

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES QUARTERLY REPORT

SUBMITTED BY (COUNTY): **MULTNOMAH**

FISCAL YEAR: **2023**

QUARTER: **QUARTER 2**

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES

QUARTERLY REPORT

The following information should be submitted **45 calendar days after the end of each quarter**, per IGA requirements. When that day falls on a weekend, reports are due the following Monday.

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Report Due	Nov 15	Feb 15	May 15	Aug 15
Reporting Period	Jul 1 – Sep 30	Oct 1 – Dec 31	Jan 1 – Mar 31	Apr 1 – Jun 30

Please do not change the formatting of margins, fonts, alignment, or section titles.

Table of Contents

Section 1. Progress Narrative	4
Overall Challenges and Barriers to Implementation	4
Opportunities in this Quarter	5
Successes in this Quarter	6
Emerging Challenges and Opportunities with Service Providers	6
Section 2. Data & Data Disaggregation	7
Data Disclaimer	7
Section 2.A Housing Stability Outcomes: Placements & Preventions	8
# Housing Placements – Supportive Housing*	8
# Housing Placements – Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)**	9
# Housing Placements – Other Permanent Housing Programs (OPH)***	10
# of Preventions	11
Section 2.B Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance Program	11
Regional Long-term Rent Assistance Quarterly Program (RLRA) Data	12
Section 2.C Subset of Housing Placements and Preventions: Priority Population Disaggregation	14
Population A Report	14
Population B Report	15
Section 2.D Other Data: Non-Housing Numeric Goals	16
Section 3. Financial reporting	16

Section 1. Progress Narrative

*In no more than 3-5 pages, please tell us about your investments and programming during the reporting period, focusing on at least one of the following topics per quarter: **racial equity, capacity building, regional coordination and behavioral health, new investments, leverage, service systems coordination** or any other topic connected to your local implementation plan. Please also provide updates and information (including numbers or data) to demonstrate progress towards your work plan goals. Note that each topic/work plan goal must be covered in at least one quarterly report during the year.*

[Example, if you set an annual goal to increase culturally specific provider organizations by 15%, please tell us by quarter 2 how much progress you've made towards that goal (e.g. 5%)]

*Please also address these areas in **each quarter's** narrative.*

Overall Challenges and Barriers to Implementation

Over the last quarter, providers across our network have been working hard to rebuild professional relationships with other service providers, as well as stakeholder groups, and local businesses. Many providers have lost vital connections during the COVID-19 pandemic that had previously provided opportunities for quick referrals to services and programs. Lost connections have posed a challenge as service programs have begun to reduce COVID-19 restrictions and to increase the number of people served in treatment and shelter settings. Providers now have more options to make community referrals, but need to rebuild the lost relationships for clients to fully take advantage of them.

Another emerging challenge relates to a commitment in Multnomah County's Local Implementation Plan to increase the number of peer support programs in our homeless services network. As the Joint Office invests in expanded peer support services, new peer staff are raising concerns about working in settings that may retraumatize them. This is a need that peer support staff members brought to their supervisors and their agencies. Peer support agencies are working internally at their organizations to seek further investment from the state to increase supervision and training, as well as to consider ways to augment their current level of training and supervision. The Joint Office is monitoring closely to better understand the level of support that might be required with the expansion of peer services.

A third challenge with implementation has been to meet the need for community-based organizations and Multnomah County staff to complete assertive engagement (AE) training. SHS funds have been allocated to expand AE training capacity. AE is a countywide initiative designed to provide continued education for social service providers, offered to county staff and community-based organizations. AE is centered on racial equity, anti-oppression, and trauma-informed care. Since the start of this fiscal year, after a trainer was hired, the AE team in the Department of County Human Services (DCHS) has trained 474 people, including many behavioral health and housing specialist staff members. Currently, the open registration for this training fills up within one hour of posting. The Joint Office is working with DCHS to

hire an additional training coordinator that will assist with expanding capacity to make this training available to more people working within the homeless service system.

