

Table of contents

Agenda

Meeting summaries from the Committee's last meetings on December 2nd & 9th

Metro respects civil rights

SHS oversight committee roles and responsibilities

Group agreements

SHSOC housing funding memo

Recommendations introduction

Proposed recommendations

Housing funding update memo

FY 24-25 reporting links

Clackamas County FY25 Q1 summary

Multnomah County FY25 Q1 summary

Washington County FY25 Q1 summary

Tri-County Planning Body November progress report

Tri-County Planning Body October meeting summary

FY24 SHSOC recommendations presentation

Regional SHS and housing funding presentation



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Agenda

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting
Date: January 13, 2024
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual meeting ([Zoom link](#))
Purpose: Vote on housing funding memo to Metro Council on behalf of the SHS Oversight Committee, discuss proposed recommendations for annual regional report, receive housing funding updates.

9:30 a.m. Welcome and introductions
9:45 a.m. Conflict of Interest declaration
9:50 a.m. Public comment
10:00 a.m. SHSOC housing funding memo
10:10 a.m. Recommendations
11:05a.m. **Break**
11:15 a.m. Housing funding updates
11:55 a.m. Next steps
12:00 p.m. Adjourn



Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services (SHS) Oversight Committee Meeting
Date: December 2, 2024
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual meeting (Zoom)
Purpose: Metro tax collection and disbursement update, housing funding update, discuss committee reflection and questions on county FY24 annual reports.

Member attendees

Co-chair Mike Savara (he/him), Peter Rosenblatt (he/him), Carter MacNichol (he/him), Felicita Monteblanco (she/her), Jeremiah Rigsby (he/him), Margarita Solis Ruiz (she/her), Dan Fowler (he/him), Mitch Chilcott (he/him), Dr. James (Jim) Bane (he/him)

Absent members

Co-Chair Dr. Mandrill Taylor (he/him), Jenny Lee (she/her), Cara Hash (she/her), Kai Laing (he/him)

Elected delegates

Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington (she/her), Metro Councilor Christine Lewis (she/her)

Absent elected delegates

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

Metro

Liam Frost (he/him), Yesenia Delgado (she/her), Breanna Hudson (she/her), Yvette Perez-Chavez (she/her)

Kearns & West Facilitator

Josh Mahar (he/him)

Welcome and Introductions

Co-chair Mike Savara provided opening remarks.

Ben Duncan, Kearns & West, shared that he will no longer be facilitating this group, and reflected on the Committee's valuable work and efforts over the past few years.

Josh Mahar, Kearns & West, introduced himself, facilitated introductions between Committee members, and reviewed the meeting agenda and objectives.

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, stated that there are two meetings this month and that Jeremiah and Mike have agreed to stay on the Committee for another term.

The Committee approved the October 28 and November 4 meeting summaries.

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Conflict of Interest Declaration

Peter Rosenblatt declared that he works at Northwest Housing Alternatives, which receives SHS funding for services and may receive additional SHS funds for housing developments.

Carter MacNichol declared that he sits on the Board of Directors of Transition Projects, which receives SHS funding.

Margarita Solis Ruiz declared that she works at Bienestar which receives SHS funding.

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

Public Comment

No public comment was received.

Housing Funding Update

Val Galstad, Metro, (they/them) shared that Metro Council has continued to consider reforms and revisions to the SHS program including asking voters to expand allowable uses of SHS funding to include affordable housing production, preservation, and acquisition; governance model reforms; and funding model reforms. They stated that since the last update the Committee received, Metro Council had conversations on a proposed allocation model and that Metro Council will discuss governance models later this week. They reviewed the process timeline, noting that Metro Council will discuss the measure ordinance language on December 15 and that the Council may make decisions in January.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Dan:** Can we get a copy of the meeting minutes and the proposed allocation models from the Metro Council meeting? Can we get a summary of public comments on this process? I am worried about timing. December is the worst time to push something new. When I hear there will be meetings in December, and the Council may make decisions in January, the process feels rushed and ill-informed. Do you want to rush this, or get this right?
 - **Metro response, Val:** We will share those materials with this Committee. Synthesizing public comments can take time. The Council is moving quickly as they are feeling urgency from their constituents.
- **Comment, Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington:** The Council has been discussing this through work sessions, so there are no public comments, except for the meeting where they passed the resolution in October. It seems to me that there will be a ballot measure, there will be a tax cut, there will be governance changes, and the revenue level for counties will decrease. Counties are on this journey whether we like it or not. Washington County has sent letters and has not received a response.
- **Question, Carter MacNichol:** I do not understand the urgency, I would like to understand that better. I would mirror everything Dan said. We have been told for the last three years that it takes three to five years to build a program and understand what the long-term goals are, and now we are about to take funds away from services. I think the timing is ill-advised. I would be curious to see the public opinion research and how the questions were asked as the public likely does not understand the nuances.
 - **Metro response, Val:** The original impetus for Metro was thinking about how to address the affordable housing funding cliff. The public opinion research indicated a

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

strong desire from voters for affordable housing to be an allowable use and that a bond is not viable. We can share the public opinion research that was completed in June and can share the current research underway once it is complete and analyzed.

- **Question, Peter:** It is clear that Metro is not exploring whether to do this, but how to do this. As a Committee Member, it is frustrating to be told that we will receive information later or we will see it on a slide. We have been asking to see materials in advance constantly and this pattern continues, which is a challenge for oversight. If all we want to do is change oversight, does that require a vote? There has been a huge shift from having housing development as an eligible activity to a mandated activity.
 - **Metro response, Liam Frost:** For the question about whether changing oversight requires a vote, I would have to ask an attorney. The urgency is the same sense of urgency when voters passed the measure in 2020 to serve populations in need.

Brian Kennedy, Metro, reviewed a series of bar charts illustrating scenarios that model potential future allocations (see [12/02/24 meeting packet pages 73-82](#)). He noted that the bar charts are not forecasts, but scenarios that model historical patterns of volatility. Scenario 0 is the current law. Scenarios 1 and 2 include assumptions for a tax sunset extension to 2050, tax indexing beginning in 2026, and inflation at 3%.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Peter:** Why does there have to be a funding dip for counties in each scenario? Is it possible to see a scenario where counties do not lose money? If the Regional Investment Fund (RIF) goes away, what happens to the Tri-County Planning Body (TCPB) projects that are funded by the RIF? I sit on other oversight committees in Clackamas County, and sometimes I hear two different things. At the last Clackamas County Board of Commissioners meeting, staff projected a \$28 million loss of funding, which is different than what is shown here. It would be nice to have Metro and county staff join us together to discuss this and help us provide oversight.
 - **Metro response, Brian:** The funding dip is to manage volatility and create stability for counties. It is possible to see that scenario, but I am not sure if it would be productive. The difference in numbers is that counties are discussing their budget and current and forecasts for upcoming fiscal years, whereas what we are looking at are numbers that are exercises, not forecasts.
- **Question, Felicita:** Are these charts reflective of funds set aside for built infrastructure? Not only is there less money for the services counties need but there will be even less due to funds set aside for construction.
 - **Metro response, Brian:** I would say that the money is not gone and that these graphs are trying to show the base allocations for stability. The other buckets of money are in the mix.
- **Question, Dan:** I second Peter's request to have Metro and County staff join us and I would like it to be a three-hour work session. Let us all remember this is a vote of the public, and we are the supporters of this work. Why are we allocating funds to cities? They have not historically been social service providers, and this takes money away from existing programs. There are other options to fund work within cities such as grant funding. Who will run the housing program, the counties or Metro?
 - **Metro response, Brian:** Counties hear from city partners that there are intersections with people experiencing homelessness and they are interested in

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

accessing some resources. The Affordable Housing Bond is a successful model for implementation partners, where Metro is the funder for partners.

- **Question, Carter:** All these governments are under-resourced, and you are proposing to remove resources from them. What is the goal for housing unit production? There are strategic preserves and contingencies to deal with volatility, it is baked into the system already. Metro had a successful housing bond measure. The impact on these programs from this approach is inexcusable.
 - **Metro response, Brian:** Goals for housing production have not been set, Metro is still looking at scenarios. There is no scenario where all needs are met. Metro is focusing on the volatile tax structure and looking at how to have long-term stability. The political polling has shown that another bond measure will not pass.
- **Comment, Jeremiah Rigsby:** Regarding the intent of this input, Metro Council will vote on this regardless of what we are saying. What is our role as a committee to give input to Metro Council? It does not seem that we have time to do issue spotting, get consensus, and share with Metro Council.
- **Comment, Co-chair Savara:** We can exert influence around where and how oversight happens, and where oversight is and is not functioning. We can also provide feedback unrelated to our role as a Committee, but based on our individual experiences in our jobs, which is also important. We can look at creating a joint letter, or other options, to elevate our perspectives on oversight to the Council.
- **Comment, Carter:** I agree that how oversight works is part of it, but a lot of it is how funds are spent and the commitment to the people we are trying to serve.
- **Comment, Peter:** There is a significant difference between advisory and oversight bodies, yet I do not see oversight happening at the Metro level or Clackamas County level. I am frustrated by the tremendous lack of oversight. I think a decision needs to be made, but I do not know why voters have to make that decision.
- **Comment, Dan:** Back to responsibility, it is the financial management and how it has been spent. I do not feel that we have the right numbers. We do not know what the impacts are because the numbers are different. We cannot tell if we can support the funding reduction or not. Maybe our recommendation could be to support a scenario, modify a scenario, or slow down the process.
- **Comment, Washington County Chair Harrington:** Metro staff is doing a good job representing the Council's direction. The Committee is doing good work, but the Council is dealing with the need for affordable housing, and they feel that they do not have enough control. They feel that there is an element missing for changing the course that the counties have taken. This has come up in the conversations from the stakeholder advisory table. Trying to recognize the delicate nature of how the original measure is put together and the issues the Council is grappling with today. This committee does have great oversight experience and has something to offer back to Metro Council.
- **Comment, Metro Councilor Christine Lewis:** After each meeting, I bring back notes and a summary to my colleagues and will share this discussion with them tomorrow. We are not looking for control but looking for lines of sight. We are two years into negotiating a data agreement, and we still cannot show the data that the taxpayers are asking us for. We cannot show the voters what we are doing. This is not about control, but access and lines of sight.

