

**SOUTHERN NEVADA HOMELESSNESS CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
May 12, 2016**

**In attendance:** Michael Pawlak, Co-Chair, Clark County Social Service  
Arash Ghafoori, Co-Chair, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth  
Kelly-Jo Shebeck, Vice Co-Chair, Clark County School District  
Erin Kinard, Vice Co-Chair, WestCare, Inc.  
Barbara Geach, City of Henderson  
Lorena Candelario, alternate, City of North Las Vegas  
Julie Calloway, City of Boulder City  
Kathi Thomas-Gibson, alternate, City of Las Vegas  
Jesse Robinson, Advocate  
Monica Gresser, Brazen Architecture  
Nick Spriggs, Briggs and Spriggs  
Dawn Davis, alternate, Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada  
Melissa Clary, Huntridge Neighborhood Association  
Cynthia Hurtado, alternate, Las Vegas Metro Police Department  
David Slattery, Las Vegas Fire & Rescue  
Vesela Zehirev, MGM Resorts International  
Merideth Spriggs, alternate, Nevada Homeless Alliance  
Christy Shannon, alternate, S.A.F.E. Nest  
Donna Jordan, alternate, Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services  
Taylor Hough, Touro University Nevada  
Bob Morgan, United Way of Southern Nevada  
Shalimar Cabrera, U.S. Vets – Las Vegas  
Phyllis Cobb, alternate, Veterans Administration  
Ardell Galbreth, Workforce Connections

**Absent:**

Mike Mullin, Nevada HAND  
Kena Adams, Moapa Band of Paiutes  
Angela Marshall, Second Chance Christian Ministries  
Dwayne Alexander, Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority  
Henry Sneed, The Church LV  
Corrine Valencia, U.S. Army Veteran  
Nancy Menzel, UNLV

**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, May 12, 2016, 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 May 12, 2016; 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 March 10, 2016 meeting; for possible action.**

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

**Agenda Item 5. Receive a report by the Board Steering Committee on recent activities; for possible action.**

Mike Pawlak, Clark County Social Service, explained that the Steering Committee has been working many items, one of which is setting the calendar for the board meetings. At this time, that item is still being looked at, but the end results are close and the board will be notified as soon as it is determined. The committee has also been working on changing the format of the agenda in order to be able to have the meetings move more expeditiously and efficiently, as well as inform the public

of specific items being addressed. Arash Ghafouri, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, added that as part of the agenda, identifying items as old business, issues that are a continuation, and new business. Mr. Ghafouri stated that the format for reporting from the working groups was being reviewed and standardized for the working group champions, as well as having the report available with the board meeting agenda in order for people to have an opportunity to read the report and use the time during the board meeting, i.e. today for agenda item 10, as a Q&A or follow-up with a particular group. That should be completed by the next board meeting.

