

North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

bos@ncceh.org

919.755.4393

www.ncceh.org/BoS

Balance of State Steering Committee Meeting

5.1.12

Regional Leads Present:

Karen Holliday (for Albert Barron), Susan Bellew, Michael Bloomer, Faythe Canson, Kristi Case, Debbie Cole, Spencer Cook, Jim Curtin, Joe Marks (also sitting in for Teena Willis), Amy Modlin, Jane Motsinger, Faye Pierce, Joel Rice, Glenn Silver, Marty Stebbins, Michele Steele, Paulette White, Shari Wright

Regional Leads Absent: Katherine Pullicino, Jackie Sheffield

Interested Parties Present: Ellen Blackman, Ellery Blackstock, Kim Braxton, David Collins, Nicole Dewitt, Bonita Duncan, Terrence Gerald, Melissa Ledbetter, Laura McDuffee, Adrienne O'Neal, Glenn Silver, Teesie Townsend, Nina Walker, Lori Watts, Lynn White, Talaika Williams

NCCEH Staff Present:

Nancy Holochwost, Denise Neunaber, Emila Sutton

Approval of February Minutes

There being no changes needed, a motion was made and approved to accept the minutes [Bellew, Rice].

Regional BoS and ESG Meetings Recap

- The Balance of State CoC held 3 meetings in conjunction with the State ESG meetings (in Durham, Hickory, and Greenville). About 80 BoS members attended these meetings. They covered basic BoS information for people who are new to the table as well as what Regional Committees should be doing in preparation for ESG applications. The slides from these meetings will be posted on the NCCEH website.

Intent to Apply Forms for CoC and ESG Funds

CoC funds:

- The pre-application for CoC funding will not be released until HUD publishes the 2012 pro rata.
- The Intent to Apply Form is posted on the NCCEH website. Any agency interested in applying for new CoC funding and all agencies applying for renewal funding must fill it out. The Intent to Apply Form helps NCCEH staff assess interest in new projects and ensure that needed renewals are being renewed.

- Emila emailed Regional Leads and grantees with the link to the form. Regional Leads should talk to interested applicants about the requirements for competitive applications.

ESG funds:

- The BoS application process has not yet been determined since the State application process has not been defined. What we do know is that the State has indicated that the application will be competitive, that higher outcomes will result in a higher score, and that there will be some type of required approval from the Regional Committees and the Steering Committee for BoS applications. NCCEH will share information from the State as it becomes available.
- Regional Committees should begin discussing what their applications might look like and should keep NCCEH informed. The Intent to Apply Form is posted at www.ncceh.org/boeseg for both existing and new ESG grantees.
- The State has released 2 substantial amendments about ESG funding, which are posted at www.ncceh.org/boeseg. BoS members should read and comment on them.

ESG Funding Proposals

- The State is proposing to change how ESG funding is awarded. Previously, funding was based on threshold requirements and on the daily occupancy rates of agencies, and it was given to entitlement and non-entitlement communities equally. The State feels this process is not fair and wants to determine a new way to distribute funding. The State presented one alternative proposal at the regional meetings held in April; since then, new proposals have been put forth by other communities. All of these proposals were reviewed by the Steering Committee.
- State Proposal #1 (original proposal presented by the State at regional ESG meetings)
 - Funding would be based on HUD's pro rata (thus based on need).
 - Under this proposal, the BoS's allotment of ESG funding would increase. In 2011, the BoS received 34% of the State funding; in 2012, the BoS would receive 43%. In 2011, the BoS received \$824,916 in ESG and \$3,933,333 in HPRP. Under this proposal, the BoS would get \$665,402 in 2011b funding (for rapid re-housing/prevention only) and \$2,229,459 in 2012 (\$2,894,861 total).
 - The funding for other CoCs vary; some increase and some decrease. Four of them either lose money for facilities or will not receive enough money to implement a rapid re-housing program.
 - This proposal would involve a CoC-wide application, so the BoS would hold a competition within the CoC and then submit one overall application to the state (for both 2011b and 2012 funding).
- Guilford Proposal
 - Some communities that would lose funding or receive a smaller percentage of funding under State Proposal #1 have created alternate proposals to address these concerns. The Guilford CoC is one such community; it would lose \$65,000 for facilities (although it would receive an overall increase of \$109,000). Guilford stakeholders advocated strongly for their proposal at the State's public hearing.

