

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (MAG)  
CONTINUUM OF CARE REGIONAL COMMITTEE ON HOMELESSNESS

January 27, 2014

MAG Office Building, Saguaro Room

Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

\*Tammy Albright, City of Mesa  
KariaBasta, Arizona Department of Housing  
Libby Bissa, City of Phoenix Family Advocacy Center  
Donna Bleyle, Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES)  
\*Kathryn Brown, Arizona Department of Corrections  
Rick Buss, Town of Gila Bend, Town Manager  
Steve Capobres, Catholic Charities  
\*Kendra Cea, Arizona Public Service  
\*Michael Celaya, City of Surprise  
\*Krista Cornish, Town of Buckeye  
\*Shana Ellis, City of Tempe, Councilmember  
\*Kevin Hartke, City of Chandler, Councilmember, Chair  
\*Ian Hugh, City of Glendale, Councilmember  
\*Theresa James, City of Tempe  
Stephanie Knox, Magellan Health Services  
\*Nick Margiotta, Phoenix Police Department  
Michael McQuaid, Human Services Campus  
\*Frank Migali, Arizona Department of Education

\*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

#Attended by telephone conference call

+Attended by video conference.

Melissa Kovacs for Maricopa County Justice System Planning and Information  
Darlene Newsom, United Methodist Outreach Ministries (UMOM) New Day Center  
Sean Price, Arizona Department of Veterans Services  
\*Gina Ramos Montes, City of Avondale  
\*Christina Plante, City of Goodyear  
Catherine Rea, Community Information & Referral Services  
Amy Schwabenlender, Valley of the Sun United Way  
Joan Serviss, Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness  
Bruce Liggett, Maricopa County Human Services Department  
Jacki Taylor, Save the Family  
\*Margaret Trujillo, MG Trujillo Associates  
Ted Williams, Arizona Behavioral Health Corp.  
Thelda Williams, Councilmember, City of Phoenix, Vice Chair  
Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections

## OTHERS PRESENT

Chris Bartz, Recovery Innovations of Arizona  
Mike Bell, St. Vincent de Paul  
Billie Cawley, Central Arizona Shelter Services  
David Clitheroe, The Salvation Army  
Jay Cory, Phoenix Rescue Mission  
Tiffani Cullin-Johnson, Sojourner Center  
Mark Dobay, A New Leaf  
Kellee Ellis, Chrysalis  
#Cindy Ensign, City of Scottsdale  
Charlene Flaherty, Corporation for Supportive Housing  
Jason Gunby, Phoenix Rescue Mission  
Rosalie Hernandez, A New Leaf  
Tom Hutchinson, A New Leaf  
Miranda Jilek, Lifewell  
Karen Kurtz, Community Bridges  
Terri Leveton, NOVA Safe Haven  
Gilbert Lopez, City of Glendale  
Mattie Lord, UMOM  
Suzie Martin, Homeward Bound  
Kenneth McKinley, Tumbleweed  
Mary Alice McKone, The Salvation Army

Jim Medis, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation  
Barb Mikkelsen, DES Laura Peters, Labor's Community Service Agency (LCSA)  
Brian Petersen, HOM Inc.  
Kim Riley, Care Directions  
Jake Sedillo, LCSA  
Laura Skotnicki, Save the Family  
Barbara Sloan, Phoenix Rescue Mission  
Sharon Stephenson, City of Scottsdale  
Nicky Stevens, Arizona Behavioral Health Corp.  
Charles Sullivan, Arizona Behavioral Health Corp.  
Michelle Thomas, Community Information and Referral  
Keith Thompson, Phoenix Shanti  
Kimberly Thompson, Phoenix Shanti  
John Wall, Arizona Housing, Inc.  
#Christine Wudarski, Women in New Recovery  
  
Brandee Mead, MAG  
Amy St. Peter, MAG

### 1. Call to Order and Introductions

Councilmember Thelda Williams, City of Phoenix, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:36 p.m. Introductions of the Committee and audience ensued.

### 2. Call to the Audience

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

### 3. Approval of the November 18, 2013, Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness Meeting Minutes

A motion was requested to approve the November 18, 2013, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Amy Schwabenlender, Valley of the Sun United Way.

