Disclaimer: These notes are not intended to represent direct quotes, things may not be in chronological order, and ideas may not always be accurately attributed. If you have corrections or comments, please let Scott know and he will edit accordingly.

**Augusta:** Scott Tibbitts (MaineHousing), Josh D’Alessio (PCHC), Mike Mooney (New Beginnings), Janelle Bechard ((Bread of Life), Dan Fleming (Shaw House), Donna Kelley (Kennebec Behavioral Health), Chet Barnes (DHHS), Melody Fitch (Family Violence Project)

**Portland:** Rob Parritt (City of Portland), Vickey Rand (CHOM), Cullen Ryan (CHOM), Joanie Klayman (Preble Street), Adam Harr (City of Portland), Ginny Dill (Shalom House), Bill Higgins (Homeless Voices for Justice), David Beseda (YCSPI), Amy Grommes Polaski (Grommes-Polaski Consulting)

**Bangor:** Gail Garrow (OHI), James Gagne (Preble Street), Sharon Flood (Next Step), Ally (Partners for Peace – Formerly Spruce Run/WomenCare),

**On the Phone**: Alley Smith (Veterans, Inc.), Janice Laura Hewey (Catholic Charities), Melanie Lamore Gagnon (Safe Voices), Elaine Gray (Knox County Homeless Coalition), Craig Phillips (Tedford Housing), Emily Flinkstrom (Fair Tide), Veronica Ross (The Opportunity Alliance), Gerald Botta (HOME, Inc), MJ Boyd (Emmaus), Jennifer Weatherby (CHCS), Kari Bradstreet (HJP), Mike Merrill (VOA), Jessica Wood (DHHS-OCFS), Mellissa McEntee (Rumford Group Homes), Joe McNally (Milestone), Heidi Bradley (CHCS), Awa Conteh (City of Bangor)

[If I missed anyone or misspelled your name, please let me know]

**Meeting: Maine CoC**

**Date: September 21, 2017, 1:00 to 4:00 PM**

**Location: Tandberg Teleconferencing Sites**

**Maine**

**Continuum of Care**

**Review of Minutes**: Minutes from August 17, 2017 reviewed. David Beseda added as attending. Approved as amended.

**Attendance:** A reminder that tracking attendance is not easy and is not simply a formality – it is a factor in both CoC and ESG Monitoring, so it is important to make sure your presence is recorded. It is often difficult to hear people on the phone, especially if more than one person speaks at a time so we may need to have folks repeat themselves to be sure we do not miss anyone. If you arrive or call in late, make sure we know you are here.

**MCOC NOFA: Due September 28th.** This will be the last full meeting prior to that deadline so the group needs to finalize and approve the Application itself and the separate Project Ranking results so that both sections can be submitted next week. Copies of both documents were posted for folks to review prior to today’s meeting.

-Overall, the CoC level Application process went really well this year, the NOFA Committee worked very hard but everyone felt good about the process and we think we have a strong application.

-Those who previously worked with both MCOC and PCOC agreed that organizing and completing one application is much easier than doing two at the same time.

-Cullen thanked everyone for making the merger happen – it is important that we trust each other.

-Everyone was given an opportunity to ask questions or express any concerns.

-Hearing none, a MOTION to APPROVE the APPLICATION portion for submission was made by Melody, 2nd by Cullen. PASSED without objection.

**Review of Scoring and Ranking:** Again, this must be finalized and approved for submission.

-Overall, this part was not so easy. Both the Monitoring Committee and the Selection Committee (the group that does the actual scoring of applications) had to meet again this week to make adjustments based on questions, concerns, and additional information.

-There is currently a 16 way tie for the top rank, and several other ties further down the list. These tied projects are currently listed in alphabetical order on the Ranking Chart provided for reference.

-If they were all approved for funding, does it matter which particular order they are in?

-They have all been recommended for funding by the committee, meaning no applications were rejected or disqualified, but HUD may not fund them all, typically because the money runs out at some point, so the order in which they are place on this list may make the difference between being funded or not, regardless of the actual score.

-We feel we have a strong overall Application which we hope will improve the odds of all of our projects being funded, but it depends on how HUD scores us, how well other CoC’s do, how much funding is ultimately available, and other factors we have no control over.

-In the past, we have ranked ‘tied’ projects in order from highest to lowest dollar amount requested. Other CoC’s also do this. Size, either in terms of dollars or units/beds seems like a reasonable factor to consider in the ranking process.

-Do we factor in Geography or Population served? Population served is a factor in Monitoring, which feeds into the scoring process. Geography is something we have also considered in the past on a case by case basis, but not something we have formally incorporated into scoring.

-All of the projects tied for first were S+C, either DHHS or City of Bangor. It was suggested and agreed to that we would place the City of Bangor projects first, in order of dollar amount, then the DHHS projects, also in order of dollar amount, since these were all safely in Tier 1.

-Other ties further down the list were discussed and most were resolved in a similar manner.

-On the list as posted, PCHC’s Hope House TH project straddled the Tier 1/Tier 2 line. If our CoC Application did not score well enough to qualify for Tier 2 funding, or if the money were to run out before any of our Tier 2 projects were funded, HUD would make a determination as to whether or not a project on the line would be viable if it received only the Tier 1 portion. Given the amounts here, and the nature of the project, that would not seem likely. DHHS volunteered to switch the rank order of their Maine 22 S+C project with the PCHC project to allow the PCHC project to be fully in Tier 1. Maine 22 is now split between Tier 1 and Tier 2, but could more easily adjust to the reduced funding should that be necessary.

-Preble Street had voluntarily reallocated the funding that would have gone to their Florence House Safe Haven project, and requested that same amount in their application for the expansion of their Huston Commons project. They were asked by the CoC to change from requesting Reallocation funds to Bonus Funds, in order to allow another project to access the reallocated funds. MaineHousing had submitted an application for a Coordinated Entry project that, because of HUD stipulations, can only be funded through reallocation – it could not access any other funding, whereas the Huston Commons Expansion could apply for ether Reallocated or Bonus funds. As it turned out, the Coordinated Entry project scored and ranked above the Huston Commons Expansion, so if the funding runs out somewhere in between, Huston Commons Expansion would not be funded. If they had stayed with their original request to use Reallocated funds, might they have had a better chance?

-The request to change from Reallocation to Bonus was based on the desire to maximize the number of projects and the total amount of funding that could potentially be awarded to MCOC. It was done prior to any scoring or ranking, so there was no way to know where the projects would end up in relation to each other on the final list. Also, we did not know ahead of time – not until the day before the project application submission deadline – that we were going to have any reallocations funds available at all. If we had, we might have been able to develop a clearer protocol for how such funds might be used.

-What is the Huston Common Expansion project for? It is to provide an expansion of medical service at the facility. But it isn’t creating new units – why was it was classified as Permanent Housing? Services in a Permanent Housing project are considered a Permanent Housing application. HUD is not really looking at Project Type as a scoring or ranking factor anymore.

-We should bring Project Presentations back into the process, at least for new projects. It would help everyone have a better sense of what each project is proposing to do and give members not on the selection committee a chance to ask questions before the applications are already approved.

-Some of the New Projects scored well but are at the bottom of the list? That is due to Renewals being Prioritized over new. If we had placed projects in order strictly by score, some new projects could have landed in Tier 1, which would have pushed Renewals into Tier 2, placing them at risk. We would rather lose a new, hypothetical project than lose a real one that is already housing people.

- There was still a question about the MaineHousing TBRA renewal? The project was not operationalized at the time of monitoring (no one was leased up yet). MaineHousing asked the Monitoring Committee if they needed to submit a Monitoring Form, as there was nothing to report. They received no reply, and did not submit a form. When the initial results were released, projects were given an opportunity to provide feedback. At that time, seeing that other similar projects were awarded points simply for submitting the forms, even though there was no meaningful information to report, MaineHousing submitted a Monitoring Form, but the Monitoring Committee chose not to make any adjustments to the Monitoring results. When the Selection Committee reviewed everything again, they asked the Monitoring Committee about this, but received no answer, so they did not feel they could adjust the score.

-Scott said the score, as it appears, is wrong, but there is no time now to run this through both the Monitoring and Selection committees again, and even if the score were to be adjusted it would probably not change the ranking placement, so it is not worth pursuing.

-MOTION to APPROVE the PROJECT RANKING as amended here today. 2nd and PASSED.

**State and Federal:** The House and Senate have competing versions of the THUD bill. The latest attempt to repeal and replace the ACA would dramatically cut Medicaid. MOTION that Cullen draft a letter to our Senators to protect MaineCare. 2nd and PASSED.

-The 1115 Waiver comment period has ended.

**SHC:** Kirsten Capeless from DHHS OCFS attended and there was a good discussion about homeless youth. MaineHousing was able to release another 40 HCV’s. Also discussed opioid and other substance abuse.

**LTS:** Portland lists are now down to 36 people and they are starting list #5. Bangor is down to 3 to 6 people, who all either have vouchers in hand or have refused to accept one.

-A new, updated version of the Maine Prioritization Chart is in the works. A Draft was sent out earlier. Some of the numbers till need to be updated but the language has been revised. While this is not yet fully finalized, we would like to include an updated version with the NOFA Application, and can work on another revision soon after.

-MOTION to approve this version pending addition of updated numbers. 2nd and PASSED.

**Governance:** Again, we would like to include an updated version with the NOFA Application.Three items have been changed since the last version was approved: A narrative describing the Youth Committee was added; a section describing Involuntary Reallocation was put back (this was inadvertently left out of the last version); [www.mainehomelessplanning.org](http://www.mainehomelessplanning.org) is designated as the official website of MCOC.

-It was pointed out that the narrative under the Data Committee begins with “Steering”. A cut and paste error - we will fix that too.

-MOTION to approve the newly revised Governance. 2nd and PASSED.

**RHC’s:** R3 – nothing new to report. R2 – hosted presentations on Legislative Updated from Maine Equal Justice Partners and Coordinated Entry from Josh. R1 – had a discussion of the opioid crisis and the need for a subsidy that can work in Recovery Residences. Chet has heard from several folks about using BRAP for this. BRAP has been successful because it was focused on a specific group. The Department wants to support recovery, but not with BRAP. If another source of funding can be found, the department would be happy to administer it.

-Joe said he understand the point, but this is not a ‘new’ population. There are a lot of folks with co-occurring disorders here – these are a lot of the same clients we have been seeing already. Substance Abuse is a mental health issue and should be treated as such. If his clients had access to proper health care, they would likely all have a mental health diagnosis already. We need more resources for this, but they are not there. BRAP is here, and not fully utilized. There must be a way to use it without damaging the integrity of the program.

-The SHC has recognized the need for a new funding source, modeled on BRAP, but not BRAP.

-This population needs their own solution. Yes, there is some cross over, but there is such a different level of need here.

-This is a current and growing issue, but not one are going to solve today. We should add it to our regular agenda and continue this discussion at future meetings.

**Board of Directors:** The BOARD has approved the following (which, again, we need for the application, and which have all been posted on the MHP site): HMIS Roles and Responsibilities; HMIS Data Standards; HMIS Policies and Procedures.

-MOTION that MCOC approve all of these. 2nd and PASSED.

-Most of the last several BOD meetings have focused on the NOFA, and the information has been covered in other parts of this meeting. The BOD still needs to establish clearer roles and responsibilities, and line of authority.

**Consolidation Committee:** Has been more or less on hold during the NOFA. As of next week we will have submitted one CoC for the entire state, so we really cannot use the merger excuse any more. Rather than continuing to put all this time and effort into cobbling together two old ways of doing things, we need to look at and focus on new ways and moving forward. We should be looking around and seeing what other CoC across the country are doing. Not looking backwards.

-True, but the merger happened so fast that there still are things that need to be ironed out to bring the groups closed. One NOFA submission does not make us one Continuum.

**Coordinated Entry:** At this point, most folks have a good sense of the big picture, but we still need the details – what exactly will it mean for each individual agency? There are trainings coming up that will help with some of these sorts of questions. The Train the Trainer session is about an hour and covers all of the “nuts & bolts”. It is very straightforward – there is a script to follow, a log in process, and some data entry. The process has been very well thought out and it will be easy to implement.

**Committees:** We really need more people to volunteer on all of the committees. Don’t be afraid. Ask one of the Chairs or anyone who is already on one. Awa said that both James and Fiona were new to the Project Committee this year but they both jumped right in, asked questions, helped out, and it was great. All projects should have people on committees.

**Other Business**: Both the Application and the Project Ranking were approved earlier in the meeting. Some attachments still need to be added, including some of the documents approved here today, to complete the entire package. MOTION to authorize Scott to complete and SUBMIT the Application, Project Ranking, and Attachments to HUD prior to the final deadline. 2nd and PASSED.

**Next Meeting:** October 19, 2017 from 1:00 to 3:00.