

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

MONDAY

9:00 A.M.

APRIL 4, 2022

PRESENT:

Alexis Hill, Chair
Ed Lawson, Vice Chair
Neoma Jardon, Member
Devon Reese, Member
Kristopher Dahir, Member
Bob Lucey, Member

Janis Galassini, County Clerk
Herbert Kaplan, Deputy District Attorney

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, County Clerk Jan Galassini called roll and the Board conducted the following business:

22-027C AGENDA ITEM 3 Public Comment.

Ms. Eileen Bidwell advocated for the County to join the House America campaign. She noted the program was a national partnership to reduce homelessness and was funded through the American Rescue Plan Act; there was no cost to join the partnership and no additional reporting requirements. The membership benefits included access to free technical assistance from experts and the opportunity to learn from the successes and failures in other cities across the United States. She expressed her concerns about phase three of the Cares Campus plan, which included building transitional housing. Current research, she explained, had shown that permanent supportive housing was more successful in helping vulnerable people achieve stability in their lives. She opined now was the time to concentrate on permanent solutions.

Ms. Brooklin Laeno said when she came to the region six months ago, she had nowhere to go and no idea of what she would do. The Eddy House opened its doors to her and provided her with the tools and guidance to be a functioning adult. She was grateful for the love and support the Eddy House had shown her, and she said staff treated their clients like family. She explained the transitional housing that she currently lived in gave her the freedom to be an adult and make her own decisions while also receiving guidance from staff to make the right choices. The Eddy House scholarship program helped fund her schooling to become a nurse. She opined her life was better due to the help she received from the Eddy House, and she asked the Board to give the program its support.

22-028C **AGENDA ITEM 4** Approval of minutes of the February 7, 2022, and March 7, 2022, meetings.

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

On motion by Member Reese, seconded by Member Jardon, which motion duly carried on a 6-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 4 be approved.

22-029C **AGENDA ITEM 5** Eddy House, Homeless Youth Facility and Program, update and presentation, Trevor Macaluso, Chief Executive Officer, Eddy House.

Eddy House Chief Executive Officer Trevor Macaluso conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, and reviewed slides with the following titles: Eddy House; Values; Timeline; Programs and Services; Outreach (2 slides); Drop In Center (2 slides); Emergency Shelter (2 slides); Community Living (3 slides); Transitional Living (2 slides); Independent Living Home; 2021 Data (2 slides); 2021 Drop In Center Exits; 2021 Emergency Shelter Exits; 2021 Community Living Exits; 2021 Transitional Living Exits; and 2022 Data Trends.

Information from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development stated if a youth or individual had permanent housing prior to the age of 25, the risk of them becoming chronically homeless was significantly reduced. Due to this, Mr. Macaluso said, the Eddy House focused on ages 18 through 24. He said the Eddy House hoped to launch a pilot independent living home with the Washoe County Human Services Agency later that year. The individuals that staff met during outreach followed a ladder step approach, however, clients were able to jump into different programs at any point and move forward faster.

Mr. Macaluso said the drop-in center offered dental services and haircuts on a monthly basis. The on-call support for the youth advocates allowed them to assist clients 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Traditionally, the Eddy House tended to serve a higher number of men over women, however, the number of females had continued to grow over the previous nine months.

The Community Living Program was based on research done by the University of Nevada, Reno to help clients become aware of their skills and abilities in five areas of focus. Mr. Macaluso noted it was important for clients to be informed of the resources in the community so they could access those services when they were no longer with Eddy House. The five areas of focus were taught in 15 to 20 groups per week; 80 percent of the groups were hosted by the community.

Mr. Macaluso said the Transitional Living Program was currently full. Clients in the Transitional Living Program met with case managers to move towards independent living. The aftercare program followed up with clients who were no longer

being supported by an Eddy House program. This follow-up had been recently launched as a way to measure the efficiency of the program.

The Independent Living Home, after approval from the Human Services Agency, would be launched in 2022 and would act as a homelessness prevention program for foster youth who had aged out. Mr. Macaluso noted the foster youth would still be supported by the independent living program under the County, but the Eddy House would provide housing and programming. Without a home like the Independent Living Home, aged-out foster youth had nowhere to go and could end up in shelters. The 2021 Data slide he provided showed the transient nature of homeless youth. High school equivalency courses were provided at the Eddy House due to a large number of clients without a high school diploma or high school equivalency.

