

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services (SHS) Oversight Committee Meeting

Date: October 28, 2024

Time: 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual meeting (Zoom)

Purpose: Metro tax collection and disbursement update, Tri-County planning body

coordinated entry implementation presentation and vote, annual report timeline

review, FY24 recommendation parameter, FY25 budget and work plans

Member attendees

Peter Rosenblatt (he/him), Dan Fowler (he/him), Co-Chair Dr. Mandrill Taylor (he/him), Cara Hash (she/her), Mitch Chilcott (he/him), James (Jim) Bane (he/him), Carter MacNichol (he/him), Kai Laing (he/him), Jenny Lee (she/her), Jeremiah Rigsby (he/him), Margarita Solis Ruiz (she/her),

Absent members

Felicita Monteblanco (she/her), Co-chair Mike Savara (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

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

Kearns & West Facilitator

Josh Mahar (he/him)

Welcome and Introductions

Co-chair Dr. Madrill Taylor provided opening remarks and reflected on how coordinated entry is about providing clear paths and a well-coordinated system to those trying to navigate the housing system.

Josh Mahar, Kearns & West, introduced himself as the meeting facilitator and facilitated introductions between Committee members.

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, shared that Co-chair Mike Savara and Jeremiah Rigsby have renewed their terms and that Margarita Solis Ruiz is back from leave.

Craig Beebe, Metro, shared an update on the regional housing and Supportive Housing Services (SHS) Funding Discussion and responded to questions and comments related to the memo that was shared with the committee.

The Committee had the following questions and comments:



- **Question, Carter MacNichol**: Is there any response to my emailed questions? I am concerned about timeframes and the transition creates uncertainty. It would be helpful to provide guidance.
 - Metro response, Craig: That is part of what Metro Council has asked staff to present for the next steps. Staff will clearly outline details in the coming weeks.
 - o **Metro response, Patricia Rojas**: Metro Council's resolution started the next step in the process where staff will provide policy positions and recommendations.
- Question, Peter Rosenblatt: Oversight and advisory are two different roles, and Metro needs to decide what role the future committee has. In terms of current oversight, I have not seen Local Implementation Plan (LIP) oversight for Clackamas County. The LIP stated that the steering committee would be expanded to include oversight of United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and SHS funding, which has not happened. Multnomah County was held accountable with a Corrective Action Plan (CAP).
 - Metro response, Craig: The structure would include oversight and planning, the
 details are still being worked out. We would want to apply lessons learned from
 current structures to improve the future committee.
 - Metro response, Patricia: The oversight role of this committee is to make any recommendations for LIPs. The Committee can discuss this further in the annual report process.
- **Comment, Jim Bane**: I support Carter's comments. <u>Resolution No. 24-5436</u> Articles 2a and 2b relate to the expanded use of SHS funds and connect to 2f which relates to conserving funding. This will cause consternation for the counties; I encourage clarifying for the counties what funding they have.
- Question, Dan Fowler: When looking at policies and restructuring, look at what the distributions are now and how much will go to SHS when the measure is implemented. We need to know what the proposals could be or what staff recommend to provide feedback. Is the Committee being asked our opinion? This will have impacts on current nonprofit providers. We need to know the proposals so we can be clear with ourselves and providers about what will happen and what distributions will look like. How much will each county receive, will there be flexibility, and what is allocated for housing or nonprofit providers? I worry about creating an additional layer of housing personnel.
 - Metro response, Patricia: These are the questions staff will be answering in the coming weeks and will provide recommendations and policy positions to the Council to make decisions. Staff can come back and give updates. There will be no changes to Metro personnel.

Craig thanked the Committee for their comments and reiterated Metro's commitment to serving Populations A and B and that any materials that would go to Metro Council would be shared first with the Committee for feedback.

Josh reviewed the meeting agenda and purpose and noted that the Committee's next meeting will be virtual only.

The Committee had a quorum and approved the September Meeting Summary.

Conflict of Interest Declaration

Peter declared that he works at Northwest Housing Alternatives, which receives SHS funding. Carter declared that he sits on the Board of Directors of Transition Projects, which receives SHS funding.



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

Kai Laing declared he works at Self Enhancement Inc., which receives SHS dollars.

Jenny Lee declared she works at the Coalition of Communities of Color, which has partnerships with Metro and other organizations that may receive SHS funds.

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

Public Comment

No public comment was received.

Update: Metro Tax Collection and Disbursement

Jane Marie, Metro shared that September is a higher tax collection month because of due date extensions.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- Question, Peter: Are things trending as expected or are there any concerns?
 - o **Metro response, Jane**: Yes, September collections are the same as 2023, we expect to see some variation, but we are on track.
 - **Response, Peter**: There seems to be a pattern, and it looks like things seem to be settling.

Presentation: Tri-County Planning Body Implementation Plan (Coordinated Entry)

Yesenia reviewed the Committee's responsibility in approving the Tri-County Planning Body's (TCPB) Regional Plan.

Abby Ahern, Metro, introduced herself and thanked those who helped develop the Coordinated Entry Regional Plan. She read a statement from TCPB Co-Chair Steve Rudman, which reflected on the TCPB's process to develop and approve the plan.