The motion was seconded by Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing. The motion passed.

4. Continuum of Care HEARTH Act Implementation Update: CoC Governance Charter

Vice Chair Williams welcomed Amy St. Peter, MAG, to offer an update on implementation of the governance charter. Ms. St. Peter acknowledged everyone who provided input on the CoC Governance Charter noting it is a living document that supports the work of the Continuum. Input received is essential to ensuring the charter is reflective of and responsive to the different stakeholders in the process. Ms. St. Peter advised the charter was reviewed and discussed during the previous CoC and Planning Subcommittee meetings and was also shared in draft form via email. Additional input was welcomed to ensure the best outcome for continued success.

Ms. St. Peter referenced the summary of changes and resolution advising that some of the suggested revisions were grammatical while others were technical. The goal is to gain consensus on the Charter enabling staff to submit the document with the Department of Housing and Urban Development application for funding. Ms. St. Peter advised the Committee would need to consider and take action on additional policy questions that remain. Ms. St. Peter proceeded with an overview of the document and suggested changes as noted below.

No	Section	Pg	Original Text	Requested Change	2 <sup>nd</sup> Requested Change	Resolution
1	Board membership selection	6	Membership Working Group will include current officers of CoC and Planning (before phased out) and up to four other people.	Membership Working Group will not include current officers of CoC or planning.	Keep original text.	Original text approved.

Language for the board membership selection and requested changes were reviewed. Ms. St. Peter clarified that the Planning Subcommittee is being phased out however, the current Chair of the Planning Subcommittee will remain as a member on the membership working group. The rationale is that individuals who have invested time in the Continuum may be in a good position to help establish the board and committee membership. A question was raised on whether the discussion referenced individuals or the agency. Ms. St. Peter clarified the membership does not follow the individual but noted the current discussion is referring to individuals. Discussion ensued regarding the current language versus the proposed change.

Ms. St. Peter referenced language in the Charter indicating that no agency should have membership on the board and the committee. Clarification was made noting the discussion at hand referenced the membership working group and not the CoC or board as a whole. Concern was expressed over not having members of the CoC or the board participating in the membership work group as those individuals would have knowledge of the Committee's efforts. Ms. St. Peter noted the concern speaks to the original language. Further input was requested pertaining to the revised language.

Jackie Taylor, Save the Family, made a motion to maintain the original language. Donna Bleyle, DES, seconded the motion. Clarification was requested on whether the membership work group is ongoing or is being created with a specific purpose. Ms. St. Peter clarified the purpose for the membership work group is to establish the CoC board membership. Having no further discussion, Ms. St. Peter confirmed the motion to retain the original language. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

2	Board membership selection	6	Membership Working Group will recommend Board members. CoC will vote on members of first Board.	Membership Working Group will vote on members of first Board.		Keep original text.
---	----------------------------	---	---	---	--	---------------------

Language for the board membership selection and recommended change was reviewed. It was noted that working groups generally make recommendations to the CoC for voting and, as such, it may make sense to keep this practice. A question was raised on whether a person who is recommended to be on the board can vote as a CoC member. Ms. St. Peter advised the individual should abstain from voting on his or her own membership. A recommendation was then made to include language that would clarify this point. There was consensus among the Committee to add clarifying language. Mike McQuaid, Human Services Campus, made a motion to maintain the original language with the clarification that individuals should abstain from voting for themselves. Ms. Taylor seconded the motion. The motion passed.

