

**NC Balance of State CoC Special Steering Committee Meeting Minutes – FY22 CoC Application Ranking Approval**September 6, 2022

**Regional Leads Present:** Derek Lancour *(abstaining)*, Kristen Martin *(abstaining)*, Tonya Freeman, Laurenn Singleton, Kristen McAlhaney *(abstaining)*, Natasha Elliot *(abstaining)*, Marie Watson, Denise Riggins, James Stroud, LaTasha McNair *(abstaining)*, Kit Claude *(abstaining)*, Tujuanda Sanders *(abstaining)*, Brian Fike *(abstaining)*

**At-Large Members Present:** Torie Keeton, Ellen Blackman, Angela Harper King, Lisa Phillips, Brooks Ann McKinney, Jeff Rawlings, Rachelle Dugan

**SC Members Absent:** Emily Locklear, Cassie Rowe, Tiffany Askew, Isaac Sturgill

**Interested Parties Present:** Kenett Melgar, Alyce Knaflich, Lori Watts, Bonnie Harper, Teresa Robinson, Lesly Delgado, Teena Willis, Arwen March, Kristen Martin, Leanne Greer, Christine Craft, Emily Lowery

**NCCEH Staff Present:** Brian Alexander, Laurel McNamee, Adriana Diaz, Debra Susie, Ashley VonHatten, Adrianna Coffee

**Scoring Process & Project Applications**

The CoC Consolidated Application has 3 parts:
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* The Project Review Committee plays a crucial role in the application process.
  + Composed of one representative from each Regional Committee and interested at-large Steering Committee members (not grantees or applicants)
  + Scores new and renewal Project Applications using approved scorecards
  + Recommends ranked list of new and renewal Project Applications for CoC Collaborative Application to the Steering Committee for approval
* Scoring and ranking projects allows the CoC to prioritize funding for the best projects
  + Allows the CoC to prioritize funding based on HUD and CoC priorities and needs
  + Ensures the CoC prioritizes funding for projects that have high performance and manage funds well
  + Required by HUD
* NC BoS CoC has almost $14 million in homeless funding at stake in the FY22 CoC competition.
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* On Friday afternoon, HUD released an updated PPRN for CoCs. The ARD remains the same, but the NC BoS CoC did see an increase in the amounts for CoC Bonus, DV Bonus, and the CoC planning grant funding.
* Project ranking was informed by the CoC’s Funding Priorities document and the scorecards.
  + NC BoS CoC Funding Priorities
    - Guidance from the Continuum of Care on its priorities for funding. This includes priorities for funding specific project types and regional need.
  + Scorecard
    - *Thresholds:* Essential components that must be met in order to be funded
    - *Standards:* High priorities for projects to ideally meet that indicate programmatic success
    - *Minimums:* Meeting section minimums indicates well-rounded projects and that essential components are not missing that could affect performance
    - *Points:* Used to incentivize practices and to pull higher performing projects up in the ranking list
* PRC and NCCEH staff used approved scorecards to review applications.
  + Two Types of Scoring
    - Combined Scoring section of each application scored by:
      * One member of the PRC
      * One member of NCCEH staff
      * Combined Scoring section scores are averaged
      * Note: We had two PRC members that did not finish their application scoring. A second NCCEH staff member scored the 5 projects not scored by a PRC member so that each application had two scorers.
    - Staff Scoring section scored by NCCEH staff.
  + Combined Scoring + Staff Scoring = Total Score

**FY22 CoC Application Summary**
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**Renewal Project Review**

Summary:

* 27 renewal projects turned in applications.
  + (1) HMIS project (not scored)
  + (1) SSO-Coordinated Entry project (not scored)
  + (18) Permanent Supportive Housing projects
  + (7) Rapid Rehousing projects
* Scored renewal projects:
  + (0) applications with threshold issues

Renewal applicants missed a range of standards.
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* The Project Review Committee identified two renewal projects that deserved special consideration because of key standards issues, performance, and low scoring.
  + Rockingham County Help for Homeless RRH
    - RCHH Rapid Rehousing
      * Renewal application: $213,986
        + Met only 13/15 Rapid Rehousing Benchmarks
        + Missed the Anti-Discrimination Policy standard

Scored zero points in the Equity Section

* + - * Scored 27% of possible points in the renewal scorecard
      * Scored 53% of the next lowest operating\* RRH renewal application
        + RCHH scored 42.5 points – next lowest score was UCCS RRH at 77 points
      * Lowest ranking operational RRH project in 2021
      * This discounts the two RRH projects that have not started that received fewer points – the HUD NOFO does not allow us to reallocate first time renewals
  + New Reidsville Housing Authority PSH
    - New Reidsville Housing Authority PSH
      * Renewal application: $287,303
        + Met only 6/9 Permanent Supportive Housing Key Elements
        + Missed the Anti-Discrimination Policy standard

Scored zero points in the Equity Section

* + - * + Scored 22% of possible points in the renewal scorecard
        + Scored 50% of the next lowest PSH renewal application

NRHA scored 41 points – next lowest score was RCHH PSH at 82 points

* + - * + Lowest ranking PSH renewal in 2021
    - Angela asked if New Reidsville was offered technical assistance in 2021. Brian answered that the CoC staff offered technical assistance to all CoC-funded agencies.

