

**SOUTHERN NEVADA HOMELESSNESS CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
June 8, 2017**

In attendance: Erin Kinard, Co-Chair, Health Care Provider
Kelly Jo Shebeck, Co-Chair, School District, Clark County School District
Barbara Geach, Co-Vice Chair, Government, City of Henderson
Shalimar Cabrera, Co-Vice Chair, Veteran Service Provider, U.S. Vets – Las Vegas
Steve Harsin, Government, City of Las Vegas
Mike Pawlak, Government, Clark County Social Service
Mel Frailey, Law Enforcement, Las Vegas Metro Police Department
Emily Paulsen, Advocate, Nevada Homeless Alliance
Monica Gresser, Business, Brazen Architecture
Laure Raposa, Public Housing, Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority
Takiyah Butler, EFSP Board, United Way of Southern Nevada
Troy Oglesbee, Faith-Based, Save A Life
Henry Sneed, Faith-Based, The Church LV
Amie Duford, alternate, Health Care Provider, Touro University Nevada
Dawn Davis, Social Service Provider, Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada
Christy Shannon, Social Service Provider, S.A.F.E. Nest
Siloh Moses, Homeless or Formerly Homeless, Serving Hope LV
David Slattery, Emergency Medical Services, Las Vegas Fire & Rescue
Peter McCoy, Veteran Service Provider, Veterans Administration

Absent: Julie Calloway, Government, City of Boulder City
Lorena Candelario, alternate, Government, City of North Las Vegas
Mandy Martin, Business, Las Vegas SANDS
Jaime Cruz, Workforce Investment, Workforce Connections
Kevin Sharps, Affordable Housing, Nevada HAND
Donna Jordan, Mental Health Provider, Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services
Arash Ghafoori, Social Service Provider, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth
Jesse Robinson, Homeless or Formerly Homeless, Advocate
Melissa Clary, Advocate, Huntridge Neighborhood Association
Kena Adams, Advocate, Moapa Band of Paiutes
Michael Johnson, University, 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 2:08 p.m., on Thursday, June 8, 2017, 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 8, 2017; 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 11, 2017 meeting; for possible action.

A motion was made to approve the minutes for the May 11, 2017 meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 5. Update by co-chairs on recent activities of the Steering Committee; for possible action.

At the May 17 Steering Committee Meeting, an update was received from the Homebase Change Advisory Team regarding the governance structure and assessment tools. Aisha Henderson, a doctoral student conducted a 30-minute focus group interview session for her graduate research project on homelessness. She may continue to utilize the Steering Committee and the CoC Board for further questions, discussions, and focus groups until her research project is finished.

Agenda Item 6. Presentation from the Coordinated Intake Change Advisory Team; for possible action.

Kelly Robson, HELP of Southern Nevada, and Maurice Cloutier, WestCare, explained that the use of coordinated intake was mandated by the HEARTH Act. Before coordinated intake came about, many homeless service programs had a first come, first serve policy, but each agency had their own requirements. With the coordinated intake system, it is an equal opportunity for all to access benefits and programs by being 1 assessment tool used by all agencies. A timeline was then presented showing the progress from

