

MINUTES OF THE
CONTINUUM OF CARE COMMITTEE
March 4, 2015

Maricopa Association of Governments Office Building, Chaparral Room

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing
David Bridge, Human Services Campus
Erin Callinan, Arizona Coalition Against Sexual
and Domestic Violence
Arjelia Gomez, Chicanos por La Causa
Joann Hatton, Arizona Department of Health
Services
Tom Hutchinson, A New Leaf
*Jessa Johnson, Mercy Maricopa Integrated Care
Stephanie Knox, Arizona Department of Housing
Karen Kurtz, Community Bridges
Mattie Lord, UMOM New Day Center
Nancy Marion, House of Refuge East
Suzie Martin, Homeward Bound
Ken McKinley, Tumbleweed
Linda Mushkatel, Lodestar Day Resource Center

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

OTHERS PRESENT

Libby Bissa, City of Phoenix
Kristina Blea, City of Phoenix
Kellee Ellis, Chrysalis
Davis Eolivarez, Terros
Catherine Rea, Community Information and
Referral (CIR)
Stephanie Shaw, Area Agency on Aging

*Dennis Newburn, City of Mesa
*Rodrigo Olivares, Crisis Response Network
John F. Scott II, MSW, United States Marine
Corps U.S. VETS-Phoenix
Sharon Shore, HOM Inc.
Billie Cawley, proxy for Ursula Strephans,
Central Arizona Shelter Services
Charles Sullivan, Arizona Behavioral Health
Corporation
#Jacki Taylor, Save The Family
Keith A. Thompson, Phoenix Shanti Group
*Kimberly Thompson, Labor's Community
Service Agency
John Wall, Arizona Housing Inc

Michelle Thomas, CIR please spell out all
acronyms the first time used
Amy Vogelsson, Southwest Behavioral Health
(SBH)
Will Vurkurich, House of Refuge
Brand Mead, MAG
Amy St. Peter, MAG

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Ms. Brande Mead, MAG, called the meeting to order at 9:35 A.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 the Committee, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. There were no comments from the audience.

3. Continuum of Care Committee: Roles and Responsibilities and Areas of Focus

Addressing the first order of business, Ms. Mead presented a brief history of the Continuum of Care (CoC), the breakdown of CoC Committee membership and the Committee's roles and responsibilities as outlined by the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act. She stated that the CoC has been at the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) since 1999, and since then, more than \$295 million have been secured in CoC funding. The Phoenix/Maricopa CoC received \$26 million in funding for 55 funded projects in 2015.

- 78 percent of the projects are Permanent Supportive Housing(PSH)
- 16 percent are Transitional Housing programs(TH)
- One Safe Haven project
- One HMIS project
- One CoC planning grant

Allocations for Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) are larger than usual. In previous Notice Of Funding Availability (NOFA) cycles, Transitional Housing (TH) programs have reallocated to PSH.

In the January 2014 Point-In-Time Homeless Street Count, there were 5,918 people counted in Maricopa County. Of that total, 43 percent were in Emergency Shelters, 39 percent in TH, and 18 percent were unsheltered. The 2014 street count was 1,053 people. The 2015 Point-In-Time Homeless Street Count was recently completed and the data will be complete by May 2015.

Ms. Mead advised that the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) released an interim rule in 2012 clearly defining the CoC's. The HEARTH Act does promote best practices that have recently emerged. The CoC is important because it helps the region to:

- Assess capacity
- Identify gaps in the community
- To develop solutions
- Identify common goals

- Increase access to mainstream resources
- Increase the competitive advantage to receiving funds
- Ensuring that the region has a comprehensive and collaborative process.

In 2014, the CoC approved the governance charter and in August 2014, the CoC Board was in place. Membership for the CoC Committee was approved in January 2015. The new governance structure is displayed below:

- CoC Board –make the decisions
- CoC Committee –carries out responsibilities of HEARTH Act, makes recommendations to the CoC Board.
 - The Committee has 24 members currently
 - Ad-Hoc stakeholders that meet on time-limited basis- as needed- with several stake holder groups currently meeting.

