



North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

bos@ncceh.org

919.755.4393

www.ncceh.org/BoS

NC BoS CoC Steering Committee Meeting February 5, 2019 Minutes

Regional Leads Present: Destri Leger, Emily Lowery (for Trina Hill), Casey McCall, Mollie Thompkins, Nicole Dewitt, Natasha Elliott, Emily Locklear, Joel Rice, Melissa Eastwood, LaTasha McNair, Jim Cox

At-Large Members Present: Deena Fulton, Dora Carter, Parker Smith, Ryan Carver, Todd Rosendahl, Eric Edwards

SC Members Absent: Marie Watson, Richard Gorton, Jessa Johnson, Thea Craft, Angela Harper King, Lisa Phillips, Bob Kurtz

Interested Parties Present: Brooke Hudson, Amy Steele, Andrea Merriman, Angela Jones, Brian Fike, Charlotte Stewart, Erin Ashton, Jai Baker, Janice Sauls, Joshua Edwards, Kim Crawford, Kristen Martin, Leila McMichael, Linda Golden, Lorelei Watts, Lynnette Gordon, Monica Frizzell, Manuel Hyman, Melissa McKeown, Nikki Ratliff, Renee Urban, Sonia Gibbs, Teena Willis, Paultett Wall

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

Approval of Consent Agenda

- The consent agenda will be voted on as a whole at the beginning of each meeting. Steering Committee members may request to move an item from the consent agenda to the regular agenda, if they feel it requires additional discussion.
- The consent agenda was sent out prior to the meeting and is posted at: <https://www.ncceh.org/files/9912/>
- There being no changes needed, the consent agenda was approved by common consent.

NC DHHS ESG Office

- FY2018-19 RFA Observations
 - The ESG office stated that as a funder, they review the applications to ensure they meet the requirements of the grant. They emphasized that they do not wish to change an agency's mission and that agency's that do not align with the eligibility requirements for the grant may not want to apply.
 - The ESG office reminds applicants to read the application instructions, use the checklists, and view the webinar the office releases with the application.
- Application Review Process
 - The ESG office referenced application instructions pg. 16-18 regarding submission and review criteria. They stated that if the application was incomplete, it was not reviewed. They did relax that requirement and provided special consideration for several applicants, but they point out that the review criteria was provided in the application instructions.

- The applications were reviewed by an independent review team who have ESG and homelessness background with no conflict of interest. Each application was reviewed by 3 people.
- Applications were broken down into 3 components:

<p>1. Application Sections 1-15</p>	<p>New applicants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max score 140 points • Minimum passing 110 points <p>Renewing Applicants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max Score 140 points • Minimum passing 100 points
<p>2. Application Activities:</p> <p><i>Street Outreach, Emergency Shelter, Rapid Rehousing, Homeless Prevention, , and HMIS</i></p>	<p>New applicants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max score 30 points • Minimum passing 22 points <p>Renewing Applicants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max Score 30 points • Minimum passing 20 points
<p>3. Contract Performance Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Monitoring – financial and client file • QPR • Requisition submissions 	<p>Returning Applicants Only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max score 30 points • Minimum passing score 20

- Sections 1-15: Reviewers were looking for all questions to be answered and if the answer fulfilled the response requirements; they also looked for what was included in the application, including items such as budget, sworn financial statement, and other items in the checklist.
 - Maximum score of 140, minimum passing to 100 for renewals and 110 for new applicants. If passed, then review moved to activities review.
- Application Activities: When reviewing activities, they looked for consistency with program guidelines for that particular activity. They also reviewed if these were consistent with the CoC Written Standards.



