

**SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES QUARTERLY REPORT**

**SUBMITTED BY (COUNTY):**            **MULTNOMAH**

**FISCAL YEAR:**                        **2023**

**QUARTER:**                              **QUARTER 3**

***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
<b>Report Due</b>	<b>Nov 15</b>	<b>Feb 15</b>	<b>May 15</b>	<b>Aug 15</b>
<b>Reporting Period</b>	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.

### Edits to report on May 18, 2023

After submitting this report to Metro on May 15, 2023, the JOHS found content errors in the narrative section. The following edits were made:

- The table of contents was updated to accurately reflect page numbers
- The *Rockwood 8 Bridge Shelter* section on pages 7-8 incorrectly listed the priority population as Population B. This has been corrected to Population A.
- In the *Urban League of Portland Culturally Specific Chat Expansion* section on pages 8-9, the program was described as launching in FY 23 Q3. This was incorrect, the program launched in 2020 and was funded this year to expand program capacity. This has been corrected.
- In the *New Permanent Supportive Housing Projects* section on page 9, clarity was added to the section to reflect that the affordable housing buildings were funded by the Metro Housing Bond and the City of Portland Housing Bond.
- Minor edits throughout were made for content clarity.

## Table of Contents

<b>Section 1. Progress Narrative</b>	<b>4</b>
Progress to Housing Capacity, Placement, and Prevention Goals	4
Opportunities in this Quarter	6
Successes in this Quarter	8
Emerging Challenges and Opportunities	10
<b>Section 2. Data &amp; Data Disaggregation</b>	<b>11</b>
Data Disclaimer	11
<b>Section 2.A Housing Stability Outcomes: Placements &amp; Preventions</b>	<b>12</b>
# Housing Placements – Supportive Housing*	12
# Housing Placements – Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)**	13
# Housing Placements – Other Permanent Housing Programs (OPH)***	14
# of Preventions	15
<b>Section 2. B Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance Program</b>	<b>15</b>
Regional Long-term Rent Assistance Quarterly Program Data	16
<b>Section 2. C Subset of Housing Placements and Preventions: Priority Population Disaggregation</b>	<b>18</b>
Population A Report	18
Population B Report	19
<b>Section 2.D Other Data: Non-Housing Numeric Goals</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Section 3. Financial reporting</b>	<b>21</b>

## 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.*

### Progress to Housing Capacity, Placement, and Prevention Goals

In Q3 the Joint Office partnered with several Multnomah County Departments and over 70 contracted community-based organizations to serve a total of 1,243 people:

- 757 people with eviction prevention
- 40 people with rapid housing placement
- 94 people with permanent supportive housing placement
- 342 people with emergency shelter

Combining all funding types, systemwide Q3 outcomes show that thousands more were served in Multnomah County (see the JOHS System Performance Quarterly Report that aggregates all of the outcomes for each quarter).<sup>1</sup> Progress is slower than expected with the annual SHS goals we set for this year; however, Q3 outcomes are strong and higher in most categories than in previous quarters. These outcomes make a difference in people's lives and demonstrate steady progress toward laying the foundation to meet our 10-year goals for SHS investment.

In Multnomah County's Local Implementation Plan (LIP), we set 10-year goals that will be achieved through the full implementation of SHS funds. These long-term, high-level goals are to add 2,235 Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) apartments and voucher capacity to the county's overall portfolio, develop a homeless system that will annually place 2,500 people in PSH and Rapid Rehousing (RRH), and annually deliver eviction prevention to 1,000 people. The immediate goals we have set in Multnomah County's FY 2023 Annual Work Plan are aligned to build the infrastructure and capacity required to achieve our 10-year goals.

As the JOHS closes out the third quarter, we have worked to solidify the programmatic gains made since first receiving SHS funds in FY 22. The JOHS has focused on building out the capacity to place people into

---

<sup>1</sup> The Joint Office of Homeless Services (JOHS) System Performance Quarterly Report retrieved from the JOHS Official Tableau Website on May 12, 2023 at: <https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/johs/viz/JOHSSystemPerformanceQuarterlyReport-FY23Q2/Report>

long-term supportive housing by expanding evidence-based programming such as the Frequent Users System Engagement (FUSE) pilot and new housing programs for justice-involved adults. Currently, we have achieved 51% of the 10-year PSH capacity goal. We are on track to meet systemwide goals to place 2,500 people in permanent housing and rapid rehousing annually and annually support 1,000 people with eviction prevention services.

