

September 17, 2026

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

OF

THE NEVADA INTERAGENCY ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS TO HOUSING

September 17, 2026

The Nevada Interagency Advisory Council on Homelessness to Housing was called to order by Chair Tim Robb at 1:02 p.m. on Thursday, September 17, 2026. The meeting was video conferenced via Microsoft Teams. This meeting is being conducted virtually. This meeting was noticed in accordance with Nevada Open Meeting Law and posted at the locations listed on the agenda, as well as on <https://dss.nv.gov/Home/Features/Public-Information/> the Division of Social Services website.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Tim Robb, Director – GSD, BRK Nevada LLC

Dina Neal, Senator, Nevada

Robert Thompson, Administrator, Nevada Department of Human Services Division of Social Services

Stephen Aichroth, Administrator, Nevada Housing Division

Emily Testwuide, Deputy Director, Nevada Department of Corrections

Colonel Mary Devine, Director, Nevada Department of Veterans Services

Judge Kathleen Delaney, Eight Judicial District Court, Nevada

Sheriff Jerry Allen, Pershing County, Nevada

Dr. Catrina Grigsby-Thedford, Governor appointed member who has experienced homelessness

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT:

Max Carter, Assemblyman, Nevada

Judge Mike Montero, Sixth Judicial District Court, Nevada

Dr. Annie Wilson, HOPE Liaison, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

Lieutenant Shatawna Daniel, Washoe County, Nevada

September 17, 2026

OTHERS PRESENT:

Nicole Fritz, Social Services Manager, Nevada Department of Human Services Division of Social Services

Carlea Freeman, Supervisor 1, Family Specialist, Nevada Department of Human Services Division of Social Services

Abigail Bagolor, Administrative Assistant, Nevada Department of Human Services Division of Social Services

Gregory Farris, Administrative Assistant, Nevada Department of Human Services Division of Social Services

Devan King, Administrative Assistant, Nevada Department of Human Services Division of Social Services

Chelsea Heath, Presenter, Nevada Housing Division

Taisacan Hall, Presenter, Nevada Homeless Alliance

Agenda Item I. Welcome, Call to Order and Roll Call

Abigail Bagolor:

Good afternoon and welcome to the Governor's Interagency Advisory Council on Homelessness to Housing. This meeting has been publicly noticed and in compliance with Nevada's Open Meeting Law. Chair Tim Robb will call the meeting to order.

Chair Tim Robb:

Thank you so much. Good afternoon, everyone. It is 1:02 p.m. on September 17, 2026. I'd like to call this meeting of the Nevada Interagency Advisory Council on Homelessness to Housing to order. Will you please call the roll?

[Roll Call. We Have Quorum.]

Chair Tim Robb:

Thank you so much.

Agenda Item II. [General Public Comments]

September 17, 2026

Chair Tim Robb:

No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on the agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

Comments will be limited to three minutes. If you are making a public comment via phone, please call 1-775-321-6111 and the meeting ID is 391 651 778 followed by pound. We are now open for public comment. Please unmute yourself and state your name for the Council. Two written public comments were received and entered into the record.

Written Public Comment Submitted by Jeff Church:

Interagency Advisory Council on Homelessness to Housing

Public Comment:

As a part of the loyal opposition, I want to present another point of view on homeless. My background is below.

First I ask you to look at the Powerpoint at www.HomelessSolutionsUSA.org (I believe you have to type it in not search.)

The first reality is that agree or not the present administration is moving away from housing toward treatment that was long supported by Democrats in the past. I and others believe it's Drug Addiction and Mental Illness not Housing or Jobs.

Following California's lead we need changes in NRS 4333 Mental Health Commitments to allow Judicially approve d longer stays for those in need.

NRS 433.003 Declaration of legislative intent.

2. To charge the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, and the Division of Child and Family Services, of the Department with recognizing their duty to act in the best interests of their respective consumers by placing them in the least restrictive environment.

It is not in the best interest of sals tormented by perceived demons and totally unable to care for themselves to be released on the street, often to be victimized. Sadly but it is necessary to place these persons in a humane treatment facility while meeting all NRS 433 legal and Judicial requirements.

Stats show that mentally ill are prone to petty criminal behavior or worse and fires be them accidental or arson. Homeless fires are the #1 fire calls that urban fire departments respond to.

At the 2026 Homeless Alliance conference, these realities cannot be ignored and must be discussed.

The official stated policies of the DHHS and Administration cannot be ignored.

I'll point out that year after year I offer, as the loyal opposition, to present that point of view and the at first agreed then refused saying that none of these ideas are prove. Really, which programs that are offered are working? We have more homeless than ever! Plan A is proven not to work but I or others can't present the other side.

September 17, 2026

Please urge the conference hosts to include all sides and I'm sure somebody from the federal government could be found to attend and speak.

If you can't log in a copy of the updated Powerpoint available on request.

Sincerely, Jef Church, Reno Tax Revolt

Written Public Comment Submitted by Pastor Tim Royal:

Members of the Interagency Advisory Council on Homelessness to Housing:

Elko F.I.S.H. respectfully asks the Council to ensure that rural and frontier communities are distinctly represented in Nevada's homelessness strategy, data collection, funding priorities, and outcome measures. F.I.S.H. operates northeastern Nevada's primary multiservice safety-net organization, including a food pantry, soup kitchen, case management, the 20-bed Samaritan House emergency shelter, and the Rural Nevada Continuum of Care Coordinated Entry access point for Elko and Eureka Counties.

Rural homelessness is routinely undercounted because people are widely dispersed across vehicles, motels, encampments, temporary arrangements, and remote locations that are difficult to identify during a single Point-in-Time Count. Nevada's 2026 rural data nevertheless identified 791 people experiencing homelessness, including 721 who were unsheltered, while only 121 people were housed in permanent supportive housing across the entire Rural Nevada CoC. Samaritan House remains consistently full and regularly must turn people away.

