SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES Quarterly Report

Submitted by (County):   **Multnomah**

Fiscal Year: **2023**

Quarter: **Quarter 4**

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.

Edits to report on August 21, 2023

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

- In the Introduction, the JOHS' 10 year permanent supportive housing goal was incorrectly listed as 2,350, and the total number of PSH opportunities the JOHS brought online by the end of year two was incorrectly listed as 962. These numbers have been corrected to 2,235 and 987, respectively. The goal language has also been updated from "permanent supportive housing" to "supportive housing," as the goal is intended to measure both permanent supportive housing and recovery-oriented transitional housing (ROTH). After additional quality assurance work and after adding our placement numbers for ROTH projects, the total supportive housing number rose to 987.

- In section 2.B, (regional long term rent assistance program), the number of people in housing and the number of households in housing using RLRA vouchers during the reporting period were incorrectly swapped (373 individuals and 466 households). This number has been corrected to 373 households and 466 individuals.

Table of Contents

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.*

Introduction

This report represents the culmination of not only another quarter of SHS programming in Multnomah County, but also the end of year two of SHS implementation across all three counties. This quarter we have an opportunity not only to reflect on the last three months of work, but also to consider our progress within the broader scope of the SHS timeline.

This year, SHS funds supported:
- 624 people to move from homelessness into permanent supportive housing
- 694 people to move from homelessness into rapid rehousing, and
- 5,380 people to avoid homelessness and stay in housing with homeless prevention.

Overall, Multnomah County served 6,698 people with SHS funds, and exceeded last year's SHS outcomes for moving people out of homelessness and back into housing.

Similar to last year, that total number of people served is skewed toward Population B because of a one-time-only investment in homeless prevention. However, separating housing placement (ending someone's homelessness) from prevention (helping people avoid becoming homeless), the breakdown of Population A and B households for housing placement demonstrates a clear prioritization of Population A.

Of the 1,318 people placed into housing with SHS funding in FY23, 70% were in Population A (934 people) and 30% were in population B (384 people).

A high priority in Q4 was to address the pace of SHS spending in the first three quarters. Overall, in Q4 the Joint Office spent $42 million — more money than in the previous 3 quarters combined (Q1: $8.6 million, Q2: $13.2 million, Q3: $18.1 million = $39.9 million).

Beyond year-over-year budgeted program expenses, some of the increased spending can be attributed to a one-time-only investment in homelessness prevention work made to the Department of County Human Services. That program, combined with other rent assistance programming, is administered by Home Forward, which invoiced the Joint Office for $13 million in Q4.

Through the framework of our Local Implementation Plan, the Joint Office also reallocated funds in Q4 to increase a SHS-funded technical assistance program supporting community-based organizations ($1.8 million) and added a 2% cost of living increase to existing contracts receiving SHS funds ($1.5 million). The increase in Q4 builds on a 4% cost of living increase implemented July 1, 2023, per the County's budget.

During Q4 the Joint Office hired a permanent Business and Operations Senior Manager to lead our finance team, increasing internal capacity, and the Joint Office collaborated with Metro on a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) that will guide, along with the County's FY24 budget, how carried-over FY23 funds are spent.

Throughout FY23, our community partners provided eviction prevention assistance to 5,380 people in 2,067 households — far above our Work Plan goal of 800 households — allowing these families to maintain their housing and avoid becoming homeless. Much of that success came in Q4, thanks to $12.2 million in one-time-only rent assistance funds administered through our partnership with the Department of County Human Services (DCHS).

Of the households served with these funds, 79% identified as coming from a Black, Indigenous, Latino/a/x, Asian, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, and other people of color (BIPOC) community, and 91% were from households earning less than half of the area's median family income. The need for rent assistance in Multnomah County is tremendous, and these funds ensured that thousands of households did not have to resort to living outside. Preventing homelessness in the first place — slowing the rate at which people are forced to live on our streets and our shelter system — is one of the most effective and humane strategies for reducing the impacts from homelessness across our community overall.

At the heart of the Supportive Housing Services program is a focus on providing permanent, affordable housing and services to those who need those services the most, with an emphasis on supporting people experiencing chronic homelessness. We accomplish that work by helping people access affordable rents and/or support services in existing apartments, while also working with partners to construct dedicated supportive housing developments.

At the end of year two of SHS implementation, we are already 44% of the way to our 10-year goal of adding 2,235 supportive housing opportunities in Multnomah County. Of the 987 opportunities, 570 came online in FY22 and the remaining 417 came online in FY23. Of the total new supportive housing opportunities, 453 are tenant-based permanent supportive housing (rent assistance and services move with the household), 499 are project-based permanent supportive housing (rent assistance and services are tied to units at a specific property), and 35 are recovery-oriented transitional housing. Again, these opportunities are in addition to existing apartments that can also serve as supportive housing when the appropriate rent subsidies and support services are attached.

In year two, a total of 1,318 individuals (98% of our Work Plan goal of 1,345 individuals) were housed through SHS funding, across all housing types — exceeding last year's total of 1,129 individuals. Because of ongoing quality assurance work ahead of our formal annual report, due in October, this number and others in this Q4 report may increase further.

In FY23, we met 71% of our Work Plan goal of placing 545 households in permanent supportive housing (PSH), placing 387 households overall, including 87 who moved in during Q4. Within those households, 624 individual community members now have a safe place to live and services to assist them in achieving housing stability.

Many of the 387 households placed into permanent supportive housing this year were referred through Multnomah County's Coordinated Access system. After completing the Coordinated Access standardized assessment tool, households are prioritized based on local, state, and federal eligibility guidelines and priorities and are supported throughout the referral process with document readiness and barrier mitigation, including reasonable accommodation letters, debt mediation, legal assistance, application fees, move-in costs, and more.

Weekly lease-up meetings for project-based PSH and other system meetings tracking housing referrals ensure households are matched appropriately and are provided adequate support services. Providers ensure a warm handoff between housing placement staff and PSH retention workers as households move into their new homes. SHS funds have helped establish a referral system, and expand staffing capacity and PSH project-based and tenant-based opportunities.

Our rapid rehousing efforts help people exit homelessness by identifying permanent housing options while also helping people retain their housing. In Q2 of FY23 the Joint Office released a rapid rehousing NOFA (notice of funding availability) that received a high volume of proposals. Of the nine providers who received funding, three are new contractors and two are culturally specific. Following contract negotiations, 114 households were placed into housing in Q4, and programs are scaling up to be fully operational in FY24.

In year two of SHS implementation, the Joint Office continued to equip and expand our provider base and support their growth, with particular focus on emerging, culturally specific providers who are leading the work to reduce racial disparities within Multnomah County's homeless services system. By Q4 we doubled our FY23 Work Plan goal of initiating contracts with at least 5 new culturally specific community based organizations, bringing on 10 new providers throughout the year. These new partnerships are essential to the success of the SHS measure and will help reduce the disparate rates that Black, Indigenous, and people of color experience homelessness in Multnomah County. Because initiating new contracts takes longer than allocating funding to existing contracts, the Joint Office's work exceeding this goal contributed to our ramp-up time before some funding could be spent.

In Q4 the Joint Office also built provider capacity in alignment with our Local Implementation Plan and Work Plan goals by using available SHS funds to provide $677,602 in one-time-only support for 18 organizations in need of additional technical assistance and capacity building. This investment was in addition to the capacity building and technical assistance funds the Joint Office awarded to 23 additional providers throughout FY23.

Overall Challenges and Barriers to Implementation

While we celebrate the thousands of people who either left or avoided homelessness thanks to SHS funding, we also acknowledge ongoing challenges with ramping up this work and their ultimate impact on our unhoused neighbors. Multnomah County's Local Implementation Plan envisioned a three-year

ramp-up period to establish SHS programming, and navigating that growth process has revealed barriers and opportunities for improvement that we are actively working to operationalize.

Our providers continue to uplift their struggles in recruiting and retaining staff to carry out the work of the SHS measure. Without qualified, well-compensated professionals to deliver services, our system cannot scale operations to meet community need. Frequent turnover also causes delays in implementation as institutional and relational knowledge can be lost during staff transitions. The Joint Office sought to mitigate this challenge in FY23 by funding a wage increase for lowest earners, increasing the cost of living adjustment (COLA) in existing SHS-funded contracts to 6%, up from 4%, and conducting a community-wide wage assessment to determine opportunities for higher wages and educational attainment for employees of community based organizations. We will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of these strategies, and we recognize that additional work will be needed in FY24 to ensure providers have the financial support to compensate staff equitably for the crucial work they perform.

In year two we have also continued to receive feedback from emerging organizations that it's been challenging to spend funds quickly given the County's contracting structure, which functions on an invoice/reimbursement basis. To alleviate this financial hardship, in FY23 the Joint Office piloted a process to offer new and expanding organizations capacity-building funds that equal up to 60 days of their annualized operating budgets. We will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of this approach in year three.

Finally, the unanticipated tax collection in the last year (actual revenues exceeded the forecasts Metro provided each County last year) means that we are in a position to increase funding in our contracts, but for one-time-only projects rather than year-over-year investments. This issue may be unique to Phase 1 of SHS, as overcollections are expected to taper off with time. Because of the one-time limitation that comes with these unanticipated funds, they are less appealing to providers to apply for, given that providers mostly need longer-term funding for ongoing staffing and rental support.

While many of our barriers are natural growing pains associated with implementing a groundbreaking new level of funding to tackle homelessness in our community — an issue which has been decades in the making — this does not make the crisis and our interventions any less urgent.

Opportunities in this Quarter

As the Joint Office gains a deeper understanding of the incredible power of the SHS funding stream, we are better prepared to take advantage of opportunities. In Quarter 4, the Joint Office and SHS team supported the new Housing Multnomah Now initiative, the launch of a new Built for Zero data collection pilot, and an innovative partnership between the Department of Community Justice, OHSU, and Transition Projects. Each opportunity represents further building of a foundation that can last for years as Multnomah County supports people as they move not just from the streets but into housing and out of homelessness altogether.

Housing Multnomah Now is an outreach-focused, streets-to-housing pilot program developed by Multnomah County Chair Jessica Vega Pederson's office in partnership with the City of Portland, community-based service providers, and the Joint Office.

Seizing on this opportunity for collaboration and action, the Joint Office expedited contract negotiations to fund a team of outreach workers to start the Housing Multnomah Now project during FY23 in the program's first designated location of Old Town Chinatown. As of June, outreach workers have provided housing and shelter opportunities to 146 people camping beneath the Steel Bridge along NW Naito Boulevard, and 12 people have been housed.

The Built for Zero (BfZ) initiative in FY23 moved out of the development and planning phase and remains full steam ahead. The BfZ team launched a public-facing dashboard with a monthly snapshot of people experiencing chronic homelessness in our homeless services system. The team is working with our Coordinated Access team to modernize data collection and internal referral processes, and launch work to better include people who aren't already seeking or receiving services. Through this work, the BfZ team identified a need to pilot the new data collection methods they have designed. In Quarter 4, their team developed a pilot that targets the first entrypoint for people experiencing street homelessness: street outreach services, including work with Housing Multnomah Now.

This means, thanks to the investment of SHS funds, the Joint Office is improving how data is collected for and through our street outreach services. The significance of this step cannot be overstated; it has been a long-standing community request to improve this process for those people who interact only with outreach workers and aren't otherwise appearing in our services database. The pilot kicked off at the beginning of August and the provider will start to collect client-level data in October 2023.