starting with community discussions around the coordinated intake model in August 2012 to an evaluation of CHAT in January 2017. Next, the route through which a client moves through the system was explained. It was also noted that the process for veterans is slightly different, in that the veteran first checks with the VA and if the VA cannot assist, the veteran is then referred to Clark County Social Service to start through the coordinated intake process. The coordinated intake system evaluation was done by HomeBase. A copy of the results can be found at www.helphome.com. Within the evaluation, the issues addressed are Outreach – Communication and Marketing, and Systems Entry Point; Assessment – Assessment Tool, and Education & Communication; Prioritization – Fairness, and Efficiency; Waitlist - Efficiency; and Referral/Placement – Efficiency. Initially the coordinated intake system used was VI-SPDAT, but it was determined that the tool was not capturing the most vulnerable on the streets, i.e. gambling and heat exhaustion. The recommendations were to modify or alter the tool, or supplement the VI-SDAPT with an additional assessment tool that asked additional questions. The Coordinated Intake Change Advisory Team (CI CAT) decided to look into a supplemental tool. In order to come up with a tool, power meetings, each lasting 4 hours over a 6-week period took place. At the end of the 6-week period, CI CAT decided to create a tool called Community Housing Assessment Tool (CHAT). The reason for selecting CHAT was: 1. It was customized for Southern Nevada, i.e. gambling and heat related issues; 2 It collected detailed information about risks; 3 It identified “presumptive” homeless chronicity; 4. It simplifies the matching process; 5. It gives an increased priority based on vulnerability; and 6. It is a standardized tool. The CHAT questions consist of 53 scored questions and 11 other questions which are used to gather information to assist with matching, i.e. prior living situation; foster care history; jail and or prison information, including number of times; health insurance; pets; another person the client wants to be housed with; contact information; and permission to take the client’s picture for ease of identification. With the additional 11 questions, the client can be geared towards the appropriate program. In January 2017, HUD paid HomeBase to evaluate the tool to determine efficacy and validity. Focus Groups with clients, surveys, data analysis, and a review panel were used for the evaluation. From the implementation of CHAT on November 1, 2016, until January 2017, over 600 CHATs had been administered. During that time, both CHAT and VI-SPDAT were done in order to make a comparison of the 2 systems. The key findings were: 1. CHAT is easy to use and typically takes only 20 minutes to complete, depending on the client’s disclosure; 2. CHAT reliably addresses conditions that are specific to Southern Nevada; 3. It is reasonably accurate and reliable; 4. It needs to be combined with a more conversational interview to yield accurate information about sensitive topics like crime, drugs, and sex work; 5. It accurately reflects clients’ vulnerability, even for “outliers” whose scores had changed significantly since their last assessments; 6. The distribution of CHAT scores follows the correct curve for a tool that’s meant to identify extremely high-risk individuals; 7. Standard deviation shows that the differences between scores are mostly based on real differences between clients; and 8. CHAT has a moderately positive correlation with VI-SPDAT scores, just as expected for 2 related but distinct tools. Therefore, the recommendations were: 1. Continue using the CHAT for Coordinated Intake; 2. Plan for future evaluations with long-term data; 3. Provide additional training for new assessors; 4. Invest in sound barriers and privacy walls; and 5. Set up automatic alerts for sharply different scores. A graph showing Need vs. Availability effective 5/30/17 was shown. David Slattery, Las Vegas Fire and Rescue, asked if future versions could include questions about the number of times the clients use of 911 and/or accessed emergency departments? Ms. Robson stated there are questions asking the client about the use of the ER and 911 in the last 6 months, but a review to see about addressing the issue further can be looked into. Mr. Cloutier also stated that frequent user use is taken into account. Takiyah Butler, United Way of Southern Nevada, asked for a clarification of the coordinated intake process, since she is new to the board. Ms. Robson stated that because the community did not own VI-SPDAT it could not be modified, only supplemented, so the decision was made to create a new tool. Ms. Butler then asked how the validity and creditability of the tool was measured. Ms. Robson stated that a meeting was held to determine the differences in scores between VI-SPDAT and CHAT. Some of the differences were that VI-SPDAT lumped the medical questions, whereas, CHAT asked individual medical questions. She also stated that the new tool put the most vulnerable where they needed to be by scoring them more accurately. Erin Kinard, Health Care Provider, asked if other communities also had issues about the assessment tool not addressing their community needs as well? Ms. Robson stated that Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Clark County Social Service, would be the better person to answer that question; however, she was not present at the meeting. Ms. Robson went on to say she assumes that other communities also had issues with the system not meeting their community needs, since CI-CAT has been asked by other communities for the use of the CHAT tool. However, they have declined allowing others to use CHAT because it had not gone through the evaluation with HomeBase and looking at the validity of the tool. Ms. Kinard suggested that if VI-SPDAT isn’t working in our community as well as other communities, perhaps HUD should be informed that it isn’t working. She also asked what was meant by “Automatic Alerts”? Mr. Cloutier explained that if information entered for reassessment of a client caused the scoring to be extremely different, an alert would be received to review the current information. Ms. Kinard then asked if the tool is to be used in the sub-populations for coordinated intake, to which Ms. Robson stated it would not. The youth group has decided to use the Next Step tool, which is a VI-SPDAT tool; the families group is going to use the F-SPDAT, which is the VI-SPDAT for families; and the domestic violence group will be creating their own tool. However, the youth group is finding that several of the questions are not relevant and are adding more questions for informational purposes. Ms. Kinard stated that since this is the 3rd year of use of a coordinated intake tool for single adults, instead of working harder to develop new tools, couldn’t 1 tool be devised for all in order to work smarter? Catherine Huang Hara, Clark County Social Service, interjected that each sub-population group is going with a tool that is relevant to their group and asking questions in a different way to relevant to their group of clients. Ms. Robson stated that although the validity of CHAT has been tested, the VI-SPDAT is evidence based so whereas CHAT at present is not, which is cause for concern with some of the groups. However, they know that in the future they will have to create their own tool, but the focus at present is to get the various sub-population tools up and running. Christy Shannon, S.A.F.E Nest, stated the 1st issue to address for the domestic violence group is safety, and then homelessness. Ms. Kinard suggested adding a sub-addendum to address the safety of the homeless. Ms. Butler questioned duplications of the tools and clients being able to jump between programs, and asked what would be required for each sub-population to be on the same page. Ms. Robson stated that time is the biggest factor and since each group is trying to roll out their

