

**SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION  
SOUTHERN NEVADA HOMELESSNESS CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
July 9, 2015**

**In attendance:** Julie Calloway, Co-Chair, City of Boulder City  
Tim Burch, Vice Co-Chair, Clark County  
Arash Ghafoori, Vice Co-Chair, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth  
Barbara Geach, City of Henderson  
Kathi Thomas-Gibson, alternate, City of Las Vegas  
Lorena Candelario, alternate, City of North Las Vegas  
Kelly-Jo Shebeck, Clark County School District  
Bret Ficklin, Las Vegas Metro Police Department  
Donna Jordan, alternate, Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services  
Stacy Sutton Pollard, Nevada Homeless Alliance  
Joshua Brown, Veterans Administration  
Dawn Davis, alternate, Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada  
Terry Murphy, Fremont Street Experience  
Jesse Robinson, HELP of Southern Nevada  
Melissa Clary, Huntridge Neighborhood Association  
Kena Adams, Moapa Band of Paiutes  
Angela Marshall, Second Chance Christian Ministries  
Henry Sneed, The Church LV  
Vicki Chan-Padgett, Touro University Nevada  
Pastor Rand Marshall, alternate, U.S. Army Veteran  
Nancy Menzel, UNLV  
Shalimar Cabrera, U.S. Vets – Las Vegas  
Geoff Spataro, United Way of Southern Nevada  
Erin Kinard, WestCare, Inc.  
Heather DeSart, Workforce Connections

**Absent:**  
Nick Spriggs, Co-Chair, Briggs & Spriggs  
David Slattery, Las Vegas Fire & Rescue  
Mike Mullin, Nevada HAND  
John Hill, Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority

---

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

A meeting of the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition's Southern Nevada Homelessness Continuum of Care Board was called to order at 2:05 p.m., on Thursday, July 9, 2015, 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.**

No public comment was given.

**Agenda Item 3. Approval of the Agenda for July 9, 2015; for possible action.**

A motion was made to approve the agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

**Agenda Item 4. Approval of the Minutes from the June 11, 2015 meeting; for possible action.**

A motion was made to approve the Minutes. The motion was approved.

**Agenda Item 5. Receive an update on the local Continuum of Care application process; for possible action.**

Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Continuum of Care Coordinator, explained that the community is presently in the middle of the HUD Homelessness Assistance of Funds application process, which is a nationally competitive process. She explained that some of the funds, when awarded, assist in transitional housing programs, rapid rehousing programs, and permanent supportive housing programs. Although it is a nationally competitive process, it is a community consolidated application. The multiple components that make up the application are the community-wide application, which reports the outcomes and performance for our community as a whole and the plan to move forward to address the issues of homelessness regardless of

funding. The other multiple components that go into the application are the applications of each agency and project of the community that gets combined into one package that gets turned into HUD. HUD's release of the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) fluctuates from April – November of each year. The local process is done to assure a very strong, consolidated application goes into HUD in order to get the maximum amount of funding into our community.

Part of the local process is the Evaluation Working Group, which is one of the working groups of this board. They meet throughout the year on a monthly basis, but during the local process, they meet very intensely around reviewing the programs and agencies that are eligible for renewal, which are all of the existing CoC funded transitional housing, rapid rehousing, and permanent supportive housing. The group receives applications not only from agencies renewing their application, but they open the process up to new potential projects to come forward for inclusion into the application as well. They develop what the application is, and put the application through ZoomGrants, which is an electronic portal used for the application process.

A mandatory technical assistance meeting was held in 2 identical sessions on May 26 and 27, for anyone interested in coming forward with a new project or to renew an existing project that wanted to submit an application. Applications were due June 15 through the ZOOM Grants portal. A review team, which is a subgroup of the larger Evaluation Working Group, reads through and scores the applications, and hears presentations from each applicant. The review team works collaboratively with the Monitoring Working Group to make the decisions of who should proceed with going forward in this year's CoC application. Things taken into account as the decisions are made are: reviewing outcomes and performance for each currently funded project, ensuring that the projects are fully utilizing the beds in their community with regards to cost per client according to HUD guidelines, and what the current community needs are. Presentations were received June 25, and the ranking process, which was previously planned, has been postponed since HUD has not yet released the NOFA. Until HUD releases the NOFA, the exact guidelines are unknown, and in order to best utilize everyone's time and not have to go back to the drawing board, the ranking process is held up until the NOFA is released. During the ranking, the outcomes, performance measures, utilization, and all of the information and data of each project given from the Monitoring Group is reviewed. Based on HUD's guidelines and the funding, which is broken out into Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding, the Evaluation Working Group has to make the strongest application possible, maximizing dollars coming into our community. Any money that is not allocated for, either in Tier 1 or Tier 2, is lost to our community. With regards to the funding tiers, HUD tells the break off points for Tier 1 and Tier 2 when the NOFA is released. After the ranking, there will be an appeal process available for anyone who wishes to appeal the decision. The recommendation for the Evaluation Working Group will then come before the board. At that time, the board has to determine if the recommendations will be accepted from the Evaluation Working Group on what goes into this year's consolidated application or if they have to reconfigure their ranking, based on what the applicants look like and what the composite for the projects look like that go into our application.

Once the NOFA is released, there is a limited time to complete a lot of tasks that include convening the Evaluation Working Group to do the ranking, allowing for an appeal process, and coming to the board for a decision. Once the board's decision is made, the providers need to work with myself to make sure all the applications get appropriately put into e-Snaps, which is an electronic portal used by HUD. Then the evaluators have to review all the applications again to ensure the solidness of the application in that system, and I and my team have to work at compiling the consolidation of the application. Since this is very time sensitive, all efforts will be made to make the next board meeting after the release of the NOFA. If it is not, based on the date of the scheduled board meeting and the time sensitivity of the applications, it may be necessary to call a special session of the board in order for you to hear the recommendations of the Evaluation Working Group, vote on who should or should not be part of this year's process. The board members were strongly urged to review Article 11 in the Governance Charter, which speaks to conflict of interest. If someone feels there will be a conflict of interest in making a decision regarding the recommendations brought before the board, that person should recuse themselves from the decision making prior to the decision and any discussion of who should be included in that decision. Any questions regarding conflict of interest can be brought up and it will be further discussed on an individual basis. The next scheduled meeting of the CoC Evaluation Working Group is this coming Monday, 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m., at the Clark County Social Services building. Although it is the Evaluation Group that does the work, it is an open door meeting and individuals may sit in the audience. Providers are encouraged to sit in the audience during the meeting.

