

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES QUARTERLY REPORT

SUBMITTED BY: Multnomah County

FISCAL YEAR: FY 2025

QUARTER: 3

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES QUARTERLY REPORT TEMPLATE DRAFT

The following information should be submitted 45 calendar days after the end of each quarter, per IGA requirements. When that day falls on a weekend, reports are due the following Monday.

| | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <i>Report Due</i> | Nov 15 | Feb 15 | May 15 | Aug 15 |
| <i>Reporting Period</i> | Jul 1 – Sep 30 | Oct 1 – Dec 31 | Jan 1 – Mar 31 | Apr 1 – Jun 30 |

Please do not change the formatting of margins, fonts, alignment, or section titles.

| | Permanent Supportive Housing | Rapid Re-Housing | Prevention | Shelter Units* |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| YTD Progress (placements) | 571 people 453 households | 757 people 397 households | 984 people 612 households | 1,727 units 49 new / 1,678 sustained |
| FY 25 Annual Work Plan Goal | 360 people 300 households | 550 people 440 households | 800 people 600 households | 1,397 units 309 new / 1,088 sustained |
| SHS Year 1 to Current Date** | 3,610 people placed | 2,873 people placed | 15,822 people served | 1,997 units 592 new / 1,405 sustained |
| <i>*The shelter units shared in this table represent fully or partially SHS-funded shelter units and are not representative of the entire shelter units available in Multnomah County, as some utilize funding sources other than SHS.</i> | | | | |

Section 1. Progress narrative

In no more than 3-5 pages, please provide an executive summary and additional narrative to include:

- A high-level snapshot of your quarterly outcomes that tells us if you are on track or not on track with your Annual Work Plan goals. Which can include overall challenges and barriers to implementation, opportunities in this quarter, success in this quarter, emerging challenges and opportunities with service providers.*
- A focus on **one** of the following: regional coordination and behavioral health, new investments, leverage, service systems coordination or any other topic connected to your local implementation plan.*

- A focus on **one** out of the three categories associated with your annual work plan. At least one or two highlights or progress updates in one of the following qualitative goals: racial equity, capacity building: lead agency/ systems infrastructure, or capacity building: provider capacity.
- A reflection on your progress for the quarter that includes your investments and programming during the reporting period.
- Please also connect any of the above narratives to your data tables, as applicable.

Note that one of each category/work plan goal must be covered in at least one quarterly report during the year. Metro will assist each county by tracking accordingly to ensure each category is covered throughout the year.

Executive Summary

What are we seeing in the third quarter of year four of SHS implementation?

At the close of the third quarter of FY 2024-25, the Homeless Services Department (HSD) is on track to meet or exceed our annual housing and prevention goals. In the first three quarters of the fiscal year, HSD used Supportive Housing Services (SHS) resources to help our network of service providers move 453 households into permanent supportive housing (PSH) and move 397 households into homes through rapid re-housing programs (RRH). Additionally, Multnomah County is now supporting over 1,000 qualified low-income households with rent subsidies through our Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance (RLRA) program, with 70% of those household members identifying as Communities of Color. Our providers also used SHS resources to prevent 612 households from becoming homeless in the first place.

Our latest results are supported by months of rigorous data quality improvements, including a new project to better match our SHS spending to our services outcomes. With these more accurate outcomes, we now know that we reached 151% of our annual PSH goal for households, 90% of our annual RRH goal for households and 102% of our annual prevention goal for households by the end of Q3. We also made progress toward our goal for navigation this quarter in the midst of the longest severe weather outreach activation in Multnomah County history, and exceeded our employment services goal by supporting providers in offering employment services that touched the lives of more than 600 formerly or currently homeless folks who gained expertise in culinary arts, film production, the medical field and more.

These encouraging outcomes are a result of the growing capacity, partnerships and momentum we have been able to build over time with the SHS measure. With unexpected reductions in SHS revenue on the horizon, we will seek to find stability and continue serving the community that relies on the funding from this measure. Even during the initial years of the measure when collections consistently exceeded Metro's forecast, SHS funds alone were not enough, and not expected, to solve the crisis our neighbors are facing on the streets. However, with leaner years ahead, participants and providers are more affected by the reality of fewer resources for more people, as the affordable housing crisis continues to push people into homelessness faster and at higher rates than SHS can address. While we seek to mitigate the impacts to SHS-funded programs as much as we can, the entire system has been affected by funding insecurity and some programs — both SHS- and non-SHS funded — are having to scale down services, causing a ripple effect in our system. This quarter we have also continued to work across sectors, making good on our goal of leveraging SHS funds for

cross-departmental programs to reduce homelessness and bolster Local Implementation Plan priorities such as mental and behavioral health services. We've also continued to work with regional partners to enhance collaboration and multiply our impact in key areas such as healthcare integration — especially relevant given our current financial and political environment.

The current federal environment has also taken a destabilizing psychological toll on participants who have been most affected by racial and identity-based disparities in homelessness and who now face further racial and social inequities as federal protections and commitments are weakened. Multnomah County stands firm in our commitment, memorialized in our Local Implementation Plan, to eliminate disparities in access and outcomes for Communities of Color participating in homeless and housing services, by working toward our racial equity goals and infusing a racial equity lens in every aspect of our work.

Annual Work Plan

Highlights from our SHS Annual Work Plan Quantitative & Qualitative goals

| FY 2025 Annual Housing and Program Quantitative Goals | | | |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Category 1: Regional Metrics | Year to Date Q1+Q2+Q3 | FY25 Work Plan Goal ¹ | % Achieved of goal Based on households |
| Permanent Supportive Housing | 571 people 453 households | 360 people 300 households | 151% |
| Rapid Re-Housing | 757 people 397 households | 550 people 440 households | 90% |
| Housing With Services (Includes Transitional Housing) | 272 people 254 households | N/A | N/A |
| Housing Only | 62 people 25 households | N/A | N/A |
| Homeless Prevention (Eviction Prevention) | 984 people 612 households | 800 people 600 households | 102% |

HSD has made strong progress toward each of our housing placement goals in Q3, surpassing many. During this quarter we placed 200 people (158 households) into Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), bringing our year-to-date total up to 571 people (453 households), representing 151% of the annual work plan household goal in the PSH category. Similarly, we've made significant strides in meeting the annual work plan goal for Rapid Re-Housing placements with 90% of the household goal complete by the end of Q3. Additionally, during the reporting period we hit a milestone in the Regional Long-Term Assistance (RLRA) program with over 1,000 active households (1,663 people) leased in the program. Notably, 70% of household members in the RLRA program identify as Black, Indigenous and other People of Color (BIPOC), reflective of the program's intentional design to address racial disparities.

¹ Housing with Services and Housing Only service categories were added in Quarter 2 in the place of Other Permanent Housing (OPH). Since this update occurred after FY 2025 goals were set, there are no goals for these two service types.

“Housing With Services” is any program that offers permanent housing and supportive services to assist people experiencing homelessness but does not limit eligibility to individuals with disabilities. “Housing Only” is any program that offers permanent housing for people experiencing homelessness but does not make supportive services available as part of the project. Placements in Q3 brought the year to date numbers for Housing With Services up to 272 people (254 households), and the year to date numbers for Housing Only up to 62 people (25 households). Transitional Housing programs were previously captured within a category called “Other Permanent Housing,” but are now captured in Housing With Services. **We want to be clear that 97% of people placed into housing and out of homelessness through SHS received rent assistance as well as support services.**

Homeless Prevention includes any program that offers services or financial assistance to prevent an individual who is not currently part of the homeless services system from entering homelessness, including emergency rent assistance that helps people facing eviction stay housed. HSD is ahead of our annual work plan goal for homeless prevention, having achieved 102% of the household goal.

