

**SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES QUARTERLY REPORT**

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

**FISCAL YEAR:**                        **2024**

**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
<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.

Table of Contents  
*hyperlinked*

<b>Section 1. Progress Narrative</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Section 2. Data &amp; Data Disaggregation</b>	<b>16</b>
Data Disclaimer	16
<b>Section 2.A Housing Stability Outcomes: Placements &amp; Preventions</b>	<b>17</b>
# Housing Placements – Supportive Housing*	17
# Housing Placements – Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)**	18
# Housing Placements – Other Permanent Housing Programs (OPH)***	19
# Houseless Prevention – Newly Served Final	20
<b>Section 2. B Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance Program</b>	<b>21</b>
Regional Long-term Rent Assistance Quarterly Program Data	21
<b>Section 2. C Subset of Housing Placements and Preventions: Priority Population Disaggregation</b>	<b>23</b>
Population A Report	23
Population B Report	25
<b>Section 2.D Other Data: Non-Housing Numeric Goals</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Section 3. Financial Reporting</b>	<b>26</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.*

- *Overall challenges and barriers to implementation*
- *Opportunities in this quarter (e.g. promising findings in a pilot)*
- *Success in this quarter (e.g. one story that can represent overall success in this quarter)*
- *Emerging challenges and opportunities with service providers*

## Executive Summary

On July 1, 2021, the Joint Office of Homeless Services began implementing the Supportive Housing Services (SHS) measure, increasing our resources and expanding our ability to deliver services to our neighbors experiencing homelessness in Multnomah County. Closing out the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2024, we are proud to report significant progress and momentum in our work to house and shelter these members of our community.

In FY 2024 alone, SHS dollars paid for work to place 2,322 people out of homelessness and into housing across all types — supportive housing, rapid rehousing, and other permanent housing (OPH) programs. That's a 76% increase over our SHS housing outcomes last year. In addition to SHS-funded housing outcomes, there are other Joint Office funding streams that contributed to placing an additional 3,000-plus people into housing.

Other permanent housing (OPH) encompasses all housing programs, with no disability requirement for eligibility. OPH includes all of the Population B rental assistance vouchers, recovery-oriented transitional housing programs, and Supportive Housing Services (SHS)-funded services attached to Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHV). Home Forward's EHV program, funded by the American Rescue Plan Act, was awarded 476 vouchers in FY 2021. SHS funds pay for the ongoing housing retention support for 300 EHV households. The EHV program falls under OPH because it does not require disability for eligibility.

One category within that total, rapid rehousing, saw particularly high outcomes. We placed 1,510 people in rapid rehousing last fiscal year, which is more than double the goal we set. We got close to hitting our permanent supportive housing goal as well, placing 442 households into supportive housing this fiscal year, which was 90% of our goal.

Additionally, we are on track to exceed our financial goals for the year, spending close to 85% of our SHS program budget. And, when you exclude the excess dollars carried over from previous years, **we actually invested every new dollar that Metro distributed to the Joint Office in Fiscal Year 2024** — despite Metro collecting and sending us more funding in the midst of the year than they initially forecast.

We are excited to build upon this foundation, continuing to make improvements and ensure we are serving our community as effectively as possible.

**This year**, SHS funds supported:

- Housing 1,510 people out of homelessness through rapid rehousing programming — a 117% increase over last year, and more than double our annual work plan goal.
- Placing 442 households out of homelessness and into supportive housing — 90% of our annual work plan goal. (This number is lower than expected; construction delays pushed off the opening of 242 apartments expected to serve as supportive housing this fiscal year, at the time this goal was set.)
- Eviction prevention services for 398 people.

**This quarter**, key SHS-related accomplishments from the Joint Office and Multnomah County are:

- Placing 689 people (Q4 PSH+RRH+OPH) out of homelessness and into housing, a 271% increase from those placed in Q4 from last year.<sup>1</sup>
- Serving a cumulative total of 4,232 people in Q4 (including both people newly served and people who are continuing to receive resources from previous years) with SHS-funded services.
- The Homeless Mobile Intake Team winning a national award recognizing its innovations in serving older adults.
- Supporting the opening of 30 new PSH apartments dedicated to immigrants and refugee households.

**Annual Program Goals**

In FY 2024, Multnomah County placed 2,322 individuals into housing using SHS funding. That’s across all housing types: supportive housing, rapid rehousing, and other types of permanent housing. For our two most common housing interventions — permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing — we’d aimed to house 1,005 households. By the end of the year, we housed 1,352 across those two interventions, exceeding that combined goal by 34%.

FY 2024 Annual Housing and Program Quantitative Goals			
Category 1: Regional Metrics	Year to Date Q1+Q2+Q3 +Q4	FY24 Work Plan Goal	% Achieved of goal <i>Based on households</i>
Supportive Housing (PSH) removed transitional housing from reporting group	574 people 442 households	655 people 490 households	90%
Rapid Rehousing	1,510 people 910 households	690 people 515 households	176%
Other Permanent Housing (Permanent Housing + Transitional Housing)	238 people 197 households	<i>Did not set goal</i>	N/A
SHS-funded Homeless Prevention (Eviction Prevention)	398 people 334 households	800 people 600 households	55%
JOHS ARPA-funded Homeless Prevention paired with SHS-funded FTE for distribution	5,685 people 2,198 households <sup>2</sup>	800 people 600 households <i>using the HP goal set in annual plan</i>	336%

**Adapting Funding Strategies, Enabled by SHS, for Successful Homeless Prevention Outcomes**

<sup>1</sup> See data tables in Section 2.

