

Agenda



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services Tri-County Planning Body Meeting
Date: April 10th, 2024
Time: 4:00pm-6:00pm
Place: Metro Council Chambers, 600 NE Grand Ave, Portland, OR 97232 and Zoom Webinar
Purpose: The Tri-County Planning Body (TCPB) will receive a progress update regarding the Technical Assistance and Training Goals and receive information on the Supportive Housing Services Fiscal Year 2023 Annual Regional Report.

4:00pm **Welcome and Introductions**

- Decision: meeting summary approval

4:15pm **Public Comment**

4:20pm **Staff Updates**

4:30pm **Technical Assistance and Training Progress Update**

5:20pm **Supportive Housing Services Fiscal Year 2023 Annual Regional Report**

5:55pm **Closing and Next steps**

- Next meeting: May 8th, 2024

6:00pm **Adjourn**

Contents

Agenda

Tri-County Planning Body meeting summary March 2024

Supportive Housing Services Regional Annual Report July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023

Training and Technical Assistance Goal Timeline

Goal progress report April 2024

Tri-County Planning Body Goal and Recommendation Language

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee meeting minutes – February 26th, 2024

Presentation slides

Metro respects civil rights

Metro fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes that ban discrimination. If any person believes they have been discriminated against regarding the receipt of benefits or services because of race, color, national origin, sex, age or disability, they have the right to file a complaint with Metro. For information on Metro's civil rights program, or to obtain a discrimination complaint form, visit www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights or call 503-797-1536. Metro provides services or accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and people who need an interpreter at public meetings. If you need a sign language interpreter, communication aid or language assistance, call 503-797-1700 or TDD/TTY 503-797-1804 (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. weekdays) 5 business days before the meeting. All Metro meetings are wheelchair accessible. For up-to-date public transportation information, visit TriMet's website at www.trimet.org.

Thông báo về sự Metro không kỳ thị của

Metro tôn trọng dân quyền. Muốn biết thêm thông tin về chương trình dân quyền của Metro, hoặc muốn lấy đơn khiếu nại về sự kỳ thị, xin xem trong www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Nếu quý vị cần thông dịch viên ra dấu bằng tay, trợ giúp về tiếp xúc hay ngôn ngữ, xin gọi số 503-797-1700 (từ 8 giờ sáng đến 5 giờ chiều vào những ngày thường) trước buổi họp 5 ngày làm việc.

Повідомлення Metro про заборону дискримінації

Metro з повагою ставиться до громадянських прав. Для отримання інформації про програму Metro із захисту громадянських прав або форми скарги про дискримінацію відвідайте сайт www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. або Якщо вам потрібен перекладач на зборах, для задоволення вашого запиту зателефонуйте за номером 503-797-1700 з 8.00 до 17.00 у робочі дні за п'ять робочих днів до зборів.

Metro 的不歧視公告

尊重民權。欲瞭解Metro民權計畫的詳情，或獲取歧視投訴表，請瀏覽網站 www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights。如果您需要口譯方可參加公共會議，請在會議召開前5個營業日撥打503-797-1700（工作日上午8點至下午5點），以便我們滿足您的要求。

Ogeysiiska takooris la'aanta ee Metro

Metro waxay ixtiraamtaa xuquuqda madaniga. Si aad u heshid macluumaad ku saabsan barnaamijka xuquuqda madaniga ee Metro, ama aad u heshid warqadda ka cabashada takoorista, booqo www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Haddii aad u baahan tahay turjubaan si aad uga qaybqaadatid kullanka dadweynaha, wac 503-797-1700 (8 galka hore illaa 5 galka dambe maalmaha shaqada) shan maalmaha shaqo ka hor kullanka si loo tixgaliyo codsashadaada.

Metro의 차별 금지 관련 통지서

Metro의 시민권 프로그램에 대한 정보 또는 차별 항의서 양식을 얻으려면, 또는 차별에 대한 불만을 신고 할 수 www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. 당신의 언어 지원이 필요한 경우, 회의에 앞서 5 영업일 (오후 5시 주중에 오전 8시) 503-797-1700를 호출합니다.

Metro의差別禁止通知

Metroでは公民権を尊重しています。Metroの公民権プログラムに関する情報について、または差別苦情フォームを入手するには、www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights。までお電話ください。公開会議で言語通訳を必要とされる方は、Metroがご要請に対応できるよう、公開会議の5営業日前までに503-797-1700（平日午前8時～午後5時）までお電話ください。

សេចក្តីជូនដំណឹងអំពីការមិនរើសអើងរបស់ Metro

ការគោរពសិទ្ធិពលរដ្ឋរបស់ ។ សំរាប់ព័ត៌មានអំពីកម្មវិធីសិទ្ធិពលរដ្ឋរបស់ Metro ឬដើម្បីទទួលបានកម្មប្រតិបត្តិការរើសអើងសម្រាប់សេចក្តីណែនាំ www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights។ បើលោកអ្នកត្រូវការអ្នកបកប្រែភាសានៅពេលអង្គប្រជុំសាធារណៈ សូមទូរស័ព្ទមកលេខ 503-797-1700 (ម៉ោង 8 ព្រឹកដល់ម៉ោង 5 ល្ងាច ថ្ងៃធ្វើការ) ប្រាំពីរថ្ងៃ មុនថ្ងៃប្រជុំដើម្បីអាចឲ្យគេសម្រួលតាមសំណើរបស់លោកអ្នក ។

إشعار بعدم التمييز من Metro

تحتزم Metro الحقوق المدنية. للمزيد من المعلومات حول برنامج Metro للحقوق المدنية أو لإيداع شكوى ضد التمييز، يُرجى زيارة الموقع الإلكتروني www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. إن كنت بحاجة إلى مساعدة في اللغة، يجب عليك الاتصال مقدماً برقم الهاتف 503-797-1700 (من الساعة 8 صباحاً حتى الساعة 5 مساءً، أيام الاثنين إلى الجمعة) قبل خمسة (5) أيام عمل من موعد الاجتماع.

Paunawa ng Metro sa kawalan ng diskriminasyon

Iginagalang ng Metro ang mga karapatang sibil. Para sa impormasyon tungkol sa programa ng Metro sa mga karapatang sibil, o upang makakuha ng porma ng reklamo sa diskriminasyon, bisitahin ang www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Kung kailangan ninyo ng interpreter ng wika sa isang pampublikong pulong, tumawag sa 503-797-1700 (8 a.m. hanggang 5 p.m. Lunes hanggang Biyernes) lima araw ng trabaho bago ang pulong upang mapagbigyan ang inyong kahilingan.

Notificación de no discriminación de Metro

Metro respeta los derechos civiles. Para obtener información sobre el programa de derechos civiles de Metro o para obtener un formulario de reclamo por discriminación, ingrese a www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Si necesita asistencia con el idioma, llame al 503-797-1700 (de 8:00 a. m. a 5:00 p. m. los días de semana) 5 días laborales antes de la asamblea.

Уведомление о недопущении дискриминации от Metro

Metro уважает гражданские права. Узнать о программе Metro по соблюдению гражданских прав и получить форму жалобы о дискриминации можно на веб-сайте www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Если вам нужен переводчик на общественном собрании, оставьте свой запрос, позвонив по номеру 503-797-1700 в рабочие дни с 8:00 до 17:00 и за пять рабочих дней до даты собрания.

Avizul Metro privind nediscriminarea

Metro respectă drepturile civile. Pentru informații cu privire la programul Metro pentru drepturi civile sau pentru a obține un formular de reclamație împotriva discriminării, vizitați www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Dacă aveți nevoie de un interpret de limbă la o ședință publică, sunați la 503-797-1700 (între orele 8 și 5, în timpul zilelor lucrătoare) cu cinci zile lucrătoare înainte de ședință, pentru a putea să vă răspunde în mod favorabil la cerere.

Metro txog kev ntxub ntxaug daim ntawv ceeb toom

Metro tributes cai. Rau cov lus qhia txog Metro txog cai kev pab, los yog kom sau ib daim ntawv tsis txaus siab, mus saib www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Yog hais tias koj xav tau lus kev pab, hu rau 503-797-1700 (8 teev sawv ntxov txog 5 teev tsaus ntuj weekdays) 5 hnuv ua hauj lwm ua ntej ntawm lub rooj sib tham.

Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services Tri-County Planning Body Meeting
Date: Wednesday, March 13, 2024
Time: 4:00 PM – 6:00 PM
Place: Metro Council Chambers, 600 NE Grand Ave, Portland, OR 97232 and Zoom Webinar
Purpose: The Tri-County Planning Body (TCPB) will receive an update regarding Multnomah County’s Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) work and review and vote on the Landlord Recruitment and Retention Implementation Plan.

Member attendees

Co-chair Eboni Brown (she/her), Co-chair Matt Chapman (he/him), Zoi Coppiano (she/her), Yvette Marie Hernandez (she/her), Monta Knudson (he/him), Nicole Larson (she/her), Michael Ong Liu (he/him), Sahaan McKelvey (he/him), Cristina Palacios (she/her), Steve Rudman (he/him), Mindy Stadlander (she/her), Mercedes Elizalde (she/her)

Absent members

None

Elected delegates

Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington (she/her), Metro Councilor Christine Lewis (she/her), Multnomah County Chair Jessica Vega Pederson (she/her)

Absent delegates

Clackamas County Chair Tootie Smith (she/her)

County staff representatives

Clackamas County – Adam Brown; Multnomah County – Breanna Flores (she/they), Dan Cole (he/him) Min Chong (she/her, Gartner consultant); Washington County – Nicole Stingham (she/her), Jes Larson (she/her)

Metro

Abby Ahern (she/her), Liam Frost (he/him), Valeria McWilliams (she/her), Patricia Rojas (she/her), Chris Pence (he/him), Ruth Adkins (she/her), Yesenia Delgado (she/her), Melia Deters (she/her), Giovanni Bautista (he/him)

Kearns & West Facilitators

Ben Duncan (he/him), Colin Baker (he/him)

Note: The meeting was recorded via Zoom; therefore, details will be mainly focused on the discussions, with less detail regarding the presentations. Presentation slides are included in the archived meeting packet.

Welcome and Introductions

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, introduced himself and welcomed the Tri-County Planning Body (TCPB) to the meeting and facilitated introductions between TCPB members.

Valeria McWilliams, Metro, introduced new Metro staff Chris Pence and Ruth Adkins.

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, provided update on the recent SHS Oversight Committee meeting and the development of its regional annual report. She indicated that the SHS Oversight Committee co-

Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

chairs and staff will share the report with Metro Council and the Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington County Boards of Commissioners.

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, reviewed the agenda and objectives.

The TCPB approved the February Meeting Summary.

Public Comment

No public comment was received.

HMIS Strategic Sourcing Analysis Update – Multnomah County

Patricia Rojas, Metro, shared an overview of the Tri-County Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) technology strategic sourcing analysis that the Multnomah County IT team has completed with consultant Gartner.

Dan Cole, Multnomah County, introduced himself and his role on Multnomah County's Information Technology (IT) team, which has been leading the HMIS strategic sourcing analysis project with the support of Gartner. He reminded the TCPB that Multnomah County's IT team leads the technology infrastructure of HMIS for the Tri-Counties, while each county implements and operates HMIS itself. For context, he shared that the current HMIS system has caused concerns about data accuracy and quality and has created barriers to implementing new houselessness initiatives. Given this, Gartner has conducted an assessment of the current HMIS system, helped articulate a future-state vision for houselessness and housing services, identified gaps between the current system and a future-state system, identified the capabilities needed in a new system to support the future-state vision, shared insights into the current market of HMIS system products, and proposed recommendations for achieving the future-state vision with updated HMIS technology.

Min Chong, Gartner, presented more detail on the HMIS strategic sourcing analysis project. She shared findings from stakeholder engagement efforts and Gartner's assessment of legacy HMIS capabilities. Current HMIS capabilities cannot fully support an expanded vision for HMIS, which limits the effectiveness of houselessness coordination and response. She outlined how the current HMIS system fully performs only eight of fifty possible capabilities, with many capabilities partially or insufficiently performed and several not performed at all. Some of these capabilities are critical to achieving the future-state vision for houselessness services. She highlighted that the current HMIS system also has technical limitations that restrict its ability to perform important business capabilities, such as the inability to log geospatial data, upload and edit data in bulk, produce insightful data analysis with reports and dashboards, among others. Improvements could be made to the legacy system to mitigate some of these limitations, but it will still not meet the full future-state vision for data infrastructure. She shared other HMIS system options on the marketplace that would perform better, including two recommended vendors and two less capable vendors. Finally, she shared recommendations on how to achieve expanded HMIS vision, such as an initiating an HMIS governance model and expanded vision, developing a data reporting strategy, identifying priority improvements for a new HMIS system, selecting a new HMIS contractor, and implementing a new HMIS system.

Co-chair Eboni Brown asked if there would be any anticipated downtime during a system transition, and, if so, what the impact on HMIS usage and houselessness services would be?

Dan Cole, Multnomah County, responded that his team anticipates almost no downtime and little service impact. He clarified that the transition would likely be conducted over a weekend.

Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington noted that the HMIS project's timeline could mean that full implementation of a new HMIS system might not occur until year seven of the ten-year term of service for the TCPB. This would require the Counties to continue to operate an insufficient system for several more years. She expressed a desire for the TCPB to make a motion to direct Metro staff to share the Gartner presentation with Metro Council and the SHS Oversight Committee. After sharing her hope that the Regional Investment Fund (RIF) would have sufficient funds, she asked about the cost of a new HMIS system.

Dan Cole, Multnomah County, responded that the current timeline for implementing a new HMIS system is two years, with a January 2026 target launch date. He noted that this project needs to be sufficiently resourced, so that it meets this target. He highlighted that, despite the two-year timeline, updating the HMIS system would, in the long run, save significant time, effort, and energy for all involved. He also shared that updating the HMIS system would ultimately improve the delivery of housing and houselessness services, in contrast with the current state of HMIS, which is a data collection tool that cannot be leveraged to improve the delivery of services. Finally, he noted that there is not yet a price for the proposed HMIS system updates.

Cristina Palacios asked for more clarity about what fully functioning housing eligibility capabilities would look like in a HMIS system and how they would be incorporated into a new system.

Dan Cole, Multnomah County, answered that this has not yet been decided, and prioritization of capabilities in a new HMIS system will be a future step in the process.

Co-chair Matt Chapman commented on the high quality of the presentation. He noted that large-scale systems transitions are lengthy and complex processes and cautioned against speeding up at the risk of compromising quality and functionality. He stated that the process should be rigorous and disciplined to achieve the desired future state of HMIS, and that trying to salvage the current system is not a viable option. He asked about what can be done in the interim to mitigate some of the challenges and inadequacies of the current HMIS system.

Dan Cole, Multnomah County, responded that there should be immediate action to get the process started. One possibility is to collaborate with TCPB members to advise on stakeholder engagement on critical user pain points that could potentially be addressed with temporary "Band-Aid" solutions, e.g. layering other systems onto the current system.

Mercedes Elizalde asked about the timing and process of vendor selection.

Dan Cole, Multnomah County, responded that vendor selection should occur between July 2024 and the end of the calendar year. His team will evaluate tradeoffs of each vendor and technology option, including comparing their relative strengths and weaknesses. He highlighted that one of the key features his team will look for is each option's ability to integrate with other technologies that would allow for more customization and flexibility with data reporting. He said the selection process will include input from a broad spectrum of community stakeholders to inform prioritization of capabilities and features.

Mindy Stadtlander noted that some housing services are included as "health related services" in Oregon and therefore can be billable to Medicaid and/or the state, so interoperability and the capacity to share individuals' information across platforms would be useful.

Multnomah County Chair Jessica Vega Pederson shared her strong commitment to this project and appreciation for others' sense of urgency on it. She reflected that the current HMIS is outdated, and an updated system is needed.

Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

Michael Ong Liu noted that housing inventory management would likely be a feature in a new HMIS system and asked if comparisons to other housing inventory management systems have been made. He also asked about plans to ensure a new HMIS system remains a single, cohesive tool. Finally, he inquired about how a new system would relate to and/or work with Built for Zero.

Dan Cole, Multnomah County, answered that there still needs to be decisions made about the possible capabilities in a new system, including defining the minimum requirements, considering “nice to haves”, and identifying unnecessary features. Then, it can be determined if all the chosen capabilities can be implemented within a single product or via plug-in/integrated products. He shared that Built for Zero is a methodology or framework for how data is collected rather than a data tool or product itself.

Sahaan McKelvey questioned the complexity of deciding on a new HMIS system vendor. Noting that other communities with similar houselessness situations use one of the two recommended vendors, he recommended considering these examples to help expedite the decision-making process.

Dan Cole, Multnomah County, shared that a complete public procurement sourcing process is required by law.

Yvette Marie Hernandez expressed her excitement for this project.

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, reminded the TCPB that this project does not require a vote or funding from TCPB because it is led by Multnomah County.

Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington reminded the TCPB of her desire for a motion that the project presentation be shared with the Metro Council and SHS Oversight Committee. Patricia Rojas, Metro, assured the TCPB that the presentation will be shared with these bodies.

Landlord Recruitment and Retention Implementation Plan

Valeria McWilliams, Metro, presented an overview of the Landlord Recruitment and Retention Implementation Plan (implementation plan) and reminded the TCPB that it is the first chapter that the body is being asked to approve. She reiterated that the implementation plan will help recruit and retain landlords in the Tri-County area. If approved, the next step for the implementation plan would be for the SHS Oversight Committee to vote on approval.

Breanna Flores, Multnomah County, focused the group’s attention on racial equity considerations in the implementation plan. She encouraged the members to be mindful of the ways equity considerations should arise in this work, given the deliberate ways that housing policies and practices have historically created and reinforced racial disparities in housing, so that the TCPB does not unintentionally continue these harms. She also expressed Multnomah County’s commitment to the implementation plan process.

Chris Pence, Metro, presented the first strategy of the implementation plan: a communication and education plan. Metro will hire a consultant to create a regional communications plan to recruit and educate landlords, with a specific focus on Black, Brown, and Indigenous landlords. The anticipated cost is between \$50,000 and \$150,000 and would start by June 2025.

Nicole Stingh, Washington County, presented the second strategy of the implementation plan, alignment of financial incentives, which will include research into changing and/or expanding existing landlord incentives and communications materials based on the research. The anticipated cost is \$100,000 and would start at the end of calendar year 2024 or early 2025.

Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

Breanna Flores, Multnomah County, presented the third strategy, tracking and access to unit inventory, for which Multnomah County will pilot a unit acquisition and tracking program along with Housing Connector during FY24-25. After the pilot, the Counties will analyze outcomes and decide whether to expand the program regionally. The anticipated cost is \$810,000 and will recruit 30 property partners, house 72 households, and list 10 property units (70% of which will be below Fair Market Rent (FMR)).

Adam Brown, Clackamas County, shared the fourth strategy, prioritize quality problem-solving services, which Clackamas County will pilot. This strategy will include a 24/7 landlord hotline to alleviate strain on case managers and add support to landlords. Hotline staff will direct landlords to existing supports and services (e.g. risk mitigation programs, case managers, incentives, landlord-tenant law, fair housing law, etc.). The anticipated cost is \$500,000 and will be online by winter 2025.

Chris Pence, Metro, presented the fifth strategy: investigate needs for property management. Metro, with input from the Counties, will hire a consultant to study mission-driven property management and provide strategies to expand it. The anticipated cost is \$50,000 to \$100,000 and one or more strategies will be identified by spring 2025.

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, facilitated a round robin discussion, where each member had the opportunity to express their perspectives on the implementation plan and then indicate their support with a thumb up, their opposition with a thumb down, or their support with reservations with a thumb sideways. He indicated that members who disapprove of the implementation plan must propose an alternative or suggestion to address their concerns for the TCPB to consider.

Mindy Stadtlander voted “yes” to support the plan.

Cristina Palacios voted “yes” to support the plan and commented about the need for tenants to have strong renters' insurance and that low-income renters who cannot afford it are not disqualified from the program.

Yvette Marie Hernandez voted “yes” to support the plan.

Zoi Coppiano voted “yes” to support the plan.

Steve Rudman voted “yes” to support the plan. He noted his approval of this plan because of the specific inclusion of landlords as a priority but raised concerns about the 24/7 landlord hotline because of potential implementation barriers beyond Clackamas County.

Co-chair Matt Chapman voted “yes” to support the plan and indicated his agreement with Steve Rudman’s points.

Metro Councilor Christine Lewis voted “yes” to support the plan.

Monta Knudson indicated his reserved support with a thumb sideways, noting that the TCPB has not been updated on the other goals.

Valeria McWilliams, Metro, responded that there was a crosswalk between this implementation plan and the goals that identified why some of the goals were incorporated into this implementation plan and why others were not. She offered to talk in more detail with Monta after the meeting.

Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

Michael Ong Liu voted “yes” to support the plan. He also highlighted two areas of possible concern, the 24/7 landlord support hotline, and the source of funds for the risk mitigation program of the implementation plan and TCPB’s authority to approve the use of those funds for the risk mitigation program. He noted that 911 is struggling with wait and response times in the region, so the landlord support hotline must be adequately staffed for it to be effective. He asked when members think the TCPB should approach the Counties and/or the SHS oversight committee for financial support for the risk mitigation program, especially given that it is relatively expensive (\$6,000,000 of the \$7,810,000 - \$8,060,000 total anticipated cost of the implementation plan).

Valeria McWilliams, Metro, confirmed that these funds have already been approved and offered to follow up with more information after the meeting.

Adam Brown, Clackamas County, clarified that the \$6,000,000 figure represents the anticipated annualized cost of claims utilization through the risk mitigation program based on the number of housing units that will be online.

Michael Ong Liu expressed his opinion that TCPB funding should not be used for a reserve like this for the risk mitigation program.

Nicole Larson voted “yes” to support the plan and expressed her desire to have access to a cost breakdown of the risk mitigation program to better understand the source of funds (e.g. SHS funds going to Counties or TCPB funds from the RIF).

Liam Frost, Metro, confirmed with members that Metro will provide additional information about the risk mitigation program funding after the meeting.

Sahaan McKelvey voted “yes” to support the plan and asked to have a clearer line of sight into the forecast of future implementation plans to have a better understanding of overall costs. He shared that he believes the relatively high cost of this implementation plan assumes that future implementation plans will have lower costs.

Co-chair Eboni Brown voted “yes” to support the plan and noted that she would like the budget for the 24/7 landlord hotline to be increased so it can be fully staffed with at least two people always available. She indicated that for the risk mitigation program, she would prefer a policy in which a third party assesses unit damages so that housing providers and participants in programs are not taken advantage of and leveled with exorbitant repair costs.

Mercedes Elizalde voted “yes” to support the plan and stated that she is comfortable using RIF funding to expand the 24/7 landlord hotline to other Counties beyond Clackamas County. She also asked that Metro and the Counties be clear about which providers are responsible for landlord recruitment and which are responsible for landlord retention. In reference to the irregular reporting timeline structure on the slides, she asked that Metro and the Counties create a single, consistent way of reporting timelines to avoid confusion in the future. Finally, she asked if the approximately \$8,000,000 allocated to this implementation plan is flexible to shift around to fund the five strategies or if the funding for each strategy is fixed.

Patricia Rojas, Metro, responded that the costs presented today are estimated so Metro and the Counties will return to the TCPB with more exact amounts once the actual costs are known. She also

Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

explained that if a strategy or project costs more than initially estimated, they will return to TCPB for its approval.

Multnomah County Chair Jessica Vega Pederson voted “yes” to support the plan and posed a question about the benefits to the implementation plan for landlord and property management companies, wondering if or how the plan would treat them differently than community development corporations. She noted that she can talk with the relevant people for a response after the meeting. Finally, she indicated her support for the risk mitigation program, saying that it is necessary for landlords to have that type of security.

Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington voted “yes” to support the plan, expressing her readiness to approve funding so that “on-the-ground” work of the TCPB can start. She also asked that TCPB staff prepare “as you recall” documents of previous TCPB meetings and materials to provide context and reminders during preparation for upcoming meetings.

Co-chair Eboni Brown presented a motion to approve the implementation plan. The motion was seconded. The implementation plan was unanimously approved.

Closing and Next Steps

Co-Chairs Eboni Brown and Matt Chapman shared closing remarks and meeting reflections.

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, noted that the next meeting is Wednesday, April 10th from 4:00 to 6:00 pm.

Next steps include:

- Metro to share HMIS Strategic Sourcing Analysis Update presentation with the Metro Council and the SHS Oversight Committee.
- Metro to share crosswalk of goals and the Landlord Recruitment and Retention Implementation Plan.
- Metro to share more details about the anticipated cost of the risk mitigation program.
- Jurisdictional staff to provide previous meeting materials to TCPB members ahead of future meetings.
- Co-chairs Eboni Brown and Matt Chapman will present the implementation plan recommendations to the SHS Oversight Committee.