Yesenia, Metro, reiterated that feedback shared in this meeting will be shared with the Council and that Metro staff will follow up with the Co-chairs to work through some of the action items that arose from this discussion.

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Metro Tax Collections and Disbursement Update

Brian, Metro, shared that through October 2024, there has been \$62.4 million in tax collection and that this year's tax collections are trending below prior fiscal years. He clarified that the calendar year for tax collections is July 2024 through June 2025.

Discussion: FY24 Annual Report Reflection and Questions

Yesenia, Metro, stated that the counties have provided their annual reports, as shared and discussed at the November meeting, and now it is time for the Committee to discuss its priorities for the regional report.

Co-chair Savara reflected that Dr. Taylor and he discussed how Population A and B data was not received. He shared that the Co-chairs developed a letter regarding the ongoing challenges with a regional approach to Populations A and B and stated expectations on resolving that issue.

Peter reflected that the letter the Co-chairs sent was great and reflected the content and spirit of the Committee.

Josh asked for each Committee member to share any initial reflections on the counties' annual reports, including thoughts on overall progress and main successes and challenges.

- **Comment, Peter:** There was a tremendous amount of success in goals and outcomes. Not every goal was met and it is important to note why. The two challenges were Population A and B data, and not having a bigger picture of what the system needs. Additionally, Clackamas County does not have a Local Implementation Plan (LIP) and that is a challenge that should be called out.
- **Comment, Jeremiah:** I echo Peter's comments. I appreciate each county's work, and seeing the amount of people being served was helpful and encouraging. I saw what equity meant in the reports and the successes of culturally-specific organizations.
- **Comment, Jim Bane:** The work the counties have done is amazing, and the significant tax cut is scary. When I reviewed the LIPs, the counties seemed to be short on their PSH goals.
- **Comment, Felicita:** I support everyone's comments so far. Amazing profound work is being done and I appreciate Washington County's training programs.
- **Comment, Dan:** I echo everything that has been said and have questions about training and duplication of efforts. Where are there communication gaps and where have communications worked well? I want to ensure that work is not being duplicated at the Metro or county level. There is an opportunity to be on the same page and spend money wisely. One of the reasons the Committee is concerned about getting the housing reform change right is because we have seen this work be successful. We want to be critical and ensure the next steps are right.
- **Comment, Mitch Chilcott:** There is a lot of great work being done by many. I have enjoyed the elevated, passionate, and honest discussions and hope that continues with the structure of governance conversations.
- **Comment, Margarita Solis Ruiz:** I do not have much to add because of my leave of absence this past year. I appreciate sharing the space and the passion of the Committee. There are many successes and a lot to still do.
- **Comment, Co-chair Savara:** Seeing the results is impressive and incredible. There are challenges around basic contracting and payment, alignment with LIPs to keep priorities and values updated, and having the correct balance of investments between prevention and rehousing abilities.

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

- **Comment, Washington County Chair Harrington:** There is a lot to be proud of in the region. For the Year Three annual report, I wonder how this group will go through its work session discussions regarding Population A and B and LIP requests.
- **Comment, Metro Councilor Lewis:** I will take this conversation back to my colleagues. I heard today about how to have these conversations, what is oversight, and the roles of bringing the unknowable and unquantifiable perspective and weaving in stories of success. Now about leveling up to the systems level.

Annual Report Outline

Kris Smock, Kristina Smock Consulting, reviewed the annual report process and her role in supporting the Committee by writing the technical pieces of the report. She stated that the Committee's work will be focused on the transmittal letter, which will include key successes and challenges from the past year. She asked for the Committee to hone in on key elements that it would like to highlight in the letter. She reviewed the draft report outline and asked Committee members to email her for any questions or feedback.

Next Steps

Josh thanked everyone for their contributions.

Next steps include:

- Metro to share Council meeting materials and public comments regarding housing funding.
- Metro to share housing funding public opinion research.
- The Committee to consider having additional work sessions to develop their approach to providing input to Metro on the housing funding conversations.
- The Committee to meet on December 9, 9:30 am-12:00 pm.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.



Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services (SHS) Oversight Committee Meeting
Date: December 9, 2024
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual meeting (Zoom)
Purpose: Metro five-year forecast presentation, Tri-County Planning Body technical assistance updates, discuss recommendations for annual regional report.

Member attendees

Co-Chair Dr. Mandrill Taylor (he/him), Co-chair Mike Savara (he/him), Peter Rosenblatt (he/him), Kai Laing (he/him), Felicita Montebancho (she/her), Jeremiah Rigsby (he/him), Margarita Solis Ruiz (she/her), Dan Fowler (he/him), Dr. James (Jim) Bane (he/him), Jenny Lee (she/her), Mitch Chilcott (he/him)

Absent members

Carter MacNichol (he/him), Cara Hash (she/her)

Elected delegates

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

Metro

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

Kearns & West Facilitator

Josh Mahar (he/him)

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

Co-chairs Dr. Mandrill Taylor and Mike Savara provided opening remarks and shared updates regarding the Population A and B letter they shared with Metro and the three counties. They shared that they received response letters from the jurisdictions and the next steps include meeting with the jurisdictional leadership team and identifying ways to move forward. They reflected that the Committee had a clear interest in having a focused discussion on housing funding and they will follow up with the Committee to schedule a work session.

Josh Mahar, Kearns & West Facilitator, facilitated introductions between Committee members and reviewed the meeting agenda and objectives.

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Peter Rosenblatt reminded the Committee that Carter MacNichol was not able to attend but had emailed comments regarding the five-year forecast.

Conflict of Interest Declaration

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

Kai Laing declared a potential conflict of interest as he works at Self Enhancement Inc., which receives SHS dollars.

Margarita Solis Ruiz declared that she is a Regional Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA) case manager in Washington County and receives SHS funding.

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

Jenny Lee declared that she works at the Coalition of Communities of Color, which has partnerships with organizations that receive SHS funding.

Public Comment

No public comment was received.

Five-Year Forecast

Josh Hardwood, Metro, stated that he received Carter's comments and that his comments reflected the chicken-and-egg scenario with revenue and expenditure forecasts. Josh Hardwood noted that this forecast was for revenues and reviewed the FY23-24 variability graph, the FY24/25- FY29/30 forecast graph, and the Oregon capital gains graph (see pages 60-65 in the [12/09/24 archived meeting packet](#)). He shared that 2024 ended 6% below forecast, that the local economy is doing worse than the national economy, and that the next two years are expected to be slow to no growth. He reflected that long-term growth in tax collections is dependent on the Metro region attracting investment.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Peter:** There was information in the meeting packet about how some taxpayers have not paid yet and others, who have paid, are getting refunded. I use H&R Block to pay taxes, and their program does not know this tax exists. It is challenging for me to have siloed discussions without discussing corresponding items like expenditures and cash flows. I hope in the future we can place our discussions into the context that is needed. I would also like to know more about the potential impacts of the volatility of the tax on housing developments.
 - **Metro response, Josh Hardwood:** The tax is available in other programs like TurboTax, and we are working on expanding the programs that incorporate this tax.
 - **Response, Co-chair Savara:** From the last meeting I heard a request to hear from county leadership both regarding the housing funding reform and the five-year forecast. We are working on finding the right time and opportunity to bring in county staff.
- **Comment, Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington:** I appreciate the clarity about the conditions you foresee and how enforcement of the tax has helped with revenue collections.

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

- **Question, Co-chair Taylor:** Can you elaborate on what local investments can drive future incomes?
 - **Metro response, Josh Hardwood:** I am talking about professional investments in the region, like Intel and Nike where the average employee is a high-income earner. Large professional, long-term investments from outside the region can help us.
- **Question, Dan:** I would like to know more about when areas of deficiency occur and when the Committee gets that information to discuss. There are two nebulous areas of expenditure: collection cost and Metro staffing. Are there ways to lower those costs? It would be helpful to get the big picture and numbers related to Metro's full-time employee (FTE) growth, FTE in collections, and administration and personnel costs from each county.
 - **Metro response, Yesenia Delgado:** Each year we get better at trying to have a coherent and strategic way for the Committee to provide feedback and input, and there is still room for improvements. County expenditures and broader financial information will be available in the annual report and the Committee can discuss that as part of that process. As Co-chair Savara stated, we are trying to identify opportunities to hear from the counties sooner.
 - **Metro response, Josh Hardwood:** To clarify, tax collection costs are 100% for our city partners to cover the cost of tax administration and that component is baked in until 2031.
- **Comment, Kai:** Cost is not our group's responsibility. We can fixate on cutting costs, but it is important to focus on capacity as well. We had a lot of revenue, so capacity was ramped up, and it is important to not swing in the other direction. If we cut staff, then there will not be people to do the work. I encourage the group to maintain the mission as its long-term goal.

