



# North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

---

bos@ncceh.org

919.755.4393

www.ncceh.org/BoS

## **Balance of State Steering Committee Meeting 8.30.16**

### **Regional Leads Present:**

Kim Crawford, Sally Love, Teena Willis, Austin Pearce, Jamal Troublefield, Mollie Tompkins, LaTasha McNair, Tammy Gray (for Sarah Lancaster), Roxanne Curry, Joel Rice, Marie Watson, Juliet Rogers, Susan Bridgen, Nicole Dewitt, Jim Cox, Robert Lawler, Marlene Harrison, Emily Locklear, Jennifer Molliere

### **Regional Leads Absent:**

Sharon Covington, Alvin Foster, Trina Hill, Tyrone Lindsey, Debbie Briscoe Smith, Monica Frizzell, Ginny Mohrbutter, Mary Mallory

### **Interested Parties Present:**

Janice Sauls, Lori Watts, Tamara Veit, Amy Modlin, Amy Steele, Linda Brinson, Brian Fike, Talaika Williams, Leila McMichaels, Faye Pierce, Brenda Chorzelewski, Kareem McDuffie, Melissa McKeown, Debbie Cole

### **NCCEH Staff Present:**

Brian Alexander, Emily Carmody, Nancy Holochwost, Denise Neunaber

### **Approval of August Minutes**

There being no changes needed, the minutes were approved by common consent.

### **Project Priority Listing for CoC Application**

- The 2016 CoC competition is currently underway. The consolidated application, which is due to HUD by September 14, consists of three parts:
  - The CoC application, which contains information about activities across the entire 79-county BoS CoC. This part is completed by NCCEH staff using input from Regional Committees, the Steering Committee, and other stakeholders.
  - Project applications, which are the applications from agencies seeking new and renewal funding as well as the CoC planning grant.
  - The project priority listing, which is a ranked list of project applications recommended by the Project Review Committee and approved by the Steering Committee. The purpose of today's meeting is to review and approve the project priority listing.
- The CoC application process is managed at the CoC level by NCCEH staff and the Steering Committee. Project applications from agencies are reviewed by the Project Review Committee using scorecards created by the Scorecard Committee. The applications are ranked and recommended for funding by the Project Review Committee and are then submitted to HUD through the consolidated application.

- The BoS has over \$8 million at stake in the 2016 competition.
  - Annual Renewal Demand: \$7,888,001
    - Amount needed to fund all renewal projects
  - Permanent Housing Bonus (5% of FPRN): \$525,572
    - Available for new PSH and RRH projects
  - CoC planning grant (3% of FPRN): \$315,343
    - Available for CoC coordination activities
- Project applications must be ranked and placed in tiers.
  - Tier 1 = 93% of ARD amount: \$7,335,841
  - Tier 2 = 7% of ARD plus Permanent Housing Bonus amount: \$1,077,732
  - Projects can be placed in either tier, regardless of type and whether they are new or renewal. New projects can be placed in Tier 1 and renewals can be placed in Tier 2.
  - HUD requires all project applications to be ranked and placed in tiers except for the CoC planning grant application.
- The Project Review Committee and NCCEH staff have completed scoring the project applications. The scorecard consists of two parts:
  - Community section scored by both NCCEH staff and Project Review Committee representative. These two scores are averaged.
  - Staff section scored only by NCCEH staff.
  - The scores from these two sections are added together to create the final score.
- This year, due to changes in the HUD application that were released after the scorecards were created, two questions that were on the scorecard were omitted.
  - The scorecard contained a question about the amount of leverage documented. HUD stated that leverage would not be reviewed or scored this year, so staff chose not to ask applicants for leverage letters and did not score this question.
  - The scorecard contained a question about performance measures. The HUD project application did not contain questions about performance measures this year, so this question was not scored.
- The BoS has 46 applications to rank in the project priority listing.
  - 43 renewal applications were received
    - 42 were scored
    - 1 HMIS renewal was not scored (following precedent, and the scorecard is not designed to score non-housing applications)
  - 5 new project applications were expected, but only 3 were submitted with complete application materials
    - 2 new RRH applications did not meet the timeliness threshold due to submitting incomplete application materials
    - 1 new PSH was received for Southeast region
    - 1 new PSH was received for Wilson/Greene
    - 1 new RRH was received for Pitt County
  - The CoC planning grant will be completed by NCCEH staff. This application was not scored because it is not required to be ranked or placed in tiers.
- 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 NCCEH 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.
  - Coordinated Assessment participation: 15 applications from 3 agencies did not meet this standard. Coordinated assessment participation is a HUD requirement for all grantees. NCCEH 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. NCCEH staff will follow up with agencies to ensure they are following the HUD prioritization.
- NCCEH staff will provide the individual scorecard for each application to the applicant agency and will offer the agency a phone call to discuss it.
- The BoS received 3 eligible new applications.
  - Pitt County Planning:
    - RRH serving Pitt County for \$110,000
    - Total score was 41
    - Did not meet 4 of the 15 RRH Criteria
  - Eastpointe:
    - One PSH for Southeast region for \$144,606
    - One PSH for Wilson/Greene for \$62,014
    - Total scores were 125 and 129, respectively
    - Did not meet standards on community need statement explaining local need for these projects or previous spending rates
    - Met all 6 of the PSH Key Elements
- The Project Review Committee reviewed a special consideration for the new projects from Eastpointe. On the scorecard for new projects, operating as a housing first project is a threshold requirement. During scoring, there was a discrepancy between the information Eastpointe provided in the applications and the program policies regarding drug use. Staff contacted Eastpointe to review this issue. Eastpointe stated that the program policies had not been updated to reflect current requirements and provided a letter and revised



