



North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

bos@ncceh.org

919.755.4393

www.ncceh.org/BoS

Balance of State Project Review Committee Meeting 8.26.16

Committee Members Present:

Bill Adams, Donnell Buckner, Fredrika Cooke, Jane Earnest, Gloria Kesler, Mary Mallory, Mary McClain, Jennifer Molliere, Sharon Tirrell, Rosemarie Glenn, Valerie Brooks

NCCHE Staff Present:

Brian Alexander, Terry Allebaugh, Emily Carmody, Nancy Holochwost, Beth Bordeaux

Review of Scoring Process

- The Project Review Committee is composed of representatives from the BoS Regional Committees. 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.
- The committee uses a scorecard created by the Scorecard Committee to review and score project applications for new and renewal funding in the Balance of State 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 BoS 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.
- The BoS CoC has over \$8 million at stake in the 2016 CoC competition. This amount is sufficient to cover all project applications that have been submitted to the BoS.
 - Potential amount available to the BoS CoC:
 - Annual Renewal Demand (ARD): \$7,888,001
 - Amount needed for all renewal projects
 - Permanent Housing Bonus: \$525,572
 - Available for new permanent supportive housing and rapid re-housing projects
 - These are not guaranteed amounts, but what the CoC is eligible to apply for.
- HUD requires CoCs to place project applications into two tiers.
 - Tier 1: 93% of the ARD amount: \$7,335,841
 - Tier 2: 7% of ARD amount plus the amount of the Permanent Housing Bonus: \$1,077,732
 - Tier 1 is regarded as the relatively "safe" tier, and projects placed in Tier 1 are likely to receive funding from HUD. Tier 2 is the "riskier" tier, and projects placed in this tier have a higher chance of not being funded.

- The Project Review Committee and NCCEH staff have completed the scoring process. For each application, the combined scoring section of the scorecard was completed by one member of the committee and one member of NCCEH staff, and these scores were averaged. The staff scoring section of the scorecard was completed by NCCEH staff. The scores from these two sections were added together to create the total score for each project application. This score, along with meeting standards and minimums on the scorecard, are used to inform the ranking of applications. The purpose of today's meeting is for the Project Review Committee to create the recommended ranked list of projects.

Updates on Actions After Scoring

- On some standards, the score from the Project Review Committee member and the score from staff did not match. The precedent set in prior years when this occurred was to trigger an alert for NCCEH staff to complete further review, which would be considered a tie-breaker. The staff that completed this review was not the staff that originally scored the standard. There were 34 instances where the standard scores did not match.
 - 27 were for PSH Key Elements
 - Many of the discrepancies were due to the Project Review Committee member selecting "n/a" as a response instead of "documentation not provided"
 - About half of the discrepancies were from one applicant who did not submit complete documentation
 - One discrepancy was due to an applicant (United Community Ministries) submitting program policies that contradicted answers in the application. Staff contacted the agency to clarify which documentation was correct. This was the only case in which staff followed up with the applicant agency.
 - 6 were for RRH Program Standards
 - 1 was on the spending statement
 - NCCEH staff tracked the specific issue and how the tie-breaker was decided for each of these 34 instances in case the applicant had questions.
- One agency (Trillium) had 2 renewal grants that scored differently on the PSH Key Element regarding voluntary services. Per precedent, this triggered further review by staff. Upon review, staff found the documentation provided met the standard on both applications.
- Project Review Committee members were asked if they had comments on the review process. Members noted that it seemed to be fair and reasonable.

Special Consideration for Project Review Committee

- Eastpointe submitted applications for 2 new projects. The scorecard for new projects contains threshold questions that the renewal scorecard does not contain. One of these thresholds is that the project must operate as a Housing First project.
- On Eastpointe's 2 new applications, there was a discrepancy between the information included in the application and the program policies. The policies stated that participants who engage in drug use will be terminated from the program, but the application stated the program would not screen for substance use and that the program would operate as Housing First.
- Because this was a threshold question that could prevent the applications from being eligible for funding, staff contacted Eastpointe to follow up.



