Three County CoC Ranking and Evaluation Committee Meeting

May 22, 2020

Meeting notes

***Present:* Keleigh, Brooke, Michele, Kim S, Rebecca M, Dave C.**

**Update on planning for site monitoring & NOFA planning updates**

**No current updates on NOFA release or COVID-19 differences/expectations**. Keleigh had a call with the National Alliance to End Homelessness last week and was informed that they are working to encourage Congress to pass a plan for automatic renewal for CoC projects. No real news,

The CoC has scheduled **OFFsite monitoring zoom** meetings with projects and sent out a self assessment tool requesting needed information for preparation. Keleigh shared with the group the self assessment and the list of items which will be addressed in monitoring meetings. No onsite monitoring will be planned for quite some time.

***APRs.***  Annual Performance Report will give us some of these – Michele has created these for the identifiers.  TIMEFRAME:  we will choose dates from Spring of 2019-spring of 2020, there are issues we need to manage in the new reporting platform.

Suggestion: Include questions regarding COVID-19 responses. Discussed sharing the information with partner agencies coming from HUD. PPE, what kind exposure might landlords be concerned with. The COC should put together information for partner agencies regarding turnovers in housing and other best practices.

 **Overview from Threshold requirements discussion last meeting & discussion of what to include for this year’s scoring tools.**

* CoC Threshold Requirements
* **Coordinated Entry Participation** -Keleigh shared that Last year we separated it in to four areas.  Shouldn’t include “performs vulnerability assessments.” .  Group shared concerns about removing it.  Suggested just TH be evaluated for doing it.
* **Housing First and Low Barrier**  - How do we evaluate? Review files for when project reject or decline a referral and for terminations… make sure all steps taken to avoid termination and following Fair Housing
* **Project has reasonable costs per permanent housing exit as defined locally”**  Represents some of what is really apple and oranges/housing costs are not the same in our broad geography. Some have subsidies.  Footnote this and summarize as part of the narrative.
* **Active CoC participation** –What is a member in good standing  - points for attending meetings, and chairing committees – include work they are doing on the ground that can be making an impact to end homelessness.
* **Bed Utilization** – what do we do for new projects? – agency explanation in narrative?  COVID-19?  First year processes.  Weigh their score?  ***From a nuts and bolts perspective – we need to approve a new threshold for new projects – held to a 50% rate? Group agreed.***

 ● **Performance Measures** – may need to check **length of stay for RRH, Returns to homelessness** – should we be adding this? Maybe for this year, baseline, but not add this year, - consider how statewide database can support this for next year. **Increased income** – because we have projects in such large ranges of geography – how is this affected by transportation issues and locations.
 ● **Serve Priority Populations –** this seems like it is more an assessment of the CoC in general, unless someone isn’t using the CE system. Interesting info, but are we rewarding folks for something that we aren’t measuring. Is the program turning over if someone who is high need, is ready for a move on strategy. The CoC should be thinking about strategizing about that. It is hard to move people on because of the supply and demand.

 ● **Other and Local Criteria.** **Georgraphic coverage –** people who live in remote locations – programs are high need (TH) that don’t have a lot of services in this area. Historically – **Hilltown, North Berkshire - LH, North Quabbin (Dialself).** Non-entitlement communities. North Adams – mini entitlement. Should it be ten points?

- Keleigh is asking - Should we be thinking about extra points for “**New Projects**” – Rebecca said, should we be worrying about getting “dinged” for permissiveness for the application.

Dave and Rebecca discussed the subjectiveness that has come and how can we be competitive about what our expectations are with projects and protect the agencies.

**Priority populations** – is this different than the populations from

**Rebecca** – asked why are some of these local criteria not checked. Should we check everything? HUD reviewers may not think that we are paying attention to things that are not checked. Lets find the balance between accommodating projects and supporting them, and HUD’s thoughts around expectations.

**CE –** CoC should look this over and determine which “assessing clients” to use.

next meeting: Friday, June 19th 11am-12:30pm

* Look at new project planning/customization
* Plan for NOFA response