

**MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
CONTINUUM OF CARE REGIONAL COMMITTEE ON HOMELESSNESS
AUGUST 9, 2012 MEETING MINUTES**

MEMBERS ATTENDING:

*Tammy Albright, City of Mesa
Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing
Donna Bleyle, Arizona Department of Economic Security
*Kathryn Brown, Arizona Department of Corrections
*Kendra Cea, APS
*Krista Cornish, Town of Buckeye
Libby Bissa for JoAnn Del-Colle, Phoenix Family Advocacy Center
Catherine Rea Dunning, Community Information & Referral Services
Shana Ellis, City of Tempe, Councilmember
Steve Frate, City of Glendale, Vice Mayor
*Janeen Gaskins, City of Surprise
Trish Georgeff, Maricopa County
*Kevin Hartke, City of Chandler, Councilmember, Vice Chair
Theresa James, City of Tempe
*Michael Johnson, City of Phoenix, Vice Mayor
+Stephanie Knox, Magellan Health Services of Arizona
*Nick Margiotta, Phoenix Police Department
*Michael McQuaid, Human Services Campus
*Frank Migali, Arizona Department of Education
Linda Mushkatel, Maricopa County
Mattie Lord for Darlene Newsom, UMOM New Day Center
Joanne Osborne, City of Goodyear, Vice Mayor, Chair
Sean Price, Arizona Department of Veterans Services
Christina Avila for Gina Ramos Montes, City of Avondale
Sean Price, Arizona Department of Veterans' Services
Amy Schwabenlender, Valley of the Sun United Way
Joan Serviss, Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness
Kathy Talmadge for Jacki Taylor, Save the Family

OTHERS PRESENT

Dawn Bogart, Homeward Bound
Cheryl Belcher, Catholic Charities
Amber Botommer, UMOM
Lydia Carrillo, MPS
Chris Carter, RIAZ
Steve Carter, NOVA Safe Haven
Tim Cole, City of Phoenix
Jenny Day, Basic Mission
Deanna Jonovich, City of Phoenix
Charlene Flaherty, CSH
Mona Francis, City of Glendale
Dick Geasland, Tumbleweed Center for Youth
Tom Hutchinson, A New Leaf
Margaret Kilman, Department of Economic Security
Terri Leveton, NOVA Safe Haven
Jodi Liggett, Mayor's Office
Nancy Marion, House of Refuge
Richard Marten, HMIS
Mary Alice McKone, Salvation Army Development
Jacki McWhortor, HMIS
Jim Medis, ABC
Lisa Miller, UMOM
Mary Murphy, Governor's Office for Children Youth and Families
Cynthia Nagendra, HomeBase
Brian Petersen, HOM Inc.
Connie Phillips, Sojourner Center
Robert Ruocco, Homeward Bound
John Scott, US Vets Phoenix
Jake Sedillo, LCSA
Sharon Shore, HOM, Inc.
Jeremiah Smith, Salvation Army
Nicky Stevens, ABC
Charles Sullivan Arizona Behavioral Health
Michelle Thomas, Community Information and Referral
Keith Thompson, Phoenix Shanti
Kim Thompson, LCSA
John Wall, AHI
Danielle Wildkress, HomeBase

*Margaret Trujillo, MG Trujillo Associates
Ted Williams, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation
*Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections

Nichole Wojtanowski, Southwest Behavioral Health
Chris Wudarski, Women in New Recovery
Brandie Mead, MAG
Rachel Brito, MAG

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.
+Those members present by audio or videoconference.

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Joanne Osborne, Vice Mayor, City of Goodyear, called the meeting to order at 10:11 a.m. by beginning the meeting with a celebration of the Committee. She recognized their efforts to address both challenging and rewarding issues through collaborative teamwork. Introductions ensued. Chair Osborne noted the high-temperature days and encouraged the Committee to continue to share resources in support of the Heat Relief efforts.