Mr. Macaluso noted program exits were counted individually to measure how each program was doing, as opposed to how each client was doing. He said the Eddy House provided food to those who were already in permanent or temporary housing but were food insecure. An unsuccessful exit from the Drop-In Shelter meant someone who ended up leaving the program to go back on the street or was suspended from the Eddy House for behavior issues. The unsuccessful exits from Community Living were typically when people moved back into the Drop-In and Emergency Shelters. He noted it was not unusual for clients to have attempted Community Living more than once. He said the Eddy House was on-trend to serve more clients in 2022 than in previous years.

Member Dahir commented he was a big collaborator in youth services and asked how the community was working together in youth services. He noted job training was a key area in helping youth avoid homelessness.

Mr. Macaluso responded that the Eddy House collaborated with many agencies in town regarding the continuum of care for homeless youth, and he noted the Eddy House had discussions with new agencies in the community every week. He said job training was a major focus of the Eddy House's programming. The Eddy House had a Community Liaison who identified employers in the community who were interested in employing Eddy House clients. These employers were on campus weekly to meet with clients. The Community Liaison also assisted clients with job training skills. He noted that Eddy House partnered with the Community Services Agency and the Community Health Alliance to provide training programs to clients.

Chair Hill looked forward to working with the Eddy House on future programs and thought the Community Homelessness Advisory Board should investigate how to support the pilot of the Eddy House Independent Living Program. She acknowledged the Eddy House helped to divert people from going to the Cares Campus and opined there was future collaboration the Board could do with the Eddy House. Mr. Macaluso mentioned that the Eddy House had a great relationship with the Cares Campus and had identified 15 youth on campus to transfer to the Eddy House.

22-030C **AGENDA ITEM 6** Veteran Affairs Sierra Nevada Health Care System update and presentation. Chris Stadter, VA Health Care for Homeless Veterans (HCHV) Supervisor; Kara Fraki, VA Coordinated Entry Coordinator.

Veteran Affairs (VA) Coordinated Entry Coordinator Kara Fraki conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, and reviewed slides with the following titles: Health Care for Homeless Veterans; HCHV Eligibility; Available Services; HCHV Outreach Social Workers; and Transitional Living Programs.

Ms. Fraki said the employees at Health Care for Homeless Veterans (HCHV) worked endlessly to assist veterans. She mentioned that HCHV had different eligibility requirements than the main VA healthcare system; many veterans that were not eligible for VA healthcare were eligible for HCHV. She noted if a homeless veteran was not already enrolled at the VA, they could meet with an outreach social worker to discuss their eligibility.

The Outreach Social Workers were the first contact for homeless veterans and focused on developing a rapport, building trust, and creating relationships while engaging the veteran in services. During intakes and follow-ups, the social workers completed various mental health assessments; suicide risk evaluations were done yearly. Ms. Fraki explained the transitional living programs provided: a support network, case management, three meals a day, and a safe living environment. She noted many veterans had success in the programs because they were stably housed and able to focus on working toward their goals.

VA Health Care for Homeless Veterans Supervisor Chris Stadter conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, and reviewed slides with the following titles: Justice Outreach/Re-Entry; Homeless Patient Aligned Care Team; HCHV Case Management; HUD-VASH; and Housing Progress.

Mr. Stadter explained that HCHV had social workers who liaised to ensure the court had access to the veteran's treatment records and the veteran had access to needed treatments while in court. The liaisons worked with veterans exiting jail or prison to transition them back into community living. He noted the service was relatively new to HCHV. He mentioned the Homeless Patient Aligned Care Team's services were heavily based on walk-in hours. He explained the Housing and Urban Development and Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Program (HUD-VASH) had recently expanded eligibility; if a veteran had previously been told they were not eligible for the program, they should recheck their eligibility with HCHV.

Member Jardon was excited to hear many programs were working with the Cares Campus and a system of information and services was being created. She asked whether HCHV helped veterans who were on the cusp of homelessness. She noted veterans were often unsure of their benefits, and she wondered whether HCHV could assist those individuals. Mr. Stadter replied that HCHV frequently assisted veterans in navigating their

benefits. He noted the VA was limited in what it could do to help veterans on the cusp of homelessness, however, it was able to help veterans facing eviction and housing instability navigate community resources. Member Jardon asked how veterans could get in contact with HCHV. Mr. Stadter indicated veterans could contact the local number listed in the PowerPoint presentation.

Member Reese appreciated HCHV's focus on justice-related work. He explained the City of Reno received vouchers for veterans to use towards housing services, however, the City of Reno was unable to use all the vouchers due to a lack of eligible veterans. He was concerned the vouchers were a resource that was not being accessed and wondered about the disconnect in the process. Mr. Stadter was not familiar with the program but said HUD-VASH worked to find landlords who were willing to accept the VA vouchers. He noted that HUD-VASH actively sought veterans to engage in the program, and he opined veterans felt more comfortable with HCHV than the VA because it was a smaller, intimate building.

