recommendations?

Mr. Sullivan: PSDQ received some policies and procedures from CIR that cover data security, data privacy and data quality, and at this point they are specific to HMIS. PSDQ is looking to expand those to include community-wide comparable databases. Also looking to have feedback surveys from agencies and clients for feedback on documents and procedures so that policies and procedures are updated on an annual basis.

Co-chair Hartke: opened the floor for a motion.

Mr. Liggett: motioned to approve the creation of Affinity groups and the Policy for establishing Affinity groups.

Mr. Hall: seconded to motion to approve the creation of Affinity groups and Policy for establishing Affinity groups.

There were no further comments. The motion passed unanimously

6. Data Sharing Recommendations-Documents: Mr. Sullivan moved on to agenda item six to make the recommendations listed below.
   - There are two documents to be adopted by the community, which will also be part of the feedback so that documents are revised in six months.
   - The Release of Information ("ROI") is intended to provide clear and definitive client consent.
     - The clients' rights are clearly highlighted.
     - Clients also have the right to refuse to share data and still receive services.
   - The Privacy Notice will be given to each client upon request. It provides more detail on how data is used and disclosed within the community.

Co-chair Hartke: inquired about clients not wanting to share information.

Mr. Sullivan: if a client chooses not to share data, their file can be locked in the system. Agencies who have not previously served that client cannot see historical data. It will not affect aggregate data, the agencies that locked the file or those currently serving the client. Data is still available for all the reports that the community needs.

Co-chair Hartke: sought additional clarification if clients went to another agency.

Mr. Sullivan: the originating agency could unlock the record to that specific agency so the client wouldn't have to answer the same questions. This would require coordination between both agencies.

Mr. Gallegos: inquired how complicated the current ROI is, stating this one is eight pages long.

Mr. Sullivan: it is now down to one page with one signature line.

Mr. Gallegos: inquired if what he was reading-is what a client would need to sign.

Mr. Sullivan: yes, staff would work through the documents to help the client understand the benefits and risks of data sharing. The client would also get a copy of the policy.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: stated her concern about the condition of the person entering the facility, stating that the document may be overwhelming.

Ms. Sullivan: noted that there is a section for the client to revoke the document at any time. Also notes that the documents provide a lot of information. The starting point for the documents was based on language from the 2004 HUD Data Standards document.

Mr. Bridwell: inquired about whether the documents advance the informed consent on the client portion for that to occur.

Mr. Sullivan: referred to part C, number five of the Privacy Notice. The ROI should be signed on an annual basis and with every agency. The initiatives may have additional ROIs separate of this process. Initiatives may have an additional ROI that may include other data elements.

Mr. Bridwell: inquired if it was Mr. Sullivan's personal opinion that the ROI covers all initiatives.

Ms. Scott: this is designed for all current initiatives and the By-Name-List (BNL).

Mr. Bridwell: sought clarification whether providers must seek an ROI signature from past clients.

Ms. Scott: every year, clients will be signing it.

Mr. Gallegos: Were providers' part of the process of putting the document together?

Mr. Sullivan: the initial discussion was part of the ad-hoc group, then it was brought back to PSDQ and then to the committee. A document needs to be in place, thus the feedback survey within six months to bring back to board for improvement.

Co-chair Hartke: sought clarification of what PSDQ was asking for.

Mr. Sullivan: asking for adoption of the living documents to be put into use to be updated.

Co-chair Hartke: opened the floor for comments from the Board.

Mr. Sullivan: appreciates the work that went into the documents. He also voiced that the complexity of the document is hiding the fact that the community lacks trust.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: inquired how the process would be rolled out.

Mr. Sullivan: we would mirror the current process that is in place with ROIs that go through CIR. It will be sent out through the CoC.

Ms. Scott: all the documents would be available on the CIR website.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: can see case managers struggling to communicate the information, and she then suggested training.

Ms. Scott: A script and training was discussed at the PSDQ meeting that occurred before the Board meeting.

Mr. Hall: inquired if tracking the number of ROIs being signed was possible to identify any changes.

Ms. Scott: it's very low at this point.

Mr. Sullivan: depending on the Board's approval, one or both documents would be implemented.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: motion to approve the document.

Ms. James: seconded the motion to approve the document.

The motion approved unanimously. There were no further comments.