3	Board membership selection	7	Board members will serve staggered terms with 33 percent completing their terms every two years.	Board members will serve staggered terms with 33 percent completing their terms every year.	Board members will not have term limits.	Requested change approved.
<p>Ms. St. Peter reviewed the requested changes in terms of board member term limits. Ms. Taylor made a motion to approve the requested change. Ms. St. Peter requested clarified that the motion was for the first requested change - to have staggered terms ensuring membership terms are completed every three years. Donna Bleyle, Arizona Department of Economic Security, seconded the motion to approve the requested change. The motion passed.</p>						
4	Board leadership	7	Letters of interest will be invited to select Co-Chairs for the Board.	The current CoC Chair and Vice Chair will be the Board's first Co-Chairs. Letters of interest will be invited as the first Co-Chairs complete their terms.		Requested change approved.
<p>A review of the board leadership original text and requested change was provided. There was discussion regarding current term limits for the Chair and Vice Chair positions. It was noted for the purpose of continuity, it may be best to start the process after the Chair and Vice Chair have completed their terms. Ms. St. Peter noted the remaining term limits for the current chair and vice chair. Steve Capobres, Catholic Charities made a motion to accept the requested change. Mr. Williams requested clarification on language regarding two and four year terms for the co-chairs versus language on page eight of the charter referencing staggered years rotating off on even and odd years. Ms. St. Peter clarified the language regarding even and odd years pertains to the next set of officers. Ms. Bleyle seconded the motion. Vice Chair Williams abstained. The motion passed.</p>						
5	Board leadership	7-8	One Co-Chair will be an elected official. The other Co-Chair will represent a nonprofit agency member of the Board.	The other Co-Chair can represent a nonprofit or other relevant stakeholder.	The other Co-Chair will represent a nonprofit or relevant stakeholder and may also be an elected official. Employment is not a condition for representation.	Second requested change approved.
<p>The original text and two requested changes were reviewed. Ms. Taylor noted in reference to the</p>						

second recommended change that an elected official could be an employee of a nonprofit. She noted this is different from a nonprofit seeking an elected official to represent their agency. Ms. St. Peter noted the seconded requested change allows for an elected official representing a nonprofit when they do not necessarily work for the nonprofit.

Clarification was requested on language pertaining to “the same geography.” Ms. St. Peter advised the language refers to Maricopa County. Clarification was noted that a stakeholder may also be an appointed official. Ms. Taylor made a motion to maintain the original language. There was clarification that the recommendation would not exclude an elected official from representing a nonprofit, but that it could exclude any other stakeholder. Ms. Schwabenlender commented that the language regarding a nonprofit is limiting. Ms. Taylor withdrew the motion.

Mr. McQuaid made a motion to implement the first requested change. Ms. St. Peter clarified the first requested change precludes an elected official from representing a nonprofit or other stakeholder and asked for confirmation of the motion. Libby Bissa, City of Phoenix, expressed concern over limiting the potential participation of elected officials. Discussion ensued regarding clarification of the first and second requested changes.

Mr. McQuaid made a motion to adopt the first recommended change where the other co-chair can represent a nonprofit or other relevant stakeholder. Ms. St. Peter asked if the motion precludes elected officials. Mr. McQuaid responded not necessarily. Ms. St. Peter clarified her understanding of the motion follows the second recommended change of not precluding an elected official. Mr. McQuaid withdrew the motion.

Ms. Bissa made a motion to approve the second requested change. Ms. St. Peter advised this would open the co-chair position to a nonprofit or relevant stakeholder and not preclude an elected official of serving in that capacity at the request of a nonprofit or other relevant stakeholder. Mr. McQuaid seconded the motion. Vice Chair Williams and Diana Yazzie Devine abstained from the motion. The motion passed.

Mr. Williams referenced language pertaining to the two co-chairs serving staggered terms and inquired if they serve staggered terms with two and four years, how is it possible to rotate off on even and odd years. Ms. St. Peter noted that language would need to be corrected as long as the co-chairs rotate off on different years to ensure staggered terms.

6	Board meetings	8	Board will meet quarterly.	Board will meet bimonthly like the Committee.		<i>Requested change approved.</i>
---	----------------	---	----------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------

Ms. St. Peter reviewed the language and proposed change. Mr. Capobres inquired whether achieving quorum had been of any concern. Ms. Mead confirmed there have been no issues with achieving quorum. Rick Buss made a motion to implement the requested change for bimonthly meetings. Ms. Bissa seconded the motion. The motion passed.

7	Committee membership	9	Committee members will not have term limits.	Committee members will have three year staggered terms.	Keep original text.	<i>Requested change approved.</i>
---	----------------------	---	--	---	---------------------	-----------------------------------

Ms. St. Peter reviewed the recommended changes. Mr. Williams recalled previous discussion that

anyone who is a member of the Continuum would remain without need for membership terms. Ms. St. Peter confirmed there was consensus for that among the Planning Subcommittee. She noted the requested revision adds term limits for the CoC members. Ms. Bleyle noted confusion due to language pertaining to the membership working group “annually” reviewing committee membership. Ms. Mead advised that the HEARTH Act requires an annual review of membership.