Opportunities in this Quarter

In the second program year of SHS implementation, the Joint Office set out to fund innovative and effective programming to address homelessness, with a particular focus on bringing in new, culturally-specific providers that have experience with marginalized communities.

Multnomah County is leveraging SHS funds to open an emergency shelter onsite at the new Behavioral Resource Center. The new Behavioral Health Resource Center (BHRC), a peer-led facility for unhoused community members experiencing substance abuse and mental health crises, opened in the second quarter of this fiscal year (in December 2022). The BHRC is located at 333 SW Park Ave. in downtown Portland, in a building purchased by Multnomah County in January 2019. Services at the BHRC include peer support, restrooms, showers, laundry, lockers, computers, and charging stations.

The emergency shelter is set to open in the third quarter. This quarter, the BHRC has taken steps to establish a BHRC Advisory Council. To honor the integrity of the BHRC program's peer-led design, the majority of the council members identify as having lived experience and/or identify as being a peer. Fully formed, the Advisory Council will consist of 24 community leaders that will review and advise all BHRC programs and services to ensure the consistency of services for program participants.

Since opening, the BHRC has hosted multiple tours, completed various presentations, and created multiple marketing materials to promote the additional BHRC programs slated to launch in spring 2023. The Multnomah County Behavioral Health Division and the Communications Department plan to host a Shelter and Bridge Housing Grand Opening event to spotlight the new SHS-funded BHRC Shelter, which will have enhanced hours of operation (24/7) and clinical support attached to the on-site programs.

Another opportunity, which has been mentioned in previous reports, is the system-wide process launched by the Joint Office to allocate SHS funds through Notices of Funding Availability (NOFA) for all of our qualified providers. In quarter 2, the Joint Office launched NOFAs for Permanent Supportive Housing, Alternative Shelter, Employment Services, Rapid Rehousing, and Outreach. The Joint Office has received dozens of proposals from providers through this process and is looking forward to sharing more information in future updates.

- The Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) NOFA received 12 proposals from qualified providers. This opportunity develops the capacity for 135 new tenant-based PSH opportunities, 135 new site-based PSH opportunities, and 30 new LGBTQIA2S+-focused PSH opportunities.
- The employment NOFA received seven proposals for low-barrier employment opportunities for culturally specific service providers serving Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) individuals who are currently experiencing or are at risk of long-term homelessness throughout

Multnomah County. The range of services proposed by applicants includes on-the-job training experiences across various industries. Currently, we are in the evaluation process and look forward to announcing the providers selected to provide low-barrier employment services by mid-February. The Alternative Shelter NOFA invited qualified shelter providers to express interest in operating either a Safe Parking program or a Village-style Alternative Shelter. This programming is part of a broader strategy to fund additional shelter beds, with an anticipated total system-wide capacity to reach over 150 individuals per night.

- The Rapid Rehousing NOFA received 24 proposals to expand rapid rehousing programs for adults, families, and youth. This means that the JOHS will have an opportunity to bring additional new providers into the homeless service system to provide housing placement services to our communities.

Successes in this Quarter

Successes this quarter include the profound impacts of housing stability leveraged by Regional Long Term Rent Assistance (RLRA). In the Homeless Youth Continuum (HYC), the flexibility of the voucher program provided a couple in the youth system (both parents under 25) to keep stable housing for themselves and their child while they pursue U.S. citizenship. Another success this quarter has been the use of RLRA vouchers to provide housing to households that are going through the U.S. residency process. With RLRA vouchers, culturally specific providers are now supporting several of these households with long-term housing stability. This is another example of the incredible power that the RLRA program can offer to our region's overall housing stability – from supporting families pursuing citizenship to helping house young families just starting out. Being able to provide a housing resource that supports youth with disabilities and youth that are undocumented has been invaluable. The RLRA voucher is also very flexible and has generous rent support at a reasonable price maximum. New Avenues for Youth has been able to serve a total of 30 youth since July, including 12 youth in this last quarter.