7. HMIS Memorandum of Understanding: Mr. Sullivan moved on to present agenda item seven. He recapped that at the last Board meeting the MOU between the CoC Board and Community Information and Referral was presented. Since CIR had not yet reviewed the final document, the Board agreed to postpone the MOU until CIR reviewed the document. Following the Board meeting, CIR accepted the changes that PSDQ made, and then PSDQ sent the MOU to the Board for review. Mr. Sullivan opened the floor for questions.

   Mr. Bridwell: asked for clarification on what the original issues were-that prevented the Board from approving the MOU in March.

   Mr. Sullivan: noted that there were minute wording changes that did not changed the intent of the document; however CIR was not comfortable signing the document without having the ability to review the word changes.

   Ms. Scott: clarified that there were no changes to the document since it was presented at the last Board meeting.

   Mr. Bridwell: noted that on page nine, under number nine "Amendment Notices", it simply states that "the MOU may be amended in writing by either party". He felt the legal statement gave open authority to amend without the approval of the Board.

Ms. Scott: noted that the MOU was reviewed by three attorneys, representing each party of the MOU. She added that the attorneys advised that the language in the MOU is common language in an MOU or contract, noting that an amendment can be made anytime by any party-as long as all parties agree.

Mr. Bridwell: agreed on the common language but stated that the specificity that Ms. Scott referred to was not in the contact, based on his interpretation.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: suggested “in agreement by both parties”.

Mr. Liggett: inquired about the Corrective Action Plan.

Mr. Sullivan: the MOU is the first step to enacting a Performance Improvement Plan. Performance measure will begin around the MOU.

Co-chair Newsom: concerned about the party responsible for paying for the analysis of data. All HMIS users pay user fees, and there are planning dollars with MAG, however providers are still stuck with paying for the analysis if data. She does not feel that user fees are accurately addressed in the MOU.

Mr. Sullivan: stated that user fees are in discussion with PSDQ and will be in the next PSDQ agenda.

Co-chair Newsom: suggests adding HMIS user fees to the May CoC Board agenda.

Ms. Schwabenlender: agreed and notes that in “purpose and background” funding data analysis is discussed but a responsible party is not identified.

Discussion continued on who would establish a data analysis request and the funding that would follow.

Co-chair Newsom: there are three buckets-including MAG planning dollars that should be responsible for funding data analysis.

Mr. Bridwell: suggests funding monthly data analysis.

Mr. Gallegos: inquired if the MOU was approved by CIR.

Michelle Thomas, CIR: stated that CIR did approve the MOU but noted their concern for “comparable databases” and sought clarity on that.

Mr. Sullivan: “comparable databases” was meant to cover all the databases used in the community. He added that it is the responsibility of the CoC to work with HMIS to identify the comparable databases.

Co-chair Hartke: opened the floor for further questions. There were no further questions. He then sought a motion.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: motioned to approve the MOU with the language alteration and the understanding that the document is a work in progress.

Mr. Bridwell: seconded the motion to approve the MOU with the language alteration and the understanding that the document is a work in progress.

The motion passed unanimously. There were no further comments.

8. Recovery Housing Recommendations: Mattie Lord, UMOM, CoC Committee Chair, presented the recommendation for Recovery Housing. She began to explain the history of the process of how the community came to this recommendation. Lord made the following recommendation: at the policy level, that we as a Continuum of Care adopt a Recovery Housing Model as defined by HUD as a valid intervention in our Continuum of Care. The criteria that are included in the recommendation were established by HUD through the HUD guidance. If approved by the Board, there would be many other action steps that would follow. A process should be outlined on how to determine qualifying projects and then make sure that those projects are not penalized in the competitive process.

   Co-chair Hartke: opened the floor for comments from the board.

   Ms. Yazzie-Devine: states her appreciation for the work involved in this recommendation. She then noted that there is a distinction between a sober living environment and a recovery environment. This recommendation provides more opportunity and choice.

   Mr. Bridwell: there is room for Recovery Housing (RH). Notices that HUD is defining it as Permanent Housing ("PH") but it is RH.

   Committee Chair Lord: the Committee did not discuss in detail the criteria of HUD, but felt that RH would be a small part of the CoC. It seemed logical to use HUD's criteria, however if the Board does not like the criteria determined by HUD, then perhaps the PH work group could revise the criteria.

   Co-chair Hartke: noted that if the criteria are HUD criteria, he feels there is nothing to revise.

   Discussion continued.

   Mr. Bridwell: having a difficult time understanding the point of the recommendation based on the openness.