Ms. Taylor noted the importance of determining if members are actually participating. Ms. Taylor made a motion to implement the first recommended change, thereby supporting the three year staggered term. Ms. Schwabenlender seconded the motion. Ms. Bissa expressed concern that the motion differs from the Planning Subcommittee discussion. She suggested starting with no term limits and having the annual review to then determine if a change is necessary. Mr. Williams noted if there is an annual review, there has to be some criteria in place for conducting the review. Audience member Charles Sullivan, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation addressed the Committee commented that staggered terms become very complicated and recommending the original text be maintained. Mr. Sullivan advised that the Planning Subcommittee had discussed having funded providers on the committee along with other agencies that also need to be represented. He suggested staggered terms may be necessary for the non-funded agencies. He also noted prior discussion that the membership work group is a one-time only group to establish the board and therefore could not do annual reviews.

Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections, noted the broader discussion included having everyone who was funded represented on the committee. She recommended not making changes without having further discussion and noted the review may focus on attendance and whether an individual is still representing the agency. Ms. Bleyle inquired how quorum would be established. Ms. St. Peter noted both the board and committee would operate according to open meeting law and an established membership list. Therefore quorum would be determined by a simple majority.

Ms. Schwabenlender acknowledged the Planning Subcommittee and future workgroups for their efforts moving the work forward and bringing these issues to the broader continuum. She noted the need for clarifying language about the size of the committee and whether all funded partners will have a seat on the committee. Additionally, she noted the difficulty in assessing the terms without having language that clarifies the purpose of the committee. Ms. St. Peter stated there had not been a lot of consensus for setting a size limit for the committee nor was there consensus from the Planning Subcommittee for having term limits. She noted requests were later submitted for the committee to consider having three year staggered term limits. She acknowledged difficulty to determine the size of the Committee if the role remains unclear. Further discussion ensued regarding establishing quorum based on the membership.

Laura Peters, Labor’s Community Service Agency, addressed the committee regarding discussion among the Planning Subcommittee noting agencies are already being graded for participating in the CoC as a method of maintaining accountability for attendance. Ms. St. Peter noted attendance may refer to participation either as a committee member or an audience member. Ms. Bissa raised a question on staggered term limits and the affect it will have on smaller agencies not represented for a period of time because of the staggered terms. Additionally, with regard to purpose, she noted the flow chart states the purpose as carrying out HEARTH requirements.

Ms. Taylor made a motion for the recommended change requiring three year term limits. Ms. Schwabendlender seconded the motion. Eleven Committee members voted in favor of the motion; six committee members voted against the motion: Mike McQuaid, Libby Bissa, Bruce Liggett, Catherine Rae, Diana Yazzie Devine, and Councilmember Thelda Williams. The motion passed. Clarification was requested on whether all funded providers will remain represented on the Committee. Ms. St. Peter clarified they will not be based on the action taken by the Committee. It was noted further clarification was needed on the agency membership versus the categories represented by each agency.

Ms. St. Peter advised a second motion can be taken addressing language that all HUD funded providers will have a seat on the CoC; the second issue is the clarification required. Mr. McQuaid requested clarification regarding the HUD required categories. He noted from the working group sessions, there had been agreement that anyone on the current CoC would indicate in writing if they would like to continue. He inquired who would make the final decision. Ms. St. Peter noted the membership working group would make the recommendation and the CoC would vote on the recommendation.

Ms. Bleyle suggested all current members can remain members until their term limits expire and funded providers can remain represented at all times. She suggested the intent is to be able to establish quorum and that can be done once the number of members is confirmed. Mr. Williams expressed his opinion that all funded programs should be on the Committee. Ms. St. Peter inquired how many HUD funded agencies are currently on the Committee. Ms. Mead advised there are 60 programs and 24 agencies. Ms. St. Peter noted as a point of reference, the Committee would be at least 60 people or more if non-funded programs have ongoing membership without term limits.