Tri-County Planning Body (TCPB) Technical Assistance Updates

Yesenia shared that the Committee would receive updates on the technical assistance and training goals from the TCPB and noted that the implementation plan would come later. She reminded the Committee that training and technical assistance were part of their recommendations from last year.

Cole Merkel and Nui Bezaire, Metro introduced themselves and noted that this presentation will only focus on technical assistance (TA) updates. The Committee will tentatively receive a training update in March. They expect to come back and ask for approval on the implementation plan in April. They noted that these goal areas are being funded through Metro's administration funding.

Cole and Nui reviewed the goals of Metro's Regional Capacity Team and noted that there are now 67 technical assistance consultants qualified to provide regional services. They presented Metro's permanent supportive housing (PSH) work to develop a regional framework that includes programmatic policies, regionally consistent definitions, and standards of practice. They reviewed the PSH project's guiding values and goals, including avoiding duplicating efforts and building a regional TA program. They reviewed the project structure, and the benefits providers would receive by being a part of the project.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Felicita Monteblanco:** Funders love TA. Can you clarify that this PSH exploration is step one of the whole project? If I am a nonprofit, how do I access these resources?
 - **Metro response, Cole:** We want to identify what role Metro can play in supporting providers. We are focusing on services and provider needs related to PSH to inform future work. Counties have set up their own TA doorways.

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

- **Question, Co-chair Taylor:** Are there metrics for what success looks like for this demonstration project?
 - **Metro response, Nui:** There are best practices that have been put forward. This project is about using those as a starting place and then learning and developing our regional lens.
- **Comment, Peter:** I appreciate that we will not be voting on the budget, but it would be helpful to see the budget to understand the big picture and what funds and staffing levels at Metro look like.
- **Question, Dan:** I appreciate the comments on measuring success, the feedback loop is critical. Can you explain why it is okay to currently use SHS funding for PSH?
 - **Metro response, Cole:** There are three components to PSH: the unit, rent voucher, and services. We cannot spend SHS funds on the unit, but we can spend on rent vouchers and services. This effort is specifically focused on services.
 - **Comment, Peter:** As a provider, the first time I heard PSH I thought it did not apply to us, but now I understand how expansive PSH is.
 - **Metro response, Patricia Rojas:** Part of our role as funders is to support regionalization of the work and to understand what goes into regionalization and that is also part of why SHS funding is going towards this effort.
- **Comment, Co-chair Savara:** As a state employee it has been great to get outreach from Metro on what has been done, what has worked, and what is challenging. Reflecting on Metro's role as a funder, there is a difference between being a funder and a pass-through agency. As a funder, Metro needs to have an infrastructure of staff to analyze outcomes, reports, and recommendations.

Recommendations Discussion

Yesenia reviewed the Committee's roles and responsibilities for the annual reports and the FY 23 recommendation categories: financial and data transparency and accountability, program expansions, regional communication and engagement, workforce and capacity issues, and outreach.

Yesenia shared updates on the recommendations within the financial and data transparency and accountability category. For the "optimize financial reporting" recommendation, she noted that two components were in progress and three were completed. She mentioned that Metro and two of the counties had reached an impasse regarding a data monitoring framework.

Hunter Belgard, Metro, reviewed the "enhance data integrity" recommendations and provided updates. He noted that three recommendations have been completed and that three are in progress. He noted that Committee members can check the Metro progress tracker website for specific updates. Hunter reviewed the "evaluate to inform improvement" recommendations and provided updates. He noted that one recommendation has been completed and that two are in progress.

Lizzie Cisneros, Metro, reviewed the "strengthen implementation of new programs" recommendations and provided updates. She noted that the two recommendations are in progress.

Israel Bayer, Metro, reviewed the "regional communication strategy" recommendations and provided updates. He highlighted that the RFQU for a consultant to develop a regional communication strategy to be fully implemented in Spring 2025 will be released in Winter 2025.

Ruth Adkins, Metro, reviewed the "institute livable wages" and "expand access to health and behavioral health services" recommendations, and provided updates. She highlighted that these recommendations align with the TCPB's goals and recommendations and shared updates on their progress.

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Yesenia reviewed the remaining workforce and capacity issue recommendations and outreach recommendations and shared updates. She noted the connection of these items to Metro's TA work and the counties' work to provide multi-year contracts.

Yesenia reviewed the Committee's parameters for the FY 24 recommendations, including focusing on the depth of recommendations and limiting the overall number of recommendations.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Comment, Peter:** I am not sure what organizations Clackamas County is giving multi-year contracts. I would like to hear more at our next meeting about the two counties rejecting the monitoring framework. This reminds me of the Population A and B responses. It seems that counties can opt in and out of what they choose. For healthcare integration, I always hear about HealthShare, but never Trillium. Living wages are a long-term issue and SHS funding is a beneficial way to be able to pay front-line staff an equitable wage.
 - **Metro response, Ruth:** Great point about Trillium, we have done some outreach, but we did start with HealthShare since they are the largest provider in the region.
- **Comment, Co-chair Savara:** One theme this year is how decision-making happens in this space. The intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) lay out how decision-making should happen, but it is not being actualized in the way that it needs to, and that is impacting our ability to have oversight and accountability. For our recommendations this year, we should think about how to set the framework to allow these things to effectively happen.
- **Comment, Felicita:** I agree with Peter's comments on wages. Multnomah County did not give a timeframe for payments, and I would like to know what that is. Regarding Co-chair Savara's comments, I imagine that the upcoming ballot measure is making things complicated and that the IGAs will be wiped clean on July 1.
 - **Metro response, Yesenia:** We can follow up with Multnomah County to get that information.
- **Comment, Washington County Chair Harrington:** I was unaware of the fact that there was a disagreement regarding the monitoring framework. I like to think of myself as a problem solver and if the decision makers are unaware, the process is not working.

Next Steps

Yesenia asked the Committee to share any remaining questions or comments regarding the recommendation update over email.

Next steps include:

- Co-chairs and jurisdictional leadership to discuss next steps regarding Population A and B.
- The Committee to discuss housing funding updates at a work session.
 - Metro and Co-chairs to support scheduling.
 - The Committee to discuss the potential impacts of the volatility of the tax on housing developments.
- Metro to follow up with Multnomah County to get specific timeline payment information.
- The Committee to meet on January 13, 9:30am-12:00pm.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Metro respects civil rights

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

Thông báo về sự Metro không kỳ thị của

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

Повідомлення Metro про заборону дискримінації

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

Metro 的不歧视公告

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。如果您需要口譯方可參加公共會議，請在會議召開前5個營業日撥打503-797-1700（工作日上午8點至下午5點），以便我們滿足您的要求。

Ogeysiiska takooris la'aanta ee Metro

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

Metro의 차별 금지 관련 통지서

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

Metro의差別禁止通知

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

សេចក្តីជូនដំណឹងអំពីការមិនរើសអើងរបស់ Metro

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

إشعار بعدم التمييز من Metro

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

Paunawa ng Metro sa kawalan ng diskriminasyon

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

Notificación de no discriminación de Metro

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

Уведомление о недопущении дискриминации от Metro

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

Avizul Metro privind nediscriminarea

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

Metro txoj kev ntxub ntxaug daim ntawv ceeb toom

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

Supportive housing services – Oversight committee

Overview of role and responsibilities

Last updated: September 2024

Background

In May 2020, voters in greater Portland approved Measure 26-210 to fund services for people experiencing or at risk of homelessness. The measure also established a “community oversight committee to evaluate and approval local plans, monitor program outcomes and uses of funds.”

The Metro Council established the Regional Oversight Committee on December 17, 2020 by amending Metro Code Chapter 2.19 via Ordinance No. 20-1453. The purpose of the Regional Oversight Committee is to provide independent program oversight on behalf of the Metro Council to ensure that investments achieve regional goals and desired outcomes and to ensure transparency and accountability in Supportive Housing Services Program activities.

