



# North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

[bos@ncceh.org](mailto:bos@ncceh.org)

919.755.4393

[www.ncceh.org/BoS](http://www.ncceh.org/BoS)

## Balance of State Steering Committee Meeting 11.5.15

### Regional Leads Present:

Kim Crawford, Casey McCall, LaTasha McNair and alternate Kareem McDuffie, Brian Alexander and alternate Trina Hill, Roxanne Curry, Joel Rice and alternate Kanika Turrentine, Susan Pridgen, Robin Shue (alternate for Nicole Dewitt), Sarah West (alternate for Debbie Cole), Marlene Harrison, Emily Locklear, Jennifer Molliere, Linda Brinson (alternate for Ginny Mohrbutter), Candice Rountree (alternate for Mary Mallory)

### Regional Leads Absent:

Wanda Feldt, Teena Willis, Alvin Foster, Asia Elzein, Mollie Tompkins, Sharon Poarch, Marie Watson, Juliet Rogers, Sarah Lancaster

### Interested Parties Present:

Donna McCormick, Tameka Gunn, Amy Modlin, Cheryl Manuel, Janice Sauls, Mitch Fahrer, Mark Owen, Mary Pat Buie, Sherrie Smith, Tamara Veit, Gloria McDuffie, Ursula Ingram, Curtis Pierce, Laressa Witt, Fannie Clyburn, Tanzia Tabb, Patricia Bryant, Joyce Moore, Sharon Covington, Talaika Williams, Jim Cox, Lynne James, Lori Watts, Tammy Gray, Monica Frizzell, Suzanne Storch, Shana Baum, Brian Fike, David Jacklin

### NCCEH Staff Present:

Thurston Alexander-Smith, Beth Bordeaux, Emily Carmody, Nancy Holochwost, Denise Neunaber, Amber Peoples, Corey Root

### Approval of October Minutes

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

### Coordinated Assessment

- NCCEH staff are expecting 25 coordinated assessment plans (one from each Regional Committee).
  - Sixteen plans have been approved by the Steering Committee and are being implemented
  - Four plans have received recommendation from the Coordinated Assessment Council (CAC)
  - Two plans have been reviewed by the CAC and need further revisions
  - Three plans are in the process of passing threshold
- There is a Coordinated Assessment Dialogue Call on Tuesday, November 4, from 3:00 to 4:00. These calls are held on the second Tuesday of each month and are aimed at communities that

are implementing coordinated assessment. The November call will cover the outcomes report and the upcoming change to version 2 of the VI-SPDAT on January 1, 2016.

### CoC Grant Competition

- The CoC application was released by HUD on September 17 and is due November 20.
- The consolidated application consists of three parts:
  - CoC application that asks about CoC-wide information and performance, which is completed by NCCEH staff with input from agencies, Steering Committee, and Regional Committee members
  - Project applications from each agency requesting new or renewal funding
  - Project priority listing, which is a ranked list of all new and renewal project applications
- The BoS has over \$8 million in funding at stake in the 2015 CoC competition.
  - Annual Renewal Demand (amount required for all eligible renewal applications): \$6,815,972
  - Permanent Housing Bonus (15% of Final Pro Rata Need): \$1,470,508
  - CoC Planning (3% of Final Pro Rata Need): \$294,102
- HUD is requiring CoCs to rank projects into two tiers.
  - Tier 1 is 85% of ARD: \$5,793,576
  - Tier 2 is 15% of ARD plus the Permanent Housing Bonus: \$2,492,903
- The Project Review Committee has completed its scoring of all project applications using the 2015 scorecards. The scorecard has two parts: the Community Section, which is scored by NCCEH staff and a Project Review Committee representative (their scores are averaged), and the Staff Only Section, which is scored by NCCEH staff. The sum of the scores for these two sections is the final score.
- During the scoring process, two issues arose that were brought to the Project Review Committee's attention.
  - For the first time, the scorecard included a question about the project's previous spending rates. The goal was to assess how much funding is being recaptured by HUD. Applicants were asked to submit a screenshot from eLOCCS.
    - Seven agencies submitted the wrong screenshot.
    - Staff felt that the screenshot alone was not sufficient to assess spending performance, as there may be valid reasons why grantees did not spend all funds.
    - Staff recommended that the points for this question be omitted from the total score, and the Project Review Committee approved this recommendation.
  - The scorecard includes questions about project performance, which are based on APRs. Cardinal Innovations had 12 projects for which an APR had not been submitted. According to the scorecard, projects with no APR receive zero or the most negative points for APR-related questions, so this is reflected in Cardinal Innovation's scores.
- The BoS received 49 total project applications for the scoring/ranking process.
  - Forty-four renewals were submitted, of which forty-three were scored. The HMIS renewal grant was not scored because the scorecard is not designed to assess HMIS projects.
  - Five new project applications were submitted.



