

Veteran Homeless Committee Minutes

Date and Time

Wednesday, January 6th, 2016 from 2:00 pm to 3:00 pm

Location

Family Willows, 161 S. Beech St, Manchester, NH

Attendees

Melanie Chavez, Dan Ward, Nicole Clark, Emily Reisine, Keith Howard

2:00 Meeting Begins

Introductions and By Name List

- I. At the beginning of the meeting, committee briefly reviewed where we are now as a CoC and as a state. The Balance of State CoC (BoSCoC) and the Greater Nashua CoC (GNCoC) both already have a working by-name list. The BoSCoC's list is coded, where GNCoC's has full information, but requires a ROI.
- II. Committee discussed how it would begin to implement a MCoC by-name list. Dan mentioned a working example of a Connecticut ROI as one place where we might receive some guidance on implementing our own ROI form.

Vets@HOME TA

- I. We were joined at our meeting by Melanie Mondello, our Technical Assistant from Vets@HOME. The committee began its discussion by discussing how it could expand the BoS (or GNCoC)'s by name list to the MCoC.
- II. Melany helped guide this discussion with several questions. For example, who are the key players in the MCoC which can get this process running efficiently? How do we get them involved? She went on to propose these steps:
 - a. Identify those veterans still considered homeless (sheltered or unsheltered), who still need to be connected with permanent housing.
 - b. In her experience, CoCs have run into difficulty when they go back in time and begin to list the veterans already housed. She urged the MCoC to be forward looking when creating the by-name list.
 - c. The committee should identify the shelters, outreach teams, soup kitchens, clothing/food pantries, and veteran service providers in the area, to create a strong core then expand our participation to any others who are willing to help, in order to access as many resources as possible.
- III. The committee was also strongly encouraged to consider our ending goal. Regardless of what we determine our ending goal to be, we should be prepared to start the process. For example, what is our housing plan?
- IV. Because the MCoC serves a smaller geographic location than the BoS and therefore has a smaller population of service providers, it might be more reasonable to fashion our by-name list and ROI

after the GNCOC rather than the MCoC.

Finding a process where people are able to see

uncoded list across agencies is the ideal.

- a. Melany asked how many service providers would be involved in this process. Committee estimated half a dozen to dozen at most, including but not limited to: Veterans Inc SSVF, The Way Home, New Horizons for NH, Liberty House, the VA, Harbor Homes, and the city welfare office, as well as others.
 - b. There are currently 10 estimated identified homeless veterans in the Manchester area, 8 of which are sheltered and 2 that have currently refused to receive services. This prompted the discussion that the MCoC will have to have a process in place for veterans who don't wish to be housed at this time.
- V. This process will only be successful if organizations are able to communicate between themselves. How will these organizations facilitate information sharing? One major aspect behind the by-name list is to let veterans access a host of services without having to repeatedly share their history of homelessness and, often, trauma. Melany recommended to the committee that we focus not on the list, but on how information flows.
- VI. There was a brief review of where the MCoC is in terms of Coordinated Entry (CE). The MCoC is just beginning the process, where the BoS has CE for veterans already in place. As the MCoC begins to put the CE in place, we will have to consider how we disseminate this information. Are we going to have one common phone number, as Vermont does, or will we have a drop in location? Where we would have this physical location (remembering that some veterans may be reluctant to use VA services)?
- VII. Overall, we were urged to consider what resources we currently have within the MCoC and how we can maximize our use of them. How can we expand our access/knowledge of resources in the area to our advantage?
- a. One suggestion our TA Melany had was that we look at the housing authorities in the area, find veteran connections, and reach out to them on what preferences they might have towards potentially housing veterans.
 - b. The same could be done with local landlords, many of whom want to house veterans. How do we connect with these landlords?
- VIII. Finally, we should really focus on the ROI. What information do we absolutely need/want from our homeless veterans? As more information is added, the likelihood of getting ROIs goes down. Melany suggested we form three standards- the bare minimum, silver standard, and the gold standard. ROI should be CoC membership wide.

Future Actions

- I. Decision was made that committee would meet every two weeks, on the first and third Wednesdays of the month, from 2:00 to 3:00 pm. We will continue to meet at the Family Willows location, at 161 S. Beech St, unless otherwise indicated.
- II. At these meetings, we should work towards putting the by-name list in place. Meetings can also serve as a way of regularly connecting housing providers with names of homeless veterans provided by outreach and intake workers. For example, Melanie shared that the Way Home currently has two PSH spots available for veterans. They need to be Chronically Homeless, but otherwise don't need an income and will be accepted regardless of discharge status.



III. Recommended future steps:

- a. Identify number of partners. MCoC needs to identify who should/shouldn't be in the conversation.
- b. What is the priority?
- c. Contact GNCoC for policies and ROI potentially. Share them at next meeting- see what fits for Manchester, what doesn't, and make the changes.
- d. Figure out how to collect information once and only once- where would we then store this information?

3:00 Meeting Concludes

Minutes Prepared By

Nicole Clark

Manchester Continuum of Care Coordinator, VISTA