- Minimum passing was 20 for renewals and 22 for new applications for this section, and if passed, then moved to performance measures review.
 - Performance Measures: For renewal applicants, there are performance measures from the contract regarding QPR submission, requisition submissions, and desk monitoring.
 - Those measures were used for renewal applicants, with a maximum of 30 and minimum passing was 20.
 - If a new applicant, the ESG office could not use performance measures, so the minimum for the first section (1-15) was bumped to 120, the minimum application section score was 22, and they were not scored for performance.
 - If the applicant received a passing score in all 3 sections, then an award was determined
 - \$\$ Amount requested x Tier status = award amount
 - Tier 1 = \$\$ request x 100%
 - Tier 2 = \$\$ request x 80%
 - Tier 3 = \$\$ requested x 50%
- The ESG office received 92 applications across NC
 - 15 new
 - 76 renewal
 - The average agency section score was 121
 - The average activity section scores were:
 - Street Outreach: 23
 - Emergency Shelter: 21
 - Rapid Rehousing: 20
 - Homeless Prevention: 21
 - All averages were above the minimum passing score.
- The ESG office stated that they have received questions asking if they reduced or denied funding because the agency is not Housing First. The ESG office stated that they did not deny funding because of issues with Housing First or barriers. However, they reviewed the application and policies and procedures against the CoC's Written Standards to ensure they are compliance.
 - All of the NC BoS CoC's written standards require using a Housing First approach. The biggest issue the ESG office identified was eligibility criteria at entry.
 - If applicants scored 15-19 in activities and program guidelines contradicted the CoC's written standards, the ESG office provided opportunity for them to obtain a minimum passing score. If the agency successfully provided clarification, they were approved but not at 100%.
- The ESG office will provide opportunity for eligible grantees to apply for additional funding in the next few months. Current grantees were notified that if they are in tier 1 and adhering to guidelines, they would be eligible to apply for additional funds.
- ESG Expectations for 2019
 - Requisitions are expected to be submitted 45 days after the last billing date of the month. This performance measure is in the agency's contract.
 - Client files will be reviewed this year both on-site and via desk monitoring.
 - Chris Battle will be the primary contact for monitoring, and Lisa Worth will be sending email notifications for desk monitoring.



- Goal is 20 if not 25-30 agencies. This offers a TA opportunity, but it is a requirement to monitor 20% of grant award each year.
 - 1-on-1 technical assistance is available for agencies that wish to receive it.
 - The ESG Desk Guide can be used as a good reference for expectations for monitoring visits and general funder expectations.
 - QPR
 - The ESG office is working with NCCEH Data Center to improve the QPR. They eliminated the data entry excel spreadsheet. Data can give us a story about the organization, CoC, and entire state. ESG understands that this QPR data does not tell the full story about your organization, but they are required to monitor effectiveness and efficiency, so they use the QPR. They also monitor data quality to ensure projects are meeting HUD data quality standards of 10% or less. Agencies will continue to submit a QPR each quarter.
 - ESG office has plans to visit LPAs/Regional Committees
 - They have found when they attend the Regional Committee meetings, their attendance is well-received, there is fruitful conversation, and they found it allowed an opportunity to discuss recommendations and what works well.
 - Their goal this year is to get to each LPA. They are requesting dates from each LPA for which month they would like for them to visit during their regional meeting. They currently have a date for Region 1 to meet in June.
 - A main goal for ESG: How can they assist the agencies to end and prevent homelessness?
- FY2019-2020 RFA
 - Expect RFA to be released late July/early August to allow as much time as possible to complete the application. It will be due again mid-October. Do not anticipate a lot of changes to the RFA.
- All forms are on the DHHS website as well as tutorials for requisitions and client files.
<https://www.ncdhhs.gov/divisions/aging-and-adult-services/nc-emergency-solutions-grant/nc-emergency-solutions-grant-%E2%80%93>
- ESG Program Coordinator Contact Information

Kim Crawford

ESG / Homeless Programs Coordinator

Division of Aging and Adult Services

North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services

919-855-4991 office

Kim.Crawford@dhhs.nc.gov

Chris Battle

Homeless Programs Coordinator

Division of Aging and Adult Services

North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services

919-855-4984 office

Chris.Battle@dhhs.nc.gov

Lisa Worth

ESG / Homeless Programs Coordinator



Staff solicited further discussion. None expressed. Staff encourage questions be directed to the ESG Program Coordinators.

ESG Awards by Regional Committee

Region	RC Pro Rata	Percent of Pro Rata Received 2017*	Percent of Pro Rata Received 2018
1	\$118,896	91%	84%
2	\$106,516	100%	55%
3	\$78,528	118%	39%
4	\$157,442	119%	100%
5	\$287,278	107%	93%
6	\$183,385	39%	69%
7	\$351,780	110%	96%
8	\$164,182	89%	100%
9	\$224,805	82%	88%

*NOTE: Difficult to compare numbers because we do not know what final allocations will look like after the reallocation process.

Region	RC Pro Rata	Percent of Pro Rata Received 2017*	Percent of Pro Rata Received 2018
10	\$222,074	108%	77%
11	\$103,338	0%	0%
12	\$146,486	101%	100%
13	\$140,883	66%	26%
Total	\$2,507,060	74%	76%

NOTE: *NC BoS CoC has increased around 2%, but these numbers are not final due to not having the reallocations.