<sup>2</sup> ARPA-funded outcomes are from Q3. We will provide Q4 numbers in the upcoming annual report.

While SHS-funded eviction prevention outcomes are currently below initial projections due to a portion of the funding being reallocated to support 10 staff members within the Expanded Provider Network, the overall impact on homeless prevention remains positive thanks to the strategic utilization of \$8 million in JOHS-provided ARPA funds. This combined approach has not only allowed the County to meet but exceed its homeless prevention goals, demonstrating the effectiveness of leveraging multiple funding streams and adapting to evolving needs in addressing the critical issue of homelessness in Multnomah County.

***Financial Spend-Down: Exceeding Expectations***

In contrast to previous years when the Joint Office was not able to meet the ambitious SHS spend-down goals it set, we're pleased to announce that we not only met, but exceeded our Metro-approved target of spending at least 75% percent of our SHS program budget, which was larger than normal because of unused funds carried over from past years.

The Joint Office will have spent close to 85% of its program budget in FY 2024. When not including carryover from previous fiscal years, we spent 100% of our program budget, meaning every dollar Metro distributed to us this past fiscal year was put to work.

Building the internal and external capacity needed to deliver on this measure required not only time but a series of strategic steps, from developing spending dashboards to improving contracting and procurement practices. Last year we missed our spending target, leading to a year-long Corrective Action Plan decided between Multnomah County and Metro. At the close of year three, our capacity-building efforts are paying off.

We also leveraged over \$4 million for behavioral health capital investments this quarter through unanticipated revenue carried over from FY 2023. These vital investments will strengthen our supply of long-term recovery-oriented housing through the acquisition or renovation of residential housing settings to folks in their recovery.

Our work to re-house and shelter hundreds more people year over year — alongside our significant improvements in spending — demonstrates our ability to serve people in need, meet the expectations of our community, meet milestones, and effectively manage a large and growing funding stream. Our fiscal team is finalizing the FY 2024 financials, and we look forward to sharing more details in our upcoming final financial report to Metro, to be submitted at the end of August.

***SHS Program Continues to Expand its Cumulative Reach***

We also examine the cumulative number of people currently being served by SHS-funded housing. The nature of many of these housing interventions means they are long-term, continuing to actively provide services to some people years after they were first placed in housing — which means the total number of people newly placed in housing doesn't tell the whole story.

In Q4 of FY 2024, a total of 4,760 people were actively supported by SHS-funded housing programs through the Joint Office (including both people newly placed in housing and people still housed and receiving services after they were first placed in previous fiscal years).

For permanent supportive housing, we are currently sustaining 987 households (1,128 people), which is already 44% of our Local Implementation Plan goal to provide ongoing permanent supportive housing to 2,235 households by 2031, seven years from now.

FY 2021 - Present: 4,232 People Actively Served in Quarter 4 40% Achieved of Local Implementation Plan Goals*					
Project type	FY 2024 Q4 Newly served this quarter	FY 2024 Q1+Q2+Q3+Q4 Newly served this year	FY 2021-FY 2023 Still receiving services from previous years	FY 2021-Present Total receiving services in Q4	LIP Goal % based on households
<b>Supportive Housing</b> (PSH only)	100 people 79 households	574 people 442 households	554 people 545 households	1,128 people 987 households	2,235 households <b>44%</b>
<b>Rapid Rehousing</b>	545 people 397 households	1,510 people 910 households	708 people 335 households	2,218 people 1,245 households	2,500 households newly placed per year <b>44%</b>
<b>Other Permanent Housing</b>	44 people 35 households	238 people 197 households	502 people 232 households	740 people 429 households	
<b>Homeless Prevention</b> (Eviction Prevention)	83 people 66 households	398 people 334 households	276 people 123 households	674 people 457 households	1,000 households per year <b>33%</b>
<b>Total</b>	772 people 577 households	2,720 people 1,883 households	2,040 people 1,235 households	4,760 people 3,118 households	40% of LIP Goals

\*Average of the percentages

## Investments & Programming

### Successes

#### ***Cross-Department Partnerships Successfully Deliver Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance Programs***

This quarter, we've seen further success through our Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance (RLRA) partnerships with three other County departments. The RLRA program benefits both qualified low-income tenants and private landlords by offering long-term rent subsidies and services to people exiting homelessness, and pays rent to landlords at fair market rates. RLRA is administered by Home Forward (the Housing Authority for Multnomah County), which delivers rent assistance directly to property owners and works with community-based organizations to enroll recipients in the program.

**Department of County Human Services Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities RLRA Program**

In Q2, DCHS launched a new RLRA housing program in its Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (IDD) division. IDD received 15 long-term PSH RLRA vouchers, significantly increasing the number of housing opportunities available to program participants. In Q4, the IDD team successfully placed 13 people in housing using RLRA vouchers. The access to both housing and the services of the IDD team help participants overcome barriers like mental health challenges and legal histories. Housing has led to significant improvements in participants' lives, including better health, employment, and overall happiness. One previously homeless individual, Allie, moved into housing despite several barriers including a legal history, evictions, landlord debt, mental health challenges and behaviors, substance use, seizures, and a disability. Since becoming housed Allie has worked to maintain stability with the help of a Direct Support Professional, various Multnomah County departments, a behavior specialist, on-site resident services, and teamwork from property management. Allie got an Emotional Support Animal, makes hip-hop music and art with her partner, and works part-time as a caregiver. Her Direct Support Professional recently took her to the Pacific Ocean for her birthday.

