

**SOUTHERN NEVADA HOMELESSNESS CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
June 9, 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
Monica Gresser, Brazen Architecture
Nick Spriggs, Briggs and Spriggs
Dawn Davis, alternate, Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada
Cynthia Hurtado, alternate, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Kena Adams, Moapa Band of Paiutes
Jackie Bañales-Garcia, Nevada HAND
Emily Paulsen, Nevada Homeless Alliance
Christy Shannon, S.A.F.E. Nest
Henry Sneed, The Church LV
Taylor Hough, Touro University Nevada
Bob Morgan, United Way of Southern Nevada
Shalimar Cabrera, U.S. Veterans Initiative – Las Vegas
Susan Kingsbury, alternate, Veterans Administration
Jaime Cruz, Workforce Connections
Nancy Menzel, UNLV

Absent: Julie Calloway, City of Boulder City
Stephen Harsin, City of Las Vegas
Jesse Robinson, Advocate
Melissa Clary, Huntridge Neighborhood Association
David Slattery, Las Vegas Fire & Rescue
Vesela Zehirev, MGM Resorts International
Ellen Richardson-Adams, Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services
Angela Marshall, Second Chance Christian Ministries
Dwayne Alexander, Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority
Corrine Valencia, Military Veteran

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 2:07 p.m., on Thursday, June 9, 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 June 9, 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 May 12, 2016 meeting; for possible action.

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

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

Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, stated that the Board Steering Committee has been working on standardizing the templates for the overall board meeting and for each of the working groups. The July board meeting will incorporate the next board meeting and include a presentation by Bob Morgan, United Way of Southern Nevada, about measuring the cost of homelessness and moving to reduce that. Mr. Morgan mentioned that his presentation will include

information about funding and barriers that clients have. The workshop will be to facilitate and brainstorm in order to help clients. Mr. Ghafoori also stated that the Steering Committee also discussed looking at attendance and urging participation of the board members in areas and working groups they want to be involved in. He continued by stating the Board Steering Committee discussed reviewing the HelpHopeHome website with regards to updates, as well as Working Group updates. Nick Spriggs, Briggs and Spriggs, stated that the July meeting will be 4 hours long to allow the regular meeting and facilitation of the workshop by Mr. Morgan, in order set new priorities. Erin Kinard, WestCare, again stressed that the business meeting will take place first, since the July meeting is to be the whole Continuum of Care (CoC) bi-annual meeting for all business, followed by the workshop.

Agenda Item 6. Receive a report for discussion on recommendation on public comment regarding U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development funding formula for the Continuum of Care; for possible action.

Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Manager, Clark County Social Service, gave a general overview of the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) CoC funding formula by explaining that funding first became available in 1987 when the McKinney-Vento Act was initiated. HUD was unable to determine how to allocate monies to the community, so it used 1 of 2 formulas for each community. Formula A uses 25% of the population size, 50% of the poverty, and 25% of the units of overcrowded housing. Formula B uses 20% of the population growth lag, 30% of the poverty, and 50% of the units of housing built before 1940. Our CoC was only eligible for a smaller funding based on either formula. In 2009, the McKinney-Vento Act was reauthorized as the Homelessness Emergency And Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act. In 2010, Southern Nevada CoC signed on to the national letter which was sent to the HUD secretary to revisit the funding formula. In 2012, Southern Nevada CoC again participated in a letter writing campaign urging the revisiting of the funding formula. In 2016, HUD opened public comment on revisiting the funding formulas. At the Directors Meeting held on June 1, 2016, a discussion was held as to what factors would affect our CoC, as well as factors affecting CoCs throughout the country. Things determined to affect homelessness in our community were: physical disabilities, mental illness, substance abuse, gambling, background issues, precariously/marginally housed, PSH demand vs. capacity, cost of living changes/variables, free & reduced lunches, percent of students accessing Title I HOPE, poverty. Four things identified that applied not only to our community, but to all communities were unemployment/underemployment (but not using unemployment board data as many have exhausted unemployment benefits and therefore, are not captured in that data), affordable housing availability (worst case need), overcrowding (those individuals and families who are doubled up), and living wage/income/poverty (which can be pulled from the federal census). She explained that the worst case need are those individuals whose earnings are less than 50% of the area median income, but are paying more than 50% of their income for rent. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that current funding is based on the Preliminary Pro-Rate Need (P/PRN) based on the funding formula, in the amount of \$9,950,160. The Annual Renewal Demand (ARD), which is the cost for renewing the projects in our community, is \$12,996,431. Currently, HUD has used ARD when ARD is greater than the current P/PRN funding formula. If the board decides that the CoC submits a collective response to HUD on the funding formula, giving direction to the staff on what factors are to be considered in developing a revised funding formula. If the Southern Nevada Homelessness CoC does not put forward any public comment, we can only hope that HUD continues to allow CoC's to apply for the ARD rather than the P/PRN. Michael Pawlak, Clark County Social Service, asked if specific requests had been made in the prior letters to HUD. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that in the national letter and the letter writing campaign, requests on poverty, overcrowding, and income limits were made. Nick Spriggs, Briggs and Spriggs, asked if the open comment period is an opportunity to let HUD know that the unsheltered are dropping through the cracks and therefore, try to make the funding available for resources for all as one community need, instead of breaking it up. Bob Morgan, United Way of Southern Nevada, asked if the ARD is maintenance of the current projects. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer responded with a yes to both Mr. Spriggs and Mr. Morgan. Mr. Morgan then asked how to make allowances for the anticipated changes. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that with the HUD CoC application process, the Evaluation Working Group takes all the data, identifies and prioritizes the community need, as well as trying to align that with HUD's funding as well as stacking our agencies against each other and putting it forth in the package application. The ranking process, which will be done in the next few months, is how HUD is informed of the community's priorities. Mr. Morgan then asked how similar are the yearly grants? When asked to clarify, Mr. Morgan restated the question by asking if the grant money received is going to the same agencies every year. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that would depend yearly, based on the project ranking. Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, asked if there is something to be done to address Mr. Spriggs comment regarding informing HUD of the need to make funding available for resources for all, including the unsheltered. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that comments could be given to the Steering Committee, with permission for the Steering Committee to draft a letter on behalf of the board, prior to the closing of the public comment period on June 21. Barbara Geach, mentioned she felt it would be a good idea that CoC members with public comments contact Board members to take to the Steering Committee prior to their meeting on June 15. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that suggestions could also be put on the HelpHopeHome website at www.clarkcountynv.gov including "CoC Formula" in the subject line, then all the suggestions would be sent to the Steering Committee. Mr. Ghafoori

asked for a motion to be made for the CoC Board to allow the Steering Committee to draft a letter regarding public comments to the CoC formula and submit it prior to the June 21 deadline. The motion was made and approved.

Agenda Item 7. Receive a report and discussion on 2016 Housing Inventory Count and Point-in-Time Count and receive the 2016 Southern Nevada Homeless Census and Survey Comprehensive Report from Clark County Social Service; for possible action.

Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Manager, Clark County Social Service, stated the purpose of the HIC PIT is not only because it is mandated, but it also helps to track the community progress toward ending homelessness, which is critical to the community receiving HUD funding. The HUD approved methodology is used for the census. The PIT count covers sheltered and unsheltered clients. For those that are sheltered, the count comes from HMIS and provider verification. For unsheltered clients, the count is derived by urban and rural canvassing. If census tracks have a zero count in the previous year and there are no emergency calls for assistance to homeless clients for that same time frame, then that census track could be eliminated from the count. There are also specialty teams that cover the tunnels and the youth, and the school district report, code enforcement, and LVMPD helicopters canvassing uninhabited areas with infrared equipment. A follow-up is done within the next 14 days with street and shelter surveys, including youth surveys. In the past, HUD had allowed the “hidden homeless” to be included in the census count. However, in 2015, HUD no longer allowed this to be taken into consideration, and our numbers had to be adjusted by removing the “hidden homeless” numbers from 2015 back to 2009. Key finds were that 6208 homeless were identified in the 2016 Homeless PIT Census. This was a 17.3% (1301 person) decrease from 2015; 55.4% were newly homeless; 71.6% were living in Southern Nevada at the time they became homeless; 41.1% of youth were between the ages of 18-21 when they first became homeless; there was a 40.1% reduction in family homelessness, a 66.2% reduction in unaccompanied youth under the age of 18, and an 11.0% reduction in youth ages 18-24. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer commended Clark County School District (CCSD) for the phenomenal job in getting a more accurate unsheltered youth count. On the day of the census, students who had been identified as unsheltered youth according to the definition in the HEARTH Act, not the McKinney-Vento Act, talked with a counselor. This could account for part of the reduction in the unaccompanied youth under age 18, since the methodology was tightened. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that since the full report is over 200 pages and accessible on the website, just an overview of the important factors is being presented. When a cross year comparison of sheltered, unsheltered, and total was done, the numbers for totals were higher in 2013, but there were less sheltered persons. In 2016, 118 homeless families with children were identified, which represents 357 individuals. That is any household with a child under the age of 18. There were 279 unaccompanied homeless youth under the age of 18, meaning they are not attached to an adult while on the street. There were an additional 1252 homeless youth between the ages of 18-24 identified. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer noted during the presentation that the slide headed as “Annual Estimate” is an incorrect slide and will be corrected and placed on the HelpHopeHome website. The general survey results showed that the majority of the community’s homeless population identified their race as White/Caucasians, followed by Black/African Americans, and most are Non-Hispanic/Non-Latino. Loss of job continues to be the primary reason for homelessness, followed closely by “Other” category, and then alcohol or drug use, illness or medical problem, argument or asked to leave, and incarceration. Since the options given on the survey are very comprehensive, it is unclear what “Other” reasons could encompass. With regards to economic support the results showed that 84.7% of the survey respondents reported they were experiencing unemployment at the time of the survey. The 2016 data indicates homeless individuals seem to be receiving lower amounts of income from other sources (e.g. panhandling, recycling, etc.). More specifically, 74.8% is 2016 survey respondents claimed to be receiving no money from other sources. This is a 1.1 % increase from 2015 (79.7%). Between 2015 and 2016, the amount of survey respondents receiving Food Stamps increased from 70.3% to 76.2%. With regards to disabling conditions, the general survey results showed that 70.8% of survey respondents reported one or more physical disabling conditions; an 11.0% increase compared to 2015 when 59.8% of survey respondents were in this category. It also show that 48.7% of survey respondents reported no developmental disabling conditions; an 8.6% decrease since 2015 when 57.3% of survey respondents reported no disabling conditions. Keep in mind that for Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) and a client must have a disability. For homeless sub-populations, 285 individuals, which is 170 less people or a 37.4% reduction, were classified as chronic homeless individuals. It should be noted that these are not individuals who have been verified as chronic homeless, but they self-identified as having a disabling condition and self-identified as having been homeless for 1 year or more OR had 4 episodes of homelessness in the last 3 years based on a series of questions. With regards to other subpopulations, there was an increase in all categories. This included 1,386 adults who self-reported they have a serious mental illness; 31.5% increase of the adults reporting they have a substance use disorder; 14.1% increase of the adults reporting they have HIV/AIDS; and 12.4% increase of adults indicating they are victims of domestic violence. The homeless subpopulations for severely mentally ill was broken down into 3 major areas: mental illness, depression, and PTSD. For survey results involving co-occurring disorders, meaning they have a disability and a substance abuse issue, the data is fairly new, starting in 2013. Those reporting having a mental disorder and substance abuse have increased, while those reporting they suffer from depression and substance abuse or PTSD and substance abuse have decreased, but only slightly. For homeless veterans’ data, there were a total of 730 veterans enumerated in the 2016 PIT Count (sheltered and