We recommend region-specific reporting that measures unsheltered homelessness, shelter turnaways, Coordinated Entry wait times, discharges into homelessness, housing placements, and long-term housing stability by county or rural service region. Statewide totals alone can obscure the distances, severe winters, transportation barriers, and limited service capacity confronting northeastern Nevada.

We also urge Nevada to require stronger discharge-planning partnerships among hospitals, behavioral-health and treatment providers, correctional facilities, homeless-service organizations, and Coordinated Entry access points. Local providers should be involved before discharge when a person lacks safe housing, subject to appropriate consent and confidentiality protections. This would reduce repeated movement among shelters, hospitals, treatment programs, jails, and unsheltered settings.

Elko F.I.S.H.'s proposed Northeastern Nevada Supportive Housing Initiative offers a concrete response to this cycle. The initiative would create 23 permanent supportive-housing units in Elko and connect eligible residents with coordinated treatment, recovery, healthcare, benefits, employment, and stabilization services. It would also create badly needed permanent-housing exits from Samaritan House for people who cannot regain stability through emergency shelter alone.

We respectfully ask the Council to recognize northeastern Nevada as a distinct service region, incorporate rural-specific performance measures, strengthen coordinated discharge requirements, and support permanent supportive-housing development where regional capacity is currently inadequate.

September 17, 2026

Grateful to Serve, Pastor Tim Royal, Executive Director Elko F.I.S.H.

Chair Tim Robb:

Hearing and seeing no further public comment, we will close this agenda item.

Agenda Item III. [For Possible Action – Discussion and Possible Approval of Meeting Minutes from March 19, 2026 and May 21, 2026, Interagency Advisory Council on Homelessness to Housing Meetings]

Chair Tim Robb:

Are there any questions, edits or proposed changes to the minutes? I will entertain a motion to approve the minutes for March 19, 2026.

Mary Devine:

I move to approve the March 19, 2026 meeting minutes.

Robert Thompson:

I second.

Chair Tim Robb:

All those in favor of approving the meeting minutes for March 19, 2026, please indicate by saying “aye”.

Dina Neal, Robert Thompson, Stephen Aichroth, Emily Testwuide, Mary Devine, Jerry Allen, Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

Aye.

Chair Tim Robb:

Any opposed, please indicate by saying “nay”. The meeting minutes for March 19, 2026 are approved. I will entertain a motion to approve the minutes for May 21, 2026.

Robert Thompson:

I move to approve the minutes for May 21, 2026 meeting.

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

I second.

Chair Tim Robb:

All those in favor of approving the meeting minutes for May 21, 2026, please indicate by saying “aye”.

Dina Neal, Robert Thompson, Stephen Aichroth, Emily Testwuide, Mary Devine, Jerry Allen, Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

Aye.

September 17, 2026

Chair Tim Robb:

Any opposed, please indicate by saying “nay”. The meeting minutes for May 21, 2026 are approved. This agenda item is now closed.

Agenda Item IV. [For Possible Action – Discussion and Possible Action on Any Additional Updates from the ICHHTA Committee Regarding the Action Plan to the Strategic Plan]

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

I would like to introduce a memo from ICHHTA and explain what we need from the Council members. The purpose of this is to better understand what already exists across Nevada related to three of the primary priority issues that are in the strategic plan. Those issues are Housing, Homelessness Prevention and Intervention, and Wraparound Services. We want to learn what programs and resources are currently available, how they’re funded, who they serve, where partnerships are working, and where gaps still exist. This information will help us assess the implementation of the next strategic plan. If we’re going to develop a meaningful plan, we need a clear picture of what’s happening across the State and throughout Nevada. The ICHHTA is not asking to recreate information that already exists. We will be reviewing available reports, websites, dashboards, and other materials. We are asking every ICHH member to provide point of contact within your respective agencies to help gather information. The individual should understand your agency’s programs, funding, policies, and other work connected to housing and homelessness. We’re also requesting the Council members to share the memo with external partners who could be part of the conversation. That could include local jurisdictions, health care systems, service providers, the CoCs, and other statewide or regional partners. The statewide plan cannot be shaped only by the people who are already at the table such as the ICHHTA and ICHH. We need more information from people working in different systems and communities throughout the State. Abigail, will this memo be sent to the Council members after this meeting?

Abigail Bagolor:

It was emailed and posted to the public website.

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

Thank you. This is not to duplicate any services. It is a straightforward request. Please identify a contact within your agency, share this information with your external partners, and help connect the ICHHTA with people who have information that should inform our Nevada statewide strategy. We want the next plan to reflect the realities of Nevada, the urban, rural, and tribal communities, and establish some practical priorities for the next three to five years.

Chair Tim Robb:

Thank you so much. This is a great memo. Any thoughts on this from the members of the Council?

Stephen Aichroth:

Thank you to the ICHHTA for putting this together. I would like to request that the memo be re-sent to membership.

September 17, 2026

Chair Tim Robb:

Thank you, Administrator.

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

Once members complete their point of contact list, who should they send it to?

Abigail Bagolor:

They can send it to the Homeless to Housing team at DWSSH2H@dss.nv.gov for consolidation.

Mary Devine:

Once the list is completed, will you send the consolidated list back to us or do we wait for it on the strategic plan?

Chair Tim Robb:

It would be great to have these contacts for the members of ICHH and ICHHTA. Having subject matter expertise, this is a great step to push things in a good direction. Any other thoughts from members of the Council?

Mary Devine:

I agree. This is a great step and I appreciate it.

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

ICHHTA will have a booth at the 2026 Nevada Statewide Conference on Addressing Homelessness in Las Vegas on October 1 and 2. ICHHTA will be sharing information about its work and the ICHH. We are distributing an approved flyer to help attendees understand how ICHH and ICHHTA work together. We will also be asking conference attendees to complete a survey to help inform strategic planning. The survey will help us understand what people know about the statewide strategy and what they believe the next plan should address. One of the basic questions is whether attendees were aware that we have a statewide plan. The flyer includes a QR code for people to access the statewide plan and complete the survey. You are welcome to attend if you like.

