

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

THURSDAY

9:00 A.M.

SEPTEMBER 19, 2019

PRESENT:

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

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

The Community Homelessness Advisory Board convened at 9:02 a.m. at the McKinley Arts & Culture Center, 925 Riverside Drive, Nevada. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, the Clerk called the roll and the Board conducted the following business:

Associate Director of OrgCode Consulting, Inc. Tracy Flaherty-Willmott and Associate David Tweedie introduced themselves. Chair Lucey pointed out that Reno City Vice Mayor Naomi Duerr and Sparks City Councilmember Charlene Bybee were also present.

19-086C AGENDA ITEM 2 Public Comment.

Ms. Elise Weatherly thanked Second Judicial Court Judge Egan Walker for two separate decisions he made regarding Reverend Marvin Neal and the custody of her grandson. She told a story about her daughter's homelessness and said money should not be given to those who would not work for it.

Mr. Jeff Church provided documents to the Board, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. He expressed frustration that the public could only comment before the presentations or after decisions were made. Quoting from the OrgCode Consulting, Inc. report, he said the purpose was to connect individuals experiencing homelessness to permanent housing without preconditions. He expressed concern that drug addicts and criminals, among others, would receive free housing without conditions. He wished to have 10 minutes to present an opposite point of view. He promoted several videos which addressed homelessness.

Mr. Jay Kolbet-Clausell remarked it was difficult to obtain information about this meeting, telling two stories about encounters with Reno Direct and a representative from the Regional Transportation Commission. He implored the Board to

was not merely enough to coordinate entry into their services; they needed to facilitate passage through and exit from it. Providing housing was only the first step and they needed to help ensure people would never experience the indignity of homelessness.

Mr. Tweedie mentioned online surveys were used to allow people to anonymously provide feedback. He stated OrgCode's intention was to hear from as many people as possible to inform what the appropriate pathways forward might be. He stressed strong leadership was needed to help prevent and end homelessness. He contested it was easier for a person to refrain from substance abuse, get connected to a doctor, and receive mental and physical health services from a home as opposed to a shelter. He admitted providing housing first was a challenge, not just for his staff but for any collective group of people working in homelessness services.

Mr. Tweedie stated the biggest predictor of future homelessness was having experienced it in the past. He provided an illustration of someone initially staying with family members, then friends, then people they didn't know well, and finally people with whom they needed to trade something for a place to stay. In that situation, people would often rather be homeless than turn to a shelter. In addition to wanting to prevent that situation, he indicated providing housing was financially wise; one homeless person cost a community \$1 million a year. He noted the longer someone stayed in a homeless shelter, the less likely they would be to seek to end their own homelessness.

Mr. Tweedie stated there was no one solution for having an adequate supply of housing, but the available housing should go to the most vulnerable or sick. Additionally, effort must be made to ensure those people stayed housed and worked toward a robust, healthy life. He indicated part of the visioning session would be used to determine what Nevadans valued and how they envisioned their homeless services. Ultimately, the groups would determine which community services could support specific goals, such as preventing death or ensuring housing that could be maintained.

Mr. Tweedie questioned what it would take to make homeless shelters only part of a process and not the ultimate destination for the homeless. He posited homelessness was not caused simply by the failure of homelessness services, but by the failure of the behavior health, foster care, and criminal justice systems. He felt it was important to shift from managing homelessness to ending homelessness by connecting the most vulnerable to housing resources using criteria such as the length of time homeless or the likelihood of death.

Mr. Tweedie said the first step in preventing the trauma of homelessness was rallying homelessness supports and other systems, such as mental health teams, hospitals, and police forces, which were not running at peak efficiency. The second part involved shelters evaluating what was and was not working. Based on evidence, a housing-first approach was proven to be the most effective, instead of requiring people to resolve every issue in their lives before earning the right to housing.

Mr. Tweedie stated the leadership around homelessness needed to be related to a COC rather than a single entity; it needed to be a body that was most connected to homelessness services. Determining who led this was pivotal. He said their responsibilities would include designating and operating a homeless management information system to track outcomes, and coordinating entry into and out of services. This visioning session was set up in response to the recommendation to determine the lead agency for a COC. He remarked the discussions should determine which agencies were not included to ensure the best coverage to end homelessness. In evaluating the effectiveness of certain entities, it was important to support each entity to better end homelessness. He stressed the leadership needed to understand the urgency of the work they were performing because it was not simple.

