



# North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

bos@ncceh.org

919.755.4393

www.ncceh.org/BoS

## Project Review Committee Minutes 8.29.18

### Committee Members Present:

Carl Thompson, Andrea Merriman, Jacquetta Bullock, Kay Johnson, Ken Becker, Chris Berg, Destri Leger, Deniece Cole, Parker Smith, Angela Battle

### NCCEH Staff Present:

Brian Alexander, Ehren Dohler, Denise Neunaber, Bagé Shade, Jenn Von Egidy, Nancy Holochwost

### Review of the Scoring Process

- 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 applications is a requirement from HUD.

### Summary of Potential Funding

Annual Renewal Demand (ARD)	\$8,388,382
Bonus Funding	\$699,562
DV Bonus	\$1,165,937
CoC Planning (not ranked)	\$349,781
TOTAL	\$10,603,662

Projects will be ranked into two tiers

Tier 1: 94% of ARD	\$7,885,079
<hr/>	
Tier 2 + additional bonus: 6% of ARD + Bonus + DV Bonus	\$2,368,802
<hr/>	
TOTAL	\$10,253,881

- Scoring
  - 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

#### 2018 applications

- CoC planning application not ranked
- HMIS grant is not scored, typically ranked as first project.
- 34 renewal applications
  - 28 Permanent Supportive Housing
  - 4 Rapid Rehousing
  - 1 SSO-CE Renewal
  - 1 HMIS Renewal
- 8 new project applications
  - 1 Permanent Supportive Housing
  - 5 Rapid Rehousing
  - 1 DV-RRH Bonus Funding
  - 1 Supportive Services Only (SSO) for Coordinated Entry
- Scorecard order of priority. The scorecards have items which hold different weight in the scoring: thresholds, standards, and scores.
  - Thresholds: If projects do not meet them, they cannot move forward in the competition.
  - Standards and Section Score Minimums: Important aspects that projects are expected to meet. Project standards and minimums should be evaluated to determine where ranked or if project is funded.
  - Score: Help determine the order of ranking after considering thresholds and standards

#### Renewal Project Review

Summary:

- 34 renewal projects
  - 1 HMIS project (not scored)
  - 1 SSO-CE project
  - 4 RRH projects
  - 28 PSH projects

- 1 PSH project did not renew
- Scored renewal projects:
  - 0 applications with threshold issues
  - Every project but one missed standards

**Renewal Standards**

Renewal applicants missed a range of standards

- Most applicants missed two standards:
  - Match documentation
  - Services funding documentation
- Staff do not recommend using these two standards in the final ranking list

Number of Standards Missed	Number of Renewals
0	1 (NCCEH SSO-CE Renewal)
1-2	20
3-6	11
More than 6	1 (Allied Churches RRH Renewal) – Missed 14 standards

Standards missed without match and services documentation

Number of Standards Missed	Number of Renewals
0	1 (NCCEH SSO-CE Renewal)
1-2	25
3-5	6
13	1 (Allied Churches RRH Renewal)

## Renewal Project Minimums

There are five sections in the renewal scorecard. Each section has a minimum total number of points. If applications do not meet the section minimum, a review is triggered.

Section Minimum	Number of Renewals
Section 1: General Application	0
Section 2: Program Design	0
Section 3: NC BoS CoC Priorities	10
Section 4: Project Performance	8
Section 5: Application Deadlines/Documentation	1 (Allied Churches)

- Staff identified an issue with minimum in Section 3
  - Only one question with points (housing over services): Projects with less than 75% of housing funding missed the minimum
  - Staff recommend not using this minimum in the rankings
- Staff recommend using Section 4 minimum in the rankings, which is the section that scores project performance.
  - Funding priorities indicate ranking projects based on performance
- Section 5 is an outlier.

## New Project Applications Review

Summary of new projects:

- 8 applicants submitted initial documents at beginning of process
  - 1 application did not meet initial threshold requirements and staff notified that they could not proceed.
- 7 new projects turned in applications by the due date
  - (1) PSH project
  - (4) RRH projects
  - (1) DV-RRH bonus funding project
  - (1) SSO-Coordinated Entry Expansion project
- Scored new projects:
  - 6 applications had minimums issues
  - 4 applications had 3 or more standards issues

**New Project Comparison**

Project	Standards missed	Minimums missed	Total Missed
NCCEH SSO-CE	0	1	1
Union County RRH	2	0	2
Pitt County RRH	2	2	4
NCCADV RRH DV Bonus	4	3	7
Diakonos PSH	9	5	14
Robeson County RRH	12	4	16
Allied Churches RRH	15	2	17

**Four projects stand out as the projects to include in ranking**

Project	Standards missed	Minimums missed	Total Missed
NCCEH SSO-CE	0	1	1
Union County RRH	2	0	2
Pitt County RRH	2	2	4
NCCADV RRH DV Bonus	4	3	7
Diakonos PSH	9	5	14
Robeson County RRH	12	4	16
Allied Churches RRH	15	2	17

