

Agenda



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting 9
Date: Monday, September 27, 2021
Time: 9 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.
Place: Virtual meeting ([Connect with Zoom](#))
Purpose: Provide updates to committee, review connections between housing bond and SHS work.
Outcome(s): Shared understanding of integration between housing and SHS, direction from group on approach for group retreat.

9 a.m. Welcome and Committee Housekeeping
9:05 a.m. Conflict of Interest Declaration
9:10 a.m. Public Comment
9:20 a.m. Clackamas County updates
9:40 a.m. Housing Bond and SHS Integration
11:00 a.m. Break
11:05 a.m. Retreat discussion
11:20 a.m. Final questions and next steps
11:30 a.m. Adjourn



600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting minutes

Meeting: Metro Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee
Date/time: Monday, July 26, 9 AM – 11:30 AM
Place: Virtual meeting (Zoom)
Purpose: Provide SHS program implementation and tax collection updates. Learn about the current work of the affordable housing bond oversight committee and discuss opportunities for intersections between the two programs.

Member attendees

Co-chair Susan Emmons, Dan Fowler, Armando Jimenez, Jenny Lee, Carter MacNichol, Felicita Monteblanco, Jeremiah Rigsby, Roserria Roberts, Co-chair Kathy Wai, Seth Lyon, Gabby Bates
Heather Brown

Absent members

Ellen Johnson, Jahed Sukhun, Dr. Mandrill Taylor

Elected delegates

Multnomah County Commissioner Susheela Jayapal, Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington, Clackamas County Commissioner Sonya Fischer, Metro Councilor Christine Lewis, City of Portland Commissioner Dan Ryan

Metro

Nui Bezaire, Breanna Hudson, Pilar Karlin, Patricia Rojas

Facilitators

Allison Brown, JLA Public Involvement

Welcome and introduction

- Kathy Wai, Co-chair, reviewed the agenda for the meeting.
- Susan Emmons, Co-chair, thanked committee members who responded to the SHS Oversight Committee survey.
- Roll call was taken, present and absent members are listed above.
- Meeting 7 summary was approved.
 - Correction requested: Roserria Roberts requested that staff review the meeting 7 summary where Susan asked a question of the Metro Auditor about outcomes, and check to see if it was captured correctly because she understood the question differently.

Conflict of interest declaration

Jenny Lee works at the Coalition of Communities of Color and shared that her organization is currently working with the counties and may have more specific information from them than the Oversight Committee would receive.

Public comment

Kathy Wai, Co-chair, provided an overview of the written testimony submitted from the Here Together Coalition in response to the Clackamas County Local Implementation Plan (LIP). Furthermore, Kathy explained that many of the questions and concerns reflected in the written testimony would be addressed at the end of this meeting during the budget discussion.

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Eric Fruits Research Director at Cascade Policy Institute: Eric expressed his concerns with the supportive housing services income taxes and collection mechanism. Additionally, Eric urged the oversight committee to reevaluate Multnomah County's LIP and to specifically address the outcome metrics.

Staff update and report back

- Carter MacNichol asked if staff would be discussing any of the comments made in the Here Together Coalition letter.
 - *Susan responded that some of the comments in the letter were true and should be addressed but that many of the comments could be addressed by the committee on a later date once everyone has had a chance to review the letter.*
- Dan Fowler, shared in regards to the Here Together Coalition letter, that many of the claims were thought provoking and mentioned his interest in looking into the idea of income for money.
- Armando asked if there will be time in a future meeting to review an updated local implementation plan (LIP) from Clackamas County.
 - *Patricia responded that later in the meeting staff will be discussing Clackamas County's LIP and will be a better time to ask questions about Clackamas County.*
- Roserria Roberts asked what the process is for responding to concerns raised in public comment and that she would like there to be time to openly discuss issues brought up during public comment.
 - *Susan responded that many of the claims Eric Fruit's public testimony will be addressed later on in the meeting and that many of his claims have already been addressed.*
- Dan shared that he would like to know more about Eric Fruits claim that Metro is paying for a software upgrade that the city of Portland already allocated money for.
 - *Alison reminded committee members that if there are any topics they would like to address in future meetings they should reach out to their co-chairs and Metro staff about adding those items to the agenda.*
- Seth Lyon asked in regards to the Here Together Coalition letter concerning the Clackamas County LIP, whether there will be an update during this meeting about the comments made in the letter.
 - *Patricia responded that many of the questions surrounding the county's budgets would be addressed by staff today and that they will make sure to set aside time in future meetings to address the rest of the concerns mentioned in the letter.*