The opportunity was given for questions, but no questions were asked.

#### **Agenda Item 6. Receive an update on the progress of the 25 Cities Initiative; for possible action.**

Michelle Fuller-Hallauer, Continuum of Care Coordinator, reported on some of the progress that has occurred with regards to ending veteran homelessness and chronic homelessness. The Emergency Shelter Working Group met with Home Base, our TA providers, and identified various components of the barriers and the vision to have a healthy entry into the emergency response into our community. Items identified were some of the various supports in our community, and the challenges that go along with the bold steps that were identified. In order to have an emergency response in our system that is healthy and able to address the needs of our homeless citizens, these are some things that will need to be done. Vision – Access for specialized populations, especially the medically fragile, Bold Step – Identify the scope of the problem. Need to know how many are needed and what the needs are. Need to ensure they have immediate access, and we have immediate response. Need to transform the discharge program from the medical facilities. Need to cultivate program ownership in finding a solution. Solution – A director's communication tree. Best Practices in other communities, such as San Diego, the

emergency beds for medically fragile are paid for by the hospitals. Encourage SOAR enrollment. Some challenges and supports were shown on the power point, but not individually reviewed. Vision- Ensure access to shelter for every type of family composition, especially single fathers and intact family, which are areas our system has gaps. Bold Steps – Identify problem. Who do we have and what is the family composition. Make sure we have access, availability and shelter to meet the needs. Help agencies that are interested in working with this population to build their capacity so they can fill that need. Need robust bridge housing component to our community. Need to create more permanent supportive housing and affordable housing units in order to move those families into permanent housing placements as quickly as possible. Place clients in the least restrictive units appropriate for them to open lower barrier beds for those who need minimal barriers. Vision – Ensuring programs are welcoming to gender non-conforming clients. Bold Steps – Identify onsite training and technical assistance from the center at all levels of staff, including competency training and educating of clients. Identify where the resources are. To ensure we have communication and collaboration between all our agency directors, and community communication so the clients understand what is available to them. To bust any myths regarding eligibility and any other myths in our community regarding those who are gender non-conforming. Common goals around changing the emergency shelter system that have been identified are identifying the scope for each of the sub-areas; create a director’s circle for communication; to develop and immediate response plan; to build capacity for our non-profits in our community; to develop a navigation system; and to reduce barriers to our system. The next Emergency Shelter meeting is this Thursday, July 16, 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. at the VACRRC. Invitation was given to attend if any member would like input as board members, with their vast influence, can reach out and find to fill these gaps and meet these bold steps in our community. The next two items to ID using the same type of thought process as discussing minimizing barriers to accessing programs consistent with funding requirements as well as access to programs for substance users.

The next item is regarding coordinated intake. Coordinated intake has been used to process our homeless folk without children and veterans for 1 year. Initially the coordinated intake was a very simple process, but as time progressed, many unforeseeable nuances were identified. However, the community should be applauded for working together to address those challenges and propose creative solutions. Since July 1, 2014, through the community coordinated intake sites, our outreach partners, our mobile crisis intervention partners, 2162 VISPDAT or housing assessments have been done. The VA has done well over 1000 additional assessments. Data was presented showing that although the scale remains the same, the numbers continue to rise. However, there is still a bell curve, and therefore, over 700 folks are still identified as needing rapid rehousing. In the past year, 1542 clients have been housed in transitional housing placement. Through the VA Supportive Services for Veterans Families (SSVF) partners, a majority of 384 have been housed through rapid rehousing. Permanent supportive housing has been provided for 510 clients. Although many have been housed in the past year, the community cue still has 408 people who have been assessed as appropriate for permanent supportive housing. There are an addition 714 people in the community cue. Some of those folks have been assessed for transitional housing, but the majority have been assessed as most appropriate for rapid rehousing. Currently available in the community, as of yesterday, there were 11 permanent supportive housing units available, and folks are in the pipeline to be put into those spaces. There are 0 rapid rehousing placements and 50 transitional housing beds, and 1 safe haven bed. Michele then presented a dashboard from the 2016 25 Cities data given each month regarding placements. Shown is the takedown number which is the number of folks needed to be placed each month in order to get to 0, and the number that has actually been housed. With regards to our chronic homeless clients, we have been doing very good at being close to, if not exceeding, placing our chronic homeless clients in permanent housing. Although there is still a ways to go, if we continue at the rate we have been, we should reach functional zero for chronically homeless by October 2016. As a side note, the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness released a revision to Opening Doors, the federal plan to prevent and end homelessness, and modified the goal to end chronic homelessness by the end of 2017. Therefore, if we continuing at the rate we have been going, we will be ahead of much of the nation for ending homelessness in Southern Nevada.

June 23, 24, and 25, intense VA targeted outreach and registry. Over a 3 day period, 10 outreach teams consisting of over 55 staff and 6 community partners working with the VA covered 30 different locations, doing housing assessments in the field, those identifying veterans. Those that were identified as veterans were determined whether they were eligible to receive any of the VA housing services. Some community partners donated water and hygiene kits for distribution at those field locations. Those identified as VA eligible were transported to the VA in order to use the VA system, the HANC and the VIS, to determine the veteran’s discharge status, their eligibility to HUD VASH, or VASSFV. Those veterans were determined to be eligible for HUD VASH were also screened and assessed by the Housing Authority. This demonstrated true community collaboration by meeting the clients in the field where they were. Although the focus was mainly on identifying veterans, non-veterans were also identified and made sure they also got access to the housing assessment. The VA brought forward 20 cars to be used for this effort, as well as providing a nurse and HPACT on site. A video covering the first 2 days of this event, provided by Shalimar Cabrera of U.S. Vets, was shown, depicting the hard work taking place and the things encountered by the teams while in the field. After the video, a general thank you was given to all involved in the event, as well as to Shalimar Cabrera for putting together the video. It is anticipated that an update will be provided informing the outcome of the placements at the August CoC board meeting.

