

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (MAG)
CONTINUUM OF CARE COMMITTEE
January 20, 2016
MAG Office Building, Ironwood Room

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing
(ADOH)

David Bridge, Human Services Campus (HSC)

*Erin Callinan, Arizona Coalition to End Sexual and
Domestic Violence

#Robert Ferraro, City of Tempe Law Enforcement

Kelli Donley for Joann Hatton, Arizona Department
of Health Services

Vicki Helland, Community Bridges

Tom Hutchinson, A New Leaf

Michelle Jameson, United States Veterans Initiative,
U.S. VETS-Phoenix

Jessa Johnson, Mercy Maricopa Integrated Care
(MMIC)

Stephanie Knox, Arizona Department of Economic
Security

Mattie Lord, UMOM New Day Center

Alicia Kenney for Nancy Marion, House of Refuge
East

*Neither present nor represented by proxy.

#Attended by telephone conference call.

+Attended by video conference.

OTHERS PRESENT

Riann Balch, City of Phoenix

Ken Curry, Southwest Behavioral Health (SBH)

Alfred Edwards, DES

Michael Flores, Department of Housing and Urban
Development (HUD)

Lisa Miller, UMOM

David Olivarez, Terros Safe Haven

Suzie Martin, Homeward Bound

Kenneth McKinley, Tumbleweed

Linda Mushkatel, Lodestar Day Resource Center

*Dennis Newburn, City of Mesa

#Rodrigo Olivares, Crisis Response Network

Stephen Sparks, Labor's Community Service Agency
(LCSA)

Sara Sims, Phoenix Elementary School District

Ursula Strehphans, Central Arizona Shelter Services
(CASS)

Charles Sullivan, Arizona Behavioral Health
Corporation (ABC)

#Jacki Taylor, Save The Family

Keith A. Thompson, Phoenix Shanti Group

John Wall, Arizona Housing Inc.

Ty Rosensteel, CASS

Stephanie Shaw, Area Agency on Aging

Barbara Sloan, The Salvation Army

Craig Tribken, CASS

Michelle Thomas, Community Information and
Referral

Richard Thompson, HUD

Kim Van Nimwegen, Valley of the Sun United Way

Celina Brun, MAG

Brandie Mead, MAG

Anne Scott, MAG

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Mattie Lord, UMOM New Day Center, Chair of the Continuum of Care (CoC) Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:39 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. Chair Lord noted that agenda item seven will be skipped.

3. Approval of the December 9, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Chair Lord entertained a motion to approve the December 9, 2015, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Ursula Strehfens, Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS). The motion was seconded by Charles Sullivan, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation (ABC). There were no comments. The motion passed.

4. Reports from Work Groups

Chair Lord moved to agenda item four, stating that standing verbal updates would be provided by the groups selected at the December Committee meeting. Furthermore, the Committee decided on a consistent format for the reporting process. The reports are for information and discussion by the representatives from the groups listed below. Chair Lord added that the Permanent Housing Work Group will be reporting live at this meeting only and in writing with the remaining work groups thereafter.

- Performance Standards and Data Quality (PSDQ): Charles Sullivan, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation (ABC) provided the updates listed below.
 - Met three times: 12/21/15, 1/4/16, 1/11/16
 - Finalized Roles and Responsibilities document which is ready for recommendation to the CoC Board.
 - Discussed a Request for Proposal (RFP) on the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) lead agency, Community Information and Referral (CIR) and concluded that it was not appropriate at this time to move forward with an RFP.
 - Developing recommendation to the CoC Board to create an action plan on correcting any items identified in the process of suggesting an RFP in the first place.
 - Formed an ad-hoc data sharing work group and requested membership from the Committee. More will be discussed in agenda item six.
 - Feel that the key decisions fall under *continuously improving program and system quality, and informing community planning and decision efforts*.
 - For the next agenda, PSDQ will be revisiting the draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Continuum and CIR and will define the roles

and responsibilities for both entities. Mr. Sullivan stated that to answer the formatted question about what PSDQ needs from the Committee; he read a note stating that PSDQ should be asking the Committee what PSDQ can do for the Committee.

