Balance of State Project Review Committee Meeting
8.11.16

Committee Members Present:
Bill Adams, Valerie Brooks, Donnell Buckner, Fredrika Cooke, Jane Earnest, Jennifer Molliere, Rosemarie Glenn, Frances Johnson, Gloria Kesler, Mary Mallory, Mary McClain, Sharon Tirrell

NCCEH Staff Present:
Terry Allebaugh, Brian Alexander, Emily Carmody, Nancy Holochwost, Beth Bordeaux

Overview of CoC Application Process

- The Balance of State is one of twelve Continuums of Care (CoCs) in North Carolina. CoCs are regional or local planning bodies that coordinate housing and services funding for homeless programs.
- The Balance of State covers 79 counties. Because it is so large, it has Regional Committees that coordinate local-level planning and work.
- CoCs promote a community-wide commitment to ending homelessness, prioritizing getting homeless people back into housing as quickly as possible.
- CoCs are tasked with organizing two funding processes: CoC funding (which is the process we are discussing today) and Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) funding.
    - In the CoC funding process, agencies applying for funding submit their applications to their CoC, which is responsible for reviewing these applications and prioritizing the applications that will be submitted to HUD for funding consideration. The Project Review Committee is part of this CoC-level review and prioritization process.
- The Project Review Committee is composed of one representative from each Regional Committee that nominates a representative. To avoid conflict of interest, people from agencies applying for CoC funding may not serve on the committee.
- The Project Review Committee uses a scorecard, which was created by the Scorecard Committee, to review and score all project applications from agencies. Once scoring is complete, the Project Review Committee has a final meeting to create a ranked list of applications in order of priority for funding. This list is presented to the BoS Steering Committee for approval.
- Scoring and ranking applications allows CoCs to prioritize limited CoC funds for projects that meet the CoC's priorities and needs, are performing well, and are managing the funds effectively. The scoring and ranking process is also required by HUD for all CoCs.
- In the 2016 CoC competition, the BoS CoC is eligible to apply for a total of $8,413,573 in project applications. The CoC's Annual Renewal Demand (ARD), which is the amount needed to renew all existing projects, is $7,888,001. The CoC may also apply for up to $525,572 in new projects under the Permanent Housing Bonus.
- Project applications must be placed into two tiers:

- o Tier 1: 93% of ARD amount ($7,335,841)
- o Tier 2: 7% of ARD amount + Permanent Housing Bonus amount ($1,077,732)
- o Any grant may be placed in either tier. For instance, a new Permanent Housing Bonus project may be placed in Tier 1, and a renewal grant may be placed in Tier 2.
- o HUD has indicated that Tier 1 is the relatively "safe" tier, and projects placed in Tier 1 will most likely receive funding from HUD. Tier 2 is the riskier tier, and projects placed in Tier 2 may or may not receive funding. In the 2015 competition, two of the BoS projects placed in Tier 2 did not receive funding.

Overview of Scoring and Ranking
- The Project Review Committee will score new and renewal project applications submitted by agencies to the BoS CoC. The deadline for project applications is August 12. The committee will only score materials submitted by this deadline.
- The Project Review Committee will use their scores and may also use other considerations to rank the project applications and place them into Tier 1 and Tier 2.
- The Scorecard Committee met earlier this year and created one scorecard for new projects and one scorecard for renewal projects. The scorecards have four goals:
  - o to fund organizations that have the capacity to run effective programs
  - o to fund projects that reflect the BoS CoC's priorities and HUD's priorities (providing permanent supportive housing, serving chronically homeless people and veterans)
  - o to incentivize agencies to be good partners with the CoC, Regional Committee, and other local programs
  - o to ensure that funded agencies are being good stewards of CoC funding and performing to BoS CoC standards
- The scorecards have two parts: a Combined Scoring section and a Staff Scoring section.
  - o The Combined Scoring section is scored by both the Project Review Committee and NCCEH staff. Each Project Review Committee member will be assigned a particular number of applications to score. Each Project Review Committee member will also be paired with a member of NCCEH's staff. Both the committee member and the NCCEH staff member score the same questions, and then the two scores are averaged to create the final score. The committee member and NCCEH staff member may have different scores.
  - o The Staff Scoring section of the scorecard is scored only by NCCEH staff. This portion of the scorecard contains more technical information.
- Once all applications have been scored, the Project Review Committee will meet a final time on August 26 at 2:00. During this meeting, the full committee will review the final scores for all applications, discuss any special considerations, and create the proposed ranked list of applications.
- NCCEH expects to receive a total of 47 project applications to score and rank. There are two additional project applications that are not scored:
  - o HMIS renewal grant: This grant provides support for the HMIS that serves the entire BoS CoC. It is not scored because it is not a housing program and the scorecard is not designed to evaluate it. This grant has historically been ranked first because HMIS is a

