SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES QUARTERLY REPORT
SUBMITTED BY (COUNTY):   Clackamas
FISCAL YEAR: 2024-2025
QUARTER: Q3

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.

	Permanent Supportive Housing (Households)	Rapid Re-Housing (Households)	Prevention (Households)	Shelter Units
YTD Progress	165	189	1,274	214
Goal	275	160	1,000	230
SHS Year 1 to Current Date	1,095	404	2,788	214

Section 1. Progress narrative

Executive Summary

Five years early, Clackamas County has surpassed its share of the regional, ten-year Supportive Housing Services commitment to place 5,000 households in permanent supportive housing. The 1,065[th] household in the county was placed in PSH early this past quarter, and 1,095 households have now moved into PSH through the end of Q3. Staff are working to sustain new PSH placements in future years through pilot initiatives Move Forward and Housing 4 Success.

Several other SHS goals were eclipsed this quarter, as well. The county has prevented 1,274 evictions this fiscal year, exceeding our annual goal of 1,000. 189 households have been placed in rapid rehousing, surpassing our annual goal to rapidly rehouse 160 households. Since SHS was first implemented in 2021, a total of 3,192 households have been stabilized in permanent

housing—through eviction prevention and rapid rehousing—well beyond the county's original ten-year commitment of 2,130 households.

Even as staff and provider partners worked with remarkable efficiency to house people in critical need, the 2025 Point In Time Count documented an increase in the county's homeless population—from 410 people in January 2023 to 568 people in January 2025. Notably, 358 people were experiencing unsheltered homelessness in January 2025, double the unsheltered count in 2023. Between the two counts, the county's system of care placed 796 chronically homeless households into permanent supportive housing; our coordinated outreach team has expanded capacity to engage hundreds more people experiencing homelessness annually; and the county has launched a range of new rapid rehousing, health-integrated, and recovery-oriented programs to meet the urgency of our local homelessness crisis effectively and compassionately.

Countywide Coordination

Cold Weather

The Father's Heart in Oregon City serves as Clackamas County's primary severe weather shelter, remaining open around the clock when temperatures drop below freezing or when hazardous conditions pose additional risk. Guests of the shelter are met with a safe and warm environment with meals, access to medical and dental care, showers, clothing, and accommodations for pets. For families with children and individuals with medical vulnerabilities, motel stays are arranged. This quarter the warming shelter at The Father's Heart served 299 households.

From February 4th through 11th, during a prolonged stretch of extreme cold, county staff coordinated with The Father's Heart to open an overflow shelter site and ensure no one was turned away. On these nights, an average of 60 to 70 people took shelter from freezing weather, and the overflow site sheltered individuals in excess of The Father's Heart's approximately 50-individual capacity. In preparation, staff from the county's Behavioral Health Division, the Housing Services team, the Community Paramedic, and Disaster Management coordinated training for overflow shelter staff. Topics ranged from basic shelter operations to safety, de-escalation, and Narcan administration.

Outreach teams also worked on cold and dangerous days, distributing essential supplies, including flashlights, batteries, gloves, hats, hand warmers, hygiene kits, electrolytes, and high-protein food, and encouraging

Blankets of various sizes and materials delivered to The Father's Heart

individuals to seek shelter. In addition to broadcasting through county websites, media, and emergency communication partners, messaging strategies targeted people who lost power, who do not speak English, or who are low technology users. Libraries, senior centers, culturally specific groups, and other places of community received multilingual flyers containing information on shelter availability and how to stay safe out of the cold.

Infrastructure

Advancing our goal to promote geographic equity, particularly for rural and underserved areas of the county, this quarter we executed a grant agreement with AntFarm for a service-enriched resource center in Molalla. Funding through the State of Oregon will pay for the acquisition of an existing facility, which will offer a diverse array of services from peer support, work readiness, and connections to homelessness prevention and permanent housing. To address immediate needs during facility renovations, AntFarm will also administer 20 emergency shelter beds through motel vouchers.

Homelessness Prevention

This fiscal year, 1,274 households in the county were able to keep their own homes through eviction prevention services, surpassing our annual goal of 1,000 homelessness preventions. As an upstream investment, eviction prevention stabilizes vulnerable households before they lose their permanent housing. Seven service providers engage through a variety of methods—site-based services, peer support, short-term rental assistance to pay back-owed rent, and landlord-tenant mediation. In Q3 alone, our partners on the Housing Authority of Clackamas County's Resident Services team successfully resolved 127 eviction notices through proactive work with residents.

