

**SOUTHERN NEVADA HOMELESSNESS CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
September 7, 2017**

In attendance: Erin Kinard, Co-Chair, Health Care Provider, Nevada Behavioral Health
Meg Pike, Co-Chair, School District, Clark County School District
Emily Lewis, Co-Vice Chair, Alternate, City of Henderson
Shalimar Cabrera, Co-Vice Chair, Veteran Service Provider, U.S. Vets-Las Vegas
Amie Duford, Touro University Nevada
Arash Ghafoori, Social Service Provider, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth
Christy Shannon, Social Service Provider, S.A.F.E. Nest
Dawn Davis, Social Service Provider, Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada
David Slattery, Emergency Medical Services, Las Vegas Fire and Rescue
Donna Jordan, Mental Health Provider, Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health
Emily Paulsen, Advocate, Nevada Homeless Alliance
Henry Sneed, Faith-Based, The Church LV
Julie Calloway, Government, City of Boulder City
Kenadie Cobbin Richardson, Alternate, Workforce Investment, Workforce Connections
Laure Raposa, Public Housing Authority, Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority
Leone Lettsome, Alternate, Government, City of North Las Vegas
Mandy Martin, Business, Las Vegas Sands
Mel Frailey, Law Enforcement, Las Vegas Metro Police Department
Melissa Clary, Advocate, Huntridge Neighborhood Association
Michael Pawlak, Government, Clark County Social Service
Monica Gresser, Business, Brazen Architecture
Peter McCoy, Veteran Service Provider, VA Community Resource and Referral Center
Takiyah Butler, EFSP Board, United Way of Southern Nevada
Troy Oglesbee, Faith-Based, Save A Life

Absent: Jesse Robinson, Homeless or Formerly Homeless
Kena Adams, Advocate, Moapa Band of Paiutes
Kevin Sharps, Affordable Housing, Nevada HAND
Michael Johnson, University, UNLV
Siloh Moses, Homeless or Formerly Homeless, Serving Hope LV
Stephen Harsin, Government, City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item 1. Call to order, notice of agenda compliance with the Nevada Open Meeting Law.

A meeting of the Southern Nevada Homelessness Continuum of Care Board was called to order at 2:09 p.m., on Thursday, September 7, 2017, at United Way of Southern Nevada, 5830 W. Flamingo Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89103. The agenda was duly posted in compliance with the Nevada Open Meeting Law requirements.

Agenda Item 2. Public Comment.

Erin Kinard, Healthcare Provider, a quick reminder for the board members, please make sure that you are signing in on the board member sign in sheet. We want to make sure that all of the board members that are present are captured in the minutes and their attendance is recorded accurately. Also your microphones are on so please remember that if you're going to engage in any side conversation, it will be recorded.

Agenda Item 3. Approval of the Agenda for September 7, 2017; for possible action.

A motion was made to approve the agenda excluding agenda item number 6. The motion was approved.

Agenda Item 4. Approval of the Minutes from the August 10, 2017 meeting; for possible action.

A motion was made to approve the minutes from August 10, 2017. The motion was approved.

Agenda Item 5. Update by co-chairs on recent activities of the Steering Committee; for possible action.

No updates were received.

Agenda Item 6. Hear and render decisions on appeals from applicants on the recommendations for funding for the local 2017 Continuum of Care competition per the Scoring and Ranking Policies and Procedures; for possible action.

Item excluded

Agenda Item 7. Approval of recommendations for funding for the local 2017 Continuum of Care competition and authorize the collaborative applicant to make necessary modifications for final application submission to U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD); for possible action.

Catherine Huang Hara, Clark County Social Service, presented an overview of the 2017 HUD Continuum of Care Consolidated Application Recommendations process. You have the slides that are also in your packet as well as another handout that shows the scoring and ranking that was separate from the packet. Local Application Timelines: On May 5th we released the local application on zoom grants. On May 9th and July 26th we had mandatory technical assistance training with the potential applicants to give them information about what the application was eligible to apply for. We also updated any noteworthy items that came up in the notice of funding availability that was released by HUD on July 14th. On August 13th local applications were due in zoom grants. We had scoring and ranking last Wednesday on August 30th and later that evening after the scoring and ranking concluded the recommendations were posted on our website helphopehome.org. We had an option for appeals for any organization that felt that their scoring and ranking is deemed unfair to them were able to submit an appeal. We had appeal hearings yesterday, and you are receiving the recommendations of the board today.

