



System Performance Committee Meeting Minutes

Theory of Change

If we create a homelessness response system that centers people with lived experience of homelessness, then we will be able to respond to needs and eliminate inequities, in order to end homelessness for all.

Land Acknowledgment

The King County Continuum of Care Board acknowledges that we work on the unseated traditional lands of the Coast Salish peoples, especially the first peoples of Seattle, the Duwamish people. The original stewards of the land, past and present. We honor with gratitude the land itself and the Duwamish tribe. This acknowledgement only becomes meaningful when combined with accountable relationships and informed action and is the first step in honoring the land that we today sit on and their peoples.

Date & Time

February 18, 2026; 2:00 – 4:00 pm PT

Roll Call

Name	Present
Tamara Bauman	P
Sherry Tillman	P
Ruby Romero	P
Marvin Futrell	A
Kristina Sawyckyj	P
Ben Vaagen	P
Victoria Ewig-Kwan	P

Mustafa Mohammed	P
Shawna McMahon	P
Vacant	-

- Roll Call – 8 members present – 1 absent.
- Quorum Met – Yes

Meeting Minutes Review: Meeting Minutes weren't reviewed and will be forwarded to the March meeting for review and approval.

- Motion: N/A
- Second: N/A
- Motion P/F

Public Comment:

Dorsol Plants - I'll be quick, because I think I only have two minutes. Hello everyone, my name is Dorsal Plants, I use he/his pronouns, and I'm a resident of the City of Renton in King County. I have lived experience both as someone who has experienced homelessness and as a survivor of domestic violence, and I bring about 17 years of service provider experience in the Seattle–King County area.

I want to start by saying a huge thank you to the co-chairs and to Daniel for their grace and patience as they worked with me to find the proper channel for the letter. The letter—basically the too-long-didn't-read component—was that I initially reached out to the System Performance Committee and the data team at KCRHA to better understand how our metric numbers reflect the challenges our region identified in calendar years 2024 and 2025 around evictions in the affordable housing provider community, turnover, and vacancy rate challenges.

I just wanted to encourage and request a deeper dive beyond the HUD-required metrics, which are important, and to explore additional ways and opportunities to look more closely at the data. I did receive a response from Daniel suggesting that some of this data may already exist and is currently being used by KCRHA, and I'm encouraging that we find a way to further share and understand it.

One example I'll give is the vacancy rate. I understand HUD requires us to track occupancy rate, and in an apples-to-apples comparison, vacancy rate is closely related. But other COCs have found ways to look more deeply at vacancy. For example, if a building shows 90% occupancy, that looks like a good and successful program—and I'm not saying it's not—but within that 5–10% vacancy rate, there could be trends we could learn from if we examine the information in context. Maybe 90% of units are occupied, but it's the same five ADA-compliant units that remain vacant.

I was particularly curious about vacancy rate because in 2025 multiple public funders in our region, the State Department of Commerce, King County, the City of Seattle, and others—



recognized the need to include vacancy rates as part of their outcome metrics. It was discovered that while a building may appear fully occupied, that number may not reflect potential issues such as an overabundance of studio apartments or a lack of units with accessible features. I want to say firmly that I'm not suggesting anything is wrong, invalid, or purposeful in terms of disconnects. Rather, as other COCs and public funders have begun looking more deeply at numbers that aren't contractually required but speak more directly to mission, I'm curious to learn more about what the SPC and the Regional Homeless Authority can do in partnership with the COC and service providers to gain a deeper picture of what's happening in our projects. It may also be helpful to understand what is different about COC HUD-funded projects, where we did not see the same vacancy rate concerns present in projects operated by the same providers under Commerce and King County contracts.

Thank you for your time and patience. I'm happy to answer questions. The letter does a better job of explaining these points and includes citations and additional data points. I'm not saying we're wrong—I'm just curious to do a deeper dive and learn more about how SPC and the Regional Homeless Authority are examining these numbers. Thank you.

Meeting Topic: Co-Chairs: CoC Board Updates – Ruby Tuesday Romero

Ruby Romero provided updates on the NOFO and COC Board activities. She reported that after delays and legal back-and-forth, the required confirmation email was submitted to affirm interest in receiving renewal funding from the 2024 NOFO. This action secures renewal of grant dollars for the upcoming contract year, and the team anticipates receiving grant agreements soon.