**Department of County Justice Tenant-Based RLRA Program**

The Department of Community Justice's new housing program made substantial progress this quarter. The program, which supports justice-involved individuals who face significant barriers to housing, includes 12 PSH units at Argyle Gardens and 45 tenant-based RLRA vouchers in the community. While initially facing challenges with tenant screening because of the legal history of participants, currently 31 out of 45 vouchers are in use, with another 10 assigned to participants actively seeking housing.

**Health Department Assertive Community Treatment/Intensive Case Management RLRA Program**

In FY24, the Multnomah County Health Department expanded its support for people living with “dual diagnoses” — meaning they have both mental health challenges and substance use disorders — by adding 25 vouchers for intensive case management and treatment. This increased the total vouchers available for program participants to 150. All are funded by SHS. We heard one powerful success story from a woman who, after 12 years of homelessness, found stability and improved mental health after being placed in housing with an RLRA voucher. This highlights the vital role these vouchers play in participants' recovery and overall well being.

***Homeless Mobile Intake Team Wins National Award for Innovation in Aging Services***

This quarter, the Aging, Disability and Veterans Services Division's Homeless Mobile Intake Team, funded with SHS dollars through the Department of County Human Services, received a national award for its innovative work serving older adults and people with disabilities who are experiencing homelessness. Launched in fall 2022, the team adopts a unique, proactive approach to serving this population. Instead of people having to navigate bureaucratic hurdles, the team brings expertise and services directly to them, building relationships and understanding individual needs.

The support they provide includes housing, food assistance, and medical care. Case managers connect with service partners to help cover move-in costs and provide supportive services, including furniture, access ramps, and home modifications when needed. Significantly, the team's work can also help open the door to long-term housing vouchers. Since its inception, the team has served 295 individuals,

primarily those aged 61 to 80.

In Q4 the team was selected for the USAging Aging Innovations Award. The national award recognizes teams that find new ways to support older adults, people with disabilities, and caregivers.

## **Opportunities**

### ***Permanent Supportive Housing FUSE Pilot Begins Outreach and Placement***

The SHS-funded Frequent Users System Engagement (FUSE) pilot, aimed at supporting individuals with complex needs who often cycle through the health, housing, and justice systems, began conducting outreach and successfully placed its first participant into housing in Q4. The program uses data to identify individuals with high use of all three systems and prioritize them for housing and wraparound services. The program's goal is to house and support 40 individuals by the end of FY 2025, while also reducing participants' jail bookings and emergency department visits, and increasing their engagement with comprehensive healthcare services.

Two providers, Greater New Hope and East County Housing, are collaborating to implement FUSE. East County Housing is focused on outreach, engagement, housing navigation and tenancy support, while Greater New Hope provides behavioral health services.

The first phase of the FUSE pilot identified 898 individuals in Multnomah County as frequent users of those three systems, and the second phase will support a portion of those who would benefit from these services. In Q4 participants began receiving RLRA vouchers, and while housing placements are expected to increase throughout FY25, Greater New Hope is already providing crucial behavioral health services to support participants in stabilizing and maintaining their housing.

Integrating health and housing resources can be complex because of the differences between those systems, but the FUSE pilot offers a valuable opportunity for cross-sector collaboration. The Joint Office actively supported Greater New Hope in Q4 to obtain Medicaid billing approval, allowing them to expand their services. Additionally, Joint Office staff are coordinating with Health Share, Trillium, and Care Oregon to support future PSH projects that will be capable of billing health systems for services. This is a crucial innovation, as other PSH programs are struggling to provide services that meet the needs of households with acute behavioral health challenges.

### ***Hazel Ying Lee Apartments: A Multifaceted Funding Approach***

The Hazel Ying Lee Apartments, a new 206-unit affordable housing development in the Creston-Kenilworth neighborhood, held its grand opening celebration in Q4. This program demonstrates a successful integration of diverse funding streams to address critical housing needs.

The project is a partnership between Home Forward, Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization (IRCO), the Portland Housing Bureau, and the Joint Office. While Home Forward owns and manages the property, the Portland Housing Bureau contributed significant funding to develop the site. The Joint Office, using SHS dollars, is funding essential wraparound services for the 30 units of permanent supportive housing onsite. Those units, which are designated for immigrant and refugee households, will be supported annually with \$524,985 of supportive services, funded by SHS and provided by IRCO. Those services will help residents maintain housing stability and thrive in their new homes.

This strategic partnership is an example of how leveraging multiple funding sources, including critical SHS dollars, can support the creation of much-needed affordable and supportive housing, particularly for vulnerable populations such as immigrants and refugees.

### ***Emergency Housing Voucher Retention Services Create Stability in the Family System***

Client assistance funds — flexible funding that supports individuals and families in remaining stably housed — was particularly important this quarter to the Emergency Housing Voucher (EHV) program in the Joint Office’s family system.

SHS funds pay for the ongoing housing retention support for 300 EHV households delivered by 10 full-time staff members that were added to the family, youth, and DV systems with SHS funding. These households receive comprehensive assistance like home visits, service navigation, domestic violence support, employment services, and benefits acquisition, supporting them to achieve stability and independence.

