

Washington County
Department of Housing Services
Homeless Services Division



Supportive Housing Services

Fiscal Year 2023–2024

Annual Report

October 31, 2024



161 NW Adams Ave
Unit 2000
Hillsboro, OR 97124
WashingtonCountyOR.gov/Housing

Annual Report

Content

Executive Summary	3
Year in Review: Outcomes Summary	6
Housing Programs	7
Shelter Programs	8
Outreach Programs	9
System Capacity and Coordination	12
Investing in Provider Capacity	12
Advancing a “One Governance” Approach	14
Cross-sector Alignment	14
Evaluation and Quality Improvement	16
Financial Overview	18
Attachments	19

Executive Summary

Together, we are making the experience of homelessness rare and brief in Washington County. While state and national trends show upticks in homelessness, Washington County has **achieved a 35.5% decline in unsheltered homelessness** with a solutions-based approach, thanks to investments from the voter-approved Supportive Housing Services measure. After three years of building this system of care, people experiencing homelessness in Washington County can now more easily connect with immediate shelter and housing services. This regional transformation is only possible through local partnerships, cross-sector collaboration, and political leadership. Through our coordinated system of care, we are closing encampments, helping Washington County residents access shelter and stable housing, and opening doors to home.



Senator Wlnsvey Campos, Mayor Lacey Beaty, Chair Kathryn Harrington, Councilor Gerritt Rosenthal, Housing and Homeless Initiative Director Taylor Smiley Wolfe, Councilor Juan Carlos González attend construction event for Beaverton Year-Round Shelter.

Our local partners are the heart of this work, meeting individuals experiencing homelessness where they are and connecting them to services. The 24 community-based providers that contract with the County provide a network of geographically coordinated and person-centered support services. Together, these local partnerships make up a system of care that includes outreach workers serving the entire county, more than 400 shelter beds, thousands of supportive housing placements, and over 100 case managers with the expertise and relationships to guide people experiencing homelessness toward long-term, stable housing solutions.

Our city jurisdictional partners are expanding regional housing capacity, working side by side with the County to coordinate services in partnership with local shelters, law enforcement, library services, local businesses, neighbors and more. The City of Hillsboro and the City of Beaverton are developing purpose-built year-round shelter capacity, while the City of Tigard supports a local shelter project in their community. We're proud to partner and fund staff coordination services helping to make homelessness rare and brief in Beaverton, Hillsboro, Tigard, Tualatin, and Sherwood.

Through cross-sector collaboration, we are meeting individuals' holistic needs with healthcare, behavioral health and housing coming together. Washington County is in the midst of transforming how homeless services are delivered, tearing down silos and building up integrated systems to connect health and housing services and funding sources that will better serve entire families. We have embedded liaisons in Community Corrections, the Hawthorn Walk-in Center behavioral health clinic, and other points of service where housing needs intersect. We are partnering with Virginia Garcia Medical Center to provide on-site medical care and coordination for shelter participants needing respite care and meeting biweekly with hospital and health system partners to conduct healthcare case conferencing. We are also investing in transitional housing, prioritizing projects that will provide behavioral health funded services on site to support people in their transitions to recovery.



Partners from Community Partners for Affordable Housing (CPAH) and Sequoia Mental Health Services give a tour of Heartwood Commons for local and federal officials.

Finally, political leadership makes this work possible by prioritizing pathways to housing. At the start of the program year, some members of our community expressed concerns about opening two new pod shelter programs in Washington County. After a lengthy public engagement process, the Washington County Board of Commissioners directed staff to move forward with the programs. As of July 2024, our pod shelter program supports more than 90 guests every night with a safe place to sleep and resources to get connected to stable housing. Since the opening of the pod shelters, several neighbors have come forward to acknowledge the progress made with encampments reduced or eliminated across the county. This progress would not have been possible without collaboration between political leaders across Washington County.

Looking to the future, program year four will focus on making our comprehensive system of care even more effective as SHS resources are fully allocated, committed, and assigned. The achievement of this significant milestone means that our staff are working to ensure our homeless services system of care continues to improve how it serves our community and addresses the most pressing needs within the constraints of available resources. This will require continuous process improvement and will be based in community listening, program evaluation and evolution, and coordination across systems of care. We remain committed to the goal of making the experience of homelessness rare, brief, and one-time.

Stories of Hope

Meeting program participants where they are

Amanda has been working as a Project Homeless Connect outreach team member for years and she has seen the night-and-day difference Supportive Housing Services (SHS) resources have made in Washington County. Chad is newer to his role with the organization, bringing important lived experience to this work. Chad's firsthand experience of homelessness and struggle with addiction enable him to relate with program participants on a deeper level.

Recently, when Amanda and Chad set out for their outreach shift, they were prepared with a box of ham and cheese sandwiches, bagged lunches, bottled water, and a short list of people they wanted to connect with throughout the day. The goal was to offer resources and support to anyone in need as they made their rounds. They noted that many locations that used to be filled with tents are now mostly cleaned up, with only a handful of people passing through.

One of the people they were looking for, "Scott," was at the park enjoying lunch with a few other people. Amanda and Chad introduced themselves to the small group warmly. They chatted briefly with one person who they knew had recently gotten an apartment, and introduced themselves to a new person, sharing information about the "yellow house" where he could get connected to a variety of resources. Then they talked with Scott, asking about his health, checking in on where he was staying, reminding

him that his housing case worker was working on his housing paperwork and that they hoped to have good news for him soon. After a few minutes of friendly conversation, Amanda and Chad wished the group a good afternoon and promised to check back in in a few days.


There is more work to be done. The team expressed concern for many of the people they work with, hoping they can hold on a few more months, and get into housing before winter.

Reflecting on the last few years, Amanda said, **"We went from working out of churches and borrowed spaces, to being able to offer a space where people can find showers, food, help, and ultimately housing. It's life changing!"**




Chad Giakas, Amanda Terpening, and Wes Barrett are part of the outreach team for Project Homeless Connect.

The Year in Numbers: Highlights



**2.5
Years**

average length of homelessness for people who moved into housing



**100%
SHS Budget
Spent**

exceeding the 85% goal




**10,400+
People**

served through SHS-funded services



**4,400+
People**

remained housed with eviction prevention and rent assistance programs



**1,200+
People**

moved into housing through SHS-funded programs



**90
New Shelter
Pods**

exceeding our goal. 1,844 people accessed shelter across 420 shelter units.

Housing Programs: Where Stable Housing and Services Align

Washington County’s homeless services system remains focused on our goal of providing people experiencing or at risk of homelessness with long-term housing. Housing programs include eviction prevention to avoid homelessness, rapid rehousing case management and time-limited rent assistance to help people transition out of homelessness and stabilize to independence, and regional long-term rent assistance (RLRA) paired with housing case management services to help people who have been homeless, oftentimes for many years, find stable housing again and thrive with ongoing supports. Washington County also launched a new program which offers move-in assistance to help households who just need a little bit of financial support to secure an apartment and quickly get back on their feet.


We set ambitious housing goals to stretch our system and best serve our community. While we did not meet all of our housing goals this last fiscal year, we are proud of the outcomes achieved and are in the process of implementing several process improvements that will keep our work on track to meet ambitious and achievable goals next year.

	Outcomes	Goal
Housing Case Management Services	399 households	500 households
Rapid Rehousing	241 households	300 households
Eviction Prevention	1,569 households	500 households
NEW Move in Assistance *	6 households	200 households

*This program was delayed and continues to be refined to improve effectiveness.

To maximize the effectiveness of homeless services programs, Washington County braids funding sources together. The Affordable Housing Bond provides a critical opportunity to leverage affordable housing with supportive housing services. Currently, RLRA vouchers support renters in five housing bond funded projects, including the Heartwood Commons and the Viewfinder where project-based vouchers paired with on-site services have created 74 units of dedicated Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) to date. Plambeck Gardens is the next Affordable Housing Bond project planned with dedicated PSH units.

The Viewfinder combines on-site services with rental assistance for 20 families.



Shelter Programs: A Steppingstone to Housing

In our third program year, shelter capacity increased with 90 new shelter pods through the Safe Rest Pods program, exceeding our annual goal of 60 shelter units. This was due in large part to additional funding from Governor Tina Kotek's Executive Order 2023-02, part of her statewide plan to address homelessness.

Last year, three shelter pod sites in Aloha, Hillsboro, and Cornelius opened their doors. This pod shelter capacity fills a critical need in our system while purpose-built year-round shelters are under development and provides an alternative model of sheltering that has helped many chronically homeless individuals come inside.

Two permanent shelter sites, in partnership with the City of Beaverton and Just Compassion of East Washington County (located in Tigard), are under construction and an additional site is gearing up for construction, in partnership with the City of Hillsboro. When completed, these three sites will create roughly 175 permanent shelter units, allowing Washington County to move away from temporary shelter capacity. In total, Washington County maintains a system of 433 shelter units, 420 of which are funded by the SHS measure.



Safe Rest Pod shelters allowed Washington County to increase shelter capacity with 90 additional units last year.



Just Compassion and partners celebrate the ground breaking for the Just Compassion Resource Center.

Outreach Programs & Access Centers: The Front Door to our System of Care

Washington County works with 10 community-based organizations to provide geographically designated and population-specific outreach services. These providers know unsheltered community members by name, build trust over time, and create connections to services. During severe weather events, outreach workers deliver blankets and water, provide transportation to emergency shelters, and coordinate with emergency response services to keep people alive. When someone's name comes up on a housing waitlist, our outreach providers are the first to know where to find them.

Washington County is anticipating the development of two access centers, which were awarded funding during program year three. Access centers will provide meals, storage, showers, and connections to shelter, housing and other services for our homeless community seven days a week. These community centers will be safe and welcoming places for people experiencing homelessness, offering points of connection on their path to stability. Importantly, these future centers will also activate as emergency shelters during heatwaves and cold snaps. Just Compassion Resource Center (developed, owned, and operated by Just Compassion) is currently under construction and Project Homeless Connect will break ground on their Hillsboro access center later this year. Up to two additional access centers are planned for Western Washington County and the Beaverton area.

Linda grew up around Vernonia and Hillsboro and often went camping with her family. She has a lot of appreciation for the outdoors and teases when she calls herself “born and bred country folk.” But Linda never expected camping would become her only home when she became homeless 15 years ago.

Linda has struggled with lupus since she was a teenager and started self-medicating with alcohol and pain meds as a young adult, which ultimately led to a substance addiction, and later homelessness. She bounced around Washington County for many years, just trying to survive.

But that all ended when her best friend, who had been sober for many years, refused to give up on her. With her friend’s support, step by step, Linda was able to seek treatment, make different choices, get healthier, and stay sober. Four years later, Linda hasn’t looked back.

Linda maintained her sobriety, trying to put together a deposit and find housing she could get approved for and afford, but she was still homeless. That’s when she met her case manager who helped Linda to get her apartment. Linda recently moved into her first apartment in more than a decade, and her case manager continues to support her as she adjusts to life back inside.

Tragically, Linda lost her daughter this year and is grieving a loss no parent wants to imagine. But she is more focused than ever on staying housed and sober because she needs to be ‘grandma’ for her two grandsons. The playground outside her new apartment is a perfect spot for the young boys to play when they visit their loving grandma at her new home.

“I can look in the mirror and be okay with myself and know that it has been worth all the hardship it took to get here and be there for them,” she said.



Linda’s apartment complex has an on-site playground for her two grandsons to enjoy whenever they visit.

Stories of Hope

Being a grandma starts with a stable home

Partnership in Action at the State Level

When Governor Tina Kotek signed Executive Order 2023-02 (EO 23-02) declaring a state of emergency in much of Oregon due to homelessness, Washington County was already hard at work addressing homelessness in our community. Additional resources from EO 23-02 were used to fund the purchase of 60 brand new pallet homes and extend operations at winter shelter locations to operate year-round. These pallet homes give us flexibility to move to new locations down the road as needed and provide urgent shelter capacity while permanent shelters are under construction.

“Addressing Oregon’s homelessness crisis takes all of us doing everything we can, every day, and that’s exactly what Washington County did through my emergency order,” Governor Tina Kotek said on January 8, 2024. “I am inspired by the progress they have made, and it sends a clear message that if we work together, Oregon can be a place where everyone has a safe place to live.”

This executive order directed local Continuum of Care agencies (Washington County Homeless Services Division) to focus on bringing unsheltered individuals inside. Washington County responded by establishing Locally Coordinated Command Centers (LC3s) that prioritized areas with larger encampments and/or higher levels of unsheltered homelessness for focused engagement. The LC3s brought outreach, shelter, and housing opportunities together to identify the best options for community members living unsheltered in encampments across the county and work collaboratively to get people inside.

Oregon Housing and Community Services and the Oregon Department of Emergency Management were instrumental in supporting Washington County. At the same time, Washington County leveraged partnerships with city jurisdictions, Metro, libraries, law enforcement, and community-based service providers. The first LC3 in operation in Washington County started on the outskirts of Forest Grove at the Highway 47 encampment. Working collaboratively, the LC3 developed a by-name-list of campers and offered every single person staying at that encampment a shelter option and a path to long-term housing. Linda (page 10) was part of this coordinated effort.



Governor Kotek and other local officials celebrated the opening of the Hillsboro Safe Rest Pods on SW 17th Avenue.

System Capacity and Coordination

Over the last three years, Washington County has implemented a system of care that is strategically coordinated to meet our community's needs. This includes investing in community-based providers, engaging local experts and listening to community members with lived experience, coordinating programming across systems of care, and more.

Investing in Provider Capacity

Washington County partners with 24 service providers, seven of which are culturally specific organizations, to provide services and advance our shared mission. Many of these service providers have grown exponentially with us over the last few years and building their capacity to serve is key to our system's ongoing success.