The target to end veteran homelessness is the end of this year. The federal takedown is a monthly goal of 110. With the exception of a few months, our community has come close to, if not reaching, a goal of 150, which would achieve the overall

goal of ending veteran homelessness much sooner than the end of 2015. A dashboard was presented, similar to the chronic homeless dashboard shown earlier in the presentation, showing that the community is placing above the target, and is on target to end homelessness for veterans by the end of this year. VA, CoC, SSVF providers, and HUD representatives, are working together to identify what the community definition for functional zero for our veterans will be, based on federal guidelines, as well as what makes the most sense for placement in our community. Once the matrix for identifying when functional zero has been achieved, it will be presented for final approval by the board. As the community moves forward to functional zero, it is important that everyone knows what is meant by the term “functional zero” in our community.

The opportunity was given for questions. Melissa Clary of Huntridge Neighborhood, asked for clarification on the chronic dashboard slide predicting functional zero in October 2016 as to whether it is taken into account the rate of the existing housing supply. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer explained that it is assuming permanent housing placement of 28 chronically homeless individuals per month is taking place and does not take into account the lack of current housing. Therefore, as a community, to ensure we hit functional zero by October 2016, an increase in permanent supportive housing availability needs to become a priority.

Angela Marshall, Second Chance Ministries, inquired as to whether there is a plan in place to meet the goal by acquiring more housing and acquiring more beds. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that Best Practices throughout the country are being studied around landlord engagement and what that might involve for a more robust recruitment and ensuring that places are available. However, the larger challenge is securing the funding to pay for our folks to reside in those apartment and housing situations. Additional grant opportunities are applied for as they become available. However, we look to the CoC board to bring in other monies to support housing opportunities, i.e. the rental assistance, along with case management needed by the chronically homeless. Therefore, in order to hit the target, we need to vary the funding stream and bring more money to the table.

Stacey Pollard, Nevada Homeless Alliance stated that based on the numbers provided, over 2400 clients have been housed in the past year, which is impressive and should be focused on as to the change made in the community. Currently, there are 11 permanent supportive housing openings, 12 transitional housing openings, and 1 safe haven. It should be understood that with people transitioning in and out of programs or units, there will always be some type of openings. However, has the committee put together what the appropriate number of vacancies should be on any given day, based on those factors? Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that it is part of the data analysis currently taking place along with the analysis of the data for those clients that are presently in the cue to identify their needs. During the coordinated intake process and the assessment process, it became evident that the needs of our clients vary dramatically even if they are in the same category. Ms. Pollard requested more of a clarification for a baseline for a standard rate of openings or vacancies to gauge the effectiveness of the system. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that it sounded as if Ms. Pollard wants to have an average rate of turnover to identify potential vacancies that are waiting to be filled. Ms. Pollard stated that it would be to identify the acceptable rate of vacancies.

Ms. Marshall stated that because Las Vegas is known as a second chance city in a second chance state, i.e. if you tell the truth you can get employed, with regards to transitional housing and rapid rehousing, are any agencies doing background checks to make sure you are not housing someone, for example, fleeing another state for a felony. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated the community and best practice nationally is to remove any barriers, so background checks would be a barrier to moving folks into housing. Utilizing the Housing First methodology and the Housing First true components as it is intended is to put folks into housing and have the case manager work with that client to expunge any outstanding warrants or outstanding legal issues they may have. But that should not be a precursor for someone entering into a housing situation. Ms. Marshall then raised the point of when someone who is dangerous is housed, where the liability starts and stops. Erin Kinard, WestCare, stated that for her agency it is always assumed that the client has a background or legal history and, therefore, to not house the person based on that barrier only exacerbates the situation. Training the staff and employing the skill set within your staff to handle those individuals is what our agency focuses on, as do other community partners. We focus on allowing that person who wants to be rehabilitated or habilitated to not live that life anymore. Ms. Kinard also stated that background checks are expensive and it is difficult with the funding sources available to be able to afford those. Shalimar Cabrera with U.S. Vets reiterated what Ms. Kinard stated. She also remarked that they are not putting themselves above the law, but they will not protect a client coming in and committing crimes. However, most clients have something in their past that has caused them to become homeless, so their agency, in addition to training staff and how to deal with that, works with community partners, i.e. the public defenders, to help them go through the process by working with the veteran’s court, the legal court, etc. Now there are some criminal backgrounds we don’t accept into housing and other programs, i.e. sex offenders. We do use some scattered sight programs with landlords who are aware of the issue and work with us. Ms. Marshall clarified her question to determine how far agencies are willing to go to help someone who may be dangerous. Ms. Kinard stated she spoke with the senior analyst from District Attorney’s Family Support Division recently and the DA’s office is making a push to start an outreach program to work with other community partners or providers, i.e. Catholic Charities and Salvation Army, to work with individuals who have outstanding child support issues.

Arash Ghafoori of Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth thanked Ms. Fuller-Hallauer for her presentation. He acknowledged the complexity of the consolidated application and thanked Ms. Fuller-Hallauer for all that she and her team provide in support and assistance to get through the process.

Terry Murphy, Fremont Street Experience, referred to the need for housing spots. She wanted to know what kind of non-traditional community resources are available to provide housing of each type. For example, how many of each type is needed and what is the cost, including intensive case management, staff, etc. Her purpose for questioning is to perhaps try connecting with various foundations in the community and to UNLV, based on the presentation from last month, and work with different foundations. Also possibly do a recruitment to get funding from the foundations. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated she would work on getting the information requested and respond in a future meeting.

**Agenda Item 7. Receive an update from the Nevada Homeless Alliance and presentation from Lutheran Social Services of Nevada; for possible action.**

Stacy Pollard, Nevada Homeless Alliance provided the update. She stated that the July provider meeting will be held on July 15 from 8:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m. The monthly meetings for the remainder of the year will be held at Lutheran Social Services, 73 Spectrum Blvd. Project Homeless Connect Save the Date is November 17. The VIP reception begins at 9:00 a.m.

