Charlotte-Mecklenburg CoC
Governing Board Meeting
May 23, 2024
Location: Inlivian

Board Members			
Trish Hobson, Chair	Jessica Lefkowitz, Vice Chair	Adelaide Martin	Karen Pelletier
Rebecca Pfeiffer	Eric Scott	Brittany Marshall	Sonia Jenkins
O'Shauna Hunter	Susan Crawford	Kaedon Grinnell	James Lee
Kenny Robinson	Anna London	Shaq Clarke	Tchernavia Montgomery
Cherelle Rozie	Glennis Davis	Andrew Yavorski	Venita Hood

Agenda

Time	Item	Facilitator
2:00pm-2:10pm	Welcome, attendance, guest introductions **Motion: Adopt meeting agenda & approve meeting minutes from April 25.2024 Board meeting**	Trish Hobson Branden Lewis (attendance)
2:10pm-2:15pm	System Improvement Wins	Aged out youth program: Trish, Karen, Adelaide
2:15pm-2:25pm	A Home for All Framework Implementation	O'Shauna Hunter
2:25pm-2:35pm	Committee & Workgroup Report Out Youth Action Board	Taylor Johnson, Co-Chair
2:35pm-2:40pm	Public Comment	Trish Hobson
2:40pm-3:10pm	Collaborative Applicant Staff Updates: 1. System Performance Progress Updated 2. Upcoming funding competitions: NCDHHS ESG & CoC Funding Priorities **Motion: Approve NCDHHS ESG, CoC funding recommendations** **Motion: Approve 2024 reallocation policy**	Mary Ann Priester Erin Nixon
3:10pm-3:55pm	Executive Committee Report Out CoC Board Retreat Follow Up	Trish Hobson
3:55pm-4:00pm	Agency Updates Request for July meeting agenda items	All
4:00pm	Adjourn	Trish Hobson

- **Next CoC Governing Board meeting:** Thursday, July 25, 2024 2:00pm-4:00pm; Location: Ada Jenkins Center
- **Next CoC Full Membership meeting:** Wednesday, August 14, 2024, 2:00pm-3:30pm; Location: Hope Haven
  - Who should attend: All CoC member agencies/individuals, members of the public and CoC Board members

Our Vision: Homelessness is rare, brief and non-recurring in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Community. Everyone has housing choices and prompt access to a variety of housing resources and supports that meet their needs.

CoC Governing Board
Meeting Minutes
April 25, 2024

The meeting of the CoC Governing Board was held on April 25, 2024, as an in-person meeting at Hope Haven.

Board Members Present: Trish Hobson, Jessica Lefkowitz, Adelaide Martin, James Lee, Karen Pelletier, , Rebecca Pfeiffer, Glennis Davis (via Zoom), O'Shauna Hunter, Sonia Jenkins, Susan Crawford, Andrew Yavorski, Venita Hood, Kaedon Grinnell

Board Members Absent: Brittany Marshall, Anna London, Shaq Clarke, Eric Scott, Cherelle Rozie, Kenny Robinson, Tchernavia Montgomery

CoC Staff Present: Branden Lewis, Erin Nixon, Mary Ann Priester, Kim Sanders, Shamika Agbeviade

Guests Present: Valerie Townsend

Welcome- Meeting began with introductions.

Motion to adopt agenda and approve January minutes passed.

System Improvement Wins: Jessica Lefkowitz shared about working with agencies to ensure vulnerable clients are housed. She also shared about the coordination amongst street outreach providers to ensure clients living unsheltered are served.

A Home for All Implementation Update: Upstream Emergency Rental Assistance pillar continues working with the consultant; Property Provider Recruitment pillar will being work with consultant; Emergency Response pillar combining work with CoC unsheltered workgroup; People pillar continuing work with consultant.

Committee/workgroup report out: **Coordinated Entry Oversight Committee**: Karen gave an update on the committee's work to ensure that all clients in emergency shelters have a vulnerability score to prepare for the opening of Forest Point Place; Erin Nixon shared out the CE process explaining how clients who call the CE hotline or present in person for an assessment ultimately end up on the community By-Name List, which is how clients are considered for available housing resources.