**New Project Review**

Summary:

* 8 new projects turned in applications.
  + (3) Permanent Supportive Housing projects
  + (3) Rapid Rehousing projects
  + (2) DV Bonus projects
    - Rapid Rehousing
    - SSO-CE
* Two new projects had issues:
  + Johnston-Lee-Harnett Community Action
    - JLHCA submitted by the first deadline but did not submit anything for the second deadline
    - JLHCA emailed staff to let them know they would not submit anything by the second deadline.
    - Application materials not scored
  + Greene Lamp
    - Submitted a Planning Grant Application rather than a RRH grant application
    - Application materials not scored

**New project comparison**
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Most new applicants met all key thresholds and standards.
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**Ranking Options**

The PRC used historical precedent and renewal performance to order the final ranking list.

* The Project Review Committee used several historical precedents including some key standards to order the final ranking list.
  + Housing First
  + Program Design Elements
    - Key Elements of Permanent Supportive Housing
    - USICH Rapid Rehousing Benchmarks
  + Anti-Discrimination Policy adherence

Precedent 1: Infrastructure applications

* CoC precedent is to rank the NC BoS CoC HMIS and Coordinated Entry applications at the top of the ranking list.
  + Protects required infrastructure
  + Funding Priorities document prioritizes infrastructure grants

Precedent 2: DV Bonus applications

* CoC precedent is to rank DV Bonus projects at the bottom of the ranking list.
  + Two applications with far ranging impacts for DV survivors
    - NC Coalition Against Domestic Violence RRH
    - NCCEH Supportive Services Only – Coordinated Entry
  + Full DV bonus applied for by the two applications
  + Size could eliminate other projects, if higher in the ranking list

Precedent 3: Use Housing First, Program Design Standards, and Anti-Discrimination Policy Standards to order renewal projects.

* Pull down projects missing the Housing First standard
  + Applies to only one project: New Reidsville Housing Authority PSH
* Pull up projects in groups for the number of Key Elements of PSH or RRH Benchmarks met
  + Group by standards met and then order by point total
* Pull down projects missing the Anti-Discrimination Policy standard
  + Two agencies with three projects
    - Rockingham County Help for Homelessness: PSH and RRH
    - New Reidsville Housing Authority PSH
* Remember that Tier 1 projects are considered safe as long as they meet HUD threshold, the ranking order should indicate to applicants what the CoC wants to prioritize.
* Housing First and Program Design Elements (PSH Key Elements / RRH Benchmarks) are a long-standing precedent for ordering renewal projects – we’ve seen a significant effect on renewal applicants coming into compliance over time – so it’s working to use this as a ranking tool precedent
* Because equity has been an emerging priority for the CoC over the last 3 years, the PRC and Steering Committee used the Anti-Discrimination Policy standard as a ranking tool similar to last year.

Precedent 4: Weight New Projects based on Funding Priorities document

* To ensure the CoC takes current CoC coverage into consideration, the CoC began weighting new projects applications based on their regional project priority in the CoC Funding Priorities document.
  + Priority 1 projects: 20 points
  + Priority 2 projects: 10 points
  + Priority 3 projects: 0 points

The PRC ordered Tier 2 renewal and new projects by final score.
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Recommended Scenario:

* Allows the projects fully in tier 2 to compete against one another based on scores
* All (4) new project applications would fully fall in tier 2 at their requested levels.
* The RCHH RRH project would be the last project in Tier 2, but not all of the renewal amounts could be funded. Because it’s a RRH project a $107,582 project is probably still viable but $106,404 of its renewal amount would fall outside of the Tier 2 line. The RCHH RRH project is the second lowest scoring project in the competition amongst all new and renewal projects (exception first time, non-operating renewals).
* The NRHA PSH project would be fully outside tier 2 and off the ranking list.

**Final Recommended Prioritization Ranking List**
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The Steering Committee needs to formally approve the prioritization ranking list. Marie Watson motioned for approval and Lisa Phillips seconded the motion. The motion to approve the NC BoS CoC Prioritization Ranking List for the 2022 CoC Competition was unanimously approved.

**Next steps: Notification and Appeal Process**

Staff will notify applicants regarding decisions by the end of the day.

* Staff will send scorecards to applicants and offer follow-up calls after the competition.
* Applicants whose projects were not included in the final Prioritization Ranking List can appeal decisions.

Appeals Process

* Appeal documentation due to NCCEH by Thursday, September 8th at 12 PM
* If appeals are submitted, the PRC will meet on Friday, September 9th to consider information.
* If the PRC recommends overturning a decision, the Steering Committee will consider approval of updated Prioritization Ranking List on Tuesday, September 13th at 10:30 AM.

**Next Steering Committee Meeting(s):**

* Tuesday, September 13, 2022, at 10:30 A.M. – **Regular Steering Committee Meeting**
* Tuesday, September 20, 2022, at 10:30 A.M. – **Special CoC NOFO Ranking Approval**
* Tuesday, September 27, 2022, at 10:30 A.M. **– *[Tentative]* Special CoC NOFO Appeals Meeting**