   Kim VanNimwegen, VSUW: it is about client choice, and gives the client a choice when doing the application. Currently, clients do not have that choice.

Keith Thompson, Phoenix Shanti: provided clarification, stating that there is an option to have a sober living environment. He added that in the materials that HUD released regarding CoC registration, they did have a section related to this, specifically stating that "while these projects often include many Housing First (HF) features, they may also be alcohol and drug free to support the continued sobriety of their participants". RH may take additional steps to building a sober environment that a strict HF model might not.

Mr. Bridwell: stated his concern about the regulations of the criteria that HUD defined for RH.

Committee Chair Lord: clarified that the HUD criteria are NOT recommendations.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: there is room for this model in the CoC. She then motioned to further adopt the RH model recommendation.

Mr. Hall: seconded the motion to adopt the RH model recommendation.

Mr. Bridwell: added the amendment-with the caveat to flush out what the CoC thinks the criteria should be.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine accepted the amendment.

Co-chair Hartke: Opened the floor for comments from the audience. There were no comments. There were no further questions.

The motion passed unanimously. There were no further comments.

9. Board Membership and Terms of Office:
Moved to the May meeting.

10. Morrison Institute Presentation: Due to time constraints Co-chair Hartke skipped agenda item nine to ensure enough time for the guest speakers to present on the Morrison Institute. Co-chair Hartke introduced Bill Hart and Dr. Hedberg here to present a report by the Morrison Institute on Measuring Homelessness: Ten Year Character Movement of Clients at the Human Services Campus.

Mr. Hart and Dr. Hedberg: the purpose of this report was two-fold. There was a need to dive into the HMIS system and start analyzing some basic parameters and get some baseline numbers. The more latent purpose of the report was to get an outside group like the Morrison Institute to use the HMIS data to see what we can do with it, have that presented to the community, get feedback, and begin to understand how well the HMIS system can provide analysis.

They then began discussion on the presentation.

Co-chair Hartke: opened the floor for questions.

Billie Cawley, CASS: noted that CASS' GPD data, which is 43 persons, is not included in the data being presented and understands that there may be a legitimate reason that data was not included.
Mr. Hart and Dr. Hedberg: the report was developed in full transparency and explains the reason for every choice made in the study-including the selection of data to be analyzed.

Co-chair Newsom: stated her concern about the data that incorrectly reflects the status of families.

Mr. Liggett: reflects on the purpose and outcome of the presentation and its importance for future policy making.

Ms. Schwabenlender: thanked all the parties involved including VSUW, Maricopa County, and the Arizona Department of Housing for making the research presentation possible.

There were no further comments.

11. Request for Future Agenda Items
There were no additional items requested.

12. Comments from the CoC Board
Mr. Gallegos: the City of Phoenix Section 8 waiting list will open from May 23, 2016 to May 25, 2016. Only electronic documentation/applications will be accepted to ensure electronic prioritization. Computers will be available but the city is encouraging homeless specific sites and volunteers to provide computers and assist with the application. There will be an FAQ document on the site for help.

Ms. James: noted to make sure that applicants should save their assigned ID number after submission.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: before June 1, 2016 NAC is opening up a new substance abuse treatment center.

Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned by Co-chair Newsom at 3:40 pm. The next Board meeting is scheduled for May 23, 2016.

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (MAG)
CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD
May 16, 2016
MAG Office Building, Saguaro 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, Councilmember, 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

*Neither present nor represented by proxy.
#Attended by telephone conference call.
+Attended by video conference.

OTHERS PRESENT

Riann Balch, City of Phoenix
David Bridge, Loadstar Day Resource Center/Human Services Campus (LDRC/HSC)
Billie Cawley, Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS)
Ken Curry, Southwest Behavioral
Earl Cook, HUD
Kathy DiNolfi, A New Leaf
Jennifer Dangremond, NAC
Lisa Eddings-Wilburn, Terros Safe Haven
Alfred Edwards, Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES)
Stephanie Knox, DES
Alicia Kenney, ABC Housing
Karen Kurtz, Community Bridges Inc. ("CBI")
Michael Hughes, A New Leaf
Margaret Kilman, Maricopa County Human Services Department (MCHSD)
Michelle Jamison, U.S. VETS
Mattie Lord, UMOM
Nancy Marion, House of Refuge
Suzie Martin, Homeward Bound
Stephanie Miller, City of Glendale
Lisa Miller, UMOM
David Olivares, PDSQ
Charyn Eirich-Palmisano, City of Glendale
Jake Sedillo, LCSA
Joan Serviss, Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness (ACEH)
Mike Shore, HOM Inc.
Laura Skotnicki, Save The Family
Stephanie Smelnick, HUD
Nicky Stevens, Save The Family
Jacki Taylor, Save the Family
Ted Taylor, Family Promise
Michelle Thomas, CIR
Rich Thomason, HUD
Mike Trailor, Arizona Department of Housing (ADOH)
Craig Tribken, CASS
Dorian Townsend, Sojourner Center
John Wall, Arizona Housing Inc. (AHI)
Amy Vogelson, Southwest Behavioral Health (SBH)
Kenneth McKinley, Tumbleweed
Celina Brun, MAG
Brande Mead, MAG
Anne Scott, MAG

