

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (MAG)  
CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD

January 25, 2016

MAG Office Building, Ironwood Room

MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Brad Bridwell, Cantwell Anderson-Cloudbreak	Darlene Newsom, United Methodist Outreach
Moises Gallegos, City of Phoenix	Ministries (UMOM) New Day Center
Marisue Garganta, Dignity Health	Amy Schwabenlender, Valley of the Sun United
*Scott Hall, Community Bridges Inc.	Way (VSUW)
Kevin Hartke, City of Chandler, Councilmember, Chair	Diana Yazzie-Devine, Native American Connections
Theresa James, City of Tempe	*Tami Linkletter, Save the Family
Bruce Liggett, Maricopa County	
#Nick Margiotta, Phoenix Police Department	

\*Neither present nor represented by proxy.

#Attended by telephone conference call.

+Attended by video conference.

OTHERS PRESENT

Riann Balch, City of Phoenix	Nicky Stevens, ABC
Billie Cawley, CASS	Mike Shore, Hom Inc.
Tom Hutchinson, A New Leaf	Michelle Thomas, CIR
Michelle Jameson, U.S. Vets	Kimberly Thompson, The Salvation Army
Margaret Kilman, Maricopa County Human Services Department (MCHSD)	Richard Thomason, HUD
Gilbert Lopez, City of Glendale	John Wall, Arizona Housing Inc.
Mattie Lord, UMOM	Kim Van Nimwegen, VSUW
Nancy Marion, House of Refuge	Pilar Vargus, Chicanos Por La Causa
Suzie Martin, Homeward Bound	Amy Vogelsson, SBH
Stephanie Miller, City of Glendale	Christopher Varnes, Recovery Innovations International
David Olivarez, Terros	Celina Brun, MAG
Catherine Rea, Community Information and Referral (CIR)	Brandee Mead, MAG
Charles Sullivan, ABC Housing	Anne Scott, MAG

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Councilmember Kevin Hartke, City of Chandler, Chair of the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board, called the meeting to order at 1:36 p.m. Introductions of the Committee and audience proceeded.

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 2, 2015 CoC Board Meeting Minutes

Addressing the first order of business, Chair Hartke asked if the Board reviewed the consent agenda and meeting minutes for November 2, 2015. Chair Hartke inquired if Board members had any comments regarding the consent agenda or minutes. There were no comments. Chair Hartke opened the floor to the public for comments on the consent agenda. There were no comments. Chair Hartke entertained a motion to approve the consent agenda and November 2, 2015 meeting minutes as presented. Dianna Yazzie-Devine, Native American Connections, motioned to approve the consent agenda and November 2, 2015 meeting minutes. Marisue Garganta, Dignity Health, seconded the motion to approve the consent agenda and November 2, 2015 meeting minutes. There were no comments. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Continuum of Care Updates: Anne Scott, MAG, presented the CoC updates listed below.

- The community is working hard to get the community wide data sharing process together.
  - Weekly meetings with PSDQ subgroup.
  - Met twice so far with HUD technical assistance.
  - February 23, 2016 community-wide meeting is scheduled with HUD technical assistance.
  - Will present the final draft of the Regional Data Sharing document at the April Board meeting.
- The 2016 Homeless Street and Shelter Count is scheduled for January 26, 2016. The data is expected to be submitted to HUD by April 30, 2016.
- Amy Schwabenlender, VSUW, is working with the community to complete the Plan to End Homelessness
  - Ms. Schwabenlender and Ms. Scott are working together with community stakeholders to complete the plan.
  - Workgroups can use existing meetings or new meetings to complete the worksheet sent by VSUW.
- Chair Hartke opened the floor for comments.
- Moe Gallegos, City of Phoenix: stated that he recognizes the concern about data sharing and supports the process.
- There were no further comments.