### ***Centering Racial Equity***

The JOHS is tracking the rate of housing placement for Black, Indigenous, Latino/a/x, Asian, Pacific Islander, and other people of color as compared to Non-Hispanic White people. Centering racial equity is central to both the charge from Metro to use SHS tax dollars to reduce racial disparities in the regional homeless service system and in the commitment the JOHS has made to serve disproportionately overrepresented communities in Multnomah County's homeless service system at higher rates than others served to improve outcomes for overrepresented communities.

As part of this work, the JOHS has made the strategic decision to only serve Population A households with the Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance (RLRA) program, and to prioritize Black, Indigenous, Latino/a/x, Asian, Pacific Islander, and other people of color for RLRA vouchers. In the FY 2023 year-to-date (YTD) SHS housing placement outcomes, out of 490 people newly placed into housing, 345 people (70%) were Black, Indigenous, Latino/a/x, Asian, Pacific Islander, and other people of color and 117 people (23%) were Non-Hispanic White people.<sup>2</sup> The JOHS will provide an in-depth analysis of these outcomes in our annual report.

Successful interventions we are using to center racial equity include implementing a culturally specific housing assessment program, investing in culturally specific affordable housing buildings, using a racial equity lens tool to inform investment decisions for programming, and obtaining a commitment from all the providers in our network to address long-standing racial disparities in publicly-funded housing services.

### ***Barriers to Program Launch and Expansion***

The JOHS continues to experience barriers to implementation. One barrier is the ongoing challenge to expand and modernize data collection, contracting, training, and hiring processes internally at the JOHS and externally with an expanding provider network of over 70+ community-based organizations (CBOs).

Some CBOs are experiencing persistent staffing shortages stemming from challenges with recruitment and retention. Across our CBO network, organizations are continually facing high staff turnover rates. These staffing shortages create delays in the launch and expansion of SHS programs, contributing to underspending. With a shortage of staff to implement programs, funds that are allocated for staffing and programs at the beginning of the fiscal year can remain underutilized.

### ***Capacity Building***

---

<sup>2</sup> 28 people (6%) did not share their race and ethnicity information.

To address these systemic hiring and retention challenges, the JOHS has launched capacity-building and technical assistance initiatives that will continue through FY 2024. According to feedback from CBOs one of the main challenges has been the traditional cost reimbursement model, which requires CBOs to spend their funds and then receive a reimbursement after invoicing the JOHS. This system can be a barrier when a CBO doesn't have the capital beforehand to hire and launch programming. In response to this feedback, CBOs can now seek an allocation of capacity-building funds covering up to 60 days of their annualized operating budget in advance of invoicing.

The JOHS has also developed a technical assistance (TA) grant program for CBOs. This allows organizations to access additional funds in several categories of TA that were based on a CBO survey completed this fiscal year. The following are some key areas for TA as identified in provider surveys:

- Human Resources
- Fiscal Business Services
- Strategic Planning
- Program Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation
- Policies and Procedures (other than fiscal and human resource)

At this time, the JOHS has awarded 21 CBOs in the community with TA grants and we are evaluating several more proposals from organizations in our network.

#### ***New Contracts***

The JOHS is working to contract with more CBOs to increase system capacity. In our annual work plan for this fiscal year, we set a goal to contract with five new culturally specific organizations. At the end of Q3, the JOHS made substantial progress toward that goal by contracting with eleven new CBOs, four of which are culturally specific.

Expanding a system that creates effective outcomes takes time, and we are seeing the effects of laying a strong foundation for our homeless service systems of care. The rest of the report highlights some of the successes, challenges, and opportunities with the implementation of SHS funding.

#### **Opportunities in this Quarter**

The JOHS has capitalized on several exciting opportunities during this quarter—including two new bridge housing programs, a new property owner incentive program, and the FUSE project.

#### ***Rockwood 8 Bridge Shelter with All Good Northwest***

Located in Gresham, the Rockwood 8 Bridge Shelter opened in March 2023. It is a program that provides a “bridge” to people in the process of transitioning from homelessness into permanent housing. The nonprofit provider All Good Northwest operates the approximately 40-unit motel, which is leased by Multnomah County. In most cases, the adult-only households served at the shelter have been pulled from the adult Coordinated Access list based on their vulnerability score and have been matched to a soon-to-be-available PSH apartment. While in the bridge shelter, they work with their housing placement

case managers to acquire necessary documentation, complete applications, and take any additional steps required to move into their PSH apartment. Shelter stays can be as short as a few weeks and as long as several months, depending on the situation.

