

COMMUNITY HOMELESSNESS ADVISORY BOARD MEETING AGENDA

WASHOE COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
1001 E. 9th Street, Reno, Nevada 89512

Monday, November 4, 2019
9:00 a.m.

Bob Lucey, Chair, County Commissioner, District 2, Washoe County
Marsha Berkgigler, County Commissioner, District 1, Washoe County
Neoma Jardon, Vice-Chair, Councilmember, Ward 5, City of Reno
Oscar Delgado, Councilmember, Ward 3, City of Reno
Kristopher Dahir, Councilmember, Ward 5, City of Sparks
Ed Lawson, Councilmember, Ward 2, City of Sparks

NOTE: Items on the agenda may be taken out of order; the Advisory Board may combine two or more agenda items for consideration; may remove an item from the agenda or may delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any item per NRS 241.020(2)(d)(6).

Accessibility. The Washoe County Commission Chambers are accessible to the disabled. If you require special arrangements for the meeting, call the Office of the County Manager, (775) 328-2000, 24-hours prior to the meeting.

Public Transportation. Public transportation is available to this meeting site: RTC Routes 2, 2S, 5 and 15 serve this location. For eligible RTC ACCESS reservations call (775) 348-5438.

Time Limits. Public comments are welcomed during the Public Comment periods for all matters, whether listed on the agenda or not, and are limited to three minutes per person. Additionally, public comment of three minutes per person will be heard during individually numbered items on the agenda which are designated for possible action. Persons are invited to submit comments in writing on the agenda items and/or attend and make comment on that item at the Advisory Board meeting. Persons may not allocate unused time to other speakers.

Forum Restrictions and Orderly Conduct of Business. The presiding officer may order the removal of any person whose statement or other conduct disrupts the orderly, efficient or safe conduct of the meeting. Warnings against disruptive comments or behavior may or may not be given prior to removal. The viewpoint of a speaker will not be restricted, but reasonable restrictions may be imposed upon the time, place and manner of speech. Irrelevant and unduly repetitious statements and personal attacks which antagonize or incite others are examples of speech that may be reasonably limited.

Pursuant to NRS 241.020, the Agenda for the Community Homelessness Advisory Board Meeting has been posted at the following locations: Washoe County Administration Building (1001 E. 9th Street, Bldg. A), Washoe County Courthouse-Second Judicial District Court (75 Court Street), Reno City Hall – Clerk’s Office (1 East First Street); Sparks City Hall (431 Prater Way); www.washoecounty.us/mgrsoff/board_committees/ and <https://notice.nv.gov>.

Support documentation for the items on the agenda, provided to the Community Homelessness Advisory Board Meeting is available to members of the public at the County Manager’s Office (1001 E. 9th Street, Bldg. A, 2nd Floor, Reno, Nevada) Marilyn Kramer, Assistant to the County Manager, (775) 328-2000 and on Washoe County’s website www.washoecounty.us/mgrsoff/board_committees/

9:00 a.m.

1. Salute to the flag.
2. Roll call.
3. Public Comment. Comment heard under this item will be limited to three minutes per person and may pertain to matters both on and off the Board agenda. The Board will also hear public comment during individual action items, with comment limited to three minutes per person. Comments are to be made to the Board as a whole.
4. Approval of minutes of the October 7, 2019 meeting. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION
5. Reno Area Alliance for the homeless (RAAH) staff structure and overview. J.D. Klippenstein, Vice-Chair, RAAH
6. Update, discussion, and possible direction regarding safety and cleanliness of the Truckee River. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION
 - Washoe County Sheriff: Chief Deputy Greg Herrera
 - Truckee Meadows Water Authority: Andy Gebhardt, Director, Operations and Water Quality
 - One Truckee River: Iris-Jehle-Peppard, One Truckee River Partnership Coordinator
7. Update, discussion, and possible direction on the status of OrgCode Consulting, Inc.'s report and next steps on the operational review of the housing and homelessness system in Washoe County. Bill Thomas, Assistant City Manager, City of Reno. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION
8. Update, discussion, and possible direction regarding federal funds usage and potential impacts to service provision. Bill Thomas, Assistant City Manager, City of Reno. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION
9. Board members announcements, reports, and updates to include requests for future board agenda items. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION
10. Items for possible consideration on the December 2, 2019 agenda:
 - Annual Point in Time Count
 - Nevada Department of Veterans Services appearance
 - Eddy House presentation
11. Public Comment. Comment heard under this item will be limited to three minutes per person and may pertain to matters both on and off the Board agenda. The Board will also hear public comment during individual action items, with comment limited to three minutes per person. Comments are to be made to the Board as a whole.

Adjournment

**COMMUNITY HOMELESSNESS ADVISORY BOARD
WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA**

MONDAY

9:00 A.M.

OCTOBER 7, 2019

PRESENT:

Bob Lucey, Chair
Neoma Jardon, Vice Chair
Oscar Delgado, Member*
Kristopher Dahir, Member
Ed Lawson, Member

Jan Galassini, Chief Deputy County Clerk
Paul Lipparelli, Assistant District Attorney

ABSENT:

Vaughn Hartung, Member

The Community Homelessness Advisory Board convened at 9:00 a.m. in the Washoe County Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, the Clerk called the roll and the Board conducted the following business:

19-094C AGENDA ITEM 3 Public Comment.

