Southern Nevada Homelessness Continuum of Care
CoC Evaluation/Monitoring/Data & Systems Improvement
Working Groups Joint Meeting

Clark County Social Service – SS Training Room
1600 Pinto Lane, Las Vegas, NV 89106
Monday, March 11, 2019
8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

Meeting Minutes

In attendance:

Alisha Barrett (CCSS – Ryan White)	Meg Pike (CCSD)
Amanda Wehrman (HomeBase)	Michele Fuller-Hallauer (CCSS)
Angela Phillips (Habitat for Humanity)	Michelle Livings (SNHD)
Ariana Saunders (CCSS)	Michele Johnston (US Vets)
Bridget Claridy (HELP of SNV)	Mike Pawlak (CCSS)
Catherine Huang Hara (CCSS)	Mike Reed (Bitfocus)
Christy Shannon (Safe Nest)	Peter McCoy (VA)
Danita Osborne-Morris (CCSS)	Shelley Price (City of Henderson)
Erica McWhorter (HomeBase)	Stacy DiNicola (City of Henderson)
Jennifer Hughes (SNMHA)	Stephanie Coaley (City of Las Vegas)
Julee King (Bitfocus)	Tanya Sutton (Bitfocus)
Karen Schneider (CCSS)	Tara Ulmer (CCSS)
Kristin Cooper (CCSS)	

Meeting called to order at 8:36 a.m.

1. **Introductions**

2. **Update on BLM Development and ESG Funds (CRM)** – Clark County has about 1200 acres of land from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) set-aside for affordable housing and has utilized some of it for pilot programs and is now down to 900 acres. All of the property is in southwest part of the valley with only one parcel in the southeast that they will start an RFP process for in mid-April or early May for a senior housing development. These parcels have been rezoned to residential which will expedite the process from three years to two years. BLM is very supportive of this and excited to move forward. This land will be developed over the next 20 years with the goal of developing two parcels each year. Both senior and family housing will be developed during this time. There have been three pilot properties: Harmon Pines at Jones Boulevard and Harmon Avenue – senior housing developed by Nevada Hand, Arbor Pointe at Durango Drive and Riley Street – family

housing developed by Fore Properties, and Ensemble Senior Living at Agate Avenue and South Las Vegas Boulevard -senior housing developed by Ovation.

Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) funding – The County would like to have the funding go through the Evaluation Working Group (EWG) instead of the Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC). There is a different timeline than the CoC application process so it would be a separate process from what the EWG–Scoring & Ranking Team is doing now.

3. **Review of Unmet Needs Formula (Data & Systems Improvement)** – The Data Working Group (DWG) has been developing an unmet need formula since June 2018 and are meeting at least once a month to discuss.

   At this time, the formula includes:
   T – Total annualized 2018 PIT number
   C – # of people that can be served by available beds   Capacity (2092) x turnover rate (0.91)
   D – Total bed demand   D = T - C
   X – Total bed demand including recidivism   D x (1 + recidivism rate) 0.0479
   Y – # of beds needed if 10% diversion rate   D x diversion rate (10%)
   M – True/adjusted demand for beds   M= X - Y

   This formula has been shared with HUD and they are excited about the work. Using this formula, the unmet need in our community is 2,276 beds needed on top of the beds that we already have in the system. The way that the system exists right now, this unmet need would be broken down by housing type: ES = 1362 beds, TH = 337 beds, RRH = 334 beds, PSH = 243 beds.

   Looking at the numbers and considering the human element to this work, Mike Reed at BitFocus built dashboards to show the actual activity of our whole population that experienced homelessness in the last year and within the last 30 days. We also have data from the queue that shows how many people have reached out for assistance broken down by sub-population. All of this data together gets us closer to finding the unmet need, but we aren't there yet because we don't know the exact or correct number of beds needed for each sub-population.