Mr. Tweedie emphasized the importance of having a coordinated response to entry into the system, regardless of whether a person came through the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Mental Health, or a shelter. Additionally, determining how to ensure all people had the correct documentation and how to build on each person's strengths was important. He noted the leadership team needed to convey that they did not have all the answers but had more information and resources than a person who was experiencing their first episode of homelessness.

9:38 a.m. Member Berkbigler left the meeting.

Mr. Tweedie defined coordinated outreach as targeting people who were not requesting services versus passively accepting those who showed up for services. He said people should not slip through the cracks because of faults in technological processes. He indicated housing navigators needed to become experts in engaging funders and traversing the many steps in obtaining housing. Eliminating a few of these steps could result in someone spending less time homeless. He explained the ongoing supply of housing resources did not only include government-funded housing, but it included the full, up-to-date portfolio of available housing. He said a mechanism telling when vacancies opened up or would open up needed to exist, as did a system matching people experiencing homelessness with the proper solution.

Mr. Tweedie mentioned communities were shifting away from having tiebreakers between individuals with the same assessment scores, which were based on factors such as substance abuse, mental health, and physical illness challenges. Rather, they were moving toward a dynamic prioritization based on more general dangers. He thought discussions could be held locally to decide whether that was applicable in Nevada as well.

Mr. Tweedie reiterated shelters should be a first response in situations where prevention and diversion did not succeed; they should be a process by which people get housed. He felt activities that did not focus on housing, such as feeding programs, muddied the message that shelters were working to end people's housing issues. He acknowledged Volunteers of America had a significant part in that process but they were not the total answer. He said the people in this visioning session might not

align on everything but there could be systems of commonality. Another aspect was measuring the effectiveness of the community's resources with regard to utilizing a housing-first approach and connecting people with the support needed to prevent future homelessness.

Mr. Tweedie cautioned that high levels of granularity were not always beneficial to leadership, who needed to know the number of people permanently housed on an ongoing basis. He said the statistics should not be about output, they should be about the outcome. Citing local point-in-time statistics, he said the totals were increasing over time, but more alarmingly the counts only reflected the numbers on a single day of the year. He indicated many communities in North America were using personalized lists of homeless individuals, including their names. The ultimate goal was a dashboard that showed who was already in the system in a given month, who entered the system, who left into permanent housing, who left the system but was not permanently housed, and the final count. This would provide a real-time metric that showed where any breakdowns in the process were occurring, such as a lack of housing supply or the length of time it took someone to get housed. He pointed out halving the time it took someone to get housed would effectively double the housing supply. He indicated relying on permanent supportive housing or rapid re-housing alone were not the only answers. These federally-funded resources were valuable, but the entire diversity of housing options needed to be considered.

Mr. Tweedie recognized there was a lot of work involved with targeting specific populations and systems as well. He said he wanted to have the right data communicated in a way that was meaningful, which could mean streamlining the questions asked to obtain the most meaningful pieces of information. He pointed out the data in the 'Housing First Saves Money' slides were not based on local statistics. He admitted housing alone did not cause these costs to drop to zero but it did drop them substantially. He also said housing provided quality of life savings since people were not interacting daily with police or mental health services. The estimated cost savings was one reason that a housing-first approach was a nationally-prescribed best practice.

Mr. Tweedie said OrgCode was a little behind on their timeline but several steps after the visioning session were already underway. OrgCode was available to support the lead agency and allow the community to have a voice in the visioning.

19-088C **AGENDA ITEM 4** Overview of activities and collaborations required to prevent and end chronic homelessness – OrgCode Consulting, Inc.

Associate Director of OrgCode Consulting, Inc. Tracy Flaherty-Willmott conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She reviewed slides with the following titles: Outline for our Day Together; Why We Are Gathered; Objectives For Our Day Together; A Lot Afoot in Reno-Sparks-Washoe; Participation; What is Asked; Ending Homelessness is Possible; Personal & System Motivation; Myths Impede Success; Motivation (2 slides); You Could Be Given All the Technical Assistance; Turning Motivation Into Action; Do People In Your Community