We are proud to report that all of our partner agencies participated in at least one equity-focused training with a diverse catalog of courses ranging from LGBT+ inclusion, Unconscious Bias, and Class, Race & Housing Inequities. Washington County continues to award technical assistance and capacity building grants to our service providers. This year \$235,000 in technical assistance funding was allocated to eight agencies. Fourteen agencies received a total of \$1.7 million in capacity building project funding in the second phase of the program. Capacity building projects have ranged from business services, human resources, strategic planning, policies and procedures, program design, development implementation, and evaluation. All seven culturally specific partner agencies have participated and been awarded technical assistance and/or capacity building project funding.

The Housing Careers program is a continued success, providing training and internship opportunities for community members with lived experience who are interested in housing related careers. In the second year of the program, 45 participants enrolled and 42 completed their project, achieving our goal for the program. The results will help evolve the program in year four, expanding the program beyond housing careers to general employment services and focusing the program to help housing participants successfully graduate from rent assistance programs with stable employment.

These approaches are helping Washington County build a diverse, empathic, and equitably compensated workforce. This year, Washington County providers reported that roughly 45% of their staff have lived experience of housing instability, and higher rates of staff identify as Black, Indigenous, Latino/a/e, or other persons of color compared to the general population. The County's evaluation of pay equity indicates that culturally specific providers, on average, pay their direct service workers higher rates of pay than non-culturally specific providers for SHS-funded positions. This trend has held steady over the past two program years. Service provider staff annual salaries for case management, outreach, shelter, and housing liaison positions range from \$50,000 to \$60,000, consistent with contractual recommendations and reimbursement rates for SHS funded programs.

Stories of Hope


Christina Matousek, Solutions Council member, discusses mental health & housing integration

Christina Matousek joined the Homeless Solutions Advisory Council (Solutions Council) in January 2024. Christina brings a wealth of lived and professional expertise to the group and was excited to hit the ground running. As the co-executive director of NAMI (National Alliance on Mental Illness) Washington County, she and her phenomenal team work to meet the needs of individuals and families struggling with mental health challenges at their day center in Aloha by offering 20+ support groups, meeting in person and virtually with participants, and advocating for coordination with other systems of care, particularly the housing system.

NAMI is the largest grassroots mental health organization in the world, and Christina explains that all her staff have lived experience with a mental health condition, including staff who have a child with a mental health diagnosis, staff who have experienced homelessness, and staff who have navigated outpatient services. In her work leading NAMI Washington County, Christina has seen firsthand how the County's homeless services system is serving people with mental health needs. Recently she shared two stories:

"Sarah" walked through NAMI's doors, ready to leave behind the domestic violence she was experiencing at home. She was first sheltered through Just Compassion, and then shortly after, her application was accepted for a sober living home. Sarah was able to apply for sober living because of the stability and support provided by Just Compassion and NAMI. Through the experience, NAMI empowered Sarah to make her own decisions and to this day Sarah continues to stay connected to their women's support group.

"Jessica" connected with NAMI two years ago when she was unsheltered and dealing with substance abuse. She had a lightbulb moment and put herself through Hooper Detoxification Stabilization Center. After detox, Jessica stayed at a pod shelter in Washington County before getting a housing voucher and moving into long-term housing. Today, she is still housed and works at NAMI as a resource coordinator and provides janitorial services. After Christina and Jessica attended a Washington County public listening session this summer, Christina shared, **"I saw 'Jessica' sitting with the Washington County housing director. She has come so far because now she sits at the table where decisions are made!"**



Christina hard at work at the NAMI Washington County day center located in Aloha providing a space for walk-ins, on-going support groups, and coordination.

Advancing a “One Governance” Approach

Consistent with regional goals to increase access and inclusion in our community advisory bodies, Washington County has modernized our governance structure to ensure policy guidance, program oversight, and public transparency with diverse voices and representation from across Washington County. This included a “One Governance” initiative to align multiple advisory bodies into a single governance structure. The new Homeless Solutions Advisory Council or the “Solutions Council” launched in January 2024 with 10 members. The Solutions Council currently hosts three important subcommittees: Performance Evaluation, Lived Experience, and Equitable Procurement.



Homeless Solutions Advisory Council Members

Cross-sector Alignment

The Homeless Services Division is also leveraging other systems of care, working closely with our Health and Human Services Department, Community Corrections Department, and health system partners to end homelessness for participants of these adjacent systems.

First, Washington County was awarded a \$3 million grant with CareOregon for the development of permanent supportive housing in Forest Grove. The property was acquired for this permanent supportive housing project last year and project design planning is underway, with the County participating in the State of Oregon’s Supportive Housing Institute hosted by the Corporation for Supportive Housing.

Washington County, Virginia Garcia Memorial Health Center, and Greater Good Northwest have partnered to create a Low Acuity Transitional Support program at the Hillsboro Bridge Shelter. The program serves unhoused individuals who need additional medical care while stabilizing in shelter and working toward stable housing. The program currently operates 10 beds of respite shelter and receives referrals from hospitals in Washington County.

To support this initiative, Washington County was awarded a \$250,000 grant from Kaiser Permanente to launch and sustain the medical respite pilot for two years. As part of the grant award, the Homeless Services Division will work with the National Institute for Medical Respite Care to build a program model that leverages Medicaid and healthcare funding to support the financial sustainability of the program and ensure the highest standards of care in our services.

Additionally, our healthcare case-conferencing program—partnering with Health Share, CareOregon, Kaiser Permanente, Pacific Source, Oregon Health & Science University (OHSU), and Providence—continues to connect participants experiencing homelessness to healthcare services. Case conferencing takes place twice a month among health and housing partners and is focused on supporting specific and shared clients with healthcare needs in our homeless services system. This case conferencing process also helps housing system providers navigate the health and behavioral health systems.

Beyond our healthcare partnerships, our Housing Liaisons program remains a key component of our cross-sector collaboration. Through this program, trained housing system navigators are embedded in other divisions and departments, working side by side with staff in behavioral health, child and maternal health and community corrections to help their participants identify housing options available in the community and navigate our system.



Gennesis with her daughter

Harnessing lived experience to help others find housing

Gennesis Morris participated in the Housing Careers Pilot Program. The Housing Careers Pilot Program provides a pathway for program participants to intern in various housing programs. This program allows participants to harness their lived experience as an invaluable tool to help others and develop career experience.

Today, Gennesis is a housing case manager here in Washington County and supports herself and her daughter through a full-time career helping others find housing.

“This changed my life completely,” Gennesis told KOIN 6 News in June 2024. **“I think I would’ve been maybe still in my addiction. I think this internship gave me hope again and let me know that my lived experience is everything and that’s how I better serve participants.** This helped put me in a position to be able to help people and conquer all my dreams and goals without a college degree.”

Stories of **Hope**

Evaluation and Quality Improvement

The Homeless Services Division conducts an equity analysis of our outcomes data biannually to inform program improvements and budgetary investments. This analysis includes population data consideration and comparing race and ethnicity demographics of households that seek services in our system, with households who achieve stable housing through our programs. The analysis also considers the rates of poverty, race and ethnicity in the general population of Washington County (see Attachment F for full analysis)

This year's equity analysis work found that our programs are generally serving higher rates of Black, Indigenous, and Latine households than are represented in the general population, population of poverty, and among households seeking services. We see this result most strongly with our Latine program participants. These outcomes align with the results of our equity analysis from previous years and confirm that our partners and our programs are reaching the communities we aim to serve to combat historic and persistent discrimination and disparities in housing. We also continue to see that Asian-American & Pacific Islander households experience higher rates of poverty in Washington County than the rate of households seeking our housing services. However, we are having greater success serving the Asian population through our Eviction Prevention program and generally find that the Eviction Prevention program serves the highest rate of communities of color out of all Homeless Services programs. Additional strategies are underway to better understand and address this disparity.

This year, the Homeless Services Division also conducted our second annual provider performance evaluation and report. The process assessed service providers' performance, collected organizational information, and gave providers the opportunity to comment on any challenges faced in fulfilling contractual obligations. The performance evaluation and reporting process focused on four areas: contracted performance standards by program type, financial metrics at the organization level, staff demographic data, and pay equity by position type. The results from the Annual Performance Evaluation and Report also helped inform SHS contracting decisions for program year four, including the award of multi-year contracts for high-performing organizations. Additional improvements are planned for this year including monthly scorecards for our partners to help them see and manage their performance throughout the year and performance improvement plans to provide more structure and support for struggling organizations.

The Homeless Services Division also designed and piloted a new monitoring framework. This was piloted with one service component to evaluate the program delivery of Rapid Rehousing services. The monitoring included a review of policies and procedures assessing how partners are delivering culturally responsive services, case file reviews, and compliance with program standards outlined in service contracts and the Division's program manual. The pilot monitoring program included opportunities for partner agencies to provide feedback on their experiences and make suggestions to improve the monitoring structure.

The formal monitoring process will fully launch in our fourth program year.

Finally, the Homeless Services Division evaluated our own internal processes to make improvements in quality and efficiency. In program year three, we created multi-service contracts to reduce contract preparation and tracking for all parties and alleviate the burden for providers to manage multiple contracts. Another milestone was reducing our average invoice processing time down to 18 days through process improvements, invoice automation and an expanded finance and accounting team.

Stories of Hope

A bridge to home for Kayla and her family

Kayla stayed at the Tigard family shelter, Bridge to Home, and was able to move into long-term housing with her family last winter. The shelter is owned and operated by Family Promise of Tualatin Valley, one of the 24 service providers working with us in Washington County on homeless services. Their mission is focused on serving families with children in east Washington County. Once their shelter reaches full capacity, they will be able to serve 70 families and/or adults with higher medical needs with shelter while they get connected with long-term housing solutions.

She said, "You wouldn't know that we were homeless when we were here at Family Promise because we weren't homeless; we had a bridge to home. Because of that, because of our case manager, because of Family Promise, because of everyone that helps here who helped us so much, we now have an amazing home that we live in. ...

All the other cities, other countries in the world, take a note, take a lesson because this is how you change the world!"



Kayla and Brady sat down with Washington County staff to share more about their family's journey to stable housing.


Financial Overview

In the third program year, Washington County originally budgeted \$86 million and amended the budget to \$96.2 million to accommodate rapid program growth and increased revenue forecast received in November 2023. The program was initially expected to expend 85% of this budget authority, as programs were continuing to be built and launched in year three. However, the Homeless Services Division far surpassed that spending target, expending 100% of the budget.

In year three, carry-over funds from the previous two program years were invested in eviction prevention services, shelter capital projects, technical assistance and capacity building grants for providers, and the development of the Center for Addiction Triage and Treatment (CATT). The CATT is a project to increase addictions treatment capacity in Washington County.

In our fourth program year, the Homeless Services Division has budgeted \$115 million based on the current available forecast. Remaining carry-over funds are fully committed or assigned to one-time investments in eviction prevention and capacity building for providers, or capital investments in transitional housing, access centers, and permanent emergency shelters. Given the volatile nature of this funding source, Washington County maintains healthy reserves to manage for unforeseen programmatic and economic crises.

In planning and preparing the budget for our fourth program year, the Homeless Services Division consulted with the Homeless Solutions Advisory Council and the Housing and Supportive Services Network. Feedback helped shape and refine budget planning to support stability across programs and ensure the housing outcomes our community is counting on. See Attachment G for the full annual financial report.



Attachments

Attachment A Workplan Goals and Outcomes	20
Attachment B SHS Funded Programs Overview	27
Attachment C SHS Service Provider Contracts	29
Attachment D SHS Annual Performance Metrics	32
Attachment E System Annual Performance Metrics	36
Attachment F Equity Analysis	42
Attachment G Annual Financial Report	55
Attachment H Provider Demographics Information	60
Attachment I Regional Coordination	71

Workplan Goals and Outcomes

Category 1: Housing/ program quantitative goals

Regional Metric	Annual Goal	Actual outcome	If you did not meet the goal, explain why and your plans for improving performance
Number of supportive housing units/opportunities you plan to bring into operation this year (in vouchers/units)	500 Placements	399 placements	Described in PSH Goal Below
Number of housing placements (people and households):	1,000 HH	652 HH	We set ambitious but achievable goals. Last year, we got close, but didn't fully meet our goals. County staff and providers have had discussions about why our system isn't meeting the goals, and the reasons that rose to the top are detailed under each program.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) 	500 HH	399 HH	We set our goals early, so when we housed an additional 130 households (exceeding our goal to house 500 households) in PSH in Year 2, that may have impacted the capacity we had to house individuals and families in year 3. While we did expand capacity in year 3, we have learned that program expansions take time to result in housing placements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) 	300 HH	241 HH	We're also still scaling up our RRH program and adjusting program standards to support higher needs households that meet prioritization criteria. Our year 3 goals were set based on remaining capacity from year 2 and expanded capacity in year 3. Our RRH program continues to develop structures and processes to meet the needs of households with service needs similar to those who are enrolling in PSH programs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move In Ready Fund 	200 HH	6 HH	The move in ready fund was just launched this year, and later than anticipated. Few households accessing traditionally homeless services pathways met initial eligibility criteria. Program access has been adjusted to engage the eligible Population B, and we anticipate the fund being more heavily utilized in the upcoming program year.
Number of homelessness preventions (households):	500 HH	1,565 HH	The County far exceeded eviction prevention goals with our partners, by continuing programming scaled during the pandemic. Eviction prevention resources have been a temporary intervention funded by carry forward investments. As the County faces budgetary limitations, and works to balance our system in alignment with the

			Population B 25% split, this eviction prevention program is unlikely to continue.
Housing retention rate(s) (%)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) 	85%	92%	Washington County PSH programs far exceed our retention goals and national trends.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapid Re-Housing/Short-term Rent Assistance 	85%	81%	We did not meet our retention goal for RRH but find that our retention rates are aligned with industry expectations. This lower percentage can be explained by the low volume of data we have currently for retention numbers in RRH.