tool by July 1, there is no time to develop a new tool. However, once the tools are in place a review can be done at a later date to determine if the development of a new tool would be needed. She went on to state that in order for all populations to be on the same page, it will involve enforcement or direction from the board. Ms. Kinard stated that for the betterment of the community it is important to address homelessness. Mr. Cloutier stated that from his experience, the need is to work together, not in a silo, in order to accomplish the goal of ending homelessness. Ms. Shannon agreed with Mr. Cloutier's remarks, but mentioned the difficulty comes when the sub-populations do not feel like their individual needs are being addressed and therefore, they're not being heard. She also stated she understands and agrees with eventually having 1 tool used by all. Ms. Kinard then suggested the issue of using 1 tool for all populations be put on the long-term task list for the Change Advisory Team in order to use an evaluation process to determine if each individual tool is working. If it is working, continue with each group using their individual tool; but if it is not working, use of 1 tool for all should be the goal. Ms. Huang Hara stated that HomeBase will return in 2 weeks to address having placement of an alignment process in place. In a prior meeting with HomeBase it was suggested to streamline placement on the back end to have 1 queue, so that tool prioritization in sub-populations then look at percentiles. Ms. Robson explained that since the different tools are unable to talk to each other, the use of percentiles more accurately captures efficiency. Ms. Butler asked if the tools evaluate the same for each sub-population to which Ms. Robson stated they did for determining vulnerability for housing. A discussion then took place regarding vulnerability for each sub-population. Ms. Butler then asked if the sub-populations are trying to get to a common tool. Ms. Huang Hara stated that the other chairs for the sub-populations can come back later for a more comprehensive presentation as to the looks of the rollout. Silo Moses, Serving Hope LV, asked who owns CHAT, to which Ms. Robson stated the Continuum of Care owns it. Mr. Moses then asked why the Continuum was unwilling to share CHAT with other communities. Ms. Robson explained that before sharing CHAT, the Continuum wanted HUD to evaluate the validity of the tool. Ms. Huang Hara stated that since CHAT has only been in use since November 2016, the Continuum wanted to wait until it had been in use for a while and evaluated by HUD to ensure it is a time valid tool. Mr. Moses asked where the information loaded in CHAT goes and if any other agency can see the information. Ms. Robson explained the CHAT information is in HMIS, which allows the Mobile Crisis Intervention Team (MCIT) to access the information through HMIS. She then stated that agencies can view the information in CHAT, but cannot view the results of the assessment, i.e. the housing evaluation. Mr. Moses then asked if in the future, CHAT could basically be bare bones information going to each agency for the purpose of determining eligibility for their own programs. Ms. Robson stated that is the purpose of coordinated intake. Mr. Cloutier stated it is pertinent to have each agency do their own eligibility assessment. Mel Frailey, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, asked how success is being measured and what the guidelines of the tool? Ms. Robson stated that the success is housing the most vulnerable clients that are on the streets. When asked about training for new assessors by Ms. Kinard, Ms. Robson stated that at present, Caridad, WestCare, HELP of Southern Nevada MCIT and the VA are the only outreach teams doing CHAT. Since there is a need for more field agencies, there is a need to train more agencies. Therefore, training on CHAT is scheduled for June 15 and 16. When asked if United Way could have corporate volunteers, as a project, become involved in outreach and answering the CHAT questions, Ms. Robson explained that since the volunteers would have to be trained on HMIS which would give them access to client information, they would not be eligible for the training. Mr. Frailey asked how the most vulnerable were determined in order to compare them to the least vulnerable. Ms. Huang Hara explained that a client's vulnerability is based on the assessment scores. Ms. Robson went on to state that after the assessment is completed through CHAT, HMIS then determines the score. Ms. Huang Hara explained that the most vulnerable are placed on the Permanent Support Housing list, mid-vulnerable are placed on Transitional Housing and Rapid Rehousing list and the least vulnerable are determined to be able to self-resolve. Ms. Butler asked if success is to be measured by matching outcomes? Ms. Robson said that permanent supportive housing clients are hard to measure because of the Housing First and Harm Reduction model that is in use. Ms. Huang Hara stated the measure is subjective to retention housing, or how long a client stays in that housing program. Michael Pawlak, Clark County Social Service, reminded the board that another measure is how well the HUD criteria is met for Chronic Homeless, and CHAT does an accurate assessment. Barbara Geach, City of Henderson, asked about the housing availability shown on the last presentation slide of Needs vs. Availability. Ms. Robson stated that housing providers notify the matchers at Clark County Social Service and then the matchers place the clients into housing. Mr. Cloutier responded to Ms. Geach question about wait time to be matched by stating the permanent support housing numbers are skewed since a time limit for placement is involved. Ms. Robson stated that permanent supportive housing has more units available whereas transitional housing and rapid rehousing are not as available. She also reminded the board that HUD is no longer funding transitional housing and rapid rehousing, so agencies must be creative in finding resources to bring in rapid rehousing. Ms. Geach then asked if recidivism can be measured and can the clients be asked for the reason? Ms. Huang Hara stated that within the CoC, when a client is leaving a program, their reason for leaving is supposed to be documented. Ms. Robson stated that in the future, capturing the reason for leaving and returning can be looked into. Emily Paulsen, Nevada Homeless Alliance, asked about the possibility of have a monthly update done to inform the board of the available housing. After a discussion, it was determined that a quarterly update could be provided starting in July. Ms. Paulsen then asked about receiving an update on the status of the system. Ms. Huang Hara also mentioned that system performance is done for 2015-2016 based on the federal fiscal year, so that information would be older information.

