Coordinated Entry Committee Minutes

September 15, 2026 | 2:00-3:30 PM
In Person – Kent County Community Action

FACILITATOR:	Brian Bruce
MEETING ATTENDEES:	Brianne Robach, Jess Verville, Lana VanBuren, Jordan Brinker, Maria Williams, Sam Elliot-Mosley, RJ Naugel, Kate Meyer, Maddie Strom-Coyer, Becki Nespital, Emily Stroka, Karina Montoya, Anna Diaz, Angela Gillisse, Zenaida Jimenez, Marissa Lee, Sam Westhouse, Hannah Salas, Maria DeJesus Sauro, Tammy Vincent
TIME CONVENED:	2:02 pm
TIME ADJOURNED:	3:54 pm

APPROVAL OF AGENDA – September, 2026

MOTION BY:	Jessie Verville
SUPPORT FROM:	Hannah Salas
CONCLUSION:	Ayes, no opposed – motion passed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES –July 28, 2026

MOTION BY:	Becky Nespital
SUPPORT FROM:	Zenaida Jimenez
CONCLUSION:	Ayes, no opposed – motion passed.

COALITION UPDATES

DISCUSSION: Brianne provided several Kent Homelessness Coalition updates:

- As part of the CoC rebrand, all meeting invites will be transitioned to a general KHC email. Current invites will be deleted and re-sent with that email. There will also be a prenotification before that is done to reduce confusion.
- The October meeting invite is being shifted one week earlier to the 13th. Starting in November, meetings will resume the regular schedule (3rd Tuesdays) and be held at United Way.
- The Consultant for the CE Evaluation is not under contract yet, while the CoC finalizes funding details. There should be more information at the next meeting.

Brianne also provided an update regarding the action items produced at July's meeting:

- Regarding the HAP call report, Brianne confirmed with 2-1-1 regarding language for directing callers to the online housing assessment or to HAP.
- Based on suggestions, the CoC drafted a one-page document overviewing the CE process with simple script for community partners/adjacent agencies to use. The finalized version will be sent out in the next week or two. Suggested addition: consider how to add language stating that, if participant has done a CHC

and they didn't get the option for an appointment, then there are currently no resources available

The final two updates were regarding CE workgroups:

- The Housing Preference Assessment workgroup was asked how to collect housing preference information and connect households with resources of their choice. The group met a couple weeks ago and had great conversation but got stuck on what "preference" would mean. Brianne took that conversation to chronic improvement and they requested the group focus on ways to reduce time for chronic households to get referral and how to improve referral outcomes. The workgroup will get a meeting on calendar.
- The Transitional Housing Prioritization workgroup met before the CE meeting to discuss potential prioritization framework and what information they'd need to finalize that framework. That group should meet in next month or so and have a finalized recommendation in next few months.

ACTION ITEMS:

Lana will finalize and send out CE one-page document with revisions
Brianne or Lana to send visual with homelessness categories to Jessie Verville/2-1-1
Both the THP and Housing Preference workgroups will be scheduled to meet

VOTE TO APPROVE CARLTON LOFTS PBV PRIORITIZATION POOL

DISCUSSION: Brianne indicated that Community Rebuilders is asking the Committee to approve a prioritization pool for referrals to Carlton Lofts Project Based Vouchers (PBVs). Anna shared that Carlton Lofts is a co-housing, integrated project with 20 PBV units on one side and 20 emergency shelter (or "bridge") accommodations on the other side. The units are considered single room occupancy with shared living spaces and have been operating for two years with PBVs in place for around 18 months. Community Rebuilders is recommending the following prioritization pools, in priority order, based on project design, funding requirements, and prioritization process over the last 18 months: 1) Households currently residing in Carlton Lofts bridge housing, 2) unsheltered households within the City of Grand Rapids, and 3) households residing in emergency shelter or transitional housing.

There are no anticipated changes to the process for households currently staying in the bridge portion of Carlton Lofts. PBVs permanently stay with the unit and some households choose to work with GRHC to utilize a voucher elsewhere after the first year of their lease is up. The Committee moved to approve the prioritization pool as presented at the end of the discussion.