Member Reese was excited the Volunteers of America and Save Our Reno were engaging in a process to take possession of the Highway 40 Motel. He believed the project would create an additional 35 units, and he opined the veteran population was capable of handling independent living facilities. He hoped HCHV would work with those organizations to place veterans.

Member Lucey opined veterans often got lost in the process of agencies connecting resources, and he wondered how to better bridge the resources. He asked whether HCHV Case Managers worked directly with the County's Human Services Agency to identify veterans in County programming. Mr. Stadter explained the Coordinated Entry Team worked with the Homeless Management Information System and County staff to share information on services provided to veterans.

Member Dahir noted the Cares Campus served 60 veterans and wondered whether HCHV's services were full. Mr. Stadter said the HUD-VASH program had the capacity to accept more veterans, and he informed that a Memorandum of Understanding had recently been completed to allow an HCHV social worker to provide walk-in services to veterans at the Cares Campus. Member Dahir asked for an update regarding the outcome of those services. Noting that elected officials were able to work with legislators for resources, he asked that HCHV inform the Board if there were resources it needed.

Member Dahir recalled a constituent who claimed he had nowhere to go when he left the VA; the constituent asked for Member Dahir's help. Member Dahir was confused as to why the veteran had nowhere to go. Mr. Stadter said there were services HCHV had to help get veterans into housing on a same-day request. He noted there could be a disconnect from one program to another and asked Member Dahir to let himself or Ms. Fraki know if a similar situation arose in the future.

Chair Hill asked whether transitional housing required sober living. Mr. Stadter responded the majority of them did require sober living or clean and sober on-site.

He explained the idea behind that was to avoid penalizing someone who might be using drugs or alcohol but was trying to work through the recovery process. Chair Hill asked whether HCHV requiring sobriety on-site was a federal requirement to receive funding from the VA. Mr. Stadter said it was not necessarily a requirement, but it was specifically outlined in each grant or contract that was written. Chair Hill was excited about the HCHV and Cares Campus collaboration.

22-031C **AGENDA ITEM 7** Affordable Housing presentation. Monica Cochran, City of Reno; J.D. Klippenstein, Washoe County.

City of Reno Housing Manager Monica Cochran conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, and reviewed slides with the following titles: What is Affordable Housing; Washoe County AMI; Housing & Wages; The Need; and Housing Continuum & Regional Roles. Washoe County Housing and Grants Specialist J.D. Klippenstein noted Nevada had the largest gap of any state in the country in terms of rental units that were affordable for low-income renters.

Mr. Klippenstein conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, and reviewed slides with the following titles: Housing Continuum & Regional Roles; State ARPA Opportunity; and Potential Next Steps.

Mr. Klippenstein explained the County was the lead entity regarding the continuum of care and homelessness. He said the County would focus on supporting and strengthening emergency shelter and transitional housing programs, as well as investing and engaging with stakeholders to increase permanent supportive housing options. He clarified that transitional and permanent supportive housing were different; transitional was often temporary. He noted permanent supportive housing was a best practice. Moving forward, he wanted to see Washoe County take the lead with emergency shelter, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing.

Ms. Cochran said she presented a strategic plan through the City of Reno's special meeting on housing. She recommended the City of Reno focus on the 30 to 120 percent area median income (AMI) of the Housing Continuum. She noted the City of Reno had not operated much in the 60 to 120 percent AMI area, but its action would include workforce housing. Workforce housing was not as subsidized, so it was harder to create. Most affordable units required around the 60 percent AMI mark, so the City of Reno was increasing its efforts with the home consortium projects around the 60 percent AMI mark.

The City of Reno, Ms. Cochran said, supported projects in the 60 percent AMI range and was brainstorming other projects regarding affordable housing. She explained the Home Consortium had a Technical Review Committee comprised of representatives from the regional jurisdictions. The committee reviewed applications for units and made recommendations to the managers of the three jurisdictions. Last year, the Home Consortium approved funding for 716 new units. If all the applications for this year were approved, approximately 1,500 units would be added. The City of Reno was working on housing preservation and projects to help move people into homeownership.

Member Jardon concluded that the Housing Continuum slide showed the County's responsibility being emergency shelter, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing with a crossover of services with the Cities of Sparks and Reno in the affordable rental housing section. Mr. Klippenstein explained the Home Consortium was a way for the jurisdictions to coordinate. He said home funds were grants from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) with an emphasis on providing housing subsidies for people at 30 AMI or lower. He noted there was a lot of overlap in the areas of permanent supportive housing and affordable rental housing. He opined the jurisdictions should consider a local policy that would incentivize or bring more units online because the Home Consortium effort was multi-jurisdictional.