Category 2: RACIAL EQUITY – Strategies to meet regional goals and local/LIP strategies to address racial disparities

Objective	Details	Did you achieve it? Y/N	Description of progress	If you did not meet the objective, explain why and your plans for doing so
Provide access to services and housing for Black, Indigenous and people of color at greater rates than Black, Indigenous and people of color experiencing homelessness	Increase understanding among racial disparities for Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders in housing programs to better reach and serve this community	Y	We continued to run bi-annual equity data analysis that showed this disparity continuing to occur but did see gains in serving Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders through Rapid Rehousing and Eviction prevention programs. A staff person of the County’s Office for Equity, Inclusion, and Community Engagement also reviewed our program outcomes and made recommendations for next steps, including building relationships with service providers targeting these populations and increasing language access – both efforts are currently underway.	
	Continued evaluation of Community Connect to ensure phased approach results in greater access to housing programs for Black, Indigenous, Latino/a/e, Asians, Pacific Islanders, immigrants, and refugees.	Y	Community Connect is included in our bi-annual equity analysis that we conduct to assess how our is serving Black, Indigenous and People of Color in housing programs. Additionally, we continued this work through the Tri-County Planning Body to ensure regional alignment.	

<p>Increase culturally specific organization capacity with increased investments and expanded organizational reach for culturally specific organizations and programs</p>	<p>Maintain seven culturally specific providers within the Washington County network and expand their contracting opportunities.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>See Attachment C</p>	
<p>Build (for provider network) anti-racist, gender-affirming systems with regionally established, culturally responsive policies, standards and technical assistance</p>	<p>Expand technical assistance and capacity building support for culturally specific providers</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>See Annual Report, “Investing in Provider Capacity” section. 100% of our culturally specific have participated and been awarded technical assistance and/or capacity building project funding</p>	
<p>Build (for provider network) anti-racist, gender-affirming systems with regionally established, culturally responsive policies, standards and technical assistance</p>	<p>Expand Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (DEI) training competencies to ensure 100% participation across the system of providers</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>We are proud to report that all of our partner agencies participated in at least one equity-focused training with a diverse catalog of courses ranging from LGBT+ inclusion, Unconscious Bias, and Class, Race & Housing Inequities.</p>	

Category 3: CAPACITY BUILDING – Lead agency/systems infrastructure, provider capacity

Objective	Details	Did you achieve it? (Y/N)	Description of progress	Which LIP goal(s) does this objective advance and how does it advance the goal(s)
Expand evaluation and monitoring programming to ensure contract outcomes and impact	In the third program year Washington County will strengthen our programs with evaluation and monitoring supports to enhance technical assistance, program improvements and community outcomes. This will include desk monitoring contract metric compliance management	Y	See “Evaluation and Quality Improvement” section of Annual Report	Create a Standard of Care among all service providers that is culturally responsive, based in housing first principles, guided by people with lived experience and informed in the best practices of trauma-informed and people-centered care; Establish consistent definitions, standards of care and evaluation practices to improve service provision, outcomes and supports for community partners
Launch new aligned governance structure to oversee and advise the entire homeless services system	As Washington County prepares for the coming program year and experiences continued growth in our homeless system, we are bringing our reporting and governance bodies into coordinated alignment as one homeless services system. This includes a reorganization of advisory bodies and streamlining a single set of guidance.	Y	See the “Advancing a ‘One Governance’ Approach” section of Annual Report.	
Launch 45 new housing careers	The Housing Careers Workforce Development Project recently launched. In the coming year, the program has the infrastructure to partner with leading experts to recruit, train, support and employ at least 45 individuals, with a preference for BIPOC participants who were previously homeless or experienced housing instability and desire to grow a career in the homeless services industry.	Y	45 program participants were enrolled in the Housing Careers Workforce Development Project and 42 completed the program.	Diversity of staff by race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability status and lived experience. The investment strengthens the system and ensures expanded culturally specific provisions and services to help meet the needs of the community and increase the workforce.

Category 4: OTHER ANNUAL GOALS BASED ON LIP

Objective	Details	Did you achieve it? (Y/N)	Description of progress	Which LIP goal(s) does this objective advance and how does it advance the goal(s)
Reduce average stays in shelter programs to less than 100 days	System evaluation has measured the length of time people are staying in our shelter programs. While there has been progress with shelter stays, such as adding case management until stable housing is secured and expanding year-round shelter capacity, we also know it is taking longer for people to become housed. This is largely because our shelters are open longer or year-round, so shelter stays are necessarily longer. Nonetheless, we want to ensure strong flow-through in our system such that people are able to secure housing and leave shelter as quickly as possible.	Y	Our average shelter stay for SHS shelter entries during year 3 was 91 days. Intentional efforts to increase diversionary programming for shelter residents, and coordination between shelter and housing programs have resulted in shorter shelter stays and increased exits to housing. To clarify, this metric is different than the length of time program participants are in our system before they are housed. Participants in year 3 are in SHS programs on average 90 days before being housed (this number is shorter than average shelter stay length because some participants skip shelter entirely and move directly into housing).	The Washington County SHS System of Care will coordinate and strategize investments for Shelter and Transitional Housing; To coordinate long-term system goal, phasing investments requires evaluation of progress and adjustment of programmatic approaches including housing outcomes over time.
Create new graduation and housing retention approaches for households no longer in need of intensive	We understand that many households can reach a level of stability that would allow them to exit intensive support services and maintain their housing independently with minimal supports. These exits will support the inflow by allowing support services to be available to new	Y	We launched the RLRA only program in the spring of 2024, which allows households to continue to receive RLRA funding for stable rent assistance, without unnecessary case management.	Demonstrate housing placement and stability outcomes that advance racial equity and functionally end chronic homelessness with year over year system improvements and regional coordination.; Establish consistent definitions, standards of care and evaluation practices to improve service provisions and outcomes.

<p>support services</p>	<p>households entering the system. This year, Washington County will implement a strategy that will create additional housing services capacity in our system, while providing just the right level of service needed for those in our housing programs.</p>			
<p>Launch new programs to improve system performance including Recuperative Care and youth focused housing programs</p>	<p>While many new housing programs have been launched and are robustly serving our communities in new ways, some programming area gaps remain. In the third program year, Washington County will launch new programs to better serve homeless youth and homeless individuals who need medical care while staying in our shelter programs.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Launched Low Acuity Transitional Services (LATS) Program launched in fall 2023. The youth-focused housing program was delayed and redesigned from a site-based program to expanded scattered-site rental opportunities for youth.</p>	<p>Create Supportive Housing Placements with Permanent Housing and Supportive Services; Building partnerships and programs with the Healthcare system to leverage investments and better serve people experiencing homelessness with significant healthcare needs.</p>
<p>Open 60 new year-round shelter beds to complete our shelter system capacity</p>	<p>Pod shelter programs, or “safe rest villages” are demonstrated successful programs in Washington County offering an alternative shelter option for community members. Temporary pod shelter programs will provide shelter system capacity in advance of permanent shelter sites that will sustain this compacity long term. Additionally, 30 more shelter beds are anticipated to open in Tigard at the new Project Turnkey site operated owned by Tualatin Valley Family Promise.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>See “Shelter Programs: A Steppingstone to Housing” section of Annual Report.</p> <p>At the end of the fiscal year, there were 420 shelter beds open in Washington County that are funded through SHS.</p>	<p>Add 250 year-round shelter beds in Washington County</p>

Category 5: Misc. Annual Report Requirements from Metro

Description of SHS procurement processes in year 3 and how they were equitable and transparent.

The Homeless Services Division released three procurement processes in fiscal year 23/24. The first was the Beaverton Shelter Operator Request for Proposals (RFP), released in August of 2023, which sought proposals from qualified organizations to provide congregate shelter operations at the new 12,000 sq. ft. shelter in Beaverton. The second procurement was the Access Center Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO), released in February of 2024 which was a capital procurement seeking partnership with building or landowners to fund, develop, and support new Access Centers across the County. The third procurement process was a rolling RFP, opened each month for thirty days to seek proposals from affordable housing owners looking to add Permanent Supportive Housing services and/or RLRA vouchers into their development to further the county’s goal of 500 Permanent Supportive Housing placements. The county also participated in a Metro led Request for Pre-Qualification, along with Clackamas and Multnomah Counties, to expand eligible SHS contract partners to address consulting needs (ranging from communications to human resources to compliance and more, for more details see Attachment I).

Prior to the launch of any procurement, the department notifies interested parties through various channels, like email lists, advisory body meetings, community convenings, and through newsletters. To ensure that all interested applicants are informed on the expectations of the procurement, the department holds pre-conference meetings one week into the open procurement. This ensures there is ample time for applicants to digest the information available to them. During these pre-conference meetings, county staff describe the key elements of the RFP/NOFO, review the application submittal requirements, and answer questions from interested applicants. The meetings are always recorded and posted to the procurement page for all applicants to review. In addition, the department opens an anonymous question portal to answer additional questions from potential applicants.

To ensure continued equity and transparency, the department launched the Equitable Procurement Technical Subcommittee of the Homeless Solutions Advisory Council in June. The subcommittee has completed onboarding and is providing input into the procedures for how procurement processes are conducted and how contracts are awarded. This subcommittee’s first responsibility is to define local funding priorities for the annual Continuum of Care (CoC) HUD NOFO based on the information provided by the Performance Evaluation subcommittee.

Regional Long-term Rent Assistance Data

RLRA vouchers issued in year 3	393
Households newly leased up using RLRA in year 3	394
Total households in housing using RLRA in year 3	1262
Total households housed using an RLRA voucher since July 1, 2021	1375
Total people housed using an RLRA voucher since July 1, 2021	2321

SHS Funded Programs Overview

Program name	Program type	Date program launched (contract executed)	Capacity (beds, people that can be served, etc.)	Population A/B	Contracted provider(s)
Quality Assurance	Capacity Building	July 1, 2023	19 FTE across partner orgs	Pop A/B	Bienestar, Boys & Girls Aid, Centro Cultural, Community Action, Community Partners for Affordable Housing (CPAH), Easter Seals, Family Promise of Greater Washington County (GWC), Family Promise of Tualatin Valley (TV), Good Neighbor Center, Greater Good NW, HomePlate Youth, Immigrants and Refugee Community Organization (IRCO), Just Compassion, Native American Rehabilitation Organization (NARA), Open Door Housing Works, Project Homeless Connect, New Narrative, Sequoia, Urban League
Community Connect	Coordinated Entry System	July 1, 2023	Undefined	Pop A/B	Community Action
Housing Liaison Services Program	Navigation	July 1, 2023	Undefined	Pop A/B	Project Homeless Connect, Open Door Housing Works, Bienestar, New Narrative, Community Action, Greater Good, Centro, Family Promise of TV
Street Outreach	Outreach	July 1, 2023	Undefined	Pop A/B	Forest Grove Foundation, Greater Good, HomePlate, IRCO, Just Compassion, New Narrative, Open Door, Project Homeless Connect
Inclement Weather Shelter Resource Team	Outreach	July 1, 2023	NA	Pop A/B	Open Door
Eviction Prevention	Prevention	July 1, 2023	Undefined/ Targeted 1270 Households	Primarily serves Pop B (Pop A eligible)	Centro, Community Action
Housing Case Management Services	PSH	July 1, 2023	1550 Households	Primarily serves Pop A Pop B eligible (if 55+ and homeless)	Boys & Girls Aid, Bienestar, Centro, Community Action, CPAH, Centro, Easter Seals, Family Promise of GWC, Family Promise of TV, Good Neighbor Center, Greater Good, HomePlate, IRCO, Just Compassion, NARA, New Narrative, Open Door, Project Homeless Connect, Sequoia Mental Health Services, Urban League

Permanent Supportive Housing Clinical Case Management Services - Heartwood	PSH	July 1, 2023	54 Units	Primarily serves Pop A Pop B eligible (if 55+ and homeless)	Sequoia Mental Health Services, CPAH, CDP Oregon LLC (Cornerstone Community Housing)
Permanent Supportive Housing Case Management Services - Viewfinder	PSH	Feb. 1, 2024	6 Units	Primarily serves Pop A Pop B eligible (if 55+ and homeless)	Project Homeless Connect
Rapid Re-Housing & Homelessness Prevention	RRH	July 1, 2023	652 Households	Primarily serves Pop B (Pop A eligible)	Boys & Girls Aid, Bienestar, CPAH, Centro, Easter Seals, Family Promise of WC, Family Promise of TV, Good Neighbor Center, Greater Good, HomePlate, IRCO, Just Compassion, NARA, New Narrative, Open Door, Project Homeless Connect, Sequoia, Urban League
Alternative Shelter	Shelter	July 1, 2023	90 Units	Pop A/B	Open Door
Congregate Shelter	Shelter	July 1, 2023	115 persons	Pop A/B	Just Compassion, Open Door, Boys & Girls Aid
Non-Congregate Shelter	Shelter	July 1, 2023	205 Units	Pop A/B	Centro, Project Homeless Connect, Family Promise of TV
Inclement Weather Shelter	Shelter	July 1, 2023	Undefined	Pop A/B	Project Homeless Connect, Just Compassion
Recovery Care	Shelter	July 1, 2023	10	Pop A/B	Greater Good
Furniture Services	Support Services	July 1, 2023	NA	Pop A/B	Oregon Community Warehouse
Housing Careers	Workforce	July 1, 2023	Undefined	Pop A/B	Open Door, Worksystems

SHS Service Provider Contracts

For services to be delivered July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024 – Multicomponent Contracts Only

