



Wake County CoC Governance Board

Pre-Meeting Packet

October 28, 2021

Contents

SECTION I. CONSENT AGENDA	2
SEPTEMBER 23, 2021 GOVERNANCE BOARD MINUTES	2
SECTION II. BOARD MEETING SUPPORTING MATERIALS	9
COC GOVERNANCE BOARD MEETING MATERIALS	9
COC COMPETITION RANKED LIST	9
<i>List of Projects applying for 2021 CoC Competition</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>2021 Scorecards</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>2021 CoC Competition Project Ranking Appeals Process.....</i>	<i>10</i>
GAPS ANALYSIS- SYSTEM PRIORITIES.....	12
COC SYSTEM INVESTMENT PRIORITIES	12
SECTION III. GENERAL UPDATES	12
FUNDING REVIEW COMMITTEE	12
<i>October 25, 2021.....</i>	<i>12</i>
EHV WORKGROUP	18
<i>October 19, 2021.....</i>	<i>18</i>
STREET OUTREACH WORKGROUP.....	19
<i>October 19, 2021.....</i>	<i>19</i>
CAS COMMITTEE	21
<i>PIT Workgroup October 13</i>	<i>21</i>
DATA ADVISORY COMMITTEE	21

Section I. Consent Agenda

Consent agenda items are voted on as a package. Any Board Member may request to move an item off the consent agenda to be more thoroughly considered. Any such items will be discussed as a regular agenda item at the next Board Meeting.

The following will be voted on at the September 23, 2021 CoC Governance Board meeting:

September 23, 2021 Governance Board Minutes

Posted here: <https://wakecoc.org/governing-board/>

Wake County CoC Governance Board Meeting		
MINUTES	Date: 9/23/2021	Time: 11:00 AM-12:15 PM EST
Topics:	Governance Items, Committee & Workgroup Reports, Partnership/CoC Lead Updates	
Location:	Virtual – Microsoft Teams	
Facilitator:	Marni Cahill, CoC Board Chair & Jenn Von Egidy (RWPEH)	
Board Members Attendance:	Marni Cahill, Allison Strickland, Ann Oshel, Barkley Sample, Chandra Hyacinth, David Harris, Denis Elliot, Edward Barberio, John Niffenegger, Kathy Johnson, Kelsey Mosley, Lamont Taylor, Michelle Mazingo, Natalie Mabon, Nicole Wilson, Wendy Clark	
Interested Parties Attendance:	Amanda Renfroe, Amirah Saintyl, Chelsea Mahoney, , Seth Friedman, Thurston Alexander-Smith, Arlene Smith, Shawn Walker, Jasmine Lee, COBY Guest, Seaira Green, Vanessa Kopp, Katie Ward, Scott Ferris, Diane Cilento, Darlene McClain, Ann, Lakeisha George, SMcKay	
Raleigh Wake Partnership to End and Prevent Homelessness:	Kim Crawford, Jasmin Volkel, Jenn Von Egidy, Allison Sickels, Eric Doll, Crystal Folmar, Chloe Pearson	

	Agenda
1	<p><u>Call to Order</u> (Jenn Von Egidy)</p> <p>1.1 Roll Call</p> <p>1.2 Agenda Overview</p>
2	<p><u>Governance Items</u> (Jenn Von Egidy)</p> <p>2.1 Consent Agenda - time is given to propose any items or edits regarding the following two topics that need approval from the Board.</p> <p>1. Minutes from August 26, 2021 -No objections, approved</p> <p>2. Tosharia Brown added to CAS Committee -No objections, approved</p> <p>2.2 NC ESG Regional Application (Kim Crawford)</p> <p>The CoC lead is preparing to send the application, the goal is tomorrow as the application is due Oct 1. A brief overview of the funding available for application is provided: Fair Share/ Available funding for NC 507 = \$399,175. No more than \$239,505 for emergency response, no less than \$159,670 for housing stabilization. The group is informed that nine organizations completed the Letter of Intent and six organizations submitted Project Applications. It is explained that three independent reviewers, Amanda</p>

Mason, Mariann Priester, and Stephe Travis, reviewed the applications to ensure objectivity. Next, application amounts are displayed in green on a table: Total Eligible: \$399,175, Emergency Services (60% maximum): 209, 505, Housing Stability (40% minimum): \$189,670

The amount allocation is provided in the table below and it is explained that today the CoC Board is asked to approve these numbers to be submitted for consideration in this year's application:

Agency Name	Total
Raleigh Wake Partnership	\$50,000
PLM Families Together	\$115,000
Family Promise	\$61,995
InterAct	\$66,830
Triangle Family Services	\$62,850
Urban Ministries	\$42,500
Total Request	\$399,175

Kathy Johnson asks if a scorecard was used. Kim Crawford explains that scorecard was used and was provided to all organizations before the interviews were held on Sept 9 and 10th. Kathy asks inquires about specific ranking methods and Crawford explains that they were pass/fail and data quality was also a consideration for RRH and shelter projects.

David Harris asks if any agency had to change their original budget request and Crawford responds that this was necessary - in review they found the amount to be well over 60% for ES and SO requests (closer to 80%), thus adjustments were made. It is also explained that organizations had until the 17th to file and submit an appeal, no appeals were submitted, all organizations have until EOB tomorrow to submit all required materials

Allison Strickland announces that she will abstain from voting for this item.

David Harris proposes motion to approve, John Niffenegger seconds this motion and other board members vote in accordance, no objections, this motion is approved, and the applications will be submitted.

Kim Crawford goes on to provide some observations gathered during this application review and explained that Regional Application has Submission Requirements in several areas including: Written Standards, the Coordinated Access System – Coordinated Entry, Evaluation of CAS System, VAWA Policies, Anti-Discrimination, and CoC Policies. She expands on this last criterion and informs we currently have gaps in or written standards, our CoC CAS standards do not meet expectations, CAS committee will have to focus on this during the next year. The state understand our CoC just underwent restructuring and are aware that the CAS Committee will focus on this item during the next year and the committee met for the first time yesterday and were informed of this.