Ms. Pollard then introduced Armena Mhkitaryan, the Executive Director of Lutheran Social Services of Nevada for a presentation. Ms. Mhkitaryan also introduced 2 teammates, Cherry Richardson, Client Services Manager, and Derrick Felder, Development and Marketing Director. Lutheran Social Services is a non-profit organization that has been in existence since 1996, and served over 185,000 people in the community. We are a faith based organization, not a church, but a 501(c)3. We serve everyone by asking questions about their financial situation, income and needs. It provides services to the community such as nutrition services, which includes client choice food pantry, nutrition education kitchen, SNAP outreach program, and the heart of the city senior meal program. The food pantry is about 6000 square foot area that resembles a supermarket for people to come in and choose their own food. We feel that provides a dignity facto to the clients. The food pantry is open Monday and Friday, 8:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m., and Wednesday for the seniors. The clients are allowed to shop every 30 days, but we do allow some exceptions on a case by case basis. The organization also provides Open Air Free Markets since 2010. By working with community partners it has provided 18,000 – 25,000 lbs. of food within a few hours to 400-500 households. As an organization we distribute 500,000 lbs. of food annually to over 12,000 individuals. Although the food pantry is considered a supplemental emergency support, we do provide the community nutrition kitchen which is more of an educational component service. We provide cooking demonstrations; educate them on budgeting, planning, safe food handling, and healthy eating. We also have a holiday program called Christmas Love Dinner where we get our clients together to spend time with them and thank them. SNAP outreach program is funded by the State of Nevada, Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services. This is the program formally known as food stamps. We have case managers trained and certified to provide the SNAP applications on behalf of our clientele. Approximately 1-2 years ago, the Heart of the City senior meals program was started. We are located in the Reformation Lutheran Church, one of our partners that allow us to host our kitchen so seniors can come and eat hot meals daily, Monday – Friday, 2:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m. Lutheran Social Services also has an Empowerment Center, which is a social employment retention services, birth certificate and NV identification assistance, bus passes for employment interviews, and tax preparation assistance. Lutheran Social Services also provides family stabilization services, homeless prevention, rental and utility assistance programs, and rapid rehousing. Lutheran Social Services introduced a program a few years ago called Angel Health Care Non-Medical Home Care Services. A fee is charged for this service, which is fee based. Although we are not Medicaid certified, we provide care to seniors and individuals with disabilities in their homes, and we expect to receive our Medicaid certification soon. We also have special programs done annually, i.e. Easter Baskets, Back to School backpacks and supplies, Turkey Baskets, Christmas Gift Assistance, and Christmas Love Dinner.

The opportunity was given for questions. Donna Jordan, Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health, asked if Lutheran Social Services has a representative payee program to act as the payee for individuals receiving Social Security benefits. Ms. Mhkitaryan stated they do not.

Kena Adams, Moapa Band of Paiutes, questioned whether the location of Lutheran Social Services was near St. Louis. Ms. Mhkitaryan stated it is closer to Pecos and Charleston. Ms. Adams stated that in the past she has had a difficult time getting in touch with Lutheran Social Services. Ms. Mhkitaryan stated that Ms. Adams could take Ms. Mhkitaryan contact information and she would get a response. Ms. Mhkitaryan also mentioned that in 2016 Lutheran Social Services will be moving to a new location, but will notify everyone as the time gets near.

**Agenda Item 8. Receive a presentation from the City of North Las Vegas on the Choice Neighborhoods grant; for possible action.**

Jim Haye, City of North Las Vegas Neighborhood Services, presented the board with information about the Choice Neighborhood Planning Grant, the progress being made, and to create an open, long-term dialogue with the board about addressing the homelessness issues being faced by everyone in the community. Mr. Haye introduced additional team members: Dr. Tiffany Tyler, Nevada Partners; Armena Mhkitaryan, Lutheran Social Services; Melanie Braud, Southern Nevada Regional Highway Authority; and Lorena Candelario, City of North Las Vegas. Team members absent from the meeting are Cass Palmer, City of North Las Vegas and Mr. Paul Amazo, Housing Authority. Mr. Haye opened the slide presentation showing a logo which represents Choice Neighborhoods. He explained that the grantee is the City of North Las Vegas and the co-grantee is Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority. The list of partners presented to the board only