- Three of the new projects were ineligible:
      - One RRH project from an agency that is not a current ESG RRH grantee, which was a standard on the scorecard
      - Two PSH projects that would not serve 100% chronically homeless participants, which is a required eligibility element for Permanent Housing Bonus projects
    - Two of the new projects were eligible:
      - One PSH for Henderson County
      - One RRH for Alamance County
  - In addition, NCCEH plans to submit an application for a CoC planning project. This is a grant to help increase capacity for the CoC. Planning projects do not need to be ranked or placed into Tier 1/Tier 2, so this application does not affect the priority or the funding for any other applications.
- NCCEH staff presented an overview of the scoring process. Overall, the highest score was 149 and the lowest score was 45.5. The average score was 97.8.
  - PSH projects: highest score was 149 and lowest was 45.5 (out of possible 199)
  - RRH projects: highest score was 106 and lowest was 84.5 (out of possible 184)
  - TH projects: highest score was 77.5 and lowest was 55 (out of possible 179)
- There were several questions on the scorecards for which projects had to meet a standard instead of receiving a point value. Projects did not meet standards in several sections:
  - PSH Key Elements, which are six best practice elements from SAHMSA for permanent supportive housing programs. According to the scorecard, projects have 6 months to comply with all six elements. Thirty renewal projects from 14 agencies did not meet this standard.
  - Services funding plan, which was required from agencies requesting services funding to explain how they will reduce the use of CoC funds for services and replace it with funding from other sources. Eight projects from 7 agencies did not meet this standard.
  - Prioritizing PSH turnover beds for chronically homeless participants. The BoS has a policy, based on HUD priorities, requiring all PSH programs to prioritize 100% of turnover beds for chronically homeless participants. Fifteen projects from 8 agencies did not meet this standard.
  - Leverage. The scorecard standard is \$1.50 in leveraged funds for every \$1 in the project budget. Seventeen projects from 9 agencies did not meet this standard.
  - NCCEH staff will follow up with any project applicants that did not meet one or more standards.
- NCCEH reviewed the five new project applications that were submitted. As mentioned above, three of these projects were ineligible.
  - Eastpointe submitted two new PSH projects.
    - Neither project would serve 100% chronically homeless participants, which is required by HUD for PSH projects funded under the Permanent Housing Bonus, so these projects are ineligible.
    - One application was submitted after the deadline and supporting documentation for both projects was submitted after the deadline. In addition, some documentation was incomplete.



- The projects did not meet standards on the scorecard for PSH Key Elements, Regional Committee participation, and match and leverage amounts.
  - The Chatham County Housing Authority submitted an application for a new RRH project.
    - This project is ineligible because the Housing Authority is not a current ESG RRH grantee, which is a requirement on the scorecard. This requirement is on the scorecard because CoC funds are the only source for PSH projects, while RRH funds can also be accessed through ESG. Agencies should be using all available ESG funds for RRH before requesting CoC funds for RRH. The BoS has left ESG funds on the table for the last few years.
  - NCCEH staff will follow up with Eastpointe and the Chatham County Housing Authority after the Steering Committee meeting.
- Two new projects were eligible.
  - One new RRH project was submitted from Allied Churches of Alamance County. They requested \$180,204 and will serve Alamance County. The application did not meet the standard for leverage.
  - One new PSH project was submitted from Homeward Bound. They requested \$65,130 and will serve Henderson County. The application met all standards.
- After scoring all project applications, the Project Review Committee met on November 3 to determine its recommendation for ranking. The committee recommends ranking projects in the following order:
  - Rank the HMIS renewal first
    - The BoS has a precedent for ranking the HMIS renewal first. This is a community-wide project that supports HMIS, which is required by HUD for all CoC and ESG projects, so this project affects other agencies' eligibility for funding. In addition, because the scorecard is not designed to measure non-housing projects, the HMIS renewal was not scored.
    - In previous years, the HMIS grant was administered by the NC Housing Coalition. This year, it was transferred to NCCEH. NCCEH staff clarified that the CoC would be following a multi-year precedent by ranking the grant first and that this was also done when the grant belonged to the Housing Coalition.
  - Rank permanent housing renewals next (PSH and RRH)
    - First: PH renewals meeting all six PSH Key Elements, in order of score
    - Next: PH renewals not meeting all six PSH Key Elements and RRH projects, in order of score
    - Because the PSH key elements are an important benchmark to ensure PSH programs are being implemented in the way they are intended to be, the Project Review Committee recommended prioritizing grants that do follow these standards over those that don't.
  - Rank new projects next, in order of score (both new projects are permanent housing projects)
  - Rank transitional housing renewals last in order of score
- The Steering Committee reviewed the proposed list of project applications ranked in this order.
- The 38<sup>th</sup> project in the proposed ranked list (Cardinal Kerr Tar New PH Renewal) straddles the line between Tier 1 and Tier 2. HUD will first fund the portion of the project that is in Tier 1 and then come back to fund the portion in Tier 2. NCCEH staff



noted that, while Tier 2 is not as secure as Tier 1, HUD has said they expect to have enough funding for all renewal projects, meaning the entirety of this project is expected to be funded.