Abby, and staff from Washington, Clackamas, and Multnomah Counties took turns presenting the plan. They presented an overview of coordinated entry and summarized the Racial Equity Lens Tool (RELT) that was used to review the plan. They presented the plan's strategies and identified the key deliverables, milestones, budget, metrics, and timeline. The overall budget for implementing the strategies in the plan is \$1,195,000. Implementation would begin in October 2024 with refinement of objectives and strategies and partner engagement lasting through 2025. Piloting plan strategies would begin in January 2026. 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.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

• **Question, Dan**: What is the ultimate goal? Is it to get live calls in all the counties? In working together, do you find that there are a lot of crossover of individuals going to different counties for support?



- Washington County response, Kisa Quanbeck: A live call system is not a stated goal, but a default of one of the goals. Aligning coordinated entry system questions will improve call efficiency and participants will not have to answer the same questions if they are receiving assessments in multiple counties.
- Clackamas County response, Lauren Decker: Improved accessibility is the goal, which can be a variety of things including answering live calls or setting up recurring times in the library. For crossover, the assumption is yes. Part of the goal is to be transparent, work together, and collaborate.
- Metro response, Abby: The whole purpose of having a regional measure is knowing there is regional movement.
- **Response, Peter**: As a provider, I can think of multiple families that are connecting to multiple counties.
- **Question, Jim**: What kind of data will be collected to evaluate this plan and when might this Committee expect to review that data?
 - Metro response, Abby: TCPB Implementation Plan reporting will be wrapped into the SHS reporting this Committee receives, either quarterly or annually beginning in March 2025.
- **Question, Peter**: I am surprised to see 2027 as the due dates, while we want quality work to be done, 2027 is far out. Why are we not creating a singular coordinated entry system for the region? Having worked in coordinated entry in three states, it is pretty similar. If one county has a great program, why can it not be expanded regionally?
 - Clackamas County response, Melissa Baker: Coordinated entry systems are meant to be tailored to the community they serve. Each county is unique in population and need, and having one system for all counties would impact the quality of service. Some states have multiple systems within one county.
 - o **Clackamas County response, Lauren**: We looked at making a regional system but changes to each local system to align a regional system need to happen slowly.
 - Metro response, Liam Frost: TCPB members and others have raised this suggestion. Regionalization is an iterative process, and we want to ensure changes will not have unanticipated impacts.
- **Question, Kai**: How will we know if this is being implemented in the way it is intended to be? How will we track progress to know if we are moving closer or farther away from the goal?
 - Washington County response, Kisa: This is built into the longer strategy proposal. We will do an analysis at the beginning to get a picture of where we are at, then another analysis after the pilot phase, and then continual reevaluation of systems to meet the goals of the program.
 - Metro response, Abby: Metrics are attached to each strategy to be accountable for improvements.

Josh facilitated the vote to approve the TCPB implementation plan. The Committee approved the plan.

- Yay: Margarita, Jim, Jenny, Kai, Co-chair Taylor, Dan, Jenny, Carter, Mitch Chilcott, Cara Hash
- Nav: Peter

Presentation: Annual Regional Report Timeline & FY24 Recommendation Parameters

Yesenia reminded the Committee that the counties will present their annual reports at the next meeting. She reviewed the Committee's roles and responsibilities related to the annual report and



the report timeline, which starts in October 2024 and ends in March 2025. She reviewed the timeline of the Committee meetings and topics.

Co-chair Taylor presented an overview of the Committee's recommendation parameters. He highlighted that the Committee should focus on limiting the number of recommendations and deepening the recommendations.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Peter**: Has Metro begun scheduling to get on county board agendas? Does the TCPB do an annual report? Is there a way to change the timeline of the report in the future?
 - Metro response, Yesenia: We have started coordinating with staff. If the dates are scheduled in March, that puts a hard deadline on the report. Only this Committee does the annual report, the TCPB's work will be rolled up into it. Metro has thought about timelines internally, but the intergovernmental agreement (IGA) deadlines with the counties state their annual reports are due on October 31, which begins this Committee's process.
 - **Response, Peter**: If there was a ballot measure to make changes, perhaps the timeline could be updated then as well.
- **Question, Kai**: Is the November 4th meeting in person?
 - o **Metro response, Yesenia:** It is virtual only now.

Discussion: FY25 Budget and Work Plans

Yesenia shared that the Co-chairs requested more time to discuss questions regarding the counties' FY 25 final work plans.

Co-chair Taylor reflected that Clackamas County reported growth in provider partnerships, yet workforce capacity was still an issue. He noted that this was something to consider and asked how as a Committee they should be monitoring issues and encourage greater transparency.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Dan:** With regional housing funding discussions moving forward, what does our funding look like for 2025, and when does that change?
 - Metro Response, Patricia: The Metro Finance Department provides a five-year forecast. Let's hold this question until Metro staff determine implementation timelines.
- **Question, Kai**: The service provider bottleneck challenge Multnomah County presented was interesting. Are there any solutions to that? What are the obstacles to seeing funding trickle down to providers? It would be helpful to see where those bottlenecks occur.
 - Metro Response, Yesenia: The Committee raised similar questions about this, and we will follow up with Multnomah County. The Annual Report mechanism can include recommendations for implementations next year.

Co-chair Taylor stated that Committee members can reach out to the Co-chairs if any additional comments or questions arise.

Next Steps

Josh thanked the Committee and staff for their participation.



Next steps include:

- Metro to continue to provide updates regarding the regional housing funding update to the Committee.
- Metro to follow up with Multnomah County on the provider bottleneck challenge.
- The Committee to meet on November 4, 9:30am-12:00pm.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.