Mr. Jeff Church submitted documents for the Board, copies of which were placed on the record. These included a 1-page handbook about mitigating homeless issues, a summary of the 286-page Regional Strategy for Housing Affordability (RSHA) report presented by Enterprise Community Partners, a handout by Paul White regarding homelessness, and a PowerPoint presentation about mitigating homeless issues. He offered to present his PowerPoint presentation to the Community Homelessness Advisory Board (CHAB). He submitted an additional document regarding the use of the goods and services car tax for affordable housing or homeless purposes. He said the RSHA report did not discuss giving anything to the homeless for free; it discussed empowering working class people and low-income workers by providing subsidized housing. He asked the CHAB to consider a community forum which would allow the community to speak. He opined the mental health system in Nevada was broken. He thought the CHAB needed to consider improving Nevada's mental health system and emergency committals because it was virtually impossible to help people with the current system.

Jan Galassini, Chief Deputy County Clerk, noted she received a document from Ms. Donna Clontz, a copy of which was placed on the record for the meeting.

Ms. Donna Clontz indicated she served on the City of Reno Senior Citizen Advisory Committee (SCAC) and the Washoe County Senior Services Advisory Board.

She said the SCAC would update their strategic plan to make affordable housing and the elimination of senior homelessness part of their strategic objectives. SCAC members wanted to attend meetings such as the CHAB meeting to stay informed and advocate for making progress on eliminating homelessness and affordable housing solutions. She said the SCAC hoped to see implementation of some of the solutions which were suggested to the Board. She stated the SCAC wanted the opportunity to tour upcoming affordable housing projects so they could inform seniors. She mentioned Paul McKenzie from the Building & Construction Trades Council of Northern Nevada helped reprint 10,000 copies of the *Elder Services Guides and Resources* booklet. The booklet would be distributed throughout the community and posted on the City of Reno's and Washoe County's websites. She thanked the Board for their work and offered the SCAC's assistance in any way possible.

Mr. Andy Gebhardt, Director of Operations & Water Quality for the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA), indicated his desire to help the CHAB. He asserted the community had a difficult, longstanding issue which could not be fixed immediately. He stated TMWA had a vested interest in the condition of the Truckee River because it was the source of drinking water for the community. He noted TMWA had two water treatment plants along the Truckee River. One plant was located west of McCarran Boulevard on 4th Street and the other was on Glendale Avenue and Galletti Way. He said there were approximately 175 to 200 people who lived in camps, without bathroom facilities, along the Truckee River between Fisherman's Park and Greg Street. The camps were close to the Glendale Avenue treatment facility. He explained the amount of waste dumped into the river had increased. He stated TMWA employees had to remove colostomy bags, catheters, and hypodermic needles from the intake structures so they could work safely. He said TMWA wanted to be involved in trying to ensure the community had safe drinking water. He offered to conduct a presentation at a future CHAB meeting or to speak with any of the Board members independently.

9:09 a.m. Member Oscar Delgado arrived.

19-095C **AGENDA ITEM 4** Approval of minutes of the September 9, 2019 and the Special Meeting of September 19, 2019.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Berkbigler, seconded by Member Dahir, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote with Member Hartung absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 4 be approved.

19-096C **AGENDA ITEM 5** Update, discussion, and possible direction on the Village on Sage Street and the Community Foundation Community Housing Land Trust. Nick Tscheekar, Community Foundation of Western Nevada.

Mr. Nick Tscheekar, Community Engagement Officer with the Community Foundation of Western Nevada (CFWN), conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He reviewed slides with the following titles: The Village on Sage Street; Development of The Village; Timeline; Project Costs; Funding Needed: \$3.1 Million approximate; Lodger Qualifications; Amenities; Community Profile; and Thank You.

Mr. Tscheekar encouraged Community Homelessness Advisory Board members to contact Community Administrator Devin McFarland with any specific questions about operations. He explained the CFWN entered into housing in 2017 when several donors indicated they wanted to take action to impact affordable housing. Community Foundation's CEO Chris Askin and Jim Frommer, the Board Chair at the time, went with him to the Bay Area to learn from other community foundations and non-profit organizations how to make housing more affordable. They devised a community housing land trust which was a sub-entity of the CFWN. The sub-LLC allowed them to receive contributed land restricted for affordable housing. He said the project became more affordable because the cost of the land was eliminated. He mentioned the project received support from many community partners including the City of Reno, Volunteers of America, and Q&D Construction. He said that members of the community volunteered when a specific project was defined.

Mr. Tscheekar outlined the timeline for the project from conception in April 2018 to the grand opening in August 2019. He noted the first resident moved into The Village on July 10, 2019. He reviewed the project costs, which totaled \$9.5 million. He noted \$3.1 million was still needed for the project, but the CFWN had received donations from individuals, private foundations, and contributed labor in-kind construction.

Mr. Tscheekar reviewed the qualifications for residing at The Village. He stated residents were required to earn 3.3 times the rent in order to ensure they were not rent-burdened. The maximum income of \$2,735 for residents was approximately 60 percent of the area median income. Resident income included Social Security, Veterans Affairs pension, and other forms of benefits. He said the resident background check screened for anything disruptive to the health of the community and whether someone might be a bad neighbor. Volunteers of America primarily screened for violent or sexual criminal convictions.

