



## Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services (SHS) Oversight Committee Meeting  
Date: December 9, 2024  
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.  
Place: Virtual meeting (Zoom)  
Purpose: Metro five-year forecast presentation, Tri-County Planning Body technical assistance updates, discuss recommendations for annual regional report.

---

### Member attendees

Co-Chair Dr. Mandrill Taylor (he/him), Co-chair Mike Savara (he/him), Peter Rosenblatt (he/him), Kai Laing (he/him), Felicita Montebianco (she/her), Jeremiah Rigsby (he/him), Margarita Solis Ruiz (she/her), Dan Fowler (he/him), Dr. James (Jim) Bane (he/him), Jenny Lee (she/her), Mitch Chilcott (he/him)

### Absent members

Carter MacNichol (he/him), Cara Hash (she/her)

### Elected delegates

Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington (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 Councilor Christine Lewis (she/her)

### Metro

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

### Kearns & West Facilitator

Josh Mahar (he/him)

*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.*

### Welcome and Introductions

Co-chairs Dr. Mandrill Taylor and Mike Savara provided opening remarks and shared updates regarding the Population A and B letter they shared with Metro and the three counties. They shared that they received response letters from the jurisdictions and the next steps include meeting with the jurisdictional leadership team and identifying ways to move forward. They reflected that the Committee had a clear interest in having a focused discussion on housing funding and they will follow up with the Committee to schedule a work session.

Josh Mahar, Kearns & West Facilitator, facilitated introductions between Committee members and reviewed the meeting agenda and objectives.

## Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Peter Rosenblatt reminded the Committee that Carter MacNichol was not able to attend but had emailed comments regarding the five-year forecast.

### Conflict of Interest Declaration

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

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.

Jenny Lee declared that she works at the Coalition of Communities of Color, which has partnerships with organizations that receive SHS funding.

### Public Comment

No public comment was received.

### Five-Year Forecast

Josh Hardwood, Metro, stated that he received Carter's comments and that his comments reflected the chicken-and-egg scenario with revenue and expenditure forecasts. Josh Hardwood noted that this forecast was for revenues and reviewed the FY23-24 variability graph, the FY24/25- FY29/30 forecast graph, and the Oregon capital gains graph (see pages 60-65 in the [12/09/24 archived meeting packet](#)). He shared that 2024 ended 6% below forecast, that the local economy is doing worse than the national economy, and that the next two years are expected to be slow to no growth. He reflected that long-term growth in tax collections is dependent on the Metro region attracting investment.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Peter:** There was information in the meeting packet about how some taxpayers have not paid yet and others, who have paid, are getting refunded. I use H&R Block to pay taxes, and their program does not know this tax exists. It is challenging for me to have siloed discussions without discussing corresponding items like expenditures and cash flows. I hope in the future we can place our discussions into the context that is needed. I would also like to know more about the potential impacts of the volatility of the tax on housing developments.
  - **Metro response, Josh Hardwood:** The tax is available in other programs like TurboTax, and we are working on expanding the programs that incorporate this tax.
  - **Response, Co-chair Savara:** From the last meeting I heard a request to hear from county leadership both regarding the housing funding reform and the five-year forecast. We are working on finding the right time and opportunity to bring in county staff.
- **Comment, Washington County Chair Kathryn Harrington:** I appreciate the clarity about the conditions you foresee and how enforcement of the tax has helped with revenue collections.

## Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

- **Question, Co-chair Taylor:** Can you elaborate on what local investments can drive future incomes?
  - **Metro response, Josh Hardwood:** I am talking about professional investments in the region, like Intel and Nike where the average employee is a high-income earner. Large professional, long-term investments from outside the region can help us.
- **Question, Dan:** I would like to know more about when areas of deficiency occur and when the Committee gets that information to discuss. There are two nebulous areas of expenditure: collection cost and Metro staffing. Are there ways to lower those costs? It would be helpful to get the big picture and numbers related to Metro's full-time employee (FTE) growth, FTE in collections, and administration and personnel costs from each county.
  - **Metro response, Yesenia Delgado:** Each year we get better at trying to have a coherent and strategic way for the Committee to provide feedback and input, and there is still room for improvements. County expenditures and broader financial information will be available in the annual report and the Committee can discuss that as part of that process. As Co-chair Savara stated, we are trying to identify opportunities to hear from the counties sooner.
  - **Metro response, Josh Hardwood:** To clarify, tax collection costs are 100% for our city partners to cover the cost of tax administration and that component is baked in until 2031.
- **Comment, Kai:** Cost is not our group's responsibility. We can fixate on cutting costs, but it is important to focus on capacity as well. We had a lot of revenue, so capacity was ramped up, and it is important to not swing in the other direction. If we cut staff, then there will not be people to do the work. I encourage the group to maintain the mission as its long-term goal.

### Tri-County Planning Body (TCPB) Technical Assistance Updates

Yesenia shared that the Committee would receive updates on the technical assistance and training goals from the TCPB and noted that the implementation plan would come later. She reminded the Committee that training and technical assistance were part of their recommendations from last year.

Cole Merkel and Nui Bezaire, Metro introduced themselves and noted that this presentation will only focus on technical assistance (TA) updates. The Committee will tentatively receive a training update in March. They expect to come back and ask for approval on the implementation plan in April. They noted that these goal areas are being funded through Metro's administration funding.