Adjourn

Adjourned at 6:00 p.m.



Metro



Supportive housing services

Regional annual report

July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023

oregonmetro.gov

Metro respects civil rights

Metro fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that requires that no person be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin under any program or activity for which Metro receives federal financial assistance.

Metro fully complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act that requires that no otherwise qualified individual with a disability be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination solely by reason of their disability under any program or activity for which Metro receives federal financial assistance.

If any person believes they have been discriminated against regarding the receipt of benefits or services because of race, color, national origin, sex, age or disability, they have the right to file a complaint with Metro. For information on Metro's civil rights program, or to obtain a discrimination complaint form, visit oregonmetro.gov/civilrights or call 503-797-1536.

Metro provides services or accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and people who need an interpreter at public meetings. If you need a sign language interpreter, communication aid or language assistance, call 503-797-1700 or TDD/TTY 503-797-1804 (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. weekdays) 5 business days before the meeting. All Metro meetings are wheelchair accessible. For up-to-date public transportation information, visit TriMet's website at trimet.org.

Memo

Date: March 19, 2024

To: Metro Council

From: Supportive Housing Services Regional Oversight Committee

Subject: Regional annual report for July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023

A report to the Metro Council and the community from the Supportive Housing Services Regional Oversight Committee

Greater Portland's livability is one of its primary assets, but for tens of thousands of our neighbors the region has become a challenging place to call home. Many individuals and families across greater Portland struggle each day to maintain stable housing in the face of insurmountable housing costs and insufficient housing supply. For households already facing housing instability, personal challenges like a health crisis, job loss or substance use disorder can swiftly lead to homelessness. Stagnant wages and the rising cost of living have exacerbated the problem, putting many of the region's renters at risk of losing their housing.

In May 2020, voters in greater Portland took a historic step to address this crisis by approving a significant new funding source to support housing access and stability for people across our region. The supportive housing services fund, or SHS, reflects voters' commitment to address a problem that has been decades in the making due to chronic under-investment in housing and other systems of care to meet community needs. It provides an unprecedented infusion of flexible resources that expands the region's capacity to meet the needs of people experiencing housing insecurity, with the goal of connecting 5,000 households experiencing prolonged homelessness with supportive housing and stabilizing 10,000 households experiencing short-term homelessness or at risk of homelessness in permanent housing.

The Supportive Housing Services Regional Oversight Committee is tasked with monitoring the implementation of the SHS fund on behalf of the region's voters. Since the SHS fund's launch in July 2021, the committee has received quarterly and annual reports from Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties, which we have reviewed for consistency with the counties' approved local implementation plans, annual work plans and SHS regional goals. We have also received quarterly and annual reports on Metro's oversight and administration of the SHS fund. We have worked to promote accountability to voters and address implementation challenges, and we have made recommendations in an effort to strengthen the SHS fund's outcomes.

Our second annual regional report for the SHS fund covers the period from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023. The report provides our formal assessment of counties' performance, challenges and outcomes in year two of the fund's implementation. Based on this assessment, along with our ongoing monitoring of performance to date, we believe that urgent action is needed to accelerate the progress of SHS implementation. We have identified specific opportunities for improvement and a comprehensive package of recommendations to strengthen the SHS fund's impact in producing visible, measurable outcomes.

KEY HIGHLIGHTS

The results from the SHS fund's first two years demonstrate the promise of this historic investment in our region's homelessness response system and also highlight the work still needed to build the infrastructure for a regional system of care where homelessness is rare, brief and non-recurring.

Progress to date

The SHS fund prioritizes solutions for people experiencing prolonged homelessness through investments in permanent supportive housing, which pairs rent subsidies with wraparound services to address each person's complex needs.

In the first two years of implementation, SHS-funded services and rent assistance supported the creation of 2,996 units of permanent supportive housing across the region. Once these units are fully leased up, they will represent 60% of the SHS fund's 10-year goal of connecting 5,000 households experiencing prolonged homelessness with permanent supportive housing.

Each of these units provides long-term rent subsidies and access to services to support housing stability. Housing retention data from year two show that this model is working: **98% of households placed in SHS-funded permanent supportive housing have remained housed 12 months later.**

Year-two outcomes

During the fund's second year, 4,851 households (10,528 people) were placed or stabilized in permanent housing with SHS funding. This includes:

- **Supportive housing:** 1,416 households (2,232 people) placed in permanent supportive housing and other service-enriched housing for people experiencing prolonged homelessness
- **Rapid rehousing:** 668 households (1,136 people) placed in permanent housing through short- and medium-term rent assistance and services
- **Homelessness prevention:** 2,767 households (7,160 people) prevented from losing their homes through rent assistance and eviction prevention services

One of the key tools supporting these housing placements is the **regional long-term rent assistance** program. A total of 1,118 households (1,857 people) were newly housed using a regional long-term rent assistance voucher in year two.

SHS funding was also used to create or sustain 930 **emergency shelter beds** in year two, providing households experiencing homelessness with interim stability and support.

Advancing racial equity

The SHS fund is guided by a commitment to lead with racial equity by increasing the availability of culturally specific services, improving outreach and access, and delivering all services in a manner that is anti-racist and culturally responsive. Counties' equity analyses show that these strategies are leading to improved access to services for communities of color disproportionately impacted by housing instability and homelessness. Across the region, 48% of people placed in supportive housing, 61% of rapid rehousing placements and 68% of people served by homelessness prevention programs in year two were people of color. Counties report that people of color are accessing SHS-funded services at higher rates than their representation in each county's homeless population. Counties plan to use the data from their equity analyses to inform targeted strategies to improve service access and outcomes for specific communities.

Populations served

The SHS fund serves two primary populations: Population A – defined as people who have experienced literal homelessness for extended periods of time, have a disability and little to no income, and Population B – defined as people who are experiencing or have a substantial risk of experiencing homelessness. In year two, 68% of people placed in supportive housing or rapid rehousing were in Population A and 32% were in Population B. Across supportive housing, rapid rehousing and homelessness prevention services, 22% of people served were in Population A and 78% were in population B.

Regional infrastructure

SHS funding has supported a historic expansion of the region's homeless service system infrastructure. Washington and Clackamas counties have significantly scaled their systems of care, building new programs and services from the ground up. All three counties have increased their internal capacity and added program staff to support SHS implementation (including a three-fold increase in program staff in Clackamas County in year two alone). Counties stepped up their work in year two to build sustainable systems to support SHS implementation. This included expanded outreach capacity, updates to coordinated entry and referral systems, and improvements to data collection and reporting infrastructure.

Provider partnerships

Nonprofit and community-based organizations are the backbone of SHS implementation. Counties are working to build a robust regional system of care through service provider partnerships, with a particular focus on engaging new partners and culturally specific organizations.

- **Regional provider network:** Counties collaborated on a second tri-county procurement, which qualified 60 additional organizations for the regional SHS supplier pool, bringing the total to 169. Counties allocated \$114 million in contracts with 77 providers to deliver SHS services in year two.
- **Culturally specific partners:** Counties partnered with 14 culturally specific providers to deliver SHS services to Black, Latine, Indigenous, immigrant and refugee community members, with contracts totaling \$22.6 million.
- **Capacity building:** To support provider capacity, counties funded technical assistance and capacity building grants, provided training and technical support, conducted studies to assess wage equity and took initial steps to address workforce challenges.

Cross-sector alignment

Homelessness is a complex issue that involves multiple systems of care. In year two, SHS funding supported new and expanded programs in partnership with other sectors, including behavioral health, healthcare, community justice and housing. Examples include a new shelter for adults with behavioral health needs, a program that pairs regional long-term rent assistance with intensive case management for people with severe and persistent mental health challenges, and housing liaisons and peer support specialists who connect people in other sectors to housing services.

Metro affordable housing bond alignment

The Metro affordable housing bond plays a critical role in addressing greater Portland's housing shortage. The opportunity to align SHS-funded services and rent assistance with bond-funded capital investments significantly expands our region's ability to develop critically needed housing for people experiencing homelessness. Counties have paired SHS funding with Metro bond-funded housing projects to create 571 units of permanent supportive housing, with more in the pipeline.

Regional coordination

The SHS fund has created an unprecedented level of regional collaboration across jurisdictional partners to address homelessness. The counties and Metro worked closely together in year two to align implementation of the regional long-term rent

assistance program, coordinate on landlord engagement, develop regionally consistent data reporting templates, and negotiate a data sharing agreement to strengthen data tracking and evaluation. In addition, the tri-county planning body, or TCPB, leads the development of strategies that leverage regionalism to strengthen SHS outcomes. In year two, the TCPB worked with Metro, the counties and other partners to develop six regional goals focused on landlord recruitment, healthcare system alignment, employee recruitment and retention, coordinated entry, training and technical assistance.

CHALLENGES

While SHS funding has had a measurable impact on the lives of thousands of community members across the region, year two continued to be marked by the challenges associated with implementing a historic transformation in our regional system of care. The rapid growth of programs and services to support SHS implementation requires a major scaling up of the region's homeless services infrastructure and provider workforce. This work is still underway, and program expansion remains constrained until this build out is complete. SHS resources offer an unprecedented level of flexibility compared with other public funding sources, but leveraging this flexibility requires a shift in how counties manage procurements, contracts and spending to create a more nimble and responsive system. Urgent work is needed to expedite the development of the infrastructure and systems that will enable the region to see the full results of the fund's potential.

Infrastructure building

SHS implementation has required a rapid expansion of the region's homeless services infrastructure in a short timeframe, and there have been growing pains. Since the SHS fund launched, counties have been working to develop new systems to support effective implementation of SHS-funded programs. This system-building work began as counties were responding to a global pandemic, and it has been further challenged by severe workforce shortages and other regional economic trends. Counties' capacity limitations along with rigid and cumbersome procurement and contracting processes have constrained the effective deployment of SHS funding. Accelerating the progress of SHS implementation will require increased focus on updating bureaucratic protocols and improving counties' capacity to administer contracts and support providers with implementation.

Workforce and capacity issues

Contracted service providers have had to quickly increase their staffing to enable them to implement SHS-funded programs. The pace of ramp up has been undermined by ongoing challenges in hiring and retaining program staff due to

regional workforce shortages affecting multiple sectors and especially impacting hiring and retention of frontline workers.

Inadequate wages and high turnover rates have further undermined workforce capacity. County contracting structures and financial procedures, which require providers to invoice for services provided and then receive reimbursement, also created challenges as some providers struggled with prolonged reimbursement delays. Without sufficient provider capacity, the counties and their partners have been unable to launch and scale up SHS programs at the pace required to meet their implementation goals. While the counties took initial steps to address these workforce and capacity issues in year two, more remains to be done.

Spending

Spending of regional SHS funding has not kept pace with available revenue, leading to voter frustration. While total SHS spending in year two was almost three times higher than in year one, challenges with ramp up and implementation capacity meant that regional spending fell below projected resources from forecasted revenue plus prior year carryover. Multnomah County's significant underspending of its year-two budget led Metro to initiate a corrective action plan. The plan, which was developed in collaboration with County leadership, lays out a strategy and timeline for the County to use the unspent funds to address priority needs. The plan was signed in August 2023, and Metro and the County are meeting monthly to monitor progress, with regular reports to the oversight committee.

Program delays

Due to the challenges with infrastructure and workforce capacity, some new SHS-funded programs took longer to launch than anticipated, and some planned service expansions were delayed. As a result, counties did not achieve their year-two goals for some programs, with particularly disappointing results for rapid rehousing programs that launched in year two. The work completed in year two to lay the foundation for these services means the counties should be expected to meet their goals and support the continued growth of these services in future years.

Data and analysis

While significant progress was made in year two to strengthen regional data collection and reporting, several complex data challenges limit the effective analysis and evaluation of the SHS fund's impact. Additional work is needed to develop effective methodologies for tracking and reporting on funding allocations by Population A and B, calculating returns to homelessness, aligning the service categories used for programmatic and financial reporting, and aligning programmatic reporting with the SHS fund's regional 10-year goals to support clearer tracking on progress. More comprehensive and consistent data are also

needed to track the impact of SHS investments in relation to overall levels of homelessness.

Growing need

While SHS investments are successfully ending and preventing homelessness for thousands of people, broader systemic forces continue to push more people out of their homes.

The counties' inflow and outflow data show that for every 10 households who exited the region's homeless services system in year two, 11 new households entered the system.

Stemming the crisis of homelessness in our region will require broader policy and systems changes to address the economic factors and systems failures that continue to force people into homelessness each year.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The oversight committee issued recommendations to Metro Council in July 2023 to strengthen SHS implementation and charged Metro staff with carrying the recommendations forward. Most of these recommendations are multi-year bodies of work. Progress has been made on many elements of the committee's original recommendations, but there is more to be done.

Exhibit A summarizes progress to date on these recommendations. Our updated recommendations to Metro Council aim to further advance this work so that the SHS fund's investments will yield visible, transformative results in communities across the region.

The committee charges Metro staff with developing a work plan and timeline for implementation of the updated recommendations by July 2024. Many of the recommendations are inter-connected, and the implementation plan will need to consider the relationships and intersections between them.

While Metro is responsible for coordinating implementation, many partners, including the counties, service providers and the tri-county planning body are engaged in carrying this work forward. To support the committee's oversight role, we ask Metro to provide quarterly reports on recommendation progress so that the committee has a broad understanding of all the work happening across the region related to these areas of work.

Regional communication and engagement

1. **Strengthen understanding: Create and implement a robust regional communication strategy for the SHS fund that effectively reaches the broader community.** The strategy should help the community understand the complexity of homelessness, the nature and goals of the SHS fund, and communicate progress, successes and challenges in a manner that is easily accessible and understandable by the general public. Metro should fund and lead the development of the regional strategy in collaboration with jurisdictions and nonprofit providers and manage the strategy's implementation.

The regional strategy should include:

- A timeline and roll out plan that reflect the urgency of the work
- Collaboration and coordination between Metro, counties and community-based partners to build on the communications work already happening at the county level, share learnings across jurisdictions and align on regional messaging
- Methods for getting the message out through a wide range of channels and mediums designed to reach diverse audiences
- A commitment to provide accurate and trustworthy regional data and information to the community
- Clear communication on progress in meeting the SHS fund's regional goals for housing placements and racial equity
- Communication support to counties and nonprofit providers in the form of technical assistance and access to the Metro communications team
- Incorporation of community engagement strategies to gather input and feedback, hear the perspectives of stakeholders and community members, and promote shared understanding

Financial and data transparency and accountability

1. **Optimize financial reporting: Strengthen strategic oversight and accountability by improving the quality, clarity and consistency of regional financial reporting.** Priority areas for Metro's work include:

- Work with counties to lead the development of tools, definitions and methodologies for measuring and reporting on spending by Populations A and B and release guidance to ensure accurate and reliable data are provided in counties' year three annual reports
- Support the development of tools and methodologies for tracking future financial obligations such as long-term rental assistance payments
- Align financial reporting categories with programmatic reporting to support analysis and oversight

- Provide clearer information to the oversight committee on allocations of SHS funding to reserves and contingencies
- Expand reporting to the oversight committee on tax collections to include collection challenges

2. Enhance data integrity: Strengthen the accuracy, reliability and consistency of program data to support regional analysis and oversight.

Priority areas for Metro’s work include:

- Provide up-front guidance and support to counties on definitions and methodologies to increase the accuracy, reliability and consistency of quarterly and annual reports
- Clearly define the SHS fund’s 10-year goals and align programmatic reporting and definitions with the goals to support clearer tracking on progress
- Strengthen regional methodologies for contextualizing SHS outcomes in relation to overall regional and county-level need; this includes calculating returns to homelessness, inflow and outflow, and methodologies for comparing SHS data with homeless population data
- Incorporate methodologies and tools into reporting templates to capture data on street outreach including contact rates, coverage, and placement in housing and services
- Provide user friendly summary information on program data and quarterly report progress to support the committee’s oversight role
- Work with the counties to develop systems and technologies for regional data collection that meet the needs of providers and counties while supporting Metro’s regional oversight responsibilities

3. Evaluate to inform improvement: Evaluate regional progress and refine strategies and goals as needed to maximize SHS outcomes.

Priorities for Metro’s work include:

- Support the collection and analysis of process and outcome metrics to inform continuous improvement in program design, strategy refinement and data-driven decision-making
- Develop a framework for assessing service quality, service delivery methods and fidelity to established standards of practice to identify areas for improvement
- Develop a framework for assessing the SHS fund’s progress in achieving its racial equity goals at a regional level

Workforce and capacity issues

1. Address providers' workforce and capacity needs: Develop a regional work plan reflective of community-identified needs with timelines that incorporate short-term and long-term strategies for addressing workforce and capacity issues. The work plan should consider the following:

- Multi-year capacity building investments
- Regional training and capacity building support for providers
- A particular focus on meeting the needs of small, emerging and culturally specific providers
- An assessment of the current guidelines for allocation and use of administrative funds to ensure that providers' expenses necessary to administer SHS programs are covered
- Regional strategies to support livable wages for direct service staff
- Additional supports for existing staff (e.g. mental health and wellbeing) to increase staff retention
- A framework for regular monitoring and evaluation

2. Provide multi-year capacity building funding: Develop and implement a regional strategy for providing multi-year capacity building investments for service providers:

- Complete Metro's feasibility assessment with the counties to determine how multi-year capacity building investments can be made
- Work collaboratively with counties to problem solve to address any administrative hurdles to developing multi-year grants
- Design a regional strategy to provide multi-year capacity building investments for service providers, with a particular focus on culturally specific, small and emerging providers
- Report back to the committee with funding requirements, expected outcomes, potential funding commitments and an implementation timeline

3. Institute livable wages: Address service provider wage/compensation equity to provide better guidance to county partners in meeting their SHS equity goals and to develop more consistency in wage standards across the region:

- Develop strategies in collaboration with jurisdictions and local and state stakeholders that take into account the distinct context and challenges of implementation in each county
- Prioritize the needs of small, emerging and culturally specific providers

- Work collaboratively with counties to problem-solve strategies to address any administrative hurdles to providing county contracts that enable service providers to pay livable wages to direct service staff

4. Streamline county administrative practices: Work collaboratively with the counties to support the development of systems for managing procurements, contracts and spending that match the urgency of the crisis.

This includes:

- Creating more nimble and responsive administrative practices that are able to leverage the SHS fund’s unprecedented flexibility
- Streamlining contract administration practices to better support provider capacity and expedite program implementation
- Promoting payment practices that provide up front funding to support program start-up costs and expedited payments during implementation, particularly for small, emerging and culturally specific providers

Program expansions

1. Expand access to health and behavioral health services: Continue work to identify and implement regional strategies that facilitate integration of health services, with a focus on behavioral health including mental health and recovery support services:

- Prioritize the needs of people of color and LGBTQ+ households in accessing health and behavioral health services
- Integrate health and behavioral health services into outreach, shelter, housing navigation, short-term housing and permanent housing, including strengthening crisis and long-term supports
- Continue to provide regional oversight and coordination to strengthen system-level integration and support county and program-level integration strategies
- Expand reporting on ongoing work to integrate health and behavioral health services in SHS programming at all levels (project-level, county-level and regional)

2. Strengthen implementation of new programs: Monitor implementation of new and expanded program areas to support accountability and effectiveness:

- Monitor program areas that did not meet regional or county-level year-two goals, particularly rapid rehousing, to assess whether they will meet their goals in year three and provide oversight and problem-solving support as needed

- Monitor cross-sector alignment and programming to assess the need for regional strategies to support integration of wraparound supports such as employment, workforce and education

Outreach

1. **Promote comprehensive outreach: Increase the visible impact of SHS investments through outreach strategies that are scaled to match the need:**

- Provide information to support the oversight committee’s monitoring of counties’ outreach work, including the scale and scope of outreach efforts, who is being reached and the outcomes
- Work collaboratively with counties to identify opportunities to expand outreach strategies as needed to support a robust regional infrastructure for reaching the unsheltered population and connecting them with services

TRANSFORMING LIVES

Behind the numbers in this report are thousands of people in our region whose lives have been transformed by the services and supports made possible through the SHS fund.

Metro and the counties have shared many moving stories of community members supported by SHS-funded services, like Kathy from Clackamas County:



When her sister passed away, Kathy was evicted from the apartment they had shared. As a senior on disability income, Kathy did not have the thousands of dollars she would need to move into a new home. At first staying in her car, Kathy moved to the sidewalk when her car was repossessed.

During this time, Kathy was in and out of the hospital, trying to control her diabetes without medication or the ability to monitor her blood sugar. A few times, she lay on the sidewalk unable to get up. “I was scared I was going to die from a diabetic coma,” she said. “I feared that more than anything being out there.”

Eventually Kathy was able to move into a motel shelter run by local nonprofit The Father’s Heart in partnership with Clackamas County. From there she was enrolled into the regional long-term rent assistance program by Northwest Family Services. Both programs are paid for by the SHS fund. Kathy now has a one-bedroom apartment close to where she grew up. “I’m in

a very much better place now,” Kathy says. “I’m very, very happy. And I love being in my own place. I feel happy to be alive.”

Stories like Kathy’s demonstrate the transformative potential of our region’s commitment to invest in services that help people exit homelessness and transition into safe, stable housing.

We are honored to have the opportunity to provide oversight for this important work and would like to thank Metro, the counties and especially the nonprofit and community-based organizations across the region working to implement SHS programs and services.

Thank you,

Supportive Housing Services Regional Oversight Committee members:

Susan Emmons (Co-chair)

Mandrill Taylor (Co-chair)

James Bane

Mitch Chilcott

Dan Fowler

Cara Hash

Jenny Lee

Eugene Lewis

Carter MacNichol

Felicita Montebianco

Jeremiah Rigsby

Peter Rosenblatt

Mike Savara

Margarita Solis Ruiz

Becky Wilkinson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Supportive housing services background	4
Housing and services	7
Populations served	12
Provider partnerships	16
Capacity building	18
Cross-sector work	21
Regional coordination	24
Progress in advancing racial equity	27
Performance assessment	30
Financial review	40
Looking ahead	46
Exhibits	50
• Exhibit A: Oversight committee 2023 recommendations progress report	50
• Exhibit B: Glossary of terms	56
• Exhibit C: Counties' year-two quarterly and annual reports	58
• Exhibit D: Additional demographic data	59
• Exhibit E: SHS regional annual financial report	61
• Exhibit F: Counties' memo on spending by Population A and B	73

INTRODUCTION

In May 2020, voters in the greater Portland region approved Measure 26-210 to create a dedicated revenue stream to address the region's homelessness crisis. The supportive housing services (SHS) fund supports a continuum of services that help people find and keep safe and stable homes. The new funding supplements existing local, state and federal resources to increase the region's capacity to meet the needs of people experiencing homelessness and housing insecurity.

SHS funds have supported an unprecedented expansion of our regional homelessness response system. Metro, the three counties and numerous nonprofit and community-based organizations are building the infrastructure for a regional system of care that will provide supportive housing for 5,000 households experiencing prolonged homelessness and stabilize 10,000 households experiencing short-term homelessness or at risk of homelessness over the next 10 years.

This report provides an assessment of the SHS fund's second year of implementation, covering the period from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023. It includes:

- A summary of SHS-funded investments in housing and services and key regional outcomes
- A summary of populations served by SHS investments
- An assessment of counties' work to build a regional system of care through partnerships and capacity building with community-based organizations
- An overview of system development work including regional and cross-sector coordination
- Analysis of counties' progress to advance the fund's racial equity goals
- An assessment of each county's performance in relation to its approved local implementation plan and year-two work plan
- A financial review of year-two budgets and expenditures

To put this assessment in context, it is important to understand the broader framework for the SHS fund's investments:

- The services funded by the SHS tax are just one component of the region's broader homeless services system. The information in this report focuses specifically on the activities and outcomes in fiscal year 2022-23 that were supported with SHS funding. SHS funding has provided a significant expansion in resources, but in fiscal year 2022-23 the counties also budgeted an additional \$187.5 million in local, state and federal funding that supported a wide range of other services and outcomes not featured in this report.

- Homelessness is a complex issue that involves multiple systems of care. While the region's homeless services system plays a critical role in identifying people experiencing homelessness and connecting them with services, addressing the underlying conditions of people's homelessness and the larger housing crisis requires cross-sector alignment between homeless services, behavioral health, housing, community justice, healthcare and other related systems.
- While SHS investments have increased our region's capacity to help people experiencing homelessness transition to stable living, broader systemic forces outside of the SHS fund's control continue to push more people out of their homes. These include high rents, insufficient housing supply, incomes that do not enable people to meet their basic needs and Oregon's failure to provide an adequate system of mental health and recovery support services. The impact of these factors is even greater for people of color due to the pervasive effects of institutional and systemic racism. Achieving an end to homelessness in our region will require broader policy changes to address these root causes.