Oversight committee role and responsibilities

Requirement	Source text
Local implementation plans and Regional Plan	
Evaluate and recommend Local Implementation Plans	SHS Work Plan, section 3.4: The committee will be charged with the following duties...A. Evaluate Local Implementation Plans, recommend changes as necessary to achieve program goals and guiding principles, and make recommendations to Metro Council for approval.
Approve Regional Plan developed by the Tri-County Planning Body	Tri-county planning body charter: Develop a Regional Plan for <i>approval by the Regional Oversight Committee</i> that incorporates regional strategies, metrics, and goals as identified in Metro SHS Workplan and the counties’ Local Implementation Plans.
Review LIP amendments and recommend approval or denial to Metro Council for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment with Tri-County Plan 	Intergovernmental Agreement, section 5.2.4: Within one year of the adoption of the Tri-County Plan, and as needed thereafter, Partner will bring forward any necessary amendments to its Local Implementation Plan that incorporate relevant regional goals, strategies, and outcomes measures. The ROC will review the amendments and recommend approval or denial of the Plan amendments to the Metro Council.
Request County Partner amend its LIP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on one or more SHSOC recommendations; Based on a significant change in circumstances impacting homelessness in the region; 	<p>Intergovernmental Agreement, section 5.2.3: Within 60 days of the date that Partner presents its Annual Program Report to Metro Council, Metro or the ROC may, in consultation with the other, request that Partner amend its Local Implementation Plan based on one or more ROC recommendations or a significant change in circumstances impacting homelessness in the Region.</p> <p>SHS work plan, section 5.3: The Regional Oversight Committee will review each Annual Progress Report and may recommend changes to the Local Implementation Plan to achieve regional goals and/or to better align the Local Implementation Plan with the Work Plan.</p>

Requirement	Source text
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To achieve regional goals; and/or To better align LIP with SHS Work Plan. 	
Annual reporting and work plans	
Review county annual work plans	Intergovernmental Agreement, section 5.3: Beginning in FY 2022-23, Partner must annually submit an Annual Work Plan to Metro and the ROC for their review on or before April 1 for the subsequent Fiscal Year.
Accept and review annual reports for consistency with approved Local Implementation Plans and regional goals	SHS work plan, section 3.4: The committee will be charged with the following duties:...B. Accept and review annual reports for consistency with approved Local Implementation Plans and regional goals.
Provide annual reports and presentations to Metro Council and Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington County Boards of Commissioners assessing performance, challenges and outcomes	SHS work plan, section 3.4: The committee will be charged with the following duties:...D. Provide annual reports and presentations to Metro Council and Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington County Boards of Commissioners assessing performance, challenges and outcomes.
Fiscal oversight	
Monitor financial aspects of program administration, including review of program expenditures.	SHS work plan, section 3.4: The committee will be charged with the following duties:...C. Monitor financial aspects of program administration, including review of program expenditures.
Annual review and consideration of whether the recommended administrative costs should be reduced or increased. (for Metro, County Partners and service providers)	SHS work plan, section 5.3: As part of the annual review process, the Regional Oversight Committee will evaluate tax collection and administrative costs incurred by Metro, Local Implementation Partners and service providers and consider if any costs should be reduced or increased. The committee will present any such recommendations to the Metro Council.
Review Metro Budget	IGA 5.4.1: At least annually, Metro will prepare a written budget for its SHS program that details its use of Income Taxes and its Administrative Expenses and will present its SHS budget to the ROC [Regional Oversight Committee]. The ROC will consider whether Metro’s SHS budget, its collection costs, and its Administrative Expenses could or should be reduced or increased. The ROC may recommend to the Metro Council how Metro can best limit its collection and Administrative Expenses in the following Fiscal Year.
Review five-year forecast	IGA 7.2.1.1: Metro’s CFO, in consultation with the FRT, must prepare a five-year revenue forecast to support the Counties in developing their annual budgets and revising current year estimates as needed. The forecast will evaluate Income Taxes collection activity, SHS program expenditure activity, cash flows, adequacy of funds in Stabilization Reserves, economic factors impacting tax collections, and the overall financial health of the SHS program. Metro will provide these forecasts to the ROC and TCPB by the first business day in December, and provide timely updates of those projections, as available.



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

Requirement	Source text
Other	
Provide input on corrective action plans before Metro requires them of counties	Intergovernmental Agreements, section 6.3.5: after appropriate notice and opportunity to remedy identified concerns, Metro reasonably determines that Partner is not adhering to the terms of its Plan, current Annual Work Plan or Annual Program Budget, or current spend-down plan, then Metro may, with input from the ROC and from Partner, require Partner to develop a Corrective Action Plan.

Supportive housing services regional oversight committee

Meeting guidelines

Arrive on time and prepared.

Share the air – only one person will speak at a time, and we will allow others to speak once before we speak twice.

Express our own views or those of our constituents; don't speak for others at the table.

Listen carefully and keep an open mind.

Respect the views and opinions of others, and refrain from personal attacks, both within and outside of meetings.

Avoid side conversations.

Focus questions and comments on the subject at hand and stick to the agenda.

When discussing the past, link the past to the current discussion constructively.

Seek to find common ground with each other and consider the needs and concerns of the local community and the larger region.

Turn off or put cell phones on silent mode. Focus on full engagement in the meeting, and refrain from conducting other work during meetings as much as possible.

Notify committee chairperson and Metro staff of any media inquiries and refer requests for official statements or viewpoints to Metro. Committee members will not speak to media on behalf of the committee or Metro, but rather only on their own behalf.

Group agreements

We aren't looking for perfection.

WAIT: why am I talking / why aren't I talking.

You are the author of your own story.

Impact vs intention: Intention is important, but we attend to impact first.

BIPOC folks or folks with targeted identities often don't / didn't have the privilege to assume best intentions in a white dominant space.

Invited to speak in draft- thought doesn't need to be fully formed.

We are all learners and teachers.

Expertise isn't privileged over lived experience and wisdom.

Liberation and healing are possible.

Expect non-closure.

TO: Metro Council

FROM: Metro Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee (SHSOC)

DATE: January 10, 2025

SUBJECT: SHSOC Recommendations and Feedback Regarding Changes to Oversight and Governance for the Supportive Housing Services Measure

The SHSOC has been engaged in multiple briefings on the Metro Housing Funding changes that Metro Council is currently considering based on Chief Operating Officer Marissa Madrigal's recommendations released in the summer of 2024. As the primary oversight body currently responsible for ensuring the Supportive Housing Services (SHS) measure attains the goals and objectives intended by voters, we provide the following feedback and recommendations regarding oversight, accountability, and governance. This memo reflects our commitment to ensuring that investments achieve regional goals and desired outcomes with transparency and accountability.

Scope of Feedback

As the oversight body tasked with monitoring the implementation of SHS, our feedback focuses on key aspects that will ensure the program is efficient, accountable, and transparent in delivering services across the region. While individual committee members have expressed concerns ranging from reductions in services due to funding limitations to the broader funding landscape, this memo emphasizes alignment between our oversight responsibilities and the proposed changes we have reviewed over the past year.

Current Challenges

1. Limited Authority for True Oversight:

True oversight requires the power to influence or redirect decisions. Many members have experienced a disconnect between the SHSOC's mandate and its authority, leading to a perception of "rubber-stamping" strategies from implementing jurisdictions without the ability to enforce accountability.

2. Unclear Decision-Making Pathways:

There is a lack of clarity on how decisions are made when there is misalignment between Metro and counties. Counties often request changes to policy or operations that are not thoroughly deliberated with Metro or SHSOC, leading to inefficiencies and confusion.

3. Barriers to Data Sharing and Reporting:

The absence of regionalized, timely, and actionable data continues to hinder oversight and performance evaluation. Discrepancies in data sharing agreements and technical challenges prevent a comprehensive understanding of system performance.

Recommendations for Governance Reform

1. Renegotiate Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs):

The current IGAs provide a framework for collaboration but fail to address the complexities of interjurisdictional coordination. Unresolved disagreements often lead to inefficiencies and undermine accountability. Renegotiating these agreements is essential to ensure streamlined decision-making and alignment across jurisdictions.

The IGAs between Metro and counties must be updated to clearly define roles, responsibilities, and decision-making pathways. This renegotiation should:

- Establish structured escalation protocols, including facilitated mediation, to resolve disagreements between jurisdictions in a timely manner.
- Preserve regional collaboration by ensuring decisions reflect shared goals and prevent fragmentation.
- Include accountability mechanisms that clarify consequences for non-compliance or misalignment with regional priorities.

2. Adoption of Outcome-Based Performance Management:

Outcome-based performance management can be achieved without the need for ballot measure and is within Metro's current scope of responsibility. Programs funded by the SHS measure have made progress, but the absence of a robust performance management system limits their ability to demonstrate measurable outcomes. Standardized metrics and data-sharing agreements are essential to ensure real-time evaluations and equitable results. This approach is vital to maintaining public trust and achieving long-term program success.

Shared commitment to outcomes-based performance management is needed to ensure efficiency and equitable resource allocation. This includes:

- Identifying and addressing barriers to data sharing by convening a working group to create standardized reporting templates, establish data-sharing agreements, and invest in shared reporting platforms.
- Setting interim regional performance metrics, such as reductions in unsheltered homelessness, disaggregated by race and ethnicity.
- Mandating regular reporting to track progress and ensure transparency, supported by public dashboards or summaries.

3. Evidence-Based Decisions with Funding and Governance:

There is growing concern over how funding decisions are made, especially amid resource constraints and competing priorities. Without a clear evidence-based approach, investments risk misalignment with pressing needs. Grounding decisions in data and shared goals is essential to optimize the program's impact and maintain public confidence.

To avoid misalignment of funds and goals, the SHSOC recommends:

- Developing a coordinated approach to ensure SHS and affordable housing initiatives complement rather than compete with one another.
- Articulating clear objectives for affordable housing efforts to maintain public confidence and ensure funds are used strategically.

Conclusion

The SHS Oversight Committee is committed to supporting the SHS measure's success through rigorous oversight and actionable recommendations. We strongly urge the Metro Council to:

- Prioritize IGA renegotiations to strengthen regional coordination and accountability.
- Immediately address data-sharing challenges to enable outcomes-based performance management.
- Protect SHS initiatives while clearly defining the future goals of affordable housing efforts.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide this feedback and remain dedicated to ensuring the SHS program achieves its mission of creating a regionally aligned system of care for people experiencing homelessness.



