

**SOUTHERN NEVADA HOMELESSNESS CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
August 22, 2016**

In attendance: Michael Pawlak, Co-Chair, Clark County Social Service
Arash Ghafoori, Co-Chair, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth
Terri Thompson, alternate, Vice Co-Chair, Clark County School District
Kevin Moss, alternate, Vice Co-Chair, WestCare, Inc.
Julie Calloway, City of Boulder City
Barbara Geach, City of Henderson
Lorena Candelario, alternate, City of North Las Vegas
Monica Gresser, Brazen Architecture
Vesela Zehirev, MGM Resorts International
Nick Spriggs, Briggs and Spriggs
Donna Jordan, alternate, Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services
Emily Paulsen, Nevada Homeless Alliance
Taylor Hough, Touro University Nevada
Phyllis Cobb, Veterans Administration
Nancy Menzel, UNLV
Melissa Clary, Huntridge Neighborhood Association
Jackie Bañales-Garcia, Nevada HAND
Christy Shannon, alternate, S.A.F.E. Nest
Henry Sneed, The Church LV
Laure Reposa, alternate, Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority

Absent: Stephen Harsin, City of Las Vegas
Bret Ficklin, Las Vegas Metro Police Department
David Slattery, Las Vegas Fire & Rescue
Dawn Davis, alternate, Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada
Kena Adams, Moapa Band of Paiutes
Jesse Robinson, Advocate
Bob Morgan, United Way of Southern Nevada
Shalimar Cabrera, U.S. Vets – Las Vegas
Ardell Galbreth, Workforce Connections
Pastor Rand Marshall, U.S. Army Veteran

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 2:12 p.m., on Monday, August 22, 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 August 22, 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 July 14, 2016 meeting; for possible action.

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

Agenda Item 5. Presentation by Clark County Social Service and discussion of the Southern Nevada Coordinated Intake process; for possible action.

Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Manager, Clark County Social Service, provided the update for the intake process in Southern Nevada, to ensure that all board members were fully aware of what is available at this time. Coordinated Intake is mandated by the HEARTH Act, and changes the way communities across the country receive clients into their programs. In the past, clients have had to determine, on their own, which agencies meet their individual needs, by visiting each agency. By having coordinated intake sites, or hubs, it allows for every person to be accessed equally and to be referred to the most appropriate

