**Special Steering Committee Meeting Minutes – CoC Project Ranking Meeting**
**September 24, 2024**

**Regional Leads & Alternates Present**: Derek Lancour (Abstain), Lori Watts (Abstain), Michael Absher, Amber Brafford (Abstain), Cory Bragg, Pamela Hinton (Abstain), Erin Gaskin (Abstain), Natasha Elliott (Abstain), Kerry Bashaw (Abstain), Tonya Gray Young (Abstain), Kisha Darden (Abstain), Lynne James (Abstain), Catonnia Pitt, Brian Fike (Abstain)
**At-Large Members Present**: Karen Carroll, Erin Joy Crossfield, Lisa Phillips, Angela Harper King, Jackie Lucas (Abstain)

**Steering Committee Members Absent**: Emily Lowery, Emily Locklear, Shawanda Barnes, Crystal Gwendo, Cassie Rowe, Brooks Ann McKinney, Joseph Chilton, Melissa Hewitt

**Interested Parties Present**: Kim Hemphill, Alicia Broadway, Amy Modlin, Sarah Lancaster, Talaika Williams, Amy Steele, Kea Alexander

**NCCEH Staff Present**: Brian Alexander, Allie Card, Debra Susie, Jenny Simmons, Laurel Benfield, Ashley VonHatten

**Review of Scoring Process**
The CoC Consolidated Application has 3 parts:

| | |
|---|---|
| CoC Application | Captures CoC-wide information |
| | NCCEH, as Collaborative Applicant, writes this application on the CoC's behalf |
| | Input from agencies, Regional Committees, Steering Committee, & stakeholders necessary to give full scope of the CoC's work |
| Project Applications | New projects |
| | Renewal projects |
| | DV Bonus projects |
| | CoC Planning grant |
| Project Priority Ranking List | Ranked list of each project |
| | Recommended by the Project Review Committee |
| | Approved by the Steering Committee |

The Project Review Committee scored and met to create a ranked list of project applications.

Goal: To review and score renewal and new applications and recommend a ranked list of projects to the

Steering Committee for final approval.

The projects will be listed in ranked order and divided into 2 tiers per HUD instructions in the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO).
- Projects in Tier 1 are conditionally awarded as long as HUD thresholds are met.
- Projects in Tier 2 are at greater risk to not be funded.

Scoring and ranking projects allows the CoC to prioritize funding for the best project applications. Scoring and ranking:
- 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 $20 million in homeless funding at stake in the FY24 CoC Program competition.

| Potential Amount Available to NC Balance of State CoC Applicants | |
|---|---|
| Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) | $13,967,931 |
| Bonus Funding | $2,259,324 |
| DV Bonus | $2,824,155 |
| CoC Planning (not scored or ranked) | $941,385 |
| **Projects will be ranked within 2 tiers** | |
| Tier 1: 90% ARD | $12,571,138 |
| Tier 2: ARD - Tier 1 + CoC Bonus | $3,656,117 |
| Domestic Violence Bonus | $2,824,155 |

Project ranking was informed by the CoC's Funding Priorities document and the approved scorecards.

The FY2024 CoC Program Funding Priorities document provides guidance from the Continuum of Care on its priorities for funding. This includes priorities for funding specific project types and regional need.

The approved new and renewal scorecards organize evaluation using:
- *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*: Use to incentivize practices and to pull higher performing projects up in the ranking list

The PRC and NCCEH staff used approved scorecards to review applications.
Two types of Scoring
1. Combined Scoring section of each application scored by:
   a. One member of the PRC and one member of NCCEH staff
   b. Combined Scoring section scores are averaged

> c. Any standards discrepancies were reviewed by a second staff member to break ties.
2. Staff Scoring section scored by NCCEH staff

1. Combined Scoring plus 2. Staff Scoring = Total Score

The PRC can use the following to rank projects:
- Funding Priorities
- Standards
- Total scores

FY2024 CoC Project Application Summary

| Applications scored & ranked | 21 renewal project applications |
|---|---|
| |     16 Permanent Supportive Housing |
| |     5 Rapid Rehousing |
| | |
| | 4 new project applications |
| |     2 Permanent Supportive Housing |
| |     1 SSO-CE DV Bonus |
| |     1 RRH DV Bonus |
| Applications not scored but ranked (renewals typically ranked as first projects) | 1 HMIS grant renewal application |
| | 1 SSO-CE grant renewal application |
| | 1 new SSO-CE grant expansion application |
| Applications not scored or ranked | 1 Planning grant application |

**Renewal Project Scoring Overview**

23 renewal project applications submitted
- 1 HMIS project (not scored)
- 1 SSO-Coordinated Entry project (not scored)
- 16 Permanent Supportive Housing projects
- 5 Rapid Rehousing projects

Scored renewal projects:
- 0 applications with threshold issues
- 5 applications from Greenville Housing Authority missing all but the project application from e-snaps, including missing match documentation

Renewal applicants met all key standards including Housing First, PSH Key Elements and RRH Benchmarks.