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

As part of the Supportive Housing Services Regional Annual report process, the Oversight Committee is tasked with putting forth recommendations to Metro Council that will strengthen the oversight and monitoring SHS funds. Based on previous discussions and recommendations from the FY 23-24 regional annual report, SHS Oversight Committee Co-Chairs have proposed the following draft recommendations for the committee's consideration and discussion at the upcoming 1/13 meeting.

Initial draft recommendations for oversight committee discussion on 1/13

The oversight committee issued a comprehensive package of recommendations in March 2024 to strengthen SHS implementation. Most of these recommendations are multi-year bodies of work. Over the upcoming year, the oversight committee will continue to monitor and support the work that is underway to further advance each of the recommendations.

Our 2025 recommendations to Metro Council focus on several critical issues that will affect the long-term success of the SHS fund's implementation:

Regional priorities

As we move into the second phase of SHS implementation, Metro Council should convene a conversation about regional priorities to ensure we are using SHS resources as strategically as possible. This includes a discussion about how to allocate SHS funds between different priorities such as homelessness prevention, emergency shelter and permanent supportive housing. In order to facilitate this conversation, Metro and the Counties should ensure data is readily available to ensure data-informed best practices are incorporated into the prioritization conversations.

Oversight and accountability

Appropriate levels of oversight and accountability are essential to ensure effective stewardship of tax dollars. Metro, and the SHS Oversight Committee, should be empowered to conduct core oversight and monitoring functions in alignment with funder best practices and provide data to the oversight committee and Metro Council so they have the necessary information to operationalize their charge.

Jurisdictional partnerships and decision making

The development of a cohesive regional system of care requires effective coordination between Metro and the three counties. Further work is needed to clarify the roles and relationships between Metro and the counties and how decisions are made. This may require a reassessment of the decision-making process laid out in the counties' intergovernmental agreements with Metro. The SHS Oversight Committee recommends that collaborative efforts to shape the processes and requirements of the Measure are consistently used, with final decision-making authority resting with Metro to ensure key policies can be implemented after engagement is completed. Furthermore, we recommend a reassessment of the SHS Oversight Committee's responsibilities and tasks to ensure accountability for Metro and the three Counties is clear and actionable.

Data integrity and evaluation

Providing transparency and accountability to voters requires regionally consistent data. Metro and the counties should continue to work together to align financial and programmatic data reporting. As we move into phase two of implementation, further work is also needed to develop clear frameworks for evaluating progress toward the regional 10-year goals and the SHS fund's commitments to advancing racial equity.

Provider partnerships

The counties, Metro and the tri-county planning body should work to advance critical strategies that will support the capacity and stability of SHS providers, with a particular focus on small, emerging and culturally specific providers. This includes:

- Expediting the development and implementation of regional strategies to provide equitable and livable wages for all frontline workers.

- Continuing to improve counties' contract administration practices to address challenges related to payment delays and cash flow issues. Improve contract administration consistency across all three counties to ensure alignment.
- Building on promising pilot projects to expand and institutionalize advance payments, multi-year contracts and capacity building investments.



Memo

Date: Monday, Jan. 6, 2025
To: Regional Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee
From: Craig Beebe, Policy and Communications Advisor,
Government Affairs & Policy Development | craig.beebe@oregonmetro.gov
Subject: Update on Regional Affordable Housing and Supportive Housing Services Funding

Dear Oversight Committee members:

As you know, the Metro Council is nearing decision-making on a proposal for an additional two decades of regional funding to address homelessness through investments in supportive services rental assistance, and affordable housing.

In its discussions, the Metro Council is also considering updates to oversight structures to support the program's long-term transparency, accountability and impact with partners across the region.

Throughout these discussions, Councilors are reflecting on input and discussions with a broad array of partners throughout the last year – including Regional Oversight Committee members' reflections on what has worked well in the existing program, and what can be improved for the future. Thank you for making time again on your agenda for an update on Monday, Jan. 13 with Metro Council President Lynn Peterson.

Key upcoming dates

Below is the current planned timeline for Metro Council. Please note that dates could change.

- **Friday, Jan. 10, 9 a.m.:** The Housing Funding Stakeholder Advisory Table, which informed COO Marissa Madrigal's recommendation to the Metro Council last year, will reconvene to hear an update on proposed Council actions and discuss next steps. Metro Councilors will be in attendance to listen to their discussion.
- **Thursday, Jan. 16, time TBD:** Metro Council Work Session – Councilors will discuss proposed language for a pair of ordinances. One ordinance would include items to put forward for voter consideration in a measure referral. The other ordinance would establish Council's intentions, priorities and direction on next steps that would happen if a measure is approved by voters, including developing and executing a transition work plan.
- **Thursday, Jan. 23, 10:30 a.m.:** Metro Council Meeting – First read of potential ordinances and public hearing. Councilors may also propose and consider amendments to the ordinances.
- **Thursday, Jan. 30 and Feb. 6:** Metro Council Meetings – Second read and if necessary, third read" of ordinances, including any amendments approved by Metro Councilors. Council will likely decide whether to adopt the ordinances as well as a resolution to refer a ballot measure to voters in the May 2025 election.

Ongoing informational outreach

Metro Councilors and staff have held presentations and discussions with key partners and stakeholders across the region in recent months to receive feedback and discuss the path forward. These will continue in the weeks ahead.

(continued, next page)

Below is a partial list of recent and upcoming presentations and discussions as of this writing. All dates are tentative.

- 11/13: Tri-County Planning Body
- 11/18: Milwaukie City Council
- 11/21: Metropolitan Mayors Consortium
- 11/25: Forest Grove City Council
- 12/2: SHS Oversight Committee
- 12/3: Hillsboro City Council
- 12/9: Affordable Housing Bond Oversight Committee
- 12/9: Westside Economic Alliance
- 12/11: Metro Policy Advisory Committee
- 12/11: Tri-County Planning Body
- 12/20: Community-based organization leaders listening session
- 1/7: Beaverton City Council, Lake Oswego City Council
- 1/8: Regional City Managers
- 1/8: Tri-County Planning Body
- 1/10: Regional Housing Funding Stakeholder Advisory Table: A reconvening of the group appointed by Metro Chief Operating Officer Marissa Madrigal in early 2024, which informed her recommendations to the Metro Council last year.
- 1/13: SHS Oversight Committee
- 1/13: Tualatin City Council
- 1/21: Gresham City Council
- 1/23: Wilsonville City Council

Additional presentations are actively being scheduled now. If you are aware of an organization that would like a presentation, please let me know. More information about this work can be found at <http://oregonmetro.gov/housingfunding>.

Thank you once again for your dedication to this important work. We look forward to the conversation with you on January 13.



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

Metro - Supportive housing services
Quarterly reports by county, FY25 Q1

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

Clackamas County FY 2024-2025 Quarter 1 Update

Quantitative Goals

FY 2024-2025 Annual Workplan Objective	FY 2024-2025 Annual Workplan Goal	Quarter 1 Update	Progress from Year 1
Supportive Housing units/opportunities (vouchers/units)	275 vouchers/units	0 vouchers/units	518 units
Housing Placements (PSH+RRH) (households)	435 households	TBD	1,145 households
PSH Placements (households)	275 households	75 households	930 households
Rapid Re-housing Placements (households)	160 households	59 households	215 households
Homelessness Preventions (households)	1,000 households	472 households	1,514 households
Supported Emergency/ Transitional Shelter Units	230 units	0 units	210 units
Outreach Engagements (households)	750 households	138 households	1,081 households

Qualitative Progress Narrative

Clackamas County made significant strides in expanding its outreach efforts in rural communities during Q1, securing a \$1.6M contract aimed at supporting up to 1,400 homeless households. This funding improved rural programming by enhancing staff capacity to better address community needs.

To promote racial equity goals, the county conducted a staff demographics and pay equity survey for SHS-funded service providers, ensuring that culturally specific

organizations offer living and competitive wages, particularly when compared to non-culturally specific organizations. In partnership with other Tri-County equity leaders, Clackamas County also conducted a thorough review of the Coordinated Entry Regional Plan. The review produced key recommendations for regional alignment, including the use of equitable language and trauma-informed practices in assessment tools, as well as a standardized case conferencing approach with an equity lens. The Coordinated Entry Regional Plan calls for cross-jurisdictional learning and streamlining processes to enhance move-in readiness by ensuring access to essential household supplies that are equitably distributed and culturally relevant.

The county also made notable progress on its capacity building and systems infrastructure goals, including providing case conferencing for over 50 participants. Expanding this initiative, Clackamas County is now focusing on households newly housed through RLRA vouchers, further improving housing access and stability. To support these efforts, the county has issued a notice of intent to award contracts to two organizations specializing in housing navigation and case management services.

Additionally, Clackamas County awarded funding to Sunstone Way to open a new transitional shelter, which will provide 24 beds for single homeless adults. This shelter is part of the county's broader recovery-oriented system of care. In Milwaukie, the county is moving forward with the Clackamas County Stabilization Center, with a completed program design and site management plan. Renovation is set to begin by the end of 2024, with an anticipated opening in winter 2025. The county's Coordinated Housing Access Resource Navigation program has shown early success, assisting 32 individuals in its first full quarter this fiscal year.