Some of the upward trends in outcomes are what we typically expect in the second half of each fiscal year, since outcomes reporting is often somewhat delayed. However, the upward trends are higher than normal this quarter because of data improvement work recently undertaken across the department, described in the following section.

Quality Improvement Work on SHS Reporting Data

Over the past several years, both Multnomah County and Metro have worked to improve data availability and reporting processes. This was highlighted earlier this year by a Metro-led update to the SHS quarterly reporting template, and recently underscored by the launch of Multnomah County’s [new homeless services dashboard](#) in April.

In that spirit of continuous quality improvement, HSD launched a pilot project in March 2025 to modernize and improve the precision of SHS quarterly reporting. This project was largely made possible because of other data improvement work taking place at HSD, specifically the recent development of a Data Mart that helps the department extract and report data much more efficiently than before.

Before this improvement project, SHS quarterly reporting was a mostly manual process of identifying SHS-funded programs and matching program outcomes to budget expenditures. We are now aware that limitations in that process likely resulted in under-reporting SHS outcomes. Now, following our data improvement work, this process of tracking SHS outcomes is now mostly automated.

The new process has also allowed HSD to identify strategies to ensure programs are in alignment with Metro’s new reporting categories, and ultimately allow HSD to more precisely share the impacts of SHS funding on the communities we serve. As a result of the new methodology and performing a more extensive scan of available data, in Q3 we have been able to find programs that were previously left out of our SHS reporting that should have been included. This has led to an increase in the outcomes for our SHS-funded programs. (Please note that these increases are only for SHS-funded programs. Our systemwide outcomes remain the same.)

This new process is improving the accuracy and integrity of our data reporting. Moving forward, we will continue to work toward continuous process improvement. HSD will continue to seek opportunities to increase data accuracy and accountability to the promises of the SHS Measure.

Saving lives during severe weather with SHS-funded navigation services

This quarter, we also made progress toward our annual navigation goal. Navigation is a subset of outreach and engagement and often takes place as a navigation worker gets to know someone experiencing homelessness and makes referrals to services based on that person's needs. Service referrals may include things like emergency shelter, behavioral health services, housing services, domestic/sexual violence resources, benefits acquisition, and employment services.

This winter, navigation teams made many connections with unsheltered residents, in part because of a particularly brutal stretch of severe weather in January when enhanced outreach services were conducted throughout the County. During the severe weather in January, outreach and navigation staff at the SHS-funded Behavioral Health Resource Center (BHRC) jumped into action to save lives. BHRC employees were instrumental in connecting participants to emergency warming shelters and other live-saving resources. In the midst of these frigid temperatures, outreach encounters surged by 500%.

One navigation worker shared, "While on outreach we noticed someone huddled up under a sleeping bag in the snow. We asked if they needed help getting to a warming shelter....He was freezing cold; he is also wheelchair bound. I called the 211 back-door number and arranged a ride to pick him up and take him to a shelter. We waited with him for about 45 minutes until the ride arrived, then helped him up into his wheelchair and into the van."

During severe weather and beyond, BHRC staff continue to walk alongside many people who are eager to access resources and improve their circumstances, and foster the human connection that is an instrumental element in rekindling hope and providing a path toward self-actualization for people experiencing homelessness.

Another factor in making progress toward our navigation goal was the launch of a new program in partnership with The Salvation Army to provide outreach and navigation services in East County cities including Wood Village, Fairview and Troutdale. HSD is committed to geographic equity, particularly in serving East Multnomah County. In FY 2024, HSD performed a Geographic Equity Study, which confirmed what providers and community members had long been voicing: that low-income East County residents have the highest unmet housing needs, as measured by the number of people living in cost-burdened and overcrowded households. East County also has a higher share of the population who are affected by racial disparities and have lower levels of economic resources than the county overall. The new navigation team is a key resource that the smaller East County cities can now use to support people experiencing unsheltered homelessness through basic outreach and navigation to services.

SHS leveraged to provide over 600 people with employment services and career support

An array of SHS-funded providers have supported over 600 people so far this year with employment services, exceeding our goal for this service area. Many providers have experienced success connecting people with these programs and have been able to go beyond their outcomes goals for the year. Some examples include:

SEI Workforce Development Academy Program

SEI has established partnerships with area employers to support apprenticeship and job opportunities for underrepresented Black youth and adults in medicine, architecture, engineering, construction and real estate. They recently hosted a "Thrive-In" event that offers an intensive week of full-day training sessions focused on job readiness and career discovery. They have also partnered with a Black-owned business to sponsor an upcoming career fair in collaboration with the Oregon Association of Minority Entrepreneurs. This exciting event will create new career pathways and expand opportunities for the community. SEI has served 40 participants as of Q3 — double their annual goal to serve 20 participants.

Cultivate Initiatives Employment Programs

The Workforce Cleaning Brigade is composed of participants who are currently or formerly houseless who work with community partners to identify priority areas for waste management cleanup throughout the County. The program has provided short or long-term employment to over 120 people this year, double their annual goal. The team had already helped clear over 200 tons of waste going into Q3.

Cultivate Initiative's Mobile Shower & Hygiene Response program is also staffed by participants who are currently or formerly houseless. Staff provide showers and hygiene services for houseless neighbors throughout the county in partnership with the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office Homeless Outreach and Program Engagement Team, Multnomah County Health Department, Concordia Nursing, local businesses and churches. This small team of four has helped provide over 3,000 showers this year to over 1,500 community members.

Outside the Frame Film Workforce Development

Outside the Frame provides training, mentorship and paid work opportunities to youth typically excluded from the film industry, including workshops, equipment training, a production assistant bootcamp, community outreach screenings and peer mentorship. This quarter, Outside the Frame led 13 participants through a 12-day film intensive, culminating in the production of two films, including one on navigating life with autism. In line with their racial equity outcome measures, Outside the Frame staff and contractors reflect the demographics of the youth they are serving: 86% identify as LGBTQIA2S+, 72% identify as BIPOC, 40% identify as having a disability, 16% are immigrants or refugees, and 77% have experienced homelessness.

Stone Soup PDX Culinary Training Program

Stone Soup PDX provides participants with 12-week culinary fundamentals trainings led by chefs who teach classroom and hands-on kitchen lessons. The instruction focuses on food safety and hygiene; knife skills; how to work, talk and move safely in a kitchen; equipment and ingredient identification; as well as hands-on projects each week. Recently, a graduate of this program was hired into an entry-level kitchen role after the program ended. They were quickly promoted to kitchen manager and are now in the process of hiring a fellow graduate from their cohort. Going into Q3, the program had served 59 people and was on track to meet its annual goal of 80 people served.

Employment services support participants in engaging in low-barrier employment opportunities to increase workforce readiness skills and support community needs. This goal reflects our Local Implementation Plan's focus on offering services that enhance income to promote stability for people in SHS programs and eventually reduce or eliminate their need for ongoing rental assistance and long-term support. Unfortunately, due to anticipated reductions in SHS collections, a significant amount of funding for employment services has been impacted in Multnomah County Chair Jessica Vega Pederson's proposed budget for FY 2026. While beneficial for all populations experiencing homelessness, these services are particularly important for very low-income households experiencing or at substantial risk of homelessness.

Building momentum with \$35M investment in cross-departmental programs to reduce homelessness

This quarter, we continued to build up our ability to address the complex health and behavioral factors that contribute to homelessness, and we gained significant momentum in our cross-departmental efforts to implement SHS programming in Multnomah County. HSD staff convened regular meetings with key representatives from the Multnomah County Library and the Behavioral Health Division. Our primary focus has been to explore and coordinate how existing contracted outreach services can be brought into the Central Library to support the increasing number of individuals experiencing homelessness who utilize the space as a de facto day center.

