



North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

bos@ncceh.org

919.755.4393

www.ncceh.org/BoS

NC BoS CoC Steering Committee CoC Project Ranking Meeting

September 4, 2019 Minutes

Regional Leads Present

Kristen Martin, Natasha Elliott, Marie Watson, Joel Rice, LaTasha McNair, Melissa Eastwood, Melissa McKeown, Jim Cox, Cherri Brunson

At-Large Members Present

Eric Edwards, Deena Fulton, Parker Smith, Todd Rosendahl, Angela Harper King, Lisa Phillips

SC Members Absent

Destri Leger, Casey McCall, Mary Boyles, Tharesa Lee, Emily Locklear, Ryan Carver, Dora Carter, Jessa Johnson, Ellen Blackman

Interested Parties Present

Lori Watts, Angela Sease

NCCEH Staff Present

Brian Alexander, Ehren Dohler, Emily Carmody, Jenn Von Egidy

Staff reminded the Steering Committee that members with conflicts of interest, those applying for CoC funds, must abstain from voting. Regional Lead Alternates may vote in place of the Regional Lead as long as they are not in conflict.

2019 CoC Competition Project Ranking Appeals Process

The NC Balance of State Continuum of Care (NC BoS CoC) strives to create a fair and transparent process for reviewing and ranking CoC competition project applications. The Project Review Committee may recommend that some new applications should not be included in the project priority listing or that some renewal projects should be partially or fully reallocated. To ensure fairness, these projects will have the opportunity to appeal the Project Review Committee's decision.

- Who may appeal:
 - New applicants whose projects were not included in the NC BoS CoC's project priority listing
 - Renewal applicants whose projects were partially or fully reallocated
- Appeals must present information that shows the CoC or Project Review Committee:
 - made a clear error
 - did not follow the advertised process
 - engaged in discriminatory activity
 - had a conflict of interest
 - or the grantee experienced extenuating circumstances

- Appeals letters must also address any deficiencies in the project application. Letters requesting an appeal without additional information will not be considered.
- Situations that may result in the Project Review Committee overturning a reallocation:
 - The Project Review Committee mistakenly used false or significantly incomplete information to make decisions.
 - The deficiencies in the project application were due to extenuating circumstances that will not affect the long-term viability or performance of the project.
 - The CoC/PRC did not follow the competition process as advertised to the CoC or took steps that are not allowed by HUD policy.
 - PRC member had a conflict of interest.
- 2019 Appeals Timeline
 - Applicants must submit the NC BoS CoC Competition Appeals Form, signed by a director-level position, by 6:00 PM on September 6, 2019.
 - The Project Review Committee will consider each appeal and decide whether to amend the project priority listing by September 9, 2019.
 - If the Project Review Committee decides to amend the project priority listing after reviewing appeals, the updated project priority listing will be approved by the NC BoS CoC Steering Committee on September 10, 2019.
 - Revised project applications need to be submitted in esnaps by September 12, 2019 at 6:00 PM.

Staff solicited questions or discussion. None asked.

A motion was made to approve the 2019 CoC Competition Appeals Process [Cox, Watson]. All in favor, none opposed.

Project Priority Listing

- The CoC Consolidated Application has 3 parts:
 - *CoC Application*: NCCEH completes this part of the application as the Collaborative Applicant. NCCEH attempts to capture CoC-wide information by requesting survey responses from the Steering Committee, Regional Committees, agencies, and stakeholders to provide a full scope of the CoC's work.
 - *Project Applications*: Includes both renewal and new projects, as well as the CoC Planning Grant, HMIS grant, and the SSO-CE grant applications.
 - *Project Priority Listing*: The Project Review Committee recommends a ranked list of each project based on performance, and the Steering Committee approves the list for the Consolidated Application.

Project Review Committee

- The Project Review Committee (PRC) is composed of representatives from the NC BoS CoC Regional Committees and Steering Committee. 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. PRC members that did not attend the first meeting were not included in the scoring process.
- The committee uses scorecards created by the Scorecard Committee to review and score project applications for new and renewal funding in the NC BoS 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 NC BoS CoC 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 and ranking applications is a requirement from HUD.

Summary of Potential Funding

Potential Amount Available to NC BoS CoC Applicants:

Annual Renewal Demand (ARD)	\$8,583,575
Bonus Funding	\$766,205
DV Bonus	\$1,164,839
CoC Planning (not ranked)	\$349,452

Projects will be ranked within 2 tiers:

Tier 1: 100% of first-time renewals + 94% of ARD	\$8,085,723
Tier 2: 6% of ARD + Bonus + Domestic Violence	\$2,428,896

- Project applications must be placed into two tiers:
 - HUD has indicated that Tier 1 is 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 Tier 2 may or may not receive funding. In the past, the NC Balance of State CoC has had projects placed in Tier 2 that did not receive funding from HUD.

