

**SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION
SOUTHERN NEVADA HOMELESSNESS CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
October 22, 2015**

In attendance: Julie Calloway, Co-Chair, City of Boulder City
David Briggs, alternate, Briggs and Spriggs
Arash Ghafoori, Vice Co-Chair, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth
Emily Lewis, City of Henderson
Lorena Candelario, City of North Las Vegas
Bobby Gordon, alternate, Clark County Social Service
Terri Thompson, alternate, Clark County School District
Terry Murphy, Fremont Street Experience
Melissa Clary, Huntridge Neighborhood Association
David Slattery, Las Vegas Fire & Rescue
Bret Ficklin, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Phyllis Cobb, alternate, Veterans Administration
Nancy Menzel, UNLV
Donna Jordan, alternate, Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services
Kena Adams, Moapa Band of Paiutes
Kevin Morss, alternate, WestCare, Inc.
Henry Sneed, The Church LV
Amber Batchelor, S.A.F.E. Nest
John Hill, Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority
Vicki Chan-Padgett, Touro University Nevada
Mike Mullin, Nevada HAND
Shalimar Cabrera, U.S. Vets – Las Vegas
Nelson Araujo, alternate, United Way of Southern Nevada

Absent:

Stephen Harsin, City of Las Vegas
Thomas Roberts, Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada
Jesse Robinson, HELP of Southern Nevada
Angela Marshall, Second Chance Christian Ministries
Stacy Sutton Pollard, Nevada Homeless Alliance
Corrine Valencia, U.S. Navy Veteran
Vacant, Workforce Connections

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, October 22, 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 October 22, 2015.

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

Agenda Item 4. Approval of recommendations for funding for the local 2015 Continuum of Care competition and authorize the Continuum of Care Coordinator to make necessary modifications for final application submission to U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD); for possible action.

Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Continuum of Care Coordinator, presented to the board the recommended project applications for approval of submission to the 2015 HUD CoC Consolidated Application. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer

explained she would review the process of HUD's priorities, present the recommendations of the CoC Evaluation Working Group, and request the board's decision on those recommendations. She then reviewed the timeline of the local application. Beginning May 15 the local application process was released. The local process utilized reviews the applications and determines what the projects are, what the outcomes are for each project, and evaluates those project in order to assure the community has the strongest application to move forward with. On May 26 and May 27 mandatory technical assistance training was held. In June the local applications were due, as were the presentations of the applications before the Evaluation Working Group. In September, prior to the NOFA release, it became apparent that Rapid Rehousing opportunities would be available, so the Evaluation Working Group reopened the application process for NEW Rapid Rehousing projects. Those new rapid rehousing projects were due on October 6 with presentations done on October 12. On October 12 and October 13, the CoC Evaluation Working Group began the ranking of the applications. Finally on October 20 an appeal hearing was held for any project that wished to appeal the recommendation made by the working group. The HUD Policy Priorities included 6 policy priorities: Strategic Resource Allocation, Ending Chronic Homelessness, Ending Family Homelessness, Ending Youth Homelessness, Ending Veteran Homelessness, and Using a Housing First Approach. The consolidated application needs to show HUD that the community is working towards the 6 priorities. It was noted that the 2015 CoC NOFA is the most competitive NOFA ever, both on a national and local level. Reallocation is important as stressed in all the HUD information put forth. Also, all four Opening Doors time frames are important. Those time frames are ending veteran homelessness by 2015, ending chronic homelessness by 2017, ending family and youth homelessness by 2020 and charting the course to ending all homelessness by 2020. New items for the 2015 process were: Permanent Housing Bonus is up to 15 percent of the CoCs Final Pro Rated Need (FPRN) which allowed new and multiple projects to be put forward. In the past, only 1 project was allowed to be put forward, and the Permanent Housing Bonus could only be used for Permanent Supportive Housing to serve 100 percent chronically homeless. This year, not only were permanent supportive housing programs allowed, but also rapid rehousing for homeless. Reallocation is refunding projects created through shifting funds and includes permanent supportive housing for homeless, rapid rehousing for individuals and households with children, homeless management information systems, and supportive services specifically for centralized and coordinated assessment system. Five component emphasized for 2015 are: chronic homelessness isn't the only game in town, youth and family homelessness has to be considered; there is an emphasis on community and project performance; housing first and reducing barriers; rapid rehousing, large amount of points involved in adding new rapid rehousing stock or programming; resource allocation regarding the effective use of funding. HUD strongly encourages communities to decrease transitional housing projects and to increase permanent housing beds, which can be permanent supportive housing or rapid rehousing. The Evaluation Working Group utilized a scorecard using a large amount of data elements in order to make data driven recommendations. Components of the scorecard included the application score, the cost per client for each of the projects, performance monitoring and outcomes, utilization of the beds, exits to permanent sustainable living situations, and recidivism rates of the program. Each agency was given a scorecard showing the score for each component. The score given in the outcomes total is the combination of the application score and the performance monitoring score, and was heavily used in this year's process. Performance monitoring looks at whether the project is serving the hardest to serve clients in the community; are they reducing the length of homelessness; are clients being moved to the permanent housing placement; are clients receiving increased income job sufficiency; and how is HMIS participation and data quality. Also explored was the housing utilization, along with the average yearly utilization, exits to permanent destination and the recidivism percentage. The Evaluation Working Group relied heavily on the Monitoring Working Group which evaluated each project by utilizing HMIS data to provide scores for the scorecards, which populated the ranking tool used by the Evaluation Working Group. The Evaluation Working Group asked the Coordinated Change Advisory Team to provide a report on each project that serves households without children, with regards to compliance. The Evaluation working Group also explored the local needs, which included housing as well as other needs identified by the Point-In-Time count, gaps analysis, housing inventory chart, and the community queue. A subgroup of the Evaluation Working Group met with the ad-hoc group to evaluate the housing needs, and that report was submitted to the Evaluation Working Group, which then ranked the projects. During the ranking process, a gap in the system for rapid rehousing projects for transition age youth was identified, so additional projects to address this issue was requested and ranked. Then the recommendations are brought to the board. The 2015 funding allowed by HUD is based on a formula to determine the preliminary pro rata need (PPRN) which is \$8,892,355. However, the annual renewal demand (ARD) amount, which is the cost to renew all of the projects up for renewal is \$12,421,218. Because the ARD is higher than the PPRN, HUD allows the community to request the ARD amount. HUD then instructs the rankings to be divided into Tier 1 and Tier 2 divisions. Tier 1 being the projects most likely to be funded, and Tier 2 are heavily ranked on community consolidated application score as well as subcomponents, i.e. who is being served, is the project

