



North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

bos@ncceh.org

919.755.4393

www.ncceh.org/BoS

Special Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

8.30.18

Regional Leads Present: Marilyn Chamberlin, Trina Hill, Teena Willis, Nicole Dewitt, Ellery Blackstock, Emily Locklear, Joel Rice, LaTasha McNair, Nicole Boone, Jim Cox

At-Large Members Present: Dana Mangum, Thea Craft, Angela Harper smith, Lisa Phillips

Steering Committee Members Absent: Eric Edwards, Jessa Johnson, Parker smith, Christina Miller, Juliet Rogers, Marie Watson, Kevin Hege

Interested Parties Present: Leonard Tillery, Lori Watts Tiana Joyner, Tujuanda Sanders, Melissa Eastwood, Monica Frizzell, Amy Steele, Amy Modlin, Kristen Martin, Brian Fike, Melissa McKeown, Mary Boyles, Jai Baker, Ashley Gray, Richard Gary, Tomeka Shaw

NCCEH Staff Present: Brian Alexander, Ehren Dohler, Bagé Shade, Jenn Von Egidy

Staff reminded the Steering Committee that members with conflicts of interest, those applying for CoC funds, must abstain from voting. Regional Lead Alternates may vote in place of the Regional Lead as long as they are not in conflict.

- Teena Willis (via chat message) asked for the location of the documents noted in a previous email to be distributed prior to the meeting.
- Ehren responded to Teena's question and provided the link to documents on NC BoS CoC website and confirmed an e-mail would be sent out momentarily with the link as well.

Project Priority Listing

- The CoC Consolidated Application has 3 parts:
 - CoC Application: NCCEH completes this part of the application as the Collaborative Applicant.. NCCEH attempts to capture CoC-wide information by requesting survey responses from the Steering Committee, Regional Committees, agencies, and stakeholders to provide a full scope of the CoC's work.
 - Project Applications: Includes both renewal and new projects, as well as the CoC Planning Grant, HMIS grant, and the SSO-CE grant.
 - Project Priority Listing: The Project Review Committee recommends a ranked list of each project based on performance, and the Steering Committee approves the list for the Consolidated Application.

Project Review Committee

- The Project Review Committee (PRC) is composed of representatives from the NC BoS CoC Regional Committees and Steering Committee. Each Regional Committee may send one representative. To avoid conflict of interest, people from agencies applying for CoC funding are not allowed to serve on the committee. PRC members that did not attend the first meeting were not included in the scoring process.
- The committee uses scorecards created by the Scorecard Committee to review and score project applications for new and renewal funding in the NC BoS CoC.
- After scoring, the committee meets to create a recommended ranked list of project applications to be included in the CoC Collaborative Application sent to HUD. This ranked list is presented to the NC BoS CoC Steering Committee for approval.
 - Scoring project applications allows the CoC to prioritize limited funds based on need and on the CoC’s priorities. Scoring also allows the CoC to fund projects that have high performance and manage their funds effectively. Scoring applications is a requirement from HUD.

Summary of Potential Funding

Annual Renewal Demand (ARD)	\$8,388,382
<hr/>	
Bonus Funding	\$699,562
<hr/>	
DV Bonus	\$1,165,937
<hr/>	
CoC Planning (not ranked)	\$349, 781
<hr/>	
TOTAL	\$10,603,662

Projects will be ranked into two tiers

Tier 1: 94% of ARD	\$7,885,079
<hr/>	
Tier 2 + additional bonus: 6% of ARD + Bonus + DV Bonus	\$2,368,802
<hr/>	
TOTAL	\$10,253,881

Project Ranking

- Project ranking was informed by the CoC’s Funding Priorities and the scorecard.
- The NC BoS CoC Funding Priorities provide guidance from the Continuum of Care on its priorities for funding. This includes priorities for funding specific project types and regional need.
- The 2018 CoC Scorecard includes thresholds, standards, section minimums, and total scores.
 - Thresholds: If projects do not meet them, they cannot move forward in the competition.
 - Standards: Important aspects that projects are expected to meet. Project standards should be evaluated to determine the ranking or if project is funded.

- Section Score Minimums: Ensure every project meets a basic level of performance in every section of the scorecard.
- Total Score: Helps determine the order of ranking after considering thresholds and standards.

Using the Scorecard

- PRC and NCCEH staff used scorecards to review the applications.
 - Combined Scoring section scored by one PRC member and one NCCEH staff member
 - Staff Scoring section scored by NCCEH staff: more objective measures and performance
 - Combined scoring + staff scoring = total score
 - PRC will use standards, section minimums, scores, and funding priorities to rank projects.
- Staff solicited questions or comments. None expressed.