- Eastpointe stated that the program policies were outdated and the project would not terminate for substance use.
- Eastpointe submitted a letter and an updated policy document for the Project Review Committee's review. These were emailed to committee members prior to today's meeting.
- Committee members discussed whether the letter and updated policy sufficiently addressed the threshold issue.
- A motion was made and approved to accept Eastpointe's 2 new applications as meeting threshold, with the understanding that the decision about their ranking is still to be decided [Kesler, Glenn]. All in favor; none opposed.

Project Ranking: Renewals

- The Project Review Committee discussed the ranking for renewal projects. Staff recommended and reviewed two options for the Project Review Committee's consideration. The committee has the ability to choose one of these options or to create a different ranking.
- There were 42 renewal projects that were scored. The BoS also has 1 HMIS renewal project, which is not scored (since the scorecard is not designed to assess non-housing projects). The precedent is to score the HMIS project first since it is a CoC-wide project and affects all other projects' eligibility.
- There was a wide range of scores on the renewal projects.
 - PSH renewals: highest score was 148, lowest score was 18.5, average score was 92.3
 - RRH renewals: highest score was 99.5, lowest score was 43, average score was 77.6
- The scorecard is divided into sections that each have a minimum score. If an application does not meet the section minimum, it triggers further review by NCCHEH staff. This year, two section minimums caused notable issues for renewal applicants:
 - CoC priorities, which concerns the ratio of housing funds to services funds. Ten applications did not meet the minimum.
 - Performance, which concerns the populations served, program outcomes, data quality, and spending rates. Nine applications did not meet the minimum. Of these, three did not have an APR to be scored, one because the grant has not started yet and two because they did not submit an APR with their application materials.
- The scorecard also contains questions that are scored based on standards rather than numerical points. Applicants had difficulty meeting several standards:
 - PSH Key Elements: 19 applications met all 6 key elements, 25 met some elements but not all, and 1 did not meet any elements. One applicant that has 14 grants did not submit full documentation.
 - RRH Criteria: 1 application met all criteria and 4 met some criteria but not all. This was the first year RRH criteria were included in the scorecard, so staff expected some difficulties in meeting the standards.
 - Coordinated Assessment participation: 15 applications from 3 agencies did not meet this standard. Coordinated assessment participation is a HUD requirement for all grantees. NCCHEH staff will follow up with agencies that did not meet this standard.
 - PSH prioritization (asking for program policies showing adoption of HUD's notice of prioritization): no applications met this standard. NCCHEH staff will



follow up with agencies to ensure they are following the HUD prioritization.

- The Project Review Committee reviewed a chart detailing which PSH Key Elements standards were not met.

	Leases	Voluntary Services	House Rules	Not Time-Limited	Choices in Support Services	Services can fluctuate
Met	36	20	29	37	22	37
Not Met	1	4	3	0	3	1
Not Met- Doc. Not Provided	1	14 all same grantee	4 all same grantee	1	13 all same grantee	0

- Project Review Committee members discussed different options for how to rank the renewal projects.
- Option 1A: Rank renewals by score
 - HMIS grant ranked first (precedent)
 - Rank renewals after that by score from highest to lowest
 - Pros: performance is factored into the numerical score, so ranking by score is ranking by performance
 - Cons: this option does not take standards into account, so they are not used as part of ranking
- Option 1B: Rank by score and by ability to meet key standards
 - HMIS grant ranked first
 - First group: applications that met key standards, ranked by score
 - met PSH Key Elements or RRH Program Standards, depending on grant type
 - AND
 - met Coordinated Assessment standard
 - Second group: all other renewals, ranked by score
 - Pros: takes performance into account through the score and also emphasizes that program design and community participation (as reflected in key standards) are important
 - Cons: means some grants that have a lower numerical score will be ranked higher in the list if they met the key standards
- The Project Review Committee reviewed a list showing the projects ranked by both Option 1A and Option 1B.
 - Under 1A : Burlington Development Corporation’s HOPE PSH would straddle the line between Tier 1 and Tier 2
 - Under 1B: Housing Authority of Greenville’s Project Stable Solutions PSH would straddle the line between Tier 1 and Tier 2
 - In both instances, \$2,454 of the project’s budget would be in Tier 2, so if Tier 2 is not awarded the agency could most likely still operate the program.
 - Other than the project that straddles the line, the renewal grants in Tier 2 are the same under both 1A and 1B.