2. Call to the Audience

Audience members were given an opportunity to address the Committee. No comments were made.

3. Approval of the May 21, 2012 Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness Meeting Minutes

A motion was requested to approve the May 21, 2012 meeting minutes. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing. The motion was seconded by Vice Mayor Steve Frate, City of Glendale. The motion passed.

4. Continuum of Care Planning Subcommittee Report

Chair Osborne invited Theresa James, City of Tempe, to offer a report on the Continuum of Care (CoC) Planning Subcommittee activities. Ms. James reported the Planning Subcommittee last met in June and spent the majority of the meeting discussing recommendations for the annual point-in-time homeless count and on developing a program monitoring methodology plan. The Subcommittee weighed in on recommendations developed by the Point-in-Time Street Count Working Group and provided feedback that is included in the recommendations that will be presented later on the agenda.

Ms. James referenced the draft handout of the HUD McKinney-Vento Program Monitoring Methodology plan that is being developed for approval by the Continuum. The draft document still has some items that need to be addressed. The Planning Subcommittee is meeting on Monday, August 13th to develop final program monitoring recommendations that will be presented to the Continuum of Care. Some of the items that still need to be addressed include the idea of incorporating Peer Monitoring as part of the methodology; comparing “like programs to like programs” and adjusting program scores based on serving harder to serve clients.

The Planning Subcommittee will have a final document to present to the Continuum of Care at the next meeting. Chair Osborne requested a motion from the Committee. A motion to approve the Planning Subcommittee report was made by Amy Schwabenlender, Valley of the Sun United Way. The motion was seconded by Catherine Rae Dunning, Community Information and Referral. The motion passed.

5. Overview of HUD HEARTH Continuum of Care Program Interim Rule

Chair Osborne invited Brande Mead to provide an overview of the HEARTH Continuum of Care Program Interim Rule. Ms. Mead prefaced the overview by acknowledging the strength of the Continuum to address the challenges on the horizon. The HEARTH Act was signed into law on May 20, 2009. It is the first reauthorization since 1992. Ms. Mead encouraged the Committee to review the Interim Rule which is available on the HUD website at www.hudhre.info. A shorter, introductory Guide on the Continuum of Care (CoC) program was provided in the handouts.

Through the HEARTH Act, six different regulations were developed. The Interim Rule focuses on the CoC program. Ms. Mead provided a brief overview stating that the interim rule clarifies that the CoC is the Planning Body responsible for meeting the goals of the CoC program; and coordinating funding streams and resources, including federal, local, private, and mainstream. The Interim Rule expands and codifies into law existing community-wide planning and application efforts of the CoC; defines responsibilities and allows for planning funds to support existing and new responsibilities; requires increased collaboration between recipients of ESG funding; promotes best practices such as the development of coordinated intake, rapid re-housing, performance measurement, and access to mainstream services. Additionally, the rule defines funding activities under five program components: Permanent Housing, Permanent Supportive Housing and Rapid Re-housing; Transitional Housing; Supportive Services Only; HMIS; Homelessness Prevention (available only for HUD-designated high-performing communities).

HUD requires representatives of relevant organizations to be included in CoC; the CoC must establish a Board to act on behalf of the Continuum of Care; and the CoC must develop a governance charter. Ms. Mead noted the CoC Board must include homeless or formerly homeless representatives and must be representative of the relevant homeless subpopulations within the COC geographic area. Many CoC's have already satisfied these requirements, however all CoCs need to review their current structure to ensure compliance with each regulatory condition outlined by HUD. HUD is considering additional characteristics of a Board and is specifically asking for comments regarding the decision making requirements.

