



**Metro**

600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

# Agenda

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services Tri-County Planning Body Meeting  
Date: July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2024  
Time: 4:00pm-6:00pm  
Place: Metro Council Chambers, 600 NE Grand Ave, Portland, OR 97232 and Zoom Webinar  
Purpose: The Tri-County Planning Body (TCPB) will receive part two of a progress report on the employee recruitment and retention goal and discuss.

## 4:00pm **Welcome and Introductions**

- Decision: meeting summary approval

## 4:15pm **Public Comment**

## 4:25pm **Conflict of Interest**

## 4:30pm **Staff Updates**

## 4:45pm **Employee Recruitment and Retention Progress Report – Part 2**

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

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

## 6:00pm **Adjourn**

# Table of contents

Agenda

Meeting summary from the Committee's last meeting on June 12<sup>th</sup>

Employee Recruitment and Retention Goal Timeline

Presentation slides

Goal progress report July 2024

Tri-County Planning Body Goal and Recommendation Language

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee meeting minutes – May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2024

ERR Questions and Issues Tracker

Zoom Chat

# Metro respects civil rights

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

## Thông báo về sự Metro không kỳ thị của

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

## Повідомлення Metro про заборону дискримінації

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

## Metro 的不歧视公告

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

## Ogeysiiska takooris la'aanta ee Metro

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

## Metro의 차별 금지 관련 통지서

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

## Metro의差別禁止通知

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

## សេចក្តីជូនដំណឹងអំពីការមិនរើសអើងរបស់ Metro

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

## إشعار بعدم التمييز من Metro

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

## Paunawa ng Metro sa kawalan ng diskriminasyon

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

## Notificación de no discriminación de Metro

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

## Уведомление о недопущении дискриминации от Metro

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

## Avizul Metro privind nediscriminarea

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

## Metro txog kev ntxub ntxaug daim ntawv ceeb toom

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

## Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services Tri-County Planning Body Meeting  
Date: Wednesday, June 12, 2024  
Time: 4:00 PM – 6:00 PM  
Place: Metro Council Chambers, 600 NE Grand Ave, Portland, OR 97232 and Zoom Webinar  
Purpose: The Tri-County Planning Body (TCPB) will receive a progress report on the employee recruitment and retention goal and discuss.

---

### Member attendees

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

### Elected delegates

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

### Absent delegates

Clackamas County Chair Tootie Smith (she/her)

### County staff representatives

Clackamas County – Vahid Brown (he/him); Multnomah County – Breanna Flores (she/they), Christina Castaño (she/her), Kanoe Egleston (she/her), Washington County – Nicole Stingh (she/her)

### Metro

Valeria McWilliams (she/her), Ruth Adkins (she/her), Melia Deters (she/her), Michael Garcia (he/him)

### Kearns & West Facilitators

Ben Duncan (he/him), Ariella Dahlin (she/her)

*Note: The meeting was recorded via Zoom; therefore, this meeting summary will remain at a high-level overview. Please review the recording and archived meeting packet for details and presentation slides.*

### Welcome and Introductions

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West (K&W), introduced himself and welcomed the Tri-County Planning Body (TCPB) to the meeting, facilitated introductions, and reviewed the agenda and objectives.

Co-chairs Mercedes Elizalde and Steve Rudman provided opening remarks.

## Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

The TCPB approved the May Meeting Summary.

### Public Comment

Phillip Kennedy-Wong, Nonprofit Association of Oregon (NAO), provided public comment.

Keith Wilson, Shelter Now, provided public comment.

Caleb Coder, Flex PDX, provided public comment.

Co-chair Steve Rudman asked if Flex PDX was aware of the employee recruitment and retention work the TCPB was doing and if they had approached the three counties directly.

*Valeria McWilliams, Metro, replied that Metro can follow up offline.*

### Conflict of Interest

Cristina Palacios declared a conflict of interest as Housing Oregon has applied to be a contractor with Metro and would receive SHS funding.

Yvette Hernandez noted that she works for Home Forward which receives SHS funding, but she participates on the TCPB as a community member.

Zoi Coppiano declared a conflict of interest as Community Action receives SHS funding.

Eboni Brown declared a conflict of interest as Greater Good Northwest receives SHS funding.

Sahaan McKelvey declared a conflict of interest as Self Enhancement Inc. receives SHS funding.

### Staff Updates

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, shared a quarterly update on the SHS Oversight Committee (Committee). She highlighted that the Committee provided oversight to Multnomah County's Corrective Action Plan, received Quarter Two presentations from the counties, and reviewed and approved the TCPB's Landlord Recruitment Plan. She reflected there were lessons learned on the plan approval process, and that upcoming work for the Committee includes reviewing work plans and budgets.

Co-chair Mercedes Elizalde asked if the Committee would revisit the draft work plans to see what changed from the drafts to the final versions.

*Yesenia Delgado, Metro, replied that the Committee receives the final work plans, but it is not a formal process.*

Valeria McWilliams, Metro, shared that Melia Deters and Giovanni Bautista have been promoted within Metro and updates on the recruitment process for the vacant TCPB seats will be shared via email.

Nicole Stingh, Washington County, shared that the county has opened new regional centers and KOIN recently aired a story about Washington County work systems and work on employee recruitment and retention.

Breanna Flores, Multnomah County, shared that the county's budget was approved and will leverage Continuum of Care funds to match SHS funds, the Joint Office of Homeless Services convened a provider conference, and its housing response action plan was released.

Vahid Brown, Clackamas County, shared that the Housing and Community Development Division has a new director, Native American Youth and Family Center (NAYA) opened the first culturally

## Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

specific family center in the region, and [a video](#) on the county's coordinated access housing program has been released.

Cristina Palacios chatted that the [Housing Oregon Conference](#) is now open for registration.

### Employee Recruitment and Retention Progress Report Part 1

Ruth Adkins, Metro, reviewed the goal language and recommendations and noted any remaining questions from the presentation will be addressed in Part 2 during the July meeting. She shared that Part 1 is to level set and share regional context.

Valeria McWilliams, Metro, thanked those who gave public comment and reflected that no other committee has solved this issue and that the work should be sustainable and last beyond the SHS measure.

Kim Natarajan, Homebase, shared that Homebase completed a local and national scan, including reviewing reports and convening interviews and discussion groups to identify effective strategies and challenges to improve employee recruitment and retention. She noted that living wage is a key part of the work and reviewed the living wage calculation approaches based on the Housing Fair Market Rate (FMR).

Cristina Palacios asked how other benefits and amenities, like working from home, are being considered.

*Kim Natarajan, Homebase, replied that many factors go into working conditions that may impact recruitment and retention, but the presentation is primarily focused on wages.*

Sahaan McKelvey noted that most direct service staff have at least one child, and it might be more appropriate to include the two-bedroom market rate to calculate a living wage.

*Kim Natarajan, Homebase, replied that the one-bedroom calculation was an example and that a discussion on the target would be needed.*

Nicole Larson asked if the \$1,776 per one-bedroom was an actual calculation from the tri-county area.

*Kim Natarajan, Homebase, confirmed it was the federally published number for 2024 FMR.*

Eboni Brown noted that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) calculation includes having children and encouraged looking at the differences between MIT and FMR calculations.

Sahaan McKelvey shared his preference for the example to include having one child as that is more realistic. He noted it would be about \$85,000 a year for a living wage with one child.

Eboni Brown stated MIT's calculation is \$47 per hour to have one child.

Kim Natarajan, Homebase, shared that the national scan found four national studies on employee recruitment and retention and some examples in King County that tried to implement solutions on the topic. She noted that a living wage is a crucial need nationally, and shared challenges that arose out of national interviews, including the cost reimbursement model.

Co-chair Mercedes Elizalde asked if there was demographic data on who is working in the field.

*Maddie Nation, Homebase, replied they can follow up with that information.*

Kim Natarajan, Homebase, shared that the local scan found that pay is a large concern. She detailed emerging strategies providers are using including using reserve funds to raise wages, and shared some ideas counties are piloting, including partial advances on contract awards. She noted key

## Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

challenges include cash flow concerns, wage parity and compression, and workloads. She stated that overall, a regional approach and system changes are needed to reach a living wage.

Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington asked if there was a preference for non-line-item-based contracts and if the underlying cause of line-item budgets was Metro's requirement of detailed reports from counties.

*Eboni Brown stated that line-item budgets are not necessarily required by Metro because some Metro contracts do not require line-item receipts, while others require substantive amounts.*

*Valeria McWilliams, Metro, replied that Racheal Lembo would need to address that question.*

Co-chair Steve Rudman hoped Metro was not causing this problem and reflected that in the 1990s providers would receive funds three months in advance, and asked why that is not happening now.

Co-chair Mercedes Elizalde stated that in the July meeting, counties will be presenting and be able to address these questions. She asked for July's presentation to include what Metro requires and what each county requires.

Monta Knudson asked if there was a cost analysis done to see which solutions to challenges would be easier to address.

*Kim Natarajan, Homebase, replied that cash flow was the biggest concern that would have the most impact, but was not sure if it was the costliest. She shared that they heard that wage parity and compression seemed like an easier fix and that workloads were about discussing what is reasonable between all parties.*

Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington asked the TCPB to think about how to get input from county staff on what they think the underlying causes are and to think about what the message would be to the public and Metro Council about the nature of the problems and solutions. She emphasized the importance of staying in a solution space.

Mindy Stadtlander asked for more information on slide 38 about a proposed solution to adopt a living wage standard.

*Valeria McWilliams, Metro, replied that would be addressed in July's presentation.*

*Kim Natarajan, Homebase, replied that was a quote from the NAO report which listed suggested solutions.*

*Ruth Adkins, Metro, added that Metro has met with NAO, and will brief Homebase. She shared that Homebase would develop a roadmap of where the region could go as a next step later this year.*

Co-chair Mercedes Elizalde asked for the July presentation to include when providers are asked to provide updated costs to jurisdictions and share counties' invoice approval processes and payment models.