Ms. Mead noted in the membership selection process, members would submit letters of interest for membership on the committee. The collaborative applicant, MAG, would prepare the list of names and categories represented and provide that to the membership working group who would then recommend the composition. Ms. St. Peter noted prior discussion from the Planning Subcommittee that an agency can serve in more than one category. Input was requested on a motion or consensus regarding having HUD funded agencies on the committee. Mr. Williams made a motion to have on-going seats for all HUD funded programs. Ms. Mead noted one agency may have multiple programs. Ms. Devine recommended having the motion applicable to each HUD funded agency rather than every program. Ms. St. Peter inquired whether the motion is open for amendment to change it from programs to agencies. Mr. Williams noted difficulty having one person represent multiple programs. He noted it would not be representative to have one person per agency. Mr. Williams requested not changing his original motion. A second on the motion was not received.

Ms. Devine made a motion to have all HUD funded agencies to have a continuing seat on the committee. Mr. McQuaid seconded the motion. Clarification was requested on whether staggered term limits would be applicable. Ms. Schwabendlender clarified that HUD McKinney-Vento programs would have an automatic seat however; there are other agencies for which term limits would be applicable. Ms. St. Peter confirmed term limits would not be applicable to HUD funded agencies. Other members of the CoC would have term limits.

Discussion ensued regarding the various types of programs represented on the Committee. Ms. St. Peter noted as clarification, on page nine, the different categories are listed. She noted the motion, if

<p>not a HUD funded agency, can serve on the Committee under one of the other categories. Ms. Mead inquired whether the grantee would represent the agency on the Committee. Ms. Bissa noted issues arise with regard to the three year staggered terms. Ms. Devine amended the motion to state that all HUD funded agencies that chose to submit a letter of membership would have an seat on the committee. Mr. McQuaid seconded the amended motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed</p>						
8	Committee membership	10	The Membership Working Group will annually review Committee membership and recommend any changes to membership.	The Membership Working Group will also annually recommend Committee size.		<i>Requested change approved.</i>
<p>Ms. St. Peter reviewed the requested change. Clarification was requested on whether the membership working group would be actively recruiting new members. Ms. St. Peter advised their level of involvement would be up to the Committee. A question was raised on whether this is the same working group that established the board or a new working group. Ms. St. Peter advised this would be a new working group established by the Committee. Ms. Bissa, City of Phoenix, made a motion to implement the requested change for the membership working group to also recommend committee size. Bruce Liggett, Maricopa County, seconded the motion. The motion passed.</p>						
9	Monitoring Outcomes of ESG Recipients	12-13	Board will monitor and give feedback to ESG recipients on allocation of funds, performance and evaluation.	Board will consult and coordinate with ESG recipients to assess needs for preventing and ending homelessness.		<i>Requested change approved.</i>
<p>Ms. St. Peter reviewed the original and suggested changes. It was noted the requested change does not preclude monitoring but enhances the process. Ms. St. Peter confirmed the revised language changes it from strictly monitoring to a collaborative coordination. A question was raised on how to create accountability or enforcement of ESG participants to participate. Ms. St. Peter noted the HEARTH act requires the CoC to coordinate with the ESG and also requires ESG recipients to coordinate with the CoC. Ms. Taylor expressed concern that historically, the CoC has not been able to monitor activity. She recommended applying the requested change to allow flexibility to not only monitoring but to consult and coordinate. Ms. St. Peter noted page 13 outlines the steps and provided a brief overview. Ms. Bleyle noted one method to facilitate monitoring would be for the agency that applies to be required to provide certification from their CoC stating the proposals meets with the CoC's objective. Ms. Bissa made a motion to implement the revised language. Jacki Taylor seconded the motion. The motion passed.</p>						

Ms. St. Peter requested input on further changes and/or clarification required. Catherine Rae noted on page three, of the organization chart, the HMIS advisory group voted to combine

the data quality group and user group into one monthly advisory group. This was due to most of the staggered meetings being attended by the same individuals.

Ms. St. Peter advised the document as a whole requires a motion. She provided an overview of the action taken on each item. Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing, made a motion to approve the document with the changes as noted. Rick Buss, Town of Gila Bend, seconded the motion. The motion passed.

