

**MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL CONTINUUM OF CARE COMMITTEE ON HOMELESSNESS
MEETING MINUTES**

January 8, 2007

MEMBERS ATTENDING:

Annette Stein, Maricopa County, Chair
Maryann Beerling, New Arizona Family
Robert Duvall, Community Information and Referral
Dick Geasland, Tumbleweed
*Katie Hobbs, Sojourner Center
Deanna Jonovich, City of Phoenix
*John Landrum, The Salvation Army
*Nick Margiotta, City of Phoenix
Ric Mason, Labor's Community Service Agency
*Mattie McVey, AZ Department of Education
*Elizabeth Morales, AZ Behavioral Health Co
*Darlene Newsom, United Methodist Outreach Ministries
Margaret Reiber, YWCA
Brenda Robbins for Michelle Ryan, Arizona Department of Health Services
John Wall, CASS
* Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections

OTHERS PRESENT

Filia Ayers, Care Direction
Heather Ellis, Department of Economic Security
Theresa James, City of Tempe
Paul Ludwick, Maricopa County
Nancy Marion, House of Refuge East
Darcie Martinez, The Salvation Army
Nancy Marion, House of Refuge East
Carolyn Mitchell, Wells Fargo Bank
Amy Schwabenlender, Valley of the Sun United Way
Laura Scotnicki, Save the Family
Nicky Stevens, ABC Housing
Keith Thompson, Phoenix Shanti
Lisa Wilson, City of Mesa
*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.
+Those members present by audio or videoconference.

1. Call to Order and Introductions
Annette Stein, Planning Subcommittee Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:16 p.m. and introductions ensued.
2. Call to the Audience
Maryann Beerling thanked Margaret Reiber for her work with Haven House and praised her for how many lives she touched through the project.
3. Approval of October 16 2006 Meeting Minutes
Chair Stein asked for any revisions to the October 16, 2006 meeting minutes. Hearing none, she then called for a motion to approve the minutes. Dick Geasland made a motion to approve the minutes. Bob Duvall seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.
4. 2006 Annual Appreciation Luncheon
Brande Mead thanked those who attended the December 8, 2006 Continuum of Care Annual Appreciation Luncheon held at the Arizona Biltmore Resort and

Spa. She reported that approximately 140 people attended the luncheon. Key people that attended the luncheon were City of Phoenix Councilmember Greg Stanton, Maricopa County Supervisor Mary Rose Wilcox, Dr. Shelia Harris from the Arizona Department of Housing, and Rebecca Flanagan from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Ms. Mead stated that many different cities and towns were also represented at the luncheon. She then thanked the Stardust Foundation for sponsoring the event and their commitment to funding the luncheon for the next four years. Ms. Mead reported that there was a video presentation shown, which highlighted a formerly homeless person who went through one of the Native American Connections programs. She stated that the video will be shown after meeting for those who did not attend the lunch.

Ms. Mead also mentioned the guest speaker, Melissa Morado from Save the Family. Ms. Morado shared her success story and thanked providers for their work. The 2006 Star Award was presented to John Hogeboom of Community Bridges. Mr. Hogeboom was unable to attend so the award was accepted by Jon Wall. Ms. Mead said that a book of local success stories was compiled and handed out at the luncheon. The book features many stories of success in Maricopa County and is available if anyone would like one. Ms. Mead stated that she will be looking for recommendations for a national speaker for the 2007 luncheon.

Chair Stein asked if anyone had any comments or suggestions for a National Speaker. There were no suggestions made.

Keith Thompson commended staff for all of their work on the Appreciation Luncheon. He suggested a note of sympathy be sent to Jerry Bisgrove for the recent passing of his wife, Debi Bisgrove. Chair Stein stated that a card will be signed at the next Continuum of Care meeting. Brande Mead provided information about the service taking place on Wednesday, January 10, 2007 at 10:30 a.m. at the Paradise Valley United Methodist Church. It was added that there will also be a viewing at 6:00 p.m. at the same location on Tuesday, January 9, 2007.