Eviction prevention work often highlights the challenges particular to an individual's housing situation. In November, Housing Authority staff met with a 16-year-old participant and learned that her siblings had moved out and her mother was recently incarcerated, leaving her on her own. With support and guidance from Impact NW, Oregon Department of Human Services, and the Resident Services team, the participant decided to seek emancipation so she could keep her housing and avoid foster care. In doing so, she had to demonstrate to the court system that she could support herself financially, so she found a job she enjoys staffing a pet store. Impact NW also connected her to a GED program, and Housing Authority staff helped to fund a laptop, work clothes, and gas for her car. She recently became an emancipated minor, signed her lease agreement as head of household, and paid her past-due rent and utilities. Impact NW continues to support her stabilization as she works through complex barriers due to her unique situation.

Advisory Group Restructure

This quarter the county fulfilled its Annual Work Plan goal to establish and recruit an inclusive decision-making advisory body, advancing our commitment to enhance community inclusion in decision-making and evaluation as we continue to refine and optimize our homeless services

system of care. In November the Board of County Commissioners approved a bicameral advisory structure to balance the need for coordination and communication among a broad group of service providers with high-level policy recommendations.

In Q3 we recruited for the new Community Homelessness Advisory Board, a group that will comprise community leaders who will provide recommendations to staff and the Board of County Commissions on decision points about program improvements, resource allocations, and goal setting. This advisory board will assist in the development of or provide recommendations for certain policy and plan documents, such as annual work plans and proposed budgets. The Community Homelessness Advisory Board may also review programming, planning, outcomes, and fiscal information, act as a sounding board, ensure best practices, evaluate impact, and recommend improvements.

The former Multi-Agency Coordination Group, renamed the Housing Services Advisory Group, will continue to serve as a forum for conversational coordination and responsive feedback among key providers and county staff. The group has proven to be an effective collaborative table for planning, implementing, and maintaining new programs and services, particularly those funded under the governor's Emergency Orders. In Q3 we issued a Request for Proposals to solicit ongoing facilitation support for the Housing Services Advisory Group and awarded proposer Uncommon Bridges.

Data Quality Improvements

Throughout this fiscal year county staff have collaborated with housing services providers to improve data quality in our Homeless Information Management System (HMIS), fulfilling our Annual Work Plan commitment to do so. Core strategies to support service providers include a work instructions library, stocked with step-by-step visual guides for data entry, reporting, and compliance; regular data quality provider meetings for shared learning, troubleshooting, and co-designed tools reflecting provider needs and real-world application; and 1:1 technical assistance for individualized support to resolve data-related questions. This community of practice model centers shared ownership, open feedback loops, and peer learning, and ensures providers directly influence priorities.

Across all SHS programs in this fiscal year, the average data quality for the 12 HUD-required Universal Data Elements at program entry has improved to 93.95%, up from 93.14% from last fiscal year, showing clear year-over-year improvement. Notable completeness and accuracy improvements were reflected in key HMIS entry fields including race, ethnicity, gender, residence prior to entry, and relationship to head of household.

Recent Enhancements and Innovations

To expand HMIS technical support, two full-time, limited duration staff have been added, one of whom is bilingual and co-developing trainings with culturally specific providers in Spanish. To meet a wider range of learning styles and cognitive needs, staff are building a suite of

neurodiversity-inclusive and accessible tools, including podcast-style audio guides, mind maps that visually connect contract, administrative, and federal requirements, a friendly monthly newsletter with plain-language content, and high-quality voiceover HMIS demonstration videos. These tools aim to reduce cognitive load and make learning feel more approachable. A new Data Information and Request Tracker (DIRT) was launched in February to streamline support for internal and external HMIS data and reporting needs. Additionally, HMIS-related policies and procedures, such as those for referrals, de-duplication, assessment overrides, and inactivity, have been aligned with the four Coordinated Entry Core Elements: Access, Assessment, Prioritization, and Referral. These documents follow a structured approval process from Coordinated Housing Access (CHA) Core Team to CHA Implementation Team to executive leadership, using county templates and workflows.

In March, the county also completed Phase 1 of our data warehouse project, named UNICORN (Unified, Navigable, Integrated Clackamas Outcomes & Reporting Network), to deliver key features such as By Name List production data integration, Power BI dashboards, and a user interface for uploads and data transformation. Future versions will add role-based access, inventory tracking, and broader report integration.

Case Management Improvements

Throughout this fiscal year Clackamas County has implemented a variety of strategic improvements to case management, accomplishing our annual work plan goal to enhance service provider capacity. The initiatives have resulted in early success, and we will report annual retention rates and Supportive Housing Case Management capacity in the annual report.

One adaptive approach that provided significant value this year was a blended housing navigation and retention model. The blended concept was initially offered to allow housing navigators to remain with newly housed participants as their case manager and continue to build the relationship. This flexibility proved effective this year when the issuance of new RLRA vouchers was paused in Q2, in tandem with forecasted SHS revenue decreases, and overall system needs shifted from navigation to housing retention. Additionally, some housing navigation specialists have shifted to working with individuals who have been experiencing homelessness for less than a year, focusing on light-touch housing interventions like problem-solving conversations and resource connections. This upstream shift is meant to help people earlier and prevent deeper system involvement. Behavioral Health Case Managers in the county's Health Centers also shifted focus to housing retention for current clients and will be providing their expertise to support behavioral health case conferencing. These adaptive approaches allowed providers to be flexible in their staffing in real time to support system-wide goals.