Name of provider	Programs/ services in contract	Culturally specific provider? Y/N	Popula- tion served (Black, Indigen- ous, etc.)	FY 23-24 contract amount	Total invoiced in FY 23-24	Total paid in FY 23-24
Bienestar Inc	Housing Liaison Services, Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), Quality Assurance, and Culturally Specific Administrative Support	Y	Latine, Black, Indigenous and People of Color, Families, Adults	1,520,116	1,036,881	1,036,881
Boys & Girls Aid Society of Oregon	TAY Youth Congregate Shelter, Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), and Quality Assurance		Transitional Age Youth	678,051	509,280	509,280
CDP Oregon LLC	Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) Resident Services at the Viewfinder		Viewfinder residents	133,000	106,602.46	106,602.46
Centro Cultural of Washington County	Casa Amparo Non-Congregate Shelter, Centro Motel Non-Congregate Shelter, Shelter Housing Liaison Services, Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), Quality Assurance, and Culturally Specific Administrative Support	Y	Latine, Families	9,010,027	8,060,989	8,060,989
Community Action Organization	Housing Liaison Services (HL), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), Quality Assurance, and Community Connect		All eligible SHS program participants	9,764,496	9,443,985	9,443,985
Community Partners for Affordable Housing	Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), and Quality Assurance		Adults	948,635	671,963	671,963
Easter Seals Oregon	Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), and Quality Assurance		Adults ages 55+	976,453	627,773	627,773
Family Promise of Greater Washington County	Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), and Quality Assurance		Families	762,847	457,438	457,438

Family Promise of Tualatin Valley	Tigard Non-Congregate Emergency Shelter, Housing Liaison Services (HL), Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), and Quality Assurance		Families	4,357,041	3,912,900	3,912,900
Forest Grove Foundation	Street Outreach		All eligible SHS program participants	306,102	341,233	341,233
Good Neighbor Center	Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), and Quality Assurance		Families	1,137,459	755,973	755,973
Greater Good Northwest	Street Outreach, Hillsboro Non-Congregate Shelter, Housing Liaison Services, Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), Quality Assurance, and Culturally Specific Administrative Support	Y	Families, Transitional Age Youth, Adults, Adults ages 55+	4,265,682	3,322,439	3,322,439
HomePlate Youth Services	Street Outreach, Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), and Quality Assurance		Families, Transitional Age Youth	1,217,339	970,262	970,262
Immigrant & Refugee Community Organization	Street Outreach, Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), Quality Assurance, and Culturally Specific Administrative Support	Y	Immigrants and refugees, Families, Adults ages 55+	2,052,843	1,043,681	1,043,681
Just Compassion of East Washington County	Street Outreach, Beaverton Congregate Shelter, Tigard Congregate Shelter, Inclement Weather Shelter, Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), and Quality Assurance		Adults	3,610,266	3,358,377	3,358,377
Native American Rehabilitation Association of the Northwest Inc	Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), Quality Assurance, and Culturally Specific Administrative Support	Y	American Indian/Alaska Native, Families, Adults ages 55+	820,362	227,001	227,001
New Narrative	Street Outreach, Housing Liaison Services (HL), Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), and Quality Assurance		Adults	1,840,081	1,370,252	1,370,252


Open Door Housing-Works	Street Outreach, Hillsboro Congregate Shelter, Inclement Weather Shelter/Resource Team, Alternative Pods, Alternative Pods Site Preparation, Alternative Pods, Housing Liaison Services (HL), Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services, (HCMS), Quality Assurance, and Housing Careers Program, Operational services for the Hillsboro Alternative Shelter Pods		All eligible SHS program participants	9,033,799	7,180,509	7,180,509
Oregon Community Warehouse Inc	Household Supplies		All eligible SHS program participants	1,050,000	717,900	717,900
Project Homeless Connect Washington County	Street Outreach, Motel Non-Congregate Shelter, Inclement Weather Shelter, Housing Liaison Services, Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), and Quality Assurance		Adults	5,214,411	4,508,257	4,508,257
Sequoia Mental Health Services	Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), and Quality Assurance		Adults	1,222,367	752,658	752,658
Urban League of Portland	Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), Housing Case Management Services (HCMS), Quality Assurance, and Culturally Specific Administrative Support	Y	Black, Indigenous, People of Color, Adults	745,790	573,366	573,366
Virginia Garcia Memorial Health Center	Culturally Specific Administrative Support, and Recuperative Care Services	Y	Black, Indigenous and People of Color, and other culturally specific services	335,499	332,934	332,934
Worksystems Inc	Housing Careers		SHS program participants with lived experience of homelessness	1,200,401	678,729	678,729

SHS Annual Performance Metrics

SHS Outcome Metric 1: System Capacity

Number of housing and shelter units created and maintained through SHS funds

Number of Housing or Shelter Units Created and Total Capacity



SHS Outcome Metric 3.1: Total Households and Individuals Served by Program Type

Number of households and individuals served by SHS programs at any point during the reporting period. For Housing Programs, this count includes people who were enrolled and not yet housed.

Total HOUSEHOLDS Served by Program Type

Total Unique Households Served		5,694
Access Programs	Shelter & Transitional Housing	1,367
	Street Outreach	1,061
	Services Only	564
Housing Programs	Supportive Housing	1,574
	Rapid Re-Housing	666
	Other Permanent Housing	6
	Prevention	1,569


Total INDIVIDUALS Served by Program Type

Total Unique Individuals Served		10,466
Access Programs	Shelter & Transitional Housing	1,844
	Street Outreach	1,192
	Services Only	651
Housing Programs	Supportive Housing	2,559
	Rapid Re-Housing	1,559
	Other Permanent Housing	6
	Prevention	4,451

SHS Outcome Metric 3.2: Housing Placements & Homelessness Preventions

Number of housing placements and homelessness preventions, by housing intervention type (e.g. supportive housing, rapid rehousing).

HOUSEHOLDS Placed into Housing Programs or Receiving Eviction Prevention resources



Households newly housed and retained in projects during the reporting period. Households in permanent housing projects must have a valid housing move-in date.


Retained refers to households who moved into housing in a prior reporting period and were still in the same housing program at some point during the current reporting period

Transferred refers to households who were housed with one provider/program and then moved to another housing provider or program while still housed. Some Transfer Placements may occur during the same reporting period as the initial placement and households may be counted in both groups.

Newly Placed/Served refers to households who moved into housing during the reporting period or received Eviction Prevention funds

Note: Households may get counted in multiple buckets depending on the situation, so the total number on the left side may not match up with adding the numbers from the placement types.

INDIVIDUALS Placed into Housing Programs or Receiving Eviction Prevention Resources



SHS Outcome Metric 4: Housing Retention Rates

This will measure if housing stability is achieved with supportive housing.

SHS Household Retention Rates

Households who were retained in housing after at 1 year

% of HOUSEHOLDS Retained in All Housing Programs

92%

Households Retained in Housing	835
Households in Retention Evaluation Population	912

% of HOUSEHOLDS Retained by Program Type

Supportive Housing	92%	Households Retained in Housing	820
		Households Housed in Year Prior to Reporting Period	890
Rapid Re-Housing	81%	Households Retained in Housing	22
		Households Exiting to PH in Year Prior to Reporting Period	27

Households are considered to have been retained in supportive or permanent housing if they were housed at some point in the year prior to the reporting period and were either:

1. Still in the housing program at the end of the reporting period
- Or
2. Had exited to a permanent housing destination at some point and had not returned to the homeless services system as of the end of the reporting period

Households are considered to have been retained in Rapid Re-housing if they exited RRH to a permanent housing destination at some point in the year prior to the reporting period and either:

1. Did not return to homeless services by the end of the reporting period
- Or
2. Were housed in another housing program at the end of the reporting period

For this program year, we had an extremely small sample size for evaluating retention due to this program being new. The low retention rate is not necessarily indicative of how this program will perform on an ongoing basis.

Note: Some households exiting to certain destinations are excluded from this metric in alignment with the HUD SPM methodology

SHS Outcome Metric 5: Length of Homelessness and Returns to Homelessness

‘Length of homelessness’ and ‘returns to homelessness’. These will measure how effectively the system is meeting the need over time.

Length of Homelessness (Years)

Length of time between approximate date homelessness started (prior to system or program entry) and the last day of the reporting period (if unhoused) or Housing Move-in Date (if housed) for those enrolled in a SHS program.



Note: Unhoused is anyone with an open entry into any SHS funded Shelter or Street Outreach program with a homeless Prior Living Situation.

HOUSEHOLD Returns to Homelessness Services

Households who exited a SHS program to a permanent housing destination, and returned to the homelessness services system within two years of exit.

15.2%

HHs Returned **174**

HHs Exited to PH **1,143**

Households are considered to have returned to services if they have an entry in an CES, ES, SO, or TH project anytime after exiting to a PH destination.

Returns by SHS Program Type Exited

SHS Program Type Exited	% of HHs Returning	HHs Returned	HHs Exited to PH
Supportive Housing	10%	19	189
Rapid Re-housing	21%	35	168
Street Outreach	14%	30	213
Services Only	19%	39	206
Shelter & Transitional Housing	14%	67	477

System Annual Performance Metrics

Outcome Metric 1: System Capacity

Number of supportive housing units created and total capacity, compared to households in need of supportive housing. This will measure change in supportive housing system capacity and need over time. Supportive housing includes long-term housing programs that offer wraparound support services in addition to rental assistance.

Number of supportive housing units created and total capacity



Compared to known Population A Households engaged with our housing services system


(estimates need for supportive housing)



Households in Need are defined as households who meet the SHS Population A definition and then classified by the status of their needs:

- Households with needs Met** are households that have been placed in a housing program (supportive housing or other housing program)
- Households with needs Partially Met** are households that have been connected to a housing program, but have not moved into housing yet
- Households with needs Unmet** are households that are either on our CES waitlist, staying in Shelter, or working with Street Outreach that are waiting to be connected to a housing resource

Other non-supportive housing and shelter options that provide system capacity



Outcome Metric 2: Programmatic Inflow and Outflow

Number of households experiencing housing instability or homelessness compared to households placed into stable housing each year. This will measure programmatic inflow and outflow.

Annual HOUSEHOLD Inflow and Outflow



Inflow is anyone newly identified as homeless in the reporting period through an entry into an access program (Coordinated Entry, Shelter, or Street Outreach)

System Placement includes all households or individuals who were housed via a housing program or received eviction prevention funds that are part of the County homeless services system


Positive Exit includes all households or individuals who exited an access program with a permanent housing destination, but was not placed in a housing program in our system

Other includes all households or individuals who exited Coordinated Entry, Shelter, Street Outreach, or Transitional Housing to a non-permanent housing destination and we are not able to determine if their housing crisis was resolved or not

Note: Homelessness Preventions Households receiving Eviction or Homelessness Prevention funds are only counted in Outflow if they were included in the Inflow count prior to receiving prevention funds

of HOUSEHOLDS Unserved by Entry Point


Number of households with an open entry at the end of the program year. This includes households that carried their need over from a prior reporting period. This represents all households waiting in our system regardless of their SHS Priority Population designation.




Outcome Metric 3.1: Total Households and Individuals Served by Program Type

Number of households and individuals served in our system at any point during the reporting period. For Housing Programs, this count includes people who were enrolled and not yet housed.

Total HOUSEHOLDS Served by Program Type




Total INDIVIDUALS Served by Program Type



Outcome Metric 3.2: Housing Placements & Homelessness Preventions

Number of housing placements and homelessness preventions, by housing intervention type (e.g. supportive housing, rapid rehousing).

HOUSEHOLDS Placed into Housing Programs or Receiving Eviction Prevention Resources



Households newly housed and retained in projects during the reporting period. Households in permanent housing projects must have a valid housing move-in date.


Retained refers to households who moved into housing in a prior reporting period and were still in the same housing program at some point during the current reporting period

Transferred refers to households who were housed with one provider/program and then moved to another housing provider or program while still housed. Some Transfer Placements may occur during the same reporting period as the initial placement and households may be counted in both groups.

Newly Placed/Served refers to households who moved into housing during the reporting period or received Eviction Prevention funds

Note: Households may get counted in multiple buckets depending on the situation, so the total number on the left side may not match up with adding the numbers from the placement types.

INDIVIDUALS Placed into Housing Programs or Receiving Eviction Prevention Resources



Outcome Metric 4: Housing Retention Rates

This will measure if housing stability is achieved with supportive housing.

Household Retention Rates

Households who were retained in housing after at 1 year

% of HOUSEHOLDS Retained in All Housing Programs

94%	Households Retained in Housing	1,678
	Households in Retention Evaluation Population	1,788

% of HOUSEHOLDS Retained by Program Type

Supportive Housing	96%	Households Retained in Housing	1,496
		Households Housed in Year Prior to Reporting Period	1,559
Other Permanent Housing	87%	Households Retained in Housing	76
		Households Housed in Year Prior to Reporting Period	87
Rapid Re-Housing	87%	Households Retained in Housing	150
		Households Exiting to PH in Year Prior to Reporting Period	173

Households are considered to have been retained in supportive or permanent housing if they were housed at some point in the year prior to the reporting period and were either:

1. Still in the housing program at the end of the reporting period
- Or
2. Had exited to a permanent housing destination at some point and had not returned to the homeless services system as of the end of the reporting period

Households are considered to have been retained in Rapid Re-housing if they exited RRH to a permanent housing destination at some point in the year prior to the reporting period and either:

1. Did not return to homeless services by the end of the reporting period
- Or
2. Were housed in another housing program at the end of the reporting period

Note: Some households exiting to certain destinations are excluded from this metric in alignment with the HUD SPM methodology

Outcome Metric 5: Length of Homelessness and Returns to Homelessness

‘Length of homelessness’ and ‘returns to homelessness’. These will measure how effectively the system is meeting the need over time.

Length of Homelessness (Years)

Length of time between approximate date homelessness started (prior to system or program entry) and the last day of the reporting period (if unhoused) or Housing Move-in Date (if housed).



Note: Unhoused is anyone with an open entry into CES, ES, SO, or TH with a homeless Prior Living Situation.

Household Returns to Homelessness Services

Households who exited the homelessness services system to a permanent housing destination, and returned to the homelessness services system within two years of exit.

