

**MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
CONTINUUM OF CARE REGIONAL COMMITTEE ON HOMELESSNESS  
AUGUST 27, 2012 MEETING MINUTES**

MEMBERS ATTENDING:

+Scott Klapp for 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  
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  
Darlene Newsom, UMOM New Day Center  
Joanne Osborne, City of Goodyear, Vice Mayor, Chair  
Sean Price, Arizona Department of Veterans Services  
\*Gina Ramos Montes, City of Avondale  
Amy Schwabenlender, Valley of the Sun United Way  
Joan Serviss, Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness  
Jacki Taylor, Save the Family  
\*Margaret Trujillo, MG Trujillo Associates  
Ted Williams, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation  
\*Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections

OTHERS PRESENT

Jonnie Arnold, US Vets  
Dana Bailey, Homeward Bound  
Chris Bartz, Recovery Innovations of Arizona  
Dawn Bogart, Homeward Bound  
Billie Cawley, Central Arizona Shelter Services  
Esther Emadi, Southwest Behavioral Health  
Dick Geasland, Tumbleweed Center for Youth Development  
Katie Hobbs, Sojourner Center  
Olin Hogan, The Salvation Army  
Shari Lassiter, US Vets  
Jodi Liggett, Phoenix Mayor's Office  
Steve Carter, NOVA Safe Haven  
Richard Marten, Community Information and Referral  
Mary Alice McKone, Salvation Army  
Nancy Marion, House of Refuge  
Jim Medis, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation  
Lisa Miller, UMOM  
Cynthia Negandra, HomeBase  
Dottie O'Connell, Chicanos por la Causa  
Laura Peters, Labors Community Service Agency  
Robert Ruocco, Homeward Bound  
Jane Sedillo, Labors Community Service Agency  
Sharon Shore, Home Inc.  
Jeremiah Smith, Salvation Army  
Nicky Stevens, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation  
Charles Sullivan, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation  
Chela Sullivan, UMOM  
Michelle Thomas, Community Information and Referral  
Keith Thompson, Phoenix Shanti  
John Wall, Arizona Housing Inc.  
Danielle Wildkress, HomeBase  
Patrick Winters, Tempe Community Action Agency  
Chris Wudarski, Women In New Recovery

\*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 10:03 a.m. Introductions ensued.

2. Call to the Audience

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

3. Approval of the August 9, 2012 Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness Meeting Minutes

A motion was requested to approve the August 9, 2012, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Amy Schwabenlender, Valley of the Sun United Way. The motion was seconded by Linda Mushkatel, Maricopa County. The motion passed.

4. Technical Assistance Governance Recommendations

At the Continuum of Care meeting on August 9th, technical assistance consultants Cynthia Nagendra and Danielle Wildkress from HomeBase provided an update on the Technical Assistance (TA) work. During the last meeting, they presented the results of a survey related to the Governance for the TA process. Chair Osborne requested a recap of that discussion. The Committee was referred to the handout "Questions for CoC to Decide."

Ms. Wildkress advised as part of the Coordinated Assessment (CA) work being done, a recommendation was made to have an oversight body to the CA work. Additional CA work will be done with the community, however for the process to move forward, there is a need to develop a smaller advisory group to focus on oversight. The advisory group would take recommendations from the larger working group to set policy and procedure. The larger group also decided the community should move towards an open Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) to increase data sharing. Ms. Wildkress advised these were the recommendations offered by the larger group however; a decision now needs to be made on how to set policy and procedure. A series of questions addressing how decision will be made about a CA system, who should be on group, and how to appoint are questions needing further clarity. Chair Osborne opened the topic for discussion.

Theresa James, City of Tempe, questioned the need for another committee given that there is a very active Planning Subcommittee. Chair Osborne advised membership from critical entities are not represented on the Continuum. She posed the question on whether or not additional membership can be added to the Planning Subcommittee rather than creating another committee. Ms. Wildkress advised the group overseeing CA is usually comprised of the groups funding the project, and one or two key members of the leadership group. She stressed the importance of the advisory group being non-conflicted. One suggestion offered by the CA work group is to conduct a Request for Proposal (RFP) process to choose a coordinator position. This would help to ensure everyone is in compliance and help to streamline the process. Implementing an advisory group would not create an overlap in leadership.

