

SOUTHERN NEVADA HOMELESSNESS CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
January 14, 2024

In attendance:

Abigail Frierson, Clark County, NV
Alyson Martinez, Las Vegas Rescue Mission
Dr. Albert D. Chavez, Campus for Hope
Amy Jones, Social Service provider
Angela Ranck, HMIS Lead
Arcelia Barajas, City of Las Vegas
Brenda Barnes, CoC Director, Collaborative Applicant
Davion Smith, Youth Action Board
Donica Martinez, Lived X Consultants
Elizabeth Jarman, Veterans Administration
Kevin Murray, SilverSummit Health plan
Kim Jefferies, Campus for Hope
Lauren Boitel, ImpactNV
Lisa Corrado, City of Henderson
Martin Castro, Lived X Consultants
Miguel Davila Uzcategui, Community Advocate
PJ Moore, Coordinated Entry Lead Entity
Wilson Ramos, City of North Las Vegas

Absent:

Agenda Item 1. Call to Order.

The meeting of the Southern Nevada Homelessness Continuum of Care Board was called to order at 3:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 14th 2024, Via Teams.

Agenda Item 2. Approval of the minutes from December 10th, 2023 SNHCoC Board meeting; for possible action.

A motion was made to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved.

Agenda Item 3. Approval of the Agenda with the inclusion of any emergency items and deletion of any items; for possible action

A motion was made to approve the agenda. The motion was approved.

Agenda Item 4. Presentation on the Housing Market Analysis by Michelle Larime from the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC); for possible action.

The Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) 2050 presentation outlined the region's long-term, community-led vision for growth, with a strong emphasis on housing affordability, economic opportunity, and transportation access. The analysis highlighted widening gaps between housing costs and wages, with roughly half of renters in Clark County experiencing cost burden, alongside persistent homelessness trends. A regional housing needs assessment estimates approximately 445,000 new housing units will be required by 2050 to accommodate population growth, address underproduction, and reduce homelessness, with the greatest needs concentrated among households earning below 60% of area median income. Community engagement findings showed broad support for more affordable and supportive housing, reinvestment in existing neighborhoods, improved transit, and access to jobs and amenities, with housing preferences varying by age, income, race/ethnicity, and disability status. The presentation concluded with next steps focused on scenario planning and development of a Regional Housing Strategy to guide SNS 2050 plan adoption and implementation.

Agenda Item 5. Receive an Update by the Collaborative Applicant; for possible action.

Brenda Barnes, Collaborative Applicant, shared an update that outlines key changes and clarifications related to the 2025 Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO). Renewal projects will utilize reallocated funds referenced in HUD's reposting of the FY 2024/2025 NOFO, while eligible new projects under the currently open NOFO are limited to permanent housing models, including Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), Rapid Rehousing (RRH), Transitional Housing/RRH, joint projects, and Coordinated Entry services only. Recent community work aligned with priorities released in December 2024 is temporarily on hold, as HUD is expected to release a new NOFO later this summer with updated priorities, though the community will be well prepared due to prior planning efforts. Of the 36 grants up for renewal, 13 have confirmed renewal including some that previously planned not to renew and no projects have indicated non-renewal at this time, with confirmations due by Friday at 5:00 p.m. HUD has stated that while awards may be announced, funds

will not be released until ongoing court proceedings conclude, which the team anticipates could be by the end of February. If HUD prevails, they will revert to last December's priorities. \$200,000 in planning grant funds have become available and the Board will continue discussions on how to allocate these funds, including consideration of technical assistance and other eligible priorities.

Agenda Item 6. Board and Collaborative Applicant Relations & Communications; for possible action.

The Board communicated concerns to the Collaborative Applicant regarding ongoing gaps in communication. Specifically, members noted a lack of timely and sufficient information related to the Coordinated Entry Lead Entity and the NOFO process. As a result, the Board expressed that decisions often felt rushed, limiting their ability to adequately research, assess options, and engage in thoughtful deliberation prior to decision-making.

Elizabeth Jarman, Board Member, Veterans Administration, stated “*My concern is the bigger issue of the lack of communication to the Board about the CE Lead Entity. Because the last thing I heard at a Board meeting was that they had selected a contractor and we're in the process of getting up and running, and then I found out through happenstance at our in person meeting at City Las Vegas that the contract had fallen through, and I don't believe that was ever communicated to the board.*”

Brenda Barnes, Collaborative Applicant, responded “*While we were working through that contract process, we hit some barriers during The process of going through RFP and then there was a delay with one of the contractors and navigating next steps. I waited to share because I didn't know yet what the final unrolling of our full RFP process would result in.*”