- Chair Lord: opened the floor for questions from the audience.
 - Ty Rosensteel, CASS: sought clarification on the RFP decision.
 - Mr. Sullivan: The recommendation at this point is to not move forward with an RFP. PSDQ initially supported the request for an RFP, however after further discussion, PSDQ decided to develop a corrective action plan instead.
 - There were no further comments.
- Coordinated Entry and Oversight Work Group (CEOWG): Kelli Donley, ADHS and new CEOWG Chair provided the updates listed below.
 - Last met on January 14, 2016.
 - Two additional members were invited to the work group whom are non-voting members; David Bridge and Mattie Lord.
 - Chair Lord presented on the Family Coordinated Entry system before the holiday break and David Bridge presented on the singles coordinated entry system at the January 14, 2016.
 - CEOWG has decided to operate under Open Meeting Law; however the group will go into executive session when necessary-like reviewing providers.
 - The public will be notified ahead of time with an agenda.
 - Reviewing policies and timelines.
 - Ms. Donley: Since she is relatively new to her position and the group, she will have more in-depth information at the February Committee meeting.
 - Chair Lord opened the floor for comments. There were no comments.
- HMIS Committee: Michelle Thomas, CIR, provided the updates listed below.
 - Met on January 12, 2016 and the next meeting is February 16, 2016.
 - Spent time discussing the new HUD definition of Chronic Homelessness based on the HUD webinar.
 - Discussed the Housing Inventory Count (HIC) for the Shelter Point-In-Time Homeless count.
 - Will conduct the same process as 2015 by sending a notice out and giving providers a few weeks.
 - HMIS will also be collecting and analyzing PIT data for the second year.
 - An agency requested access to modify Bowmen case notes, so this topic was discussed at the last meeting. More research will be done-due to ethical concerns.
 - When AHAR is confirmed, it will be presented at the next meeting.
- ESG collaborators: Stephanie Knox, DES, provided the updates listed below.
 - Met January 14, 2016 and the next meeting is February 11, 2016.
 - Provided the quarterly report that all members agreed upon and discussed finalizing it at last meeting.
 - Different data elements on the number of people served. Ms. Knox continued to discuss elements of the report.

- Ms. Strepfans: are the numbers shown in addition to the new clients?
 - Ms. Knox: It is similar to the previous report, so the numbers reflect current and new clients within the quarter.
 - Ms. Thomas: There is a manual with this report to understand where numbers are coming from.
 - Chair Lord: asked if the report was ready to be pulled.
 - Ms. Thomas: The report can be pulled.
 - Ms. Knox: different contracts require different things to pull the report. Each funder will contact their agency to determine when the reports can be pulled and reported.
 - Chair Lord: are there still going to be multiple reports?
 - Riann Balch: the intention is to implement the process in the next funding cycle. The goal of the group is the reduce the burden of reporting as providers and to get an idea of how we are spending ESG funds across the region so we can have more collective decisions and have a greater impact. She added that the reports can be run, but they are not required to be run.
 - Ms. Knox: the new report does resemble the old reports that providers have used. She listed the elements.
 - Reporting on disabling conditions
 - Length of stay
 - Median, mean, and mode of length of stay
 - Coordinated entries
 - Number of individuals exiting
 - Outcomes for the year
 - Recidivism
 - Definitions of positive exit types
 - The group will focus on scope of work, monitoring and timelines.
 - Seeking feedback on report to finalize it.
 - Slated for the next agenda is monitoring and outcomes measures and standardizing meetings and looking at the quarterly reports.
 - Ms. Thomas: offered to make the reporting available after the meeting.
 - There were no further comments.
- Permanent Supportive Housing Workgroup: Kim VanNimwegen, VSUW, provided the updates listed below.
 - Met on December 16, 2016 and will meet again on February 10, 2016 at VSUW.
 - Have a roster of 41 members and averaging 20 people at meetings.
 - Discussed Roles and Responsibilities.
 - Made a change to include Rapid Rehousing, so the group will be bringing the Rapid Rehousing Work Group into the meetings discussing Permanent Housing, Permanent Supportive Housing, and Rapid Rehousing.
 - Established priorities for the next coming months which include:
 - Continuously improve program and system quality and inform community planning efforts and decision making.