Multnomah County FY 2024-2025 Quarter 1 Update

Quantitative Goals

FY 2024-2025 Annual Workplan Objective	FY 2024-2025 Annual Workplan Goal	Quarter 1 Update	Progress from Year 1
Supportive Housing Units	275 new RLRA vouchers 401 SH units coming online	97 new RLRA vouchers	1,114 units
Housing Placements (households)	1,072 people 875 new households	421 people 271 households	2,977 households
PSH Placements (PSH and ROTH) (households)	360 people 300 households	106 people 85 households	1,223 households
Rapid Re-housing Placements (households)	550 people 440 households	270 people 152 households	1,704 households
Other Permanent Housing Placements (households)	162 people 135 households	45 people 34 households	197 households
Homelessness Preventions (households)	800 people 600 households	277 people 165 households	11,577 households
Emergency Shelter <i>Health Department included</i>	309 new 1,088 sustained	10 new 1,170 sustained	1,180 units*
New Shelter Beds	250 new beds	10 new beds	n/a*

*Multnomah County uses a different metric to report shelter units created or sustained. 1,180 is how many shelter units they are funding now. They funded units previously, but because some are no longer funded, we cannot "add up" from Year 1.

Qualitative Goals Progress Narrative

The Joint Office of Homeless Services (JOHS) has released a funding solicitation, allocating \$7 million in ongoing SHS funds to expand project-based and tenant-based Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). These funds will provide rent assistance and support services for up to 200 households in Population A, helping Multnomah County achieve its goal of placing 360 people and 300 households into PSH this year. The county expects to create 170 new PSH opportunities, expand its pool of PSH providers, and increase culturally specific PSH for Black, Indigenous, and other communities of color, as well as services for adults aged 50 and older. They anticipate filling half of this capacity by the end of the fiscal year, with award recipients notified by late Q2. Multnomah County has seen positive outcomes from existing PSH projects, such as Cedar Commons, which provides mental and behavioral health resources.

The county has also strengthened partnerships with the Health Department, the Department of County Human Services, and other local agencies to leverage SHS funding for vulnerable populations. Additionally, a new SHS-funded community justice program is launched that aims to promote stability for individuals on parole or probation.

The county is expanding shelter capacity with the addition of 250 new shelter units and increasing funding for long-standing service contracts. WeShine's Avalon Village alternative shelter added 10 emergency shelter units, contributing to a total of 1,180 SHS-funded units. Of these, 87 units are sustained in partnership with the Behavioral Health Department. These efforts are helping to expand Multnomah County's systems of care and enhance services for people experiencing homelessness.

Washington County FY 2024-2025 Quarter 1 Update

Quantitative Goals

FY 2024-2025 Annual Workplan Objective	FY 2024-2025 Annual Workplan Goal	Quarter 1 Update	Progress from Year 1
Supportive Housing Units	<i>No new permanent supportive housing capacity is being added; Washington County's capacity now matches our LIP goal. (1665)</i>	n/a	1,364 units*
Housing Placements (households)	950 households	189 households	1,865 households
PSH Placements (households)	450 households	110 households	1,371 households
Rapid Re-housing/Short-term Rent Assistance (households)	300 households (45 new slots/vouchers)	67 households	494 households
Rapid Re-housing/Short-term Rent Assistance (households)	200 Move-In Ready households	12 households	6 households
Homelessness Preventions (households)	1,400	147 households	2,002 households

**Nuance around this goal that Metro has inquired about.*

Qualitative Goals Progress Narrative

Washington County has expanded its services to support individuals at risk of homelessness, focusing on short-term solutions to stabilize and promote self-sufficiency. This includes enhanced training for the housing liaison program and increased use of Short Term Solutions funds to assist individuals in stabilizing housing. This enabled more individuals to access timely financial assistance to stabilize their current housing or secure new placements. Similarly, the Move-In Only Program was also expanded to provide one-time move-in cost assistance, helping individuals and families transition into

stable housing. This program successfully served 23 households this past quarter. To provide individuals and households further access to these resources, a housing liaison position was added within the Community Connect Program to help divert households needing move-in assistance through coordinated entry. This new position will allow for more efficient connections to housing resources, and quicker stabilization for households at risk of homelessness.

Washington County also made significant strides in expanding its housing options through the launch of a \$30 million Transitional Housing NOFO targeting Population A households. The recipient of this funding award will be expected to receive notice in Quarter 2. In addition to these programmatic expansions, Washington County also held their first-ever listening sessions- one for providers and one for the public to engage the community and share priorities for the 2025-2026 fiscal year. These sessions were designed to engage the community, share departmental priorities for the 2025-2026 fiscal year, and gather feedback on how to improve services and address emerging needs.

Additionally, to further strengthen the county's housing and health system integration, Washington county secured over \$1 million from Health Share of Oregon and \$100,000 from Trillium Community Health Plan. These funds are designed to support continued collaboration with health system partners and community-based housing services to improve service delivery and the overall network of support services for those experiencing, or at risk of experiencing homelessness.

METRO SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES TRI-COUNTY PLANNING BODY

Monthly progress report | November 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*

<i>Goal</i>	<i>Progress</i>
<i>Regional Landlord Recruitment</i>	<i>Metro and county staff are continuing to coordinate on the implementation of strategies in the Regional Landlord Recruitment Regional Implementation Plan adopted by the TCPB, including meeting monthly in the Regional Landlord Recruitment Workgroup. Metro staff are working to create a webpage on Metro’s website with information on county landlord financial incentives, as part of Plan’s Strategy #1: Communication and education plan,</i>
<i>Coordinated Entry</i>	<i>The CE Regional Implementation Plan (CERIP) was approved by the TCPB on 10/9/24 and by Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee (SHSOC) on 10/28/24. Work on the four strategies outlined in the CERIP (Regionalize visibility of participant data, align assessment questions, Regionalize approaches to prioritization for racial equity, Regionalize approach to case conferencing) has begun.</i>
<i>Healthcare system alignment</i>	<i>The regional planning workgroup with Health Share, Counties, and Metro, with support from Homebase is currently drafting the implementation plan with a focus on regional opportunities to support, supplement, and advance existing health and housing system alignment initiatives. The implementation plan is scheduled to come to TCPB in January 2025. The team will provide an update to the SHS OC in January and present the plan for OC approval in February. A data sharing workgroup continues to meet, learning from existing data sharing agreements (DSAs) across the region to discuss regional data sharing infrastructure and scope for the regional plan.</i>

Training + Technical Assistance

The Regional Capacity Team is continuing to develop the framework for a training or certification for frontline housing and homeless service providers. This packet includes a research paper that outlines opportunities in post-secondary education and other existing certifications, like peer support. The team is now doing research on other potential opportunities, including workforce boards.

The team is also moving forward on developing a technical assistance demonstration project that aims to pair PSH providers with consultants to benchmark their service delivery to national best practices and measure the impact of technical assistance interventions.

Since provider feedback and buy in is core to the success of both of these projects, the team is conducting outreach to frontline service providers through county meetings and coalitions. We appreciate the counties for making space for us at their check ins with their contracted providers.

Employee Recruitment and Retention

We are meeting monthly with a tri-county workgroup to draft a regional plan, exploring concepts discussed in the June/July progress updates and opportunities to build on existing efforts in counties toward regional approaches. The Regional Implementation Plan is currently scheduled to come to TCPB in May 2025. Outreach and engagement will continue, including with providers and with local and state workforce and contract-related initiatives. In particular, we are tracking the recommendations of the state's Modernizing Grant Funding and Contracting Task Force, chaired by Mercedes Elizalde.

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

Existing REGIONAL PROGRAMS AND COORDINATION EFFORTS

***Households housed through the RLRA program as of June 30, 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>

*As of 8/15/2024, Metro has updated the way numbers are reported on our SHS dashboards. Beginning at the end of Year 3, Metro has shifted to reporting the number of households served with SHS resources. We are no longer reporting the number of people served, as several people can be members of the same household which has been served with SHS resources. Please note: This will cause the number on the dashboard to appear smaller, even though SHS service levels have only continued to increase.

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 Meeting Summary

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services Tri-County Planning Body Meeting
Date: Wednesday, October 9, 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 presentation and make a decision on Coordinated Entry Regional Implementation Plan

Member attendees

Eboni Brown (she/her), Zoi Coppiano (she/her), Yoni Kahn (he/him), Nicole Larson (she/her), Sahaan McKelvey (he/him), Cameran Murphy (they/them), Cristina Palacios (she/her), Co-chair Steve Rudman (he/him), Monta Knudson (he/him)

Absent members

Co-chair Mercedes Elizalde (she/her), Yvette Marie Hernandez (she/her), Mindy Stadtlander (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 – Melissa Baker (she/her), Lauren Decker (she/her), Multnomah County – Christina Castaño (she/her), Katie Dineen (she/her), Washington County – Nicole Stingh (she/her), Kisa Quanbeck (she/her)

Metro

Abby Ahern (she/her), Giovanni Bautista (he/him), Liam Frost (he/him), Michael Garcia (he/him), Yvette Chavez (she/her), Lo Miranda (they/them), Patricia Rojas (she/her)

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.

Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

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

Co-chair Steve Rudman provided opening remarks.

The TCPB approved the September Meeting Summary. Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington abstained.

Public Comment

No public comments were made.