5. Continuum of Care Program Performance Report Score Card: Mattie Lord, Chair of the CoC Committee presented the final edits and recommendations of the updated Performance Report Score Card listed below.
- This is a joint effort between the Committee and PSDQ.
  - The Committee is responsible for the content and PSDQ is responsible for the calculation methodology.
  - Participation points were moved up and embedded within part 1 of the score card.
  - Now worth up to 100 points.
  - Divided into two parts; 75 predetermined points and 25 points based on HUD requirements as articulated in the NOFA.
  - Number seven was left open with future determination from the Board or Regional Plan to End Homelessness.
  - Still need to review the scoring process.
  - Ms. Yazzie-Devine: inquired about question 8 on the participation points regarding agencies that may have applied but did not get a seat on the committee.
  - Committee Chair Lord: All HUD-funded agencies are granted a seat on the committee, so if they choose to accept it, they may be a part of the committee. Community seats are based on need for representation. Furthermore, recruitment occurs bi-annually in January and July.
  - Ms. Schwabenlender: inquired about how the score card acknowledges Rapid Rehousing (RRH) and how the HMIS analysis is going.
  - Committee Chair Lord: the Committee recognized that the scoring for RRH was not included last year, the community just needed to recognize RRH as an important source of housing. As for question eight, HMIS is ten points and PSDQ is working to identify how to allocate the ten points.
  - Ms. Schwabenlender: clarified her question about how HMIS would be evaluated.
  - Ms. Scott: later in the agenda PSDQ will be making a recommendation to look at HMIS.
  - Ms. Yazzie-Devine: there is a workgroup on youth that is forming, so would it count towards the question 8 points?
  - Committee Chair Lord: The Youth work group would qualify as “participating in a work group” for five points.
  - Theresa James, City of Tempe: motioned to approve the score card.
  - Mr. Gallegos: seconded the motion to approve the score card.
  - The motion passed unanimously.
6. 2016 NOFA Ranking and Review Process: Committee Chair Lord presented the revised Ranking and Review Process and listed the recommendations to the Board for approval. The Committee debriefed after the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) and developed eight recommendations.
1. Conduct a Gaps analysis to determine community needs and identify an ideal portfolio.
  2. Update on who creates, reviews, and approves the document.
  3. Transparency in the process of selecting the Ranking and Review Panel.
  4. Board members shall not be allowed to participate.
  5. Subcommittee of committee to determine the allocation of the 25 points.

6. For the Ranking and Review Panel to look past just the score and present multiple options with pros and cons of community impact for each option.
- Ms. Yazzie-Devine: suggested that it is important to have panel members with a certain level of expertise and experience when participating in the rank and review process.
  - CoC Committee Chair Lord: inquired if the language should be changed to a certain format. She suggested adding that “selected applicants have experience in federal funding”.
  - Ms. Yazzie-Devine: unsure of the exact language, but should have experience in federal funding and program funding processes.
  - Ms. Scott: concerned about making something a requirement when the number of volunteers and amount of time means volunteers to serve on the panel are not always available.
  - Nick Margiotta, City of Phoenix: suggested determining the membership before the NOFA comes out.
  - Ms. James: if the interviews are voluntary, then it will not take three days to conduct interviews.
  - Brande Mead, MAG: suggested using language like “staff will make every effort to find the most qualified applicants for the panel.” Just in case staff is not able to find the most appropriate experience.
  - Ms. Schwabenlender: concerned about how making the interview process voluntary would change the process.
  - Committee Chair Lord: some providers felt that the interviews were not a valuable use of their time.
  - Ms. Yazzie-Devine: if they do not attend an interview, then they will only be scored on what they submit.
  - Nick Margiotta, City of Phoenix: the interview is the opportunity to showcase and advocate your work, however if you choose not to take it then you will be ranked on your submission only.
  - Discussion continued.
  - Ms. Scott: if there is a conflict with the score between the rank and review panel and the self-score, the interview helps to clarify the data.
  - Suzie Martin, Homeward Bound: stated that the general concern from providers did not relate to actually “doing an interview”, rather the concern was identifying other options to the classic in-person interview. Some providers are located far away and would prefer an interview over the phone or video conference.
  - Nicky Stevens, ABC Housing: inquired if the interview is scored as additional points for those that choose to interview.
  - Committee Chair Lord: the interview is not scored.
  - Chair Hartke: believes that participating in the interview process is a wise move for applicants to make sure their project is accurately submitted.
  - Mr. Gallegos: are the differences in each application communicated to applicants before they interview?
  - Ms. Scott: an email is sent with invites to interview for the opportunity to clarify scoring and differences, however differences per applications are not identified until the actual interview.