5. 2007 Homeless Street Count Update

Brittany Lane stated that coordinators have been identified for all cities and towns in Maricopa County except for Carefree. If a coordinator cannot be identified for Carefree then MAG staff will count that area. Ms. Lane noted that there has been a lot of interest from volunteers to participate in the street count and that they have all been placed with coordinators. Ms. Lane said that the Street Count trainings will be held on January 18th for the city of Phoenix, and January 25th for the East and West Valleys. Debriefing meetings will be held either on February 1st or 2nd. Ms. Lane thanked everyone for their participation and support.

Brande Mead stated that the 2007 Homeless Shelter Count will be done using the HMIS for providers who are on HMIS. Providers that are not on HMIS will be receiving a hard copy survey as was done last year. All providers will be notified shortly of the process.

6. 2007 McKinney Vento HUD Application Planning

Brandee Mead led a discussion on the weights for the 2007 HUD application and presented a review of last year. She stated that there has not been an announcement from HUD yet on funding, but there has been word that the funding announcement will be sometime in January. Ms. Mead said that next years' application should be out around the same time as last year, which was in March. She also said that the application will not be online this year.

Ms. Mead reviewed the feedback she received last year. The feedback included:

- Start talking about the planning and weights process earlier,
- Provide more turn around time with the application and ranking and review process,
- Measure goal achievement through the Arizona Evaluation Project, and
- Define the ranking and review process more.

Application Completeness

Ms. Mead stated that many applications were turned in incomplete last year and she suggested adding a category for application completeness this year.

Maryann Beerling asked if a checklist will be included with the application. Ms. Mead indicated that yes, there will be a checklist.

Jon Wall stated that he thought it would be a good idea to include weights for application completeness, and asked it would be based off of a 1 to 3 point scale.

Ms. Beerling stated that she thinks the application completeness weight should not be a scale but rather 2 points for complete and zero points for not complete.

Keith Thompson asked if the Continuum of Care is ever criticized for not being open to new applicants. He added that he does not want the process to be harder for new applicants.

Amy St. Peter stated that new applications may take longer and that to Keith's point it's more work for new applicants to complete.

Theresa James stated that if training is provided to everyone then the application process should be the same for new and renewed projects.

Deanna Jonovich said that new projects may need some extra assistance but if a checklist of application materials is provided then there should not be a disadvantage.

Ms. St. Peter stated that other funders will not fund applications that are not complete. She continued that we want to make sure that organizations won't lose their funding. However, it takes a lot of staff time to go back and forth with agencies on incomplete applications.

Ms. Beerling asked about how many applications are turned in incomplete. Ms. St. Peter stated that roughly 75% of applications are turned in incomplete.

Lisa Wilson inquired if application checklists had been provided in the past.

Ms. St. Peter answered that yes there have been checklists for the past few years. She said that sometimes all of the forms are turned in but that the HUD application is very complex and that sometimes even though they are turned in questions can be missed.

Ms. Robbins made a motion for 2 points to be given for application completeness; 0 points for incomplete and 2 points for complete. The motion was seconded by Dick Geasland and Margaret Reiber. The vote passed unanimously.

Leverage

Brande Mead described that leverage was weighted on a 1-5 scale last year based on the percentage of leverage brought in compared to the funding request. An agency bringing in 25-49 percent of leverage would receive one point and an agency with 200 percent or more would receive five points. Ms. St. Peter stated that the overall number of leverage went up last year. Ms. Mead added that a few organizations were able to bring in over 200 % getting 5 points but the majority of applicants received 3 points in this category.

Maryann Beerling asked if there was a difference of percentages between large and small agencies. Ms. St. Peter said that so far the size difference has not made an impact. The leverage being scaled to 200% actually helps the smaller agencies.

Laura Skotnicki asked if there was any negative feedback from agencies on the leverage scale. Ms. Mead stated that the only feedback had been positive.

Nancy Marion asked if MAG was able to help and support agencies because funders do not have a willingness to support and give information to agencies.

Ms. Mead stated that obtaining leverage could be a major focus in the HUD trainings this year. Ms. Skotnicki requested that the leverage training be done early. Ms. St. Peter stated that it can be done at the next Subcommittee meeting and examples could be provided.