consisted of one-third of those partners involved, with the first 12 being the core partners. A few of the other partners include College of Southern Nevada, Catholic Charities, and UNLV. An area called the Urban Core was shown, depicting the target area of the Choice Neighborhood Planning Grant, is of North Las Vegas, and covers 1.27 square miles. Mr. Haye explained the color coding of the map: Green - Buena Vista II, a 3 acre site; Blue - Buena Vista I; both which are vacant properties that redevelopment is planned for. The Rose Garden Area in the southeast corner contains property handled by the Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority, but it is a smaller area of the Rose Garden Area being targeted, but the whole area is planned to be included in the redevelopment efforts. Everything between the two anchor areas are being considered as part of the target area. The effort is to redevelop and revitalize or transform the whole section of North Las Vegas within the Urban Core. Since the whole southern portion of the area is adjacent to Las Vegas, discussion and involvement with Las Vegas are vital regarding the overall planning. An overview of Choice Neighborhoods Grants is to transform distressed neighborhoods, public and assisted projects into viable and sustainable mixed income neighborhoods, by making housing improvements with appropriate services, i.e. schools, assets, transportation, and access to jobs. The grant amount was \$485,000 over a 2 year period. City of North Las Vegas was 1 of 7 grantees awarded the grant, and the only grantee west of the Mississippi. A competitive feature of the grant was the fact that we had over \$1.8 million leverage resources from our partners. The goal of the plan is to develop a comprehensive, transformation plan to revitalize the target neighborhood. This involves housing which is well managed and financially viable and sustainable, but also focusses on improving the neighborhood around those houses, along with amenities, transportation, people services, etc. All those things are being taken into consideration when we develop our transformation plan. To summarize the transformation plan must include planning and implementation activities and address housing, neighborhood and people, not only for the target area but also for the area around it. Another key feature of the grant is that all residents, all active neighborhood associations and businesses, and all resources must be included in the transformation plan. The grant went into effect on January 16, 2015, and we have 2 years to develop transformation plan and to conduct all planning activities. From July through October, community outreach, community engagement, resident assessment surveys and secondary data analysis will all be done. An intensive community market survey will be done within the next month, which will hopefully include 350 residents in the area as well as public housing residents in the target area of Rose Garden. A security resources developer will be engaged to help acquire investment resources to develop the overall plan and help implement the plan. The outline of the transformation plan is due by the end of 2015, with the first draft of the overall transformation plan is due in July 2016. The goal is to complete the transformation plan by December 2016. Since one of the core features is community engagement, the goal is to include neighborhood outline and people who live in the area; the Latino population, which had a large influx in the community; the youth population (ages 17-24); and the general population that has not been as involved in the past. Ms. Melanie Row, Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority (SNRHA), explained that this grant required a public housing component. Rose Gardens had already been slated to go through renovations over the next 5 years beginning in 2016, because it is a distressed 120 unit senior property that had been built quite a few years ago and presently has some failing systems. With the grant, SNRHA is looking for a 1 for 1 housing replacement, which requires looking for relocation of property. The current location is on the front of Las Vegas Blvd. There are already 2 other senior subsidized housing properties in the area. South of Rose Garden is located the Corridor of Hope. The existing location will be demolished but some of public housing currently in place must first be redeveloped. Doing surveys is an attempt to get more information from the community. Since SNRHA currently has 2 existing properties, north and west, of the Rose Gardens, the plan is to redevelop some of the senior housing in those 2 existing properties prior to demolishing the current location. Also under discussion is a plan to develop some senior housing in the larger portion of the Buena Vista area which is the vacant lot that the City of Las Vegas owns. It is also a goal to include in the transformation plan an addition of 120 units of mix income housing. By including not only subsidized housing, but also mixed income housing, in the implementation plan a higher score could be achieved by covering the gamut of all income. There are also other vacant lots within the Urban Core area being taken into consideration to determine if any leveraging can be done with this grant to create more interest with the owners of those lots. New design for the existing lots north and west of Rose Garden were presented. Since Rose Garden is a 3-story garden-style development with a courtyard area in the center, designs to create natural security boundaries, and parking, perhaps interior, are being considered so that the housing appears more like private sector housing as opposed to institutional type housing. The larger Buena Vista parcel is up for discussion depending on the community's input as to building some public housing as well as mixed income housing. A question was raised as to which Buena Vista parcel was being considered; the one on Carey or the one on Lake Mead. Ms. Rowe responded that it would be the larger parcel on Carey would be more design friendly, as the parcel on Lake Mead is not deep enough since it would be a matter of replacing the buildings that were demolished. Mr. Haye added that initial design work has been done on the Lake Mead property. He explained that a multi-family unit had previously been demolished, which increased the property value by 50% based on the previous existing problems. As part of the Choice Grant, redeveloping the area into something that is needed and wanted by the community to revitalize the area economically is a top priority. He also responded to a question regarding the 15 units that are currently in the area, stating they would remain in existence. Dr. Tiffany Tyler, Nevada Partners, explained that the purpose of the presentation to the board is to enlist the support of the board since the board has a 10-year plan or more that has been underway that is specifically designed to address homelessness, and to make it a goal to address homelessness in the Rose Garden area. As part of that discussion, residents have called for action to address homelessness in Rose Garden area. An additional purpose

is to compliment any existing initiatives and also respond to a number of social, political or economic issues happening in the Urban Core, as well as adjacent community. Plus, in the area where something must be done around transforming the community, through education, employment economic activity, health, housing, transportation and IT, there should be open discussion as to what is being done a block away, what is being proposed, what is being leveraged, what resources or strategies are already crafted or implemented. What is the natural nexus for what is being done and what are the proposals to do in the site. The purpose is to enlist support in administering the surveys required for this grant, as well as join one of the following three sectors that are noted in this effort.

1. Housing Sector, discussion on what kind of housing should be considered in this area, with a focus on mixed income housing, to the extent of what can be supported and where in the target area, including the Rose Gardens area.
2. People Sector, discussion on programs and services currently being offered, but also considering what the residents envision for themselves and the knowledge of lacking. An extensive gap analysis and asset map from that prospective.
3. Neighborhood Sector, discussion on creating conditions for public and private investment with focus on what physical assets are in that area and what physical assets should be brought in. And ways that will ensure the reduction of the unemployment rate, ways that can support mixed use housing, support small business and midsize business development minimally in an effort to improve the economic activity, and in a manner where it is currently visible to the residents and stakeholders that a transformation has happened.

The goal is to have the board:

1. Commit to administering the survey as a support of the overall initiative, whether it is on paper or online format. After conducting the surveys, some stakeholder interviews, as well as focus group interviews, determine what services could be leveraged or expanded according to the needs or priorities identified as a part of that plan.
2. Formally join one of the Sectors as appropriate, or all if the work intersects with each of the sectors.
3. Support the formal convenience over the course of the project, where an overview of the status or milestones would be provided, but as the work is evolving, informing the transformation plan as a part of the process.
4. Identify assets that currently are afforded in that area as a result of the existing work. Those assets can be physical assets, or services being provided in that area, so leveraging of those services could be done.

Hopefully, a number of opportunities to engage have been recognized, whether it be administering the surveys, participating in the stakeholder interviews, or spearheading some sub-committees that evolve as a result of the priorities identified. Dr. Tyler asked for the board's involvement in this effort, and to formally commit to leverage of work that is being done by the committee. Ms. Rowe added that there is other subsidized senior housing, as well as vacant land owned by the City of North Las Vegas, and another parcel owned by SNRHA along the Corridor of Hope. Part of the transformation plan will include a homeless section, so she emphasized the need to work closely together in order to be able to hit major key components, and be able to bring that to the table as well. Donna Jordon, Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health, mentioned that based on her work with Kathi and Capt. Kelly for community engagement in that sector for the storage thing would be a perfect spot. Kathi Thomas-Gibson, City of Las Vegas, clarified Ms. Jordan's comment, by stating that the City of Las Vegas has a homeless advisory committee focused on the urban core. Since there has been discussion between the City of Las Vegas and some of the Choice Grant members, a formalize invitation to have those members become a part of that committee, which also includes many of the SNHCoC board members. Ms. Thomas-Gibson stated that the committee that she and Ms. Jordan are a part of would commit to assisting with the surveys by providing the link to the surveys to everyone on the Homeless Committee Advisory board, as well engage where the work intersects. She also suggested that committee could participate in the stakeholder interviews. Lorena Candelario, City of North Las Vegas, clarified that part of the success in receiving the grant was due to working with partners who knows the issues in the Corridor of Hope and the encampments in the area, and to be successful with the implementation grant, it is important to work together with the community partners to solve those issues to encourage other businesses to locate and invest in the city. Dr. Tyler also interjected that the plan includes a public safety plan. Shalimar Cabrera, U.S. Vets, requested verification of the revitalization of the existing units in Rose Gardens and Buena Vista, as well as the issue specifically addressing the homeless. Will the area that is expected to be revitalized around the homeless include new construction or just alleviate the homeless issue around the areas being revitalized? Ms. Rowe responded that ideally they would like to be able to use the funding for housing. It was also noted that the money was not only to provide the opportunity for housing but to also improve the quality of life to live there, and provide services for the homeless.

**Agenda Item 9. Receive an introduction to youth homelessness from Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth; for possible action.**

Arash Ghafoori, Executive Director for Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, presented an overview of youth homelessness on a national, state and local level, as well as a discussion on why youth homelessness is occurring, and the unique needs and challenges associated with this population. Mr. Ghafoori presented the 2013 national numbers for those youth that have experienced even one night of homelessness. He also presented the 2012-2013 count for Nevada, slightly less the 24,000, which is one of the highest populations of homeless youth in the country, and was a 13% increase from the

prior year. The 2015 census has identified and average over 2200 homeless youth in Southern Nevada. Clark County ranks 3<sup>rd</sup> in the highest population of homeless youth in a major metropolitan area, and Nevada ranks 1<sup>st</sup> in the country for unsheltered homeless youth. Mr. Ghafoori went on to discuss the various unique causes and consequences of youth homelessness. Causes include severe family breakdown, i.e. running away from abuse and neglect, being kicked out by family, falling through cracks of child welfare system, deaths in family leaving youth nowhere to turn; economic, social, cultural, and accommodational factors. Consequences include substance abuse, chronic mental and physical health problems, unwanted pregnancy, crime, victimization, gang involvement, dropping out of high school, and becoming a homeless adult. Mr. Ghafoori then discussed statistics related to the cause and consequences. One-third of every homeless teen will be lured into prostitution within 48 hrs. of leaving home; one-third of homeless use engage in survival sex; homeless youth are 7 times more likely to die from AIDS and 16 times more likely to be infected with HIV. Suicide is the lead cause of death among street youth. Children with unstable homes are twice as likely to repeat a school grade, expel or be suspended from school, or drop out of school entirely. More than half of homeless or street youth had no response from their parents when they told their parents they were leaving home. Mr. Ghafoori stressed the fact that youth homelessness is a very serious issue in the community and homeless youth issues are very different from their adult counterparts in terms of needs and services that work best for them. This in part is because homeless youth are physically, emotionally, psychologically and socially still developing. They enter into homelessness with little or no work experience and are forced to leave their education due to their homeless status. They experience high levels of criminal victimization, including sexual exploitation and labor trafficking. They often enter homelessness without certain life skills, such as cooking, money management, housekeeping and job searching. According to The United States Interagency Agency Council on Homelessness, youth benefit from focused attention by systems adapted to their unique needs. All of the building blocks being discussed next come from collaboration from agencies such as Child Welfare, Juvenile Justice, Public School Systems, and community based organizations. The basic building blocks of an effective best practice research based safety net for runaway and homeless youth include prevention and outreach to youth services; drop in centers to engage youth and link them to community resources; shelter to provide a first step off the streets; family engagement and intervention when safe and appropriate; youth appropriate housing programs to provide independent living skills; case management to improve wellness and decision making; connection to education to increase earning capabilities; workforce development to enable youth to compete effectively in the job market; culturally competent and adaptive services; services in the community that respond to human trafficking of minors. Evidence shows the best practice of homeless youth programs created significant return on investments for communities by reducing incarceration rates, chronic adult homelessness rates, chronic physical and mental illness, substance abuse, crime and unemployment. This also helps create productive and healthy adults who positively contribute to society. When comparing homeless youth services to treatment facilities, group homes, foster care, juvenile corrections, custodial care, treatment and arrest, the average cost of transitional living project for youth is \$8,810, which is less than one half the minimum cost of serving a child through child welfare or juvenile justice system, which averages \$25,000-\$55,000 per youth. Policy priorities are taking into consideration the big barriers and challenges, which are lack of awareness and lack of resources. Children and youth experiencing homelessness are invisible to the public and the policy makers because many are not yet voters and significant taxpayers. Many fall through cracks of adult system because the unique circumstances and challenges associated with youth homelessness are not understood by most adults. Solutions are to improve awareness and educate the public and policy makers about youth homelessness; include youth explicitly as a special population in local, regional, and federal plans to end homelessness; must improve awareness to other systems that touch youth, i.e. child welfare, mental health and juvenile justice institutions, to improve discharge planning and prevention. Resources are a challenge on the national level and the local level. Nationally, less than 4200 beds for homeless youth exist, which only serves less than 10% of homeless youth identified nationally. The federal government designated \$114,000,000 for shelter housing and services specifically for homeless youth. Resource solutions are creative collaborations necessary among all levels of government, non-profit and private sectors. Because of lack of resources available, all entities must work together and communicate to expand a safety net for homeless youth by increasing youth appropriate housing services, education and employment support, prevention and early intervention, access to healthcare and affordable housing, targeted outreach, easier access to services for youth, and most importantly, gather better data to get more precise picture of this specific population in order to invest and monitor progress. In summary, with the work done at Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, the youth in the community are very vulnerable, but so resilient. By intervening now, the success rates will be higher and will save money for society when youth are still young rather than waiting until they reach adulthood, entrenched with bad habits and survival mode of street living. Homeless youth teeter on edge between a lifetime of poverty, abuse and crime, and a successful sustainable future. The floor was opened to questions. Mr. Ghafoori responded to Kathi Thomas-Gibson, City of Las Vegas, regarding how youth homelessness correlated sex trafficking, graduation rates, labor trafficking, victimless incarceration, juvenile incarceration, youth homelessness highly correlated to many issues effecting the age 18 and under population. It is important to combat this issue at the root. Mr. Ghafoori responded to Terry Murphy, Fremont Street Experience, regarding whether the reports are replicated by stating that the information is not mirrored but all information is gathered through surveys, census, and various other reports. He then showed the numbers as they related to our community, and compared the number of unaccompanied youth versus homeless youth with families. He then offered Ms. Murphy, at her request, with a fact sheet showing the numbers locally of unaccompanied homeless youth and homeless

