NC Balance of State Continuum of Care

Special Steering Committee Meeting
August 30, 2018
10:30 AM
Welcome

- Reminders
  - *6 to mute/unmute line
  - Please do not put us on hold
  - The chat box is available

This box is located in the top, center of your screen
Roll Call

- We will conduct Roll Call for Regional Leadership and At-Large Members to ensure quorum for votes.
- Other participants should enter their full name so we know they are here and included in the minutes.

1. Click this icon

2. Request presenter role
   Request mouse control
   Request to annotate

3. Settings

   Complete your profile!
   Enter your name here
   First Name
   Last Name
Today’s Agenda

• Project priority listing for CoC application
Project Priority Listing
## Consolidated Application has 3 parts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CoC Application</strong></td>
<td>Captures CoC-wide information&lt;br&gt;NCCEH, as Collaborative Applicants, writes this application&lt;br&gt;Input from agencies, Regional Committees, Steering Committee, and stakeholders necessary to give full scope of the CoC’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Applications</strong></td>
<td>New projects&lt;br&gt;Renewal projects&lt;br&gt;CoC Planning Grant&lt;br&gt;SSO-Coordinated Entry Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Priority Listing</strong></td>
<td>Ranked list of each project&lt;br&gt;Recommended by the Project Review Committee&lt;br&gt;Approved by the Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Review Committee

- Composed of one representative from each Regional Committee and interested At-Large Steering Committee members (not grantees or applicants)

- Scores new and renewal project applications using approved scorecards

- Recommends ranked list of new and renewal project applications for CoC collaborative application to the Steering Committee for final approval
Why do we score and rank applications?

- Allows CoC to prioritize funding based on priorities and need
- Ensures CoC is prioritizing funding for grants that are high performing and managing funds well
- Required by HUD in application process
### Summary of Potential Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Renewal Demand (ARD)</td>
<td>$8,388,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus Funding</td>
<td>$699,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV Bonus</td>
<td>$1,165,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Planning (not ranked)</td>
<td>$349,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>$10,603,662</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects will be ranked into two tiers

| Tier 1: 94% of ARD                               | $7,885,079   |
| Tier 2 + additional bonus:                       | $2,368,802   |
| 6% of ARD + Bonus + DV Bonus                     |              |
| TOTAL                                           | **$10,253,881** |
Project Ranking was informed by the CoC’s Funding Priorities and the scorecard.

**NC BoS CoC Funding Priorities**

Guidance from the Continuum of Care on its priorities for funding. This includes priorities for funding specific project types and regional need.

**Scorecard**

**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 where ranked 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.
PRC and NCCEH staff used the scorecard to review applications.

The scorecard has two sections that are scored differently.

**Combined Scoring Section**

Scored by one member of Project Review Committee and one member of NCCEH staff

Scores from two individuals are averaged for one final score

**Staff Scoring Section**

Scored by NCCEH staff

**Total Application Score**

Combined Scoring + Staff Scoring = Total Score
2018 Applications

CoC Planning Application not ranked.

HMIS Grant Application is not scored, historically ranked as first project as it supports required CoC-wide infrastructure.

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
Summary of Renewal Projects

- 34 renewal projects turned in applications.
  - (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 applicants missed a range of standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Standards Missed</th>
<th>Number of Renewals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (NCCEH SSO-CE Renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6</td>
<td>1 (Allied Churches RRH Renewal) – Missed 14 standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Determined that most applicants missed two standards:
  - Match documentation
  - Services funding documentation
- PRC did not use these two standards in the final ranking list
Standards missed without match and services documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Standards Missed</th>
<th>Number of Renewals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (NCCEH SSO-CE Renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 (Allied Churches RRH Renewal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Renewal applicants missed several section minimums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Minimum</th>
<th>Number of Renewals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1: General Application</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2: Program Design</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3: NC BoS CoC Priorities</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4: Project Performance</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5: Application Deadlines/Documentation</td>
<td>1 (Allied Churches)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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
  - This minimum was not used in the rankings
- 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Possible Score</th>
<th>Highest Score</th>
<th>Lowest Score</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>98.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lowest Performing Project

Allied Churches
RRH Renewal

Missed 14 standards
Missed 3 section minimums

Score: 20 out of a possible 172 points
New Project Review
Summary of New Projects

8 agencies submitted initial documents at beginning of process
  - 1 application did not meet initial threshold requirements and staff notified that they could not proceed.