Patricia Rojas, Metro Regional Housing Director, and Breann Hudson, Metro Assistant Housing Analyst, provided an update on the survey staff asked the committee to complete.

- Patricia is scheduling one-on-one meetings with committee members to get a better understanding of what tools and information that the committee needs from Metro staff and how the committee defines oversight/their role as an oversight committee.
- The survey is still open for committee members to complete since only 9 members have responded so far.
- The survey revealed that overall the committee wants to see more information from staff along with suggestions for presentations
- Patricia explained that she hopes that the committee and staff can organize a retreat like meeting to discuss what the committee needs from staff.

Meeting minutes

- Carter MacNichol asked Patricia when the oversight committee will be presenting the annual report to the Metro Council.
 - *Patricia responded that the annual report will be presented at the end of the fiscal year to Council. Furthermore, Patricia mentioned that in September they will be discussing what the oversight committee needs from staff in order to develop the year-one annual report.*
- Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington, asked staff in regards to Eric Fruit's comments in the Zoom chat, what the meeting procedure was for the chat?
 - *Alison thanked Eric Fruits for his comments but explained that she would be disabling the chat for attendees in order to help the committee focus on the topics on the agenda. Furthermore, Alison invited Eric Fruits to send any information in regards to Dan Fowler's question, to Metro staff so they can ensure everyone on the committee has an opportunity to review that information.*

Q & A: Tax Collection and Costs

Rachael Lembo, Metro Finance Manager and project manager of the implementation of the SHS tax collection system, reviewed the tax collection memo included in the meeting packet.

- The SHS tax collection system is the first personal and business income tax that Metro has instituted.
- Based on input from stakeholder engagement Metro staff was advised to prioritize utilizing a tax mechanism that would be able to start rolling out funds by 2021.
- As of June 30, the measure has collected \$1.5 million.
- Gabby Bates asked whether the tax memo would be available to the public and encouraged Eric Fruits and other members of the public to review the memo because it might answer some of their questions.
 - Rachael responded that the memo is included in the meeting packet which is published on Metro's SHS page.
- Dan Fowler asked how much each proposed tax collection method would have cost and how long it would have taken to collect and distribute funds through each method. Additionally, Dan asked whether the City of Portland provided cost estimates of their tax collection mechanism with Metro staff.
 - *Rachael responded that it would be inefficient to have Metro collect the taxes because Metro would have to develop a whole new system compared to the State and the City of Portland who both have established tax collection systems. Furthermore, staff decided against having the State collect the SHS tax because they wouldn't be able to begin collecting taxes for another two years. Rachael explained that at the follow Oversight Committee meeting in September she will be able to present more data on what the budget will look like for FY 2021-22.*
- Carter MacNichol asked why costs for staffing is only \$2.8 million a year for the first two years but \$5.6 million a year going forward. Additionally, Carter asked whether Rachael felt the city negotiated in good faith to offer Metro the best possible deal on the taxing mechanism as a partner.
 - *Rachael responded that staff doesn't cost as high in the startup because a software vendor is doing all the initial programming, development and testing but that after the first two years, city staff will take over. Additionally, she mentioned that she could not speak to Multnomah County acting in good faith during negotiations but that their personal income tax collection system is already established and can provide the most efficient mechanisms for tax collection.*



600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting minutes

- Co-Chair Susan Emmons thanked Rachael for coming to the meeting and for explaining the SHS tax system.