- These four programs should be included because:
  - Met most standards and minimums
  - Most viable projects
  - Meet funding priorities
  - Expand capacity

**Ranking and Prioritization**

- Recommendation for evaluating and ranking projects
  - Number of standards missed
  - Minimums for Performance Section
  - Total Score
- Staff went through several “Decision Points” and walked the committee through recommendations that were made by staff that need to be approved by the PRC

#### Decision Point: Changes to Renewal Funding

- Decision: Do we reallocate projects?
- Looking specifically at performance and history of underspending, staff presented some options where the CoC could reallocate.
- Full Reallocation Recommendations
  - Sandhills Community Action Program PSH
    - Grantee decided to not renew project
    - \$3,909
  - Allied Churches of Alamance County RRH
    - Grantee missed 14 standards and 3 minimums
    - Low performance and inadequate program design
    - \$101,958
- Staff solicited questions and comments about the 2 recommendations for full reallocation.
  - The Project Review Committee member and staff commented on the review of the Allied Churches of Alamance County RRH renewal application and corresponding documents. The application was not thoroughly written and directly stated that the project is not housing first compliant. The policies and procedures stated the project screened out clients and terminated for reasons that violate housing first. Both staff and Project Review Committee member had the same answers for their scorecards and consensus was easily met.
  - The consensus of PRC members was to move forward with reallocation as presented by NCCEH staff.
- Changes in renewal funding recommendations
  - Community Link: Kerr Tar PSH renewal
    - History of underspending
    - Spent only 59% in last operating year
    - Consider reallocating \$140,383 (15%)
  - Community Link: PBH2012 PSH renewal
    - History of underspending
    - Spent only 44% in last operating year
    - Consider reallocating \$135,969 (20%)
  - Eastpointe: Beacon II PSH
    - Program has not started after 2 competitions
    - Current Eastpointe Beacon PSH program operating in the same region is underspending (only 68% in last complete year)
    - \$53,799 (100%)
  - Eastpointe: Southeast SPC renewal
    - Program has not started after 2 competitions
    - Only PSH in Region 8
    - Consider reallocating grant: \$71,927 (50%)

#### Decision Point: Changes to Renewal Funding

- Denise pointed out that both Community Link and Eastpointe have a large portfolios with other grants that the CoC is not reallocating. The history for these grantees is they had grants reduced

last year as well. Denise reminded members that the important thing is funding needs to be spent. If the money is not being spent, the CoC needs to move that funding to another project that can use it to serve people. Ehren also stated that these grantees also have large dollar amounts.

- Ehren presented the 2018 Ranking Options Spreadsheet to show an optional priority project ranking list with total budgets of the grant portfolio of both Eastpointe and Community Link. He also showed the dollar amount of their projects staff recommend reallocating. This shows that these agencies have a large portfolio and can still have viable projects through their other project funding.
- Ehren provided an orientation to the 2018 Ranking Options spreadsheet.
- Staff provide time for the PRC to discuss potentially reallocating these projects. The consensus of PRC members was to move forward with reallocation as presented by NCCEH staff.

#### Decision Point: New Projects Ranking

- Decision: Where should new projects be placed in the final ranked list?
  - Traditionally, the CoC has not ranked new projects above renewals except in very specific circumstances. However, the CoC might consider ranking new projects higher because of need and potential performance.

#### Option 1: New Projects are placed at the bottom

- Ehren reviewed a potential priority project ranking list for Option 1 to show new projects at the bottom of tier 2 below all renewal applications.
- The reasons for keeping renewal projects “safe” means if they are currently housing persons, those people aren’t at-risk of losing their home.
- In option 1, the highest ranking new project, Pitt County Planning RRH, splits between tier 1 and tier 2. Likely, if only tier 1 projects were funded, the \$18,432 in tier 1 for the Pitt County project would not be a viable project and would not be awarded.
- Staff recommended ordering the Pitt County Planning RRH project above the Union County Community Shelter RRH project to match the CoC Funding Priorities. Region 12 (Pitt Co.) does not currently have any CoC funded RRH. Region 5 (UCCS) does have CoC RRH provided by Community Link. The funding priorities suggest that the Pitt County Planning RRH project should be ranked above the Union County Community Shelter RRH project due to current coverage of CoC-funded RRH.
- Ehren also explained the DV-RRH Bonus Funding’s placement at the very bottom of the list. NCCADV’s project is handled outside of the ranking system and will be competing nationally with other DV Bonus Funding applicants. It is not disadvantaged by being at the bottom of the list. Additionally, it did not score as well as other new project applications, and the funding priorities would not support it being higher in the ranking.

#### Option 2: New Projects are partially in Tier 1

- Staff pointed out that new projects scored better on their applications compared to some renewal projects. This could justify them being ranked higher.
- Additionally, by moving renewal projects below the new projects, the project that straddles the tiers has enough “safe” funding in Tier 1 to be a viable project. In this case, Union County

Community Shelter gets \$75,842 in Tier 1. A RRH project could be viable with this amount of money. The rest of their project budget falls into Tier 2 and is more at-risk of not being awarded.

