



# North Carolina Balance of State Continuum of Care

---

bos@ncceh.org

919.755.4393

www.ncceh.org/BoS

## Balance of State Steering Committee Meeting 10.20.14

### Regional Leads Present:

Brian Alexander, Chris Battle, Donna McCormick (for Debbie Cole), Kim Crawford, Nicole Dewitt, Rhoda Emanuel, Alvin Foster, Joe Marks, Amy Modlin, Jane Motsinger, Debra Clarke (for Bart O'Sullivan), Melissa Payne, Faye Pierce, Linda Graham (for Susan Pridgen), Joel Rice, Juliet Rogers, Candice Rountree, Rasheeda Sturdivant, Marie Watson, Bob Williams

### Regional Leads Absent:

Asia Elzein, Jennifer Flood, Tonya Gray, Kelly Lacy, Casey McCall, Sharon Osborne, Melissa Pressley, Glenda Riggs, Michele Steele

### Interested Parties Present:

Kiara Bell, Kristi Case, Jim Cieslar, Deloris Farmer, Gayle Fernandez, Trina Hill, Cheryl Manuel, Detra Purcell, Robin Shue, Amy Steele, Suzanne Storch, Mollie Tompkins, Lori Watts, Talaika Williams, Teena Willis

### NCCEH Staff Present:

Nancy Holochwost, Denise Neunaber, Corey Root, Terry Allebaugh

### 2014 Funding Context

- The Balance of State has 41 renewal projects from 22 applicant agencies. One project that was eligible for renewal was granted an extension and will renew next year.
- The CoC's Annual Renewal Demand (ARD), the amount needed to fund all projects eligible for renewal, is \$5,696,021. HUD is requiring CoCs to place projects into two tiers, as was required last year.
  - Tier 1 = ARD minus 2% (\$5,582,100)
  - Tier 2 = the remaining 2% (\$113,920)
    - Because of the project that was granted an extension and is not renewing, the actual amount of our Tier 2 is \$63,985 (\$113,920 minus the project's \$49,935 budget).
  - The tiers are HUD's way of asking CoCs to prioritize their projects. Tier 1 gets funded first, then Tier 2.
- During the last Steering Committee meeting, members discussed the option of submitting an application for the permanent housing bonus project, which would be a new project dedicated for 100% chronically homeless people. The Steering Committee asked NCCEH staff to pursue two options: the State and any agency that had submitted an Intent to Apply form.

- East Carolina Behavioral Health was the only agency that had submitted an Intent to Apply form. They were not interested in applying for a dedicated chronically homeless project.
- NCCEH talked to the State about creating a CoC-wide rental assistance project. Due to the extremely short timeline, the State decided not to apply, but they are very interested in pursuing this option during the 2015 application cycle.

### Scoring Methods

- The Scorecard Committee created a scorecard that the Project Review Committee used to score project applications. The scorecard has two parts:
  - A community section scored by both NCCEH staff and Project Review Committee member. These scores were averaged to create the final score for this section.
  - A staff-only section scored by NCCEH staff.
  - The averaged score from the community section was added to the staff section score to create the final score.
- Applications were scored based on what had been turned in by the October 3 deadline.

### Overview of Scores

- Forty projects were scored. The only project that was not scored was the HMIS grant renewal. The scorecard is not designed for HMIS grants, and this is a CoC-wide grant that benefits all agencies.
  - Total points possible: 198
  - Highest score: 159.5
  - Lowest score: 16.5
  - Average score: 98.1
  - Median score: 100.5
- The ranked list of projects is posted on the BoS minutes webpage at [http://www.ncceh.org/media/files/page/5fadd90e/BoS\\_Project\\_Priority\\_Ranking\\_2014.pdf](http://www.ncceh.org/media/files/page/5fadd90e/BoS_Project_Priority_Ranking_2014.pdf).

