



Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care

Board Meeting Minutes

July 27, 2026

This meeting was conducted in person.

MEMBERS	ATTENDANCE
Tamara Bridwell, Maricopa County	In Person
Tim Burch, Co-Chair, City of Tempe	In Person
Councilmember Wally Campbell, City of Goodyear	In Person
David Crummey, PNC Bank	In Person
Elizabeth da Costa, AHCCCS	In Person
Jason Flam, City of Mesa	In Person
Friend Kenny, Youth Action Board	Not Present
Emma Garcia, Valley of the Sun United Way	In Person
Councilmember Doreen Garlid, City of Tempe	Not Present
Vice Mayor Kesha Hodge Washington, City of Phoenix	In Person
Gabriel Jaramillo, Vitalyst Health Foundation	In Person
Benjamin Jeffrey, MACV Foundation	In Person
Matthew Kelly, Co-Chair, Mercy Care	In Person
Tianna Matthews, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office	In Person
Rachel Milne, City of Phoenix	Not Present
Gabe Priddy, Phoenix Rescue Mission	In Person
Arianna "Nikki" Ramirez, Copa Health	In Person
Amy Schwabenlender, Keys to Change	In Person
Nathan Smith, CASS	In Person
Amy Sullivan, City of Peoria	In Person
Charles Sullivan, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation	In Person
Maria Wildey, Community Bridges, Inc.	Not Present

1. Call to Order

The meeting of the Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care (CoC) Board was called to order by Co-Chair Kelly at 1:30 pm. Roll call was taken to confirm a quorum of members was present.

2. Call to the Audience

Co-Chair Kelly asked MAG staff whether any public comments had been received. MAG staff confirmed that there were no public comments received and no one had offered public comments at that time.

3. Informational Items

Co-Chair Kelly noted that Items 3A through 3J were on the agenda for information only and asked if any members had any questions or would like to request a presentation on any of the items. None were noted.

A question was raised about Item 3J, the Homelessness Management Information System (HMIS) Update. MAG staff member Natalie Davenport, Senior Planner, noted that the Board had approved the governance approach for a temporary statewide HMIS transition work group in approximately May or June; the work group comprises HMIS and collaborative applicant staff from all three Arizona Continuums of Care and routes key decisions through the HMIS and Data Systems Coordinating Committee (HDSCC) and the Board. The current WellSky contract expires in October, requiring system go-live by that date.

A Board member asked whether the HMIS transition work group had been formally established under the Maricopa CoC's governance structure and proposed that the next Board meeting include a plan to bring the work group under the CoC's formal governance charter, including a call for expressions of interest for representative membership. Davenport acknowledged the request and noted that the multi-CoC nature of the work group may not fit cleanly under Maricopa's own work group structure, but that staff could address how governance decisions are transmitted to each CoC.

A Board member identified a conflict between the HDSCC-approved decision to retain up to ten years of client-level data in the new system and the CoC's existing privacy practice, which states that personal information unused for seven years is to be deleted. It was requested that the ten-year retention decision not be implemented during the transition until the Board reviews and approves a policy change and members are properly notified of any change to how their data is used and disclosed. Davenport acknowledged the concern and explained that the current HMIS software had placed the CoC in a state of non-compliance with the existing seven-year policy; HDSCC had been tracking this and intended to address it in an imminent policy review,

but transition timeline pressures and staffing constraints had delayed the update. Randy Hade from Solari clarified that the CoC had not been operationally compliant with the seven-year policy and that the HMIS Lead had brought the question to the data committee seeking interim guidance; the committee's feedback was that ten years represented a reasonable middle-ground approach. Hade further noted that the policy language distinguishes data "unused" for seven years from data that is continuously accessed, and that under the CoC's long-standing interpretation the system may be in compliance, but that the policy language requires clarification. Hade also confirmed that the policy would be updated before any other CoC gains access to Maricopa data, and agreed to consult the vendor regarding whether the data transfer could be configured to exclude records beyond the seven-year threshold. Hade additionally reported that HUD Technical Assistance feedback had indicated the CoC's privacy notice is not aligned with the latest HUD guidance, and that the Data Committee plans to update the privacy notice in the near future as a result.