- Foster communication and collaboration.
 - Promote education and training opportunities.
 - Recognizing that the Arizona Coalition to end Homelessness (AZCEH) is also working on training and educations, the PH work group invited AZCEH to the last meeting to collaborate on training and education. The group is also committed to supporting the Coalition in their training efforts.
 - Discussed the PSH standards and cross referenced the standards for singles and families to make additional changes to ensure the group aligned with all standards.
 - Kenneth McKinley, Tumbleweed: sought confirmation if the RRH work group was officially joining the PSH group.
 - Ms. VanNimwegen: confirmed that the groups are joining.
- CoC Board: Anne Scott, MAG, provided the updates listed below.
 - Half day Retreat on December 15, 2016 at Native American Connections.
 - Meeting scheduled for January 25, 2016.
 - Scheduled to meet last Monday of every month.
 - The Board decided to begin setting their own agenda. Want MAG staff to provide updates and top three items to consider.
 - Looking for regular communication between the chair and co-chairs of the Board and Committee.
 - Focus on the gray, undefined areas.
 - Next retreat will follow the January 25, 2016 Board meeting.
 - Requesting standing updates from:
 - The Regional Plan to End Homelessness
 - CoC Committee Report
 - PSDQ and Coordinated Entry Oversight Work Group
 - data report
 - Interested in a Work Group Summary newsletter.
 - Looking at a Consent agenda for workgroup and committee reports.
 - Wants to focus on policy making.
 - Working on updating the Regional Plan to End Homelessness.
 - For the next agenda, will be looking at the final score card for approval.
 - PSDQ recommendations
 - Want to be the final decision-makers based on the criteria below.
 - Does it impact resources
 - Is there weak community consensus
 - Does it significantly impacts access to services
 - Potential for untended consequences
 - Looming deadlines
 - Does it involve high-profile people or elected officials
 - All decisions should be backed by data.
 - Now the leadership of each main group will be a part of the retreat.
 - Linda Mushkatel, Lodestar Day Resource Center: what are the gray areas?
 - Ms. Scott: the Board does not want multiple groups working on the same thing.

- Chair Lord: when there is no consensus, the Board wants to take over.
- There were no further comments.

5. Program Performance Report Score Card

Chair Lord: It is the role of the Committee to come up with the content of the score card. The Committee sent the score card to PSDQ to calculate score for each category. Once approved, had a few caveats because the scale needed to change. Now, PSDQ has completed their work and the score card is ready for recommendation to the Board.

Mr. Sullivan: still working on calculations that will come out of the HMIS report.

Chair Lord: walked through the four changes the Committee decided upon at last meeting.

- On page one-general process to add (prior to NOFA release) Gaps Analysis to indicate community needs and desired portfolio.
- Increased transparency of selecting members for the Ranking and Review Panel.
- Create ad-hoc group of Committee members to determine the 25 points that are directly tied to HUDs priorities.
- Agencies will be allowed to attend interview via telephone or video conference.
- Ms. Donley: sought clarification on the transparency process.
- Chair Lord: read the current process which states that MAG organizes a panel that is non-conflicted with the HUD program funding process, however applicants are not privy to the selection process. The Committee would like greater transparency on the process. Furthermore, there are four questions still left on the table.
 - Should Board members serve on the Rank and Review panel?
 - Should the Rank and Review Panel present multiple options to the Board or just one option?
 - Should the Rank and Review Panel be limited to ranking by score?
 - Should there be formal consideration for the community/system impact for each option presented to the Board?
- Chair Lord: asked the Committee what the role of the Ranking and Review Panel should be.
- Mr. McKinley: they are important to the ranking process.
- Stephen Sparks, LCSA: What is the point of the interview-if not to get more intangible information?
- Ms. Martin: the group should provide recommendations but be objective and neutral.
- Discussion continued with the objective vs. subjective nature of the group.
- Chair Lord: should the panel make recommendations as usual?
- Ms. Donley: are the members involved with receiving any money from the projects? And are the questions standardized?
- Ms. Scott: the members of the Rank and Review Panel are funders but they do not benefit and do not have projects in the funding process. The questions are standardized.
- Chair Lord: reiterated that the first question must be answered.
- There was a unanimous vote that:
 - The Rank and Review Panel should not be limited to just ranking the projects.
 - The Rank and Review Panel present multiple options to the Board.
 - There be formal consideration for the community/system impact for each option presented to the Board.
 - Board members do not serve on the Rank and Review panel.
- Karia Basta, ADOH: stated that Board members serving on the Rank and Review Panel would be a conflict of interest. She then motioned not to have Board members to serve on ranking and review panel.
- Mr. Sparks: seconded the motion.

- Discussion continued.
- Ms. Knox: suggested the Board and Rank & Review Panel meet right after the selection process to thoroughly work through the recommendations.
- Discussion continued.
- Ms. Strephans: suggested including improvement plans in the selection process.
- Ms. Knox: when we begin to monitor, that is information that will become valuable to each project.
- Chair Lord: reiterated Ms. Basta's motion that Board members not be allowed to serve on the Ranking and Review Panel.
- The motion passed.
- Ms. Donley: if a project is on an improvement plan, hopefully that would be reflected in the community impact.
- Chair Lord: the community impact was intended to demonstrate how the community would be affected if all youth housing projects or all family housing projects were cut.
- Mr. Sparks: motioned to include the systems impact, all intangibles like improvement plans as a means to improve multiple options to the Board.
- Ms. Martin: seconded the motion.
- The motion passed.
- Ms. Knox: motioned for the Board to meet with the Ranking and Review Panel to discuss the process and options.
- Discussion continued.
- Ms. Basta: seconded the motion.
- The motion passed.
- There were no further comments.