Project Ranking

- Project ranking was informed by the CoC’s Funding Priorities and the scorecard.
- The CoC Funding Priorities provide guidance from the Continuum of Care on its priorities for funding. This includes priorities for funding specific project types and regional need.
- The 2019 CoC Scorecard includes thresholds, standards, section minimums, and total scores.
 - *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 the ranking 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.

Using the Scorecard

- PRC and NCCEH staff used scorecards to review the applications.



- Combined Scoring section scored by one PRC member and one NCCEH staff member
- Staff Scoring section scored by NCCEH staff: more objective measures and performance
- Combined scoring + staff scoring = total score
- PRC will use standards, section minimums, scores, and funding priorities to rank projects.
- Staff solicited questions or comments. None expressed.

Applications scored and ranked	35 renewal project applications 27 Permanent Supportive Housing 5 Rapid Re-housing 3 Consolidations 7 new project applications 1 Permanent Supportive Housing 4 Rapid Re-housing 2 DV Bonus Funding 1 RRH 1 Supportive Services Only (SSO) for CE
Applications not scored and ranked (typically ranked as first projects)	1 HMIS grant application 1 SSO-CE grant application
Applications not scored and not ranked	1 Planning grant application

Renewal Project Review

- 37 renewal projects turned in applications.
 - (1) HMIS project (not scored)
 - (1) SSO-CE project (not scored)
 - (5) RRH projects
 - (27) PSH projects
 - (3) Consolidations (not scored)
- Scored renewal projects:
 - 0 applications with threshold issues
- Staff explained that the consolidated projects would be in the Project Priority Listing, with a letter 'c' next to it. If the consolidation application is not approved by HUD, then the projects that would be consolidated will remain unaffected.
- Jim Cox commented that since the HMIS and CoC Planning Grant are not reviewed by the Project Review Committee, the applications should be made public to the Steering Committee.



- Brian replied that this was good feedback and that the Scorecard Committee recommended that a report should be made at the end of each grant year to the Steering Committee.

Renewal Standards

Standards Missed	Number of Renewals
Housing First	3 agencies, 6 projects

- Housing First: ensures projects are providing access to services to all experiencing homelessness.
 - The Project Review Committee recommends pulling these projects down in ranking

Standards Missed	Number of Renewals
PSH Key Elements (missed 25% or more)	2 agencies, 5 projects
RRH Benchmarks (missed 25% or more)	1 agency, 1 project

- Key Elements are based on SAMSHA Toolkits that identified best practices for PSH.
- Benchmarks were created by federal partners for RRH program design using best practices.
- The Project Review Committee is recommending that the CoC use these 2 standards to pull agencies down to the bottom of the ranked list.
- The Project Review Committee decided not to use Coordinated Entry Standards
 - First year for the CE questions and CE participation awarded points to participating agencies.

Section Minimums Not Used in Ranking

Number of Minimums Missed	Number of Renewals
0	11 projects
1	10 projects
2	11 projects

- Minimums Summary:
 - Section 1 minimum was changed from 5 to 3 points to reflect deleted question.
 - Section 2 minimum was not considered because applicants were not told to include MOU in instructions.
- The Project Review Committee recommends not using section minimums in ranking because total score will impact ranking. The total score tells the story and minimums are not necessary in the final review and ranking order.

Projects with a History of Poor Performance

- Burlington Development Corporation: *HOPE PSH FY 2018 Renewal (\$80,361)*



- Standards: Did not meet Housing First and 3 PSH Key Elements
- Performance: Scored lowest of renewal projects with a scored APR.
- Cost effectiveness: Grant serves 6 households with 67% of budget as services, operating, or administration.
- APR shows they were only at 50% capacity for half of the year.
- **Surry Homeless and Affordable Housing Coalition: SHAHC PH Renewal 2018 (\$115,823)**
 - Standards: Did not meet Housing First
 - Lowest scoring application in 2018 and 2019 despite ongoing assistance from CoC and Data Center staff
 - NCCEH has given ample technical assistance and the program still asks rudimentary questions. (i.e. eligibility requirements).
- **Eastpointe**
 - Shelter Plus Care Combined Renewal 2018 (\$179,915)
 - Shelter Plus Care 3 Renewal 2018 (\$260,835)
 - Shelter Plus Care Beacon Renewal 2018 (\$54,411)
 - Shelter Plus Care Southeast Renewal 2018 (\$75,307)
 - Standards: Did not meet Housing First and 2 PSH Key Elements
 - History of poor spending
 - In 2018
 - Reallocated a total of \$139,524
 - Eliminated Beacon II
 - Took money from Combined Shelter Plus Care
 - 2019 spending low

