North Carolina
Balance of State Continuum of Care
bos@ncceh.org   919.755.4393   www.ncceh.org/BoS

Project Review Committee Minutes
9.8.17

Committee Members Present:
Alice Knaflich, Ken Becker, Barrett Kahl, Destri Leger, Chanda Hurms, Nicole Boone

NCCEH Staff Present:
Brian Alexander, Ehren Dohler, Emily Carmody, Beth Bordeaux

Review of the Scoring Process

- The Project Review Committee (PRC) is composed of representatives from the NC BoS CoC Regional Committees. 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.
    - The Steering Committee will meet Tuesday, September 12, to review and vote on the PRC's recommendation.
- 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.
- The NC BoS CoC has over $9 million in funding available in the 2017 CoC competition.
    - Annual Renewal Demand (ARD): $8,267,704
    - Permanent Housing bonus: $654,769 – for new RRH or PSH projects
    - CoC Planning: $327,384 (not ranked)
    - Projects ranked in two tiers:
        - Tier 1: 94% of ARD = $7,771,642. Projects in Tier 1 are generally "safe".
        - Tier 2: 6% of ARD + PH Bonus = $1,150,831. More competitive – all Tier 2 projects may not be funded. Which projects get funded is decided by HUD, based on where projects are ranked and the CoC's score on the full application.
    - New projects can be funded through the PH bonus or through reallocation of other projects.

- o PH bonus projects can only be RRH or PSH (could also fund TH-RRH, but no applications for that component this year).
  - o Reallocation can also fund SSO-Coordinated Entry or HMIS projects in addition to RRH and PSH.
- Scoring
  - o Combined scoring section scored by one PRC member and one NCCEH staff member
  - o Staff scoring scored by NCCEH staff – more objective measures and performance
  - o Combined scoring + staff scoring = total score
  - o PRC will use standards, minimums, scores and funding priorities to rank projects
- 2017 applications
  - o CoC planning application – not ranked
  - o HMIS grant – not scored, ranked first
  - o 33 renewal applications
    - ▪ 30 PSH
    - ▪ 3 RRH
  - o 8 new project applications
    - ▪ 1 PSH
    - ▪ 6 RRH
    - ▪ 1 SSO-Coordinated Entry
- Scorecard: Order of Priority. The scorecards have items which hold different weight in the scoring: thresholds, standards, section minimums, and points.
  - o Thresholds are most important: if projects don't meet thresholds, they cannot move forward in the competition.
  - o Standards and section minimums: Projects are expected to meet these aspects – missing standards and minimums triggers review.
  - o Some standards were previously points – changing them to standards allows these items to be elevated in importance.
  - o Total points: Points help determine the ranking after considering thresholds and standards.

Renewal Project Review

- **Summary:**
  - 34 renewal projects
    - o 1 HMIS (not scored)
    - o 3 RRH projects
    - o 30 PSH projects
  - Scored renewal projects:
    - o 0 applications missed thresholds
    - o 5 applications missed section minimums
      - ▪ 1 application did not meet 2 section minimums
    - o 15 applications had 3 or more standards issues