6. Ad Hoc Data Sharing Work Group

Ty Rosensteel, CASS: presented updates on the data sharing protocols, stating that the purpose is to discuss and establish a data sharing and data use plan for the CoC which covers everything from the moment the data is collected, how the client is informed the data is collected to how that data is going to be maintained and shared.

- There are 18 persons on the work group.
- Primary topics include:
 - Client privacy
 - HUD requirements
 - Federal and state laws on data sharing
 - Case conferencing protocols-agency MOU's
 - Clients releases of information-baseline standards
 - Data bases and data systems outside of HMIS and the CoC's role
- A draft of the plan is expected to be ready by the second week of February 2016. This draft is meant to be a starting place for the community. The final draft is expected to be submitted to the Committee in March following community feedback.
- The Committee met for the first time last week.
- There is significant HUD technical assistance.
- Few items for discussion
 - HUD is clear on letting communities determine what they want to share and only require communities to choose the data elements they wish to share.
 - With Coordinated Entry without data sharing will not work.
 - Need data sharing to work on chronic homelessness
 - Where do we fall along the line of sharing?
 - Mr. Rosensteel: highlighted the list of levels in data sharing.

- Keith Thompson, Phoenix Shanti: inquired if the plan was put together from scratch or if it is a template?
- Mr. Rosensteel: it is a “build your path” template.
- Mr. Thompson: options with examples on data sharing would be great.
- Ms. Thomas: based on research and experience from other CoC’s, suggested that the CoC create and choose their own data elements.
- Chair Lord: initiated a safe place for all Committee members to voice their thoughts on the elements of data sharing that they prefer. Chair Lord stated that in her opinion, data does not need to be shared universally.
- Discussion continued.
- Mr. Sparks: suggested multiple data sharing options with outcomes on various levels of data sharing.
- Ms. Donley: what is the benefit when data is not shared?
- Ms. Strehphans: suggested that case notes on clients not be shared universally.
- Mr. Thompson: added that HIV status may hurt a client if they don’t know that information is being shared.
- Mr. Rosensteel: The sheer size of our system implicates the issue and importance of data sharing.
 - With nearly one million people in the system and hundreds of users, data sharing becomes vital. For example, a case manager is going to share a client file with all parties that can assist in providing services or housing.
- Mr. McKinley: There are licensing laws in Arizona for minors that do not allow data sharing even within an agency. He is also concerned about pocket data sharing.
- Ms. Thomas: ideally, eliminating pocket-sharing would be a result of the process.
- Mr. Rosensteel: great feedback.
- Ms. Martin: supported presentations on various data sharing options, further stating that less data to share is better.
- Discussion continued.
- Chair Lord: praised Ms. Thomas and Mr. Rosensteel for leading the facilitation.
- Ms. Scott: noted that the meetings were open on Friday’s from 1:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m. at MAG.
- There were no further comments.

7. Standards of Excellence

Tabled for February

8. Standards of Excellence: Housing First Exemption

Chair Lord moved to agenda item seven, to discuss the Housing First philosophy regarding drug and alcohol free properties.

- Mr. Thompson: referred to the Recovery Housing Policy Brief that HUD recently issued in December 2015. Sought feedback from the Committee if the CoC should consider and prioritize Recovery Housing or not.
- Ms. Basta: Recovery Housing should be considered and a group should work on it.
- Chair Lord: What group would consider discussing this topic?
- Discussion continued.
- Ms. VanNimwegen: suggested proposing this discussion at a Permanent Housing Work Group (PHWG) meeting.
- Discussion continued.
- The PHWG will take on the Recovery Housing discussion which will meet February 10, 2016.
- For the Recovery Housing discussion, interested public are encouraged to contact Keith Thompson.

9. Systems Level Performance Measures
Tabled for February

10. Outreach Committee
Tabled for February

11. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chair Lord opened the floor for topics or issues of interest that members of the MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting. There were no comments.

12. Comments from the Committee

Chair Lord opened the floor for comments. There were no further comments.

Adjourn

Chair Lord adjourned the meeting at 11:17 a.m. The next meeting will occur on February 10, 2016.