In a parallel effort to maximize resources and address systemic barriers, HSD staff also coordinated a recurring meeting between the District Attorney's Office and our Coordinated Access team. The initial aim is to discuss leveraging SHS funding to support a Deputy District Attorney role dedicated to addressing outstanding warrants for individuals experiencing homelessness. This relationship with the DA's office is in its early stages but shows potential. This proactive engagement to explore a dedicated legal resource funded by SHS presents a crucial opportunity to address a significant barrier — open warrants — that often hinders a person's ability to access housing and services.

A key challenge this quarter involved the inherent complexity of aligning the operational structures, varying priorities, and distinct contractual obligations of the Library, the Health Department's Behavioral Health Division, and the HSD Adult System within Multnomah County. Establishing effective communication and coordinated service delivery models across these different entities requires careful navigation.

While we currently lack specific demographic data on the racial identities of individuals accessing the Central Library in Multnomah County, our cross-departmental team has begun the important work of examining existing contracts and organizational partnerships within the Library, the Behavioral Health Division, and the Adult System to identify potential collaborations with culturally specific organizations. This initial step reflects an awareness of the need to consider racial equity. We've specifically identified the need to introduce culturally specific programming tailored for Black/African American and Native American individuals at the Central Library. Furthermore, integrating behavioral health services, including outreach staff from the Multnomah County Behavioral Health Resource Center, is seen as crucial. Gathering specific demographic data on library users experiencing homelessness will be a key next step in more effectively advancing racial equity in our service delivery. As we move forward with the potential partnership with the District Attorney's Office, it will also be imperative to analyze potential racial disparities within the warrant system and ensure that any resulting interventions are implemented equitably.

SHS and systemwide data improvements

The data improvement project mentioned above is one of several ways Multnomah County has been able to modernize our data system thanks to SHS funding. In April the Homeless Service Department published an [online data dashboard](#) that, for the first time, provides a monthly count of people experiencing homelessness in Multnomah County. While not solely focused on SHS outcomes, the dashboard will help us understand who is entering and exiting homelessness systemwide and the impact of our efforts on the number of people leaving homelessness for housing. The data dashboard launched at the start of Q4, so we look forward to providing more details in our next report.

This quarter, SHS also made it possible to expand the Department of County Human Services (DCHS) team responsible for managing data and reporting for all of Multnomah County's community-based domestic and sexual violence programs, leading to significant improvements in data quality, training and technical assistance. The team produced a fully updated data entry manual and the first ever reporting guide for end users, restarted its ongoing data quality process of running and reviewing reports with program staff, and developed a longer training and follow-up process for end users who need more support. The SHS-funded members of this team have now taken responsibility for all training and technical support for the system, and in Q3 provided assistance to more than 75 community-based domestic violence (DV) housing case managers and advocates.

These improvements will have an impact on SHS-funded DV housing programs and the rest of the DV system's emergency shelters, rapid re-housing, eviction prevention, diversion and permanent supportive housing programs contracted through HSD. Across the system in Q3, this data team supported over

1,500 individuals in over 650 households who were served by these programs. Of those 1,500 people, 72% identified as Communities of Color, 32% of the heads of households identified as living with a disabling condition, and 12% identified as part of the LGBTQIA2S+ community. Approximately 20% of the 1,500 people served in Q3 were engaged in SHS supportive housing programs through HSD.

Being fully staffed has also meant the senior data analyst has been able to participate in regional data improvements such as the tri-county procurement for a new tool for homelessness services data. This represents an opportunity to select a new tool that can meet the reporting and data management needs of the DV system, which is a challenge with our current tool.

Finally, on March 17, HSD signed a long-awaited data sharing agreement with Metro that will improve regional data collaboration. These data improvement initiatives are part of a larger body of data modernization efforts that have largely been made possible thanks to the infusion of SHS funds into our system. These initiatives have and will continue to strengthen our data accessibility and quality, support our staff and community in better understanding homelessness, and aid our policy makers in making evidence-based decisions that have the most impact for our neighbors experiencing homelessness.

Investments & Programming

Selected investments & programs that demonstrate progress toward work plan goal areas

Successes, challenges and opportunities in the family system of care

The Homeless Services Department has a modest system of care dedicated to serving families experiencing homelessness. SHS investments in this system are in a variety of service areas, including permanent supportive housing, rapid re-housing, prevention, and shelter. This quarter we are highlighting some of the successes, challenges and opportunities from this small system that does so much for families experiencing homelessness.

Several of the family system's SHS-funded permanent supportive housing projects reported ongoing success this quarter in stably housing families, including those participating in culturally specific programs. For instance, staff at the Native American Rehabilitation Association of the Northwest (NARA) reported a 100% retention rate for nine families at Hayu Tilixam, one of the family system's SHS-funded permanent supportive housing investments. The site provides families with culturally specific supportive housing services and rental subsidies in Northeast Portland. Projects like Hayu Tilixam meet the needs of families experiencing homelessness who would not be successful in housing without additional supportive services and for whom supportive services would be less effective without stable housing. NARA supported many families living at Hayu Tilixam this quarter in identifying and realizing their goals, including helping a resident establish a resident-led and facilitated Narcotics Anonymous group, a single mother pass her written drivers test, two parents make progress toward family reunification, and a teenage daughter pursue education and find employment. Staff continue to work with families to build rapport and trust using Assertive Engagement and Motivational Interviewing strategies, and support them in setting and meeting their goals.

The family system also encountered challenges this quarter due to limited permanent supportive housing options, barriers presented by low wages and the cost of living, and the scarcity of funding for legal services. While permanent supportive housing units and options in the family system have grown in recent years, there are still not enough to meet the need for families who could use that level of support. Providers have continued to report that most families they see need permanent supportive housing services rather than a rental subsidy without intensive case management services. Providers have also shared that many families get to the end of their rental subsidy and are concerned about their ability to

sustain their housing. The cost of living and the difficulty in securing employment that pays enough for a family to attain long-term self sufficiency continue to be a barrier for families in securing and maintaining permanent stable housing.

In addition, individuals and families seeking housing often run into legal barriers that can prevent them from moving out of homelessness. This was a key challenge uplifted by family system providers this quarter. SHS-funded eviction prevention programs are available at multiple community-based organizations, and provide short-term flexible client assistance to allow households to maintain their housing and prevent people from entering homelessness. As mentioned in the Executive Summary, we have exceeded our eviction prevention goals for the year, preventing homelessness for 612 households, above our goal of 600 households. Many providers in the family system, representing a variety of programs, noted the positive impact this funding has when it is available and the challenges presented when funds run out. Many participants need legal services to prevent current evictions or navigate past ones, mitigate overdue rents, and navigate immigration requirements, and the housing process can be stalled when these funds are not available.

Amidst the challenges, opportunities have also arisen to strengthen family system programming thanks to SHS funding, in particular the increased PSH services investment and the SHS-funded match for HUD Continuum of Care projects. We have reported on these annual work plan goals in-depth in previous quarters and will provide a full accounting in our upcoming annual report, but it is worth noting here that in Q3 family system providers continued to point out the impact these funds have had in stabilizing and strengthening their programming during uncertain times.

Two new village-style shelters open in Portland

Two new alternative shelters with individual sleeping pods and community spaces opened in Q3 thanks to the hard work of providers Straightway Services and WeShine, and funding from the SHS measure.

