



Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services (SHS) Oversight Committee Meeting
Date: January 27, 2025
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual meeting (Zoom)
Purpose: Receive Metro tax collection and disbursement update, receive FY24 admin costs update, receive FY24 technical regional report status update, review FY24 transmittal letter, review FY24 recommendations.

Member attendees

Dr. James (Jim) Bane (he/him), Co-chair Mike Savara (he/him), Peter Rosenblatt (he/him), Kai Laing (he/him), Cara Hash (she/her), Felicita Monteblando (she/her), Dan Fowler (he/him), Jeremiah Rigsby (he/him), Jenny Lee (she/her)

Absent members

Co-Chair Dr. Mandrill Taylor (he/him), Carter MacNichol (he/him), Mitch Chilcott (he/him), Margarita Solis Ruiz (she/her)

Elected delegates

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

Absent elected delegates

Multnomah County Chair Jessica Vega Pederson (she/her)

Metro staff

Yesenia Delgado (she/her), Breanna Hudson (she/her), Yvette Perez-Chavez (she/her), Valeria McWilliams (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.

Summary of Meeting Decisions

- The committee did not take any formal votes during this meeting.

Welcome and Introductions

Co-chair Mike Savara provided opening remarks and reflected on the 2025 Portland Tri-County Point in Time Count as an important moment for the housing and homeless system, where surveys and data will be collected about where people experiencing homelessness slept on the night of January 22nd.

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

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.

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

Jenny Lee declared she works at Coalition of Communities of Color, which received SHS funding.

Public Comment

No public comment was received.

Metro Finance Update

Jane Marie Ford, Metro, provided a Metro finance update on monthly tax disbursement. She provided a high-level overview of the full memo in the meeting packet.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Dr. Jim Bane:** I have hard time understanding the line-graph data, is there another way this data could be displayed?
 - **Comment, Peter:** I agree.
 - **Metro response, Jane:** Yes, I can do that. We are currently testing a new month-to-month graph. We can share an online clickable graph so folks can see the data differently.

Yesenia Delgado, Metro, provided information on administrative rates and what Metro is seeing. Currently, Metro does not have a mechanism to collect rates from service providers, but they do from counties. Jane shared an analysis on this, and Yesenia asked what information the Committee needs to have the conversation around administrative and service rates.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Comment, Peter:** I appreciate seeing this, and I am confused. There is a difference between administrative rates, what we put in the contract, and what the true cost of that work is. I think we could explore these differences, and I suspect we would find significant gaps in what's contracted versus what's overhead rates.
- **Comment, Felicita Montebianco:** Thank you for this. This data is really critical to the non-profit sustainability conversation. I hope there is an opportunity to create a floor, to have an automatic percentage that the counties can provide, and then create opportunity for providers to have negotiations.
- **Question, Co-chair Savara:** It is difficult to understand county contracting processes. I suggest we have a future topic around county contracting with specific county staff here to discuss this. What is informing their planning and thinking around budgeting for their needs?
 - **Metro response, Yesenia:** On the administrative side of things, I think this a good first step toward that conversation. It is helpful to hear this and we will follow up with our county partners to see what additional information we can get. We are

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

scheduling workplan and budget presentations later this spring and into the summer.

- **Question, Dan:** If 10% is the contracted rate versus an actual rate, do you give your actual rates as a non-profit? It would be nice to know what the difference is.
 - **Peter response:** Not many funders want to know the true and accurate cost of your services. The true and accurate costs of programming is unknown to counties. They only know what they are asking for.
- **Comment, Mike:** I want to know if we are keeping rates at 10%, at that maximum limit. If we are under 15%, we need to understand the reason. We should be matching the federal government's posture on this.

Jane Marie shared that she would be happy to answer any follow up questions via email.