Additionally, thanks to the foundation of year-over-year SHS funding, we are starting to see a new type of opportunity for integrating services with our regional partners and within the County itself. This year, the Department of Community Justice (DCJ) launched an SHS-funded regional long-term rent assistance project for people experiencing chronic homelessness who are also actively on probation or parole.

With the commitment of RLRA vouchers, DCJ was then able to develop specific service enhancements for recipients that are funded through other investment sources. The I-CAN (Interprofessional Care Access Network) Supportive Housing Pilot with Oregon Health & Science University, Transition Projects and DCJ will start at Argyle Gardens, with the plan to expand to clients with RLRA tenant-based vouchers in FY24.

The I-CAN Pilot Team establishes a care plan that addresses individual social needs and improves overall housing retention. Services may include helping clients learn where to get prescriptions filled, where to shop or access nutritional food items, and how to maintain appointments with primary care. Clinicians will provide education about chronic disease management and general support for the client to be stable in their housing.

Successes this Quarter

In addition to the opportunities above, we are celebrating the successful grand opening of the Douglas Fir Apartments, a new permanent supportive housing project in Southeast Portland with services funded by SHS. Douglas Fir offers a mix of 15 studio and one-bedroom apartments to residents with serious mental illness symptoms who have experienced homelessness, have one or more disabling conditions, and live with little to no income. This aligns with our Local Implementation Plan and the goals of the SHS measure, which requires that 75% of funds are devoted to this population.

As we worked with elected officials and community members to develop our Local Implementation Plan, stakeholder groups particularly emphasized that expanded behavioral health services would be key to meeting the needs of communities of color experiencing homelessness. Douglas Fir exemplifies this value in particular, as it relies on referrals from CareOregon and the Native American Rehabilitation Association of the Northwest (NARA NW) as well as from New Narrative's Intensive Case Management Program. The Douglas Fir project brings multiple SHS priorities together under one roof.

The site also depends on collaboration with our health system partners such as Coordinated Care Organizations (CCO) and the Multnomah County Health Department's Behavioral Health Division. The project also leverages existing resources by combining funding from the SHS measure and other sources.

Regional long-term rent assistance vouchers and onsite services are paid for by SHS, and CCO funding via Medicaid covers intensive case management. This approach is an innovative way to meet our community's substantial need for permanent supportive housing and culturally specific behavioral health services. We are thankful for all of our partners who helped make this project possible for community members experiencing homelessness.

Emerging Challenges and Opportunities: Service Providers

In addition to our advisory committees, the Joint Office's system of service providers continues to be one of the best sources of feedback regarding the current opportunities and challenges in SHS implementation. In Q4 several key themes emerged in reports from contracted organizations. Chief among the current challenges are rising rent prices and increasing costs in delivering services, as well as a greater need for mental health supports given the existing strain on mental health services. However, providers also identified opportunities and successes in the areas of client assistance and collaboration within the system. These insights are a crucial piece of our work at the Joint Office, as we consider how to address our challenges and strengthen our opportunities.

Providers described several impacts from rising costs and inflation. First, many organizations have had to spend more per participant on rent and utilities, which may limit other types of assistance they are able to offer. The Joint Office's adult outreach team shared that it is also increasingly difficult to support long-term housing stability with short-term rapid rehousing dollars given rising rent costs, limited vacancies, and increased security deposits for low-barrier housing.

Rising rents and inflation can also have devastating housing outcomes for populations with fixed incomes and disabling conditions — their fixed income streams are no longer able to keep pace with increases in market-rate rents and other increases in our region's cost of living. These increasing financial pressures add to the already sizable need in our County for preventative measures and permanent supportive housing.