housing intervention. Coordinated intake is a single site or access point, which will be discussed later in the presentation. The key step is to assess and prioritize the needs of the homeless that are accessing services and ensure the community is matching those needs to the most appropriate programs in the community or housing interventions. In order to continue to receive HUD funding, it is required under the HEARTH Act. Three overarching components of Coordinated Intake are: standardized access - ensuring there is a centralized entry point for families and individuals facing a housing crisis; standardized assessment - all sites are using the same assessment and process so that they all make referrals using an equalized process throughout the system and then ensuring folks are prioritized based on need using the common assessment tool, which is VISPDAT in southern Nevada; coordinated referral – ensuring there is a referral mechanism in place to ensure that all clients are prioritized and funneled into any housing opportunity in the same manner. Since July 2014, coordinated intake has been used to assess households without children, but the move is towards implementing the process for households with children, families and youth, and persons fleeing domestic violence. There are 6 Coordinated Intake sites throughout the community, 5 of which are the Clark County Social Service offices, as well as the VA Community Resource and Referral Center (CRRC), which is the Coordinated Intake site for veterans. The CRRC uses the same housing assessment tool as Clark County Social Service, to assess households without children. Coordinated intake has several mechanisms to have access into the coordinated assessment and referral system. Folks can walk into any hub, receive an assessment and get a referral; anyone can refer a client over to one of the hubs; or the Crisis Intervention Team, the outreach team, can do assessments in the field, i.e., the people living in the tunnels and outlying areas that don't feel comfortable coming into one of the hubs. Once a client is assessed using the housing assessment tool, they are put into a community queue, which is a virtual location, where they are prioritized based on their numeric score from the housing assessment tool. Once one of the housing providers has a vacancy, the community matcher is notified, and the number of units available and the type of program is determined. The matcher then goes into HMIS, which is where the community queue is located, and based on the highest and most vulnerable, identifies which clients could be placed where. This system is currently used for permanent supportive housing, transitional housing, and rapid rehousing. Eventually, it would be nice if it could be used for emergency shelter, as well, which is encouraged by HUD. The Coordinated Intake Change Advisory Team (CAT), which meets every other Tuesday afternoon, is a multi-disciplinary team that makes the decisions and recommendations for making course corrections that take place around the coordinated entry system. They also review the data and ensure the community is keeping track of those clients who are being denied services, what the denial reasons are, and identifying with the providers what can be done to reduce barriers, and ensure the clients are being moved into the most appropriate housing placement. CAT is also responsible for ensuring the integrity of the coordinated intake process and tool. The board was reminded that at the end of 2015, a third party came in and evaluated the coordinated intake process. Through that evaluation, it was identified that the current housing tool, VI-SPDAT, was not getting at the depth of need of the clients in the community, causing a missed opportunity to serve the clients with intense issues in a particular area and getting them moved into housing. Based on this evaluation, it was recommended that either a supplemental tool to go along with VI-SPDAT be developed, or to develop a new tool for the community. The team originally decided that since the community is already using VI-SPDAT, a supplemental tool should be created to address, in depth, the issues not covered by VI-SPDAT. The team met weekly for 6 weeks to hammer out the new tool. At the end of the 6 weeks when the team was reviewing the supplemental tool, they realized they had created a new tool, which is being called the Southern Nevada Community Housing Assessment Tool (CHAT). It is a standardized assessment tool and will take the place of VI-SPDAT. In the beta testing of the new tool, it has assessed not only a broad range of issues, but also the extent of the issues. VI-SPDAT identified when clients had issues in multiple areas, but not the depth of those issues; where it is believed that CHAT will help to see both, to ensure identifying the clients who are most at risk and most vulnerable. Companion tools are currently being updated and it is anticipated that CHAT will start implementation this fall. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer then went through charts that identified the VI-SPDAT Score range from the beginning of its use, July 2014, through the week ending August 29, 2016, which includes the data from the VA partners. Of the total number of cases completed in VI-SPDAT for households without children (6,863), 2733 have been determined that permanent supportive housing is most applicable, 3319 were identified for rapid rehousing, and 811 were identified as not needing any housing intervention with case management, because those clients just needed affordable housing opportunities. She then reviewed a chart that showed there are currently 482 persons in need of permanent supportive housing, but none are available, and 407 persons are in need of rapid rehousing/transitional housing, with only 14 transitional housing opportunities available. Coordinated Intake will soon be rolling out to serve sub-populations of households with children, families, youth and victims of domestic violence. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer invited everyone to the community Charrette Planning Kick-Off Meeting on September 15, from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., at the Pearson Community Center, 1625 West Carey Ave., North Las Vegas, NV 89032, to begin the planning of the use of coordinated intake for these sub-populations. At this meeting, more detail will be provided on the current system, issues of the specific sub-populations will be identified, and the planning process will also be identified. It will also be determined who needs to be a part of the groups to help develop each model, and ensure that if someone is missing from the meeting that would be a viable member of the group, inviting them to make sure there is full stakeholder participation in the development of coordinated intake for the community sub-populations. Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) is coming into the community to help in the development of a coordinated intake model for families, for youth, and for victims of domestic violence. It is important to