Conflict of Interest

Cristina Palacios declared a conflict of interest as Housing Oregon is on Metro's contractor list and could potentially receive SHS funding in the future.

Cameran Murphy declared a conflict of interest as Boys and Girls Aid receives SHS funding.

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. She noted her position is not funded by SHS.

Yoni Kahn declared a conflict of interest as the Northwest Pilot Project receives SHS funding. He noted that he serves on the TCPB to share provider perspectives and does not represent his employer.

Sahaan McKelvey declared a conflict of interest as Self Enhancement Inc (SEI) receives SHS funds. He noted that his position is not funded by SHS.

Staff Updates

Nicole Stingh, Washington County, provided an update on the programs Washington County has been building out and that 100% of the budget has been spent. She noted that revenue collections are lower than the forecast which means the County will look at programmatic reductions to avoid overspending.

Cristina Castaño, Multnomah County, shared that Multnomah County has launched two funding opportunities for survivors of domestic and sexual violence, and is piloting cross-sector case conferencing.

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, was not able to attend to provide an update from the Supportive Housing Services (SHS) Oversight Committee.

Ben proposed that Metro send an update over in writing to the TCPB.

Coordinated Entry Regional Implementation Plan

Abby Ahern, Metro, introduced herself and reviewed the TCPB Goal and Recommendations for Coordinated Entry. She presented a background overview and context of what coordinated entry is and reviewed the Racial Equity Lens Tool (RELT) that was used to review the Coordinated Entry

Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

Regional Implementation Plan (CERIP). She invited county staff to speak about recent improvements to their coordinated entry systems.

Melissa Baker, Clackamas County, shared that Clackamas County has expanded its assessment capacity by 200% and is answering about 80% of calls received live. The County has also expanded its prevention and diversion programs by working with families and has diverted 32 individuals. She shared a story about a client who has been successfully housed through the program.

Katie Dineen, Multnomah County, shared that Multnomah County has redesigned its coordinated access assessment tool to address racial disparities, which will launch at the end of the month. The redesigning process was in coordination with community bodies over three years and is culturally responsive and trauma-informed.

Kisa Quanbeck, Washington County, shared that Washington County has updated its system known as Community Connect to support culturally specific providers. The updated assessment focuses on matching prioritization and they are looking at expanding the number of assessors.

Abby, Melissa, Katie, Kisa, and Lauren Decker took turns presenting the CERIP strategies. For each strategy, they reviewed the key deliverables, milestones, budget, metrics, and timeline. The four strategies are:

- 1) Regionalize visibility of participant data
- 2) Align assessment questions
- 3) Regionalize approaches to prioritization for racial equity
- 4) Regionalize an approach to case conferencing.

The overall budget for the four strategies is \$1,195,000, with an additional \$447,928 in proposed ongoing spending for Washington County's Community Connect, for a total budget of \$1,642,928. The overall timeline would begin in October 2024, with refinement of objectives and strategies and partner engagement throughout 2025, with piloting and implementation in January 2026.

TCPB members and elected delegates had the following questions:

- **Question, Cristina P.:** Is language access provided for the phone lines? Do you have information on how many Black, Indigenous, or People of Color (BIPOC) or non-English speakers have been helped per county?
 - **Clackamas County response, Lauren:** Clackamas County provides language access. There are three bilingual Spanish assessors and an on-call line for other languages. We are tracking that data and can share it.
 - **Response, Washington County Chair Harrington:** That data must be tracked for the Annual Report for the SHS Oversight Committee.
 - **Multnomah County response, Katie:** Language access needs can be met, and that data is tracked. 77% of individuals placed in housing were BIPOC.
 - **Washington County response, Kisa:** We have a community phone line and at least half of those who answer calls are bilingual Spanish speakers. We have assessors who speak other languages and a language access line. That data is tracked in the annual report.
- **Question, Eboni:** Will there be prioritization in working with the counties to support individuals moving to other neighborhoods or counties where they feel safe and comfortable in their homes? I have heard some Black and Brown people do not feel safe in certain counties.

Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

- **Washington County response, Nicole Stingh:** The three counties are working on transfers to support that and are working with culturally specific providers.
- **Multnomah County response, Katie:** That is a question included in the assessment, but there are funding limitations. Continuum of Care (CoC) projects do not support participants outside of the CoC area. RLRA can transfer across county lines.
- **Question, Washington County Chair Harrington:** Will this work begin in October 2024? All the milestones are in 2025, and completion ranges from 2026-2027. The coordinated entry graphic at the beginning of the presentation can be interpreted as individuals are being sorted into three separate counties, we lack graphics of where we are and where we are going and need to do a better job of storytelling and representing strategies and work.
 - **Metro response, Abby:** Yes, if approved the work would begin immediately.
 - **Clackamas County response, Lauren:** The graphic is not supposed to indicate three different counties, but that people are matched with the appropriate level of care.
- **Question, Cameran:** I am interested to hear more about what Multnomah County has done to realign the assessment questions and if it was done in coordination with a regional approach. I would like to hear more about Clackamas County's approach to case conferencing.
 - **Multnomah County response, Katie:** The County started the process before the SHS regional work, but did touch base and share analysis and learnings with the other counties. We want to be mindful of the engagement process and commitments to providers.
 - **Clackamas County response, Lauren:** We do case conferencing for four types of cases and pull a by-name list to identify barriers and problem-solve. We would like to get more provider participation, but it is successful in many ways.
- **Question, Yoni:** I want to be mindful of provider workflow. Strategies can impact workflow and could cause consequences and burdens. It is important to circle back on every assessment and set reasonable expectations for outcomes. Questions should balance between being broad and invasive. It is important to implement a true equity lens. I support an extended timeline as it is important to get the process right instead of just getting it done.
 - **Metro response, Abby:** Providers' experiences were kept in mind as the TCPB named this goal to regionally improve coordinated entry systems to serve providers. The RELT tool was created and implemented into each strategy.
- **Comment, Multnomah County Chair Jessica Vega Pederson:** The Joint Office of Homeless Services is nationally recognized for addressing disparities for racial equity and we are excited to make this regional. We also need to have flexibility for those who are not in the system yet and provide services. If we are putting a new shelter in and having a preference for certain neighborhoods, how is the system flexible? How are we recognizing the need for place-based access to services? This is a conversation I am interested in having in the future.
- **Question, Sahaan:** Who is the governing body for the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)? Using the RIF to fund Community Connect does not fully align with designated regional items. What is the point of being regional while funding individual programs? If Community Connect is the best program it should be regionalized.

Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

- **Metro response, Abby:** The HMIS governing body is made up of the three counties and their staff members. One group makes decisions about what is happening on the ground, and the other looks at sustainable funding.
- **Washington County response, Nicole S.:** Community Connect is not doing our own program but doing the work that is essential to doing coordinated entry.
- **Question, Nicole Larson:** Is the funding for Community Connect to support the program's regionalization or funding for administering the program?
 - **Washington County response, Nicole S.:** It is the cost of administering the program.
- **Question, Monta Knudson:** Is racial equity integrated with each strategy?
 - **Washington County response, Kisa:** The work is intertwined naturally as we put together the updated assessment questions and prioritization tools for the Chief Financial Officer to review. Equity is integrated into the review of the assessment and prioritization tools.
 - **Clackamas County response, Lauren:** The RELT tool will be used after every single step.

Ben asked the TCPB to vote on the CERIP as a whole and shared that anyone may propose a motion to separate the proposal into standalone items to approve. He shared that he would call on each member to share their thoughts, and then the TCPB would move into a formal vote.

Motion: Sahaan and Cristina P. motioned to vote on the CERIP as a whole.

TCPB members and elected delegates had the following comments:

- **Comment, Co-chair Rudman:** This group should think outside of the box, what is stopping the creation of a regional CoC? Last meeting the Regional Investment Fund (RIF) was discussed, and the Co-chairs will be meeting with Metro and county staff to discuss the RIF further.

Motion: Co-chair Rudman proposed to remove Community Connection from the CERIP for the time being and will circle back to the TCPB once the Co-chairs and jurisdictions completed their RIF conversations.

Ben asked the TCPB to vote on separating Community Connection from the CERIP.

Vote: Washington County Chair Harrington abstained. The TCPB approved separating Community Connection from the CERIP and circling back once the Co-chairs and jurisdictions completed their RIF conversations.

Ben asked the TCPB to discuss and then vote on the remaining four strategies of the CERIP.

TCPB members and elected delegates had the following comments:

- **Comment, Sahaan:** Any participant in any county should be able to enter into any coordinate entry system and decide where they want to go. I am planning to vote yes but want to note the following. The prioritization of the plan seeks to increase provider input, but no providers gave input on the plan. Thank you for changing the assessment tools and building capacity with culturally specific providers. I have seen a significant average score difference between 2-1-1 assessors and culturally specific assessors. Please clarify what is meant by lived experience, sometimes it can mean current traumatic lived experience, and other times it can mean those who have lived through that experience and can now provide reflections and perspective. It is important to take the time to do this right and to

Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

do it quickly. I think case conferencing can increase efficiency, but do not think it should be used as a prioritization tool. That can increase subjectivity and create more back doors to the process.