This year we promoted the use of the case management graduation protocol, which has successfully enabled participants to transition out of services when they are ready. Case managers assess participant readiness to graduate, based on factors like demonstrated rental

maintenance skills and independent management of expenses, providing a focus toward which case managers can encourage participants to move. The protocol supports long-term stability for households as well as reserves capacity for new participants in need of higher-touch services.

Contract check-ins have also strengthened case management through quality control review of participant files, monitoring of HMIS data entry, and encouraging dialogue on staffing and caseloads. Providers work collaboratively with the Program Team, aligning internal documentation with HMIS records and ensuring clarity about which case manager is working with each participant. Invoices also now undergo a detailed programmatic review of flex fund expenditures and staffing.

Two programs bolstering retention and stability for Supportive Housing Case Management participants are ASSIST and the Utility Payee Program. ASSIST is currently providing complex SSI/SSDI (Supplemental Security Income and Social Security Disability Insurance) application support to 52 participants who have physical or mental disabilities or are impacted by substance use disorder; the program has capacity to provide 160 consultations annually. The Utility Payee Program has enrolled 74 participants through 10 referring agencies, in many cases removing fees that would otherwise be deducted from utility allowances. Both programs help participants to pay rent and utilities timely and avoid lease violation notices.

Training opportunities for case managers have also broadened significantly. Monthly case manager meetings, widely attended, feature expert-led presentations. Recent offerings included Oregon Department of Human Services mandatory reporting of child abuse and Rent Well by Clackamas County Social Services. The Program Team held a Workforce and Housing Symposium to bring the two sectors together for information sharing and networking. Outreach providers participated in an outreach training module made available through Oregon Housing and Community Services, covering topics from data entry to serving specific populations such as youth and LGBTQIA+ individuals. A virtual fair housing

Workforce and Housing Symposium

training was additionally made available to all SHS providers. Regular updates on trainings and resources are shared through a monthly digest and updated calendar.

A major training milestone this quarter was the launch of Assertive Engagement training, attended by 60 individuals across our service provider community. Assertive Engagement is a model of practice building upon motivational interviewing, incorporating principles of strength-

based practices, trauma-informed care, and a three-tiered framework engaging mind set, heart set, and skill set. The county will next host an Assertive Engagement train-the-trainer session to replicate skill-building across our provider community.

Looking to next fiscal year, staff are working on a new Move Forward initiative to help participants stabilize in their permanent housing. The program components include a range of services to increase income through employment, benefits recovery, barrier removal, and goal-oriented case management. Housing 4 Success, a new time-limited rental assistance program, will be paired with matched savings to help participants increase income and graduate from rental assistance. The initiative is designed to sustain capacity for new permanent housing placements and meet the ongoing needs of the county.

Section 2. Data and data disaggregation
Please use the following table to provide and disaggregate data on Population A, Population B housing placement outcomes and homelessness prevention outcomes. Please use your local methodologies for tracking and reporting on Populations A and B. You can provide context for the data you provided in the context narrative below.

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

Section 2.A Housing Stability Outcomes: Placements & Preventions
Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Permanent Supportive Housing

Number of housing placements-Permanent Supportive Housing	This Quarter					Year to Date	
	Number	Subset - Population A placed into PSH	Percentage: Population A	Subset - Population B placed into PSH	Percentage: Population B	Number	Percentage of annual goal
Total people	66					330	--
Total households	31	20	64.5%	11	35.5%	165	60.0%

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	16	24.2%	45	13.6%
Asian or Asian American	2	3.0%	5	1.5%
Black, African American or African	7	10.6%	46	13.9%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	11	16.7%	103	31.2%
Middle Eastern or North African	--	--	--	--

Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	1.5%	6	1.8%
White	54	81.8%	271	82.1%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	33	50.0%	165	50.0%
Client doesn't know	--	--	--	--
Client prefers not to answer	--	--	1	0.3%
Data Not Collected	--	--	4	1.2%
Disability status[1]				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	23	59.0	115	62.5%
Persons without disabilities	16	41.0	63	34.2%
Disability unreported	--	--	6	3.3%
Gender identity[2]				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	19	48.7%	91	49.5%
Man (Boy, if child)	20	51.3%	88	47.8%
Culturally Specific Identity	--	--	--	--
Non-Binary	--	--	--	--
Transgender	--	--	--	--
Questioning	--	--	--	--
Different Identity	--	--	--	--
Client doesn't know	--	--	--	--
Client prefers not to answer	--	--	1	0.5%
Data not collected	--	--	4	2.2%

Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Rapid Re-Housing (all Rapid Re-Housing subtypes)

Number of housing placements- Rapid Re-Housing	This Quarter					Year to Date	
	Number	Subset - Population A placed into Housing Only	Percentage: Population A	Subset - Population B placed into Housing Only	Percentage: Population B	Number	Percentage of annual goal
Total people	80					395	--
Total households	38	7	18.4%	31	81.6%	189	118.1%

---

[1] Disability information is not provided for every person served due to limited data availability. Denominator is the number of individuals with data for this demographic (Q3 n=39; YTD n=184).