Renewal Standards

- Q2.2 Standard: Housing First

- o Partners, Residential Treatment Services of Alamance, and New Reidsville Housing Authority did not meet this standard.
- Q2.5 Standard: Key Elements of PSH
  - o Residential Treatment Services of Alamance, New Reidsville Housing Authority, and Surry Homeless and Affordable Housing Coalition did not meet this standard.
- Q2.7 RRH Benchmarks and Standards
  - o Community Link missed 2 of 15, both in one out of the four sections of this standard.
  - o Rockingham County Help for Homeless missed 4 of 15, which were in three of the four sections of this standard.
- Q3.2 Prioritizing CH
  - o Greenville Housing Authority: Seeds of Change, Greenville HA Solid Ground, Greenville HA Project HOPE, Greenville HA Project Stable Solutions, Partners, RTSA, and SHAHC all missed this standard.
  - o This standard will be met – all applications will be changed by the time they are submitted.
- Q4.17: Monitoring Findings
  - o Three Cardinal grants (Chatham-Person, Kerr-Tar, and Alamance-Caswell) missed this because they didn't fill out the form, but staff knows they do not have monitoring findings from forms submitted for other Cardinal applications.
  - o Rockingham County Help for the Homeless was monitored in May and they had findings, but they are working on them with the HUD field office and have been approved for HUD TA to work on these issues.
  - o Sandhills has three findings, but all findings have been closed.
- Q4.21 Coordinated Assessment
  - o Eastpointe SPC Beacon, Partners, SHAHC, Vaya Central Combo and Vaya Central Chronic missed this.
  - o Staff does not recommend using this standard for ranking
    - ▪ Regional Committees just restructured and are building up new systems.
    - ▪ All regions are in the middle of implementing new coordinated entry plans.
    - ▪ HUD sent out a notice about coordinated assessment compliance that requires CoCs to have full implementation by January 2018.
    - ▪ PRC should look at this standard next year.
- Q4.22 PSH Prioritization
  - o 20 of 30 projects did not meet this standard
  - o This standard looked at whether CPD Notice 16-011 is in policies and procedures. Instead of using it in ranking this year, staff will ensure that is added to policies and procedures.
- Brian clarified some standards are easily fixed while other standards are more integral to running a strong project and should be used to rank. These "key" standards are generally those related to program design like the PSH Key Elements and RRH Benchmarks and Standards.

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.

- All projects met minimums in sections 1 & 5.
- One project – Residential Treatment Services of Alamance – did not meet minimums in two sections.
- Minimums are important for ranking because they ensure all sections are important. Using minimums prevents a project from scoring well overall even if they have a very low score in a certain section.
- Section 2: Program Design
    - Section total possible points:
        - PSH 18; RRH: 10
        - Section minimum: 10
        - Average score: 14.21.
        - One project missed the minimum: RTSA received 2.5 points. The second-lowest-scoring project received 10 points.
    - Section 3: NC BoS CoC Priorities
        - Section possible points: 20
        - The scorecard set minimum of 11, but this was a mistaken carry-over from last year. This year 11 points is not possible; the minimum should have been 10.
        - Only one project scored less than 10 points – RTSA scored 0 points.
    - Section 4: Project Performance
        - Section minimum points: PSH 150; RRH 140
        - Section possible points subtracted: PSH: -15; RRH: -15
        - Minimum: PSH: 48; RRH: 30
        - Two Eastpointe projects missed the minimum. They are new projects that have not started yet. They will start in October. There is no APR to score, which is the bulk of the points in this section. They received the maximum points for a project that has not started.
        - New Reidsville HA Renewal: Turned in the wrong APR so were not scored for performance and therefore lost a lot of points. If they had turned in the correct APR, they would have scored 83 points, well above the minimum.
        - Cardinal Chatham-Person 1 Renewal is truly below the minimum.
- Renewal project score summary:

Type	Possible Points	Highest Score	Lowest Score	Average Score
All		151.0	58.0	107.9
PSH	200	151.0	58.0	110.3
RRH	182	88.0	76.0	84.0

- Lowest Performing Project: Residential Treatment Services of Alamance
    - Missed 5 standards

- o Missed 2 section minimums
- o Score: 93 points
- o This project has a history of low ranking. The 2016 Project Review Committee discussed reallocating the project but decided not to because there were not enough applications to use the available funding.