Believe What You Believe?; When People Cannot Compel People with WHY; The Alternative to Inspiration; Why Shaming and Blaming Into Submission Does Not Work; Why Do You Want to End/Address Homelessness; The Foundation of a Road Map; We believe...; 5 Core Principles; We believe...; What Does Ending Homelessness Mean?; and Table Discussion.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott said the purpose of the meeting was to figure out how to make progress in preventing and ending homelessness. She noted it was her first time connecting with community partners but she had been the project manager on this initiative since July of 2018. She felt it was important for communities to consider what they were doing to end homelessness and, if it was not working, to evaluate it along with evidence-informed practices to determine a plan of action. She told a brief story of her home island of Newfoundland, Canada.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott explained an operational review was an opportunity to do a needs assessment. OrgCode was doing that all across North America, Australia, and New Zealand. She said communities were evaluating whether evidence suggested there were different ways to prevent and end homelessness. She pointed out the point-in-time statistics showed the homeless numbers continued to increase, which presented an opportunity to do things differently. She opined the vast majority of housing, enforcement, and healthcare resources went toward treating symptoms of homelessness rather than getting people the support they needed.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott said one reason some communities were reconsidering the actions they had been taking was because an approach based on law enforcement did not work to address complicated social issues such as homelessness. In San Diego, for example, each law enforcement interaction cost \$56,000. She said no one aspect, from law enforcement to first responders to mental health providers to emergency service providers, was the solution. She suggested a balance had to be struck between ensuring public safety was identified and arresting people as a way to address homelessness. A second reason communities were reconsidering their actions was because homelessness began to feel normal after a while; having a dignified place to be could feel unnatural. She explained communities were doing things differently because people experiencing homelessness were in pain and afraid, and because of the pain of people who lost loved ones. She felt communities needed to figure out how to reclaim the potential of those people's lives, decrease the economic costs around homelessness, and capitalize on the opportunity for people to be connected to their community.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott mentioned there would be an opportunity to break into small groups and discuss why people wanted to prevent and end homelessness. She stated ending homelessness was possible but difficult. Doing so involved all sectors of the community naming the problem, owning any steps taken in the past that exacerbated the problem, and resolving to do something different. She indicated some of the eligibility criteria put in place over the prior decade reduced the capacity to help people return to a state of housing stability. Additionally, some personal and system motivations

to end homelessness could get in the way of success. She stated the only way to prevent and end homelessness was through a sense of shared ownership and a sense of urgency.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott pointed out the region had over 400 permanent supportive housing units but no one she spoke to could tell her where they were. As such, they were not helping the community prevent and end homelessness. She said the number of people experiencing chronic homelessness was increasing every year and the average length of homelessness was up to nine years. Communities needed to recognize people in that situation had nine years of trauma, including more interactions with emergency responders and exposure to violence. Remaining homeless was traumatic, which decreased the likelihood of being housed quickly.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott remarked that organizations like the Reno Area Alliance for the Homeless (RAAH), business owners, political leaders, and the general public all had a vested interest in solving the problem, even if the reasons for that interest varied. She said it was natural for there to be a lot of passion about the topic because there was a lot of pain; harnessing that energy was important rather than assuming there was one solution. She said leadership needed to ensure businesses wanted to continue operating in the area, which was important for the economy, as well as ensuring tourists felt safe and residents in the community had the opportunity to live with dignity.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott explained there would be an opportunity to have small group discussions with people who held different values and beliefs. Facilitators who worked in homelessness fields would be asked to lead the discussions. She stressed everything done during this session was designed to increase the understanding of what was working in communities and to increase the sense of shared ownership. She said the focus of this session was to determine the reason why this community worked to prevent and end homelessness. She opined the solution for ending homelessness was tied to housing. She clarified that did not mean person's rent and bills would be paid and that person could do whatever they wanted; it meant changing the old criteria which had been used to demonstrate a person's readiness to be housed. Research showed the solution to ending homelessness was not only directly tied to housing, but also helping people get the support they needed to address the issues that brought them into homelessness.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott stated she used to adhere to the belief that services should only be available to people who were worthy by presenting themselves in a certain way. With time, new policies took form, including simplifying intake forms and visiting families where they were staying. She stated some policies were created with the best intentions but they had nothing to do with assisting people, they were about protecting the agency.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott said people experiencing homelessness were often called 'the homeless', which made them lose their humanity. This sometimes allowed decisions to be made without considering consequences. She stated all people experiencing homelessness were not the same and some beliefs about them were untrue. Despite the strong correlation between poverty and homelessness, someone in poverty

