



Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services (SHS) Oversight Committee Meeting
Date: November 4, 2024
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual meeting (Zoom)
Purpose: Annual report presentations from Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties.

Member attendees

Co-Chair Dr. Mandrill Taylor (he/him), Co-chair Mike Savara (he/him), Peter Rosenblatt (he/him), Carter MacNichol (he/him), Cara Hash (she/her), Kai Laing (he/him), Felicita Monteblanco (she/her), Jeremiah Rigsby (he/him), Margarita Solis Ruiz (she/her), Dan Fowler (he/him)

Absent members

Mitch Chilcott (he/him), Jenny Lee (she/her)

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)

Kearns & West Facilitator

Ben Duncan (he/him)

Welcome and Introductions

Co-chairs Dr. Mandrill Taylor and Mike Savara provided opening remarks and reflected on the Committee's role in providing tools and resources for the counties.

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

The Committee had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Peter Rosenblatt:** Can you remind us of who the annual report audience is?
 - **Facilitator response, Ben:** Metro will answer this in their presentation.

Conflict of Interest Declaration

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

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

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

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.

Public Comment

Tiffany Graven provided public comment asking how to access health-related support besides Care Oregon and reflected on her lived and organizational experience with housing, noting that she applied to join the Committee.

Presentation: Metro Framing for Annual Representations

Yesenia Delgado, Metro presented an overview of the counties' annual report process. She reviewed what information and data is included and that the Co-chairs and Metro staff developed prompts to inform the presentations. She stated that the county reports inform the Committee as it drafts its annual regional report, which is a high-level review of the counties' performance, successes, and challenges, and includes Committee recommendations. The audience for the Committee's report is the Metro Council, each county's Board of Commissioners, the Tri-County Planning Body, and the general public.

Presentation and Discussion: Washington County Annual Report

Jes Larson, Washington County, shared a story about an individual who has transitioned from an encampment to a bridge shelter and now has a Regional Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA) apartment. She shared that Washington County spent 100% of its budget and served over 10,000 people with SHS-funded services. She reviewed each program's outcomes for Populations A and B and reviewed the progress made towards the ten-year goal. Overall, Population A is being served at 58% and B at 42%.

Nicole Stingham, Washington County, presented on outcomes and shared that Attachment F of the report includes an equity analysis. She noted that the SHS program has better reach than other programs in the county and that the next steps include receiving feedback from culturally specific providers and formalizing the racial equity lens across the department. She presented a financial overview detailing SHS spending for the fiscal year. Overall, SHS funds housed 2,941 people and unsheltered homeless declined by 35.5%.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Peter:** I am saddened about the eviction prevention funds decrease and hope the system can find a way to elevate that issue and find solutions. Your shelter goal was 200, and you almost doubled that, but what is the context of the overall need?
 - **Washington County response, Jes:** We hope the Medicaid waiver can help leverage SHS funds. SHS resources are not enough to end homelessness, but the hope is to end chronic homelessness with limited resources.
- **Comment, Peter:** As the Committee thinks of its report, how do we talk about what Jes just said? It would help to create a larger picture to know about the other available funds and what the overall gap is.

