

**Winston-Salem/ Forsyth County Continuum of Care Rating Panel Meeting**  
**August 9, 2018**  
**Minutes**

The meeting was brought to order at 9:05 am. Each person present introduced themselves, signed the attendance log and was given a meeting **agenda**. A copy of the agenda is attached to these minutes. The following people attended the meeting:

1. London Mickle, panel president (chair)
2. Max Goelling, panel member
3. Kim Gondring, panel member
4. Brenda Evans, panel member
5. Ron Hairston, panel member
6. Cynthia Rucker, panel member
7. Mellin Parker, staff
8. Tim West, staff
9. Nolan Johnson staff
10. Jackie Hundt, Grant Consultant

Tim West gave an overview of the 2018 NOFA and key steps of the local process. A total of 24 proposals were received by the City as the Collaborative Applicant. He stated that the panel's task is to discuss develop a prioritized funding recommendation. He noted City Council has authorized submission of the CoC grant application, subject to completion of the rating process. Future meetings in the process will include:

- Aug. 21: The Operating Cabinet will meet to review the panel's recommendations.
- Aug. 22: The Commission on Ending Homelessness will meet to approve the prioritized list of projects to recommend for funding.

Mr. West presented to the group a handout entitled **2018 Continuum of Care Renewal Project Summaries by Category**. This handout provided summary performance numbers from last year and described the CoC's HMIS, Coordinated Intake and Assessment, Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), CoC Planning, and Rapid Response Housing (Joint TH-RRH) activities.

Jackie Hundt discussed the **Renewal Project Performance Scorecard**. She noted every project type is scored based on the factors applicable to the project type. It was noted that the central goal is to make sure we are spending funds efficiently while providing effective services. The panel unanimously approved the use of the scorecard.

Ms. London Mickle asked if there was some way WSSU students could learn/intern during this process. Ms. Mellin Parker elaborated and indicated it would be a good opportunity and should be pursued.

Ms. Hundt provided the panel with copies of the results of the performance rating process, including raw data and points based on scoring the raw data. These documents showed that all the

projects passed the threshold review, provided an analysis of the client count in each project, gave percentages for projected performance and operation, changes in CoC system performance (strategic planning), HMIS performance, financial efficiency, and accountability. This handout also highlighted the group's prioritization methods, including the housing first approach, and that each project is using best practice standards.

Prior to ending the review of the worksheets, the group started discussion about Rapid Re-housing and Rapid Response Housing. The two names can easily be confused. Mr. Goelling commented that the Rapid Response Housing project is more about "Crisis Response Housing" and perhaps the name of projects of this type should reflect the crisis nature of the housing situation and response. Mr. West commented that HUD is looking for a more descriptive name for the Joint TH/RRH component, and we will look for an opportunity to share Mr. Goelling's comment with HUD staff.

Ms. Brenda Evans asked why there were only 12 agencies and 12 grants, when the panel books had included 24 proposals. Ms. Hundt explained that some of the agencies have multiple programs which totals the 24 programs. While discussing the projects, the topics of construction and fair treatment came up. The group acknowledged none of the current projects were under construction. Ms. Mellin Parker gave feedback to the group stating, "If you would like to purchase property that needs rehab, they can apply under the city's RFP funding." Mr. West added that use of alternate funding sources will assure CoC funds continue to be renewable.

Ms. Hundt next reviewed the handout titled **2018 Considerations for Reallocation and Ranking**. It indicated that \$1.9 million is the amount of eligible renewal projects and described the tools and options for funding under the 2018 Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA). A copy of the handout is attached to these minutes.

Ms. Hundt next reviewed the **2018 Project Priority Listing for Consideration by Rating Panel**. It shows that some of the projects will be a straight renewal while others will be New Reallocation or New Bonus or a combination of both. There was an explanation of tier one versus tier two projects. The tier two projects represent the projects that are more at risk and likely to be cut first. Ms. Hundt also reviewed a handout **2018 Proposed Reallocation for Consideration by Rating Panel**, which indicated grants she advised could be reallocated to achieve the funding goals of the CoC.