- The renewal projects at-risk are Burlington Development Corporation's RRH and Surry Homeless and Affordable Housing Coalition. Both projects missed more standards and minimums than the two new projects (Pitt County RRH and Union County Community Shelter RRH) that would be placed above them in this option. If not funded, the two renewal projects would need to exit program participants if they were to lose funding.
  - Burlington Development Corporation is in Region 6. This region has other CoC-funded RRH projects that could help house households experiencing homelessness.
  - Surry Homeless and Affordable Housing Coalition is in Region 4. The region does have one other PSH project operated by Partners Behavioral Health. Region 4 does have chronically homeless people that support having more PSH in their region, but the Partners is currently underspend its grant and could potentially take SHAHC's participants, if the project was not renewed in the competition.

#### Option 3: New Projects are fully in Tier 1

- Using this option would place the Rockingham County Help for the Homeless RRH project partially in tier 2. With \$104,320 in tier 1, the project would be viable if HUD did not award the other portion of the grant in tier 2.
  - RCHH is in Region 6. Placing the RCCH RRH project below the two new RRH projects (Pitt County RRH and Union County Community Shelter RRH) would mean two Region 6 projects are at-risk of losing funding, in addition to the already agreed upon reallocation of the Allied Churches RRH renewal.
- Staff asked for any questions or feedback on the three options for placement of new projects in the project ranking list.
- PRC members provided feedback regarding the options. Consensus from those providing feedback was that option 2 seems to be the best choice. The Pitt County and Union County Community Shelter RRH projects scored better, having fewer missed standards and minimums and showed better potential performance than the existing Burlington Development Corporation RRH project and the Surry County Homeless and Affordable Housing PSH project. The placement of Pitt County's RRH project into tier 1 completely seems right. It has a high priority in its region and the project met most standards and minimums. The Union County Community Shelter RRH project could still be viable straddling tier 1 and 2. PRC members felt that moving the RCHH RRH project into tier 2 below the Pitt County and Union County Community Shelter RRH projects puts too much RRH funding at risk in Region 6.
- PRC members agreed that option 2 for new projects should be recommended to the Steering Committee.

#### Decision Point: SSO-CE project placement

- Decision: How should the CoC prioritize the SSO-CE project and rank the expansion project versus new and renewals?
- The CoC funding priorities place emphasis on building and supporting infrastructure. The PRC could consider moving the SSO-CE new expansion into Tier 1.



- Ehren pulled up the 2018 Ranking Options spreadsheet to show the SSO-CE project in tier 1, along with other new projects.
  - This puts additional projects into Tier 2 and at-risk of not being funded.
- Staff provided time for PRC to comment or ask questions concerning moving SSO-CE expansion grant into tier 1.
  - PRC Members were concerned that moving the SSO-CE expansion application into tier 1 would move another project from Region 6 into tier 2. PRC members felt that moving the SSO-CE expansion application into tier 1 would put projects serving clients directly at-risk and decided that it should remain in tier 2.

**Decision Point: Taking advantage of bonus funding**

- Decision: Should the CoC allow Community Link and Eastpointe to apply for new expansion projects with the funding that was reallocated due to underspending to take advantage of bonus funding?
  - Under this option, Community Link and Eastpointe would be allowed to apply for new expansion projects no larger than the amount that was reallocated from their projects. These would be low priority projects listed at the bottom of tier 2 and would be allowed only to take advantage of remaining bonus funding (in the event that the NCCADV DV bonus project was funded).
- Staff provided time for PRC members to comment or ask questions regarding this option which would allow the reallocated projects through Eastpointe and Community Link to apply for the bonus funding.
  - PRC members felt that a Community Link new expansion projects should be ranked higher than an Eastpointe project because Eastpointe has two current grants that have not been started.

Project Review Committee members discussed the final ranking list and the options reached through consensus through the meeting. A motion was made and approved to reallocate the Allied Churches RRH renewal (full), Sandhills Community Action Program PSH renewal (full), Community Link Kerr Tar and PBH2012 PSH renewals (partial), and Eastpointe Beacon II PSH (full) and Southeast PSH (partial) and to approve option 2 ((moving Pitt County RRH project (fully into tier 1) and Union County Community Shelter RRH project (partially into tier 1)) as shown in the spreadsheet. The motion also granted Community Link and Eastpointe the opportunity to apply for new expansion grants in the amount no larger than the amount reallocated from the grants reallocated above to take advantage of any remaining bonus funding [Leger, Berg]. All in favor; none opposed.

**Next Steps**

- The Steering Committee will consider approving the PRC's recommendation tomorrow, 8/30/18 at 10:30AM
  - Please attend. Steering Committee members might want to hear about how decisions were made.
- Staff will notify applicants regarding decisions on Friday
  - Staff ask that PRC members not discuss decisions with grantees or Regional Committees.

- Staff will send scorecards to applicants and offer follow-up calls. Staff encourage PRC members to participate.
- Applicants may appeal decisions
  - If needed, the PRC will meet to consider appeals on **September 7, 2018 at 11:30**. Please save this time.