FY24 Technical Report Update

Kris Smock, Kristina Smock Consulting, reviewed the drafted FY24-25 Annual Report. She shared that the report is intended to provide a comprehensive summary and analysis. The revised draft that the committee received in [the meeting packet](#)^[OBJ:OBJ] incorporated feedback from the committee. To address committee comments, Kris added additional framing and contextual information throughout the Report and Transmittal Letter. She will incorporate the final fiscal update into the report. The final Technical Report and final revised Transmittal Letter will be in the February SHS Meeting Packet for the committee's final review and approval.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Comment, Felicita:** I request that we receive redlined documents so we can follow the changes made between meetings.
 - **Kris' response:** Yes, we can do that.
- **Comment, Dan:** I would like to see us incorporate a clear picture of tax collection data.
 - **Kris response:** We can try to include a link to the updated dashboard for the most clear and up-to-date data capture.

FY24 Transmittal Letter Review

Introductory Section

Kris started by going over the introductory section of the Transmittal Letter, which includes a brief introduction, the role of the measure and committee, the purpose of the report, and framing around the status of SHS as Metro moves into the second part of implementation.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Comment, Peter:** It is important to note that the report covers a certain timespan, but we are sending it out in a different timespan. Shortly into the new timespan, Clackamas County Regional Long Term Rent Assistance (RLRA) hit its cap and because of possible budget challenges, they are pulling back. We may want to indicate, with an asterisk or footnote, the changes and the caps that may have happened after the timespan of this report.
 - **Kris response:** You are getting at a challenge Metro faces each year with this report. We aim to present a comprehensive body of information. We could add some language noting this is focusing on a particular data set, and that data may have

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

changed when we give presentations about the report. I will try and add more clarifying language about what we saw through the end of the fiscal year.

- **Comment, Dan:** We have to keep in mind that not everyone will get a presentation, so that clarifying language in the report will be helpful.
- **Comment, Dr. Bane:** I appreciate the highlighted sentence. It is reflective of what I see in the report, and the times are changing.

Key Highlights Section

Kris reviewed the key highlights section, which serves as an executive summary of the key content of the report.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Peter:** I suggest adding a high-level introductory sentence on what projects the committee is working on. I am also confused on RLRA and the overlap with permanent supportive housing (PSH). Is all RLRA, PSH and vice versa?
 - **Kris response:** I can add more information on RLRA program policies and who it serves. RLRA is a tool to provide long term rent assistance and commonly used as a key component of PSH. One of the challenges referenced in the transmittal letter and recommendations are around needing to do work for greater alignment on PSH definitions.
 - **Metro response, Yesenia:** Kris spoke eloquently about this. They are not interchangeable, there are differences. In Summer 2024, the Metro PSH lead joined an SHS meeting to give a presentation, and we could link that meeting in the final report so folks can review that final presentation.

Challenges Section

Kris reviewed the challenges section, which focuses on four broad topic areas: growing need, competing priorities, financial oversight, and regional evaluation.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Comment, Peter:** Clackamas County has not had an LIP since April of 2022. Any additional indication would be incorrect. I think Washington County was the only county to create a multi-year expansive LIP, so maybe it can be written as a kudos to Washington County.
 - **Kris response:** There was general agreement among this group to keep the report focus at the regional level and not call out specific counties in the transmittal letter. But I will make sure the language is accurate.
- **Comment, Dr. Bane:** Related to the “growing need” section, I think that is an unrepresented challenge and is of extreme importance. The need is outpacing the resources. We need to know who this need is coming from. Who are the people coming into the system and what do they need? It would help to clarify who is coming into the system, and the data from the coordinated entry program could give us an up-to-date snapshot of who is coming in, where they are coming in, and what they need.
 - **Kris’ response:** That is a good point. We can look at the data and flush this section out a little bit.
- **Comment, Peter:** There may be some confusion in Clackamas County about this. Clackamas County former Board of Commissioners has different talking points than what this report

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

shows, this report is not how we have been talking about the data. Clackamas might need to see a call out of the region-specific data.

- **Kris' response:** I can talk about the range.

Kris indicated she would be providing an updated version, either redlined or highlighted by revised sections. Josh reminded the group to send any additional edits to Kris as soon as possible.

FY24 Recommendations Development

Kris provided a broad overview of the edits to the recommendations that were made after the committee's discussion in the January 13th meeting. Josh indicated that there would be a temperature check on these recommendations with the group following Kris' overview. Yvette displayed the drafted recommendations.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Comment, Peter:** As we look at the new priorities, I would like to see more sequences. I also want to see that providers want to be at the decision-making table. We want to be thought partners and help create the system and be a part of that accountability. It could expand in the provider partnership section, or in the oversight section. Metro, Counties, and providers need to be working together.

