MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
CONTINUUM OF CARE REGIONAL COMMITTEE ON HOMELESSNESS
JANUARY 14, 2013 MEETING MINUTES

MEMBERS ATTENDING:

Tammy Albright, City of Mesa
Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing
Cheryl Belcher, Catholic Charities
Donna Bleyle, Arizona Department of Economic Security
*Kathryn Brown, Arizona Department of Corrections
Rick Buss, Town of Gila Bend, Town Manager
*Kendra Cea, APS
*Krista Cornish, Town of Buckeye
Libby Bissa for the Phoenix Family Advocacy Center
Catherine Rea Dunning, Community Information & Referral Services
Shana Ellis, City of Tempe, Councilmember
*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
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

OTHERS PRESENT

Chris Burke, Recovery Innovations
Brad Bridwell, Cloud Break
Brian Petersen, HOM Inc.
Mike Bell, SVDP
Robert Ruocco, Homeward Bound
Matt Ligouri, City of Goodyear
Tom Hutchinson, A New Leaf
Todd Sherman, Native American Connections
Billie Cowley, CASS
Terri Leveton, NOVA Safe Haven
Kimberly Thomspon, LCSA
Margaret Kilman, DES
Dana Bailey, Homeward bound
Miranda Jilek, Lifewell Behavioral Wellness
John Wall, AHI
Dottie O'Connell, Chicanos por la Causa
Esther Emadi, SBH
Nicky Stevens, ABC
Charles Sullivan, ABC
Anthony Irby, Department of Veteran Affairs
Charlene Flaherty, CSH
Ted Williams, ABC
Mattie Lord, UMOM
Gilbert Lopez, City of Glendale
Dick Geasland. Sojourner Center
Michelle Thomas, CIR
Kim VanNimwegan, VSUW\
Karen Kurtz, Community Bridges
Keith Thompson, Phoenix Shanti
Jim Medis, ABC
Nancy Marion, House of Refuge
Lura Peters, LCSA
Chris Tompkins, Tumbleweed
Rachel Brito, MAG
Brande Mead, MAG

DRAFT

Jacki Taylor, Save the Family
*Margaret Trujillo, MG Trujillo Associates
Ted Williams, Arizona Behavioral Health Corp.
Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections

*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 1:39 p.m. She acknowledged Vice Chair Kevin Hartke, Councilmember, City of Chandler, for chairing the last meeting as she attended the National League of Cities conference in Boston. Chair Osborne discussed the challenges and changes faced in 2012 noting this also brings about new opportunities. She discussed the Committee's leadership and requested that Committee members take the opportunity to recognize other leaders who may need some encouragement and/or mentoring and to help find and encourage the next group of leaders that will continue to move the work forward. Chair Osborne requested a roll call of the Committee. It was noted that this would be the new process moving forward. An introduction of the audience ensued.

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

3. Approval of the November 26, 2012 Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness Meeting Minutes
   A motion was requested to approve the November 26, 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 Vice Chair Kevin Hartke, Councilman, City of Chandler. The motion passed.

4. Approval of the FY 2012 HUD Continuum of Care Funding Application
   Chair Osborne noted that this year's process is much different because projects must be listed in either Tier One or Tier Two. The tiers are split by a 3.5 percent decrease in the annual project renewal demand. The total amount allowed for projects in Tier One is $23,979,541 while the annual renewal demand (ARD) is more $24 million. Additionally, the Continuum, for the first time, has an opportunity to apply for Continuum of Care (CoC) planning funds. Chair Osborne advised that a working group was created to review the requirements of the tiers and develop recommendations as to what projects should be included in each tier. She invited Brande Mead, MAG, to provide a report on the recommendations developed by the working group.

DRAFT

Ms. Mead called to mind the need to make a decision on funding recommendations to be included in the consolidated application to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). A presentation was then offered on information provided by HUD regarding budget implications for the CoC program. The following key points were noted:

- There is $1.61 billion dollars available in renewal funding plus any recaptured funds from FY 2011 programs.
- The amount needed to fund all of the renewal projects is $1.67 billion based on grant inventory worksheets submitted to HUD last year.
- FY 2012 appropriations that have been awarded to HUD have impacted the funding available for CoC program and have impacted the priorities in the 2012 Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) and in the competition.
- CoC planning grants, which under HEARTH were up to three percent, are only being allowed this year at a rate of 1.25 percent and are capped at $250,000.
- HUD will make only administrative funding available up to seven percent as opposed to 10 percent indicated in the HEARTH Act.
- CoCs, for the first time, are required to rank all new and renewal projects in two tiers.
- The National Annual Renewal Demand (NARD) of $1.67 billion indicates that HUD may not have enough funding to award all renewal projects across the country. Recaptured funds may allow the opportunity to fund more than what was appropriated. The total amount of recaptured funds is unknown at this time.
- HUD has established the financial thresholds within each CoC. All of the projects are listed in Tier One total the CoC's ARD less 3.5 percent. This amount is just over $23.9 million dollars. Tier two will include all projects beyond the Tier One threshold.
- HUD recommends Tier One should include projects that the CoC determines to be high priority, high performing and meeting the needs and gaps of the CoC. Projects can include renewal, planning, or new projects, including reallocated new.
- HUD recommends Tier Two should include projects that the CoC determines to be meeting the needs and gaps of the CoC, lower performing and lower priority. Tier Two projects can include renewal, planning, or new projects including reallocated new.

Ms. Mead advised the CoC has nearly 60 projects. HUD will fund projects according to rank order established by the CoC. HUD will first score all of CoC consolidated applications and then go through highest scored CoC and fund projects in Tier One. Projects will be funded in the following order: renewal projects, reallocated projects, CoC planning projects, bonus projects in extreme tiny communities, permanent housing bonus projects, new permanent housing supportive service only, HMIS, transitional housing, or Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects.

DRAFT

Awards will be announced once Tier One projects have been funded. Tier Two projects will then be funded based on available funding. The same process will be followed for Tier Two projects. Ms. Mead commented that the CoC is high scoring and has a good chance of receiving funding for projects in Tier Two. Attention was directed to recommendations developed by the working group and the FY 2012 CoC project ranking document. Ms. Mead advised that when the working group met, there were items not take into consideration thereby changing the project listing considerably. She proceeded with an overview of the working group's recommendations.

Recommendation One

- Project funding for administration remain at the current HUD-funded amount of up to 5%.

Recommendation Two

- Projects are grouped by program type in the following priority order: Permanent Housing (PH), Transitional Housing (TH), HMIS, Supportive Service Only (SSO).

Recommendation Three

- Projects are listed in order of performance evaluation score.

Recommendation Four

- New Permanent Housing Bonus Projects are listed in Tier Two. Ms. Mead noted there are three new permanent housing bonus projects.

Recommendation Five

- Projects that are not in compliance with HMIS be listed in Tier 2. This includes:
  - Area Agency on Aging HIV Case Management at Congregate Living
  - Area Agency on Aging HIV Case Management at Scattered Sites

Recommendation Six

- CoC Planning Funds should be considered for Tier One but should consider a request less than $250,000.

Ms. Mead advised that when the working group met, they did not take into consideration that some of the renewal project renewal demands had increased. The increase was not realized until after the working group had met to determine the project listing for Tier One and Tier Two.

It was noted that there are nine renewal projects that in the past were receiving "leasing" funds from HUD. Under the HEARTH Act, these programs operate like rental assistance projects and under the recommendation from HUD. Ms. Mead advised that these programs were directed to change their projects from leasing to rental assistance. In addition, they are required to become fully compliant under the HEARTH act rental assistance guidelines. This requirement means that the programs have to follow the Fair Market Rent (FMR) guidelines. Therefore the renewal amount for these projects increased to meet FMR

DRAFT

guidelines to continue serving the same number of units within each project. The total annual renewal increase for all nine projects totals $209,948.

Additionally, there are three Shelter Plus Care (SPC) grants that need to become compliant under HEARTH. These grants previously used to charge admin under their rent assistance line item. However, they must now charge admin under the admin line item. The admin for those three projects, at five percent, totals $307,724.

Given these two factors, there is a total increase to the renewal demand of $517,672. Ms. Mead noted these two points were not factored into the discussion during the working group meeting and thereby impacts the project listing within each tier. The revised project listing includes projects with admin funding at their original amount (up to five percent) as well as rental assistance projects with the new renewal budget and the SPC grants with five percent admin.