This new bridge program prioritizes policies and practices designed to help people successfully remain in the shelter while they prepare to move into a permanent home. In addition to the support provided to each guest by a housing case manager, All Good Northwest's on-site staff assist in the safety and support of these highly vulnerable individuals, many of whom are coming directly from extended periods of homelessness and are living with a range of significant disabling conditions. This program model aligns with the goal of the Metro Supportive Housing Services measure to use 75% of SHS funds to serve Population A households.

#### ***Department of County Human Services Bridge Housing Pilot***

The Department of County Human Services (DCHS) bridge housing pilot is an opportunity to get more families into stable housing by addressing a gap identified by the county staff of the Multnomah Stability Initiative (MSI), a DCHS program that helps families facing housing insecurity to achieve stability. Many families experiencing homelessness are referred from the JOHS Homeless Family System of Care to the MSI program. Some of the MSI requirements had previously screened out families in need of these services. SHS funds will be used in a new program that expands the eligibility requirement for MSI services. The bridge program will initially serve 25 families with rent assistance, skill building, and wraparound support for up to two years, connecting the efforts of the MSI and the Homeless Family System of Care.

#### ***Risk Mitigation Program for Property Owners***

The Risk Mitigation Program (RMP) is a new landlord incentive program that was launched across the region in Q3. Fully funded by the Metro SHS measure, this program expands housing opportunities for people who have received Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance vouchers. The RMP was established by Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties and is modeled after a similar Portland Housing Bureau program. This new program is an opportunity to provide financial protection to landlords that offer affordable housing to people that experienced homelessness. The program reimburses landlords for eligible expenses, like repairing excessive damages to a unit or covering unpaid rent, for units that receive subsidies through the RLRA program. Administered by the Housing Development Center, this program supports the goals of the Metro SHS work plan by allowing us both to house more people through PSH and help them to retain their housing.

#### ***FUSE Pilot***

Another new opportunity this quarter is the Frequent Users Systems Engagement (FUSE) pilot, a housing placement program that will serve 50 households in its first year. The FUSE pilot will use data to identify and create a by-name list of "frequent users" of jails, shelters, hospitals, and other emergency services. Participants in the pilot will receive RLRA vouchers and wraparound services. The FUSE approach is being

utilized across the nation in cities like Denver and New York City, leading to positive housing and health outcomes for people who historically have cycled between multiple systems.

The initial Multnomah County FUSE analysis released in 2021 represented a major step toward understanding the scope of the issue in our community. The base population for this analysis looked at data from 2018 of 155,874 adults who were enrolled in Medicaid, engaged with homeless services, or were booked into the Multnomah County Jail system. From this population, a data match was conducted and found that less than 1% (1,371 people) were involved in all three systems. Of this group, 6% (74 people) were in PSH for at least a year. Based on further analysis, the FUSE report found that there were a set of 1,088 adults that were engaged in all three systems and would be eligible for PSH placement.<sup>3</sup>

This new FUSE pilot presents an opportunity to catalyze systems-level change by focusing on those that often ‘fall through the gaps’ in our current homeless service system. As of Q3, a cross-department work group finalized the program design, and the housing pilot is set to launch at the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Overall, the four opportunities described above represent the careful work the JOHS is leading to address long-standing gaps in our community to serve people who have needed assistance but did not have a county system to match their needs. The motel-based bridge shelter, FUSE model, regional risk mitigation program for landlords, and expanded housing stability programming for families represent significant future growth toward a holistic system serving population A households.

### **Successes in this Quarter**

In addition to these opportunities, we are celebrating Q3 successes in our expansion of culturally-specific housing assistance, the PSH lease-up process, and Coordinated Access expansion.

#### ***Urban League of Portland Culturally-Specific CHAT Expansion***

Due to the success of the Culturally Specific Housing Assessment Team, the ‘BIPOC Collaborative’, additional SHS funding was added this year to expand capacity. The ‘BIPOC Collaborative’ assesses people experiencing homelessness for culturally-specific services and housing. Expanding access to culturally specific services is a priority in Multnomah County’s Local Implementation Plan (LIP).