1. Call to Order and Introductions
   Kevin Hartke, Co-chair of the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board, called the meeting to order at **1:37** p.m. Introductions of the Board 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. Tier 2 Funding Announcement-overview provided by Anne Scott, MAG.
   Ms. Scott provided the updates listed below:
   - May 2, 2016 HUD announced the Tier 2 Funding Awards.
   - There was an overall increase of funds of $505,718.00 from the annual renewal demand.

   Co-chair Newsom: sought clarification on the data, stating that the calculations on families and children at UMOM were different than what was being presented.

Ms. Scott: the data is based on the HUD applications. There is a question in the HUD applications, specifically question 5a that asked about project participant households and it requests the number of households with at least one adult and one child; adult households without children; and households with only children. So we took that number directly from question 5a on the HUD application.

Amy Schwabenlender, VSUW: inquired if Ms. Scott had a breakdown of the dollars spent on each population served.

Ms. Scott: we do not have a breakdown of dollars spent per population served.

Co-chair Newsom: inquired if the chart was showing people or households.

Ms. Scott: the data shown is for households.

Co-chair Newsom: we definitely want to be able to identify resources to fund the families and youth that are going to be displaced by this cut in funding. Perhaps we can come up with a strategy to strengthen our position moving forward so that we do not have these kinds of cuts. We should begin looking at the projects that lost their funding and make sure that those families and youth are not homeless.

Diana Yazzie-Devine, NAC: found the timing of the announcement disappointing given that some project contracts are already expired and are using floating funds. Some projects have leveraged funding that restricts the sites for long term use.

Co-chair Hartke: if there is any activity going on at the Federal level it is to deal with the retro activity. From what he has heard, it is the lowest hanging fruit at the Federal level. He then opened the floor for comments.

Ted Taylor, Family Promise of Greater Phoenix: we are a provider in Phoenix and nationally. For some perspective, we in 2015 served 50,000 people in 44 states with 200 affiliates. Felt that the funding cut was significant so he went to the national office and just asked for some support in that direction. He then read the written response “Regarding the national response to Tier 2 funding the Government Relations Committee is aware of devastating losses to families in the Tier 2 decisions that were recently announced. Barbara Duffield, Director of Policy and Programs National Association for Education on Homeless Children and Youth, informs that one community completely lost eight programs for families. Some of the programs were expired contracts so there was no time for transition. Some CoCs appear to have lost Tier 2 but received no bonus projects. In at least one community, the losses for families were gains for projects serving the chronically homeless population.”

I will skip the rest of the letter and tell you this, as a player nationally with the Continuums, our partnership and what makes Family Promise what it is, it is the partners that we have in the Continuum. The Continuum is where we place our families for the most part. The impact at the local office in Phoenix that we see is about 36 percent of the families that we place who can be significantly and adversely affected by the lack of available housing. The fact that affordable housing is drying up across the valley, without a doubt the single largest impact on homelessness across the nation, it is affecting our families. So we are hoping that the reconsideration is real and that we can have an impact. We recognize the critical role that affordable housing has in this community, and the fact that affordable housing is drying up and the only providers left are sitting in this room today. We are asking for consideration of the families that will be affected.

Jacki Taylor, Save the Family: noted her concern and disappointment for the Tier 2 funding cut. The long term effect on families is serious. We must look ahead-but if we do look ahead; again family programs-even those that are complying with permanent housing by moving to rapid rehousing are going to be shoved to the bottom of the list, again only to be defunded. We need to ask ourselves, that if we look at the statistics from the Point-In-Time Count and other studies families are a significant portion of this community's homeless problem. If we as a Continuum lose sight of that and don't actively do something to preserve what precious few services we still have, I feel we are in for a dire future, because our children in these program are our future homeless population if we don't do anything to stabilize them now.