Agenda Item 7. Presentation by the City of Las Vegas on the Multi-Agency Outreach Resource and Engagement (MORE) Project; for possible action.

Jocelyn Bluiitt-Fischer, City of Las Vegas, explained that MORE stands for Multi-Agency Outreach Resource Engagement and is a part of the City of Las Vegas's Business Improvement District (BID) plan that was created in response to concerns from downtown businesses. Multiple community agencies, i.e. 7 days of Hope, CoC Coordinated Outreach, and The Giving Project, have joined together for joint outreach efforts. Although it yields great results, it is only for short periods of time and then the homeless return. The city began to consider the possibilities if a multi-agency outreach was done every day. The best practices from other cities, such

as San Antonio, TX and Phoenix, AZ were investigated and it was determined that success depended on including partnerships with law enforcement. Through the partnership between City of Las Vegas and Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD), LVMPD has provided 2 full-time officers to support the project and provided a Homeless Liaison, Annie Wilson. The City's contribution is funding for 4 outreach workers from HELP of Southern Nevada, The Salvation Army, WestCare, US Vets; and Teen Challenge, which is providing 2 formerly homeless guides. Because of the partnership between the City and LVMPD, the MORE Project is able to bring the programs and resources of multiple agencies to outreach efforts and incorporate the support of law enforcement. Regardless of the needs, someone on the team is available to help. The area of focus is from Owens Ave (North), Sahara Avenue (South), North Mojave/South Sandhill (East) and Interstate 15 (West). The goals and objectives are to connect homeless clients to services; provide consistent, proactive, daily outreach; build relationships with clients, business owners and residents, and make them aware of the active efforts being done; and reduce the number of street homeless by getting them safely off the street. Service and safety are the primary focus while connecting to the needs of the homeless. Client referrals may include non-profit agency programs and services; pop-up events at the Courtyard or just going to the Courtyard for safety; and tickets to Home Program. However, if the clients are not ready for program services, enforcement of existing laws and ordinances will be used as a last resort. Client data will be recorded in HMIS and coordinated intake using the CHAT tool will be used. The estimated start time for the MORE Project is mid-July. Barbara Geach, City of Henderson, asked if the project has started yet. Ms. Bluitt-Fischer stated the partnership with LVMPD and their liaison has begun. Ms. Geach asked if a kick-off date had been established. Ms. Bluitt-Fischer stated that on June 21, the City Council will review contracts. Then the agencies will be given time to hire and train the person for the project. It is anticipated that this will all occur by the end of July. Ms. Geach then asked if the number of outreach workers will be enough to adequately cover the area of the project, to which Ms. Bluitt-Fischer stated it will be. She added that since this is a pilot project, she would come back with an update once enough data has collected.