Another emerging theme is the heightened need for mental and behavioral health supports as part of the housing process. There is a lack of both physical space to meet the need as well as a lack of staff capacity and expertise to treat a rising number of individuals who present with serious behavioral health concerns. Providers across our systems of care indicated significant unmet behavioral health needs in their participants, often far more complex than their teams are trained to address. The feedback

revealed a clear and pressing need for more access to mental and behavioral health partnerships to facilitate complex case management and system navigation.

One significant area that presented both a challenge and an opportunity in Q4 was client assistance. Client assistance is flexible funding that can help participants as they enter housing by covering move-in costs, application fees, furniture and more. Flexible client assistance can also help clients remain stable in their housing by helping with children's activities, school supplies, and career training. In Q4, client assistance funding led to significant positive outcomes:

> *"With the one time allotment of client assistance, Our Just Future was able to help families in ways that were not possible before [SHS funding]. The funds assisted a single mom who immigrated here years ago to sign up for driving lessons. She has never had a license before. With ongoing health issues and frequent meetings at her child's school (her child has special needs), she needs more flexible transportation than the bus or relying on another child to drive the family car. In addition, staff helped families sign up their children for summer camps, educational opportunities for youth, and purchasing bus passes. Another individual was able to purchase furniture for all three bedrooms that she would never be able to afford as a single mom on a limited income."*

On the other hand, many providers indicated that without client assistance it is difficult to find resources that resolve households' immediate needs when they are struggling financially or experiencing unexpected life events. In these situations, staff spend significant time looking for scarce resources for each family. Having limited client assistance funds, or none at all, presents a significant challenge for these providers.

Finally, one of the most encouraging opportunities we heard providers emphasize this quarter is the quality of partnerships they have built with each other and the impact this has had on their work.

One example that stands out is the Barbur Motel Shelter, run by Do Good Multnomah, which established a strong referral and support relationship with Rose Haven, Central City Concern, PDX Saints Love, and Cascade AIDS Project, some of whom are also SHS-funded providers, and all of whom focus on serving those most impacted by systemic inequity in the community. Case managers have been successful in working with these organizations to navigate services and mitigate barriers to access. The case management team continues to network and develop relationships with providers to facilitate more collaboration for individuals with acute needs. The shelter has also recently joined the "Tuesday Veterans Outreach" organized by Transition Projects to collaborate and assist with veterans in need of shelter and support, which has enabled them to connect directly with the veteran population seeking shelter.

While our service providers as a whole continue to struggle with staffing shortages, they have shown incredible resilience and ingenuity in building capacity through collaboration. In nurturing relationships they have strengthened our system and offered a more expansive level of community support than they would have been able to provide without the SHS measure.

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	
	#	%	#	%
Total people	*101*	*N/A*	*624*	*N/A*
Total households	*86*	*N/A*	*387*	*N/a*
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	*2*	*2%*	*15*	*2.4%*
Black, African American or African	*30*	*29.7%*	*227*	*36.4%*
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	*25*	*24.8%*	*143*	*22.9%*
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	*21*	*20.8%*	*124*	*19.9%*
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	*4*	*4%*	*33*	*5.3%*
White	*60*	*59.4%*	*326*	*52.2%*
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	*33*	*32.7%*	*174*	*27.8%*
Client Doesn't Know	*0*	*N/A*	*0*	*N/A*
Client Refused	*1*	*1%*	*11*	*1.8%*
Data Not Collected	*0*	*N/A*	*0*	*N/A*
Disability status				
Persons with disabilities	*82*	*81.2%*	*347*	*55.6%*
Persons without disabilities	*17*	*16.8%*	*255*	*40.9%*
Disability unreported	*2*	*2%*	*22*	*3.5%*
Gender identity				
Male	*49*	*48.5%*	*275*	*44.1%*
Female	*47*	*46.5%*	*323*	*51.8%*
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	*3*	*3%*	*11*	*1.8%*
Transgender	*3*	*3%*	*6*	*1%*
Questioning	*0*	*N/A*	*0*	*N/A*
Client doesn't know	*0*	*N/A*	*0*	*N/A*
Client refused	*0*	*N/A*	*12*	*1.9%*
Data not collected	*0*	*N/A*	*0*	*N/A*

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

The year to date total is higher than adding together the outcomes listed in the previous quarters' reports because additional placements were added due to quality assurance work and late data entry.