would not necessarily experience homelessness; less than 1 percent of any community experienced homelessness. She said much could be learned from people who experienced intergenerational poverty but not homelessness. She said many people with mental illnesses did not experience homelessness, though people who experienced long-term homelessness were more likely to have compromised mental wellness. Citing the ‘Myths Impede Success’ slide, she pointed out most people with alcohol or substance dependence struggled with their addictions but were not homeless.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott said some people were motivated to help because they felt it was part of their life’s work. Others were motivated by personal morality, whether because of a belief that nobody deserved to live like that or a belief that resources were provided to those who would make the most of them. She referenced an earlier slide, which claimed a community could save \$2.2 million by housing and supporting people. The final primary motivation to end homelessness was concern about the impact to the safety of the community. She stressed none of these motivations was more important than another. She said most communities told OrgCode about what they did to help address the issue first, and only then would they discuss how they did so. She said some communities considered permanent supportive housing as truly permanent while others limited it to two years. She said communities rarely talked about why they were motivated to help. She expressed talking about why made it easier to collaborate and find solutions rather than argue over finite resources.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott commented the difficult part was harnessing the various beliefs and motivations to make decisions using a common voice. It was important that people understood why decisions were being made that were different than the ones in the past. She explained assistance was historically given to people experiencing homelessness for the first time without considering their needs. However, in areas where chronic homelessness was on the rise, consideration needed to be given to doing things differently since too few people were leaving the system. She said leadership also had to figure out how to ensure the work being done produced results.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott said different motivations could result in tensions with the approaches utilized. She said there would always be people who did not heed the evidence-based key practices that were proven to prevent and end homelessness. She opined that, without a clear understanding of the motivation behind trying to help, people relied on strategies that were fun but ineffective. This could result in people resorting to manipulation to try to achieve their goals. Leadership that shamed and blamed could inadvertently undermine the continuum of care. She remarked two goals of the visioning session were determining a shared vision and a method to proceed with accountability and transparency.

10:43 a.m. The Board recessed.

11:04 a.m. The Board reconvened with Member Berkbigler absent.

Chair Lucey announced there was no longer a quorum of the Reno City Council.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott reviewed a timeline for the remainder of the visioning session. She asked each person present to think about why they were interested in preventing and ending homelessness, at which point everyone would break into small groups to discuss their motivations. She requested each table write down the reasons to be collected and used by the Community Homelessness Advisory Board to create one shared vision.

11:07 a.m. Attendees broke into small groups; there was no quorum of the Community Homelessness Advisory Board in any group.

11:23 a.m. The Board reconvened with Members Berkbigler and Delgado absent.

David Tweedie, Associate with OrgCode Consulting, Inc., pointed out he saw several recurring themes in the answers gathered, one of which was the belief that housing was a basic human right. There was an additional belief that everyone was a stakeholder in the community. He saw a desire to collaboratively improve services to everyone and not rely on each agency's portion of the overall responsibility. He indicated he would compile the answers written, but he observed the results showed more commonalities than some other communities OrgCode had worked with.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott stated one person's desire to help end homelessness for economic reasons was not mutually exclusive from someone else's motivation to help because housing was a basic human right. That could also reduce the cost of emergency responses. She stressed the importance of creating principles which would provide the framework for how to dedicate finite resources, measure success, and recognize not all programs would be successful. Sometimes failures provided the groundwork for changing the process. She reviewed some of the common beliefs held by communities across North America who had changed how they attempted to end homelessness. She mentioned she took part in many programs that were, in hindsight, horrible programs, but they were thought to be the best at the time. Having transparency and accountability meant taking responsibility for some of those programs but tweaking them to demonstrate that everyone had a right to service. She said innovation took risks but it had to come with a sense of ownership and urgency.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott reviewed the core principles that worked in other communities. The first was treating people with respect and dignity as opposed to imposing various home-readiness requirements. The second was allowing people to have a choice in their housing because people placed in locations they did not want were less likely to stay there. Regarding recovery orientation, she pointed out people were expected to have all their issues resolved first and they would be rewarded with housing. She contested substance abuse would likely increase in a homeless state because substances were used to take away pain and fear. Even the substances people took were dictated by their housing situation. Women, for example, might take substances that kept them awake

so they could be safer. She acknowledged substance abuse might go up initially when someone was first housed because being housed might feel abnormal. Research and experience showed substance use usually decreased over time as long as housing stability continued. She argued doing nothing but housing someone with mental illness improved the symptoms associated with their mental wellness.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott admitted each person or family's needs varied in their journey back from homelessness. Service providers needed to be ready to adapt and address issues most relevant to the particular situation. Lastly, it should be acknowledged that people experiencing chronic homelessness created long-term relationships; they needed help reintegrating into their community or they could gravitate back to their old social relationships.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott said communities needed to determine how to serve people without creating barriers which branded some people as unworthy of services. A social service agency that refused to serve people served no purpose. She indicated there were still expectations that needed to be met with low-barrier services. Acknowledging human dignity and utilizing a person-centric approach ensured that decisions were made to prevent and end homelessness.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott explained ending homelessness did not mean that zero people within the region would experience housing instability, crisis, or homelessness. It meant there would be a community response to those experiencing housing instability. She said one goal was to help people resolve their housing crises by finding other safe places that did not require them to leave their community. This did not include the use of shelters, which could still be traumatic for people; third-party agencies were for people who did not have immediate access to shelter or basic needs. She said even shelters which provided access to basic needs could still cause a person's vulnerability to increase.