We would like to highlight a story from JOIN, one of our outreach providers. The organization has worked with a Black/African American man who accessed housing after 15 years of homelessness and housing instability. He was close to the top of the coordinated housing access list when an outreach worker became aware of a long-term housing voucher. The participant and the outreach worker had developed a relationship over the years, and when the voucher became available, the outreach worker was able to secure an apartment for him. The two plan to celebrate this significant win together with lunch or coffee soon. This story highlights the dedication of the JOIN Adult Outreach Team and the transformative power of our community-based organizations paired with housing for individuals experiencing homelessness.

Emerging Challenges and Opportunities with Service Providers

We continue to see emerging challenges and opportunities with service providers. An ongoing challenge is high staff turnover among providers, resulting in a continuous need to re-train staff and rebuild relationships with case managers. Multnomah County providers noted that insufficient funding to compensate direct services staff appropriately has led to the systemwide practice of high caseloads and high staff turnover. This has been a consistent challenge in this program, but also presents an

opportunity. Multnomah County continues to explore capacity-building strategies and is in the middle of finalizing a wage study to further understand and implement strategies that will support community-based organizations with recommendations to achieve sufficient and appropriate compensation.

Service providers have uplifted the need for consistency across the referral processes and application submission for Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) programs. Different PSH programs and property management organizations have different rules and procedures when processing applications for specific PSH projects/programs. We are currently working on processes to build connectivity between the different referral systems, which will lead to improving equitable access for the communities that we serve.

The Joint Office is at a critical juncture, as we are now halfway through the Phase 1 goals set in the Local Implementation Plan. The Joint Office has prioritized investments that:

1. Build system capacity to launch critical new programming
2. Fund critical responses to the short-term economic impacts of COVID-19 that will prevent an increase in homelessness
3. Stabilize and support culturally specific and newly emerging organizations so that they can be part of the system's rapid expansion

We have seen success in our ability to launch new housing programs that are helping hundreds of households obtain permanent housing, while also preventing thousands from losing their homes. We continue to develop opportunities to provide additional support to culturally-specific organizations to support the meaningful work they are doing, and to add new and emerging providers to support the transformational work to address homelessness in Multnomah County.

Section 2. Data & Data Disaggregation

Please use the following table to provide and disaggregate data on Population A, and Population B housing placement outcomes, and homelessness prevention outcomes. Please use your local methodologies for tracking and reporting on Populations A and B. You can provide context for the data you provided in the context narrative below.

Data Disclaimer

HUD Universal Data Elements data categories will be used in this template for gender identity and race/ethnicity until county data teams develop regionally approved data categories that more accurately reflect the individual identities.

Section 2.A Housing Stability Outcomes: Placements & Preventions

Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Supportive Housing

# Housing Placements – Supportive Housing*	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
Total people	135	50.9%	265	100%
Total households	72	46.4%	155	100%
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	2	1%	10	4%
Black, African American or African	44	33%	93	35%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	26	19%	39	15%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	29	21%	57	22%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	5	4%	10	4%
White	60	44%	127	48%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	26	19%	67	25%
Client Doesn't Know	0	0%	0	0%
Client Refused	23	17%	23	9%
Data Not Collected	0	0%	0	0%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	52	39%	128	48%
Persons without disabilities	35	26%	89	34%
Disability unreported	48	36%	48	18%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male	41	30%	114	43%
Female	49	36%	105	40%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	3	2%	3	1%
Transgender	3	2%	4	2%
Questioning	0	0%	0	0%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0%
Client refused	40	30%	40	15%
Data not collected	0	0%	0	0%

*Supportive housing = permanent supportive housing and other service-enriched housing for Population A such as transitional recovery housing

Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Rapid Re-Housing & Short-term Rent Assistance

# Housing Placements – Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)**	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
Total people	47	27.8%	169	100%
Total households	29	25.8%	112	100%
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	1	2%	2	1%
Black, African American or African	19	40%	56	33%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	12	26%	34	20%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	10	21%	26	15%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander			6	4%
White	28	60%	90	53%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	16	34%	57	34%
Client Doesn't Know	0	0%	0	0%
Client Refused	0	0%	11	7%
Data Not Collected	0	0	0	0
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	25	53%	86	51%
Persons without disabilities	22	47%	83	49%
Disability unreported				
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male	21	45%	73	43%
Female	23	49%	85	50%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	3	6%	6	4%
Transgender	0	0%	2	1%
Questioning	0	0%	0	0%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0%
Client refused	0	0%	4	2%
Data not collected	0	0%	0	0%

