

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES QUARTERLY REPORT

SUBMITTED BY (COUNTY): CLACKAMAS

FISCAL YEAR: 2022-2023

QUARTER: THIRD

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES

QUARTERLY REPORT TEMPLATE DRAFT

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 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <i>Report Due</i> | Nov 15 | Feb 15 | May 15 | Aug 15 |
| <i>Reporting Period</i> | 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.

Section 1. Progress narrative

This quarter Clackamas County continued to expand its continuum of housing and homeless services using SHS resources. Four procurements for new and expanded services were completed, internal hiring continued with the addition of five new staff, a new eviction prevention program was launched in partnership with the county's Social Services Division, and spending continued to increase with a 53% increase in quarterly spending between the second and third quarters. This quarter 214 people were placed in permanent supportive housing, bringing the total number of people placed in permanent supportive housing with SHS resources to 581 people since funding began in July, 2021.

New Investments in Services and Capacity Building

Clackamas County continued to support the expansion of critical housing services this quarter. In the third quarter the Housing Services Team conducted four new procurements, with a collective value of approximately \$5.9 million, to further grow Clackamas County's continuum of housing and homeless services. The county continued its commitment to include people with lived experience in decision making processes by including individuals with lived experience on the evaluation committees for these procurements. Supportive Housing Services funding supported not only the expansion of these services within the Urban Growth Boundary, but also enabled other funding to be dedicated for the initiation of new services in rural areas of the county. ***New and expanded services for urban and rural Clackamas County are anticipated to launch late in the fourth quarter or in early FY 2023-2024 and include:***

Connections to Stable Housing

Clackamas County will soon be launching its first expansion of SHS-funded rapid rehousing programming. Rapid rehousing assists households on the edge of homelessness and those who have recently become homeless. Services include housing search assistance, case management, and short-term rent assistance to help households move from temporary housing or homelessness into permanent housing.

This recent procurement will expand contracted services with two providers for a total value of \$1.1 million and the capacity to place approximately 90 households in permanent housing in the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) annually. In addition to these expanded services within the UGB, the procurement included the initiation of \$350,000 in new rapid rehousing programming dedicated to rural areas within the county using non-SHS resources. These new services will have the ability to place approximately 20 households into permanent housing in rural Clackamas County annually.

Permanent Supportive Housing

Third quarter procurements included new supportive housing case management services to support the continued expansion of the county's Regional Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA) program. The county will be adding \$1.6 million to existing contracts which will serve over 200 additional households with case management services to promote long-term housing retention. Case managers provide highly

flexible services tailored to meet the unique needs of each household they work with. Case managers assist with benefit application assistance, lease compliance, connect program participants to independent living supports and education/employment opportunities, and more.

Youth Services

The county will soon be launching an expansion of services dedicated for housing unaccompanied youth and young adults aged 16-24. \$1.9 million will be invested in the expansion of youth services to provide additional capacity in both urban and rural Clackamas County through a blend of SHS and other leveraged funding. These investments will expand a full continuum of services throughout the county for supporting unaccompanied youth. Services include shelter and transitional housing, housing navigation and placement, rapid rehousing, and supportive housing case management. Services will transition youth experiencing homelessness or housing instability into permanent housing with either short-term rent assistance until they can stabilize or long-term rent assistance with case management to provide permanent supportive housing. These investments will provide capacity to shelter and move approximately 50 youth in urban Clackamas County and 30 youth in rural Clackamas County into permanent housing each year.

Rental Assistance for Eviction Prevention

This quarter the Housing Services team partnered with the county's Social Services Division to provide \$2.0 million in funding for rental assistance to households in the UGB experiencing housing instability and at risk of losing their housing. An additional \$200,000 in County General Fund has also been reallocated to provide rental assistance for eviction prevention in rural Clackamas County outside of the UGB. This funding will be used to pay for a household's past due rent or to temporarily pay for their rent until the household can resume paying the entirety of the rent on their own. One of the most effective ways to address homelessness is to prevent it from happening in the first place and this new rental assistance program will provide stability for households before they potentially lose their housing and experience homelessness.

