



Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

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

Member attendees

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

Elected delegates

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

Absent elected delegates

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

Metro

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

Kearns & West Facilitator

Ben Duncan (he/him)

Welcome and Introductions

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

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

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

The Committee approved the January 29 meeting summary.

Conflict of Interest Declaration

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

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



Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

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

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

Public Comment

Stephanie Rose and Daniel Boone provided verbal public comment.

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

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

Presentation: SHS Audit

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

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

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

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

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

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion: Final draft of FY23 annual regional report

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

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

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

Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Peter Rosenblatt asked what would be left in Category 4.

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

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

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

The Committee voted to approve creating Category 5.

The Committee voted to approve all the recommendations.

Annual Regional Report

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

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

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

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



Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Felicita Monteblanco stated she is leaning towards Option 1.

Peter Rosenblatt and Mike Savara preferred Option 1.

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

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

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



Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

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

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

Jim Bane and Cara Hash preferred Option 2.

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

Dan Fowler and Becky Wilkinson yielded to Option 1.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Committee approved the Regional Report.

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

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

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

Metro Tax Collections and Disbursement Update

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

Next Steps

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

The next steps are:



Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

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

Adjourn

Adjourned at 12:00 pm.