Shelter Plus Care Beacon Renewal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spent 38% of most recent operating year • 38% projected for current grant
Shelter Plus Care 3 Renewal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spent 56% of most recent operating year • 56% projected for current grant

New Project Applications Review

Summary of new projects:

- 4 new projects turned in applications by the due date
 - (2) RRH projects
 - (2) DV Bonus funding projects
 - (1) SSO-Coordinated Entry project
 - (1) RRH project
- 3 new projects did not complete the process:
 - 1 new RRH project had initial threshold issues
 - Staff notified project they could not proceed in the competition.
 - 1 new RRH project decided to not move forward after first submission.
 - 1 new PSH project did not turn in a project application.
 - Staff notified project they could not proceed in the competition.
- Thresholds are to determine if new applicants have capacity to operate a CoC grant. If they are unable to get through the CoC's application process, they likely do not have the capacity to manage a HUD grant.

New Project Comparison



Project	Standards missed	Minimums missed	Total Points
Trillium (RRH)	4	0	48.5
NCDHHS (RRH)	7	0	32
NCCADV RRH DV Bonus	2	1	20
NCCADV SSO-CE DV Bonus	1	2	5

- NCCEH was not anticipating a Coordinated Entry (CE) application this year. The scorecard committee did not design the new scorecard to capture information for a CE application. Last year, no agency was interested in applying for an SSO-CE grant with the DV bonus. The CoC approved the new scorecard before the NOFA was released.
 - The total points do not reflect the quality of the NCCADV SSO-CE application.

Project Review Committee recommends all 4 new projects be ranked

- New projects ranked because:
 - High quality projects
 - Meet CoC funding priorities
 - Increase coverage in priority areas

Project Review Committee recommends the DV Bonus new applications be at the bottom of the ranked list:

- Lowest scoring new projects
- Only applications that can get DV bonus funding and the only way they get funding is through the DV bonus
- Other renewal and new projects, if funded, could serve DV survivors

Options for funding both new Trillium and NCDHHS applications

- Reallocating renewal funding to fund these new projects
- Lower the amount of both applications to fit bonus funding available

Ranking and Prioritization

Tier 1- \$8,085,723

Tier 2- \$9,349,780

DV Bonus- \$1,163,318

Renewal Projects

Renewed at full funding

34

Renewed at reduced funding

1



Not funded - Reallocated	2
New Projects	
RRH	2
Funded with bonus or DV bonus dollars	2
Not included in the listing	3

Renewals Reallocated

- HOPE PSH FY 2019 Renewal
 - APR shows running at 50% capacity for half the year
 - Grant serves 6 households with 67% of budget as services, operating, or administrative
 - Application: \$80,361
 - Funded: \$0
 - Reallocated: \$80,361 (100%)
- Eastpointe Shelter Plus Care Beacon Renewal
 - Projected to spend 38% of current grant
 - Application: \$54,411
 - Funded: \$0
 - Reallocated: \$54,411 (100%)
- Eastpointe: Shelter Plus Care 3 Renewal
 - Projected to spend 56% of current grant
 - Application: \$260,835
 - Funded: \$207,784
 - Reallocated: \$53,051 (20%)

Project Recommendations from the Project Review Committee

Projects ranked as follows:

- HMIS & SSO-Coordinated Entry Renewals ranked first and second
 - Community-wide projects for required CoC infrastructure
 - Applied for by NCCEH
 - Scorecard not designed to measure
- Renewal Projects
 - Pull down renewal applications that do not meet Housing First and Key Elements/Benchmark Standards
 - Pull down programs that did not meet Housing First first and then programs that missed Key Elements/Benchmark Standards
 - Then sort in order of score
- New RRH Projects



- New RRH projects performed better than SHAHC renewal projects & ranked higher.
- Trillium: \$200,087
- NC DHHS: \$763,919
- NCCADV DV Bonus Projects
 - Ranked at the bottom because ranking will not affect its chances for DV Bonus
 - Increasing RRH for NC DV Survivors
 - Potential Funding \$924,283
 - Increasing CE for NC DV Survivors
 - Potential Funding \$239,035

Staff solicited questions or comments. None expressed.

- A motion was made to approve the project priority listing as recommended by the Project Review Committee [Brunson, Smith]. All in favor; none opposed.

Next Steps

- Staff will notify applicants regarding decisions by the end of the day
 - 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.
 - Applicants may appeal decisions by September 6 at 6:00 P.M.

NCCEH will notify all project applicants whether their applications were accepted or rejected September 4

Appeals Due September 6

PRC Appeals Meeting September 9

NCCEH will post CoC application & project priority listing for review (projected) September 24

NCCEH will submit consolidated application to HUD (projected) September 27