The NOFA includes four policy priorities, which include ending homelessness for all persons; creating a systemic response to homelessness; strategically allocating, and using resources and a housing first approach. Overall, there's approximately \$2 billion available for CoC funding nationally. There is a strong emphasis on system performance. The same tiering and selection process was still in play for this year. As long as we still have tier 1, which has 94% of our annual renewal demand allocated to that tier, and the rest would be put into tier 2. The deadline for the application is on the 28th. New for 2017: The permanent housing bonus is slightly larger at 6% of the annual renewal demand and we have two new project types. We have a dedicated plus project and a joint TH-RRH, which we covered in the presentation a couple of months ago. There are slightly more projects protected in tier 1 and tier 2 scoring in national competition no longer considers project type. It used to be you had to score in a certain order, but now you do not have to do that kind of rank order. Strategies for Success: We want to utilize a performance scorecard for ranking, which we did do. We want to use intervention appropriate metrics to measure system performance, which we now as a CoC do, as well as do our reporting to HUD data exchange, which captures all of that data. We utilize a transparent coordinated entry system which we have been doing for the last 3 years as well as we will be onboarding our additional subpopulations in the next couple of weeks. The strategy is to reallocate from underutilized or ineffective projects. We want to thoroughly review every local application or every project application. We also want to prioritize admission to turn over PSH units to chronically homeless individuals that's a permanent supportive housing bed. If that gets turned over or someone leaves that program we still prioritize a chronically homeless person to fill that bed until we do not have any more chronically homeless people in our community. We also want to use housing first and leverage other resources such as Medicaid for supportive services. We also want to prioritize planning and data gathering in the CoC process, which we did do as well. Reallocation: The importance of reallocation is to reallocate whenever it would reduce homelessness to be able to reallocate funding and increase resources for housing would be part of that emphasis. We want to use CoC approved scoring criteria and selection priorities and review transitional housing projects for cost effectiveness and performance in ending homelessness. Scorecard Components: Every project had been evaluated on their application score. The score for the application that was submitted to zoom grants was scored by the members of our scoring and ranking team and a performance monitoring score. They had the opportunity to undergo a desk audit with our monitoring working group, which includes some elements such as participant eligibility, to make sure that was in line with what their application was supposed to cover utilization and spending down of their funding. On the sample scorecard you can see there's an application score, which has the percentage ranking for that particular sample project, a monitoring tool score and the outcomes total which is an average. The performance monitor score has 25 maximum points per section, that adds up to the 100%. Ranking/Recommendations: We receive the application as a collaborative applicant. We had the scoring and ranking teams score the applications and we have the scorecard information available. We want to follow HUD policy and priorities, and the guidance from the NOFA and we also want to take in account some local needs, rank the projects and then again bring the recommendations the board. 2017 Funding and Requests: The annual renewal demand (ARD) was at \$12,968,681. For tier 1, 94% of ARD is \$12,309,527. For tier 2, which includes the annual renewal demand plus the housing bonus minus tier 1 is \$1,571,430. The permanent housing bonus which gives an opportunity to apply for new projects, specifically geared towards permanent housing can include permanent supportive housing and TH-RRH or rapid rehousing projects. The permanent housing bonus is \$785,715. We had a total of 30 project applications that were eligible for scoring and ranking at \$13,880,957.

Will Reed, Nevada 211, stated that the funding recommendations that was provided by the scoring and ranking team of the actual scores in the order that they were ranked. Tier 1 Recommendations: CCSS - HMIS Expansion \$504,900, WestCare – Safe Haven \$329,612, Safe Nest - Operation Fresh Start (Bonus) \$270, 636, LSS - Welcome H.O.M.E. \$285,988, US Veterans Initiative – Chronically Homeless Maintenance 2 \$218,487, SNCF – A place called home \$193,208, US Veterans Initiative – Chronically Homeless Maintenance 1 \$167,645, US Veterans Initiative – Permanent Housing Vets with Disabilities \$120,781, NPHY – NPHY Independent Living \$226,210, HELP of SN – Shannon West Homeless Youth \$210,282, CCSS – Healthy Living \$565,540, US Veterans Initiative – Permanent Housing Vets with Disabilities 2 \$662,933, US Veterans Initiative – Vets in Progress \$122,854, The Salvation Army – Housing the Homeless \$269,754, HELP of SN – HELP them HOME expansion \$324,970, HopeLink of SN – HomeLink \$362,446, St. Judes Ranch – Crossings \$344.6 10, HELP of SN - A New Start \$583.793, HELP of SN - HELP them HOME \$407,980, NCF - Moving Forward \$175.107, CCSS - New Beginnings \$1.380,976, CCSS - STAR TH-RRH 1 – Bonus

\$515,079, CCSS - STAR TH-RRH 2 – Reallocation \$1,060,353, CCSS - STAR – Reallocation \$1,601,349, SNAMHS – Stepping Stones (Straddling Tiers) \$1,404,034. Tier 2 Recommendations: SNAMHS – Stepping Stones (Straddling Tiers) \$104,870, St. Jude's Ranch – Crossings \$327,575, CCSS – Keeping Families Together 2 Reallocation \$581,229, SNAMHS – Dual Success \$412,553, SNAMHS – Families First \$100,328, SNCF – Paradise \$44,875. Reallocated Renewal Projects: CCSS – Clark County FUSE 2015 Bonus Project \$1,322,339, CCSS – Keeping Families Together 2015 Bonus Project \$255,784, CCSS – The VIVO Housing Project 2014 Bonus Project \$1,601,349, The Shade Tree – Housing Opportunities Mean Empowerment \$195,200, SNCF – Paradise (Involuntary Partial Reallocation) \$195,834. Total Reallocations is \$3,568,506. Bed Counts – Renewal Projects: Permanent Supportive Housing 666 beds, Rapid Rehousing 187 beds, Transitional Housing 187, and Safe Haven 25 beds as well as our HMIS Expansion project renewal. New Projects: Permanent Supportive Housing 120 beds, Rapid Rehousing 167, while the Joint TH-RRH 194 beds. Bed Counts - All Projects: The overall inventory for Permanent Supportive Housing is 786 beds, Rapid Rehousing 354, Transitional Housing 187, Joint TH-RRH 194, and Safe Haven 25 beds for a total of 1546 beds under this competition. Appeals: Two organizations came forth for an appeal based upon what the recommendations were. The hearing took place yesterday; we had a mutual review team that included one person from the scoring and ranking team as well as two other people that did not participate in the process previously. The appeals were from St. Jude's Ranch-New Crossings RRH and SNAMHS-Dual Success, Families First. They are both ranked in tier 2. Based upon the appeals that were heard there were no recommendations for changes to the ranking. The breakdown of the requests for tier 1 is \$12,309,527 and tier 2 is \$1,571,430 for a total of 13,880,956. Eligible CoC planning costs applied for is \$392,857; the amount is not ranked in our local competition, it's not required to be ranked. The total 2017 request that we were eligible for is \$14,273,814.