- **Comment, Yoni:** I love the idea of regionalizing the visibility of participants to their data. I am curious about how this goal relates to others, specifically health and housing integration. I hear that there is rising acuity, perhaps there is potential for coordinated entry to link to a health plan, so individuals know where to go to address health needs.
 - **Metro response, Abby:** The healthcare housing integration plan is coming in January and connects to the CERIP with the assessment alignment questions.
- **Comment, Cameran:** Echo Sahaan's comments. I want a regional system that is accessible and seamless no matter what housing authority a participant connects with. I do not want any adverse impacts on providers or participants.
- **Comment, Zoi:** Excited to move this forward. I was an assessor of Community Connections and saw the evolution of trauma-informed questions.
- **Comment, Cristina P.:** Those with lived experiences should be compensated for their work. Being trauma-informed collects more data and is not a check-the-box exercise.
- **Comment, Nicole L.:** Excited to move this forward. Separating the Community Connection program is not about the validity of the program but appropriately allocating funding.
- **Comment, Washington County Chair Harrington:** The CERIP has been well researched and thought through.
- **Comment, Multnomah County Chair Vega Pederson:** I am supportive of this work. The TCPB needs to have a conversation in the future about regionalization and moving from one county to another as that is not how funding currently works.
- **Comment, Metro Councilor Christine Lewis:** The discussion is going in the right direction. We currently have three programs and regional strategies. I hope to get to the point where we see a regional program. I look forward to the conversations about what regionalization means.

Eboni and Monta had no comments.

Vote: The TCPB approved the CERIP with the removal of Community Connection.

Ben asked the TCPB to discuss and then vote on Community Connection.

TCPB members and elected delegates had the following comments:

- **Question, Multnomah County Chair Vega Pederson:** Will there be impacts for Washington County if this is not funded today?
 - **Washington County response, Nicole S.:** It is difficult to understand impacts today, the current fiscal year (through June 2025) is funded. I would like to circle back to this conversation. This could increase the funding deficit that is currently forecasted.
- **Question, Monta:** How much time do we have without causing impacts to Washington County?
 - **Washington County response, Nicole S.:** Before the budget begins July 1, 2025.
- **Comment, Co-chair Rudman:** This is indicative of a larger shift of RIF fund use, not just a tension point with this program. I suggest that the Co-chairs meet with staff and circle back. RIF funds are for regional strategies and efforts, the other 95% of tax funds can go towards these elements.
- **Question, Cameran:** I am not feeling prepared to vote on Community Connections. Can we vote next month?

Tri-County Planning Body Meeting Summary

- **Metro response, Liam Frost:** This proposed investment is not the only one regarding the shift of RIF fund use. Metro will meet with county staff and Co-chairs to get ahead of that July 1, 2025 deadline and limit disruptions.
- **Comment, Washington County Chair Harrington:** I am not going to vote on this action. I am also confused by the previous meeting summary. I would like to see clear documentation of what happens with funding for all goal areas.
 - **Facilitator response, Ben:** Metro can follow up on a summary of funds being spent versus utilization.
- **Question, Eboni:** How much is the deficit and how much of Community Connection is for regionalization?
 - **Response, Washington County Chair Harrington:** There was a \$21 million shortfall in collections.
 - **Washington County response, Nicole S.:** The funding is to run our coordinated entry system.
- **Comment, Nicole L.:** This emphasizes the value in clarifying language on what RIF funding is specifically spent on regionalization versus county programming. I do not want to see negative impacts from this. Is the RIF supposed to be spent to meet the goals even if it is not regional? Does it need to be regional and meet the goal? I don't know how to vote on that.
 - **Metro response, Abby:** That is for the TCPB to decide.
- **Comment, Zoi:** If the TCPB's goal is to regionalize coordinated entry, wouldn't this program move into that regional system?
- **Comment, Co-chair Rudman:** This is a good case of a larger point. Counties have budgeted items before with the RIF, but we have decided that the 2025-2026 fiscal year has a new process. We do not want to harm counties but be in the process together.
- **Comment, Cristina P.:** I am hesitant to make a decision, I believe in this work, but I do not want to give one amount of funds to one county and leave the others with less.

Vote: Zoi voted to approve. Washington County Chair Harrington, Multnomah County Chair Vega Pederson, Cameron, Nicole L., Yoni, and Eboni abstained. Ben stated that the vote failed.

Closing and Next Steps

Ben shared that the next steps are:

Next steps

- Metro staff to send an SHS Oversight Committee update over in writing.
- Co-chairs, Metro staff, and staff from the three counties to meet and discuss the next steps for RIF funding non-goal related items, including Community Connections.
- Metro to follow up with Washington County Chair Harrington on a summary of RIF funds being spent versus utilization.

Adjourn

Adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

The following materials were
received during the meeting



Metro

Metro Regional Supportive Housing Services

Draft FY24 recommendations

SHS Oversight Committee | January 2024

FY24 draft recommendations

- Regional priorities
- Oversight and accountability
- Jurisdictional partnerships and decision making
- Data integrity and evaluation
- Provider partnerships

Topic: Regional priorities

As we move into the second phase of SHS implementation, Metro Council should convene a conversation about regional priorities to ensure we are using SHS resources as strategically as possible. This includes a discussion about how to allocate SHS funds between different priorities such as homelessness prevention, emergency shelter and permanent supportive housing. In order to facilitate this conversation, Metro and the Counties should ensure data is readily available to ensure data-informed best practices are incorporated into the prioritization conversations.

Topic: Oversight and accountability

Appropriate levels of oversight and accountability are essential to ensure effective stewardship of tax dollars. Metro, and the SHS Oversight Committee, should be empowered to conduct core oversight and monitoring functions in alignment with funder best practices and provide data to the oversight committee and Metro Council so they have the necessary information to operationalize their charge.

Topic: Jurisdictional partnerships and decision making

The development of a cohesive regional system of care requires effective coordination between Metro and the three counties. Further work is needed to clarify the roles and relationships between Metro and the counties and how decisions are made. This may require a reassessment of the decision-making process laid out in the counties' intergovernmental agreements with Metro. The SHS Oversight Committee recommends that collaborative efforts to shape the processes and requirements of the Measure are consistently used, with final decision-making authority resting with Metro to ensure key policies can be implemented after engagement is completed. Furthermore, we recommend a reassessment of the SHS Oversight Committee's responsibilities and tasks to ensure accountability for Metro and the three Counties is clear and actionable.

Topic: Data integrity and evaluation

Providing transparency and accountability to voters requires regionally consistent data. Metro and the counties should continue to work together to align financial and programmatic data reporting. As we move into phase two of implementation, further work is also needed to develop clear frameworks for evaluating progress toward the regional 10-year goals and the SHS fund's commitments to advancing racial equity.

Topic: Provider partnerships

The counties, Metro and the tri-county planning body should work to advance critical strategies that will support the capacity and stability of SHS providers, with a particular focus on small, emerging and culturally specific providers. This includes:

- Expediting the development and implementation of regional strategies to provide equitable and livable wages for all frontline workers.
- Continuing to improve counties' contract administration practices to address challenges related to payment delays and cash flow issues. Improve contract administration consistency across all three counties to ensure alignment.
- Building on promising pilot projects to expand and institutionalize advance payments, multi-year contracts and capacity building investments.

Regional SHS and Housing Funding: Update

SHS Regional Oversight Committee

January 13, 2025



Oversight Committee Feedback: Current Program Challenges	Proposed actions
Limited authority for true oversight, perception of “rubber-stamping”	<p>Measure establishes a more empowered, accountable oversight committee – Housing and Homelessness Policy Advisory Committee (HHPAC)</p> <p>HHPAC includes elected officials as well as community leaders and experts – a model that has worked well at Metro for meaningful regional planning and action in other issues</p>
Unclear decision-making pathways	<p>Eliminate the duplication of SHSOC and TCPB, bringing planning and oversight roles into a single body</p> <p>Clarify roles of implementation partners, HHPAC and Metro’s authority</p>
Barriers to data-sharing and reporting	<p>Measure is explicit that compliance with data-sharing, reporting and other regional standards and policies will be required to receive SHS Program funding</p>

Oversight Committee Recommendations	Proposed actions
Renegotiate IGAs	Revisiting agreements with implementation partners would be needed after measure passage.
Adopt outcome-based performance management practices	<p>Council to set interim performance metrics, until HHPAC recommends more lasting KPMs as part of Regional Housing and Homelessness Action Plan</p> <p>Compliance with KPMs, regional standards and policies, etc. will be required for implementation partners</p> <p>Establish technical subcommittee for HHPAC</p>
Evidence-based decision-making	<p>Measure to set key allocation priorities including prioritization of people experiencing chronic homelessness; addressing racial and other demographic disparities; increasing predictability for partners, providers, and recipients of services.</p> <p>Specifics of allocation approach, including funding housing and potential investments by cities, to be recommended through HHPAC process as part of Regional Action Plan.</p>

Proposed Council actions

	Current draft key elements
Measure Ordinance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Extension to 2050, allow affordable housing• Establish single oversight committee• Define allocation goals for services and housing• Key requirements for implementation partners• Tax rate beyond 2031
Companion Ordinance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Timeline and process for HHPAC recommendation of future allocation structure, metrics, compliance mechanisms <u>through 2025</u>• HHPAC detailed membership and roles• Regional Action Plan: Key elements for inclusion• Local Implementation Plan requirements• Indexing income tax threshold to inflation, initial tax rate reduction

Draft Metro Council timeline