** RRH = rapid re-housing or short-term rent assistance programs

Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Other Permanent Housing Programs (if applicable)

If your county does not have Other Permanent Housing, please write N/A: N/A

# Housing Placements – Other Permanent Housing Programs (OPH)***	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
Total people				
Total households				
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American				
Black, African American or African				
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)				
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous				
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander				
White				
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)				
Client Doesn't Know				
Client Refused				
Data Not Collected				
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities				
Persons without disabilities				
Disability unreported				
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male				
Female				
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'				
Transgender				
Questioning				
Client doesn't know				
Client refused				
Data not collected				

*** OPH = other permanent housing programs (homeless preference units, rent assistance programs without services) that your system operates and SHS funds

The quarter and year-to-date sections are grayed out to indicate there are no OPH projects, at this time.

Context narrative (optional): In no more than 500 words, please share any additional context about the data you provided above on Housing Placements.

Eviction and Homelessness Prevention

# of Preventions	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
Total people	45	23.4%	192	100%
Total households	28	23.7%	118	100%
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	6	13%	9	5%
Black, African American or African	8	18%	58	30%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	5	11%	33	17%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	2	4%	6	3%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	11	24%	23	12%
White	18	40%	83	43%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	13	29%	61	32%
Client Doesn't Know	0	0%	0	0%
Client Refused	1	2%	5	3%
Data Not Collected	0	0%	0	0%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	22	49%	70	67%
Persons without disabilities	23	51%	129	43%
Disability unreported	0	0%	0	0%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male	16	36%	83	43%
Female	28	62%	106	55%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	0	0%	1	1%
Transgender	1	2%	1	1%
Questioning	0	0%	0	0%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0%
Client refused	1	2%	2	1%
Data not collected	0	0%	0	0%

The year-to-date (YTD) total is the de-duplicated number for Q1 and Q2. If someone had a new entry in both Q1 and Q2, they would be de-duplicated in this YTD count.

Section 2.B Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance Program

The following data represents a **subset** of the above Housing Placements data. The Regional Long-term Rent Assistance Program (RLRA) primarily provides permanent supportive housing to SHS priority Population A clients (though RLRA is not strictly limited to PSH or Population A).

RLRA data is not additive to the data above. The housing placements shown below are duplicates of the placements shown in the data above.

Please disaggregate data for the **total number of people in housing using an RLRA voucher during the quarter and year to date.**

Regional Long-term Rent Assistance Quarterly Program Data	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
# of RLRA vouchers issued during reporting period	44	44%	100	100%
# of people newly leased up during reporting period	49	39.8%	123	100%
# of households newly leased up during reporting period	38	38.7%	98	100%
# of people in housing using RLRA voucher during reporting period	339	96.8%	350	100%
# of households in housing using RLRA voucher during reporting period	277	96.5%	287	100%
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	5	1.5%	5	1.4%
Black, African American or African	108	31.9%	109	31.1%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	36	10.6%	38	10.9%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	60	17.7%	61	17.4%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	19	5.6%	20	5.7%
White	184	54.3%	193	55.1%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	138	40.7%	145	41.4%
Client Doesn't Know	0	0%	0	0%
Client Refused	0	0%	0	0%
Data Not Collected	0	0%	0	0%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	262	77.3%	273	78.0%
Persons without disabilities	77	22.7%	77	22.0%
Disability unreported	0	0%	0	0%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male	202	59.6%	207	59.1%
Female	136	40.1%	142	40.6%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	1	.3%	1	.3%
Transgender				
Questioning				
Client doesn't know				
Client refused				
Data not collected	0	0%	0	0%

A section of the above gender identity table is grayed out because these are not gender identity options within the Yardi database, one of the main databases used to capture RLRA data. A regional data team composed of members from Clackamas, Washington, and Multnomah counties are working together to update the data code in Yardi to incorporate the additional gender identity categories.