It is also important to understand how the context of SHS implementation has changed since the measure passed:

- When the SHS measure was placed on the ballot, the COVID-19 pandemic had not yet reached Oregon. Responding to the pandemic placed a significant strain on the region's homeless services system just as the system was preparing for SHS implementation. The ongoing economic fallout from the pandemic has amplified the region's homelessness crisis while creating workforce shortages that have hampered the region's ability to staff up services to meet the need.
- At the launch of SHS implementation, the region had an estimated 7,359 households in need of permanent supportive housing. By year two, that number had grown to 7,747 despite hundreds of SHS-funded housing placements. The rise in evictions following the lifting of pandemic-era protections also dramatically expanded the number of households in need of homelessness prevention services. Along with the increased scale of the crisis, the needs of many people experiencing homelessness across the region have become more acute due in part to the growing fentanyl epidemic.
- Since the SHS measure passed, the year-over-year costs to achieve the fund's regional goals have increased. Providing long-term rent assistance to support housing stability is a core SHS strategy, but rising rents have increased the costs of these subsidies. High rates of inflation have raised the costs of delivering other SHS programs and services. Efforts to increase worker salaries to provide a living wage – a key priority for the upcoming year – will further increase costs.
- Increased state attention to the homelessness crisis has provided additional resources while also creating new layers of accountability. In January 2023, Governor Tina Kotek declared a homeless state of emergency which the Oregon legislature supported with a multi-million dollar funding measure. Each of the

metro region's counties were required to create multi-agency coordination groups tasked with developing plans to achieve state goals to prevent homelessness, increase shelter capacity and rehouse unsheltered households. The state allocated \$5.4 million to Clackamas County, \$15.4 million to Multnomah County and \$8.0 million to Washington County to support these plans. The counties have largely integrated this emergency response work into the systems established to support SHS implementation.

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES BACKGROUND

Approval of Measure 26-210 created a new tax that was projected to generate an average of \$250 million per year to fund a regional system of care governed by four jurisdictions: Metro and Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties. The tax took effect in January 2021 and will expire in 2031 unless reauthorized by voters.

In December 2020, the Metro Council adopted a supportive housing services work plan to guide implementation. The work plan defines the fund's guiding principles, racial equity goals, priority populations, service areas, accountability structures and funding allocations.

Within the framework of the regional work plan, each county's specific SHS investments and activities are guided by local implementation plans informed by community engagement and approved by Metro Council in spring 2021.

Guiding principles

SHS implementation is guided by the following regionally established principles:

- Strive toward stable housing for all
- Lead with racial equity and work toward racial justice
- Fund proven solutions
- Leverage existing capacity and resources
- Innovate: evolve systems to improve
- Demonstrate outcomes and impact with stable housing solutions
- Ensure transparent oversight and accountability
- Center people with lived experience, meet them where they are, and support their self-determination and well-being
- Embrace regionalism: with shared learning and collaboration to support systems coordination and integration
- Lift up local experience: lead with the expertise of local agencies and community organizations addressing homelessness and housing insecurity

Leading with racial equity

People of color are overrepresented in the region's homeless population due to the impact of systemic, institutional and interpersonal racism. To account for and correct these disparities, the SHS fund is guided by a commitment to lead with racial equity by especially meeting the needs of communities of color who are disproportionately impacted by housing instability and homelessness. The fund aims to increase the availability of culturally specific services across the region, improve outreach and language access, and ensure that all SHS services are

delivered in a manner that is anti-racist and culturally responsive. The fund is also designed to engage people of color in planning and oversight of SHS services through significant representation on local and regional advisory bodies.

Priority populations

The SHS fund serves two primary populations:

- Population A, defined as people with extremely low incomes and one or more disabling conditions, and who are experiencing or at imminent risk of experiencing long-term or frequent episodes of literal homelessness
- Population B, defined as people who are experiencing homelessness or have substantial risk of experiencing homelessness

As defined by the measure, 75% of SHS investments will be dedicated to meeting the housing and service needs of Population A, while 25% of the investments will be dedicated to housing and services that address the needs of Population B.

The goal of this distribution of SHS investments is to build a system of care that fully addresses the needs of people experiencing prolonged homelessness, while also investing in programs that end and prevent episodic homelessness.

Service areas

SHS tax revenue is distributed to Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties to invest in local strategies to meet the needs in their communities. The three county governments work in partnership with nonprofit service providers and community-based organizations to develop and implement services based on priorities identified in counties' local implementation plans.

Eligible uses of SHS funding include:

- Outreach and engagement to connect people experiencing homelessness with available services and address their housing barriers
- Emergency shelter and transitional housing to provide people experiencing homelessness with interim stability and connect them with pathways to stable housing
- Housing navigation, placement and rent assistance to assist people in moving from homelessness to stable housing
- Housing retention case management to support people exiting homelessness to stabilize in and retain permanent housing
- Eviction prevention, case management and rent assistance to prevent people from losing their homes
- Wraparound supports including peer support services, workforce and employment services, legal services and connections to healthcare, mental health and recovery support services

Funding can also be used for capacity building and systems development to support program implementation, as well as administrative costs within applicable limits.

SHS funding is intended to work in tandem with other systems and investments. The fund was designed to strengthen the impact of the 2018 Metro affordable housing bond and other local, state and federal housing investments by providing the supports that people experiencing or at risk of homelessness need to find and stay in housing.

Similarly, because access to mental health and recovery support services is an essential element in addressing homelessness, SHS is designed to work in close alignment with the behavioral health system to connect people experiencing homelessness with clinical services and to link people accessing clinical services with housing. SHS is also designed to work in coordination with other related systems including the criminal justice, workforce and healthcare systems.

Accountability structure

Counties' SHS investments and activities are guided by their local implementation plans and led by designated agencies – Clackamas County's Housing and Community Development Division, Multnomah County's Joint Office of Homeless Services and Washington County's Department of Housing Services – with oversight by local community advisory committees and each county's board of commissioners.

The Metro Council appointed the Supportive Housing Services Regional Oversight Committee to provide regional oversight of the fund's implementation. The committee reviews counties' quarterly and annual reports for consistency with approved local implementation plans and regional goals, monitors financial aspects of program administration, assesses performance, and reports to the Metro Council and each county's board of commissioners regarding the fund's challenges, successes and outcomes.

Funding allocations and requirements

As required by the voter-approved measure, SHS funding is allocated within the portions of Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties that are inside the Metro jurisdictional boundary in amounts proportionate to the tax revenue estimated to be collected from individuals in each county. Metro is responsible for distribution and oversight of SHS funding.

Metro's intergovernmental agreements with each county include specifications for budgets, administrative costs, use of funds, financial reporting, contingency funds, stabilization reserves and debt service. The oversight committee provides financial oversight of funding investments and expenditures.

HOUSING AND SERVICES

Regional capacity

The SHS fund prioritizes solutions for people experiencing prolonged homelessness (generally defined as 12 or more months of literal homelessness over three years) through investments in permanent supportive housing, which combines long-term rent subsidies with ongoing supportive services to help people achieve housing stability.

In the first two years of implementation, SHS-funded services and rent assistance supported the creation of 2,996 units of permanent supportive housing across the region. Once these units are fully leased up, they will represent 60% of the SHS fund's regional 10-year goal of connecting 5,000 households experiencing prolonged homelessness to permanent supportive housing.

Permanent supportive housing created	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
SHS-funded PSH units added since July 1, 2021	518	1,114	1,364	2,996

Based on counties' calculations of estimated need, these units will be able to house 39% of the region's households currently in need of permanent supportive housing.

Permanent supportive housing needed	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Households in need of PSH in 2023	793	4,582	2,372	7,747

This increase in regional capacity represents an ongoing commitment to invest in rent subsidies and supportive services for the 2,996 units into the future. These critical housing resources would not exist without SHS funding, and they expand the region's capacity to transition people out of homelessness and support their long-term housing stability.

Housing placement

SHS-funded programs connect people experiencing homelessness with permanent housing through services that are tailored to meet each person's specific situation and needs and typically include:

- Assessment of housing barriers, needs and preferences
- Support and flexible funds to address immediate housing barriers
- Housing search assistance including landlord outreach and engagement
- Assistance with preparing applications for housing, filing appeals and advocating with landlords
- Support with application fees, security deposits and other move-in costs

- Rent assistance or placement in subsidized affordable units
- Case management and connections to wraparound services as needed to support housing stability and retention
- Partnerships and linkages with healthcare, mental health and recovery support services to meet each participant’s needs

Supportive housing

In year two, SHS-funded programs placed 1,416 households (2,232 people) in supportive housing, which includes permanent supportive housing and other service-enriched housing for Population A.

Supportive housing	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Households placed in supportive housing in year two	393	387	636	1,416
People placed in supportive housing in year two	619	624	989	2,232

Regional long-term rent assistance

A key strategy in the counties’ supportive housing placements is the SHS-funded regional long-term rent assistance program (RLRA), which provides rent subsidies for many of the counties’ SHS-funded permanent supportive housing units. Participants pay 28.5% of their income toward the rent and the remaining amount is covered by the program. The program provides tenant-based vouchers that participants can use to rent housing in the open market as well as project-based subsidies that attach the rental voucher to a specific unit. Participants are provided with ongoing case management and supportive services to help them achieve housing stability.

In year two, 1,202 RLRA vouchers were issued and 1,118 households (1,857 people) newly leased up using an RLRA voucher. A total of 1,722 households (2,702 people) were in stable housing using an RLRA voucher, which includes people housed in year one who remained in their homes.

RLRA (a subset of supportive housing)	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
RLRA vouchers issued in year two	385	265	552	1,202
Households newly leased up using RLRA in year two*	296	216	606	1,118
Total households in housing using RLRA in year two	412	404	906	1,722

*RLRA placements are a subset of the supportive housing placements.

Rapid rehousing

SHS funding also supports rapid rehousing, which provides short- and medium-term rent assistance (typically up to two years) combined with housing navigation and retention supports to help people who have recently become homeless to find and maintain stable housing. In year two, 668 households (1,136 people) were placed in SHS-funded rapid rehousing or other short-term rent assistance programs.

Rapid rehousing	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Households placed in rapid rehousing in year two	19	419	230	668
People placed in rapid rehousing in year two	46	694	396	1,136

Delays in ramping up counties' SHS-funded rapid rehousing programs due to infrastructure and capacity challenges resulted in lower placement rates than planned. The pace and scale of rapid rehousing placements is expected to increase significantly in year three.

Housing retention

Housing retention rates measure the percentage of people who remain housed 12 months after receiving assistance. More than 98% of people placed in SHS-funded permanent supportive housing remained housed 12 months after move-in. This outcome demonstrates that SHS investments in long-term rent assistance and ongoing supportive services are working to end people's homelessness and keep them stably housed.

12-month retention rate	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional range
Permanent supportive housing	98%	99%	98%	98-99%

Retention rates for rapid rehousing were somewhat lower, but still in line with the regional goal of 85%. Given that rapid rehousing is a less intensive and more time-limited intervention, a lower retention rate is to be expected.

12-month retention rate	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional range
Rapid rehousing	96%	84%	n/a*	84-96%

**Washington County's rapid rehousing program was launched in year two and therefore did not have any households that had been in housing for at least 12 months.*

Another metric for tracking housing stability is returns to homelessness, which measures the percentage of households exiting the homeless services system to a permanent housing destination who returned to the homeless services system within 24 months of exit. Preliminary data on rates of returns to homelessness for SHS-funded housing programs range from 3% to 11%.

Returns to homelessness	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional range
% of exits to permanent housing that returned to homeless service system	3%	10%	11%	3-11%

These data are preliminary because no households had completed the full 24-month lookback period by the end of year two. Additional work is also needed to ensure consistent methodologies across the counties for calculating this metric.

Homelessness prevention

In addition to supporting housing placements for people experiencing homelessness, counties used SHS funds to prevent thousands of additional households from losing their homes. Prevention services help people at risk of homelessness stay housed through short-term rent assistance, legal supports and connections to other resources. Homelessness prevention is a critical investment because it is much more difficult and expensive to rehouse people once they have lost their homes than to support them to remain in their housing.

In year two, SHS funding supported homelessness prevention services that helped to keep 2,767 households (7,160 people) in their homes.

Homelessness prevention	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Households supported with prevention services in year two	286	2,067	414	2,767
People supported with prevention services in year two	643	5,380	1,137	7,160

Emergency housing

SHS funding supports a range of emergency housing options to provide households experiencing homelessness with interim stability and support. In year two, counties used SHS funds to create and sustain a mix of emergency housing models including congregate, facility-based and alternative shelters such as motels, villages and pods. These shelters serve adults, families and youth, with some shelters focused on specific populations such as domestic violence survivors, adults with behavioral health needs, veterans and medically fragile individuals.

In year two, SHS funds created or sustained a total of 930 emergency housing beds/units. This includes new capacity that has been added as well as existing capacity that has been turned into permanent capacity with SHS funding.

Emergency housing	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Beds created or sustained with SHS funds in year two	140	460	330	930

These figures count each unit of non-congregate shelter, such as motel-based shelters or pods, as one bed even though the unit may serve multiple people.

Street outreach

The counties have built comprehensive outreach programs to connect people on the streets with SHS-funded shelter and housing services. In Clackamas County, six organizations conduct daily outreach across the county through a combination of methods. Multnomah County funds 107 outreach workers across multiple organizations, ensuring that outreach is conducted seven days a week by several providers, each with different areas of expertise. Washington County's outreach program includes nine teams of outreach workers that conduct coordinated countywide outreach in geographically assigned and population-specific teams.

Outreach workers visit encampments, address immediate survival needs, work to build trusting relationships with the people they engage, conduct coordinated entry assessments and facilitate referrals to housing and services. The counties' outreach teams include culturally specific providers, mental health and substance use disorder specialists, and organizations with other specialized areas of expertise to connect people with services that meet their specific needs. Counties also fund in-reach and mobile screenings to engage people in shelters and service sites with housing-focused services. All three counties are working with the evidence-based Built for Zero initiative to develop by-name lists to track the people they engage and support their connections to housing and services.

POPULATIONS SERVED

Populations A and B

The SHS fund serves two primary populations: Population A – defined as people who have experienced or are at imminent risk of experiencing long-term or frequent episodes of literal homelessness, have at least one disability and little to no income, and Population B – defined as people who are experiencing homelessness or have substantial risk of experiencing homelessness.

People served in supportive housing and rapid rehousing

In year two, 68% of the people who were placed in SHS-funded supportive housing and rapid rehousing were in SHS Population A and 32% were in Population B.

Supportive housing and rapid rehousing	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Percentage of people in Population A	85%	67%	61%	68%
Percentage of people in Population B	15%	33%	39%	32%

People served in supportive housing, rapid rehousing and preventions

Of the total people placed in supportive housing and rapid rehousing housing or served by homelessness prevention programs, 22% were in Population A and 78% were in Population B.

Supportive housing, rapid rehousing and preventions	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Percentage of people in Population A	43%	14%	33%	22%
Percentage of people in Population B	57%	86%	67%	78%

Race and ethnicity

The SHS fund is guided by a commitment to lead with racial equity by especially meeting the needs of communities of color who are disproportionately impacted by housing instability and homelessness. A key SHS regional goal is to provide access to services and housing for people of color at greater rates than people of color experiencing homelessness. All SHS-funded programs are required to collect and report on disaggregated race and ethnicity data to allow counties to track whether this goal is being met.

This section provides race and ethnicity data for participants in SHS-funded supportive housing, rapid rehousing and homelessness prevention programs. Counties’ racial equity analyses indicate that, on the whole, populations of color are accessing SHS-funded services at higher rates than their representation in each county’s homeless population. This conclusion is based on detailed comparisons of the demographics of SHS program participants and the overall homeless population of each county, drawing on multiple data sources including coordinated entry, point in time counts and census data.

More detailed information on each county’s analysis and conclusions is available in the Progress in Advancing Racial Equity section, with additional details and comparison data available in the counties’ annual reports (see Exhibit C).

Supportive housing placements

Across the region, 48% of people placed in supportive housing in year two were people of color. The percentage varied by county, with 35% in Clackamas County, 70% in Multnomah County and 41% in Washington County.

Supportive housing placements*	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	7%	20%	8%	11%
Asian or Asian American	<1%	2%	2%	2%
Black, African American or African	12%	36%	10%	19%
Hispanic or Latine	16%	23%	29%	24%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1%	5%	3%	3%
Non-Hispanic White	64%	28%	57%	51%
Race/ethnicity unreported	1%	2%	5%	3%

* The tables in this section use “alone or in combination” categories. This means people may identify as many races and ethnicities as they choose, and they are counted once in each category. Percentages are based on the number of people who identified each race and ethnicity out of the total number of people for whom race/ethnicity data were reported.

Rapid rehousing placements

Regionally, 61% of people placed in rapid rehousing in year two were people of color. In Clackamas County, the percentage was 50%, in Multnomah County it was 63% and in Washington County it was 57%.

Rapid rehousing placements	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	4%	14%	7%	12%
Asian or Asian American	0%	3%	2%	2%
Black, African American or African	11%	31%	13%	25%
Hispanic or Latine	43%	21%	46%	31%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0%	7%	5%	6%
Non-Hispanic White	43%	34%	39%	37%
Race/ethnicity unreported	7%	3%	5%	4%

Homelessness prevention

Across the region, 68% of people served by homelessness prevention services in year two were people of color. In Clackamas County, the percentage was 25%, in Multnomah County the percentage was 76% and in Washington County the percentage was 54%.

Homelessness prevention	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	5%	2%	3%	2%
Asian or Asian American	1%	13%	3%	12%
Black, African American or African	10%	50%	23%	47%
Hispanic or Latine	15%	10%	34%	15%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2%	6%	4%	6%
Non-Hispanic White	74%	16%	40%	27%
Race/ethnicity unreported	2%	8%	6%	7%

Length of time homeless

People served in SHS-funded programs in year two had been homeless for an average of more than three years across the three counties. The average length of time homeless was almost twice as high in Multnomah County as the other two counties.

Length of time homeless	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional range
Average years of homelessness for people served in SHS programs	3.53	6.72	3.47	3.47-6.72

PROVIDER PARTNERSHIPS

The successful implementation of SHS programs relies on the on-the-ground work of nonprofit and community-based service providers across the region. Counties have focused significant time and resources to build a strong regional network of SHS providers, with a particular focus on engaging new partners and culturally specific organizations.

Procurement strategies

Since the launch of SHS funding, counties have implemented procurement strategies designed to expand partnership opportunities to a diverse range of providers, including two tri-county Requests for Programmatic Qualifications (RFPQs) in 2022 and 2023. The RFPQs incorporated application questions and evaluation criteria that emphasized racial equity and the delivery of culturally responsive and culturally specific services. To support the participation of smaller and emerging organizations, one-on-one technical assistance was available to assist applicants with navigating the process and writing their proposals.

The 2023 RFPQ qualified 60 additional community-based organizations for the tri-county SHS provider pool, increasing the total pool to 169 organizations. Many of the organizations in the pool have never held a government contract before.

Counties also updated and strengthened their internal procurement and allocation processes to expand contracting opportunities for new and emerging providers, with a particular emphasis on culturally specific providers.

Service provider contracts

Counties partnered with 77 nonprofit and community-based organizations to deliver SHS services in year two with contracts totaling \$114.1 million.

All providers	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Number of service providers contracted to deliver SHS services in year two	17	50	23	77*
Total value of contracts with service providers	\$12.3 million	\$64.2 million	\$37.7 million	\$114.1 million

**Eleven providers contracted with more than one county. The regional totals reflect the unduplicated number of providers.*

The contracted providers include small and emerging organizations that are new to the counties' networks as well as established providers that have leveraged SHS resources to scale up existing programs, expand into other service areas or serve other parts of the region. Eleven providers have contracts with multiple counties while 66 providers are focused on a single county.

Culturally specific provider contracts

All three counties expanded their partnerships with culturally specific providers in year two, partnering with 14 culturally specific organizations to deliver SHS-funded services, with contracts totaling \$22.6 million. (Culturally specific provider contracts are a subset of the contracts with all service providers in the previous section.)

Clackamas and Washington counties each added three new culturally specific providers to their networks in year two and Multnomah County added four. Clackamas and Washington counties' homeless service systems had contracts with only one culturally specific provider prior to SHS, making the expansion of culturally specific partnerships particularly notable.

Culturally specific providers	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Number of culturally specific providers contracted to deliver services in year two	5	7	7	14*
Total value of contracts with culturally specific providers	\$2.7 million	\$9.3 million	\$10.6 million	\$22.6 million

**Four providers contracted with more than one county. The regional totals reflect the unduplicated number of providers.*

Each county's culturally specific provider contracts include organizations that specialize in delivering services to the following communities:

- Black
- Latine
- Native American/Indigenous
- Immigrant and refugee

Culturally specific providers deliver a wide range of SHS-funded services:

- Clackamas County's culturally specific partners provide housing navigation, housing placement, case management and outreach services.
- Washington County's culturally specific providers deliver housing case management, rapid rehousing, housing liaison, shelter, outreach, recuperative care and permanent supportive housing services.
- Multnomah County's culturally specific partners provide permanent supportive housing, short-term housing assistance, other supportive services, system support and development, shelter and outreach.

In addition to contracts with seven culturally specific organizations, Multnomah County also contracted with five mainstream organizations that have culturally specific programming.

CAPACITY BUILDING

SHS implementation has required a historic expansion of the region's homeless service system infrastructure. Counties have had to strengthen their internal capacity to administer contracts and payments, manage data reporting and oversight and support providers with implementation. Contracted providers have also had to quickly scale up their staffing and administrative capacity to enable them to implement SHS-funded programs. The pace of ramp up necessary to support SHS implementation has been hindered by these capacity building challenges.

Regional infrastructure

A primary focus for counties in year two was the continued work to build sustainable systems to support SHS implementation. This included increased staffing capacity, updated coordinated entry and outreach systems, and improvements to data collection and reporting infrastructure.

- **Staffing:** All three counties increased their staffing capacity to support the administration of SHS contracts and programs. The increase was most dramatic in Clackamas County, which tripled its housing services staff from 13 to 42 members in year two. Other counties increased staffing capacity in specific areas of work.
- **Coordinated entry:** To strengthen equitable access to SHS-funded services, the counties continued to evaluate and modify their coordinated entry systems. Clackamas County streamlined and simplified the assessment process and increased staffing capacity to clear a backlog of calls and create a more responsive call system. Multnomah County worked with stakeholders to refine the county's coordinated access process and create a tool to pull a monthly by-name list of chronically homeless adults. Washington County evaluated its recently restructured assessment process to ensure it is supporting equitable access. The counties also worked with the tri-county planning body to explore opportunities to align coordinated entry at a regional level.
- **Outreach:** Counties continued to expand their outreach and mobile screening capacity to facilitate connections with services. Clackamas County launched the county's first coordinated outreach system, which connects people to services through a combination of site-based, in-reach, pop-up and mobile methods. In Multnomah County, SHS funding supported an increase in street outreach capacity and funded new mobile outreach, intake and screening services for people with developmental disabilities and for aging, disability and veterans services. Washington County expanded its outreach program to include additional providers and launched a Locally Coordinated Command Center strategy that focuses coordinated interventions on specific sites using a by-name list to connect unsheltered individuals to services as quickly as possible.

- **Data and evaluation:** Counties also strengthened their internal capacity to collect, analyze and report on data from SHS-funded programs. For example, Multnomah County developed a strategic plan for improving data quality and modernizing its data infrastructure and is working to implement new performance indicators and a new data dashboard. The three counties' data teams have been meeting monthly to operationalize regional metrics, problem-solve and share best practices. All three counties also participate in the national Built for Zero initiative which works with communities to measurably end homelessness by strengthening data-driven systems.

Provider capacity building

The counties increased their capacity building supports to providers in year two, funding technical assistance, training and capacity building grants. For example:

- Clackamas County entered into contracts with two new grassroots providers in year two, providing an influx of funding, dedicated capacity building funds and connections to technical assistance to support their expansion. The County also contracted with four organizations to deliver technical assistance to smaller providers to support internal systems capacity in year three. The County plans to conduct in-depth analyses of providers' use of SHS funding and their financial record-keeping in year three, coupled with the provision of technical assistance.
- Multnomah County allocated \$713,000 in technical assistance funding to 19 providers to support increased staffing and administrative capacity and improve equity training. In addition, nine service providers received capacity building allocations totaling \$1.7 million which they used to strengthen organizational stability and effectiveness. The County also expanded training for frontline staff, offered 12 new training sessions for service providers, and supported service providers' data reporting through increased data quality review, communication and one-on-one support.
- Washington County launched a phased grant offering contracted providers up to \$200,000 in one-time funding to provide technical assistance and organizational assessment, with 19 organizations participating in the first year. A new systemwide training program provided 2,515 hours of training to frontline staff. The County also conducted provider performance evaluations to identify strategies for improving data quality and reporting. Planned improvements for year three include the addition of quality assurance staff for each provider.

Workforce and wage equity

Workforce challenges have imposed significant constraints on provider capacity. Contracted providers have struggled to recruit and retain the staff necessary to launch new SHS-funded programs and expand existing services. Without sufficient

staffing capacity, the counties and their partners cannot scale operations to meet their SHS goals. Staff recruiting and retention challenges are rooted in regional workforce shortages affecting multiple sectors, but they are exacerbated by inadequate wages and staff burnout from the emotional toll of the work.

Counties took initial steps to address workforce challenges in year two, with recognition that additional steps will be needed. All three counties conducted wage studies of SHS-contracted providers that gathered data on rates of pay for frontline workers and the distribution of pay for employees by agency. These studies informed initial strategies to improve wage equity. For example, Clackamas County advocated for higher rates of pay for staff when negotiating or renewing contracts. The County also funded mental health services for frontline staff in some contracts to support employee retention. Multnomah County funded a wage increase for the lowest earners and increased the cost of living adjustment in existing SHS-funded contracts. The County also allocated \$10 million for capacity building grants to support the organizational health of contracted providers in year three. Workforce issues will be a primary focus of work by Metro, the counties and the tri-county planning body in year three to enable nonprofit and community-based partners to provide livable wages for their staff.

Contracting and invoicing

Long-established countywide contracting and invoicing systems have created additional barriers to effective deployment of SHS resources. Counties' procurement and funding allocation processes are slow and cumbersome, hindering the efficient allocation of SHS resources. Some contracted providers experienced challenges implementing the counties' complex accounting and invoicing requirements, and counties struggled to add staffing capacity quickly enough to manage the growing workload associated with managing contracts and processing invoices. This resulted in delays with contract implementation and invoice payments.

Providers also experienced challenges with the counties' contracting structures and financial procedures, creating financial hardships for smaller and emerging providers. Countywide contracting regulations require providers to invoice for services provided and then receive reimbursement. Providers without sufficient financial reserves struggle to front the funding for program costs before getting reimbursed, further destabilizing their capacity. Delays in timely invoice payments exacerbated these challenges.

Counties have worked to address these issues by funding capacity building grants for providers and piloting new processes to offer contract advances to support program start-up. Metro also worked collaboratively with the counties' finance teams on the development of best practice guidelines for contracting to be released in year three. However, fully solving these challenges will require system-level changes to countywide procurement and contracting systems.

CROSS-SECTOR WORK

Homelessness is a complex issue requiring coordination among multiple systems of care. Cross-sector partnerships and service integration are key to building an effective regional homelessness response infrastructure. In year two, counties used SHS funding to implement cross-sector initiatives in partnership with behavioral health, healthcare, law enforcement, community corrections, housing and other systems. The examples highlighted in this section demonstrate the scope and breadth of this cross-sector work.

Behavioral health

- Clackamas County placed two case managers in the county's Health Centers division to assist people requiring higher levels of behavioral health support to find and remain in permanent housing, receiving over 100 referrals.
- Clackamas County funded a behavioral health case manager to partner with a Milwaukie Police Department behavioral health specialist to provide services to individuals referred for targeted outreach.
- Multnomah County expanded programs that pair 125 regional long-term rent assistance vouchers with intensive case management for people with severe and persistent mental health challenges.
- Multnomah County opened a new 33-bed shelter for adults with behavioral health needs co-located in the county's Behavioral Health Resource Center.
- Multnomah County opened a 14-bed culturally specific transitional housing program for justice-involved Black men who are having behavioral health challenges.
- Washington County's Housing Liaisons program embedded trained housing system navigators in behavioral health programs, working side by side with staff to help their participants navigate the homeless services system.
- Washington County opened the 54-unit Heartwood Commons permanent supportive housing building that includes on-site services provided by Sequoia Behavioral Health.

Healthcare

- The counties, Metro, Health Share and other health system partners worked together to plan for implementation of the Medicaid 1115 Demonstration Waiver and improve system coordination across the healthcare and housing systems to meet the needs of households in both systems of care.
- Multnomah County's Joint Office partnered with the Behavioral Health Division, Health Share and CareOregon to align Medicaid-funded services with 65 permanent supportive housing units in a Metro housing bond-funded project set to open in year three.

- Washington County implemented a medical case-conferencing program in partnership with Providence Health Services, Kaiser Permanente and Health Share that supports data sharing and care coordination for people experiencing homelessness with unmet medical needs.
- Washington County partnered with Virginia Garcia Memorial Health Center to develop the county’s first recuperative care program for patients being discharged from the hospital without stable housing for recovery.

Law enforcement/community corrections

- Clackamas County expanded the Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion program, which diverts households experiencing or at risk of homelessness from arrest and incarceration toward case management and housing placement services, in partnership with law enforcement agencies and the District Attorney’s Office.
- Multnomah County’s Joint Office partnered with the Department of Community Justice to provide access to regional long-term rent assistance for people on parole or probation who are experiencing chronic homelessness.
- Washington County’s Housing Liaison program expanded to include two liaison positions embedded in the Community Corrections Department to facilitate connections to shelter and housing for people exiting the criminal justice system.

Metro affordable housing bond

A key example of cross-sector work is the alignment between the SHS fund and the Metro affordable housing bond. The opportunity to align SHS-funded services and rent assistance with bond-funded capital investments significantly expands the region’s ability to develop permanent supportive housing for people experiencing prolonged homelessness.

Across the three counties, SHS-funded supportive services and rent assistance are being integrated with bond-funded capital investments to create a total of 571 PSH units in bond-funded projects, with more in the pipeline.

Permanent supportive housing	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
PSH units that integrate SHS funding and bond funding	231	228	112	571

Examples include:

- Fuller Road Station (Clackamas County): 25 PSH units with services provided by Clackamas Women’s Services.
- Tukwila Springs (Clackamas County): 36 PSH units for older adults and 12 PSH units for Native Americans with services provided by Native American Rehabilitation Association.

- Meridian Gardens (Multnomah County): 65 PSH units with recovery-focused services provided by Central City Concern.
- 74th and Glisan (Multnomah County): 41 PSH units with culturally specific services.
- Heartwood Commons (Washington County): 54 PSH units with services provided by Bienestar, Community Partners for Affordable Housing and Sequoia Mental Health.
- Viewfinder (Washington County): 30 PSH units with services provided by Project Homeless Connect.

REGIONAL COORDINATION

The SHS fund has created an unprecedented level of regional collaboration across jurisdictional partners to address homelessness. The counties and Metro work closely together to align SHS programs and systems. The tri-county planning body (TCPB) leads the development of strategies that leverage regionalism to increase the SHS fund's effectiveness.

Tri-county planning body

The TCPB is charged with setting regional goals, strategies and outcome metrics related to addressing homelessness in the region. Five percent of SHS funds are reserved for a regional investment fund designed to support the counties and Metro in achieving SHS alignment, coordination and outcomes at a regional level. The TCPB guides the fund's investments and supports coordination on solutions to regional challenges.

In year two, the TCPB developed six goals and recommendations designed to strengthen SHS implementation through regional solutions:

- **Coordinated entry:** Assess opportunities for regional coordination to make coordinated entry more accessible, equitable and efficient for staff and clients
- **Landlord recruitment:** Identify areas where regionalization can increase the availability of accessible and appropriate housing units for service providers
- **Healthcare system alignment:** Promote greater alignment and long-term partnerships with healthcare systems that meaningfully benefit people experiencing homelessness and the systems that serve them
- **Training:** Support regional training that provides service providers with access to the knowledge and skills required to operate at a high level of program functionality, prioritizing the needs of culturally specific providers
- **Technical assistance:** Support regional technical assistance and capacity building investments to ensure organizations have the support required to operate at a high level of functionality, prioritizing culturally specific providers
- **Employee recruitment and retention:** Establish regional standards for county contracts with SHS-funded agencies and providers to achieve livable wages for direct service staff

The TCPB is working with Metro, the counties and other partners to move forward work on each of these goals in coordination with the SHS oversight committee.

Regional long-term rent assistance

A workgroup with representatives from the counties and Metro has been meeting monthly since 2021 to develop regional policies and guidelines for the SHS-funded regional long-term rent assistance program. A regional data team also meets

regularly to develop coordinated data collection and reporting tools and methodologies for the program. The regional workgroup reviews and analyzes tri-county data reports on a quarterly basis to monitor progress, identify areas for improvement and ensure the program is achieving its goals. The workgroup also engages in shared learning and problem solving, the development of shared procedures and templates, and identifies updates to the regional policy framework to support effective implementation.

Landlord engagement

To strengthen landlord participation in the regional long-term rent assistance program, the three counties worked together to launch the RLRA Risk Mitigation Program, which provides financial protection to landlords renting to RLRA voucher holders. The program is guided by regional policies and administered at a regional level through a partnership with the Housing Development Center.

The three counties and Metro also began meeting monthly in year two to coordinate landlord outreach and education efforts, plan regional landlord trainings, share landlord engagement tools and identify innovative strategies for expanding unit availability across the region.

Regional service provider network

The three counties collaborated on a second tri-county Request for Programmatic Qualifications to further expand the regional SHS service provider network in year two. The development of a single, coordinated process for providers to qualify to deliver homeless services throughout the tri-county area reduces barriers to government contracting, particularly for smaller and emerging organizations, while supporting consistency in program standards and guidelines. The second RFPQ added an additional 60 providers to the pool, resulting in a total pool of 169 qualified providers with diverse expertise and geographic representation.

Regional data systems and standards

The counties and Metro have worked together since 2021 to develop regional data definitions and standards to support consistent SHS data collection and reporting practices. In year two this work focused on developing consistent methodologies to operationalize key SHS regional annual metrics. Metro and the counties also worked on a data sharing agreement to track progress toward measurable goals and support research, planning and program evaluation.

In January 2023, the counties conducted the first-ever regional Point in Time Count of homelessness. This tri-county coordinated effort included creating a shared methodology and analysis, a centralized command structure, and unified logistics around the recruitment and deployment of volunteers. The coordinated count supports regional deduplication of data and analysis of regional trends in unsheltered and sheltered homelessness.

The three counties also worked together to move toward regional implementation of the Homeless Management Information System, which will enable the counties to collaborate on sharing data. The new system will share some participant information with all system users throughout the region, which will expedite finding client information, streamline data entry and reduce the creation of duplicate client records.

Medicaid 1115 waiver coordination

The three counties engaged with Metro, Health Share and other partners to plan for the implementation of the forthcoming Medicaid 1115 Demonstration Waiver, which will allow certain housing services to be covered by Medicaid. Several work groups have grown out of these regional collaboration meetings focused on broader coordination across the healthcare and housing systems.

PROGRESS IN ADVANCING RACIAL EQUITY

In the greater Portland region and nationally, people of color are far more likely than their white counterparts to experience homelessness due to the cumulative impacts of systemic and institutional racism. Recognizing that to effectively reduce homelessness we must account for and correct these disparities, the SHS fund is guided by a commitment to serve people of color at higher rates than people of color are experiencing homelessness and to show equal or better outcomes for people of color.

Strategies to advance racial equity

Counties' local implementation plans and annual work plans include detailed goals and strategies for achieving equitable service delivery and housing outcomes. Progress on these goals is tracked through SHS regional outcome metrics and counties' annual work plan progress reports. In year two, counties advanced their racial equity goals through strategies that included:

- **Expanding culturally specific services:** A core strategy for connecting people of color to SHS-funded services is by expanding the availability of culturally specific services. All three counties increased their partnerships with culturally specific organizations in year two, adding contracts with additional providers and increasing their total contract allocations to \$22.6 million. Counties also provided technical assistance and capacity building support to assist culturally specific partners to expand their work.
- **Improving equitable access to services:** Counties continued to evaluate and modify their coordinated entry systems to improve access to services for people of color. For example, Clackamas County modified its coordinated entry assessments to address inherent biases and be inclusive of more diverse experiences, and it increased its bilingual assessment capacity. Multnomah County continued work to redesign its assessment tool to increase equitable access through a multi-year process with extensive community engagement. Washington County evaluated its recently redesigned assessment process to ensure it is facilitating equitable access to services.
- **Ensuring service provider staff diversity:** Counties assessed the demographic diversity of frontline staff in contracted provider organizations to ensure services are being delivered by people who reflect the communities they serve. The surveys showed high rates of diversity among staff. In Clackamas County, 50% of service provider staff identify as people of color and 55% have lived experience with homelessness or housing instability. In Multnomah County, 63% of service provider staff identify as people of color and 12% have lived experience with homelessness or housing instability. In Washington County, 48% of service provider staff identify as people of color and 45% have lived experience with homelessness or housing instability.

- **Ensuring services are culturally responsive:** Counties provided training and technical support to contracted providers to ensure that all SHS-funded services are delivered in a manner that is culturally responsive and anti-racist. For example, Multnomah County required all contracted SHS providers to complete an equity assessment and an equity work plan. Clackamas County’s program coordinators supported providers in developing program policies that are anti-racist and gender affirming. Washington County developed a training program for providers that includes trainings in anti-racist practices in program design and implementation, and trainings on culturally responsive service provision for all partner organization staff.
- **Engaging diverse community input:** Implementation of each county’s SHS work is overseen by community advisory bodies with strong representation from communities of color and people with lived experience of homelessness. Multnomah County reorganized its advisory structure in year two, developing five advisory bodies including an Equity Advisory Committee and a Lived Experience Committee. Clackamas and Washington counties laid the groundwork to launch updated advisory bodies in year three, both of which will include lived experience advisory groups. Counties also gathered targeted input from people of color and people with lived experience to inform specific program design and planning decisions.
- **Analyzing disaggregated data:** Counties continued to work with providers to strengthen the collection of demographic data for SHS participants. In year two, SHS quarterly and annual reports included disaggregated race and ethnicity data by program type and for Populations A and B. In addition, counties conducted equity analyses comparing SHS program data with population and system-level data to assess progress in meeting racial equity goals.

Equity analyses

Findings from counties’ year-two equity analyses indicate that SHS programs are leading to improved access to services for populations of color. The equity analyses compare the demographics of SHS-funded program participants with homeless population data from coordinated entry or point in time counts and with census data on each county’s population in poverty. Based on these analyses, counties report that populations of color are accessing services at higher rates than their representation in each county’s homeless population, though specific populations continue to experience disparities in some counties.

The findings and conclusions vary by county and population. For example:

- Clackamas County’s analysis shows that Black, Native American/Indigenous and Latine individuals are overrepresented in SHS-funded permanent supportive housing placements and are accessing services at greater rates than they are experiencing homelessness when compared to the county’s coordinated entry data. However, these populations continue to experience

homelessness and seek services through coordinated entry at higher rates than expected based on census data.

- In Multnomah County, while people of color represent larger shares of the participants who received SHS-funded services for Population A, and persons identifying as Black, Asian or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander represent larger shares of SHS-funded Population B clients, Native American/Indigenous populations were underserved in rapid rehousing placements and homelessness prevention for Population B.
- Washington County's analysis found that SHS programs are generally serving higher rates of Black, Native American/Indigenous and Latine households than are represented in the population in poverty and among households seeking services, but Asian and Pacific Islander populations are under-represented in the population seeking services through coordinated entry compared with their representation in the population in poverty.


Counties plan to use the data from their equity analyses to inform targeted strategies to increase service access for specific communities. Counties will also need to monitor SHS outcomes over time to ensure SHS programs are leading to housing placement and retention rates for participants of color that are equal to or better than housing retention rates for white participants.

Broader systemic disparities create ongoing challenges for populations of color that may impact program outcomes despite improved access to SHS services. For example, Washington County's culturally specific SHS providers note that Black households often have more difficulty finding permanent housing due to landlord bias, discriminatory housing practices and higher rates of justice system interactions, which can create barriers to obtaining housing. These types of challenges will persist as long as deep-rooted systems of institutionalized racism go unaddressed.

PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

One of the oversight committee’s primary charges is to assess counties’ performance for alignment with the priorities and goals identified in their local implementation plans (LIPs) and annual work plans. Overall, counties’ year-two activities and investments were well-aligned with their LIP priorities for phase one, which focuses on years one through three of implementation.

Counties also made significant progress on their year-two work plan goals, exceeding the regional goals for homeless preventions and shelter beds and achieving more than 80% of the regional goals for supportive housing units and placements. Due to the challenges described earlier in the report with county infrastructure and provider workforce and capacity, new SHS-funded rapid rehousing programs took longer to launch than anticipated, resulting in only 50% of the planned placements. Counties note that the work done in year two to lay the foundation for these services will support much higher placement rates in year three.



Clackamas County

Clackamas County’s year-two activities and investments align well with its local implementation plan, achieving progress on all the county’s phase-one priorities.

Phase-one local implementation plan priorities

System-wide priorities

LIP priority	Year-two achievements
Build community-based organization capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contracted with 17 community-based organizations, with contract allocations of \$12 million. Provided two grassroots service providers with an influx of funding, dedicated capacity building funds and access to technical support.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Established contracts to provide technical assistance to smaller providers.
Expand culturally specific services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanded from one culturally specific provider before SHS to five, with contract allocations of \$2.7 million. Worked internally to implement procurement strategies to expand culturally specific services. Coordinated on a tri-county procurement that offered technical assistance to support the participation of culturally specific providers.
Evaluate system and program strategies to inform priorities and ensure quality improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conducted an evaluation of staff diversity and pay equity in SHS-contracted providers. Completed an annual equity analysis of SHS-funded programs. Identified strategies to improve performance and outcomes in year three.
Strengthen data collection and reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased the capacity of the County's data team to capture, process and analyze SHS data. Continued engagement in Built for Zero, creating the county's first by-name list. Coordinated with the other counties on regional implementation of the Homeless Management Information system and regional metrics and reporting standards.
Enhance system navigation, outreach and coordinated entry to ensure equitable access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanded the capacity of the county's coordinated entry system, clearing a backlog of 1,800 calls and beginning to answer calls live every day of the week. Launched the county's first coordinated street outreach program, reaching 579 households. Created plans to launch service-enriched resource centers in year three.
Expand County implementation capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added 29 staff in year two, for a total of 42 staff, supporting expanded capacity in program design, implementation, administration and contract management.

Housing-related priorities

LIP priority	Year-two achievements
Increase emergency shelter capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported 140 units of emergency and transitional shelter with SHS resources, serving 788 people.
Increase housing placement services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Placed 619 people in permanent supportive housing for a total of 794 people placed in permanent supportive housing since SHS funding began.
Expand existing high performing programs including eviction prevention as funding allows	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Served 643 people through eviction preventions. Committed to create 231 permanent supportive housing units by integrating SHS funding into Metro affordable housing bond-funded developments.
Convert time-limited vouchers to long-term rental assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housed 676 people using regional long-term rent assistance vouchers, including 507 people newly leased up in year two.


Supportive services-related priorities

LIP priority	Year-two achievements
Increase outreach and engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Launched the first coordinated outreach and engagement system in the county's history, reaching 579 households.
Expand wraparound services to support housing stabilization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doubled the number of organizations providing housing case management. 98% of households in supportive housing retained their housing over 12 months.
Expand behavioral health services integrated with homelessness and housing services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funded two behavioral health case managers in the county's Health Centers and a peer support specialist in the City of Milwaukie to connect people with behavioral health needs to housing services.

Year-two work plan goals

Clackamas County met or exceeded all but one of the regional housing metric goals included in its year-two work plan and made significant progress toward goals related to racial equity, capacity building and other LIP priorities.

- Housing/program goals:** The County met or exceeded its goals for supportive housing units, permanent supportive housing placements, homelessness preventions, shelter beds and retention rates. It did not achieve its goals for rapid rehousing due to a delayed launch stemming from strained capacity both internally and within contracted providers. Program infrastructure is now in place to scale up rapid rehousing placements in year three. In addition to the regional metrics, the County set a goal of serving 700 households in outreach. Because this new program required extra time to reach full implementation, the County fell short of its goal, providing outreach to 579 households. Outreach providers are now fully staffed, and the County is committed to the continued growth of this new program in year three.



- **Racial equity goals:** The County met all of its work plan goals for racial equity, which included increasing the number of culturally specific providers from two to five, hiring program coordinators to support providers in building anti-racist and gender affirming practices, providing access to services for people of color at greater rates than people of color experiencing homelessness, and implementing the recommendations in the county’s local implementation plan to advance racial equity within the coordinated entry system. The County did not meet its objective of hiring an Equity Lead, but plans are in place to fill that position by the second quarter of year three.
- **Capacity building goals:** The County achieved three of its four goals for capacity building: It significantly expanded its housing services team, contracted with two grassroots organizations and provided them with capacity building allocations, and engaged with the Built for Zero initiative to create the county’s first by-name list. It made progress on its goal to expand inclusive decision-making with plans to complete implementation of a Lived Experience Council and expand the membership of its Housing Services Committee in year three.
- **Other goals based on LIP:** The County met its goal to strengthen alignment with the behavioral health system, funding two behavioral health case managers in the county’s Health Centers division and funding a peer support specialist in the City of Milwaukie. It also met its goal of using county general funds to expand homeless services in rural Clackamas County.

Multnomah County

Multnomah County’s year-two activities and investments align well with its local implementation plan, achieving progress on all but one of the county’s phase-one priorities.

Phase-one local implementation plan priorities

System-wide priorities

LIP priority	Year-two achievements
Build community-based organization capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contracted with 50 community-based organizations with a total allocation of \$65 million, including \$9 million to culturally specific providers. • Provided technical assistance awards to 19 contracted providers and capacity building allocations to nine providers. • Expanded training for frontline staff and launched five new training opportunities for service providers.
Ongoing evaluation to ensure quality improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required all contracted providers to complete an equity assessment and annual equity work plan. • Conducted an evaluation of staff diversity and pay equity in SHS-contracted providers. • Completed an annual equity analysis of SHS-funded programs.

Strengthen data systems, collection and reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Launched evaluations of alternative shelters and geographic equity. Supported service providers' use of HMIS through data quality review and one-on-one support. Developed a strategic plan for improving data quality and systems. Coordinated with the other counties on regional implementation of the Homeless Management Information system and regional metrics and reporting standards. Made progress on implementing new performance indicators and a new data dashboard.
Improve navigation, outreach and coordinated entry to ensure equitable access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worked with Built for Zero to create a quality by-name list of single adults experiencing chronic homelessness. Worked to improve coordinated entry to ensure equitable access through a multi-year, stakeholder-led process. Expanded mobile outreach and screening for people with intellectual disabilities and for aging, disability and veterans services. Expanded street outreach capacity to 107 outreach workers.
Expand County program implementation capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanded staffing capacity for the Joint Office's data team and communications team.

Housing-related priorities

LIP priority	Year-two achievements
Supportive housing in bond-funded projects and for specific communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased supportive housing capacity by 612 units, including vouchers and project-based apartments dedicated to specific populations. Placed 624 people in permanent supportive housing. Committed SHS funding to create 228 units of permanent supportive housing in bond-funded projects.
Regional long-term rent assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housed 496 people using regional long-term rent assistance vouchers, including 279 people newly leased up in year two. Regional long-term rent assistance capacity grew to support a total of 662 households.
Flexible short- and medium-term rental assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 694 people were placed in rapid rehousing.
Eviction prevention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5,380 people were served through eviction preventions.
Street and shelter services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 460 shelter beds were added or sustained with SHS funding. SHS funding supported an increase in mobile outreach workers to ensure that outreach is conducted seven days a week by several providers with different areas of expertise.


Supportive services-related priorities

LIP priority	Year-two achievements
Behavioral health services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinated with the Health Department to open a new 33-bed shelter for adults with behavioral health needs located in the Behavioral Health Resource Center. • Coordinated with the Health Department on a culturally specific transitional housing program for justice-involved Black men with behavioral health issues. • Expanded programs that pair 125 regional long-term rent assistance vouchers with intensive case management for people with severe and persistent mental health needs. • Worked with partners to align Medicaid-funded services with 65 permanent supportive housing units in a recovery-focused project set to open in year three. • Contracted with New Narrative to provide emergency shelter motel vouchers for people receiving behavioral health services, with capacity to serve 70 people.
Education, training, employment and benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SHS-funded programs included the Workforce Brigade Employment Program, with capacity to serve 60 people.
Housing placement and retention case management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 99% of households in supportive housing retained their housing over 12 months. • SHS-funded programs included housing placement, retention and case management services.
Legal assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SHS-funded programs included an Oregon Law Center legal services program with capacity to serve 2,000 people and a Metropolitan Public Defenders program with capacity to serve 340 people.
Childcare and other supports for families with children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This priority was not addressed in the County’s reporting on year-two achievements.