Chair Hill commented all jurisdictions had a role in the policy for an affordable market in rental housing and Mr. Klippenstein agreed. He thought Governor Steve Sisolak's proposal for \$500 million in American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) money to go toward affordable housing created a historic opportunity for the region. He noted it was a challenge to affordable housing when the affordability period expired, and the housing returned to the market rate.

Member Dahir asked what group would make the decisions on the funding for the ARPA money and Ms. Cochran replied that the Nevada Housing Division would make those decisions. Member Dahir opined the jurisdictions had to figure out how to support developers and projects so they could access funding. Chair Hill mentioned she had talked with some developers who wanted to get involved with affordable housing, and she had referred them to Mr. Klippenstein. She opined if a member of the Board had projects they wanted to facilitate, they could do that through staff at the Nevada Housing Division. Mr. Klippenstein informed that the administrator for the Nevada Housing Division had a meeting with local jurisdictions to enable the jurisdictions to better understand what the process would look like and how to support the community and potential projects.

Vice Chair Lawson noted that \$300 million for developing multifamily units was a lot of money but divided up around the State it would only amount to approximately 500 apartments. Mr. Klippenstein explained that affordable housing tended to be a layered process, which meant a project would use many different financial tools for funding. He opined the money would equal more than 500 units because no project would rely solely on one funding source.

Vice Chair Lawson recalled the affordable housing projects done in the early 2000s that were currently market-rate apartments, and he asked whether the funding would be in perpetuity. Ms. Cochran was unsure what the State would assign as its period of affordability, but she assumed it would be at least 20 years. She noted the Home Consortium typically set the period at 30 years for home units. Mr. Klippenstein said the low-income housing tax credit tended to have a 30-year affordability period. He did not believe the affordability period had been set yet, but he believed the period would have a baseline of 30 years.

Vice Chair Lawson opined the longer the affordability period, the better. He believed the real solution for long-term care was to give away land to build affordable housing that would stay affordable forever. He mentioned he would like to see more long-term solutions because developers were getting breaks and could sell the property at the market rate after the period expired. Ms. Cochran thought there were some models where the land had deed restrictions and stayed affordable in perpetuity.

Mr. Klippenstein thought the jurisdictions needed to have conversations with stakeholders regarding how to increase land availability for affordable housing and ensure the affordability remained long-term. He opined that fast-tracking affordable housing was pertinent to ensure there were no delayed timelines for developers. Delayed timelines could lead to increased costs of materials.

Member Dahir recalled a conversation from a meeting in Washington, D.C. that if housing was too expensive for the vouchers, there was a phone number to call for the voucher amount to be expanded. Ms. Cochran said the Housing Authority was the expert on the vouchers because the vouchers came in through that agency. She explained that rental assistance for a client could not pay more than fair market rent, which was set by HUD. She noted there had been an exception during COVID-19, but that had expired. Member Dahir commented that HUD had been at the meeting where he heard the vouchers could be expanded. Ms. Cochran stated she would look into the matter and noted the Housing Authority was the only entity in the region that could raise the amount. Mr. Klippenstein added that the level of rent increase in the community was significant, and he opined it was hard for the voucher process to keep up with how quickly rents were rising.

Member Reese wondered what portion of the ARPA money allocated for affordable housing would go to the Northern Nevada area. He opined it was important for the regional partners to act quickly regarding affordable housing projects in an effort to make the most out of the funds available. He was concerned the majority of the money would be used quickly by Southern Nevada.

Member Reese said the funding for the Highway 40 Motel and the expansion of the Village on Sage Street were examples of the layering effect Mr. Klippenstein spoke about. Both projects required a commitment from the City of Reno and the State. He noted the Nevada Youth Empowerment Project was working on an intergenerational living model, and the JUSTin Hope Foundation had a project that focused on permanent solutions for people with health or mental disabilities. He mentioned the Domestic Violence Resource Center's focus was on transitional housing and it had many opportunities to help with homelessness.

Member Reese opined the region was running out of land, and he asked for further clarification regarding the Next Steps PowerPoint slide that mentioned increasing available land. He said the City of Reno looked to partner with people who had ideas for City-owned land. Mr. Klippenstein said the use of public land and land bills were imperative, and creative uses of the land were essential. Deed restrictions, he noted, could be a way to ensure affordable housing in perpetuity.

