

GOVERNANCE BOARD MEETING MINUTES



Date: 5/21/24

Facilitator: Stephen Gruver

Location: Virtual

Virtual Governing Board Meeting

Stephen Gruver, Chair of the Governance Board, sent an email to the Governance Board that said the following:

Good morning everyone,

I apologize for the late notice, but we are unfortunately going to have cancel the Governing Board meeting this week. In leu of having a board meeting, I wanted to send out a few items for you to consider prior to next month's meeting and 1 item that I would like to request an electronic vote on.

- ***Voted needed:*** *I would like to make a motion that "Governing Board meeting transition to the 2nd Thursday of the month starting in June." It will remain at the same time. This will allow agenda items to go to the Governing Board prior to being presented to membership. It also will allow our Funding Review dates to be a bit more manageable rather than having a month timeline between board and membership meetings. If you have any questions about this, please let me know. If you could please cast your vote by End of Business Friday, May 24th. We will calculate the vote and send out the results first thing Monday, May 27th.*
- *I have attached the Funding Review Committee's approved ESG scorecard and Ranking/Review policy for you to review before the next meeting. You should also expect to see in the next few weeks the Reallocation policy and the local ESG competition timeline.*
- *I have attached a draft Conflict of Interest policy for you to review. We likely can add further clarity into this policy once the transition with Wake County into the Lead Agency is complete. However, we are in need of a reviewed policy to move forward with our funding requirements for ESG and the NOFO.*

Thank you again for all that you do and hopefully you will appreciate the additional hour and a half to your schedule. I look forward to seeing you all today at the membership meeting.

John Niffenegger seconded the motion to move the meeting.

Thanks, Stephen. I will second your motion and vote yay for the Governing Board meeting transitioning to the 2nd Thursday of the month starting in June.

The following individuals voted in support of the vote (by email) –

Danielle Butler:
Vote yay

Wendy Clark:
Yay

Johnnie Thomas:
I vote yes and I will be at home all day tomorrow so if you have a few minutes to spare please call me Stephen.

Kathy Johnson:
I vote yes.

Eric Braun:
Yes.

Nicole Stewart:
I vote yes.

Chandra Hyacinth:
Vote Yes

Richard Averitte:
Yes. Thank you

Nicole F. Wilson:
Vote: Yes

Kelsey Mosely:
Vote Yes

Sheryl Cromedy:
I vote yes

Ann Oshel:
Vote Yay

Barkley Sample:
Vote Yay

Next Meeting

June 10th @ 11 AM

Location TBD



RANKING AND REVIEW POLICY AND PROCEDURE

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires Continuum of Care to rank all projects being recommended for funding into two tiers as part of the Consolidated Application's Priority Listing. Tier 1 is defined by HUD in the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) as a percent of a Continuum of Care's (CoC) Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) approved by HUD. Tier 1 projects traditionally maintain existing funding in the NOFO competition provided the CoC's Consolidated Application is properly submitted and meets the minimum threshold score established by HUD. The amount of funding available in Tier 2 is the difference between Tier 1 and the CoC's ARD plus any amount available for all bonus projects. Tier 2 projects must compete nationally for funding and are therefore at risk of not being awarded.

Renewal projects are those with existing CoC funded grant agreements, as noted on the approved HUD Grant Inventory Worksheet (GIW). New projects are those applying for the first time in a given year. Project applications are ordered from highest to lowest ranking in the CoC's Priority Listing, and in accordance with HUD's two-tier system as outlined in the NOFO.

CoC's that score high enough on their NOFO may be awarded Bonus Funds and/or Domestic Violence Bonus Funds. Both types of Bonus Funds are awarded by HUD based on a competitive national rating and ranking process.

Projects are ranked according to their assigned score in the Priority Listing in two Tiers as outlined below, with the exception of projects supporting the CoC infrastructure (i.e. HMIS, SSO-CE) necessary to maintain the homeless delivery system and first time renewals. These CoC infrastructure projects are often referred to as the CoC's Planning Project. As required by HUD, the CoC's infrastructure projects do not receive a score and are not ranked in the CoC Priority Listing.