The CoC three primary responsibilities include operating the CoC, designating and operating an HMIS and CoC Planning. Ms. Mead advised there are nine primary responsibilities for operating a CoC. An overview was provided. Ms. Mead noted additional requirements regarding the development and operation of a coordinated assessment system would be discussed during the technical assistance agenda item. There are also additional requirements related to evaluating eligibility for assistance that includes determining and prioritizing which eligible individuals and families will receive transitional housing (TH) assistance; developing standards for determining what percentage or amount of rent each program

participant must pay while receiving rapid re-housing assistance; and prioritizing which eligible individuals and families will receive permanent supportive housing (PSH) assistance. Ms. Mead noted many of these items will fall under the development of the coordinated assessment system.

Ms. Mead noted HUD is also seeking comments from victim service providers on baseline requirements for the coordinated assessment system. Page 25 of the interim rule includes specific questions for which HUD is seeking feedback. The CoC will need to develop policy on how its coordinated assessment system will address the needs of individuals and families who are fleeing or attempting to flee DV situation.

The Interim Rule also defines the responsibilities of the CoC with respect to HMIS. Responsibilities include designating a single HMIS; selecting an applicant to manage HMIS, monitor participation and reviewing and approving privacy, security and data quality plans. Ms. Mead noted the rule places greater emphasis on the CoC's role in monitoring HMIS implementation and compliance with HMIS regulations. Under CoC Planning, the rule establishes that COCs must coordinate and implement housing and services system; conduct homeless Point-in-Time counts at least biennially, conduct an annual gaps analysis, provide information to consolidated plans and consult with ESG recipients on allocation of funds and evaluation of performance.

Ms. Mead noted applicants may apply for and receive planning funds. How planning funds can be used was briefly described. The HEARTH ACT states there may be up to three percent available for planning funds however, HUD clarified this depends on budget. It was noted MAG has been operating the CoC since 1999, but has never received planning funds. The HEARTH Act also discusses the Unified Funding Agency Model however this process is not yet in place. Critical program changes for programs receiving HUD funding include changes to the match, lease and occupancy, and housing quality standards. Renewal projects are grandfathered in. Ms. Mead completed her overview and advised additional information is available at www.hudhre.info

Ms. James asked if the CoC could serve as the Board required by HUD. Ms. Mead noted additional information is required, it was unknown if an additional board would need to be developed. Donna Bleyle noted her understanding of the Rule indicates the COC would become the primary planning committee aside from a separate Board. Cynthia Nagendra, HomeBase Consulting, advised her understanding is also that the board is a separate, smaller, group that is representative of the CoC. Ms. Mead added the CoC may need to grow to ensure representation of certain groups required by HUD.

Ms. Mead advised as the CoC develops its governance charter, the process and structure would also need to be developed. She added one of the themes at the conference was that HUD funding is meant to be a competitive funding process each year. This process would apply not only to new projects, but also for renewal projects. Evaluating performance and outcomes will be key to the CoC.

Ted Williams, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation, addressed the committee noting any provider that has services that are being combined may face significant challenges in how they have historically conducted business. Particularly with regard to tenant based leasing. He asked if staff would be coordinating any additional opportunities to gather comments to submit to HUD. Ms. Mead advised HUD would be releasing additional guidance that will be passed along to grantees and sub-grantees. Additionally, the CoC will be starting the grant inventory worksheet process for all renewal projects and will provide clarification to all of the programs. Mr. Williams offered to organize a small committee to work in this area. Due to the timeframe for submitting comments to HUD and because of the substantial changes to supportive housing, he expressed a need to speak as one voice. He offered to outreach to any programs receiving these grants to join in a detailed analyses of the impact of the new rule.

Danielle Wildkress, HomeBase Consulting, advised developing a governance charter would be discussed as part of the technical assistance provided. This should help to decide the direction of the board. Ms. Mead advised developing a CoC governance charter was one item identified by the Continuum as an issue the wanted to address through technical assistance.

Chair Osborne discussed the challenges moving forward, previous discussion by the Committee to add different participants to the CoC, and the importance of accountability and performance. She noted the technical assistance offers tools that will help the Continuum move forward. The Planning Subcommittee is scheduled to meet on August 13, 2012 to develop the final recommendations on the performance and monitoring plan. Chair Osborne recommended a special meeting at the end of August to review the plan, determine funding priorities and the process for funding of renewal projects.

