



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 Montebianco (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.