requirement for all grantees, and without it, no other applications would receive funding.
- o CoC planning grant: This grant provides funding for CoC-wide coordination, administration, and training. The funds for planning grants are outside of the tiers, so it is not required to be ranked or scored.
- The proposed ranked list of projects will be presented to the BoS Steering Committee for approval at its meeting on Tuesday, August 30, at 10:30. Project Review Committee members are encouraged to participate in this meeting.
- The Project Review Committee has options for creating the ranked list and fitting projects into the available funding amounts.
- o HUD allows CoCs to reallocate part or all of the budget amounts from renewal grants to create new projects.
- o The budgets for new grants can be reduced to fit into the available amount of funding, as long as the program would still be able to run effectively on the reduced budget.
- o The Project Review Committee can choose to recommend some of the new project applications for funding and not recommend others.

2016 Scorecard Review & Discussion
- All project applications will be scored on the application materials that are submitted by the deadline, which is 5:00 p.m. on August 12. NCCEH staff will send Project Review Committee members the application materials for the applications they have been assigned to score.
- Some questions on the scorecard are worth numerical points. Other questions are "standards" or "thresholds." Standards are benchmarks that applicants are expected to meet, so the Scorecard Committee chose not to award these numerical points. Threshold questions are requirements that applicants must meet. Applications that do not meet thresholds cannot be recommended for funding.
- Project Review Committee members will complete one scorecard per application. At the top of the scorecard, there is a section to indicate the agency, project name, and project type, as well as the reviewer's name and signature. The signed scorecards must be emailed or faxed to NCCEH staff after Project Review Committee members have completed their follow-up call with their NCCEH staff partner.
- The scorecard is broken into sections, each of which has a minimum score. Projects that do not meet minimums will be discussed by the Project Review Committee, which has the option of deciding to not recommend them for funding.
- Staff reviewed the Combined Scoring section of the renewal scorecard.
- o Section I pertains to general completeness and accuracy of the project application.
- o Section II pertains to BoS and HUD priorities, including program type, Housing First program models, and key elements/program standards for permanent supportive housing and rapid re-housing programs. Some of these questions will be scored on the project application and some will be scored on other documentation submitted by the agency. Staff reviewed the specific information that should be used to answer these questions.
- o For questions that are standards, there are four options for answers:
  - ▪ standard is met

- standard is unmet (applicant submitted materials for scoring and materials did not meet standard)
- standard is unmet – documentation not provided (applicant did not submit materials for scoring even though question pertains to their application)
- n/a (question does not pertain to the application)
- Staff reviewed the Combined Scoring section of the new scorecard.
  - Section I asks if this project is consistent with the mission of the agency.
  - Section II pertains to the general completeness and accuracy of the project application.
  - Section III asks about BoS and HUD priorities. It contains the same questions as Section II on the renewal scorecard, plus some additional questions.
    - One question pertains to a statement of need in which the applicant demonstrates how this project will meet an existing need in the community.
    - Other questions ask if the project will serve target populations of people with disabilities, chronically homeless people, and veterans.
    - Projects applying for leasing instead of rental assistance funds must submit an explanatory statement.
    - New rapid re-housing projects must already be operating an existing rapid re-housing project with other funds.
    - One question asks what percentage of the project's budget is for housing activities.
  - Section IV pertains to services that the project proposes to provide.

Next Steps for Project Review Committee Members
- NCCEH staff are anticipating 47 applications: 42 renewal applications and 5 new applications. Each Project Review Committee member will likely have 3 or 4 applications to score. To avoid conflict of interest, Project Review Committee members will be assigned applications from areas that are outside their Regional Committees.
- Next week, each Project Review Committee member will receive emails from NCCEH including the following information:
  - blank scorecards, the applications they are assigned, and instructions for filling the scorecards out
  - attachments from Smartsheet (these are the materials that need to be scored)
  - the name of their NCCEH staff partner
  - instructions on how to schedule a follow-up call with their NCCEH staff partner
    - these calls will be held from August 18 to August 22
- After receiving these emails, Project Review Committee members can begin scoring their applications. The scoring must be completed prior to the follow-up phone call. During these phone calls, the Project Review Committee member and NCCEH staff partner will review the scores they each gave to the applications.
- After holding the phone call with their NCCEH staff partner, Project Review Committee members must email or fax the Combined Scoring pages of their scorecards to NCCEH by August 23.
  - email: bos@ncceh.org
  - fax: 888-742-3465

- The Project Review Committee will convene for a final meeting on August 26 at 2:00 to create the ranked list of projects. Project Review Committee members are asked to register for the meeting at www.ncceh.org/events/999/.
- Project Review Committee members who have questions can contact NCCEH staff at 919-755-4393 or bos@ncceh.org.