Technical Assistance for Service Providers

As Clackamas County's continuum of housing services has dramatically grown over the last year, the county has begun partnering with a number of smaller grassroots service providers that have historically served our community with little support and few resources. These new partnerships provided an influx of funding and connections to the wider continuum of county-funded services, but also required these small providers to significantly expand their internal capacity and administrative apparatus. In order to support their growth in a sustainable manner and help ensure their long-term success, the county is procuring professional technical assistance services that will provide capacity building and organizational development services to these providers.

The county will allocate approximately \$1.0 million per year for technical assistance which will be prioritized for grassroots and culturally specific service providers. Technical assistance will primarily focus on areas of organizational development and stability such as establishing and refining policies &

procedures; fiscal business services; human resources; strategic planning; and program design, development, implementation, & evaluation.

Supporting the sustainable growth and development of grassroots and culturally specific providers is a key tenet of the SHS measure and the county's Local Implementation Plan (LIP). Supporting the continued growth and development of small providers in our community will help ensure that the expansion of our continuum of services is sustainable and will expand capacity to assist Clackamas County residents for years to come.

Behavioral Health Support

This quarter the county hired a new SHS-funded behavioral health case manager who is bilingual in English and Spanish. SHS funding now supports two case managers in the county's Health Centers Division. These positions are dedicated to supporting individuals experiencing homelessness or housing instability who require higher levels of behavioral and mental health support to find and remain in permanent housing. These staff assist with housing navigation, breaking down barriers for health clinic patients to access housing, participating in case conferencing meetings, advocating for referrals to RLRA vouchers and housing programs, and providing comprehensive case management for participants who require significant behavioral health support.

By the end of the third quarter these case managers were already working with approximately 30 program participants to help them access permanent housing, rental assistance, and connections to additional behavioral and mental health supports. Behavioral health case managers have access to the full continuum of housing services to help their referrals access shelter, housing placement assistance, and rental assistance vouchers. Beginning in the fourth quarter they will be fully integrated into the Coordinated Housing Access system and will do their own assessments which will expedite their referral process and enable them to assist more individuals in need of specialized behavioral and mental health services while looking for housing.

All program participants referred to the behavioral health case managers are experiencing severe and persistent mental illness which has been exacerbated by their insecure housing situation. Approximately half of their referrals are literally homeless with the other half being housing unstable. The specialized support these case managers provide, in conjunction with the other services already in place, creates a supportive environment for people experiencing severe and persistent mental illness to access shelter, permanent housing, and supportive services. Access to housing and case managers is an essential step to help them stabilize and manage their behavioral or mental health.

System Improvements

Coordinated Entry System

A key focus for housing services this year has been the continued expansion of the county's Coordinated Housing Access (CHA) system and consistent improvement of its processes. The CHA system is a centralized resource for all residents in need of housing assistance to contact and be placed into the

system to be matched with the necessary program or service provider to help them move into or remain in permanent housing.

Housing services staff have been collecting and incorporating feedback received from clients and housing community partners over the past several months. This quarter, staff reviewed recent feedback and eliminated two technical coordinated entry processes that were no longer serving the system, therefore streamlining the assessment process to serve additional residents in need more efficiently.

Case Conferencing

Refining and improving the county's case conferencing process has also been one of housing services primary goals. Case conferencing is the process through which county staff and our community partners gather to identify the county's most vulnerable households experiencing homelessness or housing instability and match them with service providers for assistance. The county has now established a consistent cadence of two weekly case conferencing meetings: one dedicated for the general by-name list and one dedicated for families. A third set of recurring case conferencing meetings focused on matching youth with service providers has also been established and will begin meeting in the fourth quarter.

A key aspect of the case conferencing process is the inclusion of all relevant community partners, not just contracted service providers, with the knowledge and expertise to assist the county's most vulnerable residents. Local law enforcement entities have a wealth of knowledge of many individuals on the county's by-name list who are in need of assistance and are eager to begin participating in this process. While housing services staff and our service provider partners already work closely with local law enforcement, such as through the Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion (LEAD) program, they have not yet been formally included into the county's case conferencing process. Housing services staff are working closely with law enforcement representatives and our community partners to begin including them in these meetings moving forward.