ensure that the model for those 3 sub-populations has a common intersection with the households without children process, since there are clients that will cross from one population to another. By ensuring the common intersection, the needs of all clients should be met. Nick Spriggs, Briggs and Spriggs, stated his hope that Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority will be on the charrette board, since they could help bring in money for housing in order to bring down the numbers. Mr. Spriggs then asked about the break off for housing availability on one of the charts in Ms. Fuller-Hallauer's presentation. Ms. Fuller Hallauer stated that the break off depends on the units available, and finding the client to meet those requirements. Also, for permanent supportive housing in the community, the client must meet the definition of chronically homeless. Since the change in the definition of chronically homelessness at the beginning of the year, the verification requirements for chronically homeless have also changed. Because of these issues, clients who have an assessment score of 11 or 12 are seldom accommodated. Mr. Spriggs then asked if there is a resource map as to how to help with those scoring 11 & 12? Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated at present, nothing is being done for those scoring 11 and 12. Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, asked if it is known how long homeless transitional age youth (TAY) have been on the waiting list. Mr. Ghafoori also asked about the type of resource mapping or contingency plans in place for TAY. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated she doesn't know, but if TAY are recognized and score above a 10, the matchers are good about ensuring they go to the next person on the list. Mr. Ghafoori stated he felt the leaders of the sub-populations should be invited to teleconference meetings being held with the consultants in between the charrette meetings, and asked if there was any reason why they had not. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that inviting the leaders of the sub-populations is part of the plan. She went on to explain that the only meeting held thus far is the kick off planning meeting. After that meeting, members of the sub-populations will be invited to all other meetings, and this has been conveyed to CSH. Mike Pawlak, Clark County Social Service, asked if the data from CHAT was going to be tracked parallel to the VI-SPDAT data. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated it would be tracked and there may be a period of time that the data overlaps, in order to ensure no one misses an opportunity for housing. Mr. Ghafoori asked if CHAT had been externally validated. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that presently, CAT has been working with HomeBase as the technical assistance provider, but a third party has not validated it; however, it has proved successful in the community through beta testing. CAT has also talked with case managers who have worked with both VI-SPDAT and CHAT to see if they felt CHAT more accurately reflects the needs of the client. Mr. Ghafoori asked if it had been tried by case managers in a program or case managers in outreach teams. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that outreach teams had been testing the system; once clients are in program and have a case manager attached to them, as they are working with issues for wrap-around services, hopefully the client's score would go down. Mr. Ghafoori stated he understood, but since the goal of the new tool is to get the best possible placement upfront, that he feels that information should also be gathered from program case managers to determine how well the tool is scoring. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated it would make sense, going forward. At this point, with the beta testing, it was based on the clients on the street with an assessment through VI-SPDAT and CHAT. The outreach workers who had been working with those clients and had a rapport with them, were then asked how accurate the assessment was with the issues the client is experiencing. Sometimes the number went up and sometimes it went down. The response from the outreach team was that CHAT is more reflective of the true needs/barriers of the client. As CHAT goes forward, the data needs to be reviewed, and its validity needs to be identified. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that going forward with CHAT, case managers can be included when looking at the validity once the clients have been assessed through CHAT and housed. Terri Thompson, Clark County School District, took over as acting chairperson.

Agenda Item 6. Approval of recommendations for funding for the local 2016 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, Manager, Clark County Social Service, recapped the events of the 2016 CoC application process that had taken place this far. On May 27, 2016, the local application was released through Zoom Grants, which was closely aligned with last year's CoC electronic application. On June 3rd and 6th, a mandatory technical assistance training was held for new or renewal applications. On June 24, 2016, the local application was due. Application presentations were given the week of July 11. On August 10th, the Scoring and Ranking Team met, followed by the posting of recommendations by the team on August 11. Appeal requests were due on August 15, with the appeals hearings scheduled for August 17, if necessary. Today, August 22, the SNHCoC Board is receiving the recommendations to decide how to go forward with the local application. She then explained that HUD has 6 policy priorities included in the NoFA which are: 1. Creating a systemic response to homelessness; 2. Strategically allocating/reallocating resources. The reallocating process involves taking funding from low scoring projects and applying those funds to new projects, or taking monies from those projects that have chosen not to come in for renewal and applying those funds to new projects; 3. Ending chronic homelessness by 2017; 4. Ending family and youth homelessness by 2020; 5. Ending, or in our case, sustaining veteran homelessness; and 6. Using a Housing First Approach. Approximately \$1.9 billion is available for CoC funding in 2016. There is a strong emphasis on system performance, i.e. there was an entire section for separate submission on system performance, whether those outcomes were for CoC programs, outreach, emergency shelter, transitional housing, rapid rehousing or permanent supportive housing, regardless of funding. There is the same tiering & selection process as before, but with different tier percentages than in 2015. The deadline for submitting the application is September 14, 2016. In 2016, there is available a Permanent Housing