It is also added that all the above policies are available at <https://wakecoc.org/>

David Harris asks if many gaps were found, and Crawford explains that there is a grid that identifies where the gaps are and she will send this out (proposes that it is added to the website as well). She states there may be 4-5 gaps out of 20 and they agree that the committee can resolve this quickly. Also explains that necessary CAS evaluations haven't taken place since before March 2020, an official evaluation must

take place and the CAS committee will be working on this important item as well, the state has been notified.

2.3 Gaps Analysis – CoC Priorities (Kim Crawford)

This analysis has been discussed for two months and the full presentation has taken place twice, the recording is available on the website. Some suggested investments based off of the gaps analysis findings include: Ramp up PSH development (Scattered site and congregate), Continue to secure Affordable Housing, Invest in Rapid Rehousing, invest in flexible rapid exit funds coupled with → Re-purposing existing staff where possible to act as housing/system-focused case managers. It is concluded that where we are closest to meeting needs or may be over-resourced include the areas of Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing.

A table of data is displayed, and Kim Crawford elaborates that HMIS data from 7/2020-7/2021 was analyzed to come to conclusions and make the discussed suggestions. The concept of a system case manager is highlighted, and it is explained that this is a person who works with a household from beginning to end. At this moment, for example, a household first has a shelter case manager who then hands the case off to a RRH case manager and then they are shifted to a new case manager for PSH, for this reason the concept of a system case manager was proposed. Another proposal that is highlighted is to focus on investing in rapid exit funds based on the assumption that many people can solve their homelessness crisis independently or with little intervention, this is a strengths-based approach and data tells us that our CoC would need approx. \$3,000 per household, at 86 households per month, equaling about 3 million dollars to provide this assistance to the community. It is explained that these funds would be best directed to people who don't require case management - access to funding to resolve their situation can help divert them from a long-term crisis. Next, it is explained that the largest gaps lie with RRH, currently there is an estimated need for more than 1,000 units and the community has 300, all PSH beds are being utilized and the community needs an additional 743. Additionally, we currently have 138 EHV's which indicates the need for another 138 affordable housing units that come without barriers (i.e. landlords that accept vouchers and have relaxed criteria for evictions, credit, and criminal background checks). Kim Crawford also adds that TAA is completing a longitudinal study to determine if we need to wait 10 years to allow someone to apply with a criminal background, this is not in effect yet but is being examined. It is again stated that affordable housing refers to housing without the many common barriers previously mentioned.

Kathy Johnson asks about TH capacity and inventory; how do we look at this inventory knowing that its not a HUD priority?

Kim Crawford explains that this data represents the CoC currently and when making recommendations for funders we may not recommend this area knowing that it is indeed not a HUD priority.

The System Priorities for NC 507 CoC are then displayed: Invest in Rapid Re-Housing, Investigate and Invest in flexible rapid exit funding, ramp up PSH development (scattered site and congregate), continue to secure Affordable Housing, re-purpose existing staff where possible to act as housing/system-focused case managers. It is again concluded that where we are closest to meeting needs or may be over-resourced include the areas of Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing.

Kim Crawford further explains these suggestions by drawing an analogy and states that our system is like a bathtub with a small clogged drain while the faucet continues to add more water, explains that in this analogy the community that we serve is the water and the tub is overflowing. In this analogy, these

priorities are Drain-o because what ends homelessness is housing, shelters are a temporary solution but not housing and while the shelters are overflowing, more shelters, or a bigger tub, does not solve the issue of a clogged drain, therefore these investments are proposed – to solve the root of the problem.

David Harris draws attention to the fifth bullet point regarding repurposing existing staff where possible to act as system-focused case managers and opines that it is important to understand that some system-focused case management is already happening, and we should first study how case management is currently being delivered to then make informed recommendations at how we could improve that based on findings.

Kim Crawford agrees that this suggestion is not definitive, agrees that due diligence is necessary and explains that the priority is here to ensure that this observation will happen to then make informed decisions on how to build on that especially leaning on service providers that are already experts in this field.

Marni Cahill agrees that this could be a huge game changer in breaking down barriers for clients and greatly improving workflows among the system. She then proposes a vote for these system priorities, the board approves with none in opposition. Priorities are passed as written.

3 **Committee & Workgroup Reports** (Margaret Cahill)

3.1 Coordinated Access System Committee (Jasmin Volkel)

Members of the committee are: Amanda Renfroe, Arlene Smith, David Harris, Erin Yates, Mary Mosley, Michelle Mozingo, Natalie Mabon, Nicole Wilson, Priscilla Batts, Samantha Weintraub, Tosharia Brown

Jasmin Volkel states that the committee had first introductory meeting yesterday, and goes on to explain the focus and responsibilities of the CAS Committee including: Ensuring fair and equitable distribution of services and resources, regularly reviewing and overseeing the prioritization process, ensuring consumers, providers, and key stakeholders are involved with the prioritization process, ensuring homelessness service providers receive ongoing training and learning opportunities, recommend changes/modifications to the CAS written standards and the policies and procedures, ensuring feedback loops are created for consumers and homelessness system providers, feedback should be presented to the COC Governance Board, and provide oversight of the COC's CAS Lead to ensure compliance with Hud reporting, standards, and expectations.

Meetings are led by the committee but open to the public, so anyone that would like to join can always join. The link to the webpage of the committee is shared where the public may access meeting materials and the link to join: <https://wakecoc.org/coordinated-assessment-system-cas-committee/>

3.2 Data Advisory Committee (Jasmin Volkel)

Members of the committee are: Corey Miller, Emily Downing, Jackie Sapaugh, Kathy Johnson, Liz Lobaton, Thurston Alexander-Smith*, Vanessa Kopp (*will recuse during transition discussion)

Jasmin Volkel goes on to explain the focus and responsibilities of the Data Advisory Committee including: Ensuring data quality is high and in alignment with CoC priorities, to be reviewed at least quarterly, ensuring CoC Victim Service Providers are providing comparable database reports, all Victim Service Provider data should be presented along with HMIS data when possible, ensuring HMIS vendor is sufficient and meeting reporting needs and declines, direct the HMIS Lead on identifying options for vendor changes. Recommends to the CoC Governance Board any potential vendor changes, recommend

changes/modifications to the CoC Governance Board for a formal vote, ensuring HMIS Lead is sufficient in meeting reporting needs and deadlines, ensuring the HMIS Lead is providing sufficient support and training to HMIS users, organizations, and the CoC, recommends training when insufficiencies are identified, and establishing a feedback loop from users on effectiveness of HMIS Lead, Vendor, and data reporting.