Tier 1: Project Ranking

CoC Infrastructure projects are defined as dedicated HMIS grants and Supportive Services Only- Coordinated Entry (SSO-CE) grants. The CoC's renewal infrastructure projects will be automatically renewed and given a rank in the middle of Tier 1 based on the total of applications on the Priority Listing ranked in Tier 1 that maximizes the allowable ARD. Renewal CE-SSO project will be ranked above renewal HMIS project as CE-SSO project provides direct services to people experiencing homelessness.

Projects that are renewing for the first time in the competition, and subsequently have not completed a full project year and have not submitted an APR to HUD will not have a Project Renewal Scorecard. These projects will be automatically renewed and ranked in the middle of Tier 1 based on the total number of applications on the Priority Listing ranked in Tier 1 that maximizes the allowable percentage of the ARD. Fully funding high performing renewal projects by placing them fully in Tier 1 maximizes the amount of funding coming into our community. See the Reallocation Policy to determine handling low performing renewal projects. HUD regulations prevent first year renewals, HMIS or SSO-CE projects from being placed as a straddler in Tier 1 and Tier 2.

Tier 1: Tie Breaking

In the event that two projects earn the same score based on the NC 507 scoring tool, resulting in the same rank/placement on the Priority Listing, the following criteria will apply:

- First Tie-Breaker: CoC Funding Review Committee identifies a project as a priority to meet a community-wide need based on current data (point-in-time count, needs and gaps analysis, system performance measures, e.g.)
- Second Tie-Breaker: The project exceeded the number of households served from the previous grant year.
- Third Tie-Breaker: The project with the highest percentage of project participants who exited to permanent housing.
- Fourth Tie-Breaker: The project with the highest percentage of project participants with increased income or benefits.

Tier 1/Tier 2: Project Straddling

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 viability of a project to operate with only the Tier 1 amount will be determined by the CoC Funding Review Committee taking into account the feasibility of operating the project with reduced funds, community need (reduced outcomes), and maximizing the percentage of Tier 1 funding available to the CoC. The Funding Review Committee may continue to evaluate all Tier 1 low ranking projects until a viable project for Tier 1/Tier 2 straddler is identified.

Tier 2: Project Ranking

Renewal projects will be ranked in Tier 2 according to their overall project score. If applicable, new and Expansion Projects created from reallocated funding may be ranked higher than renewals placed in Tier 2. The CoC Funding Review Committee may take into account the project's positive impact on the community, whether the renewal project had fund recaptured, and the percentage of the ARD left in Tier 2 funding that is available to the CoC. Because CoC Bonus Project and DV Bonus Project applications must compete nationally for funding they are ranked according to scores chronologically, below renewal and reallocated projects. If a Bonus Project is ranked higher than a renewal or reallocation project the community risks losing part of the ARD while also not guaranteeing that Bonus funds will be awarded to our community. In order to maximize the potential

funding coming into the community Bonus projects will be ranked below renewal and reallocation projects.

Tier 2: Tie-Breaking

In the event that two projects earn the same score based on the NC 507 scoring tool, resulting in the same rank/placement on the Priority Listing, the following criteria will apply:

- First Tie-Breaker: The project emphasizes HUD priorities as outlined in the NOFO.
- Second Tie-Breaker: CoC Funding Review Committee identifies a project as a priority to meet a community-wide need based on current data (point-in-time count, needs and gaps analysis, system performance measures, e.g.)

North Carolina Emergency Solutions Grant F

Applicant Ac

NC-507 Raleigh

Applicant Information
Applicant
Proposed ESG Activity(s)
Staff (Reviewer) Name
Reviewer Score
Funding Request:
Other Reviewer Comments, Recommendations, or Conditional Requirements