% of HOUSEHOLDS Returning to Homelessness Services	HHs Returned	1,137
	HHs Exited to PH	5,706

19.9%

Households are considered to have returned to services if they have an entry in an CES, ES, SO, or TH project anytime after exiting to a PH destination.

Returns by Program Type Exited

		% of HHs Returning	HHs Returned	HHs Exited to PH
Housing Programs	Supportive Housing	11%	24	225
	Rapid Re-housing	31%	165	529
Access Programs	Shelter & Transitional Housing	15%	112	727
	Street Outreach	14%	31	217
	Coordinated Entry	23%	466	2,024
	Services Only	20%	673	3,384

Equity Analysis

Washington County is committed to advancing racial equity work through our housing work. This work includes strengthening avenues for public participation through our advisory bodies, conducting bi-annual racial equity analysis to better understand who our system is currently serving, where the need is in our community, and the gaps between Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) experiencing poverty and accessing housing services. As we continue to serve BIPOC program participants, we are also assessing and encouraging greater workforce racial diversity and supporting our culturally specific service providers. We are proud to report strong outcomes in serving BIPOC program participants and addressing housing access disparities, while still exploring the ways our system can improve in the future.

Advancing racial equity through representation in decision-making

Consistent with regional goals to increase access and inclusion in our community advisory bodies, Washington County has modernized our governance structure to ensure policy guidance, program oversight, and public transparency with diverse voices and representation from across Washington County. This included a “One Governance” initiative to align multiple advisory bodies into a single governance structure. The new Homeless Solutions Advisory Council or the “Solutions Council” launched in January 2024 with 10 members, the demographics of the members are listed in the pie chart below. The Solutions Council currently hosts three important subcommittees: Performance Evaluation, Lived Experience, and Equitable Procurement. While two members of the Solutions Council have lived experience of homelessness, the Lived Experience Advisory Body also supports decision making that centers the needs of those navigating our system.

In addition to the Solutions Council, Washington County convenes the Housing and Supportive Services Network (HSSN). HSSN, a network of hundreds of service provider and community partners, meets monthly and represents a diverse group of organizations and workers with lived experience. HSSN is engaged early in projects to inform values and criteria staff use to support decision making.

The Racial equity data analysis report

Washington County conducts a bi-annual data analysis to continue to understand racial and ethnic disparities in our community and track progress in our programs to mitigate these disparities. Our racial equity analysis uses two distinct approaches to evaluate how effective our programs are at reaching a diverse population.

First, the data is presented according to racial identities used in our HMIS reporting, with categories people are more likely to use to identify themselves, according to best practices in data equity reporting. This summary is found in the color block charts. These data sets also utilize an “alone or in combination” methodology – meaning that people get counted in each of the distinct racial groups they identify with. In these summaries, the percentage by each racial group will add up to more than 100% since people can be counted in multiple racial groups.

To properly understand how we are reaching communities in need, the analysis also compares our HMIS data to the population data sets that come from American Community Survey (ACS) data. The ACS data uses a different reporting methodology that groups people into a singular racial identity (called a “mutually exclusive” methodology). We adjust our data into the categories used by the ACS for all comparative analysis. In the report, bar charts with comparative population analysis typically follow the color block charts to illustrate how that particular service area compared to the population in poverty and the overall Washington County population.

Highlights from the racial equity data analysis

Housing Placements and Preventions programs from 7/1/21 through 6/30/2024 across Washington County's Homeless Services system have been very successful at reaching a diverse population. The diversity of our population served has increased with each fiscal year, which is predominantly due to the addition of programs that focus more on SHS Priority Population B (Rapid Re-Housing and Prevention). We have been most successful at reaching the Latine (41%) and Black (14%) populations in our programs, and have additional effort needed to increase reach to Asian American and Native American households in some services areas. Data charts are available at the end of this attachment.

Overall HMIS Data Analysis

Our homeless services system sees similar percentages by racial identity as it does for those served in our programs. We also recognize the data quality challenges as we are missing racial identifiers for 8% of our program participants. This is partially due to the early engagement our Street Outreach services provide, before trust with participants can be established. Our successes in reaching the Latine population have resulted in that population representing a lower proportion of those in need (28%) than we serve on average (41%).

HMIS Entry & Exit Data

Looking at the racial identities of those who entered our system at some point in FY 23-24, we see a similar diversity level as those awaiting services in our system. A significant portion of people did not report a racial identity (8%), most noticeable with those entering through our Street Outreach Services.

Regarding the racial identities of those who exited our system at some point in FY 23-24, we also see a similar diversity level as those entering the system. Additionally, a large portion of those who do not report their racial identity end up exiting to an unknown situation (10%). This could be people who had less system interaction and were exited due to our Community Connect inactive policy.

SHS specific data

Similar to the Washington County overall system housing placements, SHS programs have been successful at reaching a diverse population, increasing each fiscal year. This is predominantly due to the addition of programs that focus more on Population B (Rapid Re-Housing and Prevention). We have been most successful at reaching the Latine and Black populations in our programs. When comparing the population served to the percentage of the population experiencing poverty in Washington County, we have been successful at serving many communities at higher rates than they experience poverty. The Asian-American and Pacific Islander population remains the exception.

Supportive Housing (PSH and HCMS)

SHS Supportive Housing programs are the least successful at reaching a diverse group of individuals. However, these programs have still reached high rates of diverse populations. One significant group of note is the Native American population. We can see the impact of having a culturally specific provider serving this group. Other than the Asian population, Supportive Housing programs are serving populations at similar rates to the percentages of those groups experience poverty in Washington County.

Rapid Re-housing

SHS Rapid Re-Housing programs have been successful at reaching a diverse group of individuals. One significant stand out is the 39% of the individuals served that identify as Latine. The ability for Rapid Re-Housing providers to reach this population stands out very clearly when comparing the percentage served (40%) to the percentage of those experiencing poverty (27%) in Washington County. These programs have also succeeded in serving most other communities of color at higher rates than they experience poverty.

Prevention

SHS Eviction and Homelessness Prevention programs have been our most successful programs for reaching the Asian-American and Pacific Islander population, which are underserved in other programs. This program is even more successful than Rapid Re-Housing in its ability to reach a diverse group. It serves the lowest percentage of people who identify as "White: Non-Hispanic" (30%) of any of our current programs, while reaching other populations at higher rates than they experience poverty in the county.

Advancing racial equity through our providers and workforce

As the front line to those accessing services, Washington County racial equity efforts have been focused on supporting our providers. The County collaborates with 24 service providers, including seven culturally specific organizations, to enhance services and advance equity. All partner agencies engaged in at least one equity-focused training, covering topics like LGBT+ inclusion and housing inequities. The county allocated \$235,000 in technical assistance grants to eight agencies and \$1.7 million for capacity building projects across 14 agencies. Notably, the Housing Careers program enrolled 45 participants, with 42 completing their projects, and expanded its focus to general employment services.

Approximately 45% of staff at provider agencies have experienced housing instability, and many identify as people of color, with culturally specific providers offering higher pay for direct service roles. The county conducts biannual equity analyses of outcomes data to guide program improvements, revealing that programs serve higher percentages of Black, Indigenous, and Latine households compared to their representation in the general population.

Strategies to advance racial equity: next steps

The intentionality of partnering with multiple culturally specific organizations has yielded clear and demonstrated impacts for serving diverse populations, and Washington County is proud of our partnership that make that reach possible. However, we continue to see gaps in reaching Asian-American and Pacific Islander households.

Participants identifying as Asian-American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) alone make up a smaller proportion of those that are either served (3%) or awaiting services in our system (3%) than the proportion of these individuals experience poverty in Washington County (8%). Although the SHS Eviction and Homelessness Prevention has shown success in serving this community, further strategies are being developed to address these disparities. We will prioritize renewed outreach to AAPI Community Based Organizations to generate feedback and recommendations unique to this population. We expect this work to take time, and we're committed to expanding equitable reach to all programs.

Internal improvements on our racial equity strategies are also underway. A recruitment for the first ever Homeless Services Equity Coordinator launched at the end of Program Year Three. With this new staff capacity, the county has expanded efforts to address longstanding disparities, particularly racial disparities, in housing outcomes. We will open new doors for culturally specific providers to provide direct feedback to county decision-makers, formalize a racial equity lens across the department, and increase investigation where our outcomes don't align with our goals. In Program Year Four, the counties and Metro are increasing regional coordination on equity advancements in the homeless services system. This includes sharing tools and approaches across the region that will help address disparities each county sees in their system.

Attachment F: Equity Analysis of System Outcomes


Housing Placements through 6/30/2024

When looking at the Housing Placements and Preventions from 7/1/21 through 6/30/2024 across our full Homeless Services system, it is clear that our programs have been very successful at reaching a diverse population. The diversity of our population served has increased with each fiscal year, which is predominantly due to the addition of programs that focus more on SHS Priority Population B (Rapid Re-Housing and Prevention). We have been most successful at reaching the Latine and Black populations in our programs.

% of Individual Housing Placements and Homelessness Preventions by Racial Identity
(alone or in combination)

- Asian
- Black
- Hispanic/Latina/e/o
- Native American
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- Middle Eastern or North African
- White: Non-Hispanic
- Not Reported

Note: Middle Eastern or North African was only added a race option in HMIS in October 2023 and has limited data



	Placed FY22		Placed FY23		Placed FY24		Grand Total	
	# of Individuals	% of Individuals	# of Individuals	% of Individuals	# of Individuals	% of Individuals	# of Individuals	% of Individuals
Asian	9	1%	34	1%	338	5%	377	4%
Black	134	13%	325	14%	1,202	16%	1,611	15%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	232	22%	949	41%	3,058	41%	4,042	39%
Native American	62	6%	152	6%	222	3%	417	4%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	33	3%	101	4%	314	4%	437	4%
Middle Eastern or North African			17	1%	117	2%	129	1%
White: Non-Hispanic	668	63%	971	41%	2,576	35%	4,069	39%
Not Reported	9	1%	22	1%	176	2%	205	2%

Equity Analysis for those Awaiting Services


as of 6/30/2024

Looking at our system as a whole and who is still in need, we see similar percentages by racial identity as we do for those served in our programs. Though we do have more data quality challenges with missing racial identities for 8% of those still in need. This is partially due to the early engagement our Street Outreach services provide, before trust is established. Our successes in reaching the Latine population has resulted in that population representing a lower proportion of those in need than we serve on average.

% of Individuals Unserved as of 6/30/2024 by Racial Identity
(alone or in combination)

- Asian
- Black
- Hispanic/Latina/e/o
- Native American
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- Middle Eastern or North African
- White: Non-Hispanic
- Not Reported


Note: Middle Eastern or North African was only added a race option in HMIS in October 2023 and has limited data



	# Unserved	% of Individuals Unserved
Asian	225	4%
Black	684	11%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	1,721	28%
Native American	233	4%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	315	5%
Middle Eastern or North African	45	1%
White: Non-Hispanic	2,820	46%
Not Reported	486	8%

How do the populations in need of housing programs compare to the overall population and populations in poverty in Washington County?

Those remaining unserved in our system make up a smaller percentage of the population experiencing poverty for most racial groups, and we are typically serving these groups at a higher rate than they are being left unserved. That said, our system has struggled to reach the Asian population. Those identifying as Asian make up a smaller proportion of those that are either served or awaiting services in our system than the proportion of these individuals experience poverty in Washington County.



Population data is from the American Community Services 2022 poverty data found at:
<https://data.census.gov/table?q=S1701%20&g=050XX00US41067&y=2022&d=ACS%201-Year%20Estimates%20Subject%20Tables>

Equity Analysis for those Served in Shelter


for the period from 7/1/2023 to 6/30/2024

Our Shelter system has been the least successful at serving the Asian and Latine communities, though it also has some data quality challenges with 6% of the population served not having a racial identity reported. Shelters do serve a similar rate of other communities of color as our housing programs.

% of Individuals served in Shelter by Racial Identity
(alone or in combination)

- Asian
- Black
- Hispanic/Latina/e/o
- Middle Eastern or North African
- Native American
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- Not Reported
- White: Non-Hispanic


Note: Middle Eastern or North African was only added a race option in HMIS in October 2023 and has limited data



	# of Individuals	% of Individuals Served
Asian	27	1%
Black	230	11%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	481	23%
Native American	112	5%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	149	7%
Middle Eastern or North African	13	1%
White: Non-Hispanic	1,164	55%
Not Reported	128	6%

How do the populations served in Shelter compare to the overall population and populations in poverty in Washington County?

Our Shelters have been successful at serving most population groups at higher rates than those experiencing poverty. The most notable exceptions are the Asian and Latine communities.




Population data is from the American Community Services 2022 poverty data found at: <https://data.census.gov/table?q=S1701%20&g=050XX00US41067&y=2022&d=ACS%201-Year%20Estimates%20Subject%20Tables>

Equity Analysis for Housing Retention Rates

for those housed at some point in FY 22-23 who retained their housing as of 6/30/2024 (please see attachment E for more details on Retention)

We do not see significant variance in the housing retention rates by racial identity with a few exceptions. Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders have a lower retention rate than average and this could be partially due to a lower sample size. Sample size is a similar challenge for the those identifying as Middle Eastern or North African since we have only served 9 individuals in this group. We see more variance across racial groups for our Rapid Re-housing and Other Permanent Housing program types though those programs also had a very low sample size and it is unclear if these variances are significant.




Note: Middle Eastern or North African was only added a race option in HMIS in October 2023 and has limited data

	Supportive Housing			Rapid Re-Housing			Other Permanent Housing			Grand Total		
	Individual Retention %	Individuals Retained in Housing	Individuals in Retention Evaluation Population	Individual Retention %	Individuals Retained in Housing	Individuals in Retention Evaluation Population	Individual Retention %	Individuals Retained in Housing	Individuals in Retention Evaluation Population	Individual Retention %	Individuals Retained in Housing	Individuals in Retention Evaluation Population
Asian	93%	28	30	86%	6	7	50%	1	2	90%	35	39
Black	93%	229	245	77%	56	73	50%	13	26	86%	287	333
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	93%	422	454	78%	119	153	93%	41	44	89%	573	641
Native American	94%	123	131	83%	15	18	80%	8	10	92%	141	153
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	93%	53	57	63%	19	30	71%	5	7	81%	73	90
Middle Eastern or North African	100%	9	9							100%	9	9
White: Non-Hispanic	92%	1,048	1,143	74%	117	159	69%	68	99	88%	1,206	1,372
Not Reported	93%	14	15				100%	2	2	94%	16	17

Equity Analysis for Individuals Returning to Homeless Services

for those exiting programs to permanent housing destinations since 7/1/2022 and returning to homeless services at some point by 6/30/2024

When looking at those returning to homeless services after exiting a program to a permanent housing destination, we do see a lot of variance across racial identities. Similar to Retention though, these variances are hard to evaluate for some groups due to lower sample sizes. Additional analysis is needed to determine what could be contributing to these variances.




	Supportive Housing			Rapid Re-housing			Access Programs			Grand Total		
	% of Individuals Returning	Individuals Returned	Individuals Exited to PH	% of Individuals Returning	Individuals Returned	Individuals Exited to PH	% of Individuals Returning	Individuals Returned	Individuals Exited to PH	% of Individuals Returning	Individuals Returned	Individuals Exited to PH
Asian	0.0%	0	6	13.6%	3	22	13.3%	54	407	13.3%	55	414
Black	5.9%	2	34	22.7%	53	233	15.2%	259	1,706	15.2%	270	1,776
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	5.1%	4	79	13.7%	64	468	13.3%	642	4,810	13.4%	667	4,966
Native American	8.3%	1	12	37.0%	20	54	17.2%	74	431	18.5%	84	454
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.0%	0	6	37.2%	35	94	19.8%	133	673	22.0%	151	685
Middle Eastern or North African				0.0%	0	1	20.5%	8	39	20.5%	8	39
White: Non-Hispanic	9.3%	17	182	24.0%	134	559	16.6%	827	4,978	16.9%	874	5,186
Not Reported	8.3%	1	12	12.5%	2	16	13.0%	35	269	12.7%	35	276

Equity Analysis for Average Length of Time Homeless


Based on Housing Status as of 6/30/2024

In terms of how long people stay homeless prior to moving into housing, we are finding that most racial groups experience a lower length of time homeless on average as compared to those identifying as White: Non-Hispanic. Those who did not report a racial identity had the longest average (4 years) though that is likely skewed due to a low sample size.

For those that are still waiting for a housing resource, we do see that most racial groups have a higher average length of time homeless than those housed, though it is generally minimal. Our Native American population is experiencing the longest length of time homeless and that seems to be driven by a few outliers that may indicate data quality challenges.



Note: Middle Eastern or North African was only added a race option in HMIS in October 2023 and has limited data



	Avg Length of Time Homeless		Housed in FY24		Unhoused at end of FY24	
	Length of Time..	# of Individuals	Length of Time..	# of Individuals	Length of Time..	# of Individuals
Asian	2.1	106	1.5	24	2.3	85
Black	2.1	538	2.0	208	2.2	345
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	1.8	1,367	1.5	555	1.9	859
Native American	3.2	223	2.3	76	3.6	151
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2.0	269	2.2	117	2.0	160
Middle Eastern or North African	1.2	35	1.9	13	0.9	22
White: Non-Hispanic	2.9	2,564	2.7	747	2.9	1,875
Not Reported	2.7	292	4.0	30	2.6	267
Grand Total	2.4	5,049	2.3	1,625	2.5	3,558

Attachment F continued: Disability & Gender Identity of Program Participants

Disability Status of people served in SHS-funded programs

PSH Placements		
Individuals Newly Placed this Year	#	%
Persons with disabilities	446	66%
Persons without disabilities	142	21%
Disability unreported	91	13%

RRH Placements		
Individuals Newly Placed this Year	#	%
Persons with disabilities	200	38%
Persons without disabilities	270	51%
Disability unreported	57	11%

Housing Only Placements		
Individuals Newly Placed this Year	#	%
Persons with disabilities	1	100%
Persons without disabilities	-	-
Disability unreported	-	-

Preventions		
Individuals Newly Placed this Year	#	%
Persons with disabilities	246	6%
Persons without disabilities	674	15%
Disability unreported	3,523	79%

Gender identity of people served in SHS-funded programs

PSH Placements		
Individuals Newly Placed this Year	#	%
Male	329	48%
Female	333	49%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	11	2%
Transgender	9	1%
Questioning	-	-
Culturally Specific Identity (e.g., Two-Spirit)	-	-
Client doesn't know	-	-
Client refused	1	0%
Data not collected	-	-

RRH Placements		
Individuals Newly Placed this Year	#	%
Male	237	45%
Female	279	53%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	7	1%
Transgender	3	1%
Questioning	1	0%
Culturally Specific Identity (e.g., Two-Spirit)	1	0%
Client doesn't know	-	-
Client refused	-	-
Data not collected	2	0%

Housing Only Placements		
Individuals Newly Placed this Year	#	%
Male	1	100%
Female	-	-
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	-	-
Transgender	-	-
Questioning	-	-
Culturally Specific Identity (e.g., Two-Spirit)	-	-
Client doesn't know	-	-
Client refused	-	-
Data not collected	-	-

Preventions		
Individuals Newly Placed this Year	#	%
Male	2,005	45%
Female	2,410	54%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	7	0%
Transgender	7	0%
Questioning	1	0%
Culturally Specific Identity (e.g., Two-Spirit)		
Client doesn't know		
Client refused		
Data not collected	14	0%

Annual Financial Report

and Additional Population A/B Reporting Requirements

The chart below is an assessment of program spending against the requirement that it be split 75/25 between Populations A and B over the life of the ten-year SHS Measure. In quarterly reporting, consistent with the reporting 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. Last year, there was no population specific quarterly reporting for Outreach or Shelter, the other two reported service types. Outreach and Shelter have been added to this analysis, using the updated and recommended regional methodology. This methodology entails totaling the number of households served in each service type, by their identified Population A and B household type. Then program spending is calculated by applying the share of population type served in that program.

Service Type	Population A	Population B	Total People Served	Pop A %*	Pop B %*
Outreach***	702	496	1198	59%	41%
Supportive Housing**	1,253	354	1,607	78%	22%
Housing Only	4	2	6	67%	33%
Shelter	1201	678	1879	64%	36%
Eviction Prevention*	91	1542	1633	6%	94%
Rapid Rehousing*	360	334	694	52%	48%

*Population percentages are based on households, not people. Households with undetermined status were assigned to populations using the category's existing split.

** Supportive Housing is Permanent Supportive Housing, Housing Case Management System, and Regional Long-Range Assistance.

*** Outreach is often a person's first interaction with a provider, and information collected is not always accurate as trust is not built between participants and providers at that time.

Service Type	Pop A %	Pop B %	Total Spending*****	Pop A Spend	Pop B Spend
Outreach	59%	41%	\$ 2,182,354	\$ 1,278,808	\$ 903,546
Supportive Housing	78%	22%	\$ 32,048,131	\$ 24,988,368	\$ 7,059,763
Shelter	64%	36%	\$ 12,972,883	\$ 8,291,875	\$ 4,681,008
Shelter Infrastructure***	64%	36%	\$ 9,225,256	\$ 5,904,164	\$ 3,321,092
Eviction Prevention	6%	94%	\$ 12,833,428	\$ 715,151	\$ 12,118,277
Rapid Rehousing	52%	48%	\$ 12,354,674	\$ 6,408,765	\$ 5,945,909
Total*			\$ 81,616,726	\$ 47,587,131.25	\$ 34,029,594.75
% of Total Services Spending by Population				58%	42%

****This funding was used to construct or rehab shelters across the county. The same A/B split for shelter was applied to this funding

***** Expenses that are not part of this calculation are spending on pilot programs (recuperative care, workforce development), system infrastructure, capacity building, technical assistance for service providers, Regional Investment Fund expenses, as well as internal administrative charges. In total, these amount to \$14,516,155.

Washington County included increased eviction prevention resources in Fiscal Year 2023-2024 to strategically use one-time carry forward investments and continue to dull the impact of the expiration of COVID era rental assistance programs. These investments helped us serve more diverse communities and had a significant impact on our Population A/B financials. Staff also believe that data from street outreach interactions is likely less reliable than other program data as it can be challenging to accurately identify household type as Population A or B during these interactions.

Populations A and B Served by Program

PSH placements (households)	
Population A	354 placed this year (1,253 people served)
Population B	52 placed this year (354 people served this year)

RRH placements (households)	
Population A	144 placed this year (360 people served)
Population B	118 placed this year (334 people served)

Housing Only placements (households)	
Population A	4 placed this year (4 people served)
Population B	2 placed this year (2 people served)

Prevention (households)	
Population A	90 served this year (91 people served)
Population B	1,478 served this year (1,542 people served)

Shelter (households)	
Population A	945 this year (1,201 people served)
Population B	488 served this year (678 people served)

Outreach (households)	
Population A	660 served this year (702 people served)
Population B	416 served this year (496 people served)

shington County
2023-2024 Q4

SEP-23 DEC-23 MAR-24 ADJ-24 ADJ-24
7/1/2023 10/1/2023 1/1/2024 4/1/2024 4/1/2024
9/30/2023 12/31/2023 3/31/2024 6/30/2024 6/30/2024

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

	Annual Budget	Q1 Actuals	Q2 Actuals	Q3 Actuals	Q4 Actuals	Total YTD Actuals	Variance Under / (Over)	% of Budget	Comments
Metro SHS Resources									
Metro Beginning Fund Balance	111,634,198	111,634,198				111,634,198	(0)	100%	Adjustment to Beginning Fund Balance to remove GASB 31 Adjustment (Unrealized gains/losses of investments) that is included in Beginning Fund Balance line. Aligns this report with how Metro and other counties account for unrealized gains/losses, while allowing Beginning Fund Balance line to reflect Washington County's financial statements.
Metro Beginning Fund Balance Adjustment		3,839,382				3,839,382	(3,839,382)	N/A	
FY 23-24 GASB 31 FMV Adjustment	-				435,295	435,295	(435,295)	N/A	Adjust the Fund Balance line to Show the GASB 31 Adjustment (Unrealized gain).
Metro SHS Program Funds	109,000,000	5,757,975	24,145,380	32,592,707	38,173,750	100,669,811	8,330,189	92%	
Metro SHS Program Funds Adjustment				(13,392,342)	15,984,500	2,592,158	(2,592,158)	N/A	*See footnote
Other Grant Funds	-	125,000	-	118	(125,118)	-	-	N/A	Kaiser Foundation and Recuperative costs to be moved out of Fund 221 in Q4.
Interest Earnings	2,000,000	710,519	851,926	925,208	621,022	3,108,676	(1,108,676)	155%	
FY22 non-congregate shelter charges reimbursement by FEMA					3,073,330	3,073,330	(3,073,330)	N/A	
<i>insert add'l lines as necessary</i>						-	-	N/A	
Total Metro SHS Resources	222,634,198	122,067,074	24,997,306	20,125,691	58,162,778	225,352,850	(2,718,652)	101%	
Metro SHS Requirements									
Program Costs									
Activity Costs									
Shelter, Outreach and Safety on/off the Street (emergency shelter, outreach services and supplies, hygiene programs)	9,678,523	1,966,255	5,646,390	954,850	6,587,742	15,155,237	(5,476,714)	157%	
Short-term Housing Assistance (rent assistance and services, e.g. rapid rehousing, short-term rent assistance, housing retention)	21,182,067	2,551,543	2,554,057	4,550,864	15,532,116	25,188,580	(4,006,513)	119%	
Permanent supportive housing services (wrap-around services for PSH)	11,452,584	1,192,911	1,883,955	3,800,623	3,756,563	10,634,051	818,533	93%	
Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA, the rent assistance portion of PSH)	23,780,824	4,681,118	3,379,701	7,353,610	5,999,651	21,414,080	2,366,744	90%	
Systems Infrastructure (service provider capacity building and organizational health, system development, etc)	1,876,285	873,963	340,259	62,220	744,139	2,020,581	(144,296)	108%	
Built Infrastructure (property purchases, capital improvement projects, etc)	12,943,088	1,563,056	1,914,277	4,429,475	2,838,266	10,745,072	2,198,016	83%	
Other supportive services (recuperative care, workforce projects and other pilot programs)	3,363,179	159,140	1,606,676	1,481,389	(1,126,377)	2,120,828	1,242,351	63%	
Operations (technical, employment, benefits, training and consulting)	3,753,741	645,294	932,504	710,696	9,070	2,297,565	1,456,176	61%	
<i>insert add'l lines for other activity categories</i>						-	-	N/A	
Subtotal Activity Costs	88,030,291	13,633,278	18,257,818	23,343,728	34,341,170	89,575,994	(1,545,703)	102%	

Administrative Costs^[1]

County Admin: Long-term Rent Assistance	487,351	88,751	68,024	130,724	136,590	424,089	63,262	87%
County Admin: Other	2,204,081	542,220	145,720	1,078,452	223,098	1,989,490	214,591	90%
Subtotal Administrative Costs	2,691,432	630,971	213,744	1,209,176	359,688	2,413,579	277,853	90%

Service Provider Administrative Costs are reported as part of Program Costs above. Counties will provide details and context for Service Provider Administrative Costs within the narrative of their Annual Program Report.

Administrative Costs for long-term rent assistance equals 2% of Partner's YTD expenses on long-term rent
 Administrative Costs for Other Program Costs equals 3% of total YTD Other Program Costs.