HSD celebrated the opening of Oak Street Village this winter. Operated by nonprofit provider Straightway Services, the shelter is located in the Montavilla neighborhood and provides sleeping pods sheltering up to 40 adults along with 24/7 on-site services. The site includes showers, on-site trash services, restrooms, laundry and a kitchenette. St. Andrew's Village also opened this quarter, featuring 10 sleeping pods for up to 10 adults at St. Andrew's Episcopal Church in North Portland. The micro village will serve adults who are 45 or older and adults of any age with a physical disability, and will promote equity by prioritizing those who identify as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color and members of the queer community, as well as unsheltered residents camping in the nearby area. The village also includes a full kitchen and three bathrooms for village use, as well as a large community meeting room and office space. WeShine is partnering with St. Andrew's church to integrate ADA features to ensure access for both congregants and villagers.

While shelter alone doesn't end homelessness, providing safe shelter, and a path to housing for someone staying in shelter, remains a priority of our department. Data provided to the Board of Commissioners in recent weeks shows that housing outcomes for shelters — no matter the model, provider or jurisdiction — are most closely correlated to funding that allows shelter participants to access rent assistance and support services.

Quarterly financial update: Revenues from Metro fall short of budget forecasts, while County reduces carryover by ramping up spending to match workplan goals, leading to deficit

In December 2024, almost halfway through FY 2025, Metro released a revised SHS revenue forecast that was substantially lower than anticipated when budgets and allocations for FY 2025 were approved. The reduced revenue is leading to a deficit in the Homeless Services Department's FY 2025 and FY 2026

budgets. To mitigate the impact of the deficit, our fiscal team submitted a series of budget modifications to the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners, which were approved. These modifications included:

- Replacing some SHS expenses with federal and state funding sources.
- Using all contingency and reserve funds accumulated in prior years to maintain service levels.
- Reducing operating expenses for services that were underspent or not yet ready for FY 2025.

As of Q3 of this fiscal year, Multnomah County has spent \$130.1 million in SHS funds. This current expenditure rate indicates that the County is projected to exceed our minimum spending goal for FY 2025. Over time, as SHS programs have launched and expanded, expenditures have also risen, and for the first time Multnomah County's SHS expenditures have exceeded revenue. In this environment, both our budget modifications and carryover funds from FY 2024 have played a critical role in offsetting the deficit. However, going forward, this means the County is likely to have significantly less carryover available to mitigate future funding shortfalls.

Local Implementation Plan

Advancing regional goals through continued collaboration

Active partnerships among the three counties who are working to reduce homelessness through SHS is a priority of the SHS measure. By working together, we can align on solutions and create a more integrated system that is easier for people to navigate. Throughout the life of the measure, Multnomah County has collaborated with regional committees such as the Tri-County Planning Body (TCPB) to advance regional goals to end homelessness. The TCPB set six regional goals and has been working toward these goals through workgroups led by consultants and made up of staff from each county.

In Q3, Multnomah County partnered with the TCPB and the other counties to make progress on the regional goal to create greater alignment and long-term partnerships with healthcare systems that benefit people experiencing homelessness and the systems that serve them. Because data sharing is key to the success of this strategy, Multnomah County was able to leverage our search for a new Homelessness Management Information System (HMIS) platform as an opportunity to explore enhanced incorporation of HMIS into the regional healthcare system with Metro and other regional partners. This work built upon previous efforts by a Healthcare and Housing Data Sharing group composed of staff from Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington County data teams. In coming months the TCPB group will continue to collaborate toward the goal of an integrated data system that can share information between healthcare and housing providers, improve participant access to medical care, and facilitate problem-solving across sectors.

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 | 200 | | | | | 571 | 173% |
| Total households | 158 | 125 | 79% | 33 | 21% | 453 | 151% |

| Race & Ethnicity | This Quarter | | Year to Date | |
|---|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| | # | % | # | % |
| American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous | 41 | 21% | 132 | 23% |
| Asian or Asian American | 2 | 1% | 11 | 2% |
| Black, African American or African | 36 | 18% | 129 | 23% |
| Hispanic/Latina/e/o | 47 | 24% | 105 | 18% |
| Middle Eastern or North African | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 9 | 5% | 19 | 3% |
| White | 94 | 47% | 285 | 50% |
| Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category) | 78 | 39% | 221 | 39% |
| Client doesn't know | 1 | 1% | 1 | 0% |
| Client prefers not to answer | 3 | 2% | 8 | 1% |
| Data Not Collected | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Disability status | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Persons with disabilities | 144 | 72% | 438 | 77% |
| Persons without disabilities | 42 | 21% | 102 | 18% |
| Disability unreported | 14 | 7% | 31 | 5% |
| Gender identity | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Woman (Girl, if child) | 82 | 41% | 255 | 45% |
| Man (Boy, if child) | 100 | 50% | 282 | 49% |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|----|----|------|
| Culturally Specific Identity | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0.2% |
| Non-Binary | 7 | 4% | 30 | 5% |
| Transgender | 9 | 5% | 15 | 3% |
| Questioning | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Different Identity | 1 | 1% | 2 | 0.4% |
| Client doesn't know | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Client prefers not to answer | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0.2% |
| Data not collected | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |

(Only if Applicable) Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Housing with Services

| Number of housing placements- Housing with Services | This Quarter | | | | | Year to Date | |
|---|--------------|---|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| | Number | Subset - Population A placed into Housing with Services | Percentage: Population A | Subset - Population B placed into Housing with Services | Percentage: Population B | Number | Percentage of annual goal |
| Total people | 93 | | | | | 272 | N/A |
| Total households | 89 | 69 | 77% | 20 | 23% | 254 | N/A |

| Race & Ethnicity | This Quarter | | Year to Date | |
|---|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| | # | % | # | % |
| American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous | 6 | 6% | 19 | 7% |
| Asian or Asian American | 3 | 3% | 5 | 2% |
| Black, African American or African | 22 | 24% | 79 | 29% |
| Hispanic/Latina/e/o | 13 | 14% | 35 | 13% |
| Middle Eastern or North African | 0 | 0% | 2 | 1% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 2 | 2% | 5 | 2% |
| White | 61 | 66% | 176 | 65% |
| Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category) | 49 | 53% | 141 | 52% |
| Client doesn't know | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Client prefers not to answer | 1 | 1% | 4 | 1% |
| Data Not Collected | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Disability status | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Persons with disabilities | 84 | 90% | 233 | 86% |
| Persons without disabilities | 7 | 8% | 34 | 13% |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|-----|----|-----|
| Disability unreported | 2 | 2% | 5 | 2% |
| Gender identity | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Woman (Girl, if child) | 6 | 75% | 35 | 57% |
| Man (Boy, if child) | 2 | 25% | 23 | 38% |
| Culturally Specific Identity | 0 | 0% | 1 | 2% |
| Non-Binary | 0 | 0% | 1 | 2% |
| Transgender | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Questioning | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Different Identity | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Client doesn't know | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Client prefers not to answer | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Data not collected | 0 | 0% | 1 | 2% |

Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Housing Only

| Number of housing placements- Housing Only | 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 | 19 | | | | | 62 | N/A |
| Total households | 6 | 0 | 0% | 6 | 100% | 25 | N/A |

| Race & Ethnicity | This Quarter | | Year to Date | |
|---|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| | # | % | # | % |
| American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous | 3 | 16% | 3 | 5% |
| Asian or Asian American | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Black, African American or African | 6 | 32% | 10 | 16% |
| Hispanic/Latina/e/o | 7 | 37% | 40 | 65% |
| Middle Eastern or North African | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 0 | 0% | 1 | 2% |
| White | 4 | 21% | 14 | 23% |
| Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category) | 2 | 11% | 7 | 11% |
| Client doesn't know | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Client prefers not to answer | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Data Not Collected | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Disability status | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Persons with disabilities | 2 | 11% | 4 | 6% |
| Persons without disabilities | 8 | 42% | 46 | 74% |
| Disability unreported | 9 | 47% | 12 | 19% |

| Gender identity | | | | |
|------------------------------|----|-----|----|-----|
| | # | % | # | % |
| Woman (Girl, if child) | 12 | 63% | 33 | 53% |
| Man (Boy, if child) | 5 | 26% | 27 | 44% |
| Culturally Specific Identity | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Non-Binary | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Transgender | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Questioning | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Different Identity | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Client doesn't know | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Client prefers not to answer | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Data not collected | 2 | 11% | 2 | 3% |

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 | 239 | | | | | 757 | 137% |
| Total households | 122 | 71 | 57% | 51 | 43% | 397 | 90% |

| Race & Ethnicity | This Quarter | | Year to Date | |
|---|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| | # | % | # | % |
| American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous | 17 | 7% | 59 | 8% |
| Asian or Asian American | 27 | 11% | 48 | 6% |
| Black, African American or African | 67 | 28% | 259 | 34% |
| Hispanic/Latina/e/o | 70 | 29% | 224 | 30% |
| Middle Eastern or North African | 2 | 1% | 6 | 1% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 9 | 4% | 37 | 5% |
| White | 86 | 36% | 278 | 37% |
| Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category) | 60 | 25% | 197 | 26% |
| Client doesn't know | 0 | 0% | 2 | 0% |
| Client prefers not to answer | 4 | 2% | 8 | 1% |
| Data Not Collected | 3 | 1% | 8 | 1% |
| Disability status | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Persons with disabilities | 88 | 37% | 289 | 38% |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Persons without disabilities | 121 | 51% | 390 | 52% |
| Disability unreported | 29 | 12% | 75 | 10% |
| Gender identity | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Woman (Girl, if child) | 153 | 64% | 447 | 59% |
| Man (Boy, if child) | 83 | 35% | 304 | 40% |
| Culturally Specific Identity | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Non-Binary | 1 | 0% | 7 | 1% |
| Transgender | 0 | 0% | 7 | 1% |
| Questioning | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0% |
| Different Identity | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0% |
| Client doesn't know | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Client prefers not to answer | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Data not collected | 2 | 1% | 2 | 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 | 323 | | | | | 984 | 123% |
| Total households | 188 | 37 | 30% | 151 | 70% | 612 | 102% |

| Race & Ethnicity | This Quarter | | Year to Date | |
|---|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| | # | % | # | % |
| American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous | 23 | 7% | 86 | 9% |
| Asian or Asian American | 11 | 3% | 50 | 5% |
| Black, African American or African | 158 | 49% | 415 | 42% |
| Hispanic/Latina/e/o | 62 | 19% | 184 | 19% |
| Middle Eastern or North African | 0 | 0% | 9 | 1% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 10 | 3% | 26 | 3% |
| White | 84 | 26% | 304 | 31% |
| Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category) | 67 | 21% | 241 | 24% |
| Client doesn't know | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Client prefers not to answer | 2 | 1% | 6 | 1% |
| Data Not Collected | 9 | 3% | 16 | 2% |
| Disability status | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Persons with disabilities | 107 | 33% | 326 | 33% |
| Persons without disabilities | 172 | 53% | 515 | 52% |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Disability unreported | 44 | 14% | 143 | 15% |
| Gender identity | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Woman (Girl, if child) | 161 | 50% | 511 | 52% |
| Man (Boy, if child) | 152 | 47% | 457 | 46% |
| Culturally Specific Identity | 1 | 0% | 1 | 0% |
| Non-Binary | 1 | 0% | 2 | 0% |
| Transgender | 1 | 0% | 2 | 0% |
| Questioning | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Different Identity | 1 | 0% | 1 | 0% |
| Client doesn't know | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Client prefers not to answer | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Data not collected | 6 | 2% | 10 | 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. 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 | 60 | 26 | 43.3% | 27 | 45% | 206 | N/A |
| Number of people newly leased up during reporting period | 108 | 40 | 37% | 58 | 53.7% | 470 | N/A |
| Number of households newly leased up during reporting period | 50 | 29 | 58% | 14 | 28% | 264 | N/A |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-----|
| Number of people in housing using an RLRA voucher during reporting period | 1,658 | 1,100 | 66.3% | 460 | 27.7% | 1,705 | N/A |
| Number of households in housing using an RLRA voucher during reporting period | 1,009 | 810 | 80.3% | 134 | 13.3% | 1,052 | N/A |
| Number of people in housing using an RLRA voucher since July 1, 2021 | 1,942 | 1,317 | 67.8% | 503 | 25.9% | N/A | N/A |
| Number of households in housing using an RLRA voucher since July 1, 2021 | 1,243 | 1,011 | 81.3% | 146 | 11.7% | N/A | N/A |

| Race & Ethnicity | This Quarter | | Year to Date | |
|---|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % |
| American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous | 168 | 10.1% | 171 | 10.0% |
| Asian or Asian American | 26 | 1.6% | 27 | 1.6% |
| Black, African American or African | 618 | 37.2% | 634 | 37.1% |
| Hispanic/Latina/e/o | 412 | 24.8% | 414 | 24.2% |
| Middle Eastern or North African | 4 | .2% | 4 | .2% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 56 | 3.4% | 60 | 3.5% |
| White | 825 | 49.6% | 850 | 49.7% |
| Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category) | 493 | 29.6% | 515 | 30.1% |
| Client doesn't know | 5 | .3% | 5 | .3% |
| Client prefers not to answer | 14 | .8% | 14 | .8% |
| Data Not Collected | 9 | .5% | 9 | .5% |
| Disability status | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Persons with disabilities | 938 | 56.4% | 978 | 57.2% |
| Persons without disabilities | 725 | 43.6% | 732 | 42.8% |
| Disability unreported | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Gender identity | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Woman (Girl, if child) | 900 | 54.1% | 917 | 53.6% |
| Man (Boy, if child) | 725 | 43.1% | 746 | 43.6% |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|----|------|----|------|
| Culturally Specific Identity | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Non-Binary | 16 | 1.0% | 16 | 0.9% |
| Transgender | 30 | 1.8% | 31 | 1.9% |
| Questioning | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | 0.1% |
| Different Identity | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Client doesn't know | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| 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 | N/A | | | | | N/A |
| Total households | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| Race & Ethnicity | This Quarter | | Year to Date | |
|---|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| | # | % | # | % |
| American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian or Asian American | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Black, African American or African | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Hispanic/Latina/e/o | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Middle Eastern or North African | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| White | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Client doesn't know | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Client prefers not to answer | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Data Not Collected | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Disability status | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Persons with disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Persons without disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Disability unreported | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Gender identity | | | | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| Woman (Girl, if child) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Man (Boy, if child) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Culturally Specific Identity | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Non-Binary | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Transgender | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Questioning | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Different Identity | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Client doesn't know | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Client prefers not to answer | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Data not collected | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

SHS-Funded Outreach

Metro has approved the Homeless Services Department to use the narrative section for reporting on SHS-funded outreach programs, replacing the previously required outreach table. Outreach providers currently track their activities using a combination of HMIS and internal systems. The quarterly narrative reports they submit to the Homeless Services Department offer the most reliable summary of these efforts.

The Homeless Services Department acknowledges the current system's limitations, especially the lack of a mobile-friendly way to record interactions with individuals experiencing unsheltered homelessness in our current HMIS platform. The Tri-County Region's participation in the fiscal year 2025 HMIS procurement process is expected to yield improved in-field data collection capabilities for outreach staff, leading to more accurate and comprehensive data collection, reporting and care coordination.