Agenda Item 8. Presentation from the Homeless Trust Fund Sub-Working Group; for possible action.

Emily Paulsen, Nevada Homeless Alliance, stated the committee meets monthly with a draft of record to present to the board at the July meeting. During the meetings, a discussion of what the funds are to be used for takes place. The Homeless Trust Fund, which currently has approximately \$90,000, is overseen by United Way of Southern Nevada. The committee is to see how to bridge the gap that other funding doesn't cover. Emily Kinard, Health Care Provider, stated this agenda item would be agendaized for the July 11th meeting.

Agenda Item 9. Presentation from HomeBase on the Prevention and Diversion Gaps Analysis; for possible action.

Amanda Wehrman and Erica McWhorter, HomeBase, explained that HomeBase had put together a report and the gaps analysis. Ms. Wehrman explained that in reviewing the methodology, the following items were looked at: previous regional studies and current tools; relevant local government and funding stream data; consumer focus groups and surveys; key stakeholder interviews and meetings; Southern Nevada Homeless Continuum of Care (SNHCoC) board and provider surveys; HMIS data; and applicable federal guidance and community examples or best practices. From this information came a report broken down into Context, Background, Southern Nevada System Structure, Relevant questions, Gaps, and Possible solutions. In the Context are resources sought and offered, under which Nevada 2-1-1, that offers housing, individual and family support services, food, utilities, and income support and employment, is addressed. Ms. McWhorter explained the difference between prevention and diversion as well as the types of prevention and diversion assistance available in the community. Ms. McWhorter then stated that the review was also to make sure the benefits that clients can qualify for should be connected as well as assuring the community requirements align with the HUD guidance on prevention and diversion. In order to align with those HUD requirements, coordinated entry would require easy access points, written policies and procedures for process of accessing ESG funded prevention and diversion resources making a prioritization so that if there are separate access points, written procedures are in place for how persons are prioritized for referrals. She next discussed the best practices for prevention and diversion which address housing subsidies, supportive services coupled with permanent housing, mediation in housing courts, cash assistance for rent or mortgage arrears, and rapid rehousing. Some of the challenges faced are: 1. Identification of the target population, since it is difficult to identify and engage this population; 2. Making access easy and clear, which requires well-trained and knowledgeable staff as well as marketing; and 3. Evaluation and measurement of activity to ensure it is working. Because of varying casualty, it makes engagement and access difficult, as well as being difficult to track and measure activity that occurs after services in order to measure the non-occurrence of homelessness. Next, the existing prevention and diversion resources in Southern Nevada were reviewed. It was determined that identification varies from word of mouth and walk-ins, and that better screening tools are needed at the front end. Access to resources also varies from multiple access points; walk-ins, some coordinated entry; and service provider-dependent. The process varies based upon service provider; multiple tools; varying mechanisms; and service and assistance availability. The review also looked at the system strengths and determined that overall, the substantial network of providers and resources available for prevention and diversion services is vital for that strength. Ms. McWhorter then discussed the gaps that were discovered in the community. Overall, it was determined that there is a lack of information coordination and dissemination and a lack of centralization to provide information and services. Also, identified were gaps with funding, SNHCoC priorities, and partnerships and tools. It was determined that the SNHCoC should reprioritize prevention and diversion to ensure providers and funders orient their efforts in this way. Upon review of HMIS, it was determined there was insufficient data to inform what gaps exist in the system or to report longitudinal data, no system-wide or program-wide documentation of entries, exits and interim processes. Ms. Wehrman concluded with recommendations to improve marketing and outreach, better utilize partnerships and tools, improve identification of target population and access, review SNHCoC priorities, and improve data analytics and reporting. She then went over the SNHCoC characteristics and effectiveness according to the best practices and metrics. Erin Kinard, Health Care Provider, stated she liked the format of the slide "Conclusion: SNHCoC

Effectiveness”, because it would allow tasks to be assigned to specific working groups. Takiyah Butler, United Way of Southern Nevada, agreed that there is a need to market the 2-1-1 service more.

Agenda Item 10. Questions and answers regarding reports from the Board working groups (Community Engagement, Evaluation, HMIS, Planning, Monitoring).