Sahaan McKelvey asked for the TCPB to consider that a 5% cost of living adjustment does not work when inflation is at 8%.

Co-chair Steve Rudman asked for the July presentation to include the reasoning behind why there are or are not cash advances for providers.

Ruth Adkins, Metro, stated that all answers may not be received in July, but Metro may provide a frequently asked questions document on the issue.

## Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, shared that Metro will accept any additional questions through the post-meeting survey.

### Closing and Next Steps

Mercedes Elizalde provided closing remarks and shared that there is some work on this topic at the state level. She emphasized the need to be clear on the values driving the work.

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, adjourned the meeting and noted next steps include:

- TCPB to meet Wednesday, July 10th from 4:00 to 6:00 pm.
- Metro to confirm if Flex PDX was aware of the TCPB's work and if they have approached the three counties directly.
- Metro to share updates on the recruitment process for the vacant TCPB seats via email.
- Homebase to share demographic information on who is working in the provider space.
- Committee members to share any remaining questions with Metro.
- July's meeting packet and information to include:
  - The underlying cause of line-item budgets.
  - Each jurisdiction's payment models and requirements.
  - When providers are asked to provide updated costs to jurisdictions.
  - Each jurisdiction's invoice approval process.
  - Why or why not cash advances can be given to providers.

### Adjourn

Adjourned at 6:00 p.m.



## Tri-County Planning Body Employee Recruitment and Retention Goal Timeline July 2024

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

### **November 9, 2022 TCPB Meeting**

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

### **December 14, 2022 TCPB Meeting**

- TCPB reviewed the draft recommendation filtering criteria.
- The TCPB continued to engage in issue prioritization.
- Ben Duncan, Kearns and West, shared that a survey would be sent out to prioritize January’s meeting topic.

### **January 11, 2023 TCPB Meeting**

- The prioritization survey sent out after December 2022’s TCPB meeting resulted in strategies across four categories, including “Prioritization of Capacity Strategies.”
- The TCPB engaged in a “dot exercise” in which they voted on strategies across all four categories.
  - Under the “Prioritization of Capacity Strategies” category, 17 TCPB members voted for the top-ranked strategy, “Support wages and training for service providers as well as pay compensation for contractors since culturally specific services are often contracted out.”
- Liam Frost, Metro, shared that next steps for staff would include taking the top voted strategies and delivering recommendations for the TCPB to vote on in February.

### **February 8, 2023 TCPB Meeting**

- Metro and county staff translated TCPB’s voted upon priorities into regional goals, sharing this information with the committee in a memo on February 1, 2023.
  - Staff decided to separate the training and wages priority into two goals: “training and technical assistance” (split into two goals at the March 8, 2023 TCPB meeting) and “employee recruitment and retention.”
- The employee recruitment and retention goal, as drafted by staff, read: “Fair and equitable pay for Supportive Housing Services (SHS)-funded agencies and providers throughout the region.”
  - This included a recommendation to “Map current wage conditions and draft a housing-worker wage framework that provides guidance to SHS-funded agencies

and providers. Framework may include differential pay for lived experience, bilingual employees, and culturally specific organizations.”

- The TCPB agreed to continue the discussion at a future meeting.

### **March 8, 2023 TCPB Meeting**

- Staff presented two options for the Employee Recruitment and Retention Goal:
  - Option 1: Keep the same goal language
    - Fair and equitable pay for supportive Housing Services (SHS)-funded agencies and providers throughout the region.
  - Option 2: Separate goals
    - Goal A: Supportive Housing Services (SHS) funded agencies and providers throughout the region pay livable wages to direct service staff.
    - Goal B: Distribution of pay from lowest to highest paid staff within SHS-funded agencies and providers is equitable throughout the region.
- Staff also presented new Employee Recruitment and Retention recommendation options:
  - Original recommendation language: Map current wage conditions and draft a housing-worker wage framework that provides guidance to SHS-funded agencies and providers. Framework may include differential pay for lived experience, bilingual employees, and culturally specific organizations.
  - New recommendation language options:
    - Map current wage and benefit conditions.
    - Draft a housing-worker wage framework that provides guidance to Counties and SHS-funded agencies and providers.
    - Consider ways to allow for differential pay for lived experience, bilingual employees, and culturally specific organizations.
    - Consider ways to address challenges focused by organizations with multiple funding streams.
- The conversation continued into the next TCPB meeting.

### **April 12, 2023 TCPB Meeting**

- Mercedes Elizalde, TCPB member, stated that goal implementation lies within counties and their contracting processes. She recommended that the language specifically states, “achieve livable wages for direct service staff.”
- Patricia Rojas, Metro, shared that during the iterative recommendation process, staff and a consultant would develop a workflow to be shared with the TCPB.
- **The TCPB approved “map current wage and benefit conditions and include previous and existing work.”**
- **The TCPB approved “draft a housing-worker wage framework that provides guidance to counties and SHS-funded agencies and providers and includes contracting evaluation and alignment.”**
- **The TCPB approved “consider ways to allow for differential pay for lived experience, bilingual employees, and culturally specific organizations.”**

- **The TCPB approved “consider ways to address challenges faced by organizations with multiple funding streams.”**
- **The TCPB approved “assess reasonable scale of outcomes and caseload as it relates to compensation.”**
- A few members expressed a preference for option 1. Most members expressed a preference for option 2. [Option 1: Keep the same goal language from the February meeting. Option 2: Separate goals—Goal A and Goal B.]
- **The TCPB approved Goal A “County contracts for SHS-funded agencies and providers will establish standards throughout the region to achieve livable wages for direct service staff.”**
- Liam Frost, Metro, and Patricia Rojas, Metro, shared that Goal B language is in the work plan as a metric, not a requirement.
- **The TCPB approved Goal B [in concept, to be amended]: Distribution of pay from lowest to highest paid staff within SHS-funded agencies and providers is equitable throughout the region.**

#### **May 10, 2023 TCPB Meeting**

- On May 2, 2023, the TCPB had a work session. The work session group decided that to make Employee Recruitment and Retention Goal A successful, Goal B should become a recommendation under Goal A. The recommendation language is “Within each Supportive Housing Services (SHS)-funded agency, monitor the distribution of pay from lowest to highest paid staff to ensure improvements in pay equity.”
  - **The TCPB unanimously approved the recommendation.**

#### **June 14, 2023 TCPB Meeting**

- Vahid Brown, Clackamas County, presented on capacity building and pay equity. He shared that Washington County developed a pay equity survey tool that Clackamas County used to assess provider compensation ranges and that Clackamas County focuses on the rate of compensation in contract negotiations and the need to support a living wage.

#### **August 2023**

- Metro contracted with a consultant, Homebase, to support work on the TCPB’s Employee Recruitment and Retention goal.

#### **September 2023 – May 2024**

- Metro finalized scope of work and timeline with Homebase; Homebase conducted stakeholder engagement with key jurisdictional partners and providers, including a national and local scan.

# Employee Recruitment and Retention (ERR)

Progress Update – Part 2

July 10, 2024

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

# Employee Recruitment and Retention Progress Update

## Agenda - Part 2

- Metro introductory remarks
- County updates
- Homebase Findings, Part 2
- Metro wrap up/Next steps
- Questions/Discussion



# TCPB Goal

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

## Recommendations:

- Map current wage and benefit conditions.
- Draft a housing-worker wage framework that provides guidance to Counties and SHS-funded agencies and providers and includes contracting evaluation and alignment.
- Consider ways to allow for differential pay for lived experience, bilingual employees, and culturally specific organizations.
- Consider ways to address challenges faced by organizations with multiple funding streams.
- Assess reasonable scale of outcomes and case load as it relates to compensation.
- Within each Supportive Housing Services (SHS)-funded agency, monitor the distribution of pay from lowest to highest paid staff to ensure improvements in pay equity.

# Metro introductory remarks

- Today's progress update will set the stage for development of regional strategies and an implementation plan, including potential RIF investments
  - Connect with statewide and local initiatives and partners
  - Apply TCPB Equity Lens to proposals
  - Crosswalk to original goal language + Homebase report + TCPB input
  - Ongoing progress updates

# Employee Recruitment & Retention

---



**CLACKAMAS**  
C O U N T Y



Joint Office of  
**Homeless Services**



# Pre-SHS Contracting Landscape

## Multnomah

- One-time funding for hiring and retention bonuses
- One-time funding for continuity of operations
- Limited-term funding for hazard pay
- Additional 3% increase to contract operating budgets

## Washington

- Small amount of funding, rough \$5M/year
- Limited, one-time contracts with rigid federal guidelines for federal funds
- Homeless services funding supported ~12 case/outreach workers (support over 140 now)

## Clackamas

- Smaller contracts led to few cash flow issues for providers
- No inflationary/COLA increases for contracts each year
- Services scattered across several divisions created a lack of consistency

# Cash Flow

## Multnomah

- Capacity Building Allocations for New/Expanding Organizations Pilot
- Advance Payment Pilot

## Washington

- Contractual advance policy exists, focuses on expanding or new programs
- Other advance request are reviewed on a case-by-case basis

## Clackamas

- Offer up to two months of a contract's budget as an advance
- Doubling the size of the HCDD Finance team
- Refining finance workflows and procedures

# Wage Parity and Compression

## Multnomah

- 2023 Wage Study
- Wage Adjustment: FY 2023: Up to 8% increase in provider operating budgets
- 5% COLA and additional 3% for a total of 8%

## Washington

- Ongoing wage analysis of providers
- Provided a 3.5% COLA for FY 24-25, increase of roughly \$5,000/FTE
- COLA also provided in FY 23-24

## Clackamas

- Ask providers to increase pay during contract negotiations
- Will review culturally specific provider pay to ensure any wage disparities are addressed

# Caseload and Employee Workloads

## Multnomah

- Capacity Building Grants
- Rebase Shelter Contracts
- PSH Service Gap Increase

## Washington

- Initial caseload of 20:1 set using national best practices
- Caseload of 30:1 given changing caseloads from housing placement to retention support
- Flexibility for providers to manage caseloads across programs

## Clackamas

- Regular communication with providers to assess caseloads
- Flexible with providers when staff are working with very high acuity clients

# Progress on Goal Recommendations

- ✓ **1. Map current wage and benefit conditions.** All three counties do this annually.
- 2. Draft a housing-worker wage framework that provides guidance to Counties and SHS-funded agencies and providers and includes contracting evaluation and alignment.** Could be legal barriers for counties in mandating a pay scale, might be a state legislative strategy.
- 3. Consider ways to allow for differential pay for lived experience, bilingual employees, and culturally specific organizations.** Variety of approaches.
- 4. Consider ways to address challenges faced by organizations with multiple funding streams.** Variety of approaches.
- 5. Assess reasonable scale of outcomes and case load as it relates to compensation.** Variety of approaches.
- ✓ **6. Within each Supportive Housing Services (SHS)-funded agency, monitor the distribution of pay from lowest to highest paid staff to ensure improvements in pay equity.** All three counties do this annually.