At the last CoC Board meeting there was a recommendation and approval to create a Performance Measurement and Standards Data Quality (PMSDQ) group. This group also reports to the CoC Board. The structure of the CoC Committee and PMSDQ group allows for both groups to work jointly or independently.

Currently, there is also an HMIS Advisory Group (user operations group) staffed by the HMIS lead agency, Community Information and Referral. Ms. Mead requested questions from the Committee. There were no questions or comments.

Ms. Mead proceeded to the HEARTH Act language and the role of the CoC Board outlined in the Governance Charter which was approved in January 2015. Ms. Mead explained that the Board acts on behalf of the CoC as the decision making group and makes decisions with input from the CoC Committee. The CoC Board has representatives of relevant organizations and projects representing homeless subpopulations throughout the region including one homeless or formerly homeless individual. The Board uses a written process that is reviewed, updated, and approved at least once every five years, and complies with conflict of interest requirements.

The role of the Committee, per the Governance Charter, is to make recommendations to the Board. Membership of the Committee includes representation of all the categories that are identified in the HEARTH Act by HUD. The intent is to be inclusive and representative given the diversity of the region. The HEARTH Act includes language on primary responsibilities of a CoC, and in the HEARTH Act the CoC is very broad. The CoC includes the entire homeless service delivery system in this region. The CoC must designate and operate an HMIS, ensure that Continuum of Care planning is taking place and that applications are submitted annually for CoC program funding.

Operating activities under the HEARTH Act require the following:

- Indicating that the CoC must consult with Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) out recipients on performance

- Evaluating outcomes
- Taking action against poor performers
- Evaluating and reporting to HUD on ESG and CoC projects
- Implement a coordinated entry-which is now referred to a Coordinated Access System
- Establish and follow written standards for providing CoC assistance

In the HEARTH Act, HMIS activities governed by the CoC are described as follows:

- A single HMIS must be designated
- Recipient and sub-recipients participation in HMIS must be monitored
- Review and approve privacy and security data quality plans
- Ensure HMIS is in compliance with HUD regulations

There are CoC planning activities identified in the HEARTH Act indicating that the CoC should:

- Coordinate implementation of a housing and services system within the geographic area
- Conduct an annual Point-In Time Homeless Street Count
- Conduct an annual Gaps Analysis
- Provide information to complete consolidated plans - for the municipalities throughout the region that are required to submit a consolidated plan each year
- Consult with ESG recipients regarding the allocation of funding, performance, and evaluation.

Additional planning items include:

- The HEARTH Act indicates that the CoC should have a plan that describes the number of people that become homeless
- How those numbers will be reduced
- How the length of time that persons remain homeless will be reduced
- How the recipient of CoC funds will collaborate with local education authorities to assist in identifying persons who become or remain homeless are informed of their eligibility for services.
- Addressing needs of relevant subpopulations
- Incorporating strategies for reducing homelessness, including demonstrated strategies
- Setting qualifying performance measurements.

Ms. Mead added that timelines must be made to ensure the completion of specific tasks, the identification of funding sources for specific activities, and identifying an individual or body responsible for overseeing implementation of the strategies. The CoC must apply annually for the CoC program funds. The collaborative applicant prepares and oversees the application for funding using a collaborative process, prioritizing projects and designating a collaborative applicant to apply for those funds on behalf of the CoC.

There are seven performance indicators in the HEARTH Act

- The length of time individuals/families remain homeless

- The extent to which individuals/families who leave homelessness experience additional spells of homelessness
- The thoroughness of grantees in reaching homeless individuals/families
- Overall reduction in the number of individuals/families
- Job income and growth for homeless individuals/families
- Success at reducing the number of individuals/families
- Other accomplishment related to reducing homelessness that have not been identified

Locally, members can identify what is important as a Continuum.