This revised reporting solution, using narrative reports, will remain in place until the new HMIS is implemented, offering more advanced and refined in-field data collection capabilities for outreach activities.

Section 3. Financial Reporting

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

The Q3 financial report has been attached at the end of this report. Please see pages 22-26.

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 is designed to assist nonsubsidized market rate landlord run units.

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---|------------|------------|------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|--|
| 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 | | | | | | | | | |
| FY 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 | Under / Over | % of Budget | Comments |
| Metro SHS Resources | | | | | | | | | |
| Beginning Fund Balance | 113,432,776 | 113,432,776 | | | | 113,432,776 | - | 100% | 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 | 134,264,829 | 4,335,440 | 23,867,141 | 30,254,605 | | 58,457,186 | 75,807,643 | 44% | |
| Interest Earnings ⁽¹⁾ | - | 1,011,953 | 860,337 | 535,327 | | 2,407,617 | (2,407,617) | N/A | |
| insert add'l lines as necessary | | | | | | - | - | N/A | |
| Subtotal Program Revenue | 134,264,829 | 5,347,393 | 24,727,478 | 30,789,931 | - | 60,864,802 | 73,400,027 | 45% | |
| Total Metro SHS Resources | 247,697,605 | 118,780,169 | 24,727,478 | 30,789,931 | - | 174,297,578 | 73,400,027 | 70% | |
| 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 | 40,537,288 | 2,891,527 | 6,932,369 | 7,048,046 | | 16,871,942 | 23,665,346 | 42% | Q2 Note: Small change to Q1 from \$2,871,304 to \$2,871,265 Q3 Note: Small change in Q1 from \$2,871,265 to \$2,891,527 Small change in Q2 from \$6,936,807 to \$6,932,369. This is due to Personnel restructuring |
| Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA) | 16,965,790 | 1,753,734 | 2,790,826 | 4,737,338 | | 9,281,898 | 7,683,892 | 55% | Q3 Note: Small change to Q2 from \$2,805,227 to \$2,790,826 due to miss identifying |
| Long-term Rent Assistance Admin | 525,576 | 124,843 | 198,588 | 172,386 | | 495,817 | 29,759 | 94% | Administrative Costs for long-term rent assistance equals 5% of Partner's YTD expenses on long-term rent assistance. |
| Subtotal PSH | 58,028,654 | 4,770,104 | 9,921,783 | 11,957,770 | - | 26,649,656 | 31,378,998 | 46% | |
| Rapid Re-housing (RRH) | | | | | | | | | |
| Support to individuals experiencing a loss of housing | | | | | | | | | |
| Rapid Re-housing (RRH) | 27,808,969 | 4,354,417 | 8,039,550 | 6,608,040 | | 19,002,007 | 8,806,962 | 68% | |
| Subtotal RRH | 27,808,969 | 4,354,417 | 8,039,550 | 6,608,040 | - | 19,002,007 | 8,806,962 | 68% | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Other Housing and Services Programs (not otherwise listed) | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Support to individuals who are experiencing homelessness or have substantial risk of homelessness</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Housing Only | 4,613,060 | 507,675 | 764,851 | 1,472,565 | | 2,745,091 | 1,867,969 | 60% |
| Housing with Services | 8,737,435 | 548,037 | 1,797,158 | 1,403,223 | | 3,748,418 | 4,989,017 | 43% |
| Subtotal Other Housing and Services Programs | 13,350,495 | 1,055,712 | 2,562,009 | 2,875,788 | - | 6,493,509 | 6,856,986 | 49% |
| Eviction & Homelessness Prevention | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Support to individuals experiencing a potential loss of housing</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Eviction & Homelessness Prevention | 7,429,028 | 515,188 | 1,183,954 | 1,244,756 | | 2,943,898 | 4,485,130 | 40% |
| Subtotal Eviction & Homelessness Prevention | 7,429,028 | 515,188 | 1,183,954 | 1,244,756 | - | 2,943,898 | 4,485,130 | 40% |
| Safety On/Off the Street | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Support to individuals <u>unhoused</u> or in temporary housing</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Shelter | 63,988,726 | 10,064,796 | 15,372,035 | 11,417,536 | | 36,854,366 | 27,134,360 | 58% |
| Outreach | 13,507,112 | 1,767,400 | 3,413,375 | 3,048,921 | | 8,229,696 | 5,277,416 | 61% |
| Subtotal Safety On/Off the Street | 77,495,838 | 11,832,196 | 18,785,409 | 14,466,457 | - | 45,084,062 | 32,411,776 | 58% |
| System Support Costs | | | | | | | | |
| System Support Costs | | | | | | | | |
| Systems Infrastructure | 4,463,196 | 1,589,004 | 940,145 | 498,797 | | 3,027,946 | 1,435,250 | 68% |
| Built Infrastructure | 13,050,000 | 108,841 | 181,088 | 90,274 | | 380,203 | 12,669,797 | 3% |
| Other supportive services | 13,254,134 | 1,879,238 | 3,342,191 | 3,158,890 | | 8,380,319 | 4,873,815 | 63% |
| Subtotal System Support Costs | 30,767,330 | 3,577,083 | 4,463,424 | 3,747,961 | - | 11,788,468 | 18,978,862 | 38% |
| Regional Strategy Implementation | | | | | | | | |
| Regional Strategy Implementation | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Investments to support <u>SHS</u> program alignment, coordination and outcomes at a regional level</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Coordinated Entry | 3,337,018 | | | | | - | 3,337,018 | 0% |
| Regional Landlord Recruitment | 4,576,415 | 222,665 | 328,111 | 536,784 | | 1,087,560 | 3,488,855 | 24% |
| Healthcare System Alignment | 952,046 | 32,442 | 46,883 | 85,513 | | 164,838 | 787,208 | 17% |
| Training | 650,206 | | | | | - | 650,206 | 0% |
| Technical Assistance | 1,349,228 | | | | | - | 1,349,228 | 0% |
| Employee Recruitment and Retention | 10,330,000 | | | 10,000,000 | | 10,000,000 | 330,000 | 97% |
| Homeless Management Information System | 3,637,394 | | 1,693,783 | 34,554 | | 1,728,337 | 1,909,057 | 48% |
| Subtotal Regional Strategy Implementation | 24,832,307 | 255,107 | 2,068,777 | 10,656,851 | - | 12,980,735 | 11,851,572 | 52% |

Q2 Note: Small change in Q1 from \$10,065,225 to \$10,064,796
Q3 Note: Small change in Q2 from \$15,374,710 to \$15,372,035
Q3 Note: Small change in Q1 from \$1,813,402 to \$1,767,400 || Small Change in Q2 from \$3,435,943 to \$3,413,375. This is due to personnel restructuring

Q2 Notes: Small change to Q1 from \$1,853,259 to \$1,853,498
Q3 Notes: Small change to Q1 from \$1,853,498 to \$1,879,238 || Small change to Q2 from \$3,300,783 to \$3,342,191. This is due to personnel restructuring