Ms. Huang Hara requested that the next steps be for the board to approve or deny the recommendations as listed. We have project applications due in eSnaps soon. We will start working with agencies once the recommendations are approved and will work with agencies to get there applications in eSnaps. We have technical assistance available next Monday to do that, based upon what happens today. We will have a team review of eSnaps project applications which includes members of our evaluation working group. We welcome any other people that want to volunteer to help review those applications as well as reviewing drafts of the consolidated application. The consolidated application is completed as well as the priority listing which lists all the projects that we are applying for. It will be posted on September 26th; the whole package is due to HUD on September 28th.

David Slattery, City of Las Vegas, asked if you could briefly talk about the CoC planning cost portion and what is it used for. Ms. Huang Hara stated it could include things that have a regional impact such as evaluations, gaps analysis, and technical assistance from other outside vendors around the nation and best practices. We can do anything related to our consolidated application process, like what we did this year with having a third-party facilitator come in for the scoring and ranking. We also are able to find activities related to planning of coordinated entry, things related to the homeless census and things that have a CoC impact. Takiyah Butler, United Way of Southern Nevada, asked how many applications were rejected because they didn't fit the bill. Ms. Huang Hara replied that 30 eligible applications went forth for scoring and ranking. One was ineligible; it did not meet the threshold by applying for services in categories that were not eligible under the competition. Ms. Butler asked if this group was making any sort of systemic change from the way that things have been.

Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Clark County Social Service, stated all of the renewal projects maintain what we currently have in our system. It's the new projects that add to the system that can serve new clients. There was a needs group that met prior to the scoring and ranking team meeting and they did a presentation to the scoring and ranking team around what they felt the needs were in our community based on our homeless census, community queue, gaps analyses, HMIS and from our by-name list. They looked at a lot of data and came forward to say, these are the things that are really needed in our community. The scoring and ranking team looked at that and utilized it as a basis when they were making decisions. One of the things that we have to look at is the performance of our system, and that's what HUD directs us to do in terms of the way we score, rank and propose projects. Once this board makes its decisions on which projects are approved and recommended the collaborative applicant has to take those and try to make the best argument to submit an application to HUD on a competitive funding basis. It's difficult if you're not well-versed in the scoring of each project and how it factors into the NOFA in response to HUD's questions. Based on the direction from CoC and the evaluation working group, we took the direction not to allow applicants to sit on the scoring and ranking team. None of the people who are receiving funding or applied for funding could sit on the scoring and ranking team, and that left a lot of folks who have historical knowledge and also have a keen sense of how the individual applications roll into the NOFA and what the strategies are for getting the strongest possible applications submitted. It appears that if we submit the applications as recommended we are likely to lose \$1.3 million in funding for this application cycle. The money is gone for good once you lose it, then it feeds into the next formula cycle; you don't get that back. You have to find a way back in to get additional money into the system.

Mrs. Fuller-Hallauer further explained that we had a third-party facilitator that came in; unfortunately because of the timing of when we got the contract from HUD for our planning grant and being able to execute that contract, they had less than 30 days to become familiar with all of our local processes that we have been through, what our projects were doing, what our system has done historically and how we've been working strategically as a system. They were at a deficit from the start, they understand scoring and ranking and NOFA, but they don't understand our community. The folks that sit around the scoring and ranking team historically have had a lot of extra information so they can make strategic decisions. The facilitator went by straight forward scoring and ranking processes, whereas if we move forward with this particular scoring and ranking how does that affect our future allocations and annual renewal demand amount for next year. How does having x numbers of projects in tier 2 potentially impact the allocations or the awards that are made by HUD? What do we need as a system in order to have a strong application so that we can move forward? There's some nuances that weren't able to be discussed at the table and I don't think that many of the folks there really knew what questions to ask to get there, so I'm not putting the fault on anyone necessarily it's just that it was the result of the situation.