The 2013-2014 CoC NOFA included the following priorities

- Strategic resource allocations
- Ending chronic homelessness
- Ending family homelessness
- Removing barriers to resources
- Maximizing mainstream resources
- Building partnerships
- Other priority populations the CoC identifies as a community

Ms. Mead mentioned that the CoC Board retreat was held in December 2014. In February 2015, a community wide strategic planning session was held. Ms. Mead explained that Ms. Piper Elhen from Homebase and Matt White from Apt Associates are HUD assigned technical assistants providers that are developing a summary of the recommendations that came out of that strategic planning session. They will offer an update on the results at the March 30th Board meeting.

Ms. Mead noted the CoC Board's vision is to have zero homeless by 2020 in Maricopa County and set forth four main pillars that explain the process; data, accountability, best practices, and collaboration. She requested comments or suggestions from the Committee.

Karen Kurtz, Community Bridges, suggested adding the scoring tools as short-term goals to the next agenda. She said she sees the role of the Committee as being the eyes and ears of the community and the initiator of issues in the community. Mattie Lord, UMOM New Day Center, stated that it would be best to prioritize the responsibilities in order to ensure completion. Ms. Kurtz asked what zero by 2020 looks like. David Bridge, Human Services Campus, inquired about what the recommended community priorities were, such as family issues, youth issues, and shelter issues. Mr. Bridge indicated that he would like to see a list of the prioritized issues.

Kenneth McKinley, Tumbleweed, added that the Coordinated Access process should be equitable across all areas. Ms. Lord inquired about Coordinated Access, stating that in the charter, Coordinated Access is listed as a responsibility of the Board. Ms. Mead clarified that the Committee could certainly make recommendations to the Board regarding Coordinated Access.

Mr. Bridge further suggested the initiation of communication and participation with the ad-hoc groups to ensure an understanding of what is happening with outreach, Coordinated

Access, and other various groups. Ms. Lord stated that the Committee has a lot of experience and knowledge which will aid the collaboration efforts in the community. Mr. Bridge reiterated that a connection was missing between the community and some working groups, and this Committee will be a great tool to establish new connections. Ms. Mead also added that there is a section for standing agenda items where other groups could present findings.

Suzie Martin, Homeward Bound, inquired about a list of the ad-hoc groups and other agencies that could present findings at CoC Committee meetings. Ms. Mead stated that a list could be presented at the next Committee meeting. Ms. Kurtz stated that the Committee should have a significant role in evaluating the context or content of the performance standards before they are presented to the CoC Board. John Scott, U.S. Vets, stated his concern about the direction of transitional housing. Argie Gomez, Chicanos por La Causa, inquired about the status of domestic violence shelters in relation to the responsibilities and goals of the CoC Committee. Ms. Lord stated that with the recent formation of the new Performance Measures and Data Quality Committee, all groups should have access to data due to its critical role in decision making.

Ms. Kurtz inquired if there were additional approaches to strengthening the HUD application process. Ms. Mead noted that the CoC is scored by HUD each year on the application process. Sharon Shore, HOM Inc., asked if HUD was going to debrief why the Maricopa/Phoenix CoC was not awarded the bonus project. Ms. Mead informed the Committee that the request for a debriefing was sent, though no response has been received.

Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing mentioned the idea that communities awarded the bonus project had a connection to the Affordable Care Act. Mr. Bridge inquired about increasing capacity across the board and standardizing training. Ms. Lord inquired about the Committee being able to weigh-in on opportunities for reallocation. Ms. Lord suggested the use of data and experiences to drive decisions. Ms. Martin concurred and added that the Community Needs Assessment should also be formalized and understood before beginning work on community needs. Ms. Lord also added that the topics of youth and domestic violence must be addressed as critical issues.

Keith Thompson, Phoenix Shanti, inquired about a clarification of who and what the CoC Committee is serving. Nancy Marion, House of Refuge East, stated she wanted to know the target of what to look for in a service-rich organization. Ms. Basta added to that, inquiring about the percentage of what organizations receive-goes to services.