Cole and Nui reviewed the goals of Metro's Regional Capacity Team and noted that there are now 67 technical assistance consultants qualified to provide regional services. They presented Metro's permanent supportive housing (PSH) work to develop a regional framework that includes programmatic policies, regionally consistent definitions, and standards of practice. They reviewed the PSH project's guiding values and goals, including avoiding duplicating efforts and building a regional TA program. They reviewed the project structure, and the benefits providers would receive by being a part of the project.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Felicita Monteblanco:** Funders love TA. Can you clarify that this PSH exploration is step one of the whole project? If I am a nonprofit, how do I access these resources?
  - **Metro response, Cole:** We want to identify what role Metro can play in supporting providers. We are focusing on services and provider needs related to PSH to inform future work. Counties have set up their own TA doorways.

## Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

- **Question, Co-chair Taylor:** Are there metrics for what success looks like for this demonstration project?
  - **Metro response, Nui:** There are best practices that have been put forward. This project is about using those as a starting place and then learning and developing our regional lens.
- **Comment, Peter:** I appreciate that we will not be voting on the budget, but it would be helpful to see the budget to understand the big picture and what funds and staffing levels at Metro look like.
- **Question, Dan:** I appreciate the comments on measuring success, the feedback loop is critical. Can you explain why it is okay to currently use SHS funding for PSH?
  - **Metro response, Cole:** There are three components to PSH: the unit, rent voucher, and services. We cannot spend SHS funds on the unit, but we can spend on rent vouchers and services. This effort is specifically focused on services.
  - **Comment, Peter:** As a provider, the first time I heard PSH I thought it did not apply to us, but now I understand how expansive PSH is.
  - **Metro response, Patricia Rojas:** Part of our role as funders is to support regionalization of the work and to understand what goes into regionalization and that is also part of why SHS funding is going towards this effort.
- **Comment, Co-chair Savara:** As a state employee it has been great to get outreach from Metro on what has been done, what has worked, and what is challenging. Reflecting on Metro's role as a funder, there is a difference between being a funder and a pass-through agency. As a funder, Metro needs to have an infrastructure of staff to analyze outcomes, reports, and recommendations.

### Recommendations Discussion

Yesenia reviewed the Committee's roles and responsibilities for the annual reports and the FY 23 recommendation categories: financial and data transparency and accountability, program expansions, regional communication and engagement, workforce and capacity issues, and outreach.

Yesenia shared updates on the recommendations within the financial and data transparency and accountability category. For the "optimize financial reporting" recommendation, she noted that two components were in progress and three were completed. She mentioned that Metro and two of the counties had reached an impasse regarding a data monitoring framework.

Hunter Belgard, Metro, reviewed the "enhance data integrity" recommendations and provided updates. He noted that three recommendations have been completed and that three are in progress. He noted that Committee members can check the Metro progress tracker website for specific updates. Hunter reviewed the "evaluate to inform improvement" recommendations and provided updates. He noted that one recommendation has been completed and that two are in progress.

Lizzie Cisneros, Metro, reviewed the "strengthen implementation of new programs" recommendations and provided updates. She noted that the two recommendations are in progress.

Israel Bayer, Metro, reviewed the "regional communication strategy" recommendations and provided updates. He highlighted that the RFQU for a consultant to develop a regional communication strategy to be fully implemented in Spring 2025 will be released in Winter 2025.

Ruth Adkins, Metro, reviewed the "institute livable wages" and "expand access to health and behavioral health services" recommendations, and provided updates. She highlighted that these recommendations align with the TCPB's goals and recommendations and shared updates on their progress.

## Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Yesenia reviewed the remaining workforce and capacity issue recommendations and outreach recommendations and shared updates. She noted the connection of these items to Metro's TA work and the counties' work to provide multi-year contracts.

Yesenia reviewed the Committee's parameters for the FY 24 recommendations, including focusing on the depth of recommendations and limiting the overall number of recommendations.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Comment, Peter:** I am not sure what organizations Clackamas County is giving multi-year contracts. I would like to hear more at our next meeting about the two counties rejecting the monitoring framework. This reminds me of the Population A and B responses. It seems that counties can opt in and out of what they choose. For healthcare integration, I always hear about HealthShare, but never Trillium. Living wages are a long-term issue and SHS funding is a beneficial way to be able to pay front-line staff an equitable wage.
  - **Metro response, Ruth:** Great point about Trillium, we have done some outreach, but we did start with HealthShare since they are the largest provider in the region.
- **Comment, Co-chair Savara:** One theme this year is how decision-making happens in this space. The intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) lay out how decision-making should happen, but it is not being actualized in the way that it needs to, and that is impacting our ability to have oversight and accountability. For our recommendations this year, we should think about how to set the framework to allow these things to effectively happen.
- **Comment, Felicita:** I agree with Peter's comments on wages. Multnomah County did not give a timeframe for payments, and I would like to know what that is. Regarding Co-chair Savara's comments, I imagine that the upcoming ballot measure is making things complicated and that the IGAs will be wiped clean on July 1.
  - **Metro response, Yesenia:** We can follow up with Multnomah County to get that information.
- **Comment, Washington County Chair Harrington:** I was unaware of the fact that there was a disagreement regarding the monitoring framework. I like to think of myself as a problem solver and if the decision makers are unaware, the process is not working.

### Next Steps

Yesenia asked the Committee to share any remaining questions or comments regarding the recommendation update over email.

Next steps include:

- Co-chairs and jurisdictional leadership to discuss next steps regarding Population A and B.
- The Committee to discuss housing funding updates at a work session.
  - Metro and Co-chairs to support scheduling.
  - The Committee to discuss the potential impacts of the volatility of the tax on housing developments.
- Metro to follow up with Multnomah County to get specific timeline payment information.
- The Committee to meet on January 13, 9:30am-12:00pm.

### Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.