# Other Promising Practices

## Multnomah

- Providers conferences help collect provider feedback and information to improve workforce recruitment, retention and equity strategies.

## Washington

- Housing Careers Program, partnership with Worksystems
- Regular provider trainings and office hours to provide support to staff

## Clackamas

- Investments in mental health treatment for caseworkers



**Questions?**

# Recap – Part 1 Summary

Living Wage Benchmark, Local and National Scan Results



# Overall Key Takeaways

- **Low wages** are a national challenge linked to poor recruitment and retention.
  - Preliminary evidence shows raising wages increases recruitment and retention.
- Both locally and nationally, providers have used similar methods to **raise wages on an individual provider scale**, which may be replicable on a regional scale in some cases.
- **Systemic approach** is necessary for sustained change.
- Nationally, there is **not yet a template for how to do this work sustainably at a regional level**.

# Initial Feedback

- **Equity Implications**
  - People who identify as black or other historically marginalized races are disproportionately represented among direct service workers
  - Salary transparency is closely tied to perceptions of pay equity
- **Effects on Families**
  - Many who work in this industry are single-income Households with children, for whom a one-bedroom living wage would be insufficient
- *These should be considered further in implementation planning*

# What next?

Strategies for Impact

# Core Strategies for Achieving a Livable Wage

**Commitment to  
and Coordination  
of Regional  
Strategy**

**Planning for and  
Allocating More  
Funding to  
Compensation**

**Addressing the  
Cashflow  
Concerns for  
Providers**

# Strategies for Impact

## Commitment to and Coordination of Regional Strategy

- Create a Tri-County Regional Implementation Plan
- Launch a Communication Strategy
- Assign Accountability and Oversight
- Provide Multi-Year TA for Support

## Planning for and Allocating More Funding to Compensation

- Establish a Funders Table for Coordination
- Directly Increase Wages on New and Existing Contracts
- Offer Flexible Match Funding for Providers to Increase Wages
- Offer Incentive Grants to Providers who Pay Living Wages
- Plan for Benefits Cliff
- Address Benefits Gaps

## Addressing the Cashflow Concerns for Providers

- Offer Capacity Building Grants to Improve Provider Financial Capacity
- Implement Policies and Procedures Updates
- Pilot Emerging Contract Models
- Risk Mitigation Fund

# Commitment to and Coordination of a Regional Strategy

## Commitment to and Coordination of Regional Strategy

- Create a Tri-County Regional Implementation Plan
- Launch a Communication Strategy
- Assign Accountability and Oversight
- Provide Multi-Year TA for Support

# Planning for and Allocating More Funding to Compensation

## Planning for and Allocating More Funding to Compensation

- Establish a Funders Table for Coordination
- Directly Increase Wages on New and Existing Contracts
- Offer Flexible Match Funding for Providers to Increase Wages
- Offer Incentive Grants to Providers who Pay Living Wages
- Plan for Benefits Cliff
- Address Benefits Gaps

# Planning for and Allocating More Funding to Compensation

## Establish a Funders Table for Coordination

New allocations toward service line items will be needed to raise wages. The funding landscape is a complex network of varied grant types, guiding strategies, and regulations. Any changes to this landscape will need both technical expertise and a big picture view to balance investment in wages with the need for service capacity and reasonable caseloads.

A group of representatives working together at a “Funders Table” can discuss regional budget plans and their impacts on the wage goal. This group would have the knowledge to set and monitor progress on wage allocation targets and may be a good fit to oversee incentives.

### Strategies for Impact:

- Develop big-picture view of allocations for services funding
  - Explore opportunities for reallocation of existing funds
  - Create short- and long-term sustainability plans
- Incorporate new funding sources (e.g., SHS, philanthropy)
- Time-limited ‘Wage Board’ Working Group
  - Mixed representatives of funders and providers
  - Annual review and update of wage targets



# Planning for and Allocating More Funding to Compensation

## Ways to invest in wages:

- Directly Increase Wages on New and Existing Contracts
  - Offer Flexible Match Funding for Providers to Increase Wages
  - Offer Incentive Grants to Providers who Pay Living Wages
- Some of these techniques are already happening, and could be brought to scale with regional coordination

# Planning for and Allocating More Funding to Compensation

## Additional Concerns Around Benefits:

- Plan for Benefits Cliff
- Address Benefits Gaps
- Wages and Benefits are connected, and adjustments to one should be considered within the context of the other

# Addressing the Cashflow Concerns for Providers

## Addressing the Cashflow Concerns for Providers

- Offer Capacity Building Grants to Improve Provider Financial Capacity
- Implement Policies and Procedures Updates
- Pilot Emerging Contract Models
- Risk Mitigation Fund

# Addressing the Cashflow Concerns for Providers

## Offer Capacity Building Grants to Improve Provider Financial Capacity

Counties are currently leveraging SHS funding to offer capacity building grants to providers. These capacity building grants have typically been flexible, with providers and counties working together to identify the best use of funding. Very flexible funds could be invested in building provider cash reserves.

Future capacity building grants could be more targeted to improve providers' *financial* capacity.

### Strategies for Impact:

- Advertise the eligible uses of capacity building grants in a broad and transparent manner
  - Offer cash reserves increases as an explicit option for capacity building grants
  - Encourage investment in financial expertise
- Encourage providers to increase their financial capacity by increasing cash reserves
  - Improved cash reserves will increase providers' ability to raise wages and sustain higher wages

# Addressing the Cashflow Concerns for Providers

## Policies and Procedures Updates

A top request from providers consulted was revisions to funder policies and procedures around contracts and reimbursement. This was cited as a key barrier to long term planning and cashflow management necessary to raise wages.

Funders should provide full transparency of any policies and accommodations available. When possible, consistency of policies associated with contracts simplify administrative burdens.

This topic is also being explored by the NAO Contract Reform task force, so there are opportunities to learn from active statewide efforts.

## Strategies for Impact:

- Establish a group with the expertise to plan revisions to funder policies and procedures for grants contracting and reimbursement.
- Transparency and Consistency in Standards
- Contracting
  - Consistent Grant RFP Schedules
  - Timely Contract Execution
  - Contract Advances
- Reimbursement
  - Simpler Reimbursement Paperwork Requirements
  - Parallel-Pay for Invoices with minor issues
  - Implement emerging contract models

# Addressing the Cashflow Concerns for Providers

## Emerging Contract Models

The traditional cost-reimbursement model of contracting has a large impact on cashflow. Alternative models are able to provide more flexibility to providers than line by line tracking of expenses.

Both Case-Rate and Outcomes-Based models are a monthly payment that does not require receipts. Reconciliation is done periodically and at the end of the grant period.

## Strategies for Impact:

- **Case-Rate Payment Model**
  - A flat price per month per client enrolled is established in the contract
  - Provides a reliable payment based on case enrollment
- **Outcomes-Based Payment Model**
  - Providers receive a base amount to operate the contract and are eligible for extra payment tied to outcomes
  - Incentivizes providers to reach high outcomes

# Addressing the Cashflow Concerns for Providers

## Risk Mitigation Fund

Changes to policies and procedures and contracting models incur risk to funders. However, that risk can be planned for.

Many government funded contracts have complicated paperwork requirements. Utilizing innovative techniques will take time to develop new systems that fit seamlessly with such requirements.

Risk mitigation funds can cover the gaps for funders.

## Strategies for Impact:

- Potential Uses of the Fund:
  - Temporarily cover mistakes in reimbursement paperwork while the resolutions are worked out
  - Temporarily cover advances or pre-payment
  - Temporarily cover parallel-pay until invoice issues are resolved
  - In some extreme cases, permanently cover issues deemed unresolvable after a period of review.
- In theory, this fund can have ongoing mechanisms to replenish itself as mistakes are resolved and advances are repaid

# Overall Key Takeaways

- **Low wages** are a national challenge linked to poor recruitment and retention.
- A coordinated systemic response will be necessary to achieve livable wages for direct service staff
  - **Market forces and provider-level efforts alone will not be enough**
- 3 Core Strategies of a Systemic Approach:
  - **Commitment to and Coordination of Regional Strategy**
  - **Planning for and Allocating More Funding to Compensation**
  - **Addressing the Cashflow Concerns for Providers**
- More discussion will be needed to develop a detailed **tri-county regional implementation plan**



**Questions?**

# Wrap-up + Next Steps

- Thank you to Homebase and all
- Next up: Counties + Metro develop implementation plan
- Crosswalk to goal language, your questions, Homebase framework
- Continue provider and partner engagement including local, state efforts
- Return to TCPB with implementation plan – timing TBD

# METRO SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES TRI-COUNTY PLANNING BODY

## Monthly progress report | July 2024

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

### TRI-COUNTY PLANNING BODY REGIONAL GOALS\*

Goal	Progress
Unit/landlord recruitment and retention	Metro and county staff have started executing the Regional Implementation Plan to advance the Regional Landlord Recruitment goal. The Tri-County Planning Body (TCPB) voted to approve the Plan at their March meeting. The Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee gave final approval for the Plan during their April meeting. A workgroup of staff from Metro and the Counties has been meeting monthly to coordinate this work. We are finalizing reporting and metrics, and we plan to share those plans in our first quarterly implementation update in August.
Coordinated Entry	The Coordinated Entry Regional Alignment Workgroup (CERAW) continues to meet monthly. Focus groups of people with lived experience, led by people with lived experience, will take place at the end of July. These focus groups will gather information that will be crucial as Metro and the Counties build the CE regional implementation plan. Consensus building and clarification around strategy areas continues in a productive manner, and Metro/County staff plan to present to county CoC and CE boards to raise awareness and collaboration.
Healthcare system alignment	The regional leadership meeting continues monthly with Health Share, Counties, and Metro. The subgroup, focused on implementation planning, continues to meet monthly. The data sharing workgroup continues to meet, working toward consensus and building data use cases. Work sessions with providers and other key stakeholders have occurred over the past month, and conversations are ongoing. Homebase, with support from Metro and County staff, have completed the landscape of health/housing initiatives. This landscape is crucial to identify current areas of collaboration and potential future efforts across systems. Metro is working with Homebase to develop a health/housing

integration proposal for the regional implementation plan.