Ms. Mead provided an overview of the project listing. It was noted that low performing are those projects that are meeting less than 50 percent of the 75 points available (37.5 points). Ms. Mead advised that this is the first year that the CoC is using the performance tool that was developed and approved by the Continuum in August. It was acknowledged at that time that the tool may require adjustments, based on what is learned from using the tool during the first year. Ms. Mead advised there are seven SSO projects adding that the tool does not do a good job of measuring performance for those projects. Performance scores for the Permanent Housing (PH) and Transitional Housing (TH) projects are more reflective of the programs.

Ms. Mead reported that HUD allowed for Continua to apply for planning grants up to 1.25 percent of the CoC funding demand or $250,000, whichever is less. The maximum available for the CoC is $250,000. She advised that the working group asked that the CoC consider an amount less than what is available. As such, the CoC Planning amount is listed at $180,000. This is $70,000 less than what is available to the Continuum and less than one percent (7/10 of a percent) of the CoC project funding amount.

The budget will allow for MAG to increase capacity, adding an additional person to ensure that the Continuum can meet the requirements in the HEARTH Act and remain competitive. Although the CoC is strong, there are many new requirements and additional capacity is needed to meet not only the requirements but to ensure that the CoC is performing in the top ten percent of Continua across the country. Ms. Mead concluded her report and opened the topic for discussion.

DRAFT

Darlene Newsom, UMOM, noted that the planning tool was never meant to be used for SSO projects. She added that the UMOM child care center received points for attending this meeting and entering data in HMIS; however, it received no points as an educational center. Information to score the project was not available as it was never meant to be used for SSO; it was intended as a pilot. Ms. Newsom added that the project does not have good performance data as they have never monitored the project.

Additionally, the project received no points for employment as information was not available on the number of parents at the child care center who are employed. She noted this as an example of how the tool was an unfair measure used to score projects, specifically for a child care center. She added that for other SSO projects that scored low, it does not mean they are low performing, but that the tool used is not relevant. Chair Osborne noted that it has been apparent to all that this is one of the issues to address moving forward.

Amy Schwabenlender, Valley of the Sun United Way, advised that the working group had requested a budget for the CoC planning, but did not have consensus of where it would fall within the tiers. She expressed concern with planning funds being ranked above projects that fall into Tier Two. Additionally, she noted conversations regarding SSO projects and the group's understanding that they were following HUDs recommendation of PH, TH, and SSO. Ms. Schwabenlender added that there was no agreement on the seven projects being comparable to each other and noted it is unfair to list them in a priority order based on scores.

Nick Margiotta, City of Phoenix Police Department, congratulated the Committee on their efforts adding that the CoC is moving in the right direction. Funding should be used to serve the community in the most effective manner and as such, the CoC has a responsibility to the community to ensure the best service with the best outcome. He added the new process is difficult because of the nature of automatic renewals. He noted this positive change will help generate performance improvement and eliminate programs that may not be performing. He recommended keeping in mind what HUD wants because if the CoC loses ranking as a national Continuum, the projects will not be funded. He commented that SSO projects always seem to hurt the Continuum's score and although they are important, they don't fall in line with HUD's direction.

Mr. Margiotta questioned with regard to HMIS, if there are different levels of privacy requirements and whether or not that has been part of the challenge. Ms. Mead advised SSO projects are still required to report in HMIS and there are other projects that serve that same population.

DRAFT

Jacki Taylor, Save the Family, commented that an objective scoring mechanism is needed to be able to accurately score projects. She expressed the need for an appeal process for those organizations that perceive they have not been scored fairly.

Ted Williams, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation, agreed on the need for an appeal process. He noted ABC had grants that were identical, but were scored very differently. He gave the example of one project that received zero points for disabilities, yet everyone in the grant is seriously mentally ill (SMI). He noted that while an objective process is needed, there is also a need to train the people who are scoring to do so in a consistent manner. Ms. Mead noted that the performance is being measured through a report created in HMIS. Therefore, everyone is measured against the same factors, but it also indicates that data quality in HMIS is what is being measured rather than project performance. She added more work is needed on the scoring tool.

Libby Bissa, Phoenix Family Advocacy Center, noted the CoC planning funds seem high but noted there are no other program at that level for funding and administration overseeing funding. SSO programs are not adequately evaluated by the tool however, she added if the belief is that the PSH or TH is adequately evaluated, is it not to the CoC's benefit to consider that really low performing PH should be below an SSO project. She noted HUD looks at PH as a higher priority, but questioned if they would look at that as a high priority when it is low performing as compared to something that is in support of and equally as important.