#### 5. Approval of FY 2013 HUD Continuum of Care Program Funding Recommendations

Vice Chair Williams welcomed Ms. Mead to present on the funding recommendations. Ms. Mead provided an overview of the process to determine the rankings. She advised the ranking and review panel consisted of five non Continuum of Care members including Ms. Mead, Amy Schwabenlender, Sean Price, Libby Bissa and Theresa James.

Ms. Mead advised the project listing recommendation is a result of a three phase process and proceeded with a brief overview of each phase.

- Phase one was a self-score sheet. All renewal project applicants were asked to complete and submit a self-score sheet using data from HMIS and their annual performance report (APR). Domestic violence providers completed the self-score sheet using their APR.
- Phase two required all project applications to present an overview of the project, discuss the self-score sheet and address questions from the panel. Ms. Mead provided an overview of the questions. Presentations were scored on the presentation and responses to the questions.
- Phase three required the ranking and review panel to meet and discuss the projects self-score and to review and recommend project listings per HUDs priority listing recommendations.

Ms. Mead noted recommendations presented take into account all three phases of the ranking and review process. In addition to renewal projects, Ms. Mead noted there were four projects listed as new projects. These projects reallocated from one program type to another. Ms. Mead noted these are not reflective of new dollars but that the projects are using their renewal funds in a new way. The reallocated projects were also scored and the scores for the reallocated new projects were based on the application responses submitted in the electronic application system. They were also required to present to the panel on their project.

Per the CoC recommendation, the panel grouped projects in HUD's priority listing for the tier one listing. Ms. Mead advised that HUD's project selection priorities are permanent housing renewal, followed by permanent supported housing reallocated or new projects, followed by rapid rehousing then transitional housing, CoC planning, HMIS and all other SSO projects. She noted HUD will fund projects in the order provided.

The CoC has an annual renewal demand of \$26,496,714. The threshold for tier one projects is \$25,324,999. The decision to list projects in tier two was based on a full ranking and review process. Ms. Mead noted all SSO projects are listed in tier two as they are HUDs lowest priority for funding. Tier two listing was based on a combination of factors including project self-score, presentation score, how the agency responded to questions during presentation, program compliance factors, eligible use of CoC funding and other factors. Ms. Mead advised she will follow up with each of the projects in tier two to provide specific information on why they placed in tier two.

Ms. Mead restated that the project listing is a result of detailed review process noting it was not easy to make funding recommendations knowing there could be potential funding reductions. Ms. Mead thanked all of the applicants and ranking and review panel for their time and effort. The project listing was presented for action.

A question was raised on reverted funds. Ms. Mead advised all projects were asked to report on reverted funds and noted the amount of reverted funds that the Continuum has is less than one percent and not a factor in the ranking decision.

A question was raised by an audience member requesting clarification of which projects were in tier two. Ms. Mead advised the threshold for the projects would be at \$25.3 noting tier two began with the Recovery Innovations of Arizona (RIAZ) project Another Chance. Clarification was further requested on projects that fall between tier one and two. Ms. Basta clarified the NOFA states that if a project falls between tier one and tier two, it will be placed in tier two. Audience member Charles Sullivan, noted RIAZ had requested the self-score be reviewed. He noted there was some misinterpretation on the self-score by RIAZ staff and the score could be changed by 21 points moving them from 74 to 95. Additionally, he cautioned against not placing a \$1.2 million project below the funding line when the majority of the funding could be funded if placed in Tier one.

Ms. Bissa requested clarification on whether funding reductions are made starting from the bottom of the list. Ms. Mead clarified HUD will first score the CoC as a whole, and then they would fund all projects based on the scoring of the COC beginning with the first project in Tier one and move down the project list in the funding order listed in the NOFA. Then they would move to Tier two and so forth. HUD would not cut programs starting from the bottom of the list.

Mr. Williams acknowledged comments by Mr. Sullivan noting this information had just been received and there may be others who also had issues with scoring. He inquired if the CoC has time to review the scoring concerns and if there would be a process to be able to do that as it may affect the reprioritization of these projects. Ms. Mead advised that she has concerns with this because of timing as the HUD application is due on Monday. The goal is to submit the application by Friday. She noted a decision from the Continuum is needed on the project listing as it is a required component of the HUD application. A question was raised concerning mathematical errors made by RIAZ in the project self-score sheet. Ms.

