

## Working Group Report to the Board

1. **Working Group: PLANNING (PWG)**
2. **Champion: CITY OF LAS VEGAS**
3. **Working Group Members:** Arash G, Catherine H., Emily P., Brooke P., Michele FH, KTG
4. **Date, Time, and Location of Working Group Meeting**

Thursday, February 22, 2018

Standing meeting dates in 2018 will be **4th Thursdays in February, April, June, August, October and December**, Las Vegas City Hall 5th from 1:00-3:00 pm Floor, 495 S. Main Street, Las Vegas 89101. A call in number will be provided.

5. **Accomplishments-Action Items Completed:**

See subcommittee reports.

6. **Near term: Action Items In-progress/Pending:**

- Discussion of CoC planning dollars and providing regular updates to Steering Committee and Board. Collaborative Applicant will provide quarterly reports. Steering Committee needs to formally notify the trustee of the Trust Fund (United Way) to provide the data related to the fund so that the collaborative applicant can compile and present it.

7. **Sub-Committee Reports**

- **Youth**
- **Housing**  
Minutes attached.
- **Governance Structure**  
Revised documents sent to members
- **Coordinated Intake**  
Has been moved to a stand-alone working group.
- **PIT Count**  
PWG agreed to facilitate PIT planning throughout the year.
- **Functional Zero**

8. Goals not yet met/Issues:

n/a

## **Joint Housing Working Group**

### **Meeting Minutes February 7, 2018**

In attendance: Co-Leader Steven Silverman (HELP USA), Co-Leader Monica Gresser (Brazen Architecture), Angela Phillips (City of Las Vegas), Tim Whitright (NV Housing Division), Ritchie Duplechien (HPN/MyConnections), Laure Raposa (SNV Housing Authority), Karen Schneider (CCSS), Mimi Woodruff (HUD), Angel Lash (WestCare), Stacey Youngblood (City of Henderson), Susy Farray (Rep. Dina Titus), Mindy Torres (HELP of S NV), Shalimar Cabrera (US Vets), Brooke Page (CCSS), and Richard Davis (Dignity Health-St. Rose Dominican).

Steve welcomed the group and introductions were made.

He recapped the December meeting, specifically the recent request for suggestions and ideas toward addressing the need for housing for those experiencing homelessness. Only a few responses have been received thus far. The first was from Laure Raposa at the Housing Authority, who talked about the Connection to Home program and the continued requirement for accompanying supportive services; another was from Terry Lindemann at Family Promise, who talked about the Connection to Home collaboration as well as concerns and suggestions around tracking available funding and sources within the community. Lastly, another was received from Brooke Page at CCSS, who talked about making priority the areas of landlord engagement, Moving On, and Connection to Home.

Steve recapped that he wants the HWG to set priorities for the upcoming year. The hope is to be able to show results in terms of number of families that have been permanently housed. He talked about functional zero, describing it for veterans and how we need to work toward this for all.

He then turned it over to Shalimar Cabrera to talk about Built for Zero, a national initiative working with Community Solutions toward Las Vegas becoming the first major city to reach functional zero for chronic homelessness. There is a BFZ leadership team that is working on an approach to reach functional zero by going into the community to raise money to create more housing options. As of February, there are 611 chronically homeless individuals known by name. She explained that it is estimated that \$427,000 will help fund 20 housing units and a case manager for those 20 households for one year with the outcome of those individuals maintaining housing.

She went on to explain that BFZ is looking at filling the gap of federal shortfalls. BFZ does not want several community initiatives asking the same questions or competing against one another. We need to start to align the work of the various groups. Steve agreed, stating that the community has limited resources. One of the goals of the HWG is to seek housing for identified populations and Steve stated that BFZ definitely fits into our priorities. Shalimar suggested that we should consider how many working groups there are (City's Funding Strategies, BFZ, HWG, etc.); we then need figure out what are each groups' goals, and then need to determine total of what needs to be raised.

Steve explained that we have identified support processes and issues, have talked about 211, rental assistance, etc.; we need to focus our limited resources on a few key items. No metrics have been developed yet. Steve reiterated that he has limited responses from the request for input and suggestions from HWG members. He asked what our priority is and how we are we going to accomplish it. He finished by saying that obviously the joint HWG will support BFZ.

Ritchie then asked for clarification on the parameters of the 'ask' to incorporate; Shalimar explained the 20:1 ratio of clients to a case manager, leading to the grouping of 20 households for \$427,000. Ritchie suggested that HPN has the metrics that can help to illustrate the need and impact of providing supportive housing that includes case management. Ritchie will be added to the BFZ mailing list. Shalimar indicated three housing providers (US Vets, LSSN, and HELP) who will be working with their own partner landlords. The landlords will have various requirements and restrictions on what they will accept regarding backgrounds, etc. Brooke mentioned that the identified clients are already on the community queue and these are folks that need to be addressed right now.

Homeless individuals on the queue that cannot get housing due to inventory shortages would be the way to start the conversation on establishing metrics for this group. Brooke talked about the Moving On Subgroup and shared that she felt it would be a good fit for the HWG to work through how to increase housing inventory to be able to house those that are moving on, so that those more vulnerable can move into available PSH spots, ultimately working through those that are waiting on the queue that are most vulnerable.

Steve then talked about other issues that the HWG has been looking at, to include the numbers of homeless youth in our community. Steve reiterated a point made by Tim at an earlier meeting, talking about how building affordable housing takes time. So that is a more long-term approach.

Tim then talked about tax credits being able to afford 400 units per year; bonds produce more. Tax credit projects take approximately 3 years to the actually house folks. Steve said an average unit costs \$125k to build. That can fund a lot of people in housing if we can divert some of that money into providing immediate housing for the homeless.

