

MINUTES OF THE

MEETING

OF

THE NEVADA INTERAGENCY ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS TO HOUSING TECHNICAL
ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

January 20, 2026

The Nevada Interagency Advisory Council on Homelessness to Housing Technical Assistance Committee was called to order by Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer at 1:03 p.m. on Tuesday, January 20th, 2026. This meeting is being conducted virtually. This meeting was noticed in accordance with Nevada Open Meeting Law and posted on <https://dss.nv.gov/Home/Features/Public-Information/> the Division of Social Services website.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Owner, CEO, Chief Strategist, Winged Wolf Innovations LLC

Vice Chair Brooke Page, Western Region Managing Director Corporation for Supportive Housing, Nevada

Adrienne Babbitt, Deputy Administrator-Programs, Nevada Housing Division

Julee King, Sage Product Manager, The Partnership Center, Ltd

Chris Murphey, Grants Manager, Churchill Council on Alcohol and Other Drugs DBA: New Frontier, Nevada

Arash Ghafoori, Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth (NPHY)

Dr. Dayona Turner, Title II-Part A State Director, Nevada Department of Education

NEVADA INTERAGENCY ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS TO HOUSING
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE – January 20, 2026

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Dr. Pamela Juniel, Mckinney-Vento Coordinator, Nevada Department of Education

Dr. Catrina Grigsby-Thedford, Executive Director, Nevada Homeless Alliance

OTHERS PRESENT:

Alexis Ochoa, Social Services Chief, Nevada Department of Human Services Division of Social Services

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

Carlea Freeman, Family Services Supervisor, Homeless to Housing, Nevada Department of Human Services Division of Social Services

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

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

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

Veronica Jarchow, DAG

Agenda Item I. [Welcome, Call to Order, Roll Call]

Abigail Bagolor:

Good afternoon, and welcome to the meeting of the Governor’s Interagency Advisory Council on Homelessness to Housing Technical Assistance Committee. This meeting has been publicly noticed in compliance with Nevada’s open meeting law. Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer will call the meeting to order.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Good afternoon. It is 1:03 p.m. on January 20th, 2026. I’d like to call the meeting of the Nevada Interagency Advisory Council on Homelessness to Housing Technical Assistance Committee to order. Abigail, will you take roll, please?

Abigail Bagolor: [Roll Call. We Do Have Quorum.]

Agenda Item II. [General Public Comments]

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Item number two on our agenda is public comment. No action may be taken upon a matter raised until the matter has been specifically added to the agenda. Comments are limited to three minutes. If you are making a public comment via phone, please call 1-775-321-6111, ID 731 029 308 followed by pound. We are now open to public comments. Please unmute yourself and state your name for the committee. Do we have any public comment? Abigail, was there any public comment sent in writing or via email?

Abigail Bagolor:

There is none.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

OK. I will remind the public that there is a second opportunity at the end of the meeting. We will close this agenda item.

Agenda Item III. [For Possible Action – Discussion and Possible Approval of Minutes from December 16, 2025, Interagency Advisory Council on Homelessness to Housing Technical Assistance Committee Meeting]

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

You all should have received a copy of the minutes in the appointment invite in your calendar. I will entertain any discussion or edits that need to be made to those minutes. If there are none, I will entertain a motion for approval.

Adrienne Babbitt:

I move to approve the minutes.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Thank you, Adrienne. We have a motion to approve the minutes from December 16, 2025. Do I have a second?

Julee King:

I second that motion.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

We have a motion and a second to approve the minutes from December 16th, 2025. All those in favor, please unmute yourself and indicate by saying “aye”.

Adrienne Babbitt, Arash Ghafoori, Julee King, Dayona Turner, Brooke Page:

Aye.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Any opposed, please unmute yourself and indicate by saying “nay”. Any abstentions? Motion carries. We’ll close agenda item number three.

Agenda Item IV. [For Possible Action – Discussion and Possible Vote Around the Definition of the Scoring Criteria and Letter of Interest for Recruitment]

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

At our last meeting, we discussed our voting criteria, definition of the scoring criteria and letter of interest for recruitment. A subgroup was created to help with this. They met and we received some information from them. Arash, do you want to present that information?

Arash Ghafoori:

Doctor Catrina and I met a couple of times and whipped this up for you guys. We tried to make it self-explanatory. The email, though sent only this morning, speaks for itself. We improved alignment of scoring, common definitions and different things. We broke apart homelessness experience versus other types of experience, made lived experience binary and tried to clean up the actual score from one to five to be more consistent with each other or specific to what the question is seeking. For example, geographical representation has a different reason to be one to five than homelessness sector experience. We made some adjustments to the LOI to make it follow the score criteria more so we can get more information out that we could use. The next topic item is an updated scoring matrix and LOI components that could be added to a new draft of the LOI instructions that go out to potential candidates. The next step, aside from scoring, is thinking about the composition of the group overall. Since I’m the new kid on the block, I defer to the others for that one. That is what Catrina and I did. I’m happy to take any questions, explain any thoughts or suggestions, and report back to Catrina with any notes.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Thank you, Arash. Any questions, comments or concerns from the committee? Did everybody get the email?

Adrienne Babbitt:

I received the email but did not have a chance to review the content.

Dayona Turner:

The same for me.

Brooke Page:

I received the email.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Since folks did not have an opportunity to review the information in the email, we have two courses of action. We can take the time now to go through the components of the recommended scoring criteria that are being put forth by the ad hoc subcommittee, or we can table the vote on this item until our next meeting.

Julee King:

I would be in support of tabling this item until the next meeting, so folks have time to review the email.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Thank you, Julee. Any other thoughts, ideas or suggestions?

Adrienne Babbitt:

Would we be utilizing this new scoring matrix for the new applications that we received with these new criteria? If that's a yes, I would not want to delay.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

If I recall correctly from our meeting last month, we discussed that the applicants that are before us would be under the old scoring criteria that is currently in place.

