

**ORANGE COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE
COORDINATED ENTRY SYSTEM STEERING COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING**

Wednesday, July 9, 2025

2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Location:

Orange County Housing Authority (OCHA)

1501 E. St. Andrew Pl., 1st Floor,

Conference Room A, Santa Ana, CA 92705

[Click Here](#) for parking information.

Virtual Meeting Option:

Zoom Meeting Link: [Click here for meeting link](#)

Join by phone: +1 669 444 9171

Webinar ID: 981 5056 2103

****Listen-in option only****

Committee Chair: Andrew Crowe, Scholarship Schools

Purpose: The Coordinated Entry System (CES) Steering Committee will function as an advisory group to the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board and Policy, Procedures and Standards (PPS) Committee to align its efforts to those of the Orange County CoC Board Vision including but not limited to reviewing CES policies and procedures for process review, policy formation, assessment of current policies and procedures and formation and conduct of committees in the service of the CoC, CES and Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). The CES Steering Committee will support the CoC Board with policy development, supporting strategic implementation of the CES and evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of CES.

MEETING MINUTES

Call to Order – Andrew Crowe, Chair

Public Comments – Members of the public may address the CES Steering Committee on items listed within this agenda or matters not appearing on the agenda so long as the subject matter is within the jurisdiction of the CES Steering Committee. Members of the public may address the CES Steering Committee with public comments on agenda items after the agenda item presentation. Comments will be limited to three minutes. If there are more than five public speakers, this time will be reduced to two minutes.

In order to address the CES Steering Committee, members of the public are to complete a Request to Address the Committee form prior to the beginning of each agenda item and submit

MINUTES

July 9th, 2025

it to Continuum of Care (CoC) staff. Staff will call your name in the order received. Members of the public may also submit public comment by emailing CareCoordination@ocgov.com. All comments submitted via email or at least 24 hours before the start of the meeting will be distributed to the CES Steering Committee members and all comments will be added to the administrative records of the meeting. Please include “CES Steering Committee Meeting Comment” in the email subject line.

BUSINESS CALENDAR

1. Welcome and Introductions – Andrew Crowe, Chair

- a. The CES Committee Chair Andrew Crowe welcomed meeting attendees.

2. CES Updates – Daniel Garcia, CES Administrator, Office of Care Coordination

a. Individual CES – Tianna Terry, Individual CES Manager, Friendship Shelter

- i. As of May 31, 2025, there were 5,335 adult households active in the ICES project, with 3,807 households on the ICES Community Queue. 123 households were matched to a housing opportunity and pending approval.
- ii. Tianna Terry shared overall program updates for the end of the fiscal year, addressing work on improving prioritization and developing training materials with the Office of Care Coordination.
- iii. Tianna Terry also shared that the data quality goals set last year have been met and will continue to be improved upon.

b. Family CES – Jocelyn Morales, Family System Manager, Family Solutions Collaborative

- i. As of June 2, 2025, there were a total of 378 families receiving Family CES services. 64 families are waiting for shelter, 21 families have reconnected to a support system to resolve homelessness, and 10 families have moved into housing.
- ii. As of May 31, 2025, there were 364 active households in FCES, with 304 families on the FCES Community Queue.

c. Survivor CES – Tianna Terry, Individual CES Manager, Friendship Shelter

- i. As of May 31, 2025, there were 149 active survivors in the Survivor CES project, with 10 households with a pending match.
- ii. Tianna Terry shared a program update regarding the development and finalization of a survivor training.
- iii. Tianna Terry shared the efforts to continue the work of building relationships with the Victim Service Providers and potentially expanding the amount of Access Points for SCES.

- d. **Veteran Registry** – James Bacon, CES Staff Specialist, Office of Care Coordination
 - i. As of May 31, 2025, there were 212 veterans experiencing homelessness on the Veteran Registry. In the previous 12 months, 201 veterans have been housed.
- e. **Transitional Aged Youth Registry** – Julia Davis, CES Staff Specialist, Office of Care Coordination
 - i. As of May 31, 2025, there were 227 active TAY households in the TAY Registry, with 154 households on the Community Queue.
- f. **Virtual Front Door** – Amy Arambulo, Director, Community Impact, OC United Way
 - i. Amy Arambulo shared data from the Virtual Front Door Housing Data Dashboard and that the dashboard can be accessed at the HMIS website.
 - ii. Amy Arambulo shared about updated collaboration between Family CES and OC United Way.

Public Comments:

- Amy Arambulo, from OC United Way, inquired about what the possible exit destinations for ICES are in the “Other” category.
- Mia Ferreira, from Friendship Shelter, inquired about the trends regarding the volume of calls at the call center for the Virtual Front Door. Mia also shared the success of the Salida Del Sol housing project opening in the next week and the excitement that people will be housed.

3. CES 2-for-1 Match Policy – Daniel Garcia, CES Administrator, Office of Care Coordination

- Chair Andrew Crowe provided some background information about the process of establishing the 2-for-1 policy.
- Daniel Garcia, CES Administrator, provided background information about the development of the 2-for-1 Policy. The Orange County CES had previously allowed the use of matching multiple households to a single housing opportunity, but in the interest of ensuring an equitable and fair process, pivoted to only allowing one household to match to one opportunity. In certain circumstances, housing providers could request 2-for-1 matches.
- The Office of Care Coordination as the CES Lead proposed a policy for 2-for-1 matches to be allowed only in the circumstances that a property has a unit(s) that is approaching the 120-day vacancy date, or a newly opened property needs to achieve a specified occupancy rate by a specified date. The proposed 2-for-1 Match Policy can be viewed at <https://ceo.ocgov.com/care-coordination/homeless-services/coordinated-entry-system>.

- The proposed 2-for-1 Match Policy Draft will be shared for public feedback from July 10, 2025, to July 25, 2025, along with a virtual feedback session, if needed. The draft will then be shared at the August meetings of the Lived Experience Advisory Committee (LEAC) and the Policies, Procedures, and Standards (PPS) Committee, respectively, for review and feedback before beginning the formal approval process at the CES Steering Committee in September.

Public Comments:

- Sandra Lozeau, from the City of Anaheim, shared a comment in support of the policy and noted the importance of replacing matches as soon as participants are denied from the housing opportunity.
- Mishaun Watkins, from the Santa Ana Housing Authority, shared support of the policy and detailed that the policy will prevent delays in the housing process and promotes efficiency to fill vacancies.
- Judson Brown, from the City of Santa Ana, shared that the City of Santa Ana, being the largest provider of permanent supportive housing, is in support of this policy. Judson shared a scenario and insights on the inefficiencies of sitting on a vacant unit for an elongated amount of time while there are people experiencing homelessness and expressed the necessity of the policy to fill vacant units in a timely manner. Judson suggested shortening the time frames from 120 days of vacancy to 90 days of vacancy to be considered for the 2-for-1 matches.

Discussion:

- Mia Ferreira, from Friendship Shelter, inquired about the process for the secondary match. Daniel Garcia provided clarity and confirmed the secondary match would need to sign a consent form to acknowledge that that participant knows of their secondary match status and removal from the community queue and that the secondary match can be returned to the community queue at any point if that participant no longer wanted it. Chair Andrew Crowe suggested the use of a graphic to provide clarity about the process.
- Tianna Terry, from Friendship Shelter, inquired about the timeline of when the secondary match is returned if the primary match is approved. Daniel Garcia explained that process will still be aligned with the HMIS procedures considering returns.
- Jocelyn Morales, from Orange County United Way, Family Solutions Collaborative, inquired about timeframes of 2-for-1 match processes regarding the housing authorities. Daniel Garcia expressed that since each housing authority has their own timeframes and other contributing factors, it would be difficult to streamline a single timeframe to utilize for match processes.
- Mia Ferreira inquired if there are parallel application processes involving the Access Points and completing the application and documentation.
- Maria Hodson, from the Santa Ana Housing Authority, confirmed that both applicants will complete documentation simultaneously. Maria expanded that the

primary match would need to have a resolution before the secondary match can be processed.

- Amy Arambulo, from OC United Way, inquired about the length of time it takes to reach a resolution for a single match. Maria Hodson explained that the process is generally around 30 days, depending on the processing of documents and the application, along with the approval from the housing authority and property management.
- Tianna Terry and Mia Ferreira inquired about the timeline for housing authorities to return matches and if there can be an established time frame. Maria Hodson gave information about the current time frame being utilized by the Santa Ana Housing Authority. Each housing authority has their own specific timeline, but share similar general timelines and processes. The Orange County Housing Authority expressed that a further discussion should be held if timelines are expected to change with new policies.
- Carina Bravo, from Salvation Army, shared a personal experience with working in outreach and inquired, considering the undetermined time lease up takes, if there was a way to compensate an individual's time should they be the secondary match and it doesn't go through. Carina suggested implementing a backup plan, like dynamic matching, so that person can still have a good chance to be housed.
- Amy Arambulo inquired about the current 1-for-1 match system and what the current bottlenecks are. Daniel Garcia provided clarification that bottlenecks occur when a match is denied and there are delays in the time to return those matches to HMIS and acknowledged the possibility of varying factors that affect the matching system.