- Ms. Schwabenlender: sometimes applicants score themselves more or less points and the interview helps to assess the accurate score.
  - Mr. Gallegos: it is clear that any provider who cares about their project will show up. The document is fine the way it currently stands.
  - Ms. Garganta motioned to accept the Maricopa Continuum of Care document on the recommendations and the process of the recommendations.
  - Ms. Schwabenlender seconded the motion to accept the Maricopa Continuum of Care document on the recommendations and the process of the recommendations.
  - The motion passed unanimously.
7. Performance Standards and Data Quality (PSDQ) Work Group Roles and Responsibilities: PSDQ Leader Charles Sullivan, ABC Housing will present the work groups' Roles and Responsibilities for the Board's consideration. Mr. Sullivan discussed the points listed below.
- Working to understand what the group should be doing and how the group fits in with the goals of the CoC.
  - Recognize the large list of tasks to be done.
  - In order to move forward, the group must have established roles and responsibilities.
  - Ms. Scott: many of the roles and responsibilities were completed and recommended by the HUD Technical Assistant (TA).
  - Mr. Gallegos: inquired about what the HMIS action plan is.
  - Mr. Sullivan: the action plan was done over a year ago by a HUD TA which highlighted the roles and responsibilities between PSDQ and HMIS. The document was sitting for awhile because neither party had authority until PSDQ took charge of the plan.
  - Chair Hartke: opened the floor for comments from the audience. There were no comments. Chair Hartke opened the floor for comments from the Board.
  - Ms. Yazzie-Devine: concerned about the work load versus the size of the committee.
  - Mr. Sullivan: the task load is large and the group is dedicated. The group is now open with Chairs and Co-chairs and will be finalizing a membership process. The group also anticipates opening up the membership process for letters of interest.
  - Ms. Yazzie-Devine: inquired about the timeline on the open meeting process?
  - Mr. Sullivan: the timeline will be discussed at the next meeting. There is strong communication through email in between meetings and a Dropbox where members can also work in between meetings. The group also meets bi-monthly.
  - Mr. Gallegos: is there currently a Chair and Co-Chair?
  - Mr. Sullivan: the group is working on that process and will finalize it by the next meeting.
  - Ms. Yazzie-Yazzie-Devine: with only four members, membership should be a priority added to the agenda.
  - Ms. Garganta: is there a process when a member must leave?
  - Mr. Sullivan: the group needs to work on that process, since there are no steps in place to replace Chairs or Co-Chairs
  - Mr. Gallegos: it will be tough to work with only four members and inquired if PSDQ will begin open meetings.
  - Mr. Sullivan: after community feedback, the group intends to have open meetings.

- Ms. Mead: to clarify, any committee adopted by MAG and listed in the Committee page must follow Open Meeting Law (OML). Work groups are not subject to OML but can be open.
- Chair Hartke: opened the floor for comments. There were no further comments
- Ms. Schwabenlender: motioned to recommend approval of the PSDQ Roles and Responsibilities as presented.
- Ms. James: seconded the motion to recommend approval of the PSDQ Roles and Responsibilities as presented.
- The motion passed unanimously.

8. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Lead Agency Recommendation

Mr. Sullivan continued to agenda item eight where he discussed the initial recommendation, made by the Ranking and Review Committee to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the HMIS lead and system administrator. Mr. Sullivan stated the following:

- Discussed the recommendation of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the HMIS system. After further discussion, the PSDQ group feels that it is not appropriate to implement an RFP since the community has not yet implemented a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). For now, PSDQ will develop a timeline for a PIP. If HMIS's performance does not improve following a PIP, an RFP may be an option. PSDQ is seeking a recommendation to move forward with a PIP and timeline for HMIS rather than an RFP.
- Bruce Liggett, Maricopa County: inquired if the PIP and RFP are mutually exclusive.
- Mr. Sullivan: they are not mutually exclusive.
- Since the community does not have in writing the requirements of an appropriate HMIS team, CIR should be given the opportunity to adhere to written requirements once developed, and then judged after.
- Mr. Liggett: inquired if the ranking and review panel recommendation was made official in writing.
- Ms. Schwabenlender: cannot clearly recall if the recommendation was officially made in writing, and then inquired about the timeline of the PIP.
- Mr. Sullivan: the score card used for the HMIS project was a compilation from other communities and used for the first time in the 2015 cycle.
- Mr. Margiotta: there is a timeliness factor.
- Mr. Gallegos: inquired about other agencies that fell into the PIP process?
- Ms. Yazzie-Devine: when the providers are ranked, we can tell them why. We have not done a PIP and it still worked, however HMIS is ranked differently since they work for the community. HMIS deserves the right to improve before administering a PIP.
- Mr. Sullivan: there are no timeframes established yet, however it is on the next PSDQ agenda. Also clarified that a HUD TA confirmed that adhering to changes for a PIP could occur within a funding year.
- Mr. Liggett: inquired if the CoC originally procured HMIS and how long has it been working with CIR.
- Ms. Mead: the community voted for CIR in 2002 through an RFP process, but the HMIS system has not been reviewed, procured or RFP'ed since then.
- Co-Chair Darlene Newsom, UMOM New Day Center: inquired if the contract between CIR and MAG has been updated since 2002?

- Mr. Sullivan: there is no contract yet between the MAG CoC and CIR, however an MOU is being worked on and it will outline the roles and responsibilities between both parties.
- Chair Hartke: inquired if the goal was to go for an RFP once the PIP and MOU were finalized.
- Mr. Sullivan: the current sentiment is to give CIR a chance, and if things do not change, then take the next steps.
- Ms. Garganta: it is important to be upfront with what we want delivered when putting together a contract. If they cannot meet the goals of the MOU, then TA will be provided, if they still fail, an RFP should occur.
- Ms. Garganta: motioned to accept the recommendation from the PSDQ work group to actually work on the MOU and elevate those standards that were outlined, and to bring some measurements for the next coming year and then review it after a year.
- Ms. Schwabenlender: suggested to Ms. Garganta that the motion also refer to accepting the recommendation to not RFP HMIS and begin working on a timeline and standards for the PIP.
- Ms. Garganta: inquired if it is fair to give a timeline to HMIS.
- Mr. Sullivan: the development of the MOU does not have a timeline yet.
- Mr. Margiotta: motioned to the PSDQ work group's recommendation to move forward with the MOU and PIP and then reporting back with a monthly report on the status and a CIR timeline with the MOU where the Board can decide.
- Ms. Yazzie-Devine: suggested developing the RFP process before implementing an RFP.
- Catherine Rea, CIR: two years ago CIR contracted with the Arizona Department of Housing (ADOH) and Balance of State, have grown tremendously since and have tried to meet all needs. CIR welcomes the MOU and believes the agency needs performance standards.
- Mr. Liggett: seconded the motion to the PSDQ work group's recommendation to move forward with the MOU and PIP and then reporting back with a monthly report on status and a CIR timeline with the MOU where the Board can decide.
- The motion passed unanimously.
- Ms. Yazzie-Devine: reiterated that the highest priority is to expand the PSDQ group.
- Mr. Liggett: supported Ms. Yazzie-Devine's point.
- There were no further comments.

9. Request for Future Agenda Items

- Mr. Liggett: requested a presentation on the regional approaches to supporting homelessness, but more specifically a funding analysis of funds being spent in the valley to support Emergency Shelters.
- Ms. Schwabenlender: suggested inviting the Morrison institute study to present data analysis on the homeless campus shelter providers.

10. Comments from the CoC Board

Chair Hartke opened the floor for comments.

Ms. Yazzie-Devine: announced that there is an open house for Cedar Crossing on February 18, 2016 which has 70 units of Affordable Housing

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Hartke at 3:00 pm. The next Board meeting is scheduled for February 22, 2016.