Increased Housing Services Capacity

The influx of supportive housing services funds has resulted in the largest expansion of housing services in Clackamas County's history. To accommodate this, the county's LIP and FY 22-23 Annual Work Plan established objectives to increase the size of the county's housing services team to support this significantly larger system. Five new staff were added in the third quarter to support a variety of functions including: further developing and supporting the CHA system; supervising the housing services data team; and supporting housing services fiscal and administrative functions.

The increased capacity for the CHA team will improve screening time, processing time for referring households to case conferencing, further integrate new providers into the county's coordinated entry system and begin the transition towards a system that has the capacity to answer calls in real time. The new supervisor for the data team will lead new initiatives to streamline reporting processes, establish new data visualization tools, and work with providers to increase data entry accuracy and timeliness.

Regional Long-term Rent Assistance and Regional Coordination

This quarter the county made significant strides in expanding its Regional Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA) program with the initiation of the new Landlord Partnership Program, the Risk Mitigation Program, and further coordination with Multnomah and Washington counties on aligning standards and practices between the three RLRA programs.

The Landlord Partnership Program is a new initiative wherein the county seeks to partner directly with landlords and housing providers to reserve portions of their properties for chronically homeless households now in housing and renting with RLRA. This program provides additional benefits to participating landlords and housing providers such as guaranteed rental income, sign-on bonuses, vacancy payments, additional funds for repairs, accessible staff specialists to support tenant success, and more. The goal of this program is to expand the number of properties available to households receiving RLRA, expedite the housing placement and move-in process, and ensure that landlords and housing providers have adequate support. Since the program's recent launch two landlords have already signed-on and rented units to households receiving RLRA, with at least two more anticipated to join in the coming months.

Additionally, this quarter county staff collaborated closely with counterparts from Multnomah and Washington counties as well as the Housing Development Center to design and launch the Risk Mitigation Program. This new program will help increase access to apartments for those with the highest barriers to housing by providing reimbursements to landlords for eligible expenses such as excessive damages or unpaid rent for units that receive RLRA. The Risk Mitigation and Landlord Partnership programs are key initiatives in improving landlord recruitment and retention, housing placement time, and housing retention.

SHS Funding in Action – Rachel's Story

Rachel and her ex-husband raised their three children in West Linn, where Rachel was a certified nursing assistant for 15 years. In 2016 Rachel experienced a number of crippling deaths in her family, including her beloved younger brother. Rachel visited California to put her family's affairs in order, but when she returned she found that her then husband had left and broken up their family. The compounded mental and emotional toll led Rachel to relapse.

"Negative thoughts in my head kept going around and over and over again and kept me in a shameful state of mind," Rachel



says. “I reached out and got recovery three times. I was aware of my depression. I knew the things that I was doing at the time were wrong as far as using. And I just continued on day after day because I really didn't have a [self] worth.”

While she was homeless, Rachel mostly stayed around McLaughlin Blvd, in shelters, friends’ houses, tents, cars and motels. As Rachel reached out to organizations for help, she began to learn how to grieve and take better care of herself. Among many programs, Rachel says she benefited from hospital outpatient therapy groups and utilizing the crisis hotline.

After several years, Rachel’s daughter came to find her on the street. When “my daughter came back into my life, that gave me a reason, it gave me worth” says Rachel. “I got to have a second chance at being a mom.”

Rachel saved up money over the course of a month, paid for her own rehab program, and went from there into sober living.

Rachel began volunteering with The Father’s Heart in Oregon City, an organization that offers shelter and services for people experiencing homelessness. “They liked me and offered me a job and then quickly offered me a management position for the warming shelter,” says Rachel. She then received a housing voucher from The Father’s Heart through the Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance program.

“I had seven years feeling dead inside,” says Rachel. “I struggled for acceptance. And people we want acceptance from people. And when we're not accepted, it is so harmful. I didn't realize how badly not being accepted by society hurt me until Sarah and Dawn from The Father’s Heart told me they loved me and that I’m great. Their [acceptance] made me cry every day.”