Staff solicited questions or comments. None expressed.



ESG Debrief Questions

The Steering Committee discussed the questions posed during the January 2019 Steering committee meeting.

- **How are you feeling about the amount your region was awarded? What would change in your process in 2019 to increase the chances for increased funding?**
 - Nicole Dewitt: feels pretty good about what their region was awarded despite a decrease of \$20,000. They are hoping they'll be able to get reallocated money. This was the first year of the weekly status calls, which were a change, but she wouldn't change anything about the process just yet. Nicole liked detailed feedback from NCCEH in the applications and felt that it was helpful for those who took advantage of that feedback.
 - Teena Willis: Region 3 had a very different experience as they lost significant funding. Only 1 agency in one county got funded which affected the other 4 counties. They're discouraged and frustrated. Teena stated that it sounds like they need to take a better look at the written standards to realign their agency's policies. If not lined up, they want to advocate for change within the written standards if needed. She states Region 3 needs to do more research to either advocate for written standards or align their policies with current written standards.
- **Do you think the CoC needs to change the way it currently selects ESG applicants? Does running a local process at the Regional Committee level still make sense?**
 - Teena Willis: It does make sense to keep the process at the Regional Committee level because they know what they have and don't have. The loss of funding in Region 3 also helped them realize that they have items to work on. She feels the Regional Committee needs to understand the process well to help new folks understand what to look for. It helps keep the RC involved and educated on these opportunities.
 - LaTasha McNair- stated she is from Region 10 and also feels the funding process should continue to be at the Regional Committee level. They feel the weekly status calls were helpful and having the process local helps because they know and understand the needs locally.
 - Nicole Dewitt: Posed a question to other Regional Leads: They have 5 counties and have 5-7 agencies that apply. They've hired out for professional help, and she's looking for feedback on how other regions get their applications done and coordinating all applicants and writing regional application.
 - Destri Leger, from Region 1, responded that they do their monthly Regional Committee meeting, and during the application process, their meeting is centered around providing those updates. She also e-mailed heavily so agencies would be kept up-to-date on the process. The majority of their agencies are not direct homelessness services providers, but domestic violence services providers, and some of their challenges are largely from those providers not having the homeless lens and only having a DV lens. She felt it was time consuming, but they made it work.
- **What ideas do you have for changes the CoC could make to ensure we get our entire pro rata amount?**



- Destri Leger: Stated they needed to continue working through the learning curve. She felt like there were a lot of changes of which they weren't aware and communication seemed to breakdown. Their applications have been geared towards domestic violence, and they had to educate their victim services providers because their focus had to change to being homelessness providers. The ESG paperwork (client file documents) changes very often, which discourages grantees.
- Monica Frizzell: Echoed what was stated by Destri. She felt like they didn't know what ESG wanted and are grateful for NCCEH staff who reviewed the applications. The region didn't feel expectations were clearly communicated and felt the suggestions from NCCEH contributed to them receiving funding because NCCEH has the connection to the ESG office.
- **What support is needed to assist current grantees or potential grantees to meet the increasing expectations from the ESG office?**
 - Jim Cox: Region 12 was pleased with process. Jim is already thinking about next year based on what they learned this year. He wonders if they could have NCCEH review this as a year-long process, instead of jamming it in during the competition. Are there things NCCEH can prompt them to do throughout the year?

Staff solicited questions or comments. None expressed.

SSVF Letter of Support

Ehren provided an overview of current SSVF providers in the NC BoS CoC.

- Volunteers of America: Regions 3 (Alexander), 4 (Iredell), 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 (Hertford), 12, 13
 - Many of these counties were served by Family Endeavors/Community Link previously and are now being served by VOA
- ABCCM: Regions 1, 2, 3
- ECHO Ministry: Region 8 (nNew this year)
 - These counties were previously covered by Family Endeavors.
- United Way of Forsyth: Region 5 (Davidson), Region 4 (Davie, Surry, Stokes, Yadkin)
- In 2018 the NC BoS CoC asked each SSVF provider to commit to the following in order to receive a letter:
 - *Fully implement all aspects of the NC BoS CoC Plan to End Veteran Homelessness.*
 - *Ensure Veterans in every county they serve have access to SSVF and other services*
 - *Set up systems for passive and assertive outreach.*
 - *Maintain a region-wide by-name list in HMIS, including any necessary data entry, such as entering data for non-HMIS participating agencies.*
 - *Set up a regular meeting, at least every two weeks, to go over the by-name list, case conference currently homeless Veterans, and ensure efficient referrals to housing.*
 - *Attend the regular coordinated entry case conferencing meeting, whether or not the Veterans meeting is part of the CA meeting.*
 - *Take all referrals through coordinated entry. If coordinated entry does not provide referrals to SSVF or is not functioning in another way, SSVF will work with CoC staff and the Regional Committee to set up a more successful system.*
 - *Attend at least 75% of regular Regional Committee meetings in every region they serve.*