2018 applications

- CoC planning application, not ranked
- HMIS grant is not scored, typically ranked as first project.
- 34 renewal applications
 - 28 Permanent Supportive Housing
 - 4 Rapid Rehousing
 - 1 SSO-CE Renewal
 - 1 HMIS Renewal
- 8 new project applications
 - 1 Permanent Supportive Housing
 - 5 Rapid Rehousing
 - 1 DV-RRH Bonus Funding
 - 1 Supportive Services Only (SSO) for Coordinated Entry

Renewal Project Review

- 34 renewal projects
 - 1 HMIS project (not scored)
 - 1 SSO-CE project
 - 4 RRH projects
 - 28 PSH projects
 - 1 PSH project did not renew
- Scored renewal projects:
 - 0 applications with threshold issues
 - Every project but one missed standards

Renewal Standards

Renewal applicants missed a range of standards

- Most applicants missed two standards:
 - Match documentation
 - Services funding documentation
- Project Review Committee did not use these two standards in the final ranking list

Number of Standards Missed	Number of Renewals
0	1 (NCCEH SSO-CE Renewal)
1-2	20
3-6	11
More than 6	1 (Allied Churches RRH Renewal) – Missed 14 standards

- Standards missed without match and services documentation

Number of Standards Missed	Number of Renewals
0	1 (NCCEH SSO-CE Renewal)
1-2	25
3-5	6
13	1 (Allied Churches RRH Renewal)

- Staff solicited questions or comments. None expressed.

Renewal Project Minimums

There are five sections in the renewal scorecard. Each section has a minimum total number of points. If applications do not meet the section minimum, a review is triggered.

Section Minimum	Number of Renewals
Section 1: General Application	0
Section 2: Program Design	0
Section 3: NC BoS CoC Priorities	10
Section 4: Project Performance	8
Section 5: Application Deadlines/Documentation	1 (Allied Churches)

- An issue was identified with minimum in Section 3
 - Only one question with points (housing over services): Projects with less than 75% of housing funding missed the minimum
 - Staff recommend not using this minimum in the rankings and have identified this as an area for the Scorecard Committee to work on next year in the creation of the 2019 scorecards.

- The Section 4 minimum was used in the rankings because the CoC Funding Priorities give guidance to rank projects based on performance.
- One applicant did not meet the section 5 minimum.

Renewal Project Scores

Type	Possible Highest	Highest Score	Lowest Score	Average Score
All	192	160	20	90
PSH	192	160	37.3	98.65
RRH	172	83.5	20	51.75

Allied Churches of Alamance County's RRH Renewal Project

ACAC's renewal project has been Identified as the lowest performing project.

- Missed 14 standards
- Missed 3 section minimums
- Scored 20 out of a possible 172 points

Staff solicited questions or comments. None expressed.

New Project Applications Review

- 8 applicants submitted initial documents at beginning of process.
 - 1 application did not meet initial threshold requirements and staff notified the agency that their project application could not proceed in the competition.
- 7 new projects turned in applications by the due date
 - (1) PSH project
 - (4) RRH projects
 - (1) DV-RRH bonus funding project
 - (1) SSO-Coordinated Entry Expansion project
- Scored new projects:
 - 6 applications had minimums issues
 - 4 applications had 3 or more standards issues

New Project Comparison

Project	Standards missed	Minimums missed	Total Missed
NCCEH SSO-CE	0	1	1
Union County RRH	2	0	2
Pitt County RRH	2	2	4
NCCADV RRH DV Bonus	4	3	7
Diakonos PSH	9	5	14
Robeson County RRH	12	4	16
Allied Churches RRH	15	2	17

Four projects stood out as the projects to include in ranking, the other 3 are not included

Project	Standards missed	Minimums missed	Total Missed
NCCEH SSO-CE	0	1	1
Union County RRH	2	0	2
Pitt County RRH	2	2	4
NCCADV RRH DV Bonus	4	3	7
Diakonos PSH	9	5	14
Robeson County RRH	12	4	16
Allied Churches RRH	15	2	17

- These four new projects were included because they:
 - Met most standards and minimums
 - Most viable new projects
 - Meet funding priorities
 - Expand capacity

New Project Scores

Type	Possible Highest	Highest Score	Lowest Score	Average Score
SSO	34	20	20	20
PSH	86	11	11	11
RRH	85	56.5	26.5	41.5

- Staff solicited questions or comments. None expressed.

Ranking and Prioritization

Renewal Projects

Renewed at full funding	29
Renewed at reduced funding	3
Not funded	2
Did not apply	1

New Projects

Funded with reallocated dollars	2
Funded with bonus or DV bonus dollars	1
Funded with a combination of reallocated and bonus dollars	1
Not funded	3

Renewal Grantees that received a funding cut

Invitation to create new expansion project to be ranked lowest on project priority list for a maximum of what was cut from their renewals

2

Renewals Not Funded

- Sandhills Community Action Program PSH
 - Grantee decided to not renew project
 - \$3,909
 - Application: \$3,909
 - Funded: \$0
 - Reallocated: \$3,909 (100%)
- Allied Churches RRH
 - Grantee missed 14 standards and 3 minimums
 - Low performance and inadequate program design
 - Application: \$101,958
 - Funded: \$0
 - Reallocated: \$101,958 (100%)