**Agenda Item 6. Receive a report for discussion on the 2015 Gaps Analysis from HomeBase; for possible action.**

Jeff Ugai, HomeBase, stated that rather than go over the entire Gaps Analysis report, he would be presenting on key findings and recommendations. Starting with background information, the purpose of the report is a high-level view of where the community is with the homeless services system, where there are opportunities to improve performances and do a better job serving clients, and outline recommendation steps at the systemic level to help lead the leadership groups of the committee. Since the report is intended to support future planning efforts, it is not a strategic planning report. Many of the gaps addressed in the report may be perceived issues as opposed to literal issues, since many focus groups were surveyed. The contents of the report will cover accessibility, availability, and coordination. The CoC's role is a balancing act between state and federal policy; providers; and local, political and economic climate. The report also does not focus on the many successes of the Southern Nevada CoC, but concentrates more on opportunities of gaps to improve or where to improve on something that may be working. With regards to Accessibility, homeless persons should be able to quickly and easily access information about existing homeless resources. It was determined that consumers are unable to access, or are unsure of where to go in order to access, up-to-date information regarding the availability of existing resources. Major issues are a universal frustration with the 2-1-1 system, with the challenge of getting a comprehensive list that provides all the resources currently available, as well as homeless providers rely on (sometimes outdated) contacts to refer homeless person to other providers for housing/services. Recommendations coming from the gap of accessibility are: A. Develop a homeless resource guide and/or public awareness campaign particularly designed to reach persons at-risk of homelessness and the unsheltered population. B. Improve interagency communication and ensure that programs possess up-to-date information regarding the services currently offered by other agencies. Another issue is Physical and Geographic Accessibility. Access to transportation services varies among programs and is limited in nature. Lack of transportation is the major barrier keeping the client from getting from one agency to another as well as getting to employment. Bus passes are only available in some programs and the number provided is insufficient to meet overall need. Several emergency shelters are inadequately equipped to properly serve disabled persons. The recommendations include: A. Improve consumer access to transportation services. B. Engage local jurisdictions to ensure that consumers are able to access the full range of homeless housing and services, regardless of the particular jurisdiction in which they are located. C. Encourage improvement of existing facilities to increase physical accessibility for disabled consumers and ensure existence of alternative arrangements where necessary. Outreach and Identification was another area that received much feedback. The Mobile Crisis intervention Teams (MCITs) and Caridad team have had success targeting the most vulnerable populations. Higher levels of engagement to more vulnerable populations, as measured by VI-SPDAT scores, use of HMIS and iPads have yielded success, good relations with Downtown Business improvement District and private organizations. Feedback was also received about coordination of outreach being inconsistent across local jurisdiction. Recommendations in order to move forward include: A. Replicate the previous successes with the outreach teams to improve and expand to geographic areas that may not have been as well covered, as well as take into account the Point-In-Time (PIT) count results when it becomes available to provide a more detailed results in order to help prioritize and conduct outreach across Southern Nevada. B. Incorporate GIS mapping into outreach planning to ensure that outreach providers are serving all areas where the unsheltered population is concentrated. C. Engage local businesses – particularly, casinos – to aid with and supplement existing outreach efforts. D. Increase access to HMIS for outreach workers in the field by providing additional tools and increasing software utility. Bob Morgan, United Way, asked when engaging businesses, what would their roles be to buy in, or tasks be? Mr. Ugai stated one way would be to become involved in the buy-in list to act as an extra set of eyes and ears, as well as helping with financial assistance. Another area that was reviewed was Prevention and Diversion. Current prevention resources are insufficient to meet overall need. Being seen in the community are high levels of first-time homelessness (58.3%), a high need for prevention services. Recommendations are: A. Increase access to and improve operation of diversion and prevention services. B. Improve discharge planning by working with jails/prisons and hospitals to reduce the number of persons exited to homelessness. C. Increase relocation and reunification services, where appropriate. D. Build off the success of the frequent Users Systems Engagement (FUSE) projects to divert person from hospitals, jails, and prisons as appropriate. The next issue reviewed is the Assessment and Referral Process. This comprises of utilizing the coordinated intake process to determine the need of the consumer, how to best connect them with the needed services and then connecting them to those services. Consumers expressed frustration with the lack of understanding the prioritization process, the expectations they should have, and the inconsistency between the programs. Providers are concerned that the assessment is not always accurate using the present VISPDAT, in collecting the client's vulnerabilities, and therefore, the clients were not being prioritized as the providers felt