Meetings are led by the committee but open to the public, so anyone that would like to join can always join. The link to the webpage of the committee is shared where the public may access meeting materials and the link to join: <https://wakecoc.org/data-advisory-committee/>

3.3 Funding Review Committee (Jenn Von Egidy)

The committee has been meeting and creating the rubric, will be utilizing the HUD Rating & Ranking Tool. The committee is adapting question goals to reflect CoC averages and priorities. The Applicant Worksheet has been posted on the COC NOFA website. This will be a piece of the funding review packages used when reviewing applications and conducting interviews with application to gain a full picture while rating and ranking. The committee will decide if they will go with the ranking list or if adjustments need to be made based on CoC Priorities. The scorecard will be posted online at the beginning of next week and the entire timeline is reviewed and displayed to inform all in attendance:

NOFA Posted August 18

Oct 4: Project Application deadline

Oct 5: FRC meets; scoring materials sent

Oct 6-15: Project Application reviews

Oct 18-20: Scorer interviews

Oct 28: Board votes, notification to applicants, appeals process

Nov 1: Appeals deadline

Nov 12: Collaborative app posted to website; constant contact

Nov 15: NC-507 Submission

Nov 16: HUD's Deadline

3.4 Street Outreach Workgroup (Eric Doll)

The Encampment Policy draft is being finalized by Partnership staff after receiving feedback from workgroup and other experts in the field and this will be sent out to the workgroup imminently. In the last meeting, the Street Outreach agencies expressed interest in expanding mobile access site capabilities. GIS mapping for encampments to organize work continues to be a whether it be through HMIS or a third party software.

3.5 Emergency Housing Voucher Committee (Allison Sickels)

The workgroup continues to meet bi-weekly in between weeks of case conferencing to discuss progress and workflow. Updates on the numbers today are provided: Total EHV allotted: 138. Available: 109. Applicants identified: 43. Applicants applied: 29. EHV issued: 5 (executed voucher and leasing packet sent out) EHV housed: 0

4 Partnership/CoC Lead Updates (Margaret Cahill)

4.1 Ending Homelessness Academy (Jenn Von Egidy)

The Academy is going to wrap up shortly, there are two remaining workshops intended for COC system leads, funders, and Board members. A description of both are provided:

1. Conducting a System Check Up: A Session for Community Leaders, Agency Executives and Funders - Tuesday, October 12, 2:00 P.M. After outlining why a system check-up is so important,

the session examines how shared principles govern the system, the roadmap to ending homelessness, a holistic view of system components, regular monitoring, when a deeper dive is needed for system performance, how to invest in change and spend on impact, and how to apply an equity lens in this part of the work. Register: <https://partnershipwake.org/ending-homelessness-academy/>

2. How to be a high-functioning CoC - Tuesday, October 22, 2:00 P.M. For anyone that is a staff person or board member of a Continuum of Care, this training is designed to help you focus all that you do on being a high-functioning system of care, with remarkable attention to proven practices, and funding decisions that reinforce the desired changes you wish to see in your community. Register: <https://partnershipwake.org/ending-homelessness-academy/>

The group is reminded that pre-registration is necessary and advised to sign up as soon possible if interested in attending. Full Academy details and registration are always available on Partnership website.

Kim Crawford adds that while the community is coming to the end of the NC ESG RFA and in the middle of the CoC Collaborative application she highlights the importance of the second training titled “How to be a High Functioning COC” and further purports that this training may be valuable for all to attend especially when considering funding requirements. Whether receiving funding from that source or not this does affect the entire CoC; how high our CoC scores determines if we can be considered for CoC dollars, she further highlights the importance to recognize and understand they we are all members of the CoC and have a role to play when it comes to impacting performance.

4.2 CoC NOFA Update (Jenn Von Egidy)

How much can we apply for? Jenn Von Egidy presents some numbers and explains each section: Pro Rata Need (HUD defines what we should need) - \$4,816,620, Annual Renewal Demand (this is based off of the application we are allowed to renew each year) - \$3,362,405, Tier 1 - \$3,362,405, CoC Bonus - \$240,831, DV Bonus - \$722,493, Total bonus - \$963,324.

While ranking projects we must use two tiers to determine what will get funding. Tier 1 is considered the “safe” tier knowing that we can at least get annual renewal demand, this funding can be obtained but it is important to consider that after the pandemic we won’t be eligible for that renewal amount. Tier 2 is a less safe tier because it based off our collaborative application which is based on how well our entire system is working together. The higher we score on that application, the more likely we are to receive funding for tier 2. Bonus funding is only available to us if we reallocate 20% of our ARD. DV bonus is only for projects that serve victims of DV, an application will be submitted for DV bonus funding. Just because a project is labeled as a bonus project doesn’t mean it can’t be ranked as a tier 1 project. The committee will determine how we can strategically apply to ultimately receive as much funding as possible. Our CoC has been receiving the same ARD and the only way we can get more money is by getting bonus projects funding – this will boost the ARD for future years and allow us to become a high-performing CoC.

Jen Von Egidy goes on to elaborate the Sections in the Collaborative Application:

CoC Structure and governance: Inclusive structure, coordination, addressing COVID-19, Project Review and Ranking. Data Collection: HMIS Implementation, PIT count, System Performance. Housing and Healthcare bonus points, DV Bonus application.

Lastly, questions are proposed: What do we need from partners? We need to know more about how partners are collaborating across the system Who are you collaborating with? Do you have MOUs or formal agreement? -HUD is looking for formal agreements. To best answer these questions a survey will go out to CoC Distribution list imminently.