Josh called for a temperature check, asking members to share a thumbs up for full approval, a thumb sideways for approval but with some additional suggestions, and a thumbs down if they had concerns with approving the recommendations. A majority of the group indicated via thumbs up that the draft shared today incorporates the committee's thoughts and recommendations and that they would be comfortable approving the recommendations. Some group members indicated via thumbs sideways that they were comfortable with the recommendation but also had ideas for additional improvement. No members shared a thumbs down.

Josh facilitated discussion around final suggested improvements.

- **Comment, Co-chair Savara:** This generally captures our recommendations. There are a few recommendations where I do not think we have solidified a solution. I want to hear from other folks.
- **Comment, Peter:** I shared my thoughts moments ago.
- **Comment, Dr. Bane:** I appreciate and generally like the recommendations. I missed the last meeting, and have not seen a meeting summary, so I am not really sure I understand everyone's thoughts and how these recommendations came to light. I want to review the last meeting summary.
 - **Josh response:** I know that meeting summary is working its way through internal approval and we will make sure you receive it and aim for a quicker turnaround on those.
- **Comment, Kai Laing:** It is good to see the group's additional suggestions for refinement, and this is good as written.
- **Comment, Jeremiah Rigsby:** I agree with a lot of the things folks are saying around providers. I care about jurisdictional partnerships and decision-making space. I am concerned about the swirl around Metro and the counties' roles and am wondering what our role is as we think about oversight bodies moving forward.

Supportive Housing Services Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

- **Comment, Felicita:** I want to give major kudos to Kris for this work. The only thing that stood out to me was some of the language on page 8 and 9 of the letter around oversight and accountability and jurisdictional partnerships. I wrote out my suggested changes in the chat:
 - Page 9 suggested rephrasing: *The oversight committee recommends that collaborative efforts to shape the processes and requirements of the SHS measure are consistently used. The Committee requests that a framework for decision-making be agreed upon by the Counties and Metro with a process that ensures the Oversight Committee itself can enact decisional authority on key topics relating to the oversight of the SHS funds.*
 - Page 8 suggested rephrasing: *The SHS Oversight Committee through Metro staff should be empowered to conduct core oversight functions in alignment with funder best practices. This includes performance monitoring, evaluation, and compliance activities on a regular basis.*
 - **Kris Response:** I would like to hear from committee members if they are comfortable with these recommended changes.
- **Comment, Co-chair Savara:** I fully support the recommended changes here. For the first one, I love the idea of creating a framework that Metro would work with the counties on. That framework should encompass how decisions on funding are made and bring clarity to who makes budget decisions or why they are made. There have been times when that has not been clear. I like that this elevates the committee's role of meaningful oversight.
- **Comment, Peter:** I agree with what Mike beautifully said.
- **Comment, Dan:** I am wrestling with this tension, but where does it exist? The funding and oversight of this measure is from the top down and region-wide, while the delivery is bottom up. It comes from the nonprofits and the counties. Policy is better with cooperation and consensus decision-making. We have to decide things collaboratively. I support the language Felicita put forward. I really like the language in the oversight and accountability section.
- **Comment, Cara Hash:** I have no additional thoughts. Felicita's additional language captures that piece.
- **Comment, Jenny:** I echo that. Thank you, Felicita, and thank you Kris for your work on this.

Josh asked folks to indicate their support for Felicita's proposed updates, and there was full agreement among committee members to incorporate Felicita's recommended language. Josh noted that the group will officially vote on these in the next meeting.

Next Steps

Yesenia stated that feedback on the draft report would be incorporated into the next version, with the hope of voting on the draft at the February 10th meeting. All additional feedback or questions should be sent to Kris as soon as possible. Yesenia will reach out to members not in attendance to bring them up to speed. Depending on the vote on February 10th, we will begin to work on the presentations to counties and Metro Council. The Metro Council presentation is scheduled for March 4th, Multnomah County on March 18th, and Washington County on April 1st. We are still working on scheduling Clackamas County.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:23am.