Other Costs

Regional Strategy Implementation Fund ^[2]	5,450,000	-	-	692,372	3,468,132	4,160,503	1,289,497	76%
<i>insert add'l lines as necessary</i>								N/A
Subtotal Other Costs	5,450,000	-	-	692,372	3,468,132	4,160,503	1,289,497	76%

Subtotal Program Costs	96,171,723	14,264,249	18,471,562	25,245,276	38,168,990	96,150,076	21,647	100%
-------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	---------------	-------------

Contingency ^[3]	5,450,000					-	5,450,000	0%
Stabilization Reserve ^[4]	16,350,000					-	16,350,000	0%
Regional Strategy Impl Fund Reserve ^[2]	8,228,639					-	8,228,639	0%
RLRA Reserves	-					-	-	N/A
Other Programmatic Reserves	96,433,836					-	96,433,836	0%
<i>insert add'l lines as necessary</i>						-	-	N/A
Subtotal Contingency and Reserves	126,462,475	-	-	-	-	-	126,462,475	0%

Total Metro SHS Requirements	222,634,198	14,264,249	18,471,562	25,245,276	38,168,990	96,150,076	126,484,122	43%
-------------------------------------	--------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	--------------------	------------

Ending Fund Balance	-	107,802,825	6,525,744	(5,119,584)	19,993,789	129,202,773	(129,202,773)	N/A
----------------------------	----------	--------------------	------------------	--------------------	-------------------	--------------------	----------------------	------------

This amount does not include contingencies and reserves and any available fund balance that is already committed, assigned and planned to be spent down over the next few FYs.

Fund Balance Adjustment: GASB 31 Adjustment to value investments at fair value: Unrealized gains/losses	(3,839,382)
For Metro Reporting, SHS Revenue received in JUL and AUG posted to FY 23-24 (but per auditors, it belongs in FY 24-25)	(15,984,500)
Ending Fund Balance per County Financial Statements	109,378,892

*Metro SHS Program Funds Adjustment: The purpose is to align this report more closely with how Metro, Multnomah County and Clackamas County recognize revenue. Washington County's external auditors recommended that SHS program revenue is recognized when received. For Q3, the Metro SHS Program Funds Adjustment line includes reducing July and August 2023 funds received due to being previously reported in the fund balance. For Q4, the Metro SHS Program Funds Adjustment line includes adding July and August 2024 funds received for inclusion in the Annual Report. Washington County will recognize the July and August 2024 funds received on the Metro SHS Program Funds line in FY 2024-25.

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

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

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

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

Non-Displacement (IGA 5.5.1)

ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT ONLY

	FY18-19 Budget	FY19-20 Budget	Prior FY Budget	Current FY Budget	Current FY Actuals	Variance from Benchmark	Comments
Current Partner-provided SHS Funds (Partner General Funds) ^[5]	N/A	794,401	N/A	2,452,400	1,174,046	379,645	Decrease from FY19-20 amount requires a written waiver from Metro.
Other Funds ^[6]	3,875,537	N/A	4,481,259	9,469,356	4,388,455	512,918	Explain significant changes from FY18-19 Benchmark amount or Prior FY amount.

^[5] Per IGA Section 5.5.1.2 TERMS, "Current Partner-provided SHS Funds" means Partner's general funds currently provided as of FY 2019-20 towards SHS programs within Partner's jurisdictional limits including, but not limited to, within the Region. "Current Partner-provided SHS Funds" expressly excludes all other sources of funds Partner may use to fund SHS programs as of FY 2019-20 including, but not limited to, state or federal grants.

^[6] Per IGA Section 5.5.1.1 OTHER FUNDS include, but are not limited to, various state or federal grants and other non-general fund sources. Partner will attempt, in good faith, to maintain such funding at the same levels set forth in Partner's FY 2018-19 budget. However, because the amount and availability of these other funds are outside of Partner's control, they do not constitute Partner's Current Partner-provided SHS Funds for purposes of Displacement. Partner will provide Metro with information on the amount of other funds Partner has allocated to SHS, as well as the change, if any, of those funds from the prior Fiscal Year in its Annual Program Budget.

Spend-Down Report for Program Costs

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

Program Costs (excluding Built Infrastructure)	% of Spending per Quarter			Comments
	Budget	Actual	Variance	
Quarter 1	15%	15%	0%	Per guidance from Metro, Program Cost spend-down budget adjusted to match actuals for first three quarters after budget amendment. Less spent in Built-Infrastructure (as a result of more operational costs).
Quarter 2	20%	20%	0%	
Quarter 3	25%	25%	0%	
Quarter 4	25%	42%	-17%	
Total	85%	103%	-18%	

Built Infrastructure	\$ Spending YTD			Comments
	Budget	Actual	Variance	
Annual total	12,943,088	10,745,072	2,198,016	Provide a status update for below. (required each quarter)

^[1] A "material deviation" arises when the Program Funds spent in a given Fiscal Year cannot be reconciled against the spend-down plan to the degree that no reasonable person would conclude that Partner's spending was guided by or in conformance with the applicable spend-down plan.

Spend-Down Report for Carryover

This section compares the spending plan of investment areas funded by carryover to actual costs.

These costs are also part of the Spend-Down Report for Program Costs above. This section provides additional detail and a progress update on these investment areas.

Carryover Spend-down Plan	\$ Spending by investment area			Comments
	Budget	Actual ^[2]	Variance	
Metro Beginning Fund Balance (carryover balance)	111,634,198	115,473,580	(3,839,382)	GASB 31 unrealized loss is not recognized on Metro reporting (per Metro guidelines).
Describe investment area				
Shelter Capital Funding	22,000,000	9,225,256	12,774,744	Shelter Capital Grants (POs 190269, 190805, 191001, 191781, 191953, 191984, 192020, 192408, 192942).
Rent Assistance Expansion	10,000,000	13,137,052	(3,137,052)	Eviction Prevention Contracts with Community Action Organization and Centro Cultural (POs 191471, 191943).
Capacity Building	2,500,000	1,060,695	1,439,305	Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Grants (POs 190869, 190880, 190881, 190958, 190961, 190962, 190972, 190992, 191032, 191235, 191662, 191670, 191884, 191889, 191938, 191964, 192193, 192294, 192296, 192316, 192338, 192341, 192358, 192376, 192378, 192676).
Supportive Housing Acquisition	17,000,000	1,628,368	15,371,632	Heartwood Common Stabilization (192462) and Elm Street (WIRE, 190129, 190283, 190338, 191963, 192613).
Access Center Capital Construction	5,000,000		5,000,000	Projects committed but work and spending delayed until FY 24-25.
Center for Addiction Triage & Treatment	1,500,000	1,500,000	-	Center for Addiction Triage and Treatment.
<i>insert addt'l lines as necessary</i>				
	58,000,000	26,551,372	31,448,628	
Remaining prior year carryover	53,634,198	88,922,208	(35,288,010)	
Ending Carryover Adj. (Projected Unspent Program Expense)	12,939,399	(21,647)	12,961,046	Projected as 15% unspent projected program expenses.. Actual unspent amount is less than 1%.
Ending Carryover Adj. (Δ between Dec 2022 and Aug 2023 Rev. Forecast)	27,201,667	24,317,712	2,883,955	New Metro SHS Revenue Projection Δ.
FY 25 revenue rollback	-	15,984,500	(15,984,500)	Two extra months of revenue (JUL-24 and AUG-24) roll back into FY 24 to become part of FY 24-25 Carryover (per Metro guidelines).
Metro Ending Fund Balance (carryover balance)	93,775,264	129,202,773	(19,443,010)	
JUL-24 Revenue and AUG-24 Revenue to be part of FY 24-25	-	(15,984,500)	15,984,500	Because July and August 2024 revenues are part of FY 24-25, they do not contribute to FY 23-24 ending fund balance carryover.
GASB 31 Unrealized Loss	-	(3,839,382)	3,839,382	GASB 31 Unrealized Loss (adjustment to bridge the gap between investment revenues and portfolio balance at June 2023) is to be recognized per audit recommendation.
Estimated Available Fund Balance for next FY planned investment	93,775,264	109,378,892	(3,458,510)	Ending fund balance per County Financial Records
Contingency	(5,450,000)	(5,750,000)	300,000	Per Metro guidance - should be 5% of budgeted revenue. Per Metro Oct 25, 2023 projection, revenue for FY 24-25 is estimated to be \$115m.
Stabilization Reserve	(16,350,000)	(17,250,000)	900,000	Per Metro guidance - should be no less than 10% of budgeted revenue. Per Metro Oct 25, 2023 projection, revenue for FY 24-25 is estimated to be \$115m.
Regional Strategy Impl Fund Reserve	(8,228,639)	(9,814,333)	1,585,694	Cumulative Regional Strategy Implementation Fund set aside to be spent per Metro directive. Per next FY budget, this amount is expected to be \$9.8m.
Estimated Available Fund Balance for planned Investments	63,746,625	76,564,559	(2,258,510)	This amount is committed, assigned and planned to be spent over the next multiple years. This amount is an estimate because next FY will have different reserve figures (based on Metro's projected revenue for FY 24-25).

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

Provider Demographics Information




The Annual Performance and Evaluation Report asked organizations to report a breakdown of their staff's demographics. The demographics of interest were race/ethnicity, gender identity, age group/generation, sexual orientation, veteran status, disability or functional difficulty, experience of homelessness, and additional languages spoken. Organizations were asked to use the Washington County Staff Demographic Survey to collect this information. Providers could also report staff demographics using internal organizational mechanisms, such as Human Resources data. Providers were asked to summarize any previous and future efforts to increase equity, diversity, and inclusion within their organizations. Providers were given a score for providing staff demographic data. The Annual Performance and Evaluation Report also asked organizations to provide the lowest, highest, and average annual salary for each position type, including direct client service, administrative, management, and executive leadership roles. Providers were given the option to comment on the salary information provided and explain any differences in pay between positions funded by SHS compared to other sources. Providers were given a score for providing pay equity information. The following data compiles the staff demographic and pay equity reports received from all SHS funded and contracted services providers.



STAFF DEMOGRAPHICS




This section summarizes the demographics of staff employed at Washington County's SHS-contracted organizations.¹ It also highlights providers' previous and future efforts to increase diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) within their organizations. The demographic summary below represents 1,912 employees; however, not all employees are included in every graph due to missing data and/or because the number of organizations reporting data in each category varied. For other languages spoken, race/ethnicity, and gender, staff could select more than one category they identified with, thus the percentage may not add up to 100%.

¹ The number of staff reported on by organization ranged from two to 580. Organizations with higher reported numbers are more heavily represented in the results, while organizations with lower reported numbers may not fully capture their staff's demographics. A few organizations appear to have only reported demographic information for SHS-contracted positions.

Demographic Summary







Efforts to Increase Workforce Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Over the past year, contracted organizations implemented and/or continued several efforts to increase diversity, equity, and inclusion in their organizations. The efforts primarily focused on internal organizational policies and practices and staff training to help make service delivery more equitable for participants.

Several providers partnered with external consultants or set up internal committees to review and update staff recruitment efforts. Enhanced recruitment efforts included diversifying where jobs were posted and intentionally recruiting candidates who are bi-lingual, have lived experience, and/or reflect the community served. Some organizations provide training in leadership and have set goals on internal promotion rates to support staff's professional development. Some organizations also offer higher differential pay for bilingual staff and some have conducted pay equity assessments.

A few providers have added new staff positions including Human Resources staff that focus on DEI and program staff focused on identifying and connecting with culturally specific resources for participants. Many providers continue to review and update policies and procedures, strategic plans, key performance indicators, and mission statements to reflect a commitment to diversity and inclusion. Providers have DEI and population-specific workgroups and committees, have scheduled routine internal discussions to increase staff knowledge around culturally specific topics, and have processes in place to receive staff input on internal policies.

Most organizations provide opportunities for DEI training to their staff and in some cases their board. Providers described offering both in person and virtual training options on topics such as the fundamentals of DEI, bias, anti-racism, trauma-informed care, cross cultural communication, disrupting microaggressions, and decolonizing the workplace. Providers have also offered trainings on serving LGBTQ and Indigenous populations, providing gender affirming care, serving pregnant persons, and disability justice.

Future Plans to Increase Workforce Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion


Most organizations' DEI focus is on improving and expanding current efforts related to recruiting and hiring diverse staff, training on DEI topics, and supporting internal equity committees and affinity groups. Specific plans include revising employee handbooks, engaging with external partners and/or consultants, conducting pay equity surveys, revising pay scales, and hiring for equity focused positions. Some providers also described new practices they anticipate will increase workforce equity and retention including blind application screening procedures and implementing a four-day work week. A few providers plan to enhance demographics data collection practices, update performance metrics, and monitor the effectiveness of new diversity practices.

PAY EQUITY ANALYSIS

This section summarizes pay equity data reported by Washington County's SHS-contracted organizations.² Washington County is interested in exploring any differences in pay for similar positions both within an organization and across different contracted providers. The graphs below show the


² Two organizations did not report minimum, maximum, and/or average salary for some position types for which they reported staff counts. Those organizations were excluded from calculations for those positions.

minimum, maximum, and average salary by position across all SHS-contracted providers. A table with more detailed results of the pay equity analysis is found in Appendix A.



For Case Managers/Workers, Housing Liaisons, and Outreach Workers, most organizations had an average annual salary between \$50,000 and \$60,000. Three organizations had an average salary below \$50,000 for any of these positions, while two organizations had average salaries above \$60,000. Shelter staff positions had a lower average salary and a wider salary range, with all applicable organizations' average salaries falling between \$41,530 and \$55,250. The difference between the highest-paid housing liaison staff and the lowest-paid housing liaison staff across all SHS-contracted providers was \$35,043, the largest difference across these client-facing roles. The smallest difference was within shelter staff salaries with a difference of \$22,880.

