



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.