Bonus of up to 5% of a CoC's Final Pro Rated Need (FPRN) or Annual Renewal Demand (ARD). Rapid rehousing is considered a permanent housing program to serve individuals or families, and is an eligible component this year, as it was last year, under the Permanent Housing Bonus. The Permanent Housing Bonus could be permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless sub-population, or rapid rehousing for individuals, families, transition age youth, or victims of domestic violence. This year, a leverage amount and corresponding letters are not required. A "Strategies for Success" webinar was provided by the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, in collaboration with HUD, to help the community provide a strong application for this year's process. It was suggested that communities: 1. Utilize performance scorecards for ranking was stressed, in order to make objective data driven decisions; 2. Use intervention-appropriate metrics to measure system performance, to ensure the CoC is measuring the providers against each other and good outcomes from the providers; 3. Utilize a transparent coordinated entry system, reallocate for underutilized or ineffective projects; 4. Thoroughly review every local application; 5. Prioritizing admission to turnover permanent supportive housing units to chronically homeless individuals using Housing First methodology, and leveraging other resources (e.g., Medicaid) for supportive services; and 6. Prioritize planning and data-gathering in the CoC process. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer brought to the board's attention that 3 years ago all providers signed on to start using the Housing First Approach. The webinar explained that what makes a community strong to end homelessness is reallocating funds whenever it would reduce homelessness in the community. CoC's should use CoC-approved scoring criteria and selection priorities, and review transitional housing projects for cost-effectiveness and performance in ending homelessness. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer summed up the success strategies by stating the key is, "What will make the community strong to ending homelessness?" The scorecard components used locally have 4 overarching components: 1. Application score; 2. Cost per client for each program; 3. Recidivism rate – how many clients exiting the program to permanency are returning to the homeless system; and 4. Performance monitoring. This year the Monitoring Working Group monitored the different programs, and did a more in depth monitoring than in the past. The Monitoring Working Group will be using lessons learned from this year to tighten up the monitoring for the future. The scorecard components consisted of: performance monitoring; project eligibility – are projects removing or reducing barriers for clients entering their programs; utilization – are their beds filled on a regular basis, has there been an ebb and flow for how their beds are filled, or is the program having a hard time filling beds; and spending – are programs pulling down money for reimbursement on a regular basis, are all the funds allocated being spent, or are some funds going back to HUD. A sample scorecard was then presented showing the 4 components. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer pointed out the performance monitoring tool which can be pulled from HMIS, which each program can review their own performance. The 4 overarching components of the monitoring tool are: 1. Is the hardest to serve being served; 2. Is their program reducing homelessness and how long are clients kept in permanent housing; 3. Are clients increasing income to self-sufficiency – employment, non-employment, and education; and 4. HMIS participation and quality – is data being entered into the system in a timely manner to determine real-time data, as well as what is the quality of the data. The ranking and recommendation process involved: receiving presentations, scoring applications, receiving scorecard information from the CoC Monitoring Working Group; reviewing the Coordinated Intake Change Advisory Team compliance report; reviewing HUD Policy priorities; reviewing the HUD Notice of Funding Availability (NoFA) funding priorities and guidance; identifying the local needs; ranking the projects; and then sending those recommendations to the CoC Board. To determine the amount of 2016 funding available, the FPRN equaled \$9,831,686. In order to get the Permanent Housing (PH) Bonus of \$648,434, one or more projects had to total that amount. Also, to be eligible for the bonus, a way of identifying projects that need to be reallocated and/or having reallocated projects in past 3 years had to be proven. The ARD for Southern Nevada, which is the amount that is needed to renew existing projects in the community, was \$12,968,681. Tier I is equal to 93% of the ARD which equals \$12,060,873. Tier II equals the ARD + the PH Bonus – Tier I, which comes to \$1,556,242. Application requests were received from 32 projects for a total of \$15,172,661. There were 2 renewal project that did not come forward in this application, and 1 provider that did not renew their 2015 application, so they were not eligible to apply for 2016, which in turn caused the ARD to be reduced. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer explained that in order to maintain the CoC's competitiveness, the Scoring and Ranking Team chose to keep HMIS Expansion in the number 1 position. She further explained that no new Safe Havens are being funded across the nation, so in order to ensure the project goes forward, the team determined it is necessary to fund them through the CoC. She also explained that of the 3 new rapid rehousing projects, 2 projects are PH Bonus projects. She then presented the board with the following recommendations:

TIER I – HMIS Expansion – Clark County

Safe Haven – WestCare

Rapid Rehousing (NEW) – Salvation Army – Rapid Rehousing

Rapid Rousing Program (NEW) – Lutheran Social Services of NV – Rapid Rehousing

HopeLink Supportive Housing Program (NEW) – HopeLink of Southern NV – Rapid Rehousing

Re-entry Housing Program – Women's Development Center – Permanent Supportive Housing

Housing Stability for Families Program – Women's Development Center – Permanent Supportive Housing

Permanent Housing for Veterans with Disabilities – US Vets – Veterans Permanent Supportive Housing Program

Paradise – Southern Nevada Children First – Youth Permanent Supportive Housing Program

HELP the HOME – HELP of Southern NV – Chronically Homeless Permanent Supportive Housing Program

Chronically Homeless Aspiring for Maintenance 2 – US Vets – Chronically Homeless Veterans Program
 A New Start – HELP of Southern NV – Family Permanent Supportive Housing Program
 A Place Called Home – Southern Nevada Children First – Program for Transition Age Youth
 Permanent Housing for Veterans with Disabilities 2 – US Vets – Permanent Supportive Housing
 The Vivo Housing Project – Clark County – Chronically Homeless Permanent Supportive Housing
 FUSE – Clark County – Chronically Homeless Permanent Supportive Housing
 New Beginnings – Clark County – Chronically Homeless Permanent Supportive Housing
 Chronically Homeless Aspiring for Maintenance 1 – US Vets - Chronically Homeless Perm. Supportive Housing
 Healthy Living – Clark County –Medically Fragile Chronically Homeless Permanent Supportive Housing
 Moving Forward – Southern Nevada Children First – Pregnant and Parenting Teen Transitional Housing
 Keeping Families Together – Clark County - Rapid Rehousing
 NPHY Independent Living – Nevada partnership for Homeless Youth – Youth and TAY Transitional Housing
 Housing Opportunities Mean Empowerment (H.O.M.E) – The Shade Tree – Families & Domestic Violence RRH
 Veterans in Progress (VIP) – US Vets –Veterans Transitional Housing
 Shannon West Homeless Youth Center – HELP of Southern NV –Youth and TAY Transitional Housing
 Dual Success – Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (SNAMHS) – Chronically Homeless, Mental Illness
 And Substance Abuse Permanent Supportive Housing
 Crossings – St. Jude’s Ranch – Transition Age Youth Transitional Housing
 Families First – SNAMHS –Families with at Least 1 Adult with Mental Illness Permanent Supportive Housing
 Stepping Stones - SNAMHS (Tier I portion) – Individuals and Families with Mental Illness PSH
 Tier II – Stepping Stones – SNAMHS (Tier 2 portion) – Individuals and Families with Mental Illness PSH
 New Crossings – St. Jude’s Ranch – Transitional Age Youth Rapid Rehousing
 Homeless Coordinated Care Project (HCCP) – WestCare – Chronically Homeless Permanent Supportive Housing

This maximizes the available funding for the community and prioritizes in Tier I and Tier II, as required by HUD. It also meets the financial limitations.