Member Lucey opined the Board had been instrumental in finding ways to create a transitional program and a foundation to move forward. He met with Mr. Brian Bonnenfant, Project Manager for the Center for Regional Studies at the University of Nevada, Reno, to discuss housing challenges in the region. He said Mr. Bonnenfant explained the changes in vacancy rates and average rent trends from 2010 to the present. He noted the numbers made it very challenging for the jurisdictions to work on housing, however, he felt they had worked together well to identify each jurisdiction's role in affordable housing. He opined there was still work to be done regarding affordable housing.

Member Lucey noted many individuals were moving into the region because of the high availability of jobs. He explained unemployment was higher across the nation than in Washoe County, which had unemployment rates of around 2.3 percent, however, the wages in the region did not match the income needed to live here. He opined the outlook was positive for the region because there were jobs available, and the jurisdictions were working to provide the services needed for affordable housing.

Member Lucey commended the public-private partnerships the Cities of Sparks and Reno had created to advocate for affordable housing. He opined the region was in a period of exuberance where people purchased homes for financial benefit, instead of residential use. He thought the jurisdictions had made a shift in the past three years to make affordable, multi-family housing a focus. He urged the Board to continue this work and make progress toward affordable workforce housing units. He thought it was important that housing was close to services, such as transportation. He hoped a flattening of supply and demand would help the region move forward with additional housing projects.

Member Jardon said affordable housing was the number one priority in the region and the jurisdictions were looking at ways to quickly increase units to meet the critical need of the community. She felt the jurisdictions were reacting to the crash of the economy and the broken tax structure. She opined nobody wanted to tackle the tax issue, but it needed to be fixed or the region would be in a perpetual boom and bust scenario. She noted the region attracted businesses due to great incentives and said none of the incentives were balanced with an understanding that the companies would assist with housing.

Member Jardon said there were opportunities to fast-track projects. She proposed an idea to the City of Reno several years ago that gave developers discounts on fees if they built certain types of housing. She thought putting all affordable, low-income housing in one area was unwise and asked for a snapshot of the locations of affordable housing. She explained she had heard from the development community that even with the jurisdictions waiving every fee, it would still not be beneficial to the developers to build due to the exorbitant costs of labor and materials. She opined everyone needed to come together to encourage the State legislators to fix the broken tax system.

Chair Hill noted the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) wanted to take a more active role in the next legislative session. She said it was time to plan strategies and thought if the jurisdictions came together with a proposal for the State, it would be successful. She mentioned Ms. Christine Hess at the Nevada Housing Coalition could

gather the jurisdictions together to discuss the nonprofits that wanted to work with the State on its funding measures.

Mr. Klippenstein noted he and Ms. Cochran participated in the Policy Committee for the Nevada Housing Coalition and there had been a lot of jurisdictional participation. Chair Hill said action needed to be taken soon and asked for an update regarding the matter. She mentioned there would be policies presented to the BCC. Agreeing with Member Dahir, she thought it would be a good idea to have the City of Sparks participate in the next presentation regarding affordable housing.

22-032C **AGENDA ITEM 8** Board update and discussion on the Nevada Cares Campus Emergency Shelter. Dana Searcy, Washoe County.

Special Projects Manager Dana Searcy conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, and reviewed slides with the following titles: Cares Campus Priorities; Updates; Partnerships; Jon DeCarminie Recommendations; Staffing; Emergency Shelter (5 slides); Safe Camp; and Up Next.

Ms. Searcy noted the Cares Campus (CC) was approaching its first anniversary. She said many of the easy fixes had been done and work would focus on building the campus' foundation for the future. She stated staffing and training remained the CC's top priorities. The Modpods had been placed and the Safe Camp was able to move out of the garage and into the Modpods. She explained the previous week had a 7-day average of 21 open beds, so the decision was made to close the winter overflow on April 1. The Warming Center would remain open for several more weeks until warmer temperatures were consistent.

She informed the shower buildings were in place and would remain until the completion of the new bathroom and shower building in January of 2023. Ms. Searcy noted the new operator of the CC had not been announced yet; she would share the news as soon as it was released. She relayed that Councilwoman Bonnie Weber would host a meeting between the CC staff and the Interfaith Group regarding volunteer work. Volunteers would be focused on foodservice and handling the mail service when it transferred to the CC. She mentioned the stat pack was operational and the data was being used to make decisions regarding the CC.

Ms. Searcy said the CC received an overwhelming response to the case management recruitment. She noted all three supervisors were in place and the fourth had started that day. Staff was performing reference checks and would be working through job offers for 17 Case Manager positions that week. The case managers, she explained, would be working closely with the Volunteers of America (VOA) Case Manager. She was pleased to see that many of the VOA case managers had applied for the open positions and thought that would lead to a smooth transition. She noted that the Mental Health Counselor position was challenging and a difficult position to fill.