Three projects will not renew in this year's competition and will be reallocated.
Two agencies with 3 projects requested grantee changes.

- Thrive PSH, Thrive RRH, Community Link PSH
- Initially intended to transfer grants to NCORR
- Decided to reallocate these projects and instead have NCORR apply for 1 new PSH project

- Existing households will eventually transfer to the new NCORR PSH project

Greenville Housing Authority – administers 5 PSH projects in Region 12
- $1,482,407 for 111 units
- Only submitted project applications from e-snaps for the competition
- Lowest scoring PSH projects in the CoC (minus projects that have not completed a full operating year)
- Spending concerns

| Project | FY20-21 | FY21-22 | Current |
|---|---|---|---|
| Seeds of Change | 75% | 57% | 26% (10 mos) |
| Solid Ground | 89% | 64% | 24% (10 mos) |
| Project HOPE | 93% | 92% | 30% (9 mos) |
| Stable Solutions | 62% | 47% | 51% (12 mos) |
| Project LIFE | NA | NA | NA |

- APRs submitted almost 1 year late – a risk factor for HUD as these are due 90 days after the operating year
- No HMIS licensed users for several months after staff turnover and could not fully participate in the Point-in-Time and Housing Inventory Count process in 2024
- NCCEH staff increased outreach to provide support and technical assistance mostly on administrative aspects of projects.

Question asked regarding what happens to the households in the GHA projects if not funded. The NC BoS CoC staff have met with GHA leadership who indicated they would transfer the households to Housing Choice Vouchers if projects were reallocated.

**New Project Scoring Overview**

New Project Summary
4 agencies submitted 5 new project applications
- 2 PSH projects
    - 1 PSH expansion
    - 1 PSH project replacing 3 reallocated CoC program funded projects from Thrive and Community Link
- 1 SSO-CE expansion project
- 2 DV Bonus projects
    - 1 SSO-CE
    - 1 RRH expansion

All new project applicants met key thresholds and standards including Housing First, PSH Key Elements, and RRH Benchmarks.

New project comparison

| Project | Project Type | Funding Priority | Thresholds Missed | Minimums missed | Total points | Max points |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Trillium PSH | PSH | 4 | 0 | 0 | 134 | 177 |
| NCORR | PSH | NA | 0 | 1 | 77 | 177 |
| NCCEH SSO-CE expansion | SSO-CE | NA | 0 | NA | NA | NA |
| NCCEH SSO-CE DV Bonus | SSO-CE | NA | 0 | 1 | 85.5 | 103 |
| NCCADV RRH expansion | RRH | NA | 0 | 3 | 56.5 | 168 |

Trillium PSH Expansion Project
This is an expansion of Trillium PSH existing Eastpointe (now Trillium) PSH project in Region 8 and brings healthcare and housing leverage.

NCORR PSH Project, replaces 3 currently operating projects: Thrive PSH, Thrive RRH, Community Link PSH
NCORR administers the CoC-wide Back@Home BoS rehousing program; projects will become part of the Back@Home BoS infrastructure

NCCEH SSO-CE Expansion Project, not scored

NCCEH SSO-CE DV Bonus Project
The new project will allow the CoC to develop a separate but complementary centralized CE system specifically for people experiencing interpersonal violence

NCCADV RRH Expansion Project, DV Bonus project, and doesn't compete in the same way with other projects.

**Recommended Prioritization Ranking List**
Follows precedent used in previous competitions to make fair and transparent decisions in the competition using the CoC Program Funding Priorities document, scorecards, and precedents

The Project Review Committee used several historical precedents to order the final ranking list recommendation:

- Renewal infrastructure – HMIS & SSO-CE renewals
- DV Bonus applications
- Key Standards:
    - Key Elements of PSH
    - USICH RRH Program Standards & Benchmarks
    - Anti-Discrimination Policy adherence

*Precedent 1: Renewal infrastructure applications*
CoC precedent is to rank the NC BoS CoC HMIS and Coordinated Entry renewal applications at the top of

the ranking list – protects required infrastructure, Funding Priorities document prioritizes infrastructure grants

*Precedent 2: DV Bonus application*
CoC precedent is to rank DV Bonus projects at the bottom of the ranking list – 2 applications with far ranging impacts for survivors; ranking projects higher on the list above other non-DV Bonus projects could put them at risk; HUD first considers DV Bonus projects separately from other ranked projects – if not considered for DV Bonus, these projects switch to non-DV Bonus projects

*Precedent 3: Use Program Design Standards, Housing First, and Anti-Discrimination Policy Standards to rank projects*
Pull up projects in groups by the number of Key Elements of PSH, RRH Benchmarks, and Housing First standards met – group by standards met and then order by point total; all new and renewal projects met these standards in FY2024
Pull down projects missing the Anti-Discrimination Policy standard – 3 agencies with 8 projects did not meet the Anti-Discrimination Policy standards

The Project Review Committee treated the new NCORR PSH project like a renewal project.

