**Augusta:** Vickey Rand (Community Housing of Maine), , Chet Barnes (DHHS SAMHS), Donna Kelley (Kennebec Behavioral Health), Paula Paladino (Maine Housing),

**Conference Call:** Ginny Dill (Shalom House), Awa Conteh (Bangor Health and Community Services)

**Meeting: MCOC Steering**

**Date/Time: 8/17/15 10:00 am – 11:30 pm**

**Location: MaineHousing & Conference Call**

**Maine**

**Continuum of Care**

**Review and approve minutes:** No formal minutes were drafted at the last meeting as it was a small brief steering meeting.

**NOFA Preparation (Work Plan, Priorities, Project/Monitoring, etc.)**

Paula reported reviewing the HUD website regularly – not new info on the nofa. Last notice indicated about 60 days at least for the release but the group noted some conflicting info floating around.

* October 1 – Sept 31 is HUDs fiscal year. System performance standards in effect Oct. The 2014 data standards 2014 so they may want a full year of info. Maybe we will see a November release – just speculation.
* Vickey reported that CHOM is moving – just down the street to new digs.
* Given that the NOFA is not out and the budget MaineHousing has is tight we will not involve Anne yet. We may lose the opportunity as she goes away soon too.
* Today do a review of the following as we can:
	+ Work plan
	+ Priorities
	+ Reallocation
	+ Ranking
	+ Project priorities
* Review of HMIS:
	+ Mary taking over as Cliff will be gone she will participate in the Data committee and do monthly reports.
	+ UDE completeness reports reviewed monthly. Going out and work continues with some projects for DATA clean up and showing results.
	+ Bowman training is tomorrow.
	+ The Steering Committee requested a presence from HMIS at all COC meetings. Paula reported that there are no resources to support that. It was suggested then that someone who does attended the COC meeting be able to address HMIS issues and questions. Paula indicated only specific requests made ahead of time can be addressed at the COC meeting. Data Committee does get reports and then can be brought back to the COC.
	+ Reporting can go from the DATA group to the COC. And HMIS can make a plan to assist Projects to clean up data.
	+ Reports are run on the 10th of the month. If not improvement after working with Projects the reports will be run for the COC Chairs if a project continues to be “non-compliant”. I think we need to be clear about noncompliance and what that means. Some of the data issues are relative to the type of project and population. Outreach is a different animal then a shelter with a captive audience or a PSH project.
* Review of work plan:
	+ GIW done
	+ Registration Done
	+ Waiting for the opening of the NOFA competition
	+ Reallocation was estimated at registration about 30,000 we will not be held to that.
	+ Priority listing was discussed (last year’s process)
	+ Review of The Projects monitoring process to date:
		- All project completed with exception of one.
	+ Reviewed the YCS issues with monitoring/data and APR amendments.
		- Some felt maybe they did not care
		- Clearly they had tech issues and it appears changes in data entry staff
		- A lot of data entry issues
		- They do good work focusing on the persons served but appears not to have same focus on paperwork data needs
		- It was suggested that they go back to HMIC training.
		- Some questioned if they still care about the COC HUD funding
		- Wes appears to have not control – both Donna and Awa have reached out to him.
		- Awa has spent a lot of technical assistance time with David and the data people but issues are still not resolved.
		- This is the only entity beyond any and all deadlines to resolve monitoring issues at this point don’t really have usable info to monitor. End result is multiple corrected APRs.
		- Discussed reaching out further to Executive Director since this could impact funding.
		- There will be some potential natural consequences relative to issues and scoring and ranking potentially which could result in funding issues and or loss.
		- Steer and COC could offer more training and support. Not sure what that would look like beyond the work Awa/monitoring has already done.
		- The group decided to identify all leadership at YCS and sent another email to encourage training and attending the user group training Tuesday. Donna will send
		- They were to correct data issues by Tuesday to AWA and Projects. If they do not get those in Awa and Donna will notify the Chairs an Email with clear expectations and consequences may be sent.
		- Paula will review the master lists to see would the contacts are. She provided those.
		- Discussed the outline of a notice if they do not follow thru with data requested by time from provided by Projects.
			* Need corrected info by X date
			* This effects YCS funding and COC project funding.