Chair Osborne suggested some possible options requiring further discussion may include:

- Funding renewal projects this year with a clear plan for performance evaluation and a competitive process beginning next year.
- Making this year a competitive process by reviewing performance of programs going back over the past three or five years. This would make partial or full funding reallocation on the table.
- Reviewing the spending of renewal projects and reallocate unspent funding.

Chair Osborn noted the early start time for this meeting noting the CoC typically meets at 2:00 p.m. She asked for the Committee's input on a preferred meeting time. By show of hands, the Committee showed preference for an earlier start time. Mr. Williams suggested starting the meetings at 9:00 a.m. Chair Osborne asked for input on the special meeting tentatively scheduled for August 27th. Ms. Mead advised the NOFA will be released soon. As such the Continuum has to decide on funding priorities and how to move forward this year. She suggested additional time is needed to receive and review input from the Planning Subcommittee and recommended moving forward with the August 27th meeting. The Committee expressed agreement.

Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing, raised the question on whether there are other issues that need to be discussed prior to the August 27th meeting. She questioned the need to have additional small group discussions expressing concern that the Interim Rule will be in effect through 2012. Beyond that, a new rule and additional changes are forthcoming. She asked if other aspects aside from planning and gathering of comments need to be addressed prior to August 27th that will help the Committee decide how best to move forward.

Clarification was requested on the purpose for the August 27th meeting. Ms. Mead advised the Continuum will be discussing developing funding priorities for the NOFA; reviewing the monitoring for performance evaluation that will be completed by the Planning Subcommittee; and determining the process for moving forward the renewal process. The immediate priority is anything related to NOFA. Ms. Mead offered to distribute a meeting notice for August 27th. She advised the Continuum has two years to develop its governance structure. It was noted HUD will accept public comments until September 30, 2012.

Chair Osborne noted the special meeting scheduled for August 27th; the Continuum of Care meeting scheduled for September 24, 2012 and the public comment period end date of September 30th. She requested Mr. Williams submit information gathered for public comment to Ms. Mead for distribution prior to the next regular meeting. This will allow the committee enough time to review and agree upon the public comments prior to submitting to HUD.

6. Continuum of Care Technical Assistance

Chair Osborne welcomed Cynthia Nagendra and Danielle Wildkress, HomeBase Consulting, to discuss technical assistance. Ms. Wildkress, provided a brief background of her and Ms. Nagendra's training and experience. HomeBase Public Policy is a technical assistance firm located in San Francisco, CA.

Ms. Wildkress provided a brief history on the process to-date. She noted Phoenix was chosen as a priority community by US Interagency Council on Homelessness and HUD. Through that process, the Committee was beta tested for a CoC check -p process. The results were made available in early 2011. Representatives from HomeBase presented the preliminary results, offered feedback, and a plan was developed on how to address core issues that surfaced through the assessment process.

The next step was to discuss the action plan and determine what actions would receive technical assistance from HUD. The three key areas picked for technical assistance were development of coordinated assessment system; an evaluation and retooling of transitional housing; and developing the governance structure. In April, a kickoff event was held during which time work groups were developed to address coordinated assessment and transitional housing.

Coordinated Assessment (CA) is a system that covers an entire geographic area accessed by individuals and families needing housing or services. It is well advertised and offers the same assessment to all individuals and families to help determine the most appropriate intervention. Ms. Wildkress noted it is important that it CA be specific to the region. HUD

requires coordinated assessment to provide assistance and use resources more effectively. Ms. Wildkress noted HUD is seeking public comment on the role of domestic violence providers within a CA process. Different models related to domestic violence were also during the kick-off event.