Definitions:

The number of RLRA vouchers issued during the reporting period: Number of households who were issued an RLRA voucher during the reporting period. (Includes households still shopping for a unit and not yet leased up.)

The number of households/people newly leased up during reporting period: Number of households/people who completed the lease-up process and moved into their housing during the reporting period.

The number of households/people in housing using an RLRA voucher during the reporting period: Number of households/people who were in housing using an RLRA voucher at any point during the reporting period. (Includes (a) everyone who has been housed to date with RLRA and is still housed, and (b) households who became newly housed during the reporting period.)

Context narrative (optional): In no more than 500 words, please share any additional context about the data you provided above on the RLRA program.

[enter narrative here]

Section 2.C Subset of Housing Placements and Preventions: Priority Population Disaggregation

The following is a **subset** of the above Housing Placements and Preventions data (all intervention types combined), which represents housing placements/preventions for SHS priority population A.

Population A Report	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
Population A: Total people placed into permanent housing/preventions	80	33.8%	236	100%
Population A: Total households placed into permanent housing/preventions	70	34.8%	201	100%
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	3	4%	7	3%
Black, African American or African	22	28%	62	26%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	13	16%	42	18%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	23	29%	54	23%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	1%	9	4%
White	65	81%	139	59%
(Subset of White): Non-Hispanic White	35	44%	100	42%
Client Doesn't Know	0	0%	0	0%
Client Refused	1	1%	9	4%
Data Not Collected	0	0%	0	0%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	69	86%	187	79%
Persons without disabilities	0	0%	6	3%
Disability unreported	11	14%	43	18%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male	37	46%	110	47%
Female	36	45%	103	44%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	4	5%	9	4%
Transgender	4	5%	5	2%
Questioning	0	0%	1	<1%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0%
Client refused	0	0%	8	3%
Data not collected	0	0%	0	0%

The following is a **subset** of the above Housing Placements and Preventions data (all intervention types combined), which represents housing placements and preventions for SHS priority population B.

Population B Report	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
Population B: Total people placed into permanent housing/preventions	80	26.1%	306	100%
Population B: Total households placed into permanent housing/preventions	47	23.6%	199	100%
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	6	8%	14	5%
Black, African American or African	20	25%	106	35%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	17	21%	64	21%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	12	15%	33	11%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	11	14%	26	8%
White	36	45%	142	46%
(Subset of White): Non-Hispanic White	21	26%	84	27%
Client Doesn't Know	0	0%	0	0%
Client Refused	2	3%	2	1%
Data Not Collected	0	0%	0	0%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	44	55%	132	43%
Persons without disabilities	35	44%	148	48%
Disability unreported	1	1%	26	8%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male	31	39%	136	44%
Female	46	58%	161	53%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	2	3%	5	2%
Transgender	2	3%	3	1%
Questioning	0	0%	0	0%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0%
Client refused	2	3%	1	1%
Data not collected	0%	0%	0%	0%

Context narrative (optional): In no more than 500 words, please share any additional context about the data you provided above on Population A/B.

[enter narrative here]

Section 2.D Other Data: Non-Housing Numeric Goals

This section shows progress to quantitative goals set in county annual work plans. Housing placement and prevention progress are already included in the above tables. This section includes goals such as shelter beds and outreach contacts and other quantitative goals that should be reported on a quarterly basis. This data in this section may differ from county to county and will differ year to year, as it aligns with goals set in county annual work plans.

Instructions: Please complete the tables below, as applicable to your annual work plans:

All counties please complete the table below:

Goal Type	Your FY 22-23 Goal	Progress this Quarter	Progress YTD
Shelter Beds	400	56	304

If applicable for quarterly reporting, other goals from your work plan, if applicable (e.g. people served in outreach, other quantitative goals)

Goal Type	Your FY 22-23 Goal	Progress this Quarter	Progress YTD
[ADD here]			

Context narrative (optional): In no more than 500 words, please share any additional context about the data you provided in the above tables.

[enter narrative here]

Section 3. Financial reporting

Please complete the quarterly financial report and include the completed financial report to this quarterly report, as an attachment.

Financial Report (by Program Category) COMPLETE THE SECTION BELOW EVERY QUARTER. UPDATE AS NEEDED FOR THE ANNUAL REPORT.

	Annual Budget	Q1 Actuals	Q2 Actuals	Q3 Actuals	Q4 Actuals	Total YTD Actuals	Variance Under / (Over)	% of Budget	Comments	
Metro SHS Resources										
Beginning Fund Balance	44,918,800	61,720,728	-	-	-	61,720,728	(16,801,928)	137%	Counties will provide details and context on any unbudgeted amounts in Beginning Fund Balance in the narrative of their report, including the current plan and timeline for budgeting and spending it. Actuals tax receipts (cash basis): \$86m - Metro Forecast \$68.4m County FY22 Budget \$52,129,500 Metro adjusted FY22 forecast mid year from \$52.1m to \$68.4m mid year. The difference was budgeted in the FY23 Adopted Budget. Multnomah County accounting procedure is to accrue 60 days of tax receipts for the quarter ended June 30th.	
FY22 Revenues exceeding Forecast	-	17,623,588	-	-	-	17,623,588	N/A	N/A		
Diff FY22 Actual vs Budgeted Exp	-	15,740,260	-	-	-	15,740,260	N/A	N/A		
Prior Year Collections Budgeted in FY23	-	16,318,800	-	-	-	16,318,800	N/A	N/A		
July-August 22 collections recorded in FY22	-	11,766,772	-	-	-	11,766,772	N/A	N/A		
FY22 Interest Earnings and Other Misc Revenues	-	271,307	-	-	-	271,307	N/A	N/A		
Metro SHS Program Funds	90,803,734	6,182,934	20,991,484	-	-	27,174,419	63,629,315	30%		
Interest Earnings	-	328,102	790,409	-	-	1,118,512	(1,118,512)	N/A		
Other Misc Revenues	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/A		
Total Metro SHS Resources	135,722,534	68,231,764	21,781,894	-	-	90,013,658	45,708,876	66%		
Metro SHS Requirements										
Program Costs										
Activity Costs										
Shelter, Outreach and Safety on/off the Street (emergency shelter, outreach services and supplies, hygiene programs)	27,293,613	3,849,926	4,863,453	-	-	8,713,379	18,580,234	32%	Service Provider Administrative Costs are reported as part of Program Costs above. Counties will provide details and context for Service Provider Administrative Costs within the narrative of their Annual Program Report. Administrative Costs for long-term rent assistance equals 9% of Partner's YTD expenses on long-term Administrative Costs for Other Program Costs equals 5% of total YTD Other Program Costs.	
Short-term Housing Assistance (rent assistance and services, e.g. rapid rehousing, short-term rent assistance, housing retention)	42,557,898	1,770,846	4,045,671	-	-	5,816,517	36,741,381	14%		
Permanent supportive housing services (wrap-around services for PSH)	21,944,883	1,141,061	1,975,540	-	-	3,116,600	18,828,283	14%		
Long-term Rent Assistance (RIRA, the rent assistance portion of PSH)	11,144,204	292,432	569,118	-	-	861,550	10,282,654	8%		
Other supportive services (employment, benefits)	6,264,815	698,454	820,298	-	-	1,518,753	4,746,062	24%		
System Development and Capacity Building	4,913,539	117,019	111,557	-	-	228,576	4,684,963	5%		
System Support, Planning & Coordination	1,634,755	238,081	245,531	-	-	483,612	1,151,143	30%		
Subtotal Activity Costs	115,753,707	8,107,819	12,631,167	-	-	20,738,987	95,014,720	18%		
Administrative Costs ^[1]										
County Admin: Long-term Rent Assistance	258,960	16,864	67,456	-	-	84,320	174,640	33%		
County Admin: Other	3,907,452	515,336	488,108	-	-	1,003,444	2,904,008	26%		
Subtotal Administrative Costs	4,166,412	532,200	555,564	-	-	1,087,764	3,078,648	26%		
Other Costs										
Debt Service										
Regional Strategy Implementation Fund ^[2]	3,422,415	-	35,512	-	-	35,512	3,386,903	1%	Regional Strategy Implementation Fund equals 0% of Partner's total YTD expenses.	
Subtotal Other Costs	3,422,415	-	35,512	-	-	35,512	3,386,903	1%		
Total Program Costs	123,342,534	8,640,019	13,222,244	-	-	21,862,263	101,480,271	18%		
Contingency and Stabilization Reserve										
Contingency ^[3]	12,380,000	-	12,380,000	-	-	12,380,000	-	100%	Contingency equals 32% of Partner's total YTD expenses.	
Stabilization Reserve ^[4]	-	5,000,000	-	-	-	5,000,000	(5,000,000)	N/A	Stabilization Reserve equals 13% of Partner's total YTD expenses.	
Subtotal Contingency and Stabilization Reserve	12,380,000	5,000,000	12,380,000	-	-	17,380,000	(5,000,000)	140%		
Total Metro SHS Requirements	135,722,534	13,640,019	25,602,244	-	-	39,242,263	96,480,271	29%		
Ending Fund Balance	-	54,591,745	(3,820,350)	-	-	50,771,395	(50,771,395)	N/A		
FY22 Fund Balance budgeted for use in FY23	-	28,085,572	-	-	-	-	-	-	This includes \$16.3m+\$11.7m reflected in cell D16 and D17	
Available One-Time Only Fund Balance	-	28,635,156	-	-	-	-	-	-		
FY23 Activity (Revenue - Expense)	-	(2,128,983)	8,559,650	-	-	-	-	-		

