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 Paula know and she will edit accordingly.

**Augusta:** Scott Tibbitts (MaineHousing), Chet Barnes (DHHS) Craig Phillips (Tedford Housing), Beth Crow (FVP), Mike Mooney (New Beginnings).

**Portland:** Vickey Rand (CHOM), Ginny Dill (Shalom House), Cullen Ryan (CHOM), Steve Ellis (Frannie Peabody) Amy Grommes Pulaski (G/P).

**Lewiston:** Mike Mooney (New Beginnings), Danielle Keeser from Senator Kings office.

**Bangor:** Awa Conte (City of Bangor), Gail Garrow.

**Phone:** Catherine Sullivan (Hope House), Donna Kelley (KBH), Tricia Plourde (Western maine Homeless Outreach), Tom Michaud (Milbridge Harbor), Sheena Curry (Shaw House).

**Maine**

**Continuum of Care**

**Meeting: Maine CoC**

**Date: September 7, 2016 Time: 10:00am**

**Location: Tandberg Teleconferencing Sites**

1. **Member Introductions**

The attending members and guests introduced themselves.

1. **Review of Minutes** There is a motion to approve minutes, it is seconded. Any discussion. No one opposed. –**Approved as submitted**.
2. **CoC NOFA- Scoring and Ranking.**

The Selection Committee chair, Steve Ellis introduces the scoring. There was a question regarding the scoring of the MSHA HMIS project- which the total score was reported at 119 points. The selection group scored the HMIS project and awarded an additional 5 points for self-sufficiency, however this award was not appropriate as HMIS is a data and software application and does not move people to self-sufficiency. There had been a decision previously by the steering committee that the maximum that HMIS could score 114. This change in score will change the ranking of this project.

The group discusses how this was brought to the selection committee’s attention. There was an email from the monitoring committee who raised the question. After re-evaluation of the tool and the points awarded, it was noticed that this self-sufficiency points were awarded erroneously.

There was other score changes since the project scores and ranking were presented to the Steering committee at the last meeting. The chairs explain what these changes were. When Monitoring evaluated the projects they did not count the steering committee as an additional committee. However, once the governance was reviewed, it is apparent that Steering is a standing committee and those projects that did not receive those points, were then appropriately awarded those points.

The group discusses whether to re-score and rank HMIS according to the appropriate score.

The group discusses how HMIS and NEW projects are not eligible to receive the full maximum points of 118. HMIS can only achieve 114 points and New projects can 100 points.

**There is a motion to change the HMIS score to be 114. This is seconded. Any discussion, no. No one is opposed. KBH is abstaining. This motion passes.**

**There is a motion to accept the scores and ranking that has been presented with the change is score from 119 to 114 for HMIS. This is the ranking and scoring that will be submitted to HUD for the MCoC application.** There is some discussion:

Tedford raised an issue regarding the size of projects and how occupancy affected their score. Another issue that was subcommittee attendance.

A member raises the question regarding the NEW MaineHousing TBRA project. The group discusses how HUD encouraged new projects to be competitive with renewal projects.

Several of the smaller more rural projects end up closer to the bottom. There is a concern that smaller rural projects don’t scores as well with the current scoring. There is a suggestion that the COC looks at some of the smaller projects to see how to make them successful.

To get the permanent housing bonus money as a continuum, our combined application has to score high enough to get the bonus. If it gets funded it will be funded based on the bonus money, not out of renewal funding.

The group discusses how last year the projects below the permanent housing bonus were transitional housing at non-priority populations according to HUD and that’s why they were likely not funded. The projects that are under the permanent housing bonus this year are still high performing projects and are still a priority to HUD and as long as the MCOC application scores well, it is possible that this projects will still be funded.

Once the discussion is complete, they decide to vote. **There is one abstention- KBH. The motion passes unanimously.**

Issues raised:

1) Occupancy based on size of project, especially for rooms in units.

2) Committee participation.

3) HMIS and NEW project total scores cannot compete with renewal applications (Total possible points HMIS=114, New=100, Renewal=118)
4) Rural smaller projects score lower.

**Next MCOC Meeting:**

Next **Steering Committee Meeting September 12 from 10-12** which will be to finalize the MCOC NOFA application. All are invited to attend.

The next MCOC scheduled for **September 15, is being proposed to be canceled.**

**The Next full MCOC meeting is October 20, 1-3 at the Tandberg sites.**