Year-two work plan goals

Multnomah County exceeded three of the regional housing metric goals included in its year-two work plan and made progress on its other housing goals. The County also made significant progress toward goals related to racial equity, capacity building and other LIP priorities.

- **Housing/program goals:** Multnomah County exceeded its goals for homeless preventions, shelter beds and permanent supportive housing retention. It did not fully meet its other goals, primarily due to the challenges with county infrastructure and provider workforce and capacity issues identified elsewhere in this report. It achieved 62% of its supportive housing unit goal, 71% of its permanent supportive housing placement goal, 60% of its rapid rehousing placement goal and was one percentage point below its rapid rehousing retention goal. To strengthen its capacity to achieve these housing and program goals, the County is engaged in ongoing work to address provider capacity issues, support workforce recruitment and retention, and improve contract management.



- Racial equity goals:** The County achieved its goals to use disaggregated race and ethnicity data to center equity in all decisions, launch the SHS Advisory Committee and ensure that people of color are overrepresented on all decision-making and advisory bodies. It achieved 80% of its goal to contract with five additional culturally specific organizations. It initiated contract negotiations to achieve its goal of increasing culturally specific emergency bed capacity by 10% but did not complete the goal during year two. Achievement of its goal to increase the number of people of color served by housing placement and retention services by 10% is pending the development of a methodology for accurately tracking and analyzing the data.
- Capacity building goals:** The County achieved its goals to launch a technical assistance program, launch five new training opportunities, create a quality by-name list of single adults experiencing long-term homelessness, and support providers to effectively collect and enter data into the Homeless Management Information System. It decided against implementing its goal to develop data hubs to assist providers with their HMIS reporting requirements, encouraging providers to instead seek support through technical assistance.
- Other goals based on LIP:** The County met its goal to conduct a community-wide wage assessment to determine opportunities for higher wages for frontline workers. It made substantial progress but did not complete its goal to analyze the geographic distribution of services in Multnomah County; the project team identified data elements and completed a racial equity lens review of the research design, and it will continue work on this project in year three.

Washington County

Washington County’s year-two activities and investments align well with its local implementation plan, achieving progress on all the county’s phase-one priorities.

Phase-one local implementation plan priorities

System-wide priorities

LIP priority	Year-two achievements
Expand culturally specific services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanded from one culturally specific provider before SHS to seven, with contract allocations of \$10.6 million. Coordinated on a tri-county procurement that offered technical assistance to support the participation of culturally specific providers. Culturally specific organizations’ staff completed 781 training hours. Conducted informational interviews with culturally specific partners to inform a Culturally Specific Cohort work plan.
Support community-based organization capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funded a network of 23 organizations with contract allocations of \$37.7 million. Launched a phased grant to provide technical assistance and organizational assessment for contracted service providers. Conducted a provider performance evaluation and report to support improvements in data quality and programming. Provided 2,515 hours of training to service providers.

Housing-related priorities

LIP priority	Year-two achievements
Winter and year-round shelter operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased shelter capacity by 230 additional beds/units, for a total of 330 beds/units created or sustained with SHS funding in year two. Converted all winter-only shelter programs to year-round operations.
Housing barrier costs and short-term rent assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Placed 396 people in rapid rehousing. Served 1,137 people through homeless preventions.
Regional long-term rent assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housed 1,530 people with regional long-term rent assistance vouchers, including 1,071 people newly leased up in year two.
System capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased supportive housing capacity to 1,364 SHS-funded units and a total capacity of 1,763 units. Increased SHS-funded shelter system capacity to 330 year-round beds/units.


Supportive services-related priorities

LIP priority	Year-two achievements
Outreach and navigation services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluated the county’s coordinated entry system to ensure equitable access to programs. • Expanded the county’s SHS-funded outreach program to increase engagement and facilitate access to services. • Embedded Housing Liaisons in other systems of care to help people in those systems access housing services.
Behavioral health services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connected behavioral health services participants with housing resources through Housing Liaisons embedded in behavioral health programs. • Opened Heartwood Commons, a 54-unit permanent supportive housing building that includes on-site services provided by Sequoia Behavioral Health.
Supportive services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 98% of households in supportive housing retained their housing over 12 months. • All households placed in supportive housing received case management services. • 112 project-based units will provide enhanced supports with on-site wraparound services.

Year-two work plan goals

Washington County met or exceeded nearly all the regional housing metric goals included in its work plan and made significant progress toward goals related to racial equity, capacity building and other LIP priorities.

- **Housing/program goals:** The County exceeded its goals for supportive housing units, permanent supportive housing placements, homelessness preventions, emergency shelter and permanent supportive housing retention. It met 58% of its goal for rapid rehousing placements because it is a new program and additional time was needed for ramp up; with program infrastructure now in place, the County expects to meet this goal in year three. Data were unavailable for rapid rehousing retention because no households had been housed through that program for more than 12 months by the end of year two.




- Racial equity goals:** The County achieved its goals to partner with more culturally specific providers, measure partner program staff diversity, re-evaluate coordinated entry and begin to measure the number of technical assistance hours provided. It made progress on its goal to strengthen a capacity building cohort for culturally specific organizations, gathering feedback to inform a work plan that will guide the relaunch of the cohort in year three. The County began the build out of a centralized training platform for providers and plans to increase training offerings in year three. Feedback on trainings was gathered from over 60 providers in year two, and work to gather and integrate feedback will be expanded in year three.
- Capacity building goals:** The County achieved its goals to add 80 year-round shelter beds and add 72 service staff to increase providers’ housing, outreach and shelter staff capacity. It achieved 70% of its goal to create 120 new project-based permanent supportive housing units, with 84 units. It plans to ramp up progress on this goal in year three by expanding its strategies to incentivize the development of project-based permanent supportive housing.
- Other goals based on LIP:** The County developed guidelines and plans for balancing geographic distribution of services and capital investments with urgency of need. It expanded shelter and outreach capacity in locations throughout the county and has plans to add access center capacity across the county. Project-based permanent supportive housing units are currently located in Aloha and Tigard with plans to expand to other parts of the county.

FINANCIAL REVIEW

Total SHS spending by the counties was 2.7 times higher in year two than in year one. However, challenges with ramp up, implementation capacity, workforce shortages and bureaucratic hurdles to procurement and contracting prevented counties from fully spending available revenue. This section provides an overview of tax collections, disbursements, county revenue and spending in year two. A more comprehensive financial report is available in the Exhibits.

Tax collections

Metro tax revenue for year two totaled \$347.3 million, exceeding the original forecast by \$122 million. The increase is due to payments for tax year 2021 that were made in fiscal year 2022-23 as well as unanticipated levels of income growth.




The September 2022-August 2023 period shown in the chart reflects the period of fiscal year 2022-23 tax revenue, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

Revenue above the original forecast will be carried over to fund one-time or limited-term programming starting in year three. Due to the timing of income taxes, with the largest payments coming in April, the counties do not have time to adjust their programming within the fiscal year to respond to the increased collections.

Tax disbursements

The counties' share of year-two tax revenue totaled \$321.1 million. In accordance with the SHS fund's distribution formula, 21.3% was disbursed to Clackamas County, 45.3% to Multnomah County and 33.3% to Washington County.




County revenue and carryover funds

Counties' revenue for year two included carryover funds from year one plus the counties' portion of fiscal year 2022-23 tax revenue and interest earnings. The combined \$150.1 million in prior year carryover and \$327.5 million in new revenue created a total of \$477.5 million in resources.

Revenue and carryover (in millions)	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Prior year carryover	\$40.9	\$61.7	\$47.4	\$150.1
SHS program revenue	\$70.2	\$141.1	\$116.2	\$327.5
Total resources	\$111.1	\$202.8	\$163.6	\$477.5

County SHS spending

SHS spending in year two by the counties totaled \$149.1 million. This was 2.7 times higher than year one spending.



The increase in spending from year one to year two was greatest in Clackamas County, but total spending in Multnomah County was significantly higher than the other counties.

Spending (in millions)	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Year one	\$3.4	\$36.4	\$16.2	\$55.9
Year two	\$18.4	\$82.6	\$48.1	\$149.1
% increase	448%	127%	198%	167%

Non-displacement of funds


Metro’s agreements with the three counties require that SHS funds do not displace existing county-provided general funds for supportive housing services. Counties’ fiscal year 2022-23 budgets submitted to Metro showed no displacement of funds.

Counties’ year-two budgets and expenditures

Clackamas County

Clackamas County’s fiscal year 2022-23 SHS budget of \$32.2 million was based on the anticipated carryover balance of revenue received in fiscal year 2021-22 and prior. The County did not budget any new revenue, based on its practice of budgeting revenue in the year following collections to ensure sufficient resources.

The County’s spend down plan projected that it would spend 78% of its annual program budget in fiscal year 2022-23; actual spending was 63%. Spending did not increase at the anticipated rates for the third and fourth quarters due to strained capacity and workforce hiring and retention challenges.




Due to the combination of carryover funds and fiscal year 2022-23 collections, Clackamas County had a total of \$111.1 million in resources by the end of year two. Clackamas County reported \$18.4 million in expenses, which left a carryover of \$92.7 million for next fiscal year. With revenue collections becoming more consistent, the County’s future budgets will be based on forecasted new revenue for the fiscal year, in addition to any anticipated prior year carryover balance.

Multnomah County

Multnomah County budgeted a total of \$90.8 million in fiscal year 2022-23 based on Metro’s forecasted SHS revenue and \$44.9 million in carryover funds from the previous year.

The County spend down plan projected that it would spend 100% of its budgeted SHS funding. Due to challenges with county infrastructure and administrative processes as well as provider workforce and capacity, the County did not reach that goal and finished the fiscal year with 65% spent.




Due to higher actual carryover and fiscal year 2022-23 collections than originally projected, Multnomah County had a total of \$202.8 million in resources by the end of the fiscal year. Multnomah County reported \$82.6 million in expenses, which left a carryover of \$120.2 million for next fiscal year, including \$5 million in reserves.

Washington County

Washington County budgeted \$50.3 million for year two, the full amount of forecasted revenue. The County’s budget did not include estimated carryover.

The County’s spend down plan projected that it would spend 75% of its budgeted SHS funding. Final spending exceeded this projection, with 97% of the budget spent, due in part to funding opportunities for capital investments in shelter expansion and capacity building funding to address the needs of community-based providers.



Due to higher actual carryover and fiscal year 2022-23 collections than originally projected, Washington County had a total of \$163.6 million in resources by the end

of year two. The County reported \$48.1 million in expenses, leaving a carryover of \$115.5 million for next fiscal year.

Multnomah County corrective action plan

The scale of Multnomah County's underspending in year two led Metro to initiate a corrective action plan following the county's quarter two financial report. The plan, which was developed in collaboration with County leadership, lays out a strategy and timeline for the County to distribute the unspent funds to address priority needs. The plan was signed in August 2023, and Metro and the oversight committee are meeting monthly with the County to monitor progress.

Workforce challenges were a major factor contributing to Multnomah County's underspending. The biggest investment in the corrective action plan is \$10 million for capacity building grants for service providers to be allocated in year three. The corrective action plan also resulted in additional year-two spending for service provider wage increases, technical assistance and near-term strategic capital investments.

Spending by population

The SHS fund serves two primary populations: Population A – defined as people who have experienced literal homelessness for extended periods of time, have a disability and little to no income, and Population B – defined as people who are experiencing or have a substantial risk of experiencing homelessness.

As defined by the SHS measure, 75% of SHS investments over the life of the program are expected to be dedicated to meeting the housing and service needs of Population A, while 25% of the investments may be dedicated to housing and services that address the needs of Population B.

Counties submitted initial data to Metro on spending by Populations A and B in follow up to their year-two annual reports (see Exhibit F). Tracking homeless services spending by population is a systemwide challenge since the Homeless Management Information System is designed to track service delivery based on people served and services delivered, not spending. This is the first year of required reporting on spending by Populations A and B, and due to issues with incomplete data and inconsistent methodologies, the data do not provide a reliable assessment of regional spending by population.

Metro's analysis of the submitted data (see Exhibit F) highlights multiple challenges including lack of alignment in reported service types, differences in levels of data availability and differences in allocation methodologies. Metro will work with counties to lead the development of tools, definitions, methodologies and guidance for measuring spending by Populations A and B to ensure reliable regional data are available in annual reports going forward.

Administrative spending

The Supportive Housing Services measure allows for up to 5% of net tax collections to cover the costs of Metro program administration and oversight. Metro’s agreements with the counties also recommend that no more than 5% of SHS program revenue is used to cover the costs of each county’s program administration. In fiscal year 2022-23, the counties’ administrative costs represented 1% of SHS program revenue.

Administrative costs	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
% of SHS program revenue	2%	1%	1%	1%

In addition to tracking the administrative cost caps and recommendations based on revenue, Metro also tracks administrative costs as a percentage of expenses. In fiscal year 2022-23, total regional administrative costs represented 5% of all SHS costs. Metro’s administrative costs represented 2% of total costs and counties’ administrative costs represented 3% of total costs.

Administrative costs	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Metro	Regional total
% of SHS program costs	7%	2%	2%	2%	5%

County administrative costs do not include the administrative costs of contracted service providers or regional long-term rent assistance. RLRA is administered by the housing authority of each county, separate from SHS, and these administrative costs are detailed below. Metro recommends that administrative costs for RLRA not exceed 10% of annual RLRA expenses, and all counties were below this recommended limit.

RLRA administrative costs	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
% of RLRA program costs	4%	5%	2%	3%

Service provider administrative costs are reported as direct costs. Moving forward, the counties will provide information on service provider administrative costs as part of their annual reports.

LOOKING AHEAD

The results from the SHS fund's first two years demonstrate the promise of this historic investment in our region's homelessness response system and also highlight the work still needed to build the infrastructure for a regional system of care where homelessness is rare, brief and non-recurring. The oversight committee has provided comprehensive recommendations for strengthening SHS implementation. Metro staff will work in collaboration with the oversight committee, county partners, service providers and the tri-county planning body to move forward the recommendations while strengthening overall oversight and monitoring of the SHS fund over the upcoming year.

Regional communication and engagement

Metro's housing department is developing a regional communications strategy that will strengthen the ability of decision makers and the public to track progress toward SHS goals. The department is expanding its communications capacity to support this work and will contract with a third-party communications expert to develop a regional communications plan. Implementation of the communications plan will launch by summer 2024 and be fully rolled out by December 2024.

Metro will continue to work closely with the counties to align messaging and support communications capacity across the region. This includes working with the counties to identify additional resources or training that Metro can provide to support their communications.

Financial and data transparency and accountability

Optimize financial reporting

Metro will continue working with the counties to improve the quality, clarity and consistency of regional financial reporting. As a first priority, Metro will work with the counties to develop a consistent methodology and release guidance for tracking spending by Populations A and B to ensure accurate and reliable data are provided in counties' year three annual reports. Metro will also work with the counties to update quarterly and annual reporting templates to better align financial reporting with program metrics and improve reporting on future financial obligations. An enhanced fiscal review will be incorporated into the oversight committee's regional financial reports with additional details on administrative costs, allocations of SHS funding to reserves and contingencies, and tax collection challenges.

Enhance data integrity

Metro will continue working with the counties to update quarterly and annual reporting templates to ensure comprehensive and consistent tracking of regional data and incorporate the oversight committee's reporting recommendations. This

includes clearly defining the SHS fund's 10-year goals and aligning programmatic reporting with the goals to support clearer tracking on progress. Metro will also work with counties to refine methodologies for tracking and reporting on outreach, returns to homelessness, inflow and outflow, and other metrics that can provide a broader context for SHS program outcomes. To support the oversight committee's role, Metro will work to provide user friendly high-level summary information on program data and regional progress.

In alignment with Metro's intergovernmental agreements with the counties, Metro will continue working with the counties to develop data sharing agreements and systems for regional data collection that meet the needs of providers and counties while supporting Metro's regional oversight responsibilities.

Evaluate to inform improvement

Metro is in the process of establishing a data and compliance team that will strengthen SHS monitoring, program evaluation and compliance related activities. A priority for this work in the upcoming year will be establishing frameworks for assessing progress in achieving the SHS fund's regional housing placement and racial equity goals.

Metro has contracted with a consulting firm to develop a compliance and monitoring framework and tools. The first phase of compliance monitoring is expected to begin in spring 2024, and Metro will consult with the counties prior to implementation.

Metro has also launched a process to develop frameworks for assessing service quality and fidelity to established standards of practice across SHS programming. As a first step, work is currently underway to establish SHS standards for permanent supportive housing, including clarifying eligible populations, establishing clear definitions, levels of care and service models.

Workforce and capacity issues

Address providers' workforce and capacity needs

Metro is building a regional capacity team charged with developing technical assistance and training programs to support the capacity of SHS service providers. The team is leading a cooperative procurement process with the counties to increase the pool of qualified providers of technical assistance and will work with counties and service providers to build out a series of regional capacity building programs. The tri-county planning body is supporting this work by developing recommendations for regional training for direct service staff, with a particular focus on the needs of culturally specific organizations.

Provide multi-year capacity building funding

Metro has been working with the counties to assess the feasibility and potential design of a multi-year capacity building funding program for service providers, with a particular focus on the needs of culturally specific, small and emerging providers. Metro will continue to collaborate with the counties to support the development of strategies for multi-year capacity building grants and will keep the oversight committee informed.

Institute livable wages

The tri-county planning body is taking the lead on developing regional standards to achieve livable wages for direct service staff. The TCPB is working with a consultant to conduct a scan of local and national service provider compensation practices, with recommendations to be released in early 2024. The TCPB's proposed strategy will be presented to the oversight committee for approval once it is complete.

Streamline county administrative practices

Metro will work collaboratively with the counties to support the development of administrative practices that are able to leverage the SHS fund's unprecedented flexibility and will report back to the oversight committee with updates.

Program expansions

Expand access to health and behavioral health services

Metro and the counties will continue working with Health Share to identify and implement strategies that facilitate integration of health services with the homeless services system. A new leadership and workgroup structure to support this work was adopted in November 2023 with a regional leadership team that includes representatives from Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties, Health Share and Metro. Metro has contracted with a consulting firm with experience in health systems integration to facilitate and structure this work.

Planning for the implementation of the forthcoming Medicaid 1115 Demonstration Waiver, which will allow certain housing services to be covered by Medicaid, is also continuing at the regional leadership meetings. Oregon Housing Authority has identified people who are at risk of eviction or homelessness as the initial priority populations to receive housing benefits from Medicaid under the waiver.

Metro will work to ensure the oversight committee receives clearer and more comprehensive reporting on these regional efforts and on the integration of health and behavioral health services into SHS programming.

Strengthen implementation of new programs

Metro will work with the oversight committee to develop a framework to support the committee's monitoring and assessment of new and expanded program areas to support accountability and effectiveness.

Outreach

Promote comprehensive outreach

Metro will work with the counties to provide the oversight committee with a more comprehensive overview of current outreach strategies and outcomes. The counties' updated annual work plan template for fiscal year 2024-25 includes outreach-related goals, which will provide a framework for improved committee oversight and monitoring of this area of work beginning in July 2024.

EXHIBIT A: OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE 2023 RECOMMENDATIONS: PROGRESS REPORT

Supportive housing services – Oversight committee recommendations

Last updated: January 2024

This document contains updates on the recommendations that the SHS oversight committee developed for the FY22 annual regional report.

These recommendations were finalized in July 2023, and given that some are process improvement recommendations where we have made progress we have shared updates below. Other recommendations involve building new systems and processes that will require additional capacity and time.

PROGRESS TO DATE	
Complete	This task has been completed, or is expected to be completed by March 2024.
In progress	This task is underway. Details are included below.
On hold	This task is on hold. An explanation for why is included below.

Category 1: Regional communication strategy			
<p>Create a robust communication strategy on the progress and nature of Metro supportive housing services that effectively reaches the broader community.</p> <p>Metro staff will lead and coordinate with jurisdictional partners and nonprofit providers to create and implement a communication strategy that helps the public understand the nature and goals of Metro supportive housing services and communicates progress, successes and challenges of the supportive housing services fund in a manner that is easily accessible and understandable by the general public. Additionally, Metro will offer communication support to jurisdictions and nonprofit providers in the form of technical assistance and access to the Metro communications team.</p> <p>Metro will contract with external communications experts to help design the campaign and allocate internal resources to implement and manage the campaign.</p> <p>A successful strategy will ensure the public understands clearly what the Metro supportive housing services team and each county are doing in layperson’s terms and that the information is shared through various mediums.</p>			
Task	Lead(s)	Timeline and deliverables	Progress to date
Create and implement a communication strategy	Metro – Housing communications	December 2024: Strategy to be fully built out	Work has begun with consultant (see below).
Contract with external communications experts to help design the campaign	Metro – Housing communications	FY24: Consultant will develop strategy	A scope of work is currently being developed with a consultant, who will begin working in February / March to develop the strategic communications strategy for the department.
Offer communication support to jurisdictions and nonprofit providers	Metro – Housing communications	Ongoing	Metro will continue working closely with the counties to align on messaging and increase the effectiveness of communications across the region, and work to further identify needs around communications, and what resources and/or training Metro may provide.

Category 2: Budgeting/financial reporting and expectations

Update reporting templates by the start of FY23-24 to clearly show quarterly and annual progress toward annual work plan goals. In coordination with jurisdiction partners, Metro will update all programmatic and financial tools, including the annual budget template, spend down plans, and quarterly and annual financial reporting, to effectively communicate the fiscal state of supportive housing services. Adjustments include the following elements:

- a. Improved communication on budget to actuals
- b. Quarterly reporting on roll-over and spend down plans to actuals
- c. Clarity on unspent funds and their intended use
- d. Clarity on future financial obligations such as long-term rental assistance payments
- e. Narrative regarding financial challenges
- f. Information about number of contracts and amount of contracted funding
- g. Semi-annual reporting of total invoiced by providers by investment area
- h. Clearly articulated financial expenditures to outcomes, including spending on Population A and Population B
- i. Updates on tax collections costs, implementation and challenges

Metro will also coordinate technical assistance for jurisdictions and partners as necessary.

Task	Lead(s)	Timeline and deliverables	Progress to date
Improved communication on budget to actuals	Metro – Housing finance	FY23: Updated county quarterly financial reports; Metro quarterly financial reports	Oversight committee receives quarterly financial report with improved communication and clarity on budget to actuals.
Quarterly reporting on roll-over and spend down plans to actuals	Metro – Housing finance	FY23: Updated county quarterly financial reports; Metro quarterly financial reports	County quarterly financial template has been updated. Oversight committee receives this information on a quarterly basis.
Clarity on unspent funds and their intended use	Metro – Housing finance	FY23: Updated county quarterly financial reports	County quarterly financial template has been updated.
Clarity on future financial obligations such as long-term rental assistance payments	Metro – PSH lead	Spring 2023: PSH estimates received from CSH	Metro is currently working with CSH to develop rental assistance estimated costs for PSH, which will be available in spring of this year.
Narrative regarding financial challenges	Metro – Housing finance	FY23: Updated county quarterly financial reports; Metro quarterly financial reports	County quarterly financial template has been updated. Oversight committee receives this information on a quarterly basis.
Information about number of contracts and amount of contracted funding	Metro – Housing finance	FY23: Updated annual reporting template	Annual reporting template has been updated. Oversight committee receives this information on an annual basis.
Semi-annual reporting of total invoiced by providers by investment area	Metro – Housing finance	FY23: Updated annual reporting template; updated quarterly reporting template	Annual reporting template has been updated. Oversight committee receives this information on an annual basis. More discussion needed on whether this is needed semi-annually.

Clearly articulated financial expenditures to outcomes, including spending on Population A and Population B	Metro – Housing finance	FY24: Updated annual reporting template	The counties provided the first Population A/B financial expenditures for FY 22-23. Given the information provided Metro will work with counties to ensure a consistent methodology for the annual reports for FY 23-24.
Updates on tax collections costs, implementation and challenges	Metro – Housing finance	FY23: Updated Metro annual financial reports	Oversight committee receives annual financial report from Metro with this information.

Category 3: Workforce issues

Develop a work plan and timelines that incorporate short-term and long-term strategies for addressing workforce issues. Though the supportive housing services regional goals and metrics include workforce related items, these represent minimum standards.