Elizabeth Jarman responded “*I wonder if maybe moving forward there could be A and I know it's hard to come to a team without much information, but just something like hey, we're still working through the process, we're not sure of the outcome or, this RFP is going slower than we thought it would. We don't need confidential info, but just a check in update.*”

Lauren Boitel, Board Member, ImpactNV, stated “*At a high level, I'm just kind of concerned about what I feel is a growing or maybe continuing strain in the relationship or communication between the board and the collaborative applicant. At times, the dynamic feels sort of dismissive or maybe even antagonistic. And I don't think that it serves us or the collaborative applicant and definitely not the community. We're all on the same side. We're not adversaries. We should be working towards the same goal, and I just think that there's enough division in the world right now. We don't need to perpetuate that in the community.*”

Lauren Boitel Continued “*The NOFO is one of the most significant high stake decisions that we make all year with huge implications, and so I don't think the communication or the ask to do that via e-mail really reflected that gravity of the decision making role of the Board as sort of this deliberative body. That was one concern and then, when we did get on the call and we started asking questions, some of the responses were, everything's already in the recommendations or uncertainty about what was included or even request that we stop asking questions and just vote on the recommendations, which is just troubling to me. I think we should be encouraged to ask questions especially when decisions are complex and time sensitive and have huge consequences for the Community. Discouraging the board from asking questions and even challenging the collaborative applicant or recommendations from anyone would just make us a rubber stamping entity and that's not really what the Board is supposed to be. In a healthy system.*”

Kim Jefferies, Board Member, Campus for Hope, shared “*At the Monday meeting that we had in the afternoon there was again, a couple of hours talking through our priorities as a Board, which is our responsibility to set those priorities for the NOFO as the Board, obviously, we're going to take recommendations from the staff. The staff did come in with recommendations and there was a pretty broad consensus of where we ended up, which were a little bit different than the recommendations that were presented to us and then when we got the e-mail on Wednesday requesting to vote and then subsequently, the meeting that, in my opinion, did not represent the conversation that the board had on Monday. I was being asked to vote on recommendations, and I didn't feel like they represented the conversation from Monday accurately.*”

Abigail Frierson, Board Member, Clark County, shared “*This year, with this administration has been incredibly challenging for us to get direction from the federal government, we have been struggling with getting our legal team and our fiscal team to understand the impacts and then to turn that around on crazy short time frames, this one in particular, I got looped into after the Monday vote went the way it went, and I wanted to let you know that we were very scared at the county about the impact of what had come out of the Monday meeting specifically that the community and the county, was potentially going to receive a \$12 million hit. I was even scrambling to figure out how many people living in permanent supportive housing that this would impact and what we were going to do to help house those 600 plus people like it. It was a challenge to do all those things in a short period of time and so I'm very sorry for the quick turnaround, but I did want to add that context.*”

Brenda Barnes added “*It is a valid issue that if we can't come together and show continuity of the work to end homelessness and focus these meetings on prioritizing and ending homelessness, we're not doing our community any service. The Collaborative Applicant (CA) Is looking forward to improving relationships, improving communication but I think what that really comes down to is being able and not afraid to speak to each other. It's easy to lose focus on why we're here sometimes and that's to ensure that we're doing the best we can by those experiencing sheltered and unsheltered homelessness and preventing it from increasing in our community and so I guess at this point I would just like to take this opportunity to absorb this conversation and then really come up with a plan of moving forward.*”

Kim Jefferies added “*I appreciate the ability to hear feedback and process it and be vulnerable with how difficult this year is. I also want to challenge you all as the collaborative applicant to also hold us accountable when we're not doing something.*”

Miguel Davila Uzcategui, Chair, Community Advocate, stated “*We've had situations in the Board meetings and unfortunately there is a little bit of a pattern there. When there is a challenging conversation or discussion, we can't refuse that conversation or avoid it or even attempt to bully a person because there is a disagreement or a perceived level of disagreement. We had this earlier with the PIT count, for example, there was kind of a hostile interaction between one of the Board members and one of the CA staffers. and again, we're not here to pinpoint the specific situations or who did what, because we're all human beings and we're trying to build a team together. it's to the point of trying to identify what are the opportunities to have private conversations versus Board conversations and*”

what are some of the opportunities to do so in a way that feels safe and brave for everybody to be transparent about any issues that might be devolving.”