4.3 HMIS Updates (Jasmin Volkel)

It is explained to the group that she will outline some concerns that are the focus of the data advisory committee which plans to meet next week. HMIS Needs are identified with the following information: Our CoC uses HMIS software called ServicePoint through our vendor WellSky, responsibilities include ensuring HMIS complies with all HUD reporting requirements, can produce all required federal/state reports by HUD's deadline, can de-duplicate reports for accurate reporting, and has built-in privacy and security controls. Some HMIS Concerns are identified including: This software is managed by our statewide HMIS Lead Agency, Michigan Coalition Against Homelessness (MCAH). Responsibilities include: Ensuring the HMIS meets the needs of the CoC that utilizes it, HMIS governance committee clearly represents the needs of the CoC, Ensure the HMIS vendor is meeting all federal reporting guidelines per contract requirements, Holding vendor accountable if/when vendor is unable to fulfill their contractual responsibilities, ensuring the CoC receives accurate/timely budgets, creation of high quality HMIS trainings.

In conclusion it is stated that to-date WellSky and MCAH have not met their contractual or financial obligations for our CoC. This conversation is ongoing in the committee, all are welcome to join, and the Data Advisory Committee recommends that NC 507 becomes our own HMIS Lead to ensure community needs are always met and find new a software vendor via RFP.

HMIS Sharing Agreements –

This topic is proposed again as many agencies have expressed a desire to join the community. Current sharing agreements (QSOBAAs) are outdated as new agencies want to join our CoC & HMIS. New sharing QSOBAA are needed as new partners join the HMIS database. The HMIS Team will send out new agreements via DocuSign week of September 27th and will include these new agencies: Wake County Public Schools, ACORNS, Under One Roof, St. John's MCC. These documents are shared as a “round-robin”, once one organization signed it will be forwarded to next, and so on and so forth.

Kathy Johnson makes a request as a board member: Is it possible for all board members to receive a packet that includes all meeting materials and supporting documentation that needs to be voted on instead of links to following?

Jenn Von Egidy agrees that his is reasonable, and the request will be met.

Vanessa Kopp makes a suggestion circling back to the topic of system level case management: she states that she has ideas about a qualitative research design that is more rigorous than a program evaluation, further she has colleagues at NC State that would be interested in joining this effort and an IRB to do the research can take time. For this reason, she suggestions prioritizing this item sooner rather than later to ensure adequate time.

	<p>Natalie Mabon adds that she plans to attend the Local Re-entry Council meeting later today and she would like to share information with them on how to become part of the CoC. She inquires what information could be shared with those members to encourage tat they join.</p> <p>Marni Cahill shares that the link to join from the website and the overview information published online is a great starting point.</p> <p>Jenn Von Egidy agrees and suggests that joining a member meeting can be helpful as well to give context on current activities.</p> <p>Marni purports that to keep all informed, any questions, issues, or concerns may be brought up at the Board meeting and stresses the importance to request time in advance to bring these topics to the meeting to ensure ongoing organization. Time may be requested by contacting herself, Jenn, Jasmin, or Kim.</p>
5	<p><u>Adjourn</u></p> <p>5.1 Tabled Items - None</p> <p>5.2 Next CoC Board Meeting – Oct 28, 2021 11:00 AM -12:15 P.M.</p>

CoC Board Materials: https://wakecoc.org/governance-board/	
Next CoC Governance Board meeting: Oct 28, 2021 11:00 AM -12:15 P.M. *Nov and Dec meetings have been moved to 3 rd Thursday to avoid holidays*	

Section II. Board Meeting Supporting Materials

CoC Governance Board Meeting Materials

The agenda, Premeeting packet, slides, and minutes are all posted online! <https://wakecoc.org/governing-board/>

CoC Competition Ranked List

During this section staff will be referencing the list of projects applying for funds, the New and Renewal Scorecards, and the Appeals Policy.

List of Projects applying for 2021 CoC Competition

Applicant Name	Project Name	Project Type	Total Units	Total ARA
Raleigh/Wake Partnership	2021 NC507 HMIS	HMIS	0	\$76,682
Raleigh/Wake Partnership	2021 NC507 HMIS-Expansion	HMIS	0	\$76,418
Wake County Human Services	2-1-2020 to 1-31-2021 Fully Consolidated Wake Rental Assistance	PSH	156	\$2,392,457

Wake County Human Services	2-1-2020 to 1-31-2021 Fully Consolidated Wake Rental Assistance-Expansion	PSH	0	\$93,500
CASA	Families at Home	PSH	0	\$82,976
CASA	Mckinney	PSH	0	\$194,921
Passage Home, INC	Ruth House II - 2019	PSH	9	\$241,299
Raleigh/Wake Partnership	2019 NC507 Rapid Rehousing Community Project	RRH	9	\$171,440
PLM Families Together	Families Together Rapid Rehousing FY2019	RRH	7	\$134,564
Raleigh/Wake Partnership	2019 NC507 SSO - Coordinated Entry	SSO	0	\$68,066
Raleigh/Wake Partnership	2019 NC507 SSO - Coordinated Entry- Expansion	SSO	0	\$100,000
Alliance Health	Wake Healthy@Home	PSH	7	\$159,916
InterAct	DV Bonus Rapid Rehousing Project 2021	RRH	23	\$715,268
Haven House	RRH Homeless Youth 18-24	RRH	4	\$96,679

Total Amount Requested: \$4,604,186

Total Annual Renewal Demand: \$3,362,405

Difference: \$ 1,241,781

2021 Scorecards

The Funding Review Committee adapted the HUD Rating and Ranking Tool to create the Scorecards. Scorecards are posted to the website as PDFs.

- [PSH Renewal](#)
- [RRH Renewal](#)
- [New RRH/PSH](#)
- [New DV Bonus](#)

2021 CoC Competition Project Ranking Appeals Process

The Wake CoC strives to create a fair and transparent process for reviewing and ranking CoC competition project applications. The Funding Review Committee may recommend that some new applications should not be included in the project priority ranking or that some renewal projects should be partially or fully reallocated. To ensure fairness these projects will have the opportunity to appeal the Funding Review Committee's decision.