Co-Chair Tim Burch offered that the ten-year provision allows existing data to migrate rather than resurrecting deleted data, and suggested the policy fix is a matter separate from the migration itself. It was noted that the Board had previously empowered the work group to carry out the transition and that, as an informational item, the agenda provided no mechanism to halt the process. Co-Chair Kelly confirmed that no resolution mechanism existed at that meeting and directed the matter to a future agenda. Staff confirmed the request to add the item to a future agenda had already been received.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Co-Chair Burch stated that Items 4A through 4E were on the Consent Agenda. Co-Chair Burch asked if any board member had questions, comments, or wished to request a presentation on the item.

Emma Garcia noted a correction to Item 4A: Garcia was present at the June 22nd meeting and the minutes should reflect attendance accordingly. Staff confirmed the correction would be incorporated into the motion and the minutes would be updated.

Elizabeth da Costa commented on Item 4C, commending Randy Hade for leading the DWEL-AZ Collaboration and Data Sharing Agreement through a multi-year approval process that required sign-off from two state agencies, legal counsel, and multiple

Continuums of Care. Elizabeth da Costa also credited a colleague and the Balance of State CoC for their contributions to the effort.

Elizabeth Acosta asked whether the VA data request under Item 4D would encompass all HMIS data — with the VA identifying veterans from the full dataset — or only data for individuals who self-reported veteran status. MAG staff clarified that the request applies only to VA-funded programs: specifically VA Aftercare, Grants Per Diem (GPD), and Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF). Elizabeth da Costa acknowledged the clarification and identified a future opportunity to improve data sharing by establishing a return data flow from the VA back into HMIS to verify veteran status for individuals who do not self-report, which would improve care coordination. No formal direction was taken on that suggestion at this meeting.

Co-Chair Burch requested a motion to approve the Consent Agenda item. Amy Sullivan moved to approve the consent agenda, and Tamara Bridwell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with the following members voting in favor: Tamara Bridwell, Co-Chair Tim Burch, Councilmember Wally Campbell, David Crummey, Elizabeth da Costa, Emma Garcia, Vice Mayor Kesha Hodge Washington, Gabriel Jaramillo, Benjamin Jeffrey, Co-Chair Matthew Kelly, Tianna Matthews, Gabe Priddy, Amy Schwabenlender, Nathan Smith, Amy Sullivan, and Charles Sullivan/

4A. Approval of June 22, 2026, Meeting Minutes

The Board approved by consent the meeting minutes.

4B. Approval of June 29, 2026, Meeting Minutes

The Board approved by consent the meeting minutes.

4C. DWEL-AZ Data Sharing Agreement Update

The Board approved by consent the Data Sharing Agreement Update.

4D. U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Reoccurring Data Request

The Board approved by consent the data request.

4E. Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures

The Board approved by consent the policies and procedures.

5. Arizona Housing Coalition Federal Advocacy Update

Item 5 on the agenda featured the Arizona Housing Coalition Federal Advocacy Update. Nicole Newhouse and Austin Bates jointly delivered the update. Nicole Newhouse began with an overview of the political landscape following the recent legislative session and primary election, emphasizing low voter turnout and the resulting implications for the upcoming November races, including the governor and attorney general races as well as legislative control. Nicole Newhouse noted that housing had emerged as a prominent electoral issue and that candidates across parties increasingly framed housing as an economic development, workforce, family stability, and cost-of-living concern.

Nicole Newhouse summarized the legislative session, describing the extensive number of bills screened by the Arizona Housing Coalition and the narrowing of those bills to thirty-one priorities. Nicole Newhouse reported that the coalition supported seven bills, opposed five, and sought amendments to one. All five opposed bills failed, and only one supported bill, HB 2244, was signed into law. Nicole Newhouse explained that significant accomplishments included preventing harmful legislation, preserving the Housing Trust Fund, avoiding a rollback of middle housing reforms, halting the homelessness office bill, and maintaining \$17.5 million in carry-forward funding. Nicole Newhouse also detailed revisions to Housing Trust Fund priorities, increases in mobile home relocation assistance, and new processes for recording satisfied eviction judgments. Nicole Newhouse concluded that progress occurred largely on prevention-related issues, although major objectives such as ongoing homelessness funding, restoration of the state housing tax credit, and a statewide prevention strategy were not achieved. A discussion followed with Board members, including clarification regarding legislation that expanded transition services for individuals exiting corrections by up to ninety days.

