

# North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

---

bos@ncceh.org

919.755.4393

www.ncceh.org/BoS

## Balance of State Steering Committee Meeting

1.16.14

### Regional Leads Present:

Brian Alexander, Chris Battle, Ellen Blackman, Kim Braxton, Fredrika Cook, Spencer Cook, Nicole Dewitt, Rhoda Emanuel, Jennifer Flood, Kelly Lacy, Joe Marks, Amy Modlin, Jane Motsinger, Whitney Morton, Debra Clark (for Bart O'Sullivan), Melissa Payne, Marlene Harrison (for Faye Pierce), Susan Pridgen, Candice Rountree, Michele Steele, Mary Pat Buie (for Rashida Sturdivant), Kannika Turrentine, Bob Williams, Teena Willis

### Regional Leads Absent:

Debbie Cole, Shanna Poole, Nickie Siler, Shari Wright

### Interested Parties Present:

Natalie Allen, Dave Burnette, Kristi Case, Kim Crawford (voting for Kim Braxton), Trina Hill, Barbie Hunt (voting for Rhoda Emanuel), Janice Johnson, Gloria Kesler, Casey McCall (voting for Teena Willis), Sharon Poarch, Melissa Presley (voting for Ellen Blackman), Nikki Ratliff, Joel Rice, Janice Sauls, Robin Shue (voting for Nicole Dewitt), Nina Walker, Lori Watts, Paulette White, Carol Wilkins, Talaika Williams

### NCCEH Staff Present:

Emily Carmody, Nancy Holochwost, Corey Root, Tia Sanders-Rice

### CHIN MOU

- Paulette White updated the Steering Committee about the CHIN MOU, which is the proposed agreement between CHIN and the CoCs in North Carolina. In December, the CHIN Governance Committee met to discuss this MOU as well as concerns about CHIN's capacity to provide needed services. As a result of this discussion, the MOU was changed to include an end date of December 31, 2014. Signing the MOU will only commit the BoS to using CHIN until that date. The Steering Committee was asked to approve the MOU so that DHHS, as the official lead agency of the Balance of State CoC, can sign it.
  - A motion was made and approved to approve the MOU for DHHS to sign on behalf of the Balance of State CoC [Rice, Alexander].

## **Collaborative Application Input**

- NCCEH staff is continuing to work on the Collaborative Application for the BoS, which includes questions about our CoC-wide structure and operations, planning, and performance. NCCEH discussed and solicited feedback on several sections of the application from Steering Committee members.

### Strategic Planning Objective: Increase housing stability

- This objective was discussed at the last Steering Committee meeting, but since that time, HUD revised the instructions on how to calculate the answer. This caused a slight change in the 2013 actual baseline numbers. NCCEH staff adjusted the 2014 and 2015 proposed numbers based on this change, using the increases approved at the last meeting.
  - Total PSH participants: 2014 proposed=1158, 2015 proposed=1108
  - Total stayers + those who exited to PH: 2014 proposed=1089, 2015 proposed=1053
  - % of participants achieving housing stability: has not changed
- A motion to approve the adjusted 2014 and 2015 proposed goals was made and approved [Motsinger, Dewitt].

### Strategic Planning Objective: Increase project participants' income

- This objective asks how many project participants increase their income while in CoC-funded programs. In the BoS, the most common source of income is SSI; the second most common source is earned income (from participants in transitional housing).
  - Percent of participants that increased income from employment:
    - 2013 actual=6%
    - 2014 proposed=10%, 2015 proposed=12%
  - Percent of participants that increase income from sources other than employment:
    - 2013 actual=15%
    - 2014 proposed=20%, 2015 proposed=22%
- NCCEH noted that the BoS has a lot of missing data in HMIS. By conducting data clean-up, we expect to see an increase in these percentages. NCCEH will also provide TA to programs to help increase participants' access to employment and benefits.
- Steering Committee members discuss the proposed goals. Some members felt the goals were too high. It was noted that much of the increase in 2014 is expected to come from data clean-up. It was also noted that for non-employment sources, programs can tap into existing resources, and SSI has had a cost of living increase over the past three years that would contribute to increased income.
- A motion was made and approved to use the proposed 2014 and 2015 goals [Motsinger, Harrison].
- The collaborative application asks for the CoC's 2-year plan to accomplish these goals. Steering Committee members were asked if their programs are incorporating strategies that will increase income.