Public Comment: None

CoC Staff Report Out: **Quarterly Monitoring Report Out**: Positives: strong workforce, spending & # served are overall being met, Concerns: some files had missing documents, spending concern with 1 RRH program, question about how to measure success with supportive services only funding, lack of participation in CoC activities from persons with lived experience, System-Level concerns: clients with SPMI, lack of affordable housing, staff retention; long stayers at emergency shelters; Next steps: follow up with agencies that were missing paperwork in files, continue lunch-n-learns, next monitoring will be in February; **PIT/HIC submission:** data that will be submitted to HUD shared for review

Executive Committee Report Out: Erin shared proposed System Performance Targets approved by MeckHMIS GC and Board voted to approve targets. Board will receive a system performance progress update at May's Board meeting. Rosalyn Allison-Jacobs shared summary of Board retreat in February

(included in Board meeting materials). Board broke up into small groups based on their assigned goal to strategize actions to make improvements in their goal areas. Small groups will meet between April & May meetings and will report out at May's meeting.

Agency Updates: James Lee shared about his work in the community.

Meeting Adjourn

Why it Matters: Setting Funding Priorities

The CoC Board is responsible for setting the funding priorities for at least 2 sources of funding: HUD CoC Program (CoC) and North Carolina Department of Health & Human Services-HUD-Emergency Solutions Grant (NCDHHS ESG) funding. Both funding sources require that each CoC set its own funding priorities and run its own project review & ranking process. The CoC, through the collaborative applicant (Meck Co CSS), is responsible for submitting 1 communitywide application for each funding source which includes the projects ranked for funding.

Activities Funded by Funding Type:

Funding Type	Street Outreach	Emergency Shelter	Homelessness Prevention	Transitional Housing	Rapid Rehousing	Permanent Supportive Housing	HMIS	CE
NCDHHS ESG	🟩	🟩	🟨	🟥	🟩	🟥	🟥	🟥
CoC	🟥	🟥	High Performing Communities only	🟨	🟩	🟩	🟩	🟩
City ESG	🟩	🟩	🟩	🟥	🟩	🟥	🟥	🟥

Key:

🟩	Activity currently funded
🟨	Activity eligible, but not currently funded
🟥	Activity not eligible

Funding Priority Recommendations:

NCDHHS ESG Recommendation**: 2025 Available: $489,169**
Motion: Approve 40% or $195,667.60 (Crisis Response)/60% or $293,501.40 (Housing Stability) split with Homelessness Prevention as priority for available Housing Stability funding & Emergency Shelter Services as priority for available Crisis Response funding with discretion left to the ranking committee if percentages do not exactly align

CoC Funding Priority Recommendation: Motion: **Approve CoC ranking priorities** (attached)

HUD CoC-FY23

Most recently awarded—grant/project dates vary

Activity	$	% of overall awarded
Permanent Supportive Housing	$4,340,408	63.94%
Permanent Supportive Housing Single Site-Operations & Supports	$347,460	5.12%
Rapid Rehousing for DV Survivors	$887,109	13.07%
Rapid Rehousing for unaccompanied youth ages 18-24	$213,242	3.14%
Rapid Rehousing for families	$308,492	4.54%
Coordinated Entry	$148,000	2.18%
HMIS	$240,000	3.54%
Planning	$303,392	4.47%
Total	$6,788,103	100%

NCDHHS ESG Funding-2023 & 2024

Activity	2023 Awarded	% Spent 2023	2024 Awarded	% Spent 2024 25%	Suggested % 2025
Street outreach	$64,595	98% $63,018	$102,182	3.7% $3,804	40% $195,667.60
Emergency Shelter **Services**	$6,155	0%	$0	NA	
Emergency Shelter **Operations**	$185,545	100%	$214,236	26% $55,721	
Rapid Rehousing **Services**	$19,025	70% $13,318	$0	NA	60% $293,501.40
Rapid Rehousing **Financial Assistance**	$230,827	82% $189,456	$202,012	15% $29,810	
Homelessness Prevention	$0	$0	$0	$0	
Total	$506,147	89% $451,337	$518,430	17% $89,335	$489,169