committed to Housing First, and is the community needs being met. Tier 1 is 85% of the ARD which equates to \$10,558,035.30. Tier 2 is the remaining 15% plus the 15% allowable for a permanent housing bonus, although not all the permanent housing bonus has to be allocated to Tier 2 projects. The total Tier 2 funding request is \$3,726,365.40. This year, HUD is allowing a project to straddle Tier 1 and Tier 2. This helps alleviate the challenge for the Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects to come to the exact allowable amount in each perspective tier. This year 39 project application requests were received for a total request of \$14,591,872, which exceeded the allowed funding request of \$14,284,400.70. The CoC Evaluation Working Group Recommendations for Tier 1 are ranked in order as follows:

Clark County- HMIS Expansion	HMIS
St. Jude's Ranch-Crossings	TH
Women's Development Center-Transitional Housing	TH
Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth-Independent Living	TH
Women's Development Center- Housing Stability for families - expansion	PSH
Women's Development Center-Housing Stability for Families	PSH
St. Jude's Ranch - Crossing Expansion	TH
US Vets-SHP-Disabled Vets	PSH
Women's Development Center-Re-entry Housing Services	PSH
Southern Nevada Children First-Moving Forward	TH
US Vets-CHAMPS	PSH
Southern Nevada Children First- A Place Called Home	RRH
The Shade Tree (HOME)	RRH
US Vets-CHAMPS2 PH	PSH
St. Jude's Ranch-New Crossings HUD	RRH
Southern Nevada Children First-Paradise	PSH
US Vets-GPD Veterans in Progress	TH
WestCare-HCCP	PSH
New Genesis-HOPE Project	PSH
Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services - HUD I	PSH
HELP of Southern Nevada- A New Start	PSH
HELP of Southern Nevada-HELP them HOME	PSH
US Vets-Disabled Vets 2	PSH
HELP of Southern Nevada-SWHYC HUD TH	TH
WestCare-Safe Haven	SH
Clark County Social Service-New Beginnings	PSH
Clark County- Healthy Living	PSH
Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services-Dual Success	PSH
Clark County- The Vivo Housing Project	PSH

The CoC Evaluation Working Group Recommendations for Tier 2 are as follows:

Clark County- The Vivo Housing Project	PSH
Clark County Social Services-Keeping Families Together (Bonus)	RRH

Clark County Social Services- FUSE (Bonus)	PSH
Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services HUD Expansion	PSH
US Vets-RRH Project (Bonus)	RRH
Southern Nevada Children First-Another Place Called Home	RRH
Safe Nest - Operation Fresh Start	RRH
Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth RRH	RRH
St Jude's Ranch for Children - Crossings Phoenix	RRH

The Reallocated Renewal Projects voted on by the Evaluation Working Group to defund and reallocate those funds into the Tier 1 and Tier 2 recommendations are as follows:

Catholic Charities – St. Vincent - St. Vincent Apartments	TH
Nevada Community Associates – Project HOPE	RRH
Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services - Pathways	PSH

The Tier 1 and Tier 2 renewal projects provide continued funding for 976 beds/724 units in permanent supportive housing; 119 beds/64 units in rapid rehousing; 246 beds/101 units in transitional housing; 25 beds in safe haven; HMIS expansion. The new projects bring an additional 104 beds/93 units of permanent supportive housing and 141 beds/80 units of rapid rehousing. There were 2 appeal requests received – Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services – Pathways, and Nevada Community Associates – Project HOPE on October 20. The appeals were heard by a neutral review team, not actively a part of the current evaluation team, but with past experience of working on the evaluation working group. This team voted to uphold the original recommendations for reallocation from the CoC Evaluation Working Group. The current package equates to Tier 1, \$10,558,035.30, and Tier 2, \$3,726,365.40 for a total of \$14,284,400.70. The CoC is allowed to and will apply for an additional \$372,637 for a planning grant, bringing the total 2015 request to \$14,657,037.70. The Evaluation working Group is asking the board to approve or deny the recommendations. By November 5, 2015, project applications are due in esnaps, the electronic portal which HUD uses to receive the applications. A draft of the consolidated application will be available to the review team by November 6, 2015. Anyone interested in being on the review team was invited to contact either Ms. Fuller-Hallauer, or Catherine Huang Hara. The completed application completion is due to HUD on November 20, 2015, but bonus points are given if the application is submitted by November 19, 2015. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated her goal is to have the application into HUD by November 18, 2015. The floor was opened for questions and comments. Julie Calloway, City of Boulder City, commended Ms. Fuller-Hallauer and the Evaluation Working Group for all the effort put forth. Nelson Araujo, United Way of Southern Nevada, requested more details about the appeals which were made. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services – Pathways came to the appeals team indicating their project had a late start in serving clients because the state was delayed in accepting the funds from HUD and therefore, should not have had outcomes measures based on not having clients served. The appeals team requested the HMIS data used by the Monitoring Working Group be reviewed. It was determined that during that period of time, 3 clients in the program. The appeals team, in fairness to the agency, took the application score and added an agency average for outcomes, which is the standard methodology. That number was then added to the outcome score. The appeals team did the same calculation for other projects that do not have any projects in the CoC, and those projects were given a community average. Taking the new information into consideration, the Evaluation Working Group determined that the score remained low. The appeals team determined that in addition to the low score, the difficulty of folks accepting that housing type, which is individual rooms with a shared living space, would not promote the best use of resources to the community, and therefore, upheld the recommendation to reallocated those funds. For Nevada Community Associates – Project HOPE, an appeal was requested based on the fact they did not have data for the first 6 months of the program year for their project. They requested the data be reevaluated. The appeals team had the original data reviewed by the Evaluation Working Group. The original data had 38 clients for which outcome data was used. The same methodology was used for Nevada Community Associates – Project HOPE as was applied to Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services – Pathways. The same outcome was found and the appeals team upheld the recommendation. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer referred to Terri Thompson, Clark County School District, who was a member of the appeals team, in case a further explanation was needed. Ms. Thompson stated that Ms. Fuller-Hallauer explained the process very well, and all fairness was used by the appeals team to make their decision.

John Hill, Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority, asked about the total number of applications received. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer responded that 39 project applications were received. Mr. Hill asked if the number of applications received was in the realm of the number expected. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that although she would have liked to have seen more, but due to the parameters placed on the application, she was not surprised by the number. However, in the future she would like to see more applications put forth in the future. Mr. Hill then asked how on-going monitoring occurs. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that there are multiple mechanisms in place, with the Monitoring Working Group which monitors outcomes and performance, the HMIS Working Group which monitors the data to ensure it is good data, and as the CoC Coordinator, her role is to work continuously with the providers to increase the capacity and constantly maintain where the providers are with their utilization of funds, outcomes, and checking to see if they are encountering any challenges. The Evaluation Working Group receives reports from HMIS Working Group and the Monitoring Working Group to give direction to the CoC coordinator for technical assistance. Various member of the Evaluation Working Group have gone to the providers to monitor and provide technical assistance. The advertising for the application was done through the public venues, but was also mentioned at every provider meeting and public meeting, and was on the HelpHopeHome and Nevada Homeless Alliance websites.

Emily Lewis, City of Henderson, asked for clarification between the 39 applications received and the 38 projects recommended. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that the Evaluation Working Group found on the second day of ranking there was been a gap in rapid rehousing for transitional age youth. The providers were then asked if they had the capacity to bring forward a new rapid rehousing project. One provider, Southern Nevada Children First, already had a project that was in competition, so the Evaluation Working Group added \$50,000 to their request to increase the housing capacity for that project. Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth and St. Jude's Ranch were also asked about their capacity to manage \$119,000 in rapid rehousing funds. Both agencies came forward and stated they could meet the capacity as well as the match requirement and leveraging requirement. The Shannon West Youth Center, the other youth provider in the community, indicated that they would consider the situation next year, although they are not able to do so this year. With the 2 additional applications for the rapid rehousing for transitional age youth, the number increased from 39 to 41, but the original number of applications submitted was 39. Also, the Clark County Social Services – The Vivo Project which straddles Tier 1 and Tier 2 is given 2 numbers, 29 and 30, even though it is the same project and same application.

Melissa Clary, Huntridge Neighborhood Association, asked if because the 1 project is given 2 numbers, is the scope clearly delineated in the 2, if it were to get only 29? Although the funding is one large amount of money, how does it affect the scope of each project? Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that since it is one community application, the instructions given by HUD state that once the final determination for funding is made, if the Tier 2 projects are funded in the community, The Vivo Project will be funded as one project as it has been and renewed at the full amount. However, if the community is only awarded Tier 1 funding, The Vivo Project will be awarded \$628,995.30, and the scope and amount of clients served will be adjusted at the time of contract. Ms. Clary asked if this was an operational funding for the program, since she is not familiar with the project, as opposed to constructional funding. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer explained that it is rental assistance, support services and a little administrative cost.

David Slattery, Las Vegas Fire and Rescue, commended the group and all the work done, but questioned the reduction of funding to SNAMHS where there is a shortage in mental health beds. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer responded by stating many discussions were held which led to many tough decisions by the Evaluation Working Group to determine which project applications would be accepted and which would not. This involved determined which projects needed to be preserved and go into Tier 1 and which projects should be in Tier 2 and at large risk, based on the fact that certain project types get lower points if they are in Tier 2, i.e. Permanent Supportive Housing will get the maximum points whether they are in Tier 1 or Tier 2. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that it was determined the Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health HUD Expansion was a smaller portion of the agencies programs and as an expansion of their HUD I program, it could afford to be relegated to Tier 2. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer then stated that the minutes from both days of the rankings will be available on the website.

Terri Thompson, Clark County School District, asked which of the new projects the reallocated programs funds are being reallocated to. Those projects include Clark County Social Services- FUSE, US Vets-RRH Project, Southern Nevada Children First-Another Place Called Home, Safe Nest - Operation Fresh Start, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth RRH, St. Jude's Ranch for Children – Crossings Phoenix, Clark County Social Service – Keeping Families Together and all were put into Tier 2. Prior to calling for a vote on the recommendations, Ms. Calloway reminded board members to recuse themselves from the voting if their agency has a project included in the recommendations. The motion was made to accept the CoC Evaluation Working Group Recommendation. The

motion was approved. Those abstaining from voting were: Terry Murphy, Arash Ghafoori, Nelson Araujo, Bobby Gordon, Shalimar Cabrera, and Kevin Morss.

Agenda Item 5. Receive an update from each board member regarding relevant activities within their respective organizations relating to homelessness; for possible action.

Kena Adams, Moapa Band of Paiutes, requested assistance from CoC board members to help her with assistance for the homeless or those suffering from mental illness in the small tribal community. Kevin Morss, WestCare, announced the ribbon cutting ceremony of the Community Triage Center on October 28 at 11:00 a.m.

Agenda Item 6. Public Comment.

Marlene Richter, The Shade Tree, commented on the importance of the CoC Funding in the community to address domestic violence.

The meeting adjourned at 2:57 p.m.