unsheltered). This is a 5.5% increase, or 38 more veterans, since the 2015 PIT count. Of these veterans, 102 were female, 628 were male, and none were transgender. It should be noted that the data was extrapolated from the survey and showed a significant increase, meaning an individual identified themselves as a veteran rather than being based on veteran history, so this figure could include those clients that do not meet the definition of veteran. There were no homeless veteran households with children at the time of the PIT count. Nick Spriggs, Briggs and Spriggs, brought to the board's attention that Brenda Fonseca, Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority, states the VA wants to give SNRHA 500 more VASH housing vouchers, because the VA thought there was a vastly larger number of veterans and were having a hard time reconciling that with the By Name List. He voiced whether the difference between HUD and VA definition could resolve the issue. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer reminded the board, that 30% that are identified as veterans aren't eligible for veteran housing. Shalimar Cabrera, U.S. Vets, noted that the CoC definition and Veteran Administration definition of veteran are different, and asked if in the future, there could be a consensus between the two. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that it would probably not happen. Ms. Cabrera suggested that the information would need to be reconciled with the public who doesn't sit in on the meetings in order for them to understand. There were 136 veterans surveyed, of which 41.2%, or 56 respondents, were unsheltered. Family homelessness decreased by 40.1%, or 79 less homeless families, between 2015 and 2016. Between 2015 and 2016, homelessness among unaccompanied youth under age 18 decreased by 66.2%, or 546 less children. Between 2015 and 2016, homelessness among youth ages 18-24, decreased by 11.0%, or 155 less homeless youth. When looking at the demographics based on the youth survey, most are transitional age youth. Of the respondents, 57% were identified as male, 0 identified as transgender, and 20.6% of female respondents reported they were pregnant. Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, asked what is about the sample size of the surveys. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated she would have to check the full report. Mr. Ghafoori asked if there was a concentration of surveys at one agency, which would skew the numbers? Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated each agency was given surveys based on 15% of the total physical count. Anyone counted that was age 18-24 was asked to complete the survey, if they were willing. Mr. Ghafoori asked if there was any information for youth under age 18, i.e., can it be assumed that if 41% of those surveyed were youth between the ages of 18 and 24, the remaining 59% are youth under the age of 18. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that assumption could not be made since the 41% was of all individuals surveyed, not just youth surveyed. Mr. Ghafoori again asked if there was any information about the youth under age 18. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer referred Mr. Ghafoori to the full report which is on the HelpHopeHome website. Mr. Ghafoori asked if the data was extrapolated or exact numbers. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that it was from a percentage of the surveys completed. Mr. Ghafoori noted the striking drops in numbers for homeless youth, to which Ms. Fuller-Hallauer explained that the methodology changed in the Title I Hope program. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that those unsheltered youth not in school were assumed to be counted in the street census, according to the methodology. Mr. Ghafoori stated his concern about the large reduction in numbers, and how representative of the actual numbers it is since all other statistics show Las Vegas as having the 2nd highest number of homeless youth, etc. Kelly-Jo Shebeck, Clark County School District, also mentioned that the day before the census, a report of identified homeless youth in the middle school and high school system was pulled and sent to the counselors so that each student identified was counted and surveyed, according to a questionnaire put together with the help of Ms. Fuller-Hallauer based on the HEARTH Act. However, only those in school were counted. Ms. Shebeck also reminded the board that McKinney-Vento is the CCSD program used in the past to identify homeless youth, which uses a different definition. Mr. Ghafoori observed that could account for one big change in the numbers, and the other is making the assumption that if the counselor did not survey the student, they must be on the street, or that the school knows of all its youth that are unaccompanied. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that according to the results from the youth surveys, the top 5 primary causes of homelessness among youth are: 1. Kicked out of the house. 2. Emotional abuse. 3. Financial issues. 4. Ran away from family home, group home, or foster care. 5. Other. The results also showed that the majority (45.7%) of survey respondents had been couch surfing for 2-6 months at the time of the survey, and 23.6% had been experiencing homelessness for 1-2 years. The top 3 needs and support identified as helpful to prevent homelessness were: 1. Job training/employment. 2. Housing assistance. 3. Education. According to survey results, 46.8% have a 12th grade/high school diploma or equivalent. When surveyed about service utilization, 10% utilized permanent housing, 10% transitional housing and 68% utilized other, which includes the drop in center and Title I HOPE. Factors preventing youth from seeking services are: 1. 12% don't trust anyone. 2. 10% don't have transportation. 3. 10% are afraid that their parents will be contacted. 4. 10% are afraid they will be put in Child Protective Services. Mr. Ghafoori asked if the question regarding education was whether the individual was enrolled in any kind of educational program, or is it a measure for the highest level of educational attainment. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated the question asked if the individual was in an educational program and clarified that 46.8% are either presently enrolled in the 12th grade or have received a high school diploma or the equivalent. She again reminded the board that the full report could be found on the HelpHopeHome website at <http://helphopehome.org/homeless-census/>. Erin Kinard, WestCare, shared that she had been under the assumption that individuals were homeless when they moved to Nevada, but according to the key findings they became homeless after moving to Nevada. She also mentioned she felt that clients need to be educated as to what disabilities are to determine possible qualifications for other benefits. She then asked if "Chronic Homelessness" could be an area addressed in the future (Verified vs. identification). Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that it does not take place in the census but it did occur in the