Donna Bleyle, Arizona Department of Economic Security, recommended omitting the SSO projects because the scoring tool is not applicable. She noted while an appeal process is needed, it would be difficult to do so within the timeframe. Ms. Bleyle also questioned who is ultimately responsible for data quality. She suggested a need for greater emphasis on training new hires and explaining the consequences of their actions in HMIS.

Vice Chair Hartke inquired about the timeline. Ms. Mead advised applications are due by Friday, January 18. Vice Chair Hartke noted that while appeals might be admirable, the project listing requires a decision be made by the Committee. Ms. Mead confirmed a decision on the project listing is needed. She noted that implementation of an appeal process can be done, including a revised scoring tool, and meetings with programs to help them improve their process. However, this could not be done with enough time to impact the current process.

Ms. Newsome commented that utilization data previously requested was not available. She added utilization and leverage plays a part in that it helps the score and overall Continuum if taken into consideration. Ms. Newsome expressed that she has strong ethical issues with SSO projects being scored with a tool that has nothing to do with what is being scored. She

DRAFT

said it is difficult to have UMOM scored as low performing as it is a top notch child care center that was scored with an irrelevant tool.

Joan Serviss, Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness, expressed agreement with the discussion on SSO projects and the need for an appeal process. However, she requested feedback from those who attended the working group meeting given that there were changes made to the priority listing since their meeting was held.

Ms. Taylor responded noting the requirement for additional dollars was unknown at the time of the meeting and that it was an anomaly that no one anticipated and therefore could not plan for. Ms. Schwabenlender added that the working group did not have the information available to them at the time of the meeting. However, she added that given the direction of the conversation, the group would have found another way to identify projects to move to Tier Two. She added that the working group spoke in great depth about the tool not being able to score SSO projects equitably. She added that there is no reason to believe an accredited child car center is low performing and that from United Way's perspective it is not a low performing project.

Ms. Taylor noted there was one other project not compliant with the grant application process due to missing data. She expressed difficulty justifying funding for that project when two projects were bumped specifically for not participating in HMIS. She noted projects that are not submitting the data are not participating in HMIS. The project total was more than $500,000 which more than compensates for the additional $416,000 required to be added back into the funding.

Linda Mushkatel, Maricopa County, inquired whether there are secondary evaluators from other funding sources, such as DES or United Way, that conduct programmatic evaluations that could be reviewed to support a ranking among SSO projects. Ms. Schwabenlender advised Valley of the Sun United Way invests in all seven of the agencies in question. The only exception may be Phoenix Shante as a self-determination project. However, she noted VSUW would not compare the list of seven agencies against each other. For example, the CONTACS hotline would not be evaluated against a child care program.

Ms. Mead agreed it is difficult to compare projects adding that more work is needed to develop tool that better measures the programs. Ms. Mushkatel clarified that her suggestion was not to compare projects but rather to review whether or not they were meeting utilization and programmatically whether they were meeting some criteria at some level of outcome. Chair Osborne noted the availability of additional information may be considered for future reference. She noted the CoC is a high performing, highly regarded CoC and as such, there is the possibility of receiving all the requested funding. However, given the timeframe, the

DRAFT

Committee will have to make a decision and move forward. Mr. Margiotta commented these are exciting times to be having such conversations noting that the conversation will be much different next year. With regard to the SSO projects, he posed the question of whether each is a valid service that would be "bought" in today's environment.

Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections, Inc., noted one of their permanent supportive housing projects is not included in the list. Ms. Mead confirmed the project is not included as it has been operating for less than one year. Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing, reminded the Committee that over the last 10 years, HUD has been drawing away from SSO projects. She stressed that SSO programs are not a priority with HUD as they do not include housing. Chair Osborne requested clarification regarding domestic violence projects entering data into HMIS. Ms. Mead advised domestic violence shelters are prohibited by HUD from entering data into HMIS.

Joan Serviss, Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness, requested further clarification on the increases related to FMR and SPC. Ms. Mead noted these issues were not discussed at the working group meeting. She added that she had not realized it would impact the funding as she was looking at the amount funded in previous competitions, not taking into consideration the additional increases. Leasing grants have always received a certain amount from HUD to operate a certain number of units. To become compliant under HEARTH, they moved from leasing to rent assistance and as such, are required to meet the FMR amount which increases renewal demand. Ms. Basta advised that FMRs have increased since most of the projects were originally funded. In SPC grants, admin used to be taken out of the rent assistance line item however, they now have to add in an admin line to be able to provide admin support for those grants. Therefore, the five percent that was factored in, similar to admin for other grants, created the additional increase for SPC.