Mr. Tscheekar said The Village provided small rooms but it offered a variety of amenities. There were 120 parking spots for 216 single-occupancy rooms, which seemed sufficient based on existing residents. He outlined some of the features intended to make it a great community that was affordable and felt like home. He said

most residents listed employment as their primary source of income. Some residents worked part-time and earned social security, and a few lodgers earned enough benefits to meet the minimum income requirement. He stated people found out about The Village from the internet, word of mouth, and case worker recommendations from other programs such as Crossroads. He said occupation of units was slow in the first months but it had increased; 100 percent occupancy was expected by late December 2019 or early January 2020. He noted the CFWN and Volunteers of America tracked information to evaluate the impact of the project. Applicants were asked a variety of questions, such as their personal and professional goals. He said many residents listed saving money, working on financial literacy, and financial coaching as their goals. He indicated non-profits and other organizations could host workshops in the community room at The Village. Some workshop providers included Nevada Legal Services and Bank of America. He said programming would be determined by resident recommendations based on personal and professional goals. He noted the incoming and outgoing credit scores of residents would be tracked to determine whether they increased, and exit interviews would be conducted.

Chair Lucey thanked Mr. Tscheekar for the presentation.

Vice Chair Jardon said the project was transformative for the community and she thanked everyone who worked on it. She asked why occupancy was slow, though she added she was glad they expected to be fully occupied by the beginning of 2020. She indicated one concern she heard was that pets were not allowed. She recalled discussion about allowing pets in one of the dorms. Mr. Tscheekar replied there was no immediate plan to allow pets. Vice Chair Jardon said further discussion might be needed regarding that policy. She observed people might hesitate to leave a pet behind. Mr. Tscheekar expressed a willingness to discuss the policy.

Chair Lucey asked about the specific educational programs that would be offered to residents. Mr. Tscheekar replied financial literacy was the biggest need identified with the existing residents. He said Bank of America had provided financial literacy classes, and Nevada Legal Services had provided some financial coaching programs. He indicated future programs, such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous support groups, would be determined by resident needs and interests.

Chair Lucey inquired whether the units had kitchens. Mr. Tscheekar said no, the units were single occupancy. He mentioned there was a dinning hall on the east side of the property and a store with pre-packaged food and fruit operated by Rounds Bakery. The property had no commercial kitchen but there was access to microwaves and toaster ovens. Chair Lucey asked where residents who received Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits would store their food. Mr. Tscheekar said residents were permitted a small refrigerator in their rooms to store food but there was an energy usage restriction. Chair Lucey inquired whether residents would purchase the refrigerators. Mr. Tscheekar said they would since rooms were fully furnished but did not include refrigerators.

Member Delgado asked for a price comparison between the project and new construction. He noted one reason the dorm units were selected for the project was the possible reduced price. Mr. Tscheekar replied price comparisons with local construction projects had not been done. A comparison had been done in Wyoming and costs there were approximately 50 percent of normal costs. The combination of the units and the contributed land made the project affordable. Member Delgado expressed an interest in seeing a comparison between these units and single-occupancy units with shared bathrooms in the local housing market. He mentioned local developments offered single units with kitchens and bathrooms, which he thought might be worth comparing to Village units. Mr. Tscheekar commented the amount of time necessary to develop a similar project was another factor to consider. He said The Village had not relied on subsidies or a low-income housing tax credit, which could have delayed the project.

Vice Chair Jardon asked about the reasons given for applicants who did not qualify for residency. Mr. Tscheekar responded the primary reason was not meeting the minimum income of \$1,320 per month. He said some early applicants had difficulty obtaining the \$800 to cover the deposit and first month's rent, but that had not been the case with later applicants.

Member Berkbigler asked for the age range of residents. Mr. Tscheekar said five residents were between the ages of 18 to 25, nineteen were between 26 to 40, 21 were between 41 to 55, and 29 were 56 or older. He summarized the average age was 52. Member Berkbigler noted there were a few residents moving into the senior category. She asked whether the bathrooms and showers were community facilities. Mr. Tscheekar responded yes. Member Berkbigler asked how many were in each dorm. Mr. Tscheekar replied there were 44 units in each dorm and eight bathrooms. He stated the bathrooms offered complete privacy because each bathroom had a toilet, sink, and shower with a locking door. He noted every dorm provided bathrooms and bedrooms which were compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Member Dahir asked about the best way for someone to volunteer. He said there were many groups looking for ways to make a difference, particularly during the upcoming holiday season. Mr. Tscheekar provided the direct phone number for The Village, 775-499-5198, and indicated he could provide contact information for Devin McFarland, who coordinated the volunteer programs.

Chair Lucey asked how many units there were. Mr. Tscheekar responded there were 216 single-occupancy rooms and 80 residents to date. He anticipated reaching 50 percent occupancy by late October and 100 percent occupancy by late December or early January. Chair Lucey asked whether the first residents were accepted at the beginning of summer. Mr. Tscheekar said yes, the first residents moved in on July 10.

Chair Lucey shared the concerns of other Board members regarding restrictions and price. He believed the pet restriction and lack of food storage were significant issues. He referred to Member Delgado's comment regarding potential housing options, which would include a kitchenette for approximately \$600. He thought

The Village at Sage Street was a great project but said one type of product would not meet everyone's needs. He recommended different types of dorms and allowances for residents to move in. He suggested one dormitory with 44 rooms could be set aside for pet owners and another which could be easier for residents to move into. He hoped the project continued to be productive and viable. He believed solutions needed to be dynamic.