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

- **Comment, Felicitia Monteblanco:** From a philanthropy perspective, I am also curious about other available funds and gaps to help connect the dots.
- **Question, Metro Councilor Christine Lewis:** How is Washington County tracking and reporting Populations A and B? I have heard some concerns about how we maintain definitions. I had heard stories that when someone was deemed Population A and then matched with rent assistance, that seemed like bad data.
 - **Washington County response, Jes:** We received guidance from Metro and are using that. The definitions are built into the coordinated entry assessment and are captured in the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data. To pull data, we pull each person and what services were provided. Sometimes it can be challenging to get data from participants. Some spikes can happen and Population A can use RLRA.
- **Co-chair Savara:** Eviction prevention funding does not flow through the county; it flows through Community Action. The Population A and B data for each county is displayed differently. Did Metro provide a template?
 - **Washington County response, Jes:** The annual report is different than the quarterly template. The template provided is a checklist of elements, not a form of data the counties enter. There was a separate Excel document shared between finance teams, but there were errors in the document.
- **Question, Carter:** I agree with Peter on the gap and understanding the greater need. I heard you would like to consider a change from the 25/75 percentage split for Population A and B, do you not have a Population A need? As Metro is considering diverting SHS funds to other uses, I hope that the eviction prevention gap issue is considered. It is important to balance service and capital needs.
 - **Washington County response, Jes:** We have unmet needs for Population A. It is important to highlight that as we service more Population A households, we will see a reduction in household diversity which reflects the demographics of Population A in Washington County. There is an assumption that Population A programs are more expensive to operate than Population B programs, but that is not true they are about equal in cost.
- **Comment, Jim Bane:** Congratulations. I want to emphasize that we do not want Population B to become Population A. I hope the new reporting system allows us to get accurate data on who is coming into what system and what the needs are. The racial equity data from eviction prevention highly skews the way you want it to. The public has an impression that many houseless individuals need services, but the dynamic and systemic problem is that more people are becoming houseless.
- **Question, Co-chair Taylor:** Are we tracking unexpected expenditures? I know there are reserves, but it may be good to check for patterns and when budgets are exceeded knowing why. Overall, great job Washington County.
 - **Washington County response, Jes:** We are getting to the level of details of what a shelter bed costs and what the cost is of launching a pod village. The underspending from the first two years helped cover unexpected costs like electricity setup, but now all resources are accounted for and there are going to be values-based choices.
- **Question, Dan Fowler:** When thinking about the report audience, some people will notice the unmatched nature between the quarterly and annual reports. Are they going to match in the future?
 - **Metro response, Yesenia:** Ensuring better quarterly, annual, and financial reports was part of last year's Committee's recommendations. Quantifying program services are different, and we will have exciting updates to share next month. We were able

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

to connect reports to financial templates and will work with county partners to coordinate reports.

- **Comment, Ben:** Jerimiah Rigsby is not here, but he always raises the point of direct outreach which was captured in the presentation.
- **Comment, Co-chair Savara:** I appreciate the racial equity data work. Regarding the disparities, it is important to determine interventions and have those communities share what works for them.

Presentation and Discussion: Multnomah County Annual Report

Breanna Flores, Multnomah County, shared a story about an individual who has navigated housing programs and Multnomah County's progress toward LIP goals. Multnomah County has reached 68% of its 10-year LIP goal, served 2,322 people with SHS funds, and people of color are being placed at higher rates than they are experiencing houselessness. She reviewed outcomes for Population A and B by each program, overall, Population A is being served at 71% and B at 29%. She shared an overview of the provider partnership and capacity-building investments over the past year including \$10 million in flexible spending across 61 providers.

Kanoe Egleston, Multnomah County, presented on racial equity advancements highlighting intentional Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) representation on advisory bodies and prioritizing BIPOC household investments. She shared a financial overview and that the County reached its spending target and met its corrective action plan, for a total of spending over \$143 million.

Dan Field, Multnomah County, encouraged the Committee to take a big-picture view of what the Committee sees in all three counties when putting together its report. He noted that SHS work will quickly become a limited resource, and commitments will exceed revenue if there are changes to the SHS measure. He asked the Committee to consider how proposed revenue reductions would impact committed investments and how the diversion of funds would impact momentum.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Comment, Felicita:** I appreciate the work Multnomah County has done. The advance payment model pilot is exciting, and I hope other jurisdictions take this on.
- **Question, Peter:** When taking a big-picture view, it is important to have context and include other funding streams and the goal and size of the system needed. It looks like three agencies billed significantly more than their contract allocation; can you explain why?
 - **Multnomah County response, Kanoe:** We can follow up, but likely that was due to expanding day services.
 - **Multnomah County response, Dan Field:** I encourage the Committee to understand the impacts of diverting funds. Our reality is that all funds are committed.
- **Comment, Dan Fowler:** To understand what impacts could be, it would be helpful to know what is being spent by providers and by the administration. We collected more than anticipated, are we spending more than anticipated? It is critical to understand the real revenue to understand impacts.
 - **Multnomah County response, Dan Field:** The City of Portland recently referenced the underspending, and we had to remind them that was two years ago. It is important to speak to the public currently and accurately that we are no longer underspending.