New Project Applications Review

- Summary of new projects:
  - o 8 new projects turned in applications by the due date
    - 1 PSH
    - 6 RRH
    - 1 SSO-Coordinated Entry Project
  - o 7 of the 8 new projects had initial threshold issues
    - Staff gave new projects an opportunity to address threshold issues with an extended deadline
    - 3 of 7 responded by the deadline
  - o 4 of 8 projects met thresholds after additional review

New Project Thresholds

- As of the initial deadline: VOA missed 1 threshold, Pitt missed 2, Wilson HA missed 7, Family Crisis Council missed 8, Southwestern Child Development missed 8, Diakonos-RRH missed 7, Diakonos-PSH missed 2
- Information these projects subsequently sent by the extended deadline were reviewed by NCCEH and PRC members.
- VOA, Pitt County, and Wilson Housing Authority addressed their threshold issues.
- Family Crisis Council's project missed 8 threshold questions:
  - o Q2.8: RRH program history
  - o Q2.14: Housing First
  - o Q2.16a4: RRH Standard: Housing identification
  - o Q2.16b2: RRH Standard: Rent and move-in assistance
  - o Q2.16b3: RRH Standard: Rent and move-in assistance
  - o Q2.16c4: RRH Standard: Case mgmt. and services
  - o Q2.16d2: RRH Standard: Program philosophy
  - o Q2.16d3: RRH Standard: Program philosophy
- Southwestern Child Development's Rural Housing Assistance project missed 8 threshold questions:
  - o Q2.16a1: RRH Standard: Housing identification
  - o Q2.16a2: RRH Standard: Housing identification
  - o Q2.16a4: RRH Standard: Housing identification
  - o Q2.16b2: RRH Standard: Rent and move-in assistance
  - o Q2.16b3: RRH Standard: Rent and move-in assistance
  - o Q2.16c3: RRH Standard: Case mgmt. and services
  - o Q2.16c4: RRH Standard: Case mgmt. and services
  - o Q2.16d1: RRH Standard: Program philosophy

- Diakonos' Fifth Street Ministries RRH project missed 7 thresholds:
    - Q2.14 Housing First
    - Q2.16a1: RRH Standard: Housing identification
    - Q2.16a2: RRH Standard: Housing identification
    - Q2.16b2: RRH Standard: Rent and move-in assistance
    - Q2.16c3: RRH Standard: Case mgmt. and services
    - Q2.16c4: RRH Standard: Case mgmt. and services
    - Q2.16d2: RRH Standard: Program philosophy
- Diakonos' Fifth Street Ministries PSH project missed 2 thresholds:
    - Q2.14: Housing First
    - Q2.15b: PSH Key Element: Voluntary services
    - Note: there are far fewer threshold questions for PSH projects than RRH projects.

New Project Standards

- Q1.3 Does the agency have prior experience serving homeless persons?:
    - Wilson Housing Authority missed this standard originally. They sent a letter addressing this standard which was reviewed by NCCEH staff and a PRC member who both believe they now meet this standard.
- Q2.1 Community Need Statement:
    - Pitt County RRH missed this standard originally because they turned in an incomplete form. They have since turned in the form and now meet this standard.
- Q2.2 Provided narrative explaining subpopulations to be served & how they will be engaged.
    - Pitt County RRH missed this standard originally because they turned in an incomplete form. They have since turned in the form and now meet this standard.
- Q2.3 Plan to prioritize households with longest history of homelessness
    - Pitt County RRH missed this standard originally because they turned in an incomplete form. They have since turned in the form and now meet this standard.
    - Wilson Housing Authority missed this standard originally. They sent a letter addressing this standard which was reviewed by NCCEH staff and a PRC member who both believe they now meet this standard.
- Q2.4 Plan to ensure people are moved into housing quickly
    - Pitt County RRH missed this standard originally because they turned in an incomplete form. They have since turned in the form and now meet this standard.
    - Wilson Housing Authority missed this standard originally. They sent a letter addressing this standard which was reviewed by NCCEH staff and a PRC member who both believe they now meet this standard.
- Q4.9 Capacity to provide needed services
    - Wilson Housing Authority missed this standard originally. They sent a letter addressing this standard which was reviewed by NCCEH staff and a PRC member who both believe they now meet this standard.
- Q6.1 Participation in 75% of Regional Committee meetings