functional zero working groups. Ms. Kinard then asked if the “Victims of Domestic Violence” were those individuals currently experiencing domestic violence or if there was a history of domestic violence. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated she would have to see how the question was worded. Christy Shannon, S.A.F.E. Nest, suggested adding the question, “Are you currently fleeing to escape domestic violence?” to determine whether the individual is currently experiencing or has a history of domestic violence. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer suggested that those interested in tweaking the questionnaire, should join the Census Planning Group. Ms. Kinard asked about the reasoning for breaking down the “Severely Mentally Ill” into “mentally ill”, “depression” and “PTSD.” Ms. Fuller-Hallauer explained that HUD had determined the breakdown. Ms. Kinard expressed her concerns of getting the veterans’ definition figured out as it could be skewing the community’s information. She also asked if the questions on the survey for youth were the same questions asked each year. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that due to the tightened methodology to get solid data the questions used were to get the needed data. Ms. Kinard asked whether this years’ data is more of a baseline. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer affirmed that assumption. Mr. Ghafoori asked if by tightening the methodology, other factors should be looked at to assure all the needed information is gathered, as well as looking at other communities to see how their youth is counted. Ms. Shebeck stated she felt this it is because the McKinney-Vento Act has a different definition than what is being considered for this report, so CCSD has had to change the student information system in the past few years. Although it is a long process, CCSD is moving forward. Ms. Kinard stated that the category “Other” under “Primary Causes of Homelessness” for youth doesn’t display the full story. She asked if the question had multiple choice answers or a fill in the blank option. If more information was collected as to what the “Other” causes of homelessness were, the community would be better able to have more tangible interventions available. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that since the “Other – Youth” category has spiked in the past 2 years, the available options need to be explored. Noel Bruelle, a member of the audience, stated that she felt the disability aspect should be more advertised as one of the providers was able to house and get a client benefits, based on their disability. Ms. Kinard stated she felt that example catapults the reason to have peer support specialists to mentor clients. Nick Spriggs, Briggs and Spriggs, asked if the reason for the 17% reduction in the homeless population could be attributed to the virtual zero count for veterans and the VASH vouchering. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that CCSD education system had a better way to collect data and break out the homeless category, i.e., literally homeless vs. at risk of homelessness. Also, there was a better utilization of beds and the community, as a whole, is better with the utilization of beds and at moving persons to housing. It also had to do with the virtual zero count for veterans. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer went on to report on the housing inventory. The inventory includes the capacity of beds, how many are in beds, which agencies and type of beds, including overflow beds. The totality of beds (year round beds) consist of 2,225 permanent supportive housing beds, 2,199 emergency shelter beds, 824 transitional housing beds, 526 rapid rehousing beds, and 25 Safe Haven beds. Based on household type, there are 3,982 beds for households without children, 1,219 beds for households with children and 33 beds for households with only children. When comparing the household composition type to the type of housing, at Emergency Shelters, there are 1,349 beds for households without children, 265 beds for households with children, and 19 beds for household with only children. At Safe Haven, there are only 25 beds, all allocated for households without children. Transitional Housing has 659 beds for households without children, 163 beds for households with children, and 12 beds for households with only children. Rapid Rehousing has 205 beds for households without children, 321 beds for households with children and no beds for households with only children. Permanent Supportive Housing has 1,744 beds for households without children, 479 beds for households with children and 2 beds for households with only children. According to the inventory, there are 4,872 current beds, 145 new beds, and 217 beds under development, meaning they will be coming on line. At the time of the count, 14% of the available beds were empty. For permanent supportive housing utilization rate by project, the under development beds are not included in the vacant beds. Of all the beds available, 5,235 of the beds are under the HMIS system, including HUD VASH beds and other agencies. Approximately 10%, or 564 beds, are non-HMIS beds. For the HMIS participation rate by component type, 128 domestic violence beds for single females or households with children can’t be entered into HMIS and are not counted in the PIT count. Nancy Menzel, UNLV, asked if any of the beds were barrier free or wet housing. Catherine Huang Hara, Clark County Social Services, stated that at the time the HIC data was being captured, the wet beds at WestCare were not online. Ms. Kinard clarified that housing providers are not supposed to allow clients to drink and use. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that according to Housing First methodology, all housing types should be using housing reduction/barrier free criteria. Mr. Pawlak asked if the community had many housing types that fell into that category, to which Mr. Spriggs commented the community has none. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that the community is moving in that direction. Mr. Spriggs suggested the community demand and hold accountable in the Monitoring Working Group to the Housing First low-barriers/no-barriers standards of be adhered to and enforce HUD best practices in order to score higher on the CoC application. Mr. Ghafoori stated that would be a good idea, but it is not always applicable, due to security and staffing concerns involved. Mr. Spriggs acknowledged that it would need to happen in increments, and therefore, not an overnight result. Mr. Ghafoori stated that when decisions are made, the board needs to be conscious of the provider consequences as well as the implications, and therefore, support and understanding to the providers is needed. Mr. Ghafoori also assured Mr. Spriggs that in the past 6 months, the language “low barrier” has been written into applications. A small discussion regarding the upcoming review of the providers by the Monitoring Working Group was held between Mr. Ghafoori, and Mr. Spriggs. Ms. Kinard noted that it’s