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

- **Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington:** There seems to be an ask for Metro to take the data from each county and put it together regionally for the Committee to view. It also sounds like the Committee is asking for each county to account for all funds regardless of source, and that is beyond the counties' reporting scope and is out of the Committee's scope. The counties report on SHS measure goals in the quarterly and annual reports.
- **Response, Peter:** I agree that it is outside our purview, and at some level, an entity needs to look at the entire piece so the Committee can determine if SHS funds are being spent adequately.
- **Question, Felicita:** Would it be appropriate to ask Metro to have a better sense of the different funding streams and how they interact with each other?
 - **Metro response, Yesenia:** SHS was always intended to be an additive to existing funding structures. There is data requested on leveraged funds and how other funding streams work in combination with SHS.
- **Comment, Co-chair Savara:** The values of the measure and our approach are about connecting people to services and solving the problems they are experiencing. The conversation is about finding the right balance between shelter and RLRA vouchers. The dollars are flexible to do both, and we need to think about how we want to show up as a regional community. Homelessness is a systemic problem because of the lack of affordable housing. Part of the big picture is understanding that proportion.
- **Comment, Dan Fowler:** Housing is a piece of the system, and we need to do the right thing with SHS funding. Political leaders want our support or comment on any proposed changes, but the system needs to be set up to survive.

Presentation and Discussion: Clackamas County Annual Report

Vahid Brown, Clackamas County, reviewed Clackamas County's progress towards its annual goals and shared that the first Native American youth and family center was built and that the County received the National Association of Counties Award for coordinated entry. He noted that the County did not meet its household furnishing contract goal which moved into a regional conversation, but the other goals were met. He reviewed the County's LIP progress, and that Population A is 62% served and Population B is 38% served. He shared that investments in culturally specific providers have significantly increased and Black and Native American demographics are now more represented. He highlighted that they are forming a new advisory body with the hope of reviewing all funding streams together. He shared a financial overview of the budget and actuals of each program, noting that most spending has tripled since last year.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Co-chair Taylor:** I noticed that the systems infrastructure exceeded the budget, but the actual infrastructure was less than budgeted. Can you speak to the barriers to spending on actual infrastructure?
 - **Clackamas County response, Vahid:** System infrastructure included carryover spending, mainly on expanding the coordinated housing access system to be a responsive system, which was achieved. System spending also includes technical assistance and capacity building. The reason capital infrastructure spending is lower than anticipated is that while capital infrastructure spendings were approved, such as the Clackamas Village, these investments did not land in this fiscal year.
- **Question, Metro Councilor Lewis:** For the furnishing contract, that idea was raised at the Tri-County Planning Body but does not fit into the six goal areas. Do you see a clear path

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

forward or is there tension between what counties would like to see regionalized and the six TCPB goal areas?

- **Clackamas County response, Vahid:** Staff from Metro and the three counties have been discussing how this fits and we are still brainstorming.
- **Facilitator response, Ben:** The TCPB is exploring how to move things forward outside of the goal areas. The Committee has referenced TCPB work in its annual report, and the TCPB is an audience of the report.
- **Peter:** Why is the Regional Investment Fund (RIF) underspent? It is important to talk about geographic equity and the SHS ripple effect. Without SHS, the largest geographic parts of Clackamas County would not be receiving funding. The other counties spoke about eviction prevention, did I miss that in your presentation?
 - **Clackamas County response, Vahid:** The RIF is the 5% of SHS funding the three counties set aside for regional strategies and investments. There has been some expenditure, but now the TCPB is approving funding for the RIF. We did have a goal for eviction prevention and similarly, the funds go through Community Action.

Next Steps

Yesenia thanked county staff for presenting and reminded Committee members they had all of November to review the reports before they meet again in December to begin the Committee's annual report process. She noted that Metro will share review tools for the report.

Ben encouraged newer Committee members to review last year's work.

Committee members had the following questions:

- **Question, Peter:** Can we receive today's presentation?
 - **Metro response, Yesenia:** Yes, we will share them in the final meeting packet.
- **Question, Carter:** Can we receive last year's report?
 - **Metro response, Yesenia:** Yes.

Co-chairs Taylor and Savara thanked everyone for their contributions and the progress made in the reports.

Next steps include:

- Multnomah County to follow up on why three agencies billed more than their contract allocation
- Metro to share the meeting's presentation and last year's annual report.
- The Committee to meet on December 2, 9:30am-12:00pm.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm.