

**Continuum of Care Program | FY 2015  
Competition Debriefing**

---

CoC Name: Maine Balance of State CoC

CoC Number: ME-500

---

The chart below indicates the maximum amount of points available for each scoring category and the actual score your CoC received.

| Scoring Category                              | Maximum Score (Points) | Your CoC Score (Points) |
|---|------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>CoC Engagement</i>                         | 55                     | 44.25                   |
| <i>Homeless Management Information System</i> | 27                     | 25                      |
| <i>System Performance</i>                     | 98                     | 80                      |
| <i>Accessing Mainstream Benefits</i>          | 19                     | 19                      |
| Leveraging                                    | 1                      | 1                       |
| <b>CoC Application Score</b>                  | <b>200</b>             | <b>172.25</b>           |
| <i>Bonus Points – Early submission</i>        | 3                      | 3                       |
| <b>Total CoC Score with Bonus Points</b>      | <b>203</b>             | <b>175.25</b>           |

**Overall Scores for all CoCs**

Highest Score for any CoC: 188

Lowest Score for any CoC: 49.5

Median Score for all CoCs: 149.75

Weighted Median Score for all CoCs: 158.25\*

\*CoCs that scored higher than the weighted median score were more likely to gain funding relative to their Annual Renewal Demand, while CoCs that scored lower than the weighted median were more likely to lose money relative to their Annual Renewal Demand.

## Continuum of Care Program | FY 2015 Competition Debriefing

### Specific CoC Application Questions with Points

Below is a selection of some CoC Application questions that includes the total points available for each of the questions listed and the points received by the CoC for the question.

| CoC Application Questions   | Maximum Score Available | CoC Score Received |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------|
| 1C-4. List each of the Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) within the CoC's geographic area. If there are more than 5 PHAs within the CoC's geographic area, list the 5 largest PHAs. For each PHA, provide the percentage of new admissions that were homeless at the time of admission between October 1, 2014 and March 31, 2015, and indicate whether the PHA has a homeless admissions preference in its Public Housing and/or Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program. (Full credit consideration may be given for the relevant excerpt from the PHA's administrative planning document(s) clearly showing the PHA's homeless preference, e.g. Administration Plan, Admissions and Continued Occupancy Policy (ACOP), Annual Plan, or 5-Year Plan, as appropriate). | 3                       | 3                  |
| 4B-1. Based on the CoC's FY 2015 new and renewal project applications, what percentage of Permanent Housing (PSH and RRH), Transitional Housing (TH) and SSO (non-Coordinated Entry) projects in the CoC are low barrier? Meaning that they do not screen out potential participants based on those clients possessing a) too little or little income, b) active or history of substance use, c) criminal record, with exceptions for state mandated restrictions, and d) history of domestic violence.   | 6                       | 6                  |
| 4B-2. What percentage of CoC Program-funded Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), RRH, SSO (non-Coordinated Entry) and Transitional Housing (TH) FY 2015 Projects have adopted a Housing First approach, meaning that the project quickly houses clients without preconditions or service participation requirements?   | 6                       | 6                  |
| <i>This question assessed whether a CoC used objective criteria and past performance to review and rank projects. To receive full points, CoCs would have had to use performance-based criteria to at least partially evaluate and rank projects. Examples of performance criteria include reducing the length of time people experienced homelessness and the degree to which people exited programs for permanent housing destinations.</i>   | 13                      | 8                  |
| 1F-2. In the sections below, check the appropriate box(s) for each section to indicate how project applications were reviewed and ranked for the FY 2015 CoC Program Competition. (Written documentation of the CoC's publicly announced Rating and Review procedure must be attached.)   |                         |                    |
| 1F-2a. Describe how the CoC considered the severity of needs and vulnerabilities of participants that are, or will be, served by the project applications when determining project application priority.  | 3                       | 3                  |

**Continuum of Care Program | FY 2015  
Competition Debriefing**

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 3A-3. Performance Measure: Length of Time Homeless. Describe the CoC's efforts to reduce the length of time individuals and families remain homeless. Specifically, describe how your CoC has reduced the average length of time homeless, including how the CoC identifies and houses individuals and families with the longest lengths of time homeless.                                    | 6 | 6 |
| 3A-5. Performance Measure: Returns to Homelessness. Describe the CoC's efforts to reduce the rate of individuals and families who return to homelessness. Specifically, describe at least three strategies your CoC has implemented to identify and minimize returns to homelessness, and demonstrate the use of HMIS or a comparable database to monitor and record returns to homelessness. | 5 | 5 |
| 3B-1.4. Did the CoC adopt the orders of priority in all CoC Program-funded PSH as described in Notice CPD-14-012: Prioritizing Persons Experiencing Chronic Homelessness in Permanent Supportive Housing and Recordkeeping Requirements for Documenting Chronic Homeless Status?  | 6 | 3 |
| 3B-1.5. CoC Program funded Permanent Supportive Housing Project Beds prioritized for serving people experiencing chronic homelessness in FY2015 operating year.   | 6 | 3 |
| 3B-2.8. Using HMIS, compare all unaccompanied youth (under age 18, and ages 18-24) served in any HMIS contributing program who were in an unsheltered situation prior to entry in FY 2013 (October 1, 2012 - September 30, 2013) and FY 2014 (October 1, 2013 - September 30, 2014).  | 5 | 2 |