youth with families. Kelly-Jo Shebeck, Title I coordinator for Clark County School District, offered to assist in answering some of Ms. Murphy's questions as the school district also collects data. The count was 9200 last year, 11000 this year which includes homeless youth with families, unaccompanied youth in high school is approximately 700 students. Mr. Ghafoori interjected that about 3 years ago, the count was about 6000 students in the district. Melissa Clary, Huntridge Neighborhood, asked of the primary funding source for Nevada Partnership for Youth, and number of staff. Mr. Ghafoori stated that this presentation was more about youth homelessness, but at present he has 12 staff, an army of independent contractors, and as for the budget, 55% is private funding and 45% is government funding.

**Agenda Item 10. Receive an update on the Monitoring Working Group; for possible action.**

Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Continuum of Care Coordinator, explained that the Monitoring Working Group is tasked with identifying and evaluating outcomes/performance measures for the providers and the system as a whole. The group has been meeting weekly to prepare the report for the Evaluation Working Group for decisions and recommendations to the board for the local process. On a large scale, the Evaluation Working Group will be provided information by the Monitoring Working Group, which will be evaluating all of the CoC renewal projects, and new projects. The Monitoring Working Group will be looking at multiple components. One of the components is the performance monitoring desk audit tool that is in the HMIS system looks at projects that serve those that are harder to serve in the community. It checks to see how many of those harder to serve populations are the projects serving, and the percentage of those clients fall within the harder to serve categories, i.e. substance abuse, chronic health conditions, HIV/AIDS, developmental disability, physical disability, domestic violence survivors, unaccompanied youth under age 18, and unaccompanied transition age youth who are 18–24. The second component measured under the performance monitoring desk audit tool is length of homeless episodes and new and return entries into homelessness, i.e. how many folks are leaving transitional rapid rehousing or permanent supportive housing programs to a permanent destination, or how many in a permanent supportive housing program are staying in that program in order to continue to get the support they need to maintain sustainability. Also, income support is considered, such as maintaining and sustaining income. All three measures will be combined, since more providers may deal with youth that have more education needs, but others may be serving chronically homeless that do not have an income per employment to connect to other income benefits, and then the income measure. HMIS participation and quality is considered. Data entered into HMIS, entered timely, score higher when entered closer to real time as possible. Then all information is added to scorecard for each program, cost per client, application score, performance monitoring score, recidivism (folks left program and percentage that have returned into the program). Then the evaluation group is given the information for them to make good decisions, before the evaluation group gives its recommendations to board. Arash Ghafoori asked if monitoring is different than performance. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that the techno assistance monitoring given to providers is different than the data pulled from HMIS. Mr. Ghafoori asked how recidivism was used to score a program. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated it does not have a scored number to it, rather it is shown across agencies so each agency can see their recidivism rate. They also have scorecard for program type, i.e. all supportive housing programs compare against each other, see recidivism rate and as well as community wide.

**Agenda Item 11. Receive an update on the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Working Group; for possible action.**

Barbara Geach, City of Henderson and champion for the HMIS Working Group, explained that all the information Michele Fuller-Hallauer had previously reported on through the Evaluation Working Group and Monitoring Working Group all get sent through the tool which is HMIS, which is a definite component interacting with both groups. Ms. Geach stated that the first HMIS Working Group meeting had taken place June 16 and involved the 16 members which included Ms. Geach. Because of the diversity of the group, items covered included What is HMIS, How does HMIS work statewide, How does HMIS impact the Evaluation Working Group as well as the Monitoring Working Group, and What are the HEART Act requirements. A copy of the HMIS draft charter, which was written before the group was ever formed, was given to each member for evaluation and review to determine whether any updates were needed. Three immediate tasks were identified.

1. Review and update, if applicable, the HMIS governance charter.
2. Establish protocols for clarity passport cards.
3. Establish application process criteria for evaluating requests to be end user of HMIS system. With so many requests to use the system, it needs to be vetted as to what the need is, i.e. inputter, extractor, or both.