- o Wilson Housing Authority missed this standard originally. They sent a letter addressing this standard which was reviewed by NCCEH staff and a PRC member who both believe they now meet this standard.
  - o VOAC met this standard in Region 11, but not in Region 7. They don't cover Region 7 yet and have only just begun engaging in these meetings.
- Q6.3 Participation in region ESG planning process
  - o VOAC met this standard in Region 11, but not in Region 7. They don't cover Region 7 yet and have only just begun engaging in these meetings.
- Q7.2 Match documentation
  - o Pitt RRH 2017 did turn in match letters, but there were errors in letters. These will be fixed before the application is submitted.
- Summary of standards:

Project	Number of Standards Unmet
BoS CoC Coordinated Entry	0
VOAC Rapid Re-Housing	2
Pitt RRH 2017	5
Wilson Housing Authority Homeless Housing Program	5

- All of these standards issues have been addressed since the original application, so the PRC decided not to use them in ranking.

- New project scores:
  - o All section minimums were met
  - o The scorecard didn't capture performance for SSO very well. It also didn't always capture the Wilson HA's quality either.

Agency	Project	Score
Volunteers of America Carolinas	VOAC Rapid Rehousing	67.5
Pitt County Planning	PittRRH2017	47.0
NCCEH	BoS CoC Coordinated Entry	39.5
Wilson Housing Authority	Wilson Housing Authority Homeless Housing Program	33.0

Ranking and Reallocation

- Key standards and minimums should be used to rank projects.
    - Use select standards and meeting section score minimums to determine groups of projects.
    - Groups will be projects that met the same number of standards.
    - Ranked order within a group will be set by project score.
    - Standards to use:
        - Housing First
        - PSH Key Elements (6)
        - RRH Benchmarks and Standards (4)
        - Section score minimums
    - Focusing in on these key standards helps predict high-performing projects. Minimums are important for ranking because they ensure all sections are important. Using minimums prevents a project from scoring well overall even if they have a very low score in a certain section.
- Ehren summarized two potential ranking scenarios that take these standards and minimums into account:
    - One funds all renewal projects at current levels
    - One uses reallocation to create the SSO Coordinated Entry project
- Scenario A: Projects that met all key standards and section minimums are ranked at the top, ordered by total score
    - Projects that missed key standards or minimums are ranked by number of standards or minimums missed, then ranked by total score as a tie-breaker.
    - In this way, projects are ranked by standards and minimums first, which are most important for project performance, then by score, rather than focusing on total score first.
        - Projects that missed 1 standard or minimum are: Partners Consolidated Renewal, SHAHC PH Renewal, Community Link RRH Renewal, and Cardinal Chatham-Person Renewal.
        - Projects that missed 2 standards or minimums are: New Reidsville Housing Authority
        - Projects that missed 3 standards or minimums are: RCHH RRH Renewal
        - Projects that missed 5 standards or minimums are: Residential Treatment Services of Alamance Women's PH renewal
    - New projects ranked after renewals, by score.
    - No reallocation, so the Coordinated Entry SSO project is not funded.
    - The Project Review Committee discussed this proposal:
        - Destri and Ken agreed it looks reasonable to take standards and minimums into account as the basis for ranking.
        - Alice clarified that after standards and minimums are taken into account, point scores are used.
        - Nicole clarified that the projects above Partners on the ranked list missed no minimums or standards.