Dorian Townsend, Sojourner Center: noted that the largest impact for her organization is the timing of the announcement. Sojourner Center has been looking at alternatives with the Department of Justice OBW Transitional Funding and its local funders. She then reiterated the disappointing nature of the cuts, that is does predominantly impact families, the Veteran population has been affected with one program cut, and that it was a shame the programs were cut.

Nancy Marion, House of Refuge: noted her support for Ms. Taylor's comments. Since they met with MAG previously, they have met with the Town of Gilbert and have reached out to the City of Mesa and Mesa United Way. At this time we have not received actual financial support with the exception of one place. I would like to publicly thank Ted Williams from ABC for supporting us at their own financial risk to help the families that are in dire need.

Nicky Stevens, Save the Family: we are looking at our ESG funding to see if we can assist any of the families in need.

Michael Hughes, A New Leaf: we will do everything we can to keep Faith House open, but it will not be open in its current status because 75 percent of its funding is going away

immediately. We will be working to move the existing families into some sort of rapid-rehousing funding and will do everything we can to turn it into an Emergency Women's Crisis Shelter with other services that can be provided. The issue was the timeliness. How does this happen with the national choices not aligning with the local recommendations.

Kenneth McKinley, Tumbleweed: Tumbleweed has a strong relationship with Native American Connections and is working diligently to find another solution for the youth that are being effected by the funding cut.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: thanked Mr. McKinley for speaking about youth. She added that youth have been missing from the conversation but Transitional Housing has been identified as an appropriate intervention for youth. So having that not recognized in Tier 2 is quite shocking. It is discouraging when you are seeing a coordinated and productive effort with youth providers only to see this happen.

Jake Sedillo, LCSA: we are in the same position and have been looking at other resources. We are one of the only places with three and four bedroom locations that house large families. This will be very difficult for larger families-especially if they must move.

Suzie Martin, Homeward Bound: in support of Ms. Taylor's previous comments, the other concern is the disintegration of the family unit. Multiple stressors may initiate alternative methods of coping from substance abuse to crime and may end of back on the streets as a result.

Michelle Jamison, U.S. VETS: inquired if the community can get together to fight this with a stronger voice.

Mike Trailer, Department of Housing: noted that fighting HUD will not work. He then suggested that the community continue working together to provide resources to the families, youth, and veterans that will be affected. He also noted that reaching out to HUD on the inappropriate and unethical nature of announcing the funding cuts should also be considered. He believes it would only be appropriate that HUD provide transitional funds for the programs affected.

Ms. Scott: of the projects not funded by HUD, one project's contract expired January 31 and that is House of Refuge. It is through ABC and they floated the funds going forward. Three projects have contracts that expired March 31; Native American Connections; the Area Agency on Aging; and Southwest Behavioral Health. The U.S. VETS, Faith House, LCSA, and Sojourner Center contracts expire at the end of June. There is no reasonable time transition any of the families or youth affected.

Moises Gallegos, City of Phoenix: urges the immediacy of reaching out the HUD in full force. He then inquired if MAG staff has reached out to HUD.

Ms. Scott: we have had contact with HUD. We have been in contact with Richard Thomason whom has helped us with the appeals process. We have been disseminating the information we receive from HUD headquarters out to the community. We also had a conversation with Stephanie Smelnick, the HUD Field Director for Phoenix. Her advice is for us to put together proposals and submit them to HUD and that they will take a look at things. We do need to keep in mind that there are funding restrictions with all of the funding dollars that are not only outlined in the regulations but also outlined in the Notice of Available Funding ("NOFA") for which funding cycle they were released in. In at least the last two funding cycles, the Rapid Rehousing dollars were targeted to individuals coming from the streets or Emergency Shelter. We have been told by HUD Technical Assistance ("TA") that if we are going to look at Rapid Rehousing dollars we should be looking at ESG Rapid Rehousing dollars. We have been in contact with HUD and have HUD TA coming tomorrow for a day-long session to meet with both the defunded Transitional Housing providers and then we have two meetings broken up in the afternoon; one for those that did not receive funding and one for those that continue to receive funding and talk about strategizing for the future.