[2] Gender information is not provided for every person served due to limited data availability. Denominator is the number of individuals with data for this demographic (Q3 n=39; YTD n=184).

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	10	12.5%	27	6.8%
Asian or Asian American	2	2.5%	2	0.5%
Black, African American or African	10	12.5%	56	14.2%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	12	15.0%	86	21.8%
Middle Eastern or North African	--	--	5	1.3%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1	1.3%	12	3.0%
White	53	66.3%	262	66.3%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	39	48.8%	182	46.1%
Client doesn't know	--	--	--	--
Client prefers not to answer	--	--	1	0.3%
Data Not Collected	4	5.0%	21	5.3%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	29	36.3%	160	40.5%
Persons without disabilities	44	55.0%	194	49.1%
Disability unreported	7	8.8%	41	10.4%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	40	50.0%	239	60.5%
Man (Boy, if child)	36	45.0%	142	35.9%
Culturally Specific Identity	--	--	--	--
Non-Binary	1	1.3%	1	0.3%
Transgender	--	--	--	--
Questioning	--	--	--	--
Different Identity	--	--	--	--
Client doesn't know	--	--	--	--
Client prefers not to answer	--	--	1	0.3%
Data not collected	3	3.8%	12	3.0%

Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Eviction and Homelessness Prevention

Number of preventions	This Quarter					Year to Date	
	Number	Subset - Population A placed into Prevention	Percentage: Population A	Subset - Population B placed into Prevention	Percentage: Population B	Number	Percentage of annual goal
Total people	598					2,667	--
Total households	309	27	8.7%	282	91.3%	1,274	127.4%

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	19	3.2%	109	4.1%
Asian or Asian American	7	1.2%	49	1.8%
Black, African American or African	68	11.4%	327	12.3%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	86	14.4%	521	19.5%
Middle Eastern or North African	--	--	--	--
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	6	1.0%	80	3.0%
White	447	74.7%	1,907	71.5%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	227	38.0%	1,015	38.1%
Client doesn't know	--	--	2	0.1%
Client prefers not to answer	--	--	38	1.4%
Data Not Collected	36	6.0%	61	2.3%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	175	29.3%	770	28.9%
Persons without disabilities	318	53.2%	1,625	60.9%
Disability unreported	105	17.6%	272	10.2%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	293	49.0%	1,492	56.0%
Man (Boy, if child)	278	46.5%	1,101	41.3%
Culturally Specific Identity	--	--	--	--
Non-Binary	1	0.2%	9	0.3%
Transgender	3	0.5%	10	0.4%
Questioning	--	--	--	--
Different Identity	--	--	--	--
Client doesn't know	--	--	1	0.05%
Client prefers not to answer	--	--	16	0.6%
Data not collected	23	3.8%	38	1.4%

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. 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	
	Number	Subset - Population A in RLRA	Percentage: Population A	Subset Population B in RLRA	Percentage: Population B	Number	Percentage of total
Number of RLRA vouchers issued during reporting period	7	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	140	
Number of **people** newly leased up during reporting period	51	29	56.9%	22	43.1%	420	
Number of **households** newly leased up during reporting period	24	17	70.8%	7	29.2%	201	
Number of **people** in housing using an RLRA voucher during reporting period	1,733	1,216	70.2%	513	29.6%	1,800	
Number of **households** in housing using an RLRA voucher during reporting period	913	707	77.4%	204	22.3%	953	
Number of **people** in housing using an RLRA voucher since July 1. 2021	1,888	1,329	70.4%	555	29.4%	--	--
Number of **households** in housing using an RLRA voucher since July 1, 2021	1,014	791	78.0%	221	21.8%	--	--

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	115	6.6%	125	6.9%
Asian or Asian American	32	1.8%	37	2.0%
Black, African American or African	298	17.1%	314	17.4%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	390	22.4%	399	22.1%
Middle Eastern or North African	--	--	--	--
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	58	3.3%	58	3.2%
White	1,357	78.0%	1,402	77.7%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	--	--	--	--
Client doesn't know	--	--	--	--
Client prefers not to answer	--	--	--	--
Data Not Collected	--	--	--	--
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	835	48.0%	871	48.3%
Persons without disabilities	904	52.0%	934	51.7%
Disability unreported	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	1,074	61.8%	1,107	61.3%
Man (Boy, if child)	657	37.8%	690	38.2%
Culturally Specific Identity	--	--	--	--
Non-Binary	4	0.2%	4	0.2%
Transgender	--	--	--	--
Questioning	1	0.1%	1	0.1%
Different Identity	--	--	--	--
Client doesn't know	1	0.1%	1	0.1%
Client prefers not to answer	2	0.1%	2	0.1%
Data not collected	1	0.1%	1	0.1%

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

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

Instructions: Please complete the tables below, as applicable to your annual work plans in Quarter 2 and Quarter 4 Reports.