### Special Considerations

- Several applications were turned in late: neither the applications themselves nor any other required materials were submitted by the deadline. The Project Review Committee placed these applications at the bottom of the ranked list. This is the same decision the committee made last year when an application was late.
- APR scoring represents a large portion of points in BoS scorecard. Transitional and rapid-rehousing projects can gain up to 55 points in this section, permanent supportive housing projects can add up to 65 points, and all projects can lose 15 points in this section. There were problems scoring this section on five project applications.
  - Three projects had not submitted their APRs to HUD, so staff were unable to score them, and the projects received zeroes on the APR section of the scorecard.
  - One project could not submit their APR to HUD due to a technical error in esnaps, but the agency was able to give the APR to NCCEH staff, so it was scored.
  - One project's APR had incorrect information (the numbers did not add up and did not match the data in HMIS). Staff were unable to score it because they



could not verify the data, and the project received zeroes on the APR section of the scorecard.

### **Thresholds and Minimums**

- The scorecard is divided into sections, each of which has a minimum point requirement. In three of the sections, some projects did not meet minimums.
  - HUD and BoS Priorities (community section of scorecard)
    - 31 projects did not meet minimum, mostly because they are not serving chronically homeless people and veterans
  - Correctness of Application (staff section of scorecard)
    - 8 projects did not meet minimum: 7 were turned in late and 1 had many errors
  - APR Data (staff section of scorecard)
    - 29 projects did not meet minimum
    - NCCEH staff will re-evaluate the minimum point value for next year's scorecard and will also for consider the APR measures during performance improvement with grantees
- Several questions on the scorecard are “threshold” questions instead of being worth points. These questions ask about items that the Scorecard Committee thought all applicants should be required to meet. However, some projects did not meet threshold.
  - Supportive services justification statement: 6 projects did not meet threshold
  - Previous spending on grant: 19 projects did not meet threshold
  - Participation in Regional Committee: 6 projects did not meet threshold
  - Participation in ESG process: 7 projects did not meet threshold
  - Regional Committee minutes: 7 projects did not meet threshold
  - Steering Committee attendance: 3 projects did not meet threshold
  - Corey noted that the Project Review Committee was concerned by how many projects did not meet minimums and thresholds, which they felt was unacceptable. They asked for the Steering Committee and NCCEH staff to offer assistance to grantees to improve scores. NCCEH staff have also discussed this and plan to incorporate these poor-scoring areas into the performance improvement process with grantees.

### **Project Scores and Ranking/Tiering**

- The HMIS renewal was ranked first, as it has been in past applications.
  - Community-wide project, required by HUD
  - Scorecard not designed to measure HMIS grants
- Late applications were ranked at the bottom. They will still be included in the application.
- All other projects were ranked by the project type (according to HUD's priorities) and then the total score. This means that permanent housing projects (PSH and RRH) were ranked first in order of their scores, and then transitional housing projects were ranked in order of their scores. Steering Committee members reviewed the ranked list of applications and their scores.
- The lowest-scored late application falls into Tier 2:
  - Cardinal Innovations Alamance-Caswell grant for \$206,185
  - Tier 2 = \$63,985. Putting the Alamance-Caswell grant into Tier 2 would leave \$142,200 on the table for Tier 1.



- Because all of the late applications were from the same applicant agency (Cardinal Innovations), the Project Review Committee decided to give the applicant the option of deciding which of their projects will go into Tier 2 to minimize the amount of funding might be lost. NCCEH staff will work with Cardinal to make this decision.
- Steering Committee members were asked for questions or comments.
  - Joel asked what it means to be in Tier 2. Denise noted that Tier 2 is riskier than Tier 1, but we expect it will be funded. In the last two applications, HUD did not have enough funding for all eligible renewal projects, so they asked CoCs to make cuts. This year, we expect there will be enough funding to cover all renewals. HUD will fund projects based on their priorities, and since permanent housing is highest, the permanent housing grants (like Cardinal's) will be funded before any other project types in Tier 2.
  - Denise also clarified that all applications will be submitted at the full amount they are requesting. The Steering Committee needs to approve the order in which the projects are ranked, but no projects need to cut their budgets.
- A motion was made and approved to approve the final project ranking as proposed by the Project Review Committee [Motsinger, Watson]. All in favor, none opposed.

### **Next Steps**

- NCCEH staff will continue to work on application revisions with applicants. All applicants will be asked to submit in esnaps by this Friday, October 24.
- HUD is requiring CoCs to report how many permanent supportive housing beds are expected to turn over during the next grant year. NCCEH staff will be contacting grantees to ask for these numbers.

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