   The DWG also took into account that some beds are dedicated to veterans. To get to the annualized number of veterans, it was assumed that the rate of veterans experiencing homelessness in the last year and within the last 30 days was the same as the general homeless population.

   Some other assumptions made:

- That our system has the correct % of each housing type (ES, TH, RRH, PSH) – that our system has the correct make-up
  - Our housing assessment measures the vulnerability but not the type of housing needed
- Assume the % of subpopulations based on BFZ data
- Assume that the turnover rate remains the same based on the housing type
- Assume a diversion rate of 10% based on the lowest percentage that other communities who are doing diversion without funding
- Making some assumptions on veterans:
  - Community reached Functional Zero for Veterans and there are beds dedicated to serving veterans
  - If we remove the number of veterans beds in the capacity in each housing type, we have to make further assumptions:
    - We don't have some specific information for veterans, such as who became homeless in the last 12 months and in the last 30 days, so we had to make some assumptions to get to the annualized number.

What we still don't know:

- We don't know the percentage of sub-populations that need each type of housing
- We don't know the correct housing type for people except for PSH because they are chronic. This would need some further analysis.

Discussion around the concerns that we are not capturing the correct data for homeless youth; some youth are chronic that aren't captured as such. Systems performance report captures recidivism rate for 6 months, 1 year, and 2 years. Some youth may need PSH and for some TH programs is not appropriate if they have mental health issues not being addressed in those programs. Do we need to account for the different kinds of outcomes along with the housing type? There are more opportunities for further study and analysis on this to get closer to identifying what works for our community. In the future, the DWG could look at subpopulations within each subpopulation (DV, mental health, etc.). BitFocus has been working with the community to improve data quality and has come a long in the last year. Utilization rate could also be reviewed. We don't know why people are staying on the queue; is it because they have been identified to enter a certain program but there aren't any beds? Or is the recommendation being made for the wrong program?

HomeBase gave some guidance on identifying priorities for this year's application process. Last year the EWG preserved the PSH in the community and then family units. Our community needs more of everything so maybe it's less about unmet need and more about what CoC funding should be used to address. HomeBase can help us to move through this. This is good data to consider but the group should also consider if the EWG will encourage new applicants to apply to address unmet needs or encourage the expansion of projects to meet unmet needs.

4. **Review of Monitoring Timeline for CoC Projects (Monitoring)** – The Monitoring Working Group (MWG) is finalizing the monitoring tools so that they can be posted to the website so that providers can review. Desk audits will begin in the next couple weeks and on-site monitoring is scheduled to wrap up before the end of June. The third-party vendor is confident that they can provide information for this upcoming application/evaluation process assuming that no providers will need a second or follow-up monitoring visit. There were concerns last year that the monitoring tool was not equitable, and those concerns were addressed with revisions to the tool this year. The MWG will continue to work with V2 this year until V3 is ready next year.

5. **2019 CoC Local Competition**

   - **Timeline Finalization (Collaborative Applicant)** – The EWG decided to move from ZoomGrants to PRESTO as a scoring tool. The scoring tools and monitoring guide are being updated to reflect changes to the tool. Also working on building out PRESTO so that we can start the application process sooner. Registration of the CoC to HUD is complete and closed last week. Also participated in a HUD debrief last week on 2018 funding awards and HUD is still saying that NOFA will be released in May 2019. Hoping to have local application released around April 15, but this depends on monitoring and build out of PRESTO. Applications should be due around June 7. There will be a mandatory TA session with HomeBase on May 6. These joint meetings will continue to occur quarterly and the next joint meeting will be held on June 10.

   - **Scoring and Ranking Team Policies & Procedures Final Review (HomeBase)** Final comments need to be submitted by March 15 to include in the final version for review by the CoC Board. Catherine and Danita are working with HomeBase every two weeks to finalize P&Ps and get ready for the upcoming application process.