Shalimar Cabrera, U.S. Vets-Las Vegas, asks where does the \$1.3 million come from? Mrs. Fuller-Hallauer stated that in the NOFA, the Notice of Funding Availability, HUD clearly indicates that they will award tier 2 based on a 100 point scale and there are three major components that they identify. One is based on our consolidated application, how does the consolidated application score and get applied to all of the projects in tier 2? We don't know what our application score is going to be but we know that whatever the score is, it's going to be applied equally among every project in tier 2. In order for our projects to be competitive nationally we need to make sure that our whole package is competitive nationally so we can score as high as possible. A second component is Housing First. Housing First for every project in tier 2 that commits to being 100% housing first and meets the housing first fidelity gets 10 points. Every application in tier 2 in our local application indicated that they were a housing first project, so that would be applied equally amongst every project in tier 2. Where we can make some educated strategic decisions or recommendations moving forward, is there's a formula that's put in place, it's a complicated formula and it takes a long time to apply it but when you peel it apart and apply it, it's really impactful. I'm going to read through the handout, and then we're going to work through the sample. CoC project ranking get up to 40 points for the CoC's ranking of the project applications to more evenly distribute funding across the CoC's and take into account the CoC's ranking of projects point values will be assigned directly related to the CoC's ranking of projects. The calculation of point values will be $40 \times (1 - \frac{x}{500})$, where x is the ratio of the cumulative funding request for all projects or portions of projects ranked higher by the CoC in tier 2 plus one half of the funding of the project interest to the total amount of funding available in tier 2. From the example, if the CoC is eligible to apply for projects totaling \$500,000 in tier 2 and it applies for five projects ranked in tier 2, every project in tier 2 is \$100,000, the requested amount. The highest ranked project will receive 36 points and subsequently ranked projects will receive 28, 20, 12 and 4 points. You have \$100,000 for your first project and you have the 40 points, it's the amount of the project prior to that, that's above that in tier 1 or 2. This one is the first project so there is a zero because there is no project ahead of that, times the amount which is 100 times half. Half of the 100, which is 50 divided by the total requests in tier 2 which is 500, that is x. One minus x is point 9. 0.9×40 is 36. You apply that same formula to the next one down. Historically, what's not clear is which format HUD is going to use to make these tier 2 allocations, they've done it two different ways over the years; it is not clear in the NOFA. I read the NOFA before this meeting to make sure I was giving you accurate information. They could do one of two things, the first way they could do it is stack every community and continuum of care, from highest scoring consolidated application to lowest and start funding every project in tier 1 until you get to the lowest and start back at the highest scoring and keep going until they run out of money. The other thing that they could do is stack all of the points for the projects from tier 2 against each other nationally from highest scoring point project to lowest scoring point project and fund until they have run out of money. Either way if you have a low point score you're probably not going to get funded. Historically and given that congress hasn't allocated extra monies to the CoC and looking at our historical allocations, things that are running below the 30 points are probably at risk and of course the lower your numbers, the more at risk you are. Best case scenario, the bottom three projects will probably not be funded; there is a high risk that keeping families together 2 will also not be funded which is why those are gray. If you add the 3 grayed areas that gives us \$1,138,985 that we potentially could lose in the current ranking that we have going forward. Ms. Butler asked if only two tier 2 projects would then have higher scores than if you had a bunch of projects in that space. Mrs. Fuller-Hallauer stated to be conscious of the process and the decision-making rubric I've really looked at a lot of different things to try to come up with a best case potential scenario. To answer your question, the agency and the project, the project type, and the scoring and ranking team used multiple scores, so we had a humongous spreadsheet that included the performance measures, monitoring, utilization and recidivism rates, it included everything we could think of. We have a maximum score which is the combination of the full monitoring total and the application score. There were some projects that didn't have performance measures or have monitoring because they either hadn't been in contract yet or didn't have a full year of monitoring. The scoring and ranking team had discussion and determined a fair equitable way to assign points to those projects and put that into the full monitoring tool score for those blanks so that we had numbers to really match agencies up against each other and stack them against their numerical value. I think all of that is based on sound calculations. What you have for the maximum score, they started with the highest to lowest ranking and then they made some decisions around prioritization for the community, some things that we needed to have, so as you can see there were a couple of projects, three particularly, St. Jude's, A New Start, Help Hope Home and Moving Forward that have lower scores but they are kind of in the middle because the team indicated that because of community need they needed to be prioritized, so they got some prioritization points which are not reflected in here. What you see otherwise is scoring in score order. If you look at tier 2, the bottom 3 projects are scoring 119.5, 119 and 116.5. Those projects are significantly less than the next highest scoring project. Leone Lettsume, City of North Las Vegas, asked if it was possible for Tauri Royce, Bitfocus, to give a brief summary of the information she provided to the scoring and ranking group regarding our community needs. Mrs. Royce, who is the HMIS Administrator for Nevada, explained what she brought to the table in that meeting was the data. The subgroup of the evaluation working group came together and looked at a large amount of different factors to make a recommendation. Parts of the data that we looked at were the folks that are on our community queue. When we look at who are on the wait list right now for housing we know that we're limited to our adult individuals on that actual queue because that's been the only population right now for coordinated entry. Looking at those folks, what is their situation, where would they fall for housing and did they have income, which was a big factor. So we looked at those on the community queue for our subpopulations where we don't have that wait list factor to look at, we pulled from our census, looking at the families and the youth that were identified in the most recent census; what did their situation look like, what percentage of those folks identified from our census as having some type of income and what were their actual situations. Factoring those in, looking at our current inventory, what do we have now and how that would meet those needs. We looked at census data, our GAPS analysis that was performed for the community that was a big factor too, where have we identified our gaps in the past year. Income was a big deal because when we have these folks that identify as income, how many folks could we redirect to mainstream resources. How many folks could be best presented with rapid rehousing and how many of those census, those wait list, those folks that we know we've identified already, really need that permanent supportive housing. Looking at all of those

factors, the recommendation that we made was that we need to maintain the permanent supportive housing that we have, the big need was for additional rapid rehousing and that was just looking at the overall population, what we've been able to identify, which I think we have a substantial amount of information on those folks in our community, particularly for those who have gone through coordinated entry to this point. That was the recommendation of the group in a nutshell.

Melissa Clary, Huntridge Neighborhood Association, asked if there was also drill down into mental health beds versus what a veteran is eligible. Mrs. Royce stated that overarching recommendation did not drill down that far. We did look at the different subpopulations as far as our youth, but didn't drill down as far as to those actual substance abuse or mental health issues. It has always come up during the ranking process and I'm definitely not the one to speak about the overall process but I definitely know from being present that it is something that is always considered when projects are being shuffled around between the tiers. What type of beds they have and what populations they serve is always a huge factor. Ms. Clary stated that she constantly hears that we don't have enough beds for mental health, and is curious as to where that factors in on this list. Ms. Huang Hara clarified around permanent supportive housing beds. Right now the prioritization is to house people that are chronically homeless, that includes people with a diagnosable disability that could include mental illness. Regardless of the provider of the housing themselves they are still going to be given case management and wraparound services to meet whatever needs that are applicable to them. If it is a mental health diagnosis, substance abuse history, medical diagnosis as well as the chronicity of their length of homelessness that should be addressed to the project type, regardless of the individual entity that is doing the housing. Ms. Royce, stated what was left out of her summary was that of the population that we were reviewing, how many of those folks were chronic. There was recognition that we needed to maintain the permanent supportive housing that we have in order to house those that were chronic and how many we have on our wait lists who don't meet that definition of chronicity. PSH is not going to be a fit for them and they're not going to be eligible. They could be equally vulnerable but they're missing that chronicity component and that's where the recommendation for the rapid rehousing came in when we looked at what those percentages were in the population.