Mead noted that the project self-score was not the only reason the project was recommended in tier two and she referenced the three phase review process.

Chris Bartz, Recovery Innovation, Another Chance Program, addressed the Committee noting that he had a conversation with Ms. Mead before the meeting regarding the issue with the score sheet. He noted the self-scoring tool makes up the majority of the points and mathematical errors by RIAZ are possible due to the interpretation of the scoring sheet. He noted that his original interpretation of the score sheet gave the Another Chance project a total of 74 points but a different interpretation of the score sheet gave them 94 points.

Ms. Schwabendlender advised the score was just one piece of information. Additionally, because there were points in the presentation score, the weighting was very much in favor of the points in the self-score but did not create the only reason as to how the committee ranked the projects. She noted, as had been previously mentioned, that there were other concerns with the program, that the HUD office had at times raised concern over the project, and that there were concerns about how the agency was spending the grant. These were other reasons that caused the project to be ranked lower on the project list. Mr. Sullivan expressed his understanding, but reiterated his point on putting such large program into tier leaves a gap of around \$200,000 that could still be placed in tier one.

Ms. Schwabendlender noted the Another Chance program has the most likelihood of being funded in tier two before any other program because it is listed first in tier two. Mr. Sullivan stated that if the funding from HUD does not reach tier two based on the Continuum's score in the national ranking because they run out of funding, the CoC has just placed an extra \$1 million in tier two that could potentially not get funded. Ms. Schwabendlender noted a great deal of time was spent trying to determine another ranking list that reflected the priorities of HUD and of the community. She commented as a member of the review panel another option was not available. Mr. Price, Arizona Department of Veteran Services, commented the project was placed in tier two because of the presentation, the scores and other reasons and it would be unfair to move projects around.

Catherine Rae, Community Information and Referral (CIR), noted some programs in tier two are not low performing programs at all but noted that SSO projects are in tier two because they are not a HUD priority. She noted that the CONTACS shelter hotline, which all of the projects use for shelter referral, is one of the lowest scored programs and there are no alternative funding options available. Vice Chair Williams thanked Ms. Rae for her input noting the importance of her comments.

Michelle Thomas, CIR, inquired if the self-scoring tool scores were taken directly from how the agencies scored themselves or was there comparison to the actual APRs and HMIS data submitted. Ms. Mead advised the ranking and review panel used the self-score that was submitted by the agency for each project. Changes were not made to those scores due to an APR review. Ms. Bissa noted there were some changes made during the presentation when the panel realized, through the discussion, some areas that were miss-scored. She added that more often than not, scores increased rather than decreased. It was noted that changes were made within the presentation times and not before or after the agency presentation.

Ms. Mead advised the panel will follow up with each project listed in tier two. She advised a detailed list of reasons is available for those project listed in tier two.

Ms. St. Peter inquired if during the previous year, the Continuum of Care had assessed the ranking and review process and if so, would that happen again this year. Ms. Mead confirmed. Ms. St. Peter advised that if there are concerns, the panel is open to and welcomes feedback or ideas to help improve the process. Input received can be considered by the Committee for the next process.

Diana Yazzie Devine noted Area Agency on Aging provides HIV case management to HIV residents at one of their facilities. This project is listed in tier two. She noted it is a fairly small amount but expressed hope that the panel reviewed the impact it would have on programs that would were going to be funded that would lose a significant part of medical case management. Vice Chair Williams noted that was one of the challenges the Continuum knew it would face due to the changing regulations. Ms. Rae noted that Area Agency on Aging was in tier two last year because of HMIS non-compliance and still had not entered data into HMIS.

Vice Chair Williams noted the community values all of the programs in the community, but with changes to HUD this year, she applauded members of the Committee that went through this process knowing how difficult it would be.

Mr. McQuaid acknowledged the Committee for their work noting difficult decisions affect different programs and organization. He commented the individuals involved did it fairly and arbitrarily and reminded everyone that all tier two projects were funded last year. Mr. McQuaid made a motion to approve the list of application schedule as presented. Ms. Bleyle, DES, seconded the motion. Vice Chair Williams reminded the Committee that any funded providers must abstain from voting on this item as it is a conflict of interest. The following recused themselves from the vote: Jacki Taylor, Save the Family; Catherine Rae, Community Information and Referral, Steve Capobres, Catholic Charities, Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections, Darlene Newsom, UMOM New Day Centers, The motion passed.

