NC Balance of State CoC Funding and Performance Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes
01.17.20

Members Present: Melissa McKeown, Talaika Williams

NCCEH Staff Present: Brian Alexander, Amy Sawyer, Kevin McNamee, Jasmin Volkel

Minutes:
- Brian welcomed members and introduced the agenda for today's meeting.
- Amy gave an update on the progress for a dashboard to use for monthly Steering Committee meetings.
    - The process has been delayed to ensure that the regular reporting pulls data in a uniform way. NCCEH staff is looking at pulling raw data from HMIS for the NC BoS CoC so that all measures in the dashboard are uniformly presented. This will require staff to create a script to transcribe the raw data into a dashboard.
    - Simultaneously, NCCEH staff are pursuing current HMIS reports that might be used for a dashboard in case the raw data and script cannot be pulled together efficiently.
    - Staff want to ensure that whatever data is used presents an accurate picture and can most easily be pulled on a monthly basis.
    - Staff will report the progress of dashboard efforts at our next meeting and hope to have a draft dashboard for FPS members to review and provide feedback.
- Brian introduced the 2019 CoC Funding Priorities in preparation for the committee to update the document for the FY20 CoC competition.
    - The 2019 CoC Funding Priorities set overall and regional priorities.
        - 2019 CoC-wide priorities
            - Ensure essential infrastructure elements are in place, including HMIS and coordinated entry.
            - Ensure adequate coverage of permanent supportive housing across the CoC.
            - Increase the availability of rapid rehousing.
            - Ensure CoC funding is being used well, including potentially re-allocating some funding from projects that have patterns of low spending or poor performance.
        - In the past two years, the Project Review and Steering Committees have used these extensively to make funding decisions.
            - Placed HMIS and SSO-CE applications at the top of the ranking list.
            - Expanded an initial SSO-CE grant to extend coverage of the grant to fund CE activities in more regions.

- Included several RRH applications from agencies with experience for regions that need to bring these activities to scale:
  - Union County Community Shelter RRH – Union County (awarded)
  - Pitt County Planning RRH – Region 12 (awarded)
  - Trillium RRH – Regions 12 and 13 (pending)
  - NC DHHS RRH – NC BoS CoC-wide (pending)
  - NCCADV DV-RRH – NC BoS CoC-wide (pending)
- Re-allocated renewal projects based on low performance and historical underspending to new applications:
  - Eastpointe – underspending
  - Community Link/Cardinal – underspending
  - Residential Treatment Services of Alamance County PSH – poor performance
  - Burlington Development Corporation PSH – poor performance
- Regional programmatic priorities
  - Using the 2018 PIT/HIC and FY18 CoC funding levels, the funding priorities assign a level of priority for RRH and PSH for each Regional Committee based on need.
    - Priority 1: The region has more unmet needs than existing PSH beds, implying that it needs to significantly increase PSH stock to meet the need.
    - Priority 2: The region has no current CoC-funded RRH.
    - Priority 3: The region already has CoC-funded RRH and /or some need for PSH but less than their current stock of PSH beds, implying a relatively small increase in PSH in the region could meet the need.
    - No Priority: The region has the PSH stock to currently meet their needs.
- Brian asked members if the overall structure of the CoC Funding Priorities still make sense with both CoC-wide and regional programmatic priorities.
  - Members said they believe this structure works well to help the Project Review Committee and Steering Committee make their decisions. They did not think we should change the current structure.
- Keeping the structure the same, Brian asked members if there were specific changes that the CoC should make in the CoC-wide priorities or if something might be missing.
  - Melissa asked a question about projects that were reallocated and whether the reallocation put people already in housing in jeopardy.
    - Brian answered that the current document has language as explanation that the Project Review Committee should take into consideration funding in the region and whether other resources exist that could help house any individuals that need continued assistance.
  - Members felt that the CoC-wide priorities still seem relevant and should not be changed for 2020.

- o Brian asked members if the regional priority system, making PSH the highest priority followed by RRH as well as the methods by which the priorities are calculated still make sense.
  - ▪ Members felt that PSH should remain the highest priority since CoC funding is the only public funding source that funds this activity.
  - ▪ Members felt the current methods for calculating the priorities made sense and should be used for the 2020 priorities.
- o Brian asked members to consider a few other items in the 2019 CoC Funding Priorities document:
  - ▪ Acquisition, Rehab, and New Construction: In the 2019 priorities, the CoC will not fund these activities because of the overall cost and timing of these activities and instead priorities funding for direct housing assistance.
    - • Members felt that this prohibition should remain in place to prioritize funding for direct housing assistance.
  - ▪ TH-RRH: In the 2019 priorities, the CoC will not fund these activities because CoC needs to work more closely with emergency shelters to lower barriers and increase utilization.
    - • Members indicated that the CoC has started technical assistance efforts to help shelters lower barriers and increase utilization, but the environment indicating the need for this program type still doesn't exist. They felt that this prohibition should remain in place until more work has been done with shelters.
  - ▪ DV Bonus – TH-RRH and/or SSO-CE: Brian said that the 2019 priorities mentioned that agencies applying for DV Bonus funds were allowed to apply for TH-RRH projects but did not address SSO-CE projects, which caused confusion of how to handle the one DV Bonus SSO-CE application submitted. The document needs to address whether the CoC should prohibit or allow one or both project types under DV Bonus funding, if available in the FY20 competition.
    - • Members felt that both project types should be available for DV Bonus project applicants. Melissa mentioned that an explanation about how the SSO-CE bonus money should be used and suggested that DV Bonus SSO-CE projects should be CoC-wide and enhance and provide connection to the current CE system rather than create a separate CE system for DV survivors. Talaika agreed with this analysis.
- • Next Steps: Members charged NCCEH staff with updating the 2019 CoC Funding Priorities with feedback from today's meeting.
  - o Staff will update the document and email to members at least one week in advance of the next Funding and Performance Subcommittee meeting. Members will have the chance to ask questions and provide feedback to impact the final draft of the document.
  - o Members will consider approving the final draft document at their February meeting, and upon approval, present to the Steering Committee for approval at its March meeting.

Next Meeting: Thursday, February 27, 2020 at 11 AM