- The Project Review Committee discussed options for how to rank the renewal projects. Committee members agreed that they wanted to hold applicants accountable to the key standards.
- Committee members discussed the possibility of creating 3 groups instead of 2: one for applications that met all PSH/RRH standards, one for applications that met some standards, and one for applications that met no standards. Staff noted that only one agency (Residential Treatment Services of Alamance) did not meet any of the PSH/RRH standards. Committee members discussed the lowest-scoring grants on the list. Staff noted that the two Cardinal grants received low scores because they did not submit APRs or HMIS reports to be scored and thus received negative or zero points on performance questions. Staff noted that United Community Ministries has had low performance in the past and that staff have been working with them on improvements.
- A motion was made and approved to recommend using Option 1B to rank renewal projects, with the note that the Project Review Committee flagged as a concern the agency that did not meet all the PSH key elements and wanted this noted to the Steering Committee [McClain, Tirrell]. All in favor; none opposed.

Project Ranking: New Projects

- Staff expected to receive 5 new applications, but only 3 were submitted with complete application materials.
 - Eastpointe: Southeast PSH (Bladen, Columbus, Robeson, Scotland Counties)
 - Eastpointe: Beacon II PSH (Wilson and Greene Counties)
 - Pitt County Planning: RRH
- Staff noted that there is enough funding available to put all 3 applications through without having to cut funds from other programs.
- Scores:
 - Eastpointe Southeast: 125
 - Eastpointe Beacon II: 129
 - Pitt County Planning: 41
- Eastpointe had the opportunity to receive more points because the agency has existing grants and the scorecard awards points for this.
- All new applications missed a minimum score:
 - Eastpointe did not meet the performance minimum due to low spending rates in the past.
 - Pitt did not meet the minimum for BoS/HUD priorities by 1 point.
- The new applications varied on meeting standards:
 - Eastpointe met all 6 PSH key elements, but did not meet the standard for the community need statement or previous spending rates.
 - Pitt met the standard for the community need statement, but missed 4 of the 15 RRH Criteria.
- The Project Review Committee discussed recommended options for scoring new projects. Staff noted that new projects can be placed anywhere on the list (in Tier 1 or Tier 2).
 - Option 2A: Rank new projects after the renewal projects
 - Pros: precedent from past years and protects existing projects



- Option 2B: New projects that met the PSH/RRH standards and the CA standard are pulled to the top of Tier 2
 - Order of Tier 2:
 - 2 Eastpointe new applications (which met PSH and CA standards)
 - All Tier 2 renewals, ranked by score
 - 1 Pitt County Planning new application (which did not meet RRH standards)
 - Pros: takes performance and program design into consideration (not prioritizing low-performing renewals just because they are renewals) and creates more competition, which is encouraged by HUD and needed to increase project performance across the board
- Project Review Committee members looked at a list that showed the ranked list for each of these options.
- Project Review Committee members discussed options for ranking the new projects. Emily noted that regardless of where new projects are ranked, the BoS is not guaranteed access to the Permanent Housing Bonus funds. Committee members agreed that they preferred Option 2B to reward the higher-performing new applications.
- A motion was made and approved to recommend using Option 2B to rank the new project applications [Tirrell, Glenn]. All in favor; none opposed.

Next Steps

- Staff thanked the Project Review Committee members for their participation and work on the committee.
- The ranking recommendations will be presented to the BoS Steering Committee at its August 30 meeting. Project Review Committee members are welcome to attend this meeting.
- After this meeting, NCCEH staff will notify all project applicants of Steering Committee's decision. Staff will also share the decision with Project Review Committee members.
- Project Review Committee members were asked not to share the ranking recommendation or the documents from today's meeting until after the ranking has been finalized at the August 30 meeting.