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	153	N/A	694	N/A
Total households	82	N/A	419	N/A
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	5	3.3%	19	2.7%
Black, African American or African	49	32%	215	31%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	29	19%	143	20.6%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	12	7.8%	96	13.8%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	19	12.4%	49	7.1%
White	85	55.6%	383	55.2%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	54	35.3%	235	33.9%
Client Doesn't Know	0	N/A	0	N/A
Client Refused	3	2%	20	2.9%
Data Not Collected	0	N/A	0	N/A
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	74	48.4%	353	50.9%
Persons without disabilities	59	38.6%	226	32.6%
Disability unreported	20	13.1%	115	16.6%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male	72	47.1%	297	42.8%
Female	80	52.3%	375	54%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	1	<1%	12	1.7%
Transgender	0	N/A	2	<1%
Questioning	0	N/A	1	<1%
Client doesn't know	0	N/A	0	N/A
Client refused	0	N/A	8	1.2%
Data not collected	0	N/A	0	N/A

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

The year to date total is higher than adding together the outcomes listed in previous quarters' reports because additional placements were added due to quality assurance work and late data entry.

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	*3,523*	*N/A*	*5,380*	*N/A*
Total households	*1,397*	*N/A*	*2,067*	
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	*436*	*12.2%*	*741*	*13.3%*
Black, African American or African	*1,700*	*47.6%*	*2,791*	*50.3%*
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	*343*	*12.3%*	*551*	*10.2%*
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	*57*	*1.6%*	*83*	*1.5%*
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	*221*	*6.2%*	*313*	*5.6%*
White	*838*	*23.4%*	*1,197*	*21.6%*
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	*552*	*15.7%*	*862*	*16%*
Client Doesn't Know	*4*	*<1%*	*5*	*<1%*
Client Refused	*118*	*3.3%*	*163*	*2.9%*
Data Not Collected	*197*	*5.5%*	*256*	*4.6%*
Disability status				
	#	*%*	*#*	*%*
Persons with disabilities	*251*	*7.1%*	*388*	*7.2%*
Persons without disabilities	*2,913*	*82.7%*	*4,416*	*82.1%*
Disability unreported	*359*	*10.2%*	*576*	*10.7%*
Gender identity				
	#	*%*	*#*	*%*
Male	*1,456*	*41.3%*	*2,305*	*42.8%*
Female	*1,934*	*54.9%*	*2,911*	*54.1%*
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	*5*	*<1%*	*10*	*<1%*
Transgender	*1*	*<1%*	*2*	*<1%*
Questioning	*0*	*N/A*	*0*	*N/A*
Client doesn't know	*0*	*N/A*	*0*	*N/A*
Client refused	*128*	*3.6%*	*163*	*3%*
Data not collected	*0*	*N/A*	*0*	*N/A*

The data management for the eviction prevention program primarily sits within the Department of County Human Services with the Youth and Family Services (YFS) data team. For the SHS-funded eviction prevention investments, the Youth and Family Services data team worked with 15+ vendors, Home Forward, and the Joint Office to create the HMIS data entry system for this project. The Joint Office likely under-reported eviction prevention outcomes during Q2-Q3 because of the time lag to set up the HMIS data entry process and the reporting handoff between the Joint Office and YFS. Overall, the YFS data team has been a fantastic partner this year in collecting the HMIS data.

Note: Gender identity responses can be selected alone or in combination (same as race & ethnicity), so the raw numbers added up can be greater than the total people served. For example, in the table above, the gender identity outcomes, when added together, are higher than the total served. This means that some people selected more than one gender identity.

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	73		265	
# of people newly leased up during reporting period	67		216	
# of households newly leased up during reporting period	120		279	
# of people in housing using RLRA voucher during reporting period	466		404	
# of households in housing using RLRA voucher during reporting period	373		496	
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	5	1.3%	5	1.2%
Black, African American or African	116	31.1%	121	30.0%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	39	10.5%	40	9.9%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	60	16.1%	64	15.8%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	11	2.9%	12	3.0%
White	216	57.9%	238	58.9%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	167	44.8%	187	46.3%
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	352	94.4%	381	94.3%
Persons without disabilities	21	5.6%	23	5.7%
Disability unreported	0	0%	0	0%

Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male	212	56.8%	232	57.4%
Female	157	42.1%	168	41.6%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	2	0.5%	2	0.5%
Transgender	2	0.5%	2	0.5%
Questioning	0	0%	0	0%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0%
Client refused	1	0.3%	1	0.2%
Data not collected	0	0%	0	0%

Gender Identity Categories in RLRA Data
Update - As of Q4, the gender identity categories within the Gender Identity table have been implemented across the region. Currently, the data is only collected at the Head of Household. The regional data team composed of members from Clackamas, Washington and Multnomah counties is continuing to work on this issue to capture the gender identity of each household member.

Note: Gender identity responses can be selected Alone or in combination (same as race & ethnicity), so the raw numbers added up can be greater than the total people served.

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 **people** placed into permanent housing/prevention	193	N/A	934	N/A
Population A: Total **households** placed into permanent housing/prevention	150	N/A	677	N/A
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	10	5.2%	27	2.9%
Black, African American or African	66	34.2%	302	32.3%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	28	14.5%	144	15.4%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	21	10.9%	140	15%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	8	4.1%	28	3%
White	101	52.3%	503	53.9%
(Subset of White): Non-Hispanic White	59	30.6%	294	31.5%
Client Doesn't Know	0	N/A	0	N/A
Client Refused	4	2.1%	26	2.8%
Data Not Collected	0	N/A	0	N/A
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	131	67.9%	612	65.5%
Persons without disabilities	54	28%	269	28.8%
Disability unreported	8	4.1%	53	5.7%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male	88	45.6%	400	42.8%
Female	94	48.7%	498	53.3%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	4	2.1%	18	1.9%
Transgender	3	1.6%	8	<1%
Questioning	0	N/A	1	<1%
Client doesn't know	0	N/A	0	N/A
Client refused	0	N/A	13	1.4%
Data not collected	0	N/A	0	N/A

The table above asks for the total people and households placed into permanent housing and/or

prevention. Population A, by definition, excludes people in housing. We do not include homeless prevention and/or eviction prevention outcomes in the Population A Report.

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/prevention	3,476	N/A	5,647	N/A
Population B: Total **households** placed into permanent housing/prevention	1,392	N/A	2,274	N/A
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	426	12.3%	733	13%
Black, African American or African	1,671	48.1%	2,849	50.5%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	412	11.9%	580	10.3%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	58	1.7%	122	2.2%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	236	6.8%	359	6.4%
White	826	23.8%	1,302	23.1%
(Subset of White): Non-Hispanic White	559	16.1%	965	17.1%
Client Doesn't Know	2	<1%	3	<1%
Client Refused	115	3.3%	1,703	30.2%
Data Not Collected	187	5.4%	244	4.3%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	276	7.9%	476	8.4%
Persons without disabilities	2,850	82%	4,597	81.4%
Disability unreported	350	10.1%	582	10.3%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male	1,447	41.6%	2,417	42.8%
Female	1,903	54.7%	3,068	54.3%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	6	<1%	15	<1%
Transgender	1	<1%	3	<1%
Questioning	0	N/A	0	N/A
Client doesn't know	0	N/A	0	N/A
Client refused	122	3.5%	155	2.7%
Data not collected	0	N/A	0	N/A

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

The total people served in Supportive Housing, Rapid Re-Housing, and Homeless Prevention is higher than the total people in Population A and Population B. The difference can be explained by the Homeless Prevention programming, 117 people were not entered into the HMIS system with a priority population designation.