Emily Paulsen, Nevada Homeless Alliance, stated that she thinks it's important that it be known that HomeBase, which was the third party facilitator, did not introduce this information to the scoring and ranking team. There was not a consideration of how and what the implications of the ranking would be in tier 2 this way. We didn't have these formulas at our disposal on the day of scoring and ranking and I just wanted to make sure that you all are aware of that. Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, asked if that would that have affected the decision making. Mrs. Paulsen, stated that she think it's important to see how this conversation goes from here. With what now and what next, it's hard to say with the scoring and ranking team. Mr. Ghafoori asked if there is another alternative so we can discuss what our options would be if any, that would be a way to figure this out. Mrs. Fuller-Hallauer stated there's no excellent alternative. The option that we stand to lose the least amount of the money would give us a potential loss of \$581,429. No matter which way you slice it, there's really no way to gain with the system. If there is, I just don't have the brain to figure it out. Option B is kind of complicated and trying to stay with the process that the scoring and ranking team went through. First, based on the scores of the lowest ranking projects in tier 2, HUDs going to ask because we have to verify why folks are ranked the way they are. It will be alarming to HUD; also you have one agency that has 3 projects in tier 2 which is going to raise a red flag for HUD as well because they are falling to the bottom. The option B would be to involuntarily reallocate those low performing projects, and that's based on the NOFA. It indicates that applicants must demonstrate the ability to reallocate lower performing projects to create new higher performing projects. We have to prove that the CoC actively encourages new and existing providers to apply for new projects through reallocation and we have to provide verification that we've done that. We have two new projects that are in tier 2. We have to explain to HUD how we encourage folks to come forward with new projects or to do a voluntary reallocation to develop a new project but yet we scored them low. We have to justify that in our consolidated application. The recommendation would be to reallocate the 3 bottom projects of \$557,756, create a new project in tier 1 and that new project could be a housing project, rapid rehousing project, a supportive service only for coordinated intake or an HMIS project. It also could be a project that those monies allocated to an existing high performing project and expand it so they could do more services, or you can expand your HMIS system. It's up to the board to decide what to do. Any projects not moving forward in this year's application have to be notified in writing no later than 5 pm next Wednesday. The next thing would be to possibly move St Jude's ranch - New Crossings into tier 1 and my thought process with that was given their overall score, their score was actually higher than a couple of the bottom projects in tier 1. Having them moved to tier 1, it shifts part of Stepping Stones into tier 2, but it leaves Stepping Stones and Keeping Families Together in tier 2. Mr. Ghafoori asked if we have a good application compared to last year's or if there are concerns about option A, Ms. Fuller-Hallauer indicated as mentioned earlier in conversation concerns about the strength of the current application with the current recommendations. Mr. Ghafoori stated that this has a potentially big ramification for our community because if I understand this correctly, we can't recoup that money. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated all of the components that were talked about up to this point, the things that are in the NOFA that were spelled out, impact our consolidated application, our score, our ability to receive funding and our ability to receive as much of tier 2 funding as possible. This is why we're peeling these things apart to talk about the potential implications to our community, based on the package we currently have and with the recommendations that are currently in front of us.

Ms. Paulsen stated that as a member of the scoring and ranking team she was very concerned. We put recommendations forward without this formula. We put this numerical value on the ranking of tier 2 to determine what a potential loss would be. I think now that we have this tool and have this insight we should absolutely reconsider option A and the recommendations that our scoring and ranking team put out. I'm only one member of the scoring and ranking team and that is my personal opinion. I think it was a disservice of our third party facilitator that they did not disclose that this was a part of the NOFA this year and that this formula existed and that it was something we should consider. It's not as though our committee knew that this formula existed and decided to forego it. Ms. Butler stated I think I hear you saying that if you knew that you needed to finagle a little bit you would have. I'm not comfortable with that because I'm personally okay with, if we have some flaws in our community that we need to figure out, this HUD money might

not be the way we figure it out. There might be other money in the road we need to look towards to do that. If the applications weren't good because they don't move for what we intend to move for, I don't want to try and hide the fact that we have deficiencies if we have them.

Mrs. Kinard stated she wants to piggy back on that because if we have programs that are scoring low and are not performing well, we need to allocate money more wisely. If programs are not performing then they shouldn't be rewarded by continued funding. The HMIS working group wants to dive into the data and the outcome measures so that we can prevent these scores from coming at us once a year and let the agencies know that they are performing low in their HMIS category which means that potentially they could not be funded again. This is still kind of a business so we need to make sure that we are allocating the money responsibly to the highest performing programs. If you're not performing you don't get funded. With the three entities that are potentially not going to be funded, is this the first time that they have scored this low in their application. The question is do we know with option A to B how that alters the bed count associated with those dollars. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated, starting with St. Jude's Ranch-New Crossings, they've put forward 15 units, a total of 45 beds, those are family rapid rehousing. Clark County Keeping Families Together 2, which is a redesign of a renewal, it has 25 units, 25 beds. The Dual success is 21 units, 38 beds. Families First are 10 units, 20 beds and Paradise is 6 units, 6 beds. Ms. Butler stated that we're at the point where we're trying to decide if maybe it's best to move option B as opposed to option A. and asked if there are things that stick out as problems in option B, and is there anything else other than losing the potential beds that we might think are issues. Emily Lewis, City of Henderson, says she believes there is an option of adding to our HMIS, increasing our HMIS funding for new programs. Mrs. Fuller-Hallauer also mentioned Coordinated Entry. Ms. Lewis asked if those are two other options that we can put in that spot, and Mrs. Fuller-Hallauer stated that is correct.

