

**SOUTHERN NEVADA HOMELESSNESS CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
April 22, 2026**

In attendance:

Dr. Albert D. Chavez, Campus for Hope
Arcelia Barajas, City of Las Vegas
Alyson Martinez, Las Vegas Rescue Mission
Amy Jones, Bridge for Hope LV
Angela Ranck, HMIS Lead
Bailey Washington, Youth Action Board
Brenda Barnes, Clark County, NV
Donica Martinez, Lived X Consultants
Elizabeth Jarman, Veterans Administration
Karla Amezcua, Collaborative Applicant
Kevin Murray, Silver Summit Health
Kim Jefferies, Campus for Hope
Lauren Boitel, ImpactNV
Lisa Corrado, Vice-chair, City of Henderson
Martin Castro, Lived X Consultants
Miguel Davila Uzcategui, Chair, Community Advocate
PJ Moore, Coordinated Entry Lead Entity

Absent:

Wilson Ramos, City of North Las Vegas

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, April 22nd 2026, at the Clark County Government Center.

Agenda Item 2. Approval of the minutes from April 8th, 2026 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. NOFO Planning Discussion; for possible action.

Brenda Barnes, Board Member, Clark County Social Services provided an overview of anticipated timelines and planning considerations for the upcoming HUD NOFO. HUD was expected to release the NOFO by June 1st, which, while still a compressed timeline, allowed slightly more time for planning than in previous years. It was also noted that HUD had not consistently met prior deadlines, reinforcing the need for flexibility as federal priorities had recently shifted. The presentation revisited the four key planning areas previously introduced. The Board has already taken action on the first item, approving the formation of a small workgroup to collaborate with CoC leadership, advocacy partners, and consultants to explore alternative funding sources. The presentation then focused on planning areas three and four, particularly those impacting funding decisions and system design. A significant portion of the discussion centered on preserving existing system capacity. The presentation highlighted that, given funding constraints, not all projects could be protected, requiring the CoC to prioritize strategically. HUD's requirement to fund at least 60% of projects in Tier 1 (lower than historical levels of 90% or more) was identified as a key factor increasing the number of projects at risk of funding loss. The local ranking process was emphasized as critical in determining which projects would be more secure. The team presented the option of reaffirming permanent supportive housing (PSH) as a system priority, consistent with prior Board direction. While this approach would continue to prioritize serving individuals with the highest needs and longest histories of homelessness, it was acknowledged that prioritizing one project type would reduce protections for others. The Board also discussed the broader strategic question of whether to prioritize project types that are currently effective within the local system or to shift focus toward HUD's emerging priorities, such as street outreach, substance use treatment, workforce development, and supportive services in an effort to enhance competitiveness.

It was clarified that aligning with HUD's stated interests did not guarantee a more competitive application, noting that over 300 CoCs compete nationally for funding. The importance of balancing competitiveness with maintaining a functional and effective local system was emphasized throughout the discussion.

Kim Jefferies, Board Member, Campus for Hope stated, "I think it is important to prioritize permanent housing. I do have concerns about prioritizing only PSH. While it is the most expensive and it's an effective intervention, not very many people move on from PSH, so if we only prioritize PSH and that's the only housing dollars that get funded in our community, we're not going to have people get off the queue as quickly, because there will be only PSH spots on the queue and so they don't turn as quickly as rapid rehousing spots. I think we need to be thoughtful about our system and make sure, yes, we're prioritizing housing that's effective, but also prioritizing the ability for people to move out of the queue into housing as well."

Martin Castro, Board Member, Lived X Team asked, "Do we have any data on transitional housing, and rapid rehousing to see what works?"

Lisa Corrado, Board Vice-chair, City of Henderson stated, "When there's a change in administration, we must shift. The administration shifts their priorities, their criteria, their goals or outcomes and this has happened with each administration. We must shift and try to align because our needs are so vast that we need street outreach, and we need substance use help. We need to shift the funding source and just try to get the feds money for the things that they want to pay for and then try to realign the other things that we still need."

Donica Martinez, Board Member, Lived X Team added, "There is data actually. From 2023 I believe until now there was only 11% of the people that were going from the queue into the shelter into PSH."

Kevin Murray, Board Member, SilverSummit Healthplan, stated, "I would like to consider just a diversification of the investment priorities. I understand the priority PSH, but I would call for consideration for rapid rehousing. Reviewing prior metrics, I think there is a lack of diversification and rapid rehousing funding recently. Out of jurisdictional types, as funding continues to, I think maybe we should consider funding changes across the state. Considering where we are going towards."

Brenda Barnes, Board Member, Clark County Social Services asked, "Can you explain that though? Like what do you mean across the state?"

Kevin Murray, responded, "Looking at our footprint is only a region. But as you look at just general budgets across our state, state budgets where budgets will eventually go, I think we're looking at some certain areas I think that we have funding from certain points and looking at future funding or we might want to look at how we diversify."

Lisa Corrado, asked, "if we're going to have a couple of priorities, does that mean you reserve a certain percentage of the funding, or we just encourage that when we do? The call for applications like how does that work so that we can communicate that and then score and rank accordingly?"

Elaine de Coligny, Ede Coligny Consulting responded, "One thing you could do is when you rate and run projects, you decide what factors you will score and we bring you guys each year factors that you score and it's performance and are you spending all your money, are you turning in your reports on time? Etc. One of the things you could do is give points based on what kind of project. So, if you have 100-point scale, you could give slightly more points for PSH and then maybe more points for RRH. So that you're prioritizing project type, so they have the opportunity to score slightly higher. It doesn't automatically put them in tier one because they're PSH or RRH. They also would have to score well on other performance factors, but it does then give your PSH and RRH projects the strongest ones."

Brenda Barnes added, "Historically we leaned on objective data for renewal projects, performance outcomes, HMIS minus reporting, scoring for new projects relies more heavily on subjective reviews and narrative responses. The benefit of objective scoring in this since we started talking about the points, it is consistency and transparency within the process. The benefit of our subjective scoring."

Elaine de Coligny. Added, I think that's the guidance we're hoping for from the board today is direction of do you want to create a point structure that gives some bonus points to PSH and potentially also RRH. It wouldn't automatically put those projects in tier one. It would indicate the intention to protect well-functioning existing housing projects.

The Board will continue this discussion, and the consulting team will draft a rubric on objective factors and present at the next Board meeting.

Agenda Item 5. Strategic Planning Implementation; for possible action.

The Board will continue the strategic plan implementation discussion at the May 13th meeting.

Agenda Item 6. Identify emerging issues to be addressed by staff or by the Board at future meetings, and direct staff accordingly; for possible action.

No updates were provided.

Agenda Item 7. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.