Ruby also shared that Charter-related committees and workgroups are expected to reconvene shortly, along with the Cross Cutting Policy Workgroup. Additionally, planning will begin to revamp the Point-in-Time (PIT) Committee for the 2026–2027 cycle. A debrief process will occur, and stakeholders are encouraged to submit feedback, concerns, challenges, and successes from the most recent PIT to inform improvements.

Daniel Ramos asked whether final decisions had been made regarding board seat appointments. Ruby confirmed that notifications were sent to membership and that selections had been finalized.

Catherine Todd clarified that four board seats (not five) were filled. The new board members are:

- Valerie Sasson (Elected Official seat)
- Rocco DeVito (Elected Official seat)
- Sheriff John (Law Enforcement seat)
- Jen Carl (Business seat)

The new members will be formally introduced at the next meeting CoC Board Meeting on March 4, 2026.



Meeting Topic: CoC Letter – SPC Review – Dorsol Plants

Dorsol explained that his questions stem from his experience as a service provider, particularly noticing that his program’s return-to-homelessness rate remained at zero even when he knew some participants had returned to homelessness. He learned this was due to how HMIS systems communicate and how HUD calculates returns at a system-wide level rather than by individual program. He emphasized that he is not questioning the accuracy of reported numbers but is curious whether current public metrics may be missing important trends—especially given vacancy rate and eviction concerns raised by other public funders. He asked whether additional data, such as 6-, 12-, and 24-month return rates or vacancy rates for COC-funded units, could be more transparently shared. He also expressed interest in understanding system bottlenecks across AMI levels and raised concerns about practices like “self-evictions” and how those are reflected in data.

Victoria Ewing-Kwan (King County DCHS):

Victoria clarified that many vacancy rate challenges have occurred in 60% AMI affordable housing, where market supply meets demand, rather than in 0–30% AMI permanent supportive housing (PSH), where demand remains high and vacancies are less common. She shared that King County has begun providing eviction filing data to contract managers to help identify concerning trends and support providers through technical assistance. She agreed that statewide analysis of returns to homelessness could be valuable but cautioned against advocating for nationwide HMIS data-sharing with HUD due to privacy concerns in the current political climate.

Daniel Ramos:

Daniel clarified that HUD’s System Performance Measures already report return-to-homelessness rates up to 24 months, though some local presentations may have focused on shorter timeframes. He explained that HUD’s methodology is complex and system-focused, tracking whether individuals return to any HUD-funded program within a two-year period rather than returning to a specific program. He highlighted the work of the HMIS and data teams in training providers and ensuring accurate data entry, noting that small data points significantly affect calculations. He suggested that the Washington State Department of Commerce would be best positioned to conduct statewide return analyses. Daniel also shared that the team now has near real-time bed and unit inventory tracking for most COC-funded programs, making vacancy rate analysis within that portfolio possible. He offered to share reports and dashboards and asked how the committee could best support Dorsol in next steps.

Overall Discussion Outcome:

The conversation focused on improving transparency, understanding system-wide versus program-level metrics, and exploring opportunities for deeper data analysis—particularly around



returns to homelessness and vacancy rates—while balancing innovation with data privacy considerations.

Meeting Topic: Federal Report – Point in Time Count (PIT), Housing Inventory Count (HIC), & System Performance Measures – Daniel Ramos III, KCRHA Data Asset Manager

PIT

The unsheltered data collection period has been completed, and analysis is now underway. Daniel thanked the PIT Workgroup—this was the first year KCRHA convened a dedicated workgroup to advise on implementation of the respondent-driven sampling (RDS) methodology used to estimate the unsheltered population. He also expressed appreciation for KCRHA staff, the Research and Data Team, Ewan and Kathy for coordinating scheduling and volunteer management across 27 hub sites, and approximately 150 community volunteers. He noted the significant operational lift involved in running hubs across the county. Daniel also thanked the Bitfocus team for completing the Housing Inventory Count (HIC), which reports available beds and is closely linked to the PIT. University of Washington partners, including Dr. Zach Omquist and Dr. Eason, were acknowledged for supporting the statistical methodology and estimation model.

Unsheltered Count Methodology:

Daniel reviewed the respondent-driven sampling (RDS) approach used for the unsheltered count. Individuals experiencing unsheltered homelessness completed surveys at hub sites and received three coupons to distribute to others experiencing homelessness, generating referral chains that support statistical estimation. The final unsheltered estimate incorporates survey network data along with sheltered count data using a formula developed with UW partners.

Data Collection Overview:

Data collection began January 26 and ran for two weeks. Twenty-seven hub sites operated across King County regions, including Vashon Island, South King, Southeast King, East King, North King, and the Seattle/metro area. New and continuing strategies included:

- A mobile data collection van (new this year), which supported outreach in rural areas
- A family phone line to assist families unable to travel to hub sites, with case manager verification
- Distribution of bus tickets to improve access to survey locations

Daniel shared observations from rural outreach, noting significant vehicle residency and suggesting that future efforts may consider gas vouchers to better support vehicle residents. He also reported anecdotal feedback from faith communities indicating lower visibility among



Latino/Chicano community members, raising questions about whether immigration enforcement climate may have influenced participation. These contextual variables will be considered in the final report.

Sheltered Count:

The sheltered count includes emergency shelters, transitional housing, and safe havens. Data is compiled from:

- HMIS-participating providers (including households with and without children, child-only households, and subpopulations such as veterans, youth and young adults, and unaccompanied minors)
- Non-HMIS shelters (20+ providers), from whom aggregate night-of-count data are being collected

The Housing Inventory Count (HIC)

Daniel introduced the Housing Inventory Count (HIC) update and invited Lauryn Searles to provide a status report. He later shared his screen to walk through what information is collected and emphasized key takeaways for the committee.

Daniel noted that the HIC is a federally required companion report to the Point-in-Time (PIT) Count and that the team is on track to meet HUD submission deadlines (anticipated early April). As HMIS Lead, KCRHA is actively executing the reporting plan for both PIT and HIC.

He explained that the HIC captures system-wide bed and unit inventory, including project type, funding source, total beds and units, and any dedicated beds (e.g., for veterans, youth, or chronically homeless individuals). He emphasized that this inventory represents the primary assets of the homelessness response system. In April, the committee will receive total counts of people experiencing homelessness alongside total available beds and units, allowing for system-level comparison of need versus capacity.

Daniel also clarified that the count extends beyond emergency shelter, transitional housing, safe havens, and unsheltered populations—it includes rapid rehousing and permanent supportive housing programs, reflecting a comprehensive snapshot of utilization across the full continuum.

Lauryn Searles:

Lauryn provided a detailed status update on the HIC process. The team is currently in the initial data quality review phase and plans to distribute agency “workbooks” (error reports in spreadsheet form) to providers by the end of the week. These workbooks identify data quality issues and provide guidance and resources to help providers correct errors.



The team will conduct multiple rounds (two to three) of review and correction with providers before final submission. Providers are also being asked to review utilization rates based on enrollments active on the night of the PIT (January 29). HUD flags utilization is above 105% as high and below 65% as low, requiring explanation from providers (e.g., capacity changes or other operational factors). Lauryn confirmed that once corrections are finalized, the HIC will be submitted to HUD through HDX in coordination with Daniel and KCRHA leadership.

Next Steps:

- Agency workbooks distributed by end of week
- Multiple rounds of provider review and correction
- Anticipated HUD submission in early April
- April presentation to committee with final counts of people experiencing homelessness and total system bed/unit inventory

System Performance Measures (SPM)

Daniel provided an update on the upcoming System Performance Measures (SPM) Report, due to HUD on March 4. He explained that SPM is a comprehensive system-level federal report that includes more than seven measures evaluating the performance of the homelessness response system.

Key measures include:

- Measure 1: Length of time persons remain homeless
- Measure 2: Returns to homelessness (previously discussed)
- Measure 3: Number of people experiencing homelessness
- Measure 4: Income growth (earned income and benefits at program entry compared to exit or within one year)
- Measure 5: First-time homelessness (individuals newly entering the system)
- Measure 6: Category 3 homelessness (not widely reported locally)
- Measure 7: Successful placements into permanent housing

Daniel noted that some measures contain multiple sub-sections (A and B components), though a deeper review of those occurs at the COC Board level. He reported that the team is currently in the data quality review phase and remains on track to meet the March 4 submission deadline.

Lauryn Searles:

Lauryn confirmed that the team is in the final stages of preparation. She noted that HUD allows resubmission of prior-year data, so the team will resubmit updated 2024 data alongside the 2025 submission. She will be meeting with KCRHA leadership to finalize the report before submission.