4. CES Policies & Procedures – Daniel Garcia, CES Administrator, Office of Care Coordination

- Daniel Garcia provided background information on the CES Policies and Procedures.
- Continuums of Care (CoCs) are responsible for developing local policies governing CES – such as eligibility, prioritization, and engagement standards. The most recent version of the Orange County CES Policies and Procedures was approved by the CoC Board on December 20, 2023. The Office of Care Coordination sent an updated version of the CES Policies and Procedures for public feedback from June 26, 2025, to July 6, 2025, with feedback incorporated on July 7, 2025 to clarify prioritization.

Public Comments:

- Juan Montiel, from the City of Santa Ana, shared personal experience and background relating to homeless services and expressed that individuals are being set up for failure by directly housing them from living on the streets. Juan continued by expressing that individuals should first seek shelter to gain valuable assistance through services that shelters offer. Juan shared other personal experiences that highlighted the importance of individuals receiving the necessary

resources to prepare them for being permanently housed and urged not to remove the shelter preference.

- Judson Brown, from the City of Santa Ana, expressed that this policy comes down to equity in Orange County. Judson shared that Santa Ana has more shelter beds and permanent housing than any other city in Orange County and that there should be acknowledgement of system flow through utilizing shelters and supporting individuals to go into shelter for stabilization and wraparound services.
- Maria Hodson, from the Santa Ana Housing Authority, respectfully requested to keep the preference for sheltered participants as part of the prioritization.
- Sandra Lozeau, from the City of Anaheim, shared only being opposed to the language for the removal of the prioritization. Sandra shared information about the Salvation Army shelters being operated by Anaheim and their successes and that prioritization for sheltered households contributes to system flow. Sandra concluded that policies should not be changed until data shows that it will improve system flow.
- Mishaun Watkins, from the City of Santa Ana, shared opposition to removing the prioritization for sheltered participants, as it undermines the efforts to remove homelessness and moving people out of shelter into permanent housing. Mishaun expressed that these policies should ensure fairness and partnership.

Discussion:

- Mia Ferreira discussed the removal of prioritization and inquired about how resources for non-chronic homelessness would impact the prioritization. ICES and FCES clarified that there are no specific resources for non-chronic homelessness.
- Juan Montiel, City of Santa Ana, expressed issues with certain organizations and outreach that do not have access to refer to shelter and additionally, individuals that do not want to go to shelter and are working with an Access Point of some sort. Juan provided additional context by expressing that people should be coming to shelters first to get stabilized before they move forward with permanent housing options.
- Judson Brown, City of Santa Ana, suggested altering the prioritization by removing “or unsheltered homelessness,” and arranging it from Sheltered Chronic Homelessness, and then Unsheltered Literal Homelessness, and restructuring the prioritization to incorporate the sheltered again. Judson expressed it would allow the housing of someone in shelter so that they wouldn’t be residing in a shelter for a long period of time. Judson also suggested returning to the previous prioritization from 2023. Judson addressed the unintended consequences of removing the shelter preferences in 2023, how it has affected system flow, and how bringing back the preference will open beds for families and assist flow.
- FCES expressed that the shelter preference causes problems for families, as it cycles the same families repeatedly and the unsheltered never make it to the top of the list. Jocelyn Morales added that there are limited opportunities, and families in shelter stay there, but the street-level homeless families are not getting opportunities.

- Tianna Terry expressed that the proposed changes do not really affect ICES and the matching process and inquired why the shelter preference was removed before. Mia Ferreira clarified that there were not enough shelter beds and there was an equity issue.
- James Bacon, CES Staff Specialist, referenced the prioritization table and added additional context to the proposed policy change and how the policy does not affect the local preferences. James added that CES would is about prioritizing the most vulnerable and unsheltered households are the most vulnerable. James shared personal experiences working with unsheltered clients and expressed how the prioritization adversely affects people that cannot go into shelter or do not want to go into congregate shelter.

Next Meeting: September 3, 2025, from 2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m., in-person at the Orange County Housing Authority, 1st Floor, Conference Room A, 1501 E St Andrew Pl, Santa Ana, CA 92705