^[1] Per IGA Section 3.4.2 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS, Metro recommends, but does not require, that in a given Fiscal Year Administrative Costs for SHS should not exceed 5% of annual Program Funds allocated to Partner; and that Administrative Costs for administering long-term rent assistance programs should not exceed 10% of annual Program Funds allocated by Partner for long-term rent assistance.

^[2] Per IGA Section 8.3.3 REGIONAL STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION FUND, each County must contribute not less than 5% of its share of Program Funds each Fiscal Year to a Regional Strategy Implementation Fund to achieve regional investment strategies.

^[3] Per IGA Section 5.4 CONTINGENCY, partner may establish a contingency account in addition to a Stabilization Reserve. The contingency account will not exceed 5% of Budgeted Program Funds in a given Fiscal Year.

^[4] Per IGA Section 5.5.3 PARTNER STABILIZATION RESERVE, partner will establish and hold a Stabilization Reserve to protect against financial instability within the SHS program with a target minimum reserve level will be equal to 10% of Partner's Budgeted Program Funds in a given Fiscal Year. The Stabilization Reserve for each County will be fully funded within the first three years.

Ramp-Up/Spend-Down Plan - IGA 5.5.2.1 INCLUDE THIS SECTION EVERY QUARTER AND IN THE ANNUAL REPORT.

	Expected % of Budget Spent per Quarter	Actual % Spent ^[5]	Variance	Comments
Quarter 1	10%	7%	3%	Explain any material deviations from the Spend-Down Plan, or any changes that were made to the initial Spend-Down Plan. ^[6] Underspending in Q1 is typical due to timing of invoice processing Programs are in development and still ramping up.
Quarter 2	30%	11%	19%	
Quarter 3	30%	0%	30%	
Quarter 4	30%	0%	30%	
Total	100%	18%	82%	

^[5] For the purpose of comparing "Actual % Spent," Partner should utilize the "% of Budget" figure from the "Total Program Costs" row in the above Financial Report (i.e. excluding Contingency and Ending Fund Balance), as indicated in the formula.

^[6] A "material deviation" arises when the Program Funds spent in a given Fiscal Year cannot be reconciled against the spend-down plan to the degree that no reasonable person would conclude that Partner's spending was guided by or in conformance with the applicable spend-down plan.