The 2 projects that did not apply for renewal, and therefore, had their funds reallocated are:

Hope Project – New Genesis -	\$161,596
Housing Stability Program Expansion – Women’s Development Center -	\$108,158
Total	\$269,754

The Women’s Development Center did not accept the 2015 contract for their Transitional Housing program, so the \$128,474 in 2015 funds were lost from our budget. The bed counts for the renewal projects are: 1102 beds – permanent supportive housing; 201 beds – rapid rehousing; 203 beds – transitional housing; 25 beds – Safe Haven. The new projects bring on 169 beds in rapid rehousing projects. The bed counts for all projects are: 1102 beds – permanent supportive housing; 370 – rapid rehousing; 203 beds – transitional housing; and 25 beds – Safe Haven; for a total bed count of 1700 beds. Once the recommendations were posted, appeals were schedule for August 17, to be heard by a neutral review team. However, no appeals were received. In summarizing the 2016 request:

Tier I =	\$12,060,873
Tier II =	<u>\$ 1,556,242</u>
Total =	\$13,617,115
Eligible CoC Planning Costs -	<u>\$ 389,060</u>
Total 2016 Request =	\$14,006,175

The next steps are: asking for the Board’s approval/denial on the recommendations of the Scoring and Ranking Team; Local project applications are due in eSnaps, the electronic system into HUD, on August 29, 2016 (An eSnaps data entry training session will be held Friday, August 26 at the Clark County Government Center in ODC #4); Team review of eSnaps Project Applications will be conducted on August 30 & 31 by members of the CoC Evaluation Working Group and the CoC Scoring and Ranking Team that have agreed to review the applications; the draft of the consolidate application will be available for the review team on September 7; and HUD CoC Consolidated application completion is due September 14, 2016. Nick Spriggs, Briggs and Spriggs asked if any bonus points were available, as in the past, if the application was filed early. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that type of bonus points was not an option this year. Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, asked how much did the actual evaluative process change since last year? Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that since this is the second year the Monitoring Working Group has reviewed programs, the process was tighten up more, by doing a more in depth process this year by looking at files and performance measures. The Monitoring Working Group and the Evaluation Working Group worked together to compare projects equally and putting a numeric value, as much as possible, to each component. Some areas still need to tighten up, which will be worked toward for next year. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer continued to say that the team made sure a variance taken into consideration for projects with less than a full year of data available, in order to equalize the measures. Mr. Ghafoori asked who came up with the variance and how it was applied. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated the Monitoring Working Group was responsible for the variance, and asked Mr. Spriggs to address the details. Mr. Spriggs stated that because of the varying contract years and fiscal years, the Monitoring Working Group took the data and the period to report and determine. Mr. Ghafoori stated he didn’t feel the variance balanced well, and that