The PRC treated the new NCORR PSH project like a renewal and ordered it with renewals in the final ranking list.

- Replaces 3 currently operating CoC Program-funded grants which will be reallocated in the FY2024 competition.
  - Thrive PSH
  - Thrive RRH
  - Community Link PSH

- Intends to transfer existing households into the new project
  - NOTE: The PRC also recommends that NCORR can apply for this as a non-dedicated grant to:
    - Allow easier transition of households because of eligibility
    - Matches existing CoC Program grants in B@H BoS – making them easier to consolidate
- Chose to apply as a new applicant rather than transfer existing grants for admin purposes
- Working with Thrive and Community Link to transfer existing households
- Will become part of the B@H BoS infrastructure

The Project Review Committee reallocated 4 Greenville Housing Authority renewal projects due to:

- Only submitted project applications during the competition
- Lowest scoring renewals that were in operation for at least one year
- Underspending
- Grant administration issues
- Increased CoC staff engagement and attempts to provide technical assistance provided little to no improvement

GHA's remaining renewal project, Project LIFE, could not be reallocated due to HUD NOFO rules disallowing first time renewals to be reallocated. The PRC placed this project at the bottom of Tier 2.

The PRC followed CoC precedent to assign reallocated funding to a scored new applicant.
Per precedent, the Project Review Committee chose to increase the new NCORR PSH project application budget to utilize reallocated funding from the 4 Greenville Housing Authority projects.
- Most feasible agency to absorb the large amount reallocated ($1,112,687)
- Project already using reallocated funding
- Large amount of match required ($287,172)
- Continue to scale up Back@Home BoS rehousing efforts
- Project covers all 79 counties in the CoC
- Agency indicated their willingness to apply for additional reallocated funding