“I’ve been homeless, living in tents on the street for several years, and had decided there was no help for me until I was told the Urban League had a culturally specific CHAT Team that could advocate for me. ***Thanks to the Urban League CHAT Team I have regained confidence, self-worth, and so much more. From day one I was encouraged and reassured that I can live a normal life.*** They were pleasant to talk to and I was handled with patience and understanding. I felt like a human being again ... Making that call changed my entire life. I

<sup>3</sup> Corporation for Supportive Housing, Multnomah County FUSE Report, 2021. Retrieved from CSH’s official website on May 8, 2023, at: [https://www.csh.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Multnomah-FUSE-Report-FINAL.WEB\\_5.25.pdf](https://www.csh.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Multnomah-FUSE-Report-FINAL.WEB_5.25.pdf). See page 5 for an analysis of the local FUSE population.



am not homeless anymore. I am now a resident of the Hattie Redmond Apartments. Thank you Urban League for not giving up on me!” –NN

Initially, many participants were reluctant to disclose personal information and scored low on assessments, but the Culturally Specific Housing Assessment Team has worked to build trust. Many participants have now become eligible for PSH and some have even been placed on the top 10 Coordinated Access for Adults list. People within the top 10 of the Coordinated Access list are considered the most vulnerable of those experiencing homelessness and are slotted for immediate housing placement opportunities. After the assessment, the Culturally Specific Housing Assessment team stays connected with participants and provides supplies and resources until they are housed.

One of the key goals outlined in the LIP is to build additional permanent supportive housing opportunities that place historically marginalized people into housing. By the end of Q3, after months of momentum-building, the Joint Office has increased the permanent supportive housing opportunities in our system.

#### ***New Permanent Supportive Housing Projects***

In February and March, the JOHS supported the opening of three new affordable housing buildings. Some of these were funded by the Metro Housing Bond, the Portland Housing Bond, and funds from the Oregon Housing and Community Services. Multnomah County will leverage SHS funds to provide project-based rental assistance and support coordinated access referrals to these apartments. SHS funds will also be used to support operational costs, flexible client assistance, and staffing to ensure that residents are successful in their new apartments.

***Emmons Place*** is a new building with 48 apartments of permanent supportive housing for people 55 and older in inner Northwest Portland’s Historic Alphabet District. The project prioritizes seniors, veterans, Black, Indigenous, Latino/a/x, and other communities of color, and people with disabilities. All residents are served by Northwest Housing Alternative’s onsite resident services coordinator, with additional services provided by Northwest Pilot Project and Native American Youth and Family Center (NAYA).

***Hattie Redmond*** is a new building with 60 studio apartments in the Kenton Neighborhood of North Portland. This neighborhood is part of Albina, the historic center of Portland’s Black/African American community. All units in the building are permanent supportive housing targeted to individuals who have experienced homelessness and seek culturally specific services for African Americans, reconnecting displaced residents to the Albina community. On-site services are provided by the Urban League of Portland.

***Douglas Fir*** is a new building with 15 apartments in East Portland for people experiencing symptoms of serious mental illness and homelessness. New Narrative (formerly Luke-Dorf) owns and operates the site and has partnered with the Native American Rehabilitation Association (NARA) to prioritize housing for people receiving NARA’s services. All of these programs will serve our most vulnerable community

members who have experienced homelessness, have one or more disabling conditions, and are living with little to no income. The program design of these projects aligns with feedback from our community members, service providers, and people who have experienced homelessness. It also aligns with the goals of the Metro Supportive Housing Services measure, which requires that 75% of funds are devoted to this population.

### **Emerging Challenges and Opportunities**

Below are some of the challenges that service providers are experiencing with implementing SHS programming in Q3.

#### ***Department of Community Justice RLRA Program***

The JOHS and the Department of Community Justice (DCJ) are working closely together on a new PSH project for justice-involved adults. This program is representative of both challenges and opportunities involved in creating new programming. An opportunity presented with this project is a new partnership between DCJ and Oregon Health & Science University (OHSU) to develop long-term medical support for the program, which will support 12 PSH units at Argyle Gardens and 45 tenant-based RLRA vouchers in the community. The current challenge with this project is the screening process for new tenants. DCJ case managers are spending significant time in the appeal process to overturn initial denials of DCJ-referred participants. The JOHS recognizes this as an opportunity to build stronger working relationships with property managers and to create a county-wide strategy to better work with property managers through the application process.