- NCCEH staff will send scorecards out to applicants, and staff will be available to explain and answer questions about individual scores.
- Steering Committee members were asked for discussion or questions about the Project Review Committee's ranking recommendation.
  - Suzanne asked if NCCEH had specific instructions from HUD about how to treat the project straddling the line between Tier 1 and 2. Denise noted that the explanation provided is based on HUD's instructions, and CoCs are not being asked to fit entire projects into Tier 1 like we have had to do in past years.
- A motion was made and approved to approve the Project Review Committee's ranking recommendation [motion made by Project Review Committee, seconded by Susan Pridgen].
  - Regional Leads who are also project applicants were reminded to abstain from voting. Abstaining: Brian Alexander, Kim Crawford, LaTasha McNair. Joel Rice was not present at time of vote. Alternates voted in their stead.
  - All in favor; none opposed.
- NCCEH will notify all project applicants today of their applications being accepted or rejected.
- NCCEH will post the full collaborative application and project priority listing on the NCCEH website around November 16. NCCEH plans to submit the application to HUD no later than November 18.

#### **ESG Update**

- The ESG application materials are posted on NCCEH's website at [www.ncceh.org/esgapplication](http://www.ncceh.org/esgapplication).
- CoC-wide information for the Regional application is on NCCEH's website at [www.ncceh.org/bos/esg](http://www.ncceh.org/bos/esg).
- All application materials are due to the State ESG Office by 4:00 p.m. on Friday, November 6.

#### **NCCEH Data Center & HMIS Update**

- One of the crucial parts of completing migration is getting agency agreements from all agencies using HMIS. Currently, 90% of agencies have submitted these. Agreements are missing from Caldwell County Yokefellow, Cardinal Innovations, Harbour House, Mountain Projects, Surry Homeless and Affordable Housing Coalition, and The Haven of Transylvania County.
  - These agreements give agencies a legal right to be on HMIS, so any agency without an agreement does not have a legal right to be on the system, and at some point this will be enforced.
  - Agencies must mail the original signed copies of the forms to the NCCEH Data Center
- Provider page set-up is complete for 80% of BoS agencies. Some agencies still need work done and are asked to contact the Data Center: Harbour House, Infinite possibilities, Partners Behavioral Health Management, Sandhills Community Action Program, and the Washington Area Interchurch Shelter.
- Ten agencies that operate in BoS also operate in other CoCs, which makes their set-up more complicated. At this point, Data Center staff have completed the portion they can do, and now are waiting to work with MCAH and other CoCs on remaining items.



- The BoS has 5 Emergency Assistance Network (EAN) agencies whose set up is scheduled for November to December.
- Work on the Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) is underway.
  - There are some tasks for agency admins to complete:
    - Agency admins who did not attend the AHAR webinar held on October 23 must watch the recording: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4KMk9JN9rC0&feature=youtu.be>
    - Run the 0252 Data Completeness Report Card and the 0216 Unexited Clients report, review client files, and consult Data Center staff to make any needed corrections
  - Data Center staff are updating agencies' bed/unit inventory to match the HIC.

### **NC HMIS Bylaws**

- The NC HMIS Governance Committee revised bylaws to incorporate advice from HUD technical assistance and requests from MCAH, the HMIS lead agency. The revised bylaws also include significant changes to the structure of subcommittees for the Governance Committee. The bylaws maintain the 4 representatives and 4 alternates for the BoS CoC.
- The revised bylaws need to be approved by CoCs. The bylaws were posted on NCCEH website in October for review: [www.ncceh.org/files/6133](http://www.ncceh.org/files/6133)
- The BoS Governance Committee representatives on the call were asked for any other input and Steering Committee members were asked for comments or questions about the bylaws; none were raised.
- A motion was made and approved to approve the revised bylaws [Harrison, Crawford]. All in favor; none opposed.

### **BoS Governance Charter Update**

- HEARTH legislation requires all CoCs to update their governance charter annually. NCCEH staff recently found that some changes could be made to the governance charter that would help the BoS's score on the CoC application. These changes would not affect how the CoC operates; they would only update the document to be current. Staff posted a draft version of the amended charter with tracked changes for Steering Committee members to review. Proposed changes include:
  - incorporating HMIS language provided by HUD TA
  - incorporating ESG written standards
  - updating outdated references (NC HMIS instead of CHIN, list of Regional Committees, Data Quality Subcommittee)
- Steering Committee members were asked for feedback or any additional changes they would like to see in the governance charter; none were raised.
- A motion was made and approved to amend the BoS governance charter as outlined in the draft document [Alexander, Harrison]. All in favor; none opposed.

### **Upcoming Meetings & Reminders**

- ESG application materials due to State ESG Office Friday, November 6, at 4:00 p.m.
- BoS Coordinated Assessment Dialogue Group



- Tuesday, November 10, 3:00-4:00 p.m.
- Register: [ncceh.org/events/944](https://ncceh.org/events/944)
- Permanent Supportive Housing Subcommittee
  - Monday, November 16, 10:30-11:30
  - Register: [ncceh.org/events/878](https://ncceh.org/events/878)

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, December 1 at 10:30.