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	124	460

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

Joint Office of Homeless Services
Metro Supportive Housing Services Spending
FY2023 Q4 (As of 8/11/2023)

Metro SHS Resources	Annual Budget	Q1 Actuals	Q2 Actuals	Q3 Actuals	Q4 Actuals	Total YTD Actuals
Beginning Fund Balance	44,918,800	61,720,728	-	-	-	61,720,728
Metro SHS Program Funds	90,803,734	6,182,934	20,991,484	31,158,434	79,184,426	137,517,280
Interest Earnings	-	328,102	790,409	1,029,020	1,331,089	3,478,620
Other Misc Revenues	-	-	-	108,650	-	108,650
Total Metro SHS Resources	**135,722,534**	**68,231,764**	**21,781,894**	**32,296,104**	**80,515,515**	**202,825,278**
Metro SHS Requirements						
Program Costs						
Shelter, Outreach and Safety on/off the Street	27,293,613	3,849,926	4,863,453	6,067,204	8,140,285	22,920,867
Short-term Housing Assistance	42,557,898	1,770,846	4,045,671	4,004,597	19,303,502	29,124,616
Permanent supportive housing services	33,348,047	1,141,061	1,975,540	3,333,453	8,342,799	14,792,852
Long-term Rent Assistance	3,723,130	292,432	569,118	793,795	1,083,905	2,739,250
Other supportive services	6,264,815	698,454	820,298	1,510,802	2,762,612	5,792,167
System Development and Capacity Building	4,917,662	117,019	111,557	1,296,115	1,606,288	3,130,979
System Support, Planning & Coordination	1,648,542	238,081	245,531	550,842	640,163	1,674,617
Subtotal Activity Costs	**119,753,707**	**8,107,819**	**12,631,167**	**17,556,807**	**41,879,554**	**80,175,348**
Administrative Costs						
County Admin: Long-term Rent Assistance	258,960	16,864	67,456	50,901	-	135,221
County Admin: Other	3,907,452	515,336	488,108	427,807	497,880	1,929,131
Subtotal Administrative Costs	**4,166,412**	**532,200**	**555,564**	**478,707**	**497,880**	**2,064,352**

Other Costs	Annual Budget	Q1 Actuals	Q2 Actuals	Q3 Actuals	Q4 Actuals	Total YTD Actuals
Debt Service	-	-	-	-	-	-
Regional Strategy Implementation Fund	3,422,415		35,512	35,123	38,714	109,349
Subtotal Other Costs	**3,422,415**	**-**	**35,512**	**35,123**	**38,714**	**109,349**
Total Program Costs	**127,342,534**	**8,640,019**	**13,222,244**	**18,070,637**	**42,416,149**	**82,349,049**
Contingency and Stabilization Reserve						
Contingency	8,380,000		12,380,000		(4,000,000)	8,380,000
Stabilization Reserve	-	5,000,000	-	-		5,000,000
Subtotal Contingency and Stabilization Reserve	**8,380,000**	**5,000,000**	**12,380,000**		**(4,000,000)**	**13,380,000**
Total Metro SHS Requirements	**135,722,534**	**13,640,019**	**25,602,244**	**14,070,637**	**42,416,149**	**95,729,049**
Ending Fund Balance	**-**	**54,591,745**	**(3,820,350)**	**18,225,467**	**38,099,367**	**107,096,228**

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 — Explain any material deviations from the Spend-Down Plan, or any changes that were made to the initial Spend-Down Plan. [6]
Quarter 1	10%	7%	3%	
Quarter 2	30%	10%	20%	
Quarter 3	30%	14%	16%	
Quarter 4	30%	33%	-3%	
Total	100%	65%	35%	

[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.