Organizational Capacity and Financial Stability	Source of Information	Allowable Points	Points Received	Comments
Organization is eligible subrecipient of ESG funding and the proposed activities will serve Wake 507 CoC?	Project Application: Section 1- Organizational Information	yes 5 / no 0 (If No- Applicant is Ineligible)		
Organization's mission, vision, and values are consistent with homeless programs service and housing delivery?	Project Application: Section 1	up to 5		
Organization has experience in ESG contract requirements, reporting, invoice requirements and expended all ESG funds in prior FY? If no experience, Organization clearly details financial oversight and contract and invoicing experience?	Project Application: Section 2- Financial Capacity Q. 3	up to 5		
Organization has sufficient operating funds to pay ESG eligible expenses and request reimbursement from the NC ESG Program 45 days after the last day of the billing month?	Project Application: Section 2- Financial Capacity	yes 5 / no 0		
Organization has experienced paid staff, specifically for the ESG program, and utilizes community volunteers partners in some capacity to support funded activities?	Project Application: Section 2- Organizational Staff Capacity	up to 5		
Organization describes how it will monitor activities to ensure ESG compliance and how ESG funds will be applied and tracked against specific activities.	Project Application: Section 2- Organizational Capacity and HUD Compliance Q. 3	up to 5		
Organization's most recent financial audit, including management letter, showed no findings and if findings or concerns, a clear corrective action plan?	Project Application: Section 2 Q. 5 and Organizations Financial Audit	up to 5		
Board/Staff Capacity and Diversity and Equity	Source of Information	Allowable Points	Points Received	Comments
Organization's Board of Directors have persons with lived experience of homelessness or a plan to add persons with lived experience?	Project Application: Section 2- Board Capacity Q. 1	up to 5		
Organization provides training to homeless service staff outside of NC ESG offered trainings than inform and support the proposed activities?	Project Application: Section 2- Staff Capacity Q. 4	up to 5		
Organization employs persons with lived experience of homelessness. If no, organization explains whether or not organization plans to employ persons with lived experience?	Project Application: Section 2- Staff Capacity Q. 5	up to 5		
Organization's Board of Directors and staff are representative of the demographics, special sub-populations, including racial and ethnic populations, that are served in the community?	Project Application: Section 2- Board and Staff Capacity	up to 5		
Organization strives to educate and develop board and staff about issues of racial equity, implicit bias, cultural competence, diversity, and inclusion?	Project Application: Section 2- Capacity to Address Racial Equity/Diversity Q. 2	up to 5		
Organization works to solicit, honor, and utilize input from the voices of those most affected by homeless services and includes program participants and individuals with lived experiences in decision making?	Project Application: Section 2- Capacity to Address Racial Equity/Diversity Q. 4	up to 5		
Street Outreach	Source of Information	Allowable Points	Points Received	Comments
Applicant describes how outreach and engagement is conducted, including participant eligibility and how referrals are made, participants engaged or denied services, and how often outreach will be/is conducted?	Project Application-Outreach: New-Q. 4- 5 (Returning- Q. 4 and 6)	up to 5		
Applicant describes Housing First approach and philosophy aligns with HUD best practices and NC 507 Written Standards?	Project Application-Outreach: Q.4-5 and Agency Operations Manual and Wake Housing First Assessment	up to 5		
Applicant has experienced and qualified staff for ESG program and staff to program participant ratios support best practices in service delivery?	Project Application-Outreach: Q. 7	up to 5		
Applicant clearly describes Coordinated Entry utilization and partnerships to ensure shelter access, services, and housing placement in the community?	Project Application-Outreach: Q. 8 and 9	up to 5		