There was no public comment or action taken on this item.

19-097C **AGENDA ITEM 6** Update, discussion, and possible direction on the VOA shelter demographics and outcomes. Pat Cashell, Regional Director for Volunteers of America Northern Nevada.

Pat Cashell, Regional Director for Volunteers of America Northern Nevada (VOA), conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He reviewed slides with the following titles: Five Keys to Effective Emergency Shelter; Shelter Flow; Client Process; two slides of statistics; Demographics (3 slides); Trends: Year-Over-Year; For every 100 clients...; and Exit Destinations.

Mr. Cashell said the ReStart program was a VOA program located at the shelters, although it was not part of the contract. He said they had provided housing over the previous five years using the Five Keys best practices. One of the first things the case manager did when an individual went to the shelter was to find an alternative to staying at the shelter. He said the shelter offered low-barrier access and they did not turn anyone away. The shelter was housing-focused, so staff members consistently discussed housing with shelter clients. He said they were held to standards of success established approximately eight years earlier. He said the program tracked data to measure performance, but he hoped updated performance measures might be established in the future when the contract was updated.

Mr. Cashell stated the VOA operated two shelters and a warming room. He summarized there were 160 men and 50 women at the Record Street facility, 109 people at the family shelter, 150 at the overflow shelter, and 66 men and 30 women using the warming room, for a total of 565 people per night. He mentioned a winter tent which could serve 60 people would be set up again, he believed, in mid-November.

Mr. Cashell reviewed the client intake process for the shelters. Julianna Glock, Operations and Compliance Manager for the VOA, clarified that only 80 percent of adults had a needs assessment. The other 20 percent left before meeting with a case manager. Those individuals stayed at the shelter one to two nights and then left. Mr. Cashell said the number of people experiencing homelessness as displayed in the presentation was from 2018; 1,256 people were homeless in 2019. He noted staff started checking people in at the front gate of the shelter, which helped with security and provided a count of unique individuals. He said 805 unique individuals visited the shelter each day, and the rest of the 1,306 people were returning customers.

Ms. Glock reviewed the demographics of shelter clients from 2016 to 2019. She noted the disabled category included mental, physical, and developmental disabilities. She said she could provide additional demographic information if the Board members wanted to see different information. She clarified she included Las Vegas in the out-of-town category, although they were not from out of state. She said 91 of 133 families and 546 of 1,049 individuals exited the shelter with income. 99 out of 133 families and 429 out of 1,049 individuals transitioned into appropriate housing.

Vice Chair Jardon asked whether the people who exited the shelter into a homeless situation left because the shelter had a maximum stay period. Ms. Glock replied there was a 90-day maximum stay. She said an extension could be approved for individuals who had a plan, such as waiting for a definite apartment vacancy date.

Vice Chair Jardon asked whether the primary reason for people exiting to homelessness was the lack of affordable units. Ms. Glock said yes. Mr. Cashell said the policy was to transition clients to the overflow shelter when they reached the 90-day maximum stay, which helped avoid sending them back to the streets. He noted some clients got into the cycle of transitioning between the two shelters. They were only required to stay at the overflow shelter for 30 days before they could move back into the shelter. He said individuals were comfortable in the cycle, so it was difficult to break. Vice Chair Jardon asked whether data pertaining to the difficulty of breaking the cycle was available. Mr. Cashell responded that information could be provided. He said staff would investigate whether the exit packets asked about the reasons for cycling through shelters. He indicated mental health and drug addiction were reasons he had observed. He stated case managers at the shelter provided information about resources for mental health and addiction, but the shelters did not offer those services.

Vice Chair Jardon mentioned the demographics of the Reno Works project revealed that addiction issues were the reason for returning to homelessness. In response, the program redirected resources to post-graduation addiction support as a way of preventing a return to homelessness. She thought having that type of information was important to help the shelters focus resources in the future.

Member Dahir agreed with Vice Chair Jardon that having data that confirmed the homelessness cycle was important. He asked how the data connected with community groups that wanted to help could be translated to warm handoffs. He stated the cycle of homelessness would continue if changes were not made. He said it was great to see some people getting out of the cycle but the percentage of people who remained in homelessness was substantial. He wanted information about handoffs between the groups who worked with the shelters. He said identifying groups that might not be effective was important as well. He asked whether the connections with other groups could be improved. He emphasized each individual was unique and a single solution would not serve everyone. He acknowledged not everyone would move out of the cycle of homelessness, but he believed warm handoffs were the solution to reducing the percentage of homeless individuals.

Member Delgado referenced the demographics for disabled and veteran homeless and said the assumption was those individuals would be eligible for some type of assistance. He noted Ms. Glock stated it took two to three days to perform a needs assessment, and asked what could be done to reduce that time. Ms. Glock said everyone met with a case manager when they entered the shelter. The case manager would attempt diversion. She noted a weekend case manager was recently added so people who arrived during the weekend could meet with someone. The delay of needs assessments before this was due partly to weekend arrivals. She stated shelter policy was for the case manager to do a full needs assessment within 48 hours of arrival. The case manager would then develop a service plan for that client. Member Delgado clarified a quick evaluation was performed when the client entered the shelter to determine whether they qualified for services. Ms. Glock replied it was part of the intake process. The client would then be given two days to settle in before they met with a case manager to develop a service plan. Mr. Cashell stated they were able to identify a better place for some clients because their needs were obvious at intake. The needs of other clients could be deduced by observing them at the shelter. He said building relationships with the clients was a significant part of the process because some were fearful when they arrived and did not say much.