#### Training + Technical Assistance

The Metro Regional Capacity Team and procurement department are expecting to qualify a list of vendors from our regionwide technical assistance qualification process in the next few weeks. In total 70 vendors (including for profit consulting firms and nonprofit service providers) applied to share their expertise in areas like human resources support, housing and homeless services best practices and racial equity and social justice. Once finalized, this four-jurisdiction procurement will serve as the bench for technical assistance support in the coming years. Thank you to the 21 people who helped score the RFQu, including staff from all four jurisdictions and four community partners (special shout out to the TCPB's own Eboni Brown and Zoi Coppiano for supporting the process!)

Metro and the counties are continuing to develop an exciting opportunity around ensuring new and emerging houseless service workers have access to a baseline of trainings when starting out. Metro is also designing a technical assistance demonstration project to support providers in ways that are additive to the region's systems. We're excited to share more info with the TCPB soon.

#### Employee Recruitment and Retention

We will present part 2 of the progress update on this goal to TCPB on July 10, including the second half of Homebase's findings as well as updates from the Counties on current and potential local and regional strategies. These preliminary concepts will be explored and refined in the coming months to build the Implementation Plan. Outreach and engagement will continue, including with providers and with local and state workforce-related initiatives.

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

## EXISTING REGIONAL PROGRAMS AND COORDINATION EFFORTS

### People housed through the RLRA program as of March 31, 2024:



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

# TRI-COUNTY PLANNING BODY GOAL AND RECOMMENDATION LANGUAGE

May 10th, 2023

---

## COORDINATED ENTRY

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

## REGIONAL LANDLORD RECRUITMENT

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

## HEALTHCARE SYSTEM ALIGNMENT

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

## TRAINING

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

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

## **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

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

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

## **EMPLOYEE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION**

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

**Recommendations:** Map current wage and benefit conditions.

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

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

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

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

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





## Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services (SHS) Oversight Committee Meeting  
Date: May 20, 2024  
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.  
Place: Virtual meeting (Zoom)  
Purpose: Metro tax collection and disbursement and FY25 budget update; discussion on county work plans for fiscal year 2024-25; and discussion on the regional housing funding process.

---

### Member attendees

Jim Bane (he/him), Mitch Chilcott (he/him), Co-chair Susan Emmons (she/her), Cara Hash (she/her), Felicita Montebancho (she/her), Peter Rosenblatt (he/him), Mike Savara (he/him), Co-Chair Dr. Mandrill Taylor (he/him), Dan Fowler (he/him), Jenny Lee (she/her), Jeremiah Rigsby (he/him)

### Absent members

Margarita Solis Ruiz (she/her), Becky Wilkinson (she/her), Carter MacNichol (he/him)

### Elected delegates

Multnomah County Chair Jessica Vega Pederson (she/her), Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington (she/her)

### Absent elected delegates

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

### Metro

Yesenia Delgado (she/her), Breanna Hudson (she/her), Patricia Rojas (she/her), Yvette Perez-Chavez (she/her)

### Kearns & West Facilitator

Ben Duncan (he/him)

### Welcome and Introductions

Co-chairs Dr. Mandrill Taylor and Susan Emmons provided welcoming remarks.

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, facilitated introductions and reviewed the meeting agenda.

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, introduced herself and shared that Becky Wilkinson and Eugene Lewis will no longer be serving on the SHS Oversight Committee and that Metro is recruiting for the two seats.

Patricia Rojas, Metro, informed the group that the Metro housing department has added three new positions that will be supporting the SHS work.

The SHS Oversight Committee unanimously approved the February 12, February 25, March 25, and April 22 SHS Oversight Committee meeting minutes.



## Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Peter Rosenblatt asked the project team to include a call out for decisions in future meeting minutes.

### Conflict of Interest Declaration

Dan Fowler declared he is Chair of the Homeless Solutions Coalition of Clackamas County which receives SHS funding.

Peter Rosenblatt declared that he works at Northwest Housing Alternatives which receives SHS funding.

Jenny Lee declared that she works at Coalition of Communities of Color which has a contract with Metro.

Mike Savara shared that he is on the Board of Directors for the Washington Housing Authority.

### Public Comment

Savana J. shared that they represent Portland State University students and summarized their experience working with the houseless community. They acknowledged the high rates of staff burnout in housing assistance programs. They shared that housing assistance facilitators have indicated a lack support to do their jobs and asked that the committee involve their perspectives in decision making.

Shaun Ireland shared that his organization provides service support and that they are commenting on noise abatement. They informed the group that eviction prevention and litigation fall on the shoulders of case managers and that multi-unit properties are experiencing noise abatement issues. They asked the group to consider the noise abatement issue during discussions.

### Update: Metro tax collection and disbursement and FY25 budget

Rachel Lembo, Metro, shared that she will provide an overview of the monthly tax collection and disbursement update and shared that Metro is still collecting taxes for FY 2024 and that Metro is on track to collect the expected returns.

She shared an update on the FY 2025 budget and that an updated budget report is included in the meeting packet which includes actuals for FY 2024, forecasts for FY 2025 and the budget for FY 2025. She shared questions and answers that Carter MacNichol asked her to share with the Committee.

Peter Rosenblatt asked for clarification on the tax collection report charts.

*Rachel Lembo, Metro, clarified the connections between the charts and shared that the colors do not have significance.*

Peter Rosenblatt suggested that the charts include the full dollar amount on the charts moving forward.

### Presentation and Discussion: FY 2025 Draft County Work Plans

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, introduced the topic and shared that the county work plans are an annual SHS requirement due by April 1. She shared that Metro distributed the updated work plan template to the counties for their reports.

Breanna Flores, Multnomah County, shared that the work plans are drafts and pending the budget being finalized. She shared an updated timeline and noted that the program is entering FY 2025 and that the focus will be on evaluating and refining the program. She shared an update on the FY 2025

## Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

program goals and noted that an additional update will be included in Multnomah County's annual report.

Peter Rosenblatt requested that Metro send slides in advance when possible.

Adam Brown, Clackamas County, shared the SHS expenditure forecast graph and detailed the path toward reaching 100% funding commitment.

Peter Rosenblatt asked for clarification on the SHS expenditure forecast chart.

*Adam Brown, Clackamas County, clarified that the program will be fully built when the red and purple lines meet in FY 25-26. He added that the anticipated timeline will be earlier.*

Peter Rosenblatt asked how shifting SHS money to affordable housing development could affect the timeline.

*Adam Brown, Clackamas County, shared that policy changes would impact the counties current investments.*

Adam Brown, Clackamas County, shared an update on investments funded with carryover funds and included examples.

Nicole Stingh, Washington County, shared an update on regional themes, system improvements for the Washington County draft work plan, and strategies for advancing the counties equity goals. She provided an overview of strategies Washington County will be implementing to meet metric targets for capacity and people.

Cristal Otero, Multnomah County, shared an update on the county's draft work plan and shared that the county is scaling up and maintaining programming with SHS funds. She shared an overview of emerging themes and the total number of housing placements, emergency shelter beds, outreach, and other services.

Adam Brown, Clackamas County, shared an update of goals identified for FY 24-25. He noted that the next steps for Clackamas County include a focus on system improvement.

Dominique Donaho, Clackamas County, shared an update on the FY 24-25 racial equity and system capacity building strategies included in the Clackamas County draft work plan.

Adam Brown, Clackamas County, provided an overview of upcoming Clackamas County projects and shared that the County is collecting feedback on their draft plan, making changes, and submitting the final work plan to Metro following budget approvals.

Co-chair Dr. Mandrill Taylor shared his appreciation for the focus on wage equity and asked whether there is a plan to focus on additional training or technical assistant support.

*Dominique Donaho, Clackamas County, shared that the pay equity analysis looks at culturally specific service providers vs non culturally specific service providers, and position. She shared that the county understands that different positions require different trainings, and that part of their analysis includes asking what providers need to serve their populations. She shared that as a next step they will be looking into specific trainings.*

*Adam Brown, Clackamas County, shared that there are contracts with six technical assistant organizations to provide support as needed and that the county is encouraging coordination.*

## Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Felicita Monteblanco shared her appreciation for the work and asked what Clackamas County will do when they see a difference in pay between culturally specific providers and other groups.

*Adam Brown, Clackamas County, gave an example of a culturally specific organization's contract and shared that the County found that the proposed wages were too low and worked with the organization to make adjustments at the outset.*

Co-chair Susan Emmons asked Multnomah County to provide clarity on the low number of RLRA vouchers.

*Breanna Flores, Multnomah County, shared that the team is working to balance other funds including RLRA and SHS affordable housing units.*

*Cristal Otero, Multnomah County, shared that in the Q2 report Multnomah County shared the number of RLRA vouchers which included 75% for Population A and 25% for Population B. She shared that both will be increased and that the report will clarify those details. She shared that the permanent supportive housing (PSH) goal for the year will include an additional 135 vouchers.*

Co-chair Susan Emmons shared that she will follow-up with comments.

