**Maine Continuum of Care**

**Full MCOC Meeting in Place of the Steering Committee Meeting**

**Minutes**

**10-20-14**

**Attendance:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Agency** | **Name** | **Present** | **Absent** |
|  | Bread of Life Ministries | Heather Lea | **X** |  |
|  | City of Bangor | Awa Conteh  Rindy Fogler | **X** |  |
|  | Community Housing of Maine | Vickey Rand | **X** |  |
|  | Hope and Justice Project | Francine Sark | **X** |  |
|  | Kennebec Behavioral Health | Donna Kelley |  | **X** |
|  | Maine Department of Health & Human Services | Chet Barnes | **X** |  |
|  | MaineBehavioral Health Care | Steve Price | **X** |  |
|  | MaineHousing | Paula Paladino |  |  |
|  | Mid-Maine Homeless Shelter | Betty Palmer | **X** |  |
|  | New Beginnings | Mike Mooney | **X** |  |
|  | OHI | Gail Garrow | **X** |  |
|  | PCHC | Catherine Sullivan | **X** |  |
|  | Shalom House | Ginny Dill  Norm Maze | **X** |  |
|  | Shaw House | Tiffany Albert | **X** |  |
|  | Tedford Housing | Craig Phillips | **X** |  |
|  | WCARC (Millbridge) | Tom Michaud |  |  |
|  | York County Shelters | Wes Phinney  David Beseda | **X** |  |

**Minutes Taken By: Paula Paladino**

**Agenda Items:**

* Finalize Ranking and Tiering for Project Applications for the FY2014 Project Priority Submissions for the NOFA Competition.

**Discussion:**

* The purpose of today’s meeting was to continue the discussion that ensued at the full MCoC meeting on Thursday, October 16, 2014. During the meeting the Project Committee informed the full MCoC that it had completed its scoring of the renewal projects and the one new project application (the planning grant). However the committee did not get to the ranking and tiering of the projects and a substantial amount of discussion occurred at the full MCoC meeting about both HUD and MCoC priorities. Due to timing, it was decided to change the regularly scheduled Steering Committee on 10/20/14 to a full MCoC meeting and to extend an open invitation to all members to participate in continuing this discussion.
* As a result, the meeting for today was extended by an hour so that the meeting ran from 9:00 am-12:00 pm. MaineHousing offered a GoTo meeting so that all members across the state could call in and participate remotely and also be able to see the ranking document as it was being discussed and finalized.
* The meeting began with one of the members asking why not all applications were scored again in this competition? The FY2013-2014 NOFA Competition stated that the Exhibit 1 only had to be submitted in the first round. However all project applicants needed to submit their applications in both rounds. It was discussed that due to the short turn around time and the fact the applications had recently been scored in January, that the Project Committee made the decision that they would only score first time renewals and new project applications. Concerns about this approach that were discussed included the fact that some projects worked hard to improve their programs and thus their scores in 2014: by keeping the same scores, it is unfair and does not reflect on the work they actually did this year to improve. Also, since projects have various operating years, the scoring process should occur consistently on a yearly basis: the January scoring was in fact 4 months late if it was compared to 2012 and therefore, scoring for this round should have occurred.
* After much discussion it was agreed upon that this should have gone to a vote for the full MCoC: however in the interest of time, the group can move forward with the realization that the scores are only one part of the ranking process.
* The other part is a discussion about where the projects fit into the MCoC and HUD’s priorities. For example, the Project Committee said that it would continue to adhere to the MCoC priorities agreed upon in the last round: Transitional Housing (TH) for Veterans, youth and victims of DV would take priority over other TH projects. The discussion then ensued that the substance abuse and mental health TH programs also should get a priority as this is a special subpopulation.
* Paula provided and displayed the slides with HUD’s priorities for Tier 1 and Tier2 and also displayed the documents that summarized the process for ranking and selection in the last round. This was discussed in great depth and in particular how, HMIS seemed to be at the bottom (#8) for both Tiers in terms of HUD priorities.
* The discussion moved to the role of HMIS and the fact that HMIS does not serve clients. Where does HMIS fit? It was noted that if HMIS was put in Tier 2 then all the projects serving clients would get funded and the only two in Tier 2 would be the HMIS application and the planning grant. The pro’s and con’s of this was discussed and Paula was asked to have an HMIS staff or Cindy call in to discuss some of the HMIS grant details. The very real concern is that if HMIS was put in Tier 2 and not funded, all the projects would need to absorb the HMIS costs because this would still continue to remain a HUD requirement. Are projects prepared to absorb these costs and how would they be distributed. Megan joined the call and spent time answering questions.
* It was finally decided to put HMIS as the last project in Tier 1. Next, the group spent time placing all the PH projects above the TH projects. Finally, the TH projects were ranked according to populations served.
* It was noted that Paula needs to notify all projects today of the ranking and also post this on [www.mainehomelessplanning.org](http://www.mainehomelessplanning.org) website.
* Awa made a motion which was seconded by Betty to accept the FINAL Ranking and Scoring Document as it was displayed for all to see. The vote was as follows:

Vickey: yes

Awa: yes

Betty: yes

Mike: yes

Ginny: yes

Tom: yes

Paula: abstain

David: no

Chet: abstain

Catherine: yes

Gail: Yes

Heather: yes

Craig: ?

* Another motion was made by Awa and seconded by Betty to give the Collaborative Applicant the authority to enter the Final Ranking and Scoring document into e-snaps and to submit the Project Priority listing on behalf of the MCoC. All voted yes, except for three who abstained: Chet, David and Paula.
* Paula stated that as a result of the votes, she would notify projects and post the document on the [www.mainehomelessplanning.org](http://www.mainehomelessplanning.org) today.

The next meeting of the Steering Committee will be on 10/20/14. The purpose of the meeting will be to review the results of the Compliance Review by the Project Committee on 10/23 and to complete any unfinished items that need to be addressed so that MaineHousing can submit the application on Wed. 10/29.