### Strategic Planning Objective: Increase number of participants receiving mainstream benefits

- The application asks how many people (adults and children) exit CoC-funded programs with mainstream benefits. The most commonly received benefit in the BoS is SNAP.

- 2013 actual=65% have benefits at exit
- 2014 proposed=66%, 2015 proposed=67%
- There is a lot of missing HMIS data for this measure, so conducting data clean-up should help increase the percentage. However, the measure asks only if participants receive benefits (not how many types of benefits), so obtaining more than one benefit will not increase our percentage. Since many participants already receive SNAP, there is not much room to increase.
- A motion was made and approved to use the proposed 2014 and 2015 goals [Harrison, Hunt].
- Steering Committee members were asked for feedback on their work to enroll participants in benefits. NCCEH staff will present on benefits linkages at BoS subcommittee meetings in 2014.

Strategic Planning Objective: Use rapid re-housing as a method to reduce family homelessness

- This objective asks how many families with children will be housed with rapid re-housing funds during the Point-in-Time Count each year.
  - CoC-funded RRH programs:
    - 2013=0 (no CoC-funded programs in the BoS)
    - 2014 and 2015 proposed=0 (no CoC funds have been reallocated to RRH)
  - ESG-funded RRH programs:
    - 2013=21
    - 2014 proposed=80, 2015 proposed=85
    - NCCEH staff noted that a large increase is expected in 2014 from ESG programs that are now up and running. A smaller increase is expected in 2015 because ESG funding will be at about half its previous level, but programs will be more experienced and presumably spending less per household by then.
  - Non-McKinney-Vento funded programs (SSVF, TANF, HOME, or other public/private funding):
    - 2013=0
    - 2014 proposed=15, 2015 proposed=45
    - NCCEH noted that SSVF programs that started in the fall of 2013 are expected to be operational in the 2014 PIT Count. A larger increase is expected in 2015 due to more SSVF funding being available.
    - Steering Committee members were asked for feedback. SSVF grantees noted that the proposed goals looked low based on the number of families that are currently being served. It was proposed that the 2014 goal be increased from 15 to 20 and the 2015 goal be increased from 45 to 60.
- A motion was made and approved to use the proposed 2014 and 2015 goals for CoC and ESG funded programs and to use the amended 2014 and 2015 goals for non-McKinney-Vento funded programs [Harrison, Dewitt].
- Steering Committee members were asked if they receive or are seeking additional funding for RRH programs. Brian Alexander noted they receive community funding for their existing program. Chris Battle noted he would like to increase his ESG-funded program with CoC funds. Dave Burnette noted his agency is considering applying for SSVF funding.

- The application asks which individual, organization, or committee will be responsible for ensuring the CoC achieves the 2014 and 2015 goals. NCCEH proposed that the Rapid Re-Housing Subcommittee will be the responsible committee.
- The application asks what routine follow-up is provided for households that have exited RRH programs. NCCEH provided a proposed policy for the Steering Committee to review and approve. The proposed policy says programs follow up with households within 12 months of the end of RRH assistance to evaluate returns to homelessness.
  - A motion was made and approved to approve the policy [Alexander, Modlin].