Ms. Newsome questioned whether the percentage of transitional housing programs in the Continuum hurt the CoC. Ms. Mead advised the percentage does not hurt the CoC, however the performance of those transitional housing programs could hurt the CoC. Ms. Newsome noted there is a very small amount of funding dedicated to SSO programs.

Ms. Bleyle asked for further clarification on how the FMR increase is determined. Ms. Mead advised that the nine leasing grants were funded many years ago at a certain dollar amount to provide leasing to a certain number of units. They have now transitioned to become rent assistance grants and must become compliant with FMR. The FMR has increased from the time the grant was initially funded.

Ted Williams, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation, noted their grants always have to demonstrate FMR. The experience has been that there are some units under FMR and some

DRAFT

over FMR, because of this, the programs are able to serve more people that what is required. Ms. Basta noted that rents fluctuate, but in terms of the FMR increase, it is based on formula. Ms. Mead noted the SPC grants, in the past, received rent assistance dollars. Their annual renewal amount changed each year based on FMR. Now that the leasing grants have transferred into the rent assistance component type, their renewal amount will change as well based on FMR.

Ms. Taylor noted that the working group felt very strongly that the two agencies that were not reporting in HMIS should be put in Tier Two. She noted one scored at 46 and the other scored 32 which is below the threshold. She expressed difficulty justifying how ranking an agency that scored the lowest score (19) in both PS and TH can be placed in Tier 1. She added that the reason the program scored low was for failure to report data. Ms. Mead confirmed there was some data that was not provided however, she noted the application was completed. She noted there were also other reasons why this particular project scored low.

Ms. Taylor noted this issue may be irrelevant because the CoC is in fact a high scoring Continuum. However, the CoC has to move forward with a recommendation based on some objectivity. She questioned how both rationally or ethically, a project that has scored extremely low can be included in Tier One when there are two other projects that have scored much higher who did not report in HMIS. She expressed strong belief that lack of data is lack of data.

Chair Osborne advised the audience will be allowed to comment after the Continuum concludes discussion. Michael McQuaid, Human Services Campus, commented that not having an equitable manner in which to assess SSO projects is a real issue. He recommended discussing whether or not to make changes to the priority listing given that a decision is needed.

Catherine Rae Dunning, Community Information and Referral, noted the Committee acknowledges that the performance tool is not an accurate reflection of SSO projects, but most agree that it is a fairly good tool. Given the priorities recommended, Ms. Dunning recalled HUDs priorities for programs in Tier Two is that programs meet the needs and gaps of the Continuum, but is low performing and low priority. Ms. Dunning recommended looking at those programs that are low performing PH (two programs), low performing TH (four programs) and the two programs that did not enter data into HMIS which are also low performing.

Clarification was requested on the admin funding for SPC grants. Mr. Williams advised admin funding was previously included but was not identified as a separate line item as it is now. Ms. Mead noted however that the renewal request has increased due to adding the

DRAFT

additional line item. Ms. Basta advised SPC admin was drawn from what the tenants paid in rent and that could only be drawn if there was a high percentage of tenants paying rent. Programs were only able to receive more admin if there were more tenants who were able to pay 30 percent of their income. The programs now are all CoC and separate line item is available for admin funding. Chair Osborne opened the meeting for public comment.

Karen Kurtz, Community Bridges, addressed the Committee regarding the issue of identifying a proposal as low performing. She advised there was information that was not previously provided to the work group; otherwise the issue could have been addressed at that time. She added that discrepancies in the scores were found. One such discrepancy was that none of the clients were identified as mentally ill when in fact all of the clients are both mentally ill and have substance abuse. Had this not been a discrepancy, the project's score would have been raised by five points to a score of 37. Ms. Kurtz expressed her belief that it is inappropriate to rank projects using a tool that was not accurately applied. She requested the Committee take this into consideration and offered to provide data to prove the scores were inaccurate in areas related to training and number of meetings attended. She expressed agreement with the need to measure performance but that it needs to be done accurately.

Nicky Stevens, ABC Housing, also addressed the issue of discrepancies in the scores. She inquired whether a check and balance is in place to ensure accuracy. Ms. Mead advised the tool was developed this year and that there are intentions of going back to check the scores. However, because of the timeframe, this has not been accomplished within this year's process. Ms. Mead noted a check and balance was included within the evaluation guidelines.