Darlene Newsom, UMOM, agreed that a separate committee is not needed. Having participated on many committees that make funding decisions, she noted participants can excuse themselves if there is a conflict of interest. She expressed concern with not having providers participate on a committee that will be making decisions about assessment tools. She added the Planning Subcommittee has the ability to work within the current structure and add additional membership as needed. Ms. Wildkress clarified the advisory group will not choose the assessment tool, but will finalize recommendations made by the working group.

Chair Osborne summarized the discussion at hand to address how decisions will be made. The option being recommended is to create an advisory group. Working groups would funnel information to the advisory group that would then present recommendations to the CoC. She noted the Interim Rule also requires that the CoC add additional membership to include representation from missing entities. Chair Osborne noted by adding additional membership to the Planning Subcommittee, the Interim Rule requirement would be met and there would not be a need to create an advisory group.

Jackie Taylor, Save the Family, commented on the effectiveness of the Planning Subcommittee. She recommended forming a smaller group, if needed, from members of the Planning Subcommittee. Chair Osborne noted part of the issue is entities not represented on the CoC. Additional membership has been identified both by the Committee and given as a directive in the Interim Rule. She suggested the Membership Committee provide input on whether additional membership is needed at the Planning Subcommittee or CoC level.

Donna Bleyle, Arizona Department of Economic Security, discussed her concerns in regard to funding. She noted funders have processes that are required to be followed such as an RFP or using Arizona Procure. Funding can only be provided to entities that can be held to a contract; not committees. She expressed concern that if the Committee is seeking funders, they may be headed in a direction that is not accomplishable. Ms. Nagendra recalled the recommendation for wider representation came from the CoC check-up. The governance survey also recommended a smaller advisory group. She clarified the purpose for a smaller advisory group would be to help streamline decisions. The CoC would still have final decisions on all major points.

Linda Mushkatel, Maricopa County, expressed agreement with Ms. Newsom's comments. She acknowledged the need for additional members but stated adding another layer will slow down the process and discourage participation from those very entities the Committee is trying to attract. She recommended putting effort into attracting additional members to the Committee as was recognized prior to release of the Interim Rule. Amy Schwabenlender, Valley of the Sun United Way, addressed the Committee regarding the survey. She noted no option was given for the Planning Subcommittee to serve as the advisory group and added that the discussion points in the direction of the Planning Subcommittee serving as the advisory group. Chair Osborne noted the fourth option for how decisions will be made about the CA system is "other". A motion from the Committee was requested.

Ms. Taylor made a motion that the Planning Subcommittee serve in the capacity of advisory committee with expanded members to represent different community partners not at the

table. Catherine Rae Dunning, Community Information and Referral seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Brandee Mead, MAG, advised members of the Membership Subcommittee include Kendra Cea, Arizona Public Service, and Amy Schwabendlender, Valley of the Sun United Way. Recommendations for additional members can be made by the Membership Subcommittee. Chair Osborne suggested additional participants are needed as the membership committee will be making recommendations to satisfy the interim rule. Additional input can be provided by Ms. Nagendra and Ms. Wildkress. Ms. Newsome offered to assist the membership subcommittee. Ms. Mead offered to schedule a meeting of the membership subcommittee and seek recommendations for additional members prior to that meeting.

5. Point-in-Time (PIT) Homeless Street Count Recommendations

Chair Osborne advised the working group has been convening to develop recommendations to enhance the annual PIT street count. Ms. Mead advised that a working group was developed and has been meeting over the past six months on efforts to improve the process. This came about as a result of discussion held after the 2011 PIT count. The working group has been researching methodology used across the region and from other cities across the country. They met from January through June 2012. In addition to the working group, a class from the ASU Public Affairs program also spent a semester researching methodology. Ms. Mead referred to the recommendations brought forth by both groups to improve the street count methodology. An overview of the recommendations was provided.

*Recommendation One: Implement a Universal Methodology:* This recommendation is for one methodology to be implemented on a region-wide basis and adopted by all cities and towns. The methodology would mirror the City of Phoenix methodology which has been seen as a best practice. Cities would have the option to opt-out if the methodology does not work. This may be applicable in smaller cities. However they would still have to meet all of HUD's requirements for conducting a PIT. Other requirements would also apply such as complying with the hours in which the count is conducted. The time frame was recommended to be from 3:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. to make it easier to identify homeless individuals. The CoC would provide regional training to ensure consistency across region. A methodology handout would be developed and provided to all street count coordinators to be used as a training tool.