Q3 Notes: Small change to Q2 from \$46,941 to \$46,941

| County Administrative Costs | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------|------------|------------|---|-------------|-------------|-----|---|
| 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 | 7,518,725 | 1,656,586 | 1,612,638 | 1,936,371 | | 5,205,595 | 2,313,130 | 69% | Q2 Notes: Small change to Q1 from \$1,656,357 to \$1,656,157Q3 Notes: Small change to Q1 from \$1,656,157 to \$1,656,586 Small change to Q2 from \$1,610,334 to \$1,612,638 |
| Subtotal County Administrative Costs | 7,518,725 | 1,656,586 | 1,612,638 | 1,936,371 | - | 5,205,595 | 2,313,130 | 69% | County SHS Administrative Costs equals 4% of County's annual Program Funds. |
| Subtotal Program Costs | 247,231,346 | 28,016,393 | 48,637,544 | 53,493,995 | - | 130,147,931 | 117,083,415 | 53% | Admin cost % will decrease in the next quarters due to the increase of provider expenses |
| Ending Fund Balance (incl. Contingency and Reserves) | 466,259 | | | | | 44,149,647 | | | |
| Budgeted Contingency and Reserves | | | | | | | | | This section reflects budgeted contingency and reserve figures. |
| Contingency ⁽³⁾ | - | | | | | - | | | Contingency equals 0% of Partner's budgeted annual Program Funds. |
| Regional Strategy Implementation Contingency | - | | | | | - | | | |
| Stabilization Reserve ⁽⁴⁾ | - | | | | | - | | | Stabilization Reserve equals 0% of Partner's budgeted annual Program Funds. |
| RLRA Reserves | 466,259 | | | | | 466,259 | | | |
| Other Programmatic Reserves | | | | | | | | | |
| insert add lines as necessary | | | | | | - | | | |
| Subtotal Contingency and Reserves | 466,259 | | | | | 466,259 | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | | | |

| |
|---|
| ^[1] Per IGA Section 3.4.2 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS, Metro recommends, but does not require, that in a given Fiscal Year Administrative Costs for SHS should not exceed 5% of annual Program Funds allocated to Partner; and that Administrative Costs for administering long-term rent assistance programs should not exceed 10% of annual Program Funds allocated by Partner for long-term rent assistance. |
| ^[2] Per IGA Section 8.3.3 REGIONAL STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION FUND, each County must contribute not less than 5% of its share of Program Funds each Fiscal Year to a Regional Strategy Implementation Fund to achieve regional investment strategies. |
| ^[3] Per IGA Section 5.5.4 CONTINGENCY, partner may establish a contingency account in addition to a Stabilization Reserve. The contingency account will not exceed 5% of Budgeted Program Funds in a given Fiscal Year. |
| ^[4] Per IGA Section 5.5.3 PARTNER STABILIZATION RESERVE, partner will establish and hold a Stabilization Reserve to protect against financial instability within the SHS program with a target minimum reserve level will be equal to 10% of Partner's Budgeted Program Funds in a given Fiscal Year. The Stabilization Reserve for each County will be fully funded within the first three years. |
| ^[5] Per IGA Section 6.1.4 "Program Funds" includes interest earnings. As such, calculations of the % of Program Funds spent on various budget lines will include interest earnings in the formula. |

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
FY 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% | 14.9% | | 4.9% |
| | Quarter 2 | 10% | 20.7% | | 10.7% |
| | Quarter 3 | 25% | 22.8% | | -2.2% |
| | Quarter 4 | 35% | 0.0% | | -35.0% |
| | Total | 80% | 58.4% | | -21.6% |
| Fixed Formula - it is similar to FY 2024, excludes Built infrastructure | | | | | |

| \$ Spending YTD | | | | Comments |
|----------------------|--------------|------------|----------|--|
| Built Infrastructure | Budget | Actual | Forecast | Provide a status update for below. (required each quarter) |
| | Annual total | 13,050,000 | 380,203 | |

^[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.

| Carryover Spend-down Plan | § Spending by investment area | | | Comments |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|
| | Budget | Actual ⁽²⁾ | Variance | |
| Beginning Fund Balance (carryover balance) | 113,432,776 | 113,432,776 | - | Provide a status update for each Investment Area line below. (required each quarter) |
| Describe Investment Area | | | | |
| Support Services | 1,110,445 | 677,539 | 432,906 | |
| Rapid Re-housing (RRH) | 20,098,154 | 15,060,479 | 5,037,675 | |
| Housing with Services | 3,903,800 | 1,437,350 | 2,466,450 | |
| Eviction & Homelessness Prevention | 5,665,828 | 1,842,410 | 3,823,418 | |
| Shelter | 30,050,454 | 13,464,885 | 16,585,569 | |
| Outreach | 8,777,120 | 5,100,715 | 3,676,405 | |
| Systems Infrastructure | 2,898,935 | 1,617,242 | 1,281,693 | |
| Built Infrastructure | 13,050,000 | 348,742 | 12,701,258 | |
| Other supportive services | 7,073,468 | 3,332,286 | 3,741,182 | |
| RSIF: Regional Landlord Recruitment | 2,334,215 | 936,807 | 1,397,408 | |
| RSIF: Employee Recruitment and Retention | 10,330,000 | 10,000,000 | 330,000 | |
| RSIF: Homeless Management Information System | 3,591,153 | 1,728,337 | 1,862,816 | |
| RSIF: Coordinated Entry | 859,882 | 735,794 | 124,088 | |
| RSIF: Healthcare System Alignment | 20,045 | | 20,045 | |
| RSIF: Technical Assistance | 1,115,640 | | 1,115,640 | |
| County Administrative Costs | 2,087,378 | | 2,087,378 | |
| RLRA Reserves | 466,259 | | 466,259 | |
| | 113,432,776 | 56,282,587 | 57,150,189 | |
| Remaining prior year carryover | - | 57,150,189 | (57,150,189) | |
| Estimated current year carryover | - | | - | |
| Ending Fund Balance (carryover balance) | - | 57,150,189 | (57,150,189) | |

⁽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).

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
FY 2025

Financial Report (by Program Category)

COMPLETE THE SECTION BELOW EVERY QUARTER. UPDATE AS NEEDED FOR THE ANNUAL REPORT.