For families with disability-related challenges, client assistance funds have proven to have a significant impact. The funds can be used to cover essentials like utilities, food, and medical expenses. This is evident in the success of families housed through the Emergency Housing Voucher (EHV) program through provider Path Home.

Path Home shared a notable success story of a family whose primary income earner became disabled, leading to a significant loss of income and homelessness. The EHV program started at the perfect time to help this family regain housing, provide client support, and pursue their goals. Now, two of the children are graduating from high school and have received college scholarships, while the family member with the disability is exploring employment opportunities. The father credits Path Home’s program for providing the stability needed to achieve these milestones. This highlights the transformative power of housing paired with comprehensive support, made possible by SHS.

## **Annual Work Plan Progress**

### ***Fostering a Shared Commitment to Reduce Racial Disparities***

Multnomah County’s 10-year Local Implementation Plan emphasized that all efforts to tackle homelessness must prioritize racial equity in order to address disparities produced by institutional and systemic racism. In FY 2024, the Joint Office worked toward this goal by requiring all SHS-funded providers to create an equity plan or goal.

As described in the FY 2024 annual work plan, the Joint Office made pointed efforts throughout the year to support providers in meeting this requirement by offering training, technical assistance, identifying provider-specific barriers, and developing plans to monitor progress. The Joint Office’s Equity Manager collaborated with the JOHS Program Team to establish clearer expectations for developing, collecting, and monitoring equity work plans and goals in partnership with providers. To expand on this work, the JOHS Equity Manager and Evaluation staff presented a session on Equity Work Plans at the Joint Office’s second Provider Conference hosted in spring 2024. During the session, providers received information on

equity work plan requirements, asked questions, and engaged in small group activities to brainstorm equity plan ideas and goals with other providers and JOHS staff.

The Joint Office also sought feedback and received recommendations from our Equity and SHS advisory committees. Members from the Equity Advisory Committee were consulted to determine best practices for monitoring equity plans and the SHS Advisory Committee formed a workgroup focused on enhancing equity considerations within SHS programming. The SHS subcommittee developed a set of recommendations focused on intersectional equity, evaluation, accountability, and investment priorities. The feedback and recommendations provided by the advisory bodies will continue to help guide future equity efforts within our department and our network of providers.

To close this fiscal year, we note that 60% of providers receiving SHS funds have submitted either an equity work plan or have an equity-focused goal identified in their contract, and 76% of all SHS-funded providers submitted either equity work plans, an equity goal, or included equity considerations in their narrative reporting. While this isn't 100%, we are confident that our work over the past year to help providers set racial equity goals, coupled with our ongoing work in improving equitable program design and provider procurement, had an impact in fostering a shared dedication to eliminating racial disparities and rooting our homelessness services system in racially equitable practices.

***Equity and Engagement Analyst's Key Role in Capacity Building and Provider Support***

This year, the Joint Office helped build capacity not just among our existing contractors, but with small, emerging, and culturally specific organizations newly qualified for SHS funding. These efforts helped us surpass our goals to provide technical assistance and/or capacity building funds to 15-20 new and expanding providers, and engage and provide support to 10-15 new and emerging culturally specific organizations.

This was due in large part to the efforts of the Equity and Engagement Senior Analyst at the Joint Office, an SHS-funded position that has been instrumental in building capacity among new, expanding, and culturally specific organizations seeking SHS funding. The analyst surpassed these two goals primarily through designing and implementing a new System Development pilot grant designed to help smaller providers build administrative infrastructure and secure contracts with the Joint Office.

The pilot leverages county general funding (CGF) for new and emerging providers to strengthen their infrastructure and enhance services. The analyst collected feedback on the grant design from a group of 27 culturally specific providers, then supported that same group with the application process, including helping with technical writing and budgeting. Of the 27 original providers, 12 applied and 11 were selected as inaugural grant recipients.

Providers will use grant funding for various projects such as HR support, strategic planning, data management infrastructure, equity consultations, and gender identity training. These projects will support organizations in expanding their service capability and position them to more easily contract with the Joint Office in the future. The Joint Office has budgeted over \$1M in SHS funding for FY 2025 to continue this work, and will rely on insights gleaned from the pilot to inform program design going forward.

The analyst also actively supported culturally specific organizations by connecting them to the equity team for learning opportunities and fostering their engagement in Joint Office processes. This work is in alignment with the SHS Community Advisory Committee's recommendation to build capacity among small, newly qualified organizations, and prioritize culturally specific providers for capacity building funds.

Additionally, the Joint Office supported new and expanding providers this fiscal year through improvements to our contracting, invoicing, and payment processes. Joint Office staff conducted quarterly contract management retreats to support ongoing training and development, and created updated tools to simplify performance reviews, communication, and monitoring. A recent Multnomah County audit showed these efforts are paying off: the Joint Office was recognized for leading the county in timely invoice payments, which are crucial for smaller, emerging providers dependent on prompt reimbursements.

### ***Analysis of Unmet Needs and JOHS Investments in Multnomah's East County***

The Joint Office is committed to geographic equity, particularly in serving east Multnomah County, an area historically underserved by government programs, including homeless services.

In FY 2024, the Joint Office performed a Geographic Equity Study, an analysis of the extent to which the Joint Office fulfills that mandate equitably in all areas of the county, as recommended in our Local Implementation Plan. In Q4, the Joint Office began the final phases of the study, which will be completed in FY 2025.