*Recommendation Two: Identify Hidden Locations In Advance of the PIT Count:* This recommendation will assist in locating hard to find populations such as youth and families. Ms. Mead noted HUD is developing recommendations for a PIT count for homeless youth. Those recommendations would be incorporated as well.

*Recommendation Three: Partnering with ASU for Additional Volunteers:* Additional volunteers will be needed once the region implements a universal methodology. Ms. Mead noted there are a few programs wherein students are required to complete volunteer hours. This would allow partnering with the ASU schools for volunteers for the street count. The change in time may also prompt the need for additional volunteers.

Ms. Mead noted the Planning Subcommittee offered a fourth recommendation:

*Recommendation Four: Collect Additional Data Beyond HUD's Requirements:* Ms. Mead noted the Planning Subcommittee is offering three options for how to collect additional data. However, they are also seeking additional input from the CoC. Recommendations include:

- Add additional questions to the PIT Count.
- Partner with Project Connect to use the data collected to supplement information received through the PIT Count.
- Utilize data collected from the Summer Survey to supplement PIT Count data.

Ms. Mead concluded her overview and opened the topic for discussion and approval.

A question was raised on whether HUD requires that the count be completed by the Continuum or by each city. Ms. Mead advised the requirement is for the CoC. Further clarification was requested on why cities have the option to opt-out. Ms. Mead clarified the count is Continuum wide which encompasses all cities and towns. She noted there are 25 cities and towns within the region. Each city and town has established a street count coordinator and all have been very engaged in the PIT count. Staff would continue working with them to implement the methodology and maintain the strength of those partnerships.

Trish Georgeff, Maricopa County Human Services Department, inquired to what extent other cities and towns are using the Phoenix methodology and whether or not it would require a significant change. Ms. Mead advised the majority of cities and towns are not using the City of Phoenix methodology; it would require significant change. Further clarification was requested on how big a challenge it would be to require everyone to subscribe to the same methodology; without the opt-out option. Ms. Mead suggested it would not be very challenging to implement on a region-wide basis. She noted the existing coordinator could essentially allow the CoC to organize the count for their specific area; opting-in would offer them the opportunity to participate as part of a larger group. Ms. Georgeff noted implementation of the universal methodology would ease the burden across the board by having everyone complete the process in the same manner. Ms. Mead noted the Phoenix methodology is a method that has been seen in many larger cities and towns with many similarities.

Ms. Newsome inquired whether or not the Committee has discussed or developed a plan for distributing results of the PIT count to the media. Ms. Mead confirmed recommendations were developed at the Planning Subcommittee level on how to release and convey information to the public. Ms. Taylor inquired if the shelter wait list can be reviewed as it would be a great source of data to report on the number of homeless individuals. Discussion ensued on including shelter wait list data and a question was raised on how to avoid duplication of numbers such as for individuals on more than one wait list.

Ms. Mead advised the Planning Subcommittee is requesting input from the CoC on whether to move forward with plans to collect additional data other than data required by HUD.

Ms. James noted data is available from the summer survey and Project Connect. Ms. Schwabenlender clarified the summer survey is in fact a survey, not indented to reach every homeless individuals as with the PIT count. However, the questions can be shared with the Planning Subcommittee. Additionally, she noted the United Way can sign an agreement to make available data from Project Connect events. She suggested data from one event may not be enough however data collected over a period of one year may help create a profile for individuals who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. Chair Osborn noted these topics can be included on the Planning Subcommittee agenda for discussion.

Joan Serviss, Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness, noted the Committee is discussing whether or not to include additional questions, yet the questions themselves are unknown. However, she said it would be beneficial to seize the opportunity to ask the questions since the individual is already engaged in discussion. Ms. Dunning expressed support to have the Planning Subcommittee further discuss and flush out use of a survey, extended data or additional questions. She noted it would be helpful for CI&R to be included from the beginning so as to advise on what can and cannot be done accordingly. Ms. Bleyle advised ACHH is conducting the survey this summer. As noted, it is not the same as the PIT count; however the data will be published in an effort to offer background data.