Number of people in Shelter	This Quarter					Year to Date
	Number	Subset - Population A in Shelter	Percentage: Population A	Subset - Population B in Shelter	Percentage: Population B	Number
Total people	489					1,256
Total households	386	200	51.8%	186	48.2%	918

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	54	11.0%	160	12.7%
Asian or Asian American	5	1.0%	32	2.5%
Black, African American or African	35	7.2%	87	6.9%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	95	19.4%	293	23.3%
Middle Eastern or North African	1	0.2%	1	0.1%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	10	2.0%	23	1.8%
White	309	63.2%	770	61.3%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	264	54.0%	666	53.0%
Client doesn't know	--	0.0%	1	0.1%
Client prefers not to answer	--	0.0%	14	1.1%
Data Not Collected	--	0.0%	6	0.5%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	224	45.8%	553	44.0%
Persons without disabilities	130	26.6%	461	36.7%
Disability unreported	135	27.6%	242	19.3%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	178	36.4%	515	41.0%
Man (Boy, if child)	292	59.7%	705	56.1%
Culturally Specific Identity	--	--	--	--
Non-Binary	9	1.8%	10	0.8%
Transgender	--	0.0%	1	0.1%
Questioning	2	0.4%	2	0.2%
Different Identity	1	0.2%	1	0.1%
Client doesn't know	--	--	--	--
Client prefers not to answer	6	1.2%	13	1.0%
Data not collected	1	0.2%	9	0.7%

Number of people in Outreach**	This Quarter					Year to Date
	Number	Subset - Population A Engaged	Percentage: Population A	Subset - Population B Engaged	Percentage: Population B	Number
Total people	326					875
Total households	300					740
Sub-Set – Total people "Engaged" during reporting period	285	193	67.7%	92	32.3%	725
Sub-Set – Total households "Engaged" during reporting period	269	182	67.7%	87	32.3%	654

**The Following Section is only for participants that have a "Date of Engagement"

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	% [3]	#	% [4]
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	13	4.6%	34	4.7%
Asian or Asian American	2	0.7%	4	0.6%
Black, African American or African	9	3.2%	25	3.4%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	17	6.0%	56	7.7%
Middle Eastern or North African	1	0.4%	2	0.3%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	4	1.4%	8	1.1%
White	221	77.5%	529	73.0%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	186	65.3%	430	59.3%
Client doesn't know	--	--	2	0.3%
Client prefers not to answer	18	6.3%	60	8.3%
Data Not Collected	16	5.6%	41	5.7%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	100	35.1%	244	33.7%
Persons without disabilities	65	22.8%	182	25.1%
Disability unreported	120	42.1%	299	41.2%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%

---

[3] Percentage denominator is based on the number of individuals who were engaged during the report period (n=285).
[4] Percentage denominator is based on the number of individuals who were engaged year to date (n=725).

Woman (Girl, if child)	113	39.6%	297	41.0%
Man (Boy, if child)	157	55.1%	366	50.5%
Culturally Specific Identity	--	--	--	--
Non-Binary	--	--	2	0.3%
Transgender	2	0.7%	4	0.6%
Questioning	--	--	--	--
Different Identity	--	--	--	--
Client doesn't know	--	--	--	--
Client prefers not to answer	8	2.8%	36	5.0%
Data not collected	5	1.8%	20	2.8%

Section 3. Financial Reporting

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

Glossary:

Supportive Housing Services: All SHS funded housing interventions that include PSH, RRH, Housing Only, Housing with Services, Preventions, and RLRA Vouchers. This also includes shelter, outreach, navigation services, employment services or any other SHS funding to help households exit homelessness and transition into safe, stable housing.

Supportive Housing: SHS housing interventions that include PSH, Housing Only and Housing with Services.

Regional Long Term Rent Assistance (RLRA): provides a flexible and continued rent subsidy that will significantly expand access to housing for households with extremely and very low incomes across the region. RLRA subsidies will be available for as long as the household needs and remains eligible for the subsidy, with no pre-determined end date. Tenant-based RLRA subsidies will leverage existing private market and regulated housing, maximizing tenant choice, while project-based RLRA subsidies will increase the availability of units in new housing developments. RLRA program service partners will cover payments of move-in costs and provide supportive services as needed to ensure housing stability. A Regional Landlord Guarantee will cover potential damages to increase participation and mitigate risks for participating landlords.