Member Delgado pointed out the permanent supported housing destination for people leaving the shelter had the lowest numbers. He thought it correlated with the demographics for disabled people. He mentioned working with the State in terms of permanent supportive housing opportunities was complicated, observing it was an underutilized resource. Mr. Cashell said permanent supportive housing was difficult because rents were predicted through fair market rates and landlords would rather rent to someone paying \$1,000 for a studio than to a ReStart client paying \$600 or \$700 for the same unit. Member Delgado asked whether permanent supportive housing included wraparound services. Mr. Cashell said yes, though the wraparound service was difficult because some case managers had up to 30 clients and it became a burden to do weekly checkups. If the landlord felt the tenants were not checked on often enough or apartments became damaged, they would not rent to the program again. Ms. Glock mentioned the reason permanent supported housing made up only a small portion of housing was partially because the average length of stay was five years, so units were seldom available.

Vice Chair Jardon asked whether the numbers for 2018-2019 reflected that the year had not ended yet. She noted the overall numbers of homeless individuals increased but the numbers in the shelters decreased. Ms. Glock said it was due to higher recidivism. She stated the number of people in the shelters was lower because the same people entered the shelter more frequently. She noted the length of stay was increasing as well.

Chair Lucey confirmed there were 565 residents in the shelter. He asked whether that included the warming rooms and Ms. Glock confirmed it did. Mr. Cashell explained the warming room was a basic room with a television, tables, and chairs. He said clients were not able to lay down because of the fire code so they sat up throughout

the evening. Chair Lucey asked whether all shelter clients, including those in the warming room, went through the same intake process. Mr. Cashell said yes. Chair Lucey asked whether the intake was done at the time of arrival and whether the case worker was employed by the VOA. Ms. Glock said intake was done at arrival and the VOA employed five case workers. Chair Lucey asked how soon the post-assessment service plan was put into place after the assessment with the case worker. Ms. Glock replied each plan was individualized so a plan's implementation depended on the person's need, but some services could begin immediately. She said representatives from the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) went to the shelter once a week and someone from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program visited twice a week.

Chair Lucey expressed concern about the 48-hour delay in completing an assessment and asked what could be done to ensure they were done immediately. He thought the intake form for the shelter was robust enough to be a needs assessment. He asked whether the intake form could be utilized to place the clients into programs sooner. Mr. Cashell commented the largest need for the shelter was additional case managers. The women's shelter case manager had a case load of 50 people so there was a backlog before new assessments could be performed. He said one or two additional case managers would help expedite the process.

Chair Lucey asked whether some case workers would transition to the Record Street shelter or whether they would go to the Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (NNAMHS) campus when it opened. Mr. Cashell replied the case managers in the family shelter would transition to the NNAMHS campus because they were Washoe County employees. The five VOA case managers worked between the men's, women's, and overflow shelters. Chair Lucey expressed heightened concern because the added beds at the NNAMHS campus would potentially double the population of men at the Record Street shelter without additional case managers being hired. He noted individuals would continue to cycle through the shelter if they were not quickly assessed by a case manager. Mr. Cashell noted clients could not be forced to see a case manager because it was a low-barrier shelter and it was part of the VOA's policy. He said many clients figured out they could choose to not see a case manager. Shelter staff faced the challenge of trying to get clients to meet with case managers and progress through their service plans.

Chair Lucey asked whether that policy could be changed. He suggested making a needs assessment a requirement through an Interlocal Agreement. Mr. Cashell said the policy related to part of the shelter funding and it was a Department of Housing and Urban Development policy.

Human Services Agency (HSA) Director Amber Howell stated HSA staff added two additional case managers and a supervisor to the Record Street shelter when the budget was prepared for the new year. She clarified the case managers transitioning to the NNAMHS campus would be replaced so the number of case managers at Record Street would not be reduced.

Member Berkbigler expressed concern about the large number of homeless veterans and seniors. She asked where veterans could go other than the veterans' home located at the NNAHMS campus. She thought it was a bad idea to cycle the same seniors and veterans through the shelter to become homeless again, only to be handed off to the VA or other groups to care for them.

Member Dahir said help and finances were available to assist veterans. He questioned why the connection with those resources was not taking place. He thought it was necessary to review the data about who was taking charge of the clients to determine if the handoffs worked. He said it was possible that shelter staff was directing clients to a resource that was not as effective as expected. He said there were plenty of groups offering to work with veterans, but it was necessary to ensure veterans were handed off to the correct groups.

Member Lawson said he had repeatedly requested information at prior meetings that would help with the assessment of resource providers. He stated the Board needed to review where shelter clients went, who provided services, and which services were effective. He thought they had to review what was available before making changes. He understood veterans' success rate of getting out of homelessness was approximately 80 percent nationwide if they were in the correct program. He reiterated Member Dahir's question about whether there was a warm handoff for veterans. Mr. Cashell said shelter staff performed warm handoffs with all service providers in the community. He opined all the service providers in the community were effective and worked well together. He said he could provide a list of providers to the Board if requested. Ms. Glock said the City of Reno had a contract with the VA, so the shelter had 20 beds set aside for veterans.