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Continuum of Care

Reallocation Policy

Item	FY22 Edit made	Rationale for edit
2b. Definition of Chronic Underperformance	Added to the definition of chronic underperformance to include when a renewal project does not consistently meet performance benchmarks in the monitoring process	HUD wants communities to be evaluating projects on their overall performance.
4. Projects subject to reallocation	Added that projects that no longer meet HUD or local priorities are subject to reallocation	To ensure projects align with HUD & local needs and priorities to make the most efficient use of funding.
6. Special Reallocation Amount Rules	Added this section to determine how to treat reallocated projects in subsequent grant years.	To avoid projects being penalized twice before having a chance to improve performance.
	FY23 Edit made	
2. Definitions	Changed measurement period for new grants to be years 2 & 3 instead of first 2 years	Projects are not subject to reallocation after its first year of operating so that performance year should not be evaluated for reallocation.
7. Voluntary Reallocation	Removed: "they have been operating for a minimum of 12 months."	Projects that have not operated for a full 12 months can still reallocate all or part of their funding if circumstances have changed that prevent them from utilizing the funding.
7. Voluntary Reallocation	Added: When evaluating projects for reallocation, projects that voluntarily reallocate funds will be evaluated for chronic underspending using the total project amount post-voluntary reallocation.	If projects voluntarily reallocate funds, they have intentionally evaluated the funding needed by the project so should be able to show they can spend that amount before

1. **Purpose and Background**
   The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Continuum of Care (CoC) manages the performance of all CoC projects in the community and reallocates financial resources to improve the CoC's capacity to end homelessness. The CoC encourages new and existing providers to apply for new projects each fiscal year in accordance with identified community priorities, strategies, and resource

gaps. Chronic underspending or underperformance by a project risks recapture of those funds by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development, making those funds unavailable to the community for use in ending homelessness. Therefore, the CoC has developed this policy to provide rules that govern the process for reallocation.

2. **Definitions**
   a. Chronic Underspending. Chronic underspending occurs when a renewal project that has not already been reallocated fails to expend 90% or more of its grant funds during each of its three most recently closed out grant years prior to the measurement date OR fails to expend 90% or more of its grant funds during each of its second and third completed grant years.
   b. Chronic Underperformance. Chronic underperformance occurs when a renewal project fails to serve 90% or more of the projected number of households during each of its three most recently completed grant years prior to the measurement date OR fails to serve 85% or more of the projected number of households during each of its first two completed grant years, per its APR. Chronic underperformance can also occur when a renewal project does not consistently meet performance benchmarks in the monitoring process.
   c. CoC funding priorities. HUD & local funding priorities identified in the NOFO and by local community data & gaps analyses.
   d. Measurement Date. The measurement date will be the earlier of June 1 of each year or the release date of the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO).
   e. Collaborative Applicant (CA). The CA is the organization designated by the CoC to submit the required CoC application for all projects selected for funding, and to apply for CoC planning funds.
   f. Recipient. A recipient is an organizational member of the CoC that receives HUD CoC funding for a project directly from HUD.
   g. Ranking Committee. A CoC Committee responsible for developing fair and transparent processes and recommending the ranking for projects eligible for funding under the CoC Program and Emergency Solutions Grant Program.

3. **Effective Date**
   This policy is effective as of May 23, 2024

4. **Projects Subject to Reallocation**
   There is no guarantee of on-going CoC funding for any project because HUD wants communities to continually evaluate how best to deploy resources to end homelessness. The annual Notice Of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) is a competitive process, and the CoC Ranking Committee has tools and processes in place to ensure an equitable and transparent review of applications, in accord with community needs and priorities. Renewal projects that are determined to have chronic underspending or underperformance as defined in Section 2. above will be subject to reallocation. Renewal project that do not align with HUD and/or local funding priorities are subject to reallocation. The Collaborative Applicant will notify all projects with chronic underspending and/or underperformance and/or no longer meeting HUD and/or local funding priorities of its intent to reallocate, within 14 business days of the request date. The first year of

a new project will not be included in any calculations related to underspending or underperformance.