Break

Group break took place from 9:55am to 10:01am.

Presentation: Year 1 Regional Investments & Multnomah County SHS Budget

Marc Jolin, the Joint Office of Housing Services Director, reviewed Multnomah County's FY 2021-22 budget for Supportive Services program. Furthermore, Marc summarized Multnomah County's SHS program for FY 2021-22.

- Multnomah County approved a \$52.1 million budget for the first year of SHS programming.
- In the first year of the SHS program, Multnomah County plans to invest in supportive mental behavioral health services, addiction and recovery services, additional shelter capacity and culturally specific programming.
- Outcome reports from FY 2021-22 of the SHS program will be posted on A Home for Everyone's website and will be updated quarterly.
- Felicita Montebalanco asked if the outcome reports will include staff retention and support.
 - Marc responded that the outcome reports will include staff retention and support but that in the first quarter they might not be able to provide as much information. Furthermore, he explained that Multnomah County staff will be conducting a wage study that will be able to further evaluate staff retention and pay equity.
- Seth asked how Multnomah County plans to prioritize vulnerable populations and how does that compare to prioritizing the BIPOC community as well.
 - Marc responded that HUD requested Multnomah County to use a single vulnerability assessment process that tries to identify the most vulnerable community members. However, they plan on adapting these metrics in order to address some of the specific vulnerabilities that the BIPOC community faces.
- Co-Chair Susan Emmons asked Marc if staff can create a spreadsheet that shows the number of permanent supportive housing units and rapid rehousing teams each non-profit plans to serve and how it breaks down with the regional rental assistance program and by project.
 - Marc explained that although they cannot immediately provide the spreadsheet once the Joint Office has completed negotiating contract outcomes with providers they will be able to send that information to the Oversight Committee at least yearly.
- Carter MacNichol asked Marc how provider's salaries compare to the City and County employee's salary. Furthermore, Carter mentioned the importance of regionally standardizing data collection.
 - Marc responded sharing that he is not certain but it is likely that county employee's will be compensated more than what most non-profits pay their service providers.
- Dan mentioned the importance of data coordination between the three counties.
- Co-Chair Kathy Wai, asked whether Washington County and Clackamas County will also use the A Home for Everyone's website to present and track program outcomes.
 - *Patricia Rojas responded that Metro plans to develop a data dashboard on the Metro website, but that during the first year the focus will be on developing the reporting tools and metrics needed for future data collection. Furthermore, she mentioned that because counties are all at different points in the program and that the end goal will be to track these outcomes of all three counties on Metro's website.*

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Nui Bezaire provided a broad overview of the first year investment allocations of each county, program goals and next-steps. Additionally, she shared that the Oversight Committee will have the opportunity to meet with Washington County and Clackamas County staff to discuss their year-one investment allocations.

- The first year projections show that there will be around \$180 million generated for the program.
- Washington County has a budget of \$38,329,500 for the first year and plans to place 500 residents into supportive housing, as well as, develop program infrastructure, provide rental assistance to 500 households and create additional year-round shelter beds.
- Nui shared this video about Veterans Village, a non-profit that provides supportive housing services to United States Veterans, located in Clackamas County.
- Clackamas County has approved \$10 million from the SHS budget and has requested a \$5 million loan from Metro.
- Patricia Rojas reviewed the Here Together Letter sent to Metro staff and Clackamas County Commissioners expressing their concern with Clackamas County's ability to implement their original plan now that they are operating with a smaller budget. Furthermore, Patricia mentioned that Commissioner Fischer sent a letter in response to the Here Together letter. In the letter, Commissioner Fischer addresses the cash flow concerns and brought up the idea of Clackamas County taking out an \$18 million loan from Metro in order to help supplement the first year of programming.
- Jill Smith Clackamas County Housing Director, stated that Clackamas County is committed to fully implementing their local implementation plan but that they are in the process of securing alternative funding. Additionally, Jill shared that initial focus will be on placing folks who currently in temporary housing situations into motels and providing rental assistance through Metro 300. In the first year of implementation, Clackamas County's will focus on preparing for year-two programming by expanding capacity.
- Commissioner Fischer, reflected on Clackamas County's supportive housing services budget. Commissioner Fischer, highlighted Clackamas County Commissioner Board's commitment and support of their local implementation plan. Furthermore, Commissioner Fischer shared that Clackamas County needs bridge funding in order to do more than just providing permanent housing for those in temporary housing services.
- Metro Councilor Christine Lewis, expressed her concern with Clackamas County's funding gaps particularly because funds generated for the supportive housing services measure were intended to be spent on capacity building not to subsidize already established programs.
 - *Jill Smith responded that Clackamas County is only using SHS funds to pay for temporary programming that is currently funded from the Healthshare program and state and federal Covid-19 funding.*
- Patricia Rojas shared that staff is preparing to convene the Tri-County Advisory Board this fall and for the Counties and the Oversight Committee to start thinking about what outcomes and metrics they would like to see incorporated into a regional data system. Additionally, Patricia briefly reviewed some of the outcomes and metrics stated in the SHS work plan and highlighted that this program will expand supportive housing strategies that work.
- Dan Fowler asked Jill Smith to further explain the request for proposals (RFP) process and what has changed since the oversight committee approved Clackamas County's LIP.
 - *Jill responded that when Clackamas County had initially passed their LIP, they began the RFP process and received applications from service providers based off of their original budget. However, due to the changes to the budget Clackamas County closed*



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting minutes

their

first RFP and are preparing to open a new RFP in order to receive applications based off of the new budget.

- Co-Chair Kathy Wai, asked whether the budget changes will impact the original local implementation plan and whether the oversight committee would need to approve the changes made.
 - *Jill responded that as of right now Clackamas County is committed to implementing their LIP and that moving forward if there are still cash-flow issues they will come to the oversight committee to discuss next-steps.*
- Seth asked Jill to further explain the county staff executive team's role compared to the implementation committee and stated his concern with service providers having to repeat the RFP process during such a chaotic time.
 - *Jill responded explained that the executive team is comprised of two board members and staff in order to provide the information the board needs and that the responsibility of determining provision of services will still be left to the implementation committee. Furthermore, with respect to Seth's comment on service providers redoing the RFP process, Jill explained that after talking with service providers they expressed their preference to re-apply based off of the new budget rather than try to scale down their original plans.*

Integration with housing bond program

Due to the meeting going overtime, Co-Chairs and the oversight committee agreed to push this item to the following Oversight Committee meeting.

Next steps

- The next meeting is in September.
- Scheduling one-on-one's with Patricia.
- Oversight Committee retreat.
- Washington County and Clackamas County's FY 2021-22 budget presentations to come.

Adjourn

Co-Chairs Kathy and Susan thanked everyone for being here today and adjourned at 11:33 a.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Pilar Karlin, Metro Council Policy Assistant.

Clackamas County Questions & Answers for SHS Regional Oversight Committee

September 2021

As promised at the July 2021 SHS Oversight Committee meeting, Metro SHS staff, in collaboration with Clackamas County partners, have prepared a Q&A document using questions that were not able to be addressed at that meeting, along with follow-up questions sent by committee members via email.

Outstanding Questions and Answers:

Questions sent to Metro staff have been grouped together, if they were similar, and re-phrased for clarity. Questions where answers can be found in the July Oversight Committee meeting materials [supplemental packet](#), were omitted.