The work plan should consider the following:

- a. More robust training for providers
- b. Multi-year capacity building investments
- c. More intentional capacity support to small/emerging culturally specific providers
- d. Evaluating current allocation and use of administrative funds with the goal of ensuring that all expenses related to Metro supportive housing services administration are covered. Research will include incorporating feedback from providers and jurisdictions
- e. More capacity building support for providers
- f. Increased ability to hire and retain workers
- g. Specific data on the number of staff positions and diversity of organizations workforce, what they are doing for employee retention including preventing burnout and average pay for peers/outreach
- h. Raising awareness that these workforce problems exist for other publicly funded services as well, and those challenges must also be addressed
- i. Additional supports for existing staff (e.g. mental health and wellbeing) for retention

Metro will update the committee by July 2023 on progress toward a work plan that includes strategies for expanding resources, technical assistance, training and other supports to service providers in service of strengthening provider capacity. Workforce-related goals and metrics may also be updated as part of the tri-county planning body's recommendations.

Task	Lead(s)	Timeline and deliverables	Progress to date
Develop a work plan that incorporate short-term and long-term strategies for addressing workforce issues	Metro – Tri-county planning body	FY24: Regional training needs identified	The tri-county planning body is developing recommendations that enable the counties and Metro to coordinate and support regional training that meets the diverse needs of individual direct service staff, with sensitivity to the needs of BIPOC agencies.
	Metro – Regional capacity	February 2024: RFQu released Spring 2024: Pool of qualified providers identified	A cooperative procurement process with the Counties will launch in February to increase the pool of qualified providers of technical assistance available.
		FY25: Series of regional capacity building programs developed	This work to begin once the Regional Capacity manager is onboarded in February 2024.

Determine the feasibility and potential design of multi-year capacity building investments for service providers and report findings back to the oversight committee. The feasibility analysis should answer:

- a. Can these types of investments be made? If not, why?
- b. Could these be made available at least to culturally specific and small/emerging organizations? If not, why?

Then, create a multi-year funding program for culturally specific, small and emerging supportive housing services providers. Report back to the committee with funding requirements, expected outcomes, potential funding commitments and implementation timeline.

The above are specific strategies the oversight committee recommends being deployed within one year, with a report back from Metro staff or counties on commitments and timelines by May 2023.

Task	Lead(s)	Timeline and deliverables	Progress to date
Determine the feasibility of multi-year capacity building investments.	Counties	April 2024: Feasibility analysis provided to Metro	The counties are continuing to analyze their processes and identify if there is an opportunity for a multi-year funding program for culturally specific, small and emerging supportive housing services providers.
If feasible, create a multi-year funding program for culturally specific, small and emerging supportive housing services providers.	Counties	TBD	This work depends on the feasibility analysis above.
Report back to the committee with funding requirements, expected outcomes, potential funding commitments and implementation timeline.	Counties	TBD	This work depends on the feasibility analysis above.

Address service provider wage/compensation equity to provide better guidance to county partners in meeting their SHS equity goals and to develop more consistency in wage standards across the region. Strategies should be developed in collaboration with local and state stakeholders and prioritize culturally specific providers.

Task	Lead(s)	Timeline and deliverables	Progress to date
Develop strategies to address service provider wage/compensation equity.	Metro – Tri-county planning body	Early 2024: Draft recommendations for regional standards finalized	The tri-county planning body is currently working with Homebase, who is conducting a scan of local and national service provider compensation practices as part of their goal to ensure contracts between counties and SHS funded agencies and providers will establish standards throughout the region to achieve livable wages for direct service staff.
	Counties	Ongoing	All three counties conducted wage studies of SHS providers. The results are summarized in their annual reports. These studies supported Clackamas in advocating to their internal teams on

			higher wages for providers during their yearly contract renewal process. Multnomah County conducted a more comprehensive study of all contracted providers. The study can be found here .
--	--	--	--

Category 4: Program expansions

Identify and implement regional strategies that facilitate integration of health services, with a focus on behavioral health including mental health and substance use services, that lead to increased service access/options for people experiencing homelessness. The strategies should prioritize the needs of Black, Indigenous and other people of color (BIPOC) and LGBTQ+ households in accessing health services. The strategies that are developed should apply in outreach, shelter, housing navigation, short-term housing and permanent housing, including strengthening crisis and long-term health supports.

Task	Lead(s)	Timeline and deliverables	Progress to date
Identify regional strategies	Metro – Tri-county planning body	June 2024: Draft strategies and framework developed	Metro has been in close communication with County leadership and Health Share to identify and implement strategies that facilitate integration of health services with the homeless services system.
	Counties	June 2024: Draft strategies and framework developed	There is a regional leadership team that includes representatives from Clackamas, Multnomah, Washington, Health Share, Metro and Homebase. Sub-groups will include a data sharing/integration workgroup and multiple systems integration project teams. The Medicaid Waiver work is also part of the regional leadership meetings.
Implement regional strategies	Metro – Tri-county planning body	TBD	This work will advance once strategies are identified.
	Counties	TBD	This work will advance once strategies are identified.

Category 5: Data, reporting and evaluation

Evaluate current practices for data collection, reporting and evaluation to ensure that all reporting, evaluation and program needs are being met. Metro staff will come back to the oversight committee with any additional considerations for reporting needs from this evaluation, including the following suggestions from the committee:

- a. Numbers served, disaggregated by demographics
- b. Key performance measures for each intervention
- c. Overall regional numbers and trends
- d. Regional long-term rent assistance vouchers deployed and retention
- e. Evidence-based reporting on contributing factors
- f. Other evaluation, programmatic and compliance needs that arise

Task	Lead(s)	Timeline and deliverables	Progress to date
Evaluate current practices for data collection, reporting and evaluation	Metro – SHS team	FY23: Update annual reporting template	The annual report template has been updated. Major changes include: table of SHS programs and populations served; provider contracts table; data tables showing progress to county annual workplan goals; full regional metrics reporting, including equity metrics; and stronger focus on spending successes, challenges and next steps
		Spring FY24: County monitoring to begin	Metro is working with Homebase to establish a compliance framework to ensure ongoing monitoring, compliance and performance risk assessments. The first phase of monitoring is expected to begin Spring 2024.

Create a plan to address ongoing regional data alignment and community input needs, including developing regional data definitions, standards and methodologies. Metro staff may consider launching an ongoing regional data workgroup.

Task	Lead(s)	Timeline and deliverables	Progress to date
Develop regional data definitions, standards and methodologies	Metro – SHS team	FY25: Metro staff will work with counties to develop a plan.	Metro is building out its data and compliance team. This team will be hired and onboarded by the end of FY 24. This team will develop a plan establishing regional definitions, standards and methodologies building upon the work Metro has already done.
	Metro – Tri-county planning body	FY24: Workgroup started	The tri-county planning body is working with the regional data team to develop benchmarks for quarterly and annual report metrics.
Create a plan to address ongoing regional data alignment and community input needs	Metro – SHS team	FY24 & FY 25: Develop a plan that includes the community.	Metro and the counties are continuing to negotiate the data sharing agreement, which will advance our ability to measure program performance, efficacy, quality and integrity.

EXHIBIT B: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Administrative costs: Metro recommends no more than 5% of SHS program revenue to cover the costs of each county’s program administration. County administrative costs are those related to managing the program, not delivering services. Examples include senior management personnel, accounting, insurance, procurement, and other costs that are not attributed to a particular SHS program or program delivery.

Carryover funds: Funding remaining from one fiscal year that is “carried over” and used in a future fiscal year. One-time carryover results from higher than expected revenue or lower than expected spending. Recurring carryover results from the timing of revenue flow, such as fourth quarter tax collections.

Contingency funds: An account that is established to provide resources for emergency situations or unplanned program expenditures that, if left unattended, could negatively impact service delivery. Counties may establish contingency accounts that do not exceed 5% of budgeted program funds in a given fiscal year.

Coordinated entry: A systemwide intake and assessment process that uses standardized tools to connect people experiencing a housing crisis to services and resources that best fit their specific situation and needs.

Homelessness: An individual or family who lacks a fixed, regular and adequate nighttime residence including:

- Individuals or families who are sharing the housing of others due to loss of housing, economic hardship or a similar reason; are living in motels, hotels, trailer parks or camping grounds due to the lack of alternative adequate accommodations; are living in emergency or transitional shelters; or are abandoned in hospitals
- Individuals or families who have a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings. This includes individuals or families who are living in cars, parks, public spaces, abandoned buildings, substandard housing, bus or train stations or similar settings.

Local implementation plan (LIP): A plan developed through extensive community engagement that defines a county’s priorities and goals for supportive housing services program activities and investments.

Measure 26-210: A ballot measure approved by voters in May 2020 that creates a new regional tax to fund supportive housing services.

Metro affordable housing bond: A 2018 voter-approved bond that provides capital funding to support affordable housing development across the region.

Metro supportive housing services work plan: A plan developed by Metro with community input to guide implementation of the regional fund.

Permanent supportive housing (PSH): Permanent housing with supportive services to assist people with a disability who have experienced long-term homelessness to achieve housing stability.

Populations A and B: The SHS fund serves two primary populations: 75% of SHS investments are expected to be dedicated to services for Population A, defined as people who are extremely low income, have one or more disabling conditions, and are experiencing or at imminent risk of experiencing long-term or frequent episodes of literal homelessness; 25% of SHS investments may be dedicated to services for Population B, defined as people who are experiencing or have a substantial risk of experiencing homelessness.

Procurement: The process by which county governments secure the services needed to support SHS implementation by identifying and contracting with qualified service providers. Each county's procurement procedures are strictly regulated to ensure responsible stewardship of tax-funded resources.

Rapid rehousing: Programs that provide short and medium-term rent assistance, typically up to two years, with targeted services to help people who have recently fallen into homelessness to find and maintain stable housing.

Regional investment fund: A fund created through a five percent set-aside from each county to be used for regional supportive housing services strategies.

Regional long-term rent assistance (RLRA): A regional program that subsidizes the cost of rent so that households with very low incomes can afford housing.

Stabilization reserve: Counties are required to establish a stabilization reserve to protect ongoing services from the impact of revenue fluctuations. The target minimum reserve level is equal to 10% of budgeted program funds in a given fiscal year. Reserves must be fully funded within the first three years of implementation.

Supportive housing: Permanent supportive housing and other service-enriched housing for Population A, such as transitional recovery housing.

Supportive Housing Services Regional Oversight Committee: A community committee established to provide transparent oversight of the supportive housing services fund on behalf of the Metro Council.

Tri-County Planning Body (TCPB): A community committee established to set regional priorities and guide implementation of the regional investment fund.

EXHIBIT C: COUNTIES' QUARTERLY AND ANNUAL REPORTS

Fiscal year 2022-23 SHS quarterly reports

Quarter 1

- [Clackamas County](#)
- [Multnomah County](#)
- [Washington County](#)

Quarter 2

- [Clackamas County](#)
- [Multnomah County](#)
- [Washington County](#)

Quarter 3

- [Clackamas County](#)
- [Multnomah County](#)
- [Washington County](#)

Quarter 4

- [Clackamas County](#)
- [Multnomah County](#)
- [Washington County](#)

Fiscal year 2022-23 SHS annual reports

- [Clackamas County](#)
- [Multnomah County](#)
- [Washington County](#)

EXHIBIT D: ADDITIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Disability status

Housing placements: supportive housing

	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Persons with disabilities	55%	56%	63%	58%
Persons without disabilities	43%	41%	27%	35%
Disability unreported	2%	4%	10%	6%

Housing placements: rapid rehousing

	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Persons with disabilities	61%	51%	40%	48%
Persons without disabilities	35%	33%	57%	41%
Disability unreported	4%	17%	3%	11%

Homelessness prevention

	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Persons with disabilities	49%	7%	20%	13%
Persons without disabilities	51%	82%	80%	79%
Disability unreported	0%	11%	<1%	8%

Gender identity

Housing placements: supportive housing

	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Male	43%	44%	42%	43%
Female	55%	52%	50%	51%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	<1%	2%	1%	1%
Transgender	0%	1%	1%	1%
Questioning	0%	0%	<1%	<1%
Gender unreported	1%	2%	6%	4%

Housing placements: rapid rehousing

	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Male	46%	43%	40%	42%
Female	48%	54%	57%	55%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	0%	2%	1%	1%
Transgender	4%	<1%	1%	1%
Questioning	0%	<1%	0%	<1%
Gender unreported	2%	1%	2%	2%

Homelessness prevention

	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Regional total
Male	35%	43%	44%	43%
Female	65%	54%	56%	56%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%
Transgender	0%	<1%	<1%	<1%
Questioning	0%	0%	0%	0%
Gender unreported	0%	3%	<1%	2%


EXHIBIT E: SHS REGIONAL ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

Metro Supportive Housing Services FY22-23 Annual Financial Report July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023


Metro designed this financial report to provide the information necessary for the SHS Oversight Committee to monitor the financial aspects of the program. It includes details on tax collections and disbursements, county partner expenses, tax collection costs and administrative costs. This annual financial report provides an update to the figures provided in the FY23 Q4 report, which changed slightly due to year-end adjustments.

Year 2 annual financial overview

In FY22-23, Metro's tax revenue totaled \$347.3 million. This exceeded the FY22-23 budget by \$122.3 million. The increase is due to spill over from tax year 2021 (payments for tax year 2021 that were made in FY22-23) and widespread income growth coming out of the pandemic, which was also seen at the state and national level.




The September 2022 – August 2023 period shown in the chart reflects the period of FY23 tax revenue, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.



Revenue in excess of the forecasted amount was carried over to fund one-time or limited-term Supportive Housing Services programming starting in FY23-24. Due to the natural timing of income taxes, with large payments and tax filings primarily in April, the counties do not have time to adjust their programming within the fiscal year to respond to the increased collections. Spend down plans specific to carryover funds have been provided by the counties as part of their FY23-24 budget submission.

Spending in Year 2 was significantly higher than the prior year as the program continued to ramp up. Overall, Year 2 spending was \$152.7 million – 2.6 times higher than Year 1.



For County specific data, see the Year 1 – Year 2 Growth charts in the County Snapshots below.

Supportive Housing Services tax overview

Key takeaways

- As noted above, tax revenue in Year 2 totaled \$347.3 million.
- Tax collection costs were below budget, primarily due to unused contingency on the tax system implementation.

Tax Revenue Summary			
	Budget	YTD Actuals	% of Budget
Tax Revenue	225,000,000	347,290,142	154%
Tax Collection Costs (Details Below)	14,436,666	9,271,584	64%
Net Tax Revenue	210,563,334	338,018,558	161%
Metro Admin Allowance (5%)	10,528,167	16,900,928	161%
County Partner Revenue	200,035,167	321,117,630	161%
Multnomah County	90,682,609	145,573,326	161%
Washington County	66,678,389	107,039,210	161%
Clackamas County	42,674,169	68,505,094	161%

Tax Collection Costs			
	FY23 Budget	FY23 Actuals	% of Budget
Tax Collection Costs	14,436,666	9,271,584	64%
Implementation	3,923,280	781,504	20%
Personnel	4,879,657	4,062,020	83%
Software	3,498,257	3,497,383	100%
Other M&S	1,345,061	930,677	69%
Contingency	790,411	-	0%

Tax collections above are on an accrual accounting basis. This includes collections by the tax administrator through July 2023, received by Metro and disbursed to county partners in August 2023, since these tax payments are for income earned during the fiscal year.

County partner snapshots

The following pages summarize financial information by county, in both numerical and visual form. This provides a consistent format to compare the similar but unique programs of each county.

Note: SHS Program Revenue reported below is per the counties' financial reports. It will differ from the revenue reported above due to additional revenue, such as interest earnings, and differences in timing per each county's accounting policies.

Key takeaways


- Together, the counties spent a combined total of \$149.1 million on SHS program costs in Year 2 (July 2022 – June 2023).
- All counties had more carryover in Year 2 than in Year 1, which was expected due to the estimated 3-4 year program ramp-up period. Spend down plans specific to carryover funds were provided by the counties as part of their FY23-24 budget submission.

County Summary (in millions)				
	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Total
Prior Year Carryover	\$40.9	\$61.7	\$47.4	\$150.1
SHS Program Revenue	\$70.2	\$141.1	\$116.2	\$327.5
Total Resources	\$111.1	\$202.8	\$163.6	\$477.5
Program Costs	\$18.4	\$82.6	\$48.1	\$149.1
Total Expense	\$18.4	\$82.6	\$48.1	\$149.1
Reserves	\$0.0	\$5.0	\$0.0	\$5.0
Ending Balance (incl. Reserves)	\$92.7	\$120.2	\$115.5	\$328.4

Non-displacement of funds

Metro’s agreements with the three counties require that SHS funds do not displace existing County-provided general funds for supportive housing services. The FY22-23 budgets submitted to Metro showed no displacement of funds.

Regional SHS spending by program category



Clackamas County snapshot


Clackamas County budgeted estimated carryover as its total revenue for FY22-23. The County did not budget any new revenue, under the principle that FY22-23 revenues would fund FY23-24 program costs. This was due to a cashflow issue in Year 1, when the vast majority of tax collections happened in Q4. In FY23-24 Clackamas County budgeted both new SHS revenues and carryover.

Due to higher actual carryover and FY22-23 collections, Clackamas County had a total of \$111.1 million in resources by the end of Year 2. Clackamas County reported \$18.4 million in FY22-23 expenses, which left a carryover of \$92.7 million for next fiscal year.


Clackamas County			
	Budget	YTD Actuals	% of Budget
Prior Year Carryover	32,200,000	40,912,115	127%
SHS Program Revenue	-	70,171,378	
Total Resources	32,200,000	111,083,493	345%
Program Costs	28,980,000	18,381,615	63%
Contingency	1,610,000	-	0%
Expense & Contingency	30,590,000	18,381,615	60%
Reserves	1,610,000	-	
Ending Balance (incl. Reserves)	1,610,000	92,701,878	

Charts


The chart below compares Clackamas County's Spend Down Plan with its actual expenses. Clackamas County's Spend Down Plan projected that it would spend 78% of its annual program budget in FY22-23; actual spending was 63%. A series of new procurements was expected to result in contracts by the beginning of Q4, but staff capacity and scope changes caused a one quarter delay. In addition, service providers faced recruiting and retention challenges that resulted in underspending.




The following chart compares Year 1 spending with Year 2. Clackamas County spent over 5 times more in Year 2 as compared to Year 1.



The chart below compares expense and revenue (original forecast and actuals). Actual revenue reflects the county's calculation of fiscal year revenue and may differ from Metro's calculation due to differences in accrual accounting policies and interest earned by the county.



Clackamas County SHS spending by program category
(Year 2: July 2022 – June 2023)



Multnomah County snapshot


Multnomah County included estimated carryover in its FY22-23 budget. Due to higher actual carryover and FY22-23 collections, Multnomah County had a total of \$202.8 million in resources by the end of Year 2. Multnomah County reported \$82.6 million in FY22-23 expenses, which left a carryover of \$120.2 million for next fiscal year, including \$5 million in reserves.

Due to overall spending below the spend down plan target for the year, Metro and Multnomah County agreed to a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) with specific spending goals for FY22-23 and FY23-24. The CAP resulted in FY22-23 spending of \$3.7 million for technical assistance provider support, funding for service provider wages and near-term strategic capital investments.


Multnomah County			
	Budget	YTD Actuals	% of Budget
Prior Year Carryover	44,918,800	61,720,728	137%
SHS Program Revenue	90,803,734	141,104,550	155%
Total Resources	135,722,534	202,825,278	149%
Program Costs	127,342,534	82,576,442	65%
Contingency	8,380,000	-	0%
Expense & Contingency	135,722,534	82,576,442	61%
Reserves	-	5,000,000	
Ending Balance (incl. Reserves)	-	120,248,836	

Charts


The chart below compares Multnomah County’s Spend Down Plan with its actual expenses. Multnomah County’s Spend Down Plan projected that it would spend 100% of its annual program budget in FY22-23; actual spending was 65%.




The following chart compares Year 1 spending with Year 2. In Year 2, Multnomah County more than doubled its spending as compared to Year 1.



The chart below compares expense and revenue (original forecast and actuals). Actual revenue reflects the county’s calculation of fiscal year revenue and may differ from Metro’s calculation due to differences in accrual accounting policies and interest earned by the county.



Multnomah County SHS spending by program category
(Year 2: July 2022 – June 2023)




Washington County snapshot

Washington County did not include estimated carryover in its FY22-23 budget and program revenue was based on Metro’s original forecast, which was later revised higher. Due to higher actual carryover and FY22-23 collections, Washington County had a total of \$163.6 million in resources by the end of Year 2. Washington County reported \$48.1 million in FY22-23 expenses, leaving a carryover of \$115.5 million for next fiscal year.


Washington County			
	Budget	YTD Actuals	% of Budget
Prior Year Carryover	-	47,427,624	
SHS Program Revenue	50,328,300	116,183,687	231%
Total Resources	50,328,300	163,611,311	325%
Program Costs	49,587,320	48,137,244	97%
Contingency	740,980	-	0%
Expense & Contingency	50,328,300	48,137,244	96%
Reserves	-	-	
Ending Balance (incl. Reserves)	-	115,474,067	

Charts


The chart below compares Washington County’s Spend Down Plan with its actual expenses. Washington County’s Spend Down Plan projected that it would spend 75% of its annual program budget in FY22-23 as the program continues its ramp-up; actual spending was 97%.




The following chart compares Year 1 spending with Year 2. In Year 2, Washington County nearly tripled its spending as compared to Year 1.



The chart below compares expense and revenue (original forecast and actuals). Actual revenue reflects the county’s calculation of fiscal year revenue and may differ from Metro’s calculation due to differences in accrual accounting policies and interest earned by the county.



Washington County SHS spending by program category
(Year 2: July 2022 – June 2023)



Administration and oversight costs


Program administration

The Supportive Housing Services measure allows for up to 5% of net tax collections to cover the costs of Metro program administration and oversight. This includes the Metro SHS team, as well as supporting operations like finance, legal, communications, IT and HR.

Metro recommends no more than 5% of SHS program revenue to cover the costs of each county’s program administration. This includes:

- senior management personnel
- administrative staff travel costs
- general services such as HR, accounting, budget development, procurement, marketing, agency audit and agency insurance
- partner-wide membership fees and dues
- general facilities costs such as rent, depreciation, operation and maintenance
- equipment rental/purchase, insurance, utilities and IT costs that are not program specific
- any other costs not specifically attributed to a particular SHS program or program delivery.

In addition to tracking the administrative cost caps and recommendations based on revenue, Metro also tracks administrative costs as a percentage of expenses. This is shown in the chart below.



Key takeaways

- In FY22-23, regional administrative costs of Metro and the counties made up 5.2% of total costs:
 - County administrative costs totaled 2.9% of total costs.
 - Metro’s administrative costs totaled 2.3% of total costs.
- Administrative costs are expected to fluctuate as program operations continue to ramp up at Metro and the counties.

County Administrative Costs				
	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Total
County Administrative Costs	1,328,720	1,907,764	1,130,529	4,367,013
<i>% of SHS program revenue (recommended limit is 5%)</i>	2%	1%	1%	1%
<i>% of SHS program costs</i>	7%	2%	2%	3%

Metro Administrative Costs			
	FY23 Budget	YTD Actuals	% of Budget
Prior Year Carryover	-	7,773,934	
YTD Admin Allowance (5%)	10,528,167	16,900,928	161%
Interest Earnings	281,250	591,556	210%
Total Resources	10,809,417	25,266,418	234%
Direct Personnel	1,429,783	1,038,071	73%
Indirect Costs (Allocation Plan)	1,827,068	1,827,068	100%
Materials & Services	1,457,540	708,992	49%
Contingency	6,095,026	-	0%
Expense & Contingency	10,809,417	3,574,131	33%
Carryover to next period	-	21,692,288	

As with the ramp up of county programs, Metro expects its own administrative spending to ramp up over the first 3-4 years. As of July 2022, the SHS team had 4.7 FTE; as of July 2023, it had grown to 12.1 FTE; and during FY23-24 it plans to grow to 34.6 FTE. Metro ended the year with \$21.7 million in carryover. Metro will be using carryover funds to fund program growth in FY23-24, including limited duration FTE and other one-time investments to provide necessary capacity for new and growing bodies of work and programmatic opportunities.

Provider administration

The county administrative costs detailed above do not include the administrative costs of service providers or regional long-term rent assistance (RLRA). RLRA is administered by the housing authority of each county, separate from SHS, and these administrative costs are detailed below. Provider administrative costs, including for RLRA, are reported as direct costs. Moving forward, the counties will provide information on service provider administrative costs as part of their annual reports.