Sean Price, Arizona Department of Veteran Services, noted the 25 communities in the region that will have to adopt a universal methodology for the PIT count, which may pose a challenge for some communities. He suggested implementing the methodology first and waiting until next year to add the additional questions. Ms. Mead noted many of the cities and towns are already engaged in the working group so rolling it out on a very large scale is possible. She suggested the Planning Subcommittee could add one or two questions to collect additional data on the day of the count and then gathering information from all other data already being collected to help develop the message that would be distributed to the media and the public.

Mike McQuaid, Human Services Campus, expressed agreement with Mr. Prices' comments. He further inquired whether the working group identified or discussed who or what outreach groups can help with the recommendation to identify hidden locations in advance of the PIT count. Ms. Mead noted discussion to partner with outreach teams that are familiar with encampments; school liaisons and family service providers. Chair Osborne expressed appreciation for those efforts noting the challenge with finding homeless youth. She requested a motion from the Committee. Ms. Bleyle made a motion to approve the recommendation to the homeless street count methodology. Stephanie Knox, Magellan Health Services of Arizona, seconded the motion. Chair Osborne asked for any further discussion. Ms. Schwabenlender noted her agreement, but stated her belief that cities should not have the option to opt-out. She further stated the methodology should be the Continuum's recommendation and as Ms. Mead and staff work with each city to identify a coordinator, every city and town should be assisted with implementation of the universal methodology. From the standpoint of a Continuum, she stressed the importance of taking a stand and working with those communities. Discussion ensued noting the additional input changes the motion by deleting the option for cities to opt-out.

Ms. Bleye withdrew the motion to allow for additional discussion. She noted as long as everyone meet's HUD's requirements, the Committee as the CoC does not have the authority, only influence, over cities and towns to tell them how to conduct their street count. Ms. Schwabenlender noted if the CoC is charged by HUD to conduct the PIT count, the CoC should set the universal methodology. She noted it is upon the CoC to convince the cities and towns of the importance of following the universal methodology. For the record, Ms. Knox also withdrew her motion.

A member of the audience addressed the Committee regarding security issues and staffing during the proposed time of 3:00 – 9:00 a.m. for conducting the street count. Ms. Mead noted the working group had a lot of discussion on this issue. She noted many surveys have been conducted during that timeframe without any safety issues arising. Safety however, is an important part of the training and would continue; teams would be paired up, and outreach would be conducted to secure additional volunteers. Ms. Taylor noted Maricopa County Community Colleges also have a significant volunteer base; she recommended reaching out to them as well. Additionally, she expressed concern that if a city elects not to participate in the universal methodology, their data would not be discarded. She stated however, that as a CoC, if a best practice has been identified, the CoC needs to express and encourage support for that practice.

Chair Osborne addressed the Committee regarding differences in cities and towns. She noted, while the CoC is seeking to implement best practice, another option may be that the CoC give smaller cities or towns the opportunity to identify five areas in which they would not be able to adhere to the universal methodology. This may be one way to recognize a smaller city or town that would not fit into a methodology used by a larger city such as Phoenix. Janeen Gaskins, City of Surprise, suggested eliminating the language that cities can elect to opt out. She recommended alternative language may be that in the event a city cannot fulfill the requirements it will be cited in the data. This would replace the language allowing cities to opt-out. Chair Osborne agreed the change in language removes the option to opt-in or opt-out and recognizes that a smaller city or town may not fit the methodology.

Ms. Service asked for clarification regarding previous discussion held by the Planning Subcommittee that indicated those cities that did not want to participate were going to increase the number of volunteers from ASU and other community colleges. Ms. Mead confirmed discussion was held, but clarified this was for cities that were opting in and needed more assistance to ramp up their efforts to implement the universal methodology. Ms. Mead expressed concern over developing a regional methodology, but then having numerous cities opt-out. She agreed with the revised language as was suggested and also with presenting the strong points of utilizing a universal methodology allowing smaller cities to present their reasons for not being able to participate. Ms. Gaskins made a motion to remove the language stating that cities can elect to opt out and revise it to include language that will cite any significant adjustments that need to be made for cities and towns that cannot comply. Ms. Taylor seconded the motion. The motion passed.

6. Approval of HUD Project Performance Methodology Plan

Chair Osborne invited Ms. Mead to present the HUD project performance methodology draft plan. Ms. Mead advised the Planning Subcommittee engaged in developing a program performance monitoring methodology plan and tool for scoring the performance of each HUD funded program. The process to develop a plan has been in place over several months. Ms. Mead noted as competition for McKinney Vento funding becomes more difficult to secure each year, the CoC needs to ensure programs that receive federal funding are meeting performance goals under the HEARH Act and local performance goals.