Brooke asked if that means we can have some conversation about a homeless preference. We are currently working with HUD but need to have Housing Authority at the table. Laure explained that the Housing Authority established a homeless preference for the housing program quite a few years ago. They have been pushing the reestablishment of the Connection to Home program; currently in excess of 65 available slots for that program. Caveat is that the referring agency has to provide supportive services. Brooke asked if she could include Laure in the Moving On meetings; Laure agreed. Steve also asked to be part of that group.

Steve then talked about the series of recent articles in the RJ concerning the lack of affordable housing in the valley. Federal government is going to rely more on local initiatives to fund homeless housing. Tim talked about the CR1, which stated we need to know what the housing needs are; legislators have said we have studies and know the needs; they want to move beyond the studies and determine how to start addressing the problem. He talked about discussions that are currently happening with the gaming industry to apply resources toward units that will increase housing inventory.

Steve stated that from a process point of view, we should be supporting and be a part of the BFZ process; the group agreed. Shalimar and Steve agreed that we need to have an understanding of the BFZ so we don't duplicate efforts. If we are going to come up with a parallel strategy, need to ensure it is consistent between both groups.

There was then discussion about the breakdown of costs at \$1,780 per unit per month, which includes rent and supportive services (intensive case management and connecting the individual with resources within the community). The money would also help to support a landlord mitigation fund.

Steve then talked about current sources of funding from county, city, etc. From the perspective of the HWG, is there a way to find additional funding from state to provide rental assistance. In lieu of building 400 units, could we tap in and build 200 units and use the other money to provide immediate housing?

Tim indicated that is probably not viable due to the use of the funds, and then elaborated on the types of funding programs that support units and requirements of each. A challenge is that many of these programs serve low income vs. homeless, in which there is a money contribution from tenants. Tim asked if there was a way to get the supportive services covered, if we can get the unit costs covered through tax credits, bonds, etc. That might help us to reduce the 'ask' and make the goal more reachable. Laure mentioned that they have been doing research on Chicago hospitals, who have started working with supportive service providers to provide services and sponsor housing units. It's cutting down on ER costs and helping to provide supportive services. They are seeing more hospitals join in. Monica stated that the hospitals were asked last year and were not interested at the time; perhaps we need to fine-tune a presentation and ask again. Brooke interjected that HPN has a lot of data that can illustrate the impact of intervention and reductions in cost to the system.

Steve said that the way we are going to succeed this year is to come up with a goal/priority. One of the ideas previously proposed was that we would provide housing to the next x number of people on the community queue. He indicated that we need to be a part of the BFZ initiative so we do not duplicate efforts. He asked the group if we perhaps want to challenge the hospitals to work with us in solving this problem. Stacey suggested that we should look at a smaller sale and subset and that it could be an opportunity for a great partnership with Dignity Health and HPN. She suggested we should look at building a pilot program to work with the hospitals on frequent utilizers who are medically fragile. Monica suggested that a partner in that should be fire/rescue.

Steve revisited the previously discussed cost analyses and suggested that if we establish a goal that does not compete with the BFZ process, we could develop a different 'ask' for our specific goal for this year. Brooke asked if the group could make a goal to increase landlord engagement and unit provision, expressing the concern that we will be back at square one if we raise money but have no landlords or housing to house them.

Steve asked where the Moving On initiative fits into this process. Brooke explained that the approach is to take clients that are currently in permanent supportive housing when they are at a point in which they no longer need an intensive level of case management, but lack the funding to live on their own. They perhaps need light services and help with rent. This would free up the PSH units for the chronically homeless clients that BFZ is trying to help.

Steve reminded the group about research last year on Seattle's process and the approach of a landlord mitigation pool. Steve would like to start with a tangible project to move forward on. There was then discussion of those to focus on and the group agreed that those on the community queue would be the most critical and are identified right now who need housing. There was then discussion about the nonchronically homeless that have already been through coordinated intake but is still within 30% Area Median Income (AMI). Steve suggested that we get the numbers at the next meeting of those that are on the queue. Karen will request some data from Bitfocus to share at the next meeting.

Tim suggested that the next question is the "how"; he suggested designated number of units per development. He also brought forth the idea of offering to rehab units at no cost to the owners, but

they have to be dedicated to the population. He also asked what our role would be in this. Steve said we would want to be advocates. Shalimar asked how this might be measured. Steve suggested that initially the metrics include the numbers of people that cross over from the queue to housing. Shalimar asked how we do that if we are not a housing provider. Would it be to write letters, advocating and encouraging NV Housing Division to develop policy around accomplishing the goals of ending homelessness, etc.?

Angela asked about moving forward on the work that occurred as a result of the landlord engagement summit. Do we want to adopt that or a portion of that to shape our focus? Steve suggested that the Seattle model of a landlord liaison could be revisited and that the summit was a good start. There was then discussion about MOU's possibly being handled through jurisdictions. Stacey explained that landlord MOU's are typically between the nonprofit and the landlord. There need to be landlords available (funded by CoC funds, BFZ campaign funds, etc.); there need to be units in inventory, ready to house.

Karen then suggested some possible metrics around the earlier stated objectives for the landlord summit, which at the time included engaging 20 new landlords and identifying 50 additional housing units; this goal could be revisited and/or expanded, to be realized in an established amount of time. The other goal could be the development of the landlord mitigation pool within an established amount of funds dedicated within an established amount of time.

The group then talked through establishing a definitive overarching goal for the Joint Housing Working Group and agreed on **expanding inventory of housing through private landlords**. Within this goal are to 1) support the work of the BFZ, 2) move forward with developing a landlord liaison process, and 3) articulate how we identify landlords and pull together an overall strategy/plan. Steve adjourned the meeting.

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 7<sup>th</sup> 1:30pm-3:30pm at Las Vegas City Hall.