Chair Tim Robb:

Having attended in the past, it's always been a great conversation and people doing incredible work are there. We want to thank you and the members of ICHHTA for putting the memo together, for representing us at the upcoming conference, and for all that you do. I look forward to seeing the fruits of the memo once we're able to compile some of the data and have additional conversations. Are there any final thoughts on this agenda item? With that, this agenda item is close.

Agenda Item V. [For Possible Action – Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Review of Housing Applications from the Nevada Housing Division – Stephen Aichroth]

Stephen Aichroth:

We have Chelsea Heath to provide information for this agenda.

September 17, 2026

Chelsea Heath:

Good afternoon. I am the State and Federal Grants Manager for the Housing Division. We want to give an update about the Supportive Housing Development Account to date. In our first cohort of grantees, we made five awards totaling \$13,839,144. The five grantees are making progress towards leasing up and expending those grant funds. We currently have two active properties, one is the Cares Campus in Washoe County. We also have Coordinated Living of Southern Nevada, which is actively leasing-up tenants within the program and providing supportive services. To date, over \$800,000 of the \$13,000,000 has been drawn from the Nevada Housing Division. We are actively monitoring each project. They provide quarterly status reports and dashboards to our partner, Urban Institute, which we are partnering for our program design and evaluation with the Housing Division and CSH. Our percentage drawn at this time is 5.8% of the initial funds of \$32,000,000. There are two remaining projects who were awarded funds. Firstly, Carville Court in Washoe County, who has changed their name to Hope Landing. They are still in the construction phase of the project. Construction and development is progressing nicely. They anticipate construction to be completed in May of 2027 and will begin drawing funds thereafter. Secondly, Highway 40 which is also in Washoe County. All construction for this project has been completed. They will be going through grantee onboarding with the Nevada Housing Division in early October. Grantee onboarding is to review the programmatic guidance, request for reimbursement, reporting and any training that the Division requires per program guidelines. We have some dashboards for the three projects that are currently placing tenants that we are happy to share with ICHH. The Nevada Housing Division recently opened applications for funding, again. We had four applicants that applied for funds through the Division. We are recommending two of those projects for approval of funding awards. Highway 40 reapplied to the Division to add 13 units to their project. We are recommending approving their request of an additional \$1,362,340.01. The maximum rental assistance contract amount is up to maximum Fair Market Rents in the service area and up to our supportive services maximum award amounts. Awards also include administration of the program and training dollars for the project so that staff can be onboarded and appropriately trained to the high-fidelity model that the Housing Division has for our program design. The second application that we are recommending for approval is for Vitality Unlimited. It is to serve seven participants in the program. It would add seven units for 20 total units in this second cohort of awards. This is a smaller, rural project and a new program. We don't have many rural partners at this time, but we are doing targeted outreach. We are recommending approval of \$83,331.95 to support those seven clients. There are two projects that applied but aren't ready to be approved. Marvel Way Apartments in Washoe County is one of these. We are not recommending to approve them because their applications proposed temporary rental assistance and don't align with Nevada's high fidelity permanent supportive housing model. The Nevada Housing Division is going to provide targeted outreach and training to Marvel Way. This is to educate them on what our high-fidelity model looks like, our program design, and all of the programmatic requirements so that, if they wish to reapply, they are more than welcome to do so. We anticipate opening an off-cycle award funding round by the end of the year to meet our goal of adding 50 units to our inventory in fiscal year 2027. The second application that was not recommended for approval was US Vets in Clark County with the same rationale for not recommending approval. We will do targeted outreach and education for the high-fidelity model. Once we do targeted outreach, we will encourage them to reapply during our off-cycle funding

September 17, 2026

round that should be coming by the end of the year. We will also do targeted outreach to rural areas, and we anticipate holding office hours for any other interested applicants.

Chair Tim Robb:

Thank you so much. Are there any questions from members of the Council for the Housing Division?

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

Is the maximum FMR that you are approving for Washoe County?

Chelsea Heath:

Yes.

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

Thank you.

Chelsea Heath:

From our last update, we learned some lessons since we started this new program. We are very grateful to have received the funding and be able to pilot this program throughout the State of Nevada. We looked at our program guidance and updated it to be more comprehensive. We are using some best practices in other States that have excellent PSH programs and a high-fidelity model. We are leaning on Oregon and Washington and through our partnership with CSH, who assists in reviewing our program guidance and providing best practices. This is to ensure that Nevada has a high-fidelity model and we are meeting the needs of the entire State. We also updated our application for the off-cycle funding round to be more succinct. We improved budgeting and expenditure schedules so that we can forecast the expenditure for the SHDF account funds. Information is easily transferred into the funding agreements and quarterly reporting. We looked at the application and how we could make it more user-friendly but provide the most valuable data to the Division when evaluating applications. Regarding implementation support, we conduct project onboarding with all our grantees. We have on-demand training and technical assistance available through the grants and with our projects analyst Rohan Wight. We have quarterly oversight of our projects. We have them submit quarterly spending plans as well as quarterly progress reports and other reporting for their program dashboards to Urban Institute. The Nevada Housing Division continues to do targeted outreach in Southern Nevada and the rural areas of the State. We recognize that our awarded grantees are primarily in Northern Nevada and Washoe County at this time, but we want to ensure that we are serving all Nevadans throughout the State. We are specifically looking at other States and working with DSH on how we could implement scattered site PSH units throughout the State. Our current program guidance requires at least five units. Through our upcoming office hours, we will be able to explain that five units doesn't have to be in one building and that if people can have scattered site units that meet our program requirements, we encourage them to apply.

Chair Tim Robb:

Are there any questions for the Housing Division? Thank you so much for the update and for all the work that you and team in Housing Division do. You truly make a difference in the work that our Council is here to support.

September 17, 2026

Chelsea Heath:

Thank you.

Chair Tim Robb:

Hearing and seeing no further comments, we will close this agenda item.

Agenda Item VI. [For Information Only – Bird’s Eye View – State of Homelessness in Nevada
Presentation by Nevada Homeless Alliance]

Chair Tim Robb:

Do we have a member that is going to present this for us?

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

It would be me and Taisacan Hall from Nevada Homeless Alliance. For those who may not know me, I’m a person in long-term recovery, with lived experience of homelessness and justice involvement. I am the current Executive Director of Nevada Homeless Alliance. I’m a licensed social worker and a certified drug and alcohol counselor. I have spent about six years of serving people experiencing homelessness. I truly believe that I was saved from homelessness to serve the homeless. Prior to that, I spent nine years from 2000 to 2009 on the streets of Las Vegas and Reno. My lived experience and professional background frame how I do this work today.

Taisacan Hall:

Thank you for the opportunity to present to all of you today. I’m a lived experience specialist at Nevada Homeless Alliance. I’m a person with lived experience of homelessness, having spent two years unhoused as a youth with my family. However, I have been doing advocacy work for nearly a decade. Being able to serve in this role and lean into the advocacy side, meeting and educating people on what homelessness looks like in our State, is very near and dear to my heart. This presentation is a bird’s eye view of homelessness in Nevada. Over the last five years, Nevada has made significant progress in addressing homelessness. We’ve expanded outreach, strengthened shelter capacity, and added new programs. We’ve enhanced our supportive services, improved coordination among providers, and made several other important progresses. These efforts have built a stronger homelessness response system. Despite building a substantial system, we still need to recognize that homelessness doesn’t operate in isolation. Homeless services system is influenced by broader systems like housing, behavioral health, health care, employment, and the justice system, among other related systems. We will be sharing a supplemental report to all of you after this presentation.

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

Many of you may have heard of the river parable. A group of villagers are running toward a fast-flowing river when they notice someone drowning. They immediately jumped into the water, pulled the person to safety, and revived them. A few minutes later, another person called for help and they helped them. This pattern continues. Before long, these villagers built rescue teams and watchtowers. They trained people and set up medical tents along the riverbank. They developed a whole system to respond to the downstream in this river. But the people keep coming. The teams

were exhausted and resources were stretched thin because they're pulling people from this river as quickly as possible. One of the villagers gave up and walked away. The others asked where the person was going, as they still need help pulling people out of the river. That person wanted to go upstream to find out why people are falling in. When that person got upstream, there was a broken bridge, missing guardrail, or someone pushing people into the river. This parable truly reflects where we are in our response to homelessness today. Every day, outreach teams, shelters, housing programs, healthcare providers, behavioral health professionals and community organizations are pulling people from the river. We are helping people to survive. We're connecting them to services and helping them move into housing. That work is necessary. We can't stop pulling people from the river, but we also have to go upstream. We have to identify the broken bridges and replace the missing guardrails. We have to confront the policies and practices that continue to push people into homelessness. That is the perspective I want you to hold on to as we move forward in our presentation. Most of you heard of Point-in-Time count or PIT count as a way to measure homelessness. I want to emphasize that the PIT count is only a snapshot. It represents the number of people identified as experiencing homelessness on a particular night. It is important but is also generally recognized as an undercount. It is mandated by HUD. The PIT count doesn't capture homelessness throughout the year. Some people may become homeless, return to housing in between counts and never appear in the numbers. Others may be staying on places where outreach teams can't reach them. Also, HUD doesn't allow us to count the people in jails, hospitals, emergency rooms and detox facilities, even though they meet the literal definition of homelessness, if they're not on the streets or in shelter that night. So, think about how different the numbers truly are. Our statewide count increased 13% between 2024 and 2026. In Clark County, we saw a 12% increase, rising from 7,906 in 2024 to 8,859. We didn't conduct a count in Southern Nevada in 2025 because we focused on revamping the survey, reviewing maps, and identifying more person-centered ways to engage with individuals to gather better information. Washoe County increased to 1.5% from 1,760 to 1,787. Rural Nevada had an 80.% increased from 439 to 791. We must take these increases seriously but also need to interpret them carefully. Changes in account in these increases can reflect actual increases in homelessness. They can also reflect changes in outreach, better methodologies, more community participation, weather, and our ability to locate and identify people. As part of the planning committee for the PIT count in Southern Nevada, we feel that we did a better job of finding and locating people. There could be a full 12% increase in people experiencing homelessness or we did a better job counting more people, and the number is more accurate for the purpose of that count. An increase in the PIT count doesn't mean that no one is exiting homelessness. People are moving into housing through rapid rehousing, permanent supportive housing, recovery programs, vouchers, family reunification, and other pathways every day. The PIT count doesn't reflect this. But according to the 2026 Housing Inventory Count in Clark County, over 2,000 people were enrolled in permanent supportive housing, 1,600 or more in rapid rehousing, and over 800 in other permanent housing. Also in 2025, we saw 3,500 people exit to permanent housing from emergency shelter, temporary housing and rapid rehousing with 1,800 maintained permanent housing. That means they were in a system such as the rapid rehousing program, potentially discharged and maintained their housing. I want to help fill the gap in understanding when individuals see an increase in homelessness. It's not like the same people that were homeless in 2024 are still homeless in 2026. Some of them are. I believe it's very important to share these numbers to show that people are

September 17, 2026

moving from homelessness to stability on a regular basis. But when more people are entering homelessness than the people our system can help exit, the overall number continues to rise. That is why the PIT count can't be our only measure of progress. We should also be looking at how many people enter homelessness during the year, how they remain homeless, how many move into stable housing, and how many return to homelessness after housing. Going back to the river parable, the count tells us how many people we saw in the river on one night. It doesn't tell us how many people entered the river throughout the year, how many were pulled out, or why people continue to fall in.

Taisacan Hall:

Homelessness can begin in many different ways. People can enter through a variety of circumstances. This is often a result of several pressures coming together rather than one isolated crisis. Whether it's a crisis or a combination of events that results in homelessness, it often depends on the resources and options available beforehand. In my role, I get to train our community on housing problem solving. This is an approach on how we are engaging with people that are experiencing a housing crisis and empowering them to self-resolve. We are doing what we can to ensure that they are experiencing homelessness for a very short time or not at all, through prevention. During this training, we discuss the book *Homelessness is a Housing Problem* by Gregg Colburn and Clayton Page Aldern. The authors looked across a wide range of commonly cited explanations for homelessness, including individual, economic and social factors. Their central finding, however, is that housing costs are the leading cause of homelessness. We can be good at responding once someone becomes homeless without necessarily changing the conditions that are creating homelessness in the first place. Stronger outreach, shelters and supportive services are essential, but without addressing the underlying challenges, we are only managing the consequences of housing instability. It's not one or the other, it's two things. We need to be better at responding to homelessness but also make it harder for people to become homeless in the first place. Homelessness is not a neutral state. It is inherently traumatic. The longer someone remains without a safe and stable place to live, the more susceptible they are to compounded risks. These have shifted people's focus from achieving long term stability to trying to navigate daily survival. The experience of homelessness can worsen existing challenges. It can create new and long-term ones too. I've been stably housed for six years but I still have a packed bag with all my vital documents and everything that I might need. I'm ready to go if I need to. My experience influenced the car I bought. I have a RAV4 and I specifically got it because it is very reliable and large enough to at least preserve some aspects of my life, if my housing is taken from me at any given point. What could have started as a housing crisis can become a much broader health and stability crisis. But again, has long term effects. Even if someone successfully exit into stable housing, they're still dealing with the aftermath of that crisis. Ultimately, stable housing can be a form of prevention. When we think about the Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, the bottom of the pyramid represents the foundation, which includes housing. This foundation is what people need in order to address other challenges in their lives as they move toward greater stability. Once someone is experiencing homelessness, things start to get more complicated quickly. These challenges can create a cycle where the longer someone remains homeless, the more support they may need to exit homelessness. We have to look at what happens before someone becomes homeless. This is when people begin to lose housing stability but still have opportunities for intervention. If we only respond after people enter homelessness, we risk continually addressing a growing number of

September 17, 2026

people with increasingly complex needs in a response system that has historically been overwhelmed. We need to address the systemic gaps alongside our response to homelessness.

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

We hear reports that people are homeless due to substance use and mental health issues. Some people are, but we also have to recognize that substance use, and mental health concerns can be either a cause or a condition of homelessness. An individual can be on drugs, potentially lose their job and not pay their rent, ultimately ending up in homelessness. There could be a death in a family that leads a person into deep depression, making them unable to go to work. As a result, they may experience homelessness and begin drinking to cope with the traumatic situation, while also not taking their medications. We don't know if people experiencing homelessness have substance use or mental health issues as a cause of homelessness or as a condition that developed because of it. We should avoid broadly labeling everyone as vagrants, drug addicts, and people with undiagnosed mental health conditions. These are human beings. They are our neighbors, someone's mother, father, daughter, son, uncle, aunt, and the list goes on. We have a housing problem that we can't ignore. Nevada's housing shortage affects people across income levels, but the consequences are most severe for people with the fewest resources. This is not simply about whether Nevada is building more housing. We must distinguish between increasing overall housing supply and creating affordable housing for our extremely low income or zero to 30% population. A person does not have to be unemployed to be at risk of homelessness. Many Nevadans are working, living on fixed incomes or relying on disability and retirement benefits. But their income has not kept pace with the cost of housing. For households already living close to the edge, a single rent increase, reduction in work hours, a medical expense, or unexpected emergency can quickly become a housing crisis.

Taisacan Hall:

We will be sharing The Gap report from the National Low Income Housing Coalition. They do incredible research across the board for available affordable housing, as well as housing wages. They are very thorough with their data and analyses. We gathered the report covering over the last five years from 2021 to now. NLIHC's Gap report looks at the available affordable housing units available across income thresholds, but they particularly focus on extremely low income renters. They also look at the cost burden on households across those income thresholds. They defined people who are extremely low income as meeting or below the federal poverty line or are 30% and below the area median income. For households that spend over 30% of housing cost, are defined as cost burden while households that spend over 50% are defined as severely cost burden. Over the past six years, Nevada had the lowest amount of available affordable units for extremely low-income renters in the country and is also significantly below the national average. We have an incredibly high percentage of extremely low-income renters that are severely cost burdened. These numbers show how difficult it is for many low-income and extremely low-income households to find a housing option that fits within their budget. For households with very limited income or fixed incomes, there is little room to absorb a rent increase or any unexpected expenses. Any financial disruption can put a household at risk of losing their housing, adding further pressure to our homelessness response system. The availability of affordable housing is a critical part of the infrastructure needed to keep people housed and get people out of homelessness. We are doing a lot of incredible housing development across the board. We've

improved our zoning laws and increased our density. Those are good things, but housing supply only goes so far when people at the lowest end of the income threshold are not able to get into those units. According to NLICH's Out of Reach report, the amount needed to afford a typical modest two-bedroom rental has increased dramatically. This report looks at housing wages to see how much earnings or work hours are needed in order to afford housing. For a worker that earns a minimum wage, the number of hours required are far beyond what one person can realistically work. Minimum wage workers need to work 111 hours per week, nearly three full-time jobs to afford a two-bedroom rental. There is a significant gap between what people earn and the housing costs. Employment alone doesn't necessarily provide a pathway to housing stability when housing costs have moved far beyond wages.