Section 2. Data and data disaggregation

Please use the following table to provide and disaggregate data on Population A, 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.

The below tables only report outcomes funded by supportive housing services and is not reflective of county-wide housing and homeless services outcomes.

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 | 214 | | 418 | |
| Total households | 141 | | 265 | |
| Race & Ethnicity | | | | |
| Asian or Asian American | 1 | 0.05% | 2 | 0.05% |
| Black, African American or African | 28 | 13.1% | 42 | 10.0% |
| Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) | 23 | 10.7% | 39 | 9.3% |
| American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous | 11 | 5.1% | 28 | 6.7% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 6 | 2.8% | 6 | 1.4% |
| White | 153 | 71.5% | 314 | 75.1% |
| Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category) | 141 | 65.9% | 290 | 69.4% |
| Client Doesn't Know | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client Refused | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Data Not Collected | -- | -- | 1 | 0.02% |
| Disability status | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Persons with disabilities | 123 | 57.5% | 231 | 55.3% |
| Persons without disabilities | 86 | 40.2% | 182 | 43.5% |
| Disability unreported | 5 | 2.3% | 5 | 1.2% |
| Gender identity | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Male | 75 | 35.0% | 188 | 45.0% |
| Female | 133 | 62.1% | 224 | 53.6% |
| A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female' | 1 | 0.05% | 1 | 0.02% |
| Transgender | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Questioning | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client doesn't know | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client refused | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Data not collected | 5 | 2.3% | 5 | 1.2% |

*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

| | This Quarter | Year to Date |
|--|--------------|--------------|
|--|--------------|--------------|

| # housing placements – RRH** | # | % | # | % |
|--|----|-------|----|-------|
| Total people | 20 | | 23 | |
| Total households | 7 | | 10 | |
| Race & Ethnicity | | | | |
| Asian or Asian American | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Black, African American or African | 4 | 20.0% | 5 | 21.7% |
| Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) | 3 | 15.0% | 5 | 21.7% |
| American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous | 1 | 5.0% | 2 | 8.7% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 14 | 70.0% | 15 | 65.2% |
| Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category) | 11 | 55.0% | 12 | 52.1% |
| Client Doesn't Know | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client Refused | 1 | 5.0% | 1 | 4.3% |
| Data Not Collected | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Disability status | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Persons with disabilities | 14 | 70.0% | 17 | 73.9% |
| Persons without disabilities | 5 | 25.0% | 5 | 21.7% |
| Disability unreported | 1 | 5.0% | 1 | 4.3% |
| Gender identity | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Male | 11 | 55.0% | 11 | 47.8% |
| Female | 8 | 40.0% | 11 | 47.8% |
| A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female' | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Transgender | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Questioning | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client doesn't know | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client refused | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Data not collected | 1 | 5.0% | 1 | 4.3% |

** 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

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

Supportive Housing Placement data includes some people/households which were already housed, but are now receiving SHS funded supportive services to ensure they have the support needed to remain permanently housed. The reported figure above is likely an undercount due to data entry limitations many of our providers are currently experiencing which will be resolved for future reporting.

Eviction and Homelessness Prevention

| # of preventions | This Quarter | | Year to Date | |
|--|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % |
| Total people | 254 | -- | 284 | -- |
| Total households | 108 | -- | 138 | -- |
| Race & Ethnicity | | | | |
| Asian or Asian American | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Black, African American or African | 35 | 13.8% | 35 | 12.3% |
| Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) | 56 | 22.0% | 58 | 20.4% |
| American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous | 15 | 5.9% | 15 | 5.3% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 3 | 1.2% | 3 | 1.1% |
| White | 204 | 80.3% | 232 | 81.7% |
| Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category) | 166 | 65.4% | 194 | 68.3% |
| Client Doesn't Know | 1 | 0.04% | 1 | 0.04% |
| Client Refused | 8 | 3.1% | 8 | 2.8% |
| Data Not Collected | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Disability status | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Persons with disabilities ¹ | 72 | 28.4% | 102 | 35.9% |
| Persons without disabilities | 104 | 40.9% | 104 | 36.6% |
| Disability unreported | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Gender identity | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Male | 96 | 37.8% | 103 | 36.3% |
| Female | 156 | 61.4% | 179 | 63.0% |
| A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female' | 1 | 0.04% | 1 | 0.04% |
| Transgender | 1 | 0.04% | 1 | 0.04% |
| Questioning | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client doesn't know | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client refused | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Data not collected | -- | -- | -- | -- |