policies to the Project Review Committee. After reviewing these documents, the committee agreed that the applications met the housing first threshold and chose to put the applications forward in the competition.

- The Project Review Committee met on August 26 to review options for ranking project applications. After discussing several options, the committee chose the following recommendation to put forward for Steering Committee approval:
  - Rank HMIS renewal first
    - This grant has historically been ranked first because it is a community-wide project that affects other projects' eligibility for funding. NCCEH is the grantee as of last year, but this precedent existed in prior years as well.
  - Rank renewal projects in the following order:
    - First group: renewals that met the PSH Key Elements/RRH Criteria AND Coordinated Assessment standards, ranked by score
    - Second group: all other renewals, ranked by score
  - Rank new projects in the following order:
    - First group: new applications that met the PSH Key Elements/RRH Criteria AND Coordinated Assessment standards are pulled to the top of Tier 2
    - Second group: new applications that did not meet these standards placed at the bottom of Tier 2 (below renewals)
- One renewal application (from Residential Treatment Services of Alamance) did not meet any of the 6 PSH Key Elements. The Project Review Committee considered ranking this application at the bottom, but chose not to. However, committee members wanted to bring this concern to the Steering Committee and to NCCEH staff.
- The Steering Committee reviewed the recommended listing of the project applications in ranked order. This list is posted at <http://www.ncceh.org/files/7427/>.
- The Greenville Housing Authority's Project Stable Solutions grant straddles Tier 1 and Tier 2. Out of the total budget request, \$57,305 falls into Tier 1 and \$2,454 falls into Tier 2. The CoC NOFA states that for projects straddling the tiers, HUD will conditionally select the project up to the amount of funding that falls within Tier 1. If sufficient funding is available, HUD may also fund the Tier 2 portion. If HUD does not fund the Tier 2 portion, HUD may award the project reduced funding (only the Tier 1 amount) if the project can still be operated at this amount. Because so little of Project Stable Solutions' budget falls in Tier 2, it is likely it would still be able to operate if only the Tier 1 amount was awarded.
- Staff asked Steering Committee members for any questions or discussion regarding the project ranking; none were raised.
- A motion was made and approved to approve the project ranking as recommended by the Project Review Committee [Harrison, Watson]. All in favor; none opposed. Regional Leads who are project applicants abstained from voting.
- To meet HUD deadlines, NCCEH will notify all project applicants today of whether their project applications were accepted or rejected.
- NCCEH will post the CoC application and the priority listing to the NCCEH website on or around September 8. Staff will send an email when this is available.
- NCCEH will submit the consolidated application to HUD in advance of September 14 deadline.



**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, September 6, at 10:30.