5. **Reallocation Amount**

   If there is chronic underspending, the reallocation amount may be the **greater** of the average underspending for the two most recently completed grant years, or ten percent of the annual project funding. When evaluating consolidated projects for reallocation, the average underspending will include the underspending for the projects that have been consolidated.

   If there is chronic underperformance as defined in Section 2. above, but there is no underspending, the Collaborative Applicant, together with the Ranking Committee, may recommend a reallocation amount. History of grant consolidation will be considered when determining a reallocation amount.

   If the calculated reallocation amount is less than $7,500, then no reallocation will be made

6. **Special Reallocation Amount Rules:**
   a. A project that has had its grant amount reduced by the CoC's reallocation policy ("Reallocated Project") will not be subject to reallocation the subsequent year. The following year, the project would be subject to reallocation if there is chronic underspending in the 2 most recently closed out grants. The reallocation amount may be the **greater** of the average underspending for the two most recently completed grant years, or ten percent of the annual project funding.
   b. A reallocated project is not eligible to apply for expansion funds until the completion of its first reallocated grant year.

7. **Voluntary Reallocation**

   Renewal projects that cannot effectively expend all of its funding may choose to relinquish some or all of their funding for the purpose of creating new projects in the community as long as they meet these criteria:
   a. They commit to identify placement for any household that would be displaced as a result of the reallocation.

   Interest in a voluntary reallocation should be communicated by the Renewal Project to the Collaborative Applicant as soon as possible to allow the community to plan for new project applications. Projects that voluntarily reallocate funding will be evaluated for chronic underspending utilizing the grant amount after voluntary reallocation.

8. **Waiver Request**

   A renewal project may request a one-year waiver of the reallocation within 5 business days from the receipt of the reallocation notice under the following circumstances:
   a. The recipient has not been granted a waiver within the last two years, and
   b. The project recipient has a detailed plan in place to fully expend the funds for the current grant year and the drawdown activity for the current grant year can clearly demonstrate

that the grant will be more than 90% expended. AND/OR
c. The project recipient has a detailed plan in place to address chronic underperformance as defined above.

The waiver request should be made to the Collaborative Applicant, and should include at a minimum a detailed corrective spending plan and projections of future drawdown activity. The CA, together with the Ranking Committee, will review the waiver request and make a decision within 5 business days of the waiver request.

9. **Conflicts of Interest**
No member of the Ranking Committee who is associated with a project impacted by this policy may participate in deliberations or vote on any reallocation decision.

10. **How Funds are Reallocated**
If a project has its grant amount reduced because of this Policy, the project budget must be adjusted by the recipient prior to the submission of the NOFO application.
The reallocated funds are included in the NOFO funding amount available for new or existing projects.

The Notice for Letters of Intent, Notice of Project Process Competition, New Project Application Scorecard and Renewal Project Application Scorecard are posted annually by the Collaborative Applicant at: www.charmeckcoc.org

Charlotte-Mecklenburg CoC FY23 NOFO Project Priority Ranking Policies

CoC Board Approved: 05/23/2024

This document provides the policies by which projects seeking funding in the FY2024 Continuum of Care competitions will be prioritized and ranked. These priorities are subject to change based on HUD's funding priorities.

A. **Project Priority Ranking Order**

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Continuum of Care (CoC) is required to prioritize and rank projects applying for Continuum of Care (CoC) funding in the annual CoC competition. Projects seeking renewal or new funding in the FY2024 CoC competition will be prioritized and ranked as follows.

1. The CoC's **renewal infrastructure projects** will be ranked first. Infrastructure projects are defined as dedicated HMIS grants and Coordinated Entry Supportive Services Only (CE-SSO) grants. Renewal CE-SSO project will be ranked above renewal HMIS project as CE-SSO project provides direct services to people experiencing homelessness

   - Projects funded in this section:

Agency	Amount	Activity
Meck County	$63,000	1 CE staff person
	$85,000	1 CE staff person focused on DV survivors
Meck County	$240,000	1 HMIS staff; operating HMIS

2. **Renewal Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects** ranked by overall percentage scored on the renewal application, from highest to lowest.
   - Projects funded in this section:

Agency	Amount	Activity
Meck County: Shelter Plus Care	$2,733,220 $6,620	Scattered Site Rental Assistance Admin
Roof Above: Homeless to Homes Consolidated	$254,475 $5,930 $16,073 $966	Agency Leasing Supportive Services: case management Operating Admin
Supportive Housing Communities: Scattered Site	$287,896 $61,844 $9,783 $33,000	Agency Leasing Supportive Services: case management Operating Admin
Roof Above: Moore Place Expansion	$79,360	Supportive Services: Director, Tenant Engagement Specialist (event coordinator)

3. **Renewal Rapid Rehousing (RRH) projects** ranked by overall percentage scored on the

renewal application from highest to lowest.

- Projects funded in this section

Agency	Amount	Activity
Salvation Army: Families	$167,476	Scattered Site Rental Assistance
	$141,016	Supportive Services case management
The Relatives: Youth	$90,648	Scattered Site Rental Assistance
	$53,042	Supportive Services case management
Roof Above: Youth	$69,552	Scattered Site Rental Assistance
Housing Collab (Ada Jenkins): DV survivors	$307,596	Scattered Site Rental Assistance
	$117,000	Supportive Services case management
	$11,068	Admin
Meck County: DV survivors	$348,084	Scattered Site Rental Assistance
	$90,000	Supportive Services case management
	$13,361	Admin

4. **Renewal projects that have not yet completed one full calendar year** of operations as of May 31, 2024 will be ranked in the following order by how they were ranked in the FY23 priority list:
   a. PSH projects
   - Projects funded in this section

Agency	Amount	Activity
Supportive Housing Communities: Healthcare & Housing	$325,608	Agency Leasing
	$121,280	Supportive Services: case management
Roof Above: The Rise on Clanton (Single Site)	$85,900	Supportive Services: Director, Tenant Engagement Specialist (event coordinator)
	$6,000	Operations
Roof Above: Homeful Housing (Single Site)	$168,200	Supportive Services: Director, Nurse, Tenant Engagement Specialist (event coordinator)
	$8,000	Operations
Carolinas CARE Partnership	$185,328	Agency Leasing
	$249,800	Supportive Services

   b. RRH projects

      c.   TH-RRH projects

5. **New, including expansion project(s)** created via reallocation and/or CoC Bonus that increase the number of subsidies available in the following order by overall project score:
   a. New or expansion PSH LEASING (master leasing) projects
      • Preference for new PSH that will serve families or unaccompanied youth due to increasing number of chronically homeless family & unaccompanied youth households
   b. New or expansion PSH RENTAL ASSISTANCE (scattered site) projects
      • Preference for new PSH that will serve families or unaccompanied youth due to increasing number of chronically homeless family & unaccompanied youth households
   c. New or expansion RRH projects
   d. New or expansion CE-SSO (Coordinated Entry-Support Services Only) projects
   e. New or expansion dedicated HMIS (Homeless Management Information System) projects

6. **New Domestic Violence Bonus projects** that increase the number of subsidies available by overall project score in the following order by overall project score:
   a. New or expansion RRH or Joint TH-RRH (Joint Transitional Housing-Rapid Rehousing) projects
   b. New or expansion CE-SSO projects

B. **Tiebreaking Criteria**

Tiebreakers for ranking policies 3 & 4 (renewal) will be applied in the following order:

1. First tiebreaker: points earned on Length of Time Homeless component
2. Second tiebreaker: points earned on percentage of participants who gained or increased income from entry to exit.
3. Third tiebreaker: points earned on exits to permanent housing component
4. Fourth tiebreaker: the percentage of points earned on component that addresses involving persons with lived experience in the delivery of services

Tiebreakers for ranking policies 5 & 6 (new) will be applied in the following order:

1. First tie-breaker (for PSH, RRH, TH-RRH project applications): Points earned on Housing First Assessment component

2. First tie breaker (for infrastructure projects: Points earned on Project Description component

3. Second tie-breaker (for all applications): Points earned on Equity Factor component addressing under-represented individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ+, etc) in managerial & leadership positions.