Chair Lucey agreed with Mr. Cashell's statement regarding service providers in the community. He thought everyone working on solutions for homelessness was well-intentioned, but breakdowns in communication might still occur. He noted processes sometimes failed but the Board wanted to provide better solutions to break the cycle. He stated homelessness presented several challenges for everyone in the community and there was a need to reevaluate the outcomes of services. He thanked Mr. Cashell and Ms. Glock for the data they provided. He pointed out The Village at Sage Street offered \$400 apartments. He acknowledged there were challenges with moving people into the units. He suggested approaching the Community Foundation about developing a different housing solution with a range of prices to accommodate a larger range of clients.

Mr. Cashell said service providers in the community did amazing work. He noted the shelter clientele was difficult to work with and multiple warm handoffs might be necessary. He stated consistency was important for client success. Chair Lucey acknowledged the challenges of working with service-resistant individuals.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Jeff Church stated he was previously Board President of a 501c3 homeless center. He cautioned that some shelter clients reported military service on their intake form but their service could not be verified. He

said the demographics needed to reflect veterans whose service and discharge could be verified for ineligibility. He believed mental health and addiction caused the homelessness cycle. He said offering housing aid without addressing mental health and addiction would not resolve the issue. He suggested relocating to an area with a more affordable housing market as a solution for the lack of affordable housing. He asserted many homeless individuals had no ties to the community and might benefit from housing elsewhere. He suggested a standard agenda item for the VA to provide updates to the Board. He thought the Community Homelessness Advisory Board (CHAB) needed a budget to provide staff as the primary contact for homeless veterans.

Ms. Camille Jones said she was employed as a psychiatric case worker for the State but she was not representing the State in her comments. She stated case managers often competed for the same resources for their clients. She noted community members often mentioned the shelter had a 90-day limit for the year and she was unsure if that information was correct. In reference to Mr. Church's comment about relocating homeless individuals, she retorted the homeless were part of and belonged in the community. She asserted they had ties to the community and deserved the opportunity to thrive. She stated psychiatric case management services changed because of the Affordable Care Act. She said case managers previously worked with clients closely through their service plan, but much of the current work involved submitting paperwork. Case managers were not allowed to provide individualized help. She thought requiring 2.5 times the rent for a low-income apartment was unrealistic.

Ms. Elizabeth Pope, coordinated entry specialist for the Healthcare for the Homeless Veterans program, indicated the VA was represented at every CHAB meeting. She offered to explain community services available for veterans outside of the meeting. She said the continuum of care offered by the VA was robust and included street outreach, transitional housing, emergency housing, and permanent supported housing. They offered case management to assist with housing plans for veterans who did not fit into those categories. She said there was an outreach center located at 350 Capitol Hill Avenue, which was open Monday through Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. The shelter offered showers, laundry, and staff available for walk-in appointments. She said there were approximately 110 transitional housing beds and more than 300 housing choice vouchers throughout the community. She stated VA staff would be happy to present to the CHAB. They regularly went to the Record Street shelter and planned to visit the new shelter on a regular basis as well. She noted the VA offered a veterans' workgroup as part of the continuum of care. She said the workgroup had a meeting scheduled for October 10 at 3:00 p.m. She said the workgroup had established a list to identify all homeless veterans in the community and ensure they had a housing plan.

Mr. Joe Arrascada, Co-owner of Nevada Fiduciary Solutions LLC (NFS), explained NSF was a representative payee agency that managed federal funds for people who were deemed unable to manage their money. He said NFS inherited clients from a previous payee agency who utilized the shelter for years by cycling through the main shelter and the overflow shelter. One of the NFS clients recently left the shelter after a 2.5-year stay. The client received \$771 per month for supplemental security income but

gambled the entire amount at a casino. He said clients of the shelter had all their needs met so the NFS decided the client only needed \$35 each week. The client was housed at a hotel after several months, but his income would not sustain long term shelter. He offered the services of the NFS.

Ms. Jennifer Cassady stated the cycle of homelessness was never comfortable, and most homeless people looked for housing options. She stated the case management system provided clients with a to-do list, which was required to continue their stay. She acknowledged case managers were overwhelmed and were not to blame. She asserted homeless community members were fearful and she believed the expectations placed on them were unrealistic. She emphasized adequate permanent housing was not available in the community and all service providers had to compete for resources for their clients. She said waitlists were approximately nine months to two years. She opined it was time to admit there were no long-term resources for many people.

Chair Lucey thought the next step for CHAB members was to discuss these issues with their respective boards.

On motion by Member Dahir, seconded by Vice Chair Jardon, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote with Member Hartung absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 6 be accepted.

19-098C **AGENDA ITEM 7** Update, discussion, and possible direction on the Nevada Youth Empowerment Project (NYEP) Housing Program & Use of Youth Prioritization Tool. Monica DuPea, Executive Director.

