



Coordinated Entry Committee Regular Meeting Minutes

Roll Call - 9/24/2026

Name	
Devin Konick-Seese	P
Noah Fay	P
Eddy Matlock-Mahon	P
Martha Lindner	Absent
Elliot Hart	Proxy - Sirita McClay Jenkins
Kelsey Beckmeyer	Absent
Sherry Tillman	P
Finn Rogers	P
Mustafa Mohammed	P

- Roll Call – 7 members present – 2 members absent
- Quorum – Yes

Land Acknowledgement & Theory of Change

- **Land Acknowledgement:** The King County Continuum of Care Board acknowledges that we work on the unceded 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.
- **Theory of Change** – If we create a homelessness response system that centers people who have lived experience of homelessness, then we will be able to meet needs and eliminate inequities, in order to end homelessness for all.

Minutes Review

- Motion: To approve August Meeting Minutes – Finn Rogers
- Second – Noah Fay
- Vote: Passed via voice vote

Public Comment – It was noted that attendees were not visible in the meeting.

Attendees were invited to submit questions or comments through the Zoom Q&A feature. No in-person public comments were received, and no requests to have public comments read aloud had been submitted by email.

The chair acknowledged that public comment had inadvertently been omitted from the meeting agenda and apologized for the oversight.

Meeting Topic: Membership Updates – Tom Regan

Tom provided an update on Coordinated Entry Committee membership and term lengths. The Committee Bylaws and CoC charter recommend two-year terms for work group and committee members. Mustafa and Finn, who joined the Committee in June 2025, remain within their current terms. Other members were contacted regarding whether they wished to extend their service for one additional year or open their seats to new members.

Based on responses received, approximately five Committee positions are expected to become available. Tom noted that there are currently approximately 19 applications on file from individuals who have expressed interest in serving on CoC committees. A public announcement will also be shared with CoC membership and through the KCRHA newsletter regarding the open positions. The goal is to start bringing applications forward for Committee review and approval beginning next month.

Tom also discussed the goal of broadening Committee representation. Potential areas for recruitment include youth and young adult service providers, funders, representatives from local government and housing programs, and individuals with evaluation or data analysis expertise. Committee members were encouraged to identify potential candidates and share their recommendations with either Tom or Catherine.

Meeting Topic: Managing Growth of the Coordinated Entry System – Daniel Ramos III, KCRHA Data Asset Manager

Daniel Ramos III, HMIS Data Asset Manager, presented an overview of Coordinated Entry access, system coverage, and the process for managing growth among agencies participating in



HMIS and Coordinated Entry. He noted that KCRHA is currently undergoing organizational transitions, including changes to contracts and staffing, and emphasized the importance of using HMIS data to inform decisions about access to services and system capacity.

The presentation reviewed the five contracted regional access points that serve as the primary entry points for Coordinated Entry. While these access points provide coverage across North and South King County, they are concentrated primarily west of Lake Sammamish, which may create geographic access challenges for communities in areas such as the Snoqualmie Valley. Staff noted that access involves more than geographic location and includes hours of operation and alternative methods such as 211. Access to Coordinated Entry also does not necessarily mean that housing or shelter interventions are available within an individual's local community.

Daniel and Tom Regan discussed the distinction between contracted regional access points and community or agency-based assessors. Regional access points are contracted to provide Coordinated Entry assessments to the broader population, while community-based agencies may conduct assessments for individuals and households they serve, including specific subpopulations. Staff have established a process for reviewing agencies that are not funded specifically to participate in Coordinated Entry but have expressed interest in becoming agency-based assessors.

The discussion focused on how to evaluate whether the Coordinated Entry system provides sufficient coverage by geography, hours of access, and subpopulation. Potential areas for analysis include youth and young adults, families, veterans, single adults, and culturally specific communities. Staff emphasized the importance of understanding both where access points are located and whether the system has sufficient capacity to support households after assessment and connect them with available resources.

Tom noted that approximately 7,000 new households access Coordinated Entry each year and that system capacity is affected not only by the availability of housing resources but also by the availability of staff to provide ongoing housing navigation. He reported that approximately 20–25 agencies are currently awaiting review to potentially participate as agency-based assessors. Staffing changes and reductions at KCRHA have affected the capacity to complete the review and onboarding process.

Staff asked the Committee to consider whether future efforts should prioritize broader geographic coverage, increased access for specific subpopulations, or other identified gaps. Daniel and Tom will continue developing data and analysis to help the Committee assess coverage and inform planning for 2027. Daniel also emphasized that any priorities established for specific subpopulations should be clearly documented in writing to support transparency, accountability, and compliance.



Q&A

Q: What happens to households after they complete a Coordinated Entry assessment?

Finn raised the need for data showing what happens after individuals complete an assessment at a Coordinated Entry access point. He requested information on how many assessed households are subsequently housed through Coordinated Entry, how many continue to engage with the system, and how many have no further interaction. He noted a particular gap in the single adult system, where there is currently limited connection between completing an assessment and receiving ongoing case management or housing navigation.

A: Tom explained that this gap was a primary consideration in the policy developed for allowing agencies without an HMIS funding contract to participate in Coordinated Entry. Agencies seeking access to conduct assessments are expected to demonstrate that they also have the capacity to provide housing navigation. The intent is to ensure that agencies are not only conducting assessments but also helping households connect to available resources.

Q: Can the Committee receive data on the housing navigation process and outcomes?

Finn requested a future presentation focused specifically on data related to housing navigation and what happens after Coordinated Entry assessments.

A: Daniel indicated that enrollment and other related data could be incorporated into future process-improvement work. He asked Committee members to communicate additional data needs to him or Tom so the information can be prepared for future analysis and discussion.

Q: Should Coordinated Entry access be evaluated geographically or by subpopulation?

Tom asked the Committee to consider whether future analysis should focus primarily on geographic and subregional coverage, subpopulation coverage, or both.

Eddy noted that the map presented a significant geographic disparity for residents in the Snoqualmie Pass and North Bend areas, who may need to travel to Kirkland for an assessment. He expressed support for exploring additional access options in the area, potentially through mobile services, libraries, or other community-based locations.

Tom noted that HUD guidance addresses geographic coverage in relation to the availability of resources within a community. He also highlighted the importance of ensuring that people have adequate access to Coordinated Entry and noted that some residents in the Snoqualmie Valley prefer to remain in their communities rather than relocate to the Seattle metropolitan area.

Q: If resources are concentrated in one area, should Coordinated Entry access points also be concentrated there?

Finn asked whether the discussion of resource locations implied that access points should primarily be located where housing resources are available. He expressed concern about requiring vulnerable individuals to travel significant distances and suggested that communities should have local access to assessments even when housing resources are limited locally.



A: Tom clarified that he was describing HUD guidance rather than recommending a specific approach. He noted that HUD guidance calls for appropriate geographic coverage while also indicating that access points do not necessarily need to be established in areas where there are no housing resources. He acknowledged that the guidance creates a balance between ensuring adequate access and considering where resources are available.

Q: What concerns were raised by other providers regarding navigation after assessment?

A participant submitted a comment through the Q&A noting that their agency frequently receives clients who were enrolled in Coordinated Entry by another provider and then instructed to find a case manager on their own. This can result in additional workload for the receiving agency's case manager, who may then be responsible for providing comprehensive support while the client remains enrolled in Coordinated Entry.

Meeting Topic: Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures - Tom Regan

Tom provided an update on several Coordinated Entry policies and procedures currently under development. The first is a proposed policy addressing mobility transfers between housing programs and internal transfers within the same agency. The policy is intended to clarify that, when appropriate, housing providers should consider an internal transfer as a less intensive intervention before requesting a mobility transfer to another agency's housing program. The policy will define internal transfers and mobility requests, outline roles and responsibilities, and establish a clear procedure for processing requests.

Tom also noted that approval of a mobility transfer by the Coordinated Entry system does not guarantee that the household will meet the eligibility requirements of the receiving housing program. In particular, a household's eligibility for a transfer is separate from its current homelessness eligibility status. The policy is intended to clarify this distinction and address confusion that has occurred when households have exited their previous housing program.

A second policy under development addresses emergency VAWA transfers outside the Seattle/King County Continuum of Care geographic area. The policy will clarify the responsibilities and procedures for assisting households who need to relocate to another county, state, or Balance of State region due to an emergency VAWA transfer. The policy will incorporate applicable federal requirements under the VAWA Final Rule. Both policies are undergoing internal review and will be shared with the Committee in advance of a future meeting for review and endorsement.

Tom also provided an update on the new Coordinated Entry assessment and prioritization structure. The goal remains to implement the new assessments before the end of 2026. The assessment questions are currently under review by external legal counsel to ensure



compliance with federal requirements, including HIPAA and 42 CFR requirements related to the collection and storage of substance use disorder information. Once the legal review is complete, a group of trained interviewers and assessors will begin testing the assessment questions with community participants as part of the pilot process. Tom indicated that a more substantive update is anticipated at the next meeting.

Next Steps & Adjourn

Motion to adjourn meeting – Noah Fay
Second – Finn Rogers

- **Next meeting: October 22, 2026; 10:00 AM – 11:30 AM**