In order to assess whether the Joint Office is providing services equitably across the county, the study includes both a needs assessment for different areas of the county and an analysis of Joint Office investments, services, and participant outcomes for different areas.

Overall, this assessment suggests that unmet housing needs among low-income households are highest in Gresham, East County and North Portland, as measured by the number of people living in cost-burdened and overcrowded households. Gresham and East County also have a higher share of the population who identify as BIPOC and who have lower levels of economic resources than the county overall. Meanwhile, Portland's Downtown, Old Town, and Pearl District, and Inner/Central East Portland have the largest populations experiencing homelessness, both sheltered and unsheltered.

Looking next at the geographic distribution of Joint Office investments, the analysis identifies projects in the FY 2024 and FY 2025 JOHS budgets that are either contracted to providers located in East County, targeted towards residents of East County communities, or are sites (e.g. shelters and housing) located in East County. To name a few, in stride with the East County analysis, the Joint Office has made key updates to investments in East County for FY 2025 such as increasing designated SHS funding for furniture banking and a \$300K increase in homeless services in East County cities. The project is currently reviewing and updating this list. Using the findings, the analysis will summarize the level of investment and bed/unit capacity in shelter and housing in East County, as well as the number of participants served in these programs and performance outcomes such as housing retention rates. The takeaways from this analysis will include programmatic and policy recommendations for improving geographic equity across the county.

## Overall Challenges & Barriers

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) remains a critical solution for individuals facing chronic homelessness, but providers face challenges:

- **Increased landlord risk aversion:** Stricter screening criteria and reluctance to participate in PSH programs result in more denials and delays for housing applicants.
- **Acute behavioral health needs:** The rising complexity of participant needs stretches PSH resources, particularly in site-based programs where it can impact the broader community.
- **Safety concerns:** Increased safety issues related to a surge in acuity has caused providers to take costly security measures, which impacts residents.

These challenges highlight the need for continued support and collaboration to ensure the effectiveness of PSH programs. The increasing complexity of needs among individuals experiencing homelessness is a trend observed not only in PSH projects but also across various care systems and housing projects. The Joint Office is actively tackling these challenges through various strategies:

- The Homelessness Response Action Plan, which aims to provide holistic support for homeless individuals through multi-system collaboration.
- Increased investment in PSH services, raising the supportive service cap from \$10,000 to \$15,000 annually per household, with further increases for culturally specific, family PSH, and site-based projects.
- The FUSE project, specifically targeting high-acuity participants with complex needs.

These initiatives demonstrate a proactive approach to addressing the evolving needs of the homeless population, and we anticipate their positive impact in the coming year.

## Emerging Challenges & Opportunities

### ***SHS Provides Emergency Support for Immigrant, Refugee, and Asylum-Seeking Families***

This quarter, providers in the family and youth systems noted emerging challenges and opportunities related to a rising number of immigrants and asylum seekers arriving in Multnomah County. Scarce resources for this population make navigating services a challenge. Even though resources for asylees<sup>3</sup> and refugee families are the primary responsibility of other agencies, JOHS provides services to people regardless of residency status and, as a result, providers were able to use SHS funding to identify opportunities for these families and connect them with support.

For example, within the family system, IRCO started leasing units in their Hazel Ying Lee Apartments, providing 30 permanent supportive housing units exclusively for immigrant and refugee families. The project will be fully operational in FY 2025. Additionally, Rockwood CDC exceeded its housing goal for families, using the challenges of helping asylum-seeking households as a learning opportunity to better serve this population. Finally, Our Just Future helped a Venezuelan family who sought asylum in the U.S.,

---

<sup>3</sup> An asylee is a person who meets the definition of refugee and is already present in the United States or is seeking admission at a port of entry. See [dhs.gov](https://www.dhs.gov)

providing housing and connecting them with legal and case management services, demonstrating the impact of culturally specific support for vulnerable families.

In the youth system, Metropolitan Public Defender (MPD) also faced a growing backlog of 62 immigration cases due to increased referrals from undocumented families in shelters. Despite assigning six new cases weekly, limited staffing prevents MPD from addressing the demand promptly. This highlights the escalating need for legal services, particularly for immigrants —an issue the Joint Office will continue to examine.

## Section 2. Data & Data Disaggregation

Please use the following table to provide and disaggregate data on Housing Placement and Homelessness Prevention outcomes for Populations A and B. Please use your local methodologies to track and report Populations A and B. You can provide context for the data you provided in the context narrative below.

### Data Disclaimer

HUD Universal Data Element 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 individual identities.

Changes to Data Reporting Categories in FY 2024			
Change Category	Specific Change	Impact	Effective Date
Supportive Housing Table	Removed recovery-oriented transitional housing programs from outcomes to align with regional methodology	Previously reported ROTH outcomes for FY24 were removed from SH table and added to OPH table.	FY 2024 Q4
Race/Ethnicity	Addition of "Middle Eastern or North African" category	Modify data model to include new category, update code to handle input and reporting for this category.	FY 2024 Q3
Gender	Change to multiple-selection field	Modify data model to allow multiple selections, update code to handle input, storage, and reporting for multiple gender selections.	FY 2024 Q3
Supportive Housing Table	Removal of permanent housing outcomes from programs with rent assistance but no wrap-around services	Filter out data related to these programs from the Supportive Housing table.	FY 2024 Q2
Supportive Housing Table	Inclusion of outcomes from recovery-oriented transitional housing programs	Modify code to include data from these programs in Supportive Housing table calculations and reporting.	FY 2024 Q2
RLRA Table	Collection of gender identity information for all household members	Modify data model to store gender identity for all members, update code to handle input, storage, and reporting for this expanded data set.	FY 2024 Q2