Monica DuPea, Executive Director of the Nevada Youth Empowerment Project (NYEP), conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She reviewed slides with the following titles: NYEP Housing Program & Use of Youth Prioritization Tool; Who is NYEP?; NYEP's Housing Program; We Ensure A Pathway Out For Those We Serve; NYEP's Pathway Out; You Must Assess To Adequately Respond; There's Even A Tool For Youth; images of NYEP's prioritization tool (2 slides); Youth Scoring Summary; We Need A Continuum Of Housing Matches; With the housing shortage...; and Opportunities To Make A Difference Together.

Ms. DuPea said the NYEP provided a high-accountability, housing-based program. The program offered 15 beds and targeted women between the ages 18 to 24 who were directionless and homeless. She noted the program was grounded in structure, standards, consistency, and accountability. She said they worked closely with their clients following designated plans with clearly stated goals. She stated resident expectations were coupled with staff expectations, which ensured goals were met. She said prior experience demonstrated that simply providing a list of goals was not effective; their clients needed a higher level of assistance. She stated the NYEP's goal was to increase innovative programs and services to deliver housing, daily interaction, resource support,

skills training, monitoring, and accountability to ensure youth became productive members of the community. She invited people to tour the NYEP because it was a model of self-reliance.

Ms. DuPea mentioned the NYEP's community living program cost \$15,000 to \$20,000 per bed, which was the same cost as a jail. She said the NYEP realized affordable housing was decreasing and clients who left the program with an income of \$11 to \$12 per hour needed additional assistance. In response, Truckee Meadows Housing Solution (TMHS) was created as a pathway for their clients to exit the program with rents between \$400 and \$500 per month. She reviewed the NYEP process that started with a four to six-hour intake to determine the client's uniqueness. She said the program was comprised of 13 components. The personal needs of the client were considered but there was a standard program which all clients had to learn. Clients completed the community living program when they graduated high school, finished a skilled-wage certificate, and found affordable housing. At that point, clients were on the path to self-reliance. She stated the poverty model based on government reliance was the alternative to the self-reliance model for youth. She said service providers often had a fixed poverty mindset with the expectation that people could not change, grow, or help themselves. She asserted having a fixed mindset was counterproductive when working with people. The NYEP emphasized a growth mindset focused on clients helping themselves.

Ms. DuPea said the NYEP housing program was similar in length to transitional housing. She stated the program matched young people within the continuum of housing needs. She discussed the assessment tool used to identify youth who needed to be placed into a service. She stated the prioritization tool could be used by providers to assess every youth and the assessment tool determined the level of intensity of service needed. She mentioned that Washoe County had hired OrgCode Consulting, Inc. to provide training on the assessment tool. She developed a chart of the continuum of housing which was needed for homeless youth. She noted all types of critical first-step housing was absent, so it was very difficult to transition from the shelter to affordable housing. She said most young women who received assistance from the NYEP required extensive individualized assistance. She noted the NYEP community living program was in the second tier of housing types. Graduates of the program required affordable housing from tiers four through six. She mentioned the housing chart included the 49 homeless deaths in 2017-2018, which were not often discussed. She summarized a lot of work was necessary to ensure the supply of all types of affordable housing was commensurate with the need.

Member Dahir mentioned he and Member Lawson had toured the NYEP facility. He expressed appreciation for the work Ms. DuPea was doing. He thought the young women in the program made significant progress and they said good things about the program. He thought the program had an important role. He thanked Ms. DuPea for the presentation.

Vice Chair Jardon said she had toured the facility as well and she was impressed by how organized it was and by the clearly defined expectations and rules. She thought there was a lot to learn from the program about the benefit of structure, expectations, and rules. She noted a nudge was sometimes necessary to help someone move out of a situation in which they were comfortable. She thought structure might help individuals make progress and she wanted to discuss it in the future.

Member Delgado observed Ms. DuPea was always thinking of creative solutions. He expressed appreciation for her determination and the effect it had on the young women she mentored. He thanked her for the work she did.

Member Lawson said that, when touring the facility, he listened to graduates of the program who spoke about their progress toward independence. He suggested the other members of the CHAB do the same. He said it was an unrestricted discussion which took two hours, and it helped them understand what help was necessary. He said the experience was eye-opening and he thanked Ms. DuPea.

Ms. DuPea said the NYEP would meet with Eddy House on October 24 because a sense of urgency regarding the youth in the community was needed. There was a large population of youth who fell out of school and work. She stated those youths had no mental illness or drug addiction; they had a fixed poverty mindset. She asserted youths needed to be helped to prevent an increased population of homeless.

Member Lawson stated the solution he perceived for homelessness was to prevent it before it happened. He expected positive outcomes in the fight against homelessness from the work being done to help the youth in the community.

Chair Lucey agreed that helping the youth in the community first was important. He said the County pushed to establish the Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services campus because of the vulnerable youth. He thought providing youth with opportunities would dissuade them from the poverty mindset. He believed the community and the region needed to focus on helping youth who were aging out of the system because they were the future. He thanked Ms. DuPea for her commitment and expressed appreciation for everyone working with children.

There was no public comment or action taken on this item.

19-099C **AGENDA ITEM 8** Update, discussion, and possible direction on preparing for a winter overflow site at the Record Street or other facility. City of Reno.