Ms. Mead referenced the Program Performance Monitoring Methodology handout. She provided an overview of the background and methodology. The MAG CoC would be responsible for measuring the performance of each of the HUD funded programs. Achievement of program and community outcomes will directly impact the score of the annual consolidated funding application and the competition for new program funding. The CoC would establish a monitoring team that would be selected by the Chair and Vice Chair of the CoC and the Chair of the Planning Subcommittee. Program performance would be assessed once per year at a minimum. Ms. Mead advised a program performance report would be created for each of the HUD funded programs as well as a continuum-wide report. These would be the performance evaluation tool and indicate program achievement for each standard outlined in the tool.

Programs that meet less than half of the standard would be considered programs of concern and would be required to develop a 12-month action plan for improvement. They would also be required to participate in quarterly meetings with the monitoring team. These meetings would be intended to assess progress over the 12-month action period. The monitoring team would ultimately identify whether or not the program has made improvements in the areas identified. If no significant progress is made, the program would be recommended to the CoC to be considered for possible funding reallocation or program repurposing during the McKinney Vento application cycle.

Chair Osborne requested clarification regarding the current year process. She noted applicants will know the standard moving forward and will have one year to show how they are performing. Ms. Mead confirmed adding each program would be assessed this year. Programs identified as programs of concern would be put on a 12-month action plan to improve their performance.

Ms. Mead noted the Planning Subcommittee discussed involving peers in the program evaluation process. It was noted both Darlene Newsome and Dick Geasland have participated in a peer monitoring team and had indicated it was a very positive process. Additional discussion recommended included peers in the process, but requiring them to sign a conflict of interest statement and not involving them in making the recommendation for repurposing or reallocation. Peers would serve as resources to help each other improve. Ms. Mead noted the funding reallocation and repurposing would be determined by a vote of the CoC and would be based on recommendations submitted by the monitoring team. Ms. Mead provided a brief overview of the scoring factor and points available. She discussed methods to score programs that are serving the harder to serve population.

Ted Williams, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation, expressed major concern with the scoring factors for serving harder to serve populations. He noted the points are not in tune with the reality of populations served. Ms. Mead advised the intent under the client complexity score is not that the full ten points would be available for every project, but rather to balance the APR goals. Ms. Newsom expressed agreement noting the recommendation is a good start, but suggested more discussion is needed to determine the incentive for serving the harder to serve populations.

Ms. Bleye suggested what is being created is something way too complex. As a Continuum, there are monitoring targets that must be reported to HUD. She suggested the only thing that can be done is to evaluate those specific areas, but also to develop a separate plan to address the structure of the community. She noted the CoC is creating something way too complex and losing focus of HUD's requirements. Ms. Wildkress noted the recommendations have been developed based on tools used in other communities. Many of the requirements embedded in the tool are actually keeping in pace with the outcomes HUD is expecting from this community.

Ms. Mead noted discussion at the Planning Subcommittee level to be able to perform well as a community per HUD standards, but to also add a component to take into consideration the population being served by each of the providers. This would help to encourage those programs to continue serving that populations and give additional points for doing so. Ms. Mead noted another option would be to remove the ten points from the scoring factor and instead add them to a bonus points section allowing programs to earn between one and ten bonus points.

Ms. Taylor supported targeting the harder to serve population but noted the way the criteria are written is stacked against the harder to serve families. She suggested developing criteria that holds family provides to a standard of reserving resources for the harder to serve. She noted that is not reflected in the criteria as it is written. Ms. Taylor requested asking the Planning Subcommittee to rework the criteria. She noted Save the Family assesses housing barriers and would be able to codify what that would look like in terms of scoring. She noted the challenges to have families represented and expressed concern that this process would be a step backwards. Mr. Williams agreed noting ABC's criteria for hard to serve clients include being in the behavioral health system and being homeless. He suggested defining "hard to serve" may need to be reviewed again.

Chair Osborne noted the difficulty these changes will bring for many providers. She expressed concern for ensuring that a process is in place on time for the upcoming application season. Changes have been occurring over the past year and the concern is to be prepared before October. Ms. Mead advised the Notice of Funding Allocation (NOFA) is expected to be released mid-September, therefore, if the Planning Subcommittee is being asked to rework the recommendation, they would have to action quickly. Ms. Mead advised she had previously spoken with Norm Suchar and Brooke Spellman regarding the scoring tool. They indicated there is no clearly defined process but instead referred to the client

complexity score. She noted some communities utilize One Common Housing Barrier assessment tool, however that tool is not utilized in this community.

Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing, raised a question on whether the Continuum is even looking at if the hardest to serve population is meeting the HUD definition of homeless and where that is being documented. She noted programs that having been reviewed in a long time noting when these programs are first reviewed; it will need to be determined if the program is meeting HUD's definition of homeless and if documentation is available. Additionally, she suggested it has become even more critical to determine homeless status. Ms. Basta made a motion to take this issue back to the Committee to rework and bring forth again. Mr. Williams seconded the motion.

Ms. Mead advised the next CoC meeting is scheduled for September 24<sup>th</sup> at which time the NOFA is expected to have been released. She suggested a few options including moving forward with a motion to approve the methodology and performance report based on the work of the Planning Subcommittee. The other option would be to have another special meeting at the beginning of September; after the Planning Subcommittee meets. Discussion ensued regarding timing of the meetings and release of the NOFA. Ms. Basta noted once the NOFA is released, there is still time to approve the recommendations. Ms. Mead advised there is a local process that needs to be completed within two week of the NOFA being released. Meeting a few days after the NOFA is released would work.

Ms. Wildkress addressed the timing issue regarding the NOFA. She advised it appears that it will more likely be released in early October. HUD is also indicating this year's process will be much shorter than in the past. Ms. Taylor recommend calling for a Planning Subcommittee in one week; followed by a special call-in meeting of the CoC. Chair Osborne stressed the need to have a quorum during the special CoC meeting.

Ms. Gaskins noted HUD's focus when scoring will be to review the specific numbers they are interested in. She agreed with the recommendation to have the Planning Subcommittee rework the tool but cautioned any process put in place may not match the NOFA. She suggested having more than one option available.

Chair Osborne noted agenda item six: Approval of HUD Project Performance Methodology Plan will be tabled to allow the Planning Subcommittee to revise the recommendation. She expressed appreciation for everyone's willingness to get together again.

Ms. Basta revised the motion to table the discussion and meet once again after the Planning Subcommittee has met and reworked the tool. The motion was seconded by Mr. Williams. The motion passed.

#### 7. Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness Report

Joan Serviss, Executive Director, Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness, advised that in July over 30 delegates attended the National Alliance to End Homelessness in Washington, D.C. On the last day of the conference, a meeting was held at the Capital to meet with several congressional delegates. Ms. Serviss advised she will be sending thank you letters

and wanted to offer the opportunity for site visits. She asked if any of the Committee members would be interested in hosting a site visit for the representative or for their local staff members. Anyone interested in doing so may contact Ms. Serviss. She noted in terms of the federal budget, nothing will be decided until after the general elections therefore site visits would show the importance of federal funding to support efforts.

Ms. Serviss shared information on the 19<sup>th</sup> Annual Arizona Statewide Conference on Homelessness scheduled for October 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>. Registration will open on September 1<sup>st</sup>. A brief overview of keynote speakers and topics was provided.

8. Request For Future Agenda Items

Chair Osborne asked for input from the Committee on any requested topics or issues of interest to consider for future agendas.

Chair Osborne requested the Committee be provided a form at the next CoC meeting to identify their preference for the meeting schedule. Committee members may choose between 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. or the current schedule 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. to determine the best option.

Collaboration between the CoC and the MAG Regional Domestic Violence Council was requested as an agenda item to brainstorm ideas for working together.

9. Announcements

Committee members were offered an opportunity to make announcements.

Mr. Williams advised they have developed a seven page document addressing the Continuum's concerns and offering suggestions regarding the interim rule. He requested any additional concerns be submitted promptly to ensure they are included in the document prior to sending it to HUD. Ms. Mead acknowledged everyone who was participating in the summer survey taking place August 23-30. The goal is to survey 1,000 people over the seven day period. Ms Schwabenlender thanked everyone who participated in Project Connect in Goodyear. One-hundred sixty individuals were served. The next event is scheduled for September 19, 2012 in Gilbert at Sun Valley Community Church.

10. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:39 a.m. The next regular meeting of the Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness is scheduled for September 24, 2012 at 2:00 p.m., in the Saguaro Room.