## 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>	100		574	
<b>Total households</b>	79		442	
<b>Race &amp; Ethnicity</b>				
Asian or Asian American	1	1%	17	3%
Black, African American or African	30	30%	196	34%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	18	18%	99	17%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	22	22%	118	21%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2	2%	21	4%
Middle Eastern or North African	0	0%	1	0%
White	45	45%	255	44%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	37	37%	178	31%
Client Doesn't Know	0	0%	0	0%
Client Refused	0	0%	0	0%
Data Not Collected	1	1%	16	3%
<b>Disability Status</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	76	76%	426	74%
Persons without disabilities	22	22%	124	22%
Disability unreported	2	2%	24	4%
<b>Gender Identity</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Male	48	48%	289	50%
Female	44	44%	243	42%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	6	6%	23	4%
Transgender	2	2%	13	2%
Questioning	0	0%	2	0%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0%
Client refused	0	0%	1	0.2%
Data not collected	1	1%	11	2%

**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>	545		1510	
<b>Total households</b>	397		910	
<b>Race &amp; Ethnicity</b>				
Asian or Asian American	12	2%	50	3%
Black, African American or African	161	30%	507	34%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	109	20%	303	20%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	41	8%	119	8%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	16	3%	116	8%
Middle Eastern or North African	1	0.2%	3	0.2%
White	268	49%	650	43%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	219	40%	498	33%
Client Doesn't Know	0	0%	0	0%
Client Refused	0	0%	0	0%
Data Not Collected	22	4%	51	3%
<b>Disability Status</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	269	49%	641	42%
Persons without disabilities	226	41%	745	49%
Disability unreported	50	9%	124	8%
<b>Gender Identity</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Male	289	53%	705	47%
Female	238	44%	758	50%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	6	1%	25	2%
Transgender	4	1%	6	0.4%
Questioning	1	0.2%	1	0.1%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0%
Client refused	2	0.4%	3	0.2%
Data not collected	9	2%	17	1%

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

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

# Housing Placements – Other Permanent Housing Programs (OPH)***	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
<b>Total people</b>	44		238	
<b>Total households</b>	35		197	
<b>Race &amp; Ethnicity</b>				
Asian or Asian American	0	0%	4	2%
Black, African American or African	11	25%	76	32%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	8	11%	44	18%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	7	16%	25	11%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	2%	8	3%
Middle Eastern or North African	0	0%	0	0%
White	23	52%	127	53%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	18	41%	95	40%
Client Doesn't Know	0	0%	0	0%
Client Refused	0	0%	0	0%
Data Not Collected	1	2%	6	3%
<b>Disability Status</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	35	80%	187	79%
Persons without disabilities	9	20%	45	19%
Disability unreported	0	0%	6	3%
<b>Gender Identity</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Male	27	61%	143	60%
Female	16	36%	87	37%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	1	2%	3	1%
Transgender	0	0%	2	1%
Questioning	0	0%	0	0%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0%
Client refused	0	0%	1	0.4%
Data not collected	0	0%	3	1%

**Eviction and Homelessness Prevention**

# Houseless Prevention – Newly Served Final	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
<b>Total people</b>	83		398	
<b>Total households</b>	66		334	
<b>Race &amp; Ethnicity</b>				
Asian or Asian American	1	1%	8	2%
Black, African American or African	22	27%	114	29%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	4	5%	37	9%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	4	5%	24	6%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	3	4%	4	1%
Middle Eastern or North African	0	0%	2	1%
White	52	63%	241	61%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	49	59%	209	53%
Client Doesn't Know	0	0%	0	0%
Client Refused	0	0%	0	0%
Data Not Collected	2	2%	14	4%
<b>Disability Status</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	58	70%	278	70%
Persons without disabilities	22	27%	94	24%
Disability unreported	3	4%	26	7%
<b>Gender Identity</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Male	37	45%	154	39%
Female	45	54%	228	57%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	0	0%	8	2%
Transgender	1	1%	5	1%
Questioning	0	0%	0	0%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0%
Client refused	0	0%	2	1%
Data not collected	0	0%	2	1%

## 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 below are duplicates of those 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	130		453	
# of people newly leased up during reporting period	237		730	
# of households newly leased up during reporting period	116		428	
# of people in housing using an RLRA voucher during reporting period	1178		1241	
# of households in housing using an RLRA voucher during reporting period	771		826	
<b>Race &amp; Ethnicity</b>				
Asian or Asian American	22	1.6%	23	1.6%
Black, African American or African	458	36.8%	477	36.3%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	254	15.0%	259	14.6%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	124	12.8%	134	13.1%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	47	3.4%	49	3.3%
White	631	54.2%	666	54.4%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	357	36.4%	385	37.0%
Client Doesn't Know	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Client Refused	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Data Not Collected	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Disability Status</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	671	87.0%	722	87.4%
Persons without disabilities	100	13.0%	104	12.6%
Disability unreported	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Gender Identity</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Male	395	51.2%	433	52.4%
Female	357	46.3%	372	45.0%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	14	1.8%	15	1.8%
Transgender	5	0.6%	6	0.7%

