

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

Wednesday, September 3, 2025

2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

**Location:**

**Orange County Housing Authority (OCHA)**

**1501 E. St. Andrew Pl., 1<sup>st</sup> 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.

**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.

**MINUTES**

**September 3, 2025**

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 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@ceo.oc.gov](mailto:CareCoordination@ceo.oc.gov). 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. CES Updates – Daniel Garcia, CES Administrator, Office of Care Coordination**

- **Individual CES** – Tianna Terry, Individual CES Manager, Friendship Shelter
  - As of July 31, 2025, there were 5541 adult households active in the Individual CES (ICES) project, with 3722 households on the ICES Community Queue. 150 households were matched to a housing opportunity and pending approval.
  - Tianna Terry provided additional data from the ICES annual report. There has been a 72% decrease in housing opportunities for the last fiscal year within the ICES system.
- **Family CES** – Liz Valadez, Family System Specialist, Orange County United Way
  - As of August 1, 2025, there were a total of 373 families receiving services from Family CES. 47 families are waiting for shelter, 19 families have reconnected to a support system to resolve homelessness, and 13 families have moved into housing.
  - Liz Valadez provided additional data and shared that as of September 2, 2025, there were currently 332 household on the Community Queue.
- **Survivor CES** – Tianna Terry, Individual CES Manager, Friendship Shelter
  - As of July 31, 2025, there were 153 active survivors in the Survivor CES project, with 27 households pending a match.
  - Tianna Terry provided additional information expressing the lack of housing opportunities available for the program.
  - Tianna Terry shared a highlight that the Survivor CES program just housed its first survivor in a Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) scattered site unit.
- **Veteran Registry** – James Bacon, CES Staff Specialist, Office of Care Coordination
  - As of July 31, 2025, there were 228 veterans experiencing homelessness on the Veteran Registry. In the previous 12 months, 186 veterans have been housed.
- **Transitional Aged Youth Registry** – Julia Davis, CES Staff Specialist, Office of Care Coordination
  - As of July 31, 2025, there were 221 active TAY households in the TAY Registry, with 140 households on the Community Queue.

- **Virtual Front Door** – Delia Van Kampen, Director, Operations, 2-1-1 Orange County, Orange County United Way
  - Delia Van Kampen shared data from the Virtual Front Door Housing Data Dashboard.

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

Daniel Garcia, CES Administrator, shared background on the proposed 2-for-1 Match 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 2-for-1 Match Policy, which was presented during the CES Steering Committee on July 9, 2025, to meet the requests of some local housing authorities. The policy was developed and proposed for housing providers that wish to opt-in to this process. The 2-for-1 Match Policy documents the situations in which the Office of Care Coordination will consider a 2-for-1 match request and the requirements for these requests. The public feedback period was open from July 10 to July 25, 2025. The Office of Care Coordination revised the policy based on the feedback received.

Recommended Action a: Approve the proposed CES 2-for-1 Match Policy for review and approval by the Lived Experience Advisory Committee (LEAC).

Chair Andrew Crowe approved the recommended action on behalf of the CES Steering Committee, with direction to the Office of Care Coordination to make the following updates: revise to “Housing Provider will provide a housing opportunity in respective housing inventory, with next available unit, with the goal of housing match within 45 days”; remove “Property has unit(s) that is approaching the 120-day vacancy date”; remove “1c. And 60 days have passed since the original match request date”; and revise “60 days” to “15 days” as applicable throughout the Policy.

### Committee Discussion:

- Judson Brown, City of Santa Ana, expressed appreciation to the Office of Care Coordination for working with the housing authorities to bring a solution forward. Judson shared the first thought to consider is that the policy is optional, which is important context for recommended revisions. Regarding the 60-day requirement, it shows acknowledgment that it’s okay for a unit to be vacant for two months and that is irrational to most people. The second thought is to revise the requirement to house the secondary match after 45 days to housing the secondary match to the next available opportunity. The Housing Provider should not be pressured, especially if there are no available units. Judson Brown also noted that delays in filling vacant units occur due to not finding matches that meet the criteria, clients declining referrals, and not being able to locate clients. Judson Brown noted that the policy would allow too much to pass and that 45 days is that much longer a person will be unhoused. Judson Brown further recommended

to remove the first part of the policy entirely, as it is limiting. Judson Brown recommended revising the language to a “15-day vacancy” and removing anything regarding the 60 days.

- Andrea Raez, Anaheim Housing Authority, expressed appreciation for the effort to create a structured framework, but expressed disagreement with the policy in its current form. Anaheim has contractual obligations to housing providers and if units are not filled in a timely manner, it would have further implications that would affect future PSH projects and referrals. The policy is placing housing authorities in difficult positions. Each project has strict eligibility requirements and if referrals are withheld, the housing authorities may be unable to meet the requirements. Andrea expressed agreement with Judson Brown regarding the verbiage surrounding the next available housing opportunity. Having multiple matches helps speed up the process and move people into housing. Andrea Raez shared that withholding referrals would be a disservice. Andrea Raez clarified that the referrals work on a development basis and that it is unknown when another unit will be vacant, and it would be easier to house with the next available unit. Andrea Raez continued by expressing that the concern falls on the timeframe and the potential to be penalized, adding to Judson’s point that it takes up to 20 people to vet to see who would be qualified for a unit and that two matches may likely not be enough to fill the vacancies. Andrea Raez noted that the policy would allow too much to pass and that 45 days is that much longer a person will be unhoused.
- Chair Andrew Crowe asked for clarification about Judson Brown’s first point involving the changing from 90 days to 60 days. Judson clarified that the policy should not have a minimum number of days and continued by saying that the Santa Ana Housing Authority affordable housing projects have thousands of applications, so the 2-for-1 Match Policy being optional with no minimum requirements would be optimal. Andrew Crowe inquired about what the concern is regarding “the next available,” and if 45 days is too long, or if there are no comparable units. Chair Andrew Crowe asked the committee what the solution should be regarding the 45-day rule. Judson and Andrea both echo that the policy would allow too much to pass and that 45 days is that much longer a person will be unhoused. Chair Andrew Crowe discussed the suggestion that the 90 days should change to 60 days.
- Delia Van Kampen, Orange County United Way, asked for clarification regarding the 60 days and if Judson Brown wants to remove it completely and change the 45-day requirement to reflect the next opportunity available. Delia Van Kampen also inquired if there will be an opportunity to make additional revisions to the Policy. Delia Van Kampen inquired what the penalty would look like if the deadline of housing the Secondary Referral in 45 days is not met. Delia Van Kampen recommended language changes to the Policy to include “Property has unit that is vacant.”
- Tianna Terry, Friendship Shelter, inquired about the 90-day/60-day issue and asked for the potential reasons a unit is vacant that long.
- Tracey Garcia, Anaheim Housing Authority, asked for clarification about the strong language regarding withholding matches if the policy steps are not taken. Tracy Garcia, responded to Tianna Terry’s inquiry regarding reasons for longer lengths of vacant units and shared varying situations that would make a unit vacant for that period of time, such as matches not being document-ready, live-work preferences, and not being able to request a match for a unit until it is vacant. Tracy shared overhearing a comment at the

LEAC indicating that applicants are free to decline a unit and discussed that being a buildup of why a unit is left vacant.

### **3. CES Policies and Procedures Recommended Changes – Daniel Garcia, CES Administrator, Office of Care Coordination**

Daniel Garcia, CES Administrator, shared background on the proposed CES Policies and Procedures Recommended Changes. At the May 7, 2025, CES Steering Committee meeting, the Office of Care Coordination provided an update that the CES Policies and Procedures was being reviewed for potential revisions. The Office of Care Coordination sent an updated version of the CES Policies and Procedures for public feedback from June 26, 2025 – July 6, 2025. During the July 9, 2025, CES Steering Committee meeting, discussion on the updated CES Policies and Procedures centered on the removal of sheltered preference in the prioritization schema. Other proposed changes included additional clarification on Access Points, grievance processes, and dynamic matches.

Recommended action a: Approve the revised CES Policies and Procedures, including the removal of shelter status from the prioritization schema, updates to formatting, and other clarifying language, for review and approval by the LEAC.

Chair Andrew Crowe approved the recommended action on behalf of the CES Steering Committee.

#### Committee Discussion:

- Judson Brown, City of Santa Ana, provided background on the history of shelters in Orange County and discussed the shelter preference prior to 2022. Judson also expressed that the shelter preference should not be removed and that the goal should be improving system flow. Judson Brown shared that the shelter preference was able to improve system flow previously and that it should not be removed just because of the information demonstrated in the presentation. Judson expressed that the preference should not have been removed back in 2022, that shelter preference would be best to stabilize a person, and that it is important for sheltered people to be housed first.
- Tianna Terry, Friendship Shelter, inquired why the preference was removed previously in 2022.
- Tracey Garcia, Anaheim Housing Authority, inquired if there was a way of sharing data that the proposed policy would improve housing processes. Daniel Garcia revisited the data in the presentation regarding sheltered and unsheltered clients and expressed that removing shelter preference would enhance the shared goals of the CoC.
- Andrea Raez, Anaheim Housing Authority, expressed that removing shelter preference disrupts system flow.
- Chair Andrew Crowe concluded that the idea would then be to either remove all shelter preference or add preference to all and suggested to move the policies forward for discussion at other committees.

### **4. CoC Updates – Felicia Boehringer, Interim CoC Manager, Office of Care Coordination**

Due to time constraints, item was not presented.

**Next Meeting:** November 5, 2025, from 2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m., in-person at OCHA, located at 1501 E. St. Andrew Pl., 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Conference Room A, Santa Ana, CA 92705