Terry Leveton, NOVA Safe Haven, spoke not as an agency representative, but as a member of the working group. She expressed agreement with Ms. Taylor's comment about some of the programs specifically in regard to one project whose request is for more than half million funding and is the lowest scored project. She also noted that if there are PH projects that are moved from Tier One to Tier Two, this could negatively impact the entire continuum score. She asked that these to items be taken into consideration. Finally, she requested that the CoC define a way to measure those programs that are considered low performance, not support services, but others that are applicable, so that they are expected to raise their scores in time for next year's funding process.

Dottie O'Connell, Chicanos por la Causa, provided a brief overview of the clients served by CPLC. She said the program will always be low performing in terms of outcomes because they are a 100 bed domestic violence shelter in which 58 beds are crisis and 42 are transitional living which includes children. There is almost 2/3 as many children as there are women. CPLC reports according to number of beds. The number of women who are being sent to work force or permanent housing will always be very low. As an organization,

DRAFT

CPLC is committed to the Latino population. Familia is one of the most important things and many women would never leave their abuser if they had to leave their children. Ms. O'Connell noted there are at time up to four to six children with a woman. Those take up a huge portion of the transitional living beds. Also under Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), women coming into shelter are protected. CPLC works with them to obtain proper documentation, but the priority is their safety. She noted that the reality is in this political and economic climate there are huge issues and CPLC will never be overachieving in this area yet always remains in full capacity.

Brad Bridwell, Cloud Break Communities, clarified that Cloud Break receives no funding from the Continuum. However, he commented that it is unfortunate that a formula is driving a significant cost increase to a Continuum that is struggling to figure out how to retain and prioritize projects. He commented that due to ABC's efficiency, more homeless individuals will likely be served through the grants. Mr. Williams added the program consistently served 300+ more folks than required.

Mr. Bridwell suggested reviewing the admin to determine if there is a way to keep the admin where it was instead of applying the five percent formula. He expressed agreement with Mr. Margiotta's comments about moving in the right direction adding that the CoC has been moving slowly and should have been doing this three to four years ago. He noted the SSO portion of the equation is an important discussion. He recommended researching whether SSO programs are having a broad continuum impact or if they are benefitting a singular agency. He noted child care has a huge impact on homeless families getting back to work. He suggested possibly reallocating some of those programs to serve across the continuum and the importance of structuring going forward.

Tom Hutchinson, A New Leaf Faith House and East Valley Men's Center, advised Faith House is a domestic violence shelter with 64 beds in 16 units. Their transitional housing serves primarily domestic violence victims and families; primarily children. There are currently 11 units occupied. The remaining have been under reconstruction for the last two quarters. Mr. Hutchinson noted the need to resolve the HMIS issues in terms of providing information. He stressed that reductions would harm the program in terms of the volume of women and children they would be able to serve. Additionally, Faith House has established a Maricopa County Workforce access point at the site to assist with employment issues. Given the changes underway, the program should begin to see improvements.

Ms. Dunning noted the performance review report is not a good indicator for SSO projects but noted that it was based on an annual performance report generated by the programs themselves. She also noted that moving programs that are low performing into Tier Two does not indicate they will be de-funded. Because the CoC is high performing, they will

most likely be fully funded. Ms. Mead agreed the chances of being fully funded are high but the reality is that the outcome is uncertain.

Chris Tompkins, Tumbleweed Youth Development Center, commented the measurement tool is not applied well to an organization like Tumbleweed that is a SSO. He questioned how the CoC will address youth nothing that the tool has scored the program low. Additionally, he questioned why one youth center was rated low performing while the other was not. He added it would be a very significant loss to homeless youth in the community to lose funding for these programs.

Mr. Margiotta advised he has served on the continuum for several years. He noted this meeting as one of the best meetings he's ever attended adding that the CoC is taking leadership on decisions that will hopefully lead to performance improvement in future years. He added these are the types of conversations the CoC needs and should be having. Mr. Margiotta made a motion to move the lowest scoring transitional housing program to Tier Two just above the Area Agency on Aging projects in Tier Two.

Chair Osborn noted the motion to move the lowest performing TH program to Tier Two. Understating also that in discussion that will be moving forward, the CoC will consider different performance measurements for SSO. She reminded the Committee that if they have an item on the list, they must recuse themselves from the vote. Clarification was requested on whether it would be a conflict of interest. Ms. Mead confirmed noting the process in the past has been that if an agency's project is being voted on for funding, they must recuse. Mr. McQuaid seconded the motion.