   - **Scoring Tool (HomeBase)** – HomeBase has a web-based tool called PRESTO and have been looking at ways to make it user-friendly for both applicants and reviewers. There are areas for the Scoring & Ranking team to make notes on their scoring and these scores get rolled up into a ranked list. Currently looking at how the monitoring scores will get included in this year's score due to the timing.

     HomeBase worked with both the MWG and EWG to make sure that all the questions currently being asked are needed or if they should be asked in a different way. Scoring & Ranking Team factors include:
     1. Agency Experience and Capacity   30 points
     2. Scope of Project   30 points

3. Project Performance   10 points
4. Community Priorities   15 points
5. Budget   15 points
     Scoring & Ranking team points   100 points
     Monitoring Score points   X points
     Total Points   Y points

There has been some mixed input on scoring Housing First Model and there was some discussion that this should be reviewed in monitoring but also on Scoring & Ranking Team because HUD awards points based on this information. The current application asks a question about Housing First but there should also be a narrative. This should be scored and not just in threshold questions. Also, look at the data entry in HMIS and don't expect 100% because there could be clients that refuse to have their information in HMIS and share their data. These clients can still be entered in HMIS with some alterations to their information to keep them anonymous.

HomeBase reviewed the different scoring tools for renewal and new projects. The DWG will review the process and feedback from last year's process and will bring recommendations back to the EWG. The question around prioritizing dedicated chronically homeless beds was included in previous years because it was HUD's focus that particular year. HomeBase will include language on Dedicated Plus beds. On Budget, the match requirements will be moved to the Threshold section and the review of the Budget form will remain scored by Scoring & Ranking Team.

Are there any projects that we want to automatically place in Tier 1, such as HMIS, Safe Haven, or Coordinated Entry? The Safe Haven program in our community operates differently than how HUD originally intended and differently than how it operates in other communities and should probably be reviewed along with the other projects. Direction to preserve HMIS and Coordinated Entry in Tier 1.

HUD has confirmed that the DV Bonus project will be offered again this year so our community should start planning for that now so that it is a strong application.

How does the Scoring & Ranking score get weighed with Monitoring score? The monitoring score should weigh more for renewal projects. We lost a lot of points overall for our lack of objective criteria in scoring and ranking the CoC applications and this is an area that we need to improve. Last year the scores factored in 60% for monitoring and 40% for application scores. This year there will be on-site monitoring completed prior to Ranking so there will be more

things considered. For monitoring scores, new projects would receive a threshold monitoring review.

6. **General Updates**
    - **Rapid Rehousing Written Standards (Evaluation)** – Written standards were sent out to those who work on RRH and asked to submit any feedback by March 15.
    - **Rapid Rehousing Learning Collaborative (Evaluation)** - National Alliance to End Homelessness will provide technical assistance over a nine-month period.

7. **Next Steps/Action Items**
    - Future meetings
      - Evaluation Working Group Meeting – April 8 at 8:30 a.m.
      - Monitoring Working Group Meeting – April 10 at 1:30 p.m.
      - Data and Systems Improvement Working Group Meeting – March 18 at 8:30 a.m.
      - Joint Working Group Meeting – June 10 at 8:30 a.m.

8. **Upcoming Community Events**
    - CoC Statewide Meeting
      - Day 1 – March 12 from 12:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
      - Day 2 – March 13 from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
      - Clark County Wetlands, 7050 Wetlands Park Lane, Las Vegas, NV 89122
    - Southern Nevada Homelessness Continuum of Care Board Meeting – March 14 at 2:00 p.m.
      - United Way of Southern Nevada, Boyd Board Room, 5830 W. Flamingo Road, Las Vegas, NV 89103
    - Pop-up Homeless Connect – March 19 from 10:30 am to 1:30 p.m.
      - The Salvation Army, 35 W. Owens Ave., Las Vegas, NV 89030

Meeting adjourned at 11:34 a.m.

Next Joint Working Group Meeting on Monday, June 10, 2019 at 8:30 a.m.