Michael Pawlak, Clark County Social Service, stated that the only other issue to consider is how we move forward because we do have a deadline to hit so we need to think through how we figure out if we're going to do that today. Mrs. Kinard clarified if as far as scoring and ranking, if there's a new application. Mr. Pawlak asked how to handle getting that \$557,000 into another project or multiple projects. Ms. Kinard referenced that it was experienced a little bit last year when we had some projects not funded and we had to quickly reallocate within a 48 hour period. That decision was done by the chairs and the co-chairs of the board. I think we could probably move to do that again if you guys are okay with that. I don't know if there is specific governance or a motion that we need to make to do that. I think that's a separate motion. Do we have potential or new projects or ideas of how we could quickly formulate new projects to spend this \$557,000? Ms. Clary says I know there's a fairness in how we allowed for the application, but is there no way to strengthen the low-scoring applications and ask for a revision and maybe work with something we have if it's not a complete performance based issue in their rating? Mr. Ghafouri stated that he doesn't know if that would be fair without giving everyone else the opportunity, too.

Ms. Huang Hara offered one point of clarification that there is opportunity to have existing projects apply for expansion funds. For example if you have a higher performing project that you want to request that they expand their current project potentially is an option that they could then apply for additional funds, and then when they get there executed agreements from HUD, hoping that both projects, the current project and the expansion project gets funded than it would be operated as a single project and go under contract that way. Julie Calloway, City of Boulder City asked if the all the money could get split evenly. Ms. Huang Hara replied that it sounds extremely easy on paper to do that but there are so many different moving parts that go into a project's composition. For example, a lot of the permanent supportive housing projects, their dollar amount are dependent upon fair market rent. If they have to then increase the number of clients served, they have to do it by the amount of fair market rent available for a single person, if that's what they're serving is single individuals. The other thing that every potential new applicant or additional applicant has to take into account is that every project is required to provide a 25% match. That would be another challenge of a project coming in that maybe doesn't have additional matched resources to be able to expand an existing project as well. Those are all things that even in addition to piecing a new project together or divvying up funds that they would have to take into account. Mrs. Fuller-Hallauer stated the other thing is if you were to divvy it up among all existing projects, they would all have to come in with an extra new project to account for the monies being added. Granted it would expand their contract upon execution of contract but every project would need to have another application put forward. Mr. Pawlak says it looks like a possibility that we could approve option B, and ask the chair or through delegation to reach out to the tier 1 projects to see if any of them would want to do an expansion, I guess they have to be an existing project. Mrs. Fuller-Hallauer states if you're going to expand an existing project, it needs to be in a high performing existing project to do an expansion. They have to put that expansion piece as a new application that has to be put in. Mr. Pawlak said the chair would reach out to identify high performing existing projects and reach out see if anyone wants to put in a new expansion project. The chairs and co-chairs would then make that decision to go into the application and we would have to ratify it at some point. Mrs. Fuller-Hallauer stated we also have the other option of adding those monies or dividing them up between the new projects that came forward this year and asking them if they have the capacity to expand the services that they put forward in the application and are able to meet that math or you can create a brand new coordinated support services only project for coordinated entry.

Mr. Ghafouri stated that the community has been working through a pretty intense HUD mandated process to implement coordinated entry in our community but it is a unfunded mandate and we're getting to the point where we are ready to flush out the systems and we really could use some TA, some outreach dollars, etc. to support the capacity building that we know we're going to need for coordinated entry as well. That's always an option; could either the CoC or collaborative applicant apply. Mrs. Fuller-Hallauer stated that the big thing would be from where would the match dollars come from. Mr. Ghafouri, asked if it could any kind of match. Hundreds of thousands of match dollars have been leveraged and will continue to leverage as long as we keep meeting. Ms. Huang Hara stated that it could be either cash or in kind match. This is the first time they've allowed a supportive services only project in many years to come forth as a new project. It's specifically for coordinated entry because we are now under a HUD mandate by January 2018 to have full coordinated entry implemented for all CoC's. I think that's probably impetus of why they have that availability for the funding now. Mr. Ghafouri asked if it would it strengthen our application to show that we're strategically thinking

about coordinated entry and trying to get some dollars to deal with expanding the progress of our work. Mrs. Fuller-Hallauer said she think it would. There was indication about how HUD is really focusing in on data and planning and capacity building. Mr. Ghafoori asked if we explore that option, who is going to make this decision: does it go back to the working group or is it the chairs decision. Mrs. Paulsen stated, if we determine now that a certain amount has to be spent on the SSO grant and weak applications are put forth, you've created another problem. I think these decisions should be made in the same way our scoring and ranking team made these decisions; it should be based on the strength of the application and the monitoring history of the agency that's applying. Donna Jordan, Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services, asked to make a motion to either accept or decline the recommendations. Vote on that, and then move forward with the next motion to accept or decline the alternate or alternative. Ms. Butler asked to move for the rejection of option A of funding recommendations. A motion was made to reject the original funding recommendation, option A. Board members recusing themselves from the vote are: Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth; Donna Jordan, Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services; Christy Shannon, S.A.F.E. Nest; Michael Pawlak, Clark County Social Service; Shalimar Cabrera, US Vets. Motion Passes.