- If letter of support is provided, should it be because the provider is being an active participant in CoC? Ehren suggests this is the standard we should set. We can ask for improvement, but if participation is not active and the aforementioned bullets are not met, letters of support may not be provided. We will vote on each letter of support individually.
- Ehren provided background and further context for each grantee to ensure the Steering Committee had the information necessary to make an informed decision.
 - Volunteers of America, ABCCM, and United Way of Forsyth have established grants and relationships with the NC BoS CoC.
 - ECHO does not have a track record with the NC BoS CoC, so it was acknowledged that we cannot hold them to this standard. Brian mentioned ECHO is also an SSVF provider in SC, so they do have establishment in another state—they were hand-picked by the VA to take over counties in Region 8.
- Volunteers of America (VOA)
 - Emily Locklear (Region 8) is not sure who their VOA representative is and does not think they've participated in the region. Ehren thinks they only cover one of their counties (possibly Columbus, which just started this year.) Brian noted that in the southeastern part of the state (Regions 8 and 13), VOA is still in process of staffing up so Region 8 might not have seen VOA yet. Ehren indicated that this process does involve them participating while they're staffing up and that a discussion will be had with them to discuss their involvement and participation.
 - Joel Rice (Region 9) states VOA is a primary vendor for RRH and have stepped up to cover the entire region with housing. VOA is active in the region and works well with the coordinated entry process. They are pleased they are in the region.
 - Jim-Region 12: States VOA attends the Regional Committee meeting. They've created a Veteran affairs contact, and they've agreed to fulfill this role.

A motion was made to provide a letter of support for VOA [Dewitt, Rice]. All in favor, none opposed.

- ABCCM
 - Emily Lowery (Region 2) stated that she sees ABCCM for Henderson, Polk, Rutherford, and Transylvania counties, and they attend probably 90% of local meetings and represent and serve them well.
 - Destri Leger (Region 1) stated they have a different experience. They see them a few times a year and only if they have major updates. No negative feedback but definitely do not have 90% participation.
 - Teena Willis (Region 3) stated ABCCM has taken a leadership position in their region; they feel they have good participation.
 - Ehren acknowledged Kristi Reisig from ABCCM is active on the Veterans Subcommittee level and noted a discussion could be had with them about their participation in Region 1.

A motion was made to provide a letter of support for ABCCM [Edwards, Lowery]. All in favor, none opposed.

- ECHO



- Emily Locklear (Region 8) states ECHO has attended the last two meetings, but not sure about VOA. ECHO has been with them since October 2018 and thinks they've been to every meeting since then.

A motion was made to provide a letter of support for ECHO [Locklear, Lowery]. All in favor, none opposed.

- United Way of Forsyth
 - Ehren noted that UWFC indicated to NCEH that they do not intend (due to funding) to participate with the Regional Committees but will take referrals. They will not do active engagement to ensure outreach nor help to build coordinated entry, etc. They will serve Veterans if they show up. They did have higher participation in years past, but it has certainly not been consistent.
 - Nicole Dewitt (Region 5) is not surprised that United Way of Forsyth is not willing to participate. Nicole is not aware of anyone from United Way of Forsyth having been involved in their meetings or coordinated entry. They identified a contact person when they revised their coordinated entry plan, but they have not been involved.
 - Teena Willis (Region 3) stated that UWFC came to Region 4 off and on for some meetings when they were getting their Veterans' Coordinated Entry plan started. Ehren asked if their participation has sustained. Teena stated it had not and had decreased.
 - Ehren stated that two things could happen if a SSVF provider doesn't get a letter of support. They might get 90% instead of 100% of funding or another option is that another SSVF provider could apply to expand their coverage or a new provider could apply for those counties. Those final decisions are out of the hands of CoC, but Ehren wants to assure them that not providing a letter of support doesn't mean we lose SSVF for those counties. Another consideration is that there could be a loss of bargaining opportunities through positive reinforcement with partners despite acknowledging a pattern.