7 agencies turned in new project 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Standards missed</th>
<th>Minimums missed</th>
<th>Total Missed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCCEH SSO-CE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union County RRH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitt County RRH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCADV RRH DV Bonus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diakonos PSH</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robeson County RRH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Churches RRH</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four projects stood out as the projects to include in ranking, the other 3 are not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Standards missed</th>
<th>Minimums missed</th>
<th>Total Missed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCCEH SSO-CE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union County RRH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitt County RRH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCADV RRH DV Bonus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diakonos PSH</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robeson County RRH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Churches RRH</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## New Project Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Possible Highest</th>
<th>Highest Score</th>
<th>Lowest Score</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSO</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ranking and Prioritization
### Renewal Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renewed at full funding</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewed at reduced funding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not funded</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not apply</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funded with reallocated dollars</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded with bonus or DV bonus dollars</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded with a combination of reallocated and bonus dollars</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not funded</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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: Community Link

- Community Link: Kerr Tar PSH renewal (formerly Cardinal)
  - 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)
  - 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*
  *approximate amounts, final amount has to be calculated by FMR
Reduced Renewal Funding: Eastpointe Human Services

- 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*
  *approximate amounts, final amount has to be calculated by FMR
Project Recommendations from the Project Review Committee
Project Recommendation from the Project Review Committee

Projects ranked as follows:

- HMIS
- SSO-CE renewal
- Other renewals
  - # of unmet Standards + performance Minimum
  - Scores
- New Projects
  - Because of funding priorities 2 RRH projects were pulled into Tier 1 and ranked in order of Funding Priorities
Project Recommendation from the Project Review Committee

HMIS grant & SSO-CE renewals ranked first

Community-wide project

Required by HUD

Scorecard not designed to measure

NCCEH is the grantee
Project Recommendation from the Project Review Committee

Renewal Ranking

Sorted by standards unmet

Then performance minimums

Then score

Funding Priority
Ranking Recommendation from Project Review Committee

New RRH Projects are partially in Tier 1

New RRH projects scored better than some renewal projects & ranked higher.

Pitt County’s full budget in Tier 1

Tier 1 $115,139

Union County Community Shelter straddles Tier 1 & Tier 2

Tier 1 $75,842
Tier 2 $89,014
Renewal Projects in Tier 2

New projects are a funding priority this year, so some projects were placed in Tier 2.

Burlington Development Corporation:
Steps RRH in Tier 2
Region 6

$59,704

Surry Homeless and Affordable Housing Coalition: SHAHC PSH in Tier 2
Region 4

$112,845
Ranking Recommendation from Project Review Committee

**NCCADV DV-RRH Project**

Could be funded by DV Bonus Funding

Potential Funding $1164,937

Or partially by CoC Bonus

Potential Funding $699,562

Ranked towards the bottom because ranking will not effect its chances for DV Bonus
Ranking Recommendation from Project Review Committee

New expansion applications for reduced grants in case of Bonus Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bonus Funding</th>
<th>$699,562</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Link</td>
<td>ranked first for Bonus funding because it’s a newly inherited grant from Cardinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastpointe</td>
<td>ranked bottom because it has 2 grants not started and no spending history</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steering Committee Discussion

To meet HUD deadline, Steering Committee must decide today on the Priority List recommended by the Project Review Committee.

Discussion?

Motion?

NCCEH will notify applicants in writing about CoC decision to accept or reject project application by the end of the day tomorrow, August 31.
Next Steps
Next Steps for CoC Application

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

NCCEH will post CoC application & project priority listing for review  
September 12

NCCEH will submit consolidated application to HUD  
Before September 18 deadline
Next Steps

Staff will notify applicants regarding decisions by the end of the week

- Please do not have discussions with grantees before staff have the chance to notify grantees.
- Staff will send scorecards to applicants and offer follow-up calls.
Next Steps

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.

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

Contact us
   bos@ncceh.org
   (919)755-4393