Emergency Shelter Applicants	Source of Information	Allowable Points	Points Received	Comments
Applicant clearly describes eligibility requirements, low barrier approach and reasons, if any, for denial of access to emergency shelter?	Project Application-ES: Q. 4	up to 5		
Applicant clearly describes experience implementing emergency shelter and support services?	Project Application-ES: New Q. 7; (Returning Q. 6)	up to 5		
Applicant has experienced and qualified staff for program and staff to program participant ratios support best practices in service delivery?	Project Application-ES: New Q. 7; Returning Q. 6	up to 5		
Applicant clearly describes connection to Coordinated Entry (CE), Rapid Re-Housing and Permanent Supportive Housing programs and describes plan to ensure/improve exits to positive destination for program participants?	Project Application-ES: New Q. 8 and 9; Returning Q. 7 and 8	up to 5		
Housing Stabilization Applicants	Source of Information	Allowable Points	Points Received	Comments
Applicant clearly describes how it will utilize a Housing First approach including: 1) eligibility criteria 2) process for accepting new clients 3) process and criteria for exiting clients 4) process and criteria for termination of assistance?	Project Application: RRH/HP Q.4	up to 5		
Applicant clearly describes organizational experience in operating housing assistance program?	Project Application: RRH/HP New Q. 7; (Returning Q. 6)	up to 5		
Applicant clearly describes how landlord engagement and retention is achieved and how staff address issues that arise with participant or landlord in securing and maintaining housing?	Project Application: New RRH/HP Q.10; (Returning Q. 9)	up to 5		
Applicant clearly describes progressive approach to financial assistance that adjusts to each households specific needs in determining duration/amount of financial assistance provided and tenant contribution, if any.	Project Application: RRH/HP New Q.11; (Returning Q. 10)	up to 5		
Data Collection (HMIS/Comparable Database)	Source of Information	Allowable Points	Points Received	Comments
Applicant clearly describes how they will ensure compliance with HUD data requirements, including staffing, timely data entry, and data quality standards. (CoC HMIS system or comparable database).	Project Application: Section 3-New Q. 3; (Returning Q. 2) HMIS Application Q. 4 and 5	up to 5		
Applicant clearly describes how ESG funding will contribute to the collection and analysis of data?	Project Application: Section 3 and Application HMIS: Q. 4	up to 5		
Project Description and Agency Policies	Source of Information	Allowable Points	Points Received	Comments
Applicant clearly describes work to ensure housing stabilization and/or positive exit outcomes for program participants.	Project Application ES and Outreach: Q. 10 Housing Stabilization-New Q.12; Returning RRH-Q. 9 and HP Q. 11	up to 5		
Applicant currently participates in Wake CoC's Coordinated Entry System?	Project Application: Activity Application Q. 5 and Wake CE records	yes 5 / no 0		
Applicant's Operations Manual aligns with HUD requirements and NC 507 Written Standards.	Project Application: Section 2, Project Application Q. 5, and Operations Manuals	up to 5		
Applicant's policies and services improve safety for person fleeing Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault and Stalking Survivors. Agency follows/will follow NC 507 VAWA Emergency Transfer Plan.	Project Application: Narratives and Operation Manuals- VAWA/ET policy and Emergency Transfer Plan	yes 5/ no 0		
Applicant provides specific ways ESG funds will be utilized, including if project is contingent on other funding, how project be sustained.	Project Budget; Activities New Q.5 and 6 (except HMIS/Comparable Q.3)	up to 5		

Continuum of Care	Source of Information	Allowable Points	Points Received	Comments
Organization's attendance is at least 75% of CoC meetings and/or workgroups?	Project Application: NC 507 meeting minutes/committee participation	up to 5		
Organization demonstrates effective community partnerships and collaborations to maximize program impact to meet community needs.	Project Application: Section 2 and Activities Description New Q. 8 and 9; (Returning Q. 7 and 8)	up to 5		
Organization offers evidence to demonstrate that it meets an existing gap in the continuum of services and facilitates access to mainstream resources?	Project Narratives, NC 507 Priorities/Needs and APR if applicable	up to 5		
NC 507 Additional Questions	Source of Information	Allowable Points	Points/Response	Comments
Organization's HMIS or comparable database software will meet ESG reporting and HUD requirements?	Project Application: Section 3 - New Q.1-2 (Returning Q. 1)	yes 5 / no 0		
Organization clearly describes how participant records and PII are kept confidential and the procedures align NC 507 Written Standards?	Policies and Procedures/Operations Manual	up to 5		
Organization has/had no HUD or ESG monitoring findings, resolved or unresolved, within the past 5 years?	Project Application: Section 2- Organizational Capacity to Meet HUD Guidelines Q. 1-2	up to 5		
If current recipient, met quarterly requisition requirement and Project spent at least 50% of funds awarded in current grant cycle by end of 2nd Qt. in 2024? If not current subrecipient, agency has experience with similar homeless service or housing activities and/or HUD funded programs and has timely expenditures?	Project Application: Section 2-Financial Capacity and/or NC ESG Spending Report	yes 5 / no 0		
Bed Utilization Rate (except Street Outreach).	2024 Housing Inventory Count (HIC)	% of bed utilization		
Total number of Persons projected to be served by Project Activity.	Project Application: Crisis Response- New Q. 10; Ret. Q. 9; Housing Stabilization - New Q.12; Ret. Q.11	N/A		
Population served by this project type?	Project Application: Q. 2-3 for each corresponding activity except HMIS	N/A		
Percent of funding requested for Supportive Service Costs.	Project Application: Activities Budget and New Q. for 6 each corresponding activity	N/A		
TOTAL POINTS			0. Points	
Scoring Guidelines				
5 Points= Complete, insightful, and value added response. The Applicant provided a complete response to the question indicating mastery of the topic, answered all question components required and demonstrates innovative application of cutting edge approach(es) that may set a best practice standard.				
4 Points= Clear, complete, and detailed response. The Applicant response reflects a robust understanding of salient topics and application of accepted best practices.				
3 Points= Complete Response. The Applicant provided a thorough response and answered all question components.				
2 Points= Acceptable Response. The Applicant answered the question with enough detail to compare the answer to other responses. The response answers a majority but not all of the question components.				
1 Point= The Applicant failed to answer the basic components of the question, the answer was confusing or misleading, or the information provided does not allow for a comparison to other responses.				
0 = The Applicant failed to provide a response to the question.				