Ms. Searcy said the number of unduplicated clients continued to reduce and thought that was due to the opening of the overflow area. She explained the number of veterans at the CC had decreased from 60 to 34 in the last month. She clarified that veteran status was self-reported because staff could not verify the status of individuals. The CC case managers would continue to work with the veterans, and she opined the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Department of Veteran Affairs (VA) would help lower the number of veterans at the campus.

The CC staff looked forward to working with the Eddy House team to move youth out of the CC. Ms. Searcy noted staff had been told by clients that the CC was their only option, sometimes because they had been asked to leave other facilities due to their behavior. The CC was always looking for ways to support large population groups at the campus, and staff was working with partners to get people out of the CC and into more appropriate options. She hoped the exits from the Safe Camp would go up as resources and staff increased.

Ms. Searcy said construction preparation continued and was tentatively scheduled to begin on June 1. She noted there would be construction on most of the campus and many temporary buildings would be set up. She said there would be a lot of preparation involved in moving the community mail from Record Street to the CC, and she thought the transfer would occur in about two weeks. The CC was working closely with the Restart Team to ensure the mail made it to the correct place. She believed the updating of the Community Dashboard was more consistent and said staff was working towards an automatic live bed count.

Ms. Searcy informed the operator transition would occur on July 1, and a lot of preparation on the back-end case management would need to happen for the transition. The Request for Proposal (RFP) for medical support would go out the following week; the RFP would allow different partners to work together to address needs at the CC.

Member Jardon asked who had put in for the RFP. Ms. Searcy responded she could not say who had put in for the RFP, but she confirmed that more than one party had put in for it. Member Jardon asked for more information regarding the medical support RFP. Ms. Searcy said the CC was working towards a layered approach regarding medical support to alleviate the strain on Reno Fire, the Regional Emergency Medical Services Authority (REMSA), and the Washoe County Sheriff's Office. She mentioned many MOUs had been put into place to bring services on-site. A temporary building would be dedicated to a clinic with a rolling schedule of services to be provided.

Staff was working on getting a dedicated nurse call line through REMSA for the CC and Our Place. The dedicated nurse call line would ensure resources were sent out only when they were truly needed. Ms. Searcy said the medical need on the campus was severe and they were looking for a medical aide to assist until Northern Nevada HOPES was set up.

Member Jardon noted summer brought a higher number of homeless individuals to the shelters and expressed her concern with the reduced number of beds due to construction. Ms. Searcy said the numbers at the shelters went down in the summer because of the warm weather, however, the CC was actively working on a plan in preparation for winter. She stated nobody at the shelter would be asked to leave because a bed had been eliminated. She explained the hope was that by getting case managers in and working with partners through MOUs, a large number of people at the CC would transition out.

Member Reese opined Mr. Jon DeCarmine was brought in to determine ways the CC could improve. Ms. Searcy agreed with Member Reese and commented Mr. DeCarmine was brought in as a partner because he was a known leader in the field of homelessness. She noted that Mr. DeCarmine was the only person in the country who had successfully housed a safe camp on the same property as an emergency shelter. Mr. DeCarmine's process, she explained, was to advise how the campus could take what it had and build on it to improve. She opined different choices could have been made in the past, but staff chose to look at where they were presently and the resources they had to move forward.

Member Reese said the advocate community had asked about Right to Rest statutes. He wondered what Mr. Jon DeCarmine's thoughts were on those statutes and thought it could help the Board with future discussions. He wondered whether the CC had set hours for construction to allow guests to sleep without disruptions. Ms. Searcy responded the construction team's focus was to make sure people had safe entrances and exits and that construction was staggered to be less impactful.

Member Reese was concerned about the dust from construction and asked whether increased cleaning protocols had been established. He asked about the food quality at the CC. Ms. Searcy explained the RFP process had been closed without a viable option and noted that a lot of the kitchens in the area were at production capacity. She said the CC was working with Catholic Charities on an MOU to provide food at the level it had been but with more transparency. She was grateful for the partnership the County had with Catholic Charities.

Member Reese thought the work Catholic Charities did was incredible and he was excited to hear about the partnership. He thanked Chair Hill and Member Jardon for their involvement in the partnership between the CC and Catholic Charities. He asked whether the CC provided a place for people to use the restroom, shower, and laundry facilities. Ms. Searcy responded there were two-bathroom units, two shower units, and a temporary laundry unit available to the guests. Those facilities would be demolished and removed once the new bathroom buildings were built. She noted the wear and tear on the facilities had happened much sooner than predicted. She explained a temporary shower unit was purchased because it was cheaper than renting one.