1. **Has the Clackamas County Local Implementation Plan changed in any way? If no, how is that possible when the budget is much smaller than revenue projections?**

No. Clackamas County has not changed its LIP and remains committed to implementing its approved plan in full. For context: The LIP is a high-level policy and strategic framework. Budgets are not incorporated into the Local Implementation Plan itself, so a budget that differs from what the community expected to see does not necessarily indicate a change in the LIP. The SHS budget approved by Clackamas County was an initial program budget. Clackamas County intends to amend its SHS budget as it identifies funding sources that can advance funds until the largest portion of revenues from Metro comes through in spring of next year.

2. **Can you please provide additional detail behind your approved current SHS budget? Does the current budget contain the bridge funding from Metro? Yes, the current budget of \$10M does include the Metro Bridge funding of \$3M.**

The \$10M approved budget includes \$3M in bridge funding from Metro and is an initial program budget to begin a phased roll-out of the SHS program as revenues from the measure build over the fiscal year. Clackamas County is committed to amending the budget once it identifies the funding sources that can advance the amounts needed after the first phase of roll-out.

Additional Phases, including Metro's use of the remaining \$2M initial loan from Metro will be proposed as it is needed for ramp-up and roll-out of programming to meet the first-year goals of the Local Implementation Plan.

Here are more details on the first phase of Clackamas County's initial SHS budgeted programming.

Initial Program Phase Investments – initial \$10M – not necessarily listed in order of priority:

Housing & Housing Services

- **Housing Navigation/Placement** - New contracted services from the RFP to first assist participants in short term emergency shelter to permanent housing solutions. Once this population is served, the focus will shift to those on our Coordinated Housing Access wait list as funding allows.
- **Case Management** - New contracted services from the RFP to provide supportive case management to participants in RLRA to ensure housing stabilization.

- **Immediate/Emergency Shelter** – Focus is to ensure those who were recently sheltered in immediate/emergency shelter programs that are ending do not transition back into homelessness. Participants may transition into any available/appropriate housing programs including SHS programs.
- **Transitional Housing** – Stabilization of a high performing transitional program, without an ongoing funding source. This program offers unique transitional housing for those exiting the justice system that would, without intervention, be returning to homelessness. This unique program focuses on those dealing with severe and persistent mental health conditions that make housing stability challenging.
- **Regional Long Term Rent Assistance, (RLRA) and Short-term Rent Assistance** – Rent assistance to ensure people temporarily housed through time limited & emergency funded programs do not return to homelessness. Serving this population will stabilize our system of care and allow us to then move on to serving those on our waiting lists through Coordinated Housing Access or identified in new outreach programming.

Capacity Building/Program Operations & Admin

- Increasing staffing and pacing program operations expansion just ahead of service level increases to ensure adequate internal capacity.
- Development of capacity building activities for culturally specific providers and other CBOs to match system expansion to prepare partners for additional funding coming through the life of the measure.
- Funding for ongoing engagement efforts.
- Limited general administration expenses.

Additional Phased Investments – as funding is secured:

- **Outreach** – Focus on outreach to all populations including safety off the streets programming to build relationships and meet people where they are, ensuring resources are readily available when folks are ready to pursue immediate/transitional or permanent housing solutions.
- **SHS Rent Assistance** – RLRA and Short-term Rent Assistance – Increasing these programs to additional households as funding is available.
- **Supportive Case Management (Services)** – Ensuring that participants housed with Rental Assistance programs have the stabilizing services they need to remain housed.
- **Immediate Housing/Shelter/Transitional Housing** – Funding multiple methods to increase capacity of these service components.
- **Capacity Building/Program Operations & Admin** – Continue to pace program operations expansion ahead of service level increases to ensure adequate internal capacity. Capacity building efforts for culturally specific providers and other CBOs to match system expansion. Funding for ongoing engagement efforts and general admin costs.

3. **Of the funded programs in the Clackamas County budget, which are new, increased or expanded programs? Of continued programs, is SHS replacing any local funding, or is it all State and Federal funding? Can CARES or ARPA funding cover any of what is in this \$10M budget?**

The currently funded SHS implementation is a mix of new and continued programs.