The group then took a break.

Ms. Hundt next reviewed with the panel the **2018 Project Priority Listing for Consideration by Rating Panel with Agency Funding Detail** handout. This handout provided additional information on the possible distribution of funding to subrecipient agencies by grant. It also linked grants to the subrecipient proposals received. Finally, it indicated number of staff proposed to be funded by grant and agency as well as amounts of services funding versus housing funding.

Ms. Hundt described how tiers 1 and 2 are determined and how scoring works in tier 2. Ms. Hundt proposed there be an open discussion about the tier one projects. It was decided by the group that there was no need to discuss in depth the tier one projects, as the projects represent the core

activities of the CoC. Max Goelling motioned to accept tier one projects and rankings as presented. Ms. Cynthia Rucker seconded the motion which was accepted unanimously.

Tier 2 received much more discussion than tier 1, particularly around the possibility of receiving funding for the DV Bonus project. Panel members agreed that the need for the project in the community is great. The panel reviewed a **Tier 2 Ranking Analysis** handout, prepared by Mr. West, to visualize the impact of various tier 2 rankings of the DV Bonus project. The panel also talked at length about the power of words and the importance of an appropriate name for the DV Bonus Project. Ms. Hundt stated that she is working with the project sponsor agency to select a proper name which conveys the purpose of the project. Ms. Cynthia Rucker moved for acceptance of version three of the tier two rankings, which ranked the DV Bonus project high enough to hopefully be funded with or without DV Bonus funding. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ron Hairston. After a vote, version 3 was approved unanimously.

After a review of project threshold reviews, Max Goelling moved to accept all the projects as passing eligibility on the threshold review. Ron Hairston seconded the motion and the group unanimously agreed. The motion was passed.

Before the meeting was adjourned, the group elected new officers. A handout of the **CoC Rating Panel** listing the members of the panel was provided. Ms. London Mickle nominated Ms. Cynthia Rucker as the new chair and herself, Ms. London Mickle, as Vice Chair. Ms. Cynthia Rucker accepted the nomination, and Ms. Brenda Evans seconded the nomination. The panel unanimously approved the slate of officers. Ms. Cynthia Rucker's term as chair is effective 10/1/2018. By virtue of being chair of the CoC Rating Panel, she also will serve on the City's Community Agency Allocation Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:22 am.

**Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Continuum of Care Rating Panel  
2018 WS/FC HUD Continuum of Care Project Ranking/Review Process  
August 9, 2018, 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM**

**AGENDA**

1. Welcome
2. Overview of 2018 NOFA and Funding Process
3. Review and Approval of Renewal Project Scorecard
4. Review and Approval of Threshold Eligibility
5. Review of Renewal Project Performance and Scoring
6. Discussion of Proposals and Grant Options: Renewal, Reallocation and Bonuses
7. Development of New and Renewal Project Rankings
8. Panel Membership and Officers
9. Adjourn

## Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Continuum of Care (CoC)—NC-500

### 2018 Considerations for Reallocation and Ranking

The basis for funding is the amount of eligible Renewal Projects: \$1,956,291. Renewal grants can be submitted for renewal or we can request that renewal grant funds be reallocated to new projects. The majority of project proposals submitted to the CoC this year were for renewals and/or expansions of Renewal Projects. As in the past, Bonus funding is available for CoCs (\$117,377), and HUD added a new Domestic Violence (DV) Bonus program (\$179,275). The total amount requested by the subrecipients exceeds our CoC's renewal, Bonus, and DV Bonus amounts.