- The Guilford proposal presumes that not all BoS communities have the capacity to use ESG funds or the need for these funds, so it would take money from the BoS and distribute it to other CoCs that meet two requirements:
 - Single county population over 200,000 and population density over 500 people per square mile
 - Homeless population of over 3000 people in one county according to previous year's CHIN data
- Eight communities meet these requirements: Mecklenburg, Wake, Guilford, Forsyth, Cumberland, Durham, Gaston/Lincoln/Cleveland, and Buncombe. \$636,869 would be taken from the BoS this year to be given to these communities. It is unclear how long this redistribution would last if this proposal were adopted.
- The Guilford proposal only addresses 2 of 4 the communities that would lose money under State Proposal #1 (Buncombe and Guilford, but not Orange and Wilmington).
 - Steering Committee members commented that urban areas have access to more resources outside of ESG and CoC funding that they can use to serve homeless populations. They also commented that HMIS data is not a representative indicator of community need, especially in BoS communities that have deliberately avoided investing in facilities.
- ESG Facility Hold Harmless (proposed by Orange CoC)
 - This proposal would take funding from all CoCs that do not have a potential loss in crisis service funding (emergency shelter and transitional housing facilities) and give it to those that do. This proposal is more equitable because it takes money proportionately from all CoCs and gives to all that would have a decrease in facilities funding. Under this proposal, the BoS would lose \$107,910.
 - The disadvantage of this proposal is that it only looks at losses to existing ESG grantees without considering the loss of HPRP funding. It takes a step backwards by taking money away from rapid re-housing activities and ensuring it goes to facilities. NCCEH believes that local communities, not the State, should decide whether funding goes to facilities or to rapid re-housing.
- \$50,000 Minimum for Rapid Re-housing (proposed by Orange CoC)
 - This proposal assumes that every community needs a minimum of \$50,000 in new money for rapid re-housing. The BoS would lose \$25,045.
 - The current proposal doesn't necessarily take the BoS regions into account correctly, so it might not equal \$50,000 for each BoS Regional Committee.
- State Proposal #2
 - Under this proposal, instead of one BoS application, each Regional Committee would apply as its own community (more like HPRP applications than the CoC application).
 - Each Regional Committee would have its own pro rata reserved for it. Applications would have to meet certain thresholds and score highly enough to be funded.
 - If there is money left on table because some BoS areas do not apply or do not meet threshold, this proposal allows the State to give it to other communities based on where

they think it would be best used. It may be based on capacity, on areas that need more funding to implement rapid re-housing, or on areas that need funding to lower homeless numbers. The extra funding would be distributed to communities in the following order:

- First to other BoS Regional Committees to meet need within the BoS
- Second to non-entitlement communities if the BoS has met its need
- Third to entitlement communities
- Because this proposal gives more authority to Regional Committees, it takes away some control from the BoS and Steering Committee. The BoS needs to use ESG money effectively in order to score well on the CoC application under HEARTH. It would be in the CoC's best interest to retain some authority to approve Regional Committee applications since each community's performance will affect all others.
- NCCEH would be able to provide some technical assistance on program design, but would not have the ability to provide assistance with the writing of applications.
- NCCEH would recommend to the State that, if there were communities that did not score well enough to receive funding this year, the State would assign a TA provider to help them build capacity for next year to ensure that consumers have options for services no matter where in the state they live.
- Steering Committee members asked what the Regional Committee application would look like and whether RCs need to identify a fiscal agent.
 - NCCEH expects that, no matter how many agencies in a region are applying, the RC would submit one application package to the State. It is expected that RCs will be asked to apply for their pro rata shares and also to describe how they'd use extra funding if it were available. NCCEH will email Regional Leads with information about pro rata and current ESG grant amounts. RCs are not required to have a fiscal agent this year, but one will be required one in the future, so they should begin discussions about what agencies would be suitable.
- BoS members should send questions and comments about the ESG proposals to bos@ncceh.org.
- Official comments can be sent to the State via email, fax, or mail. Comments for the 2011 amendment are due May 4 and comments for the 2012 amendment are due May 21. Informal comments may be sent to Michael Leach and Martha Are via email. BoS members were asked to send copies of their comments to bos@ncceh.org so they can be incorporated into NCCEH's comments.

BoS CoC Action Plan

- The CoC Action Plan was submitted to HUD on April 13th. It is posted on the NCCEH website at www.ncceh.org/bos. Regional Committee leads are asked to read the Action Plan and share with their committee members.
- Several action items will take place during spring and summer; Regional Leads will hear from NCCEH about needed actions in the upcoming weeks. The plan will help strengthen all Regional Committees as well as the overall BoS structure.

Regional Lead Approval

- Steering Committee members were reminded that Regional Committees needed to elect their Regional Leads during their January, February, or March meetings in order to be considered an active Regional Committee. Meeting minutes documenting the election were due to NCCEH by April 6.
- Minutes are still needed from Catawba, Person, and Onslow Regional Committees.

Upcoming Subcommittee Meetings

- Balance of State subcommittees have their quarterly meetings in May:
 - Transitional Housing: May 8 at 10:30
 - Permanent Supportive Housing: May 15 at 10:30
 - Families: May 22 at 10:30
- Topics for the calls will include the restructuring of the subcommittees and the addition of an HMIS/Data Quality Subcommittee.
- These calls are open to all interested parties in the BoS. Participants must register for the calls on the NCCEH website calendar: <http://www.ncceh.org/en/cev/mon/>

QPRs

- All grantees must email Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs) to NCCEH 30 days after the end of each quarter of their operating year. Timeliness of QPR submission is scored during the CoC application.
- NCCEH staff created a new QPR form to streamline the reporting process. The new QPR form is available for download on the NCCEH website at www.ncceh.org/BoS/grantees. Old forms will no longer be accepted.
- Because the new QPR form calculates the QPR due dates for each quarter, NCCEH staff will no longer send reminder emails to grantees whose QPRs are due. All grantees should download the new QPR form now and enter in their grant start dates to calculate their QPR due dates for the year.
- Grantees must request an APR report from CHIN to be able to fill out the QPR.

Regional Committee Updates

- Nash: An agency working with male veterans has a property with 5-6 units and is seeking funding to create a residential program.
 - Denise noted that this is the first year Grant & Per Diem funding can be used for rapid re-housing/transition-in-place, so communities should keep that in mind as they plan programs.

To-Do List

- Register for subcommittee meetings in May.
- Read the CoC Action Plan and discuss it in your Regional Committees.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 5 at 10:30.