Continued Programs: The County wanted to ensure that SHS could continue programming that was set to close due to short-term emergency funding or funding that has ended. This includes continuing permanent housing and services for the Metro 300 program and other similar housing programs.

Clackamas County is waiting for clear guidance on eligible uses of ARPA (or other COVID-related emergency funding) to determine whether those funds could cover any of the above mentioned investments. The needs and potential uses of ARPA funding throughout the county are varied and highly competitive so SHS remains the funding source for the above investments for now.

Clackamas County is also bringing new services online. The county just released a Request for Proposals, that closed on August 25, to initiate new housing navigation and supportive housing case management service contracts, which will be coupled with the launch of the new Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance program. Those services will be available in the community next month.

In terms of SHS “replacing” funding, this is a matter that cannot be answered at this time. Defining displacement and the baseline funding calculation are all matters within the IGA negotiation that will provide clarity in these areas once negotiations are complete.

- 4. The Clackamas County LIP appears to require significant ramp-up and investment in additional staffing and other infrastructure in order to meet the annual goals, including equity metrics. How does the County plan to meet your LIP goals when the budget is not funding any new capacity? If you get the funding but not until later, how will you meet your goals given the delayed start?**

Clackamas County has hired 5 new staff members for its SHS program team and have been approved to bring on 4 additional staff by December 2021.

The county is working to identify additional funding sources for subsequent phases of SHS program implementation. Again, the approved \$10M SHS budget is an initial program budget – a budget that is intended to grow. Additional ramp-up of staffing and programming will occur over time via budget amendments.

- 5. What is the reasoning for not accepting the full \$5M bridge loan right away to progress our efforts and the Clackamas County LIP?**

The Clackamas County Board approved accessing up to the full \$5M advance approved by Metro for startup purposes. Clackamas County intends to access the remaining \$2M of the advance following the programming of existing funds.

- 6. Is the smaller budget the result of cash flow issues? Do you project similar cash flow issues after Year 1?**

Yes, the smaller budget is the result of not being able to identify funding that can advance SHS programming until the bulk of the 21/22 revenue arrives in spring 2022. For years 2 and beyond,

Clackamas County plans to create a SHS contingency reserve that can help carry programming in the earlier parts of the Fiscal Year when revenues are slower.

7. How has your LIP Advisory Board been involved in decisions on what part of the LIP gets rolled out first? Has any community engagement been done related to these decisions?

The LIP Steering Committee and extensive community engagement were required to guide the development of the LIP, which has not changed. Program implementation aligns with the goals and investment priorities that were established in the LIP.

The Continuum of Care Steering Committee (CoCSC), as stated in the LIP, will be expanding to fully include its role as a decision-making body for the implementation of the Supportive Housing Services program. Although the full expansion of the CoCSC into this role is still underway, their work on SHS programs has already begun. Committee members just finished reviewing and scoring the applications for Housing Navigation/Placement and Supportive Housing Case Management Services RFP and their scores resulted in contract awards which are being negotiated now.

Memo



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Date: Tuesday, Sept. 21, 2021
To: Supportive Housing Services Community Oversight Committee
From: Patricia Rojas, Regional Housing Director, Metro
Subject: Staff updates for September 27, 2021 committee meeting

Since the last time we convened on Monday, July 26, 2021, Tri-County Planning Board meetings and intergovernmental agreement (IGA) negotiations have been making progress.

Clackamas, Washington and Multnomah County staff met for two full days of IGA negotiations that were positive and productive. The Metro legal team is in the process of incorporating agreements into the next draft and we hope to send that back to partners the week of September 27th. The parties have agreed to a 30-day extension of the revenue sharing agreement that is set to expire on October 1, 2021.

The Tri-County Planning Board discussions are also progressing. We are optimistic that we will complete these negotiations in the next two weeks and move forward with next steps in establishing the group.