Mr. Gordon Gossage asked for the definition of chronic homelessness. Ms. Flaherty-Willmott responded the American definition of chronic homelessness was any homeless situation that lasted for more than a year. Mr. Tweedie clarified it was defined by a year or more of living somewhere not meant for human habitation or in an emergency shelter, with an accompanying disabling condition. He listed a number of physical and mental health conditions.

Mr. Gossage asked which North American city best achieved its goal. Mr. Tweedie answered both Salt Lake City, Utah and New Orleans, Louisiana reduced their homelessness by more than 90 percent. Ms. Flaherty-Willmott listed a number of Canadian communities of comparable size to this region which also achieved this. She added that Canada defined chronic homelessness as being homeless for six months with no disability requirement.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott invited people to discuss whether any of the beliefs adopted by successful communities triggered anything.

11:51 a.m. Attendees broke into small groups; there was no quorum of the Community Homelessness Advisory Board in any group.

12:02 p.m. The Board reconvened with Members Berkgigler and Delgado absent.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott asked which beliefs were the most challenging to get behind. She said sometimes people attributed the most challenging 15 to 20 percent of people experiencing homelessness as the face of homelessness. She admitted there would always be people who refused support and outreach, and the housing needed by people who were very unwell was different than for healthy individuals. This is where permanent supportive housing units and assisted living became very important; the whole realm of housing options needed to be considered. She said many of the people who most needed services were historically told they were not eligible for various reasons. She changed her perception from wondering what was wrong with a person to wondering what happened to them. Communities needed to revisit how they defined success and how they provided options that made sense based on people's needs.

Mr. Donald Gallimore Sr. said his group discussed the 5 to 20 percent of people who were not amenable to solutions. He said the group was unsure whether to prioritize the 80 percent or to consider the smaller percentage in the prioritization process. When Ms. Flaherty-Willott posed the question to the audience, the general consensus was the 80 percent should not receive higher priority.

Ms. Lisa Lee of the Foundation for Recovery said there were a number of programs that failed people and she identified with those people. She told a story of a person who has been on a prioritization list for two and a half years but was now going back to prison. She said they had not been able to locate a rental option for this person with multiple barriers. She thought the community needed to be more proactive, not just in seeking out vouchers for market-rate rentals but with single room occupancies and group living. As someone who experienced eight years of episodic homelessness, she explained her sense of isolation drove her back outside. Some people felt they were isolated from their community when they were housed. She stated the system failed to meet their needs as individuals, noting people used to camping in groups needed to be set up in group living situations.

In response to Mr. Gossage's inquiry about triage, Ms. Flaherty-Willmott responded systems and programs tended to select nice people sooner than those with numerous challenges, or those whose relationships with the homeless community could reduce the likelihood of staying housed. She said people rejecting help was more symptomatic of the system not meeting the needs of the people. Mr. Gossage posited triage was used to help different types of people rather than determining eligibility.

Mr. Tweedie responded with an example of how three different medical emergencies would be prioritized based on the stakes of the injuries. Mr. Gossage concluded no one should be turned away. Mr. Tweedie agreed but not because of a scarcity of resources. He stated it did not come down to helping the 80 percent over the

20 percent, but rather directing the right intervention to the right person based on their level of vulnerability.

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

12:15 p.m. The Board recessed.

1:18 p.m. The Board reconvened with Members Berkbigler and Delgado absent.

19-089C **AGENDA ITEM 5** System Design Session: Creating a High Functioning System of Care.