Peter Rosenblatt noted that Clackamas County doesn't share a funding rationale and suggested the formation of a system wide approach to improve clarity. Peter requested that the counties present numbers in context. He shared that the Clackamas County Local Implementation Plan (LIP) was developed as a one-year plan and is still referenced today. He requested more information about how the LIPs get created and any corresponding community engagement. He noted that SHS is not the only funding and requested that other funding sources be included at some point.

Co-chair Dr. Mandrill Taylor shared that there is \$9.5 million for shelter expansion and asked whether the JOHS has done a financial feasibility analysis to see if the long-term LIP PSH goals are met and requested that any data be shared with the committee.

*Breanna Flores, Multnomah County, shared that she will check with the financial team. She shared that Multnomah County is on track to be able to support the units committed to in the LIP.*

*Cristal Otero, Multnomah County, added that next steps depend on policy discussions and noted that increased shelter capacity is a community need. She shared that there may be other funding sources that can be leveraged.*

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, shared that next steps are contingent on the approval of the FY 25 budgets and that the committee's feedback will be included as the counties continue refinements on their work plans.

### Discussion: Regional Housing Process Funding Update

Co-Chair Dr. Mandrill Taylor introduced Marissa Madrigal, Metro's Chief Operating Officer.

Marissa Madrigal, Metro, shared that Metro Council directed staff to explore the concept of using unanticipated revenue from the SHS program to fund affordable housing creation. She noted that the Stakeholder Advisory Table (SAT) is one of several channels of input and summarized the feedback shared by the group, noting that the SAT was not tasked with reaching consensus. She shared that the group expressed consistent alignment regarding the following:

- Core population focus

## Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

- Supporting flexibility, maintaining commitments
- Cautious approach to tax changes
- Hunger for collaboration, and accountability

Marissa shared an overview of community and partner engagement opportunities and noted that community members shared increased support for serving those with the greatest need. She noted the community engagement that was incorporated into the bond funded projects and shared that Metro partnered with the Coalition of Communities of Color to hold listening sessions with community members. She shared an update on early findings from the Coalition's engagement including the following:

- Recognizing the services housing link
- Focus on populations with greatest need
- A spectrum of housing investments
- Welcoming culturally responsive stable communities
- Eagerness to engage directly

Marissa shared an update on regional committee input and noted that Metro will continue to engage closely with committee members to collect feedback and perspectives. She shared an update on public partner engagement and noted that she presented to city managers around the region in April and has met with program staff and county partners.

She shared an update on Metro's investment and revenue analysis and noted that Metro has sought to prioritize investment types identified by stakeholders and to elevate the voices of practitioners working directly with the community experiencing homelessness or housing instability. She shared that Metro reported that affordable housing developers need flexibility in spending, improved coordination with agencies that provide funding, and the need for financing in the predevelopment phase.

She shared that she would issue a recommendation to Metro Council during the summer of 2024 and offered to attend the June SHS Oversight Committee meeting to discuss updates to the recommendation.

Marissa highlighted the following areas of alignment from all the input received:

- Centering deepest housing needs and impacts
- Flexibility to create affordable housing along with maintaining commitments to services
- Addressing the funding sunset - long term certainty for providers and community

She shared the following next steps for finalizing details of a recommendation to Metro Council:

- Revenue allocation for housing and services
  - Ensuring stability, addressing urgency
- Future housing investments
  - Prioritizing need and deliverable results
- Oversight and implementation structure
  - Clarity, flexibility, accountability

She shared the following discussion questions for Committee consideration:

- What is important to consider as Metro, counties and other partners continue conversations to inform a recommendation?
- What questions do you have about the process or preliminary findings?

## Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

### Discussion

Felicita Monteblanco shared that she struggles with the idea of diverting funds and that as an overarching theme the Committee has heard that the counties know how to spend their money and that there are no excess funds. She asked for clarification around the lack of viable funding paths.

*Marissa Madrigal, Metro, shared that there is a lack of trust in government and that polling has indicated that reupping the bond funding is not a viable option. She shared that polling for using existing resources to fund affordable housing is a popular concept. She shared that extending the sunset has been met with limited support and added that if you expand the uses to include affordable housing the support for extending the sunset goes up. She shared that there is not enough money in the program to build mass housing, but that this approach would extend the SHS program and include funding for affordable housing production.*

Felicita Monteblanco shared that community groups would be interested in doing polling and that a comms plan has been suggested several times over the last two years.

Peter Rosenblatt shared that providers are negotiating the full second year contract for SHS and that not enough progress has been made to discuss diverting funding. He asked for details on how much funding will be diverted and how diversion would impact SHS and new build construction. He shared that funds should not be diverted and noted that if they are they should be diverted from new projects and not existing projects.

*Marissa Madrigal, Metro, shared that details are being discussed with the county partners and that expanded flexibility is still being defined. She noted the need for the SHS program, and that funding is limited, and is needed for affordable units as well as deeply affordable units. She shared that Metro needs to be creative in using its resources.*

Mitch Chilcott shared that he will follow-up with Marissa Madrigal on polling to the community.

Mike Savara shared that SHS focuses on people experiencing chronic homelessness and his interest in maintaining that focus. He shared that the goals for the measure are different than the Metro affordable housing bond and that the original intent of the voters should be maintained. He shared that the counties are not building towards the funding projections, but rather the real reported numbers. He shared that if this decision were to move forward, planned housing may change. He shared that the conversation should be focused on excess funds and that cuts to services should be avoided.

*Marissa Madrigal, Metro, shared that one of the process values is stability and that Metro will prioritize stability for providers. She added that the focus will be on Population A and Population B. She shared that she will likely not go outside those bounds with her recommendation and that the priority will be to work with the counties to understand what will work with them.*

Peter Rosenblatt shared that without understanding the details of the proposal there is concern on behalf of the audience.

*Marissa reiterated that the details are under development with the counties.*

Co-chair Susan Emmons asked whether the situation for management companies and the effects of any changes are being discussed. She shared that management companies are declining applications and asked whether that issue is being discussed.

## Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

*Marissa Madrigal, Metro, shared that she has heard similar comments.*

*Patricia Rojas, Metro, shared that there are different systems and that PSH has been attempting to connect the resources. She shared that Metro is working to be intentional about connecting the resources proactively.*

Jim Bane shared his appreciation for the work. He shared that there is an assumption that expenditures will stay the same but noted that adding housing may reduce the trajectory of expenses overtime.

Jenny Lee acknowledged the difficulty of not understanding the details.

Co-chair Dr. Mandrill Taylor shared that a lot of the Committee's comments came up at the SAT. He shared that there is ambiguity, but that this direct engagement is helpful to begin that process.

Mike Savara asked for details on oversight and accountability.

*Marissa Madrigal, Metro, shared interest in a future conversation on oversight and accountability. She noted that there is some ambiguity in the current system that needs to be addressed regardless of the future approach.*

Marissa Madrigal, Metro, thanked the group for their time and questions. She shared that she looks forward to continuing the conversation.

### Next Steps

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, shared that the tri-county planning body team came last meeting to provide the landlord recruitment and retention update and that the Metro team will follow-up on the topic at a future meeting.

Next steps include:

- Metro to consider restructuring meeting minutes to include decision callouts.
- Metro to consider including full dollar amounts on the tax collection report charts.
- Metro to send slides as early as possible.
- Counties to consider presenting outcome numbers in context of their LIPs.
- Counties and Metro to share any data related to long-term LIP PSH goals.
- Marissa Madrigal, Metro, to attend the June Committee meeting to discuss updates to her recommendation to Metro Council.
- Co-chair Susan Emmons and Mitch Chilcott to follow-up with staff to share additional comments.
- Next meeting: Monday, June 24<sup>th</sup> 9:30am-12:00pm

### Adjourn

Adjourned at 12:00 pm.

The following materials were received  
during the meeting.



Responses to questions and action items from the June 2024 TCPB meeting related to the Employee Recruitment and Retention goal.

See information compiled by Counties (“County Responses to June TCPB Questions”), attached below.

Questions/comments: [Ruth.Adkins@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:Ruth.Adkins@oregonmetro.gov) or 971-347-8637

Action Item/Comment/Question	Status	Next steps
<p>Public comment: Phillip Kennedy-Wong, Nonprofit Association of Oregon (NAO)</p> <p>Phillip provided an overview of statewide work on nonprofit employment retention/ wages, requested to align efforts.</p>	<p>Metro + HB have met with NAO twice to date; another meeting scheduled for July 23.</p> <p>Mercedes Elizalde, co-chair of the state’s Modernizing Grant Funding and Contracting Task Force, briefed Metro staff and HB on 6/24/24 on the taskforce findings. The taskforce’s report to the Legislature will be available this fall.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metro will continue to engage with NAO and follow work of the statewide task force</li> <li>• Explore opportunities to align/build on statewide efforts</li> <li>• Include any opportunities/partnerships that emerge as part of the IP</li> </ul>
<p>Public comment: Keith Wilson and Caleb Coder re: FlexPDX</p> <p>Steve Rudman question to Keith/Caleb: Have you reached out and discussed FlexPDX with each of the three counties, and are you familiar with the ERR work TCPB is doing?</p>	<p>Metro staff has met with FlexPDX representatives at least twice. This issue overlaps both ERR and Regional Capacity (training/TA); Metro staff will collaborate on next steps.</p> <p>Metro staff are participating in the Supported Employment Advisory Council meetings convened at Worksystems.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metro schedule additional meeting(s) with FlexPDX to learn more, get answers to Steve’s questions, discuss potential partnership</li> <li>• Explore opportunities to align/build on FlexPDX and other supported employment efforts</li> <li>• Include any opportunities/partnerships that emerge in the IP for ERR and/or Regional Capacity</li> </ul>