Mrs. Kinard asked if the second motion is to accept option B, are we going to talk about how the \$557,000 is going to be allocated or just let new projects apply. Ms. Butler asked if we should discuss what we will do with that pocket of money and once that decision is made, that's the version that we vote on. Mr. Slattery says I have some concerns regarding losing 58 mental health beds in our community. My question to the scoring group is, are there irreconcilable issues with those programs or do we think we can bolster those programs because the mental health gap in our community and state is so great, that losing any of those beds is impactful unless there's other higher performing providers that are providing those services. Ms. Kinard said going back to what Mr. Ghafoori stated before about bolstering those applications, we would have to give everybody that applied the opportunity to do that to be fair across the board. We've already rejected these recommendations because we run the risk of losing \$1.1 million, but with this the risk is almost cut in half. Do we lose a significant 1.1 million dollars' worth of beds or do we lose \$557,000. With that being said, we have the ability for the folks that may not be reallocated or re-funded, they can apply for new projects and apply for new dollars, which doesn't necessarily take the beds out of the community. Mr. Pawlak stated all of our permanent supportive housing is available to that same population. Our priority is to serve chronically homeless and those are typically folks with co-occurring disorders, physical/mental health issues or substance abuse issues or multiple. Mrs. Kinard asked if we allow for new projects to submit applications, expansion projects, or for supportive services. Mr. Pawlak stated that he was concerned about the timing, it doesn't seem that we have time to put out a whole open application process, review them for threshold and everything else and get them organized and reconvene scoring. We barely convened the scoring and ranking team as it was. One possibility is simply to go back, draw a line and do all tier 1 or you say here are the high performing projects; do you want to expand those projects or does someone want to put in one of those specialty projects for coordinated entry. Mr. Ghafoori suggested to limit this to high performing projects to see if they want to expand plus the option if someone wants to apply for supportive services in this community allow them to do it. The steering committee can make the decision, because there are more people than chairs and vice chairs. Mrs. Paulsen stated that many of the steering committee members are not familiar with the process of reviewing applications for consistency and trying to stay as close to our approved policies and procedures as possible while also expediting that process. I think the scoring and ranking team should be asked if their available to be a part of that discussion and process. Maybe joining the chair and co-chairs, they shouldn't be automatically left out of that process. Ms. Huang Hara stated, one thing to throw out there is HMIS: we do have existing interjurisdictional funding with our interlocal if it gets approved this year to have additional match funds towards an HMIS expansion, with the remaining funds we have in the interlocal that's strictly for HMIS. A motion was made to except option B to include looking at the following three options for the moving of the reallocated dollars; have a designee contact the current tier 1 agencies and see if they want to extend their application to spend some or all that money, see if we can get applicants for the coordinated intake piece and use a portion for HMIS. Board members recusing themselves from the vote are: Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth; Donna Jordan, Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services; Christy Shannon, S.A.F.E. Nest; Michael Pawlak, Clark County Social Service; Shalimar Cabrera, US Vets. Motion Passes.

Mrs. Kinard referenced the decision in our governance structure, which was pulled out says "When not feasible to convene in meetings of the full SNH COC board, the respective co-chairs and co-vice chairs may convene either via conference call to discuss and take appropriate action". It is in our governance structure for the chairs and co-chairs to make the decision. Now, should the scoring and ranking team not be able to convene then we'll be part of the process with the chairs and co-chairs. Then it will be left solely up to the chairs and co-chairs. But they would be included in the process.

Agenda Item 8. Update from the Coordinated Intake Change Advisory Team; for possible action.

Kelly Robson, HELP of Southern Nevada, provided an update on Family Assessment Sites; Youth Assessment Sites; Trainings; Survivors of Domestic Violence (DV) and Households Without Children Assessment Sites. We will be doing training on the Community Housing Assessment Tool (CHAT) which is used for the adults, households without children, FCHAT for the family group and the Next Step Tool for the youth. We didn't put DV on here, they will be part of our training however, there's no assessment tool for them because they call the hotline. DV will be a huge part of educating the members who are going to be doing the assessments on DV education. On September 12th there are 2 trainings 8am-12 & 1pm-5pm, September 13th and 14th 1pm-5pm, September 21st is when we will be training all of the outreach teams and September 25th, 26th and 27th is when Clark County Social Service Staff will be trained. People who are signing up for these trainings should be the people who are working at one of the access sites and are going to do assessments or the people who are actually doing outreach in the field and going to be doing assessments. All the sites will be up and running and there will be a soft roll out on October 2nd and we will report to the board in October. We also will be doing a much broader policy and procedure update and coming to you with the challenges that will happen implementing the

policies and procedures to get your feedback. Mrs. Fuller-Hallauer, if I may add that the PowerPoint, I dropped the last slide which has the VA Community Resource and Referral Center for the Vets.

Agenda Item 9. Presentation from Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth (NPHY) on the 2017 Southern Nevada Youth Homelessness Summit; for possible action.