Section 2.B Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance Program

¹ Disability status was only available for head of households in many cases. As such, the percentages and totals for this demographic category will not be aligned with other eviction and homeless prevention demographics.

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. Housing placements shown below are duplicates of the placements shown in the data above.

Please disaggregate data for the **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 | |
|---|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % |
| Number of RLRA vouchers issued during reporting period | 139 | | 224 | |
| Number of people newly leased up during reporting period | 138 | | 295 | |
| Number of households newly leased up during reporting period | 80 | | 173 | |
| Number of people in housing using an RLRA voucher during reporting period | 463 | | 468 | |
| Number of households in housing using an RLRA voucher during reporting period | 290 | | 295 | |
| Race & Ethnicity | | | | |
| Asian or Asian American | 3 | 0.06% | 3 | 0.06% |
| Black, African American or African | 67 | 14.5% | 67 | 14.3% |
| Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) | 45 | 9.7% | 45 | 9.6% |
| American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous | 21 | 4.5% | 21 | 4.4% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 6 | 1.3% | 6 | 1.3% |
| White | 322 | 69.5% | 322 | 68.8% |
| Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category) | 299 | 64.6% | 299 | 63.9% |
| Client Doesn't Know | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client Refused | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Data Not Collected | -- | -- | 5 | 1.1% |
| Disability status | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Persons with disabilities | 260 | 56.2% | 260 | 55.6% |
| Persons without disabilities | 195 | 42.1% | 195 | 41.7% |
| Disability unreported | 8 | 1.7% | 13 | 2.8% |
| Gender identity | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Male | 178 | 38.4% | 178 | 38.0% |

| | | | | |
|--|-----|-------|-----|-------|
| Female | 273 | 59.0% | 273 | 58.3% |
| A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female' | 1 | 0.02% | 1 | 0.02% |
| Transgender | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Questioning | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client doesn't know | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client refused | 1 | 0.02% | 1 | 0.02% |
| Data not collected | 10 | 2.2% | 15 | 3.2% |

Definitions:

Number of RLRA vouchers issued during 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.)

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.

Number of households/people in housing using an RLRA voucher during 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.)

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 | 629 | | 803 | |
| Population A: Total households placed into permanent housing/preventions | 397 | | 508 | |
| Race & Ethnicity | | | | |
| Asian or Asian American | 3 | 0.05% | 4 | 0.05% |
| Black, African American or African | 60 | 9.5% | 63 | 7.8% |
| Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) | 83 | 13.2% | 100 | 12.4% |
| American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous | 31 | 4.9% | 49 | 6.1% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 9 | 1.4% | 9 | 1.1% |
| White | 485 | 77.1% | 628 | 78.2% |
| (Subset of White): Non-Hispanic White | 427 | 67.9% | 555 | 69.1% |
| Client Doesn't Know | 1 | 0.02% | 1 | 0.01% |
| Client Refused | 6 | 0.09% | 6 | 0.07% |
| Data Not Collected | 9 | 1.4% | 10 | 1.2% |

| Disability status ² | | | | |
|--|-----|-------|-----|-------|
| | # | % | # | % |
| Persons with disabilities | 343 | 54.5% | 445 | 55.4% |
| Persons without disabilities | 222 | 35.3% | 294 | 36.6% |
| Disability unreported | 14 | 2.2% | 14 | 1.7% |
| Gender identity | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Male | 277 | 44.0% | 370 | 46.1% |
| Female | 336 | 53.4% | 417 | 51.9% |
| A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female' | 2 | 0.03% | 2 | 0.02% |
| Transgender | 1 | 0.02% | 1 | 0.01% |
| Questioning | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client doesn't know | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client refused | 1 | 0.02% | 1 | 0.01% |
| Data not collected | 12 | 1.9% | 12 | 1.5% |