Regional Long-term Rent Assistance Administrative Cost				
	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County	Total
RLRA Administrative Costs	230,238	135,221	254,815	620,274
<i>% of RLRA costs (recommended limit is 10%)</i>	4%	5%	2%	3%

Metro recommends that administrative costs for RLRA not exceed 10% of annual RLRA expenses. Per the chart above, all counties were below this recommended limit.

EXHIBIT F: COUNTIES' MEMO ON SPENDING BY POPULATION A AND B



To: Patricia Rojas, Metro Housing Director
From: Jes Larson, Assistant Director of Housing Services, Washington County
Vahid Brown, Deputy Director of Housing & Community Development, Clackamas County
Kanoelehua Egleston, Joint Office of Homeless Services Director of Programming, Multnomah County
RE: Fiscal Year 2022-23 Population A and B Supportive Housing Services Spending by Population
Date: December 29, 2023

Introduction

The Supportive Housing Service Measure (Measure) passed by voters in May of 2020 established dedicated funding for programs and services for people experiencing homelessness or at risk of experiencing homelessness, with priority for services to address the needs of people experiencing, or at risk of, chronic homelessness. Based on this priority to address chronic homelessness, Metro's Supportive Housing Services Program Work Plan (Work Plan) requires that each county's Local Implementation Plan (LIP) include a commitment that 75% of funds will be devoted to people that are extremely low-income, have one or more disabling conditions, and are experiencing or at imminent risk of experiencing long-term or frequent episodes of literal homelessness (Population A). The remaining 25% of funds are to be devoted to people that are experiencing homelessness or have a substantial risk of experiencing homelessness (Population B). County LIPs comply with this requirement and articulate specific programmatic priorities and investments to meet the needs of each population.

Actual county spending from year to year is not expected or required to be split cleanly 75/25 between Population A and B, but it should meet this requirement over the life of the Measure. Metro's Work Plan states that the distribution of resources to serve priority populations may be adjusted over time as chronic and prolonged homelessness is reduced.

Counties currently report spending and program outcomes to Metro on a quarterly and annual basis. Up to this point, that reporting has not included data on spending specific to Populations A and B, aside from where goals or programs can be inferred to primarily serve a specific population, such as Population A being the primary recipient of investments in permanent supportive housing and Population B being the primary recipient of investments in eviction prevention. This memo is intended as an addendum to FY 2022-23 quarterly and annual reporting to provide initial information specific to program spending according to Population A and B definitions for assessment against the 75/25 requirement over the life of the Measure.

Reporting on Population-specific Spending

The counties have reviewed data from FY 2022-23 to provide an initial assessment of program spending against the requirement that it be split 75/25 between Populations A and B over the life of the Measure. In quarterly reporting, consistent with the reporting template, the counties report on the A/B status of all households served in the following three service types: 1) Eviction Prevention; 2) Rapid Rehousing; and 3) Permanent Supportive Housing. There is currently no population specific quarterly reporting for Outreach/Safety on the Streets or Shelter/Safety off the Street, the other two reported service types.

The counties have used the following methodology for the initial assessment of population specific spending:

- Identified the total number of people or households served for each service type and the respective share of each Population A and B.
- Calculated spending by population based on the respective share of people or households served.

Multnomah County

Service Type	Population A	Population B	Total People Served	Population A %*	Population B %*	Total Spending	Population A Spend	Population B Spend	
Shelter/Outreach/Safety on/off the	1,765	336	2,101	84%	16%	\$22,920,867	\$19,255,274	\$3,665,593	
Eviction Prevention	57	5,211	5,268	1%	99%	\$12,320,089	\$133,304	\$12,186,785	
Rapid Rehousing	351	343	694	51%	49%	\$16,856,104	\$8,525,205	\$8,330,899	
Permanent Supportive Housing	528	96	624	85%	15%	\$14,990,035	\$12,683,876	\$2,306,159	
Long-term Rent Assistance	404	-	404	100%	0%	\$2,739,250	\$2,739,250	\$0	
Other Supportive Services	472	266	738	64%	36%	\$5,792,167	\$3,704,475	\$2,087,692	
Total						\$75,618,512	\$47,041,384	\$28,577,128	
<i>*Population percentages based on individuals.</i>							% of Total Services Spending by Population	62%	38%

Washington County

Service Type	Population A	Population B	Total People Served	Population A %*	Population B %*	Total Spending	Population A Spend	Population B Spend	
Outreach	233	116	349	67%	33%	\$451,228	\$301,250	\$149,978	
Shelter	794	435	1,229	65%	35%	\$10,948,967	\$7,073,621	\$3,875,346	
Eviction Prevention	358	457	815	27%	73%	\$5,186,696	\$1,406,562	\$3,780,134	
Rapid Rehousing	301	362	663	49%	51%	\$2,955,514	\$1,456,944	\$1,498,570	
Supportive Housing	1,230	433	1,663	74%	26%	\$22,213,666	\$16,429,831	\$5,783,835	
Total						\$41,756,071	\$26,668,207	\$15,087,864	
<i>*Population percentages based on households, not individuals. Households with undetermined status were assigned to populations using the category's existing split. Washington County will re-evaluate this assumption and make adjustments in FY 2023-24 Q3 reporting.</i>							% of Total Services Spending by Population	64%	36%
<i>** Supportive Housing includes Permanent Supportive Housing, Housing Case Management System and Regional Long-Range Assistance.</i>									
<i>*** Expenses that are not part of this calculation are spending on consulting, system and capacity building, technical assistance for service providers, as well as internal administrative charges. In total, these amount to \$5,381,173.</i>									

Clackamas County

Service Type	Population A	Population B	Total People Served	Population A %*	Population B %*	Total Spending	Population A Spend	Population B Spend	
Outreach/Safety on the Street	254	45	299	85%	15%	\$943,212	\$801,257	\$141,955	
Shelter/Safety off the Street	669	119	788	85%	15%	\$2,958,239	\$2,511,500	\$446,739	
Eviction Prevention	-	643	643	0%	100%	\$1,378,711	\$0	\$1,378,711	
Rapid Rehousing	39	7	46	85%	15%	\$95,427	\$80,905	\$14,521	
Permanent Supportive Housing	526	93	619	85%	15%	\$9,496,389	\$8,069,630	\$1,426,760	
Total						\$14,871,978	\$11,463,292	\$3,408,687	
<i>*Due to data limitations that have been resolved for future population-specific reporting, Clackamas County used its Permanent Supportive Housing data as a proxy for Outreach/Safety on the Street, Shelter/Safety Off the Street, and Rapid Rehousing. It also conservatively assumed 100% Population B for Eviction Prevention for the similar reasons.</i>							% of Total Services Spending by Population	77%	23%



600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
oregonmetro.gov

To: SHS Oversight Committee
From: Patricia Rojas, Director of Housing Department
RE: Metro Analysis of Tri-County Population A and B Supportive Housing Services Allocation by Population
Date: January 22, 2024

Hello Oversight Committee Members,

One of the critical responsibilities of the SHS Oversight Committee is monitoring financial aspects of program administration, which includes reporting on spending by population A and B. Counties are required to report yearly on how SHS funds are spent by population. Metro's Supportive Housing Services Program Work Plan requires that each county allocate:

- 75% of funds to services for people that are extremely low-income, have one or more disabling conditions, and are experiencing or at imminent risk of experiencing long-term or frequent episodes of literal homelessness (Population A),
- 25% of funds to services for people that are experiencing homelessness or have a substantial risk of experiencing homelessness (Population B).

Metro staff received the attached Tri-County Population A/B Memo on December 29th, 2023. The starting place for the data in this memo is each county's unique Continuum of Care data infrastructure. This is the first-year counties have reported spending by population A and B, a requirement unique to the SHS measure.

In our review, due to variability in reported service types, data availability, assumptions and allocation methodologies, Metro cannot determine spending by populations A and B. This initial memo from the counties flags multiple challenges in reporting spending by population, and a need for clear guidance and tools from Metro for future reporting. In that sense, this memo is a good first step toward accurate reporting of spending by population. However, Metro staff does not believe this memo provides a reliable assessment of regional spending by population.

Challenges

Counties service types are not aligned. Counties are reporting service types differently, which makes it challenging to roll up the data to regional spending by population. For example, the counties are describing shelter and supportive housing under different service categories.

Counties are in different places with data collection and reporting. All counties used available population A and B data to allocate total spending by population. However, the counties have different levels of data available – some are collecting population A and B data and tracking it in HMIS, and others are interpreting HMIS data. There are also service types that have no data available. For example, Multnomah County is tracking populations by intaking people, while the two other counties are using proxy information for certain service types.

Reconciliation to the annual financial report. The Tri-County Population A/B memo only includes direct client service costs, not all SHS costs. It is understandable that some costs, such

as County admin, cannot be allocated by population, but excluded costs should be named and explanations provided. The reconciliation below shows the costs excluded:

	Clackamas County	Multnomah County	Washington County
Pop A/B Total Spending	\$14,871,978	\$75,618,512	\$41,756,072
Other supportive services	\$747,049	\$0	\$1,042,160
SHS Program operations	\$729,030	\$0	\$0
System dev and capacity building	\$0	\$3,130,979	\$3,867,150
System support and coordination	\$385,942	\$1,674,617	\$0
RLRA admin	\$230,238	\$135,221	\$254,815
County admin, other	\$1,381,467	\$1,907,764	\$1,130,529
Regional strategy implementation	\$35,911	\$109,349	\$86,518
Annual Report Total	\$18,381,616	\$82,576,442	\$48,137,244
<i>Total excluded costs</i>	<i>\$3,509,638</i>	<i>\$6,957,930</i>	<i>\$6,381,172</i>

Incomplete information for the SHSOC Regional Annual Report. Given that information provided is not aligned across the counties now, it cannot be rolled into a regional population A and B financial expenditure split.

Next steps:

Given that this is the first-year counties are tracking the funding by populations, Metro’s assessment is that there are opportunities to improve and align a process for reporting on spending by population. Metro will lead development of tools, definitions, methodologies and guidance for measuring spending by population going forward.

Metro is looking forward to working on the following items with the counties:

- Alignment in service type categories (i.e. Supportive Housing, Shelter, RLRA)
- Alignment in data collection, and in assumptions and interpretations of data
- Alignment in allocation methodology
- Structure for reporting on all financial costs and alignment of direct client service costs for allocation by population
- Identification of people being served outside of these service type categories
- Identification of how costs of services differ between population A and B
- Consistency in how counties are interpreting the definition of population A and B

Metro will work with the counties on these items and release guidance by Spring 2024 for use in reporting on FY23-24 spending by population. Metro will provide the SHS Oversight Committee with ongoing updates on progress made to improve and align reporting on spending by population.

Sincerely,

Patricia Rojas
Housing Director

If you picnic at Blue Lake or take your kids to the Oregon Zoo, enjoy symphonies at the Schnitz or auto shows at the convention center, put out your trash or drive your car – we’ve already crossed paths.

So, hello. We’re Metro – nice to meet you.

In a metropolitan area as big as Portland, we can do a lot of things better together. Join us to help the region prepare for a happy, healthy future.

Stay in touch with news, stories and things to do.
oregonmetro.gov/news

Follow oregonmetro



Metro Council President
Lynn Peterson

Metro Councilors

Ashton Simpson, District 1
Christine Lewis, District 2
Gerritt Rosenthal, District 3
Juan Carlos González, District 4
Mary Nolan, District 5
Duncan Hwang, District 6

Auditor

Brian Evans

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
503-797-1700

Tri-County Planning Body Training and Technical Assistance Goals Timeline

Last Updated March 2024.

Note: The following information is largely derived from Kearns and West’s meeting summaries. TCPB Meeting summaries are available on Metro’s website:
<https://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-projects/supportive-housing-services/regional-coordination>.

November 9, 2022 TCPB Meeting

- The TCPB discussed the proposed Regional Plan workflow.
- The TCPB engaged in issue prioritization.

December 14, 2022 TCPB Meeting

- TCPB reviewed the draft recommendation filtering criteria.
- The TCPB continued to engage in issue prioritization.
- Ben Duncan, Kearns and West, shared that a survey would be sent out to prioritize January’s meeting topic.
- The December 14, 2022 TCPB meeting summary can be found on the third page of the following meeting packet: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/metro-events/TCPB-January-Meeting-Public-Meeting-Packet.pdf>.

January 11, 2023 TCPB Meeting

- The prioritization survey sent out after December 2022’s TCPB meeting resulted in strategies across four categories, including “Prioritization of Capacity Strategies.”
- The TCPB engaged in a “dot exercise” in which they voted on strategies across all four categories.
 - Under the “Prioritization of Capacity Strategies” category, 17 TCPB members voted for the top-ranked strategy, “Support wages and training for service providers as well as pay compensation for contractors since culturally specific services are often contracted out.”
- Liam Frost shared that next steps for Metro include taking the top voted strategies and delivering recommendations for the TCPB to vote on in February.
- The January 11, 2023 TCPB meeting summary can be found at: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/metro-events/2023-01-tcpb-meeting-summary.pdf>.

February 8, 2023 TCPB Meeting

- Metro and county staff translated TCPB’s voted upon priorities into regional goals, sharing this information with the committee in a memo on February 1, 2023.
- Staff separated the training and wages priority into two goals: “training and technical assistance” (split into two goals at the March 8, 2023 TCPB meeting) and “employee recruitment and retention.”

- The training and technical assistance goal, as drafted by staff, read: “Service providers have access to the knowledge and skills required to operate at a high level of organizational functionality; the need of culturally specific providers will be prioritized through all program design.”
 - This included a recommendation to “Create and support a regional training institute that supports universal technical assistance and training needs, using an accessible platform like Power DMS.”
- Jessi Adams, Washington County, presented on the regional challenge and goal for training and technical assistance. She also shared the Metro and county staff recommendation on how to achieve the goal.
- TCPB members discussed internal organizational and service delivery components.
- Vahid Brown, Clackamas County, stated that the goal is structured to elevate elements of training for regionalization. He shared that a regional approach would lead to efficiencies, especially with a new workforce, so there is a shared minimum of expertise between jurisdictions.
- TCPB members discussed goal language.
 - Metro and county staff would provide an amended training and technical assistance goal at the March 2023 TCPB meeting.
- The February 8, 2023 meeting summary can be found on the second page of the following meeting packet: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/metro-events/0-Packet-SHS-TCPB-Meeting-2023-03-08.pdf>.

March 8, 2023 TCPB Meeting

- Metro staff shared a memo with the TCPB in response to the TCPB’s request for Metro staff to provide additional language options for further discussion on the “Training and Technical Assistance” and “Employee Recruitment and Retention” goals. (The memo can be found on page 8 of the following meeting packet: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/metro-events/TCPB-April-Meeting-Packet-2023.pdf>.)
- Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, shared that the proposed Training and Technical Assistance Goal now has two different options for the TCPB to consider. Option 1 is leaving the goal as presented at the February meeting, and Option 2 is splitting the goal into two parts, Part A relating to program functionality, and Part B relating to organizational functionality.
- The TCPB discussed organizational and program functionality.
 - Nicole Larson shared that organizational functionality relates to operations, not direct services, whereas program functionality relates to direct service.
- Co-Chair Matt Chapman expressed a need for Metro staff to coordinate and identify training sources. He suggested the TCPB direct Metro staff to hire a consultant to begin work.
- The TCPB approved Option 2 as the Training and Technical Assistance Goal.
- Valeria McWilliams, Metro, shared the Training and Technical Assistance recommendations.
- The TCPB discussed recommendation language.
- The TCPB approved Recommendation A.

- The TCPB approved Recommendation B.
- In summary, during the March 8, 2023 TCPB meeting, the TCPB approved the following goals and recommendations:
 - Goal A: Service providers have access to the knowledge and skills required to operate at a high level of program functionality; the need for culturally specific providers will be prioritized through all program design.
 - Counties and Metro coordinate and support regional training that meets the diverse needs of individual direct service staff, with sensitivity to the needs of BIPOC agencies.
 - Goal B: Organizations have access to the technical assistance required to operate at a high level of organizational functionality; the need of culturally specific providers will be prioritized through all program design.
 - Counties and Metro coordinate and support regional technical assistance and investments in capacity building especially among culturally specific providers.
- The March 8, 2023 TCPB meeting summary can be found on the third page of the following meeting packet: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/metro-events/TCPB-April-Meeting-Packet-2023.pdf>.

June 14, 2023 TCPB Meeting

Vahid Brown, Clackamas County, presented on capacity building. He highlighted that capacity building is a standing question in procurement and Clackamas County contracted four organizational development consultants to partner with CBOs to determine capacity building needs and designs resulting in a menu of options for developers.

- The June 14, 2023 TCPB meeting summary can be found on the third page of the following meeting summary: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/metro-events/tcpb-july-meeting-packet-2023-archival.pdf>.

October 11, 2023 TCPB Meeting

- Metro staff provided a progress update on the Technical Assistance goal. The discussion included a panel of TCPB service providers sharing their experience with technical assistance. Staff from the counties also shared what technical assistance and capacity building support they're currently offering.
- A meeting summary of the Technical Assistance progress update can be found on the fourth page of the following meeting packet: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/metro-events/SHS-tri-county-planning-body-meeting-packet-20231108.pdf>.

METRO SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES TRI-COUNTY PLANNING BODY

Monthly progress report | April 2024

The goal of this report is to keep the TCPB, the Supportive Housing Services Regional Oversight Committee, Metro Council and other stakeholders informed about ongoing regional coordination progress. A more detailed report will be provided as part of the SHS Regional Annual Report, following submission of annual progress reports by Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington Counties.

TRI-COUNTY PLANNING BODY REGIONAL GOALS*

Goal	Progress
Unit/landlord recruitment and retention	Metro and county staff developed a Regional Implementation Plan for the five strategies the counties prioritized to advance the Regional Landlord Recruitment goal. The TCPB voted to approve this Regional Implementation Plan at their March meeting. The Regional Implementation Plan will be presented to the Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee for final approval during their April meeting.
Coordinated Entry	The Coordinated Entry Regional Alignment Workgroup (CERAW) continues to meet monthly. Lived experience leaders, who will recruit for and facilitate focus groups of people with lived experience, have been identified. Consensus building and clarification around strategy areas continues in a productive manner. Preparations for a progress update to TCPB are underway.
Healthcare system alignment	The regional leadership meeting continues monthly with Health Share, Counties, and Metro. A subgroup focused on implementation planning launched March 11 and will meet monthly. Both groups will drive toward greater alignment and coordination, focused on where we can have the most impact on health/housing integration. The data sharing workgroup continues to meet, working toward consensus and building data use cases. Work sessions with providers, people with lived experience, and other key stakeholders will be convened in the coming months. We will continue to work with partners to map the current landscape of health/housing initiatives and identify current areas of collaboration across systems.
Training + Technical Assistance	The request for qualifications seeking to qualify consultants to provide technical assistance and capacity building support for the housing and homeless systems

closes on April 18. If you are aware of consultants, firms, or nonprofit service providers who may be interested in applying to provide those services, please send them to <https://bidlocker.us/a/oregonmetro/BidLocker> and find RFQu 4269. Questions can still be sent to bidsandproposals@oregonmetro.gov until April 11.

The Regional Capacity Team just closed the application process for the three remaining positions on our team (two Program Managers, one focused on training, the other focused on technical assistance and an additional Program Coordinator). We have a strong pool of applicants and are confident we will be able to have our team fully staffed by the end of the fiscal year.

Employee Recruitment and Retention

Homebase continues to engage staff from the counties, service providers, and Metro to inform recommendation development. This includes reviewing existing data and potential additional data that will be needed to develop cost estimates and implementation pathways, as well as discussing how to expand and scale current County strategies to improve cash flow. The next Stakeholder Workgroup meeting has been scheduled for April 16. Homebase will tentatively provide a Progress Update to TCPB at the June meeting.

**A full description of regional goals and recommendations is included in Attachment 1.*

EXISTING REGIONAL PROGRAMS AND COORDINATION EFFORTS

People housed through the RLRA program as of December 31, 2023: 3,697



The data comes from the SHS quarterly reports, which includes disaggregated data (by race and ethnicity, disability status and gender identity) and can be accessed here: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-projects/supportive-housing-services/progress>

Risk Mitigation Program: All RLRA landlords are provided access to a regional risk mitigation program that covers costs incurred by participating landlords related to unit repair, legal action, and limited uncollected rents that are the responsibility of the tenant and in excess of any deposit as part of the RLRA Regional Landlord Guarantee.

The following information is derived from the counties' [FY2022-2023 annual reports](#)

Landlord Liaison and Risk Mitigation Program: In January 2023, Metro and tri-county program staff began meeting monthly to coordinate Landlord Liaison and Risk Mitigation Program education activities. Together, staff shared existing engagement tools and identified innovative methodologies for expanding unit availability across the region. Training for existing landlords is coordinated regionally and staff continues to coordinate to identify strategies for expanding unit availability.

Regional Point-in-Time Count: In January 2023, the counties conducted the first-ever fully combined regional Point-in-Time Count. This tri-county coordinated effort included creating a shared methodology and analysis, a centralized command structure, and unified logistics around the recruitment and deployment of volunteers. As a result of the combined Count, analyses include regional trends in unsheltered homelessness, sheltered homelessness, and system improvements made possible by regional investments in SHS.

An initial summary of the 2023 Point-in-Time Count data can be found in this May 2023 press release from Multnomah County: <https://www.multco.us/multnomah-county/news/news-release-chronic-homelessness-number-falls-across-tri-county-region-2023>.

Regional Request for Program Qualifications: This program year also included a Regional Request for Programmatic Qualifications to procure new and diverse organizations as partners for service provision. Tri-county partners worked to ensure broad engagement and technical assistance to support the full participation of new and emerging organizations, especially culturally

specific service providers. 60 applications were qualified to create a broad network of 167 tri-county pre-qualified service providers with diverse expertise and geographic representation.

Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Regional Implementation: Starting in 2023, an updated Privacy Notice & Policy created a more trauma-informed and person-centered approach to obtaining participant consent for data sharing while maintaining a high level of data privacy. Next steps included moving toward regional visibility and more comprehensive integration of each of the counties' HMIS systems.

TRI-COUNTY PLANNING BODY GOAL AND RECOMMENDATION LANGUAGE

May 10th, 2023

COORDINATED ENTRY

- Goal:** Coordinated Entry is more accessible, equitable and efficient for staff and clients.
- Recommendations:** Map the unique challenges and successes of each of the three Coordinated Entry Systems.
- Assess opportunities to create connectivity among the three Coordinated Entry Systems to improve equitable access and work towards regionalizing some tools within Coordinated Entry.
- Explore opportunities for co-enrollment with other systems.

REGIONAL LANDLORD RECRUITMENT

- Goal:** Increase the availability of readily accessible and appropriate housing units for service providers.
- Recommendations:** Contract with a qualified consultant to identify areas where regionalization can support existing and future county efforts and submit recommendations.
- Develop a regional communications campaign to recruit new landlords, including specific outreach and engagement to culturally specific media and BIPOC community groups.

HEALTHCARE SYSTEM ALIGNMENT

- Goal:** Greater alignment and long-term partnerships with healthcare systems that meaningfully benefit people experiencing homelessness and the systems that serve them.
- Recommendations:** Metro staff convenes and coordinates with counties and key healthcare systems stakeholders to identify opportunities that integrate the Medicaid waiver with the Supportive Housing Services initiative. Bring draft proposal with next steps and timeline to committee within 6 months.

TRAINING

- Goal:** Service providers have access to the knowledge and skills required to operate at a high level of program functionality; the need of culturally specific providers will be prioritized through all program design.

Recommendation: Counties and Metro coordinate and support regional training that meets the diverse needs of individual direct service staff, with sensitivity to the needs of BIPOC agencies.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Goal: Organizations have access to the technical assistance required to operate at a high level of organization functionality; the need of culturally specific providers will be prioritized through all program design.

Recommendation: Counties and Metro coordinate and support regional technical assistance and investments in capacity building especially among culturally specific providers.

EMPLOYEE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

Goal: County contracts for SHS funded agencies and providers will establish standards throughout the region to achieve livable wages for direct service staff.

Recommendations: Map current wage and benefit conditions.

Draft a housing-worker wage framework that provides guidance to Counties and SHS-funded agencies and providers and includes contracting evaluation and alignment.

Consider ways to allow for differential pay for lived experience, bilingual employees, and culturally specific organizations.

Consider ways to address challenges faced by organizations with multiple funding streams.

Assess reasonable scale of outcomes and case load as it relates to compensation.

Within each Supportive Housing Services (SHS)-funded agency, monitor the distribution of pay from lowest to highest paid staff to ensure improvements in pay equity.



Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services (SHS) Oversight Committee Meeting
Date: February 26, 2024
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual meeting (Zoom)
Purpose: Presentation from the Metro Auditor on the 2024 audit of SHS; discuss the final draft of the FY23 annual regional report and recommendations; and Metro tax collection and disbursement update.