Mandy Martin, Las Vegas Sands, shared that the Intersections Summit is the very first youth homelessness summit, partnering with NPHY, LV Sands, UNLV and The Review Journal. We are hoping that all of you received our invite. We perceive this as being a unique opportunity to come and hear some experts speak. One thing that I think is really special about this is the attendees. The attendees will be quite a diverse range from all over the business side; all types of community leaders have been invited. I think that will be an interesting mix to have some different perspectives from the people that live and breathe it every day. I have some postcards here with more detailed information, let us know if you didn't get the invitation and we will make sure you get that as well. Mr. Ghafoori shared that the inspiration for the Intersections Summit is that the homeless youth often don't get the spotlight; they are voiceless when it comes to funding. We want to create a platform that one time a year we cast the spotlight intensely on the issue of youth homelessness and discuss what we need to do, what the barriers are and where we want to go with this. We want to analyze these intersections and have the first year as sort of a focus group conducted by professionals. The idea of us wanting to invite all the different sectors and related groups is we need all those diverse opinions. UNLV is creating the first state of the union of youth homelessness in Southern Nevada academic paper, which is going to go in front of the review board and be presented at this conference. It will be published as academic material as well. This will give us 2 new sources of information that will aide us in driving a working group process to come up with a regional plan to address this issue and present that in year two. We have commitments from UNLV, our corporate partner SANDS and others to really drive this work and bring together other departments and entities to start crunching in analyzing this data to help us present more information about what a homeless youth dashboard could look like. We are inviting you to attend not only as members of the community, but also as fighters against this issue with homelessness in general and youth homelessness specifically. We need everyone at the table to be part of this focus group. That will be the opportunity for your voice to be heard. We are going to try to provide CEU, teacher continued education and legal continued education credits as well.

Agenda Item 10. Questions and answers regarding reports from the Board working groups (Community Engagement, Evaluation, HMIS, Planning, Monitoring).

No questions were asked.

Agenda Item 11. Receive an update from each board member regarding relevant activities within their respective organization relating to homelessness.

Emily Paulsen, Nevada Homeless Alliance, shared that booth registration is open for PHC on the Nevada Homeless Alliance website. There's flyers at the door, if you could please take some with you and post them around your agency, make copies and share them with people that you serve. The next planning meeting is on September 20th at 8:30 am. Our meeting this quarter is at US VETS the address is 525 E Bonanza Road.

Meg Pike, Clark County School District, shared that we did run numbers for the amount of youth and students in our school district that are currently facing homelessness in the first two weeks of school. We have over 8 thousands students that qualify as homeless. We have no idea how that number is going to increase throughout the year. We were contacted by district officials to send out a memo in regards to students that are already showing up from Houston. Those students most likely will automatically qualify unless they come here already with a lease in their name and a family. Those kids are receiving backpacks and uniforms.

Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Clark County Social Service, announced on behalf of the housing working group, the housing working group and collaboration with Clark County Social Service will be hosting a Housing Summit on September 25th. The county had some access funding from a state grant and rather than allow the monies to go back to the state unspent, we asked for those monies with the same purpose of the grant itself to be reallocated to conduct a summit to bring landlords to the table along with our providers so that they understand what it means to be a part of the solution in the community by partnering with us to provide housing for our clientele. The housing working group is working actively, very quickly. It was a short turnaround period to pull this together. This will be the first ever in our continuum. It will be held on September 25th, more details to come.

Agenda Item 12. Public Comment.

Phillip Hollon, Salvation Army, shared how excited The Salvation Army was with the partnership with Fox 5 and their Take 5 to Care partners, LV Subaru, Nevada Energy and Henderson Hospital. We had planned to work together for 4 days, Aug. 8th -11th on a campaign to raise \$10,000 to help provide backpacks and school supplies to 1,000 children. At the end of Day 3, we had broken our goal and hit \$20,000 with still one more day to go. In the end we raised \$48,300 in financial contributions and donations, to help provide backpacks and school supplies to more than 3,000 kids. On Saturday, Aug. 12th we were able to distribute all of the backpacks and school supplies collected to children in need. On Wednesday August 16th The Salvation Army welcomed the magazine team from US News and World Report. They visited The Salvation Army to complete a wonderful story on the great work we are doing to provide a safe shelter for our homeless transgender community. On Friday and Saturday, Aug. 18 & 19, we were honored to have a group of students from the charter class at UNLV School of Medicine provide a bottled water drive for The Salvation Army. The 60 students in this charter class took it upon themselves to organize and manage this incredible bottled water drive. Throughout the two

days, the students were able to collect more than 8 pallets of water on site and also collect financial donations to purchase an additional 8 pallets of water. In all, 16 pallets of water were provided to The Salvation Army by this incredible group of future doctors. The Salvation Army has been working hard to reach out to the community and provide campus tours to local businesses and organizations. Tours have been a great opportunity to share information on our various programs and services. Following our tours, many business and groups have committed to sponsoring a community meal for our homeless. In the upcoming weeks we will be partnering with Republic Services, Walmart, Alpha Phi Omega, and Wellcare to provide some community meals. On Oct. 2 - Oct 14, The Salvation Army will be partnering with Channel 3 and Port of Subs to provide a "Warm Souls Coat Drive". We will be collecting new and gently used coats and jackets for our homeless community at 36 Port of Subs locations as well as at the Channel 3 news station. Finally, Zappos is partnering with The Salvation Army to provide a Hurricane Harvey Community Donation Drive. The event began on Tuesday this week, and runs through tomorrow, Friday Sept. 8th. Zappos, along with LYFT, and Chet Buchanan from the KLUC 98.5 Morning show, are all working with The Salvation Army to collect donations to provide support for Hurricane Harvey victims. Chet Buchanan has been airing his morning show live from the Zappos parking lot downtown, at 7th and Stewart, from 6am-10am. We have been collecting pallets and pallets of food items, baby products, hygiene items and pet food in addition to the incredible financial donations that are being made. Zappos has also committed to providing a \$1 match for every donated item, up to \$100,000 for Hurricane Harvey Disaster needs. If you haven't been out to visit us, and bring down donations, please stop by tonight (we are there until 7pm) or anytime tomorrow from 7am-7pm. Additionally, Zappos is sending additional trucks to Texas, containing 31,000 pairs of shoes, valued at more than 1.5 million dollars, so we can provide the community with a brand new pair of shoes. The Salvation Army is so very thankful for the incredible support our community provides to help those in need, not only here in our community, but across the country.

The meeting adjourned at 4:51 p.m.