22-033C **AGENDA ITEM 9** Discussion of the continued need for the existence of the Community Homelessness Advisory Board, or the current need for the Community Homelessness Advisory Board to conduct monthly meetings, with the possibility that the Board will take action to reduce the number of meetings to at least one meeting every quarter or take action to recommend to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners that the Community Homelessness Advisory Board be dissolved.

Vice Chair Lawson said the Community Homelessness Advisory Board (CHAB) had made a lot of good things happen, including the Cares Campus. He thought the jurisdictions' cooperation and ability to come together in a common fight were outstanding. He noted many people in the community had passionate opinions on how to solve the homelessness problem and stated that CHAB still had a long way to go regarding the issue.

Vice Chair Lawson opined meeting every quarter was not enough and suggested meeting every other month. He noted the Cares Campus had come a long way in the year it had been open. He opined it was important to keep the Cares Campus progressing and for the County staff to hear from the jurisdictions.

Member Dahir opined that CHAB should continue having monthly meetings because the jurisdictions were getting closer to being able to give someone a path out of homelessness, but they were not there yet. He loved that CHAB was an example to the community of how the jurisdictions could work together. He proposed specific focuses for each meeting, with every other meeting's purpose being a time for the Cities of Sparks and Reno to give an update on the work being done. That meeting schedule, he opined, would relieve strain on County resources. He worried if CHAB meetings were held every other month, members of the Board would not have the homelessness issue as present in their thoughts. He wanted to see the work of CHAB continue and more work done for the veteran community and youth.

Member Jardon had mixed feelings about CHAB meetings. She noted the Board had accomplished so much in one year and was on the cusp of seeing the Cares Campus come to fruition and become transformative. The work for the County every month to hold CHAB meetings was heavy, and she understood the construction period the Cares Campus was entering in would be a massive time consumption for County personnel. She opined that CHAB was a way to exchange information with the community and noted the crowds at the meetings had grown. She was flexible with the meeting schedule but stated she did not want to see the Board dissolve.

Member Lucey opined each member of the Board had worked to carry the message of the Board to their jurisdictions to make homelessness a front-facing issue. He noted the mission of the Board was to act as a transitional board to find long-term solutions for individuals in the community that experienced homelessness. He acknowledged that CHAB was a clearinghouse for individuals and groups to come to and that a lot of community effort had been put into combating homelessness. The Cares Campus, he

explained, was moving into a period of construction and the Board needed to allow staff time to handle the construction. Instead of staff spending time putting together meetings, he opined they should be spending time doing the job the Board had tasked them with doing.

Member Lucey said if there were specific issues that came up, the Board could address them at that time. He opined that CHAB should move to quarterly meetings. He said the Regional Continuum of Care had been established and meetings were held with managers to evaluate what work needed to be done. Moving to quarterly meetings, he said, would allow staff to get more work done. He noted the jurisdictions worked structurally and functionally together and that needed to continue.

Member Lucey opined the homelessness issue came down to funding and allowing time to address issues going forward. He opined the Board had needed to meet every month when it first started, however, the foundation had been put in place and it was time to step back and allow staff to work on the issues. Quarterly meetings would allow staff time to show the Board substantial progress. He proposed that the Board meet in June and reminded that CHAB was formed as a transitional board. He thought the agencies and people who had an intimate role in addressing homelessness would attend meetings if they were held in a capacity other than CHAB.

Member Reese stated he was agnostic about how often CHAB met. He understood the staff resources and time that went into the meetings. He noted similar concerns were heard at every CHAB meeting. He said it had been repeatedly requested that the Board include people with lived experience in the matter. He understood it would take some fundamental changes to the body to allow that, but he felt it was worth a conversation. He opined the Chair should call meetings as needed, with meetings occurring not less than quarterly.

Chair Hill was in awe at the work done by CHAB before she even joined the Board. She opined if the number of meetings was reduced that would allow staff time to move into the Continuum of Care and follow the Built for Zero model. She thought it was important that CHAB establish relationships and continue the dialogue. She proposed that CHAB return in June to put together a schedule that would include meetings no less than quarterly. If additional issues arose, then meetings could be called at that time.

Member Lucey believed if the meetings were switched to quarterly, Special Projects Manager Dana Searcy would work with staff to provide memos and updates to the Board when needed. If an issue arose that was of grave interest to the Board, then the Chair could call a meeting. He opined concurrent meetings with the jurisdictions could be easily conducted. The concurrent meetings, he explained, would be helpful to identify how to move forward with planning because decisions could be made that could not be made at CHAB.