Nicole Newhouse then reviewed the 21st Century Road to Home Act, which passed without the President's signature and included extensive provisions designed to make housing development less administratively burdensome. Nicole Newhouse explained key elements such as ESG cap waivers for shelter and outreach spending, HUD-VASH changes to income eligibility for disabled veterans, reductions in duplicative voucher inspections, and the creation of federal reporting processes for renters dealing with institutional landlords. Nicole Newhouse highlighted new flexibilities in federal housing

dollars, including increased capacity for CDBG funds to support new affordable construction and streamlined environmental reviews for HOME. Nicole Newhouse noted that incentive grants for housing production were authorized but not funded, and described potential impacts on future CDBG allocations based on local housing growth trends. Nicole Newhouse also clarified limitations of institutional investor restrictions, emphasizing that existing ownership was not reduced and manufactured homes were not included.

Austin Bates provided a federal advocacy update and described recent meetings in Washington, D.C. Austin Bates reported productive conversations with staff from six congressional offices, with additional virtual meetings planned. Austin Bates highlighted themes discussed during federal visits, including Arizona's competitiveness as a Continuum of Care, the effectiveness of Arizona COCs despite limited state funding, and the importance of federal investment given recent positive PIT count results. Austin Bates stated that veteran homelessness progress served as a valuable focus during discussions with congressional staff. Austin Bates also relayed key national advocacy requests from the National Alliance to End Homelessness, including funding levels for homeless assistance grants, Section 202 supportive housing for older adults, and federal rental assistance. Austin Bates concluded with next steps, noting the need to further educate congressional staff on COC operations and ensure understanding of the implications of federal funding shifts on communities in Arizona.

6. NOFO Update / Consolidated Application strategies

Item 6 of the agenda consisted of the FY2026 Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Opportunity update. Senior Planner Natalie Davenport provided an overview of both the consolidated application strategies and the progression of the local competition. Natalie Davenport began by reiterating the significance of the NOFO as the primary mechanism through which the region receives most homelessness-related funding, noting that the current competition differs from previous years and requires faster timelines and increased responsiveness. Natalie Davenport explained that the prior award totaled approximately \$52 million, and decreases to fair market rents were expected to reduce the upcoming allocation to an estimated \$48 million. Natalie Davenport clarified that higher consolidated application scores could potentially access up to \$10 million in additional bonus funding, and that projected totals in the presentation reflected both standard funds and possible bonus funds.

Natalie Davenport summarized the local competition process, noting that the application portal closed at 11:59 p.m. on Friday and that the competition had moved immediately into the review stage. Rank and review work would continue intensively for the next two to three weeks, with threshold reviews, technical corrections, and scoring all contributing to the priority list scheduled for board consideration on August 11. Natalie Davenport reported receipt of forty-five complete applications and three held harmless projects, consisting of HMIS and coordinated entry. The pool included twelve renewals, ten transition grants, and twenty-three new applications. Dual applications appeared in only three projects, leaving approximately forty to forty-two for the rank and review committee. Natalie Davenport noted that most applications were for general COC funds, with six applications submitted under the DV bonus category. Transitional housing represented the largest group of intervention types, followed by permanent supportive housing, standalone supportive services, and rapid rehousing. No SSO street outreach or SSO coordinated entry DV bonus applications were submitted.

Natalie Davenport explained that approximately \$53 million in COC and bonus funds were potentially available, while requests totaled roughly \$64 million, equating to around 120 percent of available funds and representing a strong competition pool. For the DV bonus funding category, Natalie Davenport reported a \$5 million cap but only \$1.5 million requested. Natalie Davenport emphasized that although this reflected improvement compared to past years, the community continued to underutilize available DV bonus funding. Natalie Davenport referenced policy complexities, including HMIS participation considerations and program structures funded through other state sources, as factors deterring some victim service providers from applying. Natalie Davenport indicated that additional technical guidance would be pursued to improve utilization in future cycles.