Brande Mead, MAG: we have also been instructed by HUD to leave questions and comments on the Ask a Question ("AAQ") portion of the HUD Resource Exchange website. If providers that lost funding would like to request TA they should make that request through the AAQ. That information has also been shared with all of the providers that lost funding. Projects that did not lose funding can also submit inquiries to the AAQ.

Brad Bridwell, Cantwell Anderson-Cloudbreak: this sounds like a political recognition that there is not going to be a significant investment made into the plan to end chronic homelessness. HUD has made a decision to trade out populations for what the current priority is and to me that feels extremely political in nature. It carries great risks and puts extreme stress within the system. I have very little doubt that today we can find enough resources through Rapid Rehousing or other products to prevent the existing families on the verge of losing their housing-from losing their housing. The issue is with all the future households that that program could have served. He also noted that he agreed with Mike Trailer, stating that he is not sure fighting HUD will be successful but rather improving the game plan of the community. He added that the community should look at the Transitional Housing projects that are still funded and work on transitioning the project to a more sustainable future with funding.

Bruce Liggett, Maricopa County: stated that he has been contacted by some of the programs' impact as well as members from the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors. He read some of the public comments from federal officials defending the decision in terms of the "this is the direction that HUD is heading" or in terms of project outcomes, however those comments seem to miss the point that everyone in this room has said which is different. Suggested the importance of the Board having a statement in response to the Tier 2 cuts that capture what has been said here at this meeting in terms of the impact and the lack of notification, retroactive eligibility, in terms of the number of families, in terms of what Mr. Bridwell just stated on the impact of the overall system-the loss of capacity. The Board should summarize in a statement and then motion to call out the critical factors of the announcement like timing.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: noted that in her experience working with HUD, it took five years to make a change to a project. She also filed an appeal on a project and the appeal took months and tons of documents and she thought she was in a good position for the appeal but nothing came of it. She noted that based on her personal experience, she does not have a lot of faith in working with HUD in a timely manner. She added that a collective response to HUD is more powerful than an individual response.

Co-chair Newsom: currently we have 165 families on the waitlist for Emergency Shelter and 62 of those families are living on the street. We also have a Rapid Rehousing list of 90 families and 95 families on a list for Transitional Housing and 35 families on the list for Permanent Supportive Housing. We are already in a crisis, so to add families to the growing list would increase the crisis. As a community we do need to stand up. The family providers have a letter at today's meeting that is ready to be signed and sent to Congress. We need to come up with a better strategy as a community.

Co-chair Hartke: inquired if it was realistic to fight the decision. He added that working as a community is critical and believes many cities and towns in Maricopa County are awaiting the decisions that will come out of this meeting. He realizes that more change is going to occur down the road and the community should begin preparing. The community keeps second guessing what HUD will do and it is not effective. He sought suggestions from the Board on the three main points made at the meeting so that the Board could move forward-if it means getting something on the agenda for the May 23, 2016 Board meeting. He then recalled Co-chair Newsom's suggestion for a strategy group that could lead the Board. He then inquired if the Board had any thoughts on how to carry any resolutions forward.

Co-chair Newsome: inquired if there were Rapid Rehousing funds available for the families that were on the verge of becoming homeless. She also requested seeing the information from other CoC's that were fully funded and why they were 100 percent funded and what their

strategy was. She also inquired about the community's score. She made the assumption that the CoC score was not high and that the community needs to be more responsible in the approach next time around to make sure we maximize our points. She added that this was somewhat predictable five years ago and is now just shocked at how it has happened with such little notice. She suggested viewing this as an opportunity.

Ms. Scott: we have been notified by HUD that they are hosting a program competition regional debriefing on region nine which is May 25, 2016 from 4-5 pm Eastern Standard Time. A room has been reserved at MAG for anyone that wishes to participate in the call. We anticipate learning that we did well in the scoring because overall we had an increase in funds. We are hearing from other communities that they had a significant decrease in funds and even within the state they have had a decrease in funds. We will find out more at the debriefing.

Ms. Mead: stated that she is unsure if the score with be announced at the debriefing. We were told that we may not get out individual score until after that period but we will be sharing that with the community once we receive it. She added that if questions are allowed in the debriefing, the MAG staff can inquire about other communities. When the funding was announced, we could only see what was funded, not what was cut.

Scott Hall, Community Bridges Inc.: inquired if there was a way to get a strategy meeting together. He went on to say that it would be a good idea to determine the immediate need of the community so that providers and funders could begin collaborating on resources.