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

Many individuals have asked why people don't go to shelters. Being in a shelter is also considered homeless. Shelter does play an important role in our homeless response system. It can provide relief from the dangers of sleeping outside, protection from extreme weather, access to meals and hygiene, and connection to services. Shelter can save lives but again, it is not housing. Having a place to sleep tonight is not the same as having a safe and stable place to call home tomorrow. Many shelters operate primarily overnight. People line up at five o'clock in the morning, then get woken up by six a.m. and are told to leave. Which means, they may sleep indoors but still spend the day in parks, libraries, encampments, other public places, or go to work. A lot of people live in shelters and have jobs. But yet, they are still homeless. Shelter is also not accessible or appropriate for everyone. Work schedules and curfews may conflict. People may have pets they don't want to abandon. Our system, by default, is separating families. For example, a couple with a teenage son may be split between shelters, where the father would be placed in one shelter, while the mother and child would be placed in another designated for families. We are systematically separating families because we do not have enough family shelters. Other people may have medical needs, mobility challenges, and past negative experiences in institutional settings that make congregate shelter difficult or even traumatic. Shelters can be traumatic. When someone declines a shelter, we should not automatically label them as service resistant, hard to serve, or say that they are choosing homelessness. We should ask whether the option being offered is safe, accessible and appropriate for an individual. Again, we must remember that declining shelter is not intrinsically service resistant and not the same as choosing homelessness. We also need to acknowledge the pressure placed on shelter staff. There's staffing shortages, high caseloads, sometimes inadequate training, and burnout. All of that impacts the person providing services at shelters and not getting paid much over the minimum wage. We can only imagine their own struggles, not knowing if they can also meet their rent. Nevada needs adequate emergency shelter because people need somewhere to go. But the shelter must remain a pathway and not a destination. In my opinion, the purpose of our response system should not be to create a more efficient way for people to remain homeless indoors or out of sight. It must be to help people move from crisis to stable housing. When shelters, hospitals, treatment programs and other systems operate without a clear pathway to housing, we begin to see some serious unintended consequences.

Taisacan Hall:

What happens if we don't take action? What happens if systems continue to work in silos? Change is going to happen regardless. So, our inaction and systems inability to connect with one another

will allow for more people to fall through those gaps. We see people experiencing homelessness often interact with several different programs, organizations and systems. This sequence isn't always linear. Many people can enter or exit at different points. Someone might be living on the streets, go to jail, get released, return to the streets, get treatment and continue bouncing between these situations. Not everyone is experiencing all of these things, but the progress made in one setting can be stunted by a new barrier when they move to the next one. That increases the risk of them interacting with other systems or falling through the cracks of other systems. Because a person's current circumstances are not being addressed due to the prolonged homelessness period, the complexity of their needs increases. When people are moving from one system to another, they could be required to repeat their story, causing triggers and bringing back the traumas to themselves. They may have to navigate different eligibility requirements and may wait indefinitely for another service to become available. When these gaps aren't addressed, people can be pushed further into homelessness. The coordination between our systems can make that pathway to stability more consistent, fewer service gaps and opportunities for people to fall through the cracks. So, how do we break the cycle? We can strengthen the overall response by creating clearer connections between systems and breaking down silos. This includes clear processes when someone moves from one program or service to another. Everyone involved should share an understanding of what successful outcomes look like, as defined by the people we serve, and how those outcomes are tracked. When systems are better connected, providers can spend more time addressing people's unique needs.

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

What policies can move Nevada forward and what's keeping us stuck? Homelessness does not exist within one system. Housing, behavioral health, health care, economic stability, the justice system, along with several other systems, all influence whether someone remains housed, becomes homeless, or has a realistic pathway back to stability. Each of the systems have their own funding, eligibility requirements, responsibilities and measures of success, but people don't experience these systems separately. They are often in multiple systems. Some of our greatest gaps occur at the transition points between them, like getting discharged from prison or the hospital to homelessness. Someone can leave a hospital without a safe place to recover. They can complete treatment without housing that supports their recovery. They can receive a housing voucher nowadays but still unable to find a landlord who will accept it. There's no source of income protection here. They could fall behind on rent by a small amount and lose their home. A death in the family, or a landlord dramatically increasing the rent for a senior on a fixed income. These things are actually happening. At each of these points, policy can build a bridge back to stability or allow the bridge to continue to crumble. The recommendations in this next section are policy considerations, not a finalized legislative packet. Some would require funding, fiscal analysis, additional capacity and further study. The purpose is not to suggest that every recommendation must become law. It is to take an honest look at where current policies may be contributing to housing instability, where systems are failing to connect, and what Nevada could consider doing differently.

Taisacan Hall:

Nevada proposed a Homeless Person's Bill of Rights through SB 142 in 2023. The proposal centered on equal treatment, dignity, access to public spaces and services, and protection from harassment