Natalie Davenport outlined next steps, noting that technical reviews were underway to ensure complete submissions and that applicants would be allowed to make corrections. Rank and review members would receive access to applications by Tuesday or Wednesday. To manage the volume, Natalie Davenport described plans for three scoring groups and two interview tracks, enabling completion within a standard three-day window while maintaining transparency. Updates would continue for the board between the review period and the August 11 approval meeting, with confidentiality respected throughout the process.

Natalie Davenport then provided an update on consolidated application preparation. Natalie Davenport noted that the estimated consolidated score remained 156 out of approximately 200 possible points. The largest anticipated gap concerned system performance, due to reliance on system data and uncertainty about HUD's scoring methodology. Areas such as encampment reductions lacked clear federal guidance, limiting the ability to project scoring outcomes. The second significant gap involved community coordination, particularly requirements for treatment-mandated beds relative to pit count totals. Natalie Davenport stated that the community's size and renewal structure made meeting federal ratios impossible, and that staff would monitor whether narrative explanations could mitigate scoring losses.

Natalie Davenport outlined ongoing preparation of narrative materials and partnership documentation. Two formal memoranda of understanding were required, and numerous informal partnership letters had been collected across behavioral health, specialty courts, K-12 education, veterans' services, healthcare, corrections, and early childhood services. Natalie Davenport thanked work group members for extensive contributions to partnership development. Additional narrative input was still needed from jurisdictions, specifically regarding encampment reduction efforts and law enforcement collaboration. Natalie Davenport explained that the consolidated application in eSnaps had not yet been released, leaving unknown question formats and potential attachments. Preparatory work was intended to streamline rapid responses once the application became available.

Natalie Davenport also briefed the board on NOFO-related litigation. Natalie Davenport explained that efforts to attach the FY2026 NOFO to the FY2025 lawsuit were denied by the court due to differing challenge conditions. Natalie Davenport stated that recent filings indicated no expected pause in the FY2026 competition and that staff would continue monitoring developments. Natalie Davenport invited board members to share any updates received through their networks.

In closing, Natalie Davenport summarized that the local competition was moving as planned, the consolidated application was progressing with strong partner support, and HUD guidance continued to be awaited on several important issues. Natalie Davenport thanked congressional staff who had helped escalate questions to federal partners and encouraged continued advocacy. Natalie Davenport affirmed readiness to adapt should any unexpected changes occur in the competition process.

During board discussion, Benjamin Jeffrey asked about the August 10 litigation-related request and whether it affected local operations. Natalie Davenport explained recent activity concerning HUD's request for summary judgment and stated that no immediate changes were expected. Benjamin Jeffrey provided updates regarding outreach to congressional offices and efforts to escalate outstanding questions. MAG Ironwood Room asked whether new applicants were entirely new entities to the CoC, and Natalie Davenport confirmed that some applicants had not previously sought CoC funding. Another member requested a future discussion on barriers to DV bonus participation, which Natalie Davenport agreed to incorporate into post-NOFO evaluation plans. Additional questions concerned MOUs for behavioral health partnerships, and Natalie Davenport confirmed that additional partnership documentation would still be helpful.

7. [211 Update and Anticipated Impacts](#)

Item 7 on the agenda addressed updates to Arizona 211 and anticipated service impacts. Julie Shockley and Andrew Irwin from Solari Crisis and Human Services presented the update. Julie Shockley explained that Arizona 211 had previously announced the impending end of its live-answer phone operations in mid-August due to lack of funding. Julie Shockley stated that significant coordination occurred with the Governor's Office and multiple stakeholders following that announcement, resulting in new funding commitments. Julie Shockley reported that the Governor's Office secured \$2 million to maintain current 211 operations, including live-answer capability. Based on Solari's projections, those funds would sustain services through late January or mid-February of next year. Julie Shockley also shared that the Governor's Office planned to convene a stakeholder work group to secure additional funding to support live-answer operations through the end of heat season in 2027, and to develop a broader long-term vision for Arizona 211's scope and sustainable funding strategy.