Who may appeal:

- New applicants whose projects were not included in the Wake County CoC's project priority ranking list

- Renewal applicants whose projects were partially or fully reallocated

How to appeal:

- Applicants must submit a letter on agency letterhead, signed by a director-level position with any relevant supporting documentation by **5:00 P.M. on November 1, 2021**.
- Letters must be emailed as PDFs to jvonegidy@partnershipwake.org
- No appeals will be considered after the deadline.

Appeals must present information that shows the CoC or Funding Review Committee made a clear error, did not follow the advertised process, engaged in discriminatory activity, had a conflict of interest, or the grantee experienced extenuating circumstances, as outlined in more detail below.

The Funding Review Committee will consider each appeal and decide whether to overturn the decision to exclude the project as part of the final application slate on November 2, 2021.

If the Funding Review Committee decides to overturn the decision to exclude the project as part of the final application slate after reviewing appeals, the decision and its reasons must be approved by the Wake County CoC Governance board on November 4, 2021. Raleigh Wake Partnership to End Homelessness staff will email final decisions on appeals to Project Applicant agencies no later than November 5, 2021.

Appeal Decisions:

The Funding Review Committee will carefully review each eligible appeal request. The Funding Review Committee may, but is not required to, overturn its original decision for the Project Applicant filing an appeal in the following situations:

- The Funding Review Committee mistakenly used false or significantly incomplete information to make decisions and additional information presented as part of the appeal letter addresses the deficiencies in the application. The Funding Review Committee will not consider appeals that present information that applicants simply neglected to include in its original application, except in extenuating circumstances, outlined below.
- The deficiencies in the Project Application were due to extenuating circumstances that will not affect long-term viability or performance of the project. For instance, the organization experienced a fire that prevented it from completing the application thoroughly.
- The CoC and/or Funding Review Committee did not follow the competition process as advertised to the CoC or took steps that are not allowed by HUD policy.
- If an appeal is filed that shows a member of the Funding Review Committee has a conflict of interest that affected the Funding Review Committee's decision or a member or members of the Funding Review Committee discriminated against the applicant due to the applicant's race, ethnicity, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, disability, or familial status, the Funding Review Committee must conduct a new full review of the application that does not include the member or members with conflicts of interest or who engaged in discriminatory behavior. This full review does not guarantee the Funding Review Committee's original decision will be overturned.

Gaps Analysis- System Priorities

The Final 2021 Gaps Analysis Report has been posted to the website. CoC Governance Board members will be invited to discuss how to move forward on the elected priorities established from the Gaps Analysis.

Download the 17 page report at: <https://wakecoc.org/2021-gaps-analysis/>

COC SYSTEM INVESTMENT PRIORITIES

- Invest in Rapid Re-Housing
- Ramp up Permanent Supportive Housing development (scattered site and congregate)
- Continue to secure Subsidized/Affordable Housing
- Investigate and Invest in System Case managers
- Investigate and Invest in flexible rapid exit funding

[Back to top](#)

Section III. General Updates

Funding Review Committee

October 25, 2021

Funding Review Committee Meeting Materials: <https://wakecoc.org/funding-review-committee/>

Funding Review Committee

October 25, 2021

Attendance: Rick Miller-Harraway, Amanda Mason, Decorba White, Marni Cahill, Meredith Yuckman, Kim Crawford, Eric Doll, Jenn Von Egidy

Scoring Debrief

- A debrief session will be held separate from today
 - Process modifications
 - Scorecard modifications
 - Discussion of specific scorecard questions will not be entertained today unless it directly effects, and substantially impacts, a project considered for reallocation.

Funding Review Committee Overview

Goals

- Maximize impact on people experiencing homelessness to efficiently and equitably.
- Maximize points on the Collaborative Application
- Maximize funding stewardship in the community and ability to get more funding in the future.

Tier 1

Tier 1 is equal to 100% of the CoC's Annual Renewal Demand: \$3,362,405

HUD will conditionally select new project applications created through:

- reallocation
- CoC Bonus
- renewal project applications
- DV Bonus
 - If a DV Bonus project ranked in Tier 1 is selected with DV Bonus funds, the project will be removed from this tier and the projects below it will move up one rank position.

Tier 2

HUD will select projects in order of point value until there are no more funds available. In the case of a tie, HUD will fund the projects in the order of CoC application score.

Projects Partially in Tier 1

If a project application straddles the Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding line, HUD will conditionally select the project application up to the amount of funding that falls within Tier 1.

- Using the CoC score, HUD may then fund the Tier 2 portion of the project.
- If HUD does not fund the Tier 2 portion of the project, HUD may award the project at the reduced amount, provided the project is still feasible with the reduced funding (e.g., is able to continue serving homeless program participants effectively).

Scoring

Final Scores

Agency	Project	Project Type	Final Weighted Score
<i>Alliance Health</i>	<i>Healthy@Home</i>	<i>PSH</i>	<i>94</i>
<i>InterAct</i>	<i>DV Bonus</i>	<i>RRH</i>	<i>93</i>
<i>Haven House</i>	<i>RRH Homeless Youth 18-24</i>	<i>RRH</i>	<i>93</i>
<i>Wake County Human Services</i>	<i>Fully Consolidated Rental Assistance- Expansion</i>	<i>PSH</i>	<i>85</i>
<i>Wake County Human Services</i>	<i>Fully Consolidated Rental Assistance</i>	<i>PSH</i>	<i>80</i>
<i>CASA</i>	<i>McKinney</i>	<i>PSH</i>	<i>72</i>
<i>Passage Home</i>	<i>Ruth House II</i>	<i>PSH</i>	<i>68</i>

<i>Families Together</i>	<i>Rapid Re-housing-CoC</i>	<i>RRH</i>	<i>64</i>
<i>CASA</i>	<i>Fam at Home/Oak Hollow</i>	<i>PSH</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>Raleigh Wake Partnership</i>	<i>NC507 Rapid Rehousing Community Project</i>	<i>RRH</i>	<i>53</i>