Questioning	1	0.1%	1	0.1%
Client doesn't know	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Client refused	1	0.1%	1	0.1%
Data not collected	1	0.1%	1	0.1%

**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 looking for a unit and not 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	454		1,416	
Population A: Total <b>households</b> placed into permanent housing/prevention	360		1,042	
<b>Race &amp; Ethnicity</b>				
Asian or Asian American	7	2%	29	2%
Black, African American or African	115	25%	459	32%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	74	16%	226	16%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	51	11%	187	13%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	5	1%	49	3%
Middle Eastern or North African	2	0%	4	0.3%
White	255	56%	734	52%
(Subset of White): Non-Hispanic White	219	48%	571	40%
Client Doesn't Know	0	0%	0	0%
Client Refused	0	0%	0	0%
Data Not Collected	14	3%	38	3%
<b>Disability Status</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	309	68%	975	69%
Persons without disabilities	113	25%	361	25%
Disability unreported	32	7%	80	6%
<b>Gender Identity</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Male	247	54%	734	52%
Female	189	42%	624	44%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	10	2%	35	2%
Transgender	3	1%	13	1%
Questioning	1	0.2%	2	0%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0%

The table above asks for the number of people and households placed into permanent housing and/or *prevention*. Population A, by definition, excludes people in housing. We do not include homeless prevention (eviction prevention) outcomes in the Population A Report.

### **Analysis of Year to Date outcomes**

This year, a total of 1,416 people from Population A were placed into permanent housing/prevention, with 454 of those placements occurring this quarter. Among the population served this year, 69% were identified as having disabilities. The reason there are a number of people being counted as Population A without having a disability is because Population A is measured by the head of household and may not represent the other people in that household.

The following is a **subset** of Housing Placements and Preventions data (all intervention types combined), representing 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	318		1304	
Population B: Total <b>households</b> placed into permanent housing/prevention	217		841	
<b>Race &amp; Ethnicity</b>				
Asian or Asian American	7	2%	49	4%
Black, African American or African	109	34%	442	34%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	65	20%	264	20%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	22	7%	103	8%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	18	6%	100	8%
Middle Eastern or North African	1	0.3%	3	0%
White	133	42%	546	42%
(Subset of White): Non-Hispanic White	104	33%	411	32%
Client Doesn't Know	0	0%	0	0%
Client Refused	0	0%	0	0%
Data Not Collected	12	4%	55	4%
<b>Disability Status</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	129	41%	557	43%
Persons without disabilities	166	52%	647	50%
Disability unreported	23	7%	100	8%
<b>Gender Identity</b>				
	#	%	#	%
Male	154	48%	566	43%
Female	154	48%	692	53%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	3	1%	24	2%
Transgender	4	1%	13	1%
Questioning	0	0%	1	0.1%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0%
Client refused	2	1%	3	0.2%
Data not collected	5	2%	11	1%

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, 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 23-24 Goal	Progress this Quarter	Progress YTD
Shelter Beds	245 beds	544	544

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 23-24 Goal	Progress this Quarter	Progress YTD
N/A			

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, which is the number of beds the provider reports as active in HMIS.

Emergency shelter beds include non-congregate, alternative, and congregate programs that will serve adults, youth, families with children, and people fleeing domestic violence.

## Section 3. Financial Reporting

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

As agreed upon with Metro, financial reporting will be submitted on August 30.

Yellow Cell = County to fill in  
Blue Cell = Formula calculation

**Due Date:** The Quarterly Progress Report is due to Metro within 45 days after the end of each quarter (IGA 7.1.2). The Annual Program Report is due no later than October 31 of each year (IGA 7.1.1).

Metro Supportive Housing Services  
Financial Report for Quarterly Progress Report (IGA 7.1.2) and Annual Program Report (IGA 7.1.1)  
Multnomah County  
FY24 Q4

