



North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

bos@ncceh.org

919.755.4393

www.ncceh.org/BoS

BoS Project Review Committee Meeting 9.18.17

Committee Members Present:

Chanda Hurms, Destri Leger

NCCEH Staff Present:

Brian Alexander, Emily Carmody, Ehren Dohler, Nancy Holochwost

BoS Project Application Appeals Process

- At its September 12 meeting, the BoS Steering Committee decided to offer an appeals process to projects that were reallocated or rejected from the CoC application. Four projects submitted letters to the Project Review Committee appealing the committee's decision on the project priority listing. These letters (and any accompanying documents submitted) were provided to the Project Review Committee members to read prior to the meeting.
- The Project Review Committee had now reconvened to discuss these appeals. When deciding whether to accept the appeals, the committee should consider whether there was a problem with the original process that prevented the project from being included in the project priority listing.

Appeals Received from Applicants

Residential Treatment Services of Alamance's Women's Permanent Housing

- This is a renewal project that was 100% reallocated (the only renewal that was not included in the project priority listing).
- The project missed 3 key standards and 2 minimums on the scorecard:
 - Missed Housing First and two of the PSH Key Elements
 - Missed minimums in 2 of the 5 sections (Section 2 and Section 3)
- Chanda asked for confirmation if this project has had the same issues in the past. Staff noted that the project has had issues meeting standards and minimums in the past. Chanda asked why the Project Review Committee would consider an appeal from this agency.
 - Brian noted that any project not included in the project priority listing was given the opportunity to appeal; the Steering Committee did not limit it to specific projects.
 - Chanda noted that if the project has not rectified issues that it has had in the past, it does not pass muster.
- Destri noted that based on her review of the appeals letter, she did not think it met the PSH model. She asked if there are other projects like this one.
 - Staff noted there aren't similar projects in the BoS. This project focuses on substance abuse more than housing, which leads it to be unable to meet some standards and minimums.

- Destri asked if reallocating would displace the clients that are housed in the program. She suggested possibly reducing the funding this year and eliminating it in next year's competition.
 - Staff noted that the grant does not include any funding for housing, and the appeals letter states that RTSA owns the building in which clients are housed. It is not clear whether the clients would lose housing if this project were not funded.
 - Staff noted RTSA has had issues in the past on the scorecard, and they have not changed the program. While the program may provide useful assistance, it is no longer a match for CoC funding and what HUD asks of grantees. Would RTSA make changes to the program if they were given more time?
 - Destri and Chanda both agreed the program does not appear to plan to make any changes.
 - Staff noted Alamance County has other PSH programs that could potentially take clients from RTSA if those clients were to lose their housing assistance. HUD allows PSH programs to accept clients from other PSH projects. Staff noted they would be available to help facilitate the movement of clients if needed.
 - A Project Review Committee member asked when the grant funding will end. Staff noted that the next grant year starts February 1, so RTSA would have 5 ½ months to make a transition plan.
- A motion was made to deny the appeal submitted from RTSA [Hurms, Leger]. All in favor; none opposed.

Southwestern Child Development Commission's Rural Progressive Housing Assistance

- SWCDC submitted an appeal for its new RRH application. The project missed 8 thresholds and the agency did not meet the second deadline for submitting an official explanation.
- Destri noted that SWCDC is in her region. She agrees the ball was dropped as far as meeting the deadline. She noted that she has met with SWCDC and thinks they did not have a clear understanding of what some questions were asking and therefore gave incorrect answers. She noted that the region is reliant on RRH programs and only have ESG funding at this time. She would like to find a middle ground, but acknowledges that the agency should not receive everything the application requested.
- Staff noted that these concerns are valid. When making decisions, the Project Review Committee should consider how their actions are precedent-setting. If missed deadlines or missed thresholds are waived, how does that impact subsequent application processes? If the deadline is waived for one project, would it need to be waived for all projects (including one that did not submit an appeal)?
 - Chanda noted deadlines are imperative, so there needs to be a penalty for missing them.
- Staff noted that if the Project Review Committee is considering reversing its decision, it would have to ensure that projects also meet the thresholds that they originally missed, since thresholds are a requirement on the scorecard.
 - Destri asked if staff and Project Review Committee members think SWCDC's appeals letter sufficiently addressed the missed thresholds.
 - Staff noted that the letter states SWCDC cannot meet some thresholds, so it does not address them all. Staff noted that the Project Review Committee is tasked with making decisions based on the materials submitted by the applicant and cannot rely on a committee member knowing that the materials are

inaccurate. It is concerning if the applicant is unable to answer the questions accurately.

- Chanda noted that the application seemed ill-prepared. If the agency can work on its proposal over the next year, it could re-apply next year and potentially meet thresholds. She noted the appeal was not satisfactory and should not be approved.
 - Destri agreed that the appeal should not be approved.
 - Staff noted SWCDC will be given the full scorecard and an opportunity to discuss their score with staff.
- Destri noted that SWCDC applied for a 2-year grant and asked for clarification about whether they can apply again in 2018. Staff confirmed that SWCDC can apply in the 2018 application cycle.
 - A motion was made to deny the appeal submitted by SWCDC [Hurms, Leger]. All in favor; none opposed.
 - Destri asked if SWCDC had the opportunity to contact staff during with questions during the application. Staff confirmed applicants can contact staff with questions. If SWCDC plan to re-apply next year, staff is available to talk to them at any time to help plan the project.

Diakonos Fifth Street Ministries Rapid Re-Housing and Permanent Supportive Housing

- Diakonos submitted appeals for both its new PSH and new RRH projects. Both projects missed thresholds on the scorecard and the agency did not meet the second deadline for submitting an official explanation.
- Staff asked Project Review Committee members for their thoughts.
 - Destri noted that these projects should be held to the same standards as the other projects that appealed.
 - Chanda noted that the Project Review Committee has established that late submissions will not be accepted, so no exception should be made for these projects.
 - Staff asked if they had any other comments; none were raised.
- A motion was made to deny the appeals submitted for by Diakonos [Leger, Hurms]. All in favor; none opposed.

Next Steps

- Staff will notify the 4 projects of the Project Review Committee's decisions by the end of the day today.
- The Steering Committee was told it would need to vote on any change to the project priority listing. Since there is no change, staff will simply notify the Steering Committee of the Project Review Committee's decisions.