Total Request in Proposals Received for FY2018	\$2,329,910
Total FY2018 Renewal + Bonus + DV Bonus	\$2,252,943
Amount that requests exceed available funding	\$76,967

HUD created several new options for funding requests in FY2018, which include consolidation (applies to our Coordinated Entry), expansion (many subrecipients took advantage of this), and transition (not applicable for our CoC). HUD continues to encourage reallocation of resources to improve system performance. The following may be considered during project ranking:

1. Use HUD funding options as applicable. However, some renewal expansions will not work under HUD instructions, and must be simply reallocated to New Projects to account for project design and funding changes.
2. Reallocate resources FROM low performing projects and small projects with minimal impact on System Performance. Reallocate TO new projects. Reallocate in a way that doesn't significantly impact bed counts or dramatically shift funding by project type.
3. Due to changes in our coordinated entry system, most of our case management resources are targeted to rapid re-housing (RRH). As a result, permanent supportive housing (PSH) programs are not performing as well, and providers are needing funds to support increases in case management services.
4. Providers of PSH tenant-based assistance (TRA), administered by HAWS, are requesting funds to expand case management services.
5. PSH in the form of Project-based Assistance (PRA) projects operated by ESR have consistently been some of the highest performing PSH projects over the years, and also need more case management.
6. In the past, the Rating Panel has used project type as a starting point for ranking. This approach ensures that we have the right balance of activities and have them prioritized to ensure adequate funding for needed types of projects.

7. PSH needs reallocation to a project design that increases case management, focuses on clients' success, and ultimately improves system performance. There must be a balance between the number of housing vouchers and caseload capacity to serve the clients who are housed.
8. The CoC Strategic Plan calls for RRH and improved PSH. These funds are the most critical for housing homeless persons. Thus, renewal RRH and new PSH should be ranked at the top.
9. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) and the Community Intake Center (CIC) are system requirements and the components type should be ranked high--after the large RRH and PSH projects.

10. The Notice of Funding Availability NOFA states the following about the DV Bonus:

*CoCs are required to rank all DV Bonus projects on the New Project Listing of the CoC Priority Listing with a unique rank number. If a project application designated as DV Bonus is conditionally selected by HUD with DV Bonus funds, HUD will remove the ranked DV Bonus project from the New Project Listing and all other project applications ranked below the DV Bonus project will slide up one rank position (e.g., if the conditionally selected DV Bonus project is ranked #5, HUD will remove the DV Bonus project and each project below #5 will move up one ranked position). If the DV Bonus project application is not conditionally selected with DV Bonus funds, the project application will remain in its ranked position and will be considered for funding as a bonus project with available CoC Program funds.*

11. HUD also will provide up to \$58,689 to the City for a planning grant for costs of consulting, training, evaluation and other needs for developing the CoC system. In prior years, planning grant funds have been used to hire a consultant to help the CoC develop its Coordinated Entry system, hire a consultant to develop a CoC Strategic Plan, develop a CoC website, hire a CoC grant consultant and similar expenses. For the 2018 grant, the major activities will be grant consulting, project and system data evaluation, and training of CoC and agency staff.

**Summary of Proposed Quantifiable System Changes Attributable to Proposed Projects**

<b>CoC-Funded PSH Housing and Service Activities</b>		
<b>Before</b>	<b>After</b>	<b>Change</b>
<u>Current PSH beds/units</u> TRA: 103 beds/74 units PRA: 19 beds/19 units	<u>Proposed PSH beds/units</u> TRA: 92 beds/56 units PRA: 19 beds/19 units	<u>PSH beds/units</u> TRA: loss of 11 beds PRA: no change
<u>Current CM FTEs</u> TRA: 1.5 FTE PRA: 0 FTE	<u>Proposed CM FTEs</u> TRA: 4 FTE PRA: 0.5 FTE	<u>CM FTEs</u> TRA: gain of 2.5 FTE PRA: gain of 0.5 FTE

<b>CoC Funding by Project Type</b>			
<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Before</b>	<b>After</b>	<b>Change</b>
HMIS	\$101,842	\$101,842	\$0
SS-CE	\$98,115	\$98,115	\$0
RRH	\$868,345	\$1,078,435	\$210,090
PSH TRA	\$687,248	\$736,854	\$49,606
PSH PRA	\$122,213	\$159,169	\$36,956
Amount of FY2018 Funds Available in NC-500 through Bonus & DV Bonus			\$296,652