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	108,677,054	126,381,795				126,381,795	(17,704,741)	116%	Counties will provide details and context on any unbudgeted amounts in Beginning Fund Balance in the narrative of their report, including the current plan and timeline for budgeting and spending it.  43.4M is the underspend and \$14.7M is contingency and reserves Multnomah County accounting procedure is to accrue 60 days of tax receipts for the quarter ended
FY23 Revenues exceeding Forecast		46,943,361				46,943,361			
Diff FY23 Actual vs Budgeted Exp		58,146,092				58,146,092			
July-August 23 (FY24) collections recorded in FY23		17,704,741				17,704,741			
Interest Earnings and Other Misc Revenues		3,587,601				3,587,601			
Metro SHS Program Funds	96,190,265		33,648,238	33,132,820	73,655,220	140,436,278	(44,246,013)	146%	September's program funds reflected in October
Interest Earnings	-	1,911,716	3,156,475	(1,651,531)	1,083,781	4,500,442	(4,500,442)	N/A	Correction to interest posting from central finance in Q3
insert add'l lines as necessary			27,201	34,271		142,756	204,228	(204,228)	Other MISC revenue \$34K
<b>Total Metro SHS Resources</b>	<b>204,867,319</b>	<b>128,293,511</b>	<b>36,831,914</b>	<b>31,515,560</b>	<b>74,881,757</b>	<b>271,522,742</b>	<b>(66,655,423)</b>	<b>133%</b>	
<b>Metro SHS Requirements</b>									
<b>Program Costs</b>									
<b>Activity Costs</b>									
<b>Shelter, Outreach and Safety on/off the Street</b>	45,945,076	1,661,456	2,582,452	26,766,055	(2,855)	31,007,108	14,937,968	67%	qtr 4 has a credit due to reconciliation of a provider payment
Short-term Housing Assistance (rent assistance and services)	45,743,787	2,297,893	7,125,511	7,253,728	18,054,040	34,731,172	11,012,615	76%	
Permanent supportive housing services (wrap-around)	35,391,252	3,256,109	8,968,063	7,886,581	14,753,365	34,864,118	527,134	99%	
Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA, the rent assistance portion)	13,593,179	802,246	1,646,854	2,058,450	4,599,954	9,107,505	4,485,674	67%	
Systems Infrastructure (service provider capacity building and organizational health, system development, etc)	13,907,295	743,074	10,740,739	1,118,378	1,391,560	13,993,750	(86,455)	101%	
Built Infrastructure (property purchases, capital improvement projects, etc)	20,473,881				8,007,350	8,007,350	12,466,531	39%	
Other supportive services (employment, benefits)	6,505,399	574,505	1,477,716	1,595,837	3,922,627	7,570,686	(1,065,287)	116%	
insert add'l lines for other activity categories						-	-	N/A	
<b>Subtotal Activity Costs</b>	<b>181,559,869</b>	<b>9,335,282</b>	<b>32,541,335</b>	<b>46,679,029</b>	<b>50,726,042</b>	<b>139,281,689</b>	<b>42,278,180</b>	<b>77%</b>	
<b>Administrative Costs<sup>[1]</sup></b>									
County Admin: Long-term Rent Assistance	1,133,265	131,742	224,967	238,091	576,159	1,170,958	(37,693)	103%	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 11% of Partner's YTD expenses on long-term Administrative Costs for Other Program Costs equals 2% of total YTD Other Program Costs.
County Admin: Other	2,632,694	411,835	343,700	348,868	1,130,361	2,234,764	397,930	85%	
<b>Subtotal Administrative Costs</b>	<b>3,765,959</b>	<b>543,577</b>	<b>568,667</b>	<b>586,958</b>	<b>1,706,520</b>	<b>3,405,722</b>	<b>360,237</b>	<b>90%</b>	
<b>Other Costs</b>									
Regional Strategy Implementation Fund <sup>[2]</sup>	4,809,513			288,000	500,000	788,000	4,021,513	16%	Correction to Qtr 1 and 2 should be in systems infrastructure
insert add'l lines as necessary						-	-	N/A	
<b>Subtotal Other Costs</b>	<b>4,809,513</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>288,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>	<b>788,000</b>	<b>4,021,513</b>	<b>16%</b>	
<b>Subtotal Program Costs</b>	<b>190,135,341.00</b>	<b>9,878,859.45</b>	<b>33,110,002.29</b>	<b>47,553,987.30</b>	<b>52,932,561.89</b>	<b>143,475,410.93</b>	<b>46,659,930</b>	<b>75%</b>	
<b>Contingency<sup>[3]</sup></b>									
Stabilization Reserve <sup>[4]</sup>	4,809,513	4,809,513				4,809,513	-	100%	
Regional Strategy Impl Fund Reserve <sup>[2]</sup>	9,619,026	9,619,026				9,619,026	-	100%	
RLRA Reserves	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	
Other Programmatic Reserves	303,439	303,439				303,439	-	100%	
insert add'l lines as necessary						-	-	N/A	
<b>Subtotal Contingency and Reserves</b>	<b>14,731,978</b>	<b>14,731,978</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>14,731,978</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100%</b>	
<b>Total Metro SHS Requirements</b>	<b>204,867,319</b>	<b>24,610,837</b>	<b>33,110,002</b>	<b>47,553,987</b>	<b>52,932,562</b>	<b>158,207,389</b>	<b>46,659,930</b>	<b>77%</b>	
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>103,682,674</b>	<b>3,721,912</b>	<b>(16,038,427)</b>	<b>21,949,195</b>	<b>113,315,354</b>	<b>(113,315,354)</b>	<b>N/A</b>	

<sup>[1]</sup> 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.

<sup>[2]</sup> 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.

<sup>[3]</sup> 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.

<sup>[4]</sup> 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.

Yellow Cell = County to fill in

Blue Cell = Formula calculation

**Due Date:** The Quarterly Progress Report is due to Metro within 45 days after the end of each quarter (IGA 7.1.2). The Annual Program Report is due no later than October 31 of each year (IGA 7.1.2).

### Metro Supportive Housing Services

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

Multnomah County

FY24 Q4

#### Spend-Down Report for Program Costs

This section compares the spending plan of Program Costs in the Annual Program Budget to actual Program Costs in the Financial Report.

Program Costs (excluding Built Infrastructure)	% of Spending per Quarter			Comments <i>Explain any material deviations from the Spend-Down Plan, or any changes that were made to the initial Spend-Down Plan. <sup>[1]</sup></i>
	Budget	Actual	Variance	
Quarter 1	5%	6%	-1%	
Quarter 2	10%	20%	-10%	
Quarter 3	25%	28%	-3%	
Quarter 4	35%	26%	9%	
Total	75%	80%	-5%	

Built Infrastructure	\$ Spending YTD			Comments <i>Provide a status update for below. (required each quarter)</i>
	Budget	Actual	Variance	
Annual total	20,473,881	8,007,350	12,466,531	

<sup>[1]</sup> 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.