HB = Homebase

IP = Implementation Plan

Action Item/Comment/Question	Status	Next steps
Sahaan McKelvey – schedule briefing	Sahaan will be sharing his thoughts with Mercedes to bring to July, but would also appreciate a separate opportunity since this is his #1 issue but he is unable to attend the July meeting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metro staff in process of scheduling meeting with Sahaan in July</li> </ul>
Do Metro reporting requirements force the counties to use line item budgets in their contracts with providers? What are the Metro reporting requirements for Counties and what are the County reporting requirements for providers?	From Metro Finance Manager: Metro financial reporting requirements do not require the counties to use line-item budgets in their contracts with providers. Our financial report template is by program (Shelter, Safety on/off the Street, RLRA, RRH, etc.).	
Question to HB: what were the demographics of the employees in your national scan? NAO study found more women, BIPOC in lower-paying jobs	From Homebase: People who identify as black or other historically marginalized races are disproportionately represented among direct service workers. Salary transparency is closely tied to perceptions of pay equity. This should be considered further in implementation planning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include along with other equity considerations as part of IP process, using TCPB equity tool</li> </ul>
General comment about the status quo and values for dealing with contracts. State taskforce is finding that state staff are afraid they “have to find something,” fear of being called out for missing any waste, fraud and abuse. Encourage county staff to be open about this dynamic and think about how to do accountability differently.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metro, Counties to reflect and consider during IP process</li> </ul>
Let’s think about what we want the message to be about this to public, SHS Oversight Committee, Metro Council re: the nature of these problems and our ability to solve them		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metro, Counties to reflect and consider during IP process</li> <li>• Loop in Metro communications team</li> </ul>
What would be challenging re: adopting a living wage standard per the NAO report?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metro, Counties to reflect and consider during IP process</li> </ul>

HB = Homebase

IP = Implementation Plan

Action Item/Comment/Question	Status	Next steps
<p>Comment – would be more appropriate for wage benchmark to include 2 BR – most staff have at least one child. Need the “shock factor” of the higher amount.</p>	<p>From Homebase: Many who work in this industry are single-income Households with children, for whom a one-bedroom living wage would be insufficient. This should be considered further in implementation planning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metro, Counties to reflect and consider during IP process</li> </ul>
<p>Note that MIT calculator includes more data/factors; wage would be \$47/hour per MIT [= \$97,760]</p>		
<p><b>For remaining questions, see County Responses to June TCPB Questions</b></p>		
<p>What have the counties done to date to advance the ERR recommendations?</p>	<p>How did Multco get to a higher number for PSH and not for other services. (Referring to update that they raised their service cap for PSH budgets to \$15,000 per household per year, and \$17,500 for culturally specific services)</p>	<p>During contracting process, when are providers asked for updated info about their costs – is it just an exchange of budget info, when do counties reach out to providers?</p>
<p>Re: “alternative contract models,” alternative to what? Want specific detail on each county’s models.</p>	<p>Want more detail on county approval processes: What happens if there is a discrepancy? What is the period of time to get something approved?</p>	<p>Do contracts have advance recovery (90 days’ worth of funding) as was done in the 1990s? If not doing, why not?</p>

HB = Homebase  
 IP = Implementation Plan

# Tri-County Planning Body – Employee Retention and Recruitment Goal

## County Responses to June TCPB Questions

July 9, 2024

### 1. What have the counties done to date to advance the ERR recommendations?

#### a. Map current wage and benefit conditions.

- i. All three counties have undergone efforts to map the wage and benefits for contracted services providers. In Washington and Clackamas Counties, salary analysis has been conducted as part of evaluation providers. The Joint Office of Homeless Services (JOHS) contracted with a third party to support this analysis.
  1. Clackamas County: The County conducted a baseline evaluation for FY22-23 SHS contracted programs, see [Clackamas County's FY22-23 Annual Report](#) (Attachment E, page 57) for details and visualizations of the data.
  2. Multnomah County: The study, conducted by JOHS with the support of Homebase and North Third (a research and analysis firm) was designed to evaluate: (1) classification, compensation and benefits practices across JOHS-funded agencies, (2) primary factors contributing to employee satisfaction, burnout, and turnover intentions, and (3) how best to support workforce stability and equity for JOHS-funded agencies and the region's homelessness system of care. For more information about the study and recommendations, please see [Final Full Wage Study Report.docx](#)
  3. Washington County: The County conducted a baseline evaluation for FY22-23 SHS contracted programs, see [Washington County's FY22-23 Annual Report](#) (Attachment I, page 43) for details and visualizations of the data. This year's report is complete and will be included in the annual report released in October.

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

- i. The counties have explored this recommendation in a few ways, detailed below. County counsel has advised two of the counties of a potential legal consideration for "interference of contract" by requiring wage standards.
  1. Clackamas County: The Oregon Employment Department publishes [wage](#) information of mean and median wages in designated workforce areas across the state. One potential housing-worker wage framework is a recommended minimum pay of the median or 50<sup>th</sup> percentile wage for the workforce area, reassessed annually (using newly released annual data from Oregon Employment Department) or adjusted for inflation annually where annual data is not updated (Consumer Price Index for the Western Region, CPI-W, percentage increases). While the Counties and their subcontractors need flexibility and it may not be feasible to require wage standards, a recommended framework may be

Tri-County Planning Body – Employee Retention and Recruitment Goal

County Responses to June TCPB Questions

July 10, 2024

used for guidance or a recommended floor wage. Such a position would demonstrate our collective values in compensating fairly and in accordance with the complexity of the work, without interfering with the Counties' contract negotiations.

2. Multnomah County: The JOHS has and will continue to work together with service providers, supporting each agency in addressing concerns specific to their workforce, and developing agency-specific strategies to address recruitment and retention challenges. Some of the actions we have taken to support our providers:
    - a. During fiscal year 2022-23, JOHS provided funding increases for agencies of up to 8 percent of their operating budgets with the goal of increasing spending on compensation and benefits for front-line staff.
    - b. During the current fiscal year 2023-24, JOHS provided a 5 percent cost-of-living adjustment for contracts, and projects funded by the County General Fund and by the Metro Supportive Housing Services Measure (SHS) included an additional 3 percent cost-of-living adjustment.
    - c. The current fiscal year also funded two capacity building grant programs.
      - i. The first program, targeted for new and expanding providers, provided more flexibility. Agencies could choose to use these funds on a broad range of capacity-building activities, including HR and fiscal business services, equity planning, and general strategic planning.
      - ii. The second program was available for all providers and was intended to specifically support workforce recruitment, retention and equity. In partnership with the United Way, JOHS awarded \$10M to 61 contracted organizations in proportion to each organization's number of housing and homelessness services employees, to be used towards these goals.
  3. Washington County: The county provides a budget of \$108,150 per FTE and encourages providers to pay over \$55,000 for direct service positions.
- c. Consider ways to allow for differential pay for lived experience, bilingual employees, and culturally specific organizations.**
1. Clackamas County: In the FY 22-23 staff demographics and pay equity analysis, Clackamas County found that staff with lived experience of homelessness represented more than half of its SHS funded programs. While lived experience does not automatically translate to the capacity necessary to do the work for every individual, we believe the experience is

Tri-County Planning Body – Employee Retention and Recruitment Goal

County Responses to June TCPB Questions

July 10, 2024

extraordinarily valuable and is likely already accelerating any housing worker's professional development without an explicit pay differential.

We are also aware that bilingual staff within SHS funded programs are currently receiving differential pay in accordance with provider defined pay scales.

In FY24-25, Clackamas County will be conducting an equity analysis to evaluate any pay discrepancies between culturally specific and non-culturally specific organizations. Our overall goal is for staff in culturally specific organizations to receive pay equal to or better than their non-culturally specific counterparts, though this may take time to implement, depending on scale of discrepancy found.

2. Multnomah County: Multnomah County's FY 25 budget includes an increase in the services cap for each Permanent Supportive Housing allocation, from \$10,000 to \$15,000 per household for up to 2,653 households. There is also a premium rate for PSH projects that are culturally specific PSH, PSH focused on service families with children and site-based PSH projects where more than 25% of units are designated as PSH. The premium rate is \$17,500 per household for support services. This is one-way providers can adjust for differential pay. This is not a requirement of the cap increase but an avenue for the agencies to do so.
3. Washington County: The county's approach has been flexible, allowing organizations to set their own standards. 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 despite receiving the same per-FTE dollar allocation. This trend has held steady over the past two program years. Washington County's findings also indicate that nearly half of the staff surveyed report lived experience of homelessness or housing instability with 44.9% of staff indicating lived experience.

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

- i. SHS is an historic investment in homeless services. While Metro and the tri-counties do not have the authority to standardize wages for non SHS funding streams, we can position ourselves to offer a model demonstrating effective and efficient work ending chronic homelessness while compensating workers fairly and justly. There is value in the intentionality of furthering living wage efforts, in this work, and in this Metro region.

This is a challenge across many systems. For example, in the behavioral health workforce, the Oregon Legislature passed a funding package to address inadequate federal administrative rates and providing resources for organizations to raise wages. All counties have leaned on capacity building

Tri-County Planning Body – Employee Retention and Recruitment Goal

County Responses to June TCPB Questions

July 10, 2024

and/or technical assistance to support organizations receiving multiple funding streams.

1. Clackamas County: Counties may also identify beneficial partnerships between smaller and larger providers with more robust administrative apparatuses to help smaller providers manage multiple funding streams as they partner on programs.
2. Multnomah County: The United Way capacity building health grant is an example where the funding source of the program was not a barrier. This investment was available to all JOHS contracted providers. The \$10 million in organizational health grants have been used by providers for workforce and organizational health needs to help increase employee retention rates and decrease position vacancy rates.
3. Washington County: The county has provided capacity building resources to 68% of providers. In addition, we will soon be providing financial technical assistance to organizations receiving SHS resources.