Conflict of Interest Policy

Wake Continuum of Care Members

No member may participate in or influence discussions and/or decisions concerning the award of a grant or other financial benefits to the organization that the member represents or to themselves as individuals. Therefore, any individual participating in or influencing decision making must identify actual or perceived conflicts of interest as they arise and comply with the letter and spirit of this policy. Disclosure should occur at the earliest possible time and if possible, prior to the discussion of any such issue. Individuals with a conflict of interest should abstain from discussion and voting on any issue in which they may have a conflict. A Conflict of Interest Policy will be approved by the Continuum of Care annually.

In addition to complying with [24 CFR 578.95](#) and all other applicable state and federal law, the following Conflict of Interest Policy shall apply to all Wake County NC 507 Continuum of Care members, including the Board of Governors and Funding Review Committee.

Article I – Purpose

1. The purpose of this CoC membership conflict of interest policy is to protect the Wake Continuum of Care (CoC) and to emphasize the Wake CoC's commitment to the highest standards of integrity, fairness and conduct so as to ensure the maximum public trust.
2. This policy is intended to supplement, but not replace, any applicable state and federal laws governing conflicts of interest applicable to nonprofit and charitable organizations.
3. This policy is also intended to identify "independent" members.

The Wake CoC Member Conflict of Interest Policy **applies to all CoC Members** (inclusive of Voting Members, CoC Board Members and Committee Members). In their activities on behalf of and in their dealings with the CoC it is the responsibility of each CoC Member to avoid any actual conflict of interest and the appearance of a conflict of interest. Each person to whom this policy applies must be free of any activity, association or investment which might influence, or give the appearance of interfering with, the independent exercise of his or her judgment in conducting the CoC's activities or in dealing with the CoC.