MOTION BY: Sam Westhouse SUPPORT FROM: Becky Nespital

CONCLUSION: Ayes, no opposed – motion passed.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDATION FORM REVISION

DISCUSSION: The CoC is in the process of revising the process for how providers submit referral openings. This is intended to streamline the process for both providers and the CoC staff, as well as ensuring that the cover sheets are being used as the primary source of project information. That new form is pending and the CoC is seeking feedback in

changes that providers would like included and what would be best left the same. There should be an update by the next CE meeting and a rough draft available at that time. Housing providers will likely see email looking for feedback, as well.

REFERRAL DATA REPORT

DISCUSSION: The CoC is actively working on sharing data with the Committee more frequently. The desire is to continue regular data reports and updates to the Committee, at least quarterly. In July, Sam Westhouse had shared data on HAP call numbers. For this meeting, Brianne shared high-level referral data over the previous six months (March 1 – end of August).

Among housing referral types, just over half were to rent payment assistance (RRH or prevention), which can be broken down separately in the future. About one-third of referrals were to PSH projects and just over 10% to TH projects, with most of those to veteran-based TH projects. Just about half of all referrals were accepted, meaning both the provider and client agreed to move forward. A large percent (38%) of referrals were declined and both the CoC and attendees expressed a desire to dig into the reasons for those declines. A small percentage (6%) of referrals were cancelled (client refused referral) and 7% were open (in progress).

The outcomes were then further broken down by resource type, with PSH having the least accepted or in progress and RRH with the most. TH showed 41% accepted.

ACTION ITEMS: Lana will send out presentation slides with CE Committee minutes

90 DAY COMMITTEE GOAL

DISCUSSION: The CoC aims to have all Committees into a rhythm with setting goals every 90 days and working specifically toward those goals (whether that is as a whole committee or in sub-committees). Brianne invited all attendees to brainstorm what the CE Committee might want to accomplish in the next 120 days. Ideas included:

- Subgroups should meet and have tasks resolved in 120 days
- Collaboratively figuring out how to connect participants to help after hours
- Have the CE evaluation scheduled
- Analyze inflow and outflow to examine where people are getting stuck, including what anticipated resources are coming or going on how that affects inflow/outflow. Similarly, look at data if people are experiencing homelessness for the first time at varying rates and include HAP data in that examination.
- Deep dive into data: how many referrals were made, how many were successful, etc.
- Overall evaluation of what resources are available in the community and where the unmet needs are. This can include looking at the BNL and how many people report being Category 1 or 4 versus how many openings/resources there are.
- Circle back to check on the usefulness and efficiency of previous scripts, specifically the CE script. Did it solve the problems it was expected to?
- Standardization of data quality policies and procedures, including required reports. This may include revisiting previously used procedures.

- Creating a calendar that includes officer elections, CE evaluation timing, data reporting, etc.
- Finalization of Committee members – include policy about how to ensure regular attendance on making quorum

Brianne stated that the ideas collected will be refined at the next meeting. The intent settle on one or two 90 day SMART goals for the group.

ACTION ITEMS: Lana will send list of potential goals and send survey to submit ideas

COMMUNITY HOUSING CONNECT UPDATES

DISCUSSION: RJ Naugel provided an update on behalf of Community Rebuilders regarding CHC 2.0 software functionality. This new tool provides participants with a log in, where they can access the housing assessment and is intended to help automate some of what is done manually. The assessment, prioritization, and referral are built in so clients can log in to see the status of their referrals. Participants would use multifactor verification, which would provide other ways to be able to recover log in. Since it is web-based, it would be able to be accessed anytime and anywhere, including with outreach teams.

Brianne gave an overview of next steps for CHC 2.0, recognizing there have been conversations happening with Steering Council and Executive Committee. Conversations are ongoing at this time and Steering is considering adoption and implementation. They will be sharing updates when available, including around governance and implementation.

COORDINATED ENTRY CONCERNS

DISCUSSION: Jessie Verville brought concerns to the group regarding safety for unsheltered participants as we get to colder months. She shared that it is confirmed there are no hotel vouchers confirmed for the foreseeable future. Although not strictly CE-related, community agencies and partners may be able to help brainstorm possible solutions and collaborate to reduce cold-weather dangers this winter. The CoC, HAP, and 211 staff will also discuss after-hours/on-call coverage during freezing weather.

ADJOURNMENT – *Next meeting: October 13, 2026*