

**SOUTHERN NEVADA HOMELESSNESS CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
June 17, 2026**

In attendance:

Alletha Muzorewa, Anthem Workforce Development
Alyson Martinez, Las Vegas Rescue Mission
Angela Ranck, HMIS Lead
Dr. Annie Wilson, Vice- chair, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Brenda Barnes, Clark County, NV
Casandra Diaz, City of Las Vegas Municipal Court
Damarion Hicks, Youth Action Board
Donica Martinez, Lived X Consultants
Hayley Jarolimek, City of Henderson
Kevin Murray, Silver Summit Health
Martin Castro, Lived X Consultants
Maurice Cloutier, Nevada Behavioral Health Systems
Nicole Anderson, Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada
PJ Moore, Coordinated Entry Lead Entity
Wilson Ramos, Chair, City of North Las Vegas

Absent:

Arcelia Barajas, City of Las Vegas
Karla Amezcua, Collaborative Applicant
Kim Jefferies, Campus for Hope

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, June 17th 2026, at the Clark County Government Center.

Agenda Item 2. Approval of the minutes from the June 10th, 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 42026 NOFO Discussion with EdeColigny Consulting; for possible action.

A special Board meeting was held to further discuss the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) that was released on June 1st. CoC Consultant EdeColigny presented an overview of the NOFO and the Scoring and Ranking process. The Board reviewed the proposed 2026 NOFO Competition Policies and Procedures, Scoring Factors, and Timeline, which were developed to align with the strategic priorities approved by the Board on June 10, 2026. Key recommendations included reserving Tier 1 funding for renewal projects, including HMIS and Coordinated Entry system support projects, while dedicating Tier 2 funding to new Transitional Housing (TH) and Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects, as well as projects transitioning to new project types. The proposed scoring framework prioritizes Permanent Housing projects, emphasizes project quality and performance, and establishes minimum score thresholds to ensure funding is directed toward high-performing projects. The Board also reviewed updates to the competition timeline, including an earlier application deadline and a requirement for Letters of Intent from new and transitioning projects to support planning, scoring, and system stability. Renewal projects will be scored by the Collaborative Applicant and consulting team, while the Scoring and Ranking Team will focus on evaluating new project applications. Following discussion, the Board was asked to approve the Competition Policies and Procedures, Scoring Factors, and Timeline.

Damarion Hicks, Board Member, Youth Action Board, asked “How are the performance indicators for new projects being scored? Is it just based off the plan and the strategy, or how is that impacted?”

Elaine DeColigny, EdeColigny Consulting, explained “That project evaluation will consist of both narrative review and performance assessment. The Scoring and Ranking Team (SRT) will review project narratives to determine whether the proposed project design aligns with its intended outcomes, such as successfully housing participants. Applicants will also be required to submit performance data, including an Annual Performance Report (APR) or a comparable report. For projects transitioning from Rapid Rehousing (RRH) to Transitional Housing (TH), performance reports from comparable programs may be used. The SRT will evaluate whether applicants

have demonstrated success on key performance metrics and assess their ability to track and report outcomes effectively. For organizations not currently participating in HMIS, reviewers will consider whether they understand outcome measurement and have appropriate systems in place to monitor and report program performance.”

Damarion Hicks asked *“If a program that's transitioning from RH or something like that, because it seems like they're being incentivized in that aspect. Regarding their performance score, do they stay the same, or if they're transitioning to the new plan, can it be adjusted?”*

Elaine DeColigny, explained *“That the scoring framework includes three categories of projects: renewal projects, transition projects, and new projects. Each category is evaluated using a different weighting approach to reflect the unique circumstances of the project type. Renewal projects are scored primarily based on historical performance outcomes. Transition projects are evaluated using a balanced combination of project design and historical performance. New projects, which do not have an established performance history, are assessed through a combination of project design and other available indicators of organizational capacity. This approach was developed to ensure that each project type is evaluated fairly and according to its stage of development.”*

Cassandra Diaz, Board Member, City of Las Vegas Municipal Court asked *Is there a world in which a renewal would not score in the 70-to-100-point range; for example, if they score 62, but no longer eligible in Tier 2, do they just fall off?*

Elaine DeColigny, explained *“That a renewal project could potentially score below the threshold required for Tier 1 consideration. For example, a Rapid Rehousing (RRH) project may receive a score that makes it ineligible for Tier 1 funding as a renewal project but may still be eligible to apply as a transition project. To accommodate this possibility, the competition timeline was designed to allow providers flexibility. Renewal applications, which rely primarily on objective performance data already available to providers, are due July 2. Letters of Intent are also due on July 2. This allows a provider to submit a renewal application while simultaneously indicating its intent to pursue a transition application if the renewal project's score is not competitive enough for Tier 1 consideration. This process was designed to provide agencies with an opportunity to transition projects when appropriate while preserving funding opportunities within the competition.”*

The Board approved the NOFO policies and procedures, SRT scoring factor and the timeline with the addition of a special Board meeting on August 19th.

Agenda Item 8. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.