Ms. Bleyle suggested the vote be conducted by roll call as many of those in attendance would not be able to vote on the motion. Chair Osborne confirmed the Committee had quorum regardless of who has to be recused from the vote.

The following votes were taken:

In favor of the motion:	Recused from vote:
Donna Bleyle	Catherine Rea Dunning
Kevin Hartke	Cheryl Belcher
Linda Mushkatel	Darlene Newsom
Libby Bissa	Diana Yazzie Devine
Frank Migali	Jacki Taylor
Amy Schwabenlender	Joan Serviss
Joanne Osborne	Karia Basta
Michael McQuaid	Tammy Albright
Gina Ramos Montes	Ted Williams

DRAFT

Nick Margiotta	
Rick Buss	
Sean Price	
Shana Ellis	
Theresa James	
Trish Georgeff	

A question was raised on whether or not Mr. Margiotta, as a Board Member of ABC, would need to recuse and whether or not he is allowed to make a motion. Ms. Mead advised that if an agency is listed as a project, the representative needs to recuse. She advised MAG had not previously identified that board members need to recuse. Chair Osborne advised that the motion will stand. She thanked the Committee for their great discussion and hard work. Chair Osborne requested Ms. Mead update the spreadsheet and redistribute the results to the CoC.

5. 2012 Point-In-Time (PIT) Homeless Street an Shelter Count

Ms. Mead advised the PIT Street and Shelter Count is scheduled for Jan 29 and 30. She acknowledged the Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness for having the volunteer registration on their website. There is still a need for volunteers. She recommended forwarding the registration information to distribution lists and also asked that Committee Members also consider volunteering.

Ms. Mead advised this is the first year using the new methodology. Discussion will be held after the count to review the methodology, data collected and overall numbers. Ms. Mead requested agencies notify her of any locations / hot spots within their communities to be included in the street count. She noted several trainings are planned over the next week and expressed gratitude to everyone involved in planning efforts.

Ms. Schwabenlender asked if the CoC has prepared a communication plan for a media advisory. Ms. Mead advised further discussion will be held prior to issuing a press release. She noted due to the extended survey questions, it may take longer to collect the data. However, once available, data will first be shared with the Planning Subcommittee and the Continuum of Care prior to issuing a press release.

6. 2013 Committee Meeting Schedule and Goal Setting

Ms. Mead advised this item was addressed during the previous meeting.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chair Osborne requested input on topics or issues of interest to consider for future agendas. She acknowledged providers for their efforts during the cold weather days to shelter people

DRAFT

and provide coats. She acknowledged a list of agencies that came together to try to help during the cold weather days. Chair Osborne requested as a future agenda item that Committee Members report on plans for cold relief efforts during exceptional days – similar to efforts during the summer months for the heat relief networks

8. Announcements

An opportunity was provided for Committee members to present a brief summary of current events. The Committee is 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.

Ms. Devine extended an invitation to attend the grand opening of Encanto Point on February 5, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. Encanto Point is 54 units of PSH located on Indian School and 9th street.

Trish Georgeff, Maricopa County Human Services Department advised the county is undertaking a process to look at closing the men's overflowed shelter. It is a collaborative process engaging partners from on campus and beyond and facilitated by the Corporation of Supported Housing. She advised they are researching not only how to close the shelter and the implications of doing so, but also how to improve access to housing.

Ms. Service advised it is the opening day of the Arizona State Legislature. She advised information on the legislative committee's meeting dates is available on the Coalition's website.

Ms. Schwabenlender thanked participants for their efforts on the Project Connect held at the Dysart Community Center in El Mirage. More than 120 people were assisted. The next Project Connect is scheduled for February 14th at North Hills Church on 19th Avenue and Greenway. She also advised that registration is live for Arizona Stand Down volunteers. The event will be held on March 8 – 10, 2013.

Ms. Mushkatel advised Trish Georgeff is retiring from the County. She has been a wonderful contributor to the community and the continuum and in serving vulnerable populations.

Mr. Williams advised ABC now has a contract with Magellan for 107 beds, and screening has begun.

9. Adjourn

DRAFT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:32 p.m. The next Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness is scheduled for March 18, 2013.

DRAFT