**e. Assess reasonable scale of outcomes and caseload as it relates to compensation.**

1. Clackamas County: The County has regular conversations with service providers related to caseloads, particularly when it comes to permanent supportive housing with high acuity populations. Staff work with service providers to adjust caseloads to align with needs of population served at that time. Standard supportive housing case management case load is 1:25, but caseloads are adjusted to account for the acuity of the population in question. Our goal is to ensure that staff are not overworked and burdened with an excessively difficult case load.

We do not take the position that higher caseloads should result in higher compensation. Salaried case management positions should pay based on whether they are part-time or full-time. Introducing differential pay for 105% of standard caseload, for example, will likely incentivize caseloads with lower acuity clients with rare or infrequent need for contact. Ending chronic homelessness will require that case managers work with clients with high needs and provide the attention and care for high need populations.

2. Multnomah County: We are taking initial steps through the Rebasing of existing shelter budgets (as one of the Community Shelter Strategies). We started this work with an assessment of understanding the current staffing ratios in shelter programs and an evaluation of how effective those ratios are in meeting program needs. With the support of the JOHS Evaluation Team, the Program Team will distribute a mandatory survey to existing shelter providers to solicit information about current staffing models with specific details for populations served and shelter type. The goal of this survey will be two-fold: to set minimum staffing ratios by population and intervention type, and to assess whether existing shelter programs fall under these thresholds and require rebasing. The survey will assess other areas of effective service delivery in the event thresholds are largely met.

Using data from the survey, we will assess where staffing increases need to be prioritized into existing shelter programs. This initial rebasing effort will focus solely on ensuring safe and adequate staffing ratios while we work to solve for other factors that we know impact shelter safety and stability, such as compensation for staff.

3. Washington County: The county set an initial caseload of 20:1 based on national best practices. As our system needs change from intensive housing search and placement support to maintaining stability in housing, the caseload has changed to 30:1 for some retention focused-case management support. However, providers are given the flexibility to manage case loads across case management staff in a manner that works best for their organization and service delivery.

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

- i. Clackamas County: In year 1 of implementation, Clackamas County focused on PSH and was working with a handful of providers. As year 3 comes to an end, we have our first meaningful opportunity to compare our annual wage studies and annual budgets from year 2 to year 3.

Clackamas County works with a wide variety of housing services providers, some of whom are grassroots and some of whom are long-standing institutions in our community. We do expect to see some variance, especially among highest paid staff who are in executive roles, across housing services providers. We recommend prioritizing a guideline or norm for floor wages over a hypothetical ceiling, as leadership responsibilities may look radically different from one agency to another.

- ii. Multnomah County: This is completed annually through the demographic and pay equity survey conducted for the annual report.
- iii. Washington County: This is completed annually through the demographic and pay equity survey conducted for the annual report.

**2. How do the counties structure their contracts/agreements (types of contracts, length, fund sources within contracts)?**

- a. Contracting is driven by countywide policies each SHS implementor must adhere to. The overview of each county's process is outlined below.
  - i. Clackamas County: Clackamas County executes personal services contracts with community-based organizations for all SHS-funded homeless services. These contracts are typically for one-year terms with options to renew each year through the life of the procurement from which the contract originated. Contracts for services at project-based permanent supportive housing are multiyear contracts with automatic renewals each year. Clackamas County typically holds one contract per community-based organization with several services within each contract. There are some exceptions to this rule when there is historically distinct programming or when a contract includes a



## Tri-County Planning Body – Employee Retention and Recruitment Goal

### County Responses to June TCPB Questions

July 10, 2024

partnership between two agencies. Clackamas County does braid funding sources within contracts, each funding source is distinctly identified and separated within the contract's budget to ensure accurate tracking and reporting of expenditures.

- ii. Multnomah County: Procurement authority must be established before the JOHS creates a contract/agreement for human services. Procurement authority, which is the permission to enter into a contract to purchase specific services from a specified supplier for a specified period, is established through a procurement process. This process is determined by the amount of the purchase, referred to as the procurement threshold. There are three main thresholds: small purchases (\$25,000 or less per year), which requires only a limited process; intermediate purchases (over \$25,000 but less than \$150,000 per year), which necessitate an informal process with at least three bids from qualified suppliers; and large purchases (over \$150,000 per year), which require a formal procurement process (e.g. request for proposals, request for programmatic qualifications, etc). The business services team plays a crucial role in managing existing procurement authority, facilitating procurement processes, and providing technical assistance.

Contracts are structured based on several factors but human services contracts with JOHS generally structured as followed:

- Contract Length: JOHS services contracts generally follow an annual cycle. The contract period is generally July 1 to June 30. The contract period is typically only 1 year but a 5 year procurement authority.
  - Funding Sources: The County budget process runs from February through June. A budget with identified funding sources is adopted by the Board of County Commissioners in June for the upcoming fiscal year. The funding sources for individual contracts will be based on allowability, funding terms and conditions and the optimal use of public resources. Funding sources are typically identified as the beginning of the contract but there can also be off-cycle contract adjustments. Optimizing funding sources may result in mixed funding sources for an individual contract (e.g. federal, state, grant, general fund, etc).
  - Contract Documents: Key documents include Exhibit 1 (general all-County contractor clauses), Attachment A (program-specific scopes of work), and Attachment B (general all-JOHS contractor policies).
  - The contract development and management process involves several phases and teams, including planning, development, and implementation. Various teams, such as the Program Team, Fiscal/Business Services, and the Equity Team, play different roles in each phase.
- iii. Washington County: The County recently transitioned to multiyear contracts for high-performing agencies beginning in FY 24-25 and those contracts go through FY 26-27. All other contracts are single year. We aim to reduce admin burden by

having each partner hold a single contract with multiple components (i.e. outreach, shelter, case management). Contracts are primarily funded by SHS, but we blend federal and state funds on the back end, as well as our own general fund dollars to support rural services efforts beyond the Metro UGB. The goal is that the contracts are funding blind, and we do the heavy lifting of braided funding on the back end.

**3. What programs use cost per household models and why? How is that set and is it consistent across providers?**

- a. All counties provide a per household cost model for PSH, and some additional programs in specific counties have a per-household cost model.
  - i. Clackamas County: Only project-based permanent supportive housing service contracts use a cost per household model. Clackamas County makes a commitment of \$12,000 per household as the baseline for funding for all organizations providing this service. This amount may be increased during contract negotiations or with contract amendments depending on the unique circumstances at the site or with the population receiving services.
  - ii. Multnomah County: Multnomah County has used a cost per household model for funding PSH services since 2018 after the City and County made a joint commitment to significantly expand PSH. The amount of PSH services funding per household was initially set at \$10,000 based on work CSH did with local stakeholders and was intended to fund services at a 1-10 staff-to-tenant ratio along with flexible client assistance. Starting in FY 25, the County is increasing this baseline rate to \$15,000-\$17,500 per household across all PSH providers. Three types of PSH projects qualify for the higher rate: culturally-specific projects, site-based projects where 25%+ of units operate as PSH, and projects that focus on serving families with children. A number of factors were considered in setting this new rate including inflation since 2018, rises in acuity, research on national standards, and research on the true cost of PSH. The JOHS is also already hearing from some providers that this is insufficient, particularly for 100% PSH buildings that require 24/7 staffing. Going forward, we understand that there is a need to regularly reassess the true cost of PSH.
  - iii. Washington County: PSH uses a cost per household model. We also utilize a per household allocation of financial assistance funds. This is based on projected costs to house and retain households. In FY 24-25, we used our contract utilization actuals per household from FY 23-24 to inform our allocation of funds in contracts. All financial assistance allocation is consistent across program types and partners receive a uniform allocation based on the program(s) they administer. This methodology is uniform across PSH, Housing Case Management Services, Enhanced Rapid Rehousing, housing liaisons, and outreach services but per-household allocations across program types vary based on program design. Partners have the discretion to utilize per-household funds as they see fit to meet the needs of individual households, but methodology is static.

**4. What are counties base set of requirements for contracts (reporting)?**

- a. Clackamas County: SHS-funded contracts require that all participant data be entered into HMIS which is then used for reporting to Metro and for tracking programmatic outcomes internally. Each contract contains a series of benchmarks and performance measures which are reviewed with contracted organizations quarterly. This year, housing services staff designed a new contract monitoring tool which will be fully implemented for FY 2024-25 Q1 reporting and performance monitoring. This new tool will be used to assess overall contract performance by reviewing spending, all programmatic outcomes, HMIS data quality/completeness, file monitoring, status of mandatory trainings for contracted staff, and caseload sizes. Additionally, all contracts contain language that the County may require additional performance evaluations in its sole discretion.
- b. Multnomah County: All JOHS contractors are required to submit a variety of reports (annual budget, semi-annual program reports, monthly invoices, and equity plan reports). Data collection and reporting occurs through HMIS and contractors must adhere to the accuracy and completeness standards set forth in the [HMIS Data Quality Plan-Multnomah County](#). The semi-annual program reports include additional narrative information, accomplishments and challenges, technical assistance requests, etc. JOHS performs Annual Provider Performance Reviews to reflect the agency's overall performance in key contract areas, to communicate or clarify contract expectations and to open a dialogue around any technical assistance needs as it relates to the contract relationships.
- c. Washington County: For SHS funded contracts, annual performance evaluation of program outcomes is done every spring. Partners must submit quantitative data and qualitative, narrative based information. This spring, the county also launched monitoring with our Enhanced Rapid Rehousing program and will expand monitoring to all SHS programs in the fall. Each partner will be monitored bi-annually. Partners receive monthly scorecards that track their year-to-date performance across all program performance metrics and meet with County staff monthly or quarterly depending in performance.