there needs to be a standard process used in case HUD decides to review the methodology used. Some decisions made for ranking put some projects that haven't really performed above those that had. Mr. Ghafoori then praised the Scoring and Ranking Team for the excellent job they did. He then offered that perhaps some things could happen in advance to assist the team in speeding up the process. Some things improved to use a percentage of 2016 dollars to have groups help in creating a robust evaluation system that is well rounded, arithmetically sound, and can be an evaluative tool. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that putting it in planning grant is an excellent idea. However, she reminded the board that because it would be in the 2016 competition, the contract would not be entered into until 2017, which might cause a lack of time to ramp up before the 2017 CoC process, so other funding streams may need to be considered. Mr. Ghafoori asked Ms. Fuller-Hallauer to email the Steering Committee, if she has any suggestions for funding this issue. Mr. Spriggs suggested all programs pull up their numbers daily to help foresee where they stand. Melissa Clary, Huntridge Neighborhood Association, asked if Clark County Social Service staff work year round on the monitoring the applications? Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that the Monitoring Working Group evaluates the programs. The CoC Grants Coordinator provides technical assistance when providers are having difficulty. Ms. Clary voiced a concern about the performance of the Women's Development Center (WDC) since they did not renew their 2015 contract, but had 2 other projects which are ranked high. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that the Evaluation Working Group's Scoring and Ranking Team could only go forward with data that was provided. She also explained the 2 projects that ranked high were permanent supportive housing programs, compared to one WDC project that was transitional housing, which is being phased out by HUD. The other WDC project was an expansion project, which they chose not to renew. Mr. Ghafoori suggested that the grants coordination piece could be improved, regarding scheduling for data provided. The Monitoring Working Group told the providers a specific schedule, and then did not keep the schedule. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that the Monitoring Working Group was getting tools together and had a plan in place, but was then informed by HUD of the release of the NoFA, so therefore, the Monitoring Working Group had to ramp up the dates, in order to meet the federal deadlines. Hopefully, in the future, this will not be an issue. Taylor Hough, Touro University Nevada, asked what kind of gain was received. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated the gain was the bonus money. Mr. Hough then asked if the community was losing beds due to the reallocation of funds. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated the reallocation came from projects that were not renewing the application. Mr. Spriggs asked about being able to review projects that spent all their money, as well as those that over the course of 2 years didn't use all their money. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that prior to last year, there was no access to providers' management of money because they dealt directly with HUD. Therefore, the only access allowed was to a final report of the drawdown rate. Last year the local HUD field provided the information. This way, the Monitoring Working Group can have access to the spend rates. Mr. Ghafoori stated the programs should improve information about spending rates. Mr. Ghafoori then asked if the spenddown rates were taken into account for this year's application. Mr. Spriggs stated that this year it was not part of the questionnaire, but going forward, he feels it should be included so that the information is readily available from the provider. Terri Thompson, Clark County School District, reminded board members that have project applications included in the CoC application to abstain from voting. She then asked for a vote to approve the recommendations and authorize the CoC Coordinator to make necessary modification for final submission to HUD. Mr. Ghafoori asked that the motion should include what the modifications are. The motion was restated as: To approve the recommendations for funding for the 2016 CoC competition and authorize the CoC Coordinator to make necessary modifications for final application submission to HUD. Mr. Ghafoori requested that the CoC Board be notified of the modifications. The motion passed. Abstaining from the vote were: Arash Ghafoori; Michael Pawlak, Clark County Social Service; Donna Jordan, Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services; and Kevin Morss, WestCare. Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, then took over as the chairperson, and Ms. Fuller-Hallauer and the team for all the hard work that was needed to accomplish the task of providing the recommendations.

Agenda Item 7. Questions and answers regarding reports from the Board working groups (Evaluation, Planning, HMIS, Monitoring, Community Engagement).

Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, stated that the respective champions will each provide an update. He then mentioned that there have been some challenges with staff receiving the reports for posing and meeting preparations. The Board requests that reports be sent at least 7 business days prior to each board meeting, which is typically the Tuesday before the agenda posts. Mr. Ghafoori then requested the reports from the champions. Nick Spriggs, Briggs and Spriggs, stated that the Monitoring Working Group did not meet, so no report was provided. Melissa Clary, Huntridge Neighborhood Association, asked if the agenda item is for the board members to go through the reports with the champions or just to read the provided reports. Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth stated the board members are to read the reports in advance and then they are better armed to ask question and request clarification if necessary. He also stated that even if a group does not meet and therefore, does not have a report, a statement stating the reason for no report needs to be received. Ms. Clary asked whether the champions are not to go through the report at the board meeting. Mr. Ghafoori explained that since the reports are to be provided in advance, this agenda item during the board meeting is to allow questions for the champions about the report they provide. Ms. Clary then addressed Emily Paulsen, Nevada Homeless Alliance and champion of the Community Engagement Working Group, to ask if the group could be polled to see if the Community Engagement Working Group meeting at 10:00 a.m. on Monday is best for everyone involved, or if perhaps establishing a

conference call might be better. Ms. Paulsen replied that she will check into those suggestions. Mr. Ghafoori asked Ms. Paulsen if there is a plan to present to a larger group the existing documents to aid the public in understanding homelessness that the Community Working Group has been working on. Ms. Paulsen stated that the working group will review in the CEWP and then those documents will go to the Steering Committee. She then thanked the partners for assisting in providing the data.

Agenda Item 8. Receive an update from each board member regarding relevant activities within their respective organizations relating to homelessness.