Shelter: Overnight Emergency Shelter that consists of congregate shelter beds PLUS non/semi-congregate units. Shelter definition also includes Local Alternative Shelters that have flexibility around limited amenities compared to HUD defined overnight shelters.

Day Shelter: Provides indoor shelter during daytime hours, generally between 5am and 8pm. Day shelters primarily serve households experiencing homelessness. The facilities help connect people to a wide range of resources and services daily. Including on-site support services such as restrooms, showers, laundry, mail service, haircuts, clothing, nutrition resources, lockers, ID support, etc.

Outreach: activities are designed to meet the immediate needs of people experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations by connecting them with emergency shelter, housing, or critical services, and providing them with urgent, non-facility-based care. *Metro is using the HUD ESG Street Outreach model. The initial contact should not be focused on data. Outreach workers collect and enter data as the client relationship evolves. Thus, data quality expectations for street outreach projects are limited to clients with a date of engagement.*

Outreach Date of Engagement "Engaged": the date an individual becomes engaged in the development of a plan to address their situation.

Population A: Extremely low-income; AND have one or more disabling conditions; AND Are experiencing or at imminent risk* of experiencing long-term or frequent episodes of literal homelessness.

Imminent Risk: Head of household who is at imminent risk of long-term homelessness within 14 days of the date of application for homeless assistance and/or has received an eviction. The head of household will still need to have a prior history of experiencing long-term homelessness or frequent episodes of literal homelessness.

Population B: Experiencing homelessness; OR have a substantial risk* of experiencing homelessness.

Substantial risk: A circumstance that exists if a household is very low income and extremely rent burdened, or any other circumstance that would make it more likely than not that without supportive housing services the household will become literally homeless or involuntarily doubled-up.

The following list are HUD HMIS approved Project Types. Metro recognizes SHS programs do not align with these project types exactly, and value that flexibility. However, to ensure the interpretations and findings are based upon correct interpretations of the data in quarterly reports and HMIS reports, we will reference these Project Types by the exact HUD name.
Here are the HUD Standards if needed, https://files.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/HMIS-Data-Standards-Manual-2024.pdf

Permanent Supportive Housing, "PH - Permanent Supportive Housing (disability required for entry)": A long-term intervention intended to serve the most vulnerable populations in need of housing and supportive services to attribute to their housing success, which can include PBV and TBV programs or properties. Provides housing to assist people experiencing homelessness with a disability (individuals with disabilities or families in which one adult or child has a disability) to live independently.

Housing with Services, "PH - Housing with Services (no disability required for entry)":
A project that offers permanent housing and supportive services to assist people experiencing homelessness to live independently but does not limit eligibility to individuals with disabilities or families in which one adult or child has a disability.

Housing Only, "PH - Housing Only":
A project that offers permanent housing for people experiencing homelessness but does not make supportive services available as part of the project. May include Recovery Oriented Transitional Housing, or any other type of housing, not associated with PSH/RRH, that does include supportive services.

Rapid Re-Housing, "PH - Rapid Re-Housing" (Services Only and Housing with or without services):

A permanent housing project that provides housing relocation and stabilization services and/or short and/or medium-term rental assistance as necessary to help an individual or family experiencing homelessness move as quickly as possible into permanent housing and achieve stability in that housing.

Prevention, "Homelessness prevention":
 A project that offers services and/or financial assistance necessary to prevent an individual or family from moving into an emergency shelter or living in a public or private place not meant for human habitation. Component services and assistance generally consist of short-term and medium-term tenant-based or project-based rental assistance and rental arrears. Additional circumstances include rental application fees, security deposits, advance payment of last month's rent, utility deposits and payments, moving costs, housing search and placement, housing stability case management, mediation, legal services, and credit repair. This term differs from retention in that it designed to assist nonsubsidized market rate landlord run units.

Metro Supportive Housing Services
Financial Report for Quarterly Progress Report (IGA 7.1.2) and Annual Program Report (IGA 7.1.1)
Clackamas County
2024-2025