#### ***Coordinated Access***

Similarly, providers working with the Coordinated Access (CA) team are also experiencing delays in making placements into PSH units due to high-barrier screening procedures that deny housing to those with criminal histories. Site-based project managers are willing to reconsider denied applications if providers submit a letter of accommodation, but due to limited capacity and lack of training, this has not been a straightforward process and has caused delays for the referred through the Coordinated Access system to move into housing.

To address this challenge the CA team is working with Metropolitan Public Defenders (MPD) to provide legal assistance to providers with expungement and writing letters of accommodation. This partnership has been successful—109 clients received MPD legal services in Q3, and 372 total clients received services in FY 2023. However, MPD's funding was exhausted in March 2023 and additional support was required to continue the partnership. Recognizing this, the JOHS approved \$30,000 in funding for MPD to continue its work and expedite the process of obtaining PSH housing for Coordinated Access participants. This partnership has supported the JOHS to achieve the PSH housing placement goals for FY 23.

## Section 2. Data & 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.

## Section 2.A Housing Stability Outcomes: Placements & Preventions

### Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Supportive Housing

# Housing Placements – Supportive Housing*	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
<b>Total people</b>	94	100%	490	100%
<b>Total households</b>	69	N/A	286	N/A
<b>Race &amp; Ethnicity</b>				
Asian or Asian American	2	2%	12	2%
Black, African American or African	32	34%	185	38%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	21	22%	104	21%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	26	28%	97	20%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	1%	22	4%
White	43	46%	237	48%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	25	27%	115	23%
Client Doesn't Know				
Client Refused	5	5%	28	6%
Data Not Collected				
<b>Disability status</b>				
Persons with disabilities	58	62%	241	49%
Persons without disabilities	30	32%	183	37%
Disability unreported	6	6%	66	13%
<b>Gender identity</b>				
Male	46	49%	196	40%
Female	41	44%	238	49%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	2	2%	8	2%
Transgender			4	1%
Questioning				
Client doesn't know				
Client refused	5	5%	46	9%
Data not collected				

\*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	
	#	%	#	%
<b>Total people</b>	40	100%	222	100%
<b>Total households</b>	24	N/A	145	N/A
<b>Race &amp; Ethnicity</b>				
Asian or Asian American	3	8%	5	2%
Black, African American or African	14	35%	68	31%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	10	25%	44	20%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	4	10%	30	14%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2	5%	8	4%
White	17	43%	85	38%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	12	30%	109	49%
Client Doesn't Know				
Client Refused			16	7%
Data Not Collected				
<b>Disability status</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	28	70%	113	51%
Persons without disabilities	12	40%	77	35%
Disability unreported			32	14%
<b>Gender identity</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Male	20	50%	105	47%
Female	20	50%	104	47%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	1	3%	6	3%
Transgender			2	1%
Questioning				
Client doesn't know				
Client refused			6	3%
Data not collected				

\*\* 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	
	#	%	#	%
<b>Total people</b>				
<b>Total households</b>				
<b>Race &amp; Ethnicity</b>				
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				
<b>Disability status</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities				
Persons without disabilities				
Disability unreported				
<b>Gender identity</b>				
	#	%	#	%
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	
	#	%	#	%
<b>Total people</b>	757	100%	938	100%
<b>Total households</b>	304	N/A	418	N/A
<b>Race &amp; Ethnicity</b>				
Asian or Asian American	187	25%	196	21%
Black, African American or African	305	40%	358	38%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	61	8%	94	10%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	20	3%	26	3%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	31	4%	52	6%
White	210	28%	289	31%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	169	22%	227	24%
Client Doesn't Know				
Client Refused	13	2%	18	2%
Data Not Collected				
<b>Disability status</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	84	11%	154	16%
Persons without disabilities	615	81%	720	77%
Disability unreported	58	8%	64	7%
<b>Gender identity</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Male	345	46%	425	45%
Female	400	53%	498	53%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'			1	<1%
Transgender	1	<1%	2	<1%
Questioning				
Client doesn't know				
Client refused	13	2%	15	2%
Data not collected				