Since this is a new board, Ms. Geach turned the program over to Ms. Fuller-Hallauer to give an HMIS 101 Overview so everyone would know what it is, what it is used for, and how it benefits the homelessness efforts in the community. HMIS stands for Homeless Management Information System, but has also been referred to as CMIS, Community Management Information System, and is mandated by HUD in order to receive HUD homeless assistance funding and emergency solutions funding. The community has to have an active usable homeless management information system, but can determine which software system they can use, as long as it provides HUD with the necessary reports. The CoC adopted the Clarity System. All the homeless service providers and VA Supportive Services for Veterans Families utilize HMIS, and must do so in order to receive HUD assistance. Whether HUD funding is received, all homeless service providers have been encouraged to utilize the HMIS system so that there is only one portal to collect and retrieve data. At this point, approximately 99% of the

homeless service providers in the community use HMIS to collect the data. Part of the inter-local agreement among all the jurisdictions hopes to fund the ongoing operations of the maintenance of care of HMIS and basic licensure for the homeless service providers. The HMIS Expansion Grant helps to fund more licenses so we don't have to charge those providers for the utilizing the system, like other CoCs do. The HMIS Expansion Grant also supports a data analyst, who is helps pull data as well as develop an expansion to the HMIS system to be able to continue to collect data to assist in making data driven decisions and report to any of the federal entities in order for us to be competitive as a community for grants. Heather DeSart, Workforce Connections, questioned the confidentiality of HMIS and if there are any issues with regards to confidentiality. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer explained the strong privacy policies in place and the system being used in our community is one of the strongest with multi-layers of security in place, and only limited access is allowed. Kena Adams, Moapa Band of Paiutes, questioned whether her organization should check into using HMIS even though it is a small organization of 4 staff, but they have 25% of their clientele experiencing homelessness. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer affirmed that Ms. Adams should. Since there were no other questions, Ms. Geach extended an invitation to everyone to the next meeting of the HMIS Working Group being held Tuesday, July 21 at 9:00 a.m. at Woman's Development Center.

**Agenda Item 12. Receive an update from each board member regarding relevant activities within their respective organizations relating to homelessness.**

Stacy Sutton Pollard, Nevada Homeless Alliance, Community Engagement Sub-Working Group, under this committee announced a change in time for their meetings to the fourth Tuesday of every month at 10:00 a.m. instead of 1:00 p.m. at Clark County Social Services. She also invited anyone interested in attending the meeting to contact her so they can be added to the notification list. Kena Adams, Moapa Band of Paiutes, publicly invited everyone to the Moapa Band of Paiutes reservation to an open house which Voc Rehab is having on Wednesday, August 12, from 11:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. Lunch will also be served. Kelli Jo Shebeck, Title I Coordinator with Clark County School District presented new flyers that combine the previous English and Spanish flyers into one flyer and includes an agency map. The flyers pertain to the families and list school based help centers, shelters, and some social services. Kathi Thomas-Gibson, City of Las Vegas, announced that the city is working with the community partners to develop public service announcements on topics of interest, and she will be sending links to everyone and get a showing of them on the agenda. The current public service announcement is about dumping and street feeding of the homeless. Veterans is the topic of the public service announcement currently in production, and the on in fall will be on youth. Input regarding other topics of interest will be accepted and taken into consideration that the committee feels is important to develop. These public service announcements can be put on the agencies websites and Mainstream Media has been contacted to run these announcements, also. Ms. Thomas-Gibson also thanked the Community Engagement Sub-Working Group for helping to work out the meeting times. Ms. Thomas-Gibson announced that the Planning Working Group will be meeting on the fourth Tuesday of every month at 1:00 p.m. Henry Sneed, The Church LV, asked the board to make a motion for Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, to return in August to. Although Pastor Sneed was not allowed to make the motion, he was informed to let the board know his request and it would be considered when making the agenda for next month's meeting. Pastor Sneed announced that on Saturday, July 11, the Mayor's Faith Initiative is having a Citywide Unity Celebration from 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. at the East Las Vegas Community Center. The celebration will showcase the Mayor's Faith Initiative, which has various working groups, one regarding homelessness and another regarding youth. Under-Sheriff Kevin McMahill from the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department will be a keynote speaker. Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, addressed Pastor Sneed's earlier request by stating he would be willing to return to give a presentation, but also wanted to make sure parliamentary procedure was being followed. Michele Fuller-Hallauer addressed the board stating that while in the process of applications for the CoC, it is not wise to have individual agencies do presentations on their own as this could sway the board in their decision making process. Julie Callaway, City of Boulder City, interjected that it could be put aside for a future meeting. Catherine Huang Hara also clarified for the board that although Lutheran Social Services who did a presentation is not currently a CoC funded provider.

**Agenda Item 13. Public Comment.**

Phillip Hollon, The Salvation Army, thanked the City of Las Vegas for being able to provide the bottled water through the community meal, and by bringing that group or organization into the dining facility to distribute the water keeps individuals off the street. Salvation Army now has a partnership with Dunkin' Donuts. Beginning on July 6 and throughout the month of July, Dunkin' Donuts restaurants throughout the Las Vegas and Henderson areas is sponsoring a bottled water campaign to help keep the homeless clients hydrated during periods of intense heat. Customers who donate a case of bottled water at participating Dunkin' Donuts restaurants will receive a free medium coffee or iced coffee and a free donut of their choice. Mr. Hollon also stated that an individual contacted The Salvation Army just recently stating he had just purchased a pallet of water and had it delivered. The Las Vegas Justice Court began their 2<sup>nd</sup> annual The Salvation Army fundraiser, soliciting donations from the employees to purchase bottled water. To date, \$650 has been collected. Due to the support of the community, The Salvation Army has been able to distribute more than 1500 bottles of water on a daily basis; and more than

2000 bottles of water were being distributed during the intense heat days. The Salvation Army is partnering the summer food drive with Sudden Impact and Auto Body, and Findlay Acura. The 2 week food drive, which collects non-perishable food items, begins on Friday, July 17, and ends on Friday, July 31. The Salvation Army is also partnering with the Safari Club International Foundation and Sportsmen Against Hunger Project. The Club's Annual Conference will be held in Las Vegas in February 2016. On February 2, 2016, volunteers from the Club will be hosting a game meat community meal for the homeless and low income clients.

Catherine Huang Hara, Clark County Social Services, expanded on the mention of the heat and cooling stations. Clark County Social Services has currently funded day shelter providers and the daytime shelters are open until September 30<sup>th</sup>. The providers are The Salvation Army, Catholic Charities, and The Shade Tree. However, the appeal was made for cooling stations, which are additional stations for those days that are 110 degrees or more. Although there are cooling stations in the City of Las Vegas, the City of Henderson, and around Clark County, the deficit comes for stations that are open on Sundays. Ms. Huang Hara stated that any community centers, organizations, or houses of faith interested in assisting, she can be contacted by phone, 702-455-5623, or by email, c3h@clarkcountynv.gov.

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.