Article II – Definitions

- 1) **Interested person** – Any CoC Member who has a direct or indirect financial interest, as defined below, is an interested person.
- 2) **Conflict of Interest** - A conflict of interest may exist when the interests or activities of any member, director, or officer may be seen as competing with the interest and activities of the CoC; when the member, director or officer, derives a financial or other material gain as a result of a direct or indirect relationship. Such conflicts are presumed to exist in those circumstances in which a member or director’s actions may have a preferential impact upon the agency or entity employing the member or director. Such actions are presumed to include, but are not limited to, the development of policies in which a self-serving bias may be present as well as in decisions affecting the allocation of resources. Members of the Wake Continuum of Care (Voting Members, Committee Members, and/or Board Members) may not participate in decisions concerning awards of grants, provisions of financial benefits to such member or the member’s organization or implementing corrective actions as a result from CoC Collaborative Applicant monitoring activities of CoC and ESG activities. They must excuse themselves from the decision-making process.
- 3) **Financial interest** – A person has a financial interest if the person has, directly or indirectly, through business, investment, or family:
 - (a) An ownership or investment interest in any entity with which the CoC has a transaction or arrangement.
 - (b) A management position in any entity which has a financial interest, such as serving on the Board of an organization with a financial interest in the CoC;
 - (c) A compensation arrangement with the CoC or with any entity or individual with which the CoC has a transaction or arrangement; or
 - (d) A potential ownership or investment interest in, or compensation arrangement with, any entity or individual with which the CoC is negotiating a transaction or arrangement.
 - ii) Compensation includes direct and indirect remuneration as well as gifts or favors that are not insubstantial. A financial interest is not necessarily a conflict of interest. A person who has a financial interest may have a conflict of interest only if the Board decides that a conflict of interest exists, in accordance with this policy.
- 4) **Independent member** – A CoC Member shall be considered “independent” for the purposes of this policy if he or she is “independent” as defined in the instructions for the IRS 990 form or, until such definition is available, the member:
 - (a) Is not, and has not been for a period of at least three years, an employee of the CoC or any entity that has a financial interest with the CoC;
 - (b) Does not directly or indirectly have a significant business relationship with the CoC, which might affect independence in decision-making;
 - (c) Is not employed as an executive of another corporation where any of the CoC’s Board members serve on that corporation’s compensation committee; and

- (d) Does not have an immediate family member who is an executive officer or employee of the CoC or who holds a position that has a significant financial relationship with the CoC.

Article III – Procedures

- 1) Duty to Disclose** – In connection with any actual or possible conflict of interest, an interested person must disclose the existence of the conflict and/or financial interest and be given the opportunity to disclose all material facts to the Board.
- 2) Recusal of Self** – Any CoC Member has a duty to recuse himself or herself at any time from involvement in any decision or discussion in which the member believes he or she has or may have a conflict of interest, without going through the process for determining whether a conflict of interest exists. Voting Members of the Wake Continuum of Care should recuse themselves from any decision. Committee Members and Board Members should recuse themselves from any discussion and decision.
- 3) Determining Whether a Conflict of Interest Exists** – The Board shall review all Conflict of Interest Annual Statements to determine whether a conflict of interest exists. The Board shall notify each member of the CoC to review the conflict.
- 4) Violations of the Conflicts of Interest Policy**
 - a) If the Board has reasonable cause to believe a CoC Member has failed to disclose actual or possible conflicts of interest, it shall inform the member of the basis for such belief and afford the member an opportunity to explain the alleged failure to disclose.
 - b) If, after hearing the member’s response and after making further investigation as warranted by the circumstances, the Board determines the member has failed to disclose an actual or possible conflict of interest, it shall take appropriate disciplinary and corrective action.

Article IV – Records of Proceedings

The minutes of the Board shall contain:

- 1) The names of the persons who disclosed or otherwise were found to have a financial interest in connection with an actual or possible conflict of interest, the nature of the financial interest, any action taken to determine whether a conflict of interest was present, and the Board’s decision as to whether a conflict of interest in fact existed.
- 2) The names of the persons who were present for discussions and votes relating to the transaction or arrangement, the content of the discussion, including any alternatives to the proposed transaction or arrangement, and a record of any votes taken in connection with the proceedings.

Article V – Annual Statements

- 1) Each CoC Member (inclusive of Voting Members, CoC Board Members and Committee Members) shall annually sign a statement which affirms such person:
 - a) Has received a copy of the conflict of interest policy;
 - b) Has read and understands the policy; and
 - c) Has agreed to comply with the policy.
- 2) Each Member of the CoC shall annually sign a statement which declares whether such person is an independent member.
- 3) If at any time during the year, the information in the annual statement changes materially, the CoC Member shall disclose such changes and revise the annual disclosure form at the earliest opportunity.
- 4) The Board shall regularly and consistently monitor and enforce compliance with this policy by reviewing annual statements and taking such other actions as are necessary for effective oversight.

VI – Exceptions and Changes to Policy

The CoC reserves the right to make an exception to this policy and procedures based on communication from HUD that impact the CoC's ability to carry out the policy and procedures as described above. The CoC also reserves the right to amend this policy on an annual basis.