- a. Visioning Exercise
- b. Small Group Discussion on Redesign/Enhancement Activities
- c. Breakthrough Thinking for Priority Setting & Action Planning

Associate Director of OrgCode Consulting, Inc. Tracy Flaherty-Willmott conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She reviewed slides with the following titles: The Opportunity for Creative Destruction; Every system is perfectly designed; Conservation; Creative Destruction; Renewal & Re-Organization; Rebirth; System of Care; Interconnectivity of our System; Things to Remember...; High Functioning Systems; Opportunities for Enhancements; Time to Generate Creative Destruction; Clearly Explain the Problem to be Solved; Explore Goals, Activities, Partners; and Next Steps.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott indicated some approaches inadvertently compounded the community's homelessness issue and stressed the importance of learning from those mistakes. She compared a service system to a forest, saying the agencies getting the most attention thrived the most. New ways of doing things never materialized because long-standing approaches had reached a stage of maturity. In this conservation stage, it was important to never underestimate the drive for self-preservation. She stated it was natural to preserve what was being done.

Continuing her comparison, Ms. Flaherty-Willmott said soil in any area that was burned too long became destroyed. However, certain trees required massive heat to produce seeds. She said the canopy within conservation kept some of the potential of a system of care locked. In some communities, a creative destruction approach meant discontinuing all processes and starting over from scratch. Other communities recognized the value of controlled burns, enhancing or tweaking certain programs and stopping certain approaches that got in the way of ending homelessness. She admitted renewal and re-organization could be uncomfortable because old methodology was gone, even if those old methods did not work. However, as progress was seen and people recognized that different approaches were not bad, potential could be unlocked.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott commented one of the biggest challenges was creating a system of care that worked collaboratively where each agency was dedicated to the same vision. While collecting data was important, it did not tell what the system of

care was doing well and what didn't work. She said the lead agency needed the authority to create a performance framework which incentivized obtaining the desired results. It needed to increase the sense of urgency around funding, policy creation, and quality control. She noted connecting people to permanent solutions meant connecting people who were utilizing one service to other services as needed. She said faith-based agencies were instrumental in helping people gain and stay in housing by supplying furniture and other basic needs.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott stated communities who did not have a shared vision often reverted to doing things how they had always been done. The vision needed to be shared by political leaders, service providers, businesspeople, and faith-based agencies. She pointed out most communities had not invested in affordable housing in decades but were shocked that homelessness was an issue. People running agencies were responsible for people's livelihoods and incentives to fight for those agencies regardless of the outcomes achieved resulted when money was lost. She noted data needed to be evaluated to see whether agencies were achieving the rehousing outcomes they wanted.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott remarked the science of ending homelessness was tied not only to continuum of care (COC) activities, but to a performance framework. She thought those working with the most vulnerable needed the most training and the highest compensation. She also felt expectations and procedures should be standardized among shelters across the community. It was important that the finite resources provided by federal or state governments were used on the target population for which they were received. These were all things a lead agency needed to do to get the results they needed.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott said OrgCode would provide five areas where they had recommendations for enhancement. She said there was an opportunity to be innovative and include potential priorities within the COC to achieve the desired results. She explained how the next breakout session would occur and assigned individuals familiar with each topic to lead those discussions.

Ms. Flaherty-Willmott encouraged people to take on various roles, including playing devil's advocate; different opinions and beliefs were positive things. She wanted the discussions to be informed by a sense of urgency.

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

1:39 p.m. Attendees broke into small groups; there was no quorum of the Community Homelessness Advisory Board in any group.

2:24 p.m. The Board reconvened with Members Berkbigler and Delgado absent.

19-090C **AGENDA ITEM 6** Finalizing Next Steps for Preventing and Ending Chronic Homelessness.

Associate Director of OrgCode Consulting, Inc. Tracy Flaherty-Willmott noted the Community Homelessness Advisory Board would soon lose quorum and public comment needed to be taken before that happened. She stated Associate David Tweedie would compile summaries of the answers written down during the breakout sessions; these would be used to help create a platform and make recommendations around guiding principles. She concluded this session was only a starting point, not a conclusion.

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

19-091C **AGENDA ITEM 8** Public Comment.

Mr. Gordon Gossage was called but opted not to speak.

Mr. Tim McGivney, author of an article called “Reno’s Homeless Plan Will Never Work – I should Know”, expressed frustration at the short notice for this meeting. He stated the entity Quality of Life – Reno (QOL) had a plan that would work because he felt a housing-first approach would not. He claimed the town of Burien, Washington irradiated homelessness using a plan similar to QOL’s. He claimed Reno Gospel Mission did not accept federal funding so their program helped people with drug dependency while the Veterans of America experienced violence because they could not require sobriety. He wanted an end of federal funding.

Chief Deputy County Clerk Jan Galassini noted Ms. Elise Weatherly left but provided a copy of her comments for the record.

* * * * *

2:30 p.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:
Derek Sonderfan, Deputy County Clerk*