Reduced Renewal Funding

*approximate amounts, final amount has to be calculated by FMR

Community Link

- Community Link: Kerr Tar PSH renewal (formerly Cardinal)
 - Has a history of underspending
 - Spent only 59% in last operating year
 - Application: \$935,884
 - Funded: \$795,501*
 - Reallocated: \$140,383* (15%)
- Community Link: PBH2012 PSH renewal (formerly Cardinal)
 - Has a history of underspending
 - Spent only 44% in last operating year
 - Application: \$679,844
 - Funded: \$543,875*
 - Reallocated: \$135,969* (20%)
- Grantee can apply for a new expansion project for \$276,351*

Eastpointe

- Eastpointe: Beacon II PSH

- Program has not started after 2 competitions
- Current Eastpointe Beacon PSH program operating in the same region as underspending grant (only 68% in last complete year)
 - Application: \$67,414
 - Funded: \$0
 - Reallocated: \$67,414 (100%)
- Eastpointe: Southeast SPC renewal
 - Program has not started after 2 competitions
 - Only PSH in Region 8
 - Application: \$143,854
 - Funded: \$71,927*
 - Reallocated: \$71,927* (50%)
- Grantee can apply for a new expansion project for \$139,341*
- Staff solicited questions or comments. None expressed.

Project Recommendations from the Project Review Committee

Projects ranked as follows:

- HMIS & SSO-Coordinated Entry Renewal ranked first
 - Community-wide projects that are required by HUD
 - Applied for by NCCEH
 - Scorecard not designed to measure
- Renewal Projects
 - Sorted by number of unmet standards
 - Then performance minimums
 - Then score
 - Then funding priorities
- New Projects
 - New RRH projects scored better than some renewal projects and because of funding priorities, were pulled into tier 1.
 - Pitt County's full budget was ranked in tier 1
 - Union County Community Shelter's budget straddles tier 1 and 2
 - Tier 1 \$75,842
 - Tier 2 \$89,014
- Renewal Projects placed in Tier 2

New projects are a funding priority this year, putting some renewal projects in tier 2.

- Burlington Development Corporation: Steps RRH project
 - Region 6
 - \$59,704
- Surry Homeless and Affordable Housing Coalition: SHAHC PSH

- Region 4
 - \$112,845
- NC Coalition Against Domestic Violence: DV-RRH Project
 - Could be funded by DV bonus funding or partially by CoC Bonus
 - Ranked towards the bottom because ranking will not affect its chances for DV Bonus.
- New Expansion Applications: for reduced grants in case of bonus funding
 - Community Link ranked first for bonus funding because it's a newly inherited project from Cardinal.
 - Eastpointe ranked bottom because it has 2 grants not started.
- Staff solicited questions or comments.
- Ehren explained the Project Review Committee only extends the option to submit new expansion with funding that was reallocated from their own projects to Community Link and Eastpointe because they already submitted applications with high performance but were partially reallocated due to spending.
- Brian explained that these projects are added at the bottom of ranked list in tier 2, giving the option to not only keep the money for the CoC and benefit the Annual Renewal Demand but also give Community Link and Eastpointe an opportunity to improve those programs and spend out the dollars.
 - If they do not, the PRC will have the option to reallocate during next year's competition since they would be considering the history of underspending with these agencies.
- LaTasha McNair asked if the Eastpointe expansion for their Southeast project is exclusive to that area, or could it be for other areas?
 - Brian responded stating they would discuss offline due to there being very specific parameters to discuss.
- Joel Rice asked if this means Community Link only can apply for the reallocated funds, or can others in the region apply?
 - Brian replied that Community Link and Eastpointe were the only agencies invited to apply for those designated dollars as per the approved recommendation of the Project Review Committee.

Ehren presented the priority list proposed by the Project Review Committee to demonstrate the projects that fell in tier 1 or tier 2. He also pointed out the ranking of the DV-RRH project submitted by NCCADV and the new expansion projects from Community Link and Eastpointe.

Staff solicited questions or comments. None expressed.

- A motion was made to approve the priority list as recommended by the Project Review Committee [Phillips, Rice]. All in favor; none opposed.

Next steps

- NCCEH will notify all project applicants whether their applications were accepted or rejected by August 31.

- Please do not have discussions with applicants before staff have the chance to notify them.
- Staff will send scorecards to applicants and offer follow-up calls.
- NCCEH will post CoC application and project priority listing for review on September 12.
- NCCEH will submit the consolidated application to HUD before the September 18 deadline.
- Applicants may appeal decisions
 - If needed, the PRC will meet to consider appeals on September 7th at 11:30. Steering Committee will consider any appeal decisions, if rankings are changed, at next meeting.

Staff solicited questions or comments.

- Dana Mangum asked when HUD notifies CoCs on award decisions?
 - Brian responded that HUD tries to notify by the end of the year. HUD let us know two years ago by the end of the year, but last year it was in January before a notification was received. The competition is ending earlier this year so we could receive those responses from HUD by the end of the year.

Next Steering Committee Meeting: Tuesday, September 11, 10:30-12:00