Marisue Garganta, Dignity Health: recommends that the strategy meeting include funders to look at the resources that are in the community. She also volunteered herself to participated in the group and leverage her contacts.

Mr. Liggett: inquired about the appeals process.

Ms. Scott: in the 2015 NOFA, there was an appeals process. It is detailed in section ten. She noted that the items listed below would make it difficult to attempt the appeals process:

- You need to show that our annual renewal demand was not met, and since our annual renewal amount was exceeded, we think it would be difficult to meet that threshold.
- You would also need to show that HUD made a mistake, so you would need to have a thorough description of the mistake that HUD made by showing other projects in other communities that were funded that were similar to that project and ranked similarly; however that kind of information is very hard to come by.

Mr. Liggett: sought clarification if the appeals process was for the provider or the collective applicant.

Ms. Scott: the provider.

Theresa James, City of Tempe: inquired if the CoC was able to submit an appeal.

Ms. Scott: not that we can see. We have sent our ranking to HUD. Tier 1was our priority ranking and Tier 2 was the at-risk ranking. We had to put 15 percent of the overall cost into Tier 2. It is our understanding that the applicant can file an appeal.

Co-chair Newsom: suggested not proposing any bonus projects for the next round, since the one bonus project that was not funded was for families.

Ms. Scott: noted that Tucson did not put forward bonus projects because they were worried about the end scenario and overall they received a $500,000.00 reduction, so there is some risk associated with that strategy.

Mr. Bridwell: inquired about whether the CoC's difficult decisions to reallocate projects had any influence on the funding decision.

Co-chair Newsom: they actually have funding for Tier 2 and you lost points for project type in Tier 2.

Mr. Bridwell: my first thought is that we should be writing a letter that we are 2.5 million dollars less and that that should be an open letter to HUD and to every congressional representative so we've got an effort to generate as many congressional inquiries as we can to go into HUD national as a collective community.

Co-chair Hartke: there is a regional meeting on May 25, 2016 and the Board will pursue a more political solution with the leaders of cities and beyond.

Mr. Liggett: inquired if a motion was needed to ask the staff to prepare a letter or statement from the Board to HUD and copy all the relevant congressional delegation.

Ms. Schwabenlender: seconded the motion to ask the staff to prepare a letter or statement from the Board to HUD and copy all the relevant congressional delegation. She noted that MAG is the lead agency but the Board is not a Committee of the Regional Council. The Board should agree to take that action. She noted her sustained her comments because she agrees with the comments made thus far but wants to make things actionable. Suggested that the Board needs to begin taking action on Ms. Scott's categories of immediacy, fight, and prepare for the next NOFA. The community cannot wait around for permission to do something.

Co-chair Hartke: opened the floor for comments from the audience.
Laura Skotnicki, Save the Family: reiterated that for the data presented, the numbers should be doubled or tripled to accurately depict the effect of the funding cuts.

Mr. Hughes: sought clarification on whether the discussion today was regarding how the funding announcement happened or if it was pertaining to the fact that the community is losing Transitional Housing. He then noted that in previous discussion the Board recognized that Transitional Housing was not going to be the preferred intervention but rather than cut the projects, propose a phase to transition the projects. So from a New Leaf's perspective, we thought we had more than two months.

Ms. Schwabenlender: noted that Mr. Hughes was accurate, but we need to start making actions.

Co-chair Hartke: added that HUD did not approach this in an ethical manner, so despite the discussions from the Board in months previous, the Board needs to take action.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: it was timing and how it was done. Our community has an obligation to state what the most appropriate housing mix to HUD is. Furthermore, Transitional Housing for youth is important and not another bed should be lost.

Co-chair Hartke: asked for a vote of those in favor of empowering MAG staff to at least proceed to look for a political solution as part of this to address the timing, funding, and pursue the tactic to get a letter from the cities and town at MAG.

Ms. Schwabenlender: noted that that was not the accurate motion.

Mr. Liggett: motioned to empower MAG staff to capture the feedback here and can gather a letter in preparation for the 25th from this Board to HUD copying all the congressional delegation of the impact in asking for resolution in terms of the timing for transition.

Ms. Schwabenlender: seconded the motion to empower MAG staff to capture the feedback here and can gather a letter in preparation for the 25th from this Board to HUD copying all the congressional delegation of the impact in asking for resolution in terms of the timing for transition.

The motion passed unanimously.