City of Reno Assistant City Manager Bill Thomas said the Community Assistance Center was the primary shelter throughout the year, and it was supplemented with an emergency overflow shelter which was open during the evenings. He noted a winter tent was used the previous few years to accommodate overflow from the overflow shelter. He reported the three local governments had developed a cooperative agreement

for the current year to solve the issues concerning the winter tent. He said Washoe County would rent a tent. He anticipated the tent would be placed at the Community Assistance Center during the second week of November and it would cost approximately \$85,000. He said faith-based providers had staffed the tent in prior years but there was a need for additional staff because they learned from those providers that staffing the tent was very challenging. The City of Reno would provide a temporary employee and the City of Sparks would fund a second employee to staff the tent.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Jardin, seconded by Member Berkbigler, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote with Member Hartung absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 8 be accepted.

19-100C **AGENDA ITEM 9** Board members announcements, reports and updates to include requests for future board agenda items.

Vice Chair Jardon requested a future presentation regarding federal funding to clarify how much it was, what it paid for, and what restrictions it had. She had repeatedly heard that the funds were restrictive and prevented service providers from doing certain things to help their clients. She thought the Community Homelessness Advisory Board (CHAB) needed to consider how the funds helped and hindered progress. She expressed concern about the high percentage of recidivism and the low percentage of intake interview participation.

Member Lawson requested a 10-minute presentation from the Truckee Meadows Water Authority regarding the issues they faced. He thought clean drinking water was paramount for the community. He expressed concern about the disturbing debris which was disposed of in the river. He thought it needed to be brought to public attention because it affected everyone.

Member Dahir said the once-a-year count was done out of habit but he wanted to ensure progress was made toward having a monthly count. He requested a presentation about the paths being taken toward accurate counting. He mentioned providers spoke about the various metrics they tracked but he believed working together on demographics was crucial. He wanted to ensure it was a purposeful effort, not an accidental occurrence.

Vice Chair Jardon referred to the CHAB meeting on September 19, where the Board learned about the OrgCode Consulting, Inc. study. She was aware the City of Reno would serve as the continuum of care (COC) entity. She believed the CHAB was eager to act on the available data to make significant changes. She thought the priority for the next CHAB meeting should be to determine which steps could be taken to really start making an impact. She understood several jurisdictions were involved in the increased efforts to resolve issues with tents along the river. She was aware the City of Reno allocated additional resources and she believed the other jurisdictions did the same. She

requested a comprehensive report including who was involved, what the plans were, and when the coordinated efforts would be deployed.

Chair Lucey stated he shared the concerns of the other CHAB members. The presentation from the Volunteers of America (VOA) indicated the numbers in the shelter decreased but the total homeless population in the region had increased. He questioned whether it was due to missing data. He asked what information had not been compiled to identify services for the homeless. He acknowledged mental illness and affordable housing were challenges but questioned how needs were being identified. He requested a presentation from the VOA about their outreach programs and the warm handoffs they performed. He asked for a presentation from Nevada Fiduciary regarding the payee systems. He thought accountability for the COC needed to be established to redirect individuals and change mindsets.

Member Berkbigler expressed interest in a more detailed assessment from the VOA, including which groups it performed warm handoffs with. She asked whether those groups needed assistance.

19-0101C AGENDA ITEM 10 Public Comment.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

* * * * *

10:53 a.m. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

BOB LUCEY, Chair
Community Homelessness Advisory Board

ATTEST:

NANCY PARENT, County Clerk

*Minutes Prepared by:
Carolina Stickley, Deputy County Clerk*

RENO AREA ALLIANCE FOR THE HOMELESS

CHAB

Nov 4th, 2019

RAAH PURPOSE

- **Serves as the Continuum of Care**
 - HUD mandated function in order to receive federal funding for housing
 - \$1.69 million received last year in HUD funding
 - Funding specific to housing, separate from HUD funding for CAC
 - Strong CoC is required to receiving federal grant funding
 - And ensures implementation of HUD policy
- **City of Reno is the CoC lead, which has specific duties,**
 - Multi-jurisdictional representation on RAAH
- **RAAH fulfills the broader stakeholder convener role for CoC**
- **Created in 1999**
- **One of three CoCs in the State of Nevada**

RAAH ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

- **General Membership**
 - **Standing monthly meeting**
 - **Agency presentations**
 - **Committee Updates**
 - **Standing agenda items related to homeless services, upcoming events**
 - **Generally attended by 50+ people**

RAAH ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

- **Leadership Council**
 - **Responsibilities for overall governance of RAAH**
 - **Approval and coordination of items like HUD grant rating and ranking, Point in Time count strategy,**
 - **Committees formed to work on specific issues**
 - **Advocacy, Youth, Data, Veterans and Point in Time count**
 - **Broad community representation**
- **Chair, Sharon Chamberlain**
- **Vice Chair, JD Klippenstein**

RAAH LEADERSHIP REPRESENTATION

- An agency representing homeless youth
- Private sector business and industry
- The Veteran's Administration
- Faith-based and other community-based organizations
- Homeless providers;
- CoC grantees
- The Washoe County School District
- A substance abuse treatment provider;
- An affordable housing expert
- A mental health service provider
- Homeless and/or formerly homeless persons
- A substance abuse provider serving youth
- A senior services provider;
- A representative from Law Enforcement
- A health care provider
- Local jurisdictions

THE PATHWAY FORWARD

- **Next big steps**
 - **RAAH strategic plan**
 - **Point in Time Count**
- **We look forward to collaborating with you**
- **Opportunity to tap institution knowledge and decades of experience working on homelessness in the Truckee Meadows**