Joann Hatton, Arizona Department of Health, informed the Committee that Samsa Fidelity is conducting reviews where the results will determine the baseline for supportive housing throughout the county. Ms. Lord stated, in regards to best practices, that there could be strong dialogue on workforce development and collaborative funding. Mr. Bridge added to that point, stressing the balance of all funding, activities, and priorities. Ms. Kurtz stressed her concern for what the CoC really was since some organizations are not HUD funded. Ms. Shore voiced concerns about the Housing Inventory Count (HIC) spell out count and that all providers should understand what HIC is, and that a unit count is included rather than just a bed count. Ms. Mead agreed, stating that a unit count is being conducted in addition to:

- Looking at best practices
- In-depth understanding of CoC funding and CoC projects.
- ESG funding.
- In-depth understanding of transitional housing.
- Performance evaluation.
- Involvement in prioritizing issues in community.
- Training in capacity building for agencies.
- Looking at needs and gaps throughout the region.
- Ensuring that the Performance Standards and Data Quality and other ad-hoc groups are tied into the CoC Committee.
- Looking at involvement of HIT and PIT count.
- Discussing other subpopulations.
- Better understanding of connection of services.

Ms. Martin inquired about handling the issue of addressing multiple masters with multiple goals. Ms. Mead stated that the feedback was great and requested a list of needs through long and short term goals. Ms. Lord suggested that Community Needs Assessment is very important as a goal due to the NOFA coming up. Ms. Gomez asked why it would take until May to finalize the Point-In Time homeless count data. Ms. Mead stressed that surveys were still being collected and that this year Community Information and Referral would be handling the data input and output. Mr. Bridge supported data as a priority.

Ms. Mead listed the priorities as:

1. Community needs assessment
2. Setting priorities using data
3. Focusing on different subpopulations
4. Preparing for the NOFA
5. Finding a committee chair

Ms. Mead opened the floor for further comments. There were no further comments. Ms. Mead stated that this item was for action to recommend approval on areas of focus for the Committee. The motion to recommend approval on areas of focus for the Committee was made by Mr. Scott and seconded by Ms. Kurtz. The motion was subsequently approved by a unanimous vote.

4. Continuum of Care Committee Membership

Ms. Mead referred members to the roster handout listing all CoC Committee members by name, organization, position, and committee representation. Ms. Mead noted that there are currently four categories that do not have representation which included:

- Hospitals
- University
- School District
- Law Enforcement

For the selection process the Committee chose to replicate the process used to select Committee members. Ms. Mead opened the floor to comments or suggestions from the Committee on the selection process since the positions are part of the Committee.

Kenneth McKinley stated that the school liaisons were very important to the process. Ms. Lord confirms the available positions that Ms. Mead listed. Ms. Martin asked if it would be the same working group reviewing the letters as it was for the current members of the Committee. Ms. Shore suggested finding someone from Access. Ms. Mead noted that all of the additional letters awaiting a decision came in after the posted deadline.

Charles Sullivan, ABC Housing, suggested including a city with a larger housing program. Ms. Basta suggested identifying which categories are adequately represented, and then seeking applicants to fill the remaining spots. Ms. Gomez inquired about the working group membership. Ms. Mead advised that the working group members include:

- Kevin Hartke, Vice Mayor City of Chandler
- Mattie Lord, UMOM New Day Centers
- Jacki Taylor, Save The Family
- Riann Balch, City of Phoenix
- Theresa James, City of Tempe

Ms. Gomez asked if this would involve a formal process to move the voting along. Ms. Mead stated that that was possible. Amy St. Peter, MAG, stressed that although the Committee members had a right to choose who was on their Committee; strong consideration for *how big is too big* needs to take place.