Lauryn also noted that federal reporting timelines overlap, with SPM submission followed closely by HIC and PIT reporting but confirmed that King County is on track to meet all deadlines.

Overall Status:

The SPM report is in final data quality review, and the team expects to submit both the 2024 resubmission and 2025 SPM report by the March 4 HUD deadline.

Meeting Topic: System Performance Committee 2025 Year End - Daniel Ramos

Daniel provided an overview of 2025 HMIS and governance accomplishments.

Key highlights included:

- HUD Data Standards Implementation (2026): Successfully implemented with significant support from the Bitfocus team and direction from the committee.
- Coordinated Entry for Domestic Violence (CEDV): Continued development in partnership with the coalition; prioritization assessment is being finalized with a planned spring launch.
- Shelter Inventory Configuration: Ongoing work to configure shelters for live inventory tracking and utilization snapshots, with an April 1 deadline.
- HMIS Policy Updates: Passed updated HMIS policies, including Coordinated Entry Navigation Policy and related data collection standards.
- Emergency Shelter & Rapid Rehousing Subtyping: Completed HUD subtyping to better distinguish project types (e.g., night-by-night vs. continuous stay shelters; rapid rehousing with rental assistance vs. services-only models).
- Inventory Quality Enhancements: Began collecting qualitative unit data (e.g., ADA compliance, case management, substance use services) to better assess program quality (not just bed counts)—supporting stronger NOFO applications and system analysis.

System & Training Metrics (2025):

- 1,300 individuals trained across 24 trainings
- 530 new HMIS users
- 46 new programs added
- 18,000 new client profiles created
- 12 monthly newsletters distributed
- 95% profile completeness rate; 93% exit completeness rate
- 70% inventory data quality rate
- New provider dashboards for real-time data quality monitoring
- Targeted training for veteran partners on the “Current Living Situation” data field to improve By-Name List (BNL) accuracy

Daniel also noted governance accomplishments:



- 100% quorum across 11 meetings (with one holiday exception)
- Approval of the HUD NOFO under compressed timelines
- Completion of all federal, state, and local reporting deadlines
- Passage of the HMIS Work Plan

By-Name List (BNL) & Coordinated Entry Discussion

A committee discussion followed regarding By-Name Lists and coordinated entry processes.

Kristina Sawyckj:

Asked questions about how individuals may fall off the By-Name List and whether smaller organizations have equal access to referrals and housing opportunities.

Daniel Ramos:

Clarified there are two related but distinct concepts:

1. By-Name List (Data/Analysis): Used for inflow/outflow tracking—monitoring who enters, exits, or remains active in the system.
2. Case Conferencing/Nomination Process: Separate process where providers meet to match individuals to housing opportunities.

He explained that HMIS-participating programs are included in inflow/outflow analysis but acknowledged that referral and case conferencing access may differ operationally.

Shawna McMahon:

Shared concerns that smaller organizations do not have equal access to referral processes. She described prior coordinated entry case conferencing calls where smaller agencies were not included and expressed concern that larger organizations with more staffing capacity may have greater ability to monitor and respond to housing opportunities.

She also noted confusion over terminology, as some stakeholders associate “By-Name List” with coordinated entry case conferencing rather than system-level data analysis.

Victoria Ewing Kwan:

Highlighted the broader issue of coordinated entry effectiveness, particularly for smaller agencies, and asked about coordinated entry evaluation data and referral metrics (e.g., referral times and completion rates).

Ruby Romero:

Noted that conversations are occurring in youth and other population-specific spaces regarding



nomination process improvements. She mentioned possible pilot discussions about new methodologies and suggested bridging conversations between committees.

Next Steps Identified:

- Clarify terminology and distinctions between By-Name List data tracking and coordinated entry referral processes.
- Invite Tom and relevant Coordinated Entry leadership to a future SPC meeting to discuss:
 - How HMIS supports nomination and referral processes
 - Access and participation for smaller agencies
 - Current evaluation efforts and potential improvements
- Continue coordination between SPC and the Coordinated Entry Committee to ensure alignment without duplicating efforts.

The conversation concluded with agreement that further discussion is warranted to better understand how HMIS data interfaces with coordinated entry nomination and referral systems.

Next Regular Meeting

March 18, 2026; 2:00 – 4:00 pm PT