Mike Pawlak, Clark County Social Service, stated that this is the busiest time of year for the Evaluation Working Group with the CoC application being a priority. This involves the local application and then the scoring and ranking process to determine which applications to send projects forward for the national funding application. The local application was to be back by June 15; however, HUD has added a new program type and reiterated the importance of the local CoC process for evaluating the programs and sending projects for national funding. Since there will be upcoming training regarding the new data, the local application deadline has been extended to July 6. Any questions should be referred to Danyell Cadell, CoC Grants Coordinator. Scoring and Ranking Team members are still needed. There should be a minimum of 12 members, but there can be up to 15 members on the team. A third-party facilitation is also being considered. Shalimar Cabrera, US Vets, asked if anyone has reacted to the request to join the Scoring and Ranking Team. She also suggested that the target group might need to be broadened. Mr. Pawlak stated that to become a member of the Scoring and Ranking Team, it can come from the CoC membership at large and should be those with the best working knowledge of how the process works, as well as commit to the time required. Catherine Huang Hara, Clark County Social Service, stated that the Scoring and Ranking Team still has some previous team members. Erin Kinard, Health Care Provider asked about the deadline for the affirmation of the Scoring and Ranking Team membership. Ms. Huang Hara stated the NOFA has not dropped yet, so a deadline is unavailable, but roughly the scoring and ranking occurs in August or September. Ms. Kinard suggested the Scoring and Ranking Team members should be finalized by the end of June. Emily Paulsen, Nevada Homeless Alliance, appealed to board members to become a part of the Community Engagement’s Speakers Bureau to represent the CoC in educating the community at large about homelessness in Southern Nevada. It is hoped that the Speakers Bureau will be launched in July. Those interested can sign up at www.helphopehome.org under the “Get Involved” tab.

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

Emily Paulsen, Nevada Homeless Alliance, announced that registration for the National Conference to End Homelessness has closed, but a waiting list is available. Those going are welcome to join the Capital Hill Team and any providers can give their success stories to the team to take to Washington, D.C. Shalimar Cabrera, US Vets, announced that US Vets has received a grant that allows for the hiring of an Outreach position, a licensed therapist, and 3 Peer Specialists.

Agenda Item 12. Public Comment.

Phillip Hollon, The Salvation Army, shared that earlier in the year The Salvation Army had visited Clark High School to share information on their food pantry, Hope Market. They had also visited Rancho High School to share information on their human trafficking program, SEEDS of Hope. In May, The Salvation was invited back to both schools and were presented with a check to support both programs. On May 24, Silver Summit Health Plan provided not only a special community meal, but also a generous contribution to help offset the cost of the meal. Afterwards, everyone was provided with a hygiene amenity kit. On May 25, employees from Hooters Hotel and Casino and members from their F&B team served the community meal. Prior to the meal, Major Randy Kinnamon, Clark County Coordinator of The Salvation Army, provided a ventriloquism act. On the afternoon of May 29, Memorial Day, a group of individuals provided free ice cream sundaes to the homeless, veterans and families in the community. On May 31, Boy Scout Troop 633 from Evansville, IN and their chaperones visited The Salvation Army on their way to the Grand Canyon. Information on the programs and services offered by The Salvation Army was shared with the scouts. The next morning, the troop presented The Salvation Army with a donation of \$320.25. On May 31 and June 1, The City of Las Vegas and The Salvation Army presented information to guests about the programs and services available for the homeless community. On June 4 and June 6, Little Caesars Pizza served pizza at the community meal from their Love Kitchen. On June 6, Home Depot began work on the final phase of a building renovation for which they provided all funding, materials, and labor. Once completed, the project will provide 42 first floor beds for temporary housing for veterans. A grand opening is anticipated for November 10 in honor of Veterans Day. On June 6 and 7, UNLV Nursing students provided medical screening for the summer day shelter clients. On June 16, Ameriprise Financial will be serving the community meal, as well as providing a generous donation to offset the cost of the meal. On June 16-18, Insomniac Productions has teamed with The Salvation Army at the Electric Daisy Carnival. The Salvation Army will have a booth in Carnival Square and guests playing free carnival games will be encourages to trade in their stuffed animals and prizes at the booth in exchange for Insomniac and EDC memorabilia. Last year, over 1,000 stuffed animals and toys were received and distributed at the annual Christmas Toy Distribution event held by The Salvation Army. On August 8-10, Fox 5 and their Fox 5 Take 5 to Care SOS Drive will be helping The Salvation Army to provide back-to-school school supplies for kids in the community. Additional details about locations will be provided at next month’s meeting. Catherine Huang Hara, Clark County Social Service reminded the board of the grand opening of the Shannon West Youth Center on July 14 at 10:00 a.m. at 1640 E. Flamingo, behind the main building of HELP of Southern Nevada.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.