Member attendees

Jim Bane (he/him), Mitch Chilcott (he/him), Co-chair Susan Emmons (she/her), Dan Fowler (he/him), Cara Hash (she/her), Jenny Lee (she/her), Carter MacNichol (he/him), Felicita Monteblanco (she/her), Jeremiah Rigsby (he/him), Peter Rosenblatt (he/him), Margarita Solis Ruiz (she/her), Mike Savara (he/him), Co-Chair Dr. Mandrill Taylor (he/him), Becky Wilkinson (she/her)

Elected delegates

Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington (she/her), Metro Councilor Christine Lewis (she/her), Multnomah County Commissioner Jessica Vega Pederson (she/her)

Absent elected delegates

Clackamas County Chair Tootie Smith (she/her), City of Portland Mayor Ted Wheeler (he/him)

Metro

Finn Budd (they/them), Yesenia Delgado (she/her), Liam Frost (he/him), Breanna Hudson (she/her), Patricia Rojas (she/her)

Kearns & West Facilitator

Ben Duncan (he/him)

Welcome and Introductions

Co-chairs Susan Emmons and Mandrill Taylor provided welcoming remarks and reflected on the progress in developing the draft recommendations.

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, facilitated introductions, reviewed the meeting agenda and objectives, and noted that the elected delegates are ex-officio members and will not be voting for final approval of the recommendations.

Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington invited folks to come out to Washington County to see the services they are delivering to change lives.

The Committee approved the January 29 meeting summary.

Conflict of Interest Declaration

Dan Fowler declared that he is chair of the Homeless Solution Coalition of Clackamas County and received grant funding including SHS funding.

Jenny Lee declared she works at the Coalition of Communities of Color, and they may be contracted to do community engagement work.



Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Peter Rosenblatt declared that he works at Northwest Housing Alternatives which receives contracts through Clackamas County, including SHS funding.

Carter MacNichol declared that he is on the Board of Transition Projects which receives contracts from the Joint Office of Homeless Solutions (JOHS).

Public Comment

Stephanie Rose and Daniel Boone provided verbal public comment.

Carter MacNichol asked about a previous public comment received from Tom Cusack, and if he ever received a response and if that response was shared with the Committee.

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, replied that some of the questions that were asked were captured in the Population A and B Memo, which was shared with the Committee. She added that for the questions that were out of scope, Metro offered to connect with Tom Cusack to discuss further over email, and the emails are just between Metro and him.

Presentation: SHS Audit

Metro Auditor Brian Evans introduced himself and stated that the purpose of the audit was to follow up on the 2021 audit recommendations and determine any gaps or overlaps in government operations. He provided background information on the tax measure and shared that the result of the audit was that Metro had fully implemented one recommendation from 2021, and the other two recommendations were in process. He stated the audit identified areas of oversight duplication and variation in data definitions and calculations. He noted that further oversight from the Committee on administration would help implement the recommendations.

Paoa Wandke, Metro Auditing Team, introduced himself and detailed recommendations relevant to the Metro Housing Department, SHS Oversight Committee, and the Tri-County Planning Body. He stated that oversight roles should be clarified, Metro Council should receive more updates, intergovernmental agreements should be reevaluated regularly, the SHS Oversight Committee should refine its focus on administration, and that there should be consistent data methodologies, definitions, and reporting templates between counties.

David Beller, Metro Auditing Team, introduced himself and detailed data inconsistencies and reliability concerns, noting that the differences were as high as 53%. He stated that the inconsistent data was reconciled by the year's end, indicating there are methods to have consistent data. He emphasized the need for stronger quality control processes as the counties appear to be using different methodologies and assumptions, especially relating to Population A and Population B. He stated that the inclusion of non-SHS-funded services under services provided could be misleading and that long-term planning is required to successfully meet program goals as some people will need SHS for the rest of their lives.

Auditor Brian Evans, concluded by summarizing there are 18 total recommendations from the audit, seven to ensure program oversight, six to improve data and reporting consistency, and five to identify programs to inform long-term planning.

Patricia Rojas, Metro, thanked the auditing team and stated that TCPB members received in their email the response from Metro's Management Team that addressed each of the recommendations and themes. She shared that Metro largely agrees with the auditor and it will take some time to meet some of the areas.

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Peter Rosenblatt asked if the audit's recommendations are findings entities must follow or recommendations that entities could choose to follow.

Brian Evans, Metro Auditor, responded that the audit publishes findings and the recommendations are actions to address those findings.

Patricia Rojas, Metro, added that this report is specific to Metro and Metro will lead the work.

Mike Savara shared that he felt some things weren't aligned with their role as the Oversight Committee, like the administrative dollars. He shared that when he reads Exhibit A, administration means implementation of the work, meaning the Committee has oversight of the whole program, not just the administrative resources.

Brian Evans, Metro Auditor, agreed that when you read the measure, administration can be interpreted largely or narrowly. He added that the evolution of documentation in the charter and intergovernmental agreements have variations in the interpretation and it would be good to get clarity and consistency to have clear expectations.

Paoa Wandke, Metro Auditing Team, stated that the important thing is to look at the overall functionality of the program and that there is no one else to pick up the responsibility of administrative funding oversight.

Patricia Rojas, Metro, agreed that there are multiple areas of language and Metro is working on consolidating documentation for clarity. She reflected that monitoring oversight of administrative funding is one piece of financial oversight at large.

Mitch Chilcott asked to clarify the diversifying of committee members recommendation, and if that was by industry or what potential gaps there are.

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, noted that the Committee has a different membership list now than when the recommendations were drafted.

Brian Evans, Metro Auditor, shared that most of this work was completed last year and is looked at for continuous improvement. He reflected that the diversity gaps come from a public finance perspective and expertise in knowing what to do with surplus funding. He shared that Metro Management will do a self-report of progress as a next step, and then after that another formal audit will be completed.

Dan Fowler expressed interest in having an ongoing report card on the progress of addressing the 18 recommendations.

Brian Evans, Metro Auditor, shared that there is an online dashboard of all the recommendations and the public can find the status there.

Discussion: Final draft of FY23 annual regional report

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, provided an overview of the process of drafting the regional report, including an assessment of opportunities for improvement. She reflected that the recommendations are presented to Metro Council for adoption. She detailed the roles and responsibilities of the Oversight Committee and shared that some recommendations would be implemented within the Oversight Committee's jurisdiction, and others would be implemented in other jurisdictions, like Metro's Communications Team.

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, framed that the Committee will make two decisions today; the first decision will be focused on the recommendations, and the second will be focused on Population A and B and the overall report.

Recommendations

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, reviewed the recommendations: Category 1: regional communication and engagement, Category 2: financial and data transparency and accountability, Category 3: workforce and capacity issues, and Category 4: Program expansions. He asked the Committee if they had any concerns or red flags about these recommendations.

Co-chair Susan Emmons shared she had no red flags and supported the recommendations as they stand. She honored Kris Smock, the consultant who captured the Committee's recommendations, and reflected on the need for leveraging funding flexibility while balancing contracting precedent, and the issues Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) has to track spending by Population A and B.

Co-chair Mandrill Taylor reflected on Stephanie Rose and Daniel Boone's public comment and shared he is considering promoting outreach as its own recommendation to emphasize the serious need for it.

Cara Hash stated she has no concerns and supports the recommendations.

James Bane stated he had no red flags and agreed with Dr. Taylor. He reflected on the need to support the workforce in doing difficult and important work.

Jeremiah Risby echoed the public comment and considered how outreach and engagement impact those involved. He reflected that setting expectations for what is possible for the workforce and capacity is important to have context for what the goals should be and what to expect from an oversight standpoint.

Mitch Chilcott shared that he has no red flags and appreciates the recommendations. He stated he is curious to learn more about healthcare integration work.

Mike Savara agreed that there were no red flags and appreciated the work session. He reflected the Committee continues to dig in around goal setting for equity, retention, and work outcomes to make it clear when objectives are accomplished.

Becky Wilkinson stated she did not have red flags and that the recommendations encompass everything the Committee has been discussing. She stated that Dr. Taylor's comment about outreach and Jeremiah's comment about the workforce are valid.

Peter Rosenblatt stated his one concern is that SHS is a funding stream, and provider programs are usually funded by multiple funds, including SHS. He reflected that he is not sure how a holistic approach to seeing progress would be.

Dan Fowler stated he had no red flags and noted that the recommendations sounded "kumbaya-ish" and while everyone wants collaboration, the Committee also holds people accountable to objectives. He emphasized the need for the Committee's role to hold entities accountable in a collaborative way should come through in the report.

Felicita Montebianco stated she had no red flags and agreed with the workforce comments. She shared her excitement for the communications plan.

Jenny Lee stated she had no red flags and supported the recommendations.

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Carter MacNichol stated he had no red flags and agreed with Dan Fowler's comments on accountability.

Margarita Solis Ruiz stated she had no red flags and supported the recommendations. She stated she felt a disconnect between entities and what was happening on the ground.

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, reflected that Co-chair Dr. Taylor named considering if outreach should be a separate category and asked if they want to add a category.

Co-chair Mandrill Taylor shared that his concern is that outreach would get lost if it was not called out as a separate category and motioned to promote comprehensive outreach from subsection 3 of Category 4: program expansions to Category 5: promote comprehensive outreach, subsection 1 increase visible impact of SHS investments.

Patricia Rojas, Metro, asked to clarify the need for an additional category as Category 4 is for program expansions, and outreach is part of programming.

Co-chair Mandrill Taylor responded that calling it out as its own category addresses the fear of marginalization and ensures prioritization of outreach.

Co-chair Susan Emmons supported Dr. Taylor's proposal and noted that the Committee has talked about the importance of outreach for months.

Ben suggested that there be a Category 5: Promote comprehensive outreach with one recommendation: increase visible impact of SHS investments, and left open for discussion.

Peter Rosenblatt asked what would be left in Category 4.

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, responded that expand access to health and behavioral health services and strengthen implementation of new programs would remain in Category 4.

Jerimiah Rigsby, Mike Savara, and Carter MacNichol indicated their support for Category 5.

Co-chair Mandrill Taylor highlighted that this is a great example of how one voice can change a room and encouraged folks to speak up if they feel passionate that something is wrong.

The Committee voted to approve creating Category 5.

The Committee voted to approve all the recommendations.

Annual Regional Report

Kris Smock, Kristina Smock Consulting, detailed the two options of how to include Population A and B in the report. She stated that the main difference between the two is that the second option includes a summary table of county spending.

Peter Rosenblatt asked what exactly the challenge is for determining Population A and B spending.

Kris Smock, Kristina Smock Consulting, responded that they have data on population served which she feels good about including in the report. She noted that the HMIS system is set up to track services provided, but not set up to track spending by populations. She stated that the concerns with including Population A and B data are due to inconsistencies across counties by how the data is categorized and incomplete data sets.

Cater MacNichol asked to clarify if the language meant that 75% and 25% were over 10 years.

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, replied that the measure language doesn't clearly state if the percentage breakdown should be per year or over 10 years. She shared that Metro has worked with its Legal Team and the interpretation is the percentages are for over 10 years and is tracked yearly.

Patricia Rojas, Metro, added that the work plan and measure do not outline spending specifically either way and acknowledged the dynamics and costs of ramping up permanent supportive housing infrastructure. She stated they will track the ramp-up stage over time by population.

Carter MacNichol shared his concern about knowing if they are meeting those spending goals and asked for spending forecasting.

Patricia Rojas, Metro, replied that they are working towards that with the recommendation language to be able to track spending regularly.

Mike Savara supported the tracking over time approach rather than a yearly percentage split.

Co-chair Susan Emmons reflected on the February 12th work session and the conversation on HMIS limitations and how data systems will be improved to make Population A and B spending clearer.

Peter Rosenblatt stated that no database is perfect and asked the Committee to be mindful not to place the administrative burden of any new data systems or improvements onto providers.

Mitch Chilcott stated he would like to learn more about tech updates to build out programs moving forward.

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, stated that Metro and the counties are working together to have the populations defined so they can be included and aggregated in the Year 3 annual report. She shared that the Metro Data Lead will be working on tech support and framework and will share updates to the Committee.

Patricia Rojas, Metro, confirmed that providers will always be considered, and no one wants to duplicate data entry. She stated that the intent is to make work more efficient and there is significant work underway.

Kris Smock, Kristina Smock Consulting, circled back to whether the Committee preferred Option 1 or Option 2 for Population A and B inclusion in the report.

Carter MacNichol, Dan Fowler, and Becky Wilkinson preferred Option 2.

Jenny Lee indicated she is open to whatever the Committee decides.

Felicita Montebancho stated she is leaning towards Option 1.

Peter Rosenblatt and Mike Savara preferred Option 1.

Becky Wilkinson reminded the group that Option 2 still includes the same narrative as Option 1, including data challenges.

Peter Rosenblatt stated that a table can be taken out of context and narrative from a reader's perspective.

Mitch Chilcott asked if one option is recommended by Metro staff and why.



Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Patricia Rojas, Metro, responded that they can share their recommendation after this initial round-robin exercise.

Jeremiah Rigsby, Co-chair Mandrill Taylor, Co-chair Susan Emmons, and Margarita Solis preferred Option 1.

Jim Bane and Cara Hash preferred Option 2.

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, shared that Metro will support whatever the Committee decides, but recommends Option 1 given data limitations.

Dan Fowler and Becky Wilkinson yielded to Option 1.

Carter MacNichol asked how confident Metro is in having Population data in Year 3.

Patricia Rojas, Metro, felt very confident the Year 3 data will be accurate as Metro and the jurisdictions are working this spring to be clear on data definitions and methodologies.

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, asked for the Committee to vote for approval of including either Option 1 or Option 2 in the report, noting that majority rules.

The Committee voted to include Option 1 in the report, 11 to 2.

Co-chair Susan Emmons asked if they could establish a time for Metro staff to come back and give an update on the Population methodologies.

Carter MacNichol replied that it is in the recommendation that they will report in June.

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, asked the Committee to vote on approving the report in its entirety.

The Committee approved the Regional Report.

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, congratulated the Committee on approving the Report and shared that the Co-chairs and Metro staff will present at each governing board and Metro Council will approve the recommendations or ask questions. She noted that after it is approved, staff will work on operationalizing the recommendations. She shared that Metro would likely come back in June or July with the operationalized plan.

Carter MacNichol shared that the Committee is a month ahead of where they were last year and asked the Committee to reflect on lessons learned to make next year even quicker.

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, replied that it is included in the audit and staff are looking at opportunities to shorten the timeline. She noted that the counties' annual reports are due in October each year, which is what starts the Committee's process.

Metro Tax Collections and Disbursement Update

Rachel Lembo, Metro, gave a monthly update on tax collections and provided an overview of the graphs included in the meeting packet. She highlighted that monthly numbers are starting to align between years suggesting that the tax base is stabilizing making future forecasts more educated and predictive.

Next Steps

Co-chairs Susan Emmons and Mandrill Taylor made closing remarks.

The next steps are:



Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

- Next meeting: March 25th 9:30am-12:00pm

Adjourn

Adjourned at 12:00 pm.



Metro

Meeting will start at 4:00pm

Metro Regional Supportive Housing Services

Tri-County Planning Body | April 10th, 2024



Metro

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Agenda

4:00pm Welcome and Introductions

4:15pm Public Comment

4:20pm Staff Updates

4:30pm Technical Assistance and Training Progress Update

5:20pm Supportive Housing Services Fiscal Year 2023 Annual Regional Report

5:55pm Closing and Next Steps

6:00pm Adjourn



Metro

Public Comment



Metro

Capacity building, technical assistance and training

Tri-County Planning Body

April 10, 2024



Metro

Agenda

- Learn from county partners about their technical assistance and training work
- Overview of regional Request For Qualifications (RFQu)
- Next steps



Definitions

Technical assistance* (TA): targeted support akin to consulting, addressing specific developmental needs or issues.

Capacity building*: tailored resources to bolster skills, competencies, and the organizational capacity to fulfill its mission and ensure long-term viability.

**These definitions were used in the regional RFQu.*

Training: access to the knowledge and skills required to operate at a high level of program functionality.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE pre- & post-SHS

pre-SHS:

- Contract manager support for providers
- Solicitation support for providers

post-SHS:

- Increased # of contract managers
- Designated funding to support provider TA/capacity building
- Designated TA for procurement
- Office hours for NOFAs
- System development grants

TRAINING pre- & post-SHS

pre-SHS:


- Assertive engagement training

post-SHS:

- Dedicated FTE for training
- Assertive engagement trainers
- Training coordinator
- Domestic & sexual violence program specialist (TA & training focused)
- Proactive, enhanced training opportunities

Washington County pre-SHS

- The county had limited homeless services funding, around \$5-7 million per year
- Continuum of Care supported homeless services system of care but lacked resources to invest in provider capacity, technical assistance or training



Washington County **post-SHS**

- **Provider training** aimed at increasing culturally-responsive service provision is underway
- Over \$1.3 million invested in provider **capacity building** this fiscal year
 - 71% of culturally specific providers have received capacity building resources to date
 - 19 total providers served
- Expanding **technical assistance** to providers to support financial accountability

Clackamas County TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

- Provider **capacity building**
- Program and data team support
- Housing first aid training
- Coordinated entry improvements



Regional collaboration

RFQu 4269 Technical assistance and capacity building: housing and homeless systems

- First ever Metro/Tri-County Housing procurement
- Opened March 1
- Closes April 18

What this RFQu is seeking to qualify

- Human Resources
- Program Design
- Data Management
- Information Technology
- Housing and Homeless Services Best Practices
- Racial Equity and Social Justice
- Organization and Board Development
- Contract Consultation & Fiscal Management
- Technical Writing
- Communications
- Community Engagement
- Housing Development & Asset Management
- Capital Project Management
- Unit Inspectors
- Volunteer Management
- Compliance Services

Building the bench

- RFQu qualifies providers to be eligible for future allocation processes
- Using the qualified pool, Metro and each county will conduct future funding allocation process to distribute available funds

Increasing access

Questions 1, 3 and 6 include alternate question structures for culturally specific providers only



What is a culturally specific provider?

A culturally specific organization or provider is led by and accountable to a culturally specific community

(e.g. a specific racial, ethnic or other marginalized group.)

In most cases, this goes beyond an organization simply providing services to cultural group.

Question 1

All applicants, including culturally specific providers:

- How many years has your firm been in business?
- Your firm's background and staffing structure. For each service category (see A-O in Section III) you are applying to provide, clearly title and use separate sections for each.

either

Culturally specific providers only:

Previous items, plus, describe how your organization's expertise and perspective as a culturally specific organization relates to the service areas you are applying to provide technical assistance or capacity building support for.

or

Non-culturally specific providers:

Previous items, plus, describe your firm's experience in providing technical assistance or capacity building support services as described in this RFQu as it relates to the service area/s to which you are applying, include how you tailor services or supports to a client's needs and your approach to working with them.

Evaluation process

- Proposals will be evaluated by a review panel composed of Metro, Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington County staff; housing and homeless services staff and staff from adjacent sectors
- Selected qualification proposers will be added to the Capacity Building and Technical Assistance: Housing and Homeless Systems Qualified Provider Pool

Please help us spread the word!

***Do you know great contractors, consultants
or agencies who might be interested?***

Please let them know this RFQu is open until
April 18.

Building a capacity team

- Regional capacity team manager started January 29
- Metro hiring two program managers (one for training, one for technical assistance) and one additional program coordinator
- Planning to be fully staffed by FY 24 (end of June)

Next steps at Metro

1. Fact-finding to understand regional needs
2. Technical assistance demonstration project
3. Building out training program with new program manager

Questions?





Metro

Fiscal Year 2023 Annual Regional Report

Supportive Housing Services

Overview

- Supportive housing services overview
- Second year progress and highlights
- Regional oversight committee recommendations

Role of the SHS oversight committee

To provide
**independent
program oversight**
on behalf of the
Metro Council




Regional goals

10-year goals

- **Reduce barriers** to housing stability for communities of color
- **Connect at least 5,000** households experiencing homelessness to permanent supportive housing
- **Stabilize at least 10,000** households at risk of or experiencing homelessness in permanent housing




FY23 (July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023) regional performance to goals




Revenue collection and distribution

- Year 2 tax revenue was \$347.3 million
- County partners received \$321.1 million




Spending

- Regional spending more than doubled compared to Year 1



Carryover

- Spending is below revenue during the program ramp-up period
- Carryover of \$350M will be used for
 - tax stabilization and regional investment fund reserves
 - one-time investments and increases in scalable programs



Key highlights of FY23

- Progress toward ten-year goals
 - Almost 3000 of 5,000 PSH goal has been met
- Black, Indigenous and people of color served in SHS Programs
 - 48% of people placed in supportive housing
 - 61% of rapid rehousing placements
 - 68% of people served by homelessness prevention
- Counties invested \$114 million in contracts with 77 providers
 - 14 culturally specific providers with contracts totaling \$22.6 million



County performance

- Overall, counties' year-two activities and investments were well-aligned with LIP priorities for phase one (years one through three of implementation)
- Counties made significant progress on their year-two work plan goals:
 - Exceeded regional goals for homeless preventions and shelter beds
 - Achieved more than 80% of the regional goals for supportive housing units and placements
- New SHS-funded rapid rehousing programs took longer to launch than anticipated, resulting in only 50% of the planned placements

Challenges

- Growing need
- Infrastructure building
- Spending
- Workforce and capacity issues
- Program delays
- Data and analysis



Metro

Regional oversight committee recommendations

FY22 recommendations update

- Most of the recommendations from FY22 are multi-year bodies of work
- Where work was not completed, integrated into FY23 updated recommendations
- In-depth updates on progress and next steps included in report

Regional communication and engagement

Strengthen understanding: Create and implement a robust regional communication strategy for the SHS fund that effectively reaches the broader community.

Financial and data transparency and accountability

Optimize financial reporting: Strengthen strategic oversight and accountability by improving the quality, clarity and consistency of regional financial reporting.

Financial and data transparency and accountability

Enhance data integrity: Strengthen the accuracy, reliability and consistency of program data to support regional analysis and oversight.

Financial and data transparency and accountability

Evaluate to inform improvement: Evaluate regional progress and refine strategies and goals as needed to maximize SHS outcomes.

Workforce and capacity issues

Address providers' workforce and capacity needs:
Develop a regional work plan reflective of community-identified needs with timelines that incorporate short-term and long-term strategies for addressing workforce and capacity issues.

Workforce and capacity issues

Provide multi-year capacity building funding:

Develop and implement a regional strategy for providing multi-year capacity building investments for service providers.

Workforce and capacity issues

Institute livable wages: Address service provider wage/compensation equity to provide better guidance to county partners in meeting their SHS equity goals and to develop more consistency in wage standards across the region.

Workforce and capacity issues

Streamline county administrative practices: Work collaboratively with the counties to support the development of systems for managing procurements, contracts and spending that match the urgency of the crisis.

Program expansions

Expand access to health and behavioral health services: Continue work to identify and implement regional strategies that facilitate integration of health services, with a focus on behavioral health including mental health and recovery support services.

Program expansions

Strengthen implementation of new programs:
Monitor implementation of new and expanded program areas to support accountability and effectiveness.

Outreach

Promote comprehensive outreach: Increase the visible impact of SHS investments through outreach strategies that are scaled to match the need.


Transforming lives



County performance: Clackamas

- Made progress in all of their phase-one priorities
 - Detailed breakdown provided in report
- Met or exceeded all but one of the regional housing metric goals included in its year-two work plan
 - It did not achieve its goals for rapid rehousing due to a delayed launch stemming from strained capacity both internally and within contracted providers
 - Program infrastructure in place and households being served at significant rates as of FY24 Q2


Year 2 progress to goals



County performance: Multnomah

- Achieved progress on all but one of the county's phase-one priorities
 - Childcare and other supports for families with children has yet to be addressed
 - Detailed breakdown provided in report
- Exceeded three of the regional housing metric goals included in its year-two work plan and made progress on its other housing goals
 - Goals not met were primarily due to the challenges with county infrastructure and provider workforce and capacity issues


Year 2 progress to goals



County performance: Washington

- Made progress in all of their phase-one priorities
 - Detailed breakdown provided in annual regional report
- Met or exceeded nearly all the regional housing metric goals included in its work plan
 - Rapid rehousing goal not met, as it was a new program and additional time was needed for ramp up
 - Program infrastructure in place and county expects to meet their goal for FY24

Year 2 progress to goals





Metro

Closing and Next Steps

Next Steps

- Post approved meeting summary online
- Landlord Recruitment and Retention implementation plan going to the Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee on April 22nd, 2024
- Next meeting: May 8, 2024

Meeting Adjourned