- Emily clarified how the last three renewal projects were ranked: points did not come into play with New Reidsville, RCHH, and RTSA because they missed 2, 3, and 5 standards/minimums respectively.
- Scenario B: Project ranking is the same as Scenario A except:
  - Two projects are partially reallocated – requested budgets reduced by 25%
    - Eastpointe Shelter Plus Care -Combined -Renewal 2017
    - Cardinal Chatham-Person 1
  - One project fully reallocated
    - Residential Treatment Services of Alamance
  - Coordinated Assessment SSO project funded with reallocation, ranked last in Tier 1
  - Partial reallocations:
    - Six projects are spending between 50% and 60% of their funding. All other projects are spending above 70% of their funding, so these low-spending projects represent a particularly low-spending group.
    - These projects are:
      - Trillium #1, Housing Authority of Greenville Project Stable Solutions, Housing Authority of Greenville Solid Ground, Eastpointe SPC Combined, Cardinal Chatham-Person 1, Community Link PSH
    - Four of the six low-spending projects have extenuating circumstances such that they should be given another year to improve their spending:
      - Trillium had low spending because of a grant consolidation that was out of their control, and Trillium has high spending on their other grants.
      - The two Housing Authority of Greenville projects were recently transferred from another grantee, and the HA of Greenville has high spending on their other grants.
      - Community Link's PSH spending has been historically high and their other project's spending is higher, and they provided a detailed plan to improve spending.
    - Eastpointe and Cardinal Chatham-Person 1 have had several years of low spending and have had spending problems in the past in other grants as well.
    - Reallocating 25% of these projects would bring the projects up to close to the average spending for the CoC. They're currently spending 57% of their grant, so reallocating 25% would bring them to spending in the 80% range.
    - Beth asked how long these spending problems have been going on. Brian answered about as long as NCCEH has been tracking APRs, so about 4 years.
    - Ehren clarified that the reallocated funds would only go to the SSO project because additional funding is not needed for other new projects, and SSO can only be funded using reallocated funding. It cannot be funded by the permanent housing bonus.
    - Beth clarified that reallocation is justified based on prior and recent spending history, not necessarily based on score.
  - Full reallocation:

- Residential Treatment Services of Alamance is recommended for full reallocation. This project missed three standards and two section minimums. It was the only project to miss two minimums.
- RTSA has been considered for reallocation in the past, but reallocated funding must be used the year it is reallocated, and the CoC didn't have a project to use the funding. This is the first year the CoC has a project to reallocate to.
- This project's funding is also all in supportive services, so direct financial assistance would not be taken away from clients. Alamance County, where the RTSA project resides, has other CoC funding for PSH.
- Discussion:
  - Emily, who reviewed this project, mentioned that this project no longer fits in the PSH model: RTSA is a treatment program, not a permanent housing program that houses people permanently in the community.
  - SSO Project Ranking:
    - The SSO project can only be funded using reallocated funding. Funding that is reallocated is lost if it isn't used the year it's reallocated. In order to protect that funding for the whole CoC, the SSO project should be ranked at the very bottom of Tier 1, rather than Tier 2 like the other new projects.
- Summary of the differences between Scenario A and B:
  - In Scenario A, all renewal projects are funded at requested levels and three new permanent housing projects are funded at the bottom of Tier 2. New Reidsville Housing Authority straddles Tier 1 and Tier 2 and RCHH and RTSA are the other renewal projects in Tier 2.
  - In Scenario B, Cardinal's Chatham-Person 1 and Eastpointe's SPC Combined Renewal 2017 projects are partially reallocated and RTSA's project is fully reallocated. These reallocations fund the SSO-Coordinated Entry project, ranked at the bottom of Tier 1. New Reidsville still straddles Tier 1 and 2, but more of its funding is in Tier 2. RCHH is the only other renewal project in Tier 2.
- Options to use additional bonus funding:
  - Under both scenarios, the CoC hasn't used all of its bonus funding. There are two potential options to use more bonus funding: Increase VOA's budget and/or award Wilson Housing Authority a two-year grant.
    - Increasing VOA's budget makes sense because they cover many counties and may be able to manage the additional funding.
    - Awarding Wilson HA a two-year grant would not be as advantageous because it wouldn't increase the CoC's ARD next year, but does make next year's application easier. The CoC shouldn't offer VOA or Pitt County two-year grants because large increases in project budget can disadvantage projects ranked lower in the national competition.
- A motion was made and approved to recommend using Scenario B to rank all project applications, and to reallocate some projects. [Knaflich, Becker]. All in favor; none opposed.
- A motion was made and approved to recommend allowing VOA to increase its budget and/or to offer Wilson Housing Authority a two-year grant. [Becker, Knaflich]. All in favor, none opposed.