### CoC Funding Recommendations

- Corey reviewed the funding context for this year's CoC application.
  - HUD is requiring all CoCs to make a 5% cut to their funding this year.
    - BoS Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) = \$5,073,847
    - 5% cut = \$253,692
  - HUD asks CoCs to place project applications in tiers.
    - Tier 1 is the "safe" tier. The amount of funding available for Tier 1 is equal to the BoS' ARD minus 5% (\$4,820,155).
    - Tier 2 is unlikely to be funded.
  - Three applicants have chosen not to renew grants and one applicant voluntarily reduced its budget, which has reduced the amount of funds the BoS must cut to stay within Tier 1. The current amount left to cut is \$106,571.
- The Project Review Committee scored project applications over the past two weeks. The scorecard has two parts: a community section that is scored by NCCEH staff and a Project Review Committee representative, whose scores are averaged; and a staff-only section that is scored by NCCEH staff. The averaged score from the community section is added to the score from the staff section to determine the final score.
- Corey reviewed the Project Review Committee's recommendations.
  - There were special considerations for three applicants.
    - The application for Sandhills Community Action Program's Shelter+Care program was submitted late. The Project Review Committee scored the late application and the application received maximum loss of points for lateness.
    - For Cardinal Innovations-Alamance/Caswell's two Shelter+Care renewals, the APRs were not submitted to HUD before they were submitted to NCCEH. The Project Review Committee chose not to score the APRs, so the two applications received zeroes on questions that asked about APR data.
      - Note: After the Steering Committee meeting, it was brought to NCCEH's attention that one of the APRs had been submitted to HUD prior to being submitted to NCCEH. The application was re-scored using the APR and the total score for the APR section was zero, so this change did not affect the application's overall score or ranking.

- Residential Treatment Services of Alamance submitted a revised APR to HUD after the application deadline. The Project Review Committee used the revised APR for scoring.
  - The Project Review Committee recommended that the necessary funding cut should be taken from the two lowest-scoring transitional housing projects. The cut would be approximately one-third of each project's budget. (Once all other project budgets have been finalized, NCCEH will ensure the final cut is as close to the exact dollar amount of the 5% cut as possible.) All projects would remain in Tier 1; none would move to Tier 2.
    - The reasoning behind this decision involved several factors:
      - Reflects HUD's and the BoS' funding priority, which is to fund permanent housing projects. Permanent housing projects were not considered for budget cuts.
      - The two bottom transitional housing projects had much lower scores than the other transitional housing projects.
      - Cutting two projects instead of one reduces the chance of funding leaving the BoS, because it is less likely that either project would be unable to continue with a smaller cut. A big cut to one project might mean it couldn't continue and would have to drop out entirely.
      - Cutting two projects reduces the geographical impact. The lowest scoring project is in the AHRRM Regional Committee, which has very few CoC programs (only 6 units of permanent supportive housing). The second-lowest scoring project is in the Alamance Regional Committee, which has multiple CoC programs. Dividing the cut lessens the impact on an underserved Regional Committee.
    - Steering Committee members were asked for feedback on the Project Review Committee's recommendations. Jane commended the committee on the fairness of its decision. Kim asked if there was a way to reduce the impact of the cut to prevent projects from placing themselves in Tier 2. Emily noted that the Project Review Committee chose to do a percent cut instead of a flat cut to try to reduce the impact. She also noted that the two affected applicants have not indicated they will place their projects in Tier 2.
  - The Project Review Committee recommended ranking the CHIN HMIS renewal project first because it is a community-wide project that affects all grantees and is required by HUD for the BoS' CoC and ESG programs. The Committee recommended ranking all other projects in order of their scores. The Steering Committee reviewed a ranked list of projects with their final scores.
    - Highest score = 135.25 (Cardinal Innovations-Piedmont's Shelter+Care)
    - Lowest score = 41 (Sandhills Community Action Project's transitional housing)
    - Mean score = 94.31, median score= 101.0
- A motion was made and approved to accept the Project Review Committee's recommendations for ranking, tiering, and funding cuts [Motsinger, Clark]. All in favor; none opposed.

**Scoring Debrief**

- Corey has asked the Project Review Committee members to review the scoring process at their next Regional Committee meeting.
- All project applicants are asked to schedule a debriefing with Corey to discuss their project scores. These should be scheduled for a date after the CoC application has been submitted (February 3). Applicants should contact NCEEH at [bos@ncceh.org](mailto:bos@ncceh.org) to schedule the call.

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, February 4 at 10:30.