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 | 184 | | 247 | |
| Population B: Total households placed into permanent housing/preventions | 69 | | 115 | |
| Race & Ethnicity | | | | |
| Asian or Asian American | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Black, African American or African | 47 | 25.5% | 58 | 23.5% |
| Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) | 27 | 14.7% | 29 | 11.7% |
| American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous | 10 | 5.4% | 10 | 4.0% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 1 | 0.05% | 1 | 0.04% |
| White | 113 | 61.4% | 163 | 66.0% |
| (Subset of White): Non-Hispanic White | 102 | 55.4% | 144 | 58.3% |
| Client Doesn't Know | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client Refused | 3 | 1.6% | 3 | 1.2% |
| Data Not Collected | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Disability status ³ | | | | |

² Disability status values will not sum to 100% of total Population A people served due to limited data availability.

³ Disability status values will not sum to 100% of total Population B people served due to limited data availability.

| | # | % | # | % |
|--|-----|-------|-----|-------|
| Persons with disabilities | 66 | 35.9% | 107 | 43.3% |
| Persons without disabilities | 99 | 53.8% | 121 | 49.0% |
| Disability unreported | 2 | 1.1% | 2 | 0.08% |
| Gender identity | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Male | 59 | 32.1% | 86 | 34.8% |
| Female | 124 | 67.4% | 160 | 64.8% |
| A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female' | 1 | 0.05% | 1 | 0.04% |
| Transgender | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Questioning | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client doesn't know | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Client refused | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Data not collected | -- | -- | -- | -- |

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 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 |
|--|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Supported Emergency/Transitional Shelter Units | 140 Units | 0 | 139 Units |

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 |
|-----------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
|-----------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------|

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Outreach and Engagement | 700 Households | 90 Households | 90 Households |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|

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

This year Clackamas County executed contracts with six providers for outreach and safety on the streets services. These organizations began providing services in the second quarter and have assisted more people/households than are reflected in the table above. However, these providers are struggling with their current capacity for data entry. County staff are working to train additional staff and further support these agencies as they continue to stand-up the first coordinated outreach system in Clackamas County's history.

Section 3. Financial reporting

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

Section 3. Financial Reporting

Metro Supportive Housing Services

Financial Report for Quarterly Progress Report (IGA 7.1.2) and Annual Program Report (IGA 7.1.1)