The average pay differences for the same position type ranged from about \$4,700 for housing liaisons to about \$8,600 for case managers/workers. The largest pay difference for the same position within a single organization was a difference of about \$31,000 for case managers/workers.



*Other client-facing roles Includes staff data from three organizations collected using different categories (e.g., direct service staff, health workers).



For administrative, management, and leadership roles, there is a wider difference in salaries within SHS-contracted providers. The average salaries per organization for administrative roles ranged between \$20,000 and \$67,000. For management roles across all SHS providers, there is a difference of close to \$132,000 between the highest and lowest reported salaries. Executive leadership had the largest gap between the highest and lowest salaries, with a difference of nearly \$345,000.

Although the range in salary for other client-facing roles is about \$132,000, it is difficult to meaningfully interpret due to potential major differences in the roles, responsibilities, and requirements of the various positions represented. Quality Assurance (QA) staff had one of the lowest differences between the highest and lowest paid positions of about \$29,000. This primarily reflects differences across organizations, as only 4 of 16 organizations reported more than one QA staff member.

Across all providers, the average difference between the highest and lowest paid staff member was about \$126,000, ranging from a difference of about \$36,000 to over \$350,000.

Of the 20 providers who provided narrative responses describing any differences in pay between SHS-funded and non-SHS funded positions, three-quarters (75%) reported no differences based on funding sources. Some providers noted that many positions are not funded by a single source and several providers stated that pay is set in part using market rates, tenure, and skill sets such as speaking multiple languages or having lived experience. Some providers who noted a difference in pay cited specialized skills or duties, while one provider has been working to raise non-SHS funded salaries across the organization to more closely align with the salaries set in their SHS contract.

In the optional narrative responses, some providers mentioned having conducted salary analyses of similar organizations in the Portland Metro region to set their staff's salaries. One provider noted their commitment to paying staff at 75% or higher of average salaries at comparable organizations. Some providers have internal workgroups or committees focused on pay equity. Some providers also cited contextual information to help explain pay differences. One provider noted that only a portion of time is spent on SHS for many of their staff roles, while another provider noted that a full-time work week for some positions is 31 hours, which leads to slightly lower pay for those positions compared to others within the organization.

CULTURALLY SPECIFIC ORGANIZATIONS

Differences between culturally specific and non-culturally specific providers were explored using the Annual Performance Evaluation and Report results. The comparison explored any unique challenges faced by culturally specific providers that may be impacting how they are evaluated, as well as any differences in demographics and pay equity compared to non-culturally specific providers. Seven organizations were considered culturally specific organizations.


The program types explored for differences were ERR and HCMS, as six of the seven culturally specific providers had contracts for both program types. Culturally specific providers had a higher average overall score (48 points) for ERR compared to non-culturally specific providers (41 points). Culturally specific providers had a better average performance for contract utilization, percentage of households that exit to permanent housing, percentage of households with increased income at exit, average days to house, and average days to accept or contact referrals.

For HCMS, culturally specific (48 points) and non-culturally specific (49 points) providers had similar average overall scores. Culturally specific providers had better average performance for the percentage of households exiting without housing and average days to accept or contact referrals, and lower average performance for contract utilization, average days to house, and average days for program entries.

Narrative responses for ERR and HCMS were similar across culturally specific and non-culturally specific providers, highlighting challenges like ramping up new programs, staff capacity and hiring, and



contacting and/or engaging with participants. One culturally specific ERR provider noted that some participants may face additional barriers such as having no Social Security or Individual Taxpayer Identification Numbers, experiencing obstacles to services in their preferred language, and being unable to access public benefit programs.

Race and ethnicity were explored to compare culturally specific and non-culturally specific providers.³ Culturally specific providers had substantially higher percentages of staff who identify as African/Black/African American (20%) and Asian (15%) compared to non-culturally specific providers (6% and 4% respectively). The percentage of staff who identify as Latina(o)/Latinx or Hispanic was slightly higher in non-culturally specific providers (25%) than in culturally specific providers (21%). The percentage of staff who identify as white was substantially higher in non-culturally specific providers (54%) compared to culturally specific providers (31%).



Salary data was also explored for differences between culturally specific and non-culturally specific providers. Average salaries were higher for culturally specific providers for each position reviewed, ranging from 1% higher (about \$650) for case managers/workers to 26% higher (about \$14,400) for QA staff. Culturally specific providers had a larger difference between the highest and lowest paid staff, ranging from \$20,000 for an administrative staff member to \$400,000 for an executive leadership position.

³ The number of staff reported on by culturally specific providers ranged from two to 580. Organizations with higher reported numbers are more heavily represented in the results, while organizations with lower reported numbers may not fully capture their staff's demographics.



APPENDIX A: PAY EQUITY ANALYSIS TABLE

Washington County SHS-Contracted Organizations Salary Overview					
	Number of Organizations	Number of Employees	Min Salary	Average Salary*	Max Salary
Position Type					
Case Managers	18	258	\$39,520	\$53,919	\$72,684
Housing Liaison	14	82	\$39,957	\$53,057	\$75,000
Outreach Workers	9	35	\$43,680	\$53,210	\$70,000
Shelter Staff	11	126	\$36,400	\$44,793	\$59,280
Other Client Facing Role**	14	582	\$34,216	\$51,221	\$166,400
Administrative Role	21	245	\$20,000	\$58,007	\$90,100
Quality Assurance Staff	16	22	\$44,720	\$57,229	\$73,500
Management Role	22	398	\$37,873	\$71,953	\$169,620
Executive Leadership	22	115	\$55,120	\$116,903	\$400,000
Other full-time staff	12	70	\$33,500	\$54,311	\$87,000
Organization Size					
1-15 staff	5	45	\$45,760	\$74,498	\$278,553
16-50 staff	10	276	\$20,000	\$64,156	\$259,778
Over 50 staff	8	1630	\$33,500	\$59,490	\$400,000
Culturally Specific Services					
Culturally Specific	7	845	\$20,000	\$63,276	\$400,000
Non-Culturally Specific	16	1106	\$34,216	\$58,375	\$228,000

* Weighted by number of staff in each role per provider

** Includes staff from three organizations collected using different categories (e.g., direct service staff, health workers).

Regional Coordination

This section was co-drafted by Washington, Clackamas, and Multnomah counties.

No one person, organization, or county can solve the homelessness crisis alone—it will take all of us working in close coordination to address homelessness across the region. Over the past year Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties continued to work closely together, in partnership with Metro, to advance shared objectives. This collaboration took place through the Tri-County Planning Body, collaborative administrative projects, and special initiatives such as Built for Zero. In addition, regular leadership conversations and jurisdictional work groups elevated lessons learned across programs and promoted common approaches. Below is a summary of key elements of our regional collaboration over the last year.

Tri-County Planning Body

To strengthen coordination and alignment of program implementation across the Metro region, the Tri-County Planning Body (TCPB) — the leadership body that defines the regional priorities for SHS implementation — has identified six regional goals, strategies, and outcome metrics to address homelessness. In FY 2024 the TCPB made progress toward these goals by approving Regional Implementation Fund (RIF) expenditures based on implementation plans developed by the three counties and Metro. The TCPB approved the first implementation plan in March of 2024, directing \$8 million to support a menu of interventions to increase participation from landlords in rehousing programs, including outreach materials, additional policy workgroup spaces and studies, pilot approaches, and the Risk Mitigation Program. The TCPB is expected to approve additional implementation plans in 2024.

Health and Housing Integration

In alignment with the TCPB's goal to create system alignment and increase long-term partnerships, the Regional Implementation Fund (RIF) is currently being utilized to invest in staff supporting health and housing system integration and regional coordination. These positions are supporting Medicaid 1115 Demonstration Waiver coordination and implementation, partnerships with Coordinated Care Organizations and health care partners, and the establishment of regionalized best practices for housing and health care integration.

The Medicaid 1115 Demonstration Waiver represents an opportunity for Medicaid dollars to pay for certain Health-Related Social Needs (HRSN), since food insecurity, housing instability, unemployment, and lack of reliable transportation can significantly contribute to poor health outcomes. This past year Clackamas, Washington, and Multnomah counties began work with Trillium and Health Share to establish network hubs, which will allow counties to receive referrals for HRSN housing services, including up to six months of rent and utilities, home modification and remediation, and tenancy support through case management. Counties will help create housing plans, provide technical assistance, sequence services, and manage the provider network.

To further support system alignment the three counties also worked toward establishing the first medical respite program in the region through a grant partnership with Kaiser Permanente. Too often, people experiencing homelessness encounter barriers to health recovery after hospitalization as they attempt to recuperate without housing stability. Medical respite provides a safe, stepped-down level of care upon discharge. Such programs have demonstrated improved health outcomes, greater service connectivity, and cost savings for hospitals. Through the grant the counties are also able to participate in the National Institute on Medical Respite cohort, designed to provide support for building, maintaining, and improving medical respite programs.

The counties are also in collaboration to better coordinate services with long-term support partners for im-

proved behavioral health outcomes. To this end, Washington County has established population-specific liaisons, such as a housing case manager who works with people over the age of 65 and/or are connected to disability services, and Clackamas County has used this model to develop and issue a program offer for similar services. Clackamas County staff are standing up a behavioral health intervention team at fixed-site supported housing programs to help stabilize participants to be able to retain their housing, and sharing ideas and best practices regarding this work.

Washington County also led efforts in the tri-county region to stand up case conferencing with health plan partners and nationwide consultants. Based on this foundation, Clackamas County established a Health and Housing Case Conferencing Pilot in March 2024. Regular participants of case conferencing include Health Share, Trillium, behavioral health partners, peer supports, and plan partners. Clackamas, Washington, and Multnomah Counties will continue to work together to help establish and improve these practices regionally.

Collaborative Administrative Projects

Request for Qualifications (RFQu) Process

In FY 2024 Metro led a four-jurisdictional effort to create a pre-approved list of contractors that can provide Training and Technical Assistance. Staff from all jurisdictions worked together to craft a procurement opportunity that yielded a list of 67 qualified providers. Providers qualified in 15 different areas of expertise, ranging from racial equity and social justice to unit inspection. This large pool of subject matter experts is now readily available to support capacity building across the region.

Homeless Management Information System

In March 2024, Multnomah County officially became the central administrator of the region's Homelessness Management Information System (HMIS). To facilitate this transition, the region's data teams coordinated closely to regionalize HMIS policies and procedures and update intergovernmental agreements. This robust coordination is memorialized in a regional HMIS governance structure that is still taking shape.

One of two HMIS governance bodies are currently in operation. The Regional HMIS Council, a body responsible for overall vision, strategic direction and governance, is yet to be formed. However, the Technical Change Control Board (TCCB) has been operational since April 2024 and meets monthly to advance key activities. The TCCB consists of a representative from each county, the primary system administrator, and a representative from the Domestic Violence Comp Site. This coordination has allowed us to set and move forward with regional priorities, such as procuring a new HMIS system, merging duplicate entries, and establishing an HMIS regional Data Mart. The Data Mart has given us the opportunity to improve data access, quality, and reporting efforts across the region. It incorporates regional HMIS data and is accessible to regional partners for further development to match their needs.

Data Collaboration

In addition to the coordination that occurs as part of the new HMIS tri-county governance structure, the data teams in each county meet on a monthly basis to exchange information, discuss best practices for project structure and resource allocation, and coordinate around all things pertaining to SHS. In addition to this monthly meeting, a larger group of analysts from each county meet on a monthly basis to exchange information about metric operationalization and other topics related to our roles as analysts. This is also a group where we discuss potential alignment with respect to SHS topics and learn best practices around other aspects of work such as Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance (RLRA) quality control in HMIS. We also consistently collaborate across the three jurisdictions, with support from Metro and external consultants, on key projects like the Medicaid 1115 Waiver expansion.

Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance Workgroup

The Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance (RLRA) workgroup was created at the beginning of the SHS measure with the intention of streamlining the administration of the RLRA program for the region. Initial meetings

brought representatives from each county's Housing Authority together to create regional policies and processes for administering the program, which included uniform application packets and landlord documents. These foundational documents and conversations have supported the evolution of the program and set universal standards aimed to decrease barriers for folks administering and accessing the services across the region.

Over the first three years of SHS implementation, this workgroup has broadened their focus to address ongoing revisions to program policies, evaluate regional RLRA data to identify similarities and differences between the counties, troubleshoot challenges in administering rent assistance, and explore opportunities for peer learning. Notably, a core function of the workgroup is to discuss and recommend programmatic improvements for the counties to assess and implement. Additionally, in an effort to simplify the transfer process and limit undue stress from having to navigate different systems, the workgroup created deliberate space to review and discuss specific cross-county transfer requests for when a household participating in the RLRA program wants to move to a neighboring county. Other work products included updating intake forms to reflect changes to inspections, demographic categories, and clarified rights and responsibilities as part of ongoing maintenance of the program.

As the RLRA workgroup continues their work into year four of SHS implementation, the counties remain grounded in the SHS mission of supporting folks in moving out of houselessness into housing across the region through our shared commitment of providing efficient and equitable delivery of the RLRA program.

Special Initiatives

Built for Zero Collaboration

In the third year of Built for Zero (BfZ), Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties met monthly to collaborate, share progress, and learn from each other's case conferencing sessions to strengthen our regional approach to ending homelessness. The counties focused on enhancing leadership involvement, aligning on common goals, and using accurate data to guide our efforts. We are also improving our ability to implement new strategies and drive change.

Point in Time Count (PIT)

The three counties worked in unison to launch their Point in Time (PIT) counts in 2023 and continued that collaboration again for a sheltered count that was completed in 2024. Through our combined efforts, all three jurisdictions have prioritized advancements to achieve a more accurate count. This collaboration continues as all three jurisdictions are in regular planning meetings to prepare for the January 2025 sheltered and unsheltered PIT count.