Adrienne Babbitt:

Thank you for refreshing. Tabling, reviewing and coming back to this next month is a good course of action.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Is anybody opposed to tabling this item?

Arash Ghafouri:

No, certainly not opposed to it. Thanks for clarifying how we are going to score the existing applicants. Do we need to pend the following agenda item, too, or are those correlated but not necessarily causal?

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

The following item being establishing the size of the ICHHTA?

Arash Ghafouri

I didn't know whether talking about the size would also mean talking about the composition of the group and how we score or if that is overcomplicating the matter.

Julee King:

They feel like two different things that are correlated but not causal. We should table the definition to the next meeting but decide today on number five, establishing the size of the committee.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

I'm hearing that folks would feel more comfortable if we tabled a vote for item number four, the definition of scoring criteria and letters of interest until next month, giving us an opportunity to review

the materials that were sent to us just prior to this meeting. We will table that item to be put on our next meeting for vote. Please make sure you review those items so that we can have a good discussion and vote at next month's meeting on the new scoring criteria for any potential new members. Let's close agenda item number four and move on to agenda item number five.

Agenda Item V. [For Possible Action – Discussion and Possible Vote Around Re-establishing the Size of the ICHHTA Committee]

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Currently, our committee is eleven. We historically had an odd number on our committee because that makes it easier to make quorum of fifty percent plus one. At one point, the size of our committee was fifteen. We reduced the number of our committee because we were having a hard time meeting quorum to hold meetings. We felt it was critical to meet quorum to have our meetings monthly to get the work done. You all have expressed interest in wanting to discuss expanding the number of people on this committee. Is that just an expansion of the number or are there other components to that? I will open it up for discussion.

Adrienne Babbitt:

Having the right people on this group that will participate and show up is important. We reduced the size because we did not have many of us who were showing up regularly, making the size eleven as six of us were showing up. We've done outreach and new interest has been coming. We have two strong applicants that want to join this committee but only one open slot. I would be in favor of increasing the size to accommodate both of our new applicants with the understanding that they are going to show up and participate.

Brooke Page:

Thank you, Adrienne, for your comments. I hear the essence of your rationale of wanting to accommodate those that want to be on this committee. Historically, people start off genuinely with a strong desire to want to join. Life happens and over time that impacts their availability. This affects our ability to make quorum, which is frustrating. Considering the work that is intended for this committee, between eight and eleven people is an ideal number, meaning you only need five to six people to meet quorum. Once it gets above eleven, it's hard to schedule and get everybody on the same page. Keeping it at a workable number, this could even be between five and seven, would be ideal for more decision making. Between eight and eleven seems like a number that can get people scheduled and meet a quorum.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Doctor Turner?

Dayona Turner:

I would agree to increase the size. I also want to go back to when I first joined. I recall getting into the strategic plan and doing the work of looking at those categories and the work itself. There's been quite a few meetings where we haven't even touched the plan. Possibly, getting back into the work of the plan will get people reengaged who are currently on the committee. We spent quite a few meetings determining some foundational things like Arash and Doctor Catrina have worked on. Their document gives good structure that we can possibly implement going forward. If we can shift back to the focus of our strategic plan and getting our current members engaged, maybe we will find out that we don't need to increase our size. We have two individuals that have submitted for participation on the committee. We should look at them and possibly consider increasing for that purpose. I heard a few comments from Adrienne and Brooke that we have the people and it's about getting people to be involved, engaged and attending meetings. When I think of the purpose of this committee, we are to be looking at the strategic plan. I don't know if getting back into the purpose or the work of what we're supposed to be doing will engage the current members to be more active. I'm new. This could have been something before where you guys were engaged in the plan and people still weren't joining or showing up. I would be ok with increasing our size, specifically for the two people that have applied and are waiting. We should also shift the focus of our committee back to that original purpose to start looking at that plan and see who's engaged and participating to inform us that it needs to increase or decrease.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Arash?

Arash Ghafouri:

Thank you Doctor Turner. I appreciate those comments. They resonate with me, as well. Being new to the group, I can't speak to history and evidence of purpose. We will always possibly be in a situation where we have one or two shiny, new objects where we increase the size of the group and have a new person come on. Then, we're either going to have to increase the group size again or evaluate the composition of the group. Does this group have a healthy amount of people in a room to divide and conquer? Having synergy is good. Having too many cooks in the kitchen can be problematic. From the purpose of existing members versus considering new members, is there any sort of rhyme or reason to why we're on besides our individual merits? Do we have enough research types of people? Do we have too many nerds? Do we have enough or not enough Lived X? Do we have the wrong balance of people for the technical part of the strategic part of our work? Do we have enough experts, frontline people or whatever this group is looking for that can help achieve its goal?

Adrienne Babbitt:

Arash, I like what you just said. As a strategic committee, being strategic about our membership is important to consider.

Brooke Page:

That also goes back to the scoring criteria. We need to think broadly about the makeup composition of

what we need. Are we scoring based on that logic? Would it need to be considered in terms of ensuring that we aren't overrepresented in certain areas.

Arash Ghafoori:

Doctor Catrina and I did not game out the suggestions on what to do next. We were thinking that there's two ways. We could go back and reevaluate the scoring thing. We don't want to overcomplicate the scoring matrix, either by trying to put everything into it. I'm not sure if the purposes of this group changes, so I don't know whether you want to define a scoring matrix, have a good LOI and then internally, every quarter or once a year, decide what the composition of the group should be and do a check to ensure members are distributed throughout the composition categories. That's how we thought we could use those tools together without over encumbering one tool to the point where it's biased. The group could seek to have six types of things that could be subject matter that could be used when looking at a scoring criterion. We want a couple of fives in each category. We want a couple of twos in each category. You want people who've been around for awhile and some that are newer. I don't know, but that could help us decide that we are seeking about eleven because we need two of these plus one of those. We could separate it, make a list or incorporate it into the scoring matrix formally in some other way. If you keep it separate, then you can adjust one without having it mess with the other. Did that make sense?

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

It does make sense. Thank you, Arash. This is great and needed conversation. It goes back to some of the things that have been said over the last few months with the scoring criteria as it historically was, with needing folks from across the state to have geographic representation. And needing folks with skill and knowledge expertise as opposed to experience in homeless, mental health or substance abuse services versus people with lived experience. Needing a variety of people on the committee but doing it previously in a more simplistic manner. Being more sophisticated in thinking about what the composition of this group is and how we get to that composition. Now that we have more people interested, rather than being volunteered to be on the group. We have great candidates coming forward to be on the group, we can be more selective. We can identify who are the best candidates coming forward to sit on the group and what are the true skill sets and experiences that we need to have in the makeup of this group. It's time for us to become more sophisticated on identifying who we need to do the work. I also heard questions concerning what we are supposed to be doing and calls to get back to the bones of what we're supposed to be doing. I hear and understand the frustration of not working on the strategic plan for a few months. As you may or may not remember, Brooke and I have identified that we have been waiting for directions for our future activities from the ICHH. We take our direction from them. We had done what we had been directed to do, which was to create the strategic plan and give them the action plan that goes with that. We were waiting for directions for our next steps. We were in that lull of what to do next. In the meantime, we have been trying to take care of some administrative business that we need to get done as a committee. I appreciate you hanging in there with us so we can get that work done like cleaning up our scoring and ranking and getting our slate of members full and to who we need on the team. So, at this point, identifying not only the

number, but the composition of the team. We did have a resignation last month from Austin Pollard. We currently have two vacancies on the team.

Brooke Page:

Thank you, Michele. This could probably be a moot point.

Arash Ghafoori:

It sounds like there might be a little longer runway to talk about everything in terms of composition and size because you can fit the two in now without having to revote or do anything.

Chair Michele Fuller Hallauer:

I don't know if that negates the conversation, though. We've got two vacancies. We slot two people into those vacancies. This conversation is important. Are we bringing the right people on? Do we have the right makeup of the team? Does it make sense moving forward or are we just putting people on to put people on and keeping status quo to keep status quo to move forward? Is that really helping us to do the work that needs to be done? Are we making purposeful decisions or are we just moving forward and going through the motions? Having purposeful conversations is important. That is why I didn't start with telling you about the vacancy. Adrienne?

Adrienne Babbitt:

That goes back to the potential new scoring criteria and are we going to have these new applicants go with the new scoring. They applied to this group under our old model. We could potentially vote on their membership. Then, we can look, as a group, to see whether our existing makeup is strategic. Do we fit our strategic needs as a state working group and if anybody needs to resign or be invited to use this time for something else so that we can try to get the right people. That's a larger conversation that we could incorporate with our new members.

Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Doctor Turner?

Dayona Turner:

When we all applied, we were scored. Is there a central place for all our scores?

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Abigail, do you know the answer to that question?

Abigail Bagolor:

All the scores that were received and discussed during the meetings are posted to the public website.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Is there a centralized place where all the scores are compiled in one spreadsheet?

Dayona Turner:

That aggregate report is on the website or are you saying the individual scoring?

Abigail Bagolor:

The individual scoring.

Dayona Turner:

Looking at our current scores in an aggregate format, for example, if I had zero for lived experience but five in another category and someone else is a five in lived experience. If we have a majority of our members and are high in certain areas, we can look at that aggregate information and see what we don't have so we can assess our needs at recruitment. If that makes sense.

Arash Ghafoori:

Makes sense to me.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Thank you, Doctor Turner. Arash?

Arash Ghafoori:

I serve on a couple different boards that have a twofold scoring matrix. Once a person is on the board, they get a sort of baseball card, which is based off the scoring matrix. It's candid in explaining strengths and where a person lacks experience. That becomes an aggregate score for the group. Each thing is its own color. Blue, purple, orange. Any board member, when considering a new member, can look at the distribution of these colors and decide what the board needs. I agree with Doctor Turner. We may have too much Lived X or too much this or whatever just because of what we decide. If the board is going to be embarking on a really technical exercise for the next year versus thinking about a whole bunch of program improvements for the next year, maybe this next year we're going to need to be top heavy on Lived X because we're doing so much of a specific activity and that could also inform how you populate people moving forward.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

It sounds like we need to do an inventory of what the knowledge, skills and abilities are of the people that are on the committee.

Dayona Turner:

I would say yes. Since we already have that information available, it's a matter of putting that into one report or document that we can put those categories up there that we were scored by and filter out that way.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

I agree. We do have the scores but those are from the old scoring system, and we do have this potential new scoring system that we will be looking at over the next month that goes into a bit more detail. The letter of interest is asking for a bit more from potential applicants that the current members on the committee may not have. It may behoove us, moving forward, to collect the data from us to populate whatever it is that we want to populate to capture the information as we move forward.

Dayona Turner:

Does that mean that current members would be evaluated according to the new criteria? Would we resubmit our information for us to score one another?

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

We would collectively need to decide how we would move forward. We need to get a sense of who has what experience, knowledge, skills and abilities, and who is representing what areas. Let's get it in some type of chart or something so that we can represent that. Then, as we determine what we need on this committee, we need to have some hard conversations. If we have major overrepresentation in a specific area, we need to not let our egos get in the way. We need to be able to thank people for serving and ask them to step down.

Adrienne Babbitt:

I'll concur with what you said. I joined this group because I wanted to make a difference working on ending homelessness and being part of a state strategic plan. If I'm not the right person because I don't have strong policy background, data analytics or whatever, I will happily step aside to move this work forward.

Brooke Page:

I agree with all that has been said. It would be good for all of us to reapply, update all our information and make sure there's consistency. Seems like it would be a good use of parity across the committee.

Arash Ghafouri:

I couldn't agree more. Whatever we develop moving forward, we should also apply to ourselves to ensure that we're not already composed in a way the group needs to be. Then, we can either self-select or have conversations.

Dayona Turner:

Would we all start over? Would we self-evaluate in the categories. Or would we submit, let our peers review and then score us?

Arash Ghafouri:

You could go either way. You could formally have everyone reapply, but no one is technically approved. What we are looking for is to ensure that the existing board meets the balance of what we want in terms of the group's composition. Therefore, this group, who are the only people who can do it, should come up with ideas about what the composition should be. We want three of X or three of Y or whatever the case may be. Then, once we finalize the scoring matrix and that decision, we can self-evaluate or rescore ourselves. The staff can keep an updated roster on how everyone who's on the group scores in what areas. Then, we can look and see areas where changes need to be made to the composition of the group. That would be my thought on how to handle it. One, having a conversation as a group and deciding what the composition of the group should look like. Two, not firing anybody, but having everyone evaluated among that new standard. This would allow us to decide if we have too

many people leaning in a specific way or if we have the right composition or need to add one person. We don't have to formally reapply as a whole group.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

We've been talking about size and composition of the group. We've talked about potentially doing a reevaluation of everybody in the group. Once we've evaluated everybody in the group, we can determine if we have over or under representation in the group composition. Is that accurate?

Dayona Turner:

I would agree.

Brooke Page:

That sounds right to me. It sounds like the work group might need to reconvene and provide some recommendations if there's this idea of assessing the composition.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Regardless of the composition, can we decide on the size? Is that determined by the composition?

Adrienne Babbitt:

That's determined by the composition.

Brooke Page:

I agree. Some of this needs to be informed by the role and expectations that the Interagency Council has on this committee. There's a lot of wishful processes that we perceive this committee be doing. Without that direction and guidance all of this could be speculative until we have further direction from the Interagency Council.

Adrienne Babbitt:

Have those meetings been scheduled for this new calendar year?

Abigail Bagolor:

Their first meeting will be on March 19th.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Arash, would your subgroup that did the scoring be able to make some recommendations on the composition of the group? The composition might help drive the thought around the size of the group.

Arash Ghafoori:

Absolutely. I figured that it might come up. Is Doctor Catrina on the call?

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

I haven't seen her come on.

Arash Ghafoori:

Doctor Catrina has been on this committee longer. I believe she is also a member of the council, not just the Technical Assistance Committee.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Correct.

Arash Ghafoori:

I would not be the best suited for that because I don't have the experience, depth or connection yet. I haven't been to enough meetings to observe it. I could contribute but I need some assistance from Doctor Catrina. I don't know if I can commit her or not. In theory we can. I'm just telling you what my limitations will be. I can only speak for myself, and I feel ill equipped to do that part alone. Perhaps Doctor Catrina would be able to help. If not, Madam Chair, maybe the three of us could have a twenty-minute conversation. From your vantage point, you could give us a couple of things that could help start the conversation. Everything we did so far was reasonable. We didn't bring a lot of assumptions, just cleaned everything up and made things talk to each other better. Here, we would be making some assumptions.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

I would be glad to join with you guys to have that conversation if you would like me to.

Arash Ghafoori:

We will take care of it.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

After much discussion, we will table the vote until we hear back from the ad hoc committee that did the scoring tool and rationale. That subcommittee will look at the composition of the group and give us recommendations for composition and size at our next meeting on February 17th.

Adrienne Babbitt:

I'm sorry. I have another commitment and have to leave early today.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Ok.

Arash Ghafoori:

Is it unreasonable to ask the group to send back some informal measure of whether they agree or disagree with the groupings of the scoring. Everything is subjective to being discussed at the same time. It's going to be hard to peg everything off one another. If we're going to start talking about composition, we need to get an opinion of the group if they feel the categories are equally weighted. We could do that right now.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

What is it that you need feedback on?

Arash Ghafoori:

You all received an email with the proposed scoring matrix. Do you all agree that the six different points of scoring is an appropriate amount? Should they all be weighted equally as different scores and

within the score? For example, in homelessness services experience, we have a range from volunteer to twenty plus years of experience. That doesn't mean that the group always wants to score high. We would suggest having a balance of someone that's newer to the field and some that may be a veteran in the field. Does everyone think that these six or so scoring subjects are good and that they should be approximately equal among each other. Do any of these have any more weight?

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

If I'm understanding correctly, you want to know if each of the individual scoring criteria is separate but equal.

Arash Ghafouri:

Yes.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Brooke?

Brooke Page:

If we have the composition question at the same time as the scoring question, would that resolve this tension? If we want people on the committee who are newer to the field versus the makeup we currently have of experienced people, novices and experts, would that inform how we score them? We would know what our gap is and that we need folks who have these deficits on the committee. The committee can go forth and score new applicants. If the criteria allow us to meet the gaps that we have, it would address this concern. We would then have the make up that we need and a tool that's nimble enough to give us flexibility to score candidates based on what we need.

Arash Ghafouri:

The best way to answer that question is to redirect what this subcommittee of Catrina and I are agreeing to, which is that we will talk about this and come back with one of two things. We are either going to come back with specific recommendations on composition and size, or we will come back with a guided discussion of three to five questions that need to be answered to determine this. Let me see what Catrina and I come up with based off that. I see what you're saying, Brooke. I can see the answer either way. You could do it where one informs the other or you could have them totally unrelated. The way we designed the scoring matrix was to not assume bias if you happen to score a bunch of fives. Scoring a bunch of fives isn't ideal. Even in the LOI, once you review it, there is a disclaimer that the point is not to score high. The point is to tell us where you fit into the equation so we can make the best decision concerning the balance. Now, the group is discussing what the balance needs to be. We will either come back to you with three or five questions that help us determine that balance or an idea of what we think the balance should be. Then, we can evaluate it all together.

Brooke Page:

Thank you, Arash. I didn't mean to complicate things. Even the lived experience category feels like a representation that we want on this committee. It shouldn't be scored simply because a person does or doesn't have that. If our composition now has representation, does that allow us to feel like we've

addressed these categories, making sure that we have geography of the state and who represents various areas of the state?

Arash Ghafoori:

Those are good points. Doctor Catrina and I are going to have to discuss some of those things so we can bring back to you what we think. The state one is easy. You want to have some people who are experts in their area and if we're missing an area is equally important. Having someone who has worked in separate areas and knows how to put all the glues together is good. We can figure that one out. Lived experience is a little more nuanced and complicated. That gets into other problems boards have when they're considering skills versus backgrounds, demographics and how to weigh, score and consider all those things in an equitable and transparent sort of way. Luckily, Doctor Catrina is a Lived X expert, not only because of her own experience but as part of what she does. She will be able help us make some recommendations on how we should think about that in terms of composition or balance.

Brooke Page:

Thank you.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Anything else you need from the group, Arash?

Arash Ghafoori:

No, that's more than enough. Does the staff on this call take notes of everything we're discussing and are those notes made available to us?

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

They do take minutes. Do you need the minutes for your meeting?

Arash Ghafoori:

No, I took notes. I wanted to know if I could rely on that moving forward. It sounds like I can.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

We can talk directly with Abigail and team for portions of the meeting if there are specific things that you need for you to do your work moving forward. This is great conversation that I appreciate. Even though we don't have an actual vote on this item, we have had some critical conversation that has been good for us as a group. With the work the subcommittee will do, we will have some good movement going forward. Arash, do you need anybody else on the team to help with this work?

Arash Ghafoori:

That's why I was saying that I wasn't sure if we would come back with questions or a specific recommendation. We might have to email the group saying that we have hit a wall and request they fill out a survey to help us. I'm not sure without talking to Doctor Catrina. We'll have a phone call to discuss next steps if needed and out of the group's scope.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Ok. We will close this agenda item and move on to agenda item number six.

Agenda Item VI. [For Possible Action – Discussion and Possible Vote on New Applications to Join the ICHHTA Committee]

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

We have two applicants, Ms. Juawana Grant and Ms. Vevlyn Grant. We sent those applications back out to gather scores from additional folks as we were missing some scores. Scores have been compiled. Eight people have scored for each of the applicants. We can discuss what we want to do regarding voting. We currently have two vacancies. We previously discussed group size and did not decide on whether we are going to expand the size and the composition of our group. We need to determine if we are going to vote to accept either one or both applications that onto the committee. We have the scores and the average for each categories. Both Juawana Grant and Vevlyn Grant have an average score of 4.625 in experience in homeless, mental health and substance abuse services.

Dayona Turner:

Do you guys have a cut score that candidates don't qualify if scored below? Are we reviewing scores just to review them? Are we just looking at how they scored and voting to say ok?

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

It gives you an idea. It tells you what the scores were and how they were scored to allow for any discussion.

Arash Ghafoori:

Are there term limits for being on this group?

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

There are not. It doesn't mean we can't enact term limits but there are not.

Arash Ghafoori:

Do you guys want to accept two candidates or fill just one. The group limit is eleven and we currently have two vacancies. If we fill them both, unless someone leaves or resigns, we can't accept any unless we change the group size. Do we want to leave one open? That can help us decide if we are deciding between candidates or whether we want to put both on and call it a day.

Chris Murphey:

The main difference in the scores was in homelessness experience. With the work that's before us, at some point we are going to need to have additional seats on this committee. It's not a disadvantage to fill them both. Presently, we are not having an issue with not being able to make quorum. It was our

concern with having a larger committee in the past. Under our present participants, we're not having that issue.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Other thoughts or comments?

Brooke Page:

We should entertain a motion.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Do you have one that you want to propose?

Brooke Page:

I am going to recuse myself from this process, but we should vote.

Julee King:

I move to approve both applicants for membership.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

We have a motion on the table to approve both applicants for inclusion on the committee. Do we have a second?

Chris Murphey:

I second that.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

We have a motion and a second. All those in favor, please unmute yourself and indicate by saying "aye".

Chris Murphey, Julee King, Dayona Turner, Arash Ghafoori:

Aye.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Any opposed, please unmute yourself and indicate by saying "nay". Any abstentions?

Brooke Page:

I abstain.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Thank you. Motion carries. We now have two new committee members. Ms. Juawana Grant and Ms. Vevlyn Grant. Welcome, ladies, to our committee.

Juawana Grant:

Thank you, everybody.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

We will close this agenda item and move on to our next agenda item.

Agenda Item VII. [For Information Only – Introduction of New and Continuing Members of the ICHH Technical Assistance Committee]

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

We just voted in our two newest members of our Technical Assistance Committee, Ms. Juawana Grant and Ms. Vevlyn Grant. Do either of you want to go first and introduce yourself to the group? Do any of our existing members want to introduce themselves? This is a time for us to get to know each other.

Dayona Turner:

Welcome to the committee. I am also new, as well. My name is Dayona Turner. I am with the Nevada Department of Education.

Brooke Page:

Welcome to the committee. This is Brooke Page from the Corporation for Supportive Housing and have been on the committee for a while. I am excited to welcome you both.

Vevlyn Grant:

Thank you Brooke and Doctor Turner. I'm Vevlyn Grant. My background is in community health work and behavioral supportive services. I'm a care extender for an organization that works with Medicaid in Nevada called Mindoula Health. I have been in Nevada for about five years. I look forward to my experience in whatever way that can support the efforts of the committee.

Arash Ghafouri:

Welcome, Vevlyn.

Juawana Grant:

Great to meet you, Vevlyn and everybody. I am Juawana Grant. I am the Director of the Southwest Region for Corporation for Supportive Housing. I'm very excited to be here. I've been working in the affordable housing development space for the past few years in Las Vegas, which is my hometown. Before that, I was a direct service provider, case manager at some supportive housing organizations and an outreach worker in the jail diversion space in Seattle. I am very excited to be here and part of this committee and carrying forward this great work at the systems level with all of you.

Arash Ghafouri:

Welcome, Juawana, as well. My name is Arash Ghafouri. This is my second meeting. I just got voted on to the group. I work in the youth homelessness space, directly. I contribute to underground work at a programmatic level and a systems level. That is in partnership with great folks like you all and with a lot of young people with lived experience who are leaders helping us with systems, analysis, tweaking and impact.

Julee King:

My name is Julee King. I have worked in the field of housing and homelessness for twenty or twenty-one years. I currently work for The Partnership Center for the SAGE HMIS reporting repository.

Chris Murphey:

I'm Chris Murphey. I'm with New Frontier. We have provided homeless services here since 2004. I don't know how long I've been on the committee. We also have residential and outpatient services. My expertise, as well as being part of the Rural Continuum of Care, is in the behavioral health side of the house.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

I am Michele Fuller-Hallauer with Winged Wolf Innovations. I'm the current chair of this committee. I have 38 years of experience in the human services field, working in both micro and macro services. I specialize in systems transformation, housing and homeless solutions and organizational development. My commitment is to work in any way that I can with providers and agencies that serve people who need advocates or need folks to assist them in being able to help themselves do and be better. We are here as catalysts for transformative and innovative changes for individuals, agencies, organizations and communities. Is there anybody who did not introduce themselves? Juawana and Vevlyn, do you have any questions for us?

Juawana Grant:

I don't have any right now.

Vevlyn Grant:

Nothing so far.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

We appreciate you. We welcome you to the group. You can now actively participate in the discussions. We welcome your voice. We will close this agenda item and move on to agenda item number eight.

Agenda Item VIII. [For Possible Action – Discussion and Possible Vote Regarding the Current Strategic Plan and Any Revisions that Need to be Made. Follow-Up on the Outcome of the Direction from the ICHH]

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

I don't believe we've gotten any further direction from the ICHH. I'm going to look to Brooke, Abigail, Carlea or anyone else on the team to see if we've gotten any further direction from the ICHH.

Abigail Bagolor:

We have not received anything aside from the direction that the TA Committee will have to vote before the ICHH can vote to adopt.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Thank you for the reminder, Abigail. We did get verbal direction from Chair Tim Robb that the ICHH would like us to make revisions and corrections to the strategic and actions plans. Then, do a formal vote to accept and move all that forward to the ICHH for formal adoption of the action plan to the strategic plan. We can do that all as one fell swoop or we can do that in pieces. I'll open it up for discussion. Brooke?

Brooke Page:

We had an ad hoc group that met to discuss some recommendations related to the strategic and action plans. Adrienne was part of that. We weren't able to get Chris on the meeting we had scheduled. We want to report back to you all in terms of what we are recommending be sent to ICHH in addition to the current action and strategic plans. We aren't throwing out all the important work that has happened from this committee to this point. We want to signal the importance of getting them to think more strategically about the state's representation in the work. We created a memo for you all. The recommendation stems from the background of the council's purpose and the fact that we developed a strategic plan that was adopted in October of 2022. Subsequently, we've been working on an action plan. We recognized that there is a gap. The key issue identified by the working group was that the current strategic plan does not fully reflect or integrate the diverse homelessness-related initiatives that are already underway within the State of Nevada's various departments and agencies. These agency led efforts from Health and Human Services, Behavioral Health, Corrections, Welfare, Housing and Veterans Services are all essential to how we operate as a state and can provide statewide system response that could be informing the strategic plan that we are not currently getting information on. This is a missed opportunity for cross-agency alignment around homelessness and housing. It lacks visibility into state level investments that are happening to address homelessness and housing in relation to programs and measurable progress that's being made. We don't know what those things are at the various agencies. That is important for us to talk about the efforts that are happening statewide. There's also a gap in terms of strategic actions that reflect community priorities. This is not a unified statewide homelessness strategy. Maybe local jurisdictions are doing a lot. Homelessness tends to be a localized issue. There's a lot of state resources that go into supporting those efforts. How can those things be coordinated across local and state strategy? The ad hoc committee is bringing a recommendation to align off of work that's happening in other states such as California. Their statewide action plan allows for a multi-governmental and coordinated approach to addressing homelessness. They have a three-year road map for preventing and ending homelessness. It's structured around measurable goals, multi-agency action areas and coordination across state agencies that is supported by annual progress reports and monitoring activities. It's anchored in an all-government approach. It's not just state agencies but is also informed by local agencies. This integrated model provides transparency, accountability and a clear state-level strategy that guides local partners. The committee suggests that we make recommendation to shift to a state centered plan framework for the next iteration of the strategic plan. The current plan is a five-year plan. We recommend that the state considers starting to document efforts that are happening statewide across

agencies that are addressing homelessness and housing, behavioral health, reentry, prevention and supportive services. This would allow those agencies to provide presentations and updates to the Interagency Council and use these state actions to form the foundation of a future iteration of the plan. This would ensure alignment with statewide priorities and investments. We recommend that the committee convene these presentations from the various state agencies and allow the staff of the Interagency Council to compile reports to help inform what a future strategic plan could include. There are specific indicators we would ask for the presentations to include. These would be state agency actions, any targets or metrics, any fund sources that support their work, and accountability components. If there's any equity frameworks or data that's being disaggregated by demographics that can be used to understand who they are serving. To ensure there's an opportunity for ongoing updates and progress reporting on the different topics related to their presenting around homelessness and housing. Once the statewide infrastructure is in place, it would be expanded beyond the state and start including presentations from local counties, continuums of care and service providers to help inform and build upon a statewide action plan. We are proposing a language to use for the recommendation to the ICHH. And the summary to that language is we recommend that the Interagency Council take a more statewide, targeted approach to informing action plans and moving forward. Then, allowing them to use this structure to inform the strategic plan moving forward. We may want to consider how to interface with that. We have action and strategic plans that we have recommendations around. The challenge with the plan we currently have is the lack of accountability and structure to hold people accountable with the recommendations that we are making. Some of the things could live with the state agency. Some of those things may live outside the state's responsibility. Having some conversation around that is important. Layering with this type of structure provides for the state to have accountability and control over things that they're doing and have control over.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

I want to thank the ad hoc subgroup for the work. That's comprehensive and a great idea. I appreciate all the considerations that went into the memo and recommendation. I like the idea of going back to the state agencies and holding them accountable. You mentioned the CoCs, local and county jurisdictions and the providers. We talked about each of the CoC's to take pieces of the actions plan and that be the actions plan for the CoC to utilize in their respective geographic areas. Is that something that could be utilized with this approach or does that get rid of that concept?

Brooke Page:

This is something we should discuss and make a recommendation around. This is not intended to supplant what has already been developed but to provide a path forward to gain information that's happening across the state agencies in addressing homelessness. We want the Interagency Council to adopt our recommendations and allow for work to happen on the action plan. This is a missing component that the state has agency and authority to make decisions around. We aren't capturing and don't know what's happening to help inform local jurisdiction work. There could be duplication of effort or gaps. To have something more comprehensive while also addressing what's happening at the local jurisdiction level would help create a better picture of the work.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Thank you. I agree. Do other people have any thoughts, ideas or anything else they want to bring forward? Chris?

Chris Murphey:

I participated in writing our current strategic plan. I read California's strategic plan and reread ours. The thing that stood out to me most was what Brooke tried to explain. The California plan shows all the organizations working together in everything they're doing across the state. When we started looking at an action plan, we were focusing more to the agencies that we're aware of, in the state that are working with homelessness, which are primarily our CoCs. What was obvious is that vision is too narrow. We're all doing so many wonderful things. If we could incorporate everything into one plan, how to track it and know we're making progress in those areas. Those are missing in the original strategic plan. We did a remarkable job in getting a plan together and approved. I don't want to take anything away from that. I'm just saying that we can build on it and document what everybody is doing to end homelessness in our state and include all these other agencies.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Thank you, Chris. Other thoughts or comments? Brooke, what do you think the next step is? Do we need to vote on moving the language forward to the ICHH? Do we need to do some work on the action plan to move that forward?

Brooke Page:

There is a need to decide if this is the right approach. Are we on the same page about taking this recommendation forward? As suggested by ICHH, it is important to ensure that the things in the action plan are still the recommendations we think are important to move forward. When we met before, we prioritized housing as a strategic issue with a recommended action of identifying permanent funding sources. Next was homeless prevention and intervention, ensuring prevention funds are more accurately targeted for diversion and problem solving. And wrap-around services where we recommended engaging stakeholders to establish partnerships and leverage existing resources. These were the three priorities and recommendations that had been voted on for ICHH to hone in on and help us flush out. That is what we've been waiting for them to give us direction on. If that's something we still believe in, then we continue to advocate for those things and make a recommendation for state agency involvement in this process. We also asked them if they still want us to be in this role of advising their council. Giving recommendations of important topics that they should be raising to be addressed. Considering the makeup of that council are decision heads and leaders within their respective departments. We asked them what our role is. Do you want us to help support implementation of the action plan and monitor the actions being raised. We have this robust workbook that has various timelines and metrics that need to be tracked. Who's responsible for that work? Where does that live? Getting feedback around our role related to the action plan and align priorities to maximize each other's time in this space.

Juawana Grant:

It will helpful to show them the California example and demonstrate how this work moves or can move forward. Sharing ideas and recommendations is one thing. It will also be helpful to share recommendations for what are the next steps to make sure things are moving forward. So, they understand the ownership that Brooke was talking about and what that looks like in action. Part of the stalling might be that they see a lot of information and too many ideas to break down the next steps into smaller steps. This committee could share and help with that as the accountable party, but also the project manager around some of that stuff. Bringing in other agencies that are already doing the work might be helpful. Then, there's more people to do the work but also avoid replicating work that's already being done in other places.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Great suggestion. Other thoughts or comments? What are our next steps? What do we need to do? What is our next action item?

Brooke Page:

Do we need to give folks some time? We can send the action and strategic plans with the recommendations in the memo to give people time to review and come with any recommendations. Then, vote at our next meeting how we should proceed and what we will recommend to the ICHH at their meeting in March.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Brooke, would your subgroup mind putting together a call to action describing what the homework for the committee is and what they should be prepared to discuss at the next meeting?

Brooke Page:

I would be happy to. Abigail, could you confirm that the direction from the ICHH was for this committee to review and adopt the action plan?

Abigail Bagolor:

Yes. They wanted the TA committee to polish whatever you have and take a formal vote. Once we have that formally voted action plan to the strategic plan, they will add it to their agenda so they can vote to adopt the plan.

Brooke Page:

It would be important to vote and adopt the action plan at the next meeting. Then, if there's any changes to the action plan, we could make those before making a vote.

Juawana Grant:

I apologize but I have to jump off because I had a pre-existing meeting. but I'm looking forward to working with all of you. I will see you at the next meeting.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

If I'm understanding correctly, Brooke, you're saying that we would need to get any recommendations,

changes or edits back to Abigail and team in the next two to three weeks so that this group could review and vote on that at our next meeting.

Brooke Page:

We will be bringing the action plan for a vote at the next meeting is what I'm saying. If someone has any concerns with the current action plan, they should provide those recommended changes in a memo by a certain date and we have a deadline. That way, there's time for those recommended changes to go out to the committee for review and informed the vote. Then, we bring those recommendations forward and have a discussion on any of the proposed changes when the item comes up for a vote. Is that reasonable?