**5. What does the invoice approval process look like (timeline from submission to payment, how much back and forth happens with incorrect invoices)?**

- a. Clackamas County: All invoices first receive a financial review by the Housing and Community Development finance team where the invoice is reviewed for accuracy and to ensure that all required supporting documentation is included and matches the line items on the invoice. A payment request form is then completed and reviewed by secondary finance staff for accuracy. The invoice and payment request form is then sent for programmatic review to ensure that the invoice aligns with the current activities of the program. Once the financial and programmatic review are completed the invoice is approved for payment. Incorrect invoices are typically corrected within a few business days depending on how incorrect the information/documentation is and how responsive the organization which submitted it is. Corrections typically result from incomplete supporting documentation or minor inconsistencies in line items that do not

## Tri-County Planning Body – Employee Retention and Recruitment Goal

### County Responses to June TCPB Questions

July 10, 2024

match the amount(s) on the supporting documentation. Clackamas County contracts state that invoices will be paid within 30 calendar days of final submission. In FY 2023-24, Housing and Community Development paid 82% of invoices within this 30-day period.

- b. Multnomah County: The invoice approval process begins when a provider submits an invoice to the Joint Office, emailing it to both the contract manager and accounts payable (AP). The contract manager and AP staff then conduct a parallel review of the invoice. This review is completed within 5 business days. If the invoice is approved, it moves to the next step. If revisions are needed, the contract manager notifies the provider, and when the revised invoice is submitted it undergoes another review within 3 business days. This process is repeated until the invoice is accurate and complete. The invoice is then sent for approval via email. When approved, an AP specialist enters it into Workday within 2 business days. Finally, cost object managers and the AP supervisor review and approve the invoice in Workday within 3 business days. The timeline from submission to payment can vary depending on the need for revisions. The process allows for back and forth between the contract manager and provider to correct any errors or discrepancies in the invoice. Some contracts have net 10 payment terms and others the standard net 30. In May 2024, about 94% of invoices were paid within their contract's payment terms.
- c. Washington County: Washington County uses ShareFile and automated monthly invoice templates to generate invoices for all SHS-funded multi-scope contracts. Invoices and supporting documentation are reviewed by program management staff first and by finance staff secondarily prior to processing payments. Once invoices are submitted, our staff begins review and connects with providers to request corrected information, if applicable. Providers are generally given a minimum of 3 business days to submit correct information. Invoice accuracy dictates how much back and forth occurs. From final submission to payment averaged 17-18 days in 2024. In the event that partners are not able to provide supporting documentation for a cost incurred in a month, Washington County allows partners to add these costs to the following month's invoices to refrain from delaying payment to partners.

#### **6. Do counties advance funding to providers and what have the results been?**

- a. Clackamas County: In FY 2023-24, several community-based organizations began experiencing cash flow issues as contracts grew to the largest they had ever been in the homeless services system. To rectify this, beginning in FY 2024-25, Clackamas County will allow advances for all homeless services contracts for up to 1/6<sup>th</sup> of the contract's total budget, equivalent to two months of operations. Organizations who receive advanced funding will invoice as normal from July-March and begin reconciling against the advanced funds in April. Since up to two months of funding is allowed as an advance, we have instituted a three-month reconciliation period to ensure that organizations will have time to reconcile against the total amount even if their monthly spending is lower than anticipated.
- b. Multnomah County: The general practice of the JOHS at Multnomah County is to pay for goods and services after they have been rendered or provided. As of June 2024, the

Tri-County Planning Body – Employee Retention and Recruitment Goal

County Responses to June TCPB Questions

July 10, 2024

JOHS is piloting an advance payments process as JOHS develops criteria for this exception and establishes approval and reconciliation processes.

- c. Washington County: We have historically but have found that this creates cashflow issues in the second half of the year for partners when we net against advances. We've traditionally approached this by netting the advance amount across four months of payment to avoid significant cashflow impacts but this has still created challenges given that some of our partners have underspent contracts historically. Our advance policy this year (FY 24-25) is to provide advances to partners who are expanding existing contractual relationships or adding new components but they are no longer an automatic provision in contracts. Any other requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- 7. When and how do the counties engage providers in the budget making processes (considering provider increases in costs)?**
- a. Clackamas County: When contract renewals begin in February/March, a total budget amount per contract is sent to providers with a suggested breakdown by service component based on historical spending and the size of the service in their current contract if it is being amended. Providers then have the opportunity to negotiate if they feel the standard 3% increase provided for all service contracts is not sufficient to meet the increased costs of their programs or if their programs require some type of new support to effectively deliver services.
  - b. Multnomah County: Throughout the year JOHS program staff meet regularly with system leadership individually and in group settings to discuss service and contract gaps. JOHS system leadership staff bring those engagements to inform the budget process. Additionally, JOHS engages providers in budget making process during contract renewal season. Contract managers meet with providers regarding next fiscal year projected funding allocations to discuss any proposed changes to existing system services, priority population, outcomes, etc.
  - c. Washington County: Washington County conducts a budget survey for partners and the public in the Fall. That informs high-level program budget decisions within the county as budgets move through the County Administrative Office process. Partners are provided with a draft contract and budget in May and invited to discuss and negotiate contracts. Later this year, we will do an assessment of shelter costs across partners and work with partners to gather information on increased costs due to insurance requirements.

16:06:29 From Zoila Coppiano to Hosts and panelists : Can you guys hear or its only me?  
16:06:36 From Cristina, she/her, Housing Oregon to Hosts and panelists : nope  
16:06:41 From Ruth Adkins to Hosts and panelists : no sound!  
16:06:41 From Jessica Vega Pederson (she/her) to Hosts and panelists : I can't hear anyone  
16:07:00 From Ariella Dahlin (She/Her) to Hosts and panelists : Wifi just went down in the room, we are pausing while we are restarting Zoom online  
16:07:29 From Jessica Vega Pederson (she/her) to Hosts and panelists : Thank you!  
16:11:35 From Ruth Adkins to Hosts and panelists : Any panelists who still need to be promoted, please let us know  
16:12:07 From Cristina Castaño-JOHS to Hosts and panelists : Ruth, can we promote Kanoe Egleston as a panelist? Thanks.  
16:12:14 From Ruth Adkins to Hosts and panelists : yes will do  
16:22:23 From Zoila Coppiano to Hosts and panelists :  
16:22:31 From Ruth Adkins to Hosts and panelists :  
16:23:26 From Cristina, she/her, Housing Oregon to Hosts and panelists : I like to announce the upcoming Housing Oregon Conference  
16:24:07 From Mindy Stadlander (she/her) to Hosts and panelists : Big kudos to the counties for all their work over this last week - thank you for all you all are doing!  
16:24:30 From Ruth Adkins :  
16:24:56 From Cristina, she/her, Housing Oregon : <https://housingoregon.org/conference/>  
16:26:29 From Mercedes Elizalde to Hosts and panelists : I'm need to drop off to switch devices, I'll be right back  
16:50:35 From Metro Housing Department : Reposting chats to ensure they are viewable to everyone:

From Ariella Dahlin (She/Her) to all panelists 04:04 PM

Metro staff, can you promote Mindy, Yvette, and Washington County staff?

From Zoila Coppiano to all panelists 04:06 PM

Can you guys hear or its only me?

From Cristina, she/her, Housing Oregon to all panelists 04:06 PM

nope

From Ruth Adkins to all panelists 04:06 PM

no sound!

From Jessica Vega Pederson (she/her) to all panelists 04:06 PM

I can't hear anyone

From Ariella Dahlin (She/Her) to all panelists 04:07 PM

Wifi just went down in the room, we are pausing while we are restarting Zoom online

From Jessica Vega Pederson (she/her) to all panelists 04:07 PM

Thank you!

From Ruth Adkins to all panelists 04:11 PM

Any panelists who still need to be promoted, please let us know

From Cristina Castaño-JOHS to all panelists 04:12 PM

Ruth, can we promote Kanoe Egleston as a panelist? Thanks.

From Ruth Adkins to all panelists 04:12 PM

yes will do

16:50:46 From Metro Housing Department : From Zoila Coppiano to all panelists 04:22 PM

From Ruth Adkins to all panelists 04:22 PM

From Cristina, she/her, Housing Oregon to all panelists 04:23 PM

I like to announce the upcoming Housing Oregon Conference

From Mindy Stadlander (she/her) to all panelists 04:24 PM

Big kudos to the counties for all their work over this last week - thank you for all you all are doing!

From Mercedes Elizalde to all panelists 04:26 PM

I'm need to drop off to switch devices, I'll be right back

16:52:58 From Kathryn Harrington : Is there any comparison across all 3 cos to see how we are doing across one another, for example with a common provider (ex. Great Good NW operating in multiple

counties) - are we counties funding their employees similarly?

16:53:36 From Ben Duncan (Kearns & West) : thanks Chair---I'll start with your question when we pause for q&a

16:56:22 From Mindy Stadlander (she/her) : Apologies that I have to leave today. Thank you all so much!

17:04:04 From Cristina, she/her, Housing Oregon : On documentation, are you guys prepare to get around documentation incase of a disasters that destroys documents?

17:17:05 From Metro Housing Department to Prateek VasudevAnd all panelists : Hi, Prateek! At this time we are only taking questions from panelists. If you do have a question feel free to contact Valeria.McWilliams@oregonmetro.gov and we will be happy to help you out.

17:18:24 From Cristina Castaño-JOHS to Hosts and panelists : Ruth, can Antoinette be promoted as panelist?

17:18:33 From Ruth Adkins : yes

17:18:34 From Cristina Castaño-JOHS to Hosts and panelists : She just joined

17:19:36 From Cristina Castaño to Hosts and panelists : I am here

17:20:42 From Metro Housing Department : Reminder to please keep chat set to Everyone. Thank you.

17:25:22 From Ruth Adkins : Cristina/Antoinette, let us know if you need a separate meeting link to join? It looks like you are sharing a room, just checking.

17:29:32 From Mercedes Elizalde : I want to say thank you as well to that investment. One to many losses without mental health and emotional support was ultimately how I moved from case management to other work. It's incredibly difficult to support people in these roles that require carrying a lot of emotional baggage

17:31:33 From Vahid Brown (he/him) : ditto to what Allie said

17:35:15 From Vahid Brown (he/him) : Thanks all and apologies, I need to hop off

17:57:40 From Ruth Adkins : Noted, thanks

18:02:27 From Ruth Adkins : Appreciation to all the presenters!