Three County CoC Ranking and Evaluation Virtual Committee meeting

9/12/22, 10:30-12

Present: Heather Roy, DTA, Calpurnyia Roberts, MHSA; Justine Dodds, City of Pittsfield; Kim Croce, Gfld Housing Authority; Pamela Schwartz, WMNEH; Stacy Parsons, Mckinney Vento; Andy Klatka, ELIOT, Michele LaFleur, CoC; Keleigh BenEzra, CoC.

**Share interested parties in reallocated funds from the Shelter Plus Care Project and detail**

 Committee Discussion

**Projects Interested:**

**Louison House –**

* + Joint Component - This is likely a transition grant/ as a combo of these two projects (current TH, **increased SS and new** **RRH funds**) - This moves funds to Berkshire County from Hampshire.

Program does well with demonstrating ss

often high ranking, especially for a TH project

Is a small program and fills pockets

Demonstrated need

Concerns: Will need TA to be sure we are doing it right

Concerns re: TH start is SOO early in the year, it could be difficult to start the transition so early.

* + - * **Transition grant/Joint Component OR it is a NEW EXPANSION project (new RRH funds to be added to existing TH Project – but confusing if this can then become a joint component–** believe the addition can still be ranked at the bottom
	+ OR PSH consolidation grant application (this is what Kathy did last year) - to increase housing for GLBTQ and Pregnant and Parenting youth (this would support a Capital Project that currently is underway for LH) can still be ranked at the bottom.

This moves funds to Berkshire County from Hampshire.

Program does well with demonstrating ss

often high ranking

Is a small program and fills pockets

Demonstrated need/supports a Capital Project under way

* + - * Renewal Project/Consolidation, could rank at the bottom (would work with Kathy to determine budget line items) -

**A Positive Place Betsy – PSH – same project type – serving chronic**

* Cooley will support this, can use DPH new supports – had to write in a clinical framework in vespar – mini-proposal. Not doing anything new – **still awaiting CE0 approval.**
* Match - cash - it might be that there are two new contracts by Aug of 2023, OD testing, counseling, Health Navigator/Harm reduction specialist – DPH funding.
	+ $22, 250. - Health Navigator support – cash match.
	+ SS - $34,068, units total, and admin.
	+ 4 1 Bedrooms – 988x4=
	+ Admin

Highest ranking agency, most years

Program does well with demonstrating SS

Excellent work on racial equity efforts

Funds remain in Hampshire County

* + - * **Could apply as a new project – EXPANSION** - if have health care support – would likely need to rank at the top – unless committee recommends the board change it’s decision on this (but MIGHT get 10 additional points for health care access)
			* **OR Renewal project - Consolidation,** and could rank at the bottom

**Wayfinders – PSH – same project type – serving chronic**

* Likely looking at a SS line item to staff with units that are existing – ***see attachments.***
* Still determining the details: If we use the funds to transition the existing Paradise Pond grant to include supportive services (for tenants at other properties in the Northampton portfolio) would we have to add the heath care component?
	+ **I think that if we do it as a "New Project" - we would want to try to include the health care component and we could show leveraged housing, which would be great. As you heard in the meeting, the committee may decide to support moving it to the bottom of the ranking chart even if it is a new project - however, we could also make it a project amount that works instead of just using the shelter plus care funding.**
* Under the same scenario, existing tenants in the other properties who receive supportive services would have to meet the “homeless” definition at move in, but not the chronic homelessness definition. However, any new move ins would have to meet the chronically homeless definition to receive services right? **Yes. If we do it as a PSH. I don't think we can do it as an RRH, because it isn't vouchers, but units.** **this scenario gets tricky to have it be a SS across projects. We couldn't really use this to support the current tenant is the existing PSH funded by the CoC - it would have to be outside of it, unless we want to increase the project that exists - as an expansion project..then increase the number of beds supported by this person - so this would NOT be a New project/would not need the health care component (but of course would welcome it).**
* Any vacancies at Paradise would continue to be offered through CE, but I am not sure that will be the case at other properties (depends on funding requirements) – will that be an issue? I know you said it would be for a new project, but I wasn’t sure about a transition project. - **Yes, all Units funded by the CoC (even those that are not literally using CoC funding, but the SS staff are supporting them, MUST come from CE.**

Ranks lower, most years

Program struggles with demonstrating SS, though this would provide that funding and with Deb moving to get this up and running..could be well supported.