Clackamas County

FY 2022-2023

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 | 32,200,000 | 40,912,115 | | | | 40,912,115 | (8,712,115) | 127% | The budget for Clackamas County's SHS program is based on the prior year carryover amount (ending fund balance). When constructing the FY 2022-23 budget, county staff estimated an ending fund balance for FY 2021-22 of \$32.2 million. The actual ending fund balance was \$40.9 million, a difference of \$8.7 million. Clackamas County will do a supplemental budget to appropriate these funds in FY 2022-23, if needed to ensure that program spending does not exceed the budgeted amount. Staff are currently working on FY 2022-23 year-end projections to determine the anticipated carryover amount to include in the FY 2023-24 budget. |
| Metro SHS Program Funds | - | 9,618,954 | 10,235,195 | 16,061,347 | | 35,915,495 | (35,915,495) | N/A | |
| Interest Earnings | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | |
| <i>insert add'l lines as necessary</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A | |
| Total Metro SHS Resources | 32,200,000 | 50,531,069 | 10,235,195 | 16,061,347 | - | 76,827,610 | (44,627,610) | 239% | |
| Metro SHS Requirements | | | | | | | | | |
| Program Costs | | | | | | | | | |
| Activity Costs | | | | | | | | | |
| Shelter, Outreach and Safety on/off the Street (emergency shelter, outreach services and supplies, hygiene programs) | 6,855,667 | 152,366 | 783,895 | 1,077,796 | | 2,014,057 | 4,841,610 | 29% | |
| Short-term Housing Assistance (rent assistance and services, e.g. rapid rehousing, short-term rent assistance, housing retention) | 1,670,262 | - | 20,682 | 794,555 | | 815,238 | 855,024 | 49% | |
| Permanent supportive housing services (wrap-around services for PSH) | 6,221,600 | 199,155 | 721,392 | 959,776 | | 1,880,323 | 4,341,278 | 30% | |
| Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA, the rent assistance portion of PSH) | 7,400,271 | 615,916 | 955,663 | 1,399,602 | | 2,971,180 | 4,429,091 | 40% | Includes cost for RLRA staff conducting RLRA program operations in addition to direct rental assistance. |
| Other supportive services (employment, benefits) | 591,937 | - | 181,135 | 20,619 | | 201,754 | 390,183 | 34% | |
| SHS Program Operations | 1,741,379 | 306,842 | 141,120 | 158,317 | | 606,280 | 1,135,100 | 35% | |
| System Support and Coordination | 538,858 | - | 94,733 | 63,840 | | 158,573 | 380,285 | 29% | Operational expenditures for system support and capacity building funds for providers. |
| Subtotal Activity Costs | 25,019,973 | 1,274,279 | 2,898,620 | 4,474,505 | - | 8,647,404 | 16,372,569 | 35% | |
| Administrative Costs ^[1] | | | | | | | | | |
| County Admin: Long-term Rent Assistance | 740,027 | 28,390 | 88,157 | 62,742 | | 179,289 | 560,738 | 24% | Administrative Costs for long-term rent assistance equals 6% of Partner's YTD expenses on long-term rent assistance. |
| County Admin: Other | 1,610,000 | 73,641 | 202,265 | 351,140 | | 627,045 | 982,954 | 39% | Administrative Costs for Other Program Costs equals 10% of total YTD Other Program Costs. |
| Subtotal Administrative Costs | 2,350,027 | 102,031 | 290,421 | 413,882 | - | 806,334 | 1,543,692 | 34% | |
| Other Costs | | | | | | | | | |
| Debt Service | | - | - | - | | - | - | N/A | |
| Regional Strategy Implementation Fund ^[2] | 1,610,000 | - | - | - | | - | 1,610,000 | 0% | Regional Strategy Implementation Fund equals 0% of Partner's total YTD expenses. |
| <i>insert add'l lines as necessary</i> | | - | - | - | | - | - | N/A | |
| Subtotal Other Costs | 1,610,000 | - | - | - | - | - | 1,610,000 | 0% | |
| Total Program Costs | 28,980,000 | 1,376,310 | 3,189,041 | 4,888,388 | - | 9,453,738 | 19,526,261 | 33% | |
| Contingency and Stabilization Reserve | | | | | | | | | |
| Contingency ^[3] | 1,610,000 | 1,610,000 | - | - | | 1,610,000 | - | 100% | Contingency equals 13% of Partner's total YTD expenses. |
| Stabilization Reserve ^[4] | 1,610,000 | 1,610,000 | - | - | | 1,610,000 | - | 100% | Stabilization Reserve equals 13% of Partner's total YTD expenses. |
| Subtotal Contingency and Stabilization Reserve | 3,220,000 | 3,220,000 | - | - | - | 3,220,000 | - | 100% | |
| Total Metro SHS Requirements | 32,200,000 | 4,596,310 | 3,189,041 | 4,888,388 | - | 12,673,738 | 19,526,261 | 39% | |
| Ending Fund Balance | 0 | 45,934,759 | 7,046,154 | 11,172,959 | - | 64,153,872 | (64,153,871) | 149,195,051 | |

^[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 5.5.4 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 | 5% | 5% | 0% | Explain any material deviations from the Spend-Down Plan, or any changes that were made to the initial Spend-Down Plan. ^[6] The county currently uses a soft period close, quarter 3 figures will likely be updated with additional expenses in the 4th quarter report. |
| Quarter 2 | 10% | 11% | -1% | |
| Quarter 3 | 25% | 17% | 8% | |
| Quarter 4 | 38% | 0% | 38% | |
| Total | 78% | 33% | 45% | |

^[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.