Julie Shockley confirmed that no changes to services would occur at this time. Individuals could continue calling 211 at all hours, with live-answer agents available from 9 a.m. to 7 p.m. daily. Julie Shockley stated that transportation to cooling centers during heat season, coordinated entry activities, and the full range of navigation and referral work would remain operational. Julie Shockley committed to providing additional updates as the Governor's Office work group progressed.

Andrew Irwin reiterated that funding was secure for the immediate term and expressed confidence in ongoing discussions with the Governor's Office and philanthropic partners. Andrew Irwin acknowledged the annual pattern of uncertainty regarding

funding and noted Solari's commitment to ensuring continuity of live-answer services during critical periods such as heat season.

During board questions, MAG Ironwood Room asked whether Arizona 211 would continue supporting the Family Housing Hub, and Julie Shockley confirmed that all existing service functions would remain unchanged and that staff retention had largely been successful. Benjamin asked about Solari's operations in Colorado and whether that model could influence Arizona's approach to funding and legislative engagement. Andrew Irwin explained that Solari's Colorado contract related to crisis line operations rather than 211 services and that the 211 funding challenges Arizona faced mirrored national trends following the expiration of pandemic-era funding.

Additional questions centered on the discontinuation of the domestic violence hotline formerly operated by Solari. MAG Ironwood Room requested information about whether the change was related to overall 211 funding. Andrew Irwin clarified that the DV hotline was a separate service staffed by clinical personnel with expertise in crisis and domestic violence. Andrew Irwin reported that only five percent of callers were reaching shelter placement, primarily due to the lack of available beds and the absence of a unified shelter intake process. Andrew Irwin explained that individuals could bypass the centralized line by contacting shelters directly, which made coordinated placement unreliable. Solari produced a report for ACES DV outlining system challenges, including capacity limitations and the need for shelters to adopt a coordinated access model. Andrew Irwin stated that Solari would be open to future conversations about participating in a revised hotline model if the community established the necessary structural agreements.

Further discussion explored the complexity of domestic violence shelter bed availability, the difficulty of assessing placement outcomes across systems, and the structural barriers created by administrative requirements for DV providers. MAG Ironwood Room asked whether Solari observed increased domestic violence calls following the hotline's discontinuation, and Julie Shockley stated that 211 did not show an increase. Andrew Irwin noted that many domestic violence-related calls reached the 988 crisis line instead due to the acuity of the situations.

MAG Ironwood Room requested access to Solari's report delivered to ACES DV and asked what Solari would need to reestablish a hotline. Andrew Irwin stated that the report could be shared and that restarting the hotline would require system-level agreement among DV providers regarding coordinated access and referral procedures.

As discussion concluded, Board members expressed appreciation to Julie Shockley and Andrew Irwin and highlighted ongoing advocacy by the Arizona Department of Veterans Services Commission supporting sustained funding for 211 services. Julie Shockley and Andrew Irwin thanked the board for the opportunity to present.

8. Request for Future Agenda Items

Co-Chair Burch asked if any members had requests for future agenda items.

Elizabeth da Costa requested that earlier discussions be formally captured as a future agenda item. Da Costa asked that the board receive an update at the next meeting on establishing the HMIS transition work group under the governance structure and charter, including confirmation of whether the board previously authorized the work group to make decisions for the Continuum of Care. Da Costa also requested that the committee review the privacy practice language regarding seven-year disposal of unused data and report any operational concerns related to implementing that requirement.

Another Board member added that, as part of the same future agenda item, the board would benefit from clarity regarding data migration processes. They asked for information about standard data purge practices, the rationale for migrating legacy data, and how storage costs and vendor requirements influenced those decisions. They requested that these details be incorporated into the HMIS transition work group update.

Another Board member requested a future discussion about CoC Builds, specifically how the board could approach those opportunities strategically rather than reactively. The Board member indicated that timing for this discussion was flexible and could be scheduled anytime in the coming year.

Adjournment

These meeting minutes were initially drafted using artificial intelligence (AI) and have been reviewed, edited, finalized, and verified for accuracy by MAG staff.