Excellent work on racial equity efforts

Funds remain in Hampshire County

Concerns re: being new units (can’t create a project to serve already housed folks – unfortunately)

* + - * Could apply as a new project **– Expansion** - Unit leveraging– would likely need to rank at the top (but MIGHT get 10 additional points for unit resource leveraging)
			* **OR Renewal project – Consolidation -** and could rank at the bottom
				+ Either it’s own project and we are consolidating two very similar projects, which we would likely do as a consolidation project.

 **committee discussion and vote**

Questions:

* For FY21, How much funding is in what part of the region? How many units are in each county?
	+ - Below includes total funding/including CoC CAPV grants for administration.
			* Berkshires – **$677,019.49, 49 units**
			* Franklin – **83 units - $1,633,749** (just under 1 MIL YHDP)
			* Hampshire – **51 units (would be removing 8 if moved from Hampshire), $582,989.70**
			* Hampden – **7 units, $72,810.33**
* How many units do these possibilities increase in the CoC’s unit number?
* **LH – TH/Joint Component** – increase their units to 4-5 (decrease from 8 in the Shelter Plus Care Project). Could possibly do the expansion project versus consolidation.
* **LH - PSH -** increases their units by Capital project amount - ( won’t be more than the Shelter Plus Care number.)
* Meets many of our goals and HUDs goals.
* Justine would make a plug for Louison House – have significant issues with Homelessness, but the increase in points.
* Stacy Parsons – second Justine.
* **Wayfinders**– how many units would this supportive services project serve? - would be easier to find match for an increase if there was a need for additional funding. would not add units to them/may increase our overall unit number.
* APP – increase their units by 4-5 (decrease from 8 in the Shelter Plus Care Project). Would not be interested in additional funds, worried about match amount. Could do this as the expansion project OR consolidation.
* **Choose 1st and 2nd choice** – to manage any concerns/uncertainties (and perhaps allow both to be applied for?)
	+ ***Total of $238,141 - SHelter Plus Care Renewal Project Funding ($89,702) & CoC Bonus funding – Approx. $148,439***
* **All of the above agencies do well with on time billing and processes/follow through with CoC commitments and participant on the board as well as at least 1 committee.**

**Votes:**

**LH** – Most committee members are very interested in supporting LH first. Real demonstrated need for people experiencing homelessness in this region to be served, demonstrated performance.

* PSH – higher likelihood would score better for HUD this year /Joint component – RRH could improve scores in future years

**PSH – all 1st choice – work to include some leveraging**

**Joint component – 2nd choice** - 4

**APP –2nd choice -** 2

**\*\*Keleigh will communicate first, to Kathy, in order to share the interest in supporting one or both of these project application possibilities and determine if there is interest in this. PSH is supported first, but based on the Joint Component being the second choice for many, they would go for either.**

 **Determine this project ranking/ finalize ranking structure**

* Group is recommending that we submit for two projects if at all possible (if these subrecipients are interested and able), but placing both at the bottom of the tier structure, because of the uncertainty HUD has identified for FY22 programs.
	+ Justification to communicate to the board re: bottom tier structure ranking for new projects
		- These projects were not applied for during the public funding competition process and are being applied for ONLY due to the available renewal project funding possibility however can apply for 2 in order to use New Project funding and meet the CoC’s goals for scoring purposes.

 **timeline/additional planning needs**

* Additional meeting needed? - No
* Non-Funded Partner Board Member communication – tomorrow after communicating with subrecipients today.
* Subrecipient communications – Thursday, Sept 15th
* Posting ranking – Thursday, September 15th

**Note: Three County CoC Annual Meeting – September 29th – 1-3pm.** *Please click* [***here***](https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZIude2spjwuGtXd0Ar0WFHkO4LXu3HEObqf) *to RSVP.*