Co-chair Hartke: like the way this was presented. He then inquired if a strategy group could be put together to look at and assess who is being impacted with families and youth and then

bring to the Board a suggested path to proceed. He then inquired if there were people at the meeting who were willing to be a part of the group.

Ms. Schwabenlender: offered to help with the framework, but needs the data.

Ms. Mead: we did reach out to the providers that lost funding and requested that detail.

Discussion on identifying members for the group and the purpose continued.

Co-chair Newsom: we should look at how to move forward as a community.

Mr. Liggett: is in support of preparing for the future, but notes that there is an urgency that must be addressed.

Ms. Schwabenlender: it is important that funders participate. Furthermore, the group should look into the *Board of Directors* for the projects that were not funded to determine alternate routes and resource allocation.

Ms. Scott: for the programs that declined to participate, there was only one program that we have not met with.

Ms. Schwabenlender: noted that the suggestion was to include all eight projects.

Ms. Taylor: stated her concern that she hopes the Continuum can find a solution before the families at risk become homeless once again.

Mr. Hughes: suggested that the projects that were successful help the projects that were not successful.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: stated her concern and urgency for that matter for House of Refuge.

Mattie Lord, UMOM: this is a result of HUD priorities. HUD is prioritizing the chronic population and is also not fond of Transitional Housing-which most families use. We have done everything we can to align those resources with the federal priorities and yet we had a 38 percent decrease in funding. She then noted that the pie chart being presented does not accurately showcase the number of families homeless. We have a plan to end family homelessness. We have eight versions of the action plan that goes along with that. The Plan was approved by this Board in August of last year. We were on track to end family homelessness and now this decision has set us back. There is now concern that with federal

priorities changing, some resources may not be regained and a more strategic long term plan needs to be put in place.

Mr. Trailer: focused on the immediate crisis. The community needs to attack the immediate crisis and use the funding partners in the community. He also noted that the disappointment with HUD should not be with HUD locally-just nationally.

Co-chair Hartke: opened the floor for volunteers for the group in question. Suggested that only community members that have the ability to serve on the group and meet in a timely manner within the next month meet.

Ms. Schwabenlender: inquired about when MAG could have a draft letter ready to review that we actually send it to HUD and our congressional representative before the 25th and in-fact use FedEX to highlight the urgency.

Co-chair Hartke: inquired with Ms. Mead about the reasonable timeframe to get a letter ready for the Regional Council. The Board meets on May 23, 2016.

Ms. Mead: we can draft something right away, as far as drafting a letter for the Regional Council to support, and then we would need to present it to Regional Council on May 25, 2016. We can send something out on behalf of the Board sooner than that, but if we are wanting MAG Regional Council support, we can take that to them on the 25th.

Ms. Schwabenlender: suggested that the Board do both. The letter does not need to be beautiful or long, it just needs to state out points and get sent off.

Co-chair Hartke: if the letter can be ready for approval at the next Board meeting, then we can go from there.

Mr. Gallegos: for the experts on family and youth, can the letter be used for all groups.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: for this purpose, yes.

Mr. Liggett: suggested that MAG staff get the letter out in the next day or two.

Ms. Mead: we can draft a letter immediately and then send it to the co-chairs for review before sending it out.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: suggested having HMIS to pull the data to support a data message in the letter detailing the effect of the funding cuts.

Co-chair Hartke: inquired if a press release from the Board could be sent as part of the letter. He then inquired if the press release requires a motion.

Ms. Mead: we can put together a press release.

Discussion continued.

Co-chair Hartke: believes that the community can fight this. Let us continue the political advocacy route and continue to go after the differential in time. We have put together a group that can assess the community's needs and get a message out to the community funders. Cities are looking at the decisions of the Board to see what to do next. He then inquired if there were any other questions.

Ms. Martin: noted that the Point-In-Time count drastically underrepresents families on the streets. She then suggested taking into consideration the Point-In-Time Homeless count and Rapid Rehousing funds.

Karen Kurtz, CBI: we have a policy focus that weighs populations differently. We should advocate to HUD to develop policy which weighs funding based on the needs of each community. If you want strong outcomes, then support the recommendations that the community makes.

Mr. McKinley: wonders about what the CoC values and suggested looking at youth to see where homelessness really begins.

4. Comments from the CoC Board
There were no further comments from the Board.

Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned by Co-chair Hartke at 3:23 pm. The next Board meeting is scheduled for May 23, 2016.