important to make sure the housing providers are on board with the low barrier standard, because they could remove themselves as a provider. Therefore, approaching the matter with them should be done delicately. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated the importance to ensure providers have proper training and staffing. Mr. Spriggs commented he feels that chronic homelessness cannot be ended if there are housing barriers and under the harm reduction model need to have the freedom to drink, if they choose. Cynthia Hurtado, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD), voiced a concern about the need to train armed security as barrier free areas are conducive to violence, murder and rape. Mr. Spriggs stated that literature over the past 5-10 years disputes that assumption but by putting them in housing, it would actually reduce crimes. Ms. Hurtado again expressed her concerns for the need of training. Ms. Kinard stated the severity and functioning of the population needs to be looked at, they need to be assessed according to the needs they are presenting with their chief complaints, as well as take a look the clinical aspect and treat them holistically, as some may respond quite well to the harm reduction model, whereas, others may not respond as well. However, ultimately, the goal is to reduce harm. The board would need to work with providers about reducing harm, as some clients are not always able to do so.

Agenda Item 8. Receive a report for discussion on the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the Continuum of Care program and the 2016 grant application process; for possible action.

Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Manager, Clark County Social Service, introduced Danyelle Cadell as the new CoC Coordinator, explaining that in the future, Ms. Cadell will be the contact person regarding any grant application questions and concerns. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer then reported that the local application was released on May 27, 2016 and is due June 24, 2016, which allows agencies four weeks to load the application into Zoom Grants. HUD will release the NOFA in June and allows 30 days to submit, but normally the deadline is 45 days. Project Monitoring will be a full day and will consist of desk monitoring June 13 – 27, 2016; participant eligibility, performance measurement v2 report, including the hardest to serve clients, exits to permanent housing, increase in self-sufficiency, and HMIS data quality; bed utilization; recidivism rate; drawdown report from HUD, and recapture of funds per HUD. All these factors will go into a report to score for ranking in the CoC application. Mandatory Technical Assistance sessions were held on June 3 and 6. Application presentations will be July 11-13, with scoring and ranking, appeals, and appeals hearings (if necessary) contingent on release of the NOFA.

Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, recommended the remaining presentations be tabled based on time constrictions. Catherine Huang Hara, Clark County Social Service, suggested that the 211 presentation be allowed to proceed since the presenter is not a regular CoC member. Some board members stated they would have to leave at 4:00 p.m. based on previous commitments, but the 211 presentation was permitted.

Agenda Item 9. Receive a presentation and discussion on the direction and updates to the 211 Nevada service referral system (Innovations, Challenges, and Call for Community Support) by the Financial Guidance Center; for possible action.

Christie O'Melia, Financial Guidance Center, gave background information regarding their involvement with the 211 system. Financial Guidance Center was established in 1972. HUD approved housing counseling agency in 1990. Financial Guidance Center is presently a United Way member agency and was selected by the State of Nevada DHHS to administer and provide oversight for Nevada 2-1-1 system. The 2-1-1 resource came under the federal communications commission (FCC), state of Nevada revised statutes, executive orders, and state of Nevada DHHS RFP. The purpose of Nevada 2-1-1 is to provide information and referral (I&R) to Nevadans, such as basic human services; physical and mental health resources; employment support services; programs for children, youth, families, seniors, and persons with disabilities; volunteer opportunities; and community crisis and disaster recovery. Access to the system is available 24/7/365, by phone, text, or the website for individuals needing help who don't know where to find it. It is also a helpful repository for service providers including 1,130 agencies, 3,341 programs, and 5,017 services. When looking at opportunities to enhance the 2-1-1 system, the previous strategic plan was reviewed. In the review, it was determined that 49.15% of providers never used 2-1-1, and 23.75% rarely used 2-1-1. Since no one was held accountable, the accuracy of the database was questionable, the website was not intuitive to use, there was a lack of buy-in from partner agencies, and there was a general lack of awareness of 2-1-1 and the resources provided. For the time period of July 1, 2015, through May 31, 2016, 115,793 callers accessed the system. Of those, 31,899 were repeat callers, and 84,289 calls were answered in less than 30 seconds. Referral sources during that period came from 13,878 social services/nonprofit agencies, 9,354 friends/family, 5,366 previous 211 users, 4,042 state of Nevada agencies, and 3,624 web searches. The users of 211 range in age from 16 – 96. The web statistics for May 2016 were 32,287 page views in Nevada, 8,622 page views in California; and the page was viewed by those in more than 100 countries. Service requests included 12,808 referrals to 3,664 clients for food; 10,027 referrals to 5,015 clients for rental assistance; 7,741 referrals to 3,789 clients for utility assistance; 4,059 referrals to 1,541 clients for homeless shelters; 2,516 referrals to 829 clients for subsidized housing; and 3,603 referrals to 1,124 clients for transitional housing. The value of the 211 system is the leverage of benefits, eliminating duplicative services, stretching funding, and having a 24/7 resource in a 24/7 state. Nevada 2-1-1 must be comprehensive, remain current, expand accessibility, and become and remain relevant.