| | Annual | Q1 Actuals | Q2 Actuals | Q3 Actuals | Q4 Actuals | Total YTD | Variance | % of | Comments |
|---|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------|---|
| Metro SHS Resources | | | | | | | | | |
| Beginning Fund Balance | 113,432,776 | 113,432,776 | | | | 113,432,776 | - | 100% | 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 | 134,264,829 | 4,335,440 | 23,867,141 | 30,254,605 | | 58,457,186 | 75,807,643 | 44% | |
| Interest Earnings ^[5] | - | 1,011,953 | 860,337 | 535,327 | | 2,407,617 | (2,407,617) | N/A | |
| insert addtl lines as necessary | | | | | | - | - | N/A | |
| Subtotal Program Revenue | 134,264,829 | 5,347,393 | 24,727,478 | 30,789,931 | - | 60,864,802 | 73,400,027 | 45% | |
| Total Metro SHS Resources | 247,697,605 | 118,780,169 | 24,727,478 | 30,789,931 | - | 174,297,578 | 73,400,027 | 70% | |
| 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 | 40,537,288 | 2,891,527 | 6,932,369 | 7,048,046 | | 16,871,942 | 23,665,346 | 42% | Q2 Note: Small change to Q1 from \$2,871,304 to \$2,871,265 Q3 Note: Small change in Q1 from \$2,871,265 to \$2,891,527 Q3 Note: Small change to Q2 from \$2,805,227 to \$2,790,826 due to miss identifying Administrative Costs for long-term rent assistance equals 5% of Partner's YTD expenses on long-term rent assistance. |
| Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA) | 16,965,790 | 1,753,734 | 2,790,826 | 4,737,338 | | 9,281,898 | 7,683,892 | 55% | |
| Long-term Rent Assistance Admin | 525,576 | 124,843 | 198,588 | 172,386 | | 495,817 | 29,759 | 94% | |
| Subtotal PSH | 58,028,654 | 4,770,104 | 9,921,783 | 11,957,770 | - | 26,649,656 | 31,378,998 | 46% | |
| Rapid Re-housing (RRH) | | | | | | | | | |
| Support to individuals experiencing a loss of housing | | | | | | | | | |
| Rapid Re-housing (RRH) | 27,808,969 | 4,354,417 | 8,039,550 | 6,608,040 | | 19,002,007 | 8,806,962 | 68% | |
| Subtotal RRH | 27,808,969 | 4,354,417 | 8,039,550 | 6,608,040 | - | 19,002,007 | 8,806,962 | 68% | |
| Other Housing and Services Programs (not otherwise listed) | | | | | | | | | |
| Support to individuals who are experiencing homelessness or have substantial risk of homelessness | | | | | | | | | |
| Housing Only | 4,613,060 | 507,675 | 764,851 | 1,472,565 | | 2,745,091 | 1,867,969 | 60% | |
| Housing with Services | 8,737,435 | 548,037 | 1,797,158 | 1,403,223 | | 3,748,418 | 4,989,017 | 43% | |
| Subtotal Other Housing and Services | 13,350,495 | 1,055,712 | 2,562,009 | 2,875,788 | - | 6,493,509 | 6,856,986 | 49% | |
| Eviction & Homelessness Prevention | | | | | | | | | |
| Support to individuals experiencing a potential loss of housing | | | | | | | | | |
| Eviction & Homelessness Prevention | 7,429,028 | 515,188 | 1,183,954 | 1,244,756 | | 2,943,898 | 4,485,130 | 40% | |
| Subtotal Eviction & Homelessness Prevention | 7,429,028 | 515,188 | 1,183,954 | 1,244,756 | - | 2,943,898 | 4,485,130 | 40% | |
| Safety On/Off the Street | | | | | | | | | |
| Support to individuals unhoused or in temporary housing | | | | | | | | | |
| Shelter | 63,988,726 | 10,064,796 | 15,372,035 | 11,417,536 | | 36,854,366 | 27,134,360 | 58% | Q2 Note: Small change in Q1 from \$10,065,225 to \$10,064,796 Q3 Note: Small change in Q2 from \$10,064,796 to \$10,064,796 Q3 Note: Small change in Q1 from \$1,813,402 to \$1,767,400 Small Change in Q2 from \$3,435,000 to \$3,435,000 |
| Outreach | 13,507,112 | 1,767,400 | 3,413,375 | 3,048,921 | | 8,229,696 | 5,277,416 | 61% | |
| Subtotal Safety On/Off the Street | 77,495,838 | 11,832,196 | 18,785,409 | 14,466,457 | - | 45,084,062 | 32,411,776 | 58% | |
| System Support Costs | | | | | | | | | |
| System Support Costs | | | | | | | | | |
| Systems Infrastructure | 4,463,196 | 1,589,004 | 940,145 | 498,797 | | 3,027,946 | 1,435,250 | 68% | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Built Infrastructure | 13,050,000 | 108,841 | 181,088 | 90,274 | | 380,203 | 12,669,797 | 3% |
| Other supportive services | 13,254,134 | 1,879,238 | 3,342,191 | 3,158,890 | | 8,380,319 | 4,873,815 | 63% |
| Subtotal System Support Costs | 30,767,330 | 3,577,083 | 4,463,424 | 3,747,961 | - | 11,788,468 | 18,978,862 | 38% |

Q2 Notes: Small change to Q1 from \$1,853,259 to \$1,853,498 **Q3 Notes:** Small change to Q1 fr

| Regional Strategy Implementation | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Regional Strategy Implementation | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Investments to support SHS program alignment, coordination and outcomes at a regional level</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Coordinated Entry | 3,337,018 | | | | | - | 3,337,018 | 0% |
| Regional Landlord Recruitment | 4,576,415 | 222,665 | 328,111 | 536,784 | | 1,087,560 | 3,488,855 | 24% |
| Healthcare System Alignment | 952,046 | 32,442 | 46,883 | 85,513 | | 164,838 | 787,208 | 17% |
| Training | 650,206 | | | | | - | 650,206 | 0% |
| Technical Assistance | 1,349,228 | | | | | - | 1,349,228 | 0% |
| Employee Recruitment and Retention | 10,330,000 | | | 10,000,000 | | 10,000,000 | 330,000 | 97% |
| Homeless Management Information System | 3,637,394 | | 1,693,783 | 34,554 | | 1,728,337 | 1,909,057 | 48% |
| Subtotal Regional Strategy Implementation | 24,832,307 | 255,107 | 2,068,777 | 10,656,851 | - | 12,980,735 | 11,851,572 | 52% |

Q3 Notes: Small change to Q2 from \$46,941 to \$46,941

| County Administrative Costs | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|
| County Administrative Costs | | | | | | | | |
| County Administrative Costs | 7,518,725 | 1,656,586 | 1,612,638 | 1,936,371 | | 5,205,595 | 2,313,130 | 69% |
| Subtotal County Administrative Costs | 7,518,725 | 1,656,586 | 1,612,638 | 1,936,371 | - | 5,205,595 | 2,313,130 | 69% |
| Subtotal Program Costs | 247,231,346 | 28,016,393 | 48,637,544 | 53,493,995 | - | 130,147,931 | 117,083,415 | 53% |

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

Q2 Notes: Small change to Q1 from \$1,656,357 to \$1,656,157 **Q3 Notes:** Small change to Q1 fr

County SHS Administrative Costs equals 4% of County's annual Program Funds.

Admin cost % will decrease in the next quarters due to the increase of provider expenses

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|--|--|--|--|-------------------|--|--|
| Ending Fund Balance (incl. Contingency and | 466,259 | | | | | 44,149,647 | | |
| Budgeted Contingency and Reserves | | | | | | | | |
| Contingency ⁽³⁾ | - | | | | | - | | |
| Regional Strategy Implementation Contingency | - | | | | | - | | |
| Stabilization Reserve ⁽⁴⁾ | - | | | | | - | | |
| RLRA Reserves | 466,259 | | | | | 466,259 | | |
| Other Programmatic Reserves | | | | | | | | |
| insert add'l lines as necessary | | | | | | - | | |
| Subtotal Contingency and Reserves | 466,259 | | | | | 466,259 | | |

This section reflects budgeted contingency and reserve figures.

Contingency equals 0% of Partner's budgeted annual Program Funds.

Stabilization Reserve equals 0% of Partner's budgeted annual Program Funds.

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.

⁽¹⁾ Per IGA Section 3.4.2 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS, Metro recommends, but does not require, that in a given Fiscal Year Administrative Costs for SHS should not exceed 5% of annual Program Funds allocated to Partner; and that Administrative Costs for administering long-term rent assistance programs should not exceed 10% of annual Program Funds allocated by Partner for long-term rent assistance.

^[2] Per IGA Section 8.3.3 REGIONAL STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION FUND, each County must contribute not less than 5% of its share of Program Funds each Fiscal Year to a Regional Strategy Implementation Fund to achieve regional investment strategies.

^[3] Per IGA Section 5.5.4 CONTINGENCY, partner may establish a contingency account in addition to a Stabilization Reserve. The contingency account will not exceed 5% of Budgeted Program Funds in a given Fiscal Year.

^[4] Per IGA Section 5.5.3 PARTNER STABILIZATION RESERVE, partner will establish and hold a Stabilization Reserve to protect against financial instability within the SHS program with a target minimum reserve level will be equal to 10% of Partner's Budgeted Program Funds in a given Fiscal Year. The Stabilization Reserve for each County will be fully funded within the first three years.

^[5] Per IGA Section 6.1.4 "Program Funds" includes interest earnings. As such, calculations of the % of Program Funds spent on various budget lines will include interest earnings in the formula.