Jacki Taylor put forth the motion to keep the leverage the same. Brenda Robbins seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

Performance

Brande Mead stated that to get the performance rating MAG took the average percent of all the goals that were listed in the APRs and then based it off of a 1-10 scale. A project achieving 20-39 percent of their goals identified in their APR received 2 points on up to an agency achieving 95-100 percent of their goals received 10 points. Ms. Mead stated that this was an area of great feedback and asked for comments or possible changes.

Maryann Beerling asked if there was an average rating amongst the agencies. Ms. Mead stated that there were a few agencies which received full points, but the overall average was around 6.

Dick Geasland said that this is an area where an agency can challenge itself and that some agencies were creating challenging goals.

Ms. St. Peter stated that staff has been frustrated because many agencies were not pushing themselves to do better. She also stated that agencies have different types of goals and it is hard to measure the achievement of different types of outcome measures.

Mr. Geasland asked how this piece fits into the overall performance of goals in the HUD application. Ms. St. Peter stated that it is important to HUD and is a section that is scored higher each year. She added that our average tends to be below the national average.

Brandee Mead stated that transitional housing, how long they stayed in housing, if client's transition into permanent housing, and employment is what's important to HUD.

Mr. Geasland suggested that our performance weight should be determined by what is important to HUD.

Laura Skotnicki mentioned the difference in wage issues, because some agencies want their clients to have higher than a minimum wage job and some just want their clients to have any job.

Ms. St. Peter suggested using the self-sufficiency matrix in measuring performance.

Mr. Geasland wanted to know in terms of HUD rating, do they take points away based on low scoring APRs. Ms. St. Peter stated that HUD rates on raw, computer generated numbers concerning housing and employment.

Maryann Beerling asked if outcome measures can be changed in the ARP for renewal projects. Ms. St. Peter stated that yes you can change outcome measures that have been turned into MAG and HUD allows it on APRs as well.

A discussion on lack of services in the West Valley ensued.

Laura Skotnicki stated that numbers get skewed on 2 year programs because people leave at different times and numbers can look good one year but not the next.

Ms. St. Peter asked if the group wanted to recommend using the self sufficiency matrix as the measurement tool. Ms. Beerling stated she was uncertain if people know the matrix well enough to do so.

Ms. St. Peter stated that the matrix is a good measurement tool, and that HUD has been looking at it as a best practice. Ms. St. Peter also stated that maybe before the next meeting MAG staff could put some information together on how the matrix could be used in this format and report back to the Subcommittee.

Amy Schawbenlender stated she would rather focus on what HUD is looking at and use APR questions 12 and 14.

Amy St. Peter said that measurement with the matrix would be based on overall movement in the matrix. She explained that the focus would be on how many points had been increased in the matrix and not what the outcome measure might be from that movement.

Deanna Jonovich expressed her concerns with how the self sufficiency matrix would help with the overall application improvement to HUD.

Ms. St. Peter responded that if a program is making good progress within the self sufficiency matrix, then they would probably be scoring well with housing and employment too.

Ms. Jonovich asked if it is possible to measure just housing and employment through the self sufficiency matrix since that is what HUD is measuring. Amy St. Peter responded that it is possible to just look at those categories.

Margaret Reiber suggested leaving the weight on performance the way it was last year until more can be done through the self sufficiency matrix.

Mr. Geasland posed that we only focus on questions 12 and 14 from the APR.

Maryann Beerling asked what does that do to the programs that don't, do they rank lower. Ms. Mead stated that they would get fewer points. A discussion ensued over how measuring through questions 12 and 14 would hurt various programs present.

Laura Skotnicki posed that we leave the measurement the same way.

Ms. St. Peter stated that the application process is getting more and more competitive and that last year we were 2 points away from not getting a new project funded. If we leave it the same way we could get fewer points if project performance is scoring low. Ms. Mead added that this is the area HUD has increased points in the last couple of years.

Ms. St. Peter suggested finding best practices of other Continuums and report on them at the next meeting, and then make a decision.