			* Failure to submit and correct could put your funding at risk. (discussed that this This is not something we have ever done before).
			* Data issues and concerns can be addressed thru HMIS support staff
			* If they did not complete info and correction to AWA and Donna by Tuesday Steering will send notice as described above.
		- The group wanting an update if they registered and or attend the Training tomorrow and after we send the email. Paula noted they did not register.
		- There was concern overall with the effort YCS is putting in. Are they taking this seriously? Multiple APR already entered and corrected multiple times.
	+ NOFA and funding realities and consequences
		- Not all renewals will continue to be funded
		- There is just not that much funding
		- HUD is changing priorities
		- Have we been clear about our direction to the COC and projects.
		- We have until now not been directive - we have been supportive and provided technical assistance and some projects have responded well – Like Milbridge.
		- If we are going to get more directive of responsibilities we need to be more clear with our notifications.
		- Currently our scoring and ranking has been more of let the numbers fall based on our identified priorities and then we ranked to maximize funding toward the bottom of tier 1 and 2.
		- Some suggested that some don’t even move to ranking but automatically go to the bottom due to poor performance. We would have to set a clear threshold to do this and preferably ahead of time. Scoring and priorities can do some of this but we have never just moved a project to the bottom based on not meeting a minimum threshold. What would that be? Not completing data and monitoring? Do we keep extending the process date to complete? Is it multiple unresolved APR correction? As this in the end also impacts COC overall.
	+ Review Ranking and Priorities:
		- Our COC priorities have general aligned with HUDs for the most part. We have been consistent over the last few years to priorities renewals, PSH including S+C) and TSH for certain populations. We have not prioritized SSO project and gave reduced point for any projects seeking Service funding in general to encourage other services resource use.
		- HUD has clarified some items for us recently Services in projects can be used and encouraged
		- HUD is also recognizing the importance of SH **TH** programs.
		- Our 2013 rankings were reviewed
			* No SSO projects in Tier 1.
			* HMIS was always in Tire 1
			* PSH tended to land ahead of TSH with some exceptions for THS priority populations youth DV and Vets.
			* Pulled forward monitoring from 2013 to 2014
		- Different this year with monitoring form these last year’s we also monitored and reviewed program goals. Not sure if this should remain a big emphasis but continue our focus on the main HUD standards as we area.
		- Currently we have 31 projects:
			* 7 TH
			* HMIS
			* S+C
			* All others PSH
		- There was discussion about HMIS:
			* Some felt it should be put at the top automatically.
			* Some felt it should be scored and ranked as with all others but we need to get better about monitoring this type of project against its own standards.
			* Some felt it has always been in Tier 1 and should stay there.
			* The 1500 in user cost and some projects had 21 users
			* All agreed HMIS should continue to be a priority but not all agreed on placement
		- Prioritizing
			* Need to be more strategic maybe in these this year
			* Discussed housing and services type and a better review of services priority populations. The group felt that the populations serviced as priorities should be those based on the program design not is the program client demographic on whom they happened to have.
			* Example: KBH population is SPMI but we have had client also be DV or SA or Chronic or Vets but the target is SPMI not a vet. So by design we target SPMI
			* Example: Hope and Justice DV by design
			* Example: New Beginning youth by design.
			* TSH should only get points for the proposed population targeted by design.
			* Should we continue to give the same priorities for Family TSH as we do for youth or DV or Veterans?
			* Planning grant funds can also be used.
				+ There was a discussion as to this is part of the allocation or not. Some thought it was outside of the ARD. It was clarified it is part of the ARD so competing with all current for existing for funds.
			* Discussed reallocation;
				+ If project defunded or want to reallocate or if a new project comes in like the planning grant we will need another process and or scoring template based on COC priorities for new projects as well.

**Next Meeting will be:**

**September 14rd, 2015 at 10:00 am**

**The Conference Call number for the meeting will be distributed via email by Paula.**