and discrimination for people experiencing homelessness. We worked on an updated approach that could carry forward those civil rights principles while also looking at the specific systems where unhoused people face significant barriers. We've expanded on this in a report that will be sent out to all of you. Housing is a huge part of resolving homelessness. Distinguishing between attainable housing for moderate income and affordable housing extremely low-income households is incredibly important. Recent legislation, including AB 540, recognizes housing needs across a broad range of incomes. This definition can be useful when considering Nevada's overall housing needs. However, affordability for a household earning 120% or 150% AMI is fundamentally different from someone receiving SSI, Social Security and disability benefits, minimum wage, or from households earning 30% AMI or less. For people experiencing homelessness, that distinction can become the difference between having a housing opportunity or not being able to find one at all. Nevada continue to authorize summary eviction, one of the fastest summary eviction processes in the country. While this process is designed to move cases quickly, it can be devastating for tenants with disabilities, transportation barriers, regular work schedules, no access to legal assistance, or with limited literacy, especially because the process is so convoluted. There's not enough education on how tenants can navigate through the process because it doesn't operate with a good-faith mindset towards tenants. Under this current framework, a tenant who doesn't contest the eviction within a short time frame can face removal from their home. Telling someone they must sue themselves to contest an eviction within a short time frame is confusing and not aligned with any other civil process in the country. Households that temporarily fall behind on rent or experience a financial disruption can turn a manageable financial crisis to housing instability, leading to homelessness. Once that household is displaced, the cost to the public system through our emergency interventions can exceed the amount of rent that was originally owed. Beyond pre-eviction diversion, mediation, eviction defense, meaningful notice and opportunities to appear, repayment plans, and mechanisms that allow approved rental assistance to be processed, it is essential to reform our eviction process. This is by requiring landlords to initiate eviction proceedings with the court. Nevada already has laws that authorize crisis services, detoxification facilities, residential treatment, behavioral health providers, and Medicaid behavioral health coverage. However, this authorization doesn't guarantee access to appropriate level of care for people. Our state's lack of mental health care access reflects this more broadly. According to Mental Health America's latest Access to Care ranking, Nevada ranked fifty-first among the states and Washington, D.C., in access to mental healthcare. The ranking considers insurance coverage, access to treatment, workforce availability, affordability, and unmet need. Mental health and any other services exist but doesn't mean they're available when someone needs them or they're equipped to treat specific needs. In establishing measurable statewide access standards and requiring annual public reporting by county and population, we need to consider that relationship works both ways. Behavioral health conditions can contribute to housing instability, and housing instability can cause behavioral health conditions to become more difficult to treat. Behavioral and mental health, as well as substance use, are not universal explanations for what causes homelessness. Nevada should consider measuring behavioral health access by whether people can actually receive care, regardless if someone is experiencing homelessness or not. Our statewide standards could establish maximum wait times for routine and urgent appointments, crisis response expectations, regional treatment capacity goals, and provider to populations ratio. Annual reporting could show where the shortages are and where access differs significantly

between urban, rural, frontier communities, and other community types. Requiring public real time bed availability information is also important. We could be establishing evidence-based standards to protect people from being exploited through fees, patient brokering, forced labor, retaliation and other inappropriate discharge practices. This is true with healthcare and the justice system in terms of discharge planning. Under Nevada law, we already recognize that discharge planning should be involved when caring for patients. So, the caregiver advises, records and enable provisions. They require hospitals to allow certain patients to identify a caregiver and requires hospitals to notify and consult with that caregiver on the patient's discharge plan. These have limitations for people experiencing homelessness. They depend on a patient being able to have an identified caregiver. They require hospitals to attempt contact but not requiring guaranteed contact. They don't establish a specific safe discharge standard for people who have nowhere to live. They also don't require hospitals to get an actual placement before discharge or prohibit discharge to the street. We have this provision, but it can be a lot stronger. Providing third party transportation or a list of shelters doesn't mean that shelter has a bed, can accommodate medical needs, or has agreed to take the patient. The State should establish safe discharge standards for patients experiencing homelessness, require hospitals to screen for housing instability at admission and prior to discharge. With patient's consent, discharge planning should allow hospitals to engage homeless service providers, medical respite programs and community health workers while patient are still receiving care. Medical respite is a huge opportunity for our State because it can close the gap between recovery and worsened medical conditions. This is by providing a way for people who don't require hospitalization anymore with a safe place to recover. This work began in 2025, when the Legislature created a Medicaid medical respite benefit for people experiencing homelessness. This benefit doesn't take effect until July 1, 2027. It can cover up to 90 days of medical respite during a 12-month period which includes case management and care coordination. We can build on that by pairing the new benefit with state investment in the infrastructure that's necessary to make this usable. We could be providing capital funding to build or renovate medical respite facilities. We could fund room and board costs that Medicaid doesn't cover. We can establish sufficient regional capacity. Programs should be equipped across the board to serve people with complex medical needs, so we are not creating narrow eligibility that excludes people who most likely need the service. Concerning economics stability, we need to consider increasing our minimum wage and requiring annual cost of living adjustments. We have a \$12 minimum wage that provides a baseline, but many people earning minimum wage still have few options for stable housing. If a household's annual income is \$24,960 before taxes, and we apply the traditional standard that a household shouldn't spend more than 30% of its income on housing, that leaves \$624 for monthly rent before the household becomes severely cost burdened. There are many landlords that require income to be two or three times the rent. With our state's lack of rent stability, it's increasingly more difficult for someone to get into housing and keep it. Someone can be working full-time and still be experiencing homelessness crisis because the gap between what people can earn and what it cost to remain housed is so wide. I know several people who work multiple jobs or full-time students who are doing the right things but are still unable to make it into housing. Minimum wage should be evaluated against the actual cost of living instead of being a fixed floor. Our state's constitution allows our legislature to establish a higher minimum wage and implement regular cost of living adjustments. We should be doing that here especially for people living on fixed incomes. This challenge is going to look a little bit different where they have little