Bob Duvall stated we have to be aware of the fact that HUD is moving their focus to permanent housing and that the committee needs to be proactive and consider the importance of what HUD is doing.

It was decided that MAG staff will generate a menu of choices and best practices and put together information on what the average weight scores were last year.

Participation

Brandee Mead stated that participation is based on Continuum of Care meetings, HMIS meetings, and the Homeless Street Count.

Deanna Jonovich asked how agencies rated on this category overall last year. Ms. Mead stated that there were mostly 2's and many 3's.

Dick Geasland asked if there is a list of all of the meeting dates that are considered for this category. Brandee Mead stated she had a schedule of the meeting dates of last year and this year for the Continuum meetings and HMIS meetings as well. Bob Duvall said he has a list of attendees of the HMIS Advisory Board and HMIS User Group meetings.

Mr. Geasland asked if the Street Count was the only non-meeting participation they receive points for. Ms. St. Peter replied yes.

Deanna Jonovich asked if overall did we score well on participation. To which Ms. St. Peter also replied yes.

Brenda Robbins made a motion to keep the participation weight the same as it was last year. Laura Skotnicki seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

Arizona Evaluation Project

Ms. Mead stated that last year's question regarding the Arizona Evaluation Project was a yes or no question. Organizations received points for attendance in meetings and compliance with the project. Ms. Mead stated that there had been discussion of increasing points of the Evaluation Project, because of the importance of the project.

Ms. Robbins asked stated her concern of the controversy and time consumption of the Evaluation Project for agencies. Ms. St. Peter responded that the Evaluation Project measures performance which is an area that HUD is increasingly looking towards and sees the Arizona Evaluation Project as a tool they can be used to increase performance. Ms. Robbins stated she wanted to hear what a provider had to say instead.

Laura Skotnicki stated that it does not take anymore time then anything else and that it is easier to put information in the computer than filling out a form. Maryann Beerling stated that agencies agree to do HMIS when they agree to do the application.

Jacki Taylor made a motion that the 3 point system remains the same. Ms. Mead stated if it remains a 3 point scale then the way it is scored would need to change.

Jacki Taylor made a motion to keep the Arizona Evaluation Project weights the same as last year. Margaret Reiber seconded the motion. Brenda Robbins abstained from the vote. The motion passed as presented.

Bonus Points

Brande Mead then brought up the bonus point category awarded for amending a contract with HUD and reclassifying funding from services to housing. She explained that 5 bonus points were given last year because the reclassification of funding can help the Continuum of Care overall with the total HUD scoring.

Margaret Reiber stated that she likes the opportunity for the bonus points but that organizations should be clear on what counts as reclassifying funding.

Brenda Robbins made a motion keep the bonus points the same. Jon Wall seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

Ms. Mead asked if the subcommittee wanted to consider anything else when determining weights. Mr. Geasland suggested looking at what is important to HUD and have the same priorities. It was decided that this will be an open discussion at the next meeting.

7. Evaluations of Planning Subcommittee

Chair Stein tabled the discussion of the evaluation of the Planning Subcommittee to the next meeting on February 12, 2007 due to lack of time. Chair Stein stressed the importance of evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the Planning Subcommittee.

Brande Mead asked members if they would fill it out the paper survey form handed out today and leave it for staff or fax it back. Ms. Mead thanked the subcommittee for all their hard work and stressed the importance of their feedback.

8. Call to the Audience

No comments were made.

9. Announcements

Maryann Beerling stated that New Arizona Family, Inc. has 12 beds for permanent housing that will be open in February for SMI clients. If anyone has clients that fit the requirements, please let her know.

Brenda Robbins stated that a Senate Bill 10-38 is of interest, particularly to those with interest on future development This Bill deals with the revising Arizona Tax Code for development and will be discussed on Wednesday January 10, 2007. Ms. Robbins stated that the lawsuit which fostered this litigation is going to court and suggested that members attend the hearing for more information.

Chair Stein reminded everyone that the next meeting will be on Monday, February 12, 2007.

10. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:37 p.m.