Renewal Applicant Subsections

Agency	Project	Per. Measure 100 points	Serve high need 20 points	Project effect. 30 points	Equity Factors 60 points	Local Criteria 20 points	Total Score 230 points	Weighted Total 100 points
<i>Wake County Human Services</i>	<i>Fully Consolidated Rental Assistance Expansion</i>	<i>87</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>195</i>	<i>85</i>
<i>Wake County Human Services</i>	<i>Fully Consolidated Rental Assistance Expansion</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>183</i>	<i>80</i>
<i>CASA</i>	<i>McKinney</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>165</i>	<i>72</i>
<i>Passage Home</i>	<i>Ruth House II</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>156</i>	<i>68</i>

CASA	Fam at Home/Oak Hollow	37	5	25	53	20	140	61
Families Together	Rapid Re-housing-CoC	54	0	26	56	9	145	64
Raleigh Wake Partnership	NC507 Rapid Rehousing Community Project	45	0	20	47	7	119	53

New Applicant Subsections

Agency	Experience 30 points	Design housing & Support 35pts	Timeliness 10 points	Financial 45 points	Proj. effective 5 points	Equity Factors 70 points	Total Score 195 points	Weighted Total 100 points
Alliance	29	35	7	45	5	62	183	94
InterAct	29	35	7	38	3	70	182	93
Haven House	30	31	9	42	4	66	182	93

Reallocation

The CoC Collaborative Applicant states CoC and DV Bonus Funding determination partly depends on the CoC’s ability to reallocate 20% of Annual Renewal Demand over the last 5 years.

Wake County CoC has reallocated \$75,292 over the last 5 years. 20% of ARD= \$672,481

2021 Reallocation Factors

- Reallocation history
- Performance/Scorecard
- Spending History

CASA's Reallocation History

FY	Project	ARD	Amount Awarded	Amount Reallocated
2016	Aurora Harrington	\$54,066	\$0	\$54,066
2016	Families at Home/Oak Hollow	\$90,246	\$76,246	\$14,000
2017	CASA McKinney	\$195,262	\$188,036	\$7,226

Lowest Performers

RRH Community Project

- Scored 53/100
- Left \$59,462 on the table last 2 FY

Families at Home/Oak Hollow

- Scored 61/100
- Left \$13,601 total on table in last 2 FY

Wake County Human Services History of HUD Recapturing Funds to give to other communities

ARD	FY20-21 Expenditure	Left on the table	FY19-20 Expenditure	Left on the Table	FY18-19 Expenditure	Left on the Table	Total last 3 years
\$2,392,457	\$1,973,860	\$418,597	\$1,757,529	\$634,929	\$1,672,517	\$719,940	\$1,773,466

Ranked List Generated by Score has problems, as New applicants scored much higher than renewals, bumping renewals into tier 2.

CoC Bonus Funding	\$240,831	DV Bonus Funding	\$722,493	Tier 1 (ARD - YHDP)	\$3,362,405	Tier 2 (CoC Bonus)	\$963,324
Allocated	\$296,595	Allocated	\$715,268	Allocated to DV Bonus	\$715,268	Allocated to DV Bonus	\$0
% Allocated	123%	% Allocated	99%	Allocated from Tier 1	\$3,642,568	Allocated from Tier 2	\$933,923
Straddle	-\$55,764	Remaining	\$7,225	Straddle*	-\$280,166	Remaining	\$29,401

*If DV Bonus not selected this will be subtracted from Tier 1

Ranking	Priority Le	Weighted Rating Scc	Renewal, New, Expansion, Reallocate	Grant Number	Project Type	General/DV	Organization Name	Project Name	CoC Funding Requested	CoC Amount Expended Last Operating Year	CoC Funding Recommendation (manual entry)
1	Unspecified	NOT RATED	Renewal	NC0164L4F072011	HMIS	0	Wake County Contin	2021 NCS07 HMIS	\$ 76,682	\$ -	\$ 76,682
2	Unspecified	NOT RATED	Renewal	NC0371L4F072004	- coordinated e	0	Wake County Contin	2021 NCS07 SSO-Coc	\$ 68,066	\$ -	\$ 68,066
3	Unspecified	94	New		PSH	General	Alliance Health	Wake Healthy at H	\$ 199,916	\$ -	\$ 199,916
4	Unspecified	93	New		RRH	DV	The Family Violence	DV Bonus Rapid Re	\$ 715,268	\$ -	\$ 715,268
5	Unspecified	93	New		RRH	General	Haven House	RRH Homeless You	\$ 96,679	\$ -	\$ 96,679
6	Unspecified	85	Expansion		PSH	General	Wake County Housin	2-1-2022 to 1-31-20:	\$ 93,500	\$ -	\$ 93,500
7	Unspecified	80	Renewal	NC0090L4F072013	PSH	General	Wake County Human	Fully Consolidated	\$ 2,392,457	\$ 1,973,860	\$ 2,392,457
8	Unspecified	77	Renewal	NC0089L4F072013	PSH	General	Passage Home	Ruth House Rental	\$ 241,299	\$ 221,547	\$ 241,299
9	Unspecified	72	Renewal	NC0137L4F072012	PSH	General	CASA	McKinney	\$ 194,921	\$ 191,862	\$ 194,921
10	Unspecified	64	Renewal	NC0347L4F072005	RRH	General	Families Together	Rapid Re-housing-	\$ 134,564	\$ 119,924	\$ 134,564
11	Unspecified	61	Renewal	NC0084L4F072013	PSH	General	CASA	Fam at Oak Hollow	\$ 82,976	\$ 78,328	\$ 82,976
Exceeds ARD	Unspecified	53	Renewal	NC0369L4F072004	RRH	General	Wake County Contin	2019 NCS07 Rapid F	\$ 171,440	\$ 135,918	\$ 171,440

Ranking Options:

1. Reallocate Poor Performers & Recapture Funds

- Reallocate RRH Community Project & Families at Home/Oak Hollow
- Recapture unspent Wake Co. Human Services Funds
 - Fund Alliance, Haven House in full
 - Fund viable portion of InterAct
 - Fund System Expansions to SSO-CE, HMIS

2. Reallocate Poor Performers Only

- Reallocate RRH Community Project & Families at Home/Oak Hollow
 - Fund Alliance in full;
 - Funding left not viable for another new project
 - Add SSO-CE Expansion

3. No Reallocation-proceed as we always have

- Fund all Renewals
 - Unable to fund new projects in Tier 1

Need for System-wide expansion since last NOFO

SSO-CE Expansion \$100,000

Our system has gone from 0 to 6 Specialists answering CAS calls, reliving other homeless response providers. Emergency Shelters, especially family shelters, have requested we begin outbound calls to manage system flow into shelter

HMIS \$76,418

- Workload has increased by 66%
- System licenses almost maxed out
- HMIS transition requires increased staff time

Option 1 meets the HUD reallocation goal of 20%

Final Ranked List voting

The committee discussed whether to alternate the ranking so Wake County Human Services' Expansion project was completely in Tier 1 above InterAct. This project is specifically for Supportive services for reentry clients in their current PSH project. Because InterAct scored higher than the Expansion project, the Funding Review Committee voted to move InterAct above the Expansion project 4 in favor; 1 against. RRH Community Project and Families at Oak Hollow were fully reallocated and Fully Consolidated Rental Assistance was reduced to the amount they spent last FY, \$1,973,860.

Ranking	Priority Level	Weighted Rating Score	Renewal, New, Expansion, Reallocate	Grant Number	Project Type	General/DV	Organization Name	Project Name	CoC Funding Requested	CoC Amount Expended Last Operating Year	CoC Funding Recommendation (manual entry)
1	Unspecified	NOT RATED	Renewal	NC0371L4F072004	- coordinated e	0	Wake County Contini	2021 NCS07 SSO-Coc	\$ 68,066	\$ -	\$ 68,066
2	Unspecified	NOT RATED	Renewal	NC0164L4F072011	HMIS	0	Wake County Contini	2021 NCS07 HMIS	\$ 76,682	\$ -	\$ 76,682
3	Unspecified	NOT RATED	New		- coordinated e	0	Wake County Contini	2021 NCS07 SSO-CE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000
4	Unspecified	NOT RATED	Expansion		HMIS	0	Wake County Contini	2021 NCS07 HMIS E	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 76,418
5	Unspecified	94	New		PSH	General	Alliance Health	Wake Healthy at H	\$ 199,916	\$ -	\$ 199,916
6	Unspecified	93	New		RRH	General	Haven House	RRH Homeless You	\$ 96,679	\$ -	\$ 96,679
7	Unspecified	80	Renewal	NC0090L4F072013	PSH	General	Wake County Human	Fully Consolidated	\$ 2,392,457	\$ 1,973,860	\$ 1,973,860
8	Unspecified	77	Renewal	NC0089L4F072013	PSH	General	Passage Home	Ruth House Rental	\$ 241,299	\$ 221,547	\$ 241,299
9	Unspecified	72	Renewal	NC0137L4F072012	PSH	General	CASA	McKinney	\$ 194,921	\$ 191,862	\$ 194,921
10	Unspecified	64	Renewal	NC0347L4F072005	RRH	General	Families Together	Rapid Re-housing	\$ 134,564	\$ 119,924	\$ 134,564
11	Unspecified	93	New		RRH	DV	The Family Violence	DV Bonus Rapid Re	\$ 715,268	\$ -	\$ 715,268
13	Unspecified	85	Expansion		PSH	General	Wake County Housin	2-1-2022 to 1-31-20:	\$ 93,500	\$ -	\$ 93,500

EHV Workgroup

October 19, 2021

EHV Workgroup Meeting Materials are available here: <https://wakecoc.org/emergency-housing-vouchers-workgroup/>

Date 10.19.21
Attendees

Topic Notes

Stats

Total EHV allotted - 138
 # EHV available - 100
 # EHV applicants applied - 38
 # Withdrawal from application process- 1
 # early stage application process [gathering documentation]- 13
 # submitted initial welcome paperwork- 14
 # EHV issued - 11 [executed voucher and leasing packet sent out]
 # of RFTA returned- 1
 # EHV housed - 0
Information on the 37 in application process

Head of Household Gender

22 Male

- 15 Female
- 1 Transgender

household type

- 34 Singles
- 4 Families

Primary race listed for head of household in HMIS

- 24 Black or African American (Non-Hispanic/Latino)
- 14 White (Non-Hispanic/Latino)

Age of head of household

- 4 Between (18-24)
- 17 age 25-54
- 17 55+

income/disability noted

- 14 income listed in HMIS
- 26 disability noted in HMIS

- 1 Veteran

process flow/identified barriers

Assistance request form feedback

RHA finance department will need more information on the landlord/agency that will be paid. First request form has been received and approved, this will help gauge a timeline for the application form. If a landlord will accept a promissory note this is acceptable.

reminder

Next case conferencing 10/21/21

Street Outreach Workgroup

October 19, 2021

Street Outreach Workgroup Meeting Materials: <https://wakecoc.org/streetoutreachworkgroup/>

10.19.21	
Go To Meeting	
attendees	Chloe Pearson, Anna Duggins, Jane Hartley, Brianna Clark, Kennard France, Paige Felton, Elliott Brooks, Renae Lockhart, Wendy Clark, Sheri Abraham, Chelsea Levy, Mia Philips, John Niffenegger, David Harris, Darlene McClain, Amirah Saintyl, Arlene Smith
recap on encampment policy	Sept meeting, rough draft of encampment send out to smaller sub-committee. After meeting it will go out to encampment work group, so that a final draft can be completed.