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

I understand what you're saying and the importance of moving things forward expeditiously. We have a few things that we've already said need to be reviewed and brought to the next meeting. I'm not going to speak for anybody but myself. I know that I will not be able to meet a deadline of reviewing the full strategic and action plans and come back with recommendations because of other requirements and things that are on my plate. If you all can move forward without my review of that, I will support it.

Brooke Page:

Yes, that makes sense.

Arash Ghafoori:

As the new kid on the block, I will try to do my best. The reason I'm so quiet on this is that I'm trying to piece together what's going on, what our purpose is, what the subcommittee is trying to do, what we need to do and by when without some of the guidance that we need. I'm still trying to piece this together. Send me whatever homework I need to do and I'll try to get it done.

Brooke Page:

Thanks, Arash. With us having so many new members, time is important. A lot of this has been developed by the committee over the last year and it's been sitting. It was the recommendation of the ICHH to double-check that this is, in fact, what we want to move forward. I don't see it as a complete overhaul, but we do have new members.

Arash Ghafoori:

Do you think new members need to get out of the way so that you all can make this decision faster?

Brooke Page:

No. We want to make sure everybody is on board with that is in the action plan.

Arash Ghafoori:

I can do that within a two-to-three-week window if this doesn't involve dissecting the strategic plan in twenty different ways.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

It's more important that the new members do a close review than those of us that have been bogged down of it. Vevlyn?

Vevlyn Grant:

Are these plans living documents or, once they're voted on, is it just that and it doesn't have to change until they ask again?

Brooke Page:

That's a great question. I was assuming the action plan was living because it needs to be updated on a regular basis. The strategic plan hasn't been updated for a while. That was also part of why the ad hoc committee met, to make a recommendation around the strategic plan needing to incorporate this state agency lens. That's a separate discussion from the action plan, which is intended to inform the strategic plan.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Great point and great question. I believe the strategic plan must be updated every five years and the action plan is a living, breathing document that gets updated as some things will fall off because they're not applicable anymore. New things will need to be added because they become important, which is part of why the ICHH wants us to make sure. Have things fallen off because they've been resolved? Are there new things that have become an issue that need to be added? Are there things that are duplicative? That needs to be done to justify that this is where they live. That's probably some of the things that need to be cleaned up. Have things started in one area but need to be completed somewhere else? That happens in some projects, as well. Something might be started under some agency and the completion of it must happen somewhere else. That might be the case, too. The lead of it might need to change or something to that effect.

Vevlyn Grant:

Thank you, Chair. Brooke's information was comprehensive. I agree with everything that I saw on the document. I don't know if I'll receive a copy for deeper review, but it sounds like it covers most of the bases of the items I would bring up for action or recommendation.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Do folks want to give their feedback and be prepared to vote at the next meeting on any recommendations, changes or edits?

Arash Ghafouri, Vevlyn Grant, Julee King:

Yes.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

We can move forward with that. If we could have a blurb to identify when we need that information for the team so those things can be easily incorporated and voted on. Abigail, when would you and

your team need all the information back so that you could compile everything from the group into one document?

Abigail Bagolor:

We would need to have it by February 9th.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Once we do that, will we vote on those recommended changes for the strategic and action plans and the memo?

Brooke Page:

The recommended changes are just for the action plan. If there's any feedback on the memo and the ad hoc committee's language, we want to be able to vote for that, as well. We shouldn't address the strategic plan at this time.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Anything else on this agenda item? Seeing none, we will close this agenda item and move on to agenda item number nine.

Agenda Item IX. [For Information Only – Discussion of Agenda Items for the Next Meeting on February 17, 2026]

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

We know we will have discussion and possible vote around the scoring criteria and letter of interest for recruitment. We will have discussion and a possible vote around the composition and group size of the ICHHTA and next steps. Can we keep agenda item eight as it currently is? Will that cover what we need, which is the recommendations for any changes or edits to the action plan and memo to the ICHH, or do we need to change that language?

Brooke Page:

It probably needs to encompass the action plan, as well. I don't know if that's all inclusive, strategic plan and action plan or synonymous.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Anything else that needs to be on next month's agenda? We've got some homework between now and then. It's going to be a month of homework. With that, we will close this agenda item and move on to agenda item number ten.

Agenda Item X. [General Public Comments]

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Item number ten on our agenda is public comment. No action may be taken upon a matter raised until the matter has been specifically added to the agenda. Comments are limited to three minutes. If you are making a public comment via phone, please call 1-775-321-6111, ID 731 029 308 followed by pound. We are now open to public comments. Please unmute yourself and state your name for the committee. I have one quick public comment. I'm taking off my Winged Wolf hat and putting on my Rural Nevada Continuum of Care hat. The homelessness Continuum of Care point in time count is coming up. The three Continuums of Care across the state have collaborated on when they are doing their point in time count, as we do every year. Wherever you are in the state, connect with your local Continuum of Care for the morning of January 29th. That is when the point in time count will take place. Ensure you get connected to do the point in time count. In Southern Nevada, Clark County and all jurisdictions therein, connect with Help Hope Home. For Northern Nevada, Reno, Sparks, and all jurisdictions within Washoe County, connect with the homeless services agency up there. For the rest of the state, Rural Nevada Continuum of Care, you can connect with the Rural Nevada CoC website and get connected to the appropriate county. Does anybody else have any public comment? Abigail, has anything come in via email or otherwise during our meeting?

Abigail Bagolor:

There is none.

Chair Michele Fuller-Hallauer:

Hearing none, seeing none, we will close public comment. It is 3:19 pm. I will adjourn this meeting. Thank you all for being here and participating. I appreciate the great discussion. Have a great day.

Agenda Item XI. [Adjournment 3:19 PM]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:



Abigail Bagolor, Committee Moderator

APPROVED BY:



Michele Fuller-Hallauer, Chair

Date: 02/04/2026