Ms. Kurtz suggested going ahead with how the Committee is currently filled and perhaps filling positions as needed down the road. She inquired if the Committee would get a significantly different result by moving the deadline for applications further out. In addition, Ms. Kurtz stated that there is a lot of discussion around the community action agencies being the prevention system; however Ms. Kurtz stated her hesitancy on whether they really are since they are underfunded. She suggested either bringing on a member of the community action agencies as a Committee member or removing the community action agencies from the discussion of prevention systems due to lack of funding/participation. After further discussion Ms. Mead reviewed the key suggestions stated.

Mr. Bridge stated that a business representative was not necessary at the Committee level, but perhaps the Board level. Ms. Mead listed the following names as applicants for consideration as committee members.

- Thom Reilly from Arizona State University(ASU) Morrison Institute
- Vicky Staples from ASU Center for Applied Behavioral Health Policy
- Mary Alice McKone from the Salvation Army
- Sara Sims from the Phoenix Elementary School District
- Officer Rob Ferraro from the City of Tempe Police

Ms. St. Peter clarified that letters were being sought for the original vacant positions-in addition to the recently added. Ms. Lord added that a process for the Performance Measurement and Data Quality Groups should be finalized. Ms. Mead stated that Tom Hutchinson, A New Leaf, motioned to solicit letters of interest for the four open categories in addition to looking for representatives from CAP (Community Action Program), AHCCCS (Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System), PHA (Public Housing Authority). The motion to solicit letters of interest for the four open categories in addition to looking for representatives from Business, Service Providers, Behavioral Health Access, PHA, and Community Action Program was seconded by Mr. Keith Thompson. The motion was passed unanimously.

Ms. Mead moved the discussion to leadership. Ms. Mead noted that in the governance charter it is stated that letters of interest would be solicited for members of the Committee to serve as Chair and Vice-Chair. Ms. Mead further stated that once letters were received, the Committee would follow the governance charter in selecting leadership.

Ms. Martin suggested expediting the membership selection process to prevent a delayed Committee agenda. Ms. Lord motioned to move forward with seeking letters of interest for the Chair and Vice Chair positions among the current group. The motion was seconded by Ms. Basta and passed unanimously. Ms. Lord confirmed with Ms. Mead that the CoC Committee Chair, Vice Chair, or any other member could report out to the CoC Board.

5. Standing Agenda Items

Ms. Mead opened the floor for suggestions on standing agenda items. Ms. Shore stated that she would prefer to see what is going on with the Ad-Hoc groups before listing a standing agenda item. Mr. Wall stated his interest in the Centralized In-take process, systematic training, and seeking a report on training that is occurring in the community. Ms. Gomez suggested data for community needs. Ms. Lord added a dashboard to Ms. Gomez's suggestion on data needs. Ms. Mead requested comments from the Committee. There were no comments. Ms. Shore motioned to move the standing agenda items. Ms. Gomez seconded the motion to move the standing agenda items forward. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Future Meeting Logistics

Ms. Mead stated the importance of addressing the Committee's preference for the logistics of the meeting. Ms. Marion asked how often the CoC Board meets. Ms. Mead stated that the Board meets monthly, on the last Monday of the month at 2:00 p.m.. Ms. Mead then asked the Committee how often they would prefer to meet. The Committee agreed to meet monthly two weeks before the Board meeting to allow for development of recommendations to the Board. The Committee also agreed on Wednesday mornings at 9:30 a.m. In addition, the Ironwood space would be reserved for future meetings.

Ms. Gomez requested more contact information to the membership roster. Mr. Wall, include affiliation, motioned to confirm the new meeting logistics. Ms. Billie Cawley, Central Arizona Shelter Services, seconded the motion to confirm the new meeting logistics.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

Ms. Lord asked if Open Meeting Law applied to the Committee. Ms. Mead said that it does apply and she could have a review at the next meeting. Ms. Marion requested receiving information prior to each meeting to review in order to make knowledgeable decisions.

8. Comments from the CoC Committee

Ms. Mead opened the floor for comments or suggestions. Ms. Marion requested a copy of the PowerPoint presentation which Ms. Mead stated would be sent out to all Committee members.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Ms. Mead at 11:05 a.m.