C. **Projects Straddling Tier 1/Tier 2**

If a project, once listed in ranking order, straddles the Tier 1/Tier 2 funding line with a portion of the project budget falling within Tier 1 and the remaining within Tier 2, the feasibility of the project to operate with only the Tier 1 amount will be determined as follows:

1. Utilizing the response to the question that asks the impact on the project if it does not receive

full funding, the Ranking Committee will decide whether the project would be feasible & still have impact at the reduced amount. If the committee determines it would be feasible, the project will be submitted as is, straddling the Tier 1/Tier 2 line. If the committee determines it would not be feasible, that project will be dropped down so that it is entirely in Tier 2, and the next ranked project will be moved up. The feasibility of this project will then be determined.

2. If an agency indicates a minimum amount needed to still be feasible exceeding the project's Tier 1 amount, that project will be automatically moved into Tier 2, and the next ranked project will be moved up and the process given in #1 above will then be repeated with the next ranked project.

3. This process will continue until the following are realized:
   a. All Tier 1 funds are allocated; OR
   b. The amount of funds remaining in Tier 1 are a negligible amount. If this occurs, the ranking committee retains the discretion to allocate the remaining funds to another project in Tier 1 that can accept additional funds.

4. If the amount remaining in Tier 1 is of such a small amount that no project indicates it would be feasible at that reduced amount, steps 2 & 3 will not apply, but rather project will be ranked according to their original order

D. Renewal Project Threshold Score

All project applying for renewal funding will be evaluated and scored on a given point scale on the scorecard. In the FY2024 competition, renewal projects must score at least 50% of the points possible to be placed on the project ranking list. Renewal projects that do not score at least 50% will be able to submit an appeal. Projects should anticipate the 50% threshold may increase in subsequent competitions

E. Final Ranking List Review and Recommendation

Following the review, scoring and appeals of renewal & new project applications, a preliminary project ranking list will be developed in accordance with the above priority ranking order. This ranking list, with projects identified by name and type, will be reviewed by the Ranking Committee. The committee will present its final recommended project ranking list to the CoC board in accordance with the timeframe required by HUD. The CoC board will vote to approve the final project ranking list

Renewal Project Appeals

Renewal projects can appeal their project score but may not appeal its placement on the project priority ranking list

Measure	FY22	FY23	FY24 Goal	FY25 Goal	FY26 Goal
NC-505 3-Year System Performance Measure Targets					
1a Length of Time Persons Experience Homelessness ES, SH, TH	Average: 142 Median: 60	Average: 151 Median: 66	Average: 136 Median: 59.5	Average: 122.5 Median: 53.5	Average: 110 Median: 48
1b Length of Time Persons Experience Homelessness ES, SH, TH, PH	Average: 457 Median: 163	Average: 465 Median: 188	Average: 425 Median: 203	Average: 410 Median: 196	Average: 396 Median: 189
2b Returns to homelessness within 2 yrs	19.6%	23%	18.50%	15%	12%
3.1 PIT Count (sheltered & unsheltered)	1,761	1,916	1,859	1,803	1,749
3.2 Annual Count (sheltered)	5,307	5,212	5,083	4,930	4,782
4.1 Increase earned income stayers	5.19%	4.80%	7.75%	9%	10%
4.2 Increase non-cash income stayers	46.3%	40%	44%%	47%%	50%
4.3 Increase total income stayers	49.6%	44%	46%	48%	50%
4.4 Increase earned income leavers	11.6%	7%	13%	17%	20%
4.5 Increase non-cash income leavers	17.5%	44.30%	46%	48.0%	50%
4.6 Increase total income leavers	29.1%	47%	48%	49%	50%
5.1 First Time Homeless ES, TH, SH	3,144	2,870	2,767	2,664	2,560
5.2 First Time Homeless ES, TH, SH, PH	3,515	3,461	3,408	3,355	3,300
7a.1 Positive exits from SO	29%	32%	38.5%	44.5%	50%
7b.1 Positive exits from ES, TH, SH, RRH & PSH, OPH, RRH	35.7%	30%	36%	43%	50%
7b.2 Change in Exit to positive destination & Retention of PSH & OPH	93.1%	94%	95%	96.5%	98%

Meck HMIS GC apprved   *03.06.24*
CoC Board apprved   *04.25.24*