Emily Paulsen, Nevada Homeless Alliance, reminded the board that Project Homeless Connect will be held on Tuesday, November 15. The planning meeting will be held on September 21 and providers will be given information, at that time, to share with their clients. Phyllis Cobb, Veterans Administration, announced that the CRRC is on move on September 19. From now until September 16, the CRRC will continue to operate at 916 W. Owens. On September 19, services will start being provided at 4461 E. Charleston, NE Primary Care Clinic. Flyers are not available today, but will be in the future via email. Ms. Paulsen asked if shuttle service will be available from the west clinic to the north clinic, to which Ms. Cobb could not verify, but stated she would continue to advocate for the service. Ms. Paulsen asked if any partners in the room could help. Ms. Cobb stated she would get the information to Catherine Huang Hara, Clark County Social Service. Terri Thompson, Clark County School District, reminded everyone that school starts on August 29, and with the McKinney-Vento Act, it allows even those without proper documents to be enrolled in the school system. She offered the phone number, 702-855-6682, for anyone wishing additional information.

Agenda Item 9. Public Comment.

Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Clark County Social Service, reminded the board to response to an email they have either received from HelpHopeHome or Jocelyn Salgado (City of Las Vegas AmeriCorps Vista) regarding the SWAP (System-Wide Analytics Projection) tool and requests for full budget data to populate the tool. All agencies are asked to please respond with full budget data. This will help to identify the true cost of ending homelessness in Southern Nevada. Arash Ghafoori, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth, asked that since accounting was under funding, as well as assets, how accounting for assets and funding considered per project. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer state direction on data collection is provided by Focus Strategies; their SWAP tool collects data. Once data is collected, a group of people with strong analytic financial background will be needed to analyze the data and discuss it with projects and providers. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer responded to Mr. Ghafoori's question by asking providers to provide additional details with their responses if they have specific concerns or circumstances to share. Nick Spriggs, Briggs and Spriggs, stated that it would help if a balance sheet were required. Ms. Fuller-Hallauer stated that it wasn't asked for, but would be good. Mr. Ghafoori stated he would like all considerations taken into account. Phillip Hollon, The Salvation Army, thanked Michelle Fuller-Hallauer, The COC Evaluation Working Group and everyone that played a role in the COC grant process. Mr. Hollon acknowledged Cricket Wireless for their participation in the "Stuff the Pack - Backpack Event" by collecting backpacks and school supplies between July 15 and August 13. Approximately 100 backpacks were collected throughout the campaign. He also noted that Krispy Kreme Doughnuts held a "Fill the Bus" campaign at their 3 locations, collecting backpacks and school supplies for children in the community, from August 8-10. Customers who brought school supplies to any of the 3 locations were treated to a free doughnut, and customers who brought a backpack filled with supplies were treated to a dozen doughnuts. Mr. Hollon mentioned from August 15-17 that Fox5 and their Take5 to Care Partners, Subaru of Las Vegas, NV Energy and Henderson Hospital held their annual Supply Our Students (SOS) drive, collecting backpacks and school supplies. In addition to the enormous supply of backpacks and school supplies collected, more than \$5,500 was also collected. During the 3-day event, Mobile Misting LV for providing use of free misting fans to keep everyone cool. For their "Gives a Hoot" campaign, Hooters Casino Hotel Las Vegas has canceled their advertisements and torn down billboards for the month of August and donated the funds, which would have been their marketing budget in the amount of tens of thousands of dollars, to benefit The Salvation Army and 8 other local charities. Mr. Hollon also recognized Maxx Properties, who held a donation drive for The Salvation Army collecting 300 cases of water, 100 pairs of flip flops, razors, socks and backpacks for the homeless. The Salvation Army is partnering with Walgreens, who will be providing a total of 4 flu vaccinations clinics for the homeless and low-income during the months of September and October. Mr. Hollon then acknowledged Home Depot and the Home Depot Foundation for selecting The Salvation Army to receive an empty building which has been renovated to allow for additional services for Veterans in the community. Beginning in October/November, Team Depot Associate Volunteers will be completing a building transformation consisting of a total renovation of 14 client rooms, to accommodate 44 Veterans, a complete overhaul of the community room, new laundry facilities, new kitchen facilities, energy efficient lighting and new flooring throughout.

The meeting adjourned at 3:42 p.m.