Member Jardon was open to the idea of quarterly meetings to give staff more time to accomplish goals. She opined it was important to give clarity to the

community regarding the CHAB meeting schedule because the meetings were where people got information regarding the homelessness issue. She requested that important information, such as updates regarding showers and the foodservice contract, be added to the website and provided to the community. She believed the community at large was interested in updates regarding homelessness services. If CHAB moved to quarterly meetings, she wanted to see the option for the Chair to call meetings when needed.

Chair Hill noted staff informed her that CHAB was required to meet quarterly according to the bylaws. She said Ms. Searcy had been very transparent during the issue with the showers by posting the information on the website and sending emails to the Board. She opined it was important for the Board to stay updated and check the website for developments.

Member Reese thought the meetings might need to be longer if the Board moved to quarterly meetings. Chair Hill opined the meeting length would be dependent on the agenda items and a longer meeting could be planned for.

Member Lucey noted the concern from the Board regarding outreach and the distribution of updates. He asked Ms. Searcy if there was a localized place on the County website for individuals to get monthly updates about situations that arose. Ms. Searcy said the Regional Homeless Services email address was a way to update the Board regarding issues and the Board could submit questions to that email. She noted there were many opportunities for people with lived experiences to provide feedback, such as committees and advisory boards.

Member Lucey made a motion to reschedule CHAB meetings to a quarterly basis and have staff provide monthly updates to the Board regarding pertinent information. Vice Chair Lawson seconded the motion. Member Jardon clarified members of the Board could still request potential future agenda items for meetings. Member Dahir said he would not argue with the will of the Board, however, he felt CHAB was a body to hold people accountable for action and to bring the community together. He thought that would be lacking if meetings moved to quarterly. He recognized the CHAB meeting took away from staff's time to make progress, and he said that was the reason he could agree with quarterly meetings.

Member Lucey mentioned when CHAB started it was three members that met in a caucus room and there was no participation from the community or transparency. He acknowledged that CHAB was able to get engagement from the community by making the meetings public. He opined Ms. Searcy and staff heard the complaints and challenges from the community more than the Board did because they were on the front line. He noted that CHAB was an advisory board and if structural changes needed to be made, it would not be by the CHAB board. He said the entities had a unified mission and could take serious issues that needed to be addressed back to the jurisdictional boards for action. He opined when situations came up in the community, individuals contacted staff to have action taken immediately rather than waiting to attend a CHAB meeting for action. He thought an advisory board was only beneficial to build a foundation, which had already been done.

Member Jardon noted most groups had a point of interest and she heard from groups in the past who preferred a more in-depth discussion about their point of interest. She said her jurisdiction had found a lot of success in holding issue-based Zoom meetings. She opined the meetings could be held by a single jurisdiction and open to anyone who wanted to participate. She thought that would be an outlet for issue-based discussion in between the quarterly meetings.

Member Lucey pointed out the success of the Cares Campus that came to fruition through a concurrent meeting during COVID-19. He noted Our Place had won the Cashman Good Government Award. He opined what the jurisdictions had accomplished together in five years was tremendous. He believed people recognized Northern Nevada as a true leader in addressing homelessness. The proof, he said, was there and it was now time to let staff do their job.

Chair Hill opined there were opportunities for the jurisdictions to conduct issue-specific discussions that were not public meetings that required staff time. She asked for collaboration with Members Dahir and Jardon regarding the issue.

On motion by Member Lucey, seconded by Vice Chair Lawson, which motion duly carried on a 6-0 vote, it was ordered that the number of Community Homelessness Advisory Board meetings be reduced to at least one meeting every quarter.

22-034C **AGENDA ITEM 10** Board members announcements, reports, and updates to include requests for future board agenda items.

Member Reese wanted to ensure the Board was addressing the climate issues that affected the unsheltered population. He asked for an update on the regional protocols regarding smoke, heat, and cold. He opined it was important to be proactive regarding the matter.

Member Jardon asked for an update on how the Cares Campus would keep the 600-person capacity throughout construction. She requested a snapshot of where the affordable housing units would be located. Member Lucey said Mr. Brian Bonnenfant, Project Manager for the Center for Regional Studies at the University of Nevada, Reno, gave a wonderful presentation regarding affordable housing. He opined it would be beneficial to have Mr. Bonnenfant present to the Board at a future meeting.

Member Dahir thought the Board needed to do an assessment regarding mental health issues and set a goal for accomplishments. Chair Hill was in discussion with staff regarding the rental assistance programs and mentioned there would be a future presentation to the Board regarding the matter.

22-035C **AGENDA ITEM 11** Public Comment.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

* * * * *

11:25 a.m. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

ALEXIS HILL, Chair
Community Homelessness Advisory Board

ATTEST:

JANIS GALASSINI, County Clerk

*Minutes Prepared by:
Evonne Strickland, Deputy County Clerk*