ability to increase their earnings even as rent and other living expenses rise. All of our economic stability strategies should account for fixed income and minimum wage, connecting people to support help preserve limited income that people may have. Also, the strategies should allow people to actually live and meet their basic needs. Employment and occupational licensing barriers related to criminal records can make reentry more difficult by preventing people from using their existing skills or pursuing occupations that provide better wages and long-term employment. We should review the licensing requirements to determine whether restrictions based on criminal history are actually related to the job or necessary for public safety. If we did that, we would find that most of them aren't and are arbitrary. Beyond traditional employment, licensing and permitting requirements create unnecessary obstacles for people earning income through arts, street performance, vending, and related activities. For people that are trying to rebuild their lives, that independent work can represent some of few immediate opportunities that they have to generate income. When permanent housing is not immediately available, we should also have sufficient transitional and reentry housing capacity to prevent release from incarceration from becoming an entry point into homelessness. We could establish reentry housing vouchers and landlord mitigation funds to make it easier for people leaving incarceration to obtain and keep their housing. Programs such as Returning Home model developed by the Corporation for Supportive Housing, provide examples of the connection between housing and reentry systems. Sealing criminal records can also create additional barriers long after someone has completed a sentence. Under our current law, we allow a variety of criminal records to be sealed. However, the process still requires someone to determine eligibility, obtain records, prepare documents and navigate a court process. The record should automatically be sealed when the statutory waiting periods are over, charges are dismissed or acquittals happen. Those should be sealed without requiring someone to navigate a completely separate process. We should also consider shorter waiting periods for lower-level offenses and provide legal assistance for cases that generally require court involvement. All of these recommendations are examples of how our broader systems can play a more direct role in reducing the barriers that make housing instability harder to resolve. Homelessness is shaped by so much more than what many people consider to be a personal failure. Individual circumstances matter but they also exist within a much larger set of conditions and policy frameworks. Two people could be experiencing a similar setback but have very different incomes depending on what's actually available to them. It's very important that we look beyond what seem to be an individual choice to help us better understand where change is possible. It doesn't live within itself. It is not a vacuum. There are many other things that intersects with it which make it harder for people to exit homelessness and get stable housing. We have to consider these in any type of policy framework.

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

I would like to return the conversation to the Nevada Interagency Advisory Council on Homelessness to Housing. I am sharing this as a fellow Council member and as an ICHHTA member, with genuine respect for the experience, authority and commitment represented on our team. Throughout the presentation, we talked about systems and policy, and how they work together or not. We want to ensure that we are humanizing our neighbors who are experiencing struggles, work for them rather than against them. All of you have seen our strategic plan which includes many of the issues we discussed. The Council was created for exactly the kinds of challenges we have discussed today. These are the challenges that do not belong to one agency and cannot be

September 17, 2026

resolved by one system alone. Our responsibilities as a Council are outlined in NRS 232.4981 through 4983. We are not created simply to receive presentations and discuss homelessness but be Nevada's response. Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson championed several legislative efforts to combat housing insecurity. His legacy includes the creation of this advisory council designed to streamline cooperation between state and local agencies. Many of the issues we discussed occur in spaces between systems, housing and health care, behavioral health and recovery, corrections and reentry, income and housing instability, state policy and local implementation. This makes the Council the appropriate place to bring these systems together to identify where the responsibility belongs and to move recommendations forward. Our current strategic plan has already been adopted, and State law requires for it to be updated every five years. This gives us an opportunity as we approach 2027. We can use our next strategic plan to move from identifying problems to assigning responsibility. For each priority, we should ask ourselves, in coordination with the ICHHTA these questions. What can be changed administratively? What requires legislation or funding? Which agency would lead it? Who needs to be at the table? And how will we measure whether people's lives are actually improving? This is not about blaming any individual organizations. Every system represented here and the systems we talked about faces limitations. It could be staff shortages, funding limitations, legal requirements and competing responsibilities. Our role is to help close the gaps, elevate recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature, and publicly track Nevada's progress. In my opinion, success should not be measured by the number of meetings, presentations received or plans we published. Our success should mean that fewer Nevadans become homeless, spend less time homeless, and obtain housing with the support and opportunity to remain stable. We have the authority in this Council, the collective knowledge, and the opportunity to move this work forward. We must decide how we use it. Thank you so much for allowing us to present here today. We are available for any questions and if anyone want to talk more about some of our recommendations.

Chair Tim Robb:

Thank you for your thorough job. This is an excellent presentation, and we appreciate the effort to you put into preparing it. I look forward to reviewing the report and determining what we can continue to press forward. I appreciate the discussion about our role and how we can best play our abilities as members of the Council. Thank you for bringing the spirit to the work that we do every day, keeping the focus going, and to drive that difference.

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

You're welcome.

Taisacan Hall:

If you think of anything further, please feel free to contact us. Thank you.

Chair Tim Robb:

Sounds great, thank you. Any thoughts or questions from any members of the Council? Hearing and seeing none, we will now close this agenda item.

Agenda Item VII. [For Information Only – Discussion of Agenda Items for the Next Meeting, October 29, 2026]

September 17, 2026

Chair Tim Robb:

Go ahead, Doctor Catrina.

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

I would like to invite CSH to present their Nevada Returning Home Replication Feasibility Study. This is to discuss how a proven supportive housing model could help Nevada reduce homelessness and repeat incarceration among people returning from prison. Their presentation highlights Ohio's Returning Home model. They identified current gaps between release from corrections and access to housing, outline partnerships, housing capacity, services, and investments that Nevada would need to implement a similar approach. They will also discuss potential roles for State agencies, housing providers, community partners and people with lived experience. That would be a great presentation for us.

Chair Tim Robb:

Great. Please provide CSH's contact information to the Homeless to Housing team.

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

Yes. Can we also add an agenda item to address the written public comment that we received?

Chair Tim Robb:

Yes, we will look into how to best address that.

Catrina Grigsby-Thedford:

Thank you.

Chair Tim Robb:

Sounds great. Any additional items from the members of the Council? Hearing and seeing none, we will now close this agenda item.

Agenda Item VIII. [General Public Comments]

Chair Tim Robb:

No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on the agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Comments will be limited to three minutes. If you are making a public comment via phone, please call 1-775-321-6111 and the meeting ID is 391 651 778 followed by pound. We are now open for public comment. Please unmute yourself and state your name for the Council. Does anyone wish to make public comment? Hearing and seeing none, I want to thank you all for joining. Thank you to our presenters and to everyone that does the work in our homelessness to housing spectrum across the State. This meeting is adjourned at 2:29 p.m.

Agenda Item IX. [Adjournment 2:29 p.m.]

September 17, 2026

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Abigail Bagolor

Abigail Bagolor, Committee Moderator

APPROVED BY:

Tim Robb

Tim Robb, Chair

Date: 10/01/2026