### 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	67		168	
# of people newly leased up during reporting period	70		195	
# of households newly leased up during reporting period	51		151	
# of people in housing using RLRA voucher during reporting period	403		425	
# of households in housing using RLRA voucher during reporting period	319		340	
<b>Race &amp; Ethnicity</b>				
Asian or Asian American	5	1.6%	5	1.5%
Black, African American or African	91	28.5%	95	27.9%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	35	11.0%	37	10.9%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	57	17.9%	60	17.6%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	11	3.4%	12	3.5%
White	188	58.9%	202	59.4%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	142	44.5%	154	45.3%
Client Doesn't Know				
Client Refused				
Data Not Collected				
<b>Disability status</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	299	93.7%	320	94.1%
Persons without disabilities	20	6.3%	20	5.9%
Disability unreported				
<b>Gender identity</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Male	183	57.4%	195	57.4%
Female	135	42.3%	144	42.4%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	1	<1%	1	<1%
Transgender				
Questioning				
Client doesn't know				
Client refused				
Data not collected				

#### Gender Identity Categories in RLRA Data

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. As of FY23 Q3, this work is still in process.



**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 the 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.*

## 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 <b>people</b> placed into permanent housing/prevention	99	100%	519	100%
Population A: Total <b>households</b> placed into permanent housing/prevention	77	N/A	353	N/A
<b>Race &amp; Ethnicity</b>				
Asian or Asian American			13	3%
Black, African American or African	30	30%	168	32%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	12	12%	95	18%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	12	12%	103	20%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander			20	4%
White	25	25%	292	56%
(Subset of White): Non-Hispanic White	34	34%	179	34%
Client Doesn't Know				
Client Refused	1	1%	15	3%
Data Not Collected				
<b>Disability status</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	72	73%	331	64%
Persons without disabilities	25	25%	155	30%
Disability unreported	2	2%	33	6%
<b>Gender identity</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Male	50	51%	243	47%
Female	46	46%	254	49%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	2	2%	12	2%
Transgender			6	1%
Questioning			1	<1%
Client doesn't know				
Client refused	1	1%	13	3%
Data not collected				

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 <b>people</b> placed into permanent housing/prevention	792	100%	1,131	100%
Population B: Total <b>households</b> placed into permanent housing/prevention	326	N/A	523	N/A
<b>Race &amp; Ethnicity</b>				
Asian or Asian American	189	26%	200	18%
Black, African American or African	319	44%	441	39%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	66	9%	126	11%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	23	3%	40	4%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	34	5%	63	6%
White	216	30%	330	29%
(Subset of White): Non-Hispanic White	173	24%	247	22%
Client Doesn't Know				
Client Refused	17	2%	48	4%
Data Not Collected				
<b>Disability status</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	90	12%	178	16%
Persons without disabilities	638	88%	808	71%
Disability unreported	64	9%	145	13%
<b>Gender identity</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Male	359	49%	481	43%
Female	417	57%	588	52%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	1	<1%	6	1%
Transgender	1	<1%	2	<1%
Questioning				
Client doesn't know				
Client refused	17	2%	58	5%
Data not collected				

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

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

This section shows progress toward 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 quarterly. 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	41	342

**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.*

### Methodology to Track Shelter Bed Goal

The JOHS measures the programmatic capacity in HMIS of the active SHS-funded shelter beds. The programmatic capacity is the number of beds the provider reports as active in HMIS.

**Section 3. Financial reporting**

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

Metro Supportive Housing Services  
 Financial Report for Quarterly Progress Report (IGA 7.1.2) and Annual Program Report (IGA 7.1.1)  
 Multnomah County  
 FY 2023 - Q3