Recommended Prioritization Ranking List

| Rank | Grant Number | Funding Priority | Agency | Project Name | ARA / Request | Running Balance | App Type | Project Type | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | NC0035L4F032316 | | NCCEH | 2024 HMIS Renewal Balance of State | $ 769,299.00 | $ 769,299.00 | Renewal | HMIS | |
| 2 | NC0384L4F032306 | | NCCEH | 2024 NC BoS SSO-CE Renewal | $ 423,767.00 | $ 1,193,066.00 | Renewal | SSO-CE | |
| 3 | NC0240L4F032207 | | Vaya Health | Vaya Health PSH Central Combo | $ 540,938.00 | $ 1,734,004.00 | Renewal | PH: PSH | 175.5 |
| 4 | NC0255L4F032210 | | Vaya Health | Vaya Health PSH Western Combo | $ 466,538.00 | $ 2,200,542.00 | Renewal | PH: PSH | 175.5 |
| 5 | NC0198L4F032210 | | Rockingham County Help for Homeless | Renewal Project Application FY2024 | $ 290,039.00 | $ 2,490,581.00 | Renewal | PH: PSH | 155 |
| 6 | NC0238L4F032207 | | Trillium | Eastpointe Shelter Plus Care 3 | $ 247,660.00 | $ 2,738,241.00 | Renewal | PH: PSH | 144 |
| 7 | NC0262L4F032211 | | Trillium | Eastpointe Shelter Plus Care – Combined | $ 215,699.00 | $ 2,953,940.00 | Renewal | PH: PSH | 129 |
| 8 | NC0042L4F032013 | | Partners Health Management | Partners Consolidated Renewal 2024 | $ 296,697.00 | $ 3,250,637.00 | Renewal | PH: PSH | 119.5 |
| 9 | NC0040L4F032215 | | Trillium Health Resources | Trillium PSH #1 | $ 1,235,328.00 | $ 4,485,965.00 | Renewal | PH: PSH | 114 |
| 10 | NC0446L4F032203 | | Trillium Health Resources | Trillium RRH | $ 228,647.00 | $ 4,714,612.00 | Renewal | PH: RRH | 99 |
| 11 | NC0409L4F032204 | | Pitt County Planning and Development | PittRRH2024 | $ 130,382.00 | $ 4,844,994.00 | Renewal | PH: RRH | 98 |
| 12 | NC0338L4F032206 | | Trillium | Eastpointe Shelter Plus Care – Southeast | $ 84,127.00 | $ 4,929,121.00 | Renewal | PH: PSH | 91 |
| 13 | NC0410L4F032204 | | Union County Community Shelter | FY24 COC-RRH_UCCS_Renewal_Grant | $ 225,540.00 | $ 5,154,661.00 | Renewal | PH: RRH | 79 |
| 14 | New | | North Carolina Office of Recovery and Resiliency (NCORR) | HUD CoC FY2024 New PSH Project | $ 3,209,259.00 | $ 8,363,920.00 | New | PSH | 77 |
| 15 | NC0508L4F032220 | | Central Piedmont Community Action | CPCA Breaking Barriers RRH 2024 | $ 294,363.00 | $ 8,658,283.00 | Renewal | PH: RRH | 54.5 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | NCD46504F03220 | | NCCADV | Safe at Home 2024 | $ 3,274,177.00 | $ 11,932,460.00 | Renewal | PH: RRH | 21 |
| 17 | NCD045L4F022215 | | Brick Capital Community Development Corporation | Piedmont 1 | | | Renewal | PH: PSH | 83.3 |
| | | | | TIER 1 Portion | $ 838,678.00 | $12,571,138.00 | | | |
| | | | | TIER 2 Portion | $ 868,495.00 | $13,130,633.00 | | | |
| 18 | NCD507L4F022301 | | Diaconos, Inc. | 2024 Fifth Street Ministries PSH | $ 182,360.00 | $ 13,282,993.00 | Renewal | PH: PSH | 66.8 |
| 19 | NCD506L4F022200 | | Brick Capital Community Development Corporation | Region 7 Permanent Supportive Housing | $ 315,218.00 | $ 13,598,211.00 | Renewal | PH: PSH | 28.8 |
| 20 | New | | Trillium Health Resources | Trillium Welcome Home PSH | $ 58,644.00 | $ 13,656,855.00 | New | PSH | 134 |
| 21 | New | | NCCEH | NC BoS CoC SSO-CE Expansion | $ 2,200,680.00 | $ 15,857,535.00 | New | SSO-CE | 0 |
| 22 | NCD509L4F022200 | | Housing Authority of the City of Greenville | Project LIFE Renewal 2024 | $ 369,720.00 | $ 16,227,255.00 | Renewal | PH: PSH | 9 |
| | | | DV Bonus | | | | | | |
| 23 | New DV | | NCCEH | NC Balance of State CoC IPV CE Project | $ 199,741.00 | $ 199,741.00 | New | SSO-CE | 85.8 |
| 24 | New DV | | NCCDV | Safe at Home 2024 Expansion | $ 841,237.00 | $ 1,040,978.00 | New | RRH | 56.8 |
| | | | DV Bonus | | | $ 1,240,719.00 | | | |
| | | | REALLOCATED PROJECTS | | | | | | |
| | NCD139L4F022209 | | Housing Authority of the City of Greenville | Seeds of Change Renewal Project 2024 | $ 394,368.00 | $ 16,621,623.00 | Renewal | PH: PSH | 48 |
| | NCD237L4F022207 | | Housing Authority of the City of Greenville | Project HOPE Renewal 2024 | $ 561,260.00 | $ 17,182,883.00 | Renewal | PH: PSH | 36 |
| | NCD183L4F022213 | | Housing Authority of the City of Greenville | Solid Ground Renewal 2024 | $ 79,788.00 | $ 17,262,671.00 | Renewal | PH: PSH | 34 |
| | NCD239L4F022209 | | Housing Authority of the City of Greenville | Project Stable Solutions Renewal 2024 | $ 77,271.00 | $ 17,339,942.00 | Renewal | PH: PSH | 33 |

The Steering Committee needs to formally approve the recommended prioritization ranking list.

Questions: Question was asked about GHA's grants: They provide Financial Assistance and Supportive Services to those households and that would go away, but GHA's housing vouchers are not going away and could be used to support the households. Question about Tier 1 vs Tier 2 projects and what is expected to be funded. We expect Tier 1 projects to be funded and we expect most Tier 2 projects to be funded, but depends on our CoC Collaborative Application score.

Motion: Michael Absher made the motion to accept the Project Review Committee's recommended ranking list and Erin Joy Crossfield seconded. All eligible to vote Steering Committee members voted to approve. No 'Nay' votes.

Next steps: Notification & 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 26th at 12 PM
- If appeals are submitted, the PRC will meet on Monday, September 30th to consider information
- If the PRC recommends overturning a decision, the Steering Committee will consider approval of an updated Prioritization Ranking List on Tuesday, October 1st at 10:30 AM.

Thank you!

Special thanks to the Project Review Committee for their time and work in scoring project applications.