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

	Annual Budget	Q1 Actuals	Q2 Actuals	Q3 Actuals	Q4 Actuals	Total YTD Actuals	Variance Under / (Over)	% of Budget	Comments
Metro SHS Resources									
Beginning Fund Balance	97,724,635	107,556,145				107,556,145	(9,831,510)	110%	*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.*
Metro SHS Program Funds	73,650,336	2,040,207	11,231,596	14,237,461		27,509,264	46,141,073	37%	
Interest Earnings[5]	1,000,000	-	-			-	1,000,000	0%	
insert addt'l lines as necessary						-	-	N/A	
Subtotal Program Revenue	74,650,336	2,040,207	11,231,596	14,237,461	-	27,509,264	47,141,073	37%	
Total Metro SHS Resources	172,374,972	109,596,352	11,231,596	14,237,461	-	135,065,409	37,309,563	78%	
Metro SHS Requirements									
Program Costs									
Individual Support Costs									
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)									
Support to individuals who have extremely low incomes and one or more disabling conditions, who are experiencing long-term or frequent episodes of literal homelessness or imminent risk of experiencing homelessness									
Support Services	18,863,618	776,070	4,285,820	2,570,619		7,632,509	11,231,110	40%	
Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA)	23,544,215	2,793,858	3,097,996	7,313,695		13,205,549	10,338,666	56%	
Long-term Rent Assistance Admin	2,332,421	159,094	233,042	523,669		915,805	1,416,617	39%	Administrative Costs for long-term rent assistance equals 6% of Partner's YTD expenses on long-term rent assistance.
Subtotal PSH	44,740,254	3,729,022	7,616,858	10,407,982	-	21,753,862	22,986,392	49%	
Rapid Re-housing (RRH)									
Support to individuals experiencing a loss of housing									
Rapid Re-housing (RRH)	2,267,050	262,796	777,234	273,808		1,313,839	953,212	58%	
Subtotal RRH	2,267,050	262,796	777,234	273,808	-	1,313,839	953,212	58%	
Other Housing and Services Programs (not otherwise listed)									
Support to individuals who are experiencing homelessness or have substantial risk of homelessness									
Housing Only	-	-				-	-	N/A	
Housing with Services	-	-				-	-	N/A	
Subtotal Other Housing and Services Programs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	
Eviction & Homelessness Prevention									
Support to individuals experiencing a potential loss of housing									
Eviction & Homelessness Prevention	18,907,467	1,945,391	2,544,354	694,013		5,183,759	13,723,708	27%	
Subtotal Eviction & Homelessness Prevention	18,907,467	1,945,391	2,544,354	694,013	-	5,183,759	13,723,708	27%	
Safety On/Off the Street									
Support to individuals unhoused or in temporary housing									
Shelter	13,337,616	775,997	2,940,101	2,160,005		5,876,103	7,461,512	44%	
Outreach	4,344,854	1,122,145	817,513	714,989		2,654,647	1,690,207	61%	
Subtotal Safety On/Off the Street	17,682,470	1,898,142	3,757,614	2,874,994	-	8,530,750	9,151,720	48%	
System Support Costs									
Systems Infrastructure	5,674,022	783,591	951,507	953,610		2,688,709	2,985,314	47%	
Built Infrastructure	42,489,492	534,979	1,043,525	2,889,138		4,467,642	38,021,849	11%	
Other supportive services	1,075,186	57,267	285,333	218,616		561,216	513,971	52%	
Subtotal System Support Costs	49,238,700	1,375,837	2,280,366	4,061,364	-	7,717,567	41,521,134	16%	
Regional Strategy Implementation									
Investments to support SHS program alignment, coordination and outcomes at a regional level									
Coordinated Entry	482,844					-	482,844	0%	

Metro Supportive Housing Services

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

Clackamas County
2024-2025

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
Regional Landlord Recruitment	1,935,337	3,231	17,998	93,172		114,400	1,820,937	6%	
Healthcare System Alignment	767,523	22,335	168,623	115,575		306,533	460,990	40%	
Training	165,604					-	165,604	0%	
Technical Assistance	6,290,000					-	6,290,000	0%	
Employee Recruitment and Retention	165,604					-	165,604	0%	
Subtotal Regional Strategy Implementation	9,806,913	25,566	186,620	208,747	-	**420,933**	9,385,980	4%	
County Administrative Costs									Service Provider Administrative Costs (including RLRA) are reported as part of Program Costs above. Counties will provide details and context for Service Provider Administrative Costs in their Annual Program Report.
County Administrative Costs	8,502,054	430,489	1,158,553	1,152,853		2,741,894	5,760,160	32%	
Subtotal County Administrative Costs	8,502,054	430,489	1,158,553	1,152,853	-	**2,741,894**	5,760,160	32%	
Subtotal Program Costs	151,144,908	9,667,243	18,321,599	19,673,761	-	**47,662,603**	103,482,305	32%	
Ending Fund Balance (incl. Contingency and Reserves)	21,230,063					**87,402,806**			
Budgeted Contingency and Reserves									This section reflects budgeted contingency and reserve figures.
Contingency [3]	3,682,517					3,682,517			Contingency equals 5% of Partner's budgeted annual Program Funds.
Regional Strategy Implementation Contingency	2,817,479					2,817,479			
Stabilization Reserve [4]	14,730,067					14,730,067			Stabilization Reserve equals 20% of Partner's budgeted annual Program Funds.
RLRA Reserves	-					-			
Other Programmatic Reserves	-					-			
insert addt'l lines as necessary						-			
Subtotal Contingency and Reserves	21,230,063					**21,230,063**			

Program Category Descriptions

Support Services case management, behavioral health, mental health and addiction services, peer support, other connections to healthcare programs