Abigail Frierson responded “*There might have been situations where what you perceived might have been caused by things outside of our control, or that there’re situations beyond our control that maybe didn’t provide the opportunity for us to come as our best selves. But Me and my team will take as much responsibility for our portion that we need to. It has felt that the tone coming in our direction has, in my opinion, felt hostile sometimes as well. So we are going to take responsibility and I am going to talk to my team and ensure that we are coming to these meetings as our most professional selves and that we need to be as collaborative as a collaborative applicant can be but this is my ask for you is also, That maybe we can have discussions when things come up, because I, I do feel that sometimes there’s a little misunderstanding about how things happen. I do feel like there’s a lot of frustration directed toward the collaborative applicant in general that I don’t think is always earned, and that is just my two cents, and I don’t know if this helpful for landing the plane here.”*

The Board expressed that these communication challenges have impacted the Board’s ability to fulfill its governance and oversight responsibilities effectively and have contributed to uncertainty in decision-making processes. As a next step, the Board requested improved and more consistent communication, earlier engagement in key processes, and adequate timelines to allow for thorough review and informed discussion prior to future decisions.

Agenda Item 7. Receive a report on the activities of the Continuum of Care Committees; for possible action.

Nicole Anderson, Co-chair, Coordinated Services Committee (CSC), shared that the Committee has partnered with the Long Term Project team and Bitfocus to revise the current CE assessment process. The Long Term Project Team is currently reviewing feedback from Bitfocus and once the review is complete, the team will present the findings to the Board. CSC has struggled with making quorum but anticipates attendance will pick up after the holidays.

Dr. Catrina Grigsby-Thedford, Co-chair, Programs Committee, shared at the last Programs Committee meeting, deployment captains were in attendance, and a presentation was provided by the collaborative applicant that provided a detailed overview of the roles and responsibilities of the deployment captains. There was a deployment captain training on Monday, January 12th and was facilitated by Jason Lilly, from the city of North Las Vegas. Community partners and Metro's UNLV, Social Work students, will be meeting at Nevada Homeless Alliance to pack incentive items for PIT survey participants.

Kim Jefferies, Committee Member, Campus for Hope, shared that the HMIS Steering Committee shared that the HMIS Memorandum of Understanding, (MOU) was emailed to the Board for questions and feedback due on January 21st. The Committee will then convene to review next steps and bring the MOU back to the Board with a high level overview. Committee members have also been diligently working on the HMIS Lead monitoring. Lead and vendor monitoring is the responsibility of the COC, and it's delegated to the HMIS Steering Committee to do that work. The Committee also reviewed 3 agency applications and approved 1.

Bailey Washington, Alternate Board Member, Youth Action Board, provided an update on behalf of the Youth Action Board (YAB). YAB is continuing the onboarding process for new executive members. YAB is also continuing its biweekly volunteering at the Nevada Partners Food Distribution Center. The team is currently recruiting new members to participate in the PIT.

Donica Martinez and Martin Castro, Board Members, Lived X Team of Southern Nevada, shared, The Lived X Team met to align on its 2026 meeting structure, operational updates, upcoming system activities, and key deliverables, with current discussions focused on governance clarity, accountability, and readiness for community and system-level work. The team reaffirmed community agreements, including shared language, meeting roles and responsibilities, standing agendas, and clarified attendance and Pulse policies. Members also led several key contributions, including the implementation of a new, more user-friendly timesheet, the development of an evidence-based case management tip sheet focused on older adults experiencing homelessness, facilitation of recent Housing Problem Solving (HPS) training, and final coordination of PIT Count attendance and mandatory training requirements. The team has begun work on its annual report, identifying key 2025 highlights such as advocacy efforts, conferences, community outreach, policy work, and system engagement, with a targeted completion in March 2026. Additional initiatives discussed included a proposed HPS participant survey to capture feedback and outcomes, the introduction of a dedicated HPS team to strengthen coordination and follow-up, finalization of onboarding materials for new members, acknowledgment of upcoming system, youth-focused, and frontline meetings, and ongoing review of regional updates related to food insecurity and emergency and transitional housing resources.

Agenda Item 8. Identify emerging issues to be addressed by staff or by the Board at future meetings, and direct staff accordingly; for possible action.

Brenda Barnes, Collaborative Applicant, shared an update regarding the recent grant termination from the Trump administration. Several team members reviewed the recent grant termination, and one member conducted research identifying multiple grant-funded projects that have been terminated. While the full list is extensive, select examples were found publicly available online and can be shared with the Board via email for informational purposes. The discussion highlighted potential implications for the CoC, with concern expressed about the limited ability to respond within the 2025 NOFO timeline, given e-snaps deadlines of February 9. However, it was noted that this issue should remain a priority for future planning, particularly in anticipation of the 2026 NOFO, which is expected to be released later this summer. The Board discussed the status of the strategic plan and next steps as it pertained to the Board meeting structure. It was suggested that strategic planning sessions be held in person, building on the strong participation and positive feedback from the recent session at the City of Las Vegas, while virtual meetings would focus on CoC priorities and standing agenda items. This approach

would allow for a dedicated, uninterrupted two-hour block to complete the strategic plan and prepare it for presentation to the broader community.

Agenda Item 8. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.