Staff solicited further discussion. None expressed. Staff called for a motion. None expressed.

- Nicole Dewitt feels they are serving Veterans at some capacity, and she would not want to jeopardize that opportunity for the CoC. She would be in favor of providing a letter of support but attach some caveats.
- Teena Willis agreed that she would be in favor of providing a letter with the attached caveats.
- Ehren noted we asked them last year to perform those duties and they have shared what they would and would not do this year based on funding. What happens if they come back after being provided a letter of support and they refuse?
- Nicole Dewitt wonders if would be a violation of their grant as a part of their agreement with the VA?
 - Brian and Ehren stated that the wording is vague and could allow for flexibility.
- Nicole suggested that the support letter list why we support them to serve Veterans but state we would like to see specific participation.
- Jim Cox asked if we add expectations of CoC when we write this letter?



- Ehren said the letter last year was general, but we can add them this year. The NOFA does ask for discussion of this information.
- Teena Willis asked if they could have a call-in number to participate.
 - Ehren has concerns that if we provide special considerations for UW, the Veterans will not have equal access in the counties they are serving.
- Teena stated we should reach out to United Way and let them know that in order to get a letter of support, we need the following items listed.

A decision was made to discuss expectations with United Way first to see what they will agree to. NCCEH staff will then email the Steering Committee and ask for some direction on the letter via email.

CoC Competition

HUD announced FY18 CoC renewal awards on January 26, 2019. HUD awarded the NC BoS CoC all of its renewals in the FY18 CoC competition.

- Renewal Awards are at \$8,034,131
- A second award announcement will be made to include the new projects, expansion projects, and DV Bonus project.

HUD announced initial steps for the 2019 CoC Competition.

- Registration was released January 31 and is due on March 14.
 - Staff will verify information and submit prior to the deadline.
- GIW is expected to be released in the next 6 weeks.

NC BoS CoC Preparations for 2019 Competition

- The Funding and Performance Subcommittee will meet this month to discuss funding priorities for both overall priorities and regional component priorities.
- The Intent to Apply form has been released. If you are interested in applying for a new CoC-funded project in the NC BoS CoC in the FY2019 CoC competition, please fill out this form. NCCEH staff will be in touch to discuss your proposal. It is mandatory that all agencies wanting to apply for new CoC funding complete an Intent to Apply form. The deadline to apply is 2 weeks after the release of the CoC Competition Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA).
2019 Intent to Apply Form: <http://bit.ly/2t8YKQa>
- New CoC Applicant webinar: February 28, 2019 at 10:00 AM
 - This webinar will cover the CoC competition application process and requirements. Any agency that has thought about beginning or expanding rapid re-housing or permanent supportive housing programs should attend this webinar. Register here: <https://www.ncceh.org/events/1321/>
- Renewal CoC Applicant Webinar: March 7, 2019 at 11:00 AM
 - NCCEH staff will review common challenges applicants had in the 2018 competition and will discuss what renewal applicants should be thinking about to strengthen their application in the 2019 competition. Register here: <https://www.ncceh.org/events/1322/>

Staff solicited further discussion. None expressed.

Meetings and Reminders

- **Point in Time Status Call** February 8, 10:00-11:00 AM



View the presentation: <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/791696621>

Phone: +1 (646) 749-3112 Access Code: 791-696-621

- **Coordinated Entry Council** February 12, 2:00-3:30 PM
View the presentation: <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/791696621>
Phone: +1 (646) 749-3112 Access Code: 791-696-621
- **February 2019 BoS HMIS User Meeting** February 21, 1:00-2:30 PM.
Register here: <https://www.ncceh.org/events/1301/>
- **Funding and Performance Subcommittee** February 28, 1:00-2:00 PM
View the presentation: <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/791696621>
Phone: +1 (646) 749-3112 Access Code: 791-696-621
- **CoC New Applicant Webinar** February 28, 10:00-11:30 AM
Register here: <https://www.ncceh.org/events/1321/>
- **CoC Renewal Applicant Webinar** March 7, 11:00 a.m.- 12:00 PM
Register here: <https://www.ncceh.org/events/1322/>
- **NC Bringing it Home Conference** Save The Date
May 21-May 22, 2019
- **Project Review Committee Representatives** Due Friday, February 8
Send representative contact information here: <http://bit.ly/2HHPoVB>

Next Steering Committee Meeting: Tuesday, March 5, 2019 10:30 AM