they should. This included the assessment tool as well as feeling that since this is a self-reporting tool, consumers often try to hide certain characteristics that would increase their chances of receiving housing. Providers also indicated that referrals from the mainstream systems posed a challenge. Recommendations are: A. Coordinate with the education and foster care systems to develop Coordinated Intake for Families and Youth and utilize the lessons learned through the development and implementation of Coordinated Intake for Single Adults and for Veterans. B. Engage transitional housing providers to adapt housing and service provision models as appropriate to better align with the emerging Coordinated Intake system. C. Continue to engage healthcare providers to ensure that persons referred to homeless housing and service providers are homeless and that their needs are manageable. Also discussed was the issue of Entry Barriers and Requirements. This has been a major discussion point for the past year. There has been a lot of success, especially with the shelters, to change those policies to ensure individuals can come to those shelters with as few barriers as possible to prevent entry to that shelter. Recommendations are: A. Reengage providers regarding the implementation of Housing First principles and provide technical assistance as necessary to support the reduction of entry barriers and requirements. B. Engage community leadership and local funding sources to eliminate entry barriers imposed by local funding requirements. Ardell Galbreth, Workforce Connections, asked whether any employment or training barriers were identified and how they could be addressed. He also asked if the employment and training service providers had been contacted. Mr. Ugai stated that although the employment and training service providers and not been reached out to, he suggested clients could take advantage of provider relationships that assist with getting the clients identification. Erin Kinard, WestCare, asked if the suggestion is for transitional housing providers in Southern Nevada that are CoC funded to adapt their model. Mr. Ugai suggested that there needed clarification that there are a few, specific models that state transitional housing is a best practice, i.e. substance abuse. The effort is to focus on those more general transitional housing providers that are not a HUD funded priority and don't fall into the permanency focus of the coordinated intake system. Ms. Kinard stated that transitional housing works, especially for the special populations, and therefore, should not stray from non-HUD funded transitional housing. Mr. Ugai agreed with Ms. Kinard stating that the longer version of the report lists the opportunity for the CoC to better utilize those special transitional housing programs to ensure those clients best suited for that type of housing are being directed to them. Melissa Clary, Huntridge Neighborhood Association, asked with regards to the prevention and diversion recommendations if there was any University Medical Center (UMC) representation in the CoC or any connections to interact with them? Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Clark County Social Service, stated that although UMC is not on the board, the medical community is represented. Mr. Ugai stated that in the past, UMC has engaged with the CoC in smaller projects and have been strong partners. He feels a more meaningful and systemic inclusion with not only UMC but other area hospitals would help. David Slattery, Las Vegas Fire & Rescue, stated that he clinically practices at UMC and fully supports reaching out to the leadership there. He also offered to bridge the issue between the hospital and the board. Nick Spriggs, Briggs and Spriggs, stated that the actual insurers of managed care organizations have recently reached out; specifically Thomas Hart, Anthem, and has asked to be part of the CoC to represent Anthem and the organizations in general. They informed Mr. Spriggs they would like to apply their data analysis and management skills to help the board be more effective and efficient with the delivery of services. Mr. Ugai replied that it is a great way to try to move some service expenses from the providers to a dedicated funding source. Mr. Ugai continued with the Gaps Analysis by discussing Availability. Housing stock is a main concern as the existing stock of housing is insufficient to meet the needs of the overall homeless population in Southern Nevada. Southern Nevada has successfully repurposed or reallocated much of its transitional housing to permanent supportive housing dedicated to chronically homeless persons to meet shifting priorities. Recommendations for the availability issue are: A. Continue to expand the number of rapid rehousing programs in the community. B. Establish a landlord engagement strategy to engage additional landlords in homeless housing programs by making use of lessons learned through SSVF's recent landlord engagement efforts. C. Develop and implement data collection requirements necessary to support the implementation of a Pay for Success funding model. Mr. Ugai spoke briefly about Special Populations. A lot of feedback was received regarding the special populations. Current resources are insufficient to meet the needs of survivors of domestic violence, as well as the needs of homeless families, homeless youth, and LGBTQ population (especially youth). Many providers are not culturally competent in serving LGBTQ persons. There are very few LGBTQ-oriented providers and a low capacity or knowledge to serve transgender persons. The last special population considered is the aging population. Recommendations for special populations are: A. Review 2016 Homeless Census information to confirm findings. B. Focus efforts on increasing the availability of specialized housing and services for survivors of domestic violence, unconventional families, LGBTQ persons, youth and elderly/seniors. C. Improve system-wide cultural competency in addressing the unique needs of the LGBTQ community in Southern Nevada. D. Engage funders and identify alternative solutions for non-residents and non-citizens. Program Operations and Rules cover the barriers that had been discussed earlier. The Housing First training and model working group has been very successful in the past year, by expanding the population served by emergency shelters and addressing many barriers from earlier reports. However, there was feedback received about long waiting lists, lack of uniformity in provision of housing and services from provider-to-provider and jurisdiction-to-jurisdiction, difficulty in documenting eligibility vis-à-vis local residency requirements. Feedback was also received about the entry process to emergency shelters. The introduction of Clarity identification cards has simplified data entry leading to

streamlined program entry. By streamlining the process, the cycle of waiting, obtaining a bed, leave and then repeating the process has been broken. Recommendations to address the program operations and rules are: A. Engage local jurisdictions to improve uniformity in the provision of housing and services and/or improve location-related data collection in HMIS to document eligibility. B. Develop community standards for the provision of rapid rehousing. C. Engage providers to increase longer-term availability of emergency shelter beds and free consumers from the repetitive cycle of re-obtaining an emergency shelter bed each night. D. Establish 24-hour access to emergency shelter. With regards to Service Availability identification documents is the primary barrier to access programs. The struggle to replace lost identification is a real challenge, and is compounded by the transportation challenges and other logistical issues that stand in the way of a person's ability to walk through the process. Consumers have difficulty accessing basic services, such as restrooms or showers. This includes housing search, assistance, multiple system entry points, and provision of basic services as an outreach opportunity. – Recommendations for service availability are: A. Increase access to services designed to obtain identification documentation. B. Increase access to basic services, such as bathroom and shower facilities. C. Incorporate additional housing search and navigation assistance to aid persons in identifying and acquiring housing. D. Better utilize Coordinated Intake hubs to support the provision of basic services and/or implement multi-service centers to improve the efficiency of service delivery.

Coordination is key to the success seen in the past. Consumers, providers, and Board members expressed a sense of isolation from the broader community. There is no strong public engagement strategy in place, and there is no place for the homeless providers, as a whole, to market themselves and communicate as 1 body, to create a bridge between the dedicated homeless providers and potential allies. There is a need to be able to explain the causes of homelessness; promote the success of existing housing and services; identify humanitarian and financial benefits to public; and expand volunteer opportunities. Recommendations for coordination are: A. Organize a public relations campaign to mobilize the broader community (including both private citizens and businesses) to support the fight to end homelessness in Southern Nevada. B. Utilize cost studies to determine and better educate the public on the system-wide cost saving of providing unsheltered persons with housing. Funding Attainment and Maximization – In addition to ensuring the existing dedicated homeless funds are utilized in the most efficient possible manner, communities should explore alternative sources of funding, such as from private organizations/foundations or non-homeless specific government resources to supplement those funds. There is presently a minimal participation from local businesses, particularly from casinos and corporate groups. Improved regional funding coordination is needed on the funding side. On the healthcare side, there is a bigger opportunity to take advantage of billing Medicaid or other insurance providers in order to maintain the funding to fill in the gaps. Recommendations for funding attainment and maximization are: A. Diversify funding sources by engaging private foundations and businesses in the goal of ending homelessness in Southern Nevada. B. Increase the efficiency of funding allocation in Southern Nevada by reestablishing a regional funding collaborative or individually engaging policymakers in all local jurisdictions. C. Maximize use of alternative government funding sources – such as Medicaid – to free additional homeless resources for housing. D. Conduct a cost study to determine the amount of savings incurred by providing unsheltered persons with housing and engage policymakers and the public to leverage additional resources and reinvest savings into the housing stock that is necessary to address the community queue and the needs of the housing services.

Continuum of Care Governance – CoC Board membership has dramatically expanded. However, feedback received impressed that a better job is needed to bring new members up to speed on all activities, and has the necessary resources to be able to take necessary action as needed. The feedback also suggested the need to look at the working group and committee structure by creating smaller bodies that would be able to accomplish tasks more efficiently. Recommendations regarding the Continuum of Care Governance are: A. Develop an introductory training to rapidly engage new CoC stakeholders in the goals and practices of the Southern Nevada Continuum of Care. B. Improve CoC governance to better reflect the changing size and membership of the CoC Board, by streamlining existing working groups to improve functionality and increase outputs. C. Reconsider staffing arrangement for the Continuum of Care and the committees. In conclusion, the report highlights real and perceived gaps in the system and the response should be to focus on the existing efforts underway and better connect with the consumers who need them or the providers who are not aware they exist. Once that is done, identify the gaps that exist and translate them down to actual items and go forward to address those gaps. Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, asked what was meant by a reconsider staffing arrangements for the CoC. Mr. Ugai stated the comment was focusing on the subcommittees and ensuring which subcommittees would be best tasked to handle gaps recommended. Although it was a clear fit for some working groups to handle some gaps, there were other areas that needed to be more clearly set out, in order to keep from overwhelming one particular working group. Kathi Thomas-Gibson, City of Las Vegas, asked if Mr. Ugai would recommend reestablishing funding collaboration. Mr. Ugai stated he would recommend creating a body of local funding to promote uniformity, coordination, and cooperation. Since federal funding does not always cover the need, the board needs to try to fill the gap by addressing the common goal. Shalimar Cabrera, U.S. Vets, noted one need was to have a public relations professional to organize a PR campaign. Does the feedback suggest this is would be more of an in-kind service or is formalizing a position needed? Mr. Ugai stated that whether it could be either, but a more concerted effort is needed to push forward with the information and inform the community. Mr. Ghafoori asked if Mr. Ugai would make any recommendations regarding the structure of the Southern Nevada Continuum of Care vs. other community structures. Mr. Ugai stated that he

has seen other communities with a more formal board, but would not recommend it as this board structure has many strengths. He would recommend making better use of the board members. Mr. Spriggs commended HomeBase for the 2016 gaps report. However, he stated that a lot of the gaps from the 2005 to 2013 reports are the same as in the 2016 report. He suggested that the board should propose solutions and go forward with a concrete plan. Even if only 1 issue in the gap is resolved, then the board could forge ahead with other solutions. Since the current plans seem complex, simplification of the plans should also be done. Matt Olsson, HomeBase, suggested looking at the worksheets included with the handouts provided to the board. The worksheets were brought to the Evaluation Working Group to work with them and identify working groups and other subcommittees in the community that could go forward with some recommendations and actions. Mr. Ugai stated it was a matter of prioritizing the issues in order to see progress made. Mike Pawlak stated that since the gaps report is a matter of real vs. perceived, it is up to the working groups to delve into the gaps and put numbers and measures into the items that are real and address the perceptions. Although there are still gaps that need to be address, by having a scale, it would show not only the gaps, but also the accomplishments made as well as the relativity of the gap. Mr. Ugai stressed that progress in housing stock and other areas has been made in Southern Nevada, but the report just allows the focus on how to best use the resources available. Mr. Spriggs stated that the number of homeless has remained constant at between 3000-4000 for the past 10 years, and emphasized that the effort to decrease those numbers needs to be made. Ms. Clary brought to everyone's attention that although it had been previously noted that gaming was not being represented, Vesela Zehirev, MGM Resorts International, is a board member. The floor was then opened to the public for questions regarding the 2016 Gaps Analysis Report. Ambrosia Crump, Nevada State SOAR Coordinator, addressed the board and suggested that the connection between Social Security benefits and the success to end homelessness should be looked at, as well. Prior to Mr. Morgan speaking to board, Mr. Ghafoori introduced Mr. Morgan as the new CEO, and representative for United Way of Southern Nevada. Mr. Morgan then cautioned about investigating into the work of philanthropy in order to bridge the funding gap, as it is not sustainable and pales in comparison to the offer to assist clients to get Social Security disability benefits. He also stated he felt that the more effectively institutional dollars can be aggregated on top of the problem to make them more easily and quickly accessible, the more financial resources will be available to put a dent in the problem. If outreach can be created to have fast, consolidated benefit enrollment, there will be more collective resources available to go after the problem.

**Agenda Item 7. Receive an update for discussion on the submission of the 2016 Housing Inventory Count and the Point-in-Time Count from Clark County Social Service; for possible action.**

Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Manager, Clark County Social Service, impressed on the board that the update is not a full census report and she is only providing a high-level overview, which will provide where the community has been and what is needed to move forward. The homeless census took place on January 26 and 27. Numbers, data, and information are collected from survey data, and HMIS, as well as from shelters. Shelter data includes emergency shelters, Safe Haven and transitional housing. HUD mandates the Housing Inventory Count and Point-in-Time (HIC/PIT) report must be submitted by May 2. The information and data that is in the complete HIC/PIT report, still needs to be analyzed, in order to determine what the data is telling the community. That report should be presented at the next board meeting and will include a full housing inventory count, i.e. current housing stock, current utilization, and the number of beds included in HMIS. During the census, 6208 homeless individuals were counted, a 17% decrease from 2015. The shelter count was 2477 and the non-shelter count was 3731, both of which were a decrease from the previous year. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer impressed on the board that much work has been accomplished, but with the number of clients still experiencing homelessness, much work is still needed. Merideth Spriggs, Nevada Homeless Alliance, asked the board to acknowledge the decrease with a round of applause for all the efforts to make this result occur.

**Agenda Item 8. Receive a report for discussion on the 2015 Continuum of Care awards from Clark County Social Service; for possible action.**

Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Manager, Clark County Social Service, reported that the Continuum of Care (CoC) awards were distributed according to 2 phases. This year, when the 2016 CoC Consolidated applications were submitted, the projects had to be ranked in either the Tier I or the Tier II system. The 2 tiers were broken up in a dollar amount set by HUD. The Evaluation Working Group determined for which tier the individual project application qualified and the ranking of each project within the tier. Results of the Tier I awards had been given in a previous board meeting. Tier I received the maximum amount requested, which was \$10,189,596, or 99.73% of the request, but funding was reduced according to fair market rent amount. The Tier II awards were announced last week and did not receive 100% funding. The amount received for Tier II was \$3,179,472, or 83.44% of the request. A nuance of the Tier II funding was that The Vivo Housing Project, which straddled both Tier I and Tier II, was not announced until the Tier II awards were announced. Of the projects submitted for funding, only 3 were awarded; the remaining 5 rapid rehousing new projects and 1 renewal project did not receive any funding. The total amount requested was \$14,028,042, but only \$13,369,068 (or 95.3%) was awarded. Going forward as preparation begins for the next CoC grant application, the reasons all projects were not funded will be explored,

and areas will be revisited in order to shore up efforts. There will be a debriefing by Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to determine how to shore up the applications. Once Ms. Fuller-Hallauer receives the information for the debrief, she will pass the information along so board members can listen and/or participate in the phone call. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer did caution that the debriefing is nationwide and not local, so specifics to the local application will not be addressed. HUD is exercising an opportunity put forth in the HEARTH Act, which allows the Secretary of HUD to revisit the funding formula. The current funding formula is antiquated and does not address many of our community needs, which keeps us from applying for the funding needed in our community. HUD is requesting comments and feedback until July 21, 2016, to aid in making a change to that formula. In order to have a comprehensive CoC response to the comment opportunity, information will be collected. The next all agency director meeting being held on June 1 will have a portion set aside to determine feedback for submission. Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, asked if previously, 100% of the Tier II funding had been received, to which Ms. Fuller-Hallauer affirmed that observation. Mr. Ghafoori then asked if the cut in funding occurred based on the quality of the local application, or because of HUD's overview. He also asked if the application was submitted in a certain order according to a hierarchy score based on our CoC's ranking of the projects, or if HUD ranks them according to merit? Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that the Evaluation Working Group evaluates project performance application score factor data, which then leads to the ranking of each project. Once the NOFA ranking is released by HUD, then the evaluation group then tries to marry the local needs with HUD's requirements. Then new project applications in Tier I or Tier II are weighted to determine if clients would be displaced, if renewal projects are not funded. HUD then reviews the entire application, including community outcomes, preparedness, structure, and how the community is systemically addressing homelessness, both in general and in subpopulations. HUD rankings determine funding, and set the community threshold. Mr. Ghafoori asked if Tier II funding had been cut across the board (throughout the United States) or was it only in Southern Nevada. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that most communities were cut, with only a few being fully funded. Mike Pawlak, Clark County Social Service, mentioned that there are still some transitional housing projects being funded in Tier I, although HUD suggests transitional housing is not the preferred methodology. He questioned whether Southern Nevada is being penalized by continuing to include transitional housing in the Tier I application. If Southern Nevada is being penalized, then a discussion about finding alternative funding needs to occur. He also mentioned that the Evaluation Working Group is still in need of members to assist in the ranking process for the local application. Jeff Ugai, HomeBase, stated that HUD is becoming more serious about the policy priorities, which was reflective of what the funding should go towards. Other communities in order to maximize the dollars they have received have started trying to divert the transitional housing programs towards funding streams in the community. Mr. Ghafoori asked again whether HUD is penalizing continuums for having transitional housing in their applications. Mr. Ugai state that HUD is penalizing in a few ways, most notably, permanent supportive housing increases the ranking over transition housing. Also, HUD does not feel that transitional housing projects do not further the numbers HUD is looking at to judge the community. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer also iterated that a portfolio of transitional housing does not promote ending homelessness, since HUD still classifies transitional housing as homeless. As a community, the goal is to move towards permanency in housing. Therefore, by housing clients in transitional housing, we are not moving them away from homelessness. Barbara Geach, City of Henderson, referred to the workshop held in February that showed rapid rehousing is more needed in the community and asked whether HUD funds rapid rehousing. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated rapid rehousing is funded by HUD and that transitional housing is the highest cost intervention for homeless clients. Melissa Clary, Huntridge Neighborhood Association, asked if transitional housing could be renamed as rapid rehousing, in order to benefit from more funding. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer explained that transitional housing is designed differently than rapid rehousing. Also, if the program type is changed, it now becomes a new program on the application. Cynthia Nagendra, National Alliance to End Homelessness, posed three questions to the board to consider. 1) Can more clients be housed with rapid rehousing? 2) Would rapid rehousing decrease the length of stay to get the outcomes? 3) Can the transitional housing be used as bridge housing, lower the barriers in order to use them as crisis beds? She also stated that rapid rehousing houses 5 times the clients than transitional housing. Kathi Thomas-Gibson, City of Las Vegas, mentioned that if the board decides to stay with the transitional housing, expanded funding streams need to be explored. Also, most of the clients in transitional housing have co-occurring issues. Every effort should be made to decide how to effectuate the better housing. Mr. Ugai stated the Ms. Thomas-Gibson has a valid point and emphasized that the CoC funding is a relatively small portion of the housing stock and going forward, the recommendation is to look for under 10% of the dollars to go to a funding stream that would be most effective and doable.

**Agenda Item 9. Receive a report for discussion on the continuum of Care funding application process survey results from Clark County Social Service; for possible action.**

Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Manager, Clark County Social Service, stated that as part of an ongoing effort to improve the Southern Nevada Homeless Continuum of care (SNH CoC) Local Application Process, surveys were sent out to evaluation working group members, providers that were part of the CoC process and agencies that came to the technical assistance training even though they did not submit an application. This was done in late January to gather information for process improvement. This process offered participants an opportunity to provide feedback and recommendations anonymously, as

all responses were collected by HomeBase. Of the 77 surveys sent out, 22 responses were received: 9 from CoC Evaluation Group Members and Subcommittees; 12 from CoC Applicants or Providers; and 1 from Agencies that started but did not complete the CoC application process. The survey was comprised of two sections; multiple choice and narrative. Overall, responses were very positive with a majority of the responses expressing satisfaction with the local application process and methodologies. The positive comments recognized and supported: capacity building and community partnerships; transparency; technical assistance and program/agency support; scoring and ranking tools, processes, and methodologies; staff support and assistance to group members, providers, and other interested parties; and advanced scheduling of trainings and meetings. The negative comments focused mostly on: NOFA (timeframe, application requirements, project requirements); constant changes; subjective and unprepared group members; membership of the Evaluation Working Group needs to be more active and diverse; quality of provider applications; unprepared and unconcerned provider presentations; and communication with providers. Recommendations for process improvement are improving communication, knowledge, fair representation, transparency, efficiency, and effectiveness. Regarding the SNH CoC Board/Evaluation and Other Working Groups, recommendations were: encourage objectivity of group members; increase group membership diversity, participation, and attendance; recruit representatives to participate on committees throughout every step of the process. The recommendations for the local application process included: establish standardization, tools and protocols around processes and decision-making; develop and enforce standards for accountability with providers on applications, presentations and project performance; develop ways to improve communication with providers regarding scoring and ranking tools, processes, and methodologies before implementation; ensure clear communication regarding the local application process; develop/improve standards, regarding the scoring and ranking process that include timeframes and information for what data will populate the scorecard and other tools; standardize the presentation process and share the information with providers ahead of time; schedule meetings and trainings as far in advance as possible. For Provider/Citizen Engagement, the recommendations were: provide additional and ongoing training opportunities to group members, providers, and citizens; develop a “provider portal” on the HHH website where providers can access information and resources; implement ways to be able to capture ongoing feedback. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer mentioned that copies of the 2016 Process Survey Report and Executive Summary can be found at [www.helphopehome.org](http://www.helphopehome.org).

**Agenda Item 10. Receive questions and answers for the Board working groups; for possible action.**

Barbara Geach, City of Henderson, recommended the working group reporting format be tabled since no formal reports were submitted in advance. Arash Ghafouri, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, asked of any objections to tabling the issue. Nick Spriggs, Briggs and Spriggs, stated that although working groups had not submitted advance reports in order to receive questions on, he felt each working group should give an update. Ms. Geach reported the HMIS Working Group meeting will be held on May 19 at 1:30 p.m. and reminded the board it would be a conference call. Although last month’s meeting had resulting in a conference call, it was due to working with all the Continuum of Care, including northern and rural Nevada, on HMIS concerns and issues. Mike Pawlak, Clark County Social Service, stated that at the last meeting of the Evaluation Working Group, a discussion of the standard operating procedures for scoring applications tool was held. There had been some discussion about a scheduled release of new software that would be compatible with eSNAPS, but the new software is not going to be ready in time. Therefore, ZOOM Grants will continue to be the portal for this year. Mr. Spriggs, stated the Monitoring Working Group meeting was held on May 1. Grant audits will be done in June. Merideth Spriggs, Nevada Homeless Alliance, reported that the Community Engagement Working Group is working on having a unified group and monthly news release for press releases and social media. She also reported that Family Connect was held on May 7 and thanked all providers who attended the event. An update will be provided at the next meeting. She brought to everyone’s attention the new, updated HelpHopeHome website, which was shown on the overhead monitors, and acknowledged Catherin Huang Hara for her work in updating the site. Ms. Spriggs reported that housing vouchers are being released beginning May 16 for non-aged (under age 62) disabled clients from the Southern Nevada Housing Authority. Kathi Thomas-Gibson, City of Las Vegas, stated the last meeting was a teleconference meeting. In the future, meeting reminders for the Planning Working Group will be sent out. Ms. Thomas-Gibson also mentioned that included under the umbrella of the Planning Working Group are also Coordinated Intake Planning Group, as well as the Youth Planning Group. Most recently, groups have been discussing landlord engagement. Arash Ghafouri, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, mentioned that a presentation will be made with regards to the Youth Planning Group at either the next or subsequent board meeting.

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

Mike Pawlak, Clark County Social Service, reported that he had been approached by community partner that is an auction liquidator, to determine if Clark County Social Service (CCSS) is willing to aggregate leftovers from auctions to help the homeless community and providers. Although, CCSS cannot provide the service, Mr. Pawlak stated he would be more than willing in serving as an intermediary if any group wanted to become involved in this venture. Donna Jordan, Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services, announced May is Mental Health Month. All Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (SNAMHS) outreach offices will be holding activities throughout the month. On May 13, the office located at 6161 W. Charleston will have activities for those clients utilizing the campus; May 20, the office in East Las Vegas will have activities in their parking lot; On May 27, the Henderson Clinic will have activities in their parking lot, including free food, gently used clothes, and fun activities. Barbara Geach, City of Henderson, mentioned that a survey was sent to board members, of which 25 have been returned. These surveys are regarding meetings, and the results will be brought to the board once the results have been determined. Merideth Springs, Nevada Homeless Alliance, mentioned that the Community Engagement Working Group will meet on May 16 at 10:00 a.m. at Clark County Social Service, 1600 Pinto Ln. Melissa Clary, Huntridge Neighborhood Association, brought up the fact she had emailed the Steering Working Group about an item to be put on the agenda, but had not heard a response. She inquired as to the next step after the email is received. Kathi Thomas-Gibson, City of Las Vegas, stated the item had been discussed with Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD), who suggested that since issues could get tangled depending on the involvement of those issues, the crime issues should be handled by LVMPD and the board should handle the homeless issues. Ms. Clary stated she is aware of tangled issues, but feels at a loss as to how to address the matter with the business community in the area she represents. Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, stated that the solution has to be handled by law enforcement, but a forum may be needed for a viable discussion. Ms. Clary wondered if part of the solution could be to increase the amount of outreach taking place at Circle Park, to which Mr. Ghafoori referred Ms. Clary to contact Annie Wilson, Homeless Liaison for LVMPD. Nick Spriggs, Briggs and Spriggs, stated that Jay Dapper had approached Caridad last December to set up a business improvement district. Included in the plans were paid outreach, 24/7 graffiti removal, policing of the area with regards to cleaning up the park, and engaging Securitas or Acme to provide additional patrolling for the businesses and patrons in the area. That plan went by the wayside in March or April. Since then Alex de Castroverde, Castroverde Law Firm, has shown an interest in getting something going. The strategy is that if 51% of the businesses sign on to the plan, it becomes a property based business improvement district. Ms. Clary stated she would like to be included in any discussion held on the matter.

**Agenda Item 12. Public Comment.**

Phillip Hollon, The Salvation Army, praised the work by the Tzu Chi Buddhist Foundation on April 9 at the dental clinic held. There were 60 volunteers on hand which provided 71 clients with dental services and 17 with free haircuts. Plans are being made to return in October to provide the same services. On April 18, the Corridor of Hope Career and Resource Fair is being held. Beginning first thing that morning, 20 employers and 12 service providers were on hand for a one-stop employment and social services resource fair. During that day, 254 homeless clients were helped. Approximately 200 applications were processed, 67 clients received resume assistance, and 42 clients were hired on the spot. Mr. Hollon personally thanked Annie Wilson, LVMPD, for her assistance with the resource fair, as well as individually naming and thanking the other community providers who collaborated on the project. On April 8, United Airlines volunteered to paint various administration offices and rooms at the Salvation Army. They returned on April 19 to host a spaghetti dinner, vowing to volunteer on a quarterly basis, and presenting the Salvation Army with a check for \$1500. Plans for The Salvation Army's pre-bagged food pantry warehouse located on Main Street to be converted to a Client Choice Food Pantry are underway thanks to a significant donation from Pinball Hall of Fame. This will allow clients to select food they need and like. He concluded by noting that May 9 - 14 is National Salvation Army Week.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.