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	
<b>Metro SHS Resources</b>										
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 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 Multnomah County accounting procedure is to accrue 60 days of tax receipts for the quarter ended June	
FY22 Revenues exceeding Forecast		17,623,588				17,623,588				
Diff FY22 Actual vs Budgeted Exp		15,740,260				15,740,260				
Prior Year Collections Budgeted in FY23		16,318,800				16,318,800				
July-August 22 collections recorded in FY22		11,766,772				11,766,772				
Interest Earnings and Other Misc Revenues		271,307				271,307				
Metro SHS Program Funds	90,803,734	6,182,934	20,991,484	31,158,434		58,332,853	32,470,881	64%		
Interest Earnings		328,102	790,409	1,029,020		2,147,531	(2,147,531)	N/A		
Other Misc Revenues		-	-	108,650		108,650	(108,650)	N/A		
<b>Total Metro SHS Resources</b>	<b>135,722,534</b>	<b>68,231,764</b>	<b>21,781,894</b>	<b>32,296,104</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>122,309,762</b>	<b>13,412,772</b>	<b>90%</b>		
<b>Metro SHS Requirements</b>										
<b>Program Costs</b>										
<b>Activity Costs</b>										
<b>Shelter, Outreach and Safety on/off the Street</b> (emergency shelter, outreach services and supplies, hygiene programs)	27,293,613	3,849,926	4,863,453	6,067,204		14,780,583	12,513,030	54%	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 8% of Partner's YTD Administrative Costs for Other Program Costs equals 4% of total YTD Other	
<b>Short-term Housing Assistance</b> (rent assistance and services, e.g. rapid rehousing, short-term rent assistance, housing retention)	42,557,898	1,770,846	4,045,671	4,004,597		9,821,114	32,736,784	23%		
<b>Permanent supportive housing services</b> (wrap-around services for PSH)	21,944,883	1,141,061	1,975,540	3,333,453		6,450,053	15,494,830	29%		
<b>Long-term Rent Assistance</b> (RLRA, the rent assistance portion of PSH)	11,144,204	292,432	569,118	793,795		1,655,345	9,488,859	15%		
<b>Other supportive services</b> (employment, benefits)	6,264,815	698,454	820,298	1,510,802		3,029,555	3,235,260	48%		
<b>System Development and Capacity Building</b>	4,913,539	117,019	111,557	1,296,115		1,524,691	3,388,848	31%		
<b>System Support, Planning &amp; Coordination</b>	1,634,755	238,081	245,531	550,842		1,034,454	600,301	63%		
<b>Subtotal Activity Costs</b>	<b>115,753,707</b>	<b>8,107,819</b>	<b>12,631,167</b>	<b>17,556,807</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>38,295,794</b>	<b>77,457,913</b>	<b>33%</b>		
<b>Administrative Costs<sup>[1]</sup></b>										
County Admin: Long-term Rent Assistance	258,960	16,864	67,456	50,901		135,221	123,739	52%		
County Admin: Other	3,907,452	515,336	488,108	427,807		1,431,251	2,476,201	37%		
<b>Subtotal Administrative Costs</b>	<b>4,166,412</b>	<b>532,200</b>	<b>555,564</b>	<b>478,707</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,566,472</b>	<b>2,599,940</b>	<b>38%</b>		
<b>Other Costs</b>										
Debt Service	-	-	-	-		-	-	N/A	Regional Strategy Implementation Fund equals 0.12% of Partner's total YTD expenses.	
Regional Strategy Implementation Fund <sup>[2]</sup>	3,422,415	-	35,512	35,123		70,634	3,351,781	2%		
<b>Subtotal Other Costs</b>	<b>3,422,415</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>35,512</b>	<b>35,123</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>70,634</b>	<b>3,351,781</b>	<b>2%</b>		
<b>Total Program Costs</b>	<b>123,342,534</b>	<b>8,640,019</b>	<b>13,222,244</b>	<b>18,070,637</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>39,932,901</b>	<b>83,409,633</b>	<b>32%</b>		
<b>Contingency and Stabilization Reserve</b>										
Contingency <sup>[3]</sup>	12,380,000		12,380,000			12,380,000		100%	Contingency equals 10% of Partner's total YTD expenses. \$12.3 million was moved to contingency in Q2 while the Board determined the appropriate programming. In Q4, the spend report will include that funding in their respective programmatic areas and the Contingencies/Reserves will reflect the IGA required commitments.	
Stabilization Reserve <sup>[4]</sup>	-	5,000,000	-	-		5,000,000	(5,000,000)	N/A		
<b>Subtotal Contingency and Stabilization Reserve</b>	<b>12,380,000</b>	<b>5,000,000</b>	<b>12,380,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>17,380,000</b>	<b>(5,000,000)</b>	<b>140%</b>		
<b>Total Metro SHS Requirements</b>	<b>135,722,534</b>	<b>13,640,019</b>	<b>25,602,244</b>	<b>18,070,637</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>57,312,901</b>	<b>78,409,633</b>	<b>42%</b>		
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>54,591,745</b>	<b>(3,820,350)</b>	<b>14,225,467</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>64,996,862</b>	<b>(64,996,862)</b>	<b>N/A</b>		
FYE 22 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		28,635,155								
FY23 Activity (Revenue - Expense)		(2,128,983)	8,559,650	14,225,467						

[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 <sup>[5]</sup>	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. <sup>[6]</sup>
Quarter 2	30%	11%	19%	
Quarter 3	30%	15%	15%	
Quarter 4	30%	0%	30%	
Total	100%	32%	68%	

[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.