Ms. Nagendra addressed the Committee noting work groups were developed from the larger group of stakeholders that attended the kickoff. The goal was to be as inclusive as possible by reaching out to other providers, the domestic violence community, and others who have not been attending the CoC meetings. The technical assistance housing work group will meet as needed. The first group met at of June. They focused on addressing what it means to evaluate a program, and how the outcomes relate to TA housing. Transitional housing providers were invited to attend and participate in an exercise to get people thinking about how their programs are performing. They reviewed their APRs, the number people exiting programs, why information is collected in HMIS and how it is used. This was not intended as a competitive process, but focused on how programs are spending resources, if programs are serving certain populations of clients that could also serve other clients, barriers that may exist, and how to use resources most effectively. The TA group will meet on August 10th. One-on-one team session will be conducted with providers who are considering repurposing their transitional housing programs to other types of models. The meeting will allow an opportunity to address their questions, formulate a plan, and focuses on providers who are ready to move forward. As the process does proceed, the goal is to turn this into a peer learning community. Ms. Nagendra and Ms. Wildkress will also participate during the meeting scheduled for August 27th and will offer suggestions on how to honor the fact that people are trying to improve.

With regard to Coordinated Assessment, 30-40 people met in June. The process began with discussion about what model would work best in Maricopa County. A number of presentations on available models, challenges, and benefits, had previously been shared. The group supported a “no wrong door” approach in which a person could be present at any agency and expect to receive the same access and assessment services as they would at any other agency. Assessment staff would be trained to offer a standardize process. The design features such as the number of different locations (gateways); and how gateways are chosen would be addressed through the governance. With regard to implementation, the group discussed either a pilot process, or including all demographics from the beginning. Ms. Nagendra advised the group, by general consensus, recommended full implementation from beginning, serving all populations, including domestic violence. The desire was for a comprehensive implementation.

Ms. Nagendra discussed a governance survey that was developed to get input from both the CA and TA work groups, along with members of the CoC, to seek input on how decisions are going to be made. Ms. Nagendra provided a brief overview of the types of questions asked in the survey. Fifty-five Responses were received. The top recommendation was to develop an advisory group; the second highest recommendation was to send all recommendations to the CoC to vote on or approve. Ms. Nagendra noted input requested today is to determine what type of oversight is needed for the work groups as they will make many decision. She expressed the importance of having an oversight committee to make sure

the CA is working and changing as needed. Chair Osborne summarized the question presented is whether or not to develop an advisor group for the technical assistance work, and how soon this would need to be implemented. Ms. Nagendra advised implementation would need to occur as soon as possible as the work group has already developed recommendations. The CoC now needs to determine the process to adopt those recommendations.

Ms. Bleyle commented one suggestion was to have some sort of advisory group that focused on strategy, not the individual methods to arrive at the end goal. The advisory group would then synthesize the recommendations and report back to the CoC. Mattie Lord, UMOM, noted the importance of having provider representation on an advisory group. Ms. Dunning inquired if oversight of the technical assistance work is something that could be undertaken by the Planning Subcommittee.

Ms. Nagendra advised the Planning Subcommittee has good representation however one of the issues is that there could be some conflicted providers when deciding some of the entry points for Coordinated Assessment. She recommended possibly including some of the funders on this group, as well as some political representation. It was recommended an advisory group consist of no more than 10 persons. The advisory group would meet regularly. Ms. Lord asked for clarification on the function of the advisory group. Ms. Nagendra advised the CoC would need to decide if the advisory group would make decisions or bring forth recommendation for the CoC to make decisions.

Chair Osborne noted a possible loss of quorum. Ms. Mead confirmed loss of quorum. She requested a brief summary of things to consider prior to the August 27th meeting. Ms. Nagendra noted her agreement that more time is needed for the CoC to consider the questions being posed. These include: how decision are made by the CA and TA work groups; should there be an advisory group of the CoC; should the advisory group make decisions and reports back to the CoC; who is approving the decision and who should the members be.

Ms. Mead advised under open meeting law, due to loss of quorum, staff is required to adjourn the meeting. Chair Osborne thanked everyone for attending. The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m..