Rapid Re-housing (RRH) RRH services, short-term rent assistance, housing retention, case management

Housing Only rent assistance

Housing with Services support services and rent assistance

Eviction & Homelessness Prevention short-term rent assistance geared toward preventing evictions, diversion assistance, one-time stabilization assistance, other relevant services

Shelter congregate shelter, alternative shelter, motel shelter, transitional housing, recuperative centers

Outreach support and services other than overnight shelter, including case management, hygiene programs, survival gear, day centers, and navigation to other services

Systems Infrastructure service provider capacity building and organizational health, system development/management, technical assistance, community engagement, advisory body support, etc

Built Infrastructure property purchases, capital improvement projects, etc

Other supportive services broad services which cannot be allocated under individual support costs above, including: Systems Access and Navigation, Coordinated Access, Housing Navigation, employment, benefits, ancillary homeless services that support overall programmatic objectives, etc

County Administrative Costs Costs not specifically attributed to a particular SHS program or program delivery, including: senior management personnel, general facilities costs, general services such as HR, accounting, budget development, procurement, marketing, agency audit and agency insurance, etc.

Metro Supportive Housing Services
Financial Report for Quarterly Progress Report (IGA 7.1.2) and Annual Program Report (IGA 7.1.1)
Clackamas County
2024-2025

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.

	% of Spending per Quarter			Comments
Program Costs (excluding Built Infrastructure)	**Budget**	**Actual**	**Variance**	*Explain any material deviations from the Spend-Down Plan, or any changes that were made to the initial Spend-Down Plan.* [1]
Quarter 1	10%	8%	-2%	Clackamas County uses a soft period close, quarterly expenditures will be updated again in the Q4 report.
Quarter 2	15%	16%	1%	
Quarter 3	22%	15%	-7%	
Quarter 4	30%	0%	-30%	
Total	77%	40%	-37%	

	$ Spending YTD			Comments
Built Infrastructure	**Budget**	**Actual**	**Forecast**	*Provide a status update for below. (required each quarter)*
Annual total	42,489,492	4,467,642	7,800,000	Construction continued on the new Clackamas Village transitional shelter project. This new village is currently scheduled to open at the end of FY 24-25. The County also purchased a building for a new recovery campus which will be named Cascade Heights.

[1] 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.

Note: It is possible for actual spending against the Spend-Down Plan to exceed 100% without exceeding budget authority due to the use of savings in categories excluded from the Spend-Down Report calculation.

Spend-Down Report for Carryover
This section compares the spending plan of investment areas funded by carryover to actual costs.
These costs are also part of the Spend-Down Report for Program Costs above. This section provides additional detail and a progress update on these investment areas.

	$ Spending by investment area			Comments
Carryover Spend-down Plan	**Budget**	**Actual** [2]	**Variance**	*Provide a status update for each Investment Area line below. (required each quarter)*
Beginning Fund Balance (carryover balance)	97,724,635	107,556,145	(9,831,510)	
Describe Investment Area				
Contingency	3,682,517		3,682,517	Reserved for emergency situations or unplanned program expenditures that could negatively impact service delivery.
Stabilization Reserves	14,730,067		14,730,067	Reserved to protect against financial instability and to insulate continuing program expenses from significant revenue fluctuations.
Regional Strategies Implementation Fund Conting	2,817,479			Reserved for currently unplanned regional investment strategies.
Regional Strategies Implementation Fund	3,016,944		3,016,944	Funds to support limited-duration regional investments.
Expanding Capacity	5,468,501	1,280,224	4,188,276	Expenditures include funding for limited-duration positions to support the county's CHA, RLRA and HMIS teams; technical assistance for service providers; and CHA assessment process improvement work.
Upstream Investments	6,864,041	533,642	6,330,399	Expenditures include funding for a money management pilot program; a benefits recovery pilot program; and an employment, training and education program.
Short-term Rent Assistance	6,791,066	3,914,039	2,877,027	Continued support for the county's short-term rental assistance program which prevents several hundred evictions every year.
Built Infrastructure	7,800,000	4,655,833	3,144,167	Construction continued on the new Clackamas Village transitional shelter project which is opening in May 2025. The County also purchased a building for a new recovery campus which will be named Cascade Heights.
	51,170,614	10,383,739	37,969,397	
Remaining prior year carryover	46,554,021	97,172,406	(47,800,907)	
Estimated current year carryover	8,388,164	4,443,869	3,944,295	
Ending Fund Balance (carryover balance)	54,942,185	101,616,275	(43,856,611)	

[2] If the actual costs for any carryover investment areas are not tracked separately from existing program categories, use the Comments section to describe the methodology for determining the proportion of actual costs covered by carryover. For example: if service providers received a 25% increase in annual contracts for capacity building, and the costs are not tracked separately, the capacity building portion could be estimated as 20% of total actual costs (the % of the new contract amount that is related to the increase).