The database is presently being updated, by hiring 4 “boots-on-the-ground” employees to get current data. Also, agencies are asked to become certified, which requires paperwork to be put on file. Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, asked if there was a standard protocol used to update the information. Ms. O’Melia stated the updates will be done annually. Starting in July, a report will be sent of calls/referrals for each agency in the 211 system. Mr. Ghafoori suggested that with funding, added functionality and diversity of communication platforms will be added. Ms. O’Melia stated that in the next 4-6 months, online chat options will become available. Also, a texting option will be available to 898211. Mr. Ghafoori asked when clients call in if they are connected directly to agencies. Ms. O’Melia responded that currently they partner with an agency in northern Nevada, for those clients that may call regarding suicide. Erin Kinard, WestCare, asked about what accreditation does for the 211 system, i.e., does it aid in increasing funding and staffing, etc.? Ms. O’Melia stated it does help in funding. For the accreditation, an agency form is sent regarding a point of contact for the agency. A service form is also sent to the agency for each service the agency provides. Ms. Kinard stated that although the accreditation may initially be lengthy, the board should provide assistance in helping the agencies get accreditations.

Agenda Item 10. Presentation for discussion from U.S. Vets Las Vegas on the Impacts of 2016 Veteran’s Stand Down (Innovations, Challenges, and Call for Community Support); for possible action.

Shalimar Cabrera, U.S. Veterans Initiative-Las Vegas, stated that due to time limitations, she would provide her presentation regarding the Impacts of the 2016 Veteran’s Stand Down at the meeting in 2 months.

Agenda Item 11. Receive questions and answers for the Board working groups; for possible action.

Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, asked if the working groups reports had all been provided regarding their monthly meetings, and if any board members had questions regarding the reports. Catherine Huang Hara, Clark County Social Service, stated that all were included in the packet except for the report from the Planning Working Group, which will be included in the next reporting.

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

Nancy Menzel, UNLV, reported that UNLV with HELP of Southern NV applied to EPA for a \$500,000 grant to look at the problem of open defecation and the pollution of the water. However, it will not be known until November if they have been awarded that grant.

Agenda Item 13. Public Comment.

In Phillip Hollon’s absence, Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, presented the public comment for The Salvation Army. On May 14, the National Association of Letter Carriers and the Summerlin Post Office conducted their annual Food Drive, collecting over 311 boxes of food which provided 9,680 pounds of food being donated to The Salvation Army food pantry. The UNLV School of Nursing was praised for their visits to the Day Shelter facility several times throughout the month of May and providing blood pressure and wellness checks. On June 3, Pink Box Donuts, in celebration of Annual Donut Day, partnered with The Salvation by giving 10% of the day’s proceeds to help support those in need. United Airlines will be returning to prepare and serve a free community meal at The Salvation Army Lied Dining Room on June 30 from 2:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. This meal is open to anyone.

Catherine Huang Hara, Clark County Social Service, stated that during the report on the Census and the HIC/PIT report, thanking the community partners was omitted, so Ms. Huang Hara took time to acknowledge those partners assisting in the effort to conduct the census. Mr. Ghafoori openly thanked Ms. Huang Hara and Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Clark County Social Service, and their team for coordinating, spearheading, and preparing the reports.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.