Ms. Schwabenlender noted not all SSO providers are in a position to repurpose or reallocate. She noted the Committee's appreciation to those that did because it converts dollars into permanent housing which is HUD's priority.

#### 6. Ad Hoc Working Group to Define Homeless Recidivism

Ms. Mead advised the HEARTH Act requires that each CoC collect and report data on homeless recidivism, or returns to homelessness. She advised that HUD has not defined what recidivism is but noted the need to begin collecting data on returns to homelessness. Ms. Mead advised that a suggestion was received to create an ad hoc working group that would be time limited and focused on the process locally define homeless recidivism and how it is measured in the community. This is on agenda today for possible approval to create a working group to help define that process.

Vice Chair asked if Ms. Mead will be taking the lead. Ms. Mead confirmed and advised she will also be seeking volunteers to assist. Ms. Bleyle inquired if HUD is in the process of defining recidivism. Ms. Mead advised HUD is in the process of proposing a definition, but the timeliness is unknown. She noted the process developed as a community would be in place until HUD issues a definition. At that point, the Continuum would need to realign the local definition to the federal definition. Ms. Bleyle cautioned against measuring data and then having to start over again.

Ms. Bleyle recommended working with the other two CoCs to develop a standard definition of recidivism. Ms. Mead advised she can reach out to the other CoCs and invite them to be part of that process.

A motion was required. Ms. Bissa, City of Phoenix made a motion, the motion was seconded by Ted Williams, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation. The motion passed.

#### 7. 2014 Homeless Point-in-Time Count

Ms. Mead advised the Point-in-Time count is taking place on Tuesday, January 28, 2014 from 6-9 a.m. She acknowledged street count coordinators across the region and thanked them for involvement. Ms. Mead advised volunteers have been identified and assigned to specific areas. In addition to the PIT, the shelter count will also be taking place. She noted a majority of shelter count data will come from HMIS. Agencies not reporting in HMIS will conduct a separate survey being issued to providers.

A question was raised on whether residential substance abuse programs been included in past. Ms. Mead advised a decision was made awhile back not to include these programs as they are not considered homeless programs as defined by HUD. Ms. Mead advised a new process for defining homeless veterans is in place this year. She noted volunteers have been trained to contact the Community Resource and Referral Center (CRRC) when a homeless Veteran has been identified. CRRC will then send staff to the location for additional follow-up and attempt to provide housing and or services.

Joan Serviss advised the survey team can continue conducting the count and do not have to wait for the outreach team that will have been dispatched to the location. The outreach team will take the Veteran to the CRRC to determine what eligible programs they are able to receive. Ms. Mead thanked the Coalition and members of the veterans group for their participation.

#### 8. Request for Future Agenda items

A request was made for an update on efforts to restore the state housing trust fund.

#### 9. Comments from the Committee

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. Serviss announced the Maricopa County StandDown will occur on February 14-16 at Veterans' Memorial Coliseum. There is an open call for volunteers. A victory celebration will be held on Saturday February 15 at 9 a.m. More information is available at [www.ArizonaStandDown.org](http://www.ArizonaStandDown.org). Information was also shared on the Mayor's Faith Forum scheduled for January 30<sup>th</sup>. The Coalition to End Homelessness and Arizona Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence will be working with the City of Phoenix to host the forum.

Mr. Williams advised that in the previous year, ABC put forth \$1.8 million in funding before they actually received the grant awards. This has been done for five to six years and ABC is anticipating having to put forth between three to four million dollars this year. Mr. Williams stated having to do this affects programs. ABC has contacted the Department of Housing and the Arizona Department of Health Services as much of the populations are served through the behavioral health system.

Mr. Williams noted that if programs expend funds with the expectation that they will be funded and in fact are not funded, they should not expect HUD to fill in that funding. He inquired whether the Continuum can assist in advocating for all programs to eliminate programs from having to fill in gap funding.

Vice Chair Williams advised the Committee cannot discuss nor take action on this item. She requested the topic be added to the next agenda item.

10. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m. The next Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness is scheduled for March 17, 2014.