updates from agencies	
TFS updates	adding on extra staff, (5 new) focusing on consistent schedule when interacting with encampments. Engaging with folks matched to EHV. 2 weeks out with referrals, so in the month of October.
Wendy Clark	540 and Capital engagement in encampment, encampment location near progress energy property [Wake field crossing drive] behind fire station. They have posted no trespassing signs. TFS has tried to engage, he could not locate encampment. Renae shared address with chat. address: 2700 Wakefield Crossing Dr. Raleigh, 27614- behind Fire Station, enter the parking lot of Duke Energy Progress and tents are in the back. Please let me know if you intend to go out
Sheri Abraham (Cary police)	New encampments popping up in Cary: Harrison Oaks behind Embassy Suites. Will be posted by DOT within the next two weeks. There is one behind LaQuinta on Crescent Commons Dr. and near Mainstay Hotel on Buck Jones Rd. please email me at sheri.abraham@townofcary.org for any further information. Elliott [TFS] would like to engage with Cary encampments.
Access Site Capabilities	
Support needed [tech]	ensure phones/tablets can have Hot Spot capabilities. {HH}
	paper forms could be used, not ideal, tablets would be preferred {TFS}
	laptops might be the best interface for service point.
additional HMIS trainings would be needed, emails of those interested:	TFS interested in training for HMIS. Safety/preparation for those utilizing computers while engaging for physical safety.
TFS	attending monthly Access Site meetings
engagement teams [coverage locations]	TFS- Zebulon, Wake Forest, whole County, Haven House- Wake County, ACORNS- City of Raleigh, will assist greater Raleigh area.
Street Outreach engagement with clients	fairly common that outreach members meet clients with hesitance towards assistance, sometimes due to failed expectations in the past. Meeting people where they are and engaging when they choose.

barriers	timeliness with connection to services, covid testing at SWSC providing negative results. When crisis or emergency calls happen intake, enrollments can occur but immediate shelters do not.
----------	--

CAS Committee

Coordinated Access Committee decided to break into 2 smaller workgroups, PIT Workgroup and CAS Policies and Procedures to tackle competing timelines and workloads. For more information: <https://wakecoc.org/coordinated-assessment-system-cas-committee/>

PIT Workgroup October 13

Members: Arlene Smith, Erin Yates, Frank Baldiga, Jasmin Volkel, Jenn Von Egidy, Megan Soros

Ideas for count:

- Smaller activities throughout the week with a big event on Saturday
- Put together gift baskets with smaller items (ex: bus ticket, socks, hand warmers, food gift cards) and including brochures with resources in these baskets; Access Hub has brochures that can be given out as well
- Conduct a survey and towards the end ask questions such as “would you like further assistance; can we contact you?”
- Use Harvester Data App
- Arlene, Frank, and Erin are going to work on seeing what donations they can get; Erin is going to try and get her staff together.
- Need to put together a call to action for donations and volunteers
- Meeting frequency: Bi-weekly with combination of emails and meetings; if unable to meet, will follow-up via email.

Data Advisory Committee

Data advisory Committee has approved the HMIS Transition Request for Proposal. Read the full RFP at <https://wakecoc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/NC-507-HMIS-RFP.xlsx>

The Partnership reserves the right to revise the below schedule at any time and without notice to the respondents.

MILESTONE	TIMELINE
PHASE I	
RFP Issuance	Tuesday, October 12, 2021
Notify Bidders: Post RFP on CoC and/or Partnership website	Tuesday, October 12, 2021
Notify Bidders: Contact via email (10 vendors) - need email example	Tuesday, October 12, 2021
Build RFP Smartsheet	Thursday, October 14, 2021
Compile list of Bidder questions - respond via email or post to website?	Ongoing
Deadline for Clarifications Request	Tuesday, October 19, 2021

DAC Meeting: Share/discuss clarifications at the DAC meeting	Wednesday, October 20, 2021
Incorporate DAC feedback into final clarifications	Friday, October 22, 2021
Send final RFP Clarifications to DAC	Friday, October 22, 2021
RWPEH responds to Bidder clarifications	Friday, October 22, 2021
DAC Meeting: Review Bidder progress	Wednesday, November 17, 2021
CoC Board Meeting: Update on Bidder progress?	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Bidder Proposals Due	Friday, November 19, 2021
DAC gets update on all bids submitted	Monday, November 22, 2021
RFP Coordinator utilizes Phase I Scorecard for completeness to identify Bidders eligible for Phase II	Tuesday, December 7, 2021
DAC gets copy of final Phase I Scorecard	Wednesday, December 8, 2021
DAC Meeting: Make formal recommendation to present to CoC Board Mtg; Select demonstration dates	Wednesday, December 15, 2021
CoC Board Meeting: Vote on recommendations - Vote 1: move forward with HMIS transition; Vote 2 - move forward with DAC Bidder demo recommendations	Thursday, December 16, 2021
RFP Coordinator notifies Bidders if made it to Phase II	Friday, December 17, 2021
Notification of Demonstration Dates (By RFP Coordinator)	Friday, December 17, 2021
PHASE II	
RFP Coordinator schedules demos to be attended by DAC	Friday, December 31, 2021
Demonstrations of Software	January 3-14, 2022
Scoring & Selection Committee scores Bidder during demos	January 3-14, 2022
Scoring & Selection Committee contact former & current references	January 3-14, 2022
Scoring & Selection Committee will score Bidders using the References Scorecard	January 3-14, 2022
Scores are compiled by the RFP Coordinator	January 3-18, 2022
Software Selection	Wednesday, January 19, 2022
Scoring & Selection Committee discusses scores	Wednesday, January 19, 2022
Scoring & Selection Committee makes formal recommendation for a Vendor to CoC Board	Wednesday, January 19, 2022
CoC Board votes to move forward with a new HMIS Vendor	Thursday, January 27, 2022
RFP Coordinator notifies new Vendor of contract award	Thursday, January 27, 2022
RFP Coordinator notifies Bidders not selected of CoC decision	Thursday, January 27, 2022
Contract Negotiations	January - February 2022
HMIS Team works with current and new Vendor on data formatting for migration	January - February 2022
HMIS Team works with new Vendor on training schedule, documentation development, and quality assurance checks	January - February 2022
Data Migration and New System Implementation	February - June 2022

[Back to top](#)